U. S. Congress.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 76th CONGRESS
THIRD SESSION

Appendix

VOLUME 86—PART 17

AUGUST 6, 1940, TO SEPTEMBER 27, 1940

(PAGES 4801 TO 5932)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1941

DEPOSITED BY THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

JUL 3 '41

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 76th CONGRESS, THIRD SESSION

Appendix

Who Favors What?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. FRANCIS HARTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 6, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE BUFFALO EVENING NEWS

Mr. HARTER of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Buffalo Evening News in its issue of August 5, 1940. It seems to me that when the war tempo is obviously being "stepped up" it is well that all arguments should be brought to our attention. This editorial presents the question, "Who favors what?" in primarily discussing the proposed peacetime conscription bill, but, above all, it aptly brings out the noncommittal and conflicting positions taken by those in high authority—those who have confidential and technical knowledge, or at least have available to them confidential and technical information.

WHO FAVORS WHAT?

"Confusion thrice confounded" is the only phrase applicable to the military conscription issue after the three latest pronouncements on that all-important phase of national defense. The first statement, long overdue, came from President Roosevelt. It was this:

"I am distinctly in favor of a selective service training bill and I consider it essential to adequate national defense."

The President amplified this remark with a discussion of World War draft experience and the lesson of the present war that trained men are necessary in advance of an attack. It was all very edifying but contributed not one whit toward answering the one question in the minds of Congress and the people, namely, "Where does the President stand on the Burke-Wadsworth bill and the specific method of compulsory registration, selection, and military training provided therein?" On the curious ground that he did not want to be labeled "Mr. Dictator," the President refused to commit himself on the issues involved in the Burke-Wadsworth bill.

The second statement came in the form of a letter from former Secretary of War Harry H. Woodring to Senator ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG, of Michigan. Mr. Woodring declared emphatically that the traditional volunteer system of Army enlistment had not broken down, as implied by Army heads and others testifying before Congress, and urged that it be given a fair trial before any conscription plan was adopted. One of the reasons for the reluctance of young men to enlist in the Army, he said, was the unfair discrepancy between the Army base pay of $21 a month and the higher pay for Navy men and C. C. C. enrollees. Mr. Woodring said he had sought to correct this matter several months ago but had been turned down by the administration.

The third utterance came from Maj. Gen. James K. Parsons, commander of the Third Corps Area, who criticized conscription of "ungainly numbers" in an address to business and professional men completing 30 days of military training. General Parsons said that only men in the 18–31 age group should be registered and that only those of 21 should be drafted immediately for 2 years of training, not 1 year, as provided in the Burke-Wadsworth bill. This would give the Nation 500,000 trainees, as many as it truly needs and can train carefully. The general went contrary to the opinions expressed or implied by some of his superiors before Congress when he said that a relatively small but well-trained force was adequate for the defense of this country. "Alarmists who think we are wide open to attack are merely the victims of their own ignorance," General Parsons asserted. "The great need," he added, "is for a completely integrated national-defense plan, directed by one man and backed by a statement of just what area we want to protect."

The situation in Washington, aggravated by noncommittal or conflicting statements by the highest responsible authorities, is rapidly becoming detrimental to the national interest. Some form of compulsory military training is likely to become necessary in the near future, but here is the President, with the prime responsibility for recommending the proper measures, straddling the issue for obvious political reasons. Here is the Army, apparently divided on the question of the method and type of training most desirable. Here is a former Secretary of War in fundamental disagreement with the present Secretary on the need for immediate conscription. Here is the Burke-Wadsworth bill, originally drafted by a private group of citizens and sponsored by two political enemies of the President, hanging in midair as a sort of political punching bag while all other plans are held in abeyance. With 600,000 trained and partly trained soldiers available for service, there is no need for hasty action on the conscription issue. But there is a vital need for the President and the Army heads to assume their proper responsibility by stating exactly what form of training the country needs.

My Report to the People of Cowlitz County

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN F. SMITH

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 6, 1940

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, in conformity with my established practice I hereby render my report and account of my official record to the citizens of Cowlitz County.

I agree with the many thousands of citizens who have written to me that our first task remains that of keeping our country out of war. I shall continue my vigorous support of neutrality legislation. We are the only neutral nation in the world whose ships and citizens have not been attacked.

I shall cooperate vigorously in supporting President Roosevelt's national-defense program, and am remaining at my post of duty in order to do so.

May I take this opportunity to sincerely thank my fellow citizens for their kind expressions of approval of my work in Congress; their generous letters have been a source of inspiration and encouragement.

Influence in Congress depends upon seniority of service on important committees. Why throw away the influence of seniority and experience? What do candidates have to offer except their own personal ambition? I now rank sixth out of a membership of 27 on the powerful Rivers and Harbors Committee, having started at the bottom of the ladder in 1933. As a direct result, we have had more regular worthy river and harbor, jetty, and flood-control projects approved and carried out in southwest Washington during my period of service than during the entire previous history of our State. It is also my privilege to be chairman of the Pensions Committee, which gives me added rank and prestige in the House. I also am serving on the important Committee on Education, vital to the students and faculties in our public schools and colleges, and on the Indian Affairs and War Claims Committees.

When politicians are desperate they sometimes resort to issues of the most trivial and amusing nature, and this year for the first time the Congressman's county of legal residence is seemingly being made such an issue.

I have been a permanent resident of southwest Washington for 30 years and have been continuously visiting all the communities in the district and am, therefore, thoroughly familiar with conditions and problems in every community. However, length of residence in the district is important, for a comparative newcomer from a distant part of the State could not be expected to know our people nor our problems and would consequently not be qualified to represent our interests effectively.

The particular city or county in which the Congressman resides has absolutely no bearing on his effectiveness to serve his district, which depends on his length of service, his rank, and his experience.

SERVICE IN CONGRESS—THERE IS NO SUBSTITUTE FOR EXPERIENCE

The gentleman from Texas, Congressman MARVIN JONES, who is retiring after 24 years in Congress, paid a tribute the other day to the seasoned Members of the House.

The rest of the States, he said, should follow the example of Texas in reelecting its Congressmen, then they would control more committee chairmanships. Texas, with 21 Members in the House today holds 5 chairmanships, he pointed out. It is exceeded only by New York with 6 out of its 45 Members holding committee chairmanships. The Texas Congressman ended by quoting former Speaker Champ Clark:

> A man has to learn to be a Congressman just as he must learn to be a blacksmith, a carpenter, a farmer, an engineer, a lawyer, or a doctor.

IMPROVED BUSINESS CONDITIONS

The steady improvement in business conditions and recovery from the depths of 1929–33 continues.

I shall never forget the gloom and despair of the storekeepers, laborers, and farmers in 1932 when I visited Longview, Kelso, Castle Rock, Kalama, Silver Lake, Woodland, Ryderwood, and all the communities of Cowlitz County. There were hardly any jobs or money in circulation—prices were down and there was no market. Conditions are vastly different now, and we are far better situated than we were then.

GOVERNMENT AID AND COOPERATION

Not only has this beneficial change been wrought, but our Government has also aided and cooperated in the construction of many worth-while projects which make our local communities better places in which to live.

BONNEVILLE—RURAL ELECTRIFICATION

I am proud of my sponsorship of the Bonneville $70,000,000 project and rural electrification projects and shall exert every effort to bring their benefits to all our citizens.

An allotment of $55,000 was made available in July for construction of Cowlitz County's third rural electrification line. It will provide electric service for over 200 families in the Mount Pleasant, Carrolls, and Ostrander districts. The line will extend along 52 miles of county roads in the district to the north and south of Kelso. The R. E. A. lines constructed previously cover the Silver Lake, Toutle, and North Castle Rock areas and along the west side of the Cowlitz River into the Coal Creek region.

LONGVIEW SUBSISTENCE HOMESTEADS

I take pride in the fact that it has been my privilege to actively cooperate in the establishment of the Longview subsistence homesteads project, made possible by a P. W. A. grant of $164,304 by the Federal Government, which has been designated as No. 1 of its type in the United States. It is not only a credit to the 60 families who comprise the group of homesteaders, but it is also a great credit to the entire community of Longview and the civic leaders, public officials, and all public-spirited citizens and firms who collaborated so successfully in its establishment. Much credit properly goes to Mrs. Erma Johnson, local manager of the homesteads since their inception.

KELSO POST OFFICE

The citizens of Kelso have earnestly desired for many years the construction of a new Federal post-office building. I introduced my first bill to authorize its construction in 1933, and after several years of persistent effort succeeded in 1935 in securing the funds for the commencement of the building. The total cost for building, site, furnishings, and fixtures was $67,602, and is one of the finest post-office buildings of its size in the State of Washington.

Bills for post-office buildings for Castle Rock and other communities in Cowlitz County are in a favorable position. Their actual construction will depend upon the progress of the new public-building program. The latter is temporarily deferred owing to the emergency national-defense program.

LONGVIEW-KELSO ARMORY

I have introduced a bill for $100,000 Federal aid toward the construction of a new armory for Cowlitz County and the project has been referred to the Federal Works Agency. I have also sought to enlist the cooperation and support of the national-defense agencies.

WOODLAND WATER SYSTEM

The water system of Woodland will be reconstructed and extended as a result of a W. P. A. allotment of $25,875, the project application having received Presidential approval early in July.

FLOOD CONTROL

I secured the enactment by Congress of my bills for flood-control surveys of the Cowlitz, Columbia, Lewis, and Chehalis Rivers, following the disastrous floods of 1933. This was the first legislation to control the floods in this vicinity

ever enacted by Congress. We went to work immediately to enlist the active interest and financial aid of the Federal Government. We succeeded in the difficult task to have the Federal Government bear the entire cost instead of the local communities being required to contribute and match funds as had been done in other parts of the Nation, notably along the Mississippi, Ohio, and Sacramento Rivers and in other regions in which Federal aid for flood control had been provided in the past. I personally conferred with President Roosevelt, the Chief of United States Army Engineers, Hon. Harry L. Hopkins, Secretary Harold L. Ickes, and other officials of the Federal Government.

We have followed through with necessary legislation, appearances before congressional committees, Government departments and boards. As a result considerable diking and flood-control works have been constructed in all parts of Cowlitz County, at an aggregate cost of several million dollars.

I have my complete files of telegrams and correspondence with the Cowlitz County Flood Control Committee, Mr. J. M. McClelland, chairman; Mr. J. D. Tennant, who came to the Capital and whose council and assistance were invaluable; and Mr. Thomas G. Jordan; Mr. T. H. VanNoy, chairman of the Cowlitz County Planning Council; the Board of Cowlitz County Commissioners, city and county officials, labor and civic organizations, and private citizens expressing appreciation of my activity and effective cooperation throughout our campaign for flood control and the proper protection and safeguarding of the lives and property of our people. Our success has been due to the untiring efforts of numerous organizations and individuals, all of whom are entitled to great credit.

FEDERAL EXPENDITURES

During the period from March 4, 1933, to June 30, 1939, there was expended by the Federal Government in Cowlitz County the sum of $4,537,904, and loaned therein the additional sum of $1,339,386, a total of $5,877,290.

Flood control, subsistence homesteads, power transmission lines, water systems, schools, streets, sidewalks, sewers, airports, drainage, athletic fields, swimming pools, street lights, parks, recreation facilities, playgrounds, community buildings, sanitation projects have been provided and will constitute valuable community assets for many years to come and serve future generations as well as our own.

MY PROGRESSIVE LABOR RECORD

During the period of my service as a Member of Congress, I have supported and voted for every piece of legislation of benefit to labor. I realize that our business prosperity is measured by the income and wages received by labor and agriculture. I have therefore supported their reasonable demands 100 percent. We have conferred upon labor the same right as that enjoyed by their employers, viz, to bargain collectively in regard to wages, working hours, and working conditions. I have had the active support of every branch of organized labor and the railroad brotherhoods ever since I have been a Member of Congress and intend to continue to merit and deserve their support in the future as I have in the past. I have likewise heartily supported all legislation designed to accord to our Federal and postal workers more liberal treatment. They serve the public faithfully and efficiently and should be treated accordingly.

WAR VETERANS' LEGISLATION

For 4 years I served as a member of the steering committee of 22 House Members, which led the successful fight for the soldiers' bonus. Instead of paying our veterans in bullets, tear bombs, and poison gas, the way the bonus army was paid, we paid in cash in 1936 the bonus which had been delinquent since 1924. Veterans in Cowlitz County thus received $695,486.99.

I have sponsored two bills familiar to every Spanish War veteran—the Smith bill of 1935, paying their pensions in full, and the Philippine travel-pay bill of 1940—as well as numerous other measures for hospitalization, increased benefits, and so forth.

I have favored every bill in the interests of the veterans of the World War, their widows and dependents, which has come before Congress, and am nationally known for my active support of veterans' legislation. I shall continue this policy, for it is my firm belief that it is the solemn duty and sacred obligation of our Government never to forget, but always to remember, and to compensate to the fullest possible extent those who have defended our Republic. I hereby acknowledge the fine cooperation I have always received from the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the United Spanish War Veterans, the Disabled American Veterans, and their auxiliaries.

FEDERAL HOUSING, HOME OWNERS' LOAN, BANK AND SAVINGS AND LOAN DEPOSITS

As one of the five Members of the House who conferred with President Roosevelt, March 20, 1934, and sponsored the first housing legislation in Congress, I am gratified at the benefits which have accrued therefrom to our people. In Cowlitz County 355 citizens have received loans, aggregating $987,400, for the construction, modernization, and repair of their homes. This has been of vast benefit to the workers in the building trades, including electricians, painters, and plumbers, and the lumber, plywood, shingle, and other allied industries.

I actively supported the Home Owners' Loan Corporation Act and am glad that 306 citizens of Cowlitz County have received loans aggregating $566,646.89. I expressed my belief in this legislation on April 28, 1933, in these words:

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to render available the sum of $2,000,000,000 to restore, redeem, rehabilitate, and save the homes of many of the American people, and, Mr. Speaker, when we save the homes of the American people, we save America.

Depositors in the five banks of Cowlitz County have their deposits up to $5,000 insured by the Federal Government under the acts of Congress, which I heartily supported and voted for. The 1,096 depositors in two savings and loan associations likewise have their deposits insured under the same legislation. I am happy and proud that the Roosevelt administration has provided this protection and security for our people and that it has been my privilege to have a humble part in bringing about these great reforms, which should have been introduced many years ago.

OUR PUBLIC SCHOOLS

As an active member of the House Committee on Education, I have vigorously favored providing in public-works and relief appropriation bills adequate funds to aid in paying the salaries of school teachers and maintain, repair, and improve our public-school buildings, as well as institutions of higher learning, as I consider the cause of public education and the recommendations of our parent-teacher associations to be paramount.

I favor the following program:

First. Adequate free public education for the children of the United States.

Second. Adequate pay for public-school teachers as a matter of justice and as a means of retaining in and attracting to the teaching profession the most competent, devoted, and best-equipped men and women.

Third. An annual minimum of at least 8 months' teaching in the public schools of all the States.

Fourth. An adequate number of safe, commodious, and well-equipped school buildings.

Fifth. Free textbooks for all public-school pupils.

Sixth. Adequate assistance by the Federal Government through appropriations and otherwise in accomplishing the foregoing objects.

Seventh. Such of the allied purposes as may serve the best interests of the teachers and pupils and the P. T. A. in making the public schools a more effective, far-reaching, and American force in local, State, and national life.

OLD-AGE PENSIONS

I have been an ardent, outspoken advocate of old-age pensions during my service in Congress. I have continued the interest which, as a veteran member of the Fraternal Order of Eagles, I have manifested for the past 25 years. I have on

every occasion promptly signed every petition to bring old-age pension and general-welfare legislation before the Congress for action.

I was the first Member of Congress to publicly espouse the Townsend plan in 1934, and in a brief 6 years have, as a member of our steering committee, actively participated in the growth of our movement until today we are approximating a sufficient following in the House of Representatives to enact our legislation in its present form into law. The United States Senate recently, for the first time, authorized a thorough study of the Townsend plan. In view of this progress we confidently expect to reelect a sufficient number of our old supporters and elect a sufficient number of new supporters in the elections this year to enact H. R. 8264 into law in the next Congress.

FARM LEGISLATION

The farm problem is recognized as the most difficult with which we have to deal, having been acute since 1920. We have done more for the farmer than any previous national administration and have, since 1932, doubled our farm income. We have recaptured our lost foreign-export trade in agricultural products, without sacrificing our home markets, and should you desire the official Government statistics bearing on this entire subject, please write to the Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C., or write to me and I shall be glad to obtain them for you. Self-seeking politicians running for office do not hesitate to distort and misrepresent the facts. Therefore if you are interested in ascertaining the true facts, I shall be glad to assist you in doing so. We have not entirely solved the farm problem but we have made more progress toward a solution than any previous national administration.

The condition of the farmer everywhere is much better than it was in 1932, when his prices and market were the worst in the history of American agriculture. Think back to 1932 and compare the lot of the average farmer in your own neighborhood as it was then with his condition today in 1940 and you will realize this fact. We intend to keep on helping the farmer. It remains my opinion that the Grange cost-of-production plan, to insure the farmer parity prices with industry, offers the best solution of the farm problem. In the next Congress I shall again vigorously support it. During my entire service in Congress I have never cast a single vote detrimental to agriculture and would be glad to have you verify this fact by writing to Mr. Ervin E. King, master of the Washington State Grange, 3104 Western Avenue, Seattle, Wash., or Mr. Fred Brenckman, legislative representative, National Grange, 1343 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.

FISH AND GAME RESOURCES

One of the most important enterprises which can be encouraged by the Federal Government is the developing, propagating, and corserving of our fish and game resources. I have, therefore, at all times cooperated with the House Special Committee on Conservation of Wildlife Resources and the various "pogy," wildlife, sportsmen's, game, and rod and gun clubs and associations in southwest Washington. I voted for the Robertson-Pittman Act last year and the appropriation this year of $2,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941. The Federal contribution to our State is estimated at $60,575, to be matched by the State contributing $20,191.66, a total of $80,766.66. I have actively cooperated in obtaining W. P. A. and Federal funds for fish hatcheries, fish ponds, and fish and game preserves and wildlife projects in southwest Washington.

I have given prompt attention to the requests received from the holders of fish and game licenses in southwest Washington for information regarding the Federal laws and pending legislation relating to the subject of wildlife.

LUMBER, SHINGLES, PULP, PLYWOOD INDUSTRIES

During my entire service in Congress on every occasion, without a single exception, I have supported and voted for beneficial legislation desired by the lumber, shingle, pulp, and plywood industries and advantageous to their workers, and have at all times extended to them my whole-hearted cooperation. Self-seeking politicians apparently have no scruples in misrepresenting the facts. Therefore, if you wish to verify my statement in regard to my official record, I would suggest that you write to the official legislative representatives of the organizations to which our local industries belong: Col. W. B. Greeley, secretary-manager, West Coast Lumbermen's Association, 364 Stuart Building, Seattle, Wash.; David M. Williams, secretary-manager, United States Red Cedar Shingle Industry, Inc., 340 White-Henry-Stuart Building, Seattle, Wash.; Henry Bahr, counsel, National Lumber Manufacturers' Association, 1337 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.; Axel H. Oxholm, managing director, Pacific Forest Industries, Tacoma Building, Tacoma, Wash.; O. M. Porter, secretary, United States Pulp Producers Association, 122 East Forty-second Street, New York City.

In the general election 2 years ago, in 1938, my Republican opponent had the nerve to display a bundle of shingles and talk about protection for shingles. At that time and for 5 years previously the shingle industry and workers enjoyed a 25-percent quota, the only protection in 25 years. The Republicans kept shingles on the duty-free list for 25 years, without any quota, causing Senator HOMER T. BONE in the campaign in 1932 to say the shingle industry was ruined because of this fact.

In the period since I took my seat in Congress in 1933 the shingle industry has been revived, old mills remodeled and equipped with new machinery, and new mills built, until now we have three times as many plants and number of shingle weavers employed as in 1932.

November 18, 1935, Charles McGrath, secretary-manager of the United States Red Cedar Shingle Industry, Inc., wrote me:

I hasten to send you this brief note to thank you for the fine help we received from you in our fight to secure the import quota on Canadian shingles. I want to express to you my appreciation of your efforts in our behalf.

To render the quota more effective, I introduced the bill which became law for a census of the shingle industry. On May 27, 1937, Mr. McGrath wrote when President Roosevelt signed my bill:

This news is about the most important that has come to red cedar shingle manufacturers and the logging and lumber operators associated with the shingle business.

February 1, 1938, the United States Red Cedar Shingle Industry, Inc., wrote me:

At the annual membership meeting of this association, held in Tacoma, February 1, 1938, a resolution was unanimously approved instructing the secretary to write you expressing the gratitude of this association for your faithful services in our behalf in connection with the import limitations on red cedar shingles.

On November 2, 1938, the following news article was published in the Hoquiam Washingtonian:

SHINGLE WEAVERS COMMEND SMITH

A resolution endorsing MARTIN F. SMITH in his campaign for reelection to Congress was passed this week by Grays Harbor Shingle Weavers, Local 2576. The resolution endorsing SMITH is being sent to all shingle weaver unions in the district council. The resolution commends Congressman SMITH for diligent work in limiting importation of Canadian shingles into the United States.

In this Congress I have actively cooperated in efforts to secure aid for the workers and the shingle industry. Following vigorous efforts before the State Department and Ways and Means Committee, we have recently secured the passage of a bill providing for a duty of 25 cents per square on red cedar shingles imported from Canada, the first duty imposed in 29 years. On June 28, 1940, David M. Williams, secretary-manager, United States Red Cedar Shingle Industry, Inc., wrote me:

The final passage of our shingle bill in the Senate on June 22 brings to a conclusion the long struggle to put shingles back on the duty list. To say that we are pleased, expresses our feeling very mildly.

Having full knowledge of the difficulty of getting a tariff bill through Congress, and particularly one giving protection to the shingle or lumber industries, we are grateful for the continuous thought and effort you have given our affairs.

all during the struggle, since January 1, it has been heartening to know that you were tirelessly working for the passage of our shingle bill and it has been of great value to the writer to be able to confer with you at any time when a conference was deemed necessary. You have been "on the job" for us and we are very appreciative.

With best wishes for your continued success, we remain

Yours truly,

UNITED STATES RED CEDAR SHINGLE INDUSTRY, INC.,
By DAVID M. WILLIAMS,
Secretary-Manager.

I would suggest that when candidates of the opposing party talk about shingles that citizens ask them about the do-nothing record of their party for 25 years, and the do-something record of the Roosevelt administration and request an explanation. I would appreciate citizens writing me briefly what explanation, if any, they give. I am curious, as you must be, after reading the foregoing recital of fact, to know what alibi and excuse they have to offer.

LUMBER EXCISE TAX

The lumber business is the best it has been in 10 years. Last year pay rolls and wages in private industry were the highest in the history of the State.

A candidate for Congress should have respect for the voters and for the office he is seeking. What about the candidate who deliberately circulates malicious falsehoods? Two years ago and again this year the same falsehood is being circulated and published that Members of Congress from our State, including myself, voted to reduce the excise tax on lumber. The best answer to this campaign lie was made December 12, 1938, by Col. W. B. Greeley, secretary-manager and legislative representative of the West Coast Lumbermen's Association, of which our local lumber firms are members:

The west coast lumber industry has had the effective and loyal support of Mr. Smith on every occasion when we have been asking for his help. He has voted for renewal of the excise tax on imported lumber on every occasion when the matter has been before Congress. He has supported our efforts to have lumber properly defined for taxing purposes, as in the classification of large timbers and with withdrawal of allowances for planing and milling. He has helped us in every question arising for the clarification and administration of the excise tax.

The West Coast Lumbermen's Association keeps wholly out of politics. I just want, as a matter of fairness, to point out that Mr. Smith has been a very loyal and conscientious supporter of the interests of the lumber industry since he entered Congress. I feel it only square that this fact be made known.

Sincerely yours,

W. B. GREELEY,
Secretary-Manager.

My amendment of the lumber import excise tax, known as the Smith amendment, introduced as H. R. 7934, was attached to the Revenue Act in 1938 and passed the Senate, was approved by President Roosevelt and became law. It prevents deductions for tonguing, planing, and grooving of imported lumber and is estimated to increase about 25 percent the excise tax, which is the tax unscrupulous candidates for Congress falsely accuse me of voting to reduce. April 4, 1938, Henry Bahr, counsel for the National Lumber Manufacturers' Association, wrote me as follows:

Regarding your amendment of the lumber import excise tax, which was tacked onto the revenue bill in the Ways and Means Committee and retained by the Senate last week, I am sure Colonel Greeley must have told you how sincerely we appreciate your helpful cooperation in this matter.

Candidates of the opposite party should be asked by the 1930 and the Fordney-McCumber Tariff Act of 1922 left lumvoters why their party under the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act of ber and shingles on the duty-free list, without any import excise tax or quota limitation, and provided 100-percent free trade with Canada. Such an explanation, if any, would be interesting, probably amusing.

PULP LEGISLATION

I am the author of H. R. 7312, the Smith bill, to amend the Antidumping Act of 1921, to plug up and curtail importations of foreign pulp in competition with our local product. This bill has received wide support from the pulp and sulfite workers' unions and the manufacturers. It has strong support in Congress. The United States Pulp Producers' Association, O. M. Porter, has written me as follows:

I am very glad to be able to tell you that the executive committee of this association has instructed me to do everything possible toward developing Nation-wide support of your bill (H. R. 7312) to amend the Antidumping Act of 1921.

The changed conditions suddenly caused by the invasion of the Scandinavian countries and removal temporarily of competition from that quarter has deferred immediate action, but the legislation is in fine shape for consideration in the next Congress.

PEELER LOG LEGISLATION

Past national administrations have permitted the exporting of peeler logs without hindrance so many years that now this, too, has created a problem to deal with. This has nothing to do with the reciprocal-trade agreements, which have made no change whatsoever. The question is simply one of whether we should limit the export of raw materials, the supply of which is becoming limited on account of our generosity in the past, which we now need for our own domestic use and manufacture by our own labor. I have vigorously favored the enactment of this legislation, which presents difficulties because it establishes a new precedent. Past neglect always renders application of the remedy difficult. The outlook for the enactment of this legislation in the near future is favorable on account of the hearings which have been held and the efforts which have been put forth in its behalf by the entire Washington Congressional delegation. On May 24, 1940, Mr. Axel H. Oxholm, managing director, Pacific Forest Industries, with which plywood manufacturers in southwest Washington are affiliated, wrote me:

The board of directors held its annual meeting on May 21 and I was directed to express to you the board's appreciation of the valuable assistance which you have given in the peeler log matter.

APPOINTMENT TO UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY

Stanton Wayne Josephson, of Longview, was appointed to the United States Military Academy, at West Point, on my recommendation in July 1938 and is due to graduate in 1942.

NATIONAL YOUTH ADMINISTRATION—CIVILIAN CONSERVATION CORPS

The National Youth Administration has made a splendid record in the State of Washington and many young men and women in my district have greatly benefited from the program. Through the office of Mr. John H. Binns, Washington State Administrator of the N. Y. A., I have obtained official figures on the out-of-school program and the school work program which reflect the actual earnings of the young people. However, the figures on the college work program do not take into account students living in my district but attending college elsewhere. There are, of course, a great many young men and women from southwest Washington at the University of Washington, Washington State College, and elsewhere, and they are receiving their full share of the college work funds. In Cowlitz County a total of 69 young men and women have participated in the out-of-school work program, receiving total monthly earnings of $1,035. Under the college work program there are 10 students attending Lower Columbia Junior College, with a total yearly quota of $1,485. Six schools of Cowlitz county are included in the school work program, with a total of 100 student-workers and a total yearly quota of $4,182.

The useful and constructive work performed by the young men in the C. C. C. camps has received universal praise. In my district, in addition to building trails, roads, bridges, the prevention of floods and soil erosion, and other public improvements, their services in effectively fighting forest fires has resulted in a saving of millions of dollars. The young men themselves have benefited greatly from the training and instruction which they have received, and, of course, their own compensation and the allotments to their dependents have provided added purchasing power. The expenditures for materials and supplies in the vicinity of the camps have been a direct benefit to numerous business firms and merchants.

C. C. C. camps have been in operation in practically every county in my district and the entire State of Washington.

AMERICA FOREVER; COMMUNISM, FASCISM, NAZI-ISM NEVER

On June 22, 1940, I voted for H. R. 5138, the most thorough and far-reaching revision of our immigration and deportation laws in the past 25 years. It is directed against all subversive, "fifth column," and un-American activities and provides punishment for those who attempt to overthrow the Government by force and violence. H. R. 5138, as amended, was carefully considered and provides effective remedies against all foreign "isms" without violating our Constitution and American traditions.

My friends, we have the finest country and best Government on earth. Let us keep them that way. There is no room in America for communism, fascism, nazi-ism. There is room only for one ism, and that is Americanism. We are going to keep America out of Europe, and we are going to keep Europe out of America.

Colleges and Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. NELSON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 5, 1940

LETTER FROM DEAN E. P. PUCKETT, FAYETTE, MO

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter received by me from Dean E. P. Puckett, Central College, Fayette, Mo.:

JULY 24, 1940.

Congressman WILLIAM L. NELSON,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. NELSON: Doubtless you and all the other Congressmen have received more letters than you need relative to the pending defense measures. Nevertheless, I hope that you will have yet remaining enough patience to read what I have to say. I am interested, not as an individual, but as the dean of a non-State, liberal-arts college.

As you perhaps know, there is and has been for a number of years a company of the Missouri National Guards in Fayette. The members of this company are, almost without exception, students in Central College. Naturally the college administration is interested in helping the young men of college age continue as normally as possible their college work, even in the midst of the present national defense emergency. It is our hope that the military plans can be so sensibly developed that college students may be able to get ample military training and, at the same time, not have their college, preprofessional and professional, work sidetracked.

It seems to me that institutions such as Central College could, in case of required military training, work out with the Federal Government plans by which certain phases of the military training could be carried on concurrently with college courses of study and the summer college vacation period be used for follow-up, intensive training with modernized, up-to-the-minute defense equipment. Some reasonable adaptation of student army training corps or extension of R. O. T. C. might serve the purpose, or in a situation such as has been existing in Fayette, a cooperative adaptation of National Guard and college program might attain the preparedness goal sought. I am in thorough accord with the recently arrived at determination to have the United States and all the Americas alert and prepared to defend the interests of the Western Hemisphere. In this preparedness program I hope that the equipment to be produced will not be patterned merely on the 1940 German model, but will be projected on a basis of superiority over current fighting machines. I believe Central College would be found ready and willing to give cooperation to the national administration in sensible plans for national defense. I am hoping that you and your fellow Congressmen will be alert to all the other and perhaps more lasting interests of the youth of this generation so that higher education may not be set back in the rush of getting through Congress the requisite acts for developing an honest-to-goodness superior defensive and, if necessary, offensive fighting machine. All that I have said may be summarized in three points.

First, that intensive summer training in regular, Federal Army posts or training schools be used for college-age men to supplement such preliminary training as may be taken by students in the regular school year.

Second, that enrollment of college students in cooperating National Guard units located in college towns may be considered in the general plan of military training. This would call for a cooperative adaptation of such National Guard units, which would not be such a bad thing, after all.

Third, that independent, endowed colleges such as Central be given opportunity to work out a cooperative plan with the Federal Government in administering military training to men of college age. Such plan should be harmonized with college work so that military training and college courses would be carried on concurrently.

A final point I would like to mention because of our experience with the S. A. T. C. in 1918. It would be helpful to colleges like Central if plans that may involve college students be determined and published in the near future so that colleges may, with some assurance, make plans in line with probable enrollments. I confidently believe that the National Government will not purposely disrupt college organizations to the hurt of institutions such as the one I represent, but serious injury may inadvertently be worked to such institutions unless sensible Congressmen plan carefully.

With kindest personal regards and best wishes to you individually and officially, I remain,

Sincerely,

(Signed) E. P. PUCKETT,
Dean, Central College, Fayette, Mo.

County Report of Federal Expenditures, McPherson County, Kans.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. HOUSTON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 6, 1940

EXPENDITURES MARCH 4, 1933, THROUGH JUNE 30, 1939

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following report of Federal expenditures in McPherson County, Kans., from March 4, 1933, through June 30, 1939:

County report of Federal expenditures—McPherson County, Kans. (57)—Mar. 4, 1933, through June 30, 1939

LOANS

	Number	Amount
CURRENT PROGRAMS		
Federal Loan Agency:		
1. Reconstruction Finance Corporation (from Feb. 2, 1932)		$130,401
2. Disaster Loan Corporation		
Federal Works Agency:		
3. Public Works Administration, non-Federal projects	1	[1] 16,000
4. U. S. Housing Authority, loan contracts signed		
Department of Agriculture:		
5. Farm Credit Administration, Land Bank Commissioner	163	[2] 344,500
6. Farm Credit Administration, emergency crop and feed	33	[2] 3,660
7. Farm Security Administration, rural rehabilitation		13,634
8. Farm Security Administration, farm tenant purchase		
9. Rural Electrification Administration (total project cost divided by number of counties participating)	1	100,081
COMPLETED PROGRAMS		
10. Farm Credit Administration, 1934-35 drought relief	3	565
11. Home Owners' Loan Corporation, 1933-36	102	209,907
Total, repayable		818,748

EXPENDITURES

CURRENT PROGRAMS			
Federal Works Agency:			
1. Public Works Administration, non-Federal projects		17	$478,284
2. Public Works Administration, Federal projects			
3. Public Roads Administration, completed projects			323,043
4. Public Buildings Administration, Federal buildings			100,973
5. Work Projects Administration			121,854
6. Other projects under works program			
Federal Security Agency:			
7. Social Security Board:			
Old-age assistance	$35,045	216	41,901
Aid to dependent children	5,299	98	
Aid to the blind	1,557	12	

[1] These projects received both loans and grants.
[2] As of Dec. 31, 1938.

County report of Federal expenditures—McPherson County, Kans. (57)—Mar. 4, 1933, through June 30, 1939—Continued

EXPENDITURES—continued

	Number	Amount
CURRENT PROGRAMS—continued		
Department of Agriculture:		
8. Agricultural Adjustment Administration conservation programs:		
1936	$98,511	$138,254
1937	39,743	
9. Farm Security Administration, rural rehabilitation		8,069
COMPLETED PROGRAMS		
10. Federal Emergency Relief Administration		98,296
11. Civil Works Administration		46,657
12. Agricultural Adjustment Administration rental and benefit payments		1,951,886
13. U. S. Housing Authority, housing (former Public Works Administration housing only)		
Total, non-repayable		3,309,217
Grand total, repayable and nonrepayable		4,127,965

OTHER BENEFITS

Federal Housing Administration:		
Title I. Modernization and improvement loans insured	68	$23,895
Title II. Mortgages accepted for insurance	94	315,900
Total, housing insurance		339,795
Farm Security Administration, farm debt reduction	9	34,671
Public Roads Administration, active project allotments		

COUNTY STATISTICS [1]	*No.*
Families in county, 1930	5,998
Dwellings, 1930	5,601
Individual income tax returns, 1935	826
Passenger autos registered, 1936	8,105
Families with radios, 1938	4,280
Residential telephones, 1935	4,629
Domestic electric meters, 1930	2,804
Farms, 1935	2,563
Retail employees, 1935	723
Wholesale employees, 1935	178
Manufacturing employees, 1935	311
Persons on farms, 1935	11,387

[1] Source: Consumer Market Data Handbook.

The Third Term Is Something That Just Isn't Done in America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD KNUTSON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 6, 1940

EDITORIALS FROM THE WYOMING STATE TRIBUNE-CHEYENNE STATE LEADER

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorials from the Wyoming State Tribune-Cheyenne State Leader of July 22, 1940:

[From the Wyoming State Tribune-Cheyenne State Leader of July 22, 1940]

A PATRIOTIC DEMOCRAT SPEAKS

Let a Democrat testify concerning the third term and the ambition of the man who seeks it. The following is by the Right Reverend Hugh L. McMenamin, rector of the Cathedral of the Immaculate Conception at Denver, who was born into the Democratic Party, has been a Democrat all his long life, is still a stalwart, uncompromising Democrat—but not a revolutionary. No comment concerning his statement is necessary; it speaks for itself. He said yesterday for publication:

"If President Roosevelt, against all precedent, answering, as he admits, a quiet voice known as conscience, submits against personal wishes to a so-called draft to become a candidate for a third term as President of the United States, then I, a humble priest, who am first an American, listening to a voice of conscience that marches like an army with drums and banners, call upon free Americans to join with me in organizing an offensive against an inevitable dictatorship for this country.

"Never, in a long life crowded with events, can I recall such an insult offered to the intelligence of American people as that included in the message by Franklin D. Roosevelt, transmitted by radio to the delegates at the Democratic National Convention in Chicago in which he states the motives for acceptance.

"Did he imagine as he sat at his desk reading that speech that the people of the United States are so dumb as not to know it had been carefully prepared?

"Does Franklin D. Roosevelt imagine that he can hide a consuming greed for power and more power under pleasant words arranged to emphasize the virtue of self-sacrifice?

"Do the people of America, the women and men who will cast the votes in November, believe for a minute that the delegates had a free choice in the selection of leaders?

"We are not dumb! And because we are not dumb and because our intelligence can resist insult, we must, as loyal Americans, holding to policies laid down by Washington and Jefferson, defeat Roosevelt at the polls.

"Otherwise America as we have known and loved it is gone.

"This is not the first time we must put service to country above party. This is not a privilege but a duty. Never more earnestly than now must we accept the duty.

"A third term, which Roosevelt has accepted, savors of dictatorship.

"Dictatorship savors of war. Roosevelt as a third-term President will continue as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy. Looking forward to the boring-in of the old Pendergast-Hines-Leche gang rotating in Washington, we'll find ourselves like the South American republics under that sort of arrogant dictatorship.

"When Franklin D. Roosevelt said: 'I do not wish to continue as President,' he tossed an insult to me and every thinking citizen.

"Does he imagine that millions of Americans, capable of thinking for themselves, will believe that he meant a word he said or that the acceptance speech had not been carefully prepared long in advance?

"Did Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, who appeared at the Chicago convention, think we could take seriously her amazing statement that she was surprised to learn that delegates did not think themselves free to vote as they wished?

"Both were flouting the intelligence of the American people!

"The only way we can preserve the policies of Washington and Lincoln, which are the foundation stones on which this Government rests and has developed, is to defeat Roosevelt.

"An individual's lust for power and inability to gage the intelligence of the people has worked for their benefit before. It will work again for their benefit and salvation. But we must organize our forces, too. That is why I call on free men and women to join me in a walk to save America and its precious institutions from what will be inevitable dictatorship if Roosevelt wins again."

WHAT WHEN THE "ONE MAN" IS GONE?

(By John de Meyer)

Well, the Democrats had their convention. It's probably all right to say it was democratic. It was held in a democratic country, and nothing was actually said about a divine right of succession. The Democrats just said that the country is better off than under the Republicans, even if it is in bad shape. Out of a hundred and thirty million people there's only one man big enough to keep the country going. And between now and November we've got to find out how to nurse that man along to a good ripe old age, because when he retires we're all done. That's what the new dealers said. What the country will say we won't know until November. But the country may be stubborn and refuse to see the light. The country may not believe the new dealers. If it doesn't, Jim Farley wants to know what's going to happen to the Democrats when their one man big enough to be President is gone.

Sending Destroyers to Great Britain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ERNEST LUNDEEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 6 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON TIMES-HERALD

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial published in today's Times-Herald entitled "Fifty Destroyers to Britain?" The article is preceded by a quotation from the Farewell Address of George Washington, which I ask be included;

and I also desire to include the text of the law forbidding the transfer of war vessels to foreign powers.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FIFTY DESTROYERS TO BRITAIN?

General of the Armies, John J. Pershing, made a Nation-wide radio address Sunday evening, his two most important paragraphs being these:

"And I am telling you tonight, because it is my duty to warn you before it is too late, that the British Navy needs destroyers and small craft to convoy merchant ships, to escort its warships and hunt submarines, and to repel invasion.

"We have an immense reserve of destroyers left over from the other war, and in a few months the British will be completing a large number of destroyers of their own. The most critical time, therefore, is the next few weeks or months. If there is anything we can do to save the British Fleet during that time, we shall be failing in our duty to America if we do not do it."

Wherefore, General Pershing urged that Congress arrange for an early sale, to Britain or Canada, of "at least 50 of the over-age destroyers which are left from the days of the World War."

Two pieces of evidence convince us that the Pershing speech voiced the wishes of President Roosevelt in this matter.

One of these pieces of evidence is the fact that Secretary of State Hull warmly congratulated General Pershing, and posed for a picture of himself doing so.

The other is the fact that Joseph Alsop and Robert Kintner echoed the speech with a must-do, now-or-never editorial dolled up as a news story, dated August 4, circulated by the North American Newspaper Alliance, and published locally yesterday by the Evening Star. Messrs. Alsop and Kintner are the authors of the widely read "American White Paper" (Simon & Schuster, New York, 1940, $1), a book which frankly states this administration's interventionist ideas from official and very highly placed Washington feedboxes.

DESTROYER FIGURES

Our allegedly huge batch of destroyers comes, by the latest figures we can obtain, to 236 on hand and 61 building. Of these, 167 are in the over-age class alluded to by General Pershing.

As of June 30, 1940, with the Battle of France over and the Battle of Britain expected to begin at any moment, Britain was estimated by competent American observers to have 100 destroyers completed and available for service around the British Isles. The British are thought to have picked up 8 or 9 French destroyers in the July 4 coup that smashed part of the French fleet and put most of the rest of it in British hands.

The Germans have been knocking off or disabling British destroyers pretty rapidly, so that quite a number of those unsunk are out of action for repairs.

THEN WILL COME THE CALL FOR ANOTHER 50 DESTROYERS

Destroyers, at least, appear exceedingly vulnerable to air attack. These 50 of ours, if considerately placed within reach of the German bombers, will also be disabled pretty rapidly.

Then will come the call for another 50, and after that for as much of our Navy as we can spare.

Well, how much can we spare? We've been told over and over again that our Navy should be doubled in size. Appropriations have passed Congress to make it so. So how much can we spare out of a Navy that's only half big enough?

Now, we should be sorry indeed to see the British Empire fall. This country will be in greater danger if it does so. But it will be in greater danger still if it sends any considerable portion of its armed forces to Europe within reach of Hitler's bombers.

If we have to fight Hitler some day, as we may, why in heaven's name should we accommodate him by sending our warships within reach of his bombers based on his land airfields, instead of compelling him to come over and fight us within reach of our bombers based on our land airfields?

It would be 10 times as difficult and as expensive for Hitler to kill an American soldier on this side of the ocean as it would be to kill him if we sent him over to Europe.

George Washington said: "Excessive partiality for one foreign nation and excessive dislike for another cause those whom they actuate to see danger only on one side and serve to veil and even second the arts of influence on the other."—From the Farewell Address.

LAWS RESTRICTING SALE OF NAVAL VESSELS

Act of July 19, 1940 (54 Stat. —, ch. 644, sec. 7; Public, No. 757, 76th Cong.):

"No vessel, ship, or boat (except ships' boats) now in the United States Navy or being built or hereafter built therefor shall be disposed of by sale or otherwise, or be chartered or scrapped, except as now provided by law."

Act of March 3, 1883 (22 Stat. 599, sec. 5; U. S. Code, 34:492):

"The Secretary of the Navy is authorized to sell vessels that have been stricken from the Navy Register, after a report by a board of naval officers to the effect that such vessels are 'unfit for further service.' Such vessels are to be sold after advertising for proposals for not less than 3 months; bids must be accompanied with a 10 percent cash deposit and bond for the remaining 90 percent of the price offered."

Act of August 29, 1916 (39 Stat. 605; U. S. Code 34:493):

"The Secretary is authorized to sell 'colliers, transports, tenders, supply ships, special types, and hospital ships, which are 18 years and over in age, which he deems unsuited to present needs of the Navy and which can be disposed of at an advantageous price, which shall not be less than 50 percent of their original cost.'"

ADMINISTRATION VIOLATES ARTICLE VI OF 1907 HAGUE CONVENTION

Mr. President, I wish to read article VI of the Hague Convention of 1907. That convention was signed by both Germany and the United States. It concerns the rights and duties of neutral powers in naval warfare. I read the provision of article VI of the 1907 Hague Convention:

The supply in any manner, directly or indirectly, by a neutral power to a belligerent of warships, ammunition, or war material of any kind whatever is forbidden.

ACT OF JUNE 15, 1917, CHAPTER 30, TITLE V, 6, 40 STATUTES 222

During a war in which the United States is a neutral nation, it shall be unlawful to send out of the jurisdiction of the United States any vessel built, armed, or equipped as a vessel of war, or converted from a private vessel into a vessel of war, with any intent or under any agreement or contract, written or oral, that such vessel shall be delivered to a belligerent nation, or to an agent, officer, or citizen of such nation, or with reasonable cause to believe that the said vessel shall or will be employed in the service of any such belligerent nation after its departure from the jurisdiction of the United States (June 15, 1917, ch. 30, title V, 3, 40 Stat. 222).

Whoever, in violation of any of the provisions of sections 25, 27, and 31 to 38 of this title, shall take, or attempt to conspire to take, or authorize the taking of any such vessel, out of port or from the jurisdiction of the United States, shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both; and, in addition, such vessel, her tackle, apparel, furniture, equipment, and her cargo shall be forfeited to the United States.

My Report to the People of Clark County

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN F. SMITH

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 6, 1940

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, in conformity with my established practice, I hereby render my report and account of my official record to the citizens of Clark County.

I agree with the many thousands of citizens who have written to me that our first task remains that of keeping our country out of war. I shall continue my vigorous support of neutrality legislation. We are the only neutral nation in the world whose ships and citizens have not been attacked.

I shall cooperate vigorously in supporting President Roosevelt's national-defense program, and am remaining at my post of duty in order to do so.

May I take this opportunity to sincerely thank my fellow citizens for their kind expressions of approval of my work in Congress; their generous letters have been a source of inspiration and encouragement.

Influence in Congress depends upon seniority of service on important committees. Why throw away the influence of seniority and experience? What do candidates have to offer except their own personal ambition? I now rank sixth out of a membership of 27 on the powerful Rivers and Harbors Committee, having started at the bottom of the ladder in 1933. As a direct result we have had more regular worthy river and harbor, jetty, and flood-control projects approved and carried out in southwest Washington during my period of service than during the entire previous history of our State. It is also my privilege to be chairman of the Pensions Committee, which gives me added rank and prestige in the House. I also am serving on the important Committee on Education, vital to the students and faculties in our public schools and colleges, and on the Indian Affairs and War Claims Committees.

When politicians are desperate they sometimes resort to issues of the most trivial and amusing nature, and this year

for the first time the Congressman's county of legal residence is seemingly being made such an issue.

I have been a permanent resident of southwest Washington for 30 years and have been continuously visiting all the communities in the district and am therefore thoroughly familiar with conditions and problems in every community. However, length of residence in the district is important, for a comparative newcomer from a distant part of the State could not be expected to know our people nor our problems and would consequently not be qualified to represent our interests effectively.

The particular city or county in which the Congressman resides has absolutely no bearing on his effectiveness to serve his district, which depends on his length of service, his rank, and his experience.

SERVICE IN CONGRESS—THERE IS NO SUBSTITUTE FOR EXPERIENCE

The gentleman from Texas, Congressman MARVIN JONES, who is retiring after 24 years in Congress, paid a tribute the other day to the seasoned Members of the House.

The rest of the States, he said, should follow the example of Texas in reelecting its Congressmen; then they would control more committee chairmanships. Texas, with 21 Members in the House today, holds 5 chairmanships, he pointed out. It is exceeded only by New York, with 6 out of its 45 Members holding committee chairmanships. The Texas Congressman ended by quoting former Speaker Champ Clark:

A man has to learn to be a Congressman just as he must learn to be a blacksmith, a carpenter, a farmer, an engineer, a lawyer, or a doctor.

IMPROVED BUSINESS CONDITIONS

The steady improvement in business conditions and recovery from the depths of 1929–33 continues.

I shall never forget the gloom and despair of the storekeepers, laborers, and farmers in 1932 when I visited Vancouver, Camas, Washougal, Ridgefield, LaCenter, Brush Prairie, Battle Ground, Yacolt, Amboy, Pioneer, Orchards, Hockinson, and all the communities of Clark County. There were hardly any jobs or money in circulation, prices were down, and there was no market. Conditions are vastly different now, and we are far better situated than we were then.

GOVERNMENT AID AND COOPERATION

Not only has this beneficial change been wrought, but our Government has also aided and cooperated in the construction of many worth-while projects which make our local communities better places in which to live.

BONNEVILLE—RURAL ELECTRIFICATION

I shall always be proud of my sponsorship of the original legislation creating the great Bonneville $70,000,000 project and my active participation during the years in every step to bring its benefits to the citizens and communities of Clark County and our district. On March 4, 1938, the late John D. Ross, administrator of the Bonneville project, wrote me:

I wish to express my deep appreciation of your efforts in obtaining the Bonneville appropriation through the House. The cooperation which I received while in Washington and since I left has pleased me very much.

Bonneville will always remain a monument to the memory of this sturdy champion of public power for all the people.

On March 27, 1939, Charles E. Carey, acting administrator, wrote me:

With friends like you in Congress, we feel that the future of Bonneville is in safe hands. We will do everything we can to see that your friends in southwestern Washington are fully advised of your service and active support of the Bonneville project.

In this session of Congress I appeared twice before the Appropriations Committee and testified at length in support of increased appropriations this year, which we succeeded in obtaining so the work can continue unabated.

Under date of June 20, 1940, Dr. Paul J. Raver, Administrator, Bonneville Power Administration, wrote me:

I want to express my appreciation for the very able assistance which you gave this Administration in connection with our request for an appropriation sufficient to meet our construction needs to get the power from the Bonneville Dam to the market areas.

I have actively supported our rural-electrification projects, which are, of course, valuable adjuncts to Bonneville.

Vancouver has already secured two new industries and pay rolls as a direct result of Bonneville, the Aluminum Corporation of America and the Sierra Iron Co., and these mark only a beginning of the industrial development which is certain to accrue to Vancouver and Clark County.

PORT OF VANCOUVER

During the period of my service in Congress and as a member of the powerful Rivers and Harbors Committee, we have had more dredging and harbor improvements made at Vancouver than during the entire previous history of the port, which will be verified by the efficient port manager, T. P. MacComber, and the port commissioners. Indeed, the channel at Vancouver has been deepened 5 feet, first from a depth of 25 feet to 28 feet, and then from 28 to 30 feet. There is only one other channel in the United States during the same period which has been deepened an equal footage, and that is the channel of New York Harbor.

A $503,000 contract has been let for dredging 10 miles of the Columbia River from a point near Cape Horn to the Bonneville Dam. It is the second link in the project which we have had put through, to provide a 27-foot channel 300 feet wide from Vancouver to the dam. The first unit provided a 15-foot channel between Camas and Vancouver.

The next unit of the channel dredging will include the area between Cape Horn and Camas, in which the port of Camas-Washougal is to be included, at a cost of $45,000, for which authorization and allotment of funds is pending.

ARMY AIR BASE

I have introduced a bill to authorize and appropriate $2,500,000 for an Army air base at Vancouver to give adequate protection to the Columbia River area and the Bonneville Dam project. The bill has been referred to the War and Aeronautical Departments and will receive study and consideration as a part of the national-defense program.

VANCOUVER BARRACKS

We have had considerable money expended and improvements made at Vancouver barracks during the period since 1933, through Regular Army appropriations, totaling $167,234 including 1940 estimates. Through W. P. A. allotments we obtained the additional sum of $446,230. We also have included in the War Department housing program for future construction, in behalf of which I have twice made presentations before the Committee on Appropriations, items aggregating $362,600.

CAMAS POST OFFICE

In 1935 I introduced the first bill for a new post-office building for Camas and after 4 years of untiring effort I secured the allotment of $81,525, which resulted in the construction and dedication of the present magnificent building, commensurate with the bright future community prospects of Camas, on August 15, 1939. This result was extremely difficult to accomplish because the final choice had to be made between Camas and two other progressive communities in southwest Washington.

VANCOUVER POST OFFICE

We are pressing vigorously for action on the bill which we have been urging for a new post-office building for Vancouver and recently succeeded in having Vancouver placed on the first priority list. Following numerous conferences with officials of the Postal Department, we have secured their favorable recommendation for a building and site to cost $180,000. This important action resulted in abandoning the previous plans for adding a second story to the present structure. If a new public-building program is started this year Vancouver will be included, otherwise it will be included in next year's program. This is real progress and I hereby acknowledge the generous cooperation and kind expressions of approval of my endeavors which have come to me from numerous civic organizations and citizens' groups in Vancouver.

FLOOD CONTROL—VANCOUVER LAKE

The Vancouver Lake project has repeatedly been rejected by the Army engineers over a long period of years. However, we secured the survey in progress and have also introduced in this session a bill for a survey of additional area, extending from the downstream point of the Vancouver Lake area to

the upstream point of the Bachelor Island area. Altogether this contemplates a very costly project, probably exceeding $1,000,000, but will protect, conserve, and make available for development some of the finest lands to be found in Clark County and southeast Washington.

FEDERAL EXPENDITURES

During the period from March 4, 1933, to June 30, 1939, there was expended by the Federal Government, in Clark County, the sum of $5,737,228, and loaned therein the additional sum of $1,570,698, a total of $7,307,926.

Vancouver Barracks, schools and grounds, athletic field, water system, city and county mapping, playfield, parks, streets, sidewalks, sewers, pipe lines, sanitation, drainage, reservoir, fish screens, fish hatchery, gymnasium, recreation, bridge improvements, jail, cemetery improvements, city and county roads projects have been provided and will constitute valuable community assets for many years to come, and serve future generations as well as our own.

MY PROGRESSIVE LABOR RECORD

During the period of my service as a Member of Congress, I have supported and voted for every piece of legislation of benefit to labor. I realize that our business prosperity is measured by the income and wages received by labor and agriculture. I have, therefore, supported their reasonable demands 100 percent. We have conferred upon labor the same right as that enjoyed by their employers, namely, to bargain collectively in regard to wages, working hours, and working conditions. I have had the active support of every branch of organized labor and the railroad brotherhoods ever since I have been a Member of Congress, and intend to continue to merit and deserve their support in the future as I have in the past. I have likewise heartily supported all legislation designed to accord to our Federal and Postal workers more liberal treatment. They serve the public faithfully and efficiently, and should be treated accordingly.

WAR VETERANS' LEGISLATION

For 4 years I served as a member of the steering committee of 22 House Members, which led the successful fight for the soldiers' bonus. Instead of paying our veterans in bullets, tear bombs, and poison gas, the way the bonus army was paid, we paid in cash in 1936 the bonus which had been delinquent since 1924. Veterans in Clark County thus received $878,808.17.

I have sponsored two bills familiar to every Spanish-War veteran, the Smith bill of 1935, paying their pensions in full, and the Philippine travel-pay bill of 1940, as well as numerous other measures for hospitalization, increased benefits, and so forth.

I have favored every bill in the interests of the veterans of the World War, their widows, and dependents which has come before Congress, and am nationally known for my active support of veterans' legislation. I shall continue this policy, for it is my firm belief that it is the solemn duty and sacred obligation of our Government never to forget but always to remember and to compensate to the fullest possible extent those who have defended our Republic. I hereby acknowledge the fine cooperation I have always received from the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the United Spanish War Veterans, the Disabled American Veterans, and their auxiliaries.

FEDERAL HOUSING, HOME OWNERS' LOANS, BANK AND SAVINGS, AND LOAN DEPOSITS

As one of the five Members of the House who conferred with President Roosevelt March 20, 1934, and sponsored the first housing legislation in Congress, I am gratified at the benefits which have accrued therefrom to our people. In Clark County 208 citizens have received loans aggregating $592,100 for the construction, modernization, and repair of their homes. This has been of vast benefit to the workers in the building trades, including electricians, painters, and plumbers, and the lumber, plywood, shingle, and other allied industries.

I actively supported the Home Owners' Loan Corporation Act and am glad that 283 citizens of Clark County have received loans aggregating $447,545.41. I expressed my belief in this legislation on April 28, 1933, in these words:

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to render available the sum of $2,000,000,000 to restore, redeem, rehabilitate, and save the homes of many of the American people, and, Mr. Speaker, when we save the homes of the American people, we save America.

Depositors in the seven banks in Clark County have their deposits up to $5,000 insured by the Federal Government under the acts of Congress which I heartily supported and voted for. The 2,144 depositors in two savings and loan associations likewise have their deposits insured under the same legislation. I am happy and proud that the Roosevelt administration has provided this protection and security for our people and that it has been my privilege to have a humble part in bringing about these great reforms which should have been introduced many years ago.

OUR PUBLIC SCHOOLS

As an active member of the House Committee on Education, I have vigorously favored providing in public works and relief appropriation bills adequate funds to aid in paying the salaries of school teachers and maintain, repair, and improve our public school buildings, as well as institutions of higher learning, as I consider the cause of public education and the recommendations of our Parent-Teacher Associations to be paramount.

I favor the following program:

First. Adequate free public education for the children of the United States.

Second. Adequate pay for public-school teachers as a matter of justice and as a means of retaining in and attracting to the teaching profession the most competent, devoted, and best-equipped men and women.

Third. An annual minimum of at least 8 months' teaching in the public schools of all the States.

Fourth. An adequate number of safe, commodious and well-equipped school buildings.

Fifth. Free textbooks for all public-school pupils.

Sixth. Adequate assistance by the Federal Government through appropriations and otherwise, in accomplishing the foregoing objects.

Seventh. Such of the allied purposes as may serve the best interests of the teachers and pupils and the Parent-Teacher Association in making the public schools a more effective, far-reaching, and American force in local, State, and national life.

OLD-AGE PENSIONS

I have been an ardent, outspoken advocate of old-age pensions during my service in Congress. I have continued the interest which, as a veteran member of the Fraternal Order of Eagles, I have manifested for the past 25 years. I have on every occasion promptly signed every petition to bring old-age pension and general-welfare legislation before the Congress for action.

I was the first Member of Congress to publicly espouse the Townsend plan in 1934, and in a brief 6 years have, as a member of our steering committee, actively participated in the growth of our movement until today we are approximating a sufficient following in the House of Representatives to enact our legislation in its present form into law. The United States Senate recently for the first time authorized a thorough study of the Townsend plan. In view of this progress, we confidently expect to reelect a sufficient number of our old supporters and elect a sufficient number of new supporters in the elections this year to enact H. R. 8264 into law in the next Congress.

FARM LEGISLATION

The farm problem is recognized as the most difficult with which we have to deal, having been acute since 1920. We have done more for the farmer than any previous national administration and have, since 1932, doubled our farm income. We have recaptured our lost foreign export trade in agricultural products, without sacrificing our home markets, and should you desire the official Government statistics bearing on this entire subject, please write to the Depart-

ment of Agriculture, Washington, D. C., or write to me, and I shall be glad to obtain them for you. Self-seeking politicians running for office do not hesitate to distort and misrepresent the facts. Therefore, if you are interested in ascertaining the true facts, I shall be glad to assist you in doing so. We have not entirely solved the farm problem, but we have made more progress toward a solution than any previous national administration.

The condition of the farmer everywhere is much better than it was in 1932, when his prices and market were the worst in the history of American agriculture. Think back to 1932 and compare the lot of the average farmer in your own neighborhood as it was then with his condition today in 1940 and you will realize this fact. We intend to keep on helping the farmer. It remains my opinion that the Grange cost-of-production plan, to insure the farmer parity prices with industry, offers the best solution of the farm problem. In the next Congress I shall again vigorously support it. During my entire service in Congress I have never cast a single vote detrimental to agriculture and would be glad to have you verify this fact by writing to Mr. Ervin E. King, master of the Washington State Grange, 3104 Western Avenue, Seattle, Wash., or Mr. Fred Brenckman, legislative representative, National Grange, 1343 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.

FISH AND GAME RESOURCES

One of the most important enterprises which can be encouraged by the Federal Government is the developing, propagating, and conserving of our fish and game resources. I have therefore at all times cooperated with the House Special Committee on Conservation of Wildlife Resources and the various pogy, wildlife, sportsmen's, game, and rod and gun clubs and associations in southwest Washington. I voted for the Robertson-Pittman Act last year and the appropriation this year of $2,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941. The Federal contribution to our State is estimated at $60,575, to be matched by the State contributing $20,191.66, a total of $80,766.66. I have actively cooperated in obtaining W. P. A. and Federal funds for fish hatcheries, fish ponds, and fish and game preserves and wildlife projects in southwest Washington.

I have given prompt attention to the requests received from the holders of fish and game licenses in southwest Washington for information regarding the Federal laws and pending legislation relating to the subject of wildlife.

LUMBER, SHINGLES, PULP, PLYWOOD INDUSTRIES

During my entire service in Congress on every occasion, without a single exception, I have supported and voted for beneficial legislation desired by the lumber, shingle, pulp and plywood industries and advantageous to their workers, and have at all times extended to them my wholehearted cooperation. Self-seeking politicians apparently have no scruples in misrepresenting the facts. Therefore, if you wish to verify my statement in regard to my official record, I would suggest that you write to the official legislative representatives of the organizations to which our local industries belong: Col. W. B. Greeley, secretary-manager, West Coast Lumbermen's Association, 364 Stuart Building, Seattle, Wash.; David M. Williams, secretary-manager, United States Red Cedar Shingle Industry, Inc., 340 White-Henry-Stuart Building, Seattle, Wash.; Henry Bahr, counsel, National Lumber Manufacturers Association, 1337 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.; Axel H. Oxholm, managing director, Pacific Forest Industries, Tacoma Building, Tacoma, Wash.; O. M. Porter, secretary, United States Pulp Producers Association, 122 East Forty-second Street, New York City.

In the general election 2 years ago, in 1938, my Republican opponent had the nerve to display a bundle of shingles and talk about protection for shingles. At that time and for 5 years previously, the shingle industry and workers enjoyed a 25-percent quota, the only protection in 25 years. The Republicans kept shingles on the duty-free list for 25 years, without any quota, causing Senator HOMER T. BONE in the campaign in 1932 to say:

The shingle industry was ruined because of this fact.

In the period since I took my seat in Congress, in 1933, the shingle industry has been revived, old mills remodeled and equipped with new machinery, and new mills built, until now we have three times as many plants and number of shingle weavers employed as in 1932.

November 18, 1935, Charles McGrath, secretary-manager of the United States Red Cedar Shingle Industry, Inc., wrote me:

I hasten to send you this brief note to thank you for the fine help we received from you in our fight to secure the import quota on Canadian shingles. I want to express to you my appreciation of your efforts in our behalf.

To render the quota more effective, I introduced the bill, which became law, for a census of the shingle industry. On May 27, 1937, Mr. McGrath wrote when President Roosevelt signed my bill:

This news is about the most important that has come to red cedar shingle manufacturers and the logging and lumber operators associated with the shingle business.

February 1, 1938, the United States Red Cedar Shingle Industry, Inc., wrote me:

At the annual membership meeting of this association, held in Tacoma, February 1, 1938, a resolution was unanimously approved instructing the secretary to write you expressing the gratitude of this association for your faithful services in our behalf in connection with the import limitations on red cedar shingles.

On November 2, 1938, the following news article was published in the Hoquiam Washingtonian:

SHINGLE WEAVERS COMMEND SMITH

A resolution endorsing MARTIN F. SMITH in his campaign for reelection to Congress was passed this week by Grays Harbor Shingle Weavers, Local 2576. The resolution endorsing SMITH is being sent to all shingle weaver unions in the district council. The resolution commends Congressman SMITH for diligent work in limiting importation of Canadian shingles into the United States.

In this Congress I have actively cooperated in efforts to secure aid for the workers and the shingle industry. Following vigorous efforts before the State Department and Ways and Means Committee, we have recently secured the passage of a bill providing for a duty of 25 cents per square on red cedar shingles imported from Canada, the first duty imposed in 29 years. On June 28, 1940, David M. Williams, secretary-manager, United States Red Cedar Shingle Industry, Inc., wrote me:

The final passage of our shingle bill in the Senate on June 22 brings to a conclusion the long struggle to put shingles back on the duty list. To say that we are pleased, expresses our feeling very mildly.

Having full knowledge of the difficulty of getting a tariff bill through Congress, and particularly one giving protection to the shingle or lumber industries, we are grateful for the continuous thought and effort you have given our affairs.

All during the struggle, since January 1, it has been heartening to know that you were tirelessly working for the passage of our shingle bill and it has been of great value to the writer to be able to confer with you at any time when a conference was deemed necessary. You have been on the job for us and we are very appreciative.

With best wishes for your continued success, we remain

Yours truly,

UNITED STATES RED CEDAR SHINGLE INDUSTRY, INC.,
By DAVID M. WILLIAMS,
Secretary-Manager.

I would suggest that when the candidates of the opposing party talk about shingles that citizens ask them about the do-nothing record of their party for 25 years, and the do-something record of the Roosevelt administration and request an explanation. I would appreciate citizens writing me briefly what explanation, if any, they give. I am curious, as you must be, after reading the foregoing recital of facts, to know what alibi and excuse they have to offer.

LUMBER EXCISE TAX

The lumber business is the best it has been in 10 years. Last year pay rolls and wages in private industry were the highest in the history of the State.

A candidate for Congress should have respect for the voters and for the office he is seeking. What about the candidate

who deliberately circulates malicious falsehoods? Two years ago and again this year the same falsehood is being circulated and published that Members of Congress from our State, including myself, voted to reduce the excise tax on lumber. The best answer to this campaign lie was made December 12, 1938, by Col. W. B. Greeley, secretary-manager and legislative representative of the West Coast Lumbermens' Association, of which our local lumber firms are members:

The west coast lumber industry has had the effective and loyal support of Mr. SMITH on every occasion when we have been asking for his help. He has voted for renewal of the excise tax on imported lumber on every occasion when the matter has been before Congress. He has supported our efforts to have lumber properly defined for taxing purposes, as in the classification of large timbers and with withdrawal of allowances for planing and milling. He has helped us in every question arising for the clarification and administration of the excise tax.

The West Coast Lumbermen's Association keeps wholly out of politics. I just want, as a matter of fairness, to point out that Mr. SMITH has been a very loyal and conscientious supporter of the interests of the lumber industry since he entered Congress. I feel it only square that this fact be made known.

Sincerely yours,

W. B. GREELEY,
Secretary-Manager.

My amendment of the lumber import excise tax, known as the Smith amendment, introduced as H. R. 7934, was attached to the revenue act in 1938 and passed the Senate, was approved by President Roosevelt, and became law. It prevents deductions for tonguing, planing, and grooving of imported lumber and is estimated to increase about 25 percent the excise tax, which is the tax unscrupulous candidates for Congress falsely accuse me of voting to reduce. April 4, 1938, Henry Bahr, counsel for the National Lumber Manufacturers' Association, wrote me as follows:

Regarding your amendment of the lumber import excise tax, which was tacked onto the revenue bill in the Ways and Means Committee and retained by the Senate last week, I am sure Colonel Greeley must have told you how sincerely we appreciate your helpful cooperation in this matter.

Candidates of the opposite party should be asked by the voters why their party, under the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act of 1930 and the Fordney-McCumber Tariff Act of 1922, left lumber and shingles on the duty-free list without any import excise tax or quota limitation, and provided 100-percent free trade with Canada. Such an explanation, if made, would be interesting; probably amusing.

PULP LEGISLATION

I am the author of H. R. 7312, the Smith bill, to amend the Anti-Dumping Act of 1921, to plug up and curtail importations of foreign pulp in competition with our local product. This bill has received wide support from the pulp and sulphite workers' unions and the manufacturers. It has strong support in Congress. The United States Pulp Producers' Association, O. M. Porter, has written me as follows:

I am very glad to be able to tell you that the executive committee of this association has instructed me to do everything possible toward developing Nation-wide support of your bill (H. R. 7312) to amend the Anti-Dumping Act of 1921.

The changed conditions suddenly caused by the invasion of the Scandinavian countries and removal temporarily of competition from that quarter has deferred immediate action, but the legislation is in fine shape for consideration in the next Congress.

PEELER LOG LEGISLATION

Past national administrations have permitted the exporting of peeler logs without hindrance so many years that now this, too, has created a problem to deal with. This has nothing to do with the reciprocal-trade agreements, which have made no change whatsoever. The question is simply one of whether we should limit the export of raw materials, the supply of which is becoming limited on account of our generosity in the past, which we now need for our own domestic use and manufacture by our own labor. I have vigorously favored the enactment of this legislation, which presents difficulties because it establishes a new precedent. Past neglect always renders application of the remedy difficult. The outlook for the enactment of this legislation in the near future is favorable on account of the hearings which have been held and the efforts which have been put forth in its behalf by the entire Washington congressional delegation. On May 24, 1940, Mr. Axel H. Oxholm, managing director, Pacific Forest Industries, with which plywood manufacturers in southwest Washington are affiliated, wrote me:

The board of directors held its annual meeting on May 21 and I was directed to express to you the board's appreciation of the valuable assistance which you have given in the peeler log matter.

APPOINTMENTS TO UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY

Charles L. Jackson, of Vancouver, was appointed to the United States Military Academy at West Point on my recommendation in July 1934, was graduated in 1938, and is now second lieutenant, Twenty-ninth Infantry, Fort Benning, Ga.

Paul B. Cozine, of Vancouver, was appointed to the United States Military Academy at West Point on my recommendation in July 1935, graduated in 1939, and lost his life in an automobile accident December 9, 1939.

NATIONAL YOUTH ADMINISTRATION—CIVILIAN CONSERVATION CORPS

The National Youth Administration has made a splendid record in the State of Washington, and many young men and women in my district have greatly benefited from the program. Through the office of Mr. John H. Binns, the Washington State administrator of N. Y. A., I have obtained official figures on the out-of-school program and the school-work program which reflect the actual earnings of the young people. However, the figures on the college-work program do not take into account students living in my district but attending college elsewhere. There are, of course, a great many young men and women from southwest Washington at the University of Washington, Washington State College, and elsewhere, and they are receiving their full share of the college-work funds. In Clark County a total of 250 young men and women have participated in the out-of-school work program, receiving total monthly earnings of $4,750. There have been 5 Clark County students at Clark Junior College under the college work program, receiving a total yearly quota of $675. Eight schools of Clark County are included in the school-work program, with a total of 111 student workers, and a total yearly quota of $4,482.

The useful and constructive work performed by the young men in the C. C. C. camps has received universal praise. In my district in addition to building trails, roads, bridges, the prevention of floods, and soil erosion and other public improvements, their services in effectively fighting forest fires have resulted in a saving of millions of dollars. The young men themselves have benefited greatly from the training and instruction which they have received, and, of course, their own compensation and the allotments to their dependents have provided added purchasing power. The expenditures for materials and supplies in the vicinity of the camps have been a direct benefit to numerous business firms and merchants. C. C. C. camps have been in operation in practically every county in my district and the entire State of Washington.

AMERICA FOREVER—COMMUNISM, FASCISM, NAZI-ISM NEVER

On June 22, 1940, I voted for H. R. 5138, the most thorough and far-reaching revision of our immigration and deportation laws in the past 25 years. It is directed against all subversive, "fifth column" and un-American activities, and provides punishment for those who attempt to overthrow the Government by force and violence. H. R. 5138, as amended, was carefully considered, and provides effective remedies against all foreign isms without violating our Constitution and American traditions.

My friends, we have the finest country and best Government on earth. Let us keep them that way. There is no room in America for communism, fascism, nazi-ism. There is room for only one ism, and that is Americanism. We are going to keep America out of Europe and we are going to keep Europe out of America.

County Report of Federal Expenditures, Harvey County, Kans.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN M. HOUSTON
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 6, 1940

EXPENDITURES MARCH 4, 1933, THROUGH JUNE 30, 1939

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following report of Federal expenditures in Harvey County, Kans., from March 4, 1933, through June 30, 1939:

County report of Federal expenditures—Harvey County, Kans. (40)—Mar. 4, 1933, through June 30, 1939

LOANS

	Number	Amount
CURRENT PROGRAMS		
Federal Loan Agency:		
1. Reconstruction Finance Corporation (from Feb. 2, 1932)		$6,500
2. Disaster Loan Corporation		
Federal Works Agency:		
3. Public Works Administration, non-Federal projects		
4. U. S. Housing Authority, loan contracts signed		(1)
Department of Agriculture:		
5. Farm Credit Administration, Land Bank Commissioner	136	[2] 267,400
6. Farm Credit Administration, emergency crop and feed	33	[2] 3,480
7. Farm Security Administration, rural rehabilitation		22,778
8. Farm Security Administration, farm tenant purchase	10	96,415
9. Rural Electrification Administration, (total project cost divided by number of counties participating)		
COMPLETED PROGRAMS		
10. Farm Credit Administration, 1934-35 drought relief	16	1,697
11. Home Owner's Loan Corporation, 1933-36	176	301,847
Total, repayable		700,117

EXPENDITURES

CURRENT PROGRAMS			
Federal Works Agency:			
1. Public Works Administration, non-Federal projects		2	$234,490
2. Public Works Administration, Federal projects			
3. Public Roads Administration, completed projects			184,206
4. Public Buildings Administration, Federal buildings			7,834
5. Work Projects Administration			195,595
6. Other Projects under Works Program			
Federal Security Agency:			
7. Social Security Board:			
Old-age assistance	$29,818	212	36,035
Aid to dependent children	5,666	109	
Aid to the blind	551	3	
Department of Agriculture:			
8. Agricultural Adjustment Administration conservation programs:			
1936	$90,070		125,457
1937	35,387		
9. Farm Security Administration, rural rehabilitation			6,757
COMPLETED PROGRAMS			
10. Federal Emergency Relief Administration			113,966
11. Civil Works Administration			88,496
12. Agricultural Adjustment Administration rental and benefit payments			926,636
13. United States Housing Authority, housing (former Public Works Administration housing only)			
Total, nonrepayable			1,919,472
Grand total, repayable and nonrepayable			2,619,589

OTHER BENEFITS

Federal Housing Administration:		
Title I. Modernization and improvement loans insured	83	$27,942
Title II. Mortgages accepted for insurance	60	153,950
Total, housing insurance		181,892
Farm Security Administration, farm debt reduction	20	19,541
Public Roads Administration, active project allotments		5,450

[1] These projects received both loans and grants.
[2] As of Dec. 31, 1938.

County report of Federal expenditures—Harvey County, Kans., (40)—Mar. 4, 1933, through June 30, 1939—Continued

COUNTY STATISTICS [3]

Families in county, 1930	5,644
Dwellings, 1930	5,400
Individual income-tax return, 1935	741
Passenger automobiles registered, 1936	6,105
Families with radios, 1938	4,510
Residential telephones, 1935	3,252
Domestic electric meters, 1930	3,620
Farms, 1935	1,720
Retail employees, 1935	812
Wholesale employees, 1935	92
Mining employees, 1935	0
Manufacturing employees, 1935	191
Persons on farms, 1935	7,386

[3] Source: Consumer Market Data Handbook.

The National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETE JARMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 6, 1940

RESOLUTIONS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF ALABAMA OF THE AMERICAN LEGION

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolutions of the Department of Alabama of the American Legion:

Resolution No. 8

Whereas the United States is faced with the necessity of making immediate preparation for national defense, and the only practicable and democratic method of securing the requisite number of trained men for our land and naval forces is through a system of compulsory selective military training and service: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the American Legion, Department of Alabama, in its annual convention assembled, endorses the principle of compulsory selective military training and service, and calls upon the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to that end; further

Resolved, That we pledge our individual services as ex-soldiers, acquainted with the problem, do offer to serve the Government as board members, draft officers, or to do any other duty that may be assigned us; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs of the United States Senate, the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs of the House of Representatives, the two Senators from Alabama, and the Members of the House of Representatives from Alabama.

Resolution No. 11

Whereas one nation after another has been overrun by the military machines of the totalitarian powers, chiefly because each hoped that it would not become involved and therefore did not cooperate until too late with the nations fighting these powers; and

Whereas we believe that the victory of the totalitarian powers in this war will be a serious threat, not only to the democratic systems throughout the world, but also to the happiness, prosperity, and the very existence of our Nation; and

Whereas we believe that the safety of our Nation will be rendered more secure by contributing all help possible short of war to the defeat of these powers: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Department of Alabama American Legion in convention assembled, at Birmingham, Ala., That we urge the wisdom of contributing all aid possible short of war to the defeat of the totalitarian powers, not primarily to help others, but to get the help of others while they are still able to give it; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be spread on the minutes of this meeting and that copies be sent to the two United States Senators and to the Members of the House of Representatives of the United States from Alabama.

Resolution No. 10

Whereas at this time the peace of the world has been shattered in all quarters except the Western Hemisphere and is threatened here; and

Whereas in cynical disregard of international law the totalitarian countries have invaded the territory and destroyed the freedom of weaker peoples; and

Whereas those same totalitarian countries are spreading, by espionage and other subversive methods, propaganda having for its

purpose the imposition of their principle of autocracy upon the peoples of other democratic countries; and

Whereas the United States has not escaped the influence of these activities and there has been planted in this country agents of foreign powers who, by "fifth column" methods, seek to undermine our American institutions—to soften our public morale and confidence in our Government and in each other; and

Whereas the President of the United States and Congress are trying to steer a course whereby this country can remain at peace, protect our institutions, and fortify this country against the encroachments of all alien isms and at the same time check the onward rush of the forces fighting against free people and modern civilization: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this convention do go on record as condemning subversive activities in this country by foreign nations through the use of so-called "fifth column" methods having for their purposes the weakening of American resistance through a destruction of our modern civilization and American institutions and our claim to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; that we pledge ourselves individually and collectively in every possible way to eliminate these agents and their activities and to neutralize their efforts and do all in our power to eliminate as far as possible such agents as are engaged in these nefarious and subversive operations; that we do again hereby dedicate ourselves to perpetuate a 100-percent Americanism, opposing all foreign agents wherever and whenever they are found; that we pledge our aid and assistance actively and morally to the constituted authorities of the United States toward the elimination of these spies and their works; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be spread upon the minutes and a copy be forwarded to the President of the United States and a copy to each Member of the Alabama delegation in Congress.

Delay in Defense Is Dangerous

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. B. FRANK WHELCHEL

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 6, 1940

Mr. WHELCHEL. Mr. Speaker, I am firmly convinced that the President of the United States should be granted powers, as provided in the event of war or when war is imminent, in an effort to expedite and to put into effect the national-defense program, and I am today introducing a resolution granting the same to him.

It is astounding and appalling the slowness with which we are progressing in the preparation of our defense. People are wanting to know what has happened to the billions of dollars that the Congress has appropriated for this purpose; they want to know why the plants that manufacture war planes are lying idle; they want to know why we are unable to show that some progress has not been made. This Nation must realize that it is faced with a reality and not a theory, and I voice the sentiment of the majority of our people when I say they are anxious that our defense be brought up to where we can at least defend ourselves if an invasion should come. It is too late to be alarmed when this actually happens. My answer to our people for this delay is this: There are so many formalities and technicalities necessary under the existing laws, if followed, there is no help for it. This is no time for delay, and this resolution that I am introducing provides the President with powers that will obviate these dangerous delays. I think that our factories and manufacturing plants should be placed in use immediately for the production of war planes and war materials, and if we sit by without taking steps we will have cause to regret it, because this is exactly what happened to Great Britain and the other nations now involved in war, to their sorrow. One instance that I would like to call to the attention of the House—and I have this information from a source that I believe to be authentic—and that is, prior to August 1 not a single combat plane had been contracted for out of the emergency fund provided by Congress. It is alarming how inadequate our defense is and will be even when the $10,000,000,000 has been spent for planes, tanks, and so forth. For example, inclusive, as I say, of this appropriation we will only have 6,700 pilots as compared to 30,000 for Germany; 7,000 war planes as compared to Germany's 25,000; 1,500 tanks as compared to Germany's 8,000 tanks. In other words, when the $10,000,000,000 has been spent our preparation will be only one-fifth as great as Germany's.

In view of this terrible situation with which we are confronted and the slowness of our getting prepared is why I am constrained to believe that the President should be granted powers at once to rush our defense without delay.

The Broad View of Reclamation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY C. DWORSHAK

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 6, 1940

ARTICLE BY JOHN C. PAGE

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by John C. Page, Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation, before the Seventieth Annual Convention of the American Society of Civil Engineers, at Denver, Colo., on July 24, 1940:

THE BROAD VIEW OF RECLAMATION

(By John C. Page)

Irrigation of arid lands in the United States under the Federal reclamation law is a double-barreled enterprise. It is a social program as well as a business proposition. It creates opportunities for the establishment of new homes, and it develops the Western States which have been carved from the 700,000,000 acres of arid and semiarid lands within our national boundaries.

This combination social and physical development makes good common sense. Older nations have recognized that fact. Down through all recorded history, those nations situated in dry climates have viewed irrigation as a responsibility of the state. The world's oldest civilizations grew in irrigated fields, and after thousands of years they are still flourishing in the irrigated valleys of Egypt, Syria, Persia, and India.

On this continent before the time of Columbus, the Indians were irrigating fields of corn in the Southwest. The Spanish missionaries brought with them to the southwestern deserts from the lands bordering the Mediterranean knowledge of irrigation methods and practices which they planted in American soil.

The Anglo-Saxon stock which dominated in the early settlement of the Atlantic seaboard, and which participated in the expansion westward, had no experience in arid climates. Nevertheless, when it came into the arid and semiarid lands west of the 100th meridian, it quickly adapted itself to the new conditions, as evidenced by the introduction of irrigation by the Mormons in Utah in 1847. The Mormon settlements could not have been supported on the shores of Great Salt Lake except by irrigation.

It is regrettable that there was no irrigation lore among the folk who founded the United States. The common law of England, recognizing riparian rights, hardly was appropriate in arid and semiarid climes. The founders of the new nation which declared its independence in 1776, fighting a war in the humid, verdant valleys east of the Allegheny Mountains to make that declaration stick, never foresaw that the United States would cover a vast arid domain far larger than the area of the Thirteen Original Colonies.

Because of these facts, the United States was slow in assuming its national responsibility in connection with irrigating and developing its arid lands. Initial successes and final failures of other methods of settlement and development of these arid lands had, therefore, to precede Federal action. Even today, 38 years after reclamation was adopted as a national policy, there is a general lack of understanding in the populous, humid areas, where settlements are older, of the conditions and the problems in the West which make irrigation necessary and a lack of appreciation of the objectives and the achievements of the Federal reclamation program.

It is true that the United States could have become a great nation without irrigation, for two-thirds of its territory is humid. But it never would have become so great a nation as it is today without the 20,000,000 acres of irrigated land in these Western States. The economic destinies of more than 13,000,000 people in this arid region and great cities, such as Los Angeles, Phoenix, Salt Lake City, and Denver, rest upon farming by irrigation and the industrial growth made possible by conservation of water. Our irrigation projects are the piers on which the transcontinental railroads bridge the deserts of the West.

The story of this western development parallels the evolution of irrigation in the United States. After the Mormons diverted the waters of City Creek, and before the Federal Reclamation Act was passed, simple and easy water diversions were made from hundreds

of creeks and rivers in the West. By 1900, 8,000,000 acres were irrigated as the result of individual, corporate, cooperative, and State enterprise, and a population of 4,000,000 was being supported in this western third of our country.

By 1902 most of the easy diversion had been completed. Most of the remaining opportunities for developments required construction of storage dams, costly canals, and other works with which the Federal Government alone could cope. On June 17, 1902, the Federal Reclamation Act became law, culminating more than half a century of experimentation, half a century during which private financing of intricate irrigation developments was proving wholly inadequate, half a century which saw half measures tried.

The entry of the Federal Government into the field stimulated other investments as well. There was a rapid expansion of irrigation, only part of which is the direct result of Federal activities. Large areas were watered by pumping from underground sources, particularly in California. Irrigation projects already in existence were expanded. Some entirely new projects using surface waters were developed by irrigation districts. For the last 15 years, however, the Federal Government has been virtually the only agency engaged in irrigation development.

In less than four decades the Bureau of Reclamation has placed works in operation to serve nearly 4,000,000 acres of land. Of this total approximately 2,500,000 acres were once unproductive desert and 1,500,000 acres were in non-Federal irrigation districts which had inadequate water supplies. Today it has a great construction program, the largest in the Bureau's history, which will provide water to about 2,500,000 additional acres, transforming them from sagebrush wastes into productive farms that will support a million people. This will bring to 5,000,000 acres the total of new lands the Bureau has watered.

Equally as important as the irrigation of new lands is the provision of supplemental water for areas already irrigated. Water tables lowered by overdrafts on underground supplies, unanticipated droughts, and inadequate storage facilities threaten many areas with desolation or stagnation. Stabilization or succor of these communities is vital to the public welfare. Rehabilitation projects, therefore, make up about half of our present program. They will serve 3,500,000 acres, including a great area in the pumping section of central California. They will bring to almost 5,000,000 acres the lands which will have been rescued by the Federal Government.

Many of the developments which will be made in the future will require engineering works of great size and complexity, and most of them will be on interstate streams or in the main stems of the large rivers. The Bureau of Reclamation estimates that perhaps as much as 20,000,000 acres additional can be irrigated with water resources as yet undeveloped and under policies now in effect. The future growth of the West will be correlated in large measure with the conservaton of these remaining water resources and their beneficial use.

In the future, as in the past, the Bureau will build sound structures. Reclamation projects are considered permanent national assets, and so durability must be an objective of project construction.

The original basis on which irrigation was undertaken by the Federal Government was that 90 percent of the revenues from the sale of public lands should be used for irrigation in the Western States. The settlers on the irrigated projects were required to repay the cost without interest of the construction of the works serving them. The public-land revenues and the repayments by the settlers were set aside as a reclamation revolving fund.

This was considered a good business proposition on the part of the Federal Government, and, in my opinion, it has proved to be exactly that.

Reclamation projects completed and now operating as a result of this policy have repaid more than $62,000,000 of the cost of the works serving them. They support more than 1,000,000 people on some 70,000 farms and in some 258 project towns. They produce more than $100,000,000 of new wealth annually. They have produced more than two and one-half billions of dollars of new wealth since they first started operation. They have created and are protecting taxable values in excess of $4,500,000,000. They provide an annual market for produce and manufactures of the humid areas worth more than our foreign trade with many countries which are considered prime markets for American goods.

Let me repeat these facts. They are worth repetition. Homes and a chance for a good livelihood for a quarter of a million American families. A crop production valued at $100,000,000 a year. A market for American industry worth $200,000,000 a year. Taxable property carved out of lonely desert totaling more than $4,500,000,000. This is what reclamation has brought to the country.

From the first, however, the Congress has looked on the Federal reclamation program also as a social program. It directed that settlement be on family-size farms. It has written into the law from time to time provisions to prevent speculation in project lands and to protect the settlers. It directs that in selling surplus power from project plants preference shall be given to publicly owned or cooperative distributors. It declared this year "that, in the opening of entry of newly irrigated public lands, preference shall be given to families who have no other means of earning a livelihood, or who have been compelled to abandon, through no fault of their own, other farms in the United States, and with respect to whom there is a probability that such families will be able to earn a livelihood on such irrigated land."

The present practices and methods of the Bureau of Reclamation, even the present method of financing the construction and the large multiple-purpose project, are also the products of evolutionary processes.

The Reclamation Act of June 17, 1902, was brief. It contained only a few hundred words. Subsequent legislation making up the body of the Federal reclamation law, however, together with interpretations, make a volume of several hundred closely printed pages. There have been no startling innovations, however, in this body of law. The original principles—economic feasibility and reimbursability—still govern. For the most part, only logical extensions have been made as changing conditions have dictated.

When the sales of public lands diminished and virtually ceased, other revenues, such as a portion of the royalties from oil and minerals taken from the public lands, were added to the reclamation fund. When it was found that reservoirs being constructed to serve Federal project lands could also be made to provide supplemental water to projects already in existence, provisions were made by which water could be supplied under adequate contracts to those areas. When it evolved, with the construction of large dams, that power could be generated, a measure of flood protection provided, and navigation served in addition to meeting irrigation storage requirements, intelligent and constructive steps were taken to authorize consideration of and the planning for these multiple and related functions.

It obviously is appropriate that the Federal Government should insure a wide distribution of the benefits of these works built in the public interest. These advances were made step by step to that end.

In recent years, beginning with the institution of the first major Public Works program, the reclamation fund has been supplemented and augmented by allotments and appropriations from other sources. Construction financed by the reclamation fund has cost $265,000,000. In addition, allotments from emergency funds totaling $190,937,000 have been made and $324,540,000 have been appropriated from the General Treasury. The allotments from the emergency funds for reclamation projects are also reimbursable and about 25 percent of the total expenditure is chargeable to power and will be returned with interest at a rate not less than 3 percent. Projects like Boulder Dam, Grand Coulee Dam, and the Central Valley project in California never could have been financed wholly from the reclamation fund. I consider each of these, however, wholly justified in the public interest and it is appropriate that general funds have been made available for their construction.

President Theodore Roosevelt told Congress in 1901, "It is as right for the National Government to make the streams and rivers of the arid region useful by engineering works for water storage as to make useful the rivers and harbors of the humid regions by engineering works of another kind."

This cannot be questioned. Historic as is the policy of river and harbor improvement for navigation, however, I do not mean to imply that the justification of Federal reclamation rests wholly on this comparison.

The work of conservation and utilization of the precious water resources of the West stands firmly on its own feet.

While other peoples make terrible wars for expansion, we have only to build great works to provide ourselves with elbowroom. This constructive endeavor which will more than pay its own way through direct returns to the common treasury and increases in taxable wealth, pays dividends in future security as well. I see in these great water projects and the developments which go with them, ramparts which will guard our civilization and which may serve it as well as have the canals served Egypt which were built more than 4,000 years ago.

Conscription

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT T. SECREST

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 6, 1940

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. ROBERT T. SECREST, OF OHIO

Mr. SECREST. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address which I delivered yesterday over the radio:

No man has a greater love for his country than I. No man believes more sincerely in its proper defense.

In February I urged the Congress to stop the sale of steel, gasoline, and other war materials to Japan or any nation that later might become a potential enemy.

I have supported every defense measure that has come before the House in the determination that my country should not meet the fate of the eight nations who placed their reliance in the

false promises of dictators. Those nations that slept awoke to find their freedom gone.

Our people believe in our form of democratic government and desire the adoption of all legislation that will assure the protection of their liberties. We do not want war and believe the surest way to avoid it is to possess military and moral strength that no dictator will dare challenge. It is better to be powerful and avoid attack, than to be weak and invite destruction.

As to the need for a larger Army and Navy, there is no disagreement between me and the most ardent believer in conscription. I know it is useless to have a gun without a soldier trained to use it. I know it is folly to build boats without training men to operate them. I know it is ridiculous to buy airplanes unless we train pilots to fly them. Like every citizen, I realize that modern war and modern defense are highly mechanical and specialized and that it is suicide to train men after a war begins. I believe it to be no less than treason to send untrained men to certain and unnecessary slaughter. Proper training today will save the lives of countless boys should our Nation ever be attacked.

We agree as to the need for training, but I firmly believe the youth of this country, realizing the threat to our security, will respond voluntarily to every need of our military leaders if we in Congress will give them a chance. I hold that conscription should be the last resort of a free people and not the first.

I contend that our needs will be met if we allow a boy to enlist for 1 year for emergency training and pay that boy $30 per month. Today we pay a boy in the Army $21 per month, while the same boy in the C. C. C. camps would be paid $30 per month.

Today, in the Army and Marine Corps, a boy will not be accepted as a volunteer unless he enlists for 3 years. Since July 1, 1939, the Navy has not accepted a volunteer unless he agreed to serve 6 years. The education and life plans of many young men prevent them from enlisting for such long periods.

My bill compels Army, Navy, and Marine Corps officials to accept any volunteer who wishes to enlist for 1 year of emergency training. The advocates of conscription cannot claim that 1 year is too short a time, because the conscription bill provides for the same period of training. Neither will my bill affect the Regular Army or Navy, because anyone can still enlist for the full period of 3 or 6 years if he desires.

Even at the enlistment period of 3 years now in effect in the Army, let us see how successful has been the volunteer system.

On May 20 of this year the Army decided to secure 15,000 recruits by June 30. More than sufficient men responded for the 3-year enlistment.

On July 1 the Army decided to secure 38,000 recruits by August 31. The period is only half gone yet more than 30,000 actual enlistment records have been received in Washington to date. With the records that still remain in the recruiting offices throughout the country there is no doubt but that the quota will be reached long before the date set. In June of this year we had the largest peacetime enlistment in the whole history of the Republic, and, mind you, these boys enlisted for 3 years at only $21 per month. Give the youth of America the opportunity of enlisting for 1 year at $30 per month and I am convinced that the Republic will not want for patriotic defenders. We will get them faster than we can provide adequate shelter and certainly we want no tent army this winter with its resulting epidemic of influenza and death.

Like the Army, the Navy has had all the volunteers it has called for to date even though every one of them had to enlist for 6 years.

When the volunteer system fails, then, and then only, should Congress conscript and regiment the youth of this free land. Some may say it will be too late but that is pure fallacy. The very day the first gun is made with no one to use it, conscription could be placed in operation. If many who now cry for conscription had prevailed, Congress would have adjourned 2 months ago and our threatened Nation would have had neither my bill nor the conscription bill. Those of us who demanded that Congress remain in session must be given credit for the defense steps since, as otherwise they could not have been taken.

There are some who say that conscription is necessary because otherwise patriotic toolmakers and others who are essential for national defense will volunteer for lesser service in the Army. Let them worry no further. I have incorporated into my bill the exact provision of the conscription bill designed to prevent such a result. Under my bill the Army and Navy can reject a volunteer whose time is needed elsewhere for a greater service to his country.

There are some who say conscription is the American way, the democratic way. In the future it may become necessary, but God forbid it. It is the way of every dictator in the world. The way of a democracy is a way of free choice, not of regimentation. In a democracy we worship as we please. We go to bed at 9 o'clock or we go at 12. We go to a show or we stay at home. The blessings of a democracy include the right of free choice and willing service to the Government we have built. Let us give the youth of our land a chance to defend the Nation voluntarily before we resort to conscription.

Give young men a chance to decide the day they can enlist without destroying their plans for education and employment.

That, my friends, is the real American way.

Canada has been at war for nearly 1 year, yet no conscription bill has been placed into effect. They are now registering under a conscription law that will become effective October 1, but that law is conscription for home defense alone. Canada is at war, yet today there is a waiting list of volunteers. Let us try to get volunteers in the armed service by sensible changes in the present law before we resort to regimentation of every young man in America.

In 6 years, more than two and one-half million boys enlisted in the C. C. C. camps of this country. At least that many more were turned away because of a lack of camp facilities. Congress should enact my bill at once. Give a boy a chance to volunteer for 1 year at the same pay as that of the C. C. C., and I feel certain of the same response from youth in every strata of life. Never in the peacetime history of our Nation have we had conscription. I do not contend that it will never come, but I say the volunteer system should be given a fair and reasonable chance first. It is democratic, it will not deplete industry of valuable men, it will not destroy the plans of youth for education or employment, it will not prevent a Regular Army or Navy of longer enlistments, it will not cast upon youth the stigma of being unpatriotic when facts show they have responded to every call for volunteers that has been made to date.

There is no added danger to the Nation, because always as a last resort stands the European method of conscription.

Two days after I introduced my bill in the House former Secretary of War Woodring, for whom I have the greatest regard, endorsed every principle contained in my bill in a letter to Senator Vandenberg.

The conscription bill may come up for consideration in the Senate before it does in the House. If so, I am sure that some Senator who feels as I do on the subject will offer an amendment in the Senate to provide for a shorter period of voluntary enlistment and increased pay.

I believe every man should have convictions and the courage to defend them. We must not surrender to panic or hysteria, but calmly, deliberately, and with supreme common sense we must build our defenses against every enemy within and every potential enemy without our borders. Our people must be united in their faith in democracy and in their desire and willingness to preserve the American way of life. Congress should be careful not to destroy any part of the old American tradition of free choice unless there is no other way to meet the present emergency. I, together with millions of American fathers and mothers and their sons, am convinced there is another way.

County Report of Federal Expenditures, Sumner County, Kans.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. HOUSTON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 6, 1940

EXPENDITURES MARCH 4, 1933 THROUGH JUNE 30, 1939

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following report of Federal expenditures in Sumner County, Kans., from March 4, 1933 through June 30, 1939:

County report of Federal expenditures, Sumner County, Kans., Mar. 4, 1933, through June 30, 1939

LOANS

	Number	Amount
CURRENT PROGRAMS		
Federal Loan Agency:		
1. Reconstruction Finance Corporation (from Feb. 2, 1932)	-------	$27,067
2. Disaster Loan Corporation	-------	-------
Federal Works Agency:		
3. Public Works Administration, non-Federal projects	-------	(1)
4. U. S. Housing Authority, loan contracts signed	-------	-------
Department of Agriculture:		
5. Farm Credit Administration, Land Bank Commissioner	385	[2] 748,200
6. Farm Credit Administration, emergency crop and feed	103	[2] 12,690
7. Farm Security Administration, rural rehabilitation	-------	106,840
8. Farm Security Administration, farm tenant purchase	-------	-------
9. Rural Electrification Administration (total project cost divided by number of counties participating)	1	120,500
COMPLETED PROGRAMS		
10. Farm Credit Administration, 1934–35 drought relief	16	1,971
11. Home Owners' Loan Corporation, 1933–36	272	398,381
Total, repayable	-------	1,415,649

[1] These projects received both loans and grants.
[2] As of Dec. 31, 1938.

County report of Federal expenditures, Sumner County, Kans., Mar. 4, 1933, through June 30, 1939—Continued

EXPENDITURES

		Number	Amount
CURRENT PROGRAMS			
Federal Works Agency:			
1. Public Works Administration, non-Federal projects		6	$231,220
2. Public Works Administration, Federal projects			
3. Public Roads Administration, completed projects			274,204
4. Public Buildings Administration, Federal buildings			8,119
5. Work Projects Administration			922,007
6. Other projects under Works Program			
Federal Security Agency:			
7. Social Security Board:			
Old-age assistance	$65,720	365	77,253
Aid to dependent children	10,170	144	
Aid to the blind	1,363	12	
Department of Agriculture:			
8. Agricultural Adjustment Administration conservation programs:			
1936	$185,218		249,107
1937	63,889		
9. Farm Security Administration, rural rehabilitation			45,415
COMPLETED PROGRAMS			
10. Federal Emergency Relief Administration			385,390
11. Civil Works Administration			168,288
12. Agricultural Adjustment Administration rental and benefit payments			1,938,140
13. U. S. Housing Authority, housing (former Public Works Administration housing only)			
Total, nonrepayable			4,290,053
Grand total, repayable and nonrepayable			5,714,702

OTHER BENEFITS

Federal Housing Administration:		
Title I. Modernization and improvement loans insured	147	$44,843
Title II. Mortgages accepted for insurance		89,000
Total, housing insurance		133,843
Farm Security Administration, farm debt reduction	62	83,599
Public Roads Administration, active project allotments		56,650

COUNTY STATISTICS [3]

Families in county, 1930	7,643
Dwellings, 1930	7,400
Individual income tax returns, 1935	563
Passenger automobiles registered, 1936	7,377
Families with radios, 1938	5,470
Residential telephones, 1935	3,767
Domestic electric meters, 1930	4,598
Farms, 1935	3,097
Retail employees, 1935	657
Wholesale employees, 1935	108
Manufacturing employees, 1935	120
Persons on farms, 1935	12,069

[3] Source: Consumer Market Data Handbook.

Did a Party Die?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARTEL J. JONKMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 6, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE GRAND RAPIDS HERALD

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Grand Rapids Herald of July 30, 1940:

[From the Grand Rapids Herald of July 30, 1940]

DID A PARTY DIE?

Back in 1912 some of us saw an attempt on the part of a Roosevelt to kill the Republican Party. He dismembered it by forming a new party, the Bull Moose. In 1916 some of us saw that party actually die, never to be resurrected. Today a great many persons who attended the Chicago convention of the old Democratic Party are wondering if perhaps we did not see that party die.

It is a fact which cannot be controverted that Jeffersonianism as applied to the Democratic Party did die. Perhaps it was killed as early if not earlier than 1936. It certainly passed out of the picture in Chicago in 1940. What happened and what has been happening during the last 8 years was the absorption of certain elements, the leftwingers of both the Democratic and Republican Parties, by the New Deal. Today the New Deal consists of one man, Franklin D. Roosevelt, who dictates all its policies even to the nomination of himself for the unprecedented and dangerous third term, the nomination of his running mate, and the writing of a platform which he hastened to observe he will interpret as he sees fit. Therefore he alone becomes the platform and the party.

But that isn't all of it. In 1938 Mr. Roosevelt undertook a purge of all those Jeffersonian Democrats who had dared oppose his dictum. He failed because the voters refused to stand with him. But in Chicago he was entirely successful. He ignored all the Democrats, surrounded himself only with the left wingers, the New Deal, and drove out all Democrats who went to Chicago in the belief that they were to attend a Democratic National Convention.

Only the votes of the people in November really can kill the Democratic Party. The New Deal stuck the knife in its back in Chicago. If the people in November reelect Franklin D. Roosevelt, if they obey his dictum, then they will have killed the Democratic Party and set up in its stead the New Deal over which Mr. Roosevelt has declared himself the dictator. If those who attended the Chicago convention didn't see actually the death of the Democratic Party, they did see at least the stab in the back which may cause the death.

JUST SUPPOSING

Henry A. Wallace, who was nominated for Vice President at the recent Chicago convention of the New Deal Party, who was named at the demand of President Roosevelt and who was so bitterly opposed by perhaps a majority of the delegates that he collected boos every time his name was mentioned, was opposed not so much because he was Wallace or even because his nomination was dictated by the big boss of the convention and of the party as because of the implications which go along with the nomination and the possible election of him as Vice President of the United States. Wallace, himself, is a fine chap of a sort of mystic type, one who does a lot of dreaming, is not at all practical, who would reform the entire world along social and economic lines. But it must be remembered that the Vice President succeeds to the Presidency in case of a vacancy in the Executive Office.

It never is nice to speculate on a man's possible death. Yet we must admit that death comes to us all in due course. Supposing that Roosevelt and Wallace should be elected this fall. And supposing that, unhappily, the President, worn by the cares of his office—and he shows clearly what has happened to him in the last 7 years—should die or become incapacitated. Or supposing that in a year or two, after the European war is over, he should decide that the country no longer needs him and should resign. Be it remembered that such a suggestion was made at Chicago in the effort to calm the revolt which so many could see coming. Suppose for one or another reason a vacancy should occur in the office of the Chief Executive. Then automatically Mr. Wallace would succeed to that office. Not one man in a thousand who knows Mr. Wallace ever would vote for him for President. The Democratic Convention, even under the lash of Mr. Roosevelt, could not have forced the delegates to have nominated Wallace for the Presidency. Mr. Wallace definitely is not Presidential timber. Few, even of his friends, would claim he is. More than that, Mr. Wallace is far more New Dealish than is the President. Indeed, Mr. Wallace is a radical who perhaps is not far from "red" tendencies. With him in the White House the administration of Mr. Roosevelt would look most reactionary. We would see radicalism such as we in America never dreamed. We would see this Government entirely transformed so far as he might be able to transform it. We would find ourselves controlled, regimented, socialized far more than the President dares even propose.

It is that very fear, more perhaps than any other one thing, which caused such bitter resentment against the nomination of Wallace. It was the feeling, because of the feelers which had been sent out, that when the fall election rolls around Democrats will actually be voting for Wallace for President rather than for Roosevelt. And Wallace as President is unthinkable to all but the most radical element in the United States. Roosevelt in this campaign is only a phantom who may voluntarily or involuntarily be removed from the Presidency, if elected, long before the end of his term. It was that, more than all other considerations, which prompted the bitter opposition to Wallace.

Townsend Voters League Commends Congressmen Who Supported Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. R. T. BUCKLER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 6, 1940

Mr. BUCKLER of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter which was sent out by L. W. Jeffery, executive secretary

of the Townsend National Voters League, 450 East Ohio Street, Chicago, Ill., to the Townsend clubs in the Ninth Congressional District of Minnesota, which I am privileged to represent in the United States House of Representatives. Dr. F. E. Townsend is chairman of this organization, and I am personally gratified to receive the mention given me in the communication. The letter referred to dated July 11, 1940, is as follows:

To all Townsend clubs and members in the Ninth Congressional District of Minnesota:

Secretaries: Please read at your next meeting.

DEAR FRIENDS: On June 1, 1939, certain Members of the United States Congress voted for legislation embodying the principles of the Townsend plan. We are proud to advise you that the Honorable R. T. BUCKLER was one of the men who voted for our measure.

During this past session of Congress he not only supported our bill, but has worked for its enactment. He has done all that he could for us in Washington, and now comes the opportunity when we can demonstrate to him that we appreciate what he has done.

We believe that every member of our organization should not only vote for Mr. BUCKLER, but should work to secure as many additional votes for him as it is possible for them to do.

Campaigns are won by individual work. Contact your friends and acquaintances and ask them to work and vote for Mr. BUCKLER. Here is your opportunity to demonstrate to Mr. BUCKLER that the Townsendites are behind him and are willing to put forth their best efforts to see him nominated.

Very sincerely yours,

L. W. JEFFERY,
Executive Secretary.

Knights of Pythias

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. M. MICHAEL EDELSTEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 6, 1940

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. NICHOLAS ATLAS

Mr. EDELSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an address delivered by Hon. Nicholas Atlas, assistant district attorney of New York County, and member of the grand lodge law committee, Knights of Pythias, domain of New York, delivered June 28, 1940, over station WHOM, on the Independence Day program of the grand lodge of that order:

It is very good that this program of celebration of our country's one hundred and sixty-fourth birthday comes in advance of the day fixed by the choice and practice of our people for such celebration, July 4. It is good that we celebrate and commemorate the great day, as we do, now, before we lose in the din of festive cannonade and the cries of joyous huzzahing the opportunity for a moment's sincere thinking about the meaning of this birthday, the meaning of our nation-hood and ideals and independence, at a time when for so many other nations their birthdays are no longer meaningful. It is good that amid the swell of patriotic feeling engendered by the occasion there should be sober thought and expression of what this feeling, what our patriotism means. For sober thought and cautious judgment, and also an earnest search for the right and the moral, and not youthful and unconsidered revolt for the sake of revolt, fathered our independence and our nation-hood.

To me this is very significant. Our Declaration of Independence, beautiful in its language and poetically rich with the rarest, most religious, and patriotic sentiments of mankind, was not a defiance but an explanation. Before our democracy was established, it showed that our democracy already existed. It was not so much a declaration of the intentions of our ancestors—in blood or in thought, what matter, they are our ancestors—intentions already long in the hearts of those who made and fought our Revolution, as it was an honorable statement of the reasons for their conduct, made democratically to their neighbors in all the world, a statement decrying force, but acknowledging its necessity, acknowledging too that force, if used, must be justifiably used, justly used, used on the basis only of reason—a report upon their actions, to the world at large. The author of that declaration, Jefferson, who died on July 4, puts the words into the original of the great document itself: "A decent respect to the opinions of mankind requires that they (the Americans) should declare the causes which impel them * * *", to the separation from their then oppressors.

The great Declaration, therefore, is a demonstration of the rectitude and probity of purpose that actuated the founders. The important part of it is, the reasons advanced, full of nobility, for the declaration of the independence of the colonies. The Declaration itself might well have remained and been effective in the form in which, on June 7, 1776, it was introduced in the Continental Congress by Richard Henry Lee. But it was a desire for just dealing and fair elucidation of purpose that caused the postponement of Lee's resolution for 3 weeks so that "in the meantime a committee be appointed to prepare a declaration to the effect of the said first resolution"; and added is a note to show the stress of the moment, "lest any time should be lost in case the Congress agree to this resolution."

Thus, in the moment of stress they found time to be right—in their struggle for a desirable end they found the necessity of justifying that end in the light of universal morality, and in their battle they relinquished no bit of the honesty and the good character they had from their ancestral code of fair play and devout Biblical religion.

And, knowing this and reading the Declaration, we know, too, that they were moved not by a desire for power, nor by avarice and rapaciousness, but only by a desire to live their own life as free men under God, at their own expense, not at the expense of others; by their own toil and effort, not by the theft of the fruits of another's toil and effort or of that toil and effort itself; by a desire to live free from the oppression of another people, not by the oppression of another people.

We may proudly relate today that throughout all our history since that day the lover of power for its own sake has been absent from our deliberations as a Nation, from our work as a people.

"Of all our passions and appetites," says Gibbon, "the love of power is of the most imperious and unsociable nature, since the pride of one man requires the submission of the multitude. In the tumult of civil discord the laws of society lose their force, and their peace is seldom supplied by those of humanity. The ardour of contention, the pride of victory, the despair of success, the memory of past injuries, and the fear of future dangers, all contribute to inflame the mind, and to silence the voice of pity."

We are not filled with this love. Our minds are not inflamed and we have shunned the tumult. We have not sought the suppression of multitudes. No. On the contrary—being lovers of democracy and democracy being what it is, we have sought always to bring the one man forward; to make government for the benefit of all men, to be sure, but for the benefit of the one man, 130,000,000 replicas of whom are the Nation.

Democracy remembers the one man. The lesson of today must be, that the one man must remember democracy. He must remember it as his protection:

"Pray for the welfare of the Kingdom," said a Talmud sage "for were it not for that men would swallow each other alive."

He—this one man—must remember democracy as his heritage of life. He must remember it by supporting it and realize that all of its support must come from his individual loyalty, devotion, honesty, selflessness in its benefit, in short his good character.

Can there be patriotism in a democracy other than this, that each man's good character and good will are the bond given by him for the maintenance and continuance of the general weal? Men are not angels, but in a democracy they must approximate in their conduct an ideal which the ideal of democracy demands. Our striving must be therefore for the attainment in our characters and conduct of a state which John Adams, another patriot who died on July 4, the same day as Jefferson, has described.

He wrote:

"Oh, that I could wear out of my mind every mean and base affectation; conquer my natural pride and self-conceit; expect no more deference from my fellows than I deserve; acquire that meekness and humility which are the sure mark and characters of a great and generous soul; subdue every unworthy passion; and treat all men as I wish to be treated by all."

A democracy needs men. A dictatorship—or, to use an older and perhaps more respectable word, a tyranny—needs but a man. A democracy exists for and belongs to its men. A dictatorship only for and to its man.

Now more than ever in our history we need in our democracy, always richly endowed in men, men and more men, not mere human beings, but men of good purpose and good character and good will—truthworthy, loyal—helpful, friendly—courteous, kind—obedient to the authority they themselves have constituted and which they constitute, an authority duly, justly constituted within their own basic law—cheerful, thrifty men—brave men and clean, in body, thought, acts—comradely men—and reverent men, revering the democracy they uphold, revering God, and revering the worship of God, their own and that of others, respecting in their sublime respect for God and their democracy and the opinions of mankind, also each other, each his fellow in the great mass that makes this excellent whole. We need such men at the helm—we need such men in the ranks. In a democratic community where many are joined of their own free will all must be self-reliant, all reliable and reliably devoted to each other and to the voluntary association they have formed for the universal good.

Do we want these men for war and slaughter? Take no fright. We want and need these men for war and life. We want them for war on the home front. That is not a war of planes and tanks and gunfire and death. It is a war for an ideal—a war to be fought by living democracy and making democracy work—strongly, quickly, efficiently, the combined strength, speed, and efficiency of 130,000,-

000 souls with a single devotion, a single purpose—to persist by being strong within, and hale, by being strong and victorious against those who wish us ill.

What do we ask of each other, then, in our democracy? A devotion to its ideals and aims, to its common background and history of honesty and integrity of purpose, to its flag and symbols, and its language—above all, the devotion of every citizen to the other and a sublime sportsmanship—a recognition of the weaker man's right to life and its pursuits—the stronger man's forbearance while the weaker collects himself for the fray of living—the stronger man's provision of protection for the weaker for those times and events which, it is known, the weaker cannot survive without help—the recognition by the powerful that the feeble are a part of the community who in their feebleness may play the mouse to the lion and contribute nimbleness and wit and industry to support the strong man's freedom to act in the common good and guard the common home—a recognition by the weaker of his part and an effort by him to do what he can under nature to lighten the burden of all—a search and battle for greater fitness than only the necessary physical fitness for the creation and establishment of universal fitness—a reinterpretation of the words "survival of the fittest" to mean that all working together can be fit to survive—to exercise, not tolerance alone, but understanding—at worst, decent forbearance for differences in others, for things we may even dislike—to love one's neighbor.

In short, on the birthday of our country we call upon each other for unity—for integrity of the united purpose—for good character of the individual—the whole to constitute an armor to defend us within and, therefore, victoriously to defend us, if need be, without.

In contributing men of good character to this great scheme of our being may the Pythian order always have a large and generous hand.

Adjustment of Army Pay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. SHANLEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 1940

ARTICLE BY MAJ. GEORGE FIELDING ELIOT

Mr. SHANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am including in my remarks a statement of Maj. George Fielding Eliot printed in the New York Herald Tribune on the need for adjustment of Army pay to spur recruiting. Nothing is more important at this time than a review of the Army situation and its effect on recruiting.

MAJOR ELIOT URGES ADJUSTMENT OF ARMY PAY TO SPUR RECRUITING

(By Maj. George Fielding Eliot)

While recruiting for the Regular Army remains upon a voluntary basis, it is very largely influenced by what the Army has to offer the young men of America as a career. It is not generally realized that in this respect the Army is greatly inferior to the Navy, but the young man who is considering entering some branch of the armed service finds this out quickly enough when he looks into the matter before making his decision. Hence the lag in Army recruiting.

He discovers that if he goes into either service he will start at the same basic rate of pay, $21 a month. Thereafter, however, things are very different. The Navy recruit continues to receive $21 only for about 3 months, the time he spends in the training station. Presuming that he elects the seaman branch, he then goes to sea as a seaman, second class, at $36 a month. After serving in that grade for a year, and passing a qualifying examination, he can be promoted to seaman, at $54 a month, and thereafter at yearly intervals, subject to examination and to vacancies, can rise through the petty-officer grades till he reaches Grade I (chief petty officer on permanent appointment) at a base rate of $126 a month.

The Army recruit has no such cheerful prospects before him. When he is through with the recruit depot he goes to a unit, but he continues to receive $21 until vacancies make room for him in the grade of private first class, which may be a long time; then he gets $30. Later on he may be selected to become a noncommissioned officer—and as a corporal he will get $42 a month. He will not overtake the Navy seaman, at $54, until he has reached the grade of sergeant, which may be in his second enlistment or even later.

It is only fair to add that the Army recruit has two advantages which the Navy does not provide. He may qualify for "specialist pay," which may run as high as $30 a month, but there are very few of these higher-grade specialists, and almost half of the total number of men with specialist rating are in grade 6, which pays $3 a month extra. Also, the soldier gets a yearly clothing allowance, while the Navy man has to pay for his own clothing after the issue of his initial outfit. This allowance gives the soldier somewhere in the neighborhood of $2 a month, and what he does not draw in clothing he gets in cash at the end of his enlistment. The average savings are from $45 to $70 for a 3-year enlistment. These items by no means make up for the inequalities in pay.

But when we come to examine the opportunities for promotion, the dice are even more heavily weighted in favor of the Navy. Less than 1 percent of the Army's enlisted men are in grade 1 (at $126), while almost 8 percent of the Navy's are in that grade. Between 8 and 9 percent of the Army's enlisted men are in the first three grades (at $126, $84, and $72, respectively) while about 37 percent of the Navy's enlisted men are in those grades.

For promotion to the rank of warrant officer, the Navy recruit has about four times the chance of the Army recruit; and when he does get this promotion, the Army man finds himself limited to a possible maximum monthly pay and allowances of $243 after 20 years' service, and to a maximum pay and allowances on retirement of $138.75, while the Navy warrant officer after 20 years' service will be getting $356 with further raises still possible and his maximum on retirement is $281.25, more than twice that of the Army.

This whole state of affairs has arisen from the time when it was possible for the Navy to say that they required a high percentage of technicians who could be given specialist training of various sorts, and in order to retain such men in the service they had to have high rates of pay. There is, however, no longer any distinction between Army and Navy in this respect. The Army is just as highly mechanized and just as much in need of high-grade men as the Navy.

If we are to have a first-class Army raised in whole or in part by voluntary enlistment, we must see to it that the Army is made attractive as a career. In order to do this, certain immediate steps are necessary.

First, the pay of enlisted men, and opportunities for promotion (i. e., percentages in the various grades) must be placed on an equal basis with the Navy, as far as voluntary enlisted personnel is concerned. (If we come to conscription, much lower rates for conscripted personnel in either service might be envisaged.) Pay for specialist qualifications can be equalized between the two services (the Navy now has some extra-pay jobs as well as the Army). The clothing allowance might well be extended to the Navy, on an equitable basis, after study of respective average wear and tear.

Second, when this is done, the whole question of service pay can be taken up anew and studied with a view to making the services completely attractive with civil occupations. One great obstacle in the way of such revision to date has been the Army's insistence on equality with the Navy as a prerequisite, while the Navy has desired a unilateral increase.

Third, the Army must have a warrant officers' corps equal in proportionate number and in professional standing to that of the Navy. These warrant officers could perform many routine duties and could relieve commissioned officers for their main task of preparing themselves for command in war. Incidentally, an increase of Navy warrant officers would be well worth considering on the latter grounds.

What About the Monroe Doctrine Now?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 5, 1940

ARTICLE BY WILLIAM R. CASTLE

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article written by William R. Castle, former Under Secretary of State and former Ambassador to Japan, entitled "What About the Monroe Doctrine Now?" and appearing in the Saturday Evening Post of July 27, 1940. Mr. Castle's article follows:

[From the Saturday Evening Post of July 27, 1940]

WHAT ABOUT THE MONROE DOCTRINE NOW?

(By William R. Castle, former Under Secretary of State and former Ambassador to Japan)

One man says the trouble with articles on the Monroe Doctrine is that they take for granted you know all about why it started and what it is. The next man says that papers about the Monroe Doctrine are always boring, because writers stop to explain what the doctrine is, when everybody knows already. To satisfy both is impossible, but, since people dispute endlessly, and generally ignorantly, about the meaning of the Monroe Doctrine, and since many assert as indisputable a lot of things which have absolutely nothing to do with it, a few words of clarification and historical background are necessary—but only a few.

Early in the nineteenth century there was a spirit of liberty abroad in the world which came into violent opposition with the dying spirit of reaction and oppression, just as today the spirit of reaction, as typified by the dictatorships, is clashing with the still vigorous if sadly disorganized spirit of freedom. The various colonies of Spain and the one great colony of Portugal in the Western Hemisphere were forcibly breaking away from the mother countries, and Americans, who had only recently won their own freedom from Great Britain, were enthusiastic for the revolting colonies. They had a vision of a new hemisphere made up of republics of similar ideals, trading happily together, understanding one another, and together building a wonderful new world. But these new nations had to be protected until they could look after themselves. So the idea of the Monroe Doctrine was born.

President Monroe, in 1823, notified the world that the United States would tolerate no interference with the new republics of the Western Hemisphere. It was a bold thing for this young Nation, hardly out of swaddling clothes, to defy such states as Russia, Austria, and France. But, except for one or two fumbling and half-hearted attempts, the countries across the Atlantic have not even tried to find out for sure whether we meant what we said.

People say that England was the first to propose hands off the new republics. This is not true. As far back as 1811, Congress passed a resolution concerning European possessions to the south of us which said, in part, "The United States * * * cannot, without serious inquietude, see any part of the said territory pass into the hands of any foreign power." At the same time, there had been much talk of recognizing as independent nations the colonies in revolt against Spain, but England would not join with us, and as the months passed, sober American judgment decided against hasty action. There was too much danger of war as a consequence. Our ancestors of those days felt even more vigorously than we feel today that we had better keep out of Europe's quarrels. The colonies had been involved in one war after another, just because nations holding American territory were fighting in Europe. The Holy Alliance was busy meddling in matters which were none of its business, and now, in 1823, it began to look westward at the revolted Spanish colonies. So President Monroe, in his annual message to Congress, included certain sentences which he had little idea would become one of the cornerstones of American foreign policy.

What is this Monroe Doctrine which was so ably sketched by President Monroe and his irascible Secretary of State, John Quincy Adams? It was a plain statement to Europe that "the American continents, by the free and independent condition which they have assumed and maintain, are henceforth not to be considered as subjects for future colonization by any European powers." And, Monroe went on to say, "In the wars of the European powers in matters relating to themselves, we have never taken any part, nor does it comport with our policy so to do. It is only when our rights are invaded or seriously menaced that we resent injuries or make preparation for our defense."

Monroe then expressed the American disapproval of European systems of government and declared that "we should consider any attempt on their part to extend their system to any portions of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety." We had no intention of interfering, he said, with any existing European colonies. "But, with the governments who have declared their independence and maintained it, and whose independence we have * * * acknowledged, we could not view any interposition for the purpose of oppressing them, or controlling in any other manner their destiny, by any European power, in any other light than as the manifestation of an unfriendly disposition toward the United States." And a little later in the message: "It is impossible that the allied powers [Russia, Austria, Prussia, and France] should extend their political system to any portion of either [American] continent without endangering our peace and happiness; nor can anyone believe that our southern brethren, if left to themselves, would adopt it of their own accord."

That is all there is to the Monroe Doctrine. It is a warning to Europe to leave this hemisphere alone. It does not give and never has given the United States any right to interfere in the internal affairs of the other nations of the two continents; it is merely an assertion on our part that we are not going to permit them to be gobbled up or forced to change their forms of republican government. How much effect this had at the time will never be known. What was clear to Europe was that England had wanted to make this doctrine in the form of a joint declaration; that it was sympathetic with the American stand; and that the British fleet would be likely to make any expedition across the Atlantic very hazardous. People in England did not know that John Quincy Adams was thinking only of the United States when he rejected the British suggestion of a joint declaration.

He did not want Britain to be guaranteeing anything on the American continents. That would cause trouble in the future. Also, there was a mild phrase in the British suggestion which probably worried him. Referring to the revolted Spanish colonies, it said, "We aim not at the possession of any portion of them ourselves." Adams was afraid that England would not keep its word and was equally afraid we should. There was a strong popular feeling in favor of annexing Cuba, and there were rumblings in the Southwest which presaged the Mexican War and the annexation of California. Young and lusty nations do not like self-denying ordinances. In his care for his country, as against all other interests, Adams has often been called the "first isolationst."

A TWOFOLD PURPOSE

The inspiration of the Monroe Doctrine was warm sympathy for the new States; its motive was the determination to protect ourselves from alien and hostile influences. It could not give the United States any rights over the Latin American nations, was not even addressed to them. If the nations of Latin America could have realized this, and if Americans who falsely claimed that the Monroe Doctrine gave them authority to be domineering could have been suppressed, there never would have been anywhere any violent opposition to the doctrine. There would have been no excuse for prominent members of the Administration to urge that the Monroe Doctrine be replaced by the good-neighbor policy. As a matter of fact, these two policies went hand in hand for a hundred years. Neither can replace the other, because the Monroe Doctrine is simply an assertion by us of our intentions; the good-neighbor policy can give us no protection, because it has become a one-way policy, is all giving and no taking. We have turned the other cheek so often that both are inflamed.

During its long history, the Monroe Doctrine has never been seriously challenged. It is true that the French set up a monarchy in Mexico during our Civil War, when they knew we were helpless. The Mexicans themselves disposed of the new regime, but the French were prepared to retreat promptly when we suggested it. The British and the Germans at different times made a pretense of ignoring the doctrine, but when Cleveland and later Theodore Roosevelt put on a bold front, they gave up without pushing their aims further and without bad feeling. What, then, has today raised the question as to whether we shall or shall not maintain the Monroe Doctrine as formulated? It has been a tremendous success. Why change?

One reason urged for giving it up is that the Latin American republics are full grown and able to protect themselves. Many South American states say that our promise of protection should be replaced by a contract among all the nations of the hemisphere to work together to repel foreign invasion. The United States could have no objection to such a contract, but neither could it give up the Monroe Doctrine, at least so far as certain parts of the continent are concerned. It must be drummed into people again and again that the purpose of President Monroe was twofold—to protect the new states while they grew up and, above all, to protect his own country. We might today agree on common hemispherical defense, but if it were necessary for us to act alone for our own defense, we should have to do it.

For example, let us imagine, if we can, that the other states of Latin America are for some reason out of sympathy with Mexico, and consider anyhow that the doings of Mexico, at the tip of the Latin American bloc, do not much concern them. Let us imagine also that Hitler is worried over the growing popularity of Goering, wants to get him out of Germany, but at the same time to give him a job elsewhere. So he instructs the "fifth column" to do intensive preparatory work in Mexico, sends some officers to train and at the same time seduce the Mexican Army, and finally engineer a revolution which would put Goering in control of the country. This may sound fantastic, but Napoleon III did much the same thing, and anyhow Hitler's plans are unpredictable. Argentina and Brazil might not much care, but it would certainly interest the United States a great deal. We should have to move quickly, and we should move under the Monroe Doctrine. We can afford to share the responsibility of the protection of other nations; we cannot possibly sell out our responsibility to protect ourselves.

A second reason advanced for a change in the Monroe Doctrine is the revolution in Europe. European holdings in the hemisphere have not much bothered us in the past, but if they should be turned over to Germany, they would instantly become at least a potential menace. As a third reason, it is pointed out that increased speed of communications of all kinds has brought Europe to our very door. The oceans have shrunk, and this fact changes completely the whole question of defense. Last and most important reason is the existence of the Panama Canal, our canal, vital for us from a naval point of view and, moreover, a canal for which we are trustees to the world.

THE LATIN AMERICAN HERITAGE

We must think about all these things. We must also ask ourselves how much we can count on the friendly cooperation of the American republics. We might just as well be realistic and admit that they have no particular affection for us and that most of them are dictatorships in fact, although still republics in name. In cases of disagreement between the United States and Europe, Latin American sympathies have generally been with Europe. Their heritage is very different from ours. What part, then, if any, of the geographical extent of the Monroe Doctrine can we afford to give up?

It is not hard to understand why great nations like Argentina and Brazil are annoyed at the suggestion of inferiority implied in our promise to defend them. Yet, with the profound changes that modern inventions have brought, they may need our help more than at any time during the past 100 years. Nevertheless, might it not be possible and the part of wisdom to say to all these nations whose independence, because of distance, is not vital to our safety, "In face of new scientific developments which have cut the protection of the ocean, we of the Western Hemisphere must all stand together to maintain our independence. We in the United States may need your assistance as much as you may need ours. If you think such forebodings are unjustified, you are wholly at liberty to withdraw from all cooperation, but in those circumstances you

will have to excuse us from any obligation to come to your assistance. If you agree, on the other hand, that we should all stand together, it must be a real working arrangement. Every one of us, in accord with capacity, must create his share of the defense forces, must build such engines of war as he can afford. The United States would expect you to give free access to your airports and your harbors for our fighting ships of air and sea, to permit the landing of American troops in your territory if this seems necessary for defense. In this, we should, of course, reciprocate.

No man can prophesy which course the different nations would choose. It can only be said that if Argentina, for example, refused such wholehearted cooperation, it would ease the armament burden of the United States to the extent that we should not have to send our fleet so far to the south. If Argentina accepted, we should welcome its cooperation with delight, because such cooperation would be more likely than anything else to curb the predatory instincts of some overambitious nation. Also, to look at the other side of the picture, we should have to admit to ourselves that any nation refusing to cooperate would bring on itself the risk of more potent and dangerous European influences. That is why we might offer to surrender the principles of the Monroe Doctrine only in the case of really distant nations, in all probability only Brazil, Argentina, Uruguay, and Chile.

In our present hysterical state we forget that the danger of direct military attack by a foreign nation on any one of the American nations is highly improbable at any time, and inconceivable just now. You cannot send armies too far from their base of supplies, nor can you transport armies across an ocean when such transport is sure to involve collision with a strong navy. How comparatively impotent was the whole force of concentrated German air attack on the huddled vessels in the Channel during the evacuation of Dunkerque!

ECONOMIC PENETRATION

What is more likely than the coming of foreign armies is the imposition, sometime in the future, of European systems of government by means of influences working within the different countries, either Communist or Fascist. This cannot be an immediate danger, whatever one hears, because the "fifth column" can be dangerously effective only when its way has been prepared economically. If the most lucrative trade relations are with Germany, national sentiment will inevitably be more or less pro-German and the words of the propagandists will appear beneficent rather than poisonous. But dangerous as such influences may be in the future, we have no right under the Monroe Doctrine to interfere with an alien organization permitted to operate in a country, or with the form of government or the internal and domestic arrangements of any country in this hemisphere any more than anywhere else, unless we can prove that its government was imposed from abroad and against the popular will.

It is possible to imagine that the Germans of Brazil who, although they number only 300,000 among 45,000,000, might, especially with the aid of the dictatorial government now in power, seduce the million or more thoroughly naturalized Italians as well as a majority of the Portuguese and Indians of the country. A Nazi Government in Brazil would immediately form the closest connections with the Nazis in Germany. Yet if such a government apparently represented the will of the majority of the people of Brazil, there is not a thing in the world that we could legally do about it. Neither the Monroe Doctrine nor international law would permit interference. Equally difficult would be our problem if the more radical elements in Chile should establish there a Communist Government in close cooperation with the Soviet. We could not protest, unless we had conclusive proof that the change had been dictated by Moscow, and not even then if the people of Chile were satisfied.

Cases such as these point clearly to the value of an understanding with the great nations of South America, particularly since such an understanding would bring them closer to one another as well as to us. The Germanizing of Uruguay or the sovietizing of Chile is as important to Argentina as are similar movements in Mexico to us. If, in such crises, American property were confiscated and American lives jeopardized, we could intervene under the general principles of international law, but this would be inconsistent, to say the least, with our recent record in Mexico. We should also be hampered by the extraordinary promise made when our Government signed in Montevideo a treaty with all the American republics promising that there would never be resort to force at any time, under any circumstances, or for any reason. Whatever we do, we shall be denounced as treaty breakers.

If, then, changes in the Monroe Doctrine, as applied to these distant nations, seem advisable, the first thing to do would be to agree on a revision of recent pan-American treaties, thus opening the way for possible new agreements. Even the Secretary of State admits their obscurity. It might then be deemed wise to negotiate with such of the nations as so desire, outside the sphere which we must consider our safety zone, an agreement for full and friendly cooperation to prevent foreign penetration. We could not exercise coercion. Any nation might hold back, but in this case the United States would no longer offer the protection of the Monroe Doctrine. Probably the penguins of Patagonia would have little interest in who protected them, but it would be of immense interest to us to know whether our war vessels would have to patrol that remote and dangerous coast.

Those who have recently been made hysterical by the propaganda that Germany is on tiptoe to attack us would shout that it is folly to exclude any portion of the hemisphere from the operations of the Monroe Doctrine. They forget that good will among the nations of the continent is a greater safeguard of peace than are any regulations. They forget that Germany is far nearer to us than is Argentina. It probably has planes which could attack us now, across the ocean, but such an attack could have no conceivable value, even from the Nazi point of view. In any case, why send these planes thousands of miles out of the way? People remember, of course, those short and easy stages recited by the President in one of his recent addresses, the beautiful airfields already prepared for our potential enemies in Brazil and Venezuela and Colombia and Mexico, leading by pleasant steps—was it to Omaha?

It is one of the techniques of propaganda that people will remember, but will not think. If these same people used their wits, might it not occur to them that the Latin American nations mentioned in that Presidential catalog might well resent the assumption that they were helpless pawns, to be used by Germany at will in carrying out an attack against the United States? Even President Vargas, of Brazil, with all his enthusiasm for the totalitarians, might object. It is more probable that the Germans—by perfecting uranium 235, for example—could invent airplanes with an enormous cruising radius with far greater ease than they could persuade these countries to join them against the United States. There may shortly be marvelous scientific discoveries which will bring Buenos Aires as near as Mexico City, which will change all the problems of the Monroe Doctrine as well as everything else; but if we predicate our national defense on the marvels which science may, sometime, somewhere evolve, we shall never build up any national defense at all. You cannot prepare yourself in advance against something as yet unknown.

THE NEED FOR REALISM

It is probable that, with the horror of the war in mind and a clear picture of Nazi methods before us, most nations of the hemisphere would recognize that pride and distrust of one another must give way to the need really to stand together to resist penetration from abroad; that the time has come to translate the vaguely benevolent terms of the Declaration of Lima into binding agreements to cooperate to the fullest extent in self-defense. There is more chance to make such agreements now than there may be ever again. The destruction of Poland and Norway and Belgium and Holland and the brutal attack on Finland strike horror to the hearts and minds of our Latin American neighbors as they do to our own. But if Germany wins the war, there are many who will forget the horrors and remember the victories, and that shockingly soon. The enlarged German Empire will be the best market for Latin American products. Because memory is so short, the fear of today will give way to the grateful admiration of tomorrow. Every government will be convinced that, whatever happened to European states, any American nation can easily defend itself against Nazi penetration and control. Looking forward to that time, which may come sooner than we think, we must ourselves decide quickly whether we shall continue to enforce the Monroe Doctrine as it stands, or modify or renounce it. Unfortunately, whatever decision is reached now will be because of the German threat. This is not the best atmosphere in which to reach grave decisions, but it is the atmosphere in which we must live for some time to come.

We in the United States must immediately take stock both of our commitments and of our capacities. We must be wholly realistic. We must not hold to a commitment merely because it is traditional unless we are prepared and also fully able to back it up. It may be that today complete protection of the two continents, however great our good will, is beyond our capacity, especially if attacks from abroad come simultaneously in the form of internal revolutions. And this is undoubtedly how they would come.

Our Navy is admittedly inadequate to defend both continents if we must patrol the Pacific as well as the Atlantic. We could have had the Japanese Navy on our side, because the Japanese understand that friendship with us is more important than with any other nation. Now that Navy is a practical enemy, because we have continually goaded Japan until it is turning even toward its traditional enemy, Russia. We must therefore double our own Navy or fall down on our commitments. We must also look forward to immense increases in our air forces and in our Army—all three together, perhaps, beyond our financial capacity—if we are to protect all of both continents. If that seems impossible, we must at all costs fulfill the obligations of the Monroe Doctrine as they apply to those regions of the two continents on which our own safety depends. Unless we are prepared to do this, we are making an admission of impotence. Our own safety, of course, includes the safety of the Panama Canal. The existence of this great waterway doubles our responsibility for the safety from alien domination of large territories in South America which, were it not for the Canal, would be as unimportant for our defense as is the southern tip of the continent.

This is why it may be the part of wisdom to modify the Monroe Doctrine, frankly urging Argentina, Uruguay, Chile, and Brazil to build up their own defense and share with us in protecting the hemisphere. So far, whatever their protestations, they have depended on the protection of the despised Monroe Doctrine. The time has come for them to be realistic and honest with themselves, just as we must be with ourselves. The moment they take their full part in their own protection and that of their immediate neighbors, the United States will be proportionately more able to defend that region which is made up of smaller states, far less able to defend themselves, but on which our own safety and that of the

Canal depends. This region extends roughly from the Rio Grande to a line across South America some hundreds of miles south of Panama.

THE SOUTH AMERICAN TASK

Here we should have an even more difficult diplomatic task, because our demands for cooperation would have to be so all-inclusive that we should immediately be accused of imperialism. Under that accusation it would be our difficult task to prove to them that we do not want any of their territory; that we do not want in any way to interfere with their politics or their form of government; that we have no desire to dominate them economically and have no right whatever to dictate with whom they shall trade. We promise them an absolute guaranty of independence. But this being understood, we should have to insist that, in time of war, or when attacks from abroad seem imminent, we must have the right to use their airports, even to send troops across their countries to protect them and us. We should also have to get their agreement to accept our help, if necessary, to prevent foreign political penetration which might be attempted in peacetime.

Look at one more possible example, remembering that all examples are purely hypothetical.

Imagine that Mexico falls more and more under the influence of the Soviet; that the country swarms with Communist agents; that Moscow supplies money to the "red" government which comes naturally into power. We could do nothing about it, since the form of Mexico's government is none of our business.

If, however, the Soviet Government went even further, leased sites for airplane factories and for airports near our border; organized armies with the ill-concealed purpose of attacking the United States or of annexing to Communist Mexico the Central American states, thus clearly threatening the Canal, this country could not and would not sit quietly by. We should act partly under the Monroe Doctrine, which obliges us to repel foreign invasion, but primarily under the primitive law of self-defense.

If it ever came to the point that positive action had to be taken, we should always welcome the assistance and the sympathy of the rest of Latin America, but it would be dishonest to say that we should sit by and see our own safety undermined, even if that assistance and sympathy were not forthcoming. We should always deplore the use of force, but we cannot jeopardize our own liberty or let the Canal be destroyed just because we are afraid to be criticized. It is never the time to forget courtesy, but it is the time to forget the honeyed words that we have got into the habit of using with our Latin American neighbors and instead to talk with them as equals. It is time to drop the ultrabenevolent attitude, which is condescending, subtly domineering, and never quite sincere, and to get down to brass tacks. We intend freely to use our resources for the protection of this continent as well as for our own protection. We believe also that each nation should assume its share of responsibility in whatever way is most effective. In some cases this will mean the pouring out of national treasure, material and spiritual. In other cases, it will mean hardly more than giving freely and cordially the temporary use of facilities such as airports and docks to the ships of the United States which are being used in the defense of the liberties of all of us. We cannot possibly hope to achieve in common unless we are willing to sacrifice in common.

And, finally, what of Canada and the British, French, and Dutch possessions in the hemisphere? President Monroe said in his message to Congress, "With the existing colonies or dependencies of any European power we have not interfered, and shall not interfere." The reason for the specific exclusion of these dependencies from the operation of the Monroe Doctrine is clear enough. We wanted to keep Europe out of this hemisphere in order that we might be free of European quarrels. A situation of fact had to be met then as it has to be met in these perilous times, and circumstances may force us to a different treatment. President Roosevelt's public announcement that we should permit no foreign power to attack Canada was not only an enlargement of the Monroe Doctrine; it was a contradiction. By adopting Canada into the Monroe Doctrine the President was flouting its whole purpose. So far as he was able he was committing us to take part in any war in which Great Britain might be engaged.

What made matters worse was that the world knew the President had Germany in mind as the possible attacking power. This made the remark, which was apparently quite casual, provocative as well as uncalled for. One might expect a dictator carelessly to commit his nation to possible war, but one does not expect it from a constitutional chief of state. Obviously the United States could not stand by while some antagonistic foreign power established itself in Canada. Threatening airports there would be as dangerous as in Mexico. But the wise nation, like the wise man, does not boast about what drastic measures will be taken if this or that happens. Threats are breeders of war.

The fact remains that, whether or not States can be put under the operation of the Monroe Doctrine by a casual remark of the President, we cannot possibly permit a victorious Germany, or any other predatory power, to control either Canada or the European possessions lying within the sphere of the Panama Canal. Perhaps some formula could be found to persuade Great Britain and France voluntarily to turn over to us their possessions in the West Indies. We must respect British unwillingness to sell territories without the consent of their populations, as this is the only democratic position, but it is probable that the people of Jamaica and Bermuda and the other islands would choose American as against German citizenship. These questions are all hypothetical, since we hope that Germany will not win. They need not be acted on instantly, since, even if Germany wins, it would be too exhausted immediately to engage in a new war with the United States. Only one step we must take instantly if Germany is victorious, and that is to make it utterly clear that seizure of territory belonging to the Allies in the Western Hemisphere will be resisted by all the force we have. In this we slightly extend the Monroe Doctrine, but must act, since all such territory happens to be vital to our own defense.

Somehow or other, all European possessions in the Western Hemisphere should be brought—through agreement, of course, and whatever the outcome of the war—within our defense system. Since the purpose of so including the West Indian islands would be solely for the defense of the Canal, which is of almost as much interest to France and Great Britain as to us, negotiations need not present great difficulties. We should have, primarily, to lease airports, both for training purposes and for use in wartime. This would be a departure from the usual practices of international law, but strange and wonderful things happen almost daily to that elastic web which has been spun out of established customs.

THE CASE OF CANADA

The situation as to Canada is somewhat different because Canada, as a self-governing dominion, makes its own decisions. The Canadians know that we could never permit a European power to occupy territory adjacent to the United States, would face the facts realistically, would welcome our official assurance of support in case of attack, would probably agree also to some kind of mutual-assistance pact. This would all have to be done through treaties or agreements ratified by the Senate and the Canadian Government. In other words, the problem of European possessions in this hemisphere having no relation to the Monroe Doctrine must be settled by negotiation and, so far as we are concerned, as a part of our general defense program.

There are thus two attitudes which we may take today toward the Monroe Doctrine. We can stand by it as it is, try to make it better understood and therefore more acceptable to our neighbors to the south, do our best to carry out its provisions from the Canadian border to Cape Horn. This would mean the doubling of our Navy and an immense permanent air force. If this burden seems too heavy, we still cannot scrap the Doctrine, which is an essential part of our national defense, without substituting something as good. We cannot, for example, scrap the Monroe Doctrine for anything as nebulous as the good-neighbor policy. This would be like substituting butter for steel.

We can, on the other hand, if it seems wise, frankly revise the Monroe Doctrine by negotiating with the A B C powers a really reciprocal basis for defense, recognizing full equality by sharing the burden with them, as they have always said was their desire; at the same time, ever against the relaxation of the Doctrine in southern South America, frankly increase our obligations and responsibilities toward those nations on which depends the safety of the Canal and of continental United States. Any such change would take real statesmanship to accomplish successfully. But it would increase understanding and would make it far less likely that the United States would ever again assume a patronizing attitude. It would give our Latin American friends the self-respect and the self-confidence that come from dealing on an absolutely equal basis. It would not mean that the United States could let up on its preparations for defense.

With the building of the Panama Canal we added to our defense needs a heavy and inescapable burden. In these dangerous days of 1940, however, no self-respecting nation seeks to escape its rightful burdens. Nor must we think for a moment that when the war is over our burden will be less. When that time comes, after providing for our own defense, we must still have strength to go to the aid of a famished and disillusioned world. The long and successful operation of the Monroe Doctrine has helped to make the nations of this Western Hemisphere stronger to bear their responsibilities. It has done much to make and keep them free, little as they like to admit it; much to enable them to develop their own systems and institutions to a point where, for some at least, our support is no longer necessary. We must not lightly discard anything that has been so tremendously worth while, nor must we be afraid to revise something fine which has served its purpose.

Address of President Wilson to the Congress, April 2, 1917

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 6, 1940

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of the

President of the United States, delivered at a joint session of the two Houses of Congress, April 2, 1917:

Gentlemen of the Congress, I have called the Congress into extraordinary session because there are serious, very serious, choices of policy to be made, and made immediately, which it was neither right nor constitutionally permissible that I should assume the responsibility of making.

On the 3d of February last I officially laid before you the extraordinary announcement of the Imperial German Government that on and after the 1st day of February it was its purpose to put aside all restraints of law or of humanity and use its submarines to sink every vessel that sought to approach either the ports of Great Britain and Ireland or the western coasts of Europe or any of the ports controlled by the enemies of Germany within the Mediterranean. That had seemed to be the object of the German submarine warfare earlier in the war, but since April of last year the Imperial Government had somewhat restrained the commanders of its undersea craft in conformity with its promise then given to us that passenger boats should not be sunk and that due warning would be given to all other vessels which its submarines might seek to destroy, when no resistance was offered or escape attempted, and care taken that their crews were given at least a fair chance to save their lives in their open boats. The precautions taken were meager and haphazard enough, as was proved in distressing instance after instance in the progress of the cruel and unmanly business, but a certain degree of restraint was observed. The new policy has swept every restriction aside. Vessels of every kind, whatever their flag, their character, their cargo, their destination, their errand, have been ruthlessly sent to the bottom without warning and without thought of help or mercy for those on board, the vessels of friendly neutrals along with those of belligerents. Even hospital ships and ships carrying relief to the sorely bereaved and stricken people of Belgium, though the latter were provided with safe conduct through the proscribed areas by the German Government itself and were distinguished by unmistakable marks of identity, have been sunk with the same reckless lack of compassion or of principle.

I was for a little while unable to believe that such things would in fact be done by any government that had hitherto subscribed to the humane practices of civilized nations. International law had its origin in the attempt to set up some law which would be respected and observed upon the seas, where no nation had right of dominion and where lay the free highways of the world. By painful stage after stage has that law been built up, with meager enough results, indeed, after all was accomplished that could be accomplished, but always with a clear view, at least, of what the heart and conscience of mankind demanded. This minimum of right the German Government has swept aside under the plea of retaliation and necessity and because it had no weapons which it could use at sea except these which it is impossible to employ as it is employing them without throwing to the winds all scruples of humanity or of respect for the understandings that were supposed to underlie the intercourse of the world. I am not now thinking of the loss of property involved, immense and serious as that is, but only of the wanton and wholesale destruction of the lives of noncombatants, men, women, and children, engaged in pursuits which have always, even in the darkest periods of modern history, been deemed innocent and legitimate. Property can be paid for; the lives of peaceful and innocent people cannot be. The present German submarine warfare against commerce is a warfare against mankind.

It is a war against all nations. American ships have been sunk, American lives taken, in ways which it has stirred us very deeply to learn of, but the ships and people of other neutral and friendly nations have been sunk and overwhelmed in the waters in the same way. There has been no discrimination. The challenge is to all mankind. Each nation must decide for itself how it will meet it. The choice we make for ourselves must be made with a moderation of counsel and a temperateness of judgment befitting our character and our motives as a nation. We must put excited feeling away. Our motive will not be revenge or the victorious assertion of the physical might of the Nation, but only the vindication of right, of human right, of which we are only a single champion.

When I addressed the Congress on the 26th of February last I thought that it would suffice to assert our neutral rights with arms, our right to use the seas against unlawful interference, our right to keep our people safe against unlawful violence. But armed neutrality, it now appears, is impracticable. Because submarines are in effect outlaws when used as the German submarines have been used against merchant shipping, it is impossible to defend ships against their attacks as the law of nations has assumed that merchantmen would defend themselves against privateers or cruisers, visible craft giving chase upon the open sea. It is common prudence in such circumstances, grim necessity indeed, to endeavor to destroy them before they have shown their own intention. They must be dealt with upon sight, if dealt with at all. The German Government denies the right of neutrals to use arms at all within the areas of the sea which it has proscribed, even in the defense of rights which no modern publicist has ever before questioned their right to defend. The intimation is conveyed that the armed guards which we have placed on our merchant ships will be treated as beyond the pale of law and subject to be dealt with as pirates would be. Armed neutrality is ineffectual enough at best; in such circumstances and in the face of such pretensions it is worse than ineffectual; it is likely only to produce what it was meant to prevent; it is practically certain to draw us into the war without either the rights or the effectiveness of belligerents. There is one choice we cannot make, we are incapable of making: we will not choose the path of submission and suffer the most sacred rights of our Nation and our people to be ignored or violated. The wrongs against which we now array ourselves are no common wrongs; they cut to the very roots of human life.

With a profound sense of the solemn and even tragical character of the step I am taking and of the grave responsibilities which it involves, but in unhesitating obedience to what I deem my constitutional duty, I advise that the Congress declare the recent course of the Imperial German Government to be in fact nothing less than war against the Government and people of the United States; that it formally accept the status of belligerent which has thus been thrust upon it; and that it take immediate steps not only to put the country in a more thorough state of defense but also to exert all its power and employ all its resources to bring the Government of the German Empire to terms and end the war.

What this will involve is clear. It will involve the utmost practicable cooperation in counsel and action with the governments now at war with Germany, and, as incident to that, the extension to those governments of the most liberal financial credits, in order that our resources may so far as possible be added to theirs. It will involve the organization and mobilization of all the material resources of the country to supply the materials of war and serve the incidental needs of the Nation in the most abundant and yet the most economical and efficient way possible. It will involve the immediate full equipment of the Navy in all respects but particularly in supplying it with the best means of dealing with the enemy's submarines. It will involve the immediate addition to the armed forces of the United States already provided for by law in case of war at least 500,000 men, who should, in my opinion, be chosen upon the principle of universal liability to service, and also the authorization of subsequent additional increments of equal force so soon as they may be needed and can be handled in training. It will involve also, of course, the granting of adequate credits to the Government, sustained, I hope, so far as they can equitably be sustained by the present generation, by well-conceived taxation.

I say sustained so far as may be equitable by taxation, because it seems to me that it would be most unwise to base the credits which will now be necessary entirely on money borrowed. It is our duty, I most respectfully urge, to protect our people, so far as we may, against the very serious hardships and evils which would be likely to arise out of the inflation which would be produced by vast loans.

In carrying out the measures by which these things are to be accomplished we should keep constantly in mind the wisdom of interfering as little as possible in our own preparation and in the equipment of our own military forces with the duty—for it will be a very practical duty—of supplying the nations already at war with Germany with the materials which they can obtain only from us or by our assistance. They are in the field, and we should help them in every way to be effective there.

I shall take the liberty of suggesting, through the several executive departments of the Government, for the consideration of your committees, measures for the accomplishment of the several objects I have mentioned. I hope that it will be your pleasure to deal with them as having been framed after very careful thought by the branch of the Government upon which the responsibility of conducting the war and safeguarding the Nation will most directly fall.

While we do these things, these deeply momentous things, let us be very clear, and make very clear to all the world what our motives and our objects are. My own thought has not been driven from its habitual and normal course by the unhappy events of the last 2 months, and I do not believe that the thought of the Nation has been altered or clouded by them. I have exactly the same things in mind now that I had in mind when I addressed the Senate on the 22d of January last; the same that I had in mind when I addressed the Congress on the 3d of February, and on the 26th of February. Our object now, as then, is to vindicate the principles of peace and justice in the life of the world as against selfish and autocratic power, and to set up amongst the really free and self-governed peoples of the world such a concert of purpose and of action as will henceforth insure the observance of those principles. Neutrality is no longer feasible or desirable where the peace of the world is involved and the freedom of its peoples, and the menace to that peace and freedom lies in the existence of autocratic governments backed by organized force which is controlled wholly by their will, not by the will of their people. We have seen the last of neutrality in such circumstances. We are at the beginning of an age in which it will be insisted that the same standards of conduct and of responsibility for wrong done shall be observed among nations and their governments that are observed among the individual citizens of civilized states.

We have no quarrel with the German people. We have no feeling toward them but one of sympathy and friendship. It was not upon their impulse that their Government acted in entering this war. It was not with their previous knowledge or approval. It was a war determined upon as wars used to be determined upon in the old, unhappy days when peoples were nowhere consulted by their rulers and wars were provoked and waged in the interest of dynasties or of little groups of ambitious men who were accustomed to use their fellow men as pawns and tools. Self-governed nations do not fill their neighbor states with spies or set the course of intrigue to bring about some critical posture of affairs which will give them an opportunity to strike and make conquest. Such designs can be successfully worked out only under cover and where

no one has the right to ask questions. Cunningly contrived plans of deception or aggression, carried, it may be, from generation to generation, can be worked out and kept from the light only within the privacy of courts or behind the carefully guarded confidences of a narrow and privileged class. They are happily impossible where public opinion commands and insists upon full information concerning all the nation's affairs.

A steadfast concert for peace can never be maintained except by a partnership of democratic nations. No autocratic government could be trusted to keep faith within it or observe its covenants. It must be a league of honor, a partnership of opinion. Intrigue would eat its vitals away; the plottings of inner circles who could plan what they would and render account to no one would be a corruption seated at its very heart. Only free peoples can hold their purpose and their honor steady to a common end and prefer the interests of mankind to any narrow interest of their own.

Does not every American feel that assurance has been added to our hope for the future peace of the world by the wonderful and heartening things that have been happening within the last few weeks in Russia? Russia was known by those who knew it best to have been always in fact democratic at heart, in all the vital habits of her thought, in all the intimate relationships of her people that spoke their natural instinct, their habitual attitude toward life. The autocracy that crowned the summit of her political structure, long as it had stood and terrible as was the reality of its power, was not in fact Russian in origin, character, or purpose; and now it has been shaken off and the great, generous Russian people have been added in all their naive majesty and might to the forces that are fighting for freedom in the world, for justice, and for peace. Here is a fit partner for a league of honor.

One of the things that has served to convince us that the Prussian autocracy was not and could never be our friend is that from the very outset of the present war it has filled our unsuspecting communities and even our offices of government with spies and set criminal intrigues everywhere afoot against our national unity of counsel, our peace within and without, our industries and our commerce. Indeed it is now evident that its spies were here even before the war began; and it is unhappily not a matter of conjecture but a fact proved in our courts of justice that the intrigues which have more than once come perilously near to disturbing the peace and dislocating the industries of the country have been carried on at the instigation, with the support, and even under the personal direction of official agents of the Imperial Government accredited to the Government of the United States. Even in checking these things and trying to extirpate them we have sought to put the most generous interpretation possible upon them because we knew that their source lay, not in any hostile feeling or purpose of the German people toward us (who were, no doubt as ignorant of them as we ourselves were), but only in the selfish designs of a government that did what it pleased and told its people nothing. But they have played their part in serving to convince us at last that that government entertains no real friendship for us and means to act against our peace and security at its convenience. That it means to stir up enemies against us at our very doors the intercepted note to the German Minister at Mexico City is eloquent evidence.

We are accepting this challenge of hostile purpose because we know that in such a government, following such methods, we can never have a friend; and that in the presence of its organized power, always lying in wait to accomplish we know not what purpose, there can be no assured security for the democratic governments of the world. We are now about to accept gage of battle with this natural foe to liberty and shall, if necessary, spend the whole force of the Nation to check and nullify its pretensions and its power. We are glad, now that we see the facts with no veil of false pretence about them, to fight thus for the ultimate peace of the world and for the liberation of its peoples, the German peoples included: for the rights of nations great and small and the privilege of men everywhere to choose their way of life and of obedience. The world must be made safe for democracy. Its peace must be planted upon the tested foundations of political liberty. We have no selfish ends to serve. We desire no conquest, no dominion. We seek no indemnities for ourselves, no material compensation for the sacrifices we shall freely make. We are but one of the champions of the rights of mankind. We shall be satisfied when those rights have been made as secure as the faith and the freedom of nations can make them.

Just because we fight without rancour and without selfish object, seeking nothing for ourselves but what we shall wish to share with all free peoples, we shall, I feel confident, conduct our operations as belligerents without passion and ourselves observe with proud punctilio the principles of right and of fair play we profess to be fighting for.

I have said nothing of the governments allied with the Imperial Government of Germany because they have not made war upon us or challenged us to defend our right and our honor. The Austro-Hungarian Government has indeed avowed its unqualified endorsement and acceptance of the reckless and lawless submarine warfare adopted now without disguise by the Imperial German Government, and it has therefore not been possible for this Government to receive Count Tarnowski, the Ambassador recently accredited to this Government by the Imperial and Royal Government of Austria-Hungary; but that Government has not actually engaged in warfare against citizens of the United States on the seas, and I take the liberty, for the present at least, of postponing a discussion of our relations with the authorities at Vienna. We enter this war only where we are clearly forced into it because there are no other means of defending our rights.

It will be all the easier for us to conduct ourselves as belligerents in a high spirit of right and fairness because we act without animus, not in enmity toward a people or with the desire to bring any injury or disadvantage upon them, but only in armed opposition to an irresponsible government which has thrown aside all considerations of humanity and of right and is running amuck. We are, let me say again, the sincere friends of the German people, and shall desire nothing so much as the early reestablishment of intimate relations of mutual advantage between us—however hard it may be for them, for the time being, to believe that this is spoken from our hearts. We have borne with their present government through all these bitter months because of that friendship—exercising a patience and forbearance which would otherwise have been impossible. We shall, happily, still have an opportunity to prove that friendship in our daily attitude and actions toward the millions of men and women of German birth and native sympathy who live amongst us and share our life, and we shall be proud to prove it toward all who are in fact loyal to their neighbors and to the Government in the hour of test. They are, most of them, as true and loyal Americans as if they had never known any other fealty or allegiance. They will be prompt to stand with us in rebuking and restraining the few who may be of a different mind and purpose. If there should be disloyalty, it will be dealt with with a firm hand of stern repression; but, if it lifts its head at all, it will lift it only here and there and without countenance except from a lawless and malignant few.

It is a distressing and oppressive duty, gentlemen of the Congress, which I have performed in thus addressing you. There are, it may be, many months of fiery trial and sacrifice ahead of us. It is a fearful thing to lead this great peaceful people into war, into the most terrible and disastrous of all wars, civilization itself seeming to be in the balance. But the right is more precious than peace, and we shall fight for the things which we have always carried nearest our hearts—for democracy, for the right of those who submit to authority to have a voice in their own governments, for the rights and liberties of small nations, for a universal dominion of right by such a concert of free peoples as shall bring peace and safety to all nations and make the world itself at last free. To such a task we can dedicate our lives and our fortunes, everything that we are and everything that we have, with the pride of those who know that the day has come when America is privileged to spend her blood and her might for the principles that gave her birth and happiness and the peace which she has treasured. God helping her, she can do no other.

Daniel Webster's Speech Against Conscription

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEWIS D. THILL

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 6, 1940

Mr. THILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include the following speech of Daniel Webster. Many of the arguments he used against conscription are just as cogent and compelling today as they were on December 9, 1814, when Webster made his stirring address which was instrumental in defeating the compulsory draft bill of that day.

SPEECH ON THE CONSCRIPTION BILL IN HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, DECEMBER 9, 1814 [1]

Mr. Chairman, after the best reflection which I have been able to bestow on the subject of the bill before you, I am of opinion that its principles are not warranted by any provision of the Constitution. It appears to me to partake of the nature of those other propositions for military measures which this session, so fertile in inventions, has produced. It is of the same class with the plan of the Secretary of War; with the bill reported to this House by its own committee for filling the ranks of the Regular Army, by classifying the free male population of the United States; and with the resolution recently introduced by an honorable gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Ingersoll], and which now lies on your table,

[1] A bill for a classification of the militia, and for drafting individuals, including minors, had passed the Senate. It was a modification of a measure proposed by Mr. Monroe, for a compulsory draft of the free male population between the ages of 18 and 45. Mr. Webster's speech was on a motion to indefinitely postpone the bill. Public sentiment was opposed to the measure and it failed. Referring to it in 1831, Mr. Webster said: "I had a hand, with Mr. Eppes and others, in overthrowing Mr. Monroe's Conscription in 1814." Mr. George Ticknor Curtis, in the Life of Daniel Webster, said the speech was written out by Mr. Webster afterward, but never published, and that the manuscript was not to be found. It was, however, preserved, is now in the New Hampshire Historical Society, and is here printed from the manuscript in Mr. Webster's handwriting.

carrying the principle of compulsory service in the Regular Army to its utmost extent.

This bill indeed is less undisguised in its object and less direct in its means than some of the measures proposed. It is an attempt to exercise the power of forcing the free men of this country into the ranks of an army for the general purposes of war under color of a military service. To this end it commences with a classification which is no way connected with the general organization of the militia nor, to my apprehension, included within any of the powers which Congress possesses over them. All the authority which this Government has over the militia, until actually called into its service, is to enact laws for their organization and discipline. This power it has exercised. It now possesses the further power of calling into its service any portion of the militia of the States in the particular exigencies for which the Constitution provides and of governing them during the continuance of such service. Here its authority ceases. The classification of the whole body of the militia, according to the provisions of this bill, is not a measure which respects either their general organization or their discipline. It is a distinct system introduced for new purposes and not connected with any power which the Constitution has conferred on Congress.

But, sir, there is another consideration. The services of the men to be raised under this act are not limited to those cases in which alone this Government is entitled to the aid of the militia of the States. These cases are particularly stated in the Constitution—"to repel invasion, suppress insurrection, or execute the laws." But this bill has no limitation in this respect. The usual mode of legislating on the subject is abandoned. The only section which would have confined the service of the militia proposed to be raised within the United States has been stricken out, and if the President should not march them into the provinces of England at the north or of Spain at the south it will not be because he is prohibited by any provision in this act.

This, sir, is a bill for calling out the militia, not according to its existing organization but by draft from new created classes; not merely for the purpose of "repelling invasion, suppressing insurrection, or executing the laws," but for the general objects of war—for defending ourselves, or invading others, as may be thought expedient; not for a sudden emergency, or for a short time, but for long-stated periods; for 2 years, if the proposition of the Senate should finally prevail; for 1 year if the amendment of the House should be adopted. What is this, sir, but raising a standing army out of the militia by draft and to be recruited by draft, in like manner, as often as occasion may require?

This bill, then, is not different in principle from the other bills, plans, and resolutions which I have mentioned. The present discussion is properly and necessarily common to them all. It is a discussion, sir, of the last importance. That measures of this nature should be debated at all in the councils of a free government is cause of dismay. The question is nothing less than whether the most essential rights of personal liberty shall be surrendered and despotism embraced in its worst form.

I have risen, on this occasion, with anxious and painful emotions, to add my admonition to what has been said by others. Admonition and remonstrance, I am aware, are not acceptable strains. They are duties of unpleasant performance. But they are, in my judgment, the duties which the condition of a falling State imposes. They are duties which sink deep in his conscience, who believes it probable that they may be the last services which he may be able to render to the government of his country. On the issue of this discussion, I believe the fate of this Government may rest. Its duration is incompatible, in my opinion, with the existence of the measures in contemplation. A crisis has at last arrived, to which the course of things has long tended, and which may be decisive upon the happiness of present and of future generations. If there be anything important in the concerns of men, the considerations which fill the present hour are important. I am anxious, above all things, to stand acquitted before God and my own conscience, and in the public judgment, of all participations in the counsels which have brought us to our present condition and which now threaten the dissolution of the Government. When the present generation of men shall be swept away, and that this Government ever existed shall be matter of history only, I desire that it may be known that you have not proceeded in your course unadmonished and unforewarned. Let it then be known, that there were those who would have stopped you, in the career of your measures, and held you back, as by the skirts of your garments, from the precipice over which you are plunging and drawing after you the Government of your country.

I had hoped, sir, at an early period of the session, to find gentlemen in another temper. I trusted that the existing state of things would have impressed on the minds of those who decide national measures the necessity of some reform in the administration of affairs. If it was not to have been expected that gentlemen would be convinced by argument, it was still not unreasonable to hope that they would listen to the solemn preaching of events. If no previous reasoning could satisfy them, that the favorite plans of Government would fail, they might yet be expected to regard the fact, when it happened, and to yield to the lesson which it taught. Although they had, last year, given no credit to those who predicted the failure of the campaign against Canada, yet they had seen that failure. Although they then treated as idle all doubts of the success of the loan, they had seen the failure of that loan. Although they then held in derision all fears for the public credit, and the national faith, they had yet seen the public credit destroyed and the national faith violated and disgraced. They had seen much more than was predicted; for no man had foretold that our means of defense would be so far exhausted in foreign invasion as to leave the place of our own deliberations insecure and that we should this day be legislating in view of the crumbling monuments of our national disgrace. No one had anticipated that this city would have fallen before a handful of troops, and that British generals and British admirals would have taken their airings along the Pennsylvania Avenue, while the Government was in full flight, just awaked perhaps from one of its profound meditations on the plan of a conscription for the conquest of Canada. These events, sir, with the present state of things and the threatening aspect of what is future, should have brought us to a pause. They might have reasonably been expected to induce Congress to review its own measures and to exercise its great duty of inquiry relative to the conduct of others. If this was too high a pitch of virtue for the multitude of party men, it was at least to have been expected from gentlemen of influence and character, who ought to be supposed to value something higher than mere party attachment and to act from motives somewhat nobler than a mere regard to party consistency. All that we have yet suffered will be found light and trifling in comparison with what is before us if the Government shall learn nothing from experience but to despise it and shall grow more and more desperate in its measures as it grows more and more desperate in its affairs.

It is time for Congress to examine and decide for itself. It has taken things on trust long enough. It has followed Executive recommendation, till there remains no hope of finding safety in that path. What is there, sir, that makes it the duty of this people now to grant new confidence to the administration and to surrender their most important rights to its discretion? On what merits of its own does it rest this extraordinary claim? When it calls thus loudly for the treasure and the lives of the people, what pledge does it offer that it will not waste all in the same preposterous pursuits which have hitherto engaged it? In the failure of all past promises, do we see any assurance of future performance? Are we to measure out our confidence in proportion to our disgrace and now at last to grant away everything, because all that we have heretofore granted has been wasted or misapplied? What is there in our condition that bespeaks a wise or an able government? What is the evidence that the protection of the country is the object principally regarded? In every quarter that protection has been more or less abandoned to the States. That every town on the coast is not now in possession of the enemy, or in ashes, is owing to the vigilance and exertions of the States themselves, and to no protection granted to them by those on whom the whole duty of their protection rested.

Or shall we look to the acquisition of the professed objects of the war and there find grounds for approbation and confidence? The professed objects of the war are abandoned in all due form. The contest for sailors' rights is turned into a negotiation about boundaries and military roads, and the highest hope entertained by any man of the issue is that we may be able to get out of the war without a cession of territory.

Look, sir, to the finances of the country. What a picture do they exhibit of the wisdom and prudence and foresight of Government. "The revenue of a State," says a profound writer, "is the State." If we are to judge of the condition of the country by the condition of its revenues, what is the result? A wise government sinks deep the fountain of its revenues—not only till it can touch the first springs, and slake the present thirst of the treasury, but till lasting sources are opened, too abundant to be exhausted by demand, too deep to be affected by heats and droughts. What, sir, is our present supply, and what our provision for the future resource? I forbear to speak of the present condition of the Treasury; and as to public credit, the last reliance of government, I use the language of government itself only, when I say it does not exist. This is a state of things calling for the soberest counsels, and yet it seems to meet only the wildest speculations. Nothing is talked of but banks, and a circulating paper medium, and Exchequer notes, and the thousand other contrivances which ingenuity, vexed and goaded by the direst necessity, can devise, with the vain hope of giving value to mere paper. All these things are not revenue, nor do they produce it. They are the effect of a productive commerce, and a well-ordered system of finance, and in their operation may be favorable to both, but are not the cause of either. In other times these facilities existed. Bank paper and Government paper circulated because both rested on substantial capital or solid credit. Without these they will not circulate, nor is there a device more shallow or more mischievous, than to pour forth new floods of paper without credit as a remedy for the evils which paper without credit has already created. As was intimated the other day by my honorable friend from North Carolina [Mr. Gaston] this is an attempt to act over again the farce of the Assignats of France. Indeed, sir, our politicians appear to have but one school. They learn everything of modern France; with this variety only, that for examples of revenue they go to the Revolution, when her revenue was in the worst state possible, while their model for military force is sought after in her imperial era, when her military was organized on principles the most arbitrary and abominable.

Let us examine the nature and extent of the power which is assumed by the various military measures before us. In the present want of men and money, the Secretary of War has proposed to Congress a military conscription. For the conquest of Canada, the people will not enlist; and if they would, the treasury is exhausted, and they could not be paid. Conscription is chosen as the most

promising instrument, both of overcoming reluctance to the service and of subduing the difficulties which arise from the deficiencies of the Exchequer. The administration asserts the right to fill the ranks of the Regular Army by compulsion. It contends that it may now take 1 out of every 25 men, and any part, or the whole of the rest, whenever its occasions require. Persons thus taken by force, and put into an army, may be compelled to serve there during the war or for life. They may be put on any service, at home or abroad, for defense or for invasion, according to the will and pleasure of the Government. This power does not grow out of any invasion of the country or even out of a state of war. It belongs to government at all times, in peace as well as in war, and it is to be exercised under all circumstances, according to its mere discretion. This, sir, is the amount of the principle contended for by the Secretary of War.

Is this, sir, consistent with the character of a free government? Is this civil liberty? Is this the real character of our Constitution? No, sir; indeed it is not. The Constitution is libeled, foully libeled. The people of this country have not established for themselves such a fabric of despotism. They have not purchased at a vast expense of their own treasure and their own blood a magna carta to be slaves. Where is it written in the Constitution, in what article or section is it contained, that you may take children from their parents, and parents from their children, and compel them to fight the battles of any war in which the folly or the wickedness of government may engage it? Under what concealment has this power lain hidden which now for the first time comes forth, with a tremendous and baleful aspect, to trample down and destroy the dearest rights of personal liberty? Who will show me any constitutional injunction which makes it the duty of the American people to surrender everything valuable in life, and even life itself, not when the safety of their country and its liberties may demand the sacrifice, but whenever the purposes of an ambitious and mischievous government may require it? Sir, I almost disdain to go to quotations and references to prove that such an abominable doctrine has no foundation in the Constitution of the country. It is enough to know that that instrument was intended as the basis of a free government, and that the power contended for is incompatible with any notion of personal liberty. An attempt to maintain this doctrine upon the provisions of the Constitution is an exercise of perverse ingenuity to extract slavery from the substance of a free government. It is an attempt to show, by proof and argument, that we ourselves are subjects of despotism, and that we have a right to chains and bondage, firmly secured to us and our children by the provisions of our Government. It has been the labor of other men, at other times, to mitigate and reform the powers of government by construction; to support the rights of personal security by every species of favorable and benign interpretation, and thus to infuse a free spirit into governments not friendly in their general structure and formation to public liberty.

The supporters of the measures before us act on the opposite principle. It is their task to raise arbitrary powers, by construction, out of a plain written charter of national liberty. It is their pleasing duty to free us of the delusion, which we have fondly cherished, that we are the subjects of a mild, free, and limited Government, and to demonstrate, and to demonstrate by a regular chain of premises and conclusions, that Government possesses over us a power more tyrannical, more arbitrary, more dangerous, more allied to blood and murder, more full of every form of mischief, more productive of every sort and degree of misery than has been exercised by any civilized government, with a single exception, in modern times.

The Secretary of War has favored us with an argument on the constitutionality of this power. Those who lament that such doctrines should be supported by the opinion of a high officer of government, may a little abate their regret, when they remember that the same officer, in his last letter of instructions to our ministers abroad, maintained the contrary. In that letter he declares that even the impressment of seamen, for which many more plausible reasons may be given than for the impressment of soldiers, is repugnant to our Constitution. It might, therefore, be a sufficient answer to his argument, in the present case, to quote against it the sentiments of its own author, and to place the two opinions before the House, in a state of irreconcilable conflict. Further comment on either might then be properly forborne until he should be pleased to inform us which he retracted, and to which he adhered. But the importance of the subject may justify a further consideration of the arguments.

Congress having, by the Constitution, a power to raise armies, the Secretary contends that no restraint is to be imposed on the exercise of this power, except such as is expressly stated in the written letter of the instrument. In other words, that Congress may execute its powers, by any means it chooses, unless such means are particularly prohibited. But the general nature and object of the Constitution impose as rigid a restriction on the means of exercising power as could be done by the most explicit injunctions. It is the first principle applicable to such a case, that no construction shall be admitted which impairs the general nature and character of the instrument. A free constitution of government is to be construed upon free principles, and every branch of its provisions is to receive such an interpretation as is full of its general spirit. No means are to be taken by implication which would strike us absurdly if expressed. And what would have been more absurd than for this Constitution to have said that to secure the great blessings of liberty it gave to government an uncontrolled power of military conscription? Yet such is the absurdity which it is made to exhibit under the commentary of the Secretary of War.

But it is said that it might happen that an army could not be raised by voluntary enlistment, in which case the power to raise armies would be granted in vain, unless they might be raised by compulsion. If this reasoning could prove anything, it would equally show that, whenever the legitimate power of the Constitution should be so badly administered as to cease to answer the great ends intended by them, such new powers may be assumed or usurped, as any existing administration may deem expedient. This is the result of his own reasoning, to which the Secretary does not profess to go. But it is a true result. For if it is to be assumed, that all powers were granted, which might by possibility become necessary, and that government itself is the judge of this possible necessity, then the powers of government are precisely what it chooses they should be. Apply the same reasoning to any other power granted to Congress, and test its accuracy by the result. Congress has power to borrow money. How is it to exercise this power? Is it confined to voluntary loans? There is no express limitation to that effect, and, in the language of the Secretary, it might happen, indeed it has happened, that persons could not be found willing to lend. Money might be borrowed then in any other mode. In other words, Congress might resort to a forced loan. It might take the money of any man by force, and give him in exchange exchequer notes or certificates of stock. Would this be quite constitutional, sir? It is entirely within the reasoning of the Secretary, and it is a result of his argument, outraging the rights of individuals in a far less degree than the practical consequences which he himself draws from it. A compulsory loan is not to be compared, in point of enormity, with a compulsory military service.

If the Secretary of War has proved the right of Congress to enact a law enforcing a draft of men out of the militia into the Regular Army, he will at any time be able to prove, quite as clearly, that Congress has power to create a dictator. The arguments which have helped him in one case will equally aid him in the other, the same reason of a supposed or possible state necessity, which is urged now, may be repeated then, with equal pertinency and effect.

Sir, in granting Congress the power to raise armies, the people have granted all the means which are ordinary and usual, and which are consistent with the liberties and security of the people themselves, and they have granted no others. To talk about the unlimited power of the Government over the means to execute its authority, is to hold a language which is true only in regard to despotism. The tyranny of arbitrary governments consists as much in its means as in its ends; and it would be a ridiculous and absurd Constitution which would be less cautious to guard against abuses in the one case than in the other. All the means and instruments which a free government exercises, as well as the ends and objects which it pursues, are to partake of its own essential character, and to be conformed to its genuine spirit. A free government with arbitrary means to administer it is a contradiction; a free government without adequate provision for personal security is an absurdity; a free government, with an uncontrolled power of military conscription, is a solecism, at once the most ridiculous and abominable that ever entered into the head of man.

Sir, I invite the supporters of the measures before you to look to their actual operation. Let the men who have so often pledged their own fortunes and their own lives to the support of this war look to the wanton sacrifice which they are about to make of their lives and fortunes. They may talk as they will about substitutes and compensations and exemptions. It must come to the draft at last. If the Government cannot hire men voluntarily to fight its battles, neither can individuals. If the war should continue, there will be no escape, and every man's fate and every man's life will come to depend on the issue of the military draft. Who shall describe to you the horror which your orders of conscription shall create in the once happy villages of this country? Who shall describe the distress and anguish which they will spread over those hills and valleys, where men have heretofore been accustomed to labor, and to rest in security and happiness. Anticipate the scene, sir, when the class shall assemble to stand its draft, and to throw the dice for blood. What a group of wives and mothers and sisters, of helpless age and helpless infancy, shall gather round the theater of this horrible lottery, as if the stroke of death were to fall from heaven before their eyes on a father, a brother, a son, or a husband. And in a majority of cases, sir, it will be the stroke of death. Under present prospects of the continuance of the war, not one-half of them on whom your conscription shall fall will ever return to tell the tale of their sufferings. They will perish of disease and pestilence, or they will leave their bones to whiten in fields beyond the frontier. Does the lot fall on the father of a family? His children, already orphans, shall see his face no more. When they behold him for the last time, they shall see him lashed and fettered, and dragged away from his own threshold, like a felon and an outlaw. Does it fall on a son, the hope and the staff of aged parents? That hope shall fail them. On that staff they shall lean no longer. They shall not enjoy the happiness of dying before their children. They shall totter to their grave, bereft of their offspring and unwept by any who inherit their blood. Does it fall on a husband? The eyes which watch his parting steps may swim in tears forever. She is a wife no longer. There is no relation so tender or so sacred that by these accursed measures you do not propose to violate it. There is no happiness so perfect that you do not propose to destroy it. Into the paradise of domestic life you enter, not indeed by temptations and sorceries, but by open force and violence.

But this father, or this son, or this husband goes to the camp. With whom do you associate him? With those only who are sober and virtuous and respectable like himself? No, sir. But you propose to find his companions in the worst men of the worst sort. Another bill lies on your table offering a bounty to deserters from your enemy. Whatever is most infamous in his ranks you propose to make your own. You address yourselves to those who will hear you advise them to perjury and treason. All who are ready to set heaven and earth at defiance at the same time, to violate their oaths and run the hazard of capital punishment, and none others, will yield to your solicitations. And these are they whom you are allowing to join your ranks, by holding out to them inducements and bounties with one hand while, with the other, you are driving thither the honest and worthy members of your own community, under the lash and scourge of conscription. In the line of your Army, with the true leveling of despotism, you propose a promiscuous mixture of the worthy and the worthless, the virtuous and the profligate; the husbandman, the merchant, the mechanic of your own country, with the beings whom war selects from the excess of European population, who possess neither interest, feeling, nor character in common with your own people, and who have no other recommendation to your notice than their propensity to crimes.

Nor is it, sir, for the defense of his own house and home that he who is the subject of military draft is to perform the task allotted to him. You will put him upon a service equally foreign to his interests and abhorrent to his feelings. With his aid you are to push your purposes of conquest. The battles which he is to fight are the battles of invasion, battles which he detests perhaps and abhors, less from the danger and the death that gather over them, and the blood with which they drench the plain, than from the principles in which they have their origin. Fresh from the peaceful pursuits of life, and yet a soldier but in name, he is to be opposed to veteran troops, hardened under every scene, inured to every privation, and disciplined in every service. If, sir, in this strife he fall; if, while ready to obey every rightful command of government, he is forced from his home against right, not to contend for the defense of his country but to prosecute a miserable and detestable project of invasion, and in that strife he fall, 'tis murder. It may stalk above the cognizance of human law, but in the sight of Heaven it is murder; and though millions of years may roll away, while his ashes and yours lie mingled together in the earth, the day will yet come when his spirit and the spirits of his children must be met at the bar of omnipotent justice. May God, in His compassion, shield me from any participation in the enormity of this guilt.

I would ask, sir, whether the supporters of these measures have well weighed the difficulties of their undertaking. Have they considered whether it will be found easy to execute laws which bear such marks of despotism on their front, and which will be so productive of every sort and degree of misery in their execution? For one, sir, I hesitate not to say that they cannot be executed. No law professedly passed for the purpose of compelling a service in the Regular Army, nor any law which, under color of military draft, shall compel men to serve in the Army, nor for the emergencies mentioned in the Constitution, but for long periods, and for the general objects of war, can be carried into effect. In my opinion it ought not to be carried into effect. The operation of measures thus unconstitutional and illegal ought to be prevented by a resort to other measures which are both constitutional and legal. It will be the solemn duty of the State governments to protect their own authority over their own militia, and to interpose between their citizens and arbitrary power. These are among the objects for which the State governments exist; and their highest obligations bind them to the preservation of their own rights and the liberties of their people. I express these sentiments here, sir, because I shall express them to my constituents. Both they and myself live under a constitution which teaches us that "the doctrine of nonresistance against arbitrary power and oppression is absurd, slavish, and destructive of the good and happiness of mankind."[2] With the same earnestness with which I now exhort you to forbear from these measures, I shall exhort them to exercise their unquestionable right of providing for the security of their own liberties.

In my opinion, sir, the sentiments of the free population of this country are greatly mistaken here. The Nation is not yet in a temper to submit to conscription. The people have too fresh and strong a feeling of the blessings of civil liberty to be willing thus to surrender it. You may talk to them as much as you please of the victory and glory to be obtained in the enemy's provinces; they will hold those objects in light estimation if the means be a forced military service. You may sing to them the song of Canada Conquest in all its variety, but they will not be charmed out of the remembrance of their substantial interests and true happiness. Similar pretenses, they know, are the grave in which the liberties of other nations have been buried, and they will take warning.

Laws, sir, of this nature, can create nothing but opposition. If you scatter them abroad, like the fabled serpents' teeth, they will spring up into armed men. A military force cannot be raised in this manner, but by the means of a military force. If administration has found that it cannot form an army without conscription, it will find, if it venture on these experiments, that it cannot enforce conscription without an army. The Government was not constituted for such purposes. Framed in the spirit of liberty, and in the love of peace, it has no powers which render it able to enforce such laws. The attempt, if we rashly make it, will fail; and having already thrown away our peace, we may thereby throw away our Government.

Allusions have been made, sir, to the state of things in New England, and, as usual, she has been charged with an intention to dissolve the Union. The charge is unfounded. She is much too wise to entertain such purposes. She has had too much experience and has too strong a recollection of the blessings which the Union is capable of producing under a just administration of government. It is her greatest fear that the course at present pursued will destroy it by destroying every principle, every interest, every sentiment, and every feeling which have hitherto contributed to uphold it. Those who cry out that the Union is in danger are themselves the authors of that danger. They put its existence to hazard by measures of violence, which it is not capable of enduring. They talk of dangerous designs against government, when they are overthrowing the fabric from its foundations. They alone, sir, are friends to the union of the States who endeavor to maintain the principles of civil liberty in the country and to preserve the spirit in which the Union was framed.

[2] N. H. Bill of Rights.

Radio Address of Hon. Samuel Dickstein, December 15, 1933

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 3, 1940

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me December 15, 1933:

Ladies and gentlemen, during the past 15 years, and particularly during these last 4 years of dark depression, the world has been groping for light. We have been striving to restore a lost social order and to apply the marvels of a recently mechanized universe to the welfare of humanity; to supplant the suffering and utter chaos of that great convulsion of civilization, the World War, with new schemes for the coordination of our resources to our needs.

To do this the various peoples of the earth have experimented with sundry types of government, all of which, it must be said, have been designed with the honest intention of benefiting their own particular groups of subjects to be affected. Russia has chosen communism, Italy fascism; and no government in the world has been left unaffected by the tempest for change which has swept across the entire face of the earth.

One phase of this world revolution in particular has been worthy of our attention—that is, the overthrow of democratic principles and personal liberties; the freedom of the press, liberty of speech; rights of franchise without discrimination as to race, creed, or color; in short, the personal authorities endowed upon us by our Creator have been destroyed or distorted under the iron fists of new rulers in various countries.

Over the tombs of the decadent and almost forgotten Romanoffs, Stalin, the dictator of all the Russian states, has assumed power. His word is law, religion, creed, and absolute fiat to the millions of citizens who constitute the largest state in Europe.

Italy, now a monarchy in name only, genuflects before the sacred image of Benito Mussolini—a man who can create heroes and relegate them immediately to the limbo of forgotten men despite popular sentiment; a man who can control all phases of governmental operations without inviting the opinions of his subjects, or, indeed, the approval of his king; a man who can dissipate his cabinet and assume almighty powers over all the Italians and Italy's foreign relations without consulting a single soul.

Pilsudski, the grizzled soldier of Poland, has little less control over that country. Turkey, Rumania, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, and even Austria with its diminutive Dictator Dollfus—who is small in stature only—have turned into the hands of their rulers power such as even only the sultans of past centuries enjoyed.

Liberal governments, such as the Republic of France and the monarchy of Great Britain, are confronted with the necessity of concentrating their functions in the hands of a few all-powerful leaders. The liberal governments of these two countries find it difficult to defend their democratic principles against the wave for dictatorial power that has swept from the East to dash the foundations of liberty to bits. These strongholds of popular government, the lone survivors of Europe's upheaval, are being severely tried. Who knows but that in time England and France, hemmed in by neighboring dictatorships, may be forced to resort to some similar form of centralized control of all personal and public functions of their peoples.

The time has come when the United States of America, too, must think seriously of protecting its democracy. Thank God for the 3,000 miles which separate our people from the political problems of bickering European states. But is our geographical

position alone enough to keep us from being dragged into the cauldron of European upheavals?

Fully appreciative of the importance of support from this great Nation, appreciative of the strength of our young men, appreciative of our financial and industrial resources, and, above all, appreciative of the tremendous sympathy and gullibility of the American heart, European powers at this moment are using every device known to parliamentarians to inveigle us in their difficulties. Fortunately, bounded by two friendly countries, Canada and Mexico, we know little of the tension that exists in Europe, where a score of nations, penned up in an inadequate continent, are glaring at each other and awaiting the first international incident that may provide tinder for a new conflagration of armed conflicts.

Aliens who come into the United States, men who have had military experience in their own countries, men who have directed armies and navies are particularly dangerous to the welfare of our country. It is these aliens who have been taking advantage of every loophole of our immigration laws to enter these shores and to engage in pernicious propaganda destructive of the fundamentals of our Government and the principles of our Constitution.

Foremost among those who are at present seeking to influence American opinions are the agents of Adolf Hitler, the dictator of Germany. For the last 8 weeks the House of Representatives Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, of which I am chairman, has been investigating the operations of certain German organizations and German individuals in the United States. Although considerably hampered in our investigation by the lack of funds necessary to expose the intricate and deftly covered machinations of the Nazi government, we have succeeded in unearthing evidence to define the Nazi government here as the most dangerous threat to our democracy that has ever existed. Through the good offices of friends of the committee, who have worked with us for none other than patriotic reasons, we are at last getting to the bottom of a foreign political machine whose activities will prove of startling interest to all Americans when the time comes for exposure.

We hope to present sufficient evidence before Congress, when that body reconvenes in January, to make feasible the creation of a special committee, properly financed by the Government, for the uncloaking of all subversive elements connected with the Nazi movement in the United States.

At present our findings indicate beyond a doubt in the minds of those most closely connected with the investigation that Nazi activities are not confined to the mere distribution of literature which might clarify our understanding of the situation in Germany. The German propaganda that has come into our hands is of a pernicious sort, ostensibly designed to gain the sympathy of Americans for Hitler's domestic policies and to influence Americans toward Hitler's claims against foreign nations. German propaganda contains such elements as to bring to a head in this country hatred for one's fellow citizens.

Hitler has enlisted the aid of certain institutions in the United States whose help could be secured by monthly payments. He has transformed into mediums of his propaganda German-American institutions, many of which have earned the respect of our citizens through years of splendid service to our needs. Germany's industrial representatives in this country have been coordinated with the diabolical plans of the Hitler government, and I can point to a number of them as direct executors of Hitler's base aims against civilization.

At this moment in New York City, wherein we have the largest concentration of Germans in the country, the social ranks of German-Americans have been divided in two distinct groups. On the one side are the liberal Germans and Jews, who cannot conscientiously subscribe to Herr Hitler's policies of prostituting ideals to the requirements of an ambitious and unscrupulous state. On the other side are thousands of Germans who have been intimidated into bowing to Hitler's dictation. Should they refuse to bend their knees to their fanatical Chancelor, the safety of their friends and relatives residing in Germany would be jeopardized, and they themselves would never dare set foot on the fatherland again. Others of this latter category are influenced by the personal profit offered them for their support of the Hitler government.

From the meager budgets of the third Reich a surprising amount of money is being spent on propaganda in the United States, and at the same time these funds are being swelled by thousands of dollars extorted from German citizens in New York. We know the sources that finance this Nazi movement. We have evidence of the amounts being expended by the Berlin Government and we know the measures being employed to coerce Germans to contribute to this fund for the propagation of hate and unrest. Poor Germans in this country are literally being blackmailed into lending their moral and financial support to the issues of their Chancelor.

One of the most surprising features of my fan mail is the support my investigation is receiving from Germans in this country. I have on file scores of letters commending the inquiry and wishing it Godspeed. In every case, however, there is the caution, "Please do not allow this letter to leave your hands; my congratulations here might cost me my livelihood or my health."

Secret agents and spies, a secret police, a smuggling of arms for military drill—in short, activities which were unknown in this country at any time and not indulged in even by enemies of our people have become the order of the day. I know of instances where a secret Nazi police did threaten Americans who happened to have relatives on the other side with dire reprisals if they would not join the movement. I know of instances where, because of the resistance of American citizens to dictation by foreign spies, their relatives in Germany were secretly removed to places unknown. I know of instances where men and women thoroughly American in spirit were obliged to yield to persuasion of foreign spies because of their fear as to what would happen to their relatives in Germany if they did not become active members of the Hitler band in the United States.

Perhaps most important of all is the connection of German agents with a number of revolutionary movements that are expanding in the United States with astounding rapidity. Through the United States mails today, thousands of newspapers, magazines, pamphlets, and letters are being circulated by leaders of various rebellious cliques of this country. They appeal to the jobless and disgruntled elements for support that will put them into power at Washington; they appeal to the bigoted for their help in persecutions of various races and religious sects, and they appeal to the righteous for support in a campaign against imaginary abuses of a thousand and one descriptions.

Our investigation has revealed this much: That a definite connection exists between these organizations and Nazi bodies, who appear to be financing and organizing them; that the leaders of the new movement are cranks of various sorts, whose mentalities, when exposed to investigation, are undoubtedly pathological; that a movement is under way to having these various movements into a united front; and that, in consideration of the response they have received from hundreds of thousands of uninformed Americans and other persons with an unhealthy twist, they present a formidable threat to our democracy.

We are not prepared to join the chorus of "Heil Hitler!" led by a group of militant Hitlerite agents who have succeeded in finding supporters among certain perverted Americans. We shall not barter our democracy for the dictation of groups of fanatics clad in white, silver, khaki, or other colored shirts. We shall not scrap our Constitution and Declaration of Independence and accept as gospel the mysterious dispatches from on high received by one American Fascist leader. Our legislature will never be abandoned for the ouija board.

We do not propose to make the United States a battlefield upon which European nations can settle their disputes. We have purposely moved away from Europe. If we cannot agree on friendly intercourse between America and Europe, entered into with a view toward reciprocal benefit in all dealings, we shall have nothing to do with Europe. We do not attempt to meddle in European affairs; we do not try to disseminate ideas of liberalism and freedom among their fettered subjects; we won't have Europe obstructing our progress.

May I at this time reassert that our investigation is not directed against any groups of Americans who in this country seek to foster the ideals of their ancestors. Such organizations perform a useful function in our social and political life, but I am opposed to aliens with a philosophy of their own dictating to our citizens the form of government which we are to adopt for ourselves.

I am calling upon all Americans whom this message will reach to respect our traditions of democracy, to be on the alert for those dark forces who are operating against us, and to lend us your support in overcoming the most flagrant attack on our civilization that has ever been perpetrated. I refer specifically to German Nazi organizations operating secretly but effectively among us, and to the groups being fostered by the Nazis.

If we do not awaken to the menace of undemocratic enemies, if we do not act at once and in a body, we shall have the utmost difficulty in wiping out our foreign assailants and their secret, disloyal American allies when the time comes for a show-down.

Safeguarding Democracy with Roosevelt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 6, 1940

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. WRIGHT PATMAN, OF TEXAS

(Printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 6, 1940)

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, permission having been granted, I insert herewith a radio program given over Columbia Broadcasting System August 2, 1940, from 9 to 9:15 p. m., in which I discussed the subject Safeguarding Democracy With Roosevelt:

ANNOUNCER. Last Wednesday evening the Honorable Homer D. Angell, Republican Member of the House of Representatives, from Oregon, broadcast an address over the Columbia network entitled "The Ramparts We Watch—America, What of the Morrow?" in which was included a discussion on the third-term question.

Tonight, in accordance with its usual policy, C. B. S. presents a Democratic view on this subject as the Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN, Democratic Member of the House of Representatives, from Texas, discusses Safeguarding Democracy With Roosevelt, under the auspices of the Democratic National Committee.

Representative PATMAN. Ladies and gentlemen of the radio audience, the American people today are witnessing a political campaign which has no precedence in the Nation's history. The Democratic Party enters the campaign with the knowledge that, like any other administration in power, it must be judged on its record—and proudly it offers that record and the laws that have been placed on the statute books in the last eight significant years. But, unlike any opposition party that has ever gone before the American people, the Republican Party accepts the Democratic record in principle—not daring to call for the repeal of a single basic law passed during the last 8 years—and is forced to appeal to the voters of the country solely on the ground that it is better qualified to administer the New Deal that the Democratic Party has given to the Nation.

Disregarding all the accusations and insinuations and talk of tradition which have been flung about in the early days of this campaign and which will reach more fantastic proportions before it is through, this is the basic truth:

The Republican Party in 1932 left this country in the throes of economic disaster, its national life demoralized, its people disillusioned with Government itself. In 8 years the Democratic Party, under the leadership of Franklin D. Roosevelt, guided that Nation through the crisis that had been brought upon it under Republican rule, restored it to economic sanity, and passed laws which give hope that never again will its people be despoiled and impoverished, and laid the foundation for a new order. In 1940 the Republican Party returns to demand that again it be entrusted with the powers of government to better administer—note the irony—the laws that ended the chaos its own leaders brought upon us.

Unable to make any attack on the laws the Roosevelt administration has sponsored, forced to accept the basic controls on predatory interests the Roosevelt administration has introduced, the Republican Party has been forced to confine its attacks to Roosevelt the man and, of all things, to cry out against the shattering of "an American precedent" in electing him for a third term.

The Democratic Party, with an almost united voice, pleads guilty to its desire to shatter this precedent. It points to the fact that polls showed that 92 percent of Democratic voters of this country favored the President's renomination over all other party leaders before the Chicago convention—in spite of a press which said that convention was itself controlled—and that all of the so-called Democrats who have bolted the Democratic Party were repudiated by that party before they bolted. But the Democratic Party goes further in the matter of precedents. It defends, and proudly, a number of other precedents that it has shattered in these last 8 years, and still further, places upon its leader the principal responsibility for shattering them.

He shattered a precedent by giving assistance to the aged and the blind. He shattered a precedent by all the social-security laws he sponsored. He shattered a precedent of 150 years by reducing the interest rates on farms and homes and saving the public a billion dollars a year in interest alone; by establishing a yardstick for electric power rates which saved consumers another half billion dollars a year; by policies that permit farmers to receive over a billion dollars a year in benefits to offset disadvantages caused by protective tariffs and to enable them to conserve their soil; by laws which prevent the sale of worthless stocks and bonds to innocent investors; by electrifying American farms and homes.

He shattered precedents by guaranteeing your savings in banks and thrift institutions. He shattered precedents by Government aid to the unemployed. He shattered precedents by Government aid to the disillusioned youth of the Nation as well as the aged. He shattered precedents by establishing the "alphabetical agencies," which Republican opponents found so easy to ridicule in off-election years but against which they will keep strangely silent as they go before the people in this campaign—the Securities and Exchange Commission, the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, the Electric Farm and Home Authority, the Social Security Administration, and a score of others which have come to mean too much to the people of this country to suffer any political attack.

Precedents? The Democratic Party will continue to shatter them as long as precedents protect only men of wealth and gigantic combinations of capital and a theory of government, sponsored by Mr. Hoover, which said that it was all right to pour billions of money into banks and insurance companies and railroads and "let them trickle down to the masses"—but that Government aid to the small people of this Nation must first pass through the greedy hands of those who controlled their economic destiny.

However, in accepting the challenge as to precedents, we at the same time resent and deny the insinuations and plain falsehoods which accompany the outcries against a third term. Too many times we have heard the names of George Washington and Thomas Jefferson brought into this argument, because rarely have they been quoted in truth.

No one reveres Thomas Jefferson more than I. That does not mean I accept every theory he had 150 years ago—and I advise my friends in Congress to be wary of their declarations of adherence in certain respects, too. For Thomas Jefferson not only did not believe a President should have a third term, but he didn't believe in third terms for Congressmen and Senators, either. In fact, at one time he did not believe they should even stand for reelection—something that some congressional opponents of Mr. Roosevelt, now serving their fifth or tenth terms, might ponder before they use Mr. Jefferson's name again.

They also might ponder a remark of Mr. Jefferson anent a third term that there is a "circumstance which could engage my acquiescence in another election; to wit, such a division about a successor as might bring in a monarchist," and ponder whether today's menacing threat from the dictators might not be conceived by Mr. Jefferson much more critically dangerous than a monarchy.

As for George Washington, let us refer to his own serious and thoughtful words, written in a letter to Lafayette on April 28, 1788:

"As for instance on the ineligibility of the same person for President, after he should have served a certain course of years, I confess I differ widely myself from Mr. Jefferson and you as to the necessity or expedience of rotation in that appointment. There cannot, in my judgment, be the least danger that the President will, by any intrigue, ever be able to continue himself one moment in office, much less perpetuate himself in it. Under an extended view of part of this subject, I can see no propriety in precluding ourselves from the services of any man who, in some great emergency, shall be deemed universally most capable of serving the public."

This was the final judgment of the Father of his Country. This was the judgment that prevailed among the fathers when they established our Constitution. Purposely they did not place in that Constitution any restriction on the number of times a man might serve his country in the office of President. It is as if they foresaw just such an emergency that the Nation faces today—a crisis that calls for the man who has guided us through one great era of peril and now, with calm wisdom and a knowledge of international affairs not matched by any other leader in the world, is safely guiding us through another.

Perhaps some of those who have been so violent on the subject of a third term should have a little more of the faith of Washington that this democracy will live, that no man by intrigue could perpetuate himself in office. Perhaps we should get on a commoner ground and use a little sense to remind ourselves that we now are in the midst of a campaign in which the people themselves will vote as to whether or not they want Mr. Roosevelt to serve a third term.

The very fact that the vote of our people still determines the Presidency makes it unnecessary to give much attention to the wild talk which links a third term to a dictatorship in this country. At no time since his election has the President ruled Congress. He has been defeated in both Houses time and again—usually to the detriment of the people themselves—and never has he dominated that branch of the Government, except by intelligence and statesmanship. He never will be able to dominate it by arbitrary powers and neither will any of his successors. In the words of Chief Justice Charles Evans Hughes, who, by the way, joined Mr Hoover in supporting a third term for Mr. Coolidge, "You (the Congress) not we, have the purse and the sword." Congress, made up of duly elected representatives of the people, always holds the vital power against illegal dominance by the Executive—if it ever were needed. Certainly it will never be needed against a Roosevelt, whose very enemies were made because he has been a President of the people; we might well quiet our fears until we get a President who represents their foes.

However, I am only too aware of why the Republican Party raises this smoke screen. The reason lies in what I have pointed out before—that the Republican Party and its leaders cannot, dare not, challenge the things Mr. Roosevelt really stands for. They must raise a false issue or they are doomed to overwhelming defeat, for the American people demand the fundamentals of government which Mr. Roosevelt has sponsored throughout his 8 courageous years in office.

It is the old, old battle of the people against privilege, which Franklin D. Roosevelt waged once in 1932 and again in 1936. The same people who were opposed to him for a third term were opposed to him for a first and a second. Their only hope is to rally to their cause American citizens who are blinded by their new smoke screen and deluded by their false charges.

I repeat that the only argument that issues from the whole babble about the third term and dictatorship is the Republican promise that Republicans will better administer New Deal laws. This promise certainly can't be based on past performance, because not even Republicans like to talk a great deal these days about the scandals of the Harding administration, or the Coolidge policies which paved the way to the great debacle of 1929, or the Hoover administration which went down with that crash. It can't very well be based on logic either, for we well may question whether laws can be best administered by men entirely out of sympathy with them and unalterably opposed to the fundamentals of social justice they represent.

The American people 8 years ago chose the Democratic Party as the surgeon to operate and remove the tumors and gangrene in American Government and restore its vitality. I well might remind my listeners that the surgeon who wields the knife is the most anxious that his patient should live. The operation now has been performed. There will be little consolation to the American people in the future for Republicans to tell them, after making a miserable failure of the New Deal laws, that "the operation was successful but the patient died."

If the New Deal dies, and with it the movement for better government "of the people, by the people, and for the people"—the

Republican Party long since has forgotten except by name—it will be a sad day for those with a faith in democracy and the greatest Nation ever conceived on its principles.

But it will not die. The American people do not retreat. They will continue their steady march toward their democratic goals. They realize that in this war-torn world theirs is the job of making democracy work—of proving that men and women can preserve their ideals and their liberties and their sense of social justice in the face of even such menaces as now terrify the rest of the world.

They have a symbol in the name of the New Deal. They have a leader—a daring and resourceful leader, whose kindliness and humanity do not hide the high courage which inspired a nation once before and which is needed to inspire us again in the dark days that lie ahead. The country has called on Franklin D. Roosevelt to again "carry on."

ANNOUNCER. The Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN, Democratic Member of the House of Representatives from Texas, has discussed "Safeguarding Democracy with Roosevelt." He spoke under the auspices of the Democratic National Committee.

Columbia Broadcasting System presented this Democratic view, in conformance with its usual policy, to balance an address made last Wednesday by the Honorable HOMER D. ANGELL, Republican Member of the House of Representatives from Oregon.

Representative PATMAN spoke from the studios of WJSV, Columbia's station for the Nation's Capital.

This is the Columbia Broadcasting System.

Physical Geography of the Monroe Doctrine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. SHANLEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 1940

ARTICLE BY LAWRENCE MARTIN

Mr. SHANLEY. Mr. Speaker, the physical geography of the Monroe Doctrine and the limits of the Western Hemisphere are matters that are uppermost in the minds of every student of map making.

Col. Lawrence Martin, of the Congressional Library, is one of the outstanding authorities on the subject of maps and its pertinent present aspect, the Western Hemisphere.

He has written a current article in the Geographical Review which I think is of inestimable aid to the entire subject. It is unfortunate that the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD provides no place for maps, but rightly, the understood limitations of the RECORD in this respect are too well known to need further comment.

[Reprinted from the Geographical Review, vol. XXX, No. 3, July 1940]

THE GEOGRAPHY OF THE MONROE DOCTRINE AND THE LIMITS OF THE WESTERN HEMISPHERE

(By Lawrence Martin)

(The definition of the Western Hemisphere is a matter of engrossing interest at the present time. For the casually used phrase a precise meaning must be found. For instance, President Roosevelt's Executive order dated June 5, 1940, has to do in part with documents required of aliens entering the United States of America who are domiciled in "a country, island, or territory of the Western Hemisphere." Most important of all, House Joint Resolution 556, introduced June 3, 1940, as amended in committee 2 days later, specifies that "the United States would not recognize any transfer and would not acquiesce in any attempt to transfer any geographic region of this hemisphere from one non-American power to another non-American power." Hence it seemed desirable for the American Geographical Society to present a geographer's view of the problem. Colonel Martin, who is versed in political geography, was asked to help by defining the Western Hemisphere on a map and by outlining the geography of the Monroe Doctrine and its genesis. It is emphasized that Colonel Martin has done this in his private capacity as geographer and as contributing editor of the Geographical Review and not as a Federal employee.—EDITORIAL NOTE).

"I told him specially that we should contest the right of Russia to any territorial establishment on this continent," observed John Quincy Adams, of Massachusetts, in his diary for July 17, 1823. He was Secretary of State at the time and was alluding to an interview with Baron Tuyll, the Russian Minister at Washington. "We should assume distinctly the principle," Adams continued, "that the American continents are no longer subjects for any new European colonial establishments."

Our Secretary of State was no stranger to Russia and the Russians. President Madison had sent him to St. Petersburg in 1809 as American Minister. The next year, by direction from Washington, he had refused to cooperate with the Russians in regulating the trade in firearms with the aborigines of the northwest coast of North America. Thus we refrained from recognizing the sovereignty of the Czar in America, as we did again when the Russian trading post at Fort Ross in California, was set up in 1816.

"There can, perhaps, be no better time," Adams wrote to the American Minister at the court of the Muscovite monarch, on July 22, 1823, "for saying frankly and explicity to the Russian Government that the future peace of the world, and the interest of Russia itself, cannot be promoted by Russian settlements upon any part of the American continent."

Accordingly, it seems that the doctrine subsequently enunciated by President Monroe may have been a child of John Quincy Adams. It is unquestionable that he, as Monroe's Secretary of State, was initially looking westward at California, the Oregon Country, Alaska, and Russia, and not southward at Central America, the West Indies, and South America and eastward at the Great Powers of Western Europe.

The political geography of the two Americas in 1823 is shown on one of the maps (fig. 1.). The small United States of America, the large empire of Brazil, and the Spanish territories in and near Bolivia as well as Cuba and Puerto Rico all look strange to our eyes. Spanish America, Russian America, and the Danish Virgin Islands are things of the past. The independent Icelanders, the Greenland Danes, the Dutch, the French, and the British are still with us in America.

Presumably it was the European possessions south of Florida and Mexico, as well as Russian America, that Monroe and his cabinet were unwilling to allow to expand or to fall into the hands of non-American powers.

"We owe it therefore to candor," President Monroe asserted on December 2, 1823, in the message to Congress of which the Monroe Doctrine is a part, "and to the amicable relations existing between the United States and those powers, to declare that we should consider any attempt on their part to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere, as dangerous to our peace and safety" (see p. 528).

One geographer's individual view of the extent of the Western Hemisphere is indicated on the map, figure 2, which is bisected horizontally by the equator. The eastern limit of the hemisphere is the meridian of 20° west of Greenwich; the western limit is the International Date Line—the geographer's Western Hemisphere is admittedly a shade smaller than the Eastern Hemisphere. The limits are adjusted slightly to include Greenland and Iceland in the Western Hemisphere but to exclude from the Western Hemisphere the Azores, the Cape Verde Islands, and Western Samoa. Greenland, as all geographers agree, is a part of the Western, or American Hemisphere; its northeast cape (12° W.) is farther east than easternmost Iceland (13° 25′ W.). As Stefansson has shown convincingly,[1] Iceland is a part of the Western Hemisphere—few geographers have said they think so, but no geographer has denied it. Who can say that this ancient state may not eventually become a member of that family of good neighbors—the Pan American Union.

A part of the great continent of Antarctica is likewise within the Western Hemisphere. An American from Connecticut, Nathaniel B. Palmer, discovered Antarctica.[2]

"Fellow citizens of the Senate and House of Representatives, many important subjects will claim your attention during the present session.

"We owe it, therefore, to candor, and to the amicable relations existing between the United States and those powers, to declare that we should consider any attempt on their part to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety. With the existing colonies or dependencies of any European power we have not interfered, and shall not interfere. But with the governments who have declared their independence, and maintained it, and whose independence we have, on great consideration, and on just principles, acknowledged, we could not view any interposition for the purpose of oppressing them, or controlling in any other manner their destiny, by any European power in any other light than as the manifestation of an unfriendly disposition toward the United States.

"JAMES MONROE.

"WASHINGTON, *December 2, 1823.*"

Another American from Massachusetts, John Quincy Adams, conceived and planned the first official American exploring expedition to the portions of Antarctica and the South Seas within the Western Hemisphere.

---

[1] Vilhjalmur Stefansson: Iceland: The First American Republic, New York, 1939 (reviewed in Geogr. Rev., vol. 29, 1939, pp. 688–689).

[2] An article by Colonel Martin on Nathaniel B. Palmer's discovery and exploration of Antarctica will appear in a subsequent number of the Geographical Review.—Editor's Note.

Report by Committee on Economic Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAUDE PEPPER
OF FLORIDA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 7 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a report by the Committee on Economic Defense, recently published by the American Council on Public Affairs. This report entitled "Total Defense," presents matters of such importance to all of us that I consider they should receive the widest possible attention.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This report represents the considered views of the Committee on Economic Defense, an affiliate of the American Council on Public Affairs. The members of the committee are:

Clark Foreman, chairman, author The New Internationalism.
Will W. Alexander, Administrator, Farm Security Administration.
David Cushman Coyle, author and engineer.
Oscar A. de Lima, president, Roger Smith Corporation.
Paul Douglas, professor of economics, University of Chicago.
Mark Ethridge, general manager, Louisville Courier-Journal.
Edwin R. Embree, president, Julius Rosenwald Foundation.
Mrs. May Thompson Evans, assistant director, Women's Division of National Democratic Committee.
W. Jett Lauck, economist and acting chairman of American Association for Economic Freedom.
Ernest Lindley, author and columnist.
Mrs. Joan Raushenbush, political scientist and co-author of War Madness and The Final Choice.
Michael Ross, economist, Pennsylvania School of Social Work.
Phil D. Swing, lawyer and former Republican Congressman from California.

The committee will be glad to hear from persons interested in its proposals. Communication should be sent to 1721 I Street, Washington, D. C.

TOTAL DEFENSE

"I should like to be able to offer the hope that the shadow over the world might swiftly pass. I cannot. The facts compel my stating, with candor, that darker periods may lie ahead. The disaster is not of our making; no act of ours engendered the forces which assault the foundations of civilization. Yet we find ourselves affected to the core; our currents of commerce are changing, our minds are filled with new problems, our position in world affairs has already been altered.

"In such circumstances our policy must be to appreciate in the deepest sense the true American interest."—President Franklin D. Roosevelt. (Message to Congress, September 21, 1939.)

We in America cherish above all values our heritage of personal and political freedom. We have watched with heavy heart the people of other countries discard the very concept of individual liberty as a decadent weakness in the body politic. We have watched with even heavier heart the extinction of freedom by force of superior might for people who still clung to a way of life they were no longer able successfully to defend. The tragic conflict in Europe has brought very close the danger to our own cherished institutions of a world dominated by a philosophy which despises that which we hold dear and glorifies that which we ourselves reject.

In this situation there are some who sincerely feel that our only hope for survival as a democracy lies in the defeat of those countries whose philosophy is different from our own. But the course of events moves so swiftly today that we must necessarily look beyond the present possibility of ultimate victory for those whose philoscphy is similar to our own, and consider the defense of our institutions in a world where that philosophy has been effectively suppressed for other nations. It is the very essence of courage to believe that our democracy can survive in such a world. But courage alone is not enough. It must be supported by foresight, by intelligence, and, above all, by willingness to subordinate private economic interests to the common interests of the people as a whole. For it is surely self-evident that our economy could not continue to operate successfully on the old laissez-faire basis in a world dominated by highly controlled economic systems. And it is equally clear that our survival as a Nation and the protection of the personal liberties which form the very essence of our national life will depend on our ability to make the necessary economic adjustments.

This pamphlet undertakes to pose some of the problems involved in this adjustment. It seems essential that we consider these problems, for it could only mean further tragedy if we permitted our sympathy for the other liberty-loving peoples of the world to deter us from the kind of far-sighted planning which alone will permit us to keep the flames of freedom burning in our own land if it should be extinguished elsewhere.

America is not yet prepared for war; she is even less prepared for the settlement that will follow it. In the effort that is now being made to turn the vast powers of American industry toward preparedness for military defense, thought must be given to the fundamental changes in world economics that will follow when military operations cease. It would be comfortable for both business and government to assume that after the crisis in Europe is over, American business, foreign and domestic, will go on as usual. The purpose of this pamphlet is to question that assumption and to analyze the situations for which this country needs to be prepared, whether those situations are labeled war or peace.

The United States cannot afford to sit and wait for knowledge of the outcome before starting to plan what it is to do after the decision in Europe is reached. It is high time to think of alternate possibilities, in preparation for realistic protection of this country, whatever the outcome in Europe.

Those who feel that should Hitler be defeated the world economic system will settle down into a form not far different from that of the past 20 years are assuming that the Allies will have learned nothing from the disasters that followed Versailles. Actually it should be clear that the Allies will not repeat the same old mistakes, whatever new ones they may fall into when and if they defeat Germany. Moreover, there are many who hold that in the case of either an Allied or a German victory, in the long run the economic structure of Europe will be changed in essentially the same way.

Those whose thoughts have dwelt upon the danger of a Hitler-dictated peace and the large and terrifying possibilities of life in a world under the domination of Hitler, find no hope for a return to the old norms of international relations.

Obviously Germany cannot dictate the peace unless she has first defeated the French and the English Governments to the point where they either surrender or desert their countries. Just as obviously, if that occurs, no force in all Europe can prevent Germany from dictating completely the conditions of life for the European peoples. There is every reason to suppose that in the case of a German victory, the system of independent nations in Europe will be abolished in fact if not in form.

Even if, by a miracle, Germany should be defeated, or if England should for a time maintain a precarious hold on the edge of a Nazi-dominated continent, it would be necessary for the United States to have power to determine its future course independent of European events. At best there will be problems in Asia, revolutions in various parts of the world, and numerous dangers that America must meet. The Anglo-American struggles for oil throughout the world and their trade rivalries in Latin America during the 20's indicate that a common cultural heritage and a similar political regime do not preclude economic warfare.

In the post-war world, under any conceivable circumstances, international trade will be a matter of national security, with little legitimate place for private relationships between individuals of different countries. International trade will become, even more than now, a matter of intergovernmental trade and those governments that are not prepared for it will likely lose out in the coming competition.

Alsop and Kintner, in their American White Paper, say that President Roosevelt and Assistant Secretary of State Adolf Berle both agreed in September 1939 "that the war's main danger to this country lay in the alternative prospects of post-war economic chaos or world economy dominated by dictatorships." It is essential to recognize that while these dangers exist now and must be faced, there is no reason why they should paralyze us. So large and powerful a nation as ours need not lie helpless in the path of events. If we prepare our minds for the economic changes involved, and act with intelligence and speed, we can muster the physical and human power to keep our country from being overwhelmed by chaos or dictatorship in Europe.

We Americans must develop a political and economic policy, as a basis for the military preparedness which we are undertaking. Whether we are at peace or at war, we must be prepared on the economic as well as on the military front. Stated in its barest simplicity, we must, as a Nation, have within our control sufficient economic strength to be prosperous in peace and impregnable in war. An outer shell of military preparedness can be crushed unless it is bulwarked within by an economic structure that is sound.

The defense of America is not the defense of a geographic entity alone—it is the defense of a people, their way of life, their institutions and their aspirations. Any proposal for defense that would throw overboard the American form of government denies the very purpose of national defense. We must therefore demonstrate to the world that democracy is a success not only politically, but

economically as well. In other words, we must be a living example to other nations that Americans are not only politically free, but under the democratic process, American industry is providing satisfactory employment for all those able and willing to work.

To secure America, the choice need not lie between an American dictatorship or domination by a foreign power. Whatever changes in economic relationships America must make to prepare herself against either threat must be made by democratic means, and must not halt the progressive extension of the principles of democracy. In America, Government controls must, in the last analysis, be subject to the democratically expressed will of the people.

The sooner we take steps to protect our independence, the more of it we will be able to save. If we are to save our liberties, and avoid the barbaric persecution of minority groups, we must act before acute national danger makes reasonable action impossible.

What changes in our economic system must be made to give us sufficient strength to stand the shocks that the future will bring? Can those changes be made in our economic system without destroying the political system for the defense of which those changes are made? This pamphlet is not intended to be a detailed answer to these questions. It is simply an attempt to sketch the outline of the job that must be done and to suggest some of the methods that might be used.

Twenty years ago the well-known English economist, J. M. Keynes, portrayed vividly to a believing world the thesis that the Versailles Treaty had so crippled Germany that she was no longer a threat to Europe. In his famous book, Economic Consequences of the Peace, Keynes held that in crippling Germany the Allies had also mortally injured international capitalism. In this latter belief he was followed by few.

Later events were to show that Keynes was more nearly correct about capitalism than about Germany. In fact, the phenomenal recovery of Germany indicates that one result of the peace treaty was to destroy in Germany the inhibitions of conventional finance, and thus to open the way for Hitler to utilize for purposes of economic and military power the entire material and human resources of the Reich. Under these conditions Germany became larger and more formidable than even before the war of 1914. Moreover, her economic methods are such as to create new and difficult problems for any democratic state that attempts to resist her domination.

It is easy for us now to look back and say that if the post-war democracy in Germany had been aided rather than blocked in its effort to establish reforms, Germany would not have resorted to the cruelties which have become a part of her form of government. But while refused aid to liberal reform, Germany was permitted to arm herself to the extent that she could defy the rest of Europe and threaten the rest of the world. The German Government was clever enough, even in its distress, to play upon the cupidity of foreign businessmen and through them to bring about the weakening of her enemies and the superior force of Germany, which Germany could have achieved in no other way.

By strict control of foreign exchange and domestic currency, the German Government not only obtained full utilization of all internal resources but also was able to coordinate its foreign trade. In spite of serious deficiencies in real wealth, Germany was thus enabled to obtain results with an efficiency unmatched by other, richer nations. She was able to use her foreign trade as a powerful instrument of political policy. This instrument was peculiarly successful in dealing with countries that still permitted private citizens to trade abroad at will. The German Government was able to play one foreign trader against another, and even to influence the foreign policy of other states, by using centralized-purchasing power to induce the traders of a country to bring pressure upon their governments.

Similar methods were used by Russia in the period when she was seeking diplomatic recognition from countries whose nationals were beginning to trade with her. Thus, as far back as 1933 this practice was familiar not only to the dictator countries, but to their future victims, as was noted by the London Times in an editorial on July 3, 1933. The Times, after quoting the Soviet Encyclopedia's boast of this power, commented: "The need for special safeguards in trading with a gigantic state monopoly run on these principles is now recognized by all except the few who still hold that the only economic wisdom is to buy always in the cheapest market, no matter how temporary that cheapness is likely to be or how ruinous it may prove in the long run."

That the well-organized economic strength of Germany was used for undermining other nations has been repeatedly demonstrated by the events of the war. The great attention now being paid to "fifth columnists" of the mere propagandist variety overlooks the fact that the most effective weakening of Allied resistance was accomplished through legtimate business relations, before the military war began. Moreover, this weakening was effected by working on the rich and influential industrial leaders.

If Germany wins the war in Europe, there can be no doubt that she will continue her policy of bringing under her economic control all the conquered lands, and will include any remaining helpless countries in her sphere of influence. The foreign trade of 400,000,000 people will be controlled, directed, and centralized in one government, and can be brought to bear with deadly accuracy upon any foreign nation that might venture to oppose Germany's policies. If we are to defend ourselves against this new weapon we must not only recognize the danger as the London Times did in 1933, we must act promptly and effectively to shield ourselves against it.

With a unified Europe, the post-war world may contain four major economic empires: Europe with 400,000,000 inhabitants, China-Japan with about 400,000,000, U. S. S. R. with about 200,000,000, and the United States of America and Canada with about 150,000,000. The economic alinement of South America, Africa, the Pacific islands, and parts of Asia would be determined by the gigantic struggle for control that would unquestionably follow soon. In this struggle the United States cannot avoid taking some part, even if we were to content ourselves with an attempt to hold only the independence of North America and the Caribbean Sea.

It is obvious that if no measures of protection, other than military preparedness, are taken in the United States, this country would be almost immediately rendered helpless by the disruptive effects of Europe's centrally controlled foreign trade. It is obviously necessary to build an economic union, guaranteeing complete protection not only to our own territory but to all the free nations with which we may be associated for defense against the dictatorships. Across this wall of protection, it is clear, no private trade nor opportunity for bribery nor economic pressure can be permitted to pass. It appears certain that the establishment and maintenance of an effective barrier against the economic weapons of Germany will involve certain drastic changes.

In order to defend our security in war, and our prosperity in peace, our Government must have power to assure to this country a supply of all necessary materials, and also to protect our interests against economic pressure from any hostile power. This necessity requires a recognition, in acts as well as in words, that the system of international free trade cannot function as long as any important part of the world is controlled by powers which can take advantage of that system to threaten our security.

The United States should act promptly to expand its present sources of supply of strategic raw materials in the Western Hemisphere and to establish the production in Latin America of the many essential materials which can be produced there but which we now import from remote areas in Asia and Africa. We know now, from our experience of the past 20 years, that international politics, so long as dictatorships exist, are merely a form of war. Under these conditions we cannot afford to neglect our own defense under the illusion that we are at peace.

Of the materials which we now import, the latest report of the Army and Navy Munitions Board (March 1940) lists some 29 materials which it considers essential to national defense. Of these, 14 are called strategic because in a war we should depend largely on sources outside the United States for them. Fifteen other essential materials are called critical, because while essential, they would in time of war present less of a problem owing to the fact that they are obtainable in larger measure in this country.[1]

In working out such a list, the Munitions Board has made a most valuable contribution, but it is merely the first step in the solution of our problem. The Board itself, however, outlines four possible ways for meeting the present denciencies:

1. By development of domestic production of these materials on a scale equal or partially equal to requirements.

2. By development of substitutes.

3. By maintaining friendly relations with the nations who control the sources and distribution of these materials and by keeping trade routes open to the principal sources.

4. By acquiring adequate stock piles of these materials in time of peace as a war reserve, particularly those which offer the most difficulty of solution by the foregoing methods.

In planning our future economy we must consider all these possibilities and in addition a fifth—that of developing new sources of strategic materials in areas which we are prepared to defend. The method chosen in the long run must be the one that contributes most to our national safety, but that does not mean that it is necessarily better to develop a substitute in the United States than to assist in the production of the original in some other American country.

All of the strategic materials or substitutes for them are either obtainable or can be developed in the Western Hemisphere. Many also exist in Asia. The availability of these materials is a question of great importance in making out both an economic plan and a plan for military defense. The two are interdependent and should be considered together. Where the strategic material exists, therefore, both in South America and Asia, it is obviously to our advantage to rely on the South American source rather than the more distant and much more vulnerable Asiatic source.

Inasmuch as we can with proper planning get all of our essential needs from this hemisphere, the question of military defense impels us so to direct our plan. This means that the United States must strengthen its relationship with those countries and organize them on a basis of mutual advantage. The necessity of reliance on South America for certain materials merely serves to reenforce the military necessity of protecting South America from Nazi control, in order to avoid an impossible situation in the defense of the Panama Canal. All considerations of our own safety require us to obtain

[1] It should be remembered that the list is constantly changing as new supplies and new substitutes are found. The latest report, however, lists the following as strategic materials which must be imported into continental United States: Antimony, chromium, coconut shell char, manganese (ferrograde), manila fiber, mercury, mica, nickel, quartz crystal, quinine, rubber, tin, silk, tungsten.

the willing and enthusiastic cooperation of South America in hemisphere defense, at whatever cost.

Any program which envisages the large scale of development of inter-American trade coupled with the mutual extension of our cultural, social, and political relations, must be the joint product of the American nations. We cannot effect the wholehearted cooperation of our southern neighbors unless they are active participants from the start in the establishment of a program designed to increase both their security and their prosperity, as well as our own. It would be folly for us to think that we could gain the economic cooperation of other countries and the exclusion of hostile political influence merely by increasing our Army and Navy, however necessary such increases may be. Military defense is not enough defense. It is essential that all nations that we propose to defend shall prefer our friendship to any other. Even though there are some countries in this hemisphere on which we are not dependent for imports, nevertheless the difficulties of military defense of any part of South America are vastly increased if a hostile power has a foothold in any part of it. Obviously we must think of the economic as well as the military development of the whole hemisphere.

There must be no revival of the dollar diplomacy which allowed private corporations to exploit South American resources with no regard to our national interest nor to that of the country exploited. Although our long-run national interest was not considered, the exploitation proceeded with the help of our nationally supported fleet. That system brought profits to some, along with worthless bonds to many, and a "Yankee imperialism" which aroused hatred against this country and created a fertile ground for "fifth column" activity. Under the good-neighbor policy, much has, of course, been done to overcome the ills of dollar diplomacy. The unanimous declaration of Lima was a real forward step in inter-American relations. Our dependence on bilateral trade agreements has, however, provide woefully inadequate in meeting the trade technique of the totalitarian powers.

In order to build up a prosperous pan-American economy, it will be necessary to plan for the exchange within this hemisphere of goods which will increase the standard of living of the Latin-American countries as well as those of Canada and the United States. In this way the markets for all of the American countries will be increased and among themselves they will be largely self-sufficient. In 1938, according to the Department of Commerce, the United States took $553,600,000 or 31.5 percent of the exports of 20 Latin American republics, and supplied to the same countries $497,195,000, or 35.8 percent of their imports. For 11 of the 20 the trade with the United States represented more than a third of their imports as well as their exports.[2] The United States does not dominate in the trade of the more southern countries of South America where so many of the products—wheat, cotton, beef, etc.—are competitive with our own products. The problem of these South American surpluses which we do not now absorb is a difficult one, and in the solution of it we must start with the assumption that South American countries will not be satisfied unless their surpluses are sold.

Canada and the United States at present enjoy a large trade which could be greatly extended by a customs union. That would not in itself solve the problem that faces both countries in the form of a wheat surplus. This problem must be attacked in combination with those countries in South America that also have a wheat surplus. There may be several possible solutions; included among them will be increased consumption in this hemisphere, eventual substitution of some other crop on land which can only be used profitably for wheat when the farmers receive a subsidy, and trade abroad. The most important thing for us to think of at once is the development of our bargaining power as a pan-American system. We shall need all the time possible, and there is none to spare. At the end of the present war in Europe the bargaining position of the American countries will, if effectively combined, unquestionably be the greatest in the world. Regardless of cost and existing commercial customs, we must keep that advantage.

We must arrange for collective bargaining by the countries of the Western Hemisphere in dealing with the totalitarian systems as no individual American country, dealing alone, would be a match for the totalitarian powers in the field of international trade. If the United States attempted to outbid Europe in a barter arrangement with a single South American country it would mean we would have to be prepared to reduce the living standards of American labor to that of Europe. By bargaining collectively within the pan-American economy we will be able to maintain and raise our standard of living and that of all the American countries, at the same time dealing with Europe to our advantage.

We should start negotiations at once to use our great financial strength for the purchase of exports of Latin America. These commodities could then be turned over to a pan-American trading corporation, which, in turn, would use them to meet the needs of the people of this hemisphere through a circular exchange among the American countries, by direct distribution, or by trading them for desired products in other parts of the world. In fact, it is difficult to see how we can escape a rapid collapse of our influence south of Panama by any less drastic move. For the moment, we have no power but money, and we have most of the money in the world. If we hesitate to use that power we may find its value evaporating.

This action would, of course, be merely a temporary stopgap and should be accompanied as rapidly as possible by the formation of a permanent pan-American trading corporation. This public corporation should aim to develop a circular trade within the hemisphere, providing a higher standard of living, and full employment. The program could be greatly assisted by making loans at nominal rates of interest to develop the industrial programs called for by the pan-American economic plan. Our Government could supply the Inter-American Bank, which is just about to be created by the governments of the Western Hemisphere with the necessary reserves to finance these investment developments.[3]

Along with the maximum of profitable exchange between the various countries of this hemisphere, their surpluses could be offered to the other countries of the world by the Pan American trading council for the products which were still demanded here. Bargaining through the trading council would, however, be essential, as otherwise Europe, in dealing with isolated American countries, could use local price cutting to divide and rule in this hemisphere.

Every effort should be made by the pan-American trading council through normal channels and through some such device as the stamp plan which has worked so effectively in the United States to stimulate the rise in the standard of living in all American countries. This is not only highly desirable but quite practical as a measure of internal defense to prevent the formation of disaffected groups of people.

While we need important products which can be grown in South American countries, those countries also need some of our products that they are not now getting. For example, in 1937, one South American country was paying $1.50 a bushel for corn grown on its domestically protected farms, at a time when United States grown corn was being sold under subsidy to Europe at 25 cents a bushel. Similarly, a South American country was paying $2 a bushel for wheat when we were selling it for less than $1 a bushel.

The use of the movies and radio to prepare and interest Latin American peoples in a program of more intense economic cooperation is essential. Also important is the extension of cultural relations, social contacts, and a much greater inter-American travel. It has been estimated that if American tourists spent annually in Latin America half of their expenditures in Europe in 1938, they would pay interest on a loan of $5,000,000,000. This merely gives an idea of how important travel can be in the economic relations of countries; tourist expenditures have been an important factor in the balance of trade of many a European country.

Our present trade with the Latin American countries could be increased greatly by the further development in those countries of such minerals as chromium, manganese, tungsten, antimony, and tin, all of which are vitally needed by the United States. Also the United States would be much stronger defensively if the Latin American countries grew more agricultural products, noncompetitive with our own, such as rubber, abaca (manila fiber) and quinine.

The Department of Agriculture has been for many years studying the possible development of new complementary products in Latin American countries which would serve as a substantial means of increasing our trade with Latin America. Rubber is one of the most important of these products. We now import our enormous supply of it from the Far East. With cooperation between the United States and countries in Latin America, which can produce rubber, it would be possible to supply our needs from those sources. Recommendations for the development of agriculture in tropical America were made by the Department of Agriculture more than 2 years ago. There is now pending before Congress a request by the Department of Agriculture for an appropriation of $1,000,000 for the development of rubber production in Latin America.

Abacá (manila fiber), necessary for naval cordage, which we now get from the Philippines, could also be produced in Latin America. A planting experiment of 2,000 acres in Panama indicates that abacá can be produced in the American tropics. The cinchona plant, from which quinine comes, is native to South America. The United States now depends on the East Indies for its source of quinine. The American tropics are rich in various kinds of hardwoods which the United States could use. These resources which can be developed to great advantage for us and for the Latin American countries will not, however, be developed without the active assistance and cooperation of the countries involved.

---

[2] The 11 countries in which trade with the United States was this dominant are: Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Ecuador, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, and El Salvador.

[3] This bank is the outcome of the recommendations of the Inter-American Economic and Financial Advisory Conference established at the Panama meeting in 1939 of the foreign ministers of the American republics. It is provided that all of the stock of the Inter-American Bank will be owned by the governments of the republics of this hemisphere. The treaty establishing the bank was opened for signature on May 10, 1940, and has already been signed by several republics, including the United States. Our signature, however, has not yet been ratified by our Senate.

"If Germany wins, there will be a lot of big orders coming over," said an important businessman visiting Washington recently. And he was right. When the war is over, whether Germany wins or not, Europe will need badly many things that the United States can export. So great is the force of our sales organizations and the tradition of individual action regardless of social considerations, that unless our Government is prepared to take strong action the orders will probably be filled without regard to their effect on American security as a whole.

Unquestionably, we will be assured that Europe intends to carry on business as usual, just as the British businessmen were lulled into inaction by the repeated statements that Germany was a bulwark against Communism. In fact, on June 14, 1940, there was published in the American press an interview with Hitler to the effect that he saw no reason to make war in America. This effort to lull our businessmen with a poisoned olive branch reveals one of Hitler's most dangerous techniques. It happened that on the same day a German consul general in New Orleans unwittingly exposed his master. In an interview which he later said he intended to be "off the record" he was quoted by the press as saying "For the past 20 years we have been preparing, while France and England have been sleeping, expecting that they were safe * * * my country will not forget that when she was fighting bitterly for her very life, the United States gave every material aid to her enemies."

If the orders are placed immediately, the financial interests involved will be dependent to that extent upon the European economy. It will be only a short step from that to the time when firms employing individuals, who for any reason are unacceptable to the government of Europe, will not receive orders, or firms supporting a pro-American political policy will be boycotted. Such is the standard practice of Germany already in many countries. Latin America has many Nazi-controlled companies built first on favors and later on pressure and blackmail. Also, newspapers which print any unflattering news about Hitler or his Government will have to be boycotted by those firms expecting trade from Europe, and no advertising may be placed with them.

The multiplication of such subtle pressures may well undermine resistance in the powerful group at the top of our social and political systems, and leave the military forces uncalled, no matter how well armed. The United States would then gradually decline to colonial status. In order that the national interest be protected against any such conscious or unconscious move to sell the country down the ocean, a rigid system of Government control over foreign trade would have to be instituted at once, and exports swapped for imports only when the net result is gainful to the country as a whole. Only in this way can discrimination be prevented, and the loyalties of all kept unselfishly American.

It may be expected that such a course of action would immediately bring domestic repercussions, particularly in those businesses and sections which now look to foreign trade for a part of their profits. Problems of adjustment would be presented which would need solution in accordance with our democratic institutions. One of our first duties would be to find other ways of using the people, lands, and industries now engaged in supplying that part of the export trade which might be found to be superfluous.

Our Government, in providing for the employment and general welfare of our people, would have to work in close cooperation with the plans of the pan-American trading council. As an example, the health of millions of people in this country, as well as others in this hemisphere, demands a greater consumption of dairy products. The production and distribution of those products could be achieved by a Government-guaranteed price which would lead to the use of much more land for the production of dairy products, land which is now used for producing wheat, cotton, and other agricultural surpluses, the need for which is not so urgent.

Similarly, the production and processing of strategic materials must be protected. During the last war there were factories in this country for the refinement of tin. After the war, those factories were closed and Bolivian tin was shipped to England for refinement before coming here. Along the same line, our Government must not let the good work of one department be canceled out by another. Our dependence on German potash before the first World War was remedied by exploration subsidized by the Department of the Interior. The potash was found on Government land, but of the three companies formed to mine this potash, two (The United States Potash Co. and the American Potash & Chemical Corporation [4]) are now completely controlled by British interests. Presumably that control will pass to Germany if she wins the war, unless the United States has a strong policy and adequate powers for commandeering foreign-owned properties.

A different but dangerous foreign threat to our strategic necessities is through patents. As an example of a condition which exists in many fields, we may cite the production of range finders, an instrument indispensable in modern warfare. In this country they are produced by the firm of Bausch & Lomb, which in turn uses a patent of the Germany company of Carl Zeiss. Although the sale of these instruments in this country is limited to the Government, the American company signed a contract with the German company to furnish the latter with information as to the number of instruments supplied to the United States Government. Moreover, the German company reserves the right, though it has never exercised it, to name the head of the department of Bausch & Lomb which manufactures these instruments.[5]

Readjustments in our foreign trade inevitably affect the domestic economy. To meet the new needs new factories will have to be started, and some forms of production now in being will have to be changed for production more in harmony with the national welfare. In the years before the present war the German Government allowed the importation only of those products vitally needed for the national interest. At the same time it allowed the export of only those products which were not of vital importance. The uncontrolled trade of the United States in dealing with the German system led to interesting results. For cotton and copper we were receiving such items as cameras, Christmas-tree ornaments, and harmonicas. As desirable as the importations may be, it is obvious that if such a trade exchange is kept up between us and Europe after this war it will not be long before we shall be traded into a colonial status, with the power in Europe and the toys in America.

Readjustments in production will require new skills on the part of our people, and no accident of economics should be permitted to prevent the necessary training. At the same time it is necessary to prevent overcrowding of particular trades.

We are fortunately in a good position to profit now from the British experience. The methods they have adopted to meet the situation, now that the fate of the nation is in doubt, may serve to guide us while we are still able to take the precautions without worrying about parachutists. The New York Times of June 6, 1940, discussed editorially the difficult situation in which England finds herself now as a result of the failure of the Government to provide necessary training to overcome the lack of skilled labor in essential industries. After quoting an article in the London Economist on this subject, the New York Times remarked:

"There is a confessed shortage in England of skilled and experienced workers in many essential industries. Definite courses of instruction and learning periods cannot be dispensed with. In Germany, the Economist points out, 4 weeks' training is given to all unskilled recruits to the metal trades—almost wholly in the actual works and on the machines being used in production. The local 'labor front' aids in the drafting of training schemes, and defaulting employers are denied additional skilled labor until semi-skilled workers (in this lesser sense of mere machine operators) are being adequately turned out. The German slogan is: 'We must abolish the unskilled worker.'

"It should not be hard for British industry, the Economist declares, to follow suit on a massive scale. It needs only Government leadership and command. This covers not simply the Government's readiness, already announced, to pay the fares of unemployed men going to employers for training, but its decision to pay for the maintenance and cost of training as well as for the transfer of hundreds of thousands of workers not now in war work, whether idle or not, and its determination to enforce quite ruthlessly the maximum training of machine operators in the Nation's factories.

"Great Britain's failures in industrial mobilization under the Chamberlain government become, in the light of the present situation, almost incredible * * *."

We have millions unemployed and every effort to get private industry to employ them has failed to meet the situation. It is therefore particularly revealing that two such well-known conservative organs could print a sentence to the effect "that it needs only Government leadership and command." The general lack of realism in this respect is well illustrated by the speeches of one of the conservative candidates for President. He asks the people of the country to help the democracies of Europe and to achieve national unity at home. In the same breath he says that the Government must let private enterprise solve the unemployment situation "by turning industry loose." He deplored the idea that "Government increasingly must regulate economy" and begs his listeners not to call on the Government to save us.

We hope that this is not a call for that type of national unity, under the leadership of private corporations, which permitted a private company to delay for 3 months the construction of a Government powder plant, after we entered the World War, until it got the terms it demanded, because, in the words of one of the largest holders of munitions stock at the time, "* * * we cannot consent to allowing our own patriotism to interfere with our duties as trustees." [6]

---

[4] Report on the Potash Industry by U. S. Department of Commerce, May 1940.

[5] When these and other provisions of this particular contract were challenged by the Anti-Trust Division of the Department of Justice, the attitude of the American company was haughty. In fact, when the U. S. Navy ordered a supply of the range finders, the company demurred. Pointing to the action of the Department of Justice, the company said that no deliveries could be made for 6 months. This action was brought to the attention of the Justice Department just after the German invasion of the Netherlands with the consequent arousing of American public opinion. The officers of the company were called in and told that unless they agreed to deliver the instruments at once the whole matter would be brought to the attention of the public. It was also implied that the present state of public opinion might cause a sentence of imprisonment as well as fine for violating the antitrust law in such a flagrant way. The company signed, but there are many other similar instances that need to be brought to light and prosecuted.

[6] S. Rept. 944, pt. 2, 74th Cong., 1st sess., pp. 107–111.

National economic defense, like national military defense, must be undertaken by the Government. The two must be closely coordinated through the various Government agencies. Based on such a combined defense, we may build up a prosperous New World and say to the old that we are ready and willing to cooperate in peace, but also ready to turn back all attempts to undermine our security, whether the attempts are political or military, financial or commercial. If the necessity of economic preparedness is beyond our power of understanding and action, there is little point in wasting effort on a military establishment that can so easily be outflanked.

Some of the political scientists in the past have regarded foreign policy as something beyond the understanding of the common man—something removed from the democratic process. In fact, our political scientists have often implied, as did Lord Bryce in his classic work on democracy in America, that democracies were incapable of developing foreign policies. The principles of secrecy, continuity, and diplomatic usage, they felt, made democratic procedures inapplicable in this field. This led directly to the abuse of diplomatic agencies by powerful corporations ready to convert the prestige of the country to their own profiteering.

Now we realize that if we are to be safe at home we must have a foreign policy that is in the national interest, and one that will not be guided either by ideologies abroad or special interests at home. If we are to have the time to develop a democratic way of life in this hemisphere, our dealings with the rest of the world should be directed toward securing the necessary time and peace for such work. We believe our way of life is superior but it cannot be imposed at the cannon's point. Other people's doubts as to this superiority will be lessened to the extent that we succeed in insuring peace and prosperity in this continent.

Should the present world struggle eventuate, as we have suggested it well might in the rest of the world being divided in the main among three great totalitarian powers it is not the path of wisdom to have all three of those powers in common enmity to us. Such a course would require armed might far beyond our present capacity. In fact the counsel of wisdom would be to avail ourselves of such differences of interest as exist already among the other powers and use those differences to our own best advantage. In order to maintain the independence of the Americas it is clearly to our common advantage to concentrate our trading power into a single instrument, to be used first of all for our common welfare and security.

SUMMARY

1. Military defense is not enough defense; the well-being of our people and our pan-American neighbors must be secured.
2. We are faced with the possibility of an integrated and centrally controlled economy in Europe representing approximately 400,000,000 people. Should such an economy be established, the noncontrolled economies will lose out in the competition with it in the two fields in which powers compete—foreign trade and armaments.
3. We must be in a position to protect not only ourselves but also those areas from which we import the goods which are vital for our impregnability in war and our prosperity in peace. All strategic needs of the United States, or substitutes for them, are either obtainable or can be developed in the Western Hemisphere.
4. Foreign trade must be conducted as a matter of national interest. The balance between imports and exports should not be calculated in currency but in terms of the value to national welfare of the products involved
5. Without awaiting the outcome of the war, we should immediately purchase all the exports of the republics in this hemisphere.
6. A cooperative program with all the countries in the Western Hemisphere should be developed, including: An inter-American trading corporation to exchange surpluses for imports needed by the countries of this hemisphere; distribution of goods to needy people in all American countries, using some device such as the stamp plan; development of tropical agriculture in Latin America; development of necessary mineral and other resources; training and re-training of workers for necessary industrial readjustments; improvement of transportation and communication facilities; improvement of cultural relations through movies, radio, schools, and travel.
7. Ample military and naval protection for the New World.

"Fifth Columnists" and Trojan Horses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. SLATTERY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 7 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

EDITORIAL FROM CHICAGO DAILY CALUMET

Mr. SLATTERY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Chicago Daily Calumet of June 8, 1940, under the heading "Mr. DIES in South Shore."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Chicago Daily Calumet of June 8, 1940]

MR. DIES IN SOUTH SHORE

It was reassuring the other night at South Shore Country Club to hear 2,000 citizens applaud to the echo, exposés on "fifth columnists" and Trojan horses—reassuring because it makes one feel with all the enemies who bore from within, there still remains a stalwart citizenry loyal to the God of our fathers and the Constitution of the United States.

The occasion was the appearance of Hon. MARTIN W. DIES, chairman of the House Committee Investigating Un-American Activities. The fiery Congressman from Texas was at his best, and in direct language revealed the work of those who would destroy America.

But we were disappointed. We listened to 90 minutes of polished oratory; we were chilled many times by his revelations. We waited patiently for one thing: the remedy that will cure this cancer in America; but DR. DIES did not prescribe beyond the warning that we must have national unity.

We fear education for national unity has run its course and still the Trojan horses graze in our fertile fields and "fifth columnists" pitch their tents on our lawns.

It would appear that war has its compensations, however paradoxical the statement appears. With threat of invasion, war provides a swift vehicle for national unity in America. Now is the time to stamp out the rats and the snakes that have multiplied while we slept.

How are we going to accomplish this? We said before in this column that the Bill of Rights guaranteeing free speech and free press was all right to criticize the Government and the leaders in it until our hearts are content—but the Bill of Rights never was intended as an instrument to protect traitors or those bent on overthrow of the Government. Mr. DIES, we are happy to say, also said the same thing in South Shore.

The F. B. I. and the United States Army would clean up this country in a hurry. Declaration of martial law, abrogating all civil and criminal law would brush aside any claims of invasion of constitutional rights by those caught in the dragnet. It is a statement based on radicalism, we forthright admit, when we say that perhaps a purge is in order. But, mark us, radicalism will have to be fought with radicalism. Blood will be spilled anyway before we put down our enemies of free government in America.

It is time to strike while we still hold the upper hand—or do we?

Proposed Sale of 50 Destroyers to England

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 7 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

ARTICLE BY GEN. HUGH S. JOHNSON

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "One Man's Opinion," written by Hugh S. Johnson, and published in the Washington Daily News of Tuesday, August 6, 1940, dealing with the proposal to sell 50 destroyers to England.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Washington Daily News of August 6, 1940]

ONE MAN'S OPINION

(By Hugh S. Johnson)

NEW YORK.—General Pershing says that we ought to sell 50 obsolete destroyers to England to save our country from Germany. On the same subject George Fielding Eliot says:

"The question which we have to ask ourselves is a plain one. It ought not to be befuddled by such nonessentials as whether the transfer of destroyers to Great Britain would or would not be an act of war. It would be, of course, but that is only an academic question. * * * The legal definitions of international conduct * * * are now obsolete."

It seems that everything is now obsolete as far as it suits the purpose of those who are hell-bent on getting this country into a war for which it is completely unprepared.

The destroyers are obsolete. Our own engagements in treaties and conventions and the things we have always stood and sometimes fought for are, in international law, obsolete. As to destroyers being obsolete, if they are, how does it happen, as men of this opinion intimate or argue, that the Battle of Britain,

the fate of the world's freedom and the safety of our own country depend upon sending them to Britain? As an American officer said when it was being argued that we ought also to send over a million obsolete Springfield rifles, "no rifle is obsolete that will kill a man with an aimed shot at 1,500 yards—especially when you have nothing with which to replace it."

A ship doesn't necessarily become obsolete or surplus simply because it is 16 years old. We are furiously overhauling these World War destroyers and using them every day. They can't be surplus because we have nowhere near enough destroyers for our present fleet, let alone our proposed new one.

Nobody has shown this more clearly and honestly than Major Eliot. I don't know his qualifications as a naval expert, but applying well-known published naval standards and opinions as to the proper ratio of destroyers to battleships, Major Eliot showed that practically none of these destroyers is surplus or can be taken without stripping our own Navy. They are, therefore, no more surplus than obsolete.

Just as a sidelight, most of them are armed with 4-inch guns and 3-inch guns, as well as with antiaircraft guns. Except for World War 75 mm. artillery (about 3-inch), cannon of higher caliber and antiaircraft guns are what we do not have, what we most need, and what we have the least prospect of getting quickly.

In Mr. Knudsen's last progress report as published, bottleneck items of procurement were discussed as well as those in which there were no bottlenecks. But he didn't mention cannon. He probably didn't mention them because the trouble there isn't just a bottleneck; it's a needle's eye and a flock of camels.

Major Eliot is very frank and very accurate in calling the shipment of destroyers an "act of war." It is war itself. But it is vicarious war—undercover war. The kind of war we have always condemned and pledged ourselves not to wage. The weakness of this position seems to me to be this: Our policy always has been not to be aggressors in any war. We fight only when we are attacked or threatened.

These war-minded men are put in the position of having to say, and they do say, that we are so threatened now—to the death. If that is not true then we ought not to go to war, even to this blind-pig, bootleg war. If it is true then we ought to go to war tomorrow, with everything we have. In a fight to a knockout you can't "hit soft."

The fact is that it is not true. If it were true these gentlemen and Mr. Roosevelt's administration, which has given every evidence of sympathizing with them, would have no trouble at all in getting their wish and plunging us into war to the hilt tomorrow. They should not be permitted to get us in by any blind-pig entrance.

Defend Our Shores—Keep Our Men Out of Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ERNEST LUNDEEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 7 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

ADDRESS BY JEANNETTE RANKIN

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the able radio address of the Honorable Jeannette Rankin, delivered at Helena, Mont., on July 8, 1940. Miss Rankin's record in the World War Congress will live in American history. Jeannette Rankin had the vision and the courage to vote "No" on our involvement in the quarrels of Europe and the boundary disputes of the Old World.

Jeannette Rankin was born on a ranch near Missoula, Mont., one of a family of six children, all of whom were graduated from the University of Montana. Anna Howard Shaw, great leader in women's suffrage in her autobiography, The Story of a Pioneer, said of Jeannette Rankin that "to her energy and service the winning of women's suffrage in Montana was largely due."

Active in the cause of women's suffrage, she was a member of the congressional committee that worked for the nineteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which became effective in 1920, extending suffrage to women in all States, thus being the only woman able to vote for women's suffrage.

After her graduation at the University of Montana, she went to New Zealand, where she worked as a dressmaker to study labor conditions. Later she attended the New York School of Philanthropy and devoted herself to child-placing and social work. In 1919 she accompanied the late Jane Addams, internationally known social worker, to a conference of the Women's International League founded by Miss Addams at Zurich, Switzerland, and later worked with Miss Addams for several years at Hull House in Chicago and in legislatures in the Middle West for remedial legislation for women and children, particularly for 8-hour-day laws, minimum-wage laws, and child-labor legislation.

For the past 11 years Miss Rankin has been lobbying in Congress for progressive legislation as legislative secretary of the national council. For the past 5 years she has worked for a proposed measure to unify the Military Establishment so that the United States would have a more complete and modernized defense. She has become personally acquainted with the Senators in Congress and with practically all of the Congressmen, and the Senators and Representatives know and respect her, or she could not have continued with this work for so many years.

Following I include statements from the Pathfinder, World Outlook, and Kansas City Star on the ability and accomplishments of Jeannette Rankin:

[From World Outlook of November 1938]

Miss Rankin is today one of the Nation's best known women. She is acknowledged in Washington as a leading authority on peace-war issues. Her charm of manner and friendliness of attitude, coupled with a comprehensive grasp of her subject matter, make her an exceptionally able public speaker.

[John Weaver, in Kansas City Star of June 10, 1940]

CAPABLE

Thirty years of fighting for women's suffrage, minimum wages for women, and peace have not made her a zealot. She is vivacious with a quick, nervous speech, adjusting and readjusting her horned-rimmed spectacles, she can cram her conversation with statistics without sacrificing any of her feminine charm.

[From Pathfinder of June 15, 1940]

In 1916 Jeannette Rankin, of Montana, was elected to serve in the House of Representatives, and thus became the first Congresswoman in the Nation's history. No longer in Congress, she takes a prominent part today in peace-promoting activities.

We need Miss Rankin in Washington. The Congress needs her experience and advice in domestic as well as foreign affairs. America is proud of her, and I am sure Montana will promote and advance Jeannette Rankin, which she richly deserves.

The name of Jeannette Rankin is not new to you. Miss Rankin first became known in Montana as the woman who led the campaign that gave Montana women the right to vote. Two years later she was sent to Washington by the voters of Montana, the first woman elected to Congress. While a Member of Congress Miss Rankin introduced much of the progressive social legislation that is now taken for granted in our country, including the first bill to provide Federal instruction in the hygiene of maternity and infancy.

Since then Miss Rankin has continuously engaged in legislative work with national leaders at Hull House in Chicago and in Washington for social legislation and for the prevention of war. She has counseled with all the important Members of the present Congress. She knows them personally and has their friendship and respect. She is thoroughly familiar with the complicated machinery of getting laws passed in Washington. And these things are profoundly important in times like these, when Congress must work with intelligence and dispatch in order to prepare this Nation to face the coming months.

Jeannette Rankin is a candidate for Congress on the Republican ticket. When you vote for her you will be voting for a native Montanan, born on a ranch near Missoula, a graduate of the University of Montana, and a woman who has devoted her life to a study of labor and social conditions here, in New Zealand, and in Europe.

After her legislative experience in Congress, it was her privilege to be associated with the late Jane Addams for many years, working at Hull House in Chicago, and in legislatures in

the Middle West for 8-hour-day laws, minimum-wage laws, and child-labor legislation.

For the last 11 years, in behalf of the national council, Miss Rankin has worked continuously with the Congressmen in Washington for progressive legislation. And it should be a privilege for every thinking voter in this district to go to the polls and cast a vote for a woman who has devotedly served Montana in the past and whose qualifications promise the highest service in the future.

Miss Rankin has just won the nomination for Congress on the Republican ticket. We confidently expect her to win in November.

We are now in a great world crisis and men and women must vote to express our opinions. The issues have never been more vital and more real than in this election. Prepare to the limit for defense. Keep our men out of Europe.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I know that you want me to talk about the war situation. It is too horrible and depressing, but it must be faced.

For the last 20 years there have been individual officers in the Army and Navy and Members of Congress who have tried to impress military authorities with the new situations resulting from the experiences of the last war and from modern inventions.

General Mitchell was discharged from the Army because he insisted that the possibilities of the airplane be considered.

Gen. Johnson Hagood found it necessary to resign because he contended that the overlapping and duplications and obsolescence of the Military Establishments would be a serious handicap under new fighting conditions.

Congressmen have pleaded over and over again for armored tanks to protect our men and have deplored the sending of men into battle with nothing but woolen suits as protection against the bullets from modern machine guns.

WHERE THERE IS NO VISION THE PEOPLE PERISH

Our industrialists and inventors have built the tanks and new equipment and pleaded with authorities to equip our Military Establishments, and yet we have continued under the National Defense Act of 1916, as amended in 1920, with an organization which provides for an expeditionary force of millions of men rather than modernization of equipment to protect our own country.

We have been told that surprising things have been happening in Europe. Nevertheless there is yet to be pointed out one thing that has not been anticipated and discussed many times in the committees of Congress so that our militarists were aware of changed conditions. One discouraged Congressman remarked, "Tanks and planes have no votes."

Norway had the guns to defend her coast, but they were silenced. Everyone should know that the first necessity in national defense is to have loyal citizens, and to have loyal citizens, education, health, and economic security must be available.

Facilities for communication and transportation and modern industries to develop our resources are needed to defend our Nation against all enemies, including such enemies as ignorance, disease, and poverty, which are always with us.

PREPARE TO THE LIMIT TO DEFEND OUR SHORES

We also need a highly modernized, mechanized military defense provided in peacetime, and so perfected that every man, woman, and child can go to sleep, knowing that no enemy can reach us. When an enemy or aggressor nation, which is in fact an enemy is aware that our shores are impregnable, that troops cannot be landed on our shore, or the shores of our neighbors, they will not waste time crossing the ocean.

Being familiar with this condition, and knowing that the people of this country were opposed to sending men to Europe, but willing to spend any amount of money to protect our rights and our shores from invasion, I pled with the Committee on Investigations of Munitions to state our military policy to be a determination to prepare to the limit to defend our rights and shores, and let the world know that we are unwilling to send our men to Europe to fight in foreign wars.

For 5 long years I have urged the people in the United States and the leaders on the military and naval committees to decide on a policy which conforms with the wishes of the American people, and to build the military equipment to make our entire coast as impregnable as Corregidor.

The problems of the world can be seen in the United States on a miniature scale—miniature only in comparison—but very real and overwhelming in fact. The problems of the nations must be approached by an understanding of Montana and her needs.

The economic conditions in Montana require the concentrated attention of all the people, men and women—especially women; for it has been their traditional responsibility from time immemorial, to care for the children, to nurse the sick, to feed the hungry, and to protect the old.

THE MOST TRAGIC PROBLEM IS UNEMPLOYMENT

The most tragic problem is unemployment. There are millions of youths between the ages of 18 and 24 who are being callously told, "Society doesn't need you. There is no work for you in advancing the common good. We have to feed you but there is no real place for you."

We have children, hungry for food, love, and security, in the midst of plenty.

The fact that we have such an increasing number of old people fearful of their future makes a new problem for the United States. If there were only a few with their futures unprovided for, it might be the fault of the individual, but when millions find themselves in despair, obviously the fault is beyond the control of the individual and is the concern of the Nation.

No adjustment of our economic institutions will be satisfactory unless based on the astonishing fact that an abundance can be made available. Our facilities for production have been developed but the possibilities of consumption neglected.

Neither the farms nor the factories are producing at full capacity. There is a bottle neck in the consumption of the products. We know there are people in the United States who, year in and year out, never taste wheat flour products, children everywhere who would be happier with better woolen clothes, and yet Montana farmers are not producing to their full capacity. As long as we discourage ingenuity and individualism from expression in greater production, we are retarding progress. Consumption must be geared to capacity production.

From the abundance in America there is enough to spend for what we need. Wasting is the crime, not spending. Out of the waste we could provide many necessities.

NEW FRONTIERS IN AMERICA

America is the greatest market in the world, for the standard of living will continue to increase progressively. This market should be saturated with American goods before we send our military establishments to foreign soil to hold or increase foreign markets. The new frontiers in America are greater today than ever before. The possibilities of modern science and enterprise being applied to their development make them promising and dramatic.

All the good in our social legislation must be preserved, but it must not be held sacred when it can be improved. Being cognizant of these problems I will be driven to give my best efforts to their solution.

These are hard problems. They cannot be solved by a few people. They require the help of all. Women must make their contribution, whether it be big or little. No one can offer a perfect solution, but we must express our willingness to cooperate.

Coming again to the war situation we must bear in mind that governments make war. The people can prevent war.

By voting for me, Jeannette Rankin, you can express your opposition to sending your son to foreign lands to fight in a foreign war, and by voting for me you will also express your determination to prepare to the absolute limit to defend this country.

KEEP OUR MEN OUT OF FOREIGN WARS

And to defend this country means to defend the men, women, and children of the United States. If this Nation were attacked your boy would be the first to go and you, his father, his mother, and his sister, would be ready to go with him. There is no sacrifice that Americans will not and should not make to defend America.

When you vote for Congressman, vote with a determination to protect your sons from having to go to a foreign land to face armored tanks and all of the vicious, destructive implements of war, against which they have little if any chance.

Let your vote express your love and loyalty to those who mean most to you by casting that vote to keep them at home.

The issue has never been more vital and more real. So in closing let me say that if you do not want your boys to go to Europe to fight, if you want them kept at home and supplied with the most modern military equipment that science and ingenuity can produce to defend the greatest, most liberty-loving country on the face of the earth, then I ask you to vote for me and you can depend upon it that in my efforts I will not fail you. Thank you.

Attitude of Governor Hoey of North Carolina Toward the Communist Party

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 7 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

SPEECH BY GOVERNOR HOEY

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article dealing with Governor Hoey's attitude toward the Communist Party in America.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOEY WOULD HAVE COMMUNIST PARTY OUTLAWED IN AMERICA—GOVERNOR TELLS FOOD DEALERS COLLEGES SHOULD DISCHARGE COMMUNISTS

RALEIGH, August 5.—Governor Hoey asserted tonight that Congress should outlaw the Communist Party in the United States, and declared that communism should not be tolerated in educational institutions. Speaking at a banquet of the North Carolina Food Dealers Association, the Governor said that communism, "no matter where, should be kicked out."

He made no direct reference to the University of North Carolina, which was charged by some of its trustees recently with encouraging communism and "wildcat freedom," but he spoke out plainly about subversive elements in educational institutions in general.

"If we find there's a Communist in an educational institution, he ought to be given the rap," said the Governor. "If we find that there's a Communist in an office of public trust, he ought to be kicked out."

MERCHANTS CHEER

Hoey was cheered loudly as he blasted at the Communist, and told the merchants that he believed Congress also should outlaw all German bunds in America and "every secret organization that seeks to overthrow our Government."

Governor Hoey said that North Carolinians were "going to see to it that sabotage, espionage, and 'fifth columnists' do not gain headway here." He added that he believed it would be difficult to find in all North Carolina "a single disloyal person who wished to stab his country in the back."

The Habana Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 7 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

STATEMENT BY HON. CORDELL HULL, SECRETARY OF STATE

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the statement by Secretary Hull regarding the Habana conference.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRAGIC LESSON

The strong belief of the representatives of the 21 American nations at the recent Habana meeting was that the military and other sinister activities on the part of some nations in other large areas of the world present real possibilities of danger to the American republics.

It was universally recognized that a threat to any important part of the Americas means a threat to each and all of the American nations. It was, therefore, agreed that full and adequate preparations for continental defense could not be taken too soon if the threatened danger from abroad was to be checked and terminated. It was also the unanimous view at Habana that the prompt strengthening of unity and solidarity for the purpose of continental defense and for its implementation by concrete programs supported by the 21 nations was indispensable to the safety, security, peace, and welfare of this hemisphere.

There was general agreement that if the peaceful nations of Europe had thus promptly organized themselves for self-defense on the most effective cooperative basis, the chances are that their situation and that of Europe would be vastly different today. Instead, many of those countries complacently relied upon utterances of peaceful purpose and upon their own neutrality to safeguard them against the mighty forces of invasion, conquest, and destruction. Some of them have been overrun and destroyed by the ruthless invader. Their fate should be a tragic lesson to us.

The vast forces of lawlessness, conquest, and destruction are still moving across the earth like a savage and dangerous animal at large. By their very nature, those forces will not stop unless and until they recognize that there exists unbreakable resistance.

At Habana we forged new instrumentalities of continental defense. These will be of vast importance to our Nation and to every American nation. But there are other and immense tasks still before us.

I would greatly prefer to say that we are safe in this country and in this hemisphere from outside danger. But I am firmly convinced that what is taking place today in many areas of the earth is a relentless attempt to transform the civilized world as we have known it into a world in which lawlessness, violence, and force will reign supreme, as they did a thousand years ago. The people of this country cannot recognize too soon this fact and its overwhelming significance for our national safety and for the maintenance of our national institutions.

The one and only sure way for our Nation to avoid being drawn into serious trouble or actual war by the wild and destructive forces now abroad elsewhere in the world and to command respect for its rights and interests abroad is for our people to become thoroughly conscious of the possibilities of danger, to make up their minds that we must continue to arm, and to arm to such an extent that the forces of conquest and ruin will not dare make an attack on us or on any part of this hemisphere. To this end, each citizen must be ready and willing for real sacrifice of time and of substance and for hard personal service. In the face of terrific problems and conditions, and until the present serious threats and dangers have disappeared, we cannot pursue complacently the course of our customary normal life.

I feel constrained thus to offer my views in the light of what is already a dangerously widespread movement for world conquest and for the destruction of most of the worth-while things which civilization has given the human race.

Why France Fell

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 7 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE CARROLL COUNTY INDEPENDENT, CENTER OSSIPEE, N. H.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a most interesting editorial on a most important subject, entitled "Why France Fell," published in the Carroll County Independent, of Center Ossipee, N. H., July 12, 1940.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Carroll County Independent, Center Ossipee, N. H., of July 12, 1940]

WHY FRANCE FELL

As feature articles by competent observers continue to be published regarding the defeat of the French Nation, one is able to slowly secure a fairly complete picture of what happened. The French high command was hide-bound by tradition and failed to develop a modern defense for the ultramodern German offense. They most certainly knew the techniques being used by the Germans but simply sat back in smug complacency and did nothing. In the French Cabinet and among civilian administrative officials, love of self, love of pocketbook, cynicism, and easy living made complete surrender the logical way out. Among the great French middle class, corrupt newspapers, corrupt politics, and soft living had sapped the vitality of the nation. Socialist governments and Socialist propaganda had crippled the airplane industry so that French production of military machines was more or less of a joke.

Gone was the spirit of Verdun of the first World War. The grim cry of "On ne passe pas"—"They shall not pass"—was neither heard nor much of any attempt made to live up to it. The Germans went through Verdun like a hot knife through butter.

It is unfair and impossible to indict a whole nation on the strength of a few newspaper articles, no matter how accurate those articles may be, but at the same time it is possible to say with considerable assurance that corrupt politics, corrupt newspapers, too much soft living, and too much love of self and too little love of country brought about the downfall of France.

If the United States ever goes the way France has just gone, it will go down to defeat not because of the power of the invader, but because cynicism and selfishness have sapped the vitality of the Nation and rotted the strong moral fiber that was once ours.

Shortly after the close of the first World War, an attitude of cynicism came over the country. It became unfashionable to credit anyone with any honest motive. The scandals of prohibition enforcement, the corruption of the bench and bar and law enforcement bodies in our great cities, the scandals that were connected with the Long administration in Louisiana, the lack of impartial application of Federal aid and assistance, all have fostered and enforced this attitude.

Forgotten are the great mass of unselfish, hard-working teachers, doctors, nurses, ministers, police officers, public servants, and officials that are America as it is and not as the cynics think that it is. Forgotten is the fact that the great majority of employers want to give a fair day's wage and that the great majority of employees want to give a fair day's work in return for that wage—a small minority of professional reformers, union officials, and heartless employers to the contrary.

In every national crisis we have had selfish, corrupt men in public and private life who have profited for themselves while other men were dying for their country. In every national crisis we have had politicians who played politics while the very safety of the Government was threatened. In every national crisis we have had ultraconservative bungling men in high command in the Army who thought more of their salary and professional standing than of the men who were dying in the mud because of their mistakes.

This was true in the Revolution. It was true in the War of 1812 and in the Mexican War. It was true in the Civil War and in the Spanish War. It was all too true in the first World War.

But in spite of all this, the great body of the American people have risen above the example set by a minority of their so-called leaders. Confident in the destiny of their Nation, they have poured out their blood and their money to keep the Nation whole and free and safe.

It is high time that we stopped thinking about the selfish, soulless men who have always sold out their fellow men in time of danger. It is time that we stopped thinking of them as being typical of our leadership and as typical of our Nation.

It is time that we remembered the men who gave their all in money and property in Revolutionary times that the armies might be fed. It is time for us to remember the sailors of 1812 who blew the enemy vessels out of the water. It is time to remember the history of one of the New Hampshire regiments in the Civil War, whose veterans said quietly but proudly after Lee surrendered, "We marched farther, and were in more engagements and lost more men in proportion to our numbers, than any other regiment in the whole Union Army," and it is well to remember the aching cold and the wracking sickness and the tearing wounds and the never-ending roads and the long dead that the statement really meant. It is time that we remembered the men who walked into machine-gun fire in the last war and who came home and did not tell about it, because it was too terrible to talk about.

It is high time that we stopped thinking about the selfish minority. It is time that we began to think about the men who have made this country great and free simply because they were willing to die for it, and while dying, take two or three of the enemy with them.

If we do not do this, we will be untrue to ourselves and we will have broken faith with our dead.

Defense Plans of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 7 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

ARTICLE BY WILLIAM PHILIP SIMMS

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article by William Philip Simms, entitled "Defense Plans of United States Questioned by Latins," published in the Washington Daily News of Tuesday, August 6, 1940.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Washington Daily News of August 6, 1940]

DEFENSE PLANS OF UNITED STATES QUESTIONED BY LATINS

(By William Philip Simms)

Can Uncle Sam defend himself here at home and at the same time protect Alaska, Canada, Greenland, Bermuda, the West Indies, Mexico, Central and South America, likewise the Philippines and the open-door policy in the Far East?

Many South Americans are asking this question. Also many businessmen and others down there who were born in the States. They are beginning to wonder if perhaps Uncle Sam isn't including a lot of territory in his defense plans. And some of them, at least, are convinced that it might be wise to reconsider the problem raised by the Monroe Doctrine.

These point out that the whole international set-up is a vastly different thing from what it was in 1823 when Canning and Monroe brought forth the Monroe Doctrine. Then a powerful and going Britain was interested in maintaining the status quo of the western world. Then, too, the Latin American states were young and helpless

HAVE GROWN UP

Today several of these states have grown up. They resent any suggestion of protection at the hands of the United States.

I pointed out to an Argentine friend that this protection is tendered without any quid pro quo.

"Heck," he said, or words to that effect, "we never asked you for protection, free or otherwise. Moreover, it is seriously doubted that the United States ever could have protected us from any real threat of aggression or that it could do so now."

Observing my look of injured pride, he laughed and added:

"Don't take offense. I am just trying to be objective. Most North Americans usually take it for granted that South Americans ought to be, and hence are, unmitigatedly grateful for the Monroe Doctrine. And I'm afraid they aren't."

ARMY OFFICER SPEAKS

I put this up to a former American Army officer, now in South America, one who knows our southern neighbors as well as he does his own countrymen. Said he:

"I suspect your Argentine friend was correct on all counts. If England is invaded and her fleet taken over, even in part, by the Nazis, we will not be in a position to defend our own coasts, the Caribbean, and Panama areas, and successfully police the Straits of Magellan, the Bering Sea, and the western Pacific in the bargain.

"I think the time has come for us to reexamine the Monroe Doctrine in the light of our new problems of national defense. Mind you, that is what the Monroe Doctrine has been all along—a matter of what was best for us from the point of view of national defense. So, once it becomes a liability instead of an asset, the doctrine in no wise binds us, morally or otherwise, to defend Cape Horn or Patagonia against this or that aggressor.

SHOULD DRAW LINE

"We should draw a line somewhere across South America—a line which would take in whatever may be necessary to the defense of the Caribbean, Panama, and their approaches—and let the world know that we would defend that area with everything we have against any and all comers and at whatever cost.

"The way things are now, we are called on to defend too much territory. We should bunch our shots. From Alaska to Chile by way of Hawaii is 10,000 miles. From Greenland to Tierra del Fuego is another 8,000 miles. From Panama to Manila it is 9,500 miles. Yet from French and British West Africa—which the Nazis will surely take over if they lick England—it is barely 1,600 miles to one of the richest and most exposed parts of Brazil. As for the Philippines, they are in Japan's back yard."

Not everybody is in agreement with the American Army officer. An Englishman in business in Buenos Aires declared:

"The suggested deadline across South America would be just another something for the United States to defend. To limit the Monroe Doctrine in that manner would amount to an open invitation to Germany, Japan, and other aggressor powers to come and take whatever was south of the line. And once established, they would advance northward at the first opportunity toward Panama and the United States.

MUST NOT GET FOOTHOLD

"Once you let the aggressor powers gain a foothold in this hemisphere, your only salvation would be to outarm them, year after year. You would transplant in the Americas precisely the same situation as existed in Europe prior to September of last year—an armed truce which the aggressor powers would break the moment they believed themselves sufficiently strong.

"The only way to avoid such a situation is never to allow the aggressor powers to land anywhere in the New World."

Throughout the countries below the Caribbean I listened to this significant debate. Before long we are more than likely to be hearing it in the United States. For we've got to make up our minds. It is vitally important to our future as a free country.

Judaism and Americanism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 7 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

ARTICLE BY HON. HENRY A. WALLACE

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article by Hon. Henry A.

Wallace entitled "Judaism and Americanism," which appeared in the Menorah Journal for July–September 1940.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Menorah Journal of July–September 1940]

JUDAISM AND AMERICANISM

(By Henry A. Wallace)

The Christians of this land share with the Jews the tradition of the prophets. This tradition, it seems to me, is fundamental to American democracy, both political and economic. The prophets were either talking on behalf of people suffering injustice or they were warning of trouble ahead. They felt so passionately the trend of events that they discerned the outline of events that would be, should be, or could be brought to pass. Therefore they said, "Thus saith the Lord."

As distinguished from the kings and the priests, most of the prophets were progressive in religious, political, and economic matters. They looked to the future rather than the past. One of the magnificent things about the Bible is that it preserves so faithfully the insurgent spirit of the prophets. It is the spirit of a new world—a growing world. All religions in their steadfast worship of the past tend to be overconservative. The Jewish and Christian religions, therefore, in carefully preserving the message of the prophets, have preserved the growth spirit which is vital to the health of all religion.

The job of the prophets was to pour new wine into the priests' old bottles; and if the old bottles broke, to make new bottles. The clash of priest and prophet is most vividly emphasized in the seventh chapter of Amos, which, translated into sidewalk English, says: "Amaziah the priest got sore at Amos and told him to shut up and go home. Amaziah didn't want any Bolsheviks like Amos around his set-up. Swiftly Amos replied—I hesitate to put his reply into modern English; it is fairly plain as it stands:

"Therefore thus saith the Lord: Thy wife shall be a harlot in the city, and thy sons and thy daughters shall fall by the sword and thy land shall be divided by line; and thou shalt die in a polluted land; and Israel shall surely go into captivity forth of his land."

Amos preached economic justice, and the people in the court and temple could not take it.

They did not like it when he said:

"Hear this, O ye that swallow up the needy, even to make the poor of the land to fail, saying: When will the new moon be gone that we may sell corn, and the Sabbath, that we may set forth wheat, making the ephah small, and the shekel great, and falsifying the balances by deceit? That we may buy the poor for silver, and the needy for a pair of shoes; yea and sell the refuse of the wheat. * * * Shall not the land tremble for this?"

No wonder the priest Amaziah, the guardian of the status quo, complained to King Jeroboam concerning Amos, saying, "The land is not able to bear all his words."

Amaziah thought Amos was a kept prophet and suggested that he go home to Judah to eat his bread. This hint that he was on the pay roll of the priestly hierarchy of Judah angered Amos and he blasted forth a terrific malediction beginning, "I was no prophet, neither was I a prophet's son; but I was a herdman * * * and the Lord took me as I followed the flocks and the Lord said unto me, Go, prophesy unto my people Israel."

I speak of the battle of Amos because it typifies the struggle which went on for centuries between the Jewish shepherd people who lived in the hills and the Canaanites who lived in the cities. As the Jews over the centuries gradually migrated to the cities, they took on city habits. But at first they were profoundly shocked at the commercial morality of the cities. Neither the customs of the bank nor the market place pleased them. They though such customs were the devices of Baal, the god of the Amorites.

Probably the first instance in all recorded history of debt-ridden farmers rising in revolt is given in the twenty-second chapter of First Samuel. David, the young shepherd fleeing from Saul, was hiding in the cave of Adullam when, according to the Bible, "Everyone that was in distress, and everyone that was in debt, and everyone that was discontented, gathered themselves under him; and he became a captain over them; and there were with him about 400 men." David, the mighty King of Judah, was not merely the slayer of Goliath but, perhaps even more important, the leader of a social revolution.

Living for several generations under kings, the Jews became familiar with the problems of city civilization and especially with taxes and interest. The heavy taxes necessitated by King Solomon's extensive public-works program resulted in his son Rehoboam losing half his kingdom because he did not know how to handle the tax-burdened people diplomatically. When the time of the captivity approached, the prophet Ezekiel in the name of the Lord took a much harsher attitude toward usury than those who had gone before him, proclaiming that those who took usury should surely die. Ezekiel saw such an unbalanced economic, social, political, and international situation that he could predict nothing but destruction. His prophecy was fulfilled.

From the Jews in captivity in Persia came Nehemiah, a wealthy man, who was given the job of rebuilding Jerusalem and settling the country round about. Nehemiah tells the story of the mortgaged Jews in the recently resettled city of Jerusalem crying out against their brethren, the more well-to-do Jews.

"And there was a great cry of the people and of their wives against their brethren the Jews. * * * We have mortgaged our lands, vineyards, and houses that we might buy corn because of the dearth. There were also that said: We have borrowed money for the king's tribute and that upon our lands and vineyards, yet now our flesh is as the flesh of our brethren, our children as their children; and lo, we bring into bondage our sons and daughters to be servants and some of our daughters are brought under bondage already: neither is it in our power to redeem them; for other men have our lands and vineyards. * * * I said: It is not good that ye do; ought ye not to walk in the fear of our God because of the reproach of the heathen our enemies? I likewise, and my brethren and my servants, might exact of them money and corn: I pray you, let us leave off this usury. Restore, I pray you, to them, even this day, their land, their vineyards, their olive yards, and their houses, also the hundredth part of the money, and of the corn, the wine, and the oil, that ye exact of them. Then said they: We will restore them and will require nothing of them; so will we do as thou sayest. Then I called the priests, and took an oath of them that they should do according to this promise."

Throughout the Old Testament it is apparent that the justice of Jehovah, as distinguished from the justice of the Baals of the Canaanites, was justice of a kind easily understood by poor and debt-ridden farmers. No doubt in ancient Palestine—even as in the Philippines, in China, and in India today—the money lender exacted interest rates running up to 20, 30, and even 40 percent annually. Bad weather might cost a man his children or even his own liberty. The slightest misfortune caused debt to pyramid at an impossibly rapid rate. Productive capacity could not possibly keep pace with the growth of the usury load. Therefore, there was arranged the Sabbatical year and the year of jubilee. The proposed cure was not scientific, but the analysis of the trouble was profound.

There is an everlasting economic battle between those who manipulate money to put it out for hire and those who produce goods and have to borrow.

Probably the most bitter of all fates among the ancient Jews was to be sold for debt into slavery. Therefore, we find it provided in the twenty-fifth chapter of Leviticus that a relative might redeem such a man and that the manner of redemption was as follows: "And he shall reckon with him that bought him from the year that he was sold to him unto the year of jubilee. And the price of his sale shall be according to the number of years, according to the time of a hired servant shall it be with him * * *. And if there remain but few years until the year of jubilee, then he shall count with him and according unto his years shall he give him again the price of his redemption * * *. And if he be not redeemed in these years, then shall he go out in the year of jubilee, both he and his children with him."

The Jews were in captivity in Egypt and were rescued. The Jews were in captivity in Babylon and were rescued. Again and again Jews have been redeemed from slavery by relatives. Throughout the history of the Jews is the story of redemption.

Originally the idea of the justice of Jehovah Lord God was a very narrow one. The ancient Hebrews undoubtedly looked on Jehovah as their own particular tribal God. Many of them undoubtedly believed that there were other tribal gods which were almost as strong as their God. They hoped and believed their God was superior, although at times their faith wavered. Struggling with more and more complicated problems of life, the Jews finally came to look on Jehovah as God of all the world, the Redeemer of all mankind.

II

These are times of great trouble for Jew and Christian alike. Both Christians and Jews in times of such trouble gird up their spiritual loins, and in so doing many of them find their greatest strength in the Bible. When it seems as though all the forces of hell have been unchained we reach out toward the God of our fathers and find in the Old Testament the following:

"And thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy might. And these words which I have commanded thee this day shall be in thine heart; and thou shalt teach them diligently unto thy children, and thou shalt talk of them when thou sittest in thine house, and when thou walkest by the way, and when thou liest down, and when thou risest up. And thou shalt bind them for a sign upon thine hand, and they shall be as frontlets between thine eyes. And thou shalt write them upon the posts of thine house, and on thy gates."

On the foundation of this commandment, emphasized again and again, was placed the equally emphasized commandment, "Thou shalt love they neighbor as thyself," which Jesus preached afresh.

The God of the Jews and of the Christians is a just God. A God of battles, yes. But not a God of violence, fraud, deceit, and hideous injustice. Such gods stalking out of the forests of an ancient paganism have been turned loose in these later days. They will perish as such gods have always perished. The struggle will be titanic, and before we triumph it will be necessary to summon every possible source of spiritual strength to give the necessary driving power to our material strength.

There is very little in common between the Prussian militarist spirit and the traditions of the Jews and Christians. Very few of us, I am sure, have anything against the Germans in the United States. The ancestors of most of them came to the United States to flee the imperial Prussian militarist spirit. This spirit, which is

a veritable antichrist, exalts that which America abhors. Whether we be Jews or Christians, we in the United States hate the thought of the state marching in as an overmastering overlord. Most devotedly do we believe in the sacredness of the individual. We believe the state lives for the individual and not the individual for the state. Therefore, we believe in freedom of religion and freedom of expression. We believe the State has no powers except those which have been granted by the people. The imperialist Prussians, on the other hand, believe that individuals have no power except insofar as it has been granted by the state.

The spirit of democracy is in complete accord with the spirit of the Jewish and Christian faiths. Democracy, as I see it, has in it the following seven elements:

1. Action based on the will of the majority after the people have had opportunity to inform themselves as to the real facts.
2. Freedom of speech, press, art, science, and religion.
3. Stability, order, and the avoidance of violence, bloodshed, and anarchy.
4. Promotion of a stable but ascending general welfare by increasing the productivity of the people and distributing the income as evenly as possible without destroying incentives.
5. Belief in the sacredness of the individual and in the unlimited possibilities of both man and nature, which can be made manifest if those who are gifted in science, art, and religion approach the unknown reverentially and not under the compulsion of producing immediate results for the glorification of one man, one group, one race, or one nation.
6. Joyous faith in a progressive future based on the intelligent and constructive efforts of all the people to serve the general welfare.
7. Tolerance and humor in recognizing the right of all men to be different.

When democracy is threatened from time to time by a huge psychic entity like that of the imperial Prussian militarist spirit, it may be necessary to employ many of the weapons which we so heartily detest. Many individual rights may have to be sacrificed for a time to the democratic state in order to avoid the worse fate of being sacrificed to the imperialist state. Just because we love peace and democracy we must be realistic—realistic not merely in the sense of being hard-boiled believers in military preparedness, but realistic in the sense of understanding the ultimate forces which make for peace, justice, and democracy.

In the long run the real peril to democracy is within our own Nation, within our own group, within our own hearts. It is quite possible that 10 or 20 years hence the totalitarian states as we know them today will be completely demolished. It is equally possible that genuine democracy will be even more threatened then than it is today. Though we in the United States have attained a fair measure of political democracy, we have done very little in perfecting a genuine economic democracy. In this effort the Scandinavian countries, by their skillful blending of cooperatives, government ownership, corporate business, government spending, and government budgeting, had outstripped us. Partly this was because they were small. Partly it was because of the uniformly high standard of education and the similarity of training of all the people.

An economic democracy must develop a powerful concept of the general welfare. Even as the ancient Hebrews day after day, morning, noon, and night, taught their children to love God with heart and soul and might, so must we continually teach our children not only to love God in that manner but to realize that the manifestation of our love for God here on earth is the service of the general welfare. This is quite a different thing from the Prussian concept of the service of the State, because it is something imposed from the heart within rather than by command from above. Democracy is not anarchy. Democracy involves education and the devotion to similar ideals. Genuine economic democracy cannot be a hollow thing, a mere lip service. It must work continually at the problem of the increased production of wealth and a more equitable distribution of that increased production.

III

In recent years many efforts have been made to give bodily form to the spiritual message of the prophets. The cooperative movement which flowered so marvelously in Scandinavia, Switzerland, and Holland is such an effort. So also is the Zionist resettlement in Palestine. And so, I believe, are many of our own New Deal efforts, such as farm security, self-subsistence homesteads, and so on. Everywhere people are longing to lead the simple, cooperative life of neighborly fair dealing. In China, in Latin America, in fact, in nearly all areas not afflicted by totalitarian blight, experiments are being tried which would gladden the hearts of the prophets of old.

The democracy of the future will have its roots not only in the best of the sacred literature of the past but also in science. The science of genetics, for example, will, I am sure, overthrow Germanic racism and serve as one base for an enduring democracy. The geneticist of the future will, in my opinion, join the Lord in appreciating the possibilities of all the peoples of the earth. On the average, the children of the poor have just about the same potentialities as the children of the rich. In the same degree of latitude the people of one race have just about the same inborn ability as the people of another race. The differences in tradition, in religion, in education, and in food are tremendous. The group differences in inborn characteristics are far less.

It is true that all men are not born equal, but if a thousand children of one economic group are given the same training and care as a thousand children of another economic group the results will not be greatly different. There will be feeble-minded in both groups and geniuses in both groups. And so I say that the ancient Jewish institution of the jubilee, which every 50 years freed the oppressed and enslaved, was soundly conceived from both the genetic and democratic point of view.

In examining history we find that it is dangerous not to bring about economic democracy, and it is almost as dangerous to do so. Since revolutionaries almost always claim too much, the results are disappointing. Sometimes they are disastrous. For example, according to Josephus, the Jewish nation in the year 70 C. E. came to an end because the poorer Jews felt they could right their economic wrongs by storming the archives and burning their mortgages. Anarchy resulted, and the Romans dispersed the Jewish nation. We have seen that discontented debtors had much to do with creating the kingdom of David, as well as with ending the Jewish nation. In one case a constructive result was obtained, but in the other anarchy and destruction.

Neither in the Palestine of the judges, nor of the kings, nor of the exile, nor of the post exile were conditions like those of today. The Jews of Jesus' time had no responsibility for governing their own nation. It is not surprising, therefore, that we should find so little in the Gospels on the subject of permeating the economic and political order with a sense of responsibility on behalf of the whole people. Ground under the heel of an alien race, the Jews of the time of Caesar Augustus could care for the ill-clad, ill-housed, and ill-nourished only on a very simple local basis. It would have been completely impractical to have thought about the problem except on a local basis. In brief, the problem of the general welfare was a local problem in Jesus' day. Today it is much more than a local problem. The national and world problem cannot possibly be overlooked. Most of the readily quotable verses of the New Testament, if we follow sound exegesis, apply most forcibly to local problems. Those religious people who steep themselves completely in New Testament texts without regard to their inner meaning would be much happier, therefore, if all national and international problems could be returned to their local form.

In the time of the prophets the Jews had a much greater responsibility in international affairs than in the time of Jesus. We therefore find in the prophets much more attention given to international problems. Jeremiah, as he looked into the heart of nations, was moved to prophesy:

"Behold evil shall go forth from nation to nation and a great whirlwind shall be raised up from the coasts of the earth. And the slain of the Lord shall be at that day from one end of the earth even unto the other end of the earth; they shall not be lamented, neither gathered nor buried; they shall be dung upon the ground."

Fundamentally, and in the long run, our fight is not against nazism or communism or any of the other dread social psychoses. These are merely manifestations of something evil which to an extent we have also among ourselves in the United States. As St. Paul puts it, "For we wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world, against spiritual wickedness in high places."

It has always seemed to me that the final triumph of peace, democracy, and justice was never more beautifully portrayed than by the prophet Micah in the following words:

"But in the last days it shall come to pass that the mountain of the house of the Lord shall be established in the top of the mountains, and it shall be exalted above the hills; and the people shall flow unto it. And many nations shall come and say: Come, and let us go up to the mountain of the Lord, and to the house of the God of Jacob; and He will teach us His ways, and we will walk in His paths; for the law shall go forth of Zion, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem. And he shall judge among many people and rebuke strong nations afar off; and they shall beat their swords into plowshares and their spears into pruning hooks; nation shall not lift up a sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more. But they shall sit every man under his vine and under his fig tree; and none shall make them afraid, for the mouth of the Lord of Hosts hath spoken it. For all people will walk everyone in the name of his god and we will walk in the name of the Lord our God for ever and ever. In that day, saith the Lord, will I assemble her that halteth, and I will gather her that is driven out and her that I have afflicted."

Both the Old and the New Testaments are completely interwoven with our democracy. The passage from Micah which I have just quoted envisions a land populated by small men operating their own farms, men free to worship God in their own way. Compassion is had upon the poor and the afflicted. Perhaps Micah was overcome by his vision. Perhaps he did not see accurately. Possibly he was impractical. And yet that vision will be an inspiration to a hundred generations yet unborn. If the fire of that vision is kept alight, the day will come when the economists and state builders will give it bodily form. Then we shall have a practical economic democracy fitted to serve the Lord, because every individual citizen will have written in his heart the joy and understanding of the general welfare.

The Jewish tradition, the Christian tradition, the democratic tradition, and the American tradition are all one. It is right, of course, that both Jews and Christians should take pride in their respective heritages. But they should not allow this pride to shut themselves off one from another. The general welfare of American democracy calls us to big things. On us may depend the fulfillment of many a Biblical prophecy in the trying years ahead.

To preserve our democracy we must realize that the dictators have definite designs on this hemisphere. Pan-America must stand on guard against both the desperate and the ruthless. We must stand for peace in this hemisphere, but to make sure of that peace we must be fully prepared. The traditions of the past can be made into the fruitful realities of the future in terms of a broad and alert Americanism. Our motto must be: "Peace Through Preparedness."

Report of the Committee on Interstate Trade Barriers and Unemployment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE T. ELLIS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 7, 1940

COMPILED BY HON. JOSHUA L. JOHNS, OF WISCONSIN, HON. SAM C. MASSINGALE, OF OKLAHOMA, AND HON. CLYDE T. ELLIS, OF ARKANSAS

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, I take great pleasure in inserting in the record the report and recommendations of the Committee on Interstate Trade Barriers and Unemployment, which has the unanimous approval of the entire unemployment committee and which was compiled by a subcommittee composed of Hon. Joshua L. Johns, Member of Congress from Wisconsin, Hon. Sam C. Massingale, Member of Congress from Oklahoma, and myself:

Once the largest free-trade area in the world—thanks to the experience of the Colonies during the federation—the United States has today disintegrated into a "Balkanized" mesh of trade barriers.

"Perhaps the greatest menace to the internal economy of the United States today," says State Government in its editorial for March 1939, "is the growth of * * * trade barriers among the States. * * * Without exception they are the symptoms of an economic disease, which if not checked will result in the paralysis of internal trade in the United States. Already, it is evident that this new complication is sapping the strength of our domestic economy at a time when all its energies are necessary if its convalescence is to result in complete recovery."

For the most part our man-made interstate barriers take the following form:

1. Those affirmatively created by State laws and regulations.
2. Those affirmatively created by Federal laws and regulations.
3. Those created by monopolistic control in commerce and industry.

Their results are reflected immediately in lower wages for labor, lower prices for agricultural commodities and raw materials, reduced profits; decreased purchasing power and in decreased employment. And for it all, says State Government (Ib), "the general consuming public pays the bill."

The period between 1782 and 1787 is classed by most historians as the most critical period in American history, and many of the most serious problems grew out of trade barriers at that time between the Colonies. This caused much hard feeling between the Colonies, and as a result when the Constitution was written clause 2 of section 10 of article I was placed in the Constitution so as to prevent a reoccurrence of trouble experienced by the Colonies. The provision is as follows:

"No State without the consent of Congress, may lay any imposts or duties on imports or exports, except what may be absolutely necessary for executing its inspection laws, and the net produce of all duties and imposts, laid by any State on imports or exports, shall be for the use of the Treasury of the United States; and all such laws shall be subject to the revision and control of the Congress."

This clause of the Constitution was passed upon in an early case in 1827, *Brown* v. *Maryland* (12 Wheat. U. S. 419, 436, 442, 444). In that case a State license fee was imposed upon an importer selling imported goods in the original bales or packages. The Court held it repugnant to the import and commerce clauses of the Constitution of the United States.

Chief Justice Marshall in delivering the opinion of the Court at page 444, said:

"All must perceive that a tax on the sale of an article, imported only for sale is a tax on the article itself; * * * the tax on the occupation of an importer is * * * tax on importation. It must add to the price of the article, and be paid by the consumer, or by the importer himself, in like manner as a direct duty on the article itself would be made. This the State has not a right to do, because it is prohibited by the Constitution."

In the case of *Anglo-Chilean Corp.* v. *Alabama*, decided in October 1932, and cited in United States Reports, volume 288, at page 226, the Court, citing the case of *Millents* v. *Buren* (282 U. S. 216 at p. 228), said: "When the Constitution prohibits States from laying duties on imports, the prohibition not only extends to a tax upon the act of importing, but also to one upon the occupation of the importer or upon the articles imported. A tax on the sale of an article, imported only for sale, is a tax on the article itself," citing *Brown* v. *Maryland* (12 Wheat. 419, 444), *Almy* v. *California* (24 How. 169), *Fairbank* v. *United States* (181 U. S. 283), *Lilliger* v. *Kentucky* (213 U. S. 200), *United States* v. *Braslef* (237 U. S. 1), *Thomas & Nersey Ins. Co.* v. *United States* (237 U. S. 19), *Crew Levick Co.* v. *Pennsylvania* (245 U. S. 292, 295), *Sonneborn Bros.* v. *Curetare* (262 U. S. 506, 509).

The constitutional protection extends to corporations as well as to individuals. *Crutcher* v. *Kentucky* (141 U. S. 47, 57), *International Text Book Co.* v. *Pigg* (217 U. S. 91, 108). See also *Leaux Reundy Co.* v. *Cope* (235 U. S. 197), *Looney* v. *Crane Co.* (245 U. S. 178, 188), *Alpha Cement Co.* v. *Massachusetts* (268 U. S. 203), *Sprout* v. *South Bend* (277 U. S. 163, 170–171), *East Ohio Gusto* v. *Tax Commission* (283 U. S. 465, 470).

(See also *Hale, Chairman, et al.* v. *Brinko Trading Co., Inc., et al.*, decided at October 1939 term of Supreme Court of the United States and reported in volume 306 U. S. 2, 188 to 397. Also cited in official reports of the Supreme Court, August 3, 1939.)

Just one example of trade barriers of the Colonies in 1787 will illustrate in a very simple manner what the States are doing today and what the framers of the Constitution thought they were going to prevent when the Constitution was written.

The city of New York, with a population of 30,000 people, had been supplied with firewood from Connecticut, and butter, cheese, and chickens from New Jersey. New York City, then as now, wanted all this money at home but the question was how to get it. A trade barrier was finally decided upon and entrance fees were charged for every sloop that came down through Hell Gate from Connecticut, and for every boat rowed from across Paulus Hook to Cortlandt Street.

Of course, Connecticut and New Jersey Yankee farmers did not take kindly to this. The New Jersey Legislature made up its mind, just as legislatures do these days, to retaliate. But where and how? They finally discovered that New York had bought a small patch of ground on Sandy Hook for a lighthouse. The legislature promptly laid a tax on it of $1,800 a year. Connecticut agreed to not do any business with New York, and businessmen agreed unanimously upon a penalty of $250 for the first offense, and this ban was to continue for a period of 12 months. Historians say if it had not been for the good work done by the Federal Convention, it would not have been 5 years until there would have been civil war among the Colonies themselves. To these commercial disputes were added territory disputes. Today we are only trying to repeat history.

THE CONSTITUTIONAL PROHIBITION

Article 1, section 8, of the Constitution provides that: "The Congress shall have power: To regulate commerce with foreign nations and among the several States * * *." This power is specifically limited by the tenth amendment which provides that: "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

Chief Justice Marshall said of this provision in 1824, in his celebrated opinion in *Gibbons* v. *Ogden*, "If there was any one object riding over every other in the adoption of the Constitution, it was to keep commercial intercourse among the States free from all individuous and partial restraints." And why not? Had not the "several States" tried individual control of trade and commerce under the federation—and with disastrous results?

However, as we shall point out later, the evasions of the constitutional provisions by the States, by the Federal Government itself, and by American business and industry without interference from either the State or National Government—and all with the approval of the Supreme Court of the United States—have become so numerous, so effective, and so far-reaching that free trade, so vital to the American standard of life, bids fair to perish.

SPECIFIC BARRIERS, THEIR CAUSES AND EFFECTS

Of what are these monstrous and unscalable walls around States and sections of our country composed?

I

Here are some of these created by State laws and regulations:

1. The use tax now levied by many States on goods imported—and with the approval of the Supreme Court. "The tax," said Justice Cardozo, "is not upon the operations of interstate commerce but upon the privilege of use after commerce is at an end." Typical of these is the statute of the State of Washington levying a tax on the "machinery, materials, and supplies, such as locomotives, cars, conveyors, pumps, and trestle steel * * * bought at retail in other States." The motives behind the use tax are chiefly (1) to raise revenue in these depression years, (2) to encourage home industries, and (3) to retaliate for some barrier raised by the importing State. The result is, inevitably, higher living costs, stifled production, and increased unemployment.

Take Wisconsin's experience with the oleomargarine tax. In 1935 Wisconsin was at peace with the South, and for that matter with the rest of the world. It is a great dairy State, and considerable oleomargarine was being shipped into the State, which for some purposes took the place of butter produced in the State. As a result a bill was introduced to tax oleomargarine sold in the State 6 cents per pound. The South did not object seriously to this and business

proceeded as usual and the tax was paid. There is no question but what the members of the legislature meant well, but the results do not seem to justify the harsh action taken.

It was, however, a good political issue and in 1937 the tax was raised to 15 cents per pound. Well, it is needless to state what happened, but for the purpose of the record here, briefly this is what did happen: But few retailers paid the tax. It would be just like putting a tax on gasoline of 10 or 15 cents a gallon. People would think of some scheme to get rid of paying the tax, and you would not collect more in taxes than if it was 5 cents a gallon. This has been the history of the gasoline tax. This was the history of the oleomargarine tax in Wisconsin. But very few paid it. As a result in a very short time small merchants all over the State were owing the State thousands of dollars in taxes. Was it legal to collect it? That question has never been determined by the highest court of the land. Was it wise to sue to get it? No. First, it would cost as much to collect in small amounts as the amount you would get in the end. Secondly, politically to sue your constituents would not make them feel very kindly toward you. So the only thing left to do was to coax these small amounts out of the local merchants.

The actual loss to the South was not great. People bought oleomargarine just the same if they wanted it and the tax was not collected. The thought of the tax was much greater for the South to stand than the actual loss of business. As a result, however, the South began dairying in their own States and quit buying cheese and butter from Wisconsin. This was not as general as people have been led to believe, but it did follow to some extent. Industrialists have reported that contracts for goods were canceled by the South and jobbers refused to buy more goods because of this tax.

So that the committee may have excerpts from some of the decisions of the court of local resort we quote here from a few outstanding cases.

In an early case decided in 1860, the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of *Almy* v. *People of California* (24 Howard, U. S. 169), decided that a stamp duty imposed upon bills of lading for gold or silver, transported from the State of California to any part or place outside the State, was a tax on exports and was unconstitutional. Chief Justice Taney delivered the opinion of the Court and cited the law laid down in the case of *Brown* v. *Maryland* (12 Wheat., U. S. 419), an early case covering a similar state of facts, to sustain the positions of the Court. In that case the State of Maryland, in order to raise revenue for State purposes, required all importers of certain foreign articles and commodities enumerated in the law, or other persons selling the same by wholesale, before they were authorized to sell, to take out a license, for which they were compelled to pay $50, and in case of refusal or neglect to do so, they forfeited the amount of the license tax, and were compelled to pay a fine of $100 upon conviction. The law in the case of *Brown* v. *Maryland*, heretofore referred to, was applied by the Court, and the statute held unconstitutional.

Coming down to a case decided 40 years later, *Fairbank* v. *United States* (181 U. S. 283), a similar situation to the Almy case, decided 40 years earlier, was presented to the Court. In this latter case a stamp tax was imposed the same as in the Almy case. The contention of the defendant was that the law was in conflict with article I, section 7, of the Constitution of the United States, providing: "No tax or duty shall be laid on articles imported from any State." Justice Brewer delivered the opinion of the Court.

The language of the Court on page 291 is impressive. The Court said:

"The power to tax is the power to destroy. And that power can be exercised not only by a tax directly on articles exported but also and equally by a stamp duty on bills of lading evidencing the export. * * * The question of power is not to be determined by the amount of the burden attempted to be cast. The constitutional language is 'No tax or duty.'"

In the case of *Alpha Cement Co.* v. *Mass.* (268 U. S. 219), the Court said:

"It is settled that where by way of duties laid on transportation of subjects of interstate commerce, or the receipts derived therefrom, or on the occupation or business of carrying it on, a tax is levied by a State on interstate commerce, such taxation amounts to a regulation of such commerce and cannot be sustained."

2. Highway barriers, and these are many—

The truck war between the States broke into the open in 1934 when Kansas created her ports of entry, posted guards, checked all trucks in and out under stringent regulations. Oklahoma and Nebraska retaliated and the war was on. Huge signs at the Kansas ports read, "All trucks entering Kansas must register at port of entry, penalty $100 fine." Oklahoma went a step further, making her signs read, "All trucks and busses entering Oklahoma must register at port of entry, penalty $100 fine." Then Nebraska posted her signs which read, "Nebraska State law—all trucks, towed cars, cars for resale, must stop at port of entry for inspection and permit." Nineteen States have followed suit.

California and Arizona for years have stopped both trucks and private automobiles at their ports of entry and have pilfered through even the personal effects of their occupants, under the guise of searching for fruit or plant disease.

Fees and other taxes on incoming trucks are often designed to prohibit rather than to grant privileges. On a 5-ton truck they range from $30 to $400.

These are only a few of the many highway barriers. At no place in the Union can a truck cross from one side of a State line to the other without encountering many new and often harassing laws and regulations.

On this subject Attorney General Robert H. Jackson, addressing the National Conference on Interstate Trade Barriers, said:

"These discriminating regulations have caused what are described as border wars between States, some of which have smoldered for years with occasional violent outbreaks and some of which have flared up for a few days and then died out completely. Some of them have involved harassment, by State officials, of foreign motor carriers. The Secretary of Agriculture has reported 13 of these border wars in which the powers of the States were used either to discriminate against foreign motor carriers or in retaliation for such discrimination, with serious economic loss. Under the so-called port of entry legislation, some States have set up checking stations where incoming, and in some cases outgoing, traffic is halted in order to check up as to equipment, inspections, and taxes. Such a system is more than faintly reminiscent of the intolerable halting and examination which one encounters at every border of a State or municipality in Europe, and which has done so much to disintegrate European economy and bedevil European good will."

Twenty-six of the States have provided a license fee or some penalty at the border or port of entry of the State for trucks entering the State.

3. Other tax and regulation barriers:

The "use" tax is now levied by many States on goods imported; 16 of the 48 States have such a general "use" tax. These States are Alabama Arkansas, California, Colorado, Iowa, Kansas, Louisiana, Michigan, Mississippi, North Carolina, Ohio, Oklahoma, South Dakota, Utah, Washington, and Wyoming.

The oleomargarine tax is imposed by 30 of the 48 States: Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Kansas, Maine, Minnesota, New Mexico, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oklahoma, South Carolina, South Dakota, Texas, and Wyoming have a tax of 10 cents per pound; Washington and Wisconsin, 15 cents per pound; Louisiana, 12 cents per pound; Delaware, Illinois, Indiana, Maryland, Michigan, Missouri, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Virginia, and West Virginia have no tax on oleomargarine. A few States tax only the manufacture of this article.

Forty-one of the States have enacted general preference laws, giving to residents of the States some preference over others that might come in from some other States to do the same kind of work. Thirty of the States give a preference to State products. Twenty-four of the States give a preference to the State on all public printing.

Ten States have passed retaliatory liquor laws. These States are Alabama, California, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Indiana, Kansas, Michigan, Missouri, New Jersey, Ohio, Oregon, Pennsylvania, and Rhode Island.

Thirty-one States provide for differential fees (restrictions on imports and nonresidents).

Thirty of the States have certain restrictions upon the shipment of livestock from other States into their own, some reasonable, while others are not so reasonable.

Fifteen States have restrictions against the shipment of eggs into them. These States are: Arizona, California, Colorado, Florida, Georgia, Idaho, Illinois, Iowa, Louisiana, Minnesota, Montana, North Carolina, Oregon, South Carolina, and Washington.

Every State in the Union except North Carolina requires licensing and inspection of nursery stock.

All of the States have laws giving them power to quarantine and destroy nursery stock.

Registration of salesmen of nursery stock and dealers of such is required in 26 States.

State-enacted trade barriers have been created under four types of powers:

1. The power of taxation.
2. The State's police power in the protection of health, which includes the power to quarantine and to impose embargoes.
3. The general regulatory powers in the interest of public safety and morals.
4. The sovereign proprietary powers in regard to conservation of natural resources and ownership of public works and property.

II

Below we list some of the interstate trade barriers created by Federal laws and regulations:

1. First, there is the almost prohibitive Federal oleomargarine tax, favoring other sections but detrimental to the cotton-producing States.

2. The monumental trade barrier, however, in all the Nation, and one for which the Federal Government must accept full responsibility, is the one created by our freight-rate structure.

House Document 264, Seventy-fifth Congress, first session, compiled by J. Halden Alldredge, now a member of the Interstate Commerce Commission, and its supplement, House Document 271, Seventy-sixth Congress, first session, present a graphic story of freight-rate discriminations in America that has neither been denied nor justified. More by accident than design the country has become divided into five rate zones:

1. Zone 1, otherwise known as the eastern or official zone, comprises roughly that territory east of the Mississippi and north of the Ohio.

2. Zone 2, the southern zone, is the territory east of the Mississippi and south of the Ohio.

3. Zone 3, the western trunk-line zone, embraces roughly the territory west of the Mississippi to the Rocky Mountains and north of Oklahoma and Arkansas.

4. Zone 4, the southwestern zone, embraces Texas, Oklahoma, Arkansas, and Louisiana.

5. Zone 5, the mountain Pacific zone, is composed of the Rocky Mountain States and those west.

The rates south of the Ohio River and in the southern zone are 40 percent higher than north of the river.

In the western trunk-line zone they are 47 percent higher than in the eastern or official zone.

In the southwestern zone they are 75 percent higher than in the eastern zone.

In the mountain Pacific zone they are 71 percent higher than in the eastern zone.

We quote here three short paragraphs from the first document cited:

"It is the task of a transportation system to carry all commodities from points of production to consuming centers throughout the continent and to seaports for export. The more freely and cheaply they are carried, the higher the standard of living that can be attained.

"On the other hand, the maintenance of a high standard of living requires the wise use of natural resources; it necessitates reasonable economic security of a stable nature for the people in each region through proper diversification of activities. Millions of people, as previously indicated, are distributed over the country irrespective of the location of natural resources, and it would require generations for all of them to move to centers of mass-production industry and specialized agriculture, assuming it possible to persuade such millions to migrate or that it would be wise to do so even if it were possible. There are also established regions of specialized one-crop agriculture whose people must face readjustments to restore and protect their land and to diversify their sources of livelihood.

"One of the basic principles of rate making for transportation purposes, therefore, should be the prevention of rate barriers against regional or territorial development. Discriminatory or preferential rates unduly favoring some regions or territories as against others will surely operate to lower the future living standards of the American people by interfering with economic readjustments which are necessary for the national welfare."

We quote three further paragraphs from the supplemental document:

"Those who welded the indissoluble union of States found that the policy of creating a national commerce and protecting it from artificial barriers was the touchstone of the birth and growth of a nation. Allegiance to that fundamental policy today demands the adjustment of these regional freight-rate structures to remove discrimination which obstructs and distorts the flow of commerce and inhibits a natural economic development of the national resources.

"There are substantial reasons for achieving in this field of transportation a more rational economic pattern symmetrical with our time-honored predilection for a free national market.

"This regional rate discrimination penalizes substantially the present and potential movement of processed goods from the South and West, thereby discouraging the expansion and diversification of industry natural to those areas. A plea for equalization is more than a demand for regional justice. It is part of the struggle for national unity and economic stability."

There is ample evidence that many new industries would spring up almost simultaneously with a proper leveling off of freight rates. Aside from the tremendous impetus it would give to the South and West as regions, it would mean increased business and more employment for the railroads themselves.

The statements quoted from these documents have been sustained and confirmed by the Interstate Commerce Commission itself. The Southern Governors' Conference filed with the Commission, early in 1939, Case No. 27746, thereafter known as *State of Alabama et al.* v. *New York Central Railroad Company et al.* It was decided on November 22, 1939, subsequently reopened in part, and a final decision handed down on March 5, 1940. The complainants charged that the railroad companies had set up discriminatory rates, almost doubling in some instances rates on manufactured articles originating in the South; in other words, that the rail rates as set up favor manufactured articles originating in the North and shipped southward and virtually preclude the shipment of manufactured articles originating in the South and shipped northward. The Interstate Commerce Commission found that these charges were true as regards some particular items included in the complaint and ordered reductions. The Commission fixed the rates in fact and said concerning them, quoting from the supplemental decision:

"That the rates on each commodity named in the following table from shipping points thereof in the South named in the appendix to destinations in the North are, and for the future will be, unduly prejudicial to said shipping points in the South, to the traffic therefrom, and to the shippers of such traffic, and unduly preferential of shipping points of the same commodity in the North, of the traffic therefrom, and of the shippers of such traffic, to the extent that they exceed, or may hereafter exceed, rates made the same percentage of the constructive first-class rates, determined as described in finding numbered (1), from said shipping points in the South to each destination in the North as the rates generally applicable on the same commodity from shipping points thereof in the North to such destination are of the first-class rates which were in effect on November 22, 1939, from and to those points."

It made a similar finding regarding certain other carload rates and ordered similar reduction.

It is observed that this case cost the South more than $100,000 and that, although it definitely paves the way for future reductions, it is manifestly unfair for the railroad companies to maintain such rates and for the parties injured thereby to be forced to spend such vast sums and carry the burden all the way in order to obtain the very equities which the Interstate Commerce Commission was set up to guarantee.

It is our conclusion that perhaps there is no other one cause that is today contributing more to the Nation's unemployment rolls than freight-rate discriminations.

III

Interstate trade barriers created by monopolistic control in commerce and industry, are, in our opinion, Mr. Chairman, in many instances most detrimental to the general welfare. They retard growth, diminish purchasing power, unduly increase prices and thus add vitally to the causes of unemployment. However, inasmuch as there is a special committee on monopoly we shall not further invade the field of its function here except to make a recommendation at the conclusion of this report.

The General Effect

President Roosevelt, writing Gov. Robert L. Cochran, president, the Council of State Governments, April 1, 1939, had this to say:

"MY DEAR GOVERNOR: I am immensely pleased to know that the Council of State Governments has called a National Conference on Interstate Trade Barriers, to meet in Chicago in April.

"Long known as the world's greatest single free-trade area, much of our country's commercial importance has been due to the mobility of trade throughout all the States. The last few years have seen the rise of virtual tariff barriers along State lines—damaging restrictions that have hindered the free flow of commerce among the several States. Business, agriculture, and labor have all suffered because of State and regional discriminatory measures adopted in the vain hope of protecting local products from the hazards of economic fluctuations.

"Interstate trade barriers have arisen in many instances from the same causes that resulted in mounting tariff walls between nations—accountable for so much of the world's unrest in recent years. The Federal Government is seeking to break down trade walls between this and the other nations of the world, and to remove the hampering restrictions that have been placed upon world commerce.

"Interstate trade barriers, if allowed to develop and multiply, will, however, constitute social and economic problems even more serious than international tariffs. It is a matter which demands the immediate attention of all the people of our country, and it is my earnest hope that the several States meeting in Chicago will take effective steps toward the removal of all barriers to the free flow of trade within our Nation.

"Very sincerely yours,

"FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT."

But the cumulative result of all these barriers has been to destroy to a great extent free trade.

"'Thus,' says James Harvey Rogers in his article, From State Rights to State Autocracy, appearing in Harpers, November 1938, 'under the impetus of depression conditions and under the impact of lobbies supported by powerful pressure groups, State legislators today are busily destroying the chief economic basis of our national unity. Certainly it was the view of the framers of our National Constitution that interstate barriers to commerce were to be eliminated. However, the United States Supreme Court—supposedly the chief bulwark of our American system against all enemies—in its dogged attachment to words and to rationalization, rather than to substance, seems to be putting its stamp of approval on the wrecking movement. Thus, the chief influence in the unparalleled economic development of the United States and in its usual high prosperity above that in other enlightened countries is apparently on the way to being destroyed.'"

We are forced to the inevitable conclusion that these interstate trade barriers have contributed and are contributing materially to the Nation's public enemy No. 1—unemployment.

We realize that many of the barriers will have to be solved by cooperative effort between the States, and between the States and the Federal Government; however, we do believe there are certain definite steps which the Congress could and should take now.

We desire before submitting our recommendations to congratulate the Department of State, the Governors of the several States, the Council of State Governments, and the American Bar Association on the progress they have already made in eliminating interstate barriers through reciprocal agreements.

Our Recommendation

Therefore we, your committee appointed to study interstate trade barriers and their relation to unemployment recommend, Mr. Chairman:

1. That this Congress amend the Federal Aid for Highways Authorization Act to provide that after the next regular meeting of its legislature no State shall participate in said fund which shall not have adopted the uniform weights, measurements, and specifica-

tions for all motor vehicles which shall travel Federal-aid highways, as set up in said act, and until it shall have enacted uniform licenses as proposed therein, and until it shall have enacted the uniform highway code as provided therein. That this Congress provide such uniform law, but provide that a motor-vehicle license issued in one State shall be good in all States, subject only to regulations of the Interstate Commerce Commission as applied to vehicles engaged in interstate commerce; and provide that such legislation shall take into account the debt obligation of the several States.

2. We recommend that this Congress enact legislation to provide that the Interstate Commerce Commission be authorized and directed to institute an investigation into the rates on manufactured products between points in one classification territory and points in another such territory, and into like rates within any of such territories maintained by common carriers, subject to part I of the Interstate Commerce Act, for the purpose of determining whether said rates are unjust and unreasonable or unlawful in any other respect in and of themselves or in their relation to each other, and to enter such orders as may be appropriate for the removal of any unlawfulness which may be found to exist: *Provided*, That the Commission in its discretion, may confine its investigation to such manufactured products and the rates thereon as shippers thereof may specifically request be included in such investigation. And it is further recommended that section 3–1 of part I of Interstate Commerce Act be amended to include the words, "region," "district," and "territory."

3. That the Congress enact legislation providing that upon the request of Governors of two or more States the Department of State shall offer its services toward assisting such States in arriving at agreements, pacts, or understandings designed to prevent or eliminate threatened or existing barriers between the States.

4. Lastly, while the committee realizes that many monopolies existing in this country add substantially to the causes of unemployment, yet inasmuch as you have a special committee, Mr. Chairman, studying monopolies, this committee feels that it should, and it does hereby, adopt the report of your Committee on Monopolies and its recommendation as a part of this report and recommendation insofar as same may apply to interstate trade barriers.

CLYDE T. ELLIS.
JOSHUA L. JOHNS.
SAM C. MASSINGALE.

Gen. Smedley D. Butler

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS H. CASE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 22, 1940

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, last night a great American died, Maj. Gen. Smedley Darlington Butler. During the 3 years that I have been a Member of this body his picture was the only framed picture of a living man that has hung on the walls of my office. I was privileged to call him a friend. I regarded him as one of the great Americans of my day and I regard him as one of the great Americans of all time.

He was a great soldier—a brave, brilliant leader in the United States Marine Corps.

He was a great citizen—a hard-hitting, courageous leader in civilian life.

I recall the first day I met him; his quick interest in the people he met. I recall his request that we take time to go down aisle after aisle of disabled soldiers in the veterans' hospital at Hot Springs. "Just think," he said, "20 years ago these men were the flower of our young manhood. They were picked men."

He never forgot his men. That was why they loved him in war and in peace. And he fought for peace. He was engaged in that fight the last time I saw him. We traveled together from Philadelphia to New York to speak at Carnegie Hall during the debate on the Neutrality Act last fall. He was then, as ever, a personality of so much charged dynamite, vigorous, observing, resourceful, tireless.

A Quaker, he was twice awarded the Distinguished Service Medal for brilliant bravery in time of war. A lifetime soldier, he retired after 30 years of service to spend his time working for peace and against war. We shall hardly see his like again in our generation. America will be under obligation to him for all generations to come.

Insurance Benefits of Certain Persons Employed in Coal-Mining Operations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK O. HORTON
OF WYOMING
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 7, 1940

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, S. 4070 and H. R. 9955 are companion bills. S. 4070, which was sponsored by Senator WHEELER of Montana and Senator SCHWARTZ of Wyoming, has already passed the Senate.

The bill provides for more uniform coverage of certain persons employed in coal-mining operations with respect to insurance benefits provided for by certain Federal acts.

The Chairman of the Railroad Retirement Board recommends its passage, as does the Federal Security Administration and the Treasury Department. The Bureau of the Budget advises that it is in accord with the program of the President. Judge R. V. Fletcher, on behalf of the Association of American Railroads, likewise recommends its passage.

Both by letter, wire, and telephone conversation, the Union Pacific Coal Co. and the United Mine Workers of America, through Alfred Carey of Rock Springs, Wyo., urge the passage of this legislation. These two Wyoming organizations are particularly concerned in this legislation.

Two distinct groups of coal-mine workers are covered under this bill. One group consists of workers who are employed directly by a railroad itself in connection with coal-mining operations in which it is directly engaged. The other group consists of mine workers who are not in the employ of a railroad but are employed by a company which is directly or indirectly owned or controlled by some railroad to which it sells all or a large part of its coal production.

I am particularly interested in this second group and will so direct my remarks, because both the operators and miners in my State fall under this classification. This is the group of mine workers which has suffered under the interpretation of the present law.

Neither this group of mine workers nor their employing companies have ever regarded them as railroad employees. They have been coal miners pure and simple because their operations were confined to coal only and never went beyond work on the tipple. Their pay was received from an operating coal company, not from any railroad.

Prior to July 24, 1939, the U. P. Coal Co. neither paid taxes for the account of the workers or their own account on the wages of such employees nor made deductions from such wages to cover the income taxes levied upon employees by the Carriers Taxing Act.

On that date, however, the general counsel of the Railroad Retirement Board, in an opinion rendered to the Board, stated that a strict interpretation of the language used in the act seemed to indicate that this group, who, as I have already stated, were doing only regular coal-miners work, came under the provisions of the Railroad Retirement Act.

The Railroad Retirement Board at first was inclined to adopt the opinion of its counsel as its own, but later, upon petition of interested parties, called for a reconsideration of the question.

Hearings have been held, but its final conclusion has not been announced.

Naturally the interested coal companies, after the original opinion of the counsel of the Board had been announced, had to take the necessary steps to protect themselves with respect to refund of or relief from liability for taxes paid or accrued prior to the date of its enactment.

In the case of the Union Pacific Coal Co., about $169,000 has been deducted from the pay of its employees, but because the matter is still unsettled has not been paid into the Railroad Retirement Act fund.

Upon the passage of this bill, all funds collected will be returned to the miners and the miners will be covered by the State statutes enacted in conformity with the Federal Social Security Act.

There is no question of good faith involved. The miners know that the U. P. Coal Co. is only too anxious to make these refunds, and all parties interested have so advised me.

In closing, let me say that the real purpose of S. 4070 is not only to prevent the various acts mentioned in the bill from being construed as applying to the mine workers employed by railroad subsidiary coal companies, but also to amend such acts so as specifically to exclude therefrom all mine workers directly employed by any railroad in its own coal-mining operations. This is in accord with the wishes of both groups of mine workers who, like all other mine workers the country over, prefer to be covered by the various State statutes enacted in conformity with the Federal Social Security Act.

This view is concurred in by the Railroad Retirement Board, the railroad employers, railroad employees, the mine workers, the Federal Security Administrator, and the State unemployment compensation administration.

Refugee Children and House Joint Resolution 581

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RUDOLPH G. TENEROWICZ

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 7, 1940

STATEMENT OF HON. RUDOLPH G. TENEROWICZ, OF MICHIGAN, BEFORE HOUSE IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION COMMITTEE

Mr. TENEROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, the plight of all children orphaned by the present European holocaust is the concern of all humanity. This mass exodus of peoples before what has been termed "blitzkriegs"—fleeing for their lives—has awakened the sympathy and interest of America.

I have received scores of telegrams and letters from various organizations and individuals offering to take care of these poor unfortunates for the duration of the war. This morning I appeared before the House Immigration and Naturalization Committee and made the following statement in support of my bill:

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I appear before you for the purpose of making a statement in support of my bill, House Joint Resolution 581, which provides for the admission into the United States of a limited number of refugee children from Poland and other occupied countries for the duration of the European war.

It is not necessary to dwell on the mass deportation of men, women, and children to known and unknown destinations after the enemies' invasion of their countries. There are approximately 9,000,000 Poles left within the confines of the Reich who are destined to die of starvation and disease. This number includes thousands isolated in concentration camps and others, younger and more hardy, who have been separated from their families and doomed to a life of hard labor.

Authentic sources reveal that thousands of the families of those doomed to hard labor and concentration camps in the countries occupied by the enemy have escaped. The children orphaned by the war who were fortunate enough to escape from German- and Russian-occupied Poland and other countries, an endless trek of humanity, just ahead of the invading hordes, found their way into Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, Switzerland, France, Albania, Italy, and finally the more fortunate refugees arrived in Spain and Portugal.

We are chiefly concerned with the fate of the refugee children, the innocent victims of Europe's disintegration, who, bewildered, homeless, and facing starvation, have become the problem of humanity.

In recent months I have received a number of letters from organizations as well as individuals indicating their willingness to provide for these destitute children. Offers are being made daily by private organizations, business firms, the clergy, camps, schools, and philanthropists who guarantee the care of these children for the duration of the war. In a letter dated August 5, 1940, the president of the Polish-American Council, Mr. F. X. Swietlik, asked that I inform the committee that the Polish-American Council is most anxious to render aid to the Polish refugee children. This organization, consisting of a committee of all Polish-American organizations in the United States with a membership of over one million and a half, has pledged itself to defray transportation and maintenance expenses and offers the guaranty that these children will not become public charges.

Authentic sources reveal that there are about 800 known Polish refugee children in Lisbon, Portugal; about 400 in Casablanca, Morocco; and about 1,000 in England. This number of children of the entire population of Poland constitutes a very small percentage of the pre-war Polish population of 35,000,000 people and does not include the refugee children of other occupied countries. Over 7,000,000 Americans of Polish extraction in the United States are vitally interested in this problem.

The present handling of refugees defeats the purpose of maintaining a proportionate ratio and may cause some confusion. We should avoid discrimination. If a law is to be enacted it should be confined to a nationality ratio basis in determining the number of refugee children to be admitted.

The situation is such that immediate consideration should be contemplated. We must consider the possibility that the countries mentioned in my statement may be subject to invasion.

The Bryan Breakfast at the Chicago Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. DOUGHTON

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 7, 1940

ADDRESS BY AMBASSADOR JOSEPHUS DANIELS

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Ambassador Josephus Daniels, delivered at the Bryan breakfast at the Chicago convention, July 17, 1940:

"I think if you will be quiet I can make myself heard" was the first sentence audible to the packed galleries in the Democratic Convention in Chicago 44 years ago when the young Lochinvar out of the west won the leadership of the Democratic Party. "I was leaving the hall, tired because none of the speakers could make themselves heard above the confusion, when that sentence with flute-like resonance fell upon my ears," Dr. Franklin Martin told me years after. It was the first time Bryan's voice had been raised in a national convention. The ablest statesmen in the party—Hill and Russell and Daniels—in the packed superheated hall had vainly tried to speak above the din. But "the Heaven born Bryan," as Vachel Lindsey called the Nebraskan, without any apparent effort, reached the ear and thrilled every listener in the remotest gallery. You could feel that they literally hung upon his words, charmed by the music of the timbre of his voice as well as by the logic of his argument. He closed with the famous sentence that electrified his listeners. As the climax of the most remarkable speech in the annals of American political oratory, Bryan declared with the seriousness of a prophet of old and with the beauty of the purest rhetoric "You shall not press down upon the brow of labor this crown of thorns; you shall not crucify mankind upon a cross of gold." That gem of eloquence comes back today to all of us privileged to have been present with all its cadence as it lifted hypnotized men to a new and holy consecration, and as it moved hardened conventiongoers into an enthusiastic demonstration without precedent.

Twescore and four years have passed since Bryan captivated that great gathering. In the same environment as in 1896, I seem to hear again that voice of mingled sweetness and challenge and feel again the thrill that comes but once in a lifetime. Many thought and said an unknown man had captured the convention by one speech. Not so; Bryan did not suddenly reach that pinnacle. Behind that memorable hour was a brilliant record of achievement in the Halls of Congress and on the hustings. He had won two elections to the National House in rock-ribbed Republican districts in Nebraska. He had charmed listening Senates in a noble argument for tariff reform. In the battle between giants in the epoch of silver discussions, the pebble in the sling of the young David from Nebraska had compassed the political death of more than one political Goliath.

Bryan's voice—the voice of a John the Baptist crying "make straight the path"—was raised in every part of the Republic in the succeeding days. The people crowded to hear the advocate who felt the ills under which they suffered. From East to West the forgotten and burdened welcomed him as their spokesman as he pleaded their cause, which had lacked a leader. Those living on incomes derived from monopoly and enjoying the fat of the land raged in jittery fear lest he would win. Political and clerical Brahmins exhausted their vocabulary of hard names. Never in history has a

sincere man spoken bravely in behalf of the oppressed without inciting the hate and opprobriums of those enjoying unearned possession. The greater his sincerity, the more their vindictiveness. Jefferson was a Jacobin; Jackson a demagogue. It is the price a great soul must pay to ring true against caste, privilege, and exploitation.

Bryan scared half of the plutocrats out of their wits, so that they opened their purses to buy the election in an orgy of corruption and coercion which had never before disgraced the Republic. Bryan's blaze-of-glory campaign not only enthused his followers, it also attracted many who came to scoff and remained to pray. It extorted a remarkably appreciative pen-picture of the campaign from the wife of the most scholarly leader of reaction. In a letter written after the election to Cecil Spring-Rice, longtime British Ambassador to the United States, Mrs. Henry Cabot Lodge gave her British friend this illuminating comment upon a campaign waged against all for which her husband stood:

"The great fight is won. It was a fight conducted by trained and experienced and organized forces, with both hands full of money, with the full powers of the press—and of prestige—on the one side; on the other, a disorganized mob at first, out of which burst into sight, hearing, and force—one man, but such a man. Alone, penniless, without backing, without money, with scarce a paper, without speakers, that man fought such a fight that even those in the East can call him a crusader, an inspired fanatic—a prophet. It has been marvelous. * * * His speeches spoke to the intelligence and hearts of the people with a capital P. He almost won."

Mrs. Lodge might truly have added "Bryan did win but he shares with Tilden the distinction of being denied the fruits of victory." However, that would have been an indictment of her husband's party not to be expected.

Sixteen years after he had captured the convention in Chicago I sat again in the Baltimore convention under the spell of Bryan's power to move men. In Chicago he won for himself the nomination for the Presidency. In 1912, gone was the lute tone that at Chicago had been as pleasing as the strains of a Mendelssohn composition by the master of a great instrument. Gone was the suppleness and the grace that made him an Apollo. But in its place had come out of long contests against privilege, the strength and courage of a noble crusader. He had buried ambition for political honors. Only devotion to a cause dominated his actions. He had come to believe, rather slowly, that Wilson incarnated the liberalism to which he had consecrated his life. Just as at Chicago Bryan's mastery of a convention won him the victory, so at Baltimore in a historic conflict Bryan made possible the selection of Woodrow Wilson as President of the United States. If there had been no fighting Bryan at Baltimore, it is my deliberate judgment, based upon my participation in the organization to nominate Wilson, America and the world would have been denied the statesmanship of Wilson in the high office in the great days when in peace and in war Wilson was recognized as the foremost chieftain of the world. If his own countrymen and others had followed Wilson in 1919 the present holocaust would have been averted.

Among permanent achievements of Bryan's public career, to name only a few, are the writing and compelling the insertion in the Wilson-Gorman Tariff Act of the graduated income and inheritance taxes. When, by a mysterious change of one vote, the Supreme Court declared the levy of an income tax unconstitutional, it was Bryan who began and led the long campaign which resulted in the submission and ratification of the sixteenth amendment to the Constitution. If the name of the man chiefly responsible for a constitutional amendment was attached to it that amendment would bear the inscription, "Made by William Jennings Bryan." As a matter of fact, the sixteenth amendment did bear the name Bryan for, as Secretary of State in 1913, he officially signed the proclamation of its ratification and placed on it the official seal of his Government.

The same inscription should go on the amendment providing for the election of United States Senators by the people and the amendments for woman suffrage and national prohibition. No man since the reconstruction days has left his impress upon the Constitution to such an extent as Bryan. Likewise much reform legislation owed its inception to his advocacy, including the law forbidding contributions by corporations to campaign funds and requiring the publication of all contributions to political campaigns and ended Government by injunction and fathered the law guaranteeing the right of trial by jury in contempt cases. It was Bryan's championship of the Federal Reserve System in a crucial time that contributed to ending an antiquated system.

The perspective of time alone can properly appraise the place of Bryan among the distinguished men who have served as Secretary of State. In Bryan's incumbency of that office he was secretary of peace. That cannot be said of all his predecessors or his immediate successor. Bryan's policies, exemplified in his 30 peace treaties foreshadowed the spirit of the League of Nations, the Kellogg-Briand treaties for the outlawry of war, and all the attempts to substitute arbitration for force. When asked by the Japanese Ambassador in an acute situation, "Is this the last word?" Bryan gave the answer, "There is no last word between friends." That inspirational sentiment ought to be engraved in letters of living light over the door of every chancelry in the world.

Bryan's devotion to the Monroe Doctrine and his principle of consistent opposition to dollar diplomacy and the use of the big stick in dealing with small nations has grown into the doctrine of "the good neighbor," and the hope of Western Hemisphere solidarity against penetration.

Controversy continues over the wisdom of Bryan's resignation from the Wilson Cabinet because he felt the policy adopted would carry our country into war as it did. I have always believed he should have remained with the ship. Whatever may be the final verdict of Bryan's course in those troubled days, his Government has now approved his insistence that it was wiser for Americans not to assert the right of travelling on ships voyaging through the zone of war. Bryan is vindicated whereas in 1916–18 he was derided.

When passion has subsided, the historian will write Bryan's name high among the great men who followed Jefferson in the high office of Secretary of State and as an illustrious patriot who never sold the truth to serve the hour. In confidence in that verdict we gather to do honor today to William Jennings Bryan and pray that others called to leadership will be as steadfast in devotion to the common weal as the sincere and eloquent Commoner.

Shall We See England Perish?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAMPTON P. FULMER

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 7, 1940

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, we hear much in the way of debate in Congress as well as in the press and over the radio for and against a really helpful attitude on the part of the United States towards England, who is now battling for the last vestige of democracy in Europe.

Our Government has pursued a policy of nonappeasement toward Germany, Italy, Japan, and Russia. Our Government has vigorously protested the conduct of these nations in their ruthless destruction and conquest of many of the weaker nations in Europe.

It is my contention that, our foreign policy having been what it has been, and our likes and dislikes being what they are, any adoption of the Lindbergh policy today would appear as a complete back-down and would be that.

We are committed toward an attitude of hostility toward the ruthless aggression of the totalitarian states and toward their political and moral philosophy.

The question as to whether or not it would be a good policy on the part of this country at this sad hour, under these circumstances, to isolate ourselves from the rest of the world, simply praying that England may win, without doing anything to assist in this perilous hour, believing that it would help bring about an unfriendly attitude on the part of Germany and Italy is ridiculous.

The President, the Congress, and the people of our country are definitely against sending our people to Europe. I will vote against sending any of the young manhood of my district and my country to Europe to engage in the ruthless and destructive war which is now raging in Europe.

I am one of those who believe that if we can help England win along the lines which I am advocating it will definitely keep us out of war.

If it is possible to assist England in the way of furnishing her with implements of war, cruisers, airplanes—in fact, everything along this line that we can possibly send her, other than sending our ships into the war zones or sending any of our people over to Europe to engage in this destructive war, to the extent that England would be able to win—it would mean the saving of billions of dollars to the taxpayers of this country in that we would not have to continue to build up and preserve that type of defense program which we would have to have; and it would mean the saving of untold misery and slavery in Europe. It would also tend to dispel fear of an invasion at any time; and, in the last analysis, it would mean everything to this country from an economic standpoint.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to insert herein a poem entitled "Shall We See England

Perish?" written by Lalla Adams Stark, Adams Grove, Columbia, S. C., which is very appropriate at this time.

SHALL WE SEE ENGLAND PERISH?

(Inspired by last Saturday's "Merry-Go-Round" column)

Shall we see old England perish?
Turn deaf ears while bombers raid?
Play the game of watchful waiting
While she stands alone, arrayed,
One, against a ruthless axis—
Armies massed at channel gate—
Fighting for her sea-girt islands—
Shall we aid, or hold debate?

See her mighty fleet patrolling
In the gray dawn, 'neath the moon;
See our vast coasts undefended,
Timbers for our ships unhewn.
Cut the red tape, cliques dissolving;
Men, red-blooded, oh, arise,
Scrap the obsolete, the feudal—
Leo's sign is in the skies.

Hear the knell of brave ships sinking,
See the isles ringed round with steel,
Vision beauty of the ages
Ground beneath the vandal's heel.
Would we see her navy captured?
Heed not signals of distress?
See the bulwark of our ocean
Seized by foes so merciless?

Share with England our destroyers
(God, how long must we delay?).
Shall this glorious empire builder
See her star set in the gray?
She who bears the torch of learning
Day by day pleads, e'er reminds:
"Mine a struggle for existence;
Yours a tie that ever binds."

Hear her calling, calling, calling:
"America, Land of the Free,
Rise, defend your own blood mother;
Live, let live democracy."

—*Lalla Adams Stark, Adams Grove, Columbia, S. C.*

AUGUST 5.

Senator Reynolds Congratulates Governor Hoey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 7 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

TELEGRAM FROM HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS TO GOVERNOR HOEY, OF NORTH CAROLINA

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a telegram which I sent to Governor Clyde R. Hoey, of North Carolina, on August 6, 1940, with respect to the Communist Party, German-American Bund, alien enemies, and so forth.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AUGUST 6, 1940.

HON. CLYDE R. HOEY,
Governor of North Carolina, Raleigh, N. C.:

Please accept my sincere congratulations upon fine speech which newspapers report you made at Raleigh on August 5 before North Carolina Food Dealers' Association in condemnation of Communist Party, German-American Bund, alien enemies, saboteurs, spies, and "fifth columnists." For 5 long years I have been outspoken against Communists and all subversive organizations in this country and introduced bills in United States Senate to outlaw the Communist Party, the German-American Bund, and other subversive organizations. One of my bills is known as S. 4132 and other bills of similar character. May I hope that at every opportunity you will bring my bills to attention of our people of North Carolina. I earnestly solicit your continued support and also wholehearted support of American people with respect to legislation which is so badly needed in America at this time. Am happy to know that at last the American people are beginning to think in American terms.

Highest regards,

ROBERT R. REYNOLDS,
United States Senator.

The Hull Trade Treaties in 1940

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. REID F. MURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 7, 1940

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, ever since their inception I have been opposed to the Hull brand of reciprocal-trade treaties. I have always felt, and still feel, that they are wrong in principle.

The fundamental wrong is the delegation of legislative power.

During this session of Congress the House, at the request of the lawyers of this Nation, passed the Walter-Logan bill. Why was this legislation passed? The Walter-Logan bill was submitted to Congress for the simple reason that the lawyers of this country could see that if Congress continued delegating power to the President and to individuals, bureaus, and commissions there would be little need for lawyers, or for Congressmen either for that matter. The bureaucrats become judge, jury, witnesses, and executioner in some cases, and the lawyers were well within their rights in asking that the rulings of the bureaucrats be open to court review. The Walter-Logan bill sets up a procedure in Government comparable to procedures followed in several States for State commissions and bureaus. Evidently the Jeffersonian Democrats in the House were anxious to preserve or regain some of the powers delegated to the President. This is evidenced by the vote on the Walter-Logan bill, when 129 Democrats, as well as 151 Republican Members, voted for this bill in the House, and only 94 Democrats, or new dealers, voted against it.

ARE THESE FAIR QUESTIONS?

First. If the lawyers of this country who requested the passage of the Walter-Logan bill are justified in asking that delegated powers are subject to review by court procedure or hearings, am I not, as a Congressman from a rural section, as fully justified in questioning the delegation of power to one man, giving him direct control of the milk check of every dairy farmer in the country?

Second. Am I not justified in asking for the farmers of my district what the lawyers requested and obtained? If the lawyers ask and obtain this safeguard for all legislation, should not the farmer be entitled to the same legislation?

Third. Is not this a fair question to ask when you realize that 1 out of every 100 cows in the United States is in my district? Is not this of interest to dairy farmers when cheese averaged 17.5 cents per pound the 7 pre-New Deal years and only 13.2 cents per pound the 7 years of the New Deal? Is not this situation also of interest when you know that in 1939, after 7 years of the New Deal, cheese averaged only 12.8 cents per pound? Is not this delegation of power of interest to the dairymen of America when in 1938 cheese averaged only 12.6 cents per pound and the New Deal lowered the tariff by another 20 percent?

Fourth. Is not this delegation of power of interest to the dairy farmers of America when they are told that these tariff reductions are recommended by experts, and then no one can find out who the experts are? I have spent nearly 2 years trying to find out, but they tell me that they do not give this information out. Have we become so politically low that a free people cannot find out who makes or recommends decisions of the Government?

Fifth. Why is it that no Democratic colleague has been able to tell me where Jefferson, in any of his writings or sayings, has ever given anyone reason to vote for such kind of power-delegating legislation?

Sixth. Will we not, as a people, vote on November 5 as to whether we believe in a philosophy of government of Jefferson and Lincoln or in a big and little dictator form of government?

The Jeffersonian Democrats and the rejuvenated Republicans are now pretty close friends in Wisconsin and the Jeffersonian Democrats feel at home as Republican candidates for office.

Although a first-term Congressman, I am happy to think that I have been able to equalize and reduce the interest burden of the farmers of this country to an extent that it represents a saving of tens of thousands of dollars each year to the farmers of my district and an annual saving of millions of dollars to the farmers of the Nation.

Send 50 Destroyers to Britain? How Tantalizing to Warmongers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEWIS D. THILL

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 7, 1940

NEWSPAPER ARTICLE ENTITLED "FACING REALITIES"

Mr. THILL. Mr. Speaker, interventionists and warmongers are proceeding with less caution in their efforts to drag America into the European conflict. The latest suggestion to turn over United States destroyers to Great Britain is another step in the direction of war, if it is not an act of war in itself. The following newspaper article discusses the problem:

FACING REALITIES

General Pershing has posed an issue of the utmost gravity for the American people. He clearly sees that the course of events in Europe is giving rise to uncertain but nontheless real dangers for the United States. And he asks that "we make up our minds to face the truth without flinching."

This is sound advice. When any nation is confronted by the momentous issue of going to war it would be suicidal not to face realities with courage. But to do so is not a simple task. For if our national security is to be preserved, we must take a comprehensive view of world problems and our relationship thereto, and not confine our understanding of reality to one particular set of circumstances that seems of special importance at the moment.

In the opinion of General Pershing, it is not enough greatly to strengthen our armaments against possible attack. He told his radio audience that "if there is anything we can do to save the British fleet" during the next few months "we shall be failing in our duty to America if we do not do it." If that is the case we should not stop with selling over-age destroyers. We should be furnishing, of our own self-interest, our best ships, our fastest planes, and men to handle them.

The American people are overwhelmingly sympathetic with the British in their struggle against Nazi domination. But they are also overwhelmingly opposed to participation in the war in Europe. Obviously the advice offered by the distinguished commander of our expeditionary force during the World War must be examined from both these points of view.

Specifically, General Pershing suggests that the United States make available to the British or Canadian Government "at least 50 of the over-age destroyers which are left over from the days of the World War." But he made it plain that he was thinking of "measures short of war" and that this plan should go into effect only "if a proper method can be found."

Here, of course, is the weakness of the proposal. At present the law flatly forbids sending war vessels out of the jurisdiction of the United States with the intent of delivering them to a belligerent nation. Moreover, Congress recently forbade the sale or transfer of any naval equipment unless the Chief of Naval Operations certifies that it is not essential to defense of the United States. Such a certification as to over-age destroyers could not be expected from Admiral Stark, for he recently told Congress that the Navy needs all its destroyers, plus 81 more.

Thirty-nine of the World War destroyers have been converted for a special type of service. The remaining 123 are all useful as fighting ships, in spite of their age. Most of these have already been recommissioned for naval service and all of them will have been recommissioned within the next few weeks. So they are an active part of our present Navy.

To sell or give any of these vessels to Great Britain would require congressional action. And Congress could not transfer even a minor portion of our fighting ships to Britain without committing what Germany would be fully entitled to regard as a hostile act. Hitler might or might not retaliate with an act of war against the United States. But Congress would certainly have to take into consideration the very real possibility that the proposed step would take us swiftly into war, regardless of our state of unpreparedness.

In the circumstances the "probable hazards" which General Pershing sees in his own suggestion will seem to many to outweigh the aid, imperative though it may be, which 50 over-age destroyers would give to Great Britain.

Protect America!

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH J. O'BRIEN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 7, 1940

ADDRESSES OF J. EDGAR HOOVER, DIRECTOR, FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

Mr. O'BRIEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by J. Edgar Hoover, Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation, United States Department of Justice, at the Federal-State Conference on Law Enforcement Problems of National Defense, Department of Justice Building, Washington, D. C., August 5, 1940:

PROTECT AMERICA

The significance of this conference is equalled only by the emergencies which have brought it about. Today our Nation is a fortress of liberty, fighting a vicious, implacable army of foreign "isms." Never before has there been a greater need for unity, for calm appraisal of the forces which work against us, for coordination of thought and effort in building an impregnable defense.

A nation faces a desperate moment when its men and guns are called into action. It is in the period before this time, while the enemy is making every possible inroad upon our moral defenses, that the true battle takes place. That battle is now in progress in America.

This conference has been called so that we may consider every maneuver by which we may outwit a resourceful and ruthless foe. I refer, of course, to the sinister foreign "ism" advocate. Protected by sentimentalists and by innocents, these termites have succeeded in boring into every phase of American life, masquerading behind "front" organizations. Nothing is so dangerous as these foreign "isms" which are working their way into the very lifeblood of our country with their lies, their deceit, and their suave presentation of their cause.

I insist that in approaching the job of protecting America we must consider the problem of separating true liberty from license. We must set apart freedom, as defined by our Constitution, from the purloining of privileges by enemies within our gates, who would fit our country to the patterns of the dictators they serve. It is one of the paradoxes of democracy that the guarantees of freedom of speech, assembly, and the press are the shields behind which the foes of democracy conduct their vicious campaigns to destroy the system which permits them to exist.

Ours is a land of freedom, but that freedom does not include the privilege to set off bombs. It does not guaranteee freedom to those who undermine our efforts at national defense by smoke screens which pretend patriotism but in reality seek to weaken our defenses so that bloody dictatorships may find no resistance in their way. It does not mean freedom to put emery dust in the cylinders of airplane engines, to place destructive pieces of metal in the motive power of naval vessels. It does not mean the freedom to falsify the motives of those who would carry on our Government to the best of their ability.

Yet we find that every one of these heinous things has been done and is being done by persons shielded by innocent appearing but subversive forces under that portion of our Constitution which guarantees free speech and liberty of normal endeavors. America is proud of her Bill of Rights, but this sacred heritage will not be preserved by its enemies who invoke it to undermine and weaken the world's last great bulwark of democracy. Our democracy was ordained to insure the welfare of our people. The time is rapidly approaching when as a nation we must choose between the welfare of the great masses of Americans and a few interlopers who hide behind the Bill of Rights while they undermine our Nation. If any effort is made to hamper these subverters, their defenders immediately proclaim that their liberties are being trampled upon; that America has adopted the methods of the Ogpu or the Gestapo.

I submit that these persons, and not ourselves, are the ones who know best what the Ogpu is and how the Gestapo operates, because they espouse the causes which have brought these agencies into existence. They seek to carry on, in our free America, the very Ogpu and Gestapo methods which they decry by breaking down our resistance, by spreading fear and false rumors, by attempting to weaken our means of national defense.

Let me give you an example:

In a certain large factory, engaged in the production of defense materials, every possible effort is being made by a Communist-controlled labor group to foment a strike. In that factory are many, many loyal, honest, American men, devoted to this country, willing to work for it, to die for it, if necessary. But their voices have been smothered by the control of men working for the cause of Lenin and Browder, the kind of men who hate Americans and American ways and who would supplant them with a tyrannical reign of terror.

As an example to which the inane avenues of protection have been carried, I recently received a letter from a minister of the gospel who protested against a special agent of the F. B. I. carrying out his duty of telling chiefs of police to make reports on the subversive activities of Communists and members of the German-American Bund.

The Chief Executive of the United States foresaw last year the dangers which would confront us as a result of the war in Europe. He immediately gave orders to coordinate on a Nation-wide basis the fight against espionage, sabotage, and subversive activities by designating the F. B. I. to act as a clearing house to handle these matters, with the aid of all law-enforcement men of America.

Acting under the instructions of the President and Attorney General Jackson, the F. B. I. quietly set in motion its machinery of coordination of State, county, and local law-enforcing officers to enlist their cooperation and did in this important work. As a result, I am pleased to report that today all law enforcement presents a united front against so-called "fifth column" activity in every State, county, and municipality throughout our land. There is more unity today among the forces charged with the responsibility of maintaining our internal security than ever before. This is a happy contrast with the confusion that existed in the first World War, when over a score of Federal agencies were investigating spies and saboteurs, with a resultant lack of coordination and cooperation with the various State and municipal groups.

In other words, we of law enforcement, with the aid of a patriotic citizenry, are fighting a common enemy upon a national basis. We should fight him in exactly the same manner that we fought and conquered the kidnaper and his destructive forces. Defense against "fifth columnists" cannot be handled by posses or by citizen-groups operating as vigilantes. It is the task of constituted law enforcement, and it is not a matter which can be taken into the hands of private citizens, although we must have all the help citizens can give us. There is a great deal of difference between private assistance and private action. One is of great aid to us, the other of tremendous hindrance.

Law enforcement in the United States is better prepared today than ever before to meet any challenges to our democratic standards. There will be no black-out of justice in this country. Already we have seen among us vile domestic forces that are un-American. But they can hope to accomplish little, so long as law-enforcement agencies are on the job and are given the support that is typically American.

The fact must not be overlooked that meeting the spy, the saboteur, and the subverter is a problem that must be handled on a Nation-wide basis. An isolated incident in the Middle West may be of little significance but, when fitted into a national pattern of similar incidents, it may lead to an important revelation of subversive activity. It is for this reason that the President requested all of our citizens and law-enforcing agencies to report directly to the Federal Bureau of Investigation any complaints or information dealing with espionage, sabotage, or subversive activities. In such matters, time is of the essence.

It is unfortunate that in a few States efforts have been made by individuals not fully acquainted with the far-flung ramifications of this problem to interject superstructures of agencies between local law enforcement and the F. B. I. to sift what might be vital information, thus delaying its immediate reference to the F. B. I. This cannot be, if our internal security is to be best served. This is no time for red tape or amateur handling of such vital matters. There must be a direct and free flow of contact between the local law enforcement agencies and the F. B. I. The job of meeting the spy or saboteur is one for experienced men of law enforcement.

We appreciate everything which the well-meaning citizen may do for us. He can be of tremendous aid in the field of observation, but not of activity. Sooner or later, the spy, the saboteur, the dynamiter, or the subverter will be exposed and observed by the honest American citizen. It is then that the alert American, alive to the evils of the foe who has shown his hand, will decide whether to report his unusual or seemingly subversive actions.

To this challenge, there is only one answer. In justice to himself, to his country, and to the person under suspicion, the citizen should report anything which seems to him to be out of the ordinary, and once having reported it, clear his mind and his conscience of the matter. It is then the task of experienced men of training and good judgment to function—protecting the innocent and identifying the guilty.

Much has been accomplished in recent months, but the task has only begun. The F. B. I., for instance, at the request of the War and Navy Departments, inaugurated many months ago a program of surveying protective facilities of manufacturing plants engaged in the production of defense materials. There are thousands of factories in America which we will need in time of war. Already Communists have sought to impede such a program. They do not want American industry protected. The F. B. I. has been accused by these willful obstructionists as being antilabor, in an effort to stir up dissention and unrest. Everybody knows this is a malicious falsehood and nobody knows it better than the Communists and propaganda purveyors themselves.

In making plant surveys, we are concerned only with our Nation's safety. Airplane plants, munition works, and other vital industries must be made impervious to attack. Here and now, I want to give my thanks and appreciation, as well as that of every other patriotic law-enforcement officer in America, to the far-sighted and wholly American labor leaders who, knowing the truth and sincerity of our efforts, have stood shoulder to shoulder with us against the vile attacks of forces which have attempted to undermine our efforts.

So far we have been able to avoid much of the violence which characterized the early days of the World War. However, this does not mean that any of us can relax our vigilance for a single instant. The skilled saboteur carries out his acts with cunning and cleverness. Schools actually exist for these despicable subverters, wherein they may be taught the most terrible means of creating destruction. Incendiary bombs have been devised, no larger than a cigar, which will create disaster. Plans to place chemicals in boilers, with the idea of creating wholesale destruction, have been discovered.

The immediate task is to marshal and coordinate every protective facility. Industries once open to visitors, with little attention given to the background of key employees, should now scrutinize all comers and entrust secrets of production only to persons whose Americanism is thoroughly established. Gullibility must cease. These are times when too much trustful innocence may be repaid by a stab in the back. Remember that the craven propaganda-purveyors of "ism" forces are not concerned with the future of America but with the power, the secretiveness, the aggressive greed of their unholy foreign Communist cause. And their advice should be taken exactly for what it is worth, self-serving hokum designed for any sucker foolish enough to believe it!

For such statements I shall be charged as standing for the abrogation of civil rights. Such despicable lies are self-evident. I hold that for every right there is a duty. I insist that no one can claim civil rights and at the same time work for the overthrow of the civil liberties which we all cherish. The subverter is not content merely to discard freedom of thought. He wants to kill freedom in any form that exists. He sneakingly seeks the thralldom of our America. This means that we must not relax in our vigilance.

Every city, for instance, should survey its utilities to insure a maximum of protection. Think for a moment of the chaos that would ensue if a city's water power were shut off, even for a day. The demoralization of cities by means of water famine has already been used by totalitarian saboteurs.

In this period of national emergency, the strength of law enforcement is as important as the strength of our Army and Navy. Yet to the discredit of the civic spirit in many communities, local police departments are sorely undermanned and ill equipped. Should war come, uprisings and domestic violence can do more to undermine public morale than squadrons of screaming dive bombers. This will be one of the techniques used, should America be attacked. In such times, a community must depend upon its law-enforcing agencies to maintain order. Where law enforcement is weak, it should be strengthened without delay and above all it should not be hampered by impractical theorists.

Five years ago last month, in order to lift the standards of professional law enforcement, the F. B. I. National Police Academy was created. One of the things we had in mind at that time was the need for a mobile force of highly trained men throughout America in case of great emergency. Because of this academy and the training which its graduates have been able to impart to others, I am proud to say that America can today depend upon the greatest body of specially trained law-enforcement officials in her entire history—thousands and thousands of them, who know exactly what to do in emergency and when and how to do it. Thus, we are exerting every effort in closing up the holes through which the serpent of infiltration has penetrated.

Remember always that the spy, the saboteur, or the destroyer carries no badge. He hides behind a hundred fronts. He pretends innocence. He likes to rub elbows with patriotic men because he thus can seek to break down morale, to preach unpreparedness, and undermine honesty. It is his job to sap the national strength by untruth, by confusion, by fomenting unrest in the community, the school, the factory, and the mill.

Little has been published of the activities of the Federal Bureau of Investigation in carrying out its responsibility of coordinating the handling of matters dealing with espionage, sabotage, and subversion. That very fact has aided us materially in our work. The enemy does not know our actions and cannot anticipate a time when he might plan his devious task with a minimum chance of detection. The effectiveness of our activities would be hindered unless our work were conducted with the utmost secrecy. There will be honor and glory for all in the meeting of the challenge, and the public will be fully advised of all the facts in every matter when it is ready for presentation in a court of justice. There should be no trials in the newspaper columns or persecutions by word of mouth in such a vital situation.

I want to express my heartfelt gratitude to the loyal Governors, mayors, State and county officers, law-enforcement officials, and patriotic citizens for the unselfish, eager cooperation which they

have given to the F. B. I. in its efforts to combat the inner enemies of this Nation. We have depended upon you in the past; we shall depend upon you more and more in the future, feeling sure that you understand our problems and the necessities of our many common tasks.

Unfortunately the spy is not a person who can be arrested and prosecuted like a gangster. That would only allow his comrades to outwit our further efforts. So we must combat him in ways and means which have been evolved from long experience, trusting always to the confidence, the support, and the assistance of you who form our main bulwarks, our listening and observation posts, without which we could not succeed.

May we as Americans live up to our sacred trust by protecting our flag and all that it symbolizes. This is the first order of the day for every patriotic citizen. Until our land becomes impregnable there must be no cessation of coordinated Nation-wide effort in that direction. Let us press on as of one purpose to the high calling—preserving the traditions and ideals of the established Americanism whose militant spirit is our proudest heritage and surest hope for the future.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION, UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, DURING THE FISCAL YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 1940

During the fiscal year 1940 the Federal Bureau of Investigation was confronted with a greater volume of work and more responsibilities than during any other time of its history. Occasioned by the national emergency, the burden of work has increased tremendously. Nevertheless this was the most successful year from the standpoint of accomplishments during the 16 years that the Bureau has been under the direction of Mr. J. Edgar Hoover.

From 1932 to 1934 the F. B. I. underwent a transition with the passage of new Federal laws directed at curbing the interstate activities of desperadoes who were defying the control of local authorities. The national emergency has brought about another period of transition. During the past year new offices were opened in Honolulu, T. H.; Juneau, Alaska; San Juan, P. R.; Albany, N. Y.; Phoenix, Ariz.; Baltimore, Md.; Savannah, Ga.; Grand Rapids, Mich.; San Diego, Calif.; New Haven, Conn.; and Houston, Tex.

INVESTIGATIVE

During the fiscal year 1940, 5,605 convictions were secured in Federal courts in cases investigated by special agents of the F. B. I. as compared with 5,162 convictions secured in the fiscal year 1939. This represents an increase of 443 (8.6 percent) convictions during the fiscal year 1940. Convictions were secured in more than 96 percent of the cases investigated by the F. B. I. and prosecuted in court.

During the year, sentences imposed in cases investigated by the F. B. I. totaled 10 life, 17,833 years, 4 months, and 28 days, while during the fiscal year 1939 sentences imposed totaled 12 life, 16,948 years, 6 months, and 5 days.

As a result of the investigative activities of the F. B. I. during the fiscal year 1940, fines, savings, and recoveries totaled $58,390,-180.64 as compared with $16,876,717.99 in the fiscal year 1939. The regular appropriation of the F. B. I. for the fiscal year 1940 totaled $7,300,000. For every dollar spent in connection with the regular operations of the Bureau during the fiscal year 1940, $8 was saved or returned to the Government or individual citizens in stolen property recovered, fines imposed, and savings effected for the Government.

During the year, a total of 4,153 stolen automobiles valued at $1,911,162.03 were recovered in cases wherein the F. B. I. performed investigative work. Since the enactment of the National Motor Vehicle Theft Act in 1919 a total of 56,144 stolen cars valued at $32,310,216.57 have been recovered in cases wherein the F. B. I. performed investigative activity.

FUGITIVES FROM JUSTICE

During the past year, 2,389 Federal fugitives from justice were located and apprehended by the F. B. I. In addition, 7,809 fugitives were located for State, county, and municipal law-enforcement agencies through the Fingerprint Division of the F. B. I., making a total of 10,198 fugitives from justice located during the fiscal year 1940. In the fiscal year 1939, 1,890 Federal fugitives were located by special agents of the F. B. I., while 7,933 fugitives from justice were located by checking incoming fingerprints through the F. B. I. fingerprint files, making a total of 9,823 fugitives from justice located.

ESPIONAGE

In the 5-year period preceding 1938 the F. B. I. investigated on an average of 35 espionage matters each year. In the fiscal year 1938, 250 such matters were handled by the F. B. I., while in the fiscal year 1939 a total of 1,651 matters pertaining to the national defense were received for investigation. With the outbreak of war in Europe early in September and the Presidential proclamation establishing a limited emergency, this type of work increased materially. On one day alone in May of 1940 a total of 2,871 complaints were received. A total of 16,885 national-defense matters were received during the fiscal year 1940 which required investigative activity.

On September 6, 1939, the President issued a statement calling upon all law-enforcement agencies in the United States to refer "any information obtained by them relating to espionage, counter-espionage, sabotage, subversive activities, and violations of the neutrality laws to the F. B. I." The handling of such matters is definitely the task of constituted and well-trained law-enforcement agencies, and the citizens' function in the present emergency is to refer to the F. B. I. information coming into their possession which they believe bears upon the furtherance of our national defense.

The success of investigations of espionage and sabotage cannot be judged by prosecutions and convictions, as is the case with kidnaping, bank robbery, and other heinous types of crimes. Espionage and sabotage investigations must have for their objective the identification of the individuals involved, together with ascertaining their contacts, methods of operation, sources of information, and related matters. The preventive aspect is of paramount importance. There has been a negligible amount of sabotage in the second World War in contrast to a similar period in the first World War.

In September of 1939, in accordance with the request of the War and Navy Departments, a program of surveying the protective facilities of manufacturing establishments having large contracts to provide the Government with defense materials was inaugurated. A priority list of some 800 factories and manufacturing establishments has been furnished the F. B. I. by the armed services and of this number 270 have been surveyed and recommendations made to the plant officials designed to maintain a maximum of protection. The F. B. I. has no interest in the employer-employee relationship and its sole concern is bolstering the physical protective facilities in manufacturing plants and establishments. Eventually it is estimated that some 12,000 manufacturing establishments will be surveyed by the F. B. I.

In consummation of the defense plans of the F. B. I. for emergency situations, regional conferences have been held in the various F. B. I. field divisions with ranking law-enforcement officials to fully advise them as to the procedure to take in connection with the emergency matters which are arising from time to time and in order to enlist their cooperation in this type of work.

KIDNAPING

Since the enactment of the Federal kidnaping law, which was approved on June 22, 1932, a total of 184 cases have been reported to the F. B. I., of which 182 have been completely solved. In these cases 367 persons have been convicted in Federal and State courts with the imposition of sentences totaling 12 death, 42 life, 4,132 years 7 months and 13 days. During the fiscal year a total of 46 convictions was secured in this type of case with the imposition of sentences totaling 451 years 11 months and 7 days.

During the fiscal year 1940 only 14 kidnaping cases occurred, all of which were solved.

EXTORTION

The Federal Extortion Act was approved on July 8, 1932, and since that time the F. B. I. has investigated a large number of extortion cases. During the fiscal year of 1940, 105 persons were convicted for this type of violation with the imposition of sentences totaling 351 years, 1 month and 16 days with the imposition of fines totaling $4,525.

BANK ROBBERY

The Federal bank robbery statute was originally approved by the President on May 18, 1934. As a result of investigative activities of special agents of the F. B. I. into this type of crime in cooperation with State and local police agencies, bank robbery has declined approximately 80 percent since its peak year of 1932. During the fiscal year of 1940, a total of 178 convictions were secured, with the imposition of two life sentences and other sentences totaling 2,189 years and 28 days, with fines totaling $52,601. The total amount of loot recovered in this type of case amounted to $69,413.18. In the fiscal year 1939, there were only 126 Federal convictions secured.

WHITE SLAVE TRAFFIC ACT

Investigations of violations of the White Slave Traffic Act during the fiscal year 1940 resulted in 476 Federal convictions with sentences totaling 1,242 years, 8 months, and 28 days.

IDENTIFICATION FACILITIES

At the close of the fiscal year 1940, there was a total of 13,205,855 sets of fingerprint records on file in the Identification Division of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. These fingerprints are so classified and arranged in the files that an incoming record can be searched and identified within a period of 3 minutes in the event the individual has previously been fingerprinted and his fingerprints forwarded to the Bureau. A total of 2,449,397 sets of fingerprints was received during the fiscal year 1940. Identifications were effected in 60.4 percent of the criminal fingerprints received.

Included in the fingerprints received were 570,850 fingerprint impressions of citizens to be placed in the personal identification files; 182,549 sets of fingerprint impressions of individuals applying for employment in the Federal service and whose fingerprints were forwarded to the Bureau by the Civil Service Commission; together with 741,443 sets of noncriminal fingerprint impressions, including those of unidentified deceased persons and Army, Navy, Coast Guard, and Marine Corps enlistment prints.

On July 1, 1940, the personal identification files contained 1,898,-052 fingerprint impressions of citizens who desired to insure their identity against emergencies; 713,395 civil-service prints; 1,055,003 noncriminal prints, and 9,535,334 criminal fingerprint records.

During the fiscal year 1940, a total of 10,885 law-enforcement agencies were contributing fingerprint records to the F. B. I. The F. B. I. is currently receiving 7,700 sets of fingerprint records daily for search against the criminal files and approximately 2,500 personal identification prints. There are 27,493 wanted notices posted on the fingerprint records in the F. B. I. files, including 7,662 parole violators and 696 probation violators.

THE TECHNICAL LABORATORY

During the fiscal year 1940, a total of 7,097 examinations were made by F. B. I. scientists compared with 5,559 such examinations during the fiscal year 1939. Of the 7,097 examinations made in the F. B. I. crime laboratory, assistance was rendered to other Federal agencies in 369 instances and to State, county, and municipal law-enforcement agencies in 2,065 instances. The 7,097 scientific examinations involved 39,500 different specimens of evidence.

During the fiscal year concentrated research work has been carried on in the laboratory to devise ways and means to meet the many problems that have arisen in connection with the widespread activities of the F. B. I. in coping with sabotage, espionage, counterespionage, and other matters related to national defense.

F. B. I. NATIONAL POLICE ACADEMY

The fourteenth session of the F. B. I. National Police Academy was graduated on June 29, 1940. With the graduation of this class, a total of 478 select law enforcement representatives have been trained in the F. B. I. National Police Academy since its inauguration in 1935 in order that they might return to their home towns and inaugurate police training schools. These representatives come from every State in the Union. Most of the graduates have received promotions since their graduation and the great majority of them have engaged in training activities. During the fiscal year, the F. B. I. cooperated in the inauguration and organization of 418 police training schools, most of which were under the supervision of the graduates of the National Police Academy. In September of 1939 a special re-training course was afforded the graduates of the F. B. I. National Police Academy in Washington, D. C., to consider investigations arising under the national-defense laws and plans are now being made for another re-training conference to take place in September of 1940. The graduates of the F. B. I. National Police Academy constitute a reserve force for the F. B. I.

QUANTICO BARRACKS

A training center designed to be used in connection with firearms instruction and the F. B. I. National Police Academy was inaugurated on the Quantico Marine Corps Reservation with the opening of a barracks building in the late spring of 1940. In view of the emergency it was necessary to utilize the barracks as training facilities for new special agents and at the present time three classes of new special agents are being trained and graduated every seven weeks in all phases of modern scientific crime detection, although a special emphasis in the course is placed upon national-defense matters.

Summary of accomplishments during the fiscal years 1939 and 1940

	1939	1940
Convictions	5,162	5,605.
Sentences	12 life, 16,948 years, 6 months, 5 days.	10 life, 17,833 years, 4 months, 28 days.
Recoveries, fines, and savings	$16,876,717.99	$58,390,180.64.
Automobiles recovered	3,982	4,153.
Federal fugitives located	1,890	2,389.
Fugitives located through fingerprints	7,933	7,809.
Total number of fugitives located	9,823	10,198.

Prayer Offered by George Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 7 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

PRAYER OFFERED 150 YEARS AGO

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a prayer offered by George Washington.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Almighty God, who hast given us this good land for our heritage, we humbly beseech Thee, that we may always prove ourselves a people mindful of Thy favor and glad to do Thy will. Bless our land with honorable industry, sound learning, and pure manners. Save us from violence, discord, and confusion; from pride and arrogancy, and from every evil way. Defend our liberties and fashion into one united people the multitudes brought hither out of many kindreds and tongues. Endue with the spirit of wisdom those to whom in Thy name we entrust the authority of government, that there may be peace and justice at home and that through obedience to Thy law we may show forth Thy praise among the nations of the earth. In the time of prosperity fill our hearts with thankfulness, and in the day of trouble suffer not our trust in Thee to fail; all of which we ask through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

Voice of a Leader

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 7, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE CHATTANOOGA TIMES

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Chattanooga Times for August 6, 1940:

[From the Chattanooga Times of August 6, 1940]

VOICE OF A LEADER

For Americans who are not so blind they will not see and not so deaf they will not hear, the address of Gen. John J. Pershing delivered Sunday night is both a message and a challenge. The distinguished soldier who led the American Expeditionary Force in the World War asserts in support of his recommendation that at least 50 destroyers be provided Great Britain that, "by sending help to the British, we can still hope with confidence to keep the war on the other side of the Atlantic Ocean, where the enemies of liberty, if possible, should be defeated."

That recommendation gives rise to several questions, of which the most important is this one: How can any American who is reasonably well informed contend that this country is not at this time actually involved in the war? In the past 10 months the situation of this country has undergone a profound change; for the first time in our history we are not isolated in the world solely because of our splendid aloofness from international quarrels and controversies, but because isolation is being imposed upon us by combinations of aggressor nations in Europe and in Asia.

The lesson taught by the events of the past few months and implicit in General Pershing's statement is that if Great Britain is defeated, this country will be in the position Britain occupies today; we shall be without strong friends ready to help us, and we shall spend billions of dollars to defend ourselves in this hemisphere against aggressors immeasurably strengthened for attacks they will make in their own time and when it is most advantageous to them.

Whether this country can spare 50 destroyers is a matter on which no layman is competent to pass. The President, as Commander in Chief of the Nation's armed forces, and the Cabinet officers charged with the task of maintaining those forces at maximum efficiency must be depended upon to say whether warships or any other type of defense equipment can be spared. It is extremely unlikely that General Pershing would have made such a recommendation (Secretary of State Cordell Hull congratulated him warmly on his address), if he had not understood both that the British Government needs and desires the destroyers and that the Roosevelt administration is willing to make them available. Every aid we give the British will be defending our own way of life. And we can be certain that our failure to assist the British will be regarded in Berlin only as an indication of our weakness and disunity.

The layman may hesitate to pass judgment on military and naval matters, but he can have an opinion as to whether it makes any difference to this country if Great Britain is defeated. And if it does make a difference, if there is even the remotest possibility that by aiding the British the war can be kept out of this hemisphere, then it follows that we should, as a matter of self-interest if for no other reason, give the British every form of assistance they can use and we can spare.

Col. Charles A. Lindbergh believes that since we may have to deal with a Europe dominated by Germany, we should "cooperate" with the Hitler regime and thereby maintain "the supremacy of our western civilization and the right of our commerce to proceed unmolested throughout the world." General Pershing's recommendation does not foreclose any dealings with a Hitler-dominated Europe; but he proposes that we try to obviate the possibility of having to deal exclusively with Hitler by strengthening the country with which we have dealt in peace, and honorably, for a good many years. Instead of thinking about cooperating with a Europe dominated by Germany, we shall do better to cooperate with Britain so that Europe and the world may be saved from a Nazi domination of violence, brutality, and mercilessness.

No one who has not refused to face realities can question the accuracy of General Pershing's description of the present war. What we see "developing right before our very eyes" is:

"A new kind of war * * * fought with all weapons, including treason, and fought most insidiously during what some of our countrymen call 'peacetime.' It is a war against the civilization that we know. It is a revolution against all the values which we have cherished and which we wish our children to cherish in the future. It is a revolution which denies the dignity of man and which banishes the hope of brotherhood and comradeship on earth."

The United States is involved in that war, and to pretend that it makes no difference to the American people whether Germany or Britain wins is to be incredibly stupid. And to contend that this country can safely afford not to give Britain every aid which can be spared is to refuse to try to insure ourselves against having to fight in the Western Hemisphere. To be sure, we shall encounter risks if warships are sent to Britain. But the risks we shall certainly face if Britain is defeated are so much greater than any risk we dare to take now seems by comparison inconsequential.

What the American people need to understand is that if they draw back now from taking action which might enable Britain to survive, they will draw back later when other risks need to be taken to defend our vital interests. If we can spare 50 destroyers, they ought to be sent to Britain immediately. But what we need as a people even more than a willingness to send 50 destroyers to Britain is a resurgence of the spirit of freemen. We need to abandon the easy-going ways, the softness which make attractive the counsel of men like Lindbergh. In General Pershing's words:

"We must lift up our hearts. We must reaffirm our noble tradition. We must make ourselves so strong that the tradition we live by shall not perish from the earth * * * the time has come when we must rise up as a united people to make secure our country's independence and our great inheritance of constitutional liberty."

That challenge will not impress those who refuse to look or listen. It will appeal to freemen who love freedom, to freemen who understand that human liberty is being threatened as it has never been threatened before and who know that when liberty has to be fought for, the thing to do is fight and secure it.

One Man's Opinion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES SECCOMBE
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 7, 1940

ARTICLE BY GEN. HUGH S. JOHNSON

Mr. SECCOMBE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Gen. Hugh S. Johnson from the Washington Daily News of today:

[From the Washington Daily News of August 7, 1940]

ONE MAN'S OPINION

(By Hugh S. Johnson)

NEW YORK.—You can get a sample taste of what "can happen here" from Monday's debate in the Senate blasting Charles Lindbergh's speech against the massive current New Deal attempt to stumble, fumble, or blunder this country into war. Three New Deal Senators, than whom there are none whicher, danced around the torture stake: MINTON, PEPPER, and—with deep blushes for my own home State of Oklahoma—that ineffable ex-teacher of elocution and delsarte, JOSH LEE.

SHERMAN MINTON knows better. I imagine him with his tongue in his cheek having a swell time making the animals squirm. But Senators PEPPER and LEE just have no more sense. They are hot-eyed fanatics for the perfectly preposterous and patently absurd wherever they can find them.

Senator PEPPER is old Doc Townsend's godchild. He honestly wants to give $200 a month to everybody over 60, regardless of what that would do to everybody under 60 and the country in general. JOSH LEE wants to make everybody who has so much as a peanut stand put it in hock to buy Government bonds bearing, say, 2 percent interest on which, plus the peanut stand, the Government will charge them 5 percent and to hell with the American economic system and the Constitution which says that private property shall not be taken for public use without just compensation.

These gentlemen offered to disembowel Colonel Lindbergh for saying that if we are going to do business at all after this war is over we will have to do it with both victor and vanquished, even if the victor is Germany; that we shall have to reconcile ourselves to this idea, and that it would be wise to try to intercede to stop this war before it destroys any more civilization.

For that Senator PEPPER screamed "fifth column"; Senator LEE and Senator MINTON chipped in with dirty cracks about Colonel Lindbergh's courage, loyalty, and Americanism. I get a picture of three of the breed of Mexican hairless snapping at a St. Bernard.

Some journals implied that Colonel Lindbergh's speech had been ghost written by Nazis and contrasted it with General Pershing's urging that we send part of our Navy—50 destroyers—into this war by the subterfuge of "selling" them.

Is anybody fool enough to think that we can or should dictate to other countries their form of government? I disagree with part of what Colonel Lindbergh said, but the man who denies his right to say it as being un-American convicts himself thereby of an un-American state of mind out-Hitlering Hitler. It is a preview of what to expect from such hands.

There are about four living men in my gallery of living demigods, and one of them is General Pershing—comrade in arms, old commander, personal friend since I was a shavetail. But nobody can tell me that the general wrote that speech. It smells to me of Bill White.

Black Jack at 80 is still one of the world's great soldiers, but he knows as little naval strategy as I. George Eliot unconsciously "obsoleted" his text at the moment of its utterance. However, it may later be dragooned by the apostate Knox. I happen to know that the Navy doesn't agree with General Pershing.

There is a portent and an omen in this concerted New Deal attack on an American hero, even down to Senator SCOTT LUCAS' command radio appearance castigating Colonel Lindbergh, arranged before the colonel spoke.

Do you want to know whether we are going to be pushed into this war? Watch Wendell Willkie. If his progress continues toward the November victory now apparently in sight, we will be in it before the end of September.

I don't accuse the President of meditating any such poison. I accuse him of few of the recent terrible, obvious, and undeniable hypocrisies and betrayals. But I think he has abdicated intellectually to an infinitesimally small adulating group of unelected totalitarian associates who would stop at nothing to perpetuate not him, not any principle except the Nazi principle of personalized power, not anything—but themselves.

Poll-Tax Barricades

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEE E. GEYER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 7, 1940

LETTER FROM A VIRGINIAN WHO WOULD LIKE TO BECOME HER REPRESENTATIVE'S CONSTITUENT

Mr. GEYER of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I insert a letter from a woman in Norfolk, Va. Her letter is typical of the many I receive from residents of the eight poll-tax States, where American citizens are blocked from participation in Government by the poll-tax barricade.

NORFOLK, VA., *July 16, 1940.*

Hon. Congressman GEYER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Our newspaper, the Sunday Virginian-Pilot, recently mentioned your fight to have the nefarious practice of a prerequisite of $1.50 for a poll tax abolished. We know the tax is not legal. The men in office, or running for office, will pay the poll tax of friends so they can vote for these candidates.

Complaints of this abuse have appeared in newspapers from time to time.

We have in the city of Norfolk 160,000 inhabitants. We have only 7,000 voters with poll taxes paid. This poll tax must be paid 6 months in advance. Thousands of people here never have voted. Is this democracy? "Taxation without representation is tyranny." We are under a load of bureaucracy, autocracy. You are right when you say, "No feudal lord was ever more secure behind his stone walls than the Congressmen behind the stone walls of the poll-tax barricade. Even Hitler, Mussolini, and Stalin are not more secure in tenure of office."

Now, let me say. What interest do young men have to join the Army and Navy to fight and die for any nation in which they have no part?

I am politically inclined. I have lived in this city 20 years. But we don't vote. It's no use. Citizens have been trying all these years to get the slums cleaned up. We are no nearer accomplishing that than we were 20 years ago. Families who have small incomes or who are on W. P. A. can't pay a poll tax. They might as well live in Siberia, Russia, as complain of conditions.

The poll tax keeps the mighty in office.

Respectfully,

MRS. ELIZABETH SUTHERLAND YOUNG.

London Predicts That the United States Will Enter the War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HOLDEN TINKHAM

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 7, 1940

ARTICLE FROM THE ECONOMIST

Mr. TINKHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from The Economist for July 6, 1940:

[From the Economist of July 6, 1940]

AMERICA'S ROLE

The anxieties of the free world are concentrated on the coasts of England, where watch is being kept against the new Armada; but the hopes of the world are more and more directed to the outer continents. Our role here in Great Britain is to hold the bastion; for victory we shall need aid from overseas.

The turn of events in the United States has served as an encouragement to hopes that the necessary aid will be forthcoming. The evolution of American public opinion is as exasperatingly slow and illogical to us as our own has so often been to those on the continent of Europe who looked to us for support, rescue, or avenging. We are too quick, in our anxiety, to read a declaration of war into an expression of hatred for the Nazis; too apt to underrate the American's hereditary desire to escape from Europe. But, when all the necessary qualifications are noted, it is still true that such an event as the nomination of Mr. Wendell Willkie as the Republican Party's candidate for the Presidency is at once convincing evidence of the extent to which American opinion has already evolved and a guaranty that it will continue to evolve rapidly during the months immediately ahead.

Judged by the available evidence, Mr. Willkie would make an able and distinguished President. But his historical importance lies less in his possible future virtues as a President than in his actual present character as a candidate. The strong probability is that the next President of the United States will be Franklin Delano Roosevelt; Mr. Willkie's service to humanity—it is a very large one—will be to save the United States from its usual election-year predicament of having no foreign policy. Until very recently, it seemed almost certain that isolationism and intervention would be an issue, perhaps the main issue, of the Presidential campaign. The leading Republican candidates were all more or less isolationist—or at least neutralist—in their outlook. True, the great revulsion of popular feeling after May 10 had led to some entertaining displays of agility; but until the convention met at Philadelphia last week the prospect was that the Republican Party would either oppose Mr. Roosevelt's policy of aid for the democracies or, if it did not have the courage or political obstinacy to come out in formal opposition, that it would snipe at him in detail. Congress supplied an example of the delays and obstructions that such an unavowed but splenetic opposition could create by passing a bill designed to delay and reduce, rather than prevent, the flow of surplus war material to England. The platform adopted by the Republican Convention appeared to confirm this forecast, for, while approving of the principle of aid to countries defending their liberty, it made such aid subject to American defense needs and the requirements of international law—qualifications which, in the hands of an isolationist, could easily be made to nullify the main principle.

The balloting for a Presidential candidate to interpret this ambiguous platform, however, entirely upset the calculations of the trimmers, for it resulted in the nomination of a candidate whose views on foreign policy, if they differ at all from the President's, do so by being more strongly in favor of aid to Great Britain. Moreover, the circumstances of Mr. Willkie's nomination were such that he is under no obligation to any section of the party that would lead him to place any but his own interpretation on the platform. Mr. Willkie is a very remarkable candidate. His nomination has been compared to that of William Jennings Bryan in 1896, and though he was by no means as obscure before the convention as Bryan was, he was nevertheless a very dark horse, with no entry in the political form book. Bryan had at least served a term in Congress (and, incidentally, rehearsed there his famous cross of gold speech); Mr. Willkie has never held any political office, national or local, whether by election or by appointment, and he is still listed in the reference books as a Democrat. What little was publicly known of him might have been thought to have been to his disadvantage as a politician, for he is the head of a great public utility holding company and an outspoken opponent of the Tennessee Valley Authority, the grandiose idealism of whose task has seized the imagination of the public, even if its commercial methods have been condemned by those whom they affect. To have secured the nomination in spite of these disadvantages and in the face of opposition from the party managers, is a triumph of personality and a demonstration of the enthusiasm that can be aroused by Mr. Willkie's political philosophy, which might be called either liberal capitalism or progressive private enterprise. His nomination is not, of course, such a triumph of spontaneous and unorganized popular enthusiasm as it has been made to appear. Though he condemns big business, he is the businessman's candidate, and if he were elected it would be interesting to discover to what extent he could dissociate himself from supporters less progressive than himself.

From the point of view of domestic American politics Mr. Willkie has undoubtedly imported into the campaign a degree of color and popular interest that would not have been there if any of his rivals had been successful. The personality will not all be on one side; it will not this time be a contest of F. D. Roosevelt versus A. N. Other. But from the point of view of world politics (which even the American politician must now concede a primacy of importance) Mr. Willkie's nomination is a guaranty of continuity. Whatever happens in the election, the foreign policy of the United States in the remainder of 1940 and for 4 more years will be based on assistance to Great Britain. Mr. Roosevelt had already taken what precautions he could before the convention opened by nominating to his Cabinet two such eminent Republicans as Mr. Stimson and Colonel Knox—a clear hint that the Republican Party would be split if it turned to isolation. But the precaution has proved to be unnecessary. If the President's foreign policy is criticized at all during the campaign, it will be for not moving far enough and fast enough in support of Britain.

All this, of course, is very much to the good. But we in this country should beware of reading too much into recent events. It was not primarily because of this advocacy of support for Britain that Mr. Willkie was nominated, but because on a combination of personality and domestic policy he seemed the most likely man to beat Mr. Roosevelt. We cannot go further than to say that Mr. Willkie's interventionism did not prevent his success. Moreover, there are severe limitations on interventionism even of the Willkie type. American opinion has followed much the same evolution as British opinion, with a time lag of from 1 to 3 years, and many of the illusions from which we have awakened are still prevalent on the other side of the Atlantic. For example, there is the almost universal qualification that aid must stop "short of war"; that is the delusion that afflicted many here who paid lip service to collective security—the delusion that hostile acts can be taken with limited liability. Or there is the determination of Americans that, even if they are dragged into war, they will not send an army to Europe. That is the equivalent of the British decision to concentrate on a six-division army, the disastrous fruits of which we are still reaping; in its French context, it is the delusion of the Maginot Line.

Clearly, many of the implications of American policy still require to be thought out on the other side of the Atlantic. The basic fact that wars, even nonbelligerent ones, cannot be fought without doing distasteful things has yet to be learned. There is still no sign, for example, that the restrictions of the Neutrality and Johnson Acts are to be removed; until they are, though the American people say that they intend to give us all the material assistance they can send, what they mean is that they intend to sell us all the material assistance we can pay for. These hesitations and inconsistencies will disappear; events can be relied upon to bludgeon them out of existence. As has so often been pointed out in these columns, it is not the direction in which American policy is evolving, or even the goal at which it will arrive, that is in doubt but only the speed with which it is moving. The great gain from last week's events is that we, Britain and America alike, are not now faced with the hideous danger of a 6-month hiatus, during which the underlying unity of purpose might be obscured by the formalities of a rigid constitution. This is what Mr. Willkie has achieved by the mere fact of being nominated. If he and the President between them, while preserving their domestic antipathies, can now give some formal expression to their unity on foreign policy, they will be doing no more than their duty to America and to the cause in which they both believe.

The Poll Tax Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE E. GEYER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 7, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW YORK EVENING POST

Mr. GEYER of California. Mr. Speaker, while we are talking these days of giving the people of the District of Columbia

the vote, let us not forget those who, because of their economic status, are unable to make their voices heard. I refer to those three and one-half million Negroes and seven million whites in the poll-tax States that are denied the right to vote.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the New York Evening Post.

[From the New York Evening Post of August 1, 1940]

The Geyer poll-tax bill, which would make voting free in the last-remaining poll-tax States of the South, lies buried in Judiciary Committee on Capitol Hill. In 1938, when the last vote for new Congressmen was counted, it was estimated that one Representative from the city of Chicago received 28,000 more votes than all the 32 Congressmen from the eight poll-tax States put together. In a year when democracy has suffered so many set-backs on the battlefields of Europe, Chairman SUMNERS can do the democratic thing by reporting this bill out to Congress. Let the people's representatives say whether the vote shall be restored to thousands of American citizens in the South this November.

Industrial Firms Earn Average Return on Net Worth of 11.4 Percent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND S. McKEOUGH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 7, 1940

ARTICLE BY ROBERT P. VANDERPOEL, FINANCIAL EDITOR OF THE CHICAGO AMERICAN

Mr. McKEOUGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks and include therein an article appearing in the August 5 issue of the Chicago American, written by Mr. Robert P. Vanderpoel, the financial editor of that newspaper, he calls attention to a net profit of 11.4 percent having been reported by 334 leading industrial corporations of the Nation reporting earnings for the first half of 1940.

It is apparent from the exceptional earning power reported by these industrial corporations that no justification is present for the complaint so frequently repeated that the present national administration has seriously handicapped and harassed individual initiative, thus restraining earning power of industry. I think it timely that Mr. Vanderpoel directs attention to the unusual opportunity which these exceptional earnings indicate being present for private capital to find opportunity to engage itself in private profitable enterprise.

I have inserted this article in the RECORD in the hope that the Republican National Committee and all others who have criticized this administration for its interference with business, may have an opportunity to learn from this source, which is not a part of the national administration, just how the administration of the affairs of the National Government, under President Roosevelt, have benefited and not injured industry.

[From the Chicago American of August 5, 1940]

LEADING INDUSTRIAL FIRMS EARNED AN AVERAGE RETURN ON NET WORTH OF 11.4 PERCENT

(By Robert P. Vanderpoel, financial editor)

Leading industrial corporations of the Nation, totaling 334 in number, the first to report earnings for the first half of 1940, earned an average return on net worth of 11.4 percent. These figures were revealed by the National City Bank of New York in that institution's August monthly bank letter.

The same corporations in the first half of 1939 earned an average net return of 7.2 percent.

While 334 corporations are, of course, but a small segment of American industry, there being about 92,000 manufacturing corporations in the country, net worth as of January 1, 1940, of the 334 companies aggregated $10,705,551,000, which compares with net worth of all manufacturing companies in the Nation of something less than $40,000,000,000.

RANGE TO 22 PERCENT

In other words, the leading corporations covered by this National City Bank survey comprise something more than one-fourth of the total industrial worth of the Nation.

Twenty-four separate classifications are covered by the report, each showing a profit ranging from a low of 5 percent to a high of 22.2 percent.

The poorest showing was made by four firms in the shoe and leather group which earned but 5 percent on net worth.

Seven firms classified as wood products earned 5.5 percent. United States Steel Corporation, given a classification by itself because of its size, also earned 5.5 percent. Other iron and steel makers, totaling 29 in all, earned an average of 6.2 percent. Building equipment manufacturers earned 7.1, baking concerns 7.9, petroleum products 8.5.

GENERAL MOTORS NET HIGH

All other groups earned in excess of 10 percent. General Motors Corporation, also given an individual classification because of its size, earned a net profit of 21.6 percent. Other automobile manufacturers earned 22.2 percent, and producers of automobile accessories netted 20.7. Miscellaneous metal products earned 20 percent. Beverage concerns, which make their best showing in the third quarter of the year, earned 13.6 percent. The chemical and drug industry earned an average of 14.7. Many groups earned around 12 percent.

It should be borne in mind that these earnings are after all charges, including depreciation, interest, taxes, and reserves. Even the increased Federal corporate income tax recently voted by Congress has been deducted before figuring this profit. Some corporations made substantial charges covering possible foreign losses during the quarter. These, too, were deducted before computing the earnings.

COAL MINERS LOST

Corporations falling into classifications other than industrial made somewhat less favorable showings. The coal mining industry continued to operate at a deficit. Metal mining concerns earned an average of 8.7 percent on net worth; other mining, quarrying, etc., 14.6 percent; wholesale and retail trade, 6.6 percent; service and construction, 6.3. Each group showed improvement over a year ago.

These figures once more prove what we have contended in this column for many years—that great profit opportunities exist for American business. With idle capital reaching the greatest aggregate in all time and interest rates tumbling to the lowest levels of all time there should be a rapid flow of capital into productive enterprise as long as such enterprise is able to earn attractive returns on net worth as has been the case for the last 5½ years, with the exception of 1938, when the return was only modest.

AVERAGE RETURNS

We should like to emphasize again that these are average returns of the larger half of industry. While the figures cited cover only slightly more than one-quarter of the industrial net worth, this is simply because the reports as yet are incomplete; there is no reason to believe that the percentages will change greatly as more reports are made public until approximately 1,000 corporations are covered, comprising about one-half of the industrial wealth of the Nation and earning well over one-half of the industrial profits of the country.

They include the efficiently managed as well as the less capably managed concerns, the most thriving industries, as well as those which for one reason or another have experienced difficulties.

The big domestic problem before the United States is why, with the opportunities for profit as great as they have been, does not capital go to work? There are a number of explanations, some psychological and some much more fundamental.

The whole situation may be changed by the defense drive now in progress, but if ever there comes a time when the United States can once more concentrate its attention solely on its domestic problems, intensive study must be given to the failure of capital to flow more freely into profitable enterprise.

Federal Expenditures, Per Capita, in Kansas Have Been Three Times as Great as Internal-Revenue Collections for Period From March 1, 1933, to January 1, 1940

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. HOUSTON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 7, 1940

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a comparative table showing

internal-revenue collections in Kansas from March 1, 1933, to January 1, 1940, with comparative Federal expenditures in Kansas from March 4, 1933, to June 30, 1939, and a breakdown showing collections and expenditures per capita based on population estimates for July 1, 1937:

Estimated population, 1937	1,864,000
Total revenue collections	$136,625,326
Revenue collections per capita	73.29
Total Federal expenditures	444,106,787
Federal expenditures per capita	238.25
Average for group of Great Plains States (including Kansas):	
Revenue collections per capita	95.25
Federal expenditures per capita	213.02
Average for group of Middle Atlantic States:	
Revenue collections per capita	350.40
Federal expenditures per capita	157.80

The Indispensable Man

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS H. CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 7, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM HOT SPRINGS (S. DAK.) EVENING STAR

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Hot Springs (S. Dak.) Evening Star for August 6, 1940:

[From the Hot Springs (S. Dak.) Evening Star of August 6, 1940]

THE "INDISPENSABLE MAN"

President Roosevelt allowed himself to be "drafted" at the Democratic Convention at Chicago because he believed that he is the only man in the whole Nation who is capable of guiding America during these turbulent times.

This impression that Mr. Roosevelt is an "indispensable man" was carefully fostered before and during the convention by his friends and was never discouraged by him. He allowed the idea to come to full flower, until today it is the main argument of the new dealers in their attempt to break the third-term tradition.

But like other ambitious men, the President finds that his public remarks of previous years sound strangely at variance with some of his current views. Certainly he did not believe in the "indispensable American" theory in 1932, when he was out to get Mr. Hoover's job.

"This country needs the tonic effect of such a reiteration of American principles," said Candidate Roosevelt at New York on November 3, 1932. "It calls to its service with particular emphasis the independent and courageous spirits who are willing to leave the household of a betrayed faith, who are asking for substance, not shadows, who are seeking for truth, not names for truth.

"In speaking for the common * * * men and women I have, I believe, avoided the delusion that this is a campaign of persons or of personalities. To indulge in such a fantastic idea of my own individual importance would be to betray the common hope and the common cause that have brought us all together this year. A great man left us a watchword which we can well repeat: 'There is no indispensable man.'"

And when Mr. Roosevelt wound up his 1932 campaign at Madison Square Garden, we find him making this studied declaration:

"The genius of America is stronger than any candidate or any party. This campaign, hard as it has been, has not shattered my sense of humor or my sense of proportion. I still know that the fate of America cannot depend on any one man. The greatness of America is grounded on principles and not on any single personality. I, for one, shall remember that, even as President."

If what Mr. Roosevelt said about the "indispensable man" was sound in 1932—and we believe it was—it is sound now. It should be a cardinal principle of democracy that no man is indispensable in any public office.

Should the time ever come when public men become indispensable, then America no longer will be a democracy. It will be as totalitarian as any continental European state.

Money and Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELMER THOMAS

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 8 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

ARTICLE BY ROBERT M. HARRISS

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an interesting signed article appearing recently in the New York Journal of Commerce and Commercial. The article was prepared by Robert M. Harriss and discusses the relationship of money to agriculture and agricultural interests.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Journal of Commerce and Commercial of July 31, 1940]

CONSTRUCTIVE MONETARY MOVE HELD NEEDED BY AGRICULTURE—HARRISS DECLARES DEBT AND TAX STRUCTURE STIFLES RECOVERY IN COTTON, FARMING, AND BUSINESS GENERALLY—SUGGESTS THREE-POINT PROGRAM IN THIS DIRECTION

(By Robert M. Harriss)

In August 1933 I stated in an article written for the Journal of Commerce that there could be no sound recovery in agriculture, commerce, and industry without a constructive monetary program to give our people relief from the then crushing debts and excessive taxes.

During these past 7 years we have failed to adopt such a program and basically conditions have grown worse. Instead we adopted a program of Government borrowing, spending, regimentation, and planned economy. Not in a single year has it been possible to balance the Budget, but on the other hand the Federal debt has more than doubled. Taxes have become so excessive that they now absorb approximately 30 percent of an already impaired national income. Such taxes naturally curtail purchasing power and destroy incentive for capital and business to go forward.

Today I believe it is apparent that sound recovery in the great cotton industry and national recovery are impossible, and basically conditions will continue to grow worse until we adopt a threefold program along the following lines:

THREE-POINT PROGRAM

1. Restore to Congress the greatest economic privilege of all—the right to coin and regulate the value of money—where it belongs, according to the Constitution. This is to be followed by sound monetary program, free of either private or political control, with an expansion of the currency instead of bonds against the more than $20,000,000,000 of sterile or hoarded gold, until the commodity and general price level is restored to where the people can pay their interest, debts, and taxes, and realty mortgages become sound.

At existing price levels it is impossible for the people to pay interest, debts, and taxes. The lower the price level the more difficult and impossible it is to pay the interest, debts, and taxes, and the higher the price level the easier or more possible it is to pay them. Therefore, until the price level is restored, it will be impossible to have national solvency and balance the Budget.

The sterilizing or hoarding of more than $20,000,000,000 of gold, approximately 80 percent of the world's gold, has a deflationary effect not only on our country but the world. The sterilization of this gold has been a large contributing factor in the break-down of world economy and has driven nations to the barter system.

2. There must be a prompt lowering and revision of taxes, including lowering of tariff barriers, with the repeal of certain punitive and uneconomic taxes. However, this will not be practical without a constructive monetary policy to restore the general price level.

3. Businesslike and practical economy in government.

A representative constitutional government cannot support and regiment the people. This can only go with dictatorship or totalitarian states. A constitutional government can only be expected to make fair and equitable laws and enforce them. Therefore, our form of government cannot long endure if the citizens look to the Government to support and take care of them. If our constitutional Government is to endure, the citizens must instead support and take care of their Government.

We have the choice of two roads ahead. One is the road we are traveling—the road of Government borrowing, spending, crop reduction, regimentation, interference and competition with agriculture, industry, labor, business, banking, increasing Government

debts, and uneconomic and destructive taxes. The end of this road will lead to inflation, repudiation, and disaster.

The other road is the constitutional road. It will require courage and fortitude to take the constitutional road, because we must have the strength of mind and justice to face and equitably adjust the debt, tax, or money question and adopt a sound constructive economic and financial program. Further delay may mean the loss to us and our children of that wonderful God-given form of constitutional government we inherited from the founding fathers. Therefore, before it is too late, let us unite in this most serious crisis and demand that Congress take the right road—the constitutional road.

Hon. James A. Farley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 8 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

NEWSPAPER CLIPPINGS

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, my colleague, Senator CARTER GLASS is unavoidably absent from the Senate. I am requested by him to ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD certain newspaper clippings making reference to the Postmaster General of the United States, the Honorable James A. Farley.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD such newspaper clippings.

There being no objection, the clippings were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Chicago Tribune of July 18, 1940]

FARLEY RETIRES, FAITHFUL TO THE END TO HIS PARTY—DREAM COME TRUE TOPS CAREER OF SERVICE

(By Walter Trohan)

James Aloysius Farley made his exit from the American political stage last night in a dramatic exhibition of party loyalty, for which his name has become synonymous.

After his name was placed in nomination by his political father, CARTER GLASS, the senior Senator of Virginia, and the convention gave him 72.9 votes, Farley stepped before the convention to move that the nomination of Franklin D. Roosevelt, the man he twice elected to the Presidency, be nominated for a third term.

In the greatest moment of 28 years of political life, Farley received a thunderous ovation from the convention when he was announced at the end of the balloting.

READS HIS SWAN SONG

Grinning broadly, he motioned the delegates to take their seats and began reading a statement which he prepared as State after State piled up the vote which shattered American political precedent against a third term.

He began by stating that the convention twice had given him the highest honor in its gift—the chairmanship of the Democratic Party—and he was now appearing before that body to ask a courtesy.

"I have pursued a course that has been dictated by the deepest conviction, and when a man fails to follow his convictions he is false to himself, false to his party, and false to his country," he solemnly declared.

"I wanted this convention to proceed as a democratic body should proceed to nominate its standard bearers in keeping with the highest traditions of the Democratic Party. That is the democratic method and that has been observed.

PAYS TRIBUTE TO GLASS

"My name was placed in nomination by a great and noble American. As long as I live I shall be grateful to Senator CARTER GLASS, of Virginia.

"I am grateful to those delegates of this great convention who voted for me and those who would have done so had they not otherwise been pledged.

"Down through the years I have always been giving my best efforts to the Democratic Party. I want this convention to know I will continue to give that same effort to my party.

"Therefore I move suspension of the rules to declare President Franklin Delano Roosevelt nominated by acclamation."

DELEGATES CHEER HIM

This example of party devotion, which climaxed the realization of a dream of 28 years—to have his name submitted for the Presidency—and a firm conviction against the breaking of the third-term tradition, provoked a demonstration from the convention.

Officers of the convention wrung Farley's hand. In tribute to the leader who was making his exit from the American political scene, a tenor sang When Irish Eyes Are Smiling, the theme song of the Farley Presidential boomers.

Farley turned away from the speaker's stand and made his way to his chair the biggest man of the convention equal to the biggest moment of his life. He fought his fight against the third term, and when his party turned him down he bowed to the will of his party and in a magnificent gesture moved to make the third term the unanimous sentiment of the convention.

CHERISHED PRESIDENTIAL HOPE

From the day he entered political life as clerk of his Republican home town at Stony Point, N. Y., Farley had cherished the hope that he might some day be considered Presidential timber.

At the moment he realized that ambition he well knew that he had no hope of securing his party's nomination, but his cup of joy was none the less full, for he had achieved what he considered a fitting climax to his political career.

And he had carried his objective over the combined opposition of both President Roosevelt and a man whom he had saved from a New Deal purge, Mayor Edward J. Kelly, of Chicago.

In 1932 Farley's green-ink letters and drummer canvass of the county won the nomination for Mr. Roosevelt. In 1936 Farley's political salesmanship brought his chief the greatest endorsement the Nation has given a Presidential candidate in more than a century.

RECALL AID TO KELLY

Three years ago Farley persuaded his chief not to heed the advice of Secretary of the Interior Harold L. Ickes, a Republican turned new dealer, who urged the President to purge Kelly as the administration had disowned Tammany Hall, in New York City. Last night the man Farley saved was whooping it up for the third term, which Farley could not stomach.

But the few moments of triumph when he was put in nomination last night repaid Farley for the many heartaches ingratitude has brought him since 1936. There was a song in his heart.

"I am truly grateful," he said. "It is the greatest moment of my life. I consider it a high honor to have my name presented, and particularly by such a distinguished American as my old friend CARTER GLASS. It's great to be an American."

TOMORROW: HIS FINALE

Farley will complete his exit from the political stage tomorrow when the Democratic National Committee names his successor. He will retain his post as New York State Democratic chairman just to keep a hand in at the political table rather than to play the game.

The Postmaster General and party chieftain was born at Grassy Point, N. Y., May 30, 1888, of Irish parents. His father died as a result of an accident when Jim, as he is know to hundreds of thousands of Americans, was a youngster.

In his early teens financial circumstances forced his mother to permit him to tend bar in the combination grocery and saloon she operated to keep her family together. Before she would permit him to serve Rockland County neighbors she made him promise that he would not drink or smoke.

TAPERS OFF ON GUM

At the age of 52 he has never tasted alcohol nor tobacco. In the last year he has striven to give up the chewing-gum habit, which displeases his wife.

In 1920 he married Miss Elizabeth A. Finnegan, who has been admiring his convention performance from a box in the stadium. She is also a Hudson Valley native and of Irish descent. They have three children—two girls, Elizabeth and Ann, who have been on the platform with their father, and one son, James A., Jr., the baby of the family, who is at a summer camp.

As a tall, rangy youngster Jim played first base on the town ball team. This brought the early popularity which led county political leaders to place him on the ticket for town clerk of Stony Point in 1912. He held the office until 1919.

In the meantime he entered the cement business as a salesman, and he will tell you he was the world's best cement salesman when he quit in 1933 to enter the Roosevelt Cabinet after managing the Democratic campaign as party chairman.

In the years between Stony Point and Washington Farley served in the New York Legislature, held the political sinecure of port warden in New York, and was chairman of the New York State Athletic Commission under Gov. Alfred E. Smith.

He and Franklin D. Roosevelt had met only once before the latter became Governor of New York and was recognized as a Presidential possibility. Once acquaintance was made, it flourished, and Farley worked untiringly to make Roosevelt the leading contender for the nomination at Chicago in 1932. He inspired the deal with Texas and California which made that nomination a reality.

Farley has a tremendous capacity for work. He maintains a huge correspondence, spends hours on the phone, and finds time to see all callers while working at a schedule which would break down most men.

In 1936 Farley rolled up his shirt sleeves and by his personal drive he carried 46 of the 48 States for Roosevelt. For this unparalleled campaigning he received public thanks from his Chief on election night, 1936.

FORGOTTEN BY HIS BOSS

After election night Mr. Roosevelt forgot the man who had made him President and who is acknowledged to be the political master of the day. Farley was not consulted in the fight to pack the Supreme Court, because he was known to be out of sympathy with it. Consequently he was not called on to direct the purge of the Senators who defeated that plan.

Jim advised his chief to forget that lost battle and seek to reestablish party harmony. Mr. Roosevelt ignored that advice and put the political campaign in the hands of Secretary of Commerce Harry Hopkins, a social worker, and Thomas G. Corcoran and Ben Cohen, White House lobbyists.

When this strategy board lost the purge campaign in every State Mr. Roosevelt secretly blamed Farley for its failure, although Farley had told him it had no chance of success.

A BREAK DEVELOPS

From this coolness developed a break, although neither Roosevelt nor Farley would acknowledge it when Farley showed himself indisposed to lead the Roosevelt drive for a third term.

Farley went about the country "selling stamps," as he put it, but the White House was confident he was selling himself for the Presidential nomination. The White House, however, could not openly break with Farley because he did nothing but praise the New Deal and its chief in his addresses.

Never in those days did the President give Farley any hint of his third-term plans and never did Farley ask for them.

Not until the day before Farley left for Chicago to direct convention preliminaries did Mr. Roosevelt confide his secret to Farley's ears. In the President's boyhood home at Hyde Park, N. Y., Farley learned that Mr. Roosevelt would make no move to secure the nomination but would accept a draft.

After Farley came to Chicago he learned that Mr. Roosevelt had set up a strategy board consisting of Hopkins, Senator James F. Byrnes (Democrat, South Carolina), and Frank Walker, who financed the 1932 preconvention campaign, to conduct the draft movement. Farley found the President did not regard this as lifting his hand for the nomination.

With outward urbanity but inward irritation, Farley watched this group put the heat on his friends among the delegates, and in particular on the Massachusetts delegation, which was pledged to him.

He made no attempts at retaliation. In his frequent contacts with the press he preserved his high good humor, and even in his contacts with the opposition groups he showed no rancor.

WORKS AGAINST STAMPEDE

He bent his efforts toward heading off a stampede for Roosevelt which would prevent his own name from being offered, a distinction which the administration begrudged him.

Farley balked a New Deal plan to persuade GLASS not to nominate him. He balked new efforts to halt all nominations and allow no name but Roosevelt's to be voted upon.

And when the triumph of having his name put in nomination last night was his, Farley did not gloat. Nor does he intend to "take a walk" in the campaign, although he will no longer be chairman.

He will show his successor the ropes and make speeches for the Democratic ticket.

[From the Bangor Daily News of July 19, 1940]

SMILING JIM

A lot of people, in and out of the Democratic Party, are wishing today that James Aloysius Farley could have become the No. 1 man on the Democratic ticket as he surely became the No. 1 man in the affections of all who have watched him play his saga of friendship and loyalty to the bitter end at Chicago this week.

There is no President maker in our history quite like this American Warwick. The legend of Mark Hanna is kept alive by his daughter, who wields some of his wizardry today, but whoever seriously thought of him as anything more than the cleverest politician of his time? Who, including himself, ever mentioned him for the Presidency to which he had unerringly guided his fellow Ohioan, William McKinley?

Yet Farley was the outstanding independent candidate—in itself that word "independent" for the two-term chairman of the Democratic National Committee speaks volubly—before the convention, other than the President himself. Farley had the largest votes next to the President, a very poor second, indeed, but in the hands of anyone less scrupulous a very substantial spring board from which to go to the top.

All our trained observers at the convention are unanimous in their belief, that the convention was ready for anything due to the bungling of the third-term zealots. The inference is pretty plain that if Farley were wholly free in his own conscience to make the kind of fight for himself that he made for the President in 1932, there would have been no question but what he could have had the nomination. It took manhood of an extraordinary character for him to keep his hands tied while he could have had his life's ambition simply by reaching out for it. We could all feel safe with such a man at the helm.

CHIEF VICTIM

Jim Farley isn't coming out of this convention with anything special except some more experience—unless you count the increased respect and admiration which a lot of people have conceived for him since the party clans started rallying.

Farley has been the chief victim of the adroit game by which President Roosevelt killed off all rival candidacies for the nomination. Farley had ambitions of his own—but instead of getting a run for his money, he had to go out to Chicago and take charge of the ceremonies at which the ashes of his ambitions were quietly laid to rest. And it never knocked the smile off his face.

Not once during all the conferences, meetings, and public appearances which kept him busy before and during the convention, did Farley, by word or action, betray resentment at the way his chief had used him. He wasn't happy—you didn't need to know him very well to see that—but he didn't whimper, he didn't sulk, and he stayed loyal.

DISTORTED PICTURE

All of which is really worth noticing, because the general public has somehow got a distorted picture of Jim Farley, and it ought to be corrected.

Farley is supposed to be just a politician, with the accent on the word just. He happens to be a lot more than that, and that he never got credit for it is pretty much the fault of the inner circle new dealers. All through the Roosevelt administration, whenever principles had to be compromised for political expediency, Farley was the whipping boy—the guy they blamed it on. He always took the rap—and down the years he took quite a few bum ones.

As a matter of fact, for principles, honesty and general all-round decency Farley will stand comparison with anyone in the Cabinet. And as for his awareness of social and economic problems, and his ability to approach them intelligently—well, on the eve of the convention one of the most prominent and nonpolitical of the New Deal's economic general staff confided that he would be perfectly content to see Jim Farley in the White House.

DEMOCRATIC PROCESS

Farley's uncomfortable situation at the opening of the convention was aggravated by the clumsiness with which the new dealers played their hand. Farley knew that a huge majority of delegates were ready to vote a third-term nomination, and he wasn't prepared to buck; all he asked was that things take their regular order, with the names of other candidates (himself included) being put before the convention to get such votes as might be available. Yet the new dealers continued to work for a nomination by acclamation, despite the plain warnings that that would mean a fight.

To cap it all, the new dealers reversed their field abruptly on the matter of naming a national chairman. At first they had done everything in their power to get Farley out; then, about the time the convention opened, they began to realize that they needed him, and—having got him to the point where he wanted to resign—they did all they could to get him to stay.

It all added up to a bad situation for the party and for Farley personally. It would have been a great deal worse, especially for the party, if Farley hadn't been able to meet it with a good deal of real sportsmanship. No whit of his deep hurt was in his words or voice as he stepped to the microphone and testified to his abiding faith in the Democratic process. It was his desire to see it work out in orderly fashion which compelled him to let his name go before the delegates. With the vote all in he acknowledged defeat, pledged his support to the winner, and called for the nomination of the President by acclamation.

Jim Farley will go down in American political history as the man who wouldn't snatch the crown from a friend who had all but disowned him.

[From the Aberdeen (S. Dak) News of July 23, 1940]

JIM FARLEY'S POPULARITY

There is much more sincere regret among the rank and file Democrats of the country because Jim Farley, Postmaster General and national chairman, is resigning from his position as leader of the party than there would have been if President Roosevelt had decided he would not stand for reelection.

Jim Farley, by his nature, has always been closer to the people and even though he had to be content to step aside for other presidential counselors after he had accomplished the task of electing his friend to the highest office in the Nation he retained the confidence, admiration, respect, and love of the hundreds of thousands who knew him either personally or through his frequent public appearances and utterances.

Few American statesmen have ever been paid greater tribute even in eloquent obituary addresses than was paid Jim Farley in the Presidential nominating address delivered before the convention by the distinguished Senator CARTER GLASS. And few men in history, regardless of the nature of their service to humanity, have lived to read as many and as laudatory comments about themselves as have appeared during the past week about Jim Farley in thousands of editorials in newspapers of all political preferences.

The respect for Jim Farley's ability, fairness, honesty, and loyalty to his friends knows no political party boundaries.

Those who have had dealings with him know there is no secret to his popularity.

Any one of them would declare immediately if asked about his power for obtaining the highest cooperation: "He is such a square-shooter; such a regular fellow; and he never goes back on his word."

Aside from the help of those splendid qualities, he relied upon a love for his work to become the master political leader of his time.

In announcing plans to retire from public life and establish his personal fortune, he said: "I have remained in public life at great financial sacrifices because I love politics."

The same qualities that made him the "miracle man" of 1932 and 1936 will assure success in his new business interests—success that may permit him some day to return to politics.

[From the Batavia (N. Y.) Times of July 25, 1940]

DEMOCRATIC PARTY LOSES SERVICES OF ONE OF THE GREATEST NATIONAL CHAIRMAN THEY HAVE EVER HAD

With James A. Farley, Democratic national chairman and Postmaster General, passing out of the national political picture, it must be admitted that the Democratic Party has suffered a severe loss, but the Democrats are thankful that they can still retain the leadership of "Smiling Jim" in Democratic State affairs. He remains as the chairman of the Democratic State committee.

It was Mr. Farley whom President Roosevelt selected as State chairman when he ran for Governor of the State of New York the first time. Then, later, when he was elevated to the candidacy for the highest honor in the Nation, he again chose Mr. Farley as national chairman, and it was Mr. Farley who guided both of the President's last two campaigns to victory. What the loss of his services will mean in the coming campaign, of course, remains to be seen, but Democrats admit that the loss of his services as national chairman is a blow to the workers within the ranks who have come to know Jim so well.

He has been one of the greatest systematic organizers that ever entered politics, and the Republican Party has often wished that they had a man like him, so capable and competent. His successor will be chosen by a committee selected by a committee of five, who will recommend to President Roosevelt, who will then pick his successor on August 1.

It is known to all that Mr. Farley was opposed to a third term. The final meeting of the national committee was held in Chicago, when Mr. Farley tendered his resignation. The session was packed with emotion when the departing Jim bade farewell to his loyal captains. As he himself expressed it, he looked into a sea of faces when he was saying good-bye. He said he accepted the action of the convention and pledged his support to the national ticket.

All predict among his thousands of friends that he will go down in history as a great statesman in national political affairs. He remained true blue to the end to his superior, the President. Whatever his thoughts are, they are kept to himself, as he betrayed no confidences, but his many friends know that he had been on the outs with the President for some little time. We still say that if Mr. Farley had wanted to go out among the delegates in that convention to put pressure on them, he would have received a greater vote and perhaps might have been successful as a candidate. He knew, however, that many were pledged, and he was too big a man to ask them to break that pledge. He said he had a conviction and carried it through. Then he stepped down.

Whatever his future may be, he carries with him the wishes of thousands of friends for success in whatever undertaking he may assume, and still remains as one of the most popular men that ever entered Democratic politics.

[From the Daily Kennebec (Maine) Journal of July 22, 1940]

FARLEY QUITS

James A. Farley announces that after August 17 he will retire to private life, resigning both his Cabinet job of Postmaster General and chairmanship of the National Democratic Committee to which he was reelected unanimously at Chicago. Thus will come the final parting of the ways of the President and the man most responsible for his political career. Such a break has been common enough in political history, but this one may be more shattering than any of the others since Farley has been so much more of a partner than subordinate of the President and as such has enjoyed such complete confidence of his party. Without the genial Jim the political scene at Washington will never be quite the same for Democrats again.

Farley suffered the fate of all who interfered with the "draft" of the President for a third term. When he refused to go along in that he was pushed aside as ruthlessly as any potential candidate of any strength and became only a figurehead chairman. Management of the convention at Chicago was taken out of his hands by the "drafters" as was obvious in the results. What little Farley did assert himself prevented a rout becoming a party disaster. He would not permit his beloved old party to be entirely destroyed by the amateurs, although he could not prevent it being grievously hurt.

Now, all the Democrats can expect from Farley is his straight vote which they have always had. With a mess on their hands that baffles them, they hated to see him go and would have kept him if they could but that was more than even the genial temperament and loyalty of Farley could stand. Having been permitted no voice in shaping the campaign, he did not intend to run it as it had been started.

Loyal as he has always been to his party, Farley proves even more loyal to his country. Opposed to a third term for any President as a dangerous weakening of our democracy, he did all he could to persuade the President against it and when he failed stuck to his conviction and let the President go along without him. Farley probably knows how this country thinks politically as well as any man ever did and can judge all reactions accurately. When he opposed a third term he was representing far more than his own sentiments, as his successor may learn to his sorrow. For this he may have a bright spot in American history.

[From the Great Falls (Mont.) Tribune of July 26, 1940]

FARLEY IS LOYAL TO THE PARTY TICKET

It was a matter of sincere regret when the Democratic National Committee organized at the close of the party convention in Chicago that James A. Farley could not accept unanimous approval and continue as the chief executive of this important party organization.

Mr. Farley has rendered 8 years of remarkably effective service. There is realization that it will be difficult to find another party leader who can guide the committee through a national campaign with equal ability and effectiveness. When Mr. Farley assumed this leadership, the Democratic National Committee was carrying an indebtedness of a large sum of money. That was all cleared away. There was a substantial amount in the treasury at the close of this recent Chicago convention.

There was no more genuine approval expressed at Chicago than that accorded his leadership. Committee resolutions from the whole country, and from the Western States in particular, were presented in highest praise for remarkable work through an 8-year period.

From news reports over the country there has been considerable erroneous comment as to the attitude of Mr. Farley.

A number of Republican papers have endeavored to persuade their readers that Mr. Farley will be less loyal to the Democratic Party than he has been heretofore. This prejudiced comment cannot long survive. His own statement issued at Chicago at the time the national committee was organized puts aside any impression of this sort. The text of his statement is as follows:

"Eight years ago in this city I was elected chairman of the Democratic National Committee. In the intervening years I have had the happiest associations with Democrats all over the country and my debt to the party can never be repaid.

"I have remained in public life at great financial sacrifice because I love politics. I have an opportunity now to accept an attractive offer in business and in justice to my family, because of my financial situation, I am going to accept.

"Before leaving, I shall cooperate to the fullest extent with my successor as national chairman in setting up the machinery for the coming campaign. I have said repeatedly that the American people want the Democratic Party to remain in power. My opinion has not changed, and again I pledge my full support to the Roosevelt-Wallace ticket."

The statement of Mr. Farley is the best evidence of what he intends to do. Anyone who had the privilege of talking to him at Chicago will not have the slightest doubt about what he will be doing in the approaching campaign.

[From the Akron (Ohio) Beacon-Journal of July 22, 1940]

CAN THEY DO WITHOUT JIM?

During the latter days of the speak-easy era Jimmy Durante, of the headlight nose and the buzz-saw voice, used to rasp his way through a tin-pan alley chanson immodestly called I Kin Do Wid-out Broadway, But Kin Broadway Do Wid-out Me?

A parody is in order to commemorate the resignation of Jim Farley as Democratic national chairman. Farley can do without the New Deal, but can the New Deal do without Farley? It is a question Democrats will not fail to place high up on the list along with other such vital matters as: "How deep is anti-third-term sentiment?" "Can the spirit of '32 and '36 be recaptured?" and "How strong is Willkie?"

The pushing around Big Jim received at Chicago has been adequately reported. Not even the tributes paid the big, bald chairman by the President and by Mrs. Roosevelt—both of which sounded more like belated afterthoughts than like heartfelt expressions—could wipe out the impression left in delegates' minds that Farley was being eased out none too gently. The question also remains as to how much of the New Deal's genius for putting electoral votes "in the bag" departs with Farley.

Not even Farley can tell. The answer is wrapped up in Big Jim's astounding memory for names, his unfailing bonhomie with party little wigs in nearly every metropolis and bulge in the road in 48 States, his green-ink signature on thousands of "personal" letters. Not until after November will the loss of Farley be capable of measurement. The only certainty is that it will not be small.

[From the Batavia (N. Y.) Times of July 25, 1940]

FARLEY'S RESIGNATION TAKES GREAT FIGURE FROM POLITICS—TIMES EDITOR TRACES CAREER OF POSTMASTER GENERAL IN THIS STATE—FRIENDLY TOWARD ALL—DELEGATE PREDICTS RETURN OF FARLEY TO THE NATIONAL SCENE IN FUTURE

(The following intimate account of the career of James A. Farley, who is retiring as Democratic national chairman, was written by Albert F. Kleps, a long-time friend and delegate to the recent Democratic National Convention in Chicago. Mr. Kleps is editor of the Times.)

James A. Farley, who has become so well and widely known throughout the Nation, on August 17 will be giving up the reins of national chairman of the Democratic Party. All Democratic workers who have come in contact with this great national figure and who have come to know him intimately seem sad today over the thought that they will not have him as their leader, adviser, and friend in the campaign ahead. However, they are still very grateful to know he will remain as chairman of the Democratic State committee.

The writer first became acquainted with Mr. Farley in a fraternal way. It will be recalled the Postmaster General took a prominent part in the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks. He became president of the State association at the time the writer was exalted ruler of the Batavia Lodge. I never knew or asked about Jim Farley's politics. Neither did he ask me as we became stanch friends. At once I was able to observe that he was a man who was very thorough in any work he undertook and that he had a way of doing things that spelled success in his undertakings. This quality made him a great leader in fraternal work.

I met him again after being elected a Democratic State committeeman in Genesee County. I will recall the first State convention I attended when Mr. Farley was secretary of the Democratic State Committee. It was the first time that either of us knew the other's politics. We then worked together until President Roosevelt ran for Governor of New York State the first time.

At the convention in Syracuse Mr. Roosevelt was named. The first thing he did was to select Mr. Farley as State chairman to guide his campaign, which turned out to be another of Mr. Farley's outstanding successes. Before he left Syracuse he asked me if I would not further assist him up-State and take on the chairmanship of Genesee County. I accepted, and from that day on I have had the real pleasure to work with Jim and to learn all about him. He is one of the greatest leaders I have ever known and a man among men always.

While it has been pretty hard sledding in Genesee County to change votes, still we have made inroads, politically speaking, and one that wants to work for the cause of Democracy could not help but have the feeling that he was working for a great leader, an honest man whose word could always be relied upon. I can say he never made a promise he did not keep and when he became a greater man and entered national politics he never forgot those who had worked with him before. He always knew everyone he met, no matter if it was long afterward. This was borne out at the national convention just closed in Chicago. He invited the writer to attend his press conferences, held each morning, where prominent newspapermen representing some of the largest publications throughout the United States gathered. I got a great kick out of attending these sessions and listening to the questions tossed at him. He had an answer for every one and it was given in a courteous way no matter how silly the question might sound.

They all gathered about and stood around while Mr. Farley was seated at a desk. Once while he was answering their questions he happened to look my way and said, "Good morning, Al. I am sorry I did not see you when I came in the room." That is the way he knows people.

One of the foolish questions asked by a reporter was "about that Massachusetts 14 to 15 vote." "What do you think about that fellow?" the reporter asked, and as quick as lightning Farley pointed his finger and said, "I am going to write that fellow a letter and thank him."

One reporter asked him if he would like to know who the 25 delegates were that voted for him in the New York delegation, and he replied:

"I do not want to know. I never want to know because I know they were my friends just the same. You might be interested to know, gentlemen, that many of the delegates who could not vote for me came to my room yesterday afternoon with tears in their eyes. They were honest men and they told me why they could not vote for me. I appreciated that even more than if they had been able to vote for me."

If time and space would permit, I could go on and enumerate any number of things like that, that were of real human interest, all of which would go to show and bear out the greatness of Farley.

It was known that the New York State delegation was divided and I understand that it was Farley's idea to call the New York State delegation together prior to the evening sessions, while there was a chance of polling the delegates. We were called at 5 o'clock and no one but accredited delegates was allowed to enter the room. Gov. Herbert H. Lehman presided at the session, stating that he wanted to handle the New York State votes so that none of the delegates would be embarrassed. Later a committee of 10 was appointed to canvass the delegation before the evening session to make their choice known and this plan was followed. When the New York delegation was called, Governor Lehman, the floor leader, announced 25 votes for Mr. Farley, 64 votes for President Roosevelt, and several others which were scattered. Immediately the slip of paper on which they were written was destroyed.

This further shows the greatness of Jim Farley. He knew that many of these delegates might be holding some political position or might be seeking something from the administration and he would not have them embarrassed.

When I first became county chairman and would go to New York, I would find in Mr. Farley's office a complete file of Genesee County, with the name of every Democratic committeeman and of every Democratic election inspector. The names of the candidates that were running and the town tickets in Genesee County were also included in the file.

Following an election in any town, a letter would arrive from Mr. Farley, asking if any Democrats were elected. If any were, he requested their names and they would receive a personal letter from him congratulating them on the run they made. If they lost, they would receive a letter thanking them for the effort they put forth, with a wish that the next time they might be successful.

Now, this is the system Mr. Farley practiced, and he was able to keep his finger on the button at all times. There was nothing so small that he would not take notice, and it was this plan he followed in organizing his workers. He carried this system into national politics, and no doubt a great measure of the success he attained as a great leader came through his keeping in close touch with every individual.

When the writer was elected county chairman Mr. Farley put himself out to come from New York to Batavia to lend his presence at a big dinner meeting, which was attended by over 300. When in 1934 the Democrats tendered me such a rousing birthday party at St. Anthony's Community Center, with about 800 people present, Mr. Farley was unable to come himself and he sent Vincent Dailey, his confidential aide, all the way from New York to be present at the event.

I have mentioned a few of my personal reminiscences of a man who has been one of the truest friends I have ever had, and, though I may be what you might call "small fry" in politics, I was never forgotten. When success came to the Democratic Party I was never forgotten in requests that I made for appointments of some of our Democratic people. In fact, today there are 8 or 10 people working in various departments in Washington, where I have asked for a favor and the appointment was granted.

I have on my desk a copy of Mr. Farley's book, Behind the Ballots, and I prize it greatly. It is personally inscribed with his famous green-ink pen, as follows:

"To Albert F. Kleps, Sr., with every good wish to Al Kleps, one of the best friends I have ever known—a real fellow.

"(Signed) JAMES A. FARLEY."

It is needless to say that I will always retain it and prize it.

I do not mean from what I have written here that this is a swan song for Jim Farley, because I still glory in the thought that he will remain as the head of New York State Democratic politics and that another day may come when Jim will return to the front in national affairs.

[From the Baton Rouge (La.) Advocate of July 23, 1940]

MR. FARLEY STEPS DOWN

Mr. Farley steps down as chairman of the Democratic National Committee and makes his bow out of public life at a moment when his action is beheld with sincere regret by many members of his party and when his particular powers will be poignantly missed in the Democratic fold. His unique talents enhanced two highly satisfactory campaigns for Mr. Roosevelt, and his peculiar knowledge of the technique of conducting a political tour de force may be sorely missed before the coming race is over.

Loyal to the last, Mr. Farley ended his political career with a full and fond endorsement of his friends, Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Wallace. But something makes us wonder whether or not the course of events in Chicago was just a little too much for him. The course of the New Deal third-term bandwagon must have left Mr. Farley and his powers of political persuasion feeling just a bit out of things and alone. Mr. Farley's democracy is equal to a good stiff fight, but Chicago left it standing around without anything to fight for. The streamlined success of the New Deal's bright young men in engineering a third-term acclamation must have made Mr. Farley feel that his old-school Democratic tactics belonged to a different era. Those administration "insiders" who had Mr. Roosevelt nominated before anyone knew whether he would run again or not did not even bother about Mr. Farley's preconvention knowledge of the "third-term riddle," which proved to be no riddle at all.

These things and others, unless we are mistaken, must have left Jim Farley amazed, even though he had the drift of things long before the convention met. Probably there is a party element which is happy to have Mr. Farley out of the way, and perhaps it is that same element which set in motion the mechanics of the third-term nomination. On the other hand, there are those who would be pleased by more Farleys and fewer bright young new dealers on the Democratic bandwagon.

[From the Baton Rouge (La.) State Times of July 16, 1940]

FAITHFUL FRIEND

Whatever the outcome of the Democratic convention, it will be conceded that Jim Farley has been a good friend to Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Also, he has proven himself a loyal party leader. Whether he continues as chairman, his past service has been generously given, and perhaps few men could have carried the party burden so capably, and with such unfailing good humor.

His role has not been easy. Behind his friendly countenance and his affable manner, he has perhaps puzzled over many a situation not relating to his own Post Office Department. He has cheerfully shouldered blame, or disposed of criticism with a smile. One of his hardest jobs, perhaps, has been to close rifts within the ranks; and if he has not always succeeded, he has at least mitigated the stings in party friction as best he could.

Jim Farley's friendship with Mr. Roosevelt dates back over 20 years, and he has been unwavering in his loyalty to "the boss."

His own aspirations have been well known, of course. Regardless of any third-term issue, it is a matter of conjecture as to whether he might have been a serious contender for the nomination. But at least he, as others, has awaited word from the White House, though later he permitted his name to go before the Massachusetts voters.

In Chicago prior to the convention's opening, he carried the secret of Mr. Roosevelt's plans. If he was in no great hurry to withdraw his own name, that was his own affair, and could signify no lapse of loyalty. In fact, he gave glowing praise to the Roosevelt administration. But he insisted that convention procedure be as usual, and that nominating proceed regularly.

A quick thinker, Mr. Farley showed himself a match in those preconvention hours for turning aside the thousand and one questions put to him by reporters. His sense of humor came to his aid when one finally asked him, "Do you know what is happening?" and he gave a big laugh as he replied, "Sometimes."

Whether Mr. Farley continues in the political picture, or turns to the management of a major league baseball team, it will be conceded that he has been an energetic and faithful chairman for the Democratic Party. His loyal support has been of great help to Mr. Roosevelt. Should the latter be nominated, he would miss the help of the genial Jim, if Mr. Farley decides to resign the chairmanship.

[From the Battle Creek (Mich.) Enquirer and News of July 21, 1940]

"A Good Name Is Rather * * *"

Mr. James Farley quits active politics for baseball. It is an historical fact, plainly writ in the records, that Mr. Farley has been a very active part of active politics. There are many gentlemen now dwelling on the melancholy side of politics who wish he hadn't been so active.

His separation from politics to go into business for himself in the management of the New York Yankees ball club, has been subject of much discussion. It has produced a great deal of sympathetic comment. There has been a considerable feeling that Mr. Farley has been victimized by ingratitude.

However this may be, decision upon it, and equally the doing of anything about it if it requires that anything be done—may be left to those whose concern and business it more directly is. The rest of us can take a less emotional look at the matter.

And that look reveals that Mr. Farley takes with him something that is pretty fine for a man to have, whatever business he engages in.

That is a good name—a reputation for squareness, reliability, sportsmanship and moral uprightness and sincerity which no one questions, not even his political opponents.

There is a very large element of opinion which—some of it devoutly wishing that Mr. Farley had quit politics long ago or else had been less keen at it than he was—joins in the salutation and admonition which Riley's Hoosier farmer gave to the son: "Goodbye, Jim; take keer of yourself."

[From the Binghamton (N. Y.) Press of July 11, 1940]

In neighboring Owego there once lived a wise, experienced and altogether able and honorable gentleman of the old school named Thomas Platt. Over the years he developed a political philosophy, fragments of which have long been recognized as particularly pertinent to American affairs.

Tom Platt thought, among other things, that nothing could be worse than political ingratitude. In it he discerned the seeds of dissolution and decay of political systems. Not that he, or anyone with sense, would expect the public to be grateful to public servants. When he spoke of political ingratitude he was particularly concerned with the relationships between parties and members of parties—between individuals and individuals; between organizations and members of organizations.

All that Tom Platt, as a Republican, used to say on that subject must have some striking force in the reflections of James Aloysius Farley, Democrat, undoubtedly the greatest political organizer of our times, as he contemplates the approaching Democratic Convention at Chicago.

Those who fought the fight with him in 1932 when the Democratic Party was wrested from the Raskob-Shouse-Smith control that had taken it over in the 1928 campaign, are reported by early-bird correspondents present on the convention scene as "glum and sour."

They remember who it was that went out to the country in 1931 and lined up a lasting bloc of Roosevelt delegates under the very noses of the "stop Roosevelt" leaders. They remember who it was that drew the water and carried the wood in the preconvention campaign and in the long days and nights at Chicago before Jim Farley finally swung the deal that took over the Garner delegations from California and Texas to clinch the Roosevelt nomination.

They remember, too, who it was that revivified the rusted Democratic national organization for the victorious campaign which followed; they know who it was that knew the score every minute in that campaign.

And they haven't forgotten who it was that served as whipping boy for the Roosevelt administration when the fallacies of the New Deal became apparent to the American press, until the uncomplaining good sportsmanship of Jim Farley made the critics of the New Deal think twice and then put the whip down where it belonged—on other shoulders.

None knows better than some of those veterans do how desperately in the past few years Jim Farley has tried to maintain the integrity of the conservative Democratic Party against borings from within by new dealers who know nothing and care nothing of the sound political work that had to be done to make New Deal pay rolls possible.

And none knows better than these do how patient and loyal and obedient and cheerful Jim Farley has been in those past few hard years when the fair-haired hosannah boys at Washington tried to push him around. They have wondered at that patience and good nature. They knew that he could not even contemplate the word "ingratitude" in connection with the man he has served so well—the man he calls "the boss."

These men know James A. Farley as an individual who, regardless of his place in the sun, regardless of political power or crush of work, has always had the time to be courteous and fair and honest with his fellow men, with never a trace of an enlarged hatband.

And they know him as the one individual in the Democratic Party who might possibly hold its factionalisms and its disgruntlements together through a third-term campaign.

Some of them have read the short story written by another great Democrat, Col. Frederick Stuart Greene, now dead, who used to admire Jim a great deal. The story won national honors one year. It is called The Cat of the Cane Brakes.

It tells a tale of cruel ingratitude. In the last few words of it the woman who was ungrateful stepped on the fangs of a dead snake—and there was poison enough left in the fangs to kill her, quite horribly.

[From the Binghamton (N. Y.) Sun of July 22, 1940]

The Better Game

"Someone else is controlling this convention's activities from here on out," Jim Farley is quoted as having said at Chicago. And he meant it, and in meaning it he dealt the forces that be within the New Deal a staggering blow, for the only flair for doing things some of the chief stooges have is in mismanagement. Oh, they wanted him to remain, all right, but only as a work horse, a behind-the-scenes worker while they bowed and scraped and smiled and took the credit. But Jim was smart and in effect said "Here it is, it's yours; let's see what you do with it."

It will not be too long before Farley is at the head of the Yankee baseball empire, and that brings him pretty close to home, for the Triplets are part and parcel of the organization. He is slated to take over the entire holdings from the Ruppert family within 2 months' time. They include the Yankees; Newark Bears, of the International League; Kansas City Blues, of the American Association; Norfolk, of the Piedmont League; Akron, of the Mid-Atlantic League; and Easton, Md., of the Eastern Shore League, with no end of working agreements. He will be far happier, this old first baseman.

In baseball a honeyed smile, albeit a false one, doesn't get base hits. It reminds that two seasons ago Jim Farley entered Johnson Field with former Judge Dave Lee to witness a baseball game. The wonder is whether the Postmaster General at that time visioned that one day he would head this team as well as the others. At any rate he acted quite differently and humanly from what one might expect—based upon past experience anyhow—from one in his high position in Government. Unobtrusively he sat six rows up among the common people in the grandstand. He bit on the end of a score card as Dave leaned over and gave him an earful. It might have been politics, and then again Dave might have been telling about a certain play, for he, too, did some fancy tossing in his youth out Norwich way. Just two small-town boys grown to man's estate and a pretty fair job done by each.

Then Jim leaned over and whispered in Dave's ear. Dave has long since relinquished the reins of leadership in the tier. He has returned to law practice in Norwich. Could it be that his stanch friend told him the handwriting was on the wall and that he knew even then the cards were stacked? It is possible, but astute politicians rarely tell their innermost secrets to us.

Jim could have had a motorcycle escort of troopers into the ball park. He could have been escorted into a front box with official scraping and all that. His secretary could have called up the county committee and told it to hop on the old ballyhoo bandwagon and signal the great one's approach. None of this was done. Jim didn't stand up, flash a 3-acre grin and, stiff-armed, toss out a ball that couldn't bean a fly and hurt it. He did not have newspapermen there to blind him with flash bulbs. He came there to enjoy a game. And that is the way he has gone about managing his party—quietly, efficiently, and unostentatiously. About the only efficient thing about the party has been the organization for elections.

Jim will find temperament among young players coming up and plenty of it among such a group of prima donnas as there must be on a world-championship team, but how easy it will be to handle them after 8 long years in conniving Washington.

[From the Binghamton (N. Y.) Sun of July 16, 1940]

The secret locked so securely within Jim Farley's breast when he left Hyde Park must be revealed to the gaze of the world within a day or two when everybody will be privileged to share it. And would it be surprising if the secret turns out to be no secret at all? There are those who suspect that Jim knew the President's mind long before the recent historic conference between the two on the banks of the Hudson. There is the suspicion, too, that Mr. Farley didn't ask about the third term because he didn't have to and that the only topic under discussion was one of convention strategy.

This business of a rift between Roosevelt and Farley, of a misunderstanding over the third-term issue and of growing discord in Democratic ranks seems to be meat for the Republican press which

is making the most of it, but it doesn't seem at all likely that the firm friends of yesteryear would remain so long with their heads together if there were any real differences between them.

Mr. Farley is a master strategist. So is Mr. Roosevelt. Both are showmen of the first order. And isn't it quite possible that Franklin and Jim, appreciating to the fullest the necessity of having a good show at Chicago, were in perfect accord as to the principal actors, the parts to be played, and the lines to be spoken?

A convention isn't a convention without a fight. And so there must be the appearance of a fight at Chicago. But any old-time convention strategist can tell you that those in control, realizing that "opposition" must appear from some quarter, often build up a greater opposition in order to smother the lesser ones. That's old stuff, but there is nothing to indicate that this is not the plan of campaign mapped out at Hyde Park. Opposition, controlled by the one who appears to be opposed and managed by a trusted lieutenant is in reality no opposition at all. It merely paves the way for a smooth-running convention—the kind that the customers like.

We have it on the authority of staff writers of the New York Herald Tribune that the "Farley-New Deal Rift is Widening" and that the chairman says he won't let the Roosevelt stampede stop his own candidacy. Wishful thinking?

TO QUOTE FROM THE HERALD TRIBUNE

"'Do you intend to relinquish the leadership of the party?' was still another question.

"'I'll give my answer Saturday,' said Mr. Farley, his chin thrust forward in a manner that indicated his answer might be pretty strong.

"Asked if he would have anything to say about the third-term issue, Mr. Farley declared that before leaving Chicago he would express himself frankly and freely on all issues."

Well, mebby so, mebby so! Who are we to lift the veil which has proved so impenetrable to others more skilled in the ways of master politicians? It does seem, however, that two men, and two alone, have hold of the strings which will make the convention puppets dance and that, while a good show is to be expected with much outward show of bitterness, it may turn out in the end that Franklin and Jim have hold of the same string and that they have been pulling it together all of the time.

[From the Bridgeport (Conn.) Post of July 18, 1940]

THE NEWSPAPERMEN'S CANDIDATE

If the Democratic nominee for President of the United States could have been chosen by the newspapermen who are covering the convention rather than by the regular Democratic delegates, there is no doubt as to the result. The choice of the newspapermen would be Postmaster General James A. Farley, chairman of the Democratic National Committee.

Mr. Farley, from all appearances, is on his way out. He has told the President that he cannot serve again as chairman of the national committee. Behind it all is a story of loyalty to the President, loyalty to the party, splendid service faithfully performed and badly requited.

The newspapermen are solid for Jim Farley because they know him of old and in their own language "he has never let us down." He has never told an untruth, denied a quotation in order to make a scapegoat out of some reporter, or played false in any manner. To the boys of the press to whom covering national politics is a routine job he is big, lovable Jim Farley, always friendly, always honest, always on the level. No other people in America know better than those newspapermen how wholly Jim has given of himself.

It was he and he alone who engineered the convention deals which brought Franklin D. Roosevelt the first nomination in 1932. It was Jim Farley who stage-managed the election of 1936 with such triumphant results. Then he was pushed rudely aside to make room for the President's new cabinet of strange favorites who rule everything in Washington.

When the convention of 1940 was held Jim Farley was still national chairman, but Harry Hopkins, one of the palace favorites, was in Chicago to give the orders and Jim was in the cold.

The delegates knew this and realized what was going on but felt helpless to do anything about it, though many of them expressed resentment. The newspapermen, not being delegates, were much more outspoken. They were for Jim to the last man.

[From the Birmingham (Ala.) Age-Herald of July 17, 1940]

FARLEY FAREWELL?

Nearly all commentators seemed to get the impression that Jim Farley, in his brief address at the Democratic convention Monday night, was delivering a farewell to active direction of Democratic Party politics. We got the same impression.

Of course, Mr. Farley is a veteran political trooper. He would play his part to the end. And in his speech he sought to be the good soldier, the faithful leader, to the last. Indeed, he did seem to be giving up command with devotion and regret. But underneath all that there appeared to be a note of parting, of sadness.

The fact is that there has been little encouragement to Mr. Farley's Presidential aspirations. The honor of the party nomination, which he may feel that his long service and established abilities justified him in hoping for, seems altogether unlikely to come to him.

Even in the Massachusetts delegation, which was promised to him, there came this shout from a delegate in a caucus: "Mr. Farley is a phony candidate. I want the world to know where I stand—with Roosevelt."

It is even said that Senator BYRNES and Harry Hopkins are the President's personal representatives at the convention. Mr. Farley himself is said to have remarked in substance that he knew less about what was going on in the convention than anyone there.

That is not the old Farley. He was going through the motions in loyal party allegiance. But the old heart did not seem to be in him. It was almost as if he felt that he had played the game, insofar as he himself was personally concerned, to the end.

Perhaps Jim Farley is telling himself that a man has to expect this sort of thing in politics; that it is all in the game. But just now it must not seem to be such a good game as once it did.

[From the Bridgeport (Conn.) Post of July 20, 1940]

MR. FARLEY RETIRES

James A. Farley has announced that he will retire as chairman of the Democratic National Committee on August 17 to accept "an attractive private business offer," possibly head of the New York Yankees baseball club.

In his formal statement Chairman Farley pledges "full support" to the Roosevelt-Wallace ticket. He explains carefully that he has headed the Democratic National Committee for 8 years at great personal financial sacrifice and that he "owes it to his family" to take a chance to capitalize on his earning power, while he still has the earning power.

That's a good explanation and a reasonable one, and nobody will begrudge Jim Farley the chance to make some money. But the important point is if all was well within the Democratic Party he would not be stepping out now on the very eve of a crucial campaign in order to go into private business. He could defer private business for a few months longer after having deferred it for a full 8 years.

No, everybody knows what is in Jim Farley's heart and everybody respects him for the loyalty which restrains him from saying one ill-natured or ill-tempered word.

He has been very badly treated. Perhaps his successors—the men who have connived to get most of the old-time Democratic leaders out of the Democratic Party—will manage better than Jim would have done. But they have a pretty fine record to beat. Considering 1932 and 1936 we would say that Jim Farley was the outstanding political campaign manager of all time.

[From the Birmingham (Ala.) News]

JIM FARLEY

Democrats everywhere, regardless of what they think about other things, from the third-term question on down, are almost unanimous in liking, admiring, and respecting James A. Farley. The tributes paid to Mr. Farley at the Chicago convention were genuine; the Democrats feel just that way about him.

Democrats in general, therefore, will regret Jim Farley's forthcoming retirement as national chairman. He has been reelected to the chairmanship, but he has consented to serve only until the middle of August, when he will enter private business.

The party will miss Jim Farley during this campaign. But it is good to know that he will give his best to the party in private life.

[From the Birmingham (Ala.) News-Age-Herald of July 21, 1940]

THE CONVENTION IS OVER—BUT THE MEMORY LINGERS ON—LOVABLE JIM FARLEY HAS RETIRED, BUT REPORTER SAYS HE WILL BE DRAFTED FOR PRESIDENT IN 1944

(By Lily May Caldwell)

CHICAGO.—The show is over and one of the most beloved men in public life has taken his final bow from the stage of the Democratic National Convention. Genial Jim Farley has stepped from the political stage.

But that's not all * * * it's only one of the innumerable sequences of drama and comedy that were a part of the convention of 1940:

There was the memorable demonstration for Alabama's distinguished Speaker of the House, William B. Bankhead, during the bedlam that accompanied the balloting for Vice Presidency * * * the arrival of Mrs. F. D. R. * * * the tears of Mrs. Henry Wallace * * * and the nomination by acclaim of Franklin D. Roosevelt as the man to whom the party turned again in an hour of crisis, with the faith that he will safely steer our Nation again through troubled waters.

Roosevelt was the man of the hour, but that lovable Irishman, Jim Farley, the man whose ability to make friends and influence delegates brought his party from obscurity into the national spotlight in 1932 for a great historical drama—that big, square-shooting, easy, likable fellow who stood there on the platform fulfilling his last task for the man he has served for so many years—shared the heartbeat of the crowd with his "old friend Frank."

Jim Farley is stepping off the political stage forever, he thinks. But try and make those 30,000 cheering souls believe that. They know he is a great man; that politics is his life; and those of us who have sat beside him in press conferences during the past week know that Jim is making a sacrifice—we remember that his eyes were

misty when he said good-bye, "You fellows who know me know how deeply I feel your generosity and friendship."

HIS WIFE IS HAPPY, THOUGH

The happiest person in Chicago today is pretty Bess Farley, wife of the chairman, and head of the "major opposition" to his bid for the Presidency, who, with their two daughters, Ann and Betsy, is here to celebrate her husband's retirement.

"I never wanted Jim to go into politics in the first place," she told me as we talked in her flower-banked suite in the Blackstone Hotel, "and although I'm naturally proud of his success, I dislike official life and having him away from home all of the time. In the past we have always maintained an apartment at the Mayflower because Jim had to have some place to live in Washington, but I've never stayed there 3 consecutive nights in my life * * * and I much prefer our New York home to the White House."

Blue-eyed Bess Farley is witty, frank, friendly, and loves to laugh; enjoys the theater, dancing, small dinner parties, and good conversation. And she's as pretty as the girls, who have been the center of attraction since their arrival in Chicago, and who are their father's constant companions—and two good reasons why "Big Jim" is leaving politics to accept an attractive offer in business that will adjust his financial situation and, he says, "be fair to my family."

[From the Brooklyn Eagle of July 21, 1940]

FARLEY'S COMING RETIREMENT BLOW TO ROOSEVELT CAMPAIGN

It has been generally understood for some time that James A. Farley was going to resign as chairman of the Democatic National Committee. But that did not seem to lessen the severity of the blow when it finally fell.

On Friday Mr. Farley accepted reelection until August 17 at which time he will step down, his place then to be taken by the choice of a special subcommittee appointed for this purpose. Actually President Roosevelt will choose his manager, as candidates generally do.

With that decision the party leaders had to abandon the hope, which they cherished right up to the last, that the chairman might stick through the campaign or at least get it well on its way.

The experience of the New Dealers who ran the convention at Chicago for the President—for Farley was shoved completely in the background—brought home vividly to them what a great void would be left in the party structure with the retirement of the genial New Yorker.

Seldom have there been closer relationships in politics than that between Jim Farley and Mr. Roosevelt. The masterful handling of the original drive for the nomination, then the elections of 1932 and 1936, demonstrated the unusual political genius of Farley. It has seldom been excelled or even equaled.

The real break came over the third-term issue, although the chairman bitterly protested the party purge 2 years ago. That thoroughly unsuccessful "blitzkrieg" was the idea of the close New Deal insiders—the Corcorans and Cohens and the rest. And they conducted it.

In spite of that failure, their influence continued; and never since has Farley had quite the same standing at the White House.

Yet the chairman never discussed the third term openly; and when finally asked Friday about his attitude toward it, he said that he had tried to indicate his position by his candidacy for the Presidential nomination. His attitude throughout has been above criticism with never even a trace of vindictiveness.

Mr. Farley is leaving national politics to accept a remunerative position in the business world. His financial condition, he said, made it impossible for him to turn it down. Certainly his host of friends, in and out of politics, will wish him well in his new endeavor.

He has been not only a great political leader but also an able administrator, as demonstrated by his record as Postmaster General. He is known and respected by every Democrat of consequence—and numberless humble party workers—from coast to coast.

His going is ample cause for worry in New Deal circles. For with a real fight on their hands, Jim Farley is needed as never before. It's going to be hard to fill his shoes.

[From the Buffalo (N. Y.) Courier of July 16, 1940]

NOT CARRYING BAG NOW

Franklin D. Roosevelt has a secret. James A. Farley shares that secret. Mr. Farley has a secret, too. Put the two secrets together, and what do you get? Well, read the dispatches from Chicago and supply your own answer.

It can be one of several answers; or you can try combining the best features of all the answers. All the political correspondents are indulging in exercises of that sort; and there is no reason why their readers shouldn't enjoy the same game. It seems to be no end fun.

For our part, we confess to a bit of perplexity about the Roosevelt-Farley drama. Is it a political comedy? Is it a political tragedy? Or is it what Mr. Farley, in his boxing commission days, would have termed "just one of those things"?

Consider the Chicago scene in the light of the political history of the last decade. Go back to Mr. Roosevelt's gubernatorial days when he decided to avail himself of Mr. Farley's skilled professional services in a political war of maneuver, with the White House as an objective. Mr. Farley proved himself a master strategist and the objective was attained. When the Democrats gathered in Chicago 8 years ago, Mr. Farley already had the nomination "in the bag" for Mr. Roosevelt—although that fact did not become fully apparent until Messrs. McAdoo and GARNER had done their stuff. After the nomination, the election was "in the bag." Four years later, when the Democratic Convention met in Philadelphia, Mr. Roosevelt's renomination by acclamation was in Mr. Farley's bag—and so adroitly was the bag handled during the subsequent campaign that Mr. Farley was able to name the two States which Mr. Roosevelt wouldn't carry (remember them?) before the voting began. Now we have come to the end of what the President's admirers might call the Roosevelt decade—the thoughtless thirties when everything always was "in the bag."

We enter the decade of the forties; and nobody knows what that decade will bring forth. Mr. Roosevelt wants to begin the decade by being drafted for the third term which has been granted to no other President of the United States. Political observers in Chicago believe the draft renomination already is in the bag. Maybe so; but Mr. Farley no longer is carrying the bag.

On the contrary, Mr. Farley seems to be sick and sore, politically speaking. What is more, he seems determined to make some other people sick and sore before the convention is over. Sharer of the great Presidential secret though he be, Mr. Farley has another little secret of his own—or maybe a couple of little secrets—and apparently he isn't telling the answers even to Mr. Roosevelt.

[From the New Orleans (La.) Item-Tribune]

VALEDICTORY TO JAMES A. FARLEY

James A. Farley will step down as chairman of the Democratic National Committee and resign as Postmaster General on August 17. His retirement will be followed by emotions on the part of his fellow countrymen very different from those which greeted his entrance 8 years ago.

He was known then only as a New York politician with some ability for organization. He is recognized now as the possessor of talent for organization that amounts to genius not surpassed in American politics. And he is known as a "grand guy," a first-rate fighting man, and a supremely good sport.

In the past 8 years the Postmaster General has weathered many a storm. Known contemptuously as "The Jobmaster," he made himself a whipping boy to take the beatings for the Roosevelt administration, while the Ph. D.'s "brain trust" looked down their noses at him.

"Big Jim" bore it all with smiling equanimity. And he learned from experience. He got to know all parts of the United States and their ways of feeling and thinking as few New Yorkers have ever known them. The country came to know him as an upstanding, straight-shooting man, upon whose word men could confidently rely. All Democrats, and hosts of others, came not only to trust this big, bald, New Yorker but to have real affection for him.

You could have no greater proof that the boy from Grassy Point had made good than a party given for him when the Chicago convention was over. Cynicism is part of the armor of most newspaper folks. Nowhere in the fraternity is it burnished more brightly than among those correspondents who "cover" Washington. Yet these cynics were hosts at a farewell testimonial to Farley, where feeling was so genuine and unrestrained that, in the words of the New York World-Telegram, it "brought mist to eyes long dry."

As Mr. Farley quits the political arena many will probably remember Tenniel's great cartoon, Dropping the Pilot. It depicted the young Kaiser Wilhelm II watching over the rail of the ship *Germania* while the great Bismarck went down the ladder to a small boat waiting to carry him away.

Much has been said already, and more will be, about "the doctrine of indispensability." Some persons may wonder, before the present political drama reaches its climax, if the new dealers managing Mr. Roosevelt's campaign won't discover that Mr. Farley was "the indispensable man," too.

Still others, contemplating the greatly heightened stature of this simple, honest, man, will reflect that character is the one thing without which other gifts of the gods are valueless. We salute the passing pilot in words borrowed from James Whitcomb Riley:

"Well, good-bye, Jim; take keer of yourse'f."

[From the Buffalo Evening News of July 17, 1940]

OLD FAITHFUL

James A. Farley, chairman of the Democratic National Committee, is a politician. More than that, he is recognized by friend and foe alike as the best politician in the land, which is saying something for a nation where every other person is either active in politics or a self-avowed political expert. Mr. Farley is a square shooter, a truth teller, a promise keeper, and a man of conviction. He believes in the party system of government and in party responsibility to the people. He is loyal to the principles of his own party, the Democratic Party, but above his party loyalty he places loyalty to his country and what he conceives to be its best interests. Jim Farley is a man who will shake your hand as if he meant it, look you in the eye—and remember your name. But he is not a man to brook subterfuge and double dealing, whether in politics or anything else.

Today Jim Farley is the most tragic figure on the American political stage. Perhaps he does not realize fully himself the tragedy of his situation. But he is certainly aware of his most uncomfortable predicament as master of ceremonies at a Democratic National Convention which is little more than a puppet show. The leading strings of the puppet delegates are being operated by a Cabinet member and amateur politician in a hotel across the street, under instructions received on a special telephone wire from the White House in Washington. Jim Farley, the genial political

wizard who organized the overwhelming Democratic victories of 1932 and 1936, has little to do but apply his efforts to smiling through his chagrin and wondering what has happened to the Democratic Party. For in a very real sense the convention which Mr. Farley called to order on Monday was not a Democratic convention at all. It was a convention whose 1,094 delegates bore the label of Democrats but were ready to act, however reluctantly, under orders from the minority New Deal wing of the party. Strangest of all, not even the new dealers who were running the show had any clear idea of what they were supposed to do, or what the reaction would be at headquarters in the White House.

The general plot for the staged drama of the Democratic, or New Deal, convention is, of course clear enough. The idea is to "draft" President Roosevelt for a third-term nomination by an overwhelming vote of the delegates on the first ballot. The New Deal generals, headed by Secretary of Commerce Harry Hopkins, hoped to make the nomination by acclamation without a roll call. But Chairman Farley, who is more or less resigned to the outcome of the convention, would not stand for the crowning insult to the democracy of the Democratic Party which would be implied in a move to dispense with the traditional roll call of the States. Furthermore, it is questionable if a unanimous vote would be obtained in any case. The latest check up revealed at least 150 delegates who are opposed to a third term and intend to vote for other candidates. Finally, the patent lack of enthusiasm for the third term which was displayed Monday when the name Roosevelt failed to evoke the expected demonstrations has convinced the new dealers that more subtle tactics are in order.

The symbol of this weird situation in which a great political party has become the rubber stamp for one man and his idealogical minions is Jim Farley, who typifies the discomfort and ill-conceived annoyance of the delegates. Chairman Farley, himself a candidate for the Presidency, has insisted that his name be placed in nomination. He knows that this would only be a gesture, but he considers it important that his convictions be placed on the record in this way. No one can doubt that it is an anti-third-term gesture, a gesture of complete distrust and opposition to the shattering of the third-term tradition. Many of the delegates who have looked to Mr. Farley for leadership in the past, feel the tragedy of this move in its futility, and resent the situation on behalf of their chairman. Yet the tragedy does not stop there, for Jim Farley, the best of friends, is torn between his friendship for the President and his convictions on the third-term question. The President has personally appealed to his political lieutenant, often neglected and shunted aside in the past for New Deal favorites, to continue as national chairman and handle the campaign. Whatever may be his choice, the American people are likely to couple their distaste for the phoney proceeding at Chicago with profound sympathy for Jim Farley, a politician who knows where politics stops and love of country begins.

[From the Charlotte (N. C.) News and Evening Chronicle of July 21, 1940]

EXIT JIM—7 YEARS OF OFFICE HAVE COST HIM NO LOSS IN RESPECT

The Democratic Party has taken three "sockos" in rapid succession.

1. The third term.
2. Wallace for Vice President.
3. The resignation of Jim Farley.

Time was when the resignation of Jim either as Postmaster General or national chairman would have been eminently in order. This repositing in one man of two such irreconcilable offices was out of harmony with the note of high idealism which Mr. Roosevelt was sounding in the party's name. But Jim held on, and in the latter years of the New Deal it began to be generally understood that he was taking the rap and saying nothing in his own defense.

Not, mind you, that Jim turns red when caught playing politics on either a ward or national scale. Jim is first of all a party man. Andrew Jackson is his hero, and "to the victor belong the spoils" is his motto.

But his unfailing good humor in the face of criticism and ridicule, his rugged loyalty to the chief who overrode him but kept him hanging obediently on, his refusal to "take a walk" or otherwise to play the child, have combined to give Jim Farley's exit the convincing touch of dignity and manliness.

If one felt like laying it on thick, it could be sincerely said, Well done, good and faithful servant.

[From the Butte (Mont.) Standard of July 21, 1940]

FARLEY ON THE SIDE LINES

The retirement of genial Jim Farley as a political prophet seemed to foreshadow his retirement from politics. Otherwise he would have had a different answer than that he was "not for the moment in the role of prophet" when asked concerning the chances for a Roosevelt victory in 1940. The Postmaster General was gracefully bowing himself out of the field of lining up delegates and votes and distributing patronage. Still, it must be remembered that Mr. Farley had not been distributing much patronage for almost 2 years.

Into whatever field Mr. Farley ventures, his friends—and he has millions of them—will wish him success equal to that he achieved in advancing the political fortunes of his boss, President Franklin D. Roosevelt. To Mr. Farley, the President without doubt owed his first nomination and election. And in 1936, when the Roosevelt New Deal forces carried through again, it was with the Postmaster General working quietly behind the scenes, pulling wires here and there, pouring oil on troubled waters, and filling gaps.

It seems that with the breaking of the third-term tradition, the President and Mr. Farley parted ways, although the national chairman of the Democratic Party still professes loyalty. But Mr. Roosevelt will discover that the going may not be so good with his true friend sitting on the side lines. Mr. Farley's refusal to assume the role of the prophet, a role, incidentally, which he played with honor, seems more than an omen.

[From the Charlotte (N. C.) Observer of July 17, 1940]

UNHAPPY JIM

Happy and genial Jim Farley is forlorn and disconsolate.

Pictures flashed back to the newspapers from the Chicago convention prove it.

That infectious smile has worn off. In its stead, there is something akin to a scowl on his countenance.

Mr. Farley is clearly frustrated. His speech opening the convention was eloquent for its evasions rather than for its allusions.

The party chairman is in the throes of a keen and abject disappointment.

He wanted to have nothing to do with a third-term movement for the President, his long-time friend and the man he has moved heaven and earth, first to elect on two occasions, and then to support him as the head of the party to which Big Jim is earnestly devoted and dedicated.

Truth is that a few weeks ago it looked as if Mr. Farley would be on the national ticket himself. He craved that honor.

If he had only remote hopes of securing the nomination for the White House, he was practically sure that, with Mr. Hull chosen for that honor, he would tail-end the ticket for the Vice Presidency.

But a few days ago all hopes for anything which he had entertained went dashing to fragments.

The President took him into his confidence at Hyde Park and told "Big Jim" not to tell anybody what he had told him, but the latter hasn't been the same since.

The assumption is reasonable that Mr. Roosevelt told him that a third-term effort was inevitable and that he would be obliged to bow to it.

That was enough to take the heart out of the chairman, who fears for the fate of the party, the welfare of which he considers to be far above the temporary enthronement of any individual.

At any rate, the speech of the chairman and the pictures being taken of him in Chicago give the secret away.

It is no longer genial Jim.

He's disgusted and will wash his hands of the whole business, not only refusing to take the chairmanship again, but to turn a hand in the campaign, and what a magic political hand that is of his!

It's going to be very bad for the party, too, that Mr. Farley is going into the baseball business and turn the manipulations over to others, most of whom, we may reasonably fear, have not even been among his best pupils.

[From the Cheyenne (Wyo.) Tribune Leader of July 21, 1940]

DEMOCRATS ON THE SIDE LINES

Disapproving flippant flouting of the third-term tradition by a totalitarianized Democratic national convention, disgusted with the megalomanical complex "I am the only one," heartsick from the callous ingratitude of the man whose political creator he was, "Big Jim" Farley will resign the chairmanship of the Democratic National Committee of which he has been the backbone and mainstay for 8 years.

His refusal to be associated with the third-term campaign is typical of that of a host of sincere, patriotic big men of the party which has been "blitzkrieged" by political dictatorship.

They will have no part or parcel of the effort to obtain ratification at the polls of the Roosevelt junking of a national tradition made unwritten law by the approval and example of men whose statesmanship prevented them from playing greasy politics in alliance with corrupt State and municipal machines.

They, like "Big Jim," will retire to the side lines and watch the Rooseveltian revolutionaries plunge to the terrific rebuke which is formulating for expression at the polls in November.

It would be interesting to see how they mark their ballots.

[From the Chicago Sunday Herald-American of July 21, 1940]

FARLEY ALMOST STOLE THE SHOW; NOW A BIGGER FIGURE THAN EVER—HAS QUALITIES LACKING IN MANY POLITICIANS

(By James L. Kilgallen, staff writer for International News Service)

James A. Farley, the man with a million friends, emerged from the 1940 Democratic National Convention a bigger figure than at any time in his long career as a politician. In a way, he almost "stole the show," even though President Roosevelt was renominated.

Jim Farley is a man who possesses qualities many politicians lack. Above all he is true to himself, to his honest conception of right and wrong. He is a "square shooter," loyal to the core—a man who wouldn't stoop to do the slightest underhand act. One of the reasons for Farley's great success is his memory for faces, names, and events.

Newspaper men, who are close to him on all kinds of occasions and who view him with unbiased eyes, know Farley is on the level. They have known it for years. He has never "double-crossed" them, never denied a story he has given out no matter what the public reaction. He has treated writers on Republican papers with as much consideration and friendliness as those employed by Democratic publications. He plays no favorites.

"I make it a policy to tell the truth," Jim says. He has found it to be a good formula.

PROMISES GILT EDGED

His word is no scrap of paper. If he promises to do something, it is a gilt-edged guaranty that he will do it.

He is perhaps the most humane man in American public life today. He has that "common touch."

His humaneness was illustrated by an incident during the recent Chicago convention. His headquarters was crowded all the time with American's greatest reporters—Washington correspondents, star reporters from New York, and the best political writers on papers all over the country. Into those headquarters the other day came a cub—an 18-year-old chap with bright red hair, Bob Kubicek, reporter for the Oak Leaves, a weekly published at Oak Park, Ill.

Kubicek was looking for a ticket for the convention. The "big shots" in the newspaper game had long since reserved theirs—and had them.

FARLEY TO RESCUE

When young Kubicek entered the publicity office of the Democratic National Committee on his mission he was quietly but firmly eased out the nearest door without much ceremony.

Farley happened to come along a corridor. He sensed the youth was in a dilemma. He asked the boy, "What's the trouble, son?"

Kubicek, a bit awed, told him.

"Follow me," said Jim.

He led him to his own private office, opened a drawer in his desk, and produced not only a book of tickets for every session of the convention, but a press badge as well. Wasn't that boy happy when he mingled with the working press at the convention. And isn't he another Farley man.

That incident illustrates Farley and the bigness of his heart. It shows why he has so many friends.

APPLAUDED BY PRESS

I have attended many press conferences with the big wigs of politics, but I have never seen what I saw at Farley's recent press conference in Chicago. Time and again the press, composed of a good proportion of cynics, applauded him when he entered the room. And applauded the answers he gave to some of their questions. He has "sold himself" to the press of the Nation 100 percent.

Farley, now 52 years old, has an assured future. No matter what he turns his hand to, he does it well. He is thorough, a great organizer, an indefatigable worker.

His habits are good. He doesn't drink intoxicating liquor, nor does he smoke. When under tension he chews gum. It is a common procedure for him to work 12 and 14 hours a day. He sometimes dictates to half a dozen stenographers at one sitting. He can confer with 50 persons an hour, and they will all go away satisfied that he has given them a hearing.

HAD HIGH HONOR

Farley feels that no matter how much he has given of himself to the Democratic Party it was well worth while. He has been repaid by the great satisfaction he has gotten out of politics. He has had the high honor of having his name presented as a candidate for the Presidency of the United States. And his 72 votes—second to Roosevelt—was a good showing in view of the situation and was a tribute to his tremendous popularity.

But politics has not repaid Farley financially. He has a wife, Elizabeth A. Farley, two daughters, and a son, to consider. He must think of their future. Government salaries, as a rule, are below those paid in private industry—and private industry has been after Jim with offers of big, high-paying positions.

I, like scores of reporters who have known him intimately for many years, wish him well and feel he will make good in all his undertakings. He will carry into his new endeavors a wise head, a great brain, a lovable humaneness, and great strength of character. Jim Farley is a man's man—and the women love him as well.

[From the Cincinnati Times-Star of July 17, 1940]

GENIAL JIM

Although the Chicago convention of the Democratic Party is the dullest convention in living memory, it is not without a touch of unintentional drama. We refer to the plight of Chairman James A. Farley. Eight years ago Farley was the real hero of the Democratic Convention at Chicago. He had found the man, named him, got him nominated, and eventually saw him elected. In 1936 at Philadelphia Farley was the boss. Nobody ever questioned his power to run the convention and the subsequent campaign. Today, Farley is neither hero nor boss of the lifeless show at Chicago.

When Farley pounds the gavel today it is to call to order a convention over which he has no real authority. When he grants interviews he himself interviews the reporters as to what is actually going on in Chicago. The real convention was mapped out in advance at the White House. Operations on the ground are being directed by Harry Hopkins—of all people—from his fastness in the Blackstone Hotel. The new dealers have done an effective job of cashiering Jim Farley.

Some of the less ebullient new dealers are already troubled by their new responsibility—and the mistakes of Mr. Hopkins. Many veteran Democrats are appalled at the prospect of waging a campaign under such auspices against a whirlwind like Wendell Willkie. A movement to draft Farley is afoot. Unlike the movement to draft Roosevelt, this one would be genuine. But there is no indication that Farley will abandon his reputed plan to give up politics for baseball.

Nevertheless, this convention chairman in name only carries out his duties efficiently, cheerfully, and without complaint. Everybody knows that Farley disapproves a third term for Roosevelt or anybody else. But he will do and say nothing to interfere with what seems to be the convention's appointed mission. Genial Jim has taken it on the chin many times in the past 8 years. He will take it again at Chicago, more bitterly than ever before, but probably for the last time. No man has even questioned Jim Farley's loyalty to the Democratic Party. It is an outstanding quality in the man and it lends a touch of human warmth to an otherwise mechanical set of proceedings.

[From the Cincinnati Times-Star of July 20, 1940]

FARLEY STEPS OUT

Jim Farley's decision to retire as chairman of the Democratic National Committee on August 17 was expected, but that fact does not lessen the importance of his action. It is a fitting end to a convention that will probably rank as one of the most disastrous in the history of the Democratic Party. That convention was conceived in apathy and expired in dissension, as the President's hand-picked choice for the Vice Presidency was booed by many of the very delegates who dutifully, but resentfully, voted for him. Altogether, the meeting was a sordid as well as tradition-breaking spectacle.

Farley must feel that he is well out of it. For years he has been shabbily treated by the President and walked on by the more prominent whippersnappers of the New Deal. At Chicago he was inexcusably snubbed by Harry Hopkins, who controlled the private wire to the White House. Farley gets out because of principle—his opposition to a third term. But he has ample reason to be personally sore. Doubtless he will remain formally loyal to the party. He will keep his chairmanship of the New York State committee. But he will probably take no active part in the campaign after the few weeks he has allowed for breaking in a successor.

The Democratic campaign suffers a severe blow in the loss of Farley. He knows as much about practical politics as any man in the country. He has a genius for making friends and enjoys a devoted following in every Democratic district throughout the land. His retirement symbolizes quite as much as Mr. Roosevelt's quest of a third term, the final triumph of the New Deal over the Democratic Party. Whoever is chosen to succeed Farley, the real bosses of the campaign will be the new dealers who ran the Chicago show. Republicans could ask for nothing more.

[From the Cleveland News of July 19, 1940]

HERE'S TO JIM FARLEY

Opposed as the News is and was to Jim Farley's advocacies in politics, we nevertheless have to express our admiration of a thoroughbred. This Chicago convention raised the Postmaster General to real heights of sincerity and sportsmanship and in a scene which lacked both virtues.

Mr. Farley in 1928 saw a political comer in Franklin D. Roosevelt and managed his successful campaign for governorship. In 1930 he first saw Mr. Roosevelt's chance for the 1932 nomination, and he spent 2 years of unparalleled effort getting Governor Roosevelt better known to his party. The thousands of visits and letters by Mr. Farley wrote a new history of political achievement.

As party chairman, he directed the winning 1932 election campaign, and in 1936 scored his greatest election triumph. It was not entirely fortune; it was in a great part Farley's vigilant strategy that landed 46 States in the record landslide.

Last fall he did not believe the President should or would seek a third term. As a gentlemanly hint of his convictions to his great friend, he first asked permission and then offered his own name as party nominee. He was courteous, considerate, and frank in what slight campaign he made. But it was evident he considered the party should be saved from a third-term disaster.

Mr. Farley knew what would happen at Chicago. It would have been easy for him, in justifiable belligerent mood, to throw wrenches. He did not. He insured that any candidate whose name was to be presented to the convention would get a hearing, but he entered no "stop Roosevelt" conference, because the President had been his friend.

Every word he said he weighed. He did not emphasize his own feelings, but he did not misrepresent them.

His final act of unselfishness to his friend was to move that a tragic mistake—as he believes it—be made unanimous so that the party Farley had led, whose leadership he was leaving, might have a sense of unity.

We may disagree with his political regularity, but we must admire the act. American politics does not breed much honor. But it produces a great gentleman as well as a leader of triumphs in James Aloysius Farley.

[From the Cleveland Plain Dealer and Sunday News-Leader of July 21, 1940]

JIM'LL BE MISSED

Until mid-August James A. Farley will continue as chairman of the national committee to which he was first elected 8 years ago. Between now and then administration pressure will be exerted to break his determination to retire to private life.

Farley says he will support the Roosevelt-Wallace ticket. He is unwilling, however, to ignore some money-making opportunities in the business world in order to direct the Roosevelt-Wallace battle for ballots.

What the country wonders is how much it is the business opportunities which dissuade Farley from continuing in the chairmanship, and how much it is his hostility to the idea of a third-term candidacy plus his belief that someone less radical than Wallace should have been given second place on the ballot.

Next to the President himself, Jim Farley retires as chairman the most beloved Democrat in the country. What happened at the recent Chicago convention added to his stature as a party figure, as it subtracted from that of many who helped steer the steam roller over the retiring chairman.

Farley stands head and shoulders above his detractors. The Roosevelt-Wallace ticket's chances of success are diminished by his stepping down.

[From the Cleveland Plain Dealer of July 25, 1940]

UNIQUE ROLE IS ENDING AS "BIG JIM" PACKS

(By Walker S. Buel)

WASHINGTON, July 24.—Postmaster General James A. Farley and Democratic National Chairman James A. Farley are packing their bags to leave Washington and rejoin State Democratic Chairman James A. Farley in New York next month.

A one-man triumvirate unique in American politics will be dissolved, liquidated, and committed to the history of an epoch which has closed and of a political party which is no more.

When Farley steps out of the national chairmanship August 17 the Democratic Party will come into the complete control of the new dealers, who embrace former Republicans and liberals of uncertain label, leaving Jim Farley and Jack Garner and Carter Glass and conservative Democrats generally with no political home at all.

Farley will be regular. He will not bolt, and he will not go fishing.

He said at Chicago he would support the nominees of the convention, and he is a man of his word, as was mentioned by everyone who spoke of him at Chicago and as will be attested by everyone else who knows him, including both President and Mrs. Roosevelt. He undoubtedly will speak for the Roosevelt-Wallace ticket.

Nevertheless, when Farley retires, it will be breaking home ties. The old place will not be the same. Farley would not be comfortable in it if he stayed.

It is the best information today that nothing will change his mind about leaving the chairmanship August 17. It is assumed he will shed the Cabinet position shortly thereafter, and New York friends say he also is looking for someone to take over the State chairmanship, although indications have been he would retain it.

Information today also is the new dealers will not lift a hand to persuade Farley to stay. On the contrary, they want to get rid of him, and reports are that the national committee will be given a house cleaning of all of Farley's friends. The new dealers want control from top to bottom, and they unquestionably are entitled to it, for they took command at Chicago, nominated the ticket, and carried off such bacon as there was.

There was a moment or two of panic at Chicago, when gestures were made toward Farley, but they were only fright maneuvers. The President and Mrs. Roosevelt paid highest tribute to Farley in addressing the convention, but new dealers deprecate interpretation that this praise was tantamount to an invitation to Farley to remain.

To the somewhat bitter anguish of new dealers, "Big Jim" Farley, also known as "Sunny Jim," "Genial Jim," and "Just call me Jim," goes out of this picture with this chin up, his countenance as cheerful as when he came, accompanied by the best wishes of thousands in and out of Washington. His theme song still is When Irish Eyes Are Smiling, and his confidential word to all his friends in the days of uncertainty over the third-term intentions of President Roosevelt was:

"Farley still has his sense of humor."

This the new dealers cannot take from him, nor the business offers which few of them could command, acceptance of which will put him into the realm of social security, as retention of Cabinet post or chairmanship could not do.

The first-appointed member of the Roosevelt Cabinet was put on the spot by the rise of the third-term program as was no other political leader.

His loyalties were deep; his allegiance to principle was fixed. Principle argued against a third term as constituting a danger to the country and the party. Loyalties argued against breaking with President Roosevelt.

COULD HAVE TAKEN CONTROL

The result of this inner struggle was a curious kind of compromise. He did not and has not yet spoken out against President Roosevelt. But he offered his own Presidential candidacy as a rallying point for anti-third-term sentiment. Thus he did not forsake his loyalties, and he did not surrender his principle. When the moment came when the convention wanted to bolt to Paul V. McNutt or some other Vice Presidential candidate rather than accept Secretary of Agriculture Henry A. Wallace, who was the President's choice, Farley probably could have taken convention control away from the new dealers and upset the program. If Farley had flung himself openly and vocally into that fight, he undoubtedly could have brought about another Vice Presidential nomination which would have stymied the New Deal and thrown the third-term candidacy of the President into doubt.

Farley did not lift a hand to block the President's choice, and the Wallace candidacy won.

JIM GETS BEST OF IT

New dealers hotly insist the sentimental furor over Farley's departure from the national chairmanship is a lot of baloney, that if Farley was pushed around by the new dealers, he was doing a little pushing around of his own, and that, after all, he stood as a candidate to symbolize opposition to a Roosevelt third term.

This seems to be decidedly a minority view. Farley gets all the best of it in the final break.

The consensus about Jim Farley seems to be expressed in this language:

"I have known Jim Farley for a great many years, and I have never known him yet to do or think a mean thing.

"For a long time now—a good many years—he has been taking it on the chin with a smile and not batting an eyelid, because, I think, in the back of his head he had the idea that in spite of all kinds of unfair attacks, the American people, just like you and me, will read him for what he is, absolutely on the level."

Those were the words, not many moons ago, of Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

[From the Cincinnati Times-Star]

FARLEY REFUSED COMPROMISE WITH A PRINCIPLE—EVEN NEW DEALERS REALIZE THAT RESIGNATION WILL HANDICAP CAMPAIGN

(By Morris D. Ervin)

CHICAGO, July 20.—The refusal of James A. Farley to compromise where a matter of high principle is concerned is causing the leaders of the Roosevelt administration's campaign for a third term no end of worry. It is the most serious blow that has befallen them and, without the able national chairman to conduct their campaign for them, they are not at all sure about what the future holds for them.

Until the very end the leaders of the third-term movement refused to believe that Farley would carry out his threat to resign as national chairman if Roosevelt accepted a third nomination. There is some doubt that they would have been so eager for another Roosevelt nomination if they had believed he would, for they do not underrate his ability as a campaign manager. What they did underrate was the quality of his conscience and his devotion to a principle.

They really didn't get frightened about the prospect of Jim's walking out on them until shortly before the nomination of Roosevelt when it had become evident to everyone that Roosevelt would not only be nominated but that he would accept. Then, when Farley showed no sign of backing down, they began to show some concern. But still they thought they could fix it up.

FLATTERY CAMPAIGN

They started an intense campaign of flattery. All the third-term leaders in Chicago began to make a big fuss over him. Mrs. Roosevelt took it up. She called Farley on the phone as soon as the nomination had been made and made her arrangements to come to Chicago through him. When she spoke at the convention, the first of her speech was devoted to a eulogy of Farley and an expression of opinion that he would continue to work for the party. The President himself said more of the same when he addressed the convention by phone. The leaders did everything to give the convention opportunities to "demonstrate" for Farley. And they thought that they had it all fixed up. When the national committee met yesterday it immediately gave Farley a big ovation and then unanimousiy and by acclamation elected him national chairman for a third time. And it was right at that point that the third-term leaders' house of cards collapsed. Farley thanked the committee members, said he would serve for 30 days until the President had had time to select his successor—evidence in itself that the President had not thought it would be necessary to take such action—but that on August 17 he would be definitely done. After that, campaign manager or no campaign manager, they would have to run their campaign without his help.

And then suddenly it dawned on them that that would be no easy task. For the first time they realized what they were up against. The leaders of the third-term movement had no one to take Farley's place. The national committee had no one, Roosevelt had no one. The best they could think of was to appoint a committee of five persons to confer with the President and learn from him what he thought about the situation.

POLITICAL GENIUS

In the whole Roosevelt administration there is not another person the equal of Jim Farley in political management. He not only has remarkable natural ability along that line, but he has the experience and the acquaintanceship to back it up. He knows the Democratic politicians intimately from one end of the country to the other and they are all intensely fond of him. A lot of them would work like beavers for him when they probably wouldn't work at all even for President Roosevelt, though, of course, they would

go through the motions for the latter. But their hearts wouldn't be in it the way they would if Jim were asking them to do it.

Besides that, the fact that Farley refused to violate a principle which he believed to be more important than party regularity will have a considerable influence on other party workers who have been in a quandary over the same question. Many of them will be inclined now to decide the question as Farley did. Farley put a great deal of store by his political career. He was proud of it and it meant a very great deal to him. He could have forgotten about principle, gone along with the third-term movement, managed the President's campaign once more and been assured of still greater political rewards. But he was willing to sacrifice all this because he did not believe that any man should be elected to a third term in the White House. Because Farley was willing to make such a sacrifice for a principle, other party workers, for whom he has long been a shining example, may be expected to do likewise.

All of that isn't going to make the task of Farley's successor any easier. Even if one can be found who has the managerial ability of Farley, which is more than a little doubtful, he will have difficulties which Farley would not have by reason of the fact that many political workers will be inclined to follow Farley's example and put country above party. The national committee members and the party leaders who had remained in Chicago until after the committee meeting in the vain hope that they could persuade Farley to change his position were leaving the Windy City last night in a pretty low state of mind. As Ernest Lindsay, one of the New Deal's foremost columnar protagonists, put it: "The joyous eagerness for action which has characterized the earlier Roosevelt campaigns is missing now. The Democratic campaign of 1940 will begin, instead, in a somewhat grim atmosphere, tinged with fatalism."

[From The State (Columbia, S. C.) of July 19, 1940]

MR. FARLEY

Postmaster General Farley, the once Genial Jim, has not been so genial in recent months. Something has had him down. The common report is that his opposition to a third term try is the explanation of his unenthusiastic conduct. But this opposition, however sincere, probably is not the complete explanation, nor even the major part of it. The fundamental fact, as nearly as one may discover it from a distance, is this: Mr. Farley took his own candidacy for the Presidential nomination seriously. Some who know him say it has been difficult to switch his thoughts off that ambition, or to talk to him on any other subject.

To many common men this will seem strange. They have known all along that Mr. Farley would not be nominated. He is an able organizer, an able politician, and a loyal Democrat. As such he is respected and admired by a large number of Americans. He is the type of man on whom others depend for support. But, somehow (this comment is not influenced by the fact that he is a Roman Catholic) he is not the type for President. Organization men are necessary to political parties, but the common American does not look to them for his top leaders.

Mr. Farley's hopes for the Presidency were not unnatural, and neither were they improper. He knows what a great job he has done as the manager of two Presidential campaigns. He knows how many men like him. He knows how many favors he has performed for friends, acquaintances, and for strangers. He is accustomed to victory. In his contacts with his friends and his beneficiaries he has heard a thousand times that they were for him. But many of them were not for him in the way he hoped and believed. They did not think he could be elected President, but most of them failed to tell him that.

A man who is a candidate is in poor strategic position to learn the truth. Other men wish to please him, therefore they tell him the pleasant things they hear and frequently they represent their own opinions as more favorable than forthright candor warrants. Blame this, if blame must be placed, on human nature.

But it is strange that Mr. Farley, with his background as a Tammany worker, holder of political office—boxing commissioner—in New York, and later as the lieutenant chief of the national Democratic forces, should have forgotten this disposition of men to please the candidate with whom they are speaking. Surely he has seen scores of candidates go down to defeat despite the fact that prior to election day everybody spoke favorably of them. However, Mr. Farley seems to have forgotten his primary lessons in politics in his desire for the Democratic nomination. Unhappily, he soaked himself in his own worthy hopes.

None of this is written in criticism of Mr. Farley. The State rates him the ablest national chairman it has known and a delightful and lovable man. In this analysis the State is merely trying to understand politics and men.

Neither is the State offering criticism of those who speak pleasantly to candidates. After all, the average man does not think it any obligation of his to disillusion candidates, or to make them sore at him by telling the truth as he sees it. When an agreeable candidate asks a normal man, "What do you hear?" that normal man certainly is not going to reply, "I hear that you are soon to be an also-ran." No, sir. Human nature is not as acidly honest as that.

Defeated candidates often think and say that many men lied to them. No doubt some men do lie to candidates, but the mass of men interviewed by candidates do not lie. They merely withhold a part of the truth. For example:

A candidate asks a Podunk man what men are saying of his candidacy.

"I heard 5 or 6 of 'em say they're gonner vote for you," the Podunk man replies, and the reply may be correct. The Podunk man, however, shuts off the reply at that point instead of continuing with these words: "But I heard 15 or 20 say they wouldn't vote for you if you was the only man in the race."

The candidate goes on his rounds with a sense of warm affection for the Podunk voters—until the votes are counted.

Something comparable to this, on a national scale, seems to have happened to Mr. Farley.

The State regrets his deep disappointment, hopes he will recover quickly from it, resume his natural genial ways, and become even happier in the future than he has been in the past.

[From the Crestline (Ohio) Advocate of July 18, 1940]

THE TRAGIC PICTURE OF THE CHICAGO CONVENTION

Out of the mingled tumult, booing, cheering, and general consternation marking the principal sessions of the Democratic National Convention in Chicago this week reels the gaunt figure of the greatest leader in the history of modern politics, chairman of the Democratic National Committee, and Postmaster General of the United States, big, genial, courageous, able, and honest James A. Farley.

Jim Farley, the man who elected Roosevelt President of the United States in 1932 and again in 1936, literally kicked out by the man who owed him the greatest debt it is possible for any American citizen to owe, the elevation to the highest honor in the gift of the people of the United States. But that is nothing new for Roosevelt. It was the former Governor of the State of New York who pulled Roosevelt out of obscurity, Alfred E. Smith, who was kicked out in 1932 just as Farley was kicked out of Chicago this week.

Roosevelt and Farley talked together a week ago last Sunday. Nobody knows just what was said in that conference. But Roosevelt must have told Farley then that he wanted to be President again for a third term, something that had never happened before in the history of the American Nation. Undoubtedly Farley demurred, he must have told Roosevelt that it wasn't democracy, that he should step down now after 8 years of enjoying the greatest honor the American people can give. But with typical stubbornness Roosevelt hung on. He knew he had squandered billions of dollars of money of the American people to make slaves, he knew he had them by the neck and, by heaven, he was going to use them.

Like all other great American statesmen the aged Senator CARTER GLASS, of Virginia, was vigorously opposed to a third term for President Roosevelt and volunteered to put the name of James Farley before the Chicago convention. In the meantime the grand old Senator from Virginia became seriously ill and it was then that he received several anonymous letters saying that Farley could not be a Democratic candidate for President because of his religious convictions. It was the Al Smith tragedy of 1928 all over again. Spurred to action by this ravage of constitutional rights by members of his own party, the gallant Virginia Senator staggered from his bed and made the trip to Chicago to place Mr. Farley in nomination.

The grand old Democrat of honor and fame was frequently interrupted by jeers and boos from the New Deal hand-picked delegates. Right from the stage of the convention he told them of the threat against Farley because of his religious convictions. A delegate from Minnesota attempted to insert in the New Deal platform a repetition of the statement in the Democratic platform of 1896 opposing the un-American third-term argument. He, too, was jeered and booed and the amendment to the platform was defeated.

Shades of Thomas Jefferson, father of the Democratic Party and author of our cherished Declaration of Independence. The American doctrine which had decreed that all our people should be equal, that they should never be discriminated against because of their religious beliefs, that it should be the American creed to never nominate the same man for a third term for the Presidency—Thomas, Thomas, if you could only look down on Washington today.

A free people, indeed. The White House has been Hitlerized. May God in heaven help us.

No wonder that Jim Farley, one of the greatest Democrats of his generation, one of the finest of all American citizens, should seek to forever wash his hands and cleanse his body of the slime of the New Deal. What a tragic political end for great, warm-hearted American—Jim Farley.

[From the Dallas (Tex.) Morning News of July 22, 1940]

QUESTION MARK

Appraising humorously but neatly and efficiently the urbane gentleman who had progressed so far from Grassy Point, the New York Evening Post back in 1936 remarked that the G. O. P.'s severest blow was the realization that James A. Farley would not comply with the Roosevelt mandate and resign as national chairman in order to retain his Federal job. "They thought they could defeat Roosevelt," commented the Post; "they knew they couldn't beat Farley."

Many persons have been given credit for the victory of 1932. Certainly Louis Howe had a part in it. But for the most part the fact that Franklin Roosevelt was nominated, the most essential part of victory that year, was due to Farley, to a Farley who had begun the ground-laying task many months before the Chicago convention. And to the ensuing campaign he brought a directing skill that still commands the highest admiration. In 1936 reelection might have

occurred with or without Jim Farley, but with him it was a lead-pipe cinch. Now comes 1940.

Acceptance of the post of national chairman for the first month of the campaign seems to be all that could be obtained from the Postmaster General, of whom certain things are known facts: (1) He doesn't believe in third terms; (2) he believes in promotion from the ranks of deserving Democrats; (3) he wanted to be promoted to the Presidency himself.

Now James Aloysius Farley is not going to bolt the Democratic ticket. His own assurance that everybody knows he is a Democrat made it unnecessary for him to say that he will vote the party ticket. No; Jim Farley will not bolt. He will not, like an illustrious fellow New Yorker, take a walk. But the question that bothers the anxious new dealers is, Will he march?

[From the Dallas Times-Herald of July 21, 1940]

FARLEY RETIRES

The retirement of James A. Farley, "the man with a million friends," from the chairmanship of the Democratic National Committee leaves President Roosevelt to campaign for reelection without the generalship of one of the ablest and most virtuous practical politicians that this Nation has had.

Farley describes himself as a politician, and if all men to whom the word is applied were of his type, it would have no unfavorable meaning. Politics is a rough game, but Farley has played it so that, as he goes into private life, he is at the height of his popularity.

Although Farley has announced that he will vote for the Roosevelt-Wallace ticket, he is stepping out under circumstances that make his withdrawal embarrassing to the President. The public is convinced that he has refused to assist in breaking the two-term tradition.

The sincere tribute given Farley at the Democratic Convention was long overdue. His good qualities have not been generally appreciated. The brain trusters scorned him as only a politician. Partisan Democrats accused him of giving juicy patronage plums to Republicans, and Republicans have charged him with maintaining a patronage machine for Democrats. But, through it all, he has kept his poise and given good service as Postmaster General.

Farley has had to be practical, and has been content to let others put on the halos of idealism. He has had to talk politics while they have talked philosophy. Yet, if all hearts in Washington were laid bare and analyzed, it might be shown that he is the most sincere idealist of them all. After 30 years in politics, he is retiring with a record that has no ugly blots, and he stands out as a genuine, democratic, patriotic, family loving American.

[From the Davenport (Iowa) Democrat and Leader of July 18, 1940]

JIM FARLEY, DEMOCRAT

It was 25 minutes until 2 in the morning by the clock in the Chicago Stadium as a tall, bald-headed man made his way to the platform amid the bedlam created by 30,000 cheering people to get the attention of Senator ALBEN BARKLEY, convention chairman.

The cheering became louder and wilder as he approached the rostrum.

It was Jim Farley, beloved chairman of the National Democratic Committee through two successful Presidential campaigns.

The delegates couldn't give Jim their votes in a moment of world-wide emergency. They wanted the calm, steady hand of Franklin D. Roosevelt to continue at the wheel. But they could give him their cheers. They did.

Jim stood there in the spotlight with the microphones, ears of the Nation, about him. The boy from Rockland County was at the peak of a remarkable political career.

Slowly and forcefully, he speaks: "I have pursued a course here that has been dictated by the deepest convictions, and when a man fails to follow his sincere convictions he is false to himself, false to his party, and false to his country.

"I move now that the rules be suspended and that Franklin D. Roosevelt be nominated by acclamation. I want you to know that I will give my full support to the nominee of this great convention."

He stepped out of the spotlight, out of the range of the microphone. The 30,000 Democrats sang Irish Eyes Are Smiling in his honor.

A great Democrat, a great organization man, a great man—Jim Farley. It was not his lot—and probably not within the range of his abilities—to be President of the United States. But he had helped to make a President. He had fought a fight where other men might have made enemies; but as he stepped from the spotlight he left only friends.

[From the Dayton (Ohio) News of July 22, 1940]

ST. JIM

No man below the Presidency has suffered more derogation in recent years than James A. Farley, who now departs amid a storm of plaudits from the political scene. Jim Farley, now all but canonized among the saints of politics, was not so long ago, to millions of us, the devil-in-chief of politics. As the smiling center of 8 years of political strife departs in peace from the political planet, he is entitled to a satisfaction all his own.

As leader in the fight to nominate and elect the President in 1932, Farley came under the accustomed hail of rocks and rain and mud. You take that for granted in politics as politics is played. Then the national chairman became Postmaster General, the classical berth, in the age of spoils, for the successful general in a Presidential campaign. That, in the day when the post-office tail went with the political hide, was the convenient vantage from which to dispense the pay in offices for services rendered in the campaign. Farley was spotted immediately as the pay-off man of the new administration. This functionary is never popular with the people whom he is to separate from their jobs. The brickbats flew at once.

Then Farley decided to hold on to his post as national chairman. To the enemy this meant an intent to buy the next campaign as well as to pay off for the last. Immediately the Nation was being wrecked by the machinations of the most reckless and ruthless and no doubt otherwise corrupt spoilsman in the story of American politics. Jim Farley was made the millstone by which the Roosevelt administration was to be sunk. The war on Farley went relentlessly on for a full 5 years. Jim Farley sawed wood, said nothing.

The 5 years brought forth finally the facts. Farley was a good politician, one of the ablest any party has had. That did not mean, it was discovered, that he was a bad man. The country was allowed finally to see Farley as a fundamentally honest man, his word as good as his bond, and a patriot who never put Farley or party or faction above his country. The great politician was a sound and efficient Postmaster General and a faithful citizen on whose name clung no whit of the mud his detractors had cast.

Farley quits his post by his own party universally beloved and trusted. So character will tell. The realistic Jim will smile a bit wryly at the sudden love which his old detractors now express. This comes only as he parts from the President for whom their brickbats were really meant. Yet he possesses, regardless of this, the disinterested respect and confidence of old enemies as well as old friends, as he quits politics in search of an old-age security, not often to be got in politics by men of his scrupulousness, for himself.

[From the Decatur (Ill.) Herald of July 20, 1940]

GENIAL JIM STEPS OUT

Until August 17 James A. Farley will continue to be chairman of the Democratic National Committee. Then he will resign his party post to accept "an attractive private business offer." Some time prior to August 17 President Roosevelt will announce the retirement of Postmaster General James A. Farley. Thus within a month Jim Farley will relinquish the two important posts he has held for almost 8 years.

Today there is little complaint, even among Republicans, that the Democratic national chairman is at the same time the Postmaster General. Six years ago Farley was denounced as a spoilsman and was urged to relinquish either his party or his Cabinet post. But he continued as party chairman and as Postmaster General through the 1936 Presidential campaign and until now in the second Roosevelt administration. Finally he is resigning not one but both of his jobs. He is a loyal Democrat but he doesn't believe in a third term. He's still "Genial Jim." He isn't mad, but he may be a trifle hurt.

Jim Farley has been a popular and successful politician, but at the same time he had administered the Post Office Department in satisfactory fashion. If he has been guilty of "politics" on occasion, he has been so frank and absolutely honest about it that nobody could complain much. He should find deep satisfaction in expressions of affection and admiration extended on every hand as he retires to the comparative quiet of private life.

[From the Detroit (Mich.) News of July 17, 1940]

FARLEY'S FAREWELL

James A. Farley was easily the man of the day as the Democratic National Convention began. For the host of Democratic politicians in the convention, the dull and drab opening contained a genuine event. Farley, whose record as a successful manager of Democratic campaigning lacks an equal, bade them farewell.

The effect, as he delivered a brief speech calling the convention to order, was that someone else must follow him in the job of organizing and managing the campaign which will succeed or fail in electing President Roosevelt to the tradition-breaking third term.

What it means to follow Farley is signified by his successes—management of Roosevelt's campaign for nomination in 1932; management of the Roosevelt campaigns for election in 1932 and 1936; management of the successful Democratic congressional campaigns of 1934 and 1938.

Farley obviously could not do otherwise than predict another Democratic victory. He's a loyal Democrat.

As he quits, it is equally true that (1) he seeks to improve his private financial position in private employment and (2) he wants no part in a campaign to elect the President a third time, being opposed on deep-seated conviction to third terms.

Who will succeed him? Harry Hopkins, in Chicago as the President's representative? Republicans probably hope the Hopkins report is true. For Hopkins, since 1938, when he began appearing in political roles for the New Deal, hasn't made a record to alarm his opponents.

[From the Detroit News of July 20, 1940]

GOOD SPORTS

Workmen cleaning up the stadium in Chicago after the Democratic Convention found a slip of paper on which was written: "Jim, you're a good soldier." It was a note of appreciation to James A. Farley.

Two outstanding features will stick in the memories of those who attended that convention and those who were radio listeners to its noisy broadcasts: Jim Farley's graciousness and loyalty even in defeat, and the pluck of Senator CARTER GLASS in coming from a sickroom to make a political speech which was evidently a matter of conscience. Agreement will be unanimous; they were good sports.

[From the Durham (N. C.) Sun of July 19, 1940]

STILL JIM FARLEY

The Democratic rank and file of the country will be told today the plans of Jim Farley. He is one of the best loved among political figures within his party and one of the most respected if not exactly loved without his party of all American history. That may seem a broad statement, but it is made advisedly. One of the reasons, undoubtedly, is his unswerving loyalty to his friends and to his convictions.

His words last night and the night before, following the respective convention sessions, served to magnify his stature in American minds. His attitude, gracious and broad, offered a sharp contrast to the "Al Smith walk" of 8 years ago. He is still loyal. In a word, he is still Jim Farley.

[From the Durham (N. C.) Herald-Sun of July 21, 1940]

"FARLEY ORCHID SHOWER"

It would be untrue, not to mention unfair, for anyone, friend or foe, to suggest that Jim Farley does not deserve the praise and affection showered upon him at Chicago and by political writers who have been closely associated with him. It would be just as untrue and unfair to suggest that he does not merit the rating he is now being given as a political organizer, campaign manager, and so on. He has turned in the hard and effective job his friends claim he has.

Likewise, it would be untrue to suggest that Mr. Farley's stepping out as national chairman does not leave the party and Mr. Roosevelt with a problem and lessen the chances of success for the Roosevelt-Wallace ticket in November. Everybody understands that Mr. Farley feels that he has been treated more or less badly and that he is less than enthusiastic over the third-term venture. Everybody knows, too, that the Roosevelt forces tried to persuade Mr. Farley to continue as chairman.

It isn't untrue or unfair, however, to remind some of the gentlemen now covering Mr. Farley with orchids that if Mr. Farley is a hero today he is not altogether a self-made hero. And surely, it isn't untrue or unfair to remind the "hero worshipers" that they twist themselves up a bit when they undertake to say that Jim Farley is the only man who can run a campaign and denounce others for saying that Franklin Roosevelt is the only man who can handle the Presidency in this crisis.

The outstanding trait Mr. Farley has manifested these past few months is that he is a man of convictions and the will and capacity to obey them, with consistency and forthrightness. It would, we submit, reflect credit upon his journalistic admirers if they, like their hero, practiced what they preach.

For ourselves, we readily admit that if we were in Mr. Roosevelt's shoes we had rather have Jim Farley in campaign headquarters than anyone we know of. But we also readily admit that there are others capable of carrying on, even as we think there are others capable of carrying on in Mr. Roosevelt's place.

[From the East St. Louis (Ill.) Journal of July 22, 1940]

GENIAL JIM STEPS OUT

Until August 17, James A. Farley will continue to be chairman of the Democratic National Committee. Then he will resign his party post to accept an attractive private business offer. Sometime prior to August 17, President Roosevelt will announce the retirement of Postmaster General James A. Farley. Thus within a month Jim Farley will relinquish the two important posts he has held for almost 8 years.

Today there is little complaint, even among Republicans, that the Democratic national chairman is at the same time the Postmaster General. Six years ago Farley was denounced as a spoilsman and was urged to relinquish either his party or his Cabinet post. But he continued as party chairman and as Postmaster General through the 1936 Presidential campaign and until now in the second Roosevelt administration. Finally he is resigning not one, but both of his jobs. He is a loyal Democrat but he doesn't believe in a third term. He's still "Genial Jim." He isn't mad, but he may be a trifle hurt.

Jim Farley has been a popular and successful politician but at the same time he has administered the Post Office Department in satisfactory fashion. If he has been guilty of politics on occasion, he has been so frank and absolutely honest about it that nobody would complain much. He should find deep satisfaction in expressions of affection and admiration extended on every hand as he retires to the comparative quiet of private life.

[From the Fort Worth Star-Telegram of July 24, 1940]

A RETIRING LEADER

The ovations and many compliments extended James A. Farley at the Democratic National Convention in Chicago were evidence of the high respect and appreciation which the party holds for its national chairman, who is retiring September 1. Another tribute was paid Mr. Farley, the Postmaster General, who leaves the Government service September 1, in a vote of confidence extended by the Federal Employees Association of Texas at their Dallas meeting, said to be the largest gathering of Federal workers ever assembled in one room.

When the Dallas tribute was offered, it was pointed out that no political motive could be ascribed to the vote of confidence at such a time, and the same statement could have been made of the previous compliments paid Mr. Farley at Chicago. As a Federal official, Mr. Farley was described by his associates in the service as "a rare executive, an inspiring leader, and a magnificent friend." Mr. Farley has demonstrated those same qualities in his work as chairman of the Democratic Party.

But incident to his leadership as a Federal and party official, Mr. Farley has displayed many other qualities that have marked him as an outstanding man in national life during the last 8 troublesome years. Jim Farley has always kept his head in emergencies. He has never fostered hatreds or dissensions among any of the diverse groups of the country, when nerves of many others were on edge. Stamped as a "practical politician," Mr. Farley has never resorted to cheap politics to win votes. Although a leader of his party, he has kept himself in the background. Mr. Farley has been able to enforce party discipline because he first was capable of self-discipline. He has exemplified one of the rarest of human virtues—loyalty.

There are many members of both political parties, and many persons unidentified with either faction, who realize now that Mr. Farley possesses the requirements of a great national leader. Certainly, both the Postoffice Department and the Democratic Party will find it difficult to replace him.

[From the Grand Rapids (Mich.) Herald of July 24, 1940]

BACK TO PRIVATE LIFE

James A. Farley, for 8 years chairman of the Democratic National Committee, and for nearly that time Postmaster General in the Cabinet of President Roosevelt, before the week end will step down from all his political offices and become just Jim Farley, one of the owners and managers of the New York Yankee baseball team.

With his passing from public life will go one of the most beloved figures ever to hold the political spotlight in this or any other nation. Not alone among the members of his own party but among those of opposite political faith Jim Farley is respected and loved.

No man ever held public office who so universally held the respect and affection of the hard-boiled newspaper crowd as did Jim. Two events which gained no publicity in the recent Chicago convention showed more than anything else the respect they hold for him. On the day of his last press conference when Jim entered the room the entire body of newspaper correspondents rose and cheered him. And on Friday afternoon the Press Gallery gave a reception for Jim in the grand ballroom of the Stevens Hotel. Two such circumstances never before occurred for any man in the position of Mr. Farley and that demonstration of their affection for him was spontaneous. It needed neither the machinations of Mayor Kelly nor of any other cheer leader to bring about those events.

Jim Farley easily was the most popular man before the Chicago convention. The cheers for him always were genuine and from the hearts of the galleries and of the delegates. Abused, slighted, insulted as he had been by the man he had "made," Jim went smilingly about the business of handling the convention, pledged his support to the ticket even though he is unalterably opposed to a third term for anybody. He was loyal to the last moment of his public career. Disloyalty was all on the other side.

He had been hurt to the heart. The greatest hurt of all was when the President said Farley would be unavailable for the Presidency because of his religion. Jim is a devout Catholic who is sincere in his devotion and who is a credit to the church to which, as in everything else, he is always loyal.

Jim Farley started life as humbly as a man might. As a boy he was a bartender, yet he has yet to know the taste either of liquor or tobacco. His mother is a saint to him, and she warned him early against the use of either.

A wonderful memory has Farley. It is said he can call 50,000 persons over the Nation by their first names. And whatever may be their positions in life, whatever their politics, their religious beliefs, their color, or their race, Jim Farley always is their loyal friend.

The Democratic Party has lost its greatest asset in Mr. Farley's refusal to conduct another campaign for the man whom he twice so triumphantly elected. But Farley will not bolt. His loyal disposition does not permit of that. And whatever the party may have lost, public service has lost infinitely more. They don't make a Farley every day. All over this Nation are those of all political faiths who will be wishing Jim Farley the best of success in his new place in private life and who will feel that public life has lost one of its highest types of men, the kind so much needed in the political life of this Nation.

REFLECTIONS OF AN EDITOR

(By Frank M. Sparks)

Alongside this column is an editorial I wrote about the departure of Jim Farley from public life. My only regret in having written it is that I have neither the vocabulary nor the space in the editorial column to sing of Jim all the praises that I have in my heart. I have not at my disposal the space to tell of all his virtues nor of the real friendship which I have for him, and of his friendship for me, of which I am so truly proud.

Jim Farley is a most unusual character. I've known men in public life who had marvelous memories. Senator William Alden Smith was one. But of them all, Farley has the world beaten. Many a man and woman he meets only casually in a crowd but next time he meets that person he calls him by name. And always Jim wears his wonderful smile. It is a genuine smile, a contagious smile, one that sort of makes a person feel good down inside.

The newspaper fraternity everywhere loves Jim Farley. One of the reasons for this is his forthrightness, his frankness. Take his press conferences at Chicago. Many a question was asked him which he would have been justified in refusing to answer. But when such a question came, he didn't do as most men in political life try to do, be smart and slip around the edges. He either answered the question frankly or said, "I don't think I ought to answer that one. I think you should ask that one of the President." And what was the result? Whenever a correspondent framed a question, the propriety of which he doubted somewhat, he always said, "I don't know, Jim, whether this is a proper question, but if it is embarrassing to you, you don't need to answer it." And more frequently than not Jim would reply, "That's a perfectly proper question and I'll answer it."

He is a square shooter, always has been and always will be. That's why he stands so well with hard-boiled newspapermen who are accustomed to having men in public life try to outsmart them. For these they have no mercy and pursue their questions until eventually they get their man in a hole. They never try to get Jim Farley in a hole. They wouldn't put him there if they could. They think too much of him for that.

WHAT MIGHT HAVE BEEN

To use the words of Senator SCOTT LUCAS in withdrawing his own name as a candidate for Vice President at Chicago, "had this been a free and open convention," Jim Farley quite likely might have been the nominee for the Presidency. And if he failed for that office, he certainly would have been nominated for Vice President. The two names and the two men who drew the most sincere and spontaneous applause of both delegates and galleries, the two most popular men in the convention were Jim Farley and Paul V. McNutt. Had the convention been free and open, the Democratic ticket this fall probably would have been either Farley and McNutt or McNutt and Farley. I rather lean to the first, with Farley at the head of the ticket because, had the field been open, Farley, with his great organization and his thousands of friends, could pretty nearly have lined up the delegates in advance for himself.

A year ago last April when I was calling on Jim in New York, I asked him why he didn't make the effort and suggested my belief that he could line up the delegates for himself if he chose. He said then to me: "I am quite confident that in an hour or two I could get on that phone over there and have enough States pledged to me to nominate me." But then he went on to say that he would not make any such effort until the President had spoken and the President didn't speak until 48 hours before the nominations were to take place.

Jim told me at that time, too, that the President had told him and others that he would not be a candidate for a third term. But the President didn't tell all that was in his mind apparently. He defeated all ambitions of others, at the same time holding his own counsel until it was too late really for anybody to organize to win the nomination. One after another of those who had aspirations—Farley, McNutt, Garner, and many others—he shunted aside in one way or another until he had things lined up for himself. That's what makes so many leading Democrats so mad these days.

One of the things which made the Farley friends madder than ever was the attempt of the President and of Mrs. Roosevelt, evidently acting under her husband's instructions, to smooth over the feelings of Farley and his friends when it was too late. Apparently they had heard the cheers for Farley, knew of his great popularity at the convention, and decided they would do well to slick things up a bit.

The crowd accepted what Mrs. Roosevelt said of Farley as being sincere, because everybody admires the First Lady of the Land. But when only a few minutes later the President put it on so thick, the whole thing was too transparent, and Farley's friends were madder than ever.

Well, there's one thing I'm glad of. Jim told me several months ago that politics had put a severe crimp in his personal fortune, that he must get out and go to work for himself. He has landed a fine job with the Yankee baseball team. I hope he makes a fortune from it and is happy in the work. I believe he will be, because he's not new to the world of sports. He was boxing commissioner in New York for many years. His personality will help. But I'm going to miss Jim Farley in the political field just the same.

[From the Greensboro (N. C.) Daily News of July 23, 1940]

SPORTSMANSHIP

JOHN NANCE GARNER, whose friends say he has sent no congratulatory messages to his party's nominees, is expected to bundle up his traps and go home to Uvalde, there to loaf and invite his soul for the duration of the campaign. "Cactus Jack" simply cannot abide the thought of a third term and has never made any secret of it.

James Aloysius Farley, who liked a third term not a whit better, agrees to stay on as national Democratic chairman for a month and help break in a new management. Thereafter he's to drop out of the more abundant political life for a spell in an effort to recoup his private fortunes.

Both men have for years been intimate friends of Franklin D. Roosevelt. Both contributed handsomely to making him President and have supported him ably in his administration of the country's affairs. Either has the right to call it a day; but while "Big Jim" may still take a profit from his attitude none is apt to accrue to Mr. GARNER.

At 70-odd, however, a self-sufficient individual does not require the airs and graces of a good sport. What boots it if the country generally terms "Cactus Jack" a sorehead? He's got enough to live on, has put, perhaps, as much into public service as he has taken from it and doesn't have to smile when his palate report is bitter.

Mr. Farley isn't anything like so nearly through politically. The more conservative element of his party will be treasuring his willingness to set his face against precedent-smashing while the liberals will praise his cheerfulness in defeat. If he wants to become a candidate for President 4 years from now, he will have lost no ground; for he has made no enemies.

It would have been strange, indeed, if one whose stock in trade down the years has been party loyalty in a huff rushed off the reservation. No doubt it is true, as Mr. Farley has declared, that he puts country above party; but we suspect he will always put his party above any other sort of political organization or combination.

[From the Greenville (S. C.) News of July 8, 1940]

LOSS TO THE DEMOCRATS

The report that Postmaster General James A. Farley will shortly resign both from the Cabinet and from the chairmanship of the Democratic National Committee to manage the New York Yankees baseball club is, of course, one of much political significance.

For, if these plans work out as reported, it will mean that Jim Farley will not manage the Democratic Presidential campaign this year, and that will be a serious loss to the Democratic Party and the candidate whom it nominates at Chicago next week.

Farley's work in behalf of Roosevelt in the 1932 and 1936 campaigns is widely regarded as having been of inestimable value in rolling the Roosevelt vote up to such tremendous proportions. Mr. Farley's exceptional ability in these fields is sincerely conceded, even by his opponents, and he would be an exceedingly useful man for the Democrats this year, particularly in view of the prospect that the Republicans are going to make an unusually strong bid for popular favor.

Mr. Farley's reported decision may mean that he is now convinced that Mr. Roosevelt will accept a third-term nomination, of which Mr. Farley disapproves. It has been generally said that a coolness has developed between Mr. Farley and Mr. Roosevelt in recent months, and the Postmaster General may have come to the conclusion that he does not wish to be connected actively with a Democratic Party effort to elect Mr. Roosevelt for another term. A few months ago Mr. Farley indicated that his name would be presented to the convention for the nomination regardless of Mr. Roosevelt's decision; but it is now quite evident that if Mr. Roosevelt is willing to accept the nomination neither Mr. Farley nor any other candidate will have any chance to win it.

[From the Greenville (S. C.) News of July 17, 1940]

FARLEY'S "SWAN SONG?"

In his address to the Democratic Convention, Jim Farley gave the distinct impression that he was delivering his "swan song" so far as further active participation in national politics this year is concerned.

Various developments of the last year or so in Farley's public career clearly suggest that there is much ground for the judgment that he does not approve the third term and in addition feels that his own political aspirations have not been given fair opportunity by the party leadership.

In an article from Chicago to the Atlanta Constitution Ralph McGill reveals the gist of the famous secret conversation which Farley had with the President, as gleaned from "a source believed reliable."

Farley is going to retire, writes Mr. McGill, "because Farley wants to establish himself in business and because he believes he has not been treated fairly by the new dealers and because he does not believe in a third term." He will support the nominee, even if it be for a third term, and will remain a party man, but he will not lend his genius to directing it. At the 2-hour conference, the Atlanta writer asserts, "Farley told the President he would have retired 4 years ago if he (Farley) had not believed he would be given a chance to be President or Vice President. He reviewed assurances to that end made him by party leaders and by the President. It was a very frank talk. Farley was not angry. No voices were raised. But Farley spoke his real feelings. He reminded the President that as late as the Massachusetts primary he had been encouraged to enter his name in the primaries. And that then the 'brain trust' group of Corcoran, Cohen, and Ickes had gone in behind him and wrecked his campaign. He said he did not believe he had been treated fairly." And Mr. McGill whimsically sees significance in the tune most frequently played at the first session of the convention, Take Me Out to the Ball Game, which he says will be the Farley theme song.

It must be said that this analysis provides a plausible explanation of certain of Mr. Farley's actions in recent months. His announcement that he would be a candidate for the nomination "regardless" certainly suggests that he was convinced by his conferences with Mr. Roosevelt that the latter would not accept a third-term nomination.

[From the Greenville (S. C.) News of July 20, 1940]

THEY'LL MISS FARLEY

As had been indicated, genial Jim Farley is pulling out of politics.

He remains as chairman of the Democratic National Committee until August 17, evidently to give the 1940 Democratic nominees opportunity to select a successor and a campaign manager.

It is now quite clear to everybody that there has been a real break between Farley and Franklin D. Roosevelt. That seems to have been based on Farley's dislike of the third-term idea, but it is quite possible that Farley's opposition to a third term for Mr. Roosevelt was founded in part at least on Mr. Farley's own aspirations to receive a Presidential nomination.

But at any rate Mr. Farley's admittedly great political talents are not going to be put into action in behalf of the Democratic national ticket this year. That, unquestionably, is a great loss to the Democratic campaign. And with the stiffer opposition this year the Democrats are probably going to need the ablest possible management of their 1940 effort.

[From the Harrisburg (Pa.) Telegraph of July 22, 1940]

AN EXAMPLE OF LOYALTY

Withdrawal of James A. Farley, chairman of the Democratic National Committee, from the front lines as the Presidential campaign nears its crucial stage may prove decisive.

But the genial, able leader of the last two campaigns may not be accused of running out on his party.

Long in advance of the convention he had announced his decision to retire.

After the convention he reiterated loyalty to party and nominee and repeated the necessity of recouping his finances compelled him to embark in private business.

Throughout his long and honorable political career he has been frank, honest, and truthful in his public utterances. His words, "I have an opportunity now to accept an attractive offer in business and, in justice to my family, because of my financial situation I am going to accept," must be accepted at face value.

His devotion to party compelled him to make a further sacrifice.

Instead of withdrawing at the end of his term he agreed to continue until party affairs had been placed in perfect order.

Mr. Farley will retire at the peak of an honorable career and with reputation enhanced by his convention conduct.

As was his right, he had his name placed before the convention, and by one of the most independent Democrats of all time, Senator GLASS.

He insisted on equal rights and privileges for other loyal members of his party.

Though he had intimate knowledge of the President's hopes and ambitions to stampede the convention, he nevertheless insisted upon strict adherence to traditional methods.

His ability to operate the convention with fairness and justice for all again demonstrates his outstanding qualities.

The tremendous ovation given Mr. Farley by the delegates was an acknowledgment of their admiration for one who has guided them to two victories, who has won an uncounted army of friends both within and without the party, who has remained steadfast and loyal through fair weather and foul, who has never broken a promise, who has been unfailingly honest and truthful, who now retires from public life high in the esteem of Democrats and Republicans.

With lesser Democratic politicians running out on the party to clamber aboard the Willkie band wagon, the party will sorely miss the confidence-inspiring guidance of Mr. Farley.

[From the Hartford (Conn.) Courant of July 19, 1940]

THE REAL BIGNESS OF FARLEY

The man who comes out of the Democratic National Convention with the most credit is James A. Farley. Throughout the proceedings he stood steadfastly for maintaining the precedent established by Jefferson against a third-term nomination for any President. He made known his views long before the movement started to "draft" Mr. Roosevelt for another nomination. In his customary outspoken but affable manner, he advised the President to respect this great and wise tradition. He had good reason to believe at one time that his counsel would be heeded; in fact, his assurances were such that he announced his own intention to become a candidate. When he saw that the situation had changed and that delegates were being rounded up in the President's behalf, he let it be known that that would make no difference to him and that he would stick it out to the end. And this he did. He went down with his colors flying, but never once did he lose his good nature.

He saw Secretary Hopkins, who has been living at the White House of late, assuming roles that he himself had customarily played at such Democratic gatherings but if it hurt his pride he gave no outward indication of it. However, he firmly insisted for the good of the party in having his way in certain matters. He would not permit the President's more ardent enthusiasts to try for an immediate nomination by acclamation. He demanded that the convention exemplify, so far as it was possible in the circumstances, all the democratic processes customarily observed. The proposal to dispense with a roll call met with his emphatic objection. "If you do that," he said, "you might as well not hold an election in November." Shrewd, straight-thinking politician that he is he could look beyond July to November, which was more than some of the others could do.

The real attitude of the delegates toward him, bound and delivered as most of them were to the President, was shown first when his name was placed in nomination by the venerable Senator GLASS, of Virginia, and then by the spontaneous ovation that greeted him when he took the platform, after the roll call, to express his thanks for such support as he had received and to add his votes to those that had been chalked up for Mr. Roosevelt. The band struck up, "Irish Eyes Are Smiling," the vast audience chimed in and "Sunny Jim" looked supremely happy, as he had a right to be.

When historians write the story of this convention of the Democratic Party it is likely they will say that James A. Farley was about the biggest figure there, not only physically but in other respects. Lambasted and ridiculed early in his national political career as incapable of rising above his old-time Tammany affiliations, he stands today high in the estimation of the public. He has shown qualities of mind and heart, strength of character and devotion to principle that have made him hosts of friends and admirers everywhere.

[From the Hartford (Conn.) Times of July 20, 1940]

MR. FARLEY'S FUTURE

For some years there have been reports that James A. Farley would resign as Postmaster General and go into business. Long before he was a candidate for the Presidential nomination the affable and able chairman of the Democratic National Committee was known to be wearying of sacrificing his best years to the service of his party and the building up other men's fortunes, political or otherwise. Now, with the cheers of thousands of friends and admirers ringing in his ears, Mr. Farley must decide whether he will quit politics immediately and complete his negotiations for the purchase of the New York American League baseball team, or whether he will conduct the campaign of his long-time friend for a third term.

Reelection of Mr. Farley to be national chairman is a well deserved tribute. His agreement to serve only until August 17, however, means that between now and that date he must be prevailed on to stay on the job, or a successor may be found. Already there is talk of Frank G. Walker, friend of the President and former national treasurer, and Senator JAMES F. BYRNES of South Carolina. Neither Mr. Walker nor Senator BYRNES wants the job. It is likely that President Roosevelt prefers that Mr. Farley continue as national chairman, not only because of the successful campaigns of 1932 and 1936 which Mr. Farley conducted, but because Mr. Farley's continuance as national chairman would be welcome evidence of party unity, since the Postmaster General was a rival of Mr. Roosevelt for the nomination and is known to be opposed to third-term nominations.

Mr. Farley, however, would be justified in looking out for his own affairs after the 8 years he has given Mr. Roosevelt and the party. The income from his proposed office of head of the organization owning the Yankees would be welcome, and the work would be to his liking. He is also suggested for an executive position in an automobile manufacturing company. His skill as an organizer makes him sought after by big business. Whatever his decision may be, Mr. Farley always will have thousands of friends who will be his loyal rooters. If he leaves the Democratic National Committee he will be greatly missed. He has been a "square shooter," an even-tempered gentleman, and an altogether admirable citizen. Everyone who knows him will wish him success and happiness in whatever he undertakes.

[From the Helena (Mont.) Independent of July 21, 1940]

"BIG JIM" DEPARTING

One of the inevitable results of the heroic answer of President Roosevelt to the will of the Chicago convention is to be the departure of "Big Jim" Farley from national politics, where he reigned as chairman of the party, whose founder frowned on third-term aspirations of any man. So does "Big Jim," who was the directing genius of two Roosevelt campaigns, which, we learn, would have been all for the President had he not discovered in the meantime that the United States cannot go along in safety without him at the helm.

Postmaster General Farley stated his views on third terms a long time ago and when the President "released" his delegates in Chicago "Big Jim" allowed his own name to go before the convention just to show he was standing pat, although he knew that Roosevelt would be nominated that same evening.

To the rank and file of the party Jim Farley's decision to quit will be keenly felt. He was the one new dealer of them all who knew how to keep things rolling for his boss. Kindly and affable, with all of the great human qualities, "Big Jim" knew Democrats in every nook of the United States and while his secretaries once in a while mixed up his friendly, "personal" letters to the constituents from Helena to Hoboken, he was the sparkplug of the Roosevelt forces.

But "Big Jim" was sidetracked in recent years from the inner New Deal circles in favor of "brain trusters" and new politicos to whom the President took a liking and lent an ear that once listened to Farley. Sorely strained as the relations became, "Big Jim" was always loyal to "the Boss." He pulled many a chestnut out of the fire and took the "rap" for many an ill-advised move that was not his.

President Roosevelt, in his speech of acceptance, referred affectionately to "my old friend, Jim Farley" and voiced the hope that he would "continue to give all the leadership and support he can to the cause of American democracy."

However, James Aloysius Farley will leave the master-mind direction of a third-term campaign to others. He is going into the much

more enjoyable business of baseball where the paying fans turn out in numbers reminiscent of a November election and where it's part of the game for a pitcher to cross up the batter.

The decision of "Big Jim" to forsake politics—fed up and disillusioned—is going to hurt the chances of the third-term ticket. That they would liked to have had him remain was evidenced in the President's reference to "my old friend." But Jim Farley is just a plain old American, who believes two terms are enough for any President, even his old pal and buddy, Franklin D. Roosevelt.

[From the Houston (Tex.) Post of July 21, 1940]

JIM FARLEY'S RETIREMENT WILL END EPOCH IN DEMOCRATIC HISTORY

Jim Farley's approaching retirement as chairman of the Democratic National Committee will end an epochal period in the history of the political party which draws its inspiration from Thomas Jefferson.

In many ways, Farley helped to make that epoch great.

He is retiring for several important reasons. Farley had dreams of a Presidential nomination, perhaps through the aid and support of the man he has called "boss" for 7½ years, and whom he has served with unswerving loyalty. He watched those dreams and hopes crash about his ears during months of silence at the White House, while delegates were pledged to Roosevelt. Farley doesn't believe in a third term, even for the "boss."

He has made great financial sacrifices during recent years because of his deeply rooted love of politics. He likes the tumult and the shouting, the back slapping, hand shaking, and vote counting on election nights. Now he has opportunities to take big jobs at big salaries. Disillusioned and perhaps somewhat broken by the political game he played so expertly and with so much sportsmanship, he will take one of the jobs and the big money. But he probably won't like it.

There is no more proficient backslapper and handshaker in the land than Jim Farley. He knows how to pull political strings in a national campaign better than any living American. But behind his outstretched hand and ready smile lie a fine intellect and deeply rooted convictions on public affairs. "Big Jim" has made politics and politicians respectable.

As he stalked from the Chicago convention, probably the last in which he will participate as an important Democratic leader, disappointment weighed heavily upon him. But he took his medicine like a man and a true sportsman.

He agreed to remain as national chairman until August, so the burden of organizing the campaign will fall on his broad shoulders. He praised the Roosevelt-Wallace ticket, as a good party man would, swallowing his personal feelings. He said he will retain the chairmanship of the New York Democratic committee, and will make a vigorous fight for the Democratic ticket in his own State.

"Big Jim," in other words, is taking no walk.

At the end of a sordid convention, in which the kind of politics in which Jim Farley believes was sidetracked for an infinitely less worthy variety, he stands out as an exceedingly admirable figure.

When the Democratic Party drifts away from such a man, it is getting into dangerous waters.

[From the Hudson (N. J.) Dispatch of July 22, 1940]

FARLEY WINS CONFIDENCE OF THE PUBLIC

The passing of James A. Farley from public life is one of the most impressive exits from politics in many years. When Mr. Farley came upon the scene of national politics 8 years ago he was a target for one of the worst "silent" campaigns of recent times—and much of it not so silent. By inference it was made to appear that he was to be the big "fixer" of the Roosevelt Administration.

As Mr. Farley retires from public life, all this has been changed. He is one of the ablest men in public life in America. He has gained a degree of public confidence seldom acquired by men in public life. This confidence runs far into the realm of esteem, and the confidence and esteem for him run into citizens of both political parties.

It is a rather slow process, but men who are intentionally misunderstood usually win out in the long run.

[From the Knoxville (Tenn.) Journal of July 17, 1940]

FARLEY SINGS HIS SWAN SONG

There are few human qualities more admirable than loyalty, where it be directed toward a person, a cause, or a principle.

It is because Jim Farley has manifested this characteristic in such generous measure that regret at his treatment by Mr. Roosevelt and his new dealers is not confined just to the rank and file of Democratic Party workers but extends to countless Republicans as well.

Every Republican who looks forward to the election of Wendell Willkie in November was gratified from a political standpoint to find out definitely that the New Deal third-term campaign was not to be under the Farley leadership. That announcement boosted the Willkie campaign stock by several points.

But the spectacle of Farley's being snubbed consistently by such new dealers as Harry Hopkins is hard for anybody, even a Republican, to take in the light of the Postmaster General's previous record.

It will be recalled that "good old Jim" was the bright-haired boy in 1932 and again in 1936, when somebody had to shoulder the job of electing and reelecting the administration; that same administration which has made jobs for the Hopkinses et al. But Farley found, and the country observed, that the only real job he had was to get the new dealers into office, they ran the show to suit themselves and had little but criticism to pass his way.

So it's all over now for Farley. He has elected to get out before he could be thrown out, and all the time he has shown a restraint in the face of ingratitude and lack of appreciation that has amazed everyone, knowing how such treatment must have galled him.

Harry Hopkins is to take his place. Harry, the magnificent spender. Harry, the man who directed the wasted expenditures that should have gone for national defense. Harry, the boy who saw nothing wrong with using the W. P. A. for political purposes. Harry, the opportunist who flattered his way into the good graces of the White House, with a million yeses and not a single no.

For many an American citizen, Hopkins is the outstanding symbol for all that the New Deal has stood for in insincerity, impracticality, and the overweening determination to hold on to public power, no matter what the consequences to the country.

Somewhere in this now concluded friendship between Mr. Roosevelt and Jim Farley there is a moral that a wiser man than we might draw. It would be to the effect that there is something the matter with a passion for reform that takes into no account such a basic human characteristic as loyalty.

[From the Lafayette (La.) Daily Advertiser of July 22, 1940]

FARLEY QUITS POLITICS

James A. Farley, Postmaster General and chairman of the National Democratic Committee, has announced that he is closing up affairs as head of the Democratic Committee and arranging to accept a business offer. Farley managed the Roosevelt campaigns of 1932 and 1936, was the original Roosevelt for President active worker, and was connected with President Roosevelt when the Chief Executive of the Nation was Governor of New York.

"I have remained in public life at great financial sacrifice because I love politics," Farley said. "I have an opportunity now to accept an attractive offer in business and in justice to my family, because of my financial situation, I am going to accept."

"Who's going to win in November?" a reporter asked Farley after he had made this announcement.

"I think I should leave comment on that point to my successor," was the answer.

Farley stated that he had said many times that he believed that the people wanted the Democratic Party to remain in power and that he had not changed his mind and that he would support the Roosevelt-Wallace ticket.

Thus James A. Farley, known as "Genial Jim," passes from the political picture. Now it is up to the new dealers in earnest. It was reported that an old friend said to Farley at Chicago: "Better remain on, Jim. The people will forget you in 6 months if you quit." Farley is reported to have said: "When I quit politics I want the people to forget me. That is okay with me."

There will be many who will miss "Genial Jim." He was a great campaigner and he worked like a man who "loved politics." However, in the rush for the power Jim was thrown aside and much happened that dampened his love for the game. Now he quits to go into business and the good wishes of Democrats and Republicans generally will go along with him. Outside of the fact that he needs money, Jim being on a job that did not give him the opportunity, if he remained honest, to better his condition in life, his opposition to the breaking of the third-term tradition made it impossible for him to continue on without great loss of face.

Good luck, Jim. Hope you win some pennants with the Yankees.

[From the Lancaster (Pa.) Intelligencer Journal of July 20, 1940]

TAKING THE GLAMOUR OUT OF POLITICS

With the refusal of National Chairman James A. Farley to longer continue as chairman for the Democratic Party, much of the glamour will have been taken out of national politics as he retires to private life.

Mr. Farley has everything. He could make friends and hold them; he could meet a man at a grove camp meeting today and a year hence call him by name in a mob of a million. He had a ready answer for every question. He kept his feet on the ground under any and all conditions and last, but not least, he always kept his promises, although to get a definite promise was hard going.

It was Mr. Farley's understanding of people which made the Democratic Party what it has been for 7 years. There were none to say him nay in either major party.

The new national chairman of the Republican Party is a man of ability and worth, but he has little of the "it" Mr. Farley has. We do not know who will be Mr. Farley's successor, but we do know that nothing but Roosevelt luck will snare anyone half so well fitted for the chairmanship of a national party.

The best in sight today is Jack Kelly, the Philadelphia leader, and he is being considered only casually because of factional differences here in Pennsylvania.

[From the Las Vegas (N. Mex.) Evening Review-Journal of July 22, 1940]

ONLY ONE JIM FARLEY

When Jim Farley steps down from the chairmanship of the Democratic National Committee a few weeks hence, one of the greatest figures in all American political history will retire to private life.

For the past 8 years Jim Farley has been the Democratic Party. He knew more political leaders in every State in the Union than any one man ever has or perhaps ever will. And they were not just acquaintances. They were friends. He so regarded them and they so regarded him. He knew them all by their first names, knew their backgrounds and made it his business to keep track of the state of their health and that of their family.

His smile was the smile of victory. His genial personality was the personification of democracy, and his handclasp sealed a word that was as good as his bond.

It was Farley who brought the Democratic Party back into power after many long, lean years. It was he who organized the entire United States as it had never been organized before. He organized so well that in 1936 he was able to accurately predict the sweeping Democratic victory far beyond the anticipation of the most optimistic administration supporter.

Democrats everywhere will regret the passing of Jim Farley from active leadership of their party. Perhaps no one regrets it more than Franklin D. Roosevelt himself.

Whether there is anyone in the party ranks who can step into Farley's place successfully remains to be seen. One thing is certain, whoever accepts the post, will have turned over to him the most efficient organization ever welded together on a Nation-wide scale. Whether he can keep it thus remains to be seen. It was builded by a genius in his particular field and there's no certainty that it won't take a genius to keep it intact.

There seems no question but that only Jim Farley could have kept New Deal liberals and Jeffersonian conservatives working harmoniously together in the same party for 8 years. Whether he has welded them together with sufficient cohesion to withstand another campaign without his guiding touch remains to be seen.

[From the Lawrence (Mass.) Evening Tribune of July 23, 1940]

THE RETIREMENT OF FARLEY

The retirement of James A. Farley, as chairman of the Democratic National Committee, is a big loss to the Democratic Party. A born organizer and executive he was in large measure responsible for the remarkable success of the party in the last two major campaigns.

He has at all times stood for the principles of the party and for what he believed the party to represent. In this work he has been honest, sincere, and straightforward. Because of that he has earned the respect and esteem of Republicans as well as Democrats. A genial personality has added much to his success.

He has established a record that his successors will find it difficult to equal. Probably none will ever surpass it.

[From the Lexington (Ky.) Herald of August 3, 1940]

JIM FARLEY'S RETIREMENT

The retirement of James A. Farley as chairman of the Democratic National Committee will be regretted by all member of the party. Jim Farley's sacrifice in order to engage in public activities is in no way better shown than by the fact that as the head of the New York Yankees he will receive a $75,000 salary and will be free of many of the burdensome details and the constant hammering of political pressure.

At the Democratic National Convention in Chicago, Postmaster General Farley was the most popular man there. He is one man who, with great opportunity for personal achievement in business, preferred to devote his time and talents to the service of his party and his country.

Disappointed, no doubt, in his Presidential ambitions, he nevertheless is too good a soldier and too good a Democrat to sulk in his tent. He has accepted results which were not along the lines he advocated with good grace and sportsmanship. Few men in America have more real and true friends. If Jim Farley ever plans a comeback, the national stage will be set for him. He is, above all, a great American.

[From the Lorain (Ohio) Journal of July 22, 1940]

FAREWELL TO JIM FARLEY

Jim Farley bows out as Democratic national chairman with the best wishes of his associates, the newspapermen, and practically everybody in the party.

No one who listened to the tremendous ovation given Farley at the convention can doubt the popularity of the man who for 8 years was President Roosevelt's major domo.

He is unassuming. He has an amazing memory for names and faces. In 8 years he touched pretty nearly every section of the country. Lorain County Democrats will remember when he swung through on a Middle West tour and dedicated the post office at Oberlin.

Dispenser of patronage involving millions of dollars, he leaves his post not rich, but almost broke. Where now are the cries of Farleydom?

So he writes a book to pay off his immediate debts, admitting that that is the purpose of the book. And he tries to take care of the future with a job, as head of a syndicate buying the New York Yankees baseball team.

The Democratic campaign will miss the power and drive of its Postmaster General chairman.

More than that, however, is the loss to the administration of the last representative of that for which the Democratic Party once stood—leadership earned in the hard rough school of experience and not in the college classroom.

[From the Los Angeles Times]

JIM FARLEY'S DEPARTURE REGRETTED—"SQUARE SHOOTER" LIKED PARTICULARLY BY CAPITAL NEWSPAPER WRITERS

(By Warren B. Francis)

WASHINGTON, July 27.—Departure of James A. Farley from the Democratic national chairmanship is a cause of honest regret in political and legislative circles, but brings most tears from the newspaper corps.

During his 7 years in official life the bluff Irishman from Rockland County, N. Y., has made armies of admiring friends. None have a more affectionate regard, however, than the reporters, columnists, interpreters, and piundits to whom his door never has been closed and with whom he always has been ready to talk with utmost freedom.

The press sincerely hates to see Farley leave, even while understanding the sacrifices he has made, the headaches he has suffered, and the treatment with which he has put up. For the newspaper gang respects him as a hard worker and a good sport who has been widely misunderstood and unappreciated.

Since his arrival, Farley always has been ready to chat about political trends and conditions, to offer advice and prognostications. Politics is his lifeblood, so he derives much enjoyment despite his busy existence from gossiping with the press representatives who find him a fountain of information. He never fails to acknowledge a reporter's phone call or letter.

No newspaperman ever complained that Farley failed to play fair. None ever accused him of not telling the truth. When he couldn't or didn't want to answer questions, he not only said so but normally gave a convincing explanation; he did not resort to subterfuges or dodges. Always he shot straight from the shoulder.

To the reporters who have enjoyed an intimate acquaintance, it has been painful to hear Farley sneeringly described as "Jobmaster General." For there are many instances where "Big Jim" has refused to join a move to heave out some faithful worker; often he has been unwilling to have any part in saddling an incompetent on the taxpayers.

One more thing has won Farley the admiration of the skeptical, suspicious newspaper gang. He deliberately passed up enticing chances to make considerable money out of the New Deal. In marked contrast to so many officeholders, the Postmaster General refused to allow the building-supply concern in which he had an interest to take any Government orders. His feeling that this would be unethical was so strong that business associates have wailed that Farley cost them money.

[From the Los Angeles (Calif.) Times of July 20, 1940]

FARLEY

Out of the settling dust at Chicago one figure stands out with enhanced prestige—that of James A. Farley, who will step down within a month from the post of chairman of the Democratic National Committee. Farley accepted temporary reelection to the post only until the President can find a successor. A gentleman and sportsman to the last, Farley gave as his reason, through Tammany Boss Edward J. Flynn, the necessity of recouping his personal finances. But the country will understand.

More than a year ago Farley was told by the President that the latter had no intention of seeking or accepting a third term and later that Farley was free to seek the nomination for himself. Taking at his word the man to whom he had given the utmost in loyalty and support, and to whom his skill in political organization has been invaluable, Farley proceeded to make his own plans, only to discover, as Al Smith, Raymond Moley, and numerous others have found, that loyalty as Mr. Roosevelt sees it works only in one direction. When the latter's friends stand in his way they cease to be his friends.

That Farley is a machine politician with few scruples as a politician, and no squeamishness as to methods, does not alter the fact that his word, once given, is good, and that there are some things he will not do. It was painfully evident from the creaking and groaning of the Roosevelt machine at Chicago that it was not being managed by Farley, since Farley, when he said he was opposed to a third term, meant it. Instead, it was in the hands of Harry Hopkins; but the President himself had to intervene in the midst of the Vice Presidential balloting to save his chosen candidate from the results of Hopkins' blundering.

The President may get somebody else capable of running his campaign by August 17, the date of Farley's retirement, but Farley's successor will rattle a good deal in Farley's shoes.

[From the Lowell (Mass.) Courier-Citizen of July 18, 1940]

MR. FARLEY

According to a news report, Postmaster General Farley, when he was asked if he would support Mr. Roosevelt, replied about as David Hill did when he was questioned regarding his attitude at a time when the party in New York was not at all harmonious.

"I am a Democrat," represents the attitude of the machine politician. The latter words are often used by the uplifters as an opprobrious epithet. They are not so necessarily. A party cannot get anywhere without a machine, and somebody has to operate it. Party government, preferably 2-party government, seems to be the best method for carrying on democracy, so the machine politician has his place, and it may be an honorable place. Once a man has decided to enter politics on the operating side he cannot

afford to sacrifice his usefulness by kicking over the traces whenever he is not personally pleased with the candidates or issues of the moment. If he does this he will not be able to serve the party (in which, of course, for the long pull he believes) when it once more is on what he considers the right track.

So Mr. Farley will be regular, whatever his feelings are regarding the later aspects of the New Deal. For that matter his loyalty has extended so far that he has not given public expression to his personal opinions regarding the Roosevelt policies of the second term. It is supposed that he has been strongly against a third nomination of the President—but he will not oppose a third election.

Mr. Farley will probably go further and help along the cause actively to some extent, but his refusal to go so far as to continue as chairman of the national committee and assume direction of the campaign, if persisted in, may be a contributing cause to Mr. Roosevelt's defeat. Mr. Farley's record is extraordinary. Neither Hoover nor Landon could possibly have won in 1932 and 1936, but the magnitude of both victories of Mr. Roosevelt is generally attributed to Mr. Farley's management. He had a firm grasp of the situation and knew in advance just about what he could count on in the several States.

Furthermore, Mr. Farley not only is a shrewd manager but he is also a harmonizer. The party will not be so thoroughly united in this campaign as it would be if it still had his leadership. He could have done a good deal to mitigate the opposition, or arouse the enthusiasm of those who are doubtful about a third term and the general policies of the perpetual candidate. The retirement of Mr. Farley is a serious, and it may prove to have been a fatal, loss to the party, the more so because he is believed to be influenced by his disapproval of Mr. Roosevelt's candidacy.

[From the Lowell (Mass.) Sun of July 18, 1940]

JIM'S NOT HAPPY

Jim Farley isn't coming out of the Democratic National Convention with anything special except some more experience—unless you count the increased respect and admiration which a lot of people have conceived for him since the party clans started rallying.

That is the Sun's Bruce Catton's impression—and ours, too—of the Postmaster General after following the conduct of affairs at Chicago this week.

Farley, it is said, has been the chief victim of the adroit game by which President Roosevelt killed off all rival candidates for the nomination. Farley had ambitions of his own, but instead of getting a run for his money, he had to go to Chicago and take charge of the ceremonies at which the ashes of his ambitions were quietly laid to rest.

Not once during all the conferences, meetings, and public appearances before and during the convention, did Farley by word or action betray resentment at the way his chief had used him. He wasn't happy, but he didn't whimper, he didn't sulk, and he stayed loyal.

All of which is really worth noticing. Whatever may be said of Farley, you've got to credit him with a good deal of real sportsmanship.

[From the Lowell (Mass.) Sun of July 20, 1940]

THE FINGER FOR FARLEY

The present generation of Democrats will have a hard time getting acclimated to the shadow of the man who isn't there.

We mean Jim Farley, who is resigning as chairman of the Democratic National Committee to re-enter private business after a meteoric career in the political life of this Nation.

Farley died a martyr's death at the Chicago convention, although he probably had little justification for Presidential ambitions in the first place. He came from the wrong side of the tracks. He could not compete against back-room influence and machine control when they were directed at him.

The Postmaster General, however, was always completely frank as to his position on every issue, but this marks the first time he was known to take refuge in silence. His heart must have been heavy at Chicago when his well-known partisan allegiance was forgotten in the "blitzkrieg" dictated by Washington.

Party loyalty—what does it mean, after all? Jim Farley must be in a wondering mood today. How many other Democrats are in the same boat?

[From the Lowell (Mass.) Sun of July 24, 1940]

JIM FARLEY STILL EXISTS

It is rather hard to picture the Democratic national scene without Jim Farley. The picturesque Postmaster General, a self-made man if ever there was one, provided color on the American scene which will be lacking in the future.

Farley was always a practical man. He was the man who remembered thousands of names of minor political leaders throughout the land from San Francisco to Bangor. He knew humanity in the raw, and humanity in its high moments. He had, and has, a complete comprehension of the common man, the plain, everyday citizen whose help is called upon every election day.

The Democratic Party owes a lot to Jim Farley. In retiring to private life, he is not wholly through with politics, in our opinion. He will exert an influence in many sectors of the Democratic Party.

[From the Lynchburg (Va.) News of July 20, 1940]

JAMES A. FARLEY

The one man who comes out of the bedlam of the Chicago stadium with enhanced prestige is James A. Farley.

The country has known him as a politician. He has been that and a good one. The country has known him as a genial fellow with a flair for remembering names and faces and for giving all the sundry a beaming smile and a glad hand, "just a big Elk at large," as he once described himself. The country has known him as a loyal Democrat and a loyal friend who sometimes got what he would describe, if he were inclined to whimper, "a raw deal" from the New Deal.

And that about summed up what the country as a whole thought of Jim Farley.

His close friends and he had many, knew better. They knew that he had convictions and would stick to them and that sticking to them sometimes cost him a great deal he would have liked to have. They knew that though bad treatment could not make a rift in his personal loyalty, his loyalty could not sway him to action he believed inimical to the best interests of his country. They knew his courage, his determination, his devotion to fair play.

Now the country knows it. Jim Farley is the one man who comes out of that Chicago bedlam with enhanced prestige.

[From the Lynn (Mass.) Daily Evening Item, July 27, 1940]

FARLEY'S POPULARITY

It appears that nearly all the nice things to be said about a national politician this year were reserved for Postmaster General James A. Farley. And why was that? He isn't a scholar, great statesman, or an outstanding administrator of a department of the Government. He isn't weak, and he doesn't bend easily.

He is the one big man in the Government who never gets mad, never says unkind or hurtful things about anybody. He is Gentleman Jim Farley, nothing more.

That explains why he is one of the country's most popular citizens.

[From the Manchester Union of July 22, 1940]

FARLEY'S RETIREMENT

Probably no political figure ever left the political stage accompanied by more genuine well wishes than Jim Farley. Throughout his 7 years at Washington as Postmaster General, and during his term as chairman of the Democratic National Committee, Mr. Farley has steadily made friends in Republican as well as in Democratic ranks.

There has been a geniality, a straightforwardness about him that the American people like. It has not been without good reason that he has been called "Sunny Jim." Moreover, in an exceedingly difficult place he has refused to surrender the principles of democracy, and has stood squarely for what he believed the Democratic Party to represent.

The good will of the American people has been deepened also by the feeling that somehow Farley got a raw deal. Americans like fair play. They like what they are accustomed to call a square deal. They recognize that after holding the chief responsibility for the Roosevelt successes in 1932 and 1936, Farley's refusal to go along with a third-term movement by new dealers in the administration made him an enemy to that coterie of self-seeking admirers of Mr. Roosevelt.

When the third-term movement succeeded, there was nothing to do but get in line with it or step out. Farley stepped out. Rather than surrender his own conviction on a third term he gave up his career in politics and went back into the business world.

In this retirement, the New Deal campaign suffers a severe blow. For Farley is a great organizer. He knows Democratic leaders everywhere and he knows how to get their cooperation. His skill in organization was a great factor in the two Roosevelt landslides in 1932 and 1936. It will be difficult to find a man as efficient and as colorful to take over his work as chairman of the Democratic National Committee, and particularly so at this late stage of the game.

[From the McKeesport (Pa.) Daily News of July 20, 1940]

FARLEY LEAVES

The national political scene won't be the same in the months to come with "Genial Jim" Farley removed.

Shrewd, fair, enterprising, and cordial, the New York politician won a warm spot in the hearts of Americans, both Democrats and Republicans alike, for the splendid record he made as administrative head of a national party.

This results from the fact that Farley took his job as national Democratic chairman at its face value and worked for the party's success. At the same time, he kept himself clear of the machinations of the New Deal in Washington.

We have admired Mr. Farley for this fact. That this admiration is shared by other members of the press was shown in Chicago last night when correspondents who covered the convention tendered him a farewell dinner.

They paid tribute to him as a truthful, sincere, and able statesman and politician. This appraisal, we believe, will be generally echoed throughout the United States.

[From the Macon (Ga.) Telegraph of July 17, 1940]

PASSING OF FARLEY

A few hours will tell the tale, but informed correspondents at the Chicago convention are practically unanimous in their forecast that James A. Farley will resign as Postmaster General and chairman of the National Democratic Committee in order to become president and part owner of the New York Yankees.

Reports are definite that a syndicate has been formed to buy the Yankee franchise for $4,000,000, and it has been known for a long time that Farley wanted to do something to recoup his private fortune.

The report is current in Chicago that Farley told the President in their recent Hyde Park conference that he would have retired 4 years ago to enter private business if he had not been given assurances that he would have administration support for a place on the national ticket as President or Vice President.

He is represented as feeling particularly resentful toward the inner circle of the New Deal, such as Tommy Corcoran and Harry Hopkins, who are leading the movement to "draft Roosevelt."

Theme songs are an important part of every convention, and it was noted at Chicago that when Farley arose to make what was looked upon as his farewell speech the organist dropped into Take Me Out to the Ball Game.

Mr. Farley has had his share of criticism during the years he has been at the head of the Post Office Department. The abrupt cancelation of civilian contracts to carry the air mail and the sudden substitution of Army flyers to take over the job cost a number of lives.

When strikers in 1937 picketed industrial plants and refused to permit the delivery of the United States mail, Mr. Farley was blamed severely for compromising with the situation.

But from time immemorial the office of Postmaster General has been regarded as a political job, and Farley's loyalty to the party and to the leader of the party whom he had served so faithfully through the years was beyond question.

His determination to retire from the chairmanship of the national committee is said to be absolutely fixed. Every possible effort is being made to induce him to change his mind and take charge of the next campaign, but unless all signs fail he will throw in his lot with the Yankees and leave active politics to his successor as chairman of the national committee.

Farley has grown immensely in public esteem in the last few years, and he will carry into retirement the affection and esteem of thousands of good Democrats who wish him well in whatever he may undertake.

[From the Meriden (Conn.) Record of July 20, 1940]

FARLEY LEAVES THE STAGE

Amid the din and oratory of the Democratic National Convention, much of it mechanical, professional, and not too genuine, as major party conventions go, some sounds and words were heard in striking contrast to the hub-bub of such an occasion—the warmly sincere tributes paid to the national chairman, Postmaster General James A. Farley.

There could be sensed, far away, an atmosphere akin to sadness among delegates who well knew the high-minded quality of his public service, and who realized that the tide carrying them on toward participation in a tradition-smashing campaign had already swept him aside in favor of men unheard of when he began his great work of organization 8 years ago.

If there can be found, down deep, a heart and soul in politics, it was displayed in the attitude of the convention. Many a delegate declared, some over the networks, "We would like to vote for Mr. Farley, but we are bound to vote for the President." Such expressions, unmistakably, were more from the heart—in honest tribute to a good American—than one often encounters in the hard, selfish game of political warfare.

Jim Farley long ago saw what was to happen at Chicago. That was why he accepted Presidential support from Massachusetts and held it to the time of balloting. He insisted that, as far as he was concerned, there would have to be some semblance of democratic procedure in the selection of the nominee.

He held his peace and kept a disciplined tongue in cheek, while he saved for his party a dying trace of an orderly, American political process, in preventing others from robbing a political convention of all its independence of thought and action through a trumped-up, maneuvered draft that is yet to be revealed fully in its completely synthetic form.

Then, as the night ended with the third term tradition sacrificed and a new campaign about to be launched, the chairman, swallowing the fact that his powers long ago had been usurped by Presidential intimates, and concealing a full measure of chagrin caused by events around him, showed the delegates his caliber by taking it all with kindly graciousness and without the slightest sign of rancor.

This Nation owes Jim Farley a debt of gratitude, unique in political annals. He is getting it today, in acknowledgement of having given long years of upright, decent public service of the kind so much claimed and envisioned, but so rarely demonstrated. In all his career he has not been known to say an unkindly, vicious word about anyone, even of opponents not so scrupulous in their choice of weapons.

He may be remembered superficially for predictions of uncanny accuracy, which were of but passing significance. But, more important, he will long hold a high place in public esteem because he elevated to a higher plane the art of practical politics. That some associates, as indicated, would tear down what he builded so well, reflects greater glory upon him.

[From the Miami (Fla.) Daily News of July 20, 1940]

GOOD-BYE JIM FARLEY

It turns out, as everyone knew in advance, that Jim Farley's determination to quit the national Democratic chairmanship was not subject to revision. A good sport, even in the well of bitterness, he has agreed to serve until August 17, to help the new organization through its birth pains. No further demand upon him could reasonably be made by his party.

Thus passes into what we hope will be a most happy and prosperous private enterprise a man who has served his country with immense ability and fidelity and who has come to be not only respected but beloved by tens of millions. Jim Farley, true enough, was a politician. His horizons were not the distant tree lines of the statesman. But he represented all that was amiable, honest, decent, and square-shooting in the politician. He had a mind without tarnish, a personality without pretensions, and a heart devoid of meanness.

His personal stature was nowhere more cleanly outlined than at Chicago, where he never wavered in dignity, loyalty, and sportsmanship in the face of the most trying conditions.

[From the Miami Herald of July 17, 1940]

JIM FARLEY'S GETHSEMANE

James A. Farley retired gallantly Monday night as chairman of the Democratic National Committee, without one word of reproach to the Chief, without one word to indicate any deviation from his faith in the public policies that have been the guiding star of the party he has served so well.

His address of farewell, coupled with a report of his stewardship as chairman of the party for 8 years, was a masterly survey of the party's accomplishments, as he reads the record, and a sincere tribute to the administration that had kept its word to the American people during two terms in office.

It was a fighting Democratic speech; a promise to take the fight to the Republican Party and its candidate, Wendell L. Willkie, rather than allow the extremely vocal Willkie to assume the offensive.

It was just such a speech as the people might have expected from the Farley of 1932, when he and Franklin D. Roosevelt were crusading in almost holy zeal to free the people from the economic woes which had all but engulfed them. It was delivered with the same fire that has been characteristic of Jim Farley during the years he has directed the Democratic Party's battles before the people.

Earlier in the day, Mr. Farley held a press conference and invited nearly 100 newspapermen and women to "toss the book at him." They literally did, even asking some questions that were all but impertinent, rather than pertinent. He answered them all unhesitatingly, explaining in painstaking detail exactly what he meant to convey, when someone misunderstood the import of his reply.

And finally, pinned down under adroit questioning of experienced Washington correspondents, he, by forceful implications, pledged his undivided support to President Roosevelt, in the event of the President's nomination for a third term.

"I am a Democrat," said Mr. Farley in effect. "A Democrat as I see it, believes in majority rule. When a candidate has attained a majority, I contend he then is entitled to a convention vote making his selection unanimous. As a good Democrat, naturally, I shall support the nominee of my party."

Jim Farley may be bitter over the explosion of whatever political dreams he may have entertained. But whatever else he may be, no man can say he is a poor sport. No man can say he isn't loyal to the political faith through which he became a great national leader of our times.

[From the East Wenatchee (Wash.) Journal of August 1940]

JIM FARLEY

Out of public life, on the coming 17th of August, goes a man who will be remembered as one of the truly great in the field of politics. But does he go out of public life? Somehow we can't think of that great organizer, that great maker of a President, that great maker of enduring and honest friendships, as being through.

Somehow we vision him running for the Governorship of the great commonwealth of New York. We see him overwhelmingly elected and a potential candidate for the Presidency in 1944. We see his friends throughout the Nation demanding his candidacy for the great office. We see him nominated and triumphantly elected.

This country needs men of the type of Jim Farley. His stature grew in seeming defeat. The men and women of the Democratic Party know that he is an honest, courageous, and upright gentleman who never goes back on a promised word, who is big enough, fine enough, and honorable enough to realize that, in the long run the old saying that,

"To thine own self be true,
And it will follow as the night the day,
Thou cannot then be false to any man"

Is a mighty good axiom to live by.

[From the Hartford (Conn.) Times of July 18, 1940]

FARLEY IS HERO IN CHICAGO SHOW—ROOSEVELT GETS THIRD-TERM NOMINATION BUT GENIAL JIM WINS PLAUDITS OF CROWD

(By C. C. Hemenway, editor of the Hartford Times)

CHICAGO.—If this convention had not already written itself down as the most bizarre on record, it so established itself last night. Mr. Roosevelt has his third nomination, but if he was listening to the proceedings he may have had moments when he doubted the wisdom of trying for it.

Although nearly 900 of slightly less than 1,100 votes were the President's on the first and only ballot, that came like pulling teeth. There was as much rowing and wrangling before they were recorded as though a tight battle was fought.

The votes of numerous delegations were disputed, and in several cases polls were insisted upon, which revealed the ugly feelings the third-term drive had engendered.

The nomination went to Roosevelt, but the man of the evening much of the time during the convention was Postmaster General Farley.

CHEERS FOR FARLEY

Farley had predicted that when the contest was all over his conduct would have been such as would satisfy all sides. When he had taken the platform and made a speech that was more manly than it was logical not only the delegates but the galleries gave evidence by their tumult of applause and cheering that the satisfaction was both actual and eminent.

Next to Farley, the hero perhaps was aged CARTER GLASS, who left a bed of sickness and traveled a thousand miles to nominate Farley and then told the convention some caustic things to which it was not eager to listen, about the violation of the third-term tradition.

GLASS' appearance was reminiscent of days when William J. Bryan baited gallery mobs with his defiances and was alternately booed and cheered. GLASS said he came from a sick bed, but his voice sounded as though it was from the tomb. It was hoarse and raucous, so weak at first that it could scarcely be heard over the excellent amplifying system. When the microphones had been adjusted it was strong and firm, although as rough as that of a circus barker.

TRIBUTE BY GLASS

However, the 82-year-old Senator and bridgegroom had something to say and he said it in his accustomed acid manner. His tribute to Farley was high, as "an unconquerable Democrat who has conducted the affairs of the party in a way that no man in my recollection of 40 years in public service ever has done."

It was not difficult to guess to whom GLASS also had in mind when he alluded to Farley as "a man on whose word every human being can rely, who never in a lifetime violated a pledge."

Then he stirred the gallery by alluding to a matter that had been the unwritten law of the Democratic Party since the day of Thomas Jefferson and recalled Jefferson's urging, 3 months before this death, that the party should never nominate a President for a third time. That brought boos and hisses, but CARTER GLASS is not easily scared. There were almost as many cheers for him and his words as there were hoots.

The convention operated on the same mad-house procedure that has marked much of its deliberations, if such they may be called. It had a rule limiting nominating speeches to 20 minutes and second to 5 minutes in length and four in number. Then when Governor Olson of California, Senator Maloney, Governor Lehman of New York, and Senator Pepper of Florida had used up the four Roosevelt second talks, Chairman Barkley invited all other States which wished to second the nomination of any candidate to do so in a word as their names were called.

SECONDING SPEECHES

The result was a series of seconding speeches which dragged out the roll call interminably. The Roosevelt drive leaders apparently wanted a second from every State. Nevada and South Dakota passed their turns to nominate or second. BARKLEY called them again at the end and fairly insisted that they join in the seconding.

The Nevada spokesman finally rose to the point of order that a State "did not have to offer a seconding speech if it did not wish to." BARKLEY agreed, but only with reluctance did he let the matter drop. South Dakota also held off, but BARKLEY succeeded in pulling the Philippines in.

When that was all over came actual balloting, and what a struggle. There was no trouble until Massachusetts was reached. The State supposedly was instructed for Farley at the start. Then it developed that some delegates interpreted the instructions as holding only if Roosevelt "did not run." The stentorian and defiant tones in which many of the delegates announced their choice indicated the degree of feeling the dispute has caused. There were amusing answers.

One woman declared she had been pledged to vote for Farley, but had promised in her campaign to vote for Roosevelt if she was elected. She was and she did pledge notwithstanding. Another was pledged to Roosevelt and voted for him, but wished she could vote for Farley. When one delegate said he must vote for Roosevelt because that was the pledge of his district convention, the next declared he voted for Roosevelt with pleasure, and the following recorded himself similarly with "double pleasure."

It was noticeable that the delegates who voted for Roosevelt explained that their instructions for Farley held only if the President did not run, which seemed strange, since the President's message to the convention declared he was not running and did not wish to be nominated.

GAIN OF FRACTION

The upshot of it was that Farley gained a fraction over a vote as result of the poll. The sequel to the Massachusetts row came when Senator DAVID I. WALSH rose to second Farley's latter motion that the nomination of Roosevelt be made unanimous. WALSH explained that former Governor Ely had handed in his credentials and walked out of the convention in face of that move, but that all the rest of the Massachusetts votes were ready to go to the President.

When Minnesota was recorded for Roosevelt Congressman RYAN wanted a poll. It was partially taken and then explanation was offered that though the delegation was instructed for Roosevelt, its members stood 21 for him and 1, RYAN, for Farley. That was what RYAN wanted to bring out, and he withdrew his demand for the poll.

Indicative of the restlessness and dissatisfaction which has been apparent among the delegates, it was revealed when New York was called that delegates casting 3½ votes, and their alternates had not taken the trouble to attend the convention. The President did not have his own State unanimously. He got 64½ votes, and Farley had 25, while 1 was cast for Cordell Hull.

One Washington woman declined to vote at all, as there was no candidate before the convention who could be depended upon to keep the country out of war. Another from the State was for Roosevelt because he was for the "poorly clad man."

NINE-TO-ONE SHOT

With the President almost a 9-to-1 shot in the balloting, this all made no sense, but it went on. Another Washington woman from "the biggest county in the United States, by a dam site" was for Roosevelt, "who built that dam."

West Virginia, too, had difficulty in recording its vote to the satisfaction of all its delegates and had to have a poll. Roosevelt had only something like 800 of the 1,100 votes by this time, but the boys in the various State trenches were fighting as though they had a chance.

The call finally ended, and at once Congressman RAYBURN was on his feet to transfer Garner's Texas votes to Roosevelt. Then there came the strange spectacle of a candidate himself taking the rostrum to withdraw.

Farley got a tumultuous ovation. When he finally got a chance to speak he declared he had acted from deepest conviction, to his party and his country. He had wanted the convention to proceed as Democrats should, to vote the matter out in open meeting. That had been done, and he had been beaten, and he accepted the result.

"Down through the years," said Farley, "I have always given my best efforts to advance the cause of democracy and I want the delegates to know that I will give the same support to the nominees of this convention."

MADE UNANIMOUS

Thus Farley made good the prediction of his press conferences that the nomination would eventually be made unanimous and his promise that he would support it. He moved to suspend the rules and make the nomination unanimous by acclamation.

Senator WALSH followed to second and explain the Bay State rumpus. Senator TYDINGS joined in. His forces had stood out for a great principle and lost. They believed in the two-party system "and it was evident that a great majority of the delegates wanted Roosevelt." He bowed to their will. The Governor of Tennessee said that Cordell Hull, who got one vote from New York, was not and had never been a candidate. He did not say that Hull joined in supporting Roosevelt for a third term.

Probably there never was a convention before in which the actual winning of a nomination was not followed by a demonstration. But, instead of marching and cheering for Roosevelt, when Farley's motion had passed, the whole crowd rose, led by a radio star, and sang When Irish Eyes Are Smiling, for Jim as a swell fellow, a swell Democrat, and a swell Irishman. In fact, although he did not get the votes it seemed, as it has on so many occasions, to be Jim's show.

There was a Roosevelt demonstration, of course, but it had come much earlier in the evening when Senator LISTER HILL, of Alabama, had nominated him in strictly southern oratory. It seemed at first that he was about to name BANKHEAD, but it turned out that he would like to do that but was nominating Roosevelt instead.

It is, he said, "no time for untried hands to pilot the ship of state." It took the Roosevelt forces, which had marchers from practically all the delegations, 23 minutes to work off their enthusiasm in parading and cheering. GARNER, too, got an ovation after he was placed in nomination. It didn't last long but he had the only color, a parade of cowboys with a cowboy band, headed by the United States and Texas flags and with a cowboy vocalist to do a couple of songs. GARNER'S was the only band that paraded. He got 60 votes, including his 46 from Texas.

Politics does other peculiar things than make strange bedfellows. In the same hall 8 years ago where there was a savage effort to prevent Roosevelt from getting his first nomination, the same party which then named him only after a tussle, last night lined up State after State to toss out of the window a tradition of fundamental policy as old as itself and insist that he take a third nomination.

[From the Worcester (Mass.) Gazette of July 20, 1940]

WENT DOWN WITH COLORS FLYING—MR. FARLEY EMERGED AS MOST CONSISTENT FIGURE IN DEMOCRATIC CONVENTION

The man who comes out of the Democratic National Convention with the most credit is James A. Farley. Throughout the proceed-

ings he stood steadfastly for maintaining the precedent established by Jefferson against a third-term nomination for any President, comments the Hartford Courant. He made known his views long before the movement started to "draft" Mr. Roosevelt for another nomination.

In his customary outspoken but affable manner he advised the President to respect this great and wise tradition. He had good reason to believe at one time that his counsel would be heeded; in fact, his assurances were such that he announced his own intention to become a candidate. When he saw that the situation had changed and that delegates were being rounded up in the President's behalf he let it be known that that would make no difference to him and that he would stick it out to the end. And this he did. He went down with his colors flying but never once did he lose his good nature.

He saw Secretary Hopkins, who has been living at the White House of late, assuming roles that he himself had customarily played at such Democratic gatherings, but if it hurt his pride he gave no outward indication of it. However, he firmly insisted for the good of the party in having his way in certain matters. He would not permit the President's more ardent enthusiasts to try for an immediate nomination by acclamation. He demanded that the convention exemplify, so far as it was possible in the circumstances, all the democratic processes customarily observed. The proposal to dispense with a roll call met with his emphatic objection. "If you do that," he said, "you might as well not hold an election in November." Shrewd, straight-thinking politician that he is, he could look beyond July to November, which was more than some of the others could do.

The real attitude of the delegates toward him, bound and delivered, as most of them were, to the President, was shown first when his name was placed in nomination by the venerable Senator GLASS, of Virginia, and then by the spontaneous ovation that greeted him when he took the platform after the roll call to express his thanks for such support as he had received and to add his votes to those that had been chalked up for Mr. Roosevelt. The band struck up Irish Eyes Are Smiling, the vast audience chimed in, and "Sunny Jim" looked supremely happy, as he had a right to be.

When historians write the story of this convention of the Democratic Party, it is likely they will say that James A. Farley was about the biggest figure there, not only physically but in other respects. Lambasted and ridiculed early in his national political career as incapable of rising above his old-time Tammany affiliations, he stands today high in the estimation of the public. He has shown qualities of mind and heart, strength of character, and devotion to principle that have made him hosts of friends and admirers everywhere.

[From the New Orleans (La.) Times-Picayune of July 22, 1940]

MR. FARLEY BOWS OUT

James A. Farley's withdrawal from politics and public life is regretted by tens of thousands of Democrats—perhaps by the President-candidate himself. Mr. Farley led two successful campaigns for Mr. Roosevelt; no Democratic leader has a wider acquaintance nor such intimate knowledge of campaign technique and details; none has served Mr. Roosevelt more loyally. With his notice of retirement went the assurance of "full support to the Roosevelt-Wallace ticket." But all men know that it must have taken more than "an attractive offer in business" to pull the genial Postmaster General away from the political life and service he loves so well.

It has been repeatedly and insistently asserted, without denial from him, that Mr. Farley opposed the violation of the unwritten law against third Presidential terms even by the chieftain he has served so long and so devotedly. There have been no less insistent reports that the Postmaster General was the reverse of ardent in his support of certain of the schemes put forward by New Deal extremists close to the President. These differences, according to Washington writers, imposed a perceptible strain upon the Roosevelt-Farley relationship; as the influence of the New Deal insiders grew, that of Mr. Farley correspondingly declined.

In his address Thursday night the President sent his affectionate greetings to his "old friend Farley." Perhaps he would have welcomed the "old friend's" continuance at the head of the national committee. But there is a much greater probability, amounting almost to a certainty, that the New Deal group which engineered the third-term movement is glad to have Mr. Farley out of their way because they do not like his kind of democracy. Not all New Dealers are Democrats, and the converse is, of course, equally true: Not all Democrats are New Dealers. Our guess is that the explanation of Mr. Farley's retirement is to be found in one or other or both of these facts, rather than in "business opportunity."

[From the New York Evening Telegram of July 20, 1940]

FAIR ENOUGH

(By Westbrook Pegler)

CHICAGO, July 20.—It is not given to every man to listen to the eulogies of his own wake, but Jim Farley has enjoyed that experience this week, and, from the early signs at a testimonial party yesterday afternoon, I speculate that before dawn more than one loving friend of Mr. Farley will be called outside to decide with another which one has known him the longer and admires him the more. The testimonial lunch and the testimonial dinner, as a rule, are tawdry travesties on friendship arranged by pushful satellites with intent to ingratiate themselves with the guest of honor or conspired in cold blood as a means of selling at $5 a place the standard dollar blue plate and a lot of drinks for the benefit of some one who runs a restaurant. In known cases, the promoters have taken back the satchel or loving cup presented to the monkey amid flower pots of praiseful saying and put them aside to serve the same purpose again.

The little ceremonies for Mr. Farley yesterday were arranged wholly and almost devoutly in his honor by the journalists, men and women, of the Washington corps who have known him since 1932, or a little while before, and were attended by other reporters from many cities who have met him on his tours.

Walter Trohan, Turner Catledge, and some lady journalist whom I did not recognize made little speeches in presenting him with unpretentious gifts which were not reclaimed as he went out, and James himself spoke off the record in a manner which could not heighten the company's admiration but made them wish he might be quoted so the public might fully enjoy knowing Jim.

Not by any word or sign from Mr. Farley has the public learned this week of the shabby treatment which he has suffered; and inasmuch as he has not indicated hurt or resentment, even by the subtle sign or the rolling eye of the martyr, I will not spoil the party. He does not want to be pitied or to exploit the ingratitude which has been shown him, to the detriment of the Democratic Party, which still ranks about third in his loyalties, after God and country, and just in front of the American League.

Jim has been the biggest man in Chicago this week, and it is unfortunate that I have bound myself not to be mean, because only by standing him alongside others would it be possible to show the size of him. He has personified the best qualities of the Irish-American in politics, and his conduct and character should be an example and warning, as I know they will not be, to others of the same persuasion. But it can be said that Jim Farley was not among the men that Father Lord, the noted Jesuit journalist, had in mind when he wrote his strong but little-read spiritual admonition to Catholic captains of American politics entitled "Open Letter to a Boss."

Almost 6 years ago Jim was planning to retire from the Cabinet, having, as he claimed, put the Post Office Department on a self-sustaining basis, and go back into business to make some money for his family. Now, having waived many opportunities to recoup, he goes out not merely broke but owing money.

In contrast to those politicians who acquire savings and profits far in excess of their total pay during their years in office, Jim served at a great sacrifice, for the job entailed expenses out of proportion to the pay and allowances.

It has been said that just as Jim made President Roosevelt 8 years ago, the President this week, by a negative process, made Jim, and that is not acrimony. It was his clean deportment under these conditions which suddenly made the convention realize that the finest man in the party was being driven out of its councils.

It has been only a few years since the term "Farleyism" was used to describe the spoils system, because Jim was the jobmaster of the new administration, as though spoils were something which he had just invented. Farley took it without flinching, although he was just carrying the target for the entire party. And political prigs, calling themselves idealists, who made a show of holding their noses at the sordidness of Farleyism, later exploited the want of the destitute and the money power placed in their hands to create a spoils system much more dangerous and ruthless.

[From the Cheyenne (Wyo.) Tribune of July 21, 1940]

DEMOCRATS ON THE SIDE LINES

Disapproving flippant flouting of the third-term tradition by a totalitarianized Democratic National Convention, disgusted with the megalomaniacal complex "I am the only one," heartsick from the callous ingratitude of the man whose political creator he was, "Big Jim" Farley will resign the chairmanship of the Democratic National Committee, of which he has been the backbone and mainstay for 8 years.

His refusal to be associated with the third-term campaign is typical of that of a host of sincere, patriotic big men of the party which has been "blitzkrieged" by political dictatorship.

They will have no part or parcel of the effort to obtain ratification at the polls of the Roosevelt junking of a national tradition made unwritten law by the approval and example of men whose statesmanship prevented them from playing greasy politics in alliance with corrupt State and municipal machines.

They, like "Big Jim," will retire to the side lines and watch the Rooseveltian revolutionaries plunge to the terrific rebuke which is formulating for expression at the polls in November.

It would be interesting to see how they mark their ballots.

[From the Ohio State Journal (Columbus) of Tuesday, July 23, 1940]

MOSTLY ABOUT PEOPLE—FARLEY, STOPPED BY F. D., WON BY ACCLAMATION AS "SWELLEST GUY"

(By Karl B. Pauly)

Most popular and universally beloved person at the Democratic National Convention in Chicago last week was big, bald, smiling-eyed James Aloysius Farley, who for 8 years has been the party's national chairman. His was an acclamation from the heart of the convention.

Even the hard-boiled press broke down, after the convention, and gave Farley—of all things—a reception, bestowed gifts upon him, and with misty eyes sang When Irish Eyes Are Smiling.

Turner Catledge, the hard-facts political reporter of the New York Times, sounded the keynote of the reception when he said: "Many times we have heard prominent figures in our country tell us newspaper men and women that they never new us to break a confidence. Well, we're here today to honor a man in public life who never broke a confidence with a newspaperman."

Jim, the gallery of political newspaper men and women agree, is the ace of straight shooters.

Farley's technique with newspaper reporters has been perfect. He is frank and open with them. He has never misled them. If he feels he should not answer one of their gimletlike questions he says flatly, "I am not at liberty to say about that," or "I don't want to say anything about that," or "I don't think I had better answer that one just yet." If he said he would answer a question later he always would.

Such men are rare. Small wonder the gentlemen and the ladies of the press love Jim Farley.

Jim Farley has always cherished the hope—that divine right of American boys—that he might one day be President. He "made" a President once, and possibly Franklin D. Roosevelt has yet to learn just how much Farley's time, efforts, advice, and counsel meant to him in his two successful campaigns.

Farley wanted to be President. When people told him that his religion stood in the way, he would not believe it. He knew the Constitution guaranteed the right to worship God as a man pleases. He could defend that Constitution with every fiber of his soul. When he heard that the President—the one he had helped make—had said that Farley would not be acceptable even for the Vice Presidency on a ticket with Hull, because that would make Hull a "stalking horse for the Pope," it was a rude blow.

But Farley remained a gentleman. He didn't give out any ugly interviews. He just smiled—but there was a hurt look in his eyes.

As the time drew nearer for the 1940 campaign, he wondered what his role would be. If President Roosevelt had called Farley in and said: "Jim, you know I've got to have you running my campaign this year," it's a 10-to-1 bet Farley would have grasped the President's hand and accepted.

But the President was silent. Then Farley began to think again about the future of his family and how much salary he could probably draw as the head of some big enterprise. He decided it was time to step down as national chairman. So he went to see the President at Hyde Park and had a conference which he termed "satisfactory."

In other words, Farley read the President's mind. The President had no room for Jim any more. It was "satisfactory" to Jim because now nothing stood in his way of taking that big job and providing amply for the future of his wife and his three children.

Jim Farley wanted the Democratic National Convention of 1940 to remain free and open. He had no illusions about his being nominated for President. But he wanted his party, the one he had headed for 8 years, to meet in free assembly and by time-honored and time-tried methods reach a sober, solemn conclusion. He knew that there was dictatorship within his party, but he didn't want his party to yield without a sincere, firm protest.

So, as the New Deal strategists angled for a unanimous renomination for President Roosevelt, he reiterated daily that his own name would go before the convention as a candidate and that he would not release his delegates before the roll call started. He said he believed that in the end the nomination should be made unanimous for whoever had won, but that it shouldn't start out that way.

At the same time, he said he was not going to ask anyone to vote for him who didn't want to. "I have never asked anyone to do that and I never shall," he said.

It worked out just as Farley predicted. Once somebody at a press conference said: "Jim, Harry L. Hopkins says Farley will not get more than 65 or 70 votes. What do you say to that?" And Farley replied, "I think that's a lot of votes for Farley to get and I am very proud of the fact that he can get that many votes for President in the Democratic National Convention."

Farley got 72$^{27}/_{30}$ votes which, while it may show how nearly the New Deal crowd had his strength pegged, also shows how firmly his friends stood by him—how right they knew he was.

Then, in addition to all this, Farley was opposed to a third term. He felt the country would be departing from one of its soundest traditions—a tradition which transcended party and expediency, a tradition which the early great men of our country realized would keep us a republic as contrasted with the "divine right" rule which had blighted Europe.

So Jim Farley, the son of a poor widow, who worked hard and worked up, who had ascetic habits and attended church regularly and enjoyed dancing and a not-too-solemn life, climbed the ladder of success.

He was a member of the New York boxing commission under Gov. Franklin D. Roosevelt and by that time was already a veteran county chairman in New York State. He went to work for Roosevelt for President in 1931 and sold him to the country. He covered the country first and sewed up the votes so that even a powerful coalition couldn't beat him down in the convention of 1932.

Since 1933 Farley has honorably and without a breath of scandal directed the affairs of the national party organization and those of the Post Office Department, as its chief.

He will stay in office as national chairman long enough to launch the 1940 campaign and then, a month from now, he will step down, making way for a man who will be the choice of Franklin D. Roosevelt.

TRIBUTE TO FARLEY PAID BY REPORTERS—RETIRING CHAIRMAN OF DEMOCRATIC COMMITTEE IS GUEST AT FAREWELL RECEPTION BY PRESS; LEAVES POST ON AUGUST 17

(By James L. Kilgallen, International New Service staff correspondent)

CHICAGO, July 20.—"Good-bye and good luck, Jim," was the tenor of a farewell reception given by the press to James A. Farley, retiring chairman of the Democratic National Committee, before he returned today to New York to wind up his political affairs preparatory to entering private business.

It was an unusual, straight-from-the-heart tribute to Farley, who has grown in the esteem of the press during the convention, if that were possible. They gave him several presents, including a watch, a baseball, and a first baseman's mitt. But the big thing was the affection they showed toward Farley and the manner in which he showed his appreciation.

SINCERE FAREWELL

Many of the newspapermen and editors delayed their departure for home to be present at the farewell to Farley. It was a sincere farewell, too, and Jim knew it. No man in public life could have drawn such a reception from Washington correspondents, New York reporters, and the chief political writers of the newspapers of America.

They said nice things to Jim, and Jim made quite a speech himself, mostly off the record, but straight from the heart. Here was a man leaving the game of politics, which he admits he loves, but he left knowing the press was behind him 100 percent in their well wishes for his future.

Farley probably is soon to take over the job of heading the New York American League Baseball Club, but he didn't say much about that. He did say he always has been an "American League fan" and he made it clear the door would always be "wide open" for the newspapermen who, he said, never violated his confidence.

WILL CLEAN UP AFFAIRS

From now until August 17, Farley will devote his time to cleaning up affairs at the New York headquarters of the Democratic Party so that everything will be ready for his successor who will run Franklin D. Roosevelt's 1940 campaign for a third term.

Along about August 1, President Roosevelt and Secretary of Agriculture Wallace, the Vice Presidential nominee, will meet with a subcommittee of the Democratic National Committee and choose a successor to the astute Farley, who in 1932 and 1936 successfully put over Roosevelt's campaigns.

Farley won't quit politics entirely. He will retain his job as head of the New York Democratic State Committee and he will support the Roosevelt-Wallace ticket. Whether he will make any campaign speeches, however, has not been determined.

He will relinquish his Cabinet post as Postmaster General, but the announcement of this change will come from President Roosevelt.

Farley made it clear he will submerge his third-term convictions and work for the success of the Democratic Party in the November election. He is getting out without any rancor in his heart and apparently holds no ill will toward anybody.

The job of running the Yankees and its "farm" system will be a "cinch" for Farley, whose middle name is work. He confided to the press that he is one of those "saps" who get up every morning at 7:30 a. m. looking for something to do. He will be perfectly at home in a box back of third base and giving out interviews with the sports writers, with whom he previously had contact when he was chairman of the New York State Boxing Commission.

Farley jokingly expressed the hope that the Washington correspondents and political writers wouldn't lose contact with him, for he wants to "keep in touch," and said, he knows, from past experience, that they always know the low-down."

The press merely gave Farley casual assurance that they'd be around. He knew how they felt, from cub reporter to top-notch scribe. There was no necessity of putting anything in writing between Jim Farley and the press of America.

[From the Hartford (Conn.) Times of July 26, 1940]

WASHINGTON

(By Bulkley Griffin)

WASHINGTON.—It has become the fashion to write articles laudatory of Jim Farley. The practice has more warrant than most fashions. Jim Farley was the most popular man at Chicago; only the arrival of President Roosevelt could have taken that honor from him. The presence of so many newspapermen at the convention, a great many of whom did not know Farley or the esteem in which he has always been held by the Washington reporters, contributed to the current flow of pro-Farley articles.

One newspaperman on the scene put it this way: "They talk about George Washington and Babe Ruth and such being examples to the youth of the Nation; Jim Farley belongs in that group." The statement contains more than a germ of truth. It was a fine exhibition of sportsmanship that Jim Farley gave. It was a fine demonstration of human nature and politics and citizenship. The

most dramatic moment of the convention came after the President's nomination when Jim stood on the stage and, smiling, joined in that lilting Irish song that Chairman BARKLEY, with good timing and discrimination, arranged for.

Farley, of course, wanted the nomination. He thought at least that a ticket of Hull and Farley stood an excellent chance of winning. But the White House turned thumbs down on Farley and he saw friends, who probably had promised him the world when he had done valuable favors and acts of friendship for them, pass by on the other side at Chicago. Some administration leaders even worked hard, and with some considerable success, to take the Massachusetts delegation away from him. Not even a consolation prize was intended.

Mrs. Farley naturally was not happy. People who talked with her—and these included Delegate Matthew Scully, of Naugatuck—discovered how badly she felt. Everyone was sympathetic with the man who lived down and made derision of the "Tammany grafter" label that some tacked on him 7 years ago, who constituted the most effective national chairman the party has had in long years, and whose word with newspapermen was better than the word of some more "respectable" members of the administration—and sympathy was all he got. Yet out of this situation, by his character and conduct, he fashioned a great tribute to himself.

A newspaperman was standing by the box in which Mrs. Farley was watching the convention—the moment when Senator CARTER GLASS was nominating Farley for President. Some wardheeler nearby started to boo. The reporter, a very peaceable person, instinctively turned and kicked the booer. That indicated how most folks felt toward Mr. and Mrs. Farley.

Philadelphia is a long way off, yet here is a story about that convention that is amusing Washington. Former Senator Jim Watson, of Indiana, that flowery relic of days gone by, who appears at every big occasion, was a Dewey man. Jim hoped to recoup his fallen political fortunes by hopping on the Dewey bandwagon, which, when he joined it, looked like the best bet. At the convention he was very tired and on the night of the balloting fell asleep. The chairman of the Indiana delegation took this opportunity to vote Jim Watson for Willkie. On the fifth ballot Jim awoke and, his veteran political mind sensing what was going to happen, called to the chairman to vote him for Willkie. "You have been voting for Willkie since the start of the balloting," the chairman informed him. So Jim now finds himself one of the early Willkieites and is expected to make the most of the situation.

[From the Richmond Times-Dispatch of July 20, 1940]

JIM FARLEY SAYS "NO"

Jim Farley's decision not to remain as chairman of the Democratic National Committee during the coming Presidential campaign is a bad blow to the Roosevelt-Wallace ticket. Nobody else can fill his shoes as a political prestidigitator, and there is no use hoping that such a person is available.

All the pressure put upon him by the party to remain in the chairmanship until November failed to produce the desired result. President Roosevelt not only tried to persuade him to stay, when they had their preconvention chat at Hyde Park, but both the President and Mrs. Roosevelt made open acknowledgment to the convention on Thursday night of their affection and regard for him.

But Mr. Farley is opposed to the third term on principle. Besides, for years he is said to have been treated with great lack of consideration by the inner New Deal circle, including Mr. Roosevelt—so much so that he and the President were on the verge of an open break at the time of the unsuccessful "purge" 2 years ago. Mr. Farley always was against the purge, and said it would fail. The Corcoran-Cohen inner circle talked Mr. Roosevelt into going counter to his wishes on the issue, with the result that the President received one of his worst set-backs.

The same level-headed political judgment which warned the President against the purge will be sorely needed when the campaign now under way springs into full stride. This isn't going to be the pushover for the Democrats that the campaign against Landon was in 1936. They must muster all their resources. The defection of Jim Farley, the most popular figure in the party, next to Mr. Roosevelt himself, and the ablest political strategist, certainly doesn't help. Moreover, many will say that if Jim had wanted to hang on until November, he could have done so. He has been a good sport about the treatment he has received, he emerged from the Chicago convention its most admired and popular figure, but he now says he can't carry on but a month longer. It is difficult to blame him under the circumstances.

This Democratic campaign didn't get off to too good a start, in view of the partly synthetic "draft" at Chicago, the strong opposition to Mr. Wallace for second place on the ticket, and the obvious soreness in many party quarters over the strong hand kept on the whole show by the White House. In view of the foregoing, Jim Farley's aid was needed more than ever before. The fact that it isn't to be forthcoming after August 17 is far from cause for Democratic jubilation.

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer of July 21, 1940]

SCRIBES HONORED FARLEY AS STRAIGHT SHOOTER—HUNDREDS AT GOOD-LUCK DINNER PAID TRIBUTE TO HIS FRANKNESS

(By John M. Cummings)

Chicago, July 20.—Now and then you hear it said the birds who make their living by stringing one word after another for the daily press in time become case-hardened and cynical. This condition has been ascribed to frequent contact with fakers, charlatans, and other species of publicity seekers. Maybe there is something to it. Certainly in this game you meet all sorts of main chancers and the last thing your good reporter does before retiring for the night is to pick off the fleas and other forms of vermin accumulated during the day.

Still, you find in the news of the day the names of men who are not fakers, sports who are on the level, who are neither demagogues nor quacks. The newspaper men who covered the Democratic National Convention took time out Friday to honor a fine example of this type of citizen. They had Jim Farley as their guest.

This scribe has been batting around with politicians of one sort or another for a full quarter of a century. You can meet a lot of fakers in 25 years. And you can meet a lot of straight shooters, too. Jim Farley is a straight shooter and that's why some 700 or 800 newspapermen gave him the old good-luck business in the grand ballroom of the Stevens Hotel.

Jim is about to retire as chairman of the Democratic National Committee after serving his part in that capacity well and honorably over a period of 8 years. They say Jim's going to head the Yankee baseball team. That's neither here nor there. The point is that Jim, on August 17, will cease to be grand marshal of the Democratic fighting forces. And the men who have been writing of Jim and associating with him either daily or infrequently simply tossed him a party.

These newspaper scribes wanted Jim to know they appreciated his frankness, liked his geniality, and admired him as a man.

And, believe it or not, there was some huskiness in throats and an extra beat to the pulse as these hard-hearted cynics of the newspaper world told Jim they were sorry to see him leaving the post of command.

The Republicans, of course, are glad that Jim is retiring from the chairmanship. They have no man to match Jim. The Democratic Party has no man to replace him. Perhaps that's why they're having so much trouble locating a new chairman. Each man approached knows that Jim Farley is the yardstick by which future chairmen will be measured. And each in turn shies away from the thought of being shown up as a pygmy.

The reporters who gathered around Jim yesterday were not necessarily Democrats. A count of noses probably would show a majority clinging to the Republican faith. They were not gathering around Jim because he is a Democrat and about as fine a specimen of the breed as you could find. These scribes were pump-handling Jim Farley, the man.

Jim stood at the entrance to the ballroom greeting the lads as they arrived. Beside him stood that old Roman of the stinging phrase and the crushing sentence—Charley Michelson. Eddie Roddin and Bill Bray of the Farley staff were on deck.

Afterwhile they had a little ceremony. Jim was called to a small platform where a gang of musicians had been knocking out My Wild Irish Rose, Mrs. McCloud's Reel, and The Giant That Jumped the Causeway.

A bird called Mike Flynn, of the Wall Street Journal (that's enough to prove it wasn't a Democratic meeting), hopped to the platform and beckoned to a sport known to the police as Walter Trohan, White House correspondent for Colonel McCormick's Chicago Tribune.

This fugitive called Trohan said that all and sundry were assembled to honor the greatest national chairman of any party in the history of the country. Everybody applauded that declaration, so there must be something to it.

When Trohan was howled down, a dame who represents a string of Michigan papers in Washington, a dame who has acquired the "nom-de-handle" of Esther Van Wagner Tufty, stepped up and took charge of the female end of the celebration.

Esther Van Wagner Tufty had a package—a store package all wrapped up in tissue paper. She gave Jim the come-hither and he stepped to the platform. And when Jim opened the package by golly there was a first baseman's mitt. Mike Flynn tossed a ball to Jim and the photographers, including one of the skirted variety, snapped and snapped. The ball was a little low and inside but Jim caught it.

All this reminded the crowd of the Yankees, but someone said everything was off the record, and nothing was said about baseball or the prospect of the Yanks rising above fourth place, which was where they were when we looked at the standing of the clubs 3 weeks ago.

Turner Catledge, of the New York Times, went in to relieve Esther Van Wagner Tufty after Esther Van Wagner Tufty had been knocked out of the box. And Turner, in behalf of the assembled patriots and taxpayers, gave Jim one of the finest watches we ever saw—hot or cold. And he got a silver stamp box, too, for some of these special stamps Jim puts out from time to time.

There was a kind of a catch in Jim's voice as he accepted the watch. It was a nice speech, entirely off the record, and none of it will be set down here because Jim said the newspaper reporters never betrayed a confidence and by cripes we're not going to let him down at this late stage of the game.

The newspapermen and gals of the press honored themselves when they honored Jim Farley. But the men of the corps ought to take a jump in the lake. The whole business was thought up by Esther Van Wagner Tufty, the lady from Michigan.

Personally, we were glad to join the gang in paying tribute to Jim Farley. The other day we heard it said that a prominent

Republican was willing to offer 48 State chairmen, 6 Congressmen, and the whole "kit and kaboodle" of Republican Senators for one Jim Farley. For what they ought to do is draft Jim, just as the Democrats drafted Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Roosevelt drafted Mr. Wallace.

[From the Worcester (Mass.) Gazette of July 20, 1940]

BASEBALL, POLITICS, AND JIM FARLEY

Even those who have been most severe in criticism of some of his political methods (but who now can understand that he may not have been responsible for many of them) will readily admit that in the case of James A. Farley, the Democratic Party's loss is major-league baseball's gain.

In a couple of months now, Mr. Farley becomes administrative boss of the New York Yankees, a job that will give him plenty of prominence; he will have fewer headaches and several times more income than was his lot with the Roosevelt administration. There is no question of his ability to handle the job, nor is there any question of his liking and aptitude for bigtime sports. He may not be as expert at predicting pennant races and the World Series as he has been in predicting national elections, but he will know what's what, and why.

The Yankees, we should think, will take a nice boost in popular esteem as a result of Mr. Farley's connection with the club. The deal he was handed by the New Deal, amounting to the old heave-ho, has made the light of public opinion shine more favorably upon him. He will find that baseball is a business not a political party, and that the better job he does as head of the Yankees the more secure that job will be.

[From the Woonsocket (R. I.) Call and Evening Reporter of July 18, 1940]

THE FORGOTTEN MAN

Amid the whoops and whistles and chants and cheers of parading delegates the other night at the Democratic Convention when their first demonstration at mention of the President's name made your radio tubes howl, did you get a sense of a lonely figure standing wistfully aloof?

Did the air-wave description of that scene leave you—not stirred, not carried away with enthusiasm by a dynamic personality whatever your party affiliations—but instead, feeling like an adult watching the antics of exuberant but undirected children? Did you miss the husky catch in the announcer's voice; miss his efforts to find effective words with which to picture the emotion-building hero of other convention days? And wonder at the loss?—until it was recaptured for you by the prosaic statement that: "Jim Farley is standing on the platform with his two daughters, smiling down at the crowd."

That was it. A Democratic convention was demonstrating without James A. Farley functioning as the fountain head of enthusiasm. It seemed hollow; it failed to ring true. What memories of other days coursed through the mind of smiling "genial Jim" as he stood and watched, we can only conjecture. We venture, though, that the temptation to cast aside this 1940 aloofness, the wistful wish to bridge the schism between the watcher on the platform and the electric, omnipotent leader of yesteryear were strong. That he repulsed them is a measure of the political depths of the chasm that yawns today between the Post Office Damon and the White House Pythias.

[From the Winston-Salem (N. C.) Journal and Sentinel of July 21, 1940]

A GREAT LEADER

Democrats in every section of the Nation learn with deep regret mingled with sympathetic understanding of the decision of James A. Farley to retire on August 17 from the chairmanship of the Democratic National Committee.

As we see it, James A. Farley has proved himself to be the greatest national-committee chairman in the history of any American political party.

It was his superb organizing ability, his capacity to cement divided elements, and to make friends and keep them, that played a large part in the defeat of the "stop-Roosevelt" movement in 1932.

These same qualities, coupled with an almost uncanny political foresight, enabled Mr. Farley to make his remarkable prediction in 1936 that the President would carry 46 of the 48 States—a prediction that was exactly correct.

But Mr. Farley is not only a great political maestro. He is an excellent administrator, as the progress of the Post Office Department under his direction shows. And he is not only the greatest political campaign manager and one of the ablest executives of his time, Jim Farley is a sterling patriot and Democratic statesman whose loyalty to his party and to his country has never once wavered.

Mr. Farley, we are told, opposed any infringement upon the third-term tradition. He was himself a candidate for the Democratic nomination for the Presidency. But when he was defeated in the Democratic convention he proved himself too much of the sound party man, too much of the American patriot, to place his own ambitions in the path of the majority's desire to meet a great national crisis by renominating Mr. Roosevelt. And it was Jim Farley who made the motion to make the nomination of the President unianimous.

His retirement as national chairman and later as Postmaster General is occasioned, according to his statement, not by political but by personal reasons. It is an open secret that Mr. Farley's finances are low, and he hopes to recuperate them as the operator of the New York Yankees baseball club. He is not "taking a walk." He will support the Democratic ticket and will continue as chairman of the New York State Democratic Committee.

"I have said repeatedly that the American people want the Democratic Party to remain in power," Mr. Farley declared. "My opinion has not changed, and again I pledge my full support to the Roosevelt-Wallace ticket."

As Mr. Farley retires he will carry with him the gratitude of his party and that of many outside his party for his masterly achievements and his superb patriotic leadership of the past few years. To him much of the social gains credited to the administration in general is due, for he it was who laid the groundwork for the political success necessary to the institution of the policies which netted these gains. As he goes into private life, it is with the knowledge that an entire Nation wishes him the utmost success in his new undertaking.

[From the Sun (Williamsport, Pa.) of July 20, 1940]

MR. FARLEY WILL RETIRE

James A. Farley must have worn a wry smile as he listened to the lavish words of praise for "Dear Jim" which were heaped upon him at Chicago. Compliments, accompanied by words of endearment, were laid on thickly—but they didn't change Mr. Farley's decision to retire as national chairman of the Democratic Party. He will stick to the job for a month, which will let him out long before the real responsibility for conduct of the party's campaign develops.

Mr. Farley has the excuse of pending private responsibilities which will monopolize his time and energies as reason for his retirement. Who can believe, however, that his major motive is other than a desire to divorce himself from the obligation to direct a third-term effort of which he disapproves?

For all the compliments showered upon him, the one real compliment was withheld. He was not paid the honor of having his opinions and advice accepted. It is a hollow thing to be praised as an astute, adroit, loyal, hard-working political leader while one's judgment is being dismissed as of no consequence.

[From the Wilkes-Barre (Pa.) Times-Leader of July 20, 1940]

JAMES A. FARLEY RESIGNS

Decision of James A. Farley to retire next month as national chairman, although expected, is a staggering blow to the Democratic Party. Capable, shrewd, loyal, he has been a tower of strength. He has been accurately described as a political genius.

Under his leadership, Democrats rose to their greatest heights. To him President Roosevelt owed his overwhelming victories at the polls in 1932 and 1936. His talents for organization made him invaluable.

Yet, despite the eminence of his position, it has been no secret that Mr. Farley has not been satisfied. Between him and the President there has been a growing coolness. Many have believed that Mr. Farley was treated shabbily by the party to which he rendered so great a service. It has been clear to all for a long time that others enjoyed the confidence of the White House rather than the Postmaster General.

It was Mr. Farley's opposition to a third term that really brought the show-down. In becoming a candidate himself and refusing to withdraw, he showed his hand plainly, although he must have known that the cards were stacked. Characteristically, he accepted defeat without any bitterness and pledged his support to the ticket, although efforts to have him conduct the campaign failed.

There is considerable speculation about the identity of his successor, but it is safe to say that the party will have to comb the country thoroughly to find a man who combines so many qualities of leadership. His resignation, especially at this time, is a loss, the full significance of which it is difficult to gage.

[From the Wilkes-Barre (Pa.) Record of July 22, 1940]

MR. FARLEY QUITS

Reelection of James A. Farley as chairman of the Democratic National Committee, with Mr. Farley specifying that he will retire on August 17, is a gesture intended to suggest the continued existence of a state of good will and cordiality between the Postmaster General and his Chief.

As far as Mr. Farley is concerned, his loyalty has been tried and found not wanting under extremely trying circumstances. His aversion to a third term for a President was well known long before the Chicago convention met. The proceedings soon took a direction which pointed to only one outcome. Mr. Farley could have caused a serious rift. This he was too regular to do, and his high regard for what he must have believed were the proprieties in view of his Cabinet position and relations with the administration commanded the silent admiration of political friend and foe alike.

He is now showing the courage of his conviction against a third term by declining to remain as national chairman beyond the time necessary to break in his successor. Mr. Farley has been a shrewd leader. It is not unlikely tht he has his doubts as to the probable outcome of the third-term bid.

[From the Wheeling (W. Va.) News-Register of July 23, 1940]

JIM FARLEY STEPS DOWN

For ability and unswerving loyalty, the Democratic Party is in heavy debt to James A. Farley, who has announced his retirement for August 17. His agreeing to stay on the job for another month when he would like to quit right now to accept a position as head of the New York Yankee baseball club is an understandable gesture for party harmony, for it is no secret that Farley was deeply hurt by the treatment received at Chicago, where Harry Hopkins ran the show from the wings.

It may be suspected, also, that Farley is not in sympathy with the third-term campaign. There have been signs for some time that he has been in the bad graces of the inner circles of administration leaders, but, regardless of rebuffs, he went quietly and effectively about his work.

At Chicago it was obvious that his job was deliberately usurped, but not once by word or deed did Farley depart from his dignified loyalty to the President, his hero. It required a big man to stand up for his principles under the pressure that he has been under during recent months.

On the day that genial Jim Farley hands over his keys to the office of national chairman the Democratic Party will lose one of the most valuable leaders it ever possessed.

[From the Wheeling (W. Va.) Intelligencer of July 19, 1940]

EXIT MR. FARLEY

Termination of the Chicago convention marks the end of the road, we suspect, for James A. Farley as a national political figure.

And, yet, Mr. Farley emerged from the convention with perhaps more prestige, more genuine public regard, than attaches to any other man in the party.

His was a case of victory in defeat. He didn't win the Democratic nomination. But he did win public esteem. He played the game to the end. He played it squarely. Although he didn't like what was going on around him, he played his part stanchly. The American people respect a man like that, whether or not they believe as he believes.

That Mr. Farley has come to the conclusion that the game isn't worth the candle is suggested by Editor Smith, of the Fairmont Times, who has had some opportunity to study the game of politics, its rewards and disappointments. Writing from Chicago, Mr. Smith said of Farley's passing:

"Jim Farley, friend of every Democrat in West Virginia, tonight tasted the bitter dregs from the cup his political genius filled to overflowing in the same hall 8 years ago, and the cup was handed him by those who have drunk deep of its heady wine. * * * His example and his fate should be a lesson to all political geniuses to stay out of politics."

This is, we suspect, sound advice. But whether or not Jim Farley stays out of politics, he will take with him the admiration of those to whom the term "square shooter" still means something.

[From the Washington Post of July 21, 1940]

MR. FARLEY WALKS OUT

President Roosevelt won almost everything he sought at Chicago—except the continued service of James A. Farley as his campaign manager. A majority of the delegates grudgingly bowed to his wish to have Secretary of Agriculture Wallace as a running mate. But the man who directed the successful Democratic campaigns of 1932 and 1936 has resigned his post in spite of protests from both the President and the delegates at Chicago.

Mr. Farley offers a thoroughly reasonable explanation of his desire to retire to private life. He has had to make financial sacrifices to remain Postmaster General and chairman of the Democratic National Committee. Undoubtedly he is eager to accept the attractive offer in business which, he says, is open to him. But that eagerness has become dominant in his mind only because of his unwillingness to conduct a third-term campaign for Mr. Roosevelt.

Mr. Farley probably could have increased his income by entering private business several years ago. Yet he remained in office. His candidacy for both the Presidency and the Vice Presidency before the Chicago convention is ample evidence that he was willing to make further financial sacrifice to remain in public life. His failure to obtain either nomination greatly influenced his decision to retire from party and public office. But the fact that he is stepping out before the Presidential campaign gets under way, instead of waiting until November, can be interpreted in only one way.

Mr. Farley has pledged his support to the Roosevelt-Wallace ticket. This pledge apparently means, however, only that the political wizard will not bolt his party on the third-term issue, as Senator BURKE and a number of other influential Democrats have already done.

It would be useless to pretend that this resignation is not a severe blow to the Roosevelt-Wallace ticket. Mr. Farley's opposition to the third-term movement is common knowledge. Yet, if he had submerged that opposition after the convention was over, his example would doubtless have encouraged many other Democratic leaders to do likewise. For Mr. Farley has an ardent following within the party he has faithfully served. His continued hostility to Mr. Roosevelts third-term effort can only strengthen the hand of the bolters.

The November election may thus be a more clear-cut test of the New Deal than the country has yet seen. In both 1932 and 1936 a vast number of Jeffersonian Democrats followed Mr. Roosevelt, despite misgivings, because of their party affiliations. Now an ardent new dealer has replaced conservative Vice President Garner in second place on the ticket, and the President must rely more heavily upon the politically inexperienced inner circle of his administration for the conduct of his campaign.

No one realizes more keenly than Mr. Farley the fact that he has put the administration under a real handicap at the beginning of the Presidential race. Yet he has calmly and deliberately washed his hands of the 1940 campaign because of convictions that he shares with many other Democrats.

[From the Waseca (Minn.) Herald of July 25, 1940]

The retirement next month of James A. Farley, Democratic national chairman, will remove one of the most colorful figures in the history of American politics. His successful management of the Roosevelt Presidential campaigns of 1932 and 1936 brought him Nation-wide acclaim and demonstrated the working of a master mind in the political arena. But success never turned his head. He always played the game on the square, and when the contests were over he enjoyed the respect and esteem of both friends and foes. An outstanding tribute to his honesty and integrity is the fact that he is giving up political leadership in order to enter business and provide for his family. Had he been of the mold of many other prominent politicians, he could have accumulated a fortune through devious political routes. But there is no dishonesty or deceit in Jim Farley's make-up. He demonstrated the fact that politics can be conducted successfully on honest businesslike lines, and his name will go down in history as a model master politician and a model American citizen.

[From the Watertown (N. Y.) Daily Times of July 19, 1940]

WHAT ABOUT JIM FARLEY?

There are many people who believe that the Democratic political convention which ended its sessions early this morning signalized the end of the political career of one of the most colorful political leaders of modern times, James A. Farley.

For the first time in 8 years Farley attended a political convention which he could not control. For 8 years he had appeared at political conventions and other political gatherings as the personal representative of Franklin D. Roosevelt, yet in the Chicago convention he was powerless. Other men made the decisions. Other leaders lined up the votes. Farley received many demonstrations of affections—even the President had a word of praise—but it was the kind of tribute extended to a departed brother whose memory will always be green.

One wonders at the thoughts that must have passed through Farley's mind as he sat on the platform at Chicago and watched other men in command. It was in this same hall that 8 years before Farley's generalship had resulted in Franklin D. Roosevelt first being nominated for President. Probably he remembered with a wry smile of the opposition he faced then from men who were now whooping it up for Roosevelt. Perhaps he thought of his long fight to win Tammany Hall for the President, a fight finally crowned with success and with Alfred E. Smith one of the casualties. Perhaps, too, he thought how he had sold Roosevelt to the Democratic organizations of Massachusetts and New Jersey and Pennsylvania. Now he could not even hold his own delegates from Massachusetts.

A famous political partnership is at an end. Roosevelt and Farley go their separate ways. It was a powerful combination in its day, Roosevelt with his flaming idealism, his radio personality, his sense of the dramatic, and Farley with his flair for organization, his mastery of the mechanics of politics, his realism, and his practicality.

Farley says he is through. He has no desire to remain in the public eye longer and he will devote his time to private business. A saddened man, Jim Farley, and no doubt that is his sincere intention at the present time. But suppose Roosevelt is defeated. Suppose the new dealers fall and a new element arises to control the Democratic Party. We predict that Farley will then be back in the harness. Politics is in his blood. It is his business and his recreation. An old partnership has been dissolved. Another may be in the offing. It will depend upon the outcome of the Presidential election.

[From the Walla Walla (Wash.) Union Bulletin of July 21, 1940]

FARLEY STEPS DOWN

In a few weeks the national Democratic Party will swap horses in the middle of the stream.

James Aloysius Farley, national chairman and one of the Nation's most astute political leaders, has resigned to go into private business. To all appearances that private business has to do with change of ownership of the New York Yankees baseball club of the American League.

Farley is an out and out foe of the third term. He has played the good sport by issuing statements that he will support the ticket of the party of which he has long been a member. Whether that support will consist of Jim Farley's cross on his own ballot, or will be of the type that means influencing of huge numbers of votes each reader may decide for himself.

It is possible that Farley's support will be somewhat passive, particularly since the President went out of his way not long ago and commented pointedly on what he termed Farley's lack of

availability as a candidate for the Presidency. The national chairman did not like that rebuff from Mr. Roosevelt. If he does nothing for the ticket beyond marking his own ballot for the sake of remaining "regular" no one would be greatly surprised.

Taking Jim Farley out of the New Deal lineup may have the same effect on Roosevelt's November chances as Connie Mack's sale of his wonder teams did to Philadelphia Athletics pennant chances in bygone years. The opposition has been given a decided break in the decision of this talented politico to go to the sidelines.

[From the Waterloo (Iowa) Courier of July 17, 1940]

FARLEY—FROM POLITICS TO BASEBALL

James A. Farley has earned the reputation of being a President maker. When Roosevelt was first nominated in 1932, those wise in politics looked behind the scenes and saw Farley. When Roosevelt was renominated and elected in 1936, the genial New York Irishman was again behind the scenes, pulling wires, making contracts, giving advice, making friends, and saying little. When there was political work to be done, the new dealers called on Farley.

From all indications, that situation is changed now. Farley, a half-hearted candidate for President, is making plans to assume ownership of the New York Yankee baseball team.

Roosevelt, doubtless, can get along without him. There are other smart politicians in the Democratic Party.

But it must worry the President a little to have Jim breaking away. Jim was the one who knew every major politician in America by his first name. Jim always knew which way the wind was blowing. Jim exuded confidence.

But now he is going to retire as national chairman. He opposes a third term. He thinks a third term is a mistake.

James A. Farley is a smart politician. Even his opponents give him that much praise.

[From the Waco (Tex.) News-Tribune of July 25, 1940]

GOOD-BYE, JIM FARLEY

Jim Farley has resigned the chairmanship of the Democratic National Committee. Committee and party members receive the news with regret, though for months they have known that the affable Jim would not long outlast the Chicago convention. It was his destiny to see a legitimate ambition thwarted by the rapid stride of world events.

His brief address at the convention was genuine drama. It expressed his gratitude for the votes he had received. His motion for a unanimous ballot for Mr. Roosevelt, his expression of devotion to the party, all these added up to the ultimate in good sportsmanship.

Mr. Farley couldn't be a winner, but he was a superlatively good loser. The delegates responded with an ovation that was as sorrowful as it was sincere.

James Whitcomb Riley expressed it in the phrase, "Well, goodbye, Jim, take keer of yourse'f." It is a regretful farewell now, with best wishes. However, the 8 adventurous years may add up, history will provide a niche for Jim Farley, the man whose word was his bond, who never reneged on a promise, who made good in a very big way.

[From the Vicksburg (Miss.) Post]

JIM FARLEY'S WISE LEADERSHIP

James A. Farley can be proud of one fact. He relinquishes the chairmanship of the Democratic National Committee with the party out of debt for the first time in its history. More than this, Mr. Farley says there is money in the treasury.

Jim Farley has done a good job as chairman of the Democratic committee for 8 years. He deserves the everlasting gratitude of the rank and file of the party. He has carried on in the face of much discouragement and at times he had to submerge his own views for the sake of harmony and the welfare of the party.

It is well known that Mr. Farley is not in accord with the left-wingers who have had so much influence with the President, but at no time did Mr. Farley refuse to go along with the President, even if he did so in silence.

It is reported that Mr. Farley is the head of a syndicate who will purchase soon the New York Yankee baseball club at a price of $4,000,000. Baseball was Farley's first love and no doubt he will welcome getting away from the worries of a campaign manager, though the manager of a great baseball club is no bed of roses.

James A. Farley has made a fine record as Postmaster General. Under his guidance the Postal Department has been reorganized and placed on a most efficient business basis. No longer does the Department roll up the huge deficits year after year, as it did under Republican rule.

Undoubtedly James A. Farley has proven himself Presidential timber. If President Roosevelt should refuse the nomination, which it seems now is certain to be given him in spite of the fact that he has said he is not a candidate, it will not be surprising that Mr. Farley will show much strength in the convention, as he has said his name will go before the convention for the Presidency.

Within a few hours the history of the Democratic convention will be completed, and it goes without saying whoever is chosen on the Democratic ticket, James A. Farley has played a dominant part in this convention and the success of the Democrats for the past 8 years.

[From the Woodford (Versailles, Ky.) Sun of July 25, 1940]

JIM FARLEY

Postmaster General James A. Farley, strongly opposed to a third term for anyone, and a candidate himself for the Democratic Presidential nomination, showed his magnanimity and his loyalty to his friend, "the boss"—his name for the President—by moving that the Roosevelt nomination by the Democratic convention be made by acclamation when it was apparent that President Roosevelt had received an overwhelming majority of the votes of the delegates.

Mr. Farley on Friday resigned as chairman of the Democratic National Committee, but agreed to serve until August 17. It is understood that he will resign in September as Postmaster General to become owner of the New York Yankees baseball team, in an effort to recoup his personal finances.

Jim Farley has made a great Postmaster General and a great national committee chairman. He is one of the ablest, squarest, frankest men in public life. Some of the highest tributes to Farley's character have been paid by "the boss," who has known him intimately for many years.

[From the Utica (N. Y.) Daily Press of July 18, 1940]

FATE OF JIM FARLEY

The strangest development in the Chicago convention which has already shown its disregard for political precedents, is the fate of James A. Farley, Chairman of the Democratic National Committee. The one thing about Farley upon which both his friends and his critics agree, is his skill as a political leader. He has excellent judgment, a genius for organization and extensive experience in a field where they don't do it with mirrors.

Furthermore, Farley has acquired a reputation for personal integrity and loyalty to the party principles which he has espoused as convictions. Under such circumstances, it might be assumed that a party having such a man at the head of its working organization, would value him highly. But the contrary is the case. Farley has not left the Democratic Party but the New Deal has taken its management away from him.

All accounts from Chicago agree that he is no longer the leader to whom delegates would naturally turn for information or ideas about convention procedure and campaign strategy. That function has been taken over by Commerce Secretary Hopkins, who is now represented to be the President's closest adviser.

Whatever other qualifications Secretary Hopkins possess, and they are numerous, there is nothing in his record to suggest ability as a political strategist or leader. On the contrary, he has shown something of a gift for making indiscreet statements which fly back in his face and he would not ordinarily be regarded as the type of man to whom local political leaders would turn for campaign advice.

But there it is. So far as the visible evidence goes, it shows that Farley is through as a national figure in the party and that he is being superseded by others whose abilities are untried in the field of national politics. That procedure seems to be putting the party pretty far out on a limb.

[From the Tucson (Ariz.) Citizen of July 18, 1940]

NO CLOVER FOR "OLD FAITHFUL"

At the conclusion of Jim Farley's speech before the Democratic National Convention Monday night, it was clear he had tied the reins of party chairmanship to the dashboard and was ready to vacate the driver's seat to a successor. There was still a possibility, it was said, that he might be drafted for further service—that he might even get a "command" under a cachet that few would ignore or flout—for a third performance, but barring the success of that approach to his blind side Farley's speech was his hail and his farewell.

He would be callous, indeed, who did not sense the pathos of the moment, for interdiction of all mention of the cause which brought the severance could not obscure the fact that 8 years of loyal service had brought him to the end of a dead alley. There was one cardinal of 1940 republicanism to which he would give shouting approval did not loyalty to a partyism that does not deserve such devotion seal his lips, and that is the venerated principle and precedent that American rulership shall be determinate, not indeterminate.

Farley could stay and collect profuse but selfish thanks—of which he has a plethora and little else but obligations as souvenirs of his service—if he would pocket his convictions and his principles, but at the moment to which we refer he had spurned the proposal that he wink at the ravishment of tradition.

But there would be no fields of clover for "Old Faithful" Farley now that his working days for the party were ending. He had learned that the favors of the mighty are not given for reward but to bind the beneficiary to future service, the nature of which is not to be questioned. Like many who have depended on "prince's favors," he was to be on his own—again dependent on his wits.

[From the Troy (N. Y.) Record of July 22, 1940]

SAMSON AGONISTES

In one of Milton's greatest poems we have the picture of Samson, the strong man of Hebrew legend, blinded and bound by his enemies, yet triumphant. Brought to a great feast of Dagon, he was made a feature of the program to amuse the multitude. Finally, with his arms around the two great pillars, he bent forward and pulled the

edifice down, burying in its ruins hundreds of his enemies and perishing himself.

At Chicago last week James A. Farley, Postmaster General of the United States, played the role of Samson Agonistes. His record is well known. Chairman of National and State party committees, member of the Cabinet, adviser and confidant of the President, he has been for 8 years the strong man of democracy. The successes of the New Deal have been possible only because of his admirable leadership.

More than this, he carried on his activities with so deft and kindly a hand that he made friends by it. There are few, if any, Americans who know so many people in the United States and who have so few enemies. He has a remarkable personality and a gift for friendship.

But Mr. Farley has more than popularity, power, and genius behind him. He has conscience. He is willing to play the political game for a party in which he believes; he is willing to advise and assist a political leader whose program may differ, in many points, from his own. But when that party or that politician departs definitely and intentionally from the decencies upon which characters must be built, Mr. Farley cannot go along.

And so the Postmaster General played his final role in Chicago with all the charm of a finished actor but with the grim intensity of a martyr—or a Samson Agonistes. He had been in many ways the most powerful man in the land. But the new dealers and the municipal bosses had combined with the President to put his eyes out and bind him. Hopkins, Ickes, Perkins, and Wallace—the Pharisaic purists of the Roosevelt inner circle—locked arms with the slippery gang from the big cities—Hague, Kelly, Guffey, the Louisiana crowd, the Pendergast remaindermen, and the underlings of the late lamented Jimmy Hines—and decided to make a monkey of Jim Farley. They resented him because he refused to be low down.

But Jim Farley outplayed them. At the convention he smiled and talked with his friends. He remained a candidate for the Presidency although he knew Roosevelt had given him a Judas kiss. He went his way, too big to be disconcerted, too strong to be troubled by the insects of the New Deal.

The convention sensed the situation. In spite of all the machinery laid in for the various demonstrations, the convention was a Farley affair. Every mention of his name brought cheers, and they were real ones. Roosevelt cheers came, but they were bought cheers and meant far less. It was essentially Farley's week, the time of his triumph. He had turned sadly away from a life task because he could not honestly continue in it; but his head, though bloody, was unbowed. He stepped out of the picture like the gentleman he is, too much of a man to notice the dirty tricks of dirty schemers.

It was said of Samson that he destroyed more of his enemies in his death than in his life. Of Jim Farley it can be asserted that he made more friends by his final act in the political tragedy than in all his tours about the country, his conferences with partisans, and his achievements in organization. He emerges as the only hero of the convention, the only one of the erstwhile leaders who, with a spring in his walk and a smile on his face, walks out, knowing he played the game to the end as he ought to play it, and refused to play it only when he felt its objectives and its principles were crooked.

We have criticized Mr. Farley at times. If he remains in public life, we may criticize him again. But at this moment we wish to express our unbounded admiration for him. He is the only figure which emerges from the convention in Chicago bigger than he went in. Samson Agonistes, perhaps—with the things he worked for broken. But Samson, true to his convictions and his people to the end.

[From the (Tucson) Arizona Daily Star of July 20, 1940]

JIM FARLEY

One of the outstanding highlights of the Democratic Convention in Chicago was the humiliating treatment handed to Jim Farley by the Hopkins-Ickes crowd of new dealers. Here was a man who as much as any one man was responsible for the nomination of President Roosevelt in 1932, who organized and directed the preconvention of 1932, who again in 1936 organized and directed the most astonishingly successful campaign in all the history of elections, now being cold shouldered, brushed aside, and discarded because he would not bow down to Hopkins, Ickes, Cohen, and Corcoran.

As those Democrats know, who first became interested in the candidacy of President Roosevelt, when he was still Governor of New York, Jim Farley began his organizing work in 1931. From that date on no one man ever gave his chief more unselfish, more able, and more loyal service. Time after time Jim Farley "took the rap" for his chief. Time after time he was the "fall guy," faithfully assuming the blame for someone else's mistakes.

Yet when the time came for Mr. Farley to aspire higher, he was like a servant, who after years of faithful service sought to step up on a par with his master. In so many words he was told he was impudent and must keep within his servant class or get out. Only as a hired hand could he be considered.

Democrats throughout the Nation will lament the passing, temporarily we hope, of Jim Farley, because they have grown to love him. To these many friends he is still bound by ties of true and everlasting affection, the affection that all men have for loyalty and faithfulness. That these friends could not do more to reward him was due to circumstances beyond their control. If there was any man who ever deserved a reward, who deserved to have his work recognized by promotion, it is Jim Farley.

[From the Troy (N. Y.) Observer of July 21, 1940]

BIG JIM FARLEY

The imminent retirement of James A. Farley from the chairmanship of the Democratic National Committee is a great handicap to be overcome by the party at the outset of what promises to be one of the most vigorous Presidential campaigns in the history of the country. Farley was the dynamo which electrified the party organization in 1932 and 1936 and brought about the great victories of those years.

The Roosevelt Presidential victories, however, were not the result of mere quadrennial preelection campaigns. Farley started his man toward the White House as soon as he took over the chairmanship of the New York State Democratic Committee in 1930, after he was satisfied that former Governor Smith was out of the political picture. He was as much surprised as anyone when Smith decided to contest for the nomination in 1932.

The smashing victory that Roosevelt scored over Charles H. Tuttle in the gubernatorial election of 1930 convinced Farley that he was managing a winner, and from that time on Farley did a great selling job which did not end until election night in 1932. His management of the party's affairs during the first Roosevelt administration accounted for the greater victory which was won in 1936.

The committee appointed to name a successor to Mr. Farley has been given a most perplexing job. "Big Jim" is big, not only physically, but morally, and politically. They will have a tough job finding another of his stature.

[From the Trenton (N. J.) State Gazette of July 23, 1940]

MR. FARLEY WON'T TAKE A WALK

It is quite possible that the long and brilliant political career of Jim Farley is drawing to a close. Convention developments have indicated that he is about to retire from active party leadership and also from the Cabinet, in order that he may enter private business.

Mr. Farley has said many times that it is necessary for him to rehabilitate his financial position. He has never been in politics for profit. A man of rigid integrity, as well as of many other virtues, he has never capitalized his high position in Government or his influence in political life. Insofar as his own financial interests are concerned, he has never had his eye trained upon the main chance. In consequence, his personal fortunes have suffered.

It is undoubtedly true, as he has so often maintained, that he feels under an obligation to improve his financial position and that his decision to retire is traceable primarily to this factor. It is also true that his resolve has been strengthened by the feeling that he has not been treated with proper consideration by the President, that there is an estrangement in an old and close friendship.

Regardless of circumstances, however, it was hardly necessary for him to declare that he is not going to "do an Al Smith"—that is, "take a walk." There is nothing small about Farley. He is a big man in all that the term implies, and perhaps his dominant attribute is that of loyalty. He may not like the way things are going but he will not desert and move into the camp of the enemy.

[From the Tampa Morning Tribune of July 18, 1940]

FARLEY'S ADVICE

The address of James A. Farley before the Democratic National Convention may have had a farewell ring, but it also contained some mighty words of wisdom which every Democratic standard bearer can well afford to heed.

In many respects it was the same Jim Farley. His was a loyal and fighting Democratic speech. It was filled with evidence to support the administration record that is one of unmatched achievement. Yet, constantly running through it, was a strong warning against overconfidence.

Here was Jim Farley, the loyal keeper of an important secret, the real sage of the Democratic Party, gently reminding members that "unless we give the country a ticket and a platform that will satisfy the majority, we have no certainty of victory."

Remember, it was in 1936 that the same Jim Farley, checking his records carefully, calmly predicted that the Democratic Party would carry the entire country with the exception of Maine and Vermont. Now in 1940, he as good as told his party to prepare for a hard fight.

We are confident that his party will follow that advice. Jim Farley has been too strong, too loyal a leader to be permanently ignored. His own political dreams may have been smashed by this convention, he may not approve of President Roosevelt running again, but he won't bolt his party. We rather imagine that he will be in there fighting along with fellow Democrats to assure victory in November.

[From the Topeka (Kans.) Capital of July 24, 1940]

FARLEY TO AMERICAN LEAGUE

Genial Jim Farley is turning his back on a third term in the Cabinet and going in for baseball as owner of the New York Yankees. If he manages that one-time unbeatable club as well as

he did the Democratic Party for 7 years, sports fans are sure to quit belitting the champions.

Farley's friends feel that he got a raw deal at the hands of the new dealers. His popularity never was higher than at the Chicago convention, which was taken out of his hands by the White House fixers. Every time he appeared in the stadium the applause came from every corner, and more vociferously from the delegates than anywhere else.

Had Roosevelt declined to run again, Jim could have had the nomination, but his feelings went far beyond the personal glory he might have gained, but lost. He foresaw the rupture in the party, which already is doing serious damage to the organization he formed in 1932 and held together up to 1940.

As mentor of the New York Yankees, Farley will be back in his old vocation. A sportsman at heart, the Irish-American politician now takes hold of a great club that has been slipping all year. His many friends hope he rehabilitates the Yanks and makes a mint of money.

[From the Tampa Morning Tribune, of July 23, 1940]

JIM FARLEY'S FUTURE

Undoubtedly the outstanding personality of the late Democratic pow-wow was James A. Farley. This was best attested by the uniformly favorable response given every mention of his name, either before the convention or in individual groups. Unanimous was the sentiment of party leaders and members that the party loses a powerful asset in his retirement from its campaign management.

Aside from any disaffection Mr. Farley may feel with the President or some of his high advisers, or with the convention results, his explanation of the reasons for his relinquishment of party leadership is amply convincing. For 8 years he has given his time and his ability to the service of the party and of the Nation, for compensation which, for a man of his ability, has been merely nominal. In that devotion to the President and the party, the chairman has actually gone into debt. Four years more of it would mean going in deeper. He feels that the time has come for him to earn something worth while for himself and his dependents. No one can fairly quarrel with that decision or charge him with a lack of loyalty or a disposition to quit under fire.

In private association and employment Jim Farley will continue to be an element of strength in the Democratic Party. His services will not be forgotten by the great mass of Democrats the Nation over, whatever may prove to be the attitude of the chief beneficiaries of that service. We believe that Mr. Roosevelt himself keenly desired that Mr. Farley continue at the head of the party's campaign organization, but that he would not insist knowing the state of the chairman's personal fortunes. Into whatever field of action Jim Farley may go, he will have always the esteem and appreciation and best wishes of millions of Americans, including all parties, classes, and creeds.

[From the Tacoma (Wash.) News-Tribune of July 18, 1940]

AN OUTSTANDING FIGURE

The outstanding personage of Wednesday night's Democratic convention at Chicago was not the nominee chosen at the midnight hour, but Jim Farley, Postmaster General and chairman of the Democratic National Committee. He was a sturdy and courageous figure, sticking resolutely by his principles and refusing to yield to the hysteria of a convention determined to nominate the President for a third term.

The New Deal generals who are running the show had decided to have Roosevelt renominated by acclamation, to give the impression that a reluctant President was being drafted for a third term by a country which demanded that he override the third-term tradition. They wanted it to appear that he was the unanimous choice of the convention.

Although Farley knew he was hopelessly outnumbered and that opposition to the Presidential machine would get nowhere, he stood resolutely to his course. His name was presented and a vote was taken, as he himself later explained, "in accordance with Democratic principles." He received only 72 and a fraction votes, with 61 for Garner, 9 and a fraction for Tydings, and 5½ and a fraction for Hull, and with the President getting 946 and a fraction votes. Later Farley moved that the nomination be made by acclamation, which was done.

CARTER GLASS, veteran Senator from Virginia, rose from a sick bed to nominate Farley. He paid the Postmaster General a tribute of which the latter may well be proud when he said of him: "He is a man on whose word every human being can always rely, a man who never in all his lifetime ever violated a pledge, once given."

Incidentally, for the first time in a Democratic convention the name of Thomas Jefferson was "booed" when GLASS referred to the founder of the party, "who less than 3 years before his death appealed to that party never to nominate a man for a third term."

The record is very nearly written at Chicago. The convention Thursday will select as a running mate to the President a Vice Presidential candidate whom the White House has approved. The outcome is exactly as forecast weeks ago. Delegates had been selected, pledged to Roosevelt. They drafted him exactly as they were supposed to do, while the convention was run by Harry Hopkins and other New Deal leaders in the background.

What history will write of this convention and its proceedings remains to be revealed, but one thing is certain: Out of the affair the name of James A. Farley will stand with increased prestige and luster.

[From the Syracuse (N. Y.) Herald-Journal of July 8, 1940]

DEMOCRATS WOULD MISS FARLEY'S GUIDING HAND

Postmaster General Farley's reported decision to give up his post as chairman of the Democratic National Committee and his place as head of the Post Office Department would have far-reaching repercussions on national politics if carried out.

Mr. Farley's genius as political manager was given a large share of the credit for the sweeping victories of Franklin D. Roosevelt in 1932 and 1936. Of late their intimacy has faded somewhat. Farley has been opposed on principle to a third term for any President, and cherished some hope that he himself might win the Presidency.

Now he is said to believe that the nomination of Roosevelt is inevitable because it is too late to build up anyone else into a winning candidate, but he is resolved not to manage another national campaign.

The President's pledge to secrecy veiled his Sunday revelation to Farley as to his third-term intentions.

It need hardly be said that Jim Farley's guiding hand would be sorely missed, especially when the Democratic nominee must combat so popular and magnetic a candidate as Wendell Willkie. Farley's wide acquaintanceship with political leaders throughout the country is proverbial. It is said no one else in public life can call so many persons by their first names.

It has long been known that Mr. Farley's continuance in office was at a personal sacrifice, since his salary of $15,000 was not equal to the demands upon him and he felt it desirable to lay up something for the future.

Heading of the Yankee baseball club in the American League sounds at first anticlimactic for one who was talked of for the Presidency of the United States, but big-league baseball is big business and there will be opportunity for large earnings. According to reports, he would be associated with James M. Cox as principal backer. Mr. Cox was the Democratic candidate for President in 1920, losing to Warren Harding.

If Mr. Farley retains his post as chairman of the New York State Democratic Committee to aid in renominating and reelecting United States Senator JAMES M. MEAD, his withdrawal from politics will be less abrupt. Though he never reached the shining goal of the Presidency he has had a notable career.

[From the Illinois State Register]

ADMIRAL GIVES MORE CLOSE-UP VIEWS OF GREAT MEN AND OTHERS AT DEMOCRATIC FETE

CHICAGO.—(Smile-o-gram written during sessions of Democratic National Convention)—Little wonder that James A. Farley, retiring national chairman, proved the most popular man at this mammoth, smiling, laughing, shouting, singing, fighting, thoroughly Democratic battle of words, wits, and nerves.

Jim's intimate friends knew that his heart was broken when his consuming desire to be the Presidential nominee was snuffed out by the Roosevelt high command. Close friends and oldtime supporters rushed to him, some of them actually in tears, when they were compelled to choose between following Roosevelt or following Farley—two who had been as one—two who will remain as one so far as fundamental affections are concerned, but both of them could not be President.

Here is an intimate personal story characteristic of Jim Farley, which came to me through one of Jim's intimate personal friends, United States District Attorney Claude N. Sapp, of Columbia, S. C.

A year or so ago Mr. Sapp's wife was killed in an automobile accident while on a tender-hearted, charitable mission. She was carrying food and good cheer to a poor old colored mammy who had helped to take care of Mr. and Mrs. Sapp's 11-year-old boy, Joe, when the latter was a baby.

Giant Jim Farley's tender heart was deeply sorrowed by this tragedy. It was like a death in his own family. His attachment for little Joe Sapp was most beautiful, sincere, and profound. He went to him to comfort him when his mother was killed and exchanged visits with little Joe. They were like boys together—two hearts beating as one.

This great Democratic National Convention came on. Jim Farley arranged to have little Joe come to Chicago with the latter's father so they could be close together. He took little Joe to the speaker's platform where he could see and know everything that was going on. The night before the convention, when a preview was staged for the movies with Jim as a central figure, little Joe was on hand with authority to exercise unreserved censorship. When it was all over, big Jim leaned over and said to smiling, bright-eyed little Joe:

"Joe, if there is anything you don't like about this, we'll change it or cut it out."

Little Joe approved and the show went on.

Tender little human-interest stories like this flowed from the lips of many of Jim Farley's close personal friends with whom I visited in Jim's national headquarters in the Stevens Hotel, where—and this is significant—the central figure on the outer wall was a great lifelike portrait of Jim's friend, Franklin D. Roosevelt.

[From the Springfield (Ill.) State Register of July 20, 1940]

FARLEY A "GOOD SPORT"

Jim Farley is going to play ball with both the New York Yankees and the Democratic Party, of which he is a great, living symbol.

Unanimously reelected national chairman yesterday, he will retain that position long enough to help coach his successor. Then he will assume his new responsibilities as head of the New York American League baseball organization.

The most significant thing which Jim Farley said in his statement was that he wishes to see the Democratic Party remain in power, and that he will support the Roosevelt-Wallace ticket. His words synchronize in happy accord with the compliments paid to him by President Roosevelt by radio, and by Mrs. Roosevelt in person to the Democratic National Convention, and to the Nation.

That the retiring national chairman will retain his position as chairman of the State Central Committee of New York means that thoroughly democratic Jim Farley will not only be in there pitching for the New York Yanks, but for the New York democracy, which has the highest batting average in the National Electoral College.

This remarkable drama in politics again emphasizes the chivalry of Jim Farley, who has done exactly what was anticipated in these columns—be a "good sport," go along with the Roosevelt ticket, avoid anything that would savor of the memorable "walk-out" in 1932, and be entitled to share the joys and responsibilities of another Democratic victory.

This means more friends for Jim Farley. It strengthens him with his party and appeals to men and women everywhere because of its unmistakable element of good sportsmanship. It means that the future will bring its "Draft Farley" demand for this great Democrat, to whom everybody hopes financial success comes through the great national game, and who is indispensable to the greatest national game of them all in which he is a past master—politics and government.

[From the Spartanburg (S. C.) Herald of July 10, 1940]

JIM FARLEY'S PLAN

Oppositionists have tried hard to make it appear that James Aloysius Farley and Franklin Delano Roosevelt had come to the parting of the ways, but pictures taken at Hyde Park during Mr. Farley's recent visit showed two men who seemed to be the best of friends and in the best of humor. If their laughing faces were assumed it must be said that Frank and Jim are actors par excellence. Judging by the comment of Mr. Farley after the meeting the pictures told a true story.

No one knows what Mr. Roosevelt will do if the Democratic Convention asks him to be a candidate for a third term. No one knows what plans Mr. Farley has in mind. A few years ago those who busied themselves to map out a future for the Postmaster General picked out a job as president of a tottering automobile manufacturing concern. Nothing came of the assignment. Jim stayed on as a member of the Cabinet, went about the country dedicating new post-office buildings, and signed stacks of letters with green ink. The guessers were in error.

Now comes the news that Mr. Farley and Mr. Cox, a former Democratic nominee for President, may take over the Yankee baseball franchise and that Jim will have charge of the team. There may be something to the rumor and many fans hope it may prove true. The Yankees have not been doing so well this year. They lack pep, and the fans believe that James Aloysius is the one man who can put pep into any project he tackles. He put more of it into two national campaigns than any man in political history. Why not trust him to inject an abundance of the same stuff into the Yankee baseball team which seems to be much in need of it?

[From the Spokane (Wash.) Spokesman-Review of July 17, 1940]

JIM MAY BE A PRESIDENT, ANYWAY

Jim Farley appears to be the only leader at Chicago whose loyalty to his party and its traditions is greater than his subserviency to its titular head. He has all along been described as opposed to the elaborately organized third-term movement as a violation of his party's as well as of a national principle. And he is the only Democratic leader who has had the courage to stand up against the pressure of White House janizaries and submit his one rival candidacy for his party's nomination for President.

It is obvious that Mr. Farley has persisted with little, if any, hope of winning, but rather with determination to make a showing of a contest in a convention organized for submission to administration dictation. He has managed to do this and retain his dignity and the respect of his fellow partisans. Now it appears that in the end he is not going to fail entirely to realize his laudable ambition to be a president, for, if rumors and reports in baseball circles are dependable, he will become the president of the Yankees, even if he is denied, as he clearly will be, the Presidency of Yankeedom.

[From the Spokane (Wash.) Spokesman-Review of July 22, 1940]

FARLEY DISCARDED

Jim Farley, the organizing genius of the Democratic Party, is to retire from his position as chairman of the party's national committee, and director of the campaign, on August 17, sacrificed along with the historic principles of the party to the ambition of the man he has served with an almost doglike loyalty since 1932.

A more shabby return for faithfulness has seldom been recorded even in the selfish and ruthless game of politics.

It was Farley who won the presidential nomination for Mr. Roosevelt in 1932, and it was Farley who organized the forces that made Mr. Roosevelt's reelection victory in 1936 so overwhelming. But this year Farley, because he believed Mr. Roosevelt meant it when he said he did not want to serve another term and proceeded on the assumption that he would not violate the third-term principle, incurred the displeasure of the friend to whom he has given such devoted service.

Mr. Roosevelt turned against Farley when he found that, great as was Farley's personal allegiance to him, his fidelity to a principle of the party was greater and he would not stultify himself, as others did, by abandoning his announced determination to force a contest in the convention on the third-term issue by presenting his own candidacy for nomination.

Though Farley thus is discarded and superseded by more obsequious aides, he does not thereby become an object of commiseration. He retires with his self-respect intact, indulging neither in self-pity nor recrimination. Brought up in the Tammany tradition that regularity is the first great principle of professional politics, he makes formal announcement that he will support the ticket. But, henceforth, his preoccupation will be baseball and not party organization.

His divorcement from the Cabinet and party leadership breaks about the last link binding Mr. Roosevelt's administration machine to traditional democracy, as he has repudiated practically every Jeffersonian principle of that historic party.

[From the South Bend Tribune of July 17, 1940]

FARLEY'S FAREWELL

The tone and the content of National Chairman James A. Farley's address to the Democratic National Committee indicated his formal retirement from that position in the near future, perhaps within the next week. Mr. Farley has been national chairman for 8 years, and in his regime the Democratic Party achieved two sweeping national victories. Nobody in the party has more political acumen and relatively few can be credited with as much. Certainly Mr. Farley's political skill has been of inestimable benefit to Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Why, then, is Mr. Farley on the way out even while it looks as if "his man" will be the Presidential nominee again? Of course, a first rate national chairman could have some practical incentive, apart from internal party conditions, to retire after 8 years of service. Private economic conditions could be a potent force for retirement because the national chairmanship and the Cabinet position held by Mr. Farley do not have financial returns commensurate with what might be attainable for him in private activity.

It seems settled, however, that Mr. Farley is about to retire primarily because the Democratic Party has become the tool of the New Deal group that is contemptuous of Democratic Party principles. That group operates on a "rule or ruin" basis; and Mr. Farley is not disposed to be cooperative with it. He is one of the ablest Democrats; but ability does not count for much with the new dealers who have acquired tremendous power by control of the patronage system, if it is not attended by subservience to them.

If the Democratic Party is to enter the 1940 campaign with a nominee symbolizing violation of the third-term tradition, it will need consummate skill in campaign direction. It is already destined, before the nomination is made, to carry the handicaps of wildcat Government financing, failure to solve vital economic problems, and vigorous liberal opposition in the person of the Republican Presidential nominee, Wendell L. Willkie. It apparently will need a Farley more than it did in 1932 and 1936.

The rumor that Harry L. Hopkins will succeed Mr. Farley in the chairmanship is exceedingly interesting. That, of course, would be a logical development. Indeed, Republican strategists and genuine Democrats, made resentful by the new dealers' arrogance, might classify it as proof that the law of retribution has not been suspended. Mr. Hopkins, the social worker who became a New Deal dignitary in the first place because he attracted Mrs. Roosevelt's attention and who is now living in the White House, may be even better qualified, at least in principle, than the ineffable Ickes or Tommy Corcoran to direct a third-term campaign designed to keep the New Deal "experimentalists" in power. Certainly James A. Farley would be an incongruous campaign director under the existent circumstances.

Mr. Farley is not likely to announce that he intends to "take a walk" into the Republican ranks this year. He is still a thorough Democrat; and, besides, he is not devoid of friendship for Mr. Roosevelt although their relationship is not what it used to be. The treatment meted out to him by the Democratic Party in recent years and particularly in this 1940 national convention, however, remains highly significant. It is concrete proof that the Democratic Party is no longer controlled by Democrats.

[From the Scranton (Pa.) Tribune of July 23, 1940]

"GENTLEMAN JIM"

As the smoke screens of hypocrisy fade away from the Chicago "draft" session it becomes increasingly clear that the biggest man at the proceedings, the man who came away with his colors of personal integrity, self-respect, and loyalty gloriously flying was James Aloysius Farley, the top flight political leader of America, whom the New Deal's tactics has forced to the sidelines.

Never once in all the trying moments of his stay in the Windy City, a period which saw his prerogatives usurped by the inner guard of the New Deal, saw him left out in the cold while the self-appointed high command spared neither Mr. Farley's pride nor privileges, did the genial, poised national chairman show the slightest irritation or go back on what had been his party, the Democratic Party.

With equal equanimity, Mr. Farley endured indifference, slights, affronts, and shameful neglect from the Hopkins brigade, which kept the wires hot from a smoke-filled room in the Blackstone Hotel to the White House.

Throughout the trying days in Chicago, Mr. Farley carried himself with urbanity, good humor, dignity, and showed himself a man of admirable character and sportsmanship.

The cruelest blow of all to the man who made Roosevelt President in 1932 by his prodigious campaign efforts, and saw 46 of the 48 States flock to the Democratic standard in 1936, reelecting Mr. Roosevelt, was the one in which the White House crowd tried to deny Mr. Farley the realization of a dream he has pursued for 28 years—having his name placed in nomination for the Presidency.

Political realist that he is, Mr. Farley knew better than anyone else at the convention that he stood no chance of winning the nomination. He never really had any serious thoughts that the prize would fall to him, but for nearly three decades he has nursed in his heart the hope that one day he might achieve a status in American life where he could, with consistency, have his name presented to the Democratic Party as a candidate for the nomination.

The party that owed so much to him nearly succeeded in denying Mr. Farley this legitimate joy. The Hopkins roughriders sought to balk the move to have Mr. Farley's name placed in nomination. They tried to talk Senator Glass out of nominating Mr. Farley but they failed. The one thing that Mr. Farley asked from his party after years of faithful service, he got only with sullen reluctance and begrudgingly from the Roosevelt administration.

Senator GLASS made the nominating speech. It was a valiant effort from a great American who places principle before political expediency. It was a speech of which Mr. Farley has every right to be proud, and proud of it he was. "I have pursued a course that has been dictated by the deepest conviction, and when a man fails to follow his convictions he is false to himself, false to his party, and false to his country. I wanted this convention to proceed as a democratic body should proceed to nominate its standard bearers in keeping with the highest traditions of the Democratic Party. That is the democratic method and that has been observed. My name was placed in nomination by a great and noble American. As long as I live I shall be grateful to Senator CARTER GLASS, of Virginia."

It was one of the biggest moments in Mr. Farley's life. It was an hour of triumph which he had well earned. Fortunately for the good name of the American people it was not the last big moment Mr. Farley had in Chicago. Another came to him on last Friday afternoon, and more expressive than volumes of praise, it bespoke the high, personal qualities of the man the Hopkins roughriders have caused to retire from politics, the game he loved so absorbingly. It came in the form of a spontaneous reception from the American press, which with all its faults, has a way of determining the true value of man. From reporters who have covered the great and the near great for many years, Mr. Farley was presented with a handsome gold watch. It was an eloquent testimonial to his fairness, good sportsmanship, and fine citizenship. It was a natural demonstration of affection which the press would feel moved to give to few men. It was not without significance that they gave it to a man who placed his political head on the block to preserve his integrity, his honor, and to protest the violation of the third-term tradition.

[From the Sioux Falls (S. Dak.) Daily Argus-Leader of July 19, 1940]

LOSS TO DEMOCRATIC PARTY

James A. Farley said 3 months ago that his name would be offered to the Democratic National Convention as a candidate for the Presidency. Wednesday night his name was presented. Farley kept his word, even though he knew the third-term enthusiasts would reject him ignominiously.

Several times the same Farley has let it be known that he would turn down any opportunity to continue longer as national chairman of his party. When the national committee meets Saturday to select a chairman and otherwise organize for the 1940 campaign, it likely will be found that Farley has kept his word again.

In the passing of Farley from the political picture the Democrats will lose an outstanding figure. A lovable character in the eyes of his friends within the party, by his own personality, astuteness, and organizing ability he contributed immensely to two sweeping Democratic victories.

Although he has differed with the President on the third-term issue, and was replaced as confidential advisor by Hopkins, Ickes, Corcoran, Cohen, and others, it is not likely that Farley will take a walk in the 1940 election. He has a record of party loyalty not approached in modern days. Farley realizes he has had his day, and is not so thin-skinned as to be insulted by being replaced as Presidential advisor.

If Farley merely sits on the bench during the 1940 campaign, that alone will damage the Democratic cause because the genuineness of his loyalty in previous elections has been a great inspiration to his friends and party workers.

[From the Sioux City (Iowa) Journal of July 22, 1940]

JIM FARLEY'S EXIT

James A. Farley finally came to a parting of the ways with Franklin D. Roosevelt. For the man he made President of the United States turned against him in a demonstration of ingratitude that has no equal in the political history of the United States. So now "Big Jim," who achieved alone the task of putting Mr. Roosevelt in the White House, leaves politics, resigning as chairman of the Democratic National Committee at the beginning of a new Presidential-election campaign.

Mr. Farley had known for months, even years, that the man he made had less use for him than formerly. There had been a time when Franklin D. Roosevelt eagerly sought the advice and counsel of Jim Farley. He leaned heavily upon him for he had recognized in Mr. Farley a gifted politician, an organizing genius, a man whose personality attracted to his side Democrats of all types, even the New Deal radicals, as long as they could see the way clear to use his talents in their behalf.

As chairman of the Democratic National Committee Mr. Farley was impeccable in his honest treatment of all elements in the party. The soul of honor, he never deceived anyone, and he kept his pledges. His word was his bond. He did not know how to double deal or double cross. He knows now, however, what the double cross and double dealing are.

Just what it was that caused the rift between Mr. Farley and Mr. Roosevelt in the first place may be obscure for some time. It may have been because Mr. Roosevelt preferred the counsel of his "brain trust," the group of yes men he gathered around him. It definitely become known that Mr. Farley himself was not a new dealer but a Democrat of the old school. That did not help the situation, and the rift widened. At last the two men saw each other very little, although one was the President and the other a Cabinet officer.

Once Mr. Farley went to Mr. Roosevelt to ask what his intentions were for 1940. He frankly told the President that he would like to try for the Presidential nomination for himself. The President cut Jim Farley to the bone with what he said and did on that occasion. Characteristically he threw back his head and laughed uproariously. But he laughed alone. Jim Farley did not laugh. Then the President said, "Why, Jim, you couldn't be elected."

So Jim Farley is out as chairman of the Democratic National Committee, a sadder but a far wiser man than before. One wonders how many loyal Democrats who did not like the way the Chicago convention was run by the new dealers but who still are devoted to "Big Jim" Farley will vote when they go into the secret booths in November.

[From the Shreveport (La.) Times of July 23, 1940]

THE NATION ACCLAIMS MR. FARLEY

The real winner in the Democratic National Convention was James A. Farley. He alone came out of that grumbling gathering with the love and loyalty, the admiration and respect of everyone. Today, in the hearts of the vast bulk of the Democratic Party, he is its outstanding figure.

The widespread admiration for Mr. Farley within his party is reflected by those outside of it. Before and during the convention he followed the course on which his conscience and his judgment as to the welfare of his party and his country guided him. He followed it gently, so as not to harm others, but his steps were firm. To the most humble of workers, and to the highest leader, he kept his word. He never evaded, never delayed a decision, and never permitted any situation to arise that might give a false impression of his plans, or lead to embarrassment in the plans of others.

Mr. Farley has ascended from the top pedestal of his own party to a high point of national respect and approval. He well deserves every bit of the respect and acclaim he is receiving.

[From the Springfield (Mass.) Union of July 18, 1940]

WINGS AT CHICAGO

The New Deal is getting its wings as a political party in Chicago this week. Like a chicken heart in a laboratory, it has been beating for more than 7 years as the result of injections of plain old-fashioned politics administered by such shrewd and capable doctors as James A. Farley. The decision has now been made to shut off the supply lines, furnish the heart with a body, and send it forth into the wide world.

There is doubt about the strength of the new wings, not only among Republicans who have been disgruntled by the phenomenon of artificial life during the Roosevelt tenure, but among the old-line Democrats who fear the consequences of scuttling an established party and replacing it with an organization whose very foundation is the heady liberalism that has been successful politically only as it has been kept in check. Supplying the brakes were the minority opposition and that section of the Democratic Party which still adheres to the democracy of Thomas Jefferson.

Mr. Farley has been stripped of his chevrons. Harry Hopkins has replaced him as the political Moses for the third New Deal. The Hopkins-Corcoran-Cohen circle of palace pets has at last won its long-drawn-out fight with the Democratic regulars; Roosevelt has dropped the pilot.

In the convention excitement, in the certainty of Roosevelt's nomination in spite of his cryptic message of Tuesday night, there is no doubt but that the new general staff has won its

initial victory. The frantic efforts to reclaim Jim Farley for the actual election campaign are a demonstration of weakness, however. Even the omniscient inner circle probably realizes this.

It was one thing to shove the political brains of the election organization aside for convention purposes; it will be another thing to convince the people of the United States that those brains are outmoded and worthless; it will be another thing to replace the discarded parts of a political machine that has functioned with the most efficient, if most ruthless, power in the modern era of American politics.

Attempts to butter Jim Farley are being made now, after the glove has been thrown in his face. The New Deal party banks on his traditional loyalty to avert a schism that is daily becoming more imminent. Perhaps Mr. Farley will give in, for the sake of appearances and because of that loyalty, which is deep-rooted.

Farley as an acquiescent follower is different than Farley as an active leader, however. His antipathy to a third term is no secret. The insult of permitting Senator Barkley to disclose the third-term decision, rather than leaving the announcement to the national chairman, rankles in Mr. Farley's breast, according to word from Chicago. Further, the ascendant star of the superliberals, whom Farley has long detested and kept in check, must supply a backlog of bitterness for the Postmaster General's present state of mind. He may go along, but his company will not implement the New Deal cause as it did in 1932 and again in 1936.

The New York Post is probably the most ardent pro-New Deal newspaper in the country today. One of its columnists at Chicago is Samuel Grafton, who has vigorously supported Mr. Roosevelt's policies all along. If this analysis of the outlook for the coming campaign seems like Republican propaganda, read Mr. Grafton in Tuesday night's Post. He says:

"Mr. Farley is perhaps the most gifted campaign manager in the country's history, and some of the liberals, who want to run the party, also want Farley to stay as chairman. That is what they are fighting for today. Perhaps he will stay. His loyalty goes deep. But it is now going to be a new kind of party. Mr. Farley knows it, and does not like it. He knows how to run a party, and he was willing to carry liberalism along. Now it is a little uncertain who is carrying whom, and a new crystallization is taking place deep down in the oldest American political organization."

[From the Shelby (N. C.) Daily Star of July 13, 1940]

HE'LL BE MISSED

The rumor persists that after the Chicago Democratic National Convention James A. Farley, chairman of the Democratic National Committee and Postmaster General in the Roosevelt Cabinet, will resign.

That will be a great loss to the Democratic Party.

The organizing genius of Farley is unsurpassed in the political annals of the Nation. Furthermore, he has done a good job as Postmaster General. Giving credit where due, it must be acknowledged that much of the Democratic gains in the United States during the past 8 years has been due to the efforts of Farley.

The Democratic Party without Farley to direct the campaign this year, following the convention in Chicago, will be at a distinct disadvantage. To him more than any other man must go the credit of the Democratic majorities in 1932 and in 1936. His ability is conceded by his opponents and he would be an exceedingly useful man to the party this year, particularly in view of the imposing set-up contemplated by the Republican Party.

The reported resignation of Farley is taken by some to mean that he is convinced that President Roosevelt will be offered a third-term nomination by the Democrats. Further, some hold that he is convinced the President will run again.

There is little doubt but what President Roosevelt is the strongest man the Democrats can offer at this time. But, likewise, there is no question that the absence of the ability of Farley in the active campaign will take some of the Roosevelt strength from him.

Some months ago it appeared that Farley's name would be placed before the convention for President irrespective of the President's intentions. Even if this should be done, if the President's name goes before the convention, in the face of pledges he has received, neither Farley nor any other candidate will have a chance to win the nomination.

[From the Sheboygan (Wis.) Press of July 20, 1940]

A GREAT LEADER—A GRAND MAN

(By C. E. Broughton, national committeeman)

James A. Farley, chairman of the Democratic National Committee for 8 years, the man whose organization work laid the foundation for Roosevelt's first nomination, is to retire next month to reengage in business.

While it was known among his intimate friends that he had remained in public life at great financial sacrifice and that he was to retire, still the bold announcement made at the meeting of the Democratic National Committee yesterday caused keen regret.

A little over 8 years ago Mr. Farley was little known beyond the confines of New York State, but his aggressive leadership over a period of 8 years has made him a national figure and one of the most beloved men in the Democratic Party.

As Postmaster General and a member of President Roosevelt's Cabinet he has endeared himself to both Republicans and Democrats alike. As Postmaster General he has inaugurated many new business ethics that have brought the system to the highest point in all history. To every employee in the Department he is plain Jim, and when he leaves every member of the force, from the highest to those in the more humble positions, will miss him.

In political parties men come and go. Some are not even mentioned when they retire, but this was not the case with Mr. Farley. Every member of the national committee holds him in high esteem because he has never broken his word, and he is a leader others are proud to follow.

In the Chicago convention no man received greater recognition. The "boys of the press," the delegates, the men who make up the official family at Washington, all paid deserved tribute to his leadership. A number of newspapers endeavored to create the impression that there had been a break between the President and Mr. Farley, all of which was disproved in the convention.

Throughout the entire proceedings there were just two men who stood out most prominently, the President and Mr. Farley. Mr. Farley is not only a leader, but he has guided the destinies of the national committee through an 8-year period to a point where efficiency is the last word. He has built up an organization and retires with the gratifying knowledge that there is a surplus of more than $100,000 in the treasury and that all convention expenses are paid. That is a compliment for the organization under Mr. Farley.

The President paid a tribute to "Jim" in his address to the convention Thursday night. While it is only natural that two great leaders might differ at times upon public questions, that difference at no time affected the cordial relations between the two.

The Democratic Party and Mr. Roosevelt owe a debt of gratitude to Mr. Farley for the outstanding leadership he has displayed, his loyalty to the New Deal and the many financial sacrifices that he has made.

If "Jim" Farley had lived in any other State but New York, he would have been named the candidate for vice president, for all the delegates in that convention wanted to do something in recognition. They passed resolutions, they applauded, they honored him in every respect they could.

As one who has served under Jim Farley for 8 years, let me say that he is one of the grandest leaders, one of the "squarest shooters" in public life, and our friendship cannot be shattered by his retirement.

[From the Seattle (Wash.) Times of July 26, 1940]

CHAIRMAN WANTED

Messrs. Roosevelt and Wallace, holding first conference as candidates for President and Vice President, seek somebody to serve as chairman of their party's national committee. Mr. Wallace is to make a speaking tour of the country. Mr. Roosevelt, pleading pressure of business, will keep off the road and hang around the radio. There must be a chairman to run the organization and round up votes.

No doubt many persons would be willing to take the chairmanship, but there will be difficulty in getting a Democrat on the job. Democrats whose names have been mentioned in this connection quickly shy away. Southern Democratic leaders will not soon recover from the humiliation inflicted upon them in the Chicago "putsch." Northern Democratic leaders are not likely to forget the treatment of Mr. Jim Farley. And, anyway, what the new party really needs is a chairman of the same bent as the candidates.

SPURNED AND SUGARED

No matter whom they choose, Messrs. Roosevelt and Wallace will not find a chairman of such all-round qualifications as Mr. Farley has demonstrated. Big Jim goes out in an aura of mingled heroism and martyrdom; publicly spurned by the man he made President, yet as publicly smothered with sugary words of endearment. Mr. and Mrs. Roosevelt vied with each other in telling the world of their love for Mr. Farley. Some folks may swallow this; not "Big Jim."

Despite all cut and dried arrangements for the glorification of Roosevelt, Farley was easily the star of the Chicago show. We hark back to this for brief consideration of reasons for his popularity with Democrats. Even new dealers who don't like him concede Farley's political genius.

PRACTICAL POLITICS

Farley won favor with Democrats because he gave them the first taste of victory they'd had in 16 years. No one has ever given Roosevelt credit for more than a talking part in the 1932 campaign. Farley procured his nomination and put him over with the voters. Farley lined up the biggest industrial magnates of the country, later to be denounced by Roosevelt as tories, reactionaries, and crooks, to furnish money for the campaign. Farley extended the methods Tammany had taught him to induce harmonious action by every corrupt State and city political machine. Practical politics is unconcerned with any moral or social issue.

And again in 1936, it was practical politics that moved Mr. Farley to compel abandonment of the Democratic requirement of the two-thirds convention vote to nominate a candidate for President. That was shrewd preparedness for easy control of this year's convention. No doubt Farley expected to be at the controls. Roosevelt crowded him out.

HALO ASLANT

And so, as Mr. Farley moves on to take prominent part in that other national game—baseball—a Nation that wishes him well need not be blind to his share in creating a situation which has become intolerable to many and distasteful to all Democrats. The halo of

virtue which seemed to surmount his cranium during the painful processes at Chicago, appears somewhat aslant in retrospect.

People cannot help but think of the well-rewarded cooperation of Tammany's Flynn, Jersey City's Hague, Chicago's Ed Kelly; the Pendergast machine in Missouri up to the time its boss was put in jail; the Guffey Pennsylvania machine, and the racketeers of every big city in the land. The New Deal has done well by all these. They may miss Farley's leadership, but they'll go along.

[From the New York World-Telegram of July 20, 1940]

JIM FARLEY

The Democratic National Convention closed not to the swing of Happy Days Are Here Again, but to that melodious tune, When Irish Eyes Are Smiling.

No greater tribute has been paid to a politician than was given freely to Jim Farley in Chicago. The delegates gave him everything but their votes; it was too much to expect that men in politics for what they can get out of it would let sentiment or conviction stand in the way of self-interest.

And cynical newspaper correspondents, who had seen many national chairmen come and go, gave Jim a farewell testimonial party that brought mist to eyes long dry.

Remember 8 years ago, when Mr. Roosevelt and the bright young men around him were hailed as white-plumed idealists and there was much shaking of heads at the thought that they were handicapped by the grubby materialism of "Jobmaster" Farley?

With the suns that have risen and set and the water that has flowed down the river, skeptics have learned more and more about the smart young men who talked idealism while reaching out for more personal power and have learned more and more about unpretentious gum-chewing Jim Farley, who never boasted a doctor's degree nor presumed that his code of ethics was higher than that of any other honorable man.

Jim has scarcely any hair on his head, but the bright young boys got into it. They poached on his preserve, undermined his chief's confidence in him, and finally left Jim on the outside of the White House looking in.

By the time the curtain fell the Ph. D.'s of high and noble purpose had been revealed as men of greedy ambitions, and Jim Farley was no longer called "jobmaster," but "Mr. Postmaster General," the most efficient head of the postal service since Benjamin Franklin, and Jim, the politician, who never broke his word, who never failed a friend. And he made his last stand on the simple democratic principle that in a nation of free men and in a party dedicated to liberalism, delegates should vote each according to his own conscience.

[From the Schenectady (N. Y.) Union-Star of July 18, 1940]

"VAULTING AMBITION WHICH O'ERLEAPS ITSELF"

In a convention which was far from unanimous, a third-term nomination was voted for Franklin D. Roosevelt in the small hours of the morning at Chicago.

The Democratic Party allowed itself to be dominated by influences which were not in accord with either the judgment of many of its leaders or with the unwritten law of the land against conferring the Presidency of the Nation more than twice on any man. Not even Washington or Jefferson was great enough for a third term.

The big man of the convention was James A. Farley, national chairman, who stood for the orderly processes of democracy regardless of the ambition of any man, and would not permit even the President of the United States and the head of the party to dictate to him when he stood for a principle, the principle of no third term. Greater than Mr. Roosevelt himself loomed the man who largely had made him President.

It was ill-requited service which Farley gave his one-time hero. For 16 years he had done the hard, toilsome work of directing and forwarding Mr. Roosevelt's political fortunes. Roosevelt's two terms as Governor and two terms as President would have been impossible without him. The man who had been lightly—perhaps too lightly—considered merely a vote-getting politician stands revealed before the Nation, in the crucial test, the greater man of the two.

As compared with the petty equivocations and evasions which marked Mr. Roosevelt's approach to the question of the third term, the forthright statement of his faithful right-hand man, Farley, shines in contrast: "I have pursued a course here that has been directed by deepest convictions. When a man fails to follow his convictions, no matter what the consequences, he's false to himself, he's false to his party, and he's false to his country."

Thus rebuked in open convention, Mr. Roosevelt may gaze today upon the political wreckage he has caused. The party which sponsored his two elections to the highest office in the land is split wide apart. Wounded are the friends who, with shining-eyed devotion, elevated him to the heights. Ambition and the worship of power have led to political ingratitude. The idol of men's devotion turns out to have feet of clay.

[From the Scranton (Pa.) Times of July 20, 1940]

ALL SAY "GOOD LUCK, JIM"

James A. Farley, Postmaster General—Jim Farley, as President Roosevelt himself says he likes to call him—is quitting his post as chairman of the Democratic National Committee, which carries with it responsibility of directing the campaign. On Thursday night both President and Mrs. Roosevelt spoke words of praise of Farley. Jim had been voted on in the convention for both the Presidential and Vice Presidential nominations. Not only in the convention, but wherever he went in Chicago during the week, he was received like a champion and a hero. He deserved it all.

It is a bit strange how men grow in public esteem. Eight years ago Farley was looked upon by many within the Democratic Party as well as without as just another Tammany politician adept in winning friends and organizing. It is generally conceded he had as much if not more to do than any other man in bringing about Mr. Roosevelt's nomination in 1932. Four years ago when he made his prediction that Mr. Landon would carry only two States, which developed to be the exact number the Republican nominee did carry, he was scoffed at. When he was appointed Postmaster General it was agreed he was entitled to the reward from a political or purely party standpoint.

A lot of Republican newspapers and orators praising him today were certain in 1933 he had no capacity for business, that he would mismanage the postal department. Even when he was able to report the post office had been operated without a deficit they scoffed, and efforts were made to show he was thimblerigging the reports. In the face of these early suspicions and antipathies Mr. Farley continued to make friends and to force on the country the fact that he is a genuine leader, some even say a statesman, and conceivably might have been the candidate of the convention if Mr. Roosevelt had not decided to run again.

He emerges now one of the big figures of the convention more beloved by Democrats than ever and it can be said, too, more respected by Republicans. Mr. Farley is going to get into business. He feels it is time he made a little something for himself. No one can blame him for that. He has a family responsibility. Some say that Mr. Farley is not in accord with the President's seeking a third term. Be that as it may, there are few so rash as to believe or declare that Jim will ever be a bolter or take a walk.

[From the Abingtonian, Clarks Summit, Pa., of July 26, 1940]

JAMES A. FARLEY

James A. Farley, plain Jim to the thousands who know him well, is back in New York cleaning out his desk preliminary to his giving over the reins and stepping down from the driver's seat of the Democratic band wagon. He made a great national chairman of his party during those 8 years that he has been at the head of the parade.

Jim Farley has had many honors heaped upon him in his public career but none, we gather, touched him more than the little surprise party tendered him by the newspapermen and newspaperwomen of the country after the curtain rang down in Chicago. The scribes, who know and appreciate Jim's worth to his party and to the country, gave him a dinner and presented him with a fine timepiece.

"There was some huskiness in throats and an extra beat of pulse as these hard-hearted cynics of the newspaper world told Jim they were sorry to see him leaving the spot of command," Capt. John M. Cummings wired back to the Philadelphia Inquirer.

"The Republicans, of course, are glad that Jim is retiring from the chairmanship," again quoting Cummings. "They have no man to match Jim. The Democratic Party has no man to replace him. Perhaps that's why they're having so much trouble locating a new chairman.

"Each man approached knows that Jim Farley is the yardstick by which future chairmen will be measured. And each, in turn, shies away from the thought of being shown up as a pygmy," is the way Cummings expressed it. He was echoing the sentiments, the feelings, of everyone in the newspaper game who have been privileged to call Jim Farley their friend. So, best of luck in your new field of endeavor, Jim.

[From the Savannah (Ga.) Morning News of July 21, 1940]

A MATTER OF PRINCIPLE

It was a matter of principle, a question of deep-rooted Americanism, which caused Postmaster General James A. Farley to terminate his political partnership with President Roosevelt. When it came to the third-term issue, Mr. Farley could no longer go along with the President, whose determination to seek continuance in this high office, in disregard of American tradition, is even more repugnant to thousands of Democrats and Republicans alike than the President's Supreme Court packing plan.

Mr. Farley, astute politician that he is, readily sensed the fact that, in engineering a plan to have himself "drafted," the President was pursuing the wrong course just as he was pursuing the wrong course when he attempted to "purge" such opponents of some of the New Deal policies as Senator WALTER F. GEORGE, of Georgia, and Senator "Cotton Ed" SMITH, of South Carolina. Mr. Roosevelt, in his acceptance speech, spoke truthfully, yet perhaps more prophetically than he realized, when he said that only the people can "draft a President."

Mr. Farley emerged from the Chicago convention a bigger and stronger man even than when he went in. In a speech a few months ago he declared in unmistakable terms that if it ever came to a choice between his party and his country, America must come first. Mr. Farley has lived up to his convictions. He has been against the third term from the beginning and it has long been apparent that he would never manage the campaign of a third-term candidate. The whole Nation applauds his de-

cision and his courage in refusing to break the third-term tradition which for nearly 150 years has been considered an unwritten law.

Many who watched the Chicago convention carefully do not look upon Mr. Roosevelt's nomination as a "draft" by the people. It had been carefully engineered by the Hopkins-Corcoran-Ickes group who had been preparing it for many months and went to Chicago to manage and direct it. There was nothing spontaneous about it and hundreds of delegates left the convention in sadness because of the violation of the great American tradition and in fear of the results of this violation. It is a precedent which may bring about an effort to break further precedents. Many loyal Americans feel it more acutely because of a growing fear of the encroachments of the idea of the dictatorship state.

"Jim" Farley had more to do with making Mr. Roosevelt President than any other man. He was the political generalissimo of the battle of 1932. F. D. R. owes a great personal debt to his triggerman. Yet in recent years Mr. Farley has not enjoyed the President's confidence. "Dear Jim" has been shunted aside for newer friends and more polished advisers. The confidential whisper at Hyde Park as to the President's intention to run again may have been intended to make up for previous tendencies to ignore Mr. Farley. Now that the third-term nomination has actually taken place, the country unquestionably has been profoundly shocked. Such action would have been unfortunate at any time in our history. It is doubly so in these critical days when democracy is so acutely and so definitely on trial. Thousands of Democrats are firmly convinced that history will disclose that, in the recent shaping of the party's course, Mr. Farley was right and Mr. Roosevelt was wrong.

[From the Santa Barbara (Calif.) News-Press, evening of July 27, 1940]

A NEW NATIONAL APPRECIATION OF JAMES A. FARLEY—POLITICIAN

The victors in the recent Democratic National Convention at Chicago have reaped the first fruits of their victories—on front pages and in endless radio programs. They have settled down to consolidate their gains for the great battle of ballots to come. In the lull between the battle of the convention and the battle of the ballot box it is not only fitting and just, but also a real pleasure, to recognize the one man who came out of that Chicago convention a bigger and more respected man than he went in—James A. Farley.

Jim Farley went into that convention knowing that his major contributions to an important phase of national life—to which he had given the greater part of his working life—were about to end. The results of that convention were too generally anticipated to have been hidden from a man of Farley's unprecedented knowledge of politics. Yet Farley met the situation with a smile and—when the time came—he said, for the good of his party, the words that announced the death of his great and warranted ambition—to be President of the United States.

That act and those words made plain to the whole Nation that Farley's entire conduct throughout that convention was equally admirable. And, almost suddenly, the vast majority of Americans saw Jim Farley, the politician, in a new and sincerely friendly light. The millions who read about the convention and listened to its proceedings over the radio could not escape the evidences that—on the basis of friendly feeling and aside from expediency and interest—Jim Farley was the most popular man there. The genuineness of the tribute paid him—in word and song and applause—were convincing and contagious.

It is an old saying that "A man is judged by the company he keeps." It is much more true to say that a man should be judged by the fine things he preserves in himself despite the company he keeps.

Jim Farley was in practical politics. He had a job to do with the tools and materials that were available and according to the rules and regulations that custom—not he—had provided. For whatever unselfish objectives he had he was forced, to a large extent, to use the selfish motives of others. That, unfortunately, is a large part of politics. That, until the Chicago convention, was the basis of mass American evaluation of Jim Farley.

To have rounded out 30 years of outstanding political activity to such a climax of friendly national appreciation Jim Farley must have something very clean and human on the inside that would have been crushed and embittered long ago if it had not been sterling. It is to be regretted that, when Jim Farley heard the cheers in Chicago's convention hall, he could not have heard also the mental cheers of the millions listening in.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of July 18, 1940]

GOOD-BYE, JIM

It was good-bye, Jim, on many a tongue when Mr. Farley arrived in Washington in March 1933, to become a member of the President's official family as Postmaster General. True, the place was his under the aegis of political custom. It was the traditional reward for the important merit of having successfully managed a Presidential campaign.

A vague notion of propriety, however, had heretofore prompted the recipient of the postal portfolio to resign his party office. Not so with Mr. Farley. He retained a firm grip on the national chairmanship and also stayed on as chairman of New York's Democratic Central Committee. His defiance of established usage got on a lot of people's nerves.

Nobody has ever computed the number of times that wishful Washington gossip had Farley on the eve of quitting, but brain trusters flamed and faded, unofficial favorites bloomed and withered, yet Farley went amiably and happily on.

In '36 Mr. Farley reprinted the old adage that nothing succeeds like success. Washington developed a different quota of emotions toward him. Life wasn't an unbroken series of ovations, but Farley came into a wide and cordial esteem.

An exception may be noted. The smiling candidate who, on the triumphant election night of 1932, acknowledged to his campaign manager, "You're the man who did it, Jim," reputedly frowned on Farley's own legitimate ambition to be his successor, and was unappreciatively remote throughout the tension of the third-term speculation.

Early today came the climax of Farley's career, to brighten the stage play at Chicago with a bit of genuine drama. His brief address of gratitude for the votes he had received, his motion for a unanimous ballot for Roosevelt, his expression of devotion to the party, added up to the ultimate in good sportsmanship. The son of Grassy Point couldn't be a winner, but he could be a superlatively good loser. The delegates, even fanatical third-termers, responded with an ovation that seemed to outdo in sincere enthusiasm that for the President himself.

So again, according to all the omens, it is as James Whitcomb Riley put it, "Well, good-bye, Jim, take keer of yourse'f." It is a regretful farewell now, with best wishes. And however the 8 adventurous years may ultimately be summed up, history will provide a niche for Jim Farley as one of the New Deal's cast who personally made good.

[From the St. Louis Daily Globe-Democrat of July 21, 1940]

FARLEY VETOES THE DRAFT

At least one member of the New Deal's official family has a deaf ear for third-term drafts. James A. Farley was reelected chairman of the Democratic National Committee but refused to remain in the saddle. He has resigned, effective August 17, and the Democratic Party loses the services of one of the greatest organization geniuses in the history of American politics.

"Big Jim," the urbane, genial, shrewd master of political technic, was more beloved by the rank and file of party workers than any man on the Washington scene. He knew an utterly unbelievable number of good Democrats by their front names. He never forgot or failed to appreciate the efforts of the lowliest laborer in democracy's vineyard. Often he wrote them personal notes of thanks. The general regard in which he was held was reflected in the complimentary vote he received for the Presidential nomination.

His departure from the committee was due partially to personal reasons. He has long felt the need for building up an income for his family, which he was unable to do in politics. His service in electing President Roosevelt in 1932 and 1936 was ill-rewarded when his advice and council were ignored by the White House and he was ostracized from the inner circle. But the predominant reason for his departure from active politics is undoubtedly a deep-rooted, patriotic aversion to a third term for any President of the United States.

He will return to private life with the best wishes of Republicans and Democrats alike. And if G. O. P. faithful are loudest in their well wishing at his departure, they can hardly be blamed. The Democrats will hunt far and long before they find a man to fill the Farley boots.

[From the Rockford (Ill.) Star of July 19, 1940]

The Chicago convention was not of a character to elevate the stature generally of politicians, but one man came out of it with heightened respect and affection; we are not sure that we did not see the politician metamorphosed into a statesman before our eyes. It is assumed that since he has reached that state the Democratic Party will have no further use for Jim Farley.

Farley, the genius of two Presidential campaigns, the honest politician who leaves high political position a poor man, the friendly soul who always attributed to his friends purer motives than his sagacity should have advised, went down for a principle. He believed that the third term was against the grain of American tradition and wisdom. He did not quote Jefferson against violation of tradition; he simply held that it would be bad for the party. Farley spoke in party terms; he was ingenuous enough to believe that the wisdom and principles and political morals of Democratic statesmen spoke in the aggregate of party. Party to him meant collective ideals, collective moralities, to be used for the glory of the Republic. He is not a complex character; party meant to him statesmanship.

His disillusionment began some time ago. The new dealers had to use the car against a number of people who thought to climb into the boat. Farley was made no exception. But he clung to his principle and took it to Chicago to make a fight for it. He found that party meant the statesmanship of booing the 82-year-old Virginian who put his name into nomination. He found it meant the reward of gleaning 72 votes; the payoff for 8 years of toil. He has only the comfort of knowing that if Thomas Jefferson had appeared in the flesh to declare himself against a third term, he likewise would have been booed.

Farley knew what was coming, as did CARTER GLASS. But principle stood like a stone wall against the discomfiture of the moment. Then, hiding his wounds, he stood before the convention that booed him and moved acclamation. We trust the more abundant life awaits Jim Farley as he returns to private affairs.

[From the Roanoke (Va.) Times of July 21, 1940]

JIM FARLEY STEPS ASIDE

Once again Jim Farley has demonstrated that he is a man who keeps his word. He had said that, regardless of the President's decision, his name would go before the Democratic convention in Chicago as a candidate for the Presidential nomination. And it was so done, even though Mr. Farley knew perfectly well that he didn't stand a Chinaman's chance of being nominated.

Farley had also said that he would not manage President Roosevelt's campaign for reelection and would retire as national chairman. Tremendous pressure was brought to bear in an effort to persuade him to reconsider and stay on as head of the national committee. The President himself, it is understood, asked Farley to stay and the party leaders did everything in their power at Chicago to make him change his mind and remain at the helm.

All of their efforts came to naught. Farley had made up his mind to quit. And he did. On August 17 he will retire as national chairman, and shortly thereafter, will resign as Postmaster-General, his resignation to take effect at the President's convenience. His plans for the future have not been announced, but it is generally believed that he has acquired the necessary financial backing to purchase the New York Yankees and affiliated minor league clubs, and is going to transfer his interests from politics to baseball by stepping into the shoes of the late Jake Ruppert, owner of the Yankees until his death more than a year ago.

If this report is true, Farley will be returning to his first love—the realm of sport. He was chairman of the New York State Boxing Commission when Al Smith persuaded him to enter politics as New York State Democratic chairman—a post he still holds, and which he has indicated he will not relinquish for the present. In 1932 Farley threw in his political fortunes with those of Franklin D. Roosevelt—and the rest is history.

Farley was largely responsible for Roosevelt's nomination for the Presidency at the Democratic convention of 1932 in Chicago and subsequently, at Mr. Roosevelt's invitation, became the party's national chairman. He is generally acknowledged to be the outstanding political genius of his time, and his refusal to manage the President's campaign for a third term is a serious loss to the party and an equally serious blow to the President's prospects for reelection.

Asked by a reporter in Chicago, "Who's going to win in November?" Farley answered, "I think I should leave comment on that point to my successor." However, he made it clear that he intended to support the Democratic ticket.

Choice of Farley's successor will be made by a subcommittee appointed by the Democratic National Committee to confer with President Roosevelt and his running mate, Secretary of Agriculture Wallace, on the matter. The committee undoubtedly will be guided by the President's wishes. Frank C. Walker, New York businessman and former treasurer of the national committee, is understood to be in line for the chairmanship, although he is reluctant to take it. In the event that Walker does not accept, it is believed that Senator JAMES F. BYRNES, of South Carolina, is next in line. In that connection it is interesting to note that BYRNES' colleague, Senator E. D. (Cotton Ed) SMITH, has announced that he will "take a walk" and will not support President Roosevelt for reelection.

[From the Roanoke Times of July 19, 1940]

JIM FARLEY

James A. Farley knew perfectly well, of course, that he was not going to be nominated for President at Chicago. And since he knew in advance what the result of the balloting would be, he can hardly have been greatly disappointed at the outcome. As far as the nomination was concerned, it just wasn't Jim Farley's night.

But in another sense it most decidedly was Jim Farley's night. The convention cheered every mention of his name, and more than one delegate, in announcing his vote for Roosevelt, digressed long enough to give expression to his liking and regard for the party's able and efficient national chairman, who has twice guided the Democratic ticket to impressive victories at the polls.

Whether Farley stays on or retires as national chairman, he knows now how highly he is thought of by the party. He has worked long and unselfishly to promote its success, and he richly merited the encomiums so lavishly heaped upon him Wednesday night.

'Tis said that Farley and the President are no longer on the close and intimate terms that once marked their relationship. If that is so, it is the President's loss, and it is no light one. Other men have come to enjoy the President's confidence, and it was to other men, unmistakably, that he entrusted the guidance of his political fortunes at Chicago. But a dozen such men as Walker, Hopkins, and Byrnes cannot take the place of Jim Farley, as the President will find out later, if he does not already realize it.

Jim Farley has proved himself not only a loyal and zealous Democrat, but a square shooter through and through. If he has reached the decision, as is reported, to retire from politics in the near future, that is not only the President's loss but the Democratic Party's loss as well. Never an ardent new dealer, he has shown himself to be a great Democrat and a loyal American. His party ought to be, and undoubtedly is, proud of him—proud and grateful. It owes him a great deal.

[From the Pueblo Star-Journal-Pueblo Chieftain of July 21, 1940]

OUR SYMPATHY GOES OUT TO JAMES A. FARLEY

Differing from him in many ways politically, we have, however, always admired the many good qualities of James A. Farley, which have brought him the respect of others also not in political agreement with him but who join in sympathizing with this famous Democratic leader in the predicament in which he finds himself. He has been overwhelmed by a bunch of new dealers, with the full knowledge and consent of the man he made Governor of New York and President of the United States, Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

Balked in his aspirations for the nomination for President after having evidently been assured by Mr. Roosevelt that he would not be a candidate, and again balked in his backing to be Vice Presidential candidate also by the same bunch of new dealers, we don't blame Jim Farley for throwing up the sponge, although we hate to see a man of his standing and of his integrity and loyalty so humiliated as to cause him to quiver like a leaf behind a huge fan while sitting on the stage during the nomination of Mr. Roosevelt and his understudy, Mr. Wallace.

Yes; Jim Farley will be loyal. He'll go along with the party because loyalty is one of his cardinal principles, but there will be a sad difference between the Jim Farley of yesteryears and the Jim Farley of today when it comes to piloting the destiny of a great political party which, in the opinion of thousands of people, is digging its own political grave upon orders from high up in its organization.

[From the Providence Journal of July 21, 1940]

NOT EVEN VENGEANCE

After all is said and done, it was James A. Farley and not Franklin D. Roosevelt who emerged as the really dramatic figure of the Democratic National Convention.

It may be that history will concern itself more with Roosevelt, since his action, in having his personal lieutenants direct the course of the convention toward securing a third nomination for him, brought the United States to a turning point in its political history, the full significance of which no man can know until after the people have rendered their verdict next November.

If Roosevelt wins then, what he maneuvered to have this national convention do, may well mark the beginning of the end of limited tenure of office for our future Presidents, and may see the American democracy start down the same road which the Roman Republic traveled when Julius Caesar took power and which led the French Republic to the first empire when Napoleon became Consul for life.

If Roosevelt is overwhelmingly defeated, the American electorate may close that road to the ambitious of future Presidents for all time to come, and may make inviolate Thomas Jefferson's democratic principle that ours must be a government of laws and not of men, a government of limited powers in order that government shall always be the servant of the people, and therefore a government with a limited tenure of office for its Chief Executive.

It will be with such matters that historians will concern themselves when they come to write the record of the Democratic National Convention just held and of the election to come in November.

But they will write history with a dead hand indeed if they overlook the role played in this drama by James A. Farley. We are free to confess that it revealed the chairman of the Democratic National Committee to us in a new light. We had always thought of him as the genial and very able political organizer who was probably not much concerned with the philosophy of government of the administration which his organizing genius did so much to bring to power and to keep in office. Then, too, we thought of him as naturally and properly ambitious for high elective office; if not for the Presidency, then for the Vice Presidency as the tail of any acceptable Presidential candidate's kite, Mr. Roosevelt's or another's.

We underestimated Mr. Farley. To understand him, it is perhaps necessary first to accept Senator CARTER GLASS' characterization of him as a "great partisan." Now Senator GLASS, as a politician—we use the term in this instance with the deepest respect—doubtless can understand that term "great partisan" better than can the journalistic mind. The newspaper man finds his measure of greatness at the other end of the scale—to be great is to be liberal in the sense of being free from bias and therefore free from partisanship. But the "great partisan" is another character altogether. He has accepted honors at the hands of the party. He owes an allegiance.

So Jim Farley was an intense partisan, a dyed-in-the-wool Democrat, but a great partisan withal. It was to the principles of the Democratic Party as the champion of the democratic process that he gave his extraordinary loyalty. The way he conducted himself throughout one of the most difficult personal experiences that a man in public life could undergo showed James Farley to be a very unusual man of principle.

As we read the record, Farley had probably never had a very deep conviction that he would ever win the Presidential nomination. He thought himself entitled to it and was rightfully proud of the caliber of men who supported him in that position. So he was quite ready to go before a Democratic National Convention on that basis and could find his satisfaction in such a candidacy alone. He did not have to win the nomination to be satisfied for himself. If to be elected President was the greatest of all honors, it was never-

theless an honor in Jim Farley's eyes to be a candidate of a great party, and honor enough to be a proper candidate before a proper Democratic convention for that nomination.

If anyone thinks this was because Farley was a man of small aspiration, he utterly misunderstands the man. Within the strict limits of party organization, to Farley every play of the game was an honor and the whole should lead to the fulfillment of the great democratic process of which he believed his party was the true champion. He would give his loyalty to that, body and soul, without its being necessary that the prize should be his alone.

But as Farley entered this contest, he saw—and we know now that he saw very clearly and quite early in the game—that it was to be played this time to destroy a great democratic principle, to end the free selection of candidates by the convention of his party, and that he would be humiliatingly shut out in this process. He had to choose then between enduring the humiliating experience of having his constituted authority as national chairman flouted by the White House janizary and of having his candidacy reduced to complete impotency, or throwing in the sponge, taking the cash, and letting the credit go.

Farley decided that it was worth while to go through with his candidacy and endure what might come. But the remarkable thing is that he decided to do this in his natural character as a "great partisan." Not once did Farley show the slightest vindictiveness. And when a man can be hurt as deeply as Jim Farley was throughout that period and not flinch, put him down for a man of character.

And for whom or for what was this struggle so doomed to defeat worth while? Surely it was not worth while for Farley. It could get him nothing but humiliation. There was no material reward whatsoever for him at the end of it. Had he played it for vengeance, that might have been one reward. But we never saw vengeance stay out of a man's heart as it did out of Farley's. He urged Senator CARTER GLASS in his nominating speech to stick to the task of properly nominating him and not try to take vengeance on Roosevelt. He even refused to allow his close friend and stanch supporter, former Governor Ely, of Massachusetts, to second his nomination, after Farley had asked him to come to Chicago for that purpose, because Mr. Ely said frankly that he could not do so without saying that he thought Roosevelt had perpetrated a fraud upon the convention in saying that he was not a candidate and that Roosevelt was a self-seeking demagogue threatening a vital principle of democracy in seeking a third term.

No. Farley asked nothing for himself—not even vengeance. But what he did was the one thing essential to force that convention to follow the democratic process or at least the democratic form, even if it be for the last time. Because Farley would not withdraw, and because he said that American public opinion would not tolerate a nomination by acclamation and the abandonment of the form of free assemblies, in allowing all candidates to go before the convention and allowing all delegates to record their votes if they so desired, that convention at least had to function in the open and Roosevelt had to reveal that he was a candidate like any other candidate, a self-seeker after the nomination.

It was Farley who made the record straight and clear for history and for his contemporaries, if we have the sense to see it. He did it without reward for himself. He did it without the slightest show of rancor. He did it as the "great partisan" and at the end, true to that character, moved that Roosevelt's nomination be made by acclamation. His friend, Governor Ely, surrendered his credentials and left the convention rather than give his approval to a candidacy that threatens to fasten the curse of empire upon this democracy. The two men parted ways there. Both men acted from conscience. We believe Ely took the necessary course. Farley remains "the great partisan." But in that role he has earned our admiration and our deep respect. His partisanship was a loyalty to principle. Still saying he is opposed to a third term from deep conviction, Farley may be keeping to the fold to save the party from itself.

Think of the candidates who withdrew. Which of them, think you, did more for the democratic principle of limited power in our Government: Wheeler, who withdrew his name but who not very candidly attacked the President's candidacy in his first statement after the nomination, or Jim Farley who stuck, took it on the chin, and moved that the nomination be made by acclamation? Farley alone made that convention stand and deliver in the open. He paid the price to do that. The delegates thought they were honoring Jim Farley at the end of their loud applause. But rather, we think, they were taking back a little honor to themselves, of which they were in sore need after their exhibition of supine surrender to the ambition of a Chief Executive who thinks nothing of the sanctity of the principles our founding fathers gave us as the basis of free government.

[From the Portland (Maine) Press Herald of July 22, 1940]

"SUNNY JIM" RETIRES

Nothing more becoming than James A. Farley's manner of leaving the chairmanship of the Democratic National Committee and politics could be imagined. He had received cruel treatment from the President whom he had maneuvered twice into election. He had been roughly ignored at the convention; the management of affairs had been taken from him and thrust into the hands of the inept Harry Hopkins. Farley himself had had again and again to tell reporters that he did not know what was being planned. Yet in spite of this ingratitude in the White House and in spite of the disappointment in being defeated in his ambition, "Sunny Jim" never forgot to smile; he never once voiced his proper resentment; he even comes out wholeheartedly in full support of ticket and platform. He and his conduct remain the only bright spot in the whole sordid affair at Chicago.

Yet Mr. Roosevelt, after having abused the man who made him, had the temerity to plead with "Sunny Jim" to manage the campaign. No dice. Mr. Farley is adamant. He will stay on the job 4 weeks and no more. Then he will kiss politics goodbye, throw up his Cabinet post, and go to work with the Yankees, back in the world of sport where he first became known.

That is a bitter, perhaps unrecognized, blow to the President and to the Democratic Party. Farley will be missed—terribly missed. He will be missed in the direction of the campaign, in the powerful influence upon the workers of whom he knew more than any other man in the country. And he will be missed when the votes are counted. Increasingly, Mr. Roosevelt will come to realize what his ambition for a third term has done to his party. Meanwhile Republicans will be sorry for Mr. Farley who has had just a new, not a square, deal, and glad for themselves who will profit vastly from Mr. Farley's retirement.

[From the Pontiac (Mich.) Press of July 24, 1940]

A PROPHET DECLINES TO TALK

"Come on, Jim, tell us what you think about it." Thus have the newspapermen been coaxing the resigning chairman of the Democratic National Committee to make a prediction. The smiling Postmaster General has a reputation as a political guesser par excellence. To be sure, he had the benefit of the ponderous machinery of the Federal Government in finding out what was going on and what cross sections were thinking and what politicians were concluding in every little hamlet in the land. It was a Gallup poll and then some, with the costs, at least in 1936, coming out of the taxpayers. But even so, "Sunny Jim" knew how to interpret what he heard. He made estimates that were startling in their uncanny character.

But not a word will the retiring man of the mails say as to what he thinks is going to happen. It is likely that in spite of the manner in which he was tossed into the discard by the ambitious politician who used his abilities and led him to believe he might have a chance at the Presidency, Farley will not talk until he is out and away from the Washington connections. When he has put the whole experience back of him and when he is again in New York and in the congenial atmosphere of a baseball diamond, he may spill more beans than one farmer can raise. If and when he does, he will be listened to with respect. He might guess correctly again. When the New Deal was getting under motion in 1933, Farley predicted that Mr. Roosevelt would go down in history as "either the greatest or the worst President in the Nation's history." As the third-term campaign starts, Jim is getting out from under, and it is not impossible that he already has a decided opinion about how the thing is going to end.

[From the Pontiac Daily Press of July 23, 1940]

BEST WISHES AND GOOD LUCK, JIM

There was one man who walked out of the Chicago convention with credit to himself and honor to his party. He had an ambition to run for the Presidency. During the first term there was no opposition in the White House to that aspiration. His loyalty to the Chief Executive arose superior to irritations and to legislation of regimentation with which he was in opposition. But when the time came to dump James Farley into the discard in order to further the ambitions for a third term, the President had no hesitancy.

Filled, as he must have been, with resentment and animosity, the Postmaster General let no hint of it reach the floor of the convention. He kept smiling and he made the sacrifice without complaint. And it was significant that the delegates, bossed and controlled as they were from the White House, cheered the national chairman with a vigor and a spontaneity that was not in evidence when others were given a hand.

Farley did a wonderful job for Franklin Roosevelt and in return he received what many other men have received at his hand when they were in the way of his ambitions. "Sunny Jim" kept his word scrupulously. When he has told the newspaper men something, they have believed it, as they found he was not given to dissembling nor to misleading statements. And truth to say newsmen grow terribly cynical, they are lied to so frequently and so blandly.

Farley is quitting his job with the respect of not only the Democrats, but of large numbers of members of the opposition party. Such patience as Farley has shown is rarely discovered along the political highways and byways. Jim played the game, but he backed a horse that disappointed him in the end, and went counter to the rules and to tradition. However, the Postmaster General is retiring with honors and that is better than all the successful elections that can be rolled up in any man's lifetime.

[From the St. Paul (Minn.) Pioneer-Press of July 20, 1940]

MR. FARLEY RETIRES

When James A. Farley retires from chairmanship of the Democratic National Committee August 17, the Democratic Party will lose the services of the political genius who steered it through two

important victories and who did a good job during the past 4 years of trying to maintain harmony in a household battle where no rules were recognized.

A practical chairman of a national political committee cannot be too select in his political company if he wants to be successful. But, while the Democratic political organizations of Louisiana, Kansas City, Chicago, New Jersey, and some other points have been a stench in the nostrils of decency in recent years, no hint of this odor touched the Democratic National Chairman. He finished up remarkably clean, despite these unlovely associates.

As Postmaster General he is regarded as one of the most able administrators in the President's cabinet. This is not surprising for he is a successful businessman and is retiring as chairman to take over the rather important business enterprise of managing the affairs of the New York Yankees.

The President and the Postmaster General disagreed over the question of the third term. This was not the first time they disagreed, for Mr. Farley was never a member of the current brain trust. He was the practical politician who had to keep the organization in line even though purges were attempted and important local cogs were read out of the party.

Despite what some people regard as his shabby treatment by the President, Mr. Farley will remain a good Democrat and will give what time and assistance his new duties will permit. In leaving his post as chairman of the Democratic National Committee he carries the respect and admiration of most persons who realize what a tough job he has handled.

[From the Arizona Republic of July 27, 1940]

THE FORGOTTEN MAN, JAMES A. FARLEY

The whipping boy of the New Deal administration has taken another birching. It was a harder one than even he, though long experienced in this role, has been accustomed to taking without even a little squirming.

To say that "Big Jim" Farley took it like a man would be to do him an injustice.

Few men of whatever caliber in this Nation could or would have taken the whipping that he accepted smilingly in Chicago.

He could have avoided most of it by pulling out a week before the Democratic convention opened.

He had been forewarned a week ahead, by none other than the chief himself, what to expect.

In reportedly blunt words Franklin D. Roosevelt told the man whose political sagacity had steered him—the President—to safe and triumphant anchorage through two smashing campaigns, just how far his fresh-air taxi was going to carry him.

Jim Farley knew where he was going to get off—without doubt he knew it long before that historic conversation, as to the purport of which he allowed himself to be pledged to secrecy.

But the genial Postmaster General had other loyalties, too—for one, to the folk who had pledged themselves to him for the nomination which his chief all too apparently was destined to get.

He stuck by his guns on both fronts. It was Farley who insisted there must be at least one ballot—that no nominee of the Democratic Party should be acclaimed by totally unrecorded voice vote Managers of the third-term juggernaut sought to beat him down—no vote at all under the circumstances seemed fair enough to them—but "Big Jim" held stubbornly to his line.

Through it all he divulged no iota of what the President had said to him.

When his purpose had been achieved, the vote recorded, the die cast—the convention had resounding cheers for him, but few votes—he was the first to make the courtly gesture of nomination by acclamation.

Farley kept the record clear. Few delegates to the Chicago convention at any future date can say: "I didn't believe in this third-term business, but I never got a chance to vote against it."

Political friend and foe alike must admit:

Jim Farley is a man.

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer of July 20, 1940]

JIM FARLEY'S CAPABLE AND LOYAL SERVICE

For ability, forbearance, steadfastness, patience and unswerving loyalty, the Democratic Party owes a distinguished political service award to James Aloysius Farley, who, having just been reelected chairman of the Democratic National Committee, has announced his retirement on August 17.

Although this means that Farley will not direct the major part of the Democratic campaign, which will not get under way in earnest until September, his staying on the job for another month—when it is conceivable he would like to quit right now and start his presumably new career as head of the New York Yankees baseball club—is an obvious but understandable gesture for party harmony.

Loyal and uncomplaining to the last, Farley has pledged his full support to a Democratic ticket with which, it may be suspected, he is not in complete sympathy.

It has been no secret that Farley opposed a third-term nomination. But certainly there is no reason for believing that, because his name figured in the Chicago balloting, his opposition to a third-term campaign was related to personal political hopes or ambitions he may at any time have harbored.

As a true Democrat and a loyal friend and admirer of the President, Jim Farley would not be guilty of political double-dealing. His candidacy at Chicago undoubtedly represented, as he plainly implies, a declaration of his views and convictions on the third-term nomination.

For months there had been signs that Farley was the victim of many rebuffs by administration leaders. But he went quietly and effectively about his task of strengthening and consolidating Democratic ranks.

At Chicago it was apparent that his party directorship was to a degree usurped, in part by those who had had little experience with the actual workings of political machinery. But Farley went straight ahead, without anger, without resentment, with total loyalty to the President, his hero.

On the day that the capable and genial Jim Farley leaves the office of national chairman the Democratic Party will lose one of the most invaluable assets it ever possessed.

[From the Pawtucket (R. I.) Times of July 16, 1940]

"BIG JIM"—THE BIGGEST

Politics is a filthy game. One of the wonders of the world is the survival of our democratic system while politicians undermine the foundations of liberty, sell out the freedom of the people to gangsters or selfish minorities so that the political cutpurses may increase their riches.

Of one thing we are certain—politicians do not exist for the benefit of the Nation as a whole. There are too many examples of men, past and contemporary, who owe financial independence to their scheming minds and lack of morals which empower them to make a mockery of the ballot box and rob the gullible citizens of their franchise.

We believe, on the face of things which are superficial—that there are few exceptions to the rule of dirty politics and dirtier politicians. The single exception is Jim Farley.

In his younger days Jim Farley may have packed caucuses, helped to throw ballots in the river, and saw to it that "objectionable persons" did not have their way over the politicians. But we don't know it as a fact, so Mr. Farley is entitled to the benefit of the doubt.

We can say one thing for Farley and say it without fear of contradiction, Farley is loyal. It was he who sent Roosevelt to the White House. But Mr. Roosevelt has not paid off that friendship outside of making Mr. Farley a Cabinet member, dictated by tradition, a job which has cost Farley a personal competence.

Yet Farley has "gone down the line" for the boss, swallowing with great distaste the janizaries who led Mr. Roosevelt into so many political mistakes.

Jim has survived many of the Roosevelt entourage who walked the plank at the bidding of political tyros and economic experimenters.

Only Mr. Roosevelt can say why Farley has survived, although practical considerations would indicate that Jim, with the friendship of so many political leaders at his back, could, if he so desired, cut the political legs from the New Deal.

Farley is one of the old political school which put party above self. Loyalty is a lost quality in the new politics. Suspicion has taken the place of loyalty.

No one can accuse Jim Farley of being disloyal and when he steps out of political life he will carry with him the respect of friend and foe. He has taken many severe blows from the man he made President, but he has never complained.

Jim Farley comes out as the biggest man in the New Deal.

[From the Herald-News (Passaic, N. J.) of July 22, 1940]

FARLEY A GREAT FIGURE

"It is not given to every man," as Westbrook Pegler puts it, "to listen to the eulogies of his own wake," as James A. Farley did at the Democratic National Convention in Chicago last week.

That's just what it was—a political funeral. The eulogies were beautiful, including the one spoken in person from the platform by the First Lady, and the expression the President himself broadcast later from the White House, and most of these expressions, perhaps all of them, were heartfelt.

Jim Farley listened with a smile on his face, and courage, and we trust not too much resentment, in his heart. He had fought the good fight, had stood for principle in a cause which he knew well was lost, and now—within a few days—was to give up the controls of the Democratic Party organization.

There should be a place, a big place, in the Democratic picture for Jim Farley. He did great deeds for Franklin Delano Roosevelt. He all but made him in 1932. What was done for Farley? He was given the wheelhorse job of National Chairman, which he loved with every fiber of him, and with it a Cabinet post which paid him a salary insufficient to meet his bills, so that he is going out of office owing money. That's not so bad. He will recoup, whether it be in managing the Yankees and their baseball club chain, or in some other field, and he will be no longer under the restraint that caused him to forbid a contracting company, his sole business interest, to take advantage of the possibilities to make money on Government work—so that that concern, too, has operated in the red.

The sad thing about the situation is that he is obliged, for the sake of principle, to abandon the work for which he is best fitted—that of a great political leader.

Farley crossed the Rooseveltian ambition. So he is through, and he knows why he is through. But you'll hear no recriminations from him. He will stand pat, as a good general does, even when relieved of command.

But he'll make no predictions as to the result of this third-term election. No! That's the job of his successor.

Eight years ago Jim Farley came pretty close to the truth in predicting what would happen. Four years ago he hit the result squarely on the nose.

It would be highly interesting now to know his private prediction of the result on November 5, 1940.

He retires from the fight a greater man than when he went into it. He was by all odds the finest figure of the Convention. He will be heard from again.

[From the Daily Palo Alto (Calif.) Times of July 19, 1940]

JAMES A. FARLEY

James A. Farley has been defrauded of his rightful possibility of any practical chance of being nominated as his party's candidate for the Presidency. The robbery was achieved by machinations that reek of political cruelty, selfishness, and ingratitude. But Mr. Farley emerges from the party convention and heads toward the exit of political office with something more precious than political reward. He takes with him the high respect of citizens everywhere in all parties.

Throughout his years of party and governmental service he has hewed to the line of impeccable principle, and when unfairly treated by his partisan associates he has provided the perfect example of "turning the other cheek." The cruelty that has been visited upon him he has borne in silence and repaid with persistence in following his path of duty. He has met unselfishness with continued devotion, and has exchanged unswerving loyalty for the ingratitude that has been shown him.

Mr. Farley's character as revealed by his conduct in public life was summed up in that brief line in the convention nominating speech saying, "The name of James A. Farley is synonymous with straight shooting."

We do not agree with Mr. Farley in his political ideas, and if he had been nominated for the Presidency would still have supported the opposition candidate. But all parties would be better off if they had more men in them of Mr. Farley's character.

[From the Sunday Sentinel-Star, Orlando, Fla., of July 21, 1940]

WHO'LL FOLLOW FARLEY?

We cannot allow James Farley to pass out of the political picture without acknowledging his great services to the Democratic Party.

Genial and likable, with an organizing ability above the extraordinary, he guided the party expertly through two major campaigns and handled his duties so expertly that he was able to say positively beforehand that only Maine and Vermont would go to Landon.

On his retirement he again says the people want the Democrats to continue in office, and there is no doubt he has accurately represented the present sentiment.

It is regretted he will not remain to give the wise administration to make his words continue true to the end of the campaign.

But there are other able men; leaders who are astute in handling political affairs, who can take up the burden where he lays it down, and the important thing is to make a wise choice among them.

Of these, Senator BYRNES stands out as the most promising, because of his success in leadership in Washington, and his ability also to appeal to popular regard.

But he dislikes to give up his promising Senatorial career, a sentiment that does him credit, for the Senate also needs able men.

[From the Omaha Evening World-Herald of July 20, 1940]

DOWN GOES FARLEY

The long-expected has happened. Jim Farley has resigned as chairman of the Democratic National Committee and his resignation as Postmaster General is expected within a matter of days.

About 9 years ago Jim Farley went out on the road to sell the Democrats of America a bill of goods. He went into virtually every State, every important county, to talk to his friends, the Democratic leaders. He pleaded long and eloquently. He wrote letters by the thousands. He pulled strings as only a political genius knows how to pull them.

When time for the Chicago convention of 1932 rolled around, Jim Farley had done his job. He had sold Franklin D. Roosevelt to his party and, as it later developed, to the Nation.

Farley later said that Mr. Roosevelt had never thanked him for his services in 1931-32, or in 1936.

But it would be wrong to assume that the President was not grateful. He allowed Farley to stay in his Cabinet long after most of the other old Democrats had fallen from grace. Homer Cummings, Arthur Mullen, Bruce Kramer, Al Smith, Harry Woodring—they and dozens of others walked the Last Mile ahead of "Big Jim."

One of the Roosevelt-before-Chicago Democrats remains in Washington—aging Cordell Hull. We wonder what he is thinking about.

[From the Ogdensburg (N. Y.) Advance News of July 21, 1940]

JIM FARLEY RETIRES

The retirement of James A. Farley from active participation in national politics will be regretted by millions of Democrats, and countless others who came to admire his attractive personal qualities. His leadership has been a tower of strength to the administration since the first Roosevelt campaign in 1932, and he received a well-deserved tribue in the roll call on Presidential nominations at Chicago last Wednesday night. It is said Farley is leaving his post because he disapproves a third-term candidacy but we prefer to believe that after 7 years of public life he finds it necessary to recoup his private fortunes.

Unless a man possesses independent means he must sooner or later leave the Government service.

Jim Farley has made a name for himself as national chairman and Postmaster General, which will endure through the years. We hope to see him emerge from his retirement in 1942 and in the meantime he can be counted upon to give his full support to the Democratic cause in State and Nation.

[From the Oakland (Calif.) Tribune of July 19, 1940]

DROPPING THE PILOT

Many years ago at the time when a then young and headstrong man was solidifying his personal position as ruler of an empire, a rather famous cartoon was published called "Dropping the Pilot." It showed Emperor William II of Germany standing on the bridge of the ship of state with the form of Bismarck on his way out.

The friends here of National Chairman James A. Farley, and they are legion, have the very strong impression that the man who directed the successful campaigns of 1932 and 1936 is being sidetracked. He will keep his job only until August 17. He and Bismarck both found themselves in the position of being dropped by headstrong rulers after having served faithfully and well.

The natural resentment to Presidential humiliation of the man whom many consider most responsible for the initial Roosevelt success may help explain the lack of real enthusiasm among the delegates. Like good soldiers, they did their job but their hearts were not in it.

Delegates to this convention felt some of the futility that must exist among members of the Reichstag in the Germany of Adolf Hitler. The form of the democratic process remained, but the substance was that of ratifying the Executive will in an obedient and unquestioning manner.

In this new order, with Hopkins, Ickes, et al. having the Presidential ear, there hardly seems a place any more for Farley, Garner, Glass, Byrd, Clark, and the host of others who were old-fashioned enough to believe that they belonged to a political party and not a revolutionary movement.

Many old-line Democrats began to question the new order of things when the attempt was made by the President to subordinate the Supreme Court to the Executive will. Later came the attempted "purge" of members of the President's own party who had the courage to disagree with him. Now we witness that which many Democrats hoped against hope would not be: A President of the United States of America seeking a third Presidential term. Already Tammany delegates from New York have endorsed a fourth term.

A great political party has advertised to the Nation that out of 130,000,000 people only one man is qualified to hold the office of President. Four years ago Roosevelt said that the American people were approaching a "rendezvous with destiny." Now the rendezvous may turn out to be a blind date where the Democracy of Jefferson met its Waterloo.

[From the Journal-News, Nyack, N. Y., of July 24, 1940]

TRIBUTE TOO LATE

It is heartening to see the multitude of praise both by newspapers and individuals throughout the country which is heaped upon Jim Farley as he prepares to step out of the national picture. The paeans follow the formidable demonstration of esteem given Farley at the Democratic National Convention, but to many it will seem that the tribute came too late.

As one correspondent put it, the convention delegates gave Farley everything but their votes. It appears that the Democratic Party came to realize Jim's full worth when it suddenly struck them that he was about to leave their midst.

Probably a good bit of the emotional sentiment on behalf of Jim was aroused by a feeling of remorse, just as folks returning from a funeral wonder if they couldn't have treated the deceased in better fashion before he had departed. "He was a swell guy, and the things he did were fine," they are wont to say, the while recalling that they couldn't remember complimenting him while he still was alive. A well-known columnist, following this parallel, aptly recorded the demise of Farley as national chairman by writing that "It is not given to every man to listen to the eulogies of his own wake * * *."

So it was, that although his colleagues boarded the bandwagon in rendering gushing praise of his leadership, the kind words were emitted after Farley's current career had been precluded by the delegates' determination to renominate Mr. Roosevelt, a move entirely counter to Farley convictions.

There was a realization among the delegates, too, that finding another chairman with the sagacity and truthfulness of Jim would not be easy.

But despite the fact that he got little support as an actual candidate for the Presidential nomination, and finis has been written to his role as national chairman, Jim must feel content inside himself that he did a good job well. He had the courage of his convictions, and saw the day when he knew that, no matter

how shabbily he may have been treated otherwise, his efforts and capabilities were highly appreciated.

With what has come to pass there still is no basis for believing Farley is through with politics. Legion are those who fully expect even greater efforts by Jim on behalf of his country when future opportunity offers itself.

[From the Journal-News, Nyack, N. Y., of July 25, 1940]

CREDIT TO COUNTY

The Democratic convention is past and gone. Of it there remain two things that are stand-outs—the third-term aspirations of President Roosevelt and the withdrawal of James A. Farley from the picture—and of these two the latter event far transcends the former in importance to Rockland County. Franklin D. Roosevelt may be the President but he's not a Rockland County boy who made good. Jim Farley started in Grassy Point and his career has thus far carried him into nomination for the Presidency, a place in the Cabinet, and the national chairmanship of the Democratic Party.

It is seldom that so much honor falls to the lot of one man, but he carries the burden lightly and the hat he wore when he was Stony Point's town clerk still fits him. He is still a man of the people to whom the friendship of men and women in Rockland County means much. That he is the country's leading politician now just as he was 8 years ago when he elected Roosevelt is admitted without question.

Back in 1932 a chance remark was dropped in an unguarded moment to the effect that "6 people out of 10 in Rockland County had never heard of Jim Farley." The remark brought retort as rapid as emphatic and was about as sensible as a statement today that "6 people out of 10 in the United States have never heard of Jim Farley."

But Rockland County was doubly honored at the Democratic convention in that not one but two native sons served with distinction. Seldom can any small county political organization boast that a former chairman has seconded the nomination of another former chairman for the Presidency of the United States. Yet that is the honor which came to Rockland County.

Farley and Fisher are the county's two best advertisements, and neither is reluctant to own his native heath. They are both proud of Rockland County, as the county may well be proud of them.

Both men started at the bottom and worked up through the ranks, Farley in Stony Point and Fisher in Clarkstown. Both served as committeemen, reaching out to contact the average voter, and both men served their party as county chairman with distinction. They made their enemies during their rise, as must every man who aspires to public office, but their friends far outnumber their enemies.

The 1940 convention will be remembered by Rockland County as its own, so prominent has Farley become. Senator CARTER GLASS may have had the honor of nominating Farley, but it is a purely Rockland County assertion that "Pat" did just as good a job in his brief speech as did the distinguished Virginia Senator.

[From the Norfolk (Va.) Virginian-Pilot of July 20, 1940]

"SUNNY JIM" SAYS GOOD-BYE

Those who were aware of what was going on behind the scenes at Chicago knew that the strenuously warm compliments paid Chairman Farley in the speeches of both the President and his wife were something more than sincere tributes to a personal friend and to the architect in chief of the political House of Roosevelt. They were also, as every informed person knew, salutes to a political manager who was quitting his job in circumstances less than happy—salutes designed to preserve a face of outward felicity on a political partnership which, inwardly, was in an advanced state of collapse.

The parting of Frankie and Jimmie received its final papers yesterday. It was all managed decorously. The National Committee unanimously reelected Farley as chairman, but to serve only to August 17—a stipulation laid down at his request. After that he will accept an "attractive" business offer, the management of the New York Yankees, as has already been reported, and his interest in President Roosevelt's fortunes will be limited to that of a loyal Democrat giving his "full support" to the party's ticket.

Thus ends a political partnership even more famous and effective in its day than the earlier political partnership of Franklin Delano Roosevelt and Alfred E. Smith. The President will find no successor possessed of Jim Farley's ability, for managerial geniuses of his type occur only once in a blue moon. All the President's blandishments failed to induce Farley to put aside his dislike of a third term—a distaste which he registered as publicly as possible when he insisted upon having his name put before the convention as a candidate for the Presidency, and when he picked as his nominator Senator GLASS who, with Farley's full approval, made the nominating speech a vehicle for a pointed defense of the two-term tradition.

President Roosevelt's campaign will suffer for the absence of Farley from the post of field command. But it would have suffered almost as much had Farley consented to lend his presence to the leadership of the 1940 campaign but not his heart or his conscience. Which is another way of saying that, given the situation created by the "draft," the break-up of the remarkable Roosevelt-Farley team was inevitable.

[From the New York Times of July 20, 1940]

A FINE PUBLIC SERVANT

At the Chicago convention James A. Farley commanded the sympathies of the public and enhanced a reputation already high and secure. In the last few years we have all come to know, and most of us to like, him. The strong wrestler with iron fortune, the patient, shrewd, subtle, but always honorable, political manager, the winner of uncounted friends, the capable administrator, we all know. We know the scrupulous keeper of his word, in whom even the reporters, a suspicious tribe, have perfect confidence.

Having had a hand in President making and shown his talent for public affairs, he used the privilege and right of every citizen to become a candidate for the nomination for President. His long loyalty to Mr. Roosevelt is proof enough that his ambition was not at first discouraged in that quarter. In regard to the third term, Mr. Farley, no matter how much of a new dealer in other respects, is a traditionalist. As the "draft" movement went on he was urged to take himself out of the running and permit the renaming of the President by acclamation.

With certain other candidates he stuck to the ritual and insisted on independent nominations. Motions on behalf of the defeated candidates to make the nomination unanimous were also a part of the ritual. Mr. Farley was received with "tremendous" cheering. Who deserved it more? Both his past services and his present sacrifices must have been in every mind. It was a great occasion for Mr. Farley. It was a glory to be nominated by CARTER GLASS, no easy praiser. What strikes the distant hearer or reader is Mr. Farley's generosity of feeling, the magnanimity that rises above complaint and resentment. "A wise and constant man," said Bacon, "will never grieve so long as he plays, as one may say, his own part truly." Mr. Farley has so played his. His behavior at Chicago has strengthened his hold upon the general esteem.

[From the New York Sun of July 17, 1940]

FARLEY PARTY'S TRAGIC MASTER—NEW DEALERS NOW APPEAL TO CHIEF THEY SNUBBED—IN PANIC AT WILLKIE THREAT—REALIZE THAT BEST MAN IS NEEDED FOR ORGANIZATION IN CRISIS

(By Glen Perry)

CHICAGO, July 17.—By far the best-loved man in this town today is Postmaster General James A. Farley, who from all indications is about to give up the chairmanship of the Democratic National Committee and devote himself to building up financial security for his family as president of the New York Yankees. The gap he will leave in the world of politics can be filled by no one else in the Democratic Party.

Were genial Jim a different sort of man, he would be extracting great satisfaction from what is happening here this week, for if ever the stage was set for a personal triumph, it is now, as the inept new dealers who shouldered him to the side lines employ every artifice their minds can suggest to bring him back to the center of the stage. It is strange, in a way, that the creation of this situation is directly traceable to Wendell L. Willkie, the Republican candidate. Yet it is a fact.

Jim Farley emerged in the political big league in 1932, when he won the Presidential nomination for Franklin D. Roosevelt through extraordinarily capable management, and went on to direct the landslide victory over President Hoover. As Postmaster General he went to Washington with as many friends as any politician ever had in the country's history. Even the Republicans whom he had beaten liked him, for he played square, and his genial Irish nature made it impossible for anyone to feel anything but friendship and affection for him.

HAS PHENOMENAL MEMORY

With newspaper men he stood very high. Tales of his phenomenal memory for names, of the faith with which one could bank on what he said, of the unaffected simplicity with which he met all comers, made him a beloved and unusual figure in politics. Even the bitterest foes of the New Deal had no animosity for this particular member of it.

In 1936 he took command again and saw Mr. Roosevelt renominated and reelected by landslide majorities. But even then the young men in the New Deal viewed him as someone who had to be tolerated because of his ability to do the election job and as someone to be ignored on matters of policy affecting the New Deal. From that time on he was pushed into the background. His visits to the White House became fewer. Patronage which one might have expected to be handled by him was taken out of his hands and run by a little group who were interested in building up "our side," by which they did not mean the Democratic Party, but the New Deal.

The attempt to pack the Supreme Court would never have been undertaken had Mr. Farley had anything to say about it. He had nothing to say and the ill-starred fight was made. The attempted purge of Democratic Senators who dared oppose the President in that fight would never have been made had Farley's ideas been followed. They were not. Mistake after mistake was made, change after change was effected in the American system, and Jim Farley and those who felt as he did were alternately ignored and derided by the high-riding new dealers.

CONCEALED HIS WOUNDS

Reports were that he was going to get out of national politics to head an automobile company. But a renewal of the business

recession put the company out of business before he could make any effort to save it.

He stayed on in Washington, keeping his own counsel, hiding the hurt he felt at the way he had been treated by the men he had put in power.

Then the campaign of 1940 loomed on the horizon and it appeared that Jim Farley had no place in the plans of the new dealers. They figured they could do all right without him. They had to figure that way because Jim had no use for the third term, and said so. He was himself a candidate for the Presidency, and that alone was enough to make him the target for the same sniping with which they had knocked off every potential Democratic candidate.

The bright young men looked the situation over, and figured they could defeat any one the Republicans could possibly name without Farley's help. He was too conservative for them, and he believed in the American political system the way it had always been run. They didn't.

BEST MEN NEEDED

Last month things began to happen. The Republicans nominated Willkie, the one thing upon which the new dealers had not figured. Here was a rough-and-tumble champion who had already licked two of their own brightest stars in controversy. Attorney General Jackson and Secretary of the Interior Ickes. Here was a man who could and would trade wallops with the President and ask no odds. And, above all, here was a man who could not be defeated by the second string. The best was none too good, and might be not good enough.

As the time for the Democratic convention neared, the new dealers bethought themselves of Mr. Farley. They suddenly realized that, after all their scoffing and veiled attacks, they needed him badly. There was an instant change of front, where he had been ignored, he was courted. Pressure of every sort was brought to bear to dissuade him from resigning his chairmanship, to make him direct the campaign. They, who had marooned him in the handsome marble post office building in Washington, begged him to lead them once more. They came to him with their hats in their hands.

RAW DEAL BY NEW DEAL

Nobody but Mr. Farley knows what his final answer will be, although the indications in his press conferences have been that he is through. If he yields to their importunities, he will disappoint a lot of people who think he has had a raw deal, and he will please a group who will relegate him to his exile again once he has won the election for them—if even his skill can do that job.

It is a position that would be pleasing to one who holds a grievance, to one whose loyalty to his party is not binding. But Jim doesn't hold grievances, and his loyalty is beyond all question. The situation is painful for him, and the choice has been hard for him to make. Announcement of that choice will come Saturday, after the meeting of the Democratic National Committee that follows adjournment of the convention.

If he does what his friends believe he will do, it will not be a case of Achilles sulking in his tent. It will be a man who has weighed his loyalties in bitter inner struggle, making good on his statement that he is an American before he is a Democrat. To those who know him and his feeling for the system under which American politics have operated, it is difficult, almost impossible, to visualize him as making any other choice.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of July 15, 1940]

FARLEY LOYAL TO THE LAST

Eight years ago James A. Farley was the conquering hero at the Democratic National Convention. He had found his man, named him, and put him across. Four years ago at the Democratic National Convention he was the successful manager. Everybody looked to him for orders and carried them out eagerly. He was not so much conqueror as boss. Today at the Democratic National Convention he will be messenger boy—unless, that is, the master magician has a white rabbit of which even faithful Jim has not been told. This time Mr. Farley will neither plot nor direct. He will merely notify—and the decision, be it clearly noted, will not be his but that of his former friend whom he had made President.

Conqueror, manager, messenger—it sounds like the reverse of the home-town boy who made good. But in fairness to Mr. Farley it must be pointed out that the very fact that he is willing to go through with it without a murmur of complaint is a tribute to his loyalty. Everyone knows that he does not favor the third term. But Mr. Farley is still chairman of his party and Mr. Roosevelt the choice of the majority of the delegates. As chairman, Mr. Farley can and should keep himself above factions. He helped make Mr. Roosevelt. He cannot now unmake him. That's not in the code. All that he can do is, when his message has been delivered and the convention has ratified the party leader's orders, to throw himself vigorously into baseball or some other nonpolitical activity. Can he be blamed if, in seeking a new occupation, he makes as a condition the proviso that he does not have to deal with anyone who fancies himself as a quarterback, captain, manager, coach of the team, and umpire, all rolled into one?

If and when Mr. Farley steps out of political life he will carry with him the respect of opponents as well as friends and the good wishes of those who believe that unbreakable loyalty together with a capacity for taking it on the chin time after time without a squawk are qualities as admirable as they are rare. Mr. Farley comes out of this political partnership a bigger man, even though he may be a sadder and a disillusioned one.

[From the New Orleans Item of July 19, 1940]

FARLEY TRIUMPHED TOO

Aside from its remarkable upsurge for the renomination of President Roosevelt, one of the most notable things about the Chicago convention was the whole-hearted fashion in which it testified its admiration, confidence, and affection for Chairman Farley.

He stood against the third term on principle. The convention nominated Mr. Roosevelt for a third term with a riotous demonstration. It gave Mr. Roosevelt 947 votes and Mr. Farley only 73. Yet the personal acclaim that the speakers and the whole assembly bestowed on the bald, pink, party chairman, compared most favorably with that received by its President and nominee.

They refused him their votes but they gave him their hearts. It was an odd and unsual phenomenon. The aged Carter Glass received scant respect when he spoke for Farley's candidacy against a third term, but roused gusts of enthusiasm when he spoke for Farley as a man. A resolution against the third term was howled down by overwhelming roars and boos. But Farley himself received the most distinguished consideration from everybody.

It takes exceptional character, fellowship, talent, and ability to win that sort of standing in a national assembly of cagey, cynical, and skeptical politicians. If we know the temperament of the Farley type of Irishman, "Jim" came out of the convention highly pleased with himself, even though he had left his little 6 percent of its votes behind for another man.

He deserves to feel that way. For, while some of good will bestowed on him by his fellow Democrats was doubtless inspired by their desire to keep his skill and energy "in line" for their ticket, a great, great deal of it expressed a genuine regard that they have come to feel for him.

[From the New London (Conn.) Evening Day of July 21, 1940]

The comment of a number of New York delegates to the Chicago convention of the Democratic Party, to the effect that the "New Deal has become a raw deal" for James A. Farley, chairman of the Democratic National Committee and Postmaster General, about agrees with the estimate of many a political observer in the matter. The belief grows that Farley, early in the present term of the President, was practically assured that Mr. Roosevelt would not run again, and encouraged by the Chief Executive to be a candidate himself. That, at least, is the story that some New York Democrats have heard, and it is supposed to come indirectly from Farley himself. Then, however, Farley was left out on the end of a limb, going ahead on the theory that it was all right to seek the nomination himself while head of the national committee, yet growing increasingly aware of the President's odd silence about his plans. In the end Farley, of course, was left in the position of appearing to be pushing his own candidacy against that of the President—"disloyal," in other words, to "the chief."

The loss of Farley in the campaign, it is believed, will mean far more in the outcome of the election than any other factor bearing upon its operation. This doesn't mean, of course, that one or the other of the major party candidates could not do or say something of more significance than the Farley resignation, expected tomorrow. It does mean that, of all the routine factors in the operation of a campaign, the presence of Farley's organizing ability on the New Deal side is by far the most outstandingly important.

From the standpoint of fair play to Farley, the fact seems to be that he has, in many respects, received about the worst possible deal under the banner of the New Deal in other respects, also. Whenever he has had an opportunity to go out into the business world and recoup his fortunes—Farley is a long ways from a rich man—there has always been some appeal made to him to stand by the party. He has stood by, at great personal sacrifice, his friends say. In return the party, through the President, has treated him about as shabbily as it possibly could. The President long ago turned to the Corcorans, Cohens, Harry Hopkins, etc., for political counsel. Farley was crowded further and further off the scene. Yet, he was expected to continue to line up the party for the New Deal, no matter how coldly treated, and apparently never lifted his finger to knife the President, as he might have done.

[From the Newark Evening News of July 20, 1940]

GONE BUT NOT FORGOTTEN

Distracted as we have been by the noise of breaking traditions at Chicago, we confess he has escaped our attention up to now. We mean democracy's forgotten man. No, not Jim Farley. As all are aware, Jim didn't get the convention's votes. But he did get a lot of cheers. Mr. Roosevelt pulled all the stops for Good Old Pal Jim—on a coast-to-coast hook-up. Thus fortified, Jim is about the business of taking over the New York Yankees, who, to inject an alien note, have been taken over by most of the American League this season.

As we say, we didn't refer to Jim. We had in mind that vanishing American, that forgotten man of Pennsylvania Avenue and the Panhandle, "Cactus JACK" GARNER. The gentleman from Texas, who once uttered wise words about letting the cattle put on fat, has

yielded to the gentleman from Iowa. He will now find more time for Texas trout. Certainly the happy hunting grounds about Uvalde will see more of him. In any event, if Mr. GARNER is not the forgotten man, he will do until the November election makes a new "ex" for us.

[From the Nashville Tennesseean of July 19, 1940]

GOOD LUCK, JIM

Democrats of the Nation should always be glad that James A. Farley's name was presented to the national convention as a candidate for the Presidency, and that the man who has done so much for the party received a flattering vote despite the fact that the honor was destined to go to another.

Jim Farley is entitled to carry away that memory as he yields the national chairmanship to retire to private life. He knows, we trust, that the vote was no true yardstick of the esteem in which he is held, and that the party will not forget his magnificent service.

From the beginning of the convention, it now appears, the Postmaster General had resigned himself to severing the official ties between himself and the membership. His opening address was in itself a valedictory.

Throughout the sessions he was beset with uncertainty, but never did he lose his smile nor speak a word that might have caused party disunity.

Because he had promised those pledged to him that his name would go before the convention, he saw that it was done—by such an old war horse as Senator CARTER GLASS. But when his highest hopes were extinguished, he welcomed the chance to call for suspension of the rules so that the convention's choice might be made unanimous. And it was on that occasion that he must have been overwhelmed by the gathering's spontaneous tribute to unfailing courage and sportsmanship.

As he leaves politics for more fruitful fields, Jim Farley can look back upon a record that is unsullied by any unworthy act. Above all else, he has been loyal to causes and individuals. He has kept the faith and honored his convictions. No man in the land can claim more personal friends among people of all classes and creeds.

Jim Farley has come far since his early days in a small New York town. His place in history has been written as one who was instrumental in making a President and launching an administration that has done much for the country. He has been the organizing genius of his party and he has served with ability in the national Cabinet.

Although his surrender of party leadership will be regretted, there can be no misunderstanding of the natural desire to turn his talents to other fields at this time. Nashville and Middle Tennessee, which he has frequently visited, join with other cities and communities the land over in expressing the confident hope that the success which has been his in the past will further reward him in the future.

To the man whose heart harbors no rancor and whose code permits no disloyalty to his party under any circumstances, democracy cannot adequately express its thanks and gratitude.

[From the Nashville (Tenn.) Banner of July 20, 1940]

CHAIRMAN FARLEY

Genial Jim Farley, as had been anticipated for some time, has announced his retirement from the chairmanship of the Democratic National Committee, to become effective August 17. The brief delay was, doubtless, designed to relieve his action of the appearance of precipitancy, and to enable him, as evidence of his continued loyalty to the party that he has served with conspicuous ability, to assist his successor in setting up the machinery for the campaign.

The reason which Mr. Farley gives as leading him to the conclusion of his official position—that he desires to pay attention to long-neglected personal affairs, and to accept a highly lucrative financial offer—is doubtless valid; but, had not political differences of a positive character arisen between him and the President, and especially as to a third term, it is more than probable that he would have continued to serve him and his party in the responsible post which for so many years he had occupied.

The retirement, in its broad and essential aspect, represents what will be naturally regarded as being the parting of the ways between two men who had traveled side by side in intimate fellowship, though Mr. Farley is careful to emphatically assert that he will support the Democratic national ticket, hopes for its success, and predicts it.

The campaign will be scarcely begun when Mr. Farley retires. As it is not probable that the formal speeches of acceptance by the Presidential nominees will have been made before August 17; and, as has been indicated from the White House, Mr. Roosevelt will not make his formal acceptance until after that of Mr. Willkie, it may be that these addresses, which are accepted as marking the formal opening of a campaign, may not be before the country before Mr. Farley retires.

Two names, and only two, are prominently connected with the succession. One is that of Frank Walker of New York, wealthy manufacturer, who for a brief season was officially connected with the New Deal; the other is that of JAMES F. BYRNES. The South Carolina Senator was the real, if not titular, manager of President Roosevelt's interests at the recent Chicago convention, though Secretary Hopkins was on the scene a week before the convention met to see that the third-term machinery worked smoothly.

Mr. BYRNES has repeatedly done effective work in the Senate when proposals close to the White House were encountering obstacles. He is popular with his associates, adroit, and a man of real ability. He is said to much prefer giving his entire time to senatorial matters to responsible engagement in the management of a national campaign.

The prevailing opinion is that Mr. Walker will be named by the President to the special group from the national committee that has been designated to ascertain his preference.

Perhaps public opinion would accord the position of primacy among national chairmen of both parties in the last half century to Mr. Farley on the Democratic side and Mark Hanna on the Republican. Hanna is remembered as having been the Warwick of McKinley's fortunes, just as, in a substantial sense, Mr. Farley was to Mr. Roosevelt. Though Mr. Hanna did effective work to secure the nomination for McKinley, his service was by no means comparable to that which Mr. Farley rendered for Mr. Roosevelt.

Looking back at the situation throughout the country preceding the national convention of 1932, and in the convention itself, grave doubt arises, in fact, as to whether Mr. Roosevelt could have been nominated 8 years ago had it not been for the untiring, skillful, and huge amount of work done in his behalf by the man who is now to sever his connection with the national committee. It was recognized at the time that the vote-corralling cross-country tour made by Mr. Farley months before the convention, when he launched an organized Roosevelt movement, gave to it both strength and impetus; and his direction of the contest for the nomination in the convention was undoubtedly strongly contributory to the nomination.

Hanna's conspicuous service to McKinley was rather in managing and financing the campaign against Bryan than in obtaining the nomination for his choice. McKinley was the foremost representative of the doctrine of protection, then at its zenith. The tariff measure bore his name, but it was the millions that Hanna, exerting all possible pressure and means of approach, obtained from the protection interests of the country that enabled him to defeat the Commoner.

Hanna's war chest has been variously estimated at from $7,000,000 to $12,000,000, while Bryan had less than $1,000,000. Even at that, the change of a few hundred thousand votes, if made in a comparatively small group of States, would have made Bryan President.

Though Mr. Farley's direction of both the campaigns of 1932 and 1936 was notably skillful, it was not, as the results showed, as vital a factor in the November decisions as were Hanna's tactics and methods in McKinley's campaign.

[From the Montgomery Advertiser of July 19, 1940]

JIM FARLEY

The people in the great convention hall at Chicago gave Jim Farley thunderous applause upon all appropriate occasions. He didn't have a chance to obtain many votes for President, in the circumstances, but if Mr. Roosevelt had been out of the way and there had been a free-for-all, "Old Jim" would have made a great race. As it was, many of his delegates stuck doggedly to him to the end and did not switch until he personally released them and asked that Mr. Roosevelt be nominated by acclamation. This final speech by Farley showed his spirit of generosity and sportsmanship at its best. The convention recognized this and gave him a great hand.

[From the Montgomery Advertiser of July 13, 1940]

JIM FARLEY

American politics has not before produced a personality quite like James A. Farley, Postmaster General and chairman of the Democratic National Committee, who at the moment is by way of taking leave of politics to enter upon a profitable private business career.

Mr. Farley suffers from the cumulative hurts of political experience. Men do not remain long in office before the scars begin to form. There is no other bitterness, except defeat of the heart in a great love, which runs so deep as political disappointment. Few men are temperamentally prepared to absorb these hurts in good grace, except outwardly. Mr. Farley's temperament is buoyant, he is a sport and a take-it-or-leave-it man of affairs. He knows the political facts of this life. Nevertheless he has been hurt, perhaps unavoidably. He once wanted to be the Presidential nominee, failing that he wanted to be the Vice Presidential nominee, he was opposed to a third term for Mr. Roosevelt, he wanted to get into the ring and slug it out with other candidates below the rank of F. D. R.

But inexorable circumstances made this dream futile if not fantastic. Public opinion in the Democratic Party, conditioned as it is by the first world revolution ever known, left Farley and his dream stranded. A year ago he was aggrieved at his chief, feeling that he had been let down out of a cold spirit of ingratitude. Now he must realize that events beyond the control of any American leader or group of leaders are picking the American team. Mr. Farley is no match for the first world revolution.

[From the Montgomery Advertiser of July 21, 1940]

The newspaper writers at the convention gave Jim Farley a dinner, a watch, a baseball, a catcher's mitt, and assurances of their personal affection—a great tribute to him by a hard-boiled, cynical lot. His reply to the tribute is a lesson to other biggies who have frequent contacts with representatives of the press. For 8 turbulent years Jim has been a member of the President's Cabinet. He was at the same time chairman of the Democratic National Committee

Newspapermen encountered him daily. They questioned him frankly, he answered them frankly. He withheld nothing from them that he was privileged to release. He talked expansively to them, saying at the end of the interview, "Boys, don't let me down." He knew that he could trust them to write discreetly of what he said in his honest Irish candor. He wasn't afraid of them, they weren't afraid of him—nearly all of them were on his side and wanted to help him just because he was "Old Jim." He never heckled the press, he never reneged on an interview, he never quarreled with the reporters. And so after the pleasant incident in Chicago when the newspaper writers honored "Old Jim" he said: "You boys never let me down." Mr. Farley is beyond all question better loved by newspaper writers than any other man (or woman) who has sat in a Presidential Cabinet within the life of his generation.

[From the Milwaukee (Wis.) Journal of July 18, 1940]

THE TRIBUTE TO FARLEY

Though he live for many years, and we hope that he will, we doubt that Jim Farley will ever know a prouder moment than when he and the Democratic Convention of 1940 and listening millions of his fellow Americans heard Senator GLASS, of Virginia, proclaim him:

"A man on whose word every human being can rely."

No man needs a finer tribute. No man living could buy or wring or shoot from CARTER GLASS a tribute he did not mean.

[From the Mobile (Ala.) Register of July 23, 1940]

FARLEY'S RETIREMENT SHOULD BE DAY OF SADNESS FOR DEMOCRATIC PARTY

The National Democratic Convention produced a number of popular heroes, but lord of them all was the genial gentleman responsible for the party's successes in 1932 and 1936, National Chairman James A. Farley.

He dared actively at Chicago to oppose a third term for President Roosevelt as an expression of his personal conviction against establishment of the precedent; and, as was entirely expected, he received only a few votes as a Presidential candidate. Nevertheless, after the final convention note had died away, Postmaster Farley probably stood more popular and influential than at any time during his political career. He found strength in defeat, vastly increasing his popularity through courageous opposition to the President's renomination and because of the sportsmanlike manner in which he accepted his political fate and disappointment over Mr. Roosevelt's historic decision.

When Chairman Farley steps down this week, as is expected, as active head of the Democratic Party, it should be a day of mourning for the party that is being led further and further away from the political ideals and personal integrity championed by Mr. Farley. His valuable guidance was obviously missing from the recent convention and his loss will be more keenly felt during the campaign ahead.

Jim Farley was no cheap politician, and his word was respected by all. There is a pressing need today for party affairs to be conducted on the same high plane. If Mr. Roosevelt and the national Democratic executive committee name a political boss of Mayor Kelly's type as Mr. Farley's successor, they will materially weaken the party and create another handicap for the President to carry to the polls in November. Nomination of Mayor Kelly as chairman of the national Democratic executive committee would be a heavier millstone about the neck of the Democratic Party than selection of Secretary Wallace as its Vice Presidential candidate.

In choosing a successor to Mr. Farley, President Roosevelt has the timeliest of opportunities to decide whether "bossism" will or will not be allowed to control the Democratic Party. America eagerly awaits his decision.

[From the Minneapolis Tribune of July 20, 1940]

FARLEY RETIRES

The third term campaign will miss the firm, deft, directing hand of James A. Farley. His retirement as national chairman on August 17 means that the campaign strategy and executive management will be taken over by others. No one can blame him for retiring from politics to take an alluring business offer, and no associate of his can begrudge him success in the future of his chosen field.

It is no exaggeration to say that Jim Farley made Franklin Roosevelt President the first time. It was Farley who toured the States a year ahead, selling his candidate and preparing the delegations that were to meet in Chicago in 1932. Ever since that time he has carried the load of party management in addition to the labors of the Postmaster General. Though, out of sympathy with what Hugh Johnson calls the "fourth New Deal," Farley never disowned his chief, and he never became a candidate for President until he had tried in vain to learn Mr. Roosevelt's intentions.

When Farley told the correspondents that his name would go before the convention, he made them a promise to that effect. As Senator GLASS said in his nominating speech, Farley is a man "on whose word every human being can rely." He did not break the promise. He received 72$^{27}/_{90}$ votes on the roll call, but there was nothing small or fractional about the esteem in which he was held by his fellow Democrats. He was by all odds the most popular man, had the most real friends, of anyone in that Chicago stadium. As he prepares to leave political life, Mr. Farley has nothing for which to reproach himself, unless it is that he carried his loyalty too far.

Addison's Cato said: "'Tis not in mortals to command success, but we'll do more, Sempronius, we'll deserve it." That might well serve as Farley's political farewell.

[From the Minneapolis (Minn.) Times-Tribune of July 22, 1940]

EXIT FARLEY

The passing from the political scene of James A. Farley will be regretted not only by members of his own party, but by Republicans as well, for in this genial gentleman are those human qualities which are so generally loved, and so frequently taken advantage of—loyalty, fidelity, honesty and kindliness. That he suffered the fate of so many king and president makers from Wolsey to Colonel House, adds more than a touch of feeling to his departure, in which there is an appreciable measure of resentment, not greatly lessened by the last-minute avowals of affection from the White House.

It has been demonstrated innumerable times that loyalty is a virtue that is its own reward, and the case of Farley can hardly add to the proof that gratitude diminishes in proportion to the quality and quantity of service rendered.

Whether President Roosevelt would have attained the governorship of New York and the Presidency of the United States without the talents and devotion of Farley, is a debatable question, but there can be no question that Farley's assistance was of the greatest value, once frankly recognized and proclaimed but eventually depreciated to the vanishing point with the ascendancy of Hopkins, Ickes, and the other starry-eyed adulatory members of the palace guard.

That the rank and file of the Democratic Party has affection and respect for Mr. Farley was manifest by the thunderous applause that followed Senator GLASS' nominating speech on the night that the President was drafted. They knew what he had done over the years for the party and they were aware of his recompense. They evinced their disapproval of his cavalier treatment by the only method available, to show him that the party appreciated his services.

The reaction from the White House to this demonstration was prompt. Overnight there was a galvanic resumption of the "old pal" attitude. The demonstrations against Wallace no doubt suggested that there might be a serious need for the tranquilizing technique of the master politician, whose self-effacing industry has kept the Democratic machine running with a minimum of friction.

It is by no means a certainty that the party cannot attain success in November without the actual assistance of Farley. He has done his work so well that the organization may function without his direction. He will not "take a walk." He is too big a man for that. He will not sulk or give expression to the disappointment which he must, being human, feel. Loyalty is ingrained in him, and no matter what comes he will still be a Democrat, though never a believer in the third term.

The country will wish him well, regardless of party ties, with the hope that Jim will get more lasting satisfaction out of pennants than he has out of Presidents.

[From the Minneapolis (Minn.) Star-Journal of July 20, 1940]

A GOOD SOLDIER'S FAREWELL

Out of national politics, as the new campaign begins, goes Jim Farley, operating manager of Roosevelt's political fortunes since the President became Governor of New York.

He can hardly be said to be returning to private life, for the presidency of the New York Yankees merely moves him into the sports spotlight from the political spotlight. But the greatest political team of our times—Roosevelt and Farley—is about to be broken up.

Nobody knows better than Farley the disappointments and slender rewards, as well as the high satifactions, of political life. He has had to endure a good deal of abuse, both from inside and outside his party, and to subordinate his own ambitions repeatedly to those of his chief. But he has been a good fighter, a square-shooting victor, a sportsmanlike loser.

"I've been in politics 31 years," he said the other day, "and there isn't one man I've met during that time with whom I'm not still on speaking terms."

Good-bye, Jim, take keer of yourse'f.

Sorry we can't go so far as to wish your Yankees a fifth term in the World series.

[From the Milwaukee (Wis.) Evening Post of July 23, 1940]

THE CASE OF JIM FARLEY

Almost everyone likes Jim Farley and has a twinge of regret on account of his break with Roosevelt.

Up to the time of the Democratic National Convention, the cause of the break was not well understood. It was not explained there, either; that is, not in words. However, one only has to piece a few things together in order to reveal the apparent cause.

His selection of Senator CARTER GLASS to make his nomination speech seems in itself to reveal the whole trouble.

The Senator is an enemy of the New Deal. Mr. Farley would hardly have selected him to make the nominating speech if he had not been in agreement with the Senator's attitude toward the Roosevelt policies.

This indicates rather clearly where the trouble lies. Those who have been blaming the President for cold-shouldering Farley and ceasing to make him one of the confidential White House advisers probably will have to alter their viewpoint in that matter. If Farley did not believe in the New Deal, the President could do no other than to cease to accept his advice, even though he may have keenly regretted the necessity of doing so.

Farley virtually made Roosevelt President in the first place. While serving as Governor of New York, previous to 1932, Mr. Roosevelt had not yet shown any especially striking ability; neither had he developed the glamour that came later; neither had he become a radio favorite. He was apparently just another Governor, except that he was Governor of the pivotal State of New York, which is a great advantage to any person who wants to run for President.

With that advantage in his favor, Jim Farley undertook to make him a Presidential candidate—and succeeded.

This strenuous and brilliant work by Farley was done before the Democratic National Convention in 1932. After the convention no particular brilliance was necessary in order to win the election. It was much like rolling off a log, for the Hoover ineptness had handed the Presidency in advance to whomsoever the Democratic candidate might be. Nevertheless, Farley did a good job of managing the campaign.

He did a still better job in 1936, when about 80 or 90 percent of the press was in favor of Alf Landon, the Kansas sunflower. Farley actually forecast the outcome of that election correctly, conceding only two States to Landon. He sure is a wizard in managing political campaigns.

But when Roosevelt began the purge of tory Democrats in 1938, Farley refused to go along. It was thought merely that he was such a strong organization man that he did not want to oppose any Democrat. It was not thought that he agreed with the tories.

Now it seems that he kept out of the purge because he really did agree with them. What else can the selection of GLASS mean?

In any event, practically all onlookers at the political scene in the last dozen years will regret to see him make his bow and disappear through the wings. That is, all onlookers except Wendell Willkie and his supporters. They have reason to be jubilant over Farley's exit.

Futility of War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSH LEE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 8 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

ARTICLE BY HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS OF UTAH

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled, "Nations Do Not Fulfill Their Destiny in War," written by the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], and appearing in the July-August number of the China Monthly.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONS DO NOT FULFILL THEIR DESTINY IN WAR

(By Senator ELBERT D. THOMAS)

The problems facing China, like those facing the western world, are not simple, but exceedingly complex. China has now had many decades of great problems, yet through them all she has evolved a form of nationalism which in its spirit and idealistic state bears all of the characteristics of ultimate success. We may say, in fact, that the turmoil which faces China today, compared with China's condition three or four decades ago, bids fair to be a heartening influence in the world, the like of which mankind has seldom seen.

This is a day of great revolutions. There are probably similar factors which have produced those great revolutions. When we think of India, of Russia, and of China, we see both differences and similarities. The problem facing each of these great cultural centers of the world is not merely a political one; it is economic, it is spiritual, it is educational. Above all, the ultimate unifying idea behind these three great revolutions is that each of these populous culture centers must provide a condition which will make life itself more enduring and more secure for most of the people in these vast areas.

Perhaps I am thinking the way I am because the real interest in China today centers around how to win the present war with Japan; and likely because that problem is so acute our minds naturally turn toward it rather than toward the chronic conditions underlying the great revolution of which the war is an incident. The solving of the acute problem of the present war will not correct these chronic, underlying conditions which are responsible for the great revolutions.

China's struggle for independence and stable nationalism has arrived at that stage which some of us pointed out years ago would have to come; that is, the stage wherein some one nation assumes the brunt of all the antagonisms aroused against the many. To illustrate, at the time of the Boxer Rebellion China's actions united many nations against her and these nations each exacted its individual toll. The first movements within China against the unilateral treaties and the foreign controls were movements against many nations. Japan, having taken the place of one after another of these nations, now assumes alone the brunt of the whole attack; and China's actions, which were in the beginning primarily against the west, are today actions primarily against a sister eastern neighbor. Thus Japan has inherited or assumed "responsibilities and rights" which others asserted. Whether or not those responsibilities and rights are worth maintaining is a question which Japan must decide. She, like China, is probably too busy in attempting to solve a single problem of winning a war to be conscious of the greater problems.

These thoughts come to the minds of those persons in the world who genuinely admire both the cultures of Japan and China. Never can either of those two cultures go forward in such a way as to contribute to the advancement of human well-being until they go hand in hand. If China were to build her new nationalism upon hatred due to her war with Japan, it would be a fatal mistake. Were Japan to build her concept of a new Asia based upon the theory of Japan's right to exploit China, that would be fatal to both China and Japan. Some way or other, in order that both these great nations may contribute properly to world welfare, they must be brought together in cooperative endeavor. Probably there could be a no more inexpedient time than the present to make such a suggestion, even for a well-wisher. Still, it is in the time of strife and turmoil that the most constructive plans for a better world are generally evolved. No thoughtful Chinese can ever think of a defeated, crushed, worn-out Japan as contributing to the betterment of Far Eastern affairs. No thoughtful Japanese can conceive of an exploited, harassed, war-torn, poverty-stricken China as contributing anything to the welfare of a better Asia. Poverty begets poverty. It does not make for higher standards. If, then, the distress which the present war is causing brings ills which are mutual, the overcoming of that stress may, if it is done in a constructive way, bring benefits which, too, may be mutual.

These ideas are not foreign to the thinking of the Chinese, well grounded as they are in their own history and literature. I have always felt that nations which become victims of their own aggressive ambitions, nations which attempt to have their own way by force, ultimately hurt themselves. That, I believe, is the history of national strife. China is the "long-lived empire" because her expansions were natural. She has been imposed upon from without, but never has she forced herself on others excepting by the slow process of peaceful infiltration. If we searched history hard enough, we should probably find some exceptions to this statement. Japan, too, during the hundreds of years of her growth and development into that empire whose past the Japanese constantly remind us is responsible for producing a happy and strong nation, never extended herself beyond the confines of what may be termed her natural boundaries until she adopted the western notion which we now call imperialism. Both the Chinese people and the Japanese people are proud of the mighty changes which have taken place since the turn of this century and which are taking place in each country today. Those changes may, though, in a long survey of history and cultural development seem comparatively unimportant.

Being an American, my type of thinking is closely associated with the philosophical concept of progress and therefore makes me always assume that no matter how great the past may have been, the future will be more resplendent. But this may not necessarily be the case. Mistakes may be made in the Far East at the present time which may retard growth and development. Any ignoring of the fundamentals which go into social and cultural development will bring about a retardation.

Some of the fundamentals which are being grossly abused as a result of the present war may with benefit be considered here. An old Chinese social and economic proverb reads something like this: "If you gather together in one place the wealth of the people, you divide the people; but if you scatter among the people the wealth, you unite the people." Of course, if war destroys all wealth, then, it seems that we have unity because there is no wealth to divide. The sad thing about the present attempts to build Chinese unity and to hold together that which had been already attained in Japanese unity, is that in the destruction of wealth caused by this war the means of properly uniting people may also be destroyed. There is an old Japanese prophecy—and since I say Japanese, it was probably Chinese also—which I remember having learned a long time ago, which said that when men fly like birds 10 kings will go to war. Now, I do not suppose that man's learning how to fly is responsible for the almost universal war that the world has seen since the air was conquered, but the prophecy seem to imply that man's ability to fly makes for strife. It surely makes for wars of greater extent, and if man is destined to destroy himself, that terrible eventuality seems more possible. But that is not man's destiny. This fact history proves—that peoples who have made war their national objective and their most intensive occupation have become extinct. Surely, then, such a nation as China, whose ability to live so long may be ascribed to her fundamental political and social order, both of which have been based upon a life of peace and an aim toward good living, will survive.

China's real test will come when the opportunity for a return to peaceful habits comes. What a wonderful nation she will make when she is able to combine the great fundamentals of her social, economic, and political stability with her new knowledge in regard to health, sanitation, education, and engineering. If she can retain the great genius of her past while the new habits of the present are crystallizing and becoming universal, China will be the marvel of the ages and her people will become the envy of the world. What a task, therefore, rests upon her present-day leadership. May the travail through which she is now passing make greater and not mar that which the world has characterized for so many hundreds of years as Chinese civilization.

Tribute to the Late Col. Richard Rutledge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 8 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

ARTICLE BY CARL JACOBSON

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, last spring Colorado laid to his eternal rest her majestic adopted son, Col. "Dick" Rutledge. It was his privilege to commune with such hardy, restless, venturesome spirits as Colonel Cody, General Sheridan, and Kit Carson; to know their trials and burdens; and to serve with them in building the West.

Colonel Rutledge migrated in an oxcart to Colorado when it was a bleak wilderness and devoted the balance of his life to its remarkable growth and development.

Carl Jacobson, his friend and mine, penned a deeply deserved tribute to Colonel Rutledge under the caption of The Scout's Last Trail. I ask unanimous consent to insert this splendid article in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SCOUT'S LAST TRAIL

(By Carl Jacobson)

A thrilling chapter in the glorious and romantic history of the boundless West has closed with the recent passing of one of the most colorful of pioneers, Col. Richard Rutledge, of Denver, Colo.

Born nearly a century ago in Missouri, just at a time when the westward trek was beginning, Rutledge's venturesome spirit and youthful zeal led him to Colorado in an oxcart expedition—a traditionally primitive mode of early transportation that was truly western. He was only 19 when he contacted a scouting band to be with Kit Carson until the latter's death. His tales of many miraculous escapes from danger from hostile red men are classics in the lore of the plainsmen. In time he joined a former playmate of childhood days, the world-renowned Buffalo Bill. The days of Indian battles passed, he turned to aid in the commercial development of the West by freighting between Colorado mining towns during boom years. As late as 1923, Rutledge preserved the customs of a bygone age by migrating in a prairie schooner from Wyoming to Colorado. He spent his last years in the Queen City of the Plains, a living symbol of the pioneer era, his widely mourned death occurring in the spring of 1940.

His mortal life is ended, but the immortal spirit of this beloved scout will forever move along the historic and picturesque trails of the mountains and plains he loved so well and to which he devoted a long career of courageous sacrifice.

Significant, too, is the marking of the conquest of America's last continental frontier by the demise of this last survivor of the famed scouts, Kit Carson and Buffalo Bill. The advent of modern civilization with its tense might and mad tempo has gradually removed every vestige of that vast unconquered empire, which but a lifetime ago was inhabited only by roving Indian tribes and howling beasts and swept by the merciless elements of nature.

Words cannot adequately express the deep tribute which we must pay to the indomitable fortitude of Dick Rutledge, who lived 95 years through the building of a world of streamlined civilization from a barren wilderness. The most flattering superlatives at our command cannot honor fully his initiative and individualism. Were it not for these vital qualities possessed by the builders of the West—men such as Colonel Cody, General Sheridan, Kit Carson, and Colonel Rutledge—the American Nation would be deplorably lacking in the ideals of faith in the future, which have brought it incomparable greatness. The unequaled accomplishments of our method of life would have been impossible without the fearless confidence and resolute heroism of the pioneers.

Let the mad dictators of Europe learn that the men whose deeds endure and whose place in mortality and eternity is secured are built of such mettle as was Colonel Rutledge, rather than being regimented puppets of a blood-fed machine of carnage and destruction. Our Nation is great because we revere the builders—God-fearing men and women whose sacrifice and loyalty have blazed the trails which lead to security and peace, found at our homes, firesides, and altars.

We loathe the haters of mankind, the despoilers of culture and civilization, for whose self-vaunted false greatness nations and empires fall and people suffer cruelly and unjustly.

Colonel Rutledge never forsook for a moment the path of duty nor faltered in carrying out the demands of an ever-progressing empire. Fostered in a spirit of adventure; broadened into a long career of brilliant and valuable scouting expeditions under three of the most notable figures of western history, Cody, Sheridan, and Carson; given fruition in old age by remaining with nobility and benign dignity a true personification of the passing frontier, his remarkable life is an inspiring saga of national heroism.

Our hearts will fill with sadness as we gather to witness events which denote the modernization and expansion of the West, for we shall miss the traditional figure of the beloved scout who was always present for these occasions, bespeaking his keen interest in seeing the fruits of the toil of earlier days, and in experiencing the realization of fond dreams.

His hearty handclasp will be but a cherished memory, but it has left us with the intense pride of having felt kindred to the spirit he typified, in our personal association.

In every parade there will be a void, which only a short time ago was filled by a tall, kindly gentleman with flowing white hair, whose upraised hand of greeting excited admiration in the hearts of all, and conveyed a deeper sense of devotion to those who fully realized what he had done to make their happiness and comfort possible. May his soul march on forever.

In times of national stress and world crisis, we fervently respect the living patriotism, and that was Colonel Rutledge's. Its depth and intensity is real, for he gave his all that freedom might be universal in this land. This he owed largely to the genuine American stock from which he sprung, including two signers of the Declaration of Independence and a famous cousin, Ann Rutledge, sweetheart of the Great Emancipator.

Many of the world's most eminent figures have been sublime in their simplicity. Humility is a cardinal virtue of true greatness. Colonel Rutledge disdained frills and foolish fads and the unnecessary fancies of life, and abhorred personal glory and selfish gain. In his own words, this praiseworthy ideal is most aptly expressed: "I can clearly say that the scouts should ever be remembered, as they all died poor, as money was not their pride, but our country and our fellow man, and for humanity and love for our dear ones that have passed to the Great Beyond."

Col. Dick Rutledge is no more of this world, but has passed on to a glorious reward, leaving behind a rich heritage of accomplishment, foresight, vision, loyalty, patriotism, and faith. The West forever owes him a debt of gratitude and appreciation for the vital part he played in its building. America is indebted deeply for the pioneer spirit without which our national unity could never have been effected. The world shall know men of our land, such as Colonel Rutledge, for their exemplification of the American way of life, founded on the principles of liberty, justice, and Christianity.

"His work is done.
But while the races of mankind endure,
Let his great example stand,
Till in all lands and thro' all human story
The path of duty be the way to glory:
And as the greatest only are,
In his simplicity sublime.
O good gray head which all men knew,
No more in soldier fashion will he greet
With lifted hand the gazer in the street.
O iron nerve to true occasion true,
Such was he whom we deplore.
The long self-sacrifice of life is o'er.
What know we greater than the soul?
On God and Godlike men we build our trust."

—*Tennyson.*

Invasion of the South by Wendell L. Willkie

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 8 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

ARTICLE BY GEORGE ROTHWELL BROWN

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article by George Rothwell Brown regarding the decision of Wendell Willkie to invade Dixie.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHICAGO, July 18.—Wendell Willkie's tentative decision to invade Dixie in an effort to break the Solid South next November is a wise one.

It would be the irony of fate if the birthplace and nursery of Mr. Roosevelt's first experiment with the New Deal "more abundant life"—T. V. A.—should throw its support in the coming elections to the Republican candidate.

But, strange as it may seem, Tennessee, largest beneficiary of T. V. A., may give its 11 electoral votes to the former head of Commonwealth & Southern.

Mr. Willkie stands mighty well in the group of Southern States serviced by his former power companies and, as Senator "Cotton Ed" SMITH, disgruntled Jeffersonian Democrat, of South Carolina, said in announcing that he would not go to the Chicago convention, a whole lot of people down in Dixieland are going to vote for Willkie.

Make no mistake about it; the New Deal high command is very apprehensive on this score, which explains why Representative RANKIN, of Mississippi, and Charlie Michelson's smear brigade, have tried to fasten the Power Trust and Wall Street labels on the disconcerting runaway prairie fire who now confronts the New Deal on every political frontier.

Last week the House Appropriations Committee tried to jam through under unanimous-consent agreement a bill appropriating $65,800,000 to T. V. A. in the next 3 years under the guise of a national-defense emergency measure. Of this the very spicy sum of $25,000,000 was to be made available this election year.

It would seem that the mountain folk down in Tennessee still need at least $25,000,000 worth of additional education in the blessings of the New Deal.

Tennessee has four major cities of 100,000 or more population, Knoxville, Nashville, Chattanooga, and Memphis. Each has two representative daily newspapers.

Seven of these eight newspapers are actively supporting Mr. Willkie. The eighth is published by one of Jim Farley's early New Deal satellites, Silliman Evans, formerly of Texas.

It doesn't make much sense to argue that seven newspapers can be wrong and the eighth one right. Newspapers usually reflect the mass mind of the people in the communities they serve; and in spite of the great boon that T. V. A. is supposed to have brought to Tennessee, it is reasonable to suppose that these seven newspapers which are supporting Willkie know what their subscribers are thinking.

Mr. Willkie has been doing business with the people of Tennessee for a good many years. That is one State in which the people know him mighty well.

Don't think that Tennessee can't go Republican if it makes up its mind to do it. It did so in 1924 and again in 1928, and the signs indicate that history is about to repeat.

Anyhow, the new dealers in Congress fear so, and hence the last-minute effort since Mr. Willkie was nominated to dump another $25,000,000 for T. V. A. into Tennessee between now and election day.

In blocking consideration of the bill in the House the other day Representative MCLEAN, New Jersey Republican, said:

"This is just another evidence of customary T. V. A. stupidity in trying to expand its ordinary program under the cloak of national defense."

The increase of Republican sentiment in Tennessee squares with reports from other parts of the South of Mr. Willkie's high standing with the people of Dixie. A newspaper friend who recently spent some time in South Carolina told this writer he was simply amazed by the evidence of Willkie's popularity in that most typical of all Southern States.

Maybe "Cotton Ed" SMITH knows what he is talking about when he predicts that many southern people are going to vote for the former Democrat, Wendell L. Willkie.

Refugee Children and Conditions in Belgium

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 8 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

NEWSPAPER ARTICLES

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have published in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD two articles which this morning appeared side by side on the front page of the Times-Herald newspaper, one of which advised of the passage of a bill in the House of Representatives yesterday which would, under certain conditions, permit American ships to evacuate English children from the British Isles to the United States in order that they may not suffer death at the hands of an invading army.

The other article advised that United States Ambassador Cudahy, of Belgium, had stated that Europe would be a living hell this winter as the result of starvation due to the British blockade. Those interested in children the world over are desirous of these defenseless children of Belgium being protected against death by starvation. The newspaper report states that such a plan to save from death by starvation these children was received with a cold shoulder by the British.

I think it little behooves the British to object to our feeding the starving children of Belgium to prevent their deaths by the thousands this winter in the face of the fact that we are attempting to save from death their children of the British Isles by evacuating them at this time.

It is my understanding that the British Government predicates its opposition to feeding Belgium children on the theory that foods and supplies sent to Belgium for the benefit of these children would be seized by the Germans for the purpose of feeding their soldiers. In answer to this, I recall that the executives of the American Red Cross and representatives of the Hoover Relief Organization of New York, who also had representatives in Poland, testified that when about $750,000 of food, clothing, and medical supplies were distributed in Poland by these two aforementioned organizations, that the Germans in no wise interfered with the proper distribution thereof; and Ambassador Cudahy, our American representative, appointed by Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Roosevelt's personal friend, states that he has assurances to the effect that if food and medical supplies are provided to these innocent children of Belgium that there would be no interference whatsoever from German authorities.

Shall we evacuate the English children from the British Isles to prevent their being slaughtered by the invading enemy and at the same time condemn children of Belgium to death by starvation?

In addition, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be published in the Appendix extracts from the very interesting book which I have before me, entitled America for Americans, the author of which is Mr. G. Allison Phelps, author and radio commentator of Hollywood, Calif.

Also, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have published, in connection with this subject, a very timely editorial from the Times-Herald of today entitled "Howling Hell This Winter."

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REFUGEE SHIPS VOTED BY HOUSE—ASKS UNITED STATES VESSELS TO EVACUATE CHILDREN

(By Ernest Barcella)

The House yesterday voted overwhelmingly to send American ships into European war zones to evacuate thousands of refugee children, mainly British, who await an uncertain fate.

The vote was on a bill by Representative THOMAS C. HENNINGS (Democrat), of Missouri, who appealed to his colleagues to show "our traditional disregard for the consequences of a charitable deed bravely done."

The measure, applying to children under 16 of all nations, would amend the Neutrality Act to permit the vessels to enter and leave combat zones after all belligerents had given prior assurance that they would not be molested. The ships would proceed without convoys and would be identified by large American flags.

An amendment by Representative JOHN C. SCHAFER (Republican), of Wisconsin, requires that "necessary adult personnel" accompanying the children must be composed of American citizens. Another amendment by Representative JOHN TAFER (Republican), of New York, would make American citizens who accept refugee children personally liable for their support. A similar measure by Senator CARTER GLASS (Democrat), of Virginia, is pending before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

Both bills are presumed to have administration endorsement, since the State Department did not oppose them. President Roosevelt said recently, however, that the problem requires careful consideration because of the hazards involved.

BRITISH COLD TO AID FOR WAR VICTIMS, GERMANS APPROVE—EXCELLENT IDEA," SAYS NAZI EMBASSY; "NO COMMENT," RESPONSE OF LOTHIAN

(By Fred Pasley)

American aid for a famine-threatened Europe to prevent it from becoming "a howling hell" this winter met with a polite but firm cold shoulder yesterday from British Embassy officials, while German Government representatives hailed it as "an excellent idea."

They were contacted by the writer for comment on an editorial appearing in the Times-Herald and New York News yesterday proposing establishment of an American relief commission to distribute food supplies to the millions of noncombatant men, women, and children who face starvation if outside help is not forthcoming by September.

STARVATION PREDICTED

The editorial was inspired by an interview given Tuesday in London by John Cudahy, United States Ambassador to Belgium. He predicted that in that country alone some 8,000,000 persons would be affected by the food shortage, with about 2,000,000 more Belgian refugees in similar straits in France.

Meanwhile congressional impetus was provided by Representative MARTIN J. KENNEDY (Democrat), of New York, who introduced a resolution authorizing the President to appoint a food relief commission "preferably headed by Herbert Hoover."

The commission would be authorized to distribute American surplus foods to Nazi-occupied territories, with the understanding that such action would not imply United States recognition of German conquest of these nations.

After reading a transcript of the editorial, a spokesman for Dr. Hans Thomsen, German chargé d'affaires, explained that diplomatic usage would not permit a formal statement until "the Embassy has been officially approached." Then, adding it was "an excellent idea," he expressed the hope it could be put into execution.

As to whether the Germans would confiscate food supplies for refugees to their own use, the spokesman referred the writer to Ernest J. Swift, of Washington, vice chairman of the American Red Cross in charge of insular and foreign operations, and Maurice Pate, vice president of the Commission for Polish Relief, associated with the Herbert Hoover organization in New York City.

PAID VISIT TO POLAND

Both Swift and Pate, each of whom visited German-occupied Poland, asserted that the Hitler high command attempted in no way to interfere with the distribution of food, clothing, and hospital sundries to victims of the "blitzkrieg."

"Every item reached its destination," said Swift, whose unit of the Red Cross handled $700,000 worth of supplies.

Pate added a poignant touch with the declaration that there are now some "10,000,000 children in Europe, who can't hurt anybody, waiting to be fed."

HOWLING HELL THIS WINTER

The above caption is suggested by some remarks which John Cudahy, United States Ambassador to Belgium, made in London day before yesterday. Mr. Cudahy, in a press interview, predicted that 8,000,000 Belgians will come "close to famine" by mid-September unless American shipments of food can get to them through the British blockade. Said Cudahy:

"Their situation is very, very serious. Belgium imports 75 percent of her wheat. Present supplies, with severe rationing—225 grams, or a half pound, of bread per person per day—will last until September 1, or at best until early October.

"If you gentlemen think the continent is a howling hell now, what do you think it will be this winter?"

British official reaction to the Cudahy statement was calm. British spokesmen, saying it is "unlikely that Britain will allow any food into German-occupied Europe," added:

"It is not at all certain that Europe will be in such a bad way as Mr. Cudahy thinks. Belgium and the other occupied countries have to make up their shortages from Germany. If the Germans are prepared to share fairly, there probably will not be any famine in Europe this winter."

The fact is that even if the Germans "share fairly"—which they won't—famine will not be averted in a fully blockaded Europe this winter.

Europe never has been able to produce enough food to sustain itself. It always has been a food-importing continent.

And the British intend to make this a complete blockade. They are already blockading France, Belgium, Holland, Denmark, Germany, and Norway. Now they talk of having to be careful about food imports to Spain, which is not yet in the war, because some of this food might leak out to the Axis powers.

What it all means is that the noncombatants of the principal European countries are to be pinched or killed by man-made famines this winter.

HUNGER AS A WEAPON

Hitler, for his part, is doing his best to starve out the British; and he seems to be getting some results. At least, the British have now reenacted their old World War criminal laws against food waste of any description.

This mass starvation is in prospect for Europe and Great Britain because two strong men—Winston Churchill and Adolf Hitler—are in a death struggle to find out which of them is the stronger.

The prospect of mass starvation does not worry Churchill or Hitler. To them it is all in the game of war. Starvation of the enemy's noncombatant population—women, children, men unable to fight—is as legitimate a weapon to these gents as tanks, airplanes, submarines, battleships, poison gas.

GET BUSY, AMERICANS

To us this seems one of the cruelest wars in history. We can compare it for cruelty only with the inter-Allied blockade after the World War, when, with Germany flat on its back, the Allies, at French insistence, went on starving the German people.

Our interventionists seem as calm about the whole thing as Churchill and Hitler. We believe American public opinion, however, should arouse itself and unite to bring pressure on the British Government to consent to these measures:

Formation of an American relief commission, perhaps headed by Herbert Hoover, the man best qualified by experience to head it.

This commission to negotiate with Hitler for distribution of American food shipments among noncombatants in need of food in all territory occupied by the Germans—these shipments to be allowed to pass the British blockade and the German counter-blockade without undue delays or red tape.

Distribution of all such food to be under the supervision of Americans, whose sworn duty it shall be to see that the food gets to noncombatants, instead of being confiscated by combatants.

There is no other way that we know of to keep Europe from becoming a howling hell this winter. There is no greater act of international charity and decency that the United States could perform. And there is no time to lose.

Don't you think it would be much smarter on our part to solve this problem of our children before shipping the children of foreigners to our shores and trying to solve theirs? Or are you, too, a victim of the European complex? Or have you a tenth cousin over there to whom you can give a job if you can get him over here (with his wife and European children) and discharge an American father to make room in your business for the alien?

And speaking of bringing European children into the United States: Are those who are so anxious that America's immigration laws be scuttled so that refugees can pour in here from Europe, just as anxious to bring in refugees from the war-stricken areas of China? And if not, why not? I've never heard of any great Nation-wide movement among bankers and motion-picture producers, and stars, and other representatives of moneyed interests, directed to evacuate Chinese children from regions in China that have been bombed by the Japanese. Aren't little Chinese boys and girls worthy of the Christly mercy and generosity of these sympathetic, warmhearted American humanitarians who have suddenly popped up in our midst?

What kind of hypocrites are these we have among us, anyway?

But this is not a question of whether or not it is right to evacuate children from war zones. We know it is both human and right to do so, whether they are the children of rich Europeans or the children of poverty-stricken Asiatics. The question is: When their own Fatherlands have colonies and possessions to which to send them, should our immigration laws be scuttled and such refugees be permitted to pour into the United States, a nation already deeply in debt, with millions unemployed and hundreds of thousands of its own children, living miserably, dependent upon charity which has been totally inadequate to care for them properly?

No! Let's not add to our own heavy burden. Let's keep out of this country hordes of refugees from either Paris, Palestine, Portsmouth, or Peking.

Anyone who says I do not sympathize with the European men and women and boys and girls who have been afflicted by the wars of their masters, is speaking an untruth. But I am wholly, completely, and utterly opposed to having America used as the soup kitchen of the world, especially when the soup we are feeding our own hungry masses has been so badly diluted that it contains little nourishment now for American citizens who must eat it or perish.

Transportation of Child Refugees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 8 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

ARTICLE BY BOAKE CARTER

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, no vote of mine will knowingly be cast against the best interest of any child refugee or otherwise. If refugee children are to be brought here, and I hope that they may, it must be done at the risk of the sending nation. Congress has already adopted such a policy with regard to passenger and freight transportation and for the well-being of our own children it should not be abrogated now. The hazard to the United States is too great for any reckless speculation. In this connection I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD as part of my remarks a pertinent article by Boake Carter vividly portraying the grave dangers involved in such a laudable, humanitarian enterprise.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REFUGEE CHILDREN—DON'T SEND SHIPS—DANGER TOO GREAT

(By Boake Carter)

One of the direct causes of our entry into the first World War was the continued torpedoing of our merchant vessels. The Germans, engaged in a death struggle with France and Britain, warned that all neutral vessels caught supplying goods to her enemies or found in specifically stated belligerent waters would be torpedoed.

To avoid that provocation in a second World War, Congress, before the war began, established an act of neutrality which barred United States merchant ships from belligerent seas. We made that national sacrifice in order to attain a greater common end—peace for ourselves and avoidance of incidents which would inflame the public mind and provoke our entry into another foreign war.

To date the President has conscientiously executed these desires of the American people. American ships have been and are almost entirely barred from entry into waters around Europe, lest any one of them be torpedoed or bombed, and a dangerous incident be created.

Now, however, there is rising a clamor from well-intentioned but minority groups demanding that Congress amend the Neutrality Act to permit passage of American-flag ships to Europe to bring back British children to the United States.

A House committee has approved such a proposal. Lord Lothian, the astute British Ambassador, has lent encouragement. Likewise, Mrs. Roosevelt has been actively buttonholing Congressmen and Senators. Advertisements in the papers have begun to appear—"Write or wire your Congressman."

But to his credit let it be said President Roosevelt has not lent encouragement to this newest emotional outburst. On the contrary, he has been distinctly cool toward the idea.

Hardly any proposal could be more dangerous. The pity is the more because the real menace is obscured by the obvious human interest—children—which is involved.

The British cannot spare the boats. That is the most popular excuse in this country for clamor for substitution of American boats. Well-meaning people, including some of our columnists, have said that no danger will accrue if our boats are well lighted, the belligerent governments notified of their passages, and German authorities permitted to examine each vessel to see that nothing is carried but children.

It was my good fortune to sail from Norfolk to New York a few days ago on the newest, largest, and fastest American liner, the S. S. *America*. She is mentioned as one of the boats which should be sent abroad for the children.

I sought from the officers information on the experiences that befell them on the other United States Line's ships while taking refugees out of Europe in the earlier days of the war. What would be the risks in sending United States ships abroad for children, I asked. This is roughly what they have to say:

Talk about well-lighted vessels, notification to belligerent governments, and consular searches look nice on paper, sound well over the radio—but that is all.

In the twilight of dusk and in the half-light of early dawn, the silhouette of a large ship is deceiving. If the vessel is proceeding in belligerent waters, and is sighted by a belligerent submarine, the sub commander can easily be deceived by lighting conditions. He may fire his torpedo first and ask questions after—for that is war and the vessels are in war zones.

If a vessel approaches from a foreshortened angle, at dusk or dawn, it is hard to tell from the low elevation of a submarine periscope what vessel she may be. The sub commander is within his rights in assuming it is a vessel of questionable character.

But, you may say, the governments at war will have all been informed by the movements of these child-carrying United States liners and will have, in turn, notified their naval vessels. But what of some submarine who might fail to receive that broadcast notification? What if its antenna were out of order?

If a German sub and the German Government had broadcast the notification of passage of the United States ships, and yet the sub torpedoed the vessel through mistake, who would be to blame? No one. Yet a broken-down submarine wireless on one sub could cause a chain of circumstances which might lead to a horrifying tragedy and plunge the United States into a paroxysm of emotion overnight, and into war on the morrow.

And if that should occur, would not far greater tragedy be brought on millions more children because of the humane but misguided effort to salvage some children from a European nation at war?

Would not the sinking of a United States boatload of English children create almost inevitable war for the United States, and so involve many millions more children—children of the United States?

To save a few, we are preparing to risk equal miseries for many more, as yet untouched by the red hand of war. Is this mercy? Is it humanity?

With the daily bombing raids on the British ports in progress right now, would it not be the height of folly to send American ships into those ports, even though their mission be one of mercy?

When pilots are trying to bomb targets below them, with enemy fighters shooting at them in the air, and antiaircraft gunners pelting them from the ground, the bomber pilot does not conveniently and thoughtfully fly down to some ship to see whether or not it has the Stars and Stripes painted on its decks, before he pulls his bomb-rack lever. Yet one misplaced bomb on one of these proposed American ships could bring the United States to the brink of war overnight.

And while it is not the desire of humane-minded Americans to provoke measures which will send their fellow citizens to war, do not forget that there are European nations—the British—for instance, who would not be annoyed to see occur any incident which would bring America into the war.

Conscription of Wealth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSH LEE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 8 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

STATEMENT OF PHILIP MURRAY

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I noticed in last night's newspaper that Mr. Philip Murray, vice chairman of the C. I. O., came out in favor of a conscription of wealth. I ask unanimous consent that the brief item be published in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the item was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Times-Herald of August 7, 1940]

CONSCRIPT WEALTH, MURRAY DEMANDS

PITTSBURGH, August 7.—Philip Murray, vice chairman of the Congress of Industrial Organizations, today charged industrial leaders with failure to cooperate in the defense program and demanded that the Government "take steps to conscript the country's wealth and commandeer the productive facilities necessary to defense."

In an address before the annual convention of the Inland Boatmen's Division of the C. I. O.'s National Maritime Union, Murray quoted Eugene Grace, chairman of the board of Bethlehem Steel Corporation, as declaring the corporation would not expand its facilities for defense purposes "unless the Government agrees to early amortization and guarantees substantial profits."

Conscription Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN J. KENNEDY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 8, 1940

LETTER TO MILITARY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I respectfully request the careful consideration of the House Committee on Military Affairs to my proposal on exemptions from the conscription act to the religious, as follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., August 7, 1940.

Re H. R. 10132, Wadsworth conscription bill.
MILITARY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE,
House of Representatives.

GENTLEMEN: To me it seems imperative that action be taken by your committee to insure that the Wadsworth bill be so modified as to make due provision for the religious life of the American people. As you know, the sole provision of the bill in this matter is the President's right to defer the service rendered by ministers of religion actually engaged in ministerial duties. No provision is made for those who are preparing for the ministry: seminarians. Nor is any provision made for those indispensable members of a religious community, whose duties it is to attend to the domestic work of the religious house—the coadjutor brothers. These men make it possible for priests to attend to their proper work.

To me it seems clear that the good of the American people requires that all these classes—clergymen, seminarians, and brothers—be exempted from service under the bill.

Many reasons why this statement is true must occur to your mind; let me mention those which seem of weight to me. I shall not offer arguments which might appeal to my coreligionists, but such as must weigh with every thoughtful American.

It is evident to intelligent observers that religion is the backbone of all moral conduct; religion supports authority, teaching respect for law and order. Principles derived from religious moral teaching make the average man an honest man, a law-abiding citizen. Teaching, for example, that God forbids murder under threat of eternal punishment, religious instructors have proposed a motive for avoiding this crime far in excess of any which the State can assign or carry out; and so also of all other crimes. It is therefore good public policy to provide for the continued and flourishing existence of religion; I do not, of course, suggest any link with any particular form of religion, but an even-handed dealing with all religious bodies.

Religion is one of the needs and demands of the American people. In fact, the bill under discussion may be said to recognize this need, since it makes some effort to provide for religious ministers. The precise point is that the provision of this bill in this respect is not adequate.

Granted that religious ministers are to receive some consideration under this bill, consistency and thoroughness require that this consideration—

1. Amount to total exemption from training and service; and
2. Be extended not only to ministers already ordained but also to the two groups mentioned above—seminarians and brothers.

Let me take the three points that here suggest themselves in order:

1. Total exemption of ordained clergymen;
2. Total exemption of seminarians; and
3. Total exemption of brothers.

1. Total exemption of ordained clergymen: The American people enjoy the right to exercise freely their right to worship. To do this adequately, each religious group requires and desires that it be possessed of a group of trained religious educators and leaders known as the clergy. The principle, therefore, that each man should serve where he will do the most good and best further his country's interests in time of war requires that in time of war the clergy remain clergy. That is their specialty. There they are most efficient. There they are most needed. It is a well-known adage that "without hope the people perish." And truly this is especially manifest in time of war, when the buoyant and hopeful solution of life given by religion alone suffices to lift up fainting spirits.

2. Total exemption of seminarians: The public need for a properly trained clergy already described is a permanent thing, lasting as long as there endures the ineradicable tendency in man toward higher things. To satisfy this permanent need a continuous stream of trained religious leaders must be entering upon their work. This cannot be if we do not permit our seminaries to continue their normal functioning. For where are we to find our future ministers of religion if not in seminaries? It must be clear that if you take away the seminarian of today you take away the priest, minister, or rabbi of tomorrow. And whether the morrow bring peace or war, we can ill afford to lack spiritual leaders, be they chaplains to encourage and befriend our soldiers or be they pastors who instruct and serve our people.

But it may be objected that there is no intention under the bill of destroying the seminarian class, that all that is required is a temporary interruption of the course pursued by the seminarian. To this objection let me answer, first, that such an interruption of a full year in the midst of a course of study which of its nature is continuous and closely linked would be an immense setback in the progress of the seminarian toward his goal. Secondly—and this response is more basic—the objection misses the whole point at issue. That point is precisely this: The seminarian is destined to serve the people as a clergyman, whether in peace or in war. Hence any training of him for other work is a needless waste of time and money.

The measure to be taken, therefore, is one recognizing the principle that an adequate clergy group is a really fundamental necessity in time of war, and hence, parallelly, an adequate seminarian group is a real necessity in time of preparation. No bona fide seminarian should be shunted off the course he has entered upon and drafted into some other field of public service, thus deserting the line for which he is best adapted.

This leads us to another seeming objection to my proposal, which in fact, however, has no weight. That is the objection that spurious seminaries and seminarians will suddenly appear all over the country in order that conscription be evaded. Even if some less spirited youths might be tempted to try this ruse, is it not clear that a little careful examination of each institution will quickly reveal which are genuine seminaries containing sincere seminarians and which are so-called seminaries containing opportunists? For, surely, it is a matter of public record in each locality which seminaries have been in existence for a term of years before the war scare sufficient to prove that avoidance of military service had nought to do with their existence. Again, the records of these seminaries will reveal the average number of entries each year. Only if the number this year notably exceed that of recent years may suspicion be cast on the genuine good intentions of those entering this year.

3. Total exemption of brothers. We may distinguish two types of brothers, viz: Those who directly serve the people at large for example by teaching, and those who do so indirectly, namely by directly serving priests or other religious who in turn serve the people directly. I contend that both classes should be totally exempted from military service and training. This exemption is due to the first class—those who serve the people at large directly—because their functions are necessary both in peace and war. Let us consider the offices performed by the second group a little more closely. These men do the manual work necessary in religious communities and institutions. Their ministrations—given freely—are absolutely necessary, if the priests are to be free to attend to their special work. Hence, the arguments which prove the need of a clergy prove likewise the need of these relatively few but very important members of religious communities. They also ought therefore, to be exempted.

I hope my suggestions will receive the favorable consideration of the committee.

I would be pleased to have this letter included in the hearings.

Respectfully submitted.

MARTIN J. KENNEDY.

Advocacy of and Enlistment in War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RUSH D. HOLT

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 8 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE AVE MARIA

Mr. HOLT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial from the excellent paper, the Ave Maria, published at Notre Dame, Ind., and edited by Patrick J. Carroll.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Ave Maria of July 13, 1940]

A CHALLENGE

Some time ago Senator RUSH D. HOLT (Democrat, West Virginia), issued to American war meddlers a challenge that will weigh every particle of their sincerity and loyalty to a cause they have gratuitously espoused. Senator HOLT said: "Any man who advocates our entrance into this war, and who does not enlist in the cause of the Allies is a cowardly traitor to his country. If the danger is what they say, and the cause is what they preach, they should have the courage to offer their lives to the machine of death, rather than sit back and ask the sacrifice of the young fellows who want none of this war." Senator HOLT, with good reason, asked his listeners to inquire into the motives and interests of "the 'fifth column' interventionists," among whom he included "financially involved newspapers," "controlled radio commentators," "jingoistic government officials," "paid columnists," and "the active interventionists who have large financial holdings in Europe." Spurred by the Senator's invitation to warmongers to don fighting garb themselves, we checked the ages of the 429 American lawyers, educators, writers, and businessmen who urge the United States to declare war on Germany. Senator HOLT's challenge assumed added significance when we noted that the average age is well over 50. There is little cannon fodder here. There is small regard shown for those who will be called upon to lay down their lives when fighting begins.

The Migrant Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. TOLAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 8, 1940

Mr. TOLAN. Mr. Speaker, the House Special Investigation Committee to Study the Migrant Problem held hearings in New York City on July 29, 30, and 31. We open hearings in Montgomery, Ala., August 14, then to Chicago, Nebraska, Oklahoma, California, and finally Washington, D. C.

Ever since the appointment of the committee by the Speaker of the House of Representatives the press throughout the United States has given us fine publicity and rendered a distinct service to the committee.

I desire to call the attention of the Members of the House to a particularly fine and excellent editorial from one of the

very best and fairest newspapers on the Pacific coast, the Oakland Post-Enquirer, of Oakland, Calif., as follows:

[From the Oakland (Calif.) Post-Enquirer of August 3, 1940]

TOLAN COMMITTEE ON MIGRANTS OFFERS REAL HOPE

Congressman JOHN H. TOLAN, of Oakland, chairman of the important congressional committee investigating the migrant problem, says there are now more than 4,000,000 of these homeless men, women, and children wandering from State to State.

The Tolan committee is making it increasingly plain that this migrant problem is essentially an interstate matter, a Federal responsibility, and that it can be met only on that basis.

California has been forced to meet more than its fair share of the responsibility of caring for these millions of victims of drought and economic disaster in other States.

But few States have escaped some measure of the burden.

As the number of migrant families has pyramided, and the pressure of the problem presented by them has increased, the Nation has been flooded with propaganda concerning this situation.

Some of this propaganda has been true, some of it has been garbled half-truth, much of it has been wholly false.

There is a need for a show-down of facts.

This is what the Tolan congressional committee proposes to do, and is doing.

It is digging up the essential facts, sifting the truth from what is half true and what is false.

It is approaching the problem as a Federal question, realizing that individual States cannot deal adequately with the situation.

It is going into all regions of the Nation affected by this problem, holding local hearings, investigating local conditions, and in this way gaining a first-hand knowledge of the factors involved.

This promises to be an immense service—to the Nation as well as to the migrants.

Since California has been penalized more than any other part of the Nation by economic disaster in other States and the consequent uprooting of families, the work of the Tolan commission will be of particular value to California.

The realistic attitude of Congressman TOLAN and his committee toward the migrant question is the most hopeful indication we have yet had that constructive action will replace the futility that has hitherto marked most of the attempts to deal with the situation.

Congressman TOLAN is keenly aware of its seriousness. He says: "The spectacle of more than 4,000,000 homeless and destitute Americans wandering from State to State is something that strikes directly at the morale of our people."

He is right. It is a disgraceful and shocking spectacle which this resourceful Nation should not tolerate.

Nor should the various States or the Nation continue to try to deal with the situation through weak, half-hearted measures which offer no permanent solution to the migrants and which further undermine their morale.

The great majority of these unfortunate people belong to families with a long American heritage back of them. They ask only opportunity to make a living on the land, and they want to do that in the environment they have known most of their lives.

Obviously, this problem should be met at its source, in the Southern and Southwestern States which have sent millions of dispossessed people pouring into other States.

In the midst of familiar surroundings, among friends, these people would have a far better chance for rehabilitation than in unfamiliar surroundings a thousand miles or so from home.

It seems altogether likely that out of the realistic, fact-finding efforts of the Tolan committee a program will be evolved for helping the migrants to find opportunity and security in their home States.

Strike of Capital Is Blocking National-Defense Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE E. GEYER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 8, 1940

ARTICLE FROM THE NEW YORK POST

Mr. GEYER of California. Mr. Speaker, while we are speaking these days of conscription and urging that it is the patriotic duty of our young men to sacrifice for the good of their country, it might not be amiss to apply the old adage, "What is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander." Just a little more patriotism displayed by some of our big industries might set an example for our young men.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I insert in the RECORD an article from the New York Post of August 6, 1940:

[From the New York Post of August 6, 1940]

BILLIONS FOR DEFENSE—BUT HOW MUCH FOR PROFIT?—STRIKE OF CAPITAL IS BLOCKING NATIONAL-DEFENSE PROGRAM

WASHINGTON, August 6.—The national-defense program is almost 3 months old. It is possible now to appraise it not only in the statistical terms of contracts awarded but also in terms of sacrifice, of national unity, and of that quality which is far more essential than either dollars or tools—patriotism.

The defense program has been presented to the Nation in a series of generous appropriations totaling $14,000,000,000 set in a show window of glittering generalities technically known as "progress reports." On the face of it, you would think that everything is going along fine.

It isn't.

There has been, and is, delay—long delay on our most vital items of defense equipment—because, as one competent observer here puts it, the economic coefficient of patriotism has not yet been determined. The market in patriotism is extremely active, and the sale price is shooting up every day.

Washington is crowded with lobbyists and high-pressure salesmen and top executives of corporations trying to find out what they can do for their country, at what price, and at what profit.

The parallel between the Washington of 1917–18 and today is deadly. The talk 23 years ago in the lobbies of the Capitol and in offices and hotel rooms was of amortization and of cost plus such-and-such percentage. And that is all you hear today.

The steel companies refuse to contract to deliver armor plate.

The aviation companies refuse to contract to deliver planes.

Patriotism and defense and all that, they say, is very fine. But how about the amortization of plant expansion and the profits?

PROFIT NEED GRANTED

Now, every one grants, of course, that the industries on which the Nation must depend for its weapons are entitled to financial protection against loss from excessive plant capacity, and to legitimate profits. But those industries which are most vital to defense are refusing to do their part until every "i" is dotted and every "t" crossed on an agreement to their liking.

To put it another way: Steel companies and the aircraft companies could accept some contracts (and sizable contracts) now without facing great plant expansions. Acceptance of such contracts would tremendously facilitate the speedy defense of America. Such contracts are not being signed. Refusal to accept them is being used as a club to force through Congress legislation on amortization of plant costs which these firms have been seeking for years.

In 1917 Pierre du Pont, then president of the Du Pont Co., wrote:

"We cannot assent to allowing our own patriotism to interfere with our duties as trustees (of stockholders)."

On May 16, 1940, Capt. C. W. Fisher, testifying before a House subcommittee in behalf of the Navy Department on tax and labor legislation affecting defense contractors, said:

"In these perilous times, [illegible]man, we should make the Government business most attractive."

PRESIDENT SPOKE THAT DAY

Captain Fisher's plea in behalf of profits for defense was offered, incidentally, on the very day that the President delivered his historic message to Congress calling for 50,000 planes and a tremendous national sacrifice for preparedness. The President later said that the defense effort must not make a single war millionaire.

Captain Fisher and the heads of steel and aircraft companies have taken their cue from Du Pont, not from the President's message. And, incidentally, there is every indication that they will have their way. The "strike of capital," as the Senate Munitions Committee described the action of Du Pont and others during the World War, worked then, and it appears to be working equally well today.

Strong language, this "strike of capital"?

Consult the record.

On May 21, Rear Admiral W. R. Furlong testified before the subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Appropriations describing the necessity for expanding a Navy plant at which armor plate is made for ships.

DIFFER ON METHOD

He told the committee that a sum of $6,000,000 which was appropriated a year ago had proved of tremendous importance because:

"If I had not had that authority (to spend the $6,000,000 for plate), I would have been pretty badly off in the way of getting armor plate on these ships. The various armor makers have gone to the Treasury to try to have the tools and facilities amortized, but the Treasury and the armor makers do not see alike on how it should be done, so that the $6,000,000 that you gave me has enabled me to put $1,700,000, or about that much, in the Bethlehem Steel plant, because they had just stopped negotiating with the Treasury.

"There are two other steel mills which feel that they do not like to have the United States or anybody else's property on their property. (The admiral intended to convey to the committee that the Navy bought the machinery installed at the Bethlehem plant, and the Navy held title to it.)

"STILL AT STANDSTILL

"So they are at a standstill and trying to negotiate with the Treasury. But, as they have not had any success from their point of view, there is pending in Mr. VINSON'S committee (the House

Naval Affairs Committee) authority to have the Secretary of the Navy say that machine tools shall be called a part of the cost when they are particularly for Government contracts. So, between his bill and the $6,000,000, I think we can solve it."

The two companies which refused to do business with the Navy on armor plate under the terms of the Vinson-Trammell Act limiting their profits to 8 percent were United States Steel and Midvale.

These companies contended that Treasury regulations under the act allowed too little leeway in charging depreciation of machinery against taxes. Admiral Furlong offered to buy the machinery, but that wouldn't do, because, as another Navy official testified, the companies wanted to be free to use the machinery in any way they saw fit, after production for defense was completed.

WHAT THE COMPANIES WANT

What it came down to was this:

These two companies—and remember there are only three firms making armor plate—wanted to charge the entire cost of plant expansion to the Government, not over a period of 10 to 20 years through allowances for depreciation but in one chunk; that is, against the cost of any given contract. In addition, they wanted to make use of the machinery in any way that might be profitable later on.

Armor plate and ordnance are the principal components of ships of the line. Armor plate, ordnance, planes, and plane engines are the four principal defense requirements of the United States. Delay on delivery of any one of those items constitutes a threat to the safety of the country.

Has there been delay on armor plate?

J. B. Woodward, of the Newport News Shipbuilding Co., answered that for the House subcommittee. His reply was a grim one, for he said that the aircraft carrier *Hornet* must be launched without its armor plate because of delayed delivery.

The testimony:

"The CHAIRMAN. Now, you have had experience with delay on the *Hornet*.

"Mr. WOODWARD. The armor has not been delivered yet, but the schedule is such that we shall be obliged to launch the ship without its side-belt armor, I am afraid.

"The CHAIRMAN. Then the Bureau of Ordnance has not been able to keep up with your progress as to requirements of armament?

"Mr. WOODWARD. Not on the *Hornet*.

"The CHAIRMAN. Do you know whether the delay of the armor for the *Hornet* is due to inability to obtain it from the steel companies or is it due to the tests made by the Bureau?

"Mr. WOODWARD. No; to the best of my knowledge it is a question of the capacity of the armor manufacturers and perhaps a matter of priority as to which vessels get armor first."

HARMFUL TO PUBLIC MORALE

If the testimony of Admiral Furlong and Mr. Woodward and of others who have appeared before various congressional committees in recent weeks simply meant that companies supplying defense equipment intended to make a lot of money out of it, there might not be much to worry about—except taxes.

But it means two things even more important—delay in procurement of vitally essential supplies, and potential break-down of morale among citizens generally.

Senator JOSH LEE, of Oklahoma, in bringing to the attention of the Senate several days ago that Irving S. Olds, president of U. S. Steel, had said his company was delaying purchase of armor-plate machinery until proper tax legislation was passed, declared:

"If a soldier in the trenches should take the same attitude that has been taken by Mr. Olds—that is to say that he would not advance until his pay was raised—he would be court-martialed. But no soldier is going to take such an unpatriotic attitude as that."

As the story of the fall of France unfolds, we learn of profit-patriotism holding up essential war production, of cynical citizenry which accepted the Hitler charge that the war was intended to fatten the pocketbooks of munitions makers. Now Hitler is leveling that charge at British industry in an effort to break down British morale.

If Hitler heads this way, we will certainly hear that story. And there is very real danger that we now are laying a foundation for wide acceptance of it.

Centralization of Political Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 8, 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. C. WAYLAND BROOKS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a very notable address delivered by C. Wayland Brooks, Republican nominee for the United States Senate, delivered over the Mutual Broadcasting System network on July 21, 1940, in the course of the program sponsored by The American Forum of the Air, as follows:

We have confused the inconceivable with the impossible.

Because of our upbringing, we have thought in terms of faith and good will and refused to face the power of power alone.

Power is driving free expression and democratic processes from the world. Modern, mechanized, motorized, monstrous, military power is subduing the free people of Europe, while the monstrous concentration and centralization of political power in America is threatening, in the words of Wendell Willkie, "the last strong foothold of a free democracy."

It was inconceivable that the free states of Europe would fall in scheduled time under the monstrous heel of military aggression. It was inconceivable, and therefore we thought it impossible, but it is now an accomplished fact.

It was inconceivable that a Chief Executive of our free country would use the power entrusted to him to dictate not only his own renomination for a third term but also absolutely dictate the nomination of a hand-picked running mate to the exclusion of all other aspirants. It was inconceivable, and therefore it was thought impossible, but it is now an accomplished fact.

The American people who listened to the Democratic Convention on the radio know it, and no one knows it better than Vice President John Garner, Jim Farley, Speaker Bankhead, Paul McNutt, and the distinguished majority leader of the House who sits at this table, the Honorable Sam Rayburn, of Texas.

The contrast of the two conventions gives us a clear picture of our problem.

The Democratic Convention was held in the city of Chicago, a city under the domination of one of the most vicious political machines in the Nation—the Kelly-Nash machine—which delivered the 58 votes of Illinois to the will of one man. The convention was under the domination of members of the Cabinet and appointees headed by Secretary Hopkins, Secretary Ickes, and Attorney General Jackson, and assisted by many others, including the able Solicitor General Francis Biddle, who sits at this table tonight.

With the presence, power, and direction of these law-enforcing agents and the members of the Cabinet who have the power of expending billions of public money, no other candidates could show even signs of strength or possibility of selection. This was shown clearly when the name of the senior Senator from Illinois, SCOTT LUCAS, was placed in nomination for Vice President. Senator LUCAS immediately addressed the convention, saying: "Had this been a free and open convention, I would not have hesitated to make the race." He also stated earlier that the powers controlling the convention had made a survey which showed that they had enough votes to nominate for the Vice Presidency the man named by the Chief Executive. This survey included the votes of the notorious political machines throughout the country—55 votes in Illinois controlled by the Kelly-Nash machine, the solid 32 votes in New Jersey controlled by Hague, 22 votes in Tennessee controlled by Crump, and 68 in Pennsylvania controlled by Senator GUFFEY.

Further proof of domination was shown when the convention cheered the nominating speech for Mr. Paul McNutt for Vice President, only to hear McNutt, another Federal appointee, immediately rise to state: "He [meaning the President] is my Commander in Chief. I follow his wishes, and I am here to support his choice for Vice President of the United States."

All this, remember, in the face of the boos from delegates who resented the complete dictation and domination.

Contrast this domination and control with the complete freedom of the Republican Convention in Philadelphia.

The Republican Convention was a complete reverse. They freely selected an appealing, courageous, dynamic, liberal-minded product of the American system—a son of Indiana, a product of her public schools, a successful lawyer, farmer, industrial leader, and a great student of government—Wendell Willkie—as their candidate for President. He had no political power or domination to enforce his selection. His cause was directed by the young, liberal, aggressive element of the Republican Party who flocked to his support once Willkie's straightforward American views became known.

These young men consisted of young Republican Governors, Members of Congress, and so forth, who had been elected by the people in the various States against the money and landslides of the New Deal in the last few years. These young leaders included Governor Stassen of Minnesota, Governor Carr of Colorado, Governor Baldwin of Connecticut, Representative Halleck of Indiana, and Representative Bruce Barton of New York. Their efforts were led and coordinated by the youngest member of the Republican National Committee, Samuel F. Pryor, of Connecticut. They and Wendell Willkie were symbolic of a new voice and new leadership of the Republican Party. These young progressive leaders were expressing the demand of their States and the Nation for a champion who believed in and would defend and protect both the American form of government and the equally essential American system of private enterprise, a champion who would provide us with the necessary mechanized armed defense, bring about economic recovery, and continue our free Government so essential to the protection of our shores and our continued liberty.

Willkie's opposition to the abuses of the past and his knowledge of the needs of the present and the future produced a groundswell of support throughout the entire Nation. The delegates began

to sense this widespread demand and nominated Wendell Willkie as their candidate for President. These same young men were quickly joined by the Republican Senators and Congressmen in advocating the selection of that able legislator and champion of agriculture in America, Senator CHARLES MCNARY. Like Willkie, MCNARY was the free choice of the delegates, and the Republican Party presents them as the only possible protection against the encroaching military power of Europe and the encroaching political power in America.

Poll Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE E. GEYER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 8, 1940

A LETTER FROM A POLL-TAX STATE

Mr. GEYER of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert in the RECORD a letter from a resident of one of the poll-tax States. This person is one of the ten and one-half millions of persons that are unable to vote in eight of our States because a dollars and cents value is placed on the privilege of voting for those who represent us in high places. I hope after reading this lady's appeal for help, which can only come from the outside, that most of my colleagues will sign discharge petition No. 34 on the Speaker's desk and thus emancipate these persons that have these restrictions placed on them by provisions in their State constitutions.

The letter follows:

ROGERS, ARK., *July 27, 1940.*

Representative LEE E. GEYER,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. GEYER: You are presenting a bill in Congress to outlaw poll taxes.

I sincerely hope the bill will be passed. It is an outrage for a free country to allow such a law to exist. I have lived in Arkansas for 7 years and have not voted because of the poll tax. There are thousands of others. The law in this State is tied up to personal taxes and the poll tax will not be accepted without the personal tax assessment. The personal tax cannot be paid without the poll tax. No one is allowed to vote even on school elections without a poll-tax receipt. I pay the regular school levy with my real-estate taxes but they will not allow me to vote for school director. I missed out on the national election 4 years ago. I hope the law will be repealed in time for us to vote in November, if not at the primaries.

Wishing you success in getting your bill passed, I am,

Very truly yours,

A New Deal in Cabbage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEPHEN BOLLES

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 8, 1940

Mr. BOLLES. Mr. Speaker, two of the counties in my district are great producers of cabbage. We have shipped, over a period of years, thousands of tons of this very necessary article of food. It has been the source of a considerable income to the cabbage producers of Racine and Kenosha Counties, Wis. One of the products from cabbage is sauerkraut and we have several plants which produce this popular article of food. I desire to extend my remarks by printing a dispatch from Racine by Thornton Smith, correspondent with the Chicago Tribune, in the Tribune, as follows:

Along the lake shore in Racine and Kenosha Counties are acre after acre of lush cabbage fields that place these counties among the largest cabbage producers in the United States. But in the midst of this vast bounty stands a sight that provoked cabbage growers to a speechless indignation. There, being unloaded on a railroad siding, is a car of Virginia cabbage imported by the Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation for families on relief.

The cabbage producers approve of persons on relief, as well as everyone else, eating lots of cabbage, but when they recovered their breath they protested against the New Deal hauling cabbage 700 miles into the heart of what they regard as the best cabbage-growing territory in the country.

RANKS SECOND IN OUTPUT

Wisconsin is second only to New York in total cabbage production. The soil in this region is said to be ideal for its growth. Farmers have been harvesting the early cabbage for the last week, and the harvesting will continue for the next 2 months.

The importation of Virginia cabbage is irritating to the farmers, but they are willing to dismiss it as just one more strange manifestation of the New Deal if the Government will confine itself to giving cabbage to the needy and not interfere with the ordinary commercial practices of cabbage marketing, Wesley E. Hansche, one of the biggest cabbage raisers, said today.

"What provokes us most," said Hansche, "is to learn that a Government agency is again meddling with the natural supply and demand that establishes a market. Two years ago we experienced an ordeal through which no farmer cares to go again—a huge crop, with the F. S. C. C. stepping in and buying cabbage."

PRICE INCREASE THWARTED

In that case, Hansche explained, the F. S. C. C. set a price of $4 a ton for cabbage. The price stood pegged at that figure, he said, despite the fact that market conditions later developed which would have warranted an increase of 50 percent in the price.

In addition, Hansche said, the Government compelled the farmers to form a cooperative to sell cabbage to the Government agency. He said the F. S. C. C. also set up only two or three loading stations, forcing some farmers to haul as far as 15 or 20 miles, and limited the purchase to 5 or 6 tons a day per farmer instead of the usual 18 tons.

Present market conditions, Hansche continued, are similar to those of 2 years ago, and producers fear the Government is going to step in again and repeat its experiment.

He said current Chicago cabbage quotations are around $10 a ton, which is a satisfactory price, but that the demand has not yet reached the Wisconsin market.

Fear of Government interference, he said, is keeping sauer-kraut packers, who are big-volume cabbage buyers, from coming into the market at the natural time. "They are willing to pay $5 or $6 a ton now for good cabbage," he said, "but they feel the F. S. C. C. may come in and peg a price around $4, which would make them look like 'chumps.'"

Claim of Thomas A. Madsen for Disability Compensation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERNARD J. GEHRMANN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 8, 1940

Mr. GEHRMANN. Mr. Speaker, I am asking for permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter I received from Mrs. Thomas A. Madsen of Phelps, Wis., who is the wife of a disabled World War veteran. He appealed to the Veterans' Administration for disability compensation, which was denied him. I personally represented him before the Veterans' Administration with what I thought was ample proof that his present disability is the direct result of his service overseas. This letter is typical of a great many others which I, and I am sure many of my colleagues, receive. I know that Mrs. Madsen does not overstate the facts and I believe it is a shame that the burden of proof of service-connected disability should be placed upon a man who served this country during the World War. I am sure this letter will be of interest to most Members and I hope that before too long Congress will recognize the responsibility and the debt we owe to the boys who defended us in 1917 and 1918. While I am in favor of and have voted for every measure to strengthen our national defenses, I do not believe that we should neglect to do our duty in providing at least enough income for disabled World War veterans so that they will not have to become objects of public or private charity.

I am herewith including the letter as it was written to me by the wife of a veteran, who I feel has not been treated fairly:

I am taking this method of voicing my opinion in regard to the decision made by the Board of Appeals on C–2,791,802, for Thomas A. Madsen.

To begin with the verdict says that the claimant had no physical defect except for one tooth missing. The War Department also says they have no record of him receiving medical treatment or being absent because of illness. We thought it was for these very reasons that the affidavits were wanted. The claimant had two of them from buddies who knew these things to be facts regardless of whether the War Department has any record of it or not.

It was only natural that the veteran did not complain of any ailments when discharged. His main thought then was to get away from the Army, where he thought usual routine would straighten everything out. That the Army doctors found nothing wrong then is not to be wondered at, when they could find nothing wrong the winter of 1939. At that time the claimant was in the hospital for 9 weeks under their observation. He vomited everything he ate and was in severe pain most of the time. It seems it should have been easy to diagnose his trouble then, being he had been operated on for a perforated ulcer just a few months before and the vomiting showed that the food could not pass through. He came back from the hospital on a Sunday morning and on the following Wednesday we took him to the hospital at Rhinelander. Dr. Bump said that this persistent vomiting showed that the opening was closed and that an operation was necessary. But the claimant was in such a weakened condition after weeks of vomiting that he first had to be built up with extract of liver, blood transfusions, and glucose.

When the operation was performed they found the opening closed, and adhesions, also a much enlarged appendix. At the vet's hospital he was told he did not need an operation and that he should go home and diet.

Now we have several affidavits showing that the claimant was sick the first summer he was home from the Army and that he had to refrain from eating different things that disagreed with him. It is to be regretted that the doctors consulted at that time are dead. However, it is not to be expected that they could prove he had ulcers either, any more than the Army doctors could. When urged to go back to a Government hospital for care, he would say, "I can take the salts cure at home as well."

According to the findings at Wood, I notice everything was recorded as moderate or mild. Dr. Bump found him in a critical condition when he arrived at the Rhinelander hospital only 3 days later, and yet he had been much worse part of the time at Wood.

As for Dr. Finney not remembering him, that is very probable, as he had a very large practice. When he called there for an affidavit the office girl informed us that he had destroyed all old records. I am sure, had the claimant been admitted to see him, he would have remembered him.

Besides all this, there are records to prove that his health was poor the first summer he was home from the Army. Why were we asked to furnish these, when they cannot do anything for him simply because the War Department failed to record his hospitalization and absence from duty because of illness. The affidavits from his employers showing how he would lose time because of sickness, even the first summer he was back, should prove that his condition was brought on by war conditions. All knew him to be in good health before.

It does not seem possible that a few men, constituting the board of veterans' appeals, should be given sole power to say the claim is disallowed, when there are enough affidavits to prove the claimant's condition before and after his entry into the service. I am sure President Roosevelt, the Senators, and Representatives could see that the veteran in this case has ample proof to show that his disability was caused by service. They would also know that the veteran could have done as other "gold diggers" did. He could have had the Government support him all these years. Now that he has borne all this suffering in silence and paddled his own canoe until he is down and out, he is denied help. Should he be able to reach the average span of three score years and ten, the amount would now be small in comparison to what it would have been had he come back 21 years ago.

It does not seem fair to me that a man who has tried to do his best not to be an encumbrance to the Government should be denied help when he needs it.

Isn't there an avenue open to a veteran who has not been given a square deal, whereby he can get enough for his family and himself to have a decent living? Just because the claimant served his country in a cruel war overseas, he had to lose his health, and he and his family have had to do without many things that he and they should be entitled to, and could have had, had not he been disabled.

How well I remember while he was away at war, getting the insignificant sum of $1 a day, our friends and neighbors were working for ten and fifteen dollars a day. Their children can go ahead and have a decent education, and most of all those daddies have enjoyed good health. It appears to me, and I know I am voicing the opinion of thousands of others whose records were not properly kept when I say that the least the Government can or should do is to give the soldier and his family a decent living when he has come to the end of the rope. Isn't there anything that can be done for him and for the wife and children? Judging by the thousands of soldiers who pass away each year, whose pensions are dropped there should be a little to bestow on other unfortunates.

The veteran gave his all and what do many of them get in return?

Sincerely,

Mrs. THOS. A. MADSEN.

While Congressmen Debate Conscription Dixie Farm Youths Enlist by Thousands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 8, 1940

ARTICLE FROM THE GREENVILLE (S. C.) NEWS

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Greenville News, of Greenville, S. C.:

WHILE CONGRESSMEN DEBATE CONSCRIPTION DIXIE FARM YOUTHS ENLIST BY THOUSANDS

ATLANTA, August 6.—While Congress debates conscription, a record-breaking flood of volunteers from the deep South is giving the present fighting force of the United States a strong southern accent.

The Fourth Corps Area, embracing all the "Confederate States" except Virginia, Texas, and Arkansas, enrolled 2,033 volunteers in 1 week last month—a record for the United States in peacetime and a third of the national total.

Army reports showed that in the same period industrial New England, the First Corps Area, had 175 enlistments and the Second Corps Area, which includes populous New York and New Jersey, had 275.

Since the current recruiting campaign started May 16, enlistments in the Fourth Corps Area have averaged 1,500 a week, compared to 200 to 300 in New England and the New York area.

Next to the Fourth Corps Area, most volunteers have come from the Eighth Corps Area, composed of Texas, New Mexico, Colorado, Oklahoma, and Arizona. The Fifth Corps Area of Kentucky, West Virginia, Ohio, and Indiana is third.

A steady increase is shown in Fourth Corps Area enlistments. For the last half of May the figure was 2,050. For June it was 4,700, and for July it jumped to 6,750. Had all the nine corps areas contributed at this rate, the recruits for the 2½-month period would aggregate 121,500—a sizable part of the Army Congress debates raising by conscription.

The average southern volunteer is a farm youth 21 to 23 years old. Army officers say they make fine soldiers. An influx of Tennessee mountaineers has been noted. One Tennessee hamlet reported recently every able-bodied man of military age had enlisted.

Shall Organized Minorities Control the Destiny of America?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. THORKELSON

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 6, 1940

Mr. THORKELSON. Mr. Speaker, I shall quote from a press that well expresses the actual thoughts of the owners and of its subscribers; a people and a press which reach deep in the pool of defamation to slander anyone who refuses to aid them in blindfolding the people. However, we have reached a point where truth shall rise in its mantle of justice to smite its enemies; for it is said the guilty fear the truth and a liar fears exposure. These people and their press fear both truth and exposure.

As a point of interest, I shall now quote and discuss three of many like articles printed in this press: The first from the

American Jewish World of July 26, 1940—Minneapolis and St. Paul:

THORKELSON LICKED, SO PELLEY HAS TO LOOK FOR NEW "FUEHRER"

WASHINGTON (special).—Believe it or not, William Dudley Pelley, of Silver Shirt fame, is now seeking a successor to Congressman JACOB THORKELSON, of Montana, for "head man of the United States of America." Pelley had high hopes for THORKELSON to become the American "fuehrer" until Miss Jeanette Rankin entered the Republican congressional primaries in Montana and defeated THORKELSON in his first district. THORKELSON is anti-Semitic. One factor incident to his defeat by Miss Rankin is that he no longer will have the franking privilege, which permitted him to send without postage expense his anti-Semitic materials throughout the country.

Pelley now is reported looking for another prospect for his American "fuehrer."

What does it set forth?

First. The article expresses relief in my defeat for renomination to Congress.

Second. It attempts to smear me by using the name of a person entirely unconnected with me.

Third. Another attempt to defame me by printing what another person thinks, but about which I know nothing. This is presumptuous mind reading.

Fourth. The article states that I am anti-Semitic, and intimates that that is the reason for my defeat.

Fifth. The article expresses relief that I cannot mail information to the people under franking privilege.

Sixth. That my work and speeches are anti-Semitic.

Seventh. And other cowardly and obvious attempts to add more insult to injury.

The question may be asked, What justification can this press find for making these statements, and what purpose can it serve, except as a final attempt to maliciously libel and destroy my name and character? The press willfully engages in libel of me, knowing full well that none of the statements made can be substantiated or proven in any American gentile court.

What does this article reveal? (1) Elation and relief in my failure to be renominated in the Republican primaries. (2) It shows extreme intolerance and hatred, with little or no consideration for anyone except their own people and their own objectives. In other words, they commit the very act of which I am accused by them. This is a characteristic procedure of these people, which they use to protect themselves and confuse the gentile. They always label those they fear will tell the truth with their own shortcomings or crimes. In doing this, they hope to place those who might expose them on the defensive. This queer reasoning is evident in nearly all of the acts of the New Deal, and in much of the legislation which reaches the floor of the House.

Let me call your attention to a few of these incongruities: In 1933, when the bankers were called to Washington, the President said it was to correct a dangerous financial situation which was threatening the credit of this Nation, and to provide measures to protect the people. Were such measures provided? No. Measures were instead provided to protect and safeguard the bankers instead of the people, for banks in outlying districts were closed, obviously because they did not fit in with the plans promulgated at this meeting.

The reason given for passing the Gold Reserve Act was that it was a measure to protect the credit of the United States and the people; when the contrary is true, for our credit is now jeopardized and the people are entirely unprotected, as they have been deprived of gold as an investment and money security.

The reason given for plowing under crops and killing cattle was that such procedure would raise prices on these commodities and increase farm income; when nothing could be further from the truth, because it has reduced prices and decreased farm income.

Last fall, when the President insisted on repeal of the arms-embargo clause, it was to aid him in maintaining neutrality and in keeping this Nation out of war. What was the result? He has broken every principle of neutrality under the protection of the amended Neutrality Act, and actually alined this Nation in war on the side of Great Britain. Not satisfied with this, the refugee bill passed August 7, 1940, providing for the use of American ships and American personnel to carry and conduct transportation of these refugees from England to the United States. This act in itself is extremely dangerous, as one of the refugee ships might be sunk and so provide an excuse to request Congress to declare war. If not sunk by accident, who would deliberately sink one of our ships? Certainly, not a power that invites defeat by our entry into the war. Will it be a power that wants us to remain neutral? No.

Who are the people who want us to go to war? Who are the people who want the United States to sell a part of its fleet to Great Britain? They are the very same people who led us into the World War—which those who are interested in this subject may prove for themselves by reading past history. Why are not these refugees sent to Canada, for being much nearer to England and also being an English colony, makes it the logical place for them to go. There is no sound reason why we should accept every adult refugee, as we have done and are now doing. These people should be sent to some place in the British Empire and not to the United States. The people who agitate for war are not loyal Americans, or even good Americans, for if they were they would not aid to bring about an incident that might involve us in war; yes, a war in which our manpower will not be a decisive factor, but will instead leave us with thousands drowned in the Atlantic, maimed or killed on European battlefields, all in order to please some crackpot internationalists in our own administration.

The Reorganization Act of 1939 was said to be to coordinate and provide smoother operation for Federal departments and to reduce the administrative costs. What was the result? It has caused friction in the Federal departments and has increased administrative costs. As a matter of fact, it increased the Federal employees in the District of Columbia by 8,000 and throughout the United States by over 100,000. I could go on and name many similar instances, but the list would indeed be too long.

I shall now quote the second article, from the American Jewish Outlook, July 26, 1940:

THORKELSON LOSES IN MONTANA POLLING

By Jewish Telegraphic Agency.

HELENA, MONT., July 26.—The name of JACOB THORKELSON has apparently been sponged from the national political scene after a single term in which he became notorious for his Jew-hating utterances and the inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of tens of thousands of words of anti-Semitic literature.

THORKELSON was defeated by some 2,000 votes, by Miss Jeanette Rankin, first woman Representative, who returned to politics to oppose THORKELSON in the Republican primaries in Montana's First Congressional District. Miss Rankin's victory was surprising to many politicians. For many years she has not lived in Montana and only began her campaign a month ago. The first woman ever elected to Congress, she has been connected with peace and women's organizations here since 1919.

This article states that I have been "sponged from the national political scene." That may be true, but if I am to judge from communications I have received, I am in accord with the wishes of the patriotic Americans who have expressed approval of my stand in Congress.

I shall now quote the last article, from the Detroit Jewish Chronicle of July 26, 1940:

THORKELSON'S DEFEAT

Former Congresswoman Jeanette Rankin has defeated the incumbent, Dr. JACOB THORKELSON for the Republican nomination for the United States House of Representatives in the First Montana District.

This may mark the end of the career of another violent American anti-Semite. It is a remarkable tribute to the sense of fair play of American voters that they did not fall for the nonsense which has been broadcast for 2 years through the columns of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by Congressman THORKELSON. Perhaps his defeat for renomination will serve as a warning to fellow bigots who have been encouraging him in Congress. His fellow travelers, especially the two gentlemen from Michigan and Wisconsin who always came to his aid, may learn soon that the spirit of the American people works contrary to the venom which foreign powers seek to spread in this country. THORKELSON permitted himself to be the mouthpiece of those who spread religious and racial hatred. He tried to do a job in Congress for Hitler and Coughlin. Apparently the American voter will not stand for such dissemination of intolerance.

THORKELSON has paid the price for being a spokesman for evil forces in Congress.

This article continues along the same lines as the other two, in that it gives a reason for my defeat. The author of this article goes even a little further than that, because he uses my defeat as a threat or warning. Let me quote his words:

Perhaps his defeat for renomination will serve as a warning to fellow bigots who have been encouraging him in Congress.

This statement is unjust, because the writer intimates that other Members of Congress are responsible for my acts when nothing could be further from the truth.

These articles reek with hatreds, venom, and intolerance; and exemplify in my opinion the low esteem in which the gentile is held by these people. None of these statements can be substantiated or proven by this press and no evidence can be produced by anybody to show that I have ever had any connection with subversive or un-American activities. As a matter of fact, it is these very activities that I have condemned, and in doing so have let myself open to attack from this defamatory press. This is only natural, because these people are self-acclaimed leaders of all revolutionary movements, as stated by Rabbi Judah L. Magnus, in 1919.

The fact is that in the 400,000 words I have written into the RECORD, no statements I have made on money, government, or subversive activities have been disproven by anyone. The criticism levied at me by this press comes because I have called attention to the real radical leaders of communism, statements which have been proven by various congressional investigating bodies, and by books published by the subversives themselves.

For me it has not been difficult to spot the Communists for they have been working under our very noses since Paul Warburg wrote the Federal Reserve Act in 1913, an act which made banking a monopoly and control of money and credit a private prerogative. I, of course, designate as subversives all anti-Americans, those who attempt to controvert or change the actual meaning of the Constitution and to use it to shield themselves, while they are engaged in sabotage of industries and the undermining of the Government. I also included those who have read into the document their own interpretations and who have been getting away with the sabotage of the Constitution for many, many years.

I for one have profound respect for that document as it was given to us by the founders of our country, and no one regrets more than I the many needless amendments and dangerous unconstitutional laws. The result of these errors are now evident as we race toward a totalitarian Government. In speaking in this manner I am, of course, speaking as one of the common people, and not as a lawyer or Member of Congress when I say the Constitution was intended to protect the people against usurpation of the people's rights by their own Government, against the politician and those who are engaged in depriving the people of the rights they reserve to themselves and their State—amendments 1, 2, and including 10.

I take the position that our Constitution is a document in which the people speak to Congress, not a document in which Congress speaks to the people, except where such powers are specifically given to Congress by the Constitution as in article I, sections 8, 9, and 10.

The question which may now be asked is: Is the position that I have taken in regard to the Constitution correct? If it is, then it is obvious that the people have lost their rights one by one and their liberties little by little as soon as the eleventh amendment was adopted and the first restrictive law was passed by Congress. If Congress continues to legislate as it has in the past, the people will find themselves under greater and greater restrictions, and when the final power has been transferred from Congress to the President this Nation will be under a real military dictatorship. We are, as a matter of fact, just about in that position now. It should be clear that if the people speak to the Government, if the people speak to the Congress in the Constitution, legislative procedure has been in reverse for a long time.

If the Constitution is a code or laws or rules in which the people delegate certain specific powers to the legislative, executive, and the judiciary branches of the Government, what right has any of the three branches to liberalize or to widen the meaning of such delegated power? It should be obvious that liberal interpretation or wider construction of the meaning in this case will give greater and greater power to the President, as it has already done, with the ultimate loss of all rights of the people and of Congress itself.

No one can deny that it is the people who speak in the preamble of the Constitution, and that the same people delegate the powers to Congress and to the other two branches of the Government. No one can deny that it is the people who speak in their own behalf and for their own protection in the Bill of Rights, and who have reserved all rights not specifically given to the Government to the State and to themselves—amendments 9 and 10.

With this in mind, what right have we members of Congress to restrict or deprive the people of the constitutional rights by legislation? What right have we to jeopardize the national credit by injudicious borrowing and what right have we to levy excessive taxes that might bring about failure or bankruptcy to business?

As a Member of the Seventy-sixth Congress, I introduced a resolution to repeal the seventeenth amendment, an act for which I have been criticized. However, in reply to my critics, let me say, if the seventeenth amendment is not repealed, nothing can prevent the establishment of a dictatorship in this grand old Republic of ours. History will bear me out in this statement, and as a matter of fact has proven the truth of it in the regimentation that we have today. Repeal of the seventeenth amendment will restore balance in the Government, a condition which does not exist at the present time, and we will again become a sound and strong Government, for we will have—

(a) State representation in the Senate of the United States.

(b) Return of sovereign rights to the State.

(c) The right of business to operate as it should under State laws.

(d) The right of labor to regulate working conditions suitable to labor within the State.

(e) Business and labor would be free from Federal snooping, meddling, prosecution, and persecution; conditions now prevailing.

(f) The State would by its representation in the Senate be able with other States to direct the Federal Government in its foreign relations, for the protection of the State and for the security of the United States.

These are a few of the powers which the State and the people have lost and this loss is in reality the cause of the beastly condition in which we find ourselves today.

In 1939 I introduced an amendment to the Constitution, to delete the words in article I, section 8, paragraph 3, "and with the Indian Tribes." Were this amendment adopted the Indian Bureau could be abolished, at a considerable saving to the taxpayers. In addition to that it would leave the Indians free to become self-supporting and full-fledged citizens of their own country.

On February 22 and 27, 1939, I proposed that we prepare our national defenses by fortifying the Philippines and the island of Guam. Had we prepared these defenses, or had we fortified these islands, our west coast would have been reasonably secure from attack. These fortified colonies would also provide protection for Alaska and for the salmon fisheries in Bristol Bay. I also suggested that the Philippine Islands be retained as a commercial outpost to aid our exports to the Orient. These islands are not only valuable as a point for distribution of commerce to India, China, and the South Sea Islands, but would, if developed, furnish considerable employment to the natives and to our own people. In time of war, we could always trade with our own colonies, which would in addition to that, provide bases of supply and repair for our Navy and merchant marine.

I am opposed to the manner in which the merchant marine is operated at this time, for it is my firm belief that this transportation should be owned and controlled by private industry, with Government subsidies reduced to a minimum.

I opposed the lifting of the arms embargo because I knew and stated that repeal of the embargo clause was to provide a legal excuse and protection for the President to render all military aid necessary to England, and the truth of that statement is amply verified today.

I have suggested liquidation of the T. V. A., because it is nothing but a source of political graft. I am not opposed to the building of dams, but there is a limit to this construction. However, to construct a series of dams within a State, and then enact legislation to compensate the States for taxes lost, is not in my opinion sound business. We have gone far afield in this construction on money borrowed from the international bankers, and upon which we pay interest to them.

I have proposed that we place a sufficient tariff on all farm imports, to protect our own farmers and allow them to raise full crops without restriction, so that they may provide our own people with a full supply of food in times of peace, and sufficient for war emergencies.

I have proposed that Congress liquidate and close all Federal corporations now operating in competition with private industry. This is not only sound, but private operation of business and industry is a right which the people reserved to themselves in the ninth and tenth amendments to the Constitution.

I have proposed protective tariffs on all manufactured imported articles, in order to help our own industries to provide employment for our idle people. I also suggested a simple plan for retirement pension, to do away with the present Social Security Act, which is nothing but a political football and convenience for whichever party is in power. I have also opposed unemployment insurance, because it places a premium on idleness, when we should place a premium on employment. We can do this by placing a protective tariff on all competitive imports.

I have condemned the employment of aliens in our Government, and particularly the aliens who are recent arrivals in this country. With me it is Americans first, and the aliens last. I have opposed and exposed the international monetary control and the manner in which the American people are being defrauded by this group of money changers. The time will come when these defrauders must be deprived of their power, for it is, as I have said, greater than the Government itself. It is this control of money, which has given these international racketeers the monetary power to buy and control the industries of this Nation, and to provide a healthier industrial condition we must allow smaller operators freedom from coercion by monetary groups.

As I have already said, I have also proposed that we prepare our national defenses and at one time suggested that we construct another canal through Nicaragua, to be used for military purposes in case of war, and for commercial purposes with the Panama Canal in time of peace.

I have opposed and exposed radicalism, syndicalism, socialism, and communism. I have even gone so far as to say that under the Constitution, Congress should not tolerate the Communist Party in the United States. Our trouble will come from communism and from the proponents of this vicious doctrine. Communism has destroyed Europe and will destroy the United States if we do not institute the most drastic measures to stop this movement now. It is this exposé which has provided ammunition for the minority press—for many of these radicals, as the record will show, come from this organized minority party. This should be clear to everyone as they publish in their own books the manner or the procedure which is employed in the sabotage of our industries and the destruction of our Government.

These are a few of the principles for which I have stood as a Member of Congress. The last sentence in the article published by the Detroit Jewish Chronicle makes this assertion:

> Thorkelson has paid the price for being a spokesman for evil forces in Congress.

I can readily understand the statement made by this press, for constitutional government and sanity is an evil omen for them. However, I leave my case in the hands of the American people, and if anyone can find the slightest criticism of the principles which I have supported, I should like to hear such criticism from the American people and not from an alien-minded organized minority.

Boycott, Why Not?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. THORKELSON

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 5, 1940

Mr. THORKELSON. Mr. Speaker, boycott is an old Asiatic weapon employed by the internationalist to maintain himself in power and to destroy all those who challenge his control. Intrigue, deception, and gentile stupid greed gave the internationalist control of gold. This control has given him the power to destroy nations, business, and people by boycott or withdrawal and denial of gold money and credit. It is this power—that is, the control of international gold money and credit—which the international bankers may lose if Germany wins, and it is apparently to restore this international control of gold and the perpetuation of their power that interested leaders in our own administration are depleting our defenses by giving aid to England.

This war, therefore, is a war fought by the gentile, in which he sacrifices his life to perpetuate international control of gold; a war in which the gentile enslaves his own people in the service of those who wield control of gold money and credit; a war for Mammon and "that detested tribe whose god is gold and savior is a bribe." Yes; a war in which should we become involved, we lose the rights and liberties which we reserved to ourselves in the Constitution of the United States.

We are, in submitting to private control of money, a property which belongs to the people, jeopardizing the life of our Republic and our national security. In allowing private, monopolistic control of gold and money we are boycotting or denying ourselves and our posterity the constitutional rights which we should have held inviolate to pass on as they were given to us by the founders of our country.

These are a few examples showing the destructive power of boycott as now wielded by the internationalists, and in which we unfortunately acquiesce. Yes; to which the gentile submits, because he is too tolerant and indifferent to his own welfare, an apathetic mental state in which he, failing to keep the Government clean, allows minority usurpation of majority rights. We are, therefore, in a disgraceful retreat before a minority upon which we bestow greater and greater power, as we transfer by legislation to the President and this minority, congressional powers which the people have delegated to Congress in the Constitution of the United States.

It was no doubt the power of boycott and its wide destructive application that Maurice Samuel had in mind when he wrote:

> We cannot assimilate: It is so humiliating to us that we become contemptible in submitting to the process; it is so exasperating to you that, even if we were willing to submit, it would avail us nothing. A century of partial tolerance gave us Jews access to your world. In that period the great attempt was made, by advance guards of reconciliation, to bring our two worlds together. It was a century of failure. Our Jewish radicals are beginning to understand it dimly. • • •

We Jews, we, the destroyers, will remain the destroyers forever. Nothing that you will do will meet our needs and demands. We will forever destroy because we need a world of our own, a God-world, which it is not in your nature to build. Beyond all temporary alliances with this or that faction lies the ultimate split in nature and destiny, the enmity between the game and God. But those of us who fail to understand that truth will always be found in alliances with your rebellious factions, until disillusionment comes. The wretched fate which scattered us through your midst has thrust this unwelcome role upon us. Wherever the Jew is found he is a problem, a source of unhappiness to himself and to those around him. Ever since he has been scattered in your midst he has had to maintain a continuous struggle for the conservation of his identity.

And when Justice Brandeis wrote:

Let us all recognize that we Jews are a distinct nationality, of which every Jew, whatever his country, his station, or shade of belief is necessarily a member. * * * Organize, organize, organize—until every Jew in America must stand up and be counted—counted with us—or prove himself wittingly or unwittingly, of the few who are against their own people.—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, January 16, 1940.

These are not my words. They are the words of Mr. Samuel, a prominent Jew, writing about his own people. Is it true? Yes; it is true, because their own law, the Talmud, corroborates his statements and also those of Justice Brandeis.

What does he, Mr. Samuel, say? He says, "We Jews, we the destroyers, will destroy forever." How is it done? It is done, as Justice Brandeis says, by "organizing" his people into a select unit to boycott and destroy, no matter how, anything and everything owned or operated by what the Talmud designates as "Goy, Goyim, or Cuthean," or, to be plain, the gentile, a Talmudian expression of contempt for us.

The American businessman should be interested in boycott, for it is that weapon which is being used to destroy him. It is a weapon I know something about, as it is now being used against a business in which I hold stock. The members of this minority who have set up boycott are not satisfied to be alone, but employ pressure on newspapers and other business to join them in this organized destruction. The gentiles who join them in this stupid act evidently do not realize that they give them aid in destroying an industry which has for over 10 years employed a number of people at union wages, and, in addition, has expended thousands of dollars in the community. This money, of course, has in turn been spent to a large extent with all merchants. I say all merchants, when in reality there are only two gentile dry-goods stores left in the town. In spite of this, the American merchants are still asleep.

Why this boycott? According to their own statement, to break me. So history repeats itself. It is organized minorities and American dupes against a gentile; a procedure in which they do not hesitate to destroy business and send people now working back to the ranks of the unemployed. All of this, in spite of the fact that this particular business has never paid the stockholders one cent and is kept in operation only in hopes of a better day ahead.

This organized minority wants the United States and South America to fight their self-designated enemy. They want the people here to destroy Colonel Lindbergh because he has an opinion of his own. They have employed their own press, their controlled national press and hired defamers, to discredit American patriots because they do not want them to say that we should return to sanity and sound constitutional government. They want chaos, destruction, and, more than all, a world state. To obtain this, they expect the Christian gentiles to crusade for them, and that is clearly evident, as we now know, for have they not claimed military exemption for themselves?

Let me warn you American patriots that you are aiding in your own defeat. Has not the gentile lost nearly all of his business to these organized destroyers? Has he not experienced depreciation in real estate and profitable apartment houses when an unknown new owner moves undesirable tenants in the adjoining house, and even in the same city block? Has he not, when indebted, had the bank foreclose on his business and sell it to his competitor? Has not the gentile discovered that these despicable competitors will undersell him or sell at cost until he is forced out of business and his competitor in full control? How is it done? It is accomplished by queer discounts to those favored by certain manufacturers and wholesale houses. It is organized minority boycott, as so clearly stated by Mr. Samuel and Justice Brandeis in their own books.

Have not a few gentile airplane manufacturers failed to get Government contracts until they accepted a loan from a designated bank; a loan which entailed transfer of stock to the brokers who negotiated the loan? Is not all of this organized destruction or boycott of business owned by gentiles? The gentiles take no issue with individuals of this minority, but object to their principles instead, the very principles which have kept them "hot footing" it all over the earth for thousands of years, accursed and despised wanderers.

The American people are due for a rude awakening, because they have been kicked out of business and will, if Congress does not take charge, lose this Government to the international Communists. This is obvious in the appointments of Sidney Hillman and Leon Henderson on the National Defense Advisory Commission, in charge of employment and price stabilization, respectively. It is generally accepted that Sidney Hillman is a radical and alleged Communist, and in his position on the National Defense Advisory Commission in charge of employment, can anyone imagine for one moment that he will not employ those with ideals similar to his own in strategic positions? Certainly not, because that is his record. Can anyone imagine for one moment that this was not known when he was appointed? Certainly not, for that was the purpose of his appointment. To determine the ultimate result it is only necessary to review history; for the same thing is liable to happen here as occurred in Russia 23 years ago, when native Russians were liquidated as the Communist Internationalists took charge of Russia.

It was an organized minority that was behind the drafting of the Federal Reserve Act. It was an organized minority which promoted gambling in stocks in 1928, 1929, and 1930, and it was the same minority that was instrumental in the stock-market crash which broke our banks and many, many of our own people, who foolishly tried to get rich overnight. It was the same minority which organized bank corporations and bank chains, in order to boycott independent banks, which had always been an aid to their own community. It was the same organized minority which was instrumental in defeating Hoover, because they had found a person more amenable to their organized destruction of the Government and boycott of the American people. It is this organized and monopolistic control of the press that has kept the people in ignorance of these facts and many other fraudulent transactions. It is this choking of the press and denial of free speech and authentic information in which the gentile himself aids when he assists in retiring those public officials, who have risked all to inform the American people of what is happening to this Nation.

It should therefore be clearly evident that the American people defeat themselves when they aid this organized minority in eliminating those from public life who have told the truth. The best evidence that these patriots are telling the truth is in the effort made by this organized minority in their own and in their controlled national press to descry and discredit those few who have had the courage to expose their fraud and deception. It should be clearly obvious, even to the most gullible and tolerant, that the communistic press, their own press, the controlled national press, and hired defamers, should not be needed to confound, disprove, or discredit statements made by a liar; for such statements, like houses of cards, fall by themselves. Therefore it should be obvious that when the whole national press, radio, and hired defamers are employed to discredit one man, it is not because he is prevaricating but it is because they fear the truth he is telling.

It should now be clear to all patriotic Americans that following and believing this alien-minded and organized minority

can only lead to disintegration and chaos, as these self-admitted destroyers scuttle the Constitution, our noble ship of state. It is time for the patriots of America to awaken when organized minorities boycott the Constitution of the United States and those who speak in support of that wonderful document. If the people of America continue to sleep, it will without doubt terminate in the sleep of death.

BOYCOTT AND HATE

When we allowed the Federal Reserve banks, a privately owned monopoly, to control money and credit, we gave them the power that made our people poor and the Federal Reserve bankers rich; the people slaves and the bankers our masters. In giving these private bankers and their cohorts full control of money and credit we made it possible for them to buy and dominate our industries and the power to destroy small competitors. In other words, we made it possible for the money changers to boycott industry, business, and the people by the simple expedient of foreclosure of credit or call of loans.

Under the pre-1933 set-up, when the dollar represented 25.8 grains of gold, the people were secured by the gold held in the Treasury of the United States. Today, no money is secured by gold and no bills larger than $5 are payable in silver. This makes our commodity or managed money worthless. The money changers rightly estimated that a $5 bill would on the average be the highest denomination that the average gentile American would have in his possession, and that he, in seeing that the $1 and $5 bills were payable in silver, would believe that all the currency was secured by this metal. It was no doubt a trick employed by the money changers to deceive or fool a tolerant people. However, some day the Americans will see and understand this fraud and deception perpetrated by the money changers, and when they do, the money changers will be foiled, as we, the people, become wise to their rackets, trickery, and intrigue. They will then be driven out of their temple, as we set the Treasury gold up as security for the American people and for the security of American posterity.

The American people have been working under a handicap or boycott, ever since Alexander Hamilton placed our Federal Treasury under the supervision of the Bank of England, and left our money in international control. During these many years, the international money changers have controlled and used the people's bank deposits, or national currency, as their own private capital, to buy and to bribe themselves into power with free and unrestricted use of the people's deposit money. These international Shylocks first bought control of the press, in order to prevent the people from discovering how this alien horde would conquer America. The ownership and control of the press, and as a matter of fact, all publicity is important to them, because they can hoodwink the people and distort facts to suit themselves as they lead the American people into war and financial enslavement. To make it more real, they wave the Bill of Rights and shout, "Free press and free speech must be preserved!" I ask, for whom—for us? No, certainly not, they mean free speech for themselves and their people. Mr. Samuel is quoted as saying: "We will remain destroyers forever," and Justice Brandeis, when he served as Justice of the Supreme Court, advised his people to "organize, organize, and organize." For what? To do the very thing they now have done, that is, taking possession of the United States by the use of gold, banking, press, radio, cinema, private industries, war industries, gambling rackets, and in addition to that, an attempt to control both political parties, in order to retain control of courts for protection when they run afoul of the law.

THE PRESS

Why believe a people who, according to their own law, the Talmud, hold the gentiles in contempt? Have not the American people and Congress, in believing the controlled press, gone far afield from constitutional government? Why not look around and determine for yourselves, who is right and who is wrong? Remember, more mistakes are made by not seeing than by not knowing, and that none is so blind as he who will not see.

THE CINEMA

Why place credence in a picture, which reflects nothing on the screen except that which its producer wants you to see, so that he can mold your opinion so that you will become a medium for dissemination of his propaganda? Why not use common sense? Why not try to identify the producer and his object in exhibition of the picture? Most pictures, while they may be works of art, are in reality a most insidious and evil form of propaganda, to waylay the unwary and overtolerant people.

The leaders of this organized minority want this Nation to go to war, and to get your help they will in the future use the press, the cinema, and the radio, to misrepresent and obscure the real cause for this war, hoping in such deception to obtain your aid and plunge this Nation into the conflict and mass murder of Christian people.

THE RADIO

Why believe a wailer who exudes nothing but obnoxious effluvia, as he exhales his diatribes over the air to please employers as he is himself? Why not turn off the radio? Why not retaliate by boycotting the wares he is advertising, as he is doing to those he decries and defames, as he engages in mud slinging and character assassination? The strange part is that these people, these trained and natural defamers, are the first to shout: "I am being persecuted. Pass a law to protect me." And whether you believe it or not, like fools we feel sorry for these revilers, whose sordid principles plumb the depths of indecency.

BOYCOTT, HATE, AND WAR

When certain governments declared themselves off the gold standard, they deprived their people of sound money and gave the international bankers a power greater than the government itself. These governments, by giving the international bankers full control of gold, stabbed the Christian civilization in the back, as they bestowed upon these money changers the power of boycott and the power to plunge nations into war.

We helped in this treasonable act and betrayal of our own people, when in 1934 we passed the Gold Reserve Act. Where are we today? The Bank of England held in 1937, as per Department of Commerce report, $7,883,000,000 in American industrial stocks and bonds. No doubt these were acquired when the stock market collapsed in 1929–30, for they are old issues. These industrial stocks and bonds are now worth in the present international dollar, $13,348,088,985 in gold. In this sum I do not include United States Government bonds and the two hundred million gold stabilization fund which is used by Wall Street brokers to sustain foreign money and securities.

On July 30, 1940, the daily statement of the United States Treasury showed that there was $20,460,471,296.32 of gold in the Treasury. Against this, the same statement showed $18,255,460,809 in gold certificates held by interests outside of the Treasury and by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, a private monopoly. In the redemption fund, Federal Reserve notes, there was $12,853,801, and in the gold reserve, $156,039,430. In the exchange-stabilization fund, the statement shows, $1,800,000,000. Balance on increment amounts to $142,796,468, and in the working balance there is $93,320,785; which makes a total in the general fund of $236,-117.254, and a grand total of $20,460,471,296.32.

I have reproduced this statement to show that the United States does not own or control the gold in the Treasury of the United States, but that it is instead owned and controlled by those who are holding the gold certificates, and they are, as I have stated, interests outside of the United States Treasury and the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, a private banking monopoly.

When you now add to these holdings the $13,348,088,985 in American industrial stocks and bonds, held by the Bank of England, we find the outstanding liabilities against the gold in the Treasury amounts to $31,603,549,794.

It should be clear from this that we are today a debtor nation in gold to the international bankers, to the tune of

$11,143,078,498. This is not a very cheerful outlook, in view of the fact that we are operating on purely inflated currency, with the national debt at over fifty-five billions and with contingent liabilities amounts to over thirteen billions, of which only about three billion are held collectible—and the remainder ten billion a total loss. This, as you will see, leaves us with a potential national debt today of $65,000,000,000, and which I am sure will be nearly seventy-five billion at the end of the next fiscal year.

The question is, How is this going to be paid, and where is the money to come from that is to pay this colossal debt? The fact is, it will not be paid, but will instead, like our inflated currency, be repudiated. That means nothing else but national bankruptcy. That is the picture which is facing the American people today, and which the administration wants to cover up either by war, internal strife, or by having administration Communists start a revolution to provide an incident for the President to declare himself a dictator.

What can be done? We can only save this Republic by eliminating those who have been designated as the unseen or invisible government. Who are they? They are the former pro-English gentile, and the former pro-German Jewish bankers; the House of Morgan and the House of Kuhn-Loeb, both of which are now pro-English and ready to plunge this Nation in a war which cannot help England and which is liable to destroy us.

It should be obvious to these back-seat warriors that they have "missed the bus," and should in their own interests engage in the reconstruction of this Republic instead of wasting their time snarling and shouting defiance at Hitler. Our interest is in the United States and not in Europe. We also know that the internationals are not going to lead us into this war as we were led into the World War; for we are much better informed today. Our task is at home and our enemies are the Communists and those who are financing this diabolical attempt at world revolution. Our Army and Navy will be needed at home to subdue and disarm these Communists whom the administration has blessed for 7 years.

The Constitution provides that the States shall have a National Guard, and I am firmly convinced that this protection is necessary; particularly in view of the conditions now existing in the United States. The Communists no doubt are biding their time to strike, and will be ready to go when they get the "green light" from Washington. I question as to whether or not the Executive understands the real background of those who are now engaged in subversion of our Government, although it should be as clear to him as it is to us who have taken an interest in learning about these activities. I can only conclude that if he is informed, his lack of interest in communism—the most serious problem which confronts our Nation today—and in not giving orders to stop this movement, that he is sympathetic toward this most damnable doctrine. As I look upon this entirely from a constitutional viewpoint, I am opposed to any plan whereby we may recruit in conscription ranks those who favor communism instead of constitutionalism; for should that happen, I can only say it is good-bye to freedom and good-bye to this Republic of the United States of America.

Questions Addressed to Members of National Defense Advisory Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEWIS B. SCHWELLENBACH

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 9 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

PROGRAM BROADCAST OVER FOUR NETWORKS FROM WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, AUGUST 8

Mr. SCHWELLENBACH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD questions asked by radio commentators and answered by members of the National Defense Advisory Commission in a broadcast over the four radio networks from Washington on the evening of August 8, 1940.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The following are questions which were asked by radio commentators and answered by members of the National Defense Advisory Commission in a broadcast over the four radio networks from Washington the evening of August 8, 1940:

Members of the Defense Commission are: Ralph Budd, in charge of the Transportation Division; Chester Davis, in charge of the Agricultural Division; Miss Harriet Elliott, in charge of the Division of Consumer Protection; Leon Henderson, in charge of the Division of Price Stabilization; Sidney Hillman, in charge of the Division of Labor Supply; William S. Knudsen, in charge of the Production Division; Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., in charge of the Raw Materials Division.

Mr. Budd was unable to be present. His place was taken by Mr. Karl W. Fischer, his assistant.

Mr. GODWIN. What are the functions of your section of the Commission?

Mr. KNUDSEN. We cooperate with the contracting officers of the Army and Navy and try to help out on any problem involving production machines or tools.

Mr. BAUKHAGE. Mr. Knudsen, as head of the Production Division of the Defense Commission, where does Mr. Stettinius' work end and yours begin in the long line from production of raw materials to the finished product?

Mr. KNUDSEN. I told him, Mr. Baukhage, when we set up shop here that I considered everything raw material until we got ready to cut it up.

Mr. LEWIS. Then, do you mean such things as cloth for uniforms is raw material, Mr. Knudsen?

Mr. KNUDSEN. I do; until we start making the uniforms.

Mr. WARNER. There seem to be differences of opinion, Mr. Knudsen, on the present production of airplanes. Can you tell us something about that?

Mr. KNUDSEN. Present production, Mr. Warner, is approximately 900 planes per month. By January 1 the number will have risen to 1,500 planes, and the volume will increase steadily thereafter. You might also be interested in knowing that in January 56,800 people were employed in aircraft factories. Today the number is nearer 75,000.

Mr. BAUKHAGE. Is it true that not a single combat plane has been contracted for out of money appropriated by Congress up to August 1?

Mr. KNUDSEN. No. It is not true. The Navy, for example, contracted for $7,000,000 worth of combat planes in July. But, more important than that, Mr. Baukhage, is the over-all picture. Take the money appropriated by Congress thus far for the defense program. They cover about four thousand two hundred-odd airplanes. Money in the defense appropriation bill now before Congress will add 14,000 more planes to the total. We cannot make complete plans and arrange final details with the manufacturers until we know that the appropriations are passed. We won't know that definitely until the Congress passes the bill. However, we have received from the principal aircraft manufacturers complete estimates on the plant space necessary for the whole program. I would like to add that of money made available to us on July 1, 5 weeks ago, contracts have already been awarded for 45 percent of the entire Army funds and 75 percent of the Navy's funds.

Mr. GODWIN. It has been stated that delay has been caused by lack of specifications for rifles, planes, tanks, and other material.

Mr. KNUDSEN. That is not true, Mr. Godwin. Rifles, planes, and tanks are already being produced under the present program.

Mr. BAUKHAGE. It has been charged that there are no specifications available for the heavier tanks. How about that, Mr. Knudsen?

Mr. KNUDSEN. The designs for the heavier tanks are being modified on the basis of experience gained in the European war, particularly in the Battle of Flanders. The redesigning will be completed by the end of this month and negotiations are under way with several companies for the production of the tanks.

Mr. LEWIS. Are any tanks being produced at this time, Mr. Knudsen?

Mr. KNUDSEN. Yes, Mr. Lewis. One large company, for instance, has orders for 1,156 tanks. They are already producing at the rate of nearly 3 each day, and within 5 months we expect this one plant to double this figure.

Mr. WARNER. If the compulsory-service law passes, or a law that would put approximately 400,000 men in service by fall, will there be sufficient equipment for these men?

Mr. KNUDSEN. If you mean uniforms, other clothing, and general equipment, the answer is yes, Mr. Warner.

Mr. LEWIS. Are you going to stop automobile production and make planes in automobile factories, Mr. Knudsen?

Mr. KNUDSEN. No, Mr. Lewis. We don't plan any such step now. Aircraft can best be produced in aircraft factories. Several automobile factories are making parts for airplane companies, and two are making complete motors without interfering with their automobile production.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. Knudsen, it has been said that small business is not getting any defense contracts. What about that?

Mr. KNUDSEN. Many of the smaller business firms are already getting orders, Mr. Warner. They are usually subcontractors under the main contract, which is the one you see mentioned in the papers. When a big bomber is built, for example, the contract for the full cost is awarded to the general contractor. There are, however, 536 business firms participating in that single piece of construction. It is because they are seldom mentioned in connection with the general contract that people get the impression that no one but the big contractor gets any business.

Mr. BAUKHAGE. Do you expect production of combat materials to interfere with the normal production requirements of the country?

Mr. KNUDSEN. Part of our job, Mr. Baukhage, is to minimize that interference.

Mr. GODWIN. Tell me this, Mr. Knudsen. If a man is in the manufacturing business and thinks that his plant could make light tanks, gun carriages, or, say, machine guns, whom should he get in touch with here in Washington?

Mr. KNUDSEN. He should write to the Chief of Ordnance, War Department, Washington. They can tell him the name of the nearest ordnance officer to his plant.

Mr. LEWIS. Are any new plants going to be built, Mr. Knudsen?

Mr. KNUDSEN. Yes, indeed. Under the present program it will be necessary to construct quite a few of them.

Mr. WARNER. Where will they be located?

Mr. KNUDSEN. The Army and Navy are making every effort to spread the plants over a wide area, including all the Middle Western States, where suitable labor and materials are available.

Mr. BAUKHAGE. When can we expect deliveries on the combat material the Defense Commission is interested in?

Mr. KNUDSEN. I expect that the tooling-up process will more or less take up the balance of this fall, but by January substantial deliveries of most of the material should commence, and by spring 1941 production should be going at a good rate.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Hillman, your job has been described as having to do with the labor supply in the defense program. Will you tell us what that means?

Mr. HILLMAN. My job has three parts: First, to find out how many people will be required to carry on the defense program; second, to see to it that sufficient labor is available to meet the defense program; and, finally, to arrange as far as possible for good standards of employment and good labor relations.

Mr. BAUKHAGE. You say you are responsible for labor supply. Does that mean that the Defense Commission gets jobs for people?

Mr. HILLMAN. No, Mr. Baukhage; it does not. That is the job of the United States Employment Service and their affiliated State employment offices. Their activities are coordinated under the Defense Commission's program.

Mr. WARNER. But you are also concerned with training workers for defense industries, aren't you?

Mr. HILLMAN. Yes; we have set up plans for training skilled workers on the job within industry. In addition, special summer courses are now being given in our vocational schools throughout the country.

Mr. GODWIN. What are these courses like?

Mr. HILLMAN. These courses, which are given by the public vocational schools, follow closely the range of defense occupations. Among other things, they include machine-shop practice, welding, pattern making, and drafting.

Mr. LEWIS. How many people are taking the training program?

Mr. HILLMAN. The Office of Education's most recent figures show about 80,000 taking the training.

Mr. BAUKHAGE. How can people apply for this training, Mr. Hillman?

Mr. HILLMAN. They should apply to their nearest State employment office or one of its local branches. The officials there can put them in touch with those agencies offering the kind of training the applicant may be interested in.

Mr. WARNER. A minute ago, Mr. Hillman, you said your Division was also interested in maintaining friendly industrial relations.

Mr. HILLMAN. That is correct, Mr. Warner. Our activities have already helped to avert stoppages in the automobile, shipping, shipbuilding, and copper industries.

Mr. GODWIN. What agencies do you use in bringing about these settlements?

Mr. HILLMAN. First of all we use the agency that was created by the Congress to adjust industrial disputes. That is the Division of Conciliation of the United States Department of Labor. I have also had the aid of my colleagues on the Commission. The Commission also has the services of the labor policy advisory committee, which works closely with my division. That committee consists of six representatives of American Federation of Labor unions, six representing unions of the Congress of Industrial Organizations, and four representatives of the railroad brotherhoods. They meet with me once a week and the three labor groups for which they speak have consistently cooperated in all matters coming before us pertaining to the national defense.

Mr. LEWIS. I take it, Mr. Hillman, that the number of people to be employed on defense production will be pretty large. Do you expect to have any difficulty in finding all the skilled workers that you will need?

Mr. HILLMAN. We have a large body of skilled workers who are now unemployed and registered with the United States Employment Service. They number more than 900,000. Putting the unemployed back to work is, as I see it, our first big responsibility. As far as the immediate future is concerned, I cannot see any reason why any serious labor shortage should develop.

Mr. WARNER. Is there any evidence that the defense program has yet affected employment?

Mr. HILLMAN. It certainly has. The shipbuilding industry today is employing almost 40,000 more people than at the 10-year peak in 1937; the aircraft industry is employing 50,000 more people; the machine tool industry is employing 18,000 more people; and the same is true of the engine industry.

Mr. GODWIN. Mr. Davis, as the head of the Agricultural Division of the Defense Commission, would you tell us something of the problems of agriculture in relation to national defense?

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Godwin, city people continually tell me that the farm problem must be a perpetual one. I agree with that. A just balance between agriculture and the other elements of our economy is a difficult objective under normal circumstances. Recent international conditions which make the defense program essential have added to the difficulty.

You remember the slogan of 1917: "Food will win the war." Then we strained ourselves to limit domestic consumption and expand production to provide food for our armies and our Allies. Now you might say the situation is reversed. We have an abundance of food and fiber to meet normal civilian requirements and any military demand that may arise. On top of this abundance the surpluses are piling up which would have moved into export if there had been no war in Europe.

Mr. LEWIS. Well, if that is the condition, Mr. Davis, just what is agriculture's relation to the defense movement?

Mr. DAVIS. The big job, as I see it, Mr. Lewis, is to keep our farms in healthy production and at the same time prevent American farmers from becoming the first American economic casualty of this new world war. No defense program can succeed, in my opinion, if farm income and prices are not maintained at a level which will keep the farm plant healthy in the defense front.

Existing machinery developed during the past 7 years is available to do this job. My division is working with the Department of Agriculture and other action agencies inside and outside the Government to maintain our American farms as a strong line of defense.

There isn't time to describe the specific projects that are under way. I just want to emphasize again that American agriculture is one branch of our economy that doesn't have to expand its plant or step up its production to meet whatever demand may be thrown upon it. Our job is to help it keep that way.

Mr. BAUKHAGE. You, Miss Elliott, are the consumer adviser on the Commission, I believe. What do you consider your job to be?

Miss ELLIOTT. I can best describe that, Mr. Baukhage, by saying that I am charged with the responsibility of thinking of consumers of America in the broadest meaning of the word—of the ordinary people of America—their needs for food and clothes and houses, the prices they have to pay, and the wages and salaries out of which they can pay those prices.

Mr. LEWIS. What, specifically, Miss Elliott, does your division do to meet the needs of consumers as part of the defense program?

Miss ELLIOTT. We do two main things. We watch carefully what is happening to prices of the things people buy. Unnecessary increases in the prices of food, or clothes, or rents—lower living standards. Secondly, we work directly with those agencies that are working to raise levels of living where these are dangerously low—low in health, in nutrition, in welfare.

Mr. WARNER. How do you pursue this policy, Miss Elliott?

Miss ELLIOTT. First of all, we work with existing governmental groups, civic organizations, consumer and business groups in such a way as to assist in maintaining a steady flow of food and clothing to our people at fair prices and quality. At the end of this month we are having a meeting with leading retail organizations of the country to work out a cooperative relationship with them.

Then we have the leading experts in the country to see to it that the emergency needs for health, nutrition, social security, child welfare are met.

Mr. GODWIN. What is the situation at present in regard to the prices in which you are interested?

Miss ELLIOTT. Thus far, in the 2 months since the Commission was appointed by the President, there have been no significant changes in the prices of consumer goods.

Mr. BAUKHAGE. Does all this mean, Miss Elliott, that you are setting up a complicated administrative machine?

Miss ELLIOTT. Indeed not. We have no intention of imposing a master blueprint. We merely want to bring together the energy already existing in the departments of the Federal Government and in the agencies of State, county, and local governments, as well as the many civic organizations throughout the country. In other words, Mr. Baukhage, we want to act as a kind of cooperative clearinghouse for the variety of organizations so that our defense activities in this field can be integrated to the best advantage for everyone.

Mr. LEWIS. Have you discussed your problems with any of these groups outside the Federal Government, Miss Elliott?

Miss ELLIOTT. Yes, Mr. Lewis. For weeks we have been receiving hundreds of requests from organizations throughout the country and from countless individual citizens asking the one question, "How can we help?" As our first step toward providing the answer, we had a conference here in Washington last week of almost one hundred national organizations. Representatives came from every part of the United States—from civic groups, patriotic organizations, women's clubs, church groups and social-welfare agencies. Our mutual problems were discussed around the conference table. Many valuable suggestions were made and numerous recommendations were placed before the Defense Commission. We will presently have a working relationship with civic groups throughout

the country so that they can gear their programs and plans with the defense effort.

Mr. WARNER. Then you, Miss Elliott, are preparing the civilian population in these respects. Is that true?

Miss ELLIOTT. I can explain that, Mr. Warner, by saying that ill people and hungry people are a national liability at any time, and a double liability in a defense program. I can say, too, that in some countries they have guns but no butter. In this country, I think we will all agree we can have both guns and butter. My office, I assume, handles the butter.

Mr. BAUKHAGE. Mr. Henderson, you're the Commissioner in charge of price stabilization, aren't you?

Mr. HENDERSON. Yes.

Mr. LEWIS. I must confess I'm not quite sure as to what your division covers. Could you give us a rough idea about your work?

Mr. HENDERSON. It's easier to tell what the President wants done than to outline our operations. The President wants to avoid the familiar price spiral—like he saw in the last war—where wages, the cost of living and prices skyrocketed up and left the country with a postwar headache. B. M. Baruch estimates that the last war cost us at least $13,000,000,000 more than it should if prices had been stabilized.

Mr. WARNER. I gather then that you watch all prices, defense and civilian, and the price level pretty closely.

Mr. HENDERSON. That's true.

Mr. GODWIN. Can you give us some idea of how you function if you find some important prices spiraling up?

Mr. HENDERSON. Let's take paper and pulp prices, which were getting out of line recently mainly because Scandinavian imports were shut off. We consulted with experts on Stettinius' staff who try to keep accurate records necessary for insuring adequate supply. We looked into prices, exports, imports, found out how much capacity was still idle and concluded prices were rising mainly because of excitement and ignorance. We had a meeting with representatives of leading firms in the industry and their opinion was that no price inflation ought to occur. But taking the excitement out of a potential price spiral is only one method of effecting stability.

Mr. BAUKHAGE. What are some of the others?

Mr. HENDERSON. Well, we pay most attention to the things that make prices get out of line. In the last war the Government paid too much for its supplies because some forms of contracts encouraged inflation. We are working to perfect contract forms which will help keep prices down, and also tap bank and private funds for defense plant expansion.

It's very essential, too, that the Army and Navy have preference in getting supplies without bidding up prices and creating shortages. Our division handles certain phases of this activity, sometimes known as priorities. Our staff helped out the 5-year rapid-amortization plan so that new plant and equipment costs would not be added to price in too short a period. We're interested in the effect of taxation on consumption, we watch monopolistic practices, and a host of other things that affect price.

Mr. LEWIS. I understand you are constantly studying the European war experience.

Mr. HENDERSON. That's right; we spend quite a bit of time on the economic set-ups, particularly of Germany and England, to learn, for example, how these countries organize to procure and finance their supplies and how they control prices.

Mr. WARNER. Do you have any authority or intention to fix prices?

Mr. HENDERSON. I'm glad you brought that up. There's no need for Government price fixing at present, and none will be needed for any commodity if supplies are kept adequate and if new facilities are built when needed.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Stettinius, I think everyone realizes that raw materials are the basis of all production. I believe you are in charge of the raw materials division. Would you tell us something of your work?

Mr. STETTINIUS. The Army and Navy requirements and their defense plans cover hundreds of thousands of articles. Our assignment is to make sure that the raw materials for the manufacture of these articles are available at the right time and at the right place.

Mr. BAUKHAGE. What are some of the raw materials, Mr. Stettinius, which are needed most urgently?

Mr. STETTINIUS. They literally run from A to Z—from antimony to zinc.

Mr. WARNER. How are some of them used?

Mr. STETTINIUS. Well, airplanes need chromite from Turkey. High-speed tool steel requires tungsten from China. Then we turn to South Africa for industrial diamonds, which are essential to the machine-tool industry.

Mr. GODWIN. How do you go about locating these materials that you need in such large quantities, Mr. Stettinius?

Mr. STETTINIUS. The Army and Navy Munitions Board have had capable and outstanding specialists studying these strategic items for years. They are familiar with their sources and they are concentrating their energies on locating adequate supplies, so that these will be ready when needed by industry. Our staff of specialists and businessmen are working most harmoniously with the Army and Navy experts.

Mr. LEWIS. You mentioned your staff, Mr. Stettinius. I believe you have some prominent men working with you. Will you tell us about some of them?

Mr. STETTINIUS. The best way, Mr. Lewis, to answer that is to take you to a typical Wednesday morning staff meeting. Some 35 surround the table and the work of each of my groups is discussed and progress and problems are reported. Among those 35 you will find Bill Batt, president of S. K. F. Industries. He reports for division A on metals. Then there is Clare Francis, president, General Foods, who tells us what division B has been doing in connection with textiles, lumber, and so forth. Ed Weidlein, director of the Mellon Institute, presents the story for division C, which is concerned primarily with chemicals. Sometimes the reports of these men at staff meetings are amplified where necessary by others. These men and the fine members of their staffs were called to Washington to serve their country. Aside from those mentioned, there are many others of equal importance, such as Gano Dunn, president of the J. G. White Engineering Corporation; Carl Adams, chairman of Air Reduction—who are only typical of the men outstanding in their fields—who are devoting their time and energy without thought of personal credit to help our country meet this great emergency.

Mr. BAUKHAGE. People are asking, Mr. Stettinius, why, with the billions of dollars available, these raw materials can't be gotten together more quickly?

Mr. STETTINIUS. People who ask that question must realize that American industry cannot be completely mobilized and coordinated within a week or a month or several months. It is a long job. It isn't easy. It calls for full cooperation and, may I add, patience.

It can be said, however, that no effort is being spared to serve them. We are assisted by the cooperative effort of industry and through the splendid aid given us by other divisions of this Commission, the Army, the Navy, and the various agencies of the Government.

Mr. WARNER. Of course, you must encounter numerous difficulties, Mr. Stettinius. Could you give us an example?

Mr. STETTINIUS. Yes. A very practical difficulty, for instance, involves one of our sources of high-grade manganese—an indispensable alloy for the manufacture of steel. It is in Brazil. Transportation to that source is inadequate and to get the supplies we need, a railroad in Brazil will have to be rebuilt. That is typical of the kind of problems we face.

Mr. GODWIN. There has been a good deal of talk lately about synthetic rubber. Is it still in the experimental stage, Mr. Stettinius?

Mr. STETTINIUS. That is a very interesting story, Mr. Godwin. Most rubber articles, as you know, are made from crude rubber imported from the East Indies. Research has developed a substitute for this crude. The job of our division has been not only to get supplies of crude but to investigate how far this substitute might be used in an emergency which would be created by cutting off our supplies of crude from the Indies.

Mr. LEWIS. Is there more than one process for making synthetic rubber?

Mr. STETTINIUS. Yes; there are several. Some are out of the experimental stage and in small commercial production. Synthetic rubber is now being used in a limited way in the manufacture of commercial articles and it can ultimately be used effectively in an emergency in the manufacture of most all other important rubber products.

Mr. WARNER. Can it be used in the manufacture of some of the defense material?

Mr. STETTINIUS. Yes; for certain purposes, including some airplane parts, synthetic rubber is definitely superior to crude.

Mr. BAUKHAGE. Is progress being made toward developing emergency supplies of synthetic rubber?

Mr. STETTINIUS. Yes. We are discussing with the industry the necessary plans for production of emergency supplies. The response from the industry has been excellent. But all of us should realize that plants and necessary machinery and equipment cannot be built overnight.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. Fischer, I understand that your job is to see that the raw materials in which Mr. Stettinius is interested are delivered promptly to the factories where they will be produced under Mr. Knudsen's schedules. Is that true?

Mr. FISCHER. Well, Mr. Warner, you can also explain it this way: The Transportation Division wants to avoid, if possible, any need for priorities in transportation or any embargoes on any particular commodities.

Mr. GODWIN. Will you explain that a little further, Mr Fischer?

Mr FISCHER. Briefly, we want to make sure that all forms of transportation—rail, water, and air—are properly prepared to meet any military responsibilities they may have to face, and meet them without serious disruption or confusion.

Mr. BAUKHAGE. I recall that there were some serious jams due to crowded terminals during the last war, Mr. Fischer. What are you doing about terminals now?

Mr. FISCHER. I can say this, Mr. Baukhage, it is of the utmost importance that provision be made for the proper reception of shipments of all kinds of commodities to avoid the use of cars, steamships, or pipe lines as warehousing facilities. We are making extensive studies of warehousing and terminal facilities. They must be adequate, because goods and commodities needed in the defense program must be kept moving to their ultimate destination.

Mr. LEWIS. I read somewhere the other day something about reducing the number of freight cars in need of repair. Can you tell us about that, Mr. Fischer?

Mr. FISCHER. Yes, Mr. Lewis; I have asked the Association of American Railroads, which is cooperating with us, to reduce to not more than 6 percent the number of cars awaiting repairs. That, Mr. Lewis, will be the smallest number of cars needing repairs for many, many years.

Mr. WARNER. Do we have enough rolling stock for an emergency, Mr. Fischer?

Mr. FISCHER. For the immediate future the answer is yes. During the past year, for instance, the railroads have increased the

number of cars available by 25,000. We have also worked out several types of special equipment for the transportation of troops and military matériel.

Mr. GODWIN. What is the situation so far as the highways are concerned, Mr. Fischer?

Mr. FISCHER. Well, we have approximately a million miles of hard-surfaced roads, as you know. Already the War Department and Public Roads Administration have laid out a network of strategic highways. They cover some 80,000 miles of road. They lead to every part of the country. A survey has shown that in the entire chain of 80,000 miles there are less than 2,000 bridges that need to be strengthened to carry the heaviest military equipment, and I might add that the work of strengthening those structures has already been undertaken.

Mr. BAUKHAGE. Then you don't see any serious problems in connection with defense transportation?

Mr. FISCHER. No, sir. I can confidently say that transportation on rail, on the waterways, and in the air is today capable of meeting any emergency which we can foresee. We have better, more efficient, and faster rail transportation facilities; we have the air lines which we have never had before; we have inland waterways capable of carrying great volumes of freight; we have 30,000,000 mobile units on the highways of the country which did not exist during the last war. Everyone with whom we have talked in the transportation industry has assured us of their utmost cooperation and where results were necessary immediately they have come through. It can be truly stated that transportation is ready for any emergency.

The Mystery of Money

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNN J. FRAZIER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 9 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

ADDRESS BY E. W. MASON

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD extracts from a speech delivered by E. W. Mason, chairman of the board of control of the One Dollar an Hour Club, at Moultrie, Ga., on March 19, 1940.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MYSTERY OF MONEY

Money is a mysterious thing because it pays a certain class of people to make it mysterious. This special class can secure all the money it wishes for only the cost of printing. Of course it is printing-press money—we have no other. Printing-press money is the money of civilization; commodity money is the money of semi-barbarism. There are no other kinds of money but these two.

Our Government goes into the business of furnishing this printing-press money to the Federal Reserve banks for an average of 30 cents or less per year for each thousand dollars furnished. Some call it a gift, some call it a steal, but I prefer to call it a loan.

If the United States Government lends a thousand dollars to one class of citizens on their security for 30 red cents or the cost of handling, why not lend to all citizens alike? The only mystery is that it lends this money—this printing-press money—to the bankers and not to all citizens alike. This is one mystery.

Your Government itself simply violates the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution by giving bankers advantages over farmers, over businessmen, over workers. Well might we ask, "Why is a farmer not as good as a banker, why is a businessman not as good as a banker, or why is a worker not as good as a banker?" That they are not is the mystery.

Give us a monetary system for all the people and there will be no mystery. Henry Ford has well said, "Money is only a means of transportation of goods and services." Postage-stamp money moves communications and small parcels. There is no mystery about postage-stamp money.

Supposing, now, the Government should furnish postage-stamp money to the public as it does pocket money. Then we would have a mystery. Postage stamps would be sold by brokers. The brokers or bankers would always be short of postage-stamp money. You would have to wait days at a time for your stamps, as there would have to be shortage of stamps to enable the banker to make a living. We would only charge these bankers for the cost of the postage-stamp money—the cost of printing. Congress would vote that all Government franking in the mails should cease—that all departments and Congressmen would have to buy the stamps the Government sold the bankers at printing cost back again, paying premium on the face value of the stamps.

If Congress should pass such a law, the postage stamp would be a mystery.

When Congress lends a thousand dollars to the bank for 30 cents and borrows the same thousand dollars back again for a period of 40 years at $30 a year, it represents a loss of $29.70 per year for 40 years, or $1,188. That is a mystery.

That is one mystery of the Owen-Glass unconstitutional Federal Reserve bill. Another mystery is that every President from Woodrow Wilson to Franklin D. Roosevelt and every Congress during that period have voted for that robbery by making 80 amendments to the unconstitutional law.

When money laws and rules of distribution to the public are as simple as postage-stamp money, there will be no mystery.

Cotton and Commodity Loans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAT HARRISON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 9 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

LETTER SIGNED BY NUMEROUS SENATORS AND LETTER BY EDWARD A. O'NEAL

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter addressed to the President, signed by numerous Senators, appealing for a higher cotton loan, and also a letter from Mr. Edward A. O'Neal, president, American Farm Bureau Federation, urging that agricultural commodity loans be made at higher levels.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AUGUST 6, 1940.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The undersigned Senators, representing the cotton-producing areas of the United States, respectfully invite your attention to the critical situation confronting our farmers as a result of the dislocations of foreign trade due to the European war. Because of the large portion of the cotton crop normally exported, the situation faced by cotton growers is particularly acute.

Regardless of the amount at which the loan rate is fixed, it is evident we will be unable to export our normal quantity of cotton during this season. For this reason, as a temporary emergency measure, a higher loan rate than ordinarily would be required under normal conditions is fully justified and essential in order to protect the income of our cotton farmers until such time as more normal trade conditions can be restored.

Cotton farmers have already done their part by going the limit in adjusting their acreage of cotton to bring supplies into balance with demand. This action has been helpful.

We approve the recommendations pertaining to surplus problems faced by farmers that were submitted to you on August 2 by Hon. Edward A. O'Neal, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation. For your convenience we attach copy of exhibit to Mr. O'Neal's letter, which furnishes valuable statistical information.

A loan of 65 percent of parity on cotton would add approximately $110,000,000 to the income of cotton farmers above the amount they would receive under the present mandatory loan rate. The additional cost to the Government on approximately 3,000,000 bales which will be exported or remain in the loan should not exceed $10 a bale or a total of $30,000,000. This estimate is based upon an estimated crop of approximately 11,500,000 bales, an estimated domestic consumption of 8,500,000 bales, exports of approximately 2,000,000 bales, leaving a net increase in loan stocks at the end of the season of only 1,000,000 bales.

An increase in the loan price to 65 percent would amount to approximately 10.25 cents per pound. That figure would assure the farmers an additional $10 a bale on the entire crop. If the crop yields 11,500,000 bales this year, the farmers would be benefited in the amount of $115,000,000. What would be the probable cost to the Government for providing such a tremendous addition to the farmers' income?

It is generally believed by the cotton trade that domestic consumption this year will exceed 8,500,000 bales. If we can export 2,000,000 bales, there will be a very small amount of cotton left in this year's loan. It might be necessary to pay a subsidy as high as 3 cents per pound to secure the foreign business. That would amount to $15 a bale, or $30,000,000. The Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation has the largest fund available in its history

for export subsidies. Surplus cotton is our greatest agricultural problem at this time, and the use of that money to aid in disposing of cotton should be exceedingly liberal.

Farmers will be required to live from the proceeds of the current crop until another cotton crop is produced. Regardless of all efforts that may be made, it is reasonably certain that living costs and the costs of all things the farmers must buy will be materially higher during the new year than they have been during the past. Certainly all forms of taxes will be higher and many new taxes, some of them hidden, will be applied, resulting in increased cost of the things farmers buy. Consideration should be given to this certainty when a loan figure is fixed.

We appeal to you to utilize the facilities of our national farm program to safeguard the income of our farmers during this emergency. The producers of our great export crops must be protected from bearing a disproportionate share of the troubles we face as a result of the European war. The gains we have made toward better conditions on American farms must be safeguarded. We believe the maintenance of a strong internal economic position is fundamental to adequate national defense.

Respectfully submitted.

Charles O. Andrews, Florida; Henry F. Ashurst, Arizona; Dennis Chavez, New Mexico; Tom Connally, Texas; Hiram W. Johnson, California; Kenneth McKellar, Tennessee; Josiah W. Bailey, North Carolina; John H. Bankhead, 2d, Alabama; James F. Byrnes, South Carolina; Allen J. Ellender, Louisiana; Pat Harrison, Mississippi; Carl A. Hatch, New Mexico; Josh Lee, Oklahoma; John E. Miller, Arkansas; Richard B. Russell, Georgia; Morris Sheppard, Texas; Tom Stewart, Tennessee; Hattie W. Caraway, Arganas; Sheridan Downey, California; Walter F. George, Georgia; Carl Hayden, Arizona; Lister Hill, Alabama; John H. Overton, Louisiana; Claude Pepper, Florida; Robert R. Reynolds, North Carolina; Ellison D. Smith, South Carolina; Elmer Thomas, Oklahoma; Theodore G. Bilbo, Mississippi.

Statistical summary

Item	Cotton	Wheat	Corn
Normal domestic consumption and exports	13,000,000 bales	756,000,000 bushels	2,575,000,000 bushels.
Average farm price, July 15, 1940	9.54 cents per pound	61.4 cents per bushel	63.1 cents per bushel.
Parity price, July 15, 1940	15.75 cents per pound	$1.123 per bushel	81.5 cents per bushel.
56 percent parity loan	8.82 cents per pound	62.9 cents per bushel	45.64 cents per bushel.
65 percent parity loan	10.24 cents per pound	73 cents per bushel	52.97 cents per bushel.
75 percent parity loan	11.81 cents per pound	84.2 cents per bushel	61.12 cents per bushel.
Parity income (normal consumption times parity price)	$1,023,750,000.	$848,988,000	$2,098,625,000.
Estimated 1940 production	11,067,000 bales	729,000,000 bushels	2,415,998,000 bushels.
Estimated value of 1940 crop	$488,055,000	$458,541,000	$1,576,700,000.
Parity payments, 1940	$95,700,000	$58,000,000	$48,892,000.
Agricultural conservation payments, 1940	$105,000,000	$49,000,000	$80,496,000.
Estimated total returns to producers:			
(a) Based on 56-percent loans on cotton and wheat; 75-percent loan on corn	$688,755,000	$565,554,000	$1,606,088,000.
Percent of parity income	67.3	66.6	76.5.
(b) Based on 65-percent loans on cotton and wheat; 75-percent loan on corn	$767,330,000	$637,710,000	$1,606,088,000.
Percent of parity income	75.0	75.1	76.5.

AUGUST 2, 1940.

Hon. FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT,
President of the United States,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR PRESIDENT: Agriculture faces a critical situation. This industry which produces in abundance and where there are no bottlenecks has become the first major casualty of the war. As the new crop season approaches it is imperative that the position of agriculture be fully and clearly recognized. Half of our cotton, over a third of our tobacco, and from 10 percent to 25 percent of our wheat, rice, lard, dried and canned fruit have normally gone into export. During this coming crop year nearly all of these surpluses will be thrown back on the domestic market. The benefit payments available for these crops are not sufficient to prevent distress among producers.

A sympathetic Congress and administration have provided the farmers of the country with the machinery for dealing with this situation. We are not helpless. There is no reason why there should be widespread distress and discontent this autumn. But prompt action is imperative if we are to protect the farmers' prices and income while the bulk of their products move to market.

Farmers are alive to the urgency of this situation; they recognize that the same procedures and standards that have governed our agricultural programs in normal times will not suffice to meet this emergency. They have grave fears that the routine established over the last 7 years may not be adjusted to meet the present situation. For example, there has been substantial merit in past years in the argument that the loans on basic commodities should be low so that the normal flow of commodities into export will not be hampered. We have supported this position. This argument has no merit in a year when the great proportion of our export trade has been cut off. It has no merit when the loan rate is the only hope of the farmer that there will be a floor under his prices. Stocks will accumulate this year, to be sure. But every other country in the world would look upon such stocks as a source of strength and security. We firmly believe that our inventories of food and fiber should be regarded as a source of strength to this country.

Within the next few months, we have grave fears that ill-advised individuals will use agricultural distress as an argument for an appeasement policy—as an argument for deals with those who would destroy us. There will be no basis for such a policy if domestic prices are favorable and our domestic position is sound. Finally, we draw attention to the need for a strong internal economic position if we are to cooperate effectively with our American neighbors in efforts to cope with our mutual surplus problems. It is important that our own position be strong if we are to mobilize full and effective national support for the task of keeping the dictators out of this hemisphere.

RECOMMENDATIONS

We are not asking the creation of any new machinery to meet this emergency. All we ask is the courageous and effective use of the machinery which is now in existence. Specifically, it is our earnest desire that the following steps be taken:

1. That the commodity loans, which are now the only floor for agricultural prices, be set at higher levels than would normally be required. Specifically, we ask that the cotton loan be set at 65 percent of the parity level. We recommend further that the wheat loan, which was announced before the emergency became fully apparent, be adjusted upward to the equivalent of the cotton loan. Such loans on cotton and wheat, together with the mandatory loan on corn, will bring the total returns, including benefit payments, to approximately 75 percent of parity income, for the producers of cotton, wheat, and corn.

2. We ask that the Secretary of Agriculture immediately call into conference representatives of the Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation, the Commodity Credit Corporation, the Agricultural Adjustment Administration, and a representative of the National Defense Advisory Commission to survey agricultural surplus problems growing out of the present emergency. We ask that they formulate programs of action and determine the amounts of money which will be required to meet this emergency. For each individual commodity we urge that such programs be formulated and announced prior to the marketing season, in order that farmers may receive full benefit during the period when they market the bulk of their crops. There is always danger that relief will be too late and the benefit will accrue to handlers and speculators for whom it was never intended.

3. We ask that during the coming months there be an impressive demonstration of our ability to make our agricultural surpluses available to low income and needy people in whatever amounts may be necessary to give them a completely adequate diet.

This should include as a major element the bulk purchasing of commodities in the farmers' market and their direct distribution to needy individuals.

4. In the interest of the morale of our farm people and their single-minded support of the national interest, we ask a declaration from the President of the United States that no farm prices will be allowed to reach ruinous levels as the result of surplus problems growing out of the European war. We ask that this statement set out clearly and frankly the positive policy of holding agricultural prices as nearly as possible to parity levels.

I hope this matter will receive your immediate attention. With assurances of my highest esteem, I am,

Sincerely yours,

EDWARD A. O'NEAL,
President, American Farm Bureau Federation.

Relationships With South America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS T. MALONEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 9 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

ARTICLE BY JOSEPH ALSOP AND ROBERT KINTNER

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be published in the Appendix of the RECORD an article written by Joseph Alsop and Robert Kintner, and

appearing under the title "The Capital Parade" in last evening's Washington Star.

This article comments upon our relationships with South America, and deals in part with a proposal which has been submitted to the Senate, and which has for its purpose a continuation of the good-neighbor policy initiated by President Roosevelt, and which is intended to give protection to the Western Hemisphere against economic assault from any source.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Evening Star of August 8, 1940]

THE CAPITAL PARADE—REARMAMENT AND TRADE PROGRAM CONSTITUTE PREPARATIONS FOR DEFENSE OF HEMISPHERE

(By Joseph Alsop and Robert Kintner)

Preparation for defense of the Western Hemisphere in the event of an early German victory are being carried forward along two lines. The first is rearmament. The second is the hemisphere trade program, worked out at the State Department and recently approved at the Habana Conference. The trade program is intended to supplement rearmament, by forestalling German economic penetration in South America, and thus preventing the inevitable accompanying German political activity.

In assessing the present position of the United States in a troubled world, it is important to know that rearmament has been lagging badly thus far because of hampering tax laws which Congress has been slow to change. It is also important to realize that while the trade program is certainly an effort in the right direction, and has a reasonable chance of success, it cannot possibly be considered a sure reliance in time of crisis.

SHIELD AGAINST PRESSURE

The trade program has changed so much that it is no longer clearly understood by most people. As originally conceived in the State and Agriculture Departments the program called for the establishment of a vast hemispheric marketing cooperative, or several smaller cooperatives, all financed and managed from Washington.

The theory was that the nations of the Americas could bargain better with Germany in a united front, and that with the United States serving as the broker of the hemisphere, Germany would be unable to break down the resistance of the smaller nations by economic pressure.

As conceived after the discussions at Habana, the program is far less ambitious and more practical. Broadly speaking, three steps are planned: (1) The United States being the only Nation in the hemisphere rich in liquid capital, will lend money against South American surpluses, thus permitting South American commodities to be stored until Germany is ready to pay a reasonable price; (2) marketing agreements will be made between this country and the South American nations, dividing the world markets as they were divided, for example, in the prewar copper agreement; (3) the nations of the hemisphere will then be free to trade as they please, with Germany or anyone else, so long as they observe the conditions imposed by the United States loans and the marketing agreements.

There are certain minor points in the program, such as the promise of additional United States loans to finance South American production of raw materials like rubber, which this country must buy somewhere abroad. But the program's essence is expressed in the three major points. The object of the new program is the same as the object of the hemisphere trade cooperative, to shield the weaker American nations from German pressure.

HEALTHY DOUBTS

As has been said, the program is sane and points in the right direction. In making a balance sheet of the factors operating for and against the program's success, the most important item on the favorable side is the attitude of the South American leaders. At Habana, as at all such conferences, the Argentinians and one or two other delegations made a show of independence for the record.

This show in no way altered the basic fact that the leading men in all nations of the hemisphere hate the prospect of German domination, are now exceedingly afraid of it, and are therefore willing to agree to extraordinary measures to guard their independence.

On the other hand, this attitude of the South American leaders will last only so long as they feel reasonably sure of the protection of the United States. This psychological problem is fundamental. Furthermore, there are a number of practical obstacles also threatening the program.

For one thing, the President has asked Congress for $500,000,000 to finance the program through the R. F. C. But Congress has not yet acted. If the worst fears of the Army and Navy Departments are substantiated, Germany will be victorious this summer. The program is extremely complex, and if Congress delays much longer there will be no time even to arrange the surplus loans. Then, too, the marketing agreements will have to cover several commodities, such as wheat and beef. Being produced in this country, these are political poison and will add to the tremendous difficulties which always attend the preparation of marketing agreements. Finally, even if the loans and marketing agreements are successfully arranged, they will still be pretty feeble weapons against the incessant "fifth column" activity, the brutal economic discrimination against unsympathetic businessmen, and the elaborate propaganda with which the Germans will attempt to combat the American effort.

The Habana Pact

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 9 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

ARTICLE BY WILLIAM PHILIP SIMMS

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I have been reading from day to day articles in the Washington Daily News by Mr. William Philip Simms, who has recently flown 15,000 miles over the Pan-American Airways in South America and Central America, studying subjects in which we are interested. I have read them with so much interest that I have asked unanimous consent daily to have them inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD, and I hope my colleagues will likewise read those articles. The articles are very brief, very interesting, very much to the point.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the article published in the Washington Daily News of Thursday, August 8, 1940, by William Philip Simms, headed "Latins Doubt Habana Pact Will Succeed."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Daily News of August 8, 1940]

LATINS DOUBT HABANA PACT WILL SUCCEED

(By William Philip Simms, Scripps-Howard foreign editor)

The United States cannot shut Germany out of the Western Hemisphere with a wall of gold. All the treasure at Fort Knox could not permanently corner the products of North and South America and force the Nazis to buy them on our terms.

In all my 15,000-mile journey up and down the principal countries below the Caribbean, I failed to find a single statesman or business man, Latin or Yankee, who believed that the so-called inter-American cartel to purchase and handle Western Hemisphere surpluses would work out as a practical proposition.

They agreed that if the United States were willing and able, year after year, to lay out a billion and a quarter to $2,000,000,000 to finance such a scheme, one of two things would happen. The totalitarian powers of Europe and Asia would either gang up on Uncle Sam to break his stranglehold on inter-American commerce, or else pay no attention to it and start developing their own sources of supply outside the cartel.

MIGHT BE DISASTROUS

Which of the two would happen would depend upon just how desperately Europe and Asia needed the meat, wheat, coffee, cotton, and other American products. And the betting would seem to favor the second alternative—namely, the development of new sources.

And that, South American trade experts observed, would simply add to the Americas' trouble. The warehouses of this hemisphere are already bursting with surplus cotton, wheat, corn, meats, coffee, and other products. For already the world supply is greater than world consumption. So if the totalitarian powers found it inconvenient, difficult, or impossible to buy these things in the American market and hence began to produce still more, say in Australia, India, China, Africa, Russia, and Europe, the American republics would be left holding the bag with a vengeance. Their natural markets would disappear not temporarily but for all time.

"If the cartel is out," I asked, "what can we do to cushion the economic impact of a Nazi victory in Europe on South America?"

COMPOSITE OF ANSWERS

Here is something like a composite of the answers I received:

1. If any attempt is made to invade this hemisphere militarily, hit back with everything we've got—particularly if the thrust is made anywhere near the Caribbean, the Panama Canal, or their approaches. Any weakness now in the face of foreign threats would lose us whatever prestige we may have managed to build up south of the Rio Grande.

2. Do everything we can to increase our trade with South America, especially imports. Internationally speaking, hearts follow the trade routes. If Argentina is bitter against us and friendly toward Great Britain, it is because Britain is her best customer and we are a poor one. In 1938, the last year before the war, the United Kingdom took nearly 32 percent of Argentina's exports; Germany, 11.5 percent; United States, 8.1.

3. Help reasonably with South America's rearmament. It's silly to say that this or that regime is a dictatorship or that it has Nazi or Fascist leanings. Latin American regimes, with few exceptions, have almost always been dictatorships. And Porfirio Diaz, Mexico's iron man for decades, was a sort of Fascist or Nazi before

the Duce, the Fuehrer, or even the words, were born. No South American dictator is going to allow the Germans or Japanese to invade his country if he can help it. But he may not be able to help it unless he is to some degree armed.

COULD EXTEND CREDIT

4. Find a way to extend long-term credit to buyers of American products. This could be done by Government agency or privately. It could be arranged so that American merchants and manufacturers, who have weekly pay rolls to meet, could get their money in 60 or 90 days, while some central organization carried their Latin American customers for the necessary time.

5. Help develop communications, transportation, industries, etc., on condition that equipment and technicians come from the United States. Sell productive equipment on terms which would permit such equipment to help pay for itself, as the Germans do.

6. Help culturally. Help build elementary schools, improve hygiene, train doctors, nurses. Increase manyfold the number of scholarships in American colleges and universities. Bring keymen and women to the United States to see what we have to offer. Germany is doing a vast amount of that sort of thing. Henry Ford's River Rouge plant is as impressively efficient as the Germany Army.

USE BURIED GOLD

7. Use some of the $20,000,000,000 now buried at Fort Knox to put South America's principal currencies on a gold or dollar basis, thus frustrating the reported Nazi plan to tie them to the mark and demonetize gold.

What if we did eventually lose a hundred million dollars or so, it is asked, in transactions like these? Wouldn't we get most of it back in the form of wages to American workers in the first place? And wouldn't it be a better investment in the long run than some of the billions we have tossed into the public "kitty"? Or lent to Europe?

The Value of C. C. C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS T. MALONEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 9 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

ARTICLE BY ERNEST K. LINDLEY

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be published in the Appendix of the RECORD an interesting article written by Ernest K. Lindley and appearing in this morning's Washington Post. The article deals in a most enlightening way with the great economic and social values of the C. C. C. camps.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE VALUE OF C. C. C.—YOUTH PROGRAM STILL NEEDED

(By Ernest K. Lindley)

The balancing of the Budget, which the Republicans have been grooming as a campaign issue for almost 7 years, has been pushed into the indefinite future by the exigencies of national defense. But the demand that the huge outlays for national defense be offset in part by economies in the so-called nonessentials is arising again, and doubtless will be heard throughout the campaign.

It scouting around for nonessentials some of the economizers have now picked the Civilian Conservation Corps. They give as their reason the recent relaxation of the C. C. C. regulations to permit the enrollment of youths from families with moderate incomes.

According to the Washington Post, "If the C. C. C. finds that the quotas assigned to the several States are not filled, that evidently means that relief needs are less pressing and economies could be instituted with comparative ease."

Much of the work done by the C. C. C. is not pressing, in the view of the Washington Post, and does not provide a great variety of opportunities for training. It thinks that if Government money is to be spent on training young men from nonrelief families, it could be spent more advantageously by financing vocational training in private industries.

Vocational training in private industries, properly safeguarded, can be of great value in the defense program now getting under way. It is perhaps true, also, that the C. C. C. does not provide a great variety of opportunities for training. However, the training program of the C. C. C. has been greatly enlarged in the last few years, and the emphasis from now on will be even more on training for useful civilian and noncombatant military jobs.

The unemployment problem among youth is much larger than is implied by the Washington Post and others who are beginning to urge a reduction in the C. C. C. Throughout the depression about one-third of all the unemployed have been found in the 16 to 24 age group.

The Biggers unemployment census in November and December 1937 indicated that there were almost 4,000,000 unemployed in this age range. Of these almost 2,500,000 were boys. These were youths who were out of school and who wanted jobs, but were unable to find them. They did not include a large number who were being kept in school and college with help from the National Youth Administration. Nor did they include perhaps 1,750,000 partly employed young people who wanted regular jobs.

Of course, these unemployed youth are not confined to families on relief. Must a boy of 18 or 21 or 23 be condemned to idleness because his father is employed? Regardless of the father's employment or station in life, the moral damage to a youth who cannot obtain useful work is a matter of serious national concern.

A great majority of these unemployed young people have never had regular jobs. They have never learned the habits of steady work, much less the skills which improve their chances to obtain steady work.

The C. C. C. has not been strictly limited to boys from families on relief. It has been open all along to boys whose families might have gone on relief if they had not received the $20 or $25 a month from a scn enrolled in the C. C. C. In 1937, when Congress made the C. C. C. a semipermanent agency by authorizing its continuation for 3 years, and again in 1940, when the authorization was renewed for 3 years, the test of eligibility was "unemployed and in need of employment." This was a test of the need of the individual boy, not of the need of his family. By authority of Congress the C. C. C. has been open, for 3 years, to boys from families eligible for relief, even if they were not on relief. For more than a year it has been open to boys from families whose living standard is below "normal" for the community in which they reside. The recent relaxation is only another slight broadening of the economic area from which C. C. C. boys may be recruited. As in the past, youths from families on relief or eligible for relief receive the preference.

Conscription, if approved by Congress, will reduce unemployment in the 21–24 age group. When some youths are to be called, by lot, to defend their country is precisely when it is most important that all young people be made to realize that there is a useful place for them in our society. The boys who enter the combatant services must feel that they are preparing to defend something that is worth defending. They cannot be expected to be enthusiastic about defending people so myopic as to condemn young people to idleness rather than to pay them modest sums to conserve the natural resources of the Nation and to acquire training which will make them more useful citizens, through subagencies of the C. C. C. and the N. Y. A.

Friendship of Americas Cemented by Airways

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 9 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

ARTICLE BY WILLIAM PHILIP SIMMS

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by William Philip Simms headed "Friendship of Americas Cemented by Airways," published in the Washington (D. C.) Daily News of today, August 9, 1940.

In that connection I wish to say, unhesitatingly and with perfect candor, that I think the gratitude of the United States is due to the Pan-American Airways, because that organization was started without any financial help from the United States Government. I recently observed in an article I read that $20,000,000 were put up to start that company. The Pan-American Airways have done more to cement friendship between the people of South America and Central America and the West Indies and the people of the United States than anything our Government has ever done in those countries. They have given us a decided advantage over the European countries by reason of the fact that orders have come from the southernmost portion of the South American

continent to our manufacturers in this country in a couple of days, thus giving us an advantage of anywhere from 5 to 10 days over the manufacturers in European countries.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Daily News of August 9, 1940]

FRIENDSHIP OF AMERICAS CEMENTED BY AIRWAYS

(By William Philip Simms, Scripps-Howard foreign editor)

Two things have served, probably more than all the others put together, to draw North and South America closer together in trade, friendship, and mutual understanding. These are transportation and communications.

All the ambassadors, all the good-willers, all the good neighbor policies, and everything else combined would never have got to first base—or if they had, the effect would not have lasted—had it not been for these two.

For 20 years our independent, uncontrolled and unsubsidized press associations have been carrying the news, day and nights, back and forth between the northern and southern continents. And American ships, and more recently, planes, have been speeding up and facilitating inter-American trade and travel.

AIRWAYS LEAD WAY

Of all these ties, none is more important than the comparative newcomer, the airways. What the railroad builders did for the States by opening up the rich country west of the Mississippi and helping to make us a united nation, Pan American and Panagra (Pan-American-Grace Line) Airways are now doing for the republics of the Western Hemisphere.

I have just completed 15,000 miles of air travel by Pan American. Since boarding the *Dixie Clipper* on June 24 at Lisbon, Portugal, I have flown across the Atlantic to New York, to Miami, to Barranquilla, Cristobal, Guayaquil, Arica, Santiago, Buenos Aires, Rio de Janeiro, Recife, Para, British Guiana, French Guiana, Dutch Guiana, Trinidad, Puerto Rico, Haiti, Cuba, and way stations, and back to the National Capital.

Not once is the entire distance did a single spark plug in any one of the multiple motors misfire. There was never even a sputter. I crossed the Equator twice, sailed high over steaming jungles and sizzling deserts; through tropical storms in daylight and darkness; along and across the snow-clad Andes in midwinter; past the iced flanks of Aconcagua, loftiest mountain peak of the western world, and over the 100-mile-wide mouth of the yellow Amazon. And never an uneasy moment.

SAFETY ACCEPTED FACT

But the purpose of this article is not to brag about flying. There is nothing novel about that. On every leg of my journey I had as fellow passengers graybeards and youngsters, women, children, and sometimes babies in arms—just as in any Pullman car. Safety in American planes is now an accepted fact. I aim merely to call attention to something that is going on right under our eyes, something of immense importance to the relations between North and South America, which most of us are overlooking.

Panagra's first weekly schedule from New York to Buenos Aires called for 9 days as against 18 by the fastest steamers. Even that was pretty revolutionary. Today, however, there is service three times a week, and the time has been cut in half. Soon, when the new cut-off across the Brazilian bulge is ready, the time will be further reduced to three and a half days. But even that is not all. From Miami to Barranquilla, Colombia, I traveled by stratoclipper in a sealed cabin through the substratosphere. The time was exactly 6 hours—the fastest ever made by a commercial plane between North and South America. When these planes really get going, and night travel starts, New York and Buenos Aires will be only 2 days apart.

TOUGH SLEDDING

But the going has not been easy for Pan American-Grace Airways. Both the Germans and the French were strongly entrenched on the eastern coast of South America before Panagra charted the west coast airways. And to make it all the tougher, Germany, France, and Italy subsidized their lines as a matter of national policy. The American concern had to pay its way by carrying passengers, express, and foreign mail, or go under.

So, when the Panagra pioneers planked down their original $20,000,000, it was an investment in faith, just an old American custom. True, they had a foreign mail contract, but it was entirely temporary with no certainty of continuity. Not even when another $10,000,000 was needed for equipment to keep Panagra abreast of the times. But now the uncertainty is nearly over. The Civil Aeronautics Act has adjusted rates on foreign mail to enable operators to perform the type of service required in the public interest.

There is no military objective behind the American air lines. Their purpose is to develop faster and better transportation, without which trade will stagnate. They aim to bring buyers and sellers together in close and friendly contact and make it easier and pleasanter for our South American friends and neighbors to visit us than to visit Europe.

TIME ELEMENT VITAL

The time element today is more vital than ever before in all history. It is vital to governments, to businessmen, and to political and cultural relations between nations.

"What we are trying to do," Juan Trippe, president of Pan-American Airways system, told me years ago, "is to swing the time advantage to the side of American commerce and a better understanding between nations."

Ask anybody you meet in South America today, and they will tell you the American air people are doing all that and more. I've flown in practically every country in the world, and I can say that in the air we're tops.

An Ominous Hour

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COLGATE W. DARDEN, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 4, 1940

Mr. DARDEN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, we celebrate today an event of profound importance—an event upon which rests in great part those institutions which guarantee liberty and individual freedom in our country.

We have seen in recent weeks the destruction of the French Republic at the hands of a highly trained and efficient German army led by capable and ruthless men.

This melancholy happening has surprised and profoundly shocked our people, because there has always been a close bond of friendship between the peoples of the United States and of France. We are still wondering what could have happened to an army which we had long believed to be the equal of any on earth.

The answer, I think, will be found in lack of preparation and lack of decision on the part of those charged with administering the Government of France.

We cannot repair now the great damage which has been wrought, but we can, if we are wise, profit from the lesson taught by this frightful catastrophe.

There is now under way a great armament program. We are rushing through the Congress huge appropriations in order to make available the money necessary for the materials of war. But this is only part of our problem.

Appropriations readily made will not make secure the future. This money must be turned, and quickly turned, into instrumentalities of defense and protection if we are to survive. In addition, our men must be well trained. The grim situation which today confronts us will not be overcome simply by a grant of money.

We shall be forced to exert every effort and to expend our energies to the utmost if we are to supply in time the weapons, the ships, the aircraft, and the ammunition of which we stand in immediate and desperate need.

To these must be added an unconquerable spirit if our country is to live through the challenging years which lie ahead.

Those who seek to govern themselves must be willing to accept the obligations as well as the benefits of the democratic system.

The vitality of the democracies has been sapped by a philosophy the unsoundness of which is only equaled by its broad acceptance. A philosophy of ease—a belief that the difficulties of mankind will readily yield to statutes enacted by the Congress rather than to sacrifice and to toil.

The State cannot solve the problems of mankind. It cannot guarantee either health or prosperity. It can destroy both, but it can create neither. These in the end must rest in large part with our individual citizens.

Our duty cannot be discharged by making appropriations. We must go further—much further— and see that the country is fully armed, with its fighting men well trained, if we are to celebrate at this time next year.

Taxes or Bonds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LEMKE
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 11, 1940

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Speaker, I am going to talk to you on the subject of taxes or bonds. May I ask why an intelligent people should be burdened with either taxes or bonds? Why should our Government issue Federal Reserve notes and give them away for the cost of printing—seven-tenths of 1 cent per bill—and then issue interest-bearing, tax-exempt bonds in order to get back part of its credit? If any businessman did this, he would be adjudged insane.

Why should our Government issue $5,467,445,045 Federal Reserve notes and give them to the large bankers through the Federal Reserve banking system for nothing except the cost of printing and then issue in addition $45,000,000,000 tax-exempt, interest-bearing bonds and give them to these same bankers for a check book and a deposit book? These large bankers now have the $5,467,445,045 Federal Reserve notes and they also have the $45,000,000,000 tax-exempt, interest-bearing bonds, and the Government is still in financial distress.

If our Government can issue Federal Reserve notes and give them to the large bankers for nothing, why can it not issue these same notes to pay its own obligations? If the Government would do this, then the people would not have to tax themselves $1,400,000,000 a year to pay the interest on these tax-exempt bonds. Then there would not be 12,000,000 people out of employment and millions more on a disguised dole system. As Thomas Edison so ably said:

> If the Nation can issue a dollar bond, it can issue a dollar bill.

May we ask what is money? What is its purpose and function? Money is not gold. Money is not silver. Money is not paper. Money, as such, has no intrinsic value—it is not wealth. It is a unit of exchange, a measure of values, a common denominator with which we measure the comparative values of commodities; it is a yardstick with which we measure the value of the things produced by the energy of a people.

Besides being a yardstick, a medium of exchange, money also represents the accumulated wealth of a nation. It serves as a storage of individual credit, produced by mental and physical energy, which may be exchanged for property. It serves as negotiable credit in the present or future acquisition of property, the value of which is measured by it as a yardstick.

Money is now made by law, made full legal tender by a sovereign government. It no longer has intrinsic value as such. It is a yardstick with which we measure and exchange present and future wealth. The Government should never give it away to anyone except for value received, for services rendered.

Article I, section 8, part 5, of the Constitution of the United States reads:

> Congress shall have power to coin money, regulate the value thereof, and of foreign coin * * *.

In accordance with this mandate of the Constitution, I, during the 1933 special session of Congress, introduced a bill creating the Bank of the United States. I reintroduced it in every Congress since, and it is now pending before Congress.

This bank would transfer funds to the credit of the Treasury of the United States for public works and public expenditures as directed from time to time by acts of Congress. Thus it would put the United States upon a cash basis. It would use the money and the credit that belongs to us all for the benefit of us all in place of giving it away to a few individuals and borrowing it back again by issuing tax-exempt interest-bearing bonds. It would end the tax-exempt, interest-bearing, bond-issuing racket once and for all. It would save the Federal Government and the State governments and the political subdivisions billions of dollars of interest taxes.

This bank would make loans to any State or Territory of the United States, or to any political subdivision thereof, for public improvements up to 30 percent of the assessed valuation of the property of any such State, Territory, or political subdivision. It would give preference to States, Territories, or political subdivisions whenever and wherever there is unemployment or where the wage scale for common labor falls below a living annual wage. It would enable us to establish an American standard of living for all of our citizens.

This bill provides that the bank, using its capital and other available funds as a revolving fund, shall take up the $45,000,000,000 of outstanding tax-exempt interest-bearing bonds and certificates of indebtedness. In other words, this bank, by using the money and credit that belongs to us all, would take up the Government's outstanding interest-bearing obligations and henceforth transact the Nation's business with cash. Our Government would no longer be compelled to pay $1,140,000,000 interest annually on its own money and credit. It would be freed from self-imposed bondage—debts, interest, and taxes.

If this bill becomes a law it will not be necessary for this Government ever again to issue tax-exempt interest-bearing bonds in order to borrow back its own credit. It will save the Nation billions of dollars in interest and taxes. It will save the revenues the Government now loses on tax-exempt bonds. It will enable States, counties, school districts, cities, and towns to refund their bonded indebtedness at a service charge of less than 1 percent in place of 5, 6, or 7 percent interest. It will get the Federal Government, State governments, and various political subdivisions out of debt. It will meet the requirements of the Constitution of the United States:

> The Congress shall have power * * * to coin money and regulate the value thereof.

When the bill creating the Bank of the United States becomes a law it will give the Nation a banking system owned, operated, and controlled by our Government in its sovereign and governmental capacity. It will give to the people of this Nation at all times a sufficient currency—a medium of exchange so that the energies of all the able-bodied men and women can and will be utilized in the creation of new wealth. It will give us the "abundant life" rather than poverty by scarcity produced by the wanton destruction and ignorant curtailment of the production of wealth through the insanity of official Washington.

By using the money and credit of this Nation for the benefit of all the people, the people will soon be able to pay up the $300,000,000,000 of public and private debts and save $15,000,000,000 each year in interest. There will then be no further need of the Federal Government, State governments, and other political subdivisions going into debt by issuing tax-exempt interest-bearing bonds. There will then be no further need of the people going into debt or buying on the installment plan, which has been the curse of this Nation—a human wrecking machine. We will then be able to go on a cash basis and devote our energies to producing and distributing wealth rather than to paying interest and debts. We will no longer be obliged to mortgage our own future or that of our children and grandchildren to a money and credit monopoly.

What a wonderful country this would be if we, as a whole, had started and continued on a cash basis ever since the Nation was established; if we had never permitted a lending class—a money trust—to exist. What a happy people we would be today if we had never permitted anyone to control and manipulate the money and credit of this Nation so as to destroy industry through bankruptcy and wreck millions of homes by mortgage foreclosures and evictions. What a difference it would have made for all of us if, in place of paying interest on $300,000,000,000 of public and private debts, our

Government had provided us with sufficient money to do the Nation's business and remain on a cash basis.

It is self-evident that we cannot borrow or tax ourselves into permanent prosperity. Our monetary system has been responsible for all the panics and depressions. It is a dishonest system that has been permitted to continue only because of lack of understanding. We cannot permit our Government to continue to issue its money and credit and give it away for nothing and then borrow it back by issuing tax-exempt interest-bearing bonds.

When the public once understands that our monetary system is the cause of panics, depressions, and recessions, then that unsound system can and will be changed. When the people realize that the money and credit of this Nation belong to us all and not to a favorite few, then that system will be abolished. Then there will be no need for taxes or bonds.

No power on earth—so help me, God—shall control the key to the Nation's funds but the United States Government itself.—President Andrew Jackson.

Review of Habana Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 12 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ, OF NEW MEXICO

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD a review of the Habana Conference which I made last evening over the Columbia Broadcasting System.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A REVIEW OF THE HABANA CONFERENCE

Why was the Habana Conference called? To further hemispheric solidarity for purposes of defense; to overcome a widespread belief among Latin American delegates, based upon their view of our past record, whether justified or not, that injustice had been done to Latin American countries. Fortunately, our representatives have shown an increasing degree of acquaintance with the characteristics of the Latin American people, largely as a result of the policy adopted by President Roosevelt 7 years ago and ably furthered by Secretary Hull at every subsequent conference of the Americas.

In referring to the defense of this hemisphere, it is well to point out that this defense means the safeguarding of the entire hemisphere.

And what are the results of this significant conference? Perhaps most important of all was the convention authorizing the United States to seize any colonial possessions of a foreign country in the event that its ownership is threatened, these colonies to be held in trust on behalf of all of the countries of the Western Hemisphere. Furthermore, a declaration was adopted by the conference stating: "Any attempt on the part of a non-American state against the integrity or inviolability of the territory, the sovereignty, or the political independence of any American state shall be considered an act of aggression against the states which signed this declaration." Among the resolutions that loom large may be mentioned those dealing with "fifth column" activities, the subversive activity of aliens, the completion of the pan-American highway, a declaration that American republics will settle their disputes peacefully, and another urging economic cooperation among the Americas as recommended by Secretary of State Hull. Also, and very important, a resolution calling for "a just, peaceful, and prompt solution of the dispute over Belize (or British Honduras) between Guatemala and Great Britain."

Our program of preparedness could have very little permanence or any real safety while the possibility of seditious or subversive activity continues within our own hemisphere. That the friendship, the good-neighborly attitude, of our sister republics to the south is a vital necessity may be demonstrated in the very near future. But our record as seen in Latin America has been far from reassuring. I propose to take only a few minutes to develop the reasons why we had no time to lose in effectuating, in rendering concrete and palpable, the new departure inaugurated by President Roosevelt 7 years ago, and ably seconded by Mr. Hull. If our program of national defense, which now entails hemisphere defense, was to succeed, we had to act, and act now.

We made a good beginning in our Latin American relations by being the first country to recognize the political independence of these erstwhile colonies, but we failed to have representatives at the first pan-American conference held in Panama City in what was then New Granada, later Colombia and now the Republic of Panama. In the meantime, an event of far-reaching importance—the enunciation of the Monroe Doctrine—occurred. Why was this declaration of national policy made on December 2, 1823? There is an explanation.

The continental powers of Europe had just taken France, lately the aggressor and transgressor nation under Napoleon, back into the bosom of the family of nations. They forgave their erring sister, and all was harmony once more. Two alarming alliances emerged: The Holy Alliance, the product of Czar Alexander the First's quasi-liberal mystic mind, and the Quadruple Alliance. The Holy Alliance included all of the European monarchs with the exception of King George III of England, who was disabled, and the Sultan of Turkey, who was not invited, since the organization limited its membership to Christian monarchs. One of its prime purposes was the suppression of liberalism and constitutionalism, and the safeguarding of monarchy. The program included mutual assistance, and the inner circle (reminiscent of the council of the ill-fated League of Nations which has now virtually concluded its labors) was called the Quadruple Alliance in 1815, being composed of Austria, Great Britain, Prussia, and Russia; 3 years later, upon the admission of France, it was called the Quintuple Alliance, and sought to put into practice some of the nebulous theories of the Holy Alliance. One of these projects included the recovery of Spain's colonies, with France undertaking to furnish the principal assistance. This represented a most serious threat to the independence and territorial integrity of these newly established republics. Then we had to contend with the expansionistic activities of Alexander I of Russia in the northwest. A most emphatic note was sent to the Czar. During these discussions, John Quincy Adams stated to the Russian Minister that "The American Continents are no longer subjects for any new European colonial estabments." (The Memoirs of John Quincy Adams, vol. VI, p. 163.)

This pronouncement had a beneficient effect upon our Latin American relations for it notified the world that the republican form of government and the democratic way of life were here to stay. And they are here to stay.

Then came a series of well-known but unfortunate historical incidents involving Mexico, Spain, Colombia, Santo Domingo, Haiti, and Nicaragua—none of which allayed the fears and resentment of Latin America.

My sole purpose in mentioning these incidents is to safeguard my fellow citizens against continuing a course of conduct that can only lead to tragic, perhaps disastrous consequences, for a house divided against itself cannot stand. Our national defense is today predicated upon the solidarity of the Western Hemisphere; without that solidarity, our defense problem becomes most acute.

The Latin American is, by race, background, and tradition, proud, sensitive, cultured, courteous, and quick to take offense. It should not be forgotten that the discovery of this continent was sponsored by Spain, that the conquistadores and the religious orders were largely responsible for the exploration and settlement of so much of our two continents. To carry on successful negotiations with the Latin American republics, it is imperatively essential to employ those who understand the Latin temperament. In the southwest, many of our States have more than mere vestiges of Spanish culture and tradition. My own State, New Mexico, is an outstanding example; even now, we are celebrating the quadricentennial of Coronado's explorations. We have many able and public-spirited citizens who would be happy to collaborate in this work of drawing closer, of knitting more firmly the ties of affection and of real need that bind our continents and our peoples to each other.

Our indifference to the pleas of the Argentine Republic when the British took possession of the Falkland Islands in 1833, 10 years after the promulgation of the Monroe Doctrine, guaranteeing territorial integrity in general, did not help to improve our relations with Latin America. It is common knowledge that this matter of the Falkland Islands motivated the Argentine delegates in adopting a reservation to the understanding relative to the foreign colonies reached at Habana.

Similar indifference to the British seizure of Belize or British Honduras in 1835 in spite of the protests of Central America resulted in further resentment throughout Latin America.

Certainly our representatives at the Habana conference in arriving at an understanding with the Latin American delegates were also concerned with the resources available in Latin America, as for example, tin from Bolivia and rubber from Brazil. They are vital to our defense needs; our dependence on extra-American sources of supply must end.

President Wilson understood the state of mind of the people of Latin America and how the nations of Latin America felt toward the United States because of certain of the incidents impairing our relations with South America and Central America that I have mentioned. By way of making reparation and in recognition of Colombia's claims, Congress was prevailed upon to appropriate $25,000,000 to be paid to that country.

And so the Habana Conference. This and similar conferences have accomplished much by affording opportunities for discussion and the achievement of a better understanding. But these conferences alone are not sufficient. Notwithstanding the good intentions of our delegates and their efforts to dissuade our Latin American conferees from their suspicion of the motives of the United States—and there is no question about the good faith of Secretary Hull—yet, there must be concrete results, actual tangi-

ble evidence of that feeling of solidarity in which lies the real solution to our defense problem. It can make or break this hemisphere.

For several years I have had a positive plan for the improvement of our Latin American relations. As early as August 10, 1937, I urged the Senate to direct its attention to South America where our natural interests are and where untold resources and buried wealth lie waiting for the investment of a limited amount of capital. I have frequently urged the utilization of the talents and abilities of our people of the great Southwest; their background lends itself most completely to the successful conduct of negotiations with the nations of Latin America (81 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pp. 8601–8603).

On March 3, 1938, I urged the establishment of a Government short-wave radio station for the primary purpose of improving our relations with Latin America. Shortly before I had introduced a bill to accomplish this, but apparently the Congress was not yet aware how alarmingly close the peril was even then. No action was taken.

Fearing the direction that our foreign policy might take when, more than a year ago, events in Europe seemed to be extending a formal invitation to the four horsemen of the Apocalypse to wreak general havoc and destruction, I spoke over a national network on May 11, 1939, urging this country to choose the road to peace—peace by pan-Americanism.

During the neutrality debate on October 25, 1939, I offered a solution which called for the substitution of profits out of peace for profits out of war and recommended the adoption of the following six-point program:

1. Develop our national defense—at peacetime prices for labor and materials—to such a point that no nation or combination of nations will dare attack us.

2. Cultivate our economic relations with Latin America; if necessary, by subsidizing our shipping.

3. Provide funds for the construction of a Nicaraguan Canal, and possibly the Mexican-Tehuantepec Canal, through an understanding with Mexico.

4. Build additional transcontinental highways to and through Latin America comparable to the projected pan-American highway.

5. Under suitable guaranties, arrange for long-term investments in improvements of a permanent nature, such as utilities, including transportation facilities, communications, and water-power resources.

6. Enlarge the facilities of the Panama Canal.

That was more than 9 months ago, and we are just beginning to take the necessary steps in that, the right direction. It is gratifying to note that all but the third of the foregoing recommendations are now being carried out by the Government.

Again, on April 2, 1940, on the floor of the Senate, while speaking on reciprocal trade agreements, I referred to the necessity of eliminating uncertain sources of vital raw materials and concentrating on those that would remain available in times of emergency. Specifically, I referred to manganese which can be obtained from Brazil, if necessary, althought my own State has a quantity available which should be developed so as to overcome our dependence on Russia.

Just a month ago, on July 8, 1940, in another broadcast, I emphasized the absolute necessity of effective action in Latin America, stressing some of the means whereby we could improve our new vital relations with the southern continent. I recommended: (1) Facilitation of travel and intercourse by Government grants to airways and steamship lines; (2) completion of the pan-American highway and a network of roads radiating therefrom; (3) speeding up of news services, cable and radio facilities, and their improvement; (4) immediate development of tin, rubber, and other strategic resources essential to our national defense; (5) immediate abandonment of all supercilious and condescendingly patronizing airs of superiority toward all things and peoples Latin American; (6) raising the standard of living by sound economic assistance; and (7) utilization of a personnel for the promotion of a better understanding with Latin America whose members are acquainted with the Latin American psychology and temperament because of their heritage, linguistic qualifications, and racial attributes.

Now, while there is yet time, let us turn our faces resolutely to the south—where opportunity beckons; where productive investments will lead to permanent peace with profit. Our national-defense needs dictate an immediate understanding with Latin America.

While some of the resolutions and declarations of the Habana Conference may never materialize concretely, yet this conference, perhaps more than any other, signalizes the results of actual good will and understanding. Suspicion has vanished. The 21 countries trust each other; not, as in the past, did they merely meet, smile, talk, eat—and forget; nor was there any feeling that some country had a hatchet to bury in its neighbor during the conference. The disappearance of suspicion, the actual desire to trust the conference and its program, irrespective of its formal understanding, had more to do with furthering peace and economic welfare than anything that has been done heretofore.

President Roosevelt has said that this generation has a rendezvous with destiny; from the bottom of my heart, from the uttermost depths of my being, I hope and pray the Almighty God that that destiny may not be death on the battlefield.

Transfer of Destroyers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAUDE PEPPER
OF FLORIDA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 12 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

LETTER TO THE EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter addressed to the editor of the New York Times under date of August 10, 1940, by Charles C. Burlingham, Thomas D. Thacher, George Rublee, and Dean Acheson, relative to legal aspects of the transfer of destroyers to Great Britain.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of August 10, 1940]

NO LEGAL BAR SEEN TO TRANSFER OF DESTROYERS—AMPLE AUTHORITY FOR SALE OF OVER AGED NAVAL VESSELS TO GREAT BRITAIN EXISTS IN PRESENT LAWS, ACCORDING TO OPINION BY LEADING LAWYERS

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

The policy of the United States to aid nations resisting aggression is not based on sentiment alone. It is rooted in very real and material interests of this country. Both major political parties are pledged to the extension of such aid so far as is consistent with law and the interests of our own national self-defense.

We are told, and it is not seriously disputed, that Great Britain urgently needs more destroyers to help her resist invasion by Nazi Germany. That invasion is about to be launched from neutral ports and territories which the Nazis have seized, contrary to international law, to use as bases for their armed aggression against Britain.

In the present state of the world, the maintenance of British sea power is of inestimable advantage to us in terms of our own national defense. Since General Pershing's speech, on the evening of August 4, there can be no question that there is the highest military and naval authority in support of the view that the release of at least 50 of our overage destroyers for sale to Great Britain is not only compatible with, but is vitally important to, the safeguarding of our own national defense. If Great Britain is able to resist German aggression and maintain her sea power, the danger of German aggression being directed against us in the immediate future is enormously reduced. Even if Great Britain should be forced to yield ultimately, the longer she holds the more time we shall have to strengthen our defense and the more time it will take Germany to repair and rehabilitate her armaments before she will be able to launch an attack on the Western Hemisphere.

NO TIME TO BE LOST

It has been suggested that fresh legislative authority is required to permit the executive branch of the Government to release these old destroyers for sale to Great Britain. We should like to place on record our own legal opinion that this is not the case.

Whatever might be our views on the law, we would not suggest Executive action without congressional approval if we believed that a majority of the Congress was opposed to such action. But believing, as we do, that the preponderating opinion both in and out of the Congress favors such action, we are loath to see time lost to secure authority which already exists when time may be vital to the preservation of our own liberties.

During the battle of France a number of our naval planes were transferred from the Navy Department to the War Department under the provisions of the act of July 11, 1919 (ch. 9, 41 Stat. 132, U. S. C., title 10, sec. 1274), which provides that: "The interchange without compensation therefor of military stores, supplies, and equipment of every character, including real estate owned by the Government, is hereby authorized between the Army and the Navy upon the request of the head of one service and with the approval of the head of the other service."

SERVICE PLANES SOLD

Immediately after such transfer the Secretary of War released the planes to private manufacturers under the provisions of the act of July 9, 1918 (ch. 143, 40 Stat. 849, U. S. C., title 10, sec. 1272), which provides: "Subject to the approval of the Secretary of War, motor-propelled vehicles, airplanes, engines, parts thereof, balloons, and appurtenances may be exchanged in part payment for new equipment of the same or similar character to be used for the same purposes as those proposed to be exchanged." The private manufacturers at once sold the planes to the Allies.

Shortly thereafter the Congress, by the act of July 2, 1940 (H. R. 9850, Public, No. 703) broadened the authority of the Secretary of War so that the power to make exchanges should not be

limited to any particular kind of equipment. That act authorizes the Secretary of War "to enter into such contracts (including contracts for educational orders and for the exchange of deteriorated, unserviceable, obsolescent, or surplus military equipment, munitions, and supplies, for other military equipment, munitions, and supplies of which there is a shortage) and to amend or supplement such existing contracts as he may deem necessary to carry out the purpose specified in this section."

VETO POWER PROVIDED

In order, however, to assure that the technical heads of the Army and Navy might veto the release of ships, equipment, or supplies deemed by them essential to our own safety, the following section was inserted in the act of June 28, 1940 (H. R. 9822, Public, No. 671):

"SEC. 14. (a) Notwithstanding the provision of any other law, no military or naval weapon, ship, boat, aircraft, munitions, supplies, or equipment, to which the United States has title, in whole or in part, or which have been contracted for, shall hereafter be transferred, exchanged, sold, or otherwise disposed of in any manner whatsoever unless the Chief of Naval Operations, in the case of naval material, and the Chief of Staff of the Army, in the case of military material, shall first certify that such material is not essential to the defense of the United States.

"(b) The Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy, as the case may be, are hereby requested and directed to furnish or cause to be furnished to the respective chairmen of the Committees on Military Affairs and the Committees on Naval Affairs of the Senate and House of Representatives a copy of each contract, order, or agreement covering exchange of deteriorated, unserviceable, obsolescent, or surplus military or naval equipment, munitions, or supplies exchanged for other military or naval equipment, munitions, or supplies, and a copy of each contract, order, or agreement shall be furnished regarding any other disposition of military or naval equipment, munitions, and supplies by which the title passes, either de jure or de facto, from the United States, or by which delivery of material thereunder is deferred, where the original cost of such military or naval equipment, munitions, or supplies exceeded or exceeds $2,000. The copies of each contract, order, or agreement herein referred to shall be transmitted to the respective chairmen of the committees not later than 24 hours after such contract, order, or agreement is made, and the chairmen of each committee shall consider such contracts, orders, or agreements confidential, unless a majority of the members of his committee shall direct the particular transaction to be made public."

Although some effort was made to place more drastic restrictions on Executive authority, the Congress deliberately refrained from going further than requiring the certification of the Chief of Naval Operations or the Chief of Staff of the Army. And again when efforts were made to place further restrictions on Executive authority in the Naval Act of July 19, 1940 (H. R. 10100, Public, No. 757), the Congress deliberately refrained from going further than providing that "no vessel, ship, or boat (except ship's boats) now in the United States Navy or being built or hereafter built therefor, shall be disposed of by sale or otherwise, or be chartered or scrapped, except as now provided by law."

INTENT OF CONGRESS

In light of the fact that the Congress has provided for the free interchange of supplies and equipment between the Army and Navy, there is no reason to suppose that the Congress generally intended stricter rules to be applied to the release of naval supplies and equipment than to the release of military supplies and equipment. And this would seem to be particularly true in view of the fact that after naval planes had been transferred to the Army for the purpose of permitting their release to private manufacturers on an exchange basis, the Congress chose to enlarge rather than to restrict authority of the Secretary of War to enter into contracts for the exchange of obsolescent equipment for new equipment, and conditioned the exercise of such authority solely upon the certification of the appropriate staff officer that such obsolescent equipment was not essential to national defense.

If it should be the opinion of the appropriate staff officers of both armed services, as it is the opinion of General Pershing, that the requirements of our national defense would be served rather than hurt by the release of some of our overage destroyers for sale to the British, there should be no legal bar to effectuating their release under existing statutory authority.

It is true that on June 24 a ruling of the Attorney General was announced to the effect that private builders who were constructing new torpedo boats for the account of the Navy could not, even with the consent of the Navy, complete such boats to the order of a belligerent government. The Attorney General indicated that the sending out of the country by a private builder of a vessel of war built to enter the service of a belligerent would be a violation of section 3 of title V of the Espionage Act of June 15, 1917 (ch. 30, 40 Stat. 222, U. S. C., title 18, sec. 33), and possibly also of section 23 of title 18 of the United States Code.

It is clear, in our judgment, that neither these statutory provisions nor the views expressed by the Attorney General stand in the way of the sale to a belligerent of armed ships, like our old destroyers, which were not built or completed to the order of a belligerent.

SECTION NOT APPLICABLE

Section 23 of title 18 of the United States Code is obviously not applicable to ships which were neither built nor equipped with a view to their entering the service of a belligerent power. The section reads as follows:

"Whoever, within the territory or jurisdiction of the United States, fits out and arms, or attempts to fit out and arm, or procures to be fitted out and armed, or knowingly is concerned in the furnishing, fitting out, or arming of any vessel with intent that such vessel shall be employed in the service of any foreign prince, or state, or of any colony, district, or people, to cruise or commit hostilities against the subjects, citizens, or property of any foreign prince or state, or any colony, district, or people with whom the United States are at peace, or whoever issues or delivers a commission within the territory or jurisdiction of the United States for any vessel, to the intent that she may be so employed, shall be fined not more than $10,000 and imprisoned not more than 3 years. * * *"

In *The Santissima Trinidad* (7 Wheat. 283), the United States Supreme Court held that the statute did not apply to the commercial sale of an armed vessel to a belligerent when there was no evidence that it was originally outfitted contrary to law. Justice Story stated that "there is nothing in our laws or in the laws of nations that forbids our citizens from sending armed vessels, as well as munitions of war, to foreign ports for sale."

Section 3 of title V of the Espionage Act of 1917 (U. S. C., title 18, sec. 33) also is, in our opinion, inapplicable to armed vessels, like our old destroyers, which were not built, armed, or equipped as, or converted into, vessels of war with the intent that they should enter the service of a belligerent. That section must be read in conjunction with the section which precedes it, and in the light of the rules of international law which both the then Attorney General, Mr. Gregory, and the Congress stated the statute was aimed to fulfill (H. Rept. No. 30, 65th Cong., 1st sess., p. 9). These rules are clearly stated by Dr. Lauterpacht in his fifth edition (September 1935) of Oppenheim's International Law, volume 11, section 334:

"Whereas a neutral is in nowise obliged by his duty of impartiality to prevent his subjects from selling armed vessels to the belligerents, such armed vessels being merely contraband of war, a neutral is bound to employ the means at his disposal to prevent his subjects from building, fitting out, or arming, to the order of either belligerent, vessels intended to be used as men-of-war, and to prevent the departure from his jurisdiction of any vessel which, by order of either belligerent, has been adapted to warlike use."

Section 2 of title V of the Espionage Act of 1917 (ch. 30, 40 Stat. 221, U. S. C., title 18, sec. 32) recognizes the right of American and foreign citizens to take armed vessels out of the jurisdiction of the United States for sale to belligerents, provided that assurance is given when clearance is applied for that this sale or delivery will not take place within the jurisdiction of the United States or on the high seas. It provides as follows:

"During a war in which the United States is a neutral nation, the President, or any person thereunto authorized by him, may detain any armed vessel owned wholly or in part by American citizens, or any vessel, domestic or foreign (other than one which has entered the ports of the United States as a public vessel), which is manifestly built for warlike purposes or has been converted or adapted from a private vessel to one suitable for warlike use, until the owner or master, or person having charge of such vessel, shall furnish proof satisfactory to the President, or to the person duly authorized by him, that the vessel will not be employed by the said owners, or master, or person having charge thereof, to cruise against or commit or attempt to commit hostilities upon the subjects, citizens, or property of any foreign prince, or state, or of any colony, district, or people with which the United States is at peace, and that the said vessel will not be sold or delivered to any belligerent nation, or to an agent, officer, or citizen of such nation, by them or any of them, within the jurisdiction of the United States, or, having left that jurisdiction, upon the high seas."

DILIGENCE DEMANDED

The next section (sec. 3) enforces the obligation of the neutral state to use diligence to prevent building or arming of vessels of war to the order of or for delivery to a belligerent. That section provides:

"During a war in which the United States is a neutral nation, it shall be unlawful to send out of the jurisdiction of the United States any vessel built, armed, or equipped as a vessel of war, or converted from a private vessel into a vessel of war, with any intent or under any agreement or contract, written or oral, that such vessel shall be delivered to a belligerent nation, or to an agent, officer, or citizen of such nation, or with reasonable cause to believe that the said vessel shall be or will be employed in the service of any such belligerent nation after its departure from the jurisdiction of the United States."

In other words, the correct construction of the section, in our opinion, is that vessels built, armed, or equipped as vessels of war with the intent or under any agreement to deliver them to belligerents or with reasonable cause to believe that they will be so delivered, may not be sent out of the jurisdiction of the United States. It does not mean that no vessels of war may be sent with such intent or under such agreement. Two reasons lead to, if they do not compel, this conclusion:

First, any other conclusion nullifies that portion of the preceding section which limits the President's authority to detain armed vessels owned by American or foreign citizens applying for clearance until such time as he is assured that they will not be used by such owners for hostile purposes, and that they will not be sold or delivered to a belligerent within the jurisdiction of the United States or on the high seas. He has no authority under the statute (the

provisions of the Neutrality Act of 1939 are discussed below) to detain them if assured that the sale and delivery to a belligerent is to take place in a belligerent or neutral port. This is clearly incompatible with a construction of section 3 which would make the departure of any armed vessel for sale to a belligerent illegal.

GREGORY'S DRAFT

Second, the language here involved was drafted by the then Attorney General, Mr. Gregory, who pointed out (1916 Annual Report of the Attorney General, pp. 15–16) that the section was directed to the rule of international law which he quoted as follows: "The first rule of the Treaty of Washington requires a neutral country to 'use due diligence to prevent the fitting out, arming, or equipping [within its jurisdiction] of any vessel which it has reasonable grounds to believe is intended to cruise [or carry on war against a power with which it is at peace].'"

Neither the Attorney General nor the Congress indicated in any way that the section was intended to go beyond fulfillment of the rule of international law as there stated. To construe section 3 as forbidding any sale of war vessels to belligerents would impose restrictions upon the citizens of neutral states not required by international law, as well as introducing irreconcilable inconsistencies within the act itself. To construe it as we have done fulfills in every respect the obligations intended by the Attorney General and makes the act a consistent whole.

Nor does the Neutrality Act of November 4, 1939 (ch. 2, U. S. C., title 22, sec. 245j–1), interpose any legal bar to the release of the destroyers to the British. Under that act the vessels may lawfully be taken out of the United States to a belligerent port provided title is first transferred from the American owner. Such transfer of title could be made under the act to a foreign neutral individual or corporation.

We believe that we are entirely justified in the view that the powers granted by law to dispose of these destroyers would only be exercised where, in the considered opinion of those responsible for our national safety, their exercise would increase our powers of defense. General Pershing is high authority for the view that the transfer itself may be a vital factor in keeping war from our shores. It is quite possible that in connection with the transfer arrangements might be made which would increase our defensive power in this hemisphere.

These destroyers are now built, armed, and equipped. It cannot by the farthest stretch of the imagination be said that they were built, armed, or equipped to the order of any belligerent, or with the intent that they should enter the service of any belligerent. If they are now released to private contractors, there is no insuperable legal barrier which stands in the way of their sale to the British in a manner compatible with the provisions of the Neutrality Act.

There is no reason for us to put a strained or unnecessary interpretation on our own statutes contrary to our own national interests. There is no reason to extend the rules of international law, beyond the limits generally accepted by other nations, to the detriment of our own country.

When vital interests of the United States are at stake, when the sentiment of the country is clear, the Government should not hesitate to exercise powers under existing law. To seek an unnecessary reaffirmation of these powers from the Congress now would be to run a serious danger of delay, and by delay possibly to endanger the vital interests of the people of the country in keeping war from our own shores.

CHARLES C. BURLINGHAM.
THOMAS D. THACHER.
GEORGE RUBLEE.
DEAN ACHESON.

NEW YORK, *August 10, 1940.*

The Pershing Broadcast

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BURTON K. WHEELER
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 12 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

EDITORIAL IN THE ST. LOUIS POST-DISPATCH

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the August 10, 1940, issue of a great Democratic newspaper, the St. Louis Post-Dispatch.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of August 10, 1940]

WHO INSPIRED THE PERSHING BROADCAST?

So that the people may know what forces are behind the proposal to send 50 American destroyers to help England, the Post-Dispatch has done some exploring into the background of General Pershing's speech of last Sunday. The findings are not complete, but they are most informative. Indeed, the curtain of silence and secrecy encountered at various points is highly significant in itself.

Joseph Alsop, columnist and zealous Anglophile, arranged for the broadcast, but now asserts "it would be wiser" for him to say nothing about it. The day after the Pershing speech, his column endorsed the proposal. Walter Lippmann, another columnist who wrote an article this week endorsing it, says General Pershing asked him to talk over the address, but declines to say who else participated. The general's aide, Colonel Adamson, says several persons, whom he would not name, had urged the general to make the speech. Pershing, who holds the key to the mystery, refuses to be interviewed about the speech or its origin. Just why all this disinclination to speak on the part of Messrs. Alsop, Lippmann, Adamson, and Pershing?

Enough has come out to prove conclusively that the speech was part of a concerted campaign to send destroyers to England—an action which would, in the opinion of competent experts, weaken American defenses and constitute an act of war. The choice of General Pershing to put it before the public was a canny move. He is a military hero, a venerated figure. Isn't it likely that some shrewd mind considered him the ideal person to answer another popular hero, Colonel Lindbergh, who was scheduled to make an anti-interventionist broadcast?

The people are entitled to know the full facts as to the origin and inspiration of the Pershing speech. The mystery of his sudden emergence from retirement, at almost 80, to make this plea ought to be cleared up. General Pershing is still an officer of the United States Army. It would be entirely proper for a committee of Congress to call on him, and the other figures in this strange episode, to tell the full story. It is vital that Congress and the people know exactly what is going on backstage in Washington in these crucial times. A congressional investigation is assuredly in order.

Civilian Conservation Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 12 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

ARTICLE BY FREDERIC J. HASKIN AND RÉSUMÉ OF CIVILIAN CONSERVATION CORPS WORK FROM THE NEW YORK TIMES

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, material assistance has been given to many thousands of homes in America by the creation of the Civilian Conservation Corps. Youths who might have become derelicts have been given instruction in manual training, with an opportunity to improve their physical condition, making them better citizens. Boys who might have drifted into crime have been spared such a life. They have been able to send to their homes, to needy dependents, millions of dollars.

They have built for the future by planting trees, they have built for the present by construction of roads, trails, bridges, and telephone lines. They have prevented the destruction of our forests by fighting fires. They have helped in irrigation and soil erosion work by the construction of dams. Probably the greatest service of all is that their bodies have been built to splendid physical manhood and will be the bedrock of our national defense.

I wish to offer for the RECORD an article written by Mr. Frederic J. Haskin, which covers the activities of this program. I may say that the Civilian Conservation Corps is merely one of the institutions which has been inaugurated under the New Deal for the benefit of the public welfare, and particularly it has given a chance to the underprivileged.

Also, I wish to include a résumé from the New York Times.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRAISES RECORD OF C. C. C. CAMPS

(By Frederic J. Haskin)

When history records its true appraisal of the emergency legislation enacted during the depression years, it is evident that the work of the Civilian Conservation Corps will rank high in the Government's attempts to combat an economic collapse.

The C. C. C. has possibly received more praise and less criticism than any other experiment by the New Deal. This agency has not only provided work under healthful conditions for more than 2,500,000 young men, but has given them opportunity to obtain valuable vocational training.

The C. C. C. program was initiated on March 20, 1933, when President Roosevelt sent to Congress a message urging adoption of legislation under which a vast army of idle young men could be given employment through the performance of useful public work in connection with the conservation and development of the natural resources of the United States. Congress passed the legislation on March 31, and the corps was established on April 5.

For many years the public has increasingly regarded conserving and restoring the forests and lands of the Nation as an opportunity through which young men could obtain their first experience and training in real work. The C. C. C. program gave practical expression to this sentiment.

When the first enrollees went to camp they were referred to as a weaponless army whose recruits came from broken homes, highway trails, and relief shelters, but an army that carried implements of production and not death-dealing devices.

The corps has definite and constructive purposes. One of these is the conservation of natural resources, and is regarded as an achievement of importance. No less realistic and important is its purpose in advancing personal and social objectives. The corps is also successfully engaged in the conservation of human resources.

Camps of the C. C. C. are especially well adapted to the needs and interests of those eligible for enrollment—unmarried youths between the ages of 17 and 23 who have completed their formal schooling and who have had little or no opportunity to develop work qualifications.

An enrollee in the C. C. C. soon begins to adjust himself to camp life and makes physical improvement. Moreover, he is no longer idle and dependent on others. He not only is self-supporting but from his cash allowance of $30 a month sends home to his dependents a minimum of $22 a month. If he has no dependents, the Government keeps this monthly sum for him until he leaves the corps, when he receives the total.

Since establishment of the corps, enrollees have contributed more than $575,000,000 to approximately 11,000,000 needy dependents. At present the strength of the corps is 300,000, although approximately 1,780,000 persons are receiving benefits through its program.

Enrollees work 8 hours a day, 5 days a week, except in cases of emergency. The projects on which they are engaged include reforestation, park development, soil and wildlife conservation. After work hours the men are at liberty to study, attend classes, read in the library, which is included in each camp, or engage in other recreational activities of their choosing.

The C. C. C. takes the position that it should do more than give a young man a job and security while he is in the corps and at the end of his enrollment send him home with improved health, morale, and self-confidence. It holds that during his enrollment every effort should be made to increase his employability so that he may find work when he leaves the corps. To further this, an educational and training program is an important part of each C. C. C. camp. The educational opportunities open to the individual enrollee after completion of his work hours range from the course for the elimination of illiteracy to courses in technical subjects of college level.

Among the very few critics of the C. C. C. are certain individuals who contend that it is Army training. The agency was never so designed, and those who have taken the time to understand its workings do not support this contention. However, if war should come, the millions who have been trained through C. C. C. activities will be better fitted to serve their country, and obviously better able to protect themselves.

Young men trained in C. C. C. camps are specialists in a dozen or more fields. Thousands of them know the practical workings of engines. Among them are expert truck and tractor drivers and expert mechanics and linemen. There are also radio operators, carpenters, cooks, and photographers, and in the far Northwest C. C. C. enrollees use airplanes in fighting forest fires. Along with the pilot go expert parachutists, who jump from planes to fight isolated fires in backwoods areas where no truck trail leads. Indeed the C. C. C. is the largest and best vocational school in the world.

The long list of C. C. C. accomplishments in the conservation and development of this country's natural resources gives one a higher appreciation of the country's young men. Their accomplishments include such high lights as 1,753,000,000 trees planted for reforestation purposes; more than 114,000 miles of roads and truck trails constructed, largely through forest areas; more than 75,000 miles of telephone lines built to improve forest and park communications; some 47,000 bridges built; about 4,000 look-out houses and towers erected to improve forest-fire detection; fire hazards reduced on about 2,000,000 acres; approximately 3,500,000 acres of forest stands improved; more than 5,450,000 check dams constructed to prevent soil erosion; about 1,000 new State parks and related areas developed for recreational use, and in excess of 5,000,000 man-days spent fighting forest fires.

Although the C. C. C. was inaugurated as an emergency measure, it has developed into an established institution. With so few schools having vocational-training classes and employment at its best not too favorable to young men when they leave school, the C. C. C. serves as a great training agency. In all the multiplicity of plans to help the youth of the Nation, it has evolved the most practical and constructive means to an end.

[From the New York Times]

The Civilian Conservation Corps, now holding attention because it has been called upon to further the national-defense program by training young men in technical skills, has this record of achievement since it was established in 1933:

Men enrolled	2,500,000
Sent home by enrollees to needy dependents	$593,000,000
Trees planted	1,816,000,000
Miles of truck trails or minor roads built	113,000
Bridges built	43,000
Miles of telephone lines constructed	78,000
Man-days spent fighting forest fires	5,601,056
Erosion control check dams built	5,200,000
Acres of forest stands improved to aid growth	3,625,000

Conscription

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. SMATHERS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 12 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

EDITORIAL FROM ATLANTIC CITY DAILY WORLD

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have published in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Daily World, published in Atlantic City, N. J., on the subject matter of the draft bill now under consideration before the Senate.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Atlantic City Daily World]

TO CONQUER POLAND, 17 DAYS—TO LAY WASTE FRANCE, 20 DAYS—ACTION ON CONSCRIPT BILL, 47 DAYS

Unprecedented in the peacetime history of the United States was the vote passed in the Senate to mobilize 360,000 National Guard men and Army Reserves for home defense and authorizing the dispatch of these men to South America, if necessary, to enforce the Monroe Doctrine against any foreign aggressor.

The vote of 71 to 7 in favor of the bill represents the consensus of opinions held by United States citizens—to protect our land, to protect the rights embodied in those first 10 amendments to the Constitution—our Bill of Rights.

However, prior to the voting on the mobilization bill, the Senators were faced with the problem of restricting the movement of sending these men outside the confines of the United States or its Territories and possessions, including the Philippine Islands.

This is where the divided opinion was shown. This amendment was defeated by 1 vote—39 to 38.

It shows one very important point: We are not fully cognizant of the fact that it is not 48 States which we must defend now, but an entire hemisphere.

If Europe wishes to reach us, they must come here. They won't set up arms plants and airplane bases in Atlantic City, but will choose some spot in either South or Central America. Most of the other countries in this hemisphere are not strong enough to combat the dictator nations who would seek to have our Constitution torn and sprinkled in the smoldering ruins of Europe's battlefields, but we are—if we mobilize our forces now.

"Now" means today and not a month from now. The 47 days spent in considering compulsory military training is but 30 days more than it took Hitler to conquer Poland and but 27 days more than he needed to lay France beneath his heel in the Battle of France.

The world today is not moving in such periods as 48 days to change history. It's done in a few days. This is why our Congressmen must act rapidly.

It took the United States almost a full year to wake up to the fact that Hitler was taking over Europe. We don't have half that time before we find he is looking in our direction to lay definite plans for possible conquest.

Agreement Between Tennessee Valley Authority and the Tennessee Valley Trades and Labor Council

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. H. SCHWARTZ

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 12 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

MEMORANDUM COVERING PRESENT AND PAST RELATIONS

Mr. SCHWARTZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a memorandum of the agreement effective August 6, 1940, between the Tennessee Valley Authority and the Tennessee Valley Trades and Labor Council, covering present and past relations between the Authority and organized labor in construction work, and providing for collective bargaining, and that work shall continue during any negotiation that may arise.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Renewed assurance of intensified labor-management cooperation in the national-defense program of the Tennessee Valley Authority came today as the Tennessee Valley Authority and the Tennessee Valley Trades and Labor Council announced jointly that they had signed an agreement between the Authority and its 8,000 employees in the building construction and metal trades. The announcement was made through Sam E. Roper, president of the Tennessee Valley Trades and Labor Council, and Arthur S. Jandrey, Director of Personnel of the T. V. A. The agreement, formalizing more than 6 years of amicable labor relations, improves machinery of conference through formal recognition of the Tennessee Valley Trades and Labor Council and provides for mediation facilities designed to assure uninterrupted work during the course of negotiations and settlement of disputes. While disputes are in process of settlement, the unions agree not to encourage or sanction strikes. Provisions of the agreement in this respect are similar to those embodied in the Railway Labor Act.

The agreement defines and secures the benefits of joint labor-management conference and action. It also recognizes that union membership is conducive to the furtherance of the purposes and benefits of the agreement itself. The council and the Authority point out that almost all employees in the trades and labor classifications with which the agreement is concerned are members of the unions affiliated with the council. In many of the trades union membership approximates 100 percent.

The employees of the Tennessee Valley Authority in the trades and labor classifications covered by the agreement are working at numerous locations in the valley on dam construction, transmission-line construction, hydroplant operations, property maintenance, and in the fertilizer works. The Tennessee Valley Trades and Labor Council is the central body through which various unions affiliated with the American Federation of Labor cooperate in representing these employees of the Authority in all negotiations. Conferences leading to the agreement have been in progress for more than a year, with major assistance from Otto S. Beyer of the National Mediation Board. The following international unions are now affiliated with the council and will deal with the Authority through the council under the terms of the agreement:

Brotherhood of Painters, Decorators, and Paperhangers; International Brotherhood of Boiler Makers, Iron Ship Builders, and Helpers; International Brotherhood of Blacksmiths, Drop Forgers, and Helpers; International Association of Machinists; International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers; International Hod Carriers, Building, and Common Laborers' Union; International Union of Operating Engineers; Sheet Metal Workers' International Association; International Union of Wood, Wire, and Metal Lathers; Operative Plasterers and Cement Finishers' International Association; United Association of Plumbers and Steam Fitters; United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners; Bricklayers, Masons, and Plasterers' International Union; International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Stablemen, and Helpers; International Association of Heat and Frost Insulators and Asbestos Workers.

The Tennessee Valley Authority Act and the purposes for which it was established serve as the keynote of this joint agreement. The agreement specifically stipulates:

"The Tennessee Valley Authority and the Tennessee Valley Trades and Labor Council recognize that cooperation between management and employees is indispensable to the accomplishment of the public purposes for which the Tennessee Valley Authority has been established as set forth in the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of May 18, 1933, as amended, and recognize that such cooperation rests squarely on clear-cut mutual understandings between the Authority and its employees arrived at through the processes of collective bargaining."

The agreement further provides that:

"The public interest in an undertaking such as the T. V. A. always being paramount, the Authority and the Tennessee Valley Trades and Labor Council on behalf of the employees further agree that pending the determination or adjustment of any issue arising between them by means of the conference machinery and procedure hereby set up and during the life of this agreement the Authority will not change the conditions incorporated in written schedules or recorded understandings between the Authority and the Council out of which the issue arose, and the council or its member organizations will not encourage or sanction employees leaving the service."

Representatives of the Authority and of the unions view this agreement as formal recognition of a program of responsible collective bargaining and constructive joint effort which was initiated over 6 years ago. It is the consummation of the comprehensive joint relationship to which the Tennessee Valley Authority Board and employees looked forward at the time the Authority's employee relationship policy was adopted in August 1935. That policy is made a part of the agreement just signed. The agreement itself is the result of over 6 years' practical experience, study, and work by representatives of the Authority and of the council. During the 6-year relationship between the unions and the Authority, 6 large dams have been completed, 4 more are under construction, 2,100 miles of transmission lines and 4,400 miles of rural lines have been constructed, 405,000 electricity customers are being served, developing T. V. A. revenues now grossing $15,000,000 a year, and 289,000 tons of concentrated experimental fertilizer have been produced, without a single substantial stoppage of work due to labor disputes between the Authority and its employees.

The agreement provides for the effective and rapid handling of jurisdictional questions, employee grievances, and labor disputes, and for the increased efficiency and uninterrupted work on the Authority's program of dam construction, flood control, navigation, power production, experimental chemical manufacture, and national defense. It creates joint conference machinery to regulate and determine labor conditions and labor standards, to promote education and training of employees, to improve efficiency and economy in construction and operation, and to prevent hazards to health, life, and property.

Under this agreement, as in the past, wage rates are made the subject of annual conferences for the purpose of reaching joint determination of prevailing rates of pay in the Tennessee Valley. The Tennessee Valley Authority Act requires the Authority to pay the prevailing wage rates in the vicinity with due regard for rates secured through collective agreement by representatives of employers and employees.

An article provides for the maintenance of an adequate system of apprenticeship in the skilled trades to be administered by a central joint apprenticeship council under standards approved by the Federal Committee on Apprenticeship.

Another article of the agreement of particular interest recognizes that the Authority is responsible for performing the duties assigned to it by law and must therefore assign work to maintain schedules and to meet construction, operating, and service requirements. This article goes on to stipulate that the labor unions shall determine the jurisdictional boundaries between and among the several participating unions. The Authority agrees to make work assignments according to such determinations, thus disposing of a type of labor dispute which might disrupt morale and efficiency of the service.

The agreement was signed by appropriate representatives of the council and of the Authority, to become effective August 6, 1940.

Ireland's Stand in the Present War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 12 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

INTERVIEW WITH MR. FRANK AIKEN, MINISTER OF DEFENSE FOR EIRE

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, Ireland is practically the only small nation left in Europe. Nevertheless, it is making a gallant effort to maintain its neutral rights in the face of its dangerous position as an independent nation.

The Government of Eire, under the premiership of Mr. De Valera, is entitled to the generous support and encouragement of the liberty-loving people of the whole world. Its

courageous stand for its rights as a neutral nation is inspiring to all Americans. I am confident that, with the spirit they are exhibiting, they will ward off any threat of violation of their neutrality.

Mr. Frank Aiken, Minister of Defense for Eire, has recently given an interview which explodes the propaganda which has been carried in the press and explains the stand taken by the Irish people in the present war. I have here a transcript of that interview and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Frank Aiken, Minister of Defense for Eire, in an exclusive interview for National Broadcasting Co. listeners on the Fourth of July, said that if Ireland is attacked she will ask aid from the opposition.

Interviewed in Eire by Dennis Johnson, prominent author and publisher, the Eire Minister of Defense said: "There are two sides to every war, you know, and if we are attacked by one belligerent, we shall certainly be helped by the other. And we will ask help if events prove we are not able to beat off the attacks with our own resources."

The Irish official gave facts and figures on defense and alien migration into the Irish Free State and outlined defense plans.

The complete text of the interview as transcribed from the air by the National Broadcasting Co. in New York follows:

"Mr. JOHNSON. You know, Mr. Aiken, a great many quarters are greatly concerned about the possibility of Ireland's being invaded. Now, do you feel that you can tell your American listeners whether there is any basis for these?

"Mr. AIKEN. Mr. Johnson, so far as these 28 counties of which the Irish people have effective control are concerned, there is no legitimate reason why we should be attacked by either side. We have declared our neutrality. We did it in the exercise of our national right. That declaration received the practically unanimous consent of our people, and we have abided strictly by the laws of neutrality since hostilities began. In fact, in order to avoid giving any excuse for an attack upon us, we have avoided doing a lot of things the laws permit neutrals to do.

"Mr. JOHNSON. Do you expect any scrupulous observer of neutrality will really have——

"Mr. AIKEN. Well, Mr. Johnson, all I can say is that we are neutral. We have a right to be neutral. We expect our neutrality to be respected. In the last resort, we are prepared to defend our rights to the utmost of our strength and resources.

"Mr. JOHNSON. Yes; but I think what England would like to know is whether you are strong enough to defend those rights successfully against a large belligerent power.

"Mr. AIKEN. Well, we are not—that is, alone we are not. But there are two sides to every war, you know, and if we are attacked by one belligerent we shall certainly be helped by the other, if we ask for help.

"Mr. JOHNSON. Do you think, in the second instance, you would ask for help?

"Mr. AIKEN. Yes; we would; that if, of course, if events proved we were not able to beat off the attacks with our own resources.

"Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Aiken, you are being very careful. I notice you have been talking about the war for quite a while and you haven't mentioned the name of a single belligerent so far.

"Mr. AIKEN. Of course not, Mr. Johnson. The situation is much too serious. You have noticed, I am sure, that the name of Ireland has been bandied about rather ominously these days on all sides. As an assistant of Mr. De Valera said recently, we are a small state in the midst of warring giants. In such circumstances we cannot afford to trade our coat, even if we wanted to, and so we are far from wanting to.

"Mr. JOHNSON. Does that matter very much these days, Mr. Aiken?

"Mr. AIKEN. Oh, yes; I think it does. We are determined to act in such a manner that if we are ever attacked it would be clearly an unwarranted and unjust attack, an attack so unjust that our people would resist it with the greatest vigor.

"Mr. JOHNSON. Yes; but are they in a position to resist? I mean, some people seem to think, for instance, there hasn't been a very good response to the recruiting appeal.

"Mr. AIKEN. Well, now, I don't know what you mean by good. But in an actual week about 90,000 men have enrolled, and of these a large number are trained soldiers.

"Mr. JOHNSON. That sounds like a pretty high percentage of the population.

Mr. AIKEN. It is; yes; it is a pretty high percentage. It would correspond to a figure of, say, 1,350,000 in the United States.

"Mr. JOHNSON. I see.

"Mr. AIKEN. When we started a month ago, recruiting was a bit slow for the first week. You know how difficult it is to make people realize the danger of which there is no immediate signs. But now they are enrolling in increasing numbers every day. It seems to me practically the whole of the able-bodied men in the country are prepared to fight, if we had arms for them all. If we fail, it won't be for want of men or of the will to fight, or of a good cause.

"Mr. JOHNSON. Well, that, of course, brings me to the very next point: The question of arms. It has been said that although you may not be short of men, you have not got the arms to equip them with.

"Mr. AIKEN. Well, we haven't all the arms we would like; but we are much better off now than at any time in our history. We shall try to get more, of course; but what we have we shall use effectively, I hope. We may be beaten even, of course, but we won't lie down until we are knocked down, and I guarantee that our overthrow would not be achieved without cost.

"Mr. JOHNSON. Well, there is another point, Mr. Aiken. There has been a lot of talk recently about 'fifth columnists.' Do you think there is anything in it so far as Ireland is concerned?

"Mr. AIKEN. No; at least there is very little. It is largely a scare story built on half-truths. We have, of course, a number of men who have preferred to use forceful political opposition. For centuries, as you know, we had no other effective means to redress political grievances and the traditions thus established die hard. But it is wrong to say that we haven't very large numbers of Irishmen who would help on our side in an attack on this part of the country. We had unfortunately, before the present developments in European affairs, to imprison about 500 people whose activities were a danger to the state. We feared also that any sporadic acts of undiscipline might encourage outsiders to think we were not a united and disciplined people. But at no time in our history, I think, have we shown a greater unity of purpose and a greater solidarity—the solidarity that our people are showing in this crisis to defend our neutrality.

"Mr. JOHNSON. I see. Well, so much for Irishmen. What about all the aliens who are here?

"Mr. AIKEN. Supposed to be here? You should say.

"Mr. JOHNSON. Maybe I should put it that way.

"Mr. AIKEN. You know how stories get exaggerated. As a matter of fact, we could fit all the continental citizens of all nationalities here into a single hotel holding 1,300 people.

"Mr. JOHNSON. Could you give us actual figures about the aliens?

"Mr. AIKEN. I can; yes. The total number of aliens in this country is 2,610 persons. Of these, a couple of weeks ago, almost exactly half were American citizens. Some have gone back since then, of course. The other half are from 34 different other countries.

"Mr. JOHNSON. And how many of these are, shall we say, Germans?

"Mr. AIKEN. I think there are a little over 300 Germans; yes, 326 to be exact, and about half of them are refugees.

"Mr. JOHNSON. Well, there is another point, Mr. Aiken. Are the staffs of the legations in this country, the foreign legations in this country, unusually large?

"Mr. AIKEN. The British and the Americans are the largest; they have nine each, and the French and the Germans come next with a half dozen each.

"Mr. JOHNSON. That is a little surprising. There is one other rumor which it might be interesting to deal with. Have a great many Germans come into the country since the war started?

"Mr. AIKEN. Two, at least.

"Mr. JOHNSON. How is that?

"Mr. AIKEN. Two.

"Mr. JOHNSON. Of course, Mr. Aiken, all these matters we have been discussing apply only to the 26 counties under the control of the Irish Government.

"Mr. AIKEN. Unfortunately, the other part of the country, the six northern counties, are still controlled by Britain, and when Britain declared war they were automatically at war, whether they willed it or not.

"Mr. JOHNSON. I realize that, Mr. Aiken, but I see the question of a united Ireland is being very wisely discussed at present. Tell me, would your government be prepared to give up its neutrality for the sake of union with the north?

"Mr. AIKEN. Most certainly not. We want union and sovereignty, not union and slavery. This nation, this whole island is entitled to decide its own policy in peace or war. Even though unity may not be attained immediately, there can be no foregoing or bartering of that right—the right of the Irish people to decide their own destiny. Again, we are as concerned for the well-being of our people in the north as for the well-being of our people in the 26 counties. If we once acheve union on a basis of sovereign national right, our strength of defense would be so enormously increased that I don't believe anyone would dare attack us. That, of course, is the position we are trying to achieve.

"Mr. JOHNSON. Surely, Mr. Aiken, for good or ill, the six counties are now in war. Do you suppose any belligerent would ever agree to them withdrawing from the war into a state of neutrality?

"Mr. AIKEN. Why not? After all, these are our people—Irish. They did not declare war. And if they happened to form a sovereign parliament, they would have the same right to be neutral as the rest of the country.

"Mr. JOHNSON. From the point of Britain, do you believe a unified Ireland would be as valuable as at present, in which she has six counties belligerent on her side?

"Mr. AIKEN. Now, Mr. Johnson, let me say, first of all, our right union doesn't depend upon an answer to that question; but I believe an independent military expert would say yes, much more valuable. My own view, however, is whoever would force an extension of the war to the present 26 counties would lose heavily through the venture and they would, of course, lose much more heavily in the cast of a neutral or all-Ireland State.

"Mr. JOHNSON. I see. Very well, your immediate problem at the moment, however, is defense of 26 counties. And what steps have been taken to meet the present emergency?

"Mr. AIKEN. Ever since the emergency became acute, we have taken steps to strengthen our defense forces in every way possible.

"Mr. JOHNSON. I see. You certainly seem to be feverishly active about preparing your defenses.

"Mr. AIKEN. There is no panic about them, but we are preparing with all our energy and putting our trust in God and hope to pull through. You know how the old Irish saying goes, 'God likes a little help,' and we are going to try to give him all the help we can."

San Francisco Center of Vast National-Defense Activities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCK R. HAVENNER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 12, 1940

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Speaker, I desire at this time to thank my colleagues in the House of Representatives for the support they have given during the present session of Congress to many important measures for the benefit of San Francisco, the city which I have the honor to represent. I am sure that all of my constituents will join me in an expression of gratitude to the membership of this House for their very generous attitude toward our problems and projects.

This Congress has been in large measure responsible for making it possible to continue the Golden Gate International Exposition during the year 1940. Without the assurance of funds which have been appropriated to continue Federal participation in the exposition its gates would not have reopened this year. I am happy to report that our exposition is enjoying a very successful season, and that the average attendance to date has been considerably larger than it was at this time last year.

SUPERNAVY ASSURED

Through the courtesy of my Democratic colleagues, it has been my privilege to serve as a member of the House Committee on Naval Affairs, and I am proud to say that the record will show that I have voted for every measure for the national defense since I have been a Member of Congress. It has been a most interesting and inspiring experience, Mr. Speaker, to take part in the formulation of the great naval expansion program which will provide the United States with the most powerful navy in the history of the world—a navy sufficient to protect both our Pacific and Atlantic coasts against any threat of attack in the future. This new supernavy will guarantee peace for the American Nation for generations to come. It will be our most effective insurance against war.

San Francisco has become one of the most important centers of national-defense activity in America, Mr. Speaker. The total amount of money appropriated by this Congress for national-defense projects and other public works in the San Francisco Bay region and for shipbuilding there has reached the astounding total of half a billion dollars.

MILLIONS FOR SHORE DEFENSES

The Navy Department has been authorized by this Congress to construct and acquire public works on San Francisco Bay costing $24,722,000. Much of this construction work is nearing completion, and will soon be ready for use by the Navy.

This Congress has appropriated $6,000,000 to enable the Navy to acquire ownership of the important graving drydocks at Hunters Point. A large assembling plant will be constructed on property immediately adjacent to the drydocks and this section of San Francisco will be converted into a great base for the repair of major ships of the Navy Department and the merchant marine.

For the Alameda Naval Air Base, located on the opposite side of San Francisco Bay, this Congress has appropriated $10,492,000. The Secretary of the Navy informs me that this new aviation base will be completed about the first of October this year, and it will be in operation with a full complement of about 1,300 men by the 1st of January 1941. This will be the largest naval aviation base on the Pacific coast.

For additional facilities at the Naval Supply Depot in Oakland, $2,300,000 has been made available. Money has also been allotted for new construction at the Mare Island Navy Yard in the amount of $5,931,000.

VAST SHIPBUILDING PROGRAM

The greatest shipbuilding program in history is now under way on San Francisco Bay. It began rather modestly in 1939 when the Navy Department ordered the construction in bay region shipyards, including Mare Island Navy Yard, of naval vessels costing $6,021,000. In 1940, the current year, the total cost of ship construction allotted to the same yards will be $61,566,000, and the projected program of the Navy Department for shipbuilding on San Francisco Bay in the immediate future represents an outlay of $318,852,000. Of course, Mr. Speaker, this vast program will involve the employment of large numbers of men. At the Union Plant of the Bethlehem Shipbuilding Co. in San Francisco alone it is estimated that nearly 12,000 men will be employed in the near future, in addition to the regular working force of the plant.

MANY MERCHANT SHIPS

During 1939 the United States Maritime Commission awarded contracts for the construction of 14 merchant-marine ships in San Francisco Bay yards at an aggregate cost of $31,869,020. The Union Iron Works, of San Francisco, has contracts for 5 of those ships totaling in cost $10,010,000. The Western Pipe & Steel Co., of San Francisco, has contracts for 5 vessels, amounting to $10,637,500, and the Moore Drydock Co., of Oakland, 4 vessels costing $11,221,500.

It is estimated that on these contracts alone about $10,000,000 in wages will be paid out in the bay area.

Bids have just been opened by the Maritime Commission for the construction of additional ships. Among the bidders are the Western Pipe & Steel Co. and the Moore Drydock Co.

ARMY AND COAST GUARD

For Army defenses in the San Francisco Bay area $3,351,400 is being expended under the authority of this Congress for emergency construction work of a temporary character and $958,000 for Regular Army construction. The posts at which this construction work is being done include the Presidio of San Francisco, Fort Mason, Fort Baker, Fort Winfield Scott, Hamilton Field, Moffett Field, Camp Ord, and Mines Field.

The United States Coast Guard has nearly completed its new $600,000 air station at the Mills Field airport, and the Army engineers will soon begin the dredging work necessary to construct a seaplane harbor in front of the Coast Guard station at a cost of $275,000.

We appreciate, Mr. Speaker, the appropriation recently approved which has made it possible to proceed at once with the construction of the new $4,825,000 Federal building at Sansome and Washington Streets which will house the appraisers' department of the Customs Service and the Bureau of Immigration at the port of San Francisco.

PERMANENT IMPROVEMENTS

During the life of this Congress expenditures made through the Work Projects Administration for public improvements in San Francisco have amounted to $24,055,253, embracing a wide program of highway and street construction, improvements of parks and playgrounds, and public buildings of permanent value to the city.

The new national cemetery near South San Francisco, purchased under the authority of this Congress, will be opened for burial of soldiers about October 1 of this year. This cemetery embraces 161 acres of land, purchased for $158,746, on which nearly $300,000 has been expended for improvements. The old national cemetery at the Presidio of San Francisco will be completely filled with graves next month.

The Federal Housing Administration reports that 12,190 mortgage-insurance loans, aggregating $58,546,000 have been made to San Francisco home builders, and 29,149 loans totaling $11,837,000 to property owners in our city for modernization and repair of their homes.

SAN FRANCISCO GRATEFUL

During 1939 and 1940 the Public Works Administration, which is now completing its work, has participated in financing five large public improvements in San Francisco at an estimated total cost of $12,448,663. Grants aggregating $4,874,663 and loans of $633,000 were advanced on these

projects out of funds provided by this Congress. The projects include the new junior college buildings, the new waterfront warehouse, a sewage-disposal plant, hospitals, and schools.

Seven low-cost housing projects have been approved in San Francisco during the past 2 years by the United States Housing Authority, and the loan contracts executed for these projects amount to $9,428,000.

I repeat, Mr. Speaker, that the people of San Francisco have much reason to be grateful to this Congress and to our great President, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, for the magnificent measures adopted for the strengthening of our local defenses, which are essentially national in character, and for the great material benefits which will be enjoyed by business and labor from the history-making program of ship building which has just been inaugurated.

The 1940 Farm Credit Situation

REMARKS

OF

HON. REID F. MURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 12, 1940

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, the general public is of necessity interested in a national land policy and a permanent system of agricultural production. History reveals that any great country is one with a large amount of rich, fertile, productive land. Anyone who is familiar with soils is well aware of the millions of acres of land in the United States, with its natural, inherent fertility. This is the foundation of our country and one of the factors of its greatness.

In order for any country to have a permanent agricultural system it is necessary, first, to have a constructive land policy; second, to have a general understanding of scientific and practical agricultural processes; and, third, to have long-term loans available to the farmers of the country.

The following table shows the number and amount of Federal loans in the United States since the inception of this Federal program:

Federal land banks and Land Bank Commissioner, number and amount of loans closed, 1917 to June 30, 1940

Period	Federal land bank		Land Bank Commissioner		Total	
	Number	Amount	Number	Amount	Number	Amount
1917	18,154	$39,112,115			18,154	$39,112,115
1918	49,808	118,129,836			49,808	118,129,836
1919	45,436	144,987,180			45,436	144,987,180
1920	17,997	66,984,534			17,997	66,984,534
1921	27,153	91,029,976			27,153	91,029,976
1922	74,055	224,301,400			74,055	224,301,400
1923	60,100	192,083,015			60,100	192,083,015
1924	47,227	165,509,845			47,227	165,509,845
1925	39,905	127,355,451			39,905	127,355,451
1926	36,893	131,317,715			36,893	131,317,715
1927	39,268	140,384,200			39,268	140,384,200
1928	26,988	102,236,400			26,988	102,236,400
1929	17,132	64,252,500			17,132	64,252,500
1930	12,572	47,971,000			12,572	47,971,000
1931	10,898	42,015,300			10,898	42,015,300
1932	7,208	27,569,800			7,208	27,569,800
1933 [1]	3,268	11,495,447			3,268	11,495,447
Total	534,062	1,736,735,714			534,062	1,736,735,714
1933 [2]	35,300	140,138,664	44,039	$70,812,112	79,339	210,950,776
1934	190,147	730,367,140	306,354	553,136,316	496,501	1,283,503,456
1935	58,968	248,671,200	91,004	196,395,349	149,972	445,066,549
1936	26,362	109,170,200	38,929	77,257,795	65,291	186,427,995
1937	15,989	63,091,729	21,873	40,020,173	37,862	103,111,902
1938	14,171	51,418,472	17,453	29,395,145	31,624	80,813,617
1939	13,624	51,581,500	16,423	27,417,350	30,047	78,998,850
1940 [3]	8,731	32,867,407	10,930	18,306,665	19,661	51,174,072
Total	363,292	1,427,306,312	547,005	1,012,740,905	910,297	2,440,047,217
Grand total	897,354	3,164,042,026	547,005	1,012,740,905	1,444,359	4,176,782,931

[1] Jan. 1 through Apr. 30.
[2] May 1 through Dec. 31.
[3] Jan. 1 through June 30.

Farm Credit Administration, Division of Finance and Accounts.

There are many lessons to be learned from a study of this table, even if the reader had never had any contact or personal experience with the Farm Credit Administration.

In order to approach this problem correctly, one must present his philosophy of government and governmental agencies. First of all, we hear one side say "We do not want the Government in business," and the other side say, "We want the Government to run all business."

What applies to the Government in the farm-loan business, no doubt is applicable to other branches of the Government. Most people believe in a governmental "cushion" for agriculture, business, and labor.

Some 30 years ago I heard Sir Horace Plunkett of Ireland give a talk on The Land Policy of Ireland. He went on to tell about the long-term leases and the long-term loans. He told of the stability of a country where the farmer knows when he wakes up in the morning where he will sleep the following night. You well know the improvement that took place in Ireland after they had an acceptable land policy in that country.

For over 30 years I have studied, watched, and sometimes nearly prayed that our country adopt a sane land policy and a farm-loan program that was in keeping with the needs of our people.

THE FEDERAL LAND BANK

The Federal land bank, upon its inception, went steadily ahead with its loans, as you will note, until the 1920's when troubles began to arise as shown in the number of loans made. These troubles were a reflection of the effect of the 50,000,000 additional acres put into wartime production. The number of loans made in 1922 was 10 times the number made 10 years later. The effects of the world and domestic depression is also shown in the foregoing table. Then, again, note that in 1935 there were 18 times more loans made than in 1939.

I do not care to enter into a political discussion in regard to any of the facts shown by this table, but will set forth the following observations:

First. I want to make this very evident observation, and that is that in 1932 or 1939 when the farmers really needed credit facilities in order to finance farms, this was not available from the governmental agency which had been charged with this responsibility. In other words the system "bogged down" due to certain economic and other reasons.

Second. Most rural-minded people believe that the Government was wise in the establishment of the farm land-bank system. Most rural-minded people do not wish to see the Federal Government as the only source of farm loans. Most rural-minded people think of the Federal land bank as a cushion for farm credit. They feel that when economic conditions are bad in any community, due to droughts, storms, or low agricultural prices, the farmers of this country should have this avenue of credit, not only for their own personal benefit, but for the benefit of society as a whole, as well.

Third. Most thoughtful rural-minded people want these loans at a fair rate of interest and in keeping with the value of money and crops and in keeping with the rates of interest paid by other groups of society. In a period of years, the prices which the farmer receives for his product determines what interest rate, if any, he can pay.

Fourth. Most rural-minded people believe that we should have a relatively definite land and loan policy, and that with 23 years of Federal loan experience such a program could and should be agreed upon. Policies and interest rates should be established on a permanent long-time basis and not be left to the particular attitude of a certain Congress that happens to be in session when the rates and policies are subject to change.

Fifth. The farm-credit situation should not be a political question or football for any political party, and a long-term program would eliminate the politics materially.

Sixth. The farmers themselves should be given a greater voice in the operations of the Federal loan system. With thousands of agricultural college graduates in the land, with thousands of Smith-Hughes teachers, and with thousands of agricultural extension workers and county agents, I am most certain that a sufficient number of capable agricultural men

can be secured to more properly help administer the farm-loan program of the future. I am firmly convinced that they will perform their duties as efficiently as the other groups handle their duties in the other branches of the Government.

Seventh. Though some people accuse the present Farm Credit Administration of playing politics with the present loan policies, I do not care to discuss that point. I will say this, however, that the time has come when the people of this country should realize that the farm people of this Nation are entitled to the same consideration an any other group of our people.

Eighth. During the past 7 years, 91,135 farmers have lost their homes. There was an average loan of $2,800 and the interest was about $100 per loan per year. These farmers were driven onto W. P. A., the relief rolls, and into migratory camps in great numbers at a great expense to society. During this same time the U. S. H. A. built 90,436 housing units for their city cousins with an average cost of $4,359 per unit. In addition, these housing units are subsidized by the Government for $28,000,000 per year for 60 years. This is an average of $193 per unit per year for 60 years.

Ninth. In other words, we have seen 91,135 farmers driven from their homes because they could not pay $100 a year interest, while at the same time we were building $4,359 homes for our city cousins and paying $193 of their rent each year so they could have a home that cost considerably more than the farmer's farm and home combined. We did not hear so much about soft loans when this U. S. H. A. program was being pushed through Congress.

Tenth. Rich, fertile, productive farm land is still the basis of real wealth of this or any other country. Some say that the recently adopted policy of the present Farm Credit Administration is for political or vote-buying purposes. Common sense is usually good politics, and this new interest in handling these delinquent loans and foreclosures so far has the earmarks not only of common sense but also of common justice. Over 25 percent of the Federal farm loans of the United States are delinquent and over 50 percent of the loans of my district are delinquent. We have had year after year of drought and low prices. If the farmers of my district could not carry the load with 14- to 17-cent cheese, how are they to carry it with 12- to 13-cent cheese? The problem of delinquent loans must be met with a deep understanding and an appreciation of the fundamental facts.

I am happy to have had the opportunity to have been instrumental in equalizing and reducing the interest rates so that tens of thousands of dollars will be saved the farmers of my district and millions of dollars saved for the farmers of the Nation. This equalization was a matter of equity and justice. Other adjustments should in time be included.

No one, regardless of political party, can question the spirit of the employees of the Farm Credit office, and I sincerely hope that regardless of the outcome of the November elections we can look forward to finding a sympathetic, fair, just, and common-sense Federal loan policy inaugurated and maintained.

Secretary Ickes Averts Big Tax Increase in San Francisco

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCK R. HAVENNER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 12, 1940

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to be able to report that Secretary of the Interior Ickes, by a voluntary exercise of authority vested in him by act of Congress, has acted to save the people of San Francisco from a threatened increase of about 22 cents in the annual tax rate which is about to be adopted in my home city.

One week ago, Mr. Speaker, I addressed the following letter to the Secretary of the Interior:

AUGUST, 5, 1940.

Hon. HAROLD L. ICKES,
Secretary of the Interior, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Ever since I was first elected to public office in San Francisco, 15 years ago, I have believed that municipal distribution of the hydroelectric power generated on the Hetch Hetchy project would be for the best interest of the people of the city, and have contended that the sale of this power to the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. through a so-called agency contract was a violation of the Raker Act. I have believed also that your action in declaring the contract to be illegal was in strict conformity with the duties imposed upon you by the Raker Act, which made the Secretary of the Interior responsible for the enforcement of its provisions. The recent decision of the United States Supreme Court declaring the contract to be illegal completely upheld the propriety of your action in this matter.

Since the Supreme Court rendered its decision you have twice requested the Department of Justice and the United States district court to defer the enforcement of an injunction against the continued illegal sale of this power in order to permit the city of San Francisco to work out the terms of a compliance with the Raker Act in accordance with the Supreme Court ruling. I believe that all right-thinking citizens of San Francisco will applaud your consent to these extensions as eminently fair.

However, because of certain technical provisions of the city charter which regulate the fixing of the annual tax rate, the people of San Francisco are now confronted, as a result of your extensions of time, with a financial problem of major importance. The San Francisco tax rate must be fixed by the board of supervisors not later than September 15 of each year. In estimating the amount of the tax rate the supervisors cannot take into account any revenues which are not legally assured throughout the rest of the fiscal year.

The last extension of time which you have granted for the continuance of negotiations for a lease of the Pacific Gas & Electric Co.'s distribution system will expire on October 1. But even if a lease were approved by you on that date, the supervisors could not take advantage of the continued revenues from power which the city might enjoy thereafter. In other words, the only Hetch Hetchy power revenues from which the taxpayers of San Francisco can get any benefit in the present situation are limited by the expiration date of any extension to which you and the Federal court may stipulate. Therefore, unless you can agree prior to September 15 to a further extension of the effective date of the injunction, even though the lease negotiations should be successful after that date, taxes will have to be levied on the property owners of San Francisco sufficient to raise a revenue of approximately $1,800,000, which is the estimated amount of power income to be received from the existing contract from October 1 to the end of the fiscal year, June 30, 1941. This would necessitate an increase in the San Francisco tax rate of approximately 22½ cents on each $100 of assessed property value.

For many years the obligations of San Francisco under the Hetch Hetchy grant, which is embodied in the Raker Act, were misrepresented to the people by propagandists acting for private power interests, and as a result a large number of our taxpayers and voters were honestly confused. Now that the Supreme Court has removed all doubt as to the exact nature of the city's obligations, I am confident that the people of San Francisco will, at the earliest possible date, proceed to comply with the law. In the meantime, I earnestly hope that it may be possible to relieve them from any penalty of increased taxation.

May I, therefore, respectfully request your consideration of a recommendation for a further extension of the effective date of the injunction against the agency contract until July 1, 1941, the beginning of the next fiscal year. This would avoid the necessity of levying any additional taxes upon the people of San Francisco to replace power revenues, and would give them ample opportunity to work out and put into effect a satisfactory compliance with the Raker Act as constructed by the Supreme Court. Our people are already confronted with the certainty of an increase in taxes this year from causes entirely unrelated to Hetch Hetchy power, and I am sure that they will be permanently grateful to you and to the Federal Government if they can be saved from this additional burden.

Sincerely,

FRANCK R. HAVENNER,
Member of Congress.

Today, Mr. Speaker, I have received a reply from the Secretary of the Interior, in which he expresses a desire to relieve the people of San Francisco from any penalty of increased taxation, and states that he will explore the possibilities of working out a stipulation which will justify him in recommending a further stay of the injunction against sale of the Hetch Hetchy power.

Secretary Ickes letter follows:

THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, August 10, 1940.

Hon. FRANCK R. HAVENNER,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. HAVENNER: I have received your letter of August 5, in which you urge that I recommend a further extension until July

1, 1941, of the injunction in the Hetch Hetchy litigation. I need not review with you the circumstances which have led to the present situation since you know them fully.

I am acutely aware of the problem with which the taxpayers of San Francisco are faced, and I agree with you that, if it can be legitimately avoided, there should be no penalty of increased taxation on them. I have always felt that the people of San Francisco would overwhelmingly support a program for compliance with the Raker Act if the true facts were made available to them so that they could exercise an informed judgment.

My problem lies in the necessity for securing compliance with the act and the Supreme Court's decision in the most expeditious possible manner. I am asked to recommend a stay of the injunction which will extend well beyond a year from the date of the Supreme Court decision. Under the Raker Act it is my duty to secure compliance with its provisions and it would be entirely inconsistent with that duty to agree to an extended continuation of an arrangement which has already been declared illegal by the highest Court. Consequently, I feel that I can recommend a stay of the injunction only if there is some binding obligation on the part of the city to take the steps necessary to effectuate compliance with the act immediately. I think it is important also, because of the past history of this matter, to secure commitments from the press and civic leaders of San Francisco that they will support and give vigorous publicity to the facts supporting a program for compliance with the act.

I realize the need for moving speedily on this matter. I hope that the assurances which I seek will be forthcoming promptly, and on the assumption that they will be I am proceeding to explore the possibility of working out a stipulation binding upon San Francisco which may serve to justify a recommendation for the further stay of the injunction.

For your information I am enclosing copies of letters dealing with this subject, which I am sending to Mayor Rossi and to Mr. E. D. Coblentz, publisher of the San Francisco Call-Bulletin.

Sincerely yours,

(Signed) HAROLD L. ICKES,
Secretary of the Interior.

Americans Will Volunteer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GERALD W. LANDIS
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 12, 1940

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, never have I risen to address the House with a greater sense of responsibility than at this moment. I do want to be recorded in this critical hour of our Republic as being opposed to peacetime conscription. It should be adopted only after all other methods have failed. Future generations may turn back to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and find that there were some Members of the House who believed the idea of conscription in time of peace was completely foreign to the fundamental principles of democracy and the American way of life. It is my sincere belief that Americans will willingly fight for their own country, but they will have to be drafted to fight for European countries.

There must be something wrong with an administration that cannot raise a peacetime Army without conscription. One of the significant reasons is—thousands of those who would be forced to serve under a compulsory plan are sons of World War veterans. These boys have been told by their dads how they were promised their old jobs back after it was over "over there." Upon their return, however, they found that their jobs had been taken by others. These same young men are also not blind to the fact that the present administration, for 7 long years, has been most unfriendly to the veterans of our Nation. Their memories are still freshened with the enaction of the Economy Act in 1933, in which thousands of deserving defenders of our country, under the guise of economy, were shamefully treated.

Mr. Speaker, it is yet to be convincingly demonstrated that voluntary enlistments will not provide sufficient numbers of recruits to keep abreast with our defense program. Until this has been proven beyond the shadow of a doubt, I can see no real justification for drafting the services of America's young manhood. So far, under our present enlistment program, the enlistments have exceeded the quotas set by the officials of the Army and Navy. The June quota for the Army was 15,000 and by the end of June the enlistments had reached 23,000. There were over 30,000 recruits for the month of July. The June quota for the navy was 4,300. The June enlistments totaled 4,329, while the number for July was 4,500.

I believe that we can obtain the necessary men for home defense by voluntary 1-year enlistments, and by increasing the basic rate of pay from $21 to $30 per month. The cost of one battleship would pay the increase of 600,000 Army volunteers. Young men can enlist in the C. C. C. for 1 year and draw $30 a month. We pay good wages for police and fire protection. We are spending billions for equipment. Why not spend a few additional millions to increase the pay of our Army and Navy volunteers?

What could we do with an Army of 1,200,000 men at present? According to our Army experts, we have a shortage of uniforms, tanks, antitank guns, antiaircraft guns, and other equipment. I believe we should fully equip our Regular Army and National Guard before we assume the task of conscripting 1,200,000 young men. In support of this contention, I would like to submit some statements from our experts who appeared before the Senate subcommittee on appropriations:

SHORTAGE OF UNIFORMS

General MARSHALL. The fact remains that, if it should become necessary to mobilize the National Guard at peace strength, we would not have on hand the cloth to commence the manufacture of uniforms for the additional 85,000 men, I would say, for possibly 4 or 5 months. When you think of such a situation in terms of morale, you can see what it would mean. Some might say that they could wear overalls. Well, they would in any event wear overalls while training, but human nature being what it is, and parents and constituents being what they are, there would be an unfortunate reaction if we should have to leave our men in that ignominious plight for 4 or 5 months. I am quite certain that the War Department would be very severely criticized.

ANTITANK GUNS

General MARSHALL. We have a serious situation in the length of time required to produce the antitank gun. Our total requirements are 1,556. We have on hand—218, and on order—526, on which deliveries will not be completed until June 1941.

ANTIAIRCRAFT GUNS

General MARSHALL. We have on hand the 3-inch guns for but 26 regiments, and directors and height finders for 27 regiments. By the end of 1941 we will have guns, directors, and height finders for 34 regiments.

TANKS

General MOORE. There are two kinds of tanks. Of the light new tanks, we had actually on hand on May 1, only 10. We have under order enough to provide 402.

They have ordered 734 light tanks and 194 medium tanks.

According to the information set forth by these two Army experts, you can readily understand that the Army would be unable to train and equip 1,200,000 men at this time.

I believe that our Regular Army should be thoroughly trained in modern warfare first. They will then be ready to teach new recruits to meet future needs.

Congress has followed Executive recommendation until there remains no hope of finding safety in that path. It is time for Congress to decide a few things for itself.

I for one want an army, navy, and air force designed for home defense, but not an oversized army for overseas service.

I will never vote to send American boys across the seas to fight in another European struggle.

The people have repeatedly demonstrated their desire for Congress to remain in session, and to solve the problems so sorely perplexing our democracy. It behooves each of us to stand faithful to this solemn charge entrusted to us. May we be given the courage, the human understanding, and the strength of character to solve these problems in a manner which will not be detrimental to the best interests of the American people.

One-Year Enlistments in Regular Army Now Authorized by Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EARL C. MICHENER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 12, 1940

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, during the last few weeks I have received numerous letters opposing military conscription in peacetimes and urging that the term of enlistment in the Regular Army be reduced from 3 years to 1 year in an endeavor to get the required number of men through the process of voluntary enlistment.

These writers apparently do not realize that it is possible now to enlist "in the Regular Army for a period of 1 or 3 years at the option of the soldier."

Few Members of Congress apparently realize that this is the law and that 1-year enlistments are being received and have been received in the Regular Army each year at least since 1930. I am satisfied, however, that the general "option" has not been given to the young men desiring to enlist. In short, the 1-year enlistment period has not been publicized and in fact has been discouraged by the War Department through the recruiting stations. In view of this situation on August 2, 1940, I addressed a letter to the Adjutant General of the War Department which was in part as follows:

I am not clear on the present provisions of the law and the regulations of the Department concerning the length of enlistments in the Regular Army at this time.

Will you please give me an immediate answer to the following questions:

1. Does the Army accept 1-year enlistments in the Regular Service at this time?

2. If so, from what date have such enlistments been accepted?

3. If 1-year enlistments are accepted at this time, please give me the law authorizing such enlistments, and the extent to which it has been publicized.

This matter is urgent and important because I am receiving numerous letters from constituents urging that the voluntary enlistment period in the Regular Army be reduced from 3 years to 1 year during the present emergency.

On August 8 I received a reply from the Adjutant General which is as follows:

Receipt is acknowledged of your letter of August 2, 1940, requesting information on the present provisions of the law and the regulations of the Department concerning the length of enlistments in the Regular Army at this time.

The act of June 4, 1920, authorized original enlistments in the Regular Army for a period of 1 or 3 years at the option of the soldier.

The Army regulations contain the following provisions:

"Original enlistments in the Regular Army are authorized to be made for 1- or 3-year periods but all reenlistments therein are restricted by law to 3-year periods. Men enlisted for 1-year periods will not be given original assignments or subsequent transfers where sea travel is involved, and assignments and transfers involving rail transportation may be made only as specifically authorized by the War Department. A man with any prior Regular Army enlisted service is not eligible for a 1-year enlistment in the Regular Army; however, prior service in the Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard is not a bar to the 1-year enlistment."

In recent years 1-year enlistments have not been encouraged since an efficient military force depends not only on the training of the individual soldier but also, and to a greater degree, on the coordinated training of all combat units that make up the fighting force. The rapid turnover and the short period of training that would result should 1-year enlistments be general for the Regular Army of 375,000 men would seriously hamper the development of efficient combat units in that component.

The War Department has recommended bringing into service for 1 year's training approximately 800,000 men in two increments. Only by bringing these trainees into the service in large groups can graduated instructions be given from the training of the individual through training of combat teams of all echelons. The staggering incident to any voluntary system would necessitate many classes of instruction throughout the year and seriously hamper efficient training.

I am enclosing a table showing the number of 1-year enlistments made since 1930.

Very respectfully,

E. S. ADAMS,
Major General, The Adjutant General.

One-year enlistments

	1931	1932	1933	1934	1935	1936	1937	1938	1939	1940
July	15	12	93	242	171	293	239	210	242	267
August	9	3			2	4			1	
September	1	1	1	2		1	3	1	4	
October				3	3	1	1	2	5	1
November	1		1	5	2		1		1	
December		1		1						
January	2	1		1					1	
February	1						28			
March				1			23		1	
April	3		2		1		17		1	
May	4						31		1	
June	36	30		2	1		56	2	1	
Total	72	48	97	257	180	299	399	215	258	268

It will be observed that the law specifically provides for enlistments "for a period of 1 or 3 years at the option of the soldier." It will further be observed that the Army regulations provide that "original enlistments in the Regular Army are authorized to be made for a 1- or a 3-year period."

Attention is called to the fact that "in recent years 1-year enlistments have not been encouraged."

The above table, however, shows that some 1-year enlistments have been received even though this possibility of enlistment has not been publicized and has been discouraged by the War Department.

After receiving the above letter from the Adjutant General, I called up the United States Army recruiting station on Pennsylvania Avenue, in the city of Washington, by telephone, advising that I was a young man who wanted to enlist in the Army for a period of 1 year during this emergency. I was promptly told that 1-year enlistments were not being received by the recruiting stations and that the shortest period for which I could enlist was 3 years. I called the attention of the officer to the letter from the Adjutant General's office which I have included in these remarks, and then I told the recruiting officer who I was and he then admitted that 1-year enlistments were possible under the law, but gave me the substance of the regulations and advised that recruiting stations discouraged 1-year enlistments. It is apparent that the War Department does not want 1-year enlistments in the Regular Army in peacetimes. There is possibly a very good reason for this attitude. Yet, if the Army needs additional peacetime soldiers for wartime training, and only contemplates keeping these soldiers in the Army for a 1-year period of training, then it is difficult to understand why an effort should not be made to secure this quota through the usual voluntary enlistment method and under existing law.

The Congress has authorized a mechanized army. In other words, the weapons of defense are "on order." This mechanization must be implemented. Machines without trained men are useless in national defense. I think we all realize that we must have additional men in the Regular Army. I am hopeful that immediate and enthusiastic cooperation on the part of the War Department will result in sufficient voluntary enlistments not only for 3 years but for 1 year to take care of present needs.

National Defense and the International Highway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTHONY J. DIMOND
DELEGATE FROM ALASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 12, 1940

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. ANTHONY J. DIMOND, OF ALASKA

Mr. DIMOND. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with unanimous consent therefor heretofore granted, I offer for incorporation in the RECORD a radio address made by me on July 12, 1940. It is as follows:

Question. Mr. DIMOND, the whole attention of the country is now centered on national defense, and it appears that some work of that nature is being undertaken in Alaska. Is there any necessity for it?

Mr. DIMOND. Not only is there necessity for defense works in Alaska at the present time but those installations should have been undertaken years ago. While most people are not aware of it, the southern coast of Alaska, which is free of ice and open the year round, fronts for 2,500 miles on the north Pacific Ocean, from the city of Ketchikan in the east to Attu Island in the extreme west, and Attu Island is less than 700 miles distant from the north end of the Japanese archipelago, and, of course, much nearer to Russian territory. The late great Gen. William Mitchell, who was court-martialed and dismissed from the Army for vigorously advocating views with respect to national defense which have since been proven to be 100 percent right, in testifying before the House Military Affairs Committee on one occasion, said that Alaska is the most important strategic area in the world. It is important because the nation that controls Alaska controls the north Pacific Ocean, and thus controls the short route between the United States and the Orient. Any hostile nation in possession of Alaska would constitute an immense and an immediately serious threat to the United States, because southeastern Alaska is less than 750 miles from the State of Washington. The possession of Alaska by a hostile force would outflank and seriously impair the value of our great defensive works, both naval and military, in Hawaii, because it is 2,400 miles from the United States to Hawaii, and it is less than 750 miles from the United States to Alaska. Just as in the times of Alexander the Great, and Julius Caesar, and Napoleon, the force that controls the short interior lines always has an immense military advantage.

Question. But, Mr. DIMOND, you speak as though Alaska were now totally without defense. Surely there must be some defense works or forces in Alaska.

Mr. DIMOND. Unfortunately, there is little in Alaska at the present time deserving of the name of defense. We have about 300 infantrymen at Chilkoot Barracks, in southeastern Alaska, but they haven't a single airplane.

Approximately 750 troops of various types have recently been transferred to the new military post proposed for Anchorage. Altogether they are too few to do much alone. There are, also, several Navy planes at Sitka, but they are not sufficient in number to undertake any real defense against an attacking force. Like many others familiar with the situation, I have for years urged upon Congress the need for the installation of defense works in Alaska, but it is only recently that anything at all was attempted.

Question. What is being done now for the defense of Alaska?

Mr. DIMOND. In the first place, let me say that the defense of Alaska means the defense of the United States. At the present time work is being pushed as rapidly as possible in the building of naval air bases at Sitka, in southeastern Alaska, and at Kodiak, in southwestern Alaska; and in the construction of a substantial Army air base at Anchorage, in south-central Alaska, and a subsidiary Army air station at Fairbanks in the great Yukon Valley in central Alaska. Congress recently authorized and appropriated money for the construction of an additional Navy air base at Unalaska, which is in the eastern end of the Aleutian Islands. In this connection it is worthy of comment that so-called Hepburn Board, set up by the Navy Department, has recommended the building of submarine bases at both Kodiak and Unalaska. In addition, Congress has authorized and appropriated money for the construction of a military post at Anchorage at an expense of something more than $6,000,000. This post, as I understand, is designed to accommodate 3,000 troops of various types—light artillery, including an antiaircraft force, infantry, and some engineers. Of course, this post is designed primarily for the protection of the air bases against parachutists or other attacks from the air.

Question. In your judgment, Mr. DIMOND, with all of the present works completed, will Alaska be adequately defended?

Mr. DIMOND. The answer to that question, in my judgment, must be "no"; but that answer should be qualified by saying that I am confident that as soon as this work now under way can be brought near to completion, Congress will appropriate additional money for an enlargement and expansion of the defense works of Alaska, which probably will be largely by way of air defense with just sufficient ground force to repel attacks against the air bases. In my opinion there should be facilities in Alaska, centering perhaps in Anchorage, for the accommodation of at least 1,000 airplanes of all kinds. It might never be necessary to keep any such number of planes in Alaska, because they could be flown in there on 24 hours' notice from bases in the States, but accommodations must be prepared beforehand to take care of such a force in Alaska. With a minimum of 1,000 fighting, pursuit, and bombing planes in Alaska, it would be difficult and, we hope, impossible, for any enemy to effect and maintain a landing in the Territory. In this case, as in every case, it is folly raised to the *n*th power to have just a second-best defensive air force. Our forces in Alaska should incontestably be superior to any force that is likely to be brought against it. Moreover, we have learned in the present European war that a land-based air force may be of controlling influence in naval battles. And again I invite your attention to the fact that any hostile advance against the United States is likely to come by way of Alaska and not by way of the Hawaiian Islands, which we have really adequately fortified and defended.

Question. But, Mr. DIMOND, does not our fleet control the Pacific, and, if our fleet does control the Pacific, how can any enemy effect and maintain a landing in Alaska?

Mr. DIMOND. It is true that at the present moment our fleet controls the Pacific, so far as the surface of the ocean goes, from the Hawaiian Islands east. Of course, it does not continuously and cannot pretend to effectually dominate any considerable part of the ocean west of the Hawaiian Islands. Moreover the fleet may not control the air over the Pacific, and we have now learned by what happened in Norway and in Holland and Belgium and France and Poland, that attacks in modern wars are all too likely to come by air and that whole divisions of troops with machine guns and probably with light artillery and even tanks can be successfully transported and supplied by air. There is another answer to your question, sir, and that answer is that although our fleet in the Pacific is probably now superior to the combined fleets of Japan and Russia, the day may not be far distant, and, in fact, it may be next week, that our fleet will be obliged to go to the Atlantic and thus leave the Pacific and Alaska almost totally without defense. With our fleet in the Atlantic, Alaska lies wide open at the present time to any foe which may care to exercise itself sufficiently to take over the Territory. And again I say that with Alaska in the possession of an enemy the United States is in jeopardy.

Question. Mr. DIMOND, you have spoken of the possibility of transferring our fleet to the Atlantic Ocean. If the fleet does go to the Atlantic and is obliged to remain there, how can our bases in Alaska be supplied with food and gasoline and ammunition and bombs and all of the other numerous things which are required at military and naval bases?

Mr. DIMOND. In that question you have put your finger upon what I consider the one weak spot in the present plans of Alaskan defense. Now, I assume that care will be taken to have all of the Army and Navy posts and bases in Alaska supplied sufficiently well so that they will be able to maintain themselves for at least 6 months without any additional supplies of any kind. Just plain common sense underlies that assumption. But in the event of war, which will take our fleet to the Atlantic to remain, and we are simultaneously attacked in the Pacific, it will be necessary eventually to supply these posts and air bases, and with the fleet in the Atlantic there are at the present time only two ways in which the supplies can be brought in, and those two ways are by air and by transports convoyed by airplanes. It is gravely doubtful whether any transportation attempted with the convoy of airplanes only would be reasonably safe. The hazards of such operation would be enormous. The supply of Alaska bases or airplanes alone would be difficult; at present impossible for lack of planes. And if transportation failed, all Alaska would necessarily go under. But there is a way our defense bases in Alaska could be supplied, and that is through the construction of a road through Canada and into Alaska to connect with the Alaska Railroad at Fairbanks and with the Richardson Highway near Fairbanks. With such a road built it would be a simple matter to supply all of our defense posts and bases on the mainland of Alaska, which would exclude, of course, those on Kodiak Island and at Unalaska, on Unalaska Island. However, if the Anchorage and Fairbanks bases could be supplied, it would be a relatively simple matter to supply Kodiak by air, and even, perhaps, to reach out to Unalaska. We should think, too, of the civilian population of Alaska, who must be supplied in case of war.

Question. Where would such a road be located and how much time would be required to construct it?

Mr. DIMOND. Such a road, which has been contemplated for many years for commercial purposes, would be built northwesterly from Hazelton, in British Columbia, into Alaska. The total mileage to be constructed is about 1,200. The cost of it, even under forced construction, would not exceed $25,000,000, and it could easily be completed in 18 months. It might even be possible to do the job in a year. The road system of British Columbia, which connects with our own system of roads in the United States, now extends as far north as Hazelton.

Question. Do you consider the building of this road is of great importance to the Alaska defense program?

Mr. DIMOND. In my opinion, the building of this road in order to insure the continuous supply of our military posts and bases in Alaska is not only of great, but of outstanding, importance. I think it is absolutely vital to start the construction of the road right away and to rush it to completion. Otherwise we may some day find ourselves with some perfectly good defense works, by way of air bases, in Alaska, but without any adequate means of supplying them. The road ought to be built, and built without delay. Our national safety may possibly depend upon it. Of course, it will be also necessary to connect Anchorage, where the Army air base is now under construction, with a road to the Richardson Highway, and thus with the highway to the United States, and I believe that Cordova should have like road connection with the Richardson Highway by way of Chitina. These connecting roads will inevitably be built when the road from the States to Alaska is constructed.

Question. You say a part of this road will be built through Canada, will the Canadians consent to having the United States build the road and use it for military purposes?

Mr. DIMOND. Well, sir, of course, I cannot answer what the Canadians will or will not do, but if the Canadians will not facilitate in every possible way the construction of such a road, they are the biggest star-spangled fools on this earth, because the building of that road means just as much for the defense and protection of Canada as it means for the defense and protection of the United States. I have every confidence in the traditional good sense and sound judgment and spirit of cooperation of our Canadian friends.

Question. Mr. DIMOND, would you care to make any further statement, not perhaps in answer to any specific question.

Mr. DIMOND. Many people seem to rely upon the unwarranted assumption that in the event we are attacked by a hostile nation,

and thus involved in war, we shall be obliged to fight on one front only—the Atlantic side—to repel a threatened invasion either of our own territory or of Canada, or Greenland, or of Iceland, or Newfoundland, or of one of the nations lying to the south of us—Mexico or one of the Central or South American countries. Such an assumption may only be the result of failure to face the facts, or an indulgence in wishful thinking. The strong probabilities are quite otherwise. It is highly probable that, if an attack is launched against us, we shall be compelled to face the combined might of the totalitarian powers of the world, not only in the Atlantic but also in the Pacific. Events of recent months have more and more strongly indicated an aggressive understanding between Germany and Japan, with Russia, if not a participant, at least to them a benevolent neutral. The military and naval installations of Russia along the Siberian coast, in the Kommandorsky Islands, and lately on Big Diomede Island, which lies in the very throat of Bering Strait, have for us a clear meaning which can add nothing to our peace of mind or sense of safety.

The dense population and the great wealth concentrated on our eastern seaboard will almost inevitably act as a magnet to draw the fleet to the Atlantic in case of serious trouble. No man can assure us of the continuous operation of the Panama Canal; and that is one reason why, in case of war, there will be an irresistable demand that the fleet be stationed in the Atlantic. It is not necessary to draw upon fantasy to foresee the time when the Pacific Ocean may largely fall under the temporary rulership of some power other than our own, and in that event I again ask how the military and naval forces and the civilian population in Alaska are to be supplied unless we build, and build immediately, the highway to Alaska. If we had airplanes of the proper types and in sufficient numbers, it might, conceivably, be done by air. But even then the hazards would be great on account of the long distances involved, and the capital investment necessary would be simply enormous as compared with the cost of building the highway.

A wise commander makes provision for every reasonable contingency. The contingency to which I have invited attention is entirely within reason; and every sensible man must know, upon an examination of conditions, that within 18 months or less that contingency may be the naked fact. The time to prepare is not tomorrow or the next day, or next month or next year, but now; and thus we may spare ourselves the sad lament of all of those brave peoples who have lately gone into servitude—the lament of "too little and too late."

United States Still Buying Huge Gold Hoards

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL HINSHAW

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 12, 1940

ARTICLE FROM THE NEW YORK TIMES

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following Associated Press report contained in the New York Times of August 11, 1940. The United States is rapidly accumulating the entire gold supply of the world as these figures would indicate. The article follows:

GOLD IMPORTS OFF SHARPLY IN MONTH—SHIPMENTS RECEIVED IN JULY AMOUNTED TO $519,974,000 OR $644,241,000 BELOW JUNE—GREAT BRITAIN BIG SHIPPER—PORTUGAL, SPAIN, AND SEVERAL LATIN AMERICAN COUNTRIES ALSO IMPORTANT SENDERS

WASHINGTON, August 10.—The Department of Commerce reported today that gold imports in July amounted to $519,974,000, nearly half of which was in foreign coin.

The July imports were $644,241,000 below those of June. The total for the first 7 months of 1940 was $3,265,573,000, an increase of $966,295,000 over the same period last year.

The amount of gold earmarked for foreign account in July increased by $55,064,000 and compared with an increase of $437,234,000 in June.

The United Kingdom, as usual, was the largest shipper of gold to this country with $301,737,000, while Canada was second with $172,272,000. France, a heavy shipper in the early months of the war, was missing from the list for the first time as a result of capitulation to Germany in June.

Several Latin American countries and Portugal and Spain were among the more important shippers of gold, which included these amounts:

Portugal, $6,607,638; Spain, $2,147,070; Sweden, $3,157,962; Yugoslavia, $2,636,135; Nicaragua, $522,305; Mexico, $1,890,671; Brazil, $6,306,933; Colombia, $5,855,910; Peru, $1,519,206; Philippine Islands, $2,830,857; Australia, $5,262,101; Union of South Africa, $3,432,995.

Exports of gold amounted to only $8,000, compared with $1,249,000 in June.

Silver imports were valued at $5,378,000, an increase of $705,000 over June. Among the heavier receipts were $1,639,000 from Mexico, $1,499,000 from Burma, and $820,000 from Canada. Exports totaled only $15,000.

Exports and imports of gold during July compare as follows with preceding years, (+) indicating excess of imports and (−) indicating excess of exports:

Year	Exports	Imports	Excess
1940	$8,000	$519,974,000	+$519,966,000
1939	8,561	278,644,761	+278,636,200
1938	65,070	63,879,655	+63,814,585
1937	206,353	175,623,720	+175,417,367
1936	695,362	16,073,990	+15,378,628
1935	58,572	16,287,474	+16,228,902
1934	113,695	53,329,748	+53,216,053
1933	85,375,112	1,496,510	−83,878,602
1932	23,473,774	16,333,991	−7,139,873
1931	1,009,396	20,512,427	+19,503,031
1930	41,528,739	21,888,514	−19,640,225
1929	806,828	35,525,490	+34,718,662
1928	74,190,223	10,331,461	−63,858,762
1927	1,803,360	10,738,480	+8,935,120
1926	5,069,472	19,819,990	+14,750,518

The movement compares with other recent months, as follows:

Month	Exports	Imports	Excess
July	$8,000	$519,974,000	+$519,966,000
June	1,249,411	1,164,215,000	+1,162,965,589
May	3,563,051	438,694,724	+435,131,673
April	33,000	249,884,712	+249,851,712

For the first 7 months of the calendar year the exports and imports of gold compare as follows:

Year	Exports	Imports	Excess
1940	$4,938,196	$3,265,573,000	+$3,260,634,804
1939	443,850	2,299,278,000	+2,298,834,150
1938	5,814,483	311,853,810	+306,038,967
1937	354,481	1,204,950,593	+1,204,596,112
1936	27,117,932	552,766,344	+525,648,412
1935	1,284,376	821,676,480	+820,392,104
1934	13,325,206	905,717,126	+892,391,920
1933	179,078,437	185,010,105	+5,931,668
1932	791,311,825	164,183,813	−627,128,012
1931	1,798,366	260,453,533	+258,655,167
1930	51,191,387	254,087,371	+202,895,984
1929	7,856,911	217,032,460	+209,175,549
1928	529,708,254	93,307,761	−436,400,493
1927	31,674,342	172,110,281	+140,435,939
1926	46,804,600	142,939,807	+96,135,207

Exports and imports of silver in July compare as follows:

Year	Exports	Imports	Excess
1940	$15,000	$5,378,000	+$5,363,000
1939	639,773	5,530,688	+4,890,915
1938	193,268	18,326,354	+18,133,086
1937	214,174	4,475,629	+4,261,455
1936	138,121	6,574,291	+6,436,170
1935	1,546,637	30,229,954	+28,683,317
1934	1,788,605	1,590,118	−198,487
1933	2,571,678	5,386,065	+2,814,387
1932	828,274	1,288,202	+459,928
1931	2,304,573	1,663,469	−641,104
1930	3,708,679	3,952,742	+244,063
1929	6,795,100	4,723,359	−2,071,741
1928	6,160,202	6,544,060	+383,858
1927	6,649,865	4,288,161	−2,361,704
1926	7,921,418	5,948,630	−1,972,788

For the 7 completed months of the calendar year the exports and imports of silver compare as follows:

Year	Exports	Imports	Excess
1940	$3,077,809	$35,403,560	+$32,325,751
1939	9,254,217	61,057,332	+51,803,115
1938	1,792,965	129,857,726	+128,064,761
1937	10,336,388	39,000,682	+28,664,294
1936	1,703,667	124,167,902	+122,464,235
1935	13,778,701	121,455,798	+107,677,097
1934	9,512,884	20,953,866	+11,440,982
1933	5,371,105	31,963,039	+26,591,934
1932	9,097,510	12,041,294	+2,943,784
1931	17,080,169	15,697,011	−1,383,158
1930	33,710,349	27,225,250	−6,485,099
1929	48,150,928	37,458,323	−10,692,605
1928	48,491,574	37,986,651	−10,494,923
1927	44,642,333	31,284,273	−13,358,060
1926	57,290,599	42,935,715	−14,354,884

Soviet Russia and Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANTHONY J. DIMOND

DELEGATE FROM ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 12, 1940

Mr. DIMOND. Mr. Speaker, under permission duly granted, I am offering for insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article written by the famous newspaper correspondent, Hallett Abend, for the New York Times, as it appears in condensed form in the Washington Post of August 11, 1940. The complete article appears in the issue of the New York Times of the same date.

Mr. Abend is one of the best-informed men in the world upon conditions in eastern Asia and upon their relations with the dominant nations of that region, namely, Japan and Soviet Russia. In this article, as will be evident from a reading of it, he invites attention to the extraordinary military activities of the Soviet Government in northeastern Siberia immediately opposite Alaska and, what is perhaps more important, to the claim which is now being advanced through the Soviet press which, as we all know, is completely under the domination and control of the government, for reclaiming Alaska as a part of Russia. In this article Mr. Abend refers to a statement attributed to me concerning work being done on Big Diomede Island. That island lies almost in the middle of Bering Strait. It is a part of Soviet Russia. A short distance away is Little Diomede Island, which is a part of Alaska and so a part of the United States.

During the past spring the Eskimos on Little Diomede Island, which is our territory, noted great activity on Big Diomede, and one of our Eskimos who came to the mainland reported that there appeared to be thousands of new people on Big Diomede. Since Big Diomede is closely guarded, it is not possible for us to find out precisely what is being done there. In making a statement to the press on June 14, I was careful to state the source of my information and that it was not then possible of confirmation. Nor has it been possible of confirmation since, except that we know by further similar reports that there is considerable new activity being carried on by the Russians on Big Diomede Island. However, Big Diomede is so close to the Siberian mainland that I personally doubt if any really large military establishment is to be located there.

What is more alarming is the building up in the last few years at a number of places in eastern Siberia, and particularly on Bering Island—which is one of the Komandorskie group and which lies relatively close to our own Aleutian Islands—of substantial military, naval, and air bases of various types. As Mr. Abend has pointed out, these posts are so located that they can scarcely be conceived as being offensively aimed at Japan, or constructed and maintained from any defense policy having any relation to Japan. Accordingly, we are well justified in concluding and, in fact, almost forced to conclude that the military activity of Russia in that region has relation to Alaska and not to Japan.

The Russians know that we would not take any of their territory on the other side of Bering Strait if it were offered to us. We do not want any territory on the other side of the Pacific. Many people think our interests now existing in the islands off the Asiatic mainland or on the mainland itself are more than we should undertake to maintain, and that the sooner we get out of China and the Philippines the better. In any event, neither Russia nor Japan nor anyone else even suspects that we are trying to enlarge our interests in that area. Knowing as they do our determination in that respect, we are justified in viewing with wonder and with amazed concern the construction of such powerful military establishments as have lately come into existence in eastern and northeastern Siberia and in the Komandorskie Islands. The presence in those islands of large numbers of Germans is a further significant circumstance.

In my judgment, Mr. Speaker, so far as the United States is concerned, it can all be boiled down to a warning that we should speed our defense measures in Alaska without delay. There is no time to lose. So far as we can judge the future by the past, peace can be maintained by us only by being so strong, so well armed, and so well prepared that even the most aggressive and powerful and ruthless nations will refrain from attacking us. Not hysteria or fright but only plain, hard, common sense impels me to join with those who say that we should be prepared at the earliest possible moment to defend our way of life, our liberties, and even our existence against the combined hostile power of all of those nations which are daily demonstrating before our eyes their uniformity and close coordination of purpose and of power to bring to destruction and under servitude all of the free peoples of the earth.

Mr. Speaker, before concluding, I desire to invite particular attention to the last paragraph of Mr. Abend's article, wherein he quotes from the Soviet monthly review, Economy and Industry, announcing that in this vast region near Alaska, Moscow has more than 6,000 research parties in operation, partly engaged in seeking mineral deposits. Much as we detest and despise the slave mentality which finds its most perfect expression in the Soviet form of government, it must be admitted that the Soviet Government has shown much more intelligence and foresight than has our own Government in recognizing the value of its northern regions and taking adequate steps for the economic development of those regions.

Let me give just one illustration. On our side of Bering Strait and Bering Sea in Alaska extends a considerable area perhaps 400 miles long and 100 miles broad in which relatively small quantities of the most common tin ore, cassiterite, are found mixed with the placer gravels. In fact, there is sufficient of this ore in places, as at Tin City near Bering Strait, that some of it is mined by one of the more ordinary placer-gravel-mining methods. Tin is a vital necessity for our industrial well-being and equally necessary in time of war. We import practically all we use. And yet until this year our Government has declined to make the slightest effort to determine whether or not a domestic source of tin measurably sufficient for our needs may be developed in northwestern Alaska, the only place in the United States which offers any substantial promise for production of tin. We can at least properly emulate the Russians to the extent of attempting to find out whether it will be possible to end our dependence upon foreign sources of supply of this vital and strategic mineral by developing a domestic source in Alaska.

Mr. Abend's article, condensed as appearing in the Washington Post, is as follows:

SOVIET PAPERS TALK OF GETTING ALASKA BACK—THOUSANDS SETTLING IN NEARBY SIBERIA; GUNS, FORTS ERECTED

(By Hallett Abend)

SHANGHAI (special correspondence).—When on June 14 Alaska's delegate to Congress, ANTHONY J. DIMOND, announced in Washington that thousands of Russians, supposedly colonists, were being settled on Big Diomede Island in Bering Strait, only 5 miles from Little Diomede, an American island, he sounded an alarm for the American position in Alaska.

From confidential information, and an official Soviet war map, it appears that the United States Army and Navy should take alarm, too.

Working in secrecy, the Soviet Government during the last 6 years had deported all the natives from the Bering district and has sent tens of thousands of trained young Soviet soldiers and workmen into this far northern area.

GUNS, AIRFIELDS SET UP

Simultaneously a string of nearly a dozen "Soviet bases of culture," which include army and navy contingents, have been established in this region, fortresses have been built, coast-defense guns have been mounted, submarine bases are being built, airfields have been completed, and all foreigners are rigorously excluded from the whole area.

The United States does not threaten Russia's position in the northeastern part of Asia, and the region is far from Japan's plans for Asiatic mainland expansion. In the opinion of military and naval men here, this vast and secret military development can mean

only a Soviet design against sparsely populated and poorly defended Alaska, which was Russian territory before the United States bought it.

Soviet newspapers and magazines have been devoting much space to Alaska and its riches, while articles extol the deeds of Czarist generals and admirals of a century ago. There is an intensification of the campaign for "recovery of rich lands that once belonged to Russia but do not belong to the United Soviet Socialist Republics because they were ineptly lost or corruptly sold later when the dynasty became decadent."

THOUSANDS SETTLING

Since the only territory that Czarist Russia ever sold outright was Alaska, the implications are plain.

The thousands of young Russian men and women who are being settled in northeast Siberia are all representatives of the "younger generation" that has matured entirely under Soviet control. They are said to be carried away with the idea that they are to be the glorious conquerors of the world, that they must sow the seeds of revolution everywhere, and that, to quote from a Vladivostok newspaper, their mission "first of all is to get their hands on Alaska, which so idiotically was sold to capitalist America by the Czarist Government."

These far northern outposts of Soviet empire are not isolated and inaccessible. They have good sources of supplies and are rapidly developing more supply lines for civilian needs and for military necessaries.

ARCTIC ROUTE DEVELOPED

From time to time during the last 2 years there have appeared relatively obscure news items about trips of Soviet warships, submarines, and merchantmen from Murmansk and Archangel on the White Sea to Vladivostok. Soviet newspapers now corroborate the news that a far-northern route has been developed that is feasible despite ice floes.

A branch of the warm Japan current appears to be deflected along the coast of north Kamchatka, and then pushes through the Bering Strait before turning westward. This warm ocean flow makes navigation possible in regions far north of portions of the Siberian coast, which are icebound half the year.

The Soviet monthly review, Economy and Industry, announces that in this vast region near Alaska, Moscow has more than 6,000 research parties in operation, their activities running all the way from looking for gold, coal, iron, and other mineral deposits, to organizing punitive expeditions for the extermination of illegal settlements of Russian peasants and native tribesmen. No outsider may live in this area. At least 80,000 Chinese and Koreans have been deported westward to work on railway projects.

Willkie in Iowa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 12, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE CENTERVILLE (IOWA) DAILY IOWEGIAN

Mr. LeCOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Centerville (Iowa) Daily Iowegian of August 6, 1940:

WILLKIE IN IOWA

Iowans who saw and heard Wendell Willkie in Des Moines Monday were convinced that a new type of candidate has appeared on the scene. He made it plain that he did not set himself above the people with whom he had grown up in a midwest agricultural environment. But he was glad to have the opportunity of a place of leadership where he hoped he could do the job of restoring the country to the ways of life for which it was founded. He saw as the great fundamental issue in this campaign the restoration of such ideals. He was hunting for the best approach to the farm problem, proposing to hold on to all that is good and find the things that are better. He tried to make it plain that he is approaching the whole matter, not as a theorist, but as one who has been next to the soil. Asked whether he could pick out the farm on which he once husked corn north of Ottumwa, he said he believed he could, but did not remember the name. He was strong for bringing industry and the farm closer together by decentralizing industry from the large cities and putting it into many smaller cities such as are to be found in Iowa. He sees the big job of the future as that of getting unity instead of discord among the various elements in American life. He believes Government should be the great coordinator working for justice to all, and not an instrument for setting class against class.

Mr. Willkie was not making campaign speeches in Des Moines. His addresses were brief. In his press and other conferences he answered many questions with sincerity and plainly. Some he said he preferred to leave for his acceptance speech and later addresses. He promised to return to Iowa.

It was a rather odd spectacle to see this man who, until a few months ago had not figured in politics, now the candidate for President. He has qualities of leadership that caused the American people to become his advocates and demand his nomination. He is the champion of the fair deal in government, and he believes in the ability of the American people to meet all obstacles and carry on to greater achievements, if they are not hampered by unwise laws and burdened with unbearable taxes and debt.

America—On Guard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 6, 1940

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the Nation is now witnessing a repetition of the scenes and occurrences of 1917, when wild-eyed zealots and loud-mouthed exponents of intolerance undertook immediately to impugn the motives and to blast the reputation of anyone who disagreed with their demand that this Nation go to war. One of the most vociferous and hot-tempered bigots of them all was a certain Detroit industrialist whose business organization later secured fat war contracts on a cost-plus-10-percent basis. After the war this same business organization was compelled by this Government to restore to the Treasury more than $1,500,000 which a Government audit disclosed had been overpaid on its contracts. This instance is only one of many of like character which occurred at that time.

There are still in the United States Congress men who were then branded as traitors to their country because they dared to advocate caution and coolness in sending American boys to spill their blood and give up their lives on the fields of France. We all know of the dreadful injustices and persecutions which occurred under the hysteria of war in those days, persecutions and injustices which have been regretted ever since by every right-thinking American citizen.

Yet today the same mistakes are being repeated, the same injustices are being wrought, the same intolerance is being shown, not alone in connection with the foreign policy being followed by the administration but also in connection with the political campaign.

Men of high standing, of outstanding achievements, of unquestioned patriotism and of proven experience and ability, such as Col. Charles A. Lindbergh, are being bitterly attacked by spokesmen for the administration because they dare to differ with the views of the little crowd of exploiters and opportunists surrounding the President.

"Fifth columnist" has become a common epithet in the vocabulary of those who would again lead this country into war on a wave of hysteria and manufactured fear.

The President himself is now bitterly condemning those who refuse to agree to his third-term aspirations. Even his early supporters, who, after finding the trends and the tendencies of this New Deal administration, had to part company with it, are not safe from the acid of his denunciations. Men who, while they were supporting him, the President declared to be the greatest patriots in the Nation, regardless of whether they were Republicans or Democrats or Socialists or Communists, he is now quick to condemn if they disagree either with his policies or with his ambitions.

There is one trait that has been common to all dictators throughout history. It is common of all dictators today. That trait is intolerance of criticism, disagreement, or opposition to their policies. Every dictator history has ever known has crushed out as quickly as he could every agency of criticism or opposition as soon as he attained to sufficient power.

No well-read person can deny that we have witnessed in this Nation attempt after attempt to crush out newspapers,

Members of Congress—any sort of opposition or criticism of New Deal policies and acts.

It is time for the American people to awaken to the danger that is indicated by these significant attacks which are so quickly made by spokesmen of the administration on those who dare to disagree with their policies or their acts.

In that day when any political party in America rises above criticism we can prepare for the dictator to come. Whenever it becomes un-American, unpatriotic, or unsafe for any citizen, from the most humble farmer to the highest figure in industry or finance honestly to criticize the policies and the acts of the public servants, in that day the American way is ended and dictatorship has begun.

There are people in this country, people in places of power and influence who want to take this Nation into war. They want to embroil us in the conflict now going on in Europe. And they, of course, want no opposition; they want no criticism; they will spare no effort to impugn the motives and if necessary to assassinate the character of anyone who opposes them.

But it still remains a fact that in the United States of America we can say what we think, and so long as we have that privilege the plotters cannot too easily persuade us into war.

But the American people must constantly be on guard.

Labor and National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. WAGNER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 12 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

ARTICLE BY HON. ROBERT F. WAGNER, OF NEW YORK, AND AN ARTICLE FROM THE AMERICAN FEDERATIONIST

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix an article entitled "Exploding a Myth," appearing in the American Federationist, official publication of the American Federation of Labor, issue of August 1940, together with an article by myself from the American Forum, entitled "Does National Defense Require Modification of Existing Labor Laws?" appearing in the Washington Daily News for June 22, 1940.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the American Federationist for August 1940]

EXPLODING A MYTH

In these incredible times, when the events of today telescope into those of yesterday, when world-shaking upheavals pile upon one another between sunrise and sunset, the vision of the keenest observer is easily blurred by the rapidity of developments.

When there is little time to plot the cross-currents underlying the trend of events or to chart their direction, even skilled observers may find it hard to sort out fact from fiction and check the reliability of their sources.

In this tense atmosphere in which powerful forces seek to sway public opinion, in which gigantic interests strive for recognition and struggle for preservation of their special domain, it is easy for a false rumor to spread and gain acceptance and for fabricated fiction to be mistaken for solid fact.

SLY ANTILABOR PROPAGANDA

It is not surprising that under these conditions, when our people are mobilizing their every resource for the gigantic task of national defense, subtle propaganda is widely used to reinforce covert attacks against labor.

An outstanding example of this is a widespread assault against American labor standards recently launched from several quarters under a flimsy cover of pretense that the maintenance of fair labor standards is an obstacle to our defense activity.

The ink was not yet dry on the bills embodying the first defense measures and congressional committees had not yet met to consider them, when the first shout went up from groups determined to make the most of the emergency for their own profit, in blind disregard of the welfare and real interests of the American people.

"Repeal the wage and hour law," was the outcry. "Amend all statutes protecting labor standards. Make room for unlimited hours of work."

The demand was promptly echoed by columnists and editorial writers throughout the length and breadth of the land. This demand was widely repeated because the argument used to back it sounded so plausible.

First of all, it was argued that the wage and hour law, Walsh-Healey Act, and other statutes limiting the work week to 42 or 40 hours made it impossible to produce the airplanes, warships, tanks, and guns necessary for national defense quickly enough and in sufficiently large quantities.

Maximum hours imposed by these laws, it was said, would cause critical shortages of skilled workers and would create bottlenecks in defense production.

To clinch the argument, those marshaling the attack on labor standards made a sweeping comparison between our maximum-hour laws and the French 40-hour law of 1936. Thus a great legend was created overnight.

According to this legend, the French 40-hour-week law made it impossible to produce the war materials needed for defense and was thus the primary cause of the French defeat. Our laws are the same, it was claimed, and, being therefore equally destructive, should be stricken at once from the statute books.

WHAT ARE THE FACTS?

The issue raised by these allegations goes to the vital roots of our whole problem of national security. Its dominant importance in shaping the policies which will determine the destiny of our Nation demands a searching examination of the facts.

Just what was the French maximum-hour legislation? How did it operate? What was its relation to the French production program? How did it compare with our wage and hour law and other American laws providing for maximum hours of work?

The French labor law in question was a decree promulgated on June 21, 1936, soon after the popular-front government of Leon Blum came into power. It was part of a legislative program which in its entirety was Marxian-Socialist in orientation and was frankly aimed to curb and even stifle private enterprise.

In its very direction the French legislation differed fundamentally from the American labor legislation of recent years. For the French law represented the attitude of antagonism toward a system of free enterprise and private profit, while the American labor laws were based on the principle of cooperation of labor, management, and Government and were designed to improve the mechanism of our competitive system by offsetting the destructive effects of the depression.

The principle of the maximum hours of work was by no means new in France. From the end of the nineteenth century French workers were protected by maximum-hour laws which generally provided for a 48-hour workweek.

The law of 1936 established a rigid maximum workweek of 40 hours in industry and of 38 hours and 40 minutes in underground mining. The law provided that workers should receive the same regular weekly wage despite the reduction in maximum hours.

NO PROVISIONS FOR READJUSTMENTS

This meant a 20-percent increase in hourly wage rates for nearly all French workers—an increase applied abruptly, without providing an opportunity for necessary readjustment.

The decree itself was merely a statement of legislative policy which left the method of application to the council of ministers. This was done by means of supplementary decrees effecuating the basic law in each industry.

For the bulk of employees in basic industries the maximum hours were rigidly applied, permitting no overtime whatsoever. In continuous-operation industries, split shifts, rotation of work, and other devices necessary to insure continuity of production were forbidden. Only in a few isolated industries was an attempt made to accomplish the transition slowly. In a vast majority of industries the hours were cut in one operation.

There are several vital differences between the French law and the American laws applying to the hours of work.

With but a few minor exceptions, the French law prohibited all work beyond the maximum limit set, while our laws make possible unrestricted overtime work and merely require that overtime compensation be paid for excessive hours of work.

The French law not only established a rigid maximum but, except in a few instances, accomplished the reduction in a single drastic readjustment. Our Fair Labor Standards Act lowered the overtime pay limit in three gradual steps, each spaced a year apart.

The most important difference is found in the fact that, while the French law established a maximum which drastically curtailed the prevailing normal hours, our laws placed the overtime requirement at a level actually above the average workweek prevailing in the industry.

In most of the French industries the workweek was reduced from 48, and in some industries from 56, to 40 hours per week. In contrast with this effective reduction of from 8 to 16 hours per week in actual hours of work, our wage and hour law merely placed an overtime-pay requirement at the final limit of 40 hours per week when the average workweek in the entire industry was averaging considerably less than 40 hours.

With the basic decree enacted in June 1936 and supplementary decrees issued at varying intervals, the French maximum-hour law did not become fully effective until the summer of 1937. Its complete application to French industry lasted less than a year.

By the spring of 1938 the popular-front government was no longer in office. The process of liberalizing the rigid standards of the law was begun with the decree of May 24, 1938, which permitted increases beyond the maximum of as much as 8 hours per week.

By August 1938 another decree was promulgated, authorizing further lengthening of the workweek in all establishments connected with national defense, safety, or public service.

After Munich the Daladier-Reynaud law was formulated, and it was put into effect on November 12, 1938. This law extended the workweek to 50 hours.

Following the decree of March 20, 1939, and a general decree issued in April 1939, as part of the defense program, the wartime enactment of September 1, 1939, authorized a general 60-hour week, with a week as long as 72 hours in certain national-defense and public-service operations.

This brief chronicle of the rise and fall of the French labor law makes it clear that there was no connection between its provisions and the defense of the French Republic. The authors of the French labor-law myth have clearly strayed from the facts in urging their conclusions.

They did so also when they claimed that among the reasons for the French defeat was the fact that German workers were toiling 84 hours a week for 5 years preceding the war while the French were easing along at a 40-hour pace.

Of course, these statements are equally untrue. From July 6, 1934, to January 1, 1939, German industry was on a 48-hour week. This means that 9 months before the war broke out, the French allowed industry to work longer hours than the Germans.

EVEN HITLER FOUND OUT

The Nazis introduced a 60-hour week in January 1939.

In certain munitions industries longer hours were permitted, but the Nazis soon discovered, as did others before them, that long hours tended to destroy efficiency instead of improving it. The back-breaking schedules had to be cut down to reasonable length in order to maintain maximum production per worker.

To quote from the Monthly Labor Review:

"Production began to fall off rapidly, accompanied by such an alarming increase of industrial accidents and stoppages as to attract the serious attention of the governmental authorities. * * * The government applied the sternest measures against the suspected saboteurs, but also began to lighten somewhat the hard labor conditions."

As Colonel Fleming, the Wage and Hour Administrator, tersely put it:

"The Nazis could shoot the lagging worker, but they couldn't stand outraged Mother Nature up against the wall. Fatigue is still fatigue in any language. This accords with common sense and the experience of every other industrial nation.

"The fact is that no important nation in the world today, whether democratic, Fascist, or Communist, believes that it is possible for a modern industrial system to operate in peace or war without social and labor regulation."

In England, too, they pushed defense production to the hilt. In many war factories workers were put on the schedule of as many as 78 hours a week. Current experience has shown, however, that this did not help meet the maximum production requirements.

On July 18, 1940, the Minister of Labor, Ernest Bevin, stated that "excessive overtime in war factories is retarding rather than increasing production." He announced that because long weekly hours not only impaired production schedules but also injured the health of workers, beginning August 1 maximum-hour schedules designed to yield maximum production would be put into effect.

OUR OWN EXPERIENCE

This squares with the experience in our own country. During the last war our Army was as desperately in need of supplies as it is today. The Army's primary concern was not reemployment, or welfare, or leisure of the workers. Its foremost consideration was that of efficiency.

Remembering this, let us look at General Order No. 13, issued by the Chief of Ordnance and by the Quartermaster General of the United States Army on November 15, 1917, 7 months after we had entered the war.

In the words of the ranking officers of the Army responsible for supply and production of munitions, addressed to arsenal commanders and manufacturers:

"Industrial history proves that reasonable hours, fair working conditions, and a proper wage scale are essential to high production. The pressing argument for maintaining industrial safeguards in the present emergency is that they actually contribute to efficiency. To waive them would be a short-sighted policy, leading gradually but inevitably toward lowered production.

"It might be expected that an individual working 10 hours a day, instead of 8, would turn out more goods. He can—for the first few days.

"But experience shows us that in a few weeks, or a few months, the output will be the same, or even less, than it was during the shorter day."

Suppose we put the accuracy of this statement to a practical test and lengthen the hours. Here is what happens when that is done, as illustrated by a thoroughgoing study of the British Health of Munitions Workers Commission during the last war:

In a munitions plant women workers were employed in turning fuse bodies. At 47½ hours per week each worker produced 169 pieces per hour. When the hours were 54½, each worker produced 131 pieces. At 66 hours per week the hourly output per worker was cut down to 108 pieces.

Did the lengthening of hours result in increased weekly production? No, the lengthening of hours did not help a bit. The weekly output of the worker at 47½ hours was 8,028 fuse bodies. At 66 hours per week it was only 7,128.

The maintenance of the standards of hours of work laid down in the Fair Labor Standards Act, in the Healey-Walsh Act, and in other statutes now in effect in the United States is thus clearly imperative. Not only as a means of reemployment for the still enormous reservoir of jobless workers, not only as a welfare measure concerned with the health of workers and with prevention of industrial accidents, but above all as a measure dictated by the stern considerations of productive efficiency.

Our laws are flexible. They place no compulsory maximum on hours per week or per day. They merely require that for excessively long hours workers be compensated at the rate of time and one-half the regular rate of pay.

The heavy demands of defense production bring the operations in the industries concerned to near capacity. To these industries capacity production on defense orders means profitable production.

In special situations in which the nature of operations requires overtime work, manufacturers filling defense orders can more than afford to pay the overtime required by law. They have been paying such overtime and will continue to pay it under voluntary union agreements with most of the skilled craftsmen they employ.

The semiskilled and unskilled workers who are not equally well organized and among whom unemployment is more widespread should not be deprived of the protection of overtime pay extended to them by law.

The story of the French law which has been so widely heralded and repeated with such credulity can be dismissed for all time as a chimeric myth.

NO EFFECT ON FRENCH MIGHT

Neither did the French law resemble our labor legislation nor did its short life affect the industrial strength of France. Certainly the French experience with maximum hours in 1936–37 offers no valid ground for modification of our laws.

In the words of the Wage and Hour Administrator, Colonel Fleming: "No relaxation of the wage and hour law is necessary at this time, nor is it desirable. Legitimate businessmen themselves are not asking for it, because they know perfectly well that it does not handicap them.

"The law is fair, because if upon labor is laid the burden of long hours, a corresponding burden is laid upon the employer who must pay for that overtime. The wage and hour law represents a part of that fair, equitable, democratic order of which we are so proud and which we are resolved to defend at any cost.

"Certainly no sane man defends his most priceless possessions by throwing them away as he gets ready to fight for them."

[From the Washington Daily News of June 22, 1940]

THE AMERICAN FORUM: DOES NATIONAL DEFENSE REQUIRE MODIFICATION OF EXISTING LABOR LAWS?

(By ROBERT F. WAGNER, United States Senator from New York)

Modern warfare embraces all the economic and human resources of the combatants. The conditions on the home front, the services of supply, and productive efficiency of industry are all as important in a successful war effort as the maneuvers of armies on the battlefield. By the same token, successful preparation for national defense requires the maintenance of high morale and vigor in the economic system backing up the armed forces.

In a dictatorship, which can conscript labor and control every phase of industry and finance, these essentially human factors may not be all-important. They are decisive, however, in a democracy such as ours, which in peace or war has held fast to the principle that "the highest and best form of efficiency is the spontaneous cooperation of a free people."

That is why, in the name of national defense, apart from all other reasons, we must not weaken the social legislation which protects the masses of our working people against insecurity and exploitation. To relax those safeguards on the industrial front would provide fertile soil indeed for the termites of the "fifth column."

We could not be true to ourselves, and to the ideals we are preparing to defend against aggression from without, if we failed to press our drive to provide a democracy of opportunity within our gates for all the basic necessities of life.

STRONG INDUSTRIAL DEFENSES

In the last 7 years, we have built our industrial defenses well. In 1917, our industrial system was completely unprepared for the unprecedented demands that were made upon it. The Federal Government was compelled to improvise principle after principle, agency after agency. The remarkable fact is that the essential principles of industrial efficiency arrived at by trial-and-error methods during our participation in the World War, are now firmly established in our normal, peacetime economy.

The mobilization of our labor supply for armament production was then an extremely difficult and unwieldly operation. That task can now be readily achieved through the United States Employment Service. In meeting the housing requirements of expanding industrial areas, we need only increase the financial sinews of the United States Housing Authority, instead of hastily creating a new and untried agency as we did in 1918.

Standards for minimum wages, fair and healthful working conditions, and recognition of collective bargaining had to be worked out during the wartime emergency by the temporary War Labor Board, under the cochairmanship of William Howard Taft, former

President and later Chief Justice. Comparable standards are now written into permanent law.

LABOR STABILIZED

Agencies for the adjustment and arbitration of labor disputes were established piecemeal during the last war, after most of the labor troubles arose. Today we have available the excellent facilities of the Railroad and Maritime Labor Boards and the expanded United States Conciliation Service. A final, powerful factor in the higher efficiency of our industrial machine at the present time is the stabilizing influence of collective-bargaining agreements, effective over a larger area of American industry than ever before.

The labor standards improvised during the last wartime emergency period proved so effective that Charles Evans Hughes, now Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, publicly declared after the armistice: "I trust there will be no more struggles in futile opposition to the right of collective bargaining on the part of employees. The recognition of the right of representation and the prompt hearing of grievances provide the open doors to reasonable and just settlements. And in returning to peace conditions there should be the utmost care to preserve every possible means which has been found helpful during the war for the investigation of the complaints of labor and for the adjustments of demands."

Failure to adopt this suggestion at the time contributed to the enormous increase in labor strife that followed. The number of workers involved in strikes during 1919 was greater than in any prior or subsequent year in our entire history.

INDUSTRIAL LIBERTY PREVAILS

The application of these principles of justice and fair play since the National Labor Relations Act was upheld in 1937 has brought increasing labor peace and increasing resort to the peaceful practices of collective bargaining. An even greater measure of industrial peace should continue to be sought in accordance with the tenets of democracy. But we do not want industrial peace on the Fascist and Communist model—peace purchased at the price of industrial liberty.

In expanding our armament production, it is important to recognize that the maximum-hour provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act and the Walsh-Healey Act impose no restraints on productive efficiency or the use of the available labor supply for armament purposes. Both laws permit the maximum to be exceeded if time and a half for overtime is paid. This is a standard clause embodied in innumerable collective bargaining agreements.

For the Government to abandon that standard in its armament contracts would place fair employers at a competitive disadvantage in bidding for Government work, and in effect would levy a special tax on the wages of those who happen to be employed in defense industries. The more extensive the Government's expenditures, the more important it becomes that such expenditures be used to maintain wages, expand purchasing power, and uphold fair social standards of employment.

FLEXIBLE STATUTES

The much-discussed 40-hour week established in France in 1936, with limited exceptions, rigidly restricted the working time of the entire establishment and allowed no overtime by individual workers, at least in its inception. As already stated, our own recent statutes have carefully avoided those blunders. Moreover, to meet the labor requirements of naval construction, an 8-hour-day law, dating from the year 1892 and applicable to all public works, is now being properly adjusted to permit overtime work at the time and a half rate.

With this minor adjustment, our statutes will be flexible enough to meet our present defense requirements, while continuing the national policy of encouraging absorption of the unemployed by private industry.

There is no present shortage of labor, skilled or unskilled. Should such a shortage develop and the needs of national defense require relaxation of maximum-hour standards, labor's traditional patriotism guarantees that proper adjustments will be worked out through its representatives in our councils of national defense. But until that emergency presents itself, there is only one patriotic answer to those who clamor for relaxation of work week standards—an emphatic no.

Senator Holt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RUSH D. HOLT

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 12 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

EDITORIAL FROM MOUNT STERLING (KY.) GAZETTE

Mr. HOLT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the fearless and well-edited Mount Sterling (Ky.) Gazette.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MORE LIKE HOLT NEEDED

What is needed at Washington in this hour of the Nation's "emergency," as Mr. Roosevelt calls it, is more men like United States Senator RUSH D. HOLT, of West Virginia. He is a real American, an honest-to-God fighter, and minces no words when he takes his position. It is men like Senator HOLT who will keep this country out of war, if it is kept out, and we need more Americans like him in the United States Senate. Here's hoping that he lives long to fight for the Constitution, the Declaration of Independence, the Bill of Rights, and for true American principles. It is a disgrace to the country that we do not have at Washington in the Congress—House and Senate—more real Americans who care more for the lives of the sturdy youths of America than for a trip across the "big pond" to meddle in something in which we have no interest. Senator HOLT, we salute you, and express the hope that you will continue to fight to keep the boys of the United States out of a war across seas.

Raising Willkie Campaign Funds by Chain-Letter Methods

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 12, 1940

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] talks about propaganda, and the new leader of the Republican Party, Mr. Wendell Willkie, complains about certain advertisements which he contends appear in a publication got out by the Democratic National Committee. I want to call attention to the latest departure, which is a chain-letter system to raise campaign funds for the Willkie candidacy. I have here one of these chain letters.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I have not the time.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I want to tell the gentleman that is not official in any sense of the word.

Mr. RANKIN. I do not know whether it is official or not, but I have here one of these letters signed by the head of a lumber publication, and it asks that everybody send in a certain amount of money and send numbers of these chain letters to other individuals for the same purpose and to address them to the Advertising Industrial Section, Willkie Campaign Fund, Roosevelt Hotel, Madison Avenue at Forty-fifth Street, New York City.

This chain letter reads as follows:

ADVERTISING INDUSTRY CHAIN LETTER

Here's an opportunity to participate in a chain letter that will really do all of us who enjoy life when business is moving forward a real service.

Mr. Wendell L. Willkie has said he does not want large individual campaign contributions. So—let those of us who are concerned with advertising, whether it be publishing, printing, typesetting, platemaking, papermaking, inkmaking, agency service, or managing advertising departments, start a chain-letter effort that will pour a flood of individual contributions of dollar bills into the Willkie campaign fund. Send your dollar bill in today in the attached envelope to:

Advertising Industry Section, Willkie Campaign Fund, Roosevelt Hotel, Madison Avenue at Forty-fifth Street, New York City.

Then send a copy of this letter to each of five men you know personally who earn a livelihood in the advertising industry, attaching an envelope made out to the above address. If you have already received and acted on an advertising industry chain letter, pass this one on to someone you know personally in the advertising business, whose name was not on your previous list.

Do this now: And Mr. Wendell L. Willkie will be able to finance his campaign in such a way that no large individual campaign contributions are necessary. Don't break this chain because it will help American business and that can't help but be beneficial to you. Don't break this chain because it will show that the right copy appeal to the right people will pull.

I understand that the Mr. Wood who signed this particular copy of this chain letter is the editor of the Lumber Journal.

If the Republican Party, under this new leadership, is going to criticize the Democratic Party for accepting advertisements in its campaign book, and yet permit these chain letters to be spread all over the country to raise funds in this way then the people of the country ought to know it, so they can manifest their disapproval in the proper way. [Applause.]

City, County, and State Officials, Not W. P. A., Responsible for Projects

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 12, 1940

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, on August 7 the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH] spread over two pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD quotations from newspapers designed to show inefficiency and waste on the part of the Work Projects Administration. The W. P. A. activities upon which the accusations are based are located in New Bedford, Mass., and Los Angeles, Calif., and the data upon which these charges are based consist primarily of newspaper articles in papers not friendly to the administration.

The principal charge against the W. P. A. at New Bedford is that it is operating a project calling for the construction of watershed road improvements which are alleged to be unnecessary and wasteful, and for which the project authorization is said to be illegal.

I believe the gentleman from Massachusetts has been a member of the W. P. A. investigating committee for a sufficient period of time to have learned by now that W. P. A. does not conjure up the projects it operates by gazing into a crystal. He should know by now that W. P. A. operates no projects unless they are properly sponsored by local governmental units, and for which these local governments are required to put up an average of 25 percent of the total costs. In summing up his remarks on this subject, the gentleman from Massachusetts said, and I quote:

> I trust that the W. P. A. will investigate both matters thoroughly and deal with them as they deserve to be dealt with.

I am happy to inform the gentleman from Massachusetts that both of these matters are under investigation, and, while these investigations are not yet complete, certain facts have already been uncovered which should be of interest.

The New Bedford project is sponsored by the city of New Bedford, and the project proposal bears the signature of Leo E. J. Carney, mayor of New Bedford. The city of New Bedford is contributing $66,689 toward this allegedly inefficient and wasteful project. The official description of this project states:

> Improve roads in watershed area of New Bedford, including clearing, grubbing, excavating, filling, scarifying, grading, rolling, surfacing, draining, constructing tool sheds, and performing incidental and appurtenant work, all on publicly owned property.

According to the mayor of New Bedford, these roads are the only means of access to large areas of the watersheds bordering city-owned ponds. Mayor Carney states on this project proposal, and I quote:

> These roads must be kept open to permit the waterwork apparatus and watershed patrol to reach these vital sections. Should a fire start * * * severe damage would certainly result to city-owned property.

The National Board of Underwriters has recommended that this work be done and is on record as to its necessity and value.

The charge that this road construction will cost $14,000 per mile is without foundation in fact. The records show that the total cost per mile, together with other work, is running at approximately $6,500 per mile, which is a reasonable cost for the type of work being done.

There is substantial evidence to indicate that this whole thing is merely a partisan political attack on the W. P. A. growing out of a squabble between Mr. Howard C. Mandell, Chief Engineer of the New Bedford Water Department, and other local officials. Not one scintilla of evidence has been uncovered to indicate that this project is either wasteful, unnecessary, inefficient, or illegal.

As for the charges of inefficiency and waste in the Los Angeles case: These accusations are based upon articles appearing in the Los Angeles Times, a notoriously anti New Deal newspaper, that the W. P. A. permitted destruction of rubber boots, raincoats, rubber hose, galvanized buckets, and garbage cans, most of which were said to be still in good condition.

While this investigation likewise is not yet complete, it has disclosed already that the rubber hose and oilskin raincoats and hats had become deteriorated from many months of use so that they were no longer waterproof. The garbage cans had been used for several months as latrines on firebreak projects, and the buckets had been used on a syphilis-clinic project. I do not think that even the gentleman from Massachusetts would urge violating ordinary sanitary or health precautions by continuing the use of these objects. Another interesting aspect of this exposé is that when the first truckload of unusuable material arrived at the dump a photographer from the Los Angeles Times was on hand and waiting to snap a picture.

The facts as here presented, based upon preliminary investigations, indicate beyond a doubt that these accusations of waste and inefficiency are simply trumped-up charges promoted by anti-Administration newspapers, aided and abetted by local politicians, with the sole purpose of smearing the Work Projects Administration.

It can be said to the credit of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH], that he did say that he was not in possession of sufficient evidence to personally assail the projects or words to that effect. When the official report is received I hope he will place it in the RECORD because undoubtedly the Administrator will furnish him with a copy.

Mr. Speaker, during the campaign smear W. P. A. will be in evidence. Of course, we will be unable to answer every criticism but the public should remember if there are projects subject to criticism the criticism should be directed to the community and State officials who father the applications and who contribute toward their completion. Do not blame the Federal officials for useless projects, if there be such, but assail those who make the applications for such projects, city, county, and State officials

War Propaganda

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN C. SCHAFER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 12, 1940

LETTER WRITTEN BY HON. JOHN C. SCHAFER, OF WISCONSIN, TO WILLIAM ALLEN WHITE

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter written by me to Mr. William Allen White:

AUGUST 8, 1940.

Mr. WILLIAM ALLEN WHITE,
Chairman, Committee to Defend America by Aiding the Allies, 8 West Fortieth Street, New York City, N. Y.

MY DEAR MR. WHITE: I acknowledge receipt of your committee's reprint from the Gallup poll, and wish to advise that from the reports which I receive, the Gallup poll, in favor of compulsory military service, is nothing but warmonger propaganda.

I note among the members of your committee a considerable number of wealthy men, as well as many who are under the 65-year-age limit contained in the Burke-Wadsworth compulsory military service bill which your committee supports.

There is no law to prohibit the members of your committee who desire to help the Allies from contributing any or all of their wealth to the British cause or to prevent them from leaving for Canada to enlist for active service in the new British Foreign Legion or the Canadian Expeditionary Force. Why do they not do this and stop trying to get the United States into a foreign war 3,000 miles across the sea and draft others under a compulsory military service program to do the fighting and the dying.

Your committee has flooded the country with expansive and expensive "stop Hitler" war intervention propaganda. Why don't its members and financial angels turn over their many millions to England and enlist in the Canadian Expeditionary Force without delay and go onward and forward to meet Mr. Hitler and his legions on the field of battle.

I notice in the headlines of this morning's press that "Canada omits allegiance oath so Americans can enlist in her land, sea, and air forces." Do not delay, Mr. White, as you ought to be a pretty good general in charge of collecting for and disbursing supplies and pay-check funds for your committee's foreign legion expeditionary force.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN C. SCHAFER.

The Third-Term Tradition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JESSE P. WOLCOTT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 12, 1940

LETTER FROM JOHN R. ROOD, ATTORNEY AT LAW

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter received by me from Mr. John R. Rood, attorney at law, of Lapeer, Mich., former professor of law at the University of Michigan.

JOHN R. ROOD,
ATTORNEY AT LAW,
Lapeer, Mich., August 9, 1940.

Hon. JESSE P. WOLCOTT,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WOLCOTT: There is a notion abroad that the only objection to the third term for President is the third-term tradition. May I ask you to correct this error through the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD? You have the ear of the public, and it is an important point needing attention at this time.

The danger to liberty from long continuance of the Chief Executive in one hand has been known since the most ancient times. Writing 350 years before Christ, Aristotle (from whom Alexander the Great learned the mysteries of statecraft) said: "By this means both aristocracies and democracies will be less liable to be corrupted into dynasties; because it will not be so easy for those who are magistrates for a little while to do as much mischief as they could in a long time; for it is from thence that tyrannies arise in democracies and oligarchies." (Aristotle on Politics, book V, ch. 8.)

By the laws of the Roman Republic the consul was permitted to hold office only 2 years; and Cicero in his Utopian system proposed: "No one shall hold the same office a second time except after an interval of 10 years." (DeLegibus Liber III, sec. 3.)

Julius Caesar violated the Roman code to cause himself to be reelected consul four times in succession, and after his campaign in Spain against the sons of Pompey, had himself elected for life, thus ending the Republic, and Augustus Caesar by force continued the Empire.

The Fundamental Orders of Connecticut (1639), the first American constitution adopted by the people, limited the chief magistrate's term to 1 year. (West's Source Book, sec. 93; Commager's Documents, p. 22.)

No people ever were so well informed on the science of government and the perils to liberty as the generation that wrote the United States Constitution. Nearly every one of the first State constitutions prohibited the chief executive to hold office longer than a short-named term. (Maryland, art. 31; North Carolina, art. 15; South Carolina, art. II, sec. 2; Georgia, art. 23; Delaware, art. 7; Virginia Bill of Rights, sec. 5; Massachusetts Declaration of Rights, sec. 8; Articles of Confederation, art. V, delegates to Congress being then the only executives.)

The prohibition was omitted from the United States Constitution because the members of the Convention had invented a system whereby the office of President would be nonpolitical—it would be impossible to influence the election of President, because he would be chosen by the best men in each State, meeting in their own States on the same day all over the country, men elected for the sole purpose of electing a President. As stated by William R. Davie, Delegate from North Carolina, in the Convention called to ratify the Constitution:

"It was urged that no undue influence could take place in his election; that as he was to be elected on the same day throughout the United States, no man could say to himself, 'I am the man'" (4 Elliot's Debates, p. 103).

When Thomas Jefferson discovered the omission, he wanted nine States to ratify the Constitution to make sure of the good it contained and the other four to reject it until this amendment could be made. Later, when the Legislatures of Vermont, New Jersey, New York, Rhode Island, Pennsylvania, Maryland, North Carolina, and Georgia passed resolutions urging him to accept a third term, Jefferson replied:

"That I should lay down my charge at a proper period is as much a duty as to have borne it faithfully. If some termination to the services of the Chief Magistrate be not fixed by the Constitution, or supplied by practice, his office, nominally 4 years, will in fact become for life; and history shows how easily that degenerates into an inheritance."

In his autobiography Jefferson said:

"Should a President consent to be a candidate for a third election, I trust he would be rejected on this demonstration of ambitious views."

Andrew Jackson, another great Democratic President, in his message to Congress in 1830 urged Congress to submit an amendment to the United States Constitution to limit the President's term.

Dr. Herman V. Ames, in his learned treatise on The Proposed Amendments to the Constitution of the United States During the First Century of Its History, says:

"Over 125 amendments have been submitted to change the term of President and fix the period of eligibility. These were brought out chiefly by the fear that the President would use the patronage of his office to secure reelection. More than 50 of these have been propositions to fix the term as 6 years. * * * This change has been advocated at different periods ever since, within recent years more frequently than ever before. All but 14 of these stipulated that the President should be ineligible to reelection" (Annual Report American Historical Soc. 1896, vol. 2, p. 123).

The omission of a constitutional prohibition against reelection of the President was due only to the belief that the system invented by the convention had disabled the President to influence his reelection; but you know the history of the electoral college, and how it has become a mere record of votes. It only illustrates once more how "The best laid schemes of mice and men," etc.

Lest we lose our liberties like the Romans did theirs by the election of a Caesar, please inform the voters that it is not merely a "third-term tradition."

For further discussion of this matter see:

The Federalist, No. 72.

With the Fathers, J. B. McMaster, pages 57–70.

A Single Term, by Edith Phelps (H. W. Wilson & Co., New York, 1925).

The Congressional Digest, May 1938.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN R. ROOD.

The National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETE JARMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 12, 1940

RESOLUTION BY THE LEGISLATURE OF ALABAMA

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following resolution adopted by the Legislature of Alabama with reference to the program of the President and Congress of the United States for an adequate national defense.

This resolution was introduced in the legislature and sponsored by the Honorable John G. White, representative from Perry County, Ala., in my district.

Whereas all the continents of the world except the Americas are torn by war; and

Whereas the totalitarian nations of the world, acting at the whim of their ruthless dictators, have almost completely overrun all the democratic nations of the world, except those in the Americas; and

Whereas the might of the military machines of the totalitarian nations have shocked the peoples of all the democratic powers of the world; and

Whereas the continued and ever increasing successes of the military machines of the totalitarian dictators present a most serious threat to all the democratic nations of the world, even those in the Americas; and

Whereas the President of the United States and the Congress of the United States have recently recognized these conditions and are rapidly taking sweeping steps to build up the defenses of the United States and to preserve the peace of the Americas: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That the Legislature of Alabama does wholeheartedly approve of this program of the President of the United States and the Congress of the United States; and be it further

Resolved, That we urge a continuation of this program and pledge the wholehearted cooperation of the people of the State of Alabama to the President of the United States and the Congress of the United States in all of their efforts to prepare the Americas for peace; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, its Secretaries of State, War, and Navy, and the United States Senators and Members of Congress from the State of Alabama.

Financing National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 12, 1940

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. ALLEN T. TREADWAY, OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address delivered by the gentleman from Massachusetts, Hon. ALLEN T. TREADWAY, on American Forum of the Air, Mutual Broadcasting System, Sunday, August 11, 1940:

Mr. TREADWAY. Chairman DOUGHTON and I have frequently crossed swords in political debate, both in the committee of which we are members and on the floor of the House of Representatives. Tonight, however, our subject is one which is directly connected with the defense program, with respect to which politics, as such, has been definitely adjourned. We are, therefore, meeting on a common ground, as patriotic citizens clothed with an official responsibility, to discuss the problem of how best to finance the vast national-defense expenditures which have been necessitated by the existing world situation.

During the present session of Congress, approximately $14,000,000,000 have been requested for national defense, as follows:

1. The President's Budget message of last January proposed the expenditure of nearly two billions for that purpose during the fiscal year beginning July 1.

2. On May 16, following the invasion of Belgium and Holland, the President personally appeared before Congress to request $1,182,000,000 of emergency defense appropriations.

3. Two weeks later, on May 31, the President requested a further sum of $1,278,000,000.

4. Subsequently, the Navy Department proposed the creation of a two-ocean navy at an estimated cost of approximately four and one-half billions of dollars over a 6-year period.

5. On July 10, the President sent a request to Congress for $4,800,000,000 of additional appropriations and authorizations for the Army and Navy.

While the expectation has been that each new request would be the last, the program continues to be expanded, and there is reason to believe that the end is not yet in sight. For the current fiscal year alone, actual appropriations and contract authorizations for national defense—enacted and pending—total $10,000,000,000. This stupendous sum has been voted with great speed and with almost unprecedented unanimity, for it is recognized that we as a nation are woefully unprepared to defend ourselves against aggression. Congress has practically taken the President's requests on faith without being able to find out the specific purposes for which the money was proposed to be spent, or what has been accomplished with the vast sums previously appropriated.

In authorizing the expenditure of billions of dollars for national defense, Congress has performed but half its task. The question still remains, Where are we going to get the money with which to finance the defense program? The President is reported to have said that this was a "minor detail." I thoroughly disagree. Without adequate revenue or borrowing power, the Treasury will be utterly unable to provide the money to meet the tremendous expenditures which must be made. During recent years, the Federal revenues have covered only half the cost of government, the balance having been provided for by the indiscriminate issuance of bonds. The resulting series of staggering annual deficits has doubled the national debt and virtually exhausted the previously authorized Federal borrowing power of forty-five billions.

Thus, as we face the task of preparing an adequate defense, we find the Treasury of the United States "broke," the public credit stretched to a dangerous and unprecedented level, and the available sources of revenue tapped almost to the limit. It is obvious that we must take immediate and drastic steps to put our financial house in order. The financial security of the Nation is the first requisite to real military security.

As we look to the uncertain future we naturally contrast our present unwholesome state of national finances with the situation which existed in 1916, when we were also embarking upon a preparedness program. At that time we had a national debt of only one and one-quarter billions of dollars, as compared with our present total of nearly forty-five billions. We had little difficulty then in raising twenty-five billions to provide for the emergency which subsequently faced us, but it might not be so easy now, and certainly it would jeopardize the public credit to increase the present debt by any such amount. As regards the available sources of revenue, they were largely unused in 1916, while today, as I have indicated; there are few places to which we can turn to raise any substantial amount of new taxes.

In our present situation we cannot, of course, finance the national-defense program entirely by borrowing, nor is it possible to raise sufficient additional revenue to pay for it as we go.

The question of how to provide the money for national defense has already been answered to a certain extent by the passage of the recent defense-tax bill, which became law on June 25. To my mind, the method therein provided offers the only practicable solution of the problem. That measure extends the present $45,000,000,000 debt limit by authorizing the issuance of four billions of special defense bonds. However, it also provides for their retirement over the next 5 years, and raises approximately $1,000,000,000 of new taxes annually during that period for this specific purpose.

By imposing new taxes to retire these defense bonds, Congress gives recognition to the fact that we cannot continue the past policy of constant borrowing without making some provision for paying off the obligations created.

The recent Defense Tax Act was intended to take care of the financing of the defense program as outlined in the President's Budget message of last January and in his messages of May 16 and May 31. No steps have as yet been taken, however, toward the financing of the four and one-half billion dollar supplemental naval program, nor the President's most recent request involving $4,800,000,000 of appropriations and authorizations, both of which proposals came after the tax bill had been drafted. Of course, it is as essential to raise the money for this part of the defense program as for the earlier phases, and it seems to me that the same method should be used.

We are at present faced with a crisis in Federal financing. The Treasury estimates that the deficit for the current fiscal year will be at least $5,700,000,000, which is more than the Treasury has authority to borrow, even with the recent $4,000,000,000 increase in the debt limit.

Where can we turn for additional Federal revenue? That question is one with which Congress must immediately concern itself.

At the present time, hearings are being held before the House Ways and Means Committee on a proposed excess-profits tax measure, the primary purpose of which is to prevent the making of any new millionaires out of the defense expenditures. While in the preparation of the pending proposal it has not been the purpose to raise any particular amount of revenue thereby, the fact is that a considerable sum will be realized, namely, from two hundred to three hundred million dollars annually.

Such amount of additional revenue as may be raised by this tax will of course help to provide for the financing of the President's most recent requests for supplemental defense appropriations, but still further revenue must be sought. The excess-profits tax alone will not do the job.

So far as I am aware, there are only two sources where any substantial amount may be realized. The first is by drastically increasing the normal income-tax rate, which at present is 4 percent, as compared with Great Britain's basic rate of 42½ percent. The second is by imposing a general sales tax.

One thing is certain about any new taxes that may be imposed in the future, and that is that they will inevitably fall on the great masses of the people. We now take as much as 79 cents out of every dollar of income received by the wealthy, and up to 70 cents out of every dollar they leave at death, and even if we absolutely confiscated the balance, the additional revenue which would be obtained would be but a "drop in the bucket" compared to what will actually be required. Moreover, we are now taxing corporations up to 20.9 percent under the regular income tax, which is nearly double the rate in effect during the last war, and we propose in the pending tax bill to add an excess-profits tax running up to 40 percent in addition. It must be obvious, therefore, that the average citizen will be the one to whom the Government will turn for further revenue, and Heaven knows he is already paying a heavy burden, particularly in indirect and hidden taxes, which are simply added to the cost of everything he buys.

Even when we have provided in full for national defense expenditures, we still have to consider the problem of financing the regular operating costs of the Government, which have been running far in the red for 10 years. My own advice would be to economize in expenditures before imposing any new taxes for nonmilitary expenditures. The people are being asked to "tighten up

their belts" and get along with less in order to pay for national defense, and there is no reason why those departments of the Government which are not connected with the defense program should not be required to do likewise.

In conclusion, let me say that while the next few months will be a period of political discussion and activity, no partisanship will be found in connection with the much-needed and long-deferred national-defense program, although, of course, there may be honest differences of opinion as to details. Nevertheless, we are a united people in our determination to secure ourselves against aggression, and in our willingness to make every sacrifice or contribution necessary to make that security a reality. Finally, I wish to thank Mr. Graneck, who conducts the American Forum of the Air, for the opportunity of participating in this interesting hour. I hope the listeners over WOL and its coast-to-coast connections will obtain from my associates some ideas of the importance of the subject of financing national defense.

After All, the Public's Interest Is in Its Purse

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 12, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE SAGINAW (MICH.) NEWS

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, we have had some discussion here on legislation relative to a bridge, proposing the largest span in the world, across the Straits of Mackinac in my State of Michigan.

The Saginaw Daily News, a representative daily newspaper in Michigan and the largest paper in my district, is recognized for its sound editorials and generally voices the thoughts of the men and women in that area.

In an editorial on this straits bridge project appearing in its issue of August 8, the Saginaw News states "It would be nice to have but can we afford it?" That is the thought in the minds of a great throng of other Michigan people right now.

The editorial reads as follows:

[From the Saginaw (Mich.) News of August 8, 1940]

THE STRAITS BRIDGE

Two Michigan Congressmen distinguished themselves, whichever way one looks at it, when they joined hands in an unsuccessful attempt to block House approval of a bill to authorize construction of a gigantic bridge across the Straits of Mackinac.

From one viewpoint the two—Congressmen CRAWFORD and DONDERO—distinguished themselves as opponents of a great public improvement; from the other viewpoint they distinguished themselves as defenders of the public purse.

There undoubtedly is room for argument as to the need for the bridge. But the way Messrs. CRAWFORD and DONDERO look at it, it's like a lot of other things; it would be nice to have, but can we afford it?

A Saginaw professional man with a bent for statistics sat down for a few minutes with his pencil and produced these figures: The bridge would cost $37,000,000, to be financed by a bond issue bearing presumably at least 4-percent interest. The interest alone would be $1,080,000 the first year, tapering downward slowly; at least $1,000,000 a year would have to be set aside as an amortization fund; maintenance would cost approximately $160,000 a year. The total is $2,240,000 a year. The probable toll for use of the bridge: Fifty cents for an automobile, 10 cents for each of its occupants, probably an average of 80 cents for each car crossing the span. This would require 2,800,000 crossings a year to cover the financing; 7,946 cars a day, and with 3 occupants.

The Mackinac Straits Bridge Authority of Michigan has published a report on a "proposed crossing for the Straits of Mackinac" which shows that traffic volume across the straits is estimated for the current year at approximately 310,000 vehicles, 520,000 passengers. The comparative figures for 1939 are given as 280,000 vehicles, 480,000 passengers.

So it is not difficult to believe Representative DONDERO when he says it would cost the taxpayers of Michigan $1,500,000 a year to make up the annual deficit, nor easy to condemn Representative CRAWFORD when he protested against the bridge project as entailing "loose thinking, loose talking, loose spending."

Representative DONDERO had this to add: "The P. W. A. turned down this bridge project, and when one of this New Deal administration's agencies turns down a project upon which it can spend public money, one may rest assured that it is a project repugnant and offensive to the most callous of consciences."

Forest Problems in Oregon From the Standpoint of Land Utilization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER M. PIERCE

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 12, 1940

ARTICLE BY F. H. BRUNDAGE

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following paper presented by F. H. Brundage, associate regional forester at Portland, Oreg., at meeting of State Land Use Planning Committee at Corvallis, Oreg., on June 28, 1940:

In the brief time available I am going to try to give you a picture of the forest situation in the State, particularly as related to privately owned forest lands, indicate some of the problems facing everyone in the State, and let you draw your own conclusions as to the relationship of these problems to land utilization. I hope that you will all agree that the growing of a new forest crop in order to make it possible for the present lumber industry to continue after our supply of privately owned old-growth timber now being utilized is gone, is one of the most urgent and important problems involved in the land-use planning.

You are all familiar with the social and economic importance of the lumber industry in the economy of the State. Transportation of forest products constitutes a large share of our railroad freight tonnage and one-third of the highway tonnage. Without this traffic the railroads, water, and other transportation facilities could operate only with greatly reduced facilities if at all. The 65 percent of the industrial pay roll derived from the manufacture of forest products is the lifeblood which keeps our local economy in a healthy condition. The industrial structure in most of our major towns and cities is squarely dependent upon the manufacture and utilization of forest products. Schools, churches, the public utilities, the homes of our working men and professional people, have been developed and are maintained in most of our communities located in or adjacent to forest areas by utilization of the forest resource. Utilization of our forest resource in the two States of Oregon and Washington stands on a par with all other agricultural production, and together they furnish three-fourths of the economic activity which supports all of the population.

You may not be quite so familiar with the broad pattern of development of the forest industry. Naturally the industry developed first in those areas close to water transportation where extensive and high quality stands of timber were available, such as Puget Sound, Grays Harbor, and Columbia River areas. Industry expanded to meet increasing demands throughout the years and the rate of cutting has been governed entirely by market demands. As the accessible supplies of timber were cut out, logging engineers and manufacturers developed mass-production methods which made more remote supplies available.

For 35 years Oregon or Washington has maintained the leadership among all the States in lumber production. During the last 3 or 4 years the cut in Washington has decreased and now Oregon is in the lead. This leadership has been won by applying to woods operations machinery and methods devised by ingenious logging engineers, building bigger and better sawmills and utilizing a forest resource, which is able to compete successfully in the markets of this country and the world at large. At the same time the industry has paid higher wages than those effective in other producing centers.

Chiefly due to the economic factors involved, the industry in the Douglas fir has been concentrated in the territories first developed and is only spreading southward as the available supplies elsewhere are depleted. Douglas County has 60,000,000,000 feet of timber, but only a small fraction of the desirable industrial development. In the ponderosa-pine territory east of the mountains some centers, such as the territory tributary to Baker, were first developed, but the industry has spread more rapidly, and all of the producing centers now have an excess of sawmill capacity installed and are utilizing the available timber supplies at a rate which cannot be permanently maintained.

The lumber industry has always been strongly competitive. Many industrial enterprises that depend upon utilization of the forest resource have been developed without control of any supply of standing timber, depending upon the general log market which has been developed in most areas. Where manufacturers owned or controlled timber supplies the usual practice has been to provide for a 20 to 30 years' supply for their own needs. Timber owners have found through the years that carrying charges on their investments, taxes, and other charges have increased faster than the general level of stumpage prices. Faced with losses, timber owners

generally have endeavored to liquidate their holdings as promptly as possible. Judging by experience to date, and the present trends, it is apparent that privately owned timber will be put through the saw and converted into cash just as quickly as market conditions will permit. Every little bulge in the market demand is the occasion for an increase in liquidation pressure.

This wave of liquidation of privately owned timber is not limited to our old-growth supplies. Stands of second growth in the two States, which should, from the standpoint of public interest, furnish the supply 20 or 30 years from now, have been in some years liquidated at the rate of 500,000,000 board feet per year. Our industrial processes are disposing of our heifers and young ewes as well as the mature crop.

The liquidation cycle, which has run its course in the Lake States and in some other parts of the country, is in full swing here. This process is largely due to the economic set-up; and individual timber owners, while perhaps interested in a different method of operation, such as sustained yield, are governed by the competitive conditions and economic conditions under which they operate, and the possibilities of any major change affecting most operators are limited.

In 1934, under the Forest Code, industry as a whole did undertake to reduce fire losses, to leave cut-over lands in better condition for future fire protection, and to leave an adequate source of seed supply. Substantial benefits and improvements in conditions have been secured, particularly along fire-protection lines. The source of seed supply on which a new crop depends is far from adequate in many cases. It is true that many forest fires are started by the public and that the public as well as the industry should share in the protective effort to a much greater degree than is now the case. It is also true that the Tillamook burn of 1933 and the reburn of 1939 were both caused by lumber operations.

Fortunately, some private owners are showing an increasing interest in real forest practice and sustained yield operation where that can be worked out for private operations. At least one major pulp company, one large lumber company in the State of Washington in the Douglas fir, and one in the ponderosa pine are actively planning to apply forest practice and sustained yield management to their holdings. Quite a number of others are actively interested, particularly in areas where it is possible to work out joint management plans for both public and privately owned timber in the same operating unit. Where a major portion of the timber necessary for sustained yield operation is publicly owned, the financial difficulties and obstacles are greatly simplified and there is a much better opportunity for working out adequate management plans for the participating privately owned lands. However, it is better to face the fact that most of the present operations are on a liquidation basis and that there is little foundation that this system will be modified so far as most of the privately owned timber is concerned in the immediate future.

This liquidation cycle does vitally affect the economy of each producing area as the supply of timber available to that particular territory becomes depleted. There may be ample supplies to maintain the production in both States for a considerable period, but an overproduction in one area, such as Grays Harbor, and underproduction in another, such as Douglas County, does not contribute to a stable social or economic economy. Grays Harbor for years maintained a slogan: "Production of 2,000,000,000 feet or bust." They did reach a peak of 2,000,000,000 feet in production, but in the last 10 years the population has decreased by 5,000 people, or one-seventh of the total, and the general situation is such that unemployment rolls are at a peak, and labor and other difficulties are above normal. You are all familiar with the history in Clatsop and Columbia Counties and the problems which have faced the county administrations and the people on account of the decrease in the tax base. The process of depletion, while extreme, is in that area still not complete, and pay rolls are still being maintained, although on a diminished basis. The peak of the economic and social disturbance will not be experienced until timber production is sharply curtailed, and that will occur in a few years.

The situation in Bend is typical of most of the ponderosa pine producing areas. In some areas such as Klamath Falls the situation is more critical; in others such as the Ochoco territory an extreme situation has not developed. If in 1916 when operations in Bend first started, all operations there, both public and private timber, had been placed on a sustained yield basis using proper cutting methods, it would have been possible to have maintained the production of about 225,000,000 feet per annum on the average in that territory. Instead, the production has gone up and up until with the installation of additional mills it is estimated that the cut during 1940 will be about 350,000,000 feet. The mill capacity would permit a much greater cut if market conditions permitted. Up to the present time 325,000 acres of privately owned land have been cut over under cutting methods which will preclude additional supplies being secured from this area for at least 100 years, probably longer. If cutting at the rate of 350,000,000 feet per year is continued from the 306,000 acres of privately owned land still left uncut, and is supplemented by the sustained yield cut from the national forest of 83,000,000 feet, the privately owned timber supply will be exhausted in 15 to 16 years. Then the cut in that territory will decrease from 350,000,000 feet to approximately 83,000,000 feet sustained yield cut from the national forest, which is, as you know, like all of the other national forests, dedicated to the production of timber and other resources and benefits on a sustained-yield basis.

Now, of course, actually this will not happen. One new mill completed last year, which with the dependent community has involved the investment of roughly three quarters of a million dollars in town and mill facilities, owns a supply adequate for about 20 years, the life, of course, depending upon the rate of cutting. Other manufacturers have a supply varying from a few years to as much as 9 to 15 years. I would hesitate to forecast what the social and economic repercussions will be when the cut in the Bend territory is cut down to 83,000,000 feet per year, but inevitably the changes will be drastic and far-reaching.

In the Lake States the liquidation cycle of lumber production has given rise to many difficult social and economic problems which have challenged the best thought of all citizens in that area interested in or affected by these problems. State and Federal authorities are jointly engaged in the tremendous job of rehabilitation to restore the productive capacity of these lands by planting, fire protection, and other measures so that this territory can again contribute to the social and economic welfare of the States involved. It is perhaps significant that private effort is a very minor factor in this general rehabilitation effort because of the difficulties in that region.

In Oregon and Washington this liquidation process and transfer through tax delinquency from private to public ownership of cut-over and other nonprofitable timberlands has imposed heavy burdens on the counties, States, and other public agencies involved. It will be many years before a large percentage of these lands which are suitable for and needed for timber production will again be a factor in supplying commercial forest products. If the present liquidation process is continued, an increasing acreage each year is added to the burden which must be carried by public agencies. The area at present requiring rehabilitation challenges the financial and management abilities of the counties, State, and other public agencies interested in this problem. Any additional increase is certainly most undesirable.

For many years efforts have been made by those interested in these forest problems to improve economic conditions so that private owners could actually apply sustained yield management to their lands. The State reforestation law or State forest tax law, as it is more properly known, increased Federal aid on a substantial scale through outright appropriations under the Clarke-McNary law; and through the C. C. C. activity, development of a thoroughly effective code of forest-fire laws, efforts at modification of the ad valorem system of taxing mature timber, and many similar measures have either been actually applied or considered. Real progress has been made, but the actual results of these efforts over a period of many years in stopping this liquidation process and securing the application of better forest practice to privately owned lands have not been outstanding. Measures which will get at the heart of the problem are indicated.

There is one effective method to solve this liquidation problem quickly and permanently, and that is the public acquisition of those stands of privately owned timber which are pressing for liquidation. Orderly cutting and adequate forest management can be secured from forest resources which are publicly owned. Experience of many years indicates that under our present economic system only a relatively small percentage of our pulp or lumber companies can handle their lands so as to provide a source of continuous supply for industry and thereby protect social and economic stability of dependent communities as well as their own permanent source of supply. By and large, in this region public ownership, State or Federal, for much of the old growth is indicated as the one certain way to protect the public interest. Public ownership must be accompanied by some system providing for the support of local government such as the annual payment of 1 percent of the purchase price, which will in a reasonable way serve as a substitute for the withdrawal of the values involved from the tax rolls.

Continuance of private ownership in accordance with the traditional American pattern would, of course, be desirable. The economic burdens now involved in private ownership of timber are so heavy that desirable management methods and operation on a sustained-yield basis of privately owned holdings can in this territory only be secured in a few cases. Private ownership of any property is inevitably contingent upon either (1) a fairly dependable annual income over and above current operating expense, such as is the case with grazing or arable land with the production of an annual crop; or (2) a reasonable justification that an increase in values will occur above carrying charges which may be comparable to an annual income. Experience through the years clearly demonstrates that privately owned forest properties will not meet these specifications, in many cases even when they are handled on a liquidation basis. State or Federal ownership appears to be the only alternative if the public interest is to be adequately protected.

In these days when national defense is the first consideration in every activity, it is also apparent that, based on past experience, serious consideration should be given to public control as a defense measure. Forest resources, particularly spruce, Douglas fir, and other species as well, will play an important part in the national defense. It is desirable that use in the present pending emergency be secured with a minimum of damage to future supplies, and that the whole problem of timber supply be considered from the standpoint of national defense through the years. Plenty of material resource along these lines is available now, but will it be 30 or 40 years from now?

The growing of a forest crop is a long-term enterprise, a minimum of 40 to 50 years on the best localities for pulp, 70 to 120 years for Douglas fir, and 180 years for ponderosa pine. Stability of land use is vital. Areas to be used for production of timber

crop should be carefully determined, and once dedicated must be continuously used for that purpose.

If our forest industry is to be permanently maintained as an important factor in the economy of the local producing areas scattered throughout the State, and the State as a whole, this general situation must be solved in a manner which will insure continued production from present stands until a new crop can be made available. With the situation as it is, the State of Oregon will inevitably be the foremost State in the production of forest products for many years. Action can be taken which will insure that timber products and woods work will remain its leading industry. This is the only State left in the Union where there is an adequate supply of old-growth timber bequeathed to us by nature to make it possible to grow a new supply while the mature crop is being harvested.

G. O. P. Certain To Capture House in November Poll

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK B. KEEFE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 12, 1940

ARTICLE BY COLE E. MORGAN

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, August 4, there appeared in various papers throughout the Nation an article written by Mr. Cole E. Morgan which is of interest to the Congress and the Nation, and I am pleased to incorporate this article, taken from the New York Journal and American as published in its issue on Sunday, August 4, in these remarks:

[From the New York Journal and American of August 4, 1940]

G. O. P. CERTAIN TO CAPTURE HOUSE IN NOVEMBER POLL—REPUBLICANS NEED ONLY FORTY-EIGHT SEATS TO REGAIN CONTROL—SMALL MARGINS HOLD SEVENTY-ONE DISTRICTS IN WHICH CHANGES ARE EXPECTED

(By Cole E. Morgan)

WASHINGTON, August 3.—Regardless of the outcome of the Presidential election in November, indications are the House of Representatives in the Seventy-seventh Congress will be organized and controlled by the Republican Party.

The Republicans, now lacking 48 seats to control the lower branch of Congress, appear not only to be able to wipe out that deficiency, but to increase their membership to a safe working majority of not less than 39 Members over the combined Democratic and third party total—if there should be any third-party Representatives left after November 5.

Today the House, including three death vacancies, divides 170 Republicans, 261 Democrats, and 4 minor-party Members.

The Republicans need an additional 48 seats to acquire the 218 bare majority of the 435 total, elect the Speaker, other House officers, and give them the chairmanship and working-majority representation on all the 47 standing committees.

There are exactly 100 of the 265 Democratic and third party seats now held by less than 60 percent of the vote cast for all parties in 1938. Of these 71 are held by such small margins that a turn-over of 5 percent or less of the total votes in those districts would pull them into the Republican column. They were all carried in 1938 by not exceeding 55 percent of the votes cast.

ELEVEN WON BY LESS THAN 50 PERCENT

Eleven of the 71 were won by less than 50 percent, due to the effect of third party tickets in the field. Those 11 districts are in the industrial East and the Middle West farm belt. The incumbents, the districts they represent, the major cities they embrace, and the 1938 vote percentages are:

Third Connecticut, JAMES A. SHANLEY, New Haven, 43.4; Fifth Connecticut, J. JOSEPH SMITH, Waterbury, 42.0; Sixth Pennsylvania, FRANCIS J. MYERS, Philadelphia, 49.9; Fourteenth Pennsylvania, GUY L. MOSER, Berks County, 46.7; Twenty-fourth New York, JAMES M. FITZPATRICK, Bronx, 49.3; Forty-second New York, PIUS L. SCHWERT, Buffalo, 45.8; State at large, CAROLINE O'DAY, Rye, 49.5, and MATTHEW J. MERRITT, Flushing, 49.5; Ninth Iowa, VINCENT F. HARRINGTON, Sioux City, 49.6; Second Minnesota, ELMER J. RYAN, South St. Paul, 43.6; and Ninth Minnesota, RICHARD P. BUCKLER, Farmer-Labor, Crookston, 42.0.

REPUBLICANS CONTROL ELECTION MACHINERY

Next comes a group of 37 Democratic and third party seats where the incumbents received only from 50.0 to 52.5 percent of the votes cast 2 years ago. Nineteen of these are in States that in 1938 elected Republican Governors and State administration, giving that party control of the election machinery. The other 18 are in States under Democratic control. The 19 are scattered from Massachusetts to Colorado, but 16 of them are in the industrial East and Central States. They are:

Third Massachusetts, JOSEPH E. CASEY, Worcester County, 51.5; Second Pennsylvania, JAMES P. MCGRANERY, Philadelphia, 52.4; Third Pennsylvania, MICHAEL J. BRADLEY, Philadelphia, 52; Fourth Pennsylvania, JOHN E. SHERIDAN, Philadelphia, 51.8; Eleventh Pennsylvania, PATRICK J. BOLAND, Scranton, majority whip of the House, 52.5; Twelfth Pennsylvania, J. HAROLD FLANNERY, Pittston, 51.2; Twenty-first Pennsylvania, FRANK E. WALTER, Allentown, 50.2; Twenty-fourth Pennsylvania, J. BUELL SNYDER, Connellsville, 51.2; Thirty-third Pennsylvania, JOSEPH A. MCARDLE, Pittsburgh, 51.6; and Thirty-fourth Pennsylvania, MATTHEW A. DUNN, Pittsburgh, 50; Sixth Ohio, JAMES G. POLK, Portsmouth, 50.5; Ninth Ohio, JOHN F. HUNTER, Toledo, 50.4; Eleventh Ohio, HAROLD K. CLAYPOOL, Chillicothe, 52.1; Fifteenth Ohio, ROBERT T. SECREST, Marietta, 52.3; Nineteenth Ohio, MICHAEL J. KIRWAN, Youngstown, 52.4; Twelfth Michigan, FRANK E. HOOK, Calumet, 51.7; Second Iowa, WILLIAM S. JACOBSEN, Davenport, 50.4; Fifth Kansas, JOHN M. HOUSTON, Wichita, 50.3; and Second Colorado, FRED CUMMINGS, Fort Collins, 51.7.

DEMOCRATS GOVERN 18 DISTRICTS

The 18 districts of the Democratic governed States in the 50 to 52.5 percent range reach from New York to Washington State, but 14 of them are east of the Mississippi and north of the Ohio and Potomac. They are:

Sixth New York, ANDREW L. SOMERS, Brooklyn, 52; Sixteenth New York, JAMES H. FAY, Manhattan, 51.3; Twenty-third New York, CHARLES A. BUCKLEY, Bronx, 50.8; Third New Jersey, WILLIAM H. SUTPHIN, Asbury Park, 50.5; Fourth Maryland, AMBROSE J. KENNEDY, Baltimore, 50.2; Sixth Maryland, WILLIAM D. BYRON, Cumberland, 50.8; Ninth Indiana, EUGENE B. CROWE, Columbus, 52.1; Eleventh Indiana, WILLIAM H. LARRABEE, Anderson, 51.6; Twenty-first Illinois, FRANK W. FRIES, Springfield, 50.2; Twenty-second Illinois, EDWIN M. SCHAEFER, East St. Louis, 52.4; Twenty-fourth Illinois, CLAUDE V. PARSONS, Harrisburg, 51.1; Twenty-fifth Illinois, KENT E. KELLER, Cairo, 52.3; Illinois, State at large, T. V. SMITH, Chicago, 51.5, and JOHN C. MARTIN, Salem, 51.5; Sixth Missouri, REUBEN T. WOOD, Springfield, 50.5; Twelfth Missouri, C. ARTHUR ANDERSON, St. Louis, 52.2; Eighth Oklahoma, PHIL FERGUSON, Alva, 50.2; and Fourth Washington, KNUTE HILL, Prosser, 50.4.

The foregoing groups total 48, exactly the number that the Republicans need, in addition to their present holdings, to give them a 218 bare majority. They need but to hold their own and take these 48 from the opposition to win control.

But such a clean sweep without a single loss is expecting a little bit too much. Based on the performance in 1938 as compared with 1936, however, the Republicans should take 40 of the 48 in the 52.5 and less percent field.

G. O. P. EXPECTS GAINS ALL OVER NATION

There is another group of 23 districts which the Democrats hold by a 52.5 to 55 percent of the vote of all parties in 1938. On the basis of past performance, the Republicans are due to get 11 of these 23. In 1938 they took 17 of 37 that the opposition had captured in 1936 in that percentage range. These 23 districts are scattered from Massachusetts to California, but there are only 3 west of the Mississippi, the other 20 being concentrated chiefly in the eastern and central industrial areas. These 23 are:

Eighth Massachusetts, ARTHUR D. HEALEY, Somerville, 55.0; Eighth New York, DONALD L. O'TOOLE, Brooklyn, 54.6; Ninth New York, EUGENE J. KEOGH, Brooklyn, 54.1; Nineteenth New York, SOL BLOOM, Manhattan, 53.3; First Pennsylvania, LEON SACKS, Philadelphia, 53.5; Twenty-fifth Pennsylvania, CHARLES I. FADDIS, Washington, 53.7; Twenty-eighth Pennsylvania, ROBERT G. ALLEN, Westmoreland County, 53.9; Second West Virginia, JENNINGS RANDOLPH, Elkins, 54.7; Fourth West Virginia, GEORGE W. JOHNSON, Parkersburg, 52.9; Seventh Kentucky, ANDREW J. MAY, Prestonburg, 53.2; Fourteenth Ohio, Dow W. HARTER, Akron, 53.3; Fifteenth Michigan, JOHN D. DINGELL, Detroit, 54.2.

First Indiana, WILLIAM T. SCHULTE, Gary, 54.9; Twelfth Indiana, LOUIS LUDLOW, Indianapolis, 53.7; First Illinois, ARTHUR W. MITCHELL, Chicago, 53.4; Second Illinois, RAYMOND S. MCKEOUGH, Chicago, 54.2; Seventh Illinois, LEONARD W. SCHUETZ, Chicago, 54.3; Ninth Illinois, JAMES MCANDREWS, Chicago, 52.7; Twenty-third Illinois, LAURENCE F. ARNOLD, Centralia, 53.8; North Wisconsin, MERLIN HULL, Progressive, Eau Claire, 53.4; First Missouri, MILTON A. ROMJUE, Kirksville, 54.7; Second Montana, JAMES F. O'CONNOR, Billings, 53.8; and Nineteenth California, HARRY R. SHEPPARD, San Bernardino, 53.3.

BIG SHIFT FORECAST IN CONGRESS VOTE

Next there are 15 districts which the Democrats and third parties hold by 55 to 57.5 percent of the 1938 vote. In 1938 the Republicans took 13 of 31 districts, which the Democrats had carried in 1938 within the 55 to 57.5 range. On the basis of that performance, the Republicans should get six of these 15, to bring their prospective gain to 57 out of 86. These districts are:

Third Maryland, THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, Baltimore, 56.6; Third West Virginia, ANDREW EDMISTON, Weston, 55.3; Sixth Virginia, CLIFTON A. WOODRUM, Roanoke, 56.1; Eighth North Carolina, WILLIAM O. BURGIN, Lexington, 55.2; Tenth North Carolina, A. L. BULWINKLE, Charlotte, 56.5; Sixteenth Michigan, JOHN LESINSKI, Detroit, 55.1; Eighth Indiana, JOHN W. BOEHNE, Evansville, 56.4; Third Illinois, EDWARD A. KELLY, Chicago, 55.9; Twentieth Illinois, JAMES M. BARNES, Jacksonville, 55.4; Tenth Wisconsin, BERNARD J. GEHRMANN, Progressive, Superior, 57.5; Third Missouri, RICHARD M. DUNCAN, St. Joseph, 55.3; Eighth Missouri, CLYDE WILLIAMS, Farmington, 55.3; Second Nebraska, CHARLES MCLAUGHLIN, Omaha, 57.3; and Third Colorado, John A. Martin (died December 23, 1939, seat now vacant), Pueblo, 57.4.

The Democrats and third parties now hold 14 more House seats by between 57.5 and 60 percent of the 1938 total votes. In 1938 the Republicans took 10 of 35 districts carried by the Democrats in that percentage range in 1936. Based on that past performance the Republicans should take 4 of this group of 14. These districts are:

Fifth New York, MARCELLUS H. EVANS, Brooklyn, 58.3; Seventh New York, JOHN J. DELANEY, Brooklyn, 59.6; Eleventh New York, JAMES J. O'LEARY, Staten Island, 58.9; Twentieth New York, VITO MARCANTONIO, American Labor, 59.7; Fourth Kentucky, EDWARD W. CREAL, Hodgenville, 59.2; Eighth Kentucky, JOE B. BATES, Ashland, 58.8; Fourteenth Michigan, LOUIS C. RABAUT, Detroit, 57.6; Sixth Illinois, A. F. MACIEJEWSKI, Chicago, 58.4; Second Missouri, WILLIAM L. NELSON, Columbia, 58; Tenth Missouri, ORVILLE ZIMMERMAN, Poplar Bluff, 58.9; First Utah, ABE MURDOCK, Ogden, 59.7; New Mexico, State at large, JOHN J. DEMPSEY, Santa Fe, 58.5; Seventeenth California, LEE E. GEYER, Los Angeles, 58.6, and Fifth Washington, CHARLES H. LEAVY, Spokane, 57.47.

On top of all these, the Republicans on their past performance record have a chance of taking 6 more districts won by the Democrats in 1938 by more than 60 percent of the votes. There are 165 of these districts. In 1936 the Democrats carried 204 districts by better than 60 percent of the total votes. In 1938 the Republicans won 7 of that 204. Hence the prediction that this year they will take over 6 in the 60 percent and over bracket of 1938.

Summing up this analysis, the Republicans this year stand to recover 61 of the 100 districts which the Democrats and minor party won in 1938 by less than 60 percent of the total vote cast, and in addition 6 of the 165 won by the Democrats with better than 60 percent of the votes 2 years ago.

This would mean a total Republican gain of 67, which added to their 170 seats in the present House, would bring their membership in the next House to 237, or a clear majority of 19 of the 435 total House membership and a plurality over the opposition of 39.

With a working margin of 39 Members, the Republicans should have no difficulty in keeping their organization in line and absolutely controlling every piece of legislation passing through the House, regardless of the political complexion of the Senate or who might be occupying the White House after next January 20.

When it is considered that the Constitution requires that all legislation for the levying of taxes and for the appropriation of money for spending must originate in the House, it is not difficult to comprehend what an effective weapon the Republicans would have through control of the House in shaping the course of the next administration.

American Foreign Trade and the International Situation in the Far East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 12, 1940

SPEECH BY JUDGE JOHN W. HAUSSERMANN

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include a speech delivered in San Francisco, Calif., before the annual convention of the National Foreign Trade Council, by Judge John W. Haussermann, known as the first American citizen in the Philippines and the leading gold and chrome miner in those islands.

The speech contains timely and novel suggestions for the maintenance of the American foreign trade, including a discussion of the well-nigh forgotten Webb-Pomerene Act and the possibility of revitalizing it to meet the commercial competition that is offered by totalitarian countries.

The speech also presents the international situation in the Far East, the so-called Japanese Monroe Doctrine and the possibility of a new realinement of colonial powers in the Far East in which the speaker advanced the theory that Germany might reenter the Far East and occupy the Netherlands East Indies and French Indochina.

Finally, Judge Haussermann, a friend of the Filipino people and a loyal American, discusses Philippine independence, expressing the hope that the American flag, with the consent of the Filipino people, should not be hauled down in the Philippines for the good of both the United States and the Philippines and for the stability of the Pacific region.

SOME ECONOMIC PROBLEMS—THE ORIENT AND THE PHILIPPINES

This annual convention of the National Foreign Trade Council here in San Francisco on the shores of the Pacific will be watched with more than ordinary attention on the other side of the water in the Far East.

Over there they have been hearing mostly of raging wars and preparations for possible future wars. This situation is being aided greatly by the rule that "bad news is good news and good news is no news at all." This convention and its proceedings should convince our neighbors across the Pacific that the works of peace—production, commerce, and peace itself—are the things that are largely engaging the thoughts and energies of the American people.

This convention should produce useful and constructive news; and I earnestly hope that the different instrumentalities of communication will find it advisable to carry a generous account of them to the peoples of the Far East. They would be our message of high hopes, of good neighborliness, and of peaceful intentions toward them.

Businessmen will discuss the problems of foreign trade. They will deal with competitive conditions and trade wars. But there is one fundamental fact upon which they will be unanimous, and that is, that international trade rests on international goodwill. So convinced, they will spare no efforts to work for its strengthening and perpetuation.

Trading between nations is without a doubt the closest and friendliest form of contact between them. It consists of millions of people in one country producing articles with the best genius that they possess to be offered for a valuable consideration to millions of people in another country who are willing to use them. This process repeated many times, year in and year out, is the best link of understanding, appreciation, and mutual benefit between nations.

So it is that the building and extension of foreign trade should be a major concern of a nation. He who minimizes its basic importance to the economy of and amity between nations understands but little the real nature of international relations.

There is pessimism in this country today as to the prospects of our trade abroad. Truly we are steeped in the most profound uncertainty. We hear of the prospective operation of European manufacturing and exporting cartels under a unified direction in a totalitarian country that would drive American goods from the world's markets and with it reduce American influence to the vanishing point.

I would not despair in the face of such impending possibilities. I would rather collect my wits and mobilize the genius, the resources, and the experience of American industry, finance, agriculture, commerce, and management and meet the competitor primarily on the basis of service and quality and price of goods.

The situation that is developing before our eyes today compels a closer and more sympathetic cooperation between government and business. The time is long overdue when government and business should realize that they are interdependent and that any basic divergence between them would rebound to the great injury of the people.

Minds more fertile than mine will undoubtedly produce a multiplicity of ideas as to how to grapple with foreign competition, particularly in Latin America, with which our Nation desires to establish some sort of economic unity, not only for the purpose of commerce but, more importantly, for its political and strategic significance in relation to the maintenance and implementation of the Monroe Doctrine in the Western Hemisphere.

But I do believe that the Government, in conjunction with business, should immediately make an inquiry into two propositions as a first step to the formulation of a program of action: First, the exploration of areas of cooperation between Government and business to coordinate their efforts; and, second, an investigation of the failure of the Webb-Pomerene Act and pertinent acts.

The Webb-Pomerene Act was enacted by Congress years ago to meet a situation roughly similar to that we are facing today. Its central idea is that American manufacturers and exporters could fix prices and conditions without infringing on the antitrust laws. The extent to which the bilateral trade-agreement program has affected that legislation is a logical subject for investigation. The comparative smallness of our investments abroad, as distinguished from loans, is another. The absence of mandatory provisions to enjoin collaboration between American firms is still another. In any event, the investigation is pertinent and timely and should produce the facts that may or may not justify the revision and revitalization of the Webb-Pomerene Act and its financial complement, the Edge Act.

It is not overestimating the economic potency of the American people when I say that whether there will be a greater or less international trade in the world in the coming years depends chiefly on what the American Government will adopt as its international economic policy.

The American people possess five things that are vital to international commerce and finance. First, they have four-fifths of the world's gold, valued at over twenty and one-half billion dollars; second, they have now probably three-fourths of the world's total banking resources; third, they have the most complete and efficient machinery for production; fourth, they have tremendous and varied natural wealth; and, fifth, they are far and away the largest consuming unit in the world of both domestic and imported goods.

Believing that the tendency of the American people is toward liberalism in every sphere of human relationships, and believing further that they realize that for their own good and the good of others they will have to assume the leadership in the rehabilitation of the war-wrecked world, the United States, I think, may be expected to pursue a liberal policy in international commercial and financial relations, and that would mean more extensive economic intercourse between nations and hence more prosperity throughout the earth.

I should like to say a few words concerning the gold holdings of our Government as they have affected and as they may affect in the future the trade between nations. I shall not delve into the Government's monetary policy as such, nor the future disposal of the gold holdings, nor the policy of gold sterilization, nor the function of gold in the Government's fiscal and financial schemes.

Under the authorization of the Gold Reserve Act of 1934 our Government bought gold as a commodity, paying $15 an ounce more than the then existing world price. I am not stopping here to explain or justify why the Government did that, but I want to say that that extra price totaled to date to roughly $6,000,000,000. That enormous amount constitutes the number of American dollars we paid foreigners which, in turn, constitutes dollar exchanges here in their favor. Putting it in another way, we gave them that much additional buying power.

Do you realize what that means? It means that foreign countries would have to sell us at least $60,000,000,000 worth of goods to make that profit of $6,000,000,000. Based on trade statistics, it would take those foreign countries about 20 years to sell the equivalent quantity of goods if they can do so at all over and above their normal sales to the United States.

I wish to reiterate the fact that the result of the gold-purchase policy has been to give buying power to foreign countries. This item is, in my opinion, the largest single support of international trade during the last few years. This trade would have contracted to comparative insignificance if this supply of American dollars, which otherwise would have remained idle, had not been made available.

I wish now to discuss oriental affairs as they concern the United States in connection with the prospects of peace and trade.

The Orient is the home of more than a billion people, or approximately one-half of the world's population. One-half of the oriental peoples are politically associated with the western nations. China with its more than 400,000,000 souls is still an independent nation. Now under attack by a neighbor, China professes a greater friendship and attachment to the United States.

Momentous events are in the offing in the Orient. Japan has promulgated a new policy known as the New Orient in East Asia. It is otherwise known as the Japanese Monroe Doctrine. However, Secretary of State Cordell Hull has pointed out that in motive, method, and objective it is entirely different from the American Monroe Doctrine, asserting in effect that the Japanese vintage is nothing but a verbal smoke screen for the conquest of other oriental countries by force of arms.

There is a general belief that the Orient is in revolt against the west, that the oriental peoples are united in that movement, and that the United States, for one, should fold up its flag, particularly in the Philippines, and lose no time in withdrawing from that region. This point of view was given apparent confirmation by a recent statement emanating from the White House favoring three regional Monroe Doctrines—one for Asia, one for Europe, and one for the Western Hemisphere. This statement produced satisfaction in Japan but disappointment in China and elsewhere. Subsequently, the statement was elucidated and it was asserted that it contained nothing that would not be on all fours with the statement on the same subject of Secretary Cordell Hull.

There is an immense amount of solid good will in the Orient for western nations, epecially for the United States. The Far East does not consider the west good riddance, especially when they realize that a less liberal oriental nation is ready to take their place.

I am not countenancing for a moment acts of exploitation, mistreatment, and just old-fashioned imperialism, but I do believe that by and large the west has earned the admiration and gratitude of the Orient. True, the west has reaped material benefits, but in the process it also benefited the oriental peoples by making their countries more habitable through the work of institutions for their social and intellectual amelioration and by elevating their standard of living through the creation of wealth where there was little or none before.

When the time comes when Japan promulgates an honest-to-goodness Monroe Doctrine in the Orient, the United States would not be under any obligation of consistency to withdraw from that region, particularly in the Philippines. When our own Monroe Doctrine was announced in 1823, England, France, Holland, and Spain were sovereign in certain parts in North, Central, and South America as well as in the Caribbean, and their sovereign status quo was recognized and they remained as sovereigns. So it is perfectly compatible with a Japanese Monroe Doctrine for the United States to remain as sovereign in the Philippines if she chooses so to do.

European nations having dominions or possessions in the Western Hemisphere have naval bases and military establishments there. But the United States never considered them as a menace to her. The Philippines is working out a modest defense program and the United States has a naval base in Manila Bay and there is a plan, I understand, to fortify Guam and some islets in mid-Pacific. By the same token, Japan has no valid reason to consider these defenses as a menace to her safety.

The United States will maintain the open-door policy in Asia. She will defend her rights in the Orient as elsewhere. At the same time she will scrupulously respect the rights of other nations. And at all times she is ready to take cooperative action in everything that would lead to peace, amity, and prosperity.

With these points clear, there is a general desire, I think, in this country for the genuine improvement of Japanese-American relations. It is hoped that in the near future the Japanese-American treaty of commerce and navigation which expired last January will be renewed. There are so many points of common interest and so few causes of divergence between the United States and Japan that a war between them would be an unalloyed act of madness that would decide nothing. Instead of being inevitable, a war between the two countries is easily avoidable, and it has been avoided with little effort ever since the two countries heard of each other for the first time centuries ago.

Any cooperation between the United States and Japan to bring about better relations, greater trade, and more stability in the Orient will have to encompass China and its legitimate position as an independent nation. I believe that this is possible only if, with Japan determined to treat China sincerely as an equal, China herself would face realities and decide once and for all that, having given proof that the Chinese people will fight valiantly for their country and repel any invader with all their eternal might, they will be ready to meet Japan half way.

The danger is that Japan might not welcome the United States to a multilateral plan of cooperation because it might strengthen American influence with the Chinese as well as other Oriental peoples. The Japanese will realize that the Chinese people are more friendly to the United States than to Japan. But the United States, in the name of all good American principles and policies, does not have the slightest intention of establishing her sovereignty on the mainland of Asia. The Japanese will recall that it was an American President who called Japan and Russia 35 years ago to cease fighting and conclude peace at Portsmouth. Today there is a hope in this country that Japan and China may soon compose their differences and reestablish peaceful relations.

Our interest is peace, for peace is blessed and beneficent; and we desire to build up trade, bring more prosperity to all concerned, and once again resume that tranquillity around the rim of the Pacific that is so necessary for human betterment.

There is today lodged in the realm of pure speculation another possible realinement in the Orient which will have vital repercussions in the international sphere. It has to do with the course of the present European war and the post-bellum settlements.

Holland and France have possessions in the Far East, the Netherland East Indies, and French Indochina, respectively. These two colonies are tremendously rich in natural resources and have between them about 100,000,000 inhabitants. What will happen to them at the conclusion of the war is the great interrogation mark.

The press reports the activities of the Japanese presumably directed to the eventual occupation of those possessions. The United States has expressed to Japan that she looks with disfavor at the alteration of the international status quo in the Pacific region, and Japan gave her word of acquiescence with the American point of view. But the news persists that Japan will soon gravitate to those Dutch and French possessions.

I have a theory—and it is nothing but a theory—that it is both possible and probable that Germany, which had possessions in the Far East before the first World War, might occupy the Netherland East Indies and French Indochina, especially the former, herself. Today she has more color of authority than has Japan, for German political logicians could allege that having become supreme in Holland and France, she automatically becomes supreme in their colonial possessions and dependencies. That allegation is for Japan to rebut. Japan's case is with Germany, her de facto ally.

If Germany reenters the Far East as a colonial power, two results may be envisaged. First, she will checkmate, if not frustrate, the Japanese plan of expansion to the south of the Japanese Empire. And second—and I consider this of the most basic significance to the United States—much of the expected German activities in Latin America would be deflected from the Western Hemisphere to the Far East which, from the standpoint of potential economic importance, is much more promising than Latin America.

Finally, I should like to devote my concluding remarks to the subject of Philippine-American relations.

Let me stress the fact that the United States is still supreme and sovereign in the Philippines and will be so until 1946. That date may be postponed or eliminated by the voluntary action of our Government or by request of the Filipinos agreed to by our Government, or by simultaneous, spontaneous action by the American and Philippine peoples directing their respective governments to take steps to have the American flag remain in the Philippines.

There is a movement among thoughtful and patriotic Filipinos for the postponement of complete Philippine independence. They realize now that the safety and welfare of their country lie in the continuation of the present political relations with the United States. I hope and trust—and I am sure I am right in this—that

the American people, who have been generous and magnanimous with the Philippine people, will give sympathetic consideration to any Philippine suggestion in good faith to put off the complete separation of the Philippines from the United States.

I am now going to discuss Philippine-American trade, and I am doing so because this is a trade convention and not because I am placing trade and other economic considerations as paramount in my advocacy of continued Philippine-American political relations. I am much more concerned with the magnificent idealism that our country has displayed in the Philippines, an idealism that has brought untold blessings to the Philippine people—our language, our ideas and ideals, our civilization, our democratic institutions, and our effective aid in bringing about the reconstruction and regeneration of a race of people who have come under our care as by the dictate of fate.

The Philippine-American trade is roughly $200,000,000 a year. In 1939 the Philippines ranked fifth as an export market of the United States, outranked only by the United Kingdom, Canada, Japan, and France. In that year the purchases of the Philippines of American goods amounted to over $100,000,000 worth.

A freight train of 100 cars moved these goods every day of that year from points in the interior, comprising the majority of the States, to ports of shipment on the Atlantic and Pacific seaboards and the Gulf of Mexico. According to the United States Department of Commerce, 105 American products find the Philippines their best buyer abroad and 55 other products find that country their second-best buyer.

There is a great future in trade with the Philippines, for that country is rich in natural resources, both agricultural and mineral. It can produce farm and forest products natural to a tropical country that will not compete with American production and which our country now imports from foreign sources. The Philippines is valuable to us not only for their wealth but also for the fact that if we let another nation get control of those islands, we would be giving a competitor in the international political and economic field a tremendous economic asset.

The exports of the Philippines to the United States, entering this country duty-free, constitute the very foundation of the Philippine economic structure. The Philippines is a country dependent on foreign markets for its economic existence.

One out of every 3 of the 16,000,000 Filipinos is engaged in the production, handling, or exportation of goods for overseas markets. Considering that a good number of the people is not gainfully employed, it may be logically stated that the active members of the entire Philippine population are connected directly or remotely with the foreign trade of the country.

I am happy to observe that American and other economic interests are not as hostile to the free entry of certain Philippine products as they used to be. Philippine sugar, coconut oil, and other products are already under a quantitative limitation in the United States. Their competitive nature is now better understood and found inconsequential. Being the principal support of Philippine buying power for American goods, their entry in the United States should be encouraged rather than discouraged.

I wish to point out now what might possibly happen to Philippine sugar and coconut oil when the United States-Latin American economic unity is established. Brazil, for instance, might ask for a wider market in the United States for her vegetable oils, especially the babasu-nut oil, which is supposed to contain the essential ingredients of coconut oil. Other South American and Caribbean countries might ask the United States to admit more of their sugar. These matters are of vital significance to the Philippines and the Filipinos should include their consideration in their future plans.

There is in the Philippines a rising hope that Latin America might offer a market for Philippine products. This hope has no foundation in economic logic. What the Philippines produce are, or can be, produced in the tropical and semitropical sections of Latin America. And, in turn, Latin America does not have manufactures which the Philippines can import advantageously. Latin America is the coming trade cockpit of the world where financial and commercial giants will vie with each other, and there is no place for the Philippines in that situation.

I cannot conclude this paper without saying that the record of our country in the Philippines during the last 41 years is one of unselfish and constructive devotion to the best interests of the Filipino people. We have made the Philippines more healthful, more bountiful, and more beautiful. And the Filipino of today is a happier, stronger, richer, more ambitious, and more self-respecting individual.

Under our flag today the Philippines has as much self-government as the States of the American Union. The Filipinos have civil liberty and individual freedom; they have a representative government by themselves; they have the mighty protection of the United States; and, withal, their national self-respect is absolutely intact under that flag.

The Filipinos are friendly and loyal to us. They are our allies. We can depend on them in any emergency. They are a worthy and promising people, and our aid and protection in all these years have not been lost on them. I hope that they will use the attributes that God gave them and consider seriously if they want to separate from us for good. They will have to decide that for themselves. Their decision must be voluntary.

I shall end as I started, and that is that this convention of foreign traders, bankers, and allied activities should produce useful and constructive ideas that, based on practical and genuine good will, could be powerfully instrumental not only in creating a greater exchange of goods and services but also in bringing about a better understanding and a closer friendship between the nations of the world.

Mackinac Straits Bridge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 12, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE PONTIAC (MICH.) DAILY PRESS

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD by including therein an editorial from the Pontiac Daily Press of Pontiac, Mich., August 10, 1940, having reference to the Mackinac Straits Bridge across the Straits of Mackinac in Michigan, entitled, "Strait Into the Red."

[From the Pontiac (Mich.) Daily Press of August 8, 1940]

STRAIT INTO THE RED

A bridge linking the Lower Peninsula to the Upper Peninsula might be desirable if traffic demands it and if the State can afford it. For some time there has been efforts thus to connect the two peninsulas, and at last some headway seems to have been made. A bill is on its way through Congress, or may be passed by this time, which will authorize construction of a bridge, or a series of bridges, to cost no more than $35,000,000. It provides further for interest on bonds of not more than 5 percent and a retirement period of not more than 40 years. Presumably the money is to be obtained from the R. F. C. or bonds will be sold to pay back the loan.

It is assumed that if a $35,000,000 expenditure is authorized, that amount will be spent, but its proponents talk more about $30,000,000 costs. Whatever the sum, it is incumbent upon Mr. John Q. Public, who has to pay the bill, to do some straight thinking about the proposed straits span. Taking the smaller sum of $30,000,000, the annual interest charges at 5 percent would amount to $1,500,000, or if money could be secured at 3 or 4 percent it would amount to $900,000 or $1,200,000 yearly.

On a basis of the 274,749 cars crossing on the straits ferries in 1937, the charge per car for interest alone at 3 percent would be $3.27, at 4 per cent $4.36, and at 5 percent $5.45.

Given a bridge life of 100 years, 1 percent ($300,000) per year must be added to the total fixed charges for depreciation. Another little Ethiopian in the bridge pilings is the added cost of maintenance. A minimum of one-tenth of 1 percent ($30,000) per year would have to be jotted down for maintenance. Then there are additional costs for personnel, lighting, and terminal offices with which to reckon.

Adding all these together on the basis of the 1937 level it would take 120 years to retire the debt, and the toll per car would have to be $5.72 on the 3-percent basis, $6.81 at the 4-percent basis, and $7.90 at 5 percent.

But the retirement period is fixed at 40 years so an increase in these rates would have to be made to liquidate the loan in that time. Presumably the bonds might be extended but before the bridge was paid for it would be outworn and a new one demanded.

Of course no such tolls as these would be levied. It would wreck that fractional part of the tourist industry above the Straits which the proposed bridge is designed to aid. Our tourist traffic has not shown the rate of growth to justify any great added expense. While 274,749 cars were ferried across in 1937, only 280,243 cars crossed in 1939, an increase of less than 6,000 vehicles in 2 years.

We can get a fine example of the cost of bridges by the tunnel under the Detroit River and the Ambassador Bridge. There, where the traffic flows from a great metropolitan center and will be much heavier than can be expected at the Mackinac Straits, both these projects went into bankruptcy, and the international bridge at Port Huron is not carrying the traffic which will retire its costs.

To all appearances we are planning an 8-mile monument to fiduciary folly. Maybe it is justified. We've thrown away money in worse ways. But if we engage in this undertaking it is well to estimate the costs to the State, the investor, and the individual user of this connecting link and know exactly what we are attempting.

With the Nation facing a $14,000,000,000 defense program, it may be a poor time to consider any project unless there are reasons for its use and means to finance it without putting another red entry on the ledger.

Sugar Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VINCENT F. HARRINGTON
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 12, 1940

LETTERS FROM HON. HENRY A. WALLACE, SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE, TO HON. A. LEONARD ALLEN, OF LOUISIANA, AND TO HON. E. D. SMITH, OF SOUTH CAROLINA.

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a letter addressed by the Honorable Henry A. Wallace, Secretary of Agriculture, to the Honorable A. LEONARD ALLEN, a Representative from Louisiana, as well as a letter addressed by the Secretary of Agriculture to the Honorable E. D. SMITH, chairman, Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, United States Senate.

JUNE 22, 1940.

Hon. A. LEONARD ALLEN,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. ALLEN: Acknowledgment is made of your letter to me of June 11, 1940, which you had inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 12, 1940, under the heading, "An Appeal to Secretary Wallace on Behalf of Sugarcane." In this letter you express the view that action should be taken by this Department to permit a group of Louisiana sugarcane growers having excess acreage above their proportionate share allotments under the provisions of the Sugar Act to harvest such acreage.

It is clear that you have not been informed about the recommendations of this Department on this problem. I therefore enclose for your information a copy of my letter of April 13, 1940, to the Honorable E. D. SMITH, chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, in which the views of this Department were given on S. J. Res. 225, introduced by Senator ELLENDER of Louisiana, on March 7, 1940. Perhaps I should also direct your attention to the fact that a companion bill was introduced in the House (H. J. Res. 500), by Congressman MOUTON, of Louisiana, on March 27, 1940.

If it is your desire to help the group of Louisiana sugarcane growers who have excess acreage, it is necessary that Congressional approval be obtained of H. J. Res. 500 and S. J. Res. 225, which have been approved by this Department and which have been pending before the Congress for several months. These measures will permit the harvest of excess sugarcane acreage without loss of producers' payments upon the condition that certain deductions be made from the Government payments.

If the Congress is unwilling to pass these bills permitting payments to noncomplying producers with certain deductions, I am sure you will readily appreciate the impossibility of our making payment in full to such producers under existing legislation. I assume you are aware of the fact that any producer who is willing to forego the conditional payments may harvest all his acreage.

Sincerely yours,

H. A. WALLACE, *Secretary.*

The following is the text of Secretary Wallace's report to Senator ELLISON D. SMITH, chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, containing the Department of Agriculture's views on Senate Joint Resolution 225, introduced in the Senate by Senator ELLENDER, of Louisiana, on March 7, 1940:

APRIL 13, 1940.

Hon. E. D. SMITH,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture and Forestry,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR SMITH: Reference is made to your request for the views of this Department on Senate Joint Resolution 225, introduced by Senator ELLENDER, of Louisiana, on March 7, 1940.

Since the above bill was sent to this Department Senator ELLENDER proposed a substitute bill as an amendment to the agricultural appropriation bill for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941. This bill appears on page 5014 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 22, 1940, and reads as follows:

"On page 82, line 14, before the period insert a colon and the following: '*Provided further*, That no payment under the Sugar Act of 1937 with respect to the 1940 crop shall be withheld from any producer in the mainland cane-sugar area because of the marketing (or processing) of sugarcane in excess of the proportionate share for the farm, if the acreage of sugarcane grown on the farm and marketed (or processed) for sugar in the crop year 1940 is not in excess of the acreage of sugarcane for sugar planted prior to January 1, 1940, but payments shall be made only with respect to the proportionate share acreage established for the farm under the provisions of such act, and the following deductions shall be made from such payments on account of any acreage of sugarcane grown on the farm and marketed (or processed) for sugar in the crop year 1940 which is in excess of (1) 110 percent of the proportionate share for the farm, or (2) the proportionate share for the farm plus 25 acres, whichever is the greater; for so much of such excess as does not exceed 500 acres, a deduction of $10 per acre; for so much of such excess as exceeds 500 acres, a deduction of $20 per acre.'"

In our report to you of February 28, 1940, on Senate Joint Resolution 190, which was introduced in the Senate by Senator ELLENDER on January 4, 1940, we explained the problems involved in the proposal to permit harvesting of the excess sugarcane acreage in the mainland cane area. In that report it was stated:

"Under the proposed legislation producers of sugarcane in the continental United States who, under existing determinations of this Department, pursuant to the Sugar Act of 1937, were permitted to defer adjustment of acreage from the 1939 crop to the 1940 crop would now be permitted to obtain the payments contemplated by the act for the 1940 crop without making the required adjustments.

"A large number of the sugarcane growers having more than 10 acres complied with the acreage reductions in the 1939 crop, while other producers whose acreage consisted principally of plant and first ratoon cane took advantage of the option provided in the proportionate share determinations of this Department, copies of which are enclosed, to defer their adjustments into 1940. Enactment of the proposed legislation would therefore be unjust to the many producers who made the required acreage adjustment in 1939."

With the provisions contained in Senate Joint Resolution 225 limiting payments to producers on the 1940 crop to their proportionate shares or acreage allotments and the supplemental provision introduced by Senator ELLENDER on March 22, 1940, establishing certain deductions from the base rates of payments to growers for any excess acreage above 110 percent of their proportionate shares or the proportionate shares plus 25 acres, whichever is the greater, it is the opinion of this Department that the principal objection to the former proposal for harvesting the excess acreage has been met. For this reason and in view of the hardships which would fall upon producers without such amendment, this Department recommends enactment of this legislation.

As required by Budget Circular 344, this matter was referred to the Bureau of the Budget on April 4, 1940, and under date of April 8, 1940, the Assistant Director thereof advised this Department that there would be no objection to the submission of this report to the committee.

Sincerely,

H. A. WALLACE, *Secretary.*

Compulsory Conscription in Time of Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 7, 1940

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that any plan of compulsory conscription of our men and boys for military service in time of peace is wholly unnecessary. May I say that I am not without information upon this subject of compulsory conscription, because I knew it in the last World War; while in the service of my Government I saw its operation, and I saw and knew of its gruesome ills and its disastrous effects. As a captain of infantry, during that period, I witnessed some of the injustices which obtained. That was in time of war. But we are not at war now. Who will attack the United States of America? I am convinced we are not going to attack any nation. If we are not going to attack any country, and if our operations are limited to our own defense of our country, then we really wonder, Mr. Speaker, why all of this madness—why all of the apparent hysteria—regarding war?

Our Nation has never resorted to a compulsory conscription of men and boys for military service in time of peace until the Burke-Wadsworth bill was introduced in the Congress. I am advised that this bill is the outgrowth of the President's desire; he has approved of this bill; the President wants this compulsory conscription of our men and boys for military service passed. In other words, the President is for this bill.

Mr. Speaker, there has not been any good-faith effort on the part of the War Department, or the Navy Department, to secure voluntary enlistments for the military or naval service. I am convinced that every American is truly patriotic, and that they will respond voluntarily for the defense of our coun-

try. Compulsory conscription is wholly unnecessary in order to obtain the necessary manpower for training and military purposes for our defense of this country. Give the men and boys a fair chance to enlist voluntarily, under an assurance, upon which they can rely, that they will not be shipped across the ocean into some foreign land to help fight the battles of some foreign country; and reduce the time of the enlistment to 1 year and give them at least the same compensation that was paid during the last World War, which is the same amount now paid to the boys in the C. C. C. camps—who are entirely safe from every danger of war—and I am confident all of the ranks which it is desired to fill will be promptly and completely filled, and this proposed plan of compulsory conscription, in time of peace, will be wholly unnecessary.

The President wants this compulsory conscription bill passed. He has so stated. The people in my section of the country are largely opposed to the passage of the Burke-Wadsworth bill in time of peace. We reflect for the moment on the hardships suffered and the loss of jobs—the financial losses sustained—and the general disruption of business, industry, and agriculture in the event this proposed compulsory conscription plan is enacted into law. Who will be required to suffer? The people of this country will sustain the loss and they will be required to suffer. All of this will obtain at a time when this Nation is at peace. They keymen will, in all probability, be drawn from industry and business—men upon whom that branch of national defense must rely—yet when their numbers are drawn they must respond. It appears that those who would force this compulsory conscription of our men and boys for military purposes upon our people in time of peace should be the very first who would have to respond to the gruesome and unwholesome provisions of the iniquitous law.

Mr. Speaker, we have witnessed the compulsory conscription of men and boys for military purposes, in time of peace, in Europe; that is the first and outstanding policy of a dictatorship. That policy was inaugurated by Hitler, it was closely followed by Stalin, and Mussolini pursued his course along the same pathway; that is the policy of the dictator. To control and dominate the people is their watchword; that power of control is exercised through the force of law and might, and by it the will of the people is dominated. Therefore, in those countries, now under a dictatorship, resort is had to compulsory conscription for military service in time of peace.

In our country, in which liberty and freedom have been our watchword, we have never resorted to those drastic methods before. The patriotism of every American is outstanding, and we know that in the time of need, for the defense of our country, our homes, and our institutions, every able-bodied American will respond voluntarily. Compulsory methods should not be resorted to because they are unnecessary. Every American has the love of country in his heart—he will fight in the defense of his country because of that love—therefore compulsory conscription is unnecessary in time of peace in our Nation. The Burke-Wadsworth bill, which is now proposed for passage, is a direct challenge of the patriotism of every American who is subject to military service. If this bill is enacted into law, the patriotic fervor of our people will vanish, and there will be substituted the command by our Government to our people to enter the military service. That is dictation. That is merely another form of regimentation in our land. That plan destroys patriotism and conveys the power to command into the hands of those who are in control of our Government. This plan is not in keeping with our American traditions, and that policy is not in accord with the will and the judgment of our people.

Mr. Speaker, we are in favor of an adequate national defense—a defense which is both sound and strong—sufficient to repel the attack of any foe. However, this administration has utterly failed to secure the proper equipment for our national defense, although great and huge appropriations were made for that very purpose. The people have offered a protest because of that miserable failure on the part of this administration, and, not long ago, the President in another fireside chat attempted to tell of the military preparedness of our Nation—the larger part of which, he was forced to admit, was "on order" and was not available for any use in the defense of our country. War munitions which are "on order" will not be helpful in case of an attack and will not be helpful to the men and boys who are selected for military training. It was observed very recently that the National Guard outfits which are now training were using wooden guns in place of regulation equipment, and were using motor-trucks in place of Army tanks, all because our Government has failed to provide the necessary equipment for such use. If this compulsory conscription bill should pass, and the men and boys should be rushed into the Army camps at an early date, which is contemplated, they would be without uniforms and without training equipment in very large part; they would be without housing facilities and without fieldpieces; they would sit down and await the completion of the order for their uniforms, tanks, guns, and equipment. In the face of this appalling situation and the lack of training material, it is sought to rush the Burke-Wadsworth bill through the Congress to final passage to compel our men and boys to engage in military activities, in time of peace, as their numbers are drawn.

Let us smite this un-American policy of compulsory conscription in time of peace for our Military Establishment. I am confident the good judgment of our people and their representatives will not lead us along the path of the dictator. May it lead us along the pathway of liberty and freedom in this Nation.

Our National Defense to Date

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 12, 1940

INFORMATION COMPILED BY MILLARD W. RICE, LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL REPRESENTATIVE

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, for the information of my colleagues in the interest of an adequate national defense, the following information compiled by Mr. Millard W. Rice, legislative representative, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, is furnished. This information is made possible through the cooperation of the War and Navy Departments.

	June 30, 1939	June 30, 1940	June, 30, 1941[1]
Army:			
Personnel	171,415	242,914	375,000
Military appropriations	$460,201,254	$923,142,603	$2,897,731,766
Planes	1,900	2,800	11,000
Tanks		464	1,464
Armored cars		485	1,346
Antiaircraft		1,477	4,616
Garand rifles			250,000
Reserve officers	110,000	120,000	130,000
National Guard:			
Personnel	199,491	242,708	263,589
Appropriations	$43,324,733	$71,475,977	$88,466,967
Aircraft	266	294	406
Navy:			
Sailors	110,196	139,870	170,000
Marines	18,013	26,496	34,000
Appropriations	$587,556,744	$915,360,249	$1,867,444,308
Combat ships	364	395	420
Aircraft	2,090	2,173	4,000
Pilots	2,800	3,000	3,850
Coast Guard:			
Personnel	10,510	15,000	17,500
Appropriations	$38,446,144	$49,629,852	$51,133,310
Planes	50	55	61
Patrol boats, etc	302	418	424

[1] Subject to change by subsequent legislation and Executive orders.

Pungent Facts for the Public to Ponder Over

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LEMKE

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 12, 1940

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Speaker, everybody is after the almighty dollar, and rightly so, because it pays debts, interest, and taxes, and its accumulation enables us to provide the comforts and conveniences of life in our declining years after our earning power ceases. We should understand that money is a necessity in civilization. Civilization cannot exist without it. To be a part of society money is as necessary to one as air and water are to animal life. One can live longer without money than without air and water, but one cannot be a part of civilization without it; therefore, when a government permits a small class of men who deal in money for profit to dictate its monetary and banking system it may be expected to end in the money dealers owning and controlling practically all the money, thereby controlling credit and inflating and deflating the price of property, labor, and commodities at will. The fundamental cause of all financial panics and depressions is the lack of money, and this country is suffering from a lack of money.

Make this statement to a hundred people, and 99 would say you are wrong, that the banks are loaded with money. When I speak of money, I mean real money—"In God We Trust" dollars—full legal tender for all debts, public and private—not fictitious bankers' check-book money which constitutes 90 percent of our so-called money that vanishes into thin air in major panics, as in 1921, and 1929 to 1933 when banks by the thousands closed their doors for lack of real money to pay their depositors.

To prove to the gullible public that they are being misled by subtle and insidious propaganda to the belief that the banks are loaded with money, I addressed a letter to the Secretary of the Treasury for information on this subject and my letter and questions were answered as follows:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
COMPTROLLER OF THE CURRENCY,
Washington, May 13, 1940.

Hon. WILLIAM LEMKE,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. LEMKE: Referring to your letter of May 9, there is shown below the information you desire with regard to banks in the United States and possessions as of December 30, 1939:

	Number of banks	Total deposits[1]	Cash in vaults[1]	Balances with other banks, including reserve balances[1]
Member banks of the Federal Reserve System	6,362	$49,340,152	$841,215	$18,941,039
Nonmember banks of the Federal Reserve System	8,734	19,225,891	355,324	3,256,896
Total, all banks	15,096	68,566,043	1,196,539	22,197,935
Banks not insured by Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1,510	11,080,286	129,384	1,256,875
Banks insured by Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	13,586	57,485,757	1,067,155	20,941,060

[1] 000 omitted.

It will be noted that the above statement includes a fourth column showing figures covering the amount of balances with other banks, including reserve balances. Such balances reported for banks insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, however, include cash in vaults of 51 insured mutual savings banks, the amount of which is not available separately.

Very truly yours,

C. B. UPHAM,
Acting Comptroller of the Currency.

Breaking down the above official information contained in the letter from the Comptroller of the Currency, it shows the following amount in cash in the vaults of the banks on the 1st day of January 1940:

Member banks:	
Total deposits	$49,340,152,000
Cash in vaults	$841,215,000
Percentage of cash in vaults against total deposits ($1.70 cash in vault on each $100 deposit)	1.704
Nonmember banks:	
Total deposits	$19,225,891,000
Cash in vaults	$355,324,000
Percentage of cash in vaults against total deposits ($1.85 cash in vault on each $100 deposit)	1.848
Total, all banks:	
Total deposits	$68,566,043,000
Total cash in vaults	$1,196,539,000
Total percentage of cash in vaults against total deposits ($1.75 cash in vault on each $100 deposit)	1.745
Banks not insured by F. D. I. C.:	
Total deposits	$11,080,286,000
Cash in vaults	$129,384,000
Percentage of cash in vaults against total deposits ($1.17 cash in vault on each $100 deposit)	1.167
Banks insured by F. D. I. C.:	
Total deposits	$57,485,757,000
Cash in vaults	$1,067,155,000
Percentage of cash in vaults against total deposits ($1.86 cash in vault on each $100 deposit)	1.856

To carry information on this subject further, the monthly report of the Treasury Department shows that on January 1, 1940, $7,483,011,701 was in circulation. This included all kinds of money from copper cents to $10,000 bills. If the actual amount on deposit, $68,566,043,000, as shown by the above report of the Comptroller of the Currency, were divided pro rata among the depositors, each would get a fraction less than $10 for each $100 he had on deposit. I want to ask, in all fairness, with the above irrefutable facts staring you in the face, do you believe the banks are loaded with money?

On March 6, 1933, 2 days after Roosevelt was inaugurated, he declared a bank holiday, existing from Monday, the 6th day of March, until Thursday, the 9th day of March. On March 9 he issued a proclamation extending the holiday indefinitely, or until another proclamation was issued. On April 5, 1933, the President issued an order requiring all individuals, partnerships, associations, and corporations to deliver to the Federal Reserve bank or member banks on or before May 1, 1933, all gold coin, gold bullion, and gold certificates at that time owned by them. Subsequently other orders were issued by the President and the Secretary of the Treasury to expedite the delivery of gold certificates, and so forth. Under this operation, the Federal Reserve bank collected approximately $3,600,000,000 of gold and gold certificates by exchanging Federal Reserve notes to the owners of the gold and gold certificates and transferring it to the Treasury and receiving from the Treasury, or placed to the credit of the Federal Reserve bank, the same amount in gold certificates.

On January 31, 1934, after all the gold and gold certificates of record had been turned in to the Treasury—with the exception of about $70,000,000 which had never been turned in and is now carried as money in circulation—amounting to approximately $3,600,000,000, the President, by proclamation, revalued the gold ounce from $20.67 to $35 per ounce, which automatically reduced the content of the gold dollar from $25\frac{8}{10}$ grains—nine-tenths fine—to $15\frac{5}{21}$ grains—nine-tenths fine—which reduced the content of pure gold in the dollar from $23\frac{22}{100}$ grains to approximately $13\frac{71}{100}$ grains. This increase in the price of the gold ounce applied only to foreign gold and newly mined gold in this country.

As a result the Treasury received gold in great quantities for which they paid $35 an ounce. As fast as the gold arrived the Treasury would issue gold certificates to the Federal Re-

serve bank and then check on the Federal Reserve bank for the amount of certificates issued. As a result the circulating statement (United States money) issued by the Treasury Department June 30, 1940, shows the total amount of gold bullion held by the Treasury to be $19,963,090,869. Of this amount the Treasury has issued to the Federal Reserve bank $14,938,894,942. In other words, of the total amount of gold certificates issued by the Treasury, the Federal Reserve bank owns $14,938,894,942 with the exception of approximately $70,000,000 which has never been turned in to the Treasury and is carried as money in circulation.

With the foregoing facts before us, we are told, and most of us believe, the Government owns the gold, when, in fact, the Federal Reserve bank, a private corporation, owned more than 70 percent of all gold in the Treasury on June 30, 1940, which is evidenced by the amount of gold certificates they now hold.

For my information, and that of the general public, I addressed the following letter to Mr. Marriner S. Eccles, Chairman of the Board of Governors, Federal Reserve System:

JUNE 24, 1940.

MR. MARRINER S. ECCLES,
Chairman, Board of Governors, Federal Reserve System,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Kindly furnish me the following information:

What was the total amount paid the Government as a franchise tax, as provided by law, by the Federal Reserve bank from December 23, 1913, to the date that the amendment to section 7 of the original law (Public, No. 329, 65th Cong.) became effective and the capital stock of the Federal Reserve bank on that date?

What was the total amount paid the Government by the Federal Reserve bank as a franchise tax from the date that the amendment to the original became effective to July 1, 1932, and what was the capital stock of the Federal Reserve bank at the latter date?

What was the total amount of surplus of the Federal Reserve bank on July 1, 1932?

What was the total amount of surplus of the Federal Reserve bank on the first day of January 1940, and what was the capital stock on that date?

Do the Federal Reserve regional banks own their office buildings, and, if so, what is the value of each and how were the funds acquired to pay for them?

Thanking you in advance for this information, I am

Very sincerely yours,

_____.

In reply I received the following letter, which is self-explanatory:

BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM,
Washington, July 3, 1940.

HON. WILLIAM LEMKE,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LEMKE: Replying to your letter of June 24, 1940, the total amount paid to the United States Treasury by the Federal Reserve banks as a franchise tax, is as follows:

1913–1918	$1,134,234
1919–1932	148,004,066
Total	149,138,300

The paid-in capital stock of the Federal Reserve banks amounted to $80,767,000 on December 31, 1918, and to $151,292,000 on December 31, 1932. The surplus of the Federal Reserve banks on July 1, 1932, amounted to $259,431,000. On the first day of January 1940 paid-in capital stock of the Federal Reserve banks amounted to $135,599,000 and their surplus (sec. 7), to $151,720,000. You will recall that at the same time the franchise tax provision of the Federal Reserve Act was repealed the Federal Reserve banks were required to pay over an amount equal to one-half their surplus ($278,599,000) on January 1, 1933, for nondividend capital stock of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. This payment amounted to $139,299,557.

All the Federal Reserve banks and their branches now occupy their own office buildings except the branches at Cincinnati, Charlotte, Portland, and Seattle and the Savannah agency, which occupy rented quarters. There is enclosed a table giving the total cost of the various Federal Reserve bank and branch buildings and their net book value, i. e., cost less depreciation and charge-offs. The figures in the table do not include the cost of certain properties, totaling $2,697,947, and having a net book value at December 31, 1939, of $1,266,392, which were acquired for banking-house purposes but are not at present so used. Funds used by the Federal Reserve banks to purchase land and construct buildings came from the capital paid in by member banks under the provisions of the Federal Reserve Act, and their accumulated surplus.

Very truly yours,

MARRINER S. ECCLES, *Chairman.*

Federal Reserve bank premises, Dec. 31, 1939

	Cost			Net book value Dec. 31, 1939
	Land	Building	Total	
Head offices:				
Boston	$1,246,726	$4,204,760	$5,451,486	$2,889,185
New York:				
Main building	5,215,656	15,545,536	20,761,192	8,412,050
Annex building	592,679	1,666,988	2,259,667	1,048,132
Philadelphia	1,884,357	4,877,337	6,761,694	4,572,562
Cleveland	1,295,491	8,081,178	9,376,669	3,813,722
Richmond	271,924	2,523,319	2,795,243	1,409,247
Atlanta	283,000	1,711,703	1,994,703	963,423
Chicago	2,963,548	7,634,207	10,597,755	2,786,878
St. Louis	1,355,374	3,255,598	4,610,972	1,604,834
Minneapolis	600,521	2,980,984	3,581,505	1,298,818
Kansas City	495,300	4,241,974	4,737,274	2,075,992
Dallas	189,831	1,525,355	1,715,186	718,768
San Francisco	412,996	3,928,509	4,341,505	1,748,560
Total	16,807,403	62,177,448	78,984,851	33,342,171
Branches:				
Buffalo	255,000	465,707	720,707	434,400
Pittsburgh	781,364	1,401,861	2,183,225	1,733,539
Baltimore	250,487	1,577,702	1,828,189	1,135,377
Birmingham	124,137	396,171	520,308	248,941
Jacksonville	45,842	277,900	323,742	137,438
Nashville	48,000	246,707	294,707	145,362
New Orleans	201,250	974,736	1,175,986	538,465
Detroit	650,000	1,143,457	1,793,457	603,078
Little Rock	85,008	339,183	424,191	215,263
Louisville	131,177	261,760	392,937	194,496
Memphis	100,906	277,989	378,895	228,668
Helena	15,709	96,835	112,544	97,037
Denver	101,513	511,029	612,542	341,031
Oklahoma City	65,021	487,370	552,391	282,112
Omaha	176,427	471,416	647,843	406,477
El Paso	39,003	141,820	180,823	81,755
Houston	66,312	391,515	457,827	251,139
San Antonio	75,002	179,196	254,198	123,338
Los Angeles	453,458	1,311,304	1,764,762	871,643
Salt Lake City	114,075	426,263	540,338	335,662
Total	3,779,691	11,379,921	15,159,612	8,405,221
System	20,587,094	73,557,369	94,144,463	41,747,392

You will note in the first paragraph of Mr. Eccles' letter he states that the Government, from 1913 to 1932, was paid by the Federal Reserve bank, as a franchise tax, $149,138,300, in compliance with the original law which provided that a part of the net earnings of the bank be paid to the Government as a franchise tax. For some reason, best known to Congress, that provision was amended so as to eliminate the Government's participation in the earned surplus of the Federal Reserve bank, which simply means that since 1932 all of the net earnings of the Federal Reserve bank has gone into its surplus. Mr. Eccles' letter shows that the Federal Reserve bank has been very prosperous. Not only has it paid out of its earnings $94,144,463 for office buildings, but it has invested out of its surplus $139,299,557 for stock in the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation; paid the Government $149,138,300 as an excise tax; and, on January 1, 1940, had a surplus of $151,720,000 on a paid-in capital stock of $135,599,000.

The Federal Reserve Act provides:

Federal Reserve banks, including the capital stock and surplus therein, and the income derived therefrom shall be exempt from Federal, State, and local taxation, except taxes upon real estate.

I would like to know by what method of reasoning the most prosperous bank in the United States should be exempt from taxation?

From the foundation of the Government until the close of the Civil War the Government never issued a bond payable in any specific kind of money—just money of the United States. From the day war was declared, April 15, 1861, until March 3, 1865, the Government issued Government bonds totaling $2,351,699,479.26. Of the foregoing amount—before specie payment was suspended January 1, 1862—the Government sold approximately $99,000,000 of Government bonds for gold at a discount of $7,358,544.19. That was the graft which the international bankers got in buying these bonds. It must be understood that the bankers in this country had comparatively little gold except that which was owned and controlled by the international bankers.

The total amount of Government bonds sold during the Civil War, as heretofore mentioned, less the $99,000,000 that was sold for gold, was sold and paid for with United States notes—Lincoln greenbacks.

When the Government's supply of gold, including the amount received for the $99,000,000 of bonds, was about exhausted, President Lincoln appealed to the bankers to loan him their gold on Government bonds in order that he could carry on the war. The bankers told the President, as related in the Appleton Cyclopedia 1861, page 296, "Well, war is a hazardous business, but we can let you have it at from 24 to 36 percent." Lincoln branded their terms as outrageous, scandalous, and unpatriotic. He was greatly disturbed as to what to do to get money to prosecute the war, and feed and clothe the soldiers and sailors who were giving their lives to save the Union, while the money sharks stayed at home and were growing rich by usurious interest.

In dire extremities Lincoln appealed to Congress to give him authority to issue Government currency to carry on the war, and Congress yielded to his request, and as a result the first paper money ever issued by the Government of the United States was authorized in 1861. The notes issued were called demand notes and were made full legal tender. The total amount authorized and issued was $60,000,000 and was always on a parity with gold.

The issue of demand notes ceased; however, Congress authorized the issue of $450,000,000 of United States notes (commonly known as Lincoln greenbacks) and provided for the retirement of demand notes by exchanging United States notes for them. The United States notes were full legal tender for all debts, both public and private, except duties on imports and interest on the public debt. This exception clause relative to United States notes depreciated them greatly, as measured in gold, but did not affect their legal-tender value for the payment of all other obligations, both public and private; in fact, all Government bonds, the total of which I have heretofore mentioned (except the first issue of $99,000,000, which was sold for gold) were bought and paid for with United States notes. In fact, the war was fought and won with United States notes (Lincoln greenbacks), as it was the only money in current circulation.

What is the difference between a thousand-dollar Government bond and a thousand-dollar bill (Government currency)? Both are obligations of the Government, and both are good as long as the Government is solvent. Government bonds have, in the past, depreciated on the open market 25 percent, a thousand-dollar bond selling for $750, the money paid for the bond being Government currency. This Government never issued a legal-tender dollar that did not pay a dollar of debt, interest, or taxes. I am going to give you a concrete example of the difference between the Government's issue of bonds and the Government's issue of full legal-tender money. At the close of the war the volume of United States notes (Lincoln greenbacks) was reduced to $346,681,016, which has been in circulation ever since, in denominations of $1 to $10,000 bills.

In order to draw a comparison between the cost to the Government of issuing Government money and the cost of issuing Government interest-bearing bonds, Hon. South Trimble, Clerk of the House of Representatives, addressed a letter to the Secretary of the Treasury, requesting him to compute the interest on $346,681,016 at 5 percent, compounded semi-annually, from January 1, 1863, to January 1, 1936, this being the amount of greenbacks now and continuously in circulation ever since the war. Mr. Trimble received the following reply from the Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, which is self-explanatory and shows that if 5-percent bonds had been issued instead of United States notes, the compound interest on said bonds would have been $12,406,000,000:

JANUARY 30, 1936.

HON. SOUTH TRIMBLE,
Clerk of the House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. TRIMBLE: Receipt is acknowledged of your letter of January 25, 1936, pertaining to the interest calculation which you requested in an earlier letter.

The amount of interest accruing on $346,681,016 at 5 percent, compounded semiannually, from January 1, 1863, to January 1, 1936, is $12,406,000,000.

Very truly yours,

HERBERT E. GASTON,
Assistant to the Secretary.

This interest calculation up to July 1, 1940, would amount to $15,926,351,079. This astounding illustration of the expense of interest-bearing bonds should arouse the people of this country to the sense of danger that confronts them, as we soon will have $50,000,000,000 of outstanding interest-bearing bonds.

The Federal Reserve Bank Act became a law on December 23, 1913, during President Wilson's first term, and was a wonderful improvement over the old banking system. It did yeoman service during the World War. The Democrats were exceedingly and enthusiastically proud of it, as evidenced by the financial plank in their 1916 platform, viz:

1916: Democratic: Our archaic banking and currency system, prolific of panic and disaster under Republican administrations—long the refuge of the Money Trust—has been supplanted by the Federal Reserve Act, a true democracy of credit under Government control, already proved a financial bulwark in a world crisis, mobilizing our resources, placing abundant credit at the disposal of legitimate industry, and making a currency panic impossible.

Note the last five words, "making a currency panic impossible." If the act were properly and justly administered for the welfare of all the people instead of the favored few, financial panics could not occur. The administrations of the Federal Reserve System, under both Republican and Democratic administrations, have been tragic and almost criminal—absolutely responsible for the panics of 1921 and 1929, as well as the recent so-called recession, from which the country is still suffering.

I am incorporating in my remarks excerpts from a very interesting, instructive, and illuminating speech made in the Senate on April 11, 1939, by Senator KEY PITTMAN, which proves conclusively and shows from Federal Reserve bank reports, how and why the recession was brought about:

MR. PITTMAN. Mr. President, I never have been able to see how borrowing money by our Government, and its expenditure for work-relief labor, could ever raise commodity prices in this country to the level of 1936, which we seek. In fact, it has not done so. I think the time should very quickly come when this policy should cease; but I do not believe it ever will cease unless some action is taken by Congress to restore the price level of commodities in this country.

If one cannot make a profit on his business, there will be no income from it. We cannot increase income without increasing profits or at least assuring some profits to the producers of commodities and to those engaged in industry.

Again we find that a certain amount of national income is essential to prosperity. We now face, on our national income, the maximum amount that we can afford to pay in the form of taxation. What disturbs me is that we are constantly arguing about these enormous expenditures of borrowed money, and the only intimation we give out that our action is going to affect commodity prices is that if we stop the spending, private industry will spend. I do not think that naturally follows by any means. Private capital will not invest, no matter what the taxes are, during deflation or threat of deflation. It always invests during inflation. I can understand, of course, that the five or six billion dollars we might spend of the Government's borrowed money would be only a drop in the bucket if private industry did not join in with its capital and its money; but I do not know what Congress has done or is doing to retard deflation and to increase commodity prices.

We certainly have some control over our monetary agents in this country. It would seem that we should have some control over the Federal Reserve Board and some control over the Treasury Department. If we have not, we should have. It is perfectly evident that the Federal Reserve Board, in connection with the Secretary of the Treasury, in the latter part of 1936 and the early part of 1937, caused the recession of 1938, as it is called, and did it deliberately.

In the latter part of 1936 and the early part of 1937 commodity prices in this country had reached nearly the parity of 1926. As a matter of fact, farm commodity prices had reached 96, as compared with a hundred, which meant that the purchasing power of the dollar was down to 101.

Within a few months after that commodity prices were driven down 24 percent, and they are down at that point now. The general prices of agricultural products were driven down more than 24 percent, and they are there now.

We have tried every kind of scheme to save agriculture. We have paid the farmers to reduce their production; we have paid them bonuses in the form of loans. Yet it has not affected their commodity prices at all, and unless something is done to affect commodity prices, the present condition is bound to last forever.

Let us look at what Mr. Eccles, the great genius in charge of the Federal Reserve Board, said in his report at the end of 1936. This is a splendid report. In 1936 it looked as though we were not going to have any unemployment in 1937 and 1938; it looked as though the prices of all commodities would reach 100.

I want Senators to listen to this report for just a moment. On page 3 of the Annual Report of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve Board for 1936 we find the following:

"Progress in industry and trade was substantial in 1936. Production of durable goods increased considerably, and output of nondurable products also showed growth, particularly in the latter half of the year."

I am reading from a great monetary and economic genius, and I hope to conclude in a moment:

"The increase in durable-goods production reflected purchases of equipment both by industry and by individuals, as well as further expansion in construction. There was a general rise in employment, and income in both urban and rural areas was considerably larger than in other recent years. Capital values increased during the year, and in the latter part of the year there was a general advance in commodity prices. Total national income rose to $63,800,000,000 for the year as compared with $55,000,000,000 in 1935 and a low of $39,500,000,000 in 1932."

That was a splendid showing. On page 2 of the report we find the following:

"During 1936, however, business drew upon the banks and upon investors' funds to a considerably larger extent. Commercial loans to bank customers, after 3 years of little change, increased by $1,000,000,000, and securities issued by corporations to obtain new capital (as distinct from refunding issues) amounted to $1,200,000,000, or more than the aggregate for the previous 4 years combined."

The same story of prosperity proceeds. On page 1 of the report for the year 1937 we find the following:

"At the opening of 1937 economic activity was increasing rapidly. The output of mines and factories, after a steady rise for 2 years, had reached the average level of 1929. Increased activity was manifested both in the industries producing goods for immediate consumption and in those producing durable goods. Capital expenditures by manufacturing industries were increasing rapidly, in line with output and profits. There was some revival in residential construction, which had dwindled to a very low level during the depression and was still far from normal. Employment was expanding and wage payments were rising even more rapidly as the result both of reduction in part-time employment and of increases in hourly wage rates. Increased farm income, a large volume of dividend disbursements, and larger wage payments resulted in an increase in retail and wholesale distributions. Prices of securities were at the highest level since the early part of the depression; yields on bonds, both Government and corporate, had reached exceptionally low levels, and capital issues of corporations were in the largest volume of the recovery years. Many commodity prices were rising rapidly. Advances were particularly pronounced in agricultural and other raw materials; prices of finished goods were also rising. Increased domestic demand, together with a considerable volume of foreign demand, contributed to the advance. A wave of buying was in progress. * * *

"Relative to bank loans and the expansion of deposit currency, the Board reports as follows from page 2: 'The total volume of bank deposits and currency continued to grow and at the beginning of 1937 was at the highest level in the country's history. Bank loans to trade and industry had increased considerably and were growing. New York City banks were reducing their holdings of Government securities, but total investments of banks had changed little in the last half of 1936. Idle funds in the hands of institutions and individual investors continued large, and long-term money rates were exceptionally low.'"

On page 3 of the 1937 report we find the following assertion:

"Currency outside of banks had increased by about $2,000,000,000 between 1930 and 1937."

That is where currency must be to have any effect.

Now comes the report of the destruction of that prosperity, an admission on the part of Mr. Eccles that the Board deliberately destroyed that prosperity.

Yet I have never heard anything said in Congress against it. I have heard of no effort in Congress to control a situation of that kind. We are concerning ourselves with a feared waste of $50,000,000, when the act of the Federal Reserve Board struck down billions of dollars worth of capital in this country with one blow. We are talking now about saving the taxpayers' money, and, in my opinion, there is not a thing that we are talking about which has anything whatever to do with the restoration of the price level.

This is what the Federal Reserve Board did in conspiracy with the Treasury Department. On page 2 of the 1937 report we find the following:

"The rate of advance in business activity was, in fact, so fast that there were evidences of unsound developments."

There is the whole secret. There were evidences of unsound development. Prosperity was moving forward too rapidly to suit them, and there was threat of a boom. Yet there were 8,000,000 unemployed in this country at the time of that so-called threat of a boom. I read further:

"There was a large increase in forward orders in anticipation of further price and wage increases, together with uncertainties regarding deliveries, partly due to labor disputes, and shortages were developing in point and equipment and in some classes of skilled labor. Notwithstanding the fact that recovery was far from complete and that there was still a large amount of unemployment, boom conditions were developing in particular industries and boom psychology began to be manifested."

Then what happened? On page 1 of the report of 1936 we find that the Board took action to check the upswing. This is what it reported:

"In July 1936 and again in January 1937 the Board of Governors took action to increase reserve requirements and thereby to eliminate a large part of the excess reserves that had accumulated. The combined effect of these two actions of the Board was to double the reserve requirements of member banks. Thus the power conferred upon the Board by the Banking Act of 1935 to increase reserve requirements for the purpose of preventing injurious credit expansion was fully utilized.

"In December 1936 the United States Treasury inaugurated a policy of setting aside in an inactive stock all gold purchased subsequent to December 23, 1936, and thereby preventing the further acquisition of gold from increasing bank reserves. The Treasury and Federal Reserve measures taken together largely eliminated the basis of a potential credit expansion arising from the large movement of gold to this country which had begun in 1934 and had greatly expanded the credit base of the country."

Again, on page 2 of the 1937 report the Board reported that the Treasury Department joined in the program which had the effect of curtailing and checking the return of prosperity. I read:

"In December the United States Treasury, after consultation with the Board, adopted a policy of placing new gold acquisitions in an inactive account, thus preventing further gold imports from adding to the reserves of member banks."

On page 3 of the 1937 report we find the following:

"In August 1936 the Board of Governors had raised reserve requirements for member banks by 50 percent in order to absorb a part of the $3,000,000,000 of reserves in excess of requirements held by member banks. Under the law the Board has the responsibility of changing reserve requirements in order to prevent injurious credit expansion or contraction, and the Board had acted to eliminate from the credit base a part of the redundant reserves accumulated through a large volume of gold imports. The Board's action was in the nature of a precautionary measure to prevent an uncontrollable expansion of credit in the future. The policy of maintaining easy money and credit conditions pursued by the System since the beginning of the depression continued to be in effect."

On page 3 of the 1936 report we find the following:

"The Board, therefore, in January and March 1936, took action to increase the margin requirements applicable to security loans made by brokers and dealers in securities and in March also made these requirements, as increased, applicable to loans made by banks on stocks for the purpose of purchasing or carrying stocks registered on national securities exchanges. By these measures the Board undertook to check the growing use of borrowed funds for speculation in securities, without limiting the supply or raising the cost of credit available for commercial, industrial, or agricultural purposes."

Senators, watch the development and see what happens. See what happens with this control of our monetary system. I continue to read from the 1937 report, page 8:

"About the middle of March prices of stocks and of lower-grade corporate bonds began to decline from the high levels to which they had risen. Advance buying by industry and trade slackened and early in April prices of commodities traded on organized exchanges began to decline. During the summer increases in crop production contributed to the declines in prices of cotton and grains, while livestock prices advanced. Industrial output continued large, however, reflecting to a considerable extent the filling of orders previously received. In the spring months there was a decline in offerings of securities for refunding purposes which had been in record volume in the early part of 1936 when business organizations, particularly the public utilities, were taking advantage of the prevailing low level of money rates to reduce the cost of their indebtedness."

Here is the end of the story on page 10 of the 1937 report:

"As a consequence of these developments industrial production declined at an exceptionally rapid rate, and the Board's index, which had averaged 116 in the first 8 months of the year, fell to 84 in December. There were also sharp declines in factory employment and pay rolls. Movement of goods over the railroads was reduced and, with costs at a higher level, the earning prospects and financial positions of many railroads were impaired. In the commodity markets prices of raw materials and semifinished products showed widespread rapid declines, and prices of finished goods, which had risen somewhat further during the summer, also decreased. In December prices of some raw materials continued to decline, but others, including steel scrap and cotton, advanced. Reductions in incomes were reflected toward the end of the year in reduced consumer buying of automobiles, furniture, and other durable goods. Residential building, which earlier in the year had decreased as a consequence primarily of higher building costs, declined further in the autumn, as uncertainties arose regarding income prospects. At this time there were some reductions in building costs, but with business activity declining, people were reluctant to build new houses or buy old ones."

There is the history of the rise in 1936 and 1937, and there is the history of the decline down to the present time.

The Federal Reserve Board, which has extraordinary control over the monetary affairs of the United States, conceived in 1936, at a time when there were 8,000,000 unemployed persons in this country, at a time when the price levels had not yet reached those of 1926, that there was a boom, and that conditions were unsound, and the Board took every step in its power to stop the boom, and it did stop the boom, and put conditions where they are now, and since the conditions were brought to that point the Board has taken no action to overcome the wrong and the destruction it did. Instead of that, we have Mr. Eccles, in a very confused and pitiful way, writing a letter to the Committee on Banking and Currency, saying there have been very many disagreements on both sides, and that they would be very happy to have the Committee on Banking and Currency suggest to the Board what they should do.

* * * * * * *

So the Federal Reserve Board has absolute control over currency inflation and deflation. There can be no danger of currency inflation. Why not reflate?

I quote from the recent hearing before the special committee of the Senate upon the silver investigation:

"The CHAIRMAN. What do you call 'currency inflation?' Describe 'currency inflation.' I have heard the expression used quite a lot. I would like to know distinctly what it is.

"Mr. ECCLES. To me it would mean where the supply of money, bank deposits, and currency, in the hands of those that spend that money, is greater than a country's ability to produce the goods for the market. It would be a condition of overemployment, a condition of inability to produce the goods, so that the supply of money in the hands of those who spend it is in excess of a country's ability to supply the demands.

"The CHAIRMAN. What would be the effect, then?

"Mr. ECCLES. The effect would be the rapidly rising price level. It would be a diminution of the purchasing power of the dollar.

"The CHAIRMAN. Has not the Government been striving apparently for 6 years to lower the purchasing power of the dollar and to raise the price level of commodities? That has certainly been the effort of our Government for 6 years.

"Mr. ECCLES. Of course you speak of 'the Government.' It is difficult for me to say. There are different views with reference to it. There are some people in the Government, and I think practically everybody, felt that the prices should go up, it would be desirable to have higher prices certainly than they were in 1932, that the prices should bear certainly some relationship to fixed charges and debt structure. If it is possible to create that condition, I would think that was desirable.

"The CHAIRMAN. As I understand you now, and I hope I do, the effect of currency inflation would be to raise rapidly price levels; isn't that true?

"Mr. ECCLES. That is right.

"The CHAIRMAN. Then by 'currency inflation' you could bring the price levels up to what the Department of Labor fixes as parity. That is true, isn't it?

"Mr. ECCLES. You may get a great variation in prices. You may have some prices very low, and you may have other prices higher. Taking an average price level, I think that is true."

Read carefully and analyze the above colloquy between Senator PITTMAN and Mr. Eccles, and determine whether you want inflation and prosperity or deflation and poverty.

The Good Book says, "By their fruits ye shall know them"; therefore, it would be fair to judge the Federal Reserve bank by this standard. During its existence from 1913 to the present time, commodity prices have fluctuated more than during any comparable period in the country's history; commercial failures have been more numerous than ever before in a like period in the history of the Nation; as administered, the Federal Reserve Bank Act has been the greatest piece of legislation for the specially privileged that has ever been conceived in the legislative halls of the Nation. During its operation greater combinations of capital have been formed than the country has ever known, and the records show that at the peak of the present depression 15,000,000 men were walking the highways and byways for work they could not get; 25,000,000 men, women, and children—hungry, ragged, and wretched—were on relief; there were thousands upon thousands of bank failures, entailing the life savings of millions of people; and left in its deadly trail were bankrupt States, cities, counties, farmers, and businessmen—yet we were told that the Federal Reserve System would insure confidence and make financial panics impossible.

Congress is to be called on for authority to issue more bonds, interest-bearing nontaxable obligations of the Government, to sell for fictitious bank credit money, when in fact, the President has authority to issue $3,000,000,000 of United States notes, a full legal-tender circulating currency, real Government money, that bears no interest and is taxable. The Government has buried at West Point enough silver bullion, the Treasury informs, to issue 1,598,000,000 silver certificates, full legal-tender, circulating currency, and has authority to do so.

The May issue of the Federal Reserve Bulletin states: "About $2,500,000,000 of gold in the Treasury has not been put into active use and is therefore at the free disposition of the Treasury." Every dollar of the above-mentioned $7,098,000,000 could be utilized by the Government with no interest cost and obviate the necessity of issuing nontaxable interest-bearing bonds. Why is it not done? I do not know, and have never been able to find anyone who could give me a sensible reason.

The current opinion is that the Government guarantees deposits of banks that have qualified for insurance up to $5,000, which is not a fact. The Government does not guarantee anything of the sort. The Government is a stockholder to the extent of $150,000,000 in the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, which is a quasi-governmental institution that levies an assessment on all insured banks of one-twelfth of 1 percent on their deposits to create a fund to pay depositors of closed insured banks to a maximum of $5,000. Should there be a major financial depression, as in 1921 and 1929 to 1933, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation would be forced to close its doors when its cash was exhausted—just like any commercial bank in the same predicament.

The Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation does not guarantee deposits to any greater extent than any commercial bank guarantees deposits. Congress could and should pass a banking bill which would reduce bank failures 90 percent, and financial panics and depressions would become a memory of a dim and distant past. Will it ever be done? Not until the international bankers are shorn of their power—which by intrigue and Trojan-horse methods have enabled them ever since the Civil War to maintain a "fifth column" in many key positions of the Government.

The Federal Reserve Act (H. R. 7837), approved December 23, 1913, had the following caption:

An act to provide for the establishment of Federal Reserve banks, to furnish an elastic currency, to afford means of rediscounting commercial paper, to establish a more effective supervision of banking in the United States, and for other purposes.

The last four words in the above caption, "and for other purposes," gave the Federal Reserve bank unlimited power to do anything it desired, and what it desired most was to control the monetary and credit system of the country, viz, the power to contract and expand the volume of money in circulation and bank credit at will—with the result that the operators of the Federal Reserve bank are absolutely responsible for two major depressions, 1921 and 1929, and the recent so-called recession, in the last 20 years.

I quote the admonition and prophecies of four great patriotic Americans who have long since passed over the Great Divide, but whose memories still live in the hearts of the people:

I believe that banking institutions are more dangerous to our liberties than standing armies. Already they have raised up a monetary aristocracy that has set the Government at defiance. The issuing power should be taken from the banks and restored to the Government and the people, to whom it rightfully belongs. If the American people ever allow private banks to control the issue of their currency, first by inflation and then by deflation, the banks and corporations that will grow up around them will deprive the people of all property until their children will wake up homeless on the continent their fathers conquered.—Thomas Jefferson.

Money is the creature of law; its creation and original issue should be maintained as an exclusive monopoly of the National Government. The needs of all can best be served by issuing national currency and credit through the operation of a national banking system.—Lincoln.

It is a terrible situation when the Government must go into debt and submit to ruinous interest charges at the hands of men who control the fictitious value of gold. If our country can issue bonds it can also issue currency. Both are promises to pay, but one promise fattens the usurer, the other helps the people.—Edison.

The czars never had such power as the Federal Reserve.—Senator William E. Borah.

The name Federal Reserve bank is a deception and a fraud which has led 90 percent of the people to believe it is a Government bank, because Federal means Government, when, in fact, the Federal Reserve bank is a private corporation in which the Government has no financial interest. However, the Government has been very generous and kind to the Federal Reserve bank by issuing to it Federal Reserve notes free of cost of any kind, except the cost of material and printing, which is estimated to be about 30 cents per thousand dollars. Federal Reserve notes are obligations of the United States with the following inscription on each note:

This note is legal tender for all debts, public and private, and is redeemable in lawful money at the United States Treasury or in any Federal Reserve bank.

You will note that the inscription states: "Redeemable in lawful money," which is an admission that Federal Reserve notes are not lawful money.

Exposé of Radio Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. THORKELSON
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 12, 1940

ARTICLE FROM THE WASHINGTON TIMES-HERALD

Mr. THORKELSON. Mr. Speaker, on leave to extend my own remarks, I include an article in the Times-Herald of August 7, 1940.

Mr. Speaker, this article verifies statements which I have made during the 2 years I have been here in Congress. The National Broadcasting Co. is the station over which the Jewish vilifier, Walter Winchell, exhaled his poisonous defamatory remarks against any and all who believe in the fundamental principles of this Government. It does not matter to him who they are or what position they occupy, if they cannot see eye to eye with his own organized minority. They are all wrong, according to Mr. Winchell. The president of this station, Mr. Sarnoff, evidently is in accord with the statements made by Mr. Winchell, and he should be, because he is one of the same people, only he comes from Russia.

I have said many times that our national broadcasting stations and the national press are controlled and dominated by this minority, where nothing is broadcast or published except what is in accord with this minority viewpoint. It is because of this control the people have remained uninformed to date, and it is to enlighten them that I have made it my business to insert such information in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that the people of this Nation should learn the truth.

As to Mr. Winchell himself, little can be said, or, rather, nothing should be said, as even the most contemptible expressions give him too much credit. The New Yorker carried an article in which it alleged that Edgar Hoover, of the F. B. I., furnished this "Charlie McCarthy" of the air two G-men for his protection. I often wonder why the people should be taxed to protect such accidents of humanity. I cannot imagine what they are saving him for. For what purpose can he serve, except as a mediocre mudslinger? It would be much more sensible to give him a shovel so that he may engage in respectable labor. He could at least in such occupation dig a pit for himself to fall in, and what a relief that would be to those who are tired of his diatribes and slander! This crowd, as the article clearly shows, lives on bribes. Benjamin Franklin had his contacts and troubles when he tried to finance the Revolutionary War, for he had dealings with those whose god is gold and whose savior is a bribe.

[From the Washington Times-Herald of August 7, 1940]

SARNOFF BOAST HE COULD "DEAL" WITH F. D. ALLEGED—HOUSE GROUP PROBES MANEUVERING OVER R. C. A. TRUST CASE

(By William Strand)

David Sarnoff, president of the Radio Corporation of America, told an associate back in 1932, it was charged before the Senate Interstate Commerce Committee yesterday, that if he could delay prosecution of a Government antitrust case against the R. C. A. until after President Roosevelt's inauguration, he would have little trouble in "dealing" with Mr. Roosevelt.

The Interstate Commerce Committee is engaged in bringing in a report on the reappointment of Thad H. Brown to the Federal Communications Commission. During previous hearings it has been charged that Brown, a member of the F. C. C.'s monopoly committee, was derelict in his duty in not bringing to the fore evidence at his disposal concerning alleged monopolistic practices on the part of R. C. A.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA MAN'S AFFIDAVIT

Sarnoff was called for questioning in connection with charges, which were first made on the floor of the House in 1938 by Representative W. D. McFarlane (Democrat), of Texas, that the corporation used political pressure in 1932 to sidetrack an antitrust suit.

Senator CHARLES W. TOBEY (Republican), of New Hampshire, introduced in evidence an affidavit signed by Edward O. Keller, a Washington real-estate operator, which gave a sensational version of how the suit was finally settled by the signing of a consent decree. It was this document that contained Sarnoff's alleged remarks about Mr. Roosevelt.

The R. C. A. president denied both that he had ever made such remarks about the President and the bulk of the details of the settlement as given by Keller.

SENATOR RETAINERS CHARGED

Keller asserted that the defendant corporations retained as counsel, former Senators Daniel O. Hastings (Republican), of Delaware, and George Moses (Republican), of New Hampshire, to aid in getting a month's continuance. He charged that Hastings and Moses accepted $5,000 each, paid by the R. C. A. at the insistence of Sarnoff while serving in the United States Senate. Keller also charged that a bribe of $15,000 was paid to H. C. Mahaffy, Jr., at that time clerk of the Wilmington, Del., Federal District Court, to issue the continuance order.

At the suggestion of Roger J. Whiteford, a Washington attorney, who was consulted by Keller, according to the latter's version, a meeting was arranged between Senator Moses and Sarnoff in a hotel at Concord, N. H. At this meeting, Keller stated, Senator Moses assured Sarnoff he would be able to "prevent the case from proceeding to trial."

SOUGHT MOSES' "ADVICE"

Sarnoff's version from the witness stand yesterday was that he visited the New Hampshire Senator to seek "advice."

"Rather an unusual procedure, wouldn't you say?" interposed Senator TOBEY, "making a pilgrimage to Concord, albeit a beautiful place, to ask a United States Senator, not even a lawyer, his advice?"

"Oh, he was a distinguished man in the Senate and occupied many important posts," Sarnoff replied. "We thought he would know about such matters."

Senator Moses, it was alleged, suggested that Senator Hastings be called into the case. Senator Hastings, in New York at the time, sent for Clerk Mahaffy, who agreed to issue the continuance order, the affidavit charged.

"After the postponement of this case, Mr. Whiteford and Mr. O'Callaghan and myself called on Mr. Sarnoff and informed him that it was necessary that some money should be paid immediately," the statement alleged. "Senator Moses was up for reelection and needed campaign funds very badly. Mr. Sarnoff authorized Robert D. O'Callaghan, R. C. A. counsel, to have two checks drawn, each for $5,000, to be paid to Senator Hastings and Senator Moses.

SARNOFF TALK DETAILED

"A year or so later when the Radio Corporation of America wished to secure a modification of the consent decree insofar as foreign communications were concerned they employed an attorney by the name of Mr. Mahaffy, whose brother was M. C. Mahaffy, Jr., clerk of the Federal Court at Wilmington, Del., paying him a fee of $50,000 and the modification sought was granted without an objection whatsoever.

"On my boat trip with Mr. Sarnoff, from New York to Boston, Mr. Sarnoff informed me that he and President Roosevelt had been very close friends since the inception of radio, and that Mr. Roosevelt had said to him, 'Dave, you are the father of radio but when I was Assistant Secretary of the Navy, I mothered it for you,' and that he believed Mr. Roosevelt would be elected in November and that if he were able to postpone this case until after the Roosevelt inauguration he would have no trouble in dealing with Mr. Roosevelt personally."

The National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. O. BURGIN
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 12, 1940

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. ROBERT L. DOUGHTON, OF NORTH CAROLINA

Mr. BURGIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by the gentleman from North Carolina, the Honorable ROBERT L. DOUGHTON, in the American Forum of the Air program of the Mutual Broadcasting System, delivered August 11, 1940:

The paramount and overshadowing question before the American people today is the problem of national defense. It is true that our danger is potential rather than immediate, and it is also true that actual conflict is fortunately still many miles from our shores. But to those who advise against elaborate and costly preparation for that which may never occur, I believe the proper answer to be that we have too much at stake to take chances.

Those who take a complacent view of our defense situation would have us gamble the security, the freedom, the happiness, and the wealth and welfare of every citizen of our Nation against the cost of a system of adequate defense. Fortunately, such persons constitute a very small portion of our entire citizenship. There were similar groups in Poland, in Norway, in Holland, in Belgium, and in France. The snuffing out of their national existence by the powerful war machine of the dictator nation has given us a tragic and terrible example of the results of complacency.

In times past we have relied upon the constantly shrinking Atlantic to protect us from European dangers, just as the French depended upon the Maginot line. Experience has shown the French defense to have been undependable and we now realize that the miles of ocean lying between our shores and Europe would not be a serious deterrent to any determined and well-equipped aggressor.

If we face our problem with unimpaired vision and courage, we can but realize that our only certain safety lies in a thoroughly adequate system of national defense. If we are fully prepared there is little likelihood that we shall ever have occasion to use our defense facilities. However, if our worst fears do materialize, there is no hope for national security unless our armed strength not only equals, but is superior to, any force, or combination of forces, which may confront us.

Machines of aggression must be met with even stronger weapons of defense. The rights which our forefathers established for us are too sacred—our own individual liberty and happiness too important—and the vast wealth and resources of our productive country too great to risk by leaving any chink in our armor unprotected. We must be prepared to meet large numbers of warships with even larger numbers of warships, planes with planes of superior power and swiftness, gunfire and tanks with weapons powerful and effective enough to overcome any opposing destructive effort.

Of these facts I believe the American people to be entirely convinced. They know that one concentrated attack upon our shores by the combined might of all of the engines of destruction, which are the weapons of modern warfare, might easily cost more in human lives and property damage than the entire cost of an adequate defense program. I am persuaded, and will believe until overwhelmingly convinced otherwise, that the American people will make every sacrifice to keep our shores inviolate from the greedy, clutching hands of any murderous and ruthless dictator. Those who have seen the slavery enforced upon the vanquished in other lands have every reason to put a special premium upon the liberties enjoyed here and will, I believe, sacrifice their very lives, if necessary, to preserve the rights and traditions which we hold so dear.

One by one we have seen the nations of Europe, whose state of preparedness was insufficient to meet the test, fall before the deadly efficient war machines of the dictator nations. In those countries whose citizens spent precious time arguing minute points of procedure, instead of carrying forward with speed and efficiency a competent defense program, defeat came with catastrophic swiftness. In the face of threats to their national existence, they allowed internal disputes and discord to so delay or defeat their preparation that they were entirely unable to resist their aggressor. We must not make their mistake.

In former crises the American people have shown a gratifying aptitude toward discarding their internal differences and presenting a united front to the common enemy.

In this emergency I can perceive no change in our traditional practice. Petty partisanship and disputes among ourselves, in which we might otherwise engage in an election year with our usual vigor and enthusiasm, seem to be set aside by mutual consent, in view of the broader and more compelling problem with which we find ourselves confronted.

The steps which have already been taken in our defense program have met with the almost unanimous approval of the American people. The speed and efficiency of our action have clearly demonstrated to the world that a democracy can function effectively in an emergency. In this respect we have hurled back at the dictators the challenge which has so often been made with respect to the incompetency of democratic action.

Our defense program has already required the appropriation of enormous sums of money, and as the necessity for additional defense facilities continues to be acute, these appropriations will be followed by even larger sums.

If we are to perpetuate our form of government and to make secure our national integrity and safety, no part of our defense armor can be neglected. To this end, our personal sacrifices must be ever greater.

With regard to the costs of our program of national defense the response of the people of this country has been magnificent. They have already demonstrated that their devotion to the democratic method goes much further than mere lip service and protestations of loyalty. More and more severe tests will be placed upon our patriotism as the emergency grows more acute.

We have talked a lot about our love for the American form of government and of our hatred and contempt for governments founded upon brute force and a ruthless disregard for the individual rights of its citizens and neighbors. There are numerous indications that we may soon be called upon to test the measure of our love and devotion. This is a time for action—for works rather than words—for the speedy completion of a well-planned and systematic program of national defense. Nothing is of such supreme importance.

There are two ways by which we may finance the expenditures necessary to adequately arm our defense forces. They may be met by increased borrowings, but I believe I speak for the great majority of our people when I say that we should, to as great an extent as possible, pay as we go. I believe that I speak the sentiment of almost every citizen when I say that we will contribute gladly to any program, no matter how huge, if we are convinced that it is necessary to our defense, and that the burden of supporting this program is distributed as fairly and equitably as is reasonably possible.

Earlier in the present session the Congress enacted the revenue bill of 1940, the purpose of which was to lay a generally increased tax burden equally upon all Federal taxpayers. This bill was designed to raise for national defense purposes additional revenue of $1,000,000,000 annually; the largest peacetime tax increase in our Nation's history.

The Congress is now engaged in furthering the tax portion of our national defense plan by the enactment of an excess-profits tax. There is pending before the Committee on Ways and Means, of which I have the honor to be chairman, a measure which, through steeply graduated rates, would take a large percentage of those profits which are in excess of those normally received, or which are greater than a reasonable return on the taxpayer's investment.

While such a tax will allow reasonable and normal profits, free from excess-profits tax, it will, I believe, carry out our desire and firm determination of preventing the creation of new "war millionaires. However, through the allowance of special amortization, an accelerated method of depreciating the cost of production facilities, manufacturers are being encouraged to expand their plants and other facilities for the production of articles necessary to the national defense, and businessmen are being urged to exert their best efforts in order that our defense forces may be more rapidly and effectively equipped.

This tax bill, as did the Revenue Act of 1940, has as its chief aim the increase in our governmental revenues to cover a larger part of our defense expenditures. We all agree that these expenditures are urgent and necessary. Meeting this cost produces a stronger test of our patriotism. I am wondering if the time for payment will find any diminution of our patriotic spirit. Will the American people be as willing to pay the bills as they are to urge the expansion of defense facilities? The willingness and promptness with which we provide the tax revenues necessary to cover these vast expenditures will demonstrate our love for our country and our devotion to the democratic method much more convincingly than any assertions and protestations.

If we are thankful for our heritage—if we do realize that the price of liberty may be very dear, and that the payments we are called upon to make for the sake of freedom and democracy may be so high as to be prohibitive if for anything less precious—then I believe we will support gladly any program necessary to their preservation. Let us pay our tax bill without complaining, or without attempting evasion—thankful to our Maker that it is the kind of burden which we willingly impose upon ourselves through chosen representatives subject to the will of the governed.

Now is the time above all times to show our faith by our works and our patriotism by our sacrifices and action.

Legislation Muzzling American Patriots

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. THORKELSON

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 7, 1940

Mr. THORKELSON. Mr. Speaker, it is my desire to call attention to a type of legislation that, not having a better name, I have taken the liberty of calling subversive or unconstitutional. The Senate bill, S. 3876, is an example of such legislation and should in justice to our own people be thrown in the waste-paper basket. Our greatest national curse is too many laws, which will, if not corrected or repealed, result in another war for freedom as it did in 1776. In an attempt to reveal the danger which lurks within the pages of this bill, I shall now quote and discuss S. 3876.

An act to codify, revise, and amend the penal laws of the United States, approved March 4, 1909, as amended, is amended to read as follows: "The term 'indecent,' within the intendment of this section, shall include matter of a character tending to incite arson, murder, or assassination or riot and also forgeries or matter of a character fraudulent, and scurrilous, tending to incite hate against any religious sect or creed or race."

This bill is to define the word "indecent" which, in my opinion, is an impossible task, because what may be decent to one, may be very indecent to another. I think the pictures in the Police Gazette are lewd and indecent, and others think they are passable and decent. Another example: In my town, a group of people thought it was decent to produce the Passion Play, but another group of people in the same community tried to stop its performance, because they evidently thought it was indecent. I, therefore, as a matter of justice, grant others the same rights in such determination as I should like to enjoy and which I consider my right. Those persons interested in S. 3876 do not reciprocate. In this law they provide protection for themselves and for elimination of those they fear might expose them in their insidious attempt to undermine America.

Please reread the bill and note this statement. "Indecent should include anything that might incite arson, murder, and so forth."

Who can say what might incite a person to burn a house, commit murder, or assassination? And why draw a distinction between murder and assassination when the ultimate object of both acts is the same? Why was death by poisoning left out of the bill? Who can say what might incite a person to start a riot, commit forgeries, or engage in fraud? What scurrilous matter might incite hate against a religious sect, creed, or race? Here, again, the bill shows lack of intelligent construction. A Mohammedan or Hindu need only to touch each other to start a riot. In view of this, is it not obvious that this silly attempt of defining the word "indecent" is actually a red herring to obscure its real purpose?

This bill is not to punish the person who commits the crime, for nothing is said about that. It is, instead, to put away those whom the parties interested in this legislation fear; and who are they? They are the patriotic American people who tell the truth and expose these contemptible termites. They are the patriotic Americans who have obligated themselves to preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution and the Government of the United States. It is to muzzle these patriots this legislation is provided, for it is the patriots who will be accused of inciting riot when they denounce those who are engaged in subversion and destruction of this Government.

Under this act, public discussion or reading the Constitution or the Bill of Rights may he held to be indecent, should a crowd of revolutionaries, who do not believe in these documents, start a riot in order to break up a meeting of patriotic American citizens. This bill is intended to muzzle patriotic Americans, and let no one tell you differently. The fools, who want this legislation enacted, do not realize that they would be run into the ocean should Congress pass and the Department of Justice attempt to enforce this most abominable law.

The full portent of evil in this bill is obvious when we consider it with H. R. 7604 and H. R. 10289, for these are the three measures which will, if passed by Congress, give the Department of Justice power to put every Christian gentile American patriot in jail for 21 years, so that Justice Brandeis' organized people may conquer America.

I shall now quote and discuss H. R. 7604.

SEC. 346. That whoever shall send or transmit, or shall cause to be sent or transmitted, in interstate or foreign commerce or through the mails any written, printed, or oral communication which is defamatory of any religious, racial, national, fraternal, industrial, commercial, labor, or any other group of persons subject to the jurisdiction of the United States shall be liable for imprisonment for a term not exceeding 1 year or to a fine not exceeding $5,000, or both.

This bill provides legal protection for the groups enumerated therein, but it does not provide any protection for the Constitution or for the Government of the United States. In other words, while this bill appears as a harmless domestic kitten, it is in reality like a tiger, a most vicious beast of the jungle. For example, it protects all national or alien groups, it protects fraternal or oriental secret societies, it protects labor, but much of labor today is radical or communistic.

As a pleasant vehicle for this poison, it appears to give protection to any person subject to the jurisdiction of the United States. However, this is not true, for it penalizes all loyal or patriotic American citizens who speak in defense of the Constitution or in defense of the Government of the United States. For example, should any patriotic citizen criticize or denounce any alien guest, members of secret oriental societies, members of the Communistic Party, or members of any other subversive group, he would in such defense of the Constitution and our own Government be subject to prosecution under this act. On the other hand, any one of the groups named in the bill, as well as alien guests like Harry Bridges, members of oriental secret societies, Socialists, Communists, and anarchists, may engage in the most subversive and radical destruction of our Government, under full protection of this law. The real purpose of the bill is to put all the patriots in penal institutions and leave the radicals in charge of the Government of the United States.

The resolution, H. R. 10289, is a bill which defines "fifth-column" activities and sabotage. This bill is the most vicious of the three and is a sequel to the other two. These three bills are without doubt drafted by the same person for they are all, as many others, un-American and unconstitutional.

Many things may happen to the American people under this bill, for it will penalize anyone who speaks, writes, or prints anything in the support of the Constitution or constitutional government. Such a person being tried in a New York Beth-din or in similar courts in other foreign cities in the United States, would most likely be found guilty. Anyone placed in such a predicament might shudder to read, as he entered the court, He who enters here leaves all hope behind for 21 years, for that is the sentence which this bill provides as a penalty for speaking on sound principles of our Government. In addition to this, the court may shake him down or frisk him for $5,000 inflated currency, all because he preferred to speak in behalf of his own Government, or if an official, in order to honor his oath of obligation.

Is it not a tragedy to tolerate people who will introduce such trash and call it legislation? I, of course, do not believe for one moment that any Member of Congress will place his stamp of approval on any one of these bills.

I shall now quote excerpts from the bill to attempt to define "fifth columnists," H. R. 10289:

(a) The terms "fifth-column activities" and "un-Americanism" means subversive activities, consisting of advocating, teaching, aiding, or abetting (1) the overthrow of constituted government; or (2) the commission of crime, sabotage, unlawful or treasonous acts of force and violence, or unlawful methods of terrorism, as a means of accomplishing or effecting any political or governmental change or which undermines or weakens the military or naval strength of the United States; (3) inciting to riot or inciting racial or religious prejudice; or (4) aiding or comforting any foreign government to the injury or detriment of the United States; or (5) stirring or

promoting internal discord within the United States by causing others to commit acts injurious to the Government of the United States; (6) engaging in any military activities not sanctioned by the Government of the United States or by one of the States of the United States or one of the subdivisions thereof.

(b) The term "sabotage" means any willful and malicious physical damage or injury to physical property.

SEC. 2. Whoever (a) engages in "fifth column" activities or un-Americanism; or (b) willfully and deliberately, by spoken or written words, justifies or attempts to justify "fifth-column" activities or un-Americanism; or (c) prints, publishes, edits, issues, circulates, publicly displays, or possesses any book, paper, pamphlet, document, poster, or written or printed matter in any other form containing "fifth-column" activities or un-Americanism; or (d) organizes, assists in organizing, or is or knowingly becomes a member of any organization, society, group, or assemblage of persons organized or assembled to engage in "fifth column" activities or un-Americanism, shall upon conviction thereof be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned for not more than 21 years, or both.

Under (a) (1), in this resolution, please notice the word, "constituted," a word which is used in place of constitutional government. We now have a constituted government, a government which bears no resemblance to constitutional government or that for which the Constitution provides. We have now constituted ourselves into a democracy in the proper sense of the word and we will, should we continue, constitute ourselves into a totalitarian government with the same type of rulers who are now ruling and regulating the industry of Russia.

This bill in attempting to define "fifth columnists" is in reality designating the patriotic Americans as "fifth-columnists" and Mr. Brandeis' organized minority as the rulers of America.

(a) (2) No administration has sabotaged the Constitution more than the New Deal. This should be evident to anyone who acquaints himself with the many unconstitutional laws which have been enacted since 1933, laws which have made the Federal Government the biggest monopoly in the world and the greatest competitor and destroyer of private industry we have ever had. The Gold Reserve Act is unconstitutional, and the steal of gold, which was perpetrated under this law, as set forth in article 1, section 10, is a criminal offense. The Reorganization Act is also unconstitutional and one of the most destructive measures which has ever been enacted into law. Our trouble today is not from a lack of laws. It is, instead, from an unwieldly mass of laws, in a legal structure that no people should tolerate and which will, if some of these laws are not repealed, end as it did in 1776, with mass upheaval and protest against tyrannical laws.

(a) (3) The words, "inciting riot and racial or religious prejudice," identify the proponents of this bill. There is only one organized group that protests the question of racial and religious prejudice and that group is not the gentiles, in any sense whatever.

(a) (4) No one in the history of America has been more guilty of giving aid to the foreign nations than President Roosevelt. No one has done more to involve this Nation in war than the Executive, himself. Let no one forget that he is the No. 1, warmonger, for who has shouted hatred and defiance and shaken his fist across the Atlantic but Roosevelt, himself? No administration in the history of this Nation has done more to destroy our industries than the one now in power. This should be clear when we consider the tons and tons of farm products and other commodities we are importing from every foreign nation in the world.

(a) (5) I would like to know who has been stirring or promoting internal discord within and outside of the United States more than the Executive, and this is my answer to (5).

(a) (6) There is only one group of people in this Nation whose military activities are not sanctioned by the Government and that is the American people. This is clearly evident in the stamp of approval given by General Marshall to Hefter's Jewish Army now organizing in New York City. There is only one group in the United States shouting for war and they are the very people who have asked military exemption for themselves. However, I want to be liberal and this statement is made without prejudice. There is nothing to stop the President's relatives or Justice Brandeis' organized minority, from going forth as crusaders for the cause they seem to love, in which they may enlist just across the border in Canada.

WHO ARE THE "FIFTH COLUMNISTS"?

The real "fifth columnists" may be said to comprise those who by a careless or liberal interpretation of the Constitution exceed the power granted by that document to the three branches of the Federal Government, or who by departure from the literal meaning of the Constitution deprive the state and the people of the rights which they reserve to themselves in the ninth and tenth amendments. The "fifth columnist" is in reality a person or persons who engage in sabotage or destruction of constitutional government, not constituted government, as set forth in this bill. This definitely includes the highest to the lowest person who disparages or denies the people not only of the rights which they reserve to the state and to themselves, but in addition to that, the unwritten rights which are not mentioned in the Constitution because they were considered to be the inherent rights of the people. It also includes each and all who misconstrue, widen the meaning and misinterpret the Constitution, an act by which they unjustly deprive themselves and their own people of their constitutional rights.

We can only survive as a nation by returning to and operating according to the Constitution as it was given to us in 1787. We must unite to bring about a more perfect union which will establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity. When this is done, we will again be a united America and a patriotic united American people. If it is not done, and if there is no national awakening by the patriots of America, nothing in the world can stop us from degenerating into a most abject and evil democracy, a mass government, no different from that which now rules in Russia.

We have, unfortunately, become a nation divided in two or more political parties with the interest of the people centered in their own party instead of in the Nation itself. It is this interest on the part of the public that is actually responsible for our departure from constitutional government. Instead of keeping the Government clean, the people, being interested in their own parties, have built up a corrupt political machine. We need a thorough cleaning of the Government, particularly, in the branch where the members are appointed and in the branch where they cannot be changed every 2 years. We need courts and patriotic judges who understand the Constitution of the United States; judges who will base their decisions for constitutionality upon the Constitution itself instead of upon a decision rendered by some former justice who knew little or nothing of the document upon which the decision should be based. I have often said in previous remarks, basing my statement upon acts which have been held constitutional, that this document evidently does not grace the walls of the beautiful marble structure on Capitol Hill.

We need a good dose of good national discipline. If this Nation is to be policed, let it be with an American Army and Navy, commanded by American officers, officers who are first of all Americans, not pro-English, not prointernational, not promeddlers in foreign affairs, but simply plain ordinary American citizens with the interest of the United States at heart. We need people in command of our Army and Navy and law-enforcement departments who are first of all nationalists, because an internationalist can never, never be a patriotic American. The internationalists do not thrive in a healthy nation. They thrive best in the nations which are decaying, for their power is built upon the ruins of public liberties.

Here's to the Constitution,
The Good Old Ship of State,
Damn the crew that scuttled
And left her in this shape.

Let us, therefore, repair the Old Ship of State, so that she might serve as she did in 1787, when she was launched by a

crew who were pro-Americans, and, therefore, good Americans. We can do so in 1941, if we pick the right pilot for her.

Let us fix her up and launch her clear,
Sign a captain aboard who has no fear,
Who can face heavy gales that's bound to blow
After dumping the crew on the watch below.

The Ship of State should be manned anew
With American officers and sailors, too,
Who can steer her clear of reefs on the lee
As she heads into the gale in a choppy sea.

The clouds and scuds now drifting low
Are storm-threatening signs as sailors know,
For the next 4 years we are sure to see
Rough weather aplenty with a heavy sea.

Let us snug her up and leave her as slick
As the founders left her in 'Seventy-six,
With the flag full mast and flying free,
An emblem of Freedom and Liberty.

I have spun this yarn of the Ship of State,
And leave you as crew of the good old crate,
Help the "Old Man" as he takes her to sea
To clear the reefs close over the lee.

Roosevelt neutrality is a dangerous rock,
Created for trouble and national shock,
Study it closely, and you will see
That Roosevelt is the real emergency.

The shoals on the lee are piles of sand
To remind us "No War" with little Japan;
High on the shoals lies an old hull,
A reminder to steer clear of Johnny the Bull.

Let Johnny fight alone for his noble rakes
While you safely harbor the Ship of State,
Now I shall close with an "Asta La Vista"
As I leave for home for a short siesta.

My Record and Views on Various Major Problems

REMARKS

OF

HON. H. P. FULMER

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 12, 1940

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted that my people are keeping posted and are deeply interested in what is going on in Washington at this time.

I have received numerous letters and petitions from my friends and constituents requesting me to remain in Washington instead of deserting my duties in Congress for the purpose of going down to South Carolina to engage in a political campaign.

I fully realize that, because of the ruthless war which is raging in Europe, and the many serious problems confronting Congress and the country, that this is no time for anyone to desert his duty to his people and to his country, especially, if he holds the responsible position of Representative in the Congress of the United States.

I am now serving my twentieth year in Congress, a longer service in the lower House than any Member from South Carolina during all the past years.

CHAIRMANSHIP AGRICULTURAL COMMITTEE

In that the present chairman of the great Agricultural Committee of the House, of which committee I have been a member for the past 18 years, has been appointed to a judgeship, I shall become chairman of this committee at the beginning of the next regular session of Congress in January 1941.

MANY MAJOR AGRICULTURAL PROBLEMS

Realizing the numerous agricultural problems which will be confronting Congress, regardless of who wins the war, I think it is very important that, even at this busy time in the Congress, those of us who will be responsible for considering these agricultural problems in the years to come should be giving serious thought and study to these problems.

In fact, I have been holding numerous conferences with several departments being represented, with a representative from the White House, with the hope that we may be able to be in a position in the next session of Congress to commence work immediately along the line of formulating a definite, constructive program to meet these new situations.

As stated, because of these many major bills coming up from day to day in Congress, and, because of these serious problems, which should claim our attention, I feel that my active service here, with the hope of being of service to my constituents and my country, is my first duty, rather than going down to South Carolina and taking an active part in a campaign in behalf of my own personal interests.

I feel that my people have had an opportunity to observe the type of service that I have been rendering them during all of these years, and I am sure that there are thousands of loyal friends and supporters in my district who have kept in touch with my legislative record, and, in that it has been possible for me to pass numerous important major bills, I am perfectly willing to leave my case in their hands.

When I first made the race for Congress I made my people two promises—first, that I would give them prompt and efficient service.

It is common talk all over my district that "all you have to do is to write your Congressman—you can hear from him, and you will get results."

In the second place, I promised that I would give them a strictly common-sense and businesslike administration.

The thousands of letters that I have received from time to time thanking me for the many things that I have done for my constituents and my district, as well as congratulatory messages on the passage of many important major bills are sufficient to make me feel proud of the fact that I have kept the faith and definitely carried out my promises.

I served during my first 12 years in Congress under a Republican administration. Never shall I forget the friendly attitude and the wonderful assistance given me by the chairman of the Agricultural Committee at that time, Mr. Haugen, of the great corn State of Iowa, now deceased. Peace be unto his soul.

Then there were Purnell, of Indiana, and Williams, of Illinois, both of them having passed on to the Great Beyond, and one of the present members of the Agricultural Committee, Andresen, of Minnesota.

In fact, if one is to be successful in Congress, he must not only have ability but he must be able to make friends. Second, he must be conscientious and interested in rendering service and in doing things along constructive lines. One of the most important assets is experience, which can only be acquired by long service.

Out of the 435 Members in the House there are only 27 having longer service than I have had at this time. Practically all of these are chairmen of the major House committees. They have secured these positions because of long service.

SOME MAJOR BILLS

Let me mention just a few of the major bills which I have passed, to say nothing of the thousands of votes that I have cast for and against many bills which have been considered during these years in the Congress.

During my first term in Congress I passed what is known as the United States Cotton Standard Grading Act. Prior to that time not a single bale of cotton had been officially graded, either for sale in this country or for export.

The classing of cotton under this act has been accepted in every country in the world, and today not only our farmers are receiving millions annually in the way of increased income because of proper classing and proper length of their cotton but every bale that is exported is graded and certified to by our Government and accepted in all of the foreign countries.

Upon the passage of this bill the late lamented Honorable A. F. Lever, who served in the lower House of Congress for around 17 years, having made a record of which anyone should be proud, sent me the following telegram:

I want to congratulate you on the passage of such a major bill during your first term in Congress.

RED CROSS COTTON AND WHEAT BILL

I also passed a bill authorizing the distribution of cotton goods out of 800,000 bales of cotton and food products from 45,000,000 bushels of wheat through the Red Cross to the poor and needy people of the United States.

There are thousands of people in the United States today who have not forgotten that sack of flour and the few yards of cloth or the garments which were distributed to them by the Red Cross under this bill.

SEED-LOAN BILL

I introduced the first seed-loan bill for the Southeast, making one of the best cases, according to a statement by Chairman Haughen, in connection with the hearings on this bill, that was ever made before his committee.

It was my good friend Williams, a Republican from Illinois, who made one of the major speeches on the floor of the House in behalf of this bill.

The loaning of money under the Seed Loan Act has saved the very existence of thousands of farmers in the South.

SEED-LOAN AGENCY

I secured a seed-loan agency at Columbia, my district, representing South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, and Florida.

VETERANS' HOSPITAL

It was my bill which established near Columbia, S. C., the Veterans' Administration Facility, which has proved to be a godsend to ex-service men, and which will ever stand as a real, living monument to me in its service to humanity long after I have passed into the great beyond.

AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT

In 1933, although the ranking member of the Agricultural Committee, the first Agricultural Adjustment Act under the Roosevelt Administration, was passed in my name, which proved to be one of the most constructive pieces of farm legislation ever passed by the Congress of the United States. This bill was found to be unconstitutional by the Supreme Court on the grounds that agriculture is a local problem, which, as far as I am concerned, although just a common layman, is a joke. I make this statement for the reason that anyone knows that agriculture is a national, as well as an international problem, and it is my firm belief that if this same bill could be considered by the present Supreme Court today there would be no such decision.

While this bill, as stated, was subsequently killed by the Supreme Court, I am firmly convinced that it kindled the national concern toward agriculture which resulted in the many constructive acts passed during this administration, which have been of more benefit to our farmers throughout the Nation than all the legislation applying to agriculture passed during the last several decades. It was the spark that made our Nation conscious of the importance of agriculture to our national welfare.

COTTON-INSURANCE BILL

I passed during this session of the Congress a bill to insure the cotton crop at a very small and reasonable insurance premium to be paid by farmers. This bill would insure payments to farmers for three-fourths of the value of their lint cotton and cottonseed based on a normal crop if destroyed by hailstorm, flood, drought, insect infestation, or other natural causes.

This bill would have become effective in 1941. Just think what it would have meant to farmers in my district where they have had hailstorms this year under such legislation.

Losses are never general, but tremendous losses are happening in the various cotton States annually, and this is a very necessary and constructive bill in the interest of cotton farmers.

However, the President vetoed this bill, writing me a letter giving his reason, as follows:

> This is a very necessary line of work, but we should withhold putting this bill into operation until we have had further experience with the operation of the wheat-insurance bill.

This will necessitate my introducing this bill in the next Congress, because, if we are going to continue to insure wheat farmers, you can rest assured I am going to demand the same service on the part of our Government toward cotton farmers.

FULMER FOREST-RESTORATION BILL

I have a bill pending known as the forest-restoration bill, which proposes, briefly, to assist farmers and small forest landowners in building up their forest resources, sawmill timber and pulpwood, and the carrying out of proper forest practices, and cooperative selling of pulpwood by farmers direct to pulp and paper mills, so as to eliminate the hog-tied monopolistic program of buying pulpwood, which is now being carried on by the pulp and paper mills of the South, which is nothing but highway robbery. This would, naturally, add to the income of our farmers, and materially aid our national wealth, as well as properly restore and preserve our forest resources.

FULMER COTTON PULP CONSUMPTION BILL

You know that we are now carrying at a tremendous expense the millions of bales of cotton stored in the various warehouses of the country, with an eleven- or twelve-million bale crop coming on this fall.

What are you going to do with this cotton?

I believe the Fulmer cotton pulp consumption bill, H. R. 5991, now pending in Congress, will solve this serious problem.

It is a known fact that, because of our exports having been practically destroyed, and because of the tremendous inroads on our markets by rayon, pulp, and paper products, which are taking our cotton markets to a considerable extent because we are unable to compete with these products with cotton, something will have to be done to consume more cotton in this country; otherwise, we shall be forced to cut to a great extent our cotton acreage and cotton production.

Briefly, this bill proposes to have pulp and paper mills in this country, as well as importers of pulp and paper, to pay a proper excise tax, or use by mixing a certain percentage of cotton with wood pulp.

By using a small percentage of 5 pounds of cotton with 95 pounds of wood pulp we would be able to consume in this country around 4,000,000 bales of cotton annually. Low-grade cotton can be used just as well as the very best type of cotton for pulping purposes.

Under this bill Canada, which imports into this country 3,000,000 tons of newsprint annually, duty-free, would have to pay this tax, or would have to purchase and consume 600,000 bales of American cotton.

It may be of interest to you to know that 46 percent of the pulpwood and wood pulp used in this country is imported from Canada and the Scandinavian countries. Because of the World War, in that Germany has taken over a great many of these countries, the importation of pulpwood and wood pulp will be eliminated except that portion coming from Canada.

This will mean a further heavy drain on the pulpwood resources of this country.

I have had the Agricultural Department to turn over to the Bureau of Standards research laboratory a bale of cotton to be used in demonstrating the feasibility and possibility of using cotton along the line suggested in my bill.

As a matter of fact, we are using millions of tons of old cotton rags, much of which come from foreign countries, and a certain amount of cotton today in the manufacture of newsprint, rayon, and pulp products.

This program would enable the great pulp and paper industry, as well as the cotton industry, the most important industry in the South, and one which means everything to every other section of the country, to go along, hand in hand, on a normal, prosperous basis, putting thousands of people to work, increasing the purchasing power of the people in the South to the extent that not only would it tend to rehabilitate our farmers, but it would mean everything to every other section of the country.

FULMER HOSPITAL BILL

I have also pending a bill proposing that the Federal Government under appropriations made by the Congress, build and equip hospitals in counties and communities where they are sadly needed today. These hospitals would be leased to proper authorities for the purpose of carrying on a proper hospitalization of that great class of people who are unable to take advantage of present facilities and who are sadly in need of this humanitarian consideration at the hands of the Federal Government jointly with such an authority.

Out of the conferences referred to, no doubt, there will be some major bills which will come up for consideration in the next session of the Congress.

The most important matter in the interest of all farmers in every section of the country is an up-to-date marketing and distributing program for farm products.

There should be proper marketing facilities in the counties and States, and national marketing facilities all over this country where farm products could be marketed after having been properly graded and properly distributed when and where needed, at a fair price to farmers.

How long would General Motors and the manufacturers of farm implements, mowing machines, tractors, and so forth last if they had to market and distribute their products as is the case with farmers?

These well organized manufacturing groups not only control their production in line with purchasing power, but they absolutely control their distribution with fixed prices.

It is a known fact that thousands of middlemen, many of them real parasites simply sapping the lifeblood out of farmers and consumers, largely market farm products.

If there is anything left after this procedure in marketing farm products, that is given to the farmers.

Think about it today in my country, where we have watermelons and cantaloupes going to waste or selling from 1 cent to 5 cents each, while in the large cities of this country consumers are having to pay 10 and 15 cents each for cantaloupes and from 50 cents to $1 each for watermelons.

Farmers operate as individuals, and they cannot solve these serious problems. However, with the assistance of the State and Federal Government it can be done.

PROPAGANDA AND WAR

Because of so much propaganda which has been going out all over the country by mail, in the press, and over the radio, naturally, the people in every section of this country are disturbed about the serious question as to whether or not this country will be forced to take part in the destructive war which is now raging in Europe.

My people are deeply interested in building up a national defense program, not for the purpose of engaging in a war in Europe, but that type of defense program which would defy the invasion of any foreign foe.

I want to state that it is my firm belief, out of my close observation here in Washington, from day to day, that the President and the Congress are absolutely against sending the young manhood of this country to Europe for the purpose of taking part in one of the most inhuman and destructive wars ever known to civilization.

I want to take the opportunity at this time of stating, for my part, if the time comes when I shall be called upon to vote for or against sending the young manhood of my district and my country to engage in a ruthless war in Europe, I shall definitely vote "No."

Too well do I remember that we sent thousands of young men into the last war with the hope of making the world safe for Democracy. The futility of that effort is too fresh in my mind to ever again plunge our country into a war in Europe.

LET US HELP ENGLAND RATHER THAN GO TO WAR

However, I am one of those who believe that if we can help England win along the line which I am advocating, it will definitely keep us out of war. If it is possible to assist England in the way of furnishing her with implements of war, cruisers, airplanes, in fact, everything along this line that we can possibly send her, other than sending our ships into the war zones, or sending any of our people over to Europe to engage in this destructive war, to the extent that England would be able to win, it would mean the saving of billions of dollars to the taxpayers of this country, in that we would not have to continue to build up and preserve that type of defense program which we would have to have, and it would mean the saving of untold misery and slavery in Europe. It would also tend to dispel fear of an invasion at any time by Hitler, and, in the last analysis, it would mean everything to this country from an economic standpoint.

"FIFTH COLUMN" ACTIVITIES

Much has been said about the "fifth column" activities in this country. I am sure that my people and the people of the country will appreciate the fact that the President and the Congress are doing everything possible to overcome and destroy these activities.

However, if I had my way about it, in that there are just lots of the members of this outfit unfriendly foreigners who, apparently, would be delighted to have the privilege of creating a revolution in this country for the sole purpose of destroying our type of government, I would deport them to that country, where they belong, whose government, apparently, they appreciate more than they appreciate ours.

COMMUNIST PARTY

Along with our forefathers, I am a great believer in freedom of speech, the press, and at this time, freedom of the radio; but I do not believe that the writers of the Constitution, and the Bill of Rights, had in mind at that time advocating that type of free speech and free press, which would permit a Communist Party in this country, in that this party definitely believes in the government of Russia. I have every reason to believe that if this party had a sufficient voice they would attempt to destroy the type of government that we have in this country.

However, today there is a wide open Communist Party in the United States. This party has a candidate for the Presidency and a Negro candidate for the Vice Presidency, and they will be permitted to vote in the November election.

Sometime ago, when they were holding their convention in the city of New York, when the candidate for the office of President made his speech accepting the nomination for the Presidency of the United States, he referred to Russia, as usual, in all of his speeches and propaganda going through the mails. From the applause of his followers they, apparently, lifted the roof of the building in which they were holding their convention.

I want to state again, if I had my way about it I would outlaw such a party in this country.

WILL HITLER INVADE AMERICA SOON?

While we are preparing the greatest national-defense program ever dreamed of, and, in that I am just as anxious as any other patriotic citizen of this country to be prepared to defend this country against the invasion of Hitler or any other foreign foe, it is my firm belief, from a common-sense viewpoint, that even if Hitler wins over England, the years will be many before he would attempt to invade this country.

Why do I make this statement?

If the war continues much longer there will be famine, unrest, and eventually revolution in perhaps a number of the countries which are now under the dictatorship of Hitler.

It is my contention that for quite a while Hitler will have his hands full in disarming these countries, setting up the type of government which he proposes for these various countries, and in providing for an orderly, controlled procedure, putting these people to work, and in feeding and clothing the millions of his subjects, all of which, apparently, would not give him an opportunity to equip himself properly, with necessary men and armaments, to attempt to invade the United States.

However, as stated, we are not going to take any chances.

OUR TROUBLE ECONOMIC AND MONROE DOCTRINE

I believe that the serious trouble that is going to confront the United States during and after this war will be largely an economic problem and the defending of the Monroe Doctrine as applied to the South American countries.

Why do I come to this conclusion?

In the past, especially during the past 75 years, those in charge of the affairs of this country have given serious thought along the lines that the only way we could exist and prosper was on a basis of exporting and importing of farm products and manufactured goods.

I have been advocating, and I contend that because of the serious problems referred to, the time has arrived when we should give more definite thought about our own markets for our own people and a program based largely on a self-sustaining basis; for instance, if we are going to subsidize our perfectly good American products let us do it for our own people, millions of whom are unemployed, undernourished, and poorly clad.

We have millions of old people living in misery and poverty through no fault of theirs. Let us do something about it.

OUR OWN MARKETS

In regard to our own markets, for instance, why permit Japan to flood this country with products that we can produce in the United States except, perhaps, silk?—and we can do without silk.

Are we permitting these imports from Japan just for the excuse of being able to export to Japan scrap iron and other necessary materials to be used by Japan in an inhuman and destructive war against helpless China?

The facts will bear me out that Japan is securing a large part of her cotton from India, and that the people of Japan are not permitted to purchase cotton goods in Japan.

Cotton goods manufactured in Japan are sold to other countries, millions of yards of cotton cloth and cotton goods being exported into the United States.

What are the people of Japan using? They are using millions and millions of yards of goods manufactured out of synthetic fibers.

I have been asking the question ever since I have been in Congress, Why permit India, a large cotton-growing country, a competitor of the Cotton South, to ship into the United States 2,000,000,000 pounds of jute and jute products annually, taking our own perfectly good markets for our cotton at the expense of the cotton farmers of the South to the tune of 2,000,000 bales annually?

We are long on talking about America for Americans, but we are tying the mails of the United States with jute twine. We are wrapping bales of cotton goods in the textile mills of the United States with jute burlap. We are covering American cotton with old, heavy, disgraceful, and wasteful jute bagging, at a time when we are stacking millions of bales of cotton in warehouses with millions in expenses annually to the taxpayers of this country.

NET-WEIGHT-COTTON-BAGGING BILL

During this session of the Congress I passed a bill known as the net-weight-cotton bill, which proposes to sell cotton on a net-weight basis, and the using of bagging manufactured out of cotton, instead of this old heavy, wasteful, and disgraceful jute bagging.

During all of these years I have had the strongest opposition from the jute trusts and a great many people in this country who handle jute bagging for the sole purpose of making money, all of which has absolutely been at the expense of cotton farmers.

No other cotton country in the world—in fact, not even in India, where jute is grown—uses this old jute bagging. No other cotton country in the world sells cotton on a gross-weight basis.

Even all the cotton that we export to foreign countries is settled for on a net-weight basis, the actual weight of the cotton, after knocking off 30 pounds' allowance for bagging and ties.

This bill is now on the Senate calendar, and Senator "COTTON ED" SMITH is sitting down on same, making a statement some days ago that the bill shall not pass.

In the meantime, I can prove that the price to farmers for their cotton is a price less the weight of the bagging and ties, and in waste, excess freight, and insurance, and other items are costing cotton farmers millions and millions of dollars annually. What are we going to do about it? I hope that everybody that reads this speech will write "Cotton Ed" to stand up and let this bill pass.

We are sacking annually millions of bushels of grain, and tons and tons of feedstuff in jute, burlap bags, and, yet, the western people wonder why the farmers of the South, being short of purchasing power, because of what is going on, do not buy more of their mules and their farm products, which my people would like to buy if they could grow cotton and had proper purchasing power.

Listen to this:

Farmers are hauling thousands of tons of fertilizers to their farms for the purpose of growing crops, all of which is packed in jute bags, at a time, as stated, when millions of bales of cotton are being hauled to warehouses for the purpose of having the Government extend to them a loan thereon, solely for the purpose at this time, if you please, of keeping the price of cotton from going to 4 or 5 cents per pound.

A possible home-consumption program for cotton—Bales annually

1. Present annual rate of domestic consumption	7,500,000
2. Mattress program for low-income families making less than $50 a month	500,000
3. Substitution of cotton, industrially, for all jute and burlap now imported	500,000
4. Cotton-stamp program, which would raise cotton-goods purchasing power of all families making less than $200 a month to that level	2,000,000
5. Cotton pulp consumption bill	4,000,000
Total, annually	15,500,000

Another good reason why we should pay more attention to our own markets and the consuming of our own farm products and our own manufactured goods is, you know, our trade-treaty program is already largely out of the window. Hitler is already trying to make barter-treaty connections with every country possible, including the South American countries. Under Hitler's program it does not make any difference with him about how much gold he has or how much gold the United States has. He is going to produce largely or perhaps altogether, under a slave-labor program. Under his barter arrangements, because of our standard of living and high standard of wages, there is no way for the United States competing except under a large subsidy program.

UNDER THE ROOSEVELT ADMINISTRATION

Mr. Speaker, we have done a great many good things for agriculture; however, as stated, the agricultural problem with numerous other major problems that will be confronting the Congress and the country in the coming next few years will be grave and will demand serious and conscientious deep thought and profound consideration.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, allow me to state, with pardonable pride, that I feel that my service of two decades in this Congress has been unselfish and for the best interest not only of my constituents in South Carolina, who have 10 times returned me as their Representative, but to the Nation as a whole.

I have endeavored to submerge personalities in the interest of principles; I have attempted to reconcile my views with those of my colleagues on all principles where national issues were involved.

I have tried to practice tolerance and my record discloses the fact that nowhere and at no time have I ever indulged in bitter personalities or in conduct unbecoming a Member of this honorable body.

I have, first and foremost, tried to be an American, which name carries with it liberty, equality, and justice, the three grandest attributes God has ever given man.

Today, if England falls, America will stand as the last stronghold of these great principles.

Within the past year we have seen democracies crushed under the iron heel of dictatorships; we have seen millions upon millions of peace loving, free peoples enslaved; we have seen governments embodying these principles bought

with the blood of thousands upon thousands of patriotic citizens, pass out of this world's picture almost overnight.

We have seen force, the most brutal in this world's history, take the place of justice and reason to such an extent that the tragedy of world events today is the greatest since the gray dawn of history.

Therefore, I say, Mr. Speaker, that to be an American is one of the grandest things that can come to any man, and it is my hope and my firm belief that a God-fearing, God-serving, united people, those of us who have the privilege of living in the greatest republic in the world, can and will carry forward the torch of freedom, holding it high above the clouds of today's tempestuous storms, so that generations yet unborn can see its light and follow it, like the Wise Men of the East followed the Star of Bethlehem to the manger of the Prince of Peace, and that we may, in our own way, be able to preserve for posterity this freedom which we now enjoy and which was handed to us unsullied by our forefathers.

Mr. Speaker, may I urge that all of us anew resolve to bend our efforts toward carrying forward and safeguarding the principles of liberty, so that, when our race shall have been run, we can say with the prophet of old, "I have fought a good fight, I have kept the faith," and that America, conceived in liberty, born in freedom, shall continue to grow to great heights, and that the principles of Washington, Jefferson, and Lincoln shall not perish from the face of the earth.

No Need for These

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. THORKELSON

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 5, 1940

ARTICLE FROM NEW YORK HERALD TRIBUNE OF JULY 21, 1940

Mr. THORKELSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article from the New York Herald Tribune, of July 21, 1940.

On the front page of the New York Herald Tribune, July 21, 1940, appeared an article entitled "France's Fall Increases Flow of Genius to the United States." On the same page appears an eyful of pictures, all but one easily recognized as the usual type of refugee.

The press is working overtime to convince us that our national security is threatened, and the Government is working overtime to dispose of all sorts of armaments, so that we will be an easy victim for invasion. These two policies do not hitch up right, unless the administration is operating under the delusion that our national defenses begin on the cliffs of Dover.

The people responsible for this propaganda and for the calamity howling, which is now going on and published in the press, are those who come over here as refugees. It is these people who may be charged with dissemination of liberalism; yes, liberal of the people's rights and the transfer of such rights to the executive department at the expense of the liberties of the people.

Who are these refugees? Are they German? No; for no German is allowed to leave Germany. Are they Slavs? No. They also prefer to remain in their own countries. Are they Finns? No. Are they Norwegians? No. They also prefer to remain where they have lived for hundreds of years. When any of the Norse emigrate to the United States, it will not be as refugees but simply as people whose greatest desire is to aid and help other Americans in support of constitutional government. Are the refugees from Holland? No; for Holland can well take care of her own refugees by transferring them to her possessions. Are they from Belgium? No; for that country can also take care of her refugee problem by transferring them to her own colonies. Are they French? No, indeed. The French colonial empire is much greater than France itself, and therefore, quite capable of absorbing any refugees leaving France. Are they English? No. The British Empire is made up of 13,000,000 square miles of landed surface, and therefore large enough to take care of any number of refugees who may wish to leave the British Isles.

Who are these refugees, if they are none of these nationals? They are composed of the same type of people who now own and control our newspapers, our radio broadcasting stations, our cinema, and nearly all avenues of publicity. They are the people who dominate our political parties and who even reach into the States and districts, in order to dictate their wishes to the people in the smallest community within the State.

In reading this article, let me call attention to this statement: "Nearly 3 years ago, in This Week, Will Irwin wrote:

> Not in a century have we received such an excess of superior human breeding stock as these dictators have poured into us during these year in which continental Europe has gone raving mad."

I was shocked in reading this, for little did I understand the real purpose in this immigration. It is, however, important to understand that this dilution in the Nordic races is actually responsible for the collapse of Norway, Holland, Belgium, and France. It is that admixture which has destroyed every nation which has lent itself to such an experiment.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of July 21, 1940]

FRANCE'S FALL INCREASES FLOW OF GENIUS TO UNITED STATES—MAETERLINCK, ROMAINS, BERNSTEIN, AND MILHAUD JOIN EINSTEIN, BRUENING, MANN, AND OTHERS WHOSE BLOOD OR POLITICS IS ODIOUS TO NAZI-FASCISM

(By Harry W. Baehr, Jr.)

When France, virtually the last stronghold of human freedom and racial tolerance on the continent of Europe, succumbed to totalitarianism the United States received a fresh accretion of genius. Ever since Fuehrer Adolf Hitler's accession to power in 1933 a tide of men and women, renowned in the arts and sciences but unacceptable because of blood or opinion to the dominant theory of Nazi-Fascism, has set in across the Atlantic. The recent arrival of such men as Maurice Maeterlinck, Jules Romains, Henri Bernstein, and Darius Milhaud shows that this tide is still flowing.

Nearly 3 years ago in This Week Will Irwin wrote: "Not in a century have we received such an access of superior human breeding stock as these dictators have poured into us during these years in which continental Europe has gone raving mad." Since that time the influx of refugees of acknowledged talent has increased.

Perhaps the most distinguished contribution of the dictators to American culture is Albert Einstein, whose formulation of the theory of relativity has been called "the greatest synthetic achievement of the human intellect." Winner of a Nobel prize in 1920, Einstein left his native Germany just before Hitlerism, which he called a psychic disease of the masses, became dominant there. He came to America to join the staff of the school of mathematics at the Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton, N. J., and will become a citizen of the United States in September.

In addition to Einstein, many scientists of lesser fame but so'id accomplishments have come to this country from Europe, and their names appear on the roster of many educational institutions. In the field of the social sciences, the graduate faculty of the New School for Social Research has a distinguished refugee staff, whence comes its popular name, the University in Exile. In the same branch of learning the Harvard School of Business Administration has acquired the scholarly former Chancelor of Germany, Heinrich Bruening, and Lucius N. Littauer, professor of government.

On his arrival in New York, Jules Romains, author of the great comedie humaine, Men of Good Will, said he planned to set up the office of P. E. N., the international author's organization, of which he is president in this city. He explained that there was "not much left in Europe of the intellectual freedom of expression for which the club stands." The same force which has drawn Romains here sent us earlier Thomas Mann, who won a Nobel prize in 1929 for his novel, Buddenbrooks. Mann, a voluntary exile from his native Germany, first became a citizen of Czechoslovakia and came to this country after the disastrous effects of the Munich conference.

Other literary artists driven to our shores by totalitarianism include Vicki Baum, author of Grand Hotel and other works; Maurice Maeterlinck, aged Belgian poetic dramatist, and Henry Bernstein, French playwright, whose life was threatened by the Germans because of his recent anti-Nazi play, Elvire. Andre Maurois, known in this country for his biographies of Shelley and Byron, recently reached Canada from France and will deliver the Lowell lectures at Harvard University in the fall. It has been reported also that the

Norwegian, Sigrid Undset, another Nobel prize winner in literature, who escaped to Stockholm, may come to America.

In 1933 Artur Schnabel, one of the world's great pianists, predicted that the next great musical renaissance probably would take place in this country. "The whole genius of Europe is gathered and combined in the United States," he said. This remark, in a musical sense, has even more truth now than when it was uttered. Musicians are the most cosmopolitan of artists, but many who came here for concert or operatic tours are cut off from their European homes by war, racial persecution, or the type of dictatorship that reads ideological implications into art.

The list is long. It includes Schnabel himself, driven successively from Germany and Italy; Igor Stravinsky, Russian-born French citizen; Paul Hindemith, German composer who was exiled and his works banned by the Nazis as a "cultural Bolshevik," and who is now a member of the faculty of the Yale University School of Music; Bruno Walter, conductor, who assumed French citizenship after German racial laws caused him to leave his fatherland; Lotte Lehmann, the soprano, voluntary exile and now an American citizen, and Kirsten Flagstad, among the greatest of living Wagnerian sopranos, cut off from her Norwegian homeland by the war. Arturo Toscanini, the conductor, also might be included, since although not banned from his native Italy despite his frequent flouting of the Fascist theories prevalent there, he has just completed a highly successful tour of South America with the N. B. C. Symphony Orchestra, which has been termed "the United States 'fifth column' " because of its popularity on the southern continent.

The C. C. C. and National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 13 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

ARTICLE BY JAMES J. McENTEE, DIRECTOR OF THE CIVILIAN CONSERVATION CORPS

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able article written by Mr. James J. McEntee, Director of the Civilian Conservation Corps, and published in the July 1940 issue of American Forests. The article entitled "The C. C. C. and National Defense," is a splendid presentation of the part which the C. C. C. will play in our national defense.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the American Forests of July 1940]

THE C. C. C. AND NATIONAL DEFENSE

(By James J. McEntee)

The Civilian Conservation Corps has a new objective as it marches forward in its eighth year. It is national defense. Under the impact of chaotic world conditions threatening the security of the United States, the President and Congress have called upon the corps to take an active part in the prosecution of the huge new national-defense program.

For the present the corps' contribution will come largely through the training of young men in the maintenance and operation of automotive and mechanized equipment, in auto mechanics at central repair shops, in radio communications, and in other civilian activities useful in national defense. Through this program—largely an intensification of the C. C. C. training activities which have been under way for several years—the corps can provide thousands of men each year to aid industry and the Nation in the advancement of the national-defense program.

As fast as the needs of industry and the national-defense departments are made known, the corps will modify its present program to comply to the limit of its ability. If industry wants men with special mechanical training in either the automotive or aviation fields, the corps is prepared to train them. If the national-defense department wants specialists in such fields as communications and operation, maintenance and repair of mechanized or automotive equipment, the corps will train men in these fields. In short, it will be a huge reservoir of trained manpower upon which industry and the national-defense services can draw.

In advancing national-defense preparations the corps will continue and intensify its man-building activities. Since it was organized in April 1933, the corps has made men out of hundreds of thousands of undernourished, underdeveloped, and inexperienced youngsters. In addition to improving the muscular development and the health of young men, the corps has toughened them physically, taught them work skills, improved their morale, and taught them love and respect for their country and its Government. To date more than 2,000,000 young men have received such training. It has completed a huge amount of conservation work—work which increases the Nation's natural-resources assets. In addition, it is an operating institution. It has the equipment, the organization, the experience to succeed in any task asked of it.

At this time, so far as we can foresee now, the addition of national-defense tasks will not materially interfere with the advancement of the corps' conservation program. There are many fields in which for 7 years it has been contributing to national defense. It trains radiomen, mechanics, cooks, truck drivers, operators of tractors and heavy equipment, photographers, drafting clerks, and experts in the handling of explosives for construction work. It teaches men to build roads, stone, and wooden structures, to operate surveying instruments, to build bridges and dams and to do a host of other things of the type done by engineer troops in time of war. It teaches them sanitation, personal hygiene, and safety.

What of the corps' educational and training program? The corps today is providing practical job training for enrollees while they are at work. It provides an educational adviser, classrooms, shops, and instructors for all enrollees who wish to take advantage of their off-time to improve their education and develop skills.

The goal of every youth who enters the C. C. C. is a job. Our program is centered around the idea of making each youth capable of getting employment. The entire pattern of camp life is directed toward the end of helping the boy find a useful place in society where he can earn his own living. It can and should take advantage of its unusual opportunities to teach these youths how to work, with hand and brain, how to use tools and equipment available in the camps. It should teach them a sense of responsibility for doing good work, permanent, lasting work—and above all, it should teach them to do an honest day's work.

Those of us in charge of C. C. C. policy should be alert to keep our educational and training programs abreast of the times. In this critical period I feel the corps should emphasize its training especially with regard to mechanized units of all types. The corps affords unusual opportunities for training of this character because it operates daily the largest fleet of peacetime motorized units in the world—a fleet in excess of 40,000 units.

This great fleet, with its daily problems of operation, maintenance, and repair, presents a chance for practical training which the corps will use to the fullest advantage. The corps operates tractors, jackhammers, and other mechanical units. It utilizes tools of almost every description. Camp facilities for sanitation, lighting, and water offer additional training advantages.

The Civilian Conservation Corps also should continue to stress the development of physical hardihood, the inculcation of habits of orderliness, discipline, and personal hygiene, and good citizenship and love of country. The academic, vocational, and job-training features of camp life should be directed to turning out good Americans.

Should the C. C. C. be made permanent? My desk is piled high with requests from communities for location of camps. The work projects proposed in our fields, forests, wildlife refuges, and parks would keep the corps of the present size occupied for from 30 to 50 years. From another angle, each year sees another crop of youths reaching young manhood and a large percentage of them unable to find jobs, either because of employment lag or their own inexperience. Until such time as these youths can be absorbed in private industry, business, and agriculture, I believe there is justification for continuance of the C. C. C. I believe it should be made permanent.

In recent months some criticisms of corps expenditures have developed. While praising the corps as a whole, some critics have taken the position that the $1,000 a year which it costs to maintain a young man in the corps for 1 year is too high. In this connection the charge is usually made that too large a share of the $1,000 enrollee annual cost goes to civilian personnel. These attacks may be attributed largely to lack of knowledge of how C. C. C. funds are expended, a misapprehension of corps objectives and corps accomplishments or policies.

A break-down of this $1,000 a year enrollee cost figure shows that $790 is expended in the form of real wages for the enrollee and $209.91 for pay of civilians, supplies, and equipment. Of the $1,000 total, the enrollee allots home to dependents $264. If this sum is eliminated from the $1,000 item and charged against relief expenditures, the cost of maintaining a boy in the corps for 1 year, excepting relief charges, would be $736.

The real wages paid each enrollee, including his $30 a month cash allowance ($22 goes to his dependents) and all other items which he would receive if he were working for a private employer, is $790.09. It is broken down as follows:

Pay	$374.43	
Subsistence	139.86	
Clothing	60.00	
Travel	32.41	
Hospitalization	18.39	
Limitation subtotal		$625.09

Shelter, including construction, rehabilitation, heat, light, water, and routine maintenance	$50.97	
Laundry	5.16	
Education	13.34	
Welfare	.42	
Burial expenses	.31	
Subtotal		$70.20
Grand total		695.29
General supplies	1.95	
Sanitary supplies	1.31	
Soap, candles, matches, etc	1.20	
Bedding, etc	3.30	
Safety equipment, such as fire extinguishers, etc	1.13	
Mess equipment	.31	
Ambulances and trucks	8.37	
Work equipment	31.48	
Repairs to the above	38.80	
Transportation of above	6.95	
Subtotal		94.80
Total real wages		790.09

The following table shows how the $209.91 is utilized:

Pay of civilians	190.23
Travel of civilians	4.18
Passenger cars	2.79
Communications	1.97
Rents	2.09
Office supplies	.88
Office equipment	1.02
Repairs to equipment	.47
Transportation of above	1.09
Structures	1.96
Printing and binding	.75
Claims	.15
Miscellaneous	2.33
Total overhead costs	209.91

The above figures include the pay of the camp commander, the project superintendent who supervises the work program, the foremen who supervise directly the work projects, the educational adviser, the camp doctor, the camp chaplain—in short, the men who manage the camps, teach and train the enrollees, and look after the health and spiritual welfare of the enrollees.

These figures, based on 7 years' operation of the C. C. C. camps, represent the amounts which the Director, the War Department, the Departments of the Interior and Agriculture consider necessary for a proper carrying out of corps functions. Every cent being expended on the program is needed if our objectives are to be carried out efficiently. It is futile to try to determine whether C. C. C. costs are too high by simply dividing the average number of enrollees into the total appropriations for the year. The big determining factor is to be found in our record of accomplishments. Are we getting our money's worth in terms of trees planted, forests and parks improved, new recreational facilities developed, farms saved from erosion, floods checked? Are we getting value received in better citizens—citizens capable of earning their own living, interested in the welfare of their country and better qualified to aid in its defense? I am confident that on the basis of value received, the corps is much more than paying its way.

What about the corps' future work program? In what direction should its energies be directed to best advantage? Whatever suggestions I make in this connection, of course, are subject to modification by the national-defense program. The program, as outlined below, is given without reference to possible modifications which national defense considerations might entail.

In considering the corps' future program, it may be well to recall the original purpose and scope of the C. C. C., as set down by the President and in acts of the Congress. These were originally two-fold—unemployment relief and "restoration of the country's depleted resources," as stated in the original act of 1933. The President himself in his message of March 21, 1933, to the Congress stated: "I propose to create a Civilian Conservation Corps to be used in simple work, not interfering with normal employment, and confining itself to forestry, the prevention of soil erosion, flood control, and similar projects. * * * I call your attention to the fact that this type of work is of definite, practical value, not only through the prevention of great present financial loss, but also as a means of creating future national wealth."

The act of March 31, 1933, in its opening statement gives as one of the primary purposes of the E. C. W. "to provide for the restoration of the country's depleted natural resources * * * in connection with the forestation of lands belonging to the United States or to the several States which are suitable for timber production, the prevention of forest fires, floods, and soil erosion, plant pest and disease control, the construction, maintenance, or repair of paths, trails, and fire lanes in the national parks and national forests, and such other work on the public domain, national and State, and Government reservations * * *." The act goes on to authorize conservation work on county, municipal, and private lands but with certain definite restrictions.

The act of 1937 again emphasized conservation and sets up a three-fold program—"to provide employment, to provide vocational training, and to perform 'useful public work in connection with the conservation and development of the natural resources of the United States, its Territories, and insular possessions'." The 1937 act goes on to say "the employment of the corps * * * for the protection, restoration, regeneration, improvement, development, utilization, maintenance, or enjoyment of the natural resources of lands and waters, and the products thereof, including forests, fish, and wildlife * * * including the prevention and control of forest fires, forest tree pests and diseases, soil erosion, and floods."

This latter law established the basic principles under which the corps functions. On July 1, 1939, the C. C. C. became a unit of the Federal Security Agency. Later, that same year, Congress reaffirmed the act of June 28, 1937, and said: "The provisions of this act shall continue July 1, 1943."

In preparing corps work programs, it must be remembered that the new men who enter the corps each year are largely young, raw, untrained youths—unskilled, but malleable in the hands of competent camp officials, educational advisers, project superintendents, and foremen. The corps is constantly teaching new men how to work, for its best men are always leaving to take jobs for which their corps work has qualified them. The corps is one of the few institutions in the country which is constantly trying to get rid of its best men. The camps themselves are highly mobile. Built of portable units they can be moved quickly from location to location. Being virtually self-contained units, they can be set up practically anywhere, subject, of course, to health restrictions.

The corps is splendidly fitted for reforestation, erosion control, recreational development, and nearly any other kind of conservation work. In my judgment, the corps should not normally be used on big construction or engineering jobs usually handled by contract. As a rule the C. C. C. should not be used in cities or near large towns where there is a large surplus of unemployed adult laborers.

Naturally, requests have come to the Director's office from local groups, and oftentimes commercial bodies, for approval of a very wide variety of projects, some of them quite impracticable, many of them totally unsuited to C. C. C. labor, or totally outside the field of C. C. C., or even outside the field of conservation of natural resources. Extermination of ragweed throughout the United States, and the elimination of tent caterpillars are typical of such requests for approval.

I do not think the corps should undertake work projects entailing heavy annual maintenance costs except where ironclad agreements are made to make certain that the area developed will be maintained with non-Federal funds. No C. C. C. projects should be undertaken on State or private lands unless the agencies concerned agree to maintain the project after it is completed by the corps. The corps should not engage in too much maintenance work even on Federal lands. Other things being equal, preference should normally be given to projects which require little or no annual maintenance.

1. REFORESTATION

Since 1933, the corps has planted more than 2,000,000,000 young trees. This is a good beginning but an enormous tree-planting program remains to be done. The conservation experts figure there are some 138,000,000 treesless acres of barren or only partly stocked forest land, marginal and submarginal farm and pasture in this country which might well be producing some human benefits. Tree planting is a permanent investment for the future. Tree planting is popular, is sound, is badly needed, and the best part of it is that it requires little or no annual maintenance. C. C. C. enrollees can collect seed, prepare tree nurseries, grow the seedlings, and plant them out where needed—for they have been doing all these things for the past 7 years.

2. FOREST IMPROVEMENT

Much timber stand or forest improvement has been done, but there are hundreds of millions of acres of Federal and State land untouched.

The removal of decadent, crooked, diseased, and "weed" or worthless trees from existing forest stands is worth while and permanent improvement of the forest. The pruning of tree limbs would pay in future returns from quality trees. Not only the proper thinning of young forest stands but all this work leaves the forest in better condition than it was, insuring faster growth of better trees, and again—it requires no maintenance.

3. FOREST PROTECTION

It is a waste of time and money not to protect forests after they are planted or improved. Forests must be protected from fire, insects, and fungous diseases. The biggest single contribution the C. C. C. has made to conservation has been to forest protection in all of its phases. The function of the corps, however, should be as an emergency help, to do those things which the regular protective organizations cannot do. The C. C. C. contribution to forest protection has covered a wide field. Protective improvements perhaps have occupied the largest amount of enrollee time—fire lookout towers and cabins, telephone lines, and truck trails, fire hazard reduction, firebreaks, store houses, and guard cabins; while on fighting forest fires alone a total of more than 5,000,000 man-days has been spent. In addition, on millions of acres, the control of many different kinds of injurious forest insects and dangerous tree diseases has been secured. This protection work must be continued. However, a capital investment should be made only following agreement by the respective public and private owners to operate and maintain these protective facilities.

4. SOIL EROSION PREVENTION

The saving from total loss of millions of tons of our best farm soils has been aided greatly by the corps, largely through sample work on farms and demonstrations by the C. C. C. Not only has the

corps helped materially in this soil saving, but the enrollees themselves have learned first-hand what conservation of the soil is, and how to conserve it, as well as much about farm-land management. This is most worth-while work, from more than one angle; it should be continued.

5. FLOOD CONTROL

The late Director went on record in January 1938 in an address before the Rivers and Harbors Conference as strongly favoring the use of the C. C. C. in upstream engineering as a part of the long-range national plan for flood control as projected by the Congress in 1936. At that time Mr. Fechner said, in part:

"There is a splendid field and a proper one for the Civilian Conservation Corps to engage in those types of upstream engineering which are a necessary part of the national problem of flood control. Small gullies in denuded mountains, bare treeless areas that need again a forest cover, the building of small ponds and reservoirs near the heads of the smaller tributaries of our great rivers—along with continued forest protection activities—would seem to me to be proper work for the corps. This is especially true when one considers the type of workers in the corps—young men full of interest and enthusiasm for the outdoors who can be well taken care of in camps located in isolated mountain areas, individual projects small in themselves but extremely important as a part of the whole problem. Such types of work cannot be contracted for and moreover would have little or no appeal to older, more seasoned workers."

6. WILDLIFE RESTORATION

The corps has already made a large contribution to American wildlife, if in no other way than by the development of many areas, hitherto unusable by wildlife, into suitable habitats, resting and breeding places for birds and migratory waterfowl, and in providing sanctuaries for game animals. They have done many other things, made game censuses, planted food shrubs and trees for game food, and improved many hundreds of streams, lakes, and ponds for better fish conditions, as well as built many lakes and ponds. All this is a worth-while contribution to America's wildlife resources and more needs to be done.

7. PUBLIC-RANGE DEVELOPMENT

Since April 1935 the corps has been assigning camps for the improvement and development of the public-range lands of the 11 Western States. There are 141,228,423 acres of such lands, much of which needs to be brought back to somewhat of its former carrying capacity for sheep and cattle, horses, goats, and forms of wildlife. Development of water, including reservoirs, spring developments, water holes, wells, and other watering places, building of drift fences, corrals, and stock appurtenances, stopping range erosion, and actual revegetation of depleted ranges are some of the work done.

These work projects in order to perfect control and use of the range areas are necessarily scattered because concentration of livestock would add to destructive conditions. While the C. C. C. camps may be said to be located in the "wide-open spaces," their establishment, administration, and maintenance has been satisfactory because of the splendid cooperation of all agencies.

This type of work is worth while and needs to be done. It could not be done by contract labor, and probably no other Federal agency is as well fitted to do it as the C. C. C.

8. OUTDOOR RECREATION

In the park and recreation field the C. C. C. has made its greatest contribution toward the conservation of both natural and human resources. An increase of 100 percent in State-park acreage alone since 1933 has resulted almost entirely from the encouragement to expansion taken by the States from the availability of C. C. C. manpower and funds for development purposes. Several States which had no State parks 7 years ago now have areas acquired under this stimulus and are actively cooperating in the Nation-wide program for coordinated recreational planning. Others have added to existing areas and brought new parks into their systems.

The C. C. C. has given protection to and developed recreational facilities in Federal, State, and local areas on a scale which would have been impossible under ordinary circumstances. In National, State, county, and metropolitan parks the corps, under technical supervision of the National Park Service, has carried out forest and soil conservation work, built sanitary and visitor accommodation facilities; constructed bridges, dams, and trails; and accomplished numerous jobs providing many essentials for wider and better use of these areas such as trail and historical markers, guardrails, parking areas, and bathing facilities.

Extensive recreational facilities have also been provided in National and State forests throughout the country.

In spite of the accomplishments to date, a big program in park work remains ahead for the C. C. C. The park, parkway, and recreational area study, authorized by Congress and now being conducted by the National Park Service cooperatively with other Federal agencies and the States, is mapping out the future recreational needs of the people of the United States. This study has found present facilities to be inadequate and calls for the provision of extensive additional areas and developments. Because of its experience and proved effectiveness, the C. C. C. will be looked to for continued assistance in this program for many years to come.

Conscription of Wealth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSH LEE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 13 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

ARTICLE BY JAY FRANKLIN

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, in today's Washington Evening Star, Mr. Jay Franklin, in his column We, the People, has an article headed: "Conscription of wealth held necessary to successful defense program."

I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. I call the attention of the Members of the Senate to the fact that an amendment has been submitted to be printed, and is lying on the table, and will be offered at the proper time to the conscription bill, which provides for the conscription of wealth.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, does the amendment propose the conscription of all wealth by capital levy?

Mr. LEE. No; it provides for a series of forced loans.

Mr. TAFT. Are the persons who have to loan the money to be selected by lot in the same way that they are selected in the selective draft, or is everybody's property to be taken at once?

Mr. LEE. No; there would be a registration of property and income, and they would be classified in a classification similar to the income tax, and each person would be required to buy Government bonds to finance the defense program in proportion to his ability, as determined by his wealth and income, just as we require persons to pay taxes in proportion to their ability.

Mr. TAFT. Does the Senator propose to present that matter to the Senate while the bill now under consideration is pending?

Mr. LEE. Yes.

I renew my request to have the article printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Evening Star of August 13, 1940]

WE, THE PEOPLE—CONSCRIPTION OF WEALTH HELD NECESSARY TO SUCCESSFUL DEFENSE PROGRAM

(By Jay Franklin)

One element which has been lost sight of in the congressional debates on the national service bill is the vital matter of national morale.

The conscription bill, as now reported, is too narrow and too half-hearted a measure to arouse the national spirit of the American people. It is viewed with suspicion by liberals, by labor, and by young people, as an undemocratic measure to conscript the "have-nots" for the defense of the "haves" and as a means to outflank the social reforms of the New Deal and hence to weaken the national unity.

It may sound strange, but it is a fact that the same people who boggle at the idea of drafting a million young men a year into the Army warm up to the far more drastic idea of total defense.

The theory of total defense is something new in our national life. Its chief selling point at the moment is that it promises to eliminate slackers on the one hand and profiteers on the other. With private industry whittling away the safeguards against profiteering in the manufacture of munitions and with labor generally opposed to the draft, this argument is one which has great appeal.

DANGER OF PROFIT MOTIVE

The advocates of total defense make their stand on the unassailable principle that defense is the concern of everyone and cannot be entrusted to volunteers in either industry or the armed forces. They believe in a registration and conscription—as needed—of every man and woman between the ages of 18 and 65. They believe that the American people as a whole would welcome this plan to utilize and coordinate all their energies, rather than to delegate the job solely to a group of youngsters between

the ages of 21 and 31. They believe that total registration would be effective in preventing the use of a purely military conscription to break down living standards and enhance social insecurity.

They also feel that a draft on the people should be accompanied by the conscription of industry, communications and capital. Such a draft would tend to diminish the ugly spectacle of industries refusing to aid national defense unless bribed to do so and of property using the national emergency to enhance its power over the country's future.

The advocates of total defense argue that the experience of both France and England show that the profit motive can be exceedingly dangerous in time of crisis and that the delays of private industry which flow out of consideration of profits and taxes constitute the chief obstacle to effective defense in an age of split-second timing and streamlined offensives.

DOCTRINE OF UNITY

In other words, total defense is a doctrine of national unity which offers quick and willing results. Without this unity, we see business urging conscription of manpower but shying away from conscription of horsepower; and we see labor urging the nationalization of industry and the conscription of profits through excess-profits taxes, while it insists that the people of this country shall not be coerced into the national service.

Disunion and mutual recrimination belong of necessity to anything less than a national-defense program which goes the whole hog and worries no more over the fate of the individual business concern than it does over the fate of the individual man in uniform. A machine gun recognizes no distinction between the businessman and his employe, and a dive bomber is as apt to hit a tenement house as a factory.

All of these measures—including military conscription—are merely tools or weapons to help us fight effectively. They offer no guarantee of victory. But if there is one lesson of military history it is this: That the side with the newer weapons defeats the side with the obsolete weapons; that courage is no substitute for tanks or planes, and that tanks and planes are no defense against treachery, folly, or demoralization behind the lines.

Many observers of the latest dogfight on Capitol Hill believe that the time has come when the President, regardless of the effect on the elections, must come out boldly in favor of total defense as was foreshadowed in the Democratic platform, or else America will stumble and blunder into the same tragic procession of those nations whose watchword was "too little and too late" instead of "too much and too soon."

Colonel Lindbergh's Chicago Speech

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 13 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

EDITORIAL BY RALPH INGERSOLL

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial by Ralph Ingersoll, published in PM, of the issue of August 6, 1940, relative to the recent address delivered by Colonel Lindbergh in Chicago.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From New York PM of August 6, 1940]

DENOUNCING LINDBERGH

I say very simply that Colonel Lindbergh in his speech in Chicago Sunday identified himself as spokesman No. 1 for the "fifth column." The "fifth column," in America, as in Madrid, is a group who love their country's enemies and who first argue and then fight for them. The Fascist states, as General Pershing said, have "sworn to destroy the American idea." Germany under Hitler is thoroughly identified as the archenemy of democracy, and as such is the archenemy of the archdemocracy, the United States of America. On Sunday Colonel Lindbergh first tried to frighten the people of the United States by saying "A war between us (the United States and Germany) could easily last for generations and bring all civilization tumbling * * *," then counseled "cooperation" * * * "never impossible when there is sufficient gain on both sides."

These are "fifth-column" statements, naked and unashamed. They are preachment of the inevitability of German conquest, defeatism—followed by the suggestion that if we deal reasonably with the conqueror, he will deal reasonably with us. These are the things "fifth columnists"—friends of their country's enemies—have been saying for years now—in Austria, in Czechoslovakia, in Norway, in France.

Not all the slick Goebbels-like reasonableness of Lindbergh's windup will wipe these things out, neither his argument that European affairs are too messy anyway, nor his sly appeal to social consciousness with his Chinese proverbs about the rich being too rich and the poor being too poor. Goebbels' genius has always been that he wrapped his poison in sweet reasonableness—the same sweet reasonableness that took Chamberlain in and led to Munich.

Lindbergh is a political novice. His speech was postgraduate work. Obviously, he was helped in writing it. Who are the people who did his thinking and helped in his writing? Who are his gang?

Some weeks ago I wrote in this newspaper that the reasoning of the appeaser argues that the mayor of a city should cooperate with the gangster if the latter gets big enough and tough enough and seems here to stay.

This is the reasoning in Colonel Lindbergh's speech, whatever group prepared it for him. This is the way Fascist "fifth columnists" work.

I denounce Col. Charles A. Lindbergh as the spokesman of the Fascist "fifth column" in America.

RALPH INGERSOLL.

The Constitution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. DANAHER

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 13 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

ARTICLE BY COL. ANSON T. McCOOK

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article appearing in the July number of the American Legion magazine under the title "Above All, the Constitution," written by Col. Anson T. McCook, of Hartford, Conn. I believe a McCook has taken his part in every war in which our Nation has been engaged—always leaders in their respective fields of education, medicine, and the law. Connecticut's "fighting McCooks" have been steadfast in their loyalty to and attachment for those fundamentals of the Constitution which have ever been dear to the hearts of American patriots. An eminent lawyer and a veteran officer of the American Expeditionary Force, it is singularly appropriate that Colonel McCook has been asked to write the first of a series of articles dealing with the principles set forth in the preamble to the constitution of the American Legion. I commend his paper to the notice of Senators.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the American Legion Magazine of July 1940]

ABOVE ALL, THE CONSTITUTION—"TO UPHOLD AND DEFEND THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

(By Anson T. McCook)

There is nothing flabby about the American Legion or its constitution. Both are active and vigorous. The very first mandate of the preamble calls for something positive—"to uphold and defend."

But why give first importance to the Constitution of the United States? Why should it need defending? Let's see:

In three great nations one man can create war for all the people, at any time, for any cause, for no cause at all. One man, Hitler, said the word—and German bombs rained on Polish cities and villages, then on Norway, then on Holland and Belgium. One man, Mussolini, ordered the invasion of Abyssinia and Albania, and it was done. One man, Stalin, decided to attack Finland, and Soviet troops began their march. In each case, just one man's word—and all his people followed automatically along the path of blood and destruction, powerless to prevent. Powerless, because without realizing it they had permitted a centralized government to gain control over the press, the radio, their courts, their liberties. They no longer had a living constitution such as ours to protect their right to listen and to speak; and so, being in ignorance of the facts, they had lost the power to think or act for themselves.

The builders of our Constitution refused to entrust such awful power to any one man, no matter who he might be. They placed it instead in the hands of many, permitting war to be declared only by Congress—by men of our own frequent choosing, directly responsible to the people. In defending the Constitution, therefore, we defend our peace.

Everyone is talking about the coming Presidential and congressional elections, freely and without fear. If we lived in a country where the people had abandoned their constitution, there

would be only one party, one set of candidates, one voice, one vote—and the secret service would do the rest. Here, the Constitution protects us in our free choice of candidates; then protects them in doing their duty; and finally, protects us against them if they violate their duy. It protects us all alike, the majority and the minority.

But to say that the Constitution protects us is only partly true. It is our fortress; but like any fortress it can defend us only while we defend it. Recognizing this, our Presidents, beginning with George Washington, have been sworn to "preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States." Indeed, they are forbidden to take office without that oath, for the Constitution is ours. It belongs to each one of us; and any official, any citizen, who seeks either to override it or to evade it is attacking you and me in our most precious right.

The Constitution is not a dried-up document, but living and up to date. As its opening words tell us, "We the people" created it. Its obligations and its benefits run to each one of us. It is not rigid, but strong and elastic to fit present and future needs. Being the people's, it has been amended by us whenever there was need; but, being the people's, it can be altered only in accordance with its terms. Anything else is tyranny.

Who prepared it? Liberals and conservatives, farmers, lawyers, scientists, most of them young men, all sincere believers in the people. These men had the courage and the wisdom to start the Nation forward on its road of liberty and opportunity with only sufficient traffic regulations to make the people's control more effective and more permanent. In a wonderful preamble of 31 simple words they stated its objects. Read that preamble, then read again the Legion preamble.

Our constitutional form of government is the most powerful engine in the world, set on three points of balance. It is effective only while that balance is maintained between Congress, President, and courts—none more important than the other, each one vital to the engine's functioning. The Bill of Rights, two pages long, is packed with things that seem as common as the air we breathe, and yet are as essential to our happiness as air to life: Freedom to speak and meet and worship God; a fair trial, even against the state itself; the right to live in one's home without search or molestation; all powers not vested in the Federal Government to remain the people's and the States.'

Across the water, the people of the dictatorship nations bartered away their constitutions for glittering promises of greater comfort. Today, they are paying for that comfort, if it be comfort, in regimentation and war—a dreadful price indeed. This is what Abraham Lincoln had in mind when he insisted that if government was to remain for the people, it must also be of and by the people.

Our country has been the happiest on earth. But these good things can be lost by us. They cannot stand except through our own backbone and watchfulness. The dangers from without are serious, but there can also be political Trojan horses and borings from within. What comes silently or smilingly is always more dangerous than open attack.

Modern Germany and ancient Rome both were once democracies. In both, democracy committed suicide. Nor are we immune in these United States. The test is, Do we care enough to sacrifice our time and strength to fight the fires of internal disunion and dictatorship while they are yet small, to prepare against attack from without? It takes vigilance and it takes courage to preserve our peace and our liberties. By upholding and defending the Constitution we protect all that we hold dear. No task is more worth while.

Delay in Airplane Orders

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 13 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

EDITORIAL FROM CINCINNATI TIMES-STAR

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial, published in the Cincinnati Times-Star of Monday, August 12, 1940, commenting on the delay in securing airplanes for the Army.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Cincinnati Times-Star of August 12, 1940]

WHY 33 PLANES ARE ON ORDER

In June Congress appropriated $4000,000,000 for the purchase of 4,000 war planes needed by the Army. To date, according to War Secretary Stimson, the Army has been able to sign contracts for exactly 33 planes.

Stimson puts the blame for this disgraceful performance upon the failure of Congress to grant tax lenience to concerns which must expand their plants to manufacture the new planes. He did not say that the blame for that failure lies squarely on the doorstep of the White House.

The gigantic plane-building program required by national defense calls for a gigantic expansion of plant. That expansion involves a huge risk on the part of the manufacturers. Should the emergency abruptly cease, they would be left with a mass of useless factories on their hands. Yet, under existing tax laws, they could get credit for amortizing their new plant investment only over a long period of years.

Months ago the suggestion was made that the amortization rules of the tax law be amended to permit full deduction of the cost of plant expansion over a 5-year period. That seemed reasonable to most officials in Washington, including Secretary Morgenthau. But it did not satisfy President Roosevelt. He would permit no change in the amortization rules unless at the same time a new excess-profits tax was enacted.

Now, the principle of excess-profits taxation at a time like the present is perfectly sound. We had a heavy excess-profits tax during the last war and we will assuredly have one to cover the present period of enormous military expenditures. The trouble with the President's scheme is that adopting such a tax requires an extensive revision of the tax structure. That takes time, whereas the war planes must be built with the greatest possible speed. To make the amortization change wait upon passage of an excess-profits tax is to delay the plane program for months.

That is exactly what has happened. While Congress wrestles with revision of the tax structure, the airplane plants are not being expanded and the planes are not being turned out for the defense of America. The national defense must wait while Mr. Roosevelt indulges his bent for socialistic ideas. The Army must fret anxiously because the President is afraid to offend his left-wing supporters by seeming to grant a favor to "big business." The supposed political interests of Mr. Roosevelt come first. Defense comes second.

Defense Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR D. HEALEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 13, 1940

RADIO ADDRESS OF HON. ARTHUR D. HEALEY, OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address delivered by me over the network of the Mutual Broadcasting System, station WOL, August 12, 1940:

Good evening, ladies and gentlemen, I am going to discuss with you tonight a phase of the national-defense program which, although vital and of primary importance, is temporarily at least, obscured from the plans which are being formulated and expedited for the defense of our Nation.

I refer to the subject of adequate housing for the employees of our defense industries. Housing that is modern, clean, and sanitary, and which may be obtained at rentals commensurate with their incomes by the thousands of workers and their families who have flocked to industrial centers and who will continue to migrate in increased numbers as our tremendous industrial defense program goes into high gear. The communities cannot hope to cope with this burden. Thousands of workers streaming into their cities each week must be supplied with shelter if they are to stay, yet, in most instances, housing for those already employed is limited. Private industry is eager to do its share in meeting this problem, but uncertainty as to the duration of the emergency makes it impossible for them to assume the entire risk involved. The cities themselves are not financially able to supply even the temporary housing which these workers require. It, therefore, devolves on the Federal Government to assume the responsibility of providing adequate housing for those who are being employed in the key industrial centers, fabricating the materials and implements for defense.

This subject on its face may seem remote and undramatic, but I am convinced that the degree of success of our entire defense program will depend to a large extent upon its early and satisfactory solution.

If we plunge ahead, developing defense industries with no regard for where the people who work in those industries are to live, then we may expect to run into the same bottlenecks, and experience the same gigantic waste as in 1917.

In 1917 we were totally unprepared to cope with the housing emergency with which we were confronted. Today we are prepared to meet that problem squarely and to solve it before it imperils our whole defense structure. I say that we are prepared, but only if we as a nation begin by recognizing the basic importance of decent housing, in times of emergency as well as in times of world-wide stability and peace.

Three years ago, after decades of debate, the United States Housing Authority was established with the basic purpose of beginning the long fight to wipe out the slum blight in the United States. In that brief period the accomplishments of the United States Housing Authority have been many. The United States Housing Act of 1937, under which it operates, provided, and I think wisely, for the complete decentralization of the public housing program. It was the purpose of the Authority to act as consultants on technical problems and as the lending agency. Local authorities have been established under State laws in some 500 major cities, large and small, in this country. Thus, the decision of initiating local housing projects has been properly reposed in the local housing authorities, who are best qualified to pass on their housing requirements. They, as vital component parts of local government, comprise a technical staff for public housing never before equaled in any country on earth. We have, therefore, the machinery to provide housing in connection with defense.

In view of the fact that we are equipped to do this job, it is only logical that you should ask, Why not proceed? It springs from the fact that certain groups, and certain men, both in and out of Congress are making it their job to block public housing, to impede slum clearance, to hinder the work of the United States Housing Authority. Judging from the continuous postponement of congressional action, their efforts have met with a dangerous degree of success. The motives of those opposed to slum clearance are too well known to merit extended comment. Slums, that breed misery, disease, and crime, unfortunately pay dollars and cents dividends to slum owners, although their public cost in terms of health, fire, and police expense runs into countless millions annually.

Immediately following the last World War Great Britain recognized its slum problems and set about to correct them. At the beginning of the present conflict in Europe England had cause to be thankful for its comprehensive housing program. The Minister of Health has reported that in 1917 36 percent of the men examined for military service were of full normal standard of health. At the beginning of the present war 83 percent of those examined met that high test. Authorities in Great Britain claim that the major factor in this almost unbelievable improvement in national health was the fact that a great majority of those in the lowest income groups were provided with decent, sanitary housing and healthful, wholesome environments. That job was accomplished through much the same plan that we have developed. That experience, those cold statistics, prove the fallacy of the often repeated statement that people make the slums. It is the slum that molds and warps and destroys the man. Great Britain found that the home—the home of the lowest wage earner—was the very foundation of the defense of her Empire.

Today, America is in the midst of a gigantic national defense program. Billions have been appropriated for preparedness purposes. Airplanes, tanks, guns, battleships—but we have been slow to recognize that adequate housing is just as essential to the success and speedy completion of our defense program as are munitions.

In more than 150 key cities, wherein are located the plants of industries vital to our defense program, already there has developed a serious housing shortage.

In New England alone, and I stress New England because that is my section of the country, and I am familiar with existing conditions there—there are 12 cities that are desperately in need of housing.

In Newport, R. I., where a large naval station and torpedo plant are located, it is estimated that 1,800 additional homes are needed.

In Quincy, Mass., the home of the Bethlehem Shipbuilding Corporation, there is imperative need of 2,000 homes.

In Pawtucket, R. I., more than 500 homes are required to meet the demands of increased employment in industrial plants in that section.

Other examples of acute housing shortages are Bath, Maine, where 500 new homes are needed for employees of the Bath Iron Works; Bridgeport, Conn., 400 homes; Hartford, Conn., 1,000—and these figures represent the shortage as it already exists. Other New England cities, with which I am acquainted, requesting assistance in meeting a housing crisis are: Portsmouth, N. H., and New London and New Britain, Conn. And I know that these conditions can be multiplied by the number of cities throughout the country where defense industries are shifting into high gear.

Let us for a moment look backward. The report of the United States Housing Corporation which was given the job of providing housing in 1917 and 1918 proves that housing was the bottleneck in the production program. One airplane factory in New Jersey at that time reported a labor turn-over of 360 percent a month. Some manufacturers reported a slow-down in production of as much as 30 percent because of the lack of adequate housing for workers.

In 1917 a reporter for a Bridgeport, Conn., paper wrote of the housing problem created in that city by an influx of war orders:

"A tremendously difficult situation was created in Bridgeport when munition-making suddenly increased its population 40 percent. Speculators gobbled up all available land; the price of building materials rose 25 to 30 percent; rents jumped 20 to 100 percent."

Reports from the same city in those days indicate that the Bridgeport pay roll increased at the rate of $500,000 per week and high rents absorbed fully a quarter of that amount. The city was overcrowded, beds were slept in the clock around. They were rented in shifts. That kind of a situation needs no elaboration.

Today, 23 years later, Bridgeport finds itself in the same housing predicament. The New York Post for August 7, 1940, reports that the "manufacturers (in Bridgeport) can't go gunning for orders because they know there is no housing here for incoming workers." The same condition is true in cities in my State, and certainly it is in many others where basic industries are located.

These situations must be met by direct action. The United States Housing Authority is the one Federal agency equipped to do the housing job. It has the technical staff, it has close working relationships with local authorities throughout the United States. When the emergency is over, it has the facilities for disposing of the new homes and putting them to a public use in connection with the slum clearance program.

The cost of the public housing program, if done thoroughly, will represent the smallest major item in our whole defense program.

The World War caught us totally unprepared to meet this problem. At that time, we had no organization capable of doing a first-rate housing job. The Government had no facts, no experience, and no tools. All that is different today.

The defense job ahead of us is staggering. Our approach to it must be realistic. We must meet each problem with a will to solve it. We must take first things first. Defense will collapse if our industrial workers are not properly housed. That is item No. 1.

S. 591, a bill which passed the Senate more than a year ago and which would continue the work of the United States Housing Authority, has been pending before the Rules Committee of the House of Representatives for many weeks.

The Democratic Party, at its national convention, has committed itself to a continuation of this housing program. I quote the plank:

"We have launched a soundly conceived plan of loans and contributions to rid America of overcrowded slum dwellings that breed disease and crime and to replace them by low-cost housing projects within the means of low-income families.

"We will extend and acccelerate this plan not only in the congested city districts but also in the small town and farm areas, and we will make it a powerful arm of national defense by supplying housing for the families of enlisted personnel and for workers in areas where industry is expanding to meet defense needs."

Thus, the Democratic Party has pledged itself to continue the work of the United States Housing Authority. This is a mandate binding the majority party of Congress and undeniably represents the will of the American people.

It must seem inconceivable that a small group of Members of the House of Representatives is able to defeat that mandate. However, that is the situation because the Rules Committee virtually controls the machinery by which legislation is brought to the floor of the House of Representatives.

It is my earnest hope, and I think I reflect your views, that within a short period this log jam will be broken and the House Rules Committee, in view of the critical situation, will report a rule under which this necessary legislation may be considered promptly.

Connecticut Home Guard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM J. MILLER

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 13, 1940

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, on August 6, 1940, the President called on the Governors of the various States to organize a home defense force to take the place of members of the National Guard, if and when the National Guard is called into Federal service.

It is a matter of record that Gov. Raymond E. Baldwin, of the State of Connecticut, issued an order 3 months ago for a home-defense force such as that now suggested by the President. Such a force has been organized in Connecticut and part of it is now undergoing a period of field training. The nucleus of this force, as provided for in the Connecticut statute, is the historic Governor's foot guard. This force was recruited largely through the efforts of local posts of the American Legion and Veterans of Foreign Wars. The State asked for 2,500 citizens to volunteer for this service and that quota has been exceeded. Of this 2,500 volunteers, approximately 2,000 are veterans of the World War.

The spirit with which this large number of men responded to the call of Governor Baldwin proves—if any proof is

necessary—that American citizens are as willing as ever to respond to a call for service to either State or Nation in time of emergency if only the call clearly states the type of service needed and the nature of the emergency which exists.

I have been proud of the accomplishments of Governor Baldwin, but never more proud than I have been at the way he has organized the resources of the State of Connecticut in preparation for any emergency which might arise as a result of the war now going on in Europe.

In my office I have a complete set of the orders issued by the Governor and the adjutant general of Connecticut, as well as an outline of the qualifications necessary to serve in the home guard. There is also an outline of the training program now going on, company records, and all other pertinent information.

I would be happy to make this material available to any Member of the House who would like to go over this material.

The Third-Term Threat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS R. BALL

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 13, 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. THOMAS R. BALL, OF CONNECTICUT

Mr. BALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech delivered by me to the Republicans of Tolland County at Columbia, Conn., on July 25:

It makes me very happy to be here tonight in the heart of Tolland County, and it seems very appropriate that we should meet in this historic community whose loyal citizens, when met to pick an appropriate name for their township, chose one that is the very symbol of our Nation. "Hail Columbia, Happy Land!"

We are fast approaching one of the most important periods in our life as a Nation. The next few months will demonstrate the loyalty of Americans to the American way of life. Our country is faced with a threat to its constitutional form of government by a small group of its citizens who are bent on their own perpetuation in power.

On the horizon are gathering the dark clouds of war with ominous intensity. Wherever we look across the sea we see death, destruction, and devastation. Within a few months we have seen great nations wiped out, great peoples in despair. We ourselves have been led to the very brink of war, and we are not prepared for war. Surely the situation is serious. For that reason we must be brave. We must forget the little troubles in our determination to conquer the forces of evil that have been unloosed in a wild world.

The tremendous responsibility that rests on those in high places makes it imperative that we, the people, choose wisely and well our leaders in the trying days to come.

You have, in the past 7 years, had ample opportunity to study the workings of the New Deal. Some of the objectives of the Roosevelt administration were worthy. Some of its followers were honest men, eager to better conditions, and anxious to alleviate suffering—but there is a record of 7 years of spendthrift splurging at your expense, of experiments that failed, of attempts to change our form of government, of flirtations with radicalism which led to the presence of known Communists in important Government jobs, of fine words and falsehoods—and now, the man who for 7 long years has set himself up as the champion of democracy, has deliberately, with sly cunning, induced a great convention to permit him to break a fundamental tradition of the American people, that no man should serve as President for more than two terms. This heritage from Washington was reaffirmed by Jefferson, the author of our Declaration of Independence. It has been respected by public men in both political parties, only to be set aside by a man who believes that he, and he alone, is indispensable; that in a nation of a hundred and thirty million souls, he is the only man fit to rule, and rule is what he seeks to do.

It is up to you people, good Americans all of you, to get out and work, work as you have never worked before. The Republican Party has chosen a leader who has received the spontaneous and enthusiastic acclaim of millions. He is a big man, big physically, big mentally. He is kindly, sane, sensible, keenly aware of the awfulness of the task before him, upright in his loyalty and devotion. This man is humble in spirit. This man asks your help, he needs it. You and I, and everyone else who believes in the American way of life, must get behind Wendell Willkie and put him in the White House.

These times are different. The issues before us are unlike anything we have approached in the past. The situation throughout the world is such that the leadership of this Nation must not be made a political plaything. In the development of the tremendous program of national defense there must be no incompetence. We cannot tolerate the presence in positions of primary importance of those who, picked for personal political loyalty, have demonstrated their incapacity to deal with the problems of labor and industry. This is no time for dalliance. The future of America is at stake. If you are to preserve the type of government set up by your forefathers, if you are to insure the protection of your country from foreign aggression, if you are to keep an almost bankrupt Nation from inflation of its currency and repudiation of its national debt, you must get busy now.

The past 7 years have seen the Government moving further away from the people. A strongly intrenched bureaucracy has tried again and again to dictate from Washington what you should and should not do, forgetting in its mad rush for power that all power is derived from the people and that only such rights belong to the Federal Government as have been relinquished to it by the several sovereign States. Within a fortnight we have seen set up in what was our sister republic, France, a government on the imperial pattern. It can happen here, but it won't happen if America wakes up.

Many have been lulled into slumber with Federal funds dispensed with generous indulgence. They have forgotten that the right way, the healthy way, the American way, is for the small unit of government to raise the revenue, pay its just bills, and live within its income. Our Connecticut way of doing things is simple. A great man has said of our town meetings: "They are both the school and the pattern of democracy." Here our officials are truly public servants. They are close to the people, conscious of their needs, their troubles, their hopes, and their fears.

You people here assembled are typical of other groups meeting in all parts of this great country. You have watched the performances of the present administration. You have an understanding of what the New Deal has meant. You see now that, after 7 years of it, poverty and unemployment still exist, the debt limit set for our country has been passed and a new high determined. New troubles seem imminent.

Because of the mad fury that has been unleashed across the water, we have been forced into a position where we must become a military nation, perhaps temporarily, probably for many years to come. You and groups like you elsewhere are loyal patriots, willing to undergo hardship and privation to preserve your country from foreign foe, but you demand that your sacrifice shall not be made in vain. You demand that the development of a great military machine shall not mean servitude, but freedom.

It is in this spirit that you are marching forth to battle in this campaign, and through it you will win and the American way be once more reestablished in our land firmly and for all time.

Poll-Tax Meddling?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE E. GEYER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 13, 1940

Mr. GEYER of California. Mr. Speaker, the other morning the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN], in his extension of remarks, objected to what he called interference in another man's district when I announced the placing on the Speaker's desk of a petition to discharge the committee from further consideration of my anti-poll-tax bill.

"IT MAKES A DIFFERENCE WHOSE OX IS BEING GORED"

I would like to state that no man in this House has taken more time of the House or more space in the RECORD than has the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] on affairs concerning other sections of the Nation other than his own. He has interested himself in the power rates of practically all the 435 districts in the United States. It is a little difficult for me to see why he deems it proper for him to be concerned with the power rates in every State and improper for me to be concerned in these perilous days about the right to vote of the citizens of the Nation. Yes; it seems to make a "difference whose ox is being gored."

Of one thing I am sure. The three and one-half million Negroes and the 7,000,000 whites of the eight poll-tax States will never be free from political bondage until some force outside those States comes to their relief. The provisions of

the requirements of a poll tax as a prerequisite for voting are firmly imbedded in the Constitutions of the poll-tax States, and we cannot expect those people to liberate themselves when they do not have the vote with which to do it. We cannot expect them to lift themselves by their own boot straps when they have not the boot straps with which to lift themselves.

I have introduced the anti-poll-tax bill at the request of the Southern Conference for Human Welfare, an organization composed wholly of southern people. The president of this organization is Dr. Frank Graham, president of the University of North Carolina. Other organizations supporting the anti-poll-tax bill include American Federation of Labor, Congress of Industrial Organizations, Young Women's Christian Association, Descendants of the American Revolution, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, railway brotherhoods, and other labor, civic, and progressive associations.

Surely the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN], whose patriotism and love of humanity no man can doubt, is not taking the position of supporting a system in this American democracy of ours which denies a vast number of otherwise qualified people the right to exercise their American privilege of casting a ballot.

The amount of the poll tax in Mississippi is $2 per year, with counties permitted to levy an additional $1. A tax of $2 or $3 per year for each voting member of the family in those depressed sections of the Nation is more than those people are able to pay. And that is not the whole story. The tax is cumulative. That is, back taxes must be paid before the individual is allowed to vote. This sometimes boosts the poll tax to a considerable sum.

A LOOK AT THE RECORD

The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] would have us believe that it is because of the one-party system in operation in his State and not because of the poll tax that people do not come out to vote. Of course, if we had democracy in the South we would not have the one-party system. He states that it is the primary election that counts and not the general election; that the general election vote is light, giving one the impression that the primary election brings to the polls a vast number of people.

Let us look at the record. In the testimony taken before the subcommittee of the Judiciary which held hearings on the anti-poll-tax bill, figures were presented to show that in the 1934 primaries the total primary vote cast in district No. 1, the district of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN], was 22,140. This in a district with a population of 241,605, according to the 1930 census. That is 9.16 percent of the total population. This pales to insignificance when we know that the percentage of the population voting in districts in the 40 tax-free States that year was 31.24 percent—9 percent as against 31 percent.

Further testimony given at the hearings shows that Mississippi District No. 1 in its 1936 primary cast 24,100 votes. This is 9.99 percent of its population, while the average for the 40 tax-free States in that important 1936 election was 41.3 percent—10 percent as against 41 percent. In other words, the district of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] in its primaries polls about one-third to one-fourth of what non-poll-tax districts generally poll.

SOUTHERN CONGRESSMEN CAN BENEFIT

I want it definitely understood that in my endeavors to bring democracy to those places where it is denied, I am making no personal attack upon my colleagues in the House. I am sure, that should this vast group of people be given the right of franchise, that my colleagues from the South are sufficiently politically astute that they will govern their actions and their votes in this Congress in such a way as not to suffer because of the broadening of the democratic processes.

I urge that all Members get a copy of the hearings on the anti-poll-tax bill after which I am sure we will all see the good of signing the anti-poll-tax discharge petition, No. 34.

The National Catholic Welfare Conference Opposes Compulsory Military Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. SCHAFER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 13, 1940

LETTER AND STATEMENT OF RT. REV. MSGR. MICHAEL J. READY

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I favor an adequate national defense under a voluntary system of military service. I am opposed to compulsory military service in time of peace, which is a part of the New Deal plan to establish a dictatorship in the United States. Compulsory military service in a democracy in time of peace is indefensible, particularly when it has not been demonstrated that the voluntary system of military service has failed.

If human beings are to be conscripted in time of peace to prepare for war and fight future wars, then it is only reasonable that wealth should be conscripted according to ability to pay in order to finance the cost of the preparation and the fighting.

If such conscription of wealth is enacted into law there will be very little danger of the United States getting into war, as most of our multimillionaire compulsory military service advocates, war propagandists, interventionists, and warmongers will stop fomenting wars.

Mr. Speaker, under permission granted by the House I incorporate in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point a letter of July 31, 1940, which was sent to the Members of Congress by the Right Reverend Monsignor Michael J. Ready, general secretary of the National Catholic Welfare Conference and the enclosed statement which he made before the Committee on Military Affairs of the House of Representatives on July 30, 1940, in opposition to the compulsory military service bill H. R. 10132.

[National Catholic Welfare Conference. Most Rev. Samuel A. Stritch, D. D., chairman, administrative board; Right Rev. Msgr. Michael J. Ready, general secretary; Rev. Howard J. Carroll, S. T. D., assistant general secretary. National headquarters, 1312 Massachusetts Avenue NW.]

WASHINGTON, D. C., *July 31, 1940.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I am pleased to send you herewith copy of the statement presented July 30, to the House Committee on Military Affairs, regarding H. R. 10132 (Selective Training and Service Act of 1940). This statement was made by direction of the administrative board of archbishops and bishops, National Catholic Welfare Conference, acting pursuant to the resolution passed at the general meeting of bishops, on November 16, 1939, in its session at the Catholic University, Washington.

With sentiments of esteem and good wishes, I remain,

Very sincerely yours,

MICHAEL J. READY,
General Secretary.

[Statement of the Right Reverend Monsignor Michael J. Ready, general secretary of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, before the Committee on Military Affairs of the United States House of Representatives on H. R. 10132, July 30, 1940]

SELECTIVE TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT OF 1940

I appear before this committee by direction of the archbishops and bishops of the administrative board of the National Catholic Welfare Conference. The administrative board, consisting of 16 archbishops and bishops, is elected annually by the general meeting of the bishops of the United States to serve the national interests of the church, and in this particular and present action it is obeying a resolution of the general meeting adopted November 16, 1939, in its session at the Catholic University, Washington.

I have the honor to present to this Military Affairs Committee of the House a statement of general attitude toward the bill under consideration written by the board of bishops at a meeting in Chicago, July 4, 1940:

"The Catholic Church is committed by its very nature to the promulgation of the gospel of peace and to the elimination from human society of the causes of war. The ideal of the church is the 'Peace of Christ in the Kingdom of Christ.' Again and again in

these latter days the present supreme pontiff has reminded the world of this ideal, and even as his predecessors before him, has striven with all the means at his disposal to preserve the world from the horrors of armed conflict. For this he has won the admiration of religious men and women of all creeds. Inspired by his leadership, Catholics in our own country have endeavored to promote international peace and have worked and prayed, and continue to work and pray, that God may avert from this favored land the disasters of war.

"It seems that tragic circumstances of the present hour are demanding that we invoke the law of self-protection for our national security. Regretfully Christians are obliged to realize that adequate national defense demands the training of large numbers of our citizens in the arts of warfare. It is imperative that the extent of the emergency and the consequent need for action should be generally realized. On the other hand, in the interests of sound procedure, it should not be overstated. Because of the character of the times, any program promoted by any group, be it militarist, isolationist, or interventionist, should be subjected to critical appraisal and cool, sound judgment.

"The American way of life has developed certain definite democratic ideals. No emergency should be allowed to destroy the values that are of the very essence of liberty as we know it in America. Consequently, no plan for the national defense should do unnecessary violence to the religious and educational traditions upon which our democracy is founded and apart from which it will not continue to flourish."

Because of the serious damage this bill would cause to the religious, educational, and charitable institutions of the church, and consequently to our whole civil society, the bishops are opposed to provisions in this bill which include, for compulsory military service, students for the priesthood and brothers under vow to serve the works of religion.

H. R. 10132 is a bill which proposes "To protect the integrity and institutions of the United States through a system of selective compulsory military training and service."

The bill declares that "the integrity and institutions of the United States are gravely threatened and that to insure the independence and freedom of the people of the United States, it is imperative that immediate measures be taken to mobilize the Nation's strength."

Specifically, the bill proposes to mobilize the Nation's manpower so that "every able-bodied man shall fit into his proper place under a fair system of selective compulsory military training and service."

The bill does not define or state what are the dangers which gravely threaten the integrity and institutions of our country in a manner that calls for the mobilization of all the men of the Nation.

That the integrity and the institutions of the United States face possible dangers today, because of a war ravaging most of Europe, is apparent. That these dangers justify national preparedness for defense on the scale contemplated in the bill under consideration is not supported by any evidence.

The bill seems to propose compulsory military service as a permanent national policy "whether a state of war exists or not" (sec. 4).

The bill does not contemplate an emergency which might justify total mobilization. It would provide a long-range defense program as a national policy.

Dangers to national integrity and institutions are not all external; many are internal, relating to national unity, to respect for national institutions, to morale, to those virtues civic and moral which are fountains of strength and courage enabling men to sacrifice when sacrifice is required. No national-defense policy would be adequate that neglected the agencies by which these virtues are fostered and promoted.

Chief among these agencies are the churches with their charitable and educational as well as their distinctly religious activities.

We believe that the interests of our country would have been served better if this proposed legislation had originated in Congress. Certainly, Congress would have supported, not to say protected, the basic interests of religion.

There is at present a high-pressure propaganda for this bill emanating from the military professionals. This propaganda is designed to convince the American people that war is inevitable and that the time to prepare for that war is very short. If the measure of defense contemplated in this conscription bill is forecast accurately, then those who will be called to give their lives for the defense of our country should know the facts.

Military conscription is a matter of supreme importance to our present citizens and to future generations. This legislation is too important to be rushed through Congress until all other possible programs have been examined. The military professionals would convince us that necessary forces of men cannot be obtained by voluntary service. The newspapers tell us that a thousand men a day are enlisting in various branches of the service. It is certain that a proper, reasonable, Nation-wide appeal to the men of our country would be answered by volunteers in numbers greater than present resources to care for them. If the study and propaganda expended on this conscription bill had been applied to methods for getting voluntary enlistments, the Nation would have been better served. The possibility of a 1-year voluntary-enlistment program should be exhausted before resorting to a compulsory one. We are, after all, living at peace with the world and our determination should lead us to the preservation of such peace.

Every loyal American is in favor of a defense program which will make us so strong that no other nation or coalition of nations dare to attack us. In preparing such a defense, we should rely on the fine traditions which have made and kept this Nation great.

We believe that Congress understands better than military professionals the services to our American society which religion has established, supported, and administered. These services are given to the Nation, not only in specific churches and houses of worship, but also in universities, colleges, secondary schools, hospitals, houses of protection and correction for youth, and in a wide variety of special agencies for mercy and charity. These institutions are staffed and directed by a personnel consecrated to the ministry of religion. Young men willingly enter our seminaries and novitiates in answer to a call of conscience. They volunteer to dedicate their lives to the service of Christ and the service of their neighbor for the love of and in imitation of Christ.

They may expect no earthly remuneration in this ministry, except a frugal, humble subsistence. We do not believe that the Congress of the United States will knowingly destroy or interfere with such heroic religious practice. We hold that much of the world's present distress is due to the spirit of stark materialism which has seized the minds and wills of men and nations. This Republic has been enriched by the Christian social services fostered by the church and administered from the motive of Christian charity and benevolence. We believe that the Congress will insure continued protection to that consecrated service for God and humanity.

The present bill departs from that national tradition of respect for and protection of religious institutions. The military mind which drafted the bill now under consideration had an intense fear of the word "exemption." No service to the Nation, even in peacetime, according to this bill, is comparable to the lowest form of military training. All modes of life, even in peacetime, must give way to a plan which the military professionals deem necessary.

The bill, however, grants automatic "deferment" to the Vice President and governmental officers of all categories. In this instance, what is the meaning of "deferment" against the traditional exemption for such officers?

In section 7 (c) the bill gives some recognition to the importance of religion, providing that "The President shall, under such regulations as he may prescribe" defer training and service in the Army and Navy of men whose service is more important in industry and the professions. Among those whose service is thus to be deferred are "regular or duly ordained ministers of religion, in the regular discharge of their ministerial duties."

However, there is no provision in this bill for the exemption of those training for the ministry nor for those carrying on an actual ministry in religious education and charity.

Candidates for the priesthood are selected with great care, they are given a long preparatory training leading up to the study of theology. The seminary is not merely an educational institution, it is above all a place of formation for those priestly virtues and that mode of life which will enable the priest to serve Christ by example as well as by teaching and preaching and the administration of institutions of social charity. Any interruption in this strict discipline will work to the disadvantage of the individual candidates and to the great detriment of the church in the maintenance of her institutions.

In other selective compulsory draft acts, specifically the acts of 1917 and 1918, the Congress, acting even under stress of war, recognized the distinctive character of the minister and by statute exempted him and students of theology from the draft.

We believe that in any national-defense policy, such as the enactment of this bill would provide, this section 7 (c) should be amended and that after section 7 (b) a provision should be added exempting from the selective compulsory draft herein provided all priests in holy orders, ministers of religion, students who are preparing for the priesthood or ministry, and regular members of religious communities.

Just what does deferment mean in this bill? Does it mean deferred to a class to be called later than class I? Does it connote obligation on the part of the President? What area of choice is left to the President in the clause, "under such regulations as he may prescribe"? What discretion in "deferment" will be left to the various 6,000 conscription officials throughout the country who will pass on registrants?

The citizen would be protected if Congress wrote definite exemptions and defined exactly what "deferment" meant. The bill eschews deferment by class and leaves the status of the individual applicant to the judgment of a local conscription-board functionary.

The elasticity of "deferment" as conceived in the military mind is known from the language used in the proposed regulations to accompany the draft bill as designed by the Joint Army and Navy Selective Service Committee. In section 100 B of the regulations we read:

"Ordinarily registrants placed in class I will be inducted into the public armed forces before registrants placed in any of the other classes, but nothing herein contained shall prevent the induction of any registrant, whatever his classification or order number, when the President deems it necessary in the national interest."

That is, the priest or minister of religion or other person who is deferred by Executive order may, when the President deems it necessary, be subjected to the selective draft.

In another place these regulations use much language to define the term "regular or duly ordained minister." The language is totally inadequate and would exclude from "deferment" bishops, college and university presidents, hospital administrators, and other classes of ordained and regular ministers who are in administrative, missionary, and general offices of the church.

I cite these regulations to inquire who will be charged with writing such regulations for the proposed legislation, if enacted. What norms will guard the 6,000 local conscription functionaries in interpreting the regulations?

This legislation is entirely too important to be left to haphazard conjecture. The acts of Congress even in wartime were more definitely and more justly written, and besides, they accepted and followed the traditions of our country.

In view of the utter disregard in this bill for the normal recruiting of a clergy to carry on the religious, educational, and charitable works of the church, we ask respectfully that this committee and the Members of Congress generally give attention to the result which must inevitably follow. Just at a time when greater demands will be put on the church for supplying chaplains in the armed forces, in the extended Civilian Conservation Corps, and for social welfare work in cantonments, the church faces the loss of many candidates for the ministry because of the refusal to grant even a deferred status to seminarians. Nowhere in the present bill is any consideration given to this need. How can the church meet the new demands for chaplains and other personnel related to the defense program if students for the ministry are thought to be more necessary in military units? We are informed that the extended Army and Navy program already authorized calls for 500 priests. It is impossible to get candidates for the ministry as one would employees in industry.

We reject the thought that this present proposed legislation is any indication of a change in the possible attitude of Congress toward religion. That attitude has been and continues to be respectful of the liberty of the church in selecting and directing her ministers.

Experience in wartime is evidence that any loss of fighting personnel arising out of the exemption from the selective draft of ministers of religion and students for the ministry is not only meager but generously compensated for by the advantage of morale, unity, and loyalty promoted and maintained among noncombatants by the clergy and among combatants by the offices of the Chaplain Corps.

It is our firm belief that there will be available a sufficient number of volunteers for service in the Chaplain Corps if ministers of religion and students for the ministry continue to be exempt from the draft.

We speak only for the Roman Catholic Church in the United States. To enforce provisions of law such as those now considered would dangerously interfere with the progress, even with the preservation of religion and would result in grievous suffering and hardship to millions of families by depriving them of sacramental ministrations, and would curtail an influence that contributes inestimably to the preservation of morale and the strengthening of national unity.

Experience shows that the normal increase of the Catholic population in the United States requires an increase of about 750 priests each year. In the school year 1935–36, for which complete statistics are available, 1,400 students were graduated from 93 theological seminaries in the United States. That number was barely sufficient to replace the deceased and superannuated and provide the increase called for by an increase in the Catholic population. It would be extremely difficult for the existing theological seminaries to provide additional priests for service in the Chaplain Corps. Adequate provision could not be made for the necessary normal demand for additional priests and at the same time for service with the increased military and naval forces.

Taking into consideration these facts, the Parliament of Great Britain by the Armed Forces Act of 1939 exempted from military service all men in holy orders and regular ministers of religious denominations, and recent regulations added "church students and religious" to the schedule of reserved occupations; that is, gave them a specific vocation exemption from the draft. The rule applies to all "clergymen and church students of all denominations."

The British regulations define "theological student" as "a man established in his course as a student at an institution recognized by any religious denomination as a training institution for holy orders or for regular ministers of that denomination, while he continues as such a student and intends to qualify for holy orders or for appointment as a regular minister." This exemption is of particular reference, since all of us know what Great Britain has faced since September 1939.

Therefore, we respectfully recommend that ministers of religion and students for the ministry of religion be specifically exempt from the selective compulsory military service proposals now under consideration.

Immunity from military service is inseparable from the right of a people to religious liberty. It is not a privilege conceded unfairly to the ministers of religion as a class. In respecting the immunity of the clergy from military service the state recognizes the right of the people at all times to practice their religion and to have available for that purpose the ministrations of their priests.

It is argued that to recognize the immunity of theological students would open the way for abuses. Too many would seek to enter theological seminaries to escape the draft.

There will be no rush of students to Catholic theological seminaries by men seeking to evade conscription. No student is admitted at any time to the seminary without evidence of fitness and without having completed at least 2 years of study in a liberal arts college. Ecclesiastical superiors would be bound to exercise even greater caution in times of crisis and would be even more severe and exacting in ascertaining whether or not an applicant truly has a vocation for the ministry. The church would not object to reasonable efforts by the state to prevent abuses. The state certainly might designate for exemption only the seminarians or divinity students enrolled in institutions which have been functioning for a specified number of years. Indeed, such efforts would protect the church as well as the state, for to receive students or confer holy orders on candidates who had no vocation would harm the church and religion even more than it would the state.

Believing the proposed provisions of the bill as now drawn are contrary to our national traditions and national ideals, as well as hostile to the explicit declarations and laws of the church, we are confident that you Members of this Congress will wish to reexamine the whole question in relation to the points which we submit most respectfully.

Youth, Labor, and the General Public Oppose Peacetime Conscription

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN G. ALEXANDER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 13, 1940

LETTERS FROM CONSTITUENTS

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I am receiving hundreds of letters regarding the question of compulsory military training as provided for in the Burke-Wadsworth conscription bill and practically 100 percent of them express opposition to the bill.

The six letters at the end of this statement are quite typical of the dozens coming to me in every day's mail, and for the purpose of presenting a résumé of the general viewpoint of the people in my congressional district, I submit the following and ask that their viewpoint be given careful consideration:

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA,
GENERAL EXTENSION DIVISION,
Minneapolis, August 10, 1940.

JOHN G. ALEXANDER,
United States Representative from Minnesota,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ALEXANDER: I hope you will stand by with the opponents of the draft bill and will vote against this un-American measure the military clique are trying to shove down our throats.

Here's an incident which will interest you: We tried to schedule a radio forum here on conscription, but we had to cancel it because we couldn't find a young person to uphold the bill who could match in ability any number of young men anxious to speak against it!

I have yet to meet a family with boys of draft age who will vote for any Congressman who puts their boys into the Army.

People sometimes favor draft in principle, but not for themselves. The young men and women I come in contact with will not vote for Congressmen who put them in an Army camp. Nor will their families.

Yours truly,

BURTON PAULU,
Manager of WLB.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., *August 6, 1940.*

HON. JOHN G. ALEXANDER.

DEAR SIR: The members of Unit No. 5, Mothers of American Sons, Inc., are registering their protest against the compulsory military training bill in its entirety. We do not favor its passage in any form, or for any age range, as that would be tantamount to endorsing the principle of conscription, which we feel is un-American and undemocratic. We urge you to do your utmost to defeat this measure. Thanking you, we are

MEMBERS OF UNIT NO. 5, MOTHERS OF AMERICAN SONS, INC.,
MRS. KNOLL, *President.*

ASSOCIATE MACHINISTS AND ENGINEERS,
Minneapolis, Minn., August 5, 1940.

Hon. JOHN G. ALEXANDER,
United States Representative from Minnesota,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We, the undersigned citizens of the United States, residents and voters in the State of Minnesota, earnestly protest against any compulsory draft of men for the United States Army. We also protest against the mobilizing of the National Guard for a 1-year period. We believe that either one or both of these measures would take many desirable and much-needed men from commercial activity and would cripple business.

We wish to call your attention to the fact that skilled mechanics are extremely scarce in this fair land of ours, due to legislation adverse to the proper relationship that should exist between employer and employee, and that no mechanics are being trained for this reason.

To draw from the ranks of such mechanics as the country now has, to fill any quota whatsoever, no matter what the need may be so far as that quota is concerned, is no less than criminal so far as the business of the country is concerned. There are plenty of untrained men with mediocre educations who are perfectly capable of filling the ranks of privates in the United States Army, and were this number of men taken off of the relief and W. P. A. rolls they would be very glad to volunteer. We therefore earnestly request that you use your utmost endeavors to defeat any measure that would call for compulsory draft in the United States Army and mobilization of the National Guard for any period.

Respectfully submitted.

G. W. Olney, 3404 Sixteenth Avenue South; M. O. Brown, 4748 Harriet Avenue; D. H. Garmoe, 2729 Eighteenth Avenue South; E. E. Garden, 4712 Eighteenth Avenue South; H. M. Holmberg, 1843 East Twenty-eighth Street; A. H. Mortensen, 4808 Columbus Avenue; A. E. Blombeg, 3540 Eleventh Avenue South; O. W. Gardin, 4712 Eighteenth Avenue South; E. Erickson, 31 Washington Avenue; George H. Erickson, 2206 East Thirty-fourth Street; Alfred Solie, 3448 Nineteenth Avenue South; Kenneth Solie, 3133 Longfellow Avenue South; Donald Fisk, 3452 Nineteenth Avenue South.

OPERATIVE PLASTERERS AND CEMENT FINISHERS
INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION,
MINNEAPOLIS LOCAL NO. 557,
August 7, 1940.

Hon. JOHN G. ALEXANDER,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: At the meeting of our local, Tuesday, August 6, I was instructed to communicate with you regarding the Burke-Wadsworth conscription bill or any other amendments or bills that may be considered on this question. Our local is strongly opposed to any peacetime conscription in whatever form.

We are firmly convinced that conscription legislation will be a long step toward totalitarian regimentation and will result in dangerously lowering the living standards of over 90 percent of the American people. We also believe that it will seriously result in the undermining of our civil liberties.

As part of your electorate, we urgently request that you militantly oppose all such legislation.

We remain,

Respectfully yours,

CEMENT FINISHERS' LOCAL 557,
By JOHN E. GUSTAFSON,
Vice President.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., *August 7, 1940.*

Mr. JOHN G. ALEXANDER,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ALEXANDER: In spite of the name calling in the Senate and in the press by proponents and advocates of the draft bill against those who oppose it, I urge you to vote against it when it comes up for vote in the House.

It is not a defense measure but has the ulterior motive of a Fascist dictatorship. If the bill was anywhere near fair, it would incorporate these features, which I pass on to you for possible use as amendments to the bill or as a separate bill.

No registration—a call for voluntary service.

Trainees guaranteed that they will not be used as strikebreakers or as storm troopers, nor sent on military expeditions outside of our borders, and steady reemployment at regular wages after a definite period of service, punishable to the employer to the same extent as that proposed for the workers if they fail to register, in the present bill—5 years in prison with no privileges and a $10,000 fine.

Give labor unions defense contracts from the Government with these above guaranties to the workers along with stipulations as to the rate of wages at regular labor pay, hours, and so forth, the same as the manufacturers get in regard to their profits. Why not? It's supposed to be the defense of democracy, then why not be democratic about it? The workers, through unions (guaranteed to exist, both privately and in the defense army), should and must have the right of democratic process in defense besides the right to collective bargaining. Then defense will be voluntary and enthusiastic, otherwise the proponents of the present bill and the administration show intentions of placing everyone in a strait jacket and then selling out to fascism, the same as occurred in France.

My vote at the coming elections will depend upon your attitude toward this bill. I shall keep a watch on how you vote.

Yours sincerely,

GEORGE BEYER.

P. S.—I am of Swedish descent, and a citizen by birth.

[Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, Order of Railway Conductors of America, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, Switchmen's Union of North America]

CLEVELAND, OHIO, *August 1, 1940.*

DEAR SIR: The undersigned chief executives of the organizations representing engineers, firemen, conductors, trainmen, and yardmen employed on the railroads of the United States have this day given consideration to the provisions of the proposed compulsory peacetime draft or conscription bill which contemplates the inducting into the military and naval service of the United States in the immediate future some hundreds of thousands of citizens of this country for a period of training.

We refer to the Burke-Wadsworth bill now before Congress for consideration, and feel that you should be made acquainted with our views, which we are confident reflect the views of the membership of these organizations employed on American railroads.

We are in general agreement with the prevailing sentiment in the United States that every support should be given to adequate measures necessary to the protection of our democratic institutions against attack from the force of dictatorship, both within and without our country. However, grave doubt exists in many quarters with respect to the wisdom of enacting a peacetime conscription bill when it is believed other adequate measures are available. Such proposal borders closely on the principle of dictatorship, and we hold the view that regimenting our people is un-American and unnecessary.

Patriotism is not the monopoly of those who are feverishly urging this conscription bill. We may rightly assume that all citizens are patriotic, and, if given the opportunity and impressed with the necessity for their doing so, they will volunteer their services in defense of our country.

At present there is a vast army of unemployed, thousands of whom would be desirous of enlisting in the military and naval service if given an opportunity to do so, but they are so circumscribed by technical military and naval physical requirements that many of them are precluded from voluntary enlistment. Consideration should be given to assisting them in removing minor physical defects so that they may be acceptable as volunteers.

Compulsory military service in time of peace is the very antithesis of freedom. It involves an infringement on the very principles of democracy which it is invoked to defend. It imposes upon the individual a mandate to give service which he may not be in position to render without serious sacrifices on the part of himself or his family or both, and this at a time when there are thousands of other individuals who would be glad to avail themselves of the opportunity to serve if such opportunity were not denied by the restrictive rules observed by the recruiting service.

The youth of our country who are inducted into the military and naval services under the principle of conscription and who are made to serve will quite naturally acquire the viewpoint that forceful means should be adopted in all the affairs of life as an avenue to achieve desired ends.

While you are giving thought to the Burke-Wadsworth bill let not the hysteria of the moment sweep you into supporting such a drastic and ill-advised change in the American way of life. Democracy means that the state exists to serve the individual. The program at present contemplated will cause hundreds of thousands of our youth to become "war-minded" and will, if carried out, establish the fabric of a giant war machine which experience teaches us cannot and will not be permitted to rust in peace. "War games" inevitably lead to war. The voluntary enlistment principle confines and restricts the dissemination of "war-mindedness" to actual necessities through the longer term of service, and above all preserves the principle of democracy in its strictest sense.

These organizations are wholeheartedly in accord with the establishment and maintenance of an adequate national defense and their membership will not be found wanting in any support of such proper measures, but we are convinced that under present conditions the regimenting of our people according to the contemplated military pattern is unnecessary and is an infringement upon the civil liberties which they may reasonably expect to enjoy.

We trust that your committee will not favorably report the Burke-Wadsworth military-conscription bill.

Respectfully yours,

A. JOHNSTON,
Grand Chief Engineer, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers.

J. A. PHILLIPS,
President, Order of Railway Conductors of America.

D. B. ROBERTSON,
President, Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen.

A. F. WHITNEY,
President, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.

T. C. CASHEN,
President, Switchmen's Union of North America.

What They Say About Poll Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEE E. GEYER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 13, 1940

EDITORIALS FROM THE NASHVILLE TENNESSEAN AND KNOXVILLE JOURNAL

Mr. GEYER of California. Mr. Speaker, there are those who would have us believe there is no sentiment for the repeal of the poll tax in the eight Southern States that still retain it as a prerequisite for voting.

Recently the local papers carried the news item that the Young Democrats of Tennessee had gone on record as advocating the repeal of this tax.

Under leave to extend my remarks I insert three editorials, two from the Nashville (Tenn.) Tennessean and one from the Knoxville (Tenn.) Journal:

[From the Nashville (Tenn.) Tennessean of August 8, 1940]

THE FIGHT ON ANOTHER FRONT

Congressman GEYER of California has a Federal anti-poll-tax law in suspense. It is in suspense because it is in committee, where it is being subjected to the same sort of committee veto several important T. V. A. bills have undergone. In other words, the House Judiciary Committee, which has had the bill for months, will not permit it to be voted on by Congress.

The Geyer bill makes it unlawful "to require the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite for voting or registering to vote, at any election for a President or Vice President or Presidential elector or Senator or Member of the House of Representatives of the United States."

It is a good bill and deserves national support. We in the South know better than any others the nature and extent of the evil at which it is aimed. Mr. GEYER now is seeking to extract the bill from the Judiciary Committee's pocket by petition.

On this petition we should see the names of Congressmen BYRNS, COURTNEY, PEARSON, DAVIS, KEFAUVER, JENNINGS, GORE, COOPER, and REECE of Tennessee.

Because Tennessee is one of the eight States in which regularly a majority of the people of voting age are disfranchised by the poll tax.

Kill the poll tax.

[From the Nashville (Tenn.) Tennessean of August 4, 1940]

REPEAL THE POLL TAX

Davidson County has a population of 257,000. It has well over 100,000 citizens of voting age.

In Thursday's election approximately 18,000 persons voted in Davidson County.

The new census will reveal the population of Tennessee at or very near the 3,000,000 mark. This means there are over 1,200,000 Tennesseans of voting age.

In Thursday's election the total vote cast in Tennessee failed to exceed 275,000.

We face the harsh fact that the great majority of the people of Tennessee do not vote and have not voted for generations. We face the certain knowledge that Tennesseans do not vote because of the poll tax. Thus effectively the greater number of our people are disfranchised.

This is not popular rule. This is not democracy. This is not tolerable.

Today the Tennessean writes repeal of the poll tax in our masthead, and a word of explanation about that. We mean outright obliteration of the law which imposes the poll tax, section 1082 of the Tennessee Code. We pledge the people of Tennessee this demand shall not come down from our masthead till the people of Tennessee are enfranchised, till they again shall be free to try democracy.

This will be a fight. We state that anticipation fully aware that both the Democratic and Republican Parties in our State have declared against the poll tax, and that at least a majority of the candidates nominated for representative office in Thursday's election have expressed themselves against the poll tax one way or another.

It will be a fight because some of these promises are weasel-worded, because some are given with tongue in cheek, and because the political machines from one end of the State to the other are not going to permit the repeal of the poll tax if they can prevent it.

We take up this fight gladly because it is right. The people of this State know it is right and will join with us. Governor Cooper has advocated action against the poll tax and the people of this State will expect him to act accordingly.

The fight will be won in whatever time it takes.

Then to the people of Tennessee the Bill of Rights will mean what it says. Then we shall have popular rule in fact. Then we shall escape from under the sort of oligarchy which so long has been masquerading here as "self-government."

You will hear contentions against the position we bind ourselves to: the same old shopworn arguments.

You will be told the poll tax is imposed by the State constitution. That is not true.

You will be told the poll tax can be removed as a "prerequisite to voting" but retained as a tax.

That is not true.

You will be told repeal of the poll tax will increase the Negro vote.

That is true—also true that it will even more greatly increase the white vote. As it is, the political machines of our metropolitan centers regularly qualify and vote as many Negro citizens as they can, which is many indeed. Also the Constitution of the United States guarantees equality of franchise and the laws of our State draw no distinction between voters save by the $2 qualification—the poll tax. This qualification disqualifies any citizen, white or black, who cannot or does not meet it.

You will be told repeal of the poll tax will increase the vote of the "riffraff."

This is but to say the vote of the common people—and who among us is the holier-than-thou who is to say of one citizen, "He is worthy" and to another citizen, "You cannot vote"? Who will arrogate to himself the power to discern among all the people only the rich, the wise, and the good?

You will be told that repeal of the poll tax will diminish school funds.

That is utterly misleading. School funds will be appropriated. Poll-tax revenues currently provide less than 3 percent of our school funds. In any case, it is idiotic to use for the preparation of our children to be good citizens the proceeds of a tax which itself deprives them of exercise of the highest privilege of citizenship—the franchise.

You will be told that the poll tax should be kept in order that "all will share the tax burden."

This is pure casuistry. Everybody shares the tax burden in a hundred direct and hidden ways—in rent, in the purchase of clothes and food; even those who now pay no poll tax, who are in the great majority.

These above are the old favorites. You may be given other "reasons" why the poll tax should be retained. We shall be delighted to examine such presentments when and as they come.

In our opinion, it is no good any longer for our State to preen itself as a democracy, when so plainly it is something else. We shall get nowhere with such palpable pretense. We cannot be honest, we cannot salve our souls, with further self-delusion.

Only eight States keep the poll tax, ours being one. In all of these States the majority of the people is disfranchised. In States adjoining us, with populations equal to or smaller than our own, but with no poll tax, from 3 to 10 times more of the people exercise the right of franchise than in the poll-tax States.

Thursday's total vote in this county, in this State, was a disgrace. The proportion of voters to the disfranchised in this county and State has been a disgrace for at least seven decades.

Let us now end this disgrace, this sham, this intolerable thing. Let us now have to our social use and individual political profit that right of franchise which, as the cardinal democratic principle, we so long have cherished.

[From the Knoxville (Tenn.) Journal of August 4, 1940]

SIXTY THOUSAND PHONEY VOTES CONTROL OUR ELECTIONS

By a process which we hope is related to deduction it may be noted by the thoughtful reader that 2 percent of the citizenship of Tennessee—and that 2 percent's will completely subject to that of one man by the name of Crump—completely controls the destiny of Tennesssee, makes its laws, and administers them.

This conclusion may be arrived at as follows: The census just completed shows a population for Tennessee of approximately 3,000,000. State-wide government in the State is ordinarily in the hands of the Democratic Party, which votes usually about 450,000. This small segment of the population in turn is controlled by Mr. E. H. Crump's automatic vote count of from sixty to seventy-five thousand, so that in the last analysis Mr. C. runs the State to his complete satisfaction by vest-pocket control of 2 percent of the population.

This short lesson in democratic processes and their abuse is adequate to indicate to the most casual student of politics why Mr. Crump declined flatly to allow Gov. Prentice Cooper, nominated for reelection Thursday, to go through with his campaign pledge to remove the poll tax as a prerequisite for voting.

Whereas it is a comparatively easy matter for a man of Mr. Crump's long practice to manipulate the present Democratic vote, that is little more than 15 percent of the total population, the difficulties of this process would be tremendously increased by abolishment of poll-tax requirements.

It should be repeated here now, as has been pointed out before, that while statisticians reckon that in the eight States which still

hold to the poll-tax requirement, without exception to percentage of the population that votes is less than in those without it.

It is figured that Tennessee votes 33 percent of its population, as compared with our sister States of Kentucky and West Virginia, which without a poll-tax requirement vote 64 percent and 92 percent, respectively.

Address to Oregon Democrats Assembled at Hood River, Oreg., August 4, 1940

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER M. PIERCE

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 13, 1940

ADDRESS WRITTEN BY HON. WALTER M. PIERCE, OF OREGON, AND READ BY C. J. SHORB

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address written by me and read before a Democratic picnic at Hood River, Oreg., on August 4, 1940.

My title harks back to an admonition sent in a message in the early days of Christianity; the rest of the words will immediately occur to those familiar with Paul's epistles. "Whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are honest * * * whatsoever things are of good report; if there be any virtue, and if there be any praise think on these things." This has been my objective in the message to my far-away constituents whom I cannot visit because duty holds me here in attendance on the sessions of Congress. It has always been a joy to me to share my experiences with groups of friends who have listened to my addresses for nearly half a century. I try to give them the facts so they may form their own judgments, as all citizens should do.

I wish to express my appreciation for this very kind invitation from the Young Democrats of Hood River county. The delivery of the keynote speech for this Democratic picnic is of great importance. I deeply regret that official duties in the National Capital make it necessary for me to remain here. Out in the quiet and peace of the mountains of Oregon it is hard for people to realize that civilization is burning up. The lights of liberty and freedom which have burned brightly all over the continent of Europe are being blacked out, one by one, probably never to be relighted in our time. It is my firm conviction that Congress should remain in session till the dark war clouds have passed away. An emergency may arise any day which would demand the immediate attention of the legislative branch of our Government, which causes my enforced absence from the meeting and deprives me of the pleasure of greeting my Oregon friends

Thinking of the world situation as I write this greeting, I feel that we should give thanks for our blessings, just as such thanks are given by families assembled around bountiful dining tables. This is the only country in the world in which people could gather for such a meeting. You are relatively carefree. I speak, and others will speak, about public affairs. We are thankful that we are enjoying the blessings of liberty, our most precious yet most dangerous possession.

A hundred years from now, a thousand years from now, men may look to this day and this era as the most epoch-making turning point in the history of the world. We citizens of this great democracy are now called upon to devote to public problems all our intelligence and our most earnest thought. We who meet here today are those sympathetic with the principles of a great political party which has strengthened our democracy during the past 8 years. Our program for economic welfare will ever appear as the beacon light of this era. We may well take pride in it. There is no man here who would go back to those days when this Republic allowed child labor, when the workingman was without the protection of wage and hour laws, when the lot of the unemployed, the children, the cripples, the "have nots" was not the concern of the Government. Who would turn back to the days when each farmer stood by himself, alone against the world, when banks were unsafe? The historian who surveys this era will grant that we of the Democratic Party are justified in our pride in having been foremost in advancing the line in the long battle for human rights.

There are a few outstanding dates which mark significant turning points in the history of mankind. The most important date of all is when the Saviour was born, bringing into the world the idea of brotherly love, kindness, and charity. We date our calendar from His birth. Another date was when the Roman capital was moved from the Tiber to the Bosphorus, in A. D. 476. That marked the beginning of the Dark Ages. For a thousand years learning and knowledge previously acquired disappeared under the iron heel of cruel tyrants. In A. D. 1066 William the Conqueror crossed the English Channel and won the Battle of Hastings, blending Saxon and Norman. This marked the commencement of a great people, who, for nearly a thousand years, have led the civilized world. In 1776 was born in the United States the idea that the governed were capable of governing themselves through their representatives—the American idea. It now appears that 1940 will mark the close of another era that may drive civilized man into a period similar to the Dark Ages.

We are witnessing the development and actual use of the greatest, most effective, most heartless, most inhuman war machine that the genius of man has ever been able to devise. This war machine of which I speak seems to be moving toward the conquest of the world. We are being told by Hitler that liberty is a myth, that independence shows weakness, and obedience is held up as the ultimate goal. He tells us that freedom is a mark of inferiority and incompetence, and that independence is a lack of equality. The individual is nothing; the state is everything. This is totally contrary to all we have held dear in America. We have no desire to become a militaristic nation, nor to train ourselves in the arts of war. World conditions, however, compel a rightabout-face. We are forced to consider defense of our shores and of rights to trade and commerce. Hitler cannot be turned aside by soft words. Read his Mein Kampf. You will clearly see that he aims at world domination. He recognizes only one method for the attainment of that goal—force.

We cannot understand why 300,000,000 people living in Europe have sacrificed their liberties for the hope of bread. Surely they must have forgotten the words of Patrick Henry, who said: "Is peace so dear and life so sweet as to be purchased at the price of chains and slavery? Forbid it, Almighty God! I know not what course others may take, but as for me, give me liberty or give me death!" Liberty is never easily won nor securely held. As we plan for the future let us firmly resolve to maintain our democratic processes and institutions.

I was in Washington, D. C., as your Congressman when President Roosevelt took his oath of office on March 4, 1933. No one who participated in that great occasion can ever forget the tense atmosphere under which he accepted the responsibility of the Presidency. There wasn't a solvent bank in all the land. Few manufacturing plants had the money to meet the next pay roll. Wheat was 25 cents a bushel; corn, 15 cents; no market at all for apples, and there were millions of people out of work, food, and shelter. The capitalistic system under which we had lived seemed wrecked. The first bill presented to the Congress at the special session was in regard to reopening the banks, which had been closed by Executive order. They were reopened in such a manner that they have remained open. We may justly claim the credit for the happy change. Let us turn to the matters uppermost in men's minds today and review the situation. I have gone into these matters fully and most earnestly in my speech of July 25th, which I will send to all who register today.

DEFENSE

Secretary Hull has just secured certain agreements among nations on this hemisphere. The national-defense program is moving along with real efficiency. The President has selected advisors of known competence. These men are great industrialists who are sacrificing time and high salaries to the cause. They have been chosen because of ability and not for personal or political reasons. The Congress led the way and has cooperated with appropriations, authorizations, and legislation. The work is moving as rapidly as possible, considering the necessity for the establishment of newly equipped industries, requiring different machine tools, transformation of existing plants, and the building of great new plants. We have entered into a long-time program which we must be allowed to carry through. The President has always been ahead of the people and the Congress in the matter. Now, they are in accord with him.

BONNEVILLE AND THE PUBLIC-POWER PROGRAM

Meeting here on the shores of this wide lake created by Bonneville Dam, you realize what the public-works program has meant, and will mean, to the future of America. That dam, 25 miles to the west of us, which backs the Columbia River 25 miles to the east of us, can develop a half-million kilowatts of electric power, as much as is now being developed on the American side at Niagara. Three hundred miles further up the Columbia, an enormous block of concrete has been set solidly into the river bed. Think of the homes which will be built upon the million and a half irrigated acres along the banks of this great river. New settlers will know whose vision it was that made possible such utilization of these great natural resources. But for the wisdom and courage of our President, these waters would still be running idly to the sea, benefiting few, even for navigation. Ports have been brought inland, homes have been built. The community of Cascade Locks in this very county has given to the Nation an example of public ownership which should encourage other communities to utilize the current caught in the Bonneville generating plant. The President's opponent made his own record before a Congressional Committee when he justified control of power by great monopolies in giant holding companies, piled one upon the other. What would he do with Bonneville power? Think of that and gird yourselves for the campaign, my friends.

Secretary Wallace, our Vice Presidential candidate, has been recognized as a sort of a second Lincoln. One of the characteristic

stories told of him is his reply to a question about the holding-company magnate who aspires to gain control of the Government. Wallace looked out the train window to the fields and called attention to a weed, "See that yellow plant growing over the other plants in that field," he said. "That's dodder, a parasite that lives on other plants. Hasn't any roots in the ground. Something like utility-holding companies."

AGRICULTURE

What has the New Deal done for agriculture? It has stabilized it. It has, for the first time in our history, worked out an agricultural program for the whole Nation. We began back in 1933 when we passed the original Triple A Act, which gave agriculture its first real innings in this country. Because of the processing tax, the courts threw it out. It was reenacted as the Soil Conservation Act, which will never be thrown out and which will stand as long as American agriculture endures. It will help us to solve the tremendous problems which we must face during and after the present World War. Hitler is going to tell the other nations what he will allow his European states to buy and what he will demand in return for trade. What would happen to the American farmer without a world market for his surplus if it were not for the plans made by this administration? We need all the strength and vision of our wise Secretary to keep American farmers from peasantry in the future. It is true our opponents have adopted a farm program suggested by an ex-New Deal malcontent who "walked out" because he was not allowed to rule—so he decided to ruin. It is not a practical working program, except where it backs up and endorses our farm measures.

Think of the fruit industry of this valley without marketing agreements, without the surplus commodity program. It is not perfect, but there would be no bottom at all if this program were not under it. Think of the wheat farmers in this whole rich section practically guaranteed a price for their golden grain. Has agriculture gained, under the New Deal, something which it will be determined to hold? Will farmers trust the guidance in the difficult days ahead of those who refused them aid clear up to 1933, or will they prefer to march with those legions that fought the real battle which gained the victory?

SECRETARY WALLACE

While we are summarizing the gains of farmers during the past 8 years, let us consider for a moment the man largely responsible for this epoch-making program. With Wallace, the Democrats have a real ticket, a ticket on which are two men fully equipped by experience and knowledge to be President and Vice President of the United States. Mr. Wallace is a deep and steady man; he and his forbears have been devoted to the cause of agriculture. All have been great citizens of the finest American traditions. Could any one ask for a better running mate than Henry A. Wallace? For 7 years he has been at the right hand of the President. Secretary Wallace has led the way for agriculture by which it has climbed from the low depths of near-peasantry in 1933 to the present half-bright day we now enjoy. As a member of the House Committee on Agriculture I have worked with the Secretary. I know him well, and I am inspired by his place on our ticket.

THE CIVILIAN CONSERVATION CORPS

The creation of the Civilian Conservation Corps has probably been the most inspired single act of the Roosevelt administration. More than 2,000,000 young men have been enrolled in this great conservation program. It has cost the taxpayers more than $2,000,000,000, but never was money better spent. Idle boys without jobs and learning the roads to crime have been gathered up, taught to work, kept busy and interested, and have been fired with ambition through the life and training of the C. C. C. This method of handling unemployed youth was an inspiration and it surely will become a permanent institution for the strengthening of boys' minds and characters.

FOR MEN MUST WORK

The Government of the United States, which represents the institutions under which men live, must so legislate and so administer the laws that all men can have the chance to use their labors for the support of their families and the satisfaction of their ambitions. More beneficial legislation to this end has been enacted during the past 7 years than has ever been passed in any similar period of time by any legislative body on earth. It is a record unparalleled. It was begun under the clouds of a dark era, and it has been conducted during a great economic revolution accompanied by world-wide wars which have thrown economic and political systems into the discard. We have attempted to expand a work program under Government control in order to take up the slack. The public-works program has led the way, resulting in useful and beautiful structures throughout the land. The W. P. A. has had hard sledding, but no one in public life has been able to suggest an adequate substitute. Our party has insisted that the program should stand and be judged on its original purposes rather than by its few minor weaknesses. Who is it that has cried out against the equality and rights of man and would create a lower dependent class in this democracy?

The demand for turning relief back to the States, where it would perish, has come from the very men who would control politically if the other party were to come into power. We place men first, money second, and yet the credit of our Government was never stronger.

No group of workers has benefited more largely in 8 years than have the railroad workers who are now protected behind the ramparts of the Railroad Retirement and the Unemployment Insurance Acts.

THE NEEDS OF OLD AGE

Every working person, man or woman, now has, under the Social Security Act, an opportunity to go into partnership with the Government in order to provide security for old age. The Social Security Act is but the beginning of a great humanitarian program; is an act for the defense of those who are coming into old age during this generation. There must be immediate and further legislation for the security of the aged, who are the most pathetic victims of our sudden economic revolution.

One reason there are now so many tragic cases of want in old age is that, until this administration came into being, the beasts of the financial jungle preyed upon innocent and trusting investors. Oh, how they resented our Securities and Exchange Commission. How quickly they would tear it asunder if the New Deal were not here to protect it. In one county in Oregon a half-million dollars of savings was taken by the utility holding companies. This could never have happened under the present law. The apologist for monopoly who aspires to lead our Nation has been the shining light of that dangerous group.

PARTY LOYALTY

Party loyalty will not be difficult for Democrats during this coming campaign. We are led by a man who has sacrificed his personal desires and agreed to continue to bear the burden because he believes he should play his part as a citizen in these most perilous days.

The third-term discussion will come into the campaign, but it should not move reasoning people now because there are more important issues. Washington spoke wisely when he said:

"There is no reason why a man serving as Chief Executive should not continue more than two terms. An emergency may arise that would make it necessary."

Washington retired at the close of his second term because of his intense desire to return to plantation life. There was no emergency. Our people and all the nations of the world know who is the strong man of America today. Who could with more wisdom gained from wider experience better lead us in the present emergency?

THE DESERTERS

Some who have claimed to be Democrats have bolted, walked out, proving that they are turncoats who cannot be depended upon for loyalty when they cannot rule. Some of us who suffered in previous campaigns because of our loyalty to those very men now resent their desertion, but we realize they are not strong enough to bear the strain of the times.

THE CAMPAIGN

We may expect in this campaign that our ticket will be vigorously opposed by 90 percent of the press as measured in circulation. Among our opponents will be found the great utility leaders, and their money bags will be open. The various monopolies which have writhed under the demand they deal honestly and fairly with the people will not be on our side. The Fascists, who always scorn democracy, will know where to align themselves. There will be powerful opposition.

Arrayed against this mighty host will be the common, average citizens of this country, the men who never demand special privilege, but just ask the opportunity to live simply and happily and safely in a land which is a democracy.

If a class struggle develops in this country between the haves and have-nots, it will be forced by those unwilling to share. They demand that the Government itself be made into a monopoly for their own special privilege. When a nomination is forced by an advertising campaign, assisted by an advertising firm which manufactures public opinion through polls, we may expect a tremendous wave of propaganda. We must steel ourselves against this storm of so-called public opinion. I have analyzed and exposed the methods used. They will be adroit and subtle. If they become too abusive we can follow the example of the little red-haired pop vendor at the Chicago convention. When a woman in the gallery began making insulting remarks about Mrs. Roosevelt he forgot business, and, shaking his fist at her, said, "You just shut up."

I predict a more sweeping victory in 1940 for our candidates than we enjoyed in 1936. Thankful we should be that we have leaders of such standing and character. This age is the most fearful, the most threatening, the most interesting of all time. It is indeed:

"A grand and fearful age,
An age on ages telling;
To be simply living
Is sublime."

The Power To Coin and Regulate Money

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAMPTON P. FULMER

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 13, 1940

LETTER FROM DR. LOUIS LONG

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting a letter just received from Dr. L. Long,

Columbia, S. C., which should prove to be very interesting and informative, especially to a number of Congressmen here who have been specializing along the line suggested by Dr. Long.

As stated yesterday in my address before the House, because of the serious problems confronting this country, on account of the dreadful war in Europe, it is well that we give deep, conscientious thought to many suggestions coming from our constituents with the hope that we may be able not only to serve the best interests of our people but to ward off any serious depression, which would naturally lower the standard of our living, with the hope that we may be able to bring about normal prosperity and happiness to our people.

COLUMBIA, S. C., *August 10, 1940.*

Hon. H. P. FULMER, M. C.,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. FULMER: Your letter of August 6 is much appreciated, and I shall remember that you have stayed at your post in Washington to watch proceedings in the interest of your constituents and of our country, when you could have gone home. I thank you for myself, my wife, and others.

There is one fundamental thing for the welfare and security of our country which I wish that Congress could be persuaded to do. That thing appears to me as the only thing that would liberate our country from the ruinous policy of piling up billions of public debt and the inevitable increase in taxes both direct and indirect which the people will find very difficult to pay. This policy, moreover, puts our Government at the mercy of big money lenders.

It is our desire to see our Congress reclaim and use the power given it wisely by the fathers of our country in article I, section 8, clause 5, of our noble American Constitution: "Congress shall have the power to coin (issue) money and regulate the power thereof." For 160 years this clause has been impardonably ignored by our own Congressmen. We are displeased with the work of the Senators, past and present, who have unfaithfully delegated their constitutional powers to other persons or institutions, and particularly at the present time those Senators and Congressmen who have delegated precious, holy congressional powers to one man.

There are few people left who are really free, and free from debt. Most everybody is caught in the world-wide interest-grinding mill. And our own Government (who had the power to issue money, interest-free, and to regulate the value thereof) is compelled to borrow money from, and pay tribute to, the financial powers that be.

Before the Revolution there was a time of great colonial prosperity. Benjamin Franklin was asked to tell the secret of that prosperity. He answered: "Because our Colonies have the power to issue and to control their own money," or words to that effect. Later, England, pressed by the founders of the great Rothschild banks, forbade the American Colonies from issuing their own money. A great depression followed, and the present banking system was established in America. The slogan, "No taxation without representation" is only part of the truth. The full truth is or was the deprivation or loss of the "power to issue money of their own and to regulate the value thereof." Benjamin Franklin admitted that "Had England not deprived the Colonies of their right to issue their own money, they would have been willing to pay the tax on tea." Then history would be quite different. We would not have from eight to twelve millions of unemployed, the banks would not be full of idle money, Uncle Sam would not need to ask big financiers to lend him money at interest, and we would not have $49,000,000,000 of public debt (to whom?).

We very deeply appreciate the statement of your letter which shows that you do not allow propaganda for war to bias your judgment. That is fine. You say that you throw to the waste-paper basket as soon as it comes all propaganda papers. We admit that there is a great deal too much to do for Representatives who wish to do their work well, conscientiously. Yet, it is sometimes well to find out the reasons and motives of the opponents.

As a doctor, I come in contact with so much poverty in everything that I have come to the conclusion that all the proposed expenditures by the Administration will only intensify the terrible distress and deterioration of a large portion of the population.

I sent you a paper emphasizing the vast importance of a national money system according to our Constitution, which will prevent hoarding and promote Nation-wide activity. I hope you have given your attention to this. True Americans do not want Government doles, charity, nor W. P. A. debasing work. We want a Congress-ruled administration.

Rest assured, dear Mr. FULMER, that there are still many stout American hearts who appreciate to the fullest extent the work of those Representatives who uphold the letter and spirit of our Constitution. Alas, it is true also that noise in the press and otherwise is apt to drown the voice of the faithful constitutional citizens.

We pray that you may be sustained in every way in your witnessing and working for the welfare of this State and of the whole Nation.

Very truly yours,

DR. LOUIS LONG.

Outline for a Discussion of the True Nature of the Process Going on in Europe and Asia; and the Relationship of the Western Hemisphere Toward It

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN L. SWEENEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 13, 1940

ARTICLE BY COL. ASHBY WILLIAMS

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include an article prepared by Col. Ashby Williams, Esq., a distinguished member of the bar of the District of Columbia.

It is my opinion that after reading this contribution by Colonel Williams much of the fog and hysteria created by the warmongers will disappear. If sane reason functioned a proper approach to our national security could calmly and dispassionately be discussed. The necessary expansion of territory for certain nations in Europe and Asia is undoubtedly a problem that concerns their hemisphere and not this Western Continent.

OUTLINE FOR A DISCUSSION OF THE TRUE NATURE OF THE PROCESS GOING ON IN EUROPE AND ASIA, AND THE RELATIONSHIP OF THE WESTERN HEMISPHERE TOWARD IT

1. The process going on in Europe is essentially one designed to bring about a new distribution of land as a means of livelihood.

2. The same process is also going on in east Asia.

3. Whenever the land on which a people live is no longer sufficient to support them they must either (1) migrate to other lands, or (2) import raw materials to be manufactured and exported to other lands in exchange for other raw materials, or (3) they must acquire other lands, or (4) they must die.

4. Both Germany and Italy have more people than their land will support, and since they have no foreign exchange with which to purchase raw materials, they have chosen the method of acquiring more land in order to support their people.

5. The adjustments necessitated by overpopulation are usually accomplished by the gradual process of evolution, but that has been impossible in the case of Germany and Italy because of a single obstacle to their acquisition of more land.

6. The single obstacle to the evolutionary process by which Germany and Italy would normally have acquired more land in order to support their people is imperial England with her far-flung possessions.

7. England, because of her imperial interests, by opposing the acquisition of more land by Germany and Italy, has converted what would otherwise have been a process of evolution into a revolution, and hence the present world upheavel is of English origin.

8. Nazi-ism and fascism are not ideologies because there are no ideologies in government, but merely forms of political organization. They are forms in which the individual has a minimum of rights and the state a maximum of power. These and similar forms of political organization are born exclusively of the necessities of the state, and were developed in Germany and Italy only in order to more effectively overcome the opposition to their acquisition of land necessary to support them.

9. But for imperial England nazi-ism and fascism would probably not have been necessary in order to enable Germany and Italy to acquire more land. Whether, and to what extent, nazi-ism and fascism would have developed in Germany and Italy in order to enable those states to meet their internal problems is a matter of no concern to us.

10. When Germany and Italy shall have acquired, either through evolution or revolution, the land necessary to support their people, and shall have satisfactorily adjusted their internal affairs in such a way as to make the exercise of extraordinary power on the part of the government no longer necessary, then nazi-ism and fascism will be supplanted by some form of political organization in which the individual will have more rights and the government will have less power.

11. There is no overpopulation of any one of the states in the Western Hemisphere, and consequently there is no state on this hemisphere engaged, either through evolution or revolution, in acquiring more land.

12. Since a form of political organization, with particular reference to the distribution of rights and powers as between the individual and the government, is determined exclusively by the

necessities of the people embraced within the political organization, it follows that the nazi-ism of Germany and the fascism of Italy to the extent that these forms were created in order to enable those governments to acquire more land, can never be transferred to this continent.

13. Nazi-ism and fascism, or a similar form of political organization, will not arise in this country unless such form is necessary to solve our domestic problem of the distribution of land and other wealth between the citizens of this country.

14. The proper adjustment of peoples to lands throughout the world is a matter governed by natural evolution. It is an inevitable process. Obstacles may arise in the path of this evolutionary process, such as the English Empire, and turn evolution into revolution, but since the adjustment of peoples to lands is a natural process it is inevitable, and any revolution superinduced by obstacles in the path of evolution must ultimately be successful, no matter how often it may be retarded.

15. The only argument used by those who contend that Germany will be a threat to this continent if successful in Europe is that she conquered Holland, Belgium, and France. This argument is unsound, because all three of these countries have a density of population in excess of that which the country will support, and Germany did not also acquire their colonies. Holland, Belgium, and France, without their colonies, are in the same position as Germany, and it is obvious that Germany did not overrun these countries except for the purpose of enabling her to reach her real enemy, England.

16. The evolutionary (or revolutionary) process will continue until Germany and Italy have acquired the lands necessary to support their people. If they succeed in acquiring these lands in the Eastern Hemisphere, then the process designed to that end will cease to operate, and the Western Hemisphere will be free from possible attack. Only if the process of evolution (or revolution) fails to secure these needed lands in the Eastern Hemisphere will the Western Hemisphere be in danger.

17. Parallel with the process involving the adjustment of peoples to lands is the evolutionary process—greatly accelerated in recent years by improved methods of transportation and intercommunication—of regrouping all peoples and lands of the world into economic and cultural world units. This process is also inevitable, no matter what the obstacles in the path of its development.

18. Assuming that the Netherlands and French possessions—which are located in opposition to the foregoing principle—are now adrift and will ultimately be drawn into the orbit of their respective economic centers, the only remaining obstacle to the readjustment of the world into such economic units is England with her "possessions" protruding into every economic center in the world.

Assuming the foregoing estimate of the present world situation to be correct, what is the proper attitude of the United States, and what may be expected from the performance by it of its true function?

The duty of the United States is:

(1) To remain strictly neutral in regard to the evolutionary (or revolutionary) process going on in Europe and Asia, whose purpose is to secure more land for the people of Germany, Italy, and Japan, with the expectation that they will acquire such lands in Europe, Africa, and Asia.

(2) In respect to the evolutionary process designed to regroup all countries of the world into economic and cultural units, the United States should refrain from assisting, or should help to destroy, the English Empire, whose "possessions" stick into every economic group of the world and retard the regrouping essential to world harmony and economy, and should for the same reason itself withdraw from intrusion into any other economic and cultural center of the world.

(3) To further contribute toward the regrouping of the world by endeavoring to bring about an economic group consisting of the United States, Canada, and the islands adjacent to them.

(4) To encourage the infiltration into South America of those peoples of Europe who are most closely related to us by blood and culture, with a view to the economic and cultural solidarity of the Western Hemisphere.

(5) If the estimate of the situation herein stated is correct, then there is no apprehension of military invasion by any European power; our Navy should be ultimately adequate to independently protect, against alien attack, the entire Western Hemisphere, and our Army should be a small one highly trained and thoroughly equipped.

What may be expected is as follows:

The world divided into economic units, all small nations existing within the orbit and under the protection of their nearest great center; such great economic centers being composed, as far as possible, of peoples of the same races and culture, the United States being one of the economic and cultural centers composed of the United States, Canada, and the islands adjacent thereto, and ultimately South America; these great world groups, being groups composed of culturally and geographically related peoples will naturally and automatically be recognized as supreme within their respective spheres, thus affording the prospect of a long period of world peace and prosperity; amongst such great groups of people will be a Western Hemisphere of cultural and economic solidarity, at peace with all its world friends, and impregnable to all its world enemies, if it should then have any.

The Sources of Our Religious Liberty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. FLANNAGAN, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 13, 1940

ARTICLE BY REV. ROY EARLY

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein an article by my good friend, Rev. Roy Early, pastor of the Reynolds Memorial Church, Bristol, Va., on the sources of our religious liberty. Reverend Early is one of our outstanding ministers, a deep student, and I am sure the article will be of interest to a great many people:

THE SOURCES OF OUR RELIGIOUS LIBERTY

Texts:

"At a great price obtained I this freedom; but Paul said, I was free born."—Acts 22: ii.

I. INTRODUCTION

There is no more important issue in the world today than that of the relation of religion to the state. We have generally assumed in America that the problem of the relationship of the church and state has for us been solved and even in the face of what has been going on in recent years in other countries of the world most Americans are more or less unconcerned about it, at least as far as it affects us.

We were the first Nation in the world to achieve complete religious liberty. And perhaps the greatest contribution we have made, both in the realm of politics as well as in the realm of organized religion, is the achievement of that relationship between church and state which gives to the individual's conscience complete liberty, and to the church assurance of noninterference from the state.

My purpose is to describe those influences which were chiefly responsible for giving to the American people this great boon—religious liberty.

1. At the time of the establishment of the American Colonies there was no country in the world without a state church. Religious uniformity was considered necessary in order to assure the safety of the state. Unity of worship was thought indispensable for the achievement of national unity. This was true of both Protestant as well as Catholic nations. There is a mistaken notion that the reformation brought in religious liberty; that the reformers were advocates of complete tolerance of others. But nothing can be further from the truth. The reformation resulted in the establishment of numerous national Protestant churches, as in England, Scotland, Holland, and in the German and Scandinavian states. And these national churches were generally speaking as intolerant of Roman Catholicism as Roman Catholicism was intolerant of them. We must not forget the terrible code of anti-Catholic laws which were passed during the reigns of Queen Elizabeth and King James the First in England, just as completely as Queen Mary Tudor—we are accustomed to call her Bloody Mary—outlawed Protestants during her reign.

We Protestants must not forget that Protestants have been persecutors as well as the Roman Catholics, persecutions of Protestants by Protestants here in America.

II. WHERE DID RELIGIOUS LIBERTY COME FROM?

Where did the conception of the complete separation of church and state originate? Religious liberty is a relatively recent principle among civilized states.

1. Besides the established state churches which arose out of the Reformation, there arose a number of small sects. In Germany they were generally classified together and called the Ana-Baptists, or those people who held that infant baptism was unscriptural and therefore advocated the necessity of baptizing again when the person reached the age of discretion. They not only advocated rebaptizing but they attempted to establish religious organizations modeled after the early church. They advocated doing away with all the forms and practices which had grown up through the centuries, and they desired to restore the simplicity of both the worship and organization of the Christian church of the first three centuries.

Now, we know that the church during the first three centuries had no relation to the state. In fact, the early church or Christian actually had no legal status until after the Council of Nicea (A. D. 325). Therefore these small sects all stood for complete separation from the state, just as the early Christians stood apart from the state.

It is an interesting fact that the great principles of complete separation of church and state and complete religious liberty have

been principally advocated by the small sect and never by the great strong church throughout the Christian centuries.

The English Baptists, a small and despised sect, took over the principles of Ana-Baptists of the Continent and advocated as their first great principle the complete separation of church and state. And be it said for the Baptists, they have never surrendered this their first and greatest principle.

2. A second source of the principle of complete religious liberty came from the seventeenth and eighteenth century political philosophers.

Sir Thomas Moore's Utopia, for instance, is an ideal state where complete religious liberty prevails.

John Locke wrote a series of essays on toleration in the seventeenth century.

3. The Quakers also became the advocates of freedom of conscience. And all the Quaker Colonies in America invited people of all religious opinions to come and settle.

III. HOW DID AMERICA BECOME THE FIRST HOME OF RELIGIOUS LIBERTY?

We know that nine of the American Colonies had state churches. In the three New England Colonies of Massachusetts, Connecticut, and New Hampshire congregationalism was established by law. In all the Colonies south of Pennsylvania the English church was established by law. So that in the Quaker Colonies and Rhode Island there were no state churches—only four out of the thirteen.

1. Roger Williams and Rhode Island

Williams had become imbued with separatist's ideas before coming to America and lost no time in advancing his ideas after he arrived in America.

The principle which he held that was most obnoxious to the Massachusetts authorities was that the government had no authority over the consciences of men. That idea struck at the very foundation of the government of Massachusetts and we know the story of banishment.

After his banishment he had a controversy with John Cotton in which he set forth the great principles of complete religious liberty. And Rhode Island became the first civil State (1636) where these principles were actually put into operation.

2. Proprietary grants

Another great factor in creating an environment in the Colonies favorable to religious liberty was the fact that so large a proportion of the Colonies were proprietary grants. That is in such Colonies as Maryland, Pennsylvania, the Carolinas, and Georgia both the land was owned and the government controlled by the individual or a group of individuals, and they could sell their lands to whom they pleased. In fact, they had to sell land in order to make a success of their great ventures. Thus Lord Baltimore, although a good Catholic, invited Protestants as well as Catholics to buy his land. William Penn, although a Quaker, invited all religious groups to his great Colony of Pennsylvania. The proprietors of the Carolinas and Georgia did the same thing. This was a very practical influence leading in the direction of tolerance.

3. America became the sanctuary of the small sect

The fact of the European oppression of all peoples made America the haven of persecuted groups throughout Europe, especially the middle Colonies, but also all of the Colonies actually welcomed these persecuted groups, outside, perhaps, Virginia and Massachusetts.

As we have already stated the small sect has been one of the principal influences in bringing in religious liberty.

4. Unchurched people

A fourth factor creating an environment favorable to religious liberty was the presence of such great numbers of unchurched people.

They made up more than three-fourths of the population at the end of the colonial era. Unchurched people generally are opposed to granting special privileges to any one church. They say, "We believe in all the churches." It is an interesting fact that the leaders in the movement to separate church and state in Virginia at the close of the Revolutionary War were nonchurch members. Men like Jefferson and Madison, yes, and Franklin.

IV. WHEN AND HOW DID SEPARATION OF CHURCH AND STATE COME ABOUT IN AMERICA?

At the close of the American Revolution and with the adoption of the new State constitutions and the Federal Constitution. But the issue of church and state was not an issue in the War for Independence. The new governments simply put into their instruments of governments colonial experiences. Hence the first amendment to the Constitution.

V. CONCLUSION

In these days when all over the world the freedom of conscience and of speech and the press are being destroyed, I think it is one of the grave duties of the Protestant ministry of America to inform their people of the fundamental importance of standing strongly for the preservation of this most basic of all our greatest freedoms, religious liberty and the complete separation of church and state.

Address on Conscription by the Late Champ Clark

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ERNEST LUNDEEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 13 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

ADDRESS DELIVERED APRIL 25, 1917

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able speech delivered by that great Speaker of the House of Representatives, the late Champ Clark, who graced the Speaker's chair with great distinction. He was one of our very greatest Speakers. In my first term in Congress—the Sixty-fifth Congress, the war Congress—I had the honor to serve under him.

In volume 55 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, part II, at page 1119, will be found perhaps the greatest speech of his entire career, on conscription. During the first session of that Congress, on April 25, 1917, Champ Clark made clear the American way in military service. I ask my fellow citizens once again to read the eloquent words of this great man, a great statesman and a great American.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 25, 1917]

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the House of Representatives, I desire to announce before I begin that I do not want to be interrupted until I get through, and then I will answer any reasonable and pertinent question that any gentleman wants to ask. I know what I want to say and I want to say it in a connected way. Two things are true beyond the shadow of a doubt:

First. For a Member of the House or Senate to differ with the President of the Republic—any President—is not pleasant. On the contrary, it is painful, especially when the President is one whom you have helped elect. I have made it a rule to always support the President—any President—when I believe he is right, and on doubtful questions give him the benefit of the doubt. Further than that I will not go, so help me Almighty God: Further than that I cannot go and make good the oath that I took when I was sworn into this House. Further than that I cannot go and be true to the principles of representative government. [Applause.] The President of the United States is the most powerful personage in the wide, wide world—more powerful than the Kaiser, Emperor, or King, any other variety of potentate. It is because he is the head of 100,000,000 free people. [Applause.] That is the reason he is powerful. He has his functions to perform and, as far as I have been able to observe, he is not bashful about performing them. [Laughter.] The House and Senate have their functions to perform, and if we are men we will perform them. [Applause.]

When a Member of the House or Senate has thoroughly and conscientiously studied a question with open mind and with all the lights available and has formed a conclusion, he should vote that conclusion, even though it runs counter to the desire of the President. If he does not do that, he is unfit to sit in House or Senate. He should resolutely and courageously do that, be the consequences to him personally what they may. Believing these things, I am about to express my opinion on the pending bill in language as temperate, kindly, and courteous as possible—an opinion arrived at after much investigation and more thought. I regret exceedingly that I cannot agree with the President and his advisers on everything in this bill. But this is still a free country, and free speech has not yet been prohibited in the House of Representatives. For many years I have served the people in various positions of trust, always with perfect fidelity and with whatever capacity God has blessed me. I shall continue to do so to the end, whether that be near or far.

Second. We have entered into a great war—upon a stupendous undertaking. That being the case, this House will vote every man and every dollar needed to press it to a speedy and successful conclusion. On that we are all agreed, and anybody anywhere who disputes that pregnant fact grossly misrepresents a large number of men in House and Senate who are honestly endeavoring to discharge their duties. The only thing about which we debate is how best to accomplish the desired end; how most efficaciously to serve our country and our kind. The principal differences betwixt the contending forces here is this: One side wants a conscription and conscription only; nothing else will satisfy them. The other

desires to give patriotic men of military age a chance to demonstrate their courage and their patriotism by volunteering within a reasonable time before the conscription mill is started grinding. Why any man should be denounced by all the vile names found in the dictionaries and by some not admitted to any dictionary and heard only in the stews for supporting either one of the two propositions is utterly beyond my comprehension. Those in favor of giving the traditional volunteer system a chance have never abused or denounced those in favor of conscription. All the foul abuse and malicious slanders are directed against the men who advocate giving a fair, reasonable trial of the old volunteer system which gained us victory in all our wars. [Applause.] It is astounding, and it is a safe and cowardly performance at a distance—much safer than to attempt it at a space of 3 feet. [Applause.] I am unreservedly in favor of the volunteer amendment to the Army bill. [Applause.] Mr. Dent and the majority of his committee deserve great credit for reporting it, notwithstanding the pressure and blandishments used to induce them not to do so. I do not in any way impeach the integrity or the patriotism of the minority who want conscription, notwithstanding they fly squarely in the face not only of our own history but of the history of all English-speaking peoples; but why should Chairman Dent and the majority of the Military Committee be assailed with inhuman rancor because they stand for the American doctrine of giving an opportunity for the brave, the patriotic, to volunteer to fight for their country?

Of all men, Missourians should be the foremost to defend the volunteer system, for Missouri is the only State in the Union to send more than her full quota—without a draft, mark you—into both the Union and Confederate Armies. [Applause.] That is a record to which there is no parallel in all history. In 1860 her total vote was only 165,518; yet she sent 111,000 volunteers into the Union Army and, as nearly as can be ascertained, 50,000 volunteers into the Confederate Army, a grand total of 161,000 volunteers [applause], and there can be no question that she will do her full share in this emergency if only given a chance. [Applause.]

Now, when some of these high conscriptionists undertake to give the records of their States let them give one that will approach that. For a chance for that imperial Commonwealth to have the glorious privilege of raising her full quota of her brave and gallant sons by the volunteer system instead of being dragged into the Army by the scruff of their necks, I humbly pray the American Congress. [Applause.] I protest with all my heart and mind and soul against having the slur of being a conscript placed upon the men of Missouri. In the estimation of Missourians there is precious little difference between a conscript and a convict. [Applause.] Missourians wish to serve shoulder to shoulder, elbow to elbow, heart to heart with their neighbors, friends, and kindred and do not desire to be broken up into small squads and distributed among strangers from distant localities. Wounded, their neighbors would render first aid. Sick, their friends would minister unto them. Dead, their friends and neighbors would bury them. Homesick and discouraged, their comrades would cheer them up. All history teaches that men fight better under such circumstances. There cannot be any question about it. You cannot produce any single great military name that will deny it. Some of these carpet knights may do so. [Laughter.] They want the folks back home to know that they discharged the duties of a soldier bravely, faithfully, and well, even unto death. Whatever else may be said of the Germans, nobody save an incorrigible and congenital idiot will deny that they fight well and know something about warfare. Pick up any newspaper, and what do you see? The Bavarian troops; the Saxon troops; the Brandenburg division; the Potsdam guards; the Wurttemberg infantry; and so on through all the 26 states comprising the Empire and their subdivisions. Fighting thus a pride of home is cultivated, thereby increasing their gallantry and their efficiency. So in the British Army troops have local designations such as "The Scotch Greys," which twice in their experience have been almost absolutely destroyed; Princess Pat's Regiment, which has been nearly wiped out in Europe.

Why not have Missouri troops at least in companies, regiments, and brigades; Illinois troops; Kentucky troops; and so on through all the States?

It is asserted, however, that such arranging of units, such as I have suggested, into Missourians, Kentuckians, Kansans, Mississippians, and so forth, will be made. My friends, be not deceived by such talk. It is a tub to the whale—a sop to Cerberus, a blind for your eyes, a snare for your feet, a trap for the unwary—merely that, and nothing more. [Applause.] Why do I say that? Because the Senate is this very moment considering the War Department bill without the volunteer feature and without local units. The newspapers say that it will pass the Senate in the precise shape in which it was sent to the Senate by the War Department. What they hope is that we will turn down the majority of the House Committee on Military Affairs and swallow the War Department bill—hook, line, and sinker. Failing to ram it down our throats in open fight here on the floor of the House, they hope to induce the conferees to give them what they want. If they have their way, there is no more chance for the organization of troops by State units than there is for us to be translated in chariots of fire after the manner of the prophet Elijah. [Applause.]

It is maliciously asserted that we who desire to give the volunteers a chance to serve their country are endeavoring to retard the creation of an army. That is simply preposterous, and if I did not want to keep within the bounds of parliamentary language I would make it a great deal stronger than that. [Applause.] On the contrary, the call for volunteers would hasten the formation of an army. It is understood that War Department officials say that it will require from 3 to 5 months to set the draft going. Why not then call for volunteers at once and secure a large volunteer army while preparing for the draft? [Applause.] Clearly it is those who oppose calling for volunteers and not those favoring the volunteers who are delaying the formation of an army.

Another thing, if the President had the day after the war was declared asked Congress to authorize him to call for 500,000 volunteers or even a million, both Houses would have passed the bill in 48 hours, and by this time he would have thousands of volunteers in camp and in training. [Loud applause.]

But it is said in answer to all this that anyone desiring to volunteer can enlist in the Standing Army! That is no answer at all, because it is a very different thing to serve as a volunteer with volunteers and to serve in the Standing Army. There is no use to give the reasons. [Applause.] They exist and intelligent people understand them full well.

Another serious objection to the War Department bill is the conscription age limit of 19 to 25. If we are to have conscription, it should apply to all men of military age. And if it did there would not be such a hullabaloo in certain quarters. When I went out to Chicago on St. Patrick's Day to make a speech to the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick—I think that is the name of the society—a reporter came to the hotel to interview me about this war. I did not want to be interviewed: I was not in a talkative humor. I said, "I wish all the editors of this country who are shouting for war could be put into the front rank." [Applause.] I think that interview was never published. [Applause and laughter.]

Why single out boys who were too young to vote for President and Representatives? They had nothing to do with bringing on the war, and why should they not be of the exempted classes in this selective or seductive conscription, so they may finish their educations, thereby fitting themselves for the duties of citizenship? [Applause.]

Consistency is rated as a jewel. I have always thought that it is better to be right and inconsistent than to be consistent and wrong. However that may be, I beg leave to call to your attention the most delicious piece of inconsistency ever put into print since Gutenberg invented movable types.

All of us read the Washington Post, and it is a bright paper. All of us know that it is one of the stanchest advocates of conscription to be found betwixt the two seas. Homer sometimes nods, and surely the Post editor nodded when he wrote the leader in the issue of Sunday, April 22.

Here is an excerpt from it—all that is pertinent to this discussion:

"THE ROOSEVELT VOLUNTEERS

"Officers in the War Department are said to be opposed to granting permission to Col. Theodore Roosevelt to raise a division of volunteers for early service in France, because they think it would be inconsistent with the plan for raising a Regular Army by selective draft.

"If this objection were valid, Colonel Roosevelt's patriotic offer should be declined.

"But where is there any inconsistency? Where would the two plans conflict, and how?"

Roosevelt is a fighting man. Nobody denies that. I think a great deal of him, because he knows a little about more things than any other human being I ever clapped my eyes on. [Laughter.] And he is not mealy-mouthed about telling it, either. [Laughter.]

"Colonel Roosevelt proposes to raise a division of volunteers, to be commanded by Regular Army officers. He proposes to accept men above the age of 25, who would not be subject to draft."

But they ought to put into parentheses "Regular Army officers under him."

"He proposes to accept men above the age of 25, who would not be subject to draft."

In that he is entirely correct.

"The President's plan for selective draft would not be affected in the slightest degree by raising a division of volunteers."

If it will not be infringed upon in the slightest degree by raising one division of volunteers, how would it be infringed upon by raising a hundred times a thousand volunteers? [Applause.] Then he says:

"The President's plan for selective draft would not be affected in the slightest degree by raising a division of volunteers."

That is what Professor Squeers, of Dotheboy's Hall, would denominate "richness." I am reasonably certain that could Isaac Disraeli return to earth and get out a new and enlarged edition of his Curiosities of Literature he would give a prominent place to the foregoing excerpt from the Post. Colonel Roosevelt is one of the most famous Americans, but is not giving him a division of volunteers a clear infringement of the selective draft? Why should the honor of volunteer service be granted to him and denied to all other American citizens? There is no question about his fighting qualities; but there are others. [Applause.]

Now, there is another thing: Nor will the statement, oft repeated in the public press and in debate, that the volunteers will be less efficient than conscripts, because they will elect their own officers, and in many cases elect incompetent men, stand for an instant the light of truth. Under the present Volunteer Act the officers would

be taken from the Officers' Reserve Corps, selected by the War Department after proper examination. In fact, a volunteer army would be officered in exactly the same way that the conscript army would be.

Another thing: These gentlemen insist that they would have to drill an army if you would have conscripts. Now, will some of them rise and state how it happens that they can drill conscripts, who do not want to go into war at all, any quicker than they can drill volunteers? What is the sense in that sort of twaddle? [Laughter.]

Gentlemen, I am going to read a few words from an old document. I am not certain but that I ought to apologize for reading it at all. Nevertheless I am going to read it. It is the Constitution of the United States. [Laughter and applause.] It is an instrument that Gladstone said was the greatest performance ever struck from the human mind at one time, an instrument at whose making George Washington presided. And by the way, he was simply a plain volunteer. [Applause.] He was not a Regular Army officer. He was not a conscript, bless your soul! [Applause.] And while I am at it, and while it has nothing in the world to do with this debate, I am going to give you briefly my opinion about him; and, that is, that we do not do him honor enough, even yet. [Applause.] In my judgment he rendered greater service to his country and to the cause of human liberty as the President of the Constitutional Convention than he did either as Commander in Chief of the Army or as President of the United States. [Applause.] If it had not been for his vast influence we never would have had any Constitution agreed upon, and if it had not been for the certainty that he would be the first President they never would have ratified it. [Applause.] They came mighty near not ratifying it anyhow.

I want to read to you from the Constitution. I still believe we are living under the Constitution. [Applause.] Here is what it says about armies; it is in the eighth section of article I, where the powers of Congress are granted:

"To raise and support armies, but no appropriation of money to that use shall be for a longer term than 2 years.

"To provide and maintain a navy.

"To make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces.

"To provide for calling forth the militia to execute the laws of the Union, suppress insurrection, and repel invasions."

That is prefatory. Then—"to provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining the militia, and for governing such part of them as may be employed in the service of the United States, reserving to the States, respectively, the appointment of the officers and the authority of training the militia according to the discipline prescribed by Congress."

My fellow Representatives, has the Constitution of the United States also become "a mere scrap of paper"? [Applause.]

There was once a man in this country named Ulysses Simpson Grant, who had some vogue as a soldier. I take it that those who are howling for conscription and nothing but conscription would rather take the opinion of these modern carpet knights than that of the silent soldier. So far as I am concerned, I pin my faith in this matter to the invincible warrior. In his memoirs, by the way, one of the most readable books in our vernacular, he says:

"While at Cairo I had frequent opportunities of meeting the rebel officers of the Columbus garrison. They seemed to be very fond of coming up on steamers under flags of truce. On two or three occasions I went down in like manner. When one of their boats was seen coming up carrying a white flag a gun would be fired from the lower battery at Fort Holt, throwing a shot across the bow as a signal to come no farther. I would then take a steamer and, with my staff and occasionally a few other officers, go down to receive the party. There were several officers among them whom I had known before, both at West Point and in Mexico. Seeing these officers, who had been educated for the profession of arms both at school and in actual war, which is a far more efficient training, impressed me with the great advantage the South possessed over the North at the beginning of the rebellion. They had from 30 to 40 percent of the educated soldiers of the Nation.

"They had no standing army, and consequently these trained soldiers had to find employment with the troops from their own States. In this way what there was of military education and training was distributed throughout their whole army. The whole loaf was leavened.

"The North had a greater number of educated and trained soldiers, but the bulk of them were still in the Army and were retained generally with their old commands and rank until the war had lasted many months. In the Army of the Potomac there was what was known as the 'regular brigade,' in which, from the commanding officer down to the youngest second lieutenant, everyone was educated to his profession. So, too, with many of the batteries; all of the officers, generally four in number to each, were men educated for their profession. Some of these went into battle at the beginning under division commanders who were entirely without military training. This state of affairs gave me an idea, which I expressed while at Cairo: That the Government ought to disband the Regular Army, with the exception of the Staff Corps, and notify the disbanded officers that they would receive no compensation while the war lasted except as volunteers. The register should be kept up, but the names of all officers who were not in the volunteer service at the close should be stricken from it."

Now, gentlemen, I take it that the witness is competent, and that he is intelligent about the things he is talking about; and it strikes me that we had better pay some attention to such men as that rather than to a lot of fellows that have never been under fire.

I want to read now an article that was published in the Baltimore Evening Sun. It is signed by a veteran. I read:

"HARK, FROM THE TOMBS COME AN ARGUMENT AND A SONG ABOUT EQUAL IN QUALITY

"To the EDITOR OF THE EVENING SUN:

"SIR: Within the last 6 months a great deal has been said about Regulars, volunteers, and drafted men. Nearly every old soldier of the Union Army knows that during the Civil War the volunteer regiments did more than nine-tenths of the fighting. In Fox's report of the 300 regiments that did nearly all the fighting, he has 296 volunteer regiments, 4 regiments of Regulars, and no drafted regiments."

They would not put them in the front. [Applause.] They were afraid to trust them. [Applause.] I read further:

"Also, of the 46 regiments that lost between 200 and 300 killed in action, the whole 46 were volunteer regiments. Pennsylvania's share was 11, nearly one-fourth; and a New Hampshire regiment had the highest number (298) killed in action. No regiment reached 500 killed in action. The old song that I sang in wartimes—

" 'Our troops are the best the world ever saw;
Our men are the bravest that ever went to war;
Our people they are good wherever you go;
Our boys, they are fast, and our girls, they are not slow.' "

Chorus:

" 'Then hoist up the flag,' etc.

"VET.

"BALTIMORE, *April 17.*"

[Laughter and applause.]

One of the very best books ever written about the Civil War—I think Gen. Dick Taylor's Destruction and Reconstruction is the best—is a book entitled, "Stonewall Jackson in the American Civil War," by Colonel Henderson. I advise all of you who think well of the American volunteer to get it and read it. Here is what he said—and remember he was a colonel in the British Army:

"Of the prowess of Lee's veterans sufficient has been said. Their deeds speak for themselves. But it was not the battlefield alone that bore witness to their fortitude. German soldiers have told us that in the war of 1870, when their armies, marching on Paris, found, to their astonishment, the great city strongly garrisoned and hosts gathering in every quarter for its relief, a singular apathy took possession of the troops. The explanation offered by a great military writer is that 'after a certain period even the victor becomes tired of war;' and 'the more civilized,' he adds, 'a people is, the more quickly will this weakness become apparent.' Whether this explanation be adequate is not easy to decide. The fact remains, however, that the Confederate volunteer was able to overcome that longing for home which chilled the enthusiasm of the German conscript. And this is the more remarkable inasmuch as his career was not one of unchequered victory. In the spring of 1863 the Army of the Potomac, more numerous than ever, was still before him firmly established on Virginian soil; hope of foreign intervention, despite the assurances of the politicians, was gradually fading, and it was but too evident that the war was far from over. Yet at no time during their 2 years of service had the soldiers shown the slightest sign of that discouragement which seized the Germans after 2 months. And who shall dare to say that the southerner was less highly civilized than the Prussian or the Bavarian? Political liberty, freedom of speech and action, are the real elements of civilization, and not merely education. But let the difference in the constitution of the two armies be borne in mind. The Confederates, with few exceptions, were volunteers"—

[Applause]—

"who had become soldiers of their own choice, who had assumed arms deliberately and without compulsion, and who by their own votes were responsible that war had been declared. The Germans were conscripts, a dumb, powerless, irresponsible multitude, animated, no doubt, by hereditary hatred of the enemy but without that sense of moral obligation which exists in the volunteer. We may be permitted, then, to believe that this sense of moral obligation was one reason why the spirit of the southerners rose superior to human weakness and that the old adage which declares that 'one volunteer is better than three pressed men' "—

[Applause.]

I wish you gentlemen would recollect who it is that is saying this—a trained soldier of the British Army, who observed the war with the eye of a military critic.

"We may be permitted, then, to believe that this sense of moral obligation was one reason why the spirit of the southerners rose superior to human weakness, and that the old adage which declares that 'one volunteer is better than three pressed men' is not yet out of date."

[Applause.]

I do not know whether Colonel Henderson is dead or not. I hope he is not. If he is alive, it will make his eyes pop open like morning glories when he finds out what they are trying to do here. [Applause.]

"Nor is it an unfair inference that the armies of the Confederacy allied by the 'crimson thread of kinship' to those of Wellington, of Raglan, and of Clyde, owed much of their enduring fortitude to 'the rock whence they were hewn.' "

I stand on these quotations from General Grant and Colonel Henderson without any ceremony, and put them against every word

that has been said in this country, high or low, in favor of conscription. [Applause.] And with those two witnesses only I might close the evidence on our side.

But I want to read to you another little piece. One of the greatest writers on army matters that ever lived in any country, and who has written a great many books, is Col. F. N. Maude, of the British Army. Whether he is the man who is the conqueror of Mesopotamia and the capturer of Bagdad I do not know, but he is a British colonel, at any rate. Here is just a short extract from him. After telling what the British have done he says:

"What more in numbers could compulsion have afforded us; and what about the quality? After the distinction already won by many territorial units in the field"—

You know what territorials are—

"it is hardly necessary to say anything on this point, and as to the regulars, also volunteers, we will let the Prussian Guards and the German staff tells us now what they really think of our armies. Compulsion had done all that it could do, and more than even the best Prussian dared to expect, for their troops. It has carried them forward to almost certain death in a manner which has exacted the admiration of all our men and officers; but at that critical moment when the fate of empires hangs in the balance it has always failed them, and our men—territorials and regulars alike—"

And he takes pains to say that the regulars are volunteers—"territorials and regulars alike have sprung forward upon them with the bayonet with a determination never dreamt of in warfare since the days of Waterloo and the Peninsula."

Now, my friends, some gentlemen with more zeal than discretion have been trying to make out that everybody who is in favor of the volunteers is in some strange manner attacking the President of the United States and opposing him. We are not doing anything of the sort. We are supporting him better than they are, and I am going to prove it by him. [Applause.] He might not acknowledge it, but nevertheless it is true. This may be a little dry, but it is what Horace Greeley would have called "mighty rich reading."

In the months of January and February 1916, there took place considerable correspondence between Secretary of War Lindley M. Garrison and President Wilson over certain measures proposed for preparation for national defense. Secretary Garrison indorsed and warmly advocated the continental army plan of the General Staff as opposed to the National Guard plan proposed by Mr. Hay, chairman of the Military Affairs Committee.

You all know Hay. He is one of the ablest men we have had in Congress in some years. [Applause.]

The Hay plan, Secretary Garrison declared in a letter to President Wilson bearing date of January 12, 1916, was the entire abandonment of the idea of a Federal force of national volunteers. He added:

"There is unfortunately very little knowledge and very little intense personal interest in any Members of the House concerning military affairs."

It has always astonished me that men who know everything, who could pass a tariff bill overnight, who can pass any other great measure while you wait, do not come down here and get into one House or the other of Congress. [Laughter.] About 2 years ago, when we had up the Federal Reserve bank bill, one of these men came into my room and was telling me that we were all a lot of lunkheads in both the House and Senate, and he kept on in that way until I got somewhat warm. I said, "I have always wanted to know why men like you young Solomons, who know everything instantly, right off the bat, and do not have to investigate anything, do not get elected to Congress and come down here and do these things." He said, "Why, everybody does not want to come to Congress." I said, "There are not a thousand men in the United States who, if they could, would not come either to the House or the Senate." [Applause.] "And I will tell you the reason you do not come down here and get into the House or the Senate, because you cannot get votes enough." [Laughter and applause.] "People have not confidence enough in you." I have not heard anything out of him since. [Laughter and applause.]

Secretary Garrison urged upon the President the imperative necessity of his seeking an occasion at the earliest possible moment to declare himself with respect to the matter, and in doing so to make it clear beyond peradventure that nothing excepting national forces, raised by the Nation and subject to its exclusive authority, responsibility, and control, is any real settlement of this issue.

To this letter the President replied on the 17th of January 1916, following, in part, as follows:

"I am not irrevocably or dogmatically committed to any one plan of providing the Nation with such a reserve, and am cordially willing to discuss alternative proposals."

On February 9, 1916, Secretary Garrison wrote the President that he desired to be informed of the determination reached by him with respect to the so-called Clarke amendment to the Philippine bill—to which he was also unalterably opposed—and to the continental army bill.

On February 10, 1916, the President wrote Secretary Garrison in part as follows:

"As I have had occasion to say to you, I am not yet convinced that the measure of preparation for national defense which we deem necessary can be obtained through the instrumentality of the National Guard under Federal control and training, but I feel in duty bound to keep my mind open to conviction. The bill in which it will be embodied has not yet been drawn, as I learned today from Mr. Hay. I should deem it a very serious mistake to shut the door against this attempt on the part of the committee in perfect good faith to meet the essentials of the program set forth in my message, but in a way of their own choosing. As you know, I do not at all agree with you in favoring compulsory enlistment for training, and I fear the advocacy of compulsion before the committee of the House on the part of representatives of the Department of War has greatly prejudiced the House against the proposal for a continental army, little necessary connection as there is between the plan and the opinion of the Chief of Staff of compulsory enlistment."

Upon receipt of the above letter Secretary Garrison immediately tendered his resignation as Secretary of War, and it was promptly accepted by the President.

In the account of Secretary Garrison's resignation, published in the Washington Post of February 11, 1916, that paper stated that the President declined "to take any irrevocable stand on the ground that it would not be proper for him to say to a committee of Congress that it would have to take his plan or none. He declared he did not believe Members of the House dealing with military affairs were ignorant of the military necessities of the Nation, but had found them well informed.

Should a bill be presented to him which he could not accept as accomplishing the essential thing sought, he said, it would be his duty to veto it and go to the country on the merits.

Now, I say, we come nearer to backing up his well-considered opinion than Brother Kahn and his conferees. I want to read another sentence or two from the President. He is a great and good man. He writes with a great deal of facility. There has not been a more skillful artist hold of the English language in a century than he.

On Memorial Day, May 30, 1916, he made a speech at Arlington. In that speech he used these refreshing words:

"I have heard a great many people talk about universal training. Universal voluntary training with all my heart, if you wish it, but America does not wish anything but compulsion of the spirit of America."

Those words were fitly spoken and are "like apples of gold in pictures of silver."

Now, I challenge Brother Kahn, who is the head and center of this thing. It reminds me of the knighting of an Englishman, "Kneel, Julius; rise up, Sir Julius." [Laughter and applause.]

I want to say in all seriousness that if this conscription fad is to be put on the American people there are two men in this House who deserve more credit for it than any other two men on top of the ground. One is the gentleman from California [Mr. Kahn] and the other is the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Gardner]. I am in favor of giving the devil his due. [Laughter and applause.]

For several years there has been a systematic effort in Congress, in certain clubs in this city, in many newspapers, by some public speakers, and in sundry magazines to belittle, depreciate, and minimize the American volunteer. I resent such performance in the name of the living and the dead, in the name of the brave men who gave us our freedom and who have maintained it, in the name of the volunteers who have shed imperishable luster upon American arms and upon the American Republic. Our Regulars have always done well, but there have been few of them by comparison. God knows that I have not the slightest disposition to disparage them; but after all due honor has been done to the Regulars, the fact remains that the volunteer has done most of our fighting.

The American volunteer is one of the glories of the Republic. Under young George Washington he saved the remnants of Braddock's army from destruction. In the French and Indian War he fought side by side with the British regulars. From April 19, 1775, when on the village green of Lexington and at the Concord Bridge the embattled farmers and the minutemen of Massachusetts fired the shot heard around the world down to the last shot in the Spanish-American War, the American volunteer has been a very present help in every time of trouble. He made Bunker Hill a name to conjure with forever. He captured Burgoyne at Saratoga. He upheld Washington amid the horrors of Valley Forge; he destroyed the Hessians at Trenton; he achieved the astounding victory at Kings Mountain against Ferguson's British regulars, thereby turning the tide of the Revolutionary War. On a hundred fields, sometimes victorious, sometimes defeated, hungry, naked, footsore, and weary, he fought on with dogged pertinacity until he stood with the glorious and victorious Washington on the blood-stained heights of Yorktown, where Jefferson's declaration was made good and America was free indeed. [Applause.]

The critics of the American volunteer are always harping on the rout of a handful of untrained militia at Bladensburg by British regulars; why do they never, even by accident, mention General Harrison's splendid men at the River Thames? How does it happen that they never can remember Andrew Jackson, and how at New Orleans, with 5,500 untrained backwoods volunteers armed with flintlock, muzzle-loading rifles, he defeated Wellington's Peninsular army, who had snatched the iron crown of Charlemagne from the brow of Napoleon. That was the most amazing piece of shooting done by any army in any battle anywhere since the invention of gunpowder. And God be praised. American volunteers did it. [Applause.] But, strange to tell, these belittlers of the American volunteer are silent as the voiceless grave when it comes to Andrew Jackson and New Orleans. God forbid them for their lack of appreciation of the heroic deeds of the brave men who won imperishable renown on that bloody field.

The volunteer was our chief reliance in the war with Mexico. He conquered at Buena Vista, Churubusco, and Chapultepec, and placed the starry banner of the Republic on the palace of the Montezumas. In that war Col. Alexander Doniphan, with 1,100 green Missouri volunteers, marched from Fort Leavenworth, Kans., conquered Arizona, New Mexico, and Chihuahua, fighting dozens of battles, never losing even a skirmish, though frequently fighting 10 times his own numbers, and finally reported to General Taylor, ragged, hungry, but invincible, on the red field of Monterey—the most astounding march in the annals of war.

That is what a Missourian could do. The march of Xenophon and his 10,000 has been proclaimed by historians for 30 centuries, because he had sense enough to write a book giving an account of his own performances; but here is this brave Missourian, who made the most astounding march in the history of the human race, and Xenophon with his 10,000 is not a marker to it, and his glorious name does not appear in some of the great American encyclopedias. Why, if he had been a Massachusetts man, followed by Massachusetts volunteers, the world would hardly contain the books that would have been written about it. [Laughter.] I am a Missourian, thank God, and proud to be a countryman of Doniphan.

In the Civil War the volunteer did nine-tenths of the fighting on both sides. It is said that men will not volunteer; but nevertheless there was no draft until the North and the South had raised about 2,000,000 men—the best soldiers the sun has looked upon in 6,000 years of slaughter. At the first tap of the drum an entire people sprang to arms. We had, North and South, then only 33,000,000 people; now we have more than 100,000,000. Why doubt their love of country? Where is the man with sufficient temerity to stand up in a public place and assert that the volunteers who fought in the Civil War on both sides were not first-class soldiers? Who will dare to say that the men who charged with Pickett up the slippery slopes of Gettysburg or the men in blue who rallied around George H. Thomas, the Rock of Chickamaugua, for three dreadful days did not rise to the highest standard of military excellence? American volunteers, God bless them every one! [Applause.]

"On Fame's eternal camping ground
Their silent tents are spread,
And Glory guards with solemn round
The bivouac of the dead."

If this stupendous war continues long, conscription may become necessary; but in the light of the history of English-speaking people we contend that it is not necessary now. Conscription has always been repugnant to men of our blood. [Applause.] In this very war Great Britain never ordered a conscription until she had raised 5,000,000 volunteers, a somewhat sizable army, certainly; and not one British conscript is fighting on the Continent now.

Canada, with only 7,000,000 population, 3,000,000 less than that of New York, has sent 400,000 volunteers across the sea. The Canadians have done such splendid deeds as to fill the world with their acclaim, and Canada has done her full share without a draft and will have none of it. The Australians and New Zealanders have furnished their full quotas and acquitted themselves handsomely without a draft, and refused the draft on a referendum vote.

Why do gentlemen doubt the courage and the patriotism of the present generation of Americans? There is not a scintilla of evidence that we have degenerated into a race of cowards or mollycoddles. As for myself, I love to think well of my countrymen.

Patrick Henry said:

"I have but one lamp by which my feet are guided, and that is the lamp of experience."

The poet Campbell expanded Henry's thought into these lines:

"Go watch the wheels of Nature's mazy plan
And read the future from the past of man."

Assuming that the great lyric orator and the great Scotch poet were correct in formulating a rule for predicting human action, why do gentlemen jump to the conclusion that Americans of our time will fail in their full measure of duty and service in this time of stress? What right have they to assume any such preposterous condition of things? Our fathers did their duty; we will do ours, never fear.

"For we are the same our fathers have been,
We see the same sights our fathers have seen;
We drink the same streams and view the same sun
And run the same course our fathers have run."

I am sure that the House will pardon a word purely personal. My only living son is, with my full consent, going into the Army in any capacity in which he can be useful, either as an officer or a private. [Applause.] Of course, I hate to see him go, but he thinks it his duty, and I would not have it otherwise. Naturally he is dear to me—no dearer to me than other men's sons to them. I hope and pray that when the hour may come when he is subjected to the ordeal of fire, he may go into battle not by the side of the slackers and loafers whom the advocates of this bill say they desire to reach, but shoulder to shoulder with free men who serve gladly, willingly, to fight for the honor, the safety, and the perpetuity of this Republic. Should he fall, I want the privilege of carving on his tombstone these words: "This man, a Missouri volunteer, died fighting for his country." [Prolonged applause.]

International Intrigue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. THORKELSON
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 13, 1940

EXCERPTS FROM ARTICLE IN LITERARY DIGEST

Mr. THORKELSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I have included excerpts from an article appearing in the Literary Digest, February 6, 1937, and excerpts from other magazines which further expose international intrigue. These excerpts are self-explanatory, so I shall refrain from making further comments, but shall ask those who are interested in what is happening behind the scenes to read the statements.

[Copied from an article in the Literary Digest of February 6, 1937, p. 12]

PLOTTERS' PLEA: MEXICO RECEIVES TROTZKY; MOSCOW MINIONS NEAR LIQUIDATION BY STALIN

To high strung, wordy Lyoff Davidovitch Trotzky (born Bronstein), God-of-the-Russian Revolution, Nicolai Lenin turned in 1918 as the best available man to transform a demoralized, officerless, uniformed rabble into a disciplined Red Army of 5,000,000 men.

By 1924 War Commissar Trotzky was convinced that his army, like Von Moltke's was ready to the last button, that it had only to march across western Europe, gathering force as it progressed from revolution to revolution, to create a Soviet State extending from the Pacific Ocean to the Rhine.

Only thus, he believed, by spreading, as Islamism spreads theoretically, in a state of permanent holy war, could communism survive. Confined to Russia only, he declared, it would shrink like the wild ass's skin, until Russia would revert to capitalism. * * *

Exercising the perogatives of war minister, Trotzky left Moscow in 1924 for a cure in the Caucasus Mountains to rest his nerves. Before he got there Lenin died. * * *

In the councils following the red god's demise, from which Trotzky was absent, Stalin fought the expansion plan.

"Let the rest of the world remain capitalist if it wishes," he said. "To consolidate socialism in Russia, to make Russia strong" * * * that was the safer way.

STALIN WON

It was a long quarrel. But within a year Stalin had won, had, moreover, made himself sufficiently powerful in the central executive committee of the Communist Party to dispose of Trotzky in any way he chose. * * *

Trotzky gone, Stalin * * * concentrated on industrialization of Russia's vast expanses on collectivizing its agriculture, on making the "red" army even stronger than Trotzky left it. * * *

By 1932 Trotzky, graying as he was shunted from border to border, was surer than ever that he was right and Stalin wrong. Before his very eyes, it seemed, the bright red of Soviet was fading to pink, threatening to pale to white. Stalin, he was certain, was becoming like any other nationalist dictator, differing only in detail from Il Duce and Der Fuehrer. Unless something were done, the dream of Lenin would soon be completely gone.

Stalin had promised Washington to stop "red" propaganda in America, had made an alliance with capitalist France, instructed French Communists to halt their plans for a "red" uprising. Obviously. * * *

OLD THEORY

By smuggled letters, by verbal messages carried in by sympathetic travelers, he got word to his old friends that he was about to bring "active opposition" to Stalin from without. * * *

Stalin must be overthrown by reapplication of the old Bolshevist theory of seizure of power through violence, by a small, well-organized, determined minority. * * *

Bit by bit the exile built up, inside Russia, not a machine but the skeleton of a machine, hardly more than a web, composed, as would be expected, of (1) men he had known during Soviet Russia's early years; (2) intellectuals, like himself; (3) men who for the most part were, like himself, Jews. * * *

Even their slender threadlike web caught the attention of the G. P. U. within 2 years after it began to spread. * * *

Treason? Not ultimately, the accused explained. Once Stalin was out of the way, they would begin the world revolution all over again—the revolution to which Stalin himself was a traitor.

To bring about Stalin's defeat they would poison and infect troop trains, had already wrecked trains, blocked mines, blown up factories. Out of the confusion they would re-create Lenin's dream.

[From the Zionist Review, September 7, 1939, p. 5]

AMERICAN JEWRY'S RESPONSIBLE POSITION

2. As for the special role of the American Jews during the war, it is generally realized here that very responsible duties will now fall on Jewry in the United States in every field of activity. * * * Of one thing European Jewry can rest assured and that is that the American Zionist and Jewish leaders will stand on their guard to protect Jewish interests in war-stricken Europe. Together with many non-Jewish Americans the Jews here will also back the movement for changing the American neutrality law in a manner which will enable the United States of America to give material help to the democratic countries in their struggle against Nazi tyranny.

[From editorial in the same number, p. 6]

Above all it is in Palestine that the Jewish people has the will and opportunity to render important service. The Yishuv (Jewish Community) has lost no time in making plain where it stands. Its strength can be doubled and trebled from the outside if the British Government gives the word. Jewish Palestine is ready and able to assume responsibilities which would mean a significant accession of strength to the Allied forces. We cannot doubt that the British Government will have the imagination to make full use of an opportunity to add to its manpower and resources. The Jewish people at any rate is ready.

[From the Zionist Review September 13, 1939 (Jewish New Year number), p. 10]

Dr. Weizmann's letter to the Prime Minister pledging Jewish support and Mr. Chamberlain's reply will take their place in Jewish history side by side with the famous letter of Lord Balfour to the late Lord Rothschild. At that time Lord Balfour had some difficulty in knowing to whom to address this historic message.

Not so in the present case. Dr. Weizmann as president of the Jewish agency is the acknowledged and accepted leader of the Jewish people, and speaks with the same authority on their behalf as does President Benes on behalf of the Czechs.

What is more, the Jewish leader has in this instance the backing of every section of Jewish thought. It is premature to talk of the * * * form such support will take, but from what I hear from America on the one side and Palestine on the other I do not see it stop short at anything that may be demanded.

[From Correspondence From America, p. 13]

As for the Jews in America, they are all wholeheartedly siding with the democracies and they are fully confident that after the war Britain will not fail in producing a solution of the Palestine problem acceptable both to the Jews and Arabs.

Many American Jews are also anxious to do a great deal more for the democratic countries than merely demand here the amendment of the American Neutrality Act in their favor. They want to fight in Europe for the cause of democracy.

[From the Zionist Review, September 28, 1939, p. 3]

AMERICAN JEWS AND THE NEUTRALITY ACT

American Jewry is watching with keen interest the great campaign opened by President Roosevelt for the amendment of the United States of America Neutrality Act in favor of Great Britain and France. The overwhelming majority of the Jews here side with the President against the extreme isolationists, as they are very keen that America should give material assistance to the Allies in their war against Hitler.

[From the Zionist Review, October 26, 1939, p. 6]

JEWRY'S TASKS—PROBLEMS OF THE PRESENT EMERGENCY

(By David Ben Burion, member Executive Jewish Agency)

* * * As I understand them, our tasks at present are as follows: In the first place, we must secure the continuation and increase of Jewish immigration in Palestine. * * *

Our second main task is the extension of our land possessions.

The third imperative need at the moment is military cooperation with Great Britain. * * * Nor is it only a common enemy that has linked the Jewish people with Great Britain. The Jews can never forget that, of all the nations in the world, the British was the first to recognize us as a nation, and the first to confirm the historical connection which binds the Jewish people to its fatherland. * * * Our entire fate is bound up with that of Great Britain. Her war is our war.

When a state of war was declared to exist between Great Britain and Germany, we recognized instinctively our place in this world conflict, despite the "difference of opinion" on Palestine policy which existed between us and the British Government.

The fourth vital point we have to keep in mind is independence. If, for whatever reasons, war operations are extended, involving us directly, we must appear as a Jewish Nation. The military help we can offer to Great Britain and her allies must be offered, not as the casual assistance of a number of individuals, but as the active help of a single unit. Not individual Jews, but Judea will count among the helpers. There is at present no independent Judea in existence among the comity of nations. But it exists in our hearts and our souls. And if that is our desire, it can be translated into concrete facts.

It is not as a subject people that we shall participate in this struggle. Palestine is a mandatory country in which we have settled as Jews. We are sons of the Jewish Nation and only as sons of the Jewish people and as its representatives shall be allies of the British forces, fighting together in our common struggle.

[Excerpts from Money, Politics, and the Future, by H. T. Mills, published by the Boswell Publishing Co., 10 Essex Street, London, W. C. 2, England]

Search all history and you will find money in the background of events. This fact is disguised, of course. Helen of Troy was made the excuse for tension resulting in war between Trojan and Greek. The equivalent of the "popular press" of those days saw to that. * * * We find that the real cause of the rebellion of the American Colonies was purely economic and monetary, while from 1807, Napoleon, according to his own admissions in writing to Caulaincourt, realized that it was the money monopoly he was fighting, that it was Lombard Street and not the English people he had to destroy. His attempts to bleed England of gold and thus check her loan power are known to the serious student. It is no exaggeration to say that the rise and fall of civilizations are simply episodes in the history of usury. * * *

The abounding crops that might be garnered and the wealth which might be produced are neither garnered nor produced because money is kept short by the money monopolists, who can bring about slumps by simply taking money out of circulation, and booms by replacing it. Property can be purchased cheaply during slumps and sold out at peak prices during booms. When money is scarce people must borrow to manufacture and exchange their goods, and high rates of interest can be charged on loans. An artificially produced scarcity of boots or umbrellas would be bad enough. Yet people could defy the monopolists by going without these articles. They could get wet but still live. But money they must have or die. Charity may save them from this fate at the expense of other individuals. Money has been defined as a "license to consume." Consumption without this license is a crime.

It is common knowledge to students of economics that during and since the Great War the problem of production was solved by the final developments of the amazing inventive genius of man. But the problem of distribution depends on the money question. Keep the money tokens short and production must be curbed. When people badly want something but possess no money, there is said, in the jargon of orthodox economics, to be no effective demand for the goods in question. The world is teeming with people exercising much real but no effective demand. Hence the orgies of destruction of real wealth—the story of the man who considered the possibility of acquiring money by not raising hogs, and of the fact that Brazil destroys about 100,000 bags of coffee each day. * * *

In England we are suffering under Mr. Sieff's "Political and Economic Planning" (P. E. P.), one of the principal results of which is to penalize the farmer if he produces more than an approved quota of commodities, because if he creates more purchaseable goods than can be offset by the available purchasing power, either the products must be destroyed (to the public indignation) or their prices fall chaotically. Hitler found an extremely vicious type of "planning" in force when he took over power 4 years ago. The farms were very heavily mortgaged, and the farms in debt to the land banks. The interest charged was high, and owing to the absence of purchasing power among the hungry German masses the agriculturalists sold little, and that often at a loss.

This condition was rapidly changed, however, under the new regime, which desired Germany to become self-sufficient; the farmer was told to grow as much as possible, and that a market for his increasing products would be guaranteed by the government. * * * It has been evident that Germany has been working on a "production" standard for some years, and not merely changing one lot of financial masters for another. And it also seems clear that Germany has been, and is, systematically withdrawing from cooperation with the interests of international finance. * * *

In any case, a step toward monetary reform has been accomplished in the face of commercial boycotts and general opposition. The German is becoming "real wealth-conscious." The reign of gold in Germany is over, and, judging from the remarks in the financial columns of our big newspapers, the financiers over here know it. Only force, successfully applied, can bring back to the fold this somewhat determined "sheep." * * *

It is another twist of the spiral of progress since the days when Napoleon's attempt to set up a new banking system was bitterly opposed by the Barings and Rothschilds, across the channel, who, through the medium of Pitt, financed a succession of wars to accomplish his downfall.

Germany has broken with international finance and bases her currency on production. She uses gold only to purchase any necessary imports which cannot be acquired by barter (forced upon her by a Jewish boycott of her export trade). This economic nationalism is fatal to the system of international finance as practiced outside the "rebel" countries.

Regarding Japan, her finance is a mystery. With a population of about 75,000,000, her national debt is only £765,000,000, as compared to our eight billion-odd pounds. * * * There is ample evidence that Japan will not permit "sound" or "Kuhn Loeb" finance to keep

her down. Shortage of gold will not prevent her building battleships. Only shortage of material, workmen, or skill can affect that.

Now, we can roughly sum up the characteristics of the nations which already divide the world into two hostile camps. These characteristics are to an extent interdependent, being really so many facets of two different diamonds. By writing down the characteristics in order of importance we have the so-called "democracies," gold-standard countries, Freemasonry strong, communistic element strong, member of League of Nations (except United States, on account of special circumstances), versus (relatively) Jew-free "dictatorships," goods-standard countries, Freemasonry suppressed, nationalist-element strong, not members of League (except Italy, which country is as good as out of it).

In this picture England is placed near the center of gravity of the forces striving for mastery. Yet, controlled by the money power, she seems to be swinging toward the orbit of the "democracies," which, of course, are not true democracies at all. Such a path, if persisted in, must end in war, because the extent of the rift between these two groups of nations admits of no compromise. Already it seems clear that we are backing the wrong horse—the losing horse. We have made enemies of the Japanese by our behavior at the Washington Conference, where the American war debt, which Lord Reading had promised to pay in gold, preyed on our minds; enemies of the Arabs by our repudiation of a promise once made; enemies of the Italians over the Abyssinian war, in which we suffered an important diplomatic defeat on account of our subservience to the wire pullers at Geneva; and, lastly, enemies of General Franco, owing to our apparent support of the Jew-financed Spanish "Government."

The problem facing the totalitarian states is different from the bristling difficulties of the democracies. The latter have enormous potential wealth, which their money system, based on the gold standard, does not permit them to distribute, and so this wealth is either sabotaged or not produced. Whereas the former are faced with a real shortage of wealth, owing to possessing limited overseas investments and controlling very limited access to raw materials. This particularly applies to Germany. However, under a system of money based on production, wonders are being accomplished with what can be produced from the soil, together with the results accruing from a reduced foreign trade, carried on frequently by barter because of a world-organized Jewish boycott of exports. It is for this reason that we see so many currency restrictions in Germany. Her credits built up abroad must be carefully parcelled out between the varying needs of her ordinary import trade, those of rearmament, and those of the 4-year plan. * * *

Thus, the real underlying cause of the growing rift between the great peoples of the world remains hidden from common knowledge. The economic talks of the B. B. C. see to this, as also do the newspapers and the well-advertised political books and the magazines. The censorship is amazingly ingenuous in this free land. We are led to believe that Hitler has brutally crushed a terrorized Austria, not that, in fact, he is welcomed by a large majority, and that the minority who fear the German invasion consists of international bankers, disappointed usurers, their friends, and those dependent upon them. * * * Then, again, the question is beseechingly asked as to how we can rope in the United States lest civilization perish—lest international finance perish is much nearer the truth.

The courage required by Mr. Chamberlain in trying to cope with all his difficulties is self-evident. He is attempting at almost zero hour to keep this great empire out of war—a war which may destroy it utterly. But can he break away from those financial powers desirous, above all, to make us an instrument in a fight to destroy the growing money system based upon production? If he can, not only will we be spared war, but, perhaps, the coming slump also. * * *

From an international point of view, one can only speculate as to whether the democratic nations will be persuaded to fight to save the gold standard, or, at least, so as to throw a veil over its transformation into bolshevism. President Roosevelt, when not engaged in priming the pump, is actively occupied in enlisting American sympathies in the affairs of Europe—to fight, if necessary, for democracy; i. e., for the gold standard. * * *

The production standard of the totalitarian states requires peace for its development. * * * The majority of people in the democratic countries of the world also desire peace fervently. It only remains to be seen whether the interests of international finance will be able to thrust them into the holocaust. * * *

Of course, the real object of the fuss created by the press over Czechoslovakia was financial and economic. Large Jewish interests lost heavily in Czechoslovakia. * * * The papers never so much as mentioned the Pittsburgh agreement * * * guaranteeing the Slovaks their own parliament, administration, and judicature. * * * The remaining minorities suffered from similar broken hopes. * * *

Our left wing, and many members of the right, following the path of bolshevism by stealth, are ready to countenance war in Europe if only to check the expansion of the Germano-Italian unorthodox money system. These people are true champions of Jewish control by means of the gold standard. * * *

President Roosevelt's wise decision to abandon all idea of balancing the Budget and to borrow boldly for public works, as described, would usually be condemned as unsound finance were it not inexpedient to do so. * * *

Were the Americans seriously to consider the advantages of providing us "on tick" with the necessary materials in order that we might raise a great army * * * they might render the world safer for democracy and for the money power, but at the certainty of still further increasing our debt to them, which the present money system renders irrepayable, since a cash-and-carry system would be useless to us. This question throws us back on American politics, whether the citizens of the United States really love the European democracies and hate Germany and Italy enough to be willing to deprive themselves of the necessary goods, the debt for which they know full well must remain, like the last American war debt, unpaid. * * *

Money is the supreme arbiter of politics.

This pamphlet is made up of a series of articles which ran in the Patriot from March 1937 to June 1939.

A Tribute to John Nance Garner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRITZ G. LANHAM

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 13, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE FORT WORTH (TEX.) STAR-TELEGRAM

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial which appeared recently in the Fort Worth (Tex.) Star-Telegram in appreciation of the service and unique record of the Honorable JOHN NANCE GARNER, Vice President of the United States:

[From the Fort Worth (Tex.) Star-Telegram]

AN ALL-AMERICAN RECORD

The close of the current year will bring to a distinguished American the moment to which logically he has looked forward for many years. The man is JOHN NANCE GARNER, Vice President of the United States, and the moment is that of his release from the harness of public service which he has worn with honor to himself and advantage to his country for almost 38 years.

Dramatic and fruitful years they have been, witnessing the flowering of character and ability which made of the shy young Texan, first arriving in Washington in 1903 as Representative of the Fifteenth Texas District, a figure of national prestige, the acknowledged leader and master tactician of Congress. Of the qualities which led to his selection, first, as leader of his party's side in the House, then as Speaker of the House, and finally as Vice President, the chief undoubtedly was that combination of soundness in planning and practicality in acting which is sometimes called horse sense. JOHN GARNER took horse sense into public office with him, kept it all along through the 38 years of his service. And it may be observed that it is a quality as badly needed today as in 1903, and as much in Washington as at home, a quality which has not been improved upon and is not likely to be.

No man who knows JOHN GARNER will presume that his interest in public affairs and his concern for the welfare of his party and the Nation will be lulled to apathy at his long-delayed homecoming. There will be pleasant and peaceful days at Uvalde, of serene fishing and the heartening round of homely affairs, days rich with fellowship and neighborliness, quiet with the wordless communion of old friends. But the boundless grasp of national concerns, the keen understanding of trends and movements, all the special knowledge that is contained in the heart and mind of the elder statesman, refined by the fires and pressures of experience, will make themselves manifest, and the great talents which JOHN GARNER brought to the public service will not atrophy in disuse. His services in council will still be available to his country whenever and in whatever fashion they are called for. If there is need for JOHN GARNER at Washington, he will be there, and whether he is at Washington or at home he will continue to be at the command of his country. Texas' JOHN GARNER is not to be cast in the role of an Achilles sulking in his tent, but rather in that of a Nestor, his battles almost done, standing by for counsel and balance.

The mellowness of years has been added to the mental keenness, the hardy practicality, the inspired common sense that have marked Mr. GARNER'S public career. His friends anticipate, in the leisurely days that lie ahead for him under his own vine and fig tree (except that in Mr. GARNER'S case it is a pecan tree), an even greater flowering of the earthy humor and homely philosophy which are the hallmarks of his outstanding Americanism.

It is one of the ironies of fate and duty that two who possess so much of the American's traditional love of home and homely things as do Mr. and Mrs. GARNER should have been caught up for half a lifetime in the all-consuming round of public life; that two whose dearest wish has been coolness and quiet should have found themselves unendingly surrounded by the hot glare that beats upon high position—should have been able, in 38 long years, to find time only for vacations at home. At last their release is at hand, and a grateful nation freely accords them the honorable retirement which long and faithful service has earned. May there be a fish for every cast in the cool streams about Uvalde, and may household cares be non-

existent in the domain of the gracious lady whose contribution to American public life has been in its own way as vital as that of her husband.

It is easy to analyze the qualities which have endeared Mr. and Mrs. Garner to the American people. They simply are "typical Americans"—if that term be defined as that which represents the best traits native to this soil of ours. In public as well as in private life, the Vice President and his gracious consort have exhibited that fundamental faith in the destiny of America and the worthiness of its people which renders them akin to every one of us. This, and an essential integrity, a trueness that controls every act and thought, shape the character of both to form an American ideal.

They are our own people, and it is with full hearts that Texans welcome them home, praying for them many years in which to enjoy the fullness of the homely comforts they have so long denied themselves in our service.

To the First Voter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 13, 1940

ADDRESS OF HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH, OF NEW YORK

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks, unanimously granted by the House, I include the following speech which I delivered at the State convention of the Affiliated Young Democrats of New York, which was held at Utica, N. Y., on August 10 and 11, 1940.

I was happy to address myself to those voters who will participate in their first national election. It is a source of great comfort in these times to know that those young men and women appreciate the importance of the voting privilege and will exercise it with care. I congratulate them.

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, and friends, it is, indeed, a great pleasure and a privilege for me to have been afforded an opportunity to be with you on the occasion of this Third Biennial State Convention of the Affiliated Young Democrats of New York. We who have been privileged to hold elective office during the past 5 years know, of course, of the splendid service rendered to the party by your organization and the untiring and highly beneficial efforts expended on behalf of young Democrats everywhere by your State president, officers, and members.

Your president was very gracious in affording me great latitude in my choice of topic for the few minutes I shall be addressing you. With such latitude, however, goes an equivalent degree of responsibility which I shall cheerfully accept—hoping thereby to manifest a measure of the enthusiasm of a decreasingly young Democrat.

I am happy to note that party regularity and loyalty has been your convention keynote. That keynote, however, connotes the passage of time—of years—and the adherence throughout these years to the principles of our party. We who have watched the sturdy, steady course of our Government throughout these difficult and most critical days of our Nation's history can at once and with ease maintain that high degree of regularity and loyalty that has been manifested by such live and living organizations as yours. We can approach the coming campaign comforted and consoled by the thought that during these days and past years the control of our Government has rested in our party and, therefore, with the people, serving no special interest, but the interest of all: Democracy in action when democracy must and will work. We can look with justifiable pride upon our participation in and contribution to such an administration. We can be regular and loyal to the Democratic Party because we have lived and have seen what democratic government is and does. Our administrations have sought to apply our ideas and ideals.

But what of the other youth, of those millions who will participate in their first national campaign, who politically will ask why be regular, why loyal, to the Democratic Party?

Youth is not traditional, not hide-bound; it is vigorous, energetic, enthusiastic.

Its vigor leads it, at times, into new and untried fields.

Its energy prompts it to attempt the difficult, if not the impossible.

Its enthusiasm carries it to great heights, crowns its short span with great glory, accomplishments, and progress—progress that has always led to a better way of life for the youth that follows vigorous, energetic, and enthusiastic youth.

Youth is basically healthy and sound. Politically, our young people may be quizzical and anxious to be informed, but they are not un-American or subversive, as some would have us believe.

Their only shortcoming flows from their inexperience and that inexperience will eventually ripen into a loyalty to those institutions and beliefs that can stand the cruel and piercing scrutiny of a youth asking "Why?"—of a first voter asking "Why be regular and loyal to your party?"

To them, I should like to pass some of my enthusiasm—with them to share some of my confidence—enthusiasm of and confidence in the democratic way.

We should review with them the history of our party, its struggles, its temporary defeats, its victories, its permanent progress in the humanizing of Government. We can call for them the roll of constructive legislation sponsored and enacted into law under Democratic administrations, we can start with agriculture, go to banking, civil service, Civilian Conservation Corps, Federal Deposit Insurance, Federal Housing, Home Owners' Loan, labor relations, National Youth Administration, national defense, social security, and wages and hours, waging a fight against slums, disease, and underprivilege.

We can properly point out to these first voters the opportunities to be found within our party. We can and should call to their minds the distinguished sons of our party, past and present, sons of the people, chosen from the ranks, who, inspired by our party's history, rose to places of leadership in our country to the lasting credit of our country and our party.

In my own home assembly district there has been in the past 5 years a complete change in elected Democratic officials, including a justice of the municipal court, Representative in Congress, State senator, and member of the assembly. All those elected in that time were under 37 years of age, and most of them were in their early thirties.

I am proud of those young Democrats who this year are running with me. Our State Senator Daniel Gutman and my home assemblyman, Roy H. Rudd, have made enviable records in the State legislature. In the other assembly districts within our congressional district are Democratic candidates of character, of ability, of youth. All the candidates have risen from the ranks of our party.

We can unhesitatingly say to these young men and women first voters that here is the American way, the Democratic way. This is their party.

We must begin now to seek them out, to talk to them, to listen to them, and to prove to them. We are fortified by our record, we are strengthened by our belief, and we are inspired by our loyalty to a party that is truly ours, belonging to all the people, serving all the people, and calling upon all the people to join with us.

Youth will join us in our march of victory, of Democratic victory, and your organization and its members will share the joy of a job well done.

You and youth will do it.

Missed the Big Bets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES F. O'CONNOR

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 13, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE BIG TIMBER PIONEER, OF MONTANA

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include the following editorial from the Big Timber Pioneer, of Montana:

[From the Big Timber Pioneer of Montana]

MISSED THE BIG BETS

Desertions by Democrats removed from office by the Roosevelt administration, who have joined forces with Willkie, are given first-page flash-head notice in all Willkie papers. So far we have had Hanes, Douglas, High, the latter a former adviser to Roosevelt. Also Burke, of Nebraska, defeated for the Democratic nomination for Senator; Mrs. Dwight Morrow, of New Jersey, widow of a former Republican Governor and Senator of that State; also ex-Governor White of Ohio, Democrat. As stated above, all have had as much prominence on the front page as is usually given Joe Louis.

However, they have overlooked two important events.

The Order of Railway Conductors of California, 6,000 strong, gave Roosevelt their endorsement. It had a small paragraphic mention on an unimportant page.

Monday the United Automobile Workers of America, second largest unit of the C. I. O., endorsed Roosevelt and the New Deal. Its action had mention in the dailies but was almost lost near the market reports from eastern business centers.

Individual support amounts to little; organization help means thousands of votes.

Decree Issued by French Government Against So-Called Anti-Semitics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. THORKELSON

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 13, 1940

ARTICLE BY PIERRE GAXOTTE

Mr. THORKELSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I include an article by Pierre Gaxotte under date of April 26, 1939, a translation of the original French. This article is a discussion of a decree issued by the French Government against the so-called anti-Semitics, and has been in my possession since last year. I have held this article, anticipating that similar legislation would be introduced in Congress, and yesterday, August 12, 1940, I discussed three such bills, two of which are in the Judiciary Committee of the House and one in the Judiciary Committee of the Senate.

My reason for inserting these measures in the RECORD is to show that there is a movement on foot to introduce legislation similar to that discussed by Pierre Gaxotte. The two bills (H. R. 7604 and H. R. 10289) now before the Judiciary Committee of the House, and the Senate bill (S. 3876) now in the Senate Judiciary Committee, are an attempt to curb those who have been exposing subversive activities, and which will, if enacted into law, give the Government power to place anyone in jail for 21 years who is designated anti-Semitic or Nazi by Mr. Brandeis' organized minority. In other words, the bills are a minority attempt to prevent anyone from exposing sabotage and destruction of our Government.

I shall comment no further on these measures, but shall ask those who are interested in this problem to read the discussion which I have inserted in the RECORD.

THE DECREE OF JEWISH PROTECTION, THE BEST WAY TO DESTROY FRENCH UNITY

The decree law for the protection of Jews has been signed. After having hesitated, the government took the step. Under threat of penalties extending to 6 months in prison, it is forbidden to a citizen born between Strasbourg and Bayonne to call himself an anti-Semite: The tribunals will punish henceforth "excitations tending to provoke hatreds and discord between the French from motives of race and of religion."

One tells us that the government will make use of the decree only to stop campaigns the hidden end of which would be the shaking of the vigilance of the French and the turning of them aside from the German peril. Let us accept the augury. But the law is the law. It is not a question of knowing the use which will be made of it at present but of knowing what it contains and what it permits. Mandel and Zay are always there. Blum may return.

It is, therefore, proper to present the following observations:

1. The decree expressly speaks of "race," that is to say, that the signers Daladier, Chautemps, Marchandeau, Sarraut, and Mandel admit the fundamental postulate of Hitlerism, always heretofore denied.

2. The decree pretends to repress propaganda carried on for the purpose of exciting hatred between citizens or inhabitants. It does not respond to this intention, for if it had really had for its purpose the maintenance of concord and good will, it would have taken in all the propagandas of strife, beginning with the struggle of the classes, which is by far the most visible and the most pernicious. But only anti-Semitism is recognized.

This is to say that the Communists may continue to preach with impunity the social war, the revolt against taxes and against the regime of work. One may print that the middle classes want war to enrich themselves; that they basely evade their fiscal duty; that they throw on the proletariat the whole burden of the national defense, and that they are bad citizens, and bad French.

One may say that the nationals are Hitlerians; that the Lorrainers are traitors to their own kin; that Corsica is an island peopled with bandits; that the Bretons are half beasts (see Marx Dormoy); that the men of the south of France make poor soldiers; that Marseilles is a city where so and so dominates, etc. But one may not speak one severe word of the Jews.

3. The decree establishes, therefore, two categories of the French. The superior category is formed by the Jews, to whom the law accords a protection which is not given to Bretons, to Lorrainers, to Corsicans, to the Marseillais, as groups. Jewish citizens are henceforth better protected against insult and defamation than ordinary Frenchmen. The non-Jews may with impunity be the objects of insults and of propaganda which would be punishable if addressed to Jews.

4. The decree-law covers not only the French Jewish citizens but also the Jews "living" in France. It establishes, therefore, among the foreigners, refugee or domiciled, two groups enjoying a different status. The non-Jews have fewer rights than the Jews, since one may bring to bear upon them judgments which would be matters of prosecution in connection with Jews. The foreign Jews living in France are not only raised above other foreigners; they are even covered by special protection in comparison to the French who have received them and from whom is henceforth taken the right of complaining of their presence en bloc or of questioning their conduct.

Corollary. The decree-law recognizes on our soil the existence of a Jewish community, since in regard to anti-Semitism, it establishes an equality and a solidarity between the citizen Jews of France and the noncitizen Jews. These two groups have a right, as Jews, to the same special protection.

The worst anti-Semites would never have dared to hope for their doctrines such an exact official consecration.

* * * * * * *

It remains to examine what will be the moral and psychological consequences of the regime of privileged protection that has just been established.

First of all, it is certain that the German propaganda will seize upon it for use in the countries of the Arabs; in Spain; in Latin America, in central and eastern Europe. One of the favorite themes of this propaganda is to represent France as being under Jewish domination and, under pretext of chauvinism, transformed into a soldier of Israel. There is no need to be perspicacious to divine the use which will be made of the decree Daladier—Marchandeau—Chautemps—Mandel—Sarraut. It is a valuable trump given to our enemies and one which the services of Goebbels will not neglect. Evidently the ministers hope in return to win the support of high finance, which they believe still very powerful in New York. In this respect, it is to be feared that the calculation is a bad one. Since the great crash, the sentiments of the American people in regard to Wall Street are those of hatred and distrust. New York, city of Jews and city of immigrants, is far from representing, by its newspapers and its banks, the opinion of the United States. To think too much of New York, that is to risk losing America.

Finally, in what concerns the moral effect in France, one may well believe that it was not necessary to impose a sacred union by the menace of armed gendarmes.

If there was in the world an admirable spectacle, it was precisely the spontaneity with which the French have united themselves during the last weeks, the ardor with which they have responded to the appeals of their leaders, the constancy and sangfroid with which they have opposed threats from outside. There was no need of procurors to teach them patriotism and solidarity before the enemy. The Government, in adopting the decree for Jewish protection, has dealt this unanimity a hard blow, for henceforth all the French will have the feeling that someone has taken advantage of the international danger to undermine their liberty.

The Government has planted suspicion among them. They will question one another; the innocent will lend their ears to the wildest accusations, to those which may not be printed but which will be made everywhere. One institutes a new crime of lese majesty; 9 Frenchmen out of 10 will be convinced that someone has wished to cover up scandalous maneuvers by preventing the press from denouncing them. The absurdity when printed refutes itself. What will you do against sly and vagabond rumors?

Abrogate the decree, M. Lebrun; abrogate it, M. Daladier; there is still time. If you are obstinate, you run the risk of disturbing the national unanimity and of giving impetus to all the quarrels. Reflect for one moment.

You forbid to the masses certain words which they did not think of speaking; certain reflections which they did not think of making; but henceforth you inspire in them every kind of distrust and you compel them to envisage things of which they do not wish to think. You forbid that one should discuss the role and the conduct of Jews in the exterior policy of the country; but by that very fact, you constrain each Frenchman to reflect on it. Are the Jews as a block perfectly peaceable; you render them suspect. We had all thrown overboard our sentiments and our opinions; democrats or not democrats, republicans or not republicans, we were unanimous against the two fascisms, Italian and German. You make us believe that in this unanimity, this self-forgetfulness, and this gift, some people have not lost sight of their own particular interests and that they have known how to utilize the circumstances for winning themselves a privileged status.

We were confident and without ulterior motives. And now we look at one another questioningly. Do not answer to me that you have wished to defend the moral health of the country. Once more you would have forbidden all the propaganda of strife and division, beginning with the battle of the classes; but you have forbidden only one—anti-Semitism.

You run thus the danger of exciting it. As usual, you have been played upon by men who have neither psychology nor shame and who cannot keep themselves from being persecutors when they cease to be persecuted.

PIERRE GAXOTTE.

APRIL 26, 1939.

He Who Hesitates Is Lost

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LUTHER PATRICK
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 5, 1940

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker and fellow Members of Congress, this is still a national democracy. If any doubt it he should observe the patience with which we listen to arguments on the floor of the Congress of the United States—Senate and House. But please let us hasten as much as we may, and still give all a fair hearing, in the matter of the Wadsworth-Burke bill. The dictator has broken loose in the world. He is ruthless, swift, and efficient. He does not have to wait for the argument of those who do not agree with his plan, his philosophy or his ideology. He has declared that democracy is wishful thinking behind an unworkable and outmoded system. He has boldly declared war upon it. By him it has been weighed in the balance and found wanting. It is ready for the scrap heap and he has consigned it there and is only biding the day when he can step forth and execute the action. The Hitler marching song has in it a line which goes, "Today we own Germany, tomorrow the whole world." Hitler has not only pronounced the benediction upon democracy but has become more specifically overt by declaring our solemn Monroe Doctrine void and of no consideration. What more do we need? What do those who scoff at the need of a draft wish?

We should have a greater number at this moment taking military training. To this the overwhelming number all over the country agree; but we find those who agree to this and who still hold to the idea that the need may still be solved by a volunteer system. The facts do not support this conclusion. We stand today with an authorization that would give us 375,000 men in our National Army, but how many do we have? Approximately 270,000. This check-up is of the 3d day of this month of this year. In addition to this, about 7,000 men complete military terms each month and do not enlist. That is why you see the constant drive for men. Today you see a sign on the billboard at the corner of your street, a streamer on the taxicab in front of you, a line in the picture show you attend, all calling to the young man to enlist in the service of his country. Recently the efforts have been tremendous, and yet we are 105,000 men behind our legal authorization. The enlistments are indefinite and uncertain, of course. The firmest proponent of holding to it must concede that it is haphazard. In addition, it does not get an even and fair representation. The burden is borne by certain parts of the country. Kentucky leads the whole country, I believe, followed close by Tennessee, Georgia, Alabama, Oklahoma, Texas, and other States in the same general area, as a rule. For example, I have just gotten the figures from the Assistant Chief of Staff of The Adjutant General's office and find that for the past 6 months, Texas, with a State population of 5,824,715, last Federal census, has contributed 6,648 enlistments, while New York with her 12,588,066 has only seen 5,471 of her patriotic sons join the Army in the same period. Insofar as that particular feature of democratic methods may concern us the more democratic plan is the draft system.

That is the idea. It is just. It is fair. It is businesslike. Whatever may be our feelings as to voluntary enlistment we must concede that it is not the acme of definite and businesslike proceedings. We need to do a lot of preparing and we need to do it well. We cannot be too thorough. We are trying to add to our Army such a number as will bring it to the strength of 900,000 by this fall. Certainly we should have them, and the Nation feels uncomfortable and unsafe today with the small number we have in our Regular Army. This includes, by the way, the National Guard. Then by next spring we hope to run it up to 1,200,000. Some wish to run it higher, but I have an abiding suspicion that if we see it go to that figure we had better be quite happy. If accomplished, this means that we must see inducted 400,000 trainees during this fall and an additional 400,000 next spring, with a catching up of 105,000 now authorized and not in. Can you tell me how that may be done without a peacetime draft? One great lawmaker has come forward with the brilliant suggestion that we hike the Army pay $9 per month. He has heard several "amens" to his proposal. Let me rise to venture the bold remarks that it is my gentle opinion that $9 more per month will not add enough pepper to the patriotism of the men of the country to induce 505,000 to swarm to enlistment camps this fall, with 400,000 more waiting to make the plunge next spring. The best we have ever been able to do, so far, in 1 month has given a net gain of 23,000, and even this would have to be given a fivefold boost and then be kept sustained and constant through till fall to do the job. Do you think it has a Chinaman's chance? You know that it has not. Why fool ourselves? We love democracy in this country and hate to give up on any point that has been held by us as a wholesome part of our system, but the time has come in the march of time when, if we are just and reasonable, when if we are not willing to follow sentiment to the abandonment of firm duty, we must touch the youth of the land on the shoulder and say to him tenderly, gently, but firmly: "Wake up, America. There is work to be done."

I thank you.

"They Builded Better Than They Knew"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS R. BALL
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 13, 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. THOMAS R. BALL, OF CONNECTICUT

Mr. BALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me at the dedication of a monument to the founders of Norwich, Conn., on August 11, 1940:

It is with particular pleasure that I am with you today. Many memories cluster around me. With due reverence I have chosen as my text a verse from that treasury of devotion, the Psalms of David: "But as for his people, he led them forth like sheep, and carried them in the wilderness like a flock."

We are met today in the company of our forefathers, to honor them, and to dedicate to them a monument of enduring stone that will show forth our filial devotion.

Here, beneath the kindly earth, lie the founders of Norwich, whose spirits, released from the bondage of the flesh, are with God. We, their children's children, come to this holy place on this Sunday afternoon for a noble purpose. We draw ourselves away from the world of today with its troubles, its noise, and its anxiety, and recall together the men and women of a bygone age.

Think for a moment of that little band that came from the Saybrook Fort, and, without thought of conquest, dealt fairly with the Indians, and bought and paid for their 9 miles square. The stalwart leader, John Mason; the servant of God, James Fitch; the fearless Leffingwell, and their few companions began to build here in Norwich Town. "They builded better than they knew."

It was not an easy life in early Norwich. It meant hard work day after day and month after month. Remember, these men first cleared the land and laid the stones up into fences. They felled the trees and hewed the timber into massive posts and girts and summer beams. They forged their nails and their hinges. They pastured their cattle and slaughtered their beef. They cultivated

patches of the cleared land and grew corn, and ground that corn. They dipped their tallow into candles. All the time their women prepared three square meals a day. They wove and they spun. They bore and raised, and clothed and fed many children. They suffered much. They complained little. Their lives were hard, but their hopes were high, and we, their children unto many generations, today rise up and call them blessed.

The past century has seen our civilization transformed into some strange sort of monstrous mechanism. With the development of the machine, New England, and Norwich too, has gained much and lost plenty. We have our automobiles, engines of destruction, in place of the horses; tractors instead of oxen. We have radios, ice cubes, and thermostats. We have bombers, and tanks, and submarines. Neon signs brighten our once quiet streets. Swing music and shorts, hot dogs and popsicles, and roadsides cluttered with empty bottles and yesterday's papers—all are part of the present day picture. But surely they cannot be all that there is to it. Somewhere behind the tawdriness of today must be the old loyalties, the old faith, the old patriotism.

Our beloved country is in danger. She is beset from within and without by strange and evil forces. She may be obliged to fight to preserve intact her liberty. She demands of us all the supreme test of our Americanism, and, as we hear the call of duty, we will respond as worthy children of our fathers.

As we renew our obligations, and consecrate ourselves afresh we shall resolve not only to fulfill our own duty, but to teach it to the children of the generations to come "that their posterity might know it, and the generations that are yet unborn."

As we solemnly set apart this stone as a memorial to those men and women of Norwich whose unmarked graves are here about us, we reaffirm our allegiance to the faith which they preserved in the wilderness, which upheld them in their hour of trial and which lightened the darkness of their despair.

Founders of Norwich, we, your sons and daughters, salute you.

Unprecedented Action of Committee Not Hearing Author of Charges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 13, 1940

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, in the early part of June, I charged on the floor of the House that Lt. Col. Carl Byoir was guilty of un-American activities and that he should be investigated by the Dies un-American activities committee.

The gentleman from Texas, Chairman DIES, appointed a subcommittee, composed of Mr. DEMPSEY, of New Mexico, chairman; Mr. MASON, of Illinois; and Mr. CASEY, of Massachusetts, to hear the proof to support the charges.

LIEUTENANT COLONEL IN OUR ARMY EMPLOYED TO REPRESENT HITLER

Without giving me any notice whatsoever and without giving me an opportunity to submit the proof to sustain the charges, which I had and was ready and willing to present if notice had been given, a statement was issued by this subcommittee on July 20, 1940, fully exonerating Carl Byoir of being engaged in un-American activities.

Today, August 12, 1940, I wired the gentleman from New Mexico, Congressman DEMPSEY, chairman of that subcommittee, at Santa Fe, N. Mex., as follows:

> Your unwarranted action in exonerating Lt. Col. Carl Byoir on un-American activities places him in line to help administer conscription bill if passed. Since your committee acted without giving me chance to support the charges with proof I now demand this opportunity before your committee. I can convince any fair-minded person, even those who have prejudged the charges, that Lieutenant Colonel Byoir was one of Hitler's first agents, if not the first, in this country in charge of Nazi propaganda; that he diligently pursued such propaganda activities over a period of years while he was lieutenant colonel in our Army and received fabulous sums for such propaganda work from the German consul in New York and from interests in Germany by reason of the contract approved by Hitler's minister of propaganda. Our danger from within is great and this is no time to run a risk. Will you give me the opportunity to present conclusive evidence before your committee of Lieutenant Colonel Byoir's un-American activities?

Until the end of the day, August 13, 1940, no reply had been received to this telegram.

Strategy and Tactics of the Proletarian Revolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. THORKELSON

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 13, 1940

ARTICLE BY INTERNATIONAL PUBLISHERS, 1936

Mr. THORKELSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I include an article entitled "Strategy and Tactics of the Proletarian Revolution," by International Publishers, New York, 1936.

Mr. Speaker, the danger which confronts the United States today is communism, and it is that which we must curb before it is too late. This article is inserted in order to call the attention of Congress to this problem. I shall ask those who are interested in the dangers of communism and other subversive movements to read this article.

STRATEGY AND TACTICS OF THE PROLETARIAN REVOLUTION

(By International Publishers, New York, 1936)

This is a book of 96 pages compiled from the works of Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin, and others. It explains the moves and organizations approaching the 1917 revolution in Russia, and their application to the proposed revolutions in other countries. It analyzes the nature of Bolshevik strategy and tactics, how, where, and when to apply them, for the completion of the revolution in these United States. Leaders in politics and defense of the Union should read the book carefully.

We only quote a few passages which should show to even a skeptic, beyond a doubt, the progress already made in the United States of America toward their ultimate goal—The United Soviet States of America, described in W. Z. Foster's book Toward a Soviet America, 1932.

In a chapter, Leadership—Strategic and Fundamental, from page 35 we quote: "The decisive battle," says Lenin, may be deemed to be fully matured when "all the class forces hostile to us have become sufficiently confused, are sufficiently at loggerheads with each other, have sufficiently weakened themselves in a struggle beyond their capacities"; when "all the vacillating, wavering, unstable, intermediate elements—the petty bourgeois and the petty bourgeois democrats, as distinct from the bourgeoisie—have sufficiently exposed themselves before the people, and have sufficiently disgraced themselves through their practical bankruptcy"; when "among the proletariat a mass mood in favor of supporting the most determined, unreservedly bold, revolutionary action against the bourgeoisie has arisen and begins to grow powerfully. Then, indeed, revolution is ripe; then, indeed, if we have correctly gaged all the conditions outlined above, and if we have chosen the moment rightly, our victory is assured." (Left-Wing Communism, etc., pp. 93–94.)

It is not difficult to locate the conditions referred to in the above by studying the present situation in the United States of America. The "reds" have taken years to "bring about those conditions."

From page 42, a short quotation: "Secondly, there has never been, and can never be a successful offensive without a regrouping of forces in the course of the offensive itself, without consolidating the occupied positions, without utilizing reserves to develop successes and push the offensive to its conclusion." This not only applies to armed action but to political as well, here the application to the two major political parties; how they have been literally captured by the revolutionary forces and turned into able instruments of advance; and the reserves (Farmer-Labor, American Labor, and many other parties) have been brought up to help the sabotage, the division of both old parties, the confusion of the voters; and then they bring in the so-called progressives and liberals to act as sappers within the party organizations and as candidates; of course accompanied with much soothing sirup and high-sounding rescue phrases and policies."

On page 45, three short paragraphs bring us up to much of the New Deal tactics and its importance in the chain of events that must be forged to lead to the final victory: "Second, to locate at any given moment that single link in the chain of events which, if seized upon, will enable us to keep hold of the whole chain and prepare the ground for the achievement of strategic success.

"The point here is to single out from the tasks confronting the party precisely the one that must be fulfilled next, the fulfillment of which is the central point and which will assure the successful fulfillment of the remaining urgent tasks.

"The importance of this postulate may be illustrated by two examples, one of which may be taken from the remote past" (the period of the formation of the party) "and the other from the immediate present" (the period of the new economic policy).

On page 48 the following gives us more light: "The main task of contemporary communism in Western Europe and America is to acquire the ability to seek, to find, to determine correctly the concrete path or the particular turn of events that will bring the masses right up to the real, decisive, last and great revolutionary struggle." Present events at home and abroad demonstrate far greater progress than the average citizen realizes; for actual war which is to be treated the same as the 1917 war in Russia "turned into a local revolution." How well prepared are we to meet that "event" here?

Page 55 starts a chapter on The Bolshevik Attitude Toward Reforms.

"What is the difference between revolutionary tactics and reformist tactics?

"Some are of the opinion that Leninism is opposed to reforms, opposed to compromises and to agreements in general. That is absolutely untrue. Bolsheviks know as well as anybody else that in a certain sense every little helps, that under certain conditions reforms, in general, and compromise and agreements, in particular, are necessary and useful.

"To carry on a war for the overthrow of the international bourgeoisie (says Lenin) a war which is a hundred times more difficult, prolonged and complicated than the most stubborn of ordinary wars between states, and to refuse beforehand to maneuver, to utilize the conflict of interests (even though temporary) among one's enemies, to refuse to temporize and compromise with possible (even though temporary, unstable, vacillating, and conditional) allies, is not this ridiculous in the extreme? Is it not as though, in the difficult ascent of an unexplored and heretofore inaccessible mountain, we were to renounce beforehand the idea that at times we might have to go in zigzags, sometimes retracing our steps, sometimes giving up the course once selected and trying various others?

"Hence, it is obvious that it is not a question of reforms or compromises and agreements, as such, but of the use that is made of reforms and compromises."

Do not these few lines help you to understand the many, many compromises and so-called reforms entered into during the past 10 years between Republican-Democratic party leaders, public officials, and many patriotic groups, and our common enemy at home and abroad? August 23 witnessed a great historical compromise that startled the world. Watch it.

Chapter 5 cites principal tasks of the strategy and tactics of the Comintern.

1. The fight to win the majority of the working class and gain for it the hegemony over the toiling masses.

Under this heading is quoted from page 63: "To work in reactionary trade unions and skillfully to capture them, to win the confidence of the broad masses of the industrially organized workers, to relieve and remove from their posts the reformist leaders, represent important tasks in the preparatory period." Do you now see the Communist workings in the ranks of organized labor, the destruction of the patriotic unions (they call them reactionary), and the building up of the C. I. O. after the pattern of the older I. W. W. for the purpose of the revolution, and that only? Then the help of the N. L. R. B., the La Follette civil liberties committee, and other agencies to protect and defend the "red" cause.

On pages 73 and 74, just one paragraph gives a very excellent example of the coalition between the New Deal and the "united front" of all manner of "reds": "While revealing to the masses the meaning of the demagogic arguments advanced by the right social democratic leaders against the "united front," while intensifying the struggle against the reactionary section of social democracy, the Communists must establish the closest cooperation with those left social democratic workers, functionaries, and organizations that fight against the reformist policy and advocate a united front with the Communist Party. The more we intensify our fight against the reactionary camp of social democracy, which is participating in a bloc with the bourgeoisie, the more effective will be the assistance we give to that part of social democracy which is becoming revolutionized. And the self-determination of the various elements within the left camp will take place the sooner the more resolutely the Communists fight for a united front with the social democratic parties."

From pages 75 and 76 we quote: "In the circumstances of a political crisis, when the ruling classes are no longer in a position to cope with the powerful sweep of the mass movement, the Communists must advance fundamental revolutionary slogans (such as, for instance, control of production and the banks, disbandments of the police force, and its replacement by an armed workers' militia, etc.), which are directed toward still further shaking the economic and political power of the bourgeoisie and increasing the strength of the working class toward isolating the parties of compromise, and which lead the working masses right up to the point of the revolutionary seizure of power. If with an upsurge of the mass movement it will prove possible, and necessary in the interests of the proletariat, to create a proletarian united-front government, or an anti-Fascist people's front government, which is not yet a government of the proletarian dictatorship, but one which undertakes to put into effect decisive measures against fascism and reaction, the Communist Party must see to it that such a government is formed * * *. Insofar as the united-front government will really undertake decisive measures against counter-revolutionary financial magnates and their Fascist agents, and will in no way restrict the activity of the Communist Party and the struggle of the working class, the Communist Party will support such a government in every way. The participation of the Communists in a united-front government will be decided separately in each particular case as the concrete situation may warrant." If the above is not a true bill for the New Deal, then we cannot read and understand language.

Page 80 gives this little paragraph: "Communists must carry on a struggle to draw the cooperative organizations into the ranks of the united front of the proletariat and of the anti-Fascist people's front." Do you recall the many cooperatives penetrating every line of endeavor to abolish selling for a profit anything needed by the people? Of course, the Bolsheviks will conduct the sale and distribution of all commodities—will they make a profit? You answer that one.

Page 81 throws more light on the things that have just happened to the old political parties, and the old party leaders continue to compromise and deal. Quote: "Steering a course in the direction of this perspective of the revolutionary development, the Seventh Congress of the Communist International calls on the Communist Parties to display the greatest political activity and daring, to carry on a tireless struggle to bring about unity of action by the working class. The establishment of the united front of the working class is the decisive link in the preparation of the toilers for the forthcoming great battles of the second round of proletarian revolutions. Only the welding of the proletarian into a single mass political army will ensure its victory in the struggle against fascism and the power of capital, for the dictatorship of the proletariat and the power of the Soviets. The victory of revolution never comes by itself. It has to be prepared for and won."

Pages 84 and 85 prove interesting, especially in the following brief quote: "(a) The United States of America. Let us take, for example, so important a country in the capitalist world as the United States of America. Three millions of people have been brought into motion by the crisis. The program for the recovery of capitalism has collapsed. Vast masses are beginning to abandon the bourgeois parties, and are at present at the crossroads." (Note this was written in 1936.)

Page 85, quote: "It is perfectly obvious that the interests of the American proletariat demand that all its forces dissociate themselves from the capitalist parties without delay. It must, at the proper time, find ways and suitable forms of preventing fascism from winning over the broad and discontented masses of the toilers. And here it must be said that under American conditions the creation of a mass party of toilers, a farmer-labor party, might serve as such a suitable form. Such a party would be a specific form of the mass people's front in America that should be set up in opposition to the parties of the trusts and the banks, and likewise to growing fascism. Such a party, of course, will be neither Socialist nor Communist. But it must be an anti-Fascist party and must not be an anti-Communist party."

"The program of this party must be directed against the banks, trusts, and monopolies, against the principal enemies of the people who are gambling on its misfortunes. Such a party will be equal to its task only if it defends the urgent demands of the working class, only if it fights for genuine social legislation, for unemployment insurance; only if it fights for land for the white and black sharecroppers and for their liberation from the burden of debt; only if it works for the cancelation of the farmers' indebtedness; only if it fights for the equal status of the Negroes; only if it fights for the demands of the ex-servicemen, and for the interests of the members of the liberal professions, and small-business men, the artisans; and so on." Read the quotation from Adam Wieshaupt in another article herein for the outline of the above program. That was penned in 1775. Marx used it in 1848. Has the New Deal taken it seriously? All these "fundamentals" of communism and socialism directly parallel the New Deal. Why should they not? Both are the same and for the same purpose.

Pages 90 and 91 throw light upon events of yesterday, today, and tomorrow in the following lines: "On the basis of the teaching of Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin on war, the Sixth World Congress of the Communist International concretely formulated the tasks of the Communist Parties and the revolutionary proletariat in the struggle against imperialist war. Guided by these principles, the Communist Parties of Japan, and China, both directly affected by war, have waged and are waging a Bolshevik struggle against imperialist war and for the defense of the Chinese people. The Seventh World Congress of the Communist International, confirming the decisions of the Sixth Congress on the Struggle Against Imperialist War, sets the following main tasks before the Communist Parties, the revolutionary workers, toilers, peasants, and oppressed peoples of the whole world:

"1. The struggle for peace and for the defense of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. In face of the war provocations of the German Fascists and Japanese militarists, and the speeding up of armaments by the war parties in the capitalist countries, in face of the immediate danger of a counter-revolutionary war breaking out against the Soviet Union, the central slogan of the Communist Parties must be: Struggle for Peace.

"2. The united people's front in the struggle for peace and against the instigators of war. The struggle for peace opens up before the Communist Parties the greatest opportunities for creating the broadest united front. All those interested in the preservation of peace should be drawn into this united front."

We then turn to pages 94 and 95 to bring out an interesting policy of the Bolsheviks that all Americans should understand in view of the vast propaganda to force the United States of America into a war in "defense of the Soviet Union" against Japan, Germany, Italy, or any line-up that threatens the "reds." Quote: "The Communists, while fighting also against the illusion that war can be eliminated while the capitalist system still exists, are exerting and will exert every effort to prevent war. Should a new imperialist world war break out, despite all efforts of the working class to prevent it, the Communists will strive to lead the opponents of war, organized in the struggle for the transformation of the imperialist war into a civil war against the Fascist instigators of war, against the bourgeoisie, for the overthrow of capitalism."

If these few quotations do not convince the reader of the facts behind the news of the day, he can purchase the book at any "red" book store for 50 cents and read more about it.

You now know from the pens of the Bolsheviks themselves just what to expect should we be drawn into a war that is not "in defense of the Soviet Union." And what good American wants to defend that bunch, even indirectly?

Conscription

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GUY M. GILLETTE

OF IOWA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 13 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

EDITORIAL FROM WALLACE'S FARMER AND IOWA HOMESTEAD

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial which appears in the current issue of Wallace's Farmer and Iowa Homestead, entitled "Does United States Need To Draft Your Boy?"

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Wallaces' Farmer and Iowa Homestead of August 10, 1940]

DOES THE UNITED STATES NEED TO DRAFT YOUR BOY?

One of the big, hot issues that nobody likes to touch—platforms of both parties dodged it—is drafting men for the Army and Navy. There's a lot of argument on both sides. Here are some of the high points:

HOW BIG AN ARMY DO WE NEED?

If Great Britain is beaten there is a possibility that we may have to put our Navy in one ocean and rely on the Army, coast defenses and the air force to beat off an attack from the other side. Probably a highly mechanized, mobile army of 200,000 could wipe out any invading force. But we'd need as many more for garrison duty. Suppose we have to take over the French, British, and Dutch islands in the Atlantic or send a force to help a Latin American government put down a Nazi revolution. We'd need more men for that. Various estimates put the desirable size of the Army all the way from 400,000 men—the strength now authorized—to 2,000,000 men.

WHAT KIND OF AN ARMY DO WE NEED?

When President Roosevelt talks of equipment for an army of 2,000,000 men, and when Army people talk of drafting 1,500,000 men in the next year, farmers may wonder whether the President and the Army people have learned anything from the present war. Poland had a big draft army; so did France. But relatively small forces of Nazi mechanized troops went through them like a knife through butter. Fewer than 100,000 Nazis, in tanks and armored cars, supported by air forces, smashed from Sedan to the coast and destroyed France. A mechanized force of 500,000 men, led by young officers who have learned the lessons of the present war, would be worth more to the United States than an old-style Army of 2,000,000 men, led by old generals who are still fighting the war of 1918.

CAN WE GET ENOUGH VOLUNTEERS?

Right now, the recruiting campaign is going fairly well, but it will take 4 or 5 more months to fill up the Regular Army to authorized strength. But the Army never has trouble getting recruits for its aviation service. If the Army is mechanized, and the length of service cut to 1 year (now the present term is 3 years, although the proposed draft army would serve for only 1 year), it is possible that recruiting of volunteers would give us an Army of from 400,000 to 600,000 men.

WHAT KIND OF DRAFT IS BEST?

If it turns out that we cannot get the minimum number of men needed for national safety by volunteering, then what kind of a draft would work best? One plan is to register everybody between 18 and 64 years, but to call out in the first year only about 1,500,000 men between 21 and 30 years, from a group estimated to contain about 11,500,000. Men with families and in necessary occupations would be exempt in the first draft. Another plan would be to call into service practically every able-bodied young man as soon as he was 20 or 21, and make almost no exceptions.

In the long run, it may turn out that a draft is necessary to get an army as large as we need. Wallaces' Farmer and Iowa Homestead hopes not. But before any draft is made, the Army should shake off its 1918 ideas, aim at a highly mechanized force instead of the old mass army, and should see what a sensible volunteering campaign will do. Cut Army enlistments to 1 year, and prove to the boys that they're going to run tanks and trucks instead of tramping through the dust. Let's not draft men for the Army if we don't need to.

Wendell Willkie—An Appraisal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOAH M. MASON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 13, 1940

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I insert the following appraisal of Wendell L. Willkie.

In meeting Willkie one gets an impression of great strength, both physical and mental. In shaking hands with Willkie I thought my fingers would be crushed—and I have a real grip myself.

In my opinion, Willkie would be a real fellow on a camping trip into the wilds; a very valuable partner to have in a business venture; and certainly a real tower of strength in a battle of any kind, whether political or otherwise.

Willkie is a man with a powerful physique, abounding vitality, a fund of good humor, a mischievous twinkle in his eyes, a direct way of looking at one, and a bluff, hearty manner of greeting people—a good man to tie to.

I was not for Willkie before the convention in Philadelphia; I did not know enough about him. I now sincerely believe that the Philadelphia convention selected the best man of the lot, the one who will make the strongest appeal to the voters, and the one best qualified to lead us out of the wilderness we have been wandering around in during the past 8 years.

I consider Willkie the man best qualified to straighten out our "unpreparedness mess," and it needs straightening out very badly.

Not Very Encouraging

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES F. O'CONNOR

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 13, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE BIG TIMBER PIONEER OF MONTANA

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Big Timber Pioneer of Montana:

[From the Big Timber Pioneer of Montana]

NOT VERY ENCOURAGING

Official canvass of the primary election returns in this State should not be very encouraging to the Republicans, especially to those who have predicted that Willkie and the Republican State ticket will go across in November.

For Senator, Wheeler and Freebourn polled a total of 103,626; Cheadle, Carroll, and Fluent, Republicans, 42,738. A majority of

60,888 for the Democratic candidates is not bad in a total vote of 146,364.

For Governor, Ayers, Lamey, and Kathan polled a total of 105,319; Ford, Hauswirth, Leuthold, Moe, Stockdal, and Wuerthner, Republicans, 49,652. A majority of 55,667 for the Democratic candidates.

In this congressional district O'Connor polled 47,420; Hoiness and Ruffcorn a combined vote of 26,348.

In the western district the Democratic vote totals 48,380; Republican, 19,840.

John W. Bonner, unopposed Democrat for attorney general nomination, had the largest individual vote, 80,176; Fred H. Padbury, unopposed for secretary of state, the largest individual Republican vote, 37,382.

Majorities for all other nominations ran about on an average with those for Senator and Governor on both tickets.

Fifth Anniversary of Inauguration of Social Security Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAT HARRISON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 14 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

STATEMENT PREPARED BY PAUL V. M'NUTT, FEDERAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATOR

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, today is the fifth anniversary of the inauguration of the social-security law. As chairman of the Finance Committee, it was my privilege to participate in the preparation and enactment of that law. I believe that it is wholesome and beneficial.

I offer and ask to have printed in the RECORD a statement relative to the 5 years of the administration of the social-security law as prepared by the present Administrator, Hon. Paul V. McNutt.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF PAUL V. M'NUTT, FEDERAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATOR, ON THE FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

Five years ago the Social Security Act became a law. If any bold prophet had predicted in 1932 that within 3 years America would lift itself from the nadir of depression to establish a farsighted social-security program for the future, few would have believed it possible.

The fact that social security came in 1935 is a tribute to the unflagging energy and clear-headed policy of the President. In 1927, 1928, 1929, the lush years of our gamblers' boom, we had made no effort to plan for the security of American family income. We had not applied to our national economy the simple conservative principles that Benjamin Franklin recommended to our ancestors. So when the gamblers' bubble burst and hundreds of thousands of men lost their jobs the destruction of family purchasing power accelerated the depression by destroying home markets. Much more significant than the destruction of markets is the fact that the depression broke up families and thus destroyed the basic unit upon which our American democracy rests.

In 1935 with America once more on the highway of economic recovery, the President might have ignored the future. He might have been satisfied to rest on recovery. Certainly thousands were urging him to be content with the economic arrangements of the 1920's. "Why," they cried, "should we mix recovery and reform?" But the President had vision. He saw that the tragedy which comes to individuals and to nations when family income stops must be met by a farsighted plan, financially sound enough and secure enough to withstand the "blitzkrieg" of any depression.

Through the Social Security Act of 1935, and the amendments which strengthened it in 1939, such defenses were built. On this fifth anniversary of the establishment of this great program let us see just how soundly and strategically these defenses were planned. Let us consider the problems they were designed to meet, and the principles and methods and good management by which they were planned and executed to the Nation's satisfaction.

Congress attempted to construct no simple Maginot line. It recognized that the forces which attack the security of families are varied. It saw that the forces of depression were swift and changing. They waged a war of movement. And in a war of movement there must be equal versatility on the side of the defense. So the social-security plan was no simple catch-all. It grew out of experience and study.

To protect the great mass of wage earners and their families Congress created two insurance programs—programs by which workers and employers could plan in the fat years for the lean years which must follow.

The first of these was old-age and survivors' insurance. To every worker comes age, or death. In age the pay check stops for the worker. He and his family must have a regular monthly income. They must know in advance that they will have a regular monthly income if they are to feel secure. Nobody could believe in a country which didn't afford him a means to provide for his own self-respecting future.

Old age can be planned for in the working years of life if there is established in the social machinery of the Nation a dependable way to plan for it.

If the worker dies in the working years of his life his pay check stops, and there must be provision made for the widow and orphans and others who depend upon that worker as their breadwinner. That is a simple problem of insurance, not greatly dissimilar to the group insurance with which American workers and American industry have long developed.

Old-age and survivors' insurance program is financed through the years of a worker's life by contributions which he and his employer make into a social-security trust fund which can be used for no other purpose than the payment of such benefits. It met that challenge.

Fifty million workers now have social-security accounts. Monthly insurance payments are already going to more than 132,000 persons at a rate of more than two and one-half million dollars a month. To the families of workers who die leaving no one eligible for monthly benefits, more than $20,000,000 has been paid out in lump-sum death claims under this insurance program. Hundreds of thousands of old people approaching the age of 65 will find that these monthly payments related to the size of their average monthly wages will enable them to live in security in their own home among their own friends in their own home town. They come to the workers as a matter of right because they join with their employers in helping to pay for them.

Unemployment does not come to every worker but the extent of unemployment within limits can be estimated and planned for. The scope of unemployment varies from industry to industry, from section to section. These are problems best managed by the State which can thereby adapt the details of unemployment compensation to the characteristics of its industries and the needs of its own people. These programs receive Federal aid. They meet standards as to the professional quality of their administration and the professional excellence of their personnel. Every State and Territory now has a system of unemployment compensation financed by industrial contributions.

More than $1,000,000,000 has been paid out in out-of-work benefits to unemployed workers during the relatively short period this program has been in operation. More than 28,000,000 workers have earned credits toward unemployment compensation. Nearly 1,500,000 workers this month are receiving unemployment compensation based on such credits.

Thus contributory programs cushion the shock when family pay checks stop for workers in American commerce and industry. Other workers on the farms, in the homes, in nonprofit institutions, as specified by the act are not protected under either the old-age and survivors-insurance system or the State systems of unemployment compensation. Congress limited the operation of the system so that its extension could be planned step by step as the financial and administrative stability of the program dictated. I think we all look to the day when coverage will be extended to those who are not now protected.

There are others without income who cannot build up rights under these social-insurance programs which apply to wage earners. These others are the needy, who are needy from no fault of their own, who therefore should not have to accept the aid accompanied by any of the stigma of charity. For these groups there are public-assistance programs which stand behind the front line of social insurance.

Every State has today a program of protection for the needy aged; nearly every State has programs for dependent children, for the needy blind. Like the program of unemployment compensation, these are federally aided, State-administered programs. They, too, meet high standards in their management and in their personnel.

Nearly 3,000,000 people monthly are being helped through these Federal-State public-assistance programs. Of these, 1,930,000 are needy old people, more than 800,000 are dependent children, and more than 48,000 are blind. Payments made under these programs total more than $1,500,000,000 for old-age assistance, $47,000,000 for aid to the blind, and $350,000,000 for aid to dependent children. It is estimated that more than $50,000,000 dollars will be paid out through these public-assistance programs in the month of August alone. This brings the total payments made through the benefit-paying programs of the Social Security Board to a total of more than $3,000,000,000.

Other action is being taken for protecting family income—action that strengthens these benefit-paying programs. Through a reorganization order last year, the President transferred to the Social

Security Board, the United States Employment Service. It is now well coordinated in a Bureau of Employment Security, which also administers the unemployment-compensation program. When a man is out of a job, the first thing he wants is another job. A job is the first line of defense for family income. If a suitable job can't be found, then his unemployment-compensation check is the alternative. That simple logic dictated the grouping of these two activities. From them there is now beginning to flow a sounder and more comprehensive understanding of the job needs of American industry and the income needs of American families during periods of unemployment.

There is now a Nation-wide network of 1,500 full-time employment offices. There are nearly 3,000 branch offices regularly visited by traveling representatives. Last year more than 3,500,000 workers were placed in jobs. Today to meet the demands of vital defense industries we are extending our program of employment service and channeling needed workers from community to community and State to State as industry requires. In the long run the employment services will reduce the cost of unemployment compensation by putting men more promptly into jobs and thus shortening the period of unemployment.

Behind all the benefit-paying programs, there is farsighted provision for improving the health of American workers and American workers' families. When they are fully developed, these should have the effect of decreasing loss of income through preventable disease and disability. One has only to look at the broad development of public-health services throughout the Nation under the Social Security Act, the new health officers in hundreds of rural counties, the increased clinical facilities and public-health nursing facilities in the cities, the programs for infant and maternal care, to feel the tremendous contribution they have made to the strength of America.

It is indeed fortunate for America that this farsighted policy was established 5 years ago. The employment-service program is today in the front line of the defense effort, finding skilled men for defense jobs. On the part of families of American workers throughout the Nation, there is a new confidence that the American system is creating a more secure future for them and their families. These are programs which have put the management genius of America to work for the ordinary man. In so doing, they have made a major contribution to the internal defense of our democracy. "Fifth columns" don't go very far when people know the Nation is at work for them.

We Don't Want Conscription

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RUSH D. HOLT

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 14 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

ARTICLE FROM RELIGIOUS TELESCOPE

Mr. HOLT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article from Religious Telescope, the official organ of the United Brethren Church, entitled "We Don't Want Conscription."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WE DON'T WANT CONSCRIPTION

And now the country faces the possibility of a general peacetime conscription plan. The proposition is still pending. What form, if any, it may take is yet a matter unknown. The present discussion is more of the nature of a feeler to discover what the country will stand for, and if the people can be sufficiently scared the result may be a compulsory conscription plan that will include all men from 18 to 65 years of age for some form of military service. That, of course, represents the widest extreme, although some advocates would go so far as to include the women as well as the men. It indicates how near the lunacy fringe intelligent people can steer in a time of hysteria.

It is more probable that the requirement of this compulsory conscription plan will be much milder, if indeed it is adopted at all. It is possible that the sober second thought of the country will assert itself in time to forestall this wild move which would wipe out almost the last mark of distinction between America and the military powers of Europe.

Already the United States is committed to an armament program unparalleled in our history. Before the adjournment of the present Congress we will have voted for the building up of our military forces over $14,000,000,000, and almost every message of the President to Congress is an appeal for more money. The national debt limit will of necessity have to be lifted in a very short time, and this proposed conscription plan would increase indefinitely the demands upon the Treasury, committing through increased taxation the entire Nation to one giant military enterprise consuming the country's resources for an indefinite period, if not forever after. Shall we give all our strength to the war enterprise—we who have claimed to be a Nation committed to the ideals of peace and good will?

And all in time of peace, the only occasion being that a continental war is on in Europe, a continent that from time immemorial has been given to war and more war. Why should our testimony for peace be marred by this unnecessary action—this natural step toward a European regime for America? While we are not a war-like or warring Nation, our people can be counted on to arise to any emergency when it presents itself. Volunteers will not be lacking when a call is sounded, but to whip up a war hysteria by shouting "crisis" and "emergency," and even by waving a red flag in the face of other countries, is a matter to be deprecated and opposed. Our people are not ready for conscription on a basis of that sort.

Life is too short to devote any number of its precious and best years to military service unnecessarily. Its energies are intended for nobler purposes. It is time to be elevating our ideals as a people rather than to be lowering them. For, after all, our safety is not entirely in military machinery, defenses, and attitudes. Should we surrender our American ideals, forget the great fundamental principles upon which our national life has been established, and make ourselves like the nations which we are criticizing, nothing will save us. Destruction would come upon us from within. If reports from some of the conquered nations across the sea are to be accepted at face value, we are beginning to see anew that moral weaknesses are the real cause of national calamity. In fact, they constitute a calamity per se. We can't avoid the consequences of our moral weakness by process or program of saber rattling.

We favor a reasonable defense program. In this period of world insanity and revolution reason demands that the country be prepared for any possible uprising from within or sudden danger from without. That should be accepted on general principles, and should not depend on war scares. Certainly the American people would always recognize the wisdom of such a course, leaving no occasion for a sudden hullabaloo, with international ghosts and goblins dancing before our eyes to create a frenzy of fear and excitement.

Nor need safety measures be made political issues or be connected with politics in any sense. We have stated before on these pages that beyond doubt our national defenses need to be increased, and should be increased. More than that, we need to keep abreast with the progress of military equipment. The Army and Navy and air forces should be up to the minute. Every advance in invention and scientific research should be known and available to our military leaders. We have a right to expect that, and would be loath to think that those leaders were asleep while any possible enemy is creating superior military equipment.

But that is something far different from militarizing our country, exhausting its resources for the purpose of putting it on a war basis in peacetime, conscripting our manpower in gigantic military program, and turning the country into an armed camp. We don't want peacetime conscription—and don't need it.

Conscription

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD P. NYE

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 14 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. GERALD P. NYE, OF NORTH DAKOTA

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address I delivered last Friday evening over the National Broadcasting System on the subject of peacetime conscription.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

However much we detest Hitlerism, however deeply we may love our own country and democracy and want to preserve them a treasure for other generations, however healthily we may hate dictatorship, we here in the United States ought to be able to find the way to successfully combat any possible encroachment upon us by dictatorships without making the United States a dictatorship.

Peacetime conscription and draft of manpower such as is now being advanced in a legislative way would be a most direct contribution to the creation of dictatorship. No dictator has gotten anywhere without the backing of conscripts and enlarged military powers. This charge is not answered by an assertion that any such

contention discourages the cause of the Allies and is precisely what Hitler wants us to say at a time like this.

Conscription implies for our country a state of war. The mere implication of such a state carries with it executive and military powers that can be used to circumvent the highest resolve of a great people to stay out of war.

Peacetime conscription involves a deep American principle that ought to be debatable without inviting odious insinuations against those who choose to oppose it. There are times when Americanism must be both adverse and blind to what we might be given to believe to be great and lofty causes abroad.

This certainly is the time to resist the deliberate effort to paint all those who oppose the Roosevelt foreign policy as enemies of national defense. It is one of the oldest and crudest of political tricks, this one of dragging a dead herring across the pathway to destroy or confuse the scent of the real quarry.

National defense is one issue.

The Roosevelt foreign policy is another.

Let that be remembered. It is not only possible to be for one and against the other, but it is a fact that the Congress is united on the issue of national defense. There has not even been debate, except as to details, on any phase of the national-defense appropriation measures.

With others who share my complete distrust and my absolute fear of the Roosevelt foreign policy, I have consistently supported appropriations for a national defense consistent with what seemed to be our need growing out of the worst that the President's policy might invite from abroad.

At the same time, I oppose this foreign policy, which, carried to its logical extreme, can do nothing else but invite a war for us long before we are ready for it.

There is only one point where the two issues may be said to interlock. The foreign policy has made it essential that we make all speed to replace the chip on Uncle Sam's shoulder with sizeable cannons.

Had we been permitted to keep our heads about us, had our Government chosen to play the role of grim silence about affairs in Europe, which it should have played, and gone about the business of preparing for any conceivable emergency in a logical, orderly fashion, without the trumpetings of hysteria, our possible enemies would have been the ones to be confused instead of ourselves. But having strutted along the sidelines of the European war, wearing a chip, and not a thing else, yelling threats at some of the belligerents, we have been forced to show our card in the hole. Unfortunately, that card seems to be admittedly a military deuce.

Our job at hand now, by reason of this strutting and posing, is to shuffle the pack quickly and deal ourselves a new hand at a price in billions.

The defenders of the foreign policy would have it that some singular moral virtue attaches to that policy. If so, I have yet to discover it. Surely, it cannot be said that our foreign policy helped Poland, Belgium, Finland, Denmark, and Norway, or France, unless it helped her to the black doom of Nazi control. I am desperately afraid that it has not only not helped anyone, but that it has seriously impaired our own security. The future of England remains in doubt. The unpleasant possibility that we may have to face is that our foreign policy betrayed Britain even as it did France.

It is a fact largely lost sight of, but it is well to remember that unprepared England and France, who must have thought that we would come to their aid, declared war on Germany. Germany did not declare war on them. Let me acknowledge that sooner or later it might have been the other way around, that the European situation was such that the powder keg was not only tapped, but the fuze was lit. It makes little difference now who declared the war, except that the Allies, betting on our participation, and with an absolute lack of information as to our inability to be of help, plunged into it before they were ready.

Perhaps a Germany conquering all Europe might ultimately have looked in our direction. It is perfectly plain that Germany is out to carve itself an empire, as empires have been carved out of Europe for 2,000 years. But a year of stalling, a year of chess playing by the Allies, while they busily prepared behind the lines might have meant a better fate for France, at least might have meant a quicker end to Hitlerism.

If we are to be left alone and defenseless before the Hitler forces, we have our foreign policy to blame for it, a policy which betrayed those we call our friends. Let these things be remembered constantly, however unpleasant they are.

It is equally unpleasant to consider that with 95 percent of our people determined that we shall not go to war, we are being led down the pathway to war; all the trimmings and trappings and excitement of war are on full display before the enemy is in sight or is even chosen. To this there is objection, for our national security is threatened by it.

It is an old story that when one side in an argument has exhausted its points, and has learned that logic is defeating it, it resorts to calling names. It has reached a stage among some of the hard-pressed advocates of the Roosevelt foreign policy where the only defense they can stitch together against the cold light of reason is to yell: "Fifth columnist; pro-Nazi; pro-German; enemy of national defense; un-American."

Let me say here and now, much as I disapprove of playing a hand in European affairs, that if at any time it had been possible to send such portion of our armaments to Europe as to have effectively stopped the marauding ambitions of the German war lord, then I could see some logic in endorsing it. But even then on one condition, that the nations of Europe would agree to write for themselves a ticket of peace distinctly unlike the ticket of Versailles, from which Hitler emerged as the inevitable hangover. That it was never possible to do so is another cold and perhaps unpleasant fact.

But, the cruelest of all facts is that we must embark on a mad dash to arm because our foreign policy has put us on the spot, taken us back into European power politics from which we were once freed.

Let me say, however, that I do not envision Herr Hitler riding toward the mouth of the Potomac the morning after he succeeds in polishing off Britain, if he ever does. The most violent advocates of the war spirit have pulled in their horns on that proposition. The spectacle of Hitler experiencing at least a passing difficulty in getting across 24 miles of English channel rather causes them to back up on their first declaration that he could come sailing over 3,000 miles of ocean in a light breeze.

But, if we fear no attack from Hitler, then why support the cry for increased armaments?

The answer is threefold:

1. It is up to us to protect the Western Hemisphere against the worst under the Monroe Doctrine.

2. Our prospective enemies are not limited to Germany and Italy in this world of unrest.

3. The conduct of our foreign policy during these months of war and threats of war abroad, has invited new dangers, new emergencies to plan for. We must cut our defense cloth to fit the Roosevelt foreign policy, an invitation for trouble.

But there is not need to hysterically scuttle about like chickens at the sight of a hawk to meet whatever challenge may come. Part of our whipped-up hysteria is the cry for compulsory conscription. It is conceded that the times and conditions give us need for a bigger and a better Army and Navy. But that is no reason to resort to conscription.

When we propose to conscript our manpower we admit that there is something wrong with the way that our Army has been operated or else it wouldn't have to drag boys into it by the scruffs of their necks; or we admit that our modern youth does not want to serve his country, that he is so ungrateful for his own country's way of life that he refuses to give a little of his time to the lessons of national defense. I prefer to believe the former, never the latter.

There isn't a thing wrong with American youth, no reason to insult his patriotism, his courage, or his spirit by threatening him with peacetime conscription. The fact is that we have not half tried to get an Army without conscription.

The present period of enlistment is for 3 years.

The pay of the newly enlisted man is $21 a month.

The 3-year enlistment term comes about apparently from a theory that you can't make a soldier in less than 3 years, when in truth they were made in as many weeks in the last war. If it is true that you can't make a soldier out of a volunteer in 3 years, in heaven's name how are we going to make soldiers out of conscripts in 1 year, which is the time proposed under the pending draft bill?

Let us pass over the discouraging spectacle of a demand for conscription in time of peace, and deal with our actual needs. The Army wants the best men it can get; it wants men of ability, capable of absorbing the principles of a highly complicated, mechanized era, men who can work not only with the tools but with figures. This is a day of machines, of mechanics, of technicians, of men of some education.

What do we offer these men?

The privilege of entering the Army as soldiers, only to find themselves mowing an officer's lawn, running nonmilitary errands for a lieutenant, pulling some officer's car out of the ditch where he has unfortunately landed it, peeling potatoes, and making beds; we offer them the chance of entering a service where they are known as soldiers, just as soldiers, but where an officer is known as an officer and a gentleman. Did you ever hear the phrase, "a soldier and a gentleman?" There are as many gentlemen in the enlisted ranks as there are in the ranks of the officers; the advantage all officers enjoy is that they are gentlemen by act of Congress. Oh, but we are told, this is necessary for discipline. The social distinction of the officer and man must be observed at all times. Very well, if that is the extent of it all, let me suggest there is no more rigid discipline anywhere in the world than in many jobs—the factory, the city room of a large daily newspaper, or in a large corporation. Orders there are neither questioned nor disobeyed. Insubordination in the Army brings a stretch in the guardhouse. Insubordination in civilian life costs a man his job after which he doesn't sit in a guardhouse and still eat, be clothed and covered from the storms; he just doesn't eat; neither does his family.

These essentially stupid traditions which stand like a wall against recruiting the kind of Army we want, aren't going to be corrected overnight. I intrude them only to show why, in large measure, we haven't the Army we want to match our Roosevelt foreign policy.

But there are some things we can correct, so quickly and easily that all this pother of conscription can be forgotten.

1. We can cut the period of enlistment to a year. How can we expect a youth who has in mind a future civilian job to enlist for 3 years. He is just that much older when he gets out. A 1-year stretch is an entirely different matter. It could fit in between high school and college or between high school and a job.

2. We can afford to pay our recruits at least relief wages. We are asking these men to prepare to fight for us, a job surely worthy of a decent wage.

Let us try these things, and we'll get our Army. We don't need to adopt Hitler methods to stop Hitler. If Yankee ingenuity and the Yankee spirit aren't enough to throw the fear of the Lord into Mr. Hitler or any other who might contemplate attacking us, we have changed a lot in recent years.

The Senate majority leader has declared that not more than 24 votes can be recorded against conscription in the Senate. The truth is that this issue finds a completely uncertain mind with the majority of that body. The debate now starting and the degree in which the American people make themselves heard on this subject of peacetime conscription will determine whether passage of the proposal is possible. It seems quite certain that the proposal in its present form cannot prevail, that large compromise will be offered. But there ought never be compromise with the theory of conscription of men in peacetime, certainly not until and unless the emergency is counted sufficiently great to warrant conscription of profits at one and the same time.

Our Navy for Our Own Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAVID I. WALSH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

Wednesday, August 14 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. DAVID I. WALSH

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by me over Columbia Broadcasting System, Tuesday, August 13, 1940, on the subject, Our Navy for Our Own Defense.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Now, as never before, in making decisions for this Nation our judgment should be reached not by calling names or questioning the motives of all who differ with us but by dispassionate appraisal of realities, without yielding to prejudices nor swayed by sympathy and without the slightest taint of partisanship.

Repeatedly, on the floor of the Senate, before the outbreak of the European war, I asserted that our paramount concern was our national security and the avoidance of war. At that time few questioned the accomplishment of both of these objectives. Today, however, under the urgency of national defense, proposals are made that disregard all considerations of avoidance of war.

We have been moving as rapidly as possible to strengthen and to expand our Navy, our Army, our air force and air bases, and all the rest embraced within the broad term of national defense.

But there is another step, which in my opinion is even more important. In vain do we seek peace unless we establish a strong policy of war avoidance and are determined not to participate in the wars now raging in Europe, Africa, and Asia. Any other course means war, which our people do not want, and for which we are woefully unprepared.

The particular question which I wish to discuss tonight is the proposal now being pressed upon Congress and the country for the disposal of 50 or 60 of the destroyers now in our fleet, and their transfer by one means or another to Great Britain.

This proposal, in my judgment, violates both of the cardinal principles upon which rests our hope of avoidance of war.

First and foremost, the transfer of naval destroyers from our flag to the British flag, no matter by what method or device, makes mockery of our declared policy of neutrality and nonintervention. It is an act of belligerency and of war. Who, desiring to keep out of war, can deny that fact?

Note the steady march that is directing our course along the road to war. Before the war we forbade even our private citizens to trade in war munitions with belligerents. To help the Allies this embargo was lifted by act of Congress, and all private industries, except shipbuilders, have been since October last at the disposal of the Allies. Next Government contracts were canceled in order to deliver to the Allies the airplanes of the Army and Navy we had "on order" for ourselves. This was done under the pretense that the Government could legally modify its contracts and postpone the time of delivery. Next came the attempt to deliver to the Allies our so-called naval "mosquito fleet" then under construction. This failed because of our neutrality law enacted during the World War. Time does not permit me to enumerate all of the powder, arms, and other munitions that have been turned over to the Allies during the past months. And now it is suggested that we repeal long existing laws preventing the sale or disposition of naval vessels in order that we may transfer 50 of our destroyers to the British.

I am opposed to this destroyer proposal, which it is now admitted could not possibly be consummated without an act of Congress setting aside existing prohibitions.

The proposal arises from the plainly desperate need of Britain for naval reinforcements and rests upon the contention as advanced so recently by Gen. John J. Pershing, who declared that "if there is anything we can do to save the British Fleet we shall be failing in our duty to America if we do not do it."

Those were his words. Let us perceive their implications.

If that be our duty and our course of safety, then why should we limit ourselves to 50 or 60 of our least serviceable destroyers? Why should we not send at once our best ships, our fastest planes, and our trained men to handle them? And let me add, in all fairness to this group, that is just what many of them would have us do and some of them even proclaim that this would not be entering the war. Very few, however, had the courage to sign a statement as did Admiral Standley (retired) favoring a declaration that a state of war existed between this country and Germany.

I submit that this proposal presents a basic and all-important question. Either we should enter the war and give our all or we should stay out of the war and retain our fleet intact for the defense of our own country.

There is no middle course. There is no half-way point. We cannot take the leap from the precipice of nonbelligerency into the abyss of war and expect to stop in midair. The placing of a part of our Navy at the disposal of Britain, or any other belligerent, is not a measure "short of war." It is an act of war.

We all hope that Britain will not be defeated. However, conceding the great value to us of English sea power, yet I do not concede that the British Fleet is the last bulwark of American freedom and American institutions.

I say to you, my fellow citizens, with the utmost conviction that America can be and if necessary will be defended by Americans alone. Any other policy necessitates meddling in the quarrels of other nations, making alliances, political and military—which means subjecting future generations of Americans to the sufferings, sacrifices, and horrors of future wars not of our making.

Is any American so naive to think that the British, if they lose the present war, will not proceed as she should, to undo the cruel treaty that will be exacted by the Nazis? Do you think if Germany loses, she would not attempt a "comeback" as she planned to do following the Versailles Treaty? Yet Americans, accepting the propaganda that we are Hitler's next victims, now urge that we try to stop him by delivering a small part of our Navy to his foes. Whether Hitler intends to come over here or not is debatable, but one thing is certain, our involvement in this war means committing America to participation in all future European wars.

Obviously the advocates of reinforcing the British Navy with some of our destroyers can offer no positive assurance that such a step will insure British victory. The most that can be said is that it might have that happy result, that it might prove just enough to turn the scales in Britain's favor. It is said that risking 50 destroyers is a fair gamble that the war can be kept on the other side of the Atlantic.

Let me inquire: If 50 old destroyers do not save the world, will we gamble 150 or 200 destroyers—our total number of destroyers is 201, exclusive of those being converted into seaplane tenders, mine layers, and so forth. And if all our destroyers do not stop Hitler, will we next gamble with our cruisers and our aircraft carriers, then with our battleships and finally then with our manpower?

I inquire, have we a navy ample for our needs if attacked by Germany, or Japan, or both?—or even one sufficient to uphold the Monroe Doctrine?

Since January 1 of this year the Navy has requested, and the Congress has approved the expansion of our naval program three separate times. First, expansion in our combatant ships of 11 percent and our aircraft 50 percent; secondly, expansion of our aviation shore facilities and an increase in our aircraft of over 100 percent; and thirdly, increase of 70 percent in our combatant naval vessels and another 50-percent increase in aircraft. And all of these increases it will be physically impossible to complete before 1946. According to naval authorities, therefore, we have today a navy in strength 50 percent less than our actual requirements in surface vessels and nearly a 90-percent shortage in aircraft.

Yet in the face of these demands for enormous increases, fully justified, and which the Congress has authorized, it is seriously proposed that we diminish the present strength of our Navy by 50 destroyers. Ah, but they assert it is merely obsolete destroyers. Well, on March 1 last, at least 150 of our 301 combatant vessels in commission were overage or obsolete, yet they are all in commission, all being used, and all necessary. If we can spare 50 of our obsolete destroyers why cannot we spare half of our Navy, which on March 1 last was admittedly obsolete?

Incidentally, it takes 2 years to build a destroyer, and the replacement cost of each one of these would be $5,000,000.

My fellow countrymen, why gamble with the United States Fleet? It is the only force in the world today that can keep war from our shores—the only force in the world that can prevent aircraft from beyond the seas from bombing our large cities, our industrial areas, and our civilian populations.

Let me put this proposal to you in another way:

If saving the British Fleet is essential to our security and our freedom, why take half-way measures? The outstanding lesson of the war to date is that half-way measures will not suffice. England and France took half-way measures in supporting Poland, Norway, and Belgium. The French claim that England took half-way measures in supporting her in the Battle of Flanders. Why fritter away the United States Fleet by sending a few ships at a time to be destroyed piecemeal by German and Italian land-based bombers, short-range submarines, and fast motor torpedo boats? Why not send the whole fleet at once?

Let me answer that question by citing to you the conclusions and matured judgment of the Senate Naval Affairs Committee after listening to a wealth of testimony of naval officers and experts last spring in connection with the naval-expansion bill. These conclusions were summarized in a report submitted to the Senate on May 15. I quote: "Our naval and air forces should be preserved for our own defense if and when needed. * * * We are not prepared to participate in the European war, and we do not possess the necessary weapons to make our efforts effective. * * * The assumption that British sea power may be destroyed implies that we should take our stand in the Western Hemisphere where our military power can be applied effectively and efficiently; that our Navy should not be subjected to the hazards of short-range shore-based aircraft and small submarines based on the continent of Europe.

"It implies that our Navy should be retained intact to prevent ship-borne aircraft from directing attacks against our cities and industrial areas and prevent an enemy from establishing naval, air, or submarine bases in this hemisphere which would threaten our security by attacking in any manner our vital sea communications and our homeland."

How is the situation today different from the situation last May, when the foregoing declarations were submitted? France has fallen, and England's situation is more critical. The inadequacy of our own defense is more apparent. Our own fears are greater. But these circumstances are no ground for a different policy or a different judgment. Instead they serve to greatly reinforce the advice to keep out of the war in Europe and keep all of our fleet for our own defense.

Let me set at rest, also, the misleading contention that our Navy possesses a considerable number of so-called surplus destroyers for which the Navy has no immediate need. The truth is that we have no surplus destroyers. Some of these overage and heretofore decommissioned destroyers are being converted into fast mine layers, aircraft tenders, and antiaircraft vessels, types urgently needed in our own Navy. Many of them are operating with the fleet and on neutrality patrol. Is our neutrality patrol so unnecessary that we can remove 50 destroyers from commission?

These destroyers are now being used to train officers and men of the Naval Reserve. Our present urgent need is to train the enlisted men and young officers on every ship we have so that as the new ships are commissioned month by month in the future, the sailors from these 50 destroyers will be ready to man the new ships.

I estimate the transfer of these destroyers will reduce our ability to keep approximately 7,000 enlisted men and 350 officers on training duty. The very same voices which urge the stripping of our Navy of one-seventh of its combat vessels (which is what the 50 destroyers represent) and thus depriving our Navy of the ability to train our enlisted men and officers, are the ones now crying out for conscription.

Let us be honest with ourselves Months ago we declared a policy of neutrality—notwithstanding the sympathies of our people. Since the belligerents with whom we sympathize appeared to be losing, we have abandoned step by step our neutrality and the American people may well cry out in alarm at the prospects of following the advice of those who are leading us down the road to war.

In conclusion, let me state my position, as an elected lawmaker of the United States Government, and as chairman of the Senate Committee on Naval Affairs. As God gives me the light to see my duty, I shall resist every proposal that seems to me, when analyzed, to lead to war, and I shall apply to every proposal the sole test as to whether or not it is conducive to the safety and security of America. I shall resist approving chance-taking proposals—like the destroyer transfer—that may held belligerents who we hope will succeed because I consider it my duty to avoid the terrible consequences of dissipating the resources, with which the Almighty has blessed us in abundance, the slaughter of the lives of American youths, and the destruction of our free institutions.

My course today is the same as I proclaimed on the floor of the Senate on April 17, 1939, about 4 months before the outbreak of the present European war, and before we knew what countries would be the belligerents. I said then and I repeat it now:

"If we provide for and scrupulously maintain absolute neutrality and a well-balanced and efficient Navy that potential enemies will fear and respect, we can secure the blessings of peace and freedom for this and generations to follow and we will then be able to turn our attention and energy without diversion from any outside source to the very urgent problems confronting us here at home. Let us resolve to preserve America for Americans, to shun foreign wars, to close our minds resolutely against foreign propaganda, to be officially absolutely neutral, and to seek humbly but insistently the cherished ways of peace.

Conscription

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RUSH D. HOLT
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 14 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. RUSH D. HOLT, OF WEST VIRGINIA

Mr. HOLT. Mr. President, a group of 100 representatives of the Trade Union Women's Committee for Peace came to Washington to present a petition to President Roosevelt. The petition is as follows:

To Hon. Franklin D. Roosevelt, President of the United States:

We, who love our country and desire to strengthen and defend democracy at home, believe that involving the United States in this war will not bring peace or freedom, but only death to our loved ones, great suffering through heavy taxes and rising prices, and destruction to our civil liberties.

We hereby express our will and determination:

1. To keep our country out of war.
2. To use our resources to end poverty, unemployment, and insecurity at home.
3. To preserve and strengthen trade unions.
4. To defend civil liberties and gains in social legislation.
5. To make our country a haven for refugee women and children, innocent victims of a murderous war.
6. To defeat any measures for peacetime universal conscription.

American women say: We want to be wives, not widows; mothers, not mourners.

Keep our boys over here.

America wants peace.

This group has as its chairman Dr. Bella C. Dodd, of the Teachers' Union; and as its secretary Miriam Murphy, of the Women's Auxiliary Transport Workers' Union. The committee is endorsed by Norma Aronson, U. O. P. W. A. Office and Clerical Workers, C. I. O.; Winifred Crost, Women's Auxiliary, Photo Engravers, A. F. of L.; Frances Bryant, president, Ladies Auxiliary, National Maritime Union, C. I. O.; Jane Filley, Local 1250, C. I. O., Department Store Union; Esther Hagler, Women's Auxiliary, Teamsters' Union, A. F. of L.; Dora Jones, Domestic Workers' Union, A. F. of L.; Rose Labelle, Local 1, Waiters' Union, A. F. of L.; Esther Letz, vice president, Local 65, United Wholesale and Warehouse Employees, C. I. O.; Ona Luebke, Women's Auxiliary, Federation of Architects, C. I. O.; Mary Luciel McGorkey, president, New York District, State, County, and Municipal Workers, C. I. O.; Bella Lehr, Fur Dyers and Dressers, C. I. O.; Mabel Pollock, president, Women's Auxiliary, Newspaper Guild; Irene Mason, I. L. G. W. U., A. F. of L.; Edith Perrin, Local 16, Waiters' Union, A. F. of L.; Evelyn Marron, United Shoe Workers, C. I. O.; Mildred Gordon, United Beauty Culturists Union, C. I. O.; Gertrude Shostack, Local 1102, United Retail Employees, C. I. O.; Ann Wharton, secretary, United Federal Workers, C. I. O.; Gretel Spiro, educational director, Fur Workers' Joint Council; and Charlotte Stern, U. O. P. W. A.

It was my pleasure to speak to them. The speech was carried over the Mutual Broadcasting network. I ask that my speech be printed in the Appendix of the Congressional Record.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The "blitzkrieg" to drive through a conscription bill before the people can awaken has bogged down. Every day as the people find the truth about this piece of legislation, the opposition grows

at a great pace. We can win this battle to stop peacetime conscription if the people become active in expressing to their Members of the House and the Senate their opposition to this unneeded, unwise and un-American bill.

Why should we defeat this Burke-Wadsworth bill, drafted by a large corporate-lawyer interventionist?

First, it is against traditional American policy.

Second, it has not been proven as necessary.

Time does not permit a more thorough discussion tonight.

The issue is one that challenges the American way of life, it affects every home in our country. It is the height of regimentation and is a step toward establishing militarism.

Millions of fine people of Europe came to this country in the past, came to this country for a haven against military persecution in their land. They had fled from countries that considered a citizen the servant of the State. They came to this country for freedom. Free men always have resented conscription in time of peace. They knew that peactime conscription was a weapon by which rulers destroyed the rights of citizens and made them vassals.

May I read three headlines: "All Germany Rejoices in Conscription Law—Soviet to Boost Army Strength by Conscription—Military Service from 18 to 33 Decreed by Italy." And what were the reasons? I quote from the statements of those in control: "The educational value of compulsory service was given as a reason for introducing it." "The educational value." Doesn't that sound familiar? That is the same reason given in the United States in 1940.

Let me continue to give you the reasons for the establishing of conscription in Europe and I quote: "It takes the training and discipline of the army to teach us the virtue of centuries." Doesn't that sound like the reasons given to the United States in 1940? Another reason given was that it polished the crude peasants. Some of the intelligentsia in the colleges of America are advancing the same reason in America because of the polishing of the American youth, as they say, into a better understanding.

Oh, but they say, look at Switzerland. We all have the highest regard for that great, peaceful little country of Switzerland, a country that has been a factor in peace for the entire world. But, they mislead the people when they try to compare the military service in Switzerland with that proposed in the Burke-Wadsworth bill. They are not alike.

But, they say, conscription gets the boys ready for an emergency. Let me show you the effect in the words of Maj. Gen. John F. O'Ryan, an advocate of conscription, and I quote:

"The first thing that must be done," he said as he discussed the value of trained soldiery, "is to destroy all initiative, and that with the training fits men to be soldiers."

And further:

"The recruit does not know how to carry out orders. His mental state differs from that of the trained soldier who obeys mechanically. We must get our men so that they are machines.

"We have to have our men trained so that the influence of fear is overpowered by the peril of an uncompromising military system often backed up by a pistol in the hands of an officer."

I cannot refrain from pausing here to call your attention to that, mothers of boys, because your son must be made to understand that he can have no fear, that the punishment for fear is, and I quote, "an uncompromising military system backed up by a pistol in the hands of an officer." Is that American? Is that the training needed by these fine young Americans?

I must hurry on to finish the quotation:

"The recruits have got to put their heads into the military noose. They have got to be jacked up. They have got to be bawled out."

So, in the words of an advocate of conscription, in the words of this major general, your son will have that training. When American boys have to face that type of control, the greatness of our country is gone. Let us not set up Hitler methods here in order to stop Hitler over there. As the advertisements have said on the billboards of this country, "Continue the American way." Many of those pushing conscription have helped pay for ads calling for continuation of the American way but are now working to put upon us this alien doctrine of peacetime conscription.

Now, let us look at the next point. Is this peacetime conscription necessary?

There is no basis to the statement that the volunteer system has failed. In the first place, it has not been given a good chance, even though it has been a success. If those in charge of the program would really call for a recruiting drive in this country, you would note a vast difference in the number of enlistments. Compare in your own mind the drive for volunteers with the drives you have heard over the air, in the newspapers, through personal contact, for many Government and personal objectives. You know and we all know that this drive for recruits has been half-hearted and not put across to the people. As to why this has not been done, those in charge can best answer.

I recall, as a member of the Naval Affairs Committee, when we had before us representatives of both armed branches of our Government, that they did not say that the recruiting drive had been less than their expectations. To the contrary, it was stated that the recruiting drive was even above expectations.

Furthermore, the 3-year enlistment period could very easily be changed to 1 year. It is a vast difference to ask a young man to agree to be in the Army 1 year and ask him to be in the Army 3 years. If we want trained soldiers, why not open the 1 year enlistment plan for a trial. You'll see a great difference.

I wish I could discuss the so-called danger of invasion that is being spread throughout this country to create hysteria. Much of it is pure, promoted poppycock to get people willing to do anything those in control want to have done. Let us have a strong, national defense but this spreading of fear is too obvious.

These people say we are unprepared. We are financially unprepared also. We have billions of indebtedness. We are far more financially unprepared than we are unprepared in manpower. If the promoters of this legislation are so interested in getting the country ready, why haven't they drafted legislation for financial preparedness? Everyone knows that is vital in time of war. No, they say, we must study those things carefully. It doesn't take study, according to them, to draft young fellows and take them from their work to go in the Army, but it does take study for legislation to touch wealth. Let them come forward with a draft for capital in time of emergency. The same lobbyists will not be at work for that. Many of these are the same individuals who have been howling of the danger of regimentation. Anything that regulates their business is regimentation; but drafting boys, according to them, is not. They have not raised their voices about that because this is a regimentation of life and blood. They oppose regimentation of money and treasure.

I welcome you in your drive to stop this un-American doctrine. You work. You know something about labor. You know of the suffering of labor. You know that war and emergencies such as these cripple social legislation for which you have fought for years.

Your son will go into real military training. He will not be invited to go to Plattsburg, park his car in a garage, and have time to go to the cocktail bars. Your son will be a soldier.

Ask labor in Europe about peacetime conscription and its effect.

Also, I desire to note some parts of the bill.

No place in the bill specifically exempts married men from conscription. To be exact, I quote the language:

"The President is also authorized, under such regulations as he may prescribe, to defer training and service in the land and naval forces, of those men in a status with respect to persons dependent upon them for support which renders their deferment advisable." Now, get that, you are exempt, "under such regulations as he may prescribe." What if no regulations are prescribed? None are specifically required. The important words are: "under such regulations as he may prescribe." Why isn't it definite in the bill?

And while I am asking questions, may I prompt a question: What is going to happen to the property of a young man who is paying installments for a home while he is in the conscript Army at $21 a month? I have not the time to ask many more such pertinent questions which are not solved and which should be solved now, not after the boys have been drafted. This job-return clause is a fake. It is unenforcable and was put in the bill to lessen opposition.

We can win this battle. We must counteract the publicity "blitzkrieg" of the controlled newspapers, of controlled radio commentators. We can win if you get busy, now. Let's beat this un-American conscription law.

And in closing, let me leave this thought with you. Have you ever seen a man who is for war who is not also for conscription? Just think. Those for our getting into this terrible war are for this conscription. Why?

Ambassador Bullitt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENNETT CHAMP CLARK

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 14 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

ARTICLE BY GENEVIEVE CLARK THOMSON

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an article appearing in the New Orleans Item-Tribune of August 11, 1940, entitled "The Strange Career of the Ebullient Ambassador Bullitt."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New Orleans (La.) Item-Tribune of August 11, 1940]

THE STRANGE CAREER OF THE EBULLIENT AMBASSADOR BULLITT—FINE HAND OF ENVOY DISCOVERED BEHIND WELLES' CASTIGATION OF RUSSIA

(By Genevieve Clark Thomson)

At Habana, as usual, Secretary Hull did a swell job. The man from east Tennessee again brought home the bacon. But while he was laboring with his apparently inexhaustible patience to bring about effective harmony and cooperation in the Americas it seems

that one of our exuberant young ambassadors again dug his fingers into the diplomatic jam pot.

The country was startled about that time by the severity of Under Secretary of State Welles' castigation of Russia concerning its acquisition of Latvia, Estonia, and Lithuania. A sizable section of the press thereupon castigated Mr. Welles. They called his blast "presumptuous meddling" and pointed out that should the United States ever actually lock horns with Japan, since England is fully engaged on the other side of the world, our only possible ally in the Pacific would be the Soviet Republics. These are facts irrespective of whether or not we like the political philosophy in accordance with which Russia now operates.

Said the St. Louis Post-Dispatch:

"The administration's foreign policy is beyond comprehension, unless it is simply a course of world-wide meddling. It isn't even consistent. Only a few days ago, Mr. Hull assailed the British for closing the Burma Road, and thus helping Japan in its war on China. Mr. Roosevelt has publicly endorsed a 'Stop Hitler Now' campaign. Well, if there is any likely future challenger to Hitler and to Japan, it is Soviet Russia. Where does Mr. Welles' blast fit into this picture?"

Moreover there are those who feel, whether rightly or wrongly, that our harsh words to Russia certainly did nothing to help, and possibly tended to hinder, a friendly understanding which England was exerting considerable effort to bring about between herself and the Soviet Republics. This is speculation. But it is not speculation that a few days after Mr. Welles' fulmination Russia disappointed England by announcing through Foreign Minister Molotov the continuance of friendly relations with Nazi Germany. In passing Molotov gave Uncle Sam a resounding kick in the slats.

The most mystifying feature of this remarkable pronouncement was that it should have come from Mr. Welles. To those who know him as a man almost glacially calm and self-restrained its superheated phraseology was out of character. It is known that no man speaking for the State Department voices his individual opinion or uses his own words exclusively. Nevertheless no such explosive words have heretofore fallen from the lips of the present Under Secretary. And their utterance profoundly disturbed many who regard Sumner Welles as one of our most capable career diplomats.

EBULLIENT BULLITT BEHIND THE SCENES

Facts have since come to light which somewhat dispel the perplexities surrounding this deplorable diplomatic incident. It is reported that the State Department had prepared a statement couched in proper diplomatic verbiage protesting Russia's seizure of these three small Baltic states. This statement was forwarded for approval to the President at Hyde Park.

When it arrived William C. Bullitt, American Ambassador to France, was Mr. Roosevelt's guest at his country seat. And Mr. Bullitt is burdened with no self-doubt regarding his ability to supply the right answer to any and every question which arises in foreign affairs. More importantly, according to Washington correspondents, he has access to the Presidential ear, second to none. From past experience persons who keep in touch with such matters know that when Mr. Bullitt seizes his pen he is prone to wield it with more facility than discretion.

About 6 weeks ago it was said in the United States Senate that Mr. Bullitt had, in the course of his diplomatic and literary pursuits, written a letter to the then French Premier, Paul Reynaud, assuring him that if France went to war upon the invasion of Poland, she would be followed in a short time by the United States. It was added that Mr. Reynaud still has this letter in his possession, and suggested that in the future he might make use of it.

This is a charge so grave that it can't be waved away as an indiscretion. If this is true then it can be said, not without foundation, that the Third French Republic was misled into war and destruction by the word of an accredited representative of the United States.

Such a thought must sicken every American heart. Nor can it be shrugged off by saying that it was France's tough luck if the French Government didn't know that the power of declaring war for the United States resides in its Congress, and not in its diplomatic representatives.

Unfortunately there is some precedent for this unwarrantable assumption of authority to speak for the people and Government of the United States. There is evidence that the mysterious Colonel House, an unofficial ambassador to President Wilson, a man whose name was never presented to or confirmed by the Senate, roamed around Europe during the last World War making commitments and threats in the name of the American Government which were subsequently made good.

And Walter Hines Page, our Ambassador to St. James's, whose great concern for the government to which he was accredited, rather than the one he represented, led him to do things that were lamentable to say the least.

AMBASSADOR PAGE ALSO MEDDLED

For one thing he misled President Wilson by systematically telling him half the truth, instead of the whole of it and by advising Sir Edward Grey, the British Foreign Secretary, how to answer diplomatic communications which the American Ambassador had been instructed by the State Department to present to the British Foreign Office. In other words, he was answering his own Government. This is not guess work. These facts are pridefully set forth in the Life and Letters of Walter Hines Page. And they are abundantly substantiated in the hearings of the special Senate committee investigating munitions. In justice to Mr. Wilson it must be said that had he been in possession of all the facts, he might have taken a very different course regarding this country's excursion into the war to end wars.

Today there is a bronze tablet in Westminster Abbey with the inscription "In memory of Walter Hines Page, friend of England in her hour of greatest need." At the time of its erection about two decades ago this tablet was a cause of some wonderment and pride in the United States. But as time has worn on, sober second thought has led many Americans to agree with one of the great Chief Justices of the Supreme Court whose comment was "I hope that when I am dead my life will have been such that there will be some who wish to commemorate it. But if so I hope such a marker will be placed in the United States and for services rendered to the United States."

Indeed it is a hopeful sign that increasing numbers of Americans feel that our representation abroad has not always been conducted in the highest interest of this Government and look forward to the day when all American diplomats will represent the interests of the United States instead of those of the countries to which they are accredited. And there is a growing thought among their less cosmopolitan countrymen that if they don't they should be recalled.

But let us return to our mutton—Mr. Bullitt. It in no way lessens the consternation of informed people to learn that the broadside delivered by Mr. Welles was in fact drafted at Hyde Park, and that Ambassador Bullitt had a heavy hand in its drafting.

THE CAREER OF WILLIAM BULLITT

It is high time that the American people give some attention to this socially charming gentleman, who speaks so freely in their name. Here are some of the facts. He was born in Philadelphia in 1891 of wealthy and socially prominent parents. He was graduated from Yale in 1912. For several years thereafter he dabbled in the newspaper business as a correspondent of sorts, occupying three different jobs in 2 years. He became an assistant in the State Department in 1917. Although 26 years of age when we entered the war, he saw no military service. This is not necessarily a reflection upon him. Not every young man could serve in our armed forces, and some were needed in the State Department. But it may in a measure account for his enthusiasm for war in contrast to the profound aversion to it on the part of a number of leaders both in and out of Congress, who did serve overseas with our fighting forces.

In 1918 and 1919 Mr. Bullitt was an attaché of the American mission to negotiate peace. While in Paris he conceived the notion that he could work his way to Russia, which was then virtually incommunicado with the outside world, and find out how the Lenin government ticked. Accordingly President Wilson sent him on a special mission to that country. Circumstances were such that this mission could only be carried out by a high degree of secrecy and adventure which were doubtless wholly agreeable to a young man of Mr. Bullitt's ebullient temperament.

Once in Russia he became completely enchanted with Lenin and all his works. And this enchantment was reflected in his subsequent report to President Wilson. The merits or demerits of this report were thoroughly aired and debated by Congressional committees during the titanic struggle over America's entry into the League of Nations.

Suffice it to say that Mr. Wilson received his young emissary's findings coldly, and did not see fit to act upon them. Thereupon, Mr. Bullitt became so enraged that he not only threw up his job with the Peace Commission, but wrote a letter to Woodrow Wilson which for impudence in addressing a President of the United States has never been surpassed.

He retired to private life and from its deep shade was not disinterred until Mr. Roosevelt to whose campaign fund he had contributed, became President in 1933. When he reappeared upon the public scene he was, to use the words of Polonius, "still harping on my daughter." Soviet Russia still captivated him. He wanted it recognized, as it had not been up to that time by the United States. And he wished to be our first Ambassador to the promised land. Both things came to pass, it is said, largely by reason of his influence with the President.

But before long his Russian honeymoon struck a snag. Just why is not entirely clear to the American public. Possibly it was because Stalin had a taste for running things in his domain without benefit of Mr. Bullitt's advice. At any rate this scion of Philadelphia came to have an unholy hatred for "Holy Russia." He wished to leave Moscow and go to Paris as our Ambassador. The President acceded to his request.

In France he led a glamorous life. Establishing himself in a great house, he became a great host, and was able to gratify one of his cherished ambitions by having the best cook in Paris. He was a leader in cafe society, in which the Duke and Duchess of Windsor also frolicked. And it was a matter of gratification to the American people that he had a flair for wearing good clothes equal to Anthony Eden's.

This, however, was but one facet of the character of this many-sided man. Other activities—not so innocuous—engaged his attention. Disappointed in Russia, he embraced France with all the ardor of a lover. And he busied himself in France's affairs with a zeal alien to good diplomacy.

EMBASSY PAPERS ARE BURNED

Some provincial Americans were rather shocked to learn that on occasion he actually sat in French cabinet meetings. They were glad, of course, to have our Ambassador on cordial terms with the Government and people of our sister Republic. But they were un-

able to recollect any precedent for an American Ambassador mixing in the domestic affairs of any foreign state.

Most of our diplomatic representatives have been liked by France. The two greatest, Benjamin Franklin and Thomas Jefferson, both loved, and were loved, by Marianne. But they never forgot for a moment that the purpose of their sojourn in that delightful country was solely to look after the interests of the United States.

When the tragic collapse of France came a few weeks ago, Mr. Bullitt, contrary to orders from the State Department, remained in Paris, instead of following the French Government to Bordeaux. And just before the Hitler hordes entered the city, according to press reports, the American Ambassador was devoting his energies to burning the papers of the Embassy, including his code book. So we shall never know in what other mischievious writings he had been engaged.

The New York Times reported that because of this exploit Secretary Hull was greatly "vexed" with Mr. Bullitt. To those familiar with Mr. Hull's talent for swearing this seemed a probable understatement. It was also stated that he had lost favor with the President. Meanwhile it was reported that he was under "protective custody" in his own house in Paris, and was forbidden to use the telephone. This prompted a Washington wag to remark that the only good deed Hitler ever did was to take Bill Bullitt off the telephone. It seems he is a great user of the telephone, and according to columnists Alsop and Kintner is one of two or three persons privileged to call the President at any hour, day or night. In fact, they give a colorful description of at least one of Mr. Bullitt's nocturnal chats with his chief.

Now Mr. Roosevelt's favorite ambassador is back home. And without reporting to his supposed chiefs at the State Department, he went straight to the President. It is reported that the State Department is still as much in the dark as the general public regarding the events leading to and surrounding the death of the French Republic, about which Mr. Bullitt should know and which is important information to men supposed to be directing or carrying out our foreign policy.

Moreover, Mr. Bullitt, who so loved the French Republic, has blossomed out in the press as the great defender of the Petain regime, which most Americans, including officials at the State Department, regard as a mere puppet of Adolf Hitler. He is reported as urging the President to release to the Petain government the $2,500,000,000 deposited here by the French Republic for safekeeping. The Treasury Department had every intention of keeping this money frozen here, since if it is released to Petain it will find its way into Herr Hitler's hands. Consequently, the Treasury is greatly upset by Mr. Bullitt's crusade for its release.

All and all, Mr. Bullitt's visit to the homeland has not brought much peace to his fellow officials, or to his more discerning countrymen. In fact, his activities make them distinctly uneasy.

Mr. Roosevelt is notably allergic to advice. Nevertheless some have ventured to suggest that now that he is in the United States Mr. Bullitt be kept here, at least until we can find out just what he has been up to while he has been away from us, and what grievous indiscretions he may have committed in our name.

America in a New World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 14 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

ADDRESS BY PROF. MAX LERNER AT CAMBRIDGE, MASS.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Prof. Max Lerner, of Williams College, under the auspices of the Harvard defense group, at Cambridge, Mass., July 30, 1940.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The thrust of the Nazi columns has left its mark not only on the European consciousness but on the American as well. We are like someone who wakes in the middle of the night in a strange room, enclosed by unfamiliar walls, and wonders whether the spectral shapes around him are creatures of his imagination or terrible realities. Our clinging to the radio, hoping against hope as we listen to the sickening bulletins, are the attempts we make to exorcise our world. But it will not away. These are not ghosts—this brutal power of the Nazi war machine, this dynamic will of a new German governing group, these new barbarians come to sweep away the Roman empires of our minds.

One of the results of the almost fantastic disintegration of one country after another in the face of Hitler's march to power has been a complete bewilderment and an almost complete disillusionment on the part of the American people. All the old landmarks on which we had been accustomed to rely for guiding our path seem to have been washed away. The terms "liberalism," "conservatism," "radicalism" no longer have the meaning they once had, if indeed they have any meaning at all. The reactionaries in the world have become its revolutionists. If we yield to bewilderment, disillusionment, hysteria, we have three-quarters lost the battle. Now, as never before, we must understand what we believe in, what America stands for, what the imperatives are in this world of ours to which we shall have to submit, what we shall have to do within those imperatives in order to translate our beliefs into reality. Our thinking will have to become tough-minded instead of tender-minded. The world in which we live is facing a generation of wars, civil wars and revolutions. Only a new tough-mindedness on our part in the service of a set of fervent convictions can possibly rescue us from what seems to be the common doom.

One of the most important factors that is preventing us from achieving a tough-mindedness is the fact that we are still, for the most part, thinking in terms of the last war. This is inevitable. Those who win a war cling to its protections; those who lose a war profit by their mistakes—if they survive. The great debate that has been going on for some months now has been chiefly a debate as to whether we shall enter or stay out of the last war. We won the last war, but because the victors failed in their attempt to organize the world's peace, we have since then felt cheated and disenchanted by it, and determined that we would not once again be tricked. The result is a little like that of a rural visitor to the World's Fair, who has heard so much of the pickpockets, the sirens, and the enticements of New York that he spends all day escaping their snares and at the end finds that he has failed to see anything. I cannot underscore this too strongly: For America today the important thing has become to gage the dimensions and conditions of our new world, to see it, to understand the nature of total war, the strategy of terror, the limitless character of one man's will operating in the world today, the extent of his megalomania, the depth and pervasiveness of the revolutionary conditions all over the world that allow him thus to operate. And we shall never understand our world if we reject as propaganda every fact in it that may lead to action. The dangerous thing for Americans in the last war may have been propaganda, the dangerous thing for Americans in this war is not so much propaganda as that fear of propaganda that paralyzes our will and leaves us in our indecision a prey to the single-minded intelligence and the ruthless will of Hitlerism.

Nevertheless, I cannot go with those who are so preoccupied with propaganda that they see nothing else. What is leading American opinion toward interventionism today is not the persuasive power of the British and French, and of the American spokesmen sympathetic to them. Actually the biggest factor in American opinion today is not what anyone says but what Hitler does. It is not the propaganda of the word but the propaganda of the deed.

Let me develop this a bit. What has made American opinion turn increasingly toward intervention is the effect of Hitler's marching columns. It is not that England and France were good nations and Germany a bad nation. It is not the talk of Lord Lothian and Duff Cooper and Lord Halifax about western civilization. It is not even the magnificent speeches of Winston Churchill, who is the only figure to have risen to stature in this war and who deserves to be called the Pericles of Britain. It is the knowledge that Hitler is destroying the last enemies that stand between him on the one side, and us and the things we care about on the other; that he will be thoroughly ruthless and completely unappeasable; that he does not mean to stop; that he will wage against us every war of which he is capable—economic, ideological, internal, military. This has been spelled out not by British propaganda, but by the words and deeds of Hitler and the march of events in Europe. That is what I mean by the propaganda of the deed, and that is what American opinion is responding to.

We must recognize that what is happening today is something very close to a world revolution. The first World War left its ravaging effects on the world; but worse than those effects was our failure to organize the peace. We tried to make a political settlement, but it was frustrated because it did not provide for an economic settlement. We left a Europe of fragmentized nations, incapable of joining together economically because of their national hatreds, and incapable of surviving without thus joining together. Thus the way was left open for someone to organize Europe by sheer and ruthless force.

This was the framework within which Hitlerism has operated. It has been a framework of international disorganization, capitalist collapse, liberal helplessness, Tory sabotage. We speak of Hitler's triumph, and we think—and to an extent rightly—of the enormous will of one man, who turned his early misery and frustration into hate, his hate into vengeance, his vengeance into cold steel. There has been no example in history of a man who so ruthlessly willed not only his ends but his means as well, and who took not one country or even one continent but the whole world as his stamping ground. Yet we must not too easily succumb, either to the great man theory or the devil theory of history. Hitler has been able to do what he has done because he has been active in a situation ripe for him.

We have been told time and time again that nazi-ism is a revolution. Of course, it is revolutionary; but it is not in itself the revolution I am referring to. It is a revolution enforced from above by the will of a man and a group of adventurers around him—enforced by terror and accepted through fear. But—and this is

important—it is a revolution that has been accepted for want of a better one. The really revolutionary forces are these. First, our incapacity to organize world peace, which I have mentioned. Second, the failure of the nation-state to act as an economic unit. We live in a time of the breaking of nations. Even if Hitler can be stopped, the day of the nation-state is over. The small nations that remain after the war will become satellites of some large and powerful empire. We are entering on a new imperialism, in which whatever may be true of the outworn doctrine of sovereignty, the surviving economies will not be national economies, but continental or hemispheric. Germany and its satellites will constitute one; Russia and its satellites another; Japan will be the center of a far eastern constellation; America, Latin America, and Canada—the center of a far western. Thirdly, within each economic unit there has been, and will continue to be, a movement toward running the economy as a planned whole through state intervention in all the major decisions. Planning has become the new operative. Fourthly, there has been a revolution in war technology and in war administration. Fifth, and finally, there has been a psychic revolution among the ordinary men and women throughout the world.

We have, I hope, grown wiser through this experience. I hope we have learned that unless an economic system can give effective security to the masses of people, they will become the stamping-ground for political adventurers, using ideas as destructive weapons. I hope we have learned that whether in peace or war only the well-organized and well-administered society can survive. I hope that we have learned that the achieving of economic security involves a heroic effort of the collective will, and what will seem to many almost a revolution in the economic structure. To the unemployed, the W. P. A. workers, those living on or just below the margin of elementary decency, to workers who are subjected to industrial tyranny and to farmers who are the slaves of the fluctuations of the market for their commodities, political democracy will be an empty form. Maury Maverick has defined democracy as "liberty plus groceries." Unless we recognize the truth of this, we shall never understand either the roots of Hitlerism in Europe or the dangers of Hitlerism here. The roots of Hitlerism lie less in the German mind than in the fertile soil that German economic collapse in the post-war years offered to the spread of Nazi ideas.

My plea is that we must intervene—if we intervene—for something affirmative. Not just to save British civilization or the Empire, not even to defend our shores, not to defend the great tradition of the past or the social system of the past. This may appeal to a few intellectuals: It will not appeal to the mass of people, and especially to the young people. There has been complaint recently of the cynicism of the young. How should we expect them to be anything but cynical, considering the mess we have made of the world we are handing on to them; considering that we have never given content in terms of their own lives to the concepts of democracy, liberty, the career open to talent? It is these groups—the insecure, the young, the cynical, whom the political adventurers of the coming generation will find the easiest victims.

American opinion at the beginning of this war started as deeply isolationist. The rapid march of events in Europe has swung it over rapidly until now, I believe, a majority of the people are behind President Roosevelt's program for sending England every aid and material resource short of war. I am myself a supporter of that program. Nevertheless, I am not happy about the terms in which it is supported. It should not only be a matter of defense—defense of the Western social system, national defense.

It should be a matter of taking the revolutionary forces in the world and channeling them in the direction of a real democratic reconstruction. It should not be defensive but affirmative—only to affirmations will our young people respond. And it should be affirmative in the sense that our efforts toward aiding England and defending ourselves must be made part of a broader effort to reorganize our economic and administrative system, and make the democratic rhetoric words winged with fire to capture the imagination of the young of all ages. Let us remember that for the common man the great nihilisms in the world today are not Hitler's doctrines, but hunger, poverty, hopelessness.

In short, we need a new leadership of American opinion in the war today. The difficulty is that we are responding to fear. We must respond to a sense not only of our dangers but our opportunities. For one thing we can be grateful: We know now the worst that we face. We have been in danger for a long time. We have never known it until now. That, at least, is something gained. And we know, too, or ought to know, that our opportunity lies in the chance we have now of organizing our economy in the national welfare, lifting our national income, making a huge effort to produce more materials both of war and peace, streamlining our governmental machine, reducing unemployment, giving the young people a sense that they have a world to gain. That will require new technicians, more administrative experts, a collective national effort, a mass awakening to the need and the opportunity for a democratic collectivism. Above all, it will require leadership. Whoever wins in the coming election, America itself cannot defend itself by standing still. We have a war economy and will have it, willy-nilly. We are bound to have a vast increase in the size of our administrative machine. The problem is whether we shall try to do all this while maintaining "business as usual" and our ideas as usual—or whether we will take the affirmative and revolutionary energies of men and turn them into the channels of a new collective democracy.

For the real democratic revolution is not in the past. It is still ahead of us.

Opponents of Conscription Classified as Pro-Nazi "Bundite" Isolationists by Authors of Washington Merry-Go-Round

---

REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN L. SWEENEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 14, 1940

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I call to the attention of the House an article appearing August 13, 1940, in the Washington Times-Herald by Drew Pearson and Robert S. Allen in their syndicated Washington Daily Merry-Go-Round, which reads as follows:

Although first behind-the-scenes opposition to conscription came largely from Nazi, anti-British, Communist sources, there is no question that those opposing the bill now have rolled up some very genuine and sincere opinion from all walks of life, particularly the churches.

In fact, opposition to conscription seems to be one thing upon which churches of almost every denomination agree, and this is probably the first time that both Catholics and Methodists have worked together on a vital legislative issue.

Catholic opposition to conscription has been expressed by Msgr. Michael J. Ready, who is circulating a statement from the Catholic bishops; and from Father Barry O'Toole, who expressed the opposition of the National Catholic Welfare Council. Archbishop John T. McNicholas, of Cincinnati, also has circulated a pastoral letter urging opposition to the bill.

Protestant opposition has come from Charles Boss, whose organization is supposed to represent 8,000,000 Methodists; Bishop William A. Lawrence, speaking for a group inside the Episcopal Church; and also from the Federal Council of Churches, the over-all Protestant body.

Outside the church groups the Farmers Union in several States has registered opposition; also the Railroad Brotherhoods. Also, this opposition to conscription is about the only thing John L. Lewis and Bill Green have agreed upon for months.

Note, however, it is an inescapable fact that these very well meaning and sincere groups are being used, at least in part, by a militant backstage group of pro-Nazi, bundite isolationists to serve their own interests.

Mr. Speaker, in one paragraph of this article an admission is made that the opposition to conscription "have rolled up some very genuine and sincere opinion from all walks of life, particularly the churches." However, in the postscript accusation is made that these groups "are being used, at least in part, by a militant backstage group of pro-Nazi, "bundite" isolationists to serve their own interests."

The authors of this article are nationally known swear artists, and it is expected they would join other columnists and editors and publishers of controlled newspapers in attempting to question the sincerity of any American individual or group who dared to oppose the present peacetime compulsory conscription bill now pending in the Congress of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I rejoice in the fact that the Roman Catholic Church is joining with other religious denominations in opposing the present conscription bill. I rejoice that the veterans' organizations, the Farmers Union, the powerful labor organizations represented by William Green and John L. Lewis, and the strong railroad brotherhoods' organizations have all united in opposing the movement to Hitlerize the Republic of the United States.

I do not know Charles Boss, who, as stated by the authors of this article, represents a given number of Methodists. I do not know Bishop William A. Lawrence, who, the authors of this article state, speaks for a group in the Episcopal Church, and the Federal Council of Churches, the over-all Protestant body, but I do have for a number of years a personal acquaintance with the Rt. Rev. Msgr. Michael J. Ready, general secretary of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, who so ably presented a statement of the attitude of the archbishops and bishops of the administration board of the National Catholic Welfare Conference before the Committee on Military Affairs of the House of Representatives July 30, 1940.

Monsignor Ready is no stranger to the Nation's Capitol. He has a large circle of friends among the Members of the House and Senate. He is an outstanding American citizen,

and a militant leader in the great Catholic Church he represents. His appearance before the Military Affairs Committee on July 30, 1940, was at the direction of the archbishops and bishops of the administration board of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, pursuant to the resolution adopted at their general meeting, November 16, 1939, in session at the Catholic University, Washington.

I do know that Archbishop John T. McNicholas of Cincinnati is one of the outstanding members of the hierarchy of the Catholic Church in the United States, and a splendid American citizen.

Monsignor Ready was joined in his opposition by the Right Reverend G. Barry O'Toole, professor of philosophy in the Catholic University of America, before the Senate Military Affairs Committee. It is the height of folly and hypocrisy to insinuate that Monsignor Ready and Monsignor O'Toole, or the leaders of other groups who have registered opposition to the compulsory conscription bill, as being used by any pro-Nazi, bundite isolationists to serve their own interests. It is my firm belief that the united efforts of these organizations, who are well qualified and I believe speak for the inarticulate masses of the American people, will play a major part in defeating compulsory peacetime conscription now under consideration.

These groups and countless thousands of other Americans recognize that the bill under consideration does not define or state what are the dangers which gravely threaten the integrity and institutions of our country in a manner that calls for the mobilization of all men of the Nation. They are emphatic in declaring that the possibility of a 1-year voluntary enlistment program be exhausted before resorting to a compulsory one.

The church groups especially emphasize the fact that there is no provision in the bill for the exemption of those training for the ministry nor for those carrying on an actual ministry in religious education and charity. That there should be an exemption for ministers of religion and students of theology and those individuals who are carrying on the work of Christ in their respective churches, no one will seriously deny. However, the present bill seems to pattern after the ethics of the Blum government of France, which has now gone to destruction, by skillfully omitting any exemption of the religious bodies or those who labor in the vineyard of Christ and his ministry. It is rumored that the present bill under consideration will be amended to provide for such an exemption to minimize the opposition of these church groups, in an effort to secure support for the passage of the bill. In the light of the direct opposition of these groups against compulsory training in peacetime, I sincerely hope no Member of the Congress will be swayed by this sort of an attempted compromise.

It is well that the issue of compulsory military training in peacetime be considered on the eve of the Nation's general election. This issue should go before the people by way of a referendum. It certainly will be an issue in every congressional district. The Nation has earmarked billions of dollars for national defense. For the past 10 years $1,000,000,000 a year has been expended for national-defense purposes. We are not, as some of the warmongers state, a helpless Nation from the standpoint of national defense. Our Navy is second to none. The morale and spirit of our people is greater than any nation on God's earth. The experience of the last World War is still fresh in the minds of all of us. And I pray to God there will be a strong determination registered against any involvement in foreign wars or any attempt to Hitlerize the country by regimentation of our youth in forced military activity. The manpower is available, if a voluntary enlistment system is effected and decent wages are paid to men in the military and naval forces of the country.

In June 1939, I took occasion to protest to the Congress against the official visit of the British King and Queen to the United States. I stated at that time they were advance agents for a new world war, and that only imperialistic Britain would drag us once more into the blood business of Europe. The visit of the British King and Queen was step No. 1. Step No. 2 was the lifting of the arms embargo. Step No. 3 is already under way in the proposal to send 50 of our warships to Europe to engage in what appears to be a hopeless enterprise.

The proposal for compulsory military conscription in peacetime has the earmarks of a plot to bring about a participation in the European war at an early date. Condemning as we do the methods employed by Hitler and the other dictators of Europe we must also condemn the imperialism of Great Britain, which assumes in fact that the United States is a mere colony of the British Empire, and we are compelled to everlastingly pull her chestnuts out of the fire when she meets a formidable foe.

In view of the hysteria and propaganda now sweeping the United States unless one is constantly shouting for the success of the British Empire one is cataloged as a pro-Nazi, a Communist, or a Fascist. The American way of living can be preserved, and our free institutions maintained if we show the courage to adhere to the warning of the first President of the United States, George Washington, in steering clear of foreign entanglements, be they openly or secretly arrived at.

The opposition to the present compulsory peacetime conscription bill is an indication that the people of the United States are determined to decide the issue of national defense, keeping with the sentiment of the vast majority of the inhabitants of this country, and not succumbing to the pressure of a Wall Street international banking group, who met a few months ago in the Harvard Club of New York City and carefully laid the plans for the present regimentation of the youth of America under compulsory conscription in peacetime.

Pan-American Airways Begins Important Task in National Defense Preparations

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS LUDLOW

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 13, 1940

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, in cooperation with the War Department Pan-American Airways, one of the most marvelous creations of our modern air-minded age, has assumed an important function in our national defense—the training of Army men for long-range air navigation.

Year after year our Government has paid Pan-American Airways millions of dollars under the title of air-mail subsidy to carry on, extend, and strengthen its operations in foreign lands, and all along we members of the Appropriations Committee have had in the back of our heads not only the immediate benefits in the extension of trade and commerce and friendly relations among nations, but also the potential service that Pan-American Airways might perform in the cause of national defense.

Pan-American Airways is making good that promise and assurance. After 2 months of conferences between representatives of Pan-American Airways and officials of the War Department the company has established at Miami, Fla., a school where it will give cadets the training that is so much needed in the navigation of long-range combat planes, such as the "flying fortress." In its operations around the globe the company has developed its own technique of navigation and it is expected that in 14 months the Miami school will be able to turn out 850 superbly qualified long-range navigators. Each one of these will be so well trained that the captain of the flying ship to which he may be assigned will know that he can depend on his navigator.

The Miami school will not bring one dime of profit to Pan-American Airways. It was founded and will be conducted as a strictly nonprofit operation. It is deeply rooted in patriotism, harking back to the World War. Juan T. Trippe, president, and C. V. Whitney, chairman of the board of

Pan-American Airways, were World War pilots and most of the other Pan-American key men are veterans who had active service in the aviation branch in 1917 and 1918.

If in times past it may have seemed that we were a little extra liberal in our appropriations for foreign air mail, I think that now, when the war clouds are lowering and the lightning is flashing, we may be comforted by the assurance of the great service which Pan-American Airways is capable and willing to render as a national-defense factor.

By consent of the House I submit for publication in the RECORD a news release on this subject issued by the Public Relations Branch of the War Department last Saturday:

ARMY PLANS TO HAVE 850 LONG-RANGE NAVIGATORS TRAINED IN 14 MONTHS

WAR DEPARTMENT,
PUBLIC RELATIONS BRANCH,
August 10, 1940.

The War Department announced today that it has entered into an agreement with Pan-American Airways System which will permit the training of 850 flight-navigation cadets in long-range navigation technique during the next 14 months. The first class of approximately 50 cadets will start training in Miami, Fla., today (Saturday) and will be graduated November 2, 1940. The course is one of 12 weeks. The second class of 50 cadets will be enrolled on November 2, 1940. A third class of 50 will be enrolled 6 weeks later; thereafter plans provide for classes of 100 to be enrolled at intervals of 6 weeks, the last class to start on October 4, 1941. Army Air Corps officers who will supervise the cadets will be housed with the cadets in quarters made available by the University of Miami. Classrooms are also provided by the University of Miami.

Pan-American Airways will provide the instruction and all necessary flight-training facilities on a nonprofit contract basis. It is using some of its most experienced personnel, taken from transoceanic and other operating divisions, to act as instructors. Miami was selected because of weather conditions that permit 12 months of flying during the year and also because it is the location of the Pan-American Airways System base school, which has been that company's primary training ground for the development of transoceanic captains and other flight captains who are in the crews of the transoceanic clippers. In addition, the direction-finding stations covering Florida waters in conjunction with Pan-American's trans-Caribbean and inter-American services provide ideal facilities for the training of flight personnel in instrument and advanced long-range navigation.

Students for the flight-navigation course will be selected in much the same manner as those chosen for flying cadets. Candidates between 20 and 27 years of age will be considered for the course according to their educational qualifications. First priority will be given to graduates of accredited colleges and universities who have received a degree in engineering. Second priority will be given graduates of accredited colleges and universities who have had mathematics to include plane geometry, algebra, and trigonometry. Third priority will be given those who have satisfactorily completed at least 2 years of college work in accredited colleges or universities and who have had the mathematics outlined for the second priority group.

Flight-navigation cadets completing the training will be available for assignment to combat squadrons as members of crews in the flying fortress and other types of long- and medium-range bombers.

At the present all applications for appointment as flight-navigation cadets are being handled directly by the Chief of the Air Corps, Munitions Building, Washington, D. C.

The Air Corps training detachment stationed at Miami for the supervision and administration of the cadets undergoing training will consist of Capt. F. H. Goodrich and First Lt. B. T. Carnahan and two noncommissioned officers from the Southeast Training Center at Maxwell Field, Montgomery, Ala.

A list of the students chosen for the first class follows:

Frederick T. Albanese, 9044 East Prairie Road, Evanston, Ill.
Evan Angel, 824 Avenue T, Brooklyn, N. Y.
John Bryant Armstrong, Boswell, Okla.
Robert T. Arnoldus, La Grande, Oreg.
Charles G. Bones, 2306 South Fifty-ninth Avenue, Cicero, Ill.
George B. Berkowitz, 2930 Peabody Street, Dallas, Tex.
Theodore John Boselli, 105 Audubon Avenue, New York, N. Y.
Robert Lewis Brown, 139 East South Temple Street, Salt Lake City, Utah.
Richard W. Cease, 17 Oak Street, Trucksville, Pa.
Leo George Clarke, Jr., 117 West Elsmere, San Antonio, Tex.
Melvin Burdette Cobb, Cambridge, Idaho.
John Werner Cox, Jr., 1517 Central Avenue, Great Falls, Mont.
Paul E. Dawson, 2331 West Eighteenth Street, Wilmington, Del.
Thomas William Finnie, 535 Bramhall Avenue, Jersey City, N. J.
Harold Fulghum, Terrell, Tex.
Merrill K. Gordon, Jr., 201 South Third Street, Bozeman, Mont.
Merle Willard Harris, 4630 Beatty Drive, Riverside, Calif.
Norman P. Hays, Turkeyford, Okla.
Arthur Elkin Hoffman, 6168 Kingsbury Boulevard, St. Louis, Mo.
Jay Malcolm Horowitz, Sweetwater, Tenn.
Robert S. Johnson, 2327 Delmar Drive, Seattle, Wash.
Jack Edward Jones, 206 Roycroft Avenue, Long Beach, Calif.
John Joseph Kiyak, 556 Compton Avenue, Perth Amboy, N. J.
Edmund A. Koterwas, 3639 Alabama Avenue SE., Washington, D. C.
Harold T. Leonard, 1111 Fourth Avenue North, Fargo, N. Dak.
George M. Markovich, 2737 Magnolia Avenue, Long Beach, Calif.
Edward L. Marsh, 85 Cumberland Street, Bangor, Maine.
Harold C. McAuliff, 5582 Vesuvian Walk, Long Beach, Calif.
Harry Clayton McCool, 3001 West Colorado Avenue, Colorado Springs, Colo.
William F. Meenagh, 861 Cauldwell Avenue, Bronx, N. Y.
Richard Arthur Moore, 1210 Chestnut, Duncan, Okla.
Louis G. Moslenor, Jr., 356 Twelfth Street, Monaca, Pa.
Anthony E. Oliver, Smithers, W. Va.
Francis Bernard Rang, 2242 Twenty-eighth Street, Santa Monica, Calif.
Joseph A. Rawls, Jr., 530 North Eleventh Street, Corvallis, Oreg.
Harry Julius Schreiber, 2416 Avenue Q, Galveston, Tex.
Walter E. Seamen, Jr., 55 West Fifty-seventh Street, New York, N. Y.
Robert W. Snyder, Jr., Box 103, Kimberly, Nev.
Charles J. Stevans, 127 West Montcalm Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
Carl L. Stieg, 2023 Twenty-ninth Street, Astoria, Long Island, N. Y.
Homer Roy Taylor, Box 19, El Campo, Tex.
Leroy T. Tempest, Fairfield, Wash.
Robert L. Tennies, 2620 North Bartlett, Milwaukee, Wis.
Roger H. Terziam, 1078 Amoroso Place, Venice, Calif.
Berry P. Thompson, Judith Gap, Mont.
Robert A. Trenkle, Leroy, Ill.
Russell M. Vifquain, 524 Forest Glen, Ames, Iowa.
George A. Walthers, 870 South Race Street, Denver, Colo.
William Scott Warner, Richlands, Va.
Edgar D. Whitcomb, 2577 Ninety-ninth Street, Elmhurst, Long Island, N. Y.
Edgar J. Wicker, 801 Monroe Street, Abingdon, Ill.
Carl Richard Wildner, Belchertown Road, Amherst, Mass.
James Franklin Wilson, Route 2, Altus, Okla.
Clarence R. Winter, 774 Nineteenth Street, Boulder, Colo.

A Peacetime Hero

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. MURDOCK

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 14, 1940

LETTER FROM MRS. CHARLOTTE MANGUM, SCHOOL SUPERINTENDENT OF GRAHAM COUNTY, ARIZ.

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, in these days of carnage and the horrors of war when life among civilized nations is held so cheaply, it is inspiring to hear such a story as is related below. In addition to due honor which may be accorded this lad by appreciative organizations taking note of his heroism, I want to place the story here in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the inspiration of other boys throughout the country wherever this RECORD may come. The act of this unselfish spirit is contained in a letter which I have just received from Mrs. Charlotte Mangum, county school superintendent of Graham County, Ariz. The account is as follows:

I wish to call your attention to a real case of heroism.

July 5, returning from a short vacation, William Mortensen and family, of Thatcher, met with a very tragic accident. Turning the curve at Florence Junction, they were sideswiped by a car. Their car overturned, throwing Mr. Mortensen out of the window and pinning the other occupants under the upturned car which immediately caught on fire. Mrs. Mortensen and Billy, 15, began fighting; pushed Lena, 11, and Bobby, 13, out of the car. Then Billy got out and helped pull his old grandmother out, then saw his father lying unconscious with his clothes burning on him. Billy ran to him, could not pull him by his shoulders; so in spite of flames, he jumped astride his father and with flames lapping up his legs, arms, and across his chest, he dragged his father, inch by inch, away from the burning car to soft sand where he first put out the fire on his father, then thought of himself and pulled off his burning clothes.

Billy was burned terribly on arms, legs, chest, and stomach. He is still suffering untold agony. His burns are healing slowly but looks as if most of the flesh is off the right shin. The doctor says he is out of danger, but may need grafting where deepest burns are.

Mrs. Mortensen was the last to get out of the car and in trying to save the others was most seriously burned. Her mother died shortly after reaching the hospital. Billy showed his heroism and unselfishness by insisting that all others be treated before him. Nurses and everyone were too busy to heed minor calls, and Billy in spite of seriousness of burns was found administering a drink to his dying grandmother. The nurse said, "Why did you do that? You shouldn't move from your bed." Billy replied, "Grandma was pleading for a drink. I couldn't stand to have her suffer when I could help her."

Factories for National Defense Should Be Decentralized; Aircraft and Allied Industries Should Be Located Inland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 14, 1940

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, in the last few days I have been pleased to read that officials of the War Department were looking into the possibility of establishing ammunition factories, not in a few certain localities, but throughout many sections of the United States.

SHOULD MOVE INLAND

In this connection I quote the following from an editorial which appeared yesterday morning in the Baltimore (Md.) Sun:

In Europe decentralization of defense factories has been the rule since before the beginning of the war. It is apparent that in spite of intercepting planes, balloon barrages, and antiaircraft fire, no one spot can be made safe from attack. Therefore, the best defense is to reduce the size of individual targets by spreading the services vital to defense over as wide an area as is possible. If one is knocked out, there are still others that remain in operation.

It is inconceivable that the United States would ignore the lessons taught in Europe and confine the war industries to the coast. It would be equally foolish to locate them all in the Middle West, for no one can know in advance from what direction an attack might come. Should it come by way of South America and the Caribbean, the Middle West would be as vulnerable as, if not more vulnerable than, the East. Proximity to raw products, railway communications, and labor supply must, of course, play a part in the selection of sites for defense factories. But, even at that, there should be enough choice to meet all reasonable demands. The problem, if it can be called a problem, is one that ought to be capable of settlement in conference to the satisfaction of all concerned.

For many years I have been firmly convinced that our aircraft and allied industries are located so as to be vulnerable to possible aerial attack. During debate on the House floor, March 13, 1936, I sought to impress my colleagues with the need, as I saw it, to decentralize our armament manufacturing plants. At that time I said:

In this Nation practically every concern manufacturing aircraft is located on the coasts of the United States, and due to the danger from attack we should give serious consideration to the need for aircraft development inland.

ADVOCATED IN 1936

Less than a month later, April 3, I placed in the RECORD, page 4923, Seventy-fourth Congress, second session, copy of a letter which I sent to the President. Similar communications were directed to the Secretaries of the War and Navy Departments, to the chairmen of the House Committees on Military and Naval Affairs, and also the then Director of Air Commerce. In that letter I gave the names and locations of factories which were engaged in the manufacture of planes and allied industries. Almost without exception these were located near the coasts of our country.

In the final paragraph I said:

I feel justified at this time, therefore, in calling your attention to the need for careful study with the thought in mind of establishing in the interior and more inaccessible sections of the United States our plants for the manufacture of aircraft, engines, firearms, explosives, and chemicals because the picture today is decidedly different than it was even 5 years ago.

EXPANSION IS UNDER WAY

Mr. Speaker, with each passing month since that letter was written, more than 4 years ago, the need for decentralized defense factories has become more apparent. I trust protective action in the expansion program will bring the establishment of defense units in many parts of America which are removed from our borders. It is not too late, but now is the time as actual production begins.

The Basic Issue Is Not the Third Term But the Retention of Popular Government in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 14, 1940

EDITORIALS AND ARTICLE FROM THE OREGON DAILY JOURNAL

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to include in the extension of my remarks two editorials appearing in the Oregon Daily Journal in its issue of August 9, 1940, on the third-term issue and the withdrawal of James A. Farley from President Roosevelt's Cabinet; also to include an article appearing in the same issue of the Journal, written by Mr. R. Gittings. They follow:

[From the Oregon Daily Journal, Portland, Oreg., of August 9, 1940]

THE "BASIC ISSUE" IS NOT THE THIRD TERM BUT THE RETENTION OF POPULAR GOVERNMENT IN THE UNITED STATES

One of the best things about America is what amounts not only to the right but the authority to talk right out in meetin'.

And for the other fellow to do the same.

After which, the problem is to be clearly understood, especially by the person who is so preoccupied by what he is going to say next that he gets only part of what you say.

The example selected for today of speaking frankly but not accurately is the letter (elsewhere printed) from E. Bruce Knowlton, of Portland.

"As I understand it," writes Mr. Knowlton, "the Journal is now a Republican paper, promoting Wendell Willkie. Now just come out and tell us which ones of the Roosevelt laws you would repeal."

The Journal, from the beginning, has been, is now, and will continue to be, an independent newspaper. It cannot accept the third-term proposal for President Roosevelt, believing that violation of the anti-third-term tradition strikes at popular government and creates a trend toward dictatorship. Two quotations from President Roosevelt graphically support this view.

From an address on January 8, 1936, and repeated on April 21, 1940, to the Young Democrats of America:

"Whatever may be the platform, whoever may be the nominee of the Democratic Party * * * the basic issue will be the retention of popular government."

From the message to Congress March 4, 1939:

"The safety of the system of representative democracy is, in the last analysis, based on two essentials: First, that at frequent periods the voters must choose a new Congress and a new President; and, second, that this choice must be made freely; that is to say, without any undue force against or influence over the voter in the exercise of his personal and sincere opinion."

A position against the third term is without reference to Mr. Roosevelt's successor. The Journal is not "promoting Mr. Willkie." Mr. Willkie has yet to establish his claim upon the Presidency.

Nor does it imply a desire to repeal the "Roosevelt laws." The Journal, in 1932, was the first metropolitan daily on the Pacific Coast to support Mr. Roosevelt. It supported him again in 1936. It supported, and does now support, most of the social, banking, and labor-relations legislation. Likewise, the national-defense policy, the trade-agreement plan, and much of the public-works program. The protection of natural resources from monopoly, and the advancement of education, are basic in national welfare. That the aged should have pensions, that childhood should be liberated from commercial toil, that workers should have compensation and income during involuntary idleness, that the needy should have relief, that farmers should have prices commensurate with what they have to pay for the products of industry, are as sound from the humanitarian as from the economic viewpoint.

But, supporting these, the Journal, nevertheless, went against the properly defeated court-packing plan, deplored the feud against

business, advocated labor-relations amendment, opposed the tendency to regiment free enterprise through overcentralized government, and warned against excessive national debt.

Whoever may be elected President, social reform will not stop, abuses will not be again permitted. It is not necessary to elect Mr. Roosevelt to a third term to defend America or assure progress.

The basic issue is the retention of popular government.

FARLEY'S DEPARTURE LOSS TO ROOSEVELT

Jim Farley's withdrawal from President Roosevelt's cabinet closes a New Deal chapter.

His geniality, method, optimism, courage, and honesty belong to 1932, when everyone of these qualities was needed in the leadership of America back toward the way of life that we call normal, prosperous, and free.

He was indispensable in 1936, when the issue was the continuance of the recovery program.

But Jim Farley doesn't belong to 1940, and none realizes it more than he. He could not be a party to the third-term ambition. He could not concur in the unnecessary machine tactics of the Chicago convention. He was not in the picture which showed two political bosses—Mayor Kelly and Mayor Hague—seated at meat with members of the Roosevelt cabinet, one of them, Mr. Wallace, now the Democratic Vice Presidential nominee.

Jim Farley goes back to private life without a smirch upon honor, judgment, or reputation. He is a bigger man than when he entered the national political arena, bigger in conscience as well as in ability. May he command for himself and his family the success that he won for the New Deal.

THE THIRD-TERM HISTORY SPEAKS

(By R. Gittings)

In its essentials the anti-third-term tradition began with the Federal Government—even before. The spirit of it sprang forth when Washington put aside the offered kingly crown, and in such terms that the monarchial idea—at least under that name—died of its stern rejection. After his 8 years, he settled the matter of Presidential succession as decisively.

The philosophy underlying the anti-third-term tradition is older than recorded history—as old as human nature itself; for it, from hoariest eld, represents the revulsion of the free spirit against the grasp for power. The most ancient recorded expression of this revulsion came into literature more than 2,000 years ago. Let the shade of Plato be invoked to say, paraphrastically of a Scripture he never knew in life, "Before Washington was, I am." And then:

"The people have always some champion whom they set over them and nurse into greatness. * * * This and no other is the root from which a tyrant springs; when he first appears he is a protector."

This language is harsh, but it assails a principle whose workings remain the same in kind wherever it is sought to materialize it in no matter what mild degree. Hitler and Mussolini are examples, none so illustrious, of the "protector" turned tyrant.

"PERPETUAL REELIGIBILITY"

Jefferson, who was not a member of the Constitutional Convention of 1787, left, in his correspondence from Paris, where he was serving as American Minister to France, abundant evidence of his deep concern over the provision of the Constitution, section 1, article 2, which left open the way to what he called "perpetual reeligibility." To Washington and others, he wrote that he "disliked strongly the perpetual reeligibility of the President," fearing it would "make that an office for life, first, and then hereditary," only hoping that "before there is danger of this change taking place in the office of President, the good sense and free spirit of our countrymen will make the changes (in the Constitution) necessary to prevent it." He observed that the natural progress of things "is for liberty to yield and Government to gain ground," but that "as yet our spirits are free." But he warned: "Our jealousy is only put to sleep by the unlimited confidence we all repose in the person (Washington) to whom we all look as our President. After him inferior characters may perhaps succeed and awaken us to the danger which his merit has led us into—a merit that has blinded our countrymen to the danger of making so important an officer reeligible."

THE PERIL OF LONG TERMS

Jackson, in two of his annual messages, advised so amending the Constitution as to limit the Presidential term to 4 or 6 years. In one of these, he discussed the public disadvantage, possibly public peril, in lengthened terms of office, though, it is only fair to say, he was speaking only of appointive offices; but, with his "4 to 6 years" in mind, and in a paragraph just preceding, these reflections should seem equally to apply to the office of President. There are, he said, "perhaps, few men who can for any great length of time enjoy office and power without being more or less under the influence of feelings unfavorable to the faithful discharge of their public duties," one danger being that the office "is considered as a species of property, and Government rather as a means of promoting individual interests than as an instrument created solely for the service of the people." He disposed of the plea of "indispensability" by affirming that the duties of all public officers "are, or at least admit of being made, so plain and simple that men of intelligence may readily qualify themselves for their performance," and, further, his belief that "more is lost by the long continuance of men in office than is generally to be gained by their experience."

FROM BENTON TO BRYAN

By way of interlude, an incident in La Fayette's memorable tour of the United States, revisited in 1825. Congress, in typical American enthusiasm, proposed a $200,000 cash gift and a 24,000-acre land grant in Florida, in recognition of his services in the Revolutionary War. Benton—no better Democrat lived—quietly remarks in the course of his record of objections raised in Congress—objections to the principle, not to the amount of the grants:

"The ingratitude of republics is the theme of any declaimer; it required a Tacitus to say that gratitude was "the death of republics and the birth of monarchies"; and it belongs to the people of the United States to exhibit an exception to that profound remark—as they do to so many other lessons of history—and show a young republic that knows how to be grateful without being unwise, and is able to pay the debt of gratitude without giving its liberties in the discharge of the obligation."

The platform adopted by the Democratic National Convention of 1896 contained this plank:

"We declare it to be the unwritten law of this Republic, established by custom and usage of 100 years, and sanctioned by the examples of the greatest and wisest of those who founded and have maintained our Government, that no man shall be eligible for a third term of the Presidential office."

So much for democratic, and Democratic Party, attitude from Jefferson to W. J. Bryan.

A Code for Nationality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD H. REES

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 14, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON EVENING STAR

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent given me by the House to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including herein an editorial from the Washington Evening Star of August 13, 1940, entitled "A Code for Nationality." This editorial, I think, is worthy of perusal. I hope you will read it. It refers to H. R. 9980, that has been favorably reported by the House Committee on Immigration and Naturalization without objection and is now on the House Calendar awaiting consideration.

[From the Washington Evening Star of August 13, 1940]

A CODE FOR NATIONALITY

Approved by the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, a bill to revise and codify the nationality laws of the United States into a comprehensive nationality code is now before the House. Because of the many conflicts and ambiguities in existing laws, and because of the danger that through the laxness of these statutes "fifth columnists" will gain citizenship, and the right to enter the United States whenever they please, Congress should promptly approve this measure, thus protecting the United States, in the words of the committee report, "against adding to its body of citizens persons who would be a potential liability rather than an asset."

The proposed code carries out the recommendations of a committee consisting of the Secretary of State, the Attorney General, and the Secretary of Labor, in pursuance of an Executive order issued by the President on April 25, 1933. The House committee held extended hearings, and on June 5 reported the measure to the House, adding a provision strongly recommended by the War Department for greater safeguards against subversive activities by persons born in incorporated territories of the United States.

One fault in the existing statutes is that while aliens may be denied entry into the United States on any one of several grounds, a person who enjoys the legal status of a citizen of the United States cannot be barred from this country, no matter how long he has resided abroad. Therefore, a naturalized citizen, for example, may return to his native land and establish his residence there, and still enjoy the right to enter the United States at will. Because of "fifth column" activities this is one of several loopholes that should be plugged now.

In addition to defining who shall enjoy American nationality, both at home and abroad, the proposed revisions of law contain a provision under which, with certain specified exceptions, naturalized citizens will hereafter lose their citizenship if they reside continuously for 3 years in the foreign countries from which they came. In the cases of those who reacquire the nationality of their states of origin because of residence therein, the expatriation period is reduced to 2 years. These provisions will do much to bar from the high privileges of United States citizenship those who are not Americans in character and sympathy.

Apart from the desirability of a tightening of the nationality laws, it will be a great advantage to have the statutes governing nationality brought into a single and logically arranged code. In recent years Federal courts and Government departments have faced unusual difficulties in construing nationality law.

By providing uniform rules of naturalization, and by repealing obsolete and conflicting provisions of existing statutes, the proposed code will make possible a better and a more efficient enforcement of the law. This codification of nationality laws is a part of the defense program that should receive early attention.

Compulsory Military Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSHUA L. JOHNS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 14, 1940

Mr. JOHNS. Mr. Speaker, I was very much interested to find out in the morning press that the program for compulsory military training would be delayed, because with a proper bill for voluntary enlistments passed by Congress we would get all the men necessary by enlistment, and it would not be necessary to upset the whole economic system of the country by drafting people for military training and service.

From a study of the population of the different States and the enlistments from January 1, 1940, to June 30, 1940, it shows that we are getting the quotas that we are asking for, and with proper adjustment in the payment of reasonable wages or salaries to those that might enlist, we will have no trouble in getting men for military training, and for service if need be by voluntary enlistments.

The following table shows the population of the different States together with the enlistments from January 1, 1940, to June 30, 1940, inclusive, and also the percent of enlistments per 10,000 of population. The population is based upon the census estimated for 1937 from the Census Bureau.

States	Population, 1937	Enlistments	Enlistments per 10,000 population
Alabama	2,895,000	2,168	7+
Arizona	412,000	314	7+
Arkansas	2,048,000	1,071	5+
California	6,154,000	2,847	4.1+
Colorado	1,071,000	1,035	9+
Connecticut	1,741,000	636	3.5+
Delaware	261,000	108	4+
District of Columbia	627,000	184	2.1+
Florida	1,670,000	1,129	6+
Georgia	3,085,000	2,823	9+
Idaho	493,000	338	6+
Illinois	7,878,000	2,784	3+
Indiana	3,474,000	1,470	4+
Iowa	2,552,000	726	2.1+
Kansas	1,864,000	1,022	5+
Kentucky	2,920,000	3,053	10+
Louisiana	2,132,000	1,086	5+
Maine	856,000	582	6+
Maryland	1,679,000	704	4+
Massachusetts	4,426,000	1,974	4+
Michigan	4,830,000	1,254	2.1+
Minnesota	2,652,000	671	2.1+
Mississippi	2,023,000	1,157	5+
Missouri	3,989,000	1,266	3+
Montana	539,000	294	5+
Nebraska	1,364,000	680	5+
Nevada	101,000	45	2+
New Jersey	4,343,000	1,434	3+
New Hampshire	510,000	255	5+
New Mexico	422,000	301	7+
New York	12,959,000	5,471	4+
North Carolina	3,492,000	3,442	9+
North Dakota	706,000	215	3+
Ohio	6,733,000	1,956	2+
Oklahoma	2,548,000	2,261	9+
Oregon	1,027,000	801	7+
Pennsylvania	10,176,000	7,411	7+
Rhode Island	681,000	351	5+
South Carolina	1,875,000	1,763	9+
South Dakota	692,000	313	4+
Tennessee	2,893,000	2,620	9+
Texas	6,172,000	6,648	10+
Utah	519,000	234	4+
Vermont	383,000	240	6+
Virginia	2,706,000	2,169	8+
Washington	1,658,000	1,034	6+
West Virginia	1,865,000	1,618	8+
Wisconsin	2,926,000	1,109	3.9+
Wyoming	235,000	256	10+

There are several interesting things that may be observed from a study of these enlistments. They show that the strictly rural States have a larger percentage of enlistments than the metropolitan areas. This is caused probably by reason of the fact that those living in the cities receive much larger compensations than those working on farms, and also that those from rural communities like travel and excitement. The enlistments, of course, are less in the States where people are more war-minded than in others, and this is especially true where munitions are made.

Wisconsin is known as a place where the people are peace loving and are much opposed to peacetime conscription. Yet if you will observe from the table you will find that Wisconsin has a considerably higher percentage of enlistments than those States bordering on it.

The Navy, Air Corps, and Army all have their quotas filled. If we would raise the wages of those that enlist for service in the Army and the Navy so that they received a salary commensurate with what we pay those in C. C. C. camps, or wages that would compare favorably with what men receive who are employed in other industries, of course, we would receive enlistments far beyond our requirements or even our expectations.

At the present time no Member of Congress, so far as I know, and no one in the Nation, knows about the emergency that is claimed to exist and which requires compulsory military training in peacetimes.

In making this statement I do not want anyone to gather the impression that I do not believe in proper national defense and proper training of youth, but I believe there are places where it can be done, such as our high schools, colleges, and universities, to a much better advantage, especially for youth, than to take them into camp where they are trained only with the thought of going into war.

Deportation of Harry Bridges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LELAND M. FORD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 14, 1940

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Los Angeles Times of August 7:

[From the Los Angeles Times of August 7, 1940]

THREAT CHARGED IN BRIDGES CASE—"REDS" WOULD TRY TO TIE UP DEPORTATION SHIP, LEGIONNAIRE DECLARES

CHICAGO, August 6.—Communist Party leaders have threatened to stop the deportation of Harry Bridges, west coast director of the C. I. O., in event the bill to deport him is passed by Congress. This statement was made today by Homer L. Chaillaux, director of the National American Commission of the American Legion, before the Chicago Rotary Club.

"The latest threat from the Communist Party is that 'we have machinery to make it impossible for Bridges to be deported by boat,'" Chaillaux said.

UNION CONTROL

"They mean that they control the seamen's union on the west coast and will make it impossible to move any boat on which an attempt is made to ship Bridges."

Chaillaux then pointed out the need for legislation to prohibit the further influx of alien saboteurs. He told the group that the Legion succeeded in having a resolution passed by Congress asking for the deportation of all alien anarchists, revolutionists, saboteurs, habitual drug addicts, and criminals.

VETOED BILL

"That bill was vetoed by the President," he said. "The explanation was that the Secretary of Labor already has that power.

"Madam Perkins has the power—but she didn't use it in the case of Bridges. The power should be mandatory.

"We have learned there are 6,000 aliens working at the Panama Canal. Any 1 of these 6,000 could put the Canal out of commission and might be an agent for a foreign power. We know of several who are German bund workers. Yet the latest news report is that about 80 Nazis have been removed. What about the rest of them?"

Disposal of Destroyers to England

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENNETT CHAMP CLARK

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 14 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

EDITORIAL FROM ST. LOUIS POST-DISPATCH

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial appearing in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of Monday, August 12, 1940, entitled, "The Retired Admirals Sound Off."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of August 12, 1940]

THE RETIRED ADMIRALS SOUND OFF

The retired admirals are rushing to endorse the recent speech by the retired General Pershing, urging that 50 American destroyers be sent to England.

Admiral Harry E. Yarnell, retired, calls for sending not only destroyers but other "necessary types of vessels" for British defense. He also urges repeal of the Neutrality Act, which was passed to keep America out of war.

Admiral William H. Standley, retired, goes even beyond the Yarnell proposals. There is a legal barrier to transfer of the destroyers, and this admiral would evade it by having Congress declare a national emergency, and thus give the President "full powers, including whatever disposition of our Army, Navy, and air force is called for by the public interest."

One-man rule, in other words; one-man decision on war or peace—military dictatorship. This is a shocking proposal, but not surprising from Admiral Standley, retired, since he was one of the original war hawks who in June urged that this country declare war on Germany at once.

The criticism expressed yesterday in Upton Close's article, as to retired admirals who "have forgotten their history and training," is in point here.

While the retired admirals are expressing bellicose ideas, what are the admirals on active duty saying about the destroyer deal? They are saying nothing publicly. The matter has become so involved in politics and intrigue that any discreet naval man still in service knows better than to pop off about it.

If the President has consulted naval officials, their statements have not been made public. One clew to their attitude is available, however, and Arthur Krock cites it in his column in the New York Times.

The clew is found in the report of an executive session of the Senate Naval Affairs Committee, the committee which several months ago published the sharply realistic report on national defense and foreign policy. The following exchanges took place:

"Chairman WALSH. When was the decision made by the Navy Department declining, or suggesting that the Navy Department would not be disposed to dispose of any of its destroyers?

"Captain FISHER. As far as I know, day before yesterday [June 12, 1940]. * * *

"Senator LUCAS. Did anyone in the coordinating department or Navy Department, discuss with you the question of the disposition of the destroyers?

"Assistant Secretary COMPTON. As soon as we heard the rumor, naturally Admiral Stark and myself discussed the situation and determined it would be inadvisable. If we were asked to do it, our answer would be 'No'; we would definitely recommend against it."

This shows two things: That the destroyer deal had been talked about for a long time, months before it came into the open with the Pershing broadcast, and that the naval high command had taken a stand against it.

The job of national defense is that of the officers in active service; it is not that of the retired admirals. We prefer to think that the men on the active list know what work is cut out for them, and know what is best for the country.

Enforcement of Hatch Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL A. HATCH

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 14 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

ANNOUNCEMENT BY DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an announcement by the Department of Justice relative to the enforcement of the so-called Hatch Act.

There being no objection, the announcement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Department of Justice announced today that Attorney General Robert H. Jackson had issued a circular instructing all United States attorneys that the Hatch Act adds many new enactments to the criminal code of laws of the United States and that violation of these provisions are to be enforced by the Department of Justice.

The circular points out that penalties of $1,000 fine or 1 year's imprisonment, or both, are provided for the following types of illegal activity:

"Intimidation or coercion of voters in Federal elections.

"The use of official authority by Federal, and in some cases by State, officeholders to interfere in Federal elections.

"The promise by anyone of Federal employment, compensation, or other benefit from Federal funds, in return for political activity or support.

"Depriving anyone of employment compensation or other benefits derived from Federal relief or work-relief funds on account of race, creed, color, or political activity.

"Soliciting, assessing, or receiving subscriptions or contributions for political purposes from anyone on Federal relief or work relief.

"The furnishing or disclosing or receiving by anyone of lists of persons on Federal relief or work relief for political purposes.

"The use by anyone of Federal funds appropriated for work relief, relief, or public works so as to interfere with or coerce any individual in his right to vote.

"The annual receipt of contributions, or the annual expenditure, aggregating more than $3,000,000 by any political committee. (Willful violation of this section involves a penalty as high as $10,000 and imprisonment for 2 years.)"

The following criminal acts are punishable by a fine of not more than $5,000 or 5 years' imprisonment:

"The making of an annual contribution in excess of $5,000 to or for any campaign for the nomination or election of any candidate for an elective Federal office. The annual limitation likewise applies to a contribution made to any political committee or to any national political party.

"The purchasing of any advertising, or articles of any kind by anyone where part or all of the proceeds directly or indirectly inure to the benefit of or for any candidate for an elective Federal office, or to the benefit of any political party or committee.

"The making of, or promising to make, a contribution to any political party, committee, or candidate for public office by anyone who is negotiating for, or performing a Government contract."

The circular points out that the provisions of sections 9 and 12 of the Hatch Act which restrict the political activities of officers and employees of the executive branch of Federal, State, and local agencies are not enforceable by the Department of Justice, but are enforceable administratively by the Federal agency concerned or, if civil-service employees or State or local agencies are affected, by the United States Civil Service Commission.

The Attorney General's circular further states that the Department of Justice will not attempt to answer general inquiries with respect to the meaning and interpretation of the Hatch Act in particular situations. For a brief period following the enactment of the original Hatch Act it was the practice of the Department to answer such general inquiries but this practice was discontinued

some time ago inasmuch as the Attorney General is authorized by law to render opinions only to the President and to the heads of the several executive departments.

The circular specifically notes that section 15 of the new Hatch Act incorporates into statutory law certain determinations of the United States Civil Service Commission as to what constitutes political activity. Civil Service Commission Circular Form 1236 entitled "Political Activity and Political Assessments of Federal Officeholders and Employees" which describes such illegal activity is available at the United States Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C., at 5 cents per copy.

McNary of Fir Cone—Willkie's Running Mate From the Forests of Oregon Is Great With Farmers and Filberts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 14, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE (PORTLAND) OREGONIAN AND AN ARTICLE FROM LIFE MAGAZINE

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I ask permission to include an editorial appearing in the Oregonian of August 10, 1940, calling attention to the biographical article of my fellow Oregonian, the Honorable CHARLES L. MCNARY, appearing in the issue of Life magazine of August 1940, written by Richard L. Neuberger. I also ask leave to include in the extension this article by Mr. Neuberger. They are as follows:

[From the Portland Oregonian of August 10, 1940]

MCNARY AT HOME

A nearly life-size portrait of Senator MCNARY, of Oregon, smiles from the cover of the current issue of the illustrated magazine, Life. On inner pages is an article both biographical and intimately revealing, written by a fellow Oregonian, Richard L. Neuberger.

In compliment to the requirements of such a sketch, Mr. Neuberger naturally goes into the official life of Oregon's senior Senator. It is one angle that the public already knows a great deal about, so the part of the text that reveals the Oregon Senator's home life will likely take precedence in the reader's interest.

And now that that side of Senator MCNARY is so ably assembled in text and illustration, the thought comes forward that his is a private life rather made to order for one who is running for Vice President of the United States.

If campaign directors are as wise as they pretend to be, candidates for President and Vice President need display an interest in the common, the homey, affairs of life. Hence they are pictured pitching hay, or wearing cowboy regalia, or fishing in old duds, and so on. Senator MCNARY does not have to pretend. He is a practical farmer, not a gentleman farmer. When he comes home from the capital he comes home to a farm to be a farmer. The house in which he lives is a modest white bungalow set among great fir trees. There is a big fireplace with a bean kettle, not simply ornamental, that may be swung over the blazing hearth. An ordinary rural mail delivery box is the sole marker of the entrance to the farm. The dog, and a prized dog, too, is a commonplace animal. There are trout in the farm creek and nesting wild ducks and geese.

Not one item in all this is staged. It has the genuineness of many years of preference and standing. If it be true that interests such as these are political assets, it may be said that not only does the Oregon Senator possess them, but that they are so fundamental with him that a story about him, simply told, cannot but reveal them.

[From Life for August 1940]

MCNARY OF FIR CONE—WILLKIE'S RUNNING MATE FROM THE FOREST OF OREGON IS GREAT WITH FARMERS AND FILBERTS

(By Richard L. Neuberger)

Under no circumstances would CHARLES LINZA MCNARY ever live for 11 years in a New York City apartment house like his running mate on the Republican national ticket, Wendell L. Willkie. Crowds and big cities annoy him. MCNARY considers even the half-million people of Washington, D. C., too many in one place and is pained by the confusion and stir of the capital. As soon as Congress adjourns and he is sure his good friend Franklin D. Roosevelt does not need him for White House conferences, MCNARY, who is Republican minority leader in the United States Senate, boards a limited train for Fir Cone, the 300-acre Oregon nut-and-prune farm where he was born 66 years ago.

Crossing the continent, he likes to sit in the observation car and watch the farms flash past—Indiana's cornfields, the dairy pastures of Wisconsin, the broad wheat ranches of the plains, Idaho's swaying rows of potato plants, and at last the orchards of the Pacific slope. Often he reaches the end of his journey with a pocketful of notes scribbled on railroad stationery about farm conditions he has noted along the line.

Improving the farmer's life has been MCNARY'S dominant concern since he entered the Senate 23 years ago and immediately asked for a seat on the Committee on Agriculture. Preoccupation with his own specialties, walnut and filbert trees, gave a "Mr. Smith Goes to Washington" touch to his first interview. A reporter inquired what interested him most. "Nuts," replied MCNARY.

From the start MCNARY let bounties for the farmer take precedence over party regularity. He attended the meetings called by Brookhart, Norris, and other Corn Belt insurrectionists. Despite G. O. P. pleas in behalf of private enterprise, he proposed Government transmission lines to carry Government hydroelectricity to unlighted farms. Last year he confounded many of his Republican followers who were in the midst of a furious attack on New Deal extravagance when he steered through the Senate a $400,000,000 addition to the Department of Agriculture appropriations requested by the Democratic President.

A year or two ago the Old Guard of the Republican Party wanted MCNARY thrown out as Senate leader because of his heresies. At the recent Republican National Convention in Philadelphia, however, Wendell Willkie and his advisers consulted the results of the last two Presidential elections and decided that MCNARY was precisely the type who had to be kept in party councils at all costs. Perceiving that not since 1928 have the Republicans picked up a single electoral vote west of the Pennsylvania-Ohio border, they concluded that MCNARY for Vice President would strengthen G. O. P. chances in the 2,500 miles between there and the headlands of the Pacific.

Geographical qualifications aside, MCNARY is an important asset to the Republicans because for 14 years he has been a symbol of unstinted Federal help for agriculture. The McNary-Haugen bill, with its equalization fee for grain farmers, which he originally introduced in 1926, provided the lexicon for practically all subsequent discussion of the farm question. It showed farmers the door to the United States Treasury and started in MCNARY'S direction more mail from rural districts than is received by any other Senator. "The McNary-Haugen fight," wrote Gen. Hugh S. Johnson a few months ago, "made the country conscious of the farm problem and the farmers conscious of Senator MCNARY."

MCNARY is a specific antidote for all political handicaps the No. 1 member of the ticket carries into the campaign, particularly west of the Mississippi. Willkie has been the head of a far-flung utilities empire, the Commonwealth & Southern Corporation, and became a national figure waging its battles against the competition of the Tennessee Valley Authority. MCNARY has been the most consistent Republican Senate supporter of T. V. A. and was scolding the Power Trust in the days of Coolidge normalcy. Willkie has said it is "uneconomic and fallacious" for the Government to construct power dams. His running mate is the sponsor of the 576,000-horsepower colossus that cost Uncle Sam $75,000,000 to build at Bonneville on the Columbia River.

Willkie favored all aid to England and France short of war. MCNARY is one of the Western isolationists who opposed both repeal of the arms embargo and delivery of American military equipment to the Allies. Cordell Hull's reciprocal-trade treaties get Willkie's O. K. MCNARY claims the Hull treaties have weakened the agricultural market and he persuaded a preponderance of Western Senators, Democrats as well as Republicans, to vote against their extension.

Willkie has been critical of excessive Government spending and believes prudence in this respect would be a go-ahead signal to business. As early as 1918 MCNARY began getting reelected by telling the home folks how much Federal money he was wangling for Oregon.

As to whether a Presidential candidate and a Vice Presidential candidate should present quite such a complete contrast, opinions differ. "Mr. MCNARY is an unhappy choice for Vice President," declared the New York Times, "because in many of the things that matter most, Mr. MCNARY'S views are the complete negation of Mr. Willkie's views." The St. Louis Post-Dispatch maintained that the very circumstance to which the Times objected was evidence that "in choosing his running mate, Mr. Willkie, the amateur, has made a decision quite worthy of a professional."

Wendell Willkie's selection of MCNARY as a running mate unquestionably impelled the President to choose Henry Wallace. Until MCNARY was put on the Republican ticket Wallace had been so far behind the other Democratic possibilities they could not communicate with him even by smoke signals. Many party leaders had not considered him at all.

Then the New Deal hegemony decided that the paramount qualification of the President's running mate had to be ability to challenge MCNARY'S appeal to the farmers. Only the Secretary of Agriculture seemed capable of this feat, and Wallace was thrust upon an unwilling Democratic convention. A western delegate seconding his nomination shouted, "Henry's our answer to CHARLEY MCNARY!" The Wallace choice came after reports had been heard

in Washington of small-town movie audiences in rural districts who sat silently through news-reel speeches by Roosevelt and Wilkie and then applauded lustily when McNARY appeared on the screen.

M'NARY'S ADVICE TO TALKATIVE WILLKIE

McNARY'S advice to Willkie, when they met for the first time after their nominations, was: "Don't forget, young fellow, in politics you'll never be in trouble by not saying too much." In almost a quarter of a century in the Senate, McNARY has yet to deliver an oration. High on his list of taboos are crescendos, grandiloquence, and windmill gestures. He listens to voluble colleagues with amused tolerance. His own remarks are uttered in placid, matter-of-fact tones. "If Charley Mac ever really gets excited," says Senator WORTH CLARK, of Idaho, "I'll run for the door, because I'll know the Capitol dome is coming down."

Other Senators go to McNARY'S office for counsel. At sessions of the Republican caucus he quiets down Senators itching to fire oratorical fusilades. He listened to VANDENBERG rehearse a speech one day, then said: "That's fine, Van, only don't deliver it again." McNARY'S serenity enables him to judge politics from a peculiarly detached perspective. This calmness has given McNARY a constant strategic advantage over ALBEN W. BARKLEY, the bumbling Kentuckian who leads the Senate majority.

With a perky, half-sardonic smile McNARY admits political maneuvering is "as enjoyable as golf and considerably less expensive." He gets a malicious pleasure out of instigating embarrassing legislative proposals, occasionally labeled "demagoguers," and then watching BARKLEY and the top-heavy Democratic majority struggle to find a safe retreat. A favorite form of this wile is to up an old-age pension minimum or insert a union wage-scale clause in a housing bill. The 23 Republicans in the Senate can enthusiastically back the "demagoguers" but the majority party, faced with responsibility, must either vote them down or find more money.

In spite of his partisan finagling, party ties fail to shackle McNARY on issues affecting agriculture. The Republicans, as sworn enemies of New Deal socialism, are in an awkward position when their leader demands that people's utility districts, organized by farmers in the Pacific Northwest, be given prior claim over power companies to the juice from Bonneville Dam. Every so often Republicans outside the Senate wonder publicly why the party does not acquire a leader there who is a Republican first and a farmer second. That the party has not done so is certainly a tribute to McNARY.

FIR CONE, HIS HOME AND INSPIRATION

Fountainhead of McNARY'S fervid allegiance to agriculture is Fir Cone, the farm the Senator's pioneering grandfather from Tennessee homesteaded in 1845 at the end of the Oregon Trail. Fir Cone is in a timbered pocket 5 miles from the State capital, Salem (population 30,744), and 19 miles from the settlement of Champoeg, where frontiersmen organized the first provisional government in the sprawling Columbia Basin. A hundred acres of it are in walnuts, 50 in filberts and 50 in cherries and prunes. Douglas firs 175 feet high that were growing before the discovery of America cover the other hundred acres. Cones plunk on the roof of the $6,000 white-shingled bungalow that the Senator and his wife built in 1926 and fitted with only one spare room so they could not be harassed by a house full of guests. Tiny fir trees are carved in the green shutters. Back of the bungalow is a playhouse that David Lynn, Architect of the United States Capitol, designed for the McNARY'S 5-year-old adopted daughter, Charlotte.

Around the bungalow in a fir-rimmed curve twists Claggett Creek, named for the Senator's ox-driving maternal grandfather, Charles Claggett. Rainbow trout lie in its riffles, and from a lonely stump on shore McNARY'S best friend, the late Senator Jim Couzens, multimillionaire progressive Republican from Michigan, caught his first fish. A dozen times at Fir Cone—knocking golf balls across the putting green, sauntering in the arboretum of evergreen trees which may some day be deeded to the State of Oregon, rowing a little white skiff down toward the Willamette—Couzens tried to convince McNARY he should run for President and promised to finance the campaign to the limit. Twice he offered to make out a check for $100,000 right then and there. "No use; can't be done, Jim," was the inevitable reply.

As he lopes around his farm with a long hiker's stride, McNARY opens his jackknife and jerks up weeds. McNARY is fussy about his looks as well as Fir Cone's. Never on the farm is he without a tie, generally a stubby black or red bow. He constantly flicks imaginary dust from his shoes. His neighbors, to whom he is "Charley Mac," consider him a country squire rather than a bona fide dirt farmer, although Zero Polaire, master of the Salem Grange, says he is wiser in the ways of farming than anyone else in the valley. Other orchardists come to Fir Cone for seeds and advice. Before they go the Senator ladles them out a dish of the beans which he boils with molasses in the kettle that hangs in the fireplace of the 18-by-24-foot living room.

McNARY was the first farmer in Oregon to plant filberts on any considerable scale and wrote articles about the innovation for local farm papers. He developed the Imperial prune, the largest on the market, and sent pits all over the world. The same pickers have come to his place for 8 years. Most of them are nearby ranch hands. A few are migratory laborers who hit U S 99 every summer. They average approximately $4.50 a day and do better when the trees are heavy. McNARY takes juvenile pride in Fir Cone and keeps a scrapbook of poems he things descriptive of its landscape.

McNARY spends his mornings outdoors. In the afternoon, unless he has visitors, the Senator reads. Stacked on the living-room table behind a picture of Indian-fighting Gen. Nelson Appleton Miles are the books the Senator has been reading lately—Edward Bellamy's venerable Looking Backward (for the fifth or sixth time), Jefferson and Hamilton, by United States Ambassador to Chile Claude G. Bowers, Frederick Lewis Allen's Since Yesterday, a first edition of the works of the western frontier poet Samuel Simpson, the Sunbonnet Babies by Eulalie Osgood Grover, read aloud to Charlotte at evening, and volume III of Our Times by Mark Sullivan.

Cornelia Morton McNary, enthusiastic and youngish, thinks her husband's reading selection too serious and buys him detective fiction and light novels, which he tosses aside. She met the Senator at a small dinner party in Washington, where she was living with her father, a United States Army major. They were married 2 days before the end of 1923 in Chicago. A descendant of Editor Horace Greeley, Mrs. McNary now believes her ancestor's advice to go west was good.

HE WORKS HIS WAY THROUGH SCHOOL AND COLLEGE

McNARY'S first wife, the daughter of a prosperous Salem merchant, was killed in an automobile accident in 1918. The year he was married was also the year he went into politics and became assistant to his elder brother John who had been elected district attorney of the county. Both McNary boys had scrambled hard for legal educations with not much help from their inheritance. Charles, born on the farm June 12, 1874, put himself through high school working in a tree nursery in Salem for $1.15 a day. While grubbing in the loamy soil he could watch members of the legislature going into the State capitol across the street. This first contact with politics impressed on him the fact that a politician's lot was easier than a workman's.

One of McNARY'S friends, a young fellow his age, named Herbert Hoover, who had been living in Salem with relatives, had gone to Stanford University and found work in a laundry. McNARY decided he could do what Hoover had done. He went to California on a lumber boat and earned his way at Stanford waiting on tables. His long arms could hold three platters of stew at once. Law classes and his limited finances gave him little chance for social activities. McNARY came home from Stanford in 1898, passed the bar, played first base on the Salem baseball nine, and pushed a cart in the volunteer fire department. He and his brother ran the county prosecutor's office for a while and later built up a substantial legal practice handling property transactions. He attended the Baptist Church and taught real property at Willamette University, a local Methodist college.

Middle-of-the-road propensities soon began to stick out all over McNARY. He did Republican precinct work but led a revolt in the Salem commercial club against the choking off of waterfalls by private power companies. Although he supported the initiative and referendum and other progressive movements then stirring in Oregon, he never scooted off with the Progressives when they put up independent candidates. This policy he has always followed, deeming it wiser to work for reform from within the party than to stalk away and abandon the party machinery to the reactionaries. In 1913 a Democratic Governor appointed McNARY to a vacancy on the State supreme court and a year later he ran at the polls to retain the post. After 9 agonizing weeks of recounts in all 36 of Oregon's counties, the result was CHARLES L. MCNARY, 34,608 votes, and Henry L. Benson, 34,609.

War agitation hastened the death in 1917 of ailing United States Senator Harry Lane, of Oregon, one of the six "willful men" who voted in opposition to America's participation. McNARY, then chairman of the Republican State Committee, satisfied the main requirements of a successor. He got the appointment and the next year was elected to the full term, campaigning on a platform of preferential homestead rights for soldiers and sailors, women's suffrage, help for the small farmer more irrigation projects for Oregon, and vigorous prosecution of the war "to crush autocracy."

ALMOST BUT NOT QUITE AN INSURGENT

Most of McNARY'S career in the Senate has been spent in the neutral territory separating the G. O. P. conservatives and insurgents. Often he was the only liaison between the two encampments. He has hovered most of the time on the periphery of the Republican left, backing Government operation of the Muscle Shoals power plant which would one day be the first unit of the T. V. A. and cause Wendell Willkie a lot of trouble. Yet he never thought of bolting the party when the elder La Follette ran on a Progressive ticket in 1924.

Economy, in practice if not in theory, went out the window early in McNARY'S Senate career. One year his campaign literature shamelessly advised constituents exactly "what this influence and this prestige of Senator McNARY means to Oregon's future welfare:"

"It means government funds for Oregon's agricultural, livestock, and fruit industries.

"It means Government funds to build Oregon's public roads, forest roads, and trails.

"It means Government funds to harness Oregon's streams and convert them into power to grind its grain, spin its wool, and turn its wheels of industry.

"It means Government funds to preserve and develop Oregon's fishing, game, and scenic resources.

"It means Government funds to transform Oregon's arid, swamp, and logged-off lands into orchards and fields of grain.

"It means Government funds to improve Oregon's rivers and to make its harbors into ports of the first magnitude."

McNARY applies to Washington the same unruffled affability that has succeeded in his home State. He is a conciliator, ready 24 hours a day to forgive and shake hands. He had a cordial visit at the White House the afternoon after Calvin Coolidge vetoed the McNary-Haugen bill. As soon as the clerk has announced the result of a Senate roll call, McNARY, to all intents and purposes, forgets who voted which way and why. His friendship exacts no ideological prerequisites. He strolls about the Senate, bending over the white head of CARTER GLASS one minute and giving GERALD NYE an encouraging pat on the shoulder the next. He is wary of any political caldron that threatens to boil over into personal animosities. He ducked a vote on the Supreme Court appointment of Senator Hugo L. Black. Although definitely opposed to a third term for any President, he squelched as ill-mannered an attempt to haul the Senate into the rumpus with a resolution aimed against a third term for Franklin D. Roosevelt.

This deference to personal amenities has bridged many political chasms. When McNARY was nominated for Vice President a warm letter of congratulation came by messenger from "your old friend, Franklin D. Roosevelt." The President has always been more cordial to McNARY than to a lot of the members of his own party. As he signed the Bonneville authorization Mr. Roosevelt said, "I've got to give Charley his dam." McNARY was asked to come to Washington for White House conferences after the war broke out last fall and the President and Hull—although both knew he was opposed to most of their foreign policy—called him in for frequent consultation. It was McNARY to whom Hull turned for an appraisal of Senate sentiment on repeal of the arms embargo. The President's debonair pleasantries McNARY returns with dry geniality.

HIS STRATEGY DEFEATS THE COURT BILL

That this friendship has endured is doubly remarkable in view of the fact that McNARY devised the strategy that brought about the rejection of the most controversial bill Mr. Roosevelt ever sent to Congress. When the scheme to put 6 new members on the United States Supreme Court was presented early in 1937, McNARY heard his friends in the Democratic cloakroom begin to grumble and complain. He hastily imposed silence on his own followers. "Let the fellows over yonder do the talking," he said, gesturing toward the vast expanse of seated Democrats. Around the ash-littered conference table in the caucus room of the minority, he prophesied that for the outmustered Republicans to inveigh against Court packing would only solidify the majority. "But," he added, "the Democrats are going to snipe at each other as sure as grass is green, just so long as we don't give 'em any reason to unite in the face of the enemy."

Some G. O. P. speeches broke through this cordon, including one by Hoover that made McNARY swear softly, but they were not in enough force to distract the Democrats from one of the most terrific intraparty rows in Congressional history. Senator BURTON K. WHEELER, a new dealer until that time, led the sortie that rammed the Court bill into a committee pigeonhole. The Republicans in the House of Representatives under JOE MARTIN, whom McNARY considers the smartest leader the G. O. P. ever had there, lay low also and a Democratic Congressman shouted angrily at his colleagues: "You Democrats! Can't you see the Republicans are using you?" By the time the episode was over the G. O. P. had been sufficiently resuscitated to gain 7 Senators and 81 Representatives at the 1938 elections.

As Vice President of the United States, if the Republican Party is victorious this fall, McNARY can keep on enjoying the feature of Washington he likes best—the clubby atmosphere of the Senate. He can move behind the scenes, bolstering waverers, winning new converts, whispering mock threats in the ears of the opposition. He can still drive to the Capitol in his Buick with his Negro chauffeur, George Smith, whom he calls "Joe Louis" because he is an amateur boxer, and on bright mornings he and George can get out and walk briskly around 2 or 3 blocks for exercise. At lunch in the Senate restaurant he can continue to thumb through farm reports, breaking off now and then to exchange theological opinions with his waiter, John Holloway, a Negro who studied to be a minister. And on Sundays he can take Charlotte for her regular visit to the zoo, where they have agreed upon pet names for most of the animals.

Whether as Vice President of the United States CHARLES McNARY can keep on endorsing Government power projects, isolation, high tariffs, and huge outlays for farm relief under a President who believes in none of these things remains to be seen. The country has just been watching a President and Vice President at odds over basic national policies. The difference between Wendell Willkie and his running mate is pointed up by the power issue. Willkie has said that it is his patriotic duty "to do what I can for the preservation of public utilities privately owned." McNARY has advocated the principle that the people come first when the ownership, development, and control of the water power of the Nation are considered. He was one of the few Republican Senators who voted for the bond issue that T. V. A. used to buy out the Tennessee properties of Willkie's company. No divergence half so sharp as this appeared between Franklin D. Roosevelt and John N. Garner when they were meshed into the Democratic tickets of 1932 and 1936.

Before perpetual warfare is foreseen shaking the next Republican administration, other factors must be considered. McNARY is not nearly so new dealish in all matters as he is with respect to problems directly or indirectly involving the farmer. Oregon and fir cone dominate his horizon. He stubbornly resists economy drives aimed at poor farmers in the hinterland, but has helped trim funds for relief and other functions primarily important to metropolitan areas. McNARY's love of the West amounts almost to a sort of regional nationalism and he has been mistrustful of the recent concentration of authority in Washington. He is a decentralist who fears that complex regulation along a 3,000-mile line of communication could reduce the Pacific Northwest to a colonial-empire status. His agrarianism, anchored in the populist background of Oregon, is individualistic and has never synchronized with what he terms "collectivist values." He wants the farmer to receive benefit payments but he believes the checks should be handed out by a county or precinct agency rather than a Federal bureau. The W. P. A. scandals in Pennsylvania and Kentucky disturbed him and he has demanded that relief management be turned over to the States. He felt that court packing was a real threat to civil liberties. In most of these things McNARY squares with Willkie. He particularly approves Willkie's statement that we do not want monopolistic government any more than we want monopolistic industry.

Concessions were granted on both sides before the Republican ticket was formed. At first McNARY would not accept. Then it was pointed out that Willkie, whom he had never seen personally, wanted him as his Vice Presidential nominee. He was told that Willkie recognized their variance on certain questions, but believed compromise could certainly be reached. McNARY, who considers compromise the oxygen of politics, agreed to run. His wife, buying veal cutlets in a Salem meat market, would not believe it when the butcher told her the nomination of the Senator for Vice President had been announced on the radio. McNARY had wired her the previous night that he would not accept.

Precisely how Willkie and McNARY will compromise their differences no one knows yet, but in view of McNARY's genius for conciliation it is reasonable to guess that an area of agreement will be reached. Now that they have met at last, McNARY likes Willkie and says with considerable animation that his running mate has a lot of drive and color. Otherwise the senior Senator from Oregon is as placid and imperturbable as ever. He has demonstrated no excitement over the fact that his popularity in the West may be a determining factor in a crucial national election. So far as politics are concerned, he has been everywhere and seen everything. He has no illusions about why men get high public office or why they leave it. Of the 95 Senators who in 1917 watched him come down the aisle to be sworn in, only 9 are still present.

"You know," McNARY says, leaning back beneath a long picture of Fir Cone's orchards on the wall of his office, "most men are thrown into public service through accident rather than design. And when they are put in the harness there they usually stay until their constituents decide to give them their freedom."

Viewpoint of the Spokesman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN G. ALEXANDER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 14, 1940

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, in my district we have a large number of colored citizens and they have two well-edited weekly papers. One of these papers is the Minneapolis Spokesman.

Last week the Spokesman carried an editorial entitled "Military Training Needed," in which the writer spoke favorably regarding the idea of conscription.

The article is as follows:

MILITARY TRAINING NEEDED

We can't join our liberal friends who are against selective military service. The best defense for this country is armament and men trained to man and service our defenses.

Those who oppose the draft use the argument that this country is not in danger of war. We agree with them that no prepared country is in danger of war as long as the prospective enemy knows it is ready for the fray.

However, draft opponents know very well that this country is not prepared to fight a determined enemy and it is doubtful whether we could prepare ourselves in less than 2 years.

If the men and youth have to go to war to defend this country, they should be trained to do the job.

As for the Negro youth, it will help take up some of the slack of the conditions resulting from unemployment and may possibly give them some of the discipline so noticeably lacking among most of today's youth, black and white.

I have many friends among the colored people of Minneapolis, especially in the civic and fraternal groups such as the Elks, the Johnny Baker Post of the American Legion, the N. A. A. C. P., Phyllis Wheatley Settlement House, and others, and have always supported all movements sponsored for the

betterment of the colored race, including the antilynching bill and the measure to outlaw the poll tax.

Both are important, but the latter is especially needful at this time when we need to protect and promote real democratic principles. People in the Northern States little realize how menacing this poll-tax system is and how it denies to a vast number of otherwise qualified people the right to exercise their American privilege of casting a ballot.

In some States the amount of poll tax is $2 per year and counties are permitted to levy another $1. A tax of $2 or $3 per year for each voter in a family in the depressed sections of the Nation is a heavy strain on their finances. But that is not the whole story. The tax is cumulative, and back taxes must be paid before they can vote, so it can be seen what a real obstacle to voting the poll tax can be.

But the question today is, What about this editorial? Mr. Newman, publisher of the Spokesman, is a very intelligent person, and no doubt has the support and approval of many of the people to whom his paper goes. I would welcome the comment of as many colored citizens as would care to write me.

Conscription

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENNETT CHAMP CLARK

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 14 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

BROADCAST BY FULTON LEWIS, JR.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, in accordance with the permission granted me today, I offer for printing in the Appendix of the RECORD the address by Fulton Lewis, Jr., over the Mutual Broadcasting System on Tuesday, August 13, 1940.

The address is as follows:

This is Fulton Lewis, Jr., speaking from the studios of WOR in New York City, where I've been trying to check some angles of a very important story, which I'll give to you in a day or so—as soon as I've had a chance to countercheck the checks I made today. Life is like that, unfortunately.

So far as the Washington news is concerned, there still is just one story—the compulsory military-training bill—the so-called draft bill, which is under debate in the Senate.

One of the big stars of the Senate took the floor this afternoon—Senator BURTON K. WHEELER, of Montana. He is one of the most aggressive leaders in the opposition to the draft proposal, and his speech this afternoon really was the first full-length feature, so to speak, of the present battle. Usually Senator WHEELER speaks extemporaneously; in fact, he is considered one of the easiest speakers in the Senate, ordinarily, but to show you how very seriously, how gravely this controversy is being taken in the Senate, he spoke today from a prepared script. It was 55 pages long, and it took 3 hours and 25 minutes to deliver—which was just about the entire afternoon, so far as the Senate was concerned.

Senator WHEELER minced no words. He said that the need for any compulsory military training is not borne out by the facts or by the record. He told the Senate that the Army has an arbitrary idea, that it prefers the conscription method of getting men rather than the system of voluntary enlistments, and he said that the claims that the enlistment method has broken down and has failed to produce the men that the Army needs for training, is a pure sham.

Senator WHEELER said that Congress could double the pay of the Regular Army and get a million men, and the cost would be only a small fraction of the cost of the draft system. He said Army officials have estimated that the draft program will cost a billion dollars a year, which is almost twice as much as the entire annual pay of a million men at twice the wages that are now being paid to Army privates.

Senator WHEELER said the real forces behind this draft bill are the "Wall Street crowd" and the "superpatriots," and he repeated, time after time, the charge that the bill is a major and dangerous step toward American dictatorship. He charged that the Administration leaders are trying to build up the United States the same sort of military domination that has been developed in the dictator nations of Europe.

That same charge was bantered back and forth, time after time, this afternoon, as it was yesterday afternoon.

But under the surface, there wasn't a great deal of heart in the Senate debate today. Attention was fastened too tightly across the water at the terrific "blitzkrieg" that Germany finally seems to have launched against the little islands that are known as Great Britain. Senators seemed to be more interested in the latest bulletins from that dramatic story, than they were in the momentary details of how many men we should have in the Army and how we should get them. And after Senator WHEELER had finished, no one else seemed anxious to take the floor so the gentlemen of the Senate devoted themselves to a few side matters of routine, and adjourned to their radio sets for the rest of the afternoon.

Now about these charges of "dictatorship," that are being thrown around with such apparent carelessness, it occurred to me some days ago that the job of a good reporter would be to pin some of these charges down, trace them back, and find out just what these people mean, when they charge that the New Deal leaders are trying to lead the country into dictatorship. So for some days I've been quietly working on that angle for you. And a large part of the "dictatorship" talk, I find, is based on an incident that was supposed to have happened behind the scenes of the Democratic National Convention in Chicago. Most of these stories trace back to that alleged incident.

It centers around Senator CLAUDE PEPPER, of Florida, who, you know, is a bosom member of the very, very inside group of the New Deal. He is a close confidante of Mr. Tommy Corcoran and Mr. Ben Cohen and Attorney General Bob Jackson and Secretary of Commerce Hopkins, and those are the gentlemen who command the plans and strategies and the purpose and the objectives of the New Deal program.

The story about Chicago is that Senator WALSH, of Massachusetts, and Senator WHEELER, of Montana, objected to certain items which Senator PEPPER wanted in the party platform, and Senator PEPPER said they came from the President, and they said bluntly that what Senator PEPPER proposed to do was to make President Roosevelt a dictator.

(I'm telling you this because factually it's the only way I know of for you to know the real philosophies that are involved in this Senate battle, the background and the meaning of these various points of view. I'm trying to take you behind the scenes a little so that you can have a little more than just words of mud thrown from one side to the other and vice versa.)

The story is that Senator PEPPER replied to that:

"No; I only want to make the President a temporary dictator."

Now, after tracing down that much through a dozen different sources there were many things that could have been done next, but the logical and ethical one seemed to be to go to Senator PEPPER in person and ask him whether the story was true or not, which I did for you yesterday afternoon.

He said he doesn't remember any such incident, although he said he might possibly have made some reference along the line that it is necessary to recognize the difference between a democracy coasting along in peacetime and a democracy that has its back to the wall in a dire and threatening emergency.

I asked Senator PEPPER just what his views are, regardless of whether he said it or not, whether he does believe that the President should be made a temporary dictator.

His reply to that was not an unconditional "yes." In fact, he didn't say "yes" or "no." He said he believes the United States is facing the greatest crisis, the greatest emergency in its entire history, and he believes that if we are serious in wanting to preserve what we have we should give Mr. Roosevelt full and complete wartime powers, whatever the President thinks is necessary to deal with the situation and to pull us through.

Senator PEPPER said that if democracy is to survive in this country, against dictatorship in Europe, it is necessary for us to have a setup with a head that has sufficient power to cope with dictatorship on equal terms.

I asked whether that means that this country would have to give the President the same degree of totalitarian authority that Mr. Hitler has, and once again Senator PEPPER answered provisionally. He said he feels it should be power that is given to the President by Congress for the duration of the present emergency only.

The natural question then was, "Who is to decide when the emergency is over?" And his reply to that was, "Congress shall decide."

He said Congress should come back into session at intervals, and it should have the power to end the emergency or to revoke any part of the President's powers at any time.

I asked whether that would mean that elections in November would be suspended—not held. He said, "No; not under any circumstances. The elections," he said, "should go on." And if Mr. Wendell Willkie wins, Senator PEPPER thinks that these same powers should be continued for Mr. Willkie. He said that he is talking about the President of the United States, not about Mr. Roosevelt, the man. What he wants is one man who has the power to take over the reins of government and direct our defense with complete authority—whether it's the President, or a director of national security, or whatever you may call it.

He said he merely mentioned President Roosevelt because he believes there is no person in the country as well fitted to do the job as Mr. Roosevelt is.

I asked then how far he thinks this temporary power for the President should go, and he said it should go as far as necessary for the President to defend the United States.

He said Congress should outline certain general, broad objectives. It should tell the President, he said, "We want an army that's capable of defending the United States," and from there on, it should be up to the President to decide how large that army should be, how the men should be selected. His job would be to just get it.

Senator PEPPER said the President should have, in his opinion, authority to take over all private industry and all private enterprise and all private endeavor—or any part of it—any of it that has any connection with national defense. I asked whether, as a matter of practical fact, that wouldn't include almost everything in the country—almost all business and industry—and Senator PEPPER conceded quite frankly, "Yes; it would."

Senator PEPPER said he sees no reason why, if Mr. William S. Knudsen and Mr. Ed Stettinius are willing to come to Washington, to direct the National Defense Commission and give their services at a dollar a year, why some other industrial leader should be drawing $2,000,000 a year in salary or profits.

And he said, with particular emphasis, that he sees no reason why Mr. Henry Ford should be allowed to produce what Mr. Henry Ford wants to produce.

I asked him about conscription of labor, whether the President should have the power to draft whatever men he wants, not only for the military service of the Army, but also for work, and Senator PEPPER said he believes the President should have that power. He said there is no reason why soldiers should draw $21 a month, while the worker in some factory is drawing $20 a day.

I asked whether that means that the President would have the power to tell all of the workers, all of the employees in factories and plants all over the country, that they shall go to work in this place, at such and such a wage, or over here at some other wage, regardless of what they were getting as private employees, and he said, "Yes"; he believes the President should have the power to do that.

Now, that seemed to clear up all possible questions of policy and point of view, at least, all I could think of. But in view of the broader angles of the whole picture, the fact that Senator PEPPER, after all, is a recognized member of the very inner circle of the New Deal, it seemed to be important to find out for you whether these were the views of that very inner circle, officially, or Senator PEPPER's own individual views, so I asked the Senator whether these are ideas in which he stands alone. I reminded him of the fact that he is, what he is, in the New Deal family, and asked whether there are other New Deal Senators and other leaders in the administrative branch of the Government, who share those views with him. And Senator PEPPER said, with a moment of hesitation, that a great many of those gentlemen subscribe to these same theories. In fact, he made a flat prediction, he said, "The whole thing is going to come."

Now, getting back to the news—

The President got back to Washington today from his vacation to Hyde Park, N. Y., and his subsequent tour of naval defenses through New England, but he arrived too late to hold his usual Tuesday afternoon news conference, so apparently we will have to wait until Friday, to get any comments he may have on the subject of the draft bill developments, or about the Democratic campaign books, which have been printed and now turn out to be illegal.

The White House said, however, that the President—like everyone else in Washington and throughout the country too, for that matter—is keeping a constant watch on the reports from England.

Motion-Picture Producers Take Heed: Cut Out Vicious Propaganda

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEWIS D. THILL

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 14, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE MILWAUKEE SENTINEL

Mr. THILL. Mr. Speaker, too often have motion pictures been used as vehicles to spread vicious propaganda. Too often have they been used to foster some foreign political doctrine. Too often have they been used to disseminate the theory of intervention in foreign wars. Too often have they been used to enkindle the fires of hate and enmity.

Let the motion-picture producers take heed now before it is too late that the American public deeply resent the preachment of prejudice and the distribution of insidious propaganda. The following editorial from the Milwaukee Sentinel of August 10, 1940, discusses the problem now facing the motion-picture industry:

[From the Milwaukee Sentinel of August 10, 1940]

BAD POLICY—USING THE SCREEN FOR PROPAGANDA

That motion pictures be deliberately employed to further domestic and international political proposals has recently been suggested and recommended by some American producers of films.

This, of course, is a euphemism. In plain language, the proposal means using the screen for propaganda.

It means a miscalculation of the purposes and the strength of the motion picture. It means a radical departure from the sound principles that caused films to be a great art and a great industry.

After all, the first purpose of films is entertainment.

The second purpose, accuracy of information.

The third purpose, education.

There is no place for propaganda in the films. Propaganda not only offends the public but weakens the public respect for and confidence in the screen.

Propaganda is neither entertainment, information, nor education.

It is special pleading for ulterior motives, and that in the end is vitiation of entertainment, distortion of information, and falsity of education.

The screen has teemed with Communist propaganda, war propaganda, and alien propaganda of all kinds. And this has made the films both dull and disagreeable. People would rather stay at home than be bored by propaganda.

Must motion-picture producers go broke before they develop a little American common sense?

If producers cannot conquer the itch for proselyting, if the screen must be made to preach the prejudice of producers, let certain theaters be set apart for propaganda and let the other theaters give the legitimate entertainment the public desires.

What sense is there in wearying theater patrons and irritating the public against all pictures?

Why not stick to the policy which made moving pictures popular when they were popular and give entertainment, information, education—uncolored and undistorted by propaganda?

Defense! The Hurdles Ahead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL HINSHAW

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 14, 1940

ARTICLE BY ROBERT E. GROSS, PRESIDENT, LOCKHEED AIRCRAFT CORPORATION

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following highly important discussion of the obstacles to attaining defense matériel and which offers a program vital to that objective. The article follows:

[From the United States News of August 16, 1940]

DEFENSE: THE HURDLES AHEAD—AIRPLANE MANUFACTURER ANALYZES OBSTACLES AND OFFERS A PROGRAM—NECESSARY STEPS OUTLINED FOR EFFICIENT EXPANSION OF INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES

(By Robert E. Gross, President, Lockheed Aircraft Corporation)

Here are the steps and links in my chain for industrial preparedness—chronologically:

First. A determination of the objective—a definite program—what stuff, how much of it, and when?

Second. An overhauling of procurement methods, including simplification, if not standardization, of specifications.

Third. A survey of existing facilities and determination of how many emergency facilities are needed.

Fourth. A clear, simple plan as to how emergency facilities will be financed—and paid for.

Fifth. Granting of orders for the total number of units in the objective.

Sixth. Enlightenment of employers, employees, and stockholders as to what is needed of them.

Seventh. Industrial and vocational training of all kinds of civilian personnel.

Eighth. Building of floor space and installation of equipment.

WHERE CONTROVERSY ENTERS

Now surely it will be clear to anyone that a lot of these eight steps are obvious and elemental. The three steps that are more subtle, more controversial, and maybe not so visible to the naked

eye are these: Simplification of the procurement, paying the expansion bill, and, most of all, training.

Anybody knows that, before we can prepare for any job, we have to know the objective. I believe it would be just about as easy to get out 50,000 planes a year as it would be 40,000 or 60,000, and I imagine it wouldn't make a great deal of difference in the amount of facilities involved whether we build 20,000 tanks or 30,000 tanks.

It may be interesting to mention that, if the experience of the airplane program is typical, the defense industries are just beginning to get some inkling of what the real program is. And assuming that the touch-off to the whole thing occurred with the declaration of war in Europe last September, and the subsequent declaration that a state of emergency existed, it would appear that quite a generous period has elapsed before the objective so necessary for industrial preparedness has been named. Now it is entirely possible that there may exist somewhere on somebody's desk definite quantities of various types of arms and munitions, but I think I can safely say that, up to the last few days, at least, industry generally hasn't known what they were.

Again, I don't see any reason to spend a lot of time here on the subject of industrial surveys. It will be apparent to anyone that they have to be made and that, if we are going to know how much brick and mortar and additional equipment are needed, we have to know what we have to start with. I don't see any particular problem in making an industrial survey. Any one of a half-dozen branches of the Government can do it.

I might say that the floor space area of the aircraft industry in the country today is probably about 15,000,000 square feet, and the plant area necessary to do the job ahead of us, if the objective we are hearing about is the real one, would probably be at least 50,000,000 to 60,000,000 square feet. This does not necessarily mean that every plant in the United States has to be trebled. This would be unfeasible and inadvisable, and, further than that, a number of the plants already are doubling or trebling their floor space. But it is a good indication that substantial increases in facilities are called for.

The first point of need is the overhauling of the method of procurement and the simplification, if not standardization, of specifications. The creation of the National Defense Council by President Roosevelt was a very good thing and in my opinion may do more than any other one thing to save this program from failure, always provided it retains the authority to act and the caliber of the men now on it or others like them. This committee is engaged in industrial preparedness, by conducting surveys, attempting to cut out red tape, settling manufacturing priorities, and generally getting the machine going. But they are up against one terrific obstacle which I fervently hope they may be able to overcome; namely, complicated Government methods of buying and Army and Navy tolerances and specifications.

There may be other businesses where the method of buying is more complicated than the present method of buying an airplane, but, if there is, I don't know what business it is. And the worst of it is that it isn't the Army and Navy men's fault. The United States Army and the United States Navy have some of the clearest-headed and some of the most capable minds, both technical and commercial, that can be found anywhere.

But the American people have been so afraid that some shipbuilding company or some airplane company or some tankbuilding company would make a nickel here and there, or that an Army officer could be sold a bill of goods, or that a piston ring be a ten-thousandths of an inch out of the way somewhere and thus violate a contract, that they have encouraged their Representatives in the Congress to put through legislation governing the procurement of these necessary articles that is really something. I have made the statement time and time again that, if the specifications on Army and Navy contracts could be simplified and the tolerances and inspection limits reasonably relaxed, the cost of airplanes, for one thing, could be reduced at least 10 to 15 percent.

Some of the things we have to do are throwbacks from an antiquated set of procurement methods that don't have any more to do with the articles performing well in wartime than the man in the moon. I am not suggesting for one minute that we should not be turning out first-rate machines. What I am saying is that the difference between making war material that will get there and do its stuff and making war material that will conform 100 percent to these old-fashioned tolerances may be the difference between winning and losing.

What I want is a subcommittee of this National Defense Council to sit down with the Army and the Navy and simplify these specifications, relax these tolerances, and recommend to the Congress procurement legislation that will let us go cross-lots to that objective.

Of all the single things that we can do to get ready for our program of industrial preparedness, the thing that can do most for us is training. From every side comes the avalanche of questions today, "Can we get skilled men to operate the national-defense industries?" In my opinion the answer is, unquestionably, "Yes."

It is all very well to talk about big appropriations and big orders for machinery and bricks and mortar, but, after the national-defense industries have lapped up the apparent supply of top-notch skilled labor, and, in my opinion, they already have, we then have to go out and manufacture the men to manufacture the material. The point I want to make is that we can manufacture the men. We already have the tools to manufacture these men. You have to make just as much of a business of training as you make of building the cannon, the tank, the airplane, or the automobile.

Training can make a first-class aviation metal worker out of good green material in 4 months. Training can make a first-class riveter and metal assembler out of good material in 4 weeks. Training can make a template maker out of a good metal worker in 4 months. Training can make a tool maker out of a good machinist in 6 months. Yes; and I'll go further—training can make something out of everybody.

Permit me to now pass to the last of my three main points for industrial preparedness—the cost of the emergency facilities. Business is entitled to and must have a reasonable formula as to how these hurry-up plant extensions are to be financed and paid for. Now, I well realize that when I, as a manufacturer, start discussing the problem of who is going to pay for these extra plants some of my remarks are bound to be misconstrued. On the other hand, the question of how we are going to get these extra facilities and when is a pretty important cog in the wheel of industrial preparedness, and this is no time for anybody to rock the boat by questioning anybody's motives.

Furthermore, there has been a great deal of publicity in the press which I feel has been confusing to people's thinking. This feeling of unclearness as to where the Government, labor, and industry stand in the national-defense program started with the passage a few weeks ago of what has popularly become known as the Vinson Navy speed-up bill.

The feature of the bill that has come in for big publicity is the profit limitation. Profits are limited to 8 percent in competitive-bidding procedure and to 7 percent provided the work is done on a fixed-fee or modified cost-plus scheme. A good deal of the publicity has seemed to make it appear that industry is fighting the profit-limitation feature of the bill, and that in spite of what the companies say about how patriotic they are all they are really interested in is getting this profit-limitation feature knocked out. This just simply is not true.

Here are the facts. In the first place, we of the aircraft companies have nearly always worked under some form of profit limitation and have become quite accustomed to so doing. The shipbuilding companies also have had some experience with this procedure. While it has never been quite clear to us why our businesses should be subject to these restrictions when other businesses are not, still we have been willing to go along and do the best we could.

Now, when it comes down to a question of whether you get a fixed fee of 7 percent or 8 percent for competitive bidding, naturally everybody will choose to work on the fee basis because the theory, at least of the cost-plus basis, is that you get at least your cost, whereas under competitive bidding you may not. So it finally simmers down to a problem of what is cost and what is fee—but, most important, what is cost. The authors of this legislation may have had the best intentions in the world and may have felt that in talking about cost they were being entirely definite. As a matter of fact, cost is one of the most indefinite words in the book.

Now, if you are going to have to make emergency preparations to get emergency production for an emergency order, and nobody can in good faith show you that you are going to have need for these emergency facilities after the order is completed, aren't the emergency facilities a part of your cost? Is not the special machinery you are going to have to buy and have no use for after the order is over, and is not the special building you are going to have to build and have no use for after the order is over, just as much a part of the cost as the materials and the overhead that you have no use for either after the order is over?

If you are going to be allowed a fee of 7 percent on top of your cost, it seems only fair that you should get the 7-percent fee based on your real costs, not 60 percent of your cost or 70 percent of your cost or 90 percent of your cost. You should get your fee on your true cost, which must contain all the items that are involved in designing, building, and selling the article. This is the only place where the aircraft companies have any issue to discuss with the Government.

CHANGES IN COST REGULATIONS

And this is because the present regulations of the United States Treasury, whose rulings finally determine what one can and what one cannot include as cost, do not at present allow industry to include as cost items the cost of these extra facilities. If the present regulations of the United States Treasury, as applied to the present Vinson Navy speed-up bill, were left just as they are, industry could not undertake the production program which the Government wants without having to carry the excess plants after the orders that caused them have run out. This is unsound for the people, unsound for the Government, unsound for labor, and unsound for business. Industry and the Treasury are cooperating to make these changes, for industrial preparedness cannot come without them.

But, in the broadest sense, the thing that industry needs most is a clear statement on the part of Government as to what is wanted—the throttle or the brake. We must have one or the other, but not both at the same time. With no comment on whether the control that has been placed over business these past years has been called for or not, the facts remain that for the past 10 years business has had the brakes put on it. Now all of a sudden, and without any gradual acceleration or training period, the sky is the limit and this same industry that has been living a life of restraint is expected to rise to the occasion, go wide open, and go wide open right now.

You don't run any machine that has to make speed and cover ground with the throttle and the brake on at the same time. Somebody has to answer that question for industry. We'd better close the throttle, put on the brakes, and stop the machine right here, or take off the brakes, open the throttle, and go places.

Industrial preparedness in this and any country sincerely dedicated to that principle must be paid for by everyone, and with work and sacrifices, not by exceptionalism and aloofness and gains.

There will not be enough industrial preparedness to go 'round and cover the ground if any one branch of our national life holds out for special favors. Sacrifice, not gain; sharing, not shelving; realism, not romance—the throttle, not the brake.

Edmund M. Toland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY N. ROUTZOHN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 14, 1940

LETTER FROM WILLIAM GREEN

Mr. ROUTZOHN. Mr. Speaker, 1 year ago this month the committee appointed by you to investigate the National Labor Relations Board organized and selected a staff of assistants to whom was committed the details of the investigation, the selection and production of the evidence, the examination of the witnesses, and so forth.

As chief counsel to the committee, Edmund M. Toland was placed in complete charge of the staff personnel and investigation work, and, with due regard for his able corps of assistants, to him belongs the credit for an investigation that has been universally recognized as eminently satisfactory and praiseworthy.

Mr. Toland came to us with an enviable reputation as a lawyer. In his work with the committee he not only confirmed all that but he established himself with us as a man worthy of the highest respect whose love of country and devotion to duty transcend consideration of personal comfort, health, welfare, or happiness. It would be a godsend to this Nation of ours to have many others like him in the service of the public.

His great legal ability, his self-sacrifice, his indefatigable endeavors, his forthrightness, have not been entirely unnoticed, and it is with pleasure I insert herein as part of my remarks the following letter from William Green, President of the American Federation of Labor.

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR,
Washington, D. C., August 2, 1940.

Mr. EDMUND M. TOLAND,
Investment Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. TOLAND: The officers of the American Federation of Labor followed your work as chief counsel of the Smith congressional committee with very deep interest.

Now that the work of the Smith committee is nearing completion, I feel justified in writing you commending you most highly upon the skillful, judicious, and successful way in which you presented facts and data relating to the administration of the National Labor Relations Act to the committee for information and consideration. You measured up to the standards set by your friends and to the highest requirements of all your duties as chief counsel for the committee.

The facts and information which were made public by the committee enable all classes of people to know and understand how the National Labor Relations Board had failed in the administration of important social justice legislation. I commend you highly upon the work you performed as chief counsel of the committee. You rendered a great public service.

I express to you the deep appreciation of the officers and members of the American Federation of Labor for the broad, constructive, and expert way in which you discharged your great responsibilities and performed your difficult duties.

Very sincerely yours,

W. GREEN,
President, American Federation of Labor.

Water Transportation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY S. TRUMAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, August 15 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

LETTER FROM ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN RAILROADS

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter from Judge R. V. Fletcher, vice president and general counsel of the Association of American Railroads, in reply to a charge made by the Mississippi River Carriers Association that the Panama Canal Act would be repealed by the conference report on Senate bill 2009. The letter is a learned statement of fact on what is actually contained in the conference report. The letter is addressed to the conferees on the part of the Senate—the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. DONAHEY], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], and myself.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN RAILROADS,
LAW DEPARTMENT,
Washington, D. C., August 14, 1940.

The Honorable BURTON K. WHEELER,
Chairman, Committee on Interstate Commerce, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.
The Honorable HARRY S. TRUMAN,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.
The Honorable VIC DONAHEY,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.
The Honorable CLYDE M. REED,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: I am addressing this letter to you in your capacity as managers on the part of the Senate signing the conference report on S. 2009, which conference report was adopted by the House of Representatives on August 12, 1940. I am moved to write this letter by reason of a release which has come to my attention, bearing date of August 12, 1940, issued by the Mississippi River Carriers Association, in which release appears this extraordinary statement:

"Water-carrier transportation, and the economies and benefits it provides the public were struck a death blow today with the passage by the House of the Wheeler-Lea transportation bill, containing a hidden provision repealing the paragraph in the Panama Canal Act which prohibits railroads from owning and operating competing water carriers, etc."

This curious misapprehension of the effect of S. 2009 seems to have been shared by certain Members of Congress who participated in the debate in the House of Representatives when the conference report was before that body on August 12. It was stated during the course of that debate by certain Members of Congress opposing the legislation that the bill as presented by the conferees—

"Repeals paragraphs in the Panama Canal Act designed to protect the public against a monopoly of transportation by the railroads. * * * In the second conference report the prohibition against acquiring water carriers on the inland waterways and the Great Lakes has been repealed. * * * The repeal of the Panama Canal Act will give to the railroads the same power and authority that they had to acquire water carriers prior to the adoption of the Panama Canal Act."

The inference to be drawn from statements of this character would be that the conference report weakens, if it does not destroy, the effect of the Panama Canal Act, which limits and restricts authority of the railroads to engage in water transportation. I call your attention to the fact, however, that careful examination of the text of the conference report and a comparison of that text with the present law must produce the conviction that the conference report does not change the law in any particular. Such an examination justifies the statement made by the Honorable CLARENCE F. LEA in the House during the course of the House debate, that the conferees have done no more than to clarify the meaning of the law as it is written and as it has been for many years interpreted by the Interstate Commerce Commission, an interpretation which has been generally accepted by all concerned.

The Panama Canal Act, so-called, is contained in paragraphs (19), (20), and (21) of section 5 of the Interstate Commerce Act. In the conference report the subject is dealt with in paragraphs (14), (15).

and (16) of section 7, which section 7 is, in fact, an amendment to section 5 of the present act. In the conference report the paragraphs to be examined are found on pages 13 and 14 of the printed report.

Comparing paragraph (14) of the conference report with paragraph (19) of the present law, it will be found that the two paragraphs are almost identical in meaning. The only real difference is that in the conference report the railroads are more restricted than under the present law in that the conference report language not only prohibits rail carriers from owning, leasing, operating, controlling, or having interest in common carriers by water but the restrictions extend also to "any person controlling, controlled by, or under common control with" a rail carrier. This change was obviously made to conform the legislation to recent investigations and recent legislation bringing under the authority of the Commission persons who control or are controlled by common carriers.

In examining paragraph (14) it will be found that the prohibition extends to the ownership, operation, lease, or control of "any common carrier by water operated through the Panama Canal or elsewhere with which such carrier aforesaid does or may compete for traffic." The prohibition is broad enough so that it applies to all traffic moving by water, whether it be the Panama Canal, the Great Lakes, the inland waterways, or the coastwise service. No language could be broader than the simple phrase "or elsewhere." This is the same expression that occurs in the present law. It cannot be said, therefore, that the provisions of the Panama Canal Act as brought forward in the conference report are more liberal to the railroads than the provisions in the act which is amended.

With respect to operations not moving through the Panama Canal, it has always been the law that the Commission has jurisdiction to determine questions of fact as to competition and by paragraph (20) of the present law, it is provided that application may be made to the Commission to determine whether any existing service is in violation of the section and an order may be asked for to permit the continuance of any vessel or vessels already in operation "or for the purpose of asking an order to install new service not in conflict with the provisions of this paragraph." (Emphasis supplied.) It will be seen that under paragraph (20) the Commission has the authority to pass upon applications for exemption, not only with respect to existing service but to new service as well.

An examination of paragraph (15) of the conference report shows that the language of the present paragraph (20) is reproduced in substance and by no possible exercise of ingenuity can the language of the conference report, paragraph (15), be considered as having any different meaning from the language of paragraph (20) of the present law. The language has been shortened, simplified, and clarified by reference to paragraph (14) in one case and by reference to paragraph (16) in the other case, but the meaning is obviously the same.

The difficulty, if it can be said to exist, grows out of the adoption by the conferees of paragraph (16), which corresponds in reality though not in form to paragraph (21) of the present law. Early in the administration of the Panama Canal Act, the Commission was called upon to deal with the question of whether it had authority to authorize new service to the same extent that it might authorize the continuance of existing service. By examining paragraph (21) of the present law, it will be seen that the Commission is authorized clearly, in the case of existing service, to permit its continuance, if such continuance is found to be of advantage to the convenience and commerce of the people and if it be found that the extension of existing service will neither exclude, prevent, nor reduce competition.

The question debated before the Commission was whether, if a railroad undertakes to establish a new service by water, the Commission had authority to allow such service, if it found that public convenience and interest would be thus promoted and if it found further that competition would not thereby be excluded, prevented, or reduced. It was argued by those who opposed the contention of the railroads that in the case of new service, the Commission was limited to an inquiry as to whether the service would be competitive with existing service and was precluded from taking into consideration the public interest or the public convenience. This question was put to rest by a decision of the Interstate Commerce Commission in *Southern Pacific Co. Ownership of Atlantic Steamship Lines* (77 I. C. C. 124), decided in January 1923. It was there said, in discussing the question as to the authority of the Commission to pass upon new service:

"These companies contend that the applicant seeks authority to install a new service, and that the paragraph of the act which provides that we may extend the time during which service by water may be continued if such service is operated in the interest of the public and is of advantage to the convenience and commerce of the people, does not grant authority to install a new service. It is therefore urged that if we find that the proposed service is a new service and that in that service the applicant does or may compete with the all-rail routes in which applicant participates, the application must be denied, whether in the interest of the public or not.

"In construing a statute it is not proper to confine attention to particular words, paragraphs, or sections. The fundamental rule is to ascertain and give effect to the intention of the legislature as gathered from the language of the whole statute. The Panama Canal amendment to section 5 of the Interstate Commerce Act is part of a public statute, and passed in the public interest. It had been found that the ownership and operation of boat lines by rail lines had retarded and stifled competition on routes by water in the interest of the rail lines, and it was to prevent this evil and permit the development of water-borne commerce in the interest of the public that the amendment was passed. The section provides that applications may be 'filed for the purpose of determining whether any existing service is in violation of this section, and pray for an order permitting the continuance of any vessel or vessels already in operation, or for the purpose of asking an order to install new service not in conflict with the provisions of this paragraph.' The word 'paragraph' clearly does not refer to that in which it is used, because this paragraph contains no prohibitions. The word 'paragraph' in an act of Congress will be construed to mean 'section' whenever to do so accords with the legislative intent. *Marine, Collector* v. *Packham* (52 Fed., 579); *Alfrey* v. *Colbert* (168 Fed., 231). No order is necessary unless competition does or may exist, and considering the whole section, using the word paragraph to mean section, the intention of the act must be to permit the installation of new operations which are found to be in the public interest; otherwise the language used has no application. The same consideration of advantage to the convenience and commerce of the people which applies to the continuance of an existing service would have equal application to the installation of a new service, and it does not appear that it was the intention of the Congress to permit the continuance of an existing line, but to prohibit the further development of service when traffic offering warrants and it is in the interest of the public. We have authorized the installation of new service in *Ashtabula-Port Maitland Car Ferry Service*, 40 I. C. C., 143, and *Central Vermont Boat Lines*, 4 I. C. C., 589."

This is not an isolated case. It has been referred to with approval and made the basis of decision in many subsequent cases. Thus, in *Southern Pacific Company Steamboats on Sacramento River* (102 I. C. C. 658), decided in October 1925, the Commission authorized the extension of operation by the petitioner of its boat line in freight service to and from public docks, wharves, and piers in the Alameda, Oakland, and Berkeley district, on the east side of San Francisco Bay. This extension was authorized because it was found to be in the public interest and of advantage to the convenience and commerce of the people and for the further reason that it would neither exclude, prevent, nor reduce competition on the route by water on the Sacramento River.

In *Steamer Lines on Long Island Sound* (183 I. C. C. 323), decided in April 1932, the Commission had before it an application of the New Haven Railroad to continue operation of the Providence Line, a steamship line. The Director General of Railroads had suspended the service and the railroad company undertook to restore the service after the roads had been returned to their owners. The Commission, permitting this to be done, used this language:

"Further, if the service in question were regarded as a new one, we have construed the act as giving us authority to permit the development by rail carriers of services by water when traffic conditions warrant and it is found to be in the public interest. *Southern Pacific Co. Ownership of Atlantic S. S. Lines* (77 I. C. C. 124)."

In *New Orleans and Havana Car Ferry Service* (188 I. C. C. 371), decided in October 1932, there was involved an application for permission to operate a car-ferry service between New Orleans, La., and Habana. This was a new service. The Commission granted the application and in doing so said:

"Under authority conferred by section 5 of the act, this Commission in the past has authorized the Southern Pacific Co. to provide new and additional steamship service for the transportation of traffic between certain Gulf and North Atlantic ports (*S. P. Co. Ownership of Atlantic Steamship Lines* (77 I. C. C. 124, 137)); has authorized the Michigan Central Railroad Co. to institute through a subsidiary company a new car-ferry service for the transportation of foreign commerce between a port in Ohio on the south bank of Lake Erie and a port in Ontario, Canada, on the north bank of this lake (*Ashtabula-Port Maitland Car Ferry Service* (40 I. C. C. 143)); and has authorized the Central Vermont Railway Co. to install a new service by vessel between New York, N. Y., and Providence, R. I. (*Central Vermont Boat Lines* (40 I. C. C. 589))."

In *Southern Pacific Company's Ownership of Atlantic Steamship Lines* (206 I. C. C. 427), decided in February 1935, the Commission had under consideration the petition of the Southern Pacific Co. asking permission to operate the Atlantic Steamship Lines in regular service between Hampton Roads and Houston, Tex. This would be, to a certain extent, a new water service. The Commission said, in passing upon the application:

"Interveners opposing the granting of the application contend that we are without authority to grant an application under section 5 where a new service is involved. This question was considered and disposed of in 77 I. C. C. 124, in the following language:

" 'The same consideration of advantage to the convenience and commerce of the people which applies to the continuance of an existing service would have equal application to the installation of a new service, and it does not appear that it was the intention of Congress to permit the continuance of an existing line, but to prohibit the further development of service when traffic offering warrants and it is in the interest of the public. We have authorized the installation of new service in *Ashtabula-Port Maitland Car Ferry Service* (40 I. C. C. 143) and *Central Vermont Boat Lines* (40 I. C. C. 589).' "

It will thus be seen that it is thoroughly established that the Commission's authority with respect to new service is identical with its authority with respect to existing service.

Bearing this principle in mind, we come to consider paragraph 16 of the conference report. All this paragraph does is to give statutory sanction to the construction placed upon the present law by the Interstate Commerce Commission in a long line of decisions,

some of which are cited above, which construction has never been questioned in the courts and has become so well established that no one now doubts its validity. Paragraph 16 merely sets up the machinery whereby the Interstate Commerce Commission may authorize the continuance of service or the establishment of new service, other than through the Panama Canal, in cases where the interest of the public requires such extension of service or new service, and where the effect will not be to exclude, prevent, or reduce competition on the route by water.

It will be noted that in paragraph 20 of the present law, rail carriers are authorized to make application for the extension of service. This right is transferred in the revision to paragraph (16) and it is further therein provided that the same proceedings and the same principles shall control applications for the institution of new service.

This is the whole story, and certainly the statement made by those who were advocating the legislation in the House, to the effect that the only purpose was to clarify the present law, is entirely justified.

I am taking the liberty of sending a copy of this letter to the chairman of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, by whom the matter was discussed in the House debate.

Very truly yours,

R. V. FLETCHER.

National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 15 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

ADDRESS BY ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG, OF MICHIGAN

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address which I delivered in Lansing, Mich., last night dealing with three fundamental phases of national defense.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is highly appropriate that my first address in this campaign of 1940 should be under the auspices of the stalwart Republican Servicemen's League of Michigan, because a buck private, who fought has way to a commission on the field of World War battle, is about to become President of the United States. Wendell Willkie will be the first member of the A. E. F. to take possession of the White House. He will still be following the flag and stepping to the music of the Republic. He will still be a soldier fighting for the free institutions of America. His victory will be a victory for the American way of life and government. I salute the servicemen; and regardless of party, because Republicans, Democrats, and independents alike are joining in this crusade, I congratulate them that one of their own is on his way to the highest place of power and responsibility in the whole world.

In the midst of great national emergency, politics must be subordinated to the national welfare. Some of our critical problems must rise wholly above politics. But in a national election year, when the Constitution requires the American people to decide their own destiny, there are other questions which can be settled nowhere else except in the political forum; and the greater the emergency, the greater the need for courageous candor. As General Pershing recently said: "We must have the strength of character to face the truth." In connection with these problems, it is the worst kind of self-serving political prostitution to argue that the emergency robs us of the right of free speech and free discussion. It is superpolitics to attempt to ban politics. Certainly it would be utterly sinister politics to blind the American people to their problems at home just because they confront problems abroad. I propose to speak in complete disregard of politics as respects national defense. But I also propose to speak, respecting other problems, with entire frankness regarding my deep conviction that the New Deal and its dynastic chief must be defeated at next November's polls for the sake of safety, sanity, and solvency in Washington. This is "the last round-up."

I know it is difficult to draw the dividing line to which I have referred. It is unfortunate that the need to draw it exists. The need and the difficulty would have been greatly minimized if a totalitarian convention at Chicago had not confronted the country with the menace of a totalitarian third-term Presidency, which would violate every republican tradition of our Jeffersonian democracy. They precipitated this issue, not I. It would be absurd to defend against the encroachments of dictatorship from abroad and to ignore its sinister germs at home. It would be suicidal folly to lift our eyes exclusively to Europe and Asia and to neglect the desperate plight of America at home. Our citizenship must discriminate, as I intend to do, between defense support of our Commander in Chief, whoever he may be, and political support of an administration which deserves repudiation. The dividing line must be drawn.

Because I am speaking primarily tonight to servicemen, who have earned a particular right to an interest in the national defense, I deal first with this subject which, I repeat, is wholly separate and distinct from politics. Interwoven with it is the whole question of foreign policy. The best proof I can give you of my own political disinterestedness is the fact that, with possibly one inconsequential exception, I have supported every national-defense appropriation which has been sought by the Army or the Navy during the last 7 years. Let me set down my own convictions upon this score in a few simple, unequivocal sentences.

I believe in a completely adequate national defense on land and sea, including a two-ocean navy, so that we shall be invincible against external attack, and I want whatever equipment and whatever personnel is necessary to this end. I regret that the $8,500,000,000 which we have spent upon this objective during the last 10 years—always with the assurance from our Army and Navy chiefs that we were getting adequate defense—has miserably failed to produce these promised aims. I regret that we shall not have total equipment for an army of even 750,000 men until 1942. I regret that we shall not complete our grand battle fleet until 1947. But these are typical facts which we dare not ignore in charting our course and determining just how provocative it shall be. Meanwhile, however, I glory in the refreshing fact that defense procurement at last is largely in the hands of a vigorous and competent civilian who hails from the State of Michigan; and if he can have the freedom he deserves I know that we shall move full speed ahead under the dynamic genius of William S. Knudsen, whom we are proud to claim as our fellow citizen.

I believe that our national interest includes defense of the Monroe Doctrine—with particular reference to Canada and the Caribbean and Panama zones, but elsewhere in common and reciprocal partnership with those major South American nations which have reached autonomous maturity. Meanwhile I specifically decline to ignore that significant portion of the Monroe Doctrine, as enunciated on December 2, 1823, which says, "In the wars of European powers in matters relating to themselves we have never taken any part, nor does it comport with our policy to do so. * * * Our policy in regard to Europe remains the same, which is not to interfere in the internal concerns of any of its powers." In a word, I decline to mix either national defense or the Monroe Doctrine with the power politics of the Old World.

But the European problem confronts us with a condition, not a theory. Having abandoned strict neutrality last fall, but with a universally acclaimed purpose to stop short of war, I believe we must consistently pursue the resultant course. It is wholly clear that the overwhelming conscience of the Nation—and this certainly includes my own—condemns the ruthless conquest of the dictators, prays for the restoration of independence to their throttled victims, and wants every legitimate facility—consistent with our own needs and obligations—placed at the disposal of those with whom we sympathize. It is wholly clear that the subjugation of the British Empire would seriously intensify our own sense of jeopardy, and hence our defense problem. Therefore it is wholly logical that our facilities should be particularly available to England at the moment insofar as our international engagements, our own avowed purpose to keep out of war abroad, and our own defense necessities will permit. I would act accordingly. And we are doing so to a little understood extent. For example, we shall make nearly as many planes for Britain in the next 12 months as we make for ourselves. But I would never violate our own international engagements—no matter what others may do—because we could thus find ourselves thrust into the status of a cobelligerent despite our own wishes to the contrary; and I would never deplete our own essential national defense for the sake of indecisive contribution to the defense of someone else.

Let me give you an example of the perplexities involved in this latter contemplation, just as a reminder that we must all take prudent care to think things through. General Pershing recently suggested our transfer of certain naval destroyers to Great Britain on the persuasive theory that what now helps Britain helps us. But under our own signature to the Hague Convention we would thus immediately accept the status of belligerent and invite the consequences. Meanwhile, in the most recent testimony of our own Navy Department last June, Acting Secretary of the Navy Compton, speaking for himself and Admiral Stark, said that if they were asked to dispose of any of our destroyers, "our answer would be 'No'; we would definitely recommend against it" in the name of our own defense necessities.

We have accepted a dominant trusteeship for the preservation of democracy in this New World; and—prudently assessing our own defense deficiencies in behalf of this supreme cause—we owe every obligation, transcending all else, to the impregnability of our frontiers which are the God-given Atlantic and Pacific Oceans. I quote the greatest defense expert in America, Maj. George Fielding Eliot:

"It is this final and terrible responsibility which we must ever keep before our minds, and before which our spirits must do homage. In this we cannot, we must not fail. That we should maintain here in this continent the undefiled altars of liberty and justice and human decency may well, when all is said and done, be the greatest service we can render to humanity—to generations of human beings yet unborn. That we should do this must be the ultimate hope not only of all our own people but of all who cherish freedom anywhere in the world."

I do not believe that our participation in these foreign wars is inevitable—provided our foreign policies pursue a rational, real-

istic course. I hate every principle of conquest and every precept of dictatorship which blacken so much of the world's sky. But, so far as I am concerned, I propose that America shall survive no matter who wins in Europe or in Asia. If it ultimately takes a fight—which is to say, if we are attacked—we shall go in with every triumphant resource which this great people can command. I would prepare invinsibly against this exigency. But I would not precipitate the battle I would have national defense mean defense and nothing else.

As regards peacetime conscription—which would tear up 150 years of American history and tradition—I would reluctantly embrace it whenever voluntary enlistments show the slightest sign of failing to produce the full defense personnel essential to man our expanding defense equipment. But I stand with National Commander Raymond J. Kelly, of the American Legion—another honored son of Michigan—when he says that it "should not be put into effect until all other avenues have been exhausted." All other avenues have not yet been remotely exhausted. The Army and the Navy have thus far filled every quota they have set for themselves in respect to voluntary enlistments. There is no proof that continued reliance upon this traditional, peacetime American method will fail. Neighboring Canada does not resort to conscription until October 1—one full year after actual entry into this war—and even then it will be only for 30 days of intensive training and for home defense alone. I warn you to assess the direction as well as the present length of this step. Peacetime conscription of men will be followed—sooner rather than later—by the peacetime conscription of other things. The latter is no more sacred than the former. When once we set our feet upon the highways of total regimentation, there is no end short of the wholly regimented state. I will consent to that step if and when it is necessary. I shall not do so as a first, instead of a last resort.

Conscientious men keenly differ upon many of these subjects. I plead for one thing above all else. For God's sake, let us keep our heads. For the sake of America we dare not think with our emotions. Facts and realities must govern. If you were to read some of my mail—which, by the way, runs as much as 5,000 letters a day—you would think that every proconscriptionist and every believer in helping the British Empire is a "fifth columnist" for King George. If you were to read some other sections of my mail, you would think that every anticonscriptionist and every so-called isolationist is a "fifth columnist" for Hitler. These things simply are not so. There are patriots on every side of these arguments. Let us, as reasonable men and women, avoid recriminations and depend on logic. Let us, so far as we can, avoid hysteria—and this includes the hysteria of fear. We are not at war. There is no inevitability that we must go to war, particularly if we avoid policies and explosive rhetoric in high places which needlessly invite it. Let us pursue preparedness with sure, swift effort, lest we face the contingency of challenge in spite of our purpose to keep out of other peoples' wars. Let us clear the track of all truly subversive elements within our own land. Those who are not for us are against us, and the quicker we make this effective separation the safer we shall be. But let us not violate civil liberty in the zeal of our purported defense of it. Let us not sacrifice America in the name of its protection. Let us not drift into war on tides which only wishful thinking can fail to recognize for what they are. Let us move forward as one irresistible unit in preparing to defend ourselves and our freedoms and our ideals; and let that preparation be shorn of all the bureaucracy and all the barnacles which still cause it too frequently to "bog" down. Let us dedicate these facilities to the defense of America and its essential outposts, and nothing else. We do not want war; we must not seek it, and we must not flirt with it.

All of these considerations are nonpolitical. But even these cease to be nonpolitical when, in a national-election year, we face the insinuating pretense that any one Executive is indispensable to their high management. This theory of one man's indispensability may be satisfactory to Hitler or to Mussolini or to Stalin; but it is not the philosophy of our democracy. And if it shall be urged—as it is by our political opponents—that President Roosevelt is indispensable to national defense in this emergency, we have the right to reply that since national defense today is 90 percent a matter of streamlined, industrial efficiency, the national defense will be in at least equally safe hands when President Willkie dedicates his great and proven industrial genius to this heavy task. We have the right to reply that the Roosevelt administration itself confirms our faith in a great business leader for these critical assignments when it commendably summons other business leaders from the "dog house" which they have occupied for seven long, lean, outlaw years to salvage its defense responsibilities.

This leads me to some of the other issues which not only impend for American answer but which cannot wait longer for the right answer if the American system shall survive. They are issues which must be answered in the forum of politics because there is no other way in which democracy can function. Make no mistake about this: We need plenty of national defense against other jeopardies than those which gather across the seas. I shall speak of two of them tonight—defense against self-perpetuating Presidents, defense against national bankruptcy. Both considerations are vital. We shall ignore them at our peril. America needs plenty of saving right here at home; and no amount of emphasis upon international emergency should be allowed to blind our people or warp their judgments in respect to the national emergency which hangs upon next November's referendum.

The President himself has precipitated the first of these national emergencies. Having gathered unto himself—thanks to a rubber-stamp Congress—more unrestricted personal authority than was ever lodged in the White House under all of his peacetime predecessors combined, he proceeded to Chicago last month and nominated himself for a third term, in contemptuous defiance of precious American tradition, in a final display of unquenchable appetite for power, and in a potential American paraphrase of the dictatorship which is the proven curse of free institutions all round the globe. He said he did not want the job. But he cunningly created a situation which made the job inevitable. One of his friendliest columnists who heretofore has sung his deserts—and he has great deserts—in season and out, Raymond Clapper, was moved to observe:

"The urge to power and glory is an overwhelming thing when it takes hold of a public man. Only such an urge could have betrayed Mr. Roosevelt into the monumental and historic deception which he now places on the record. That is a page I would rather have never read."

Well, it may have betrayed the President. It may have betrayed the Chicago convention. But it will never betray the American people next November unless they themselves betray the very well-springs of their own free institutions. I care not how nobly meditated may be his aspirations, I care not how unselfish he believes his motives—and I am sure that Mr. Roosevelt deeply loves his country—the cold, hard fact remains that any man who seeks to perpetuate himself in a Presidential tenure prolonged beyond 8 years has established a practice and a precedent which threaten the very soul of our free, American system. If it would have been a betrayal of that system in preblitzkrieg days, it would be an infinitely greater betrayal at the present moment when the vivid dangers of one-man power are the world's despair and when our own Executive authority already heavily trespasses upon the Constitution's indispensable checks and balances which guard our liberties.

We dare not forget that this President is the one who sought to bend Congress to his unquestioned will. We dare not forget that this President has sought to chain the courts to his Executive chariot wheel. We dare not forget that this President has sought to purge—did you ever read that word in European dispatches?—has sought to purge any of his own partisans who may have dared to question his Executive omnipotence. We dare not forget that this President has sought his own ends "regardless of their constitutionality"—his phrase. Such a President, with such a conception of imperial Executive authority, should be the last rather than the first to be trusted with a further, unprecedented monopoly of Executive authority. Why? Let Thomas Jefferson, the honored father of the Democratic Party, reply. Declining the invitation of the North Carolina General Assembly to stand for a third term, he said in 1808:

"That I should lay down my charge at a proper period is as much a duty as to have borne it faithfully. If some termination to the services of the Chief Magistrate be not fixed by the Constitution, or supplied by practice, his office, nominally for years, will in fact become for life. History shows how easily that degenerates into an inheritance. Believing that a representative government responsible at short periods of election is that which produces the greatest sum of human happiness to mankind, I feel it a duty to do no act which shall essentially impair that principle; and I should unwillingly be the person who, disregarding the sound precedent set by an illustrious predecessor, should furnish the first example of prolongation beyond the second term of office."

No wonder so many Democrats—I mean Jeffersonian Democrats—are swarming from the third termites. There has not been such a significant bolt in modern times. There are some things that transcend partisan allegiance—and one of them is the American axiom that a perpetuated Presidency is poison to our free institutions. If a third term, why not a fourth or fifth? Not even George Washington thought himself good enough—or indispensable enough—to stay in the White House beyond 8 years. Yes; and when he slammed shut the door upon a third term, he slammed it shut for keeps, because Americans will not desert their birthright.

No wonder that Democratic Senator BURKE—who once got a Roosevelt prize for the best definition of the New Deal—now says:

"I disclaim the leadership of those of my party who but a few years ago put themselves on record"—(and that was against a third term for inoffensive Calvin Coolidge who lacked the remotest elements of a Jupiter complex)—"put themselves on record that any departure from the two-term tradition would be unwise, unpatriotic, and fraught with peril to our free institutions, and who today take the very action they then denounced. A fitting rebuke to their apostasy will be administered by an aroused people."

The instrument of that rebuke will be Wendell Willkie. His flaming personality, his record of high achievement in getting hard things done, his conception of free enterprise in this still-free Republic, these things captured the imagination of the Republican Convention at Philadelphia—as I have good reason to know. They have captured the imagination and the confidence of the American people; and next November they will capture their votes. We have a new President of the United States "on order."

But if you say that this third-term consideration is an academic thing—although I believe it to be basic in the American order—then let me come to the other issue to which I have referred in terms of necessity for "national defense"—defense against national bankruptcy. Here indeed is grim reality. It touches every purse-string and every hearthstone in the land. It is like the law of two and two—whether you like it or not, there it is. I am not talking merely about 7 weary years of improvident deficit-spending in which

more easy money has rolled out of the Federal Treasury than in all the years from Washington to Wilson, including the World War. (And, by the way, he promised to "keep us out of war," too.) I am not talking merely about the waste and the extravagance and the political exploitation of public money during this bonanza era. I am not talking merely of the fact that you pay the heaviest peacetime taxes in our national history and yet, in spite of it, that you carry the heaviest public debt. I am not talking merely of yesterday. I am talking about today and tomorrow. The hour of reckoning has arrived. Now we must pay the fiddler. The Christmas tree is dead. There "ain't no Santa Claus." The New Deal made this bed and now we must lie in it. Where do we go from here? Listen!

We shall reach the national debt limit of $45,000,000,000 this winter. We shall exhaust the additional national-defense debt limit of $4,000,000,000 more next summer. But meanwhile the operating deficit for the present fiscal year will be not less than $8,000,000,000. The regular deficit will be around $3,000,000,000. The defense deficit will be another $5,000,000,000. And we will have just started on the defense program which already includes $15,000,000,000 of authorizations without a penny for mobilizing the National Guard or a penny for the proposed conscript army.

Now, look at the revenue side. We wrote an extra tax bill a few weeks ago. It exhausted the imagination of the Treasury in hunting for things to assess. We piled on pretty nearly everything that anybody could think of. It will produce just $700,000,000 in this fiscal year—about one-fourth of the regular deficit, without a penny for national defense. And yet they have the crust to call it a national-defense tax. Now, we are engaged in writing another tax bill—an excess-profits tax bill. It will produce $190,000,000 this fiscal year.

When we are through with this latest tax bill, we will have raised less than 900,000,000 extra dollars. This year's deficit will be $8,000,000,000. We shall pay less than one-eighth of the deficit. Next year's deficit will be still bigger because we shall then be in full swing with the defense program. Where does all this end? How long does any sane man think it can go on? It ends either in national bankruptcy or in national repudiation of debt or in the suicidal issuance of manufactured money unless—

Unless we ruthlessly tax the people of the United States to the point of confiscation or unless we so substantially increase the annual national income that these tax rates will produce a greatly increased revenue. And there, in this latter alternative, is the only hope of solvent American survival.

We can help some with long-overdue economies in ordinary functions. We can help some in stopping extravagant capital investment of public money in socialistic enterprises. We can help some in depopulating the political pay rolls which have nearly doubled in 7 years of spoilsmanship. But in the long run, our only salvation will be to restore the American people to an annual income which can carry this load—not merely the load of national defense, mind you, but also the heavy accumulated load of 7 improvident years of deliberate, Roosevelt deficits and debts.

We now have an annual income around seventy billions. We need a national income around one hundred billions. The New Deal tries to make a $100,000,000,000 country out of a $70,000,000,000 country by spending the difference. It hasn't worked. It won't work. It is tragic Pollyanna nonsense. There is just one way to make a $100,000,000,000 country out of a $70,000,000,000 country, and that one way is to once more release all of the private enterprise, and all of the individual initiative, and all of the private investment which are the blood stream of the American system. At the base of this release is the restoration of confidence—confidence that legitimate business shall have a full, free chance—confidence that the Government will quit harassing business needlessly; quit burdening it with restriction, restraint, and regimentation; quit competing with it out of the Public Treasury; quit gunning for it as though it were a professional criminal; and, most important of all, quit those devastating uncertainties which flow from "government by Executive decree," the fatal habit of delegating plenary power to the President to do what he pleases, when he pleases, as he pleases, with so many of the fundamental elements of our economy. Furthermore, you cannot build a solvent prosperity around an insolvent Treasury; and certainly you cannot build it around the annually broken promises of a President who long since broke the Maginot line of our own national defense, which is a sound public credit.

The Brookings Institution of Washington is the greatest independent research agency in this country. It says that the future development of private enterprise is "adequate to absorb the Nation's capital and labor resources." It says that the Government's taxation, spending, and regulatory policies have "impeded the flow of capital into constructive developments." It says that the reestablishment of stable conditions depends largely upon "the removal of impediments and the restoration of confidence in the future of private enterprise."

There's your answer, my fellow countrymen. No one wants to go back to the piracies of old. No one wants to sacrifice sound social progress; and it is not necessary. Just restore confidence in the future of private enterprise. Do the things necessary to restore it. Then watch the dammed-up impulses of a starved decade go to work. There's your answer to unemployment. There are your real jobs at real wages. And there's your means to pay your public bills.

Can this administration restore confidence? It cannot. Its hostilities and its hatreds have sunk too deeply into the consciences of its victims. Its policies have too clearly fixed the vindictive zeals of its submarining attitudes. Its bright young "brain trusters"—who never met a pay roll in their lives—have scarred too many memories. It got too mad at capable, competent John Hanes (who has just bolted the Chicago ticket) because when he was Under Secretary of the Treasury he dared distribute blue cards, as a guide to policy, which read: "Will it contribute to recovery?" No. Saul could turn to Paul in 24 hours on the road to Damascus. But Mr. Roosevelt cannot ever turn himself into a confidence-builder on the road to a third term.

The Republican Party this year is the confidence party. It is the salvation party. It is the party of hope for America and the American system. Its nominee for President personifies these boons. That is why he was nominated, and that is why he will be elected.

My friends, I have but touched the rim of a few of our critical national problems. The sum total of their scope makes November 1940 the most desperately important month in generations of our history. In the midst of the nonpolitical necessity that we shall rally to the national defense in a military sense without thought or consideration of political consequences, we must also face the political necessity that we shall rally to the national defense in another sense—the defense of traditional American democracy and the defense of our economic life—which depends entirely upon political consequences. The nonpolitical problem of military defense presents a grave emergency; let us try to meet it with an eye single to the safety and the honor and the peace of the United States. The political problem of institutional and economic defense presents an equally grave emergency; let us meet it with an unyielding determination to preserve our inheritance—the American way of life.

I congratulate the Republican Servicemen's League of Michigan upon hastening early to the 1940 battle line. This is more than a campaign. It is a crusade. It is more than a Republican cause. It is just as much the cause of Democrats who love the memory of Thomas Jefferson. We present a common front to a common enemy. We dare not fail. And Michigan must do her full part.

Tribute to Senator Wheeler

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 15 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

ARTICLE BY HUGH RUSSELL FRASER

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a well-deserved tribute to the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] by Hugh Russell Fraser, the well-known columnist and editor.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INSIDE WASHINGTON

(By Hugh Russell Fraser)

Yesterday, today, and tomorrow—when the history of the last decade is recorded, the deeds of one man in the Congress of the United States will, in my opinion, live. And his deeds will be of one piece with his words.

That man is Senator BURTON K. WHEELER, Montana Democrat.

There are a few men in every decade who rise above the level of the politician. Some of them have reached the White House; some of them have not. But they all, by an incident of fate, have one characteristic in common. They are ready and willing to defy the gods of expediency to be true to their vision. They may be false to parties and factions, but never to the things they live by. They are defeated, but they never die. Indeed, they symbolize the vision that is in America.

Within the memory of living men there are names that cannot and will not be forgotten—Bronson Cutting, Edgar E. Borah, Robert La Follette.

It is not easy to extend the list, but we know there are one or two that the historian will add among those living in the Senate and House.

Among these will most certainly be GEORGE W. NORRIS and BURT WHEELER. But more especially WHEELER, for day in and day out he is on the firing line.

For example—

It is 20 minutes after 1 o'clock on the afternoon following a day when Col. Charles A. Lindbergh had been formally charged over a radio network by Senator SCOTT LUCAS, of Illinois, as being the leader of the "'fifth columnists' in the United States." Senator WHEELER is on his feet, facing the name-calling Senator LUCAS and pleading for a little more sanity in America and less hysteria.

Nobody else bothers to raise the issue. WHEELER does. Nobody else thinks it worth the candle to assail a fellow Senator over a mere speech. And as WHEELER speaks, he strikes his right fist into

his left hand, vehemently. He is not angry at LUCAS personally. He is not striking at the man but the intolerance he has expressed. Nor, for that matter, does he even defend Lindbergh. But he does ask that in this crisis we—you and I, and, oh yes, Mr. LUCAS—not stoop to name-calling and impugning the patriotism of anybody and everybody who does not agree with you.

WHEELER is on the floor, and the Senate listens. LUCAS tries to answer. He is a young-appearing man with stooped shoulders. He tries to argue, to steer the discussion into more debatable channels. Politely, WHEELER yields; then he continues. He is not out to argue this or that point that Lindbergh said or did not say. He is merely affirming a principle. He does not ask or expect Brother LUCAS to understand, but he is pleading with the Senate and the country.

And it is a strange thing—the record of the man.

Once one of Mr. Roosevelt's most powerful supporters, he listened one morning to the President of the United States' ingenious proposal for packing the Supreme Court.

And when the last sentence was finished, and as the last echoes were dying down, BURT WHEELER knew in his heart that if it meant forever breaking with his friend in the White House, and if it meant fighting every Democratic Member in the Senate, he would fight this proposal.

He went out and fought it—not the next week, or the next month, but that day.

And thus he went out from the Capitol more in sorrow than in anger. For he knew the price he would have to pay. He knew also every pseudo liberal in the country would be denouncing him from the housetops, but compared to his passionate faith in democracy it amounted to as little to him as tomorrow's weather forecast.

What did amount to a great deal in his judgment, what fired his determination, was his deep and abiding conviction that the end does not justify the means—and that, in the long run, no matter how much he agreed with the President that the Supreme Court was definitely "packed" against liberal and progressive measures, the answer was not a device which—if successful—could be invoked by some future reactionary and dangerous occupant of the White House.

And so, with that fine courage and utter unconcern for his personal welfare, BURT WHEELER went into the thick of the fray and won.

Yet there are other and less known indications of the stature of the man. It was in late fall a few years ago that a committee meeting was held.

It was a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Agriculture. They were investigating the American Cotton Cooperative Association of New Orleans. The administration was interested in protecting the cooperative. Senator WHEELER himself is a great advocate of cooperatives and always has been.

But here were grave charges of collusion and fraud and exploitation by a few insiders. The evidence was brought out by the committee's own counsel, Col. Lawrence Westbrook. Loyal Democratic Senators on the committee heckled witnesses, ignored the evidence in many instances. Finally, WHEELER spoke up:

"Look here: This kind of practices should not be tolerated in a cooperative any more than in a private business. Just because it's a cooperative is no reason to gloss over the situation and imagine it doesn't exist. I am for stopping this kind of thing whether it happens to be in a cooperative or anything else."

For purely political considerations the Senator from Montana did not need to be so blunt. Yet to expect him to be anything else is ridiculous.

And so today, in the greatest fight of all—when the President of the United States and others in his Cabinet, chiefly Mr. Stimson and Mr. KNOX, are doing their best to frighten everybody to death, Mr. WHEELER is doing what the Nation's Chief Executive should be doing—namely, he is pleading for sanity, calm and careful thinking, and an orderly, intelligent—not hysterical—examination of our whole defense problem.

He may not get it, but he is fighting for it. Every day, in and out of the Senate, he is fighting—and who knows?—perhaps, as in the Supreme Court fight, he may win.

Presenting, ladies and gentlemen, the senior Senator from Montana.

Tribute to Senator McNary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 15 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

LETTER FROM WILLIAM S. BENNET TO THE NEW YORK TIMES

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an interesting letter written by Mr. William S. Bennet for the New York Times, in which he briefly sets forth a few good reasons why the splendid record of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY], Republican nominee for Vice President, will meet with the approval of the people of the United States.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR M'NARY'S CANDIDACY—HIS RECORD IN UPPER HOUSE IS CITED AS EVIDENCE OF STRENGTH

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

The conclusion which your editorial of June 29 indicates that you have arrived at in relation to Senator MCNARY as a candidate for Vice President omits as a basis some rather essential facts and contains one criticism which is entirely unjustified.

As to the votes which Senator MCNARY has cast, and which you criticize, all of them were on measures as to which reasonable men have differed, and, in connection with some, now differ and will continue to differ in the future. There is no charge that Senator MCNARY's votes did not accord with his sincere convictions. As to each of these measures, division in the Senate was not on party lines.

You object to Senator MCNARY because he is a protectionist. The Republican Party is a protectionist party. There has been a protective-tariff plank in every platform from 1860 to 1940, including both, the statement in the 1940 platform being: "We believe in tariff protection for agriculture, labor, and industry as essential to our American standard of living." The Republican Party can scarcely be criticized for nominating a candidate who has been consistently in accord with his party's platform. The tariff position of the Republican Party is an issue this year, as it always has been, but a Republican can scarcely be criticized for the specific act of being faithful to the party's position on any subject.

In your summation you omit facts of common knowledge which have to do with Senator MCNARY's high standing in the party and among the people.

First, courage: In 1936 Senator MCNARY came up for reelection. The advocates of the Townsend plan were very strong in Oregon. Substantially one-third of the voters were members of Townsend clubs. Practically every other candidate for a major office in Oregon made some sort of a compromise with the Townsendites. Senator MCNARY refused to make any. Nevertheless, although President Roosevelt carried the State by over 140,000, Senator MCNARY was reelected. Evidently some 75,000 voters who voted for Mr. Roosevelt switched over and voted for Senator MCNARY on the Republican ticket.

Second, his record as a student of the farm policy: Senator MCNARY was one of the first to recognize that there was a farm problem. He advocated a remedy at a time when possibly the majority of those in public life were denying that there was even a problem. We shall never know whether the McNary-Haugen bill was an answer in whole or in part. It passed Congress, but President Coolidge vetoed it; neither the Republican nor the Democratic Party endorsed the idea in its 1928 platform, and both President Hoover and President Roosevelt had other proposed solutions, but the country now realizes that Senator MCNARY was right when he said there was a farm problem, and even those who disagree with his proposed remedy respect him for his intelligent and helpful interest in the problem.

Third, among legislators he stands at the head of those interested in forest conservation: Commencing with the Clarke-McNary law, every law relating to forest conservation now on the statute books enacted since his service began 23 years ago bears his name as the Senate introducer. Forest conservation is a matter of interest to the entire country, and its progress owes more to Senator MCNARY than to any other one man now in public office.

It would be easy to give other details in connection with Senator MCNARY's useful service. He has been the Republican leader or assistant leader in the Senate for more than 15 years. His success as leader during an especially trying period is universally recognized. He has the respect and confidence not only of his party associates but of his Democratic opponents as well. Such respect and confidence are never given in the Senate to an unfit man. In choosing Senator MCNARY as its candidate for Vice President, the party made no mistake. On the contrary, it is to be congratulated.

WILLIAM S. BENNET.

Senator Lodge and Conscription

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES L. McNARY

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 15 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE BEE, OF LAWRENCE, MASS.

Mr. MCNARY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial under the title "Sen-

ator LODGE and Conscription," published in the Bee, of Lawrence, Mass., under date of August 9, 1940.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Bee, Lawrence, Mass., of August 9, 1940]

SENATOR LODGE AND CONSCRIPTION

Our own Senator from Massachusetts, HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR., seems to have felt the pulse of the Nation in the present controversy over conscription.

Months ago, as a result of a survey made by him personally, Senator LODGE advocated an increase in the standing Army of the United States. Nit-wits, blow-hards, and plain ignoramuses in the present Congress pooh-poohed his suggestions, which were printed in full in the Bee.

Yet, after tons of paper have been wasted printing millions of words in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD since Senator LODGE'S suggestions were made, Congress has arrived at the same conclusion as Senator LODGE, namely, that the young men from 21 to 31 shall be called to the colors at this time.

The foresight of Senator LODGE, and his tremendous courage in calling a spade a spade at a time when his colleagues were more engrossed in their own reelection or in pork-barrel activities, again compel us to remark that Senator LODGE will be Presidential timber before long.

He has combined in him the sagacity of his grandfather and the frankness of the present generation. He calls them as he sees them. Senator LODGE is, without question, the greatest national leader of either party now in Congress. He is seldom heard and when he does speak his words are full of wisdom and facts.

That we must have conscription of some sort seems to be self-evident if we are to avoid the fate of the other European countries that have felt the heel of the dictator. We must have trained men and quickly.

Who would think of placing a man at the wheel of a tank or airplane without training? And what of the numbers of men required to care for the large quantities of tanks and planes our factories will turn out in the next year and more? The Army, Navy, and Marine Corps must be allowed time to train its new personnel before it can be required to give proper accounting.

Defense is no longer grabbing a gun or pitchfork and running into the roadway to dispute the marching enemy as it was in the days of the Revolution and of Lexington and Concord. Today the enemy will come by air and we must be prepared to meet them in the air with trained men. They will come by sea power in both oceans. They will come by land and we must have mechanical force to match theirs, since we have no fortifications.

Time marches on. Every week, every day, every hour lost is gone beyond redemption. Those pseudo statesmen heard nightly over the radio, in Congress, in protest meetings, may be the first to bewail our lack of preparedness should the enemy strike.

We will have no second chance.

Humor from the Ozarks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 15 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

COLUMN BY HON. DEWEY SHORT, OF MISSOURI

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I had the honor and pleasure of serving on the House Committee on Military Affairs with the scintillating Member of the House from Missouri, Mr. DEWEY SHORT. Mr. SHORT is a master of the English language and of debate. He is a veritable machine gun in the employment of our language. He substituted this morning for the well-known columnist, Mr. Harlan Miller, in writing his column, Over the Coffee, for the Washington Post, and I ask unanimous consent that the column written by Mr. SHORT be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post of August 15, 1940]

OVER THE COFFEE

(By Harlan Miller)

(A silver-tongued hillbilly educated at Harvard, Oxford, and Heidelberg, Congressman SHORT has a sense of humor which survives erudition; and he survives as Missouri's only G. O. P. Member in Congress out of 13 and shines as today's guest columnist.—Harlan Miller.)

HUMOR FROM THE OZARKS

(By the Honorable DEWEY SHORT, Representative from Missouri)

A prominent magazine recently called me "a voluptuous lover of words." I plead guilty. I do love words. I love even the word "voluptuous." I am not alone. Most politicians, preachers, and poets—even some newspapermen—love words.

That brilliant wit, Congressman EATON, serving his eighth term from New Jersey, discussing the New Deal on the floor of the House, recently said, "It is not Democratic. It is not Republican. It is an irrational concatenation of economic and political cacophonies."

And listen to Hon. STEPHEN BOLLES, of the First District of Wisconsin, speak of our President: "We cannot all be carried away by the soporific sophistications of the man at the other end of the Avenue or the tintinnabulations of easy-flowing sonorous sentences."

Not bad for a first-termer; but young Congressman BOLLES is an old newspaperman.

A Congressman's education, however, is acquired, not from the bad speeches of his colleagues but from his voluminous and varied correspondence with the world. The average Member of Congress today must answer more communications in a week than had to be answered during a whole session in the days of Webster, Clay, and Calhoun.

Perhaps this is the reason we have so few Websters, Clays, and Calhouns today. Those men had time to read, study, reflect, and think; government then was relatively simple. Today Members of Congress become errand boys, running frantically from one complex agency or department to another, finding little time for meditation or research.

An anonymous correspondent this morning advises me: "I believe in the Holy Scripture, Almighty God, and a greater posterity; I do not believe in present-day birth control." He adds: "I smoke regular and drink some, and occasionally get drunk, and I don't care who knows it."

An 11-year-old girl instructs me to send her a Mickey Mouse watch; she is a Republican and her seatmate is a Democrat, who is writing to the President for a similar watch; they are running a race to see who gets the watch first.

I'm afraid I'll have to concede victory to the little Democrat.

Here's a letter from a country doctor urging that the Government provide pensions for all elderly country doctors. My secretary pencils a note: "How about pensions for broken-down secretaries—or Congressmen?" Nice, but contagious.

Recently we had a letter from a veteran complaining that the false teeth provided by the Veterans' Administration did not fit—and under separate cover he sent the teeth, to prove it.

We Missourians have to be shown.

One of my constituents is the proud father of twin boys, one of whom he has named for me; natives of the Ozarks being sturdy souls, the child will probably outgrow that handicap.

Congressman ANDY ROMJUE, one of my Democratic colleagues from Missouri, has named the contrariest mule on his farm "Dewey Short." It seems that Uncle Andy knows not only Missouri mules, but me, too. My mother's maiden name, incidentally, was Long.

An Army airplane swooped down upon the Ozarks one day and so frightened stock in the pasture of one of my constituents that a horse was killed. After we got sworn statements covering everything except the horse's given name and an autopsy to prove it died of fright, the War Department settled. Not such a bad Government, after all.

The Hoover Relief Proposal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 15 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

ARTICLE BY WALTER LIPPMANN

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article by Walter Lippmann entitled "The Hoover Relief Proposal," which he has included in his column headed Today and Tomorrow.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TODAY AND TOMORROW—THE HOOVER RELIEF PROPOSAL

(By Walter Lippmann)

Mr. Hoover has proposed that the United States intervene in Europe in order to assure supplies of food to some 27,000,000 inhabitants of four nations—Norway, Holland, Belgium, and Poland—and possibly also to some of the 40,000,000 inhabitants of France. On the basis of information available to him Mr. Hoover describes the situation as follows: He says that if Germany allows the four little nations to keep their stocks of food and this year's harvest,

their situation "will not begin to be acute until some time in the fall" but that their situation "will become fatal in the winter and spring next year—as domestic supplies are exhausted."

It follows that their situation will become acute immediately only if the occupying German armies draw upon the existing stocks of food and do not allow the invaded nations to use what this summer's harvest produces. Mr. Hoover does not say whether in fact the Germans have been taking from the existing stocks and from the present harvest. But he implies that they have. For in the plan which he proposes he stipulates that Germany shall "furnish an equivalent of any food already taken." This would suggest that he believes the German requisitions may make the position in some of these countries very desperate even sooner than the autumn.

Mr. Hoover's plan calls for the setting up in these four, possibly five, invaded nations of "an adequate control of distribution" by a "neutral nongovernmental organization." This, of course, means an American organization. Mr. Hoover then defines what he means by an adequate control. He does not mean merely, as some may suppose, that Americans in these four or five nations shall see to it that food from the United States reaches only the inhabitants of the invaded countries. Mr. Hoover means much more than that. He means that the American controllers are to see to it that the occupying German armies "take none of the domestic produce." For, obviously, if the American controllers do not do this, then the equivalent, or more, of what is sent in from America may go out to Germany. If, therefore, Mr. Hoover's American controllers do not supervise the administration of the whole food supply of these four or five countries, the net result of the vast humanitarian effort would be to finance and facilitate the import of food into Germany by the use of Norwegian, Belgian, Dutch, Polish, and American funds.

But Mr. Hoover's plan does not end with the proposal to establish a control, administered by Americans, of the relief shipments and of the domestic stocks and the harvests of these four or five nations. His plan also requires the American controllers to get back from Germany "an equivalent of any food already taken." Nor is that all. His plan also requires the American controllers to see to it that these four or five invaded nations are able to import food "from Russia and the Balkan states"—in other words, that Germany and Italy do not monopolize all the exportable surpluses of central and eastern Europe.

This program, as Mr. Hoover describes it, is no simple undertaking. An organization of private citizens is to distribute relief in four or five nations. It is to administer the whole food supply—the stocks, the harvests, and the imports—of four or five nations. It is to supervise the requisitions of the occupying army in four or five nations. It is to prevent the export of food supplies from four or five nations. It is to recover from Germany the equivalent of food taken out or consumed by her armies during several months of occupation. It is to make sure that four or five prostrate nations are able to buy their proper share, as against their conqueror, of the exports of Russia, Hungary, Rumania.

Only if all these things are done by the American controllers, "only so long" as these "guaranties are fulfilled," does Mr. Hoover suggest that the British let food ships pass through the blockade. It does then seem a bit premature, to say the least, for anyone to begin talking as if a fine humanitarian plan of relief was being opposed by the British and the American Governments. Mr. Hoover's plan calls for a very large American administration set up to supervise and control and inspect the actions of Germany over a large part of the European Continent.

Is there any good reason to think that Hitler would permit Mr. Hoover to exercise any such control as Mr. Hoover proposes? If, as has already been indicated in Berlin, what Hitler would allow is what he has allowed the Red Cross to do in Poland, then obviously what the Nazis mean and what Mr. Hoover means are two totally different things. For while the Red Cross has supervised the distribution of relief in Poland, it has never controlled the food supplies of Poland or done any of the other elaborately difficult things which are called for in the Hoover plan. Nor could such a control be exercised by the few Americans who have been permitted to work in Poland. It would require a very great organization with vast powers to begin to do what the Hoover plan calls for.

In fact, Mr. Hoover is proposing to have the British open the naval blockade to four or five nations on the basis of a guaranty that Americans will establish in its place an administrative blockade—a blockade not only on the frontier between Germany and the invaded nations but also inside all these nations—as between the occupying armies, the Nazi officials, the Gestapo on the one hand, the local inhabitants on the other. What point is there, then, in developing a passionate argument now about whether the American Government ought to ask Britain to let food ships pass, or whether Britain ought to let them pass? For Mr. Hoover has not said, and evidently does not believe, that the United States should compel Great Britain to open the blockade and let food pass unconditionally to the invaded and occupied nations. On the contrary, he has proposed that Britain be asked to open the blockade only "so long as the guaranties are fulfilled."

The guaranties, for which Mr. Hoover stipulates, would have to come from a gigantic system of control, supervision, and administration by Americans in a vast territory occupied by German armies. A cool appraisal of the nature and the requirements of Mr. Hoover's proposed system is, therefore, not only morally the fairest but in practice the only sobering and enlightening introduction to the study of this great problem.

Grain Prices in 1932

REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED CUMMINGS
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 15, 1940

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I recently heard a farmer make the statement that the farmers of the United States are in worse condition now than they were in 1932. For this reason I am asking unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a statement published by the Farmers Union Herald, which shows, on the reverse side of a postal card, the prices paid for grain in 1932.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the statement and article may be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

[The Grain Bulletin, Minneapolis, Minn., Dec. 24, 1932]

	Pounds	Dark northern	Northern spring	Pounds	Winter	White
1B&1D	60	29				
1	58	28	27	60	27	27
2	57	27	26	58	25	25
3	55	25	24	56	23	23
4	53	23	22	54	21	21
5	50	17	16	51	15	15

Protein premiums	*Cents*
12.0 percent	0
13.0 percent	0
13.5 percent	0
14.0 percent	1
15.0 percent	3

	Pounds	Amber	Durum	Mixed	Red
1	60	25	23	21	20
2	58	24	22	20	19
3	56	22	20	18	17
4	54	20	18	16	15
5	51	17	15	13	12

Choice to Fancy durum 4 to 7 cents more.

Flax

No. 1	$0.88
No. 2	.85
Sample	.80

Shell corn—yellow

No. 2	$0.06
No. 3	.05
No. 4	.04
No. 5	.02

Ear corn, 2 cents less. Mixed and white corn, 3 cents less than yellow.

Oats

No. 3, white, 26 pounds	$0.05
No. 4, white, 23 pounds	.04
Sample, 22 pounds	.03

No. 2, 1 cent, over 3 pounds.

Barley

No. 2, 46 pounds	$0.12
No. 3, 43 pounds	.10
No. 4, 40 pounds	.08
1 feed, 35 pounds	.06

Choice malt, 3 to 5 cents more.

Rye

No. 2, 54 pounds	$0.15
No. 3, 52 pounds	.13
No. 4, 49 pounds	.11
Speltz, hundredweight	.15
Buckwheat, hundredweight	.55
No. 114 northern	.26

GRAIN PRICES IN 1932 BEFORE WE HAD THE AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT

This is a reproduction of the grain bulletin card mailed to grain elevators in the Northwest on December 24, 1932. Note that the

highest quotation for 60-pound No. 1 dark northern wheat was 29 cents per bushel, and it took 15 percent protein to bring any premium at all, and then only 3 cents per bushel. The highest price for amber durum was 25 cents per bushel. The best flax was quoted at 88 cents, the best oats at 5 cents, No. 2 corn 8 cents per bushel, and the best barley 12 cents, while feed barley, which accounts for most of the barley sold, was quoted at 6 cents per bushel.

If you were lucky enough to have very high-grade rye, the price was 15 cents per bushel in Minneapolis.

Those were the days of holiday associations, mortgage foreclosures, and rural mobs. Compare those times with 1940, after 7½ years of constantly improving Federal farm programs. We now have pegged loans for wheat, rye, and corn, and parity payments in addition. Wheat crop risks are greatly minimized by crop insurance, applicable now only to wheat, but with a definite promise in the New Deal program that insurance will be extended to other crops as rapidly as possible.

The Farmers Union, in cooperation with other farm organizations, has made a constant fight for better agricultural conditions. To the Farmers Union alone, however, is due most of the credit for the benefits that have come to wheat farmers.

When you get discouraged, and think that economic conditions are bad, remember 1932. We have not reached our goal, but we have made progress.

Our Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH B. SHANNON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 15, 1940

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. JOSEPH B. SHANNON, OF MISSOURI

Mr. SHANNON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address delivered by me over radio station WDAF, Kansas City, Mo., August 4, 1940:

Friends of the radio audience, I am, as you know, a candidate for reelection as your Representative in Congress from the Fifth Congressional District. What my record has been in that service I do not intend tonight to speak of. I will leave that task to others—to the good friends who have supported me and to the honest critics who may have disagreed with me in some of the ideals that I have followed. My record is now public property. I have no apologies to make for any opinions that I have from time to time expressed upon the floor of the House. I believe I have tried at all times to bear in mind that my duty as your Congressman was faithfully and to the best of my ability to uphold and protect the wishes of my constituency.

NO CONCEALMENT OF MY VIEWS

I have made no concealment of my views upon public matters, and my efforts have been governed by my conception of duty as an American citizen, as a humble follower of the doctrines of Thomas Jefferson, the founder of the Democratic Party, and by what my conscience has dictated to me as the official representative of my district. Whether my course has received your approval is now for you to decide. The record is before you, and all I can say now, or wish to say, on the eve of this coming election, is that I shall be thankful for your approval and not in any way resentful if your opinions do not happen to coincide with mine. I am glad that, so far, we live in a free country where we can still voice our opinions without looking up to the sky for menacing bombs, or over our shoulders for trailing Gestapos.

THE MONROE DOCTRINE—OUR SECOND DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE

A few weeks ago I spoke in the House upon the subject of the Monroe Doctrine, then, as now, deeply engaging the interest and the interpretation of statesmen. I wish to take this occasion to elaborate somewhat upon the subject matter of that speech, as I think that there is no political document affecting the course of American statesmanship with regard to our foreign relations that has been the subject of so much controversy, both at home and abroad.

Today we find interpreters of that doctrine who sincerely believe that it means a United States dictatorship of the affairs of the Western Hemisphere, and I believe that such opinions have done us great harm in disturbing from time to time our cordial relations with our sister republics below the line. For me the Monroe Doctrine, to quote the words of Jefferson, was "our second declaration of independence from the affairs of Europe—our last and final decree of divorce from the policies, quarrels, wars, and brutalities of the outmoded systems of European nations and dynasties."

As has been aptly said by a distinguished American statesman: "The Monroe Doctrine is not a law for anybody. It is a declaration of a public policy by and for the United States. We should not ask other nations to endorse it, and should not allow other nations to interpret it."

WAR NOT AN ARBITRAMENT OF NATIONAL DIFFERENCES

Let me at the outset make myself clear upon one subject that seems to be uppermost in the minds of our people today—that of war. I need not tell you here tonight my opinions on war as a means of settling disputes between nations. After 10,000 years of civilization and struggle for peaceful ideals of government—the sort of Government that our Constitution sought to cement in its plea for domestic tranquillity and the ideals of peace and justice—it seems to me a strange commentary upon the intelligence of human beings that we are still engaged in killing one another to attain our ends. I do not believe in war as an arbitrament of national differences; it seems to be simply an instrument of destruction and barbarism that never once in the entire history of the world ever permanently settled any question.

And the wars of today are not the wars of yesterday. If there ever was justification for the word "glory" to be attached to feats of war—in the days, say, of heroic charges and heroic defenses between men and men—that word can no longer be applied to the mechanized slaughter that is going on in Europe today. The armies are helmeted robots. The artillery is composed of juggernaut tanks that roll over and crush human bodies, and of winged airships, triple-plated, that rain down bombs upon men and women and children, hospitals and churches, art galleries, and places of earthly beauty. Whatever glory of war ever existed has departed forever. The men who plan and conduct these new devastations are of a new and inhuman type. Courting no dangers themselves—safely hidden in armor-plated de luxe cars remote from the scenes of destruction—they scatter death, disease, destruction, and pestilence across the fair fields of harmless and peace-loving countries. It is purely a European system. It has no place here. We have no place there.

The hope still clings to my heart that our America still believes in humanity, in religion, in comradeship, in freedom, and in the pursuit of happiness. And I believe that the Monroe Doctrine, rightly interpreted, in the spirit not only of the President who announced it formally, but in sayings and writings of the fathers of the Republic who paved the way for its utterance and maintenance, will, in the end, be the bulwark that will support our free institutions and keep the ravening hordes of Europe from our shores.

A SUPPORTER OF ADEQUATE DEFENSE OF AMERICA

But let me say here, lest my candor be misinterpreted, that I am not a pacifist when it comes to the defense of America from invasion by any foreign enemy, marauder, or dictator. I consider it the duty of every American to keep that sort of warfare from our shores, and to be prepared and willing to defend our country if and when it is so threatened or attacked. Further, I consider it his solemn duty to constantly guard against and frustrate every attempt to transplant the despotic ideals of either Europe or Asia on the American continent. That is my interpretation of Americanism, and upon that doctrine I have always taken my stand and tried with the best ability I possess to maintain it during my service in Congress.

As a member of the House Committee on Naval Affairs, I have consistently and faithfully supported every measure of defense; and as a Member of the House, my vote has always been for the furtherance of adequate means of defense in these days, no matter what the cost. But, at the same time, I have always insisted, and still insist, that not one American soldier—boy or man—should ever be sent abroad to take part in in European or Asiatic war. Nor should the Monroe Doctrine ever be invoked to justify our entering upon invasive wars in this hemisphere.

THE MONROE DOCTRINE A WARNING TO INVADERS

The Monroe Doctrine is a doctrine of defense—a warning to invaders—a protective shield for the preservation of our ideals of government on this side of the Atlantic.

Let us see if that is not the ideal and the destiny of our Republic, as voiced in that often misunderstood doctrine about which there have been so many disputations and disagreements. Let us see if I am warranted in believing that that doctrine is not merely a passing state document intended to meet a special situation, but a doctrine really founded in the very formative ideals of our Nation. Let us first recall the words with which Monroe enunciated the doctrine. In the face of threats of the so-called Holy Alliance that succeeded the Napoleonic era to establish foreign governments in South America, Monroe wrote in his seventh annual Presidential message of 1823 the following calm and decisive words:

"The occasion has been deemed proper for asserting, as a principle in which the rights and interests of the United States are involved, that the American Continent, by the free and independent condition which they have assumed and maintain, are henceforth not to be considered as subjects for future colonization by any European powers. In the wars of the European powers, in matters relating to themselves, we have never taken any part, nor does it comport with our policy to do so. It is only when our rights are invaded, or seriously menaced, that we resent injuries or make preparations for our defense. We owe it, therefore, to candor and to the amicable relations existing between the United States and those powers to declare that we should consider any attempt on their part to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety."

THE DOCTRINE ENUNCIATED BY MONROE NOT NEW

Here is no hint of a new destiny for the young Republic; no threat of invasive rights; no promise of allied interference in foreign wars. The doctrine enunciated by Monroe was new only in its verbal form, its adoption of a documentary formula of what long had been the policy of the founders of the Republic and of the Presidents who had preceded Monroe. It voiced a policy of defense for the United States from any system of foreign government that might seek to set up its national ideals on this hemisphere, thus becoming a menace to the continuance of our free and independent form of government. It was in no sense the formulation of a new destiny. It was the same doctrine that Jefferson voiced in the Declaration of Independence; the same that Washington advocated in his Farewell Address; the same that Jefferson, during his Presidency and in his later public utterances, firmly stood for as the basic ideal of the American Republic; and in long later years the same that Abraham Lincoln voiced in his famous Gettysburg Address.

Every President from Washington down to the present day has supported that fundamental doctrine, not merely because it was uttered by Monroe to apply to a particular situation but because it struck at the very foundations upon which our free and independent Nation was built. Today we hear echoes of a new statesmanship termed "internationalism." But America was founded and maintained upon its own interpretations of freedom, and that was represented by the word "nationalism," the conception of national defense in the spirit in which the Nation found life and which it has maintained ever since.

THE IDEALS OF THE FOUNDERS OF OUR NATION

At the risk of going back over some old ground, let me bring to you tonight again the voices of the men we have been taught to revere as those who, in the words of Lincoln, "brought forth upon this continent a new Nation, conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal." They are words that reveal to us in flaming symbols the ideals that the fathers passed down to us from the signing of the great Declaration, and which found a second birth of independence in the words of Monroe, "what oft was thought but not so well expressed," perhaps, but still deeply symbolic of the spirit that gave our Nation birth and sustained it through perilous years.

The building of this Nation was not a haphazard affair. The words I shall recall are but few. They came from men who fought for our freedom, and who sat down, when we had obtained it, and planned for us a great Nation, new in the world's history, and set upon firm foundations. Said Jefferson, in his Declaration:

"We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed with certain inalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, and that to secure these rights governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed."

That was rock No. 1 for the foundation. The constitutional preamble expressing unity and domestic tranquillity was rock No. 2. Coming down the years Jefferson again expressed the idea that the Monroe Doctrine clarified, namely, that the Declaration of Independence divorced us forever from the follies and crimes of Europe.

WASHINGTON'S WARNINGS NOT OUTMODED

Washington told us in his Farewell Address, when he was retiring from the Presidency at a time when the Nation was facing a perilous future, with wars raging in Europe, that we should guard against entangling alliances. Again he voiced the sentiment that was expressed in Monroe's doctrinal formula. He said:

"The name of American which belongs to you in your national capacity must always exalt the just pride of patriotism more than any appellation derived from local discriminations. The independence and liberty you possess are the work of joint counsels and joint efforts, of common dangers, sufferings, and successes. The great rule of conduct for us in regard to foreign nations is, in extending our commercial relations, to have with them as little political connection as possible."

And then, in words that have become classics of patriotism and homely advice, based upon the doctrine which passed down the Presidential line from Washington to Monroe, he warned his people:

"Europe has a set of primary interests which to us have none or a very remote relation. Hence she must be engaged in frequent controversies, the causes of which are essentially foreign to our concerns. Hence, therefore, it would be unwise for us to implicate ourselves by artificial ties in the ordinary vicissitudes of her politics, or the ordinary combinations and collisions of her friendships or enmities."

I know that this famous quotation has been met with the curt waiver, "Things have changed since Washington's time," but have they? Ponder his words and let your honest opinion answer whether the same, if not far worse, foreign conditions do not exist today in Europe than existed in Washington's time, and if his warning words are not as true today as when he uttered them. I say those words of Washington are not outmoded. They were beacons that lighted us down the decades that followed his wise guidance. They were reiterated by Jefferson and Madison and Monroe and they inspired Lincoln in the hope that such a nation, "conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal * * * can long endure."

PEACETIME CONSCRIPTION HAS NO PLACE IN THE AMERICAN SYSTEM

Conscription to me is an odious word. It has the sound of a whiplash upon the shoulders of a free people. It casts an ominous shadow of doubt upon American patriotism and duty. From the seeds of conscription sprang the militaristic systems now dominating Europe. Peacetime conscription has no place in the American system. I see no necessity for it; I cannot subscribe to it.

The National Guard Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. THORKELSON
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 15, 1940

Mr. THORKELSON. Mr. Speaker, the bill now under consideration, if passed in its present form, will give the President power to train the United States Army in Canada, Mexico, and Central and South America. What would our reaction be if the same countries sent their armies to train in the United States? It is unthinkable, is it not? Yet this act gives the President such power. Not only does it give the President this power, but it is something that no other nation has ever tried to do before, and which will mean war for us should we attempt to follow this plan.

The English, French, and German Armies were trained in their own countries, the proper place. Our Army should therefore be trained in the United States. We have passed one piece of legislation after another, all of them short of war; but this measure will actually give the President power to invade foreign countries, which can mean nothing else but war with the country invaded, or which he may select as a training field for our Army. What is the purpose of the bill? To give the President an excuse to come before Congress again and ask for war powers. Many of the rulers of the Central and South American republics obtain control of the government by a "coup militaire," and this bill will give the President the same opportunity, namely, to take charge of this Government by the power of the United States military forces.

If this bill is passed as it is now, there is a possibility that election will not be held in November. There is also a possibility that Congress may be suspended over the war-emergency period. It is with this in mind I have suggested that we adhere to the Constitution of the United States, as it provides the proper procedure for calling our military forces into service. To honor the oath we have taken we should sustain this document, for it is only by adhering to it that this Republic can survive.

Manufacture of Army Shoes by Convict Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VITO MARCANTONIO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 15, 1940

LETTER FROM THE UNITED SHOE WORKERS OF AMERICA

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

UNITED SHOE WORKERS OF AMERICA, OF THE C. I. O.,
Washington, D. C., August 13, 1940.

HON. VITO MARCANTONIO,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE MARCANTONIO: In behalf of the thousands of your shoe-worker constituents, and especially in the interest of those who are now unemployed, we call your attention to the fact that the Quartermaster's Corps of the Army is about to award an order for 300,000 pairs of shoes to the Leavenworth Prison for manufacture by convict labor.

The men's shoe industry, we are sure you are aware, has suffered the worst spring and summer seasons to date in many years, and weekly wages earned by many workers in this industry have hit new lows. Workers in this industry cannot afford any loss in wages as the average pay is only $880 a year, a sum too low to maintain a decent American standard of living.

Congress has expressed its will in regard to this matter in Public, No. 271, Seventy-first Congress, which reads in part as follows:

"That the Attorney General provide employment for inmates in the United States penal institutions in such diversified forms

as will reduce to a minimum competition with private industry or free labor."

The Federal Prison Housing, Inc., the agency which handles this matter, has been increasing the activities of its shoe factories until it now constitutes a serious threat to the maintenance of standards in the competitive commercial shoe industry. This is shown more clearly by the fact that in 1932 the total annual production of the shoe factory in Leavenworth Prison was 240,00 pairs, and now, having completed an order of 120,000 pairs for the C. C. C. so far this year, they are about to take this order for an additional 300,000 pairs, bringing their total production this year to a minimum of 500,000 pairs.

It seems paradoxical that it should be necessary for the thousands of trained skilled shoe workers to commit a crime before they are permitted to work at their trade.

We urge you to protest, both to the Director of the C. C. C. and to Maj. Letcher O. Grice, in charge of shoe purchases in the Quartermaster's Corps of the United States Army.

Your interest in this matter will be deeply appreciated, and we would appreciate your keeping us informed of any action you may take in regard to this matter.

Respectfully yours,

FRANK MCGRATH,
President.
JAMES J. MITCHELL,
General Secretary-Treasurer,
LEO GOODMAN,
Research Director, United Shoe Workers of America, C. I. O.

P. S.—We call your attention to the pending appropriations in the third deficiency bill, now before the deficiency subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriations, to provide funds to put into effect Public Resolution No. 85, Seventy-sixth Congress, a copy of which is attached, which would provide the facts regarding the question referred to in this letter.

Nomination, Election, and Tenure of Office of the President and Vice President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN M. COFFEE
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 5, 1940

PETITION OF RAILWAYMAN'S WELFARE LEAGUE OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herein a petition to the Congress in which is expressed on behalf of active employees of railroads in my State their viewpoint with respect to the nomination, election, and tenure of office of the President and Vice President of the United States.

It would appear that in these modern times the electoral college was outmoded and that under the system which now obtains there is grave likelihood that though a candidate for President receives a majority of popular votes, he would be denied the majority of the electoral votes. Furthermore, it is democratic and in accord with modern thought that the nominees for President and Vice President should be chosen through national primaries.

The letter is as follows:

To the Members of the Senate and House of Representatives, Care of Hon. Homer T. Bone, Member of the Senate, and Hon. John M. Coffee, Member of the House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIRS: We, the Railwaymen's Welfare League of the State of Washington, availing ourselves of the constitutional right to petition the Congress for redress against the present mode of procedure in the matter of the nomination, election, and tenure of office of President and Vice President of the United States, respectfully petition the Congress now in session to take the necessary steps to amend the Federal Constitution and to enact such legislation as may be required:

1. To abolish the electoral college and all political machinery pertaining thereto and to substitute therefor a plan for the filing of candidacy, nomination, and election of the President and Vice President of the United States somewhat similar to that now in vogue in the State of Washington, where the blanket primary ballot is now used, in connection with filing of candidacy, nomination, and election of a United States Senator, thus providing a direct vote by the people in the nomination and election of a President and Vice President of the United States, and it would also eliminate entirely the holding of national political party conventions so far as the nomination of a President and Vice President is concerned; and

2. To provide that the tenure of office of both the President and Vice President shall be limited to a single term of (——?) years. (The action of both the Democratic and Republican conventions suggests this amendment.)

NOTE.—Washington in his Farewell Address, September 17, 1796, warned the people against the "baneful effects of spirit of party" upon national tranquility. "Sooner or later," warned Washington, "the chief of some prevailing faction more able or more fortunate than his competitors may turn this disposition to purposes of his own elevation, on the ruins of public liberty." Is Washington's prophecy coming true? It would seem so, when the men and women of the State of Washington, at the last general election, supported candidates for public office without regard to fitness for position, but because they carried a "vote 'er straight" banner.

Washington's warning, and what seemed to us the political trend in this country impelled us to file the foregoing petition to Congress as a step toward giving the people a direct vote and responsibility in the choosing of their executive leadership. A study of Washington's Farewell Address at this time when foreign and domestic policies and national defense are uppermost in our minds is well worth while.

Respectfully submitted.

H. ALVIN MOORE,
Executive Secretary, Railwaymen's Welfare League of Washington.

The Third-Term Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. L. L. MARSHALL
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 15, 1940

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Cleveland Press of August 6, 1940, in which Rabbi Abba Silver raps a third term and backs Willkie for the Presidency.

[From the Cleveland Press of August 6, 1940]

SILVER RAPS THIRD TERM, BACKS WILLKIE—LIBERAL LEADER HITS "EXALTING MAN ABOVE DEMOCRATIC FAITH"

(By Richard L. Maher)

Rabbi A. H. Silver, one of Cleveland's leading churchmen and liberals, today parted company with President Roosevelt on the third-term issue.

The rabbi, for 20 years spiritual director of the Temple and a stanch, though at times critical, admirer of the President and his achievements, reiterated his earlier expressed opposition to the third term and "indispensable one-man rule" and indicated a preference for Wendell L. Willkie, the Republican nominee and opponent of President Roosevelt in the coming elections.

Rabbi Silver is vacationing in Maine, but interrupted his vacation long enough to answer an inquiry put him by the Press.

AGAINST THIRD TERM

Last March 30 the Temple's spiritual director, in an address to an overflow congregation, declared against the third term and the renomination of President Roosevelt.

He was asked by the Press, since the party conventions had now met and had chosen their nominees and since President Roosevelt had been renominated and had accepted, whether his opinion had changed.

"In reply to your letter," Rabbi Silver wrote today from Maine, "permit me to say that my conviction as to the third term remains unchanged.

"And so does my great admiration for the policies and achievements of President Roosevelt.

"What I expressed in my March address represents a settled conviction. The no-third-term tradition has been vindicated by a century and a half of American experience, and it is particularly important in these days, when the indispensable one-man rule is exalted in so many parts of the world at the expense of the democratic faith in laws and institutions rather than in persons, that it should not be repudiated.

"Only one consideration would have warranted a change of attitude—if the opposition candidate, in this case Mr. Willkie, would have been an isolationist representing a foreign policy at sharp variance with the sound and courageous one which President Roosevelt has been prosecuting.

"In such a case, the vital interests of civilization now being threatened would have outweighed any other consideration.

WILLKIE HAS TAKEN CLEAR STAND

"Fortunately, Mr. Willkie has expressed himself clearly and unequivocally in favor of tendering maximum aid, short of war, to Great Britain."

In his address of last March opposing the third term, Rabbi Silver said in part:

"Renomination of President Roosevelt will obscure the issue of the forthcoming election, relieving the Republican Party of the responsibility in showing what it proposes to do about the real problems of the country. * * *

"No matter what party is elected we must remember that substantial progress was registered under President Roosevelt and that that progress must be continued if chaos is to be averted."

Record and Accomplishments of the Democratic Party

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EWING THOMASON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 15, 1940

ADDRESS BY ERNEST GUINN, COUNTY ATTORNEY OF EL PASO COUNTY, TEX.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech delivered by Hon. Ernest Guinn, county attorney of El Paso County, Tex., at the recent Democratic county convention:

I deeply appreciate the honor that the Democratic executive committee of El Paso County conferred upon me by asking me to address this convention. I deem it an honor to be a member of the Democratic Party. I deem it a still greater honor to be called upon to make this address as a representative member of the Democratic Party in this community. I feel that in selecting me to make this speech that you believe that my views are representative of the views of the large majority of the members of our party in this community with regard to its leaders, accomplishments, and purposes.

It is fitting and proper on this occasion for us to pay tribute to our county organization. The backbone of the Democratic Party lies in the local organizations. Our great national chairman, Mr. James A. Farley, has truly said that the success or failure of the national organization depends upon the success or failure of the local organizations throughout the country. The position which the Democratic Party holds today rests principally upon those organizations. For the past 6 years El Paso has been indeed fortunate in its choice of local leaders. Leaders who have unselfishly served the party—devoting time and effort to carrying out the purposes of the party—without reward or hope of reward, other than the satisfaction arising from a job well done. Our local organization is represented by the Democratic executive committee of the county. At the head of this committee is the chairman. His duties are arduous. His problems are many. The good work that has been accomplished by the organization during the past 6 years is largely due to the efforts of this man. It is fit and proper for the members of the Democratic Party of this community to express today to that man their deep appreciation for his work. We may truly say that it is because of the work and efforts of men of the same caliber as Bob Cunningham that the Democratic Party has become the party that it is today. Mr. Cunningham, the Democrats owe you a debt of gratitude, and let me express to you their deep appreciation for your work during the past 6 years as leader of their party in El Paso County. We are also fortunate in the man we have chosen to succeed Mr. Cunningham. Mr. Howard Don has worked as assistant to Mr. Cunningham and as a member of the executive committee for the past 6 years, and if anyone can continue the splendid record set by Mr. Cunningham, it is Mr. Don.

Members of the Democratic Party in this community have acted wisely in their selection of the national Representative from this district. We are all proud of our Congressman, R. E. THOMASON, who has been renominated without opposition. He is an honor to the Democratic Party and an honor to the Democrats of this district who have chosen him to represent them and who have kept him in that office in appreciation of his good service. He now enjoys the honor of being ranking member of the great Committee on Military Affairs. He has consistently supported legislation of our President. In doing this he has followed the wishes of this district. He has always been found on the side of liberal legislation, and in this he has followed the wishes of this district. Today he has taken a strong stand in support of the national-defense program of the President, as well as supporting firm and immediate steps to handle "fifth column" activities in this country. He has likewise taken a stand in support of the aid that is given to England in its present fight, and in all of this he is acting in accord with the wishes of his constituents.

In November of this year the American people will choose their President for the succeeding 4 years. It is our duty before that time to present to the people facts on the real issues involved in the campaign. For the past 8 years there has been a Democratic President serving these United States. I state no exaggeration when I say that he is one of the greatest Presidents that these United States have ever had. There is not a one of you here who does not remember the condition which this country was in at the time he took office, nearly 8 years ago. A feeling of panic prevailed over the country as a result of conditions arising out of the negligent management of public affairs by Republican leaders for the preceding 12 years. Men who predicted two cars in every garage and promised two chickens in every pot were cowed with fear when confronted with a situation that they knew not how to handle. Leaders of industry, of banking, and of all businesses were pleading that something be done to save them. Farms were being foreclosed upon and families were threatened with starvation. Boys—driven from hope through poverty of their families—were wandering across the country seeking food.

These conditions were all brought about through the policies of Republican leaders wedded to special interests who believed that only one interest needed protection, and that the moneyed interest, who recognized only one right—and that the property right. These conditions arose by virtue of the ignorance of Republican leaders of the conditions with which the people were faced, and their failure to appreciate the needs and the wants of the people.

I need not go into detail as to what our great leader did to remedy these conditions. No sooner had he been inducted into office than he began to present and have enacted remedial legislation and to carry out his promise of a liberal administration. The Democratic Party is of the people. It always has been representative of the average American citizen. As soon as the action of the Democratic President and the Democratic Congress had relieved the situation, and removed the danger of immediate panic to the country, those interests which so gladly accepted assistance from the Government for themselves, began to oppose legislation designed to assist the average citizen and to prevent a recurrence of the situation existing in 1932. In true Republican style and belief, so long as assistance came to them, there was no complaint, but now they were safe again, and they could see no reason for assistance to anyone else. A bitter fight was waged by that group in the campaign of 1936. However, the people could not be deceived. They fully realized what our President and our Democratic Congress had done for them and for the country, and they expressed their appreciation in that election. Forty-six of our 48 States voted to return him to office.

During the course of the two terms of our President, outstanding social legislation has been enacted—legislation that has always been opposed by the Republican Party and its leaders. Let us review some of this legislation. Bank after bank had been closed, with enormous losses to small depositors. Life savings had been wiped out. A law was enacted which provides for a guarantee of deposits up to $5,000. Bank failures are practically unknown today. Enormous sums were lost by investors in fake stocks and through manipulations of unprincipled stockbrokers and corporation officials. The Security and Exchange Act was enacted to cure this evil. Strong opposition to the bill was made by the special interests which have always dictated and controlled the policies and actions of the Republican Party.

The Civilian Conservation Corps was created to care for homeless youths wandering about the country. The Public Works Administration and the Works Progress Administration were created to employ men and to afford relief to unemployed and needy. Social-security legislation was enacted to grant security to the wage earner. The Tennessee Valley Authority was created to grapple with the monster power group, which group incidentally is headed by the Republican nominee for President. The Home Owners' Loan Corporation was created to save the homes of our people. A legal right to collective bargaining was given to the workers. Reciprocal-trade treaties were enacted with other nations. Although the Republican leaders at heart opposed each and every one of these acts, fearful of the consequences of open opposition to them, not a one has been assailed in the Republican platform. Nor have the Republican leaders cared to advocate the repeal of any one of these major legislative acts of our Democratic President and Congress. The Republican Party refrains from commenting on the advances made in social legislation by the Democratic Party through its representatives in the hope of diverting the minds of the people from such issues. The people of this country know only too well what can and will be done by the Republican leaders if the opportunity is given to them to emasculate this legislation.

There was a crisis in 1932. That crisis was successfully met and dealt with by the Democratic Party, through the leadership of Franklin D. Roosevelt. The Republican Party had not only failed but, through its stupidity, had brought about the aggravated condition existing then. Today we are faced with a far greater crisis than we were faced with in 1932. We are faced not only with an economic crisis that will arise from the turmoil in which the world is found at this time but we are faced with complete destruction of everything that we hold dear—life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Freedom—freedom of the press, religion, and of assembly. As a result of this crisis, there are two principal problems that the Nation is faced with today, and those problems will serve as a basis for the coming campaign; they are (1) national defense, and (2) the foreign policy.

When elected in 1932 our President told the people of this country what he proposed to do. This he has done. Today he need not tell the people what he proposes to do with regard to national defense or what his foreign policy will be. His record on both of these matters is before the public. From what he has done in the past

we know what he will do in the future. Likewise, we know what the Republicans have done in the past, and from their record we may assume what they propose to do in the future.

We know that a goodly portion of our Navy was sunk by a gullible Republican administration in the 1920's. Have we any assurance that this same gullible group will not listen to the fairy tales of Herr Hitler? We know that for many months our President warned the Nation and the Congress of what to expect in Europe. We also know that the same Republicans who ask to be placed in control of our country today ignored that warning and pooh-poohed the idea that there would be war, and accused the President of being a warmonger. Republican leaders have never been able to see past their own selfish interests. Results which the President warned were likely to occur have occurred, and still today that same group of Republicans, blinded to everything except selfish party interests, fail to appreciate the situation. We know that no action was taken by the Republican administration toward any national defense for the 12 years preceding the election of President Roosevelt. We know that today that group is opposing acts of defense which the President is sponsoring. The foreign policy of our President is clear in every respect. He has unhesitatingly assailed every wrongful action taken by Hitler and Mussolini. He has condemned their inhuman destruction of people and of nations. He has pledged and has given all aid possible to England short of declaring war. He still stands for these things. We know that some of the leaders of the Republican Party stand for appeasement of those vultures.

We know that one of the most vital parts of our national defense rests upon the success of our good-neighbor policy—the policy that has sought to bind our neighbors to the south and ourself in common purposes for common defenses against the common enemy. We know from past experience that the Republican Party and its leaders never understood or sought to understand the people of the Latin American countries or their ways. We know that there was no such thing as a good-neighbor policy existing between those countries and our country before Franklin D. Roosevelt became President of the United States. The election of a Republican nominee would greatly jeopardize all advancement that has been made in this direction through the efforts of our President and our Secretary of State.

There is no issue that has been put forth by the Republican Party which entitles it to a return to power at this time. As in every campaign where no sound issue can be made, false issues are created. The Republican Party knowing that the policies of the Democratic Party carried out by Franklin D. Roosevelt meet with the overwhelming approval of the American people, have dodged all issues relating to those policies. The Republican Party fails to attack the foreign policy or any major legislative act that has been sponsored by the Democratic Party during the past 8 years. In one last desperate effort they brought forth the issue of tradition in an attempt to prevent the nomination of our great leader. And having failed to prevent his renomination by our party, now seek to defeat his election by stating that no President has ever served a third term. In assailing social legislation of the President, this same group called upon the Constitution, and attacked the President for being no respecter of the Constitution. Now, finding nothing in the Constitution to prevent our party from nominating, and the people from reelecting the President for a third term, this group calls upon tradition. This group does not tell you, however, that China is today found where it is because of its refusal to depart from the traditions of its ancestors. This group does not tell you that in fighting each improvement in social legislation, tradition was raised to defeat the legislation. It is with pride that I state that our President has violated tradition since the time that he accepted the nomination of the Democratic Party in 1932, and flew to the convention to make his acceptance speech. He has repeatedly broken tradition after tradition, all in the interest of the American people.

Selfishly, Republican leaders have sought to create in the minds of the people the belief that there was no sound reason why our President should continue in office at this time. It seems clear to me, and I think to a great majority of the American people, that the present condition demanded that our party renominate the President, and that he accept that nomination. He is so closely connected with the two problems which face our country today that separating him therefrom endangers our Nation. Today the life or death of civilization hangs in the balance. Anyone who has kept abreast of the events that are happening today knows that our President has, in no uncertain terms, made clear his position and the position of this country with regard to the Nazis and the Fascists and the Communists. He has assailed the action of those countries on every occasion where they have violated the rights of people and of nations. Those men hate our beloved President just as the Devil hates holy water.

Can any sensible person deny that our first line of defense against these aggressors today is England. Had our President announced, as selfish interests desired him to do, that he would not seek a third term, in deference to a baseless tradition, the effect upon the English people and the Latin American people would have been staggering. Hitler and Mussolini hope for no greater assistance from the United States than repudiation of the President, who has, and is, opposing them. To say that the very existence of our country and of civilization should be gambled against a tradition is almost unbelievable, but that is what the Republican leaders are asking the people to do today. Although this country has not openly declared war, it is in greater danger today than it was ever in during the last World War. The failure to nominate would have been, and the failure to reelect our President will in itself be sufficient to place the Latin American countries under the domination of German and Italian dictators, and destroy all hope that might remain in England to successfully withstand the assault of those nations. And when that happens, the light of civilization will be nearly out. Our President is, in my mind, the greatest man in the world today. If civilization can be saved, he is the one man that can save it. Give light, and the people will find their own way. It is our duty, and my duty, to see that true facts are brought before the people.

Data and Charts Showing Credit Standing of Latin American Countries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FREDERICK C. SMITH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 15, 1940

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and insert into the RECORD a compilation of data and charts showing the present credit standing of the Latin American countries.

The Congress now has before it S. 4204, a bill to provide for increasing the lending authority of the Export-Import Bank of Washington, and for other purposes.

The increased amount requested in the bill is $500,000,000. It provides that this money shall be used—

> To assist in the development of the resources, the stabilization of the economies, and the orderly marketing of products of the countries of the Western Hemisphere, Export-Import Bank of Washington is authorized * * * to make loans to any governments and their central banks and, when guaranteed by such governments or their central banks, to the political subdivisions, agencies, and nationals of any such governments * * *.

We are not here concerned with any political or military objectives that may be involved in this proposal to lend enormous sums of money to the Latin American countries. We are here concerned only with the question of the credit standing to each of the Latin American countries. The purpose of the following data is to show the soundness of these proposed loans from the standpoint of the credit rating of the Latin American countries.

However, it should be observed that any political or military objectives that may be sought through these loans will be vitally affected by the ability of our southern neighbors to pay them back. In other words, the extent to which any enduring political or military objectives may be achieved through these loans will depend ultimately on the soundness of the economic processes that may be involved.

It is my opinion that no enduring political or military good could possibly come from this transaction unless it were based strictly on the principles of fair and equitable trade and honest dealing between our Nation and the Latin American countries.

It is only to the extent that the United States would be paid back dollar for dollar and everybody concerned would receive the natural economic benefits that flow from the mutual interchange of goods that any valuable and lasting political or military purposes could possibly be realized.

Predicated on any other basis these $500,000,000 would not become loans in the true sense of this term. They would fall in the category of good-will purchases or outright bribes—ventures hardly to be undertaken by any self-respecting and honorable people, ventures which could result only in grief.

My own study of the credit situation of the Latin American countries convinces me that it is not sound in any of them except a few. This appears to me to be evident from a study of the figures which show the amounts of loans and investments, interest charges, defaults, and so forth. But far more is involved in arriving at a true picture of the soundness of the Latin American credit than a mere study of these figures. The political nature of these countries is a prime factor in evaluating their credit rating. Dictatorships, revolutions,

and communism are all rampant in the greater portion of the Latin American states. How these things affect the credit of those nations is shown by Mexico, almost completely communistic, which has expropriated hundreds of millions of dollars worth of American property and investments, Bolivia which has expropriated about $17,000,000 of Standard Oil investments, and Cuba which has just written into her constitution moratorium provisions affecting a large portion of her debts, and other provisions changing contracts, repudiating debts outright, and scaling down interest charges on past contracts.

Nor is this all that is necessary to complete the picture. It would be necessary also to have a comprehensive understanding of the history of the loans made by United States nationals to our neighbors south of the Rio Grande, particularly as was brought out in the hearings before the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, Sixty-eighth Congress, investigating foreign loans, as well as shown by numerous other studies relating to this question.

However, as stated, we believe the following data are in themselves sufficient to determine the quality of the credit of the Latin American countries.

Since this proposal of setting up a program of the Government lending huge sums of money to the Latin American countries has for its principal object the monopolizing of the trade of those countries as against Germany particularly, and since there appears to have been created a fear in certain quarters that this is necessary to preserve our share of that trade because of undue German economic penetration, it is well to study the actual figures to see if they bear out this apprehension.

Following are two tables put out by the Department of Commerce showing the percentage distribution, among leading industrial nations, of the aggregate value of imports and exports of the 20 Latin American republics, 1910–38.

Take first the relative percentages of the exports to the United States, United Kingdom, Germany, and France in 1913 before the World War, in 1919 after the war, and in 1938:

Year	To United States	To United Kingdom	To Germany	To France
1913	30.78	21.24	12.38	7.99
1919	44.49	18.11	.45	11.24
1938	31.50	15.90	10.30	4.00

From these figures it will be seen that the United States purchased from Latin America more goods in 1938 than in 1913 and that Germany had not attained in 1938 her pre-war level of purchases from those countries. England's and France's purchases from Latin America fell off considerably since 1913.

Now as to comparable figures on imports to the Latin American countries:

Year	From United States	From United Kingdom	From Germany	From France
1913	25.03	24.42	16.55	8.32
1919	48.79	15.30	.19	3.28
1938	35.8	12.2	17.1	3.5

From these figures it will be seen that exports from the United States to Latin America rose from the pre-war level of 25.03 to 35.8 percent in 1938, or a gain of 10.77 percent. Germany's exports rose from a pre-war level of 16.55 to 17.1 percent in 1938, or a rise of only 0.55 percent.

These tables clearly show that relatively, England and France have lost a considerable part of their pre-war exports to the Latin American countries, while the United States has gained considerably, and Germany had about regained her pre-war level in 1938.

Percentage distribution, among leading industrial nations, of the aggregate value of exports of the 20 Latin American republics, 1910–38

Year	To United States	To United Kingdom	To Germany	To France	To Italy	To Japan
1910	33.8	20.5	10.9	8.4	1.22	0.06
1911	34.29	20.92	12.85	9.15	1.66	.08
1912	33.52	19.74	11.90	7.76	1.84	.06
1913	30.78	21.24	12.38	7.99	1.99	.09
1914	38.20	22.32	8.75	6.41		
1915	38.65	22.46	.03	6.60		
1916	46.41	20.57		8.84		
1917	51.72	21.00		8.04		
1918	46.83	24.43		7.12		
1919	44.49	18.11	.45	11.24		
1920	47.68	17.94	1.80	5.33		
1921	42.01	17.52	4.91	4.26		
1922	44.57	15.10	4.51	5.04		
1923	45.19	16.82	4.76	5.85		
1924	38.92	17.50	6.54	5.93		
1925	38.73	17.84	6.95	6.50		
1926	40.90	15.92	7.10	5.29		
1927	35.28	18.84	11.15	5.58		
1928	34.23	19.39	9.82	5.35		
1929	34.0	18.5	8.1	6.2		
1930	33.4	20.2	7.7	5.8		
1931	35.0	20.1	7.6	6.7	3.1	
1932	32.1	19.2	7.2	6.6	3.1	.1
1933	29.4	22.1	6.9	6.2		.3
1934	29.4	20.2	7.9	5.0		.4
1935	32.8	18.6	8.0	4.7	2.2	.8
1936	32.9	18.8	8.0	5.0	1.9	1.9
1937	31.1	17.6	8.7	4.0	3.1	1.6
1938	31.5	15.9	10.3	4.0	1.5	1.3
1939	34.3	12.8	6.0	3.4	1.6	1.4

Percentage distribution among leading industrial nations of the aggregate value of imports of the 20 Latin American republics. 1910–38

Year	From United States	From United Kingdom	From Germany	From France	From Italy	From Japan
1910	22.6	25.0	14.9	8.0	4.86	0.12
1911	23.79	25.73	16.72	8.25	4.63	.10
1912	24.49	24.93	16.73	8.28	5.05	.12
1913	25.03	24.42	16.55	8.32	4.98	.14
1914	27.94	23.92	14.62	6.64		
1915	41.82	21.03	1.84	4.71		
1916	51.77	17.88		4.45		
1917	54.79	14.89		3.70		
1918	49.48	16.86		3.71		
1919	48.79	15.30	0.19	3.28		
1920	50.15	16.70	3.39	4.80		
1921	44.37	16.87	6.52	5.36		
1922	35.03	19.19	10.47	4.76		
1923	36.29	19.42	10.24	5.42		
1924	37.09	18.16	10.16	5.50		
1925	37.51	17.36	10.06	5.51		
1926	39.16	15.26	10.09	5.89		
1927	38.23	15.72	10.00	5.94		
1928	36.66	15.87	10.86	5.94		
1929	38.7	14.9	10.8	5.1		
1930	35.1	14.5	10.9	4.9		
1931	33.5	15.5	10.6	5.3	4.9	
1932	32.3	16.3	9.3	4.8	5.4	1.1
1933	29.2	18.1	11.5	4.9		1.8
1934	30.11	17.28	9.88	4.6		2.8
1935	31.7	14.7	13.0	3.7	2.6	3.7
1936	31.5	13.5	15.4	3.3	2.5	2.9
1937	34.3	12.6	15.3	2.9	2.6	2.7
1938	35.8	12.2	17.1	3.5	3.1	2.7
1939	40.1	10.5	12.9	3.5	2.3	1.7

NOTE.—This table is presented here subject to several reservations: Since the original data on which it is based were expressed in 20 different currency units, it was necessary to convert the statistics into dollars in order to arrive at a common denominator. Since 1931 (and in some cases for earlier years) the rates quoted in some countries have been partly nominal. Furthermore, it is known that the value of imports from Germany, as published by several countries, are overvalued by amounts ranging from 20 to 25 percent, since the corresponding transactions were effected at different rates from those used for customs statistical purposes. It may also be noted that the figures showing the distribution of export trade by countries are incomplete in several instances. Attention may also be called to the fact that this is an over-all calculation and that the share of the United States, for example, varies considerably as regards the individual Latin American countries. The United States furnishes more than half of the total imports of neighboring countries, such as Cuba and Mexico, but the proportion diminishes as the distance southward increases.

No attempt has been made to calculate the shares of Italy and Japan except for the pre-war years 1910 through 1913 and the years beginning 1931. In the pre-war years some of the countries did not show trade with Italy or Japan separately, hence the percentages for those years are based on such figures as were available.

The following population and area figures were taken from the Statesman's Year Book, 1940.

Debt figures were taken from Foreign Bondholders' Protective Council, Inc., 1938 Annual Report, and all figures shown are as of the date of this report.

Figures showing direct investments were taken from American Direct Investments in Foreign Countries, 1936, United States Department of Commerce. These figures, therefore, are as of 1936.

Argentina

[Population, 7,885,237 in 1914, and 12,958,217 in 1939. Area, 1,079,965 square miles]

External debt of Argentina (1938):

Dollar debt	233,798,290
Sterling debt	55,953,338
Swiss franc debt	129,932,450
Spanish pesetas debt	90,785,000
French franc debt	40,085,500
Italian lira debt	11,667,900
Other external pesos debt	3,527,100

Interest is being paid in full on all issues of the national government issues and the Province of Cardoba; the Provinces of Buenos Aires, Mendoza, and Santa Fe paid interest in accordance with readjustment plans, as did the city of Santa Fe. The city of Cordoba continues in default on its two issues of bonds.

The Argentine Republic was again able during this year to reap the benefit of its action in paying service on all its bonds by being able to issue a new loan for $25,000,000 in the New York market in October 1938.

External debt of Argentina in 1937, $370,099,000. Argentina's internal debt increased from $968,598,000 in 1933 to $1,421,773,000 in 1937. During the same period her external debt decreased from $542,576,000 to $370,099,000. During the same period her total debt increased from $1,511,174,000 to $1,791,872,000.

Total direct dollar investment, $348,268,000.

Bolivia

[Population, estimated for 1935, 3,226,296. Area in square miles, 509,792]

Debt of Bolivia.

External debt:

Issues (4 publicly offered) of the Republic of Bolivia	$59,422,000.00
Privately held loan (match monopoly loan)	1,188,974.86

Interest and sinking fund on the first four issued went into default between December 1930 and May 1931; the match monopoly loan went into default in May 1932. The interest in default amounts to $34,938,300, making a grand total owed by Bolivia of $95,549,275.

See table 5 for full depreciation figures of Bolivia issues.

Bolivian external debt decreased from $264,500,000 in 1933 to $117,700,000 in 1937.

Internal debt, funded and floating, decreased from $210,800,000 in 1933 to $1,500,000 in 1937.

Total direct-dollar investment, $18,337,000.

Bolivian Government in 1937 confiscated investment of the Standard Oil Co. amounting to about $17,000,000.

Brazil

[Population in 1938, 46,115,825. Area, 3,275,510 square miles. (United States, 2,973,776 square miles.)]

Dollar debt of Brazil in 1938.

External debt:

(a) Four issues of the United States of Brazil and one funding loan of the United States of Brazil totaling $168,771,745.

(b) Seventeen issues of nine individual states totaling $132,789,000.

(c) Nine issues of three municipalities totaling $54,997,000 or a total of $356,557,745.

In addition, interest due at the full contractual rate * * * totals on all these loans $53,626,598, making a grand total owed by Brazil of $410,184,343.

Interest and sinking fund on practically all of these issues went into default between June 1931 and December 1932.

See table 5 for full depreciation figures of Brazilian issues from which it will be seen that their market value is only 17.6 percent of their par value.

In addition to her dollar indebtedness, Brazil has the following external indebtedness:

Pound sterling	161,162,578
Gold francs	229,185,500
Francs	624,660,877
Florins	8,366,000

Most of these loans also went into default at the same time that the defaults occurred on the dollar bonds.

Brazil's external debt of States and municipalities increased from $530,032,000 in 1930 to $656,180,000 in 1937.

Brazil's internal funded debt increased from 2,354,000 contos in 1930 to 3,748,000 contos in 1937.

Brazil's external federal consolidated debt, exclusive of floating debt:

Dollar debt increased from $147,434,000 in 1930 to $169,106,000 in 1937.

During the same period of time the following £99,770,000 to £104,446,000.

Gold francs, 233,206,000 to 229,186,000.

Paper francs, 96,658,000 to 275,176,000.

Total direct dollar investment, $194,345,000.

Chile

[Population in 1937, 4,597,254. Area, 296,717 square miles]

Chile's dollar debt.

(a) 7 issues of Republic of Chile totaling	$118,455,500
(b) 3 municipal issues totaling	13,684,000
(c) 6 issues of corporations with government guaranty totaling	50,141,500
or a grand total of	182,281,000

During the year 1938, the amortization bureau purchased dollar bonds to the nominal amount of $33,786,500, and in addition there were redeemed outside of the bureau $2,000.

Interest and sinking fund on all these issues went into default between August 1931 and March 1932.

In addition to the foregoing dollar indebtedness Chile has an indebtedness of £27,884,131 (almost all Republic of Chile) and Swiss francs 110,022,000.

During the year 1938 the amortization bureau purchased £1,254,863 and Swiss francs 6,577,700 face value bonds. In addition, there were redeemed outside the bureau Swiss francs 282,000.

The sterling and franc loans also went into default in 1931–32.

Under the Chilean plan the Chilean Government continues to buy up at default prices bonds that are maintained at those prices through its own action in offering the bondholders but a fraction of the contractural coupon value.

This is virtual repudiation by the Chilean Government of its external debts.

Chile bought up on the market bonds during 1935 of a face amount of $14,674,500 and £14,020 for a total sum of somewhat less than $2,064,125.80, during 1936 of a face amount of $15,839,000, £71,660 and Swiss francs 839,300 for a total sum of somewhat less than $2,459,786.95, during 1937 of a face amount of $13,198,500, £381,820, and Swiss francs 1,727,000 for a total sum of somewhat less than 3,053,000, and during 1938 of a face amount of $33,786,500, £1,254,863, and Swiss francs 6,577,700 for a total sum of somewhat less than $7,067,786.94.

See table 5 for full depreciation figures of Chilean issues.

Total direct dollar investment, $483,736,000.

Chile's external debt, funded and floating, increased from $344,026,000 in 1933 to $403,683,000 in 1937.

Her internal debt, funded and floating, decreased from $121,367,000 in 1933 to $78,843,000 in 1937.

Her indirect debt decreased from $147,514,000 in 1933 to $12,603,000 in 1937.

Colombia

[Population, 1938, 8,701,816. Area, 439,997 square miles]

Dollar debt of Colombia:

(a) Two issues of bonds of the Republic of Colombia, totaling $51,223,500, and one scrip issue of the Republic of Colombia of $2,616,030.

(b) Eight issues of bonds of six Colombian Departments totaling $59,988,000.

(c) Six issues of bonds of four Colombian municipalities totaling $22,149,900.

(d) Four issues of bonds of the Agricultural Mortgage Bank of Colombia guaranteed by the Republic, totaling $10,288,500; or a total of $146,265,930.

Interest due totals approximately $53,304,000, making a grand total owed by Columbia of $199,569,930.

Interest and sinking fund on all these issues, excepting scrip due 1946, went into default between October 1931 and October 1933.

In addition to the foregoing dollar indebtedness, Colombia has an external indebtedness of £2,666,290. The sterling issues went into default when the dollar bonds were defaulted.

The following should be of considerable interest:

Colombia was fortunate in not suffering to the extent that other countries did during the depression of the last 10 years. Also in that time the economic position of Colombia has been constantly improving, and even the slight set-back caused at the end of 1937 and beginning of 1938 by the reversed Brazilian coffee policy was very short lived. All the dollar bonds of Colombia continue in complete default.

See table 5 for full depreciation figures of Colombian issues.

Colombia's external consolidated scrip and floating debt decreased from $85,037,000 in 1934 to $54,363,000 in 1938.

Her internal consolidated and floating debt decreased during the same time from $53,136,000 to $42,372,000.

Total direct dollar investment, $107,549,000.

Costa Rica

[Population in 1927 (last taken), 471,525; estimated 1939, 623,414. Area, 23,000 square miles]

Dollar debt:

(a) 2 issues of Republic of Costa Rica totaling	$6,613,000
(b) 2 issues of funding bonds totaling	1,518,720
Grand total of	8,131,720

Also the following additional indebtedness: Pound sterling 1,513,177 and francs 5,811,000.

In 1932 and 1933 the bondholders were offered funding bonds for coupons falling due for the 3-year period immediately following the default. Subsequently Costa Rica, on July 10, 1935, made a further offer to pay for 3 years 50 percent of the interest and 50 percent of the sinking fund on these $2 issues and full service on the funding bonds. Interest and sinking fund on all these bonds, however, went into default in September and November 1936.

The Government of Costa Rica on March 20, 1939, offered for a period of 3 years to pay 30 percent of the face value of the current coupons on their outstanding bonds against surrender of the coupons and to purchase the past-due coupons at the rate of 1 percent per annum of the face amount of the bonds.

The President of Costa Rica in an address to the Costa Rican Congress on May 1, 1939, said:

The purchase of bonds of the foreign debt during the year gave a profit of $5,542,292. Actual profit in the purchase, $4,928,093.02, to which is added the value of the coupons, $614,199.98.

See table 5 for full depreciation figures of Costa Rica's issues.

Costa Rica's external debt increased from $18,387,000 in 1933 to $19,702,000 in 1937.

During same time her internal debt decreased from $6,771,000 to $5,994,000.

Total direct dollar investment, $13,286,000.

Cuba

[Population in 1938, 4,227,587. Area, 44,164 square miles]

Dollar debt of Cuba, $125,746,900.

Of the seven issues, six are in default.

Only one of the issues, the sugar stabilization sinking fund, 5½ percent secured gold bonds dated December 1930, due December 1940, amounting to $42,000,000, which issues were not publicly offered, are not in default. Amount outstanding of this issue, $3,530,300.

See table 5 for full depreciation figures of Cuba's issues.

Cuba's external, internal, and floating debt decreased from $207,100,000 in 1934 to $205,600,000 in 1938.

Total direct dollar investment, $666,254,000.

The action recently taken by the Cuban Government in writing drastic debt moratorium provisions into her Constitution shows the trend of the Latin American states.

The following is copy of some of the important sections of the recently promulgated Constitution of Cuba:

TRANSLATION OF THE TRANSITORY PROVISION IN THE CUBAN CONSTITUTION REGARDING CIVIL OBLIGATIONS WHICH WAS PROMULGATED ON JUNE 2, 1940

With reference to civil obligations which were the subject of Decree Laws 412, 423, and 594 of 1934, modified by the law of September 3, 1937, whatever be their actual legal or contractual status and whether or not they are subject to moratoria, and also with reference to such obligations subsequent to August 14, 1934, and prior to September 4, 1937, but only when these refer to the payment of amounts the proceeds of or derived from the sale of cane colonias, sugar mills, or stocks representing the ownership of one or the other of these, or this is deduced from the total of the contracts, covenants, or agreements between creditor and debtor, no matter what the nature and class of the security therefor might be, the fulfillment of said obligations shall be governed henceforth by the following rules, which no law may modify:

First. Obligations which do not exceed $1,000 must be amortized on June 30, 1960. Obligations between $1,000 and $50,000 must be amortized June 30, 1965; and on the same date in 1970 if they exceed $50,000. If the obligation is represented by bonds, certificates, obligations, or notes, there shall be considered as principal for the purposes of this transitory provision the total amount of the nominal value represented by such bonds, certificates, obligations, or notes in circulation on August 14, 1934, or September 3, 1937, according to the obligation in question, and they shall be subject to annual amortization payments according to the original contract, or pro rata if they should have the same maturity. Amortization shall be payable annually, beginning June 30, 1942; but if the period agreed to by the parties has not elapsed by that time, said first payment shall be collectible on the June 30 which follows the expiration of the period referred to. In all cases, the principal owed shall be divided among the corresponding annual amortization payments in a progressive form, in order that, together with interest, approximately equal annual payments shall result from the combination of both, and in such manner that the creditor shall be entirely paid upon the expiration of the term determined for the payment of the debt, as already established.

Principal corresponding to ground rents (censos) is excepted from the provisions of this rule.

Second. All interest past due on the effective date of this provision, as well as sums owed for commissions, costs, fines, or other penalties, even though they have been capitalized shall be strictly noncollectible; but, beginning with such effective date, the obligations referred to shall be subject to interest, according to the amount of capital, as determined by decree-laws 412 and 594 of 1934 and in accordance with the rate which results in each case from the application of the following scale: When the principal owed does not exceed $15,000, the obligation shall be subject to interest at 3 percent annually; if it exceeds $15,000 but not $50,000, the obligation shall be subject to interest at 2½ percent annually; when it exceeds $50,000 without exceeding $200,000, at 2 percent; if it exceeds $200,000 and does not exceed $400,000, at 1¾ percent; if it exceeds $400,000 but not $600,000, at 1½ percent; when it exceeds $600,000 without exceeding $800,000, at 1¼ percent; and, finally, when the capital exceeds $800,000, it shall be subject to interest at 1 percent annually. The provisions of this paragraph shall be applied to the obligations referred to in the initial paragraph of this provision, whether or not they are subject to interest either agreed upon or legal, and whatever may be the rate covenanted.

In all cumulative loans, principal shall be considered to be that which the debtor actually received when incurring the obligation, and it shall be considered to have been reduced in the amount of payments made, once deduction has been made of the interest accumulated each year.

This principal, thus reduced, shall be amortized within the periods established by rule 1 or at once, at the will of the debtor.

All interest accumulated on mortgage loans shall be separated in order that interest may be applied only to the unpaid portion of the principal.

Third. The obligations referred to in the first paragraph of this provision, insofar as they affect natural or juridic persons, persons, owners of sugar mills as debtors, or guarantors, shall also be subject to the provisions of the first and second rules, so long as such obligations correspond to debts specifically contracted with a direct or indirect guaranty of sugar mills or cane colonias or so long as they arise from supplies, crop loans, rents, or services owed by said mills; but the amount of annual payments which may be required of them, applicable first to interest and then to amortization of principal, shall be limited according to the following bases: * * *

Fourth. With reference to obligations proceeding or derived from the purchase of building lots on the instalment plan prior to August 15, 1934, whatever the principal may be, the amortization shall be carried out in 30 years, as an exception to the provisions in this regard contained in the first and second rules, which otherwise shall be applicable to them, and in no case shall interest be paid.

This rule shall apply only to lots the instalment price of which does not exceed 3,000 pesos.

Ninth. The obligations guaranteed by pledges up to September 4, 1937, can be redeemed only by the property specifically pledged in the contract, and personal action against the debtor or his guarantors is therefore prohibited.

Thirteenth: * * *

(c) Obligations of the state, province, and municipality as debtors; * * *

(e) Obligations contracted by public-service companies which have the function of distributing electric energy, gas, water, or telephone service, although as subsidiary organizations dependent upon them they have control over sugar mills or cane colonias.

The provisions of paragraph (e) of this rule with respect to public service companies shall not apply to companies with a capital of less than 100,000 pesos and which are not dependent, annexed to, or subsidiaries of, other enterprises.

Dominican Republic

[Population in 1937, 1,581,248. Area, 19,325 square miles]

Dollar debt, $15,594,000.

Not in default.

No other external obligations.

External public debt decreased from $16,320,000 in 1933 to $15,740,000 in 1937.

Internal debt decreased from $3,000,000 in 1933 to $2,600,000 in 1937.

Total direct dollar investment, $40,705,000.

Guatemala

[Population, estimated for 1937, 3,001,715. Area, 45,452 square miles]

Dollar debt:

(a) One publicly offered issue, with $1,326,000 outstanding.

(b) Two non-interest-bearing scrip issues of Guatemala and Los Altos totaling $28,120.

(c) Two issues privately held—the Los Altos Railway loans, totaling $1,538,000, and the match loan of 1930 for $2,460,484, or a grand total of $5,352,604.

Interest and sinking fund on these issues went into default between April 1932 and November 1933.

In addition to the foregoing dollar indebtedness, Guatemala has an external indebtedness of £1,490,620, also in default.

See table 5 for full depreciation figures of Guatemala's issues.

Guatemala's internal debt, funded and floating, decreased from 7,600,000 quetzales in 1933 to 4,600,000 quetzales in 1937. During the same time her external debt, funded and floating, decreased from 14,600,000 quetzales to 13,800,000 quetzales.

Total direct dollar investment, $50,387,000.

Haiti

[Population in 1936 estimated at about 3,000,000. Area estimated at 10,204 square miles]

Dollar debt:

Interest is being paid in full, but both issues are in default as to sinking fund. Official reports do not include a franc external indebtedness amounting to 26,934,000 francs, French loan of 1910. The Haitian Government called the entire issue for payment at par in 1923. It is understood 50,506 bonds have not been presented for payment.

Public debt of Haiti decreased from $12,166,000 in 1934 to $8,790,000 in 1938.

Total direct dollar investment, $9,671,000.

Mexico

[Population in 1930, 16,552,722. Area, 763,944 square miles]

Dollar debt of Mexico:

(a) One national issue of $37,037,500.

(b) Three state issues totaling $3,252,000.

(c) One issue of a corporation with a government guaranty of $21,877,100.

(d) Railways expropriated by the Mexican Government in 1937, totaling $211,529,454, or a grand total of $273,696,054.

Interest and sinking-fund defaults occurred in 1913, 1914, and 1919.

In addition to the foregoing foreign indebtedness, Mexico has an external indebtedness of £37,005,223; francs 263,891,790; marks 8,668,508.

Mexico's public external and internal debt increased from $338,700,000 in 1933 to $368,700,000 in 1936.

Total direct dollar investment, $479,465,000.

Mexican Government, since 1927, has been expropriating the larger land holdings.

Began in 1938 to expropriate foreign oil interests. Up to present time has expropriated holdings of about 17 corporations, the value of which runs into hundreds of millions of dollars.

Three years ago Mexican Government seized the 49-percent interest in the Mexican National Railway. The Mexican Government had owned 51 percent of it.

A dubious plan was provided for indemnifying parties from whom the 49 percent was taken. I understand no payments are being made under this plan.

Panama

[Population in 1930, excluding the Canal Zone, 467,459. Area, 32,380 square miles]

Dollar debt of Panama, total $17,757,315.

All the other issues except that of the city of Panama, which went into default as to interest in December 1936, have been in default since October and November 1932, and January, February, and May 1933.

Partial cash payments have been made on certain of the coupons of 5-percent bonds of the Republic due 1963 and certain coupons have received part cash and part scrip payments.

Panama public debt, external, internal, and guaranteed, decreased from $22,540,000 in 1932 to $22,346,000 in 1938.

Total direct-dollar investment, $26,688,000.

Peru

[Population, estimated in 1936 as 6,500,000. Area, 482,258 square miles]

Dollar debt of Peru.

(a) Three issues of Republic of Peru totaling $81,580,500.

(b) One issue of the Province of Callao in the amount of $1,189,000.

(c) One issue of the city of Lima for $2,887,000.

Grand total, $85,656,500.

Interest in default $36,415,827.

Grand total with interest $122,072,327.

Interest and sinking fund on all these issues went into default between April 1931 and March 1932.

In addition to the foregoing dollar indebtedness, Peru has an external sterling indebtedness of £3,720,900. Most of the sterling bonds have been in default during the same period as the dollar bonds. Some service was met on the sterling Guiana loan.

Despite economic improvement that has characterized the history of Peru during the last few years no payments have been made on the Peruvian dollar bonds other than the small unilateral payment offered on August 25, 1937, as reported in the Council's annual report for 1937. Despite this satisfactory economic position the Peruvian Government still continues in complete default on the dollar bonds. The British Guiana loan is being serviced at the rate of 4 percent interest and 2 percent amortization per annum.

Internal debt of Peru increased from $52,786,000 in 1934 to $57,353,000 in 1938.

During the same time external debt decreased from $126,834,000 to $110,589,000.

See table 5 for full depreciation of Peru's issues.

Total direct-dollar investment, $96,052,000.

El Salvador

[Population, estimated in 1939 as 1,459,594. Area, 34,126 square miles]

Dollar debt of El Salvador.

Including deferred interest, total, $12,112,485.

Interest and sinking fund defaulted on these bonds in July and August 1932 and January 1933.

Also, sterling issue, of which £853,140 is outstanding.

Except for one coupon on one issue no payments have been made on any of the Salvadoran bonds during the year. The council is continuing its efforts on behalf of the nondeposited bonds.

See table 5, which shows full depreciation figures of El Salvador's issue.

El Salvador's internal public debt decreased from $4,080,000 in 1934 to $2,074,000 in 1938.

During the same time her external debt decreased from $15,327,000 to $13,598,000.

Total direct dollar investment, $17,164,000.

Uruguay

[Population in 1938, 2,093,331. Area, 72,153 square miles]

Dollar debt of Uruguay:

(a) Eleven issues of the Republic of Uruguay, totaling $54,709,353.

(b) Two issues of city of Montevideo, totaling $1,994,500.

Grand total, $56,703,853.

Interest and sinking fund on all these issues went into default between December 1931 and January 1934.

"In addition to the foregoing dollar indebtedness, Uruguay has an external sterling indebtedness of £14,920,510 and a franc indebtedness of 118,603,000.

See table 5, which shows full depreciation of Uruguay's issues.

Uruguay's internal debt decreased from $134,039,000 in 1934 to $122,696,000 in 1938.

During the same time her external debt increased from $136,985,000 to $139,873,000.

Total direct dollar investment, $13,917,000.

It is my understanding Venezuela has no external public debt.

Honduras, Nicaragua, Paraguay, and Venezuela are not shown in the 1938 Foreign-Bond Holders Protective Council Report.

TABLE 1.—*United States investments in Latin America by types of investment and principal areas, end of 1939* [1]

[In millions of dollars]

Area	Direct investments	Portfolio investments	Short-term investments	Total
West Indies	752	84	----	----
Central America and Mexico	637	26	122	----
South America	1,574	939	----	----
Total	2,963	1,049	122	4,134

[1] Department of Commerce, released July 15, 1940.

Note that practically all the issues are government or guaranteed by the government.

TABLE 2.—*Estimated United States holdings of dollar bonds in Latin America, Dec. 31, 1939* [1]

[Par value, in millions of dollars]

Country	Government issues		Corporate issues		Total
	National	Provincial and municipal	Government guaranteed	Private	
West Indies:					
Cuba	64.8	0.2	----	1.4	66.4
Dominican Republic	7.3	----	----	----	7.3
Haiti	5.7	----	----	----	5.7
Central America:					
Costa Rica	8.0	----	----	----	8.0
Guatemala	1.6	----	1.2	----	2.8
Panama	10.5	.2	.5	----	11.3
Salvador	4.1	----	----	----	4.1
South America:					
Argentina	134.8	63.1	----	----	197.9
Bolivia	53.6	----	----	----	53.6
Brazil	122.1	127.9	21.2	2.0	273.2
Chile	113.8	11.5	66.2	----	191.5
Colombia	40.7	78.2	4.1	5.0	128.0
Peru	50.8	3.3	----	----	54.1
Uruguay	34.0	1.7	----	----	35.7
Total	651.9	286.1	93.2	8.4	1,039.6

[1] Department of Commerce release, May 26, 1940.

TABLE 3.—*Interest: Default status of foreign dollar bonds of Latin America, Dec. 31, 1939* [1]

[In millions of dollars]

Country	Issues not in default		Issues in default		Ratio of defaults to investments
	Original terms unchanged	Terms adjusted	Partial	Complete	
West Indies:					
Cuba	11.4	43.6	----	11.4	17.4
Dominican Republic	7.3	----	----	----	----
Haiti	5.7	----	----	----	----
Central America:					
Costa Rica	----	----	4.9	3.1	100.0
Guatemala	----	1.2	1.3	0.3	57.2
Panama	3.4	0.1	----	7.8	69.3
Salvador	----	----	----	4.1	100.0
South America:					
Argentina	144.7	43.0	4.3	5.9	5.1
Bolivia	----	----	----	53.6	100.0
Brazil	21.2	----	----	252.0	92.2
Chile	25.2	23.1	----	143.2	74.8
Colombia	13.2	----	----	114.8	89.6
Peru	----	----	----	54.1	100.0
Uruguay	0.1	31.9	----	3.7	10.4
Totals	232.2	142.9	10.5	654.0	----

[1] Department of Commerce release, May 26, 1940.

TABLE 4.—*Market value of foreign dollar bonds of the West Indies, Central and South America, as of Dec. 1, 1939* [1]

[Percent in par value]

Areas	Issues in default as to interest	Issues in default	All issues
West Indies	46.2	67.8	64.7
Central America	36.3	72.9	42.8
South America	13.7	66.7	30.9

[1] Department of Commerce Release, Dec. 1, 1940.

TABLE 5.—*Par and market value of estimated United States holdings of Latin American dollar bonds, Dec. 31, 1939*

[In millions of dollars]

Country	Par value [1]	Market value [2]	Percent of market value of par value
West Indies:			
Cuba	66.4	41.479	62.4
Dominican Republic	7.3	5.185	71.0
Haiti	5.7	4.668	81.9
Central America:			
Costa Rica	8.0	1.277	16.2
Guatemala	2.8	.831	29.6
Panama	11.3	8.613	76.2
Salvador	4.1	.479	11.9
South America:			
Argentina	197.9	151.692	76.6
Bolivia	53.6	.900	.016
Brazil	273.2	48.214	17.6
Chile	191.5	34.642	18.0
Colombia	128.0	32.348	25.2
Peru	54.1	4.855	.8
Uruguay	35.7	15.797	44.2
Total	1,039.6	350.980	33.7

[1] Department of Commerce release, May 26, 1940.
[2] Special data supplied me by Department of Commerce, Aug. 2, 1940.

Candidate Wendell Willkie Is Asked for "Information, Please"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JED JOHNSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 15, 1940

ARTICLE BY JAY FRANKLIN

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I submit a very timely and thought-provoking article by my friend, Jay Pranklin, well-known and widely read newspaper columnist, which appeared in the Washington Evening Star, August 12, 1940. The article is:

[From the Washington Evening Star of August 12, 1940]

WE THE PEOPLE—CANDIDATE WENDELL WILLKIE IS ASKED FOR "INFORMATION, PLEASE"

(By Jay Franklin)

DEAR MR. WILLKIE: There are certain questions which the American people would like to have you answer in your acceptance speech at Elwood. You have been publicized in radio and film as the man who knows all the answers in Information, Please! The mass of the people have not yet made up their minds about you, one way or the other, and have received the impression that you agree with President Roosevelt on foreign policy, with Secretary Hull on trade agreements, and with Henry Wallace on the farm-benefit program. If you are going to draw an issue against the New Deal, it must be on some other grounds than these policies which have been strenuously opposed by the party whose one-man leadership you have assumed since your march on Philadelphia last June.

Now the people want to hear your answers, so, to refresh your mind, I'll put the questions:

You have spoken of the need for the "decentralization of industry," both as an aid to national defense and as a spurt to industrial recovery.

1. Just how do you propose to accomplish this?

2. Have you assurances that the great American industrial empires, with their centralized financial control, will build plants in towns "like the towns scattered all over the State of Iowa"?

3. Just how do you propose to persuade industry to take such a step?

WHAT OF AID TO INDUSTRY?

4. Do you regard patriotism as sufficient motivation or do you feel that industry should be assured of a profit from such decentralization?

5. If industry refuses to fall in line with your proposal, how do you propose to effect it?

6. Do you regard financial assistance by the Government as necessary or even advisable?

7. Do you consider such Government aid, if needed, as "interference with business"? And, if given and accepted, would not such aid imply Government supervision and regulation of business?

8. Would you conscript industry as well as men in the formulation of an adequate national-defense program?

9. Do you regard the availability of cheap electric power as an essential of an adequate national-defense program?
10. If so, would you tap the unlimited sources of cheap electric power provided by T. V. A., Bonneville, Grand Coulee, and other public power developments?
11. Or would you prefer that power be supplied through private generating and distributing systems?
12. If so, how long would it take to make such power available to a decentralized industrial system, and would you propose a Government subsidy to make up the difference between private and public power rates?
13. Do you also advocate the decentralization of financial control of industry?

POSITION ON FOREIGN POLICIES

There are a number of other matters of national interest which you have mentioned, and there are many more that you have not mentioned. They give rise to such questions as these:
14. Just what is your position on international affairs?
15. Do you approve the President's foreign policy?
16. If not, wherein do you differ with him?
17. What do you believe will be the effect upon the political economy of the Western Hemisphere if Germany defeats Britain?
18. What steps do you propose the United States should take to meet that eventuality?
19. Would you favor an "appeasement" with a victorious Nazi Germany after the war?
20. Precisely what is your position with regard to compulsory military training?
21. Do you consider it incompatible with American tradition to train a civilian army in peacetime?
22. If not, just how much training do you consider sufficient and just what age groups should be affected?
23. If you propose to continue the New Deal's farm benefits agricultural program, as you have stated, just precisely what changes would you make in it and why?

WHICH ARE THE CANDY STICKS?

24. Just what concessions do you believe the Roosevelt administration's "candy-stock Government" has made in the last 8 years that should not have been made.
25. Do you regard social security as a "candy stick"?
26. The Wagner Labor Relations Act?
27. The Wage-Hour (Fair Labor Standards) Act?
28. The Security and Exchange Act?
29. The Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation?
30. The United States Housing Authority?
31. The Federal Housing Administration?
32. The Tennessee Valley Authority?
33. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation?
34. The Agricultural Adjustment Administration?
35. The Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation and its food-stamp plan?
36. The Electric Farm and Home Authority?
37. The Rural Electrification Administration?
38. The Civilian Conservation Corps?
39. Work Projects Administration?
40. If not these, precisely what "candy-stick concessions" has the New Deal made that you would not make?

Kentucky Leads in Per Capita Army Enlistments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEVERLY M. VINCENT

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 15, 1940

ARTICLE BY LORENZO MARTIN

Mr. VINCENT of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to call the attention of this House to the fact that Kentucky, during the last 6 months, has had the highest per capita voluntary enlistment in the United States Army of any State in the Union. Ranking seventeenth in population, Kentucky ranked fifth in Army enlistments during the first half of 1940, it is pointed out by Lorenzo Martin, Washington correspondent of the Louisville Times. I include Mr. Martin's article in the Louisville Times of August 12, 1940, which shows that if the per capita enlistments elsewhere had equaled the Kentucky figure, the total Army enlistment during the 6 months ending June 30, 1940, would have been almost double the actual figure, which was 74,579.

[From the Louisville Times of August 12, 1940]

STATE RANKS FIRST IN PER CAPITA ENLISTMENT—HAS VOLUNTEER FOR EVERY 856 POPULATION IN LAST 6 MONTHS

(By Lorenzo Martin)

WASHINGTON, August 12.—Kentucky had the highest per capita voluntary enlistment in the United States Army during the first 6 months of this year.

Analysis of figures compiled under direction of Maj. Gen. E. S. Adams, Adjutant General of the Army, shows Kentucky, seventh in population among the States, ranked fifth in number of voluntary enlistments.

Against Kentucky's 3,053 enlistments, Pennsylvania, second in population, enlisted 7,411; Texas, fifth in population, 6,648; New York, first in population, 5,471; North Carolina, twelfth in population, 3,442.

In per capita enlistment Kentucky ranks first with 1 enlistment for every 856 population. Texas was second with 1 enlistment for every 876 population, while Wyoming, second smallest State in population, ranked third with 1 enlistment for every 888 population. The population figures used are the 1930 census.

Of the three States in addition to Texas which reported higher total enlistments than Kentucky, but which, like Texas, had a smaller per capita enlistment than the Bluegrass State, North Carolina showed one enlistment for every 921 population; Pennsylvania, one enlistment for every 1,299 population; and New York, one enlistment for every 2,300 population.

In the last 6 months, therefore, as the war clouds have moved nearer to the United States, the Regular Army's enlistment laurels apparently have been won by Kentucky, with Texas a good second.

Total enlistments for the entire Nation during the last 6 months amounted to 74,579. If there had been the same per capita enlistment elsewhere that was reported in Kentucky, the total enlistment for the Nation would have been about double that figure, or, on the basis of the 1930 census, 143,428.

Foreign Policy Ad Lib

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 15, 1940

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the current issue of the Saturday Evening Post:

[From the Saturday Evening Post of August 17, 1940]

FOREIGN POLICY AD LIB

In the middle of the world, war to the left of it and war to the right of it, there is a rich country that casts abroad in all directions its likes and hatreds, its sudden thoughts and moral judgments, with neither the sword to make them good nor a mighty foreign policy.

What is the foreign policy of the United States?

We do not know. That could be ignorance. But as we read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD we discover that neither does the Congress know what it is, and we understand that the State Department gets it by revelation and is sure of nothing until it has received the latest daybreak inspiration from the White House. "United States foreign policy," writes a Washington correspondent innocently, "has been put on a 24-hour basis."

There was an American foreign policy, continuous from the beginning, deeply established in our national character, our sentiments, and our circumstances. Its four principal articles were clear and as well known in the world as the name we signed to them or the flag that waved over them.

The first was equal friendliness toward all, no meddling in the political affairs of other nations, and no alliances.

The second was freedom of the seas, with its implications of trade in the free way of trade, no favoritism, no discriminations; the open door.

The third was neutral rights above combatant rights, perfectly phrased by Jefferson, who said: "* * * when two nations go to war, those who choose to live in peace retain their natural right to pursue their agriculture, their manufactures, and other ordinary vocations; to carry the produce of their industry for exchange to all nations, belligerent or neutral, as usual."

The fourth was the Monroe Doctrine, which has been embedded in every international agreement made by or with the United States during more than 100 years. What it meant was that the will of the United States was law in this hemisphere. President Wilson said of it: "The Monroe Doctrine was proclaimed by the United States of America on her own authority. It always has been maintained and always will be maintained upon her own responsibility.

In brief, the Monroe Doctrine, backed by all the resources of the United States of America, says to all the rest of the world, 'Hands off the American Hemisphere.'"

What has happened to this old and sound design for living in the world is the material of current history.

The first thing was that, as the signs of a second world war became ominous, the peace-lovingness of the American character, together with the dread of becoming involved in another European conflict by emotional appeal, united to write and enact a neutrality law in which the two principles for which we had been heretofore willing to fight, and had fought, namely, freedom of the seas in time of war and the superiority of neutral rights, were both surrendered beforehand, on the ground that they were not worth war. This law forbade the sale of arms and ammunition to any belligerent, forbade American ships to enter war zones and forbade American citizens to travel where war was lest they should get themselves killed and so arouse the war passion in their countrymen.

Then it was said that we couldn't get into another European war if we wanted to. We had passed a law forbidding ourselves to do it.

Suddenly, when nobody was prepared for it, President Roosevelt proclaimed in a speech at Chicago that it was the duty of this country, owing to itself, to the world, and to civilization, to do something about the aggressor. With such a self-restraining law on our books, what was it we could do about the aggressor on other continents? The President's idea was that we could unite with the peace-loving nations of Europe, calling these the other democracies, to quarantine him. As to how this might be done there were no particulars. It was an idea only, and as such it did not very greatly intimidate the aggressor. In a contemptuous manner he went on building his war machine.

It was then that another article of our traditional foreign policy broke down. There was a call to moral indignation. The American Government, represented by the President himself, by members of his Cabinet, by the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate, and others, began to utter words of insult and abhorrence against the aggressor nations and their dictators, not only for what they had done but for what they were going to do and for their antidemocratic ideologies. If this was foreign policy it was inconsistent, to say only that of it. Germany, Italy, and Japan were denounced, but Russia was not, because the Roosevelt administration had embraced Russia; and in Asia, even as we denounced Japan for what she was doing to China, we went on arming her for profit. What policy is there?

Gradually the aggressor as a plural image became singular. There was one aggressor above all. His name was Hitler. And the whole world understood that President Roosevelt meant Hitler when he said in his message to Congress, in January 1939, that where words had been powerless to stop the aggressor there were yet ways more effective than words to do it—measures short of war.

Stop Hitler by measures short of war. That was to be the theme of American foreign policy thereafter, and it was theme enough, but it swelled. Several months before the war began the President moved with all his strength to induce Congress to change that self-restraining neutrality law in a way to give him unlimited command of the economic resources of the country in support of his foreign policy, whatever that might be.

This the Congress at first refused to do, and was about to adjourn without doing it, when, on July 4, 1939, at Hyde Park, the President informed the newspaper correspondents (New York Times, July 5) that "Prevention of war in all parts of the world was the first policy of his administration," and that that was why he was demanding that the neutrality law be changed "to give the Executive a free hand to determine when and to what countries American materials of war could be shipped."

So was the foreign policy of the United States disclosed in full splendor. It was not only to stop Hitler, not only to save the forms of Old World democracy from the German system; it was to banish war from the whole world—presumably still by measures short of war. Whether we should agree with it or not, we concede that this might well be the zenith of all foreign policy. But was it policy, in common sense? What had we behind it?

At that question the daybreak dream is shattered. In case the aggressor declared war upon us we were unprepared to fight. Moreover, as it turned out, measures short of war to the utmost, even free and unlimited access to this country's economic resources by the Allies, could not have altered the event in the least. There was not time.

After the war started, the neutrality law was changed. The Allies were free to buy anything they wanted here, and they had accumulated in this country a war chest of billions to buy with; but they couldn't spend the money in time. Seeing this, the President, on his own responsibility and in violation of international conventions to which we were bound by signature, opened the American arsenals to the Allies; and it availed nothing but to increase the aggressor's contempt.

We have now a letter from Secretary Ickes in which he blames us severely for an editorial entitled "And They Were Unprepared," printed June 22. It was unfair, he thinks, because, for one thing, we did not say, as Mr. Ickes says, "It was the Republican Party that systematically blocked defense measures in Congress." It follows from this that the Republicans were to blame for the country's shocking state of unpreparedness; it was their fault, not the President's, that he was caught bluffing with an empty gun.

We waive that dispute. If the country was unprepared, that was a fact. If the President was unable to persuade it to prepare adequately, that also was a fact. Given these two facts, any high-school essayist on foreign policy would know better than to insult, threaten, and provoke on one side the most powerful and fanatical aggressor of modern times, and on the other side the Japanese at the same time, and at last actually to intervene in the conflict with futile measures.

We suppose there is one standard by which all foreign policy must be judged. Does it increase the national security and promote the national well-being? Here we care to say only that we wish the answer to that question were not already so positive, to say nothing of all that may be yet to come.

In a world of new omens we are adrift in a perilous way. The sound old foreign policy by which we steered has been forsaken or stultified, save until the very last the Monroe Doctrine, and now something has happened to that.

Fearful that certain areas pertaining to this hemisphere that had belonged by very old right to European nations now conquered by Hitler, especially some islands in the Caribbean Sea, might pass to the hostile German system, the Congress reaffirmed the Monroe Doctrine with a resolution saying the United States would not permit any geographic region of the American hemisphere to be transferred from one non-American power to another non-American power, as, for example, the island of Martinique from France to Germany. The State Department served notice accordingly upon the powers of Europe, including Germany.

Hitler's reply was to say, in effect: What of your Monroe Doctrine and why bring it up? You meddle in Europe, don't you?

To this studied Germany impudicity the State Department had no ready answer and so decided to say nothing. The foreign policy of the United States had not been slapped. It had only received what in our exquisite vernacular we call the raspberry.

However, this created a situation that seemed to demand another idea to astonish the world. The President had it. On a Saturday morning at Hyde Park he sent his private secretary forth to impart it to the amazed newspaper correspondents.

It was an idea for rearranging the political geography of the world by means of three Monroe Doctrines—one for Europe, one for Asia, and our own. In Europe, let the European nations decide for themselves what disposition to make of their unfastened possessions, and in Asia let the Asiatic nations decide, just as in the American hemisphere the Pan American Nations all together were going to decide what should be done with the islands and areas hereabouts that Hitler might claim by virtue of having conquered the European nations that owned them.

No such interpretation of the Monroe Doctrine had ever been imagined before, nor had any reinterpretation of it been thought possible. The Congress by formal resolution and the State Department in a note to the powers of the world had just been emphasizing again the defensive character of the Monroe Doctrine and that it was vital to the peace and security of the United States. If that were true, how in any case could the operation of it be left to a congress of Pan American Nations in which the United States would have 1 vote in 21? Or would it? Or what? Suppose a Latin American country should go German?

This weird and reckless balloon ride in the firmament of world diplomacy had better be forgotten, Europe and Asia permitting. What concerns us here is the light in which it leaves us revealed to ourselves. Even as to Latin America we have no foreign policy that has been thought through to the first premise.

It is most exciting, and we dare say it is perfectly suited to the President's temperament, to extemporize for this great country day by day a foreign policy, to ad lib it, as the actors say; but in a time of awful events it is also very dangerous. It is dangerous, firstly, because we are facing an aggressor who knows what he wants and pursues it in a resolute manner by plan. It is dangerous, secondly, because a foreign policy is not in itself a design, nor a game. It proceeds, or should proceed, from the national design. It should be a statement to the world of what a nation is, where it is going, how it will live, and what it will fight for. This means that unless a nation has a definite, steadfast, unmistakable foreign policy, intelligible to itself, it will be unable to formulate a sound policy of national defense. It cannot be sure of what it is doing. It will not know beforehand what it is going to defend, or why, or whether it is going to be worth what it will cost. And that is the crucial matter—the problem of national defense.

Compulsory Military Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. KUNKEL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 15, 1940

LETTER FROM DR. ALTON M. MOTTER

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, some days ago I received a letter from Dr. Alton M. Motter on the subject of the peacetime military-conscription bill. This letter is, in my opinion,

one of the best, most concise and most thoughtful expositions of the reasons against conscription that I have heard or read. For that reason, I ask permission to include it in the RECORD as part of my remarks.

My inclusion of this letter is not intended to indicate my opposition to conscription at this time; only my awareness of its dangers and evils. I am still studying the question and waiting to see the final form of the proposal which we will be called upon to approve or disapprove. My ultimate decision will rest upon whether I feel that the bill as presented to Congress is reasonably necessary in order to provide our Nation with a completely adequate defense against aggression by any nations which might seek to attack us and destroy our American way of life.

THE EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN CHURCH OF THE REDEEMER,
Harrisburg, Pa., July 31, 1940.

The Honorable JOHN C. KUNKEL,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN KUNKEL: For some days I have studied the Burke-Wadsworth conscription bill with much interest as reported by the press. Will you kindly send me a copy of the bill as soon as it is reported out of the Military Affairs Committee of the Senate in order that I may have a first-hand copy for further study? I will also appreciate your reaction to this bill.

In my own thinking, this is the most dangerous piece of legislation ever proposed before our American Congress during any period of peace within our own Nation. If it comes to the House, I sincerely hope that your vote will be against it.

The greatest long-range danger in the bill is the militarization of the American mind. As a matter of fact, this seems to be one of the purposes of those favoring the bill. The press reports Col. Henry L. Stimson testifying on July 2 that he supports military conscription not for its military value but for its propaganda value to arouse America. Mr. KUNKEL, this is nothing more nor less than the prostitution of democracy. To conscript 42,000,000 men between the ages of 18 and 65 as a propaganda step is the highest insult to America's intelligence that I can recall in my lifetime. The question naturally must be raised: If we must conscript manpower to support our Government's policies, then is it not possible that something is wrong with those policies?

The military value of conscription is seriously questioned by Maj. George F. Eliot in the July 2 issue of the New York Herald Tribune. Major Eliot points the new direction modern warfare is taking by quoting Col. Oliver L. Spaulding in his volume, The United States Army in War and Peace, as follows: "The most evident tendencies that may lead to a change are to be found in the increasing use of mechanical power. The airplane, the armored car, the tank, even the humble motor truck, are increasing the complication of operations and their speed. * * * There are indications that the use of power may enable fewer and smaller troop units to do the work of the many larger ones which we now plan to use." Major Eliot continues: "This is not to be achieved by half-trained troops. It was the misfortune of France that the decisive German blow on the Meuse fell upon the French Ninth Army, composed largely of reservists who had had only 1 year's training. * * * If this bill were to be enacted into law, the average American would immediately begin to delude himself with visions of a great army which would give us complete security. In fact, there would be no security; there would be only masses of partially trained men whom we could not arm, equip, or provide leadership for any reasonable time, and if we tried to do so, we would inevitably fatally handicap other elements of our defense forces which are of even greater importance."

The question is raised—"conscription, but conscription for what purpose?" Here, again, Major Eliot, perhaps unconsciously, states his conviction as to our own genuine need for a conscripted army: "A vast universal-service army can be really useful to us only if we are again to undertake large-scale operations in Europe or Asia (in which case we shall have time to create it) or if we are foolish enough to scatter our effort and our resources over too wide a field. * * *" He concludes with this statement: "The lessons of military history must be applied to present conditions, not confined within the rigid limits of outworn conceptions or outmoded legislation."

Mr. KUNKEL, if we need a large conscripted army only for military operations in Europe or Asia, is it the will of the American people that such an army be raised?

The more reasonable course would seem to be to develop not so much a huge army as a good army; not so much to give training to great masses of men—training which is in reality inadequate and which would send them forth to battle unprepared as to develop units of expert troops who are living in 1940—not 1861 or even 1921.

This would seem to be the way of even hard-boiled military sense. ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, JR., in an editorial in the Progressive of July 27, writes: "The power age has changed warfare. One does not have to be an expert to see that huge armies partially trained are a snare and a delusion. The war of movement by great masses of troops is finished. Tanks, airplanes, bombs, and motorized manpower have taken their place. This was proven in France. Most competent critics are agreed that the great masses of foot soldiers in that stricken country were a hindrance rather than an asset when the comparatively small hard-hitting German mechanized divisions swept through the low countries and France itself."

An even more convincing case is made by Hanson W. Baldwin in the current issue of Harper's Magazine. This military expert for the New York Times deals (pp. 236 to 238) with the kind of an army we need now and why the conscription bill should not be passed.

So far, I have talked mostly about the military aspects of this bill. I have done so knowing that in these days of war hysteria only cold-blooded military logic will be of any avail. But as a Christian pastor, I am much more concerned about the effects a conscription law would have upon American spiritual life. To militarize the manhood of America—which is apparently the chief aim of the bill—would be to set the clock of Christian teaching back a hundred years or more in this country. I say that because the military method is not the method of Christ or the followers of Christ, in the settlement of differences which may exist with those of another nation. When the military method—i. e., the method which depends on brute power and brute power alone—grows, then the chances for the peaceful settlement of disputes diminish. We talk about our good-neighbor policy now, but if we conscript American manhood for a single decade the expression will be completely omitted not only from our State Department but from the thinking of our people as well. To me, this is deeply tragic, for this is the way which has led to the downfall of every great nation in the past. These words of Jesus seem eternally true: "He that takes the sword shall perish with the sword." I suppose they are true because when we "take the sword" our faith and trust go to the sword rather than to processes of good will in our relationship with other peoples. And because the method of the sword is dependent upon hate and greed and selfishness it is eventually destroyed by another sword. And so, on and on.

Naturally, I also feel very deeply that such a law would be deeply contrary to true American democracy. Conscription is the seizure of a man's body, time, and service by force under threat of heavy penalty. While some say this is equality, I am afraid it is the equality which prevails among regimented galley slaves and is no more democratic than any other form of involuntary servitude.

While we used the conscription method in 1917 and 1918 for the first time on a universal basis, it is pointed out that this would not have been necessary if we had been raising a force for the defense of our territory rather than an army of 5,000,000 men for service in Europe.

Nor do I think it is necessary to be used today—in a time of peace—to defend the United States of America. The plan savors more of the Nazi policies of Germany than anything America has ever seen. Are democratic methods so hopeless that regimentation is necessary? To agree with that would be to confess that American people have grown decadent and that they must be conscripted to prepare for the possible task of defending their country.

I refuse to believe this. American youth are refusing to volunteer mainly because of dagger-waving speeches which will cost them their blood on the battlefields of Europe or Asia for the defense of European imperialisms, not for the defense of America or even yet of democracy.

Thanking you for your fair consideration of those proposals aimed to keep this country out of war and for your own deep-seated interest in keeping the long-range welfare of our country in first place, I am,

Most sincerely,

ALTON M. MOTTER, *Pastor.*

States' Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM P. LAMBERTSON
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 15, 1940

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, on the 10th day of last June, President Roosevelt vetoed the bill to provide for intervention by States in certain cases involving the validity of any power by the United States, or any agency thereof.

This was a States' rights bill.

On last Monday, August 5, this House passed the bill over the President's veto by the overwhelming vote of 253 to 46.

In the debate the able and distinguished gentleman from Alabama, Judge HOBBS, pleaded for the passage of the bill "in the name of justice, in the name of statehood, in the name of that theory of States' rights which has been proclaimed

in every lawbook in which there appears a Supreme Court decision on the subject, and thereby give to the States the rights therein provided." Mr. Speaker, if there is one State in the Union more than another that stands for and has always advocated States' rights as a fundamental and cardinal doctrine and principle in our form of government, it is the old Free State of Maryland.

That State has unswervingly exemplified and adhered to that principle throughout its colonial and constitutional history. It has resented any encroachment upon its sovereignty from without and has insisted upon its rights. It is recent history that when President Roosevelt undertook to purge a Maryland Senator because of his opposition to certain New Deal policies, chiefly his Court-packing scheme, and to interfere in an election with the free exercise of their right to manage their own affairs, the people of Maryland rose in their indignant might and repudiated such interference.

And so has it always been. The love of freedom and of home rule is inherent in the citizens of that old Free State. The principle of States' rights therein is bred in the bone and is of the warp and woof of its citizenry.

I was not surprised, therefore, upon an examination of the vote to pass the Satterfield bill over the President's veto that four of Maryland's Representatives in the House, namely, Messrs. COLE, D'ALESANDRO, KENNEDY, and WARD, were true to the Maryland tradition and principle of States' rights and voted to override the veto.

But I was also surprised to find that one member of the Maryland delegation, Mr. BYRON, of the Sixth Congressional District, was one of the 46 Members who voted against the bill. The gentleman from Maryland, Mr. BYRON, did not speak on the bill. I am therefore at a loss to know for what reason he departed from the time-honored principle of States' rights, so characteristic of Maryland freemen, unless it was through ignorance of that principle, or else his forgetfulness of it in a desire to uphold the objections of a Chief Executive whose attempt to purge a Maryland Senator was frustrated by the good people of the gentleman's own State.

I am wondering what reason or excuse the gentleman will give to the people of the Sixth Congressional District of Maryland for having voted for a bill of such vital interest to the people of that State in their relationship to the Federal Government and how he will undertake to reconcile his position against the bill in the face of its support by his four colleagues who voted for it.

Of course, the gentleman exercised his right to vote as he pleased, but I think he will have a lot of explaining to do.

In the coming campaign the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. BYRON] will have as his opponent for a seat in this House the national and favorably known candidate, my friend, Walter Johnson, a man of impeccable character as a citizen and as a successful dirt farmer in Montgomery County, Md., an example to the youth of this country of the value of thrift and clean living.

I doubt not that if Mr. Johnson had been a Member of the House on last Monday he would have voted with his four Democratic colleagues from Maryland to sustain the principle of States' rights so dear to the hearts of the people of that great State.

Mr. Speaker, under the leave granted by the House, I insert the following editorial from the Washington Post of August 7, entitled "Unreasonable Veto," in which it will be noted that it advocates passage of the bill in question by the Senate "so that the States may have an unquestioned right to lay their arguments, in constitutional disputes involving their powers, before the Federal courts":

[From the Washington Post of August 7, 1940]

UNREASONABLE VETO

In the excitement over war in Europe and national defense in this country a recent Presidential veto of an important bill passed almost without notice. To the credit of the House, it reverted to that issue on Monday and repassed the bill over Mr. Roosevelt's veto by a vote of 253 to 46.

Three years ago Congress was much concerned by the problem of threshing out constitutional issues in the courts. It properly decided that the Federal Government should have the right to intervene in lawsuits involving the validity of acts of Congress. Moreover, it permitted direct appeals to the Supreme Court in disputes of this character to which the United States is a party.

There is no question now as to the wisdom of that action. Congress has merely taken note of the fact that the States as well as the Federal Government have vital interests in lawsuits in which the powers of their respective governments are involved. Representative SATTERFIELD told the House that in nearly all the major cases establishing precedents for the exercise of National or State authority the States have not been parties to the litigation.

The House insists that the States should have the same rights to intervene to protect their constitutional powers against encroachment as has the Federal Government. It is difficult to see how there can be any reasonable dissent from that view. According to Congressman HOBBS, the bill was amended before its original passage to meet every objection raised by the Department of Justice and other Federal agencies.

The Post does not attempt to pass judgment upon the technical details of this bill. It is clear, however, that few Members of the House—a body in which the legal profession is abundantly represented—found merit in the President's veto message. Unless the Senate discovers defects justifying the substitution of another bill, it should also override the veto so that the States may have an unquestioned right to lay their arguments, in constitutional disputes involving their powers, before the Federal courts.

New Deal Preparedness for Coming Election

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 15, 1940

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the administration is very gently easing out the news to the Nation that W. P. A. jobs are about to increase again.

The answer is that this is a campaign year. Despite the fact that this increase in W. P. A. jobs will come at a time when a rise in the activity of industry is already under way does not appear to bother the New Deal bureaucrats who have long since, apparently, come to regard W. P. A. as the happy hunting ground of the politicians.

In the smoke screen of war fears and national defense hysteria that has been created by the administration, relief has been relegated to the background of public thinking. And yet this Congress has appropriated $975,000,000 to support W. P. A. this year, with the provision that this sum of money may be spent in 8 instead of 12 months. Signs are accumulating that this money will be spent in the shorter period, which means that expenditures for relief will be as great as they were last year.

Recently the gentleman from Michigan, Representative PAUL W. SHAFER, of the Third Michigan District, revealed to the House of Representatives figures showing a startling increase in the printing of blank relief checks and food stamps by the Bureau of Engraving and Printing. Within a week, Representative SHAFER disclosed, orders for 10,000,000 blank relief checks were received by the Bureau of Engraving and Printing. This was more blank checks than had been printed by the Bureau in the last 9 months. Three million of these checks were printed for use in Minnesota, whose Governor is Harold E. Stassen. Other blank checks were for use in Illinois, New York, Michigan, and other key political States. More food stamps were shipped out in 3 days recently from the Bureau of Engraving and Printing than had been shipped out in the entire history of the food-stamp plan. The supply went to Brooklyn, Minneapolis, Cleveland, and other politically strategic centers.

The administration claims, of course, that the W. P. A. is not affected by the armament program or national-defense activities, although it is very difficult to see why this is so. It does remain a fact, however, that the past record of the New Deal administration discloses the reason why the relief rolls will rise again during this campaign. In the past, Federal relief rolls have greatly increased from June through October in each election year, while they have declined in the same period in nonelection years.

In 1933, a nonelection year, the number of persons on Federal relief declined 15.4 percent during those months, although the index of industrial production, reflecting employment, had also declined 16.5 percent in that period. Yet in the election year of 1934 the number of persons on Federal relief increased 11.6 percent from June through October.

In 1935, a nonelection year, the Federal relief rolls showed a decline of 9.6 percent from June through October; but in 1936, an election year, the Federal relief rolls increased 14.4 percent, although unemployment in that period had been reduced 13 percent.

In 1937, when there was no election, the Federal relief rolls showed a decline of 16.9 percent from June through October, although the index of industrial production also declined 10.5 percent in that period.

In 1938, an election year, the Federal relief rolls showed an increase of 19.2 percent, although unemployment declined 9 percent from June to October of that year. In 1939, when there was no election, the number on relief declined 25.5 percent for the months preceding the usual election date.

So it is not surprising that in this campaign year we should again be told that the relief rolls are going to rise although industrial activity has risen very greatly. It is easy enough for the bureaucrats to find excuses to show why the activities of industry in national defense are not relieving unemployment. The bureaucrats claim, of course, that the effect of these huge expenditures will not be felt for a year or two. They also claim that most of the workers on relief are unskilled labor and the demand in national defense is for skilled labor. And so the story goes. But the glaring fact remains that ever since the New Deal administration has been in power the relief rolls have risen in election periods and have declined in nonelection periods. Harry Hopkins, former W. P. A. administrator and one of the managers of Mr. Roosevelt's third-term campaign, as well as Secretary of Commerce, gave the blunt answer when he said in a press conference on July 21, 1938:

> We got about 3,000,000 people working for us, and they are Americans like ourselves, and no one can tell them how to vote * * * they have their own political views, and incidentally I think I know what their views are. * * * At least 90 percent of them are for Roosevelt.

The Outstanding Record of Achievement in Promotion of Industrial Peace in the United States, Under the National Labor Relations Act, Challenges Comparison

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABE MURDOCK

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 15, 1940

ADDRESS BY J. WARREN MADDEN, CHAIRMAN, NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD, AND A PRESS RELEASE BY THE BOARD

Mr. MURDOCK of Utah. Mr. Speaker, for 5 years now we have had the National Labor Relations Act on the statute books of the National Government. Notwithstanding the fact that 2 years of that time passed under the misconceived and misguided opinion of a large number of Liberty League lawyers that the law was unconstitutional, greater strides toward the goal of industrial contentment and peace have been made in these 5 years than in our entire previous history as a nation. Having supported the act and having kept in close touch with the achievements under it, I take pleasure today in submitting, for your consideration, a speech made by the Chairman of the National Labor Relations Board, Hon. J. Warren Madden, over the National Broadcasting Co. network, on July 5, 1940, and a press release from the Board, covering its work under the act, dated August 8, 1940:

LABOR AND NATIONAL DEFENSE

Five years ago today President Roosevelt signed the National Labor Relations Act. Today, then, is the anniversary of our national determination to accord to workmen of America the rights of citizenship in an industrial democracy. That is to say that those who tool and tend machines, those who dig and fabricate metals, those who spin, weave, mold, rivet, and assemble the articles of our daily use and enjoyment shall have a collective voice in negotiating the terms of their employment.

Five years ago collective bargaining was largely a pious theory, granted under pressures to those relatively few organizations of workers strong enough to insist upon it. Today it has been accepted by the great majority of employers who in 1935 rejected and fought it.

This is a change which needs appraisal. We are embarked as a Nation on a program of national defense. Government determines the measures of defense. Employers accept the responsibility of production. It is the millions of workers whose trained hands produce the actual products. It is essential that the relationship between employers and employees be a just one.

There are only two choices. Either the employer shall name the terms upon which he shall let men work for him, or else those terms shall be the result of bargaining between the employer and the representatives of his employees. At this moment of resurgence of national energy in production it is well to look to the experience of the past to see whether on July 5, 1935, we chose wisely in promoting the procedure of collective bargaining under the National Labor Relations Act.

The search for a parallel situation leads us at once to the intense preparation program pursued 23 years ago after the declaration of war on April 4, 1917. We were not, at that time, geared to produce goods adequate for the emergency need. We were in danger of the unrest which ferments when unorganized workers seek to fit their individual needs to fast-changing industrial conditions. Let me illustrate. The government of Woodrow Wilson said that ships must be built quickly and in quantity. Contracts were awarded. Shipyards sprang up on rivers that had not seen the laying of a keel since clipper days. Workmen gathered outside the new shipyard gates, the skilled and the unskilled, the unemployed, and the employed who hoped to better their wages. Such an unorganized labor market is no boon to an employer. Restless men come and go, and the cost of the turn-over is assessed on those who stay. There is no economy in this. It merely means chaos for the employer, for the worker, and for the Government whose need they jointly serve.

The Nation soon found this out in 1917. A shipbuilding labor adjustment board was established in August of that year to achieve uniform wage scales, to adjust wages to meet the increasing cost of living, to organize shop committees of workmen, to settle grievances—to do everything in fact which organized labor and organized employers achieve when they meet in good will across the bargaining table.

Shipbuilding, I have used as an example. Before the World War was over the unrest of the unorganized in other vital industries led to the establishment of adjustment boards for labor relations on the docks, on ships, on railways, in the fuel, clothing, food, packinghouse, and construction industries.

Piecemeal the labor adjustment boards served well the national cause in 1917 and 1918. Of more over-all importance was the National War Labor Board, contrived at the initial suggestion of employers to safeguard production by relieving employee unrest. This is the first clause in the statement of War Labor Board policy:

"The right of workers to organize in trade-unions and to bargain collectively, through chosen representatives, is recognized and affirmed. This right shall not be denied, abridged, or interfered with by the employers in any manner whatsoever."

If those words are familiar to you, it is because they were embodied almost verbatim in the National Labor Relations Act which President Roosevelt signed 5 years ago today. These words have not lost their validity. In fact it is to be regretted that a Federal law to protect collective bargaining was not passed immediately after the 1918 armistice. To remind you what informed people were thinking in 1918, I quote a public statement made shortly after the armistice by Charles Evans Hughes, who said:

"I trust there will be no more struggles in futile opposition to the right of collective bargaining on the part of employees. The recognition of the right of representation and the prompt hearing of grievances provide the open doors to reasonable and just settlements. And in returning to peace conditions there should be the utmost care to preserve every possible means which has been found helpful during the war for the investigation of the complaints of labor and for the adjustments of demands."

This expectation of the present Chief Justice was to be almost immediately disappointed. No sooner had the protecting hand of government been lifted than employers refused to recognize the unions with whom they had been dealing. The door of the bargaining room was locked. The channels for grievances were destroyed. Disappointed workers laid down their tools to force from employers rights which the law no longer accorded them. In 1919 half a million coal miners and about 400,000 steel workers struck and were beaten to their knees. A victorious Nation, whose employees and employers only a year before had worked in amity for national security, relapsed into savage industrial warfare. The year 1919 saw more than 4,000,000 workers on strike,

the greatest number in our history, with a billion dollars lost in wages and property, and an incalculable destruction of the good will and stability which might have flowed from the collective-bargaining procedure during the decade ahead.

Industrial management in the 1920's engrossed its energies in corporate consolidations and the application of new techniques to mass production. The 1920's learned how to produce, advertise, and sell in the grand manner, but not how to govern human relationships in industry. That problem was left to the 1930's. Exactly in the middle of that decade your Government, distressed by endless strikes by workers seeking to enforce collective bargaining on unwilling employers, decided to abandon half-way measures and to give full protection to that procedure under the National Labor Relations Act.

I have not time to review the first 5 years of attacks upon the act, the injunction suits, the refusals to comply with the law, the review of Board rulings in the courts, the split in labor's own ranks, the conscious distortion of the act's aims, and what has amounted to a boycott on the facts which show its gradual acceptance as a wise working principle in American industrial life.

If today at last we have truly set our eyes upon industrial democracy, as we did briefly in 1917 and 1918, we have present reason to believe we shall not again relapse as a Nation into industrial savagery. The times call upon us for cooperation of men and management. The intensity of preparation for national security again will require that the hand of Government will protect collective bargaining. Most hopeful of all is the fact that the contractual relationship between strong unions and strong employers has gained more ground during the past few years than you probably realize.

Five years ago there were few if any labor agreements in many of our basic defense industries. Today 600 iron and steel companies employing 550,000 steel workers are under union agreements, 70 agreements have been written to cover about 50,000 rubbers workers, the automobile industry has binding agreements between 340 companies and 400,000 union members, the electrical industry has more than 600 labor agreements. Written agreements, renewed year after year, apply in the majority of the Nation's machine shops. Rail and water transport and the longshoremen who serve the ships are almost entirely covered by agreements. Soft coal mining is entirely organized and petroleum production partially.

Why during the past 5 years has the written agreement made such headway. The answer is that these contracts have earned their salt. They have decreased employment turn-over, increased stability of production, placed responsibilities on union shop stewards instead of on armed company guards, and have accorded workmen that independence as men which alone can assure loyalty to any enterprise. It is my guess that employers who have lived a year or two under written labor agreements would not go back to the open shop if they could.

A nation anxious for its security should be grateful for the new order that has found roots in American industry. We at the Labor Board have watched fear and labor-spy ridden industrial towns change to self-respecting communities as soon as the employer's supposed need to govern by force was relieved by open negotiations with his workers. We have watched the initial warfare continue sporadically even after recognition of a union, until time and responsibility ripened the relationship into an understanding between industrially mature men. We have reason at the Labor Board, because we have been close to what has happened, to believe that American workmen have courage and fairness and a will to contribute to the common good.

If you are concerned with the possibility of strikes interrupting defense preparations, let me assure you that the trend of strikes has been sharply downward since workmen have been allowed to organize. In the year 1937 the National Labor Relations Act was upheld as constitutional by the Supreme Court. During the next year strikes declined 42 percent, and during last year, 1939, strikes were 45 percent lower than in 1937.

Now consider these declines in some of the basic industries. We find that the number of iron and steel workers on strike declined 84 percent in 1938 and 92 percent in 1939, as compared to 1937; in nonferrous metals the decline was 73 and 79 percent. Similar decreases in the number of men on strike appear in textiles, in rubber, in machinery manufacturing, in transportation and communication, in lumber, and in marine transportation. The industries which ran counter to this improving trend were few and relatively unimportant.

Upon this record I confidently assert that the protection of the rights of workmen under the National Labor Relations Act has fostered a procedure which permits men and management the widest scope for cooperative adjustment of the thousand and one problems which plague every industrial enterprise. The problems are inherent. The cure must be of man's invention; and there the choice seems to lie between an autocratic control of industry and the usages of democracy.

During the past 5 years it has required the handling of 27,000 cases, the conduct of thousands of hearings and elections, and the pleading of hundreds of cases in court in order to establish compliance with the National Labor Relations Act. In another 5 years, if rights of workmen to organize and bargain collectively make comparable gains in industrial practice, the function of the National Labor Relations Board will be reduced to that of a routine traffic officer. On this, its fifth birthday, my best wish for the act is its decreasing need as an instrument to bring together employers and employees in democratic adjustment of their mutual problems.

Disputes Drop Despite Industrial Upswings

Industrial disputes remain at low levels despite increased industrial activity, the National Labor Relations Board announced today.

Comparison of the 2 fiscal years of 1936–37 and 1939–40, representing approximately equal levels of industrial activity, reveals that industrial strife has been greatly reduced, it was pointed out.

The Federal Reserve production index registered 114 during the fiscal year ending 1937, as compared with 111 during 1940.

However, during the two periods, respectively, the total of strikes numbered 3,840 and 2,147, a drop of 44 percent.

Workers involved dropped from 1,743,192 to 641,933, or 63.2 percent. Man-days of idleness fell from 26,998,000 to 9,077,000, or 66.4 percent.

Comparison confined to strikes for recognition and against discrimination, involving matters directly concerning the National Labor Relations Act, reveal similar declines during the two periods under review, it was pointed out.

Between the two 9-month periods—July 1936–March 1937 and July 1939–March 1940—the number of such strikes declined by 43 percent; and in terms of number of workers the decline was 73 percent. During the former period recognition and discrimination strikes represented 42 percent of all strikes; during the latter period the proportion fell to 32 percent. In terms of number of workers involved the percent declined from 54 to 25 percent. (Detailed data on recognition and discrimination strikes are available only up to March 1940.)

"Although the sharp decline in industrial strife since 1936–37, when industrial production almost reached the 1929 level, may be variously attributed, there is no doubt that a major factor has been the growth of labor organization and extension of collective bargaining in recent years, arising largely out of the existence and administration of the act," Chairman J. Warren Madden said, in commenting upon the figures. "Economic factors, such as relative stability of cost of living and maintenance of wage rates during the 1938 recession also had some influence."

"This sharp decline in industrial strife between periods of comparable industrial activity," he added, "would seem to indicate that a good part of the readjustments in industry accompanying enforcement of the act have been accomplished, thus making probable relative peace and stability in industrial relations during the coming period. Also, this decline in strike activity, together with the wide-spread increase in written trade agreements providing machinery for adjustment of disputes, should facilitate realization of our national-defense objectives."

At the same time the Board released its monthly summary showing that since the start of operations in the fall of 1935 it had averted and settled 2,949 strikes involving 471,075 workers.

The data showing Board activities up to July 1, 1940, follows:

N. L. R. B. Handled 28,661 Cases to July 1, 1940, Involving 6,233,319 Workers

A total of 28,661 cases has been handled by the Board. This figure includes action on charges of unfair labor practices and petitions for elections received by the Board and its 22 regional offices. The cases involved 6,233,319 workers.

The data show Board activities up to July 1, 1940. During June 529 new cases arose, involving 85,726 workers, as against 577 new cases during the previous month, involving 103,759 workers.

Of the 529 cases filed during June, 242 cases, involving 25,183 workers, were filed by A. F. of L. unions. C. I. O. affiliates filed 193 cases, involving 33,224 workers. Unaffiliated unions and individuals filed 90 cases, involving 26,933 workers, and in 4 cases, involving 386 workers, employers filed petitions.

The Board announced that 25,608 of the cases handled, or about 89 percent, have been closed, leaving 3,053 cases pending on July 1.

Of these 25,608 cases, 12,309, or 48 percent, were closed by agreement of both parties, involving 2,006,495 workers.

Four thousand three hundred and thirty-one, or 17 percent, involving 1,145,159 workers, were dismissed by the Board and regional directors.

Six thousand nine hundred and seventy cases, or 27 percent, involving 1,301,268 workers, were withdrawn.

One thousand nine hundred and ninety-eight cases, or 8 percent, involving 684,966 workers, were closed in some other way, including compliance with the Board's decisions and trial examiners' intermediate reports, certification after elections, refusal by Board to certify, intermediate report finding no violations, transfer to other agencies, such as the Conciliation Service of the Department of Labor and State labor relations boards, and by the issuance of cease and desist orders.

Of a total of 2,806 strike cases handled, involving 445,518 workers, 2,100, or 75 percent, were settled and 275,510 workers were reinstated after strikes and lock-outs.

An additional 20,556 workers were reinstated after discriminatory discharges.

Eight hundred and forty-nine threatened strikes, involving 195,565 workers, were averted through the Board's action.

There were 3,257 elections held in which 1,194,781 valid votes were cast.

During the 57 months of the Board's operation a total of 19,148 cases, involving 3,368,237 workers, were filed charging that employers had engaged in or were engaging in unfair labor practices defined in the act. The Board has received, up to July 1, 1940, a total of 9,513 petitions asking either certification of representatives or the holding of elections under Board supervision to determine the bargaining agencies of the employees. A total of 2,865,082 employees

joined in these petitions. Seventy-one of these petitions, involving 208,407 workers, were filed by employers.

The following shows the disposition of cases during June 1940 only:

Cases closed during June, 579, involving 106,420 workers.

Agreement of both parties reached in 253 cases, representing over two-fifths of the total cases closed during June, and involving 35,655 workers.

Thirty-eight cases, involving 7,173 workers, were closed by compliance with Board decisions and trial examiners' intermediate reports.

Twenty-nine cases, involving 7,880 workers, were closed by certification after elections.

Cases dismissed by the Board and regional directors, 97, involving 13,152 workers.

Cases withdrawn, 154, involving 39,960 workers.

Two cases, involving 2,500 workers, were transferred to other regional offices.

Six cases, involving 100 workers, were closed since the Board decided not to proceed with further action.

As a result of settlements secured by the activities of the Board, employers agreed to pay $50,413 in back pay to 199 workers who were alleged to have been discriminated against.

In 38 cases under consideration of the Board or its offices, 4,432 workers were out on strike, and 24 of these cases were settled during the month by agreements between the parties.

Eleven threatened strikes, involving 2,598 workers, were averted through the Board's action.

Three thousand three hundred and seventy-four workers were reinstated after strikes or lock-outs during June.

One hundred and eighty-six workers were reinstated after discriminatory discharges.

During June the Board conducted 98 elections, of which 59 were held by the consent of all parties and 39 by direction of the Board. This excludes one election which the A. F. of L. lost, though the final results have not yet been received. About 40,245 workers were eligible to participate in these elections, and 36,849 workers, or 90 percent of those eligible, actually cast their ballots. A total of 36,320 ballots were considered valid.

Of the 36,320 valid votes cast, 3,604 votes were cast for A. F. of L. affiliates in the 56 elections in which they participated, 18,834 votes were cast for C. I. O. affiliates in 49 elections, and 6,067 votes were cast for unaffiliated unions in 18 elections. In addition, 7,398 votes were cast against all unions and 417 votes were cast "for neither" when more than one union appeared on the ballot.

Of the 98 elections, 77 elections were won by labor organizations. The A. F. of L. won 40 elections, the C. I. O. won 26 elections, the unaffiliated unions won 11 elections. In the remaining 21 elections no union was successful.

In 14 elections A. F. of L. and C. I. O. unions appeared on the same ballot. The A. F. of L. won 7 elections, the C. I. O. won 4 elections, and in 3 elections neither union was successful.

Dictatorship or Defense?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 15, 1940

MEMORANDUM BY ERRETT G. SMITH, WASHINGTON ATTORNEY AND WORLD WAR VETERAN

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include the following memorandum, entitled "Dictatorship or Defense?" prepared by Mr. Errett G. Smith, prominent Washington attorney and World War veteran. It presents the proposition that it is unconstitutional to call the National Guard of the States into the Federal service "for training" and suggests that the passage today by the House of Representatives of the so-called National Guard bill may be a further move in the direction of dictatorship.

DICTATORSHIP OR DEFENSE

The President may not legally call National Guard (the militia) into Federal service "for training" either with or without legislation by Congress.

An attempt to do so would be unconstitutional.

The "authority of training the militia" is one of the things the Constitution specifically reserves "to the States respectively" (Constitution, art. I, sec. 8, clause 16).

This is one of the basic elements whereby the Constitution preserves to the States their rights and prevents dictatorship by any person or clique within the Federal Government.

Power already exists for the President to "call forth" the militia:

1. When Congress has (a) declared a national emergency; and (b) authorized the use of our armed land forces for any purpose requiring use of troops in excess of those of the Regular Army (title 32, U. S. C. A., sec. 81);

2. Whenever the United States is invaded or in danger of invasion from any foreign nation or of rebellion against the authority of the Government of the United States, or the President is unable with the regular forces at his command to execute the laws of the Union (title 32, U. S. C. A., sec. 81a); or

3. To enforce the faithful execution of the laws of the United States or to suppress rebellion against the authority of the Government of the United States (title 50, U. S. C. A., sec. 202).

MILITIA A STATE ORGANIZATION

The principle of the militia being always in peacetime an agency of the several States has never been changed since the foundation of our Government, nor has it ever been seriously questioned. In 1861 the United States Attorney General explained that the obvious theory of the Constitution and of the acts of Congress based on it is that while Congress shall prescribe by general rules a uniform militia system for the States, securing the enrollment of all able-bodied white male citizens and maintaining the system of discipline and field exercise observed in the Regular Army, yet that the details of the militia organization and management shall be left to the State governments, requiring only that an annual report of the condition of the service in each State shall be made to the President. (Power of President to Create a Militia Bureau in the War Department (10 Op. Atty. Gen. 13).)

No doubt it was in order to maintain this set-up that the original constitutional restriction was made; that is, to assure the militia being under the authority of their respective States during their training periods.

WHICH IS BETTER METHOD IN A DEMOCRACY—FRANKNESS OR INDIRECTION?

If sufficient reason exists for calling out the National Guard, why should not the country expect those responsible for doing it to have the political guts to do so directly, rather than to devise a new cover-up method which does not divulge the actual reason? There could be no more favorable circumstance for getting a dictatorship started than to have all of the Nation's armed forces under one centralized control for long periods during peacetimes. However, when the National Guard is called out for one of the purposes for which Congress already has legitimately provided, the situation is quite different. Then they are frankly engaged in one of the functions for which they are maintained. Moreover, the country fully understands the move and hence may judge it on its true merits.

EXISTENT POWERS AMPLE TO ALLOW THE PRESIDENT TO CALL OUT NATIONAL GUARD EVEN AGAINST THE DANGER OF INVASION

The Supreme Court (opinion by Mr. Justice Story), in a decision rendered more than 113 years ago, and which does not appear ever to have been seriously challenged, said: "* * * the power to provide for repelling invasions includes the power to provide against the attempt and danger of invasion, as the necessary and proper means to effectuate the object. One of the best means to repel invasions is to provide the requisite force for action before the invader himself has reached the soil" (*Martin* v. *Mott* (N. Y., Feb. 2, 1827), 25 U. S. (12 Wheat.) 19, 29).

This interpretation of the act of 1795 was in answer to the two contentions raised: (1) That the act of 1795 was not within the constitutional authority of Congress; and (2) that Congress may not lawfully provide for cases of imminent danger of invasion, as well as for cases where invasion has actually taken place. The Court, after mentioning these contentions, said that "In our opinion there is no ground for doubt on this point," and then proceeded to declare the rule, as above stated.

The Court said further: "We are all of opinion, that the authority to decide whether the exigency has arisen, belongs exclusively to the President, and that his decision is conclusive upon all other persons" (p. 30). The opinion proceeds to explain why this is true—the service in question being a military service, requiring prompt and unhesitating obedience, and continues thus: "The power itself is to be exercised upon sudden emergencies, upon great occasions of State, and under circumstances which may be vital to the existence of the union" (p. 30).

The Court thus replied to the objection that such a strong power might be abused: "It is no answer, that such power may be abused, for there is no power which is not susceptible of abuse. The remedy for this, as well as for all other official misconduct, if it should occur, is to be found in the Constitution itself. In a free government, the danger must be remote, since, in addition to the high qualities which the Executive must be presumed to possess, of public virtue, and honest devotion to the public interests, the frequency of elections, and the watchfulness of the representatives of the Nation, carry with them all the checks which can be useful to guard against usurpation or wanton tyranny" (p. 32).

Previously, the Court, in referring to the constitutional power for "calling forth" the militia, had said: "The power thus confided by Congress to the President is, doubtless, of a very high and delicate nature. A free people are naturally jealous of the exercise of military power; and the power to call the militia into actual service is certainly felt to be one of no ordinary magnitude. But it is not a

power which can be exercised without a correspondent responsibility. It is, in its terms, a limited power, confined to cases of actual invasion or of imminent danger of invasion" (p. 29).

NOTE.—This power is less limited than when the decision quoted from was rendered, because the word "imminent" was removed from the statute in 1903 or earlier (title 32 U. S. C. A., sec. 81 a).

The Supreme Court, in this Martin case, reversed the judgment of the lower court, thus rendering it against the militiaman who had been called but who had refused to rendezvous.

DEFENSE

It is not desired herein to suggest anything which in any manner needs to impede the national-defense program, but rather to show that, as to legality, there is a right way and a wrong way to do that job, so far as pertains to the method of obtaining additional Army personnel.

The right way: To increase the strength of the Regular Army.

The wrong way: To attempt to pervert the National Guard's proper function; that is, from being always, in time of peace, a State militia.

DICTATORSHIP

The only purpose a well-advised Federal official could have in planning to call the National Guard into Federal service "for training" (in view of the constitutional provision reserving that function to the States) would be in furtherance of dictatorship. The National Guard units in the several States, if not already purloined by the Federal Government, well might have proved to be the people's only bulwark against a power-mad Federal official when he decides to try more completely to take over. Can we assume that those advisers who know the technique of revolution have been unaware of this one-time obstacle to their drive for power; or that they would not thus (meaning, by seeking to put over H. J. Res. 555 or S. J. Res. 286) try so expertly further to sabotage (from the States' point of view) the militia in advance?

It is the purpose of this memorandum to point out this dictatorship squeeze play and to indicate why Congress should not permit it to proceed any further; and, perhaps, also why Congress should correct the part of it already perpetrated; that is, in June 1933, when the States' militia organizations were nationalized.

DO THE STATES NOW, IN A REALLY EFFECTIVE SENSE, HAVE A NATIONAL GUARD OR MILITIA?

A new element was added by the act of June 15, 1933, to the definition of what the Army of the United States shall consist of. That new element was "the National Guard of the United States." The definition continued to carry, as it had done before, "the National Guard while in the service of the United States." The same act, by another section, "hereby established * * * the National Guard of the United States." It seems that this group which, on paper, consists of two agencies, is composed of substantially the same men. "The National Guard of each State" is described as consisting of members of the militia having certain qualifications "and federally recognized as hereinafter provided." Then, in the next paragraph, "the National Guard of the United States" is described as consisting of "those federally recognized National Guard units" who have been appointed or enlisted "in the National Guard of the United States, as hereinafter provided." (Title 10, U. S. C. A., sec. 2; title 32, U. S. C A., secs. 4, 4a, and 4b.)

There is in section 4a, just referred to, a proviso, "That the members of the National Guard of the United States shall not be in the active service of the United States except when ordered thereto in accordance with law, and, in time of peace, they shall be administered, armed, uniformed, equipped, and trained in their status as the National Guard of the several States." This seems like a bow to the original intent of what the militia or National Guard should be and to the constitutional provision placing them under authority of the States for training purposes. But the real question of the effectiveness of the States' militia organizations against a Federal grab for all power would be this: In case of a conflict of orders to a certain militia organization from the President and from the Governor of the State, which must the men follow? Or it might not even come to that, for if they are away for training in peacetimes, under Federal control, the State simply has no militia. Under the general principles of the superiority of the Federal Government's powers over those of the States in matters where the Federal Government has authority, there would seem to be no doubt that the President's orders would control over those of the Governor, even though the militia had not been called into Federal service under one of the statutory provisions.

A very reputable legal work, namely, Corpus Juris Secundum, after describing the National Guard of the United States, newly created by the act of June 15, 1933, as above set out, says: "This changes the previous composition in that it makes the National Guard a part of the Army, while under the previous enactments it was a part thereof only while in the service of the United States, and at other times it was merely a State organization" (6 C. J. S. 350, sec. 6).

Even when the National Guard is not formally called into the service of the United States, it might be that the President effectively is its Commander in Chief. If so, there is nothing lacking now for a complete dictatorship set-up. The constitutional provision is that "The President shall be Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States, and of the militia of the several States, when called into the actual service of the United States" (Constitution, art. II, sec. 2, clause 1). The Supreme Court has said that "The President is thus, in like manner, made Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States at all times, and Commander in Chief of the militia only when called into the actual service of the United States" (*Johnson* v. *Sayre* (Va. 1895), 158 U. S. 109, 115). But neither of these statements of the law shows definitely what the conclusion must be, under the present statute, as to the President's powers as Commander in Chief of what may or may not be a State militia. There would seem to be at least two possible decisions: (1) That the same men who compose the National Guard of the States are also the National Guard of the United States; hence the President is their Commander in Chief (leaving, of course, the clear inference, even if it were not stated, that there is really no State militia or National Guard); or (2) that the Constitution clearly contemplates a separate and, in peacetimes, independent State militia, hence any law which would deprive it of that status (even though indirectly through merging it into a newly created National Guard of the United States) is unconstitutional and void. If we are not sure in advance that the final decision would be No. 2 of these possible views, then our protection from dictatorship, by reason of the States' militia organizations, is very shadowy indeed.

It may be asked why we should worry now about an attempt by Congress to give the Executive power to call the militia into national service "for training" if the National Guard or militia of the States already has been embezzled by the Federal Government. The reasons are: (1) It is much easier, in what has been a democracy, to slip into a dictatorship, if it can be done, in the beginning, through the forms of democracy—legislative action, popular approval, etc.; (2) Congress might not wish to pass this clearly unconstitutional legislation if that element is called to its attention; and (3) Congress—the people's protection against the creeping paralysis of dictatorship—might conclude to restore to the States the militia which the Constitution clearly intended should belong "to the States, respectively," always during peacetimes.

INTERESTING OMISSION (?) IN LEGISLATION PROPOSED FOR CALLING NATIONAL GUARD OF STATES INTO FEDERAL SERVICE "FOR TRAINING"

It is not a little interesting to note that the words "for training" do not appear in the latest of the proposed enactments giving the President plenary power to call the National Guard of the States into Federal service at this time. However, these words are prominent in the sales talk by which the attempt is being made to sell this plan to the public. Many newspaper stories carried this idea prominently at about the time House Joint Resolution 555 was introduced and following the President's renewal of his suggestion for power to call the States' National Guard units into Federal service at this time. Among other places, stories of this kind were on the front pages of the Washington Evening Star of July 13, 1940, and the Washington Times-Herald of July 13, 1940.

On July 30, 1940, Gen. George C. Marshall, Chief of Staff of the Army, at a hearing before the Senate Military Affairs Committee, in the name of the War Department, urged the necessity "that at least a portion of the National Guard be ordered to active duty and recruited up to full strength and seasoned and trained as rapidly as possible." The President, in his message of July 29, 1940, transmitting to the Senate the proposed joint resolution, which became Senate Joint Resolution 286, said: " * * * I am therefore transmitting herewith legislation that, if enacted, will enable me to order the National Guard of the United States to active service for such period of intensive training as may be necessary to raise its efficiency to a point comparable with that of our small Regular Establishment."

Could it be possible that the propagators of this legislation to popularize the federalization of the National Guard, which the Constitution intended should belong "to the States respectively," have been fully aware all along that it is squarely unconstitutional to employ the militia, that is, the National Guard, in the service of the United States for training (Constitution, art. I, sec. 8, clause 16); but that they are attempting insidiously to get the congressional stamp of approval on the scheme regardless of any doubts which they, the said propagators, may have as to its constitutionality?

NOTING THE ANTAEAN CHARACTER OF THIS PROPOSED LEGISLATION

The progress of this measure may be enlightening if we cast the scientific eye of dissolution upon it. At the end of his May 31 message to the Senate, the President recommended: "That before adjournment this Congress grant me the authority to call into active service such portion of the National Guard as may be deemed necessary to maintain our position of neutrality and to safeguard the national defense, * * *." Accordingly, Congressman MAY, chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs of the House, introduced House Joint Resolution 555 in its original form. When it came out of the committee, among a few slight changes, there were added, as of June 10, the words, "and training," making the introductory part of the resolution read: "That if, at any time prior to the convening of the Seventy-seventh Congress, the present Congress is not in session and, in the opinion of the President, a national emergency arises requiring the use and training of troops in excess of those of the Regular Army," etc.

This matter next "broke" upon public attention by the President's message to the Senate, July 29, transmitting the proposed joint resolution which became Senate Joint Resolution 286, introduced by Chairman SHEPPARD, of the Senate's Military Affairs Committee, providing: "That during the period ending June 30, 1942, the President be, and is hereby, authorized to order into the active military service of the United States," etc. Thus, without any ifs and ands, or the necessity of giving any reason of any kind for using it, the plenary power is to be given "hereby" to the President to "order into active military service all reserve components of the Army of the United States."

Every time this proposal touches its mother earth, the White House, it comes back with renewed strength and more in the form of a dictator's ukase, the imperial order of a czar. Like Hercules of Greek mythology, slaying the Libyan giant, Antaeus, it may be necessary for Congress, if it is to stifle this further progress of our dictatorship, to prevent this measure again coming into contact with the White House. Antaeus long had been an invincible wrestler because his strength was renewed every time he touched the earth, his mother, until Hercules strangled him while holding him off the ground.

EXPERT PUBLICITY TECHNIQUE EVIDENT

The emergence upon the public view of this questionable proposition to federalize our militia "for training" bears the expert stamp of that gentle infiltration method, the stalking and stopping technique of the modern supersalesmen who are executiveizing our Government. This stalking and stopping technique is worked thus: Its perpetrators immobilize the people's interest in the subject being marketed by a quick start in the beginning of its public incubation; then stop until the first flare of interest or opposition has died; and, a short time later, advance to the objective while the wearied interest of the would-be sophisticates among the public—being "bored" with anything they gave half a thought to last week—is somewhat offguard. The evolvement, in the present instance, of this now common pattern is evident from what already has been said here and from a careful view of the chronology of events making up the record of this scheme based upon the hope that the two Houses of Congress each will be so gullible as to father such unconstitutional procedure as calling the National Guard into Federal service "for training."

The history of this legislation is:

Recommendation by President that he be given authority. (Message to Senate, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 31, 1940, p. 7282.)

House Joint Resolution 555, introduced by Congressman MAY, chairman of the Military Affairs Committee of the House. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 3, 1940, p. 7433.)

Letter from Governor Lehman, of New York, urging granting of authority to President to call National Guard into active service. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 4, 1940, p. 7460.)

Remarks in House on House Joint Resolution 555. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 10, 1940, p. 7877).

Article by John G. Norris in Washington (D. C.) Post relative to President Roosevelt's request for authority to call out National Guard under certain circumstances. (Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 10, 1940, p. 7877).

White House announcement of July 12, 1940, per newspaper stories of the following day, such as above-mentioned stories in July 13, 1940, editions of Washington Times-Herald and Washington Evening Star.

President's message to Senate recommending that further legislative authority be given so as to enable him to order the National Guard of the United States to active service for "such period of intensive training" as may be necessary, etc. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, July 29, 1940, pp. 9634, 9635 (including the proposed joint resolution).)

Senate Joint Resolution 286, introduced by Senator SHEPPARD, chairman of the Military Affairs Committee of the Senate. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, July 30, 1940, p. 9684.)

A Southerner's Estimate of Roosevelt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 15, 1940

LETTER FROM CHARLES E. GIBSON, OF THOMASTON, GA.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, not all southerners are new dealers, as is evident from a letter received this morning from Thomaston, Ga. It reads:

DEMOCRACY'S LAST STAND

When we think of outstanding examples of heroism—of battles waged at fearful odds—four in particular immediately occur to our minds: The Spartan defense at Thermopylae, the charge of the Light Brigade at Balaklava, the defense of the Alamo, and Custer's last battle with the Indians in Montana. There are others no less famous, but there isn't room for all.

Thinking of Custer's last stand reminds me of another, and that is our problem today. "Peace hath her victories no less renowned than war," and a victory achieved in time of peace may avert a senseless war. You may ridicule this statement if you will, but it is a fact, nevertheless: We are making our last stand for civil liberty today—that is, if we lose. When civil liberty falls religious freedom dies with it, and our blood-bought heritage will be swept away.

President Roosevelt has been weighed in the balances, and is sadly lacking in weight. In support of that statement I invite your attention to the record. Just a casual survey of that record will show:

1. That he has absolutely no regard for his word.
2. That he has shown an inveterate hostility to the press.
3. That he has destroyed the prestige of the Supreme Court.
4. That he has attempted to dominate Congress.
5. That he seeks to silence all opinions not in harmony with his own.
6. That he is an incurable spendthrift.
7. That Commissar Wallace has enslaved agriculture.
8. That Commissar Lewis has demoralized labor.
9. That Commissar Madden has disrupted industry.
10. That he—the President—has fairly smothered himself with radicals.
11. That he has debauched the electorate.
12. That he buys some, intimidates others, and meddles with all.
13. That, for the third time, he plans to buy the Presidency.
14. That his record is an endless chain of "emergencies."
15. That his compulsory registration bill is more political than otherwise.
16. That such a sickening performance doesn't merit an encore.

In other words, he is forever chasing after something new, and entirely too much of it is wrong. Human nature is fallible and we all make mistakes, but these blunders of his are plain habit.

After nearly 8 years of meddling and muddling, the problem nuts that he was going to crack—unemployment, agriculture, a balanced Budget, and mushrooming bureaus—are problems still.

Eight years is long enough—in fact, altogether too long—to dabble with the destinies of 132,000,000 people.

CHARLES E. GIBSON.

What of the Draft?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 14, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE BATTLE CREEK (MICH.) ENQUIRER AND NEWS

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include the following editorial from the Battle Creek (Mich.) Enquirer and News:

[From the Battle Creek (Mich.) Enquirer and News]

WHAT OF THE DRAFT?

The objection to the conscription plan at Washington is that we seem to be going about the business backward—to be inviting the very difficulties we say we are trying to avoid.

If there is any difference of opinion in this country about having trained men, and enough trained men, to defend the country, those who take the opposite are too small in number to need notice.

Where there is argument over this conscription proposal, the argument does not arise over objection to a sound national-defense policy, or objection to a universal call to the defense when the call is needed and when it can be answered effectively.

But there are two objections now.

One is that a mystery hangs over the matter. Washington is telling the country too much or too little—too much about the dangers which Washington seems to know but which the people (whose sons and whose property will make up the defense) don't know; too little about the facts which would justify the excitement and nervousness at Washington.

That's one objection. This is still a democracy. The people feel that if they accept conscription they are entitled to do it themselves, of their own deliberate will—and that they are entitled to know just why they are doing it.

They don't know that yet.

The other objection is the backward action of the proposal.

We are for military training as an avoidance of waste, confusion, sacrifice. We train men that they may not lose their lives and their fight by going untrained against men who are trained.

As to their willingness to go when the need arises—as to the willingness of the country to send them and support them—there is no question.

The only place where Mr. Bryan was wrong when, as a profound pacifist, he said a million men would spring to arms in this country overnight in case of need was in his limitation of the number.

Not a million—but millions.

But they would be unarmed, and therefore ineffective. They couldn't save the cause and they couldn't save themselves.

So, we believe in training—adequate, thorough. And in such numbers as may guarantee safety. Coupled with this we believe—the responsible opinion among us believes—in the universal responsi-

bility of citizenship; in the obligation owned by every one of us to serve the country according to its needs and his ability.

But not to be called hastily, unnecessarily, ineffectively—and not be called without full knowledge to us of the necessity and the method of meeting it.

The same duty which makes all of us liable to call is joined to the right of free citizenship that we be fully consulted as to the reasons and the purposes which take possession of our lives and property.

All that we know of the situation now (including all that we know of England's dire peril as Mr. Stimson states it, and all that we know of perilous outlooks as the President suggests them) is joined to the apparent fact that if a million men were called to arms next week or next month, they couldn't be trained. There would not be the clothes or the equipment or the personnel to make their training possible.

And so, invoking universal draft to avoid the penalties of unreadiness, we should be running headlong into unreadiness.

Why not do the first things first? Why not have a plan and a program and a procedure—instead of having so much excitement and emotion over something that is not fully explained?

If Washington knows something that we don't know, which something puts haste above every other consideration and justifies the disruption of our national life in the processes of a universal service call, why doesn't Washington say fully what that something is?

If at Washington there is some dire fact which is due to pop out at us later and clarify the present mystery as to why we should be doing something that Canada has not yet done, though Canada has been at war these several months—if Washington expects to be able to show us, at some other time, the reasons not shown us now for rushing unprepared into the universal draft for preparedness—what's Washington's excuse for not telling us now?

This newspaper believes in getting ready when we know what we are getting ready for—in whatever that may mean for any of us in contribution of whatever we have to contribute.

But this newspaper has never seen a big job that could be done successfully through excitement and emotion—without a systematic plan calmly carried out.

If this were the time, if the needs were convincing, if the uses were practical, for universal conscription, this newspaper would be for it.

In addition, this newspaper could be for universal military training for youth in time of peace. But the purposes would have to be right, the conditions would have to be right and, above all, the leadership would have to be right.

It would have to be a leadership free of emotion, free from the lure of adventure, free from the passion for dramatics. It would have to be a leadership profoundly and reverently and reliably dedicated to the American system and a recognition of the fact that sovereignty rests in the people, not elsewhere.

This is the question which comes now in this proposal for universal conscription. Have the people been told the reasons for it? Is their authority being fully consulted? Is something concealed? What is it? If the reasons not yet explained constitute a valid reason for it—are we ready for it? Are we ready to put it into use without the very penalties of unpreparedness which we are seeking to avoid? Have we not something to do first?

Are we not proceeding on emotion rather than plan?

And what is the ultimate objective of the emotion?

To What Kind of an Organization Do You Belong?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 15, 1940

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, do you believe that, in order to get or to hold a job, you should pay me? Do you think that I should have the power to charge you for the opportunity to work in a factory? Is it your idea that, before you and your fellow citizens can go about your daily tasks, making the things which are necessary to protect you and your neighbors, your homes, from foreign invasion or from enemies from within, you must join the Elks, the Masons, the Odd Fellows, the Methodist, the Baptist, the Lutheran, or the Catholic Church? Of course not, you reply.

Nevertheless, certain labor organizations are insisting that all manufacturers must sign contracts for a closed shop. That means that only those who belong to those particular unions can work in those factories. Of course, such an idea is not only un-American but it is unjust and it enables criminal racketeers to collect and use for their own purposes a part of the wages of honest workingmen.

Not only is the idea and practice that only those who belong to a certain organization shall have the privilege of working unjust, but all too often those organizations which insist upon this practice are at the mercy of Communists and racketeers.

Note this article from the Grand Rapids, Mich., Labor News, under date of August 2, 1940. It is as follows:

C. I. O. HIRES HARRY AMES TO ORGANIZE—WILL HEAD CONSTRUCTION WORKERS' UNION IN WAYNE COUNTY AREA

DETROIT.—Members of the C. I. O. will be pleased to know that their imported State Director Sholle, of parts unknown, and James B. Boyne, State director of the Construction Workers' Union of the C. I. O., have recently employed Harry F. Ames, dynamiter, thief, and racketeer, who was thrown out of the American Federation of Labor for stealing the money of the Building Laborers and Hod Carriers' Union and for permitting sewer contractors of Detroit to employ members of the union at a wage rate less than that set up by P. W. A. projects by the Federal Government, for which his associates were thoroughly convinced he took money from contractors.

Before coming to Detroit Ames did a stretch in prison in Indiana for blowing up a theater in the northern part of the State in an effort to help some one to collect from an insurance company.

Harry Ames, as the national director of the Hod Carriers' Union of Detroit, had full charge of all receipts and expenses. An investigation of his books by other local officers and the international revealed that among the things the money of the union was spent for during Mr. Ames' administration by and under his orders were diamond rings, oil stock for Mr. Ames, landscaping for his home, rentals for his summer cottage, money for his motorboat, and expenses for the Ryma Chemical Co., as well as the cost of several saddle horses.

The investigation revealed that Ames had surreptitiously spent and diverted to his own account and expenses many thousands of dollars, and that in order to avoid prosecution in the criminal courts, he made a "settlement" with the local union for $3,000. This was at a time when funds of the local union were so completely depleted because of Ames' raid on the treasury that there was no money to pay the regular running expenses of the union.

Just how long will honest, patriotic, Christian American workers submit to this kind of procedure?

Air Supremacy Will Decide Battle of Britain and Many Future Wars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEWIS D. THILL

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 15, 1940

ARTICLE FROM THE WASHINGTON DAILY NEWS

Mr. THILL. Mr. Speaker, the air warfare now waging over Britain will decide the immediate future of the British Isles. If one belligerent has a vastly superior air force to another and succeeds in stifling the enemy's air power, it means success in wars as they are fought today. To talk about sending 50 destroyers to England and to state that it may well mean the difference between victory and defeat is nonsense if the British air force is inferior and succumbs to that of the enemy.

We should proceed with a well-planned program of pilot training and aircraft production which will make the United States supreme in the air. Training of the National Guard and development of a huge standing army will count for little if we do not have an adequate air force.

The following newspaper article discusses the air offensive over Britain:

[From the Washington Daily News of August 15, 1940]

"ALL-AIR WAR"—THIS IS THE MAIN BOUT, EXPERTS SAY

(By Maj. Alexander P. de Seversky)

The spectacular battle raging over and around the British Isles is not, as old-line swivel-chair experts have led the public to believe, a preliminary match. It is the main bout. The action is generally regarded as the prelude to an invasion or some other grand offensive

involving ground troops and naval craft. But it is nothing of the sort. What we are watching is the authentic big push.

A more realistic understanding of the air battle as the main bout underlines the absurdity of talk about saving England by contributing 50 American destroyers. The issue immediately at stake will be decided without the intercession of the Navy.

Those who have failed to adjust their tactical thinking to the realities of 1940 take it for granted that the old pattern of battle will be followed. Wherefore they assume the stage is merely being set for a regulation war of mile-by-mile conquest. They are able to point out, truthfully, that even in the recent "blitzkriegs" on the European continent that pattern was followed, though at a greatly accelerated pace.

SOMETHING NEW

But soon it should become apparent that something new and unique is transpiring. The classic all-air battle foreseen by a few of the more imaginative tacticians has become a fact. When the question of mastery of the skies over the British Isles and their sea approaches is definitely answered by the course of the present "aerial Trafalgar," the other questions will be minor by contrast.

The air offensive is developing as expected, with heavy numerical advantage on the challenger's side and clean-cut, qualitative advantage on the defender's side. Nothing has happened so far, according to available information, to indicate a genuine break through of British defensive lines by the Nazis. Not until Hitler's air power begins to inflict serious damage in the interior of England in daylight raids with relative immunity will there be justification for alarm.

If Great Britain should lose the present battle, it will in effect have lost the war, at least so far as the mother country is concerned. Whether the victors then decide to invade the islands, or prefer to lay it waste systematically from the air without anything more than a token occupation of a few spots, will be a matter of detail, without essential military significance.

Old-style military and naval men are simply unable to assimilate the startling fact that land and sea forces have become mere onlookers in a fateful engagement that started in the air, develops on an ever larger scale in the air, and is likely to be fought to a decision in the air.

We Rose With Roosevelt—Why Wilt With Willkie?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAMPTON P. FULMER

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 15, 1940

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, what the future holds for us no one can accurately foretell.

However, the seriousness of the war which is now raging in Europe, and the numerous problems which will be confronting the Congress and the Government for the next number of years, regardless of who wins the present war, should be very apparent, not only to every Member of Congress, but to the average citizen of this country.

The things to be done during this period, the legislation to be adopted, the leadership to steer the ship of state, the reaction and response of the American people to the events which lie ahead in the struggle between dictatorship and democracy, will, in my judgment, irrevocably fashion the pattern of life to which we, our children, and our children's children will of necessity conform.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, the propaganda that is now being carried to the country in the press, and otherwise, daily, about the wonderful ability of the Republican candidate, Mr. Willkie, should be carefully scrutinized to ascertain the real facts, not about Willkie as he was when he used to wash dishes, drive cattle, and so forth, but the Willkie as he is today, which is clearly set forth in an article carried in a magazine entitled "Dynamic America," written by John Bauer, which article I am, under leave to extend my remarks, inserting herein, believing that same will be of interest to the readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. In this article the writer very efficiently portrays the lack of the necessary qualifications of Willkie to meet the situation which I have just described, and the type of leader which we should have.

I am sure that the people of this country will not forget that "We had it hard with Harding, cool with Coolidge, hungry with Hoover, and rosy with Roosevelt."

WENDELL WILLKIE: THE REPUBLICAN CANDIDATE

(By John Bauer)

The Republican masses were probably no less amazed at Mr. Wendell L. Willkie's nomination as their candidate for the Presidency than were the Democrats. While he has been an increasingly prominent figure during recent years in public utility and financial circles, his fame had not reached the plain American voters—those who piled up the 11,000,000 Roosevelt majority in 1936.

A month before the Philadelphia convention Mr. Willkie was less known to ordinary business, labor, and farmers than any other candidate nominated by a major party since the Civil War. His meteoric rise to the Republican nomination is thus most remarkable, particularly as he had been a registered Democrat only 2 years before.

The extraordinary circumstances of his nomination require care by the ordinary voter to consider who Mr. Willkie really is, what he is, and whom he primarily represents in his campaign for the Presidency. That he is a person of ability there is no doubt, or that he has affability, personality, a smile, and a voice that may compete successfully with the most famous possessor of those qualities.

But, is Mr. Willkie really qualified for the Presidency of the United States? The next 4 years will be crucial ones for this country, both as to internal and external affairs. Proper Presidential leadership will be of utmost importance. This involves both outlook and seasoned experience as to national interest and welfare. Voters must ponder particularly the following three questions:

First. What are Mr. Willkie's basic qualifications in training and experience for the Presidency?

Second. What is his personal outlook on problems with which the country is confronted?

Third, what are the interests which have been backing Mr. Willkie and brought about his nomination? What would be their influence on his leadership and position in the various national and international issues that will require determination of policy and administration?

I. BACKGROUND AND QUALIFICATIONS

The voters will be regaled during the next 4 months with the extraordinary business attributes of Mr. Willkie. They will be told incessantly that he has not been a politician and would apply business methods to the Government. He will be glorified as a great businessman—needed to guide the country at this critical juncture with the same ability and standards as he devoted to the private corporation which he has headed since 1933.

Because of this impending enchantment, it is important to inquire into Mr. Willkie's background which is said to qualify him supremely now for the Presidency of the United States. Is he really one of the country's great businessmen? What is his record? And, apart from private business, what governmental experience has he had to attest suitable leadership at this time of national urgency?

His preutility career

As to his experience with private business, this adds up to practically nothing so far as direct development or operation of American industry is concerned. Mr. Willkie is rather young, only 48. He had an excellent family background as to intellectual, cultural, and public interests. As a student in Indiana University he was somewhat of a liberal.

After graduation in 1913 he started as a teacher, but soon abandoned the educational field for the law because, it has been stated, he wanted more money than teaching would provide. Here has doubtless been an emotional conflict between liberal impulses and business actualities. I have known other young liberals to become public-utility lawyers.

Mr. Willkie was admitted to the Indiana bar in 1916 and practiced for a time with his father. During this period he has been reported as representing successfully a labor group against an injunction in a picketing case. In 1919 he moved to Akron, Ohio, and became a rapidly rising corporation lawyer. In 1929 he went to New York City as co-counsel for the Commonwealth & Southern Corporation. In 1933 he was elected president, and has since devoted himself to the affairs of this huge public-utility holding company system.

Heading the Commonwealth & Southern

When Mr. Willkie became associated with Commonwealth & Southern, this public-utility empire had already been established. Whoever the business genius may have been that built up the system, it was not Mr. Willkie.

Furthermore, he headed the top-holding company which by itself was not an operating enterprise. It controlled the operating subsidiaries, and each had its own president and other official set-up, and each actually conducted the business within its own domain. He knew little or nothing about the physical properties and operation, and has had only casual contact with the actual business of the far-flung operating units.

Mr. Willkie contributed nothing in producing a great industry. He is not an Edison who fathered basic inventions upon which the electric industry has been erected. He is not a Charlie Schwab who built up the Bethlehem Steel Corporation. He is not a Henry Ford who through his own genius created the Ford Motor Co. He is not a Hill or a Harriman. He is not a businessman at all in the sense of the great business leaders of the country.

Mr. Willkie was brought to the Commonwealth & Southern because of his engaging and effective personality. After the empire had been built up, especially after the 1929 financial storm when

water-logged utility systems were tottering, someone was badly needed to handle public relations. Mr. Willkie's personal qualities, plus his being a Democrat in 1933, fitted the situation. His job as president was primarily to present in favorable public light the interests of Commonwealth & Southern, to keep the empire intact against the forces of collapse which had already reached the Insull system and were threatening other grossly overcapitalized holding company organizations.

Accomplishments for the system

Mr. Willkie has done an excellent job for Commonwealth & Southern. This has included, first, smoothing out the political relations of the system companies in the various States and communities. Second, presenting the system attractively before the public at large through discussions and appearances before governmental groups. Third, opposing the advance of municipal ownership within the Commonwealth & Southern territory. Fourth, obstructing T. V. A. in its power program and other regional developments. Fifth, selling the Tennessee properties to the public for about $25,000,000 more than their intrinsic fair value—on the basis of their special nuisance value to T. V. A. in getting rid of Mr. Willkie's obstruction tactics.

All this was fine for Commonwealth & Southern during a difficult period, and has left the system today with rather generally recognized respectability. Mr. Willkie did a swell job of handling public relations for his company, but his experience has not been that of a great businessman. His work has been primarily that of an ingenious, clever, and successful defense lawyer of a public-utility holding company system which, except for his personal qualities and efforts, might have encountered grave difficulties in maintaining its position against the forces of national progress.

Mr. Willkie's accomplishments must be considered particularly in the light of the fact that when he took the presidency the system was one of the most waterlogged or overcapitalized in the country. According to analysis based upon figures reported by the Federal Power Commission for the year 1933, the gross book values of the Commonwealth & Southern's electric properties amounted to about $815 per customer. This compares with about $560 per customer for the 22 largest holding-company systems in the country, and with a maximum of about $300 per customer that would be reasonably justified on the grounds of prudent investment. Practically all the 22 systems were overcapitalized, but only 1 exceeded Commonwealth & Southern. The latter even topped Associated Gas & Electric, whose flagrant overcapitalization has been a matter of nauseous notoriety.[1]

Mr. Willkie's principal job as president of the Commonwealth & Southern was thus to represent and defend a system whose capitalization build-up could not be justified. He did not create the overcapitalization, but he has successfully supported it. In so doing he has helped to obfuscate the general situation in the country, and especially to obstruct the advancement of the great projects which were undertaken as a matter of national policy. This is his unvarnished record as a businessman. It is for the voters to decide how this experience aptly qualifies him for the Presidency of the United States.

No participation in Government

Apart from private business, what has been Mr. Willkie's experience in direct governmental affairs? Has he ever been concerned actively in the development of public policies? Has he come to grips with the economic problems of the country at large? Has he had legislative or administrative experience in Government? Has he ever been concerned with any aspect of government except as the interests of his private clients have been affected in litigation? Has he ever represented in any important matter the public interest against private claims?

The answer is glaringly obvious. It may be that Mr. Willkie's special abilities heretofore exercised exclusively for the benefit of Commonwealth & Southern, or other corporate clients, might be applied with equal zeal and effectiveness to the affairs of the American people. This, however, would be unsupported assumption, a fervent hope, but not a sensible probability. In the light of his actual experience and activities, either as a corporation lawyer or as president of Commonwealth & Southern, Mr. Willkie is a poor bet as a progressive leader for the United States at this time.

II. OUTLOOK ON PUBLIC PROBLEMS

As to Mr. Willkie's attitude on national questions, internal and external, nothing very definite can be said. One can only imply from his past activities and associations, and from his limited published statements.

As to past connections, Mr. Willkie, as already presented, has been engaged exclusively in representing private interests, mostly against governmental policies established through national legislation. This at least indicates that in any basic conflict between public and private interests, his influence will lean to the private side. He can hardly be expected to lead forcefully on lines of public welfare where conflicting private interests are involved. Can he thus be selected as the national leader for the crucial years ahead?

As to his public statements, Mr. Willkie has naturally limited himself to generalities which can mean anything to any voter. He expressed broad approval to the New Deal measures, but thinks they have been carried to extreme, especially by the administrative agencies. But he also has stated that the issue in the forthcoming campaign is clear and simple—opposing or supporting, the New Deal. Certainly as the Republican candidate, and presumably as President of the United States, he would thus largely undo what the New Deal has done.

The truth appears to be that (a) Mr. Willkie has liberal impulses for public welfare, but (b) has been associated too closely with the reactionary sides, and (c) has not had occasion to give close consideration to fundamental matters of public interest. Hence his position has been evasive and even contradictory.

Look at the vital internal problem of the country—mass unemployment. Mr. Willkie has stated that if private business cannot furnish jobs for everybody, other means must be used. This sounds like the New Deal. But he has also stated that private business must be relieved from taxes and restrictive regulation—and that then it will be able to expand, prosper, and furnish the needed jobs. He thus joins the National Association of Manufacturers, the United States Chamber of Commerce, the public utilities, bankers, and practically all big business, in demanding that the Government retire from the economic field and leave business alone (except for casual regulation). This appears to be Mr. Willkie's solution for unemployment.

Here is the fundamental issue between the New Deal and its opponents, whether in the Republican Party or Democratic. The New Deal represents the view that Government must assume fundamental responsibility in the economic field, and must participate actively as may be required for the welfare of the masses of people. This has been carried out in part by direct Government employment and in part by regulation of private business. But opponents look upon such governmental participation in economic affairs as evil and destructive to national welfare. If they should succeed in electing their President and Congress they will certainly strive to get what they fought for. Could Mr. Willkie avoid doing what he was elected to do?

III. THE INTERESTS SUPPORTING MR. WILLKIE

Mr. Willkie probably does not agree wholeheartedly with the extreme opponents to the New Deal and the ardent Roosevelt haters. However, he is supported by these groups, and presumably would be heavily influenced by them. It is important, therefore, to consider the origin of his build-up for the Republican nomination.

The allegation has been surging all around that the nomination was forced by an overwhelming popular demand coming from the grass roots of the country. It has been vociferated as a stupendous popular victory against the politicians. The preconvention campaign is said to have been conducted by amateurs against the determination of the political machines, and this alleged fact is urged as demonstrating the popular basis of the selection.

All the grandiose effusions about the spontaneous popular demand for Willkie are just window dressing for the realities. They come under the category of sanctimonious "blah." As stated before, Mr. Willkie had not been known to the masses of people whose votes will be needed for election. The build-up came from those who knew what they wanted, and experts in getting what they want. Big business used big business methods to pick its man and to get him nominated.

In the promotion of Republican candidates along traditional lines during the past year, Senator ROBERT A. TAFT was the natural choice of big business, and so of the Republican politicians. His obvious difficulty, however, was lack of personality or "oomph" to attract mass voters. As conditions unfolded in recent months, the fact seemed manifest that Mr. TAFT could not be elected, especially if Mr. Roosevelt should be nominated again by the Democrats, as appeared increasingly evident. So, where and how could a suitable candidate be found who had the requisite personal qualities, also the views of big business, who could be advanced to the nomination, and who finally could be elected?

Finding Mr. Willkie

In the regular political field there was no one who fitted these requisites. A new personality had to be sought, and a new technique had to be used for the nomination. No one had the palpable fitting. A try-out was started for Mr. Willkie, and it met with good response in the higher business circles, but with misgivings regarding his public-utility connections.

His personal qualities were excellent. Since there was everything to gain and nothing to lose, real experts went to work. First, there was Oren Root, Jr., a famous name and member of a leading firm of New York corporation lawyers, with lots of public-utility background. Next came Russell W. Davenport, who had been managing editor of Fortune Magazine—who had brilliant experience in organizing publicity campaigns.

The small but competent initial group had ready access to the leading business names throughout the country, and everywhere found surging eagerness to assist in promoting Willkie. Consequently, practically every broker's office in 48 States (also advertising and publicity agencies, newspaper columnists, public-utility headquarters, and other big business) became an active focus of expanding effort to promote Willkie. Here are the sources of the numbers that signed the Willkie petitions, the avalanche of telegrams to the Philadelphia convention, and the packing of the convention galleries with Willkie shouters. The techniques had been duly developed during the corporate fights against the Holding Company Act of 1935 and other New Deal measures.

In none of the organizations to promote Mr. Willkie's nomination was there a spontaneous and popular movement. All these people knew why they wanted Willkie, and they fervently hoped that he

[1] For the financial distortions of the principal public-utility holding-company systems, see Bauer & Gold, the Electric Power Industry, part II (Harper & Bros., 1939).

would lead in sweeping out the New Deal and bringing normalcy back to the Government in its relation to business. The support was large and popular with respect to big business, but it did not reach the grass roots from which the millions of voters will be needed for election.

His alleged independence

The statement has been made repeatedly that Mr. Willkie is under no commitments to politicians or other groups, and is singularly free to act as he thinks in all matters affecting the welfare of the country. This claim is doubtless true so far as specific obligations and commitments are concerned. Its real significance, however, should be considered from the standpoint of what Mr. Willkie's supporters believe and expect, and what he himself believes as indicated by his past activities and published statements.

It is, of course, possible that if Mr. Willkie should be elected President of the United States he would really carry on the New Deal, but would do the job more efficiently and better. If so, he would go counter to the assumptions of those who built up his nomination, and through such double-crossing he would end up by being hated as much as Mr. Roosevelt himself.

However, progressive-minded people who believe that government should be responsible in the economic field and do whatever is essential for public welfare, should not rely on any theory that Mr. Willkie really believes in the New Deal and that he would finally ditch his supporters in the campaign. Such an assumption is not backed by the reasonable expectations regarding a man whose business career has consisted principally in supporting a grossly overcapitalized public utility holding company system.

On July 12 Mr. Willkie spoke in Denver as an American, not as a partisan, and dedicated himself to three things:

"One, a united people without class consciousness, distinction, or class hatred.

"Two, the rehabilitation of our national economic life.

"Three, the building of an adequate defense program."

As generalities, how can anyone disagree with these pronouncements? Concretely, there is probably substantial agreement between the New Deal and its opponents on "Three." As to the first two, however, a specific blueprint is necessary.

First, the New Deal has sought unity for national welfare, but has met with class hatred. Second, it has striven heroically for economic rehabilitation of the country but has been obstructed at practically every turn by those who have promoted Mr. Willkie.

Mr. Willkie's supporters, and doubtless Mr. Willkie himself, do not want unity and rehabilitation on the broad New Deal bases but along the lines represented by the National Association of Manufacturers and their fellow travelers in big business. We all want unity and rehabilitation, but we can probably get them only through outright governmental responsibility for mass welfare—not through Government resignation from responsibility and retirement from the economic field. The decision is up to the voters on the basis of clear issues and vibrant personalities.

Shall the Judges of the Supreme Court be Impeached?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. THORKELSON

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 15, 1940

ARTICLE BY COL. WADE H. COOPER

Mr. THORKELSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I include an article by Col. Wade H. Cooper, of Washington, D. C., entitled "Shall the Judges of the Supreme Court of the United States Be Impeached for a Gross Perversion of the Constitution of the United States?"

Mr. Speaker, it is extremely important that the people take greater interest in the administration of their own Government. This should be clear as one begins to review the mass of legislation which has been enacted over a period of many years—legislation which restricts the people and deprives them of their rights. The Constitution was drafted by and is an instrument that belongs to the people of this Nation. Liberalizing this document or misinterpretation of it can only end in a steady elimination of those rights which the people reserve to themselves in the ninth and tenth amendments. What are these rights? They are the unwritten powers of the Constitution which are not delegated to Congress or denied to the States.

It is easy for a legislative body to take the position that they are the law, but in this case the Constitution is the law and the very platform upon which legislation must rest for validity. When legislative bodies depart from this document disintegration of government begins; and the result of such breaking down in the Government is quite obvious today, particularly in view of the fact that Congress is now forced to remain in session to watch so that the President does not lead this country into war. This could never happen had the people always looked after their rights; had the people watched Congress and taken care that they obey the law as it is written into the Constitution itself.

The people are the power, and the Constitution is the document through which they speak to the three branches of the Federal Government. It is therefore obvious that Congress must not widen or deviate from the meaning of the Constitution itself without specific permission from those who give this document to Congress; that is, the people of the United States.

The little pamphlet which I have inserted expresses the opinion of Mr. Cooper, and there are thousands of others throughout this Nation that hold to this same opinion. We Members of Congress must realize that we are a responsible body—with no greater rights than those written in the Constitution itself. To stretch or widen its meaning means nothing else than destruction of the people's liberties and rights, in direct proportion as legislation is enacted to deprive them of such rights.

The chaotic state in which we find our Nation today has been created by Congress itself, for had we maintained the Government as it was set up it would have been sound today. Misinterpretation of the fundamental law destroys the law itself, and when such attack is made upon the fundamental law that gives a nation security and life, the security and life are destroyed.

SHALL THE JUDGES OF THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES BE IMPEACHED FOR A GROSS PERVERSION OF THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES?

(By Wade H. Cooper, LL. D., Litt. D.)

The juxtaposition of the New Deal and the Supreme Court of the United States is such that it is difficult at times to speak of the one without referring directly or indirectly to the other.

Constitutionally, the Supreme Court is a separate and independent part of the Government, but practically and actually it has automatically become the strong arm of the New Deal. If you should wish to know whence originate the visions and dreams of the New Deal, you have only to read Rousseau's Social Contract, Sir Thomas More's Utopia, Francis Bacon's New Atlantis, or Campanella's City of the Sun—all exploded as impossible utopian dreams in the long ago, though revived by the bright but inexperienced and impractical young men surrounding and advising our inexperienced and impractical President. This accounts for the impractical spending and lending or squandering of billions and billions of dollars of the taxpayers' money.

However, it is not easy to determine how our Supreme Court ever got the idea that our bureaucratic Government officials are the masters and not the servants of the people, with plenary powers to maliciously take away or wreck and destroy the property or the reputation of the citizen at pleasure and without responsibility or liability to anyone.

Instead of being a veritable citadel for the protection of the rights and liberties of the people, the Supreme Court has become, I regret to say, a battering ram for the destruction of the rights of the people as guaranteed under the Constitution of the United States.

Let me be brief, but let me be specific.

The fifth, ninth, and tenth amendments of our Constitution specifically preserve and protect the rights of all our people; the ninth amendment declares:

"The enumeration in the Constitution of certain rights shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people." This means that a bureaucratic government official shall not have the right to purposely destroy your property or your reputation, without responsibility or liability. A number of our rights, such as freedom of the press, freedom of speech, freedom of conscience, and the writ of habeas corpus are enumerated in the Constitution, but numerous other rights, while not mentioned, are preserved under the ninth amendment, as pointed out.

The fifth amendment declares that private property shall not be taken for public use without just compensation.

Article III, section 2 of the Constitution gives the Supreme Court authority to "hear and determine all cases in law and equity arising under the Constitution, the laws of the United States, and treaties made or which shall be made under their authority." All legislative authority is vested in the Congress of the United States, according to article I, section 1 of the Constitution.

Article I, section 6 of the Constitution grants immunity to Senators and Representatives only for speeches in their respective Houses. Now it is perfectly plain from the above that the Supreme Court is without any legislative authority whatever. It is equally as plain that Senators and Representatives are the only officials in the United States who have the constitutional right of immunity.

Yet in the face of these constitutional safeguards and in the face of the common law of England, our Supreme Court has acquiesced in or affirmed the doctrine laid down by the New Deal Court of Appeals at Washington to the effect that the citizen cannot hold any bureaucratic official, high or low, responsible or liable for damages for the wrongful and unlawful destruction of his property, regardless of how arbitrary or malicious his act may be, if the matter in question is within the jurisdiction or within the "scope of authority" of the destructive bureaucratic official in question.

"Scope of authority" is merely a smoke screen for the protection of lawless Government officials. "Scope of authority" should mean and really does mean that the official must act in good faith, within the law, as there is no authority for him to go beyond the law or to maliciously or vindictively destroy the property of the citizen. But some of our courts, with the approval of the Supreme Court, have distorted and twisted "scope of authority" to mean that the Government official can abuse this authority and wrongfully and unlawfully destroy your property and not be held liable in damages for the same; there are numerous cases like this. There are numerous bureaus and commissions in Washington which have autocratic power, where the citizen is denied the right of review by the courts; if a citizen cannot appeal to the courts and cannot hold the offending lawless official liable, then his rights are all gone and he is at the mercy of a lot of irresponsible despots. Can Stalin or Hitler or Mussolini beat that? The Walter-Logan bill which passed the House a few weeks ago is intended to put a stop to such tyranny in certain cases but not all of them, as certain bureaus, for some reason, were omitted from the bill, which has not yet passed the Senate.

It is impossible to give you a clear conception of this unconstitutional granting of immunity to all officials by the Supreme Court. It is used to cover up lawless negligent or fraudulent acts on any and all occasions. Numerous cases, involving millions, have been brought. The Comptroller of the Currency alone has been repeatedly charged with violating his duty, with violating the law, with mismanagement and neglect of duty, in fraud of depositors, but all without avail, as he was acting in the "scope of his authority." He alone was involved in 17,500 lawsuits in 1935, according to his own statement, made in one case, as an excuse for neglect of duty in 1933, where he had been sued for over $1,000,000 on behalf of depositors. He was sued by a depositor in one case for the purpose of compelling him to recover all or a great part of over $2,000,000 wrongfully paid out to attorneys and for salaries, but this smoke screen, "scope of authority," still protects him, as it does all Government officials.

When—and where—will this end?

As late as 1912 the Supreme Court, in the case of the *Philadelphia Co.* v. *Stimson, Secretary of War*, said:

"The exemption of the United States from suit does not protect its officers from personal liability to persons whose rights or property they have wrongfully invaded," citing authorities.

But sometime thereafter the Supreme Court acquiesced in the doctrine of the Court of Appeals at Washington that a Cabinet officer could not be held responsible for libel as he was immune, as a Government official, and now the New Deal Court of Appeals has granted immunity to any and all Government officials, high or low, if the matter in question is in the jurisdiction or "scope of authority" of the lawless and offending official concerned.

The Supreme Court refuses to review or reverse the doctrine thus laid down by the Court of Appeals, and has therefore acquiesced in the same. This doctrine is nazi-ism, fascism, or communism accentuated, accelerated, and multiplied, as it makes every official, high or low, an irresponsible despot. Such a doctrine is an implied invitation by the courts for these officials to commit all manner of wrongful, unlawful, and fraudulent acts, with advance notice that they will be protected.

Cooley's Blackstone (1883), page 243, in discussing this subject, concludes thus:

"Since it would be a great weakness and absurdity in any system of positive law to define any positive wrong without a positive remedy."

To say that an official sworn to obey the law can maliciously, wrongfully, and unlawfully disregard the law and destroy your property and not be held liable because he was acting within the "scope of his authority" is tantamount to an acceptance of the Tertullian theory credo quia absurdum est and should not be tolerated by a free people. The sheriff aids in lynching the prisoner he is sworn to protect, but it is within the scope of his authority; the agent of the Watch and Ward Society abuses the children he is bound to protect, but it is within the scope of his authority; the Comptroller of the Currency wrongfully and maliciously wrecks and destroys a solvent bank that he is bound to protect, but it is within the scope of his authority, according to the doctrine of immunity.

Such transparent sophomoric sophistry ought to be repugnant to all men who love justice and have an appreciation of their own constitutional rights.

It is the common law of all civilized nations that the private property of the citizen cannot be taken from him or destroyed without judicial umpirage or judicial review. In England, acts of Parliament contrary to natural law or natural justice are void (*Day* v. *Savage* (1 Hob. 87)). The first great adjudication on this subject is *Vanhorn* v. *Dorrance* (2 Dall. 304). According to Cooley's Blackstone, "the King's prerogative stretcheth not to the doing of an injury." And says this same author: "When King James II invaded the fundamental constitution of the realm, the convention declared an abdication whereby the throne was rendered vacant, which induced a new settlement of the Crown."

In Outlines of Constitution Law, by Chalmers and Asquith (4th ed., Sweet & Maxwell, Ltd., London, 1930), it is stated that the Crown—that is to say the Government—cannot be held liable. "The remedy for any such wrong is against the individual wrongdoer (*Rogers* v. *Dutt Moo*, P. C. C. 209). But in practice the Crown often pays any damages which may be caused by its servants' wrongful acts committed in the course of their employment."

After explaining that Senators and Representatives were immune under the Constitution and could not be held liable for any speech or debate in either House, President Roosevelt, on March 4, 1939, in the Congress of the United States, gave utterance to a solemn truth when he declared: "And that immunity is most certainly not extended to either the Chief Justice or the President."

It seems perfectly clear that the Court of Appeals, at Washington, with the acquiescence or approval of the Supreme Court, and following the trail blazed by the Supreme Court, has annihilated the constitutional rights of our people as indicated, by an abuse of judicial power or an invasion of the Constitution.

I would not overthrow the Constitution or the Supreme Court, but I would overthrow the men who pervert the Constitution or the Court. Our Constitution must be preserved.

Status of Outstanding Foreign Bonds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FREDERICK C. SMITH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 19, 1940

EXCERPTS FROM ANNUAL REPORT OF THE FOREIGN-BOND HOLDERS PROTECTIVE COUNCIL, INC.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD my remarks and include therein certain tables showing the status of outstanding foreign dollar bonds of the Latin American countries, Europe, Far East, Africa, and Canada and indebtedness of foreign governments to the Government of the United States as shown in Foreign-Bond Holders Protective Council Annual Report for 1938.

The following schedules of outstanding foreign bonds and statement of indebtedness of foreign governments to the Government of the United States should be of the greatest interest to the Congress in considering H. R. 10361, a bill to provide for increasing the lending authority of the Export-Import Bank of Washington, in the amount of $500,000,000, "to assist in the development of the resources, the stabilization of the economies, and the orderly marketing of the products of the countries of the Western Hemisphere."

It is important to note, as shown in the schedule 4, the great amount of default of Latin America as compared with Europe, Far East, Africa, and Canada.

The proponents of the bill here referred to put up the argument that none of the governments of the Latin American countries owe the Government of the United States any money that is in default. The experience of the Export-Import Bank, which has been lending considerable sums to those countries, is also cited as showing the good credit rating of those states.

An examination, however, of the indebtedness of other foreign governments to the Government of the United States, as shown in tables 1, 2, 3, and "the German debt," should certainly show a great hazard of making loans to any but a very few foreign governments.

It can be expected that the governments of the Latin American states will pay back the loans our Government makes to them as long as we continue to lend to them in increasing amounts. It should not be expected, however, that they will be prompt in paying back these loans once we stop lending them any more money.

I. Schedule of outstanding foreign dollar bonds (publicly and nonpublicly offered) issued and/or guaranteed by governments or political subdivisions thereof—Principal amounts outstanding as of Dec. 1, 1938

Countries	Total		National		State, provincial, or departmental		Municipal		Corporate (government-guaranteed)	
	Outstanding	In default[1]	Outstanding	In default[1]	Outstanding	In default	Outstanding	In default[1]	Outstanding	In default[1]
Argentina	$233,798,290	$20,647,090	$151,603,000	$46,766,933	$75,175,290	$13,627,090	$7,020,000	$7,020,000		
Bolivia	60,610,975	60,610,975	60,610,975	60,610,975						
Brazil	356,557,745	356,557,745	168,771,745	168,771,745	132,789,000	132,789,000	54,997,000	54,997,000		
Chile	182,281,000	182,281,000	118,455,500	118,455,500			13,684,000	13,684,000	$50,141,500	$50,141,500
Colombia	146,265,930	143,649,900	53,839,530	51,223,500	59,988,000	59,988,000	22,149,900	22,149,900	10,288,500	10,288,500
Costa Rica	8,131,720	8,131,720	8,131,720	8,131,720						
Cuba	125,746,900	42,991,900	125,746,900	42,991,900						
Dominican Republic	15,594,000		15,594,000							
Ecuador	12,262,700	12,262,700	459,900	459,900					11,802,800	11,802,800
El Salvador	12,112,485	12,112,485	12,112,485	12,112,485						
Guatemala	5,352,604	3,815,604	5,352,604	3,815,604						
Haiti	8,001,999	8,001,999	8,001,999	8,001,999						
Mexico	273,696,054	273,696,054	248,566,954	248,566,954	3,252,000	3,252,000			21,877,100	21,877,100
Panama	17,757,315	17,757,315	15,938,315	15,938,315			371,500	371,500	1,447,500	1,447,500
Peru	85,656,500	85,656,500	81,580,500	81,580,500	1,189,000	1,189,000	2,887,000	2,887,000		
Uruguay	56,703,853	5,633,500	54,709,353	3,639,000			1,994,500	1,994,500		
Total, Latin America	1,600,530,070	1,233,806,487	1,129,475,480	824,300,097	272,393,290	210,845,090	103,103,900	103,103,900	95,557,400	95,557,400
Belgium	99,678,300		89,678,300				10,000,000			
Bulgaria	16,671,500	16,671,500	16,671,500	16,671,500						
Czechoslovakia	4,299,800		3,682,800				617,000			
Danzig	4,472,722	3,519,500	4,472,722	3,519,500						
Denmark	132,560,000		95,298,000				32,260,000		5,002,000	
Estonia	3,413,500		3,413,500							
Finland	19,910,000		8,885,000				7,006,000		4,019,000	
France	113,417,800		92,270,800						21,147,000	
Germany	531,311,500	382,167,400	[2]320,263,900	171,119,800	72,123,000	72,123,000	66,284,600	66,284,600	72,640,000	72,640,600
Greece	36,518,500	26,942,500	36,518,500	26,942,500						
Hungary	36,926,600	30,595,100	6,578,600	247,100			30,348,000	30,348,000		
Ireland	893,000		893,000							
Italy	111,311,200		69,789,100				37,079,100		4,443,000	
Latvia	5,886,500	5,886,500	5,886,500	5,886,500						
Lithuania	4,795,697		4,795,697							
Norway	116,985,000		98,558,000		7,000,000		6,309,000		5,118,000	
Poland	84,029,876	25,197,680	66,711,446	20,052,250	4,345,100	1,760,900	3,766,500	1,558,300	9,206,830	1,826,230
Rumania	88,394,350	88,394,350	25,498,750	25,498,750					62,895,600	62,895,600
Russia	75,000,000	75,000,000	75,000,000	75,000,000						
Yugoslavia	57,747,241	51,337,500	48,193,381	42,657,500					9,553,860	8,680,000
Total, Europe	1,544,223,086	705,712,030	1,073,059,496	387,595,400	83,468,100	73,883,900	193,670,200	98,190,900	194,025,290	146,041,830
Australia	248,657,550		153,713,000		61,365,550		26,562,000		7,017,000	
China	11,401,181	500,000	11,401,181	500,000						
Japan	249,163,600		171,887,600				30,953,000		46,323,000	
Liberia	1,602,000	1,602,000	1,602,000	1,602,000						
Total, Far East and Africa	510,824,331	2,102,000	338,603,781	2,102,000	61,365,550		57,515,000		53,340,000	
Canada	1,872,370,351	87,132,500	449,000,000		667,974,250	79,944,000	177,225,585	400,000	578,170,516	6,788,500
Grand total	5,527,947,838	2,028,753,017	2,990,138,757	1,213,997,497	1,085,201,190	364,672,990	531,514,685	201,694,800	921,093,206	248,387,730

[1] Covers defaults as to interest and/or sinking fund, and includes funding bonds.
[2] Includes conversion office 3-percent funding bonds, also $119,811,600 match loan bonds.

II. Status of service (interest, sinking fund, and principal) on outstanding foreign dollar bonds (publicly and nonpublicly offered) issued and/or guaranteed by governments or political subdivisions thereof as of Dec. 31, 1938

	Principal amount					In default as to principal—not included in totals
	Outstanding	Receiving full service	In default as to interest and/or sinking fund	In default as to both interest and sinking fund	In default as to sinking fund only	
Argentina	$233,798,290	$213,151,200	$20,647,090	$16,424,590	$4,222,500	$1,220,000
Bolivia	60,610,975		60,610,975	60,610,975		
Brazil	356,557,745		356,557,745	356,557,745		5,835,000
Chile	182,281,000		182,281,000	182,281,000		5,651,000
Colombia	146,265,930	2,616,030	143,649,900	143,649,900		142,400
Costa Rica	8,131,720		8,131,720	8,131,720		
Cuba	125,746,900	82,755,000	42,991,900	5,232,000	37,759,900	
Dominican Republic	15,594,000	15,594,000				
Ecuador	12,262,700		12,262,700	12,262,700		10,722,000
El Salvador	12,112,485		12,112,485	12,112,485		
Guatemala	5,352,604	1,537,000	3,815,604	3,815,604		27,620
Haiti	8,001,999		8,001,999		8,001,999	
Mexico	273,696,054		273,696,054	273,696,054		48,042,239
Panama	17,757,315		17,757,315	17,757,315		
Peru	85,656,500		85,656,500	85,656,500		
Uruguay	56,703,853	51,070,353	5,633,500	5,633,500		
Total, Latin America	1,600,530,070	366,723,583	1,233,806,487	1,183,822,088	49,984,399	71,640,259
Belgium	99,678,300	99,678,300				
Bulgaria	16,671,500		16,671,500	16,671,500		
Czechoslovakia	4,299,800	4,299,800				
Danzig	4,472,722	953,222	3,519,500	3,519,500		
Denmark	132,560,000	132,560,000				
Estonia	3,413,500	3,413,500				
Finland	19,910,000	19,910,000				
France	113,417,800	113,417,800				

II. Status of service (interest, sinking fund, and principal) on outstanding foreign dollar bonds (publicly and nonpublicly offered) issued and/or guaranteed by governments or political subdivisions thereof as of Dec. 31, 1938—Continued

	Principal amount					In default as to principal—not included totals
	Outstanding	Receiving full service	In default as to interest and/or sinking fund	In default as to both interest and sinking fund	In default as to sinking fund only	
Germany	[1]$531,311,500	$149,144,100	$382,167,400	$382,167,400		[1]$21,020,500
Greece	36,518,500	9,576,000	26,942,500	26,942,500		
Hungary	36,926,600	6,331,500	30,595,100	30,595,100		
Ireland	893,000	893,000				
Italy	111,311,200	111,311,200				
Latvia	5,886,500		5,886,500	5,886,500		
Lithuania	4,795,697	4,795,697				
Norway	116,985,000	116,985,000				
Poland	84,029,876	58,832,196	25,197,680	25,197,680		
Rumania	88,394,350		88,394,350	88,394,350		
Russia	75,000,000		75,000,000	75,000,000		75,000,000
Yugoslavia	57,747,241	6,409,741	51,337,500	51,337,500		
Total, Europe	1,544,223,086	838,511,056	705,712,030	705,712,030		96,020,500
Australia	248,657,550	248,657,550				
China	11,401,181	10,901,181	500,000	500,000		
Japan	249,163,600	249,163,600				
Liberia	1,602,000		1,602,000	1,602,000		
Total, Far East and Africa	510,824,331	508,722,331	2,102,000	2,102,000		
Canada	1,872,370,351	1,785,237,851	87,132,500	87,132,500		5,150,000
Grand total	5,527,947,838	3,499,194,821	2,028,753,017	1,978,768,618	$49,984,399	172,810,750

[1] Some of these are serial maturities for which various offers have been made, others are past due and unpaid bond maturities. None were paid in dollars according to contract when due.

III. Status of interest service on outstanding foreign dollar bonds (publicly and nonpublicly offered) issued and/or guaranteed by governments or political subdivisions thereof (based on treatment of last interest coupon maturing in 1938)

	Total outstanding	Principal amounts receiving				
		Full cash interest	Cash and funding bond payment	Partial cash payment	Payment in domestic currency	No payment
Argentina	$233,798,290	$217,373,700		$8,581,000		$7,843,590
Bolivia	60,610,975				$1,188,975	59,422,000
Brazil	356,557,745			[1]18,012,000		338,545,745
Chile	182,281,000					[2]182,281,000
Colombia	146,265,930	2,616,030				143,649,900
Costa Rica	8,131,720			[3]8,131,720		
Cuba	125,746,900	120,514,900				5,232,000
Dominican Republic	15,594,000	51,594,000				
Ecuador	12,262,700					12,262,700
El Salvador	12,112,485					12,112,485
Guatemala	5,352,604	1,537,000		3,786,484		29,120
Haiti	8,001,999	8,001,999				
Mexico	273,696,054					273,696,054
Panama	17,757,315	[4]3,603,000				14,154,315
Peru	85,656,500					85,656,500
Uruguay	56,703,853	51,070,353				5,633,500
Total, Latin America	1,600,530,070	420,310,982		38,511,204	1,188,975	1,140,518,900
Belgium	99,678,300	99,678,300				
Bulgaria	16,671,500			16,671,500		
Czechoslovakia	4,299,800	4,299,800				
Danzig	4,472,722	[5]953,222		3,519,500		
Denmark	132,560,000	132,560,000				
Estonia	3,413,500	3,413,500				
Finland	19,910,000	19,910,000				
France	113,417,800	113,417,800				
Germany	531,311,500	[6]119,144,100		150,939,000		231,228,400
Greece	36,518,500	9,576,000		26,942,500		
Hungary	36,926,600	6,331,500		30,348,000		247,100
Ireland	893,000	893,000				
Italy	111,311,200	111,311,200				
Latvia	5,886,500					5,886,500
Lithuania	4,795,697	4,795,697				
Norway	116,985,000	116,985,000				
Poland	84,029,876	58,832,196		25,197,680		
Rumania	88,394,350					88,394,350
Russia	75,000,000					75,000,000
Yugoslavia	57,747,241	6,409,741		51,337,500		
Total, Europe	1,544,223,086	838,511,056		304,955,680		400,756,350
Australia	248,657,550	248,657,550				
China	11,401,181	[4]5,901,181	$5,000,000			500,000
Japan	249,163,600	249,163,600				
Liberia	1,602,000			[7]1,602,000		
Total, Far East and Africa	510,824,331	503,722,331	5,000,000	1,602,000		500,000
Canada	1,872,370,351	1,785,237,851		86,732,500		400,000
Grand total	5,527,947,838	3,547,782,220	5,000,000	431,801,384	1,188,975	1,542,175,250

[1] 1 coupon only paid in 1938 on Sao Paulo 7's, due 1940.
[2] While a partial cash payment was offered for certain coupons, no offers were made for interest due in 1938.
[3] Offer of partial service not made until Mar. 20, 1939.
[4] Interest paid in full but not on due dates.
[5] Interest payments made under readjustment plans.
[6] This includes $119,811,600 match loan bonds, none of which are held in United States.
[7] Interest paid at 5 percent instead of 7 percent Jan. 1, 1935, to Dec. 31, 1942.

IV. Summary of outstanding foreign dollar bonds (publicly and nonpublicly offered) issued and/or guaranteed by governments or political subdivisions thereof as of Dec. 31, 1938

	Issued	Outstanding	In default	Percent in default of amount outstanding
Principal amount	$6,904,438,691	$5,527,947,838	$2,028,753,017	36.7
Number of issues	637	637	275	43.2

GROUPING ACCORDING TO AREAS

	Outstanding		In default		Percent in default
	Number of issues	Principal amount	Number of issues	Principal amount	
Latin America	178	$1,600,530,070	155	$1,233,806,487	77.1
Europe	133	1,544,223,086	82	705,712,030	45.7
Far East and Africa	19	510,824,331	1	2,102,000	.4
Canada	307	1,872,370,351	37	87,132,500	4.7
	637	5,527,947,838	275	2,028,753,017	36.7

GROUPING ACCORDING TO ISSUES

	Outstanding		In default		Percent in default
	Number of issues	Principal amount	Number of issues	Principal amount	
National	148	$2,990,138,757	87	$1,213,997,497	40.6
State, etc	194	1,085,201,190	82	364,672,990	33.6
Municipal	174	531,514,685	54	201,694,800	37.9
Corporate (Government guaranty)	121	921,093,206	52	248,387,730	27.0
	637	5,527,947,838	275	2,028,753,017	36.7

NOTE.—The foregoing tables show the outstanding amounts of dollar bonds, publicly and nonpublicly offered, of foreign governments, foreign political subdivisions, and foreign corporations directly guaranteed by a governmental body. A substantial part of these bonds are owned by citizens of other countries. Therefore, these figures should not be interpreted as indicating the amount of foreign bonds held by American investors or the amount of American foreign investments.

INDEBTEDNESS OF FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS TO THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The United States made loans to the Allied governments before and after the armistice for the purpose in general of assisting those governments to purchase supplies in connection with prosecution of the war. In addition, the United States after the armistice sold surplus war and relief supplies on credit to various countries of Europe, including some of the Allied governments. At the conclusion of the war period the Treasury held obligations of 20 nations, payable either on demand or within a short period of time.

The total indebtedness to the United States aggregated $10,350,479,074.70, distributed as follows:

Pre-armistice cash loans	$7,077,114,750.00
Post-armistice:	
Cash	2,533,288,825.45
War and relief supplies	740,075,499.25

The initial indebtedness of each foreign government is shown in table I.

Owing to the state of financial disorder existing throughout the world in 1921 and 1922, Congress, under date of February 9, 1922, passed an act creating the World War Foreign Debt Commission with authority "to refund or convert and to extend the time of payment of the principal or interest, or both, of any obligation of any foreign government now held by the United States of America, or any obligation of any foreign government hereafter received by the United States of America * * * arising out of the World War, into bonds or other obligations of such foreign governments in substitution for the bonds or other obligations of such governments now or hereafter held by the United States in such form and of such terms, conditions, date or dates of maturity, rate or rates of interest, and such security, if any, which shall be deemed for the best interests of the United States of America."

The principal and interest of the total debt at the time of funding operations aggregated $11,577,260,885.

The details of the indebtedness of each Government, as of that date, are shown in table II.

On March 1, 1939, the total funded indebtedness of foreign governments to the Government of the United States was $12,710,628,623.86, distributed as follows:

Principal unpaid	$11,231,083,955.50
Interest postponed and payable under moratorium agreements	184,091,606.16
Interest accrued and unpaid under funding and moratorium agreements	1,295,453,062.20

The total unfunded indebtedness of foreign governments to the Government of the United States was $408,675,575.52, distributed as follows:

Principal unpaid	$204,561,214.86
Interest postponed and payable under moratorium agreements	
Interest accrued and unpaid under funding and moratorium agreements	204,114,360.66

The details of indebtedness of each government, as of March 1, 1939, are shown in table III, the total indebtedness to the Government of the United States being $13,119,304,199.38.

On June 20, 1931, President Hoover proposed the postponement during 1 year of all payments on intergovernmental debts, reparations, and relief debts, both as to principal and interest, subject to confirmation by Congress, during the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1931. The object of the proposal was to give time to permit debtor governments to recover their national prosperity and did not involve any approval of the cancelation of the debts to the United States.

On December 23, 1931, there was signed Public Resolution No. 5, Seventy-second Congress, authorizing the postponement of amounts payable to the United States from foreign governments during the fiscal year 1932 and their repayment over a 10-year period beginning July 1, 1933, with interest at 4 percent per annum. The resolution specifically declares it to be against the policy of Congress that any of the indebtedness of foreign countries to the United States be in any manner canceled or reduced.

On May 12, 1933, there was approved the Agricultural Readjustment Act authorizing the President for a period of 6 months from the above date to accept silver in payment of installments due from any foreign governments, such silver to be accepted at not to exceed a price of 50 cents an ounce. In the payments due June 15, 1933, the Governments of Great Britain, Czechoslovakia, Finland, Italy, Lithuania, and Rumania took advantage of this offer.

On April 13, 1934, there was passed an act entitled, "An Act to Prohibit Financial Transactions with Any Foreign Government in Default on Its Obligations to the United States" and known as the Johnson Act. The act provides:

"That hereafter it shall be unlawful within the United States or any place subject to the jurisdiction of the United States for any person to purchase or sell the bonds, securities, or other obligations of, any foreign government or political subdivision thereof or any organization or association acting for or on behalf of a foreign government or political subdivision thereof, issued after the passage of this act, or to make any loan to such foreign government, political subdivision, organization, or association, except a renewal or adjustment of existing indebtedness while such government, political subdivision, organization, or association is in default in the payment of its obligations, or any part thereof, to the Government of the United States. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall upon conviction thereof be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned for not more than 5 years, or both.

"SEC. 2. As used in this act the term 'person' includes individual, partnership, corporations, or association other than a public corporation created by or pursuant to special authorization of Congress, or a corporation in which the Government of the United States has or exercises a controlling interest through stock ownership or otherwise."

The accompanying tables are taken from Memorandum, Treasury Department, Office of Commissioner of Accounts and Deposits, revised to March 1, 1939.

TABLE I.—*The following statement shows the obligations separated into prearmistice and postarmistice indebtedness*

Country	Prearmistice cash loans	Postarmistice		Total indebtedness
		Cash loans	War supplies and relief supplies	
Armenia			$11,959,917.49	$11,959,917.49
Austria			24,055,708.92	24,055,708.92
Belgium	$171,780,000	$177,434,467.89	29,872,732.54	379,087,200.43
Cuba	10,000,000			10,000,000.00
Czechoslovakia		61,974,041.10	29,905,629.93	91,879,671.03
Estonia			13,999,145.60	13,999,145.60
Finland			8,281,926.17	8,281,926.17
France	1,970,000,000	1,027,477,800.00	407,341,145.01	3,404,818,945.01
Great Britain	3,696,000,000	581,000,000.00		4,277,000,000.00

TABLE I.—*The following statement shows the obligations separated into prearmistice and postarmistice indebtedness*—Continued

Country	Prearmistice cash loans	Postarmistice		Total indebtedness
		Cash loans	War supplies and relief supplies	
Greece		[1] $27,167,000.00		$27,167,000.00
Hungary			$1,685,835.61	1,685,835.61
Italy	$1,031,000,000	617,034,050.90		1,648,034,050.90
Latvia			5,132,287.14	5,132,287.14
Liberia		26,000.00		26,000.00
Lithuania			4,981,628.03	4,981,628.03
Nicaragua			431,849.14	431,849.14
Poland			[2] 159,666,972.39	159,666,972.39
Rumania		25,000,000.00	12,911,152.92	37,911,152.92
Russia	[3] 187,729,750		4,871,547.37	192,601,297.37
Yugoslavia	10,605,000	16,175,465.56	24,978,020.99	51,758,486.55
	7,077,114,750	2,533,288,825.45	740,075,499.25	10,350,479,074.70

[1] Includes $12,167,000 authorized under act of Feb. 14, 1929.
[2] Includes $3,736,628.42 acquired by the U. S. Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation for services rendered.
[3] Exclusive of $5,000,000 conditional advance not availed of and returned.

TABLE II.—*Statement showing principal and interest computed at the rates specified in debt agreements on indebtedness of foreign governments to the United States at time of funding, credit allowances, the cash payments on execution of agreements, and the total debt as funded*

Country	Indebtedness at time of funding			Credit allowances and cash payments on execution of agreements		Funded debt
	Principal	Interest	Total	Applied on principal	Applied on interest	
Austria	$24,055,708.92	$559,176.08	$24,614,885.00			$24,614,885
Belgium	377,029,570.06	40,767,664.60	417,797,234.66		$17,234.66	417,780,000
Czechoslovakia	91,879,671.03	25,978,742.91	117,858,413.94		[1] 2,858,413.94	115,000,000
Estonia	13,999,145.60	1,765,219.73	15,764,365.33	[2] $1,932,923.45	1,441.88	13,830,000
Finland	8,281,926.17	727,389.10	9,009,315.27		9,315.27	9,000,000
France	3,340,516,043.72	684,870,643.17	4,025,386,686.89	386,686.89		4,025,000,000
Great Britain	4,074,818,358.44	529,309,727.30	4,604,128,085.74		4,128,085.74	4,600,000,000
Greece	[3] 27,167,000.00	3,127,922.67	30,294,922.67	2,922.67		30,292,000
Hungary	1,685,835.61	253,917.43	1,939,753.04		753.04	1,939,000
Italy	1,647,869,197.96	394,330,268.38	2,042,199,466.34	199,466.34		2,042,000,000
Latvia	5,132,287.14	647,275.62	5,779,562.76		4,562.76	5,775,000
Lithuania	4,981,628.03	1,049,918.94	6,031,546.97		1,546.97	6,030,000
Poland	159,666,972.39	18,898,053.60	178,565,025.99		5,025.99	178,560,000
Rumania	36,116,972.44	8,477,479.10	44,594,451.54	4,451.54		44,590,000
Yugoslavia	51,037,886.39	11,819,226.00	62,857,112.39	7,112.39		62,850,885
Total	9,864,238,203.90	1,722,582,624.63	11,586,820,828.53	2,533,563.28	7,026,380.25	11,577,260,885
Cash received upon execution of agreements	600,639.83	4,167,966.31	4,768,606.14			
Credit allowances	[4] 1,932,923.45	[1] 2,858,413.94	4,791,337.39			
	2,533,563.28	7,026,380.25	9,559,943.53			
Amount funded	9,861,704,640.62	1,715,556,244.38	11,577,260,885.00			

[1] Amount of interest written off in compromise settlement with Czechoslovakia.
[2] Allowance for total loss of cargo of steamship *John Russ* sunk by a mine in Baltic Sea.
[3] Includes 4 percent 20-year loan of $12,167,000 authorized by act of Feb. 14, 1929.

TABLE III.—*Statement showing total indebtedness of foreign governments to the United States—Mar. 1, 1939*

[All in default except Finland]

Country	Total indebtedness	Principal unpaid [1]	Interest postponed and payable under moratorium agreements	Interest accrued and unpaid under funding and moratorium agreements
Funded debts:				
Belgium	$449,080,212.01	$400,680,000.00	$3,750,000.00	$44,650,212.01
Czechoslovakia	165,729,490.80	165,241,108.90		488,381.90
Estonia	20,736,660.17	16,466,012.87	492,360.19	3,778,287.11
Finland	8,248,799.24	8,122,086.44	126,712.80	
France	4,160,824,820.69	3,863,650,000.00	38,636,500.00	258,538,320.69
Germany (Austrian indebtedness) [2]	26,011,672.09	25,980,480.66		31,191.43
Great Britain	5,419,388,374.72	4,368,000,000.00	131,520,000.00	919,868,374.72
Greece	34,068,437.00	31,516,000.00	449,080.00	2,103,357.00
Hungary	2,364,620.70	1,908,560.00	57,072.75	398,987.95
Italy	2,022,745,422.62	2,004,900,000.00	2,506,125.00	15,339,297.62
Latvia	8,546,036.99	6,879,464.20	205,989.96	1,460,582.83
Lithuania	7,650,387.79	6,197,682.00	185,930.46	1,266,775.33
Poland	259,502,346.55	206,057,000.00	6,161,835.00	47,283,511.55
Rumania	63,990,795.60	63,860,560.43		130,235.17
Yugoslavia [3]	61,740,546.89	61,625,000.00		115,546.89
Total	12,710,628,623.86	11,231,083,955.50	184,091,606.16	1,295,453,062.20
Unfunded debts:				
Armenia	23,303,395.87	11,959,917.49		11,343,478.38
Nicaragua [4]				
Russia	385,372,179.65	192,601,297.37		192,770,882.28
Total	408,675,575.52	204,561,214.86		204,114,360.66
Grand total	13,119,304,199.38	11,435,645,170.36	184,091,606.16	1,499,567,422.86

[1] Includes principal postponed under moratorium agreements and principal amounts not paid according to contract terms.
[2] The German Government has been notified that the Government of the United States will look to the German Government for the discharge of the indebtedness of the Government of Austria to the Government of the United States.
[3] This Government has not accepted the provisions of the moratorium.
[4] The United States holds obligations in the principal amount of $289,898.78, which, together with accrued interest thereon, are to be canceled pursuant to agreement of Apr. 14, 1938, between the United States and the Republic of Nicaragua, ratified by the United States Senate on June 13, 1938.

NOTE.—Indebtedness of Germany to the United States on account of costs of army of occupation and awards under Settlement of War Claims Act of 1928, as amended, not shown in above statement, but discussed on page 29 and following.

THE GERMAN DEBT

The Government of Germany is indebted to the United States on account of the costs of the American Army of occupation and the awards of the Mixed Claims Commission, United States and Germany. This indebtedness is not included in the foregoing figures.

Amount of indebtedness of Germany to the United States, Mar. 1, 1939 [1]

[In reichsmarks]

	Indebtedness as funded	Total indebtedness as of Mar. 1, 1939	Principal	Interest accrued and unpaid [2]
Army costs	1,048,100,000	1,015,005,077.36	997,500,000	17,505,077.36
Mixed claims	2,121,600,000	2,087,940,000.00	2,040,000,000	47,940,000.00
Total	[2]3,169,700,000	3,102,945,077.36	3,037,500,000	65,445,077.36

[1] Excludes amounts on account of Austrian indebtedness.
[2] Includes interest accrued under unpaid moratorium agreement annuities.

Total indebtedness as of Mar. 1, 1939, Rm. 3,102,945,077.36 converted into dollars at 40.33 cents to the reichsmark equals $1,251,417,749.70.

Wendell L. Willkie

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 19 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

EDITORIALS FROM THE PHILADELPHIA RECORD

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD three editorials from the Philadelphia Record, appearing August 17, August 18, and August 19, relating to the candidacy of Wendell L. Willkie for the Presidency of the United States.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Philadelphia Record of August 17, 1940]

DIAGRAM FOR A CANDIDATE'S ACCEPTANCE SPEECH

Today is Wendell Willkie's deadline.

This afternoon, in the little town of Elwood, Ind., the Republican nominee formally makes his party's 1940 bid for power in his long-awaited acceptance speech.

Our country today is facing its gravest crisis since 1860, when the first Republican President—the immortal Lincoln—was elected.

Yet, in spite of the fact that Congress for 8 weeks has been debating one of the most momentous legislative programs in America's history, the Republican candidate for 1940 has expressed not a single opinion on a single controversial issue now before the Senate and House.

Up to today Mr. Willkie's silence could be overlooked. It could be said that he is lacking in governmental experience; that he was wise in withholding his opinions until he had the opportunity to make a thorough study of our problems. It could be said that his own party has been divided; that the candidate, for sound political reasons, preferred to hold his fire until he could find the direction in which the Republican Party finally decides to move.

But those excuses are no longer valid. The candidate, after 2 months for research and mediation, has had far more time than Mr. Roosevelt to make up his mind and to offer at least the framework of a program.

Mr. Willkie is more than a mere candidate. He is the leader of a major political party. This year of 1940 is more than an ordinary Presidential campaign year. It is a year of national and international crisis which probably will completely change the course of our Nation.

Our Government is a two-party government. Our two parties have usually been responsible parties. This year, more than ever before in our history, it is essential that party leadership be responsible leadership.

It would be the height of presumption for a New Deal newspaper to tell a Republican candidate what to say in his acceptance speech. But we feel we are performing a public service in pointing out the obvious issues that any Presidential candidate must at least discuss in these challenging days of 1940.

What is Mr. Willkie's stand on the bill giving the President authority to call out the National Guard? The Senate and House have passed this bill, at the President's request. But it was amended in the House, must now go back to the Senate for concurrence or changes. A responsible leader will either approve or oppose it, give his reasons and obligate himself for his party's actions.

What is Mr. Willkie's stand on the conscription bill? It has been reported favorably by a Senate committee. It is now being debated on the Senate floor. There will probably be a vote next week. As Senator JOHNSON of Colorado said on Wednesday: "If Mr. Willkie comes out for this bill it will resolve the doubts of many Republican Members and it will pass without question." Mr. Roosevelt gave conscription his unqualified endorsement. Mr. Willkie can do no less than be equally explicit either for or against it.

What is Mr. Willkie's attitude on America's foreign policy? The President has recommended, and Congress has passed, a neutrality bill which quite obviously favors Britain against the totalitarian powers. It becomes clearer each day that the question of giving even more help to England will loom as a national issue. Of course, Mr. Willkie cannot see far enough ahead to chart a definite course, but he owes it to his party and to his country to say whether he approves or disapproves of our present policy of help for England, whether he thinks we have given too much or too little. To avoid this question is to evade an obvious responsibility.

What is Mr. Willkie's stand on the extension of publicly owned power plants—such as T. V. A.—in the interest of national defense? The President has asked such an extension. It has been approved by Mr. Stettinius, of the Defense Advisory Council, a Republican. But action was delayed because Republican Members of the House refused to give consent to immediate consideration of such a bill. Willkie surely needs no time for a study of this issue; electric power has been his business for many years. The country surely has a right to know Mr. Willkie's very specific opinion on this particular issue.

What is Mr. Willkie's stand on the Wagner Act? The Wage and Hour Act? Should we expand or contract W. P. A.? Does he favor modifications of the social-security laws? What is industry's role in national defense and how should President and Congress cooperate in changing our tax laws to facilitate our procurement program? A responsible candidate of a major party cannot ignore these questions.

Of course Mr. Willkie today will launch a violent attack upon the "wasteful extravagance" of the Roosevelt administration; long oratorical boos at the "corrupt Democratic machines" in the gr-r-eat cities. Mr. Willkie will probably refer to the Democratic campaign books and denounce the canvassers who solicit advertising for them. He may be slick and smooth in implying that the President's family has somehow profited from the prestige of living in the White House; he has tossed off quite a few hints about that, already.

All that we may expect as part of the American tradition in a red-hot campaign.

But that, alone, would be like putting on a vaudeville act for an audience that came to hear a symphony concert.

What Mr. Willkie doesn't say may be far more significant than what he does say.

When the sun sets behind the banks of the Wabash this evening we'll know more about Mr. Willkie than we knew last night.

For the country's sake, we hope he demonstrates the courage and the intelligence to meet the challenge of the times, to take his place as the responsible leader of a responsible party in this hour of grave national crisis.

In our editorial on Mr. Willkie's speech in Monday's Record we will compare the speech itself with our advance diagram of what a Presidential candidate's acceptance speech should be.

[From the Philadelpia Record of August 18, 1940]

MOONSHINE ALONG THE WABASH

Candidate Wendell L. Willkie discussed only two specific issues in his acceptance speech in his old Hoosier home yesterday:

1. Conscription.
2. Our foreign policy.

On conscription, he came out for "some form of selective service." But he gave not an inkling to his Republican colleagues who are Members of Congress as to whether he favors the conscription bill now being debated in the Senate.

Willkie didn't straddle on the principle of conscription but he cleverly avoided getting into the slightest argument on the merits of the one bill which will provide conscription. It was not the forthright statement of a courageous man.

On our foreign policy, the candidate approved the President's course in providing England with "the material resources of the Nation." But, he said, the President is leading us into war by his "inflammatory statements."

Whereupon Willkie said: "I promise * * * both in business and in war to outdistance Hitler in any contest he chooses in 1940 or after. And I promise that when we beat him, we shall beat him on our own terms."

We leave it to Willkie's closest friends to find any statement ever made by President Roosevelt one-tenth as "inflammatory" or irresponsible as that.

To find such a contradiction in so important a speech by the candidate of a major political party is so amazing that it staggers the imagination of well-balanced men and women.

Besides his casual remarks on conscription and his astounding contradiction in discussing our foreign policy, Candidate Willkie used about 5,300 other words to tell what was in his heart and to expound his political philosophy.

In those words lurk at least a half dozen other obvious contradictions, a plain desire to run away from the facts of life and five paragraphs closely resembling weasels. There is, however, an excellent Algeresque biography of a tousle-haired Hoosier lad playing 'round the cabin door. The boy's name is Willkie, Wendell L. He wants to be President.

As the Record promised yesterday, on Monday we will compare his speech in detail with the diagram of what a candidate's acceptance speech ought to be.

It will be a hard editorial to write. Almost as hard as trying to lasso a headless horseman who suddenly disassembles and rides off in all directions.

[From the Philadelphia Record of August 19, 1940]

THE MAN WHO WOULD BE PRESIDENT

In 6,000 words of an acceptance speech which left his listeners somewhat bewildered, Wendell L. Willkie on Saturday unveiled the major issue of the 1940 campaign:

Willkie doesn't like Roosevelt. Willkie wants Roosevelt's job.

That is the only completely clear thought in the entire speech. Nearly all the rest of the address was so vague and so full of self-contradictions that even the wobbly G. O. P. platform, by comparison, seems crystal clear.

Saturday morning in this space the Record listed nine of the important issues confronting America in these days of national crisis.

We believed any Presidential candidate ought to express his opinions on (1) conscription, (2) foreign policy, (3) National Guard bill, (4) extension of publicly owned power in the interest of national defense, (5) Wagner Act, (6) Wages and Hours Act, (7) social security, (8) future of W. P. A., (9) Government aid to industry in the national-defense program. We promised to compare the speech itself with our diagram.

It is to Willkie's credit that he discussed two of these issues at some length—conscription and our foreign policy. He briefly referred to three others—Wagner Act, Wage and Hour Act, and social security, and approved "in principle" all three reforms. It is to Willkie's discredit that he carefully skirted any comment whatever on the National Guard bill, extension of publicly owned power in the interest of our defense, Government aid to industry in our defense program, and avoided any reference to W. P. A.

It was quite natural that many Republicans deluged Willkie with questions immediately after the speech as to what he really thinks about conscription. He said he favors "some form of selective service." That statement can mean he favors the Burke-Wadsworth bill—an act written by two of his supporters—or it can mean he favors the Maloney amendment, which also approves conscription but would postpone it for months while we try to raise a volunteer army. Both provide "some form of selective service."

Willkie is for conscription "in principle." But when he avoided discussing the one bill which can give us conscription now he was obviously guilty of a straddle. His colleagues who are in Congress find not leadership here from a man who ought to lead.

On our foreign policy Willkie had the courage to approve, with only a few qualifications, the President's program of helping England "with the material resources of the Nation." He criticized the President for leading us into war by "inflammatory utterances" directed at foreign powers. But when Willkie then issued a virtual challenge to Hitler to "C'mon and fight; I'll lick you," he committed one of the classical political inconsistencies of the age.

We agree with Willkie that the President and his State Department have done too much scolding in their relations with Germany and Japan.

But neither has gone off half-cocked in so blatant and amateurish a fashion as did Willkie at Elwood Saturday afternoon. We are sure the country will still have greater faith in Roosevelt's handling of our affairs abroad than in Willkie's.

Willkie endorsed nearly all of Roosevelt's domestic program. He pledged himself to maintain and enforce collective bargaining by representatives of labor's own choosing without interference; to continue minimum standards for wages and maximum standards for hours; to maintain regulation of securities markets; to continue extension of rural electrification, Federal old-age pensions, unemployment insurance.

These reforms are the heart of the New Deal administration. After endorsing them, Willkie said in almost the same breath: "This administration stands for principles exactly opposite to mine."

No wonder so many listeners were bewildered. Willkie is for the Roosevelt foreign policy. He is for the Roosevelt domestic policy. Yet the Roosevelt policies are exactly opposite to his own. Roosevelt is too inflammatory, yet not one-tenth as inflammatory as Willkie.

Yes; it's all very confusing. The speech defies analysis on logical grounds. But it leaves the issue of the campaign very clear:

Willkie doesn't like Roosevelt. Willkie wants Roosevelt's job.

Conscription

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ERNEST LUNDEEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 19 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

RADIO ADDRESSES BY HON. ERNEST LUNDEEN, OF MINNESOTA

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two radio addresses delivered by myself, one on July 28 and the other on August 10, 1940, on the subject "Conscription."

There being no objection, the addresses were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

(July 28, 1940)

SHALL WE CONSCRIPT AMERICAN MANPOWER NOW?

Fellow citizens and fellow Americans, we have come a long way down the road toward war since the President declared a national emergency on September 8, 1939. Our neutrality law aimed to keep us neutral. At the demand of the administration, Congress was called into special session to remove the arms embargo in order that this great Nation of peace-loving people might arm one European nation against another. Interventionists in the quarrels and boundary disputes of Europe now demand that we give our guns and powder, our Army equipment, our warships, our war planes, and the entire facilities of our industries to Great Britain, and they are enforcing their demands.

LAST CROSS ROAD BEFORE WAR

We have now arrived at the last cross road before we enter the second world war, and as far as this administration is concerned, there is no turning back. For us it is either peace or war. The administration forces now place before Congress a European-minded conscription bill which lists and regiments every man from 18 to 65 years in the military services of this country—an army of 42,000,000 men.

All this in the name of defense for the United States. We are not at war with any nation. We maintain friendly and diplomatic relations with every nation on earth. There is no danger of invasion from abroad. No one has threatened us, and we have not broken diplomatic relations with any foreign countries. Why a peacetime conscript Army? No one can attack us now, or in the near future. Unless America now is to send overseas an expeditionary force to Europe, Asia, and Africa, there is no reason for a conscript Army.

THEIR WARS ARE NOT OUR WARS

American volunteers have always been willing to defend this country from invasion and from insurrection. Our citizens have repeatedly refused to serve on European soil in the armies and under the flags of foreign nations. Their wars are not our wars. Their quarrels are none of our concern. We are not interested in their real-estate titles and boundary disputes.

CONSCRIPTION SLAVERY

The Burke-Wadsworth bill is purely a wartime measure, which no country has ever enacted before in times of peace. We propose the military extreme of placing 42,000,000 men in the yoke of conscription. Whether for military service or work armies, this is conscription slavery, where men earning far beyond $21 per month are forcibly taken from their families and jobs to be enslaved at a starvation wage, leaving their dependents to shift for themselves in a truly militaristic system. I cannot support peacetime conscription, and I will fight to maintain some semblance of reason and sanity in our national-defense policy.

UNEMPLOYMENT IN AMERICA

In our conduct with foreign nations, in our repeal of the Embargo Act we are asking for trouble, yet we have more in the United States than we can take care of. At least, it is apparent that we have been unable to solve the unemployment problem. We have been unable to give jobs and some form of security to more than 10,000,000 persons in these rich United States. We have nearly 5,000,000 out of schools and out of work, and you say to them, "Get into the army; get into the Navy; be ready to fight on foreign soil." There is no justification for a peacetime conscript army of 42,000,000 men in these United States, except in the minds of those who think in terms of Europe and the Old World and in the minds of "world savers," who would sacrifice America on the altar of Old World problems.

You will pay them from $5 to $21 a month for their services and for their lives in wars beyond the seas.

NEW YOUTH BILL—CONSCRIPTION

This is the new youth bill, which the administration has given to its young people. For over 8 years, youth organizations and groups have asked for some type of bill which would give them a

job, a chance to make a decent living. Their demands went unheard; their voices struck a stone wall and reverberated over this Nation. They thronged the streets, they walked the dusty highways, they became the boy and girl tramps of America, trying to find decent employment. Our wealthy industries replied: "Help not wanted." Now, you ask Uncle Sam to say to these people, "Johnny, get your gun. I need you now." Is this their destiny? Is this the American way? This conscription slavery idea was used by the kings of Europe to keep their millions in humble subjection; and it is now proposed that we import that system to enslave the American people.

INDUSTRY WANTS PROFIT

Uncle Sam is also asking industry to serve. Unlike our young people, who have no voice in the matter, our big industries reply through the statements of their presidents on various occasions and they say bluntly that they cannot expand their industries or build the needed equipment unless they have a definite and enormous profit. Our boys are asked to serve at the paltry sum of five to twenty-one dollars a month. They are asked to sacrifice their lives in foreign wars.

"Theirs not to reason why,
Theirs but to do and die."

OLD WORLD INDUSTRIAL SLAVERY

We denounce other nations for militaristic, totalitarian conscription. We condemn them for their slave labor, for absorbing their unemployed by creating conscript armies; yet, now we propose to do the same thing over here. The administration has no solution for our vast unemployment. I ask is this an American doctrine to absorb our men into conscript armies, or is this the imported European, Old World system of industrial slavery?

MINNEAPOLIS CENTRAL LABOR UNION OPPOSES CONSCRIPTION

I have before me a telegram from the Minneapolis Central Labor Union, opposing this bill. It is their opinion that no conscription should take place at any time until sufficient wealth has been conscripted to afford employment for the unemployed at union wages. They recognize that our domestic issues are far more important to America, to American security, and American freedom than conscription which has every semblance of war and intervention.

CONSCRIPTION UNCONSTITUTIONAL

We refuse to conscript our wealth to employ our people; surely, we cannot afford to give our material defenses to any foreign country. America is the issue, not Europe!

Conscription for foreign service is unconstitutional. The great Daniel Webster said that, "A free government with arbitrary means to administer it is a contradiction; a free government without adequate provision for personal security is an absurdity; a free government with uncontrolled power of military conscription is a solecism; at once, the most ridiculous and abominable that ever entered into a head of a man." You cannot conscript American manhood for any other purposes than these: First, to suppress a rebellion; second, to repel an invasion; and third, to execute the laws of the land and that you can do only in your own country and on the decks of your own ships. That is the provision of our Constitution, article 1, section 8.

Hannis Taylor, well-known authority on constitutional law, stated during the last World War: "Every citizen of this country should know, first, that under our Constitution no American soldier can be sent abroad except those composing the Regular Army; second, that the ranks of the Regular Army can only be swelled by voluntary enlistment."

The present bill provides compulsory military training for 42,000,000 men. Let it be remembered by all of the people of this Nation that we won our liberty and our independence with a volunteer army. Our fathers won the second war of independence with a volunteer army. The Mexican War was fought entirely by volunteers. The vast majority of the Grand Army of the Republic were volunteers, and those in the Spanish-American War were volunteers.

CRUCIFIXION ON CROSS OF KINGS

When the cause is an American battle, our men are ready and willing to fight for the defense and security of this country. But you cannot crucify our American youth on the cross of kings and Old World empire struggles. They refuse to volunteer for such un-American service.

CONSCRIPTION BEFORE WAR

During the first World War, conscription followed the declaration of war because men would not volunteer for foreign service. Now, the order of events seems to have changed. Our leaders are aware of the tremendous opposition to foreign service and they seek to corral American youth by so-called compulsory training and service, which means conscription. They expect to do this before there is an actual declaration of war. Under the guise and sham of national defense and with a blare of false patriotism, 42,000,000 men are to be conscripted not only for training but for service as the bill indicates. What service? I say, war service, and since there is no war here, we must find a war somewhere, somehow.

FARMER-LABOR PARTY OPPOSED TO FOREIGN SERVICE

The old parties may favor conscription for foreign service, but I can give you one party which does not favor conscription—the Farmer-Labor Party of Minnesota. This is their foreign policy: "We are unalterably opposed to any imperialist wars or designs, and to the sending of our men across the oceans or elsewhere to participate in such wars."

ESSENTIALS OF TRUE DEFENSE

If we are truly interested in national defense, there are three necessary elements. First, jobs for every person capable of working. Second, American possession of all islands off both our coasts and the fortification of these islands by land, air, and sea. Third, creation of a separate department of the air service for the unification and effective training of our air forces. It is evident that no country can have supremacy of the sea without supremacy in the air, that ships are helpless against land-based planes.

This is the true pattern for American defense. It does not involve the fortunes of kings. It places Europe second and America first.

(August 10, 1940)

CONSCRIPTION

America prepares to take the last step before entering another World War. A nation of conscripted men, together with Ambassadors who constantly make statements that antagonize foreign countries cannot expect to remain long at peace.

The Burke-Wadsworth bill proposes to conscript Americans from the cradle to the grave. Serfs and peons—that is your destiny. I call upon the youth of America to put a stop to these un-American, pro-European doctrines. Regimentation of our youth and manhood is unnesessary in this free land of ours.

AMERICA DECEIVED

The trend of slogans is amazing. First we heard that America had no defenses, and we needed billions to build up our Army and Navy. No sooner had the money been granted and the ink dried on the approved bill than another shout arose from the blue, and we were told that we were flooded with surplus arms and that we should send them abroad. The American people barely recovered from this obvious deception when our material sent to Europe was discovered to be not obsolete and old surplus materials but the actual equipment of the United States Army and Navy.

Planes were flown to the United States-Canadian border and pushed across the boundary line to evade the laws of the United States—all with the complete sanction of the administration. Our merchant ships were transferred to foreign registry with such rapidity that in January we had lost 250,000 tons of shipping without a shot being fired—ships transferred to foreign registry and subject to all the perils of the present war. A few weeks ago the press came out with the amazing report that the President sanctioned the sending of 50 United States war vessels to England. And only a few days ago the suggestion was made by administration men that we send 50 destroyers.

Britain was then reported by the press to be willing to give us in return a few of her useless battleships—death traps and dinosaurs of the deep.

Our war makers have placed the American frontier on the Rhine, on the battlefields of Europe, Asia, and Africa.

STRIPPING AMERICA FOR BRITAIN

The record shows that we have authorized and expended more than $50,000,000,000 on preparedness in the last 50 years. More than one billion a year for 50 years. We have appropriated and authorized in this Seventy-sixth Congress alone more than $14,000,000,000 for war. We are now told by the administration that there is no preparedness, that we have no weapons—at least, our weapons are not sufficient in quantity for even a small army. I ask, and our fellow citizens have a right to ask, what became of the $50,000,000,000 we appropriated? If there is no preparedness today, what became of these $50,000,000,000 we have expended?

One of the reasons we have a shortage of weapons today is that we turned over our three-inch field pieces to Great Britain. Pictures were published in the press showing huge shiploads of these cannon on the way to the British Isles, stripping our own American army of its defense weapons. Now our soldiers, as shown by a picture in the metropolitan press the other day, are practicing with wooden guns and wooden trench mortars, and no doubt a little later we will have to train our conscripts with broomsticks because of the shipment of 800,000 rifles to the British Isles.

We sent them our powder, so we have no powder now to keep dry, as the old saying goes, and we sent them in one shipment 132 carloads of TNT. We have sent the French more than 1,700 planes—they are all Hitler's now. At Brest alone 200 complete planes and 2,000 American motors with blueprints to mount them were captured in one battle, and they are now being used to bomb Britain.

I warned the American Congress not to send our defense weapons abroad. I warned that it was dangerous, but they would not listen. They would not listen to me in 1917, and they will not listen now. I say the stripping of weapons from the American Army, our Navy, and our air force is un-American, pro-European, and pro-British. It is dangerous to the very life of America, because no matter what our manpower may be, if we take the swords out of the hands of our soldiers and leave them barehanded, we will become the most tempting nation for invasion ever known in the history of the world. Every military man, every naval man, and every airman knows that if we keep our weapons to ourselves and have a reasonable degree of preparedness, common-sense preparedness, invasion is not possible either on the Pacific or on the Atlantic. The oceans are too great; the lines of communication are too long. No army or navy can strike across such expanses. Every admiral and every general will tell you that. The only possible method of attack is through island bases on the oceans along the Atlantic and Pacific coasts, through Canada, Mexico, Central or South America. For years I have advocated taking over the islands and arming them for air, land, and sea bases. I have advo-

cated their acquisition by purchase and by credit on war debts, and I have stated that in a crisis seizure of the islands may be necessary, as once advocated by Andrew Jackson, our great American President. Danish and Dutch, British and French island possessions in the Western Hemisphere—all must become American. Only recently has the administration been giving some thought to that. Always late, always asleep until the hour and opportunity passes.

AMERICAN UNEMPLOYMENT THE ISSUE

In the meantime our debts are piling sky high, approaching fifty billions, with a $6,000,000,000 deficit this year, while our workmen go jobless and hungry and our farmers are losing their farms. Progressive, liberal, and labor-minded people have time and again urged an American common-sense program which will solve our defense and domestic difficulties, but our Wall Street plutocracy will not listen. They seem bent on their own and the Nation's destruction. "For whom the gods would destroy, they first make mad."

William S. Knudsen, head of the great General Motors Corporation, now tells us that we cannot equip even an army of 2,000,000 men before 1944. We are told that we cannot have any tanks until 1942—that we are now drawing blueprints of these tanks. In the name of common sense and all reason, what have our experts and defense men been doing? Have they all been asleep while the world was burning? I have always advocated adequate American defense, and we have made available huge sums of money, greater peacetime sums than any other nation in the history of the world. Now we are being urged on by insane hysteria. Reason! We seem to be bereft of reason. We talk about conscripting 42,000,000 men and paying them $5 a month. It is true that after the cold reception by the general public of these proposals certain changes are being considered; but remember, my fellow citizens, the proponents have not yet given up their original proposals. They are even now arguing for their restoration. Such proposals are worthy of a program for the serfs of the Old World.

CONSCRIPTION FOR FOREIGN SERVICE UNCONSTITUTIONAL

Conscription for foreign service is entirely illegal. Hannis Taylor, well-known authority on constitutional law, stated during the last World War: "Every citizen of this country should know, first, that under our Constitution no American soldier can be sent abroad except those composing the Regular Army; second, that the ranks of the Regular Army can only be swelled by voluntary enlistment."

When they tell you that conscription is constitutional, tell them that our greatest constitutional lawyer, Daniel Webster, defined it not only as unconstitutional but absurdly contrary to the very spirit of our Constitution and American Government.

An administration that will not limit the National Guard to service in the United States and its possessions, including the Philippines, is planning to stand on foreign soil.

WHY STAND ON FOREIGN GROUND

Washington, our greatest President, warned: "Why quit our own to stand upon foreign ground? Why, by interweaving our destiny with that of any part of Europe, entangle our peace and prosperity in the toils of European ambition, rivalship, interest, humor, or caprice?"

The World War proved the impossibility, even in Europe, of waging effective offensives with great unwieldy armies of conscript civilians. The present war in Europe proves that large civilian conscript armies, when confronted with small, fast-moving armies of experts, are outflanked and surrounded without ever coming to grips with combat troops.

We must not be stampeded into embracing the conscription system of foreign countries. A decent American standard of pay and a decent American opportunity for training and advancement will unquestionably provide us with an Army of adequate size. The Navy has no recruiting problem because, as one Army man has recently pointed out, the average pay of the sailor is 90 percent greater than that of the soldier. Nor does the Air Corps have a recruiting problem.

BRANDING TRUE AMERICANS

The spontaneous objections of the American people to this conscription bill have been termed Nazi-directed and subtle Nazi propaganda. Your many letters and cards were so referred to by a Senator in the hearings on the Burke-Wadsworth bill. The free expressions of Americans who refuse to be yoked to military slavery at $5 to $21 a month, the objections raised by millions of Americans to underwriting the safety of the British Empire, is being met with the cry of Nazi propaganda.

I am weary of such unfair attacks upon the sincerity of Americans. I have never heard of a German or a German-born American with the gall to ask that we help Germany; but red, yellow, brown, black, and white races—all are expected to die for the British Empire.

I warn the American people that we cannot defend America by defending the old empires and kings of Europe. Any such reasoning by any propaganda committee proclaiming such a doctrine is dragging America into European war and is subversive to the best interests of the United States. We are not a colony of the Old World. If we continue to act like one, we may as well declare our Declaration of Independence a scrap of paper.

LET AMERICANS BE HEARD

The conscription bill has not passed. Its passage is not inevitable. It can be defeated. The people should make known their protest. Write your Congressmen and Senators. Telephone them. Wire them. Come to Washington to see them. You must do this now. Immediate protest will block the way to militarizing our Nation.

I have just received a wire from the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, addressed to:

"Hon. ERNEST LUNDEEN,

"*Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.*:

"Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen respectfully requests you to vote against Burke-Wadsworth military conscription bill. We oppose this bill setting up a regimentation of citizenry as out of line with democratic principles.

"G. T. LINDSTEN, *Chairman*."

Let me say to the members of the Railway Brotherhoods, I shall remember your wire. I will stand by the American way.

Willkie and Utilities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. H. SCHWARTZ

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 19 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

ARTICLE BY GEORGE SANFORD HOLMES

Mr. SCHWARTZ. Mr. President, I ask to insert in the appendix of the RECORD an article appearing in the Sunday Herald of Bridgeport, Conn., August 18, from the pen of George Sanford Holmes. Mr. Holmes is a well-known newspaper man and writer, for 20 years connected with Scripps-Howard newspapers at Denver and in the city of Washington.

Mr. Holmes quotes from the address of Wendell L. Willkie delivered before the Economic Club of New York and the Harvard Business School Club January 31, 1935, wherein the Republican candidate places his zeal for preserving "public utilities privately owned" as more appealing than was that of his past general service to his country.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Bridgeport (Conn.) Sunday Herald of August 18, 1940]

WILLKIE ON UTILITIES MAJOR CAMPAIGN ISSUE—EARLY SPEECH SHOWS CANDIDATE'S SENSE OF DUTY MAY BE DIVIDED

(By George Sanford Holmes)

WASHINGTON.—Students of Wendell Willkie's public utterances are wondering if, in outlining his beliefs as a Presidential aspirant, Mr. Willkie will reiterate his famous statement placing the preservation of the private-utility industry on a par with patriotism and service to his country.

The Republican candidate openly pledged himself to the task of saving the private utilities at a joint meeting held in New York January 21, 1935, by the Economic Club of New York and the Harvard Business School Club.

The unrestrained terms in which Mr. Willkie, then speaking for Commonwealth & Southern, announced his devotion to this cause attracted considerable attention, and his address was printed and circulated in investment circles and Wall Street.

Since then it had apparently been lost sight of, however, until exhumed from the voluminous mass of his writings and speeches by proponents of public ownership, who are interested in learning whether or not Mr. Willkie, in his White House candidacy, will stand by or repudiate his do-or-die pledge to the power industry.

Printed copies of his speech are now said to be practically collectors' items.

The fervor of Mr. Willkie's statement regarding his own consecration to what he described as a duty aroused special interest because in the same speech he accused some of the advocates of public power of entertaining beliefs that "partake of the nature of religious frenzy."

New Dealers here acquainted with Mr. Willkie's remarks at the Wall Street dinner, however, contend that nothing the most fanatical of them has ever said on the power question compares with the emotional, almost religious zeal with which the Republican candidate in 1935 assured his hearers that he regarded the fight for the utility industry as a patriotic duty. This is what he said:

"Those who oppose the utility organization, whether they be holding companies or operating companies, assume an attitude of superior virtue and patriotism.

"They seek to paint us who represent private enterprise in the utility business as antisocial, unpatriotic, and the despoilers of men. * * *

"I yield to no Government official, be he high or low, in my social obligations, love of country, or fellow feeling for the struggling masses of humanity.

"I do not like to make personal references but I want to say to you that no duty has ever come to me in my life, even that in the service of my country, which has so appealed to my senses of social obligation, partiotism, and love of mankind as this, my obligation to say and do what I can for the preservation of public utilities privately owned.

"All that I have observed, all that I know, and all that I read teaches me that I could do nothing nobler for the future financial stability and political good of my country or the social and economic well being of my fellow citizens than to stand firm and unafraid against this foolish fad and fancy of the moment."

New Deal spokesmen have underscored this sophomoric "oath of allegiance," as an all-time high in Wall Street oratory.

They do not criticize either its sincerity or accuracy as demonstrating the philosophy of its author.

What they are wondering is just how it squares with the concepts of public duty of a Presidential candidate.

Believing the power question will be one of the major issues of the campaign, if not the dominant one, they hold that the voters should be made acquainted with the Republican candidate's views in the matter.

When he puts duty to the utilities on an equal plane with that of duty to his country, they claim Mr. Willkie has gone further than any other advocate of the power interests.

If he should be elected, they point out, the conflict between this allegiance and that of his oath of office will become most important in view of the immense public power projects to which the Nation stands committed.

It is acknowledged by them that Mr. Willkie may assert there will be no conflict between the two devotions.

However, that is what they want to find out and in view of the Republican candidate's reputation for frankness, they hope he will make his position clear, now that he is no longer spokesman for a special interest but a candidate for the highest honor in the gift of America.

The question is all the more pertinent, they point out, because Senator CHARLES L. MCNARY, of Oregon, candidate for Vice President on the Republican ticket, is recognized through the Nation as a friend and proponent of public power, a supporter of the Tennessee Valley Authority enactment and an ardent advocate of Bonneville Dam, an undertaking of great importance to his own State of Oregon.

Just how the two team mates can reconcile their opposing stands has puzzled Washington ever since Mr. Willkie dictated the choice of Mr. MCNARY as his running mate, either as an antidote to his own views on the utility question or as a bid for the farmers' votes, or both.

The 1935 speech of Mr. Willkie before the New York business interests is regarded here as the Mein Kampf of the Republican nominee.

It enunciates his economic and political philosophy, his personal convictions on the utility issue, and charts his course in the struggle to preserve the private-utility interests.

This was long before he became a candidate for President, of course, and prior to his unsuccessful court action to have the T. V. A. declared unconstitutional.

It is now being referred to by new dealers as containing the essence of his ideas and beliefs on the theme of private, corporate control of water-power sites and streams belonging to all the people and they expect him to stick by it.

The claim that in their case, Job's prayer, "Oh, that mine adversary had written a book," has been answered.

The speech before the Economic Club was an all-around defense of the utility interests by Mr. Willkie and an attack upon the alleged inefficiency, waste, political manipulation, and patronage system of municipally operated plants.

It was in this speech that he referred to Mr. Samuel Insul as a "forceful, dynamic, and attractive figure."

Year 1936 All Over Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 19 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE MONTGOMERY (ALA.) ADVERTISER

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, yesterday there appeared in the Montgomery (Ala.) Advertiser, from the pen of Mr. Grover Hall, an editorial entitled "1936 All Over Again." The editorial concludes with these significant words:

Perhaps this time Maine and Vermont will see the light, too.

The speech delivered on Saturday afternoon by Mr. Willkie was the subject of the editorial. I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Montgomery (Ala.) Advertiser of August 8, 1940]

NINETEEN THIRTY-SIX ALL OVER AGAIN

There is one great issue in the coming Presidential campaign, according to Wendell Willkie, the Republican nominee. It is whether the New Deal can be dealt more economically by the Democratic Party or by the Republican Party. As nominee of the Republican Party, Mr. Willkie is convinced that he and his party can deal it best.

"The New Deal stands for doing what has to be done by spending as much money as possible. I propose to do it by spending as little money as possible. This is one great issue in domestic policy, and I propose in this campaign to make it clear," said Mr. Willkie.

So much for the issue upon which Mr. Willkie desires to base the coming campaign. The subject of economical operation of government is one of interminable and often fruitless argument not only between the two great political parties of this Nation but even within them. If Mr. Willkie intends to argue about those details of government before the people of the United States for the next two and a half months, he will only succeed in boring them. The first assumption made about the nominee of either of our two major parties is that they are capable and efficient men. That should be the first assumption made by the electorate concerning any candidate for any office who is ultimately granted the privilege of serving. The United States approves President Roosevelt's administration insofar as the details of that administration are concerned. No valid criticism has ever been made of that management of fiscal affairs. However, upon the matter of policy much criticism has been offered, some valid, some not. If Mr. Willkie has no criticism of that policy but only of the administration of it, then he hasn't raised any issue at all.

As for the rest of Mr. Willkie's speech, it was as depressing a disappointment as his attempt to create an issue that could not be brought to life by the best of miracle workers. The speech fell easily into three general classifications.

1. Political fluff that can be found in any mayor's address to an American Legion convention—any struggling lawyer's address to a southern audience at the cemetery on Memorial Day. Considered alone, this political fluff is worthless, but if it is implemented by a significant offering it is the most valuable aspect of democratic action.

2. Demagogic contradiction of which the Advertiser, as well as many another institution, we suspect, did not believe Mr. Willkie capable until yesterday.

3. The definition of issues, which has already been discussed.

Mr. Willkie is undoubtedly a sincere patriot. He is as convinced of the rightness of the democratic life as any other citizen of this democracy from Franklin Roosevelt on down to the lowest devotee of faith. But in that he differs not one whit from the whole range of adherents to the democratic faith.

Though Mr. Willkie denied that he would allow personalities to enter into his campaign, he made this pointed charge against President Roosevelt: "There have been occasions when many of us have wondered if he is deliberately inciting us to war. * * * And I believe it to be the first duty of a President to try to maintain peace. But Mr. Roosevelt has not done this. He has dabbled in inflammatory statements and manufactured panics. Of course, we in America like to speak our minds freely, but this does not mean that at a critical period in history our President should cause bitterness and confusion for the sake of a little political oratory."

With that charge firmly in mind, it is illuminating to review again these other statements by Mr. Willkie.

"We must admit that the loss of the British Fleet would greatly weaken our defense.

"We must face a brutal, perhaps, a terrible fact. Our way of life is in competition with Hitler's way of life."

"I promise, by returning to those same American principles that overcame German autocracy once before, both in business and in war, to out-distance Hitler in any contest he chooses in 1940 or after. And I promise that when we beat him, we shall beat him on our own terms, in our own American way."

Thus Mr. Willkie places himself in the strangely contradictory position of indicting President Roosevelt for making inflammatory statements (about which Mr. Willkie is politically vague as to date and time of utterance) and then he tries to go President Roosevelt one better in acknowledging the danger which faces the United States, in excoriating the author of that danger, Adolf Hitler as leader of the German people. Mr. Willkie even promises to "beat" Germany in 1940 if given a chance, but condemns President Roosevelt for creating a "manufactured panic" about the dangers facing the Nation. By implication, Mr. Willkie charges that President Roosevelt would lead us into war for his own political designs, but Mr. Willkie would "beat" Hitler on our "own terms" in 1940 if the electorate of the United States will only discard their present warmongering President and elect Mr. Willkie.

Mr. Willkie was the Advertiser's candidate for the Republican nomination. In assuming that position, the Advertiser was not acting in a shrewdly partisan manner. Frankly, the Advertiser was

disappointed yesterday when it discovered that it had picked a dud. But this much must be said in apology for the error. Mr. Willkie was a dud among duds. Every other candidate for the Republican nomination had hung himself upon the public tree of intellectual incompetence. Mr. Willkie presented nothing but hope. He has made a fine record both as a lawyer (for corporations) and a corporation manager. He is still a good and sincere man. As much could be said for his disappointed rival, Senator ROBERT TAFT. But he is an inadequate political philosopher. He only claims, rather brashly, that he can do what President Roosevelt is doing better than President Roosevelt is doing it.

It looked for a time as if the outcome of the Presidential election would be decided principally upon the development of the situation in Europe. Now that Mr. Willkie's keyenote address has been delivered, it is apparent that it will be decided on the same issues which were presented to the electorate in 1936. Perhaps this time Maine and Vermont will see the light, too.

The Acceptance Speech of Mr. Willkie

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 19 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

ARTICLE BY RAYMOND CLAPPER

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask leave to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article under the heading "Sincere and brave words," by Raymond Clapper, appearing in the Washington (D. C.) Daily News of today, relative to the acceptance speech of Mr. Willkie.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Washington Daily News of August 19, 1940]

SINCERE AND BRAVE WORDS

(By Raymond Clapper)

REHOBOTH BEACH, DEL., August 19.—The Willkie acceptance speech was better in the newspapers than it was on the air. It must be read in type to be appreciated. Whereas President Roosevelt's remarks gain in effectiveness by delivery over the air, Mr. Willkie's lose.

The very real merits of the Willkie acceptance speech were muffled by the sloppy delivery, with frequent stumbling and slurring of words. The effect of this upon Republicans and Willkie worshipers here at this small summer resort was one of pain and disappointment. They had no specific suggestions as to the content of the speech. They said that it somehow just didn't measure up, didn't give them a thrill, didn't have the lift they had expected. That was about all one could get out of these friendly critics, but inasmuch as they are all Roosevelt-haters of long standing and had been intensely proud of Willkie, I regard their reaction as a significant index. I found that some changed their opinion about the speech after reading it in the newspapers the next morning, and thought it far better than they had at first realized.

The fact is that Mr. Willkie is being judged, as was Alf Landon 4 years ago, by the Roosevelt standard of radio crooning. The middle-western homespun style doesn't appear to have the appeal of the tailored Roosevelt speech. Mr. Roosevelt probably could have taken the Willkie script and made it sing. This all seems silly to me, but if people are going to be swayed by the cut of a radio voice, then that fact has to be taken into account. Mr. Willkie might well hope that President Roosevelt ignores his challenge to joint debate.

Not many major political utterances in modern times have rung with such courage as this Willkie acceptance speech. The world situation is driving the Roosevelt administration into steps that are disturbing and not welcome—such as conscription. Everyone would like to think that the outlook is not as black as President Roosevelt has pictured it. All would like to think with Colonel Lindbergh that everything is going to be just dandy, no matter who wins the war in Europe, and that it won't make much difference to us whether Britain wins or loses. There are some Republicans who have been tempted to dangle that fool's paradise before the voters this year. Mr. Willkie refused to indulge in such political day dreaming.

Mr. Willkie did not say things that were pleasant to hear. He spoke of toil and sweat and sacrifice. He spoke for conscription. He faced frankly the reality that the loss of the British Fleet would greatly weaken our defense, and he spoke for all possible material aid short of military involvement in present hostilities. He recognized that if Britain is defeated, we stand face to face in competition with Hitler—a competition in armaments, in production, in salesmanship.

Win or lose in this election, Mr. Willkie is bound to be a powerful voice in America for the next few years. This gives great importance to his pledge as follows: "I promise, by returning to those same American principles that overcame German autocracy once before, both in business and in war, to outdistance Hitler in any contest he chooses in 1940 or after. And I promise you that, when we beat him, we shall beat him on our own terms and in the American way."

That statement, for all practical purposes, freezes the general direction of our foreign policy for some time to come. In that pledge, Mr. Willkie has destroyed utterly the fugitive dreams of appeasement which have been hovering just below the surface of public discussion in the United States. Mr. Roosevelt in his acceptance speech warned that the opposition party might become an appeasement party. He tried to hang the tag of appeaser on Mr. Willkie. The trick didn't work. Some big business influences which have been toying with the idea that they might find a good thing in doing business with Hitler are now without any responsible spokesman.

A smaller man than Mr. Willkie, one with a weaker sense of public responsibility, one who was playing politics on a short-haul basis, would have made an entirely different kind of speech. A small-minded politician would have plunged the country into a bitter political struggle over foreign policy at a most fatal moment. He would have paralyzed us in the presence of real danger. Mr. Willkie has risen above that. He has placed national interests above politics in this crisis. He has spoken sincere and brave words. Whether the majority of voters will recognize them as such remains to be seen.

Federal Expenditures in Fifth Congressional District of Georgia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT RAMSPECK
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 19, 1940

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, under the permission given me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am printing a report to the people of the district I represent, showing the estimated expenditures of the United States in that district during the present administration, as follows:

Estimated county report of Federal expenditures, De Kalb County, Ga., Mar. 4, 1933, through June 30, 1939

LOANS

	Number	Amount
CURRENT PROGRAMS		
Federal Loan Agency:		
1. Reconstruction Finance Corporation (from Feb. 2, 1932)	----------	$403,892
2. Disaster Loan Corporation	----------	----------
Federal Works Agency:		
3. Public Works Administration, non-Federal projects	----------	(1)
4. U. S. Housing Authority, loan contracts signed	----------	----------
Department of Agriculture:		
5. Farm Credit Administration, Land Bank Commissioner	124	[2] 199,594
6. Farm Credit Administration, emergency crop and feed	867	[2] 48,722
7. Farm Security Administration, rural rehabilitation	----------	107,730
8. Farm Security Administration, farm tenant purchase	----------	----------
9. Rural Electrification Administration (total project cost divided by number of counties participating)	1	45,400
COMPLETED PROGRAMS		
10. Farm Credit Administration, 1934-35 drought relief	----------	----------
11. Home Owners' Loan Corporation, 1933-36	1,371	3,906,667
Total, repayable	----------	4,712,005

EXPENDITURES

CURRENT PROGRAMS			
Federal Works Agency:			
1. Public Works Administration, non-Federal projects		7	$118,593
2. Public Works Administration, Federal projects		----------	----------
3. Public Roads Administration, completed projects		----------	709,940
4. Public Buildings Administration, Federal buildings		----------	66,568
5. Work Projects Administration		----------	3,213,437
6. Other projects under works program		----------	15,387
Federal Security Agency:			
7. Social Security Board:			
Old-age assistance	$38,597	236	
Aid to dependent children	14,556	276	54,296
Aid to the blind	1,143	7	

[1] These projects received both loans and grants.
[2] As of Dec. 31, 1938.

Estimated county report of Federal expenditures, De Kalb County, Ga., Mar. 4, 1933, through June 30, 1939—Continued

EXPENDITURES—continued

	Number	Amount
CURRENT PROGRAMS—continued		
Department of Agriculture:		
8. Agricultural Adjustment Administration, conservation programs:		
1936 $29,145		$52,911
1937 23,766		
9. Farm Security Administration, rural rehabilitation		14,354
COMPLETED PROGRAMS		
10. Federal Emergency Relief Administration		717,159
11. Civil Works Administration		206,370
12. Agricultural Adjustment Administration rental and benefit payments		98,888
13. U. S. Housing Authority—Housing (former P. W. A. housing only)		
Total, nonrepayable		5,267,903
Grand total, repayable and nonrepayable		9,979,908

OTHER BENEFITS

Federal Housing Administration:		
Title I. Modernization and improvement loans insured	4,663	$1,923,957
Title II. Mortgages accepted for insurance	1,253	5,278,250
Total, housing insurance		7,202,207
Farm Security Administration, farm debt reduction	28	11,018
Public Roads Administration, active project allotments		122,950

COUNTY STATISTICS

Families in county, 1930	16,575
Dwellings, 1930	14,800
Individual income-tax returns, 1935	1,293
Passenger autos registered, 1936	7,500
Families with radios, 1938	12,600
Residential telephones, 1935	6,610
Domestic electric meters, 1930	(3)
Farms, 1935	2,693
Retail employees, 1935	1,089
Wholesale employees, 1935	63
Mining employees, 1935	204
Manufacturing employees, 1935	682
Persons on farms, 1935	15,531
Unemployed reporting, 1937	3,044

[3] Data included in Fulton County.

Estimated county report of Federal expenditures, Fulton County, Ga., Mar. 4, 1933, through June 30, 1939

LOANS

	Number	Amount
CURRENT PROGRAMS		
Federal Loan Agency:		
1. Reconstruction Finance Corporation (from Feb. 2, 1932)		$3,559,614
2. Disaster Loan Corporation	2	900
Federal Works Agency:		
3. Public Works Administration, non-Federal projects	2	[1] 375,961
4. U. S. Housing Authority, loan contracts signed (5)	[2] 3,645	15,011,000
Department of Agriculture:		
5. Farm Credit Administration, Land Bank Commissioner	149	[2] 160,374
6. Farm Credit Administration, Emergency crop and feed	1,450	[2] 117,651
7. Farm Security Administration, rural rehabilitation		118,188
8. Farm Security Administration, farm tenant purchase	4	17,225
9. Rural Electrification Administration, (total project cost divided by number of counties participating)	4	184,417
Completed programs:		
10. Farm Credit Administration, 1934–35 drought relief		
11. Home Owners' Loan Corporation, 1933–36	4,760	11,958,033
Total, repayable		31,503,363

EXPENDITURES

CURRENT PROGRAMS			
Federal Works Agency:			
1. Public Works Administration, non-Federal projects			$1,849,908
2. Public Works Administration, Federal projects		10	610,331
3. Public Roads Administration, completed projects			1,417,650
4. Public Buildings Administration, Federal buildings			58,479
5. Work Projects Administration			22,443,524
6. Other projects under works program			603,358
Federal Security Agency:			
7. Social Security Board:			
Old-age assistance	$336,317	1,050	480,093
Aid to dependent children	124,290	1,308	
Aid to the blind	19,486	83	
Department of Agriculture:			
8. Agricultural Adjustment Administration conservation programs:			
1936	93,506		173,767
1937	80,261		
9. Farm Security Administration, rural rehabilitation			20,463

[1] These projects received both loans and grants.
[2] Units.
[3] As of Dec. 31, 1938.

Estimated county report of Federal expenditures, Fulton County, Ga., Mar. 4, 1933, through June 30, 1939—Continued

EXPENDITURES—continued

	Number	Amount
CURRENT PROGRAMS—continued		
Completed programs:		
10. Federal Emergency Relief Administration		$11,384,471
11. Civil Works Administration		3,371,244
12. Agricultural Adjustment Administration rental and benefit payments		235,132
13. U. S. Housing Administration, housing (former Public Works Administration housing only)	[2] 1,279	5,415,399
Total, nonrepayable		48,063,819
Grand total, repayable and nonrepayable		79,567,182

OTHER BENEFITS

Federal Housing Administration:		
Title I. Modernization and improvement loans insured	8,301	[4] $2,846,270
Title II. Mortgages accepted for insurance	2,645	11,838,100
Total, housing insurance		14,684,370
Farm Security Administration, farm-debt reduction	22	8,220
Public Roads Administration, active project allotments		168,150

COUNTY STATISTICS [5]

Families in county, 1930	77,411
Dwellings, 1930	63,800
Individual income tax returns, 1935	21,178
Passenger autos registered, 1936	70,852
Families with radios, 1938	67,230
Residential telephones, 1935	32,337
Domestic electric meters, 1930	[6] 52,893
Farms, 1935	3,605
Retail employees, 1935	20,645
Wholesale employees, 1935	9,670
Mining employees, 1935	0
Manufacturing employees, 1935	22,969
Persons on farms, 1935	19,303
Unemployed reporting, 1937	25,158

[2] Units.
[4] Includes Cambell and Milton.
[5] Source: Consumer Market Data Handbook.
[6] Includes data for De Kalb County.

Estimated county report of Federal expenditures, Rockdale County, Ga., Mar. 4, 1933, through June 30, 1939

LOANS

	Number	Amount
CURRENT PROGRAMS		
Federal Loan Agency:		
1. Reconstruction Finance Corporation (from Feb. 2, 1932)		$13,296
2. Disaster Loan Corporation		
Federal Works Agency:		
3. Public Works Administration, non-Federal projects		(1)
4. U. S. Housing Authority, loan contracts signed		
Department of Agriculture:		
5. Farm Credit Administration, Land Bank Commissioner	35	[2] 43,100
6. Farm Credit Administration, emergency crop and feed	597	[2] 43,265
7. Farm Security Administration, rural rehabilitation		36,995
8. Farm Security Administration, farm tenant purchase		
9. Rural Electrification Administration (total project cost divided by number of counties participating)	2	99,257
COMPLETED PROGRAMS		
10. Farm Credit Administration, 1934–35 drought relief		
11. Home Owners' Loan Corporation, 1933–36	8	13,904
Total, repayable		249,817

EXPENDITURES

CURRENT PROGRAMS			
Federal Works Agency:			
1. Public Works Administration, non-Federal projects		3	$41,287
2. Public Works Administration, Federal projects			58,307
3. Public Roads Administration, completed projects			50,672
4. Public Buildings Administration, Federal buildings			56,213
5. Work Projects Administration			
6. Other projects under Works Program			
Federal Security Agency:			
7. Social Security Board:			
Old-age assistance	$9,966	76	10,718
Aid to dependent children	752	23	
Aid to the blind			
Department of Agriculture:			
8. Agricultural Adjustment Administration conservation programs:			
1936	$46,480		73,418
1937	26,939		
9. Farm Security Administration, Rural Rehabilitation			2,652

[1] These projects received both loans and grants.
[2] As of Dec. 31, 1938.

Estimated county report of Federal expenditures, Rockdale County, Ga., Mar. 4, 1933, through June 30, 1939—Continued

EXPENDITURES—continued

	Number	Amount
COMPLETED PROGRAMS		
10. Federal Emergency Relief Administration		$54,705
11. Civil Works Administration		14,355
12. Agricultural Adjustment Administration rental and benefit payments		120,771
13. U. S. Housing Authority, housing (former Public Works Administration, housing only)		
Total, nonrepayable		483,099
Grand total, repayable and nonrepayable		732,916
OTHER BENEFITS		
Federal Housing Administration:		
Title I. Modernization and improvement loans insured	30	$10,716
Title II. Mortgages accepted for insurance		
Total housing insurance		10,716
Farm Security Administration, farm debt reduction	1	16
Public Roads Administration, active project allotments		

COUNTY STATISTICS [1]

Families in county, 1930	1,643
Dwellings, 1930	1,600
Individual income-tax returns, 1935	38
Passenger automobiles registered, 1936	716
Families with radios, 1938	750
Residential telephones, 1935	117
Domestic electric meters, 1930	199
Farms, 1935	793
Retail employees, 1935	89
Wholesale employees, 1935	3
Mining employees, 1935	0
Manufacturing employees, 1935	445
Persons on farms, 1935	4,537
Unemployed reporting, 1937	319

[1] Source: Consumer Market Data Handbook.

Unveiling of Bust of Senator Norris at Norris Dam, Tenn.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 19 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. LISTER HILL, OF ALABAMA

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, last Labor Day, September 4, 1939, I had the honor of speaking at the unveiling of a bust of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] at Norris Dam, Tenn., under the auspices of the Tennessee Valley Trades and Labor Council. I ask unanimous consent that my remarks made on that occasion be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Fitting it is that we gather here on this day, Labor Day, set aside to commemorate all those who labor and toil, to do honor to GEORGE W. NORRIS, whose life is a story of unremitting toil and of unending labor; fitting that on this day we should do honor to him who has so tirelessly and unceasingly fought labor's battles and than whom labor has had no truer, braver, or more devoted friend; fitting that this tribute should be accorded here at this beautiful place where all about us we behold GEORGE W. NORRIS' handiwork, the wonder and the glory of his dream and where his faith has indeed removed the mountains and subdued the kingdoms.

This bust presented to the people of the Nation and to the Tennessee Valley Authority by the workers of the Tennessee Valley will stand through the years a reminder to all who pass this way of the love, the esteem, and the appreciation in which the men and women of the Tennessee Valley Authority hold GEORGE W. NORRIS.

"What is the secret of your life?" asked Elizabeth Browning of Charles Kingsley. "Tell me, for I want to make mine beautiful, too." His reply was, "I had a friend."

We who work with the Tennessee Valley Authority have a friend. We have GEORGE W. NORRIS and because of his friendship our lives have been made fuller and richer and our memories of the past will be sweeter and happier. Through the years that have come and gone GEORGE W. NORRIS has dethroned autocratic power, lashed and driven out corruption in high places, convicted the spoilsmen, defeated monopoly, destroyed entrenched privilege, rescued the people's government from the hands of the despoilers, written law after law upon the statute books, and even changed the Constitution itself. With prophetic vision he saw the coming of the power age with its miracles and its marvelous possibilities and he declared, "Since Adam and Eve were driven from the Garden of Eden there has never been discovered an element in nature with so many possibilities of usefulness and pleasure as electricity. All that is needed to give humanity the full enjoyment of this modern giant is to cheapen its production. If stock manipulations can be eliminated and if financial legerdemain and unconscionable profits can be removed, it is the cheapest source of power and light known to man."

He stood upon the banks of the Columbia River and saw the roaring torrents unharnessed going to waste, the white plumes of water tumbling vainly to the sea while about him he beheld dimly lit homes in which smoking kerosene lamps sought to combat the deepening twilight, the farmer laboriously pumping his water by hand, the wife bending her aching back over the family washtub, and the children straining their young eyes by the flicker of the kerosene lamp. GEORGE W. NORRIS put on his armor. He went forth to battle to properly insure and safeguard the development of water power that the people might enjoy their inheritance; that they might get the benefit of the power that God Almighty had given to them.

In 1920 he became chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture which committee had jurisdiction over bills affecting Muscle Shoals. He visited Wilson Dam and he beheld again the picture that had so challenged him on the banks of the Columbia. Single-handed and alone he began the great fight to save Wilson Dam and the Tennessee River to the people of the Tennessee Valley. That fight constitutes perhaps the finest chapter in all American history of one man's courage, of one man's unending devotion, of one man's ability to hold at bay through the years and finally to conquer as unscrupulous, as powerful, and as dominating forces of privilege as this Nation has seen. GEORGE W. NORRIS made ready for the great fight. He studied power reports. He studied engineering plans. He made numerous visits to Muscle Shoals at his own expense and knew in every detail every phase of the Muscle Shoals question. He mastered the intricate technical details of hydroelectric generation and transmission. He studied every major river in the United States. He went to Canada. He studied at first hand the Ontario power system, the Seattle and Tacoma systems. He forsook all else and became the master of public power.

On the floor of the United States Senate GEORGE W. NORRIS met the enemy, the public-utility companies. He compared their high rates with the low rates of public power plants. He laid bare all the sordid story of their stock manipulations, unconscionable profits and exploitation of the people's heritage. These enemies of the people's rights denounced him and hurled their anathemas of contumely at him. They called him a dreamer, an enemy to advancement, a Socialist, a Bolshevist, a Communist, and everything else within the category of denunciation. They filled the country with their propaganda. Newspapers and magazines, many of which were owned by them, university professors, public speakers, and every possible means of propaganda were put to their service. Attempts were made to insert their propaganda even in the text books of the schools. As Senator NORRIS declared, all the power of society, of wealth, and of politics and the influence of one of the greatest trusts and monopolies on earth seemed arrayed against him.

Like Leonidas at Thermopylae GEORGE W. NORRIS held the pass. He stood steadfast and unmoved day after day, week after week, month after month. The fight dragged on. Muscle Shoals developed into a perennial political issue. GEORGE W. NORRIS never relented in his struggle to bring cheap electricity with all its blessings to the people. Time and again in the face of seemingly certain and overwhelming defeat he refused to place his trembling hands upon the altar of compromise. He never yielded to serve the hour. No thought of self, no allurement of personal preferment ever changed his course. He refused to strike hands with the wrong upon the theory that he might advance the right. When others retreated he moved forward. When others turned their backs to the foe he charged the enemy's ramparts. He fought on and fared on and finally after years of bitter warfare had come and gone he passed his bill for public ownership and public operation of Muscle Shoals through both Houses of the Congress, only to have the bill killed by the veto of Calvin Coolidge. Undaunted and undismayed, once again he passed the bill to have it killed by the veto of Herbert Hoover. As we see him tired and worn, as we see his struggles, his disappointments, his defeats, as we see him spent in the long weary fight of 13 years of bitter and constant warfare there come to us the lines of the old English ballad:

"Fight on my men," says Sir Andrew Barton,
"I am hurt but I am not slain,
I'll lie me down and bleed a while
And then I'll rise and fight again."

At long last there came to the helm of State at Washington another gallant warrior whose daring battles as Governor of the State of New York had caused GEORGE W. NORRIS to say of him, "He is the nearest right on the power issue of any man in public life"—that other great humanitarian and friend of the people, Franklin D. Roosevelt. In January of 1933 Franklin D. Roosevelt, the President-elect and GEORGE W. NORRIS stood at Wilson Dam on the banks of the Tennessee and on that historic day agreed that GEORGE W. NORRIS' dream was to come true and that the Tennessee Valley Authority would be established with all of its benefits and blessings for the people of the Tennessee Valley and with its word of promise for every American home.

As the Tennessee Valley Authority and its army of loyal workers carry on through succeeding days meeting high expectations and bringing more and richer accomplishments to the social and economic life of the people of the Tennessee Valley we see unfolded in brighter outline, in more golden color the fundamental justice and the wonderful possibilities of the dream of GEORGE W. NORRIS. Here indeed is the wisest and widest experiment ever conducted by a Government moving to successful fruition, not alone a program to bring electricity in abundant fashion to all the people, not alone a coordinated plan to develop and conserve the natural resources of the vast basin of the Tennessee River, not alone a project of reclamation and conservation but indeed a program "that touches and concerns all human needs."

Because of the fight GEORGE W. NORRIS waged the people of the country became power conscious. They became aware of the shocking wrongs and the ruthless exploitation of the Power Trust. Public sentiment demanded an end to the abuses. The Holding Companies Act was placed upon the statute books; Boulder Dam, Grand Coulee, Fort Peck, and Bonneville were built and under the leadership of GEORGE W. NORRIS and Franklin D. Roosevelt, the Federal Government became the match, if not the master, of the Power Trust. Today this same Power Trust, perhaps a little chastened but still powerful with its same billions in over-capitalization and watered stock, its same lust for profits and its same desire for power and control, would sabotage, would undermine, would weaken, and, if possible, would destroy the Tennessee Valley Authority and the public-power program of the Nation. Only eternal vigilance and resolute courage on the part of the people can insure the life and the future of the Authority and the program.

The Tennessee Valley Authority, denied necessary appropriations by the Congress, denied the cooperation of the Congress, denied the support and confidence of the executive branch of the Government after 1940, hamstrung, shackled, and crippled, would be an Authority doomed to die. The resurgent efforts of the Power Trust to again influence the affairs of government and, if possible, to control and dominate government for its own selfish ends are indeed evident. It seems to have captured the capitals of at least certain of our States. Its handiwork and its potency were well seen in Washington during the past session of the Congress in the fight for the appropriation for the Watts Bar Dam, as well as in other struggles. At all costs, if the rights and heritage of the people are to be protected and preserved the Power Trust must not be permitted to capture the Nation's capital.

GEORGE W. NORRIS has never lost faith in the ultimate judgment of the people. He believes in them, in their final judgment and the moral standards that move and at last control them. He has often declared that if the people were informed and understood the truth their judgment would be just. If we would be true to him, if we would be true to the great principles for which he has fought, if we would save and preserve for ourselves and for our children and our children's children the untold benefits and blessings of the great handiwork that he has wrought, we must fearlessly and courageously carry the message to the people. We must see to it that they know the truth that the truth may make them free. We must bear the advancing torch of light and wisdom as GEORGE W. NORRIS has done that the people may not be defeated in their rights and their welfare by the powers of privilege and entrenched greed sustained and supported by those who are opposed to progressive change.

Here in this presence on this moving and historic occasion, with hearts resolved and purposes fixed, let us dedicate ourselves to the great purpose that the rights of the people and their heritage shall be preserved and in the sacrament of this hour, in holy resolution, let us plight our sacred honor, our fortunes, and our faith to GEORGE W. NORRIS and declare to him:

In the valley of decision
  Down the road of things that are,
You gave to us a vision;
  You appointed us a star;
And through the cities of derision
  We followed you from afar.

On the hills beyond tomorrow,
  On the road to things to do,
With that strength of hand we borrow
  As we borrow soul from you
We know not sloth nor sorrow
  And will build your vision true.

Eire's Stand for Neutrality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 19 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

ARTICLE BY PETER LYNE

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, the able Prime Minister of Eire, Mr. Eamon de Valera, outspoken champion of the rights of small democratic nations, has taken a resolute stand on the right of his country to remain at peace. He speaks with the authority of a courageous statesman who has spent a lifetime in the cause of freedom. His spirited defense of Irish neutrality at this time is a matter of great interest to all freedom-loving Americans who sympathize with the plight of small nations in this war-mad world.

The Christian Science Monitor of August 12 contains an article by Peter Lyne, its staff correspondent, which tells the story of Eire's stand for neutrality. I ask unanimous consent that this article may be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Christian Science Monitor of August 12, 1940]

EIRE "UNITEDLY NEUTRAL"—DE VALERA

(By Peter Lyne)

DUBLIN, August 12.—The danger of Eire falling an easy prey to aggression, like Denmark, Belgium, the Netherlands, and Norway, was vigorously discounted by Eamon de Valera, head of the Dublin Government, in an exclusive interview.

"Our position is in many ways not comparable to that of those other small neutrals," Mr. de Valera declared to this correspondent. Asked "Who?" Eire's leader was immediately beset with difficulties confronting a neutral spokesman discussing possible war developments. He consequently resorted to terms such as "If A attacks us, B would * * *." Incidentally such references come easily to him as a mathematical scholar.

Briefly his reasons for confidence were:

1. That geographically the position of Eire vis-à-vis the main belligerents presented considerable difficulty for invasion by any long sea route and that any attempt at a land invasion could be made very costly.

2. The training of the small, well-equipped, and mechanized Irish Army has for 20 years naturally been directed in large measure to the problem of how best to resist invasion.

DEFENSES STRENGTHENED

3. That in addition the recent recruiting of volunteer organizations and coast-watching services has greatly strengthened defenses.

4. That Eire in its resolve to defend its neutrality is united as never before.

5. That those in Eire who might aid one or other of the belligerents are negligible in numbers.

Finally, as Mr. de Valera expressed it, "If A invades us, B would be ready to come to our aid."

Less neutrally stated, this means to this correspondent that if Germany succeeded in landing troops in Eire, Britain would send immediate aid from the large forces waiting along the Ulster border, or in case of British invasion Irish resistance would inevitably attract intervention by Germany.

RESENT DOUBTS ON DEFENSE

So, with confidence in his country's defense and strategical position, with full support of his people for a neutral policy, and with firm conviction that any attempt at British occupation would have the most determined opposition, Mr. de Valera reaffirmed once more to me his resolve to "stay neutral."

I discussed with him certain radio-press comments in Britain and the United States which belittled or even ridiculed Eire's ability to defend itself, and drew the conclusion that these are resented here.

With regard to suggestions in one of the American comments that Britain was showing an exaggerated respect for Irish rights and should take control of Eire's land and sea defenses, Mr. de Valera said that in a war claimed to be for the liberation of occupied territories it was curious to find citizens of a neutral country speaking of exaggerated respect for another neutral's rights and demanding violation of another neutral's independence.

To a further suggestion, also from the United States, that Eire's policies of neutrality were dictated by extremists his comment was simply to recall a meeting of the Irish Parliament last September at which the spokesmen of every party—Opposition, Labor Party, Independent Group, and Government Party—unanimously approved a declaration of neutrality. The declaration was supported the next day by newspapers of every shade of opinion in the country. The Irish Times, whose British sympathies are known, declared: "In all the circumstances it is the only policy which the Irish Government could pursue."

NO PRETENSE IN RESISTANCE

When I drew Mr. de Valera's attention to a report that an Irish army would put up a mere show of force if Britain marched in first, the Premier said: "That is a dangerous misapprehension." Whoever violated Irish territory would find that there would be no pretense about the resistance the Irish people would put up. Perhaps the best way for an American to understand our situation, he said, would be to consider what he himself would do if any invader entered his country. No matter who the invader was he would resist to the fullest of his strength. So would the Irish people.

I discussed with him statements so widely made that the German Legation staff in Dublin numbers 60 and 100, that at least 500 Germans are located around Dublin, and that the River Shannon power scheme is managed by German engineers.

Mr. de Valera said the facts were that the German Legation staff numbered six, which was less than the British or American; that in the whole of Eire there were only some 300 Germans, and that the Shannon scheme engineers had gone home long before the war. He mentioned parenthetically that the last census showed over 22,000 British in Eire.

PUZZLED BY AMERICAN PRESS

Mr. de Valera seemed genuinely puzzled by the latest press attitude in the United States which so often in the past had championed the struggle for Irish independence.

Part of this attitude, he feels, is due to misapprehension of the extent of Irish preparations for defense. Eire's population is less than a fortieth of that of the United States, yet Eire's regular defense forces are almost a third of the Regular United States Army as authorized by Congress April 1938. In this connection it must be remembered also that Eire's territorial area is less than a hundredth part of that of the United States.

The recent recruiting drive for additional forces, Mr. de Valera told me, has already had a remarkable response. The total at the beginning of August was more than 170,000. This, added to the regular defense forces, means that almost one men in every four of the entire male population between 18 and 64 has enrolled for one or other form of defense. A similar proportion in the United States would be over 10,000,000.

The Irish Army command, Mr. de Valera continued, has, of course, kept up with the latest military developments and the new problems they present. Eire's terrain, Mr. de Valera claimed, is peculiarly suited to a general military policy of small mobile columns and the army proper is well equipped with modern weapons.

Premier de Valera admitted that they hadn't in the country all the arms they would like to have for the new forces that had been raised. He added, "That isn't our fault. Contracts placed for arms abroad have not been filled. We are seeking arms anywhere we can get them; we are ready to pay cash for them. We have sought them even in the United States."

ALL POWERS INCLUDED

Commenting on the suggestion that the United States might be prepared to send its fleet to protect Eire's neutrality, Mr. de Valera said he did not think the United States was prepared to do anything of the kind.

He did say, however, that an effective international guaranty of neutrality, particularly if the United States were a party to it, would be the best policy for a small country like Ireland. Indeed, he added, that was the policy of the Irish Government back in 1921 when an effort was made to negotiate a just peace with Britain.

Questioned further, he said that by "international" he meant to include continental powers as well as Britain.

He discussed the question of partition, regretting that it had not yet been settled. "Long before this war broke out," he said, "I stressed the importance of this island being a strategic unit for the purposes of defense.

"Were the partition of our country removed and the Irish people as a whole responsible for the national territory, a position of great defensive strength would have been reached.

"The mere removal of partition which is resented in every part of Ireland and by the great Irish populations overseas would have been in itself a source of strength. But partition was allowed to remain, and it is no use denying that it presents a serious danger in the situation as it exists. It creates division in public opinion in the partitioned area which profoundly weakens the defensive power of that part of Ireland."

GOOD WILL NEEDED

Asked if he saw any chance of partition being abolished now Mr. De Valera said that the wisest thing from every point of view would be to get rid of it. The right to maintain Irish neutrality was fundamental to the solution of the problem, but if there were good will on all sides a way undoubtedly could be found out of the difficulty.

Seven months before the war began he had stated in the Senate that unity could not be purchased at a price which would include taking from the Irish nation the right to decide for itself whether or not it would participate in any war.

Mr. de Valera denied reports that he had met Viscount Craigavon, Premier of Northern Ireland, since the war. "I met him once in 1921," he said, "to discuss differences between us." A smile came over Mr. de Valera's aquiline face as he referred to the fact that they had agreed on nothing.

"I have been his guest twice since them," he added, and his Irish smile broadened—"in gaol." This referred to Mr. de Valera's visit to his Northern Ireland constituency in County Down for which both he and Lord Craigavon had been elected, and to his later visit to the Nationalist city of Derry. On both occasions he was arrested and imprisoned for crossing the border.

Conscript Armies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENNETT CHAMP CLARK

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 19 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

STATEMENT BY FORMER REPRESENTATIVE PETTENGILL

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a release from the pen of former Representative Samuel B. Pettengill, of Indiana, entitled "Conscript Armies."

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONSCRIPT ARMIES

Must the world become a munitions dump and a once Christian civilization a concentration camp? No one knows, and until the fog lifts we must keep a lot of powder dry.

Still the question remains, Is there a safe middle road between inadequate preparedness and the conscript armies that have been the plaything of kings and the curse of mankind? Must we in America have a "Cossack on the back of every peasant"?

Just now we are on one of our periodical sprees. They come in different forms—barnyard golf, tree sitting, marathon dancing, Florida real estate, food fads, mission furniture, "manifest destiny," and "make the world safe for democracy." Of the last two, one took us to Asia and the other to Europe.

Conscription is now "the thing." The herd mind is on a stampede; and if anyone says, "Come, let us reason together," Senator PEPPER, self-admitted patriot, sprains his larnyx. This bill, the principle of which Mr. Roosevelt has advocated for 20 years, was written by some very enthusiastic gentlemen. In its original form the bill allowed the conscript soldier $5 a month, or $40 for 8 months. If he spent nothing for cigarettes or postage on letters to mother, he would have at the end a little more than if he had been in prison. Some people are very generous in the sacrifices they ask others to make.

Contrast the conscripted soldier with the C. C. C. boys. The latter gets $30 a month, serves only 6 months, are not under military discipline, and take no risk of stopping a bullet. These young boys get six times as much pay as the writers of the bill allowed the conscript. The C. C. C. boys get more even than the $21 a month paid the private in our Regular Army. One would think that before resorting to peacetime conscription for the first time in our history, these different kinds of service would at least be placed on an equality of pay.

Then, too, it might help if the able-bodied sons of prominent and well-paid fathers in Washington, D. C., and elsewhere were to volunteer as buck privates. "But the wind listeth and there is no sound."

Large religious groups are becoming aroused over the spread of the spirit of militarism. Organized labor is asking where it will lead. John Lewis and Philip Murray say that if you are going to conscript men you should also conscript money. This is fundamentally just. The difficulty is that the conscription of all men and all property in peacetime is the exact equivalent of totalitarianism.

It is easy to say that patriotism is not something to be purchased. I agree. And in wartime no complaint in principle could be made against the conscript serving without any pay whatever, providing everybody else works for a bare subsistence also, the machinist, farmer, manufacturer, and the pay rollers in Government, Congressmen and Presidents included.

But peacetime conscription is another story. Why should the forced conscript give up 3 years of his life in the service of the

Nation for less pay than a fireman or policeman gets in the service of his town or city? And if that pay were allowed, would we need conscription? Moreover, with the present Regular Army, National Guard and reserves totaling 750,000 men, many of whom could be trained only with broomsticks, why must conscription go into effect 1 month before election?

Conscript armies have been the curse of the ages. They are the enemy of free institutions. They are to be endured only as a matter of bitter necessity when everything else fails and then only for the period and to the extent actually needed. Whether in the barracks of czar, kaiser, or Hitler, peacetime conscription teaches men to "soldier." It makes men docile. It conditions them for the spiritual goosestep and the worship of Caesar. If this is not so then our forefathers learned nothing in centuries of tyranny.

America must be invulnerable from attack but it can be attacked only from across wide oceans. Give us then a Navy and an air arm sufficient to defend our homeland against every hazard. Give us also a small mechanized volunteer Army, magnificently equipped and well paid. Then we may escape the blight of militarism and imperialism in the land which was once the beacon of the oppressed.

SAMUEL B. PETTENGILL.

Address By Ambassador William C. Bullitt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 19 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE PHILADELPHIA RECORD

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial in today's issue of the Philadelphia Record commenting on the speech delivered yesterday afternoon by Ambassador Bullitt.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Philadelphia Record of August 19, 1940]

THEY ARE COMING

A sentry in a tower, a frightened fisherman scudding home, gave the alarm of old when the enemy approached. Nowadays the physical position of a possible adversary is almost always known. But his direction and intentions are not so clearly revealed. Modern communication eliminates the necessity of a Paul Revere's ride. But modern complexity creates confusion that gives the surprise attack as much force as it ever had.

The sentries of our time are men who use their heads as well as their eyes. Men who can analyze movements afar and say "That is danger. They are coming."

William C. Bullitt has been, for 4 years, our Ambassador in Paris, an outpost. He returns and tells his countrymen what he has seen and the meaning of what he has seen. Last evening, in Independence Square, Bullitt sounded an alarm in language plain enough.

We quote here some excerpts from a speech that should be read in full:

"America is in danger. It is my conviction, drawn from my experience and from the information in the hands of our Government in Washington, that the United States is in as great peril today as France was a year ago."

* * * * * * * *

"To prepare the way for military attack on a democracy they—the dictators—employ every variety of agent and propaganda to befuddle the public so that the democracy will not prepare in time."

* * * * * * *

"How many Americans are playing the dictators' game without knowing it?"

* * * * * * *

"The truth is that the destruction of the British Navy would be the turning of our Atlantic Maginot line. Without the British Navy the Atlantic would give us no more protection than the Maginot line gave France after German troops had marched through Belgium. The soothing words 'Maginot line' were the refrain of a lullaby of death for France. The soothing words 'Atlantic Ocean' are being used now by the propagandists of the dictators in the hope that they may become a lullaby of death for the United States."

* * * * * * *

"Our defense against the enemies who are already within our country has still to be organized. Nealy all our defense against the enemies that are still outside our country has still to be organized."

* * * * * * *

"The fighting line of the war for the enslavement of the human spirit is nearing our shores. * * * Our fate and the fate of our children depends upon what each of us does now."

It will be said that Bullitt exaggerates the danger. Is that too grave a fault in a sentry, even if it were true? Isn't it far better that the enemy be reported as a mile off, when he is actually a mile and a quarter away, than that a sleeping sentry not see the enemy at all?

Our defense lags. Conscription is still snarled up in congressional verbiage. Production is snarled in confusion and conflict over price.

If Bullitt is "alarmist" enough to alarm us into action he will have saved his country. We can think of no higher praise for one of the great speeches of our time.

Private Versus Public Ownership of Electric Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 19 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. STYLES BRIDGES, OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address delivered by me on August 18, 1940, on the program of the American Forum of the Air in a debate on the subject Private Versus Public Ownership of Electric Power.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Sixty years ago, when Thomas Edison gave to the world a practical method of putting electricity to man's uses, the public ownership and operation of electrical systems was as common as public ownership of water and sewer systems is today. But the art of manufacturing and distributing electricity is a much more difficult proposition than the simple problems of water supply. As the science developed, the skill and brains encouraged by private enterprise soon demonstrated that in this field private operation was far superior to public operation. By 1902 only 7.8 percent of the Nation's power bill was paid to public agencies. Today the percentage is down to 4.3 percent. The failure of public ownership to survive without the aid of substantial subsidy in competition with private ownership is the best practical test of its value.

Under private development electricity today is just about the cheapest item in any family budget both for quantity and quality. It is the one item that, with the exception of the war year, 1918, has been less expensive to the consumer each year since the industry began. The national average price per kilowatt-hour 50 years ago was 25 cents; today the average cost is 3.9 cents. According to Government studies, electricity is the least costly item in the poor man's budget, averaging only 1½ percent in the living expenses of the family with a total of $1,300 income.

The electric-utility industry of today, carrying all the comforts and conveniences of electricity into 30,000,000 American homes, presents the finest picture of what the American system of free enterprise can contribute to the development of a nation. Every American citizen has at his command more than twice as much electric current as does the average citizen of any other nation in the world.

The growth of this great servant of the people is typical of the possibilities of how private enterprise, blossoming under the American way, can and has spread comfort, wealth, and happiness to everyone. The automobile, the radio, the telephone, air conditioning, and a hundred other examples could be named.

After all, this huge industry is owned by the public—really a form of public ownership. Most everyone—you and I—directly or indirectly owns a substantial part of it. Besides the 4,000,000 Americans who directly hold stock in it, one-fourth of the whole value of the electrical industry is represented in the underlying securities which back up 65,000,000 life-insurance policies of the Nation. It's the clever thing nowadays among the smart-aleck New Deal intelligentsia to jeer at the widows and orphans as unimportant factors in their new blue prints for America. But to you and to me and to all home-keeping folks the security and protection of our dear ones after we can no longer provide is not the subject of wisecracks and light-hearted indifference.

In addition, there are millions of rainy-day savings accounts, each of which is partly invested in utility securities. The industry is owned on Main Street, not on Wall Street. New Deal blows aimed at big shots on Wall Street have struck the little fellow on Main Street.

In the past 7 years, however, the old, discredited idea of putting Government in business, and especially in the electrical business, has assumed new importance. Local public ownership of electrical utilities in general having proved a failure, it therefore was natural that the new dealers would like to extend the failure on a national

scale; not only did the idea present a wonderful opportunity to spend other people's money but it created tremendous possibilities for the perpetuation of the New Deal regime by the building up of an army of officeholders whose self-interest lay in expansion of the program.

The only check in the downward march of public ownership has been during the New Deal spending spree.

That strange combination of hard-boiled politicians and soft-boiled dreamers whose cynical alliance constitutes the New Deal "planned it that way." They had, for years, a standing offer of a 45-percent bribe to communities which would go into business in duplication of existing business. The record of failure established by public ownership had been so glaring that only by such outrageous use of money appropriated for unemployment relief could any interest in such projects be aroused.

But even that tremendous inducement failed in its purpose. The vote of 561 communities on this subject from the year 1934 to 1939, inclusive, stood 3 to 1 against letting the city-hall gang get its hands on the local light plant. The vote was against the bosses by approximately 7,000,000 to 2,000,000.

That's the only kind of referendum that counts in our democracy. We Americans have several fundamental ideas about the functions of our Government. We believe that our Government should serve us; not that we should be the creatures of our Government. Hence we instinctively avoid men and measures aiming to reverse our relationship with the Government.

We believe that the job of government is to govern. That is, the job of government is to divert, in taxes, a part of each year's annual productivity into channels which will provide for the national welfare. These channels include the national defense and public safety, the improvement of health, the protection of labor, of the underprivileged, and the regulation and encouragement of commerce.

We do not believe that it is the function of government to invade the field of productivity, to enter into the fields of trade and manufacture. We do not believe it to be a proper function for government to enter into competition with its citizens whose productivity furnish, in taxes, the sinews of government.

The new dealers, therefore, rarely admit that socialization of this essential American industry is their objective. No, indeed; all they say that they want are such high-sounding objectives as "conservation of our natural resources"—and who does not—the development of so-called yardsticks, unemployment relief and other sweet and noble experiments that only reactionaries could oppose.

Behind these pretty words, the New Deal fellow travelers have built themselves a mighty political machine that has little in common with cheap power. So-called cheap power such as T. V. A. supplies is about the most expensive kind of power there is when your tax bills are added.

T. V. A. charges off 50 percent of its investment to the non-revenue-producing functions of alleged control and alleged navigation improvement. Thus, it cuts its power costs in half. Its benefits in navigation and flood control are obviously phony according to the testimony of all unbiased engineers. That charge-off chiefly serves the purpose of permitting T. V. A. to set up bogus yardstick power rates at the expense of the taxpayers. It does not even pay interest to the United States Treasury on the sums appropriated by Congress. Why should you and I as Federal taxpayers have to help pay Congressman RANKIN'S light bill in his home town in Mississippi?

Let's analyze the forces behind the public-ownership movement in this country today. This movement constitutes a combination of commercial and political racketeers with enough sincere and zealous followers, who, as a whole, cover up the promoters and racketeers.

A typical example is the case of Carl D. Thompson, sometimes called Dr. Thompson because he is an ex-preacher who forsook the pulpit to take up socialism.

Dr. Thompson has a long record of activity with the Socialist Party. Years ago, while he was director of propaganda for the Socialist Party, he founded and became head of a forerunner of the 1940 "Communist transmission-belt" organization. It was called the Public Ownership League of America. It is principally financed by commercial interests profiting by the sale of services and equipment in connection with publicly owned plants. Its "front", in addition to the estimable Thompson, consists of earnest, zealous people whose intentions should not be questioned.

The coming of the New Deal and the power division of the P. W. A. was a bonanza for Thompson. His friend and patron, Harold Ickes, promptly put Thompson on the P. W. A. pay roll as an examiner of applications for municipal ownership power grants. Thompson doubled in brass on that job, continuing without interruption his job as executive secretary of his personal meal ticket, the Public Ownership League.

And today Thompson, while continuing as secretary of his league, is on the Federal pay roll of the Bonneville Administration at $466 per month as a so-called power consultant, actively speaking and campaigning in public ownership elections for that organization. The Hatch Act specifically forbids Federal employees from participating in or attempting to influence elections. But the news about the Hatch Act hasn't reached the Bonneville Administration, apparently.

The league is really a sort of super-sales organization for a tight little group of electrical engineering firms, municipal bond houses, and Diesel-engine manufacturers. It publishes a small magazine which carries heavy advertising lineage from these business concerns, but the space rates of the magazine are not known to me, despite diligent inquiry. The chairman of the finance committee of the league is also the head of the biggest engineering firm in the country specializing in municipal electric plants.

But a laborer must be worth his hire. Thompson, the front man, has delivered the goods.

While he was still in the Nation's capital he agreed to campaign for a state-wide public ownership revenue bond election in Oklahoma which was secretly being financed by a large Diesel engine manufacturer. This fact was brought out when one of the company's subagents, working for an Oklahoma attorney, sued the latter for fees past due.

I fear that this revelation may prove embarrassing to some of my colleagues of both Houses inasmuch as this league has distributed hundreds of thousands of pieces of public ownership propaganda under the free mailing privileges of Members of Congress.

This is not an isolated case. The record is rotten with proved charges of corruption and bribery of city officials. I have not the time to develop this story at length tonight but I intend to discuss it fully in the Senate at some early appropriate occasion.

I have in my possession information as to how a leading engineering firm and principal supporter of the Public Ownership League padded its fees to a midwest city in order to pay off a political henchman who had arranged a rate survey job for them from that city.

I have in my possession information as to how a Diesel company attempted to buy up a city council at a thousand dollars a head—like so many cattle.

I have said that municipal ownership is usually inefficient but please understand that I do not say that it necessarily follows that public ownership is always a failure. There are plenty of examples of good management that rival anything private enterprise can match. It is a pleasure to cite the city of Eugene, Oreg., as a model municipal plant where frugal management, the early amortization of investments, strict bookkeeping, and—note this—complete elimination of politics, have given to the people of that community fine service and low rates.

Moreover, I am personally familiar with several successfully operated municipal plants which time does not permit me to enumerate, but among them is a plant operated by the town of Wolfeboro in my own State.

In every such instance, however, the key to success is that they have kept the light plant strictly out of politics and run it on a business basis. The fact that so many publicly owned plants have failed is almost solely due to mismanagement and inefficiency by political officeholders. Instant dismissal is the price of inefficiency under private management but is rather expected from political officeholders.

Nor should my observations regarding the character of greedy money interests and politicians supporting public ownership be taken as reflecting in the slightest upon the right of any community to vote at any time on this question. That right is always a useful, if seldom needed, escape from high rates. It should always be preserved.

There is much that I have left unsaid tonight for lack of time. On another occasion I hope to present the truth behind the claims of T. V. A. and other Federal agencies that the power they are selling to a privileged few is actually the most expensive power being generated in the United States tonight and that you and I are paying for it. Until that occasion I shall leave to my colleagues the development of other phases of this discussion.

Assaying the New Deal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 19 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON DAILY NEWS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial appearing in today's Washington Daily News under the heading "Assaying the New Deal."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Daily News of August 19, 1940]

ASSAYING THE NEW DEAL

We've been hearing and reading much Democratic comment on Wendell Willkie's acceptance speech, and the substance of most of it seems to be about this:

That Mr. Willkie agreed with Mr. Roosevelt on foreign policy, approved most of the New Deal's domestic reforms, and did not

prove that he could do a better job in either field than the President has done.

Congressman T. V. SMITH of Illinois, one of the fairest and most intelligent of all new dealers, paid high tribute to the speech. He called it magnificent. But, Mr. SMITH went on to say, what Mr. Willkie offers is inexperienced leadership for the same tasks to which Mr. Roosevelt can apply experienced leadership.

It is true that both candidates endorse selective service training for defense man power. It is true that their general attitudes toward foreign policy have much in common. For these agreements the country may be thankful, since they offer hope that partisan differences may stop at the water's edge. Yet Mr. Willkie sought—successfully, we think—to make it clear that there is a fundamental difference. He would consider it his first duty as President to keep America out of war unless it were attacked, whereas he charged that Mr. Roosevelt, by some of his utterances and acts, "has courted a war for which the country is hopelessly unprepared—and which it emphatically does not want."

It is true that Mr. Willkie endorsed the principle of most of the reforms undertaken by the New Deal.

These are reforms which real liberals have always favored. By proclaiming his belief in them, we think Mr. Willkie revealed his essential liberalism as contrasted to the essential reactionism of Old Guard Republicans who have damned all the works of the New Deal.

But there are two Roosevelt policies which Mr. Willkie condemned emphatically, and these are the two which bear the seeds of destruction for all of the New Deal's desirable reforms:

1. The policy of trying to spend the country rich.
2. The policy of stirring hatred and class division.

Most of us have never ceased to believe that Mr. Roosevelt proclaimed in 1932—that a government or a family which lives beyond its income every year is headed for sure disaster. But this Government is living beyond its income every year, with outgo gaining constantly. And the people—even those who have benefited directly by New Deal spending—know instinctively that this is leading to disaster.

The Government, then, is not secure, and a government that is not secure cannot give security to its people. It cannot guarantee that internal security against poverty and greed which is the objective of the New Deal's reforms. It cannot guarantee security against external dangers.

And a people split by hatreds can neither cure their own ills nor effectively resist aggression from without.

So what Mr. Willkie proposes is not merely to do better what Mr. Roosevelt has attempted to do, but something much more. He proposes to rescue the Government from its drift toward disaster and to save the reforms instituted by the New Deal; to stop spending for the sake of spending, and to spend only for the sake of results; to stop merely trying to divide what wealth we have, and to start creating more wealth; to stop making the country weak by setting its people against each other, and to start making it strong by uniting the people for production.

The Democrats have better grounds for saying that Mr. Willkie did not explain Saturday precisely how he intends to do these things. But this was only the first of many speeches he will make.

What he presented at Elwood was a diagnosis. We believe it was an accurate diagnosis. The people will judge Mr. Willkie not by the clever phrases with which his opponents are trying to dismiss him, but by the logic and force with which he offers his remedies.

Export-Import Bank Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. WAGNER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 19 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON POST

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Washington Post on the subject of the Export-Import Bank legislation now pending before the Senate.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post]

ECONOMIC DEFENSE

In reporting out the bill authorizing a $500,000,000 increase in the lending authority of the Export-Import Bank the House Banking Committee has cleared the decks for action on the measure.

In addition to its present functions the bank would be empowered to "assist in the development of the resources, the stabilization of the economies and the orderly marketing of products of the countries of the Western Hemisphere." The present international situation makes it essential to carry out such a program in the interests of American defense.

The principal danger which the nations of Latin America face today arises out of the dislocating effects of the war and its possible aftermath. Cut off from a large part of their European markets for surplus products, these nations are plagued by economic difficulties which may make them a prey to "fifth column" elements. And should the war end in a German victory, each of these Latin American republics would, by itself alone, be in no position to withstand Nazi economic penetration that might undermine their independence.

The interest of the United States in the independence and stability of the 20 other republics of this hemisphere does not rest on a sentimental basis. The establishment anywhere in this hemisphere of a government ready to take orders from the totalitarian dictators would be a menace to our own safety. It is, therefore, scarcely less important for us to safeguard those nations against economic bludgeoning by a triumphant Third Reich than to build a navy capable of warding off any invasion of this hemisphere.

To argue, as does Congressman WOLCOTT, that the measure "will be interpreted [presumably by Germany] as an unfriendly act" is to argue that our current rearmament program is also an unfriendly act.

It is, on the contrary, a measure of defense. That point was made emphatic in the majority report of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee:

"The bill places this Government in a better position to meet an emergency which might otherwise eventuate in irreparable economic chaos and further totalitarian infiltration in Latin America. A situation of political, social, and economic instability in the Latin American republics renders them helpless to defend against future domination and control by totalitarian forces. Such a situation demands and justifies anticipatory steps to prevent a disastrous economic and political future."

Neither the United States nor the Latin American nations contemplate severance of economic relations between this hemisphere and a German-dominated Europe. That would be disastrous. But machinery must be created to protect those nations from duress by any non-American regime which may seek to employ its trading power to achieve political aims.

Meddlesome Mattie

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENNETT CHAMP CLARK

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 19 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

STATEMENT BY FORMER REPRESENTATIVE PETTENGILL

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a release from the pen of former Representative Samuel B. Pettengill, of Indiana, entitled "Meddlesome Matte—Chapter 2."

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEDDLESOME MATTIE—CHAPTER 2

According to Senator WHEELER the country would be shocked if it knew the war plank which our President desired written into the Democratic platform. It undertook to say that we would not only give aid to the Allies, short of war, but that we would continue to do so until all democracies everywhere were restored to their former estate.

This plank created a sensation in the resolutions committee. It was so truculent in tone, so far reaching in its commitments that it was recognized by the political minds on the committee as campaign dynamite. As it came from the hands of Harry Hopkins' messenger it was torn into tiny bits that it might no more be seen of men. No copies were permitted to reach the press.

Assuming, as I do, that Senator WHEELER'S report is correct, as he was present in the room when it was first read, it is apparent that Mr. Roosevelt, if reelected, has an ambitious program laid out for us. We have a sacred duty to perform in China, Manchuria, Ethiopia, Albania, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Finland, Norway, Latvia, Estonia, Lithuania, Holland, Belgium, France. Probably we will not be called on to make democracy safe in India. We will leave that to Great Britain. But Somaliland, Algeria, Tunisia, Changching, Pungchow—we have business there. There is much to do and the night cometh. We must make Djibuti safe for democracy.

It is hard to believe that any American statesman in his right mind would propose such folly. However, it exactly ties in with the practical repudiation of the milder peace plank by Mr. Roosevelt in his acceptance speech, and with the repeated statements of the administration that the United States will refuse to recognize any government anywhere that has been established by military force.

Only last week Hon. Sumner Welles, Assistant Secretary of State, took time off to "lash" Soviet Russia for its absorption of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania. "Deliberate annihilation," "predatory activities" and "devious processes" were some of the choice Harvard adjectives hurled at the bear who walks like a man.

The big papa bear says, "And then what?" With this good deed done we next propose to embargo oil to Japan. Tokio says her reaction to this "will be very great." And so we have to order more battleships. But Mr. Stimson is back on the glory seat. He once tried to get Hoover to meddle in every corner of the universe and failed.

If the higher ethics require that no government established by force is to be recognized I trust no one will embarrass us by asking by what authority our flag flies in the Philippines. As I recall, a gentleman named Gridley at Manila once fired when ready. We took the little brown men by force, first from Spain, and then by the water cure. "Civilize 'em with a Krag" was the way it was done.

And then there was our conquest of Mexico in 1846. But all this was before the new morality made obsolete the heathen rule of minding our own business.

This is not to condone ruthless aggression, even when practiced by ourselves. Still the question remains, What are we going to do about it? It is very beautiful to get virtuous about the new morality versus international anarchy. Nevertheless, what are we going to do about it, if we are not to fight abroad? Or are we? Perhaps we will know, after the election.

The next step is universal compulsory service to the State without pay by all our youth, male and female. Every boy, every girl, must be indoctrinated with the fascist dogma, "Believe, Obey, Fight"—American plan. "Hitler's first victory in the United States," some Senator called it.

And taxes. You have seen but the beginning. Wait until the election is behind us.

And the mobilization of the National Guard under Federal authority. And by October a declaration of acute emergency.

It is my profound conviction that our policy of International Scold is worse than folly; that no good and only danger can come of it; that a large fraction of our preparedness billions would be unnecessary if we had men in the Nation's capital in the tradition of Washington, Jefferson, and Monroe. But I have just read Shakespeare's remark that "war makes virtue of ambition."

SAMUEL B. PETTENGILL.

Willkie Notification Ceremonies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES L. McNARY

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 19 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

ACCEPTANCE ADDRESS BY WENDELL WILLKIE AND ADDRESSES BY HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, OF MASSACHUSETTS, AND HON. CHARLES A. HALLECK, OF INDIANA, AT ELWOOD, IND.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the introductory address delivered by Representative CHARLES A. HALLECK, the address delivered by Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, leader of the Republican minority in the House of Representatives, notifying Hon. Wendell L. Willkie of his nomination for President of the United States, and the address of acceptance delivered by Mr. Willkie at Elwood, Ind., on Saturday, August 17, 1940.

There being no objection, the addresses were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY HON. CHARLES A. HALLECK, OF INDIANA

Indiana is proud of the place destiny has given to her today—proud that there has been called to lead this mighty nation to safety, happiness, and prosperity a son of Indiana—Wendell Willkie.

Eighty-five years ago, the Republican Party was organized to rescue America from a tragic crisis. Today the party is again called to service to save a Nation of 130,000,000 resourceful, energetic, and courageous people from the ravages of continuing depression within and the threat of aggression from without.

The torch of liberty, freedom, and opportunity has been handed to a native son of Indiana. He will hold it high, leading this new crusade for American principles in government and for the reestablishment of law as the ultimate guaranty of both individual and national security.

America wants to resume the march of progress. The Republican Party is the instrument through which the American people have determined to work for the reestablishment of enlightened patriotism in the administration of national affairs. Beneath our banners are rallied members of all parties. They are determined that this country shall prosper and progress according to the skill and resources with which it is blessed.

Some weeks ago it was my high honor to present the name of Wendell Willkie to the Republican convention at Philadelphia. I nominated him with heartfelt enthusiasm because I know him to be a great American who understands the problems of all of our people—because he is a capable administrator of clear vision and great ability, and a citizen of unlimited patriotic devotion.

LAUDS MARTIN

After the Philadelphia convention had named Wendell Willkie for the Presidency and CHARLES MCNARY for the Vice Presidency, it passed unanimously a resolution of thanks to Congressman JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr., for his able and fair direction of the convention as its chairman. A week later JOE was named by Wendell Willkie to direct the Republican National Committee.

This appointment and high responsibility comes to JOE MARTIN after almost 30 years of continuous service to the Republican Party. He began as a precinct worker in his native town of North Attleboro, Mass. He served in the State legislature and was in the State senate with Calvin Coolidge. He was for a time secretary of the Republican State Committee of Massachusetts. He next advanced to Congress where he is now serving his sixteenth year.

Throughout the New Deal years JOE MARTIN has been a stalwart American. He served on the Rules Committee in those trying days when a New Deal majority lost all sense of responsibility and allowed the Congress to become a mere rubber stamp. But Joe never gave up the fight for constitutional principles and orderly procedures.

In 1937 he was elected chairman of the National Republican Congressional Committee, and in that capacity directed the 1938 campaign, which resulted in doubling the number of Republican Members in the House of Representatives and marked the turning of the tide which already signalizes a national triumph next November.

When the Seventy-sixth Congress assembled in January 1939, JOE MARTIN was unanimously elected minority leader. In that capacity he has done more to restore balanced constitutional government than any other individual in the United States. To work with him and for him has been a real privilege.

ASSAILS NEW DEAL WASTE

To JOE MARTIN now has been given the direction of this campaign to restore American Government to the American people—to turn out an administration which has wasted billions during the last 7 years, while neglecting the urgent problem of national defense—to place in the White House a man who has worked with his hands, who has won success by his own efforts, and whose heart and spirit are in tune with the aspirations of the American people for progress, security, and real recovery.

I present to you the man who will direct our victorious campaign—the Honorable JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr., of Massachusetts, Republican leader in the House of Representatives and chairman of the Republican National Committee.

ADDRESS BY HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. Willkie, we are here to carry out an old American custom—to notify you officially that you were chosen by the Republican Party in its national convention at Philadelphia on June 28 as its candidate for the Presidency of the United States. I hope it will not come as too great a surprise.

This custom originated in the time when men had to travel long distances on horseback actually to carry the first tidings of a nomination to the candidate. It may seem to some in these headlong days that custom of this kind is outmoded, but others believe it is well for the Nation to continue to cling to some of its traditions.

As chairman of the committee of notification, it is my honor and pleasure to bring you the enthusiastic greetings of the great Republican Party.

Your nomination at Philadelphia did not come from any scheming clique of political bosses. It did not come from any group of conspirators anxious to retain their control of the Government for selfish purposes. Your nomination was the result of a Nation-wide demand of a great people anxious about their own future and that of their Government.

They had seen this country drifting toward bankruptcy, inflation, and perhaps war. They had seen experiment after experiment fail. All called for huge appropriations, but none brought the security or the happiness which were promised.

PEOPLE SEEK A NEW LEADER

Ten millions of men and women begged for a chance to earn their livelihood in the American way. Millions of young men and young women pleaded for a chance for a regular job, for the opportunities which their fathers and their mothers had been blessed with. Year after year passed without those opportunities being presented. Little hope for the future was held forth; indeed, those who presumed to speak for the administration frankly stated that unemployment and distress had come to stay.

This philosophy of despair and defeat was not welcomed by the American people. It was not the spirit of the real American tamely to accept defeat. The people turned to seek a new leader—one with capacity to do big things; one who knew the many interests involved and the different problems confronting the Nation at home and abroad, one who could rise above narrow partisanship and petty prejudices and who could put the welfare of this country first.

They saw in you such a man. Born in humble circumstances. you have risen through your own efforts to a commanding position because of your ability to do things well; you have proved yourself an able man, a sincere man; one who is broad and liberal enough to give every man and every woman sheltered under the American flag equal justice and equal opportunity.

Thus you have been selected to save America and lead our country back along the road to recovery and better days. Out of the hearts of these patriotic Americans came the chant, "We want Willkie." Louder and louder came the call. An unbossed convention listened. A deliberative group of delegates acted. You became the nominee of a convention which selected you in the traditional American way.

FUNDAMENTAL ISSUES AT STAKE

No one can say you do not represent a free choice by the people.

This campaign of 1940 is vastly more significant and important than an ordinary election contest between two political parties. It is a contest between the forces of constitutional government and liberty and those influences which are moving steadily toward government by men instead of by laws in the United States of America.

We need not remind you that great fundamental issues are at stake in this contest. The fate of the free Republic established by the founding fathers at Philadelphia when they wrote the Constitution hangs in the balance.

The revered tradition that no President shall seek a third term has been assailed by men burning with an insatiable lust for power. It is our grave responsibility to see that the effort is defeated. We must not take a dangerous step, a step which may well lead to dictatorship.

The Republican Party rejoices that in you in has provided the Nation with a man who is preeminently qualified to meet the requirements of this critical period. It rejoices that your nomination has been enthusiastically acclaimed by independent Jeffersonian Democrats, progressives, liberals, and Republicans alike.

You are not the hope of one political party; you are the hope of a majority of the American people. They want you boldly to lead this great fight, this battle to perpetuate free government in this land of liberty, to restore equal justice, opportunities, and jobs to the American people; to keep this country safe and secure from attacks from within and without our boundaries.

May God bless you and strengthen you for the heavy tasks which lie ahead.

ADDRESS BY WENDELL L. WILLKIE

The ceremony of an acceptance speech is a tradition of our pioneer past—before the days of rapid communication. You all know that I accepted at Philadelphia the nomination of the Republican Party for President of the United States. But I take pride in the traditions and not in change for the mere sake of overthrowing precedents.

An acceptance speech is a candidate's keynote, a declaration of his broad principles. It cannot possibly review the issues in detail. I shall, however, cover each of them frankly during this campaign. Here I give you an outline of the political philosophy that is in my heart. We are here today to represent a sacred cause—The preservation of American democracy.

Obviously, I cannot lead this cause alone. I need the help of every American—Republican, Democrat, or Independent—Jew, Catholic, or Protestant—people of every color, creed, and race. Party lines are drawn. Nothing could make that clearer than the nomination by the Republicans of a liberal Democrat who changed his party affiliation because he found democracy in the Republican Party and not in the New Deal party.

And as the leader of the Republican Party let me say this: We go into our campaign as into a crusade. Revitalized and reunited, and joined by millions who share in our cause, we dedicate ourselves to the principles of American liberty, and we shall fight this campaign on the basis of those principles, not on the basis of hate, jealousy, or personalities. The leaders of the Republican Party, in Congress and in the party organization, have made me that pledge. I have given that pledge to them. And I extend it to all who will join in this cause. What we need in this country is a new leadership that believes in the destiny of America. I represent here today the forces that will bring that leadership to you.

There is a special reason why I have come back to Elwood, Ind., to make this acceptance speech. I have an engagement to keep in this town. It was made a long time ago with a young man I knew well.

SKETCHES EARLY IDEALS

This young man was born and raised in Elwood. He attended the Elwood public schools. He worked in your factories and stores. He started the practice of law in your courts. As I look back upon him, I realize that he had plenty of faults. But he had also three steadfast convictions. He was devoted to the ideal of individual liberty. He hated all special privileges and forms of oppression. And he knew without any doubt that the greatest country on earth was the United States of America.

That boy was myself 30 or 35 years ago. I still adhere to those convictions. To him, to his generation, to his elders, and to the youth of today I pledge my word that I shall never let them down.

In former days America was described as a country in which any young man might become President. It is still that kind of country. The thousands of my fellow townsmen standing hereabout know how distant seemed that opportunity to me 30 years ago. We must fight to preserve America as a country in which every girl and boy has every opportunity for any achievement.

To the millions of our young men and women who have been deliberately disillusioned by the political influences I now oppose; to the millions who no longer believe in the future of their land—to them I want to say in all humility—this boy I knew started like you, without money or position; but America gave him the opportunity for a career. I want to assure a similar opportunity to every boy and girl of today who is willing to stand on his own feet and work and fight.

I have more reason than most of you to feel strongly about this because the United States gave to my family their first chance for a free life. The ancestors of both my father and my mother, like the ancestors of millions of Americans, lived in central Europe. They were humble people—not members of the ruling or wealthy classes. Their opportunities were restricted by discriminatory laws and class distinctions. One was exiled because of his religion; another was persecuted because he believed in the principles of the French Revolution, and still another was jailed for insisting on the right of free speech.

As their descendant, I have fought from boyhood against all those restrictions, discriminations, and tyrannies. And I am still fighting.

PLEDGES TOLERANCE, FREEDOM

My grandparents lived in Germany. They were supporters of the democratic revolutions in that country, and when the revolutions failed they fled to the United States. How familiar that sounds. Today, also, people are being oppressed in Europe. The story of the barbarous and worse than medieval persecution of the Jews—a race that has done so much to improve the culture of these countries and our own—is the most tragic in human history. Today there are millions of refugees who desire sanctuary and opportunity in America, just as in my grandparents' time. The protection of our own labor and agriculture prevents us from admitting more than a few of them. But their misery and suffering make us resolve to preserve our country as a land free of hate and bitterness, of racial and class distinction. I pledge you that kind of America.

My mother was born in this country. My father was 3 or 4 years old when his parents settled in northern Indiana. It was then a trackless forest. As a young man he helped to clear that forest. He worked his way through the Fort Wayne Methodist College, taught school, and became superintendent of schools here in Elwood. My mother was also a school teacher. Whenever they had time they both studied law, and eventually both took up the practice of law. I doubt if any two people ever appreciated or loved this country more than they.

As you who live here with them well know, they were fiercely democratic. They hated oppression, autocracy, or arbitrary control of any kind. They believed in the qualities that have made America great—an independent spirit, an inquiring mind, a courageous heart. At school they taught those virtues to many of you who are here today. At home they taught them to their children. It is a tribute to their teaching that when the United States entered the World War in 1917, three of their four boys were volunteers, in the uniform of the American forces, within 1 month after war was declared. They withheld no sacrifices for the preservation of the America of 1917. In an even more dangerous world, we must not withhold any sacrifice necessary for the preservation of the America of 1940.

UNITED STATES NOT ISOLATED

Today we meet in a typical American town. The quiet streets, the pleasant fields that lie outside, the people going casually about their business, seem far removed from the shattered cities, the gutted buildings, and the stricken people of Europe. It is hard for us to realize that the war in Europe can affect our daily lives. Instinctively we turn aside from the recurring conflicts over there, the diplomatic intrigue, the shifts of power that the last war failed to end.

Yet—instinctively also—we know that we are not isolated from those suffering people. We live in the same world as they, and we are created in the same image. In all the democracies that have recently fallen, the people were living the same peaceful lives that we live. They had similar ideals of human freedom. Their methods of trade and exchange were similar to ours. Try as we will, we cannot brush the pitiless picture of their destruction from our vision or escape the profound effects of it upon the world in which we live.

No man is so wise as to foresee what the future holds or to lay out a plan for it. No man can guarantee to maintain peace. Peace is not something that a nation can achieve by itself. It also depends on what some other country does. It is neither practical, nor desirable, to adopt a foreign program committing the United States to future action under unknown circumstances.

The best that we can do is to decide what principle shall guide us.

For me, that principle can be simply defined:

In the foreign policy of the United States, as in its domestic policy, I would do everything to defend American democracy and I would refrain from doing anything that would injure it.

We must not permit our emotions—our sympathies or hatreds—to move us from that fixed principle.

For instance, we must not shirk the necessity of preparing our sons to take care of themselves in case the defense of America leads to war. I shall not undertake to analyze the legislation on this subject that is now before Congress, or to examine the intentions of the administration with regard to it. I concur with many members of my party that these intentions must be closely watched. Nevertheless, in spite of these considerations, I cannot ask the American people to put their faith in me without recording my conviction that some form of selective service is the only democratic way in which to secure the trained and competent manpower we need for national defense.

Also, in the light of my principle, we must honestly face our relationship with Great Britain. We must admit that the loss of the British Fleet would greatly weaken our defense. This is because the British Fleet has for years controlled the Atlantic, leaving us free to concentrate in the Pacific.

If the British Fleet were lost or captured, the Atlantic might be dominated by Germany, a power hostile to our way of life, controlling in that event most of the ships and shipbuilding facilities of Europe.

This would be calamity for us. We might be exposed to attack on the Atlantic. Our defense would be weakened until we could build a Navy and air force strong enough to defend both coasts. Also, our foreign trade would be profoundly affected. That trade is vital to our prosperity. But if we had to trade with a Europe dominated by the present German trade policies, we might have to change our methods to some tolalitarian form. This is a prospect that any lover of democracy must view with consternation.

The objective of America is in the opposite direction. We must, in the long run, rebuild a world in which we can live and move and do business in the democratic way.

The President of the United States recently said: "We will extend to the opponents of force the material resources of this Nation, and at the same time we will harness the use of those resources in order that we ourselves, in the Americas, may have equipment and training equal to the task of any emergency and every defense."

I should like to state that I am in agreement with these two principles, as I understand them—and I don't understand them as implying military involvement in the present hostilities. As an American citizen I am glad to pledge my wholehearted support to the President in whatever action he may take in accordance with these principles.

SAYS ROOSEVELT "INFLAMMATORY"

But I cannot follow the President in his conduct of foreign affairs in this critical time. There have been occasions when many of us have wondered if he is deliberately inciting us to war. I trust that I have made it plain that in the defense of America, and of our liberties, I should not hesitate to stand for war. But like a great many other Americans I saw what war was like at first hand in 1917. I know what war can do to demoralize civil liberties at home. And I believe it to be the first duty of a President to try to maintain peace.

But Mr. Roosevelt has not done this. He has dabbled in inflammatory statements and manufactured panics. Of course, we in America like to speak our minds freely, but this does not mean that at a critical period in history our President should cause bitterness and confusion for the sake of a little political oratory. The President's attacks on foreign powers have been useless and dangerous. He has courted a war for which the country is hopelessly unprepared—and which it emphatically does not want. He has secretly meddled in the affairs of Europe, and he has even unscrupulously encouraged other countries to hope for more help than we are able to give.

"Walk softly and carry a big stick" was the motto of Theodore Roosevelt. It is still good American doctrine for 1940. Under the present administration the country has been placed in the false position of shouting insults and not even beginning to prepare to take the consequences.

But while he has thus been quick to tell other nations what they ought to do, Mr. Roosevelt has been slow to take the American people into his confidence. He has hesitated to report facts, to explain situations, or to define realistic objectives. The confusion in the Nation's mind has been largely due to this lack of information from the White House.

As President, I plan to reverse both of these policies. I should threaten foreign governments only when our country was threatened by them and when I was ready to act, and I should consider our diplomacy as part of the people's business concerning which they were entitled to prompt and frank reports to the limit of practicability.

CANDOR DEMOCRACY'S HOPE

Candor in these times is the hope of democracy. We must not kid ourselves any longer. We must begin to tell ourselves the truth—right here and right now.

We have been sitting as spectators of a great tragedy. The action on the stage of history has been relentless.

For instance, the French people were just as brave and intelligent as the Germans. Their armies were considered the best in the world. France and her Allies won the last war. They possessed all the material resources they needed. They had wealth and reserves of credit all over the earth. Yet the Germans crushed France like an eggshell.

The reason is now clear. The fault lay with France herself.

France believed in the forms of democracy and in the idea of freedom. But she failed to put them to use. She forgot that freedom must be dynamic, that it is forever in the process of creating a new world. This was the lesson that we of America had taught to all countries.

When the European democracies lost that vision, they opened the way to Hitler. While Germany was building a great new productive plant, France became absorbed in unfruitful political adventures and flimsy economy theories. Her government was trying desperately to cover the people's nakedness with a garment that was not big enough.

The free men of France should have been weaving themselves a bigger garment. For in trying to pull the small one around themselves they tore it to pieces.

And in this tragedy let us find our lesson. The foreign policy of the United States begins right here in our own land. The first task of our country in its international affairs is to become strong at home. We must regain prosperity, restore the independence of our people, and protect our defensive forces. If that is not done promptly we are in constant danger. If that is done no enemy on earth dare attack us. I propose to do it.

SEES UNITED STATES-NAZI CLASH

We must face a brutal, perhaps a terrible fact. Our way of life is in competition with Hitler's way of life.

This competition is not merely one of armaments. It is a competition of energy against energy, production against production, brains against brains, salesmanship against salesmanship.

In facing it we should have no fear. History shows that our way of life is the strong way. From it has come more wealth, more industry, more happiness, more human enlightenment, than from any other way. Free men are the strongest men.

But we cannot just take this historical fact for granted. We must make it live. If we are to outdistance the totalitarian powers, we must arise to a new life of adventure and discovery. We must make a wider horizon for the human race. It is to that new life that I pledge myself.

I promise, by returning to those same American principles that overcame German autocracy once before, both in business and in war, to outdistance Hitler in any contest he chooses in 1940 or after. And I promise that when we beat him, we shall beat him on our own terms, in our own American way.

The promises of the present administration cannot lead you to victory against Hitler, or against anyone else. This administration stands for principles exactly opposite to mine. It does not preach the doctrine of growth. It preaches the doctrine of division. We are not asked to make more for ourselves. We are asked to divide among ourselves that which we already have. The New Deal doctrine does not seek risk, it seeks safety. Let us call it the "I pass" doctrine. The New Deal dealt it, and refused to make any more bets on the American future.

NEW DEAL ATTACKED

Why that is exactly the course France followed to her destruction! Like the Blum government in France, so has our Government become entangled in unfruitful adventures. As in France, so here, we have heard talk of class distinctions and of economic groups preying upon other groups. We are told that capital hates labor and labor capital. We are told that the different kinds of men whose task it is to build America are enemies of one another. And I am ashamed to say that some Americans have made political capital of that supposed enmity.

As for me, I want to say here and now that there is no hate in my heart, and that there will be none in my campaign. It is my belief that there is no hate in the hearts of any group of Americans for any other American group—except as the new dealers seek to put it there for political purposes. I stand for a new companionship in an industrial society.

Of course, if you start like the New Deal with the idea that we shall never have many more automobiles or radios, that we cannot develop many new inventions of importance, that our standard of living must remain what it is, the rest of the argument is easy. Since a few people have more than they need and millions have less than they need, it is necessary to redivide the wealth and turn it back from the few to the many.

But this can only make the poor poorer and the rich less rich. It does not really distribute wealth. It distributes poverty.

ASSERTS LIBERALISM

Because I am a businessman, formerly connected with a large company, the doctrinaires of the opposition have attacked me as an opponent of liberalism. But I was a liberal before many of these men had heard the word and I fought for many of the reforms of the elder La Follette, Theodore Roosevelt, and Woodrow Wilson before another Roosevelt adopted—and distorted—liberalism.

I learned my liberalism right here at home. From the factories that came into this town many years ago large fortunes were made by a few individuals, who thereby acquired too much power over our community. Those same forces were at work throughout the rest of the Nation. By 1929 the concentration of private power had gone further than it should ever go in a democracy.

We all know that such concentration of power must be checked. Thomas Jefferson disliked regulation, yet he said that the prime purpose of government in a democracy is to keep men from injuring each other. We know from our own experience that the less fortunate or less skillful among us must be protected from encroachment. That is why we support what is known as the liberal point of view. That is why we believe in reform.

OPPOSES MONOPOLIES

I believe that the forces of free enterprise must be regulated. I am opposed to business monopolies. I believe in collective bargaining by representatives of labor's own free choice, without any interference and in full protection of those obvious rights. I believe in the maintenance of minimum standards for wages and of maximum standards for hours. I believe that such standards should constantly improve. I believe in the Federal regulation of interstate utilities, of securities markets and of banking. I believe in Federal pensions, in adequate old-age benefits, and in unemployment allowances.

I believe that the Federal Government has a responsibility to equalize the lot of the farmer with that of the manufacturer. If this cannot be done by parity of prices, other means must be found, with the least possible regimentation of the farmer's affairs. I believe in the encouragement of cooperative buying and selling and in the full extension of rural electrification.

The purpose of all such measures in indeed to obtain a better distribution of the wealth and earning power of this country. But I do not base my claim to liberalism solely on my faith in such reforms. American liberalism does not consist merely in reforming things. It consists also in making things.

The ability to grow, the ability to make things, is the measure of man's welfare on this earth. To be free, man must be creative.

I am a liberal because I believe that in our industrial age there is no limit to the productive capacity of any man. And so I believe that there is no limit to the horizon of the United States.

I say that we must substitute for the philosophy of distributed scarcity the philosophy of unlimited productivity. I stand for the restoration of full production and reemployment by private enterprize in America.

And I say that we must henceforth ask certain questions of every reform and of every law to regulate business or industry. We must ask: Has it encouraged our industries to produce? Has it created new opportunities for our youth? Will it increase our standard of living? Will it encourage us to open up a new and bigger world?

A reform that cannot meet these tests is not a truly liberal reform. It is an "I pass" reform. It does not tend to strengthen our system, but to weaken it. It exposes us to aggressors, whether economic or military. It encourages class distinctions and hatreds. And it will lead us inevitably, as I believe we are now headed, toward a form of government alien to ours, and a way of life contrary to the way that our parents taught us here in Elwood.

ONLY STRONG ARE FREE

It is from weakness that people reach for dictators and concentrated government power. Only the strong can be free.

And only the productive can be strong.

When the present administration came to power in 1933, we heard a lot about the forgotten man. The Government, we were told, must care for those who had no other means of support. With this proposition all of us agreed. And we still hold firmly to the principle that those whom private industry cannot support must be supported by Government agency, whether Federal or State.

But I want to ask anyone in this audience who is, or has been, on relief whether the support that the Government gives him is enough. Is it enough for the free, able-bodied American to be given a few scraps of cash or credit with which to keep himself and his children just this side of starvation and nakedness? Is that what the forgotten man wanted us to remember?

What that man wanted us to remember was his chance—his right—to take part in our great American adventure.

But this administration never remembered that. It launched a vitriolic and well-planned attack against those very industries in which the forgotten man wanted a chance.

It carried on a propaganda campaign to convince the people that businessmen are iniquitous.

NEW DEAL INJURED INDUSTRY

It seized upon taxing power for political purposes. It has levied taxes to punish one man, to force another to do what he did not want to do, to take a crack at a third whom some Government agency disliked, or to promote the experiments of a brain trust. The direct effect of the New Deal taxes has been to inhibit opportunity. It has diverted the money of the rich from productive enterprises to Government bonds, so that the United States Treasury—and no one else—may have plenty to spend. Thus much of the money of the rich is invested in tax-exempt securities.

ABILITY TO PAY

In this connection let me say that, in its plan for tax revision the Republican Party will follow two simple principles. Taxes shall be levied in accordance with each one's ability to pay. And the primary purpose of levying them will be to raise money. We must—and can—raise more money at less relative cost to the people. We must do it without inflicting on the poor the present disproportionate load of hidden taxes.

The New Deal's attack on business has had inevitable results. The investor has been afraid to invest his capital, and therefore billions of dollars now lie idle in the banks. The businessman has been afraid to expand his operations, and therefore millions of men have been turned away from the employment offices. Low incomes in the cities and irresponsible experiments in the country have deprived the farmer of his markets.

For the first time in our history American industry has remained stationary for a decade. It offers no more jobs today than it did 10 years ago—and there are 6,000,000 more persons seeking jobs. As a Nation of producers we have become stagnant. Much of our industrial machinery is obsolete. And the national standard of living has declined.

NEW DEAL HAS FAILED

It is a statement of fact, and no longer a political accusation, that the New Deal has failed in its program of economic rehabilitation. And the victims of its failures are the very persons whose cause it professes to champion.

The little-business men are victims because their chances are more restricted than ever before.

The farmers are victims because many of them are forced to subsist on what is virtually a dole under centralized direction from Washington.

The 9,000,000 or 10,000,000 unemployed are victims because their chances for jobs are fewer.

SIX MILLION FAMILIES ON RELIEF

Approximately 6,000,000 families are victims because they are on relief.

And unless we do something about it soon, 130,000,000 people—an entire Nation—will become victims, because they stand in need of a defense system which this administration has so far proved itself powerless to create anywhere except on paper.

To accomplish these results, the present administration has spent $60,000,000,000.

And I say there must be something wrong with a theory of government or a theory of economics by which, after the expenditure of such a fantastic sum, we have less opportunity than we had before.

WHERE IS THE RECOVERY?

The New Deal believes, as frequently declared, that the spending of vast sums by the Government is a virtue in itself. They tell us that Government spending insures recovery. Where is the recovery?

The New Deal stands for doing what has to be done by spending as much money as possible. I propose to do it by spending as little money as possible. This is one great issue in domestic policy and I propose in this campaign to make it clear.

And I make this grave charge against this administration:

I charge that the course this administration is following will lead us, like France, to the end of the road. I say that this course will lead us to economic disintegration and dictatorship.

PHILOSOPHY OF PRODUCTION

I say that we must substitute for the philosophy of spending the philosophy of production. You cannot buy freedom. You must make freedom.

This is a serious charge. It is not made lightly and it cannot be lightly avoided by the opposition.

I therefore have a proposal to make.

The President stated in his acceptance speech that he does not have either "the time or the inclination to engage in purely political debate." I do not want to engage in purely political debate either. But I believe that the tradition of face-to-face debate is justly honored among our American political traditions. I believe that we should set an example at this time of the workings of American democracy, and I do not think that the issues at stake are "purely political." In my opinion, they concern the life and death of democracy.

JOINT APPEARANCES

I propose that during the next 2½ months the President and I appear together on public platforms in various parts of the country to debate the fundamental issues of this campaign. These are the problems of our great domestic economy, as well as of our national defense—the problem of agriculture, of labor, of industry, of finance, of the Government's relationship to the people, and of our preparations to guard against assault; and also I would like to debate the assumption by this President, in seeking a third term, of a greater public confidence than was accorded to our Presidential giants—Washington, Jefferson, Jackson, Lincoln, Cleveland, Theodore Roosevelt, and Woodrow Wilson.

I make this proposal respectfully to a man upon whose shoulders rest the cares of the state. But I make it in dead earnest.

I accept the nomination of the Republican Party for President of the United States.

SPIRIT OF DEDICATION

I accept it in the spirit in which I know it was given at our convention in Philadelphia—the spirit of dedication. I herewith dedicate myself with all my heart, with all my mind, and with all my soul to making this Nation strong.

But I say this, too: In the pursuit of that goal I shall not lead you down the easy road. If I am chosen the leader of this democracy as I am now of the Republican Party, I shall lead you down the road of sacrifice and of service to your country.

What I am saying is a far harsher thing than I should like to say in this speech of acceptance—a far harsher thing than I would have said had the Old World not been swept by war during

the past year. I am saying to you that we cannot rebuild our American democracy without hardship, without sacrifice, even without suffering. I am proposing that course to you as a candidate for election by you.

"TOIL AND SWEAT" AHEAD

When Winston Churchill became Prime Minister of England a few months ago, he made no sugarcoated promises. "I have nothing to offer you," he said, "but blood, toil, tears, and sweat." Those are harsh words, brave words; yet if England lives, it will be because her people were told the truth and accepted it. Fortunately, in America, we are not reduced to blood and tears. But we shall not be able to avoid the toil and sweat.

In these months ahead of us, every man who works in this country—whether he works with his hands or with his mind—will have to work a little harder. Every man and woman will feel the burden of taxes. Every housewife will have to plan a little more carefully. I speak plainly because you must not be deceived about the difficulties of the future. You will have to be hard of muscle, clear of head, brave of heart.

Today great institutions of freedom, for which humanity has spilled so much blood, lie in ruins. In Europe those rights of person and property—the civil liberties—which your ancestors fought for and which you still enjoy, are virtually extinct. And it is my profound conviction that even here in this country, the Democratic Party, under its present leadership, will prove incapable of protecting those liberties of yours.

CALLS FOR UNITY

The Democratic Party today stands for division among our people, for the struggle of class against class and faction against faction, for the power of political machines and the exploitation of pressure groups. Liberty does not thrive in such soil.

The only soil in which liberty can grow is that of a united people. We must have faith that the welfare of one is the welfare of all. We must know that the truth can only be reached by the expression of our free opinions, without fear and without rancor. We must acknowledge that all are equal before God and before the law. And we must learn to abhor those disruptive pressures, whether religious, political, or economic that the enemies of liberty employ.

The Republican Party and those associated with it constitute a great political body that stands preeminently for liberty—without commitments, without fear, and without contradictions. This party believes that your happiness must be achieved through liberty rather than in spite of liberty. We ask you to turn your eyes upon the future, where your hope lies. We see written there the same promise that has always been written there—the promise that strong men will perform strong deeds.

With the help of Almighty Providence, with unyielding determination and ceaseless effort we must and we shall make that American promise come true.

Wendell L. Willkie

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 19 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE PHILADELPHIA RECORD

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Philadelphia Record of August 19 entitled "The Man Who Would Be President," commenting upon the speech delivered last Saturday by Hon. Wendell L. Willkie.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Philadelphia Record of August 19, 1940]

THE MAN WHO WOULD BE PRESIDENT

In 6,000 words of an acceptance speech which left his listeners somewhat bewildered, Wendell L. Willkie on Saturday unveiled the major issue of the 1940 campaign:

Willkie doesn't like Roosevelt. Willkie wants Roosevelt's job.

That is the only completely clear thought in the entire speech. Nearly all the rest of the address was so vague and so full of self-contradictions that even the wobbly G. O. P. platform, by comparison, seems crystal clear.

Saturday morning in this space the Record listed nine of the important issues confronting America in these days of national crisis.

We believed any Presidential candidate ought to express his opinions on (1) conscription, (2) foreign policy, (3) National Guard bill, (4) extension of publicly owned power in the interest of national defense, (5) Wagner Act, (6) Wage and Hour Act, (7) social security, (8) future of W. P. A., (9) Government aid to industry in the national-defense program. We promised to compare the speech itself with our diagram.

It is to Willkie's credit that he discussed two of these issues at some length—conscription and our foreign policy. He briefly referred to three others—Wagner Act, Wage and Hour Act, and social security, and approved "in principle" all three reforms. It is to Willkie's discredit that he carefully skirted any comment whatever on the National Guard bill, extension of publicly owned power in the interest of our defense, Government aid to industry in our defense program, and avoided any reference to W. P. A.

It was quite natural that many Republicans deluged Willkie with questions, immediately after the speech, as to what he really thinks about conscription. He said he favors "some form of selective service." That statement can mean he favors the Burke-Wadsworth bill—an act written by two of his supporters. Or it can mean he favors the Maloney amendment, which also approves conscription but would postpone it for months while we try to raise a volunteer army. Both provide "some form of selective service."

Willkie is for conscription "in principle." But when he avoided discussing the one bill which can give us conscription now he was obviously guilty of a straddle. His colleagues who are in Congress find no leadership here from a man who ought to lead.

On our foreign policy Willkie had the courage to approve, with only a few qualifications, the President's program of helping England "with the material resources of the Nation." He criticized the President for leading us into war by "inflammatory utterances" directed at foreign powers. But when Willkie then issued a virtual challenge to Hitler to "C'mon and fight; I'll lick you," he committed one of the classical political inconsistencies of the age.

We agree with Willkie that the President and his State Department have done too much scolding in their relations with Germany and Japan.

But neither has gone off half-cocked in so blatant and amateurish a fashion as did Willkie at Elwood Saturday afternoon. We are sure the country will still have greater faith in Roosevelt's handling of our affairs abroad than in Willkie's.

Willkie indorsed nearly all of Roosevelt's domestic program. He pledged himself to maintain and enforce collective bargaining by representatives of labor's own choosing without interference; to continue minimum standards for wages and maximum standards for hours; to maintain regulation of securities markets; to continue extension of rural electrification, Federal old-age pensions, unemployment insurance.

These reforms are the heart of the New Deal administration. After endorsing them, Willkie said in almost the same breath: "This administration stands for principles exactly opposite to mine."

No wonder so many listeners were bewildered. Willkie is for the Roosevelt foreign policy. He is for the Roosevelt domestic policy. Yet the Roosevelt policies are exactly opposite to his own. Roosevelt is too inflammatory, yet not one-tenth as inflammatory as Willkie.

Yes, it's all very confusing. The speech defies analysis on logical grounds. But it leaves the issue of the campaign very clear:

Willkie doesn't like Roosevelt. Willkie wants Roosevelt's job.

Continued Inequities of the New Deal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ROLAND KINZER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 19, 1940

Mr. KINZER. Mr. Speaker, for more than 7 years this Nation has been ruled by an administration that has had but one solution—one rule of action—to offer for the problems which so gravely threaten the welfare of our country. The New Deal administration's solution has been to tax and tax, to spend and spend, and through that taxing and spending to elect and elect. In other words, in absolute defiance of the American way of government, the New Deal administration has pursued a policy of regimentation, of limitation, and of concentration of control under the Federal Government at Washington. Penalizing thrift, discouraging personal initiative, breaking down individual confidence and independence—the qualities which have made this Nation great—the policy of the Roosevelt administration has been to take from those who have to give to those who have not, without any regard for justice, equity, wisdom, or economic common sense.

And now, on top of that, Mr. Speaker, we have one of the most shameful spectacles ever presented to the world by a political party in the United States of America. The New

Deal convention at Chicago—for it cannot be called a Democratic convention—bossed, directed, controlled by the White House, and by the President's own personal and political henchmen, defied more brazenly and more insolently than ever before the American way.

Not only did that convention defy one of our most revered American traditions to nominate Mr. Roosevelt for a third term; that convention and the administration went further, and offered a gratuitous insult to the intelligence of the American people by trying to stage-manage and window-dress the convention in such a way as grossly to deceive the American people into believing that Mr. Roosevelt was being drafted for a third term.

Why, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Roosevelt was drafted—by Mr. Roosevelt—for a third term. No other candidate in the Democratic Party was given a ghost of a chance for the nomination. Up until the very hour of the convention itself—indeed, until the convention was under way—Franklin D. Roosevelt refused to tell his party or his country or his fellow citizens what his intentions were regarding a third term. And then, when it was entirely too late for the convention even to attempt to name anyone but Mr. Roosevelt as the Democratic standard bearer, what happened? Mr. Roosevelt sent an ambiguous message to the chairman of that convention, "Dear ALBEN" BARKLEY, to say to the convention that Mr. Roosevelt wanted the delegates to feel free to vote for whom they chose. What a travesty it was on the American way! Those delegates were no more free to vote for whom they chose than a man in a stockade under the guns of the guard is free to walk where he pleases.

Not content with this sordid exhibition of steam rolling, of dictatorship, the managers of the one-man party submitted to Mr. Roosevelt's further dictation in their choice of the candidate for the Vice Presidency.

In his hasty acceptance speech, Mr. Roosevelt had the effrontery—he displayed a supreme contempt for the public intelligence—to try to tell the convention and the country that all of his friends who knew him well had known for a long time that Mr. Roosevelt had no desire to be renominated; he had no desire for a third term, but had earnestly and sincerely yearned to retire to private life. Why, Mr. Speaker, if there is any man or woman in this country who does not know exactly the contrary, it is because he or she has not read the newspapers in the last 2 years. It has been common knowledge that Mr. Roosevelt was permitting his authorized and official spokesmen to go up and down this Nation calling for a third term.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to raise some very pertinent and grave questions here. Why should the New Deal Party be kept in power and control for another 4 years? They have had 8 years. What have they done? They have plunged this Nation deeper into debt than it has ever been before in its history. They have set class against class and section against section. They have prostituted relief to corrupt political purposes. They have built the greatest, the most expensive, and the most corrupt political bureaucracy that ever cursed this Nation. They have browbeaten, abused, and frightened legitimate business into paralysis; they have driven taxes and the necessity for more taxes to a point where they threaten to become confiscatory; they have, headed by President Roosevelt himself, provoked and assailed and meddled in foreign affairs while for 7 years they have neglected the national defense. They have failed to reduce unemployment; they have failed to solve a single solitary domestic or international problem, and in 8 years their record is one of contradictions, inconsistencies, broken promises, deceit, and ruinous spending.

Why, Mr. Speaker, what can we hope for if we give the New Deal administration 4 years more of power, except 4 years more of the same dangerous and deadly policies that we have endured under the New Deal administration for the last 7 years?

What is there, Mr. Speaker, that the New Deal administration can do in the next 4 years that it hasn't done in the last 7 years? If there were anything of a constructive nature that the New Deal administration could do if it were reelected, then the question stands stark before the people, Why has not the administration done it in the last 7 years?

As a result of these ruinous policies which are now being extended into international affairs, we have, as I have just stated, the greatest Federal debt in all history. This mounting Federal debt—mounting by the billions, mark you—the mounting deficits, the higher taxes, the increasing penalties on the thrift and industry of our people, are all being wrought while encouragement increases for those who are willing to abandon their efforts for self-support and to look to their Government and their fellow citizens for a living.

Understand me, Mr. Speaker, I would not want a single man, woman, or child in this country to starve or to suffer, but it is an inescapable fact that dangerous inequities are being fostered and encouraged, and those inequities are taking root in our whole governmental system. No one can deny that they do penalize thrift and encourage extravagance.

My own State of Pennsylvania has become one of the greatest States in the Union, and one of the greatest governmental units in the world. Why? Because our people have always been courageous; they have always been honest; they have always been industrious; they have always been ambitious; they have always been thrifty. They have not been afraid to deny themselves luxuries so they might save for a rainy day, accumulate a competence for their old age, and leave their children enough to give them a fair start in life.

The struggle in Pennsylvania was never any easier in those pioneer days, nor is it any easier today, than it was or is in Louisiana, or Texas, or Arkansas, or Arizona, or North or South Dakota. In Pennsylvania my people long ago learned that the secret of getting ahead in the world is perspiration and perseverance. It has been by that formula that my constituents have made themselves a prosperous agricultural people.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what has happened in the last 7 years of the New Deal administration? Let me quote some figures to indicate what has happened—some figures, Mr. Speaker, which are illuminating to me, and which I am sure will be illuminating to the country.

According to figures compiled by my distinguished colleague, the Honorable ALBERT J. ENGEL, of Michigan, the amount of taxes paid and benefits received by States from March 4, 1933, to July 1, 1939, shows that Pennsylvania paid over that period $2,054,690,813 in taxes to the Federal Government. It received in benefits from the Government $1,307,569,961. In other words, the total of all benefits received from the Federal Government by my State amounted to $135.76 per capita, while my State paid out in taxes to the Federal Government $213.33 per capita.

Let me note that the State of Alabama, for instance, paid in that period $28.01 per capita in taxes and received back from the Government $114.40 per capita in benefits.

The State of Arkansas paid the United States Government $17.12 per capita in taxes and received from the National Government $147.62 per capita in benefits.

The State of Mississippi paid $12.38 per capita in taxes to the Federal Government and received back $127.23 per capita benefits.

Up in the great Northwest, North Dakota paid $13.24 per capita taxes to the Federal Government and received in per capita Government benefits $302.10. While South Dakota paid $14.56 per capita in taxes and got back from the Government $312.85 per capita benefits.

Turning to the Southwest, Arizona in the same period paid into the Federal Government $39.25 per capita taxes and received $232.64 per capita benefits from the Government. New Mexico paid into the Federal Government in taxes $23.09 per capita and received back from the Government in benefits $281.21 per capita.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I could go on mentioning many other States in the Union which have received far more money per capita than they have paid in taxes, while my own State of

Pennsylvania and some other States received much less per capita benefits than they paid in taxes.

Figures are easily manipulated, and statisticians—particularly statisticians with a personal interest at stake—can do strange things with them. These figures I have given, Mr. Speaker, from the standpoint of per capita taxes paid and per capita relief received, are simple figures that everybody can understand, and are figures that are not susceptible of manipulation.

These figures show that not only has the New Deal policy of distributing money resulted in gross inequities to the people of Pennsylvania and the people of my district, but these inequities will continue far into the future as a result of the New Deal policy. This is a case where the evil done by a political administration lives after it.

The people of my district, the people of my State, are perfectly willing to bear their fair share of the difficulties arising from the depression. My people want to be good neighbors—they are good neighbors. We are willing to help feed the hungry and to clothe the ragged and to shelter the homeless. But, Mr. Speaker, we do not believe thrift should be penalized; we do not believe the people of Pennsylvania should be dragged down to a common, lower level of living. What we do believe is that the people of other sections of the United States must be helped to help themselves up to a higher level of living without impoverishing the people of Pennsylvania and other States who have the energy, the courage, and the initiative to drive ahead in spite of handicaps and difficulties brought on by the depression.

There is no reason, Mr. Speaker, why my people should be thus penalized; there is no reason why these inequities should be continued another 4 years; there is no reason why this extravagant and wasteful and inconsistent and contradictory and dangerous policy should continue to be paid for by the taxpayers over a long period of years while we continue on down the road toward national bankruptcy. Already the New Deal administration has fastened a burden upon the backs of the people that will continue to bear down long after the present occupant of the White House and his group of political henchmen have disappeared from the earthly scene.

My people are a people of peace. They do not want to become involved in foreign quarrels and foreign wars. They believe that we should have a defense adequate to defend our country against any nation or any combination of nations who might attempt aggressions against us. But my people do not want their sons sent across the seas to fight in foreign conflicts.

My people, Mr. Speaker, will not be fooled by this political talk on the part of the new dealers that some other party neglected the national defense in the years gone by. My people will remember that whatever threat has arisen to the peace and security of this Nation has arisen in the last 7 years, since Franklin D. Roosevelt took office as President of the United States. My people will not forget, Mr. Speaker, that President Roosevelt has had billions piled upon billions given over to his hands by the Congresses to spend practically as he chose. He did not see fit, until a comparatively short time ago, to begin to agitate for a better national defense. The people had no way of knowing the condition of the national defense. But Mr. Roosevelt and his bureaucrats not only were in position to know, but must have known at all times the dangerous condition of the national defense. It was, therefore, the duty of the New Deal administration to advise the Congress and the people of the dangerous condition of the national defense and to propose measures for remedying that condition.

My people will not forget, Mr. Speaker, that the 1932 Democratic platform expressed vehement criticism of the Republican Party because expenditures for the national defense were approaching a billion dollars a year at that time.

No, Mr. Speaker; there are many facts similar to these I have cited which my people will not forget next November.

We must strive for a constructive program of recovery. We must abandon these policies of penalizing thrift and initiative and of taking from those who have in order to court the favor of those who have not. We must make greater effort to get those who have too little back to work in private industry at decent American wages so they may maintain themselves and their dependents in honor and self-respect.

We must stand fast by the American way. We must turn back this assault being made upon revered American tradition by men consumed with an insatiable lust for continued power. The third-term tradition must not be violated. America must be kept American. We must not be persuaded to abandon a genuine constitutional republic and the Bill of Rights in this country under any pretext whatever.

We must stand fast, Mr. Speaker, to the ideals and the philosophy of the founding fathers. We can do that and still meet, and meet successfully, every demand of the present day.

National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY R. SHEPPARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 19, 1940

RESOLUTION BY THE SANTA ANA JUNIOR CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker and Members of the Congress, I am placing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with your consent a resolution by a group of young men from my congressional district that I think is a splendid expression of loyalty and patriotism, as follows:

Be it resolved by the Santa Ana Junior Chamber of Commerce assembled on this 12th day of August 1940, That our position with reference to the present significant problem of national defense be stated as follows:

1. We believe in the preservation of the democratic form of government which assures to our citizens the liberties and freedom guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States. We believe that the latent dynamics of a democracy, once aroused, are more powerful than the driven dynamics of dictatorships. To obtain that end, we realize that the young men of America have a special responsibility. Hence we pledge our efforts to allay hysteria and not to forget the need for our democratic form of life and to assist in welding together our people through mutual confidence and trust, recognizing that to achieve this end we must reduce unemployment, preserve industrial peace and the rights of labor, assure the fair treatment that encourages capital investment, assure fair treatment for agriculture, and discourage unfair advantage wherever shown.

2. We consider that the most important problem of the day is the immediate establishment of an adequate national defense.

3. We believe that the following are necessary elements of an adequate national defense:

A. A clear definition of the necessary geographical area of defense. As a minimum, such an area must include the United States and its possessions in the Western Hemisphere.

B. Immediate organization of all resources, including industry and manpower, which includes:

1. Compulsory military training.

2. Training of individuals in skills and techniques necessary to the rapid and efficient production of materials and equipment required for defense.

3. Administrative coordination of all agencies involved directly or indirectly in the defense program; appointment by the President of one person charged with this administrative responsibility; and elimination of delays and unnecessary procedural technicalities.

4. Elimination of excessive profits to industry, agriculture, and labor by reason of production incident to the defense program.

5. Development of our own resources with a view to national self-sufficiency through an immediate program of extensive research as to latent resources, chemical substance, mechanical devices, and synthetic products.

C. Recognition and willingness to bear the increased costs of such defense program. Insofar as possible, these costs must be paid currently out of tax revenues. As young men, we will assume our share of this burden.

D. Loyalty to the United States of America. We declare our belief in the loyalty of the great majority of our citizens. However, adequate steps must immediately be taken to eliminate all acts of disloyalty to our democratic form of government. This involves, among other steps, strict enforcement of the immigration laws and mandatory registration of all aliens.

E. Elimination of the use of the cloak of diplomatic privilege as a device to conceal unfriendly propaganda and subversive activity.

F. Public knowledge of all pertinent facts relative to problems of national defense and our relationship to foreign conflicts. We insist that our governmental leaders are under an obligation to keep us promptly and fully informed on these matters. We recognize the reciprocal obligation on the part of every citizen to keep himself fully informed.

G. Also, as an element of defense the step may be justified of making available for purchase supplies and equipment to those nations important to our plan of national defense, provided that the requirements of our own defenses shall in no event be prejudiced by such sale.

4. We oppose sending an armed force outside the Western Hemisphere.

5. No armed force shall be sent beyond our geographical area of defense.

Let's Keep the Record Straight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 13, 1940

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, everything good is New Deal originated. Everything bad stems back to the Republicans. This is one of the endless theme songs of official Washington. Fortunately, we have the record to verify the many claims heard from official circles, and we have men and women fearless enough to cite that record.

The gentleman from Michigan, Representative JESSE P. WOLCOTT, ranking Republican Member of the House Banking and Currency Committee, reading Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt's "My Day" column found it inaccurate, to say the least. And here is what Congressman WOLCOTT tells us:

Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt in her current newspaper column sought to explain to her readers the operations of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act, claiming that the insurance of bank deposits "was initiated by the present administration in Washington."

Mrs. Roosevelt is as badly misinformed as was the President when he sought to justify Secretary Wallace's continuance in office while a nominee for the Vice Presidency on the grounds that Mr. Hoover had remained as Secretary of Commerce after having been nominated for the Presidency, when the facts are that Mr. Hoover promptly resigned from the Cabinet.

The record shows that the father of Federal insurance of bank deposits was Republican Senator ARTHUR VANDENBERG, of Michigan, and that when the proposal was made by him it was bitterly opposed both by President Roosevelt and his then Secretary of the Treasury, William H. Woodin. This was the testimony of Senator CARTER GLASS, addressing the Senate in 1935, when he said:

"When it was first proposed to establish the insurance-of-deposits fund, the President of the United States and his then Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Woodin, were very emphatically and bitterly opposed to it. They said they would not stand for it."

When the 1933 Banking Act was before the Senate, Senator VANDENBERG introduced his amendment to create immediate Federal bank-deposit insurance, effective July 1, 1933, for all deposits up to $2,500 in all national banks.

The act was quickly passed by the Senate and was sent to conference, where the effective date of the amendment was changed from July 1, 1933, to January 1, 1934.

On June 2, 1933, while the bill was still in conference, the President wrote a letter to Senator GLASS in which he said:

"I must therefore again express to you my definite feeling that the Vandenberg amendment must be rejected in toto, even as revised, and again repeat that no modification of this amendment proposed so far will avoid a serious situation."

After the Banking Act of 1933 was passed, containing the Vandenberg amendment for Federal deposit insurance, the President delayed more than 60 days the appointment of members of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation and the organization of the bank-deposit system, which became effective January 1, 1934.

Leo T. Crowley, appointed by the President as Chairman of the F. D. I. C., wrote to Senator VANDENBERG on February 15, 1934:

"I consider you to be the father of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act."

Mr. Speaker, this is the true story. The record is open for all to read.

Selective Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY R. SHEPPARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 19, 1940

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker and Members of the Congress, there has been considerable discussion pertaining to a selective draft bill in order that our Nation can and will be adequately prepared to defend its national integrity.

I recently received a comment on this subject from one of the outstanding editors of a newspaper within my district which I think is most indicative of the attitude of our thinking public. I wish to express my appreciation as a legislative Representative of the Nineteenth District of California for the following comments written by Mr. Mason Yould, editor of the Santa Ana Register at Santa Ana, Calif.:

SELECTIVE SERVICE

(By Mason Yould)

I am the father of two boys. Both are single. Both are between the ages of 21 and 31. They are red-blooded patriotic sons of America.

God knows I don't want them to go to war. They don't want to go to war.

But I believe, and they believe, and their mother believes, that this Nation should be ready for any emergency. They believe in preparedness. My wife and I believe in preparedness.

These boys are fun-loving youths. One is employed gainfully. The other, the younger, goes to school and in the summer months works to help defray his expenses at school. They are typical American boys. They like to play and they play hard. They like to work and they work equally hard. They don't want to give up their play and they don't want to give up their work.

I don't want to change either one of them, or their mode of living, one whit.

They are ready to defend their country against invasion. But they oppose going to some other man's country and fighting his battle.

My boys want to help preserve this Nation for other boys, your boys, and I want them to help preserve this Nation for themselves.

Therefore both my boys, my wife, and myself are in favor of selective service—conscription draft, or call it what you like. Let's not stop at the 31-year-age limit though. Let's register every man.

We, as a family, are not militarists. Individually we are not militaristically inclined. Far from it. Naturally we would rather gather around the breakfast nook and joke, discuss problems of the day, and make plans for the future. We picture America as an ideal place to rear and educate children. A place to live and let live—in peace.

I can conceive of no greater love than that which my wife bears for her two sons. She has cared for them as only a mother can. She has been their counselor, their pal, their balm in times of trouble and their disciplinarian when discipline was necessary. The world would crumble about her shoulders should anything happen to one of her boys.

But, in spite of all this, my wife believes this Nation should be prepared. She has talked about conscription with her boys. I have, too. They are ready to give up the pleasures of the now and learn to drill, learn to be defenders, learn military discipline, learn to be of service to the country that has given them a score of years of freedom—the freedom that their mother and father and their grandparents enjoyed.

No; my boys are not militarists. And they are ready to serve that the boys of America in coming generations will not of necessity be militarists. They don't want to knock chips off the other fellow's shoulders and they aren't going around with chips on their own shoulders for someone else to knock off. As I say, they're not militarists, but they are not going to see Hitler or anyone else come over and try to break up our little home without doing something about it.

And that's what selective conscription means to me. It means being ready when our services are needed. We may never have to use these services, but there can be no danger in preparing. An old adage says: "In time of peace prepare for war." Conscription means the same thing. We won't get adequate defense against overseas attack if we don't get selective service.

We are spending billions for airplanes, tanks, new ships, and other instruments of defense. But to what avail unless we have the manpower to handle them? A tank without a driver, a plane without a pilot, or an antiaircraft gun without a gunner is just so much junk. These same pieces of defense are likewise useless without trained men to operate them.

So my wife and myself are reluctantly willing to give up our boys for a few months as insurance against destruction of our home,

their home, and your home; and my boys are willing to give up a few months' play, a few months' work, and a few months of education so that maybe within a short time they can return to their normal life with the feeling deep in their hearts that their mother and their father and all other mothers and fathers are reasonably safe from attack by outside forces.

It's not easy for a mother to give up her sons. It's not easy for sons to give up their mother.

But it's infinitely easier to do that than to decorate graves.

Lithuania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 19, 1940

RESOLUTIONS BY SOUTH BOSTON AND WORCESTER YOUTH CIRCLES

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution adopted by an organization in my district protesting against the absorption of Lithuania by the Soviet Union, and also an editorial published recently in the Boston Post:

At the outing of the South Boston and Worcester Youth Circles, which took place on August 4, 1940, at Westboro, Mass., it was unanimously voted to register the following resolution of protest against the occupant of Lithuania—Soviet Union:

Whereas the Soviet Union had made a treaty with Lithuania in 1920, fully acknowledging the territorial boundaries of Lithuania, with its permanent Capital in Vilna;

Whereas, on October 10, 1939, the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics compelled Lithuania to enter into a treaty for their common defense purportedly, and guaranteed nonintervention in the internal affairs of Lithuania;

Whereas, relying on the guaranties of the U. S. S. R. in said treaty, Lithuania permitted the U. S. S. R. to establish military bases in Lithuania; Soviet Russia, however, by unfounded pretexts went into occupation of Lithuania, and thereby broke its treaty, violated the guaranties thereof, and infringed on the sovereignty of Lithuania;

Whereas while thus occupying Lithuania, the U. S. S. R. dissolved the lawful congress of Lithuania, announced elections to be held on July 14 and 15, which elections constituted a falsification of national will, and were in contravention of the constitution of Lithuania;

Whereas this illegally elected communistic congress on July 21 voted for union with the U. S. S. R.;

Whereas by ordainment of the U. S. S. R., the established organizations of Lithuania were rendered extinct, communistic organizations were established and membership therein was made compulsory; singing the Lithuanian national anthem was forbidden; Lithuanian leaders by the thousands were arrested and ruthlessly persecuted; and of the active and of the workers, some were incarcerated in local prisons, others were deported to remote parts of Russia: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we the organized youth of South Boston and Worcester, Mass., stanch and loyal citizens of the United States, protest and deprecate these purely imperialistic and arbitrary measures of Soviet Russia against small, blameless, and peaceful Lithuania; and be it further

Resolved, That we demand lawful, democratic, and constitutional elections, and that the Russian forces be withdrawn from Lithuania; that the innocent citizens of Lithuania be released from prisons; and that their persecution cease; and be it further

Resolved, That we repudiate said communistic congress and its traitorous vote to join Lithuania to the Soviet Union and adopt Stalin's proffered constitution; and be it further

Resolved, That in the interest of law and order we respectfully request that the United States Government through President Roosevelt protest against the lawless and ruthless occupation of Lithuania by the U. S. S. R. and that the U. S. S. R. fulfill its promises; and treaties of 1920 and 1939, and abstain from intervention in the internal affairs of Lithuania, and permit Lithuania local autonomy and independence; and be it further

Resolved, That all true Lithuanians, irrespective of where they may be, unite courageously, solidly, and self-sacrificingly, to regain liberty and independence for Lithuania; and be it further

Resolved, That we, the American-Lithuanian youth, assure our brethren in Lithuania assistance in every possible form, to the end that they and Lithuania forever be free and independent; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, to the representatives of the Governments of Lithuania, Russia, and of other governments in Washington, and to the press.

ANTONAS MASJOSKE.
JULIUS P. KISHIS.
ROSTAC S. HERESKERIENN.

[From the Boston Post]

LITHUANIA

The majority of Lithuanians in the old country are very religious people, not unlike their neighbors, the Poles. The churches are integral parts of every community. The faith of churchgoers is impressive to tourists. One of the great cornerstones of Lithuanian religious life is the church marriage.

Now Russia has banned these marriages and they will henceforth be performed by commissars. This will be a bitter pill for the people to swallow, on the heels of conquest. It adds another reason for myriad millions to wish for change in the godless government of the Soviets.

The Defense Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 19, 1940

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the people of this country are deeply concerned because of the delay in the defense program. They know that after the appropriation of billions of dollars for defense the Nation is unprepared to equip even its peacetime army with guns, planes, tanks, rifles, uniforms. The people realize that in modern warfare men without mechanized equipment are as helpless to defend themselves as they would be to hurl themselves into the jaws of some gigantic meat grinder.

I do not believe that men should be drafted to drill with broomsticks as substitutes for rifles; stovepipes for artillery, and farm trucks for tanks. The air is saturated with war talk from official sources, which prompts the citizens to ask: "Why all this delay?" The record is clear on this point. On August 9, 1940, Secretary of War Henry L. Stimson testified before the Ways and Means Committee that—

Congress made available to the Army during the month of June approximately $400,000,000 for airplanes, engines, and accessories. Yet today, almost 7 weeks later, we have been able to sign contracts for the construction of but 33 planes of the over 4,000 for which these appropriations that I have mentioned were made.

In discussing this delay, Secretary Stimson further testified:

Now, gentlemen, the fault is not with the Army. So far as I am aware, there has been no undue delay in the preparation of Army specifications and designs for the contracts. The fault has certainly not been with the Defense Advisory Commission. The members of that body have brought to bear on the solution of this problem their great experience, good judgment, and wholehearted efforts. Nor has it been the fault of industry. The representatives of industry have been earnest; they have shown every desire to cooperate with the Army and with the Defense Commission in the difficult negotiations which have been carried on during these 7 weeks. So far as I have been informed, there has been no evidence that at any time there has been any tendency on the part of industry to hold back on the Army in these negotiations.

Secretary Stimson proceeded to explain the reasons for the reluctance of businessmen to enter into war contracts in these words:

The fact is that we have all been facing a difficult problem, and we have been facing it with earnest efforts to cooperate. That problem arises in a large part from the fact that the entire program of airplane construction is so large that it necessarily involves a great expansion of existing plant facilities and the construction of new plants to meet the requirements of our Army in the present emergency.

Risks are inherent in any business enterprise. Industry may be expected to undertake normal risks. But the risk to industry of undertaking at the request of the Government to expand plant capacity at industry's own expense and of then being left, upon a sudden cessation of the emergency, with these expanded facilities useless, is one that is entitled, in my opinion, to special consideration. Under those circumstances, the uncertainty of future taxation as affected by this expanded construction not only, it seems

to me, fails to give the special consideration which I have just mentioned, but it rather tends to penalize the situation which the manufacturers confront. It is this element of uncertainty in respect to the industry's right quickly to amortize its investments in an expanded construction program, and also the uncertainty, or I may say the delay, as to the amount and character of taxation which will be levied during the period of the contract, which according to our observations chiefly have prevented the execution of these contracts.

In the light of the inference to be drawn from Secretary Stimson's testimony as to the bottleneck situation retarding the defense program, I wish my colleagues and the country to know the facts. The blame for the present defense strangulation should be placed squarely where it belongs.

The first part of last June, when the defense tax bill was under consideration in the Ways and Means Committee, an amendment was proposed by one of the Republican members providing for a 5-year amortization plan for such facilities. The Treasury Department opposed the enactment of the plan at that time, saying that it should be incorporated with an excess-profits tax. However, the Treasury then stated that it would be unable to propose a plan of excess-profits taxation to the Congress in less than 2 months' time. Hence the responsibility for the continued uncertainty regarding the question of taxation in connection with plants and equipment used for defense purposes is that of the executive department alone. Congress has been waiting for 2 months to enact an excess-profits tax with amortization features included, and the fact that it has not been able to do so is no fault of its own, but instead rests entirely with the position taken by the executive branch of the Government.

Pity the Poor Besieged Congressman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE E. HANCOCK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 19, 1940

LETTER FROM HENRY L. McCLINTOCK

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter published recently in the Syracuse Post-Standard:

[From the Syracuse (N. Y.) Post-Standard]

PITY THE POOR, BESIEGED CONGRESSMAN

TO THE EDITOR OF THE POST-STANDARD:

How would you like to vote on conscription? Think of the responsibility upon a Congressman. Think of the letters from the people whom he serves—bushels of letters favoring conscription, more bushels against it—weeks and weeks of hearings with experts testifying for it, experts testifying against it, military experts, naval experts, business experts, Legionnaires, and pacifists—letters from people who fear that a German victory will be an immediate threat to our security and that we must be prepared to meet it—letters from boys who have gotten their first jobs after hopeless years of search and waiting and who are worried at the thought of giving them up—letters from mothers who write, "If anything happens to my son, his blood will be upon your head"—letters from people who write hysterically—letters from people who write with calm conviction.

It is a curious thing that almost everyone who writes to his Congressman is absolutely sure that he is right. No doubts whatever in his mind. And yet the writers disagree with each other completely. The Congressman reads the letters, listens to the experts; he believes that he has heard every possible argument, learned every differing point of view.

Then he must make up his mind how to vote. Which course is fairest to the young man who must bear the brunt of defense? Which course will be best for the country in this world crisis? Or still harder to decide, which will be the least harmful? Every possible course has so many hardships to weigh against its advantages, so many domestic adjustments which must yield to its urgency, that he spends sleepless nights and worried days.

Please have mercy on your Congressman whichever way he votes on conscription because he must have reached his decision through travail of mind and heart.

HENRY L. McCLINTOCK.

NEW BRUNSWICK, N. J.

Aid Britain or Face Attack

REMARKS

OF

HON. STEPHEN PACE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 19, 1940

ADDRESS OF AMBASSADOR BULLITT

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, I hope every Member of the Congress and every man and woman in the Nation will read the speech of Ambassador William C. Bullittt, delivered at Independence Square in Philadelphia last night. The position he has held and the experiences he has had not only justify but require that we give special heed to his timely warning.

For my part, I am not satisfied with the progress being made in the defense of this Nation, particularly the time being taken in the consideration of necessary defense measures by the Congress. It is time for politics to adjourn. It is time for those who treasure their liberties to prepare to defend them.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein the address of Mr. Bullitt.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

Fellow citizens of my country, men and women, Americans, there are times, rare and infrequent, when a man feels he has a right to ask his fellow citizens to hear him. Here tonight, in my own city, in this square where our Republic was created, I feel I have that right.

For nearly 4 years I have served as ambassador of our Republic to the French Republic. That Republic, like our own, followed the gleam of liberty, equality and fraternity for all men and all races. That Republic, like our own, strove for peace.

I have seen the French Republic destroyed.

As your emissary, as the representative of American democracy, I have witnessed the acts which destroyed the French democracy. I know of my own knowledge what blows were struck, what devices of intrigue and treachery and force employed. I know who are the enemies of freedom because I have seen them at their work. I know how dangerous they are and by what means they are dangerous.

PERIL TO LIBERTY

Because I have seen these things and know them of my own knowledge, I know that dangers beset free institutions everywhere. And I know what those dangers are. The strategy of destruction by which the free nation of France was overthrown is the strategy of destruction by which the enemies of freedom hope to overthrow liberty in this, the greatest of the nations that freedom has created. Because I have seen these things with my own eyes, heard them with my own ears, and felt them in my own body, I ask you, my fellow free Americans, to hear what I feel it my duty to say.

American is in danger.

It is my conviction, drawn from my own experience and from the information in the hands of our Government in Washington, that the United States is in as great peril today as was France a year ago. And I believe that unless we act now, decisively, to meet the threat we shall be too late.

The dictators are convinced that all democracies will always be too late. You remember Hitler's statement, "Each country will imagine that it alone will escape. I shall not even need to destroy them one by one. Selfishness and lack of foresight will prevent each one fighting until it is too late."

PROBLEMS COMPLEX

Control of government by public opinion is the essence of democracy. And it has always been our belief that free speech and a free press and free education would enable us to form and express our opinions sufficiently swiftly not only to permit but to compel our Government to act quickly and effectively. But the problems of world affairs have become so complex in this day of volcanic change that the average citizen has the greatest difficulty in understanding them and judging what is best for his country before it is too late.

The dictators have developed a strategy of attack that is based on this difficulty. To prepare the way for military attack on a democracy they employ every possible variety of agent and propaganda to befuddle the public so that the democracy will not pre-

pare in time. They succeeded in befuddling public opinion in France and England to such an extent that they were able to conquer France in a few days and are now striving to conquer an England which awakened late.

They are not yet in a position to attack America by military means; but their campaign of befuddlement, their preparatory assault, is following the same lines in America that it followed in France. Do not imagine that the French citizen was less intelligent or cared less about his country than the American citizen. The honest French patriot did his best, but he just could not see through the smoke screens of bribery, propaganda, lies, and threats which the dictators spread in his country. For every Frenchman who acted as the conscious agent of a foreign dictator, there were a thousand who, with good intentions and high patriotism, unwittingly played the dictators' game.

HOW MANY IN UNITED STATES?

How many Americans today are playing the dictator's game without knowing it?

In France, as in the United States today, there were many honest pacifists. There were many because after 1918 every Frenchman became in one sense a pacifist. The French wanted no more war. And when the German propagandists told the French that they could buy peace with Germany by making one concession after another, the French believed them.

The French, who were much stronger at the time than were the Germans, let the Germans reconstruct an army, a navy, and an air force, let them reoccupy the Rhineland, and the Saar, then Austria, then the Sudeten areas of Czechoslovakia, then the whole of Czechoslovakia. After that the Germans said that the price of peace was Danzig and Poland's outlet to the sea. By that time the French had learned that the lie, the solemn pledge given and broken, had become Germany's normal weapon in international affairs. Yet today there are Americans who argue that we should believe the dictators when they say they have no intention of extending their conquests to the Western Hemisphere and certainly not to the United States. France believed. Where now is France?

There are also Americans who argue that if Hitler should conquer Great Britain he would be content to stop there, and that the United States would be able to cooperate happily with the Hitler empire of Europe. To believe this is to misunderstand the entire nature of the Nazi system. It is not organized to develop an empire in peace. It is organized as a dynamic military machine. The ruthless hold of the Nazi leaders on the German people is based on the gearing of all energies for the sacrifices necessary to wage war. The continued sacrifices by the great mass of the people which the Nazi system demands cannot be obtained except by maintaining a supercharged war temperature. The German nation has been made a preparatory army of assault. Its organization is military. Its military operations have enormous momentum. It cannot stop in its tracks. It can only be stopped.

HIERARCHY CAN'T STOP

Were Germany to try to resume the ways of peace the military discipline which is the very foundation of the Nazi hierarchy would crumble. In order to continue in power that hierarchy must continue to lead Germany on new predatory adventures. The Third Reich cannot change its objectives and methods without changing its entire organization and leadership.

The Americans who believe that the Nazis will not have to be stopped but will stop of their own accord are indulging in the fatal vice of wishful thinking. They want to believe this. Therefore they believe it. There is no other basis than they wish for their conclusion that the Nazis suddenly will become peace-loving men.

The men and women who tell you that the dictators will not attack the Western Hemisphere may be honest, wishful thinkers, or they may be agents of the dictators, but in either case, by lulling you into a false feeling of security and retarding your preparations for defense, they are keeping the way clear for an assault on America by the dictators. They are enemies, consciously or unconsciously, of our country and our liberties.

In France there were high-placed and influential German agents who circulated in what was called society, and argued, because Hitler had said he loved France, that Germany would never so much wish to invade France as to attack the Maginot line, which was estimated to be such a tremendous obstacle. Today we hear Americans of the same stripe arguing that the dictators will never so wish to invade the Americas as to cross the Atlantic, which is regarded as such a tremendous obstacle. They ask us to ignore the fact that the Atlantic is an obstacle only so long as the European exits to the Atlantic are controlled by a nation which is genuinely friendly to us. We can remember, however, that in the past, when those exits have been in the hands of a power unfriendly to us, the Atlantic has become a broad highway for the invasion of the Americas. By way of the Atlantic our own land was invaded twice—during our Revolution and the War of 1812—and that with sailing ships. By way of the Atlantic, Mexico was invaded during our Civil War.

The truth is that the destruction of the British Navy would be the turning of our Atlantic Maginot line. Without the British Navy, the Atlantic would give us no more protection than the Maginot line gave France after the German troops had marched through Belgium. The soothing words "Maginot line" were the refrain of a lullaby of death for France. The soothing words "Atlantice Ocean" are being used now by the propagandists of the dictators in the hope that they may become a lullaby of death for the United States.

The French knew that they were outnumbered 2 to 1 by the Germans, and that all Germans—men, women, and children—had been mobilized for war. They knew that Great Britain was unprepared for war and that little help could come to France from England. When they thought hard, therefore, they knew that every French man, woman, and child ought to be working for the national defense. The French had, of course, universal military training for the army. Even the French priests were trained to fight, and they fought at the front like other good soldiers and would not have been respected if they had not.

But when the question arose of mobilizing the whole nation for national defense by compulsory national service, even as a temporary measure to save the liberties of France, the French found it more comfortable to listen to the voices, some sincere, some bought by the dictators, which told them that their individual liberties were sacred and must not be sacrificed for a moment, even to save the liberties of the nation; that it was more important for the individual to work only 40 hours a week than for his country to have enough airplanes; that the voluntary acceptance of national service as a temporary measure would be an imitation of the dictatorships. Thus, in the name of the preservation of individual liberty, the national liberty of France was condemned in advance to destruction.

PLAYING DICTATORS' GAME

Recently, in this country, we have heard men and women arguing that we ourselves would be imitating the dictatorships if we should create through conscription an army adequate to defend our country. They, too, are playing the dictators' game.

Then there were many in France, some honest, some agents of the dictators, who argued that since airplane design was changing rapidly, France should have good models but should not manufacture planes in great quantity until after the outbreak of war. They were prominent and powerful. As a result, at one time French plane production was allowed to sink to 37 a month, while Germany was producing 1,000 a month.

Have we been wiser the past years? Have we built the planes or trained the aviators to man them? Have we prepared the tanks or the men to drive them? Have we trained and equipped even infantry for our national defense? Are there not among us many who think and talk as did the Frenchmen who opposed adequate preparations?

Recently I heard a Senator who is as good an American as any of us state that while he would favor conscription the moment we should be attacked, he would oppose conscription until after we should have been attacked. The ruined homes of France, the women and children starving on the roads, cry out to him and to every one of us that wars are won or lost by the preparations made or not made before they begin; that untrained soldiers are not opponents but merely victims for trained men with tanks and planes. The dictators, who are confident that all democracies will always be too late, count not only on their agents to befuddle American opinion but also on honorable men like that Senator.

BRITISH NAVY OUR DEFENSE

What stands today between the Americas and the unleashed dictatorships? The British Fleet and the courage of the British people. How long will the British Fleet be able to hold the exits from Europe to the Atlantic? I cannot answer that question nor can any man.

You have heard the appeal of General Pershing for aid to the British Fleet. You have heard the appeal of Admiral Standley. You have heard the appeal of William Allen White and his associates. If you let these appeals go unanswered and the British Fleet goes under, do you realize what that would mean to you, to all of the people of this country?

Great Britain and Ireland, along with the whole continent of Europe, would be organized into one economic unit directed from Berlin; a unit which would be far stronger in productive capacity than the United States; which would have five times our capacity to produce warships; a unit whose trade would be controlled by one trading trust directed from Berlin. No country of North or South America would be able to trade with Europe except on such terms as might be pleasing to the dictators. Those conditions for many of the countries of South America would be the acceptance of a greater or less measure of Nazi control.

For us, since we would not accept Nazi control, they would mean the cutting off of our markets for cotton, tobacco, and other export products. That would be so fatal to the economy of certain sections of our country that we should face the gravest economic crisis in our history; a crisis which it would be the task of Nazi and Communist agents to exploit.

JAPANESE PERIL

In the Pacific would be the Japanese Navy, cooperating with the dictators, which would be able to cut us off from our supplies of rubber and tin and would compel us to leave a large part of our fleet in the Pacific to defend Hawaii and the west coast. In the Atlantic would be combined fleets of the dictators which would be so close to our own fleet in strength that they would be able to cut us off from all commerce, not only with Europe but also with Africa, and would endanger even our communications with the southern portion of this hemisphere.

Are you sure that under those circumstances the powerful Nazi and Communist movements which already exist in various countries of South America would not be able to seize power and would not invite the European dictators to organize air forces on their territories, and that those air forces would not move northward

with dive bombers to the Panama Canal and then move against this country? Are you sure that our existing fleet and air force would be able to defend even the northern route to the United States by way of Greenland, Newfoundland, and Canada?

It is as clear as anything on this earth that the United States will not go to war, but it is equally clear that war is coming toward the Americas.

ARE PREPARING WAY

The agents of the dictators are already here preparing the way for their armies. They are preparing the way in the same manner in which they prepared the way in France.

In France much of the most terrible and traitorous work was done by the Fascists and Communists working together. Many honest French democrats and liberals had been snared by Communist propaganda and argued that, because the Communists called themselves a political party and pretended at the time to be in favor of democracy, it would be undemocratic to deny to the Communists the rights of any other political party. The honest French patriots and democrats who protected the Communists did not discover until too late that the Communists were acting as spies and agents of the dictators, that the Communist Party was merely camouflaged as a political party and was in reality a conspiracy to commit patricide at the direction of a foreign dictator. They discovered too late that the Communists were traitors who were claiming the protection of the state which they intended to destroy only in order the better to prepare for its destruction.

When the German invasion began to sweep into Belgium and France, there were Communist and Nazi agents of Germany in each town and village who produced panic among the civilian populations by spreading fantastic tales of murdering by the German troops of men, women, and children. By this means 10,000,000 civilians were harried in fear from their homes and clogged all the roads, so that the French, British, and Belgian Armies could not maneuver, so that transport of supplies became almost impossible, and a magnificent fighting force became a clotted mass of men and material, a perfect target for bombing and machine-gunning from the air.

STOPPED RAIL TRAFFIC

At the most critical moment of the fighting in Belgium, other German agents, this time Communist railway men, stopped all traffic on the Belgian railways so that there was no transport by train for the French, British, and Belgian Armies.

Throughout France, especially in Paris, there were hundreds of Communist and Nazi agents of the dictators with extremely short-wave portable radio transmitting sets in their hiding places. They kept the Germans fully informed of the movements of the French Army and of the intentions of the French Government. Since they could change their hiding places daily, the French were never able to track down more than one-tenth of these spies.

The French had been more hospitable than are even we Americans to refugees from Germany. More than one-half of the spies captured doing actual military spy work against the French Army were refugees from Germany.

Do you believe that there are no Nazi or Communist agents of this sort in America?

On the 10th day of last May, the people of France were as confident as are the people of the United States today that their country could not be conquered. Three days later on the 13th day of May, the Germans had smashed through the center of the French Army and France was doomed.

SPIES CLEARED WAY

The way had been prepared by spies, agents, and propagandists but it was the strength of the German Army and the skill of its leaders that enabled Germany to strike the fatal blow. The blow was struck just where the French did not expect it. The attack was made by a new method that the French had never imagined. Waves of bombing planes preceded waves of tanks with perfect coordination maintained by radio. The tanks cut through the French lines, then wheeled and lopped off piece after piece of the French Army.

The French soldier fought as courageously and magnificently as any soldier has ever fought. Division after division, cut off from supplies of all sorts, fought on until there were no more shells for the cannons or cartridges for the guns, then charged with the bayonet. The courage of the French was magnificent but of no avail against the tanks and planes of the Germans. And, make no mistake, the German infantrymen were as brave as the French.

The entire western world had been lulled by stories of the inferiority of German equipment. I have seen myself hundreds of thousands of German soldiers with all their motorized and mechanized equipment. I have never seen one piece of that equipment broken down.

The German military machine today is without question the most powerful that has ever been created. It has been used with consummate skill. And you may be sure that if the Nazis have an opportunity to turn it against us, it will be as strong or stronger than it is today and will be used in the most unexpected manner.

CERTAIN WE ARE NEXT

I cannot tell you where and when the attack will come, any more than the French general staff could have told you that the German attack would be made at Sedan on the 13th of May; but I am certain that if Great Britain is defeated the attack will come, and that all the strength of this Nation will be needed—mobilized, organized, equipped, and ready—if we are to parry it and save the independence of our country.

Why are we sleeping, Americans? When are we going to wake up? When are we going to tell our Government that we want to defend our homes and our children and our liberties, whatever the cost in money or blood? When are we going to give the lie to those who say that the people of the United States no longer care about their liberties; that they look upon the United States just as a trough into which to get their snouts, and not as the greatest adventure in human freedom that this earth has known?

When are we going to let the world know that in spite of all the efforts of all the propagandists who call their propaganda "debunking" and try to teach us to fear even truth, we still know that when anyone tries to debunk the Ten Commandments and the Sermon on the Mount, he prepares for himself hell in this world and in the next?

When are we going to let legislators in Washington know that we don't want any more politicians who are afraid of the next election and scared to ask us to make the sacrifices that we know are necessary to preserve our liberties and our Declaration of Independence and our Constitution? When are we going to tell them that we want to know what are our duties, not what are our privileges? When are we going to say to them that we don't want to hear any longer about what we can get from our country, but we do want to hear what we can give to our country. When are we going to stand before God and say that we know a human being is worthy of freedom only when he serves the ideal in which he believes?

JOIN IN FIGHT

Do we want to see Hitler in Independence Hall making fun of the Liberty Bell? No!

Then here, in this square, where Washington walked with Jefferson, where our independence was declared, where our Constitution was framed, I ask you and all other Americans who hear my voice tonight to join in the fight to keep our country free.

Write and telegraph to your Senators and Representatives. Write to your newspapers. Demand the privilege of being called into the service of the Nation. Tell them that we want conscription. Tell them that we back up General Pershing.

If you belong to great patriotic organizations, make them act. If you want to make your will felt but do not know how to make it felt, write to me and I shall try personally to put you in touch with the men and women who know how you can help most effectively in your own home towns and villages.

Our defense against the enemies who are already within our country has still to be organized. Nearly all our defense against the enemies that are still outside our country has still to be organized. If we won't act, our Government can't. It is up to us.

The fighting line of the war for the enslavement of the human spirit is nearing our shores. For every American "there is no discharge in that war." An American is a free man or he is nothing. Our fate and the fate of our children depends on what each one of us does—now.

Speaking of Dictators: Where Shall We Rank John L. Lewis?

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN Z. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 19, 1940

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand a copy of a letter which I understand was addressed to every Member of the Congress by the "fuehrer" of the C. I. O., Mr. John L. Lewis. It deals with conscription, which subject I shall not debate this morning, but I should like to refer to a couple of passages in his letter. Mr. Lewis speaks about conscription being the first step toward the breakdown of those free institutions which we seek to protect. He also speaks about a free democracy as distinguished from a totalitarian state.

Is this the same Mr. Lewis who introduced the sit-down strike technique into American labor relations? Is this the same Mr. Lewis who maintains Harry Bridges as one of his chiefs on the Pacific coast? Is he the same Mr. Lewis who is attempting to set up a one-man dictatorship over American labor? If he is, and he wants to appeal to the Congress, I, for one, think it is high time he started in practicing what he preaches. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the letter from Mr. Lewis to which I referred, together with my reply to him, which follow:

CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS,
Washington, D. C., August 14, 1940.

Hon. JOHN Z. ANDERSON,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ANDERSON: The Congress of Industrial Organizations has already indicated to the Military Affairs Committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives its opposition to the pending measures (S. 4164 and H. R. 10132) which provide for peacetime military conscription. This statement was based upon a canvass made of the members of the executive board of the C. I. O. The consensus of their opinions was in fundamental opposition to the pending measures.

Attached is a brief memorandum which sets forth the major reasons for our opposition to measures for peacetime military conscription. I urge your most careful examination of these arguments.

I am certain that the millions of members of the C. I. O. and their families join with me in calling upon you to oppose measures providing for military conscription in peacetime.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN L. LEWIS.

MEMORANDUM IN OPPOSITION TO PEACETIME MILITARY CONSCRIPTION

The Congress of Industrial Organizations stands second to no one in its desire for effective national defense. It has, therefore, pledged itself to the fullest cooperation with proper defense measures.

In the establishment of adequate national defense, however, it is just as essential that unsound and unwise proposals be defeated, as it is that proper measures be taken. In the excitement of a period of crisis, measures are sometimes advanced so fundamentally in opposition to our national democratic traditions that their proponents would not dare propose them at any other time. It is our belief that peacetime military conscription is just such a measure.

The very genesis of the measure for peacetime conscription is open to serious question.

(1) The proposed bill was drawn up under unofficial auspices by private citizens, although no measure could be more affected with the public interest.

(2) The bill was launched by a group of prominent New York corporation lawyers and other wealthy persons. Neither these persons nor the congressional sponsors of the bill have been notable in their support of legislation for the welfare of the common people of this country.

(3) The measure has not been formally requested of Congress by the President of the United States, the responsible head of preparation for national defense.

(4) At their recent national conventions, both of the major political parties gave the proposal for conscription consideration, but neither saw fit to give endorsement to the proposal.

Briefly these are the reasons which have impelled the C. I. O. to oppose the pending measures:

(1) There is a better way to recruit a proper army for defense than conscription. Voluntary enlistment under terms which have a real concern for the needs of the individual would quickly provide a suitable army. The period of enlistment should be shortened to 1 year. The pay should be raised at least to compare with that of the self-respecting workman. The right to return to private employment should be protected. Provision should be made for the continuation of social security protection during the period of such enlistment. Private debts should be either assumed or suspended. Officers' commissions should be more freely open to enlisted men so that an army career is open to men from the ranks. Under such circumstances the most effective and loyal kind of an army could be raised with much less cost to the Nation than the enormous expenditures necessary for conscription.

(2) Military conscription now would establish the principle in this Nation that the lives of our young men are less privileged than the profit rights of dollars. Today the Nation is watching the shameful spectacle of our Government yielding to the imperious demands of corporate industry for vast tax concessions and enormous loans as a precondition to manufacturing arms. The same interests who thus strangle our national defense call loudly for the forcible conscription of our young men. They claim in one breath that no dollar will be turned to the defense of our Nation without a fat and untaxed profit being assured, while almost at the same moment they call upon our young men, most of them workers, to cast aside their liberty and sacrifice their ambitions, or suffer punishment as a felon. It would be a terrible day in American history should our young men be forced to the draft while industry is free to lay down its ultimatums to the Government.

(3) Forced military service in peace time would be an alarming departure from the basic principles of our democracy. It is the first step toward the breakdown of those free institutions which we seek to protect.

Citizens who become subject to conscription lose a substantial part of those civil rights and liberties which distinguish a free democracy from a totalitarian state.

Such conscription would further establish in the minds of the young people of the Nation the idea that voluntary loyalty to the Nation is no longer a necessary virtue. It would introduce them to the principle of compulsion, a principle native to the fascist state and alien to our own.

(4) The production of equipment for an army has lagged far behind the enlistments into the military service. Already there are more men available to the Army and the National Guard than can be equipped for some time to come. The present speed of enlistments is far more rapid than the provision of equipment. From the point of effective defense, an efficient, loyal, and highly trained army, highly mechanized, is many times more efficient than a sullen, ill-equipped, poorly trained, conscript army of three times the size. Conscription now would be an enormous waste of money and manpower.

(5) The entire fabric of the Nation, both industrial and social, would be torn by conscription. The dislocations in industrial production and in community life caused by conscription would take years to heal.

Therefore, the C. I. O. is opposed to provision for peacetime conscription as a measure inimical to the most effective kind of national defense and alien to the democratic way of life.

Furthermore, effective national defense in a democracy must not be restricted to the creation of armed forces. Democratic national defense must include the full utilization of our industrial capacity and our available manpower. It must include those measures which create faith and loyalty in citizens, such as, security for the aged, health provision for the lower income groups, a place in the sun for young people and the aggressive maintenance of civil liberties.

AUGUST 19, 1940.

Mr. JOHN L. LEWIS,
President, Congress of Industrial Organizations,
1106 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: This will acknowledge receipt of your letter dated August 14 and the enclosed memorandum on the subject of peacetime military conscription. At your request, I have carefully examined the arguments set forth and now hasten to reply.

On page 3 of your memorandum I find the following statement: "(3) Forced military service in peacetime would be an alarming departure from the basic principles of our democracy." I shall not argue that point with you, as the compulsory military training bill has not yet been reported to the House of Representatives for action. It is my firm opinion that such important subjects as this should receive the most careful consideration of the Congress before being passed on.

Reading further in your memorandum, however, I find the following statement: "It is the first step toward the breakdown of those free institutions which we seek to protect. Citizens who become subject to conscription lose a substantial part of those civil rights and liberties which distinguish a free democracy from a totalitarian state." On the last page of your memorandum this observation appears: "The C. I. O. is opposed to provision for peacetime conscription as a measure inimical to the most effective kind of national defense and alien to the democratic way of life."

It is reassuring to know that you still have faith in our free institutions, our civil rights, and liberties, and that you are opposed to any measure that you feel is alien to the democratic way of life. Frankly, I am not the only Member of Congress who has been somewhat concerned over your attitude toward our American ideals and traditions during the past few years. Also, very frankly, I am not the only Member who is very much inclined to doubt the sincerity of your high-sounding phrases at this particular time.

If I am mistaken I should like to be corrected, but it occurs to me that you are the same Mr. Lewis who introduced the sit-down strike technique into our democratic way of life. We had an opportunity to observe the uplifting effect of this particular innovation when the French Republic crumbled before the onslaught of Hitler's army. I believe France tried the sit-down strike first, under the Blum regime, and then you tried it here. It would be interesting to have your comments on just whose civil rights and liberties are saved by sit-down strikes and just how such strikes contribute to the basic principles of our democracy.

Among other things you manage to keep in your organization men whose avowed policies are violently opposed to traditional American doctrines, men with responsible positions who preach class distinction and foment strife between labor and management, while the general public foots the bill. Chief among these, of course, is Harry Bridges, the notorious alien labor racketeer on the Pacific coast, who should have been deported long ago.

You talk about the totalitarian state on the one hand, while at the same time you attempt to assume complete control over the destinies of 4,000,000 American laborers and their families. I am personally acquainted with men who are members of the C. I. O., not because they want to be, but because they are obliged to join in order to follow their chosen profession. They are free American citizens forced into a state of labor bondage through your peculiar but effective methods of conscription.

I noticed with particular interest your reference to the necessity of protecting our civil rights and liberties. Perhaps you will recall that it was a struggle for these fundamental principles that brought this great democracy into being. For over 150 years the American people have been striving to protect their constitutional privileges, and yet you would deny to the worker the most precious right of all—the right to work.

With the foregoing observations in mind and with the hope that at some future date your policies will conform more closely to your public statements, I beg to remain,

Yours very truly,

J. Z. ANDERSON.

Mr. Speaker, I also desire to insert the following pertinent editorial from a recent issue of the Monterey Peninsula Herald, published in Monterey, Calif.

Generalissimo John L. Lewis, who commands 4,000,000 in his far-flung army in strategic centers in this country, apparently is convinced that George C. Marshall, who is just a plain general, doesn't know his business or is a subversive interest undertaking to promote conscription to undermine the American system that the generalissimo has defended with immense contributions to political funds, sit-down strikes, and his own infallible wisdom that is always on tap on all subjects.

It is true, of course, that General Marshall at this writing commands only some 300,000 men, all of them volunteers.

That makes the general of inconsequential importance compared with the generalissimo. On the other hand, the generalissimo commands a considerable number of men who were indeed drafted, since they had to join the C. I. O. or else.

General Marshall's professional advice, Secretary Hull's solemn warnings, Secretary Stimson's urgent pleas—all are so much camouflage to the gentleman who knows better behind his eyebrows about how to defend America. It is sufficient, says the generalissimo of 4,000,000, to promote 1-year service in the Regular Army and pay the boys more money. That would make a good enough Army to suit him, because the only reason why this country is in danger is because there are millions of unemployed, too many hours of work, too small pay checks, insufficient pensions, and, therefore, the necessity to engage in war in order to avoid these troublesome failures.

That is what the villains behind the scenes are conniving at, with the assistance of the President, his Secretaries, and the always-to-be-distrusted generals. If anyone is in doubt about that, he doesn't have to take John L. Lewis as his authority. Earl Browder will do just as well, as he speaks the same language on this subject.

Repetition of 1896

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. GRANT

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 15, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE SOUTH BEND TRIBUNE

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the South Bend (Ind.) Tribune of August 12, 1940:

[From the South Bend (Ind.) Tribune of August 12, 1940]

REPETITION OF 1896

The year 1940 in some respects resembles the year 1896 in political aspects. In 1896 the Republican nominee was William McKinley; the Democratic nominee, William J. Bryan. Both were Christian gentlemen, both were loyal American citizens. McKinley represented sound money, a gold standard. Bryan stood for free silver, the free coinage of silver at 16 to 1. Interest in the campaign was intense. Some Democrats willed to follow Bryan's lead but many were gold-standard, sound-money advocates and could not accept the theories of the man from Nebraska who had won the Democratic nomination by stampeding the convention with what went into history as his "crown of gold" speech.

Following the Democratic convention and the nomination of Mr. Bryan with his free-silver theories sound, far-visioned Democrats found themselves in the same position that has come to thoughtful, far-seeing Democrats of today following the recent Chicago convention. The Nation-loving Democrats of 1896 loved their country first, the party afterward. They could not stomach Bryan's silver theories. While admitting that he was a great speaker, that he could make his theories appear logical, sound, and attractive they realized that to adopt those theories would bring depression and suffering to the country. What did they do?

They saw the light. They knew it was better that McKinley and the sound-money ideas of himself and the Republican Party should prevail rather than the disaster that would come from making Bryan president. With genuine common sense, with loyalty to their country, and with keep appreciation of the future they became gold Democrats and when election day came thousands upon thousands voted for McKinley and helped to save their country. They were men who had the courage of their convictions. They did not desert the Democratic Party; it actually had been taken from them. They could not bear to see their party be the instrument of a lot of theorists and be held responsible for national disaster.

Will this year be a repetition of 1896? Will the genuine, sound-minded, nationally loyal Democrats produce that same type of courage? We believe many of them will. Already it is apparent they do not propose that the great Democratic Party will be destroyed by the new deal whose purposes are selfish and whose objectives do not conform to the best interests of the American people whether rich or poor, whether employed or unemployed. These Democrats appreciate that their attitude is not desertion of the Democratic Party but loyalty to a great country that exists under the God-given rights of a constitution that has protected and advanced the Nation and that must be upheld at all costs.

The First Attack on Religion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. SCHAFER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 19, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE CATHOLIC HERALD CITIZEN

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under permission unanimously granted by the House, I incorporate in the RECORD at this point a copy of my August 14, 1940, letter to the Most Reverend Moses E. Kiley, S. T. D., president of the Catholic Herald Citizen, and a copy of the editorial, entitled "The First Attack on Religion," mentioned therein.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., August 14, 1940.

The Most Reverend MOSES E. KILEY, S. T. D.,
President, Catholic Herald Citizen, 793 North Jackson Street, Milwaukee, Wis.

MY DEAR FATHER KILEY: I have your letter of August 8 and thank you most cordially for sending me the clipping from the August 10, 1940, issue of your publication, which contains the exceptionally fine editorial entitled "The First Attack on Religion."

While I favor an adequate national defense under a voluntary system of military service, I am opposed to compulsory military service in time of peace, which is a part of the New Deal plan to establish a dictatorship in the United States. Compulsory military service in a democracy in time of peace is indefensible, particularly when it has not been demonstrated that the voluntary system of military service has failed.

Although I shall oppose the enactment of the pending compulsory military service bill when it is brought to the floor of Congress, I shall follow your recommendation and do everything that I can to incorporate the religious exemptions which you have called to my attention.

I enclose herewith pages 4973, 4974, and 4975 of the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, which contain my extension of remarks in which I incorporated the statement of Rt. Rev. Msgr. Michael J. Ready, general secretary of the National Catholic Welfare Conference.

Please be assured that I am always glad to hear from you with reference to pending or proposed legislation or if I can be of service.

With kind personal regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

JOHN C. SCHAFER.

[From the Catholic Herald Citizen of August 10, 1940]

THE FIRST ATTACK ON RELIGION

No American citizen should fail properly to evaluate some of the prosposals for national defense that certain well-meaning individuals are sponsoring. Such, for instance, is the Burke-Wadsworth conscription bill as now drawn, which, to a certain degree, undermines one of the pillars of our democratic form of government—freedom of religion.

The enactment of such a law would deprive citizens of the United States of a right guaranteed them by the Constitution. The Constitution in guaranteeing this right, likewise necessarily guaranteed the means necessary effectively to exercise this right, namely, that there be available at all times ministers of religion

to care for their spiritual needs. Depriving persons of the means necessary to exercise a right that is theirs is equivalent to depriving them of that right, since a right without the means to exercise it is valueless.

In 1917 the Congress of the United States recognized this right and exempted all ministers of religion and divinity students from military service. The present proposed law is a leaf out of the book of the dictators and is alien to the spirit of a democratic nation. No one denies the necessity of training men for the defense of the Nation, but it is likewise necessary to train students for the ministry and the priesthood in order that the citizens of the nations may have ministers of religion available to care for their spiritual needs, which right the Constitution guarantees them. The citizens in the land and naval forces of the United States like all others need the spiritual care that ministers of religion alone can give them. At no time in the history of the Nation have the various religious denominations failed to provide chaplains for the men in the service of the Nation. Seeing that the Constitution of the United States is nowise changed in this respect, the right that was recognized in 1917 should be recognized in 1940.

The Selective Draft Act of 1917 also exempted all Brothers who had taken solemn vows to dedicate their lives to the service of God. This, too, was in perfect accord with the spirit and intention of the founders of the Nation, as manifested in the Declaration of Independence. These brave, noble men, whose thoughts scanned the whole fabric of God's creation in the world in which we dwell, studied the laws of nature, and of nature's God; appealed to the Supreme Judge of the world to bear witness to the rectitude of their intentions, and proclaimed their firm reliance on the protection of Divine Providence.

To enact now a law contrary to the principles enunciated in the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution would be to go backward; would be a return to the tyranny of a government that refused to recognize that "all men are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights," which the founders of the Nation declared to be self-evident; would be to jettison all for which these patriots lived, labored, and sacrificed.

In order to preserve for himself and posterity the free exercise of the inalienable rights the patriots who established the Nation secured for him, every religious American should request his Senators and his Congressmen jealously to safeguard the rights of his constituents, by seeing that exemption is granted to all ministers of religion, to all students for the ministry and the priesthood, and likewise to those others, who, by solemn vows, have dedicated their lives to the service of that God, to whom, as the Supreme Judge of the world, the illustrious Father of the Nation appealed to bear witness to the rectitude of their intention, and on the protection of whose providence they proclaimed their reliance. That posterity might never forget all this they caused to be impressed on the currency of the land, "In God we trust."

By doing this you will stop this first subtle attack on religious freedom, the cornerstone of democracy, and without which no democratic nation can endure. Let your Representatives know that on this point you stand with Washington and the other patriots of '76, and not with some of the modern sages, who seem to think that the Nation no longer has any need of the protection of Divine Providence, on which the founders of the Nation relied.

Leave It to Willkie

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES F. O'CONNOR

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 19, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE BIG TIMBER PIONEER

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Big Timber Pioneer in Montana:

LEAVE IT TO WILLKIE

Leave it to Willkie to defeat himself before he even gets started in the main campaign. Every day the Associated Press, his best front-page advertiser, quotes him on some unimportant suggestion, something a Presidential candidate, a sound one, should not have in mind.

A week ago he announced that he was going to get Thomas E. Dewey to campaign the Midwest and show up Democratic political machines, "which do not make for good government," and hammer at the Democratic machines in Chicago, Memphis, and Jersey City.

No mention was made of Tammany Hall and Wall Street machines in New York City. It was Wall Street defeated Dewey for the Republican nomination for President due to his prosecution of some of its most prominent members, particularly John J. Hines, president of the New York Stock Exchange.

His next silly announcement is that when he goes to the White House, if he does, he will make an inventory of all his earthly possessions, and when he leaves at the end of 4 years, have a check up of the same, apparently to prove that he is not carrying away any White House china, silverware, etc.

As you know, the order of procedure on inaugural day is for the President-elect to drive to the White House, pick up the retiring President, who will remain with him until he takes the oath of President and delivers his inaugural address. But the retiring one does not return to the White House.

It may be embarrassing for Willkie and Mrs. Willkie to unload their trunks on the White House lawn and have their contents checked while they are at the inaugural ceremonies.

The latest by Willkie is that when he gets into office he will prosecute all who are contributing to a Democratic campaign book, which, he says, is a violation of the Hatch Corrupt Practices Act.

But how about those who are contributing indirectly? Two weeks ago the Sweet Grass News published a statement of the vice chairman of the Republican State Committee that she had named four local Republicans to solicit funds for the Republican campaign, 60 percent of which will go to the National Committee, the balance to State and county committees.

Of course that is not a violation of the Hatch Act. Senator WHEELER may pay 10 percent of his first year's salary for campaign purposes, but Wheeler-for-Senator Clubs may expend a half million over the State without violating the Hatch Act.

This applies to Willkie-for-President clubs now being organized in every part of the country.

In the meantime the exodus from Democratic to Republican ranks continues.

Last week a professor in the State University of Missouri announced he had switched to Willkie.

Mrs. John N. Garner, wife of the Vice President, laughingly pinned a Willkie button on a friend.

Twenty-two beet growers in Nebraska had visited Willkie in his Colorado Springs hotel and liked him. However, the Associated Press did not state how many nonvoting Mexicans they have working in their beet fields.

Now we have Metz, of Wyoming, relieved recently of a good Government job.

And so the story goes. Every Democrat who has been ousted from a Federal job during the past 8 years is after Roosevelt's scalp.

Head of the bolters, as usual, is former Senator Reed, of Missouri, who has been a bolter ever since the Democratic Party of that State bolted him from his senatorial job.

Compulsory Military Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 19, 1940

ADDRESS BY RICHARD H. KIMBALL

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a speech recently made by Col. Richard H. Kimball, of Chattanooga, as reported in the News-Free Press of August 13. Colonel Kimball sets forth very logically and forcefully the need for and equality of the conscription plan for securing necessary manpower for defense. He, as colonel in the World War, and as a man who has studied and kept in close touch with military affairs of today, can speak with authority on this subject. His remarks are well considered and deserve your study.

[From the Chattanooga News-Free Press of August 13, 1940]

VOLUNTEER SYSTEM CAN'T BE RISKED IN THIS HOUR OF PERIL, SAYS COLONEL KIMBALL IN ADDRESS—TELLS KIWANIS CLUB CONSCRIPTION VITAL TO FUTURE—SECURITY OF THIS NATION THREATENED FOR FIRST TIME

"We could suffer the old volunteer system in the Spanish-American War, but we simply can't risk it now," said Col. Richard Kimball, retired United States Army officer and local business leader, in an address before the Kiwanis Club today, during which he advocated compulsory military training.

"In the past," said Colonel Kimball, "we were able to indulge the traditional preference of our people for the volunteer system because the security of our Nation was not seriously threatened, not even in the World War. Now the situation is different. The protection hitherto afforded by certain combinations of governments

which, solely in their own interest, have stood between us and attack by other combinations of nations has been broken down.

"Great Britain, the one other powerful democracy that remains, is fighting for its life. If the British Empire goes, it is certain that we will have to face, alone, the combined totalitarian or dictator governments of the world. Already they have expressed in numerous ways their hostility toward us. Already they have taken aggressive measures against us; some openly, some through subversive activities. They may not trust each other. They may fight among themselves over the spoils, but it is certain that they are united against us, primarily for two reasons: The first is that we, in our conception of individual liberty, freedom, and justice, are the direct negation of, and a living challenge to, the slave-like state in which they hold their own and all conquered people. Second, we are rich and we stand in their way in many fields in which they wish to expand their business.

"The volunteer system of providing enlisted personnel has appeared in the past to meet the needs of the Army in peacetime because its requirements have been comparatively small. We are preparing now against the possibility of war with some one or more of the great world powers, which will have profited undoubtedly, by all military lessons to be learned in 1940 in Europe, Asia, and Africa. That calls for an expansion of our training program to an extent never before undertaken in peacetime in this country.

VOLUNTEER SYSTEM WASTEFUL

"In every other war with a foreign power, except the World War, we have depended upon the volunteer system, and it has proven wasteful, costly, and undependable from every standpoint.

"One of the things which we must keep clearly in mind is that our development of an adequate defense program is not for its own sake, but to afford us security behind which we shall be free to work out our own way of life. The war which we are waging now—the war we shall continue to wage with or without foreign aggression—is the war to make our form of government work. That calls for clearer thinking, more discipline, tougher fiber, and no little sacrifice on the part of our whole people. We must be so strong that no foreign power will venture to take a hand in that entirely private war of ours.

HITLER DEALS ON OWN TERMS

"No sane man who looks at the world today can fail to appreciate that if we are to survive we must be sufficiently strong to demand those things that are essential to maintain an economic structure which will make possible our economic and political stability and independence. Some of our isolationists say we must now appease in order to do business with a victorious Hitler. They ignore, or do they not wish to remember that Hitler does business entirely on his own terms with people who are not in a position to resist his military threats. If we do business with any foreign power we don't want to be in the position of having to trade at the point of a gun.

"Something else that we should not forget is that Hitler has been able not only to build up a powerful, highly effective war machine, but that he is also the head of a sect. Not only his own people, but groups in other nations, including our own, are being taken in by his fanatical teachings. We must be superior spiritually as well as in military power, in order to defeat such an enemy.

"Colonel Lindbergh's admiration of the efficiency of the German war machine is understandable. That his admiration should not be tempered by its use to machine-gun and crush with tanks fleeing women and children is not understandable.

"If we are realistic, there must be some question in our minds as to whether or not certain foreign governments are now at war with us—surely many of their acts are acts of war by the old standards. We must prepare quickly and adequately to face the world alone.

"While there is a chance that we may not have to meet total war, that chance is greatly improved if we are prepared to meet it. I would not be surprised if, when finally enacted by Congress, as I confidently believe it will be, the Compulsory Training Act will place a comparatively small limit on the quotas that are called into service during the next 12 months, but it will afford a basis of large, rapid military expansion at the will of Congress.

REORGANIZE NATIONAL LIFE

"Preparation for total modern war means the reorganization of our whole national life. It requires 25 men in the Army and in civil life to maintain 1 man in the line in time of war.

"The greatest value at this time of an adequate Compulsory Service Act is that it will make millions of men available for military service; they will be registered and classified so that a dependable military program can be planned.

"During the World War, the selective-service draft, which is the wartime complement of compulsory military training in peacetime, or semipeacetime, proved to be economical in time, men, and money. It is scientific, dependable, fair, and democratic. The modern army is highly technical. If you need a group of radio experts, you lose valuable time if you have to try to make them out of a group of raw youths. Registration and classification will make it possible to find the right man for the right job. Compulsory military service is fair because it takes men uniformly in proportion to population and makes every proper and reasonable exemption for prior family and Government needs. That is intelligent, for it reduces economic and social dislocation to a minimum.

"Certain political leaders have said it is undemocratic. I think it is more democratic, for an impartial, deliberate, scientific, fairly administered system to select men to receive training in the Army, than to high-pressure them into a state of temporary excitement by the use of bands and rallies under which they enlist. I also think whether or not government action is democratic depends on whether or not it is in the interest of a majority of the people—is determined by representatives of a majority of the people and can in this same manner be undone if it does not work. We can compel school children to go to school, but we cannot compel men to learn to defend themselves and their country. It doesn't make sense.

"Recently publicity was given to the fact that all the eligible boys in one community in Tennessee had enlisted except one. That probably is good for the boys on account of the training they will receive, but it is also probable that a more even distribution of enlistments throughout the country would be better for the Nation.

TENNESSEE LOYAL

"On August 10 a Washington news item stated that the first 11 States in the number of men enlisted during the first 6 months of 1940 were Tennessee, Texas, Georgia, Kentucky, North Carolina, Oklahoma, New York, Pennsylvania, Illinois, California, and Virginia. Virginia ranks eleventh with 2,169. No New England State had as many as 2,000. It is quite apparent that, generally speaking, the Southern States, although averaging much smaller populations, are producing a relatively larger number of recruits to the Army than many thickly populated Northern States in which there are large groups of citizens of foreign origin. This speaks well for the patriotism of the 7 Southern and Southwestern States, but does it make our Army as representative as it should be, or bear equitably on the country as a whole. This would be adjusted by compulsory military training.

"The important thing for each father and mother to remember is that not only does training make a better and more effective army, but it makes one in which their sons in every respect have a better chance. We know from past experience that if certain things come to pass and the security of our Nation is in danger, we will go to war. When we do, your son or grandson or neighbor's son will go as their fathers and grandfathers went before. If your boy is handling a machine gun in the turret of a tank or in the tail of a bomber you will want his pilot to be all that good training can give him. If he is in the Infantry and the Artillery is laying down a supporting barrage, you will want those artillerymen as well as his comrades to know their stuff. You will want his officers to be as expert as possible in how to supply, march, and fight with every form of modern war machinery.

"When a mechanized division moves 60 miles a day in 1940, where an infantry division moved only 12 miles in 1918, the entire Army, including the War Department, not merely the units of that mechanized division, must be synchronized to that speed.

"Training, intensive training, is now necessary to bring an entire army to that point. Remember the Germans had in France, not only tanks, planes, machine guns, but also supertrained manpower.

APPEASERS WORTHLESS

"If through complacency and consequent lack of preparation we should ever have an American Flanders or Dunkirk, the appeasers, the isolationists, and the political opportunists will be of no more avail than were those discredited leaders in England who waited too long to prepare for war.

"Finally, I would say that it is incumbent upon the men, women, and youth of this country to study and be alert to the true meaning of the problems with which this Nation is today confronted. We cannot expect our statesmen to be in their action many steps ahead of the thinking of a substantial majority of our people.

"France was lost and Great Britain is in deadly peril not because all of their political leaders did not foresee the danger (some of them did foresee it and gave warning), but because the wishful thinking of a majority of the people made them unrealistic and deaf to their warnings.

"Tell your Senators and your Representatives in Congress how you feel about compulsory military training—that is only being fair to them."

Answering Mr. Frothingham

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER M. PIERCE

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 19, 1940

LETTER FROM EDWARD E. CLARK

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter written by Edward E. Clark answering Mr. Frothingham's attack on the Securities and Exchange Commission:

ANSWERING MR. FROTHINGHAM

At the June 19, 1940, annual dinner of the Harvard class of '94, Francis E. Frothingham delivered a talk or speech which was somewhat unusual for such gatherings.

Starting with the assertion that he wanted "to speak about the dangers that confront our United States as I see them," he devoted some five-sixths of his time to the situation abroad and the threat to this country which must necessarily follow, emphasizing the perils of totalitarianism which exist both to the east and the west; and then climaxed the speech with as bitter an attack upon the present administration and the New Deal as the writer has ever heard. Later, at the suggestion of friends, the address was printed and distributed to the members of the class; and as this numbers more than 260, that means pretty wide circulation—for who can tell how many beyond the recipients were able to read it?

Most social organizations forbid political discussions at their gatherings. Whether this custom is a salutary and proper one need not be argued. For at least it must be admitted by all that common fairness demands that if one member of a meeting of individuals, coming together for social purposes alone, takes it upon himself to launch into a partisan or political speech, opportunity should be given to someone not in accord with the speaker to present a little of the other side of the picture. There was no such opportunity on that occasion as the speech was the last of the evening. I, for one, should not want to have it thought that approval of the tone, the substance, or the implications of the speech was unanimous; so I am undertaking a brief answer, at the earliest possible moment.

Here, perhaps, the writer ought to inject a personal note by stating that he is, and for many years has been, a registered Republican, and has served in many party organizations and committees, including 10 years' service on the Republican State committee of Massachusetts—facts which may warrant the suggestion that what he may have to say has no foundation of narrow partisanship such as might be true in the case of one in the position of a political opponent.

What Frothingham stated, after leaving the subject of world conditions in general, evidently as a part of "the dangers that confront our United States," to which he had referred, began as follows:

"And what do we find in this country? A New Deal that, under the guise of a more abundant life, has at a reckless rate been exhausting the credit of this country, has demoralized and intimidated business, has arraigned class against class, has taught ease and slothfulness so that Government is looked to for universal support, and has shockingly degraded the morality of a great people Our Government has broken all its promises and does not know the truth"; and more following—all as general and none with more specification or reference to evidence than that which is quoted.

Strong language, indeed! "Shockingly degraded the morality of a great people" would stand in a class by itself were it not followed by the statements that "our Government has broken all its promises" and "does not know the truth."

Such extravagance of statement, such bitterness of spirit, one might think, must have their root in some awful situation, some great injustice bringing, at the very least, untold misery upon him who utters the words. No such situation, no such injustice appear; but it does appear that Frothingham is a recent president of the Investment Bankers' Association of America; and it also appears that this organization has been put into politics, that is to say so far as its leaders can do so. All of which brings me to the main subject and purpose of this reply.

For those of us who lived during the period between 1920 and 1930 it is difficult to realize that our newest voters of 1940 were but infants and children in those years, that even many of those about to vote at their second and third Presidential elections were then generally of too tender years to understand about and be interested in affairs of public importance; and that there are some other hundreds of thousands whose interest was casual or who have forgotten outstanding features of that eventful period. For that matter, even those of us who lived through that time might find a little memory-jogging useful, in giving consideration to the things that happened, and the results that followed.

Who was it who described it as "the lush years of the twenties," or words to that effect? "Lush" years they were; when a situation of real and growing prosperity was soon succeeded by one of largely artificial prosperity, shortly to be followed by one of overcapitalization, speculation, and rampant securities dealing, some honest but injudicious, and some either just above or below the line which defines thievery, but all of a magnitude and complexity never previously approached in this world of ours.

Among the agencies which took a part and whose sponsors benefited by that financial spree was the "investment company" or "investment trust." In former years confined to rather modest proportions and simple aims, these institutions were then presented with the opportunity not only to expand and to collect, from investors and from those who fancied they were investing, amounts of capital the magnitude of which had never before been dreamed of but to perform feats of financial jugglery which would have utterly bewildered the promoters and financiers of former years.

Many of those concerns were and continue to be soundly organized and ably and properly conducted; but many others were far from being in that class. Let us consider, although it may be only briefly and partially, in a statement of this character, a few of the activities of some of the latter—yes; and perhaps even a few of the slips and shortcomings of some of the managers of those which were not strictly in that class. For there are very potent reasons why they should not be forgotten.

First, however, let us look at the magnitude to which these institutions, good, bad, and indifferent, grew in the orgy of spending, investing, and speculating, in those "lush years of the twenties," and for several years thereafter. The governmental agency which now has supervision of them—and about which a word or two will be stated later—has ascertained that, from 1927 through 1936, there existed at one time or another 1,272 investment companies of all types; and that the number known to be still active at the end of 1936 had dwindled, through numerous liquidations and reorganizations, to only 559. By the same authority it appears that "the total assets of investment companies increased sharply from a relatively small amount in 1924 to a market value of over $7,000,000,000 as of the year 1929"; and that during the first 3 years of the depression, "namely, 1930 through 1932, these companies sustained a severe shrinkage in assets, the market value thereof being approximately $2,800,000,000 as of the year end 1932."

By the same authority it is estimated that, as of the end of 1935, there were approximately 2,100,000 securities holders of all types of investment companies; and that in the two following years, sales of such securities reached about $2,500,000,000, or about one-sixth of all corporate issues sold during that time.

Far be it from me to try to indicate how many of the promoters and managers in that tremendous enterprise were good and how many were bad and how many were a little of each. But one thing is quite certain. That is that there were a very plenty who were dishonest or overreaching and that the public was mulcted many hundreds of millions of dollars by them and should be protected against any repetition of the experience.

No attempt can be made in a brief statement to classify the defects and to set out completely the faults of a system which made such events possible. They ran somewhat further than from alpha to omega—for the real artists in the business began to profit, in some instances even before the corporation which was to be the vehicle for the collection of the funds of the investing public was formed; and in other cases, even after bankruptcy and reorganization proceedings, some of them (and this includes not a few whose position has been very high in the financial world) added to the profit they had made by the original sale of their securities by the repurchase of them, at a fraction of cost and at less than asset value, from the original investor at his our of need. Reference to a few instances, however, ought to be made, for the purpose of shedding real light on the situation.

Some of the investment trusts and companies, brought into being by capable and conscientious men, operated at first largely or entirely with the funds and at the risk only of the promoters themselves, but others were started with the proverbial "shoe string" and were managed with risk only to the investors who had contributed savings; and there was only one certainly about these—that their promoters would assure a handsome profit to themselves at the very earliest moment.

It was quite natural that some investment bankers, securities distributors, brokers, and others linked with investment matters should drift into the business; but others soon perceived the possibilities of profit; and, according to the authority already referred to, "salesmen of securities and merchandise, market traders, commercial bankers, utility financiers, financial promoters, industrialists, professors, economists, lawyers, accountants, and persons engaged primarily in numerous other industries or professions sponsored investment companies and actively promoted public interest in these organizations by the use of general publicity, elaborate advertising, and a variety of other means."

Do you recall the case of the United Founders group of investment trusts? This was started in 1922 with a cash investment of only $500. Seven years later it had publicly contributed capital of more than $500,000,000, of which the investors subsequently lost $370,000,000 or more; but its promoters and managers did not permit the conditions which brought this about to interfere with their plans; and there is evidence that one of them alone amassed profits of over $30,000,000 while these things were going on. Do you remember the fiscal management group which devised a plan for obtaining control of various investment companies without the expenditure of any of their own funds—how they contracted to buy controlling blocks of stock, paying for them with funds borrowed upon the portfolio securities of the very investment companies to be acquired—and how they pursued this course of organizing by borrowing upon securities not then owned by them, assuming control, liquidating and transferring, taking in connection with these transactions substantial commissions and profits until the units which had been used in connection with the plan became the subject of bankruptcy and reorganization proceedings or were taken in charge by State authorities?

Have you forgotten the case of General Investment Corporation? The manipulations of the managers of this concern were indeed a work of art. The initial public distribution of stock was started just before the beginning of the depression, when stock selling was easy; and much of that stock was sold even before it was issued. To describe the intricacies of the building up of this stock-selling scheme would be a long, long story; but even in the comparatively early days of the process the sponsors were able to realize a profit of $4,000,000 on deliveries of stock, in addition to $500,000 as a commission for sales. Eventually the corporation raised an aggregate of approximately $78,634,000 by the issuance and resale of its securities; several years later when control was transfered to a new management, it had sustained a loss in operations of approximately $70,604,000, or nearly 90 percent of its paid-up capital.

The reference to commissions suggests the need of a word or two about the manner in which promoters pyramided their fees and other gains. One of the earlier companies, organized in 1924, took $25,000,000 from the public in return for 250,000 shares of first preferred stock and 250,000 shares of common stock. The sponsors contributed about one-fifth as much, or $5,100,000, receiving therefor 50,000 shares of second preferred stock, but three times as much (or 750,000) shares of common stock. The underwriting commissions amounted to $1,000,000, but whether this went to the promoters or to others I do not know. Whoever received it, the sponsors treated themselves very well. For those were the days of rising markets; and 4 years later the market value of the contribution of the sponsors, who still retained three-fourths of the company's voting power, showed a gain of 450 percent, while the public, who contributed 5 times as much capital, profited only about 28 percent.

Would that there were space and time to set out the details of various other beautiful instances of this class. In one particular, the case last cited is modest. For sponsors and promoters of this type were generally not content to take the voting control of a company for a relatively small figure and to wait for accretions in market value in order to realize their profits. Very generally they wanted and took them at once and in cash, if not from that contributed by the public then by more devious and ingenious means such as market manipulation.

Market manipulations. What a field that presents. For this process was not confined to shady promoters looking for an immediate and inordinate profit from their operations. There is most excellent evidence that it was widely engaged in by others, not of that type, and to an extent which will make very fine reading when the whole story is told.

One of the pleasant practices engaged in during those days—probably not generally, but sufficiently often to require notice in passing—was that of those organizations which not only managed their affairs, but made themselves, or their associates or affiliates, the bank of deposit of the funds of the public which they were handling. To cite one instance, disclosed by the investigations of the authority already referred to, let us look at the activities of Seaboard Utility Shares Corporation, sponsored in 1929 by C. P. Parker & Co., Inc., an investment-banking firm of Boston. By June 1934 this corporation had deposited with this sponsor the sum of $1,957,417, consisting of cash deposits in a checking account aggregating $622,491, and the balance in "certificates of deposits" issued by the sponsor and funds reserved for the payments for securities under order.

This firm was sponsor of two other investment companies; and, at the time, the "deposits" of all three companies totaled $3,139,608, of which nearly $2,000,000 was in cash deposits in checking accounts. Such practice is bad enough on general principles; but at that time the Banking Act of 1933, compelling the separation of private and commercial banking from investment banking was going into effect; so the instance serves, at once, as an example of the practice and as an illustration of the necessity of such a law. Needless to say, little of those "deposits" was salvaged for the stockholders of the investment companies.

Doubtless the respectable investment bankers—and that means a very, very large proportion—deplore these things as much as anyone else. Of course, they do. But the attitude and activities of a few of them seem to indicate that they would like to have them forgotten. With that I cannot agree at all. I believe they ought to be remembered.

The activities of the company last named and some of its affiliates present very fine specimens of two courses of conduct, quite commonly pursued by eager promoters with a specific end in view and not confined to those interested in investment companies. One was the possession of a "straw" directorate—so indispensable to promoters who want to do their own manipulating, without interference from any quarter. The Seaboard Utilities had 45 directors of whom 17 were employees or officers of the sponsor and 28 were dealers in and distributors of securities. One would think that such a showing would make any promoter confident that his plans would not go astray; but apparently it was not sufficient; for it appears that the company fell into the habit of giving belated notices of directors' meetings; and that at least one conscientious director voiced his objections because he was not able to attend to his duties; but the records do not show clearly whether the protests brought about any improvement or not.

The other is the habit, upon the part of dishonest management, of employing auditors who will do their bidding and engage in all sorts of improper practices from padding assets and concealing liabilities to submitting two reports—one for the use of the management and the other for the stockholders and the public. This did not originate with investment companies, but some of them were quite ready to follow it. In the case of one of the concerns just referred to, the examination of the accountant is illuminating. It runs as follows:

"Q. As a matter of fact, through the annual reports they—the stockholders—believed that $14,000,000 at cost of portfolio securities was held by the trust and that certain of these portfolio securities were pledged as collateral not only for loans, but also reserved for the purchase of other securities; isn't that so?

"A. That is right.

"Q. In other words, it was doubly misleading; isn't that so?

"A. It seems so from these reports."

My time is expiring; so I cannot go into the detail of various other matters which ought to be set out. They run from such practices as manipulation and the artificial creation and maintenance of markets for securities, and the unloading of securities of little or no value, by promoters or managers, upon their company—witness the case of Iroquois Share Corporation, whose sponsors sold to the company for $313,616 an unfinished and almost unrented office building, subsequently taken by the mortgagees so that the "investment" was a total loss—to various other dealings which transgress violently upon the principles of ethics and honesty which ought to regulate the conduct of those who stand in fiduciary relations. What a book could be written upon this score. But it will have to be reserved for some other occasion.

Judging only from the fact that the men in the investment business whom I happen to know are of the finest characters in the community, it is my belief that the members of the Investment Bankers Association of America—having I understand, a membership of about 740—are all, or nearly all, good, upright citizens. That being so, they would neither take part in nor condone practices such as I have attempted briefly and partially to describe. But I believe that those who now lead and conduct the affairs of the organization are strangely misguided and frightfully short-sighted.

As a matter of fact, if I remember correctly, members of this and other banking organizations were among the first who perceived the perils of the mad development of investment trusts and companies and, as long as 12 years ago, and even longer, pointed out the need of regulatory legislation. Observation, however, leads to the conclusion that present-day leaders have slipped far away from the attitude of those of former times.

My observation, be it remembered, is that of one who looks on from the side lines; but it tells me, whether rightly or wrongly, that the agitation now fathered by the Investment Bankers Association and about to be referred to more particularly is not more than 7 or 8 months old—and that it became articulate about the time that people began to realize that November 1940 was to bring the election of a President and a Congress. If I recall correctly, there were a few mutterings late in 1939, but the movement did not start in earnest until early 1940.

It centered about the Securities and Exchange Commission and the laws which brought that body into existence and those enacted for the purpose of regulating the issue and disposition of securities and allied matters—including the Securities Act of 1933, the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, the Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1935, the Trust Indenture Act of 1939, and the bill for the regulation of investment trusts and investment companies, now before Congress for consideration.

In January and February of 1940 the mutterings of late 1939 became steadily more frequent, more voluble, and more bitter; and on March 18 or 19, Mr. E. F. Connely, president of the Investment Bankers' Association made his open declaration of war. To an outsider it would, considering the occasion which gave it rise, seem like a somewhat remarkable and peculiar move. Considerable controversy had arisen relative to the operation of the so-called arms-length bargaining rule relative to the sale of securities; and the Commission or its agent invited suggestions from the association and others interested as to how it might best be applied. Mr. Connely's reply apparently was a virtual demand upon the Commission that it "immediately recommend to Congress that the laws administered by the Commission be reviewed and amended." Shortly thereafter he is quoted as saying: "We gave them (the Securities and Exchange Commission) an opportunity to work with us, which they declined."

A trifle arrogant? Well, if a court before which I were practicing should suggest a conference relative to a pending matter and I should refuse it and petition the legislature to abolish the court, it would be so.

Since that time, it appears, Mr. Connely and his associates have been touring widely and talking loudly, in what has been termed a drive for amendments to the securities laws. Possibly so; but, judging from some of the activities I have noticed and the things I have heard said, it would appear that it has developed into a drive of a strictly political nature.

The character of the movement and its objects are made evident from many occurrences. One somewhat amusing incident happened only 2 weeks ago, when E. L. Shea, who strangely enough, is also interested in securities, being president of the North American Co., suggested to the Securities and Exchange Commission that it revise its procedure; in effect, he stated the belief that the Commission ought not to make private investigation of questionable practices coming to its notice, but should conduct public hearings thereon. This suggestion is quite as intelligent as would be the enactment of a law forbidding district attorneys to send out investigators and to question prospective witnesses, but obliging them to bring suspected wrongdoers into court at once for public examination. It is useful, however, as showing the trend of mind and intention of some of those who, forgetful of the past, would like to make radical changes in existing securities laws; far be it from me to say that they would like to wipe those laws off

the books. But there is plenty of evidence that some would be pleased to extract their teeth, remove the heart, and take out the bowels.

One immediate objective of this war party seems to be an assault upon the Securities and Exchange Commission. Here is an administrative body, created so few years ago that much of its effort must necessarily still be of a pioneering character. It is clothed with authority to interpret and administer a very substantial mass of law, generally yet to be passed upon by any court. The magnitude and importance of its task ought to be apparent to any person. The scope of its work is as great as that of any other governmental agency and its importance might perhaps exceed that of any other if it were not for current international conditions and matters of defense. The investigations it has conducted and the disclosures it has made have added the most important volumes ever written to American financial history. Its readiness to seek the views and to confer with those interested surpasses, in this observer's experience, that of any other administrative board, state or national, although its spirit of cooperation has not permitted it to adopt their views, if they proved contrary to public interest, which, unfortunately, is the only kind of cooperation that some people care about. It does seem as if, with every increase in that body's efficiency and accomplishment, the spleen and venom of those attacking it rises more than proportionately.

My interest in these matters is a long-time one. It started when more than 30 years ago several investment companies came into New England. They were simple and crude as compared with the companies of more recent years, some of which have been referred to; but they were about as unsound and had somewhat similar methods of high-pressure salesmanship, and by the time they had operated for a year or two, they had taken some hundreds of thousands of dollars from unsuspecting New Englanders. It became my duty, with others, to try and save 15 or 20 cents of the dollar of investors' money when the crash came. That experience and others since that time enabled me to see and learn things which I have never forgotten; and which have prevented me from losing interest in the matter of securities, good or bad; that interest and the consequent desire for bona fide protective laws and faithful administration of them have never been influenced by any political consideration.

There is not time for me to discuss Frothingham's all-embracing charges, one by one, much as I should like to; but this I cannot pass: He says that the "New Deal has arrayed class against class." Many people maintain that in a democracy there are no classes; and I wouldn't be so unkind as to ask the speaker to define his classes and to state who compose them. If there is any arraying of class against class today it would seem to me as if the militant investment bankers are the ones who are trying to do it. More than 4 months ago the president of the association announced that a decision had been reached "to inaugurate a Nation-wide program of public information"; it was further designated as a program "to curb the rapidly expanding power of the S. E. C." They are traveling around the country making speeches; and I am waiting to read or hear one which is more specific, more reasonable and reasoning, and more unlike a mere partisan and political appeal to defeat the present administration than is Frothingham's.

They seem likely to array class against class. In one class will be such investment bankers as they are able to convince that they are acting wisely and that their course is justified, together with the friends they may enlist under that banner. The other class will be composed of several groups; one will consist of a few million persons who have beautifully engraved stock certificates at home, with little value except as old paper, and who realize that their loss would have been avoided if at the time of purchase there had been a Securities and Exchange Commission and the laws which it administers; another group will consist of another few million persons who are fortunate enough to have, at home or in their safe-deposit box, certificates which have real value, and who appreciate, as the country's most conservative financial paper pointed out not long ago, that thanks to the Securities and Exchange Commission and its activities they now really know something about their stocks or bonds and the corporations which issued them—which they never did in the old days; a third group will be made up of even more millions, some having, some not having, certificates at home, but all knowing, as consumers, that everyone who eats bread and wears clothes and rides in trains and automobiles is now interested in the matter of securities, because corporate development embraces the production and distribution of necessities of life and their prices depend among other things on matters of corporate capitalization; hence knowing also that a useful and capable Securities and Exchange Commission, which is required to govern such things, should continue, with effective laws for it to enforce.

These groups and others which may be added realize that it required a wait of more than 30 years and the coming of a New Deal to bring about the enactment of really protective securities laws and the creation of an efficient tribunal to administer them. They are intelligent enough to know that those laws may need some correction and amendment, for they are still comparatively new statutes. But they are also wise enough to know that the task should be assigned to real friends—not turned over to a wrecking crew.

EDWARD E. CLARK.

BOSTON, MASS., *August 5, 1940.*

Conscription

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. USHER L. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 19, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE DETROIT FREE PRESS

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Detroit Free Press:

CONSCRIPTION

The Free Press is in favor of universal military service through selective draft if, as, and when such conscription is deemed necessary to the proper defense of this Nation.

We feel, however, that it should only be enacted when the issues are so clearly presented that there is no question in the public mind as to its advisability. The people should not be stampeded into such a program by hysterical oratory or political claptrap.

If there is any real danger they are entitled to know about it.

They should be told whom they are to fight, for what purpose they are to fight, and where.

They should know the consequences of such action.

They should know that once in the Army, they waive their right to reason and must obey orders.

If we are to declare war against Germany, it should be fully explained to them why that declaration is made.

We declared war against Germany in 1917 because of deliberately overt acts of that nation against this Nation, a series of violations of our neutrality climaxed by the sinking of the *Lusitania*.

To date the Nazi Government has carefully avoided making any of those Hohenzollern mistakes, as far as the United States is concerned, with the obvious studied purpose to keep us out of it.

If it persists in this technique we have but one means of getting into the European struggle: That is by what military authorities call a "preventive war."

Such wars are fought, not because there is any immediate cause for a break between nations, but because one feels that the policies of another are of such a nature that they are fundamentally hostile to its long-range interests. Such a war is fought to stamp out a danger before it is allowed to grow. Thus the Crimean War was a preventive war on the part of Great Britain. When Russia sought to reach the Straits of the Dardanelles, Great Britain felt that her life line to the East was threatened and so went to war.

In our own case, any war that we might declare in the upholding of the Monroe Doctrine against any foreign country would be a preventive war—a protection against a potential threat.

In this connection, Walter Lippmann, who was very close to Woodrow Wilson, gives a piece of unwritten history in a recent article. He declares that President Wilson reached his determination to declare war against the Kaiser in the belief that the United States could not afford to see Great Britain defeated.

If that was his purpose, as Mr. Lippmann contends, he did not use it as a pretext. He bided his time until, by Germany's overt acts, he had some degree of solidarity of public opinion behind him. Then he used the aggressions as the logical reasons for asking Congress to make a declaration.

The real issue—always avoided—then is: Shall we declare war against Germany for the purpose of helping England as a protective measure for ourselves—in the sincere belief that we as a nation cannot live in the same world with a triumphant Nazi Government?

That is the only question. It is never brought clearly into focus. The talk of measures "short of war" is merely subterfuge. It is an inching process to prepare the public mind for what some sincere and patriotic citizens believe is the inevitable course.

The people, however, must understand that once we have been launched on this program of preventive war, there is no turning back to the doctrine of George Washington of keeping out of European entanglements.

We must take our place as a world power, take a vital part in the affairs of Europe, act as a police force, if needs be, to maintain Great Britain whenever she is threatened. This we did in the last war and this we are asked to do again.

We will be definitely committed to the business of power politics.

That may be a destiny we cannot escape as the greatest creditor Nation the world has ever known.

It may be that we will still be able to keep aloof and look after our own peculiar interests.

Time alone can determine such a tremendous question.

Meanwhile we should not be led blindly through deliberately excited emotions to take a step that will forever change the course of our lives and our children's lives.

We have a right to know where we are being led before we start.

Conscription for national defense; yes.

Conscription for nebulous, half-articulated programs with no clarity of purpose and no coherent outline of principle; no.

The people have a right to know first in which direction this Nation is headed.

The Clergy and the Draft

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEPHEN BOLLES
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 19, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE MILWAUKEE HERALD-CITIZEN

Mr. BOLLES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein an editorial from the Herald-Citizen, Milwaukee, Wis., a Catholic paper of the archdiocese of Milwaukee, as follows:

No American citizen should fail properly to evaluate some of the proposals for national defense that certain well-meaning individuals are sponsoring. Such, for instance, is the Burke-Wadsworth conscription bill as now drawn, which, to a certain degree, undermines one of the pillars of our democratic form of government—freedom of religion.

The enactment of such a law would deprive citizens of the United States of a right guaranteed them by the Constitution. The Constitution in guaranteeing this right, likewise necessarily guaranteed the means necessary effectively to exercise this right, namely, that there be available at all times ministers of religion to care for their spiritual needs. Depriving persons of the means necessary to exercise a right that is theirs is equivalent to depriving them of that right, since a right without the means to exercise it is valueless.

In 1917 the Congress of the United States recognized this right and exempted all ministers of religion and divinity students from military service. The present proposed law is a leaf out of the book of the dictators and is alien to the spirit of a democratic nation. No one denies the necessity of training men for the defense of the Nation, but it is likewise necessary to train students for the ministry and the priesthood in order that the citizens of the Nation may have ministers of religion available to care for their spiritual needs, which right the Constitution guarantees them. The citizens in the land and naval forces of the United States, like all others, need the spiritual care that ministers of religion alone can give them. At no time in the history of the Nation have the various religious denominations failed to provide chaplains for the men in the service of the Nation. Seeing that the Constitution of the United States is nowise changed in this respect, the right that was recognized in 1917 should be recognized in 1940.

The Selective Draft Act of 1917 also exempted all brothers who had taken solemn vows to dedicate their lives to the service of God. This, too, was in perfect accord with the spirit and intention of the founders of the Nation, as manifested in the Declaration of Independence. These brave, noble men, whose thoughts scanned the whole fabric of God's creation in the world in which we dwell, studied the laws of nature, and of nature's God; appealed to the Supreme Judge of the world to bear witness to the rectitude of their intentions, and proclaimed their firm reliance on the protection of Divine Providence.

To enact now a law contrary to the principles enunciated in the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution would be to go backward; would be a return to the tyranny of a government that refused to recognize that "all men are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights," which the founders of the Nation declared "to be self-evident"; would be to jettison all for which these patriots lived, labored, and sacrified.

In order to preserve for himself and posterity the free exercise of the inalienable rights the patriots who established the Nation secured for him, every religious American should request his Senators and his Congressmen jealously to safeguard the rights of his constituents by seeing that exemption is granted to all ministers of religion, to all students for the ministry and the priesthood, and likewise to those others, who by solemn vows have dedicated their lives to the service of that God, to whom, as the Supreme Judge of the world, the illustrious Father of the Nation appealed to bear witness to the "rectitude of their intention," and "on the protection of" whose Providence they proclaimed their "reliance." That posterity might never forget all this they caused to be impressed on the currency of the land "In God we trust."

By doing this you will stop this first subtle attack on religious freedom, the cornerstone of democracy, and without which no democratic nation can endure. Let your Representatives know that on this point you stand with Washington and the other patriots of '76, and not with some of the modern sages, who seem to think that the Nation no longer has any need of the protection of Divine Providence, on which the founders of the Nation relied.

Conscription

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 19, 1940

RESOLUTIONS OF SECOND OREGON REUNION ASSOCIATION

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include some resolutions adopted by the Second Oregon Reunion Association, Sunday, August 11, 1940. The resolutions follow:

RESOLUTION NO. 1

Whereas laws which will provide for the conscription of all wealth, labor, and property with proper compensation, as well as the young manpower of the Nation, for the service of the Government of the United States of America in time of war would be eminently just and fair and would result in causing all our citizens serving our country in time of war on a basis of fairness and equality, would prevent profiteering, and would make it impossible for a part of our people to remain at home in safety while the young men of the Nation are compelled to undergo the dangers of battle, the hardships of the march and the trenches for the small pay of the soldier; and

Whereas these proposed laws have been endorsed by the Second Oregon Volunteer Infantry Reunion Association at their annual reunions continuously since 1925; and

Whereas such laws would strengthen the hands of the Government and enable it to prosecute the war with a greatly increased measure of efficiency and would place behind the Government the unanimous moral force of a nation determined to make right prevail by force of arms; and

Whereas laws are now before Congress and will probably be passed providing for a limited conscription of young men for the Army with a degree of selective service; and

Whereas these laws seem necessary for the present emergency and we urge the adoption of some form of selective conscription now and without delay, yet we realize that such laws are only temporary measures and do not reach the heart of the need for universal conscription in time of war: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Second Oregon Volunteer Infantry Reunion Association this 11th day of August 1940 strongly reaffirm our endorsement of the true spirit of these resolutions and urge upon our National Congress and the President of the United States to enact and approve a fair and equitable universal conscription law to go into effect upon the declaration of war which will draft all manpower, wealth, and labor without any reservations whatsoever as to race, color, occupation, wealth, or social position; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent to each of the Oregon Senators and Representatives in Congress, to the President of the United States, and to each of our prominent local newspapers for publication.

Col. PERCY WILLIS, *President*.
RICHARD DEICH, *Secretary*.

AUGUST 11, 1940.

RESOLUTION NO. II

Whereas a state of great unrest exists throughout the world; and

Whereas certain totalitarian states have repeatedly violated treaty obligations; and

Whereas the leaders of some of these states have, by their actions, proved that their solemn promises are of no value whatsoever and no longer to be trusted; and

Whereas the democratic countries of the world have proved that they are the only countries where truth and honor are observed among nations; and

Whereas the United States of America and the British Commonwealth of nations are the only nations on earth where freedom of speech, the rights of conscience, and liberty of the press remain to the people, and,

Whereas the British Commonwealth is now engaged in a death struggle for freedom; and

Whereas if the British should lose the contest, the United States of America would remain the only champion of liberty on earth: Therefore be it

Resolved by the veterans of the Second Oregon Volunteer Infantry of the Spanish War and Philippine Insurrection, at their annual reunion in Laurelhurst Park, Portland, Oreg., August 11, 1940, That it is our firm conviction that it is the solemn duty of the Congress of the United States to enact the necessary laws and for the Executive authority to see that they are carried out, that will bring to the people of the United States of America armed security on land and sea, in the air and under the sea. To that end, we demand a two-ocean navy with fleets in the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans, capable of engaging successfully at the same time the fleets of any other nation with which they might have to engage in combat. We demand the largest and best air force in the world, and we demand a thoroughly trained and disciplined army, fully equipped with the latest and best cannons, rifles, tanks, mechanized transportation and sufficiently large to defend the Western Hemisphere and preserve the Monroe Doctrine.

We commend the present Congress and Executive for what they have done to prepare our Nation for defense and demand that the measures already initiated be prosecuted with the utmost vigor, so that we may become adequately prepared at the earliest practicable date.

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be sent to each of our Senators and Representatives in Congress, to the President of the United States, to the Secretaries of War and Navy, and to our local newspapers for publication.

August 11, 1940.

Col. PERCY WILLIS, *President.*
RICHARD DEICH, *Secretary.*

RESOLUTION NO. III

Whereas the Congress of the United States, recognizing the justice of the claim of the Spanish American War Veterans of 1898, who served for many months after their own term of enlistment had expired in the Philippine Islands, for travel pay and subsistence promised them at the time for their said services; and

Whereas the rights of these veterans are set forth in the act of May 2, 1940, known as Public No. 505, Seventy-sixth Congress, in which said act it is provided among other things that the General Accounting Office shall verify said claims for travel pay and certify same to Congress for payment; and

Whereas the veterans entitled to this travel pay are rapidly passing away, and it is imperative that said claims should be paid as soon as practicably possible so that as many of those still living might enjoy these benefits in this world: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Second Oregon Volunteers, in reunion assembled, in Laurelhurst Park, Portland Oreg., this 11th day of August, 1940, forty-one years after said claims were due and payable, request our representatives in Congress to expedite in every possible way the payment of these claims by providing funds or seeing that funds are provided for the payment of these claims as rapidly as they have been proven and certified for payment; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be forwarded immediately to our Senators and Representatives in Congress.

Col. PERCY WILLIS, *President.*

AUGUST 11, 1940.

Wanted: Businessmen in a Pinch

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL M. LECOMPTE
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 19, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE CRESTON (IOWA) NEWS-ADVERTISER

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Creston (Iowa) News-Advertiser of August 6, 1940:

[From the Creston (Iowa) News-Advertiser of August 6, 1940]

WANTED: BUSINESSMEN IN A PINCH

Merle Thorp, in Nation's Business, calls attention to the need—fully recognized by the administration—for businessmen when a real job and a real danger confronts the Nation, and he is right. It became necessary to call business out of the dog house when the pinch arrived.

For 8 years our business system and businessmen have been under attack. Bankers were "money changers"; commercial aviation was charged as "unfit to carry the mails"; makers of electricity, a "Power Trust bleeding the people white"; manufacturers, "chiselers and exploiters of labor"; coal and oil, "antisocial"; steel and chemicals, "fomenters of war"; retailers, "gougers"; telephones and insurance, "too big for public safety."

Every hour brought its "emergency." Perpetual motion through muckraking has been the rule.

The era has been one of iconoclasm. Age-old traditions, honored customs, cherished idols, have been smashed with the ruthlessness and hilarity of a frenzied Roman holiday.

Came then, first, the morning after, the feeling of futility coupled with shame. The promises of politics were unfulfilled. The crusade against "selfishness" and "power" simply transferred those vices to the crusaders. Politics was unable to provide jobs except to politicians and their relatives. The abundant life was nowhere in evidence except in the District of Columbia, city halls, and the far-flung Federal agencies. Shame-faced, people were about ready to admit that business processes had been unduly and spitefully penalized.

Came then fear of a foreign invader. The clear mandate of the people was to provide defense, and business leaders were whistled from the dog house and put in charge.

What irony! If fear of physical violence, of parachutes over Omaha, brought confession that only business management can provide production and jobs, why, then, why the other course in fighting the war against depression? If to regain the business activity for which we all prayed, theorists and social engineers were called to the colors, why, in the hours of physical fear, replace these "depression war" leaders of 1933–40 with the discredited captains of industry?

The spirit of iconoclasm marches on. It now directs a war ax at political traditions. Old formulas are swept aside, and at a national convention the people's demand for a doer and practical planner prevailed. Business baiters have turned to baiting politicians. The people chose a man who, almost alone for 7 years, has, in and out of season, fought politics invading the business field. With some sixth sense they realize that the Blums and Ramsay MacDonalds, who promised security and the abundant life by less work and more doles, only brought a terrible insecurity and prospect of miserable slavery. They realize that every country which has fallen in Europe has enjoyed a "liberal" government.

Business management is in better repute today than it has been in a decade. This spirit is reflected in the popular parody:

"Heigh ho, heigh ho,
It's off to work we go."

A policy of plenty will supplant the theory of Wallace scarcity. This spirit will recognize that textbooks on arithmetic contain methods of addition and multiplication as well as subtraction and division. It will abandon revolutionary reform "to make America over" and adopt recovery with its proved social progress. It will raise again the American banner with its insignia "Work." It will remove the obstacles which are preventing workman and manager from joining hands, and in the good old-fashioned way, lick the production record of yesterday.

It is late, but not too late, to give business a chance to do its old time stuff for the American people, and the Nation has its opportunity. Willkie can put it over.

Senator George Norris Is Worried

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EARL C. MICHENER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 19, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE JACKSON (MICH.) CITIZEN-PATRIOT

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, we all realize that Senator GEORGE W. NORRIS is one of the best-known United States Senators in the country. He has had long service in the House and in the Senate. He is and always has been an optimist, and when Senator NORRIS reaches that stage when worry overtakes him concerning anything that President Roosevelt does, then it is time for the country to stop, look, and listen.

Pursuant to the privilege given me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herein an editorial from the Jackson Citizen-Patriot, of Jackson, Mich., which has the largest daily circulation of any newspaper published in the congressional district which I have the honor to represent, in addition to being one of the outstanding smaller town dailies in the country. The editorial is as follows:

GEORGE NORRIS IS WORRIED

When GEORGE NORRIS begins to see possibilities of a dictatorship in the Roosevelt administration, even the most ardent supporter of the New Deal has cause to take stock and hesitate.

During the course of a speech Monday in which he declared emphatic opposition to peacetime conscription, the veteran Nebraska Senator warned that, "We will have here in United States what we are complaining about in other nations, a dictatorship. I can see no escape."

Coming from NORRIS such a statement has profound significance. He is a close personal friend of President Roosevelt. Throughout the two terms of the present administration he has supported the New Deal on every major issue. More than once he has taken the lead in Roosevelt policies.

But now, "his voice shaking with emotion" (quoting a news-service report), NORRIS visualizes the identical menace which critics of the Roosevelt administration warned against in the Supreme Court controversy. It is the same danger which many Democrats as well as Republicans see in Mr. Roosevelt's effort to obtain reelection for a third term.

GEORGE NORRIS knows the President. He admires him. He most frequently enjoys his confidence and fights on his side. He knows the character of Mr. Roosevelt and whether he is dominated by the type of ambition which is the stuff of dictators. If NORRIS perceives the danger of dictatorship in any circumstance under Mr. Roosevelt, the argument against a third term is definitely reinforced.

1936 All Over Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY B. STEAGALL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 19, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE MONTGOMERY (ALA.) ADVERTISER

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Montgomery Advertiser:

[From the Montgomery (Ala.) Advertiser of August 18, 1940]

NINETEEN THIRTY-SIX ALL OVER AGAIN

There is one great issue in the coming Presidential campaign, according to Wendell Willkie, the Republican nominee. It is whether the New Deal can be dealt more economically by the Democratic Party or by the Republican Party. As nominee of the Republican Party, Mr. Willkie is convinced that he and his party can deal it best.

"The New Deal stands for doing what has to be done by spending as much money as possible. I propose to do it by spending as little money as possible. This is one great issue in domestic policy and I propose in this campaign to make it clear," said Mr. Willkie.

So much for the issue upon which Mr. Willkie desires to base the coming campaign. The subject of economical operation of government is one of interminable and often fruitless argument not only between the two great political parties of this Nation but even within them. If Mr. Willkie intends to argue about those details of government before the people of the United States for the next 2½ months, he will only succeed in boring them. The first assumption made about the nominee of either of our two major parties is that they are capable and efficient men. That should be the first assumption made by the electorate concerning any candidate for any office who is ultimately granted the privilege of serving. The United States approves President Roosevelt's administration insofar as the details of that administration are concerned. No valid criticism has ever been made of that management of fiscal affairs. However, upon the matter of policy much criticism has been offered, some valid, some not. If Mr. Willkie has no criticism of that policy but only of the administration of it, then he hasn't raised any issue at all.

As for the rest of Mr. Willkie's speech, it was as depressing a disappointment as his attempt to create an issue that could not be brought to life by the best of miracle workers. The speech fell easily into three general classifications.

1. Political fluff that can be found in any mayor's address to an American Legion convention, any struggling lawyer's address to a southern audience at the cemetery on Memorial Day. Considered alone, this political fluff is worthless, but if it is implemented by a significant offering it is the most valuable aspect of democratic action.

2. Demagogic contradiction of which the Advertiser, as well as many another institution, we suspect, did not believe Mr. Willkie capable until yesterday.

3. The definition of issues, which has already been discussed.

Mr. Wilkie is undoubtedly a sincere patriot. He is as convinced of the rightness of the democratic way of life as any other citizen of this democracy from Franklin Roosevelt on down to the lowest devotee of faith. But in that he differs not one whit from the whole range of adherents of the democratic faith.

Though Mr. Willkie denied that he would allow personalities to enter into his campaign, he made this pointed charge against President Roosevelt: "There have been occasions when many of us have wondered if he is deliberately inciting us to war. * * * And I believe it to be the first duty of a President to try to maintain peace. But Mr. Roosevelt has not done this. He has dabbled in inflammatory statements and manufactured panics. Of course, we in America like to speak our minds freely, but this does not mean that at a critical period in history our President should cause bitterness and confusion for the sake of a little political oratory."

With that charge firmly in mind, it is illuminating to review again these other statements by Mr. Willkie.

"We must admit that the loss of the British Fleet would greatly weaken our defense."

"We must face a brutal, perhaps, a terrible fact. Our way of life is in competition with Hitler's way of life."

"I promise, by returning to those same American principles that overcame German autocracy once before, both in business and in war, to outdistance Hitler in any contest he chooses in 1940 or after. And I promise that when we beat him we shall beat him on our own terms, in our own American way."

Thus Mr. Willkie places himself in the strangely contradictory position of indicting President Roosevelt for making inflammatory statements (about which Mr. Willkie is politically vague as to date and time of utterance) and then he tries to go President Roosevelt one better in acknowledging the danger which faces the United States, in excoriating the author of that danger, Adolf Hitler as leader of the German people. Mr. Willkie even promises to "beat" Germany in 1940 if given a chance, but condemns President Roosevelt for creating a "manufactured panic" about the dangers facing the Nation. By implication, Mr. Willkie charges that President Roosevelt would lead us into war for his own political designs, but Mr. Willkie would "beat" Hitler on our "own terms" in 1940 if the electorate of the United States will only discard their present warmongering President and elect Mr. Willkie.

Mr. Willkie was the Advertiser's candidate for the Republican nomination. In assuming that position, the Advertiser was not acting in a shrewdly partisan manner. Frankly the Advertiser was disappointed yesterday when it discovered that it had picked a dud. But this much must be said in apology for the error. Mr. Willkie was a dud among duds. Every other candidate for the Republican nomination had hung himself upon the public tree of intellectual incompetence. Mr. Willkie presented nothing but hope. He has made a fine record both as a lawyer (for corporations) and a corporation manager. He is still a good and sincere man. As much could be said for his disappointed rival, Senator ROBERT TAFT. But he is an inadequate political philosopher. He only claims, rather brashly, that he can do what President Roosevelt is doing better than President Roosevelt is doing it.

It looked for a time as if the outcome of the Presidential election would be decided principally upon the development of the situation in Europe. Now that Mr. Willkie's keynote address has been delivered, it is apparent that it will be decided on the same issues which were presented to the electorate in 1936. Perhaps this time Maine and Vermont will see the light, too.

As One Democrat to Another

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 19, 1940

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, many will recall that eminent Democrat, John O'Connor, of New York, who, until "purged" at the last election by President Roosevelt and his Communist allies, was chairman of the Rules Committee of the House of Representatives and one of the outstanding Democratic Members of that body.

Because Congressman O'Connor of New York had opinions of his own and refused to be a messenger boy for the President, the President enlisted the aid of the Communists in O'Connor's district in New York and so caused his defeat.

O'Connor is again a candidate, and the issue in his district seems to be squarely drawn as to whether that district prefers a Democrat who believes in constitutional government or whether its voters will once more do the will of the President and of the Communists of New York.

You may recall that Senator CARTER GLASS of Virginia, another lifelong Democrat, once said that the New Deal was not only a mistake but that it was a disgrace to the Nation, and that the time would come when we would be ashamed of

having wandered so far from the dictates of common sense and common honesty.

Mr. O'Connor, in a recent letter to the Governor of Indiana, expresses a similar thought. I here quote his letter:

AUGUST 15, 1940.

Hon. M. CLIFFORD TOWNSEND,
Executive Department, Indianapolis, Ind.

MY DEAR GOVERNOR: Permit me to thank you for your courteous letter in which you extoll "our beloved President Roosevelt" and state "we do not feel it wise to change farm hands during the harvest." I note that you also refer to the President as "a symbol of democracy."

Few persons who have been close to the President during the past 12 years, at least, will subscribe to the descriptive word "beloved." They feel that he, like Ceasar, broke with his best friends as a matter of principle. The roll is long, headed by Farley and including Al Smith, Garner, Moley, Tugwell, Woodring, General Johnson, Louis Johnson, Douglas, Hanes, Reed, Ely, Senator Johnson of California, all the "purgees," and countless others, not forgetting the long list of distinguished Democrats he promised to make Vice President, viz, Bankhead, Rayburn, Jones, Stark, Lee, Byrnes, Lucas, your own McNutt, etc. His Cabinet does not contain a real Democrat except Hull, who, like Farley, has been treated shamefully.

As to changing farm hands during a harvest, I'll wager your farmers never hesitated to do so if the crop was in danger. Millions of Americans, even if you count the Democrats alone, feel our crop, our country, is in danger if we use the same hands for another 4 years. Our fundamental institutions of government, already undermined, will be lost, never to return. We shall be plunged into a foreign war surely after the election, if not before, which is my guess. Actual acknowledged dictatorship will be with us. We have it now, but it is camouflaged.

I agree with the statement of President Roosevelt as uttered to the Young Democrats on April 21, 1940:

"Whatever may be the platform, whoever may be the nominee of the Democratic Party * * * the basic issue will be the retention of popular government."

Such a "retention" is impossible if the tradition against a third term is successfully violated and we have 4 more years of a political philosophy evidenced by such acts as the recognition of Russia, packing the Supreme Court, the dictatorial reorganization bill of 1938, the "purge," etc.

Note that in his message to Congress on March 4, 1939, President Roosevelt said:

"The safety of the system of representative democracy is, in the last analysis, based on two essentials: First, that at frequent periods the voters must choose a new Congress and a new President; and second, that this choice must be made freely; that is to say, without any undue force against or influence over the voter in the exercise of his personal and sincere opinion."

Shades of Chicago, the W. P. A., etc.

You have hit the nail on the head, however, in your reference to the President being "a symbol of democracy." But it is the "democracy" of Stalin. The word, like "liberalism," has been brought into common and incorrect usage by the President and the "pinks" who surround him. The Communists here and abroad support that kind of democracy. Our forefathers abhorred it.

The United States never was a democracy in the sense in which that word is used today.

Madison wrote, "a democracy is one where the citizens administer the government in person. A republic is a form of government in which the scheme of representation takes place."

There is no mention of democracy in the Constitution of the United States nor in the constitution of Indiana. The debates prove it was deliberately eliminated from the former.

Our Constitution, article IV, section 4, states:

"The United States shall guarantee to every State in this Union a republican form of government."

Again, Madison wrote in volume XIV of the Federalist of the danger of confusing the words "republic" and "democracy."

Our official United States Army Manual refers to democracy as "the rule of the mob."

The Democratic Party, to which I have always belonged, has repeatedly supported our republican form of government.

Mr. Chief Justice Fuller in *Duncan* v. *McCall* (139 U. S. 449):

"By the Constitution, a republican form of government is guaranteed to every State in the Union, and the distinguishing feature of that form is the right of the people to choose their own officers for governmenal administration, and pass their own laws in virtue of the legislative power reposed in representative bodies, whose legitimate act may be said to be those of the people themselves; but while the people are thus the source of political power, their governments, National and State, have been limited by written constitutions, and they have themselves thereby set bounds to their own power, as against the sudden impulses of mere majorities."

This must refer even to a majority of 62 percent, as in 1936, which, under the Constitution, was no mandate for the purge. There is no legislature in "democratic" Russia, which has any representative power. If the democracy prated about here, means the same as the democracy of Stalin, our legislative branch will soon be prorogued. There are signs already in the direction that the Executive may adjourn them (the Congress) to such time as he shall think proper, as he has the power to do, in certain circumstances, under article II, section 2, of the Constitution. He would have liked to have done it this summer, when he said there was no need for Congress to stay in session, except to make speeches.

You will surely recall that Plato said:

"The people have always some champion whom they set over them and nurse into greatness. This and no other is the root from which a tyrant springs; when he first appears, he is a protector."

Page Hitler and other "protectors" turned dictators!

The American people have always agreed with the statement of President Roosevelt as to "frequent" elections.

Andrew Jackson could not subscribe to the "indispensability" of any one man—an idea sincerely entertained by President Roosevelt as applied to himself. Jackson said that the duties of public officers "are so plain and simple that men of intelligence may readily qualify themselves for their performance" and that "more is lost by the long continuance of man in office than is generally to be gained by their experience."

For the first time, in 1940, our party platform uses the word "democracy." In our platform of 1936, the reference was to "a representative government."

How did all this change, or confusion of words, come about? Is it because we have officially recognized and dealt with "democratic" Russia? Is it because we have imported from the ex-Communist and now "democratic" Russia, many of its ideologies?

Witness the constant repetition by the President and his entourage that the present European war is one to preserve "democracy."

If "democracy" really means our form of government, when were those European nations—yes, including France—ever "democracies"? Has the British Empire ever been a "democracy"? Is it now really fighting to preserve "democracy," as we are repeatedly told, or rather is it solely concerned with preserving the British Empire intact so it may continue its "democracy" in India, etc., for instance?

Let's get back to the lexicon of our fathers. They builded well because they were not demagogues. They would never have openly accepted the support of the Communists in the elections.

The Democratic Party should continue to stand for the "republican form of government," guaranteed to us and enjoyed by us for 150 years before the New Deal, which, to a great extent, represents the "democracy" of Stalin.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN O'CONNOR.

Because your letter to me was given to the press, I shall feel free to release this reply.

J. O'C.

Notification Address of Hon. Joseph W. Martin, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARL C. MICHENER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 19, 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the privilege heretofore granted, I include in this extension of remarks the splendid notification address delivered by our minority leader, the Honorable JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., at Elwood, Ind., August 17, 1940:

Mr. Willkie, we are here to carry out an old American custom—to notify you officially that you were chosen by the Republican Party in its national convention at Philadelphia on June 28 as its candidate for the Presidency of the United States. I hope it will not come as too great a surprise.

This custom originated in the time when men had to travel long distances on horseback actually to carry the first tidings of a nomination to the candidate. It may seem to some in these headlong days that a custom of this kind is outmoded, but others believe it is well for the Nation to continue to cling to some of its traditions.

As chairman of the committee of notification, it is my honor and pleasure to bring you the enthusiastic greetings of the great Republican Party.

Your nomination at Philadelphia did not come from any scheming clique of political bosses. It did not come from any group of conspirators anxious to retain their control of the Government for selfish purposes. Your nomination was the result of a Nation-wide demand of a great people anxious about their own future and that of their Government.

They had seen this country drifting toward bankruptcy, inflation, and perhaps war. They had seen experiment after experiment fail. All called for huge appropriations, but none brought the security or the happiness which were promised.

Ten million men and women begged for a chance to earn their livelihood in the American way. Millions of young men and young women pleaded for a chance for a regular job; for the opportunities which their fathers and their mothers had been blessed with. Year after year passed without those opportunities being presented. Little hope for the future was held forth; indeed, those who presumed to speak for the administration frankly stated that unemployment and distress had come to stay.

This philosophy of despair and defeat was not welcomed by the American people. It was not the spirit of the real American tamely to accept defeat. The people turned to seek a new leader; one with capacity to do big things; one who knew the many interests involved and the different problems confronting the Nation at home and abroad; one who could rise above narrow partisanship and petty prejudices; one who could put the welfare of this country first.

They saw in you such a man. Born in humble circumstances, you have risen through your own efforts to a commanding position because of your ability to do things well; you have proved yourself an able man, a sincere man; one who is broad and liberal enough to give every man and every woman sheltered under the American flag equal justice and equal opportunity.

Thus you have been selected to save America and lead our country back along the road to recovery and better days. Out of the hearts of these patriotic Americans came the chant, "We want Willkie." Louder and louder came the call. An unbossed convention listened. A deliberative group of delegates acted. You became the nominee of a convention which selected you in the traditional American way.

No one can say you do not represent a free choice by the people.

This campaign of 1940 is vastly more significant and important than an ordinary election contest between two political parties. It is a contest between the forces of constitutional government and liberty and those influences which are moving steadily toward government by men instead of by laws in the United States of America.

We need not remind you that great fundamental issues are at stake in this contest. The fate of the free Republic established by the founding fathers at Philadelphia when they wrote the Constitution hangs in the balance.

The revered tradition that no President shall seek a third term has been assailed by men burning with an insatiable lust for power. It is our grave responsibility to see that the effort is defeated. We must not take a dangerous step, a step which may well lead to dictatorship.

The Republican Party rejoices that in you it has provided the Nation with a man who is preeminently qualified to meet the requirements of this critical period. It rejoices that your nomination has been enthusiastically acclaimed by Independents, Jeffersonian Democrats, Progressives, Liberals, and Republicans alike. You are not the hope of one political party; you are the hope of a majority of the American people. They want you boldly to lead this great fight, this battle to perpetuate free government in this land of liberty, to restore equal justice, opportunities, and jobs to the American people; to keep this country safe and secure from attacks within and without our boundaries.

May God bless you and strengthen you for the momentous work that lies ahead.

Elect Mr. Willkie

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 1940

EDITORIALS FROM THE BALTIMORE SUN

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the Baltimore Sun is known throughout the country as a publication devoted to the welfare of the people of the United States. It has always supported the fundamental principles of our Government and is known as an independent Democratic newspaper. It vigorously supported Mr. Roosevelt in 1932 and has as vigorously opposed the President's attempts through packing of the Supreme Court and other acts to destroy our tripartite system of government.

Believing the editorial appearing in the issue of Monday, August 19, 1940, entitled "Elect Mr. Willkie" together with the front-page editorial in the same issue will contribute much to the understanding of the issues involved in this campaign, I offer them for the RECORD. They are as follows:

In this campaign Mr. Roosevelt stands for improvisations which have failed. Mr. Willkie stands for a principle which has produced abundant success over the generations. It is the principle which was embodied in the Democratic platform of 1932—the principle on which Mr. Roosevelt first was elected—the principle which he theatrically abandoned almost immediately after taking office.

Mr. Roosevelt had the misfortune to pass under the influence of pseudo intellectuals who thought that American opportunity was disappearing. For example, in the beginning of his administration in 1933 Washington was filled with people whose favorite patter was that "the frontiers have disappeared." Because the horizontal geographical frontiers of the West had disappeared, they argued that abundant opportunity for men in a new land had disappeared. Government, therefore, had to take charge of the affairs of Americans who had passed into a limited, restricted era; government had to organize the means of living.

In the thinking of these pseudo intellectuals, in the thinking which they imposed upon Mr. Roosevelt, there were no vertical frontiers still to be sought and conquered by bold and strong men. The upward, ever-retreating frontiers of the chemist, the engineer, the mechanic, had no place in the blueprints of these pseudo intellectuals who were favoring government with their supervisory attentions. Inventions and ventures, new industries, new employment, these were given scant thought.

The living symbol of the psuedo intellectuals, dreaming of a new, managed order, was Harry L. Hopkins, a social worker, not another Thomas A. Edison or another Henry Ford. It did not occur to them that one great, competitive, creative mechanic of Ford's type or Edison's does more to reduce human toil and suffering, more to enlarge human horizons, more to enrich human experience, than all the social workers who ever have been born into the world or ever will be born.

To this sterile conception of Mr. Hopkins as the symbol of the future, add Mr. Roosevelt's love of novelty. Add his dislike of men who have been notably successful in their ventures and have accumulated means. The result is hasty, misdirected improvisations that have caused the longest period of stagnation in new enterprises the country has known; the largest pool of permanent unemployment; the heaviest burden of Federal taxes; and a runaway national debt.

If you wish to know what Mr. Willkie offers in substitution for Mr. Roosevelt's failure, go read Mr. Roosevelt's speeches when he was first seeking the Presidency.

Go read the Democratic platform of 1932—a statement of historic liberalism—and the speeches Mr. Roosevelt made before and after his nomination. Go read what Mr. Roosevelt said before he was surrounded by pattering, chattering, pseudo-intellectuals and was pursuaded to turn the great somersault of 1933, his first year in office. Mr. Roosevelt is not a profound thinker, but he is an able speaker and skilled in exposition. In 1932 he made speeches which stand today as unanswerable arguments why he should be turned out of office and Mr. Willkie should be elected President of the United States.

It is not a complicated principle—this principle of historic liberalism. Government keeps order, of course, and acts as an umpire. Government lays down rules for a fair and free game of life and effort, and it adjusts these rules to changing social conditions. Government undertakes certain services which experience has proved that it can perform more adequately than private citizens—for example, public health, public education—and here, too, it adjusts itself to changing conditions.

But, in the historic liberal principle, government is forbidden to place paternalistic restraint upon the energies and enterprises of the people. Historic liberalism assumes that there is no limit to human desires, and no limit to human growth and achievement by which the desires are gratified. It assumes that growth and achievement will not come from precedent-ridden bureaucrats, whether they be recruited from politicians or from college faculties. It assumes that growth and achievement proceed from the imagination and the energy of spirited, ambitious men in every walk of life.

That is the principle which Mr. Willkie offers in place of Mr. Roosevelt's broken-down theory that Americans must be managed in their affairs by the Government. This principle, offered by Mr. Willkie in an hour of domestic failure and of foreign menace, is the principle upon which our fathers erected the greatest material civilization and the freest political civilization ever known on this earth. The Sun, an independent Democratic newspaper, will support Mr. Willkie with all its strength, precisely as it supported Mr. Roosevelt when he stood upon this principle in 1932.

ELECT MR. WILLKIE

The safety of this country requires the defeat of Mr. Roosevelt and the election of Mr. Willkie to the Presidency.

Mr. Rocsevelt stands for failure. His administration is a morass. The affairs of the Government itself are in a condition of confusion, disorder, and grave danger. The business of the country is in a condition of doubt, fear, and stagnation. And Mr. Roosevelt's failure in deeds has proceeded from a greater failure in spirit. He has lacked faith in the great American tradition of self-reliance, venture, and achievement. He has lacked faith that Americans could achieve for themselves in the present and the future as they have achieved in all the generations behind them.

Consequently he has appropriated to the Government an ever-enlarging task of managing the affairs of the people. But even there he has failed. He had no clear conception of a paternalistic system. The result is that, while accumulating the back-breaking

load of taxes and debt that is to be expected of a paternalistic government, he has produced few of the compensations in regimented discipline and production that are the fruits of accepted, well-ordered paternalism. And, of course, the historic American system has been undermined and partially paralyzed.

The condition in which the Government and the country find themselves would require a change of administration in any circumstances. In this day of world crisis and of swiftly gathering menace to the very security of the Nation, a change in administration is vital, imperative. Restoration of order and full release of the energies of the American people are necessary now, not only for renewal of sound and advancing prosperity. Order and release of the full energies of the people are necessary if we are to gird ourselves against a possible foreign foe.

Mr. Willkie is everything that Mr. Roosevelt is not. He is a man of faith—of faith in the strength, the courage, the capacity for achievement of the people. Himself the product of American opportunity, himself the demonstration of the reality of that opportunity, himself the symbol of a free man's achievement under the historic American system, Mr. Willkie offers not the scant, illusory security of a debt-supported paternalism. He offers the solid security, at home and abroad, that is to be created by self-reliant men who produce and who pay their bills.

FINANCIAL FAILURE

The condition of the public finances alone compels a change in administration. When Mr. Roosevelt first sought office, Federal taxes stood at $2,005,000,000. In 7 years his administration has lifted them to $5,924,000,000 a year. But so great have been his expenditures that this immense increase in Federal taxes was not nearly enough. He has been forced to borrow immensely. The Federal debt stood at $19,487,000,000 when he first sought office. Today, it stands at $43,842,000,000, which approaches double the peak of the war debt. All of this is apart from the cost of the new armament program, which already calls for $10,000,000,000.

Facing this condition, Mr. Roosevelt has thrown up his hands. He no longer discusses public finance. When he first ran in 1932, he promised a reduction in Federal expenditures of 25 percent and a Budget annually balanced. Instead, he inaugurated his program of vast expenditures. But when he ran the second time in 1936, he again promised a balanced Budget, with reduction of the national debt. Instead, he again enlarged expenditures and increased debt. Now, in 1940, neither his personally dictated platform nor his speech of acceptance has a single word on the subject of the Budget or the debt. He has confessed himself helpless. He no longer dares even to promise.

Failure to correct the condition in the public finances which Mr. Roosevelt has caused, and before which he stands in helpless silence, will lead straight to disaster for the masses of this country.

RUNAWAY DEBT

If this remains a free country, men will retain the power they always have had to place their own valuation upon the Government's bonds. And if they retain this power, the time will come when a runaway Federal debt will result in a sudden slide in the price that will be allowed for these bonds. That is the plain lesson of history. That is the plain lesson of common sense. Free men, men possessed of control over their own money, their own goods, their own labor, will not indefinitely accept at par bonds which are part of a runaway debt. The point at which they suddenly refuse can never be forecast. But it always has been reached. It always will be reached.

Let that point be reached in the runaway debt which Mr. Roosevelt has created, and every bank in this country will be in distress, for every bank is now loaded with the Government's bonds. In that hour, the Government's guaranty of bank deposits will be of scant value. For the strength behind the guaranty is the Government's credit, and that will have been undermined by the collapse in the value of the Government's bonds. In the same way that deposits will have been stricken, insurance policies will have been stricken, for the insurance companies are loaded with the bonds of the Government. Depositors and policyholders will be paid in pieces of paper of swiftly diminishing purchasing power.

The alternative, if the runaway debt is allowed to go its course under the now silent and helpless Mr. Roosevelt, will be some form of dictation of the value of the Government's bonds. In Germany and Italy there is such a system now. The value of a bond of the German or Italian Government is what the Government declares it to be. And there is a policeman available, or a soldier, to see that the citizen delivers his money or his goods or his labor at the value prescribed by the Government for its obligations. That, of course is the end of freedom. It is the end of a man's rights in his property or his toil. It undoes the work of patriots from 1776 to this day.

BEWILDERED POLICY MAKING

But Mr. Roosevelt's calamitous, and now helpless, handling of the public finances is not the beginning nor the end of his errors.

In his entire 7 years in office, he has never had a definite conception of fundamental economic policy. The economy of this country has always been based on free enterprise, on competitive capitalism. Mr. Roosevelt says he believes in free enterprise. And certainly he has never offered the people, boldly and concretely, any other system. Not any of the varied forms of socialism, and not any form of state capitalism. But, professing from time to time his undying allegiance to free enterprise as good in itself and as the economic foundation of political freedom, he has missed few opportunities to baffle free enterprise and to enlarge the Government's control of the people's affairs.

One of his first acts, after being elected in 1932 on a platform dedicated to free enterprise, was to institute N. R. A. And N. R. A. was an attempt to place the entire industry and trade of the United States under a system of monopolies supervised by the Government. The scheme, which broke down, might have been taken from the textbooks of nazi-ism and fascism. Side by side was his assumption of control over agriculture in headlong measures which ignored vitally necessary foreign markets, led to the Government's purchase of vast, accumulating surpluses in price-fixing schemes and fastened on the Nation a gigantic system of cash subsidies to farmers—from all of which we shall not be extricated in a generation.

This is not the whole, or nearly the whole, of the astounding story of Mr. Roosevelt's inability to formulate a basic economic policy and to adhere to it. His impulsive good intentions, his almost adolescent love of novelty and experiment, his distaste for successful lawyers and businessmen against whom he competed for some years in private life with inconspicuous success—these qualities have led him into courses which make unpredictability the only predictable thing, inconsistency the only consistent thing.

ILL-CONSIDERED REFORMS

There is the Wagner labor law. Its purpose is to facilitate and extend, under law, the system of collective bargaining which had been privately evolved over the years between businessmen and their employees. In its very terms it assumes the existence of free enterprise and the social and economic value of continuing the system. In its very terms it assumes that the businessman, the employer, is a useful member of society, and therefore has rights which should be respected as well as obligations which should be fulfilled. But that assumption is at the opposite pole to the practices which have prevailed under Mr. Roosevelt's administration of the act.

The businessman, the employer, the active, initiative force in this system of free enterprise, is presumed to be an antisocial, inhumane creature of greed and greed alone. He cannot so much as discuss unionism or its terms with his employees lest he coerce them. He is not allowed to reason as a friend. He is kept at arm's length as an enemy. And as an enemy he has no right even to demand the orderly naming of those with whom he is to bargain at arm's length. If opposing factions among his employees engage in bitter and demoralizing controversy as to which of them should be received in bargaining, the employer is not recognized as having any right to demand an election and a settlement.

To state these harassing conditions in the administration of the Wagner law is merely to state conditions which have been familiar in all fields. A wages-and-hours law applicable to a continent was enacted in confusion and is enforced in confusion. And a tax law—which collapsed of its own weight—was suddenly jammed upon the books to the end that, in this system based on free enterprise, every board of directors in this vast land should be coerced into increasing its dividend payments and decreasing its allotments of earnings to reserves.

Even in policies which were clearly good, there has been throughout this administration a strange immaturity of fiber. Its best work has been in the social field. But politics in relief was so glaring that a congressional investigation became necessary. And the record is clear that relief rolls were regularly enlarged in election periods. In old-age annuities such sums were taken from employers and employees to provide an imaginary reserve fund—the money actually went into payment of general expenses of the Government—that public outcry forced a halt. The necessary regulation of certain phases of the power industry was converted into a costly and destructive feud against legitimate private interests until at last another public outcry caused restraint.

The result of it all is this: The country has had the most protracted period of stagnation in new enterprise in its entire history; and, consequently, it has had the largest permanent pool of unemployment in its entire history. That is the result of Mr. Roosevelt's administration—that, and public finances completely out of his control.

THE PLEA OF INDISPENSABILITY

With this record behind him, Mr. Roosevelt now presents himself to the country as the indispensable man. Aided by the inner circle in Washington and by such big-city bosses as Kelly and Hague—but not during the primary campaign by any of the men of his party with pretensions to statesmanship—Mr. Roosevelt has undertaken to overthrow the two-term rule which was established by Washington and Jefferson and has hitherto been obeyed by every President at the end of his second term.

In the 150 years of this Republic's life, there has been no time when it was more vital that the two-term rule be enforced. The reason is not far to seek. No other President has amassed such resources to insure indefinite tenure of office. It is not necessary to argue this. Mr. Roosevelt's power to force another nomination has been conceded from the beginning of his maneuvers. His immense advantages after nomination have been conceded from the beginning. He has practically doubled the army of officeholders. He commands unprecedented sums for public works. He commands unprecedented sums with which to make loans to agriculture. He commands unprecedented sums with which to make loans to industry. He commands unprecedented sums from which

checks pour out to millions of subsidized farmers and unfortunates on relief. His power to coerce or to beguile is beyond calculation.

By the canons of American democracy, he was under moral compulsion to lay down these vast powers for the safety of democracy. He has refused to do so. He has refused, indeed, to play the rule against a third term—an unwritten part of the American Constitution—the respect of direct discussion. He was as evasive, in his speech to the Chicago convention, of his obligation to candor on the third term as he was in 1936 when he dodged questions about the Court-packing plan which he was to spring immediately after his reelection. In his flouting of the two-term rule, and in his manner of flouting it, Mr. Roosevelt's candidacy has become a menace to the political integrity of this Nation, as his administration is a menace to its economic foundations.

ENTER MR. WILLKIE

Mr. Willkie is a strong refuge in this hour of danger to our political institutions and to our economic foundations.

He has toiled with his hands to gain money with which to advance his education, and he has labored with his brain in the law and in business to gain a substance and a competence for his own and his family's protection. Such a man will not be profligate with the public's money. Nor will he believe that the long-term interests of the masses of Americans will be served by loose and wasteful administration and a runaway debt.

He has fought for historic economic liberalism throughout his career. He supported Mr. Rocsevelt when Mr. Roosevelt stood on his 1932 platform. It was Mr. Roosevelt who left that sound Democratic and liberal position, not Mr. Willkie, who still preserves the faith. And, better than any other, Mr. Willkie has put his finger on the great internal danger of the day, which is "big government," fostered by the novelty-seeking, power-loving, wasteful Mr. Roosevelt.

And in foreign affairs Mr. Willkie shares with Mr. Roosevelt the views of a majority of thoughtful citizens, but expresses them with care and with sobriety. From Mr. Willkie we shall not have speeches at Charlottesville which should have been made to Congress. We shall not have passionate, lavish, out-of-hand offers of aid to the Allies, to be followed almost immediately by necessary denials, as when M. Reynaud desperately called for airplanes.

Mr. Willkie is in the true American tradition—the tradition of industry, or frugality, of dignity, of responsibility, and of orderly growth on these great bases of individual and national character. He will be given the votes of men and women whose eyes are open to the dangers to our political and economic institutions which Mr. Roosevelt has laid in our path.

Asia for the Asiatics—Uncle Sam's Lettergram

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 20 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW YORK DAILY NEWS AND ARTICLE FROM THE AMERICAN VINDICATOR

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be published in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, a very timely editorial from the New York Daily News, and later reprinted on the editorial page of the Times-Herald of Washington, D. C., entitled "Asia for the Asiatics," together with an article from the September 1940 issue of the American Vindicator, published monthly at Washington, D. C., entitled "Uncle Sam's Lettergram," the subject of which deals with the Monroe Doctrine, likewise discussed by the aforementioned editorial.

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Daily News]

"ASIA FOR THE ASIATICS"

It looks more and more likely that Japan is going to make its "Asia for the Asiatics" doctrine stick in the long run. Maybe in the short run, if the keystone of the British Empire crumbles under the bombs of Goering's "blitzkriegers."

Anyway, the Japanese have now bulldozed the hard-pressed British into pulling their troops out of Shanghai, leaving control of the International Settlement divided between the Japanese and the United States Marines. The marines, incidentally, have been pushed down to a 4-mile strip of waterfront in Shanghai, which might be taken as a symbolic forecast of where the white man's political power in Asia is headed.

For some reason, a lot of Americans have a mental blind spot on this subject of "Asia for the Asiatics."

Ninety-nine percent of us, we estimate, can understand why it is entirely right and proper for the United States to have its Monroe Doctrine, and to back it up with all the necessary ships, soldiers, planes, and guns.

The Monroe Doctrine means "America (both Americas) for the Americans." It means we don't want England, Germany, or any other non-American power planting any new colonies over here. We don't even want their nationals to build up too much political power for themselves under existing North or South American governments.

We're the most powerful nation in the Western Hemisphere, and we'd be foolish not to take every indicated step to stay so.

But when it comes to "Asia for the Asiatics," many of us feel just the other way.

The prevailing American conviction (shared by our Government up to this writing) is that the Japanese have their nerve to suggest any such thing, and are rascals for trying to enforce such a policy.

WATERTIGHT COMPARTMENTS

We dislike as much as anybody else to see Japan rise to the overlordship of Asia. If it makes that grade, it will be more of a menace to world peace than it ever has been before.

But Japan appears to be making that grade rapidly. We think in any event that some nation or combination of nations is sooner or later going to make an "Asia for the Asiatics" policy stick—that the day of Asia for outside exploiters is about done.

When that comes to pass, will Asia shut itself from the rest of the world, and will we do likewise from Asia? Will the Japs, or whoever is running Asia, refuse to sell us the East Indies' rubber, tin, and quinine? Will we righteously refuse to sell them cotton, wool, meat, manufactured goods?

Such watertight compartment stuff will not come to pass; or if it does, it won't last long. Trade is the life blood of nations, and of the world. Tourniquets twisted onto the arteries of trade for political or moral reasons never have held for very long, and we think (and hope) never will.

BETTER ARM IN A HURRY

Our conviction is that we can save ourselves a lot of trouble by becoming realistic about Japan.

We should recognize Japan's power, energy, and ambition; and we should restore friendly trade relations with Japan—something to which we are reliably advised the Japanese would be very agreeable.

However, our official guides and counselors aren't doing anything like that. They go on scolding Japan for every move it makes toward Asiatic domination.

So we'd better rush conscription, and rush also the building of an army of at least 1,000,000 mechanic-sergeants, plus an air force of 50,000 planes and 100,000 pilots. Our present international policies may easily provoke Japan, Germany, Italy, and Russia—all four—into "ganging up" on us some day.

When and if that show-down between alleged international morality and alleged international immorality comes, we'll need every weapon and every trained fighting man we can find.

[From the American Vindicator]

UNCLE SAM'S LETTERGRAM

MY DEAR NIECES AND NEPHEWS: The Congress of the United States, as you know, has authorized and appropriated approximately $17,000,000,000 for the purpose of building up an adequate national defense, or rather such national defense as cannot be penetrated by any potential enemy of the world. As you know, it is always well to be prepared because one naturally can never tell about the future. These millions have been expended for defending ourselves against the enemy from without, if and when that enemy calls, but at the present writing I cannot really see any imminent danger from the enemy from without. Nevertheless, as I have stated, one can never tell, and it is wise to always be prepared, and for that reason we are preparing to build up impregnable barricades that will provide the American people with perfect safety. So much for that.

The real enemy, my dear nieces and nephews, is right here among us in the form of saboteurs, spies, aliens, and, I might add, there are a lot of elements in this country whose hatred is so terrific toward and against Hitler, the German Government, and the German people as a whole, that they are bent upon getting our country into war just to satisfy their lust for revenge. You know who they are, and I know who they are. What we should do, in truth, is to guard against these elements in this country who want to involve us in another bloody war, a war that is raging in Europe, and a war that is not our war. These termites within are the ones we should guard against. They are working night and day and using every available means, principally the propaganda that is rampant, and that propaganda has thrown the American people into hysterical moods. There is propaganda through the mails, over the radio, and everywhere; and unfortunately thousands of Americans have fallen for it. Our danger is in permitting this propaganda to lead us astray. We have no business in Europe. We ought to stay out of Europe. We ought to remember what the Father of our Country told us about years upon years ago. We ought to tend to our own business and let Europe tend to her business. We ought to guard and maintain our interests here in the Western Hemisphere and let

Europe look after its interests over there and let the yellow races look after their interests in the Orient. Europe is not in the Western Hemisphere and doesn't come within the meaning of the Monroe Doctrine, and the Orient is not in the Western Hemisphere and doesn't come within the meaning of the Monroe Doctrine. We are telling the Europeans to stay out of here, and at the same time we are telling them how to run their affairs over there. We are telling the Orientals to stay out of here, and at the same time we are telling the Japanese what they can do and what they cannot do. We should heed the warning of George Washington, and that means, in simple words, minding our own business and keeping out of the quarrels of other nations, and to stop telling other nations what kind of governments they should have or what kind of government they shouldn't have. We should have millions for defense, but not one dollar for offense, not one cent for aggression, and we really won't have to take billions from the taxpayers of this country for national defense if we mind our own business, but the more enmity we create against the peoples of other nations of the world, then the more money we are going to have to spend in preparing ourselves against an attack by those whom we have insulted and angered, without cause, from time to time. That stands to reason.

YOUR UNCLE SAM.

What Price Freedom?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 19, 1940

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted, I insert an article by Robert Keith Leavitt, published in This Week magazine, the magazine section of the Los Angeles Times, of the issue of June 30, 1940:

[From This Week for June 30, 1940]

WHAT PRICE FREEDOM?

(By Robert Keith Leavitt)

It is a single sheet of parchment, close written in an antique script, and boldly scrawled upon at the bottom, where 56 men in knee breeches and powdered wigs set down their names on that far-off, troubled summer day. Its glass case is a shrine with golden doors. People walk softly upon the marble floor and stand hushed before it. Copies of it are hung in schoolrooms, transcripts printed in every history book.

We are about to celebrate the anniversary—of what? Is the Declaration of Independence merely an heirloom? A curiosity? A symbol of something far off, remote, having nothing to do with our individual, preoccupied lives?

On the contrary, that Declaration was once a document of flaming personal concern to every man, woman, and child in the country, and its closing words may well be taken today as expression of our people's most urgent need.

Everybody knows how the Declaration begins: "When in the course of human events * * *."

But few people remember how it ends. And the end is the most significant part of all:

"And for the support of this Declaration, with a firm reliance on the protection of divine Providence, we mutually pledge to each other our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor."

These words were no empty rhetoric. The Declaration, for all its tempered tone, was a desperate document. The men who signed it knew only too well when they pledged life, fortune, and honor that they might be called upon to pay that pledge in person—at the end of a hangman's rope.

And the people who had sent them to Philadelphia knew what personal responsibility was their own. They had found out what it felt like to face hard-bitten British troops, at Concord and Bunker Hill. They had learned in camp and on the dusty highways that war was not a matter of shots and shouting alone, but of mud, filth, flies, disease, sweat, cold, exhaustion, hunger and thirst. Congress, making war, had the grim support of men who saw clearly that war was the end of their private prosperity and of the comfort and safety of their families. It had the fervent encouragement of women who knew every day that they might never again see alive the husbands and sons who went out in the freshness of morning. It had the backing of a people who realized, after a year during which their lives grew harder every month, that the struggle would be long and terrible for every one of them.

The people of that America knew these things, but they were determined to endure all of them, with death at the end if need be, rather than let go what they thought was right.

To them, individually and as a people, certain ideals looked bigger than self-interest, safety of life: The right of self-government; the right to be free from intolerable abuses; the privileges they later embodied in the Bill of Rights—of free speech, free assembly, a free press, and a decent respect for individual liberty.

These they knew to be precious beyond all other things—for they had nearly lost them. So, though they differed widely among themselves in lesser matters, their resolve upon the great ideals burned away all other desires.

In the fire of that resolve they went to war. In fire they hammered out the declaration. And it was fire in the hearts of the common people—behind the war and the declaration—that carried them through to win in the end.

Without that blazing resolve, the freedom of the newborn republic would have died as miserably as * * * well, as miserably as the liberties of irresolute peoples in Europe, under the roar of a mechanized might that we have heard with our own ears.

The document is yellow with age. The flaming people lie a century in dust. The grievances that fired them are forgotten. The rights they bought in common sacrifice are all ours—easy, comfortable, permanent—something to enjoy without obligation or risk, or so we thought.

But now, in the glare of what has happened to others, we can see that great wrongs and tyrannies are not things of the past; that the privileges of a free people are not undeniable as air and light, and that the price of holding them may be very high—so high, indeed, that it can be afforded only by a nation in which every individual is resolved that the price is part of his personal obligation.

Brute force is at large in the world—so big, savage, and competent that it makes the mad whims of George III look like a child's willfullness.

We have declared that we will be independent of this force, and have set about arming ourselves to implement that declaration. But declarations and arms can do nothing by themselves. It is resolve behind intent and citizens behind arms that make a declaration good—today as in 1776.

We have seen the impact of quick-striking ferocity upon peoples who were merely wishful not to meet it, and who in consequence were weak, unready, divided in counsel, tolerant of traitors and of fools. We have seen the disastrous folly of peoples who were preoccupied with divergent pettinesses, obsessed with what they could get without giving, beguiled with the notion that nothing could be so bad as to justify the hazard of personal safety.

It is wishful thinking to believe we can always indulge ourselves in similar flabbiness of thought, relying on distance or the satiety of conquerors to let us go our easy way. We should know that in matters of national defense there are burdens to be borne, sacrifices to be made, and parts to be played by every decent citizen.

We need many things today, but none more than the old resolve running in a blaze across the land. We need, each of us, the fire and faith of our ancestors. We must "mutually pledge to each other our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor." The words are old, and as out of style as buff and blue. But today, as then, they are the words of freedom.

My Work in Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NEWT V. MILLS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 20, 1940

Mr. MILLS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, the history of leadership in the Congress indicates that the best policy for the people of any district is to keep a Congressman who is rendering good service on the job. The leaders of Congress are the men who have been here from 20 to 30 years.

There is, of course, no point in keeping a man in Congress unless he is doing a good job. Therefore it is proper to review the events of my service since January 1937, when my term of office started.

FARM LEGISLATION

I introduced H. R. 6339 and H. R. 8135. H. R. 6339 was an act to extend additional years the 3½-percent interest rate on Federal land-bank loans, which was reported out under committee title, and as a result of the House and Senate's action the bill became a law.

H. R. 8135 proposed relief for the American farmers for 1938, thereby directing the Reconstruction Finance Corpo-tion to make available to the Commodity Credit Corporation $450,000,000, which would have guaranteed the cotton farmer a better price for his 1938 cotton crop. However, only $65,000,000 was appropriated for cotton-price adjustment.

Facing a problem of farm tenancy as we do, and 2,000 farms being foreclosed every legal day of the year as a result of our agricultural class not being able to meet their mortgage debts, I helped to provide means whereby thousands of families could purchase homes under the Farm Tenant Act and the Farm Security Administration.

Further I have helped to provide each year funds whereby farmers could secure loans for farming purposes. In addition persuaded the Commodity Credit Corporation to purchase all the surplus commodities in my congressional district in an effort to maintain proper prices. Helped to secure the cancelation of all oat-loan debts, saving $980,810.39 for the farmers of north and northeast Louisiana.

In 1938 I persuaded the Agriculture Committee to accept my amendment giving new-ground farmers equal protection with the old farmers. However, I do not advocate the 1938 Agricultural Adjustment Act as the correct procedure to solve the agricultural question, inasmuch as the farmers of the United States have lost $22,000,000,000 of their normal income in the last 6 years; therefore, the debt load remains virtually the same, so I believe the correct procedure to solve the agricultural question will be found in speeches delivered by me in the House of Representatives entitled "Taxes and Currency Versus Prosperity and Agriculture" under date of November 18, 1937, and "Too Late to Plant Corn After Harvesting," March 21, 1940.

OLD-AGE PENSIONS

One of the most important things I wanted to do when I came to Congress was to set up an old-age pension system. I believed, and still do, that this is a measure of justice to the veterans of civil citizenship. I voted for the Social Security Act, explaining at the time that I did so not because I thought this legislation was adequate but because it did recognize our obligations to the old people, and also it was the best bill that I could vote for that had a chance to pass at the time. Under this act Louisiana, in cooperation with the Federal Government, is now paying old-age assistance to more than half of the persons in the State over 65 years of age. I still do not think that the Social Security Act is doing the job right. I favor a Federal old-age pension, paid direct by the Federal Government by check from Washington, without the machinery that we now have checking up on and harassing the old folks. I also believe that, as a matter of principle and simple justice, the old folks in all States should receive the same amount monthly. I pledge a continuation of my best efforts to this end.

SUPPORT LABOR

Unfortunately, in the land where it is too much for all, favored laws have denied the laboring man protective hours and wages sufficient to sustain a proper livelihood for him and his family; therefore, having been reared a laboring man, I have consistently supported the man and woman who live by daily toil since I entered public life, and as a result of said support I have been endorsed by the American Federation of Labor as being the laboring man's friend.

FLOOD PROTECTION

The delta lands of northeast Louisiana are subject to overflow; therefore, the question of flood control has been a paramount question since the first settlers in northeast Louisiana, so I am exceedingly happy I was successful in having enacted into law H. R. 6600, H. R. 6601, H. R. 6602, H. R. 9435, and H. R. 9326, each introduced by me, dealing with flood protection for my district.

H. R. 9435, a companion bill to S. 3354, which reached a compromise in the Flood Control Committee, provided for the construction of the Morganza floodway, which is held will reduce the backwater area of Tensas, Boeuf, Bayou Macon, and Ouachita Basins. Further, the construction of the Morganza floodway is held by all Army engineers to be a progressive step toward solving the flood-control question that has been the uppermost one for years. Also, the compromise provides the fuse-plug levee south of Yancopin to Van Cluse, Ark., shall be reconstructed to the 1914 grade and 1928 section.

As a result, in part, of the above-enacted legislation, the Office of the Chief of Engineers is presently making a survey and study of the lower Mississippi Valley, and Gen. Thomas M. Robins advised me personally and by letter that a report of said survey would be submitted to the Chief of Engineers' Office by December 1940.

Upon receipt of this report it will be my aim to secure the necessary appropriation of money to carry out the Chief of Engineers' recommendations as to general flood protective improvements.

Secured an appropriation of $615,000 for a ring-levee project each at Columbia and Jonesville, however, the Flood Control Committee accepted my resolution that provides the War Department must make an enlarged survey of the Jonesville levee project also in addition each year have helped to secure the necessary appropriations to carry on levee improvements and project construction cut-offs.

VETERAN'S LEGISLATION

When I came to Congress the Economy Act had been put into effect, cutting off many of the veterans who had been drawing compensation. My ex-service friends were in need and wanted preference on Government relief work. In general they wanted justice from their Government, which they had served, and for which they had suffered. I led in the movement to give veterans definite preference for relief work. I have been trying to wipe out the injustices of the Economy Act.

I favor giving the veterans of the World War the same treatment on pensions that the veterans of the Spanish-American War and other previous wars have received. I also favor the same pension provisions for their widows and orphans that were given widows and orphans of previous wars. I hope that this session of Congress will make a start toward this program.

My ex-service friends of the World War are much aroused over the threat to our safety occasioned by the wars in Europe and Asia, and I have pledged to them that I will do all I can to keep us out of war. I am opposed to again sending our young men to foreign nations to settle local quarrels, and will never vote to do this. I further pledged, and here repeat, that the day that I vote to involve the United States in war for any purpose, that I will resign my seat in Congress, and will enlist in the armed forces.

FARMER COOPERATION

My district is mostly a farming section. Most of my constituents are farmers. A large part of my time in Congress has been, and will continue to be, devoted to work for the farmers.

I favor organization of farmers—just as I favor organization of laboring men into unions. I have advocated cost-of-production for our farmers which will provide at least 20-cent cotton, and corresponding prices on other crops, on that portion of our production consumed in the United States.

I favor farmers cooperation in rural-electrification projects, and am glad that rural-electrification lines are being extended into a number of the parishes of my district. I favor farmers cooperation in any way that they can. I have always made it a practice at the end of each session of Congress, when I got home, to notify the farmers of the different parishes to meet me in the county seat to consult with them about the general situation and receive their advice and reactions and first-hand information about farm practices and results.

Through such cooperation of the farmers in my district, I was able on two occasions when drought and excessive rains struck our country to bring quick relief to them through the agencies of the Federal Government. I pledge myself to continue to cooperate with the farmers by this personal contact which enables me to intelligently bring their problems to the attention of the proper agencies of the Government.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

Voted and supported all appropriations for national defense. These amounts, in conjunction with previous appropriations and contractual authorizations, bring the total available for obligation during the present fiscal year, exclusive of unobli-

gated continuing appropriations and contractual authorizations on June 30 last, to $10,040,225,543, divided between the two defense establishments.

POST-OFFICE SERVICE IMPROVEMENTS

In view of poor post-office quarters in certain sections of my district, I have given particular attention to this subject, and as a result funds were allocated to construct several new post-office buildings, and, in addition, new and larger quarters and additional clerks have been provided for in several other post offices. I consider the mail service has been improved remarkably, inasmuch as a number of rural routes and extensions have been granted and other requested extensions are presently pending awaiting the inspector's report, which I will be able to have granted as soon as the inspector's opinion is submitted.

PROGRAM FOR YOUTH

The work of the Civilian Conservation Corps has been of great value to our young people. I have strongly supported this program; and in 1937, when a reduction of one-third in the number of camps had been decided upon by the administration, helped to organize and led a sufficient group of House Members so that we were able to induce the President to rescind his order, thus saving this drastic reduction and sustaining the C. C. C. camp program at approximately that level until the beginning of this year.

The National Youth Administration has been of much benefit in enabling our young folks to continue their education in school and to obtain training out of school which would fit them for earning a livelihood. I pledge my best efforts to a continuation of this program.

The common school is the greatest institution in American life. It has always been a delight to me to go around and visit the schools and talk to the young people upon patriotic topics. In doing so I learned that many districts had old buildings, not adequate to care for enlarged enrollments, and in many instances condemned as unsafe for future use.

In order to correct this condition, I urged P. W. A. officials to encourage school-building projects and urged school boards to submit such projects. As a result my district is dotted with new school buildings; this has helped the schools and has given work to many men in need. It is interesting to note in almost every community of my district new school buildings have been erected by the P. W. A.

Of course, the principal credit belongs to the fine teachers and the earnest school boards, who had the vision and energy to initiate and push these projects, but it has been a pleasure for me to cooperate in every way possible, to work endless hours in cutting red tape that this work might go forward.

OTHER ACCOMPLISHMENTS

In 1939 the Oil Trust began to purchase cottonseed for $12 to $14 per ton. We called upon the Secretary of Agriculture and the President to have the Commodity Credit Corporation to finance the cotton farmers in marketing of cottonseed, and as a result of the coordinated efforts of the farmers the Commodity Credit Corporation called attention to this low price, and as a result seed immediately advanced to $21 to $24 per ton; however, this was far below cost of production.

Recently I have persuaded certain Federal agencies to assist the needs of my farmers as a result of excessive rains.

I helped to place an amendment to the Hatch Act which provides that no person may work for the Federal Government who is a member of any party, society, or organization which is engaged in attempting to overthrow our democratic form of government. This is in line with the ideas of those people who believe that we, who believe in Americanism, should fight for it and see that those who are not truly American should not bore from within by obtaining Government appointments.

I helped to add an amendment upon a recent civil-service act which provides that eligible applicants from Louisiana and other States which do not have their full quota under the Apportionment Act must be given appointment ahead of other applicants from States which are over their quota.

EXPERIENCE BRINGS ADDED ABILITY

My record stands on my work for measures intended to improve the conditions and opportunities of my people, and my fights against proposals intended to hurt or curtail their existing rights and privileges. I hope it has entitled me to the respect of the thousands who gave me this chance to serve them. I believe I can assure my friends that I enjoy the confidence of my colleagues in Congress and the respect of the governmental agencies before whom I have pleaded the cause of my constituents.

The experience I have gained by the continued support of the voters of my district has ripened my original enthusiasm into a steadier ability to accomplish the proper solution of the many problems of the various elements of our citizenship.

The people of the Fifth Congressional District have enabled me to gain this experience. I have used and will continue to use it for their benefit. Added experience gives me added prestige with those in Washington who have the power to give and withhold, which power was gained by them through ripe experience and long service.

The district gains in accomplishment of its needs and desires as I gain in accumulation of experience and service.

For these past expressions of confidence from my friends and neighbors I promise the continued exertion of my entire ability in their behalf. I promise a veteran's fight for a sturdy, progressive people.

Don't Be Fooled

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 20, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE DETROIT FREE PRESS

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, is the President interested in the preservation of our form of government in preparing our country to meet all threatened danger? Or is it his purpose to create fear and hysteria, bring on a war and then fool the people into believing that he is the only man in the country capable of being President?

Why, otherwise, should he run around with a chip on his shoulder, doing so much to involve us in a war for which we are wholly, according to his own statement, unprepared?

Read the following editorial from the Detroit Free Press of August 15, 1940, which cites a few facts tending to throw light on the President's motives and activities:

[From the Detroit Free Press of August 15, 1940]

TRYING TO FOOL THE PEOPLE

Preparedness is the most vital need of this Nation.

Its first requisite is honest speech.

Its biggest handicap is a barrage of half truths, emotional oratory for the manufacture of fear and hysterics, and plain bunk.

The people are not being informed; they are being misled.

Instead of the integrity of true statesmanship, we are witnessing in Washington a display of smart-aleckism that would put to shame a high-school debating team.

This sophomoric cunning stems from the janissaries of the brain trust, who feel that, knowing themselves all there is to know and the people being so dumb, it is much better not to tell them the truth. It is much better to fool them—as though they were little children who were not quite bright.

A shining example of this came during the debate on the neutrality bill. Every time it looked as though the Senate would not let President Roosevelt have his way, the public mind was whipped into a hysteria of fear and excitement by the simple device of having Mr. Roosevelt announce that he had just been informed that the Navy had sighted "foreign" submarines off our shores.

Once he had had his way no more submarines were ever reported and the merry jesters of the throne room now admit, off the record, that it was just a smart hoax to force action from the opposing Senators by pressure of excited public opinion.

We are getting more of the same in Washington today.

Brig. Gen. William E. Shedd, Assistant Chief of the Army Staff in charge of personnel, is an honorable soldier and gentleman. But as a soldier he must obey orders.

So he goes before a committee of the House Tuesday and testifies that because of the debate now waging over conscription, the Army has been "forced" to delay its mobilization plans from October 1 to January 1. The implication is that the administration and the Army Staff under Colonel Stimson, were prepared to place this Nation on a war footing but are now blocked by the demands of the Senate and Congress to get at the facts.

Immediately headlines and radio scream forth innuendo that the preparedness program is being hamstrung by those asking answers on the Burke-Wadsworth bill. The administration is pictured as making a heroic fight to get this country ready against terrific odds.

And all who dare criticize or even voice a doubt of the wisdom of the Stimson proposals are branded as Nazi sympathizers.

Now, let's look at the record.

The Burke-Wadsworth bill was reported out of committee on July 27—15 days ago, not counting Sundays. There was a brief delay in taking it up for discussion because another bill was being given necessary precedence at the request of the Army—the mobilization of the National Guard. This was passed without any serious opposition; about as fast, in fact, as it could be read.

On August 5, debate on the conscription bill started—8 days ago, not counting Sunday.

Where, then, has there been any delay in getting the Army on an efficient footing? Why must its penciled plans be rubbed out as of October 1 and postponed until January 1—3 long months?

Any consideration of chronology, backed by the calendar, makes the testimony of General Shedd in keeping with the usual line of hokum that is being handed out to fool the people.

There has been no delay on the conscription proposal—if we are still a democracy with the representative government of a free people who have a right to know what is being done to them.

There has been delay, if by delay is meant any discussion at all of a law that might forever bind the American people to a totalitarian system of government.

Does the general, and those for whom he speaks, mean that the merits of the bill should not be discussed at all, but rushed through as some more "must" legislation by a "rubber stamp" Congress?

If this is so, then the war-minded gentlemen in power no doubt think it an impertinence that the citizens should even ask about it.

More propaganda comes from Rome, through the Chicago Daily News cable service, to the effect that the totalitarian states—Germany and Italy—are laughing at us because we want to make quite sure we do not get entrapped into the same kind of dictatorial government that the Germans and the Italians are cursed with. Unnamed German and Italian "experts" in these dispatches say that we would be a "push-over."

That ought to scare us into abdicating our representative authority immediately.

But the Chicago Daily News is owned and edited by Col. Frank Knox, who is Mr. Roosevelt's Secretary of the Navy, and an all too militaristic interventionist.

As for the 3-month delay spoken of by General Shedd because the Senate has had the bill 15 days, it might be well to note the fact that President Roosevelt himself has not said one word in favor of the bill now before the Senate, other than, at a press conference, to dictate carefully an ambiguous sentence that he did favor "some form" of universal service.

In the seven and a half years he has been President he has never hesitated to make known to Congress his desires, and often they have been demands under pressure.

He is Commander in Chief of the Army and the Navy, and one wonders why he does not speak to Congress and the people in that capacity.

This silence is strangely significant and prompts the natural question: Why does he not desire to go on record?

Desperate efforts of trained legislators such as Senator WHEELER to find out what the purposes are behind this bill have been to no avail. And the mystery grows as more testimony is offered.

General Shedd was asked bluntly by Representative CLASON what the millions of men to be conscripted would be used for. His answer, verbatim, is more illuminating than it at first appears. He said:

"As to the use that they will be put, only time will tell."

Again, protesting against 1-year voluntary enlistments as impractical, he declared:

"Under such enlistments garrisons overseas could not be properly maintained."

Read that over again. Then remember that in his message on preparedness to Congress, President Roosevelt pledged his word that no American soldier would be sent overseas.

Weeks later at Hyde Park, at a press conference, he made an opening—a small crack—in this stone-wall pledge by remarking that the chances of our doughboys being sent over were less than 100 to 1. From a solemnly asserted and impregnable pledge, within 2 weeks it becomes a matter of betting odds.

Again General Shedd held emphatically that debate in Congress for less than 2 weeks had delayed American preparedness by more than 3 months, but admits, under questioning, that there is not equipment for these men to begin training even if they are mobilized.

How then has discussion brought about a delay that he says has been so costly to the program?

The First Army maneuvers in New York opened last week. Soldiers are drilling with broomsticks and pieces of pipe instead of guns. They are putting beaver-board walls on trucks and pretending they are tanks. They are using birds (when they fly) instead of airplanes to aim at.

There is not enough equipment on hand, all Army authorities honestly admit, to mechanize one unit properly. There is not enough personal equipment to take care of over 75,000 men. Cloth for uniforms has not yet been woven.

But General Shedd insists (on orders) that we must have an immediate army of 900,000 men—with the next step 2,000,000 men—and from then on up.

What for?

Nobody in authority will tell.

Senator WHEELER in his speech of Tuesday said something that all the military experts agree with when he declared:

"A small but expert force of Germans seized all of Norway. A small but expert Finnish army held the Russian Goliath at bay for many months. But a large French army was quickly crushed—less by the enemy than by its own incompetent, and in many instances traitorous generals. The years of military training that the French people had undergone, the crushing burdens they had painfully borne for generations all went for naught in the face of the lack of competence of the French General Staff.

"Outside the Army, all the most eminent military authorities of the country agree that a force of 400,000 to 600,000 would be entirely adequate."

Why then does the administration insist on the immediate conscription of 12,000,000 American citizens?

Where are they to be sent and for what purposes?

What foreign wars are they to be ordered to fight?

Are they to go to Europe, to Asia, or to police the South American republics?

Did General Shedd let the cat out of the bag when he said short enlistments interfered with "overseas garrisons"?

Will Mr. Roosevelt forget his thinly veiled inspection tours, for political purposes, and, as the President of the United States and as Commander in Chief of our Army and Navy, speak out and tell the people plainly, frankly, and freely what the whole thing is all about?

The time has passed for the technique of suddenly discovering nonexistent "foreign" submarines.

The people are weary of being "frightened."

They have the unalienable right of a free people to be informed on what their Government is planning to do to them.

The ordered testimony of General Shedd is an insult to their intelligence.

Nazis Use United States Funds in Colombia for Economic War on Democracies

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. BOEHNE, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 20, 1940

ARTICLE BY RUSSELL B. PORTER

Mr. BOEHNE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Russell B. Porter, which was published in the New York Times for August 16:

[From the New York Times of August 16, 1940]

NAZIS USE UNITED STATES FUNDS IN COLOMBIA FOR ECONOMIC WAR ON DEMOCRACIES—PROPAGANDA TO WIN MARKETS PARTLY FINANCED BY ADVERTISING OF FIRMS HERE PLACED BY THEIR GERMAN AGENTS

(By Russell B. Porter)

BOGOTA, COLOMBIA, August 15.—Nazis are waging both economic and propaganda warfare against the United States in Colombia. They began the drive to get Colombian trade away from the democracies before the war, using their askimark system. Though they failed to destroy the United State's predominant position, the country's trade actually increasing, the Germans during the barter years succeeded in dealing a severe blow to British sales.

Now the Germans have begun a campaign to convince Colombian business that its interests call for it to play ball with Germany

instead of the United States after the war. If they succeed, it will be a serious matter for the United States as it will establish a virtual economic colony of Nazidom as next door neighbor of the Panama Canal, key to the defense of the Western Hemisphere.

The Germans are conducting political and economic propaganda along parallel lines. They are telling Colombians that Germany is bound to win and that the present battle of Britain is the last stand of the democracies. In a few weeks, they say, the war will be over with Chancelor Hitler master of Europe and controlling all its markets, in which they assert Colombia must sell her coffee.

For the last 3 or 4 months they have been spreading propaganda among buyers that they would be able to deliver German goods in September or October at prices substantially lower than United States shippers can quote. They even have offered to pay penalties if they fail to deliver.

THREAT TO COLUMBIA

In cases where contracts have been made it is reported Germans now are buying in the United States through German-American agents to make good on the deliveries. This, however, they are trying to keep secret.

The main object of their commercial propaganda is to build up the psychology that Colombians had better jump on the band wagon. They say that when Germany wins she is going to be very strong economically as well as militarily and can economically help or ruin a small nation like Colombia, with only 9,000,000 population.

Why, they ask, should Colombians pay 25 or 30 percent more, and cash at that, for goods in the United States when they can buy the same articles cheaper on easy credit terms in Germany and when Germany can market Colombian products in every European country?

Although Germany has been unable to ship any goods here for nearly a year, she is keeping her commercial organization intact and working at full speed, forwarding Nazi propaganda against the United States. This organization is headed in the German Legation, where the German Minister and commercial attaché, with consular officials throughout the country, all active Nazis, coordinate the work of the German Chamber of Commerce and important German business houses here.

These firms contribute to Nazi propaganda with money and personnel and also to charitable funds for German clerical and other workers unemployed because of wartime suspension of trading but held here waiting for business resumption after the war.

From the United States viewpoint there is an unfortunate angle in that many Germans are kept going financially only because they are agents or work for agents representing American goods sold here. Worse than that, part of the profits German firms make on sales of United States goods are used to finance anti-United States propaganda.

Nazi agents even have the effrontery to use advertising appropriations made by United States manufacturers and exporters to favor newspapers, magazines, and radio stations that advocate the Nazi cause and attack the United States. They withhold advertising from those supporting the United States or even giving that country an even break. Until now American business apparently has been unaware that this was going on, and little or nothing has been done to stop it.

Pre-war German trade methods were mild compared to what may be expected from a victorious Germany. After several unsuccessful deals, the Germans in 1937 made a barter agreement that became effective September 30, 1938. Its effect was virtually to monopolize the European market for Colombian coffee in German hands.

Before the barter Colombia had a substantial free market for coffee in Europe. Afterward Germany controlled that entire market. The contract gave Germany the right to resell in Scandinavia and the Balkans coffee she bought from Colombia. She induced Colombia to agree to this by paying a premium over prices on the New York coffee exchange.

Then Germany sold coffee in Europe at a discount under Colombian prices to get exchange with which to buy war materials. The Nazis paid with machinery and other merchandise, so Colombia got no foreign exchange and could not buy in the United States with the proceeds of these European sales. Germans even dumped coffee in the New York market in direct competition with Colombian coffee, according to well-founded reports.

COLOMBIAN EXPORTS SHUT OFF

Germany took about 20 percent of Colombia's coffee, her main export crop. The loss of these sales has hit the country hard economically and made it easier for Nazi propaganda, which emphasizes the large United States coffee purchases from Brazil and asserts the United States cannot buy enough here to dispose of the Colombian surplus now piling up. As coffee prices have been going down to approach the point where the bean cannot be produced and sold abroad at a profit, some Colombians are listening to the siren song of Nazi economics with willing ears, hoping for the Germans to return to the market as buyers for all Europe.

Ambassador Spruille Braden and the staff at the United States Embassy here are working hard trying to keep Colombian markets for the United States. They are emphasizing to Colombians that the bilateral trade of totalitarianism is a false economy, as shown by Germans dumping Colombian coffee and breaking prices, which nullified the apparent advantages of the barter system.

In the long run, they say, the only sound and profitable system is that of multilateral trade with free markets and international exchange. Among other measures, they are supporting extension of reciprocal-trade agreements.

Presidential Preference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ

OF NEW MEXICO

UNITED STATES SENATOR FROM NEW MEXICO

Tuesday, August 20 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

STATEMENT BY HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ, OF NEW MEXICO

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, on August 1 I wrote a statement for a newspaper under the heading "Why I'll vote for Roosevelt." I ask unanimous consent that it be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY I'LL VOTE FOR ROOSEVELT

(By Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ, Democratic Senator from New Mexico)

WASHINGTON, August 1.—The preamble to the Constitution of the United States is as follows:

"We the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America."

1. "In order to form a more perfect union." A perfect union cannot be effected unless the government or administration thereof takes into consideration all the people of the union. President

2. "Establish justice." What the framers of the Constitution had in mind in the establishment of justice was a justice that would be Roosevelt, like Presidents Washington and Lincoln, has made that his principal concern and has devoted his administrative energies to bring that about.

applicable to all and not to one particular element of society. Roosevelt has done this.

3. "Insure domestic tranquillity." Domestic tranquillity is only insured when you have a satisfied people, by treating them all equal and making it apparent that the Government is for the benefit of all, that duties and responsibilities should be assumed and shared by all, and that privileges and opportunities should inure to all.

4. "Provide for the common defense." Executive and Congressional activities of late prove conclusively to the world that Roosevelt and this administration are doing everything possible for the common defense not only of the United States but also those nations whose ideals and traditions are similar to ours.

5. "Promote the general welfare." When a government interests itself in the welfare of all elements of society and looks to the social, economic, and political welfare of said society, then it promotes the general welfare. Roosevelt has done this.

6. "And secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity." In these times of stress, when the United States may well be described as the last stronghold of liberty and freedom, the protection of the government to the constitutional guaranteed civil liberties becomes of paramount importance.

Can there be any question that Roosevelt has by every means at his disposal sought to secure these blessings of liberty to our generation and to those that are to succeed us? I do not think that a stone has been left unturned to retain the blessings of liberty not for one group but for all the people of this land of democracy.

7. "Do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America." To ordain and establish the Constitution demonstrates the will of the people of the United States. No one class, no one section, but the entire people of this country combined to establish and create the organic law under which this Nation has prospered and grown.

Everything that has been done by the present administration has been done under the Constitution. At no time, in no way, has the organic law expressive of the will of the people been disregarded. That is what makes the democracy. That is the democratic way of life to which Roosevelt has dedicated himself.

To particularize as to the blessings derived from our Federal Union: When our Thirteen Original States first organized the

Federal Union, it was the result of necessity, for each realized that it could no longer carry on alone.

My own State, New Mexico, has benefited more from the practical development of this Federal principle during the past 7 years than at any time during its membership in the Union as a State or as a Federal Territory—a period extending over almost a century.

I am emphasizing again that at no time have the people of New Mexico, or the State itself, enjoyed the practical blessings of democracy to the extent that these have been manifested during the past 7 years.

For instance, more public schoolhouses have been built in New Mexico in the last 7 years of Roosevelt than in the 85 years prior thereto. Conservation of natural resources, conservation of water resources, public highways, national parks, actual feeding of the hungry, soil conservation, forest improvements, home loans, improvements in the Indian areas, C. C. C. camps, old-age assistance, bank deposits, railroad retirement, education assistance through N. Y. A., reclamation, and the blessings of social legislation have all been enacted since 1932.

The Destroyer Deal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENNETT CHAMP CLARK

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 20 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

EDITORIALS FROM ST. LOUIS POST-DISPATCH

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two brief editorials from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, one of Saturday, August 17, entitled "Dangers of the Destroyer Deal," and the other of August 15, entitled "Chairman Walsh Against Admiral Stirling."

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of August 17, 1940]

DANGERS OF THE DESTROYER DEAL

Two news stories of grave significance came out of Washington yesterday.

The first of these was President Roosevelt's announcement that he is negotiating with London for transfer of certain British possessions in the Western Hemisphere, for use by this country as air and naval bases.

Acquisition of these strategic territories is a move which we enthusiastically approve. The Post-Dispatch, in fact, has been urging precisely this step for the last 10 years and more. The safety of this hemisphere, and particularly of the highly vulnerable Panama Canal, demands that the United States possess enough Caribbean islands and other territories to build a solid barrier for national defense.

The other dispatch from Washington records persistent reports that the President will act shortly to facilitate transfer to Britain of 50 American destroyers. The idea is said to be for Mr. Roosevelt to authorize the deal himself, rather than submitting it to Congress, where vigorous opposition exists.

Is there any connection between these two items? Are the destroyers to be swapped to England in return for the air and naval bases?

No, says Mr. Roosevelt, there is no connection. He emphasizes that he is not discussing destroyers, that he is trying to acquire bases, and that is all. What, a correspondent asks, will this country offer in return for the bases? The President refuses to be pressed. The Post-Dispatch correspondent reports his statements, and then adds:

"Informed opinion here, in spite of Roosevelt's denial, that the negotiations for the naval bases had any relation to the destroyers, inclined to the view that eventually the vessels would go to Britain in return for the ceded bases."

This country needs and wants those bases. It should have acquired them long ago. But any thought of bartering away part of our Navy for them—and a vital part, authorities assert—should be squelched at once, if anybody is considering it.

Let us take Mr. Roosevelt at his word and assume that he is not contemplating any such deal as that. The fact remains, however, that he is seriously considering the transfer of 50 destroyers to the British. There have been trial balloons and feelers along this line for months. General Pershing's speech was only one part of the campaign. Prointervention columnists have been pounding steadily at the subject. And many of the arguments have been eloquent, persuasive, moving.

To persons who may have been carried away by these pleas we recommend close reading of the radio address by Senator WALSH, reprinted in part in the Mirror of Public Opinion today. Senator WALSH is a Democrat, a sincere patriot, and generally an administration supporter. As chairman of the Senate Naval Affairs Committee he presented to the American people 3 months ago one of the finest, most rational reports on national defense in our history. Now he makes a devastating case against the destroyer deal on the two major grounds that (1) it would dangerously weaken the country's defenses; (2) it would be an act of war.

Yet this is the action Mr. Roosevelt is reported contemplating, and without the consent of Congress. Attorney General Jackson 2 months ago cited a 1917 law that caused abandonment of the proposed transfer of 20 Navy torpedo boats to Britain—a law specifically forbidding sale to any belligerent nation of an American naval vessel. But now a group of lawyers, men not connected with the Government, have evolved a tortured interpretation of the law under which they hold the President can give away or sell these vessels by Executive order.

Under this plan Congress is not to be consulted, because it would probably stop the deal. Is this democratic? Or autocratic? What other term than the latter exists to describe an action by one man to evade the restraints of the people's representatives, to dodge the judgment of the Attorney General, in order to aid England at the expense of our own defense?

Our people sympathize with the British in their fierce battle against nazi-ism. They want every legitimate form of aid sent to England, and with all possible speed. But on an impetuous step which weakens our defenses, a step opposed by high naval authorities, they must draw the line.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of August 15, 1940]

CHAIRMAN WALSH AGAINST ADMIRAL STERLING

Another retired admiral has sounded off on the proposed sale of 50 or more American destroyers to England. In an article released by the United Press on Tuesday, Rear Admiral Yates Stirling, Jr., retired, strongly endorses the transfer, and says these ships "will be fighting for America most effectively by being added to the British Navy."

This is typical of the bellicose retired admirals. It echoes the opinions of Admiral Yarnell, retired, and Admiral Standley, retired, which we commented upon Monday. It is particularly typical of Stirling's chronic war-hawk attitude. A few instances: On August 29, 1939, before the European war began, he told a veterans' meeting, "We should, instead of keeping out of foreign disputes that will affect our prosperity and security, go into them with both feet." As far back as last October 19 he urged that the United States join the Allies. Last Memorial Day he called on this country to enter the war "actively."

While the retired admirals are sounding off, the admirals on active service are keeping discreetly silent. One official voice has been heard, however—that of DAVID I. WALSH, chairman of the Senate Naval Affairs Committee, whose report on national defense 3 months ago was a historic document.

WALSH'S view, expressed in a radio broadcast Tuesday, is exactly opposed to that of Admiral Stirling, retired. The destroyer proposal, he said, "makes mockery of our declared policy of neutrality and nonintervention; it is an act of belligerency and war." Then he paid his respects to the retired admirals and other warmongers:

"There is only one group who can honestly favor the transfer of our destroyers. This group has advocated our entrance into the European war from the beginning."

"Why gamble with the United States Fleet?" Senator WALSH asked. Let Admirals Stirling, Standley, and Yarnell, retired, answer that one.

Attitude of Railroad Brotherhoods Toward Conscription

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 20 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

LETTER FROM RAILROAD BROTHERHOODS

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter signed by the chief officers of the five railroad brotherhoods in opposition to the so-called Burke-Wadsworth conscription bill.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEAR SIRS: The undersigned chief executives of the organizations representing engineers, firemen, conductors, trainmen, and yard-

men employed on the railroads of the United States have this day given consideration to the provisions of the proposed compulsory peacetime draft or conscription bill which contemplates the inducting into the military and naval service of the United States in the immediate future of some hundreds of thousands of citizens of this country for a period of training.

We refer to the Burke-Wadsworth bill now before Congress for consideration and feel that you should be made acquainted with our views, which we are confident reflect the views of the membership of these organizations employed on American railroads.

BORDER ON DICTATORSHIP

We are in general agreement with the prevailing sentiment in the United States that every support should be given to adequate measures necessary to the protection of our democratic institutions against attack from the force of dictatorship, both within and without our country. However, grave doubt exists in many quarters with respect to the wisdom of enacting a peacetime conscription bill when it is believed other adequate measures are available. Such proposal borders closely on the principle of dictatorship, and we hold the view that regimenting our people is un-American and unnecessary.

NO MONOPOLY OF PATRIOTISM

Patriotism is not the monopoly of those who are feverishly urging this conscription bill. We may rightly assume that all citizens are patriotic and, if given the opportunity and impressed with the necessity for their doing so, they will volunteer their services in defense of our country.

At present there is a vast army of unemployed, thousands of whom would be desirous of enlisting in the military and naval service if given an opportunity to do so, but they are so circumscribed by technical military and naval physical requirements that many of them are precluded from voluntary enlistment. Consideration should be given to assisting them in removing minor physical defects so that they may be acceptable as volunteers.

BLOW AT DEMOCRACY

Compulsory military service in time of peace is the very antithesis of freedom. It involves an infringement on the very principles of democracy which it is invoked to defend.

It imposes upon the individual a mandate to give service which he may not be in position to render without serious sacrifices on the part of himself or his family or both; and this at a time when there are thousands of other individuals who would be glad to avail themselves of the opportunity to serve if such opportunity were not denied by the restrictive rules observed by the recruiting service.

WILL COLOR WHOLE LIFE

The youth of our country who are inducted into the military and naval services under the principle of conscription and who are made to serve will quite naturally acquire the viewpoint that forceful means should be adopted in all the affairs of life as an avenue to achieve desired ends.

While you are giving thought to the Burke-Wadsworth bill, let not the hysteria of the moment sweep you into supporting such a drastic and ill-advised change in the American way of life. Democracy means that the state exists to serve the individual.

CREATES DANGEROUS MACHINE

The program at present contemplated will cause hundreds of thousands of our youth to become war minded and will, if carried out, establish the fabric of a giant war machine which experience teaches us cannot and will not be permitted to rust in peace.

War games inevitably lead to war. The voluntary enlistment principle confines and restricts the dissemination of war mindedness to actual necessities through the longer term of service, and above all, preserves the principle of democracy in its strictest sense.

INFRINGES CIVIL LIBERTIES

These organizations are wholeheartedly in accord with the establishment and maintenance of an adequate national defense and their membership will not be found wanting in any support of such proper measures, but we are convinced that under present conditions the regimenting of our people according to the contemplated military pattern is unnecessary and is an infringement upon the civil liberties which they may reasonably expect to enjoy.

We trust that your committee will not favorably report the Burke-Wadsworth military-conscription bill.

Respectfully yours,

A. JOHNSTON,
Grand Chief Engineer, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers.

J. A. PHILLIPS,
President, Order of Railway Conductors of America.

D. B. ROBERTSON,
President, Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen.

A. F. WHITNEY,
President, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.

T. C. CASHEN,
President, Switchmen's Union of North America.

Deportation of Harry Bridges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LELAND M. FORD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 20, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE LOS ANGELES TIMES OF AUGUST 15, 1940

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Los Angeles Times of August 15, 1940:

[From the Los Angeles Times of August 15, 1940]

ENOUGH INVESTIGATIONS

The proposal of Senators SCHWELLENBACH and AUSTIN to have another investigation of Harry Bridges instead of ordering his deportation is mere stalling. Bridges has been investigated often and completely and the chance that any new facts would be developed is very slight.

As for an investigation by the Justice Department, to expect that, under a politician like Attorney General Jackson in a campaign year, to result in firing this pernicious alien back where he came from is to expect too much. Whatever Jackson's opinion of Madam Secretary Perkins, which cannot be very high, he would be reluctant to reverse her action in the matter. He would be still more reluctant to reverse his friend, James M. Landis.

While it was undoubtedly the public scandal of the Bridges case that caused the President to transfer deportation out of the hands of the Labor and into the Justice Department, if Jackson had any desire to investigate Bridges, he has already had plenty of opportunity to start and he has done nothing. If Congress ordered him to do so, he would have to make a gesture, but that it would be more than that is unlikely.

Unless Congress itself acts, Bridges will not be deported until there is a change of administration at Washington or unless some he-organization such as the American Legion adopts District Attorney Fitts' San Diego suggestion and removes him by the seat of the pants.

Air Route From Norfolk to Cincinnati

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 20 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE ELIZABETH CITY (N. C.) DAILY ADVANCE

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial from the columns of the Daily Advance, published at Elizabeth City, N. C., issue of Saturday, August 10, 1940, entitled "May the Board So See It," which editorial interests itself in an application for a certificate of convenience and necessity to fly the Norfolk, Va., Knoxville, Tenn., and Cincinnati, Ohio, route. I have been greatly interested in this application, for the granting of it would provide North Carolina with an east-to-west air line which is so badly needed in my commonwealth, in particular view of the fact that we are not so fortunate at the present time as to have transportation facilities of that sort, and I am further interested for the reason that it is my opinion that the inauguration of such a route would lend itself to our national-defense program.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Elizabeth City (N. C.) Daily Advance of August 10, 1940]

MAY THE BOARD SO SEE IT

Not available when Pennsylvania-Central filed its application for a certificate of convenience and necessity to fly the Norfolk-Knoxville-Cincinnati route, but interesting and competent notwithstanding, it seems to the Daily Advance, are figures on the business of the Pennsylvania-Central Airlines Co. on the route from Norfolk to Washington.

For the 3 months beginning May 1, 1940, the line has handled a total of 3,806 revenue passengers as compared with a total of around 500 revenue passengers a month when the line was first established.

In the matter of air express, shipments number 1,264 for the first 6 months of this year, which is more than all shipments handled during 1939.

Air mail dispatched from Norfolk over the period the line has been in operation will amount to more than $80,000,000.

These figures provide, as pointed out by the Norfolk Ledger-Dispatch, concrete evidence of the capacity of such a service as that proposed to be established between Norfolk and Cincinnati by way of Elizabeth City, Rocky Mount, Raleigh, Greensboro, Winston-Salem, Asheville, and Knoxville to generate patronage as it goes along.

When, then, it is remembered that North Carolina, through which a great portion of the proposed service would operate, ranks higher in population, industry, and potential traffic than many States or sections now enjoying air services, and when it is remembered that the proposed service would provide the only east-west air line between Washington and Charleston, is not the wisdom of its operation so obvious as to make out a case for the granting of a certificate of convenience and necessity without further ado? The Daily Advance sincerely hopes that the Civil Aeronautics Board, reviewing all the factors in the case, may so see it.

Insurance That Really Insures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 20, 1940

ARTICLE BY HAROLD PUTNAM

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under the privilege granted to me to extend my remarks, I include therein an interesting article which appeared recently in the Tribune, a newspaper published in my district, written by Harold Putnam and entitled "Insurance That Really Insures."

INSURANCE THAT REALLY INSURES

(By Harold Putnam)

It is so seldom that the State of Massachusetts ever forgets its Puritanical ways long enough to dream up a valuable new twentieth-century program that a very special cheer is in order for our own Division of Savings Bank Life Insurance.

More than 30 years ago a progressive young attorney felt it was time the State or National Government did something to provide low-cost insurance for its citizens. Because he was an Einstein for figures and a Job for patience, he forced the usually complacent legislators of the Commonwealth to make insurance as easily obtainable as a postage stamp and almost as cheap.

He wasn't very popular in some quarters. He still isn't even though the years have been kind to him and even though American history will record Louis Brandeis as the great jurist who carried on the liberalism of Oliver Wendell Holmes in the Supreme Court.

Today saintly Louis Brandeis is an old man. But he's still interested in the record of Savings Bank Life Insurance. He's as tickled as a boy when someone risks a financial neck to say a good word for the savings-bank program. For it's still hazardous to buck the interests who hate low-cost insurance.

Throughout a vigorous and useful life he's fought the antisocial entrenchments of organized financial monopoly. Simply, at his Chatham retreat these summer days, he'll tell you: "If I can save the little fellow a dollar through an honest insurance program, that's just as good as putting a dollar in his pay envelope."

Savings Bank Life Insurance has hoed a tough row. In more than 30 years only one State—New York—has been able to pass enabling legislation to give its people the benefits of the low-cost program. This healthy youngster, savings bank insurance, has had difficulty making itself heard above the din of its sickly big brother, private insurance.

But the story is beginning to make an impression in important places. Judd Dewey, of the Bay State division, went to Washington last spring to testify before the Temporary National Economic Committee. Armed only with a single page of statistics, comparing private and savings bank life insurance, he caused fact-weary Senators to sit up and gape.

And the facts have not been challenged. But a well-organized conspiracy of silence has seen to it that they have not been publicized. Private insurance in many instances costs from almost twice to almost four times as much as savings-bank life insurance. The financial Frankensteins didn't want that to get noised around.

The tabulation that startled the gruff old Senators was prepared by Massachusetts State Actuary Eugene F. Caldwell. It is known as Form N–1–35 and is available at the division of savings bank life insurance at the statehouse.

The report shows that savings-bank life insurance makes available 10 years of $1,000 worth of insurance for a man aged 35 for only $28.90. The total 10-year cost in private companies ranges from $51.95 to $103.20. Senatorial eyes popped.

Fortunately for the fulfillment of the democratic dream an idealist puts over an ideal every now and then. Brandeis was democracy's twentieth-century dreamer. Luckily for the people of our times, he was also one of the great legal minds of his day; clever enough in the cunning ways of the law to force the politicians of the Bay State to do something that was good for all the people and of no financial benefit to them as legislators.

The savings banks of the Commonwealth have been making this low-cost insurance program work. Able administrators in the statehouse have kept the wheels turning. Democrats (with a small d) everywhere have turned their eyes to Massachusetts to see how this idea survives in the face of cruel opposition.

The record today speaks for itself. Form N–1–35 made so much noise that many people began to wonder where they'd been for 30 years and why they hadn't heard more about savings bank life insurance. They're beginning to know.

Louis Brandeis is a soft-spoken man. He had the intellect to devise the program and the legal talents to secure the necessary legislation, but he's lacked the wiles of the propagandist to force his dream to the attention of the whole Nation.

But if you could pull up a chair in his Chatham living room, he'd smile at you and say: "If I can save the little fellow a dollar through an honest insurance program that's just as good as putting a dollar in his pay envelope.

Congestion of War Industries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 20, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE TEXARKANA GAZETTE

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Texarkana Gazette of August 18:

[From the Texarkana Gazette of August 18, 1940]

CONGESTION OF WAR INDUSTRIES

While it was planned to scatter war defense industry over a wide area in locations as far distant from seacoasts and international boundaries as possible, in order that there might not be congested areas where attacks could be concentrated, developments thus far show that both war orders and industrial expansion is gravitating toward already well established industrial areas close to the seaboard and the international border on the east and north.

The allocated munitions load, for instance, is centered in the 10 northeastern States of Massachusetts, Connecticut, New York, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Delaware, Maryland, Ohio, Illinois, and Michigan, almost to the exclusion of all other States.

The following figures show where the bulk of the war plants and Government contracts are being placed:

New England	$30,897,617
Middle Atlantic	85,169,009
South Atlantic	7,351,919
East North Central	12,424,284
East South Central	1,832,089
West North Central	5,446,857
West South Central	871,177
Mountain	1,574,181
Pacific	1,585,237
Location unknown	10,778,327

The West South Central group is composed of Arkansas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, and Texas, to which less than one million has been allotted, the division among the four States being as follows:

Arkansas	$20,109
Louisiana	10,964
Oklahoma	76,690
Texas	763,414
Total	871,177

The east-south-central area shared only a little better, as also is the case with the mountain and Pacific areas. New England and Middle Atlantic get the lion's share.

The trend is the same as that which existed just before and during the World War. There was great concentration of industries in areas already congested. This caused migration of both skilled and common labor from other regions, much to their detriment. While these areas suffered because of those facts, the overly built-up industrial areas had their troubles after the war, when war industries were choked off, leaving large numbers of workers stranded far from their original homes.

It is important that there be a minimum of concentration not only for the greater benefit of the most area while municipal munitions and war equipment are being turned out, but for the protection of all regions when demand drops to a minimum after the present emergency has passed.

It is important also that war industries be scattered as a defense measure in itself. It is far easier for Germany to inflict damage upon British war industries than for the British to damage the German industries, because the British industries are congested and the German industries are scattered.

"On Order"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. PARNELL THOMAS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 19, 1940

LETTER FROM HON. J. PARNELL THOMAS OF NEW JERSEY

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter which I have today addressed to the Secretary of War, and which contains observations made by me in regard to the defenses of Puerto Rico and the Panama Canal on my recent trip to these two United States possessions.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., August 19, 1940.

Hon. HENRY L. STIMSON,
Secretary of War, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: It is important that you immediately investigate the deplorable state of our military preparedness in both Puerto Rico and in the Panama Canal Zone. I have just returned from a visit to these United States possessions and, frankly, I am deeply shocked at what I observed. Certainly in Panama, which I had visited 3 years ago, I expected to find favorable improvement, but I regret to advise that outside of structural additions and a moderate increase in antiaircraft defense, I found nothing in the way of increased preparedness that would warrant handsprings. The failure of the War Department to bring about marked changes in our Panama Canal defense within the last 3 years is beyond human understanding.

Abraham Lincoln once said: "Let the people know the truth and the country is safe." Perhaps the same thing is true today. At any rate all foreign powers must know the sad state of affairs in Panama and Puerto Rico, so certainly, therefore, there is no sense in keeping it from our own people. I will, accordingly, present to both you and to our people the observations which I recently made with the hope that quick and necessary adjustments will be forthcoming. I am also passing on certain recommendations which I hope will be helpful.

PUERTO RICO

While this island of 100 miles in length is supposed to be the outer guard of the defenses of the Panama Canal it nevertheless is practically totally unequipped to even repel an insurrection, let alone an attack from without, for at present we have some 3,500 troops stationed on an island with some 2,000,000 people. The morale, though, of our small body of troops is excellent; the officers are capable but the equipment is almost totally deficient. There are no heavy coastal guns, only a small amount of field artillery and antiaircraft defense is almost totally lacking.

The Air Corps is so weak—12 planes—it is a crime. The Sixty-fifth Infantry (native troops) is a very well-trained and highly disciplined unit. It is one of the bright spots in the Puerto Rican military establishment. The small-arms equipment for all of the troops is antiquated; old weapons and old methods are used in training; mechanized equipment and mechanized training do not exist.

PANAMA

I visited the Panama Canal Zone 3 years ago and therefore I was much interested to see what changes had taken place in the interim, but outside of an improvement in antiaircraft defense, there has been little in the way of betterment.

Air Corps

The Air Corps, which would ordinarily be the strongest defensive arm for the Canal, is where it was 3 years ago. The number of modern planes on hand is a joke, there being only 23 modern pursuit planes. The small number of other pursuit planes on hand is antiquated and hardly good enough for training purposes. The bombers available are of short range, and then there are 10 observation planes which are nothing more than nineteenth-century hacks.

There have been five accidents since July 22, 1940, in the Panama air corps, three pilots having been killed.

Two new flying fields are under construction, one in the zone and one a number of miles north of the zone. Both of these fields will have large runways and in the case of Howard Field, at least, very modern hangers. It is my opinion, though, that a foolhardy blunder is being made at Howard Field by placing the hangars in the open, for some of these hangars, if not all of them, could be readily constructed in the side of existing large hills. I understand, from a reliable source, that consideration has been given to this plan but that to date it has not received approval. If the new open-field hangars are to be anything like existing hangars in the Panama Canal Zone, they must necessarily afford an excellent target for enemy bombers, so I think it is essential that we discontinue the plan of constructing the open-field hangars in order to place them in the side of hills, as has been so successfully done by European nations.

The men serving in the Air Corps are not equipped with any grounds weapons other than pistols and therefore would be unable to defend themselves and their equipment against enemy parachute troops.

Coast Artillery

This is well situated. The guns are heavy and in good condition but, like everything else, the number is too small. One of the greatest criticisms which I must make of the Coast Artillery is that the guns are not turreted as a protection to the crews against aerial machine-gun fire, nor is there any semblance of camouflage.

The crews are well trained and their morale is good. The officers know their business.

Ammunition is in good supply, but there is no reserve of heavy guns.

Antiaircraft

There has been substantial improvement in antiaircraft defense in the 3-year period. Searchlights are numerous and well placed; range finders are modern and in good condition, but like everything else, there is no reserve supply.

The guns are somewhat antiquated, most of them being of the old 3-inch variety. There are no new 90 mm. guns on hand, and none of the new 37 mm. guns. We are no better than 50 percent equipped in antiaircraft defense in the Canal Zone today.

As in the case of the Coast Artillery, there has been little camouflaging of gun positions. In fact, I saw only one camouflaged battery.

All guns are now being manned with full crews. The morale of the men and officers is excellent and the positions alert for emergencies.

Field artillery

The field artillery is relatively good, but like other arms, lacking in quantity. Pack artillery is excellent; both the officers and men are considerably above the average physically and fit to stand almost any hardship. Pack animals are in good condition. The guns, particularly the 75 mm. howitzers, are modern and in fair supply. Ammunition, though, is not sufficient.

Infantry

The Infantry is totally lacking in modern equipment. There are on the average about 35 gas masks to every 129 men. The gas mask shortage, incidentally, is the rule all over the zone.

The supply of hand grenades is far below natural requirements. In fact, there is about one hand grenade to every soldier in the Panama Canal Zone. There is a small supply of antitank guns on hand, which arrived in May, but there is no ammunition as yet for these guns. No modern automatic rifles—the supply of old automatics is inadequate.

Another criticism which I would make is that there is not enough time devoted to drill, and much too much time spent on matters which add little to the military training of a soldier, such as construction of new barracks.

One whole Infantry regiment does not even have a drill ground and another regiment has spent practically all of its time while in the zone in building houses. Such work should be done by the Engineer Corps. Most of the regiments have to supply sabotage and transit guards; the latter guards are placed on ships going through

the Canal, which work should be assumed by either the Navy or the Marine Corps, as both of these services are much more familiar with the operation of ships than are doughboys.

Motor equipment

Almost no prime movers. I understand that on the Pacific side there are three prime movers which, as you know, is the latest model of mechanized transportation. The ordinary truck supply is unable to meet present needs. Available motor equipment is good, but of "the olden days" variety.

General

The soldiers, however, even though meagerly equipped and outside of their lack of knowledge of modern weapons, are probably the best in the world. Their morale is excellent; they are in good health, smart, and well disciplined. The officers, with a few exceptions, are capable and deserving. There is a tendency, however, on the part of the officers to think too much of the way we "used to do things," too much thought about living conditions and not enough on what repels the enemy. This may be, however, the result of instructions from Washington. For instance, all new construction by contract is of the de luxe variety, an open invitation to enemy bombers. Some of the forts and posts look more like summer resorts than they look like centers of defense. I agree that we should afford both the officers and the soldiers recreation and rest centers, but I cannot help but believe that some of the recreation places in the zone, particularly for the officers, are bordering on the luxurious.

I think that a check-up in the attitude of the War Department toward the defense of the Panama Canal is not only timely but urgently necessary. I recommend that some of the higher-ups in the War Department visit Panama, see for themselves, and then upon their return force through the essential requirements. Let's not just determine the need for matériel for our insular possessions from a swivel chair in Washington. The War Department should realize that we cannot defend the Panama Canal with fancy swimming pools, elaborate officers' clubs, and golf courses.

Further, we should without delay complete the Trans-Isthmian Highway running between the Atlantic and Pacific oceans. There remains only 20 miles of this highway to be built, but these same 20 miles remained unfinished when I visited Panama 3 years back. This project has been hanging fire for years. The failure to complete it is both a scandal and a disgrace.

Another important step which we should take is to place all oil tanks and ammunition reserves below gound. At present both are invitations to and targets for airplane bombers and shell fire.

While I fully realize that the War Department is strenuously attempting to solve some of our defense problems, nevertheless many of us are irritated by the delays and by the apparent inefficiency and red tape in high administrative circles. I personally feel that there is no excuse for the lack of progress over the past 3 years in the defense of the Panama Canal, and it is my belief that if all the money that has been appropriated by the Congress for the Army had been used for defense purposes we would be properly equipped today, and yet we are led to believe by persons well up in the present administration that the hundreds of millions of dollars appropriated have been put to good use. I am frankly of the opinion that in the case of the Army, instead of it having been put to good use, it has been forced into nondefense channels, of which Puerto Rico and the Panama Canal Zone are striking examples.

Mr. Secretary, I also have another matter which I intend writing you about in the next few days, and that is the matter of transportation of troops. On my recent trip I was able to make certain observations along these lines, and I think I am in a position to make some recommendations to you.

I am sorry that I had to make this letter as long as it has turned out to be, but in view of its importance I think it necessary to tell as complete a story as possibile.

Thanking you for your patience and hoping that that which I have written will be of interest to you and that you will soon be able to make whatever corrections are necessary, I am,

Sincerely,

———— ————.

Refugee Children

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. F. MACIEJEWSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 20, 1940

Mr. MACIEJEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Seventy-sixth Congress may well be one of the most significant in the history of our great Nation. The war in Europe, with its ruthless conquest of the small nations of that hemisphere, has left the rest of the world aghast.

We, as representatives of the people of America, have been called upon to enact into law measures designed to protect our country from invasion, have appropriated moneys to assist in the rehabilitation of those countries which have been destroyed, and many other important measures affecting the well-being of our own country and the world generally. However, in my humble opinion, I do not believe there is a more important or a more humanitarian measure come before a Congress than that proposed in the bill, H. R. 10323, to provide a temporary haven from the dangers or effects of war for European children under the age of 16, which was reported favorably to this body by the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization a few days ago.

The purpose of this bill is to authorize the issuance of visitors' visas for temporary admission into the United States to European refugee children under the age of 16 years, regardless of their nationality. Further, the bill would remove the existing discrimination against children of certain nationalities who cannot get immigration visas because their national quotas are full and who cannot get visitors' visas because they cannot prove a clear ability to leave the United States when the present emergency is over.

Extensive hearings were held by the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, of which I happen to be a member, on various bills and House joint resolutions introduced by Members of this House, namely, the gentleman from Michigan, Hon. JOHN LESINSKI; the gentleman from Illinois, Hon. ANTON F. MACIEJEWSKI; the gentleman from Rhode Island, Hon. HARRY SANDAGER; the gentlewoman from New York,, Hon. CAROLINE O'DAY; the gentleman from California, Hon. FRANCK HAVENNER; and the gentleman from Michigan, RUDOLPH G. TENEROWICZ. At the conclusion of the testimony taken at the hearings the committee voted to report out H. R. 10323, which accomplishes the purposes as specifically proposed by the authors of the several bills and resolutions.

The bill permits visas to be issued to children under 16 years of age who are seeking to enter the United States as temporary visitors to be safe from the dangers or the effects of war, notwithstanding (1) they are under 16 years of age, unaccompanied by, or not coming to one or both of their parents; (2) their tickets or passage are paid for with the money of another, or they are assisted by others to come; or (3) their tickets or passage are paid for by any corporation, association, society, municipality, or foreign government, either directly or indirectly. It further provides, however, that in all cases assurances must be given that are satisfactory to the Attorney General that such children will be properly cared for and will not become public charges. Attention is directed to the fact that this proposed legislation will not entail an additional cost upon our Government and that existing administrative machinery is ample to take care of the additional work incident to the administration of the provisions of this bill.

To prove to the rest of the world that America is still willing to do its share toward rehabilitating the distressed, let me urge that this bill be enacted into law.

The Propaganda for the Draft Is in Full Swing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN L. SWEENEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 20, 1940

ARTICLE BY HUGH RUSSELL FRASER, "INSIDE WASHINGTON"

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a very timely article by the distinguished author, Hugh Russell Fraser, responding to the story Snuff Boxes and Safety, by Ruth Finney, newspaperwoman, which appeared in the Scripps-Howard newspapers in a recent issue. Mr. Fraser, an outstanding American, does credit in exploding this sob story, one of the many we can expect by controlled newspaper writers whose ears are constantly attuned to their master's voice.

INSIDE WASHINGTON

(By Hugh Russell Fraser)

The propaganda for the draft is in full swing.

Most vicious single sample of it was recently headlined in the Scripps-Howard newspapers. Written by Ruth Finney, a specialist in gushy sob stories, it appeared in every newspaper in the chain on August 14, 1940, under the title "Snuff Boxes and Safety."

For pure and unadulterated nonsense and number of half truths it hit a new all-time low. And yet to the uncritical reader, who consults his fears and not the hard realities, it was a masterpiece. Indeed, it was and is exhibit No. 1.

The story opens with a comparison between the debate on conscription now going on in the Senate and a similar debate in the British Parliament a year ago. The inference, of course, is that if Hitler can invade England, 22 miles from the Continent, so also can he as easily invade the United States, 3,000 miles away. She avoids the bald statement but leaves the inference.

All the way through the story the United States is placed in a similar position with Britain. In fact, the names of the two countries are used almost as geographical synonyms. No attempt has been made to be fair.

No suggestion or even so much as a hint is given that perhaps the two countries are not in the same geographical situation. Army and Navy experts testified at length before the Senate Naval Affairs Committee and declared that the enormous technical difficulties in the way of an invasion of the United States by any foreign power were so formidable as to make such an attempt wholly impractical.

To cite the latest careful analysis, Hanson Baldwin, military expert of the New York Times, writing in the August Harpers, says: "Probably the maximum force that could be transported—even if control of the sea were wrested from us—would not be much larger than 50,000 men."

No, no analysis or contrast is made by Ruth Finney. Such an attempt would defeat the purpose of a propagandist. The specialist in sob stories deals in half truths. Hard realities would becloud the issue and lead to a little calm thinking. They must be avoided as so much poison.

True to the title of the story—the title which the Washington News happened to carry—fun is poked at references in the debate to George Washington and Daniel Webster. It seems Webster and Washington are synonymous—again by inference, of course—with snuffboxes in the Senate. And snuffboxes in the Senate—oh, yes, my dear—are out of date. And that if Webster denounced conscription—well, you know, he didn't know about Hitler and how he is going to sail into New York Harbor tomorrow!

In one paragraph, fun is poked at Senator DANAHER, of Connecticut, because he had the effrontery to demand in the Senate just what the grave military and naval emergency was that necessitated a sudden resort to the draft of millions of men when it would take years to even adequately equip the Army we now have. Again references are made to the British Parliament. Again fun is poked at—this time, Senator WHEELER, because he suggests that armed invasion of the United States is a slim possibility. And the writer holds up her hands in holy horror at this statement because, she says, she can read headlines in the newspapers out on the street reading: "Bombers Blast Britain. Zero Hour Near!"

The sob sister has the jitters. One can almost hear her screaming—in fact, running from the Senate gallery with hands plugged firmly to her ears lest she hear these terrible men, WHEELER and NORRIS and LA FOLLETTE and VANDENBERG and TAFT.

The very sight of these men who plead with the Senate to face some practical and hard realities nauseates her. What! These men who say that a Nazi, or any other kind of a bomber, cannot operate more than 750 miles from their bases when, as a matter of fact, they are wiping out Britain 22 miles away! Why, it is incredible! Oh, stop these men! Please! Please! I can't stand it!

But Ruth Finney does not merely scream out her fear. She writes paragraphs that indicate she stands on her tiptoes and fairly shakes with it! She yields herself wholly and completely to it. And it is the kind of fear that thrills! Not every reporter can experience it. It only comes to those who give themselves up to it absolutely and perfectly.

Hitler in New York! Hitler on Atlantic beach heads! And, she says, the American Navy "6,000 miles away from Atlantic beach heads." This last statement is plainly false. The Atlantic Squadron is in the Atlantic, Ruth Finney to the contrary. The truth not only is that the Atlantic Fleet is right at this moment in the Atlantic, but it also happens that Hanson Baldwin, one of the outstanding military and naval experts, who has studied military and naval organizations abroad, says in the August Harpers: "The Atlantic Squadron—contrary to general belief—is not a push-over for any power." And that even without our coastal defense.

The No. 1 sob sister, however, is especially incensed at the Senate galleries which applaud the anticonscription cause. It seems also that they applaud—horror of horrors!—those speakers who suggest that "wealth should be drafted as well as men."

She continues:

"So the debate moves slowly on, safe from interruption today or tomorrow by bombs or the tramp of invading feet. Just as Hitler said it would."

The fact that Hitler never once mentioned the Senate of the United States, or the House, or the debate therein, past or future, does not deter Miss Finney. It is a good phrase to tack on. Besides, it's real scary. Anything to frighten people.

For the truth is simple: Only by concealing the facts or by distorting them beyond recognition can you frighten people. Only by dealing in half-truths can you impair their judgment and warp their reason.

Is it true that the modern bomber has an effective range of 500 miles? Then let's not tell the people that. Pretend the correct figure is six times that amount.

Is invasion of the United States, within the next several years, a practical impossibility? Then let's not tell the people that. Let's talk about what Hitler is doing to Britain 22 miles away—and infer plenty, you know.

It is easy to scare people.

And—oh yes, my dear—it's so exciting. You don't know what a thrill you get. But you must give yourself up wholly and completely to it. Really, it's the grandest feeling. Yes; and pay no attention to those nasty men in the Senate. Just plug up your ears and scream.

Agriculture, the New Deal, and the Third Term

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER H. GROSS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 20, 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. CHESTER H. GROSS OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me at the Path Valley Picnic, Franklin County, August 17, 1940:

We are just starting out on a great political campaign that will no doubt be one of the hardest fought and bitterest campaigns in our political history. We have often heard men on the platform say, "This is the most important election we have ever had." Maybe that was so, but I believe that thoughtful men everywhere agree that the election to be held this fall is of greater importance than any we have yet had, barring none. And I as one of the candidates for office in this campaign intend to assume my fair share of responsibility for the success of the ticket.

And so here today I am throwing down the gage of battle to the New Deal and intend to deal with it through this campaign as though it were an armed bandit standing by my barnyard gate or a kidnaper beside the crib of my first-born. I am not coming to you preaching a doctrine of despair, as some politicians of the country are doing today, for I believe faith, courage, and resolute determination will carry us beyond the present frontiers into a new and better day. Time forbids that I discuss any of the issues of this campaign in great detail today. I shall do that from time to time. But here in rich, prosperous Franklin County, known far and wide for the stability of its people, its agriculture, and its industry, I do want to discuss this agricultural problem in some detail.

After all, farm income is the governing factor of our national economy and agriculture is still the basis of our national wealth. A profitable agriculture solves the dual problem of idle acres in the country and idle men in the city. It is well established that a dollar produced from the soil adds $7 to our collective income. Therefore we find that in 1928 and 1932 our agricultural production was the same but due to declining prices we were short in 1932 in our collective income $43,000,000,000.

Agriculture has been the guinea pig for experiments throughout the past 7 years, and the farmer has been the victim of low prices and no markets for his products and at the same time has seen increased costs of the things he has had to purchase, and taxes have grown more burdensome.

The New Deal, upon the recommendation of Secretary Wallace, has been trying to keep the farmers sweet by large appropriations from the Federal Treasury. In spite of these heavy appropriations, the average farmer's income has gone down about $500 per year. Secretary Wallace in trying to fool the farmer has figured these $3,000,000,000 as farm income. This has not fooled the American farmer, because he knows that every dollar the Government ever gave away they took from somebody before they could give it to him, and that these $3,000,000,000 have simply become a mortgage on the real estate of the country.

Have you ever stopped to think who got these farm subsidies? Do you know that a dozen firms, life-insurance companies, and individuals got $508,841 of this money—more than half a million? Do you know that the richest farmer in this congressional district got $2,350 in 1939 to let some of his acres lie idle? I wonder how many of you know that in 1938 this county received $168,000 from the Federal Government for letting their acres lie idle. That money had to be paid out of the taxes collected from the people, and those idle acres in normal times would have produced about eight times that much money's worth of products.

And while these acres were left to lie idle we were importing into this country vast quantities of products the same as you produce

here in this county; beef and butter, and potatoes and tomatoes, and corn and practically every other commodity grown here has been brought in from somewhere outside of this country. We can only find the solution to this farm problem in a sound agriculture policy honestly administered. Had some of the money squandered by the New Deal on agriculture in the last 7 years been spent on research work to find new uses for agricultural products we would be farther along the road to recovery today. The biggest help the American farmer can have from the Government is the Government to see that he has the American market.

Secretary Wallace points to the fact that some South American country purchased twice as many automobiles under a recent trade agreement as they had before. We in turn, on checking the record, find that for that 100 percent increased sale of automobiles we received vast quantities of agricultural products in return. And when we check the record as to how many automobiles were included in that 100-percent increase we find that instead of buying 100 automobiles, as they did in 1937, they bought 200 in 1938.

There isn't a farmer under the sound of my voice today that doesn't know that if we had the American market, that if we had dollar wheat, and 80-cent corn and 10-cent hogs—and these are ordinary prices I am mentioning—Franklin County would buy next year a thousand new automobiles, 300 farm tractors, and everything else in proportion. The American farmer is the greatest consumer we have in the country. He is not looking for cheap money. He is not looking for credit. He is not looking for a hand-out, but he is rightfully demanding fair prices for his products so that he will have money to get rid of the credit he has already created. And all the while the New Deal has been trying to regiment and regulate agriculture we find them making it harder for everyone to get along.

How many of you know that under Wallace's new plan the Federal farm-lending agencies have all been huddled together in one organization and that about the only way to get a farm loan now is to sign on the dotted line, and when you do that you sign away every bit of liberty so far as the individual operation of your farm is concerned?

The Farm Credit Administration right now has $100,000,000 of farmer loans overdue. A considerable part of the $1,600,000,000 in Federal land-bank and land bank commissioner loans are now delinquent, and the Farm Credit Administration has foreclosed on farms to the amount of $130,000,000. I am wondering what the Government is going to do with all the farms that it is getting in its hands. Is it any wonder that the farm leaders of this country are declaring that the Wallace ideas are unsound and dangerous?

Many of the farmers now obtaining loans from the Federal Government are handed a budget as to how they shall spend the money they receive from their farm. I am quite sure that no one ever before thought the time would come in the United States when the Federal Government would resort to this sort of regimentation. The Republican Party does not believe that we have to go into war to restore business and agriculture in this country. Nor do we believe that we have to go down in defeat and surrender our liberties under the Constitution to find the answer to our problems. The average man and woman has an abiding faith in the American system of orderly and balanced constitutional government and in our American system of free enterprise. These 7 long years of the New Deal have been a terrible test to men, but I can assure you that the Republican leaders of this country have stood firm and today stand defiant and rededicated to the fundamentals of the American faith.

America has made up her mind to be free again. Free to prosper according to the bounty which a kindly Providence has entrusted to our care. As I look back through the years and think of the part agriculture has played in our national economy I am convinced that the farmers of America are going to stand out this fall as they never have before in the defense of liberty and constitutional government.

THE NEW DEAL

You will remember in 1932 Roosevelt was elected and took over the reins of government. You will recall the platform of '32. We also know that when he took over—which he really did—he ignored the '32 platform. And then came the "must" legislation, blank-check appropriations, the political purges, and the hand-picked Supreme Court, together with a lot of powers unheard of in America granted to the President. Now he refuses to give them back. The platform of '32 pledged a balanced Budget; pledged a 25-percent reduction in all appropriations. But it did not say when. He immediately started out with the "brain trusts." They constituted and incorporated a group of ideas. We have seen them vanish.

Moley was banished to News Week. Tugwell was exiled. General Johnson retreated. Donald Richberg went back to his legal practice. Frankfurter was promoted to the high court and Jim Farley went to the Yankees. Then came the plugged dollar and the double-header Thanksgiving. Then came the splurge, the surge, the purge, and the dirge. Then came the killing of pigs as well as the plowing under of candidates at Chicago. Then came the blue eagle and some alleged "reds" in high places.

I am now thinking of Ma Perkins and Ickes and Hopkins, and Aubrey Williams, and Sidney Hillman, and a score of others in executive positions in the Federal Government whose Americanism is questionable. This is the group that is defending Harry Bridges and many other aliens who should be deported.

Then came the $100-a-plate dinners and the $250-a-copy convention books. We remember the 1937 speech in Chicago and now we have the 1940 Chicago "blitzkrieg" to quarantine all the Democrats. Seven years ago they declared war on unemployment. Since that time we have spent money lavishly and experimented in dozens of ways and still we have as many unemployed as we had 7 years ago. What claims the New Deal has for support from these unemployed people now after 7 years is a mystery to me. The Chicago platform continues to promise relief. If they had the solution to this problem why did they not apply it long ago? If they have no plan why do they ask to be continued for 4 years more? The Federal Reserve report for 1940 tells us that we today have 10,000 fewer banks than we had in 1929 and that still we have $5,000,000,000 more deposits than we had in 1929. So that during the last 7 years we have lost 10,000 banks. Bank loans and investments have gone down $7,000,000,000 and deposits have gone up $5,000,000,000 and unemployment still stands at 10,000,000.

We have done a lot of social legislating and that is a grand thing but why talk so much about a 40-hour week when there is no job? Why spend so much time discussing collective bargaining when there is nothing to bargain about? Since 1932 the Congress has appropriated more than $60,000,000,000. In the last 18 months more than $21,000,000,000 has been appropriated. The new tax bill that will soon go into effect contains 360 pages of new taxes and the New Deal mill grinds on. The House has recently passed legislation that would be beneficial to the country as a whole which the New Deal-controlled Senate refuses to act upon. I am referring to the amendments to the Wagner Labor Relations Act and to the Walter-Logan bill as well as other legislation.

The New Deal theory that the less we produce the more we will have has been proven a farce. The theory that we can spend ourselves rich has likewise been exploded. A man on W. P. A. who received a starvation wage for 7 years realizes that he is just where he started, only that he is 7 years older. Relief by way of the Federal Treasury made possible by the reckless appropriation of billions of dollars has not solved our problems. A dollar of relief money spent has solved no one's problems but when a workingman earns a dollar in private industry and walks into the grocery store and lays that dollar on the counter and says give me a dollar's worth of beef, or milk, or potatoes, that is a sale that registers back on the farm where we are wrestling with low prices and depression, too, and it helps solve the workingman's problem as well as the farmer's.

THE THIRD TERM

The third-term question is at last directly before the people. What they propose to do about it I don't know, but I have great confidence in the final judgment of the people and have my own ideas of what is going to happen on November 5. It was George Washington who first said, "The love of power and the proneness to abuse it which predominates in a man's heart is one of those strange human qualities." Then came Thomas Jefferson, who was unwilling to take a third term. Then came Andrew Jackson, who recognized it as a dangerous procedure. Then came the great Democratic convention of 1896, when the flaming crusader, William Jennings Bryan, was coursing through the land. They denounced the third term and declared it to be an unwritten law that no man should be eligible for a third term. That was the Democratic Party speaking.

Then came the resolution in the United States Senate in February 1928, which was adopted almost unanimously, declaring that it would be unwise and unpatriotic and fraught with peril to our free institutions to allow a third term. When we refer to the record as to who supported that resolution we find dear ALBEN BARKLEY first; then there was Senator PITTMAN and Senators HARRISON, ASHURST, GERRY, GLASS, KING, HAYDEN, MCKELLAR, NEELY, SHEPPARD, SMITH, TYDINGS, and WHEELER. All Democrats voting for the resolution. It is just a bit funny when we check those names against 1940 and find how these tried, true, and trusted statesmen of the United States Senate had changed their minds and now decided that a third term would be a first-class dose of medicine for the country.

The third-term idea is not new with the President and was not caused by recent national and international developments. The foundation for it was laid by the President himself in 1936 when he had the Democrats of the Nation abolish the two-thirds rule. That made him the czar of the Chicago carnival with the power to dictate every move of the convention from the White House over the telephone. The President was not drafted; he simply nominated himself in the same manner in which the dictators of Europe are nominating themselves. Dictator procedure runs like this: Who nominated Hitler? Hitler. Who nominated Stalin? Stalin. Who nominated Mussolini? Mussolini. Who nominated Roosevelt? Roosevelt. Who nominated Wallace? Roosevelt. And yet he had Senator BARKLEY at the Chicago convention state that he had no wish to be a candidate for a third term; that he exerted no influence on the delegates; that he did not seek the opinions of the delegates; that he had no desire to continue in office or to be nominated; and, finally, that the delegates were free to vote for any candidate. Yet for 4 years prior to this time, as good men were rising and becoming Presidential timber, President Roosevelt was doing like Charlie McCarthy says, "I'll mow you down," and Wallace plowed them under.

When Secretary Ickes said there can be no other than Roosevelt in 1940 and started his one-man boom the White House accepted it with good grace. When Ickes published his book on The New Democracy he had in mind the continuation of the New Deal and a changed form of government. When Senator GUFFEY issued his new book on Roosevelt Again the White House was silent. When Secretary Wallace in California in 1939 said that Roosevelt would have to be nominated and elected the White House was pleased.

But I want to call attention today to the fact that of these boosters of a third term in the Cabinet not one of them had the courage to go before the electorate of this country and ask for public support, not one of them ever proved their vote-getting ability. They were brought in by the President and placed in the positions they now hold regardless of their interest or ability to serve. There was only one man in the Cabinet who could commandeer votes and that was Postmaster General Farley, and he has now walked out on them. When Governor McNutt came along and the country began focusing its eyes on him the President turned the income-tax experts on him and for 7 months they dogged his footsteps. When Jim Farley expressed his willingness to be a candidate the President said Mr. Farley would make a good President but could not be elected because he was a Catholic. Yet a few days ago before the convention of Governors the President declared that religious intolerance must not be permitted in America.

In the President's acceptance speech he says, "When in 1936 I was chosen by the voters for a second time as President it was my firm intention to turn over the responsibilities of Government to other hands at the end of the term." Here the President clearly indicates that he felt that it was a matter of personal choice with him as to whether he should or should not continue. But I believe that the good-thinking people of America, those who love liberty, who believe in democracy, who want free enterprise to continue and religious tolerance to hold sway are going to tell him on the 5th of November whether he shall be relieved of these duties. They are going to tell him whether he is indispensable or not. They are going to tell him whether he is the only man in 130,000,000 people in whose hands the Government is safe. If we are to reelect Mr. Roosevelt for a third term, I wonder what argument we will present 4 years hence as to why we should not elect him for a fourth term, and so on. So let us have deep, straight, honest thinking as we go among the people discussing this matter of a third term and the departure from the traditions that have been made sacred by usage and custom over 160 years in the life of this Republic.

I attended the Philadelphia convention, and I want to say to you that there was no one who controlled anyone there. I never saw an assembly that was so wide open and refused to be controlled as that group. I had the privilege of a reserved seat on the platform throughout the convention, but on the last day I went to the gallery at the far end of the auditorium in the upper row just to see what I could see and how it felt to sit up there, and as I looked down upon that great convention of 15,000 people under the strong lights, well dressed, happy, representing every walk of American life, I was thrilled when I thought here in the last country in the world where democracy is still enthroned we have the privilege of assembling in a body like this to select the leaders that we want. I was still more thrilled when finally the man that that convention selected appeared on the platform. A man who was born from poor parents on a little farm in the Middle West, who had worked his way up in the world to where men everywhere were talking about him. He was none other than that charming personality, that dynamic character, and that stalwart American, the next President of the United States, Wendell L. Willkie.

Those "Frozen" Funds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 20 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE WILMINGTON (N. C.) STAR

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask leave to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial under the heading "Those 'Frozen' Funds," appearing in the Wilmington (N. C.) Star of the 10th instant.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wilmington (N. C.) Star of August 10, 1940]

THOSE "FROZEN" FUNDS

Secretary Morgenthau's announcement that the United States is pondering disposition of funds belonging to conquered nations "frozen" in this country includes a hint that they might be seized as part payment on war debts. The Treasurer does not say that this is definitely considered, but the money is here, the governments it belonged to have fallen, and if we do not step in, the only logical course would be to turn them over to Germany which also owes us $1,300,000 and is not likely to pay as long as Adolf Hitler is in power there.

We are constantly told to accept this as a realistic era. Sentimentality in every form is in the discard. This condition may not be pleasant or agreeable. We may want to cling to the softer dealings with other nations, as in the past. But the powers which have gained the upper hand in Europe won't have it that way. Only realities count. And as long as this is so there is no good reason why the United States should not employ their method as far as the money of defunct governments impounded here is concerned.

There are reported $3,500,000,000 of these funds under padlock in this country, almost one-fifth of the total war debts. Their seizure would be justified, we believe, on the score that we have infinitely more right to them than Germany has. Also, their seizure would place another handicap upon Herr Hitler, who would not be able to use them in war purchases.

A Letter From Benedict Arnold to the Government of Uncle Shylock

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN L. SWEENEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 20, 1940

LETTER FROM "BENEDICT ARNOLD"

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter from Benedict Arnold, specialist in treason, who evidently keeps informed of the persistent efforts of friends of Britain in governmental circles, who not only request but demand that once more we sacrifice our blood and our treasury in the interest of imperialism.

HELL-ON-THE-STYX, *August 19, 1940.*

To the Government of Uncle Shylock, and especially to Senators Pepper, Minton, Lee, and Sheppard, and Secretaries Stimson and Knox:

With the express permission and approbation of His Satanic Majesty, the ruler of our present abode, and at the command of my dearly beloved King, George III, who, with myself, is in voluntary retirement here, I address to you, in his behalf, the following commands:

Continue your efforts to raise that army to aid England in holding the territory which I, my predecessors, and my successors added to the glorious Empire. Their acquisition cost us so much in blood that we should not be asked to relinquish them now. It is your bounden duty to assist us in holding them.

You, Senators PEPPER and MINTON, will report immediately to England, where your bursts of "oratory" will greatly strengthen our coast defenses. Your hot air can also be used to inflate our balloons.

You, Senator LEE, are ordered to report immediately to Buckingham Palace. The position of court jester is now open, and your antics can be counted upon to amuse the royal children.

You, Senator SHEPPARD, who made such a success of your last great effort, the prohibition law, persevere in your duty to my successor and namesake, George VI. As chairman of the Military Affairs Committee, I am counting on you to raise that army for our defense.

You, Secretary Stimson, will continue in your laudable efforts to find a war for your country. When I, George III, had a secretary of state for war who could not find one, I fired him. Look at the wonderful record my secretaries made. Go thou, and do likewise.

You, Secretary Knox, will continue to work 24 hours a day to get us those 50 "obsolete" destroyers. After you have succeeded in that, will you then return to Britain, with interest, the $15,000,000 your Government exacted from us for the *Alabama* claims.

His Gracious Majesty also commands me to thank the following Departments of your Government for their cooperation in various instances, as enumerated below:

Your State Department: For ordering your ships and passenger planes to our ports, so that we can take off your mail without any inconvenience to ourselves, and for not questioning our right to do so.

Your Treasury Department: For so ably assisting us in the purchase of war supplies, and for forgiving us our so-called war debt.

Your Navy Department: For the valiant undercover efforts made to supply us with your newer torpedo boats. (D—n that upstart, WALSH.)

Your War Department: For its effort to supply Britain with an army. Think of the wonderful experience it would get fighting for us. Ask France, or Belgium, or Poland.

Your Justice Department: For investigating all propaganda except ours. Your country, in particular, should realize that we never use such dirty stuff. The New York Times and the Herald Tribune take care of all that.

Your Labor Department: For allowing our English actors to monopolize the movies and the stage in your country. (They are so much more polished, you know!)

GEORGE III,
King of Great Britain and Ireland, Defender of the Faith, Destroyer of Washington, Emperor of India, and All Points North, South, East, and West.
By BENEDICT ARNOLD, *Secretary.*

On my own behalf I offer you honorable gentlemen this little item to ponder over. I received a paltry amount for attempting to sell West Point. Think how much more you can get for selling a country.

And why do you allow such obstructionists as Senator HOLT, Senator LUNDEEN, Congressman SWEENEY, and all others like them, to set that mangy thing called Americanism above the welfare of our empire? Have them transported to England, where they can all be hanged, drawn, and quartered. If you will take my advice on another subject, you will substitute Rule Brittania for that doggerel The Star-Spangled Banner as your National Anthem. You will also delete from your so-called Declaration of Independence all of the infamous references to His Majesty, George III.

By the way, I have never run across my old cronies, George Washington, John Paul Jones, Thomas Jefferson, Commodore John Barry, Richard Montgomery, or Nathan Hale since my arrival in the realm of His Satanic Majesty. Could any of you supply me with their present addresses?

Promising all of you who will assist Britain now a very hot reception upon your arrival here, I am,

Your obedient servant,

BENEDICT ARNOLD.

Aviation Progress and Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 20, 1940

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH, OF WEST VIRGINIA

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me yesterday over the blue network of the National Broadcasting Co.:

Civil aviation in this country is today at a peak never before reached in any part of the world. Less than 40 years after the first flight by man in a powered aircraft, the United States, its adjoining oceans and its neighboring continent to the south are criss-crossed with air lines of our own creation. Throughout our States and in our Territories, flying has become a major industry. Pilots are being trained by the thousands, factories are rapidly expanding, and everywhere, on the lips of our men and women, the urgent necessity of this expansion is a matter for anxious discussion.

A NEW TRANSPORTATION MEDIUM

On this national aviation day it is important that we look at the record. There is no greater achievement in our history than that written by the men who have broken the trails in the conquest of a new medium of transportation—the upper air. They faced hardships and dangers more dreadful than those of the earlier pioneers and did it with cheerful courage and intensity of devotion that has wrought incredible results. They worked with the tools of modern science, testing, adventuring, driven by a vision of a new world where human beings will have freer movement, better access to the necessities and comforts of living, closer contact with the far reaches of the earth.

It is a story that inspires unending admiration, that stimulates the imagination.

Take first what has happened in commercial air transport. It is only 12 years since the first coast-to-coast service began. Once a day then a small, single-engine plane took off from Newark for the Pacific, carrying mail and an occasional passenger sitting on the mail sacks, in an open cockpit. By the end of July of this year 1940, there were 20 full-fledged, constantly operating air lines in the United States proper, flying 37,180 route miles, in 322 planes.

On July 31, this year, these air lines had made a safety record that is unequalled; a billion and a quarter miles without injury to passenger or crew. In a period of a year and 5 months, they had carried nearly three and a quarter million people.

Outside this country proper, 44,470 miles of American flag lines cross the Atlantic and the Pacific, penetrate Alaska, and circle Mexico, Central and South America. This magnificent job of building air transport in foreign lands has been done entirely by our own people. Buenos Aires, 7,000 miles south of the tip of Florida, is now only 4½ days' flying time away from the United States, and it will, within the next 2 years, be brought within 48 hours of our coast. Hong Kong, in China; Auckland, in New Zealand; Nome, in Alaska—all weeks away by surface ship travel—are now but a matter of days from our eastern cities by this miracle of air transport. Before the war began last fall, it was possible to reach Paris and London in less than 2 days. Lisbon, the only neutral European port now available, is reached in 28 hours.

AIR LINES BUILD GOOD WILL

In times of peace, nothing could do more to bring the citizens of other parts of the world into close contact with us than these services by air. They have been of inestimable value to this country in the building of good will, in fostering new and speedy means of communication by mail, express, and personal travel, and in the opening of undreamed of possibilities for commerce. By the latest example, the inauguration of air service to Australasia this month, we tap an export and import market of $600,000,000 a year, which so far, because of the slowness and infrequency of steamer service, we have had but a small share.

Here in our own country the development of the air mail pick-up-and-delivery system is of vital importance in expanding to hundreds of communities the advantages of air-mail service. More than 125 towns and cities are to be served, and it is my hope and belief that hundreds of points will be added within the next few years.

In time of national emergency these air lines of ours would be of vital importance to our country's safety. Secretary of War Stimson said the other day before the Military Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives, "Air power today has decided the fate of nations." In measuring the extent of our air power, our commercial air lines must be measured, too, for they are an arm of our military air force. As Col. Edgar S. Gorrell, president of the Air Transport Association of America, recently told me, these air lines are more ready than any other industry to respond instantaneously to the demands of a national crisis. In a matter of hours, every resource of the air lines, personnel and equipment, can be devoted to the execution of plans for assisting in the mobilization of our military air force at any point throughout the Western Hemisphere. Unlike any other peacetime industry, the air lines, because of their mobility, bear a unique relationship to the national defense. Of all peacetime industries, this alone can and will be used as a whole, if need be, in the defense of our country, through acting as the vital transportation complement of our military air forces as may be required. It is for this reason that the policy of our War and Navy Departments is to maintain the air lines at all times as a functioning unit. It is more important probably than in the case of any other industry that there should be applied to the air lines the principle of keeping personnel in their civilian positions when our manpower is conscripted, and of providing even for the expansion of our air lines, both in terms of personnel and equipment. This expansion is so important to our national defense that it is entirely probable that the War Department might even assign to the air lines certain of its own personnel and equipment, if need be.

There is another side to the picture of our civil aviation development. It is in the growth of private flying that a nation becomes really airminded. The C. A. A. has accomplished much within the past 2 years. Programs for the increase in the number of civilian pilots, and instruction of mechanics for encouragement of the production of better aircraft, for training more and better instructors, for regulations that make for greater safety—all these have been under way and are bearing fruit. On July 1, this year, there were 41,006 certificated pilots of all grades, 13,873 planes, and 10,230 certificated mechanics. The factories at present have 500 private planes on order and about 400 more transports building for the air lines. This number will naturally increase as the defense program moves ahead. In 1939 private and charter pilots flew 178,000,000 miles, and it is estimated that this will leap to 240,000,000 by the end of 1940.

NATION NEEDS AIRPORTS

We need at once to formulate a Federal-airport program whereby landing fields by the thousands will be built in America. There are many progressive cities not possessing big populations which nevertheless have been farsighted. In my own congressional district, a great modern airport is nearing completion at Morgantown as eloquent testimony to what can be accomplished through cooperation, planning, and hard work.

One of the most gigantic jobs done has been the civilian pilot-training program initiated in 13 colleges as an experiment in the first semester of 1939. The result now is that just under 10,000 young men and women were trained in college and noncollege courses by June 30, and such was the stimulus given to air-mindedness that more than half again as many learned to fly in commercial schools at their own expense. The still further extension of the plan, at the President's request, will add another 50,000 by the end of the college year next June. Of that number the first 16,000 are now being trained in summer courses, the second group will begin their instruction in September, and the third next February. The Army and Navy think so highly of the results obtained that they have assigned liaison officers to work directly with the Civil Aeronautics Authority in coordinating the work with that of the services; 12,485 mechanics were trained in 1939, and under a new program 6,275 are now being trained under the National Youth Administration and many more in private industry for work in the factories, at airports, and on the air lines.

One of the most remarkable features of pilot training has been the degree of safety achieved. In the last war more students were killed while learning to fly than died in battle in France. Under the civilian pilot-training program only three casualties have occurred.

For many years I have been firmly convinced that our aircraft and allied industries are located so as to be vulnerable to possible aerial attack. During debate on the House floor, March 13, 1936, I sought to impress my colleagues with the need, as I saw it, to decentralize our armament-manufacturing plants. At that time I said:

"In this Nation practically every concern manufacturing aircraft is located on the coasts of the United States, and due to the danger from attack we should give serious consideration to the need for aircraft development inland."

At that time I laid the matter before the President, the Secretaries of the War and Navy Departments, the chairmen of the House Committees on Military and Naval Affairs, and also the then Director of Air Commerce.

With each passing month since that time the need for decentralized defense factories has become more apparent. I trust protective action in the expansion program will bring the establishment of defense units in many parts of America which are removed from our borders. It is not too late, but now is the time as actual production begins.

AVIATION MERITS STUDY

There is a growing movement in Congress to establish standing committees on aviation in both the House and Senate. Our shipping has its special committee devoted to our maritime affairs. Our land transportation has its special committee devoted to its peculiar problems. The whole matter of building roads on the ground is given the attention of a special committee. It is entirely proper, therefore—indeed, it is necessary—that transportation by air and the essential matter of building roads in the air should receive the exclusive attention of a standing committee charged with the duty of fostering and developing aviation. Of all forces in the modern world, aviation, more than any other, is changing the very map of the globe. In the greatest legislative body known to mankind, the Congress of the United States, the significance of aviation should be truly appreciated by the creation of standing committees which can devote their labors without mitigation to the further strengthening and development of America's proud position in the heavens.

Indeed, I go further. In the President's Cabinet, instead of having a separate Department of War and a separate Department of Navy with military aviation scattered between them, there should be a single department of national defense under which the three great arms of our Nation's power may be coordinated on an equal footing. Our fighting forces by air, by land, and by water should, on an equal basis, find a place in a single great department with one coordinating head at the Cabinet table. Senator CLARK of Missouri and myself have introduced in Congress legislation which would make this a reality. This proposal will be vigorously pushed.

Again and again during the past year the power of aviation has been impressed upon us by a ruthless invader. May our country learn, while God gives us time, to so nourish our aviation that the Stars and Stripes will fly ever triumphantly over land and sea, over mountain and wave, supreme against the jealousy of unprincipled aggressors.

To this great task we should bend every energy both in government and in private industry.

In building for an indomitable military strength we must, as the President has said, recognize "Civil aviation is * * * the backlog of national defense," and that "The country's welfare in time of peace and its safety in time of war rests upon the existence of a stabilized aircraft production—an economically and technically sound air-transportation system, both domestic and overseas—an adequate supply of well-trained civilian pilots and ground personnel."

PEACETIME AVIATION LIVES

Fortunate it is that through creation of an expanding civil aviation we not only build our military strength but also contribute immeasurably to the pleasure and prosperity of our people in their civilian life. This thought should always be kept uppermost. It is forcefully expressed in a significant statement recently made to me by the Honorable Harllee Branch, Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board. "Despite the necessary emphasis today on military aviation," Mr. Branch says, "civil aviation still provides a noteworthy example of American engineering genius. The building of our air transport system and the development of private flying may not have as much appeal now as the filling of the air with defensive aircraft, but its steady climb to usefulness and importance in the past few years is an achievement that is the pride of the Nation. Wars have been fought through the long span of history. Conquerors have come and gone, remaining in most cases only as names for schoolboys to learn. But the story of human progress is largely measured in terms of communication and transportation. The man who built the first wagon wheel did more to push forward the conquest of the earth than Alexander and all his legions. The Wright brothers, with their rickety airplane at Kitty Hawk, wrote the future of the race in brighter letters than any known before. When wars are at an end, man will make the earth little and friendly with this gift of wings."

To this sentiment I add the thought that onward and upward must be the flight orders for America.

Report of the Employment and Civil Service Committee of the Veterans of Foreign Wars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 20, 1940

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, it is a great privilege for me to have opportunity to ask to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the extremely able and challenging analysis of unemployment and related problems prepared by the employment and civil-service committee of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, under the chairmanship of Mr. Dan Campbell.

REPORT OF THE EMPLOYMENT AND CIVIL SERVICE COMMITTEE

To the Commander in Chief, Officers, and Delegates of the Forty-first Annual Encampment of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States:

For the fifth consecutive year it is the privilege and pleasure of your chairman to address himself to this group. Frankness requires it should be stated, with whatever reluctance, that the problems which directly concern the work of the committee are as acute and perplexing today as they were 5 years ago. However, it is not the veteran only who is a victim of this economic maladjustment of our social system. The people of the entire Nation share the burdens engendered by unemployment in lesser or greater degree. The pressure is greatest, however, upon two groups of our citizens, namely, youth, in the age range from 16 to 24, and the worker who has passed the industrial deadline of 40, into which group the veteran falls. And this latter group is in the most unfortunate position of all, because by the time a man reaches 40, family and other responsibilities have been assumed, so that the loss of a job is not only a great individual misfortune but a major tragedy for all concerned.

Your chairman will not burden you with figures covering the registration and placement of veterans during the past year, other than to submit that both for the year just past and for the entire 5-year period the employment chart bears a striking resemblance to that of a fever patient—a series of erratic ups and downs—but indicating no tendency to reach a crisis and straighten out to show recovery. Then, too, the total number of unemployed does not materially decrease from year to year, and the present estimates range from nine to eleven million so classified.

Unemployment is not only tragic in itself, but has brought many other serious factors into our social and economic life. For example, many students of history insist that a decline in the birth rate of a nation marks a turning point in its history. Whether this is true or not, under normal conditions, the birth rate in the United States was not expected to show a decrease until about 1990. But the economic effects of unemployment has already been reflected in a declining birth rate. When the primary schools open this fall, there will be one-fifth fewer children under 10 years of age than 1930, when enrollment in this group reached an all-time peak. In a time of great unemployment this might seem to be a good thing for the country in many ways. In one survey it was found that in 1933 only 27 percent of those applying for relief work were unmarried, but 5 years later the percentage had risen to more than 50 percent—youth without jobs cannot very well assume the responsibilities of marriage. One of the first major effects of this decrease in the birth rate will be a greatly lessened demand for school buildings, teachers, and so forth, thus further narrowing the field of employment, and this will eventually materially affect the whole system of education, public and private schools and colleges alike.

The present national-defense program is right now being brought into direct contact with one of the most serious effects of unemployment continued over a long period of time, namely, in its recruiting activities. During the World War, from the first draft, 500,000 were rejected as physically unfit for military service, representing approximately 16 percent of the total number examined in that draft. At that time this apparent physical deterioration of the race was the subject of much comment and discussion. Even more disturbing were the results of the Army's present campaign for new recruits. Col. Lloyd B. Magruder, chief recruiting officer of the Second Corps Area, reported that 32 percent of the young men volunteering in that area during May were rejected as physically unfit, and estimated that probably 60 percent of those from the large cities would be rejected for health and other reasons. These figures were so astonishing that your chairman took the matter up with the War Department and is informed that while the 32 percent above referred to was a local situation, yet the average rejections throughout the United States for all causes was 30 percent. During one recent drive to bring the Marine Corps up to full peacetime strength, the recruiting officers left the cities

and centered their efforts in the smaller towns and farming communities. There they found a better physical type, but many were rejected on account of bad teeth.

In peacetime the armed forces get most of their recruits from the lower-bracket families, and it is just this group, because of economic conditions, that finds it so difficult to procure the bare necessities to sustain life at anywhere near a normal level, as evidenced by the first physical manifestation of undernourishment, namely, underweight and poor eyesight, the dominant reasons for rejection. One-half of the babies born in one State were born to families on relief. How far reaching this low bracket income group affects employment and American life generally is indicated by the following analysis of the various income groups:

In a survey made by the national resources committee, under the direction of Dr. Hildegardner Kneeland, it was ascertained that the national income was approximately $59,983,000,000 (including the imposed value of homes occupied by their owners), and consumers at 41,000,000 family units and individuals. Of the 29,400,300 families spending nearly $48,000,000,000, the survey showed 14 percent getting under $500 per year; 42 percent under $1,000; 65 percent under $1,500; and 87 percent under $2,500 per year. Ten percent had incomes from $2,500 to $5,000, while only 1 percent had incomes from $10,000 up. Individuals had practically an identical income range. Combining the families and individuals into three groups, it was found that the lower third received under $780 per year, and that fully 70 percent of them were not receiving relief in any form; the middle third averaged $1,076 per year, while the top third averaged just under $3,000. The average for all groups was $1,386. This is the important factor that economists designate as the "buying power of the Nation"—and are agreed that it must be increased by a substantial amount if employment is ever again to attain normal levels.

Obviously, no successful attack can be made upon the problem of unemployment, unless there is much greater production and utilization of consumer goods than is true today. Much of the Government works program has been based upon a "subsistence" wage that has not increased incomes to a point where consumer demand would require the necessary step-up in production that would automatically absorb much of the present unemployment.

It has been suggested that increasing the national income by $10,000,000,000 would be sufficient to provide for the reemployment of the majority of the unemployed of today. When it is considered that approximately 78 percent of all consumer goods sold in the United States is purchased by the approximately 90 percent having incomes of less than $3,000, it will readily be seen that in order to release the necessary purchasing power there must be a decidedly larger increase in the income of that particular group, so that productive activity may be started and, as a result thereof, absorb unemployed workers at a wage scale above the bare subsistence level.

The current efforts to provide an adequate national defense, combined with the production of war material for shipment to Europe, may provide this necessary increase in income. This program has already stimulated employment at "prevailing" rather than "subsistence" wages, thereby increasing purchasing power to support a continuation of the larger production. A report released by the Department of Commerce, under date of July 24, 1940, definitely reflects this by showing that exports to Europe of United States merchandise in June were valued at $344,000,000, a gain of only 8 percent over such shipments in May, but 40 percent larger than the average for the corresponding month of the three immediately preceding years.

However, we cannot become too optimistic as to the effect of the national-defense program upon unemployment. It will most certainly take up some of the slack, possibly all of it, but we definitely know it will not provide a permanent abolishment of unemployment. As a matter of fact, we know that long continued and increasing production of war materials necessarily curtails production of consumer goods and thereby has a tendency to lower the general standard of living. Unless the national-defense program so stimulates normal industry to a point where it can absorb the unemployed, when the program is finally terminated, we will find ourselves face to face with the same old problem—no nearer a permanent solution than it is today. We must regard this, so far as unemployment is concerned, as a purely temporary relief, and should not for a moment be allowed to obscure the imperative need for a constructive program directed toward the removal of this plague of unemployment permanently from our national life.

Another important economic factor in the restriction of purchasing power is taxation. The purpose of taxation in a democracy is to provide ways and means for the ordinary and efficient conduct of the government, requiring each to contribute according to his means. The basic function of taxation has materially changed to include not only the maintenance of government, but to take care of the social problems that arise in our economic life, due in large part to the continuing problem of unemployment. Taxation in order to equalize social conditions is not only a new theory in our government, but is revolutionary. The far-reaching effects of taxation may be visualized to some extent when it is known that in 1937 there were 175,000 taxing units in the United States—Federal, State, county, city, town, village, school district, etc., collecting approximately some $17,000,000,000, and supporting an army of more than 5,000,000 officeholders The average citizen considers taxation as entirely remote from his own direct interests, because the other fellow pays the tax. But every person earning $1,000 a year pays $123.30 tax, or 12.3 percent of his income. These are mostly the so-called hidden taxes. They reach out, not only to the man with a job, but every person receiving income of any kind pays a proportionate share.

It is estimated that an average investment of $8,600 in plant, tools, and equipment is required to give one man a job in private industry. During the 1920's an average of $3,750,000,000 flowed into private business each year, but less than one-fifth of that amount has been going into private business since 1930. More investments means more jobs and more jobs means the best safeguard for our form of government. Congress is now engaged in studying this problem, not so much with a view to reducing taxes—that is quite impossible if our national-defense program is to be successfully carried to completion—but from the standpoint that larger investments, with more jobs and increased national income, will naturally produce greater revenue and make for a better functioning and more secure democratic form of government.

We veterans who have served in our country's wars believe our form of government is the best the world has so far known. Today we are living in the greatest changing period in all history. We have seen the lights of democracy snuffed out, one after the other, in Europe. In our own country there are many questioning whether a democracy can successfully solve the social and economic problems as effectively as other forms of government. There are two groups most vitally affected by unemployment, youth and those over 40.

As to youth, there are 21,000,000 in the United States between 16 and 24 years of age. It is estimated that 3,000,000 are girls who have married, 4,000,000 are still in school, 9,000,000 have jobs, but there are no jobs for approximately 5,000,000.

As to the over-40 group, since 1900 the life span has been lengthened 12 years. The United States Public Health Service made a Nation-wide survey and found that old age is the fastest growing cause of death. Of the 10 deadliest diseases it was found that the first 6 were those in which age is a predisposing factor. It was also ascertained that with the lengthened life span there has been no general increase in the degenerative diseases of late life. In the animal kingdom the life span is 5 times the period required to attain maturity. In man maturity is attained at 21 years, so that instead of three score and ten, the life span of man should be 5 times 21, or 105 years. With the continued advance of medical science, the time will come when old age will practically be the only cause of death, outside of accidents. This is the dream of science which is slowly becoming a reality.

Because the figures of the 1940 census are not yet available, it is necessary to go back to other years for data on old age. According to the 1900 census, our population was, in round numbers, 70,000,000, of whom 4,300,000, or 6 percent, were over 60 years of age. In 1930, with a population of 122,800,000, there were 10,385,000, or 8 percent, over 60 years of age. All census figures from 1880 on show a consistently steady increase in the number of every age group from 45 years on. The 1930 census also shows that there were then more than 28,000,000 persons over 45 years of age. In 1935 it was estimated there were 4,349,000 persons over 70 years of age. With a decreasing birth rate and a constantly increasing old-age group, it is only a question of time when we will be faced with the terrific problem of properly caring for an enormous old-age group who cannot earn any part of their own support—unless age as a barrier to employment is entirely disregarded. If men cannot secure employment after 40, it is already a grave problem as to how they may be cared for until they reach the age of 65, when they become eligible for social-security benefits. During the interim of 25 years the problem of support becomes a very vital one. And the veteran has a very definite and pertinent interest in this question, because in the age group of from 40 to 50 years he represents 43.3 percent of the total.

Among these two groups there has already developed strong resentment against the present form of government. The youth movement is charged by many with "leftist" tendencies, and the convention held in Washington a few months ago did not highly commend itself to the country. The older group has found expression through various ham-and-eggs or other old-age-pension programs. The intensity with which the over-40 group is thinking in terms of the future is best emphasized by the fact that during the Seventy-sixth Congress more than 1,100 bills were introduced calling for some form of old-age pensions.

Both groups feel baffled, confused, embittered, and resentful. Without jobs, youth cannot marry, have children, own homes, and live normal American lives. Age feels it has been cheated and defeated by life, not so much because of themselves as because of social forces over which they had no control. Among both groups unemployment has developed an unsatisfied, troubled, frustrated, discontented segment of American life, rebellious against a system of society which seemingly denies them the right to live a normal life. With such a background, not knowing where to turn, they might easily be persuaded that other forms of government were superior to our own—a great group who would feel they had everything to gain and nothing to lose.

A few years ago, such a statement would seem utterly fantastic. And yet we have seen other countries with similar backgrounds fall easy prey to dictatorships, with war as an outlet.

For 5 years the Veterans of Foreign Wars and other veteran groups have been making unemployment one of the major objectives of their programs, in connection with the Veterans' Placement and other employment services. The Employment Weeks have served to dramatize the problem through radio, press, and pulpit. Gradually the American people have come to realize that this is the most important question we have, second only to adequate national defense. Many other groups have sensed the importance of it. During the period of June 4 to 6, an Interfaith Conference on Unemployment was held in Washington. This was composed of the Industrial Division, Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, the Social Action Department, National Catholic Welfare Conference, and the Social Justice Commission, Central Conference of American Rabbis. Invited to participate were more than 40 individuals representing a great variety of interests, including your chairman. Their findings clearly recognize the gravity of the problem. In Congress itself, the Honorable JERRY VOORHIS, of California, organized a volunteer committee, nonpartisan, of some 70 members, who met weekly or oftener and have made a splendid report, a copy of which may be obtained by addressing the above-named Congressman.

During employment week of this year, Comrade Millard W. Rice secured time for a Nation-wide radio broadcast, on which speakers for the V. F. W., A. L., D. A. V., Veterans' Administration, and the Employment Service were heard. All of this has been constructively helpful in bringing home to the American public the gravity of the unemployment situation and the imperative need for remedial action.

On the situations created by the long depression and the large number of unemployed is a marked shortage of skilled workers in certain lines of industry vital to national defense. The old apprenticeship system, or other training methods, has been abandoned, except in minor instances. Many individuals because of lack of employment in their respective fields where they had acquired certain skills, found it necessary to take up other employment where possible, with the result that the old expertness has been lost of their efficiency at least greatly diminished, while young men and women who had not been able to secure employment found it increasingly difficult to do so because they had no experience. It became obvious that both groups should be provided with opportunities to recover lost skills and to acquire the rudiments of new skills if desired. With this in mind, a letter was addressed to the President of the United States May 4, 1939, requesting that he have the several Federal agencies set up a coordinated program of guidance, training, and reemployment especially designed for persons more than 40 years of age, etc. This letter and the reply of the Honorable Secretary of Labor, Frances Perkins, were given complete in the report of your chairman to the fortieth encampment at Boston last year. During June 21 and 22 a conference was held in Washington of of the Federal Advisory Council to Social Security Board, at which Comrade Millard W. Rice, legislative representative, and your chairman attended as representatives of our commander in chief. At this conference we again pressed for the adoption of some such program of training and retraining and it was finally adopted as one of the major recommendations of the conference. As an example of the speed with which action may be secured when necessary, it is worth while to state that the Social Security Board accepted the recommendations on June 22 and the National Defense Commission on June 28, and the plan was in actual operation the first week of July. Because of the part the V. F. W. had in this important matter, it is deemed desirable as a matter of record to give the report in full, as follows:

"Re: (1) Organization of the labor market and (2) training programs.

"The national-defense emergency sharpens the need of knowing what workers are available, where they are, and what they can do—or what they could do with a minimum training—and of so streamlining the functioning of the public employment service that both normal and emergency employment requirements may be known and met with a minimum of time, expense, and confusion.

"The Federal Advisory Council to the Social Security Board, subject to the controlling approval and acceptance of the National Defense Commission, therefore recommends that—

"1. All employers be encouraged to file promptly with their local public employment office, either directly or through such employment agencies as they regularly use, both (a) their immediate requirements and (b) their prospective requirements by occupation and skill; and not to advertise or solicit competitively anywhere, nor to recruit outside their immediate locality, until the local employment office has had an opportunity to meet such requirements locally or through its intercity and interstate clearance machinery.

"2. All persons employable for needed occupations but not now registered with public employment offices—including skilled workers now employed on semiskilled or unskilled jobs—be encouraged to register promptly with their local public employment offices and not to apply for work or move to other cities without first ascertaining from their local public employment office the localities in which there is a demand for their type and grade of skill.

"If recommendations 1 and 2 are systematically and thoroughly followed, undesirable and unwarranted dislocation will be minimized.

"3. The employment offices immediately proceed, in order of indicated need, with a reexamination of applicants in both active and inactive files, in order to ascertain the primary and secondary skills available in occupations for which demands are increasing.

"4. As a basis for, and to the end of insuring a comprehensive, flexible, and high-speed program of training to meet immediate and long-term needs for production and skilled workers:

"(A) The employment service at the same time ascertains the capacity of such workers to qualify for:

"(a) essential occupations by supplementary training;

"(b) immediate attention be given to the problem of selection and training of instructors for service within public and private agencies;

"(c) all training programs for national defense and all cooperating educational institutions which are Federally aided, supported, or controlled, be maintained without discrimination in the admission and treatment of trainees or students, on the grounds of race, creed, or color;

"(d) the National Defense Commission give organized attention to the early coordination of all needed facilities and activities for training and retraining purposes.

"5. To effectuate the foregoing, the Bureau of Employment Security proceed at once to a reappraisal of its organization, procedure, and personnel at Federal, State, and local levels, to insure that it is adequately prepared and staffed to meet all needs that the National Defense Commission may place upon it.

"6. Since the success of any employment and training program depends upon maximum decentralization and efficiency in each locality where supply and demand meet at the job level, steps be taken immediately to bring to full strength and effectiveness both State and local advisory councils to the employment service (as respectively required and recommended under the Wagner-Peyser Act), the same to be fully representative of the parties at interest; that is, an equal number of representatives of labor and of employers and, included among the public representatives, interested and qualified representatives of such groups or services as veterans, rehabilitation, junior employment schools, and vocational guidance, training, social and relief agencies, and of any other major groups dealing with employment and training whose resources and activities can best be coordinated with the national-defense program through the public employment service.

"7. Insofar as the powers of the Social Security Board permit priority or preference be given to citizens and to those who have taken out first citizenship papers.

* * * * * * *

"The Social Security Board and the National Defense Commission accepted the above report of the Federal Advisory Council on Employment Security on June 28, 1940, and the Social Security Board directed the Bureau of Employment Security to transmit the report to the State employment security agencies for their consideration and for their application as far as may be possible."

The foregoing report has been submitted to the State employment security agencies which, with the cooperation of the Board's Bureau of Employment Security, operates the 1,500 full-time public employment offices and the 3,000 additional employment service points throughout the country. It might be added that this Federal Advisory Council is made up of outstanding representatives of organized labor, management, and the general public.

The present set-up provides for an initial training of 150,000 students or trainees within the next 3 months. The program will be financed by an initial appropriation of $15,000,000. By the end of 3 months it is expected that about 1,043 vocational schools will be participating.

As the meeting of the Federal Advisory Council did not specifically discuss the place of the veteran in the program, your chairman addressed a communication to the Honorable Paul V. McNutt and suggested that he have Gen. Frank T. Hines, chairman, call a meeting of the subcommittee on veterans' placement. This was done on July 17, at which time it was disclosed that 50,000 of the trainees would be selected from W. P. A. and the 100,000 from other sources, and that, insofar as practicable, the veterans' preference now accorded on W. P. A. work would be extended to those desiring training. Also, that those assigned from the W. P. A. would continue to draw the same pay while in school as they did on the W. P. A. work—not paying them to go to school but paying them so that they might have the advantage of going to school. Veterans interested should keep in close touch with their nearest veterans' placement representative. At the meeting of July 17 a resolution was also adopted as presented by the V. F. W. recommending that on all national-defense activities veterans be given preference.

As to the V. F. W. bill asking for veterans' preference, there is nothing further to report on that. As between our bill and the A. L. bill, there are irreconcilable differences. Last year the A. L. encampment rejected the recommendations of its veterans' preference committee chairman, which, naturally, brought their bill in line with our own, but later the executive committee overruled the encampment, leaving the two bills in exactly the same position as before. We still do not believe it is the function of a veterans' organization to ask Congress to take away rights they already have. This matter was covered in detail in our report of last year.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Since the submission of the first report of your chairman, in which was outlined a definite program covering employment and civil service, it has been the practice of your chairman to ask for

a reaffirmation of those objectives, with such changes and modifications as may be necessary through adoption of legislation or resolutions by the respective encampments. It is therefore recommended that the following program be adopted as the objectives of the Veterans of Foreign Wars for the ensuing year on the subjects covered:

EMPLOYMENT FOR VETERANS

1. Federal civil-service preference for veterans as to:

A. Examinations:

1. Ten points to be added to earned ratings of service-connected disabled veterans, their wives, war veterans over age of 55, and widows of all deceased veterans, placement at top of civil-service register.

2. Five points added to earned ratings of all other veterans, and names placed next in order on civil-service register.

3. Quarterly examination privileges for all war, campaign, and expedition veterans, for 6-year-service veterans, and for 10-point persons.

4. Age and physical requirements waived if otherwise qualified.

5. Educational prerequisites waived if otherwise qualified.

6. Include war service as part of experience prerequisite time.

7. Credit experience gained in voluntary civic, social welfare, and veterans' service work, with same credit as if on paid basis.

B. Appointments:

1. Appointing officer to submit adequate reason for skipping over a veteran to Civil Service Commission; its reaction thereto to be available to the veteran or his representative.

C. Retention, upon reduction of forces, in all Federal agencies:

1. Preference of retention to be on basis of seniority, with all active military or naval service to be included for seniority purposes.

D. Removal only on basis of written charges; protection against lower job or salary status; transfers with same job classification and salary, as to handicapped veterans, if possible, rather than dismissal or retirement.

E. Reinstatement from furloughed, resigned or dismissed status, and after recovery from retirement disability.

F. Appeal Board to consider appeals on all Federal employment matters, veteran or his representatives to review records and present evidence.

G. Local postmasters to make permanent appointments of veterans in same order as original substitute appointments.

2. Same preference as to all Federal positions, contracts, public works, W. P. A., etc.

A. Effective preferences as to all war, campaign, and expedition veterans, the wives of unemployable veterans, and the widows of veterans who have been certified by any governmental agency as in need of employment, as to all administrative, supervisory, and work-relief employment for which they are qualified and available under the W. P. A.

3. Civil service for all non-policy-making, full-time Federal employees.

4. Preference to American citizens as to all governmental employment, services, contracts, loans, grants, and other assistance.

5. Optional civil-service retirement for all civil-service employees.

6. A census of all veterans in each community and State, cross classified as to ages, occupations, able-bodied and disabled, employed, partially employed, and unemployed, as to those:

A. Employed by the Federal Government, by States, counties, and municipalities, with and without civil-service status.

B. Employed under Federal, State, and local relief projects.

7. Urge employers, especially those who are veterans, to extend employment to qualified veterans.

8. A coordinated program of vocational training and placement in suitable employment of all unemployed employable older persons, particularly veterans.

9. Effective veteran employment and civil-service preference laws by all States, counties, and municipalities; greater uniformity of beneficial State laws relative to veterans, their dependents and their organizations.

10. Cooperation of local, State, and national employment committees of Veterans of Foreign Wars with other veterans' organizations, governmental agencies, and private employers to take such steps as will assure to all ex-service men the opportunity for permanent, suitable, gainful employment.

CONCLUSION

Veterans are urged to keep their registration alive in their nearest employment office.

The usual friendly cooperation has been maintained between your chairman and the veterans' placement representatives, and we wish to express our indebtedness for courtesies extended by Messrs. O. D. Hollanbeck and his assistant, Hugh Kerwin.

Our commander in chief has lent full sympathetic cooperation at all times and thanks are hereby extended.

As stated in previous reports, Comrade Millard W. Rice has been actively interested in the problems of this committee and has rendered valuable cooperation at all times, all of which is hereby gratefully acknowledged.

Respectfully submitted.

DAN CAMPBELL, *Chairman.*

JULY 26, 1940.

Steps Toward British Union, a World State and International Strife—Part II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. THORKELSON

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 19, 1940

Mr. THORKELSON. Mr. Speaker, we are now dominated and plagued by various pressure groups that care little or nothing about the United States as long as they can involve us in the present European war. Some of these groups are well known, others remain obscure, but nevertheless very powerful and effective in their insidious attempt to convince the people of this Nation that war is impending. These groups are composed of members who are generally classed as the "intelligentsia." I shall not question their intelligence, but if one is to judge them by what they have said and done, their intelligence is not being directed for the greater interest of the United States. Aiding these groups, I believe often innocently, are those whom we may take the liberty of calling their tools and servants. We have reached a stage where these anglophiles advance the thought that in order to qualify as a good American, one must be pro-English and willing to fight and die for England. These England-first groups and hands-across-the-sea organizations are made up of many Canadian and Anglo-American societies which are located in our larger cities. One of these, and the one to which I shall now refer, is the Pilgrims.

THE PILGRIMS

When the Pilgrims was organized in 1902, to aid in developing Anglophiles in the United States, the Canadians, being British subjects, were not solicited at first as members of this charitable and exclusive propaganda service to sell America to the British Empire. Like converts, many of these members are more loyal to England than the British themselves. In their fanatical zeal to serve Albion, I am informed by a student, that one of them placed the English crown on the flagstaff of the Columbia University. If this is true, the Columbia alumni should "crown" him who gave orders for the mounting of it, and replace the crown with the eagle, so this noble emblem can rest in its rightful place.

The Pilgrim membership may be found in our military organization, in the Government, and particularly among professors, ministers, and authors. In wielding the pen, the aid of these writers is more valuable, for can they not write, as did Carnegie when in substance he haid: Give America to England as a hemostat for the bleeding wound of the British Empire, which the surgeons left oozing after their operation in 1776; the operation which amputated the United States from the British Empire, and set America free.

These Pilgrims, being unfamiliar with the surgery of 1776, evidently do not realize that Canada joined to the United States will prove an equally efficient hemostat to stop this hemorrhage in the British Empire. The American Pilgrims no doubt fear this most sensible measure, because it might antagonize the noble and wealthy in the English Government and the Bank of England so much that they will pack up and leave for home. Such exodus might also prove inconvenient to our idle, wealthy, and charming ladies and their parents, when in their crusade to obtain a new or slightly used husband to hang on their family tree, they find it necessary to embark for Palestine to satisfy their family ambition. It is this and more that the Americans must fight to counteract the propaganda which is now disseminated throughout the country and in our daily press, in order to save America for the Americans.

Many of the members of these groups are ignorant of the real purpose of these organizations and their influence in our political life. Some of the members are so blinded by the

glamour and the exclusiveness of these clubs that they do not realize that in supporting their activities they betray America. I now quote from the annual meetings of the Pilgrims, held in New York, 1913 and 1934:

[The Pilgrims, New York. Addresses delivered at dinner in celebration of the tenth anniversary of the Pilgrims of the United States, New York, Tuesday, the 4th of February, 1913, at the Waldorf-Astoria, 1913]

(Hon. Joseph H. Choate, president of the Pilgrims and chairman of the evening, on rising and rapping for order, is roundly cheered and toasted by the members and guests assembled.)

Mr. CHOATE. I am going to ask you, in the first place, to rise, as you did just now for a much less worthy object, when I propose the loyal toasts. I ask you to fill your glasses and rise and drink to the President of the United States and his Majesty, the King of England.

(The toast was drunk with great enthusiasm, cheering and singing The Star-Spangled Banner and God Save the King.)

Before the chairman could resume, a delegation of members, consisting of Messrs. F. Cunliffe-Owen, R. A. C. Smith, Herbert Noble, George W. Burleigh, Lawrence L. Gillespie, and George Gray Ward, presented Mr. Choate with a large and beautiful gold and silver salver, richly decorated and suitably inscribed, Mr. Cunliffe-Owen addressing him as follows:

"Mr. Choate, your brother Pilgrims making you the offering herewith of the Pilgrim fare, bread and salt—bread signifying long life and prosperity and salt to ward off from you all evil spirits and every kind of harm—and we ask you, our honored president, in the name of all our brother Pilgrims of the United States, to accept this gold and silver salver as a memento of the occasion."

Mr. CHOATE. I accept the salver with profound gratitude, and I will eat the fare on some more suitable occasion. It will doubtless do for me all that you wish and foretell, but never having until this moment heard of this munificent and wholly undeserved gift, I can only now express to you my warm thanks and high appreciation of your kindness.

I now read to you a message from the President of the United States:

WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, D. C., February 4, 1913.

Please extend to the Pilgrims of the United States and their guests at their tenth anniversary my hearty greetings and my best wishes for a delightful reunion. I am unable to be with you, but I cherish the earnest hope that your gathering may emphasize the cordial relations which we know exist between Briton and Canadian and American.

WM. H. TAFT.

A message from His Majesty the King:

LONDON, *February 4, 1913.*

I am commanded to convey to the Pilgrims of the United States, celebrating their tenth anniversary, the expression of His Majesty's gratitude for their kind and friendly sentiments contained in your telegram of this evening.

PRIVATE SECRETARY.

A message from Her Majesty, Queen Alexandra, one of the best friends we ever had on the other side of the water:

"I am commanded by Queen Alexandra to ask you to convey to Ex-Ambassador Choate and the members of the Pilgrims of the United States, now celebrating their tenth anniversary under His Excellency's presidency, Her Majesty's sincere thanks for the kind sentiments expressed in the telegram which Her Majesty has just received, sentiments which I am to assure the Pilgrims are much valued by Her Majesty.

"DIGHTON PROBYN."

Now, gentlemen, it remains for me to say a few words, and a few words only. I think, if I continue in this office many years, I may make longer speeches, but I will begin with something very brief and very pertinent. I am a year younger than I was a year ago when you did me the honor to elect me your president, and if I go on, as I hope to do, and as I hope you will do, I shall be a very young man at last.

We are here to celebrate ourselves and our friends on both sides of the water, and among them the best friends that I have ever known—and I knew well their sentiments some years ago, which I believe have continued and which I believe are not well represented in the heart of his present Majesty—I will tell you, in the first place, that King Edward VII, and his Queen Alexandra were two of the most constant and devoted friends that the people of the United States ever had. They lost no occasion to manifest their good will to their kindred in America, and his present Majesty King George V was always most cordial, most friendly, and most determined, so far as I could judge from the sentiments that he expressed—most determined, I say—that the cordial relations between the two countries which have now been transmitted to him by his father should forever continue. We have no difficulty with the royal family. We have no difficulty and never have had that I know of with the people of England. The people of England and the people of the United States are always friendly to each other. Now and then the governments of the two countries come to different conclusions for a brief time on some subject of mutual interest.

It is 10 years since this organization was founded and they have been 10 years of success and constantly advancing prosperity, and, so far as I can understand, of constantly strengthened good will between the people of the two countries. And what I claim for the Pilgrims is that they have done their fair share on both sides of the water to promote this great interest in the world, the preservation of peace between the two countries that combine all the English-speaking people of mankind.

It was not my good fortune to be present when this society was founded in America on the 4th day of February 1903, but I had had the good fortune to be present in London, 6 months before, when the Pilgrims of Great Britain held their first dinner, under the presidency of that grand old soldier and royal hero, Field Marshal Lord Roberts. He believes in making his nation a great fighting nation, but not to fight against the United States. He would consider it the most barbarous, the most unnatural, the most unthinkable contest that ever could be raised. Let me read to you a dispatch from Field Marshal Lord Roberts, which is much better than anything I can say:

"Greatly touched by the Pilgrims' charming and hospitable invitation. There is none I would sooner accept, but unfortunately it is quite impossible for me to be with you on February 4. So sincerely wish it were otherwise. All prosperity to the American Pilgrims."

And from Lord Charles Beresford, who was with us at the foundation of the Pilgrims in England:

"All good luck to Pilgrims. Congratulations on brilliant success of efforts to bring together two great English-speaking nations."

Now, gentleman, that is the object, and the sole object that I know of, that this flourishing society has—the sole reason for its existence; to promote good will, good fellowship, abiding friendship and everlasting peace between the United States and Great Britain. And, for one, I have no fear of failure.

We are now entering upon the celebration of the one hundredth year of peace between the two nations. In 2 years more that celebration will be complete. It is going on all the time, from day to day, from week to week, and from month to month. You will hardly hear so much of anything else for a long time to come. Well, how has it been accomplished? How is it that we have been able to keep the peace, notwithstanding the alarming controversies that have arisen from time to time, controversies which between any other two great nations would probably have provoked and resulted in war? Why, it is because, in the long run, in the main, the people of the two countries are one. They are united in sentiments and in the general object they have in view and in their valuation of things that go to make civilization. We might have fought a dozen wars in the last hundred years, but we have kept the peace always. And how is it? How has it been done? Why, as I believe, it has been accomplished by the preservation on both sides of absolute good faith in their dealings and in ultimate fidelity to the promises that they have made to each other. I do not mean to say that they have not quarreled. They have quarreled many times, and sometimes not a little sharply.

They have threatened very much on both sides—much more than you will ever hear them do again; but every quarrel has ended in reconciliation, in peace established either by diplomacy or by arbitration—arbitration, the great boast and glory of America.

We have a little difference just now, but I do not look upon it as half as serious as the differences that have arisen in former times, 10, 20, 40, 50, 75, 100 years ago, and there is nothing in it that cannot be readily settled upon the principle of adherence on both sides to the doctrine, to the principle, of good faith and of honest dealing with one another.

I had something to do with the negotiation of the treaty which has formed—I won't say a bone of contention, because I haven't heard anything like the gnawing of bones; not at all—but this little difference that has arisen.

It so happened that that negotiation was carried on in London for several weeks between Lord Pauncefote and myself and approved, as we went along by John Hay and by Lord Lansdowne. Well, if there ever were two men who deserved the gratitude of their respective nations and each of the other's nation, it was those two men, Mr. Hay and Lord Pauncefote, for their perfectly plain, perfectly honest, perfectly straightforward, method of dealing with one another.

Their principle, their rule of action, was to say what they meant and to mean what they said, and their effort was always to express in perfectly plain English what both had equally in his own mind; and when they said, as they did say in that treaty that the ships of all nations shall have free passage on equal terms through the canal without any discrimination whatever, they thought they were using plain English. And I must say, now that both of these great men and diplomatists have passed away—I must say, as the survivor of them both, that they lived and died without believing or suspecting that their words were capable of any other than the plain meaning that they bore upon their face.

Well, but the wit of man passeth all understanding, and different meanings have been discovered for those very plain and simple words, and thus a difference has arisen as to the interpretation of a treaty. And how are you going to adjust and settle that difference?

Well, I should say, as any gentlemen would settle differences that they could not adjust which had arisen between them—refer it to some other gentlemen; and my first proposition would be to refer it to the Pilgrims on both sides of the water. We would not have any difficulty. In the first place, we would take a secret vote, if you

please, separately on both sides of the water. We would let our brother Pilgrims of Great Britain answer the question—try their hand at this little puzzle; it is only a puzzle—the question is how to put it together. Let them give their answer first and seal it up, not communicate it to us, and then let these 500 law-abiding, country-loving American Pilgrims answer the question for themselves by another sealed and secret vote.

Now, the people of this country are not going to allow anybody—any Congress, any Government, any President—to break their good faith which they have pledged to the mother country. How are we going to maintain the peace for the next 100 years? These English-speaking people are going to increase on this side of the water in the next hundred years from one hundred millions to four or five hundred millions, and England and her dominions across the seas will increase in like proportion. How are they going to keep the peace. There is only one way. It is by keeping their word, by keeping their good faith, by being always honest in their dealings with one another. So I am not afraid. This little puzzle will be adjusted. I hope that Mr. Bryce will stay here long enough to settle it with Mr. TAFT. We know both are great lovers of peace. If not settled by them, why other men—I won't say equally good; I won't say equally good, although I may think so—other men will arise in their places and settle it, and then we shall have 10 years of balmy and delightful peace, and then some other question will arise and the puzzle solvers on both sides of the Atlantic will put their heads together and it will be settled, and so again and again and again and again, and our great-grandchildren celebrating in 2013 the second centenary of the Pilgrims, will have cause to bless their fathers that they founded this society and kept the world on the right track

Now, gentlemen, I have read to you the various messages that we have received from our very eminent friends across the water and at Washington, and we did hope to have with us tonight His Excellency the British Ambassador, but I suspect that he has eaten as many dinners as he could stand—his secretary nods assent—and no man can stand the public dinner every night. I was never able to do it myself. And so we have the pleasure of welcoming here tonight as the representative of Mr. Bryce, the British Ambassador, the counselor—I call him counselor—I do not know whether he exactly likes to be called counselor, for they might think he is a counselor-at-law instead of, as he is in fact, the first secretary of the British Embassy, and I call upon him to give us his message from Mr. Bryce. I have the pleasure of presenting to you Mr. Mitchell Innes, Counselor of the British Embassy at Washington.

Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to read the speeches given by the American members of the Pilgrims, for they, like all converts are more un-American and pro-English than the British themselves.

The address of Joseph H. Choate is an example of Anglophile, pertinent at this time in view of the conditions that exist today. I shall now requote some of these statements in order to show how deceptive they can be. Mr. Choate states:

We have no difficulty and never have had that I know of with the people of England.

A statement that is perfectly true, because the people of England have little or nothing to say in the British Government. Our trouble has been with the British Government, which has never at any time been friendly toward the United States—but the gentleman did not make such statement. Furthermore, it is well to note the servile attitude of the speaker to the Crown of England, and his praise of the rulers, which again is perfectly all right, yet he has failed in his speech as others have in theirs, to say one good word for the Government of the United States. He then goes on to say:

The people of England and the people of the United States are always friendly to each other; another statement which no one can criticize, but to which I want to add that the people of all countries—the common people—have always been and are now friendly to each other. If war depended upon them there would be no war. The trouble lies with the rulers of the different governments. It is they who advocate war; war of destruction, not only of property and human life but of Christian civilization itself.

So in view of this, let us remember that no country has been at war so much as England and no country has brought about more misfortune and suffering than the British Government. This should be clear as we review the early history of our own colonies, of India, Ireland, and the 400,000,000 opium addicts in China, all of which may be charged to the greed of the British Government. Mr. Choate, in making his statements, spoke for the people of the United States, when in reality he should have hesitated even to speak for himself. His sole concern appeared to have been our friendliness toward Great Britain, but not their friendliness toward us; and again he placed the United States in the position of a suppliant to the British throne.

Mr. Choate then referred to a dispute which arose in regard to the passage of ships through the Panama Canal, and intimated that it was the understanding of Hon. John Hay and Lord Landsdowne that the British should have equal rights with us in the use of this Canal; a right which the British have never conceded to the United States in the Suez Canal. We have even been driven out of foreign markets by England for many, many years, and in her wars she has brazenly furnished us with a blacklist of firms with which we are not supposed to trade; and we, like fools, comply with her demands.

Continuing his discussion on this topic, Mr. Choate expressed himself as being quite willing to leave the decision of the Panama Canal in the hands of the British and American Pilgrims, which anyone can readily understand would be a one-sided decision; that is, all for England and nothing for the United States.

Mr. Choate then makes his most extraordinary statement, upon which every Member of Congress and the people of this Nation should ponder—particularly in view of the happenings since 1912:

Now the people of this country are not going to allow anybody—any Congress, any government, any President—to break the good faith which they have pledged to the mother country.

In making this statement, Mr. Choate takes the position that Great Britain or England is our mother country; the same position that was taken by Cecil Rhodes over 50 years ago and by Andrew Carnegie in 1893, when he wrote a book entitled, "Triumphant Democracy."

I want you to note particularly that this was in 1913, and that 1913 was the very year we changed our Government from a republic to a semidemocracy; the year in which we destroyed constitutional government, international security, and paved the road for us to become a colony of the British Empire. It was also the same year in which we, by adopting the Federal Reserve Act, placed our Treasury under the control and domination of the Bank of England and the international banking groups that are now financing the British-Israel movement in the United States. It was also the year preceding the World War; a war in which we became involved, as everyone knows, in 1917, but what everyone does not know is that we were committed to this war in 1910, and were to all intents and purposes in the war in 1914, when J. P. Morgan & Co. began to finance the Triple Entente. This statement is borne out by Mr. J. P. Morgan's own testimony before the Senate committee investigating the munitions industry.

Mr. Choate was, therefore, right, because nothing has stopped, not even Congress, the destruction of this Republic and its gradual incorporation into the British Empire through the efforts of the many subversive and pro-English groups, led and directed, as I have said, by the British-Israel movement.

Let me now quote a message sent by George T. Wilson, chairman of the American Pilgrims, to his brother Pilgrims in London, when they celebrated our entry into the World War. This message states the real hopes and the purpose of the Pilgrims:

Sir HARRY E. BRITTAIN,
Chairman (London):

I should like to read two cables which have arrived within the last few minutes from New York. The first is from our good friends and fellow members, the Pilgrims of America, and it reads as follows:

"At last the Union Jack and the Stars and Stripes are nailed to the same staff not to come down until the job is done. Our boys in khaki are anxious to rub shoulders with yours in France and share your struggle and your triumph in freedom's cause. The Pilgrims' dream of 15 years at length has come to pass. (Signed) George T. Wilson, Chairman." [Loud cheers.]

I shall now quote a speech delivered by Nicholas Murray Butler, to a meeting of the Pilgrims in New York, in 1934:

ANNUAL PILGRIM MEETING, 1934

President BUTLER. You have before you the report of your committee on nominations proposing the names of seven gentlemen

for election to the executive committee, their terms to expire in the year 1935. Are there other nominations?

Mr. CHARLES H. WARREN. I move that the secretary cast one ballot for the names mentioned in the report of the nominating committee.

The motion was seconded.

President BUTLER. It has been regularly moved and seconded that the secretary be instructed to cast one ballot for the names mentioned in the report of the nominating committee. This requires a unanimous vote. So many as are in favor will please say "aye"; contrary-minded, "nay," if any. The vote being unanimous, the secretary is so empowered.

Secretary CHURCH. Mr. President, I report I have so cast a ballot.

President BUTLER. The secretary reports that he has cast a ballot for the gentlemen named in the report of the nominating committee. Therefore, Mr. Burleigh, Mr. Darrell, Mr. Demorest, Mr Lamont, Mr. Noble, Mr. Satterlee, and Mr. Shields are elected to the executive committee, terms to expire in 1935.

Fellow pilgrims, let me first recall to mind the fact that Sunday was the one hundredth anniversary of the birth of that distinguished and beloved American, linked with Great Britain, who served so long as our president, Joseph H. Choate. In the presence of that anniversary and in your presence, I salute his memory and bear tribute to the service which his years on earth rendered to the great cause which we have so much at heart.

There have been happenings in the year 1931 so grave, so far reaching in their importance, and so massive in their historic interest that it is no slight task to make choice among them of those of which it is permissible to speak in your presence for a few moments this afternoon. Let me first, however, pay tribute to that splendid spirit of the British people which in time of storm and stress, of national embarrassment and portending danger, enabled them, in accordance with the best ideals of the race, to put aside and behind all partisan differences and all prejudices of party affiliation and to unite in that most impressive demonstration which they gave at the last general election. That spirit was voiced by Mr. Snowden on the floor of the House of Commons in the stirring words which he quoted from Swinburne's famous ode:

"Come the world against her,
England yet shall stand!"

[Applause.]

It was not only a magnificent exhibition of political capacity and political power, but it might well be an example to other peoples on this earth, facing problems such as those which are before mankind today, to forget their superficial and often artificial differences and to unite all their power and all their patriotism to solve their great problems solely in the interests of the nation and of the world. Great Britain has shown that it can be done.

I recall that a year ago it occurred to me to say something on this occasion of the movement going on to bring into existence a British commonwealth of nations, a new form of political organization to take the place of the centuries-old organization of the British Empire. I invited your attention to the fact that that movement was going forward, more Anglicana, informally, quietly, illogically, under the pressure of opportunity in events and without any formal or public announcement. During the year, however, without the world paying much attention, and hardly noticed in these United States, that movement, which has been under way for the better part of a generation, came to its climax and has now been formally written into the public law of Great Britain.

I hold in my hand the few printed pages which constitute the State of Westminster, 1931 (see appendix 2), beyond question the most important act in public law since the ratification of the Constitution of the United States. This statute, covering but three or four printed pages, contains three specific provisions which are its essence and which I should like to emphasize.

First, what is to be a dominion?

The expression "dominion" is to mean the Dominion of Canada, the Commonwealth of Australia, the Dominion of New Zealand, the Union of South Africa, the Irish Free State, and Newfoundland, six dominions in all.

What is to be the relation of local self-government in each of those dominions to the British Parliament? The Statute of Westminster reads:

"No law and no provision of any law made after the commencement of this act by the parliament of a dominion shall be void or inoperative on the ground that it is repugnant to the law of England, or to the provisions of any existing or future act of Parliament of the United Kingdom or to any order, rule, or regulation made under any such act, and the powers of the parliament of the dominion shall include the power to repeal or amend any such act, order, rule, or regulation insofar as the same is part of the law of the dominion."

In other words, absolute legislative self-control is devolved by the Parliament of Great Britain, where that control has rested for 800 years, upon the parliaments respectively of the six Dominions.

What certainty and security have these dominions that their local self-government shall be permanent and complete?

The Statute of Westminster reads:

"No act of Parliament of the United Kingdom passed after the commencement of this act shall extend, or be deemed to extend, to a Dominion as part of the law of that Dominion unless it is expressly declared in that act that that Dominion has requested, and consented to, the enactment thereof."

Those three brief paragraphs, I repeat, are the most important contribution to the public law of the world made since the ratification of the Constitution of the United States. They introduce into the government of mankind a new form of federal relationship, not a federal relationship such as exists between our own States and the Federal Government, but a federal relationship which consists in loyalty and devotion to a person who is the symbol of unity; but the legislation power is as multiform as the Dominions. The British people consciously, after 25 years of discussion and experimentation, have formulated this great statute, enacted it into law without dissent, and have started this new ship of state out on the sea of human political experience. I submit, my fellow pilgrims, that that is so stupendous a happening and so amazing an achievement that we would do well to pause for a moment to remark upon it. Let me say two things about it in addition, and you will pardon a word of personal reminiscence.

In June and July 1921 the Imperial Conference was sitting in London, and the sort of question which underlay this movement was uppermost in the minds of the conferees. There were other delegates to the conference, but the Prime Ministers of the several Dominions as now defined and the Prime Minister in the Government of Great Britain itself were, of course, the leading personalities. Mr. Lloyd George was Prime Minister. He did me the honor to ask me to come to Chequers for the week end to meet these gentlemen and to hear them discuss the problem of the possibility of a British Commonwealth of Nations.

They spent the whole of Saturday, and Saturday evening, and all of Sunday until luncheon under the trees and in the library at Chequers discussing informally and familiarly and with profound knowledge and that grasp which only comes from experience, the problems that were before them. There was the Prime Minister of Canada, Mr. Meighen. There was General Smuts from the Union of South Africa. There was the Prime Minister of Australia, Mr. Hughes. There was the Prime Minister of New Zealand, Mr. Massey, and there were two representatives from the Government of India, the Maharajah of Cutch and Mr. Srinivasa Sastri of Madras.

It was my privilege and good fortune to be questioned by these gentlemen as to the working of our own Federal system. In particular, they wished illustrations of what happened when there was conflict of authority and of jurisdiction. They pointed out that we had in our great cities officers of the Federal Government. How did they operate without inducing conflict of authority and feeling with the State and municipal officials? How were these almost invisible lines of administrative power kept from overlapping and from friction? What was the function of the courts? What the limit, if any, of their authority? I assure you it was no small pleasure and pride to be able to answer questions to that distinguished and influential group as to how a different form of the federal principle had been operating for more than a century and a half in the United States.

Finally, when the luncheon hour came on Sunday, and these informal discussions were brought to an end, Mr. Lloyd Green turned the conversation into lighter vein and called attention to the fact that it was fortunate indeed that their minds were meeting, that the words British Commonwealth of Nations were beginning to be used by them, and that the day was Sunday. A benediction, as it were, upon their efforts!

"Yes," I said, "Mr. Prime Minister, but if you will pardon an American, there is something more important than that. Tomorrow will be the Fourth of July." [Laughter.]

By pure accident they had brought their discussion of the reorganization of the British Empire and its Dominions to a conclusion at the anniversary of the Declaration of Independence [laughter], surely an interesting coincidence.

One thing more. We do not realize, my fellow Pilgrims, the foresight of our own fathers, how far those nation-builders saw into the future, and what an amazing grasp they had upon the fundamentals of political life and social organization. I sometimes think we are in the habit of taking them too much for granted.

There is on exhibition in this city today one of the two existing signed copies (the other being in the Record Office in London) of a document which in American history stands in importance and significance side by side with the Declaration of Independence itself, and probably not one American in a million has ever heard of its existence. That is the paper which John Adams called the Olive Branch Petition. (See Appendix.) That petition was presented to King George III in July 1775, over the signatures of 46 Members of the Continental Congress, praying for precisely the relationship which the statute of Westminster has written into public law, the public law of England, for the Dominions. And who signed it? The first name is the name which stands at the head of the signers of the Declaration of Independence a year later, John Hancock. Among the 46 names are those of Samuel Adams, John Adams, Roger Sherman, John Jay, Benjamin Franklin, James Wilson, Patrick Henry, Richard Henry Lee, and Thomas Jefferson. Washington did not sign because he was in command of the troops in Massachusetts, and the Congress was meeting in Philadelphia. Lexington, Concord, and Bunker Hill had been fought. And this very proposal, which 160 years afterward has been worked out in the life of the British peoples, were presented to them by the signers of the Declaration of Independence a year before they signed that Declaration as the

alternative step. It is one of the most extraordinary things in the history of government, and we pay little or no attention to it.

What happened? The Olive Branch Petition was sent to England by the hands of William Penn's grandson. He was to take it to the Government. For weeks he could not be received. Finally he was received, not by his Majesty, but by the Colonial Office, and was then told that inasmuch as the petition had not been received on the throne, no answer would be given. As John Adams had said, "We have the olive branch in one hand and the sword in the other." When the olive branch was rejected, recourse was had to the sword, and these very same men in 12 months signed the Declaration of Independence and history took its course.

It is one of the most astounding things in the history of government that these men off in this distant series of colonies, economically in their infancy, financially helpless and dependent, had the vision of organization which has come now to all the British peoples, and for which surely every Pilgrim wishes the very greatest possible measure of success. [Applause.]

So it is, gentlemen, in the history of our race. Ideas, how slowly they travel, arguments, how slowly they are apprehended; action, how slowly it follows upon conviction! To be sure, as we look back we can see that these 46 members of the Continental Congress were in advance of the opinion of the world. British opinion could not at that time have accepted that course of action. They could not think in terms of a parliament whose legislative authority ended at the island shores. Therefore, revolution, independence, separate nationhood, were of the essence of the great undertaking, and so they happened. But in the intervening years a lesson has been learned by all, by the motherland and its captains of the mind, by the Dominions and those who speak their voice, and now with great fortune and wisdom they have in the Statute of Westminster written into the public law the principles of the Olive Branch Petition of 1775. [Applause.]

Let me only add that this great principle of federation of one kind or another is the principle which is to mark the life of nations in the days that are to come. Those that are of like race and faith, that have similar economic habits and interests, that have a common language, they will tend more and more to group themselves into units as our United States of America have done. The British Commonwealth of Nations will, perhaps, be the only one of its type because Great Britain is the only far-flung empire which has gone out for 500 years and put its hand on the distant places of the earth for their enrichment, their betterment, and their increasing civilization. Other proud and powerful and ambitious nations will find ways and means, without losing their independence, their self-control, or limiting their pride, to bring themselves into new economic units for cooperation, enrichment, and the benefit and satisfaction of all their peoples.

This principle of international cooperation, in one form or another, whether it be our form, whether it be the British form, or whether it be the forms which are slowly coming on the continent of Europe, that is the principle which we may look forward to as guiding and shaping the life of the world for the next century or more. But as we Pilgrims look particularly at our own field of historic interest and affection, surely we may in the dark year of 1931 take profound pride and satisfaction in remarking the significance, the far-reaching importance, of this Statute of Westminster and the prophecy of it by our own nation-builders in July 1775.

The audience arose and applauded.

Mr. Speaker, I have included Mr. Butler's address, in order to show how far we have drifted toward this British union. In this speech, you will note he brings out the fact that the olive branch petition has now been adopted by England and extended to her colonies. He further intimates that in view of this adoption, it is now in order for us to join the British Empire. He makes the further statement that this movement has gone Anglican, or more English, which is quite true, for we are just about on the verge of capitulating to the forces which are driving us into the British Empire. To show this, let me quote:

That petition was presented to King George III in July 1775, over the signatures of 46 members of the Continental Congress, praying for precisely the relationship which the Statute of Westminster has written into public law, the public law of England, for the Dominions. * * *

I recall that a year ago it occurred to me to say something on this occasion of the movement going on to bring into existence a British Commonwealth of Nations, a new form of political organization to take the place of the centuries-old organization of the British Empire. I invited your attention to the fact that that movement was going forward, more Anglican, informally, quietly, illogically, under the pressure of opportunity in events and without any formal or public announcement. During the year, however, without the world paying much attention, and hardly noticed in these United States, that movement, which has been under way for the better part of a generation, came to its climax and has now been formally written into the public law of Great Britain.

Newspaper Articles in Opposition to Third Presidential Term

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 20 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

ARTICLES FROM NEWSPAPERS OF 1937

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD articles from various newspapers in opposition to the third Presidential term.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Herald Tribune of October 31, 1937]

SIX ROOSEVELT PARTY CHIEFS VETO THIRD TERM—FLORIDA CHAIRMAN THINKS REFERENDUM MIGHT EVEN CONDEMN SECOND TERM; COMMITTEE HALTS POLL

(By Albert L. Warner)

WASHINGTON, October 30.—The Democratic chairmen of six States advise against a third-term nomination for President Roosevelt, according to a private poll, the results of which were revealed today, along with the considered answers of these Democratic leaders.

One of them, J. B. Hodges, chairman of the Democratic State executive committee of Florida, breaks completely with the President and his administration. Attacking the President with a sharpness which no Republican has surpassed, this Democratic leader charges Mr. Roosevelt with making "unconstitutional" proposals, "encouraging" sit-down strikes, breaking his Budget-balancing promises and spreading lack of confidence. He suggests that, instead of an inquiry as to a third term, an investigation should determine whether the people want "the completion of the President's second term."

Finally, a member of the President's own family, Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., now at the University of Virginia, enters the third-term discussion to leave the door open because "what we feel today may have to be revised 2 years from now in the light of circumstances beyond our control, such as the foreign situation."

UNWRITTEN LAW

The Minnesota Democratic chairman declared the two-term rule was an unwritten part of the Constitution. The South Dakota chairman said he had already informed members of the Cabinet that the voters of his State positively were against a third term for anyone. The Kansas chairman said it would be "a bad precedent." The Alabama chairman asserted a third-term candidate would sound the "death knell" of the party sponsoring him and Alabama would go Republican for the first time in history if he were a Democrat. According to the chairman for Mississippi, "the people as a whole would look with disfavor upon a third term."

The poll which produced these results was taken by Joseph Leib, formerly of South Bend, Ind., young political writer who organized the first Roosevelt-for-President Club in 1930 and was an eager member of the Young Democratic movement in 1932. A persistent letter writer, he polled the Democratic State chairmen in 1935 and gave out the answers showing that the overwhelming majority of the delegates to the 1936 convention would carry instructions to vote for Mr. Roosevelt.

COMMITTEE HALTS POLL

The poll this year was cut short because the Democratic National Committee stepped in to halt it. Lawrence W. Robert, Jr., secretary of the committee, was informed by Charles Reid, Georgia State chairman, of the letter he had received asking his views on a third term. Robert advised Leib to stop. Subsequently, and presumably on advice from national headquarters, no more chairmen sent in their views. All six who replied thought that a third term would be distinctly unwise.

The seven-page letter from Mr. Hodges, the Florida State chairman, upon which he said by telephone later he was willing to stand publicly, was described on Capitol Hill today as a southern political development of the first order. Mr. Hodges had been a public critic of the President's Supreme Court plan and an insurgent on some other matters, but today he leads a Florida insurrection against Mr. Roosevelt personally and his whole conduct of affairs.

The more or less private views of these State chairmen are in striking contrast to public comments of several Democrats in public office who may be seeking to ingratiate themselves at the White House. Gov. George H. Earle, of Pennsylvania, is one of those who have been talking up the third-term idea.

This was the letter sent out to the State chairmen:

"I am trying to find out how the people feel about a third term for the President.

"So much has already been said about the matter. Of course, no one knows what will happen by 1940—but what do you hear and how do things look?

"Thanks and regards."

The following replies were received from State Democratic chairmen:

Herbert Holmes, chairman Mississippi State Democratic executive committee:

"Of course, it is impossible for me to know how all the people of our State regard a third term for the President, but from what I can learn from those with whom I have talked, the people as a whole would look with disfavor upon a third term.

"Those who are receiving employment or bounty from the Government, whom I have contacted, are very much in favor of his nomination for a third term, but this does not represent a very large voting strength."

C. M. Fitzwilliam, Kansas State committee chairman:

"President Roosevelt is strong as ever in Kansas, and though Kansans are not for a third term, I think he would carry the State. Personally, I think it would be a bad precedent."

A. W. Powell, South Dakota State chairman:

"Tom Berry served two terms as the most popular Governor that South Dakota ever had. He balanced the budget, reduced bonded indebtedness several million dollars, and operated the State without a levy on real estate or personal property.

"In 1936, we thought he was our strongest candidate for Governor and he ran for the third term and was defeated by over 10,000 votes when every constitutional officer won.

"Mr. Roosevelt lost over 30,000 votes in 1936, and I know it would be fatal to ask the people of South Dakota to reelect him for the third term.

"Out here there is the feeling that these things should be passed around, and the ballots are marked accordingly.

"Personally, I would vote for Franklin D. for the third term as an expression of sheer gratitude for the improvement in my situation as brought about by his program, but the 300,000 other voters in South Dakota, I am very positive, feel otherwise, and I have so informed some members of the Cabinet."

John D. McQueen, chairman, State Democratic executive committee of Alabama:

"Replying thereto (Leib's inquiry), I beg to advise that it is my candid opinion that the nomination by any party of anyone, regardless of who he might be, as a candidate for election to a third term as President of the United States would sound the death knell of the party responsible for such nomination.

"I do not believe the people of the United States would ever elect the same man as President of the United States for a third term, and it is my candid belief that if the Democratic Party does so nominate, it will mean that the party will not only go down in defeat but that it will be so torn by internal strife as to destroy any possibility of the party ever again being the dominant party.

"So far as Alabama is concerned, it is my opinion that such action on the part of the national convention would mean that this State, for the first time since its stanch Democrats redeemed the State from the ignominious rule of the carpetbaggers which was inflicted upon us following the War between the States, would fail to be found in the Democratic column."

John F. D. Meighen, Minnesota chairman:

"My opinion is that the two-term rule is part of our unwritten Constitution, just as much as the right of the Federal Government to purchase new Alaskas. Save in grave emergency, I do not think the voters will overlook the two-term rule."

J. B. Hodges, chairman of the State Democratic executive committee of Florida (excerpts):

"You have asked a very frank question, addressing me on the envelope in which your letter came, as Democratic State chairman, and I presume you desire a frank answer, and I am making one.

"There has been much said, and a great deal of speculation has been indulged in, by the people and the press of the Nation in regard to a possible third term for President Roosevelt, and he has nowhere at any time, so far as I know, made any definite statement relative thereto, preferring to dismiss inquiries in regard to that matter lightly, with statements that may be interpreted as having two meanings, apparently trying to follow in the footsteps of another President of the United States, but his statements and actions are not nearly as clever as the tart reply of such other President, to wit: 'I do not choose to run.' * * *

"In fact, propaganda is already aboard in the Nation by way of reference to the refusal of President Washington to accept a third term, such propaganda pointing out that there is now no law or statute against it; that it is not mentioned by the Constitution; that other Presidents have been besought to seek third terms; that they did not refuse because of Washington's refusal, but because of some illness or the infirmity of age, and with the propaganda set-up in the several alphabetical departments of the New Deal government, the idea of a third term can be, and is being, propagated at the expense of the American taxpayer. * * *

"It would be more profitable to the New Deal * * * to ascertain from the American people whether they are now agreeable to the completion of the President's second term instead of undertaking to ascertain whether or not the people desire the President for a third term.

"I am a Democrat—a liberal Democrat—and I expect to remain a Democrat—a liberal Democrat—as long as I live, but the platform of the Democratic Party adopted at Philadelphia last year was not prepared and written by the delegates to the convention, but was prepared and written somewhere else, and is prepared in such a clever manner that many of the planks therein are capable of more than one construction, very much like the tart statements of the President heretofore made about a third term."

Hodges' seven-page reply charged the President with disregarding platform pledges "to solve its legislative problems within the Constitution" by proposing the "amazing" Supreme Court reorganization bill. He charged the President with making other "unconstitutional" proposals, "encouraging" sit-down strikes and the C. I. O., and with promising to balance the Budget so many times that "the people of the Nation have no confidence in any such promise."

Hodges said that lack of confidence in the President "is now growing to an alarming extent," that the people see no necessity for a special session of Congress and that "they do not intend to allow the Government of the United States to be operated on catch phrases."

"Our objections are now inaudible," Hodges' letter said. "We have learned that we can only make changes on general-election years, so our people tolerate these things, knowing that there can be no change until 1940, when they hope to select some other Democrat who will reflect the actual thoughts and desires of the rank and file of the Democratic Party."

Hodges' advice on a third term for the President was: "Don't do it. The people are against it."

A letter signed by Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., from Charlottesville, Va., dated October 24, said:

"Thank you very much for your recent letter, but I am afraid I cannot give you the answer you desire. In the first place, I think it is not my position to make any statement concerning a third term for my father. And furthermore, the necessity for deciding such an issue has not as yet arisen, since what we feel today may have to be revised 2 years from now in the light of circumstances beyond our control, such as the foreign situation.

"However, many thanks for your letter, and I would appreciate it very much if you would let me know the result of your inquiry."

[From the New York Herald Tribune of November 13, 1937]

FOUR MORE PARTY HEADS JOIN FIGHT AGAINST THIRD TERM FOR ROOSEVELT—TWO DEMOCRATIC STATE CHAIRMEN AND TWO GOVERNORS WARN OF ADVERSE SENTIMENT; THREE SENATORS ALSO CAUTION AGAINST TRADITION-SMASHING ATTEMPT

WASHINGTON, November 12.—Two chairmen of Democratic State committees and two Democratic Governors today cautioned against a third-term nomination for President Roosevelt, joining the six Democratic State chairmen who 2 weeks ago were recorded as either actively opposing or warning against breaking tradition.

Also comment written by three Democratic Senators, variously dated from July to October, but made public today, showed that they were either fearful of a third term or felt sure Mr. Roosevelt would not want to run again.

The Democratic State chairman of Arizona, Junior Gibbons, declared that Arizona Democrats feared that if Mr. Roosevelt broke precedent the result might be disastrous at some future time. The Democratic State chairman of Vermont, Park H. Pollard, promised to support anyone nominated by the Democratic National Convention, but found many of his party in his own State not favorable to a third term.

The Governors of Rhode Island and Virginia, Robert E. Quinn and George C. Peery, both declared that sentiment in their States would be against a third term for anyone.

Previously, the Democratic State chairmen of Florida, Minnesota, South Dakota, Kansas, Alabama, and Mississippi had asserted opposition or warning. Their comment had included a direct attack on the President by the State chairman of Florida, J. B. Hodges, and a warning from the Alabama chairman, John D. McQueen, that a third-term nomination would be a death knell for the party.

The poll which brought today's additions to the symposium was taken by Joseph Leib of South Bend, Ind., who organized the first Roosevelt-for-President Club in 1930. He asked the reaction to the proposal of a third term.

The comments today follow:

Robert F. Quinn, Governor of Rhode Island: "Personally, I am an admirer and supporter of President Roosevelt. I do not think, however, that sentiment in Rhode Island would be against a third term for any man."

Gov. George C. Peery, of Virginia: "I think the majority of the people in Virginia are pro-Roosevelt. However, I believe there is a strong sentiment in Virginia against the President's being elected for a third term."

Junius Gibbons, chairman of the Democratic State Central Committee of Arizona: "I have made it my business to inquire quite thoroughly into the sentiment here. To date I have not found one Democrat who has not been thoroughly in accord with President Roosevelt and the policies which he has been trying to inaugurate, but I do meet with this year: Many of them are afraid that should we break the precedents set by previous Presidents for only a second term it might prove disastrous at some future time, and that none of them are skeptical of the motives of President Roosevelt; but once a precedent is broken it might easily be broken at some subsequent time and someone would be elected to the Presidency who

might have ulterior motives and disastrous results might come of it."

Park H. Pollard, chairman of the Vermont Democratic Committee: "If the President is a candidate for a third term I should expect a delegation favorable could be secured in Vermont. Among the rank and file I find many not favorable to a third term. I am a Democrat and would support anyone the national convention saw fit to nominate."

Senator MORRIS SHEPPARD, of Texas: "The President has indicated that he will not run a third time. He has thus killed that issue himself."

Senator WALTER F. GEORGE, of Georgia: "I am not in a position to discuss the third term suggested, but in my opinion we have nothing to fear. I do not know that the President has fully intended to announce himself for a third term."

Senator M. M. LOGAN, of Kentucky: "I am not for the President for a third term."

Senator ALBEN W. BARKLEY, of Kentucky, majority leader of the Senate: "I am not in a position to make any statement or prediction concerning this matter."

Charles Michelson, director of publicity for the Democratic National Committee, in a leaflet issued Saturday discussed the matter of a third term, referring to it as an "old bogy" trotted out by Mr. Roosevelt's critics. He intimated the President was looking ahead with longing retirement in 1941, but that, after all, conditions "3 years hence" were uncertain and "obviously, the President cannot in advance decline renomination that may never be offered him." Also "just as obviously, with the world in such a turmoil as it is today outside of this continent, it cannot be forecast whether the American people would permit him to lay down his burdens in view of possible eventualities."

[From the New York Herald Tribune of March 28, 1938]

THIRD TERM FOR ROOSEVELT OPPOSED BY LEADERS OF NATION'S CHURCHES—"UNBROKEN TRADITION" CITED, ELECTION ROUT FORECAST IN POLL RETURNS, BUT SOME FEAR WAR OR PATRONAGE MIGHT REELECT HIM

WASHINGTON, March 27.—Sixteen clergymen and religious leaders, including five bishops, have replied to a poll on third-term prospects for President Roosevelt by unanimously voicing either personal opposition to such a step or saying that the bulk of the people would be antagonistic or reluctant.

There were two qualifying notes from a scattering of these writers. Several felt that if the United States were at war, or on the verge of war, the situation might be somewhat changed. Two clergymen thought that if Mr. Roosevelt threw himself into a third-term campaign "political patronage" and other "resources" at his command might bring him another victory. One minister even suggested that the President might try to "jockey us into a war in order to further his own desire to continue as President."

Directly or indirectly, all 16 voiced respect for the tradition against a third term.

Bishop Joseph Schrembs, of the Catholic diocese of Cleveland, pointed to the "unbroken tradition" which he thought the majority of the American people accepted.

Bishop Adna W. Leonard, of the Methodist Episcopal Church at Pittsburgh, declared that Mr. Roosevelt's "unfortunate attempt to concentrate all power in himself" would bring a surprise to him in the next election.

Rabbi Louis I. Mann, of Chicago, thought Mr. Roosevelt could be elected again, but, personally, he hoped the President would not try because the two-term precedent is "grounded in the warp and woof of our democracy."

Bishop Henry K. Sherrill, of the Protestant Episcopal Churches of Boston, said the American people were against a third term "for any President," although a war might make a difference.

These letters constituted the answers to a poll of some 80 ministers who were queried by Joseph Leib, political writer. There was no reply endorsing a third term. The letters follow:

Rev. William E. Lampe, of Philadelphia, secretary of the executive committee of the Evangelical and Reformed Church: "I do not think that the American people would stand for a third term for President Roosevelt or anyone else. In Washington's time he and others took every step to see that there be no king or dictator. President Grant failed to secure a third term. Sentiment is stronger today against a third term than ever before. Roosevelt has made enough mistakes without being given an opportunity to add to them."

Rev. Charles E. Burton, of New York, secretary of the general council of the Congregational and Christian Churches of America: "The people would be very much against it."

PREDICTS SURPRISE AT POLLS

Bishop Leonard: "I am unalterably opposed to a third term for Mr. Roosevelt as President or for any other man as President of the United States for a third term. I am confident that nothing could more easily arouse the American people than for Mr. Roosevelt to stand for a third term. Of course, his unfortunate attempt to concentrate all power in himself will find an expression at the polls in the next election, which I think will be a surprise both to him and to the new dealers."

Bishop Schrembs: "An unbroken tradition going back to the first, and in many respects the greatest, of our Presidents would seem to preclude a third term for the Presidency. I cannot bring myself to believe that President Roosevelt would seriously contemplate breaking this tradition and neither do I believe that the majority of the American people would vote for Mr. Roosevelt if he actually attempted a third term."

George Craig Stewart, Episcopal Bishop of Chicago: "My impression would be that there would be a very vigorous resistance to any proposal for a President of the United States to become a candidate for a third term. My own conviction is that Mr. Roosevelt would echo the famous words of Mr. Coolidge, 'I do not choose to run.'"

BELIEVES HE "MIGHT WIN"

Paul B. Kern, Methodist Bishop, Durham, N. C.: "It is my opinion that Mr. Roosevelt will run in 1940 if he is persuaded that he can be elected. I think the opposition to him will grow and he would get no such vote as he did in 1936. I believe that he might win by a narrow margin. Such a victory, however, would be brought about not by his popularity nor widespread confidence in him, but by the fact that he controls sufficient political patronage to influence a large number of votes."

Rabbi Mann: "There is, naturally, much talk on this subject in this section of the country and I feel, from what I gather, that if President Roosevelt were to run for a third term next week or next month, he could be elected. Personally, I hope that he would not try because the precedent of two terms is grounded in the warp and woof of our democracy."

Rev. Julian C. McPheeters, pastor of the Glide Memorial Methodist Episcopal Church, South, San Francisco: "The people of this section would be reluctant for President Roosevelt to continue for another term. The only way I can conceive of such a possibility is for the country to be facing the imminent crisis of an impending war. Even under such conditions the people would regret facing any situation which would make possible a third term."

POSSIBILITY IN WARTIME

Bishop Sherrill: "In general, I think the American people are against a third term of any President. However, if we were in the midst of a war or any critical international situation, there might be a great difference; or if we were in the midst of a depression or in prosperity, so my very unhelpful answer is that I just do not know."

Rev. Robert G. Armstrong, secretary of the New Hampshire Congregational Christian Conference: "I feel strongly about Roosevelt running for a third term. I think he would certainly love to do so, and I have no more confidence in him than to believe that he might even jockey us into a war in order to further his own desire to continue as President. But I think that there would be a very strong reaction against him, even on the part of his admirers, in this section of the country. There has been a decided turn away from Roosevelt, I feel, so far as this section is concerned, in the last few months. I think that would be true of all New England."

Rev. Ralph H. Long, of New York, executive director of the National Lutheran Council: "I can easily conceive that situations might arise in which it would be desirable to have a President of the United States carry on through a third term. That would, of course, depend very largely upon the particular situation and upon the man himself. At the present time I do not believe that the American people will want to consider a third term."

OPPOSES THIRD TERM

Rev. A. R. Robinson, of Pittsburgh, moderator of the United Presbyterian Church: "Personally, without assuming to speak for the church of which I am the moderator this year, I feel that a third term for any President is contrary to the spirit and traditions of our national life. So much for my personal feelings. But in answer to your question I am forced to this belief—that any President who has at his disposal the resources that brought about the recent overwhelming majority, and who is willing to use those resources for political purposes, could be elected for a third term or a fourth term or any number of terms that he desired."

Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, Foundry Methodist Episcopal Church, Washington: "Of course, if at the time of the nominating convention, America is engulfed in the war wave which seems to be gathering, no one can prognosticate what would happen. Mr. Roosevelt, with his militant quarantine-the-aggressors attitude (with which I heartily agree), would then so fire the country with a high resolve to make the power of this democracy felt in world affairs that, in spite of the tradition against the third term, he might be swept into office. But if things are anywhere near normal and a world war is as far off as it seems now, personally I do not believe Mr. Roosevelt has any idea of running again. If he did, I do not think he could be nominated; and if he should be nominated I do not think he could be elected, so strong is the feeling against a third term in the hearts of the American people."

SEES OPPOSITION IN TEXAS

Rev. J. M. Dawson, pastor of the First Baptist Church, Waco, Tex.: "I would say that sentiment among my acquaintances is strong against our Nation going into war and pronouncedly against any President running for a third term. It is only fair to say that President Roosevelt is personally very popular in Texas, but neither any disposition to lead us into war nor aspiration for a third term would meet with general favor, in my belief."

Rev. Stanley I. Stuber, pastor of the First Baptist Church, Clifton Springs, N. Y.: "It rather looks that the President, through his big-money program and foreign policy, is leading us toward

war. He may have in mind, in this connection, a third term. This section in which I live, which is largely Republican, is decidedly against the third-term idea. My own view is that although I am in favor of much New Deal legislation and point of view, I am certainly against Mr. Roosevelt's war policy. For this reason I oppose the third-term idea, chiefly as a rebuke to any war ambitions which the President may have."

Rev. Carl E. Grammer, of Summit, N. J., Protestant Episcopal clergyman, president emeritus of the board of Sweet Briar College: "I am one of those who do not believe in the methods of the New Deal. I believe that the tradition against a third term is very strong and that if Mr. Roosevelt disregards it and runs again, this claim of indispensability will open the eyes of the people to his arrogance and lawlessness and lead to his defeat."

[From the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette of December 4, 1937]

COLLEGE HEADS FIRMLY OPPOSED TO THIRD TERM—PRESIDENTS OF 13 LEADING SCHOOLS IN NATION VOICE DISAPPROVAL IN REPLIES TO POLL; NEW DEAL SENTIMENT WANING

NEW YORK, December 3.—Presidents of 13 leading universities joined in a "college yell" to voice disapproval to a third term for Franklin D. Roosevelt, it was announced today by Joseph Leib, political writer and founder of the first Roosevelt-for-President Club in 1930, who conducted a poll among the school heads.

The colleges that replied were: Vanderbilt, Dartmouth, Lehigh, Duke, Brown, Drake, Colgate, Cornell, Washington and Jefferson, Beloit, Texas Christian, Lafayette, College of the Ozarks.

Only private institutions were canvassed, as State universities come under the jurisdiction of political leaders. Virginia Military Institute was polled by mistake, and C. E. Kilbourne, leader of the school, replied: "As superintendent of a State institution, nonpartisan in character, I do not feel justified in taking part in the political canvass."

REASONS FOR BEING LEFT OUT

Harvard and Princeton were not polled, since their presidents are under consideration for posts on the Republican National Committee policy board. Columbia was likewise avoided, as President Butler is a leader in Republican circles, it was explained.

Not one college head who replied came out in favor of a third term for the President. This is of particular significance, since the New Deal administration has chosen most of its important figures from the universities. The poll seemingly indicates that sentiment in the colleges regarding the New Deal is on the wane, especially should the President run for another term.

The Dartmouth president said that overthrowing the tradition of a third term would be injurious to the Government, and would react adversely upon the reputation of the President who might seek another term. From Lehigh its president reported that the sentiments of the people with whom he is acquainted are overwhelmingly opposed to a third term.

PREDICTS TREMENDOUS OPPOSITION

In the South, Duke's head informed that not a single person with whom he discussed the possibility of a third term favored it, and predicted that there would be tremendous opposition if the Chief Executive attempted to run for another term. Brown's leader advised that there was no evidence that the Nation could not produce leaders once in 8 years.

From the Midwest, Drake's president added that a third term would be ill advised and unacceptable to the people. In Tennessee, Vanderbilt's president stated that he met nothing but opposition to a third term.

In New York, Mr. Roosevelt's home State, both Cornell's and Colgate's presidents added that such an idea as a third term would encounter substantial opposition, and that the President's strongest supporters in that part of the country would vote against him. The president of Washington and Jefferson merely wrote that he was opposed to a third term, and Lafayette's head thought that the term for any President should be 7 years, eliminating any possibility of a second term.

In Wisconsin, Beloit's president announced that he has not heard a single person speak favorably about the matter. Texas Christian's head explained that he did not hear any great enthusiasm expressed for the idea for any President. And the president of the College of the Ozarks added that he would regret very much to see the precedent of the past broken down.

LETTER SENT TO EDUCATORS

The letters sent out by Mr. Leib said:

"MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: In a Republic like ours where every citizen is called upon at some time or another to take part in public affairs, may I address you on a vital question? So much has been said about the possibility of a third term for Mr. Roosevelt, yet no one seems to know just definitely how the voters feel on this matter. In this connection I am writing to you in the hope of finding the truth, no matter how the wind may be blowing. As head of a great school you have come in contact with many people. No doubt you have discussed this matter on many occasions. I would appreciate it very much if you will advise me as to the sentiments on this matter in your section of the country."

Mr. Leib recently polled Democratic leaders throughout the Nation and found that eight State chairmen, two Governors, and three Senators actively opposed or warned against breaking the third-term tradition. Much of the opposition came from the "solid South" States. The State chairman who opposed the idea came from Alabama, Mississippi, Florida, Arizona, South Dakota, Minnesota, Kansas, and Vermont. The Governors came from Virginia and Rhode Island, while the Senators were George of Georgia; Logan, of Kentucky; and Sheppard of Texas.

ONLY ONE APPROVES

The final replies of the State chairman-governors poll showed that only one chairman expressed approval to a third term for Mr. Roosevelt. The others opposed and warned against the idea or else refused to comment. V. E. Barnes, who is State chairman as well as executive director of the unemployment compensation commission of Kentucky said that there is much favorable talk about a third term for the President.

L. G. Flannery, chairman of Wyoming, who is also head of the periodical section of the W. P. A. information service in Washington, D. C., said that he took care not to bring up or discuss the question of a third term with his Wyoming citizens, as he felt that to do so would raise a controversial question on which there would be sharp and strong differences of opinion.

The Iowa chairman said that his thoughts were centered on 1938 rather than on the 1940 election. The Michigan chairman declined to comment on the 1940 situation until after the 1938 elections in his State. The Colorado chairman said that there was little discussion of the matter in his section. The Rhode Island chairman did not wish to engage in public opinion on the matter. The Utah chairman said he was not prepared to answer the question.

Governor Browning, of Tennessee, advised that the proposal has taken no kind of a form in his State so far as he knew. Governor Stark of Missouri said that he does not believe there is any very pronounced sentiment either way in his State. Governor McMullen, of Delaware, reported that he has not discussed the matter. Governor Huxman, of Kansas, advised that he has many times declined to express an opinion.

REPLIES BY COLLEGE HEADS

Following are the replies from the 13 college presidents:

Henry M. Wriston, Brown: "I am opposed to a third term for any President. The strain of the office is such that I think 8 years is enough. There is no evidence that this Nation cannot produce leaders once in 8 years."

E. M. Hopkins, Dartmouth: "I can simply say that among my friends and acquaintances, whether here in the college or in other centers, I know of no single case where a man does not believe that overthrowing the tradition against a third term would be injurious to the Government and would react upon the reputation of the individual President who might have sought or even wanted a third term."

"OVERWHELMINGLY OPPOSED"

C. C. Williams, Lehigh: "I have inquired amongst acquaintances in Bethlehem as occasion offered and I believe that the sentiments of the people with whom I am acquainted are quite overwhelmingly, if not unanimously, opposed to a third term."

W. P. Few, Duke: "I am writing to say that of the many I have happened to hear discuss the possibility of a third term for Mr. Roosevelt I cannot recall a single one who was in favor of it."

D. W. Morehouse, Drake: "I would say that from all of the information I can gather any propaganda for a third term would be ill-advised and unacceptable to our citizens."

J. H. Kirkland, Vanderbilt: "Of course, I cannot presume to know the feeling for any large part of the Nation. I can only speak for that small group of people with whom I am associated and with which the question of a third term has occasionally been discussed. I am free to say that I have met nothing but opposition to such a proposal."

George B. Cutten, Colgate: "Regardless of what a person's political stamp may be, and I have many friends in both the two main parties, I have not heard a person express himself who was not much opposed to a third term for Mr. Roosevelt, or anyone else. All the men with whom I have talked are opposed to any third term."

Edmound E. Day, Cornell: "I would assume without any actual canvass that any such idea would encounter substantial opposition."

Ralph Cooper Hutchinson, Washington and Jefferson: "I am opposed."

Irving Maurer, Beloit: "May I say that while I have heard various points of view expressed in regard to the concept of the service of President Roosevelt I do not think I have heard a single person speak favorably about the possibility of President Roosevelt's running for a third term."

SUGGESTS 7-YEAR TERM

W. M. Lewis, Lafayette: "The framers of the Constitution, so farseeing in most things, might have done well to cling to their original idea of making the term of office for the President 7 years and eliminating any possibility of a second term."

E. M. Waits, Texas Christian University: "In answer to your inquiry concerning the sentiment relative to a third term for President Roosevelt, allow me to say that I have not heard the matter discussed very extensively up to the present time. For the most part, I have not heard any great enthusiasm expressed for the idea of a third term for any President."

Wiley Lin Hurie, College of the Ozarks: "Personally I would regret very much to see the precedent of the past broken down. For no very good reason I suppose I have a feeling, based on sentiment, that it would not be a good thing to elect any President to a third term."

Preparation for Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 19 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. WILLIAM C. BULLITT

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, on yesterday in Philadelphia our Ambassador to France, Mr. Bullitt, delivered a stirring address which should challenge the attention of every American.

France, the country where our Ambassador is stationed, recently has fallen prey to a stronger nation. This was due in part to indifference to the type of its armed forces and too much reliance in the strength of its fortifications. The people of France failed to take full recognition of the constant danger by which they were surrounded and neglected to awake fully to their peril.

I am not an alarmist, but I think the address delivered by Ambassador Bullitt from the steps of Independence Hall, where America proclaimed its independence, should be carefully read and thoughtful attention given to its warning. The time to awaken to the spirit of defense is now. "The ramparts we watch" are too sacred and too precious to us all to permit them to be endangered by the neglect of proper precautions looking to necessary defense.

I ask that the address be incorporated in the Appendix of the RECORD as part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Fellow citizens of my country, men and women, Americans, there are times, rare and infrequent, when a man feels he has a right to ask his fellow citizens to hear him. Here tonight, in my own city, in this square where our Republic was created, I feel I have that right.

For nearly 4 years I have served as Ambassador of our Republic to the French Republic. That republic, like our own, followed the gleam of liberty, equality, and fraternity for all men and all races. That republic, like our own, strove for peace.

I have seen the French Republic destroyed.

As your emissary, as the representative of American democracy, I have witnessed the acts which destroyed the French democracy. I know of my own knowledge what blows were struck, what devices of intrigue and treachery and force were employed. I know who are the enemies of freedom because I have seen them at their work. I know how dangerous they are and by what means they are dangerous.

Because I have seen these things and know them of my own knowledge, I know that dangers beset free institutions everywhere, and I know what those dangers are. The strategy of destruction by which the free nation of France was overthrown is the strategy of destruction by which the enemies of freedom hope to overthrow liberty in this, the greatest of the nations that freedom has created. Because I have seen these things with my own eyes, heard them with my own ears, and felt them in my own body, I ask you, my fellow free Americans, to hear what I feel it my duty to say.

America is in danger.

It is my conviction, drawn from my own experience and from the information in the hands of our Government in Washington, that the United States is in as great peril today as was France a year ago. And I believe that unless we act now, decisively, to meet the threat we shall be too late.

The dictators are convinced that all democracies will always be too late. You remember Hitler's statement: "Each country will imagine that it alone will escape. I shall not even need to destroy them one by one. Selfishness and lack of foresight will prevent each one fighting until it is too late."

Control of government by public opinion is the essence of democracy. And it has always been our belief that free speech and a free press and free education would enable us to form and express our opinions sufficiently swiftly not only to permit but to compel our Government to act quickly and effectively. But the problems of world affairs have become so complex, in this day of volcanic change, that the average citizen has the greatest difficulty in understanding them and judging what is best for his country before it is too late.

The dictators have developed a strategy of attack that is based on this difficulty. To prepare the way for military attack on a democracy they employ every possible variety of agent and propaganda to befuddle the public so that the democracy will not prepare in time. They succeeded in befuddling public opinion in France and England to such an extent that they were able to conquer France in a few days and are now striving to conquer an England which awakened late.

They are not yet in a position to attack America by military means; but their campaign of befuddlement, their preparatory assault, is following the same lines in America that it followed in France. Do not imagine that the French citizen was less intelligent or cared less about his country than the American cititzen. The honest French patriot did his best, but he just could not see through the smoke screens of bribery, propaganda, lies, and threats which the dictators spread in his country. For every Frenchman who acted as the conscious agent of a foreign dictator, there were a thousand who, with good intentions and high patriotism, unwittingly played the dictators' game.

How many Americans today are playing the dictators' game without knowing it?

In France, as in the United States today, there were many honest pacifists. There were many because after 1918 every Frenchman became in one sense a pacifist. The French wanted no more war. And when the German propagandists told the French that they could buy peace with Germany by making one concession after another, the French believed them.

The French, who were much stronger at the time than were the Germans, let the Germans reconstruct an army, a navy, and an air force, let them reoccupy the Rhineland and the Saar, then Austria, then the Sudeten areas of Czechoslovakia, then the whole of Czechoslovakia. After that the Germans said that the price of peace was Danzig and Poland's outlet to the sea. By that time the French had learned that the lie, the solemn pledge given and broken, had become Germany's normal weapon in international affairs. Yet today there are Americans who argue that we should believe the dictators when they say that they have no intention of extending their conquests to the Western Hemisphere and certainly not to the United States. France believed. Where now is France?

There are also Americans who argue that if Hitler should conquer Great Britain he would be content to stop there, and that the United States would be able to cooperate happily with the Hitler Empire of Europe. To believe this is to misunderstand the entire nature of the Nazi system. It is not organized to develop an empire in peace. It is organized as a dynamic military machine. The ruthless hold of the Nazi leaders on the German people is based on the gearing of all energies for the sacrifices necessary to wage war. The continued sacrifices by the great mass of the people which the Nazi system demands cannot be obtained except by maintaining a supercharged war temperature. The German nation has been made a predatory army of assault. Its organization is military. Its military operations have enormous momentum. It cannot stop in its tracks. It can only be stopped.

Were Germany to try to resume the ways of peace, the military discipline which is the very foundation of the Nazi hierarchy would crumble. In order to continue in power that hierarchy must continue to lead Germany on new predatory adventures. The third Reich cannot change its objectives and methods without changing its entire organization and leadership.

The Americans who believe that the Nazis will not have to be stopped but will stop of their own accord are indulging in the fatal vice of wishful thinking. They want to believe this. Therefore they believe it. There is no other basis than their wish for their conclusion that the Nazis suddenly will become peace-loving men.

The men and women who tell you that the dictators will not attack the Western Hemisphere may be honest, wishful thinkers or they may be agents of the dictators, but in either case, by lulling you into a false feeling of security and retarding your preparations for defense, they are keeping the way clear for an assault on America by the dictators. They are enemies, consciously or unconsciously, of our country and our liberties.

In France there were high-placed and influential German agents who circulated in what was called society, and argued, because Hitler had said he loved France, that Germany would never so much wish to invade France as to attack the Maginot Line which was estimated to be such a tremendous obstacle. Today, we hear Americans of the same stripe arguing that the dictators will never so wish to invade the Americas as to cross the Atlantic which is regarded as such a tremendous obstacle. They ask us to ignore the fact that the Atlantic is an obstacle only so long as the European exits to the Atlantic are controlled by a nation which is genuinely friendly to us. We can remember, however, that in the past when those exits have been in the hands of a power unfriendly to us, the Atlantic has become a broad highway for the invasion of the Americas. By way of the Atlantic our own land was invaded twice: during our Revolution and the War of 1812—and that with sailing ships. By way of the Atlantic, Mexico was invaded during our Civil War.

The truth is that the destruction of the British Navy would be the turning of our Atlantic Maginot Line. Without the British Navy, the Atlantic would give us no more protection than the Maginot Line gave France after the German troops had marched through Belgium. The soothing words "Maginot Line" were the refrain of a lullaby of death for France. The soothing words "Atlantic Ocean" are being used now by the propagandists of the dictators in the hope that they may become a lullaby of death for the United States.

The French knew that they were outnumbered two to one by the Germans, and that all Germans—men, women, and children—had been mobolized for war. They knew that Great Britain was unprepared for war and that little help could come to France from England. When they thought hard, therefore, they knew that every French man, woman, and child ought to be working for the national defense. The French had, of course, universal military training for the army. Even the French priests were trained to fight, and they fought at the front like other good soldiers and would not have been respected if they had not. But when the question arose of mobilizing the whole nation for national defense by compulsory national service, even as a temporary measure to save the liberties of France, the French found it more comfortable to listen to the voices, some sincere, some bought by the dictators, which told them that their individual liberties were sacred and must not be sacrificed for a moment even to save the liberties of the nation; that it was more important for the individual to work only 40 hours a week than for his country to have enough airplanes; that the voluntary acceptance of national service as a temporary measure would be an imitation of the dictatorships. Thus, in the name of the preservation of individual liberty, the national liberty of France was condemned in advance to destruction.

Recently, in this country, we have heard men and women arguing that we ourselves would be imitating the dictatorships if we should create through conscription an army adequate to defend our country. They, too, are playing the dictators' game.

Then there are many in France, some honest, some agents of the dictators, who argued that since airplane design was changing rapidly, France should have good models but should not manufacture planes in great quantity until after the outbreak of war. They were prominent and powerful. As a result, at one time French plane production was allowed to sink to 37 a month while Germany was producing a thousand a month.

Have we been wiser during the past years? Have we built the planes or trained the aviators to man them? Have we prepared the tanks or the men to drive them? Have we trained and equipped even infantry for our national defense? Are there not among us many who think and talk as did the Frenchmen who opposed adequate preparations? Recently I heard a Senator who is as good an American as any of us state that while he would favor conscription the moment we should be attacked, he would oppose conscription until after we should have been attacked. The ruined homes of France, the women and children starving on the roads, cry out to him, and to everyone of us, that wars are won or lost by the preparations made or not made before they begin; that untrained soldiers are not opponents but merely victims for trained men with tanks and planes. The dictators, who are confident that all democracies will always be too late, count not only on their agents to befuddle American opinion but also on honorable men like that Senator.

What stands today between the Americas and the unleashed dictatorships? The British fleet and the courage of the British people. How long will the British fleet be able to hold the exits from Europe to the Atlantic? I cannot answer that question nor can any man.

You have heard the appeal of General Pershing for aid to the British Fleet. You have heard the appeal of Admiral Standley. You have heard the appeal of William Allen White and his associates. If you let those appeals go unanswered and the British Fleet goes under, do you realize what that would mean to you, to all of the people of this country? Great Britain and Ireland, along with the whole continent of Europe, would be organized into one economic unit directed from Berlin; a unit which would be far stronger in productive capacity than the United States, which would have five times our capacity to produce warships; a unit whose trade would be controlled by one trading trust directed from Berlin. No country of North or South America would be able to trade with Europe except on such terms as might be pleasing to the dictators. Those conditions for many of the countries of South America would be the acceptance of a greater or less measure of Nazi control.

For us, since we would not accept Nazi control, they would mean the cutting off of our markets for cotton, tobacco, and other export products. That would be so fatal to the economy of certain sections of our country that we should face the gravest economic crisis in our history; a crisis which it would be the task of Nazi and Communist agents to exploit.

In the Pacific would be the Japanese Navy, cooperating with the dictators, which would be able to cut us off from our supplies of rubber and tin and would compel us to leave a large part of our fleet in the Pacific to defend Hawaii and the west coast. In the Atlantic would be combined fleets of the dictators which would be so close to our own fleet in strength that they would be able to cut us off from all commerce not only with Europe but also with Africa and would endanger even our communications with the southern portion of this hemisphere.

Are you sure that under those circumstances the powerful Nazi and Communist movements which already exist in various countries of South America would not be able to seize power and would not invite the European dictators to organize air forces on their territories, and that those air forces would not move northward with dive bombers to the Panama Canal and then move against this country? Are you sure that our existing fleet and air force would be able to defend even the northern route to the United States by way of Greenland, Newfoundland, and Canada?

It is as clear as anything on this earth that the United States will not go to war, but it is equally clear that war is coming toward the Americas.

The agents of the dictators are already here preparing the way for their armies. They are preparing the way in the same manner in which they prepared the way in France.

In France much of the most terrible and traitorous work was done by the Fascists and Communists working together. Many honest French democrats and liberals had been snared by Communist propaganda and argued that, because the Communists called themselves a political party and pretended at the time to be in favor of democracy, it would be undemocratic to deny to the Communists the rights of any other political party. The honest French patriots and democrats who protected the Communists did not discover until too late that the Communists were acting as spies and agents of the dictators, that the Communist Party was merely camouflaged as a political party and was in reality a conspiracy to commit patricide at the direction of a foreign dictator. They discovered too late that the Communists were traitors who were claiming the protection of the state which they intended to destroy only in order the better to prepare for its destruction.

When the German invasion began to sweep into Belgium and France there were Communist and Nazi agents of Germany in each town and village who produced panic among the civilian populations by spreading fantastic tales of murdering by the German troops of men, women, and children. By this means 10,000,000 civilians were harried in fear from their homes and clogged all the roads, so that the French, British, and Belgian Armies could not maneuver, so that transport of supplies became almost impossible, and a magnificent fighting force became a clotted mass of men and material, a perfect target for bombing and machine-gunning from the air.

At the most critical moment of the fighting in Belgium other German agents, this time Communist railway men, stopped all traffic on the Belgian railways so that there was no transport by train for the French, British, and Belgian Armies.

Throughout France, especially in Paris, there were hundreds of Communist and Nazi agents of the dictators with extremely short-wave portable radio transmitting sets in their hiding places. They kept the Germans fully informed of the movements of the French Army and of the intentions of the French Government. Since they could change their hiding places daily, the French were never able to track down more than one-tenth of these spies.

The French had been more hospitable than are even we Americans to refugees from Germany. More than one-half the spies captured doing actual military spy work against the French Army were refugees from Germany.

Do you believe that there are no Nazi and Communist agents of this sort in America?

On the 10th day of last May the people of France were as confident as are the people of the United States today that their country could not be conquered. Three days later, on the 13th day of May, the Germans had smashed through the center of the French Army and France was doomed.

The way had been prepared by spies, agents, and propagandists, but it was the strength of the German Army and the skill of its leaders that enabled Germany to strike the fatal blow. The blow was struck just where the French did not expect it. The attack was made by a new method that the French had never imagined. Waves of bombing planes preceded waves of tanks with perfect coordination maintained by radio. The tanks cut through the French lines, then wheeled and lopped off piece after piece of the French Army.

The French soldier fought as courageously and magnificently as any soldier has ever fought. Division after division, cut off from supplies of all sorts, fought on until there were no more shells for the cannons or cartridges for the guns, then charged with the bayonet. The courage of the French was magnificent but of no avail against the tanks and planes of the Germans. And, make no mistake, the German infantrymen were as brave as the French.

The entire western world had been lulled by stories of the inferiority of German equipment. I have seen, myself, hundreds of thousands of German soldiers with all their motorized and mechanized equipment. I have never seen one piece of that equipment broken down.

The German military machine today is without question the most powerful that has ever been created. It has been used with consummate skill. And you may be sure that, if the Nazis have an opportunity to turn it against us, it will be as strong or stronger than it is today and will be used in the most unexpected manner.

I cannot tell you where and when the attack will come, any more than the French General Staff could have told you that the German attack would be made at Sedan on the 13th of May; but I am certain that if Great Britain is defeated, the attack will come, and that all the strength of this Nation will be needed—mobilized, organized, equipped, and ready—if we are to parry it and save the independence of our country.

Why are we sleeping, Americans? When are we going to wake up? When are we going to tell our Government that we want to defend our homes and our children and our liberties, whatever the cost in money or blood? When are we going to give the lie to those who say that the people of the United States no longer care about

their liberties, that they look on the United States just as a trough into which to get their snouts and not as the greatest adventure in human freedom that this earth has known?

When are we going to let the world know that, in spite of all the efforts of all the propagandists who call their propaganda debunking and try to teach us to fear even truth, we still know that when anyone tries to debunk the Ten Commandments and the Sermon on the Mount he prepares for himself hell in this world and in the next?

When are we going to let legislators in Washington know that we don't want any more politicians who are afraid of the next election and scared to ask us to make the sacrifices that we know are necessary to preserve our liberties and our Declaration of Independence and our Constitution? When are we going to tell them that we want to know what are our duties, not what are our privileges? When are we going to say to them that we don't want to hear any longer about what we can get from our country, but we do want to hear what we can give to our country? When are we going to stand before God and say that we know a human being is worthy of freedom only when he serves the ideal in which he believes?

Do we want to see Hitler in Independence Hall making fun of the Liberty Bell? No.

Then here, in this square, where Washington walked with Jerferson, where our independence was declared, where our Constitution was framed, I ask you and all other Americans who hear my voice tonight to join in the fight to keep our country free.

Write and telegraph to your Senators and Representatives. Write to your newspapers. Demand the privilege of being called into the service of the Nation. Tell them that we want conscription. Tell them that we back up General Pershing.

If you belong to great patriotic organizations, make them act. If you want to make your will felt but do not know how to make it felt, write to me and I shall try personally to put you in touch with the men and women who know how you can help most effectively in your own home towns and villages.

Our defense against the enemies who are already within our country has still to be organized. Nearly all our defense against the enemies that are still outside our country has still to be organized. If we won't act, our Government can't. It is up to us.

The fighting line of the war for the enslavement of the human spirit is nearing our shores. For every American "there is no discharge in that war." An American is a free man or he is nothing. Our fate and the fate of our children depend on what each one of us does—now.

Steps Toward British Union, a World State and International Strife—Part IV

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. THORKELSON

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 19, 1940

Mr. THORKELSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I include a short article entitled, "Undermining America."

UNDERMINING AMERICA

The beginning of the undermining of America was brought by Cecil Rhodes, who, in 1877, left money to establish scholarships at Oxford for the purpose of training diplomats to foster the reunion of Britain and America. In the first draft of his will, which is quoted in the book Cecil Rhodes, by Basil Williams, or the book Cecil Rhodes, by Sarah Gertrude Millen, he stated:

"Directed that a secret society should be endowed with the following objects: 'The extension of British rule throughout the world; the colonization by British subjects of all lands where the means of livelihood are attainable by energy, labor, and enterprise; and especially the occupation by British settlers of the entire continent of Africa, the Holy Land, the Valley of the Euphrates, the Islands of Cyprus and Candia, the whole of South America, the islands of the Pacific not heretofore possessed by Great Britain, the whole of the Malay Archipelago, the seaboard of China and Japan, the ultimate recovery of the United States of America as an integral part of the British Empire.'" "The foundation of so great a power as to hereafter render wars impossible, and promote the best interests of humanity."

A new will was made:

"He substituted English-speaking peoples for actual Britons; he came to realize his limitations and reduced his scheme to a mere beginning of it, the scholarships; but yet the thought behind each successive will remained the same—the world for England, England for the world." (See page 145, Cecil Rhodes, by Sarah Gertrude Millen.)

Other quotations:

Page 377: "But the essence of the wil', as the world knows, is the Scholarship Foundation. In the end all that Rhodes can do toward extending British rule throughout the world and restoring Anglo-Saxon unity and founding a guardian power for the whole of humanity is to arrange for a number of young men from the United States, the British colonies, and Germany to go to Oxford. * * * There are, accordingly, rather more Rhodes scholars from America than from all the British Dominions put together."

Page 378: "If the Union of South Africa could be made under the shadow of Table Mountain, why not an Anglo-Saxon Union under the spires of Oxford?"

In 1893 Andrew Carnegie wrote his book, Triumphant Democracy, the last chapter of which is "The Reunion of Britain and America." (The 1931 edition of this book is devoid of this last chapter.) The following is a quotation from the original book:

"Regarding those I should like Britons to consider what the proposed reunion means. Not the most sanguine advocate of imperial federation" dares to intimate that the federation that he dreams of would free the markets of all its members to each other. This question cannot even be discussed when imperial conferences meet; if it be introduced, it is judiciously shelved. But an Anglo-American reunion brings free entry here of all British productions as a matter of course. The richest market in the world is opened to Britain free of all duty by a stroke of the pen. No tax revenue, although under free trade such taxes might still exist. What would not trade with the Republic, duty free, mean to the linen, woolen, iron, and steel industries of Scotland, to the tin-plate manufacturers of England. It would mean prosperity to every industry in the United Kingdom, and thus in turn would mean renewed prosperity to the agricultural interests, now so sorely depressed."

Another quotation:

"In the event of reunion, the American manufacturers would supply the interior of the country, but the great population skirting the Atlantic seaboard and the Pacific coast would receive their manufactured articles chiefly from Great Britain."

And still another quotation:

"Time may dispel many pleasing illusions and destroy many noble dreams, but it shall never shake my belief that the wound caused by the wholly unlooked-for and undesired separation of the mother from her child is not to bleed forever. Let men say what they will, therefore, I say, that as surely as the sun in the heavens once shone upon Britain and America united, so surely is it one morning to rise, shine upon, and greet again the reunited state, the British-American Union."

1914: Andrew Carnegie took over the controlling group of the Federal Council of Churches by subsidizing what is known as the Church Peace Union with $2,000,000, and the Church Peace Union or the board of trustees has always exercised a dominating influence in the Federal Council. This endowment has provided sufficient annual income to run the budget of the Federal Council and its cooperating organizations. Among the associated groups are the World's Alliance of International Friendship Through the Churches, Commission on International Friendship and Good Will, National Council for Prevention of War, and American Civil Liberties Union. (See Pastors, Pacifists, and Politicians, pp. 5 and 6, published by the Constructive Educational Publishing Co., Chicago.)

1917–18: Witnessed the promise of England to give Palestine to the Zionist Jews, if they would throw America into the war on her side. This was reported in the New York Times March 8, 1930, Sunday editorial. It was this that caused Otto Kahn to come to America and become an American citizen. (See New York Sun, June 19, 1936—Pledged Jews National Home—p. 19.)

1917: At the annual meeting of the trustees for the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, held at the Headquarters Building, No. 2, Jackson Place, Washington, D. C., on April 20, 1917, the following resolutions were adopted by the board:

"PEACE THROUGH TRIUMPH OF DEMOCRACY

"*Resolved*, That the trustees of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, assembled for their annual meeting, declare hereby their belief that the most effectual means of promoting durable international peace is to prosecute the war against the Imperial Government of Germany to final victory for democracy, in accordance with the policy declared by the President of the United States.

"SERVICES TENDERED TO THE GOVERNMENT

"*Resolved*, That the endowment offers to the Government the services of its division of international law, its personnel and equipment, for dealing with the pressure of international business incident to the war." (See pp. 181–183 of the C. E. for I. P. Year Book, 1917.)

In connection with the adoption of this resolution, the following quotation from a letter written to Hon. Robert Lansing, Secretary of State, dated April 21, 1917, by the secretary of the board, Dr. James Brown Scott:

"Of course, a general offer to the Government should be interpreted as an offer to the particular department of the Government to which the division of international law may be of more appropriate service, and, since the nature of the work of the division is in line with, and many of its officers and employees are former officers and employees of the Department of State, I feel that the services and equipment of the division should be offered to that

Department, which offer I hereby convey as the representative of the endowment in carrying out the above resolution of the board of trustees."

In June 1918: Woodrow Wilson sent two men to England: Mr. Charles Moore, of Detroit, Mich., and Prof. Andrew McLaughlin, of Chicago University, and an agreement was made to leave the carrying trade of the Atlantic to Great Britain, which was embodied in our version of the peace treaty, as written by Col. Edward M. House, at Beverly Farms, Mass.

1918: Witnessed the American Historical Association, Carnegie endowed, meeting in London, and the agreement was made to rewrite American history to please England. (See American Historical Year Book, 1918.)

1919: When Lord Northcliffe had completed his propaganda organization in this country during the recent World War, and was returning home it was announced that he was leaving behind him $150,000,000 (our own money, of course) and 10,000 trained agents to carry on the work. His own London Times in the issue of July 4, 1919, rendered account of the "efficient propaganda" which he had inaugurated here and was being carried out by those trained in the arts of creating public good will and of swaying public opinion toward a definite purpose. (See Report on Investigation of American History, City of New York, May 25, 1923.)

Among the methods, stated by the London Times, to be then in operation or in prospect in this country were:

"Efficiently organized propaganda to mobilize the press, the church, the stage, and the cinema, to press into active service the whole educational system, the universities, public and high schools and primary schools. Histories and textbooks on literature should be revised. New books should be added, particularly in the primary school. Hundreds of exchange university scholarships should be provided. Local societies should be formed in every center to foster British-American good will, in close cooperation with an administrative committee." (See Report on Investigation of American History, City of New York, May 25, 1923.)

This same Fourth of July issue of the London Times contained a signed article by Owen Wister, American born, in which we said: "A movement to correct the schoolbooks of the United States has been started and it will go on." (See p. 62 of Report on Investigation of American History, city of New York, May 25, 1923.)

1919: Witnessed the rewriting of American history to please England. Protests were made by the Sons of the American Revolution and other patriotic societies. (See Report on Pro-British Histories, held at City Hall, May 25, 1923.)

1919: Mr. Edward Filene, of Boston, an internationalist, set up the Twentieth Century Fund, Inc., and by interlocking directorates has control over 124 trust funds, together totaling nearly a billion dollars. Included in this control are the Carnegie, Rockefeller, the Duke and Russell Sage Foundations from which funds go subsidies to subversive communistic, socialistic, and all peace movements, as well as the cooperative movements. Among activities of Twentieth Century Fund, Inc., are the following: N. R. A., S. E. C., Wagner Labor Act, International Labor Office (affiliated with League of Nations), Foreign Policy Association, credit unions, cooperatives, League of Women Voters. (See Red Network, published by Elizabeth Dilling, 53 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill., for communistic activities of these groups. Also see Year Books and American Foundations and Their Fields, published by Twentieth Century Fund, Inc., 330 West Forty-second Street, New York.)

1920: From the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, Year Book, 1920—Division of International Law—report of the director, James Brown Scott, page 111.

THE FUTURE OF INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION

"The director believes that the road to progress runs from the Hague Conferences to a distant and ever receding horizon. He believes that nations are only willing to try on an international scale those things which have been tried within national lines and which have been successful. He believes in an infinite series of little steps, not in any one leap, however attractive the prospect may be.

"During the Conference of Paris, the director daily passed through the Place de la Concorde in going to and from the Hotel de Crillon to the Quai d'Orsay. He has often stood before the obelisk marking the site where the head of Louis XVI fell, and with it the old regime. The men of that day dreamed of a newer and better future. All that has been was wrong and the wrong must be righted. They abolished the old calendar based upon the birth of the Man of Nazareth, and brushing it aside, they began their new era with the year 1. But it all ended with the final entry of Louis XVIII, the brother of Louis XVI, into the Tuileries in the year of Our Lord 1815.

"The statesmen of the future, if not of the present day, are bound to recur to the past, and in international organization, the past is, in the opinion of the director, the Hague Peace Conferences."

RECOMMENDATIONS ON INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION

(Quotations from p. 110, Year Book 1920)

"It is not necessary for a workable program of international organization that the world should be federated; it is, however, essential that the nations of the civilized world should cooperate."

1921–25: Witnessed the battle for the suppression of the Star-Spangled Banner and the desire to replace it with America the Beautiful. Nine years were consumed in getting the bill out of the pigeonhole of the judiciary, legalizing the national anthem against such attacks. In spite of this, the official national anthem is rarely heard.

Mrs. Augusta Stetson put paid advertisements in newspapers around the country, including the New York Times (August 5, 1925), and admitted under oath when subpenaed to city hall, March 5, 1924, for an investigation that she had spent $169,000 in one fund and $17,000 in another to destroy and delete the Star-Spangled Banner because it was not pleasing to England. Franklin Ford, her secretary, in 1931, admitted at his office that he was financed by the English-Speaking Union and the British Commonwealth Club, Inc. (Refer to hearing before Deputy Commissioner Lowden, March 5, 1924, New York City.)

1925: A March issue of Saturday Evening Post carries an article by Owen D. Young, the originator of the Young plan bonds for the reparation of Germany, in which he stated that American labor would have to be reduced to the status of European labor.

1929: Witnessed the visit of Ramsay MacDonald with Hoover on the Rapidan. (See World-Telegram, October 10, 1929.) "The result of those representations, both Washington and London will hold to be of vital significance to the future of organized society."

See also New York Times, October 10, 1929, Ramsay MacDonald said: "I have achieved more than I hoped."

1929: Witnessed the stock-market crash. See National Message, official organ British-Israel World Federation, New York Public Library, October 12, 1935, page 679:

"It was told to me by a heavyweight American financier before the crash came that the crash was coming, that it would be permitted to run to the danger point, and that when the danger point was passed it would be reversed by measures carefully prepared in advance to meet the situation. I carefully noted what he said and left it for events to prove the value of his statement."

1934: John L. Lewis, organizer of the Committee for Industrial Organization, attended the June conference of the International Labor Organization. (See New York Times, October 11, 1934.)

1935: See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, August 26, page 15051, Mr. Huey Long: "A newspaperman whom I know to be reliable telephoned me tonight and said: 'I have found out for you that the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Morgenthau, has given out a statement in confidence * * * that this 9-cent plan was devised by Mr. Oscar Johnson, of Mississippi.' I said, 'If it is the Oscar Johnson, of Mississippi, that I know about, he was the manager of a chain of British plantations.' The newspaperman said, 'That is the same man.' I knew this idea could not have been given birth in the brain of an American cotton owner nor an American cotton planter, nor any American who understood the situation. I knew that the idea had foreign parentage; and, lo and behold, the gentleman who was formerly a manager of a number of British plantations, and has lately returned from London, has given birth to this plan, and his brain child has become the adopted child of the A. A. A. of the good old United States. * * * And he thought the cotton farmer was doing well if he made $100 a year."

1935: September 25, New York Sun, Food From Overseas: "Twenty-two million pounds of butter came into this country from foreign countries. In the first 8 months of 1934 imported oats, for example, totaled scarcely 200,000 bushels, but this year in the same period imports exceeded 10,000,000 bushels. Imports of corn in the same period of this year exceeded 31,800,000 bushels compared with 371,700 in 1934. American wheat exports dropped from 16,600,000 bushels in the first 8 months of 1934 to 142,000 in 1935." (While crops in this country were being burned and plowed under.)

1935: Witnessed a secret national peace conference financed by a grant from the Carnegie Endowment for Peace, see New York American, December 19, 1935: "Meeting behind closed doors at the Westchester Country Club at Harrison, N. Y., the conference, composed of 29 organizations, adopted the following six-point program:

1. A Nation-wide radio campaign to commit the United States to a policy of internationalism.

2. Crippling of the Army and Navy billion-dollar appropriation bill by attaching a billion-dollar housing project clause as a rider.

3. Abolition of the Army and Navy sedition bill, which would punish anyone attempting to incite enlisted men to insubordination or mutiny.

4. Abolition of the R. O. T. C. in colleges.

5. A vigorous campaign against those who oppose this country's entrance into the League of Nations and to prevent the United States from obstructing the League in applying sanctions.

6. Adoption of the drastic neutrality bill.

Andrew Carnegie left hundreds of millions of dollars to carry out his plan.

1935–36: American Association for Adult Education, 60 East Forty-second Street, New York City, Carnegie endowed, lists the following activities that are financed by the Carnegie Corporation, and the Rockefeller General Education Board: Forum Experimentation (public forums), Federal Emergency Program (cooperates with U. S. Office of Education), C. C. C. camps, community organization, workers' education, international relations, commonwealth college. (See p. 5701, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, April 14, 1936, also see Annual Report of the Directors, above address).

1936: Witnesses Nicholas Murray Butler sailing on the *Queen Mary* June 5, for the most important Carnegie Endowment for Peace Conference in London, England, that has ever been held. It is at this meeting that the question of gold being used on an international basis is to be discussed.

1936—Herald Tribune, June 19, 1936, page 22: "Supply Held Adequate for World Gold Basis." There even may be too much, Brookings Institution says. Brookings Institution (Carnegie-endowed) study of the adequacy of the gold supply, written by Dr. Charles O'Hardy, held that no existing or prospective deficiency in the world gold supply stood in the way of restoration of an international gold standard, whenever such a step was considered advantageous. * * * Two officials of the Federal Reserve System: Dr. E. A. Goldenweiser, chief economist, and Adolph C. Miller, former governor and special member, recently made speeches heralding return to the gold standard in modified form. Henry Mongenthau, Jr., Secretary of the Treasury, has said that the United States will cooperate in such a movement as soon as the rest of the world is ready.

NOTE: What guaranty have the people of the United States that the currency which they would hold would be redeemable in gold?

1936: Witnesses the United States Government largely influenced or controlled by organized financial interests cooperating with or under the control of the 20th Century Fund, Inc., or American Foundations and their Fields. Some of these with their officers and trustees are listed herein:

OFFICERS AND TRUSTEES

Carnegie Corporation, New York, Andrew Carnegie, donor; Elihu Root, Robertson D. Ward, Fred P. Keppel, Robert M. Lester, John M. Russel, Samuel S. Hall, Jr., Barent Lefferts, Ernest A. Farintosh, Thomas S. Arbuthnot, Newton D. Baker, Nicholas Murray Butler, Samuel Harden Church, Lotus D. Coffman, Henry James, Walter A. Jessup, Nicholas Kelley, Russell Leffingwell, John C. Merriam, Margaret Carnegie Miller, Fred Osborn, Arthur W. Page.

Carnegie Corporation, Washington, D. C.,: John C. Merriam, Elihu Root, Henry S. Pritchett, Fred A. Delano, Thomas Barbour, W W. Campbell, Homer L. Ferguson, W. Cameron Forbes, Walter S. Gifford, Fred H. Gillett, Herbert Hoover, Frank B. Jewett, Alfred L. Locmis, Andrew W. Mellon, Roswell Miller, Andrew J. Montague, Stewart Paton, John J. Pershing, William Benson Storey, Richard P. Strong, James W. Wadsworth, Fred C. Walcott, George W. Wickerson.

Church Peace Union: Donor: Andrew Carnegie, William P. Merrill, George A. Plimpton, Henry A. Atkinson, Linley V. Gordon, G. S. Barker, Rev. Arthur Judson Brown, Bishop James Cannon, Jr., Rev. Francis J. Haas, Rev. Frank Oliver Hall, Prof. Hamilton Holt, Hon. Morton D. Hull, Prof. William I. Hull, Rev. Charles E. Jefferson, Dr. James R. Joy, Rev. Miles H. Krumbine, Dr. Henry Goddard Leach, Bishop Francis J. McConnell, Rev. Charles S. MacFarland, Rabbi Louis L. Mann, Dean Shailer Mathews, Rev. William Pierson Merrill, Hon. Henry Morgenthau, Dr. John R. Mott, Rev. Roger T. Nooe, Rev. Howard C. Robbins, Monsignor John A. Ryan, Rt. Rev. Henry K. Sherrill, Dr. Robert E. Speer, Charles P. Taft II, Rev. Charles D. Trexler, Dr. James J. Walsh.

Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, Washington, D. C.: Nicholas Murray Butler, Andrew J. Montague, James Brown Scott, George A. Finch, Frederic A. Delano (uncle of F. D. R.), Charles S. Hamlin, Wallace McK. Alexander, David P. Barrows, William Marshall Bullitt, Daniel K. Catlin, John W. Davis, Norman H. Davis, Autsen G. Fox, Robert A. Franks, Francis Pendleton Gaines, Charles Hamlin, Howard Heinz, Alanson B. Houghton, Frank O. Lowden, Peter Molyneaux, Roland S. Morris, Henry S. Pritchett, Elihu Root, Edward L. Ryerson, James R. Sheffield, Maurice S. Sherman, James T. Shotwell, Silas H. Strawn, Robert A. Taft, Thomas J. Watson.

Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, New York City: Walter A. Jossup, Henry S. Pritchett, Robert A. Franks, Howard J. Savage, William S. Learned, Alfred Z. Reed, Samuel S. Hall, Jr., Raymond L. Mattocks, Walter C. Murray, Thomas William Lamont, Fred. Carlos Ferry, Frank Aydelotte, William Lowe Bryan, Nicholas M. Butler, Lotus Dolta Coffman, James Bryant Conant, George Hutcheson Denny, Albert Bledsoe Dinwiddie, Edward Charles Elliott, Livingston Farrand, Frank Porter Graham, Albert Ross Hill, James Hampton Kirkland, Ernest Hiram Lindley, William Allan Neilson, George Norlin, Josiah Harmar Penniman, Rush Rhees, Kenneth Charles Morton Sills, Frank Arthur Vanderlip, Henry Merritt Wriston.

General Education Board, New York City: Donor: John D. Rockefeller, Raymond B. Fosdick, Trevor Arnett, David H. Stevens, Wm. W. Brierly, Lefferts M. Dashiell, Edward Robinson, George A. Beal, Arthur G. Askey, James R. Angell, Trevor Arnett, Harry W. Chase, Jerome D. Greene, Ernest M. Hopkins, Max Mason, Edwin Mims, John D. Rockefeller, Jr., John D. Rockefeller, 3d, Walter W. Stewart, Harold H. Swift, Ray Lyman Wilbur, Arthur Woods, Owen D. Young.

Twentieth Century Fund, New York City: Donor: Edward A. Filene, Evans Clark, Edward A. Filene, Oswald W. Knauth, Newton D. Baker, A. A. Berle, Jr., Bruce Bliven, Henry Dennison, John H. Fahey, Morris E. Leeds, James G. McDonald, Roscoe Pound.

Religious Education Foundation, New York City: O. H. Cheney, Hugh S. Magill, Russell Colgate, Paul D. Eddy, Newton D. Baker, S. B. Chapin, Robert Garrett, James C. Penney, Charles H. Tuttle, Thomas J. Watson.

Spelman Fund of New York: Donor: Laura S. Rockefeller, Arthur Woods, Guy Moffett, L. M. Dashiell, Edward Robinson, Kenneth Chorley, Cleveland Dodge, Raymond B. Fosdick, Thomas W. Lamont, John D. Rockefeller 3d, Beardsley Ruml.

Textile Foundation, Washington, D. C.: Franklin W. Hobbs, Stuart W. Cramer, Frank D. Cheney, Daniel C. Roper, Henry A. Wallace.

(The above-mentioned organizations and the men connected with them are from American Foundations and Their Fields, published by the Twentieth Century Fund, Inc., 330 West 42d Street, New York City.)

The Carnegie Fund joined with the (Rockefeller Fund) General Education Board because they found themselves doing the same work. Above quotation from the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace Year Book, 1934.

The Carnegie, Rockefeller, and Twentieth Century Funds have through subsidies control over our press, churches, schools, the stage, cinema, colleges, and our Government, and America has not had a President entirely free from this control, particularly since the war.

1776: Hark ye to the warnings of the men of the "horse and buggy days"!

In his Farewell Address, George Washington bequeathed to the American people, as he said the "counsels of an old and affectionate friend." And he did so in the hope that his advice and admonition would, in the years to come, serve the following useful purpose:

1. "Moderate the fury of party spirit."
2. "Warn against the mischiefs of foreign intrigue." (This includes Britain.)
3. "Guard against the impostures of pretended patriotism."

George Washington also said:

"I never have heard, and I hope I never shall hear, any serious mention of a paper emission in this State; yet such a thing may be in agitation. Ignorance and design are productive of much mischief. The former (ignorance) is the tool of the latter (design), and is often set at work suddenly and unexpectedly."

Daniel Webster warned you, in 1832, while in Congress:

"Of all the contrivances for cheating the laboring classes of mankind, none have been more effectual than that which deludes them with paper money. This is the most effectual of inventions to fertilize the rich man's field by the sweat of the poor man's brow. Ordinary tyranny, oppression, excessive taxation—these bear lightly on the happiness of the mass of the community, compared with fraudulent currencies and the robberies committed by depreciated paper. Our own history has recorded for our instruction enough, and more than enough, of the demoralizing tendency, the injustice, and the intolerable oppression, on the virtuous and well disposed, of a degraded paper currency, authorized by law, or in any way countenanced by government." (See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, January 24, 1934. Speech by Hon. Louis T. McFadden, of Pennsylvania.)

Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, Washington, D. C., New York, N. Y., trustees: Arthur A. Ballantine, New York; David P. Barrows, California; James F. Bell, Minnesota; William Marshall Bullitt, Kentucky; Nicholas Murray Butler, New York; Daniel K. Catlin, Missouri; William Wallace Chapin, California; John W. Davis, New York; Norman H. Davis, New York; Frederic A. Delano, District of Columbia; Leon Fraser, New York; Douglas S. Freeman, Virginia; Francis P. Gaines, Virginia; Howard Heinz, Pennsylvania; Alanson B. Houghton, New York; Philip C. Jessup, Connecticut; Frank O. Lowden, Illinois; Peter Molyneaux, Texas; Roland S. Morris, Pennsylvania; Edward Larned Ryerson, Jr., Illinois; James Brown Scott, District of Columbia; Maurice S. Sherman, Connecticut; James T. Shotwell, New York; Harper Sibley, New York; Silas H. Strawn, Illinois; Eliot Wadsworth, Massachusetts; Thomas John Watson, New York.

Division of Intercourse and Education: Director, Nicholas Murray Butler, office, 405 West One Hundred and Seventeenth Street, New York, N. Y. Telephone, University 4–1850—Cable, Interpax, New York.

Le Centre Européen: Directeur-Adjoint, Malcolm W. Davis, Bureau, 173, Boulevard Ste-Germain, Paris, France. Telephone, Littré 88.50. Adresse Télégraphique, Interpax, Paris.

Advisory Council in Great Britain: Sir Alan Anderson, Ernest Barker, Viscount Cecil of Chelwood, William P. Crozier, Mrs. Mary Agnes Hamilton, Sir Frank Heath, Francis W. Hirst, Herbert S. Morrison, Gilbert Murray, J. A. Spender; Honorary Secretary, Mrs. Neville Lawrence.

London Office: Representative in the United Kingdom, Hubert J. Howard; address, 335 Abbey House, Victoria Street, SW. 1. Telephone, Abbey 7228; cable, Carintpax, London.

Mr. Speaker, the information contained in this booklet is important at this time, particularly in view of the fact that the pro-English groups in the United States are now working in close cooperation with world internationalist organizations.

Before 1917, foreign influence came mainly from Anglo-American groups. Since the World War, these groups have been fortified by the international financiers and the internationalists, or the so-called minority group. The pressure is therefore more than double, for combined, these groups control all avenues of communication and are now using them to further their plan of British domination to establish a world federation of states.

Let me call your attention to the fact that on the reverse of the great seal of the United States, which appears on our dollar bills, you will find the exact symbol of the British-Israel world federation movement. This symbol is also carried on literature of other organizations promoting a world

government and a world religion. At the bottom of the circle surrounding the pyramid, you will find the wording: "Novus Ordo Seclorum." It was this new order that was advocated by Clinton Roosevelt several hundred years ago; recently in Philip Dru, and now followed by the Executive.

Do you not think, as good American people, that the administration has gone far from constitutional government, when there is inscribed a symbol on the reverse of our great seal, that advocates a new order? Yes, an order which means the destruction of our Republic as formulated in the Constitution of the United States.

It may also interest you to know that this contemplated "Union Now," as advocated by Clarence Streit, will be under the control of Great Britain, and is a movement to return the United States as a colony in the British Empire. Should we become a part of this union, our traditional rights and liberties will be lost, and we will have no greater status than an English possession. This was the dream of Cecil Rhodes and Andrew Carnegie, when the latter wrote his book, Triumphant Democracy, in 1893.

Embargo Against Japan in 1918

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEWIS B. SCHWELLENBACH

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 20 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

ARTICLE BY HENRY H. DOUGLAS

Mr. SCHWELLENBACH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article by Henry H. Douglas, a distinguished student of Far Eastern affairs, which appeared in the August issue of Amerasia. The article is entitled "A Bit of American History—Successful Embargo Against Japan in 1918."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Amerasia for August 1940]

A BIT OF AMERICAN HISTORY—SUCCESSFUL EMBARGO AGAINST JAPAN IN 1918

(By Henry H. Douglas)

During the past 3 years of Japanese aggression in China, officials, private individuals, and groups in the United States have consistently advocated an embargo on the sale of war supplies to Japan. All their efforts have foundered on the rock of public apathy and the unreasoning but widespread fear that such action would provoke immediate retaliation which the United States was not prepared to combat. Advocates of the embargo have repeatedly pointed out that if Japan, with large-scale American aid, is unable to conquer a country far weaker than herself, she is not likely to challenge a strong power like the United States once that aid has been removed. Still the fear remains and ties the hands of those in official circles who recognize the inconsistency of America's present behavior toward Japan.

In view of the widespread debate which has been carried on over the question of the probable effectiveness and the possible risk of an embargo, it is of the utmost importance to discover that the United States already has behind it the history of an economic embargo against Japan which proved so effective that within 3 months Japanese policy was altered to suit American wishes, and in conformance with previous agreements. The details of this almost unknown event in American-Japanese history were recently disclosed in State Department records and are summarized herewith. (Foreign Relations of the United States, 1918 Russia, v. II, pp. 270–465; 1919 Russia, p. 247 (here is to be found the reference to file No. 694, 119/245, in the Division of Research and Publication in the State Department, which was consulted, by special permission, by the author); 1921, v. II; 1922, v. I, pp. 363–371, 701–733.)

In August 1918 the United States and Japan jointly agreed to a plan of intervention in eastern Siberia, under which each country was to send 7,000 troops to that area. Japan's brazen violation of this agreement by dispatching to Siberia, with no word to the United States, 72,500 troops instead of the agreed 7,000 is well known. Also well known is the fact that they withdrew a large number of these troops by the end of 1918, but how American economic pressure was used to bring this about has not previously come to light.

Japan's desire for territorial expansion and domination, nourished for generations, found expression, after her declaration of war on Germany in 1914, in her seizure of the German holdings in Shantung, which had been leased by China to Germany. This was followed shortly after by the presentation of the 21 demands, which, if accepted, would have made a virtual protectorate of China. In Russia's exhaustion due to the war, her military collapse, and the revolution, Japan saw another opportunity for aggrandizement. The Japanese not only saw the opportunity for succeeding to Russia's position in Manchuria and Mongolia, but also for bringing all of Siberia east of Lake Baikal under Japanese domination. They did everything possible to prevent the establishment of any kind of stable government in Siberia following the Russian collapse, and immediately began acquiring mining, railway, shipping, and fishing rights, power plants, flour mills, etc., all over eastern Siberia. A host of Japanese surveyors swarmed into the maritime provinces and beyond. Subsidized colonization on a large scale also took place during this period. In whatever direction the situation developed, this economic penetration and colonization promised to be of enormous strategic value and importance. The possible possession of eastern Siberia became a fixed part of Japan's foreign policy.

Japanese merchants poured vast quantities of inferior and often worthless goods into Siberia. All this was shipped free of charge as military stores and was sold at exorbitant prices.

The idea of intervention in eastern Siberia in 1918 originated with the Japanese. By this means they saw a golden opportunity for gaining political control of this area. During the last days of the Kerensky regime they disseminated propaganda in all the Allied nations, pointing out that Japanese intervention in Siberia would save it from falling into the hands of the Germans. Later Japan made specific proposals to this effect to the United States and the other principal Allies. British and French opinion were inclined to accept the Japanese plan of intervention, but only on condition that the United States would also assent. The United States refused, and it was this refusal that killed the plan for exclusive Japanese intervention.

As a result of Japan's overtures to Gen. D. M. Horvath, the Russian commander in the Far East, it was definitely revealed that Japan was not interested in restoring Siberia but was interested only in that portion east of Lake Baikal which, once under her control, she would be able to hold indefinitely.

The United States did not relax her opposition to exclusive intervention by the Japanese, but finally agreed to a plan of joint intervention under which the United States and Japan were each to send 7,000 troops to Siberia. This announcement was made on August 3, 1918. A few days later it was tacitly agreed that Japan might send 12,000 troops instead of the original 7,000. The force dispatched by the United States totaled 7,649 fighting men and officers. With no further word of any kind to the United States, Japan proceeded within the next few weeks to send a force of 72,500 troops to Siberia. This was more than all the other forces of the Allied intervention, east and west, combined.

It was Japan's intention to do in Siberia at that time what she later did in Manchuria in 1931. It had been agreed that the army of intervention should be under the supreme command of the Japanese, and they always saw to it that a Japanese officer of higher rank was present whenever any important action of any kind was either taken or contemplated. Every harbor and every river in Siberia was dominated by the Japanese. Every bridge and road was guarded by Japanese troops and every railway station flew the Japanese flag only. No one of any nationality, military or civilian, could come or go but the Japanese General Staff was informed, though the American and European staffs were never informed of Japanese movements. Nothing moved without Japanese permission.

The situation became so bad that the commanders of the troops of the western nations made a formal protest, and on November 2, 1918, Secretary of State Lansing told Viscount Ishii, Ambassador to the United States, that Japan had gone too far. Japanese action had produced serious tension. President Wilson, disappointed and displeased with Japan's failure to observe the agreement, made the most vigorous diplomatic protest and authorized the strongest kind of economic pressure. On November 18, the War Trade Board issued an order stopping the further granting of all licenses for the export of cotton to Japan and the import of silk from that country. Outstanding licenses were not revoked, but would have been had this been found necessary. Iron and steel and their products were considered for such action, but as the feeling seemed to be that Japan would be able to obtain these products elsewhere, cotton and silk were chosen as the commodities that would make the embargo most practically effective.

At that time we were buying from Japan about $15,000,000 worth of silk and were selling that country roughly $13,000,000 worth of cotton per month. This trade was vital to Japan's economy. The action taken by the United States, together with the effect of the collapse of Germany, brought an immediate favorable response from the Japanese. Over 50,000 troops were removed from Siberia by the end of December 1918. This was so gratifying to the United States that the granting of licenses was shortly restored. In fact, the response to the embargo had been so immediate that the only eventual effect on the trade statistics for cotton and silk was the reduction of silk imports by about one-third during the first 3 months of 1919.

In this incident we have a concrete example of the effectiveness of American economic pressure. This action resulted in the removal of over two-thirds of the troops Japan had sent to Siberia.

The Washington Conference of 1922 continued the process begun in November 1918, with the result that the last Japanese troops left the Siberian mainland in October 1922.

The situation today is, of course, very different from that of the autumn of 1918. Japan is a far stronger military power and her ruling class, both military and civilian, are thoroughly committed to a program of forceful expansion on the continent. Moreover, Japanese confidence and morale have been strengthened by the successes of her fellow-aggressors in Europe. But the United States, too, is far stronger than in 1918 and, which is even more important, Japan is today far more dependent upon American supplies for the continued functioning of her war industries. She no longer has alternative sources from which to secure sufficient quantities of iron and steel products, machine tools, oil, etc. In half a dozen key commodities Japan is dependent upon the United States for the greater portion of her imports.

There is every reason to believe that if Japan had been able to do so, she would have used the same sort of "blitzkrieg" tactics against China as Hitler used against Holland, Belgium, and France. It is logical to conclude that Japan did not do so because she could not. This fact alone is a measure of Japan's weakness and of her vital dependence upon supplies she has been securing chiefly from the United States. Viewed in this light, the example of the 1918 embargo should provide a strong argument for the effectiveness of an embargo today. In 1918 the United States Government was not afraid to make its displeasure felt by measures which were easily understood by the militarists of Japan. Diplomatic protests were backed by economic pressure and the desired results achieved. Today the issues at stake are of more vital importance to the United States; the weapons at hand of equal if not greater effectiveness. This bit of history should do much to encourage the American people to demand a repeat performance on the part of the United States.

National Youth Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE J. CONNERY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 20, 1940

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Speaker, it has recently been called to my attention that a movement is afoot within the National Youth Administration to enter upon a program of constructing throughout the country for unemployed American boys a system of so-called barracks in which these youth are to be housed while being trained and educated for gainful employment.

I have no doubt whatever that the objects and intentions behind such program are worthy ones. Such an endeavor has already been undertaken, I understand, at Passamaquoddy in Maine with a great degree of success.

But in this instance I must protest, Mr. Speaker, if the information which comes to me is correct, for I have been told that the National Youth Administration must carve into the present existing limited appropriation made available on July 1, 1940, in order to carry out this vast new project. If this is done it will mean that at least 5,000 boys and girls now employed by the National Youth Administration in my own State of Massachusetts will be sacrificed in order that the mere pittance they are now receiving may be expended in the erection of wooden structures. If this is true in Massachusetts then similar cuts will be made in National Youth Administration rolls throughout the country.

After all, I believe it is the sense of this Congress that as many boys and girls, who unfortunately have been unable to secure employment, be cared for under this National Youth program as is possible with such funds as have been made available, and that the Congress having exhibited at all times a sympathetic interest in the welfare of these countless American boys and girls will therefore look with great disfavor upon any move which in all probability will send thousands upon thousands now on the rolls into the streets.

To my mind it would be much better if those in charge of the National Youth program would hesitate before making such a move and, if such an extensive program is contemplated, come before Congress and seek additional appropriations for the purpose of initiating it. We can have no sympathy for any such project when it means that wooden structures throughout the land will discriminatingly house a few at the expense of many of our youth.

Steps Toward British Union, a World State, and International Strife—Part I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. THORKELSON

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 19, 1940

Mr. THORKELSON. Mr. Speaker, in order that the American people may have a clearer understanding of those who over a period of years have been undermining this Republic, in order to return it to the British Empire, I have inserted in the RECORD a number of articles to prove this point. These articles are entitled "Steps Toward British Union, a World State, and International Strife." This is part I, and in this I include a hope expressed by Mr. Andrew Carnegie, in his book entitled "Triumphant Democracy." In this he expresses himself in this manner:

> Let men say what they will, I say that as surely as the sun in the heavens once shone upon Britain and America united, so surely is it one morning to rise, to shine upon, to greet again the reunited states—the British-American Union.

This statement is clear, and the organizations which Mr. Carnegie endowed have spent millions in order to bring this about. This thing has been made possible by scholarships, exchange professors, subsidies of churches, subsidies of educational institutions; all of them working for the purpose of eliminating Americanism as was taught once in our schools and to gradually exchange this for an English version of our history.

These organizations were organized to bring about a British union, a union in which the United States would again become a part of the British Empire. However, this has been upset to some extent by the attempt of the internationalists to establish their own government as an international or world union. And there is, therefore, a conflict between the two, for England wants a British union, with America as a colony, and the international money changers want a Jewish controlled union, in order to establish their own world government.

It is, therefore, best for us to stay out of both of these, in order to save what is left of this Republic as it was given to us in 1787, by a people who knew more about international intrigue and the real problems that confronted the world, than we know today. These early founders not only understood the problems, but in drafting the Constitution they provided an instrument for us to follow, so that we could remain secure from foreign double-dealing and intrigue. Had we adhered to the Constitution as it was given to us, we would have been secure and safe today.

Therefore, it is our duty, in the interest of our people and in the interest of this Republic of the United States, to ponder seriously and to give fullest consideration to solving the problem which now confronts the world. In doing so, I am rather inclined to believe that the real American people will decide without hesitation, to return to those fundamental principles that were set forth in the Constitution of the United States. Let no one tell you that this instrument is not as valuable today as it was in 1787; for the fact is that it is much more valuable today—so much so that complete disintegration of this Republic cannot be avoided should we fail to return our Government to the principles set forth therein.

I shall now quote an article by Andrew Carnegie, which he wrote at the request of the London Express, and which

appeared in that paper October 14, 1904, entitled "Drifting Together."

DRIFTING TOGETHER—WILL THE UNITED STATES AND CANADA UNITE?

(Written by request for the London Express, October 14, 1904, by Andrew Carnegie)

Britain and America being now firmly agreed that those who attempted to tax the American Colonies against their protest were wrong, and that in resisting this the colonists vindicated their rights as British citizens and therefore only did their duty, the question arises: Is a separation forced upon one of the parties, and now deeply regretted by the other, to be permanent?

I cannot think so, and crave permission to present some considerations in support of my belief that the future is certain to bring reunion of the separated parts, which will probably come about in this way: Those born north and south of an imaginary line between Canada and the United States, being all Americans, must soon merge. It were as great folly to remain divided as for England and Scotland to have done so.

It is not to be believed that Americans and Canadians will not be warned by Europe, with its divisions armed, not against foreign foes, but against each other. It is the duty of Canadians and Americans to prevent this, and to secure to their continent internal peace under one government, as it was the duty of Englishmen and Scotsmen to unite under precisely similar conditions. England has 7 times the population of Scotland; the Republic has 14 times that of Canada. Born Canadians and Americans are a common type, indistinguishable one from the other. Nothing is surer in the near future than that they must unite. It were criminal for them to stand apart.

CANADA'S DESTINY

It need not be feared that force will ever be used or required to accomplish this union. It will come—must come—in the natural order of things. Political as well as material bodies obey the law of gravitation. Canada's destiny is to annex the Republic, as Scotland did England, and then, taking the hand of the rebellious big brother and that of the mother, place them in each other's grasp, thus reuniting the then happy family that should never have known separation. To accept this view, the people of the United Kingdom have only to recall the bloody wars upon this island for centuries arising from Scotland and England floating separate flags, and contrast the change today under one flag.

The Canadians and Americans may be trusted to follow the example of the motherland and have but one flag embracing one whole race in America. Present petty jealousies melt away as the population north and south become in a greater degree born Americans.

Even if this blessed reunion came as early as the end of the next decade, say 16 years hence, Canada and the Republic—the Scotland and England of America—would embrace 115,000,000 of English-speaking people, probably 7,000,000 of these in Canada. By the end of the present decade, 6 years hence, their population will be close to 97,000,000—6,000,000 of these in Canada. The Republic added to her numbers the past 14 years more than the total population of Australasia, or than that of Canada, the immigration having been enormous. One of these years it almost reached a million.

CECIL RHODES

The peaceful union of Canada and America would lead Britain to a serious view of her position, resulting in the conclusion that Cecil Rhodes reached—it will be remembered that he was at first a strong British Imperialist. Mr. Stead recounts that Mr. Rhodes went to Lord Rothschild and laid that scheme before him, who replied—"This is all very well, if you can get America to join—if not, it amounts to nothing!" This led Mr. Rhodes to a study of the subject, and the result was he saw clearly that Lord Rothschild was right.

British federation would leave Britain as a member of the smaller part of her own race, and out of the main channel of progress; instead of sitting (with race imperialism accomplished) enthroned as the mother among hundreds of millions of her own children, composing all but a fraction of English-speaking men. Hence he abandoned the scheme and thereafter favored race federation, and left to America more scholarships than to all other lands. He saw that it was to the Republic, not to British settlements, his country had to look for the coming reunion of his race, with Britain in her rightful place as parent of all. A few figures will leave no room for dispute about this. In the last decade, 1890–1900, Britain, Canada, Australasia, and New Zealand, combined, added to their population 4,500,000—America 13,500,000. Canada only added 508,000, the Commonwealth of Australasia only 660,000. In the 4 years since 1900 America added more than the total population of either Canada or Australasia. During the present decade, 1900–1910, at the same rate of increase to date, she will add more than the present total white population of Canada, Australasia, New Zealand, and South Africa combined. So fast does the Republic grow, so slowly the Empire.

INCREASE OF POPULATION

The United Kingdom itself increased last decade more than three times as much as Canada and Australasia combined. It is not to her colonies, therefore, that Britain can look for much increase of population or of trade. The growth of Australasia, small as it was in the last decade, so far as reported in this decade is even less. Canada is growing faster only in the far northwest, which is separated by a thousand miles of barren land from the English-speaking Province of Ontario. Last decade Ontario Province (English) actually declined in British population; Quebec Province (French) slightly increased. The census of 1900 shows fewer British-born residents in all Canada than that of 1890. The wheatfields now reached by rail are being settled by Americans who cross the border, selling their American farms and buying new farms in Canada at one-tenth of the price realized for the old. Except for this influx, about 70,000 so far, the rate of increase in Canada will be about as last decade.

When we come to the population of the United Kingdom, we find already in England and Wales 558 to the square mile. What thoughtful man could wish much further increase, even if it were possible? A denser population must cause deterioration. The density of population in England and Wales is not reached by any European country, except the small state of Belgium. France has only 188, Germany 270 (or one-half), Italy 290, Japan has only 296. The authorities agree that England and Wales are fully populated. Ireland proves that it is so by the small increase. Scotland has increased steadily for some decades, but little scope is left for further increase. Substantially, Ireland and Scotland have today all they can maintain in comfort.

Mark the contrast. America has only 21 people per square mile, one-sixteenth that of the United Kingdom, one for every 26 in England and Wales. These figures include Alaska, which resembles most of Canada, and is not likely to support many people. Excluding Alaska, the American population is 28 per square mile, one-twentieth that of England and Wales. It is evident that Green was right when he wrote years ago that the home of the English-speaking race was not to be on the Clyde and the Thames, but upon the Hudson, the Delaware, Ohio, Mississippi, and St. Lawrence. There is not room for it in the dear old home, but there is, fortunately, in the new lands of her children in Canada and America.

When we note the development Britain has attained industrially, we are amazed. It is wonderful almost beyond belief: we doubt and investigate to assure ourselves that we have the facts. This little kingdom has today more shipping, and about as many spindles turning as all the rest of the world. She is the richest of all nations per capita. She makes more iron and mines more coal per capita than any nation. Marvelous! Nothing comparable to her in history! She positively dwarfs all previous records—a dwarf more powerful than most giants. Who is there, then, who can expect her to do more, what she has accomplished being scarcely credible?

PHYSICALLY IMPOSSIBLE

It is physically impossible that much further increase can come to Britain, and in addition to this, conditions otherwise are unfavorable to further development. Other nations by the use of her inventions, are more and more supplying their own wants, and will continue to do so. They will also compete with her more and more, especially in iron and steel, and in cotton manufactures, owing to her lack of the cotton plantations and of needed iron stone. If Britain succeeds in maintaining present production in these fields great will be the credit due to her captains of industry. As with population, therefore, so with industrials—much increase is impossible.

This is the age of consolidation, industrially and nationally. Consider the recent consolidation of Italy and the more recent consolidation and rapid growth of the German Empire. Who can imagine that the process has stopped? On the contrary, we are on the eve of further consolidations in Europe of great extent. The successes of the American Republic, 45 States consolidated into one Union, with free trade over all, and that of Germany with its Zollverein, are too significant to pass unheeded.

The day of small nations is passing. Their incorporation with larger areas is to be hailed by lovers of progress, provided always that one point be carefully preserved. The national sentiment of the small powers should not only be guarded, but fostered in every way, so that, as in the American Union and in Britain, the Virginian and the Scotsman remain as intensely Virginian or Scotch as ever. Pride in and loyalty to the wider empire do not supplant but supplement love of the part where he was born. He loves the part and is proud of the whole.

What will Britain do? The day is coming when Britain will have to decide on one of three courses. First, shall she sink—comparatively to the giant consolidations—into a third- or fourth-rate power, a Holland or Belgium comparatively? Here note that we do not postulate her actual decline, but the increased growth of other powers. Or, second, shall she consolidate with a European giant? Or, third, shall she grasp the outstretched hand of her children in America and become again as she was before, the mother member of the English-speaking race?

Assuming that other powers are to increase their present population (as Germany and Russia have yet room to do), or by further consolidation, it being evident that there is not room in the 120,000 square miles of the little, crowded United Kingdom for further increase of moment, then the conclusion is inevitable that one of these three courses is the only possible alternative, for Britain has no adjoining territory she can annex.

Some have been disposed to regard British federation as a possible fourth alternative, but the figures given, which convinced Rothschild and Rhodes, we submit, compel its exclusion, especially to such as seek for my motherland, as I do, a destiny worthy of her—a future commensurate with her glorious and unparalleled past. Let us rejoice that this is open. Her Canadian and republican children across the Atlantic will hail the day she takes her rightful place in the high council of her reunited race—that race whose destiny, I believe with faith unshaken, is to dominate the world for the good of the world.

(This article, in pamphlet form, was placed in the New York Public Library on February 27, 1906, by the Honorable Joseph H. Choate.)

Our Foreign Commercial and Agricultural Activities Under Highly Qualified Director

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL STEFAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 20, 1940

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, we are now in the midst of a great debate over our export and import business. We are worried over our future foreign trade. On July 29, 1940, Mr. Raymond H. Geist, Chief of our Division of Commercial Affairs, Department of State, delivered two very important addresses before the twenty-seventh national foreign trade convention at San Francisco. These addresses contain valuable information and answer many questions which many Members who are interested in our foreign trade have been anxious to learn about. For that reason I respectfully submit these addresses in my remarks.

Mr. Speaker, here on this floor we debate daily reasons for the loss of our foreign trade but we hear very little about the men we employ to represent us in foreign lands where they must keep in close contact with the foreign purchaser, the question of foreign economy, the questions of foreign supply and demand. It was my privilege to inspect our foreign service less than a year ago. One of my duties was to inspect and talk to the personnel. By and large I feel that those men in our foreign commercial service are highly qualified for the tasks we have assigned to them. I hope that we see the day that our Department of Commerce will emerge from its present chaotic condition and be equally as strong as our foreign commercial service. In these unsolved foreign problems our foreign commercial service is facing great obstacles, but it faces a gigantic task when the future brings about more tranquil world conditions. I feel that its personnel is equal to this great task.

Its Chief, Mr. Geist, has been in our service many years. Although these foreign service officers are not vocal and we in this House hear very little about them, the records of our Foreign Service, if examined, will show a great service already performed by this one officer. I feel we are fortunate in having Mr. Geist as Chief of the Foreign Commercial Affairs and his continued service in that capacity, in my opinion, will bring a large measure of beneficial service to American industry, service which will be reflected to the benefit of our producers.

The address and statement are as follows:

I have been asked to present at this session of the twenty-seventh national foreign trade convention a statement regarding the recent reorganization changes in the Foreign Service of the United States.

Under the President's Reorganization Plan No. II, which went into effect July 1, 1939, the Foreign Services of the Departments of Commerce and Agriculture were combined with the Foreign Service of the United States. It will be recalled that, according to this plan, all commercial attachés and agricultural attachés became Foreign Service officers, and, consequently, officers of the Department of State, functioning at our missions abroad under the direction of the Secretary of State. This plan has now been in effect over a year. These changes were brought about after mature deliberation by responsible officers not only in the Department of State, but also in the Departments of Commerce and Agriculture. It was not a plan hastily devised. The advantages inherent in effecting a well-unified organization in our Foreign Service, especially in connection with those factors having directly to do with the all-important task of promoting the foreign trade of the United States, have been recognized for many years. However, such changes are not readily brought about; they pass through a process of evolution, which process is sometimes accelerated by the exigencies and imperative needs of the times. But such changes, when they are effected through the need of reaching a state of greater efficiency, represent a definite step forward.

It is well known that one of the tendencies in government generally is to create overlapping and duplication of effort, and there must be a steady alertness at all times to counteract this. We are always prone to add something new to what already exists, believing that a new or supplementary organization will take up the loose ends of the old. It is a far better practice to strengthen existing organization and bring about efficient unification. This was the primary object of the reorganization recently put into effect in the Foreign Service. By this consolidation three separate organizations, under three different departments of the Government, with three independent services and corps of officers, became one.

These changes were not made, as must be emphasized, solely for the sake of good administration. That alone would be sufficient reason for effecting unification, and much could be said from that point of view, but the primary reason has been to afford the commercial and agricultural interests of the United States the most effective and efficient Foreign Service possible. This was the chief aim in view; this aim has been achieved.

I may say briefly that at a time like this, when foreign affairs become so important to our national interests, it is highly important that no confusion exist in the organization of the machinery of government through which we conduct our foreign relations. Nearly all departments of our Government have some interests abroad and are in need of information of one sort or another from other countries. The Foreign Service, uniting the abilities, talents, and energies of trained officers, is equipped to serve our national interests on the widest scale and to satisfy these demands to the fullest extent. It is not necessary except, probably, on temporary assignment, to send specialists abroad to supplement the qualifications of officers permanently on duty. With the addition of the commercial and agricultural attachés to the staffs of diplomatic and consular offices stationed abroad, our Foreign Service is prepared to fulfill every task which circumstances and emergencies may impose upon it. We may congratulate ourselves that owing to the foresight of those officers in our Government who were willing to devote their energies, wisdom, and untiring efforts to these problems, our country faces the threatening international situation with a well-unified and splendidly organized and equipped Foreign Service second to none.

It is unnecessary at this time to go into the impelling reasons which prompted the Government to effect the consolidation of the various services abroad. The events which are now taking place on the international stage afford sufficient argument to establish unity wherever it may be attained. It is singularly fortunate that at least on the diplomatic front our organizations have been adequately prepared to meet the added tasks and responsibilities which international events impose; the Foreign Service of the United States is ready to meet these emergencies. No one will deny that the conduct of foreign relations today is a matter of primary importance to any government. Hasty efforts to set up an efficient diplomatic and consular service might indeed prove more disappointing and difficult than putting the country in a state of adequate military defense. Both require time and a great wealth of experience and knowledge. The Foreign Service of the United States has been in process of formation for at least a hundred and fifty years. During the last generation great advances have been made, and only a year ago the last step toward unity and completeness of organization has been achieved. In these times when international events have become not only the preoccupation of the Government but of every American citizen, it will be some comfort to know that we have a strong Department of State and a strong and vigorous Foreign Service. It is of vital importance for the commercial and industrial interests of this country to know that our diplomatic and consular establishments abroad are efficiently organized and adequately staffed; that the officers, from the Ambassadors and Ministers down through the ranks, are experienced and competent. But no mater how competent the officers are and how well qualified to undertake the important tasks entrusted to them, it is well known that division of responsibility and lack of unity may well frustrate the most sincere and earnest efforts. It may be that this lack of unity in previous years did not even then prevent a good job of trade promotion being done. The fine record of our commercial attachés and Foreign Service officers during the more normal years of international commercial intercourse, I believe, will sufficiently prove this. Let me quote from a memorandum prepared in the Department of State on the question of consolidation:

"The first reason for consolidation arises from the fact that the fundamental factors involved in foreign-trade promotion have profoundly changed. After the passage of the war years there was a certain decrease in American shipments abroad, due to the reentry of competing countries in world markets, but our exports increased annually until 1929, due largely to three factors: the quality of American goods, mass production in the United States, and the enormous amount of capital funds lent abroad by this country. The problem facing the consular officers of the Department of State and the commercial attachés of the Department of Commerce was in those days of relative simplicity. They were asked to find competent distributors in good standing with no competing lines for products in which the American exporters were interested. A wealth of information of a commercial nature was accumulated; extensive lists of the importers of all kinds of products in all countries in the world were compiled; thousands of reports on distribution, competition, and standing of foreign firms were written by our officers, until today the World Trade Directory file, largely prepared by consular officers, in the Department of Commerce, contains the names of almost 700,000 firms. Under the old technique of exporting this would be all that the exporter would need to have. With the knowledge that he could compete with his merchandise and with precise information as to the standing of a prospective distributor in a given country, he was ready to do business. In many

instances the only obstacle to further advancement of American exporting in a given market was the limit of the purchasing power of the population for imported goods.

"This picture has completely and rapidly changed in the last few years and may be expected to continue to change. In many markets the questions whether the American exporter is on a competitive basis, whether his goods are of better quality, or whether the importer and the public in general are demanding his merchandise are of no consequence in the face of a local-quota policy barring all imports of that commodity in order to protect some incipient national industry, or in the presence of a clearing or barter agreement. On the other hand, the importer may be faced by an exchange-control policy so devised that if the American exporter is not actually precluded by it from entrance into the market, he can only sell goods in that market with the realization that the proceeds of his sale may be tied up indefinitely in a central bank awaiting issuance of dollar exchange by the government authorities in sole charge of this function.

"We must realize that the essence of this situation is that the old technique of trade promotion does not meet our present needs. The problem today of furthering our foreign-trade interest is in a large measure one of keeping open the channels of trade by negotiating with the central government through the medium of the Foreign Service of the Department of State; that is, ambassadors, ministers, and Foreign Service officers with representative capacities."

I would not assume that the gentlemen who have come here as delegates to the Twenty-seventh Annual Convention of the National Foreign Trade Council are interested alone in the effectiveness of the Foreign Service of the United States from the point of view of trade promotion. Our interests today are broader and more vital than that. If we are threatened the first onslaught may be against our economic security and the position of our trade in the markets of the world, against which eventualities we shall need to avail ourselves of every measure of protection. The task of defending our economic and commercial interests abroad is one of the paramount duties of the Department of State and the Foreign Service of the United States. Today this has become a major job, and according to the present outlook will become more imperative as time goes on.

In every process of recession in the course of time there sets in a countermovement. Recovery of the position of our foreign trade may be achieved only through extraordinary effort which we must be prepared to put forth when the time comes. The Foreign Service has been organized to do its part not only in promoting our foreign trade, in protecting it, but is also ready and equipped to battle ahead in the struggle for its recovery.

It will not be surprising to you to learn that during the last 12 months an unprecedented strain has been placed upon our officers in the field. Not only is this the fact with respect to nearly every office in the Service from the point of view of work and multiplicity of responsibilities and duties, but also with regard to the Service as a whole. During this period the Government has closed 5 missions in various capitals of the world and 14 consular offices. During the same period 1 new mission has been opened and 17 consular offices. Diplomatic representation was withdrawn from Tirana, Albania, on September 16, 1939; from Brussels, Luxemburg, Oslo, and The Hague on July 15, 1940. Since then the new mission at Canberra, Australia, has been opened. The consulate general at Warsaw has never formally been closed, but it is no longer functioning. The consulates have been closed at Strasbourg, Havre, Lille, Calais, and Cherbourg in France. The office at Danzig has been removed to Königsberg in east Prussia. Breslau, in Germany, was closed a few days after the outbreak of war in Europe. We have closed our offices at Hull, England, and Dundee, Scotland. In this hemisphere we have closed the consulates at Saltillo, Mexico, and St. Pierre-Miquelon. The consulate at Ensenada, Mexico, has been transferred to Tijuana, and that at London, Ontario, to Sarnia. We have opened consulates in Iceland and in Greenland. Additional consular establishments have been set up in certain places in Canada, Colombia, West Indies, British Guiana, and Brazil. These changes indicate the strain which the international crisis has placed upon diplomatic and consular activity in various parts of the world. Nevertheless, in spite of these grave events, our Foreign Service establishments have continued to function at top speed; and where our officers have had to carry on sometimes in the midst of invasions they have not failed to extend every protection and aid to American interests affected by the course of the war.

The Department, however, has not interrupted the program which has now been in progress for some time of combining the various governmental establishments at the capitals into unified offices. At present there are 33 missions in the world where all the activities of the governmental agencies are under 1 roof, and where a single administration under the supervision of the Ambassador or Minister has been established. This scheme of uniting all governmental activities in 1 mission has made it possible to carry out effectively the provisions of the reorganization plan by which the commercial and agricultural attachés became officers of the Foreign Service of the United States. There have been established at the missions where we have combined offices sections which have been designated reporting units. These reporting units have been placed everywhere in charge of the commercial attachés, whose duties are to direct the reporting work done primarily for the Department of Commerce, carry on trade promotion on behalf of the business interests of the United States, superintend the work of answering trade inquiries, the preparation of World Trade Directory Reports, trade lists, and other related activities. Besides, in order that as much unity may be achieved as is practicable, the reporting work of all consular establishments within the jurisdiction of the mission has been likewise placed under the supervision of the commercial attachés. This plan has now been in effect since July 1, 1939; but in certain cases the reporting units were not set up immediately and the full scheme of coordination has been delayed owing to the sudden occurrence of events brought about by the war. Nevertheless the physical amalgamation of our agencies abroad under 1 roof in the various capitals where the Department has been able to carry the plan through has afforded almost everywhere in the service the immediate opportunity of setting up the reporting units I have just described. The first year of this new organization has demonstrated the soundness of the plan, particularly from the administrative point of view. We have been able under this new arrangement to maintain fully unified organizations at a time when single administration was essential. Due to world conditions, a large volume of reports from the field is being interrupted through lack of transportation and by the fact that certain offices abroad are having their reporting work temporarily interfered with by events caused by the war, as in France and other countries now under military occupation. Nevertheless, the statistics of reporting work show a considerable increase during the first 6 months of 1940 compared to the same period in 1939.

Volume of work increase [1]

[6-month period from Jan. 1 to June 30]

Type of work	1939	1940	Percent of increase
Economic reports for reading, distribution, grading, and filing	13,977	17,124	22½
Telegraphic reports for reading and distribution	1,371	2,154	57
Letters from Department of Commerce for transmittal, etc.	5,011	6,144	23
Letters from firms for reply and action	291	437	50

[1] Partial statistics of work performed in the Division of Commercial Affairs, Department of State.

The volume of trade letters transmitted from the field in reply to trade inquiries from American business interests is not included in the above figures, owing to the new system of replying to certain types of trade inquiries prepared in the form of reports which have been designated as market surveys.

The changes which have been made in the manner of transmitting certain material from the field are as follows: Replies to trade inquiries from American firms or individuals concerning an agency connection, or a market survey involving the recommendation of an agent or distributor, are embodied in the form of a report and transmitted in envelopes direct to the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce for transmission to the American inquirer; World Trade Directory Reports, of which the automatic annual revision has been discontinued, are transmitted direct to the Bureau, likewise all trade lists, trade disputes and complaints, and invitations to alien businessmen.

It has been, and will continue to be, the primary duty of officers of the Foreign Service to further the agricultural and commercial interests of the United States. They conduct careful studies and report on the potentialities of their districts as a market for American products or as a competitor of American products in international trade. They investigate the standing of firms and their distributing capacity and incorporate this information in World Trade Directory Reports which are sent to the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce where they are available to American interests. Officers throughout the Service compile and submit upon request trade lists of commercial firms in their districts. They are constantly on the alert for concrete trade opportunities which are promptly submitted by mail or telegraph. There is, besides, a constant endeavor to create within the scope of the duties of officers stationed abroad a demand for American products in the countries where such officers are assigned. American interests are also promoted by taking appropriate steps to facilitate the promotion of such import trade into the United States as the economic interests of the United States may require. These duties are in accordance with the requirements laid down in the Foreign Service regulations.

There are, moreover, certain rules to be observed in replying to trade inquiries. I mention this because I understand that certain exporters are desirous of having more information as to the procedure followed in this respect by the commercial attachés and consuls abroad. The regulations provide that officers shall answer trade inquiries promptly and with their replies enclose trade-information sheets describing the commercial and economic aspects of their district. These answers are to be specific and complete. It happens sometimes that it is not possible to complete an investigation at once, and in such cases acknowledgments are sent to the inquirer advising that the complete reply will follow. It may be pointed out, however, that if the inquiry concerns a subject on which the officer has already rendered an adequate report, he may confine his reply to a brief synopsis of the information

contained in the report and also make the statement in his reply to the effect that current and complete information may be obtained upon application to the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce or to the nearest district office. Firms seeking information concerning the markets for their goods in foreign countries should bear in mind that a large volume of data and commercial information has been already made available in Washington; and it is possible that all the information required is on file in the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce. In any case when a report has been sent in on a specific commodity, subsequent inquirers will be advised to address themselves to the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce.

In view of the present condition of world trade in many countries today it would be a waste of time for officers to undertake to make investigations and prepare market surveys for commodities and articles which cannot be imported. Owing to trade restrictions which exist in certain countries, such as import licenses, or lack of exchange, or the application of a commercial policy which temporarily prevents the importation of American goods, or the export of certain classes of material, it would be purposeless for the commercial attachés or consular officers to go further in their replies to trade inquiries than to state the pertinent facts. It is obvious that no real purpose can be served in furnishing complete market information when conditions beyond control render the export of goods from the United States to certain countries impossible.

Let me also, in this connection, make an explanation about World Trade Directory Reports. American firms receive inquiries from foreign firms and individuals who are in no position to enter into contracts for the importation of goods or make agency arrangements. Often the names of such inquirers are not contained in local directories or known even to existing credit-rating agencies. Their places of business are not infrequently situated in outlying provincial towns outside of commercial centers to which a visit by a consular representative is impracticable and, from the point of view of expense, prohibitive. World Trade Directory Reports on such firms are unobtainable. It would be better policy for American firms to refrain from seeking to do business with firms of this standing and character and confine their efforts to houses or individuals of established reputation and on whom credit information is readily available.

Under the Economy Act of June 30, 1932, the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce has been obliged to make a charge, the amount to be fixed on a reasonable basis by the Secretary of Commerce, for certain services rendered to American business firms and individuals. Since the first of May 1940 a charge has been collected by the Bureau not only for World Trade Directory Reports, which charge has been fixed at $1, but also for trade lists compiled by the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce for distribution to American business firms desiring such lists. In connection with this service a new procedure has been adopted in replying to certain types of trade inquiries. On receipt of an inquiry from an American firm or individual concerning an agency connection, or a market survey involving the recommendation of an agent or a distributor, prompt acknowledgments are made by the commercial attaché or by the consular officer receiving the inquiry. In these acknowledgments it is stated that suitable connections are being investigated and that appropriate recommendations will be transmitted through the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce. After the commercial attaché or consul has made the necessary investigation and a personal canvass has been made of prospective agents or distributors, a reply in the form of a report is prepared and transmitted direct to the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce for transmission to the original inquirer. In connection with such report a list is transmitted of the names of agents or distributors who have expressed an interest in the goods offered.

A new system has also been inaugurated with regard to the handling of trade opportunities forwarded to the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce by the commercial attachés and consular officers. Trade opportunities are divided into two classes: Those dealing with the outright purchase of goods and those affording opportunities for agency or distributor connections. Those offering the outright purchase of goods are published, and those from firms seeking to act as agents or distributors are filed and furnished to American firms only on request. A charge is made for this service. I may also add in summing up the activity of the Foreign Service in connection with the promotion of the trade of the United States that commercial attachés and consular officers whose positions abroad have afforded them unusual opportunities for becoming familiar with trade conditions in the countries where they have been stationed will be available for trade-conference work in the United States as heretofore when they return on leaves of absence.

The Departments of State, Commerce, and Agriculture maintain the closest liaison in order to coordinate every phase of the work of the Foreign Service on behalf of the agricultural and commercial interests of the United States carrying on foreign trade. I have given a description of the present status of our problems and efforts. It is impossible to foresee what changes may be necessary in organization or method to meet the situations which the steadily shifting scene in international trade may create. It appears reasonable to expect, however, that any schemes which we may develop to further our interests abroad or any plans which may be elaborated to fortify and extend the commercial and economical prestige of the United States in international trade will have to be organized on a basis which takes into consideration the existing structure of the Foreign Service, which is composed of officers possessing wide and extensive knowledge of the problems involved in international trade.

While studying and acting upon the grave political problems facing us in the international field, we must, above all, continue to establish our foreign trade and our economic position in the world on a sound and strong basis. What we must do will be courageously and boldly determined and carried out. The next step is to consider ways and means of organizing ourselves further, and then to determine how to strengthen and perfect the instruments of government to meet these tasks.

ADMINISTRATION OF THE EXPORT CONTROL ACT

For the benefit of those who might have questions to ask regarding the procedure to be followed in making applications for licenses to export articles and materials (other than arms, ammunition, and implements of war and tin-plate scrap) designated by the President as necessary to the national defense pursuant to section 6 of the act of Congress approved July 2, 1940, and known generally as the Export Control Act, I might opportunely make a few suggestions.

It must first of all be borne in mind that the provisions of the act went into effect on July 5, only 3 days after its approval, and that the Fourth of July, a national holiday, came in between. It was necessary during this period to have the text of the act made available to exporters as well as the regulations prescribed by the President and the forms of application. Though the forms and all the necessary explanatory material were rushed through the printers as fast as possible, it was not possible to get the forms into the hands of the exporters during the first few days before the Department of State was overwhelmed with requests for information. As you know, the administration of the provisions of section 6 of the act is vested in an Administrator of Export Control, to which office Colonel Maxwell, an Army officer, has been appointed. The mechanical work of handling the applications and acting upon them under the direction of the Administrator of Controls is centralized in the Division of Controls in the Department of State. The machinery thus set up must of necessity be centralized in Washington, and, therefore, any wish on the part of business interests of the country to have the procedure decentralized throughout various regions of the country is not feasible.

The forms and texts and explanatory material have been sent out generally to those firms in the country who it was believed might be directly interested. Forms have also been made available at the New York customhouse. They are immediately available now at the Department of State, Division of Controls. A few suggestions in connection with the procedure may be given:

It would be in the interest of certain firms who are regularly engaged in export business to appoint a competent person to handle these applications, so that he can familiarize himself with the procedure and the details in making out the forms of applications for licenses. This will avoid the necessity of frequent long-distance calls and special trips to Washington by a representative of the company. An overwhelming majority of the questions which are asked would not be necessary if a representative of the company would make it his special task to be familiar with the text of the proclamation, the regulations, and the form of application. The forms, regulations, and instructions are clear enough; but, as in all matters, a certain amount of experience and familiarity with the procedure is valuable and contributes to the smooth and easy and prompt working of the whole process.

In this connection it may be suggested that it is not necessary for export houses to engage the services of lawyers in Washington to make out these applications for a fee. No lawyers, agents, or intermediaries are necessary.

By the end of the first week after the act had been signed, the Department had received 10,000 letters and telegrams asking questions of various sorts, and it is easy to imagine to what degree the existing organization, which was rapidly being expanded, was overburdened and deluged beyond capacity. These inquiries are now coming in at the rate of about 800 a day.

Exporters are asking many questions by telegram, by long-distance telephone, and letter, of which the following is typical: "Does the exportation of a patent medicine which has a drop of chlorine in it require an export license?" It is much better, and exporters are urged, to make out the application on the form provided for that purpose, giving a very careful description of the article or materials to be exported, and to send the application in to the Division of Controls in the Department of State as a test case. If directions are carefully followed as indicated in (c) of the general instructions on the form of application, where it states, "Articles and materials appearing under (7) below should be designated clearly and specifically, the type and model designation being included whenever applicable," it will be much easier for the Administrator of Export Control to act speedily on the application itself than to give information in advance without having all the details as required on the form of application.

Finally, let me say that the attention of exporters is directed especially to the second from the last paragraph on page 3 of the mimeographed regulations which reads:

"Except as otherwise indicated the terms used in these regulations shall not include completely fabricated articles or materials which are ready for ultimate consumption."

However, wherever there is legitimate doubt as to whether or not the article requires an export license the question should be settled by making the application on the prescribed printed form.

If no license is required, the form will be returned in a few days plainly stamped "No license required." The mechanics of handling these applications, granted or refusing the licenses, will presently be working smoothly, and it is believed that as a rule applications can be handled in Washington within a week's time. In all cases, it is advisable to make the application as much in advance of contemplated manufacture or shipment as possible.

Foreign Policy Editorials From Wallace's Farmer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ERNEST LUNDEEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 20 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

EDITORIALS FROM WALLACE'S FARMER

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD certain articles from Wallace's Farmer, well-known farmers' journal and influential in farm legislation.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Wallace's Farmer of February 11, 1939]

STAY NEUTRAL

In the European war that may be growing out of the Italian conquest of Spain and the German conquest of Czechoslovakia, the United States has only two possible policies.

It can remain neutral or it can get into the war.

There is no half-way course. If we try to discipline the aggressor nations by what President Roosevelt calls "measures short of war," we shall automatically aline ourselves with the British-French alliance and get into war ourselves.

That is why it is so important that Congress refuse to weaken the present Neutrality Act.

Our only chance of staying out of another war is to refuse to lend money abroad, refuse to ship munitions to warring nations, and refuse to let our ships take chances on running exports of American goods through submarine-infested seas.

If nations at war want our wheat and lard and automobiles, let them come to our shores, pay cash for them, and carry them back home again.

Let us prepare to pay the high costs of an effective neutrality policy in order to avoid the far higher costs of war.

Remember 1917. This time, let's stay out!

[From Wallace's Farmer of May 25, 1939]

CAN WE STAY OUT OF A WORLD WAR?

We all want to see that the United States is kept out of war. But there's a whale of an argument going on as to just how to do it. One group—we can call them the "internationalists" for short—says that if a war comes in Europe, the United States is bound to be dragged in. Therefore, let's take part in European affairs now and try to head off war.

The other group—they are usually called "isolationists"—claims that Europe is probably going to have a war no matter what we do, that if we mess into it now we'll be sure to be dragged into war later, and that we do have a chance to stay neutral if we really want to keep out.

Both sides can make pretty good arguments. Our readers ought to be familiar with both points of view.

The internationalists are quite right in saying that if war does come in Europe, the United States will have a hard time staying out. They may be right that the threat of war comes because Germany, Japan, and Italy think that Great Britain and France are weak, and that the dictatorships could win a war.

The internationalists claim that if the United States dropped its neutrality legislation, announced that it would help Great Britain and France with munitions, food, and money, Germany and her allies wouldn't dare to attack.

The isolationists take the view that Europe will have to settle her own affairs and that the United States can't help by butting in. If the United States abandons neutrality legislation, if it promises munitions, food, and money to Great Britain and France, and if war still comes, then we would be in it in 5 minutes as avowed allies of those two nations.

Does the United States have enough confidence in the present governments of France and Great Britain to put itself in their hands? Do we want to put ourselves in a situation where a diplomatic blunder by a British Prime Minister would throw us into war? And if we ally ourselves with Great Britain and France, can we be sure that they may not take the aggressive against Germany and Italy?

The debate between the isolationists and the internationalists will probably reach a crisis in the attempt to amend the present Neutrality Act.

The Neutrality Act is designed to avoid the mistakes we made in 1914–16, to block shipments of munitions to warring nations, to block loans to them, to provide for a cash-and-carry policy on shipments of other goods if it seems that American ships might get into trouble because of blockades.

President Roosevelt, together with good Republicans like ex-Secretary of State Stimson, seems to feel that the Neutrality Act should be revised, and that the best chance we have of maintaining peace is to let Germany, Italy, and Japan know that in case of war Great Britain and France will be permitted to buy munitions and anything else they need from us.

Wallace's Farmer and Iowa Homestead, along with a good many Congressmen of both parties, feels that our best chance for peace is to strengthen the Neutrality Act, and to refuse to take any part in the present squabble.

From a long-time point of view, we believe that the position of the internationalists is sound. It is necessary to have concerted action by all of the nations to keep the peace. But, at the present time, it seems to us foolish to hope that we can help the cause of peace by dealing with the present Governments of Great Britain and France.

As all of our readers know, we regard President Roosevelt as the best friend that agriculture has had in the White House during our time. We agree with most of his other policies. But on this point, as we have brought out repeatedly in previous editorials, we are convinced that he is dead wrong.

We hope that Congressmen from the farm States will see that the Neutrality Act is kept intact. We believe that we can stay out of the next war if we are willing to pay the costs of neutrality. And we are very doubtful about putting our chances for peace in the hands of the Chamberlain who sold out Czechoslovakia at Munich.

[From Wallace's Farmer of April 22, 1939]

WILL IT HELP UNITED STATES TO FORBID SALE OF ARMS?

Will forbidding the sale of arms to nations at war help keep the United States out of trouble? This is the question which Congress is debating now.

Too much of the debate has to deal with the question of whether this policy will hurt Great Britain and help Germany, or whether a change of policy would hurt Germany and help Great Britain.

The thing that is really important should be whether the policy helps the United States. Whether it helps or hurts anybody else is a minor matter.

The neutrality act now contains a provision forbidding sales of munitions to nations at war. This provision was put in the act because Congress was convinced that the munitions boom of 1914–16 helped get us into the war in 1917.

The 1914–16 munitions boom gave us a stake in the success of the allied nations. It created a fictitious and temporary prosperity based on war orders. It made participation in the war on the side of the Allies promise profits to a great many people.

We did get into war in 1917. And this munitions boom was one of a number of things that helped to suck us in.

Opponents of the Neutrality Act suggest that the munitions boom of 1914–16 was partly a product of loans to Europe, and that if we insisted on cash payments the boom would be a mild one. They suggest further that we need to expand our munitions plants for our own defense anyway, and that we need to help Great Britain at least enough so that the British Navy, and not the German Navy, will control the seas.

Their plea is that the United States should put munitions on a cash-and-carry basis. Let any nation come and buy. That would help Great Britain and France, but it would also help Japan. And Japan is probably more of a menace to the United States than Germany and Italy together.

Wallace's Farmer and Iowa Homestead believes that the safest plan is to stay out of the munitions business and to refuse to sell arms to anybody. But, unquestionably, the cash-and-carry plan applied to munitions would be much better than the credit-and-boom plan we tried in 1914–16.

[From Wallaces' Farmer of June 3, 1939]

THE BOGEYMEN CAN'T GET US

Those folks who are worrying for fear Germany, Italy, and Japan will suddenly land an expeditionary force on our shores and blow us all out of our beds can smooth down their agitated hair. It can't be done.

At last reports, the 3 nations had a combined force of 19 battleships against our 15. Of really modern battleships, they have 8 against our 12. Assuming the miracle of getting the 3 hostile fleets together in mid-Atlantic, our Navy could probably battle the lot on even terms. In our own waters, our Navy would be stronger than the combined fleet. The farther away from home a navy gets, the weaker it becomes; more ships are taken out of the battle line to protect the supply line.

But suppose three miracles happened, first that Germany, Italy, and Japan decided to forget about Russia, France, and Great Britain to attack the United States; second, that the three fleets got together; third, that they defeated our fleet. Then what?

These powers don't have ships enough to land more than 200,000 men on our shores, even if we gave the transports a police escort

and refused to bomb them. And if the 200,000 landed, they would find a combat force of 400,000 men (Regular and National Guard) waiting, with an adequate air force in support.

Nobody is going to attack us. Nobody can attack us. If we get into trouble, it will be because we go out looking for it.

Steps Toward British Union, a World State, and International Strife—Part III

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. THORKELSON

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 20, 1940

PAMPHLET BY JOHN J. WHITEFORD

Mr. THORKELSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I include a pamphlet by John J. Whiteford. This pamphlet should be of interest to every Member of Congress because it deals with a subject that will soon confront us, as it did in 1917:

SIR UNCLE SAM, KNIGHT OF THE BRITISH EMPIRE

(By John J. Whiteford)

In these days of national and international confusion and conflict there is one issue on which the American people are substantially in agreement—We do not want war.

This great desire to keep out of war is perfectly logical. We know the cost of war from bitter experience. We are no more responsible for the outbreak of the present hostilities than we were in 1914. We are not an aggressor nation and we have no designs on foreign territory. We have nothing to gain and much to lose if we again take part in foreign wars. We have enough vital problems at home that require all of our attention and efforts. When and if the time should ever arrive, we shall be fully able and willing to defend our shores against foreign invasion.

There are, indeed, a thousand-and-one good reasons why we should stay out of foreign wars.

With all the self-evident advantages of peace for America as against the horrors of war in Europe and Asia, and with an overwhelming majority of our people against war, there still remains the ominous fact that there is a definite danger of this country drifting toward war. Even as in 1914, we are again being deluged and directed by foreign propaganda, only to a much larger extent. Again we have no clear understanding of the real issues involved. In our confusion we are again taking sides, mentally so far, but that is a ripe condition for expert foreign propagandists to lead us toward active participation in the present conflicts.

I would like to say to every American, "There is only one side we can take, and that is the American side." With this in mind, let us try to find out what are the real facts behind these foreign-made conflicts, what are the basic issues at stake, and what are the forces that are so desperately working to again involve the United States in a world war. Only by facing facts and by clearing our minds from the fog of selfish foreign propaganda can we arrive at the right answer to the question, "What is best for America?"

For all our so-called civilization, the impelling force behind the present struggles in Europe and in Asia is still the law of the jungle—the survival of the fittest. Whether we like to admit it or not, that same force guided the early settlers of New England and Virginia when they had to fight for their very existence in a strange and hostile land where they were not invited. In the conquest of this new continent our forefathers proved themselves the strongest—the fittest—and the original owners, the Indians, lost. Only by the process of applying their superior fitness could our ancestors have built themselves a new home, gained their independence, and created a rich and powerful nation. We, as their descendants, stand ready to defend our country with all our might if ever the time should come when we are called upon to show our fitness to "have and to hold" what we have gained.

The struggle of the building of America is only one example of the struggle of mankind since the beginning. The greatest example of all time is the building of the greatest empire in history—the British Empire—covering roughly one-fourth of the world's land surface and inhabited by a quarter of the world's population.

When we speak of the British Empire we must bear in mind a much larger picture than just 13,300,000 square miles of land and 500,000,000 people. It is a huge international institution of world production, consumption, and distribution, with all the related activities of commerce, finance, shipping, industry, and so forth. This vast undertaking is not limited to the geographical borders of the Empire. Its influence extends to every part of the globe, from Hong Kong to Durbin, from Gibraltar to Cairo, from Singapore to Aden, from Melbourne to Montreal, from Bombay to Bermuda, from London everywhere.

The very vastness of the British Empire and its operations constitutes a constant danger to itself and to the peace of the world. Whenever any other nation feels the urge to expand, for whatever reasons and in whatever direction, it automatically comes in conflict with the broad interests of the British Empire.

In the Orient the Sino-Japanese conflict is not only a local matter between China and Japan. It is in reality a threat to British interests in China; to British "concessions" in China; to the huge British investments in China; to British control of Chinese railways and revenues; to British trade and shipping and even to the British port of Hong Kong in China. It is a blow to British prestige and power in the Orient, with repercussions throughout the world. It is actually a challenge to the British Empire. It brought from Britain a cry of outraged justice while at the same time she tried to deposit the Sino-Japanese problem into the lap of the United States.

When Italy marched into Ethiopia, Britain again became highly indignant. This was not because of a profound love for the Ethiopians nor because Ethiopia might bring Italy great wealth. If Ethiopia had really been very valuable, that country could have been, and probably would have been, annexed to the British Empire long ago. The real reason for Britain's agitation was the fact that Italy dared challenge British power in the Mediterranean and endanger British control of the vital Suez Canal regions.

The Treaty of Versailles was in reality an instrument for the permanent elimination of Germany as a world competitor of Great Britain. For years after its signing the Germany people chafed under this yoke, to the point where, defeated and discouraged, Germany became dangerously close to becoming a communist soviet republic. Gradually German leadership took hold and pulled the people out of their spirit of defeatism and, as the pendulum swings, so has Germany again become a menace to Great Britain.

The great bear of Russia is also a definite threat to the British Empire, with its communistic paws uncomfortably close to the Balkan and Suez Canal countries, to India and Burma, and already resting heavily upon a large section of China.

Today, denuded of all propaganda, there is only one fundamental issue behind all the conflict in Europe and Asia—the survival of the British Empire. That was also the real issue of the World War. It is the old challenge of Napoleon.

The most important international question before the people of this country and of the world is whether Great Britain can continue indefinitely to defend herself and her empire against all comers, singly or in combination, and prove her fitness to "have and to hold" her dominant world position. Therein also lies the key to the problem whether America may or may not again be drawn into a world war.

It seems to me that the answer to the above question is definite and indisputable—Britain cannot win a major war in Europe and Asia without the active assistance of the most powerful of all nations, the United States. In their own interest the people of this country will have to make up their minds, soon and soberly and without being influenced by undue sentiment, whether America shall continue to gamble with her youth and her treasure to help defend the British Empire in every new crisis, or whether there are saner and better ways of insuring the peace of the world.

Today the greatest single menace to the peace of the United States is the same as in 1914. It can be summed up in one word—propaganda. Even as today, this country was neutral at the beginning of the World War and managed to stay out of it from 1914 until 1917. But during that time the foreign propaganda machines were working overtime to get us involved in a war that was decidedly not of our making. Finally, on April 6, 1917, America declared war on Germany and so became an active ally of Britain. In addition to the United States, the other allies were Belgium, Brazil, China, Cuba, France, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Italy, Japan, Nicaragua, Panama, Portugal, Rumania, Russia, Serbia, and Siam. It is true that some of the Allies, like the United States, were active only during part of the war period while others were little more than benevolent bystanders. But against this powerful combination the group of Germany, Austria-Hungary, Turkey, and Bulgaria held out for more than 4 years, from August 1914 until November 1918, and the German group might have won the war but for the entrance of America into the conflict.

In the present crisis the only active allies of Britain are, so far, the British Empire units and France. If the conflict should spread into another world war Britain cannot again count on her former combination of allies; in fact, it is more than likely that some of these countries will be lined up against her. Therefore, the most powerful ally of all, the United States, must be kept in line by Britain against eventualities. That can only be accomplished through propaganda. And the British are past masters in the art of making gullible Americans swallow the bait of persuasive propaganda.

Few Americans realize the magnitude of British influence in this country. When I write frankly on this subject I fully understand that I lay myself open to the accusation of favoring Britain's enemies. That is not at all the case. I am only following the single track of being pro-American, and I would be grateful to any critics if they would join me on that straight road. I clearly see the menace of all subversive movements, as well as the great necessity of combating all these un-American activities. The point is that, in our justified agitation over communism, nazi-ism, and fascism, we are overlooking another subversive movement that has actually proven to be more destructive to our peace and welfare.

In the past it has been largely responsible for drawing this country into the World War at a cost of thousands of our young men and billions of dollars and a long period of depression. It does not work openly and it is not generally recognized by the public. It does not yell from soap boxes in Union Square, call strikes, picket, or hold parades. It operates from the top down and so it reaches into every stratum of American life. It is the far-reaching power of British propaganda to make this country subservient to the interests of Great Britain and the British Empire.

The scene is a banquet held at the Hotel Plaza, New York City, October 25, 1939. This banquet was given by the Pilgrim Society of America in honor of the Marquess of Lothian, British Ambassador to the United States. It is an old custom of the American Pilgrims to extend this honor to every newly appointed British Ambassador, the same as the British Pilgrims invite every new American Ambassador to their midst at a banquet in London.

There are several curious things about these Pilgrim functions. In the first place there is present at these dinners an array of notables such as it would be difficult to bring together under one roof for any other purpose and by any other society. The Lothian dinner was no exception. Presiding over this affair was Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler, president of Columbia University, and chairman of the American Pilgrim Society. Among the guests were John D. Rockefeller and J. P. Morgan, Thomas W. Lamont and other members of the House of Morgan, Frank L. Polk, Jeremiah Milbank, James W. Gerard (former American ambassador to Germany), the French Ambassador to the United States, Lt. Gen. Hugh A. Drum, U. S. A., Maj. Gen. John G. Harbord (chairman of the Radio Corporation of America), the Secretary of the Treasury, Henry Morgenthau, and many other leading figures in government, diplomacy, politics, finance, banking, shipping, law, industry, insurance, and education. These men had come especially to honor Lord Lothian and to hear him speak. Before this important audience Lord Lothian's speech could not merely be a light after-dinner talk of clever stories and witticisms. It was an important speech and as such it was carried by the New York Times as front-page news.

As a highly experienced publicist, Lord Lothian opened his remarks with the naive statement that his country has no propaganda in America; that he would merely explain his country's position. The "explanation of his country's position" developed into the same old theme of most British statesmen, writers, lecturers, publicists, and other trumpeters for Anglo-American unity. It can be summed up in one stereotyped formula: "For your own good and for the good of the world, these two great democracies, the British Empire and the United States, must stick together." What this plea to America really amounts to is this: "We have the largest empire in the world. Never mind how we got it. The trouble is that we may not be able to hang on to it much longer. America is rich and powerful and wants no more additional territory. You should help us out whenever we get into trouble so that we can continue to enjoy what we have."

Lord Lothian practically confirmed that message when he wrote in Foreign Affairs, 1936:

"The situation of the last century cannot be re-created by Great Britain alone. She is not strong enough. But the United States, the South American republics, and the nations of the modern British Commonwealth could together re-create it. * * * They also are both democratic and territorially satisfied * * *."

And the morning after the Pilgrim dinner a front-page headline in the New York Times read: "Lothian asks unity in democratic aims."

There is something magnetic about the word "democratic." It is very dear to Americans and it means much to them. Once they even went to war * * * "to make the world safe for democracy." They may again be fooled by an appeal to democracy. Knowing this, it has become a valuable vehicle for foreign propagandists, and its real meaning is lost sight of in the confusion. The Communist Party of America, for instance, has officially adopted democracy in its constitution, in its literature, in speeches, and generally as an appealing propaganda attraction in selling their un-American ideology to the American people. * * * All democratic workers must stick together. It is a favorate theme with the radical labor wing.

And now we witness the weird spectacle of titled British visitors, from ambassadors to platform lecturers, using the same tactics in selling their story. * * * We great democracies must stand together.

What kind of democracy are we asked to adopt and to defend? The un-American brand of Marx, of Engels, of Lenin, of Stalin, of the Communist International. * * * Or the democracy of imperialistic Britain, of India, of Ceylon, of Burma, or Hong Kong, of Africa? * * * The democracy of the soap-box orators of Union Square, or the democracy of the Pilgrim banquets at the best hotels of London and New York?

Or shall we stand by our own conception of democracy, safe under the Constitution and the Bill of Rights, which still give us far more genuine personal liberty and opportunity than any other people in any other country of the world? If so, let us not forget that today, more than ever, the price of our liberty is eternal vigilance.

We must keep the bright spotlight of public opinion on all under-cover and un-American activities so that we may learn the truth and act accordingly. And we are entitled to know what the Pilgrim Society is, what it stands for, and who these powerful Pilgrims are that can call out the great to hear a British Ambassador expound to Americans the virtues of a united democratic front.

The Pilgrim Society originated in London, July 11, 1902, as an Anglo-American club of important Englishmen and Americans. An American branch was formed January 13, 1903, at the old Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, New York. Both societies are commonly known as The Pilgrims.

An extract of the Pilgrim constitution reads:

"The object of the society shall be the promotion of the sentiment of brotherhood among the nations, and especially the cultivation of good fellowship between citizens of the United States and its dependencies and subjects of the British Empire.

"The members shall be citizens of the United States or its dependencies or subjects of the British Empire, and others prominent for their sympathy with the objects of the society, who shall be elected by the executive committee, and membership in the London Pilgrims shall ipso facto constitute membership in the New York society, and vice versa, without additional dues. The membership shall be limited to 900. The number may be altered by the executive committee."

Nothing is more needed in the world than a "sentiment of brotherhood among the nations." Nowhere is the promotion of that sentiment more urgently and desperately needed than in Europe and in Asia. This was so even in 1902. But the group of eminent men who formed the Pilgrim Society in London did not step across the English Channel to hold out the hand of brotherhood to the weary nations of nearby Europe. Instead they preferred to reach out across the Atlantic for the special purpose of cultivating "good fellowship" between leading British and American citizens. This beautiful sentiment rose to a climax in 1917, when thousands of American good fellows crossed the Atlantic to fight other people's battles, and when the United States Treasury opened wide its purse to the Allies and lent them whatever they wanted. Then, indeed, Uncle Sam became the good knight of the British Empire. But when the battle was over—over there—and when the same Uncle Sam timidly suggested repayment of some of the billions of dollars of war debts, he was immediately dubbed "Uncle Shylock" by these same Allies. "Good fellowship" is difficult to define, like friendship, but whatever the definition is it should work both ways.

Who are these good fellows that are so deeply interested in British-American friendship and in "united democracy"? They are none other than the 900 of British-American aristocracy. They represent, as a body, the most powerful combination of men of wealth and influence on both sides of the Atlantic. They, the Pilgrims' membership in America and Great Britain, have included and still include men in the highest position in government, in diplomacy, in finance, in banking, in education, in the church, in literature, in publishing, in commerce, in industry, in shipping, and in practically all other important fields of national and international activities.

The president of the British Pilgrims is His Royal Highness, the Duke of Connaught, great uncle of the present King. As vice presidents are listed: The Most Reverend His Grace the Lord Archbishop of Canterbury; the Right Honorable Viscount Hailsham, P. C.; the Lord Desbrough, K. G., G. C. V. O.; Sir Harry E. Brittain, K. C., L. L. B., O. O. C. The membership of the British Pilgrims reads like an index to British leadership.

The president of the Americans Pilgrims is Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler, president of Columbia University. Dr. Butler has worked long and faithfully with the British. A United Press dispatch from London, December 6, 1939, stated: "In the 1940 edition of the British Who's Who, appearing today, the longest biography is that of Nicholas Murray Butler, president of Columbia University, who occupies more than a column and a half of small print—the equivalent of the combined biographies of Mussolini, Hitler, Prime Minister Chamberlain, and President Roosevelt."

Vice presidents of the New York Pilgrims are:

Herbert L. Satterlee (brother-in-law of J. P. Morgan), James W. Gerard, G. C. B. (former American Ambassador to Germany), the Right Reverend James DeWolf Perry, Elihu Root (deceased).

The executive committee of the New York Pilgrims consists of: Thomas W. Lamont, Franklin Q. Brown, George W. Burleigh, John H. Finley, Frederic R. Coudert, Edward F. Darrell, James G. Harbord, K. C. M. G., D. S. M., Theodore Hetzler, the Right Reverend William T. Manning, Gates W. McGarrah, Bryce Metcalf, Frank L. Polk, William Shields, Myron C. Taylor, Harry Edwin Ward, Charles S. Whitman, Owen D. Young.

As honorary members of the New York Pilgrims are listed: H. R. H. the Prince of Wales, K. G., H. R. H., the Duke of York, K. G., the British Ambassador to the United States, His Majesty's Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, the Secretary of State of the United States, the British Consul General in New York City.

A few prominent Pilgrim members, past and present, are listed below: J. P. Morgan, Russel Leffingwell, Henry P. Davison, John W. Davis, John D. Rockefeller, Percy Rockefeller, Ogden Mills Reid, Henry Morgenthau, Otto Kahn, Robert Fulton Cutting, James B. Clews, John B. Trevor, William Fellowes Morgan, Henry W. Taft, Adolph Ochs, James Speyer, Charles H. Sabin, Sir Ashley Sparks, George F. Trowbridge, Philip Rhinelander, Andrew W. Mellon, Albert H. Wiggin, J. W. Hill, John F. O'Ryan, Frank L. Polk, George R. Goethals, Julius Ochs Adler, Alfred L. Aiken, Herbert L. Aldrich, John Whitney, W. B. Whitney, Cornelius Vanderbilt, Vincent Astor, Julius S. Bache, Robert Low Bacon, Ancell H. Ball, David H. Biddle, Robert W. Bigelow, Irving T. Bush, Newcomb Carlton, Joseph H. Choate, William M. Chadbourne, Walter P. Chrysler, Thomas W. Lamont, George F. Baker, John Bassett Moore, Dwight W. Morrow, George W. Wickersham, John George Milburn, Mortimer L. Schiff, Paul M. Warburg, Paul Outerbridge, Ivy Lee, Chauncey Depew, Charles M. Schwab, Frederic R. Coudert, Marshall Field, Paul D. Cravath, Edward S. Harkness, Oliver Harriman, Edward L. Dodge,

Frederick H. Ecker, Harry Harkness Flagler, George L. Genung, Walter S. Gifford, Cass Gilbert, Edwin H. Gould, Duncan William Fraser, Robert Erskine Ely, Harry Alanzo Cushing, Frederick W. Budd, Henry Holt, J. G. White, Henry Johnson Fisher, Edward Herrick Childs, and William Phelps Ely.

The present membership in the American Pilgrims, and those who have passed away, represent the leadership of America in many important fields. We find among these a candidate for President of the United States, a Vice President, Secretary of State, Secretary of the Treasury, Attorney General, Ambassadors, Solicitor General, Senators, and Congressmen; presidents of the largest banks and financial institutions; presidents and directors of the United States Steel Corporation, and many other large industrial corporations; of the American Telephone & Telegraph Co.; of the Radio Corporation of America; of insurance and shipping companies. Here are also to be found the members of the leading law firms serving these banks and industries, as well as the interpreters of international law; editors, publishers, and owners of America's leading newspapers; experts in publicity; social and financial leaders and generally the group of men whose influence is capable of exerting great pressure on government and public opinion.

At the outbreak of the present hostilities in Europe, President Roosevelt expressed himself strongly on the necessity for maintaining our neutrality and he promised to do all within his power to keep this country out of war. That is also the great hope and desire of the American people. The Pilgrims and Dr. Butler disagree with this.

At a dinner in New York, at the Biltmore Hotel, February 9, 1928, in celebration of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Pilgrims, Dr. Butler said in a speech:

"Among other things the Great War has proved conclusively that in a contest of those colossal proportions there were no neutrals * * * if the world should ever again become engulfed in another titanic struggle there would be and there could be no neutrals."

At this particular dinner, during which Dr. Butler expressed these sentiments so contrary to the real hopes and wishes of the American people, three telegrams were received and read to the celebrating American Pilgrims. One came from the King of England, one from the uncle of the King, and one from the Prince of Wales, the future King, now the Duke of Windsor.

The message from King George V was read by Sir Austin Chamberlain:

"The King has pleasure in congratulating the Pilgrims of the United States on the occasion of their twenty-fifth anniversary, and His Majesty takes this opportunity of conveying to them his good wishes for the future."

The future, according to the Pilgrims, does not include neutrality.

The message from the King's uncle, the Duke of Connaught, read:

"* * * The cause of promoting cordial friendship between our two great countries is one on which the future happiness of the world in a great measure depends. Ever since I have been president of the British Pilgrims I have realized to the full the success of the work carried on by the two societies with this common object in view."

Here again we have the same old story, whether it comes from an uncle of the King, from a British Ambassador, or from a platform lecturer * * * friendship * * * two great countries * * * common object. Here democracy was not mentioned, nor the promotion of brotherhood among the nations.

The message from the Prince of Wales read:

"As a Pilgrim of nearly 9 years' standing, I am very glad to send my brother Pilgrims in New York my warmest congratulations on the twenty-fifth anniversary of the club's inception in the United States. There have been many changes in the world during the past quarter of a century but ties which unite the Pilgrims on each side of the Atlantic remain firm as ever * * *. (Signed) EDWARD."

The British royal family certainly showed an extraordinary interest in a group of American citizens dining in New York. Since that time tremendous changes have occurred to Edward personally, as well as to the world, but he was right in his prediction that the Pilgrim ties "remain firm as ever."

Since we are dining so exaltedly, let us go to London and look at a dinner at the Savoy Hotel, April 12, 1917, of the Pilgrims of London "on the occasion of the entry of the United States into the Great War of Freedom." The guest of honor was His Excellency, the American Ambassador, Walter Hines Page.

The speeches at that dinner gave a clear expression of the "ties that bind" the American Pilgrims to London and confirmed Dr. Butler's conviction that "there were no neutrals" in the World War.

Sir Harry E. Brittain, chairman:

"I should like to read two cables which have arrived within the last few minutes from New York. The first is from our good friends and fellow members, the Pilgrims of America, and it reads as follows:

"At last the Union Jack and the Stars and Stripes are nailed to the same staff not to come down until the job is done. Our boys in khaki are anxious to rub shoulders with yours in France and share your struggle and your triumph in Freedom's cause. The Pilgrims' dream of 15 years at length has come to pass. (Signed) George T. Wilson, chairman." [Loud cheers.]

"The other message is from one who has been frequently and deservedly called the 'Allies' best friend in America,' that very excellent Pilgrim, James M. Beck. His cable reads:

"Joyous felicitations to the British Pilgrims now assembled to celebrate unity in blood brotherhood of English-speaking races. The day which Prussia did not want has come, when the flags of Great Britain, France, and the United States float together in defense of civilization. All hail the greater Entente which opens a new and more resplendent chapter in the history of our common race. To all who welcomed me so kindly last summer a cordial greeting at this great hour. (Signed) James M. Beck." [Loud and prolonged cheers.] (James M. Beck, prominent attorney, born in Philadelphia; United States attorney for eastern district Pennsylvania; Assistant Attorney General of the United States, 1900–1903; Solicitor General of the United States, 1921–25; Member of Congress, 1937.)

Good fellows, these American Pilgrims, or shall we say British colonials?

The Pilgrims' dream of 15 years turned into a nightmare for our boys in khaki, but the unity in blood brotherhood is still the goal of this one-way friendship between British and American aristocracy.

Viscount Bryce, former British Ambassador to the United States, spoke as chairman of the London Pilgrims. May we never have such a speech again. He said, in part:

"When the United States of America, renouncing the isolation which it had cherished since the days of Washington, obeyed the supreme call of duty and set herself in arms beside the free nations of the world in order to save the future of humanity, she took a step of full solemn significance for all the ages to come.

"And now, gentlemen, what is America going to do in this war? She is already doing what those who know her best expected from her. She waited long enough to be quite satisfied that honor and duty called her to arms. After long forbearance, when she was satisfied that the German Government was resolved to persevere with its barbarous and insulting policy, and that the whole feeling of the Nation had been aroused and concentrated as to be virtually unanimous, then America stepped to the front; then she bared her strong arm; then she began to throw all her resources, all her energy, all her inventive versatility, into the development of every possible means for the vigorous prosecution of the war.

"Gentlemen, America is in the war now for all she is worth [hear, hear] and how much that means those best know who know America best. [Cheers.] She will persevere to the end, for she knows what a successful end means to the future welfare of the world."

No one knew better than Lord Bryce how much America was worth as an ally of Great Britain. With enormous British hypocrisy he made it appear that America bared her strong arm to save the future of humanity and the welfare of the world, when in reality America came to the assistance of only one-quarter of the world, the British Empire.

Lord Robert Cecil was less diplomatic. Considering that the Pilgrim meetings in London have almost the status of official functions, owing to the important attendance, Lord Cecil overstepped the limits of diplomatic decency when he said at this dinner in honor of the American Ambassador:

"May I add one word about the staff of the American Embassy? [Hear, hear.] Many of us have had personal relations of a very friendly kind with several members of that staff, and they have always preserved the most accurate and correct neutrality in talking with us [laughter] but, somehow or another, after a conversation with any of them, we went away feeling as one does, after having received a hearty grasp of the hand from a friend and an earnest and heartfelt wish of Godspeed to our cause. [Cheers.]

"Well, gentlemen, neutrality is no longer necessary [hear, hear], and we all say thank God for that." [Hear, hear.]

Dr. Butler was right; there was no neutrality, not even in the American Embassy, before this country went into war. It was a joke to Lord Cecil and the Pilgrims.

The guest of honor, Walter Hines Page, spoke before this London group of British-American notables in his capacity as United States Ambassador to Great Britain, representing the American Government and the American people. He said, in part:

"As for the particular aspects of this great subject with which this club has from its beginning had to do—the closer sympathy of the two branches of the great English-speaking peoples—next to the removal of the great menace to free government, which is the prime purpose of the war, this closer sympathy will be to us the most important result of the victory. It will be important not only to us on each side of the Atlantic, but also to all other free nations."

And then Mr. Page made one of the strangest admissions that any diplomat could make under the circumstances. It is taken from the Pilgrim records as are all these quotations.

"Seven years ago an admiral of our Navy, Rear Admiral Sims, who sits now at this table, declared in the Guildhall that if ever the English race were pressed hard for ships, every ship that the United States had would come to the rescue. A great prophet as well as a great seaman, he has not been rebuked for that on this side of the water. [Cheers.]

"For my part I am stirred to the depths of my nature by this American companionship in arms with the British and their Allies, not only for the quicker ending of the war, but, I hope, for a moral union which will bring a new era in international relations.

"My lords and gentlemen, your generous and great compliment to me by making this large gathering in my honor is your way of expressing appreciation of the action of the Government and people that I represent and of the President at whose high command I have the honor to be among you in these historic and immortal days. I thank you with deep emotion."

It would have been more appropriate for the British to thank Mr. Page, with or without emotion, and to show their appreciation of America's participation in the great war of freedom in a more substantial manner than by getting together an imposing array of British notables for a Pilgrim dinner. It is interesting to note that among those who accepted the invitation of the Pilgrims so to honor Mr. Page were none other than Neville Chamberlain and Winston Churchill who are now leading another war of freedom, while the British Ambassador to Washington is leading another campaign in this country for unity of democracies.

In the nature of their exclusive membership and activities, the Pilgrims may be termed the wholesale agency for promoting the interests of Britain in this country. It is strictly a Tory organization. The retail outlet is the more widely known English-Speaking Union, which has for its avowed purpose:

"To draw together in the bond of comradeship the English-speaking people of the United States and of the British Empire by (a) disseminating knowledge of each to the other and (b) inspiring reverence for their common institutions."

It is interesting to note that the English-Speaking Union originated in London in the fateful year of 1917, when America bared her strong arm in defense of democracy. Like the Pilgrims, the English-Speaking Union has a British organization with headquarters in London and an American branch with central offices in New York. The purposes of the two organizations are virtually the same and there is an interlocking directorate and membership.

The patron of the English-Speaking Union (London) is His Majesty the King. The honorary president of the American English-Speaking Union is the prominent Pilgrim, John W. Davis, successor to the late Walter Hines Page as America's wartime Ambassador to the Court of St. James, Presidential candidate in 1924, and member of J. P. Morgan & Co. As treasurer of the American English-Speaking Union is listed Harry P. Davison, also a Morgan partner, whose father was instrumental in having J. P. Morgan & Co. appointed exclusive purchasing agents for the British Government in America during the World War. Another director of the English-Speaking Union is Maj. Gen. James G. Harbord, chairman of the Radio Corporation of America, and also a member of the executive committee of the Pilgrims.

As a valuable retail outlet for British propaganda, the English-Speaking Union of the United States covers this country with branches and correspondents in the following cities: Baltimore, Md.; Boston, Mass.; Buffalo, N. Y.; Chautauqua, N. Y.; Chicago, Ill.; Cincinnati, Ohio; Cleveland, Ohio; Columbus, Ohio; Dallas, Tex.; Denver, Colo.; Des Moines, Iowa; Detroit, Mich.; Grinnell, Iowa; Indianapolis, Ind.; Lake Placid, N. Y.; Lincoln, Nebr.; Los Angeles, Calif.; Louisville, Ky.; Milwaukee, Wis.; New York, N. Y.; Minneapolis, Minn.; New Orleans, La.; Philadelphia, Pa.; Princeton, N. J.; Providence, R. I.; Richmond, Va.; St. Louis, Mo.; Salt Lake City, Utah; San Diego, Calif.; San Francisco, Calif.; Santa Barbara, Calif.; Savannah, Ga.; Seattle, Wash.; Sewanee, Tenn.; Spokane, Wash.; Tacoma, Wash.; Washington, D. C.

The English-Speaking Union seeks to "draw together in the bond of comradeship" the people of this country and the British Empire. But let us not forget that in 1917 the Pilgrims spoke of "blood-brotherhood" and "comrades in arms." And now, when Britain is again at war, Sir Evelyn Wrench, C. M. G., LL. D., chairman of the English-Speaking Union of London (also a Pilgrim member), addresses his fellow members of the union in The English-Speaking World, October 1939, with the warning call:

"The English-Speaking Union was born 21 years ago during the Great War and it has an even greater function to play in the present crisis. We know we can count on your support."

The founders of the Republic speak to us today through the immortal words of George Washington:

"Against the wiles of foreign influence * * * the jealousy of a free people ought to be constantly awake, since experience and history prove that foreign influence is one of the most baneful foes of republican government."

And yet, such are the times and such are the forces a century and a half after Valley Forge that many Americans, including many leaders of America, are advocating policies and ideologies foreign and contrary to the very fundamentals on which this Nation was founded. There is needed a new Declaration of Independence and a rededication of the proven principles of our form of government.

In our position as a rich and powerful nation we can no longer avoid the responsibility of leadership in a wilderness of foreign conflict. President Roosevelt, in his message to Congress, January 2, 1940, said that "in almost every nation of the world today there is a true belief that the United States has been, and will continue to be, a potent and active factor in seeking the reestablishment of peace."

If we are to accept and to act the role of peacemaker, the first requisite should be to stand before the world with clean hands and a cool head, fair and impartial to all, and free from any taint of favoritism and prejudice. Without this we would hold out false hopes to a war-weary world; we would not be entitled to the respect and cooperation of the embattled nations; the sincerity of our motives would be justifiably questioned, and we would fail, to the detriment of all concerned, including ourselves.

As a "potent and active" factor for world peace we cannot in the meantime accept the one-sided doctrine of "unity between the United States and the British Empire"; we cannot honestly and decently pose as an impartial apostle of world peace and at the same time act as the guardian angel of the British Empire; we cannot look fairly at the world through the meshes of the network of British propaganda; we cannot again allow our statesmen, our ambassadors, our leading bankers, lawyers, industrialists, churchmen, educators, and publishers to sway the sentiment of our Government and our people in favor of one side, a foreign side, inherently and basically non-American.

We have before us a costly lesson from the past to the present as a guide to the future. Let us remember 1914, and not forget in 1940 that a rising tide of war hysteria completely engulfed our Government and our people. The climax came on April 6, 1917, with an American declaration of war, approved by an overwhelming majority of a joint session of Congress. Only 56 out of 518 Senators and Representatives voted against war. Of the Members of the Senate only 6 dared cast their votes against the tides of war. One of these few, Senator Robert La Follette, Sr., addressed the President from the floor of the Senate with words that might well be repeated today:

"There is always lodged, and always will be, thank the God above us, power in the people supreme. Sometimes it sleeps, sometimes it seems the sleep of death; but, sir, the sovereign power of the people never dies. It may be suppressed for a time, it may be misled, be fooled, silenced. I think, Mr. President, that it is being denied expression now. I think there will come a day when it will have expression.

"The poor, sir, who are the ones called upon to rot in the trenches, have no organized power, have no press to voice their will on this question of peace or war; but oh, Mr. President, at some time they will be heard—there will come an awakening; they will have their day and they will be heard. It will be as certain and as inevitable as the return of the tides, and as resistless, too."

Today, with a warm heart full of sympathy for all the suffering in the world, we must firmly maintain our independence of thought and action, free from all foreign influence and entanglements so that we may think and speak and act as unimpaired Americans. Only then can we give the best answer to the question, What is best for America?

The Last Frontier

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES H. LEAVY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 20, 1940

ARTICLE BY RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Speaker, in the magazine, Free America, of August 1940, there appears an article by Richard L. Neuberger, of the Portland Oregonian, painting a vivid word picture of the possibilities in the Columbia River Basin, in the Pacific Northwest.

This article points out without exaggeration the possibilities of a decentralized industrial development that can and will come as a result of Grand Coulee and Bonneville and future development on the Columbia River. A portion of this territory being within my own congressional district and being fully familiar with the situation, I unhesitatingly state that the picture is not overdrawn. I commend it to the serious consideration of my colleagues and every person interested in well-balanced and orderly industrial development in a region that offers greater promise than any other section of our Nation.

The article follows:

LAST FRONTIER

(By Richard L. Neuberger)

It has become axiomatic to say that the American frontier is gone. And perhaps in the old sense of the word it is. Forty-seven years have passed since Frederick Jackson Turner wrote his great essay on the impact which the passing of that frontier would have on our social and economic institutions. Yet the National Resources Committee maintains today that one vast region of the United States "still has some of the aspects of the frontier."

This region is the Pacific Northwest, stretching in timbered majesty from the Continental Divide to headlands that break off into the Pacific Ocean. It covers 11 percent of the country's area, but has only about 3 percent of the people. Seven times as large as the State of New York, it has a population about half that of New York City. Malheur County in Oregon, for example, encompasses more territory than New Jersey, yet is inhabited by fewer souls than the single New Jersey community of Ridgewood.

The Pacific Northwest represents an opportunity to build a society that will, in the opinion of President Roosevelt, "avoid some

of the mistakes and wasteful exploitation of resources that have caused such serious problems in other parts of the country." The Northwest, which consists of Washington, Oregon, Idaho, and that section of Montana west of the crest of the Rockies, has yet to fall into the old patterns that jar the mind and eye in so many regions. Its destiny is still to be shaped. It can build a new civilization without having to rehabilitate a civilization already founded.

The most important resource in the Pacific Northwest is the Columbia River. This waterway, the second mightiest river on the continent, contains in the main stream and its tributaries 42 percent of all the latent hydroelectricity in the United States. The Columbia pushes through the Cascade Mountains with a ponderous strength that is beyond computation. It snaps at granite cliffs with talons of white-capped water. It surges inexorably against basalt battlements and sandstone bluffs. And now it tosses fitfully at the foundations of two enormous dams—Bonneville, a $75,000,000 Goliath at tidewater, and Grand Coulee, biggest structure ever built by man, located in the heart of the Inland Empire.

These two huge undertakings will produce more power than the 14,082,282,000 kilowatt-hours turned out by the 260 electric plants in the State of New York. Obviously all this staggering supply of energy cannot be used in the farms and homes of the Northwest. New industries must absorb a great portion of it. Will these industries be scattered all over the region or will they be concentrated near the source of power, clustered like pup tents about the dam?

In September of 1937 the President dedicated Bonneville Dam. Standing beneath the dark crags of the Columbia Gorge, he delivered a speech which has been forgotten in the mad welter of wars, foreign crises, and political emergencies. Yet it was an important speech from the standpoint of America's future, and particularly important to the future of the Pacific Northwest. The President said the Northwest should not be a land of new "Pittsburghs." And then he added:

"It is because I am thinking of the Nation and the region 50 years from now that I venture the further prophecy that as time passes we will do everything in our power to encourage the building up of the smaller communities of the United States. Today many people are beginning to realize that there is an inherent weakness in cities which become too large and inherent strength in a wider geographical distribution of population.

"No one would suggest that the great cities of Portland and Tacoma and Seattle and Spokane should stop their growth, but it is a fact that they could grow unhealthily at the expense of all the smaller communities of which they form logical centers."

This speech went further in the direction of what John Chamberlain calls a "free, decentralist economy" than any other utterance by Mr. Roosevelt. The policy it inaugurated in the Northwest has also been in that direction. "Postage-stamp rates" govern the cost of power from Bonneville Dam. This means that the rates are no higher at the end of the transmission line than in the immediate vicinity of Bonneville. The necessity for new "Pittsburghs" is obviated. Two factories built to make use of Bonneville power—the Aluminum Co. of America and the Sierra Iron Works—are under construction not in Portland or Seattle, but in the much smaller community of Vancouver, Wash (population, 15,766). The Pennsylvania Salt Co. has an option on land in the Oregon hamlet of Cascade Locks (population, 1,135).

Near both Vancouver and Cascade Locks are grassy slopes and timbered swales where people can cultivate small farms. When the country was in the worst throes of the depression, some unemployed families from the cities trekked to Yacolt Mountain, not far from Vancouver. They cleared land, built cabins, and tilled gardens. Today they are still there, living off the soil. The Northwest is not yet blanketed with cities, towns, roadways, and factories. All its territory has not been taken up. The Federal Government owns half the region.

With thousands of men and women struggling with submarginal farms in the Middle West, with the metropolitan areas of the Atlantic seaboard crowded and jammed, the Pacific Northwest is a national safety valve. It is the one section of America capable of absorbing more population. Maj. Roy F. Bessey, of the National Resources Committee, announces that "with a reasonable development program, from one million to two and a half million additional people could readily be absorbed in the Pacific Northwest within a generation. Migration toward the region during recent years seems to indicate that the population increase may approach the higher figure."

The Northwest is vast and expansive. The population increase to which Major Bessey refers should be spread throughout the region and not concentrated in a few localities. This is not alone the hope of President Roosevelt. CHARLES L. MCNARY, senior Senator from Oregon and Republican candidate for Vice President, has often advocated the development of the whole river basin. He thinks every home ought to have a "kitchen garden." Several years ago Stuart Chase proposed that the Northwest be stabilized by having industrial workers there live on small farms that would serve as "anchors to windward" if the jobs threaten to give out.

The most important development now taking place in the Pacific Northwest is the construction of Grand Coulee. This stupendous structure, today nearing completion, will be the world's major source of hydroelectricity. It also will irrigate 1,200,000 acres of land, an area almost equal to all the farms in the State of Connecticut. This will not be soil that yields its bounty grudgingly. It will be rich, fertile land on an alluvial plain land capable of growing pears, peas, strawberries, apples, and the other prize fruits and vegetables of the Northwest.

The Coulee section will not be allowed to become either an overpopulated metropolitan area or a feudal domain of corporate farms. Congressman CHARLES H. LEAVY, of Spokane, has pointed out that the purpose of Grand Coulee is to take care of as many families as possible. Accordingly, land ownership at the great project will be restricted to 80 acres for a family and 40 acres for a single man. Combines and other large-scale operations will not be permitted. Land held in defiance of this limitation will be denied water from the Government canals and ditches.

At the same time that the dam itself rises above the murmuring river, the Bureau of Reclamation and the National Resources Committee are working to bar from the agricultural area the mistakes which are a blight in so many sections of the country. Jammed towns and crowded communities will be taboo. Recreational centers, schools, rural parks, warehouses, markets, public buildings—all will dot the entire 1,200,000 acres rather than become concentrated in any one place. An effort will be made to secure truck gardens even for the men and women living in the villages and hamlets. The land will be the basis of the whole society. And, as the St. Louis Post-Dispatch has claimed, the troublesome dilemma of agricultural surpluses will be largely avoided if most of the food raised at Grand Coulee is thus used for home consumption.

Irrigation and reclamation projects are the hope of the Northwest. Secretary of the Interior Ickes has estimated that besides Grand Coulee, smaller irrigation enterprises can reclaim 104,491 acres in the region. Such undertakings are bolstering the population total. One county in Oregon has increased 75 percent in inhabitants since 1930. This is due exclusively to a busy sugar-beet industry made possible by irrigation dams. The farms are not large, but they have been successful and are supporting hundreds of families. Many of these families are migrants from the Dust Bowl and other dried-out agricultural areas.

It is not without significance that the population rise in the Pacific Northwest in the last 10 years has been predominantly in the rural and suburban districts. The decade just closed was productive of events that sent 200,000 people trekking to the State of Washington, 175,000 to Oregon, and 85,000 to Idaho. They have not rushed to the cities. "In the past few years," says Arthur Langlie, the mayor of Seattle, "there has been a trend of population away from the cities to the suburban areas." And augmenting his statement, the Seattle Post-Intelligencer observes, "Seattle folk are demanding and getting lebensraum."

Seattle is the biggest city in the Northwest. Since 1930 its population has changed only slightly, yet the surrounding countryside has filled up like a mushroom patch. Suburban communities dot numerous roads and highways. Groves of fir trees have been cut down, and in their place are rural homes with small truck gardens. Most of these people work in Seattle, but they live outside Seattle in the adjacent rural districts. Seattle itself has had the smallest proportionate census increase in 60 years, yet the Pacific Northwest as a whole reports extensive gains.

Consider what has happened in Oregon. Portland is the only community of metropolitan proportions in that State. Since 1930 the Portland population has increased 2 percent. But the entire State has gained 14 percent, and the rural regions around Portland have soared 33 percent. Newcomers formerly rode into Portland on a train and took a lease on four rooms in an apartment house. Now they roll in on a wide highway, driving their coupe or sedan, and start making down payments on a bungalow and truck garden 14 or 15 miles from the city proper.

The eminent geographer, J. Russell Smith, once declared: "Basing my assertion on past history and economic and industrial conditions of today, it is in the Northwest where I expect American civilization, in many ways, to reach its maximum. Yes; I expect that it will outstrip New York—overcoming the advantage which the metropolis has had of an early start." Predictions of this sort are quite common in the Northwest. Why not? We live in an electric age, and any area with the greatest power stream on earth is bound to have the open sesame to future industrial development.

Although the people of the Columbia Basin want to fulfill J. Russell Smith's glowing prophecy and outstrip New York in some respects, they are not eager to outstrip it in others. Glittering word pictures of an industrial mecca have not been applauded in the region. The residents want new industries, new manufacturing, new mills, but they do not want crowded cities, densely settled factory towns, houses row on row like shoe boxes on a shelf. This attitude has been demonstrated many times.

Before President Roosevelt delivered his dedicatory address at Bonneville Dam, controversy over the disposal of the project's energy had been taking place for 6 months. One group wanted a vast factory community concentrated near the dam. The other faction maintained that factories should be scattered all over the Northwest, that power rates should not favor nearby industries and thus tend to build up new "Pittsburghs." The latter group won out. It attracted the support of most of the people. It defeated for reelection the Oregon Governor who had been the main advocate of the new "Pittsburgh" idea.

There is no doubt that the Pacific Northwest requires more industrial development. Today the region ships out raw materials—timber, wheat, salmon, copper, apples—and buys back finished products. This unfavorable balance of trade cannot continue indefinitely. Resources play out sometime. A Douglas fir can be sawed down in an hour; it took a couple of centuries to grow. Ultimately the Northwest must process and manufacture many of its raw products. But it does not want to trade the problems of a frontier, a frontier that may be even a colonial

empire, if you please, for the more aggravating problems of a complex metropolitan area.

"Let our workshops remain in Europe," warned Jefferson. During the struggle over Bonneville power rates these words of his appeared in many rural papers: "I view great cities as pestilential to the health, the morals, and the liberties of man." Inasmuch as he had first sent Lewis and Clark westward, he was cited as the unquestionable authority on the region's destiny. The mandate eventually ordered for the same electric rates all along the transmission line—a line 275 miles long—was not a mandate against factories and industries per se, but against industries and factories compounded into places like Pittsburgh, Chicago, and Detroit.

Men and women in the Pacific Northwest have a chance to combine manufacturing progress with home life close to the soil. The region is still untrammeled and open, and the inhabitants have not lost their pioneering zeal. They would rather live bravely than hit the jackpot. "Stricken the region is now, its pioneering economy a wreck," wrote George Leighton a year ago, analyzing the collapse of the lumber industry. "But its people still are free." And free they are, choosing a frontier society to an imitation of the Atlantic seaboard.

"I think we must still continue," says E. B. MacNaughton, a forward-looking banker in Portland, "to make it possible for people who have been divested of their chance to be able again to strike their boots in and become self-respecting members in our communities and in our States." Unlike California, where the migrants are adrift on the highways, the Northwest has offered sanctuary to the wanderers from the middle-western drought regions. Many of them have found new farms; some have taken over old farms and made them yield pay crops.

The frontier is closed in the sense that Professor Turner considered it. No longer can a man wander into the Idaho wilderness and find land stretching to the horizon that will grow heavy stands of wheat. But in the Columbia River Basin conservation and development still can be used to reclaim some of the frontier. Dams and canals and tree breaks can provide new acreage. Hundreds of farms on the broad plateaus, thousands of truck gardens in the dales and valleys near Portland and Seattle indicate that all avenues of escape from the city are not yet barred. The Northwest remains.

Article by Philip N. Sanborn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE J. CONNERY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 21, 1940

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of pleasure that I offer for the attention of the membership of the House the tremendously interesting editorial which recently appeared in Yankee Doings, the official publication of the Yankee Division Veterans' Association.

I have the honor of being a member of this organization, which is composed of those who served in the famous Twenty-sixth—Yankee—Division for 19 months in France during the World War, the first National Guard division to land in France in 1917.

The authorship of the article, which genuinely reflects the sentiments of those brave men, may be ascribed to Philip N. Sanborn, one who gallantly served in the ranks.

The article follows:

In what dream world is this that we are living? What is this sense of unreality that pervades these deep summer days—this awareness of things felt but not seen—this fearful uncertainty of days to come—these wheelings and strange gyrations of those very stars of destiny to which our souls have become affixed—this trembling and quavering of those foundation stones upon which the structure of our lives has been built—which have, until now, seemed as eternal as the heavens?

From where this is written, peace lies like a gentle caress upon the green earth. A song-sparrow twitters in the sun-drenched vine. Air laden with the scent of new-mown hay riffles the pages upon which we write. A distant bell tells the hours of day. A newspaper at our right hand proclaims: "Hitler and Ciano perfect plans for final destruction of England." The sweet air is laden with the portent of impending doom—not England's doom—not America's doom—but the doom of all that part of all men which was created in the image of God.

As in the final moments of some ethereal dream, where we are wafted on wings of light over fields of bay and laurel to the shores of a shining sea, only to know as the subconscious reluctantly returns to its prison cell that another inexorable world awaits our opening eyes. Are these poignantly beautiful days of midsummer, when each riotous bower of roses against a white New England doorway beneath its arching elms, when each slow-drifting snow-capped cloud across the blue, when each joy-lit childish face at play pierces the heart with the thrust of a dagger and sears the scul as a burning brand—are these hours when each joy is too dear to bear without tears, the closing moments of such ethereal dream? Shall we too not awaken to an inexorable tomorrow in whose thunderous and anguished hours these things will have no place?

Is there even one who reads these words who even dreams of the price which must be paid by the race of man before these days come again? Look upon them; drink of their sweetness, if you can, without your heart crying out in a bitterness too deep for tears. Then close the page. The dream is passing. The inexorable tomorrow is here. The price must be paid. There are none to pay it but we ourselves. We may not taste the cup too long nor too deep. The brew it holds ends in nirvana. It must be thrust aside while still brimming over. In some far day men and women and children again may dream. For us in our time dreams are done. Close the page.

Yes, we say, we'll fight, we'll sacrifice, we'll suffer to save America and what it stands for. But will we? How much and how long? How many of us? Will you? Will I? Will we toss into the insatiable jaws first the luxuries we have learned to love, our hours of relaxation and amusement, our cars, radios, movies, and the rest? Probably most of us will ungrudgingly. Will we then follow with our savings, our homes, our life insurance, all our securities against our own future? Will we consent to live on the bare necessities? Not some of us, but each and all of us? These will be but preliminaries. Will there be steel in our souls and the strength of God's hand in our hearts to live on, to fight, to kill, to destroy, to desecrate the face of the earth with foulness and horror when all that seems worth living for is gone? When we have seen our children and our wives slain before our eyes. Will human nerves stand the racking torture of hell's inferno, imminent death, or—worse—imminent dismemberment or disembowelment, when the future holds no beacon light to guide us on. No new life which some day will be ours again. Only the knowledge that our life has been lived—that what we live for is no longer ourselves but those who shall come, that life shall not be given up in vain, that happiness shall know us no more? Can we do these things? What man knows? But the stars in their courses say that we shall be called upon to do them. And when we are, no less will suffice.

Our enemy is not a nation nor a man. It is not the efficiency of modern machines of destruction, nor the supreme ability of tacticians, strategists, and diplomats, the ablest the world has ever seen. It is a way of life, a design for living, a philosophy of existence. Let us understand it so. Trapped in a forest fire, bankbooks in your pocket cannot help you. Beset with a world conflagration, our wealth as a nation is nearly as useless.

Let us look at this enemy with our blinders off. Enemy, you say? As surely as the stars wheeled over our sleepless eyes last night, our enemy it is. The utter antithesis of all that makes life livable as we have known it. The nadir to our zenith. We are as truly at grips with this enemy as if our own Nation were in the visible fray. His way of life is at grips with ours—call ours England if you will.

What is his "way of life"? In briefest essence it is based on a fundamental belief in the worthlessness of individual human life. We read of the utter amazement of the French at the complete—even cheerful—disregard of their own individual fate with which the enemy soldiers at Sedan rolled forward in wave after wave, only to fall upon the piled-up bodies of those who had fallen before. And let us understand also this.

This disregard for individual life is not the philosophy alone of those who direct the destinies of this new power, nor of those who order them forth to die, but likewise of those who must do the dying. From lisping infancy they have learned that it is nobler to die than to live. They believe it—no, believe is not the word—they instinctively do not question it. Of what avail is desire to live in a contest against willingness to die? Many Americans in the pages of history have been willing to die. Many have died that the Nation might live. Never, however, has the Nation embarked on a policy of training every child—boy or girl—born beneath its flag to be prepared to die, to expect to die, yea, to hope to die. It is as contrary to the very instincts of our souls as it is inherent in theirs. Can two such forces ever meet evenly matched? There is the problem away from which those who would defend America turn unwilling eyes. Not dollars, not guns, nor ships, not tanks, not planes, not food, not oil, not men—but that which is stronger than all of these—the immortal spirit which God planted in human breasts—the will to conquer at whatever costs, not the will of the few but the instinctive will of all. Can we meet that challenge? The hour approaches. Can we meet it?

Civilizations rise and fall. Security, prosperity, contentment, happiness, conveniences, and luxuries breed decay. Those who can and will do with less have always conquered those who cannot or will not. Is history now to do an about-face? No. History will do no about-face. Those who can and will do with less, who will sacrifice first the luxuries, then the comforts, then the essentials, and finally life itself—unquestioningly and universally—will conquer as before. Who shall it be?

Our enemy—as truly so today as he will literally be tomorrow—has had a full generation to inculcate the philosophy of sacrifice into his people. We have but a few short months. Our enemy had the pliable and unformed minds of children upon which to work. He needed merely to implant a philosophy. He had over 20 years

to do it. We have first to uproot in the minds of men and women already grown the desire to live individual lives before the doctrine of sacrifice can have space to grow. We have but a few months. Our enemy had a people with everything to gain and nothing to lose. We are a people with nothing to gain and everything to lose. If America can meet such a challenge as this, then she is as great—aye greater—than our boasts.

Let us hang red lanterns on a few of the pitfalls. The first—and it will be the most persistent—will be the overwhelming desire in all our hearts to maintain the world as we have known it—for ourselves in our time—to compromise with destiny for another hour of sunshine. Munich is no longer simply the name of a city; it is a symbol, even as that other name of unutterable tragedy Calvary. There will be no more hours of sunshine in our time. That is not our question. Our question is: Shall there ever be another sunlit hour—for those to come. The second pitfall will be a readiness to believe what we long to believe. Are we not right now longing to believe that America will be spared? Are we not longing to believe the antichrist when he says, "We have never sought to interfere with the affairs of the Western Hemisphere; therefore, your protests are without point"? For God's sake, do not believe these things. Who of us, when he reads even a rumor of a possible early peace, can quell the feeling of ecstacy in his heart? But it must be quelled. There can be but one peace. With diabolical cunning this enemy plants rumors of peace so that his enemies may look back once more longingly on the world they have known, and weakened with sorrow and nostalgia, become divided and resistless.

How then? say you. Is the game worth the candle? If America, if democracy, if Christianity, if belief in life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, if all must die to live again, what does it all matter? If to meet this foe on even terms we must sacrifice, even before we start, the things we are engaging to preserve, what is the sense? That, my countrymen, is exactly the way they want you to feel. It makes unified defense utterly impossible.

Let's leave posterity out of it for a minute. Let's see what the world will look like to us, ourselves, if we fail. Here are Hitler's own words:

"There will be a ruling caste, a historical caste tempered by battle and welded from the most varied elements. There will be the great hierarchy of the party. * * * And there will be the great mass of the anonymous, the serving collective, the eternally disfranchised, no matter whether they were members of the old bourgeoise, the big landowning class, the working class, or the artisans. * * * Beneath them there will still be the class of the subject alien races; we need not hesitate to call them the modern slave class."

From the echoing corridors of history we hear the voices of bewigged gentlemen assembled at Philadelphia: "Any government derives its just powers from the consent of the governed." And the drawl of a lank Kentuckian: "* * * and dedicated to the principle that all men are created equal."

But what are the ominous words, which follow: "* * * testing whether that nation or any nation so conceived and so dedicated can long endure."

There lies our choice. No one yet is even dimly aware of the steel that must be in our souls if our cause is not to ignominiously fail.

It must not fail. It must triumph. When latter comes to pass, be it known that some day, somewhere upon this earth, perhaps a hundred years hence, perhaps 500, man's soul will again emerge and claim its own immortality. What God has given no man can take away.

P. N. S.

The Administration's Hatchet Man

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 21, 1940

STATEMENT OF HON. STYLES BRIDGES, OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, appended hereto is a statement by the Honorable STYLES BRIDGES, issued August 20, 1940, which is an accurate, concise characterization of the methods of this administration:

"Honest" Harold Ickes' radio apology for President Roosevelt cost the Democratic National Committee around $7,500 last night. It would cost us nearly $4,000 for a reply with only half the time. Nothing Harold ever said or that Charlie Michelson could write for him could be worth that much. Refusing to chisel funds from New Deal business victims with a campaign handbook racket, we must save our funds for worthier purposes.

The keeper of the White House umbrella rushed to his master's aid against the challenge of Wendell Willkie for free and open joint discussion of the issues before the Nation. Is Franklin D. Roosevelt too proud to discuss the distressing economic issues facing the Nation?

Adolph Hilter rose to German power a few months before Roosevelt took over the American Presidency. Hitler's plans were known. They were published. The secret reports of our foreign agents concerning German rearmament were not pleasant news. So they were filed in the White House waste basket until election year. And the Congress and the people were kept in total ignorance of the dreadful portents on the European horizon which President Roosevelt alone could have disclosed. Along with Blum, with Baldwin, and with Chamberlain, Roosevelt slept as Germany armed. With 18,000,000,000 blank checks which he could spend wholly at his own discretion he built with these funds not one battleship, not a plane, not an antiaircraft gun, nor a single tank. He squandered it recklessly as he wished. Is it possible that the President has not the courage to face Wendell Willkie and be confronted before the American people with that irresponsible record for which he and he alone must answer?

Since when has Ickes defended the "dignity of the Presidency?" Since when has the Roosevelt family upheld the dignity of the White House? Like a small boy hiding behind his mother's apron strings, the New Deal has sought protection behind the dignity of an office that long ago vanished under crass commercialization by the Roosevelts.

Who is this Ickes who talks so big—at a safe distance—about Hitler? In his own right Ickes is a Hitler in short pants. Like Hitler he hates the newspapers and freedom of press and speech and would ruthlessly control them. Like Hitler he is a professional rabble rouser who never succeeded at anything else; who is a political hatchet man. The New Deal regime that Ickes schemes for is nothing but an American form of nazi-ism. Like Hitler he is a common scold puffed up by high office. The resemblance is closest in their attitude toward the truth. Who is Ickes to make faces at Hitler? Doesn't he own a mirror?

"Fifth Column" Murders and Wrecking Plots in Plants Reported

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LELAND M. FORD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 21, 1940

ARTICLE FROM THE LOS ANGELES TIMES

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Los Angeles Times of August 16, 1940:

[From the Los Angeles Times of August 16, 1940]

DIES HUNTS SABOTAGE RING HERE—"FIFTH COLUMN" MURDERS AND WRECKING PLOTS IN PLANE PLANTS REPORTED

Charges involving murder and organized sabotage in airplane factories have been made against persons in Los Angeles, and if these charges can be substantiated by investigations criminal indictments are expected to follow.

Painting a picture of so-called "fifth column" activities in southern California as he understands them, such is the statement made late yesterday by MARTIN DIES, chairman of the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

SECRET TESTIMONY

Sitting as a subcommittee, DIES opens a series of hearings at the Biltmore Hotel today.

"It depends upon what information I get how long the hearings will last," he said. "Very grave charges have been made against some people in Los Angeles. If substantiated, they should result in criminal indictments."

The leader of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, while refusing to give details, said his statement was based on sworn secret testimony already in the records of the committee.

MURDER CHARGES

"The charges involving the murders and giving names and dates are already a matter of record," he declared.

"Certain persons here have indicated that they will come forward with other details if their names are kept secret, and I intend to interview these persons in the next few days.

"In some instances the murders were committed, I am told, when certain persons refused to carry out instructions from abroad."

SAYS "COLUMN" ACTIVE

Dies made his statement as he asserted that his committee had found that "fifth column" conditions were particularly bad in American big cities and selected Chicago, New York, and the west coast metropolitan areas as outstanding examples.

"This country is in worse condition today from subversive activities than the countries that were overwhelmed by Hitler and Stalin," he commented.

Returning to the local situation he declared that he has the names of many agents for foreign governments working in southern California.

CITES CRASHES

He also intimated that his information will probably lead to an investigation of recent airplane crashes in this vicinity, in the belief that they were caused by saboteurs.

The committee chairman asserted that a relatively large number of potential enemy aliens were employed in key industries here and made the outright declaration that the shipping industry is controlled by agents of Moscow.

Pressed to elaborate on this, he said that the shipping industry is in the clutches of unions whose leaders are Communists.

BRIDGES NAMED

He cited Harry Bridges, west coast C. I. O. leader, as an example.

"Which do you consider the worst—communism, nazi-ism or fascism?" he was asked.

"One can't make much of a distinction between different kinds of poison," he replied.

DIES indicated, also, that his committee may hear further testimony about communistic activities in Hollywood.

WITNESSES HEARD

He remarked that his committee is familiar with the testimony of John L. Leech, who testified before the Los Angeles grand jury that more than a score of film celebrities were members or subscribers to the Communist Party.

DIES refused to comment upon the impression Leech had made upon the Dies committee but said that his group had heard four or five other witnesses upon the Hollywood situation.

MAJORITY PATRIOTIC

"I believe, however, that most actors and actresses, writers and directors are patriotic citizens and that only a small minority are involved," he declared.

Asked the most effective defense against "fifth column" activities, DIES said he is convinced that full exposés of the conditions so that the public may be informed is most effective.

WARNS OF HYSTERIA

"At the same time care must be taken not to involve the names of innocent persons," he declared. "Nor do we want to create a hysteria in this country. The condition can be met without resorting to the methods of undemocratic countries."

DIES was accompanied to Los Angeles by his wife, Mrs. Myrtle Dies, and their three children, Martin, Jr., 18; Bobby, 12; and Jackie, 4. Wynne Pearce, 11, a friend of the family, was also in the party.

"What Willkie Did Not Say"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND S. McKEOUGH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 21, 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. HAROLD L. ICKES

Mr. McKEOUGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address entitled "What Willkie Did Not Say," delivered by Secretary of the Interior Harold L. Ickes, from Washington, Monday, August 19, 1940; broadcast over the facilities of the National Broadcasting Co. blue network, under the sponsorship of the Democratic National Committee.

On Saturday last, Mr. Willkie gave to the American people what he called his personal keynote.

It was reminiscent of Alfred M. Landon 4 years ago. As I listened carefully, I came to understand why he had not lived up to his advance build-up. A man cannot make an effective assault upon the New Deal when he accepts the New Deal in principle. He cannot make political capital out of the foreign policy of the administration when he agrees with that policy. It has aptly been said that he agreed with Mr. Roosevelt's entire program of social reform and that it was leading to disaster.

However, on several important points, Mr. Willkie arose above partisanship and, for this, as an American citizen, I thank him.

I thank him for his denunciation of intolerance at home and abroad. And I hope that he will have the courage to tell the Coughlinites, the bundists, and other Fascists who are rallying to his support that he does not wish their favors.

I thank him for saying plainly that our interests and our way of life would be adversely affected by the loss of the British fleet, and for standing squarely with the President for aiding with our material resources those peoples who are resisting Hitler's aggression.

I thank him for recognizing the incompatibility of the Nazi way of life and our own. I thank him for standing with the President for some form of selective service.

However, I deeply deplore the fact that Mr. Willkie felt compelled to toss a sop to the bitter anti-Roosevelt isolationists by his ill-considered and demagogic attacks upon the President's conduct of our foreign affairs as "deliberately inciting us to war," and as "unscrupulously" misleading other nations. Those were contemptible remarks for you to make, Mr. Willkie, with reference to the President of the United States.

Let Mr. Willkie remember that Franklin D. Roosevelt has become the world's symbol for fearless support of democratic principles, the emblem of the world's faith in freedom, the substance of the world's hope that right will prove stronger than might.

By what warrant does Mr. Willkie presume to accuse the President of the United States of issuing inflammatory statements and indulging in manufactured panics? By what grasshopper leap of the imagination does this candidate conclude that the President has not taken the country into his confidence on foreign policy? Have the dangers against which President Roosevelt repeatedly warned failed to materialize? Is the Hitler attack on England a manufactured panic? Does not Mr. Willkie remember that, time and again, the President sought to arouse the American people to the danger in the European situation, only to have his request for defense appropriations attacked again and again as excessive and unnecessary; only to have his warnings met again and again with jibes and jeers from Mr. Willkie's new-found friends, and to be accused, as Mr. Willkie shabbily accused him on Saturday, of inventing war scares for selfish political purposes?

This sort of demagoguery cuts to the heart of Mr. Willkie's assumptions of statesmanship. Barely a year ago, Mr. Willkie himself was denying that the administration's plans for mobilizing power resources in the interest of defense were in any way justified, and he consistently refused to acknowledge the paramount importance to the national defense of the T. V. A., although this was later singled out as indispensable by the Defense Commission.

Mr. Willkie criticizes the Blum government in France and holds it responsible for the defeat of France. Has he never heard of Bonnet, Flandin, Laval, and other highly placed pro-Nazi personages in France? Has he no criticism of England's pro-Munich government, with its policy of appeasement? Has Mr. Willkie no realization of the fact that America faces today, not only a world war but a world-wide social revolution? Does he not know that the New Deal in America has made this country the only one on the face of the globe where it appears probable that the vast agglomerations of economic power and special privilege can be modified without resort to violence? Does not the Republican candidate know that our last line of defense, which is right here in America, is being thoroughly organized and is strongly held, thanks to the New Deal reforms? Has he not the candor and the courage to admit that Roosevelt in America, like Churchill in England, warned the people while the Nation slept?

Today Mr. Willkie accepts the New Deal reforms in principle. He is for curbing monopoly; he favors collective bargaining for labor; he stands by the Wage and Hour Act; the Public Utility Holding Company Act; the Securities and Exchange Act; the social-security measures; farm relief; the rural-electrification program; and the work-relief methods by which the New Deal has remembered the forgotten man.

We would like to take him at his word. But first we must ask him, since he proclaims that he is a liberal, Where was he when the battle for these measures was being fought by us of the New Deal? Where was he when his newly possessed party was whittling down the W. P. A. funds and hamstringing the relief administration? Where was he when we were struggling for a decent farm bill; when we were trying to force a reactionary Rules Committee in Congress to act on the wage and hour bill? Where was Wendell Willkie when the Republicans were fighting tooth and nail against all of these measures which he now says that he supports?

All through this period, he was doing his very able best to prevent the most dynamic and hopeful project of the whole New Deal—the Tennessee Valley Authority—from functioning.

On Saturday Mr. Willkie admitted that by 1929 the concentration of economic power had gone further than it should ever go in a democracy. Yet in 1935 he testified before the Committee on Interstate Commerce of the United States Senate, as follows: "If you think these corporations are large enough as they are, stop the matter where it is, but don't dismember them, and deal with all in that way no matter what the degree of size."

It was in 1929 that Mr. Willkie went to New York to give his services exclusively to a giant utility holding company which was

just being formed by Wall Street promoters to control local operating systems in 11 different States. When President Roosevelt proposed that we should emancipate the regional operating systems from the control of such giant holding companies, Mr. Willkie was the first to protest. And, despite the enactment of the Holding Company Act more than 4 years ago, the billion-dollar Commonwealth & Southern Corporation, under Mr. Willkie's management, still clings tenaciously to its control over its regional operating properties.

Whatever last-minute conversion on the subject of public power Mr. Willkie may later confess to, the record that he has made as a private-utility magnate stands in all its unashamed opposition to the public interest. Part of this record may be found in his address before the Economic Club of New York on January 21, 1935.

Here is what he said:

"I do not like to make personal references (sic), but I want to say to you that no duty has ever come to me in my life, even that in the service of my country, which has so appealed to my sense of social obligation, patriotism, and love of mankind as this, my obligation to say and do what I can for the preservation of public utilities privately owned."

Thus spoke Willkie, the rich man's Roosevelt; Willkie, the simple, barefoot Wall Street lawyer.

If Mr. Willkie spoke honestly on that occasion, and one of his boasts is his frankness, is he by any chance running for President of the United States in order to "do what I (he) can for the preservation of public utilities privately owned"?

Mr. Willkie loves to boast that he learned his liberalism at the feet of the elder La Follette. Here is what La Follette's Progressive, a publication which continues to carry on the fight of the great Wisconsin liberal, has said of him:

"There is one thing about it. If Willkie should * * * be elected, the country would then have a President who could teach the American farmers how to water the stock and shear the sheep."

In his speech of acceptance, Mr. Willkie challenged the President of the United States to a series of joint debates.

One cannot challenge the President of the United States to go about the country barnstorming, after the preradio fashion of the past century, without laying himself open to the charge that he is indulging in cheap bravado. The gravity of Mr. Willkie's offense consisted of the fact that he was reflecting upon the dignity and striking at the prestige of an office which, as a candidate himself for the Presidency, it ought to be his zealous duty to uphold and defend. The President cannot adjourn the Battle of Britain in order to ride the circuit with Mr. Willkie. We must realize that the Battle of Britain is the battle of the Atlantic Ocean. The Presidency of the United States is no job for a mountebank.

At that, Mr. Roosevelt has been effectively debating the Wendell Willkies of this country for years and will continue to do so.

If Mr. Willkie is so eager for a debate in order to hold his audience, I suggest that he challenge his running mate, Senator McNary, with whom he is at greater variance on domestic and foreign issues than his speech of acceptance shows him to be with the President.

The Roosevelt record of the last 7 years is an open book. The people know what President Roosevelt has done, and they know what he will do.

For a time, Mr. Willkie thought and spoke like a lion; then the weasel, which has replaced the elephant as the Republican symbol, asserted itself. Like any other professional politician, he twisted about awkward issues by the use of glittering generalities. He talked about "wider horizons," "a new companionship in industrial society," "unlimited production," "full production and reemployment by private enterprise," "hardship, sacrifice, and suffering." Here he seems to have gotton his bottles mixed. Up to this point he had been talking about regaining prosperity, increasing relief, and reducing spending.

Mr. Willkie talked like the Republican platform until it seemed to those who heard him that the Republican Party had better change its tune from "God Bless America" to "Pop Goes the Weasel!"

When the meandering platform of the Republican Party was promulgated, we were assured that Mr. Willkie would clarify it. If that gentleman's speech in Elwood means anything, it means that it is now necessary for someone to clarify Mr. Willkie.

The only clarification so far offered is the personality and record of Mr. Willkie himself. He talked about free enterprise and finding jobs for everyone. Yet his whole history negatives any interest in free opportunity. The country knows him as a holding-company executive. The opportunity that he has given to free enterprise has consisted in cutting the throats of small independent power companies. This has meant less economic opportunity for the average man and a greater concentration of economic power in Wall Street.

The American people want to know specifically, with chapter and verse cited, how the minority party's candidate proposes to do more to preserve the blessings of American liberty in the modern world than our President is doing. They want to know whether Mr. Willkie's "new life" means the New Deal for the common people or a "new life" for the Old Guard. No glittering generalities about the candidate's belief in collective bargaining will quiet labor's fears so long as the labor-baiting Weirs and Girdlers remain unrebuked. No fine words about the candidate's foreign policy will quiet fears as to what will happen if, in the event of Republican victory, HIRAM JOHNSON becomes chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Affairs and HAMILTON FISH chairman of the House Committee on Foreign Relations.

The American people are worried about the stage settings which are constantly being arranged for the minority candidate. And the American people have a right to ask what it is all about.

I would like to explain to you why Mr. Willkie's acceptance speech was staged at or near the town of Elwood, Ind. Customarily, a candidate invites the people to his home. After all, one cannot give a front-porch speech from the tenth floor of 1010 Fifth Avenue, New York City, where Mr. Willkie actually lives. It is many years since Willkie lived at Elwood, Ind., and most people had forgotten that he ever lived there. It is legitimate to infer that his going to Elwood was for protective coloration. He wanted to dissociate himself in the public mind from his banking and utility connections.

The people are being encouraged to forget Willkie, the Wall Street lawyer, the utility executive, the director of one of the principal banks affiliated with Morgan & Co. This explains the effort to put him across as the barefoot farmer's boy.

Mr. Willkie has had much to say in condemnation of political machines, especially those in the cities. I wish that he had explained just when he developed his moral fervor on this subject. At the Philadelphia convention he might have repudiated the votes of those Republican machine delegates from the southern States who, every 4 years, from time immemorial, have been bought and sold on the auction block. This particular Republican machine constitutes the greatest scandal in American politics.

No one ever heard Mr. Willkie lift his voice against any political machine until after he had been nominated for President. It was the present Federal administration that sent Boss Pendergast, of Kansas City, Mo., to the penitentiary. It was new dealer Mayor LaGuardia who cleaned up New York City despite Tammany Hall, of which Mr. Willkie is a member. It was the Federal administration which sent to the penitentiary the notorious Moe Annenberg, one of the most corrupting influences in American political life. However, Annenberg was not put behind the bars until he had circulated among the Republican delegates at Philadelphia, urging them to greater endeavors against the New Deal. And his paper, the Philadelphia Inquirer, is today vigorously supporting the candidacy of Mr. Willkie.

Mr. Willkie poses too late as a champion of political purity, especially in view of the record of public utility companies within his control. He has always enjoyed association with political machines. He was a regular Democrat in Indiana, he was a regular Democrat in Ohio, and he has been a regular Democrat in New York. He never joined in any fight on any political machine anywhere at any time. His policy has been to "join 'em." He attended conventions as a regular Democrat, and he always went along with the majority.

After Mr. Willkie had put on his shoes and become a resident of New York City in 1929 he lost no time in becoming a member of the Tammany organization. He joined in 1930, and he has not resigned to this day. Along about 1936 or 1937 there was a primary fight in which the braves of Tammany Hall were bitterly engaged. A new and young group was trying to drive out the old guard. Here was an opportunity for Mr. Willkie to show his zeal for political reform. But he didn't.

Mr. Willkie fought in the ranks of Tammany Hall, which sought the defeat of Fiorello LaGuardia, the courageous and incorruptible administrator of a great city, whose record as mayor will serve as a model for right-minded men for all time to come. Here was another chance to fight a political machine. But he didn't.

As a crusader for political purity I wish that Mr. Willkie would tell us something about the forces that make political machines corrupt. Venal politicians do not bribe themselves.

Public utilities have been among the principal corruptors of public officials in the country. I was somewhat familiar with the situation in my own city of Chicago and State of Illinois (to which I had gone as a barefoot farmer boy from my birthplace in Pennsylvania) and I knew, as did others, of the corruption lavishly indulged in by utilities under the domination and control of the late Samuel Insull. This corruption is a matter of public record.

I mention Insull because I was shocked to discover that in Mr. Willkie's speech before the Economic Club of New York he referred to Insull as a "forceful, dynamic, and attractive figure." There are many thousands of people in this country who execrate Insull as the man who ruined them. By them he is remembered as the unscrupulous manipulator who induced his employees, his customers, and even his friends to invest in his utility stocks. They remember him as a man who bribed public officials whenever he needed them; who was indicted by a Federal grand jury; who had eluded the hand of justice and had been brought back to his adopted land as a craven fugitive. But to Mr. Willkie, Mr. Insull was an "attractive figure."

I have thanked Mr. Willkie for the flash of decent statesmanship in his Elwood speech. I have criticized him for his unpatriotic demagoguery and for his unpardonable references to President Roosevelt. I have raised some questions as to his record.

But I insist that Mr. Willkie has not been specific and definite in telling the American people how he proposes to meet the challenge of our domestic situation, the menace of Hitlerism, and the threat of world revolution.

We can defend America only if we hold fast to the principles of national unity and social solidarity. I defy Mr. Willkie, who claims to be a student of history, to name any like period in the history of any great nation when so many and so great steps have been taken for social betterment with so little bitterness and dislocation. I defy Mr. Willkie to tell his fellow citizens if there has ever been a time when those who were deprived of even a little of their powers and privileges for the common good, did not protest loudly, deeply, and very bitterly. Jefferson, Jackson, Lincoln, Theodore Roosevelt, and Woodrow Wilson were hated by those whose privileges they attacked. So is Franklin D. Roosevelt hated by those whose privileges the New Deal has curtailed.

If, indeed, as he says, Mr. Willkie has no hate in his heart, there is a great deal of missionary work for him to do among his "Hate Roosevelt" followers.

Mr. Willkie's current party contains the loudest and bitterest of those who protest against farm relief, work relief, collective bargaining, fair wages and hours for labor, taxation based on ability to pay, religious freedom, racial toleration, and measures necessary to check excessive concentration of control over other people's savings and other people's lives.

The Republican Party in 1940 contains the equivalent of England's and France's pro-Nazi Munich appeasers of 1938—the men with the black umbrellas. Mr. Willkie's current party contains the men who think that they can appease Hitler by making a deal—the big-business men who were caught conferring in secret with a notorious Nazi agent, Dr. Westrick. Mr. Willkie's current party includes the men who think that they can ward off social reform by calling the reformers "reds." Mr. Willkie's current party includes the men who think that big business should be allowed to capitalize a grave national crisis for its own private profit; that, somehow or other, the country will muddle through if only the party of big business and appeasement is given an exclusive right to handle the defense program.

What has Mr. Willkie's current party to offer America but more Munichs, more appeasement abroad, and more defeatism and more reaction at home?

President Roosevelt and his New Deal administration have given America seven and a half dynamic years of defense of democracy. President Roosevelt has made America the symbol of light in a darkening world. Under President Roosevelt we are going forward to complete the mighty tasks which must be achieved if America is to be defended and democracy preserved.

The Third-Term Tradition—Fact or Fantasy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. BARNES

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 21, 1940

ARTICLE BY HAMILTON TREADWAY

Mr. BARNES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Hamilton Treadway:

President Roosevelt has been renominated by the Democratic National Convention to be a candidate for a third term as President. As will be shown later, President Roosevelt is not the first President to seek that office in three successive elections, but he is the first President, having served two terms, to be a candidate for a third successive term. The cry that tradition opposes a third term is already abroad in the land. It is therefore altogether fitting that we should explore the facts behind this most illogical argument which will be used against the reelection of the President.

In the coming weeks the people will be told by the opponents of the President that there is a tradition, well established, against any President of the United States serving more than two terms. We need not pause here to determine who these opponents are. Suffice it to say that they are the same persons who opposed the election of President Roosevelt in 1932 and 1936. Neither do we need to scrutinize the reasons for their opposition. However, it is appropriate that we examine their argument.

The proponents of the anti-third-term tradition usually rely first on the proposition that the framers of the Constitution intended that the length of service of the President should be limited. To answer this contention one need only turn to the notes of James Madison made on the floor of the Constitutional Convention. In order that the expressions of the delegates to the convention on this question may be better understood, a short review of the background of the proceedings of the convention will be given.

The Constitutional Convention of 1787 was presided over by George Washington. The sessions of the Convention were closed and no official record of the debates was made. However, notes of the debates were made by several of the members, the most complete and reliable of which are those of James Madison. After the Convention opened, Edmund Randolph introduced a series of resolutions which suggested the formation of a Federal Government consisting of a legislative, an executive, and a judicial branch, and embodying the doctrine of the separation of powers. The Convention proceeded by a committee of the whole to discuss these resolutions.

These resolutions provided for a single term for the Executive and provided that he be ineligible for reelection. Considerable debate arose over the length of the term, and the question of reeligibility of the Executive. There were among the delegates proponents of a single term, but even among those favoring a single term there was no unanimity of opinion regarding the length of such term. The fight for a single term was led principally by George Mason, of Virginia, and two obscure delegates from North Carolina, Richard Spaight and Hugh Williamson. On the other hand, the proponents of indefinite reeligibility were found among the leaders of the Convention. Such men as Roger Sherman, James Wilson, Gouverneur Morris, James Madison, Rufus King, and William C. Houston were numbered among the proponents of reelection. In ascertaining the intention of the Convention on the question of a third term, the expressions of these delegates are most pertinent.

In considering the resolutions of Randolph (known historically as the Virginia resolutions) Mr. Houston moved to strike the provision "to be ineligible a second time." Mr. Sherman seconded the motion. Gouverneur Morris thought, "the ineligibility proposed by the clause as it stood tended to destroy the great motive to good behavior, the hope of being rewarded by a reappointment." Later in the debate Morris, in discussing the effect of the proposal to make the Executive ineligible for reelection, said, "It will destroy the great incitement to merit public esteem by taking away the hope of being rewarded with reappointment. It may give a dangerous turn to one of the strongest passions in the human breast. The love of fame is the great spring to noble and illustrious actions. Shut the civil road to glory, and he may be compelled to seek it by the sword. It will tempt him to make the most of the short space of time alloted him, to accumulate wealth and provide for his friends. It will produce violations of the very Constitution it is meant to secure. In moments of pressing danger the tried abilities and established character of a favorite magistrate will prevail over respect for the forms of the Constitution." Morris felt that all of these disadvantages of a single term for the President would be eliminated by placing no limitation on his reeligibility to that office. Roger Sherman was "against the doctrine of rotation as throwing out of office the men best qualified to execute its duties." He thought, "If he (the President) behaves well he will be continued; if otherwise, displaced on a succeeding election." Rufus King remarked "that he did not like the ineligibility." He thought "there was great force in the remark of Mr. Sherman, that he who has proved himself to be most fit for office, ought not to be excluded by the Constitution from holding it." James Madison noted that "he was much disposed to think that in such cases the people at large would chose wisely." The motion to strike the expression "to be ineligible a second time" carried. Thus, the Constitutional Convention expressly rejected the principle that the President should be ineligible for reelection.

The question of whether the President should be limited to a single term was tied up with the length of the term and the mode of election. The whole problem was referred to a committee of 11 for their consideration to reconcile the views of the Convention. David Brearly, reporting for the committee, proposed a 4-year term with no limitation on the reeligibility of the Chief Executive. This proposal was eventually written into the Constitution as follows:

"He shall hold his office during the term of 4 years, and, together with the Vice President, chosen for the same term, be elected, as follows."

Thus we find that as adopted the Constitutional Convention left to the people for all time the decision of how many terms any individual President was to serve. The writers of that great document felt that the people would choose wisely. They could hardly have reached a more logical conclusion.

Those who would contend that the founding fathers intended to limit the number of terms any President may serve may gather solace from the delegates who argued for a single term. Mr. Gerry thought the President "ought not to be reeligible." Edmund Randolph thought "he should not be left under a temptation to court a reappointment." Mason said, "that the great officers of the state, and particularly the Executive, should at fixed periods return to that mass from which they were at first taken, in order that they may feel and respect those rights and interests, which are again to be personally valuable to them." However, in considering these expressions of the minority, we must not lose sight of the fact that they were made in the discussion of the Virginia resolutions, which contemplated appointment of the President by the Congress. These delegates who favored ineligibility of the President for reelection feared that in courting the favor of the Congress he would become

its puppet. When this fear was removed by the proposal of the committee of 11 for election of the President by electors, chosen by the people, their opposition was removed. In the final action of the Convention on the adoption of the 4-year term with indefinite reeligibility we find only a dissent from the obscure delegates from North Carolina. The opponents of President Roosevelt, who are at this time also the opponents of the third term for the President, cannot hoodwink the people by advancing the views of this minority of the delegates to the Convention as indicative of the intention that the founding fathers were against a third term. The facts do not support them.

Those who oppose a third term rely on a second proposition equally unsound. They say that, even though the Constitution is devoid of a prohibition against a third term, nevertheless there is a tradition against any President serving more than two terms, which is an unwritten amendment to the Constitution. To meet this contention it is hardly sufficient to state the self-evident truth that a written constitution does not admit of unwritten amendments. To refute this contention, however, one need only turn to the authorities on which its proponents rely for its establishment.

The opponents of the third term contend that the so-called two-term tradition was established by Washington. Whatever solace they are able to gather from the fact that a tired and feeble old man, feeling that his work was done, retired after having served two terms as President, must be dispelled when they read the following sentences from his Farewell Address delivered in 1796:

"The acceptance of, and continuance hitherto in, the office to which your suffrages have twice called me have been a uniform sacrifice of inclination to the opinion of duty and to a deference for what appeared to be your desire. I constantly hoped that it would have been much earlier in my power, consistently with motives, which I was not at liberty to disregard, to return to that retirement from which I had been reluctantly drawn. The strength of my inclination to do this, previous to the last election, had even led to the preparation of an address to declare it to you; but mature reflection on the then perplexed and critical posture of our affairs with foreign nations and the unanimous advice of persons entitled to my confidence impelled me to abandon the idea."

If the act of retirement of Washington is to be regarded as establishing an anti-third-term tradition, how can such interpretation of his retirement be reconciled with the fact so well stated in his Farewell Address, that he had reluctantly been called from retirement to accept the first term and that he had desired to retire at the end of that first term? If an argument that Washington intended to found a tradition remains, it is effectively refuted by the views he outlined in a letter to Lafayette written April 28, 1788. In that letter Washington said:

"There are points on which opinions would be more likely to vary, as, for instance, on the eligibility of the same person for President after he should have served a certain course of years. Guarded so effectually as the proposed Constitution is in respect to the prevention of bribery and undue influence in the choice of President, I confess I differ widely myself from Mr. Jefferson and you as to the necessity or expediency of rotation in that appointment. The matter was fairly discussed in the Convention and to my full convictions, though I cannot have time or room to sum up the arguments in this letter. There cannot, in my judgment, be the least danger that the President will by any practical intrigue ever be able to continue himself one moment in office, much less perpetuate himself in it, but in the last stage of corrupted morals and political depravity; and even then there is as much danger that any other species of domination would prevail. Though, when a people shall have become incapable of governing themselves and fit for a master, it is of little consequence from what quarter he comes.

"Under an extended view of this part of the subject, I can see no propriety in precluding ourselves from the services of any man who on some great emergency shall be deemed universally most capable of serving the public."

These words of Washington were his final judgment on the question of whether the services of a man to his country in the office of President should be limited. In these words we can find no expression of the maxim that two terms are sufficient. These facts do not make Washington a proponent of the so-called anti-third-term tradition.

This conclusion of Washington is sustained by the history of other nations and civilizations. Space will not permit an enumeration of instances. An illustration is the experience of the Athenians. The city-state of Athens in Greece was the first great democracy of the ancient world. In Athens the service of a man in the government of his country was limited to a single tenure in any office. The number of great men in any generation is naturally limited. As a result, the Athenians soon exhausted the supply of those capable of leadership. The greatest civilization of ancient times, thus precluded by its laws from the service of capable leaders then living within its borders, fell an easy prey to the ever-pressing hordes of barbarians then, as today, moving across Europe. Decay and destruction followed. We may well profit by the example of Athens. We should not preclude ourselves at any time in our history of those leaders who may at the time prove universally most capable of serving the public and of preserving our democratic institutions.

Jefferson favored a single term of 6 years for the Presidency because he feared the establishment of a monarchy. One hundred and fifty years of history have proved the fallacy of that fear. We need not discuss it further. Yet in a letter written to John Taylor in 1805, Jefferson had changed his views somewhat. In that letter he said:

"I had intended to declare my intention, but I have consented to be silent on opinion of my friends, who think it best not to put a continuance out of my power in defiance of all circumstances. There is, however, but one circumstance which could engage my acquiescence in another election, to wit, such a division about a successor as might bring in a monarchist."

That circumstance never occurred, for Jefferson himself enjoyed such political prestige and power he was able to perpetuate his policies in the Presidential office for 16 years by the simple expedient of naming his successors. Thus Jefferson was never faced with the practical question of a third term. He cannot be said to have founded a tradition against a third term when the facts show that he was willing to accept it if he should prove unable to name his successor.

These are the authorities on which the proponents of the anti-third-term tradition rely. We must conclude that the so-called tradition is a fantasy—not supported by fact. It is a political hobgoblin used against a particular man at a particular moment in our history. This point cannot be too strongly emphasized. It is aptly illustrated by the fact that one of the strongest opponents of the third term for President Roosevelt is the Chicago Tribune. Yet in 1912 that paper was a backer of Teddy Roosevelt, a candidate at that time for a third term. Of course, no one overlooks the fact that the Tribune opposed the election of President Roosevelt in both 1932 and 1936.

One fact which is given no publicity by the opponents of the third term is that twice the people of the United States voted for the same man for President in three successive elections, and both times gave that man a popular majority. In 1824 Andrew Jackson received a popular majority, tied in the electoral college, and was defeated in the House of Representatives for President. In 1828, and again in 1832, he was elected President. In 1884 Grover Cleveland was elected President. In 1888 he again received the popular majority but lost in the electoral college. In 1892 Cleveland was again elected President. Three times the people wanted Jackson and Cleveland and so expressed themselves. Incidentally, both men were Democrats.

There are no facts to support the so-called anti-third-term tradition. It is a false issue, a scarecrow erected by an office-hungry party. It is an argument without weight, unsupported by fact, devoid of plausibility, refuted by the authorities on which its proponents rely. America is a young country, unfettered by tradition. It boasts today of being the last of the great democracies in a world of dictators. The third-term issue—if it can be called an issue—is incompatible with a democracy and the right of the people to choose their President.

HAMILTON TREADWAY.

Legion Hails Plea to Oust Harry Bridges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LELAND M. FORD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 21, 1940

ARTICLE FROM THE LOS ANGELES TIMES

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Los Angeles Times of August 14, 1940:

[From the Los Angeles Times of August 14, 1940]

LEGION HAILS PLEA TO OUST HARRY BRIDGES—FITTS CALLS FOR FORCIBLE REMOVAL OF UNIONIST IF OTHER METHODS FAIL

SAN DIEGO, August 13.—Forcible removal of Harry Bridges from the United States, if all other methods fail, was urged to 2,000 wildly enthusiastic California American Legionnaires here today by Buron Fitts, Los Angeles County district attorney and past State commander of the Legion.

"Why pussyfoot with Bridges?" he asked in a fervent address to the second day's session of the State department convention. "Let's put him on a boat and send him home. We must demand America for Americans."

Conscription

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. DELANEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 21, 1940

LETTER BY RT. REV. JOHN B. GORMAN

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter written by the Right Reverend John B. Gorman, rector of St. Teresa's Church, Brooklyn, N. Y., which was published in the Brooklyn Tablet:

MONSIGNOR GORMAN FAVORS CONSCRIPTION

DEAR SIR: I have very carefully read the front-page editorial, "The Peril of Conscription," in the July 27 issue of the Tablet, also the editorial in last week's issue. I regret that I cannot see eye to eye with you on this subject.

In view of all that has happened abroad it does seem that it would be far wiser for our Government to overdo preparations rather than to underdo them. If unexpectedly our country is forced to meet a sudden attack it would undoubtedly conserve the lives of our soldiers and noncombatants if they were trained and prepared rather than if they were scrambled together helplessly endeavoring to meet a crisis.

The program as outlined for training through conscription appears to me to be reasonable in principle. Open discussion in Congress and otherwise may suggest some modifications of the program. It does seem that we can safely trust the American people. If any abuse does arise the people can readily rise in their might to adjust matters.

According to reliable reports, this proposed program for citizen training through conscription is not due to any failure of volunteers to meet present demands. Volunteers have responded to the extent that they have been urged to do so. Nevertheless, there is some doubt that a sufficient number of volunteers could be gathered together promptly to cope with a possible crisis. Past experience indicates that with the program of volunteers our own people have responded entirely out of proportion to their pro rata representation of population. Others have held back until compelled to participate. With universal conscription in limited numbers over a period of time, it would compel all, without exception, to share the burden as they enjoy the benefits of American citizenship. Besides, it is contended, with reasonable justification, that by the suggested method of equitably limited conscription, assignments could be made to such branches of service where qualifications, aptitude, or previous experience would best qualify for effective service.

Nothing in the history of our Nation indicates that our officials or our people are a saber-rattling type. We have never shown symptoms of aggression. Fear that the proposed conscription will lead to aggression on our part is less risky than the fear that we may not be prepared to preserve our liberties and form of government if we are suddenly attacked and found unprepared.

Finally, the wholesome living and training of a good cross section of the youth of our country; the commingling and mutual understanding and respect engendered in the flower of our young manhood throughout the Nation, should do much to restore a discipline which would benefit our generation and help to dissipate the softness which tends to corrode our age.

Sacrifice that is voluntarily accepted through conscription is preferable to that which is forced by the heel of a conqueror. France was far better prepared in equipment and trained manpower than we would be, even with conscription, for a long time to come. Belgium, Norway, Denmark, and Holland desired nothing but to mind their own business. But France was hollow within from dry rot, materialism, radicalism, and unjustified self-confidence. The spirit of sacrifice was dulled and the pursuit of pleasure and a false sense of security lured on to the dance of death. Now, in defeat, France will be united, pay the price, and make far greater sacrifices than would have been called for otherwise.

One thing that always commended your own program and policy to thinking people is that you did something. Your friends did not always agree with you 100 percent. Sometimes it was quite clear that, like the rest of us, you made mistakes. But you did something. You did not fritter away time in endless, fruitless discussions or wait until it was too late.

Thus it seems to me that we as a nation need to do something. Not merely to provide equipment, but also to be prepared to use it. We need a united nation that will put everything we have promptly and effectively into our preparation and promote a wholesome respect for our ability to repel disastrously for our enemies any attempt to destroy our principles of government or invade our country. It is now as plain as a pike staff that if the axis powers, united with Japan and Russia, once get the notion that they have half a chance, through South America or otherwise, to make us sue for peace our cause is lost.

There is no perfect plan. But there must be some reasonably adequate plan adopted immediately. It is essential that any such plan have Nation-wide support, be nonpartisan, and truly patriotic.

"When a strong (trained) man armed, keepeth his court, those things are in peace which he possesseth. But if a stronger (better trained) than he come upon him and overcome him, he will take away all his armor wherein he trusted and will distribute his spoils."

Rt. Rev. JOHN B. GORMAN,
Saint Teresa's Rectory, Brooklyn.

AUGUST 8, 1940.

Food for Civilian Populations in Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. DELANEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 21, 1940

ARTICLE BY RALPH INGERSOLL

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Ralph Ingersoll, which was published in PM magazine.

[From PM magazine]

II. ON IMMEDIATE ISSUES

STARVING THE CONTINENT OF EUROPE

The proposition: Shall we organize to feed civilians in the countries laid waste and conquered by treachery and "blitzkrieg," or shall we support the British blockade which aims to sap the strength of the German terror by starvation, to prove to the German people that in the long run there's more satisfaction in making butter than in making cannon?

This seems to me as open and shut a proposition as sending destroyers to convoy aviation gasoline to the men who are shooting down the Stukas.

The Germans already have a new name for the continent of Europe. It means German Europe. It means that as long as Hitler is in power there is no France or Belgium or Norway—there are only provinces and protectorates of the great, great, great Reich. It means that from the German point of view, to feed a Frenchman is to feed a vassal of the German state.

The newsreels last week showed pictures of Germans sending their French prisoners back to the fields to grow food for them to eat. For the people of the United States to send food to Europe now would be for the American "relief" administrator to put on a German Army uniform, cooperate with the German high command in the most vital of all army functions—service of supplies.

In this country the leading advocate of feeding German Europe seems to be ex-President Herbert Hoover. He has a world-wide reputation for being a humane man. It is based on his having fed the Belgians when the Belgians were our allies. It is curious how reputations stick to people. In 1920 Herbert Hoover fed the Belgians. In 1931 the American veterans marched to Washington asking food and he met them with American bayonets at Anacostia and he burned their miserable shacks over their heads. Now his heart bleeds again for the hungry. Not the American hungry. Dear me, no! He is the bitter enemy of the one man who has fed more hungry Americans than any other man in the history of the country: Franklin D. Roosevelt. He wants us to put our food on ships and send it to the Continent that has been conquered by our enemies. He was very efficient about distributing food in Belgium in 1920. He won't have to bother about distributing our food for us this time. The Germans are as good organizers as he. They will see to it that the food gets to the right places—the right places to see to it that none of the vassal states revolts against its now master, the right places to see to it that there's plenty of food left over on the Continent of Europe so that the total war can go on until the phrase is not German Europe, but German world.

RALPH INGERSOLL.

Federal Expenditures in Fifth Congressional District of Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES H. LEAVY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 21, 1940

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Speaker, under the permission given me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am having printed a report to the people of Pend Oreille, Stevens, and Ferry Counties in my district, showing the estimated expenses of the United States in those counties during the present administration. They are as follows:

Estimated county report of Federal expenditures, Pend Oreille County, Wash., Mar. 4, 1933, through June 30, 1939

LOANS

	Number	Amount
CURRENT PROGRAMS		
Federal Loan Agency:		
1. Reconstruction Finance Corporation (from Feb. 2, 1932)		$114,658
2. Disaster Loan Corporation		
Federal Works Agency:		
3. Public Works Administration, non-Federal projects		(1)
4. U. S. Housing Authority, loan contracts signed		
Department of Agriculture:		
5. Farm Credit Administration, Land Bank Commissioner	38	[2] 64,000
6. Farm Credit Administration, emergency crop and feed	49	[2] 3,300
7. Farm Security Administration, rural rehabilitation		12,472
8. Farm Security Administration, farm tenant purchase		
9. Rural Electrification Administration (total project cost divided by number of counties participating)		
COMPLETED PROGRAMS		
10. Farm Credit Administration, 1934-35 drought relief	1	295
11. Home Owners' Loan Corporation, 1933-36	16	18,719
Total, repayable		213,444

EXPENDITURES

		Number	Amount
CURRENT PROGRAMS			
Federal Works Agency:			
1. Public Works Administration, non-Federal projects		3	$39,488
2. Public Works Administration, Federal projects			
3. Public Roads Administration, completed projects			559,718
4. Public Buildings Administration, Federal buildings			
5. Work Projects Administration			52,947
6. Other projects under works program			
Federal Security Agency:			
7. Social Security Board:			
Old-age assistance	$63,605	182	71,605
Aid to dependent children	4,662	34	
Aid to the blind	3,338	5	
Department of Agriculture:			
8. Agricultural Adjustment Administration conservation programs:			
1936	$9,300		19,443
1937	10,143		
9. Farm Security Administration, rural rehabilitation			3,648
COMPLETED PROGRAMS			
10. Federal Emergency Relief Administration			103,685
11. Civil Works Administration			80,585
12. Agricultural Adjustment Administration, rental and benefit payments			7,150
13. U. S. Housing Authority, housing (former Public Works Administration housing only)			
Total, nonrepayable			938,269
Grand total, repayable and nonrepayable			1,151,713

OTHER BENEFITS

	Number	Amount
Federal Housing Administration:		
Title I. Modernization and improvement loans insured	67	$20,422
Title II. Mortgages accepted for insurance	3	5,400
Total, housing insurance		25,822
Farm Security Administration, farm debt reduction		
Public Roads Administration, active project allotments		

[1] These projects received both loans and grants.
[2] As of Dec. 31, 1938.

Estimated county report of Federal expenditures, Pend Oreille County, Wash., Mar. 4, 1933, through June 30, 1939—Continued

COUNTY STATISTICS [3]

Families in county, 1930	1,933
Dwellings, 1930	1,900
Individual income-tax returns, 1935	123
Passenger autos registered, 1936	1,196
Families with radios, 1938	2,040
Residential telephones, 1935	172
Domestic electric meters, 1930	861
Farms, 1935	686
Retail employees, 1935	89
Wholesale employees, 1935	19
Mining employees, 1935	30
Manufacturing employees, 1935	577
Persons on farms, 1935	2,559
Unemployed reporting, 1937	309

[3] Source: Consumer Market Data Handbook.

Estimated county report of Federal expenditures, Stevens County, Wash., Mar. 4, 1933, through June 30, 1939

LOANS

	Number	Amount
CURRENT PROGRAMS		
Federal Loan Agency:		
1. Reconstruction Finance Corporation (from Feb. 2, 1932)		$110,595
2. Disaster Loan Corporation		
Federal Works Agency:		
3. Public Works Administration, non-Federal projects	1	[1] 2,380
4. U. S. Housing Authority, loan contracts signed		
Department of Agriculture:		
5. Farm Credit Administration, land bank commissioner	175	[2] 258,575
6. Farm Credit Administration, emergency crop and feed	195	[2] 19,455
7. Farm Security Administration, rural rehabilitation		132,844
8. Farm Security Administration, farm tenant purchase	6	43,084
9. Rural Electrification Administration (total project cost divided by number of counties participating)	1	171,500
COMPLETED PROGRAMS		
10. Farm Credit Administration, 1934-35 drought relief	1	280
11. Home Owners' Loan Corporation, 1933-36	32	39,528
Total, repayable		778,241

EXPENDITURES

		Number	Amount
CURRENT PROGRAMS			
Federal Works Agency:			
1. Public Works Administration, non-Federal projects		8	$174,406
2. Public Works Administration, Federal projects		6	323,245
3. Public Roads Administration, completed projects			240,686
4. Public Buildings Administration, Federal buildings			73,064
5. Work Projects Administration			340,971
6. Other projects under works program			
Federal Security Agency:			
7. Social Security Board:			
Old-age assistance	$211,695	557	241,713
Aid to dependent children	27,453	178	
Aid to the blind	2,565	9	
Department of Agriculture:			
8. Agricultural Adjustment Administration conservation programs:			
1936	$67,782		137,379
1937	69,597		
9. Farm Security Administration, rural rehabilitation			15,836
COMPLETED PROGRAMS			
10. Federal Emergency Relief Administration			112,598
11. Civil Works Administration			73,842
12. Agricultural Adjustment Administration rental and benefit payments			129,653
13. U. S. Housing Administration, housing (former Public Works Administration housing only)			
Total, nonrepayable			1,863,393
Grand total, repayable and nonrepayable			2,641,634

OTHER BENEFITS

	Number	Amount
Federal Housing Administration:		
Title I. Modernization and improvement loans insured	287	$94,777
Title II. Mortgages accepted for insurance	5	11,400
Total, housing insurance		106,177
Farm Security Administration, farm debt reduction	3	1,543
Public Roads Administration, active project allotments		1,500

[1] These projects received both loans and grants.
[2] As of Dec. 31, 1938.

Estimated county report of Federal expenditures, Stevens County, Wash., Mar. 4, 1933, through June 30, 1939—Continued

COUNTY STATISTICS [3]

Families in county, 1930	5,003
Dwellings, 1930	4,900
Individual income tax returns, 1935	162
Passenger autos registered, 1936	3,065
Families with radios, 1938	5,310
Residential telephones, 1935	1,004
Domestic electric meters, 1930	1,341
Farms, 1935	2,829
Retail employees, 1935	223
Wholesale employees, 1935	15
Mining employees, 1935	265
Manufacturing employees, 1935	338
Persons on farms, 1935	11,042
Unemployed reporting, 1937	663

[3] Source: Consumer Market Data Handbook.

Estimated county report of Federal expenditures, Ferry County, Wash., Mar. 4, 1933, through June 30, 1939

LOANS

	Number	Amount
CURRENT PROGRAMS		
Federal Loan Agency:		
1. Reconstruction Finance Corporation (from Feb. 2, 1932)		$25,809
2. Disaster Loan Corporation		
Federal Works Agency:		
3. Public Works Administration, non-Federal projects		(1)
4. U. S. Housing Authority, loan contracts signed		
Department of Agriculture:		
5. Farm Credit Administration, land bank commissioner	11	[2] 17,850
6. Farm Credit Administration, emergency crop and feed	49	[2] 3,920
7. Farm Security Administration, rural rehabilitation		13,135
8. Farm Security Administration, farm tenant purchase		
9. Rural Electrification Administration (total project cost divided by number of counties participating)		
COMPLETED PROGRAMS		
10. Farm Credit Administration, 1934-35 drought relief		
11. Home Owners' Loan Corporation, 1933-36	1	1,098
Total, repayable		61,812

EXPENDITURES

CURRENT PROGRAMS			
Federal Works Agency:			
1. Public Works Administration, non-Federal projects		4	$58,049
2. Public Works Administration, Federal projects		2	68,334
3. Public Roads Administration, completed projects			23,415
4. Public Buildings Administration, Federal buildings			37,386
5. Work Projects Administration			17,158
6. Other projects under works program			
Federal Security Agency:			
7. Social Security Board:			
Old-age assistance	$51,035	147	58,324
Aid to dependent children	6,162	33	
Aid to the blind	1,127	3	
Department of Agriculture:			
8. Agricultural Adjustment Administration conservation programs:			
1936	$12,301		21,732
1937	9,731		
9. Farm Security Administration rural rehabilitation			2,737
COMPLETED PROGRAMS			
10. Federal Emergency Relief Administration			14,943
11. Civil Works Administration			37,363
12. Agricultural Adjustment Administration rental and benefit payments			21,681
13. U. S. Housing Authority, housing (former Public Works Administration housing only)			
Total, nonrepayable			361,122
Grand total, repayable and nonrepayable			422,934

OTHER BENEFITS

Federal Housing Administration:		
Title I. Modernization and improvement loans insured	61	$21,770
Title II. Mortgages accepted for insurance		
Total, housing insurance		21,770
Farm Security Administration, farm debt reduction		
Public Roads Administration, active project allotments		

[1] These projects received both loans and grants.
[2] As of Dec. 31, 1938.

Estimated county report of Federal expenditures, Ferry County, Wash., Mar. 4, 1933, through June 30, 1939—Continued

COUNTY STATISTICS [3]

Families in county, 1930	1,236
Dwellings, 1930	1,200
Individual income tax returns, 1935	40
Passenger automobiles registered, 1936	591
Families with radios, 1938	1,310
Residential telephones, 1935	37
Domestic electric meters, 1930	392
Farms, 1935	647
Retail employees, 1935	35
Wholesale employees, 1935	4
Mining employees, 1935	90
Manufacturing employees, 1935	25
Persons on farms, 1935	2,573
Unemployed reporting, 1937	133

[3] Source: Consumer Market Data Handbook.

The Amazing Story of How America's Hog Raisers Were Legislated Into Legalistic "No Man's Land"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 21, 1940

ARTICLE FROM THE SIOUX CITY TRIBUNE

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I have frequently addressed this House about the injustice which has been done the hog raisers of America by withholding from them the refunds of hog-processing taxes which they paid, which the courts have declared they are entitled to reclaim, but which the New Deal administration has persistently and consistently refused to repay. Legislation providing the means for making these repayments is before both Houses of Congress but the administrative control of the committees is so rigid and so complete that they refuse to report these bills out so we can vote upon them. Consequently, America's hog raisers continue to be the "forgotten men" and are deprived of refunds to which they have both a legal and a moral claim.

In order to give Members an opportunity to do something more for these farmers than to merely extend them their sympathies, I introduced petition No. 25 to discharge the Agricultural Committee of the House from further consideration of this legislation and to bring the hog tax refunding bill before us for a vote. Many of you have now signed this petition. Others must still sign it, however, if justice is to be done the farmers of America. I again call on you, therefore, in the interests of fair play and justice to sign petition No. 25. America has the established policy of refunding taxes illegally paid or unfairly collected. The hog raisers of America are entitled to the same consideration under this policy which has always been given corporations and to rich individuals who have made unjustly excessive tax payments. You and I have an obligation to see to it that the farmers get this traditional consideration.

The accompanying article from the Sioux City (Iowa) Tribune indicates that Secretary Wallace, himself, has been one of the biggest stumbling blocks stopping our farmers from getting the tax refunds to which they are entitled. I hope every Member will read this article. Having read it, I also hope that the sense of fair play which prevails in this House will cause Members to sign petition No. 25 and join those of us who are trying our utmost to adjust the wrong which has been done to the hog raisers of America through collecting illegal taxes from their pockets and then refusing to

follow the edicts of the courts by refunding these taxes to the people to whom they legally and morally belong.

[From the Sioux City Tribune of August 12, 1940]

HERE'S AMAZING STORY OF HOW AMERICA'S HOG RAISERS WERE LEGISLATED INTO LEGALISTIC "NO MAN'S LAND"—HOW FARMERS WERE BILKED OF PROCESS TAX TOLD

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—How the American hog producer has been legislated into a "legalistic no man's land" and deprived of his constitutional right of redress in the matter of recovering processing taxes, which the United States Supreme Court ruled were collected illegally, is glowingly told by A. I. Birch, of Marcus, Iowa, in the following article. It is a glaring tale of New Deal political chicanery.)

(By A. I. Birch)

September 5, 1933, the United States Government, through the Agricultural Adjustment Act, levied a tax on all hogs for slaughter. The packers were authorized to collect the tax to pay it to the United States Treasurer.

During the summer of 1935, eight rice millers of Louisiana brought action to test the legality of the act. At the same time the collectors of the tax posted a bond and impounded the tax from that time up to the time the Supreme Court declared the law unconstitutional, which was January 6, 1936. The amount impounded was $98,000,000. The total amount collected was $361,230,867.47. The amount turned over to the United States Treasurer prior to impounding by the packers was $263,230,867.47. The total amount of all the tax being illegal, the Court decree called for an act of Congress to legalize return of the money to the source from which it came.

On June 22, 1936, the Revenue Act of 1936 was passed by Congress and signed by the President. The act contained the two pieces of legislation that legalized the movement of the processing tax.

Title III or unjust enrichment tax, also known as the windfall bill, taxed 80 percent of the amount held by collectors to the Treasurer of the United States. The other 20 percent was allowed the collectors (packers) for their trouble of collecting.

The White Packing Co. made a test case of this act. The finding of the courts was, that the packers had shifted the tax burden and so, of course, had to comply with the law.

SET UP COURT

Title VII of the Revenue Act of 1936 provides for the refund of the tax back to the source from which it was taken. A special court was set up under this bill taking all these tax claims from the natural channel. The United States Court of Claims plainly stated that no refund shall be made or allowed, in pursuance of court decisions or otherwise, of any amount paid by or collected from any claimant as tax under the Agricultural Adjustment Act unless the claimant establishes to the satisfaction of the Commissioner, in accordance with regulations prescribed by him, with the approval of the Secretary, or to the satisfaction of the tribunal court or the board of review in cases provided for under section 906 as the case may be.

Section 906 provides that all claims for refund must be filed with the Commissioner of Internal Revenue. Also establishing in the Treasury Department a board of review composed of nine members who shall be officers or employees of the Treasury Department, designated by the Secretary of the Treasury.

RIGHT OF APPEAL

If the claimant is not satisfied with the allowance of the Commissioner, he has the privilege of appealing to the board of review and then to the United States courts of appeal and to the United States Supreme Court if desired.

Thus the bill takes all such claims from the natural channel, the United States Court of Claims. Since the year 1855 all citizens had a right to a redress of a wrong. Prior to that time all claims against the United States were passed on by Congress.

Section 903 provides that claims must be filed, after the enactment of this act, which was June 22, 1936, prior to July 1, 1937.

The decision to the claims of hog producers by the Commissioner was that bill title VII provided a recovery to a processor but not to producer unless the producer was a processor and had also paid the tax into the Treasury.

Title VII rules all of these tax claims out of the United States Court of Claims and the commissioner of the first court under title VII ruled the producers out of court; that the act, plainly stated that was the only method that recovery would be allowed.

PASSED BY THE SENATE

Resolution 66 was presented in the Senate in 1939. Resolution 66 amends and corrects the mistakes of title VII of the Revenue Act of 1936, giving the same rights to a producer of hogs as is provided for a processor, providing a new 1 year of filing claims and 18 months to present evidence. This resolution passed the Senate the 1st of last August without a dissenting vote; then was passed on favorably by the House subcommittee and was referred to the Committee on Agriculture August 5, 1939.

This resolution 66 was voted out of the House committee a short time ago, 11 to 9—20 of 25 Members being present. The opposition then rounded up the 5 absent members and then moved not to report it out and carried 13–12. I found while in Washington that the opposition in the committee was the New Deal members.

Representative KARL MUNDT, of Madison, S. Dak., presented petition No. 25, which required the signatures of 218 House Members in order to force a bill on the floor of the House. I am here quoting a letter written by Mr. MUNDT on April 1, 1940:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., April 1, 1940.

DEAR COLLEAGUES: Have you signed discharge petition No. 25?

If you are among those who have not yet signed this discharge petition, will you give me 2 minutes of your time to suggest reasons why, in justice to the farmers of your own district and to the taxpayers generally, you should sign this particular petition?

Petition No. 25 simply would bring Senate Joint Resolution 66, which passed the Senate last August, before the House for a vote. Senate Joint Resolution 66 provides for a refund to American hog producers of the processing taxes which they illegally paid before the Supreme Court declared this tax unconstitutional. An appropriation of $58,000,000 was subsequently paid to refund taxes illegally collected, and of this amount $31,000,000 still remains available and appropriated for repayment of hog processing taxes. Senate Joint Resolution 66 simply provides a method for our hog producers to establish their claims for this refund which both the Supreme Court and the United States Treasury have stated were unjustly and illegally paid by the American hog producers.

It has always been a cardinal principle of American taxation that taxes illegally collected shall be refunded to those who pay them. Income taxes are refunded when they are overpaid; the taxes paid by the hog processors were refunded from the above appropriation when the tax was declared void; taxes collected under the Bankhead Cotton Act of 1934, the Kerr Tobacco Act, and the Potato Act of 1935 were also refunded. It now remains for this Government to keep faith with the American hog producers by refunding taxes illegally collected from the producers themselves.

America cannot afford to establish the dangerous precedent at this late date of refusing to refund taxes illegally collected. Such a despotic stand would be a long step backward from our traditional policy of fair dealing with all types of honest taxpayers. More important than the money involved and the refunds due the farmers is the importance of maintaining this Government's honor in dealing with taxpayers. To deny justice in this case would place a blot on our national honor that in future years might spread to equal injustices to those who erroneously or unjustly overpay income taxes or other levies. Your signature to petition No. 25 will help Uncle Sam keep faith with John Taxpayer.

KARL MUNDT, M. C.

MR. WALLACE KNEW

In January 1937 there was released a Wallace telegram of warning: "I wish to state emphatically that there is no provision in law which directs, authorizes, or allows any refund of processing taxes to any producer unless the producer himself was the actual processor and himself paid the processing tax to the collector of internal revenue and did not pass the tax on to the consumer * * *." Such warning was placed in offices of the livestock commission houses of Sioux City.

Also in the early days of March of the same year the officials of the Agricultural Department released through the press the following notice:

(By Paul May)

"WASHINGTON.—There is no authority under the law to refund any processing taxes to a producer unless that producer also was a processor and paid such taxes directly to the collector of internal revenue, Representative HARRINGTON was advised by the Department of Agriculture Wednesday.

"Department officials issued a statement following an investigation made on complaints of operators of a farm at Remsen, Iowa, that an agency at Marcus, Iowa, was attempting to sign up farmers for refunds of processing taxes:

"'Statements to the effect that a farmer, who did not process his own products but who sold them to the packer or millers, is entitled under existing law to obtain refunds from the Government are false and misleading, and farmers should be warned against paying money to those who make such statements,' Department officials said."

These warnings plainly showed that Mr. Wallace, our Secretary of Agriculture, knew even before a decision was made by the special court, that title VII of the Revenue Act of 1936, not only had taken the producers out of the United States Court of Claims but had legislated him where he had no place to go for a redress of this wrong. I can find no evidence that our Secretary ever raised a hand or voice to correct this injustice, but on the contrary he used his position to discourage those producers who had been unjustly and illegally taxed, also to intimidate others who were making an effort to correct this wrong.

VOIDS BILL OF RIGHTS

This piece of legislation I believe to be the most discriminating and unconstitutional ever passed by Congress—there never was before an act of Congress that legislated a group of its citizens into "no man's land" by depriving citizens of their most valued constitutional rights—a court for redress of a wrong. Oh, yes; we have our Bill of Rights, free speech, free assembly, free press, and the liberty of worship, but what do they amount to if you have no court of redress against those who should deny one of these rights.

The correction of this is, to my opinion, one of the biggest issues at the present time. No Congressman should be considered that does not so consider this issue. The spirit of "can't" and "I don't believe" never gave birth to any nation or corrected mistakes made, nor can a nation be returned or perpetuated in this manner. No; we must use cooperatively the spirit of "shall" and "will be" in correcting anything that tends to destroy equality and general welfare. This is not only our constitutional rights, it is a citizen's duty.

The effort to correct this situation should be supported by every hog producer and every businessman and should be opposed by no American citizen.

Willkie's Remarkable Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAMPTON P. FULMER
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 21, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE COLUMBIA (S. C.) STATE

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, we have heard a great many remarks about the Willkie speech at Elwood, Ind., some days ago.

I am inserting in my remarks an editorial carried in the State, an outstanding paper in my district, Columbia, S. C., which so completely and interestingly analyzes this speech. I am sure it will be read with a great deal of interest not only by the Members of the House, but by all the readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. Willkie, in referring to Washington, Jefferson, Jackson, Lincoln, Cleveland, Theodore Roosevelt, and Woodrow Wilson, forgot to mention some of the Republican president's, for instance, Harding, Coolidge, and Hoover. Perhaps he realized that if he should refer to them he would be calling to the memory of the people that we had it hard with Harding, cool with Coolidge, and hungry with Hoover.

[From the Columbia (S. C.) State of August 20, 1940]

MR. WILLKIE'S REMARKABLE ADDRESS

Mr. Willkie did not discuss, directly, the New Deal's place in history, but inferentially he gives to it a large and a favored place. Listen:

"I believe that the forces of free enterprise must be regulated. I am opposed to business monopolies.

"I believe in collective bargaining by the representatives of labor's own free choice, without any interference and in full protection of those obvious rights.

"I believe in the maintenance of minimum standards for wages and of maximum standards for hours. I believe that such requirements should constantly rise.

"I believe in Federal regulation of interstate utilities, of securities markets, and of banking. I believe in Federal pensions, in adequate old-age benefits, and in unemployment allowances.

"I believe that the Federal Government has a responsibility to equalize the lot of the farmer with that of the manufacturer.

"I believe in the encouragement of cooperative buying and selling, and in the full extension of rural electrification."

These policies in which Mr. Willkie states his definite belief are New Deal policies, some out of the very heart of the New Deal. Could any administration receive higher praise than for its chief opponent, in his address of acceptance, to approve of it? And Mr. Willkie approved also of aid to England short of war, and of selective service. Remove paragraphs of general denunciation from the address, and it might be used by Democratic campaign orators.

It was a strange political address. Old line, deeply sincere Republicans, the State imagines, suffered under it. Here was their man describing himself as a liberal Democrat. Isolationists also must have suffered, for here was their hope, the Republican candidate, doing precisely what they—and he—condemned the President for doing, denouncing and threatening foreign powers. And Republican logicians undoubtedly suffered because the address had in it so many contradictions. The New Deal declared Mr. Willkie "preaches the doctrine of division." That's not his doctrine, he said. But immediately after the impressive list of "I believes," that list of New Deal policies, the Republican candidate reached this conclusion:

"The purpose of all such measures (those he had approved) is indeed to obtain a better distribution of the wealth and the earning power of the country."

Mr. Willkie made no direct appeal to the rank and file of the Republican Party. He even avoided calling himself a Republican, and most of the former Presidents he praised, or seemed to admire, were Democrats. In one sentence he grouped Washington, Jefferson, Jackson, Lincoln, Cleveland, Theodore Roosevelt, and Woodrow Wilson. Not a word about the once idolized (by big business) Cal Coolidge. Not a word, and for good reason, about "Normalcy" Harding. Not even a word—was there?—about the only living former President, the relentless fighter against the New Deal, Mr. Hoover.

Probably Mr. Willkie believes the rank-and-file Republicans will go along, anyway, because they have nowhere else to go, and that his appeal must be mainly and pointedly to Democrats and to independents. This may be good strategy—if the regular party leaders do not become indifferent or resentful under the leadership of a man who does not do as they would have him do. If they do become indifferent, if the Republican organizations or machines fail to run smoothly, Mr. Willkie will lose millions of votes. Will he gain more millions by his departure from political technique? The answer will be known next November.

The sharpest summary of the Willkie address the State has seen comes from Mr. Norman Thomas, the Socialist candidate for President. "Mr. Willkie made a speech," said Mr. Thomas, "which was a synthesis of Guffey's First Reader, the genealogy of Indiana, the collected speeches of Tom Girdler and the New Republic. He agreed with Mr. Roosevelt's entire program of social reform, and said it was leading to disaster. The speech was a classic example of the time-honored principle of a stick of candy for everybody." That summary is more than sharp—it also is intelligent.

The address brought to mind some of those made by Mr. Landon, the Republican candidate in 1936. He, too, ran on a New Deal platform, from which he uttered hot criticisms of the New Deal. Mr. Landon gave the country no real issue in 1936. Mr. Willkie gives it none in 1940. Not yet, anyway. Perhaps as the campaign develops, there will arise genuine differences between the two major candidates on some important domestic matter or on foreign policy. But today these two splendid gentlemen are close together in foreign policy and in political philosophy, and they seem close akin even in personalities. There are differences, of course, one of which is that President Roosevelt has had thorough experience in public life. Also President Roosevelt is the tallest remaining symbol of democracy as a dynamic force that can take care of its own followers, and that is not afraid of its alien enemies.

White River Power Prospects

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FADJO CRAVENS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 21, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE SOUTHWEST AMERICAN

Mr. CRAVENS. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the leave granted to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Southwest American of Fort Smith, Ark., published under date of August 19, 1940:

[From the Southwest American of August 19, 1940]

WHITE RIVER POWER PROSPECTS

Congressman CLYDE T. ELLIS' announcement that development of the White River power possibilities has been given the green light by the President will be most welcome to north Arkansas. Development of water power on the White River has been one of Congressman ELLIS' chief interests since he went to Congress 2 years ago, and he has made a dent with it.

Speaking to the national-defense committee of the State planning board in Little Rock Friday, Dr. George C. Branner talked about this White River project, just a few hours before Congressman ELLIS made his announcement in Washington. Army engineers have described the White River in northern Arkansas and southern Missouri as equal in importance to the Tennessee River at Muscle Shoals, Dr. Branner said. He quoted three Army engineers' reports as saying that natural population growth and potential power development will absorb the output of two power projects at Bull Shoals near Cotter and Table Rock in Missouri.

With Grand River power already developed and waiting for a market in northeast Oklahoma, and White River power on the way in northern Arkansas and southern Missouri, this section of

the world ought to get in on some of the billions which are about to be spent for defense industry, and the other billions which, in the normal course of events, should be spent in normal industrial development in the years ahead.

This section of the United States has much to commend it for a greater industrial growth than it has had. The lack of power has not been nearly so serious as the lack of effective markets for industrial products. A revision of the freight-rate structure, which removes the present discriminations against this area, will make possible the effective use of the extensive new power which we have and are about to develop.

Wendell L. Willkie

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. DANAHER

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 21 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

EDITORIAL FROM CLEVELAND PLAIN DEALER

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Cleveland Plain Dealer of Tuesday, August 20, 1940, entitled "The Plain Dealer Supports Willkie."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PLAIN DEALER SUPPORTS WILLKIE

The Plain Dealer supports Wendell L. Willkie for President of the United States.

We come to this decision with no regard either for party names or political considerations. Rather, our decision is based on the best analysis we can make of the moral problem confronting the United States of America. We have reached this conclusion, which seems inevitable to us, with the regret which decent people feel about breaking old ties.

For close to a hundred years the Plain Dealer has refrained from supporting for President any other than Democratic candidates. We say this in no spirit of apology or of boastfulness. On occasions we were probably wrong.

Now for the first time we depart from this century-old Plain Dealer tradition. We recommend the defeat of a Democrat who is seeking a third term to the Presidency.

If anyone reads into this an act of desertion, we insist that the result rests on the shoulders of Mr. Roosevelt and not on ours.

The Plain Dealer chooses to remain democratic. The Roosevelt administration, by contrast, has abandoned the democracy of Jefferson, Jackson, Cleveland, and Wilson.

The Plain Dealer elects to abide by the idea that the country should make social progress as fast as it can pay for it, whereas Mr. Roosevelt has attempted, not a liberal, but a radical goal. The only possible outcome of his policies, as we see it, is State socialism, followed inevitably by some form of fascism.

Under our system of government, if a sufficient majority can be obtained to amend the Constitution in a given direction, America may adopt any form of government, known or to be known, by man.

But we should proceed frankly and openly to such basic changes as these and accomplish them in the democratic way, by popular majorities on candidly expressed proposals. Never should we agree, if we hope to remain Democrats, to a subtle and unacknowledged transformation of our state of society.

Eight years ago we supported Franklin D. Roosevelt with boundless enthusiasm. Four years ago we supported him with some misgivings. The course of events since then, culminating in the President's ill-disguised and successful maneuver for a third-term nomination, force upon us the conviction that we can no longer support the President whom this newspaper helped twice to elect.

The Democratic national platform of 1932 was liberal, forthright, and courageous. Standing on that declaration of principles, Governor Roosevelt as a candidate for President was impregnable. Had the tenets of that platform been obeyed the United States would today be in a far better situation—financially, economically, politically—than it now is.

To most Americans the history of this period is too fresh in mind to justify repeating its lessons.

Instead of establishing policies of economy in government, Mr. Roosevelt inaugurated a regime of immense and largely uncontrolled expenditure. In a period when the United States was at peace he doubled the national debt. He sponsored a program of gold purchase at inflated prices, which resulted in cornering three-quarters of the world's supply, and burying it in the Kentucky hills. He subsidized the silver producers at public expense to the tune of more millions.

Contrary to experience and the lessons of economy, he used unnumbered millions in a vain effort to borrow and spend his way back to prosperity. He paid farmers for not raising crops. He killed pigs to improve the hog market. He punished business and said that he did it to help men whose welfare depends on business.

He campaigned on the class issue by denunciation of "economic royalists." He filled the ranks of his administration with radicals, leftist thinkers, and social experimenters. He obtained the support of John L. Lewis by abdicating much of his authority to labor. He kept Secretary Perkins in the Cabinet and remained deaf to complaints that she, Chairman Madden, and many other of his appointees were furnishing protection for radical elements on the labor front.

He tried to persuade a Congress, which proved wiser than himself, to pack the United States Supreme Court and bring it under the thumb of the Executive. Stooping from his high position as President of all the people he prosecuted a country-wide "purge" of Democrats who had refused to do his bidding.

Mr. Roosevelt's culminating offense against his party, his country, and the world-wide spirit of democracy stood clearly revealed in the hollow and theatrical circumstances of his third-term nomination at the Chicago convention. The talk of "drafting" the President for the run is veriest nonsense. His whole strategy for a year before the convention was to make impossible the convention's choice of any other candidate.

No other Democrat was allowed to get his head above the common level. Without declaring his candidacy the President swept primary after primary, each victory a triumph for officeholders thumbing another ride on the supposedly magical coattails. And then, having wangled the third nomination for himself, he forced a rebellious convention to name for Vice President a Cabinet member whom few in the convention really wanted.

The example of a President voluntarily retiring at the end of his second term was set by Washington. It was galvanized into a principle by Jefferson. It became an inviolable precedent by the wisdom of succeeding Presidents. It is almost as much a part of our fundamental law as the Constitution itself.

The situation Jefferson warned his countrymen against in 1821 has now come to pass. An ambitious executive, finishing his second term and wishing another, conjures up the Old World theory that he alone in all America is capable of leadership. Mr. Roosevelt paints the portrait of The Indispensable Man, and lo, the likeness is of himself.

These are perilous days in world history for any democracy to experiment with indispensable men. The German Republic tried; Italy tried it; Russia tried it. The pathway of government since the World War is strewn with the twisted remnants of democratic institutions wrecked by indispensable men.

Every modern dictator the world has known first persuaded his countrymen that he was indispensable to their welfare.

America cannot afford to take the risk. No man in this still free Republic is so wise, so strong, so exalted in character or so finely tempered by experience that the safety of the Nation requires his retention in the Presidency. America is not ripe for the advent of the indispensable man.

These facts are set down calmly by a newspaper appreciative of the fine qualities of human sympathy and social justice which inspired the earlier days of Mr. Roosevelt's performance. These achievements are part of the permanent record of the era. They will be remembered outlined against the dark background of economic fumbling and industrial failure.

Much of this achievement will survive, regardless of the result of the November election. The country is committed to its perpetuation. Opposition to Mr. Roosevelt for a third term implies no repudiation of this part of his record.

Opposing the President who seeks to violate the unwritten statute against a third term is Wendell L. Willkie, nominee of the Republican convention at Philadelphia. Unknown to national politics as recently as 3 months ago, this lawyer and businessman from Indiana has become since mid-June the hope of millions whose votes, in the good American way, make our Presidents.

Willkie was the surprise nominee of an unbossed convention. He had received no primary support, and had asked for none. His nomination came as the answer to a specific, if unspoken, demand for a man particularly trained to meet the problems which will face the administration at Washington in the next 4 years.

These are problems of business, of organization, of harnessing the vast forces of the Nation to meet the conditions of a world at war, perhaps to fight a war. These problems are too serious for endless economic experimentation; too vital to the national safety to be handled by a brain trust with leftist tendencies, or a candidate unappreciative of cost control.

The career of Willkie is typically American. From the beginning his success has been self-achieved. Born in a small town, educated in a State university, he began his professional career in a small city. From small beginnings, traveling the road common to average Americans, he has grown into the stature of successful leadership.

To a greater degree, perhaps, than ever before, the welfare of the country in the years at hand will depend on industry intelligently

directed. Willkie is trained by hard knocks for his task. He has the confidence of industrial leaders. He possesses a record of fair dealing with labor.

With such a leader America can rise to the first need of the times, which is to arm itself.

But Mr. Roosevelt cannot persuade labor to efficient production. He and his advisers spent too many years helping it get more money for less work.

Mr. Roosevelt cannot expect business to cooperate with him except under compulsion, because his studied effort has been to harry business.

Only on rare occasions in American political history have conditions conspired to bring to the front a man particularly qualified to direct affairs in the crisis. Washington was, of course, a supreme example. Lincoln was one. Jackson was another.

Without suggesting similarities between men, it will seem to many that Willkie belongs in the galaxy of Americans mysteriously prepared for command in this critical period of the Republic.

By the logic of our two-party system the choice for President lies between Wendell L. Willkie and Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Even had the President achieved a flawless record of administration, which we have denied, the time is now at hand when he should retire. He cannot in sincerity say that Willkie is any less qualified than himself to direct the Government in the next 4 years.

That Mr. Roosevelt refuses to make this concession is a partial index of his character. It harmonizes with many Executive acts since March 1933. It is the trade-mark of one who has come to consider himself the indispensable man.

The Plain Dealer makes its choice without hesitation or qualification.

We solemnly urge the people to elect Wendell L. Willkie President of the United States.

The Ramparts We Watch

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. FLANNAGAN, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 21, 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. JOHN W. FLANNAGAN, JR., OF VIRGINIA

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a copy of the address I prepared for delivery at the annual reunion of the Counts family held at Dog Branch School House, Dickenson County, Va., August 11, 1940. At the last moment, due to official duties, I found it impossible to attend and deliver the address in person. It was, however, read by a distinguished member of the family, Mr. E. J. Sutherland, of Clintwood, Va.

The annual family reunion is a custom of our section that I would like to see observed in all sections of our country. Family pride is an asset that keeps alive many of the virtures of our ancestors that should be, and will have to be, preserved if our Republic lives on. I doubt if there is a purer Anglo-Saxon-American family in America than the Counts family. Would to God we had many more such families.

The address is as follows:

It is a delightful experience to be here today and talk to real Americans, the descendants of pre-Revolutionary stock, about some of the dangers that threaten our country.

I glory in the family that takes pride in its ancestry and annually meets to pay tribute to the dead and embrace the living. It shows that you who now carry on are not unmindful of the virtues of those who have passed and are anxious to preserve those virtues and pass them on down to the generations yet to come.

Among the virtues of the Counts family is a virtue inherited from their ancestors—a virtue common to all the families of the Appalachian region. That virtue, my friends, is an innate love for the country for which our ancesters fought and died to bring into being. And as they died that it might be born, so we, their descendants, ever stand ready to die that it may live. Let me here and now declare to the world that the same sword that brought this country into existence has ever remained unsheathed to keep it alive, and today gleams in the hands of the descendants of those who in the name of equality, freedom, and liberty first tore it from its scabbard, and in turn will be passed on to their descendants on down to the remotest generation. And I am persuaded that the same God that upheld the hands of your illustrious ancestors and their compatriots, as they struck the blow for equality and freedom and liberty, will uphold the hands of their descendants if the time ever comes to strike the blow to preserve that equality, that freedom, and that liberty.

A few nights ago in one of our theaters I witnessed the picture The Ramparts We Watch, which depicts the graphic form the causes that led us into the World War.

I am glad I saw that picture, because it got me to thinking about the ramparts in this country that should ever be watched.

It got me to thinking why these ramparts, which are part and parcel of our Republic, need watching.

It got me to thinking how these ramparts, which are dear to our hearts, should be watched.

And it got me to thinking about who should do the watching.

My friends, give me your attention while I briefly discuss what ramparts need watching, why they need watching, how they should be watched, and who should do the watching.

What ramparts? Asking the question, I know, instantly focuses your mind, as it did mine, on the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States, especially the first 10 amendments to that great document, which are commonly known as the Bill of Rights.

Oh, I saw the picture and I heard the actors speak their pieces, but I saw more. In my imagination, which but reflected my heart and mind, I saw emblazoned across the screen in letters of gold declarations and pronouncements of our forefathers defining these ramparts in bold unmistakable terms.

"We hold these truths to be self-evident: that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just power from the consent of the governed."

* * * * * * *

"We the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessing of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution of the United States."

And there were other ramparts supplementing these major ramparts, even as a great sermon supplements some great Biblical truth, that I saw:

The rampart of religious freedom, freedom of speech, and freedom of the press.

The rampart of peaceable assembly and of petition for the redress of grievances.

The rampart of a free people to keep and bear arms.

The rampart of the security of the home from the militia.

The rampart of the sanctity and security of the person, the home, papers, and effects from unreasonable search and seizure.

The rampart guaranteeing the accused a speedy and public trial by an impartial jury of his district, that he be informed of the nature and cause of the charge, that he be confronted with the witnesses against him, and that in his defense he be given the assistance of counsel.

The rampart preserving the right of trial by jury in civil cases.

The rampart prohibiting excessive bail, excessive fines, and cruel and unusual punishment.

The rampart guaranteeing that the enumerated rights in the Constitution shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people.

The rampart reserving to the States or the people all powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution nor prohibited by the States.

Yes, my friends, these are the ramparts—the bulwarks of a free people—that are sacred and dear to the American people and mean more to them than life itself. Without them life would not be worth living. With them we enjoy the sweetest, fullest life ever lived by a people since the dawn of time.

Why should our ramparts be watched? I am almost ashamed to ask such a question before the descendants of this simon-pure American family. And yet it is but right that we ask ourselves searching and fundamental questions sometimes lest we become lethargic and take things for granted. You know we Americans who have enjoyed equality and freedom and liberty since the foundation of our Republic ofttimes, I am afraid, just assume that these things, being among the foundation stones, were brought to us on a "silver platter" and will ever be served to us each morning on the same silver platter. Let me tell you we have no right to indulge in assumptions with respect to these God-given rights. They were purchased at a great price—the toil and sacrifice and blood of your ancestors and my ancestors—and the keeping price is just the same as the purchase price. Someone has said that "eternal vigilance is the price of liberty." Yes; and it is also the price of equality and freedom and every other prized and cherished possession. And when "eternal vigilance" calls for sacrifice, we must be prepared to make the sacrifice; when it calls for hardships, endure the hardships. It is the only insurance we can carry against becoming soft, and you know the nation, like the man, which becomes soft, becomes neglectful of obligations, unfaithful to

trusts, and, in the course of time, like the man, becomes a derelict and is entombed over in the burying ground known as the cemetery of national derelicts.

Foundation stones, you know, need attention. For instance, when the water begins to seep through and undermine the foundation, if we fail to go to the rescue, trouble is in store. Ofttimes the owner of the structure that has permitted foundation seepage has neglected to go to the rescue until it was too late. When at last awakened from his lethargy he rushes forth to repair, only to find that, due to his lack of vigilance, the foundation has become so undermined that his effort to save only hastens its destruction. Uncle Billy Sutherland, whom I see sitting over there—a distinguished member of this great family—knows what sin seepage will do; that it will cause the loss of the greatest gift of God to man—eternal life; and I know, from the fullness of his experience, can testify that on more than one occasion, as he plead with men on their deathbed to accept salvation, he has heard them cry out in their distress and agony, "Too late; too late!" The same is true of nations. National seepage is as dangerous as foundation seepage or sin seepage. Witness the sad plight of France today. Poor, seepage-ridden France, once the proud, cultured, carefree nation whose democracy was obtained at a great price—the price of the bloodiest of all revolutions—now the helpless victim of neglect to guard the ramparts upon which her greatness rested. German bombs and tanks, my friends, did not destroy France. It was the seepage from within. When the German threat became imminent and France attempted to go to the rescue of the ramparts she cherished, and upon which her greatness rested, she found that, through neglect, her national foundation stones had been undermined. Her honest, eleventh-hour effort to save only hastened her own destruction.

From France may we learn this lesson: France was willing to make the sacrifices necessary to obtain democracy, but unwilling to make the sacrifices necessary to preserve democracy. She was willing to pay the purchase price, but unwilling to pay the upkeep price. The French people failed to watch the ramparts. My friends, your ancestors and my ancestors made the sacrifices necessary to secure for us this great democracy of ours. They purchased with their toil and sacrifice; yes, with their life blood, the equality, the freedom and the liberties we now enjoy, and bequeathed them to us as a priceless heritage to be guarded and preserved and passed on to our children and our children's children. Ours is the duty—nay, the privilege—to suffer every toil, to make every sacrifice that may be necessary, even to the laying down of our lives, to watch and protect these sacred, blood-bought, God-given ramparts and save them inviolate from the seepage of every influence foreign to our democratic system of government.

How should our ramparts be watched? Let me answer in one sentence: By living our democracy.

The more I ponder over our form of government, the more I contemplate the spirit and genius of the men who brought it into being, the more firmly I become convinced that our best governmental textbook is the Holy Bible. Our democracy as recorded in the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, and the amendments thereto known as the Bill of Rights, is nothing more than governmental Christianity; that is, applying the principles of Christianity to the government of a people. Entertaining the views that I do, I am persuaded that it is just as much the duty of an American citizen to live his democracy as it is the duty of a Christian to live his Christianity. Proclaiming the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, and the Bill of Rights by those whose lives belie their proclamations will no more save our Republic than psalm singing by a bunch of sinners will save the church. "By their fruits ye shall know them" applies to state and church alike.

Even if you forget every other thing I say today, I want you to remember this thought and carry it home with you. As long as we live our democracy, the American Republic will live. The moment we cease to live our democracy, that moment will mark the beginning of the end of our Republic.

We hear a great deal these days about unity. A democracy, like any other government, depends upon unity. Unity—forced unity—in an autocratic country is brought about by the iron hand of the dictator. In a democracy it is brought about by confidence and faith generated by the knowledge that the government is being administered in the interest of all individuals and classes alike, that in the enjoyment of our freedom and liberties we are all upon an equality. In one case the motivating cause is fear, in the other, love. The nation whose unity is brought about by fear is short-lived. The nation whose unity is brought about by love is enduring. The spirit of no nation ever has been conquered, and the spirit of no nation ever will be conquered as long as the people of that nation are united by a deep love for their institutions and a heartfelt desire to perpetuate them. And as long as the spirit of a nation lives, though overpowered and subjugated, that nation lives and her people ever look forward, with a confidence born of God, to her national restoration. And the only way to insure the continued love of our institutions and a united people in their defense is by living our democracy. And, my friends, ever remember that you are neither living your democrary nor promoting unity by crushing one class and granting special privileges to another class. Unity can only be brought about by equality of opportunity and equality of treatment.

If we live our democracy, there are certain things that will follow, even as the night follows the day, from our democratic living:

The man who not only believes in but who actually lives his democracy will never contribute to undermining governmental seepage. He will never be misled by the traducers of our institutions. I do not know of a more shining example of this statement than the citizenry of this great mountain section. Here where we find the purest Anglo-Saxon stock to be found in America; here where over 99 percent of our population is native-born, the great percentage tracing their ancestry back to the founding fathers; here where democracy is bred in the bone, we live the freedom that is ours, enjoy our liberties, and practice that equality that makes every man a king. Here we ever watch and guard our ramparts of freedom, of liberty, and of equality. And because we do, we are free from the cesspools of squalor where poverty and want breed distrust in our institutions and generate slimy undermining seepage. And we who live our democracy will ever strive to make our Government work in such a way as to clear up the cesspools by bringing to the unfortunates the blessings of a government operated in the interest of all.

We who believe in our democratic institutions to such a point that we live our democracy, will not tolerate those who are not in sympathy with our institutions and who, under the cloak of freedom of speech and freedom of the press, spread subversive doctrines. Oh, I believe in freedom of speech and freedom of the press, but I also believe in freedom of action in dealing with the traducers of our country. The man who attempts to undermine or destroy our freedom, purchased by the blood of our forefathers and guaranteed by our Constitution, by that attempt forfeits his own freedom and should never be allowed to escape the consequences of his act by invoking the protection of the very instrument he seeks to destroy.

We should watch and see that these subversive doctrines are not taught in our public schools and colleges by those in sympathy with such doctrines. While I believe in culture, while I believe in developing the mind to its fullest extent, I am against forcing the plastic minds of our young manhood, our young womanhood, to listen to this subversive "ism" or the other subversive "ism," this subversive ideology or the other subversive ideology, taught by sympathetic teachers. The man, the woman, who doesn't believe that pure, undefiled Americanism is the only "ism," the only ideology, for a free people, should not be permitted to teach in a single school or college in this country. While I would not let our youth grow up in ignorance of these strange and subversive "isms" and ideologies, I would require that those who impart the knowledge at the same time point out that these strange doctrines are repulsive to our philosophy of government and, if adopted here, would lead to the destruction of our free institutions. What I am against—and it is all wrong—is for our youth to be taught these strange philosophies by those in sympathy with them, and who are more anxious to make converts than they are to impart knowledge. Before I leave this point, permit me to pause for just a moment to pay tribute to our small church schools and deplore the passing of so many of them. The small Christian college, to my way of thinking, is our greatest educational asset. And the greatest educational loss we have suffered is the closing of so many of them due to lack of finances. Here old-fashioned religion and old-fashioned Americanism—and you cannot improve on either—is still taught, and old-fashioned American young men and women, the kind we need to keep America great, are turned out. Here we find teachers who still believe in the cleansing blood of the Saviour and in our free institutions which were purchased by the cleansing blood of our ancestors. I am not afraid of church school trained young men or women being misled by these "isms" and ideologies.

And watch these different fronts, such as the Christian front, etc. There is something wrong with the man who needs a front to hide behind. If you live your democracy, there is only one front you can wear, and that is an American front. You don't have to wear a placard to let people know you are living the democratic way. Your life will proclaim it. I am always skeptical of the man who wears a label in order for you to know who he is and what he stands for. Let me bring home to you just what I mean. There is not a man or woman, boy or girl, present here today that has to wear a label or hide behind some front to let you know that she or he is a simon-pure, unadulterated American of the highest type. Your Americanism is known by the lives you live. Most of the fronts that you hear so much about these days are either rackets that some scheming scoundrel is running to coin money or organizations set up by foreign influences to poison the minds of our people against our free institutions, and neither one can exist in the community where people actually live their Americanism. Why, one of these fronts wouldn't last in this section as long as a dewdrop on one of your sun-kissed hills would last on a cloudless hot summer morning. The dewdrop could not stand God's sunlight, and the front couldn't stand your American searchlight. We had better be watching these sections where they can last longer.

And we who live our democracy will watch this radical foreign element that we have permitted to percolate into our midst. I have only the highest respect for those who have come to our shores with the honest purpose of becoming a part of us, to share our fortunes and help us build a greater America. The element I speak of came with no such purpose. They came to stir up trouble, to undermine our institutions by derision and scorn. Yes; they came to scoff; and if they don't remain to pray, then I believe in giving them the works and sending them back where they came from so they can fry in their own fat.

Yes, my friends, if we are to preserve our democracy, we must live our democracy. There is no other way. The reason democratic institutions in other nations have crumbled—and I make the statement advisedly—is because the peoples of those nations no longer lived their democracy.

And we who live our democracy will ever see that we are prepared to meet any emergency that may threaten our country. While we do not seek 1 foot of territory held by any other nation, we do not propose to compromise our sovereignty by surrendering 1 inch of our soil or allowing the invader to plant a single footstep upon the land we love. The size of our Army, the size of our Navy, the size of our air fleet, the number of our implements of war should be measured by the danger, or the probable danger, confronting us. We should at all times keep our Army, our Navy, and implements of war up to the point that we will be able to successfully ward off the invasion by any nation or combination of nations. The best insurance policy for peace we can carry is a strong Army, a strong Navy, and a strong air fleet, manned by real Americans trained in the use of the implements of modern warfare. The dictator never wages war against the nation that he thinks his equal or superior. Like all bullies, he fights those he thinks his inferiors in physical strength.

Right now, as I see the situation, which has been brought about by madmen bent upon world conquest, bent upon destroying religion and freedom and bringing all men under their dominion and power, we are confronted with the further duty of protecting the Americas in order to insure our own protection. And, by the help of God and our own strong arm, let me tell the Hitlers and the Stalins and the Mussolinis if they want to find the end of their road they had better not head toward the Americas, because if they do they will find it just outside the international boundary line surrounding these great countries. While we do not propose to send our boys to fight on European soil, we are just as firm in our conviction that their boys are not going to invade the soil of the Americas.

Who should do the watching? Why, every American should be a watchman. This job of watching, protecting, and perpetuating our ramparts belongs to no particular American, it belongs to no particular class, it belongs to all Americans, rich and poor, humble and exalted alike.

Being the duty, the privilege of all, when the necessity arises, as it has arisen, to increase our armed forces in order not only to watch but protect our ramparts, the burden should be, as far as possible, equally distributed. This, in my opinion, can only be accomplished by passing a fair conscription bill that will distribute the burden in a fair and honest way among all classes. Equality! The philosophy of life of the true American. I have lived by that philosophy and I am willing to die by it. I make this statement knowing that my two sons—the younger a native of dear old Dickenson and the older of the adjoining county, Buchanan—will be called to the colors. As much as I love them, and they are as dear to my heart as your children are to your hearts, when the hour of watching arrives, when the hour of protecting arrives, I want them to take part in the watching and protecting. And it fills my heart with pride to be able to tell you I have talked the matter over with both of them and they share wholeheartedly my convictions. And, my friends, it will not be the first time that a Flannagan or a Counts helped do the watching and protecting, because both families did a good deal of the watching and protecting as far back as 1776. They were on the job then, have been on the job since, and I thank God for the privilege that they are on the job today.

It would be folly—absolute, unadulterated folly—to build up a great Navy, to build thousands of bombing planes and tanks, and then fail to provide the manpower. We have the manpower, the finest manpower on earth, and in endorsing conscription to obtain that manpower I am only following the American way of equality. I am only advocating that when America needs our boys, and she does need them, that when she reaches out and takes the boy from the cabin that the next reach will take the boy from the castle; that when she reaches out and takes the boy from the farm that the next reach will take the boy of the professional man; that when she reaches out and takes the boy from the home of labor that the next reach will take the boy from the home of the industrialist. Treat them alike. That, my friends, is Americanism. That, my friends, is living your democracy.

My friends, I must close. In closing let me say keep up the traditions of the Counts family by continuing to live your democracy and be of good cheer. I have no fears for America. We have too many Counts families scattered over our fair country who not only believe in democracy but who live their democracy to become alarmed. We have the production capacity, we have the manpower, and we still trust in the Lord. You cannot beat that combination. We are depending on all three to carry us through this crisis.

Back in July 4, 1776, we declared our freedom and independence. Since that eventful day the years have come and the years have gone, bringing in their wake the destruction and creation alike of kingdoms, principalities, and near democracies, but under our philosophy of government which is based upon the proposition that all governmental power rests in the people and an innate faith in the capacity of men to govern themselves through their chosen representatives, America has marched on, weathering every national storm, growing in power and prestige, and stands out today, as never before, as a challenge to the dictators that have sprung up in a crazed world, that if civilization is to be preserved the edict of the dictator must give way to the composite voice of the people as expressed through their duly chosen representatives.

Stick to that philosophy, prepare, place your faith in God, and America will continue to march on.

America's Prayer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEWIS D. THILL
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 21, 1940

POEM BY WILLIAM CHAPPELL, OF MILWAUKEE, WIS.

Mr. THILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following prayer poem by William Chappell, of 2118 North Oakland Avenue, Milwaukee, Wis.:

AMERICA'S PRAYER
(By William Chappell)

Our Father who art above,
Instill in our hearts a greater love
For the glorious liberties we have today,
Before too late they are taken away.

Continue to give us our daily bread,
And grant us the power to keep our head
When radicals rant of a favorite "ism,"
With which they'd displace our Americanism.

Forgive us for seeming to disregard
The freedoms our forefathers fought for so hard
In the Civil War and the Revolution;
Our Bill of Rights and the Constitution.

Lead us not into war with the modern-day Neros,
That would cost the lives of American heroes,
And wipe out democracy, or, worse still,
Subject us here to a dictator's will.

Deliver us our Father who art above,
From the loss of those rights we cherish and love,
So that each night when we kneel and pray,
We can say, "Thank God for the U. S. A."

Mr. Bullitt's Warning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LUTHER A. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 21, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON EVENING STAR

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks, I submit herewith an editorial appearing in the Washington Evening Star, on yesterday, concerning the radio address delivered by Ambassador William C. Bullitt, last Sunday evening, in Philadelphia, about the fall of France and also warning of the danger in which the United States is at this time.

The editorial expresses my views, and I believe the views of a majority of the American people upon this subject.

[From the Washington Evening Star]

MR. BULLITT'S WARNING

Ambassador Bullitt's frank statement of his conviction that America is in danger of German attack and his analysis of the reasons which brought about the collapse of French military resistance are, in a sense, a response to Wendell Willkie's demand that

the administration take the people into its confidence concerning the true extent of the emergency which confronts us.

The remarks of the Ambassador to France undoubtedly had the approval of the State Department and probably of the President. The statement would have been more impressive and would have carried more weight had it come directly from Mr. Roosevelt, but even in that event the President would have had to depend to a considerable extent on information obtained from Mr. Bullitt.

Thus, if Mr. Bullitt in this instance may be regarded as an official spokesman for the Government, his remarks are entitled to serious consideration, and his opinions, especially as to the reasons for the collapse of France, should not be lightly disregarded in view of the fact that he has had a most favorable opportunity to observe that tragedy at first hand.

Mr. Bullitt may be mistaken—although the evidence abundantly supports him—when he predicts that Hitler, if victorious in Europe, would seek to attack the United States. He may be in error in urging that our own safety requires that we should follow the advice of General Pershing and extend aid to the British Fleet. He is well qualified by experience to speak on these matters, but they are, after all, expressions of opinion, and those who disgree are entitled to hold their own views. But it does not follow that Mr. Bullitt is subject to criticism for stating the case as he sees it. As a matter of fact, it was his patriotic duty to speak frankly, and it is disturbing in the extreme that he should be accused of conduct "little short of treason" for so doing. Yet that charge was made yesterday by Speaker CLARK of Idaho, and made on the basis of a distorted interpretation of what Mr. Bullitt said. His address did not "amount to an appeal to the American people to go into an unprovoked foreign war," as the Idaho Senator said. On the contrary, Mr. Bullitt stated that "it is as clear as anything on this earth that the United States will not go to war, but it is equally clear that war is coming toward the Americas." If it be treason for Mr. Bullitt to urge this Nation to prepare to meet a danger that he considers to be real, or to take reasonable measures to ward off that danger, the time has come when it is useless to talk about defending America.

Peacetime Conscription

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURTON K. WHEELER

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 21 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. BURTON K. WHEELER, OF MONTANA, AUGUST 15, 1940

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by me on August 15, 1940, over the blue network of the National Broadcasting Co. on the subject of conscription.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I have said in recent weeks that the United States is marching down the road to war. Peacetime conscription is not only another step in that direction but it is the greatest step toward regimentation and militarism ever undertaken by the Congress of the United States. The General Staff has advocated it before, Secretary of War Stimson advocated it as far back as 1916, but the Congress never adopted it in peacetime.

Those who advocate peacetime conscription generally predicate their advocacy on two contentions. These contentions are, first, that large numbers of additional men are immediately needed for the Army and Navy and that this large number cannot be obtained by the traditional American method of voluntary enlistment; second, that conscription is the method of raising the needed men most consonant with a democratic form of government.

I challenge both of those contentions.

Note that these contentions are to some extent necessarily interrelated. If the Nation were in imminent danger and required 10,000,000 men for its defense, and only a half million came forward, it would doubtless be both necessary and equitable to select by lot the necessary number from among the available manpower of the Nation able to serve. On the other hand, if but 10,000 men were needed, and more than that number offered to serve, few people would argue that it is either necessary or desirable to insist upon impressing into the military service men who do not wish to enter.

Those who urge compulsory service at the present time contend that large numbers of men are immediately required for the Army and Navy to defend the Nation, and that the men required cannot be obtained without resort to compulsory service. But this contention cannot survive any sort of reasonably close examination.

That the military events of the last year and the existing world situation generally bespeak a need on the part of this Nation for increased and more effective defense, only the most foolhardy would deny. But common sense also dictates the magnitude and imminence of the dangers.

Nothing is so certain in the life of man as death. Because of this most of our citizens carry insurance against death; yet, despite its certainty, few of us deem it wise to purchase so much insurance that in order to pay the premium we must starve ourselves and our families. The people desire to take out and pay for an adequate amount of insurance against a foreseeable danger, but they do not wish to assume a load of obligation so heavy that it will bring about the very event they seek to insure against.

I believe that while avoiding hysteria and foolish excesses, adequate sums of money should be appropriated to provide the Army and Navy with the most modern and efficient equipment obtainable, in ample quantity, and that steps should be taken to ensure efficient production of military supplies by the Nation's industry. I believe, however, and on this all expert opinion is in agreement, that it is more important for our troops to be thoroughly trained and expert in the new mechanical warfare, and ably commanded, than that they be merely numerous. A small but expert force of Germans seized all of Norway; a small but expert Finnish Army held the Russian Goliath at bay for many months. But a large French army was quickly crushed—less by the enemy than by its own incompetent and in many instances, traitorous generals.

How large an army do we want? Today our Army stands at a strength of 255,000 officers and men and will soon be at its full authorized strength of 375,000. The National Guard stands at 230,000 men with the number increasing rapidly. The Navy has 146,000 men and officers and is increasing the number to 170,000. This does not take into consideration our other armed forces.

How much of an increase is desirable to provide for the national safety?

Outside the Army, all the most eminent military authorities—Hanson W. Baldwin, of the New York Times; Maj. George Fielding Eliot; Col. Frederick Palmer; Basil Walker; and many others—agree that a force of 400,000 to 600,000 would be entirely adequate.

In view of what has been printed in the press, it is surprising to find on turning to the statements of our highest Army authorities that their views do not differ materially from the quoted views of the military experts. At the recent hearings before the Senate Military Affairs Committee, General Marshall, Chief of Staff of the War Department, testified that the Army wanted a peacetime strength of 375,000 men.

When the full testimony of General Marshall is supplemented by the testimony of General Shedd, Colonel Twaddle, and Major Hershey, all of whom testified for the General Staff, the following facts are ascertained:

1. The General Staff and the War Department see no need for millions of soldiers and freely confess that it would be both unwise and impossible to attempt to induct into the Army any such huge force as the public is accustomed to hear named.

2. What the General Staff testified to was that it is necessary at the present time to increase the Army's strength immediately from 255,000 to 375,000—and to increase the strength of the National Guard from 230,000 to 400,000—a total increase of 290,000 men. Thereafter it may wish to step up the strength of the Army further to 500,000 in order to place the Army on a full war footing.

In other words, without conscription, we shall soon have an Army of 900,000 men. General Marshall definitely stated that they could be obtained by enlistment, but not, he thought, as quickly as necessary. I ask, For what purpose it is proposed to draft an additional 1,200,000 men?

It is indisputable according to the sworn testimony of General Staff officers that enlistment in the Army, instead of being negligible as is generally believed, has been running well above the Army's quota. During the month of June, when the Army was proceeding cautiously with its recruiting, approximately 27,000 men presented themselves for enlistment, of whom 18,000 were accepted. According to recent newspaper reports, enlistment during July has reached new high figures.

One should also bear in mind other factors which do affect enlistments in the Army—the minimum period for which a man may enlist, the salary received at the start, and the opportunity for advancement thereafter.

Do you know that the Army has refused to accept enlistments for less than 3 years, notwithstanding the law provides specifically that men may enlist in the Army for 1 year? The General Staff wanted them for 3 years, so they ignored the law.

It cannot be doubted that large numbers of young men who would be willing to enlist for 1 year—in order to get the training—are not willing to tie themselves down for a long 3-year period at $21 per month.

The conscription bill recognizes this fact, as it proposes to force them into the Army for 1 year.

The testimony of General Shedd and General Marshall brings home this astounding proposition. Our General Staff is recommending that there now be imposed on the men of this country, by compulsion, what they refused to allow them to do voluntarily. This may seem a strange paradox—devoid of logic—but this is the

testimony of the General Staff. Although the Nation has been led to believe that the General Staff seeks conscription because it is necessary for national defense, the General Staff desires conscription whether or not the necessary men can be obtained by enlistment.

When we are considering the question of conscripting men for the Army, we should bear in mind that the pay of an enlisted man is $21 per month, approximately $5 per week, with little or no chance for advancement. As compared with these prospects, a young man weighing the benefits of enlisting in the Army will find that enrollment in the Civilian Conservation Corps for 1 year will pay him $30 per month to start, with fair possibility of advancing to assistant leader at $36 a month, or leader at $45 a month. Better still, if the young man wishes to enroll in the Navy, he will find that he will be paid $21 a month for the first 4 months, and by the end of the first year he will, in all likelihood, advance to seaman, first class, at $54 per month. It is significant that the Navy has 7,000 men on the waiting list.

But, it will be asked, what about the expense of such a program? At a time when Congress has passed defense bills which will require an expenditure of $18,000,000,000, approximately one-fiftieth of this amount, or $320,000,000 a year, does not loom very large. More important, the program of conscription would cost, at the General Staff's own estimate, a billion dollars per year.

I have mentioned the $18,000,000,000 we recently appropriated for increased armaments. I was one of those who voted for these bills because our Army and Navy men pleaded, "What good are men without arms?" Now the Military Affairs Committee turns around and, in recommending conscription, says, "What good are arms without men?" What sort of circular reasoning—what sort of strange logic are we being subjected to? First, we are begged to give arms to our men—then men to our arms. For the arms we actually have we have men waiting aplenty. If you do not believe me, read the accounts of the current First Army maneuvers in New York—see the pictures of men drilling with pipes instead of guns, with trucks instead of tanks, and with birds instead of planes.

I believed that the testimony of the General Staff itself and the figures I have quoted definitely disprove the first and major contention of the proponents of conscription—that only by conscription can the men needed to meet the demands of national defense be secured.

But we are told that another reason why we should abandon all American traditions and adopt peacetime conscription is because it is so fair and so democratic.

How can one say that conscription constitutes the essence of the democratic concept and is at the same time the chief hallmark of all those dictator regimes from which democracy has been completely and shamelessly banished. Where is conscription found in its fullest flower, where is it ennobled and glorified as the highest honor of the citizen, if not in those lands where militarism and totalitarianism have blanketed the populace and stifled democracy most completely?

Every nation must defend itself from invasion—that is the universal law of self-preservation. Every inhabitant of a land must be ready to contribute to its defense—even to laying down his life if need be.

To say, however, that every resident of a country must be prepared to defend the country from invasion, even at the cost of his life if need be, is something very different from the proposition to turning over to one man the power to compel free citizens to spend part of their lives in the army, when men are available who are perfectly willing to make a career of this work.

To use a homely illustration, no one can doubt that keeping the streets of our cities clean, free from pestilential and disease-breeding dirt, is a matter of the most immediate and vital concern to the inhabitants of every city, and to the State. No one would dispute, either, that if some unforeseeable emergency arose every citizen in the city or State affected would be commanded to clean them if necessary to safeguard the public welfare. Yet, because this obligation is inherent in citizenship no one has come forward to advocate that it is undemocratic to permit our streets to be cleaned by those who are willing to make this their work—nor would it be contended that street cleaning should be performed by citizens conscripted for such purpose.

What has been said of street cleaning is, of course, equally applicable to the occupations of firemen, policemen, transport workers, and the like. The performance of all these tasks is vital to the functioning of our society and the welfare of our Nation—in the absence of volunteers they would fall upon the general body of citizenry, but we have never found it necessary on democratic grounds to require every citizen to spend a year of his life cleaning streets.

The democracy which we hail in our country, and which we all seek jealously to guard, no doubt means different things to different people, but it is certain that to everyone of us democracy means at least the right to choose freely our own occupations and to conduct our lives with the greatest amount of freedom consistent with the general welfare. I recognize that where the defense of the Nation and the public weal are concerned, the rights of the individual must yield. But conversely, I believe that if the public necessity does not require, the essence of democracy is to leave the individual unmolested in the enjoyment of "the inalienable rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

It is significant to point out here that the English guard their liberties more jealously than we do. In the World War, it was not until after the Battle of the Marne that England resorted to conscription. And while they were at war Australia and New Zealand defeated conscription in a public referendum. And today, Canada and Australia only resorted to conscription months after they entered this war—and even then with the provision that no conscript could be sent out of Canada or Australia.

Certainly, to many millions of Americans it will seem that if conscription in peacetime is democracy—then democracy has reached its fullest flowering in lands across the waters which surround us—in Japan; in Germany; in Italy; and in Russia.

Many sincere persons who view conscription with mistrust and dislike, nevertheless withold their opposition on the ground that "it does not seem right that only the jobless and the low-paid worker should be obliged to join the Army." General Shedd probably referred to this aspect of the question when he said "they (the principles of conscription) spread the requirements of military service over the entire personnel in such a just and proper way * * *."

In almost the next breath, however, General Shedd was explaining that if we had the compulsory selective service recommended by the General Staff it would be designed to select the "unimportant" men, while the important ones would not be inducted into the Army.

Said General Shedd, I quote, "Well, I believe it (voluntary enlistment) would tend more to disrupt the country, because you cannot pick and choose the unimportant man. I do not mean unimportant from his point of view but unimportant in the whole economic life of our country."

During the last war, after Congress had enacted the Selective Service Act, it also passed a resolution stating what categories of men would be chosen first and what classes would be deferred. It is interesting to note that in class I those to be called first were married men who have habitually failed to support their families, married men dependent on wives for support, unskilled farm laborers, and unskilled industrial laborers.

Is there anything democratic about a conscription law that grabs the unimportant man, the unskilled farm laborer, and sends him off to the trenches at $21 per month while the skilled man or the important man gets from $15 to $20 a day in the factory or draws down huge bonuses as president of a corporation? The son of a captain of industry is obviously "important" to business; he must prepare to take over his father's place. Mrs. Jones' son, an unemployed worker, is important only to the Army. It is to Mrs. Jones' son that the Army looks for recruits now, and it will be to him they will turn for conscription. The only question is, Shall young Jones be induced to join the Army voluntarily by offering him a decent rate of pay and a fair chance of promotion or shall he be forced to join the Army at $21 a month whether he likes it or not? If there is any doubt about what the answer is, just ask young Jones.

But another reason for conscription was advanced by Secretary of War Stimson. Said Mr. Stimson:

"Conscription is necessary to impress upon the country the gravity of the world situation."

For Secretary Stimson it is not enough that the American people should arrive at its opinion of the world situation on the basis of free, open, and rational consideration of the situation—it must be stampeded into a militaristic frame of mind, and made ready for any adventures the Secretary thinks necessary.

"Government by persuasion," said Secretary Stimson, "is very much slower than government by arbitrary force." So the Secretary is attempting by this bill to remedy the disadvantage by giving us "government by arbitrary force." There are, however, still a few of us who believe "government by persuasion" still has virtues for which increased speed cannot compensate. Maybe Hitler made the trains run on time, but the German people are now paying the price in tears and blood and life.

I have suggested the reasons why the General Staff wants conscription. From the beginning of time the general staffs of every country in the world have wanted conscription. That is part of militarism. I now ask, Why do high administration officials and financiers with international connections urge it upon us? I am afraid that only the future will reveal this to us—but I say to you now that it is not because they believe our shores or skies are in danger of invasion. For these men there is an entire hemisphere to be defended. When men begin to envisage the defense of their country in terms of entire hemispheres, then, of course, millions upon millions of men are necessary.

It was in the name of defense of Germany that Hitler invaded Czechoslovakia. It was in the name of defense that Hitler invaded Poland, Belgium, Holland, and Norway. In the name of defense Russia invaded little Finland. To what corners of the world is it now proposed or intended to send these millions of our men—in the name of defense?

Enact peacetime conscription and no longer will this be a free land—no longer will a citizen be able to say that he disagrees with a governmental edict. Hushed whispers will replace free speech; secret meetings in dark places will supplant free assemblage; labor and industry, men and women, will be shackled by the chains they have themselves forged. And all this, mark you, while this last great democracy is still at peace. Is this the sort of society for which our forbears shed their blood? Is this the goal for which we strive?

Some Senators say the people want conscription. I challenge them to go to the country on that issue. I would like to have the New York lawyers, the Army General Staff, and any others who are advocating the passage of this bill, stand before the farmers, the workers, the mothers and fathers and tell them what a fine thing peacetime conscription is for their boys. I would like to see a national referendum on the question of conscription. I would like to see those who will have to do the fighting and the dying decide this question.

The original Burke-Wadsworth bill recited in its preamble that—I quote—"the Congress hereby declares that the integrity and institutions of the United States are gravely threatened." The Military Affairs Committee has stricken this clause from the revised bill. I deeply deplore its omission from the present bill.

For I say to you, and I say it to you with all the solemnity of which I am capable, the integrity and institutions of the United States are indeed gravely threatened—and it is the bill now before Congress—and the hysteria which bred it—which creates that threat.

If this bill passes—it will slit the throat of the last democracy still living—it will accord to Hitler his greatest and cheapest victory. On the headstone of American democracy he will inscribe, "Here Lies the Foremost Victim of the War of Nerves."

Religion—America's Indispensable Ally

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAVID I. WALSH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 21 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. DAVID I. WALSH, AUGUST 20, 1940

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I ask permission to have inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a speech delivered by me on Tuesday evening, August 20, 1940, through the public telephone address system, to the delegates of the national convention of the Knights of Columbus at Indianapolis, on the subject of Religion—America's Indispensable Ally.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I regret that the pending in the Senate of an amendment to exempt ministers and divinity students from the training and service provisions of the conscription bill now before the Senate compelled me to remain here in Washington to support this amendment. Under the circumstances I know you will forgive my absence in person from your banquet tonight.

You assemble at a time when our country is faced with grave and stupendous problems—problems that require for their satisfactory solution patriotism and fortitude of a high degree, as well as the application of all the aid and assistance that the spiritual resources of the Nation can command.

What is this crisis? Is it the result of the war in Europe? Is it the danger of our participation in that war? Yes; and even more it is. What will be America's tomorrow?

We are living in a world that is in no way the world in which our generation was born. Confusion, doubt, and uncertainty stalk throughout the land. In most parts of the world all spiritual forces are latent, and only the rumblings of gigantic war machines are heard.

Here in America we are assailed by propaganda on every side. Propaganda to go into war, propaganda to stay out of the war, propaganda to surrender our old theories of American life and thought and to substitute laws and customs heretofore alien to all American ideals. Though we are not tonight in the conflict of war, we are certainly in conflict with dangerous proposals, new theories, the adoption of which may make our plight worse than that of war.

We are strengthening our shields and sharpening our swords to build up a great national defense. We intend to leave nothing undone to make our defense on land, in the air, and on sea impregnable. We propose to fight to the last drop of our blood those who seek to invade our land and rob us of the possession of the great natural resources the Almighty has so bounteously bequeathed upon us and the free institutions that have come down to us through the sacrifices of the founders.

But there are other defenses America needs in addition to navies, armies, and airplanes. There is something more needed to preserve America than a strong military machine. America needs a national-defense program that will build up the Nation's morale, the Nation's character, the Nation's soul to combat the forces that are assailing American institutions.

In Europe tyrants and demagogs have rallied the people by force under the claim of national unity. "The people," they cry, "must stand as one" and the one must follow the dictator. While Europe is organizing to serve the objectives of the dictators we must organize to support and defend Americanism by reinculcating the real American philosophy of life and democracy in the souls of the American people.

Shall we Americans remain as were our fathers and forefathers, content with the forms and standards of our free institutions or shall we, driven by rising winds of discontent and materialism, cast overboard the ballast of tradition and surrender our individual liberties? Shall we accept the political philosophy which makes the state the complete and final arbiter of our lives or shall we hold the Christian and democratic belief that the individual citizen shall be taught, guided, and led by his own conscience, with the least restraint from the state as possible, into the making of a better political, economic, and social order? This is an urgent, pressing question to which Americans must soon make answer. If we do not defend and support the democratic philosophy of government and apply it to the problems of our day, then others will import an alien philosophy, the consequences of which will be more serious to our religious and political rights.

It is a fight against the right of the state to dominate the lives of the individual. Against this doctrine of state dominations stands the Christian doctrine that man, as individuals, must be taught the principles of justice and charity so that there will be no social injustice of man against man, class against class, nation against nation. Against the communistic and totalitarian doctrine, "make the state so powerful that it would force all men to do its will," religion proclaims: Make men better so that they will desire to give, as well as to have, economical, social, and political equality.

For more than 150 years the people of the United States have lived by the political doctrines with which "man has been endowed by God," and proclaimed in the Declaration of Independence. We have grown large, powerful, and great as a result. Until recent times, when economic conditions here enjoined it, the oppressed and downtrodden of all the world have found haven here because of those doctrines. While we have been living under these doctrines peacefully, happily, and prosperously, the rest of the world has shifted from one form of government to another, has gone from one dictator to another, from one revolution to another, from one philosophy to another.

Why have we not been engulfed? Because for the past 150 years we have held the fortress of our essential liberties impregnable against all attacks by placing our reliance upon God; because we have sought to protect and strengthen ourselves by the application of spiritual ideals and because we have maintained unfaltering faith in the political principles of the founders. Why is there reason to fear that we shall not maintain the philosophy and progress of the last 150 years? Because the selfishness and greed of many of the possessions of wealth have led them to worship money and pleasure, and the poor have become cynical, distrustful, and disconsolate because of man's injustice. In America our problem today is to discover how we can solve this inequality and injustice while holding to our constitutional forms. Religious insistence upon justice and charity applicable in every relation of life to the individual is the sole solution.

Only recently the Catholic University of America set up a commission on American citizenship which gives promise of making an exceedingly great contribution to the solving of the social, economic, and political problems here in America. The Christian concept of Americanism and the preservation of it will permeate through the textbooks published by this commission into every Christian school. It will do much to reawaken in the soul of America and in its future citizens an appreciation and understanding of the political truths that America almost alone proclaims today in this drab and war-torn world. Other religious groups are carrying on, and will gladly carry on, similar activities.

There are many immediate and grave problems confronting the Nation at this very hour that call for the exercise of calm, dispassionate and unprejudiced judgment and I plead for the members of your order to make such a contribution.

The first and foremost obligation, as I look out upon the world scene today, is for the United States of America to avoid involvement in all the wars originating in Europe, Asia, and Africa; to remain officially neutral and to resolutely set our minds against the propaganda that would drive us into the cataclysm in Europe on the pretense of helping America by helping certain belligerents. There is only one way for America to act in this crisis and that is to think first and last of America and the future welfare of our people and our institutions.

All religions teach us that the taking of life, even on the field of battle, is only justified when it is the only means of repelling attack. The Christian program of peace excludes all bitterness and hatred. It is a program of justice tempered by warm charity. It recognizes that the natural laws grant to individuals and to citizens the right to resist the attack of an invader with physical force, and because of this we believe it obligates the people to

make every sacrifice in order to make our resistance so strong that no aggressor can succeed or will even dare to attack us.

America cannot fulfill her noble function either to her own citizens or to the world unless she is at peace. War is the destroyer of the best things that mankind has produced and inherited; it is the enemy of civilization. Therefore it becomes all Americans to avoid war as one would the sting of death, for unless it is war in defense of our own country it may become the end to all we hold dear.

Finally, let us not forget the cause of present war conditions. Fundamentally, it is because God, the natural law, and Christian revelation have all been thrown into discard. Under existing world philosophy man is to decide what is right and wrong and man will make the final judgment on all things. This is the philosophy of the modern supreme state. In place of God the state is worshipped. Liberty, justice, religion, even life and death now hang, in many parts of the world, upon the whim of the man-made authority of the state. When major disputes and differences arise among the nations there is, therefore, left as the only recourse, physical conflict or war, for most nations today recognize no spiritual authority.

The American founding fathers were the inheritors of a glorious past built upon Christian philosophy. We today stand as their heirs and upon no group of citizens does the responsibility of interpreting our American philosophy of government rest more than upon Catholics.

Americans are groping everywhere for a clear definition of American philosophy of life and government. We must not let the alien and godless philosophies define the terms of Americanism and decide the civic rights of citizens. We must join with religious men and women to preserve our political heritage. This is the challenge that confronts all religions, and in a special manner, you Knights of Columbus. It can be found only upon returning to the fundamentals, to the philosophy of the founding fathers, to the truths and beliefs of Christianity. We must not fail to meet that challenge.

Selective Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD R. BURKE

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 21 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. EDWARD R. BURKE ON ADVANTAGES OF SELECTIVE COMPULSORY TRAINING PROGRAM

Mr. BURKE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a radio address delivered by me last evening over station WMAL on the subject The Advantages of a Selective Compulsory Training Program Over the Volunteer System.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SELECTIVE COMPULSORY MILITARY TRAINING VERSUS THE VOLUNTEER SYSTEM

An adequate national defense is the desire of every patriotic American citizen. If there be those opposed to such a program, their number is infinitesimal, their reasoning faulty, their motives subject to question. Your will is being carried out by a Congress which has voted appropriations of billions of dollars for the construction of ships, planes, tanks, and all the instruments of a modern, mechanized, military establishment. That part of the task which you have assigned to Congress is well under way. The progress is satisfactory. It will rapidly improve.

There is one further step. An adequate national defense is an impossibility without manpower, suitable in number and thoroughly trained. There may be honest differences of opinion as to the number of men required, and as to the length of training that is necessary. Surely, under such circumstances, reasonable men and women will look for guidance to those who have devoted their lives to their country's service in this particular field.

There is a surprising unanimity of opinion on this subject on the part of all those best qualified to speak. I need mention only General Pershing; the Chief of Staff, General Marshall; the joint Army and Navy committee which under the direction of Congress has for years studied the question of manpower; the Secretary of War; the Secretary of the Navy; and the Commander in Chief of our armed forces.

The opinion of these qualified experts is that 1 year of training is the absolute minimum. Fifteen or even eighteen months would be better, they are sure, but a passable job can be done in twelve.

As to the crucial matter of the number to be trained and organized into units these same military experts testify that at the earliest possible moment we should have a force of approximately 1,300,000 enlisted men. There may be those within the sound of my voice who are sure enough of their own opinion to assert that number to be too large or too small. I have found that those most ready to criticize and boldest in their expression of opinion are usually the least well-informed. For myself, I freely accept the figures presented with supporting evidence by those charged with responsibility. I have no doubt that the country will do likewise.

We proceed to analyze our situation. Here are the facts. The enlisted strength of the Regular Army is now, roughly, 280,000. The National Guard is to be mobilized, and this will account for 220,000 more under arms. That means a total of 500,000. Our problem, then, is to bring forth for training and organizing into units at the earliest possible date an additional 800,000 enlisted men. Keep that figure in mind. We must have quickly, if we are to have an adequate national defense, 800,000 additional trainees.

The bill now pending before the Senate proposes to do that by the selective compulsory process. It will require all male citizens, with very few exceptions, between the ages of 21 and 30, inclusive, to present themselves for registration. These 12,000,000 registrants will be classified according to physical fitness, their status with reference to dependents, their present importance in essential industries, and all other facts bearing upon the advisability of selecting the particular individual for a year's training, or, in the alternative, placing him in a deferred classification.

Out of class A–1 there will then be selected by lot the increment that will first be called to the colors. The process will be repeated as quickly as preparations can be made until the full number of 800,000 trainees will be organized into units for training purposes. An equitable allocation will be made to all sections of the country. Full credit will be given to each community for all volunteers, thereby reducing its quota to be selected. Rich man, poor man, proud and humble, the eager and the backward, all classes will share alike this liability to submit to training for the national defense.

There are two groups of opponents to this system of selective compulsory training. First are those who protest on principle such a program in time of peace. They admit that if an enemy were at our door, if war were actually declared, the draft would be justified. There is a fatal weakness in their argument. Not yet have they given a satisfactory guaranty that such an enemy as we may have to face would patiently wait without while we feverishly rushed through ap rogram to bring our men under arms and properly train them. They do not seem to realize the full significance of the statement that "service without training means slaughter and disaster."

More formidable is the second group of protestants. They do not object on principle to selective compulsory training in time of peace. If it can be shown to be necessary, they pledge their support. That is a fair requirement. I propose to meet it now fully and completely. This group has rallied behind the substitute offered by Senator MALONEY, of Connecticut, one of the ablest and most conscientious Members of the Senate. It is the contention that it has not been demonstrated that the volunteer system is inadequate. They urge, therefore, that all action for selective compulsory training be postponed at least until the 1st of January. If by a 30-cent-a-day raise in pay, a shortening of the enlistment period to 1 year, and an intensive recruiting drive the required number of trainees has not then been secured, they will be willing to give their support to the selective compulsory program.

I need not emphasize the frightful responsibility that must be assumed by those who would unnecessarily delay by many months the certain calling into training of the required number of our defenders.

Nor need I further detail the obvious fairness of the selective system, built as it is upon the solid premise that the duty of defending our free institutions rests not alone upon the eager patriot who is ready to make every sacrifice that he may be prepared to protect his country; it is an obligation that bears with equal weight upon every male citizen.

I proceed to the specific answer to the question that will determine whether we are to have an admittedly adequate program now or countenance months of delay. What reason is there to believe that if Congress should postpone the effective date for the application of the selective compulsory program there would come forward within the time required an additional 800,000 volunteers to submit themselves to a year's training? Consider this fact: During the year ending June 30, 1940, the net result of voluntary recruiting for the Regular Army was that its enlisted strength increased by 72,870 men, or at the rate of about 6,000 per month.

Make what allowance you will for the fact that during part of that period the rate of recruitment was restricted by limitations on appropriations and authorized strength; that beginning pay was $21 per month and 1-year enlistments were not encouraged; that the rate of enlistments has increased until the net gain for June was 16,177 and for July 23,234.

Here is the exact situation. To obtain the new men required within the time limits established by those who speak with the greatest knowledge and authority, the net increase in strength per month for the 7 months' period beginning September 1, and ending next April 1 would have to be, not the average of 6,000. Not even the great showing of 23,000. It would have to average 114,000 per month. As a matter of fact, since there would be many vacancies to be filled through the expirations of enlistments, withdrawals, and for other causes, the gross rate of enlistment must be not less than 130,000 per month. In other words, the net increase per month would have to be nearly 20 times as great as the average net increase per month during the last fiscal year, and more than five times as great as the high-water mark set in July.

The record of voluntary enlistments during the World War fully substantiates the folly of relying upon that system alone. We were then at war. A highly organized emotional recruiting drive was put on throughout the Nation. No one would wish to have that repeated today. Even with all the patriotic fervor that was developed, enlistments had fallen off by September to 24,367. As I have shown, we must have 5 times that number, not for 1 month, but for 7 consecutive months, in order to bring into training the manpower required for our national defense.

In conclusion, permit me to say that virtually every competent authority, including the Chief of Staff, testifies that the volunteer system is wholly inadequate to meet the problem with which the country is now faced. The pending bill does not disturb volunteer enlistments. They are made more attractive by specific reduction of the terms to 1 year. Under these circumstances let those who have been inclined to favor the Maloney amendment remember the solemn warning uttered by a great statesman: "Better to be despised for too anxious apprehensions than ruined by too confident a security."

We dare not gamble when the stakes are the security of our free institutions and the welfare of our Nation. There should go forth from the hearts of the people of this country tonight such a prayer and demand for prompt and thoroughgoing action in aid of the national defense that all doubts would be washed away.

Profits Above Patriotism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENNETT CHAMP CLARK

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 21 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

ARTICLE FROM THE NATION, AUGUST 17, 1940

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, in connection with the Lee amendment, consideration of which has been deferred by a point of order, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the current edition of The Nation, entitled, "Profits Above Patriotism."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From The Nation, August 17, 1940]

Although big business has not hesitated to conjure up the most extreme forms of nationalism in defense of the profit system, its own patriotism has been notoriously lukewarm. Britain has never been in greater peril, even in the days of Napoleon, yet its capitalists are intent on squeezing the last possible cent of profit out of its distress. Sir William Firth, recently ousted as chairman and managing director of the $100,000,000 Richard Thomas Steel Co., has brought to light a scandal in the English steel industry. At the annual stockholders' meeting he charged that the company had obtained a contract to supply steel shells at a price yielding the company the fantastic profit of $45 a ton. As a result of his protests the price was lowered to $20 a ton. This may explain why Sir William is no longer managing director. The economist demands an investigation of the financial battle by which the British Iron and Steel Federation obtained control of the Thomas company and now permits it to operate at only two-thirds of its huge capacity. The empire may founder, but British big business holds to its profit margin as if it were, we were about to say, a Maginot line.

The news from Britain makes it easier to understand the attitude of our own defense industries. Secretary Stimson's testimony that the Army has been able to sign contracts for only 33 of the 4,000 planes for which funds were appropriated in June confirms I. F. Stone's story on aviation's sit-down strike, of which we publish the first instalment in this issue. Secretary Stimson declared at a congressional tax hearing that the fault did not lie with the Army or with the Defense Advisory Commission and that "the representatives of the industry have been earnest" in their desire to cooperate. Like their British cousins, they seem "earnest" only in trying to make as enormous a profit as they can out of the defense emergency. The amortization question, as Mr. Stone shows, is not a life-and-death matter for industry, though delay may prove a life-and-death matter for the country. "In the last war," C. F. Hughes pointed out in the New York Times of August 11, "producers built their own plants and, except for a few final additions, these paid for themselves many times over." The determination of the plane and armorplate companies to take no risk whatever in a great national emergency is truly subversive, and we hope the Senate will take note of it and refuse to join the House in repealing the power granted the Secretary of the Navy on June 28 to commandeer the plants of the recalcitrants. Commandeering a plant will not make it produce without profit, but the mere threat should be enough to make it produce.

As serious as the sit-down strike in aviation and armor plate is the situation revealed by Assistant Attorney General Thurman Arnold. A grand jury in New York City has been investigating charges that German ownership of patents and international cartel arrangements between American and German firms have been throttling American capacity to produce essential war materials. This Federal jury is also looking into the transmission to foreign companies of American military secrets under these arrangements and the price restrictions and collusive bidding that grow out of them. Patents are a privilege accorded inventors by our Government, and there is no sound reason why this privilege should be extended to foreign concerns, even indirectly, at the expense of restricted production, delays, and higher prices on defense materials. The investigation is aimed particularly, according to Mr. Arnold, at industries engaged in the production of aircraft, naval equipment, electrical supplies, and metal alloys. The German corporations involved include the Krupp steel firm. In several of the industries manufacturing defense products the agreements provide for pooling of American and German patents in one international cartel.

The case of the Bausch & Lomb Optical Co., which came up earlier this year, provides an illustration of the situation. This company had an agreement with Carl Zeiss in Germany for the use of patents for special artillery range finders, and the agreement affected not only prices here but American ability to compete with German exports in other countries. Bausch & Lomb agreed not to sell outside the United States. In the case of ships built here for use abroad, the American company was to supply the range finder only with Zeiss permission and at a price agreed upon by the two firms. In case Bausch & Lomb was forced to bid on a contract moving outside the United States, it agreed to mark up its bid 20 percent and to remit the 20-percent overcharge to Zeiss if the contract was awarded Bausch & Lomb despite the mark-up. The American concern first pleaded not guilty and then nolo contendere to the indictments against it. A plea of nolo contendere is virtually an admission of the truth of the facts alleged.

Our guess is that pressure will be brought on the Department of Justice to call off this grand-jury probe, which is being conducted under the antitrust laws. The fate of the pending action against the oil industry is important in this connection. Special exemptions from the antitrust laws to meet specific defense needs may be necessary, but blanket exemptions are another matter. If the oil companies are powerful enough to have the suit against them called off on the plea of national defense, other companies will ask a similar privilege. Should that happen, we hope some congressional committee will investigate these cartel arrangements. It would be shocking if an inquiry into international trust practices endangering our national defense were halted on the specious plea that we must do nothing to "rock the boat."

In Opposition to War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURTON K. WHEELER

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 21 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. BURTON K. WHEELER, OF MONTANA, AUGUST 20, 1940

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by

me last evening over the Columbia Broadcasting System under the heading Let's Go to War Now—An Answer.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LET'S GO TO WAR NOW—AN ANSWER

Since the present war began we here in America have heard the phrase, "All aid to the Allies short of war." Many honest, sincere people apparently think that this Nation, while still professing neutrality, can race at breakneck speed to the edge of the precipice and then suddenly slam on the brake and expect it to hold.

I have said that there is no such thing as "short of war." It doesn't make any difference who argues for aid "short of war"; it doesn't lessen the danger whether Secretary Stimson, Ambassador Bullitt, or General Pershing urge "short of war."

"Short of war" means war. The phrase is a smoke screen for those who want our country involved in this war. This smoke screen has now been lifted. Speaking on this radio network on the evening of August 10 last, William H. Standley, a retired admiral, said—I quote:

"On June 10 last, I, with some 30 other American citizens, signed a statement urging that this country 'immediately declare that a state of war exists between this country and Germany.' "

I admire the frankness of Admiral Standley. He said publicly what those who are hiding behind that smoke screen of "short of war" are thinking but dare not say. I do not share Mr. Standley's views that we ought to go to war. I do not believe the American people want to go to war. The Columbia Broadcasting Co. has asked me to reply to Admiral Standley, and I intend to do just that. But the American people will make the most effective reply. That is, they will if they have a chance.

The issue in America is not England or Germany. The issue is the preservation of our way of life here in America, and I submit that the last war proved that you cannot save democracy on the battlefields of Europe.

The United States was a small, weak confederation of poor States when it gained its freedom from the most powerful autocratic nation in the world. Since then—for a century and a half—we have protected ourselves and maintained the Monroe Doctrine without the help of any European navy. Since when has the British Navy been called upon to protect our shores from attack? When was it that a European power helped us preserve freedom and democracy here in America?

Gen. Hugh Johnson, commenting on this situation, points out how absurd is the position of those who insist we should give one-seventh of our destroyers to Britain.

We are told, says General Johnson, that the British Navy is our first line of defense and in the next breath that the British Navy can't live without the help of our destroyers. Then we are told that these destroyers are obsolete and worthless to America and therefore we should get rid of them. But then we hear these vessels are indispensable to the British and therefore we must send them. What sort of involved circular reasoning is this? Warships are warships, and if the British can use them so can we.

I am for defense of America; giving away our fleet tears down our defense.

It is well to remember the cold, hard, practical facts when somebody talks about our first line of defense being the British Navy. Our first line of defense is our own Navy and the expanse of ocean that separates us from Europe and Asia. After all men have swum the English Channel but nobody has tried to swim the Atlantic Ocean. Do you know that there are scarcely enough ships in the world to transport an army equipped to successfully invade this hemisphere.

Who are these people who so enthusiastically demand that this last great democracy be plunged into war? Let us see who it is that shouts, "Let's go to war now"; let us see what motivates this subversive un-American chant; let us see if it will be they who will risk their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor on the field of battle. Remember, it takes neither moral nor physical courage to declare a war for others to fight.

I quoted Admiral Standley a moment ago that 30 men and women met with him in New York—they always meet in New York—on June 10 and issued a statement which declared that the American way of life was threatened by the defeat of France and England. They urged that this country immediately declare war on Germany—and called on all citizens who agreed with them to petition the Government for a declaration of war.

Who were some of these 30 whom the press headlined as "notables"? Why, let us see: A 43-year-old author and newspaper editor who spent 5 years in London—he wouldn't be a conscript; a 51-year-old writer who has been a London correspondent and whose home even now is in England—he wouldn't have to serve in the American Army; a 41-year-old college president who was educated in England as a Rhodes scholar—he, too, wouldn't be doing any fighting and dying in this war he urges upon America; a 62-year-old New York lawyer of great wealth and with important clients—do you think he will shed any blood overseas when the war comes?—a 73-year-old economist whose services in the last war consisted of sitting at a desk in Washington—the draft won't touch him.

But why go on?—economists, social workers, writers, lawyers, college presidents, retired military men—these are the "notables" who boldly urge the American people to go to war. None of them has yet enlisted in this great cause.

Two months have gone by since their call, but there has been a noticeable absence of petitions from the American people demanding a declaration of war. So the retired admiral, puzzled at this lack of enthusiasm for war, took to the radio with a more fervent appeal. "Come," said the admiral gaily, "come to war. It's our war; we're already in it by the steps we have taken. Why stop now? Let's make an open declaration of war."

But the admiral and his 30 fellow notables overlooked one important thing—American enthusiasm for war was cooled by the memory of the last war, by the memory of the $40,000,000,000, back-crushing debt that it piled on them, by the memory of the bones and blood of 126,000 American boys left rotting in France, by the memory of 234,000 other American boys gassed, shell-shocked, and shot who to this day lie in narrow cots in hospitals that dot their land. No, Admiral, Americans learned a lesson. You can fool them once but not twice with the same old slogans.

Some of you well-meaning people are being hoodwinked by paid propaganda over the radio—by columnists, by blatant full-page advertisements; that to save democracy in America we must again enter this war and do it now.

You people ought to be wary of these fine phrases and fancy catchwords. Don't they have a familiar ring? Is it so hard to remember 1916 and 1917? Have you forgotten that then, too, Great Britain and the United States were sister democracies, that the Allies were fighting the battle of democracy against autocracy, that the submarine warfare meant we were in danger of German invasion, that we had to get into the war in self-defense, that if Germany won, our Monroe Doctrine would be violated? * * * Turn back to the newspapers of those days; judge for yourself.

Know this, the same newspapers, the very same newspapers, which the British in their official documents regarded as pro-Ally, are the newspapers which today are leading the fight to make this war our war.

Have you seen the advertisements of the Committee to Save America by Helping the Allies? Well, remember the men behind it are the ones who all but wrecked America up to 1929.

You Americans to whom Standley appealed—you citizens who are soon going to do the fighting and the dying, if men like the retired admiral have their way; you fathers and mothers who have sons to give in this cause; you young men whose blood and bones may soon fertilize more of Europe's acres; you Americans against whom the cards are being stacked—hear me; hear me while there still is time.

If it is war you people want, then at least go into it with your eyes open. If it is war that you want, then listen to the Pershings and the Bullitts and the Standleys. If it is war that you want, then think now—not afterward—of the death and the destruction, of the poverty and the misery that war brings. Realize now that war means the end of our democracy.

Do not let yourselves forget that war means dictatorship and the end of civil rights; that war means the end of all liberty for all time, in your generation and for generations to come. Forget, if you can, that your children and your children's children will curse you for your folly.

If, knowing these things, you still want war, then you ought to go to war now.

Delay in National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 21 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

ARTICLE FROM NEW YORK TIMES, AUGUST 21, 1940

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, on the general question of congressional responsibility for any slow-down in the national-defense program, I offer for the RECORD the very able and significant article by Mr. Arthur Krock in the New York Times of this morning, and ask that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of August 21, 1940]

IN THE NATION—A HALT TO DEFENSE WHICH COULD QUICKLY BE REMOVED

WASHINGTON, August 20.—Congressional and Treasury staff experts, working for the House Committee on Ways and Means, are still toiling over a draft of that tax bill which is indispensable to a real start on the defense program. The draft, it was said today, may be ready "Thursday or Friday," and possibly "next week some time" the legislation may emerge from the committee.

So Congress is fiddling once more while Rome burns, the reader may remark, especially if he has been influenced by the administration's attempt, most recently aided by Ambassador Bullitt, to blame all defense program delays on Congress. But if the reader makes such a remark to himself or publicly, he will, in this instance, as in many others, be ascribing to Congress guilt which fairly can be laid at the door of the President and his executive departments. For the continued postponement of action in this vital matter is simply the result of the President's insistence that an excess-profits tax must accompany changes in industrial depreciation allowances and the abolition of certain New Deal gross-earnings restrictions which have recently been imposed.

The tax and drafting experts, laboring long hours and making as swift progress as any men could, are having all their difficulties with the excess-profits section. This has proved to be as complicated as informed persons assured the administration it would be when the President suddenly demanded that it must be a part of the amortization bill. The committee hearings continued to disclose new perplexities, and more have arisen as the experts bent to their task.

The result has been to hold up for weeks action on the depreciation and earnings schedules which could have been written and passed long ago. Reliable observers of Congress have estimated that a joint resolution containing these essential changes could have been passed by both branches in 24 hours any time this summer. Since the lack of this legislation is holding up the defense production program at most points, and there is no need for haste in working out excess-profits schedules which necessarily will not apply until next year, the responsibility of the administration for this delay is as direct as it is grave.

The President has taken the position in conferences with congressional leaders that there must be excess-profits legislation at this session, and the only sure way to get it is to link it with the tax-relief items. Even those who question the wisdom or effectiveness of excess-profits taxes as the New Deal will write them—once again mixing social-economic reform with good Federal housekeeping—should find it simple to understand the President's insistence on these levies. From his standpoint and the color of his administrative record, it would be inconsistent in him to do otherwise.

But he has been told, and the best opinion in Congress supports it, that he need have no fear Congress will adjourn this session without passing excess-profits levies. The inexorable rules of the political game make it certain. To pass a bill for compulsory selective military service, as is the prospect even if its inauguration is deferred until there has been a new trial of the volunteer method, and then go home without "conscripting war profits" is something this Congress will never do.

Every Member of it who voted for the one and let the other slide would consider he had invited his own defeat at the polls. As voice after voice against the selective service bill asks why men are to be conscripted and not higher business earnings, the working of this political rule becomes more inevitable.

But the President and his executive New Deal advisers nevertheless have forbidden the separation of the items of tax legislation. The consequence is increasingly damaging delay in preparedness brought on by the very administration which keeps saying that "time is of the essence." It is the result of tactics on the part of the very administration which approved the wish of Mr. Bullitt and others to call publicly for the haste they sincerely believe to be requisite to national security.

This is merely another illustration of the halts between formulating major policy and taking the steps necessary to execute it which have steadily occurred since Mr. Roosevelt came to office. Much more frequently than not an essential move has been impeded by politics or conflict of method, and the whole present condition of national defense is only one of the consequences. This time, however, a deliberate attempt has been made to convince the public that Congress is responsible for what the record plainly shows is the fault of the administration itself.

Its supporters, while demanding that the depreciation-allowance changes and gross-earnings limits wait on the excess-profits bill, are not even united on the former. Many of them continue to refer to it as "industrial blackmail," to insist that what businessmen have sought solely to keep ruin from overtaking them if they go into defense production is an effort to make unjustified sums of money through war profiteering. The flaw in the present Government's handling of defense is basic. The immediate instance is typical.

Hitler's Power on the Seas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 21 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

ARTICLE ENTITLED "HITLER MAY CONQUER ON LAND BUT HE NEVER WILL ON THE SEAS"

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article entitled "Hitler May Conquer on Land But He Never Will on the Seas," which article is one of a series published daily in the columns of the Washington, D. C. Times-Herald under the heading "The News."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The one great thing which Winston Churchill has done as Premier of England was his capture of the French Fleet.

This he did, of course, with the greatest reluctance, but with full realization of the necessity of such action.

The French Fleet was about two-thirds the English Fleet in power and tonnage.

And if it had been added to the German Fleet, the English Fleet would have been equaled if not surpassed in strength and the invasion of England made a certainty.

To be sure, the Germans had pledged themselves not to make use of the French Fleet, but such pledges are not to be relied upon in war.

Had not France sacredly pledged itself to England not to desert its alliance under any circumstances, but to fight to the point of utter destruction rather than yield?

Still when Paris was occupied, had not France surrendered abjectly?

France might have carried on a vigorous defensive warfare for months, which would have kept the Germans busy in Europe and delayed the attack on England long enough to give England ample time for defensive preparation.

She could have transferred her naval fleet to England in its entirety and her air fleet also, and thus have made the ultimate success of Germany impossible.

This would have meant severe punishment for France, but it would have been the strategic thing to do if the ultimate winning of the war had been the sole objective.

But France had not the stamina, not the intestinal fortitude, to fight to the bitter end.

She had not the heart to see "La Belle France" laid waste.

She chose to see her liberty destroyed rather than her property and her beauty.

The protective pact that she had lured England into was a protective pact for France only—not for England.

That should have been obvious to English statesmen from the beginning, and would have been conspicuously plain to anyone except the unseeing Baldwin and his purblind associates and successors.

Chamberlain realized the insecurity of such a league but had not the spinal strength to oppose it.

There were many strong men in England who, like Rothermere, felt the instability of the French alliance; but the attitude of England's radical Labor Party, which supported an alliance with Communist France and Bolshevist Russia, was probably a determining factor in the situation.

However, England had nothing to offer Russia except naval and military support, while Germany had the division of conquered territory to feed to the great bear's greedy maw.

Moreover, to be perfectly frank and accurate, England's pledges of support to Poland and Finland had never materialized, not even to the extent of one armored plane.

England's support to Norway had failed at the critical moment, and even England's support to Belgium will be seen to have altered to moves and measures for self-preservation merely, if ever American people shall be allowed to learn the content of King Leopold's letter to them, which President Roosevelt has arbitrarily and arrogantly suppressed.

So Russia counted not on vain promises but chose the plain material gain.

She took the cash and let the credit go.

This attitude and action should have been foreseen by intelligent English statesmen.

Even American diplomats, who are for the most part "saps" and innocents, knew enough to keep clear of the French protective pact, although they do not apparently know enough not to trust Russia.

There once was an Armenian gentleman who put his little son on the mantelpiece and, holding out his arms, said to the boy, "Now, Amyntas, jump."

So Amyntas jumped, and the papa let him tumble to the floor, saying:

"That will teach you, son, not to trust anybody."

And the papa was right.

At least in wartime do not trust anybody.

Every nation is looking out primarily for itself and the country which counts on the spiritual sympathy and loyalty of another is likely to find its confidence misplaced and to land painfully but informatively on the hard floor of material fact.

The United States must not be too trustful anywhere or regarding anything.

It certainly cannot depend on Russia, which has broken every promise it ever made to anybody.

It cannot depend on the bought cooperation of the South American countries.

It cannot depend entirely on the assurances of England.

But it can appreciate the plain fact that the acquisition of the French Fleet by England did diminish to great degree, and indeed did probably entirely dissipate any danger of invasion of this hemisphere by any European powers.

Not Germany, nor Italy, nor Russia, nor Japan, nor all of them together would now have anything adequate to invade the Americas with.

Even if by some improbable chance England should be overrun, the English Fleet would be transferred to Canada, and, combined with the United States Fleet, acting either independently or in cooperation, would be amply able to defend the Western Hemisphere.

America need not be overtrustful in any direction, but it can intelligently make a shrewd estimate of the advantage to itself in Winston Churchill's acquisition of the French Navy.

Hitler may conquer on land but he will never now conquer on the seas.

No lemmings can swim the Atlantic or Pacific Oceans, and no lemmings, no matter how venturesome, will ever try.

Let us make our defense in air as strong as our defense at sea, and we can rest in certain security.

"Orson Welles" Bullitt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENNETT CHAMP CLARK

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 21 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

EDITORIAL ON AMBASSADOR BULLITT FROM ST. LOUIS POST-DISPATCH

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a very brilliant leading editorial appearing in Monday's St. Louis Post-Dispatch, entitled " 'Orson Welles' Bullitt."

I should like to read just a paragraph or two from the editorial in the hope of inducing the Members of the Senate to read the whole editorial.

The editorial goes on, in the latter part:

Of course, the fact is that Mr. Bullitt, as his record and previous statements make clear, is a prointerventionist. He is one of those who thinks we should get into the European war, and this is evident from his recommendation that we sell destroyers to England immediately. That this proposition would be an act of war should be known to Mr. Bullitt, and probably is known.

If not, we refer him to the recent address of Senator DAVID I. WALSH, of the Senate Naval Committee, in which he said:

The transfer of naval destroyers from our flag to the British flag, no matter by what method or device, makes mockery of our declared policy of neutrality and nonintervention. It is an act of belligerency and of war. Who, desiring to keep out of war, can deny that fact?

What are the standards which should govern the behavior and the public statements of our diplomats? For making a pro-Ally speech, James H. R. Cromwell, former Minister to Canada, was soundly rebuked by Secretary Hull. For saying that America should feed the starving people of German-occupied Belgium, Ambassador Cudahy was recalled to Washington and publicly scolded by Under Secretary Sumner Welles.

I may say, in interjection, that that apparently was before it was remembered that Mr. Cudahy was the uncle-in-law of Secretary Ickes; and when that fact was remembered the reprimand apparently was withdrawn.

The Post-Dispatch editorial goes on:

For, in effect, advocating the entrance of the United States into the European war, what will happen to Mr. Roosevelt's fair-haired boy, William C. Bullitt? He will probably be given a medal.

This great and powerful and intelligent Nation does not need the outpourings of the administration's boy scouts, of which Mr. Bullitt is the most notable and most juvenile example, to remind it in frenzied terms that the world is in flames. What it needs is strong, quiet administration of the colossal defense program voted by Congress. What it needs is something of the same indomitable spirit that infused the hearts of Americans when they fought the Revolutionary War, when they fought the War between the States, when they conquered the wilderness of the West. Those things were not done by radio oratory.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire editorial may be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ORSON WELLES—BULLITT

Mr. Bullitt, the brilliant and erratic Ambassador to France, made a radio speech yesterday in the manner of Orson Welles announcing the arrival of Martian hordes in New Jersey. One of our great national heroes is Paul Revere, who roused the sleeping farmers of Middlesex on April 18, 1875, to repel the British invasion. The only excuse, however, for a speech like Mr. Bullitt's is that the American people are sound asleep; that they are deaf, dumb, and blind to the events in Europe.

Mr. Bullitt has been abroad for some years and perhaps can be excused for not being aware of the temper and alertness of the country. From the potato farmers of Maine to the sandy wastes of Arizona, the tidings have long ago gone forth that Adolf Hitler is a menace to the United States, so that Mr. Bullitt's excited beating of the tom-tom does not exactly come under the head of news.

Since when have the American people become so stupid, so lethargic, so unspeakably insensible to what is going on in the world that they must be talked to like a lot of kindergarten children, as Mr. Bullitt did yesterday? Perhaps the Ambassador has been so concerned with Europe that he does not know this is not the case.

While Mr. Bullitt was still in Europe this country, through its elected representatives, has been acting fast and decisively to protect itself. At the instance of the President, Congress has appropriated ten billions for defense with hardly a dissenting vote. Our factories, arsenals, and shipyards are being tuned up to the greatest preparedness drive in history. A plan for conscription of our manhood—the first peacetime move of the kind in our history—is in the making. On every front we are moving with the utmost speed to protect our shores from any danger that may confront us.

What we need now is calm, cool direction of this great national effort. In the years that our possible adversary, Hitler, was rearming, he did not try to frighten the German people out of their wits. He put them to work. But the effect of speeches like Mr. Bullitt's is to create an unwholesome fear psychosis; it is to produce the condition vulgarly known as "jitters." Is this the mental attitude desirable for a great defense effort?

Decidely not. Of course, the fact is that Mr. Bullitt, as his record and previous statements make clear, is a pro-interventionist. He is one of those who thinks we should get into the European war, and this is evident from his recommendation that we sell destroyers to England immediately. That this proposition would be an act of war should be known to Mr. Bullitt and probably is known.

If not, we refer him to the recent address of Senator DAVID I. WALSH of the Senate Naval Committee, in which he said:

"The transfer of naval destroyers from our flag to the British flag, no matter by what method or device, makes mockery of our declared policy of neutrality and nonintervention. It is an act of belligerency and of war. Who, desiring to keep out of war, can deny that fact?"

What are the standards which should govern the behavior and the public statements of our diplomats? For making a pro-Ally speech, James H. R. Cromwell, former Minister to Canada, was soundly rebuked by Secretary Hull. For saying that America should feed the starving people of German-occupied Belgium, Ambassador Cudahy was recalled to Washington and publicly scolded by Undersecretary Sumner Welles. For, in effect, advocating the entrance of the United States into the European war, what will happen to Mr. Roosevelt's fair-haired boy, William C. Bullitt? He will probably be given a medal.

This great and powerful and intelligent Nation does not need the outpourings of the administration's Boy Scouts, of which Mr.

Bullitt is the most notable and most juvenile example, to remind it in frenzied terms that the world is in flames. What it needs is strong, quiet administration of the colossal defense program voted by Congress. What it needs is something of the same indomitable spirit that infused the hearts of Americans when they fought the Revolutionary War, when they fought the War Between the States, when they conquered the wilderness of the West.

Those things were not done by radio oratory.

The Third Term

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 21 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

NEWSPAPER ARTICLES

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD several newspaper articles on the third term. The first is from the New York Herald Tribune of Monday, April 4, 1938; the second from the Indianapolis Sunday Star of June 12, 1938; and the third is from the Indianapolis Sunday Star of May 1, 1938.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Herald Tribune of April 4, 1938]

FOUR BISHOPS JOIN IN OPPOSITION TO A THIRD TERM—DR. JONES, HEAD OF COUNCIL OF CHURCHES, ALSO VOICES DISFAVOR; PEOPLE OF UNITED STATES BELIEVED AGAINST IDEA

WASHINGTON, April 3.—Nine more church leaders, including Edgar DeWitt Jones, president of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, and four bishops of the Methodist and Protestant Episcopal Churches recorded themselves in a poll today as opposing a third term either for President Roosevelt or for any President.

Twenty-five clergymen, counting 16 announced a week ago, have taken this position. Joseph Leib, Washington political statistician, who sent out some 80 letters on the question to prominent churchmen all over the country, reports that not one answer has backed Mr. Roosevelt for another term. A few suggested that a war emergency might change the situation or that if Mr. Roosevelt chose to run again his patronage powers might bring him success.

POPULAR OPPOSITION SEEN

The replies follow:

Dr. Jones, minister of the Central Woodward Christian Church of Detroit and president of the Federal Council of Churches: "I cannot imagine the American people standing for a third term for any President of the United States unless a national emergency, coupled with general confidence in the President, should warrant the breaking of the precedent."

Ralph S. Cushman, Methodist Episcopal Bishop, Denver: "It looks to me that, if those who have received patronage from the Roosevelt administration should prove strong enough to threaten us with a third term there would, I believe, develop in this country such a reaction as Mr. Roosevelt and his supporters would not wish to experience."

E. G. Richardson, Methodist Episcopal Bishop, Philadelphia: "Entirely regardless of personalities, I am opposed to a third term for our President. You ask me whether I think that Mr. Roosevelt could be elected for a third term. This question, in my opinion, cannot be answered today. A year ago I would have answered it affirmatively. Today I am doubtful. A couple of years from now the situation may be entirely changed."

W. Bertrand Stevens, Episcopal Bishop, of Los Angeles: "My impression is that most of my acquaintances are not favorably disposed toward a third term though almost without exception they say that if the President runs they think he will be elected, though they themselves will not vote for him. My own feeling is that it would be unfortunate if Mr. Roosevelt were to be a candidate."

G. Bromley Oxnam, Methodist Episcopal Bishop, of Omaha: "You will recall that Theodore Roosevelt ran for office; and if he had been elected, in effect, that would have been a third term. Millions of people were willing to vote for him. My recollection is that large numbers would have supported Mr. Coolidge had he thought in terms of a third term. From all I can learn simply by listening to conversations and expressions of opinion, a very large percentage of American people would be willing to see President Franklin D. Roosevelt in office for a third term. However, there is a general feeling, I think, that two terms represent a tradition that is wise to keep."

AGAINST "AMERICAN SPIRIT"

Dr. William Hiram Foulkes, of Newark, N. J., moderator of the Presbyterian Church in the United States: "So far as I am personally concerned I deprecate and almost deplore a third term for any President on the ground that it contravenes our essential American spirit."

W. B. Riley, president of the First Baptist Church, Minneapolis: "The American people did not support Roosevelt for a second term; I hardly think they will for a third. The Government dependents, however, are the balance of power, and I think they would support him for any number of terms."

D. T. Gregory, of Dayton, Ohio, executive secretary of the Church of the United Brethren in Christ: "My own conviction is that the American people do not look with favor upon a third term for any President of the United States."

Luther Wesley Smith, of the First Baptist Church of Syracuse, member of the board of managers of the Northern Baptist Convention: "In my judgment no one can tell yet whether the American people would support President Roosevelt for a third term or not. Popular as he is, I do not believe that they would do so, for I do not believe that they would support any man for a third term except in the most extreme emergency. Whether the actual outbreak of war would provide that emergency is not at all clear in my mind. Personally I think it is unwise for any President to run for a third term under any consideration."

[From the Indianapolis Sunday Star of June 12, 1938]

BOTH DEMOCRATIC, NEW DEAL EDITORS OF COTTON BELT OPPOSE THIRD TERM

(By Everett C. Watkins)

WASHINGTON, June 11.—Neither the new dealers nor the regular Democrats of the South want President Roosevelt for a third term, judging by the expression of the newspaper editors of several Cotton Belt States.

Comment from editors in several Southern States was obtained by Joseph H. Leib, political statistician in Washington, formerly of South Bend, Ind. Mr. Leib has attracted much attention here with his collection of opinions on many subjects through correspondence with the country's keymen in various activities.

"Both of the Charleston newspapers have been against the President's policies since the passage of the N. R. A. in 1933. We never flew the Blue Eagle or had anything to do with it," wrote Robert S. Manigault, publisher of the Charleston (S. C.) News-Courier. "But I have sense enough to know that our position makes no difference to the administration and will influence only a few South Carolinians as the State is thoroughly bought."

WANTS NO THIRD TERM

T. M. Hederman, editor of the Clarion-Ledger, Jackson, Miss., 100 percent pro-Roosevelt, is strongly against a third term, "regardless of who he might be."

"I think that President Roosevelt saved the country. Not a one of his critics or his opponents would be willing to go back to the conditions that existed when he became President," wrote Editor Hederman. "Great progress has been made. However, I would not favor a third term for the President of the United States, regardless of who he might be."

The Dallas (Tex.) Journal will determine its policy when and if it has to cross the third-term bridge.

"The conditions under which Mr. Roosevelt might seek a third term cannot be studied at this moment, and the quality, character, and form of the opposition are unknown. So it is for the future to decide what course we would take," wrote W. B. Ruggles, associate editor of this Texas newspaper.

SAYS NOTION INCREDIBLE

Curtis B. Johnson, publisher of the Charlotte (N. C.) Observer, said there are so many reasons why no man should serve a third term that he cannot believe President Roosevelt would entertain such a notion.

"It is my opinion," said the North Carolina publisher, "that President Roosevelt will not announce for a third term, nor do I believe he would be willing to accept one unless the situation became so extraordinary that, in his judgment, he would feel that as a civic obligation he would have to offer himself again. The Charlotte Observer would not be friendly toward the idea of his seeking to extend his term of office for another 4 years. Such action on his part would at least violate the unwritten law that no American President should serve more than two terms. To my mind there are so many reasons why such a thing is undesirable and fraught with danger, and since they all seem so obvious, I think it unnecessary to detail them."

"We would militantly oppose a third term for President Roosevelt or any other President, Republican or Democratic," wrote Fred B. Wachs, general manager of the Lexington (Ky.) Herald-Leader.

REFUSES TO GIVE OPINION

John D. Wise, publisher of the Richmond (Va.) Times-Dispatch, preferred to refrain from expression of his third-term views "be-

cause I do not believe President Roosevelt expects to seek a third term."

Clark Howell, publisher of the Atlanta Constitution, nationally known Democratic journal of Georgia, considered that only President Roosevelt himself knows his political plans for the future. However, the editor's inclination was to stand by the time-honored tradition that no President shall perpetuate himself in office—that two terms should be the limit.

"I do not think there is any living man—save possibly one—who can say whether President Roosevelt will run for a third term," Howell wrote to Leib. "My inclination is to support the time-honored custom which precludes a President succeeding himself for a third term. Conditions are so changing, however, that I cannot now say whether or not we would support President Roosevelt for a third term."

OKLAHOMAN COMMENTS

E. K. Gaylor, general manager of the Daily Oklahoman, of Oklahoma City, Okla., considers that the depression in the midst of the New Deal second term precludes any possibility of the people desiring a Roosevelt third term. This Democratic editor of the Southwest believes that President Roosevelt's prestige is decreasing so rapidly that there is little possibility of his being renominated and elected. Indeed, he considers that Roosevelt, if the depression continues, will be so weak politically that he won't even be able to dictate who the next party nominee shall be. He believes that a Democratic President will succeed Roosevelt, but that he will be a real Democrat rather than a new dealer who continually snipes at business.

OPPOSITION VINDICATED

The Oklahoman was a Roosevelt supporter in 1932, but advised against him in the 1936 campaign. In view of developments it considers that its opposition to Roosevelt even for a second term has been well vindicated. Gaylord wrote:

"I have been under the impression that a year ago the President was rather eager to seek a third term, but since the advent of the disastrous Roosevelt depression his hopes along that line have been greatly weakened. There unquestionably has been a great doubt in his mind as to whether or not it would be possible for him to receive the third nomination and follow it with a successful campaign.

"I doubt very much the possibility of his obtaining the nomination for a third term; if he should obtain such a nomination it is entirely too early to forecast whether he could be elected. If the depression continues another year he could neither obtain nomination nor be reelected.

"CAN'T RESTORE PROSPERITY

"I do not believe there is any legerdemain by which he can restore prosperity. Private capital is idle and will remain idle so long as it is frightened every week or two by threats from the White House. The Government is not in position to spend enough public money to offset the private capital which is idle and which would be employed if confidence were restored.

"It is my view that President Roosevelt will not be renominated; indeed, there is even grave doubt now that he would be able to name his successor as the Democratic candidate. It is likely the Democratic Party will remain in power, although its candidate for the Presidency may not be as enthusiastic for the New Deal as the present incumbent of the White House. We would not think of supporting him for a third term."

So it would appear that both partisans and opponents of the New Deal in the Democratic South are against any President, no matter the man or his party, serving 12 years.

[From the Indianapolis Sunday Star of May 1, 1938]

FARMER OPPOSED TO THIRD TERM—ROOSEVELT STRENGTH IN CITY AND NEW DEAL PLEASES C. I. O. MORE THAN A. F. OF L.

WASHINGTON, April 30.—Farmers are less interested in the Roosevelt New Deal than are representatives of organized labor.

There are no farm leaders who want Roosevelt for a third term; there are several labor leaders, though they are divided on the subject, who would be willing to cast aside the anti-third-term tradition.

Both farmers and labor consider that business would be given a better chance to function and provide employment with a revision of taxes.

The farmer especially appreciates that agriculture has a better chance to succeed if business is less hampered. Some of the farm leaders are completely hostile to the New Deal. It is apparent that President Roosevelt's strength is in the city, not on the farm. The farmer is too conservative to have confidence in the New Deal with its radical tendencies.

C. I. O. LIKES NEW DEAL

Members of the C. I. O., the John L. Lewis labor organization, are much more friendly to the Roosevelt New Deal than are those affiliated with the American Federation of Labor.

These views are indicated in letters received from farm and labor leaders by Joseph Leib, native of South Bend, Ind., who is here as the "inquiring reporter" with offices in the Claridge Hotel.

Joseph Vesecky, president of the Farmers' Educational and Cooperative Union of America, a farm organization with headquarters at Salina, Kans., wrote: "I am not only opposed to President Roosevelt for a third term but to any President having a third term."

D. M. Hildebrand, of Seward, Nebr., president of the United States Live Stock Association, places responsibility for "our present condition" squarely on New Deal policies, "unsound and unworkable."

"Farmers are beginning to realize more and more that reciprocal-trade agreements, made through power delegated to the President, merely sell the farmer 'down the river,'" writes this Nebraska farm leader. "In my judgment it is a matter of fear as to what will happen next that retards investment in business.

CITES UNITED STATES ATTITUDE

"The President, rather than keep things unsettled, should assure business that the Government will cooperate with it and help business to go forward, that the workingman may have a chance to get on a pay roll. I firmly believe that had the New Deal administration taken a firm stand to protect property (stop seizure of property in sit-down strikes) and insisted that radical labor recognize property rights, we would not have seen the slump that has taken place in the past year. I am fearful the A. A. A., in the long run, will prove a handicap to agriculture. Benefits will not take care of the net loss our farmers must suffer if they comply with the law as it is now written."

A Blissfield, Mich., farm leader, E. A. Beamer, president of the National Live Stock Marketing Association, thinks there is "danger" of a Roosevelt third term "if the administration keeps enough voters on the taxpayers' pay roll, through the W. P. A., P. W. A., and other spending agencies, until 1940." He considers that business is harmed through excessive taxes, and that labor disturbances, experimental projects, and lack of a definite, permanent administration policy contribute greatly to the present depression. He expresses hope that Congress will assert its constitutional power and put a halt on experiments that go wrong and cause harmful uncertainties.

OFFERS 90-YEAR-OLD BOOK

"Charles L. Hall, Madison, Wis., president of the National Dairy Association, recommends that citizens read Six Centuries of Work and Wages, a book written nearly 90 years ago.

"It is time to stop all experiments with economics. I recommend the reading of Six Centuries of Work and Wages, written about 1850. Reading this will cause citizens to realize that most of the experiments now carried on were tried and with bad results hundreds of years ago," wrote the Wisconsin dairy leader. "When Roosevelt was first elected, I was in favor of trying most anything, provided experiments were paid for by taxes as we went along rather than by sinking us into a debt that no one generation can pay. I am not for the A. A. A. restrictions-on-production program. I am speaking for myself, not attempting to voice the association's views. I think right now that Roosevelt could be reelected only because no one else appears to have a program. Republicans and many Democrats seem to be just 'agin' Roosevelt, but are at sea about what to do."

DAN CASEMENT AROUSED

Dan D. Casement, Manhattan, Kans., president of the Farmers Independent Council of America, well known in his State as a breeder of cattle, sheep, and hogs, wallops the Roosevelt administration as follows:

"The only way to get out of the slump is to encourage production by removing the heavy hand of government from business, by recognizing frankly that democracy cannot exist except as its citizens are permitted to function freely in a competitive economy. But we have gone so far on the wrong road now that I think it would be impossible to reverse directions. Responsibility for the present condition I place on the refusal of the administration to admit the authority of the eternal verities and on the futile efforts the New Deal has made to repeal the fundamental laws founded in those inexorable truths. As to a third term for Roosevelt, I think the country will be in political chaos before 1940 rolls around. So long as Congressmen indorse such a fool proposal as Roosevelt made over the radio on April 14 (pump priming), patriotism is dead and America will soon stink. To h—— with the whole kit and kaboodle of them."

LABOR BACKING SLIPS

On the other hand, a labor leader, Harold G. Crose, secretary of the Utah Federation of Labor, wrote as follows:

"The C. I. O. members of organized labor are still strong for Roosevelt. However, he is losing favor and probably would not, on present conditions, at least, have the support of a majority of the people of the State for a third term."

Albert J. Maag, president of the South Dakota State Federation of Labor, thinks that the "people of South Dakota are still with Roosevelt and would support him if he should ask for a third term."

T. R. Cuthbert, secretary of the Tennessee Federation of Labor, thinks it would help business, and labor wants business revival, with a revision of the undistributed-profits and capital-gains tax. Roosevelt, he thinks, would carry Tennessee should he seek a third term.

Ambassador Bullitt's Speech

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSH LEE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 21 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

ARTICLE BY JAY FRANKLIN

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I ask leave to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very brilliant article in connection with Mr. Bullitt's speech. It appears in the column of Jay Franklin in today's issue of the Evening Star, Washington, D. C.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Star of August 21, 1940]

WE THE PEOPLE—BULLITT'S SPEECH IS PRAISED AS MESSAGE OF TRUTH TO SET AMERICA FREE

[By Jay Franklin]

At long last, after weeks of indecision and silence, a brave man has spoken out to America. He has brushed aside the niceties and evasions with which diplomats and politicians veil the ugly facts. He has spoken from the heart in words that have the best of poetry and in phrases which rang like the Liberty Bell.

Set it down that it was not President Roosevelt who gave the country this message of urgency and action. The President was busy implementing the new leadership of the Nation by establishing the new Canadian-American Axis.

Set it down also that it was not Wendell Willkie who made the bravest political utterance in recent American history. Mr. Willkie spoke at Elwood, but his acceptance speech was lacking in that straightforward, downright tone his earlier utterances had foreshadowed. For his action in supporting the President on selective service, aid to Britain, and racial intolerancy, the Nation owes Willkie respect and gratitude, but for the rest of it, his Elwood speech was dished up in a way which showed the thumbprints on the political tureen of the many cooks who had had a hand in the broth. Like any other political candidate, Mr. Willkie is being pulled and hauled by powerful interests inside his own party.

WILLKIE COULD HAVE TAKEN ISSUE

No, the man who spoke the words America has been waiting for was Bill Bullitt, our Ambassador to France, speaking from the steps of Independence Hall in Philadelphia. If Wendell Willkie had spoken with equal boldness and feeling, he would have taken the defense issue away from Roosevelt and made himself, rather than F. D. R., America's Winston Churchill. If Roosevelt had uttered the words that Bill Bullitt used on Sunday, August 18, the President would have regained at a single bound all of his inherent powers of leadership in this crisis.

At last, however, someone has mustered the courage to sing bass, to name names, talk sense, and tell the country the truth.

What is that truth? It is that many of us are, often with the best will in the world, playing Hitler's game; that America is directly threatened by the Nazi "blitzkrieg" if England falls; that Hitler cannot stop until someone stops him; that we must let England have the destroyers she needs to hold the Channel; that we must adopt compulsory national service if we are to get ready to defend ourselves; that we cannot rely on the Atlantic Ocean for defense; that France fell because it was riddled with treachery and bemused by windy emotionalists who sowed the wind of selfishness masquerading as individual liberty and reaped the whirlwind of defeat and disaster.

These were the words which should have been spoken over 2 months ago, before France fell. This is the message which should have been delivered weeks before the battle of England. This is the truth which alone can set America free from the web of delusion, selfishness, and defeatism which many of our public men have woven in a petty effort to coin public ignorance and prejudice into votes.

TIME FOR TALK IS PAST

The time for talk has long since passed. The time to act is now. It is far, far later than we have been taught to think, and the long hand of fate's clock is brushing the 12 on the dial.

My hat is off to Bill Bullitt, of Philadelphia, for what he did in daring to stand up and tell America the truth. From now on, readers of my column are warned that I shall judge all men, all utterances, all parties, and all actions with sole reference to the question of how they affect national unity, social solidarity, and American defense.

For this reason this column selects the Bullitt speech as the speech of the month and the President's Canadian axis as the act of the year. Why have we been made to wait so long when the danger is so urgent and the facts so plain?

Steps Toward British Union, a World State, and Internal Strife—Part V

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. THORKELSON

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 20, 1940

ARTICLE ISSUED BY THE IMPERIAL FASCIST UNION OF LONDON, ENGLAND

Mr. THORKELSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I include an article issued by the Imperial Fascist Union, of London, England.

I shall not comment on this article except to say that the reference to Masonry, no doubt, refers to the Grand Orient Masonry and not to the English-American Masons as we know them in the United States.

INTRODUCTION

THE BASIC FACTOR IN POLITICS IS RACE

Those Britons who stand amazed at the defeatist trend of their country's politics; who begin to ask themselves whether our civilization is worth while; and who are puzzled as to how this state of things should ever have come about, will find explained in this pamphlet the cause of it all—the race itself is changing.

The great Persian, Greek, and Roman civilizations died out from this same cause. The dominant Aryan race responsible for their development became too weak by intermarriage with lesser races, until the product could no longer maintain Aryan standards.

Colonel Lindbergh, in 1936, left the United States of America for exactly these reasons; although individual Americans will continue to pull their weight in pioneering for humanity, yet the people of the United States can no longer, in the mass, maintain a decent enough standard of public conduct to protect him from unprovoked annoyance.

This pamphlet demonstrates the Jewish contamination among the titled families of Britain. It has been difficult to "dig out" the information; perhaps the most encouraging aspect in a depressing research has been the obvious desire on the part of most of the affected families to hide their Jewishness; only when it is discovered and dragged forward into the limelight do these families sometimes begin to assert that "they are proud of their Jewish blood!"

A similar phenomenon was observed by the Jewish compilers of the Who's Who in American Jewry (1926), who state in their introduction to the volume: "Some persons preferred to be omitted rather than associate their names with those of their racial colleagues. A few even rejected with indignation the proposal of being included in a volume where their Jewish identity would become a matter of public knowledge."

How completely the Jewish masonic teaching of racial equality has conquered Aryan thought in this country is perhaps best indicated by the absence hitherto of any literature dealing with the race change.

Although this booklet deals only with the titled aristocracy, a similar state of affairs could easily be demonstrated among the official, commercial, and professional communities. Possibly the least affected and most Aryan community is the agricultural one. That, incidentally, is one of the reasons why, in a Jew-owned land, it comprises only about 5 percent of the nation's workers.

Our case can be presented best, we think, by a consideration, first, of the examples of Spain and Portugal, where the process of Aryan racial degeneration has taken place not far away from us either in distance or in time, whilst a sufficient period of the latter has elapsed to prove that nations that have gone down from racial causes cannot rise again by their own unaided efforts.

THE NECESSITY FOR AN ARISTOCRACY TO SUPERVISE THE NATION'S POLITICS IS A FUNDAMENTAL TENET OF THE FASCIST CREED

In publishing this pamphlet we have no idea of attacking the aristocratic principle; we simply present evidence that, for racial reasons, our "aristocracy" has ceased to function in its duty as a

protector of the people, and that the racial change taking place in it is symptomatic of a racial change affecting other parts of the community, a change which will destroy the British Empire unless it is rendered impotent to injure us.

FOUL BROOD—THE RACIAL TRANSFORMATION OF A NATION—ENFORCED MASONIC UNIVERSAL BROTHERHOOD

There is a disease of bees called foul brood, which, when it affects a hive, corrupts it irredeemably. An analagous malady is that which has destroyed the greatness of Spain and Portugal, and which has secured for itself a strong footing in Britain, where the symptoms are obvious enough, although puzzling to all who do not appreciate their racial cause.

Spain and Portugal bore the brunt of the early Jewish invasion into western European territory. The poison insinuated itself the more easily because racial differences were obscured by religious ones, so that it was comparatively simple for the Jew to accept Christianity outwardly, whilst remaining at heart a Jew and practicing Jewish rites in the privacy of his home; thus arose the Marrano community, or Crypto-Jecs, who at first avoided to some extent the extreme consequences of the hostility of those of the dominant faith.

In the fifteenth century, the Marranos or Secret Jews dominated Spanish life, occupying high positions not only in the administration, the universities, the forces, and the judiciary, but also in the church itself. Their outward conformity to the Catholic church, together with their accumulation of wealth, enabled them to penetrate by marriage to such an extent into the most exalted families in the land that it became difficult to find an aristocratic family in Aragon or in Castile which was not contaminated with the foul stream of Jewish blood.

The worm turned at last, and not only were all professing Jews expelled from Spain, or forcibly converted and later expelled from Portugal, but the inquisition attacked the Marrano community, the position of which was ever afterward insecure and hopeless.

The greatest period of Spanish history followed the expulsion; and Portugal built up her great colonial Empire subsequent to the riddance of the professing Jew. But in both cases, the curse descended upon the colonial possessions of these two nations; in Peru, the Jew held the commerce of the country in his hands, and it was impossible for a Castilian to succeed in business without a Jewish partner; the Jews purchased the cargoes of great fleets with fictitious credits which they divided amongst themselves, rendering large capital unnecessary. When the struggle between Portugal and Holland for the possession of Brazil took place, the Marranos worked for the Dutch enemy.

At home, the Spanish and Portuguese had, however, made the supreme mistake of imagining that any Marrano could be a substitute for a European. Absolute discrimination between white European Christians and the "new Christians" as the Marranos were called, was only insisted on by the best informed of the aristocracy, who kept a record of the new Christians so that intermarriage with them might cease. The racial quality of the people degenerated rapidly as the Jewish contagion spread by intermarriage.

Then, at last, the assault was deliberately made on the last citadel of racial purity. On St. John's Day, 1744, Frederick, Prince of Wales, grand master of English Masons, admitted the Portuguese Ambassador, Dom Sebastio de Carvalho e Mello to a London lodge; this gentleman, better known as Pombal, revived Masonry in Portugal on his return to that country.

On May 2, 1768, Pombal ordered the destruction of all registers of Marrano families, and ordered all the heads of the exclusive and race-conscious Portuguese families to arrange that any daughter of marriageable age must be engaged within 4 months to marry a member of one of the hitherto excluded Jew-contaminated families.

This horrible Masonic outrage made an end of the Portuguese as a great nation.

In Spain, discrimination between the Aryan and the non-Aryan gradually declined under similar influences, although the Corps of Cadets insisted upon an unsullied racial origin as a qualification for entry up to 1860, whilst in some parish churches, even in the nineteenth century, notices were still displayed warning the old Christians against intermarrying with the new.

To some extent, of course, in Spain the Moorish occupation had been responsible for a dilution of the Aryan and Mediterranean blood of the people, but this Moorish corruption was never subtle, and its power of penetration was therefore weak. On the other hand, the Portuguese, through their custom of intermarrying with colored people in their colonies and through the return of the resultant half-breeds to the home country, has suffered great contamination from non-Jewish races of color.

Both Spain and Portugal went down because their native peoples have sullied their blood with that of lower races to a toxic degree; "foul brood" has corrupted them beyond hope. Damage of this sort is permanent.

That being so, let our readers consider what is going on in these islands, and ask themselves how Britain can regain her proper place in the world without first recovering her race-consciousness, and how she can do that without accepting the remedy of the Imperial Fascist League?

OUR JEWISH ARISTOCRACY

It has long been one of the Jewish methods in the attainment of world domination to penetrate into privileged circles where political power is greatest; Edward the First, by expelling the Jews in 1290, saved us from too early an application of this process in Britain, but other countries were less fortunate and suffered the extinction of their nobility by Jewish women marrying into the Gentile aristocratic families.

In Britain a few "damped" (baptized Christian) Jews remained in the country when their synagogue-going brothers had been expelled. Some of these attained knighthood, for instance, Sir Edward Brampton, who became Governor of Guernsey. The first serious attempt, however, to penetrate the ranks of the hereditary titleholders of England seems to have been an attack upon royalty itself by that notorious character, Perkin Warbeck, who was a servant of the Jewish knight mentioned above. With characteristic Jewish effrontery, this man claimed the English throne.

Francis Bacon wrote in his Life and Reign of King Henry VII: "There was a townsman of Tourney that had born office in that town, whose name was John Osbeck, a convert Jew, married to Catherine de Faro; whose business drew him to live for a time with his wife at London, in King Edward IV's days. During which time he had a son by her; and being known in court, the King either out of a religious nobleness, because he was a convert, or upon some private acquaintance, did him the honor as to be godfather to his child, and named him Peter. But afterwards proving a dainty and effeminate youth, he was commonly called by the diminutive of his name, Peterkin or Perkin. For, as for the name of Warbeck, it was given him when they did but guess at it, before examinations had been taken."

How many of us at school realized that Perkin Warbeck was a figure in the Jewish world plot against Aryan sovereignty?

As everyone knows, Cromwell allowed the Jews to return and they flocked over here toward the latter part of the seventeenth century, the largest wave of rich Jews coming over with William III from Holland.

In 1718 the Attorney General, Sir R. Raymond, hammered another nail into his country's coffin, by deciding that Jews could hold land in England. Walpole had previously allowed the Jew Gideon to hold estates by a special act in his favor; this Jew had lent his "credit" to the government (!) which seems not to have realized that it had a lot of its own, and falsely posing as a Christian, for he never ceased his payments to the synagogue and died a Jew, he married a Gentile, his son being created a baronet and later Baron Eardley, a title now fortunately extinct. The first synagogue Jew baronets were Sir I. L. Goldsmid (1841), Sir Moses Montefiore, and Sir Anthony de Rothschild; these seem to have qualified for the British aristocracy by using their ill-gotten wealth in buying privileges for the Jews in this and other countries.

It was Sir Issac L. Goldsmid who led the movement for the admission of the Jews to our legislature. Once the barrier was down, the rest was easy. In 1858 legislation enabled the foreign "Baron" Lionel de Rothschild to take his oath in the House of Commons as a Jew. His son was raised to the peerage in 1885. The "damped" Jew Disraeli had of course obtained earlier honors, dying as the Earl of Beaconsfield.

Among the earlier Synagogue baronet creations were those of Sir George Jessel, Sir David Salomans, and Sir John Simon (no relation to the living Sir John Simon, who claims not to be Jewish).

Aryan peers sometimes made matters worse by marrying Jewesses, one of the most disastrous cases being that of the second Viscount Galway, who married as early as 1747 a Jewess called Villa Real, as a result of which countless fine old British families have had this Asiatic strain instilled into them. It was a Rothschild plan to marry superfluous daughters into the families of influential Gentiles; in the case of the Rothschild unions with Baron Battersea and the son of the fourth Earl of Hardwicke, the marriages were sterile, but a daughter of Mayer Amschel Rothschild married the fifth Earl of Rosebery, so that there is Rothschild blood in the present earl, one of whose sisters married the present Marquess of Crewe, himself with Villa Real blood; thus after many days, the blood of the Villa Real Jewess mingles with that of the Rothschild in the issue of this marriage of "British aristocrats."

The custom of mating with Jewesses has now become a common one; the instinct of the Aryan has been broken down by continued propaganda, and H. Belloc in his book on The Jews writes of the Jewish penetration of our great aristocratic families: "With the opening of the twentieth century, those of the great territorial English families in which there was no Jewish blood were the exception. In nearly all of them, the strain was more or less marked, in some of them so strong that though the name was still an English name and the traditions those of a purely English lineage of the long past, the physique and character had become wholly Jewish and the members of the family were taken for Jews whenever they traveled in countries where the gentry had not yet suffered or enjoyed this mixture."

A study of the "society" photographs in any copy of The Bystander will convince anyone that Mr. Belloc does not exaggerate. To those of us who believe that Aryanization is civilization it is incomprehensible that aristocrats of our race could succumb to the cunning Masonic and educational Jewish propaganda designed to cause them to forget their race. Nevertheless, the opposition to Jewish penetration into the great families has not been expressed in any decided way; Masonry is no doubt responsible for this. Queen Victoria herself had qualms about the granting of titles to Jews, because we know that when it

was recommended to her that Sir Lionel Rothschild should be promoted to the peerage, she wrote as follows in a letter dated November 1, 1869, to Mr. Gladstone: "It is not only the feeling, of which she cannot divest herself, against making a person of the Jewish religion a peer, but she cannot think that one who owes his great wealth to contracts with foreign governments for loans, or to successful speculation on the stock exchange can fairly claim a British peerage. However high Sir L. Rothschild may stand personally in public estimation, this seems to her not the less a species of gambling because it is on a gigantic scale and far removed from that legitimate trading which she delights to honor, in which men have raised themselves by patient industry and unswerving probity to positions of wealth and influence."

Her sound instincts, or "prejudices" as they would be called nowadays in our Judaized press, were, however, broken down by Disraeli and we have now reached such a pitch that in 1932 the Jews were seriously planning to get the chief rabbi into the House of Lords, ex-officio. In 1915 a daughter of the fourth Baron Sheffield married the Jew Edwin Montagu, the disturber of Indian "pathetic contentment," and actually "embraced Judaism" also in a religious sense. There was more excuse for Lord George Gordon of the 1780 anti-Popery campaign, who adopted the Jewish religion, but died insane.

In the following review of our titled aristocracy, there are many errors of omission; working chiefly with Burke's Peerage, we find a reticence on the subject of Jewish "relativity" to our nobility; in other words, the volume seems designed to baffle the investigator as much as possible. For that reason, and also because the time at our disposal for this research is strictly limited, the review is far from complete, but it is sufficiently terrible to a racist as it is.

Every effort has been made to avoid errors of commission; we do not desire to hurt the feelings of anyone, but the British people have a right to know the truth; wherever we have insufficient evidence in suspicious cases, the benefit of the doubt has been given; we hope, in many future editions, to be able to make our lists more complete. The excellent library of the Society of Genealogists could not produce a single volume which was of direct help in collecting the material for this pamphlet, which we hope, therefore, will find a place on its shelves; but we think something will prevent it getting there. It may be of interest to mention that Debrett's Peerage is published by the same Jew firm, Odhams Press, Ltd., which runs the Daily Herald. Sir Sydney Lee (Jew) edited the Dictionary of National Biography, so we get little help from those. And the Jew, M. Epstein, edits the Annual Register.

We have omitted from our list certain cases where Jewesses have married into noble families in which the titles are now extinct or from which marriages there was no issue.

In our investigations we found that the statement made by J. M. Macdiarmid in The Deer Forests that the Leveson-Gower family was descended from "a London Jew money lender" is false; the name "Leveson" in this case has no Jewish application. Also, the statement made in the Jewish Daily Post, June 17, 1935, that the present Duchess of Norfolk has Jewish blood, is untrue; she is the second wife of the last duke and mother of the present duke; and it was the first wife of the last duke, who left no heir, who had Jewish blood. The Universe is in error in stating (Feb. 4, 1937) that the Marquess of Bute is descended from the Jew Treves.

Many Jewish titles, sometimes camouflaged, like those of Barons Wandsworth (real name, Stern) and Pirbright (real name, De Worms), are fortunately extinct. Extinct, also, is the baronetcy of Sir Edgar Speyer, which was revoked by a notice in the Times of December 14, 1921, on account of his unlawful communication and trading with the enemy during the war.

The effect of even a slight mixture of Jewish blood in an Aryan family is often very great. It alters the political outlook of the individual because it alters the instincts themselves.

"One Chink or Negro or even Jew ancestor a long way back will undo your Anglo-Saxon composition, of which you may claim an unbroken line of purely Essex stock, more thoroughly than if all your ancestors, from your parents back, had been Dutch, German, Swede, Dane, French, Russian, Portuguese, Italian, or any other easily assimilated Aryan race." W. Gerhardi in Memoirs of a Polyglot, 1931.

When a large number of individuals in commanding social or political positions are rendered partly Asiatic in instinct, the nation itself becomes the victim of these destructive instincts.

Referring to Colonel Lane's book, The Alien Menace, the National Review confirms this in the following words:

"English men and women are constantly asking themselves how it comes about that a twist is so frequently given to British policy that is clearly not in accordance with British interests. There is usually somebody in a position, at the psychological moment, to deflect our government, whatever party be in power, into some line of action that is unintelligible at the time and is fraught with disastrous consequences. * * * It is as though some hostile influence were steadily throwing grit into the machine. In every international financial arrangement we fare badly, and the whole story of reparations and war debts is humiliating in the extreme and calculated to make us the world's laughing stock as well as the world's milk cow. It is in this connection that such a book as Colonel Lane has written * * * throws a timely searchlight. It is in the higher ranks of society that the alien menace is formidable through the influence exercised in government departments, in Downing Street, and high finance by gentry of unmistakable foreign origin."

The repulsive physical appearance of the Hither Asiatic or Armenoid race is often passed on over many generations of a Jew-contaminated Aryan family.

Throughout this pamphlet, the word "Jew" is employed in its racial sense, implying Armenoid, Mongoloid, or Oriental blood. The appointments mentioned in connection with any individual are either past or present ones. The lists given below are of present titleholders only.

HEREDITARY TITLEHOLDERS OF JEWISH BLOOD

(12th) Duke of St. Albans, whose grandfather was the Jew, R. Bernal Osborne, M. P. The Duke married the daughter of the fifth Marquess of Lansdowne, and is the hereditary grand falconer.

(8th) Duke of Richmond is son of a Ricardo of Jewish blood.

(1st) Marquess of Crewe, is descended from the second Viscount Galway, who married the Jewess, Villa Real; his second wife was the daughter of the fifth Earl of Rosebery and his wife, who was Hanna Rothschild. The family name is Crewe-Milnes. The marquess is a privy councilor, has occupied Cabinet positions, and was His Majesty's Ambassador at Paris, 1922–28.

(2d) Marquess of Reading. He is the son of the late Rufus Isaacs, who was a privy councilor, and who was Lord Warden of the Cinque Ports, a position once held by the present King when Prince of Wales; was also Viceroy of India, and was chiefly responsible for the "white paper" surrender of that vast empire, won to us by British valor and retained by straight dealing; was made Lord Chief Justice of England 3 months after having admitted publicly his "mistake of judgment" in connection with the Marconi scandal. Rufus Isaacs' brother was the power behind the British Broadcasting Co., and appointed its chief, Sir John Reith. The present Marquess married the daughter of the late Lord Melchett, the Jew, Mond.

(6th) Earl of Rosebery, the son of the fifth earl and a Rothschild mother, one of whose daughters married the present Marquess of Crewe. The earl is a great landowner.

(20th) Earl of Suffolk, whose mother was the daughter of the Jew, L. Z. Leiter; he is also distantly descended from John Moses.

(6th) Earl of Craven is great-grandson of the Jew Bradley Martin.

(17th) Earl of Devon is son of a Jewish Silva.

Countess Loudoun (in her own right) is descended from the Jew Treves.

(6th) Earl of Mexborough is son of a Raphael. The last earl was his half-brother and a Buddhist.

(6th) Earl of Romney is descended from the Jew Treves.

(2d) Viscount Bearstead is a Samuel, and owns 150,000 acres; he is chairman of Shell Transport and a director of Lloyds Bank.

Viscount Castlerosse says he has Jewish blood, but we know no details. He is son of the fifth earl of Kenmare.

(9th) Viscount Chetwynd is a descendant of the Jew Gideon.

(3d) Viscount Esher is of Jewish blood; we do not know whether the source was of one or of two generations back, or both, but his sister admitted it in the Sunday Dispatch of August 11, 1935, saying she was proud of it. He married a Jewish Hecksher.

(8th) Viscount Galway, descended from the second viscount who married the Jewess Villa Real in 1747; the viscount is stated to be proud of his Jewish blood.

(2d) Viscount Goschen, banker. ("Goschen was a Jew," Lord Riddell in More Pages From My Diary, 1908–14, 1934, p. 7.)

(6th) Baron Auckland is descended from the Jew Gideon.

(5th) Baron Brabourne's mother was a Jewish Von Flesch-Brunningen.

(3d) Baron Burnham, whose original name, Levy, was altered to Lawson. Members of this family have married into gentile-titled families as follows: The Hulse baronetcy, the present baronet being free from this Levy blood; the family of the late Sir H. de Bathe, Bart., with issue; and the present baron's niece married the son of the second Earl of Leicester.

(2d) Baron Cranworth is distantly descended from the Jew, Samuel Du Pass, through his mother.

(1st) Baron Duveen, trustee of many art galleries.

(1st) Baron Southwood, lately J. S. Elias, chairman of Odhams Press, Ltd., and controller of a large section of the daily and weekly newspapers, including the Daily Herald.

(8th) Baron Foley's mother was a Greenstone.

(3d) Baron Herschell is of Jewish origin, and is a lord in waiting.

(1st) Baron Hirst, chairman of General Electric Co., and of Empire Commission of British Industries and of the Association of Textile Institutes.

(1st) Baron Jessel, who was Controller of Horses Disposal Board after the war; also chairman of Military Services Committee Panel of 1918; and is president of the London Municipal Society. His son has married the daughter of the Marquess of Londonderry.

(1st) Baron Mancroft, formerly Sir A. M. Samuel, Bart., who has held countless important appointments under the government.

(2d) Baron Melchett, who, in Modern Money, advised the sale of some of our Pacific and Atlantic possessions to pay off the war debt; opened the business efficiency exhibition, 1933; is a leading

advocate of the Jew racket called planning, and is head of the English Zionist Federation. Melchett's sister married the new Lord Reading, and another sister married Sir N. A. Pearson, but was divorced.

(2d) Baron Michelham, real name Stern. One of his daughters married the fourth Baron Sherborne, but without issue.

(1st) Baron O'Neill, distantly Jewish in blood through the families of Lords Galway and Crewe.

Baroness Ravensdale is Lord Curzon's daughter and is granddaughter of the Jew L. Z. Leiter. She is unmarried.

(3d) Baron N. M. V. Rothschild. The intermarriages of the Rothschild family have already been referred to. There has recently been a Rothschild union with the son of Baron Kemsley, of the newspaper-owning family of Berry.

(2d) Baron Strachie, son of a Jewish Braham.

(3d) Baron Swaythling is a Samuel, and is head of Samuel Montagu & Co., international loan bankers.

Dowager Countess of Desart is the daughter of a Bischoffsheim, but the present earl is not her son.

Sir G. W. Albu, Bart. (South African gold mines and diamonds).

Sir Alfred Beit, Bart. (the same interests), actually half Jew.

Sir H. J. D. Broughton, Bart., a great grandson of a Rosenzweig.

Sir H. J. W. Bruce, Bart., descended from a Ricardo.

Sir S. J. Bull, Bart., is son of a Jewish Brandon.

Sir Julian Cahn, Bart., director of Everyman Weekly.

Sir Felix Cassel, Bart., judge advocate general.

Sir H. B. Cohen, Bart.

Sir Guy Colin Campbell, Bart., is son of a Jewish Lehmann.

Sir T. H. W. Chitty, Bart., is the son of a Jewish Newbolt.

Sir R. C. G. Cotterell, Bart., grandson of a Ricardo.

Sir P. V. David, Bart., a Sassoon.

Sir O. E. D'Avigdor-Goldsmid, Bart., who has been high sheriff of Kent.

Sir John Ellerman, Bart.

Sir J. P. G. M. Fitzgerald, Bart., is the son of a Bischoffsheim and has married the daughter of the 7th Earl of Dunmore.

Sir G. S. Fry, Bart., is grandson of the Jewish Capper Pass.

Sir William Garthwaite, Bart., is son of a Jewish Andrade, married a Rodrigues, and his son married the daughter of the Jew Lord Duveen.

Sir E. C. Goschen, Bart.

Sir H. Goschen, Bart.

Sir J. L. Hanham, Bart., is son of a Jewish Lopes.

Sir R. L. Hare, Bart., is descended from the Jew Treves.

Sir P. A. Harris, Bart., M. P.

Sir F. D. S. Head, Bart., is descended from Mendes, the Jew physician of Catherine de Braganza.

Sir J. C. W. Herschel, Bart., is of distant Jewish blood, but, according to a book, The Real Jew, edited by H. Newman, page 164, "anything which can be called Jewish was absolutely zero," in his distinguished grandfather, the astronomer.

Sir George Jessel, Bart.

Sir H. A. W. Johnson, Bart., is great-grandson of the Jewess Rebecca Franks.

Sir C. G. Lampson, Bart., is the son of a Jewish Van Gelderen.

Sir T. P. Larcom, Bart., is descended from a Jewish D'Aguilar.

Sir H. J. Lawson, Bart., is grandson of a Jewish Lousada.

Sir G. E. Leon, Bart.

Sir T. J. P. Lever, Bart., publisher, whose grandfather adopted this old English name to camouflage the fact that his real name is Levy.

Sir E. J. M. Levy, Bart.

Sir G. J. E. Lewis, Bart, of the firm of lawyers Lewis & Lewis, who keep in their cupboards the skeletons belonging to many great British families.

Sir H. Y. B. Lopes, Bart., of Jew descent; has married the sister of the Earl of Mount Edgcumbe.

Sir P. Magnus, Bart.

Sir A. J. Meyer, Bart.

Sir C. G. J. Newman, Bart., whose brother married the daughter of the 2nd Baron Loch. (Real name, Neumann.)

Sir M. B. G. Oppenheimer, Bart., whose father married the daughter of Sir R. G. Harvey, Bart.

Sir L. L. Faudel-Phillips, Bart., whose sister married Baron Hothfield's brother.

Sir Lionel F. Phillips, Bart., whose father was arrested in 1896 and condemned to death for high treason, but was released; interests, South African mines, Sudan cotton, etc.

Sir B. L. B. Prescott's (Bart.) mother was daughter of the Jew Lionel Lawson.

Sir L. R. Richardson, Bart., interested in South African wool; his daughter was General Smuts' secretary.

Sir H. L. Rothband, Bart., of J. Mandleberg & Co., waterproofers.

Sir E. L. Samuel, Bart., Australian wool interests.

Sir H. B. Samuelson, Bart., is of Jewish family which has intermarried to a large extent with gentiles.

Sir Philip A. G. D. Sassoon, Bart., a Privy Councilor and first commissioner of works; chairman of National Gallery Board; once secretary to Lloyd George, and acted as such at Peace Conference; royalty accepts hospitality from this Jew, who is a Rothschild on his mother's side. His sister married the Marquis of Cholmondeley.

Sir E. V. Sassoon, Bart., of Bombay, who has been a member of the Legislative Assembly, India.

Sir Felix V. Schuster, Bart., held to be a high banking authority.

Sir R. P. Staples, Bart., is descended from the Jew Mendes.

Sir G. J. V. Thomas, Bart., whose mother was a Jewish Oppenheim.

Sir W. R. Tuck, Bart., whose firm prints Christmas cards.

Sir D. Wernher, Bart., is son of a Jewish Mankiewicz.

Sir H. E. Yarrow, Bart., is son of a Jewish Franklin.

The Earl of Birkenhead is descended from an oriental called Bathsheba, described in a recent biography as a gypsy. Racially, it matters little whether it was gypsy or Jew. He married Baron Camrose's daughter, and his sister married Baron Camrose's son.

HALF-BREEDS IN THE MAKING

As though that were not enough, the following noblemen and baronets now holding their titles have married women of Jewish blood; their heirs, if by descent from these will be Jewish aristocrats:

(9th) Duke of Roxburghe married the granddaughter of a Rothschild.

(5th) Marquess of Cholmondeley's wife is a Sassoon.

(16th) Marquess of Winchester married a Jewess, Mrs. Claude Marks.

(7th) Earl Castle Stewart married a Guggenheim.

(2d) Earl of Inchcape married the Jewish Ranee of Sarawak's daughter.

(6th) Earl of Rosse married a Jewish Messel.

(1st) Viscount St. Davids married first a Jewish Gerstenberg; and secondly a descendant of the Jew Treves by whom is his heir.

(1st) Viscount Bledisloe married a Lopes for his first wife, and his heir is her son.

(1st) Viscount Dawson of Penn married the daughter of a Jewish Franklin.

(3d) Baron Crawshaw married the granddaughter of a Ricardo.

(2d) Baron Hamilton of Dalzell's married the daughter of a Jewish Lawson.

(8th) Baron Howard de Walden married a Jewish Van Raalti.

(12th) Baron Kinnaird married a Clifton of Treves blood.

(1st) Baron May married a Strauss.

(1st) Baron Mount Temple's first wife was a Jewish Cassel.

(3d) Baron O'Hagan married as first wife the daughter of a Jewish Braham, by whom is his heir.

(1st) Baron Passfield, formerly Sidney Webb, a Fabian Socialist, married the granddaughter of a "tall, dark woman of Jewish type," and his biographer states that Beatrice Webb, now Lady Passfield, inherited many of her characteristics. (See Sidney and Beatrice Webb, by M. A. Hamilton, p. 41.) This appears to be the daughter of John Aked. Baron Passfield himself is described by Mr. Hamilton as having Jewish features; he was born in Soho and his origins "he has never illuminated." Nevertheless, Mr. Hamilton says that the Baron is pure English; a curious phenomenon.

(1st) Baron Parmoor married Lady Passfield's sister.

(6th) Baron Plunket married a Jewish Lewis.

Sir L. C. W. Alexander, Bart., married the daughter of the Jewish Baron Cable.

Sir J. W. Beynon, Bart., married a Moses.

Sir J. H. Blunt, Bart., married a Goldsmid-Stern-Salomans.

Sir H. L. C. Brassey, Bart., married the daughter of a Jewish Ricardo.

Sir E. C. Coates, Bart., married a Crewe-Milnes of distant Jewish blood.

Sir T. Colyer-Fergusson, Bart., married a Cohen as his second wife.

Sir H. G. de Bathé, Bart., married the daughter of a Warschowsky.

Sir A. E. H. Dean Paul married a Jewish Wieniawski. "Brenda" was a daughter.

Sir T. E. P. Falkiner, Bart., married the granddaughter of a Ricardo.

Sir G. C. Hamilton married a Jewish Simon.

Sir L. J. Jones, Bart., married a Schuster as his second wife, but his heir is by his first wife.

Sir E. A. Lechmere, Bart., married the daughter of a Samuels.

Sir R. Leeds, Bart., married a Jewish Singer.

Sir C. E. Lyle, Bart., of the sugar-monopolist firm Tate & Lyle, married a Levy and his son married the daughter of Sir John Jarvis, conservative M. P. for Guildford.

Sir E. O. McTaggart-Stewart, Bart., married a descendant of the Jew Treves.

Sir A. Moir, Bart., married the granddaughter of a Jewish Franklin.

Sir Oswald Mosley, Bart., married a granddaughter of the Jew L. Z. Leiter; he is chief of British Union of Fascists.

Sir. P. G. J. Mostyn, Bart., married a Jewish Marks.

Sir J. Gordon Nairne, Bart., married a Costa Ricci.

Sir N. A. Pearson, Bart., married a Mond, but obtained a divorce.

Sir Giles E. Sebright, Bart., married the granddaughter of an Isaacs.

Sir C. E. Warde married a "de Stern."

We are convinced that if we could get proof of certain facts regarding the relationships of other titled families, we could more than double the above list.

Here is a "mixed pickle" of Jewish relationships which we print, not because these cases necessarily influence the titled people

mentioned in every instance, as some of them may detest the connection, but to show how intimate the Jewish penetration has become:

(9th) Duke of Devonshire's brother married a descendant of the Jew Bernal Osborne.

(11th) Marquess of Tweeddale married a Ralli, stepdaughter of an Einstein.

(2d) Marquess of Milford Haven is brother-in-law to Cassel offspring.

(7th) Marquess of Londonderry's daughter married a Jessel. His heir is godfather to a Jewish Jessel.

(4th) Marquess of Salisbury's heir, Viscount Cranborne, married a descendant of the Jew Bernal Osborne.

(7th) Earl Beauchamp's daughter is godmother to the son of Hon. E. Jessel.

(5th) Earl Peel's aunt married Charles S. Goldman, M. P., and the Earl's uncle is a director in the Jew international bank of S. Japhet & Co.

(27th) Earl of Crawford's heir married a descendant of the Jew Bernal Osborne. Another son married the daughter of a Jewish Van Raalte.

(17th) Earl of Derby's daughter married the son of a Rothschild.

(7th) Earl Spencer's brother married a Jewish Blumenthal.

(7th) Earl of Orkney is nephew of Baroness de Samuel.

(4th) Earl of Verulam is brother-in-law of a Cassel.

(9th) Earl of Jersey's stepfather is a Jewish Slessor.

(6th) Earl Ranfurly's stepfather is a Jewish Lezard.

(2d) Earl Oxford and Asquith's sister married the cousin of a half-Rothschild. A distant relationship, but significant from a political standpoint.

(2d) Viscount Chelmsford's brother-in-law is a Jew Goldman.

(5th) Viscount Sidmouth's brother-in-law is a Jew Harris.

(2d) Viscount Scarsdale's daughter's godmother is Mrs. Simon Marks.

(1st) Viscount Greenwood is brother-in-law of the half-Jew politician L. C. M. S. Amery of the Privy Council.

(1st) Viscount Davidson's second son's godmother is the Jewish Lady Reading.

(1st) Viscount Runciman's son's first wife was a Jewish Lehman.

(2d) Viscount Halifax's eldest son married the granddaughter of a Rothschild.

(1st) Viscount Hailsham's brother married the granddaughter of a Gompertz.

(8th) Viscount Powerscourt's heir married into the Jew family of Beddington.

(13th) Viscount Falkland's sister-in-law was a Jewish Leon.

(2d) Viscount Chilston is brother-in-law of a Samuelson.

(1st) Baron Rankeillour's second son married a Jewish Ricardo.

(3d) Baron Gerard's sister married the Jew Baron de Forest.

(4th) Baron Annaly is brother-in-law to Viscount Galway, of Jew descent.

(2d) Baron Aberdare is brother-in-law of Lord Rosebery, son of a Rothschild.

(4th) Baron Fermoy's daughter has a Sassoon as godparent.

(2d) Baron Hamilton of Dalzell's nephew, his heir presumptive, and himself son of a Ricardo, married the daughter of the second Baron Burnham (Lawson, Levi).

(1st) Baron Kemsley's son married a Rothschild.

(2d) Baron Phillimore's heir married a Pereira.

(2d) Baron Hothfield's heir married a Raphael. His brother married a Jewish Faudel-Phillips.

(7th) Baron Ravensworth's sister married a Speyer.

Sir E. J. P. Benn's (Bart.) heir married the daughter of the Jew Sir Maurice Hankey; and his daughter married P. Shinkman.

Sir H. M. Huntington-Whiteley (Bart.) (who married Mr. Stanley Baldwin's daughter) has a sister-in-law Cohn.

Sir J. D. Orr-Lewis (Bart.) is brother-in-law of a Stern.

Sir L. R. Phillips' (Bart.) heir married a Jewish Lehmann.

Sir A. C. Cory-Wright's (Bart.) heir married a Jewish Tree; another son married a Levy.

Sir B. G. D. Sheffield's (Bart.) son married a Jewish Faudel-Phillips.

Sir J. H. B. Noble's (Bart.) son married the granddaughter of a Jewish Goldsmid.

Sir R. Bonsor's (Bart.) sister married a Jewish Hambro.

Sir H. W. Hulse's (Bart.) son has a Jewish Lawson as godfather.

Sir C. G. E. Welby's (Bart.) son married a Jewish Gregory.

In many of the above cases, the heir to the title is involved. Once more, we must emphasize how incomplete the above list still is.

We do not know exactly how to classify—

Baron Strabolgi, formerly Commander Kenworthy, Socialist M. P., but the Daily Telegraph of April 16, 1934, is less cautious and includes him in a list of what it described as the "leaders of British Jewry." Lord Strabolgi looks Jewish, boosts the Jewish nation at every opportunity and reacts like a Jew, and once was a director of the European & Caucasian Export & Import Co., which, as the Patriot states, May 23, 1929, had a capital of £2,200 and "could be nothing but an intermediary between the Soviet that found the banking security and the manufacturers who sold the goods."

Lord Marley is another baron who appears to be a little shy as to his ancestry; Burke simply reveals him to be the grandson of George Joachim Aman, but Lord Marley's actions show that, whatever he may be, he cannot regard it libelous to be described at least as an "artificial Jew"; he spends much of his time boosting Jews and defending Jew interests.

There are scores of other "lords" who are far too shy to reveal even their mothers' names. Surely it is an important thing that the British Democrat should know something of the origins of, say, Barons Arnold, Passfield, and Snell, seeing that they hold prominent positions in the affairs of our country. Then there is Baron Ashfield, whose father changed his name from Knatries to Stanley; this fact is not given in Burke's Peerage, and we should like to know if he was a Jew. Have we not a right to know?

What is the use of a peerage reference book which does not tell where Jewish blood comes in?

A statement originally made by Mr. Shane Leslie, that Lord Curzon of Kedleston had a Jewish grandmother, and repeated by B. Falk in He Laughed in Fleet Street has, we understand from Mr. Leslie himself, been withdrawn by him. We do not know whether or no it should have been withdrawn.

"For over 14 years she had counted Lady Rothschild as her best friend," said Lady Snowden, on March 19 at the jubilee appeal for the Jewish Association for the Protection of Girls, at Grosvenor House, Park Lane.

The Earls of Listowel and of Warwick helped to direct the Jewish Daily Post of London, which has since gone into liquidation.

According to the Jewish Chronicle of May 10, Lord Winterton stated in the House of Commons, May 7, that although he was not aware of any Jewish blood among his ancestors, he would be very proud of it if there was. Faugh!

Lady Diana Cooper's child had as its godfather the late Otto Kahn, of Kuhn, Loeb & Co.

The Balfours, Cecils, Churchills, Lyttons, Russells, and Stanleys seem to have a sort of hereditary lack of Aryan good taste in favoring Jews.

Lady Patricia Moore, daughter of the tenth Earl of Drogheda, served as head of a committee of the British Association of Maccabees in 1933, together with the careerist, Mr. Randolph Churchill. This is an exclusively Jewish national organization and we do not know what these two were doing there.

Adultery with Jews accounts for certain cases where individuals of obvious hither Asiatic race suddenly appear in old Aryan families of nobility. The usual chain of circumstances in these cases was described in The Fascist of May 1934, in an article called A Side Line of Usury. It is the greater scandal that these cases may not here be advertised so that the Eurasian progeny might be chivied out of our British aristocracy, which they must permanently contaminate. These Jew-features cross-breeds often further betray themselves by their instinctive leanings toward Marxism and finance and by a preference and sympathy for Jewish company and Jewish causes. They often live under the perpetual shadow of Jewish blackmail.

Generally speaking, when people of Aryan family look like Jews, they are Jewish.

KNIGHTS OF ENGLAND

The list of Jewish knights which follows gives no real idea of the Jewish contamination of the once-prized honor of knighthood. It is far more difficult to get at the ancestry of holders of non-hereditary titles than it is of the others. It is easier for your Jewish knight to camouflage himself, and there is no doubt whatever that there are as many Marrano Jews today in this country working for Jewry under Christianized names and under the Christian religion as ever there were in Spain and Portugal. We include in the list below only names of living knights of undoubted Jewish blood; we know there are scores of others, and we may be able to add to the list in future editions, particularly if our readers will assist us in the business of identification.

The appointments mentioned are either past or present ones.

Sir S. S. Abrahams, chief justice, Tanganyika.

Sir M. A. Abrahamson, of an engineering firm in Denmark; was commissioner for repatriation of British and Allied prisoners of war.

Sir George de S. Barrow.

Sir M. Bloch.

Sir M. J. Bonn, banker; chairman of London regional advisory committee for juvenile unemployment.

Sir Montague Burton, cut-price tailor.

Sir B. A. Cohen, barrister.

Sir L. L. Cohen, banker and stockbroker and member of numerous British economic committees.

Sir R. Waley Cohen, of Shell Oil and of Baldwins, Ltd.

Sir S. S. Cohen.

Sir A. Castellani, expert on tropical diseases. His daughter married Sir Miles Lampson.

Sir Albert Clavering (formerly Closenberg), propaganda officer, central conservative office.

Sir H. Courthope-Munroe (real name Isaacs). Has had many important appointments in industrial arbitration and church tithe work.

Sir S. D'A. Crookshank, major general; general secretary, officers' association.

Sir S. Dannreuther, son of a Jewish Ionides; deputy secretary, Air Ministry.

Sir Edmund Davis, director of many mining companies.

Sir Ernest Davis, New Zealand.

Sir Benjamin Drage, installment furniture dealer.

Sir W. Deedes, brigadier general.

Sir John Ducane, was commander in chief, British Army on the Rhine, 1924–27; Governor of Malta, 1927–31.

Sir P. H. Ezechiel 3d, crown agent to the colonies since 1920.
Sir D. E. D. Ezra, late sheriff of Calcutta.
Sir L. Franklin, of A. Keyser & Co., Jew bankers; was in charge of Belgian refugees at Folkestone.
Sir F. E. Fremantle, a descendant of the Jew Gideon.
Sir S. R. Fremantle, whose mother was an Isaacs.
Sir S. H. Fremantle, brother of foregoing.
Sir S. Gluckstein, tobacco magnate.
Sir F. W. Goldstone, general secretary, National Union of Teachers.
Sir W. H. Goschen, chairman of Sun Insurance office.
Sir H. Graumann, interested in South African gold and mayor of Johannesburg.
Sir A. M. Green, High Commissioner for India in London.
Sir C. E. Hambro, director of banks, insurance companies, etc.
Sir M. Hankey, clerk to H. M. Privy Council and secretary of countless international conferences. (See the Facist for May 1935). Name of his great-grandfather changed to Hankey from Alers.
Sir Victor Harari Pasha, director general of accounts, Egyptian Ministry of Finance.
Sir D. Harris, of De Beers.
Sir P. J. Hartog, Indian educationalist.
Sir P. G. Henriques, once assistant secretary, Ministry of Munitions.
Sir A. Hirtzel, in India office since 1894, becoming Permanent Under Secretary of State for India, 1924–30.
Sir G. B. Hurst, M. P. (formerly Hertz).
Sir Isaac A. Isaacs, Governor General of Australia. Member of the committee which formed the Australian constitution.
Sir J. G. Jarmay, of Brunner Mond & Co.
Sir F. L'E. Joseph, president of the Federation of British Industries.
Sir S. G. Joseph, mayor of Marylebone.
Sir E. Kadoorie, Iraq educationalist.
Sir Cecil H. Kisch, Assistant Under Secretary of State for India and member of international financial conferences as British representative.
Sir Leon Levison, author.
Sir C. B. Levita, lieutenant colonel.
Sir J. A. Levy, jewel dealer.
Sir H. C. Luke (Lusach), has held countless diplomatic key positions.
Sir F. J. Marquis, of Lewis', Ltd.; has occupied many key positions in industrial councils, etc., in this country.
Sir H. Marks, big-business man in South Seas.
Sir Charles Mendl, press attaché, British Embassy, Paris.
Sir S. F. Mendl, member of war office advisory committee on Army contracts.
Sir R. L. Mond, interesting himself in archaeology.
Sir H. A. Miers, geologist.
Sir M. Myers, chief justice of New Zealand.
Sir M. Nathan, has had five colonial governorships.
Sir F. G. Newbolt, official referee, supreme court.
Sir H. J. Newbolt, official naval historian, 1923; controller of wireless and cables in European War.
Sir E. Oppenheimer, chairman of Anglo-American Corporation of South Africa.
Sir F. Oppenheimer, British delegate in many international commissions.
Sir C. E. Pereira, major-general.
Sir F. Pollitzer.
Sir Landon Ronald, musical conductor.
Sir C. Rosenthal, major-general.
Sir W. Rothenstein, artist.
Sir Isidore Salmon, of J. Lyons & Co., served on many important public bodies.
Sir H. Samuelson.
Sir Claude Schuster, permanent secretary to Lord Chancelor.
Sir G. E. Schuster, on many bank directorates and financial commissions.
Sir C. D. Seligman, member of advisory committee of Export Credits Guarantee Department, Board of Trade.
Sir P. C. Simmons, London County council.
Sir E. D. Simon, Lord Mayor of Manchester.
Sir H. H. Slesser, lord justice.
Sir H. J. Stanley, Governor of Southern Rhodesia; real name, Sonnenthal.
Sir L. S. Sterling.
Sir Albert Stern, director-general, mechanical warfare department.
Sir H. Strakosch, expert on scores of Empire financial commissions; British financial representative, League of Nations.
Sir Aurel Stein, explorer and traveler to Tibet, etc.
Sir Thomas White, chairman of Central Valuation Committee for England and Wales.
Sir H. A. Wernher, chairman of Anglo-Swedish Society.
Sir A. Zimmern, professor of international relations, Oxford University.
Sir Otto Niemeyer denies he is Jewish; he does not look it; he is president of the Bank of International Settlements.

The following Knights now living have married women of Jewish blood:

Sir Percy Ashley married a Jewish Hayman. Has been lecturer on history, London School of Economics, and secretary, import duties advisory committee.
Sir J. M. Astbury married a Jewish Susman (first wife). Judge, high court.
Sir R. M. Banks married an Ehrman, widow of an Epstein. Judge.
Sir E. C. Benthall married the daughter of the Jewish Baron Cable; he was Lord Reading's agent in India.
Sir A. A. Biggs married a Pollak.
Sir C. V. Brooke married a Jewish Brett. Rajah of Sarawak.
Sir E. J. Cameron married an Isaacs. Has had many Colonial Governorships.
Sir C. E. Corkran married a Ricardo. General officer commanding, London district, 1928–32.
Sir R. W. Dalton married a Bamberger. Senior trade commissioner of several Dominions.
Sir David Davis married a Platner. Lord Mayor, Birmingham.
Sir S. S. Davis married a Jewish Davis. Many administration and financial appointments, particularly Palestine.
Sir F. H. Dent married a descendant of the Jew Gideon. Governor, London School of Economics.
Sir G. M. Franks married a Garcia. General, president Allied Commission of Organization, Turkey.
Sir R. Goddard married a Schuster. Judge, high court.
Sir A. Greer married a Van Noorden. Lord justice of appeal.
Sir C. J. C. Grant married the granddaughter of a Rothschild. General.
Sir J. Hanbury-Williams married a Reiss. Chief of British Military Mission with H. Q. Russian Army in Field, 1914–17.
Sir A. E. W. Harman married a Ricardo. General.
Sir Malcolm Hogg married the granddaughter of a Jew Gompertz.
Sir A. Hore married the widow of J. I. Belisha. Permanent Secretary, Minister of Pensions.
Sir H. K. Kitson married a Jewish de Pass. Admiral Superintendent of H. M. Dockyard, Portsmouth.
Sir Miles Lampson married a Castellani. High Commissioner, Egypt.
Sir K. Lee married a Strakosch. On many industrial commissions.
Sir H. J. Mackinder married a Ginsberg, director, London School of Economics, 1903–8; British High Commissioner, South Russia 1919–20; chairman, Imperial Economic Conference 1926–31.
Sir W. Morrison married a D'Costa. On legislative council, Jamaica.
Sir F. S. Parry married a descendant of the Jew Gideon. Private secretary, First Lord Treasury 1897–1902; has been deputy chairman, board of customs, for 25 years.
Sir W. T. Southorn married a Jewish Woolf. Colonial Secretary, Hong Kong.
Sir F. T. Spickernell married the descendant of a Jew Rosenzweig. Secretary to First Sea Lord for 8 years.
Sir M. M. Wood married the daughter of Moss Davis. Liberal whip.

Other knights have allowed their children to marry Jews or Jewesses, or have other family ties with Jews, as:

Sir Hugh S. Barnes' daughter has a Rothschild as son-in-law.
Sir F. Bowater's son married the daughter of a Jewish Franklin.
Sir J. F. S. Coleridge's daughter married a Seligman.
Sir W. Dalrymple's son married a Jewish Albu.
Sir Austin E. Harris's son married a Bahrens.
Sir J. A. Hawke's daughter married the Jew Sir P. C. Simmons.
Sir A. Hopkinson's daughter married Sir G. B. Hurst (Hertz).
Sir T. G. Horridge married the widow of A. Isenberg.
Sir Oliver Lodge's daughter married a Jewish Yarrow.
Sir W. Monckton's wife's stepfather is a Cohen.
Sir Guy Standing's daughter married a Jewish Leon.

Some of the knights mentioned are themselves Jewish, but we have no proofs in these cases and therefore make no distinctions.

The following are women of Jewish blood bearing titles as being widows of knights:

Lady M. Barnard (nee Loewen).
Lady C. M. Chermside, daughter of 1st Baron Reuter.
Lady De Pass (nee Mercado).
Lady A. de Villiers, daughter of Simon Davis.
Lady M. H. Egerton, daughter of a Jewish Franklin.
Lady A. Gollancz (nee Goldschmidt).
Lady A. R. Goodrich (nee Helbert, originally Israel).
Lady A. G. Gregg (nee Samuel).
Lady A. Hayter (nee Siessor).
Lady L. Henry (nee Levy).
Lady A. E. Henschell (nee Louis).
Lady H. E. F. Jacoby (nee Liepmann).
Lady D. F. James (nee Basevi).
Lady K. de V. Lambton, granddaughter of the Jew, Bernal Osborne.
Lady J. V Lucas (nee Henriques).
Lady P. Lyons (nee Cohen).
Lady A. Mandelberg (nee Barnett).
Lady V. A. Myers (nee Levy).
Lady A. E. Nathan (nee Sichel).
Lady E. Prince (nee Jonas).
Lady A. Z. Pringle (nee Levy).
Lady R. Samuel (nee Beddington).
Lady I. Snowden (nee Isaacs).
Lady F. Walston (nee Einstein).

So, there is something rotten in the state of Denmark.

We ask our readers to join us and to help to rouse what is left of the great British Nation to race-consciousness. No man or woman can escape the responsibility which the knowledge given in this pamphlet forces upon them. The task cannot be left to future generations, because every generation will be more Judaised than the one before it.

The great Jew-wise reformer, William Cobbett thus addressed the nobility of his day (about 1827) in his Letter to the Nobility of England:

"You feel * * * that you are not the men your grandfathers were; but you have come into your present state by slow degrees, and therefore you cannot tell, even to yourselves, not only how the change has come about, but you cannot tell what sort of change it really is. You may know what it is, however * * * when you reflect that your grandfathers would as soon have thought of dining with a chimney sweep than of dining with a jew or with any huckstering reptile who has amassed money by watching the turn of the market; that those grandfathers would have thought it no dishonor at all to sit at table with farmers, or even with laborers, but that they would have shunned the usurious tribe of loan jobbers, and other notorious changers of money as they would have shunned the whirlwind or the pestilence."

GENTLEMEN, YOU HAVE BEEN WARNED—KEEP TROTH

(Current engagements on going to press: The Marquess of Queensberry's daughter to Count Bendem, son of the new Jew Baron de Forest.)

Revised to November 30, 1937, enlarged with addition of new names and removal of others through death, and in three cases through error.

Examine This Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENNETT CHAMP CLARK

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 21 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

EDITORIAL FROM ROCKY MOUNTAIN NEWS ON PROPOSED DEPARTMENT OF NATIONAL DEFENSE

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial appearing in the Rocky Mountain News of Denver, Colo., on the 19th of this month, entitled "Examine This Plan," referring to a bill which I introduced to establish in the country a Department of National Defense, with a coordinate Division for Aviation.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senator BENNETT CLARK's bill to place all armed forces under one Department of National Defense, and to establish an air force equal in rank to the Army and Navy, should have a full and fair hearing. And without delay.

The stake may be nothing less than our collective neck.

We cannot afford to rely alone on the opinion of generals who feel at home only with their feet on the ground or a headquarters desk, or admirals trained to command from the bridge of a battleship.

Top-ranking generals and admirals, of course, are opposed to Senator CLARK's bill. Most of the top-rankers in the Army and Navy are men who started their careers back in the days when the Wright brothers were building and repairing bicycles. There was nothing about flying in the books they studied at West Point and Annapolis. Indeed, even today, the cadets at those two renowned institutions—the young men who are to be the ranking officers of the future—are not taught how to fly planes.

As long as we lived in a peaceful world and felt secure it was, perhaps, not important that aviation remained a stepchild of the military services. But in today's world, where security can be attained only through superior might, it may become vital.

It is at least questionable whether anything approaching real air power, of the caliber developed by Germany and Italy, can ever be achieved under the present system, where our Army and Navy each has an air force as an auxiliary branch—where, as Senator CLARK points out, there is between the two branches neither unity of command and tactics nor of design and procurement.

We can't afford to let air power remain a side line. Germany and Italy didn't. England was long in learning that—maybe too long.

Under Senator CLARK's bill, aviation would be promoted from a secondary to a primary arm of defense. The air force would be independent of, and equal in rank to, the Army and the Navy. The three services would be in one Government department, headed by a Secretary of National Defense—a sort of lieutenant commander in chief, taking orders only from the President, and directing and coordinating the activities and preparations of our armed forces, on land, at sea, and in the air.

We hope Congress will lose no time in examining this proposal.

Aviation's Sitdown Strike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENNETT CHAMP CLARK

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 21 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

ARTICLE FROM THE NATION

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article from The Nation of August 17, 1940, entitled "Aviation's Sitdown Strike."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From The Nation of August 17, 1940]

AVIATION'S SIT-DOWN STRIKE

(By I. F. Stone)

The aviation industry is still engaged in a sit-down strike against the national-defense program. The purpose of this strike is to squeeze every possible financial concession out of the Federal Government. "This is no time," Congressman BARDEN of North Carolina lectured shipyard workers in Kearny's quickly quashed strike last June, "for labor to try and grab off 10 cents an hour more." No such petty stakes are involved in the aviation companies' sit-down. Their strike has forced the administration and Congress to lift the profit limitations imposed on airplane contracts only a few weeks ago by the revised Vinson-Trammell Act, and is obtaining amortization privileges that will give aviation greatly expanded cost-free plants when the emergency or the war is over. But these concessions do not satisfy the industry. It is also seeking to block or postpone the enactment of an excess-profits tax. A huge backlog of British orders obtained on the juiciest terms the companies could exact from England's desperate need has provided the funds necessary to feed the industry during its sit-down against our defense program.

"Treason" was the cry of Congressman Cox, of Georgia, when United States Steel's shipyard employees at Kearny asked a raise of 10 cents an hour. No such harsh accusation has been made against the aviation companies, though plane contracts to the value of $85,000,000 have been held up by their recalcitrance. Instead, the blame is being placed upon the administration in a propaganda campaign that is mounting in intensity. The sit-down strike may yet play a part in the coming election, and aviation hopes that its resistance may help to bring in a new President who can be depended upon to grant it everything instead of almost everything. It need hardly be added that in all these objectives the aviation strikers are being helped by sympathetic picketing from the other defense industries, notably steel, which is staging a sit-down of its own on armor plate.

Last May the financial editor of the New York Sun, appalled by the British excess-profits tax, thought it "difficult for many Americans to understand how Britain can expect anyone to make the tremendous extra productive effort required by war without some stimulus other than the vague one that it is necessary to save the country." Aviation has demonstrated that it agrees with him that a national emergency is too vague a stimulus to call forth its best efforts. The companies which the Nye committee found were helping to build up Hitler's air fleet in violation of the treaty of peace with Germany are in no hurry to build up our own. Pratt & Whitney, Curtiss-Wright, and Douglas Aircraft were the companies named in the Nye report of April 20, 1936. Pratt & Whitney, Curtiss-Wright, and Douglas Aircraft are among the leaders of aviation's sit-down strike.

The Wall Street Journal, which knows its big-business men, smelled a scandal of this kind coming a month ago and sent out a staff man to do a series of articles on industry and its relation to defense. It reported "with pleasure" that "these extensive investigations reveal that the armament program is progressing without undue delay and without sound basis for criticism." Its investigator, surely a descendant of Voltaire's Candide, found that "American industry is operating with its typical efficiency. If, in

the future, delays inherent in the very size and scope of the program come to light, they certainly cannot be laid at the door of a fully cooperating private industry." On the contrary, the Wall Street Journal placed the blame on the War and Navy Departments, in spite of their readiness to speak for big business before congressional committees. "The difficulty of getting action out of the Government, and particularly the Army and Navy Departments" was cited as a principal cause for delay. But $85,000,000 worth of plane contracts cleared by Army, Navy, and Defense Commission are still waiting for the aviation industry to get into action. Since the President's call in May for 50,000 planes a year the industry has accepted contracts for only $900,378 worth of trainer planes. Barron's Financial Weekly, which cannot be accused of taking too implacable an attitude toward Wall Street, reported in its issue of July 29: "The attitude of some defense industries that they must be assured of a profit is souring many Washington dispositions, even in the probusiness War and Navy Departments."

The phrase "assured of a profit" is something of an understatement. No one expects the aviation industry to serve for $21 a month. The administration has been more than tender with it. When the national defense tax bill was rushed through the House on June 11, a gag rule was imposed to prevent amendments that would tax war profits or excess profits. "The most inequitable tax bill enacted by Congress in the last decade"—the words are Senator LA FOLLETTE'S—lowered income-tax exemptions, imposed a 10-percent supertax, enacted a long list of special sales and nuisance taxes, but added only 1 percent to the corporation tax and imposed none of the mounting profits that industry will soon be drawing from defense. Trouble began when the Senate Naval Affairs Committee on June 18 discovered that the Navy, without competitive bidding, had let a billion dollars' worth of shipbuilding contracts on the old World War basis of cost-plus-10-percent. The result was that Congress, just before the convention recess, revised the Vinson-Trammell Act of 1934 to lower profit limits on plane and ship contracts. The limit on the former had been 12 percent; on the latter, 10 percent. By the act of June 28, Congress reduced the profit limitation to 8 percent on the cost of competitively bid contracts and 7 percent on those negotiated privately. It was at that point that aviation's strike began.

These limitations governed not the return on capital but the margin of profit on the contract, and the profit allowed was clear profit. The Government agreed to pay the cost not only of the work done but of any additional plant necessary to do the work. If by some chance the contractor failed to make his full 8 or 7 percent he was to be allowed to make up the deficiency on other contracts during the succeeding 4 years. These conditions hardly seem confiscatory. The entire industry, nevertheless, lined up at the wailing wall. The United States News, edited by David Lawrence, accused the Treasury of harboring "a belief that patriotism rather than a desire for profits should motivate industry." The New Deal seems to have been innocent of any such subversive intention. The Wall Street Journal set out to show how ruinous the profit limitations could be—they might affect the raising of funds for expansion, research work would be cut. It applied the profit limits to the year 1939, admitting that the comparison was not quite fair because in that year production was not continuous or at capacity. Even on this basis the figures in the Wall Street Journal seemed less than disastrous. On the 7-percent basis the return on capital for eight major aviation companies would have ranged from 4.3 percent for Consolidated Aircraft to 28 percent for Lockheed. Lockheed's high return was due to its high capital turn-over in 1939, but all the companies will show a vastly increased capital turn-over with the defense program under way. Here are the Wall Street Journal's estimates:

	Percent
Boeing	21.5
Consolidated	4.3
Curtiss-Wright	9.8
Douglas	18.3
Lockheed	28.0
G. L. Martin	9.4
North American	20.2
United Aircraft	11.2

These rates of profit seem adequate, particularly in a national emergency, to "preserve and strengthen"—we quote from the National City Bank's July bulletin—"the system of private enterprise." Men in the trenches manage to sustain morale on a lower profit margin.

The bill embodying the new profit limits was signed by the President on June 28. On July 10 he surrendered to the sit-downers. The administration agreed to drop the profit limits. In addition it promised to enact legislation that would permit companies building new plant or installing new equipment to amortize these additions in 5 years. This means that 20 percent of the cost of this new plant or equipment may be deducted by the companies from their income before arriving at the net on which income taxes and excess-profits taxes must be paid. At the end of the 5-year period the companies would have plants completely paid off out of the sums received from the Government for planes. William S. Knudsen, head of the National Defense Advisory Commission, was jubilant. He emerged from the July 10 conference with the President to say that the tax and amortization agreement "would expedite many defense contracts with companies which have been reluctant to undertake such work." The Commission announced "the placing of contracts totaling approximately $100,000,000 since July 1 in a program under which negotiations have been conducted looking to the supply of 25,000 airplanes for our national defense." Louis Johnson, at that time Assistant Secretary of War, sent out a letter asking all plane manufacturers to begin work immediately on the contracts ready for them. He pointed out that the entire program would be delayed at least 60 days if they waited for Congress to enact the administration agreement into law. It was reported that the letter offered the protection of price revisions later if anything occurred to change the situation.

That the administration had the power to make good on its promise cannot be doubted. Any Congressman who refused to back the agreement could be accused of sabotaging the defense program. The companies decided to wait. "Although contracts for some 4,000 planes have been drawn and are awaiting signature," the Wall Street Journal reported, "it is understood that the industry has declined to accept the business until definite regulations are forthcoming on amortizing new plants. It was generally felt by Government officials—after an agreement between administration officials and Congressional tax leaders that new plants would be amortized over a 5-year period and the 8-percent profit limitation removed in favor of a new excess-profits tax—that contracts could be entered into immediately. However, the industry is reported to feel that it would be unwise to accept new business until exact regulations under whatever new law is passed are made known" The President was still hopeful. On July 16 he announced that replies to Assistant Secretary Johnson's letter "indicated that arrangements are being made now by the companies for tooling their plants to fill the orders, and in some instances they are proceeding with plant-expansion plans." These indications seem to have been slightly exaggerated.

The administration surrendered on July 10, but the strike was still on a month later. The excuse was that Congress had not yet written into law the promise made by the President and congressional leaders to repeal the limitation on plane profits and grant 5-year amortization. What really lay behind the continued strike was a struggle over the excess-profits tax. President Roosevelt coupled his announcement that he would back repeal of the profit-limit law with a pledge to impose excess-profits taxes on industry as a whole. The demand of the aviation companies for 5-year amortization gave the administration a bargaining weapon in pushing an excess-profits tax bill through Congress. Those who must pay the taxes naturally preferred a more leisurely pace—no action on excess profits at all, if that could be managed. The strategy of the aviation companies, acting in this respect as a spearhead for a drive by big business, was to sit tight, refuse to build planes, continue to cry for protection on amortization. If amortization could be rushed through Congress in a separate bill, it would be easier to delay or defeat an excess-profits tax.

Closely examined, the amortization issue itself is not a very real one. Under the Vinson-Trammell profit-limitation law, the cost of any additional plant or equipment is included in the contract costs before the profit margin is figured. Without any change in the tax law a measure of protection exists for companies which, for defense purposes, build plants that will be of no use to them in peacetime. The Treasury may allow for obsolescence, and a plant can become obsolete because there is no market for its products. Or an allowance can be obtained for the cost of turning it to peacetime uses. There will be a peacetime market for airplanes, perhaps a greater market than ever. If the companies are allowed 5-year amortization, they will have cost-free plants with which to build planes when the war is over.

Unless they obtain 5-year amortization the risk for the plane companies is that if at the end of the emergency they have no use for the plants, they may have no net income against which to take an obsolescence allowance. The allowance, of course, is an allowance against income or profits taxes. This risk is not very serious, particularly in view of the prices the companies are charging for planes. These should cover at least part of their capital expenditures. But even this slight measure of risk is more theoretical than real in the light of the way in which plant expansions will probably be financed. The case of Wright Aeronautical Corporation will illustrate the financial featherbed on which the companies may be wafted through this emergency.

Any plane company that needs a Government loan to finance plant expansion for defense will get it. Wright Aeronautical is the first to be offered such a loan, and the same terms are available to other companies. Engines are one of the bottlenecks in the plane program. United Aircraft and Wright are the only producers of high-powered air-cooled engines in this country. The Government began negotiations last May with the Wright company for the erection of a plant in Cincinnati to build these engines. Originally the Wright company was to be given a loan of $20,000,000 by the R. F. C. This was raised to $55,000,000 on June 20 and on July 26 to $92,000,000. The interest rate was reported to be 4 percent. The Wright company was to have an 8-year lease with the right to renew for another 8 years. The Treasury ruled that the Wright company could amortize the plant in 8 years. The Government was to pay the Wright company enough on the engine contracts to repay the loan in 8 years. At the end of the 8 years the Wright company could renew the lease for another 8 years with a cost-free plant, or it could sell the plant back to the Government, in which case the Government would pay for the plant twice. It cannot be said that under this

arrangement the Wright company would be embarking on a speculative venture. But just to eliminate any possible risk the loan was offered as a nonrecourse loan, that is, the Government would have no claim against the Wright company if it failed to repay the loan. All the Government could do in that case would be to take the factory. Since the plant would be financed entirely by the Government, the Government would really be taking back its own property if the Wright company for some reason wanted to drop it. The amount of the loan also would provide a generous margin of safety for the Wright company.

The Wall Street Journal reported on August 2 that while the loan was for $92,000,000, "the cost of the proposed plant, and its equipment, is understood to be only $37,000,000 or $38,000,000." When asked by the Journal correspondent about this apparent discrepancy, Jesse Jones said, "We don't believe it would be in the public interest to break down that total at this time." As this is being written the Wright contract has yet to be signed. The company is now asking for 5-year amortization instead of 8. Incidentally, a vice president of this finicky company, T. P. Wright, was assigned to the Defense Commission on June 8 to help speed up production. The home office doesn't seem too cooperative.

At the risk of tugging at the reader's heartstrings I want to conclude with the Wall Street Journal's analysis of what excess-profits taxes might do to the aviation companies. The joint congressional committee has recommended a 40-percent tax on earnings above the average for the years 1936–39. The Treasury wants a sliding scale ranging from 25 percent of profits over a 15-percent return on invested capital to 50 percent on profits over a 30-percent return. The Wall Street Journal applied the Canadian excess-profits tax to six major aviation companies on the basis of their 1940 business, as shown by reports for the first 6 months of this year. Canada takes 75 percent of earnings over average earnings from 1936 to 1939. The net profit for the six companies, after deducting a 75 percent excess-profits tax, would range from a low of 14.37 percent for Curtiss-Wright to a high of 53.35 percent for North American. These are the Wall Street Journal's figures, not mine, and the Wall Street Journal is not one to underestimate the plight to which a national emergency has reduced the 100-percent—if they can get it—patriots of the aviation industry.

Editorials on Foreign Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ERNEST LUNDEEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 21 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

FOREIGN POLICY EDITORIALS FROM WALLACE'S FARMER

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD several editorials on foreign affairs from Wallace's Farmer of Des Moines, Iowa.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Wallace's Farmer, January 29, 1938]

MORE BATTLESHIPS OR MORE A. A. A. MONEY?

Farmers are locking horns with the admirals and generals in Congress just now. Farmers are not satisfied with their $400,000,000 budget for soil-conservation expenses. They want at least $200,000,000 more to provide parity payments to help bring production under control on a voluntary basis and to assist in pushing farm income up.

The admirals and generals are not satisfied with the $600,000,000 they got annually for national defense in the period from 1923 to 1935. They want a 1939 budget of $991,000,000. Much of this increase goes to the Navy for new battleships.

Should the admirals and generals get their raise? If they do, it is pretty certain farmers won't get theirs.

Every farmer knows the argument for using parity payments to influence acreage and to increase farm income. But what is the argument for boosting Army and Navy expenses?

Two arguments are used. One is that we must have more ships for adequate national defense. The other is that spending this much extra money would help pay rolls and industry.

The second argument isn't worth much. If the Government wants to spend additional millions to stimulate business, let it invest the money in soil conservation, in bridges, schools, roads, or something else that has real value, instead of on battleships that will be junked in a few years. If we're going to spend money, let's spend it for something we can get some good out of.

The national-defense argument looks much stronger. Everybody is in favor of adequate national defense.

But adequate defense of what?

If we mean adequate defense of the United States, we have plenty of ships now. Our Navy is about the same size as Great Britain's, and far greater than that of any other nation. Naval experts tell us that for a foreign power to attack across the Pacific, and be strong enough to defeat our fleet in its home waters, it would have to have a navy twice as large as ours.

No foreign power, and no possible combination of foreign powers, has that large a navy.

But if, by adequate defense, we mean adequate defense, not of the United States, but of American investments all over the world, then our Navy isn't nearly large enough. If we want a navy big enough to protect our Chinese trade by defeating Japan in Asiatic waters, we should have a navy twice as big as that of Japan.

Congress cannot provide for adequate defense until it decides what the words mean.

For defense of the home country, the present Army and Navy and a budget on the basis of 1923–35 expenses are entirely adequate.

For defense of American investments everywhere in the world, we need an army and navy enormously increased, with a budget of billions, instead of the $991,000,000 asked for.

Which do we want?

Wallaces' Farmer and Iowa Homestead believes that Corn Belt farmers will prefer a defense program devoted to protection of the United States on a budgetary basis like that of the 1923–35 period.

But will Congress go along? Will Congress prefer to spend additional funds on supporting farm income or on supporting the makers of battleships?

[From Wallaces' Farmer, March 12, 1938]

PLENTY BIG ENOUGH FOR DEFENSE

To those easily frightened people who want to vote for a bigger Navy lest Japan come over and gobble us up, we want to quote from a statement of Admiral H. E. Yarnell, now in command of the Asiatic fleet. He said:

"When we come to discuss the problem of defending the Pacific coast, it is reasonable to assume that the enemy will require the same advantages and preparedness to come to our coast that we feel are necessary to us in advancing our forces to the western Pacific. Hence, the inhabitants of the Pacific coast can sleep quietly in their beds until Japan builds a navy twice the strength of that of the United States."

Last reports were that Japan had 10 battleships to our 15. And the battleship is the major weapon for an attack delivered across so many miles.

Admiral Yarnell has repeated the orthodox Navy view. To attack Japan successfully in her home waters, we would need a fleet twice as large as Japan's. For Japan to attack us successfully in our home waters, she would require a fleet twice as large as ours.

If the admirals are correct, then why does the United States need to build more battleships? If our present Navy is almost equal to a 30-battleship Japanese Navy in a defensive battle in our home waters, why should we worry about Japan's 10 ships? And why should we start a new billion-dollar shipbuilding program?

[From Wallace's Farmer, April 9, 1938]

TAKING THE ROAD TO WAR

Is the United States going to stick its nose into another European war?

Corn Belt farmers would like to know.

The signs are bad. In 1916, we were told that Great Britain and France were fighting to preserve democracy and end dictatorship. But when the war was over, we found that these powers were grabbing land and uniting in a vicious peace treaty that produced a new crop of dictators.

Today, the news is being broadcast in the United States that we must associate ourselves with Great Britain and France to check the advance of Hitler and Mussolini.

We ought to realize that it was the peace policy of Great Britain and France that hatched out Hitler, and that the menace of the dictators is a menace to Great Britain's Egypt and to France's Morocco, but not to us.

Neither Hitler nor Mussolini is trying to grab off New York or Miami.

We may not like dictators as well as we like the parliamentary governments of France and Great Britain, but is that dislike strong enough among our citizens to put us into another war to preserve the African and Asiatic possessions of the democratic powers?

In 1916, we began to develop a larger Army and Navy, presumably for defense, but actually as an offensive weapon to use in Europe the next year.

Today, we have made an increase in our annual military and Navy budget from the $600,000,000 that was ample in the 1923–35 period to nearly $991,000,000. And the House of Representatives has passed a bill providing for the expenditure of an additional $1,113,000,000 over the next few years for more naval weapons.

In 1916, before we entered the World War, the United States lent money to warring nations, and then we found that where our cash was there our hearts turned also. Today, the Johnson Act, which forbids any foreign nation that is in default on a debt to the United States, to float loans in this country, stands as a safeguard to keep us from committing a similar error. All of the major nations in Europe are in default to us. None, under the present act, can float bonds here.

But we must be constantly on the alert. Somebody will be trying to change that, too.

In 1916 we shipped munitions and goods of all kinds to warring nations and built up an artificial prosperity on war trade. Today our Neutrality Act forbids shipments of munitions to countries engaged in war.

But the Neutrality Act is in danger. An attempt is being made to change the act so that the President can decide whether he wants to stop any sales of munitions by this country to either side or to both sides.

That, of course, means that the President would be given the power to declare war. For the United States to aid one group of nations by shipping munitions and to injure another by blocking shipments would be considered an act of war by the injured group.

Farmers of the Corn Belt should urge their Senators and Representatives to keep the United States from retracing the same path that led us into the war in 1917.

Defeat the naval-expansion measure. Defend the Neutrality Act. And, in regard to military and naval expenses, let our slogan be, "Millions for defense, but not one cent to send troops or battleships to Europe or Asia!"

[From Wallace's Farmer of September 24, 1938]

LET'S KEEP OUT OF WAR!

No American wants to get into another World War today. Neither did any American in 1914 want to get into the World War then.

But we got in anyway, didn't we?

That can happen again, unless we are smart enough to avoid the wrong turnings we took in the road from 1914 to 1917.

As this is written, Germany is on the verge of war with Czechoslovakia, with a strong chance that Russia, France, Great Britain, and Italy may be involved also. The crisis may come this week or next or may be postponed for months. Yet most competent observers seem to think that an explosion is certain.

Now or later, Great Britain and France seem destined to clash with Germany and Italy in a struggle for the mastery of Europe.

What will the United States do then?

If we do what we did in the years from 1914 to 1917, we will:

1. Lend money to the warring nations.
2. Build up a war-trade boom in munitions and other goods.
3. Permit ourselves to be tricked into thinking that we can help ourselves or the world by going into the war.

Our decision to go into the World War was not actually made in 1917. It was made when we permitted foreign bonds to be floated here, and when we allowed the boom in war goods to rise to a point where we had to continue that boom, by participation in the war, or bring on a domestic crash by refusing to sell any more goods abroad on credit.

The United States must decide soon whether to repeat these mistakes or to avoid them. Our Neutrality Act now provides:

1. No loans to warring nations.
2. No shipments of munitions.
3. No sale of other goods to warring nations except on a cash-and-carry basis.

This cash-and-carry program is weakened by the provision that the President is given power to apply it or not as he chooses.

Our Neutrality Act will help to keep us out of trouble, if it is retained and strengthened. But there is a strong campaign on to repeal it and to let the United States take sides.

Farmers must see that the Neutrality Act is kept intact and made more vigorous. They will have to sacrifice something in so doing. They will sell less pork and less wheat to Europe, and at lower prices, if a cash-and-carry provision exists than if American ships are permitted to carry supplies to warring nations.

But, remembering what the last war did to them, farmers may be willing to make some sacrifices to stay out.

In the congressional campaign now on, farmers who want peace and are willing to pay for it should see that candidates for the National Congress are on record for the preserving and strengthening of the Neutrality Act.

This time, let's mind our own business and stay out of trouble.

Last Frontier

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES L. McNARY

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 21 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

ARTICLE BY RICHARD L. NEUBERGER IN AUGUST 1940 ISSUE OF FREE AMERICA

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the August 1940 issue of Free America, by Richard L. Neuberger, entitled "Last Frontier."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Free America, August 1940]

It has become axiomatic to say that the American frontier is gone. And perhaps in the old sense of the word it is. Forty-seven years have passed since Frederick Jackson Turner wrote his great essay on the impact which the passing of that frontier would have on our social and economic institutions. Yet the National Resources Committee maintains today that one vast region of the United States "still has some of the aspects of the frontier."

This region is the Pacific Northwest, stretching in timbered majesty from the Continental Divide to headlands that break off into the Pacific Ocean. It covers 11 percent of the country's area, but has only about 3 percent of the people. Seven times as large as the State of New York, it has a population about half that of New York City. Malheur County in Oregon, for example, encompasses more territory than New Jersey, yet is inhabited by fewer souls than the single New Jersey community of Ridgewood.

The Pacific Northwest represents an opportunity to build a society that will, in the opinion of President Roosevelt, "avoid some of the mistakes and wasteful exploitation of resources that have caused such serious problems in other parts of the country." The Northwest, which consists of Washington, Oregon, Idaho, and that section of Montana west of the crest of the Rockies, has yet to fall into the old patterns that jar the mind and eye in so many regions. Its destiny is still to be shaped. It can build a new civilization without having to rehabilitate a civilization already founded.

The most important resource in the Pacific Northwest is the Columbia River. This waterway, the second mightiest river on the continent, contains in the main stream and its tributaries 42 percent of all the latent hydroelectricity in the United States. The Columbia pushes through the Cascade Mountains with a ponderous strength that is beyond computation. It snaps at granite cliffs with talons of white-capped water. It surges inexorably against basalt battlements and sandstone bluffs. And now it tosses fitfully at the foundations of two enormous dams—Bonneville, a $75,000,000 goliath at tidewater, and Grand Coulee, biggest structure ever built by man, located in the heart of the inland empire.

These two huge undertakings will produce more power than the 14,082,282,000 kilowatt-hours turned out by the 260 electric plants in the State of New York. Obviously, all this staggering supply of energy cannot be used in the farms and homes of the Northwest. New industries must absorb a great portion of it. Will these industries be scattered all over the region or will they be concentrated near the source of power, clustered like pup tents about the dam?

In September of 1937 the President dedicated Bonneville Dam. Standing beneath the dark crags of the Columbia gorge, he delivered a speech which has been forgotten in the mad welter of wars, foreign crises, and political emergencies. Yet it was an important speech from the standpoint of America's future, and particularly important to the future of the Pacific Northwest. The President said the Northwest should not be a land of new "Pittsburghs." And then he added: "It is because I am thinking of the Nation and the region 50 years from now that I venture the further prophesy that as time passes we will do everything in our power to encourage the building up of the smaller communities of the United States. Today many people are beginning to realize that there is an inherent weakness in cities which become too large and inherent strength in a wider geographical distribution of population.

"No one would suggest that the great cities of Portland and Tacoma and Seattle and Spokane should stop their growth, but it is a fact that they could grow unhealthily at the expense of all the smaller communities of which they form logical centers."

This speech went further in the direction of what John Chamberlain calls a "free, decentralist economy" than any other utterance by Mr. Roosevelt. The policy it inaugurated in the Northwest has also been in that direction. "Postage-stamp rates" govern the cost of power from Bonneville Dam. This means that the rates are no higher at the end of the transmission line than in the immediate vicinity of Bonneville. The necessity for new "Pittsburghs" is obviated. Two factories built to make use of Bonneville power—the Aluminum Co. of America and the Sierra Iron Works—are under construction not in Portland or Seattle but in the much smaller community of Vancouver, Wash. (population, 15,766). The Pennsylvania Salt Co. has an option on land in the Oregon hamlet of Cascade Locks (population, 1,135).

Near both Vancouver and Cascade Locks are grassy slopes and timbered swales where people can cultivate small farms. When the country was in the worst throes of the depression some unemployed families from the cities trekked to Yacolt Mountain, not far from Vancouver. They cleared land, built cabins, and tilled gardens. Today they are still there, living off the soil. The Northwest is not yet blanketed with cities, towns, roadways, and factories. All its territory has not been taken up. The Federal Government owns half the region.

With thousands of men and women struggling with submarginal farms in the Middle West, with the metropolitan areas of the Atlantic seaboard crowded and jammed, the Pacific Northwest is

a national safety valve. It is the one section of America capable of absorbing more population. Maj. Roy F. Bessey, of the National Resources Committee, announces that "with a reasonable development program, from one million to two and a half million additional people could readily be absorbed in the Pacific Northwest within a generation. Migration toward the region during recent years seems to indicate that the population increase may approach the higher figure."

The Northwest is vast and expansive. The population increase to which Major Bessey refers should be spread throughout the region and not concentrated in a few localities. This is not alone the hope of President Roosevelt. CHARLES L. MCNARY, senior Senator from Oregon and Republican candidate for Vice President, has often advocated the development of the whole river basin. He thinks every home ought to have a "kitchen garden." Several years ago Stuart Chase proposed that the Northwest be stabilized by having industrial workers there live on small farms that would serve as "anchors to windward" if the jobs threaten to give out.

The most important development now taking place in the Pacific Northwest is the construction of Grand Coulee. This stupendous structure, today nearing completion, will be the world's major source of hydroelectricity. It also will irrigate 1,200,000 acres of land, an area almost equal to all the farms in the State of Connecticut. This will not be soil that yields its bounty grudgingly. It will be rich, fertile land on an alluvial plainland capable of growing pears, peas, strawberries, apples, and the other prize fruits and vegetables of the Northwest.

The Coulee section will not be allowed to become either an overpopulated metropolitan area or a feudal domain of corporate farms. Congressman CHARLES H. LEAVY, of Spokane, has pointed out that the purpose of Grand Coulee is to take care of as many families as possible. Accordingly landownership at the great project will be restricted to 80 acres for a family and 40 acres for a single man. Combines and other large-scale operations will not be permitted. Land held in defiance of this limitation will be denied water from the Government canals and ditches.

At the same time that the dam itself rises above the murmuring river, the Bureau of Reclamation and the National Resources Committee are working to bar from the agricultural area the mistakes which are a blight in so many sections of the country. Jammed towns and crowded communities will be taboo. Recreational centers, schools, rural parks, warehouses, markets, public buildings—all will dot the entire 1,200,000 acres rather than become concentrated in any one place. An effort will be made to secure truck gardens even for the men and women living in the villages and hamlets. The land will be the basis of the whole society. And, as the St. Louis Post-Dispatch has claimed, the troublesome dilemma of agricultural surpluses will be largely avoided if most of the food raised at Grand Coulee is thus used for home consumption.

Irrigation and reclamation projects are the hope of the Northwest. Secretary of the Interior Ickes has estimated that besides Grand Coulee, smaller irrigation enterprises can reclaim 104,491 acres in the region. Such undertakings are bolstering the population total. One county in Oregon has increased 75 percent in inhabitants since 1930. This is due exclusively to a busy sugar-beet industry made possible by irrigation dams. The farms are not large, but they have been successful and are supporting hundreds of families. Many of these families are migrants from the Dust Bowl and other dried-out agricultural areas.

It is not without significance that the population rise in the Pacific Northwest in the last 10 years has been predominantly in the rural and suburban districts. The decade just closed was productive of events that sent 200,000 people trekking to the State of Washington, 175,000 to Oregon and 85,000 to Idaho. They have not rushed to the cities. "In the past few years," says Arthur Langlie, the mayor of Seattle, "there has been a trend of population away from the cities to the suburban areas." And augmenting his statement, the Seattle Post-Intelligencer observes, "Seattle folk are demanding and getting lebensraum."

Seattle is the biggest city in the Northwest. Since 1930 its population has changed only slightly. Yet the surrounding countryside has filled up like a mushroom patch. Suburban communities dot numerous roads and highways. Groves of fir trees have been cut down, and in their place are rural homes with small truck-gardens. Most of these people work in Seattle, but they live outside Seattle in the adjacent rural districts. Seattle itself has had the smallest proportionate census increase in 60 years, yet the Pacific Northwest as a whole reports extensive gains.

Consider what has happened in Oregon. Portland is the only community of metropolitan proportions in that State. Since 1930 the Portland population has increased 2 percent. But the entire State has gained 14 percent, and the rural regions around Portland have soared 33 percent. Newcomers formerly rode into Portland on a train and took a lease on four rooms in an apartment house. Now they roll in on a wide highway, driving their coupe or sedan, and start making down payments on a bungalow and truck garden 14 or 15 miles from the city proper.

The eminent geographer J. Russell Smith once declared, "Basing my assertion on past history and economic and industrial conditions of today, it is in the Northwest where I expect American civilization, in many ways, to reach its maximum. Yes; I expect that it will outstrip New York, overcoming the advantage which the metropolis has had of an early start." Predictions of this sort are quite common in the Northwest. Why not? We live in an electric age, and any area with the greatest power stream on earth is bound to have the open sesame to future industrial development.

Although the people of the Columbia Basin want to fulfill J. Russell Smith's glowing prophecy and outstrip New York in some respects, they are not eager to outstrip it in others. Glittering word pictures of an industrial mecca have not been applauded in the region. The residents want new industries, new manufacturing, new mills, but they do not want crowded cities, densely settled factory towns, houses row on row like shoe boxes on a shelf. This attitude has been demonstrated many times.

Before President Roosevelt delivered his dedicatory address at Bonneville Dam, controversy over the disposal of the project's energy had been taking place for 6 months. One group wanted a vast factory community concentrated near the dam. The other faction maintained that factories should be scattered all over the Northwest, that power rates should not favor nearby industries and thus tend to build up new "Pittsburghs." The latter group won out. It attracted the support of most of the people. It defeated for reelection the Oregon Governor, who had been the main advocate of the new "Pittsburgh" idea.

There is no doubt that the Pacific Northwest requires more industrial development. Today the region ships out raw materials—timber, wheat, salmon, copper, apples—and buys back finished products. This unfavorable balance of trade cannot continue indefinitely. Resources play out some time. A Douglas fir can be sawed down in an hour; it took a couple of centuries to grow. Ultimately the Northwest must process and manufacture many of its raw products. But it does not want to trade the problems of a frontier, a frontier that may be even a colonial empire, if you please, for the more aggravating problems of a complex metropolitan area.

"Let our workshops remain in Europe," warned Jefferson. During the struggle over Bonneville power rates, these words of his appeared in many rural papers: "I view great cities as pestilential to the health, the morals, and the liberties of man." Inasmuch as he had first sent Lewis and Clark westward, he was cited as the unquestionable authority on the region's destiny. The mandate eventually ordered for the same electric rates all along the transmission line—a line 275 miles long—was not a mandate against factories and industries per se, but against industries and factories compounded into places like Pittsburgh, Chicago, and Detroit.

Men and women in the Pacific Northwest have a chance to combine manufacturing progress with home life close to the soil. The region is still untrammeled and open; and the inhabitants have not lost their pioneering zeal. They would rather live bravely than hit the jackpot. "Stricken the region is now, its pioneer economy a wreck," wrote George Leighton a year ago, analyzing the collapse of the lumber industry. "But its people still are free." And free they are, choosing a frontier society to an imitation of the Atlantic seaboard.

"I think we must still continue," says E. B. MacNaughton, a forward-looking banker in Portland, "to make it possible for people who have been divested of their chance to be able again to strike their boots in and become self-respecting members in our communities and in our States." Unlike California, where the migrants are adrift on the highways, the Northwest has offered sanctuary to the wanderers from the midwestern drought regions. Many of them have found new farms; some have taken over old farms and made them yield pay crops.

The frontier is closed in the sense that Professor Turner considered it. No longer can a man wander into the Idaho wilderness and find land stretching to the horizon that will grow heavy stands of wheat. But in the Columbia River Basin, conservation and development still can be used to reclaim some of the frontier. Dams and canals and tree breaks can provide new acreage. Hundreds of farms on the gaunt plateaus, thousands of truck gardens in the dales and valleys near Portland and Seattle, indicate that all avenues of escape from the city are not yet barred. The Northwest remains.

Steps Toward British Union, a World State, and International Strife—Part VI

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. THORKELSON

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 21, 1940

ARTICLE FROM THE SAN FRANCISCO LEADER, FEBRUARY 17 AND 24, 1912

Mr. THORKELSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I include an article which is a reprint from the San Francisco Leader of February 17

and 24, 1912, by Lillian Scott Troy. The article is entitled "Benedict Arnold Peace Society—Some Inside and Interesting History of the Infamous Peace Proposal—How the Scheme To Form an Alliance With England Is Being Engineered—Carnegie's Crafty Method."

This is in line with the other matter which I have inserted in the RECORD, of which it is part VI. In these articles I have made it a point to show that this insidious British influence to return the United States as a colony of Great Britain has been active for over a hundred years.

[Reprinted from The Leader of February 17 and February 24, 1912, San Francisco, Calif.]

BENEDICT ARNOLD PEACE SOCIETY—SOME INSIDE AND INTERESTING HISTORY OF THE INFAMOUS "PEACE" PROPOSAL; HOW THE SCHEME TO FORM AN ALLIANCE WITH ENGLAND IS BEING ENGINEERED; CARNEGIE'S CRAFTY METHOD

(By Lillian Scott Troy)

Andrew Carnegie is in high favor in England just now. Britons who formerly sneered at the return of the Scot American to his native Highland heath biyearly, now nod satisfied approval when the iron master's name is mentioned.

When English sneer, they hate; when they hate, they hate forever. Why this sudden change? Carnegie's money? No! His libraries, hero funds, etc.? No! His ambition? Yes!

Within the soul of the little Scotsman dwells a burning weakness, which only an experienced physiognomist could discern in his immobile features.

Ambition! Mad ambition; the ambition of Caesar.

The man who so cleverly amassed one of the largest individual fortunes it has been man's luck to gather together in the age of the world would be less than human had he not some weakness. To be ambitious is good but to be ambitious with a feverish but deliberate intensity which sacrifices principle for trickery and craftiness is bad. The master mind that engineered the ways and means to a colossal fortune has no limitations! Carnegie expands and basks in the limelight; it is the one joy of his declining years.

Since the visit of King Edward to Skibo Castle in Scotland, a new germ of ambition has been sown in the mind and soul of the Scotsman. On that memorable day, when he was honored by the King of England, a flag floated over Skibo Castle, which showed the Stars and Stripes on one side and the British flag on the other. As the King was leaving the castle, after offering Carnegie a dukedom—on terms, the laird of the castle is said to have raised his hand to the flag and exclaimed subjectively, "Your Majesty entered Skibo Castle under the American flag, and the British flag flies over your Majesty as you leave. May there be only one flag over Skibo Castle when your Majesty graciously design to enter again, and may that flag be the British flag. And may it also float over the United States from the Atlantic to the Pacific."

Immediately after the peacemaker's visit, the Carnegie peace fund was started in America.

The fair name of peace was substituted for treachery and betrayal. The word "peace" caught the popular mind for the moment. The subtlety which marks the character of Andrew Carnegie forbade mentioning arbitration with England until the peace fund had been well advertised, and duly cemented in the minds of the American people as the best scheme for good the laird of Skibo had initiated.

The "Peace" Fund Committee was painstakingly selected, with a careful regard for future development. And trading under the holy name of "peace" the object and aim of this congenial committee (neat salaries, etc.) was what? To sell the United States to England!

These were the terms demanded for Carnegie's dukedom! His money could buy men buyable, to favor "peace," it could buy or lease secretly newspapers to spread broadcast Carnegian doctrine until their protean proclivities gradually permeated into easily influenced minds; it could hire unnaturalized Englishmen or Canadians who had lived and amassed fortunes in the United States but who found the land of their long residence too inferior for adoption, to spread the doctrine; and lastly, to be ultracharitable, it could even pull the wool over the eyes of the President of the United States!

This sudden haste about arbitration was unwittingly brought about by the impending war between England and Germany. Carnegie was forced on against his will and more farsighted judgment to bring about a working "entente" with the United States before Germany made any hostile move against England. In fact, the United States was to be held over the head of their friend Germany in the shape of a "big stick" by England.

Look well at the men who are talking themselves hoarse trying to tell us why we must have arbitration with England. Is there a man amongst them who is a representative American? Is there one whose patriotism for America we would class with that of Washington, Jefferson, or with that of any of the great men who have passed away, but whose example of shunning "entangling alliances" has helped to make America what it is today, the sun in the constellation of nations?

Of Carnegie I have already spoken—and sparingly. And what of Mr. Eliot of Harvard? We are told that the gentleman is an Englishman and as such probably knows what is good for England more interestedly than he knows what is bad for America.

Mr. Choate, the ex-Ambassador to Great Britain? This gentleman was principally notorious for his ultra-English tendencies and sympathies when Ambassador to Great Britain; and any fame he may have attained was chiefly as an after-dinner speaker.

Mr. Whitelaw Reid, the present Ambassador to Great Britain? This gentleman is remarkable for the facility with which he manages to marry his relatives of the gentler sex off to decadent members of the English nobility; and also almost famous for the beaming smile he bestowed upon Commander Sims of the U. S. S. *Minnesota* when that previously inspired American officer made his clever faux pas at the Guildhall luncheon in London, given to the officers and sailors of the American Fleet in the Thames some short time since. This speech, which the Englishment gulped down with joy, and which gave serious offense to Germany, contained these most un-American sentiments:

"If Great Britain were to be threatened with an external foe, she could count upon every dollar, every man, and every drop of blood in America."

Like the famous speech of an ex-President of the United States at the Guildhall some time previous, it is generally accepted that Commander Sims simply had his little say, as he was parroted to, and felt amply repaid in the genial nod and beaming smile of approval of the American Ambassador.

This speech was intended to convey false news to Germany; it was intended to scare Germany off.

If the little "feeler" passed unchallenged in America, the intended end would have been accomplished; if exception were taken as to how and for whom we Americans were willing to shed every drop of our blood, there was Sims to be the scapegoat.

I am in Germany as I write this and I want to say right here that Commander Sims' unlucky inspiration has done exactly what these "Benedict Arnolds" expected it to do, and the American people have been greatly injured in the eyes of a friendly nation. Without any other reason than that the Germans have made such wonderful progress in their foreign trade, England has continually insulted and misrepresented German motives and ideals until an industrious people have had the last straw added and they are going to have compensation.

The Boer War opened the eyes of England to her own delinquency and she discovered, after all the rest of the world had done so, that she was the happy possessor of an army that was "brag" and a navy officered by sap-headed gentlemen's sons which was all "boast."

The bragging, boasting, and bluffing went merrily on, but Great Britain immediately began to look around for crutches and a cane. She made an alliance with Japan; Germany minded her own business and sawed wood. She made an "entente" with her old bitter enemy, France; Germany continued to saw wood and work. She made an alliance with Russia and then triumphantly began to insult Germany. She made demands on Germany—commanded her to cease increasing her navy. Germany quietly told Great Britain that her armaments would increase in the ratio of Great Britain's hostile alliances. England tried bluffing and got her bluff nearly called. Germany said she was ready to take her chances with the quartet of England, Japan, France, and Russia, but politely added that she much preferred to work and increase the prosperity and happiness of her people; but * * * If Great Britain wished to have a little fracas * * * "Barkis was willin'."

Like the slinking coyote which has the will and desire but not the courage to pounce on the lamb, England, with all the reinforcements of three other hungry powers, decided that the time to attack Germany had not yet come. And then the question of how, was the nightmare of Great Britain. A man of initiative, clever in handling difficult situations with dispatch was needed. America was looked to with covetous eyes—but no Englishman dare suggest arbitration. Why? Because the American mind would immediately become suspicious of a "nigger in the woodpile." The suggestion must come from an American! It must appear as if America graciously made the initial move, and England immediately fell into her arms.

Andrew Carnegie, whose sentiments were always British, while willing to father the scheme and pay the bills, was too far sighted to openly suggest the idea himself, knowing the propensity of the American people to ask embarrassing questions, so he whispered first to the King, and the peacemaker found Carnegie's whisper so dashingly funny that he must hold his kingly sides in acute risibility.

The question of arbitration with England must come from no lesser an American than the President of the United States!

Pulling England's chestnuts out of the fire—no wonder the King laughed!

Then the canny Scot, the clever organizer, came to the United States on mischief bent. He tickled President Taft under the ribs and cooed something into his ear—several things. And out of a clear sky "our" President—all by himself (?)—holds out the glad hand to England and says, "Let us arbitrate."

And he says he thought it all out by himself! Ananias!

One high in authority and near to the Throne, in a speech in 1908 said: "In seven years the Union Jack will float over the whole of the United States."

Elihu Root wishes us to celebrate one hundred years of peace with England in 1915—the seventh year. Synchronism!

Why not celebrate with our friends, with whom we have never had war? Why celebrate with the only nation on earth who has always been and still is our own enemy, the only nation who has had the distinction of oppressing us, and whose smoldering hate

and contempt for the "Yankee" is only second to the hate and ill will she bears her Irish and Indian subjects?

The present King of England openly boasts that if George III (3rd) had held court in New York, there would have been no American Revolution. The Queen, a woman hard and cold as Queen Elizabeth but without Elizabeth's brains, detests Americans fiercely. No opportunity is lost in showing her royal contempt even to American women who have, by marrying musty and decaying scions of the British nobility, not only reinstated their husbands in three full meals a day, but their whole families as well.

The Duchess of Marlborough was insulted before the world at the Coronation. Why? Because she was a hated "Yankee".

It is quite safe to say that the only Americans who are treated by the English royalties as if they were human beings are the numerous relatives of Ambassador Reid. Not that the Reids are supposed to be in any degree more eligible than any other American family, but because Mr. Reid is and may still be very useful in furthering the arbitration treaty—and a few other things.

The Liberal and the Irish parties have on two occasions taken serious umbrage at Ambassador Reid's attempt to take sides in the British election. At one time it was thought that the Irish party would take the matter to Washington.

On last Thanksgiving Day, Ambassador Reid contemptuously aired his opinion of Americans at the dinner given by the American Society in London. He said that Americans who visited England were generally of two kinds: Those who referred to America as "God's country" and who couldn't find anything as good in England as in America, and women who wished to intrude their republican presence on English royalty.

And thus in a public speech did the man who represents the United States in Great Britain hold his own countrymen and countrywomen up to ridicule. And on Thanksgiving Day, a day on which, if he couldn't bring himself to say something fair and kind, he had done better to have held his peace.

The English newspapers made much of Ambassador Reid's anti-American speech. Many were the gloating references made to the effect that even the American Ambassador could not stand his own people. And why, may the American people consistently ask, does our patriotic reference to the United States as "God's country" exasperate Mr. Whitelaw Reid to such an extent that he must select Thanksgiving Day of all days to criticize at a public dinner our warm-hearted and truthful reference to our own country? As to the American women he holds in such contempt for endeavoring to "intrude" their republican presence on English royalty, why should they not, if they wish to, and royalty wants their money to save the disintegrating nobility? Can Mr. Reid, with all his close experience of royalty, begin to compare any royal house in the world with even the average American family? No! Can he compare any of the royal women with American women in refinement, courtesy, genuine kindness, brains, wit, or honorable pride and virtue? No doubt the United States Ambassador, knowing the distaste the English King and Queen have for Americans, would turn it to account by barring out all but his numerous family and family-in-law from the sensitive royal presence. One has only to glance casually at the picture of the group of guests at Ambassador Reid's country home in England, where King Edward is seen sitting close to D. O. Mills, Mr. Reid's father-in-law, to observe the angry and disgusted expression on His Majesty's face at being roped in so neatly and being obliged to sit and have his royal face and figure taken "with that d——d old nobody, Mills."

But the possibility of an entente with America, and possibly in time—well, the King was only playing the game, even if it did upset him.

Cecil Rhodes' dream of empire found expression in his legacy providing for the education of American youths in England. Rhodes hoped that the process of time would gradually prove an influence in changing the history of the United States as it is written and studied in America to the way England teaches it in her colleges and desires that it should be taught in America in order to "do justice to England."

Rhodes sagaciously remarked that as far as education went, every 10 years saw a new generation. As the influence of American boys educated under English direction increased, so would the tendency to rewrite the history of the United States become easier to suggest and more certain of success. The history of our country as written, studied, and believed in England would put Baron Munchausen to shame.

The first seeds of hate for America are sown in the young student's mind by a cruelly calumnious attack upon George Washington. George Washington is spoken of as a "most inferior rebel general." One wonders what were the delinquencies of the British he whipped. Children are taught that Americans are the refuse of Europe; the descendents of servants, adventurers, and criminals.

The Japanese are right when they say that a secret is best kept by three men when only one man knows it.

Intoxicated with what appeared to them as signs of success in the great "peace" fraud, there are a few whose loquacity, whose brag of American dependence, is more fluent than their silence. Hence this article.

We are told in England that Andrew Carnegie is a loyal subject of the King, and has sworn allegiance to the British crown. Although born a Scotsman, no American cares a rap whether he is a Scotsman or a Frenchman or a Russian, but we most certainly do take exception to his pretending to the American people that he is acting for the best interests of America as an American when he is neither the one thing, nor doing the other.

Why was President Taft in such an indelicate hurry to rush the arbitration treaties through the Senate last July? Because Germany was preparing to attack Great Britain in August, and only the moral influence of a possible entente between Great Britain and the United States, which at a moment's notice could be widened into an offensive and defensive alliance, prevented hostilities.

Mr. Astor, otherwise known as the expatriated American, is keenly in favor of "peace." That's enough to make us suspicious. He loves America so.

John Hays Hammond is in favor of "peace," too. Our President commented most kindly on the warm reception accorded Mr. Hammond at the coronation last June.

And why was John Hays Hammond sent to represent the United States at the coronation of the King and Queen? Why did he receive such a fall-into-my-waiting-arms reception? Because he fought in South Africa with the English against the brave Boers. Also because he is all for England and Carnegie "peace."

While no one in their normal senses would question or attack the patriotism, guilelessness or artless simplicity of heart of Elihu Root, yet—keep your weather eye on him.

Many reputable citizens whose patriotism was unquestioned were misled into taking an active interest in public demonstrations in favor of the special brand of buncombe called Carnegie "peace." The chief aim and object of getting prominent names associated with Mr. Carnegie's scheme was partially successful for a short period but now the eyes of the deceived are widely opened to the full and complete campaign of treachery launched against the United States in Skibo Castle.

If the arbitration treaties must be discussed in the Senate, let the debate be an open session, and let us mark well the men who call upon the dishonored spirit of Benedict Arnold to help them to a ready flow of eloquence that they may hide under their scintillating utterances the sardonic curl of a traitor's lips.

The following is what a few very ambitious but traitorous Americans in high positions could tell us if they would, and to which policies they have either pledged their wealth, their brains, or their influence. Many of these men are under pay from a fund which has given none of its "peace" money to prevent war between Italy and Turkey, or any other nations or peoples at war; a fund which under a false name, is only being used, and only will be used to assist to the utmost the destruction of American independence, and the slow or fast betraying of America's nationhood into the ready hands of the only genuine enemies she has ever had.

As far as can be ascertained, the following are the guidance rules laid down for the accomplishment of this secret society which we can make no mistake in calling the "Benedict Arnold Peace Society."

1. Power of the President of the United States to be increased so as to gradually diminish the powers of Congress.

2. Supreme Court of the United States to be revised so as to embrace only judges agreeable to absorption by Great Britain, and uniformly hostile to the United States Senate.

3. Precedents must be established by said Court against the United States Senate in rulings, decisions, etc., (specially prepared).

4. Strong campaign must be waged in the several States and Territories against Congressmen and Senators showing hosility to Great Britain. If unsuccessful in defeating them, they must be continually watched until discovered in some overt act, mainly personal, and under threat of exposure forced to resign.

5. When the success of the arbitration treaties is assured a few unimportant disputes between the United States and Great Britain may arise, in which the preference must be given to the United States. These apparent victories must be widely advertised in order to create confidence in the propitiousness of arbitration with Great Britain. While the scope of the treaties must be of considerable latitude, care must be taken not to in any way bring such questions as to the fortification or navigation of the Panama Canal, or the Monroe Doctrine, into dispute until the situation is under firm control.

6. As soon as compatible with conditions, the arbitration treaties must be widened into an offensive and defensive alliance.

7. On accomplishment of same, British and American naval officers must be mutually exchanged, but care must be taken that this suggestion is made by an American.

8. Quietly and unobtrusively, American soldiers must be sent to Egypt and India; British soldiers may then be quartered in the United States.

9. English royalty, preferably the Duke and Duchess of Connaught, must be sent to Canada, from whence they must make frequent trips to New York. But great care must be taken not to enter Washington if there is a demonstration against them, or until they have practically "held court" in New York.

10. The wives and daughters of men controlling great wealth and influence in America must be given preference at these "courts." They must be selected carefully from every State and Territory in the United States. Thus a new "society," through royal favor, must quietly and expeditiously be created.

11. Honors must be conferred on the husbands of women thus given preference in the social circles of America, and a rank or position determined by judiciously distributed decorations.

12. Honor must be conferred on all American officers favoring "peace."

13. The women of men showing hostility to "peace" must be socially ostracized.

14. When a strong phalanx of influential people in favor of "peace" has been created, and the exchange of British and American naval officers accomplished, and as many as possible of the United States troops transported to India, the King and Queen of England may then visit Washington.

15. Should any demonstration of hostilities to their Majesties occur, the Hindu troops and the British may, in the absence of the American soldiers, quell any disturbances.

16. Men whose wealth prevents their being influenced by money must have honors and position and possibly a title dangled before their wives' eyes.

17. When newspapers cannot be bought or leased, new publications must be started.

18. Educators must receive special favors in flattering newspaper notices; and wide publicity must not be given to Independence Day celebrations; people persisting in demonstrations must be "cut" and held up to ridicule. Any demonstrations with fireworks must be strongly opposed and discouraged on the ground of protection to life and property.

19. An elaborate celebration must be arranged to take place in the United States in 1915, to commemorate 100 years of peace between Great Britain and America, by which time the object and aim of "peace" will be at the apex of consummation.

20. Education of the masses must be discouraged, in order to create harmony with the desires of the wealthy and the several trusts, who will see in such a suggestion a strong tendency to reduce wages from their now unreasonable heights to the basis of wages paid in Great Britain; also, the suggestion that the ignorant cannot organize so formidably as the educated masses will be widely appreciated as dissension and suspicion of their own leaders can be more easily advanced.

21. A popular feeling against Irish immigration may be aroused in the United States by giving wide publicity to all individual cases of rejection of immigrants for reasons of acute poverty, insanity or criminality, or disease.

22. Arbitration, offensive or defensive alliances, and finally peace must be brought about as quickly as possible. For the latter, armed compulsion may be necessary, and it is recommended that the Indian and British troops be altogether confined to the east of America, leaving the protection of the west to the Japanese troops, 80,000 of which are already scattered throughout the Sandwich Islands, Mexico, British Columbia, and California. Reciprocity with Canada can be passed almost unanimously through the American Congress, and then opposed bitterly in Canada on one ground only—that of annexation by the United States. Simultaneously with the rejection of reciprocity by the Canadian people, a member of the British royal family, preferably the Duke of Connaught, must take up his residence in Canada.

23. With the assistance of some interested and powerful trust, such as the Meat Trust, strained relations may be brought about between Germany and the United States; in such event, and with a defensive and offensive alliance with Great Britain, a casus belli of England would be more easily turned into account by a simultaneous attack on Germany. Great Britain's diplomatic relations with Germany must remain intact until the consummation of the alliances with the United States.

24. It is suggested to embrace France in the arbitration treaties, for the moment, as suspicion must not be created during the initial efforts.

It will be remembered that when the Japanese hero of Port Arthur visited the United States last summer, he graciously informed us that "arbitration between Great Britain and the United States would be such a benefit to the United States." He had just come fresh from England; he hadn't been provisionally promised the Philippines, either in the event of * * *.

As the great Japanese admiral placed a wreath at Washington's Tomb, did any of us remember the almost prophetic words of the first American President, "to beware of entangling alliances"?

Let the shades of Benedict Arnold blush for shame, for there are those today who exceedeth him in treachery and betrayal. Away with the Carnegian peace at the price of liberty!

England's attempted dictation and interference both in our internal and foreign affairs is plainly and boldly illustrated in a book written by Lieutenant Colonel Lowther, military secretary and official mouthpiece of the Duke of Connaught. Lieutenant Lowther says that he suggested a solution of the Japanese tangle to Colonel Roosevelt, namely, that the United States of America should give the Japanese all the facilities they asked for in California, on condition that the Empire of the Rising Sun should take over the Philippines from the United States.

In these few words Lieutenant Lowther has embodied two shots for one bird:

Firstly, the flooding of the United States with cheap coolie labor will reduce wages, thus gradually making it more difficult for the man in ordinary circumstances to spare enough money to support his children during the time they should be in school, and thereby making it necessary for children's education to be reduced to the level of the children of the poor in England, which would tend in a very short time to make for a sharp class distinction or "illiterate rabble." This latter class is regarded as very desirable in England, as the more ignorant the lower classes, the more easily they are controlled.

Secondly, Japan wants the Philippines. Her alliance with England was made for one purpose, and that was, by the careful and cunning treading of certain intricate and complicated paths of diplomacy, to bring about the peaceful or otherwise militant absorption of the Philippines. England's alliance with Japan was made to offer the tempting bait of the Philippines as a reward for services which Japan must be ever prepared and ready to offer, if necessary.

What about the Japanese coaling station recently discovered in Mexico? Preparation?

Lieutenant Colonel Lowther has held the post of naval attaché; his advice has been highly appreciated in the deliberations of his Government; he has lately accompanied the uncle of the King of England to the United States as military secretary and official mouthpiece; therefore let no one discount his set idea of what our policy with the Philippines should be; a man so strictly trained in the policy and diplomacy of his Government speaks with authority from his King and government.

Should a suggestion be made to Congress that "it will be next to impossible to hold the Philippines without increasing our Army, which will entail a great burden of expense on the United States," it will be well to investigate the company the suggester of this statement has been keeping; also, if it is his own opinion, or if it is the opening wedge to the proposal of the English officer, Lieutenant Colonel Lowther, military attaché and official mouthpiece of the Duke of Connaught, to "turn over the Philippines to the Empire of the Rising Sun." * * *

The opening chapter of Lieutenant Colonel Lowther's book, in its general exaggeration of lawlessness in the United States, has helped to cement the idea in the English mind that the United States must come under British rule speedily.

Simultaneously with the publication of this British officer's book depicting Americans as a lot of wholesale murderers, devoid of the slightest honor or courage, and comparing them detrimentally to the gentlemen he had known in Pall Mall, he was scattering broadcast in New York and Washington his hypocritical expression of admiration for "the great Republic and the American people." His comparison of the Canadian soldier to the United States soldier leaves nothing to be admired in the American soldier. In fact, every reference to anything or anybody in America is teeming with contempt and bitterness. Even the clubs in the United States, which received him with open-hearted hospitality, he refers to with sneering contempt, and, to be accurate, one must say that many of his statements regarding the people whose bread he broke are devoid of the merits of truth.

The inefficiency of the Senators and Representatives is systematically advertised to the British public in cleverly written magazine and newspaper articles and books. The English portion of the British public are not overly given to think for themselves; when they read that India "must be governed," Egypt "must be governed," they are one with the Government; and now that they are daily and weekly being fed on the suggestion that the United States has completely gone to the bow-wows, and can only be saved if she throws herself into British arms, they won't let go of the idea, and will help to a man to bring about the consummation of "Carnegie peace."

Even Mr. A. Maurice Low, an Englishman who has lived in the United States for 20 years, tells his countrymen the following in his book on America:

"Secrecy is often essential in negotiations, but secrecy is impossible when a treaty must be communicated to the Senate. The Senate is not popular with the country at large."

He goes on to explain that Members of the Senate are certain to break their oath of secrecy taken regarding "executive sessions." He also says, "It is generally believed that Members of Congress, as a body, are corrupt."

Lest some of my statements regarding the hatred the English people cherish for America and the Americans be doubted, I am going to give a few extracts from a book written by an Englishman during the last term of the ex-President in the White House. While the actual literary merits of this book may be nil, its long and complicated sentences obscure and badly constructed, and its syntax amateurish, nevertheless its purpose and its veiled meaning is as clear as crystal. Every page of this book shows malice; every paragraph venom. When I first began to read this book—on the recommendation of another English writer that I would find out some truths about my own country—I naturally supposed the publication to be a sort of "freak" idea; but on closer investigation of all books written by Englishmen about the United States I found that nearly all of these books contained far-fetched lies and calumnies written with pens that were steeped in bitter jealousy, detestation, and hatred. "Americans who favor 'Carnegie peace,' otherwise called 'absorption,' will do well to read 'Y, America's Peril.'" The Y is intended to mean Yankee. This book is intensely popular in England, no less a personage than the late King Edward finding in it the best book on the "Yankee" he has ever read. The author is almost a hero. You had better make up your minds to read some things which you will find real "nawsty."

Following are a few printable extracts from this book:

"There can be no doubt that America is the dumping ground of Europe's refuse; it is the scum of other lands. It has no right to be called a nation. Everything in the United States seemed unwholesome. I think the desire for gold is so deep-rooted in Yankee that if he could "beat" his own father he would do it. In less than three generations the United States will be unfit for a civilized lady or gentleman to live in.

"From the boy who shines your boots to the Senator, they are a nation of boodlers. Americans are the cast-offs from every land on the face of the earth.

I saw a good deal of the American woman—in fact, "most all" that she could show me without exposing herself to Yankee's anger.

Verily Yankee's women, and sometimes unwise ones, do not believe in hiding the light of their charms under a bushel or anything else. By the time I had been in the States a month, I began to ask myself, was any woman in the land to be trusted?

I was informed * * * that in a western town, there was not a virtuous woman, and that 75 percent of them had suffered from "modern appendicitis."

(Writer's note—particulars regarding the explanation of this last statement, which appears in the book, cannot be printed.)

Yankee is a deadly assassin, worse than a rattlesnake. Yankee is awfully brave, especially when it is 20 to 1. Yankee does not care to fight with his fists. The American police are no more fitted for police than a barrel; they bear a resemblance to a walrus on end. The standard of fair play, even that of good taste, is not the same as in England. Yankee is vulgar and ignorant. He wears tan shoes with a dress suit. The typical American has no intellectuality. He has a nether lip like a motherless foal reared on a whisky bottle. His hair is cut "slop bowl" fashion. He is sallow, with pointed narrow jaw. Of this type are made magistrate, judges, and so forth. Young men of America are of the ladylike type. Men in America are effeminate looking. They are a mixture of poodle dog and girl.

It is quite a rarity to see an American city-bred child with legs. Their poor little apologetic pipestems are simply pitiful. Already this process of decay has begun. Yankee has no instep. His foot is as flat as a pancake and as "narrow as the trend of his mind." * * * His legs are thin, and so infrequently is his body. He is a tramcar. I visited the Philadelphia University and had a look through the dental school there. I inquired carefully for the specialists who would not take on anything but canines. I found that it had not come to that yet, but it is trending that way.

The carrion-eating vulture would have suited the Americans quite as well as an emblem of liberty as the eagle.

In four generations when the aggressive newness of the Congressional Library at Washington has been toned down, it may be a fine building. The Capitol is shoddy.

The English writers of books, and those who write for the press, have attacked and calumniated every ideal of our nationhood for generations, but they have left the virtue of our women unassailed until of late years. Where one heard a grudging compliment paid to the virtue of our women, now we hear the most cruel and untruthful aspersions cast upon them individually and collectively. There is no use to remonstrate; they will tell you that several English writers who visited the States have written in their books that the American woman is simply "rotten," and they ought to know. The English are more like sheep than lions; they herd close together in their opinions, which they generally do not form for themselves and when the leader of the flock says "bah," they all "bah, bah." If he says "boo," they all "boo" together. They read Y, America's Peril, because the King read it. They like it for the same reason he liked it—because it "slammed it to the Yankee upstarts."

This particular writer says he came away from America with a nasty taste in his mouth. He says the first hotel he stayed at was in San Francisco and the waiters look like "a lot of dirty brigands."

He evidently bears a most venomous spleen for Washington, like the rest of his compatriots. He says he doesn't see how Washington could have been an American if he never told a lie. Writing of the Washington Monument at Washington, he waxes torpidly eloquent. He says that Washington's Monument is a mere elevator "and like everything in America, from justice on, it is hollow and corrupt." He says the Washington Monument is typical of American usages and customs—hollow and corrupt. He adds: "Yankee! Yankee! have you anything in your land that is not hollow?" He calls the American boys "young American dastards. * * * Poor, pitiful little Yankees."

It is puzzling and singular that the only American he admires is Theodore Roosevelt, of whom he speaks pityingly as "Roosevelt, president of champion spitters of the world."

Like many Englishmen, he frets because on our currency we have the words "In God we trust." He says that this should be changed. It is to be wondered if the inspiration to eliminate "In God we trust" from our currency during the term of office of the only American this Englishman admired was done to solve the particular sensitiveness of this anti-American Britisher.

He says, "The dollar is dirty in the West. It is positively filthy in the East, both metaphorically and actually."

The inscription "In God we trust" is a lying religious inscription.

He says that he apostrophized a Negro thus: "Aye! Whiter than you, Yankee, except for about a hundredth of an inch. Whiter than you!"

Americans will be surprised to learn the author's story of the Battle of Manila Bay, but they may rest assured that if the history of the United States is rewritten according to Carnegian ideas and to coincide with the British patriotism of Prof. Morse Stephens, of the State university at Berkeley, Calif., this, in a few generations, will be accepted as the correct version:

"England beat the Spaniards at Manila. This isn't generally known, and I got the strictest confidence from a certain admiral in Chicago when Dewey gave the whole secret away."

This writer tells his readers that Dewey went all the way to Manila without ascertaining if he had certain guns and ammunition. In consternation, Dewey sent to Admiral Seymour, of the British squadron in Manila Bay, and obtained the guns and British ammunition with which the Spanish were whipped.

He says that Dewey was confused as to what to do in the battle and signaled Seymour, who from the British flagship directed the American admiral how to proceed, signaling "Fire your port broadsides," and in reference to one Spanish ship Admiral Seymour directed Admiral Dewey not to fire but to "blow her out of the water."

The closing reference to the battle of Manila Bay is as follows: "And now you have for the first time the story of how the English beat the Spaniards at Manila."

This book, which so pleased the late King, and which was read so widely in England, did not miss its mark—the ever growing tendency of the English public to accept as final that the absorption of America by Great Britain would simply be a matter of a few years.

Referring to the United States being skillfully steered into British waters, one is astounded to read that "courageous President Roosevelt realizes the decaying tendencies of the United States of America. A skillful pilot is at the helm, and he is not unaware of the danger * * * but his assistants—what of them?" (The Senate).

Continuing, he says he hopes the President will "wear ship" ere it is too late, and steer the ship into the safe and deep waters beyond (England). His book ends with the expression of a certain conviction that America and Great Britain would "go hand in hand and that time is not far off," and a full-paged curse on the United States and its citizens:

"Land of sallow, scurrying men!
Land of bribery and corruption!
Land of the greasy food!
Thrice cursed art thou!"

But these British plans for the peaceful or militant absorption of the United States, with the assistance of Andrew Carnegie's executive ability and money, the treason of members of the Benedict Arnold Peace Society, and the willing cooperation of the rewriters of the history of the United States have gone sadly amuck on account of the threatened war between England and Germany. The matter of the arbitration treaty with England has been unduly and indecently rushed, much to Mr. Carnegie's displeasure; this indelicate haste was caused by the hysterical announcement of Lord Charles Beresford, the hero of many a naval parade, that the British Navy was not what it seemed; that the Navy was "without officers, without men, without the necessary units, and in the event of war with Germany the British Navy would be a present to the enemy."

Plans for the peaceful or otherwise absorption of the United States were overwhelmed with the fear that Germany would give unto herself a present of the British Navy, and possibly even more. While the plans of Carnegian peace were not scheduled to be ripe for a test until 1915, the fear of war with Germany in the immediate present forced the issue with such feverish haste that more than one cat was let out of the bag of diplomacy. England could not tax her people any heavier than she was taxing them, and even if she had the necessary funds at her command to build a navy that would compare with Germany's she did not have time. Germany was ready to spring, and England had little faith in the French and Russian Navies combined against the Germany Navy. She dare not expect the Japanese Navy to fight ship to ship with the Russian Navy for fear they might remember old scores and forget they were fighting for England and turn their guns upon each other.

There was only one subtle influence which could stay Germany's hand, and that was the arbitration treaty between England and the United States and the possible ratification of that treaty by the United States Senate. The treaty was sprung upon the Senate, just as reciprocity with Canada was, and it did not occur to the British Government that there would be any difficulty in quietly slipping the treaty through the Senate, and quickly widening it into a defensive and offensive alliance.

There have been times in the history of the United States when the country has not only been threatened with enemies from without, but also from traitors from within.

There have been times when the United States Senate has taken upon itself the functions of a court of impeachment.

If war is to come between England and Germany, let us keep our hands off. While deploring war and the horrors of war, we must choose between the lesser of the 2 evils—the killing of some thousands in battle or the continual oppressing and torturing of millions. A war between England and Germany would mean the killing of perhaps a few thousand men; but it would also mean liberty for 350,000,000 oppressed of India; liberty for 12,000,000 Persians; liberty for 4,000,000 Irish; liberty for the struggling Egyptians from Alexandria to the Sudan. It might even mean the peace of the world—the break in the trail of blood.

From the Sudan to London, Theodore Roosevelt hurrahed for England; in Egypt he told a patriotic and brave people to be "loyal" to the British Government; he said English rule in India was great. Ask the Indians. Ask the Egyptians! * * * and you might also ask Mr. Morgan Shuster. Hands off!

Carnegie set up the Church Peace Union in 1914 with a $2,000,000 fund to further his aims.

World Alliance for Promoting International Friendship through the Churches has as its stated purpose "To organize the religious forces of the world so that the weight of all churches and Christians can be brought to bear upon the relations of governments and peoples."

The Betrayal of France

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 21 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

ARTICLE BY HARTLEY W. BARCLAY

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, in accordance with the permission granted to me, I present for printing in the Record an article by Hartley W. Barclay, entitled "The Betrayal of France," published in Mill and Factory for July 1940.

The article is as follows:

[From Mill and Factory for July 1940]

THE BETRAYAL OF FRANCE—POLITICALLY AND INDUSTRIALLY SABOTAGED BY THE "FIFTH COLUMN," FRANCE BECAME AN EASY VICTIM OF TOTALITARIAN POWER BECAUSE IT WAS ECONOMICALLY HAMSTRUNG. THIS DEBACLE OF DEMOCRACY WAS NOTHING LESS THAN AN "INSIDE JOB." IT IS AN OBJECT LESSON FOR AMERICA

(By Hartley W. Barclay)

Treachery and treason went unpunished in France, it is alleged by reliable reporters, because these tactics destroyed the power of the government to punish the culprits who engaged in undermining the power of the nation. When the French Army, formerly vaunted as the finest army in the world, admitted defeat and surrendered in the middle of June at Bordeaux, the last act of dishonor had been committed by those who dedicated their activities to Communist and Socialist intrigue, rather than to the development of social and economic stability within the nation. The seeds of dissension and class warfare had been well sown. The sabotage of national defense had been completed. Either by accident or design the theories of Henri Barbusse, Leon Jouhaux, Leon Blum, and other assorted leftists of varied hues had brought the nation finally to its knees. In this tragic extermination of democracy lies a lesson for America. If leftist power remains unchecked here, it continues to exist at the risk of the United States paying the same price for minority dictation that was paid by France.

When world depression hit France, Communist influence brought to life a variety of measures of government intervention in control of economic life. France, like America, had her economic planners. France, like America, substituted visionary idealism for practical realism, despite the fact that unemployment was never as serious a problem in France as in the United States. France earlier limited the employment of aliens, a step which this Nation is now beginning to take, with the result that French citizens exclusively received the entire benefit of French depression alleviatives. The new measure recently introduced, that American employers can employ not more than 10 percent aliens, was adopted by France more than a year and a half ago. Relief payments in France were limited to French nationals. The severity of the economic depression in the United States in terms of real income, in comparison with the French people, is shown by the accompanying table which was published by National Industrial Conference Board in May 1939.

The French Utopianists won a sweeping victory at the polls in 1936. The Popular Front coalition, headed by Socialist Leon Blum and supported by the C. G. T., won a sweeping victory at the polls amid an epidemic of sit-down strikes and merchandised by the promise of extreme social reforms. The Matigon agreement was used as a measure of dealing with the sit-down strikes, through introducing immediate wage increases and the labor code was revised so that public authorities could intervene to enact collective-bargaining agreements and to impose them, despite the objections of employers. New laws provided for 40-hour weeks, paid vacations, public-works jobs, and other benefits under the devalued franc. The French equivalent of the American "60 families" was known as "200 families," and to break their hypothetical monopoly on jobs the Bank of France was reorganized and Leon Jouhaux was made a principal officer of the bank with the title of regent. Then the Government stepped in to control money markets, just as they have been controlled here. Direct control was exercised over key industries related to national defense. Direct price control was imposed. Agricultural regulation and control was carried to extremes. The principal tenet of the Popular Front was that the purchasing power of the masses could be raised and recovery induced by thorough-going economic reforms.

These demands voiced in Paris paralleled demands voiced in other nations—all sponsored by Popular Front advocates—and yet in none of the countries subjected to the "blitzkrieg" can be found any Popular Front advocates who were capable of assisting their countries when the Nazi "blitzkrieg" hit in full force.

TABLE 1.—*National income, France and United States, 1929–38*

[Sources: France—Leopold Dugé de Bernonville, "Les Revenues Privés," Revue d'Economie Politique, Paris, May to June, 1937, p. 549 (1937) estimates by the (Conference Board); United States—the Conference Board]

Year	Total national income [1]		National income per capita		Per capita income		Per capita real income (adjusted for changes in cost of living)	
	France	United States	France	United States [1]	Index numbers, 1929=100		Index numbers, 1929=100	
					France	United States	France	United States
	Billions of francs	*Millions of dollars*	*Francs*	*Dollars*				
1929	245	79,324	5,942	653	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
1930	243	72,187	5,840	586	98.3	89.7	94.1	93.0
1931	229	59,834	5,471	482	92.1	73.8	90.9	84.7
1932	206	46,244	4,921	370	82.8	56.7	87.4	72.9
1933	199	43,944	4,751	349	80.0	53.4	87.9	71.5
1934	184	50,283	4,386	397	73.8	60.8	84.8	76.7
1935	172	54,732	4,101	429	69.0	65.7	84.4	79.6
1936	189	64,437	4,510	501	75.9	76.7	84.7	90.5
1937	212	68,221	5,054	528	85.1	80.9	79.5	91.4
1938		[2] 60,910		[2] 468		[2] 71.7		[2] 83.2

[1] Estimates for the United States have been adjusted to conform to the French definition of national income, which consists of total production income plus other accountable items as follows: Interest on mortgages on owned homes, net rent on rented farm and nonfarm homes, work relief from public and private sources, pensions and compensation for injuries derived from government.

[2] Preliminary.

FRENCH MILITARY PREPAREDNESS PLAN

A complete French mobilization plan was presented to the Chamber of Deputies in 1924 as bill No. 6949. Although it was never passed in its entirety many features of the bill were placed in effect. It provided for economic organization in time of war. Each minister was made responsible for the assembly of any resource or material or any class of resources that was in their field. Each ministry was required in time of peace to evaluate the needs of each ministry to satisfy wartime requirements. They were required to determine the facilities for the procurement of all types of raw materials, commodities, manufactured products, tools, motive power, labor, means of communication, and other resources necessary for the successful prosecution of war. The Superior Council of National Defense was established as the official agency for planned distribution and mobilization of industrial resources. A decree dated August 11, 1936, provided for the total or partial expropriation of private industrial enterprises by the French Government. On April 5, 1938, France is reported to have been spending 30,000,000,000 francs annually in preparation for war. The kinds of munitions purchased included revolvers and automatic pistols, rifles and carbines, machine guns and automatic rifles, field guns, howitzers and trench mortars, ammunition, projectiles and cartridge cases, grenades, bombs, torpedoes and mines, special sighting devices, fire-control apparatus and listening-in devises, tanks and armored cars, warships, aircraft carriers, destroyers, and submarines, aircraft, including replacement motors and parts, and chemical warfare materials. Great defense preparations had been completed including the highly vaunted Maginot line and the French Army had been hailed as the finest army in the world. Yet with all these defense preparations and large supplies of material on hand, the impregnable Maginot line was pierced, the Flanders defense was lost, and Paris fell before the Nazi drives.

The weaknesses of France proved to be primarily industrial in character generated by leftists' demands for extreme forms of social control which made adequate preparedness impossible.

FORESIGHT LACKING

Where Germany had used foresight in locating airplane plants in concealed, remote, and inaccessible locations, France did not develop protected plants in safe areas until after conditions became critical. When Germany completed underground hangars on protected air bases, France clung to conventional-type above-ground hangars fully exposed to bombing. Not having learned from experience, France reconstructed her northern industrial areas on the same sites where they were demolished during the last war. The development of new manufacturing areas remote from the 1914–18 battlefields was secondary to the rehabilitation of war-torn industrial districts.

The French airplane-production plan was of hapless design. It had fallen behind schedule by 1938 and French plants were producing only 54 planes per month compared with 500 per month produced in Germany at that time. The general characteristics of the industrial plan in 1938 provided for governmental subsidy of the merchant marine and completion of the electrification of railroads rather than adequate national defense. Although in 1890 France recognized the importance of adequate industrial preparedness and commenced planning the handling of food supplies in military emergencies, the plans were never fully or adequately

developed. Similarly a plan of developing adequate reserve supplies of munitions had been developed, but this plan was soon made a football for political exploitation. In both 1914 and 1940, France made the common error of underestimating the ability of modern defense armies to consume supplies and the ability of offensive armies to destroy. Just as there was a 20- to 36-month delay in 1914 in meeting the material requirements of the French Army the inadequacy of emergency production schedules in 1940 proved to be the weakest link in the plan of preparedness.

POLITICAL BLUNDERING

This fault cannot fairly be charged to the military leaders of France. Rather, the blame belongs upon political leaders who continuously diverted the attention of the nation from real problems and concentrated mass interest upon utopian political objectives. In 1936 the Popular Front government passed 40-hour-week legislation. The result was the precipitation of an economic crisis for business and industry. This step was the climax to a trend of constantly increasing the percentage of the total national income spent by government. The following table shows how this expenditure grew:

COST OF GOVERNMENT IN FRANCE—PERCENT OF NATIONAL INCOME PER YEAR

1913	20
1929	26
1930–31	33
1932	38.5
1935	46
1936	41
1937	50

To insure the progress of so-called social reforms, in December 1936 the French Government granted a virtual debt moratorium to small business concerns on rent payments and on promissory notes given in payment of business obligations. In addition, legislation was passed to provide all employers with cheap Government-guaranteed credits from the Bank of France for sums equivalent to increased wage costs incurred by conforming to social-reform legislation.

The results of the Popular Front social reforms were these:

1. Diverted attention from adequate national defense.
2. Nationalized key munitions industries, thus rendering them inefficient and nonproductive.
3. Internal prices rose 47 percent at retail in 1936–38.
4. Internal prices rose 62 percent at wholesale in 1936–38.
5. External prices were higher than world levels, making it economically impossible for France to maintain favorable trade balances.
6. The highly vaunted increased consumer purchasing power predicted to result from politically decreed wage increases was wholly absorbed by rising prices while the purchasing power of the fixed-income classes was more than cut in half and the capital losses of the wealthy classes were irreplaceable.
7. Labor-reform measures seriously interfered with the French rearmament program. Although France had only 40,000 skilled workers available for rearmament production, according to the French Minister of War, Italy at that same time had 80,000 and Germany had 100,000. In Germany at this time (1938) the skilled workers were working 52 hours per week, while in French factories they worked only 37 hours per week. At best, therefore, French workers were producing goods at the rate of only 1,480,000 man-hours per week while German workers were producing at the rate of 5,200,000 hours per week. After reviewing this comparison, even in 1938, military experts said: "In its present conception, the 40-hour week is incompatible with adequate national defense and the security of the country, and all credits (Government) will be useless if steps are not taken to increase working hours."

It should not be forgotten that at that time France was economically favored. Germany was driven to acceptance of substitutes—ersatz materials—because of natural raw-material deficiencies. Even in the depths of depression, however, France, with her colonial empire, was well supplied with food and industrial materials. Through favorable treaties she had access to supplies unavailable to Germany. She was economically self-sufficient in food, wood, salt, potash, coal, iron, bauxite, and antimony. She had adequate cork, alcohol, sugar, bromine, glycerine, wheat, and nitrates. Although some strategic raw materials of importance were lacking—such as rubber and cotton, copper, lead and mercury, tin, sulfur, and manganese—the allies of France favored her with terms and arrangements for procurement of these materials on schedules which could not be duplicated by Germany. With these natural advantages, France lacked an adequate labor supply; therefore she, like the United States, admitted alien labor. During the decade from 1921 to 1931 more than 1,750,000 alien workers were admitted, with the result that, like the United States, since 1931 there was a serious surplus of alien labor. This alien labor was readily victimized by political opportunists when depression set in, and the unemployed alien-labor group was most prominent in the planned labor disturbances which arose during the administration of the Popular Front cabinet.

A war-material program was authorized in 1936. It amounted to a test of the organization set-up designed to control production. Even then, tests showed that this plan failed to meet the productivity scheduled. Output was lower and costs were higher than was expected. By a decree dated January 16, 1937, political leaders decided to seize the fanciest and juiciest plum in the whole national-defense field. Therefore, the aero plants were nationalized (i. e., taken over for governmental operation). The justification given was that the Government needed to create an industry capable of maximum production. Twenty-three aircraft factories and one engine plant were expropriated. In addition, 12 munitions firms, included the noted Schneider-Creusot Co. were grabbed by the expropriators. At that time, it was adequately pointed out that far from aiding aircraft production, the step actually hindered expansion of output. The real motive was obviously political. It tended to further increase the financial burdens of the state at a time when further financial burdens were embarrassing. Immediately the step increased costs and reduced production efficiency.

ENTERPRISE STIFLED

It encouraged French Communists, already a powerful group to seize even more power. The decree tended to destroy public confidence and to stifle enterprise and initiative among industrial entrepreneurs. It placed inefficient management in charge of plants—replacing capable management. The government's payments for the plants were made slowly—behind schedule. Development work and research virtually stagnated in aircraft fields. Efficient engineering was displaced and bureaucratic political planning was imposed. Labor became indifferent to its responsibilities. Morale in the French Army decreased to a low ebb. In 1936, despite an increase in the budget for aircraft of 18 percent, production decreased 65 percent, and even then the modernization of design of the airplanes produced was not up to foreign standards. The question of nationalization of industry became a fiercely fought political issue. Labor stabbed France in the back, directed by Leon Jouhaux (a notorious ally of Henri Barbusse, noted French Stalinist Communist) and strikes set in quickly in the government-owned plants. It was at this time that the door was opened for Hitler—by the joint action of overreaching labor groups and the traitorous incompetence of the Popular Front government of Leon Blum and his radical Socialist-Communist adherents.

Charles Rist, a French economist, summarized the 1938 plight of the French Government from an economic standpoint when he asked, "How can France support a budget of 85,000,000,000 francs when only 55,000,000,000 is provided by taxes and the remaining 30,000,000,000 must be raised in some other way?" The response from the Blum government was further enlargement of public expenditures. But, as was to be expected, this failed to increase either the national income or the productivity of French industry. Indeed, just the opposite occurred. Blum's "social reforms" boosted costs of production and widened the great gap between income and expenditures. The French Parliament, after borrowing up to the limit on both short-term and long-term loans, on March 10, 1937, authorized the Blum administration to float the first national-defense loan at 4½-percent interest. However, by June the funds had been spent, the treasury was again empty, and further heavy borrowing from the Bank of France was necessary. This marked the turning point in the political fortunes of Leon Blum. He asked for emergency powers to act by decree—virtually demanded dictatorial control over France—and was turned down by the hostile conservative senate on June 19, 1937, and the popular-front cabinet resigned.

Blum's successors were given even wider decree powers than those which Blum had demanded. But even in the haste to modify laws and relax restrictions upon industry, it could be seen that French industry could never recover rapidly enough to meet the impending crisis. The 40-hour-week law was drastically modified. Taxes were increased, but production was encouraged. Tax rebates were given to manufacturers who could prove they had materially increased output in key industries.

Events rapidly moved toward a show-down between the new government and the extreme left coalition of Socialists, Communists, and labor elements. The C. G. T. (comparable to the C. I. O. in the United States) under Leon Jouhaux called a general strike of 24 hours as a protest against the new-decree laws. Premier Edouard Daladier, backed by public sympathy, accepted the challenge of the general strike as a test of power between democratic government and dictatorship of a "proletarian minority." His reply was:

1. Requisitioning the railroads.
2. Threatening general mobilization of the country.
3. Threatening to declare the nation in a state of siege under a law of 1878.
4. Mobilizing the bottle necks.

THE GOVERNMENT ATTACKED

The penalty for disobedience when the railroads are requisitioned is imprisonment and a fine up to 1,000 francs. In explaining his position during a radio talk, Premier Daladier said: "Let us be clear and frank. The sudden strikes and occupations of factories and this call for a general strike are simply a brutal assault on the peace policy of the Government, which is seeking to avoid spilling the blood of Frenchmen for interests that are other than those of France. These threats and occupations of factories were launched without warning. * * * What happened Thursday night at the Renault factory is complete proof of what I just said. No labor question of any kind was at stake. Neither working conditions nor pay questions were raised. But the cries, the posters, and the orders passed about the factory fully betrayed the movement as of political origin. The aim was to launch a movement of masses against the Government of the French Republic. What has to be done and what will be done is to force that movement to yield." Supporting Daladier, the National Convention of War Veterans unanimously passed a resolution condemning the proposed general strike.

When the C. G. T. finally called 4,000,000 men to strike, events happened swiftly. Two thousand workers in an aircraft plant refused to work and were dismissed. Employers were permitted to discharge all employees in event of a strike so that workers could be reemployed as desired—omitting the strike leaders and troublemakers. Public employees who deserted their posts were liable to dismissal and punishment. When a strike occurred on the railroad leading to Auzin, Daladier turned the line over to Government troops headed by General Doumene and his staff. Railway workers were arrested in Paris for demonstrating against the Government following union meetings. A special decree authorized the Ministry of Labor to requisition all mines and industries connected with mines in northern France.

The Mobile Guard, composed of France's toughest veteran soldiers, was ordered to clear all sit-down strikers out of factories at once. At Rennes they drove 150 sit-downers from a Government arsenal. At Sockaux the Mobile Guard was defeated by workers who seized an automobile plant.

Since the spearhead of the rebellion against preparedness was the Communist Party, Daladier threatened to indict the party for high treason, dissolve it, and jail its leaders who ordered its members to strike. By December 1 more than 700,000 workers who took part in the nation-wide strike had been notified of their dismissal. Strikers were being sentenced to prison in almost every industrial district, and 120,000 were locked out of factories as the Daladier decrees took effect. Labor leaders, strikers, and even city officials—who encouraged strikes (such as the Communist assistant mayor of an industrial village near Valenciennes) were arrested and charged with rebellion. Former Socialist Premier Leon Blum went ahead with a plan to call a rump session of Parliament—but only Communists and Socialists supported his scheme. Striking dock workers at Marseille placed a bottleneck between importation of African troops by Daladier despite the fact that mobilization of Hitler's legions had already reached the French border. Daladier responded by placing the entire water front at strategic points under fully mobilized control. By November 30 the C. G. T. threat was completely broken and resulted in a huge public triumph for Daladier. He responded by immediately declaring a 3-year state of economic mobilization. Blum became a ridiculous public figure. Leon Jouhaux became a nonentity.

The full meaning of the victory was expressed by Daladier when he said, in commenting upon events: "Some foreign newspapers were asking yesterday whether it was possible for democracy to prevent anarchy. * * * Today the whole world knows that France has triumphed over her internal difficulties." But the triumph came too late. The damage had been done. It was then too late to organize adequate national defense material production.

The complete history of subsequent political and military events cannot be reviewed in this brief article. It is sufficient to draw the obvious conclusions generally accepted by economists familiar with the planned sabotage of national defense in France by social reformists.

1. The French Popular Front promoted centralized planned economy.
2. It assumed that prosperity could be achieved by heavy governmental expenditures.
3. It harassed and restricted private enterprise and nationalized many varieties of production.
4. It introduced control of prices.
5. It reduced working hours and increased wages excessively.
6. It unbalanced the budget—kept it unbalanced—financed Government works by excessive borrowing and piled up a hopeless governmental deficit.
7. It revalued the currency and depreciated it.
8. It brought about a lowered standard of living.
9. It destroyed the morale of industry and science.
10. It made adequate national defense impossible of attainment and paved the way for Hitler's success.

The job of sabotage was well done in France. No small details were overlooked in planning the thorough destruction of industrial preparedness. The social schemers and Utopian planners opened the door to Hitler's triumph in a way which can be paralleled by a "fifth column" in any democratic country. In fact, the experience of France conclusively proves that democratic processes are most vulnerable to seizure by incompetent minority blocs.

The Great Precedent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 22 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

AN ARTICLE BY WALTER LIPPMANN

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask leave to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article under the heading "The Great Precedent," by Walter Lippmann, published in the column Today and Tomorrow of the Washington (D. C.) Post of today.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post of August 22, 1940]

TODAY AND TOMORROW—THE GREAT PRECEDENT

(By Walter Lippmann)

The negotiations now under way between the British Empire and the United States demonstrate how permanent and continuous, in spite of changing circumstances, are the fundamental lines of American foreign policy. To those who have forgotten or have never learned the tradition in which American foreign policy was formed, it may seem novel and therefore surprising for the United States to negotiate an understanding with Britain in the midst of a great imperialistic revolutionary and imperial war. But as a matter of historic fact the basic foreign policy of the United States, which gave this hemisphere a century of security, independence, and freedom, was shaped by just such understandings with Great Britain during the great wars of Napoleon and the threatened wars of the despotic Holy Alliance.

Jefferson, Madison, and Monroe would have recognized these negotiations as a continuation of their own, as dictated by the same necessity, as actuated by the same vital interests, as inspired by the same instinct of self-preservation. The negotiations between Jefferson and the government of Pitt which preceded the Louisiana Purchase and the negotiations between Monroe and Canning which led to the Monroe Doctrine were two decisive chapters in the same story which is now continued in the negotiations between Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Churchill.

The analogy is not apparent and superficial. It is real and it is organic. The foundations of our foreign policy were laid by necessity in the tremendous upheaval of the Napoleonic era. That same foreign policy is being developed by necessity in the tremendous upheaval of our own era.

On February 15, 1798, while Great Britain was at war with the revolutionary imperialism of Napoleon Bonaparte, the American Minister in London had a conversation with Lord Grenville in which he learned that Napoleon might obtain control of Spain, and through Spain of the resources of South America. Shortly afterward it was learned that Spain had secretly ceded to Napoleon the great region of the Mississippi Valley known as Louisiana. When Jefferson became President he took the position that while the United States could tolerate Spanish possession of this territory because Spain was feeble and pacific, it could not tolerate its possession by Napoleonic France because of the impetuosity of her temper, the energy and restlessness of her character.

He then went on to say that "the day that France takes possession of New Orleans fixes the sentence which is to retain her forever within her low-water mark. It seals the union of the two nations who, in conjunction, can maintain exclusive possession of the ocean. From that moment we must marry ourselves to the British Fleet and Nation. * * * This is not a state of things we seek or desire. It is one which this measure, if adopted by France, forces on us as necessarily as any other cause, by the laws of nature, brings on its necessary effect."

The Louisiana crisis was settled by purchase and not by war. It was settled that way because Napoleon lost command of the seas and could not, therefore, maintain his empire in this hemisphere. But Jefferson, unlike the latter-day isolationists who cite his words without studying his acts, had no illusions on three fundamental points. The first was that revolutionary imperialism must not be allowed to establish itself on this side of the Atlantic. The second was that this could be prevented only by Anglo-American control of the ocean. The third was that to preserve that exclusive possession of the ocean he would, if necessary, "marry ourselves to the British Fleet and Nation." Jefferson took this position on April 18, 1802; 13 months earlier in his first inaugural he had coined the historic phrase warning us against "entangling alliances."

It is evident that in his mind an understanding with Great Britain for the joint control of the Atlantic Ocean was not an entanglement but the very basic condition of American security. So what Mr. Willkie said at Elwood about our relations with Britain and what Mr. Roosevelt is doing in his negotiations with Mr. Churchill is in the direct line of descent from the founders of American independence.

That Jefferson's views about Anglo-American relations at the time of the Louisiana Purchase were no passing notion is clear from the fact that 20 years later, in the crisis which led to the announcement of the Monroe Doctrine, he repeated them no less emphatically.

In 1823 the continent of Europe was in the grip of four despotic monarchies bound together in the so-called Holy Alliance. They turned their eyes to this hemisphere; the Russian Empire began to move down the west coast from its base in Alaska; the other European despotisms began to formulate plans to reconquer Spanish-America which had rebelled and became independent. Again as in the case of Louisiana 25 years earlier, Great Britain and the United States began to negotiate, and in these negotiations between Canning and our minister in London, Benjamin Rush, an agreement was reached to forbid, if necessary by war, the conquest of Spanish America. The agreement was reached in London on August 23, 1823, and the papers were received in Washington by Secretary Adams and President Monroe on October 9, 1823. A week later the President sent the papers to Jefferson asking his advice.

Within a week Jefferson replied urging acceptance and said that while "Europe is laboring to become the domicile of despotism, our endeavor should surely be to make our hemisphere that of freedom. One nation, most of all, could disturb us in this pursuit; she now offers to lead, aid, and accompany us in it. By acceding to her proposition, we detach her from the bands, bring her mighty weight into the scale of free government, and emancipate a continent at one stroke, which might otherwise linger long in doubt and difficulty. Great Britain is the nation which can do us the most harm of anyone, or all on earth; and with her on our side we need not fear the whole world. With her, then, we should most sedulously cherish a cordial friendship, and nothing would tend more to knit our affections than to be fighting once more side by side, in the same cause. Not that I would purchase even her enmity at the price of taking part in her wars.

"But the war in which the present proposition might engage us, should that be its consequence, is not her war, but ours. Its object is to introduce and establish the American system of keeping out of our land all foreign powers—of never permitting those of Europe to intermeddle with the affairs of our nations. It is to maintain our own principle, not to depart from it. And if, to facilitate this, we can effect a division in the body of the European powers, and draw over to our side its most powerful member, surely we should do it. But I am clearly of Mr. Canning's opinion, that it will prevent instead of provoking war. With Great Britain withdrawn from their scale and shifted into that of our two continents, all Europe combined would not undertake such a war, for how would they propose to get at either enemy without superior fleets? Nor is the occasion to be slighted which this proposition offers of declaring our protest against the atrocious violations of the rights of nations by the interference of any one in the internal affairs of another, so flagitiously begun by Bonaparte, and now continued by the equally lawless alliance calling itself holy."

At President Monroe's request, Jefferson sent the papers to Madison who replied on November 1, saying:

"I return the letter of the President. The correspondence from abroad has gone back to him, as you desired. I have expressed to him my concurrence in the policy of meeting the advances of the British Government, having an eye to the forms of our Constitution in every step in the road to war. With the British power and Navy combined with our own, we have nothing to fear from the rest of the world; and in the great struggle of the epoch between liberty and despotism, we owe it to ourselves to sustain the former, in this hemisphere at least."

It was after this consultation by the most eminent living Americans, themselves the founders of the Republic, that the Monroe Doctrine was promulgated 1 month later in the form, be it noted, not of a treaty but of a Presidential declaration. Yet there are men today who dare to charge that a negotiation based upon recognition of the vital connection between American security and British sea power is un-American.

But Mr. Roosevelt need have no doubts and Mr. Willkie need have no doubts that they are walking on the main highway of American foreign policy and that they are following the greatest precedents of American history.

Drafting Wealth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSH LEE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 22 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

EDITORIAL FROM ST. LOUIS STAR-TIMES

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the St. Louis Star-Times of August 13, 1940, entitled "Draft the Dollars Now."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the St. Louis Star-Times of August 13, 1940]

DRAFT THE DOLLARS NOW

An overwhelming necessity exists, in order to prepare this country adequately for dangers that lurk in the world situation, to determine now, right at the outset of our national-defense program, to draft dollars along with men.

The excess-profits bill, though it heads in the right direction, does not cover this necessity. It allows a profit of 20 percent a year for 5 years, to pay the cost of new buildings and equipment, plus a normal profit on the entire investment. Thus the taxpayers will pay for the new plants and give them to the corporations. That is one of the penalties we pay for having to rely on the American brand of private enterprise, put into sudden competition with a European system of national socialism in which business men and financiers are water boys for political dictators.

If the United States were limited to a choice between sugaring American investors to sweeten their patriotism, and dosing them with bitter Nazi pills, it would be a sad choice. But we are not. Beyond the excess-profits tax is the realm of the direct income tax, both personal and corporate. It is in that field that the United States Government will answer the question: Is the conscripted doughboy, and he alone, going to get it in the neck?

The Treasury Department has just given out income-tax figures for 1938, showing that three Americans had incomes in excess of $5,000,000 apiece. Their combined incomes were $21,804,000, and they paid a combined income tax of $6,664,000.

Under our tax laws, the surtax rate on incomes in excess of $100,000 (up to $150,000) is 50 percent, and on everything above $1,000,000 a year it is 59 percent. Adding the 4 percent normal tax the total is 63 percent.

If these three gentlemen had paid nothing at all on their first $1,000,000 apiece, and had paid the legal rate of 63 percent on the remainder, their total tax would have been $11,846,520. That is almost twice what they actually paid on their entire incomes. The rate they paid was not 63 percent but 30 percent.

How did this come about, a legal rate of 63 percent, and an actual rate of 30 percent, for men getting more than $5,000,000 each in 1 year? The answer is easy. Tax-exempt bonds. The colossal fortunes of America are being put out of reach of taxation.

The little fellow, earning $3,000 a year in salary, pays the full legal rate. The movie star with a salary of $300,000 a year pays the full rate—more than half of what he takes in. The prize fighter pays in full. In fact, the government sends a collector right down to the stadium and takes the money on the spot—no income tax, no prize fight. But the man with an income of $5,000,000 a year, obviously drawn largely from investments, not salary, cashes his coupons and laughs.

It is true that the cost of national defense cannot be paid by the multimillionaire dollar-slackers who live on tax-exempt income. It cannot be paid by the citizens, many thousands in number, who pay comparatively low taxes on incomes between $6,000 and $30,000 a year. It cannot be paid, solely, by the corporations whose profits make up the undivided incomes of stockholders and bondholders.

But these groups, in combination, have as fair a claim to be put in a favored class—favored with the privilege of paying most heavily for national defense—as young men of 21 to 30, inclusive, have of being put in the favored class of answering the first call to arms.

If the United States is going to come through this national crisis with a sound society, a sound political economy, and a secure homeland, sacrifice of the pocketbook must not lag one foot behind the sacrifice called for from young American manhood. The first step of all should be to repeal the monstrous system of tax exemption of income from State and municipal bonds, the racket of the $5,000,000-a-year slacker on national defense.

Address by Ambassador Bullitt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 22 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

ARTICLE BY JOSEPH ALSOP AND ROBERT KINTNER

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD an article by Joseph Alsop and Robert Kintner which appeared in last night's Evening Star. I do this in view of the fact that my colleague the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] referred to this article in debate yesterday, and I think the Members of the Senate should have full benefit of it.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Star of August 21, 1940]

THE CAPITAL PARADE—BULLITT'S SPEECH, DISCUSSED WITH PRESIDENT, SEEMS TO SUPPORT WILLKIE'S CHARGE ON CANDOR

(By Joseph Alsop and Robert Kintner)

William C. Bullitt's speech before the American Philosophical Society at Philadelphia was no blundering indiscretion, in the manner of James H. R. Cromwell or John Cudahy. It was not only passed by the State Department, as was reported at the time; it also was discussed at length with the President, both in the early and final stages of composition, and was approved in detail by him.

It must be taken, therefore, as an exact expression of the President's own views.

Regarded in this light, the Bullitt speech is unquestionably the most significant utterance on foreign affairs to come from any administration source, including the President himself, since the outbreak of the second world war.

For Bullitt did not speak in the broad generalities and careful indirections which have characterized such Presidential utterances as the message requesting repeal of the arms embargo. He painted in the most lively and moving colors the tragic picture of the fall of France. He grimly told his countrymen that the same pattern of events might be repeated here in the United States. He urgently pleaded that destroyers and other forms of aid be made immediately available to England. And he sharply warned that if England fell, the danger of German aggression against the United States would be immediate and terrible.

"America is in danger," he said. "It is my conviction, drawn from my own experience and from the information in the hands of our Government in Washington, that the United States is in as great peril today as France was a year ago. And I believe that unless we act now, decisively, to meet the threat we shall be too late."

WILL THE PRESIDENT FOLLOW?

The disparity has always seemed completely fantastic, between the calm face shown to the world by the President and the desperate private pessimism of every informed man around him. Proof was lacking that the President shared his advisers' pessimism, until it was supplied in the Bullitt speech. Certainly there could be no better proof that the President's approval of an unvarnished, unqualified prediction, by one of his own ambassadors and most intimate friends, that within 12 months the American way, the American Government, the very independence of the American people, may all have fallen before the German onslaught.

The Bullitt speech, of course, seems to substantiate Wendell Willkie's charge of lack of candor in the President. There is reason to hope, however, that the President himself follow Bullitt in telling the people frankly what he believes to be the truth.

Whether he does or not will depend, no doubt, on the total reaction to Bullitt. In the Senate, news of what Bullitt said in Philadelphia promptly touched off a violent demonstration, in which Senators BURTON K. WHEELER, BENNETT CHAMP CLARK and other isolationists joined in shouting for Bullitt's blood, impeachment, or both. In the country, on the contrary, the reaction appears to have been good, for both the White House and Bullitt's office at the State Department have been deluged with approving telegrams, and editorial comment has generally been favorable.

THE INDISCREET PROPHET

Whatever the President decides to do, Bullitt may be expected to carry on what he regards as a vitally important campaign to educate the American people. His gloom is so complete that he has told friends he very much doubts whether anything can be done to avert the peril ahead. He expects England to go under unless it receives aid from this country. He questions whether the aid can be obtained in time. He is positively convinced that the defeat of England will soon be followed by a German attack on the United States. And he is equally sure that our rearmament cannot be quick enough to make really sure the warding off of such an attack. Yet he also feels, as he puts it, that it is his job to "shinny on his own side" until the end of the game.

Two questions remain. Why has not the President spoken out before? And are Bullitt and the President right in their dark views? To the first, only the President can supply the answer, and to the second, only the future. It must be said, however, that if the Senators who denounce Bullitt are right, they must be right by instinct only. Bullitt, on the other hand, has all the available information at his disposal, and has lived close enough to the event to form a competent judgment. Before they dismiss his warnings as foolish and groundless, the Senators might also remember, that from the day when Bullitt exactly forecast the results of the Versailles Treaty in Paris in 1919, he has proved a surprisingly accurate, if often irritating and indiscreet prophet.

Possibility of War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 22 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

SYNDICATED NEWSPAPER ARTICLE

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, an American columnist, who writes daily under the heading "In the News," released today through a syndicate of newspapers one of his articles entitled "War Before November Is the Writer's Forecast." I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IN THE NEWS—WAR BEFORE NOVEMBER IS THIS WRITER'S FORECAST

How long do you think it will be before we get into the present war head over ears?

What is going to put us in?

What is to be our part when we do get in?

And what is to be the situation and condition of our people and our country during our participation and afterward?

It is well to be thinking about these things because our entrance into the war seems very near.

Many people think it will occur before the Presidential election in November.

Why?

Oh, because it would be very fortunate for Mr. Roosevelt if we should get in before that time, and Mr. Roosevelt is very fortunate.

Second, because the agreement with Canada is an indication that the administration thinks that war is close at hand.

Third, because administration insistence that American vessels sail through dangerously mined ocean zones in spite of warnings of unavoidable catastrophe is likely to provide an immediate critical occasion.

Fourth, because Mr. Roosevelt's Cabinet is being built for war.

Col. Frank Knox, a military figure of distinction, is very war-minded.

And Henry L. Stimson has always been, when a Republican office-holder, a strong advocate of intervention in European affairs and participation in the League of Nations.

Fifth, because war propaganda is being encouraged on every side.

Mr. Bullitt, ambassador extremely extraordinary to almost everywhere, stands incongruously on the steps of Independence Hall and at the instance of the Roosevelt administration inconsistently incites the American people to enter the disastrous European conflict.

Even the gentle First Lady of the Land sponsors an inflammatory anti-German picture made from the writings of Ernst Toller, who was, in 1919, leader of the Communist revolution in Bavaria against the republican government of President Ebert.

James Roosevelt is being sued by the heirs of Toller for a financial interest in the film, which was produced by an English company as war propaganda.

Sixth, because of the proposed disposal of some 50 of our older naval destroyers to England to be employed in the war.

And, seventh, because the especial kind of conscription which the administration advocates would seem unnecessary and undesirable unless expeditionary forces are contemplated.

Of course there are also many powerful influences other than the administration in favor of war.

There are social influences, financial influences, racial, and religious influences.

Ours is a wonderful country—an amazing melting pot, the product of which is a democratic alloy valuable to our civilization and to all the world.

But many of the ingredients in the pot are not yet thoroughly fused.

Many for some generations will retain much of their original character and connections.

These elements have been deeply affected by the conditions prevailing in Europe and are eager to correct them—to democratize them according to American standards—not by example but by force of arms.

All of these political and personal causes make pretty certain our involvement in the war.

The defensive agreement with Canada is in itself a beneficial thing.

But it must necessarily mean that the United States will defend Canada more than Canada will defend the United States, unless the agreement includes the provision that the British Navy shall cooperate to defend the Western Hemisphere.

In which case we have entered into an alliance not only with Canada but with the British Empire.

Everybody knows that the South American republics will be not an advantage but an obligation to the United States in case of war—not an asset but a liability in matters of mutual defense—which would in no way be mutual.

No one can seriously suppose that Chile, Peru, Ecuador, Guatemala, Brazil, or even Mexico is going to supply tatterdemalion soldiers for the defense of the United States.

And they certainly are not going to supply ships, because they have not got any worthy of much consideration.

Everyone can see equally clearly that the reason the conscription bill does not confine the activities of the United States Army to the United States and its possessions is because the administration contemplates using the Army in other parts of the Western Hemisphere—if not in various parts of the Eastern Hemisphere.

In other words, the administration purposes to use this Army for world war without securing the specific consent of Congress or without consulting in any way the wishes of the American people.

The agreement with Canada is like the treaty of Habana, a purely personal Roosevelt agreement imposing upon the people of the United States the defense of the whole American Continent.

This obligation is immense and wholly unilateral unless, as has been said above, specific provision is made for the equal employment of the British Navy, in which case the treaty is with the British Empire.

Would it not be well to have these treaties formalized and constitutionally approved by the Senate of the United States and to have their consequences in widespread warfare referred to the approval of the people of the United States?

As for propaganda, its effect is astounding.

It carries us away like the current of a great tide.

It causes us to forget all the lessons of our experience.

It transforms facts into fancies and fancies into facts.

We are fortified against the propaganda of the warring nations.

We expect them to color their statements and to exaggerate their achievements.

But we are unprotected against the insidious and insistent propaganda of our own Government.

We naturally tend to rely on the good faith of our own representatives, and their attack upon our credulity with biased statements and prejudiced personal views reaches us under our guard.

Consequently, a sentiment for war is gradually developing in this country as it did in the World War.

Soon, therefore, we may look for war.

How soon and how certain it is difficult to say, but if your columnist were inclined to venture an opinion he would say before November—and he is not wholly without practice as a prognosticator.

Federal Expenditures in Fifth Congressional District of Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES H. LEAVY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 22, 1940

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Speaker, I am having printed a report of certain statistical data of interest to the people of Chelan, Douglas, and Okanogan Counties, in my district, showing the nature and extent of estimated expenses of the United States in these counties during the present administration.

These figures are instructive and illuminating and readily make it possible for interested persons to know what has been done in each county during the 7-year period to better the conditions of the people that live in that county.

County report of estimated Federal expenditures, Chelan County, Wash., Mar. 4, 1933, through June 30, 1939

LOANS

	Number	Amount
CURRENT PROGRAMS		
Federal Loan Agency:		
1. Reconstruction Finance Corporation (from Feb. 2, 1932)	1	$3,297,719
2. Disaster Loan Corporation		
Federal Works Agency:		
3. Public Works Administration, non-Federal projects		(1)
4. U. S. Housing Authority, loan contracts signed		
Department of Agriculture:		
5. Farm Credit Administration, land bank commissioner	160	[2] 302,200
6. Farm Credit Administration, emergency crop and feed	1,709	[2] 433,163
7. Farm Security Administration, rural rehabilitation		870,732
8. Farm Security Administration, farm-tenant purchase		
9. Rural Electrification Administration (total project cost divided by number of counties participating)		
COMPLETED PROGRAMS		
10. Farm Credit Administration, 1934–35 drought relief	609	198,945
11. Home Owners' Loan Corporation, 1933–36	459	995,088
Total, repayable		6,097,847

[1] These projects received both loans and grants.
[2] As of Dec. 31, 1938.

County report of estimated Federal expenditures, Chelan County, Wash., Mar. 4, 1933, through June 30, 1939—Continued

EXPENDITURES

		Number	Amount
CURRENT PROGRAMS			
Federal Works Agency:			
1. Public Works Administration, non-Federal projects		12	$383,874
2. Public Works Administration, Federal projects			
3. Public Roads Administration, completed projects			958,952
4. Public Buildings Administration, Federal buildings			198,517
5. Work Projects Administration			902,408
6. Other projects under works program			
Federal Security Agency:			
7. Social Security Board:			
Old-age assistance	$262,288	656	349,154
Aid to dependent children	74,269	377	
Aid to the blind	12,597	18	
Department of Agriculture:			
8. Agricultural Adjustment Administration conservation programs:			
1936	$7,276		19,877
1937	12,601		
9. Farm Security Administration, rural rehabilitation			48,933
COMPLETED PROGRAMS			
10. Federal Emergency Relief Administration			390,612
11. Civil Works Administration			207,582
12. Agricultural Adjustment Administration rental and benefit payments			10,321
13. U. S. Housing Authority, housing (former Public Works Administration, housing only)			
Total, nonrepayable			3,470,230
Grand total, repayable and nonrepayable			9,568,077

OTHER BENEFITS

	Number	Amount
Federal Housing Administration:		
Title I. Modernization and improvement loans insured	1,142	$469,387
Title II. Mortgages accepted for insurance	132	470,000
Total, housing insurance		939,387
Farm Security Administration: Farm-debt reduction	138	[3] 903,741
Public Roads Administration: Active project allotments		156,000

COUNTY STATISTICS [4]

Families in county, 1930	8,295
Dwellings, 1930	7,800
Individual income-tax returns, 1935	1,291
Passenger automobiles registered, 1936	8,890
Families with radios, 1938	8,730
Residential telephones, 1935	3,603
Domestic electric meters, 1930	6,974
Farms, 1935	2,421
Retail employees, 1935	1,393
Wholesale employees, 1935	774
Mining employees, 1935	39
Manufacturing employees, 1935	962
Persons on farms, 1935	10,490
Unemployed reporting, 1937	1,825

[3] Includes 8 group cases in the amount of $453,011.
[4] Source: Consumer Market Data Handbook.

County report of estimated Federal expenditures, Douglas County, Wash., Mar. 4, 1933, through June 30, 1939

LOANS

	Number	Amount
CURRENT PROGRAMS		
Federal Loan Agency:		
1. Reconstruction Finance Corporation (from Feb. 2, 1932)		$81,765
2. Disaster Loan Corporation		
Federal Works Agency:		
3. Public Works Administration, non-Federal projects		(1)
4. U. S. Housing Authority, loan contracts signed		
Department of Agriculture:		
5. Farm Credit Administration, land bank commissioner	49	[2] 81,100
6. Farm Credit Administration, emergency crop and feed	581	[2] 145,825
7. Farm Security Administration, rural rehabilitation		333,018
8. Farm Security Administration, farm-tenant purchase		
9. Rural Electrification Administration (total project cost divided by number of counties participating)		
COMPLETED PROGRAMS		
10. Farm Credit Administration, 1934–35 drought relief	297	107,390
11. Home Owners' Loan Corporation, 1933–36	21	52,720
Total, repayable		801,813

[1] As of Dec. 31, 1938.
[2] These projects received both loans and grants.

County report of estimated Federal expenditures, Douglas County, Wash., Mar. 4, 1933, through June 30, 1939—Continued

EXPENDITURES

	Number	Amount
CURRENT PROGRAMS		
Federal Works Agency:		
1. Public Works Administration, non-Federal projects	4	$166,635
2. Federal Works Administration, Federal projects		
3. Public Roads Administration, completed projects		122,759
4. Public Buildings Administration, Federal buildings		
5. Work Projects Administration		96,232
6. Other projects under works program		
Federal Security Agency:		
7. Social Security Board:		
Old-age assistance—$98,597	217	112,864
Aid to dependent children—11,477	63	
Aid to the blind—2,790	4	
Department of Agriculture:		
8. Agricultural Adjustment Administration conservation programs:		
1936—$99,129		116,247
1937—17,118		
9. Farm Security Administration, rural rehabilitation		17,916
COMPLETED PROGRAMS		
10. Federal Emergency Relief Administration		53,811
11. Civil Works Administration		71,566
12. Agricultural Adjustment Administration rental and benefit payments		798,982
13. U. S. Housing Authority, housing (former Public Works Administration housing only)		
Total, nonrepayable		1,557,012
Grand total, repayable and nonrepayable		2,358,830

OTHER BENEFITS

Federal Housing Administration:		
Title I. Modernization and improvement loans insured	111	$46,847
Title II. Mortgages accepted for insurance	7	36,800
Total, housing insurance		83,647
Farm Security Administration, farm-debt reduction	28	88,678
Public Roads Administration, active project allotments		63,800

COUNTY STATISTICS [3]

Families in county, 1930	2,100
Dwellings, 1930	2,100
Individual income-tax returns, 1935	160
Passenger autos registered, 1936	1,033
Families with radios, 1938	2,230
Residential telephones, 1935	378
Domestic electric meters, 1930	1,046
Farms, 1935	1,368
Retail employees, 1935	96
Wholesale employees, 1935	29
Mining employees, 1935	5
Manufacturing employees, 1935	2
Persons on farms, 1935	5,152
Unemployed reporting, 1937	349

[3] Source: Consumer Market Data Handbook.

Estimated county report of Federal expenditures, Okanogan County, Wash., Mar. 4, 1933, through June 30, 1939

LOANS

	Number	Amount
CURRENT PROGRAMS		
Federal Loan Agency:		
1. Reconstruction Finance Corporation (from Feb. 2, 1932)		$323,024
2. Disaster Loan Corporation	2	5,250
Federal Works Agency:		
3. Public Works Administration, non-Federal projects	1	[1] 9,000
4. U. S. Housing Authority, loan contracts signed		
Department of Agriculture:		
5. Farm Credit Administration, land bank commissioner	109	[2] 198,150
6. Farm Credit Administration, emergency crop and feed	672	[2] 146,181
7. Farm Security Administration, rural rehabilitation		401,983
8. Farm Security Administration, farm-tenant purchase		
9. Rural Electrification Administration (total project cost divided by number of counties participating)		
COMPLETED PROGRAMS		
10. Farm Credit Administration 1934-35, drought relief	191	58,575
11. Home Owners' Loan Corporation, 1933-36	86	125,597
Total, repayable		1,267,760

[1] These projects received both loans and grants.
[2] As of Dec. 31, 1938.

Estimated county report of Federal expenditures, Okanogan County, Wash., Mar. 4, 1933, through June 30, 1939—Continued

EXPENDITURES

	Number	Amount
CURRENT PROGRAMS		
Federal Works Agency:		
1. Public Works Administration, non-Federal projects	13	$519,587
2. Public Works Administration, Federal projects	1	72,780
3. Public Roads Administration, completed projects		334,485
4. Public Buildings Administration, Federal buildings		4,316
5. Work Projects Administration		121,324
6. Other projects under works program		
Federal Security Agency:		
7. Social Security Board:		
Old-age assistance—$153,029	404	181,110
Aid to dependent children—20,289	94	
Aid to the blind—7,792	14	
Department of Agriculture:		
8. Agricultural Adjustment Administration conservation programs:		
1936—$30,184		123,616
1937—93,432		
9. Farm Security Administration, rural rehabilitation		19,936
COMPLETED PROGRAMS		
10. Federal Emergency Relief Administration		77,919
11. Civil Works Administration		98,475
12. Agricultural Adjustment Administration rental and benefit payments		112,544
13. U. S. Housing Authority, housing (former Public Works Administration housing only)		
Total, nonrepayable		1,669,092
Grand total, repayable and nonrepayable		2,936,852

OTHER BENEFITS

Federal Housing Administration:		
Title I. Modernization and improvement loans insured	367	$191,229
Title II. Mortgages accepted for insurance	10	31,600
Total, housing insurance		222,829
Farm Security Administration, farm-debt reduction	68	933,181
Public Roads Administration, active project allotments		168,366

COUNTY STATISTICS [3]

Families in county, 1930	4,984
Dwellings, 1930	4,900
Individual income-tax returns, 1935	707
Passenger autos registered, 1936	4,557
Families with radios, 1938	5,260
Residential telephones, 1935	1,370
Domestic electric meters, 1930	2,786
Farms, 1935	2,539
Retail employees, 1935	546
Wholesale employees, 1935	219
Mining employees, 1935	66
Manufacturing employees, 1935	915
Persons on farms, 1935	9,789
Unemployed reporting, 1937	774

[3] Source: Consumer Market Data Handbook.

Federal Expenditures in Fifth Congressional District of Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES H. LEAVY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 22, 1940

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Speaker, I am having printed a report of certain statistical data of interest to the people of Spokane and Lincoln Counties in my district, showing the nature and extent of estimated expenses of the United States in these counties during the present administration.

These figures are instructive and illuminating and readily make it possible for interested persons to know what has been done in each county during the 7-year period to better the conditions of the people that live in that county.

Estimated county report of Federal expenditures, Spokane County, Wash., Mar. 4, 1933, through June 30, 1939

LOANS

	Number	Amount
CURRENT PROGRAMS		
Federal Loan Agency:		
1. Reconstruction Finance Corporation (from Feb. 2, 1932)		$22,072,271
2. Disaster Loan Corporation		
Federal Works Agency:		
3. Public Works Administration, non-Federal projects		(1)
4. U. S. Housing Authority, loan contracts signed		
Department of Agriculture:		
5. Farm Credit Administration, land bank commissioner	359	[2] 633,370
6. Farm Credit Administration, emergency crop and feed	496	[2] 61,110
7. Farm Security Administration, rural rehabilitation		142,525
8. Farm Security Administration, farm-tenant purchase		
9. Rural Electrification Administration (total project cost divided by number of counties participating)	1	171,500
COMPLETED PROGRAMS		
10. Farm Credit Administration, 1934-35 drought relief	1	394
11. Home Owners' Loan Corporation, 1933-36	2,795	4,503,437
Total, repayable		27,584,607

EXPENDITURES

		Number	Amount
CURRENT PROGRAMS			
Federal Works Agency:			
1. Public Works Administration, non-Federal projects		25	$1,293,066
2. Public Works Administration, Federal projects		2	6,867
3. Public Roads Administration, completed projects			1,583,518
4. Public Buildings Administration, Federal buildings			105,370
5. Works Projects Administration			10,671,903
6. Other projects under works program			371,390
Federal Security Agency:			
7. Social Security Board:			
Old-age assistance	$1,423,765	3,571	1,636,821
Aid to dependent children	184,859	986	
Aid to the blind	28,197	57	
Department of Agriculture:			
8. Agricultural Adjustment Administration conservation programs:			
1936	$254,651		444,089
1937	189,438		
9. Farm Security Administration, rural rehabilitation			50,274
COMPLETED PROGRAMS			
10. Federal Emergency Relief Administration			4,290,029
11. Civil Works Administration			1,217,371
12. Agricultural Adjustment Administration rental and benefit payments			1,470,360
13. U. S. Housing Authority, housing (former Public Works Administration, housing only)			
Total, nonrepayable			23,141,058
Grand total, repayable and nonrepayable			50,725,665

OTHER BENEFITS

	Number	Amount
Federal Housing Administration:		
Title I. Modernization and improvement loans insured	7,030	$2,370,896
Title II. Mortgages accepted for insurance	1,017	3,079,950
Total, housing insurance		5,450,846
Farm Security Administration, farm-debt reduction	13	25,186
Public Roads Administration, active project allotments		214,168

COUNTY STATISTICS [3]

Families in county, 1930	40,493
Dwellings, 1930	35,400
Individual income-tax returns, 1935	8,544
Passenger automobiles registered, 1936	36,787
Families with radios, 1938	42,220
Residential telephones, 1935	18,796
Domestic electric meters, 1930	31,036
Farms, 1935	4,910
Retail employees, 1935	6,959
Wholesale employees, 1935	3,004
Mining employees, 1935	126
Manufacturing employees, 1935	5,641
Persons on farms, 1935	18,908
Unemployed reporting, 1937	8,315

[1] These projects received both loans and grants.
[2] As of Dec. 31, 1938.
[3] Source: Consumer Market Data Handbook.

County report of estimated Federal expenditures Lincoln County, Wash., Mar. 4, 1933, through June 30, 1939

LOANS

	Number	Amount
CURRENT PROGRAMS		
Federal Loan Agency:		
1. Reconstruction Finance Corporation (from Feb. 2, 1932)		$97,210
2. Disaster Loan Corporation		
Federal Works Agency:		
3. Public Works Administration, non-Federal projects		(1)
4. U. S. Housing Authority, loan contracts signed		
Department of Agriculture:		
5. Farm Credit Administration, Land Bank Commissioner	113	[2] 346,200
6. Farm Credit Administration, emergency crop and feed	42	[2] 9,480
7. Farm Security Administration, rural rehabilitation		25,125
8. Farm Security Administration, farm-tenant purchase		
9. Rural Electrification Administration (total project cost divided by number of counties participating)		
COMPLETED PROGRAMS		
10. Farm Credit Administration, 1934-35 drought relief		
11. Home Owners' Loan Corporation, 1933-36	10	9,562
Total, repayable		487,577

EXPENDITURES

		Number	Amount
CURRENT PROGRAMS			
Federal Works Agency:			
1. Public Works Administration, non-Federal projects		10	$217,890
2. Public Works Administration, Federal projects			
3. Public Roads Administration, completed projects			492,731
4. Public Buildings Administration, Federal buildings			
5. Work Projects Administration			159,365
6. Other projects under works program			
Federal Security Agency:			
7. Social Security Board:			
Old-age assistance	$99,911	220	109,671
Aid to dependent children	8,342	45	
Aid to the blind	1,418	2	
Department of Agriculture:			
8. Agricultural Adjustment Administration conservation programs:			
1936	$121,259		145,657
1937	24,398		
9. Farm Security Administration, rural rehabilitation			1,028
COMPLETED PROGRAMS			
10. Federal Emergency Relief Administration			33,218
11. Civil Works Administration			80,035
12. Agricultural Adjustment Administration rental and benefit payments			2,397,367
13. U. S. Housing Administration, housing (former Public Works Administration, housing only)			
Total, nonrepayable			3,636,962
Grand total, repayable and nonrepayable			4,124,539

OTHER BENEFITS

	Number	Amount
Federal Housing Administration:		
Title I. Modernization and improvement loans insured	140	$62,540
Title II. Mortgages accepted for insurance		13,250
Total, housing insurance		75,790
Farm Security Administration, farm-debt reduction	6	2,190
Public Roads Administration, active projects allotments		2,000

COUNTY STATISTICS [3]

Families in county, 1930	3,099
Dwellings, 1930	3,100
Individual income-tax returns, 1935	541
Passenger automobiles registered, 1936	3,199
Families with radios, 1938	3,280
Residential telephones, 1935	1,619
Domestic electric meters, 1930	1,351
Farms, 1935	1,447
Retail employees, 1935	299
Wholesale employees, 1935	147
Mining employees, 1935	12
Manufacturing employees, 1935	54
Persons on farms, 1935	5,942
Unemployed reporting, 1937	228

[1] These projects received both loans and grants.
[2] As of Dec. 31, 1938.
[3] Source: Consumer Market Data Handbook.

The Third Term

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 22 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE STANDARD-TIMES, NEW BEDFORD, MASS.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask leave to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial on the third term by Basil Brewer under the heading "Roosevelt 'Drafted,'" published in the Standard-Times, New Bedford, Mass., issue of July 22, 1940.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New Bedford (Mass.) Standard-Times of July 22, 1940]

ROOSEVELT "DRAFTED"

Probably all Americans would prefer to avoid the situation which now confronts them, a President nominated for a third term.

School boys know Washington and Jefferson urged against the third term and counseled that those who offered themselves be sternly and promptly rebuked.

In 150 years of the Nation's history no one seriously has gone counter to this solemn warning.

On the surface it would seem the voter would find the solution simple—but we see no such conclusion.

For the crisis of the times lends itself to the sorry scheme, and the President who offers himself for the third term is a master political strategist, a master of plausibility.

He did not plan or desire to run, he said, as he accepted the nomination, but, "Today, all private plans, all private lives have been repealed by an overriding public danger. In the face of that public danger all those who can be of service to the public have no choice but to offer themselves for service in those capacities for which they may be fitted."

Are there in the English language more convenient words with which to excuse a third-term candidacy?

It even is possible the President has convinced himself by the plausibility of his own phrases. Otherwise, he conjures faithlessly in the country's crisis and out of the people's fears.

But there are simple questions which, if answered, will help to clear the air, may even help the President out of his self-hypnosis, if such it is. They are questions which will not down and must be asked over and over during these next few fateful months.

Was the President drafted, or did he knowingly and willingly contrive by action or inaction to bring about his third-term nomination?

Were the people represented at this Chicago scene, where the President says he was drafted? Or was this, on the whole, one of the sorriest spectacles of political ward heeling ever staged in a convention, with hundreds of delegates there representing nothing but a city gang, paid and grown fat with Federal projects money?

And what is the truth about the President's claim that he alone is best qualified to meet the present national crisis, the only "experienced man," as he modestly says, capable of steering the Nation through its difficulties?

All partisanship aside, what is there in the past 7 years of this administration to justify the President's sublime faith in himself?

National debt, admittedly bordering on bankruptcy, with unemployment, if we disregard Federal work projects, almost at its peak.

Military unpreparedness, so serious as to constitute now the greatest element of the "crisis" which the President uses to justify his candidacy—a condition which, despite warnings, has improved but little since the President called it to the country's attention; a condition repeatedly called to official attention by Baruch and others as Hitler power rose in Germany.

A country divided into class-conscious groups, created by the President's deliberate efforts, employer and business tagged with hateful names, employee encouraged to thwart employer against their mutual interest.

Taxes, the highest in the country's history, a brake on all business enterprise, some of it admittedly punitive; business asked to expand employment, but the money needed to provide this employment taken by excessive and punitive taxes.

Are we to believe, then, the President is the "only man" who can save the country in the crisis?

Is there encouragement in this record for breaking the third-term precedent of 150 years?

But there is more than inconsistency in this third-term position of the President.

There is definite menace.

The President does not have the respect for constitutional government which the ordinary citizen has and which, of course, should be the President's.

Had he this respect he would not have attempted to pack the Supreme Court, to secure approval of his measures.

We assert the President does not take seriously the breaking of the third-term unwritten law. Did he do so, he would refuse to run as did Washington and Jefferson. But even clearer than this is the fact that in no speech or statement has he so much as mentioned the subject, not even in his address of acceptance Thursday.

The President is a student of history. He has not failed to see that free government often has been made into dictatorship by easy stages of disregard of precedent such as the third-term tradition of this country.

The conclusion is inescapable—he does not take the matter seriously, or excuses himself on the basis of the national crisis. He excused his Supreme Court packing attempt, which failed, on the same basis of emergency.

It is true the country faces a grave crisis. But the President, in this decision, has imposed a second crisis on the one which already existed.

We do not know whether the President is self-hypnotized or deceived by his inner circle of advisers.

But, deceived or not, the President must not be allowed to deceive the country in this time of crisis.

Neither President Roosevelt, nor any other man, ever must be elected to a third term as President of the United States.

BASIL BREWER, *Publisher.*

Transfer of Destroyers to Great Britain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSH LEE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 22 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

EDITORIAL FROM ST. LOUIS STAR-TIMES

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the St. Louis Star-Times of August 21, 1940, entitled "Send the Destroyers!"

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the St. Louis Star-Times of August 21, 1940]

SEND THE DESTROYERS

The time has come when the American Government, moved solely by concern for our own national interests, should transfer to Great Britain the overage destroyers which Britain needs to bolster her defenses in the immediate future.

Two objections, previously, have prevented this bold step. The first was the argument that 50 light warships could not possibly prove decisive. This was based on the theory that the battle of Britain would be finished quickly—that the Nazis would stake all on a spectacular aerial invasion, which would succeed or fail without reference to sea power. The second argument, vigorously pumped up by our isolationists, was that selling destroyers would be an "act of war," and that it would make Hitler turn against us either now or later—when, as, and and if he broke Britain.

The first objection has been answered. Prime Minister Churchill states a clear, definite reason for England's need of these vessels—to "bridge the gap" between Britain's peacetime navy of 1939 and the much larger wartime navy she expects to have substantially completed by next year.

The theory of a short Battle of Britain has been weakened by events of the last 2 weeks. Every observer reports that England has successfully beaten back the preliminary Nazi efforts to smash her by a bombing "blitzkrieg." Now Germany has announced a sea and air blockade.

Always granting that this may be merely a trick to lull the defenders into a false sense of security, the apparent meaning is that Hitler is driven to revise his plan, to resort to a siege of Britain—a war directed against her vital food and supply ships with the objective of starving her people and her factories.

In such a war of attrition it is possible that acquisition of 50 additional destroyers from America would decisively strengthen the British Fleet for the next few critical months.

The vital importance Britain attaches to American destroyers is further proved by agreement to lease bases in the Atlantic and Caribbean to the United States.

Considering the importance of Newfoundland, Bermuda, and the Caribbean Islands as strategic bases for defending the Western Hemisphere, Churchill's offer of 99-year leases of these island strongholds is equivalent, almost, to a transfer of sovereignty and at least comparable in value to a pledge to send the remnants of the British Navy to Canada if England finally falls. Such a pledge, however, also should be sought—to copper-rivet our security.

The final objection to sale of the destroyers—the fear of Hitler's wrath—always has been more fanciful than real. Such a transfer would be no more an act of war than the other technically hostile acts we already have committed against the Nazis—the sale of obsolete aircraft, for example, through the flimsy device of returning them to the manufacturers, who then have vended them to England.

These scrupulous niceties are not important. Hitler shows no sign of yielding to the resentment he naturally feels following our previous aid to Britain. Would he declare war against us at once on account of a destroyer deal? It is possible but not likely. At present he doesn't even threaten it; he prefers to slaughter one victim at a time.

As for the future, if Hitler conquers Britain despite Churchill's efforts and despite our aid to England, the question of whether or not we sold destroyers to the British would be insignificant.

Nazi operations in the Western Hemisphere will not be governed by such relative trivialities. The only thing which will govern them is Hitler's judgment of his chances to win against the United States.

The destroyer-sale issue should be decided, therefore, by the simple question of whether the transfer would diminish or increase the chances of a successful Nazi assault on the United States.

The most logical answer is that it would bolster our security. If it helps England win, by strengthening her both materially and in her morale, we shall never have to face a direct attack from Hitler. And, since the fate of the Orient will be decided primarily in Europe, it may save us an embarrassing and dangerous challenge from Japan.

If it merely postpones a British defeat, it probably will be selfishly worth while through buying us additional time to build up our own armed forces and implement pending plans for hemispherical defense.

In the light of these considerations, the breast-beating anguish and obstructionism of do-nothing isolationists fade into insignificance. Let us act decisively for once, without further confusion, and sell the destroyers which—by aiding England—will defend the Americas.

Defend America With Equipment "on Order"?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 22, 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert herewith an address recently delivered by me before the Williamsport Consistory of the Scottish Rite Masonry at Williamsport, Pa., Friday, June 28, 1940:

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, it is a real pleasure to accept your kind invitation and to have the privilege of again mingling with my Masonic brethern on this happy occasion.

Since I had the good fortune to be introduced to you by my good friend and colleague, BOB RICH, who so ably represents the Sixteenth Pennsylvania District in Congress, I really feel at home among you, even though Bob did not include in his remarks his copyrighted daily congressional question, Where are you going to get the money from?

Seriously, you represent a cross section of American citizenry that appreciates a straight-from-the-shoulder discussion of the perplexing questions incident to the war situation. Every war is accompanied by a wave of propaganda. You and I know the World War was no exception, and today from experience I hope that you have not been misled by the abundance of foreign propaganda that has been unloaded on the American people during the past few years.

I hold in my hand a portion of what the average Member of Congress receives daily as propaganda from abroad. Here is a piece from Germany, a pamphlet from England, a circular from France, as well as Japan, Belgium, China, and other countries. Each of these pamphlets blames the other fellow in an effort to have the American people take sides in their century-old world wars.

To many of you who have served in the World War, this propaganda is old stuff. During the hectic days of 1917–18 we rubbed elbows with the Frenchman, the Britisher, the Jap, and others now involved in this effort to sell their own bill of goods to America. Those of you who served in the A. E. F. are qualified to take this propaganda with a grain of salt.

However, since the World War, the babies of 1917–18 are now young men and women and are being fed the same old war propaganda. It appears that the American people are falling for this propaganda, hook, line, and sinker. Therefore, as good Americans, we must assume the responsibility of acquainting our neighbors with the true facts and in so doing make a worth-while contribution to the welfare and preservation of our form of government. Unfortunately, all propaganda has not been confined to foreign sources, because I hold in my hand pieces of printed propaganda now being circulated throughout the United States by William Allen White, Kansas publisher, and his Committee to Defend America by Aiding the Allies. For months and months the White committee has been leading the American people down a blind alley by advocating that we strip our own meager defenses to aid the Allies. There is no question the Allies have your sympathy and mine in the valiant struggle they put up against a superior military foe. But when it comes to exposing our national defense to danger, common sense tells us that we are forfeiting our own national safety.

At this point I want to impress upon you one thing, and that is, the White committee almost overnight developed to be self-appointed saviors of this Nation. Do you believe for a minute William Allen White is paying the bill for all this propaganda being fed the American people? Do you realize the members of the White committee are beyond military age? Can you forget that a few years ago this same band of superpatriots labeled the World War veterans of America "Treasury raiders" when the adjusted compensation, commonly miscalled the bonus, was being considered in Congress? The patriotism of the White committee was forgotten as they raised their voices in loud protest over payment of benefits to those whose service to country rendered them in need.

Let's forget William Allen White and his band and talk about cold facts. For more than 150 years the American people have enjoyed the freedom of a democracy and a form of government universally recognized as a masterpiece of statesmanship. During that time we have accomplished more than the nations of the Old World achieved in 10 centuries.

We value blessings that the Old World has never enjoyed. Therefore, if we are to continue to enjoy these benefits, we must safeguard our form of government by an adequate national defense, with a determined effort to stay out of this war.

Before talking about our national defense, let us give some thought to the type of defense needed should we be called to repel invasion from the Old World. The Hitler military machine, which is recognized as a mechanical military monster the like of which the world has never seen before, has required 7 years to develop at a cost of $40,000,000,000. It has consumed the energies of Europe's greatest industrial country, mobilizing every energy, talent, and resource of the industrious and talented German people. This military monster, a product of Hitler's mind, has revolutionized every phase of warfare to the extent that today it knows no equal. The striking power of Hitler's war machine is terrific.

In the short space of 21 days Hitler conquered Poland, destroyed a half million soldiers, and took 700,000 prisoners.

In spite of the British blockade, Hitler invaded and mastered Norway in 8 days. In similar fashion he crushed Holland in 4 days and vanquished Belgium in 17 days. In like manner he required but 21 days to destroy or capture the British expeditionary force in France together with three entire French armies.

Following the surrender of Belgium, it required Hitler but 17 days to conquer Paris, capture the Maginot line, drive the French Army more than 100 miles south of Paris, and to reduce the French people to servitude.

In 2 months of active military operations Hitler has conquered a territory as great as New England, New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Michigan, Illinois, Indiana, and Wisconsin. He has conquered more than a hundred million people, possibly destroyed 2,000,000 soldiers, and taken as prisoners 3,000,000 more.

With the exception of Norway and Denmark, each of the nations subdued was of the opinion that it had set up a real defense against German aggression.

Let us examine this German war machine. From information available, it has a dozen mechanized divisions, commonly referred to as Panzer divisions. Each division consists of 1,274 motor vehicles, that consume 10,568 gallons of gasoline and 1,023 gallons of oil every 24 hours. These divisions move at the unbelievable rate of 40 miles a day. Surely you recognize the great problem of keeping this giant military monster in operation, whose make-up is as follows:

A Panzer division—Its fuel consumption

	Number	Daily use in gallons	
		Gas	Oil
TANK BRIGADE			
Light tanks	288	8,740	576
Medium tanks	72	3,600	216
Armored cars	50	625	43
Attached tanks:			
6-ton "Assault"	45	1,350	90
20-ton "Break Thru"	36	4,320	360
80-ton "Break Thru"	12	6,000	360
Total	503	24,635	1,645
INFANTRY BRIGADE			
Two motorized battalions: Trucks	100	850	100
Infantry transport: Trucks	550	4,450	475
Motorized artillery:			
Carriers (7½-10-ton)	45	1,350	70
Truck train (80 2½-ton; 20 5½-7-ton)	100	1,034	134
Motorcycle battalion:			
Cycles	64	112	8
Trucks	42	115	13
Antitank battalion:			
Gun trailers	36	360	54
Cargo trucks	72	504	36
Reconnaissance battalion:			
Scout cars	24	360	24
Trucks	79	475	37
Motorcycles	32	56	4
Trucks	8	80	11
Engineers' battalion:			
Light motorcars	12	72	4
Trucks	50	435	30
Service signal battalion:			
Light motorcars	24	70	5
Trucks	36	245	18
Total	1,274	10,568	1,023

Table above gives break-down estimates on a German Panzer division and shows tremendous daily consumption of gas and oil in gallons. Supply factors should double the figure shown for tank brigade gas and oil requirements, making totals 49,270 and 3,290. An air cooperation squadron is attached to each division but number of planes varies greatly. Figures for supply vehicles attached to a division are not available.

Recently I had an opportunity, with other Members of Congress, to view the official German war films in an "off the record" private showing in which was revealed the bloodiest warfare the world has ever known.

We saw German parachutists land and immediately assemble machine guns; we saw giant German bombers unloading their cargo of death and destruction on the peace-loving countries of Norway, Holland, and Belgium; we saw the flame thrower taking its toll of human life and property; we saw the 6-ton, 20-ton, and 80-ton tanks in action; we saw the armored cars and motorcycles—in short, we saw Panzer divisions, with not one soldier on foot, destroy modern armies that yesterday were heralded as among the world's greatest military forces.

Ladies and gentlemen, it is too bad William Allen White and his committee, who advocate stripping our own national defense to aid the Allies, could not witness the harrowing spectacle revealed by these films. In one Panzer division they employ 288 light tanks, 72 medium tanks, forty-five 6-ton tanks, thirty-six 20-ton tanks, and twelve 80-ton tanks, or a total of 453 tanks. Remember, this is only 1 Panzer division, and Hitler boasts of many such units.

Let us in passing, and for contrast, dwell for a moment on the amount of our own military equipment from an inventory of supplies actually on hand, together with the equipment that is considered as being "on order" and revealed by the following tables:

Actually on hand May 1, 1940

Ordnance:	
Small arms and miscellaneous:	
Semiautomatic rifle, cal. .30	38,000
37-mm. antitank gun	228
60-mm. mortar	3
81-mm. mortar	183
Machine gun, .50 cal	319
Machine gun, .30 cal. (light)	86
Automatic rifle, cal. .30	0
Artillery:	
75-mm. gun (modern)	141
75-mm. howitzer (field)	60
105-mm. howitzer	0
155-mm. howitzer (high-speed)	436
155-mm. gun (modern)	4
155-mm. gun (high-speed)	88
8-inch howitzer	0
Combat vehicles:	
Scout car	485
Combat car	114
Light tank	10
Medium tank	18

Actually on hand May 1, 1940—Continued

Ordnance—Continued.	
Antiaircraft equipment:	
3-inch gun, AA	448
90-mm. gun, AA	0
Director	168
Height finder	142
Sound locator	194
37-mm. gun, AA	15
Cal. .50 machine gun, AA	1,014
Detector, AA	0
Searchlight, 60-inch mobile, AA	285

On order, May 1, 1940

Item	Number	Date of delivery
Ordnance:		
Small arms and miscellaneous:		
Semiautomatic rifle, caliber .30	131,789	June 1942.
37-mm. antitank gun	744	Do.
60-mm. mortar	1,840	April 1941.
81-mm. mortar	479	November 1940.
Machine gun, .50 caliber	367	April 1941.
Machine gun, .30 caliber (light)	960	July 1941.
Automatic rifle, caliber .30	6,558	December 1940.
Artillery:		
75-mm. gun (modern)	459	June 1941.
75-mm. howitzer (field)	96	May 1941.
105-mm. howitzer	60	October 1941.
155-mm. howitzer (high-speed)	295	March 1941.
155-mm. gun (modern)	36	April 1942.
155-mm. gun (high-speed	56	August 1940.
8-inch howitzer	0	
Combat vehicles:		
Scout car	0	
Combat car	34	December 1940.
Light tank	392	June 1941.
Medium tank	126	August 1941.
Antiaircraft equipment:		
3-inch gun, antiaircraft	52	September 1940.
90-mm. gun, antiaircraft	114	September 1941.
Director	39	September 1940.
Height finder	58	January 1942.
Sound locator	321	August 1941.
37-mm. gun, antiaircraft	584	Do.
Caliber .50 machine gun, antiaircraft	126	August 1940.
Detector, antiaircraft	18	August 1941.
Searchlight, 60-inch mobile, antiaircraft	294	January 1941.

You will note from the above tables that in the entire United States Army on May 1, 1940, we had 10 light tanks and 18 medium tanks, or a grand total of 28 modern tanks of a type comparable to a modern German tank. Yes, it must be admitted we have 392 light tanks on order, but you will note they will not be delivered until June 1, 1941. You will also note we have 126 medium tanks on order and their delivery is not until August 1941.

Let us not forget the Air Corps of the Army and Navy and their important place in present day methods of warfare. Rear Admiral John H. Towers, Chief of the Bureau of Aeronautics, recently told the Senate Naval Affairs Committee that the Navy had only 1,755 and on order, 1,137. He continued by asserting the Navy would have only 1,902 combat planes by July 1, 1941.

Major General Arnold, Chief of the Army Air Corps testified that of the 2,752 planes in the Army Air Corps, only 52 planes are fit for modern warfare, and of the remaining 2,700, perhaps a half dozen could be rendered fit for combat. In other words, we have 58 fighting planes in the United States Army and Germany has 18,000.

William Allen White and his committee, eager to furnish aid to the Allies, especially planes, should thoroughly analyze the fact that as to the planes on order, the whole delivery schedule of Army and Navy planes has been delayed by a recent order giving the Allies priority on all American military production desired by them. Thus the 3,837 planes on order are not in fact in production for our own use should the Allies elect to call for them.

Ladies and gentlemen, you recall from the start of this discussion we decided to look at the facts. One fact you cannot overlook is that soldiers, sailors, and marines cannot fight wars with equipment on order, and William Allen White and his committee should recognize this fact. Another fact is that the General Staff of the United States Army knows more about war than the President or anyone else, and I am convinced when Hon. Harry H. Woodring resigned as Secretary of War he was forced to do so because he elected to follow the advice of military experts rather than to accept the viewpoint of a group of international meddlers whose military knowledge is zero plus and whose only concern is to utter high-sounding phrases tending to send the youth of America to the battlefields of Europe. Hon. Harry H. Woodring is entitled to the esteem and love of the great American public for his courage and manhood in refusing to become a tool of the international bankers. One has only to read the following statement from Harry Woodring's own lips to arrive at a suitable conclusion as to why he was forced to resign as Secretary of War. Upon returning to his native State of Kansas on June 1, 1940 to receive honors from Washburn College, Secretary Woodring said:

"I'm an advocate of adequate defense, but I will never stand for sending American boys into Europe's shambles. There is a comparatively small clique of international financiers who want the

United States to declare war and get into the European mess with everything we have, including our manpower. I'm not going to stand for it and I'm not going to resign until forced to do so. They don't like me because I'm against stripping our own defenses for the sake of trying to stop Hitler 3,000 miles away. Eventually they will force me to resign, and I'll be darned glad to come back to Kansas where the people have their feet on the ground and are not easily swayed by demagogues and subtle propaganda."

Ladies and gentlemen, Harry Woodring saw the handwriting on the wall and, as a true American, he put the welfare of his country first. In other words, he has the only sensible viewpoint—build an adequate national defense by arming to the teeth.

But the White committee of superpatriots would have us police the entire globe and neglect our own back yard.

We must recognize the fact that in addition to building up our own military defenses we have the problem of assisting in militarizing the Western Hemisphere, which means adequate defense for every country south of the Rio Grande.

No doubt some of you have visited Latin America and realize the shortcomings of our neighbors in these countries and the impossibility of developing them into military men. They lack both the temperament and the physique to make real soldiers. In order to protect our own interests and to offset the alien influences now running hog wild in these countries, we have a huge task in being forced to send men, money, planes, tanks, and other implements of war to properly militarize this Western Hemisphere.

In the face of building our own inadequate defenses and shouldering the burdens of our Latin American neighbors, William Allen White and his committee have the gall of an army mule in advocating that we strip our armed forces of greatly needed military equipment in their frenzied efforts to meddle into European affairs.

I take the position we must arm to the teeth and when that task is completed militarize South America before turning our attention to the plight of European nations.

America has a huge task in carrying out our national-defense program, because it is easily seen that needed equipment cannot be delivered for a period of from 18 months to 2 years. At the completion of that period we hope to have an Army and equipment comparable to Hitler at a cost of approximately $50,000,000,000. We cannot possibly achieve this goal if we are to listen to William Allen White and his cohorts or the propaganda from Europe that would have us strip our armed forces of material necessary for an adequate national defense.

Our national-defense program will be of no avail unless we as a nation unite in our efforts to properly defend this country and the Western Hemisphere. There was never a time in the history of this great Nation when national unity was at a greater premium.

If this objective is to be attained our national unity must be above suspicion. America will not countenance the presence of those who harbor a desire for other forms of government. Such deluded individuals with their warped minds and false political philosophies are the scum of creation and unfit to associate with liberty-loving Americans. These breeders of international hatred and disrupters of the American way of life are the tools of Stalin and Hitler and form the backbone of the "fifth column" in America. Despite the love of Americans for national unity, it is a known fact that the "fifth column" is running hog-wild throughout the country. Yes; the "fifth column" is on the march.

No city in this great land is immune to the workings of these disciples of Stalin, Mussolini, and Hitler. They preach and practice their un-American doctrines with a sneer on their faces and a song of hate in their black hearts.

With reckless abandon and unmitigated gall they have invaded Government departments in the Nation's Capital, enlisting Federal employees in their determined drive to undermine this Government.

Make no mistake about it—the "fifth column" is on the march.

Daily the corridors of many Government buildings in Washington resound to the footsteps of hundreds of Federal employees known to harbor un-American doctrines.

I hold in my hand a printed membership list of the Washington, D. C., branch of the American League for Peace and Democracy containing the names of 563 Government employees known to be members of this organization, branded by the Dies Committee as a Communist-front organization. The salaries of this group range from $1,080 to $10,000 annually, which are paid from the pockets of the taxpayers of America. Since this list was published in the official hearings of the Dies Committee on October 5, 1939, only 20 persons named therein have notified the Dies Committee that they have renounced their membership. During the month of June the House of Representatives was informed that this group of employees was still on the Federal pay roll. One week later specific attention was directed to a fellow traveler in the Department of Labor who, while occupying a $7,000-a-year position, finds time to carry on at the expense of the American taxpayer the program of another Communist-front organization.

A week later I had called to my attention that the acting chairman of the Federal Advisory Council for Employment Security, when asked to consider a motion granting preference to American citizens, publicly confessed the fact that he was an alien.

The climax in this parade of "fifth columnists" was reached several days ago when there arrived in Washington a man who from his own lips asserted that he was a delegate to the Twentieth Anniversary of the Russian Revolution in Moscow. This individual is daily awaiting an appointment to a key position in our national-defense program concerning the training of the youth of America.

Yes; the "fifth column" is truly on the march in this great Nation. Congress has enacted the necessary laws to suppress the "fifth column" if only those high in authority would recognize this menace and move promptly to exterminate it.

America cannot afford to allow this parade of "fifth columnists" to go on unmolested. With the entire country working at a feverish pace to attain the objectives of our national-defense program, it is not difficult to realize how the "fifth columnists," or, as they are more appropriately termed, "filth columnists," can disrupt our well-organized plans.

Every loyal American will find no difficulty in recognizing the real threat of the "fifth column" to our national unity and likewise to our priceless heritage—a free democracy.

It is unthinkable that the taxpayers of America should be called upon to pay the salaries of Federal employees who have "fifth column" tendencies. Nor should the mothers and fathers of America be asked to entrust the training of their sons to Moscow-minded individuals. We have only to recall the sad fate of France and other countries of Europe betrayed by the "fifth columnists," who were permitted to thrive unmolested at the expense of the people.

Let the message of the American people to these alien agitators be phrased in plain language—if you don't like the American form of government; get out and stay out.

We have heard a lot recently of purging political officeholders for differences in opinion. If we are to attain the required solidarity of this Nation, let us witness those in high authority conducting a worth-while purge in ousting from Government circles known enemies to the American way of life.

America has a gigantic task in building a national defense to preserve our priceless heritage of liberty and freedom. But we can never accomplish our task while there lurks in the shadows of the Nation's Capitol a group of alien-minded ingrates who, like vultures, are bent on destroying this Nation.

America is at the crossroads. If we are to proceed in the right direction, let us with a firm hand and a stout heart inform the "fifth columnists" that their heydey is over and that they will be no longer coddled, nursed, or tolerated.

In short, there is no choice. You are either an American or not an American.

Let our actions and our words convey to these "fifth columnists" in blunt language the command of all liberty-loving Americans: If you don't like America, get out and stay out.

In closing, let us for a moment pay tribute to those of our citizens who have laid down their lives in defense of this country. Let us keep in mind the many sacrifices of our forefathers that were necessary in developing this great Nation.

Three thousand miles away a war is raging, but here we are peacefully assembled in this beautiful auditorium, protected by a form of government that has been given us as a priceless heritage.

Let us return to our respective homes conscious of the many blessings we enjoy and with a firm resolve to protect and defend with our lives, if necessary, our cherished possessions—peace and freedom.

Chances We Might Not Have a President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 22, 1940

NONPARTISAN RADIO FORUM OF THE AMERICAN GOOD GOVERNMENT SOCIETY

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herein the text of the broadcast of Nonpartisan Radio Forum of the American Good Government Society, on which I was guest speaker. This was broadcast over the coast-to-coast blue network of the National Broadcasting Co., August 21, at 9:30 p. m., eastern standard time. Also I include the bill H. R. 9642 at the end of the broadcast script.

ANNOUNCER. In keeping with its policy of bringing listeners broadcasts on important public questions, the National Broadcasting Co. presents the Nonpartisan Radio Forum, conducted by the American Good Government Society.

The distinguished guest on the program is Representative ESTES KEFAUVER, Democrat, of Tennessee, who will be introduced and interviewed by Richard A. Staderman, Independent, of New York, and president of the society.

Mr. STADERMAN. Thank you, George Gunn, and good evening all friends of good government from the Atlantic to the Pacific coast. It is true but unfortunate that a Presidential election is the greatest sporting event in the Nation. Every 4 years we witness national political conventions full of ballyhoo and almost everything but the

calm deliberation the founding fathers of 1787 hoped to apply to the choosing of a President. After the nominations we witness much the same thing until election day. Sometimes genuine issues are debated, other times the candidates seem to try to outdo each other in mud slinging, having little or no bearing on the fundamental public questions involved.

It seems particularly difficult to arouse public interest in the defects of the basic law of the land pertaining to Presidential elections. Last year, over another network, it was our privilege to present Congressman CLARENCE F. LEA, of California, who is not only chairman of the House Interstate Commerce Committee, but a leading authority on election laws. In that broadcast we showed how, in 1876, Mr. Tilden received a quarter of a million more popular votes than Mr. Hayes, and yet Hayes become President through the outmoded electoral college, which we felt and still feel should be abolished, as the Lea bill in Congress provides.

Tonight we are considering another serious defect in the Presidential election laws which might sometime, perhaps even in 1941, bring an inauguration day with no one legally able to be inaugurated. This may sound like a fantastic statement, but we believe that after you have listened to our distinguished guest tonight, most of you will agree.

Before proceeding to him we invite listeners to give us their comment on this program. Simply write the American Good Government Society, Washington, D. C. On a recent program over this network, we presented Republican Congressmen. Tonight, therefore, we present a Democratic one, Congressman ESTES KEFAUVER, of Tennessee—his last name being spelled K-E-F-A-U-V-E-R. An attorney and now member of the House Judiciary Committee, he is eminently qualified to discuss this topic.

Congressman KEFAUVER, what do you propose to do about these election laws?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Thank you, Mr. Staderman.

I wish first of all to commend you and the American Good Government Society for the public services you are rendering in bringing important but neglected problems to the attention of the American public.

Even during these hectic days, when our thoughts pertain mainly to our national defense and to the selection of a President in November, I think it is well to consider and examine our laws, or, rather, some omissions in our laws, which might result in great confusion and uncertainty as to the office of the President, or even in our failure to have a President.

"The executive power shall be vested in a President of the United States of America." These two lines in the Constitution establish all executive power in one person. It places the President beyond the reach of any other department, except impeachment and conviction by Congress.

Mr. STADERMAN. Tell us what situations might arise to keep us from having a President.

Mr. KEFAUVER. It is not necessary that I discuss the confusion, uncertainties, and havoc that would result from our failure to have a President, even for a very short time. The difficulties that would arise are obvious to everyone. There would be no head of the executive department. The members of the Cabinet and the chiefs of departments could not be appointed. No vacancies in the executive department could be filled. The Army and the Navy would be without a Commander in Chief. All laws would have to be passed by a two-thirds majority in both Houses of Congress, and it is doubtful if any valid law could be enacted even by a two-thirds majority, as under the Constitution a law must be presented to the President before it can be passed by a two-thirds majority.

The idea of a vacancy in the office of President was abhorrent to the Constitution makers. Such a thing was unthinkable. But while they studiously avoided the use of the word "vacancy," they failed to provide against such a contingency, and no provision has as yet been made by constitutional amendment or by congressional enactment to insure that we have a President under all circumstances and at all times.

The contingencies, remote but nevertheless real and possible under which we might on Inauguration Day, January 20, find this Nation without a Chief Executive are:

First, should the President-elect and the Vice-President-elect die or become disqualified before the inauguration, or should the President-elect die or become disqualified before the inauguration and the Senate fail to elect a Vice President.

The second contingency may arise through failure (1) of the electoral college to elect a President, and (2) through failure of the House of Representatives to choose a President before the beginning of his term.

Suppose there should be no majority over all for any Presidential candidate in some Presidential election. A third party has, and might again bring about this situation. Two hundred and sixty-six votes are necessary to elect. The election of a President would then be thrown into the House of Representatives. It would be a new House, one elected at the previous election. It would meet on January 3. It would have to organize. It could not organize until it elected a Speaker. This may not be possible for days or weeks or even months. Deadlocks have occurred in the past over the election of the Speaker, one lasing several months. The electoral vote is required by law to be counted on January 6, only 3 days after the first meeting of a new Congress.

Obviously, if a deadlock over the Speakership should ensue and not be broken by January 6, the two Houses of Congress could not even meet in joint session on that date to count the electoral vote, much less proceed to the election of a President or Vice President. Assuming, however, that a Speaker of the House were to be elected promptly, and the count of the electoral vote disclosed a stalemate, the House would proceed to ballot for President. No other business would be in order from day to day. The date for the inauguration of the President is January 20, as fixed by the Constitution, allowing but 12 weekdays in which to make a choice, and if no one is chosen by that time the Vice President, if the Senate meanwhile has elected one, would become Acting President; otherwise, under this bill, the Speaker of the House would become Acting President, and the House and Senate would continue to ballot for President and Vice President, respectively. In the election of a Vice President by the Senate two-thirds of the Senators shall constitute a quorum, and a majority of the whole number is necessary to elect. It might be an easy matter to prevent an election by the absence of a constitutional quorum.

In the extremely remote possibility of the death or disqualification of both the President-elect and the Vice-President-elect, there is no provision now in our Constitution or statutes for the selection of an Acting President.

To meet these contingencies the bill, H. R. 9462, designates the Speaker of the House of Representatives as Acting President until a President shall have been qualified. If the House of Representatives has not chosen a Speaker, then, and then only, the bill designates the President of the Senate pro tempore to act as President.

Mr. STADERMAN. What does the United States Constitution have to say about succession to the Presidency, Congressman KEFAUVER?

Mr. KEFAUVER. The Constitution, Mr. Staderman, makes no provision for succession in the event of the death or disqualification of both the President and of the President-elect, or in the event the House has failed to elect a President and the Senate a Vice President, when that duty devolves upon them.

Three years after the ratification of the Constitution, the Congress, in which sat many members of the Constitutional Convention, passed a law to take care of a vacancy in the office of President, providing for the succession, first, to the President pro tempore of the Senate, and then to the Speaker of the House, who should act as President until a special election could be had.

This law remained on the statute books until 1886, when it was repealed. The reason for its repeal was that Vice President Hendricks had just died. The President pro tempore of the Senate was a Republican. He would have succeeded to the Presidency in the event of the death of President Cleveland. The Succession Act of 1886 made the succession fall first to the Secretary of State, and then on down through the Cabinet.

This is the law today, but it takes care of a vacancy arising only after a President has qualified. Most constitutional authorities do not interpret the law to provide for succession in the contingencies contemplated in the bill under discussion, to wit, where a President has not been chosen before inauguration or where a President-elect and a Vice-President-elect should not have qualified.

Mr. STADERMAN. Before the passage of the twentieth amendment to the Constitution (the so-called Norris amendment), the new President qualified on March 4, so that the House had 3 months in which to elect a President in the event the election of one devolved upon it. But by the Norris amendment the term of the retiring President expires on January 20. The House meets on January 3, thus the House, as you have previously said, has only 12 working days in which to elect a President if it should be required to do so. This amendment increases the necessity for the passage of the Kefauver bill, does it not?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Yes; and furthermore, Mr. Staderman, the twentieth amendment contemplated that Congress would pass a law to take care of the contingencies we have been discussing.

Section 3 of the twentieth amendment is as follows:

"If, at the time fixed for the beginning of the term of the President, the President-elect shall have died, the Vice-President-elect shall become President. If a President shall not have been chosen before the time fixed for the beginning of his term, or if the President-elect shall have failed to qualify, then the Vice-President-elect shall act as President until a President shall have qualified; and the Congress may by law provide for the case wherein neither a President-elect nor a Vice-President-elect shall have qualified, declaring who shall then act as President, or the manner in which one who is to act shall be selected, and such person shall act accordingly until a President or Vice President shall have qualified."

Thus it will be seen that this amendment authorizes this legislation. The bill is in pursuance to provisions of section 3.

Under this provision it will be seen that Congress derives authority to designate any person whomsoever it desires to act as President under the circumstances indicated. An analogy is furnished in the temporary function exercised by the Chief Justice of the United States when presiding over the Senate in a trial of an impeached President. His authority so to act is in the Constitution. Likewise, the authority of Congress to designate a person, any person, to act as President is derived from the same source, the Constitution.

Mr. STADERMAN. Have any Presidential elections ever been thrown into the House of Representatives?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Yes; in 1800 Thomas Jefferson and Aaron Burr received the same number of electoral votes—73. The Jefferson-Burr controversy threatened a dissolution of the Government. It was said that the country escaped from a civil war only by the prevalence of that kind temper in the Congress which prevailed in the Constitutional Convention itself. This was the first time a Presidential election had been thrown in the House of Representatives, and it nearly wrecked the young Republic.

The second and last time an election was thrown into the House of Representatives was in 1824. In the electoral college Jackson had 99 votes, Adams 84, Crawford 41, and Clay 37. The great Tennessean, Andrew Jackson, had a plurality of 50,000 in the popular vote. There was no question as to the election of John C. Calhoun as Vice President. Henry Clay was Speaker of the House at that time. Before the day for counting the votes a great scandal arose. Charges of corruption were made against Clay, which were investigated without result. The situation was one which invited intrigue, and no doubt there was much bargaining and attempted trading of votes. Excitement ran high. A coalition between the followers of Clay and those of Adams resulted in the election of John Quincy Adams on the first ballot. Clay, on account of being fourth in the electoral college, was eliminated in the House. If the old provision of voting for the five highest on the list had not been changed to the three highest, Clay instead of Adams probably would have been the choice. Adams, when a Senator, had opposed the change from five to three, and had his argument prevailed, it is unlikely he would have become President.

Another election was almost thrown into the House in 1876 during the Hayes-Tilden controversy. Congress, by setting up a joint committee, whose decision as to the election was final, avoided an election by the House. Hayes was found to be elected by a majority of one.

Mr. STADERMAN. Why in your bill, Congressman KEFAUVER, have you designated the Speaker of the House of Representatives as first choice and President pro tempore of the Senate as second choice for Acting President?

Mr. KEFAUVER. The reason, Mr. Staderman, is that the Speaker of the House has been recently elected by a majority of the Members of the House. The House represents the latest expression of the people. In other words, it might be said that he derives his power direct from the people, as a result of the recent election. In a lesser degree the same could be said of the President pro tempore of the Senate.

There is a great deal of logic in succession to the Cabinet members beginning with the Secretary of State if a vacancy occurs after the beginning of a term. The Secretary of State and the Cabinet members are the choice of the President and are familiar with and sympathetic with the policy of the administration and would be best fitted to carry it forward. But this logic does not apply where a President does not qualify, as a Cabinet member of the old administration might be entirely out of harmony with the recently expressed will of the people and with the intended purposes of the new administration.

By designating the Speaker of the House, and if no Speaker has been elected, the President pro tempore of the Senate, the Congress by the enactment of this bill would be designating a compatible officer just as it did recently when an Assistant Secretary of the Navy was designated as Acting Secretary.

Upon the election of a President or of a Vice President, the Acting President would automatically resume the duties of his office of Speaker of the House or President pro tempore of the Senate, as the case may be. The bill provides that no vacancy in these positions would have ensued, and the Acting President would receive the emoluments of the President only so long as he should act as such.

Mr. STADERMAN. Thank you, Congressman KEFAUVER, for your convincing explanation of your bill. We of the Good Government Society certainly hope that your plan will become law. Listeners may send their comment on this program directly to the American Good Government Society, Washington, D. C. Those persons favoring the Kefauver bill, H. R. 9462, just discussed, would help to make it law by expressing their views about it.

I believe we have a few moments to summarize several high points of the program for the benefit of listeners who tuned in after it began. There might be no one legally able to assume the duties of President on inauguration day due to (1) possible death or disability of President-elect and Vice-President-elect; (2) due to repetition of the 1876 situation when Congress was unable for months to determine whom the rightful President-elect and Vice-President-elect were, on account of conflicting and allegedly fraudulent election returns; (3) due to lack of a majority in the electorial college having thrown the election of President and Vice President into the House and Senate respectively as the Constitution provides, and if neither Chamber is able to muster a majority needed to select any one candidate; and (4) due to the fact that if no one political party should have a majority in the House in the new Congress counting the Presidential votes, the House might be unable to legally organize to elect a Speaker and there might be no joint session of Congress legally possible to carry out the constitutional mandate of approving the votes in what might otherwise be a clear-cut election of President and Vice President.

This is Richard A. Staderman saying good-bye and good government.

A bill designating the person who shall act as President if a President shall not have been chosen before the time fixed for the beginning of his term, or when neither a President-elect nor a Vice-President-elect shall have qualified

Be it enacted, etc., That if a President shall not have been chosen before the time fixed for the beginning of his term, or neither a President-elect nor a Vice-President-elect shall have qualified, the Speaker of the House of Representatives shall act as President until a President or a Vice President shall have qualified: *Provided*, That if the House of Representatives shall not have elected a Speaker, the President of the Senate pro tempore shall then act as President until a President or a Vice President shall have qualified: *Provided further*, That no vacancy shall ensue in the office of the Speaker of the House of Representatives nor in the office of the President of the Senate pro tempore by reason of this act.

SEC. 2. The person who shall act as President shall take the oath of office prescribed in the Constitution before entering upon the discharge of his duties, and he shall receive compensation at the rate prescribed for the President and none other during his incumbency as Acting President, and he shall exercise the powers, functions, and prerogatives of the Chief Executive while so acting; and when a President or a Vice President shall have qualified such person shall thereupon relinquish the office as Acting President and automatically resume the duties of the office of Speaker of the House of Representaitves or President of the Senate pro tempore, as the case may be.

Interstate Trade Barriers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE T. ELLIS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 21, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON EVENING STAR

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, a most excellent editorial entitled "Interstate Trade Barriers," appeared in the Washington Evening Star Saturday, August 17. The statements contained therein lend emphasis to the report of the Committee on Interstate Trade Barriers and Unemployment, which was submitted to this House a few days ago and which is contained in House Document 850, Seventy-sixth Congress. In that report we of the committee simply went a step further than does this editorial and pointed out that freight-rate discriminations constitute perhaps the greatest barrier of all. I am happy to insert herewith in the RECORD that editorial:

[From the Washington Star of August 17, 1940]

INTERSTATE TRADE BARRIERS

In its plans to conduct an educational and promotional drive, through its field offices, for the removal of interstate trade barriers, the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce is undertaking a project well worth while. For these trade barriers impede the free flow of commerce between the States, and their elimination will do much to speed business recovery. Under the program announced this week by Director James W. Young, the Bureau will explain to business and civic organizations the economic effects of these discriminations against trade, and cooperate with them in collecting local examples of laws, rules, and regulations that serve as obstacles to the movement of commerce from one State to another.

These discriminations are of many kinds. Several States, for example, tax nonresident motor vehicles so as to discriminate in favor of busses and trucks owned locally. In laws regulating dairy, oleomargarine, trucking, and other operations, farm products face many barriers. In one State, a fresh egg is an egg laid only in that State. However fresh eggs from other States must be labeled "foreign eggs," and the containers from which they are sold must be so marked. The regulations governing sizes, weights, and measures differ widely, and are a cause of much confusion. Though Idaho and Maine sell their potatoes all over the country, standards of weight or the cubic content of a bushel of potatoes vary between the States by as much as 30 percent. Oil-burning equipment made in New Jersey cannot be installed in New York City.

For several years Federal officials have been studying the problem created by the increasing barriers to interstate trade. Last fall, at the suggestion of Secretary Hopkins, an interdepartmental committee on interstate trade barriers was established. The committee has assembled a great deal of information on the subject. These data have been turned over to State organizations.

As Secretary Hopkins pointed out some months ago, the removal of these barriers rests with the States. The Southern Governors' Conference, at its meeting at Nashville in January, approved resolutions condemning specific kinds of discriminatory laws, and there have been evidences elsewhere that the States are beginning to realize the economic significance of these discriminations against interstate commerce. This is a hopeful sign.

Roads and Trails To Develop Inaccessible Regions Where Enormous Natural Resources Remain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 29, 1940

STATEMENT OF HON. COMPTON I. WHITE, OF IDAHO, BEFORE THE SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, the construction of roads and trails to open the inaccessible regions in vast, rugged, mountainous sections of the West is one of the most important undertakings depending on the policy of the Federal Government. The development of the extensive mineral, timber, and waterpower resources of this important section of our country is entirely dependent on the construction of the necessary roads by the Federal Government. In support of the program I have appeared before the Senate Appropriations Committee and presented the facts concerning this appropriation, which is submitted for the RECORD:

FOREST SERVICE

[Statement of Hon. COMPTON I. WHITE, a Representative in Congress from the State of Idaho]

FOREST ROADS AND TRAILS

Representative WHITE. Mr. Chairman, I come to you to speak about one of the most important appropriations carried in this appropriation bill, as I see it. That is the item for forest roads and trails. I understand the Budget authorization of $10,000,000 has been cut by the House to $7,500,000.

IMPORTANCE OF DEVELOPING ROADS AND TRAILS

In dealing with the appropriation for forest roads and trails we are dealing with the development of our great resources which are inaccessible. I have a very heavy responsibility in representing a district which contains the greatest concentration of national forests within the United States. There may be a little greater area in California, but in that great strip of country which commences at the national divide and extends down to the Snake River, dividing Oregon and Washington, we have vast resources that are locked up. They are in the national forests. Seventy-two percent of the State of Idaho is federally owned, and there is no way of opening up the country. We are working under a terrific handicap. The forest needs every dollar in that item. It is a short-sighted policy to cut that appropriation, which should be increased, if anything.

We are dealing here with the great Territory of Alaska. The habitable portion of Alaska, in the southern part, is largely in national forests. We are dealing with Arizona, and with all the Western States—with a territory that is in the undeveloped section of the country. There is no way the States and counties can go into this territory, where there is no taxable property. If we could develop the resources of that territory we could put men to work. The strategic minerals which the Government is searching for are to be found in that territory.

I have here some pictures of Stibnite, Idaho. I wish to take the time of the committee to show some of the pictures of the things we have in Idaho. I could furnish you a whole book.

Antimony comes from stibnite. The Government has just gone in there and is financing the development. That country is reached by going over three mountain roads to a place called Yellow Pine, where the stibnite operation is going on, employing about 200 men, producing a metal which is of vital importance in supplying alloys needed in the manufacture of steel.

That activity is concerned with this item of the appropriation for forest roads and trails. These pictures show the character of the country and the kind of roads we have to build to obtain access to the territory. This [indicating] is a bird's-eye view. This [indicating] is a picture of old Thunder Mountain, the place that was opened when William Allen White went in there, and the town of Roosevelt was established in Teddy Roosevelt's day. I have here a picture of the town of Roosevelt, which was built in Teddy Roosevelt's time. It is now under about 40 feet of water. A slide came down the mountain, crossed the valley and formed a big dam which backed up the water. This is the way it looks today [exhibiting a photograph] with a few houses floating around.

We are also dealing with a gold treasure. We have the great Idaho granite intrusion, containing seams of gold which produced gold back in 1860 and 1870. We are credited with having produced $300,000,000 in gold. Heavy machinery must be taken back into the mountains to operate the mines, and the work is done under a terrific handicap.

Senator RUSSELL. What minerals were produced at the Roosevelt mine?

Representative WHITE. They are now producing gold there. There is a mill in there. This is the way they got oil in [exhibiting photograph]. The mine was up on Thunder Mountain.

A peculiar thing about Thunder Mountain is that the only way to get into Thunder Mountain is to follow the forest roads and trails to the end, and then go in on horseback. I was up there. I followed the forest trails and roads to the end, parked my car, and the little party I was with was met by a string of pack horses.

In the center of the United States, we cannot get a road into Thunder Mountain. This picture [indicating] shows a barrel of oil which was dropped from an airplane to keep that mill in operation. It broke into a thousand pieces. Some of the oil was scooped up out of the snow.

We are dealing with a serious proposition when we talk about roads and trails. We must have a constructive policy that will open up the country and put men to work developing our resources. I was trying to help this thing along. I saw Mr. Bell, Director of the Budget, and tried to impress him with the importance of this activity, and pave the way for a slight increase in the Budget for forest roads and trails. I went on to tell him about the gold lying there waiting to be developed. He said, "We have too much gold now." I said "All right. Let us fold up and go home."

This picture shows the way they get machinery into the mine. This [indicating] is a winch. The machinery is let down from the top of the mountain. If you want to get down to a mine, you have to let the machinery down with a hand winch. When you get it down there, how are you going to get your gasoline and fuel oil in to run the machinery and open up the country? Those are some of the things we are up against.

Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to take too much of the time of the committee. We are making many, many appropriations. I certainly hope that when the committee scans the little item for roads and trails it will have a little appreciation of what it means to all of us. It is important to the eastern section of the country, which supplies the machinery. It is important to the oil-producting section of the country, which supplies the oil to run the machinery. It is important to those who supply the food and clothing that go in there.

In that rough and rugged country there is no competition. Everybody in there has to take in everything he consumes, whether it be oil to drive a Diesel engine, the clothes he wears on his back, or the food he eats.

We are interested in permanent employment. We are not interested in the little job of building a road. We do not care anything about that. We are interested in putting men to work permanently in these mines and adding to the national wealth.

AMOUNT OF AUTHORIZATION

Senator HAYDEN. The situation, for the record, is that the authorization for this appropriation was $14,000,000 the previous 2 years. For this 2-year period, because of the failure of Congress to appropriate the amount authorized, there was a lag in the expenditures. The authorization for this fiscal year is $10,000,000. The reduction from $14,000,000 to $10,000,00 was caused by the failure of Congress to appropriate the amount of money authorized by law. Congress simply has not appropriated the money, and the lag in the authorization has accumulated in that way. For the fiscal year 1941 the authorization is $13,000,000. I take it, what Mr. WHITE wants is the full amount authorized by law appropriated.

Representative WHITE. I do. I am not asking you to go beyond that.

Senator TOWNSEND. You are in favor of developing our domestic gold, and not buying so much foreign gold.

Representative WHITE. I think the whole monetary policy of the country is in error. It does not conform to the fundamental principles of economics. We must have in this country a good, workable, adequate money system based upon precious metals; and we will never get away from it.

Just now we are witnessing another reduction of the gold content of the franc. In the old days things were stabilized and nearly all the European units were on the basis of 5 to our dollar—5 marks to a dollar, 5 francs to a dollar, and so forth. Just think of the experience those people are going through over there, on account of the money system we have, which has upset the whole situation.

I do not want to go into the money question with you gentlemen, but just contrast our policy in the United States with the policy being followed in Canada. I have a photostatic copy of an article telling of the money being spent by the Canadian Government to assist in developing their mining industry. They are doing everything in the world, and they are just walking right away from us. In the past 2 years we have always exceeded Canada in the production of gold, but in recent times we have fallen further and further behind. Canada's gold production is contributing to her industry, her prosperity, and her business recovery.

We are dealing with a serious problem.

Senator TOWNSEND. The Canadians are developing their mining interests and sending the gold to us, and we are paying $35 an ounce for it.

Mr. Speaker, the Senate Appropriations Committee in recognition of the need for an adequate appropriation for this work increased the amount in the appropriation bill from $7,500,000 to $10,000,000 as it appears in the amended bill,

H. R. 8202, an act making appropriation for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, which is shown in the item for forest roads and trails, page 46 of the amended bill, as follows:

FOREST ROADS AND TRAILS

For carrying out the provisions of section 23 of the Federal Highway Act approved November 9, 1921 (23 U. S. C. 23), including not to exceed $59,500 for departmental personal services in the District of Columbia, ~~$7,500,000~~ *$10,000,000*, which sum consists of the balance of the amount authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year 1940 and ~~$500,000~~ *$3,000,000* of the amount authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year 1941 by the act approved June 8, 1938 (52 Stat. 635), to be immediately * * *.

Production of Shoes by Convict Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE J. CONNERY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 22, 1940

LETTER FROM UNITED SHOE WORKERS OF AMERICA

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Speaker, for the edification and information of the Members of the House, I present herewith the letter I have recently received from the United Shoe Workers of America, C. I. O., voicing the protest of that organization against the mass production of shoes by convict labor in the Federal prisons. I have already voiced my protest to the Director of the C. C. C. and to the War Department in this matter.

The letter follows:

UNITED SHOE WORKERS OF AMERICA, OF THE C. I. O.
Washington, D. C., August 13, 1940.

Hon. LAWRENCE J. CONNERY,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CONNERY: In behalf of the thousands of your shoe worker constituents, and especially in the interest of those who are now unemployed, we call your attention to the fact that the Quartermaster's Corps of the Army is about to award an order for 300,000 pairs of shoes to the Leavenworth prison for manufacture by convict labor.

The men's shoe industry, we are sure you are aware, has suffered the worst spring and summer seasons to date in many years, and weekly wages earned by many workers in this industry have hit new lows. Workers in this industry cannot afford any loss in wages as the average pay is only $880 a year, a sum too low to maintain a decent American standard of living.

Congress has expressed its will in regard to this matter in Public, No. 271, Seventy-first Congress, which reads in part, as follows:

"* * * that the Attorney General provide employment for inmates in the United States penal institutions in such diversified forms as will reduce to a minimum competition with private industry or free labor."

The Federal Prison Housing, Inc., the agency which handles this matter, has been increasing the activities of its shoe factories until it now constitutes a serious threat to the maintenance of standards in the competitive commercial shoe industry. This is shown more clearly by the fact that in 1932 the total annual production of the shoe factory in Leavenworth prison was 240,000 pairs and now, having completed an order of 120,000 pairs for the C. C. C. so far this year, they are about to take this order for an additional 300,000 pairs, bringing their total production this year to a minimum of 500,000 pairs.

It seems paradoxical that it should be necessary for the thousands of trained skilled shoe workers to commit a crime before they are permitted to work at their trade.

We urge you to protest both to the Director of the C. C. C. and to Maj. Letcher O. Grice, in charge of shoe purchases in the Quartermaster Corps of the United States Army.

Your interest in this matter will be deeply appreciated, and we would appreciate your keeping us informed of any action you may take in regard to this matter.

Respectfully yours,

FRANK MCGRATH,
President.
JAMES J. MITCHELL,
General Secretary-Treasurer.
LEO GOODMAN,
Research Director, United Shoe Workers of America, C. I. O.

Reply of Secretary Ickes to Mr. Willkie

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RUSH D. HOLT

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 22 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

ARTICLE BY WESTBROOK PEGLER

Mr. HOLT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article by Westbrook Pegler entitled "I Can Lick Ickes." It is the story of "Honest" Harold Ickes, the famous stamp collector.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FAIR ENOUGH

(By Westbrook Pegler)

"I CAN LICK ICKES"

When I was writing sport back in the era of wonderful nonsense we had a muscle-bound middleweight with a nose like a summer squash who called himself Johnny Wilson and who couldn't lick anybody but the champion of the world. He admitted that he wasn't much good, but he insisted that there was one guy that he could lick, anywhere, any time.

"I may be a lousy fighter," he used to say, "but I can lick Mike O'Dowd," and the fact of the matter is that he was and he could.

That is the way I feel about Harold Ickes.

I may not be so hot when you put me in with some of those main-event ideology blokes and fancy-Dan economists, but give me Ickes any time. He was made for me. Santa Claus brought him for me. In this world every guy has a sign on at least one other guy, and Harold Ickes is my guy.

I murdered him out in Chicago during the Democratic Convention when the party of Roosevelt and humanity renominated the great indispensable under the social and political auspices of a gang of political porch climbers and who else but Harold the pure in heart? It was like catching a parson in a raid and hearing the parson explain that, believe it or not, he was just waiting for a streetcar.

Here was the great reformer messing around, and even getting his picture taken, with Ed Kelly, the mayor, whom he himself had denounced as a gang politician of the worst type and against whom he had been of more than half a mind to run for mayor, in a noble sacrifice to save Chicago from a fate which is worse than death.

Mr. Ickes and Harry Hopkins, another sanctimonious devil chaser, went out to handle the job for the party or humanity, and not only got caught with Kelly and his mob but with Frank Hague, of Jersey City, and, what's more, somebody snapped Harold's picture with them.

Harold's weakness is his own kind of stuff. He likes to rip and tear and try to pull your arms off; and if you stand back and try to box him fancy, he will knock your head through the skylight. But tear into him before he can get out of his corner and bat him a couple, then pull him and bull him around a little, and he will start to look for that gate, yelling "Foul!" I know my guy from experience.

I don't wish I were running for President, but I tell you one thing—if I were I couldn't ask for sweeter luck than to have them send Ickes after me. Inside of a week you would read that Mr. Ickes had been compelled to drop out of the campaign and put himself away in the United States Naval Hospital in Washington, his favorite rest cure, at $3.25 a day.

I wouldn't quit reminding the citizens that Mr. Ickes is so cheap that when he gets sick or wants a rest he muscles into the naval hospital, where he has no legal right to put himself, not merely because he considers himself too good and precious to take a chance in the regular civilian hospital in Washington, as the taxpayers must, but because the service is practically free.

When he pulled that crack on Wendell Willkie about how Willkie made his money and about his residence on Fifth Avenue, I wanted to ask, and now I do ask, how Ickes first got into the chips and how he compares his own residence in the dude country north of Chicago, where he has lived much longer than Willkie has lived on Fifth Avenue, and his present country mansion outside Washington, with Willkie's Fifth Avenue apartment. Go ahead, Harold; give us a tell.

A long time ago my guy Harold got fresh. He said I had been a sports writer and that, after all, what could one expect? Do you know the answer to that? The answer is that he was a sports

writer himself under the same boss in Chicago years ago, but such a punk that he never made the grade, whereas, anyway, I was a major leaguer for 15 years and quit of my own accord.

Yes, chums; I may be a bum, but I can lick Harold Ickes. And you can throw in that Charlie Michelson, too. There is another one I can lick. That kind were made for me.

War Before November

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 22, 1940

ARTICLE BY WILLIAM RANDOLPH HEARST

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by William Randolph Hearst, which appeared in the Washington Times-Herald on August 21:

IN THE NEWS—WAR BEFORE NOVEMBER IS THIS WRITER'S FORECAST

How long do you think it will be before we get into the present war head over ears?

What is going to put us in?

What is to be our part when we do get in?

And what is to be the situation and condition of our people and our country during our participation and afterwards?

It is well to be thinking about these things, because our entrance into the war seems very near.

Many people think it will occur before the Presidential election in November.

Why?

Oh, because it would be very fortunate for Mr. Roosevelt if we should get in before that time, and Mr. Roosevelt is very fortunate.

Second, because the agreement with Canada is an indication that the administration thinks that war is close at hand.

Third, because administration insistence that American vessels sail through dangerously mined ocean zones in spite of warnings of unavoidable catastrophe is likely to provide an immediate critical occasion.

Fourth, because Mr. Roosevelt's Cabinet is being built for war.

Col. Frank Knox, a military figure of distinction, is very war-minded.

And Henry L. Stimson has always been, when a Republican office-holder, a strong advocate of intervention in European affairs and participation in the League of Nations.

Fifth, because war propaganda is being encouraged on every side.

Mr. Bullitt, Ambassador extremely extraordinary to almost everywhere, stands incongruously on the steps of Independence Hall, and at the instance of the Roosevelt administration inconsistently incites the American people to enter the disastrous European conflict.

Even the gentle first lady of the land sponsors an inflammatory anti-German picture made from the writings of Ernst Toller, who was in 1919 leader of the Communist revolution in Bavaria against the republican government of President Ebert.

James Roosevelt is being sued by the heirs of Toller for a financial interest in the film which was produced by an English company as war propaganda.

Sixth, because of the proposed disposal of some 50 of our older naval destroyers to England to be employed in the war.

And, seventh, because the especial kind of conscription which the administration advocates would seem unnecessary and undesirable unless expeditionary forces are contemplated.

Of course there are also many powerful influences other than the administration in favor of war.

There are social influences, financial influences, racial and religious influences.

Ours is a wonderful country—an amazing melting pot, the product of which is a democratic alloy valuable to our civilization and to all the world.

But many of the ingredients in the pot are not yet thoroughly fused.

Many for some generations will retain much of their original character and connections.

These elements have been deeply affected by the conditions prevailing in Europe and are eager to correct them—to democratize them according to American standards—not by example but by force of arms.

All of these political and personal causes make pretty certain our involvement in the war.

The defensive agreement with Canada is in itself a beneficial thing.

But it must necessarily mean that the United States will defend Canada more than Canada will defend the United States, unless the agreement includes the provision that the British Navy shall cooperate to defend the Western Hemisphere.

In which case we have entered into an alliance not only with Canada but with the British Empire.

Everybody knows that the South American republics will not be an advantage but an obligation to the United States in case of war—not an asset but a liability in matters of mutual defense—which would in no way be mutual.

No one can seriously suppose that Chile, Peru, Ecuador, Guatemala, Brazil, or even Mexico is going to supply tatterdemalion soldiers for the defense of the United States.

And they certainly are not going to supply ships, because they have not got any worthy of much consideration.

Everyone can see equally clearly that the reason the conscription bill does not confine the activities of the United States Army to the United States and its possessions is because the administration contemplates using the Army in other parts of the Western Hemisphere, if not in various parts of the Eastern Hemisphere.

In other words, the administration purposes to use this Army for world war without securing the specific consent of Congress or without consulting in any way the wishes of the American people.

The agreement with Canada is like the treaty of Habana, a purely personal Roosevelt agreement imposing upon the people of the United States the defense of the whole American Continent.

This obligation is immense and wholly unilateral unless, as has been said above, specific provision is made for the equal employment of the British Navy, in which case the treaty is with the British Empire.

Would it not be well to have these treaties formalized and constitutionally approved by the Senate of the United States, and to have their consequences in widespread warfare referred to the approval of the people of the United States?

As for propaganda, its effect is astounding.

It carries us away like the current of a great tide.

It causes us to forget all the lessons of our experience.

It transforms facts into fancies, and fancies into facts.

We are fortified against the propaganda of the warring nations.

We expect them to color their statements and to exaggerate their achievements.

But we are unprotected against the insidious and insistent propaganda of our own Government.

We naturally tend to rely on the good faith of our own representatives, and their attack upon our credulity with biased statements and prejudiced personal views reaches us under our guard.

Consequently a sentiment for war is gradually developing in this country as it did in the World War.

Soon therefore we may look for war.

How soon and how certain it is difficult to say, but if your columnist were inclined to venture an opinion he would say before November—and he is not wholly without practice as a prognosticator.

Loans to Latin America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 22, 1940

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday the House passed a bill to make possible $500,000,000 of loans to Latin America through the Export-Import Bank. In spite of the several hours spent in the debate, I do not believe that many of the most essential factors in this matter were made clear.

I voted for the bill for three reasons: First, because I believe it is very important from the standpoint of national defense to prevent the Latin American republics from being forced to become economically dependent upon a Europe which is already largely dominated by dictators; second, because anything we can do to increase the welfare of the Western Hemisphere republics and to assist in giving them better balanced economies is a good thing to do; and, third, because I want to make the United States as nearly self-sufficient as possible, and, by the same token, I want us to be able to obtain the few strategic and necessary materials and commodities which we really cannot produce as near home as possible.

I am hopeful that this move on the part of the American Government will result in putting the whole Western Hemisphere in a stronger bargaining position with regard to the sale of export products. Somewhere a market must, of course, be had for the commodities which are produced in such abundance in South America. Some of these, from the northern part and the Caribbean region, the United States needs, cannot produce, and is in a position to purchase. On the other hand it is, of course, ridiculous to expect that temperate South America will cease to trade with Europe and no one, I think, even desires to bring about such a situation. The best we can do—and all we should try to do—is to support the bargaining position of the South Americans, to enable them to trade on fair terms and not on European terms and thus to leave them both economically and politically independent.

This whole effort will, of course, be of no avail if the United States or its representatives or nationals do anything that smacks of imperialism or "dollar diplomacy" or of an attempt to induce a return to the gold standard on the part of any nation. It must be a sincere effort to help—not a move to dominate.

I earnestly hope that most of these loans will be made for such purposes as public improvements—roads, schools, improved communication systems, better transportation facilities, and similar things. These things will help to balance the Latin American nations' economies and make them less dependent on foreign trade. They will improve the lot of the common people. That should be a major aim.

Another legitimate objective is the development of such products as rubber, tin, nickel, tungsten, and manila fiber—essential things which cannot be produced in the United States and for some of which we are dependent on very far distant sources of supply in regions where there might be danger of war unless we are extremely level-headed.

I am not particularly interested in trying to increase foreign trade in commodities which our people desperately need themselves. This includes most of the things we produce. The answer to most of our so-called "surpluses" is an increased buying power on the part of American consumers. We can achieve this whenever we want to really try to do it. Foreign trade is important where nations exchange goods which one but not the other can effectively produce. In any case, loans won't increase exports. It is an economic contradiction of terms to say they will. For a loan implies interest payments from the debtor to the creditor and when these are made the creditor must in the long pull buy more from the debtor than he sells to him. For the same reason, the higher the interest rate the greater must be the excess of imports by the creditor over his exports to the debtor.

Our market should be here at home for all but a very few things which we produce in actual surplus over our possible needs. I hope that out of all this can come the possibility—remote though it may seem—of the Americas using their bargaining power derived from their possession of the only considerable supplies of food products in the world for the purpose of bringing about a just and decent peace. To try to deliberately starve whole populations is to make war almost inevitable. But that there can be conditions attached to the feeding of nations is clear and obvious and here is where we may have a real opportunity.

Finally, I regret very much that the occasion of the debate on this bill has been taken by some Members of the House to say some perfectly unnecessary and in some cases untrue things about the nations to the south of us. Some of these remarks have come with exceedingly poor grace from people who have themselves for whatever reasons criticized other American officials for outspoken attacks on European nations. Our aim must now be to build good will in the Western Hemisphere, and that good will rather than a counteracting imperialism must be our answer to attempted Nazi or any other kind of foreign penetration in the Western World.

This Was Foretold

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW C. SCHIFFLER
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 22, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE SATURDAY EVENING POST OF AUGUST 24, 1940

Mr. SCHIFFLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask the privilege of inserting in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial appearing in the August 24, 1940, issue of the Saturday Evening Post, as follows:

THIS WAS FORETOLD

In Philadelphia, 153 years ago, the founders sat. Their task was to reconcile government with liberty. The great ends to be served were two. One was to protect the people against their rulers. The other was to protect the people against themselves—for was it not the lesson of history that people, being liable to passion, suggestible, dreading responsibility, tending by power of majority to oppress minorities, were wont to sacrifice or surrender their liberties?

"But there is a natural inclination in mankind to kingly government," said Benjamin Franklin to the Convention. "I am apprehensive, therefore, perhaps too apprehensive, that the Government of these States may in future times end in monarchy."

They understood what Franklin was saying. They knew what the problem was. The problem was how to limit the power of the Executive, who might be called magistrate or president; limit his access to the emotions of the people, lest he persuade them by promises and eloquence to make him monarch; and at the same time limit the power of the people to act directly upon their own Government, lest in fits of sudden feeling or aberration they should act unwisely upon it, to their sorrow. They solved the problem by creating that delicate political mechanism of checks and balances which was the American contribution to the art of government.

The popular principle was established in a House of Representatives, elected directly by the people.

The conservative principle was set up in a Senate, elected not directly by the people but by their several State legislatures.

How to elect the President was long and anxiously debated. If he were elected by the people directly it would be too easy for him to strike hands with Demos and override everything else. If he were elected by the Congress, as some preferred, an ambitious man would be tempted to corrupt the legislative principle and so again make himself monarch. It was decided at last that he should be elected not by the people directly but by electors chosen by the people. How long his term should be and whether or not he should be eligible for reelection, which would be dangerous, were questions of extreme difficulty. Finally, the term was made 4 years and the question of reeligibility was left open.

There was yet a judicial principle to be established. So there was ordained a Supreme Court, the members not to be elected at all, but to be appointed for life by the President, subject to the approval of the Senate.

Nowhere an absolute power. The President could veto a law passed by a majority of Congress; by a two-thirds vote the Congress could pass it over his veto. The Supreme Court could declare a law unconstitutional; the Congress could then amend the law and pass it again, or, if that did not avail, it could move to amend the Constitution; and the Constitution could be changed only by will of the people. Sovereignty at last was in the people, only that they were bound by the Constitution not to exercise it in an unreflecting or capricious manner.

And it was shrewdly provided that never should the sword and the purse be in the same hand. The President was commander in chief of the armed forces; but control of the purse was delivered to the House of Representatives—that is, to the popular principle—which was right, because so long as the people themselves kept the purse in their hands it was certain that they could never be taxed beyond their consent or made to pay for more government than they wanted.

This was not a democracy. The founders dreaded democracy almost as much as they feared despotism, believing, indeed, that one would tend to produce the other. What they had devised was a system of limited, representative, constitutional government. In the papers of Dr. James McHenry there is this quaint footnote of an incident that occurred after the founders had finished their work: "A lady asked Dr. Franklin, 'Well, Doctor, what have we got, a republic or a monarchy?' 'A republic,' replied the Doctor, 'if you can keep it.'"

We have not kept it. Step by step we have moved from being a republic toward becoming an unlimited democracy, until now the word "republic" has been almost expelled from our political speech.

What were the steps?

The first was universal suffrage, touching all matters whatever, local, regional, and national, whereas in the beginning the right to vote was qualified by State laws, generally requiring a modicum of property interest in the Commonwealth.

The second was that the business of electing the President was brought closer and closer to direct vote of the people, until now, in fact, it is direct; it has become a fiction that we choose electors to elect a President.

The third was the election of Senators by direct popular vote instead of by vote of the State legislatures. Thus the conservative principle was destroyed. There is no longer in the scheme of government a conservative principle as such.

Fourth was the graduated income tax. That kind of taxation was strictly forbidden by the Constitution, and the Constitution, therefore, had to be changed to permit it. The justice of the income tax, everyone to pay according to his ability, is not easily impugned. Exercised in a reasonable manner, under restraint of a conservative principle in government, it might well be the ideal tax. Nevetheless, it makes possible—one would say, inevitable—a vast extension of beneficent Government; secondly, it makes it possible for an administration seeking its own power to promise, and to effect, a redistribution of the national wealth in favor of the groups and classes that support it, and so corrupt the electorate. It was precisely for that reason that the Constitution originally forbade the Federal Government to lay taxes except in a uniform manner.

What followed in natural sequence was that inevitable extension of beneficent government, a very great rise in the power and prestige of the executive principle, and then bureau rule over the people by administrative law.

Such were the steps. They were taken slowly at first, with long and thoughtful debate; then faster and faster, sometimes without any debate at all, even without looking. And now, almost unawares, we arrive at the doctrine of indispensability—the doctrine of one leader above all, infallible, who knows better than anyone else what is good for people and how to do it. That idea had been heard before in the extravagance of campaign oratory; never before in this country has it been asserted by the leader himself.

The objections to a third term for President, we think, are not absolute. There is no law against it; only a tradition. If Washington had served a third term and refused a fourth, the tradition, we dare say, would lie against a fourth term and not against a third. But this new doctrine of indispensability, which might be only immoderately egoistic, becomes sinister in relation to a background of 7½ years during which there has taken place a centralization of power in the Federal Government and a subordination of that power to the will of the Executive such as hitherto had been thought impossible under the Constitution. The sovereignty of States has been systematically eroded by new legislation, by reinterpretation of old law, and by a kind of Federal bribery. The Congress, which is the legislative principle, has surrendered or delegated such powers to the President as formerly it had jealously defended. As the power of the President has been exalted, all other powers have been diminished to a point at which even the judicial principle has been annealed and made responsive to Executive will. Finally, control of the purse was surrendered when the Congress began to vote billions for the President to spend in his own discretion.

Briefly, during these 7½ years the Roosevelt administration went further to intervene in the economic and social life of the country, to control it, to plan it, and to administer it, than any other government in the world not already totalitarian in character.

As he was receiving into his hand from an obedient Congress the new instrumentalities of power, Mr. Roosevelt himself remarkably said: "In the hands of a people's government this power is wholesome and proper"; in bad hands, he added, it "would provide shackles for the liberties of people."

And now what is he saying?

He is saying that he alone is the people's government. He alone can be trusted to exercise that power. He is saying that he accepts the nomination for a third term because he is convinced of a duty to keep the Government from passing to other hands. The power is too much to lay down. It may be abused. It may be used to provide shackles for the liberties of people.

That is not all. If the power now changes hands the people may lose their liberties in a worse way. The President says that in what he has done to awaken the country to the menace of the aggressor he has been opposed by "appeaser 'fifth columnists.'" And: "If our own Government should pass to other hands next January—untried hands, inexperienced hands—we can merely hope and pray that they will not substitute appeasement and compromise with those who seek to destroy all democracies everywhere."

That is to say, if the Republican Party wins, the country may be betrayed.

For shame! The pity is that Mr. Roosevelt does not believe it as he says it.

A President of the United States who has arrived at this state of mind is no more a Democrat than he is a Republican or himself a "fifth columnist." There is among us no one word that defines him, nor ever before was the want of it felt. He is the one whom the founders feared and partly foretold—I, Roosevelt.

National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DAN R. McGEHEE
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 22, 1940

PETITION OF ALBERT WILLIS AND OTHERS

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, the patriotic and liberty-loving citizenship of Walthall County, Miss., which is a part of my congressional district, have sent me a petition expressing their feeling and ideas as to the course of action that should be taken by the Congress in the proper preparing of our country to meet any emergency that we may be faced with in the future. I am so impressed with the spirit manifested, that I ask leave to extend my remarks and attach the petition as a part. The petition is signed by several hundred citizens and is as follows:

We, the undersigned citizens of Walthall County, Miss., mindful that the ideals embodied in our form of government are threatened with destruction by the mad ambitions of the totalitarian powers, firmly believe that the fundamentals of the American way of life may be preserved only by an adequate national defense, by the training and equipping of our fighting forces of land, sea, and air. We need fighting forces sufficient to repel the totalitarian forces of the world, even when combined with the "fifth columnists" of our own country.

The Congress has seen fit to take the first steps in this direction by the appropriation of billions of dollars for the construction of planes, tanks, guns, ships, and other implements of war. But we are convinced that these appropriations are not sufficient—that there must go hand in hand a program of intensive training of manpower to operate these implements of war. The sentiment of this section is overwhelming that some form of selective conscription is not only the best method of obtaining this manpower, but is also the most democratic. We, therefore, urge that the Members of the Congress divert their eyes from the coming elections, and focus them on the defense needs of the nations, enact some form of conscription at once. It is late already. We confess that we are unable to understand why such measures as national defense should be subjected to such prolonged debate when the fate of the Nation hangs in a balance. The American people have delegated to the Congress the high duty of providing for the national defense, and will hold them to a strict accountability should there ever come a day when it may be said of our efforts "Too little and too late."

We believe further, that our defense is so intricately bound up with that of Great Britain, that it is essential that we aid her in every way possible short of war, even to supplying surplus ships, as well as other necessities of war. We are convinced of this necessity in order to gain time to develop our own defenses.

We believe in our form of government and the ideals it represents, and as red-blooded 100-percent Americans insist that proper measures for its protection be taken in this hour of peril, and that they be taken now.

ALBERT WILLIS.
SAM B. LAMPTON (veteran).
L. L. STINSON.
W. D. TYNES
(And others).

Loyalty of American Citizens of Foreign Birth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EARL R. LEWIS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 22, 1940

Mr. LEWIS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the district which I have the honor to represent, the Eighteenth Congressional of Ohio, includes among its citizenship men and women who have been born in many foreign lands but who have of their own free will chosen the United States of America as the land in which to make their homes and rear their children

and acquire citizenship. One of the most heartening and encouraging occurrences growing out of the present troubled state of our international relations is the voluntary expressions of loyalty and devotion to the land of their choice by many of these citizens of foreign birth.

There has recently come to my desk a most touching example of the loyalty and devotion to the land of their choice by many of these citizens of foreign birth. There has recently come to my desk a most touching example of the loyalty and devotion which citizens of Polish and Slavonic extraction have for this country. These citizens are banded together under the name of the United Political Clubs of Jefferson County, Ohio, with headquarters at Steubenville, Ohio, and their communication is as follows:

[Boleslous Stankiewicz, honorary president; Vincent Kensicki, president; John Valuska, first vice president; Steve Konicki, second vice president; Walter Niemec, financial secretary; Mrs. Pearl Kaczmarek, recording secretary; Frank Grygo, cashier; Frank Januszkiewicz, sergeant at arms; Bill Cebulski, publicity]

UNITED POLITICAL CLUBS OF JEFFERSON COUNTY,
August 5, 1940.

Hon. EARL LEWIS,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LEWIS: At a regular meeting on Sunday, August 4, 1940, the delegates to the United Political Clubs of Jefferson County, composed of citizens of Polish and Slavonic extraction, by a unanimous vote instructed us to respectfully urge you to vote and support the Burke-Wadsworth conscription bill.

We also take this opportunity to express our loyalty and our readiness to lay down our lives, if need be, for the country of our choice and adoption, the United States of America.

Respectfully yours,

VINCENT KENSICKI, *President.*
WALTER NIEMEC, *Secretary.*

Poll Taxed, He Can't Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEE E. GEYER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 22, 1940

LETTER FROM A VIRGINIAN WHO IS FORCED TO WRITE TO A CALIFORNIA REPRENSENTATIVE BECAUSE HE HAS NO CONGRESSMAN OF HIS OWN FOR WHOM HE CAN VOTE

Mr. GEYER of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herein a letter from a Virginia citizen prevented from casting a ballot because of the poll-tax requirement. This letter is but one of the many of its kind received by me.

RICHMOND, VA., *August 8, 1940.*

Hon. LEE E. GEYER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: As I live in a State where there is a machine set up so far as politics go, I have heretofore never had much interest in voting, because the same men in office are always put back in office; or if not the same men, then some one they select.

Since the advent of Mr. Hitler, however, I am very much interested in our national politics and for the first time in 27 years enough interested to vote—but I find I can't vote. Why? I must first pay my poll taxes 3 years and this applies to my son also, who it happens was 21 in May of this year. I was required to have paid these taxes 6 months before the coming election and to have registered 4 months prior to said election.

I have no criminal record, have raised five well thought of children, own my home, work every day and spend my money in this State only, my people have been Virginians since 1733 and so far as I can find there were no "hoss thieves" among them. So you see why I am interested in your anti-poll-tax law.

Any 100-percent American citizen with reasonable proof of his mental qualifications should be allowed a voice in any election. There should be no tax imposed if he be otherwise qualified.

Here's wishing you speedy luck in getting your bill through.

Respectfully,

W. A. BROADWELL.

The Negro Is Wise to the New Deal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 19, 1940

ARTICLE FROM THE COLUMBIA (S. C.) STATE

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, an illuminating article revealing that the Negro is wise to the New Deal in its dealing with him appeared a few days ago in the State, Columbia, S. C., daily newspaper, in the form of a reprint from the South Atlantic Monthly. The article was by Archibald Rutledge. I submit it under the unanimous consent granted me by the House:

[From the Columbia (S. C.) State of August 18, 1940]

AS THEY ARE SAYING TODAY—THE NEGRO AND THE NEW DEAL

(Archibald Rutledge in the South Atlantic Monthly)

Nothing more revolutionary in American politics has ever occurred than the defection of the Negro from the Republican Party—and, of course, his consequent alignment with the Democrats. Faithful, after his fashion, since 1863 to the party of Lincoln, the party of freedom, he has now completely deserted his old friends. His allegiance has vanished. Every principle, every sentiment, every higher consideration urged him to remain true to the party which had effected his manumission and had stood for his securing of citizenship. But suddenly all was forgotten. Almost, it might be said, hundreds of thousands of Union soldiers who died in battle are now affronted. The fealty, the obligations, the soul's loyalty—where are they now? What has caused this amazing defection? The answer is short. Money has accomplished the seemingly impossible. The great corrupter of mankind has here wrought his perfect work. Not reason brought about this sinister change; not some change in ideas, which might have rendered the change respectable; not some evolution in the Negro which might enable him to choose now for himself what masters he shall follow. We might as well deal in plain terms; arrant bribery has done what nothing else could possibly have accomplished. Bribery involves money in some form. Whose money is being used to make the Negro a complete political turncoat? The public funds; the taxpayers' money; your money and mine.

While I am not in a position to discuss this question in its broader and more general aspects, yet I do know what the New Deal is doing, not for the Negro, but to the Negro in my region of the rural South; and since the same influences appear to be at work everywhere, among whites as well as Negroes, I believe the condition I shall describe represents rather fairly the present plight of the colored man in America. His present situation is of great moment to me, not because it affects me directly, but because the Negro's welfare has always been close to my heart; and whenever I discover that he is being morally debased, I cannot keep quiet. For I take it that moral degredation is rottenness of the foundation; and we must not forget that the Negro, whether we will or not, is an integral part of the foundation of our Republic. In my opinion, he is a most vital part.

What, then, is the situation that gives me alarm, and in what way does it differ from the situation of a few years ago? The Negro of my country is a small farmer, or a fisherman (and a good Negro fisherman is the very best I know), a worker in the fields, the sawmills, and about farms and gardens. In these days a great number own their own homes; and many of these used to be pretty little places, nearly always gay, now with blossoming fruit trees, now with flowers, now with song and laughter. Negroes used to grow excellent money crops; they had gardens that helped to make them self-sustaining and independent. They raised cattle, hogs, chickens, and turkeys. There was, all over the rural South, a pleasant rustic life, now darkened by hardships, now brightened by better times. But people got along. They managed, as people will always manage if they have to. The Negro could always get work, and the employer could always get labor. It was a decent and natural and orderly system of life.

Now, what has happened? Almost to a man, every able-bodied Negro man and boy of my acquaintance is on relief. The countryside is empty of its laborers. The little farms and gardens, the fences and the fields, the chicken yards and hog lots, the crops that would sustain life through the winter even though things from stores could not be bought—these are gone. They have been suffered to be utterly neglected in order that the Negro laborers may make a little easy money. Whereas formerly it was always possible

to buy chickens and turkeys, rice and potatoes, corn and peanuts from Negroes, they now have none for sale and none for themselves.

Not long ago I was talking with Steve Boykin, one of the Negroes on my place who has been on relief 4 years. He is 66 years old. He told me that, after this period of working for the Government, he is far worse off than he ever had been before. Lately he was laid off, as being overage, and was told that he was eligible for social security. He brought these official announcements to me; and I was obliged to tell him that I did not believe he would ever get any social security. That phantasm is America's will-o'-the-wisp. What is Steve now doing? He told me with appalling frankness that he had eaten nothing for 3 days, and that he would starve if I did not help him. He is now my firewood cutter, and an excellent one at that. Since I see him every day, he tells me a good deal of the inner workings of the W. P. A., of how much he had to pay to be transported to work, of the pressure brought to bear on him to trade at certain stores, of suggestions that he contribute to the Democratic campaign chest. After these deductions had been made from his wages, he had hardly enough to meet his ration account. He told me that certain storekeepers had W. P. A. workers' checks delivered directly to them to meet the laborers' past and current expenses.

It might be explained that Steve's expenses for matters domestic are, I admit, unusual, for he has an indeterminate number of children. To suggest how bewilderingly many there are, and also to hint of this Negro's total equanimity of character, this story is told. One day he was ambling up to his cabin when his wife rushed to the door, screaming and waving her apron.

"Steve, Steve," she cried, "a alligator done eat one of de chillun!"

"Mandy," Steve drawled, "ain't I done tole you week befo' las, something been gettin' de chillun?"

But this Negro's equanimity is shaken now. Strange to him are the ways of that secret and almighty force known as "de Gov'ment." He said to me not long ago, since everyone appeared to be on relief, "I think de Gov'ment is gwine to move down into dis country."

It has moved; and I lament the economic disaster that, because of the W. P. A., is sure to overtake the Negro. I lament much more the fatal undermining of his character. For he is losing his independence, and, with it, his self-respect. His plight is that of a temporary ward of Government. He is afraid to work for himself for fear that he will lose his job with the W. P. A. For the same reason he will not work for anyone else. And into his deep yet simple soul are creeping the shadows of futility and frustration. It is only fair to say that he is in worse slavery now than his race has ever known. Nor are futility and frustration the only feelings he has about this work; he is developing a subtlety that he may have had before but which he has never been free to exercise. Negroes are past masters at getting something for nothing. I once asked a plantation owner why he had persuaded the 20 Negro families who lived on his place to move off.

"Well," he said, "it's like this: If there is a Negro on my place, and I have a dollar, he will get it."

I know cases in which as many as six men and boys from one family are on relief. They do not hesitate to change their names in order to secure this alluring yet spurious benefit. I know one case in which a Negro mother pools the resources of her husband and four sons. They regard the Government as some easygoing Santa Claus, and they will take all they can get. They are human, just like the rest of us.

Nor is the Negro at all deceived by the foolish and futile character of most of the work on which he is employed. He knows very well that it is a mere set-up. If, therefore, he labors at all, he does so without interest or enthusiasm or hope. While I cannot say that all this work is in vain, yet I know that some of it is. In my part of the South, the ditching and road making are especially so; and I wish to mention several projects that have been begun in stupidity and have ended in folly. I know a tiny Negro village of about a dozen cabins. It has always been served by two roads, one a concrete highway. Someone conceived the happy idea of constructing a third road, parallel to the other two, and this road is laid through a deep swamp, and is 60 feet wide. There was an old winding sandy road through that country, and this was destroyed to make this new and almost superhighway. Well, one of the Negroes on the project told me that they never did much work unless they saw a car coming, and as only two people traveled that road, and one of them only once a week, the workers had a grand chance to do a lot of nothing. Nor is there the remotest possibility that more than two people will ever travel that road, the other two highways are much shorter and much better.

Casting about vaguely for something to do, certain eminent local politicians determined on draining an immense and gloomy swamp, far off from everywhere. It was a very good basin for water; and the water in it should have been left there. But, no; it must be drained. So huge canals were dug, and one of these was brought under Highway 17, the great road to Florida. Some 2 miles from the coast, the big ditch came to a man's property who did not want a canal through his place. The work stopped right there; and now, since the canal has no outlet, it floods the pleasant countryside with surplus water that was doing no harm where it originally was.

The trouble about a lot of this work is it is done with costly elaborateness; roads are much wider than necessary through the back country; the ditches and drainage canals are too big, and their tops and sides are manicured with needless meticulousness. You may rightly ask if all this is not well done. In a sense, it is; and for a few weeks, these roads and ditches look impressive. But everything of this kind demands upkeep; and the more extensive the operation, the greater the cost of maintenance. The old one-track sandy roads, quiet and winding and beautiful, that used to amble through the back country were entirely sufficient for their purposes. They were always passable; and the traffic was so occasional that their upkeep was negligible. But on some of these new W. P. A. roads, a man now drives at his peril and the peril of his car. Where once we had good roads 12 and 15 feet wide, we now have 60-foot morasses. On more than one occasion I have had to get a car to pull mine out of one of these New Deal triumphs in road making.

In his quiet infectious way, the Negro makes all kinds of fun about this project work; he labors on the schemes, but he has no faith in them. Referring to one stretch of road through a swamp, a road that was loud with frogs rejoicing in a sea of mud, a Negro said to me that he hoped the Government would give him permission to plant rice in that fetid morass. Another Negro, referring to the monstrous size of a ditch that had been dug to drain the fields of a politician of some local standing, said that it looked as if either the Government or the owner of the property was building another Inland Waterway. Nor are the Negroes insensible to the fact that much of this project work is done upon lands of those who have political influence. I never knew of a day's public labor to be spent on a Negro's property, or on the lands of a man of such acute political insignificance as myself. Nor do I believe this condition to be incident merely to my own locality; it is certain to be true wherever human nature is tempted by a vast and foolish outpouring of the Government's funds. When released at its source (and its true source is every man's pocket), these funds may be clean and humanitarian; but by the time they reach the back country and the political lords and rulers there, and their able henchmen, this money becomes an agent of corruption of public morals, manners, and character.

Here is a story of my own experience with trying to help the Negro, and of my rebuff at the hands of the W. P. A. I have some 20 Negro families on my place; and just next to where they live I have a fine tract of about 80 acres of land. It used to be the main planted field on the plantation, but is now partly grown to yellow pine timber. Thinking not of the Negro's today but of his tomorrow, I offered to give this land to the Negroes to plant if the W. P. A. (employing all these same Negroes, and hauling some of them 15 miles away every day to puddle futilely in the mud) would help to clear and condition the land. I stood to lose by the venture, for I would lose all my young longleaf pines. I did not want to plant the land. I did not, for my own sake, want it cleared. But I was thinking of enabling the Negroes to earn a living on the land. It was to be theirs for nothing.

To my appeal, the Government replied that it would never consider doing a thing like that; it was out of the question. I suspect that those who read my appeal could not make the grade—could not see tomorrow. For it is coming, that tomorrow when all this futile work, eating up the public moneys, must end. And I then want to see the Negro as I know him in something like a position of rustic security. Senator ELLISON SMITH is reported to have said that in the rural South a man can live on 50 cents a day. Whether or not he said it, it is true of the Negro. A Negro can live on nothing a day if he has made his crops.

One day I was talking to young George Myers, whose venerable father Gabe has been one of my Negro friends for these 50 years, I asked George what he was doing this winter.

"Nothin'," he said lightly.

"Well, who is taking care of you?"

"Pa is."

"What is he doing?"

"Nothin'."

It has long seemed to me that the Negro has what may be accounted a certain dim infallible genius in his ability to get along without money. I know Negroes who rarely ever have had as much real cash as $10 a year. But they managed. They were ingenious. They grew crops and raised livestock, on which they lived; and sometimes they exchanged their labor for commodities and for clothes. But now this easy money from the Government (it is really from the politicians) lures them away from their independence, hardy and admirable, until we are getting a race with us, always a problem, and now an acute one of total dependence. I have been noticing that W. P. A. workers drive cars for the first time in their lives; they have radios; and they consume whole oceans of raw liquor. The money they make does them no good, for they utterly neglect their homes and the good earth about them. And whereas, even in the height of the first depression, Negroes got along somehow without Government help, now, if they were suddenly cut off, they would be perfectly helpless. They are being schooled to be helpless except in the ability to lap up the pap that is spoon-fed to them. Nor do I blame them; to a vicious system is to be attributed their present physical and moral decay.

The New Deal has affected the Negro in ways other than by compelling him to neglect his legitimate work: It often beggars him completely. For example, I have a friend who is a typical large cotton planter. He has for a generation grown about a

thousand acres of cotton each season. He had on his ample place 15 Negro families. Along comes the A. A. A. and tells him that he may plant only 600 acres. Why is this done? Why, solely to put up the price of cotton; to make it a scarcity, so that the great army of consumers must suffer; and, primarily, of course, to corral the farm vote. But what happens to the laborers who have to be turned off when work on the farm is cut down? Literally, they face starvation. My friend had to let six of his Negro families go out into the wide, wide world. He had no work for them to do. The Government had told him that he must not plant what he had once planted; hence he must not employ so many people as he once did. In a very real sense, the Government has forced these contented and happy and self-supporting people to be either tramps or to try to get jobs with the W. P. A. It does not appear to be exactly reasonable, in times when jobs are at a premium, to make it impossible for some people to keep the work they have had all their lives, and to force them on the public pay roll. And, mark you, this cotton planter who was compelled to turn these families off his place will be paid out of the Treasury for not doing what he really wanted to do. He gets a bonus, and his former helpers, unskilled in any labor but in that in which they have long been trained, get the bum's rush, and then, perhaps, some stultifying Government stipend. If there is any reason in all this, it is a purely political one; and a purely political reason is almost sure to be rotten.

We often hear that private industry should absorb the unemployed. Too often private industry is considered merely to mean the great corporations. It really means any firm or any individual who offers employment. Yet, as things now are, men on relief (and this, I know, is especially true of Negroes) are afraid to do any kind of work for fear that their easy money will be taken away. I know, here in my rural community, scores of such cases. Over the country there must be hundreds of thousands. For that reason it is a difficult thing for employers to get the labor that they need. Men now receiving Government aid of some kind feel that they are pensioned; and if they do any work, their velvet money will be cut off. Such a way of living cannot fail to have its moral effect on the people as a whole; it is a tricky sort of existence, unworthy of our manly traditions.

It is the history of the world that civilizations and countries rise, flourish, and then, in many cases, vanish. Usually, they pass out of existence because of conquest, but some decay from internal causes. It should be the prime duty of government, charged as it is with the safety of a country, to combat with all its power every cause which may tend to undermine the morale of its people. To the impartial observer it would appear that our Government, however professedly good may be its intentions, is contributing to our ruin by piling up debt and by taking from a vast army of our citizens all ambition, all initiative, all self-reliance, and almost all self-respect. One race in our Nation peculiarly affected is the Negro. Whatever may be said for or against this system, it is gone forever. The Negro, after 75 years of freedom, was beginning to make headway for himself. He was becoming commendably self-sustaining. He was learning that the only way for a real man to stand is on his own feet. Then came the New Deal; then came relief. The Negro was just getting away from that sort of thing when his Government, coming apparently to his rescue, really has come into his simple, humble, rustic life to fill him with bogus dreams of perpetual support, to turn him from honest industry into the paths of dishonest, makeshift, spurious toil. Not long ago I was stopped on a highway by a man with a red flag. * * * Before I had passed the crowd, I had counted eight men with red flags. I asked the foreman why the bank was being moved.

"To get it on the other side," he said, grinning. "But it would be better over here where it is."

In a very deep sense the Negro feels that he is in collusion with his white bosses to beat the Government. The Negro is smart. He is hard to fool; and he realizes that he is living in a fantastic time. Besides, he reasons, the white man is supposed to be his superior; and if his boss is a grafter, why shouldn't he be? Practically every Negro I know is trying to raid the United States Treasury; he would not put it that way, but he is going after what everyone else seems to be getting. Only this week a Negro woman came to me to try to get on "de roll." She said she had nine children and no means of support. I found out just in time that she had never been married. But unless I am gravely mistaken, public funds are now being paid out to a lot of Negroes just like her.

I do not find it in my heart to blame the Negro. He does not reason. He accepts. And if the Government offers to support him, he immediately accepts support. But I hate to see a race that I love walking on crutches. I remember times harder by far than we are having now; but they were happier and they augured better for our future. They were normal in that people met hardship and privation with courage and caution and steadfast labor. Now, everybody who will accept cuddling and coddling can get it for nothing; but the price is slow but fatal degeneration of our morale.

A short time ago a lieutenant commander in the Navy, in commenting on this very thing, said to me gravely that both Army and Navy men felt that if we should have a war now, the Government has so pampered its people that the fiber, the sinew, the mettle could not be found. It is a startling reflection, and a great truth is there.

Of the effect of Government aid to Negroes, I am positive; for I have watched that effort for years. It has been distinctly harmful; in a sense, it is dangerous. I cannot speak with the same assurance of its effect on members of other races. But the character of the Negro is fast losing, under this pernicious system, many of its finest virtues. And it is because I admire him for those virtues that I hate to see him made the victim of political ambition sponsoring impractical experiments.

The Spirit of '76

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 22, 1940

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, some years ago a disabled World War veteran from New York came to the mountains of Highland County, Va., to regain his health. He fell in love with our Virginia mountains and with the people of the community in which he was sojourning and decided to make Monterey, in Highland County, his permanent home.

For several years he has published a column in the local paper, the Highland Recorder, under the nom de plume of Erasimus Bluegrass, and from that column of last week I quote the following:

The curse of every country and time has been its slackers, its profiteers, and its opportunists. Like the poor, they have been with us always, and their presence is no sign of degeneration. What should chiefly concern us is how we ourselves really think. What are our ideals? What kind of a world must we confront with them? Are we willing to tighten our belts, thrust aside the slacker, the profiteer, and the opportunist, and face it unafraid and open-eyed?

If this is our intent, there is nothing degenerate about us. The world we have to confront has declared itself in no uncertain language. It is a world which has thrown democratic ideals into the discard and is intent on carving up the peoples of the earth to suit its own ends. Germany claims Europe. Italy claims Africa. Japan claims Asia. These three have elected to control the commerce and the raw-material areas of the world and to do it by sheer force of arms. England alone is in the way, and she is fighting a last-stand battle with her back to the wall. There is no question about the kind of world we confront.

With what kind of ideals do we confront it? There we find ourselves confused. To what is our own internal economy to be geared; private interests or national needs? If private interests, can we depend upon them to work for the conservation of national ends? Should the Government keep its hand from the private individual as well as the private corporation? Should the Army be manned by volunteers or by drafted citizens? If it is to be volunteers, can we depend on the citizen to serve voluntarily? To both questions past experience answers "No."

If we resign our accustomed liberties to our Government, will we ever recover them? That depends on ourselves. Do we doubt our own will to remain a democracy? If not, we need fear no dictator from within. He who would lose his life or pledge his personal liberties to the end that democracy be restored to the world, will certainly find them again. He who insists on keeping them, in the face of the present turn in history, will certainly lose them. Is Germany right or do the ideals of 1776 and 1917 still live?

Outside the window the valley is steeped in the peace of an August afternoon. The mountain foliage is touched with that faint tinge of rust which suggests an early autumn. Our eye is caught by a strange commotion in Ed's favorite apple tree and out tumbles Jimmy Wagner in a shower of yellow fruit. Two little girls are trudging up the Parkersburg Pike. From somewhere comes the sound of a hammer.

But somewhere in England a thatch-roofed village is being awakened from just such a peaceful lethargy by a zoom of wings which are harbingers of destruction. Its century of plodding, self-respecting quiet is rent by the bomb of a ranging strafer and the shattered body of a white-capped grandmother lies beside her splintered churn. Peace, gentle reader? Only if the detonation of that bomb has no power to start a reverberation in your own heart.

What matters is neither Republican nor Democrat nor yet preparedness. The only thing that matters is what we Americans really mean. What is it we are preparing for? The protection of our hides or our liberties? Our liberties within the limits of the 48 States, or our liberties in a world of free peoples? If this last is our meaning, let us, in God's name, forget both our bellies and our pocketbooks, forget our prejudices and our fears, and merge our individual lives into the collective task which lies ahead.

Opportunity and Responsibility

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 22, 1940

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, the American people do not require a lengthy argument to prove the difficulties of 1940. Everywhere about us on the national and international horizon we see problems of staggering complexity. Here at home the people of our country, after 8 years of unprecedented spending, find themselves battling desperately against a spirit of hopelessness and helplessness in virtually every area of national life. Our economy has gone backward in the last decade. Living standards have sunk below the level of 1930. Vision of our destiny as a continuous upward movement has been obscured by governmental policies.

These are not idle charges. Our great army of unemployed, the staggering burden of relief expenditures, the development of an attitude of indifference and shiftlessness are all too visible. It is a sorry picture of the greatest nation on the face of the earth.

Abroad we see nothing but menace. From the ashes of stricken Poland, Norway, Belgium, Holland, Czechoslovakia, Finland, and France there rises the uncertain specter of a new kind of world order based upon force and haunted by starvation. Grim reality tells us that we must prepare for events which we have never anticipated in the history of our country.

In the midst of this scene of European devastation and American unrest there has risen, as there always rises in the midst of great crises, a vigorous challenge of a better day. The Republican Party, recognizing the seemingly insurmountable obstacles in the path of national recovery, has sounded a note of defiance, accepting the challenge, dedicating itself to the rehabilitation of the American way.

We too are realists. But our realism tells us that the inexhaustible reservoir of strength which made this country the greatest democracy in the history of the world lies within the minds and bodies of our 130,000,000 men, women, and children. We refuse to despair. We tell the world this Nation has not run its course. The greatest achievements of science, the greatest conquests of men's minds are yet to be recorded. Come what may, the people of this country are determined to pursue the goal which our forefathers so clearly delineated in the Declaration of Independence. Life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness are more than abstract terms to the Republican Party. They are the difference between civilization and barbarism.

We believe that men of good will can restore opportunities, can rebuild incentives, can reinvigorate the minds and souls of the American people. So long as there remain slums to be cleared, lands to be tilled, mouths to be fed, bodies to be clothed, the frontiers are still open.

The Republican Party has given the Nation a man ready to lead in this battle for the American way. He is a man who comes from the heart of America, who in himself reflects the story of our people. Born in humble surroundings, working with his hands, working with his mind, Wendell Willkie, a small-town boy, has demonstrated in his own life the epic which is America. He rose to success because this Nation was dedicated to the belief that all men are equal, not equal in physical strength, not equal in mentality, but equal in the opportunities which this Nation offers its children.

Wendell Willkie challenges those who urge that this Nation is permanently divided into the haves and the have nots. He rejects the concept of economic royalists ruling over an army of slaves. To the people of this country he sounds the reminder that from shirt sleeves to shirt sleeves takes but three generations.

This is the kind of America which our country has always been. It is the kind of America which the Republican Party believes it can continue to be.

Nineteen hundred and forty is a year of opportunity and responsibility. It is a grave task to which the Republican Party is summoning the people of America. No one can minimize the gravity of the situation without convicting himself of demagogery. We need a man at the head of our affairs who can weld this Nation once more into an organic unit, a man who is big enough and strong enough to extend the hand of welcome to every group, rich and poor, white man and black, Christian and non-Christian, in the struggle to keep America free. We need a man at our head who can build from the economic machinery which we have created in the last 150 years, a tremendous force, dynamic, expanding, so strong that it can never be attacked.

Wendell Willkie is that man. He has no enemies. He has no hatreds. He has ability, foresight, and industry. The Republican Party in this great moment of national peril is ready to seize the opportunity and to acquit itself with distinction and honor.

Timely Observations by Major General Rivers, Retired, United States Army

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 22, 1940

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit the following observations by Maj. Gen. William C. Rivers, United States Army, retired. General Rivers served the unusual period of 10 consecutive years with the Philippine government at Manila and is a student of Philippine affairs. General Rivers' observations are as follows:

PRESIDENT QUEZON COMING TO WASHINGTON
(Notes by Maj. Gen. William C. Rivers, retired)

President Manuel Quezon's arrival in the United States shortly may render the following brief comments of interest to some of the gentlemen of Congress. A New York Times Manila interview with Mr. Quezon stated that the President of the Commonwealth might try to get a new concession from Congress in the existing act for independence in 1946—a concession which would give increased powers of autonomy to the present government at Manila.

THE NEW CIVIC LEAGUE, MOSTLY SUGAR MEN OF MANILA, OPPOSES INDEPENDENCE; THE CIVIC LEAGUE WORKS FOR A REVISION OF THE INDEPENDENCE ACT

This revision would be a new law saying the United States intends to hold the Philippines permanently as a dominion—the McNutt plan. John Gunther, who visited Manila, states, on page 300 of his book, Inside Asia, his opinion that it is the sugar interests of the Philippines which are working for our permanent retention of the islands. Such retention—the McNutt plan—would make also permanent the responsibility of the people of the United States to defend the Philippines, although the American people had surrendered to the Filipinos all authority to govern the islands.

THE UNITED STATES TO DEFEND THE DUTCH EAST INDIES?

We get now the discussions about the United States defending the Dutch East Indies, 1,500 miles out beyond the Philippines, which lie 7,000 miles from San Francisco. If we are unable to defend the Philippines, with Japan lying on the direct route and squarely between our west coast and Manila, we can hardly take on the defense of the Dutch East Indies. Our policy has been to defend from the mid-Atlantic westward to the mid-Pacific—almost one-half the circumference of the earth. Add to this our responsibility in the South American regions under the Monroe Doctrine and it is seen that we already have a fair-sized job on hand.

Now a word on the latest grand war scare: About 50 percent of the rubber used in the United States, and about the same percentage of our tin, come originally from Netherland East Indies. We buy the tin from people—in Europe mostly—who have smelters for refining tin. The rubber comes from agents who have imported

it from those Dutch Islands. But we can readily send, or the purchasing agents can readily send out to Java by way of the Atlantic Ocean.

TWO PROFESSIONAL JUDGMENTS OF EXPERTS

Admiral Leahy, the Chief of Operations of the Navy, made last year to the Naval Committees of Congress the most exhaustive analysis of the general strategy of the North Pacific Ocean we have had in the 40 years of our control of the Philippines.

Among the measured and official judgments of the admiral were the following: "The defensive line of the American Navy at the present time reaches from the Aleutian Islands to the Hawaiian Islands, to Samoa and to the Panama Canal." Also, "The Navy which America now has and the Navy which it will have when it is increased by the authority in this bill will be seriously inadequate to the task of sending a naval force to the Philippines. I said it would require at least three times this amount of increase of our Navy, and I doubt if we could (send a naval force to the Philippines) with three times the increase."

Gen. Douglas MacArthur, field marshal of the Filipino Army at Manila, wisely stated not long ago, "It has been assumed, in my opinion erroneously, that Japan covets these islands. Strategically, possession of these islands would introduce an element of weakness in the Japanese Empire. It would split that Empire into two parts, separated by a broad stretch of almost 2,000 miles of ocean. And between the two parts of Japan would lie its present military enemy, China."

The weight of the responsibility which some would place on the people and the taxpayers of the United States can be seen by studying the statements made about March 13, 1939, before the Tydings Senate insular committee by the Washington representative of the powerful sugar interests of the Philippines. The Washington counsel for the Philippines' sugar interests in his pleading stressed heavily a part of his pleas which is very emotional and which is, in my judgment, dangerous for the people of the United States. This was set forth in declarations such as the following: "The Philippines is a Christian country; we have a moral responsibility to defend the Phillippine republic—after it is granted complete freedom and has been duly inaugurated." Again, "The people of the United States have a strong, general, and continuing responsibility to defend the independent Philippine state."

Christianity was in the Philippines half a century previous to the landing of the Pilgrims at Plymouth Rock. Of course, the people of the United States have no shadow of moral responsibility to send out to the Philippines—at the beck and call of the president of the Philippines—tens of thousands (hundreds of thousands) of American soldiers and sailors to fight an overseas war 7,000 miles away. It would be a war we cannot win, at that distance—a war that would simply crush the Filipinos between the two great fighting nations.

We have discharged our moral responsibility to the Filipino people—and on the whole well and nobly discharged that responsibility. I hope the Filipinos will obtain the independence they justly merit and for which they gallantly fought Spain and the United States for 5 years. We have always promised the Filipinos independence. We will naturally grant them trade privileges for a period of time following independence.

Two misleading statements are frequently seen in our press. They may be inserted in the press by those who are working to revoke the act for independence. One assertion is that in reality the Filipinos do not desire independence. I worked with the Philippine Government 10 consecutive years, residing with my family in many parts of the archipelago. The Filipinos of all classes earnestly desire independence. Another statement which goes the rounds of the press is that the Japanese have already overrun the islands. Japanese have always been free to enter the Philippines and to do business there. Their number was at one time as high as 20,178. But some 5,000 Japanese have gone home since the Chinese war. The population of the Philippines is fully 15,000,000.

Japan will not divide her armies and fleet in the effort to annex the Philippines. In any event, Japan is bound to obtain much of the trade in the islands. Japan is so near and the goods the Japanese make for the Filipinos are very inexpensive. It would be dangerous for Japan to divide her own forces in the face of the great Russian forces near Japan at the north.

I spent 10 continuous years of my working days in the service of the Filipinos. Soon after arriving in the Philippines as one of the first group of officers selected for Elihu Root's new Army General Staff I accepted duty under the Philippine civil authorities—with the constabulary, of which I was later the chief. I had to work in and reside in all parts of the archipelago. My work was in cooperation with the Filipino officials—the Governors, the judges, and sundry other Filipino officials. I was therefore a witness to the energy and capacity of most of the Filipino officials and to the progress throughout the islands. My first residence, with my family, was about 75 miles south of Manila—in the home town of President Manuel Quezon, who was a young lawyer in practice there.

I have affection and admiration for the Filipino people. They will do well as a small nation, if Congress grants them trade privileges for a few years. We should make a new treaty of trade and friendship with Japan. The new treaty should contain clauses showing Japan's interest in the continued independence of the Republic of the Philippines after 1946. Of course, Japan would not approve of any other country taking control of the Philippines after the United States leaves the islands. Filipino taxes pay all government and educational expenses, including such things as new roads and other improvements. But the Federal Treasury at Washington has paid out fully $2,000,000,000 in the Philippines in 40 years—a great burden on American taxpayers. This was for additional naval ships at Manila and the Army in the islands, the offices and residences of the United States High Commissioner at Manila, putting down the 1899 revolt against the occupation of the United States, and so on. Our trade with the Philippines has been a disappointment. Our great trade with Japan is more than our trade with the Philippines and China combined. Few Americans realize that our Japanese trade comes next to that with Britain and Canada—our great customers. Japan is third. The favorable balance on our trade with Japan compensates for the unfavorable balances on our trade with 20 nations to the south of the United States and for the unfavorable balances on our trade with the Philippines and with China. Our Japanese trade is much more than our trade with the Philippines and China combined.

F. H. A. Administrator Stewart McDonald

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR.

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 22, 1940

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Housing Administration is almost unique among Federal agencies now in existence, in that its operation and organization has been virtually free from criticism. The splendid record and achievements of the Federal Housing Administration has been due, in no little part, to the indefatigable industry and ability of high order and character of Stewart McDonald.

Mr. McDonald, before coming to Government service, was for many years president of the Moon Motor Car Co. of St. Louis, Mo. Industrialists throughout the Nation, and particularly in the automotive industry, have long recognized Mr. McDonald as an executive who, based upon his own record and accomplishments, is deserving of a place among the top-flight industrial leaders of the United States.

Stewart McDonald was called to the Government service in the capacity of an Executive Assistant to the Administrator on November 1, 1934. He became Assistant Administrator on January 1, 1935, and following the resignation of Mr. James Moffatt, was appointed by the President as Administrator of Federal Housing on September 5, 1935, his appointment being conferred January 28, 1936.

It is particularly fitting that upon the sixth anniversary of the Federal Housing Administration, that full tribute should be given Stewart McDonald for the service he has and is rendering to his country at personal sacrifice and with the highest degree of vitality and trust imposed upon him by the Nation. Mr. McDonald has set an example which we in Congress hope will be adopted in increasing numbers by other industrialists and businessmen, in that in a time of national emergency he has subordinated his own splendid career in private industry to perform a useful and vital service to his country.

The Federal Housing Administration observed its sixth anniversary in June with nearly $3,500,000,000 of home and property improvement financing insurance written during its operations.

This insurance includes $2,295,000,000 in premium-paying mortgages on small homes, $120,000,000 in premium-paying mortgages on large-scale projects, and $1,075,000,000 in property improvement and modernization loans.

The F. H. A.'s home mortgage insurance operations have proceeded at record levels this spring, and in May and June ran a third or better ahead of last year in applications involving new homes and in new homes started under F. H. A. inspection.

New-home applications exceeded 20,000 in number and $100,000,000 in amount during April and May, and estimates for June indicate similar figures. May was also the most

active month ever recorded under the F. H. A. program for homes started under its inspection.

It is estimated that at the present time every other small home under way in the United States is being constructed under F. H. A. inspection and financed with an F. H. A. insured mortgage.

In 1939 approximately 465,000 non-farm-dwelling units were built, the largest number since 1929. This compares with 55,000 units built in 1933 and again in 1934, the 2 years before operations of the F. H. A.'s mortgage insurance system.

During 1939 approximately 325,000 new one-family homes were financed privately, an even larger number than in 1929. The activity in construction of small homes last year and now undoubtedly results in large measure from the F. H. A.'s mortgage-insurance system.

Along with this increase in volume, the quality of home construction has also improved markedly in the past few years as result of the F. H. A.'s influence. The requirements and standards of the F. H. A. as to property, location, and construction are being observed on more and more homes.

Furthermore, a steadily growing proportion of home-financing transactions are being subjected to the F. H. A.'s risk-rating procedure, the only truly national and truly scientific method of analyzing mortgage risk. This risk-rating system has resulted in sounder transactions for both borrowers and lenders; it has kept many citizens from plunging into debt over their heads, and it has produced a far superior type of mortgage investment for lending institutions.

Altogether, approximately 12,000,000 people are enjoying improved housing standards and conditions under the F. H. A. program, a number equivalent to the combined population of 18 States. These families have bought, financed, or modernized homes under the F. H. A. program.

Since its inception the F. H. A. has been influential in bringing far-reaching changes to the residential field, to the benefit of home owners, lending institutions, and the building industry. It has caused a general reduction in interest rates on mortgage loans and has popularized the long-term amortized mortgage in place of the system of short-term first, second, and third mortgages previously characteristic of mortgage financing. The F. H. A. program has also resulted in a large degree of uniformity throughout the country in the terms and conditions of residential mortgages, as contrasted with the wide variety of practices that existed previously.

The Federal Housing Administration does not lend money and does not build homes. It is an insurance agency which protects banks, building and loan associations, life-insurance companies, mortgage companies, and other qualified lending institutions against loss on loans made to individuals or companies for the construction or purchase of residential structures or the repair and improvement of homes and other types of buildings.

Through the mechanism of its loan insurance, the F. H. A. is able to exert an important influence on the entire building, financing, and real-estate structure. In addition to modernizing the form of home-mortgage financing, the F. H. A. has raised the standards of home construction, design, durability, and neighborhood location. The result has been better housing for hundreds of thousands of American families, better neighborhood planning for American communities, and better investment opportunities for American lending institutions.

The F. H. A. program has also operated to make the advantages of modern home ownership available to a constantly broadening proportion of the American population. With the F. H. A. plan of mortgage insurance having removed the barriers which previously were held to exist against the sale of satisfactory new homes to families of modest incomes, a steady trend has developed toward lower-priced homes, with no sacrifice of standards of construction, design, and neighborhood location. Builders and manufacturers of building materials have cooperated in developing new methods for reducing the cost of home construction.

The culmination of these joint efforts has been the development of the low-cost home suitable for purchase by large numbers of families with incomes of $1,500 a year or less who previously have been unable to afford home ownership.

Since the founding of the F. H. A. in 1934, 600,000 families have been able to build or finance homes under the F. H. A. plan. More than 60 percent of these homes have been new, and 75 percent of the record-breaking number of mortgages being accepted for insurance by the F. H. A. this year are homes to be built under its inspection. In addition, 2,575,000 home, farm, and business-property owners have improved and repaired their properties through F. H. A.-insured modernization loans. Almost 12,500 lending institutions are approved to operate under the F. H. A. plan, and a large proportion of the home financing of the country is insured by the F. H. A.

But figures tell only part of the story of the F. H. A. Through the F. H. A., the Federal Government for the first time in history has established an unbiased agency to which the average family, seeking to avoid the pitfalls and dangers of home buying, may turn for a measure of protection never before available, and nowhere else now available in the same degree.

Home buyers generally have obtained better-planned, better-built, and better-financed homes than ever before, and certain major abuses of the 1920's have become the exception rather than the rule.

Continued progress is being achieved in making the F. H. A.'s underwriting, appraisal, architectural, land planning, and technical services valuable to the public. The F. H. A. is cooperating actively with various agencies and with municipal bodies in promoting quality of construction. The F. H. A.'s influence on architecture and land planning is evident on all sides.

Progress under the F. H. A. has been accomplished at little cost to the Government. Charges against the F. H. A.'s insurance reserves remain extremely small. During the next fiscal year beginning July 1, 1940, it is estimated the F. H. A.'s income, derived chiefly from mortgage insurance premiums and appraisal fees, will exceed its operating expenses, and substantial amounts will be added to reserves.

Final Declaration of Twenty-seventh National Foreign Trade Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 22 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

STATEMENT ON FOREIGN TRADE

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a very valuable statement dealing with foreign trade. It is entitled, "Final Declaration of the Twenty-Seventh National Foreign Trade Convention," held in San Francisco, Calif., July 29, 30, and 31, 1940.

This declaration constitutes a review of the convention of the National Foreign Trade Council on important matters affecting our foreign trade, and is of general public interest.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FINAL DECLARATION OF THE TWENTY-SEVENTH NATIONAL FOREIGN TRADE CONVENTION

For the advancement of civilization, it is clear that the products of the world must be exchanged among nations according to their relative natural advantages, abilities, and needs. Business and industry, upon which the people depend for essential production and employment, cannot continue to thrive if the stimulating effect of private initiative and enterprise by which they have been built up,

is unduly hampered, rather than promoted, by avoidable governmental intervention. Foreign commerce particularly is an occupation in which success depends upon exceptional individual ability, specialized experience and the readiness to incur unavoidable risks.

Adverse laws and trade practices, taxation, and transportation difficulties, foreign credit, currency, and exchange uncertainties, and other factors, call for close private and governmental study and for prompt remedial action, but the far-reaching effects throughout the world of the war situation in Europe and Asia render impossible, at this time, any conclusions which might serve as a permanent guide for the United States in the formulation of fixed commercial policies.

In many cases it may not be possible, before peace is restored, to solve the problems which confront us, in a manner entirely consistent with our present foreign-trade policies based on the unconditional most-favored-nation principle.

Governmental steps should be taken, in the meantime, to maintain export outlets for our products and to increase essential and desirable imports. Other countries that buy our products are dependent upon their exports for most of their foreign exchange and for part of their national income. The satisfaction of these interdependent requirements is of paramount importance.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

The convention commends the efforts the Government is making to further the ends of national defense, and urges the National Foreign Trade Council to respond in full measure to any demands within the scope of its activities which the National Defense Commission may make upon it for assistance in the accomplishment of these ends.

The convention holds that an adequate defense effort requires the concurrent achievement of national strength and security through maximum productiveness in all areas of industry, commerce and agriculture, to which end, in turn, the maintenance of a liberal flow of foreign trade is of vital importance.

RECIPROCAL-TRADE AGREEMENTS

The convention continues to give its full support to the unconditional most-favored-nation principle of the reciprocal trade agreements program. As soon as possible this country and the entire world should return to this principle of foreign-trade policy and practice. Subject to restrictions essential to our national-defense requirements, we desire to trade with all the world on mutually acceptable bases, with freedom from obstructive and discriminatory regulations.

THE NEUTRALITY ACT

The convention urges upon the Congress the modification or repeal of those provisions of the Neutrality Act which constitute unnecessary restraints on American trade, shipping, and finance.

THE JOHNSON ACT

We recommend the prompt repeal of this act.

INTER-AMERICAN TRADE

While the necessity of maintaining all avenues of world-wide trade is recognized, emphasis should be placed at this time on inter-American political and economic cooperation.

Latin American countries should become an increasingly important source not only for strategic and essential raw materials, but also for certain manufactured goods and foodstuffs. The convention recommends that both private and Government funds be sought to increase Latin American production for profitable marketing in the United States and other countries, thereby providing dollar exchange to pay for our exports and the return of earnings on American investments.

The convention recommends that the Government, in cooperation with the governments of Latin America, provide adequate financial assistance in support of their efforts to overcome exchange difficulties due to decline of their normal trade with European countries. As a transitional policy, pending the restoration of a more satisfactory basis for private investment and increased trade, we approve of the lending of United States Government funds for the development of natural resources, stimulation of exports, or for marketing of surpluses.

Loans should be made only for sound and constructive purposes, including the purchase of American materials, and should not be used, directly or indirectly, by governments or nationals of the borrowing countries, to compete with American private capital in those countries. Such loans should be administered and supervised by private firms having expert and experienced personnel for the successful conduct of such enterprises.

PAN-AMERICAN HIGHWAY

The convention records its strong endorsement of the efforts the American Government has made in furtherance of the development and construction of the pan-American highway, and urges the continuance and extension of these efforts in collaboration with the governments of other nations, as a practical expression of the good-neighbor policy, and to the end of fostering the close commercial, social, and cultural ties existing between the United States and Latin America.

THE PHILIPPINES

The convention recommends that the report of the Joint Preparatory Committee on Philippine Affairs be further considered and that appropriate steps be taken by Congress to prevent the damage and disruption to Philippine-American trade relations that would result from the consummation of political independence, scheduled to take effect in 1946, and to grant a longer period of time in which to permit of business making the necessary and natural adjustments.

The convention urges further amendment of the Tydings-McDuffie Act, with the concurrence of the Philippine Legislature, establishing adequate reciprocal-trade advantages for such indefinite period as may permit of the continuance of American-Philippine trade.

THE FAR EAST

The convention commends the manner in which our Government has handled, and is handling, the problems which have arisen in the relations of the United States with countries and regions of the Far East.

The convention believes in the good-neighbor policy, a policy which calls for reciprocal fair treatment. It believes that the businessmen of the United States and of countries of the Far East would welcome, under such conditions, the conclusion of new agreements wherein each country would undertake to respect the rights and interests of the others concerned and to accord broad most-favored-nation treatment toward enlarging trade and preserving the traditional peace throughout the Pacific region.

THE MONETARY POLICY OF THE UNITED STATES

We reaffirm our confidence in the gold standard. We have consistently advocated a return to stabilized currencies at a fixed ratio expressed in gold as one of the necessary requisites for the furtherance of world trade. We continue to subscribe to this doctrine. Stabilization of currencies on a world-wide basis requires, however, a restoration of peaceful relations between nations and the reestablishment of confidence between governments and private enterprises. While we realize that, until peace again is restored, the reestablishment of definitely fixed currencies by the various nations must remain in abeyance, we feel it essential, however, to reaffirm our faith in the fundamentals of co-related and freely exchangeable currencies, being strongly of the opinion that the lessons of the past few years have demonstrated the futility of endeavoring to carry on world commerce permanently through barter and controlled economies. The continuation of restricted commerce means strangulation for all.

We recognize that a great proportion of the gold now in the United States is here principally for refuge and security, and that as soon as world peace again prevails it shall return to its owners in various countries abroad, thus forming the first step in the reallocation of our present gold hoard and settlement of international balances in gold. When world conditions make this step possible, we should be willing to entertain important gold lending operations in order to assist other nations to rehabilitate themselves and to reestablish their monetary systems based on gold. In the meantime, we strongly recommend the resumption of gold payments, and that no further changes be made by our Government in its gold purchasing price. We recommend the repeal of the Thomas amendment and of the Silver Purchase Act of 1934. We feel it essential that all measures be taken that will tend toward the continuation of confidence in the American dollar and hold forth hope to a harassed world that we stand ready to assume our obligation, as a creditor nation, to cooperate with them in the reestablishment of sound monetary policies throughout the world.

FORESTRY

We urge continued recognition of the position of forest products as basic exportable commodities, and the fostering of world trade in these products as part of the forestry policy of the United States.

EXPORT TRADE ACT (WEBB-POMERENE ACT)

The United States Government should encourage and assist associations of exporters operating under the Export Trade Act. In the face of more effective and widespread foreign buying cartels, the policy expressed in this helpful legislation should be clarified and strengthened. It is recommended that the administration of the act be transferred to the Department of Commerce.

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK

With the understanding that our Government shall not enter into competition with private capital, the convention recommends the removal of the present limitation of $20,000,000 additional accommodation to any country, and favors an increase in the aggregate credit capacity available to the Export-Import Bank by $500,000,000. We further recommend that the functions of the bank be extended to provide to our foreign traders government guaranties of credits and exchange risks on bases equal to those available to foreign competitors.

INTERNATIONAL DOUBLE TAXATION

It is essential that the provisions to insure protection against international double taxation, adopted by the Congress in 1918, be freed from encroachments and indirect limitations. Reciprocal tax treaties and agreements should be concluded with additional countries, particularly in Latin America, along the lines of those already negotiated for the prevention of extraterritorial and discriminatory, as well as double, taxation.

The convention urges the tax committee of the National Foreign Trade Council to continue its effective work in meeting international tax problems.

PROTECTION OF DIRECT FOREIGN INVESTMENTS

There can be no approach to normal world economic order without a revival of confidence based on the integrity of governments.

General agreement on measures which will encourage and protect investments of foreign capital is essential to a healthy resumption of world trade. The United States has always maintained as a principle of equity and international law that property may not be expropriated without adequate concurrent compensation. Recognition and acceptance of such a doctrine is essential as a basic tenet of international cooperation. It is recommended that our Government seek to embody this doctrine, together with other provisions for the encouragement and protection of American foreign investments, in treaties with other nations.

CUSTOMS ADMINISTRATIVE REGULATIONS

The convention urges the need of further legislation in the direction of improved customs administrative laws, in order that these may conform more adequately to the practical requirements of merchants in time of war, as well as in peace. Pending congressional action to this end, the Treasury Department should take steps to assure that the appraisal and classification of imported merchandise may be made with certainty and dispatch. Greater responsibility for the administration of customs laws should be placed upon local customs officials.

CABLES

The State Department, having secured modification of drastic wartime regulations of some countries, to permit of the use of certain widely recognized business codes, is requested to continue these efforts and, further, to seek permission from foreign governments for the wartime use of cable addresses and code signatures, the elimination of unnecessary delays of censorship, the keeping or reopening of circuits to important business centers throughout the world, and protection of the interests of American communications companies and users. It is also recommended that our Government policy provide for continued operations of American private companies in the international communications field.

WAR-RISK INSURANCE

The convention approves the recent enactment by Congress of the law providing governmental underwriting of marine and war-risk insurance in times of emergency, when private facilities prove inadequate and reasonable rates are not available. We urge an amendment providing that Government facilities cover American goods when carried on foreign vessels based upon—

(1) Experience in the World War of 1914–18;

(2) The necessity for preventing discriminatory rates on American cargoes by foreign ships;

(3) The fact that 65 percent of our exports and 69 percent of our imports are carried in foreign-flag vessels; and

(4) The necessity for eliminating causes for possible retaliations by foreign governments against American private insurance underwriters.

We urge that the United States Maritime Commission afford adequate protection of the interests of private underwriters, and that the administration of the law, as in the former World War, be in the hands of practical and experienced men.

DRAWBACKS AND REFUNDS

As experience has shown that, under a fixed appropriation for drawbacks and refunds, delays in payments generally occur at the end of each fiscal year, due to insufficient funds and delay in congressional authorization of deficiency appropriation to meet accumulated claims, the convention recommends that legislation be enacted to restore the practice effective prior to 1933, whereby the Treasury Department was authorized to pay all approved drawback and refund claims out of general funds, thereby insuring prompt payment.

We recommend that the provisions of the Sugar Act, and regulations issued thereunder for refund on account of exportation, be amended to conform more closely with provisions for such similar refunds authorized in the Tariff Act and regulations issued thereunder; that provision also be made for claims in the name of the manufacturer or shipper of the product; that the time limit for filing such claims be extended to 2 years; and that "substitution" be authorized for tax as well as for duty refund purposes.

SHIPPING

We commend the Government for its active interest in behalf of American ships and shippers. Having regard to our trade needs, we urge its continued support of the construction of new vessels for important American trade routes under private ownership and operation, with the view of assuring sufficient bottoms to carry American cargoes and as auxiliaries for naval reserves.

INTERNATIONAL AIR TRANSPORT

The efficient maintenance of scheduled international air-transport services on the part of American companies during this critical period of unsettled world conditions has amply demonstrated the vital importance of these services to the Nation's commerce and industry.

The convention reiterates its recommendation for the Government's full and continued support of this important aid to foreign trade and its further extension, to the end that the utmost possible benefits of these services be made available for the needs of our foreign commerce, our Postal Service, and our national defense.

TRADE TERMS

The convention commends the National Foreign Trade Council for its 20 years' activities toward standardization of trade terms, through its publication and distribution of American Foreign Trade Definitions. It is recognized that an even greater degree of uniformity and understanding is desirable in regard to c. i. f. quotations, in order to eliminate misunderstandings arising. Consular fees, interest, inspection fees, and other charges at port of departure, should be standardized more widely as obligations of the buyer.

FOREIGN TRADE ZONES

The convention notes the progress made in the successful operation of the New York foreign trade zone, and approves the establishment of foreign trade zones at other major ports as soon as practicable. The convention opposes any legislation to amend the law governing foreign trade zones which may have the effect of restricting the operations of such zones.

IMPORT-TRADE OPPORTUNITIES

The convention commends the efforts being made by the Government to develop new sources of supply in foreign countries for products suitable for import into the United States. This is of importance to American importers under present conditions, when increased activity in the practical aid thus given to merchants is desirable.

FOREIGN-TRADE EDUCATION

Wars in Europe and the Orient have disrupted former trade channels and given rise to trade practices, in forms so adverse to American commercial enterprise as to render more necessary than ever the work of the education committee of the National Foreign Trade Council. It is urged, accordingly, that attention be given by educational institutions and civic forums to that phase of the work which aims at informing the public of the fundamentals involved and of their influence on our domestic well-being and security, as distinguished from those of a purely academic nature, as required in our schools and colleges. Foreign trade begins at home. It is essential, therefore, that the average citizen understand all that this implies.

Who's Going To Sacrifice What?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN A. HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 22, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW BERLIN (N. Y.) GAZETTE

Mr. EDWIN A. HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New Berlin (N. Y.) Gazette for August 15, 1940.

[From the New Berlin (N. Y.) Gazette of August 15, 1940]

WHO'S GOING TO SACRIFICE WHAT?

The American people, driven by the need for military security, must build a Military Establishment costly beyond all precedents. An incredible proportion of the national income must be taken from the pockets of the people and diverted to government. All of us will have fewer luxuries. All of us must conserve. All of us must sacrifice.

That is clear enough and reasonable enough. But it has become tragically plain that a very substantial portion of the American people have the idea that the other fellow should make most, if not all, of the sacrifices. It's the other fellow's standard of living which should suffer, not their own. It's the other fellow who should pay the bill and do the work, while they go on much as they did before.

Certain influential segments of labor, for instance, demand still higher pay, shorter hours, excessive extra pay for overtime, and other special privileges and prerogatives for the workmen, despite the fact that pay is now the highest and the workweek the shortest in history. Their argument is that industry must sacrifice more of its profits in the interests of labor, while the worker grows fat on the national emergency.

Those who have gone on Government relief as a career favor sacrifice, too—so long as it doesn't touch relief appropriations. The Government, under the guise of "relief," still pays out millions for leaf raking, boondoggling, and other completely nonproductive activities. Powerful influences demand that not one nickel of this waste be eliminated, no matter how much others sacrifice to pay it, or how dire the menace the country faces.

The professional politicians talk of sacrifice, in noble words. But it is a rare politician who is willing to sacrifice one thin dime of patronage that might cost a vote, to support a principle. The self-seeking hand of politics handicaps a real defense program which would get maximum results with a minimum of waste of time and money.

Who is going to sacrifice what? That is the question that America faces today, if national security is to be a reality, not a mirage. The answer is plain. All must sacrifice; all must contribute their full share. The other fellow isn't going to do it for us. Selfish interests now at play in America, whether they be in labor, industry, or government, are the real "fifth columnists" within our gates.

Consolidated Fiscal Returns for Corporations Seen Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. BOEHNE, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 22, 1940

ARTICLE BY MERRYLE STANLEY RUKEYSER

Mr. BOEHNE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Merryle Stanley Rukeyser, which was published in the Washington Post of August 16:

[From the Washington Post of August 16, 1940]

CONSOLIDATED FISCAL RETURNS FOR CORPORATIONS SEEN NEEDED

(By Merryle Stanley Rukeyser, economic commentator)

It is extraordinary that Congress should be considering a stiffer excess-profits tax without permitting corporate taxpayers the privilege of making consolidated returns. In the circumstances, it is not surprising that spokesmen for organized business, appearing before the joint congressional committee should have emphasized the desirability of this change.

The answer of Senators HARRISON and KING that if the question of consolidated returns was gone into, too much time would be consumed, with corresponding delay to the tax program recommended by the administration and the Defense Commission, seems inadequate.

As a matter of fact, this country has had long fiscal experience with the consolidated return, and only abandoned it for regular taxation a few years ago during the New Deal.

Under the principle of the consolidated return, the whole corporate family is treated as a unit for tax purposes. Thus intercorporate transactions are thoroughly eliminated.

Moreover, if one organ in the corporate family is highly profitable but another loses an equal amount, one is offset against the other.

The consolidated return enables the corporate taxpayer to apply to the tax payments the same accounting principles which record for business purposes the operation of a group of enterprises.

If the consolidated return is a sound principle for ordinary taxes, it is indispensable for excess-profits taxes.

Because profits are not excessive unless the over-all profit result for the entire corporate group is excessive. This can be measured through a consolidated return.

At present, it is difficult to translate the emotion behind excess profits tax legislation into sound fiscal measures.

This time the sentiment has taken form in the slogan that no millionaires shall result from the American quickened preparedness program.

As a means of accomplishing this objective, the administration proposes through excess-profits legislation to indulge in what is tantamount to price fixing on the profit side.

But it is one-sided price fixing such as was done in the Esch-Cummins Transportation Act of 1920, which limited maximum railroad profits without guaranteeing minimum profits.

What is commonly called profit is more accurately a business cost—growing out of a payment for the use of tools or other corporate assets. The excess-profits formula is designed to limit the rate of payments on tools which can be made during wartime or national emergency.

The intention is noble enough, but practical difficulties are confronted in working it out, if the rate is dependent on results during a previous test period. There always arises the question of whether the test period works out fairly for a particular enterprise. On the other hand, if invested capital is the criterion, this principle works against good management which buys tools wisely and economically, and which makes a good return on them through efficiency of operation.

On the general formula of depreciation and amortization of emergency war plants, there has already been a meeting of the minds between the administration and industrialists, and in the circumstances it is desirable to get congressional action in order to remove the psychological bottleneck on defense plans which comes from lack of clarifying legislation on this vital subject.

America's Economic Front

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 23 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

ADDRESS BY JAMES A. FARRELL

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, Mr. James A. Farrell, former president of the United States Steel Corporation, is a distinguished authority on matters pertaining to foreign trade. On the occasion of the annual convention of the National Foreign Trade Council, held at San Francisco, July 29–31, Mr. Farrell delivered a very able address dealing with the present status of our foreign trade, as well as the many complicated problems of international trade relations in a world geared to the demands of military economies.

This address should have the careful study of everyone interested in international affairs. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Today, more than ever in the past, the necessity for clear thinking is impressed upon the minds of American businessmen by a situation confronting them abroad which had no parallel in the previous war and post-war periods. Superimposed on the disrupted world economy that ended so disastrously in 1929, we have had 6 years in which international trade was increasingly geared to the demands of military economies, in nations which we now know were preparing to risk all on a throw of the dice, in a mad attempt to subjugate the world to their ambitious lust for power.

The past decade presents the spectacle of a world torn by economic rivalries, with mounting momentum leading inevitably to the present war, to the preparation for which the totalitarian nations had mobilized their manpower and all their available resources and energies.

When war was declared, following the overthrow of Austria, Czechoslovakia, and Poland, it was apparent to Americans that their front lines in European markets had been broken and that nothing was left but to guard with greater vigilance our lines of communication with other markets.

At the present time, estimated on a basis of the combined 1939 trade with Europe and the British Empire, a total volume of America's normal export and import trade, valued approximately at $2,500,000,000 is subject to the severe restrictions of an economic war, and to those imposed by our neutrality legislation. For all practical purposes much of this trade, other than military necessities, may be written off our national ledger as an assured source of national income, until a military decision is reached and peace terms indicate what prospects remain for resumption of our peacetime trade with these nations.

Whatever the outcome of the military struggle, it is likely that efforts will be made at its close to establish an economic bloc in Europe. With Europe under a dictatorship, we would have to match the power of a European economic union with the combined power of this Western Hemisphere in bargaining our way through to a reciprocal commercial understanding.

The uncertainty of our trade relations with the Orient, due to the Sino-Japanese War and the trade effects of the Philippine Independence Act, if carried through in its present form, calls for serious consideration of the direction in which we should look for a strengthening of our bargaining power with a European economic bloc comprising our former leading markets.

In these circumstances, with Canada remaining in close cooperation with pan-America, the balance of economic power in bargaining with a European bloc would be greatly strengthened by a trade agreement between the United States and all British Empire countries.

Australia, which is represented at this convention by her Minister, the Right Honorable Richard G. Casey, who will address the Pacific trade session, has strongly advocated an agreement of this kind, as a logical approach to satisfactory trade relations between Empire countries themselves. It is no less essential to the economic security of the Western Hemisphere that future trade relations with British Empire countries, which were greatly improved by agreements with Canada and the United Kingdom, should establish an orderly and mutually profitable marketing system which would eliminate injurious competition. Pan-America and the British Empire combined would establish an economic front to the rest of

the world, with bargaining power adequate to secure equality of treatment and fair dealing in international commerce.

The situation in the Pacific does not tend to improve our trade relations in that area. It is not in professions of friendship but in deeds that we look for a change in this situation. Much has been said recently of the right of Europe and the Orient to proclaim the Monroe Doctrine for those areas. Our Government has raised no objection to such a plan, but it has challenged, and rightly so, the intention of either a totalitarian Europe or a totalitarian Orient to adopt a Monroe Doctrine similar to that accepted by the 21 American republics. On the contrary, all the evidence points conclusively to the fact that there is no analogy whatever between the Monroe Doctrine of pan-America, and that which totalitarian governments in Europe and the Orient propose to proclaim.

An interpretation of our century-old Monroe Doctrine, of which the Americas approve, was given in unmistakable terms by the Secretary of State, Mr. Cordell Hull, at the Lima Conference. This bears no resemblance whatever to the aims and purposes of governments in Europe and the Orient.

President Monroe was thinking primarily in terms of security for the United States. He was making no claim to a protectorate over the other Americas, no pretensions to hegemony. Recognition of the sovereign independence of the 21 republics, nonintervention in their internal affairs, close cooperation by means of consultation on all questions of general concern to pan-America; these are the basic ties of the democracies on American soil which are united in defense of their economic and political freedom.

The delegates to these annual conventions have a profound respect and admiration for the Secretary of State, who, at Lima, while disclaiming any idea of economic or political advantage for the United States, urged that conference to be on guard against the ominous shadow cast by the totalitarian axis over the whole Western Hemisphere.

The policy of the United States is one of trading with the rest of the world, but on terms of equality. The problem that confronts the commercial world is not one of an impasse between its businessmen in reaching an understanding and agreement on matters of trade. Were world economic affairs directed by its businessmen, there would be little difficulty in establishing a system of international cooperation, based on consultation, by which a new world order in commercial relations would prove of lasting advantage to all countries.

The futility of international economic conferences, dominated by Government representatives who give lip service to resolutions which they have no intention of implementing, focuses attention on the seat of the disorder from which the business world suffers. Whether we look to the Orient or to Europe, we find the paralyzing hand of a totalitarian government in control of all industry and trade. It would be to the advantage of the Orient and Europe to have normal trade relations with the United States. We would welcome trade agreements to this end. The National Foreign Trade Council and the Japan Economic Federation have laid the foundations for such an understanding on trade relations, by an exchange of missions before the outbreak of the Sino-Japanese War. The friendships then established between the respective business communities may yet survive this era of military domination, provided peace in the Orient is founded on the principles of our Monroe Doctrine.

Expansion of trade within the pan-American area has engaged particular attention at the present time. While not encroaching on those who will speak at the session devoted to the Americas, I may repeat here what I said in 1928, that there is a mutuality of benefit in this exchange of commerce between the United States and the sister republics that fulfills the real intentions of businessmen in the United States toward our southern neighbors. The mistaken belief is frequently held that the previous war was the cause of the considerable growth in our trade with Latin America. His Excellency Senor Don Carlos G. Davila, Ambassador at that time from Chile to the United States, pointed out, in a pamphlet published by the National Foreign Trade Council, that the expansion of our trade was a logical advance, not a war growth. While the war gave a tremendous impulse to our trade with Latin America, it will be found that the maximum figures for the war peak, 1918, were $10,000,000 less than the figures for 1927.

American businessmen are keenly interested in the proposals of the Government for more scientific regulation of inter-American trade, but, as this will doubtless be discussed at the Americas session, I only wish here to emphasize the importance of avoidance of expectations of compensatory trade which can only be realized over a period of years of intense development of Latin American resources. In any consideration of future large loans are investments for the purpose of stimulating our trade with Latin America, we should place no reliance on the generally accepted theory that trade increase invariably follows loans. While our loans to 16 principal Latin American countries in the period 1925–29 amounted approximately to $970,000,000, the increase in our exports in that period amounted only to $166,000,000.

It is not my purpose to infringe upon the subjects allotted to other speakers. It has been my privilege since the inception of these annual conventions to be asked to give a keynote to the proceedings by a survey of our overseas trade. The situation today is one in which the outlook is obscured by an impenetrable fog. It is a situation, moreover, in which the past no longer serves as a safe guide to our course in the future. Our policies during the war will be dictated by our necessities; expediency, not fixed rules, will govern our action in meeting every emergency.

We meet in this convention to deal with broad issues that divide the world into separate camps. Of transcendent importance is a united front on the fundamentals of our peacetime relations with the rest of the world. No previous convention has been charged with greater responsibility in examining and deciding upon the course we intend to pursue as a nation, both during and after the war.

Great care has been exercised in the preparation of the convention program and in the selection of speakers, befitting the abnormal situation that confronts us in world affairs. In selecting the theme of the convention, America's Economic Front, which is the subject of my address, it was felt that the attention of the convention could be concentrated on no more important issue than that of seeking to find our legitimate place in a new world order that foreshadows so many difficulties for those upon whom the task falls of building its foundations.

It is evident that the new world order conceived by totalitarian nations, will be one in which their external trade will be under strict government control. Our future trade relations with Europe may be similar to that with Soviet Russia. It is not too soon to give serious study to this totalitarian economic revolution, to its effects upon our future trade, and to the discovery of the ways and means by which American individual enterprise, reinforced by effective organization of the Government's foreign commercial services, may continue to find outlets for the surplus products of the soil and of manufacturing industries.

In these times of doubt and uncertainty as to the kind of world in which coming generations are expected to live, there should be no defeatist attitude to any proposals which aim at the subversion of our democratic institutions, under which are guaranteed the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. We are too conscious of the greatness of our Nation, of its vast potential resources, to fear what the future may bring or to doubt our own determination and ability as a Nation to preserve the American way of life.

Proposed Antitrust Suits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GUY M. GILLETTE

OF IOWA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 23 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

ARTICLE BY ERNEST K. LINDLEY

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, if time is of the essence of national defense, personally I see no justification for sit-down strikes in industry.

I, of course, shall not take the time to go into the controversy which has been discussed in the public press relative to Government contracts; but I am much interested in the postponement of contemplated antitrust suits in the oil industry, which have been postponed at the request of the Council of National Defense after the Department of Justice, for a year and a half, has carefully prepared a suit ready to file, on the plea that such action would interfere with the cooperation of the large oil companies in our defense program.

We are considering a bill which does not take into consideration the individual and his contribution to national defense. I see no reason whatever for making the patriotism of any company and its contribution to national defense contingent on a money proposition, and I am sure the oil companies would not want to have that deduction drawn in the public mind.

Mr. Ernest K. Lindley, a columnist, has published a very interesting article pertaining to this matter. I ask unanimous consent to have it inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NECESSARY SACRIFICES—IS BUSINESS TO BE PAMPERED?

(By Ernest K. Lindley)

One reason why conscription for military service is encountering an uphill struggle is the feeling that business is not being called upon for corresponding sacrifices. There are multiplying signs that the national policy with regard to business enterprise in its rela-

tion to national defense is to become one of extreme solicitude, bordering on pampering.

On one side it is proposed to compel men to bear arms. At least, they will have to take a year of military training. At most, they will be called upon to sacrifice their lives.

On the other side, it is not proposed to apply in any way the principle of compulsion to the industrial mechanism which must provide the weapons for these men, or to any other sector of the American economic system. Instead, to some who are dubious about the conscription of manpower, the official approach to business enterprise seems to be a compound of cajolery and bounties.

The two chief exhibits of the present approach to business are (1) taxation and (2) the efforts to throttle certain suits under the antitrust laws.

The tax question falls into two parts, depreciation and the taxation of profits. It is generally conceded that if private capital is to be induced to invest in new buildings and new tools for the manufacture of munitions, it must be given reasonable assurance of recovering the investment within the period that the orders for munitions probably will occur. Accordingly, the Defense Commission obtained an agreement among all Government agencies that companies making these special investments useful only for military purposes should be allowed to write them off in 5 years. This means that they can deduct 20 percent for depreciation each year for 5 years as an item of cost in calculating the profit on which they may be taxed. The understanding is that if orders for military defense purposes do not continue over a 5-year period, these companies can come back and obtain a further readjustment of taxes in their favor.

Until this arrangement is set up by law through Congress, the defense program on the manufacturing side is held up.

This liberal allowance for depreciation supposes, however, that the industries receiving it will make very small profits. Since industries, understandably, do not want to shoulder the risk of loss through failure of Government orders to continue long enough to justify the new investment, they are not entitled to a counterbalancing reward for taking the risk.

When it comes to taxing profits, however, the policy seems to be "go easy." In the view of several influential Members of Congress, the Government tax policy with regard to national defense is, for business, a "heads-I-win, tails-you-lose" proposition.

The Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice has pending several suits involving industries of importance to the national defense. But it is feeling the pressure to "lay off," lest it make the industries involved noncooperate with the defense program.

It already has run into difficulty in its suit against a number of the large oil companies. This was to have been filed almost 3 weeks ago. It was not regarded with open hostility by the oil companies, because it was a civil suit. It covered various questions which had been raised already in criminal suits and which would be raised eventually in additional suits, if this over-all civil suit were not carried through.

The filing of the suit, however, was deferred on representations from the Defense Commission that it might impair the psychological attitude of the oil company officials toward the national-defense program. Thurman Arnold, Assistant Attorney General in charge of antitrust work, has taken the reasonable position that he will not prosecute any practice, otherwise in contravention of the antitrust laws, which is essential to the national defense. But he balks at being asked to discontinue a suit, otherwise justified, on the ground that it might instill in the leaders of a particular industry a noncooperative psychology.

When the Defense Commission has completed its study of the specific hearing of the case on national defense, it may agree with Mr. Arnold. It may have to pass similarly on four or five other impending suits.

It seems clear enough that if a specific business practice, otherwise illegal, is valuable for national-defense purposes, it should be openly sanctioned during the period of the emergency.

But the contrast between the wary solicitude for the psychological attitude of business and the approach to the problem of obtaining men to bear arms is griping some of the administration's sturdiest supporters in Congress. It may lead shortly to a real political explosion.

Description of New York State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. MEAD

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 23 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

RADIO ADDRESS BY EDWIN C. HILL

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a very interesting and illuminating description of the beauties and marvels of the great Empire State, recently broadcast by Edwin C. Hill, renowned radio commentator and world-famed reporter.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Good evening, everyone, only 80 days remain to see the greatest show on earth—one that this generation at least, will never see again—the New York World's Fair, so brilliantly conceived and organized by Grover Whalen, so efficiently and graciously conducted by Harvey Gibson. Of the countless things which appeal to the heart and head over there on Flushing Meadows, there is nothing, it seems to me, more stirring to the spirit than the foreign buildings still proudly flying the flags of their nations, still gallantly carrying on even though their homelands lie crushed under the heavy boots of the invader. And a thrill may flutter your heart as you are reminded that it is under the protection of the Stars and Stripes that this gallant gesture is made possible. Only 80 days remain to enjoy the beauty and fascination of the greatest of all world's fairs, for on October 27 the flags come down and the lights go out. Of the many thousands who will visit the New York World's Fair between now and the 27th of October, very many, one supposes, will want to see more of the State of New York—the Empire State. It ranks first in population, 13,000,000, although only twenty-ninth in area. It lies mainly in the lake region of North America. The eastern part of Lake Ontario and one-half of Lake Champlain are controlled by the State. Of the waterfalls, Niagara, of course, furnishes the most magnificent spectacle, but there are others noted for beauty—the falls of the Genesee, Trenton Falls, the Kaaterskill Falls in the Catskills, and the falls of the Cohoes, of Ticonderoga and of Watkins Glen.

All this, with magnificent woodlands and State parks, makes for scenic beauty that calls insistently to the motorist these summer days, and will continue to call, not only through the gorgeous autumn, when the woods fly their banners of scarlet and gold, but through the winter months when all the northland is mantled in snow and winter sports come merrily into their own. If we were motoring in leisurely fashion through New York State, with ample time to see it all, and see it as we chose, we might start up in the northwest corner at the breath-taking falls of Niagara. And we would remember that this was once the land of the fierce-hearted Senecas of the Six Nations—the great Iroquois Confederacy of the Senecas, the Mohawks, the Oneidas, the Onondagas, the Cayugas, and the Tuscaroras, whose names live still in rivers and lakes and valleys and in towns and cities and counties. And we might roll pleasantly southward along the shore of Lake Erie to Chautauqua, famous, the world over, for its lecture courses. And then to Lake Ontario, gently caressing a favored land, and so through a historic region to the Thousand Islands and the broad St. Lawrence River. We might perhaps find time to enjoy the natural beauties of the great northern counties of Jefferson, St. Lawrence, Franklin, and Clinton along with the lovely and storied Lake Champlain. And so down to the Adirondacks and famous Saratoga with its healing waters and its beautiful race course. Perhaps a vision might come to us of the old days of Saratoga's greatest fame—the days before the War between the States; the days of perfumed curls and hoopskirts.

We might even in imagination see General Washington and General Schuyler pacing their horses through the woods where they beat "Johnny" Burgoyne and his redcoats so soundly, and hear Schuyler say to the great man: "General, there are some wonderful springs off in the woods here. I would be most happy to show you them." And we might even see the gentleman from Virginia descend from his charger and sip the waters. From Saratoga we might motor on to the Finger Lakes, extending southward exactly like the fingers of a human hand. And then to the storied Indian country—to Johnstown and the mansion of the great Sir William Johnson, Johnson Hall—that doughty old Sir William who was His Majesty's superintendent of Indian affairs for North America. We might pause at Johnson Hall to recall how old Sir William, ill in body and troubled in spirit, foresaw the break between the American Colonies and the mother country and how his heart was torn almost in twain between the pull of his loyalty to the King and the tug of love for the new and wonderful land. This was the land of Sir John Johnson, Sir William's cold-hearted son, and of Walter Butler, the infamous renegade. It was the country of the powerful Six Nations. A land of great beauty; a storied land; a land of romance and great achievement and stark tragedy, too. And we come presently to the southern tier—those counties marching in orderly fashion along the Pennsylvania border, and so east again to the Catskills and the most beautiful river in all the world, the Hudson. In these weeks, the sun and the season fill the Hudson River Valley with a soft gold light.

The mist comes up slowly in the morning from the valley floor, drenching the leaves that are yellowing fast this year after a dry summer. Down from the Adirondacks over the Catskills and the Taconics, the brightening band of fall foliage begins to push toward the great city where the river ends. From the harbor of New York the ocean freighters steam up the Hudson toward Albany. Safe in a world at war, they move slowly through a lovely land overhung with the brooding peace. The vintners around Highland are crushing their sweet white grapes. From its source on Mount Marcy to its mouth at Manhattan Island, the Hudson River is 350 miles long. Along its lower half, between Albany and New York, its valley carries more traffic—in boats and barges on the water, in trains, trucks, busses, automobiles alongside it—than any comparable stretch of water in the country, perhaps in the world. But the Hudson has an importance over and above this usefulness. The

Hudson is a very beautiful river. Those who know it well and love it think that no river in the world is quite so lovely. It originates in springs of pure water more than 4,000 feet high in the Adirondack Mountains and after a journey of 350 miles, in a valley of matchless scenic beauty, it disappears in New York Bay, but, strangely enough does not end there. For it is a river of such strong and virile nature that it maintains its identity even in the Atlantic Ocean, and remains a river, unseen by man, many miles out to sea. New Yorkers see the last of it from the Statue of Liberty or the tower of the Empire State Building or the delightful and lofty roof of the Petroleum Building over at the world's fair.

One could travel a lifetime and hardly exhaust the wonders of the State. Niagara thunders at the frontier. There is old Ticonderoga—with its memories of Ethan Allan. There is West Point and the United States Military Academy which is the pride of the Nation; West Point where young men, selected in accordance with the truest principles of democracy, are taught the meaning of loyalty and honor and truth. At Rensselaer we see the old fort where Yankee Doodle first was heard. At Cooperstown you may see where the Leatherstocking Tales were spun, and where baseball originated. The first free school in America was established in New York State, and the largest university, Columbia, is there. At Troy is Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, the oldest engineering school. Where the waters of Lake Erie flow into Niagara stands Buffalo, a gateway to all the West. In Rochester, the marvel of modern photography was developed. From Syracuse a hundred products find their way to the markets of the world. At old Schenectady, once a trading post, wonders are wrought daily with the magic of electricity. From busy Albany, the capital, you look out on the Hudson to the spot where Robert Fulton brought his fussy little *Clermont* from New York. And throughout the State, with its 90,000 miles of splendid motor roads, you may see hills and valleys and rolling fields, producing every tree and flower and plant that may be found in the Temperate Zone. Truly, New York, you are an empire. And your men and women have been worthy of you. Four of your sons have sat in the White House—Martin Van Buren, Millard Fillmore, Theodore Roosevelt, and Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

From every State and city, eager boys and girls have brought their talents to your door and won rich rewards. "Excelsior" is your motto. Your eyes are toward the future. And you are the eyes of all the world.

I thank you.

National Defense Housing Projects

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. WAGNER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 23 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

STATEMENT BY UNITED STATES HOUSING ADMINISTRATOR

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement of the national-defense housing projects which the United States Housing Administration is constructing in cooperation with the War and Navy Departments.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

National-defense housing projects

I. U. S. HOUSING AUTHORITY DEFENSE-HOUSING PROJECT LIST NO. 1 APPROVED BY THE PRESIDENT

Place	Defense agency recommending project	Post or defense activity involved	Number of dwelling units	Agency to construct and operate housing project
Pensacola, Fla	Navy Department	Extension of aviation training operations at naval air station.	200	The housing authority of the city of Pensacola, Fla.
Portsmouth, Va	do	Extension of shipbuilding program at navy yard	600	Housing authority of the city of Portsmouth, Va.
Corpus Christi, Tex	do	Construction of new naval air station	250	Housing authority of the city of Corpus Christi, Tex.
Newport News, Va	do	Assignment of several shipbuildings to Newport News Shipbuilding & Dry Dock Co.	500	Housing authority of the city of Newport News, Va.

II. U. S. HOUSING AUTHORITY DEFENSE-HOUSING PROJECT LIST NO. 2 SUBMITTED TO PRESIDENT FOR APPROVAL

Columbus, Ga	War Department	Expansion of operations at Fort Benning	614	The housing authority of the city of Columbus, Ga.
Portsmouth, N. H	Navy Department	Expansion of navy-yard activities	400	Navy Department.
Canal Zone	do	do	400	Do.
Puget Sound, Bremerton, Wash.	do	do	600	Bremerton housing authority, Bremerton, Wash.
Charleston, S. C	do	do	400	Charleston housing authority, Charleston, S. C.
Mare Island, Calif	do	do	600	Navy Department.
Newport, R. I	do	Expansion of naval activities connected with naval torpedo station, naval training station, and naval hospital.	262	The housing authority of the city of Newport, R. I.
Anchorage, Alaska	War Department	Expansion of military activities	325	War Department.

III. U. S. HOUSING AUTHORITY DEFENSE-HOUSING PROJECT LIST NO. 3 TO BE PROPOSED FOR SUBMISSION TO PRESIDENT WITHIN A WEEK

Montgomery, Ala	War Department	Expansion of operations at Maxwell Field	434	The housing authority of the city of Montgomery, Ala.
Rock Island, Ill	do	Expansion at United States arsenal at Rock Island, Ill.	300	Rock Island City housing authority.
East Moline, Ill	do	do	100	Rock Island County housing authority.
Moline, Ill	do	do	200	Moline housing authority.
Rantoul, Ill	do	Expansion of Army landing field	100	Champaign County housing authority.
Jacksonville, Fla	Navy Department	New naval air base	400	The housing authority of the city of Jacksonville, Fla.
Hampton Roads, Norfolk, Va.	do	Expansion of shipbuilding activities	500	The housing authority of Norfolk County, Va.
Aberdeen, Md	War Department	Expansion of Army testing field	24	War Department.

Foreign Policy of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ERNEST LUNDEEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 23 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

EDITORIALS FROM WALLACE'S FARMER

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD five short editorials from Wallace's Farmer, a prominent and widely circulated farm journal, on various aspects of the foreign policy of the United States.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Wallace's Farmer, of December 30, 1939]

NO ANGELS FIGHT IN THIS OR ANY WAR

How much more simple the war seemed in 1917. Then most of us were sure that we were fighting to make the world safe for democracy and to end war. We pictured one side as white—all good and pure—and the other as black—all wicked and cruel.

As time went on we learned that Russia shared with Austria the blame for starting the war, that Great Britain had determined to enter the war before poor little Belgium was invaded, that the Allies were much less interested in saving democracy than in grabbing German colonies, that our loans wouldn't be repaid, and that the treaty of Versailles had left Europe not with peace but with a sort

of prolonged armistice. And we noted that French harshness to the German Republic was preparing the way for somebody like Hitler.

In a few years after the excitement had worn off and facts could be seen, we learned that the war of 1914–18 was a mixed affair, with good and bad on both sides, with economic interests more important than slogans about "imperialism" or "democracy," and that the interests of world welfare probably would have been served better by a peace without victory, a stalemate instead of a conquest for one side or the other, with its consequent harsh peace terms.

The things we learned about the World War, but learned 10 years too late, are applicable in many ways to the war now going on. Is the present war any more a war against Hitler than the last war was one against the Kaiser? Are the Germans fighting to conquer the world to keep Hitler's gang in power, or to make sure of adequate raw materials from eastern Europe? Are the Allies fighting to save democracy or to preserve the British and French colonies and to prevent the growth of Germany on the Continent?

Here is an extract from a letter to us from Henry C. Taylor, distinguished farm economist and recently American delegate to the International Institute of Agriculture at Rome. He knows the economic background of the war better than any but a few other Americans, and he says:

"It is not worth while to destroy Hitler. The important thing is to destroy the conditions that have made Hitler possible. Otherwise, another Hitler will arise. The conditions causing the war are not differences in political ideologies. The causes are economic. Every effort will be made to draw us into the conflict on the theory that it is a war to save the democracies, but nothing could do more to destroy such democracy as exists."

He adds that "No American, no Britain, should ever expect peace in Europe until each population group has access to the basic economic necessities of national life."

This is no war between devils and angels over the rule of heaven. It is a conflict between great empires, each of which wants to be sure of the economic assets it thinks it must have. If Americans think of the war in terms of coal, wheat, iron, timber, oil, and feed grains, they will come nearer to understanding it than if they think of it in terms of "dictatorship" and "democracy."

[From Wallace's Farmer of May 20, 1939]

NO PROFIT FOR BOYS WHO GO TO WAR

American businessmen are protesting loudly against the proposal to tax away practically all war profits. The only way to get industry to produce the excessive amount of munitions and other goods needed in war-time is with the bait of large profits, they say.

If war comes, the Government will put your boy on the firing line, and neither he nor you will have anything to say about it. He will not be lured into the Army in the hope of making a profit. He will receive as pay less than he could earn in almost any peacetime job.

You have raised and educated him at considerable expense. Your investment in him is large in terms of cash, larger in terms of hope and affection. You have had visions of him carrying on the work that you have begun, and doing it more effectively.

The boy has a large investment in himself. Out of boyish hopes and dreams and trials and errors he has built a personality that makes the years ahead an exciting adventure. He is in love with life, ambitious to make the most of it. He has no desire to shoot or be shot.

On the cover of this issue is the picture of a Cass County, Iowa, farm boy who was killed in France, March 9, 1918. He had landed in France, December 12, 1917, on his twentieth birthday. Fred Turner served with Company M of the One Hundred and Sixty-eighth Infantry. He was one of the first three members of his company to be killed.

That picture shows the kind of price the Turner family, Cass County, Iowa, and the Nation paid for participation in the World War in 1917. Death was the pay Fred Turner got for his services. War paid his farm neighbors at home a heavy purse full of inflation, mortgages, and foreclosures.

There is no profit in war for the boys who do the fighting, nor for the fathers and mothers of those boys. Why should there be for anyone else? Is industry, doing its part in comparative safety far from the battle lines, so lacking in patriotism that it has to be bribed to do its best?

[From Wallace's Farmer of July 1, 1939]

WHY NOT CLEAR OUT OF CHINA?

There is a war going on in China even though, for some reason, the Government of the United States doesn't admit it. American citizens, American soldiers, and American warships are right smack in the middle of that war zone, in a fine position to be shot up by both sides.

We have urged before, and now urge again, that our troops and warships be taken out of China and that our citizens be warned that they stay there at their own risk. If France were fighting Germany, we wouldn't insist on the right of Americans to camp in between the lines and not be hurt. Yet that is exactly what we're doing in China now.

The Japanese are stirring up a row now by trying to run the British out of Tientsin. But the British and every other group holding special privileges in China will be run out either by the Japanese or by the Chinese before this war is over. Special privilege for foreigners in China is ended.

Americans might as well realize that, withdraw now, and stay out of trouble. Let China and Japan do the fighting. It isn't our war.

[From Wallace's Farmer of July 29, 1939]

WE SAVED THE WORLD ONCE—THAT'S PLENTY!

"Experience is a hard school, but fools will learn in no other," said Poor Richard. He was too optimistic. Fools very often won't learn from experience, and too frequently the burned child goes right back to the fire again.

The United States went through the hard school of experience in 1917 and 1918, but it seems sometimes that precious few of us learned anything from it. At least, those people over 40 ought to remember that we were sucked into the last war because—

1. By selling munitions and other goods abroad we created a war boom that made us willing to lend money to the Allies and finally to help in other ways, to avoid an ending of the war boom and a consequent business crash.

2. By permitting American citizens to travel on ships of warring nations, we authorized their death whenever a ship was sunk. Then we were very indignant at the side that fired the shell or launched the torpedo.

3. By letting American ships try to run blockades with shipments to nations at war we risked capture and sinking of these ships—then we got mad whenever a ship was captured or sunk.

4. By believing propaganda about the need to "make the world safe for democracy" by helping one side in the European fight for power and colonies, we were ready to go to war when other errors of policy produced "causes" for fighting.

After we got into the last war, and after we had helped win it for the Allies, the United States discovered that it had not "made the world safe for democracy" at all. It had merely won colonies for Great Britain and France, and had planted the seeds for another war by a ridiculous and cruel peace treaty.

That new war is getting nearer in Europe now. What is the United States doing to stay out of that war when it comes? Are we going to make the same old mistakes again?

It begins to look that way. The present Neutrality Act, coupled with the Johnson Act, blocks loans to nations at war. It puts an embargo on shipments of arms to warring nations, but it does nothing else.

At the present time, if a war broke out, American citizens could risk their necks and our national safety by traveling in dangerous territory.

At the present time, if a war broke out, American exporters could ship goods to warring nations and run crying to the Navy and the State Department for help if these goods were confiscated.

The unhappy fact is that both sides in the battle over neutrality—the "isolationists," led by Senator JOHNSON of California, and the "internationalists," led by Secretary Hull—agree that a cash-and-carry plan is desirable, that title to exports should be transferred at the water's edge, and that the foreign buyer should take the risks of getting the goods through the blockade. Both sides are also agreed that American citizens should be kept out of dangerous territory.

Yet, because of a fight over repealing the arms embargo, these necessary and generally approved steps may not be taken. We hope that both the administration and the opposition will cool off, postpone the arms-embargo fight, and put through promptly the cash-and-carry and combat-zone provisions which both sides want, and which the Nation must have, if we are to stay out of trouble.

[From Wallace's Farmer of September 23, 1939]

LET YOUR BOY STAY ALIVE

Don't say: "I suppose we'll get pulled into the World War ourselves pretty soon."

Don't say it unless you are also willing to say: "Jack and Jim have gone out to cut each other's throats. I suppose I'll have to cut my throat, too, pretty soon."

One statement is just as sensible as the other.

The United States will not get into this war unless somebody talks us into it or unless we talk ourselves into it.

Our national safety is not immediately affected, no matter who wins. If the British and French Navies were sunk tomorrow, if the German, Italian, and Japanese Navies were untouched, and if by some further miracle, the combined navies of these three powers were to attack the United States, our fleet and air forces could meet the invaders off either coast and defeat them.

Europe is going through its perennial struggle to see who is top dog. How many farmers want to see their boys killed to help decide who is to rule Britain's India, or France's Morocco, or Germany's lost colonies?

It will take money to avoid war booms and to pay the expenses of neutrality, but neutrality costs a lot less than war, and it doesn't kill a single man.

TIME TO KEEP OUR SHIRTS ON

If Americans want to stay neutral, the first step is to avoid getting too enthusiastic over one side or the other. Once we begin

feeling as partisans, we will be looking for excuses to take sides in earnest.

Here is some very good advice on the subject:

"A passionate attachment of one nation for another produces a variety of evils.

"Europe has a set of primary interests which to us have none or a very remote relation. Hence, she must be engaged in frequent controversies, the cause of which are essentially foreign to our concern. Why, by interweaving our destiny with that of any part of Europe, entangle our peace and prosperity in the toils of European ambition, rivalship, interest, humor, or caprice?"

That was George Washington speaking. And he was talking about an earlier European struggle in which Great Britain and her allies were fighting the greatest land power in Europe, which at that time happened to be France.

Another comment, of more recent date, is by Ernest Lindley, in his syndicated column in the Des Moines Register and other papers. Lindley says:

"Twenty-two years ago we saved Great Britain and France at tremendous cost to ourselves. Now they are in trouble again.

"If we are going to assume the heavy costs of rescuing the British Empire every time it gets into serious difficulties we ought to take over the job of running the Empire.

"Taxation without representation was a minor complaint beside that of fighting without control over the policies which lead to war."

The 1914–18 World War was a good war to stay out of. This is an even better one to avoid. As in 1914, Europe is fighting over land and power. Great Britain and France are fighting to maintain their colonies and the system of alliances that upholds them. Germany is fighting to gain control over all eastern Europe.

With these ambitions Americans can have little concern, no matter how much we may sympathize with the millions of innocent victims of the old game of European power politics.

The Hatch Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 23 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

LETTER FROM HENRY P. FLETCHER

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I asked Hon. Henry P. Fletcher, general counsel of the Republican National Committee, for a letter outlining precisely what he and the committee propose to do in conformity with the so-called Hatch Act. I agree to the importance of living strictly within the spirit as well as the letter of the law. Knowing Mr. Fletcher's distinguished record not only as a lawyer but also as a public servant, and having the highest personal regard for his integrity and his patriotic public spirit, I have felt that he shares these attitudes.

Mr. Fletcher has replied to me. I think his answer is significant and stimulating and wholly and scrupulously satisfactory. I ask that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPUBLICAN NATIONAL COMMITTEE,
Washington, D. C., August 21, 1940.

Hon. ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: The general impression seems to be that the Hatch Act of July 19, 1940, allows the Republican National Committee to spend $3,000,000 in this campaign. This is not the case. The act says (sec. 21): "No political committee shall receive contributions aggregating more than $3,000,000 or make expenditures aggregating more than $3,000,000 during any calendar year."

I have held that in strict compliance with this section, the national committee must deduct from its allowable $3,000,000 all expenditures made in this calendar year of 1940, even those made before the act was passed. We shall thus have about a million and a half for our expenditures in this campaign and in the balance of this year.

Heretofore our general plan of political financing was to have one solicitation for funds and the proceeds were divided between the State and national committees on an agreed basis and the national committee financed the Republican senatorial and congressional committees. Obviously this plan had to be abandoned and the fund raising and spending decentralized. Each committee—senatorial, congressional, and the various State committees, and the independent political committees—will be obliged to look after themselves independently of the Republican National Committee.

When one remembers that the Democratic and Republican National Committees each spent well over $6,000,000 in the 1936 campaign it is clear that the Republican National Committee cannot carry all the expenditures of this campaign on its outside figure of a million and a half dollars, nor do I think the act so intended.

I may be wrong in holding that the act allows any national committee (whether it be senatorial, congressional, Willkie clubs or other committee) to collect and expend $3,000,000, but as a practical matter, whether this be so or not, Mr. Willkie has definitely stated that the aggregate expenses of all committees working for his election will be held well under the $3,000,000 limit.

An interpretation of the act is part of my duty as general counsel. There was no question of evasion. I myself made my opinion public and did so before the campaign was actually under way and while the Congress is in session so that if my interpretation of the act is erroneous, it may be corrected by amendment and contributors and the committees working in this campaign might know definitely what Congress intended they could and could not legally do.

Sincerely yours,

HENRY P. FLETCHER.

Ambassador Bullitt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENNETT CHAMP CLARK

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 23 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

EDITORIAL FROM ST. LOUIS POST-DISPATCH

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial appearing in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of Tuesday, August 20, having to do with the activities of Mr. William C. Bullitt, entitled "1940's Walter Hines Page."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of August 20, 1940]

WALTER HINES PAGE OF 1940

One of the curdling memories of the last war and the events that preceded our participation in it, was the attitude of Walter Hines Page, then Ambassador to Great Britain. Page was more English than American. Instead of representing this country's interests in the British capital, he represented Britain's interests to a scandalous degree. It was necessary for President Wilson to reprimand him for his unceasing efforts at undermining American neutrality at a time when the President himself was doing his best to preserve that policy.

William C. Bullitt is the Walter Hines Page of 1940. The full story of his meddling in affairs which are no concern of an American representative, has yet to be told. We have all read, however, his incendiary and completely unneutral statements made in Europe; we have heard him described as an unofficial member of the French Cabinet; we heard his radio speech of last Sunday urging the United States to commit an act of war by sending destroyers to Britain, and now comes another sidelight on his activities.

It is told by Joseph Alsop and Robert Kintner, who have a pipe line into the White House and who have devoted their syndicated column for a long time to the interventionist point of view. In fact, these two men have found fault with the President from time to time because he has not gone as far in his meddling with Europe as they would like to see him go.

Messrs. Alsop and Kintner now reveal that the reason Mr. Bullitt stayed in Paris after the French Government fled was "to serve as unofficial Governor of the French capital until the German occupation took place." As unofficial Governor, he was in charge of the Paris police and firemen, who were instructed to stay in Paris at his urging, and it was in his assumed power to give them orders as to how to receive the Germans.

Was there no member of the French Government who could perform this function for his own country? By what tradition of our Diplomatic Corps was Mr. Bullitt justified in representing, not his own Government but the government of a country to which he was accredited? Taken alone, this action of our Ambassador might be explained and defended by the tragic conditions surrounding the impending fall of France. Taken in the context of his definite unneutrality, Ambassador Bullitt's behavior seems to us eminently improper, mischievously dangerous.

Peacetime Military Conscription

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURTON K. WHEELER

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 23 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

BRIEF SUBMITTED BY THE LAWYERS' COMMITTEE TO KEEP THE UNITED STATES OUT OF WAR

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a brief on peacetime military conscription, submitted by the Lawyers' Committee to Keep the United States Out of War. I will say that I have carefully examined it, and other lawyers have examined it, and I feel that it is a real contribution on the subject of the constitutionality of the bill under consideration.

There being no objection, the brief was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BRIEF ON PEACETIME MILITARY CONSCRIPTION (BURKE-WADSWORTH BILL (S. 4164) AND THE MALONEY AMENDMENT)

FOREWORD

The Burke-Wadsworth bill (S. 4164), introduced in the Senate June 20, 1940, now being debated in Congress, confronts the American people for the first time in their history with the immediate prospect of wholesale military conscription of the Nation's manpower in peacetime.

The vigor of the pending debate, the mounting tide of protest to Congress, the conceded closeness of congressional alignment regardless of party—all attest the fast developing popular awareness of what this measure really holds in store for the standards, the ideals, the daily routines which, in turn, constitute our American way of life.

The bill, in its present form, would register for induction into military service for at least 1 year the entire male population, between 21 and 31 years of age, numbering 12,000,000. Deferment of service, whether for dependents, character of employment, or physical reasons, is left entirely to a vast rule-making power conferred upon the War Department, subject only to the direction of the President. This unconditional power in the military to grant, withhold or cancel deferment of service involves the authority to allocate men to particular industries, regardless of their will, and then, to condition their deferment upon such mode of behavior as the War Department may see fit to prescribe.

We address ourselves primarily to the Congressmen of both Houses, whose grave responsibility it becomes to decide whether this proposed invasion upon our civilian life in peacetime is sanctioned by the principles of our Constitution, and is in harmony with the basic philosophy of the American form of government.

SCOPE AND PURPOSE OF THIS BRIEF

In this brief we shall establish that military conscription in peacetime is unconstitutional. In ordaining the Constitution the people vested no such power in the Federal Government. Neither expressly, impliedly, nor inherently can the Congress be said to possess any such power under the Constitution.

The Constitution was itself enacted to destroy for all times the very system and conception of government which this bill would now resurrect. The vehement opposition to such a power in government, we shall show, stems from the struggle of the English people against their own despots, and is expressed in the deep and unmistakable conviction running through the debates and utterances of our own founding fathers during the adoption and ratification of our Constitution.

Moreover, our argument transcends the purely legalistic analysis of the constitutional issues posed by the bill. For we shall show that this proposal is utterly incompatible with the fundamental principles of our American form of government. Thus, in the profoundest sense of the term, the bill is unconstitutional.

Finally we shall show that apart from the manifest unconstitutionality of the bill its enactment will militarize and regiment our Nation, suppress civil liberties, dislocate industry and agriculture and destroy that free government which our Constitution was ordained and established to secure for all time.

PEACETIME CONSCRIPTION IS UNCONSTITUTIONAL

With respect to the power of the Federal Government to compel military service in peacetime, we will show that it possesses—

A. No inherent power.

B. No express power.

C. No implied power.

D. That such power is incompatible with the general nature and object of the Constitution.

A. There is no inherent power

The Constitution and the Bill of Rights were established by the people, and it is the Constitution which furnishes the final rule of decision and action for all departments of the Government—the legislative, the executive, and the judicial. It is the Constitution which must control until it shall be changed by the people who established it. Acts which are passed in opposition to the fundamental law are void. The Senators and Representatives are bound under article VI by oath or affirmation to support the Constitution. The Constitution is the supreme law of the land.

The Constitution itself so provides. Under the tenth amendment all powers not delegated to the United States are expressly reserved to the people of all the States. And this amendment, the Supreme Court has held, must be liberally construed to effectuate its intent and purpose (*Kansas* v. *Colorado*, 206 U. S. 46 (1907)). "* * * no power, therefore, not enumerated could be inferred from the general nature of government," said one of the founders of the Constitution, James Madison (Annals of Cong., 1st Cong., vol. 2 (1789–91), p. 1950).

Thus, there is no inherent power in the Federal Government to pass laws upon the plea that good, perchance, may follow (*Jones* v. *Sec. & Ex. Comm.*, 298 U. S. 1, 27 (1936)). Even the treaty-making power, that foremost of sovereign powers, Madison tells us, is conferred by the Constitution and by it alone: "Had the power of making treaties, for example, been omitted, however necessary it might have been, the defect could only have been lamented, or supplied by an amendment of the Constitution" (Annals of Cong., 1st Cong (supra), p. 1950).

Congress may not exceed its constitutional power by enacting this bill on the plea of inherent sovereign power to serve the national welfare.

The Supreme Court of the United States has decisively rejected the theory of "inherent powers" and condemned the unlawful assumption of arbitrary power rendered possible thereby:

"The proposition, often advanced and as often discredited, that the power of the Federal Government inherently extends to purposes affecting the Nation as a whole with which the States severally cannot deal or cannot adequately deal, and the related notion that Congress, entirely apart from those powers delegated by the Constitution, may enact laws to promote the general welfare, have never been accepted but always definitely rejected by this Court. Mr. Justice Story, as early as 1816, laid down the cardinal rule, which has ever since been followed—that the general government 'can claim no powers which are not granted to it by the Constitution, and the powers actually granted, must be such as are expressly given, or given by necessary implication.'" (*Carter* v. *Carter Coal Co.*, 298 U. S. 238, 291 (1936).)

The Supreme Court has stated with respect to constitutional grants of power: "Those who act under these grants are not at liberty to transcend the imposed limits because they believe that more or different power is necessary." Hughes, C. J., in *Schechter Poultry Corporation* v. *United States* (295 U. S. 495, 528 (1934)).

Clearly there is no inherent power in the Federal Government to enact the Burke-Wadsworth military conscription bill.

B. No express power to enact peacetime conscription

There is no express provision in the Constitution concerning compulsory military service. There is, in fact, not a single word in the Constitution which grants to Congress power to enact peacetime conscription.

C. No implied power to enact peacetime conscription

The only references in the Constitution to the military powers of the Federal Government are to be found in article I, section 8. There, the Federal Government is empowered to "provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States;" "to declare war * * *," "to raise and support armies, * * *;" "to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces;" "to provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining the militia * * *."

Is the power to compel peacetime military service to be implied from any of these?

We shall show that—

(1) The founding fathers never intended to grant Congress the power to raise armies by conscription in peacetime, the free government they founded being indeed the culmination of an historic struggle against standing armies and forced military service.

(2) The courts, in all the 164 years of our national life, have never implied any such power from the Constitution, and such expressions as were occasioned on the subject have been unmistakably against implying it.

(I) Historic background of the rejection of peacetime conscription by the framers of the Constitution.

The authors of the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution rejected military conscription in peacetime as abhorrent to the free government they founded. In so doing they carried forward a tradition firmly established by the English people in their struggle against their own military despots. Without an understanding of this English struggle, it is impossible to realize how profound was the hostility of the founders of the American Government to standing armies and forced military service.

The English Background

In England, where military conscription was attempted from time to time in different forms, the long and successful struggle against it firmly established voluntary enlistment as the only principle consonant with the dignity of a free people.

Voluntary enlistment existed in England in early times and its origin is closely linked to her constitutional history. (May, Constitutional History of England (Holland ed., 1912), vol. 3, p. 281.) The right to maintain a standing army under martial law, claimed

by the Stuart Kings, was first denied by Parliament and then condemned as illegal by the Bill of Rights itself. (May, ibid., p. 282.) The petition of right to Charles I in 1628 expresses the popular opposition to maintenance of a conscript army in peacetime:

"VII. And whereas * * * it is declared and enacted; that no man shall be forejudged for life or limb against the form of the great charter, and the law of the land; * * * nevertheless * * * certain persons have been assigned and appointed * * * according to the justice of martial law * * * and by such summary course and order as is agreeable to martial law, and as is used in armies in time of war * * * cause to be executed and put to death. * * *

"X. They do therefore humbly pray * * * that none be called to make answer or * * * in any such manner * * * be imprisoned or detained; and that Your Majesty would be pleased to remove the said soldiers and mariners, and that your people may not be so burdened in time to come * * *."

By 1689, the Mutiny Act declaring standing armies and courts martial unknown to the law of England, authorized them for the current year and on a regular yearly footing thereafter under the sanction of Parliament. But the historian says:

"To have proceeded further and to have decreed that every Englishman must serve in that Army would have seemed to our ancestors a surrender of their liberties" (May, ibid., p. 282).

Blackstone's famous Commentaries on the Laws of England, familiar to the framers of our Constitution, likewise inveighed against the practice of raising armies in peacetime:

"In a land of liberty it is extremely dangerous to make a distinct order of the profession of arms * * *" (Blackstone, Commentaries (Ed. 15, 1809), vol. 1, p. 408).

He prescribes "enlistment" as the only alternative in a free government (Blackstone, ibid., p. 413).

"* * * it (the Army) ought only to be enlisted for a short and limited time * * * no separate camp, no barracks, no inland fortresses should be allowed * * *" (Blackstone, ibid., pp. 406, 413).

Space forbids a detailed treatment of this historic struggle, but careful study will show that the military despotism of Cromwell left an idelible impression on the English people; that the maintenance of a standing army of 30,000 by King James, without consent of Parliament, was a major cause of his unpopularity; that while the Stuart Kings sought to maintain, in peacetime, a considerable military force altogether subject to their control, the Parliament, on the other hand, developed a militia which they believed could never become inimical to the principles of free England, and insisted upon disbanding in time of peace, the whole army of the king, except perhaps a bodyguard and garrisons for the forts. See Lecky, History of England in the Eighteenth Century (London, 5th ed., 1891), volume 1, page 508.

Throughout the Eighteenth Century, this struggle against a standing army in peacetime continued unabated. Most significant it is too, that never, during this entire period, was it contended by King, Parliament, or people, that Englishmen could be forced into the army against their will. Even in time of war, when press-gangs drafted suspected criminals or notorious characters for army service, the Act of Anne expressly restricted the practice only to such able-bodied men as had no lawful calling or employment or visible means for their maintenance or livelihood. Lecky, ibid, page 510.

Thus, the draft, even when invoked in wartime, was a mark of disgrace upon the man conscripted—a method applied only against those who had no lawful or respected place in the society of their day. This, then, is the background of the English struggle, in the light of which the American struggle must be understood.

The American Background

Our own Declaration of Independence categorically declared the causes which impelled the Colonies to separate from England. The signers of that memorable document were addressing themselves to all mankind. They were not dwelling upon trivialities when, in submitting their grievances "to a candid world," they said of their royal oppressor:

"He has kept among us, in times of peace, standing armies without the consent of our legislature.

"He has affected to render the military independent of and superior to the civil power."

And in the turbulent period of the Revolutionary War itself, with the life of the new country at stake, Thomas Jefferson, himself a signer of the Declaration, wrote John Adams on May 16, 1777:

"* * * Our battalions for the continental service were sometime ago so far filled as rendered the recommendation of a draft from the militia hardly requisite, and the more so as in this country it ever was the most unpopular and impracticable thing that could be attempted. Our people, even under the monarchial government, had learnt to consider it as the last of all oppressions." * * * Adams, C. F., The Life and Works of John Adams (Boston, 1854), volume IX, page 465.

Jefferson's opposition was typical of the prevalent sentiment among the young Nation's leadership. They recognized, though not without misgiving, the conceivable necessity of a standing army even in peacetime, but the record shows that in the spirit of the Declaration they were adamant in their opposition to raising it by conscription.

Thus in 1775 the Continental Congress had resolved "to raise several companies of riflemen by enlistment for 1 year, to serve in the American Continental Army" (Elliot's Debates (Ed. 2, 1854), vol. 1, p. 47), and the commission to George Washington, as Commander in Chief of the American Army subscribed by the President of the Congress on the 19th day of June 1775, declared:

"We, reposing especial trust and confidence in your patriotism, conduct, and fidelity, do, by these presents, constitute and appoint you to be General and Commander in Chief of the Army of the United Colonies, and of all the forces raised or to be raised by them, and of all others who shall voluntarily offer their service, and join the said Army for the defense of the American liberty, and for repelling every hostile invasion thereof * * *" (Elliot, supra, p. 47).

Throughout the conflict which followed the practice of using only enlisted men in the Army never varied. The States, too, in filling their quotas fixed by the Congress, resorted to the method of volunteer service only. True, it was assumed that all able-bodied men were available for war service, but this was deemed a privilege of Americans, not a duty exacted by law (Brandeis, J., in *Gilbert* v. *Minnesota*, 254 U. S. 325, 339 (1920)).

The Constitution

After victory and achievement of independence, the unabated aversion to any Federal peacetime army, disclosed in every recorded reference to the subject, implies a clear intent against peacetime conscription.

On August 6, 1787, a committee of five delivered the draft of a constitution to the Constitutional Convention, whose proceedings had been referred to them for that purpose. Article VII, section 1, provided that the Legislature of the United States be empowered "to raise armies" (Elliot, ibid., vol. 1, p. 226); it was later moved and seconded to insert "and support" between "raise" and "armies" (Elliot, ibid., p. 248); but, a further amendment adopted by the Convention added the words "but no appropriation for money for that use shall be for a longer term than 2 years" (Elliot, ibid., p. 285). Such was the final version which was plainly quite different from the one originally submitted.

Yet, even this final version was under constant attack throughout the proceedings of the Convention and every possible effort was made to limit its effect. Farrand, Records of the Federal Convention of 1787 ((1911), vol. 2, pp. 505, 509). Indeed, even as the Convention moved toward final adoption, voices were still heard in protest, and in protest—be it noted—against the maintenance of any standing army at all in peacetime. And, as a study of its proceedings will show, no delegate at that Convention, engaging in the acrimonious debate on this question of any standing army in peacetime, ever conceived, much less asserted, that along with this limited power the far more drastic power of peacetime conscription was to be conferred on the Congress.

But the Constitution had not yet been adopted. The States had still to ratify it. There, too, the popular aversion to standing armies manifested itself. In Massachusetts, General Thompson, at the State Ratifying Convention, declared:

"We are now fixing a national consolidation. This section, I look upon it, is big with mischiefs. Congress will have power to keep standing armies. The great Mr. Pitt says standing armies are dangerous—keep your militia in order—we don't want standing armies." (Elliot, ibid., vol. 2, p. 80.)

And Mr. Nason:

"Suffer me, sir, to say a few words on the fatal effects of standing armies, that bane of republican governments. * * * Britain attempted to enforce her arbitrary measures by a standing army. But, sir, we had patriots then who alarmed us of our dangers; who showed us the serpent, and bade us beware of it. Shall I name them? * * * We had a Hancock, an Adams, and a Warren. Our sister States, too, produced a Randolph, a Washington, a Greene, and a Montgomery who led us in our way * * *." (Elliot, ibid., vol. 2, p. 136.)

In Virginia, Patrick Henry thundered:

"A standing army we shall have, also, to execute the execrable commands of tyranny" (Elliot, ibid., vol. 3, p. 51).

And James Madison replied significantly:

"Let us observe, also, that the powers in the general government are those which will be exercised mostly in time of war * * * (Elliot, ibid., vol. 3, p. 259).

And from George Mason came the prophetic words:

"But when once a standing army is established in any country the people lose their liberty" (Elliot, ibid., vol. 3, p. 380).

And Madison again replied:

"I most cordially agree with the honorable member last up, that a standing army is one of the greatest mischiefs that can possibly happen" (Elliot, ibid., vol. 3, p. 381).

Edmund Randolph, Governor of Virginia, then and there agreed:

"With respect to a standing army, I believe there was not a member in the Federal Convention who did not feel indignation at such an institution" (Elliot, ibid., vol. 3, p. 401).

And Mr. Dawson concluded:

"Governments ought not to depend on an army for their support, but ought to be so formed as to have the confidence, honor, and affection of the citizens" (Elliot, ibid., vol. 3, p. 611).

From such a widespread sentiment came the reservations, provisos, and exceptions that attached to the ratifications of practically all the 13 States filed with the Constitutional Convention. We shall give merely the major ones here. From New Hampshire: "that no standing army shall be kept up in time of peace, unless with the consent of three-fourths of the Members of each branch of Congress; nor shall soldiers in time of peace be quartered upon private houses without the consent of the owners" (Elliot, ibid., vol. 1, p. 326); from New York, the admonition: "that standing armies in time of peace, are dangerous to liberty, and ought not to be kept up, except in cases of necessity; and that at all times

the military should be under strict subordination to the civil power" (Elliot, ibid., vol. 1, p. 328); from North Carolina: "that no standing army or regular troops shall be raised or kept up, in time of peace, without the consent of two-thirds of the Senators and Representatives present in each House" (Elliot, ibid., vol. 1, p. 330); and Rhode Island counseled: "that standing armies, in time of peace, are dangerous to liberty, and ought not to be kept up, except in cases of necessity" (Elliot, ibid., vol. 1, p. 335).

This brief historical survey establishes the temper of the people and their representatives on this basic issue when the Constitution itself was being debated. Clearly, a deep-seated fear and aversion to compulsory service in peacetime were the dominant sentiments at the time. They are expressed in the restrictions and qualifications attached to the power in course of debate, in the pronouncements of important leaders of the day, and in the reservations of the ratifying States.

It is manifest from the foregoing that the framers of the Constitution, the States which ratified it, and the people who ordained and established it never intended to empower the Federal Government to compel military service in peacetime.

(2) Judicial Decisions on Implied Power

There has never been a decision by the United States Supreme Court which has upheld expressly or by implication the power of Congress to enact a peacetime conscription law.

The two leading cases in our law on the constitutionality of conscription are *Kneedler* v. *Lane* (45 Pa. St. 238 (1863)), and the *Selective Draft Law Cases* (245 U. S. 366 (1917)). Both decisions were concerned with wartime conscription and were decided in wartime. The decisions of the courts of our Nation will be searched in vain for a single one, dealing with conscription, which was concerned with the power of Congress to enact peacetime conscription.

The Civil War case, *Kneedler* v. *Lane* (*supra*), is extraordinary in that the first decision in that case held even wartime conscription unconstitutional. On motion for temporary injunction, the Court held the Conscription Act unconstitutional by a 3 to 2 vote.

The Chief Judge, Lowrie, speaking of the power to conscript in general, stated:

"If any such mode had been in the intention of the fathers of the Constitution, they would certainly have subjected it to some rule of equality or proportion. * * * The fathers of the Constitution * * * would have regulated the mode if such a mode had been intended * * * they had no experience of forced levies for the Regular Army * * * and it seems to me they did not intend to grant such a power to the Federal Government" (p. 243).

Woodward, J., added:

"To raise armies—these are large words, what do they mean? There could be no limitation upon the number or the size of the armies to be raised, for all possible contingencies could not be foreseen; but our question has no reference to numbers or size, but to the mode of raising armies. * * * Assuredly the framers of our Constitution did not intend to subject the people of the States to a system of conscription which was applied in the mother country only to paupers and vagabonds. On the contrary, I infer that the power conferred on Congress was the power to raise armies by the ordinary English mode of voluntary enlistments" (p. 254).

Thompson, J., felt that the power to raise armies "was an ordinary power, not superinduced by impending war. * * * We cannot suppose that the moment the country had achieved its liberty, at so much cost of blood and treasure, that such a despotism over the lives and liberties of men would be incorporated into the Constitution as would authorize Congress to fill the armies to be raised, by conscription, as if by the agency of the press-gang" (p. 266).

Between the time of the decision on the temporary injunction and the final hearing, the Court was reconstituted and reversed its former decision, again by a 3 to 2 vote.

In the *Selective Draft Law Cases*, 245 U. S. 366 (1917), the Court was dealing entirely with the war powers of Congress, which we shall presently show are quite different from its peacetime powers. As the Court said:

"The law (the 1917 Conscription Act), as its opening sentence declares, was intended to supply temporarily the increased military force which was required by the existing emergency, the war there and now flagrant" (245 U. S., at p. 375).

And Mr. Justice Cardozo's observation in *Hamilton* v. *Regents* (293 U. S. 245 (1934)), leaves no doubt that the selective-draft cases related in no way to the conscription power of Congress in peacetime:

"There is no occasion at this time to mark the limits of governmental power in the exaction of military service when the Nation is at peace" (p. 265).

Thus we see how careful the Court was to point out that it was dealing with a wartime statute enacted pursuant to the war power of Congress. In so doing, the Court was but emphasizing the basic distinction in character and extent between Congress' power in war and in peace. We now consider the relevance and importance of that distinction.

Certain legal principles run deep in the fiber of our law. Emergency does not create power. Extraordinary conditions do not create or enlarge constitutional power. The Constitution established a National Government with powers deemed to be adequate, as they have proved to be both in war and peace, but these powers of the National Government are limited by the constitutional grants *Schechter Poultry Corporation* v. *United States* (295 U. S. 495, 528 (1935)).

"Emergency does not create power. Emergency does not increase granted power or remove or diminish the restrictions imposed upon power granted or reserved. The Constitution was adopted in a period of grave emergency. Its grants of power to the Federal Government and its limitations of the power of the States were determined in the light of emergency and they are not altered by emergency. What power was thus granted and what limitations were thus imposed are questions which have always been, and always will be, the subject of close examination under our constitutional system" (*Home Bldg. & L. Ass'n* v. *Blaisdell*, 290 U. S. 398, 425 (1934)).

The Laws of War and the Laws of Peace

Any attempt to draw an inference of implied constitutional power to enact conscription in peacetime from decisions upholding such power in wartime overlooks the fundamental distinction between the laws of peace and the laws of war.

The classic case defining the character and extent of that distinction is *Ex parte Milligan* (4 Wallace 2 (1866)). During the Civil War, Lamdin P. Milligan, a northerner with southern principles, acted in such manner as to cause his loyalty to be questioned. He was arrested by the general commanding the military district of Indiana, and in the fall of 1864 he was tried by a military commission upon the following charges: Conspiracy against the United States Government; affording aid and comfort to rebels, including insurrection and disloyal practices and violation of the laws of war.

Milligan was found guilty upon all these charges and was sentenced to be hanged. He then applied to the circuit court for a writ of habeas corpus. He claimed that a military court had no jurisdiction over him for he had never been in the military service of the United States, nor had he been in any of the States that had rebelled, and that he was simply a citizen of Indiana and was entitled to trial in the civil courts which were then in full operation. Since the judges of the circuit court disagreed as to what should be done, a question was certified to the Supreme Court as permitted by the act of Congress, April 29, 1802.

Counsel for the Government argued before the Supreme Court that the military commission had acted properly. The Government conceded that Milligan had been deprived of his liberties under the Bill of Rights but "these, in truth, are all peace provisions of the Constitution, and like all other conventional and legislative laws and enactments, are silent amidst arms, and when the safety of the people becomes the supreme law" (p. 20). Counsel for the petitioner replied: "A violation of law on the pretense of saving such a Government as ours is not self preservation, but suicide"; and the Government answered again: "We agree to that but we assert that, in peace, when there is no commotion, the constitutional provisions should be most rigidly enforced * * *." (p. 104).

The opinion of the Court was delivered by Mr. Justice Davis (p. 120):

"These securities for personal liberty thus embodied, were such as wisdom and experience had demonstrated to be necessary for the protection of those accused of crime. And so strong was the sense of the country of their importance, and so jealous were the people that these rights, highly prized, might be denied them by implication, that when the original Constitution was proposed for adoption it encountered severe opposition; and, but for the belief that it would be so amended as to embrace them, it would never have been ratified.

"Time has proven the discernment of our ancestors; for even these provisions, expressed in such plain English words, that it would seem the ingenuity of man could not evade them, are now, after a lapse of more than 70 years, sought to be avoided. Those great and good men foresaw that troublous times would arise, when rulers and people would become restive under restraint and seek by sharp and decisive measures to accomplish ends deemed just and proper; and that the principles of constitutional liberty would be in peril, unless established by irrepealable law. The history of the world had taught them that what was done in the past might be attempted in the future. The Constitution of the United States is a law for rulers and people, equally in war and in peace, and covers with the shield of its protection all classes of men, at all times, and under all circumstances" (p. 120).

The majority of the Court decided that Milligan had been improperly subjected to court martial, despite the existence of war, because he was a civilian residing in a State in which no military operations were being conducted and that therefore the laws of peace were applicable.

Four members of the Court concurred in the result reached by the majority but advanced different reasons to sustain the decision. They found that a war situation actually had existed in Indiana justifying the use of martial law, but even they recognized the cardinal difference between the laws of peace and the laws of war. They said:

"We by no means assert that Congress can establish and apply the laws of war where no war has been declared or exists.

"Where peace exists the laws of peace must prevail" (p. 140).

Any effort to imply congressional power to enact conscription in peacetime from the constitutional grants of power in war wholly ignores the distinction between the laws of peace and the laws of war. Our highest Court in the Macintosh case held that drastic powers interfering with civil rights might constitutionally be exercised in wartime, but such powers "were wholly inadmissible in time of peace." * * *

"From its very nature, the war power, when necessity calls for its exercise, tolerates no qualifications or limitations, unless found in the Constitution, or in applicable principles of international law. In the words of John Quincy Adams, 'This power is tremendous; it is strictly constitutional; but it breaks down every barrier

so anxiously erected for the protection of liberty, property, and of life.' To the end that war may not result in defeat, freedom of speech may, by Act of Congress, be curtailed or denied * * * and other drastic powers, wholly inadmissible in time of peace, exercised to meet the emergencies of war." *United States* v. *Macintosh*, 283 U. S. 605, 622 (1931).

D. Peacetime conscription is utterly incompatible with the fundamental principles of our American form of government

Our argument transcends a purely legalistic analysis of the constitutional issues posed by the bill. For we shall show that this proposal is utterly incompatible with the fundamental principles of our American form of government. Thus in the profoundest sense of the term, the bill is unconstitutional.

Daniel Webster, perhaps the foremost constitutional authority in our history, on the floor of the House more than 125 years ago expounded these same considerations in a powerful analysis of Congress' power under the Constitution to conscript the Nation's manpower. (This analysis is so penetrating and illuminating that the entire address is set forth in the Appendix.) He said:

"Congress having, by the Constitution, a power to raise armies, the Secretary contends that no restraint is to be imposed on the exercise of this power, except such as is expressly stated in the written letter of the instrument. In other words, that Congress may execute its powers by any means it chooses, unless such means are particularly prohibited. But the general nature and object of the Constitution impose as rigid a restriction on the means of exercising power as could be done by the most explicit injunctions.

"It is the first principle applicable to such a case, that no construction shall be admitted which impairs the general nature and character of the instrument. A free constitution of government is to be construed upon free principles, and every branch of its provisions is to receive such an interpretation as is full of its general spirit. No means are to be taken by implication which would strike us absurdly if expressed.

"And what would have been more absurd than for this Constitution to have said that to secure the great blessings of liberty it gave to government an uncontrolled power of military conscription? Yet such is the absurdity which it is made to exhibit under the commentary of the Secretary of War. * * *

"* * * Sir, I almost disdain to go to quotations and references to prove that such an abominable doctrine has no foundation in the Constitution of the country. It is enough to know that that instrument was intended as the basis of a free government, and that the power contended for is incompatible with any notion of personal liberty. An attempt to maintain this doctrine upon the provisions of the Constitution is an exercise of perverse ingenuity to extract slavery from the substance of a free government." * * * Writings and Speeches of Daniel Webster (National ed., 1903, vol. XIV, pp. 55–69).

Mr. Webster showed that the logic which justified conscription as a constitutional power would lead inevitably to dictatorship, tyranny, and the destruction of our democracy.

"If the Secretary of War has proved the right of Congress to enact a law enforcing a draft of men out of the militia into the Regular Army, he will at any time be able to prove, quite as clearly, that Congress has power to create a dictator. The arguments which have helped him in one case will equally aid him in the other, the same reason of a supposed or possibly State necessity, which is urged now, may be repeated then, with equal pertinency and effect. * * *

"Sir, in granting Congress the power to raise armies, the people have granted all the means which are ordinary and usual, and which are consistent with the liberties and security of the people themselves, and they have granted no others. To talk about the unlimited power of the Government over the means to execute its authority, is to hold a language which is true only in regard to despotism.

"The tyranny of arbitrary government consists as much in its means as in its ends; and it would be a ridiculous and absurd constitution which should be less cautious to guard against abuses in the one case than in the other. All the means and instruments which a free government exercises, as well as the ends and objects which it pursues, are to partake of its own essential character, and to be conformed to its genuine spirit.

"A free government with arbitrary means to administer it is a contradiction; a free government without adequate provision for personal security is an absurdity; a free government with an uncontrolled power of military conscription is a solecism, at once the most ridiculous and abominable that ever entered into the head of man.

"The Government was not constituted for such purposes. Framed in the spirit of liberty, and in the love of peace, it has no powers which render it able to enforce such laws. The attempt, if we rashly make it, will fail; and having already thrown away our peace we may thereby throw away our Government." (Op. cit.)

In essence, what is fundamentally here involved is the political philosophy which underlies the American democratic form of government, particularly as that philosophy is diametrically opposed to the totalitarian form of government. Advocates of peacetime conscription, who point to the exercise of this power by other governments, overlook this basic distinction.

The American conception of the state has always been that it is an agency brought into existence by the people for the promotion of their own welfare as individuals. The state exists for the people, not the people for the state. The state has no interests apart from those of its citizens. The promotion of individual welfare, individual liberty, and individual rights constitute the very foundation and justification for the state. To justify any infringement, its necessity must be clearly and overwhelmingly established.—Willoughby, W. F., The Government of Modern States (New York and London, Revised Ed., 1936), page 22.

The totalitarian conception of the state is the complete antithesis of the one which has just been stated. It is looked upon as an entity having interests, ambitions, and a will of its own quite distinct from those of its citizens collectively considered. These interests are superior to those of its citizens. To this entity the citizens are held to owe implicit obedience and whenever the interests of the state and its citizens come into conflict, those of the latter are to give way. Furthermore, the state is assumed to be justified in the use of its utmost powers to advance its particular interests, no matter how much in so doing the interests of its own citizens, or of other states, may suffer. The totalitarian state knows no law of morality and no restraint but that of expediency (Willoughby, ibid., p. 23).

Thus, it is absurd to compare the exercise of the powers of our Government with those exercised by other countries. No one would seriously contend that in order to struggle against alien philosophies we should adopt those philosophies ourselves.

It is tragic mockery that the proponents of conscription who urge this "most abominable of oppressions" upon us because of the suggested necessity of defending our democracy, forget that conscription destroys the very democracy sought to be preserved and saved.

We, as lawyers, cognizant of our sworn duty to defend the Constitution, have endeavored to establish in this brief, that a peacetime conscription law would be destructive of the American form of Government, for it would be violative of the letter of the Constitution, and abhorrent to its spirit.

THE MALONEY AMENDMENT

Clearly, the objections to the Burke-Wadsworth bill apply with equal force to the Maloney amendment. If in August 1940 conscription is a violation of the American democratic philosophy of government, it will be no less so in January 1941.

If in August 1940 conscription be wholly outside the letter and spirit of the Constitution, it will be no less so in January 1941.

If Congress has neither inherent, expressed, or implied power to conscript in peacetime, a conscription bill will be as unconstitutional and illegal in January 1941 as in August 1940.

Nor does making conscription contingent upon the success or failure of voluntary enlistment alter the issue in the slightest degree. Conscription cannot become constitutional and lawful dependent upon the results of voluntary enlistment. The success or failure of voluntary enlistment does not confer power upon Congress which it does not now have. Its power is fixed and defined for all time by the Constitution except as the people by amendment see fit to grant additional power.

The Maloney amendment simply postpones conscription. It does not forbid it. The basic provisions of the Burke-Wadsworth bill remain. The fundamental evil, peacetime conscription in the United States, is not eliminated.

SOCIAL, ECONOMIC, AND POLITICAL IMPLICATIONS OF THE BILL

We have sought to confine this brief to the issue of constitutionality, of the power of the Federal Government to conscript in peacetime, an issue which the lawyers' committee is peculiarly qualified to consider and pass upon. But we are also keenly aware of the numerous other important objections to the bill in its original form and as amended.

For the first time in the 164 years of our experience as a nation, the United States is face to face with the possibility of becoming, in a period of peace, a militarized country with the Army and military bureaucracy gaining an ascending power over the lives and activities of the civil population.

Conscription in peacetime is an unprecedented, violent, irremediable upheaval of our whole social, political, and economic life, transforming a democratic system of society into a totalitarian system, turning a democratic form of government into a dictatorship.

During the World War, conscription became the weapon for the exercise by the military of literally unlimited power over the entire population, civilian as well as military. Under the oppressive "work or fight" order promulgated under the selective-service regulations during the World War, men whose military service had been deferred could be directed by the military authorities to eschew certain lines of employment if they wanted to avoid cancelation of their deferment and immediate induction into military service.

In 1936 the Senate Munitions Committee said of the work-or-fight principle, which the committee recognized as the necessary concomitant of the draft law contained in an M-Day plan then under consideration:

"They cannot, perhaps, order every individual to work at a particular job picked out for him specifically, but they can order him not to work in certain industries in which available men must be employed if they want to stay out of the Army. * * * The committee believes that if the work-or-fight principle is authorized by law, along with a draft such as the War Department contemplates, then the country will have for all practical purposes a draft of labor" (S. Rept. No. 944, pt. 4, pp. 48–49).

In fact, the chairman of the War Industries Board in the last World War, Bernard M. Baruch, declared that the work-or-fight principle is "far more effective than any chain gang or impressment that could be invented" (ibid., pp. 48–49).

The work-or-fight principle was incorporated in 1918 in the regulations relating to deferments from military service on the basis of employment in essential industries adopted during the World War

to carry out the terms of the provisions of the Selective Service Act of 1917 (40 Stat. 76, c. 15, sec. 4). The Burke-Wadsworth bill, section 5 (c), contains identical statutory provisions in this respect.

The withdrawal of vast bodies of America's manhood from productive work will necessarily create serious economic dislocations. The conscript will be torn from his job, his home, and his family and the entire social and economic pattern of his life and that of his family jeopardized. Although the bill makes a gesture in the direction of protecting a conscript's job, the provision, as drafted, affords little protection, since employers are relieved of obligations in the event of "changed circumstances" (sec. 8).

The consequences of registration affecting millions of citizens are vast. The raids, detentions, and mass arrests by police and Federal agents during the World War on the street, in theaters, restaurants, and railway stations evidence the dangers of abuse inherent in the enforcement of registration.

So far as the millions who are conscripted are concerned, they cease to be free Americans, subject to civil process in civil courts. Immediately upon conscription, they become subject to the summary procedure of court martial. What freedom of expression is possessed by a conscript? What remains of the Bill of Rights when the military authorities acquire jurisdiction of the conscripted?

Conscription in peacetime is an end to the Bill of Rights; free speech, press, and assembly become forbidden acts; no longer will free citizens be able to disagree with executive and military edicts, to assemble and discuss their grievances, to publish their protests and demands. Such liberties cannot flourish where military law prevails.

Conscription has throughout American history been regarded as the "most abominable of all oppressions." It is a ghastly tragedy that, in this hour, America should be faced with the threat of losing its liberty in the guise of defending it.

CONCLUSION

The Burke-Wadsworth bill and the Maloney amendment should be defeated because they are unconstitutional and repugnant to the fundamental character of our American form of government.

Dated, August 20, 1940.

Respectfully submitted.

LAWYERS COMMITTEE TO KEEP THE UNITED STATES OUT OF WAR,
20 Vesey Street, New York City.
LOUIS F. MCCABE, *National Chairman.*

APPENDIX

SPEECH ON THE CONSCRIPTION BILL BY DANIEL WEBSTER, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, DECEMBER 9, 1814 [1]

Mr. Chairman, after the best reflection which I have been able to bestow on the subject of the bill before you, I am of opinion that its principles are not warranted by any provision of the Constitution. It appears to me to partake of the nature of those other propositions for military measures which this session, so fertile in inventions, has produced. It is of the same class with the plan of the Secretary of War, with the bill reported to this House by its own committee for filling the ranks of the Regular Army by classifying the free male population of the United States; and with the resolution recently introduced by an honorable gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Ingersoll], and which now lies on your table, carrying the principle of compulsory service in the Regular Army to its utmost extent.

This bill indeed is less undisguised in its object, and less direct in its means, than some of the measures proposed. It is an attempt to exercise the power of forcing the free men of this country into the ranks of an army, for the general purposes of war, under color of a military service. To this end it commences with a classification which is no way connected with the general organization of the militia, nor, to my apprehension, included within any of the powers which Congress possesses over them. All the authority which this Government has over the militia, until actually called into its service, is to enact laws for their organization and discipline. This power it has exercised. It now possesses the further power of calling into its service any portion of the militia of the States, in the particular exigencies for which the Constitution provides, and of governing them during the continuance of such service. Here its authority ceases. The classification of the whole body of the militia, according to the provisions of this bill, is not a measure which respects either their general organization or their discipline. It is a distinct system, introduced for new purposes, and not connected with any power which the Constitution has conferred on Congress.

But, sir, there is another consideration. The services of the men to be raised under this act are not limited to those cases in which alone this Government is entitled to the aid of the militia of the States. These cases are particularly stated in the Constitution, "to repel invasion, suppress insurrection, or execute the laws." But this bill has no limitation in this respect. The usual mode of legislating on the subject is abandoned. The only section which would have confined the service of the militia, proposed to be raised, within the United States has been stricken out; and if the President should not march them into the Provinces of England at the north, or of Spain at the south, it will not be because he is prohibited by any provision in this act.

This, sir, is a bill for calling out the militia, not according to its existing organization, but by draft from new-created classes; not merely for the purpose of "repelling invasion, suppressing insurrection, or executing the laws," but for the general objects of war—for defending ourselves, or invading others, as may be thought expedient; not for a sudden emergency, or for a short time, but for long stated periods; for 2 years, if the proposition of the Senate should finally prevail; for 1 year, if the amendment of the House should be adopted. What is this, sir, but raising a standing army out of the militia by draft, and to be recruited by draft, in like manner, as often as occasion may require?

This bill, then, is not different in principle from the other bills, plans, and resolutions which I have mentioned. The present discussion is properly and necessarily common to them all. It is a discussion, sir, of the last importance. That measures of this nature should be debated at all, in the councils of a free government, is cause of dismay. The question is nothing less than whether the most essential rights of personal liberty shall be surrendered, and despotism embraced in its worst form.

I have risen, on this occasion, with anxious and painful emotions, to add my admonition to what has been said by others. Admonition and remonstrance, I am aware, are not acceptable strains. They are duties of unpleasant performance. But they are, in my judgment, the duties which the condition of a falling state imposes. They are duties which sink deep in his conscience, who believes it probable that they may be the last services which he may be able to render to the Government of his country. On the issue of this discussion, I believe the fate of this Goverment may rest. Its duration is incompatible, in my opinion, with the existence of the measures in contemplation. A crisis has at last arrived, to which the course of things has long tended, and which may be decisive upon the happiness of present and of future generations. If there be anything important in the concerns of men, the considerations which fill the present hour are important. I am anxious, above all things, to stand acquitted before God and my own conscience, and in the public judgment, of all participations in the counsels which have brought us to our present condition and which now threatens the dissolution of the Government. When the present generation of men shall be swept away, and that this Government ever existed shall be matter of history only, I desire that it may be known that you have not proceeded in your course unadmonished and unforewarned. Let it then be known that there were those who would have stopped you, in the career of your measures, and held you back, as by the skirts of your garments, from the precipice over which you are plunging and drawing after you the Goverment of your country.

I had hoped, sir, at an early period of the session, to find gentlemen in another temper. I trusted that the existing state of things would have impressed on the minds of those who decide national measures the necessity of some reform in the administration of affairs. If it was not to have been expected that gentlemen would be convinced by argument, it was still not unreasonable to hope that they would listen to the solemn preaching of events. If no previous reasoning could satisfy them, that the favorite plans of Government would fail, they might yet be expected to regard the fact, when it happened, and to yield to the lesson which it taught. Although they had, last year, given no credit to those who predicted the failure of the campaign against Canada, yet they had seen that failure. Although they then treated as idle all doubts of the success of the loan, they had seen the failure of that loan. Although they then held in derision all fears for the public credit, and the national faith, they had yet seen the public credit destroyed, and the national faith violated and disgraced. They had seen much more than was predicted; for no man had foretold that our means of defense would be so far exhausted in foreign invasion, as to leave the place of our own deliberations insecure, and that we should this day be legislating in view of the crumbling monuments of our national disgrace. No one had anticipated that this city would have fallen before a handful of troops, and that British generals and British admirals would have taken their airings along Pennsylvania Avenue while the Government was in full flight, just awaked perhaps from one of its profound meditations on the plan of a conscription for the conquest of Canada. These events, sir, with the present state of things, and the threatening aspect of what is future, should have brought us to a pause. They might have reasonably been expected to induce Congress to review its own measures, and to exercise its great duty of inquiry relative to the conduct of others. If this was too high a pitch of virtue for the multitude of party men, it was at least to have been expected from gentlemen of influence and character, who ought to be supposed to value something higher than mere party attachment, and to act from motives somewhat nobler than a mere regard to party consistency. All that we have yet suffered will be found light and trifling in comparison with what is before us, if the Government shall learn nothing from experience but to despise it, and shall

[1] A bill for a classification of the militia, and for drafting individuals, including minors, had passed the Senate. It was a modification of a measure proposed by Mr. Monroe, for a compulsory draft of the free male population between the ages of 18 and 45. Mr. Webster's speech was on a motion to indefinitely postpone the bill. Public sentiment was opposed to the measure, and it failed. Referring to it in 1831, Mr. Webster said: "I had a hand, with Mr. Eppes and others, in overthrowing Mr. Monroe's conscription in 1814." Mr. George Ticknor Curtis, in the Life of Daniel Webster, said the speech was written out by Mr. Webster afterward but never published and that the manuscript was not to be found. It was, however, preserved, is now in the New Hampshire Historical Society, and is here printed from the manuscript in Mr. Webster's handwriting.

grow more and more desperate in its measures, as it grows more and more desperate in its affairs.

It is time for Congress to examine and decide for itself. It has taken things on trust long enough. It has followed Executive recommendation, till there remains no hope of finding safety in that path. What is there, sir, that makes it the duty of this people now to grant new confidence to the administration, and to surrender their most important rights to its discretion? On what merits its own does it rest this extraordinary claim? When it calls thus loudly for the treasure and the lives of the people, what pledge does it offer that it will not waste all in the same preposterous pursuits which have hitherto engaged it? In the failure of all past promises, do we see any assurance of future performance? Are we to measure out our confidence in proportion to our disgrace and now at last to grant away everything, because all that we have heretofore granted has been wasted or misapplied? What is there in our condition that bespeaks a wise or an able government? What is the evidence that the protection of the country is the object principally regarded? In every quarter that protection has been more or less abandoned to the States. That every town on the coast is not now in possession of the enemy, or in ashes, is owing to the vigilance and exertions of the States themselves, and to no protection granted to them by those on whom the whole duty of their protection rested.

Or shall we look to the acquisition of the professed objects of the war, and there find grounds for approbation and confidence? The professed objects of the war are abandoned in all due form. The contest for sailors' rights is turned into a negotiation about boundaries and military roads, and the highest hope entertained by any man of the issue is that we may be able to get out of the war without a cession of territory.

Look, sir, to the finances of the country. What a picture do they exhibit of the wisdom and prudence and foresight of government. "The revenue of a state," says a profound writer, "is the state." If we are to judge of the condition of the country by the condition of its revenues, what is the result? A wise government sinks deep the fountain of its revenues—not only till it can touch the first springs, and slake the present thirst of the Treasury, but till lasting sources are opened, too abundant to be exhausted by demand, too deep to be affected by heats and droughts. What, sir, is our present supply, and what our provision for the future resource? I forbear to speak of the present condition of the Treasury; and as to public credit, the last reliance of government, I use the language of government itself only, when I say it does not exist. This is a state of things calling for the soberest counsels, and yet it seems to meet only the wildest speculations. Nothing is talked of but banks, and a circulating paper medium, and exchequer notes, and the thousand other contrivances which ingenuity, vexed and goaded by the direst necessity, can devise, with the vain hope of giving value to mere paper. All these things are not revenue, nor do they produce it. They are the effect of a productive commerce, and a well-ordered system of finance, and in their operation may be favorable to both, but are not the cause of either. In other times these facilities existed. Bank paper and Government paper circulated because both rested on substantial capital or solid credit. Without these they will not circulate, nor is there a device more shallow or more mischievous, than to pour forth new floods of paper without credit as a remedy for the evils which paper without credit has already created. As was intimated the other day by my honorable friend from North Carolina, Mr. Gaston, this is an attempt to act over again the farce of the assignats of France. Indeed, sir, our politicians appear to have but one school. They learn everything of modern France; with this variety only, that for examples of revenue they go to the revolution, when her revenue was in the worst state possible, while their model for military force is sought after in her imperial era, when her military was organized on principles the most arbitrary and abominable.

Let us examine the nature and extent of the power which is assumed by the various military measures before us. In the present want of men and money, the Secretary of War has proposed to Congress a military conscription. For the conquest of Canada, the people will not enlist; and if they would, the Treasury is exhausted, and they could not be paid. Conscription is chosen as the most promising instrument, both of overcoming reluctance to the service, and of subduing the difficulties which arise from the deficiencies of the exchequer. The administration asserts the right to fill the ranks of the Regular Army by compulsion. It contends that it may now take one out of every 25 men, and any part, or the whole of the rest, whenever its occasions require. Persons thus taken by force, and put into an army, may be compelled to serve there during the war, or for life. They may be put on any service, at home or abroad, for defence or for invasion, according to the will and pleasure of the Government. This power does not grow out of any invasion of the country, or even out of a state of war. It belongs to Government at all times, in peace as well as in war, and it is to be exercised under all circumstances, according to its mere discretion. This, sir, is the amount of the principle contended for by the Secretary of War.

Is this, sir, consistent with the character of a free government? Is this civil liberty? Is this the real character of our Constitution? No, sir; indeed it is not. The Constitution is libeled, foully libeled. The people of this country have not established for themselves such a fabric of despotism. They have not purchased at a vast expense of their own treasure and their own blood a Magna Charta to be slaves. Where is it written in the Constitution, in what article or section is it contained, that you may take children from their parents, and parents from their children, and compel them to fight the battles of any war in which the folly or the wickedness of government may engage it? Under what concealment has this power lain hidden which now for the first time comes forth, with a tremendous and baleful aspect, to trample down and destroy the dearest rights of personal liberty? Who will show me any constitutional injunction which makes it the duty of the American people to surrender everything valuable in life, and even life itself, not when the safety of their country and its liberties may demand the sacrifice, but whenever the purposes of an ambitious and mischievous government may require it? Sir, I almost disdain to go to quotations and references to prove that such an abominable doctrine has no foundation in the Constitution of the country. It is enough to know that that instrument was intended as the basis of a free government, and that the power contended for is incompatible with any notion of personal liberty. An attempt to maintain this doctrine upon the provisions of the Constitution is an exercise of perverse ingenuity to extract slavery from the substance of a free government. It is an attempt to show, by proof and argument, that we ourselves are subjects of despotism, and that we have a right to chains and bondage, firmly secured to us and our children by the provisions of our Government. It has been the labor of other men, at other times, to mitigate and reform the powers of government by construction; to support the rights of personal security by every species of favorable and benign interpretation, and thus to infuse a free spirit into governments not friendly in their general structure and formation to public liberty.

The supporters of the measures before us act on the opposite principle. It is their task to raise arbitrary powers, by construction, out of a plain written charter of national liberty. It is their pleasing duty to free us of the delusion which we have fondly cherished, that we are the subjects of a mild, free, and limited Government, and to demonstrate, and to demonstrate by a regular chain of premises and conclusions, that government possesses over us a power more tyrannical, more arbitrary, more dangerous, more allied to blood and murder, more full of every form of mischief, more productive of every sort and degree of misery than has been exercised by any civilized government, with a single exception, in modern times.

The Secretary of War has favored us with an argument on the constitutionality of this power. Those who lament that such doctrines should be supported by the opinion of a high officer of Government may a little abate their regret, when they remember that the same officer, in his last letter of instructions to our ministers abroad, maintained the contrary. In that letter he declares that even the impressment of seamen, for which many more plausible reasons may be given than for the impressment of soldiers, is repugnant to our Constitution. It might therefore be a sufficient answer to his argument, in the present case, to quote against it the sentiments of its own author, and to place the two opinions before the House, in a state of irreconcilable conflict. Further comment on either might then be properly forborne, until he should be pleased to inform us which he retracted, and to which he adhered. But the importance of the subject may justify a further consideration of the arguments.

Congress having, by the Constitution, a power to raise armies, the Secretary contends that no restraint is to be imposed on the exercise of this power, except such as is expressly stated in the written letter of the instrument. In other words, that Congress may execute its powers, by any means it chooses, unless such means are particularly prohibited. But the general nature and object of the Constitution impose as rigid a restriction on the means of exercising power as could be done by the most explicit injunctions. It is the first principle applicable to such a case, that no construction shall be admitted which impairs the general nature and character of the instrument. A free constitution of government is to be construed upon free principles, and every branch of its provisions is to receive such an interpretation as is full of its general spirit. No means are to be taken by implication which would strike us absurdly if expressed. And what would have been more absurd than for this Constitution to have said that to secure the great blessings of liberty it gave to government an uncontrolled power of military conscription? Yet such is the absurdity which it is made to exhibit, under the commentary of the Secretary of War.

But it is said that it might happen that an army could not be raised by voluntary enlistment, in which case the power to raise armies would be granted in vain, unless they might be raised by compulsion. If this reasoning could prove anything, it would equally show, that whenever the legitimate power of the Constitution should be so badly administered as to cease to answer the great ends intended by them, such new powers may be assumed or usurped, as any existing administration may deem expedient. This is the result of his own reasoning, to which the Secretary does not profess to go. But it is a true result. For if it is to be assumed that all powers were granted which might by possibility become necessary, and that government itself is the judge of this possible necessity, then the powers of government are precisely what it chooses they should be. Apply the same reasoning to any other power granted to Congress, and test its accuracy by the result. Congress has power to borrow money. How is it to exercise this power? Is it confined to voluntary loans? There is no express limitation to that effect, and, in the language of the Secretary, it might happen, indeed it has happened, that persons could not be found willing to lend. Money might be borrowed then in any other mode. In other words, Congress might resort to a forced loan. It might take the money of any man by force, and give him in exchange exchequer notes or certificates of stock. Would this be quite constitutional, sir? It is entirely within the reasoning of the Secretary, and it is a

result of his argument, outraging the rights of individuals in a far less degree than the practical consequences which he himself draws from it. A compulsory loan is not to be compared, in point of enormity, with a compulsory military service.

If the Secretary of War has proved the right of Congress to enact a law enforcing a draft of men out of the militia into the Regular Army, he will at any time be able to prove, quite as clearly, that Congress has power to create a dictator. The arguments which have helped him in one case, will equally aid him in the other, the same reason of a supposed or possible state necessity, which is urged now, may be repeated then, with equal pertinency and effect.

Sir, in granting Congress the power to raise armies, the people have granted all the means which are ordinary and usual, and which are consistent with the liberties and security of the people themselves, and they have granted no others. To talk about the unlimited power of the Government over the means to execute its authority, is to hold a language which is true only in regard to despotism. The tyranny of arbitrary governments consists as much in its means as in its ends; and it would be a ridiculous and absurd constitution which should be less cautious to guard against abuses in the one case than in the other. All the means and instruments which a free government exercises, as well as the ends and objects which it pursues, are to partake of its own essential character, and to be conformed to its genuine spirit. A free government with arbitrary means to administer it is a contradiction; a free government without adequate provision for personal security is an absurdity; a free government, with an uncontrolled power of military conscription, is a solecism, at once the most ridiculous and abominable that ever entered into the head of man.

Sir, I invite the supporters of the measures before you to look to their actual operation. Let the men who have so often pledged their own fortunes and their own lives to the support of this war, look to the wanton sacrifice which they are about to make of their lives and fortunes. They may talk as they will about substitutes, and compensations, and exemptions. It must come to the draft at last. If the Government cannot hire men voluntarily to fight its battles, neither can individuals. If the war should continue, there will be no escape, and every man's fate and every man's life will come to depend on the issue of the military draft. Who shall describe to you the horror which your orders of conscription shall create in the once happy villages of this country? Who shall describe the distress and anguish which they will spread over those hills and valleys, where men have heretofore been accustomed to labor, and to rest in security and happiness? Anticipate the scene, sir, when the class shall assemble to stand its draft, and to throw the dice for blood. What a group of wives and mothers and sisters, of helpless age and helpless infancy, shall gather round the theater of this horrible lottery, as if the stroke of death were to fall from heaven before their eyes on a father, a brother, a son, or a husband. And in a majority of cases, sir, it will be the stroke of death. Under present prospects of the continuance of the war, not one-half of them on whom your conscription shall fall will ever return to tell the tale of their sufferings. They will perish of disease and pestilence, or they will leave their bones to whiten in fields beyond the frontier. Does the lot fall on the father of a family? His children, already orphans, shall see his face no more. When they behold him for the last time, they shall see him lashed and fettered, and dragged away from his own threshold, like a felon and an outlaw. Does it fall on a son, the hope and the staff of aged parents? That hope shall fail them. On that staff they shall lean no longer. They shall not enjoy the happiness of dying before their children. They shall totter to their grave, bereft of their offspring and unwept by any who inherit their blood. Does it fall on a husband? The eyes which watch his parting steps may swim in tears forever. She is a wife no longer. There is no relation so tender or so sacred that by these accursed measures you do not propose to violate it. There is no happiness so perfect that you do not propose to destroy it. Into the paradise of domestic life you enter, not indeed by temptations and sorceries, but by open force and violence.

But this father, or this son, or this husband goes to the camp. With whom do you associate him? With those only who are sober and virtuous and respectable like himself? No, sir. But you propose to find him companions in the worst men of the worst sort. Another bill lies on your table offering a bounty to deserters from your enemy. Whatever is most infamous in his ranks you propose to make your own. You address yourselves to those who will hear you advise them to perjury and treason. All who are ready to set heaven and earth at defiance at the same time, to violate their oaths and run the hazard of capital punishment, and none others, will yield to your solicitations. And these are they whom you are allowing to join your ranks, by holding out to them inducements and bounties with one hand while with the other you are driving thither the honest and worthy members of your own community, under the lash and scourge of conscription. In the line of your army, with the true leveling of despotism, you propose a promiscuous mixture of the worthy and the worthless, the virtuous and the profligate; the husbandman, the merchant, the mechanic of your own country, with the beings whom war selects from the excess of European population, who possess neither interest, feeling, nor character in common with your own people, and who have no other recommendation to your notice than their propensity to crimes.

Nor is it, sir, for the defense of his own house and home that he who is the subject of military draft is to perform the task allotted to him. You will put him upon a service equally foreign to his interests and abhorrent to his feelings. With his aid you are to push your purposes of conquest. The battles which he is to fight are the battles of invasion—battles which he detests, perhaps, and abhors, less from the danger and the death that gather over them, and the blood with which they drench the plain, than from the principles in which they have their origin. Fresh from the peaceful pursuits of life, and yet a soldier but in name, he is to be opposed to veteran troops, hardened under every scene, inured to every privation, and disciplined in every service. If, sir, in this strife he fall—if, while ready to obey every rightful command of government, he is forced from his home against right, not to contend for the defense of his country but to prosecute a miserable and detestable project of invasion, and in that strife he fall, 'tis murder. It may stalk above the cognizance of human law, but in the sight of Heaven it is murder; and though millions of years may roll away, while his ashes and yours lie mingled together in the earth, the day will yet come when his spirit and the spirits of his children must be met at the bar of omnipotent justice. May God, in His compassion, shield me from any participation in the enormity of this guilt.

I would ask, sir, whether the supporters of these measures have well weighed the difficulties of their undertaking. Have they considered whether it will be found easy to execute laws which bear such marks of despotism on their front, and which will be so productive of every sort and degree of misery in their execution? For one, sir, I hesitate not to say that they cannot be executed. No law professedly passed for the purpose of compelling a service in the Regular Army, nor any law which, under color of military draft, shall compel men to serve in the Army, not for the emergencies mentioned in the Constitution, but for long periods, and for the general objects of war, can be carried into effect. In my opinion it ought not to be carried into effect. The operation of measures thus unconstitutional and illegal ought to be prevented by a resort to other measures which are both constitutional and legal. It will be the solemn duty of the State governments to protect their own authority over their own militia, and to interpose between their citizens and arbitrary power. These are among the objects for which the State governments exist; and their highest obligations bind them to the preservation of their own rights and the liberties of their people. I express these sentiments here, sir, because I shall express them to my constituents. Both they and myself live under a Constitution which teaches us that "the doctrine of non-resistance against arbitrary power and oppression is absurd, slavish, and destructive of the good and happiness of mankind" (New Hampshire bill of rights). With the same earnestness with which I now exhort you to forbear from these measures, I shall exhort them to exercise their unquestionable right of providing for the security of their own liberties.

In my opinion, sir, the sentiments of the free population of this country are greatly mistaken here. The Nation is not yet in a temper to submit to conscription. The people have too fresh and strong a feeling of the blessings of civil liberty to be willing thus to surrender it. You may talk to them as much as you please, of the victory and glory to be obtained in the enemy's provinces; they will hold those objects in light estimation if the means be a forced military service. You may sing to them the song of Canada Conquest in all its variety, but they will not be charmed out of the remembrance of their substantial interests and true happiness. Similar pretenses, they know, are the grave in which the liberties of other nations have been buried, and they will take warning.

Laws, sir, of this nature can create nothing but opposition. If you scatter them abroad, like the fabled dragon's teeth, they will spring up into armed men. A military force cannot be raised in this manner, but by the means of a military force. If administration has found that it cannot form an Army without conscription, it will find, if it venture on these experiments, that it cannot enforce conscription without an Army. The Government was not constituted for such purposes. Framed in the spirit of liberty, and in the love of peace, it has no powers which render it able to enforce such laws. The attempt, if we rashly make it, will fail; and having already thrown away our peace, we may thereby throw away our Government.

Allusions have been made, sir, to the state of things in New England, and, as usual, she has been charged with an intention to dissolve the Union. The charge is unfounded. She is much too wise to entertain such purposes. She has had too much experience and has too strong a recollection of the blessings which the Union is capable of producing under a just administration of government. It is her greatest fear that the course at present pursued will destroy it, by destroying every principle, every interest, every sentiment, and every feeling which have hitherto contributed to uphold it. Those who cry out that the Union is in danger are themselves the authors of that danger. They put its existence to hazard by measures of violence, which it is not capable of enduring. They talk of dangerous designs against Government when they are overthrowing the fabric from its foundations. They alone, sir, are friends to the Union of the States who endeavor to maintain the principles of civil liberty in the country and to preserve the spirit in which the Union was framed.

Highways Serve Defense and Peacetime Needs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 29, 1940

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, defense preparations should bear the closest possible analogy to peacetime benefits, and defense construction projects should be geared to a program that will provide improvements of necessity in defense and of enduring convenience to the commercial life of our Nation. Improved highways are a crying need for the mobility of a mechanized army and for an expanded transportation system that will accommodate the ever-increasing auto traffic. Huge sums are to be spent for airport bases, for naval construction, for production of the machines of war, but little is heard about the inadequacy of the highway system or the necessity for the improvement thereof.

If we are to learn any lesson from the war plans that were conceived and executed on the European Continent, we should take cognizance of the fact that Germany's first move toward a military program was an enormous superhighway construction program that criss-crossed the nation with roads to provide speedy movement of the mechanized units which were later established.

In our present situation there should be a comprehensive program for construction of highways. Established routes should be brought to a greater degree of adequacy through widening, elimination of sharp curves, grade crossings, and other hazards; dirt roads, of which, unfortunately, such long mileage exists, should be improved, and the bottle necks where no highways at all exist should be relieved.

Since my home State of Idaho furnishes an example of a State that has been handicapped in completing its highway system because so much of its area is owned by the Federal Government, as is the case with many Western States, I beg your indulgence to discuss the problem and to suggest a solution.

There are no east-and-west highways or railroads through Idaho for a distance of 450 miles north and south. Three routes through the State have been designated by the War Department as "military" or "strategic"; that is, of primary importance in a defense plan in the Pacific Northwest. Two of these highways are built and in use but greatly in need of improvement and the third has a distance of 52 miles through the national forest that is not even a passable trail. These roads have long been advocated as of great importance to the expansion of the Northwest. The War Department's recommendation for construction of military routes is made in conjunction with the importance of the route as a commercial highway.

Appropriations by the Congress for the construction of highways through the national forest has been insufficient to permit completion of designated routes. Idaho received approximately $900,000 from the 1941 allocation of forest-highway funds. Two-thirds of the area of the State lies in the forest reserve. The highway mileage through the forest reserve is 1,078, of which 331.17 miles remains to be constructed and much that is constructed is in need of improvement. The estimate of the Public Roads Administration for completing one of the military routes through Idaho, which I have mentioned, exceeds $3,000,000.

NORTH PACIFIC HIGHWAY NO. 10

From Missoula, Mont., where a unit of the Fourth Infantry is stationed, to Spokane, Wash., where another unit of the same outfit is located, there extends through the Fourth of July Canyon in Idaho what is known as North Pacific Highway No. 10, designated on the War Department special map, issued September 15, 1939, as of "first priority." On July 31, 1940, Thomas MacDonald, Commissioner of the Public Roads Administration, reports on the condition of this highway as follows:

> The section of the North Pacific Highway from Bennett Bay to Wolf Lodge Bay, on the north side of Coeur d'Alene Lake (in Idaho), was constructed in 1920. It is narrow and crooked and since the remainder of the route from Coeur d'Alene to the Montana line (through Idaho) has been rebuilt to a much higher standard, it is entirely inadequate to serve the heavy traffic which the route now carries.

Commissioner MacDonald was speaking in peacetime terms about a road that fails to serve the present traffic and which would be a sorry spectacle when jammed with troops and their equipment.

The highway in question extends through the famous Coeur d'Alene mining district that has such heavy production of silver, lead, and zinc. It is a forest highway—that is, it lies within the area owned by the Federal Government, is recognized by a defense branch of the Government as important in the military program, and yet it is impossible to secure funds for its reconstruction or improvement.

LEWIS AND CLARK HIGHWAY

A complete bottle neck exists at Lewiston, in central Idaho, where all highways connecting with Pacific coasts points dead end insofar as traffic to the east is concerned. In February of this year the War Department designated the Lewis and Clark Highway, extending through the national-forest reserve from Lewiston, Idaho, to Missoula, Mont., as a "first priority" military route. There are 52 miles of this route where no construction has been undertaken at all and no appropriation has been made to cover it.

Secretary of War Stimson wrote to me under date of July 23, 1940, as follows:

> Receipt is acknowledged of your letter of June 24, 1940, in which you recommend completion of the Lewis and Clark Highway between Lewiston, Idaho, and Missoula, Mont.
>
> War Department recommendations, based upon military needs, are of an advisory nature to the Public Roads Administration, which agency is charged, under the Federal Highway Act, with the allotment of Federal-aid funds, to be matched by State funds for specific highway projects. The Department's recommendations are submitted for consideration in conjunction with commercial and other needs as determined by the Public Roads Administration and the State highway departments. As you know, the War Department has designated a route following the general course of the Lewis and Clark Highway as a first-priority route, and has advised the Public Roads Administration accordingly.
>
> The War Department has no funds for road construction other than on military reservations, and consequently cannot enter further into the matter.

Now, I call your attention to the fact that the War Department is only an advisory body in such an important matter of defense as the construction of highways. I remind you, too, that the appropriations to implement the Public Roads Administration program are inadequate, however much this agency might be influenced by the advisory comment of the War Department.

FOURFOLD PURPOSE

The construction of the highways through Idaho in the national forest would serve a fourfold purpose—add to the protection of the timber belonging to the Federal Government by making quick arrival of men and supplies at fires possible, provide for the development of the natural resources, especially mining, serve the commercial needs for better transportation facilities, and significantly important at this time, provide mobility for troops.

BUILD HIGHWAYS WITH DEFENSE MONEY

Defense appropriations should be released to road-building agencies of the Government and a comprehensive program undertaken to build the projects that have been designated as of military importance as well as of commercial benefit.

Highways, especially through the national forest, are badly needed for peacetime purposes at the present time, and in case of an invasion they would be a necessity.

There is another angle of the situation so far as the Pacific Northwest is concerned, especially the inland States of that area; no defense works of importance are contemplated

for construction in this section, so I am told; there is an unemployment problem which would be solved by the construction of the needed highways; it is equitable to spread the defense funds to provide benefits to as many parts of the country as possible and relieve the economic conditions.

Mr. Speaker, I propose enabling legislation for the purpose of constructing highways with defense appropriations.

Cullman (Ala.) National Farm Loan Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. BANKHEAD, 2D

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, August 24 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. A. G. BLACK

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, on the 13th day of August last, Hon. A. G. Black, Governor of the Farm Credit Administration, addressed a very large number of members of national farm-loan associations at Cullman, Ala. In view of the importance of the subject of rural credits and of the administrative activities of the Farm Credit Administration, I ask unanimous consent to have Governor Black's able and informative address printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It was with a great deal of pleasure that I accepted your invitation to come to Cullman County and to join our distinguished Senator BANKHEAD in addressing this splendid meeting of your group of national farm loan associations. We in Farm Credit are all very proud of the record of the Trade, Cullman, Falkville, and Hulaco associations and of the splendid work that is being done for this group by its secretary-treasurer, Mr. Jack Moyers. Servicing as it does a total of almost 2,300 units this set-up is the largest in the entire Farm Credit System. It is not the size, however, but the outstanding performance and the energetic cooperation shown by the farmers of Cullman and Morgan Counties of which we are particularly proud.

I do not need to tell you who have made such splendid progress with a group association what the advantages of this set-up are and what it can mean to the membership. You already know that from experience. But I am sure that you would be interested to know that the operations of the associations in the New Orleans district under the grouping system and the allowance plan have been most gratifying to us in Farm Credit. Association members throughout the country generally are finding a full-time office located right in their own community means more efficient and economical operations. The full services of the Farm Credit Administration are being brought to the farmyard and are being administered by your neighbors under this system.

Through your 4 associations there have been granted over 1,700 loans to cooperating farmer members for a total of almost $2,000,000 in mortgages on farms in this area. While this sum is but a small fraction of the hundreds of millions which have been loaned on farm mortgages the country over by the Federal land banks of the Nation, it is on the solid foundation of such a membership as yours that the structure of your Farm Credit System is soundly built. It is quite clear to us in Washington that much of the success of this system depends in a large measure on the prosperity of every one of you as farmers and on the work that you do as members of your associations. In a credit system such as this, the spirit which must animate it is one that looks to the welfare of its members. While the primary function of farm-loan associations and the Farm Credit Administration is that of making mortgage credit available to farmers, their interest and their responsibility to the borrower cannot end there. In fact, the basic law upon which the Federal land banks and the national farm loan associations were founded places upon them the duty to spread information regarding methods and principles of cooperative credit and organization among farmers and the people of the United States in general.

In this system, of which all of us are a part, the relationship is not simply that of a lender who has money he is willing to let you have at a price and of borrower who "hires" it and pays the price. In a system such as this we have all joined together mutually to further the best interests of agriculture and the farmers of the Nation as a whole, and in this instance the agriculture of Cullman and Morgan Counties in particular. Taken from that viewpoint, our program of farm credit takes on a much broader aspect than can be written into the legal jargon of a mortgage contract. What we are seeking to do together is to make the farm mortgage an instrument for building farm homes and prosperous farmers, and not an instrument for mining the soil, as has too often been the case in the past.

In the last few years we feel that we have been making progress in the realization of that aim. Today over 40 percent of the total farm-mortgage debt of the country is financed through the Farm Credit Administration. This means that nearly half of the farm debt is now financed through long-term contracts, with principal payments amortized over a long period of years. Everyone who has borrowed money under the old system where the contract had to be renewed every few years and who is now making use of the long-term farm credit system can readily appreciate the vast difference between these two methods and what the change has meant to him.

But letting a farmer have a little money for a long time is not going to help much if it takes most of the money he makes each year to pay the interest charges on his mortgage. With mortgages, like a lot of other things in this life, it is not the original cost but the upkeep that gets you down. I do not have to remind you that reducing the cost of borrowing money by lowering the interest rate at which you borrow means a saving of vast and permanent importance to you. You who are borrowers know a good deal about that from bitter experience.

Since 1933 we have moved forward more rapidly than ever before in the direction of a lower farm-mortgage interest rate. Prior to that year farmers in many sections of the United States were paying an exorbitant price for the money they borrowed and most farmers were paying more than they could afford from their small incomes to keep up the interest payments on their mortgages. Interest charges of 6, 7, and 8 percent on farm mortgages were common prior to 1933. These debts in thousands of instances have been refinanced through the Federal land banks and the land bank commissioner since 1933 at contract rates of 4 and 5 percent. These rates have been further reduced for a limited period by special act of Congress to 3½ percent, where they are today. But in order to make this reduction Congress appropriated the difference between the contract rate and the lower rate out of Treasury funds.

In the case of Alabama the average interest rate on farm mortgages privately financed prior to 1933 was about 7½ percent. Today you and the members of other associations like yours are able to borrow money at 4 percent less than that. Reduced to dollars and cents, the picture in Alabama looks something like this: If you, as a farmer in Cullman County, had borrowed $1,000 in, let us say, 1931 from a private lender, your annual interest bill would have been $75. Today, through your local loan association and the Farm Credit Administration you can borrow the same amount of money at an annual cost of $35, or a reduction in year-to-year "upkeep" of $40.

As far as it goes, this represents progress toward the goal we are striving to attain. I have always favored a policy of lower interest rates on farm mortgages, but I want to see such a rate permanently insured to farmers through a truly cooperative system of farm credit. I feel sure that you agree with me in this aim. How we can best realize that aim is a subject I would like to discuss with you for a moment. The problems confronting American agriculture and its farm-credit program at the present time raise some questions with regard to those aims which we must all consider carefully.

The first of these questions is, What is the best way for the Farm Credit System to get the money to loan to farmers at the lowest rates economically possible? As I have already pointed out, the Government in the past has taken a hand in helping us to realize this objective. It has done so in several ways. In the first instance it purchased stock in the original Federal land-bank set-up, it granted tax exemption to the banks' bonds, and it authorized the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation to purchase them. It has provided $189,000,000 to the surplus of the banks and another $125,000,000 in stock purchases. By special act of Congress the interest rate on loans from the Federal land banks and the Commissioner has been reduced by appropriating from the Treasury the difference between the contract rate and the temporary legislated rate. This appropriation, in order to make the present lower interest rate possible, has amounted to $165,000,000. This represents a total contribution to the system so far of about $500,000,000.

Obviously this is an expensive means for getting a lower interest rate for the borrower and there is question how long the Congress will keep on voting it. With the expenditures of Government going up and with the need for diverting large amounts to the purposes of national defense for some time to come, we must give thought to the possibility that Congress may not forever continue to appropriate money in order that this lower interest rate on farm mortgages may be maintained.

The question naturally arises, Is there not some other means by which a low interest rate can be maintained and that on a permanent basis? There are at least three ways in which your Farm Credit System can get funds in order to loan you money, and each of them would involve a different interest rate for you. You are all familiar with the old system in which the bonds of the Federal land banks carried nothing but the moral guaranty of the Government. Under this system interest rates were usually about 5 percent. You are also undoubtedly somewhat familiar with the present system under which the interest rate has been reduced to 3½ percent

through an annual appropriation from the Federal Treasury, amounting to $28,000,000. At the present time the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation, which has a ready market for its Government guaranteed bonds, has bought the bonds of the land banks whenever market conditions were not satisfactory. Today it holds $761,000,000 land-bank bonds. What this amounts to is an indirect guaranty of the land-bank bonds by the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation. This suggests a second method by which the Farm Credit System can obtain money to lend farmers, that is by an indirect guaranty of Federal land-bank bonds through an agency having the ability to sell Government guaranteed bonds. But this method makes the interest rate paid by the banks higher than if their bonds were directly guaranteed and could be sold direct to investors.

There is a third method, one not now available to the Farm Credit System, that is a direct guaranty of Federal land-bank bonds by the Government. Since both the old method of simply a moral guaranty of the land-bank bonds and the procedure of indirectly guaranteeing the bonds of the banks have proved more costly not only to the banks and the borrowers but to the Government as well, it would appear that the lowest rate of interest to borrowers on a permanent basis and with the least cost to the Government could be had through a Government guaranty of the Federal land-bank bonds. Some people object to a direct guaranty on the grounds that this could cause too much Federal control of the land-bank system, even though it would result in the lowest possible interest rate on farm mortgages, without resorting to a direct Federal subsidy. We believe proper safeguards can be provided whereby the low interest rates can be obtained through a Government guaranty and still preserve and strengthen farmer participation in the system.

It has been estimated that if all the bonds of the land banks which are now outstanding were replaced by 1946 with Government-guaranteed bonds bearing 2 percent interest rate, the interest rate charged on all outstanding loans of the land banks could be rewritten at 3½ percent. This would mean a saving to the Government, over the present method of making this interest rate temporarily available to you, of about $28,000,000 each year. Under such a system the banks would have the ability to sell their bonds at any time at the lowest possible interest rate available in the market and pass these benefits on to member-borrowers.

This brings us to the second important problem, that of making the system function more cooperatively than it has in the past. I yield to no one in my support of true, sound cooperation, and I want to see the present farm-credit system made a far more cooperative enterprise than it has ever been. The question for us to determine is what form of cooperative will do the best job in making mortgage credit available to farmer-borrowers on a cooperative basis. There are stock cooperatives and nonstock cooperatives. At the present time we are a stock cooperative and our experience with that has not been too good. Since we began this system about 6,000 national farm-loan associations have been chartered; today only some 3,600 remain in existence. Many of these are little more than skeletons and many others have been consolidated. About 60 percent of the associations are in such financial condition today that they cannot make loans and stockholders in national farm-loan associations in the majority of instances have lost part or all of their investment. By spreading losses on loans on a district-wide basis instead of charging losses to associations the deadening effect of these losses on associations' operations could be avoided. Besides that the capital stock now held by you could be applied on your debt at the par value of the stock.

About 20 percent of the stock in the national farm-loan associations is now held by farmer borrowers and others who are not present patrons of the system, and in some districts as much as 35 percent of the stock has become separated from the loans. This separation of stock from the loans tends to defeat the very purpose of a cooperative system.

In addition to this record the stock feature has made for increased problems not only in administration but for the borrowing members themselves. The failure to pay dividends on stock has undermined confidence of many farmers in the farm-loan system. The stock purchase requirement has made it more difficult for the associations to obtain new business. Ownership of stock has done little or nothing to build an interest on the part of the member borrowers in their associations.

There is an alternative to all this in the form of a nonstock cooperative which could overcome most of these difficulties that we should be considering in light of present conditiens. Membership in such an association would be on a nominal membership fee basis. Under this system the national-loan associations would be paid for the services they perform in terms of the values of those services. Such payments would include an allowance for ordinary services and a premium for superior service when that was rendered. If a local board and secretary-treasurer so operated the association under this system that a balance was available it could be used to pay dividends. Furthermore, members of the association would participate in net profits of the Federal land bank on the patronage basis. Patronage dividends are far more typical of the true cooperative than are dividends on stock. Removal of the stock feature in our Federal land-bank system and the substitution of membership associations would increase member interest, build a true cooperative, lead to more economical operation, and make possible the guaranty of Federal land-bank bonds by the Government.

With this program we would have a farm-credit system which would be more responsive to changing conditions and one that would make for continuous-borrower participation in the management of the system. It would remove the impairment of many local associations and provide a basis for sustained membership interest in the work of the associations and in the future of the banks that has not been possible under the present system. Instead of centralizing control, this program would make for more active and stronger local participation in management and make possible an actual decentralization of authority and responsibility. But perhaps most important of all, it would tend to insure a continuous and permanent supply of mortgage credit to farmers at the lowest rate of interest economically possible. Nothing less than this should be the goal toward which all of us should be working.

Selective Service Right Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES F. BYRNES

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, August 24 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

RADIO ADDRESS BY GEN. HUGH S. JOHNSON

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix a radio address made by Gen. Hugh S. Johnson over the Columbia Broadcasting System August 24, 1940, on the subject Selective Service Right Now.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I want to talk to you about selective service—to raise the hundreds of thousands of men we need to protect our country in this deadly dangerous world. It is being stalled in Congress by small-time politics. Small-time, because both the great leaders, Roosevelt and Willkie, have disdained petty political advantage on national defense. They are for selective service now.

But a few Members of both Houses, overlooking, I think, the sturdy patriotism and common sense of the American people, profess to fear for their own reelections if they vote against what they call the traditional American volunteering and in favor of what they call the dictatorial system of conscription.

These are the issues. I feel competent to discuss them, because under Gen. Enoch H. Crowder I planned the selective-service system of 1917 and was in direct charge of its execution.

The pending Burke-Wadsworth bill should be much improved. But it makes a start. Getting started on defense in this world of swift and deadly surprises is everything. These wasted days may now seem unimportant. They so seemed in early 1917 when, as now, people were bewildered because politicians wrangled. We, in the selective-service system, didn't wait. We set the system up before the law was passed. That saved just 60 days in the process of raising our armies. By revising the system we saved another 60 days in December 1917.

That didn't seem very important in those deliberate days. But in March 1918, when the Germans with a typical Hitleresque blitzkrieg surprise drive broke the Fifth British Army before the Channel ports and smashed through the French toward Paris as far as Chateau-Thierry, the months saved back in drowsy 1917 enabled us to rush a great American Army to France and turn certain defeat to overwhelming Allied victory. No man can foresee the tragic disaster of days lost now as they may appear in 1941—perhaps forever too late.

We will never again be fools enough to send a single American mother's son to double-crossing Europe. It isn't a question of that now. It is a question of double-crossing Europe threatening us. With our strength of men and resources we can take a defensive position which nobody will ever dare threaten—but we can't do that if we delay in utilizing every minute of these precious days of comparative peace and respite. We can't do it, if our experience in the World War and the complete collapse of nation after nation in this war hasn't taught us that, in this terrible new motorized, mechanized, lightning war, time is of the very essence of our safety and that the peoples who sleep on their opportunity are lost.

Even more than in 1917 and 1918, 4 months lost in congressional thumb-twiddling and political jockeying now, or 4 months saved in realistic common-sense American efficiency may be the difference between the safe existence of our Nation and our way of life and its destruction at the hands of the most ruthless conquerors that ever ravaged an innocent and unoffending people.

Just passing an act of Congress will no more get men than it will get tanks and airplanes. While the kind of organization we set

up in 1917 can begin to select men in a few weeks, it can't get into its full scientific and equitable efficiency in less than 4 months—not until registration and classification of millions are complete. Add to those 4 months whatever additional time is taken in congressional wrangling now and you can get a fair measure of the danger of political legislative trifling in the face of a world aflame with the greatest menace this country has ever known. It is a deliberate risking of the only kind of defense that can keep us from being drawn into this inhuman war for the destruction of our democracy—the last best hope of earth.

To keep the "traditional American system of volunteering" is the excuse. That system isn't traditional. From our beginning, we have nearly always had to abandon it because it never has worked in any major war in our history. In our Revolution the Colonies that did their part in full had to reject it and take up outright, brutal conscription—which is far from what is now proposed.

We tried "traditional volunteering" in 1812. Washington was burned and Detroit surrendered. We used fixed-term volunteers in the Mexican War and they left General Scott stranded between Vera Cruz and Mexico City. Both sides tried traditional volunterring in our War between the States—and both had to abandon it to avoid disaster.

We gave volunteering full scope in 1917 until December 1st. The flow of men just petered out. No one can argue that if we had not abandoned it then for full and vigorous selective service, the first World War would have been disastrously lost to the Allies and to us before the summer of 1918.

Up to the World War, conscription was a hateful thing. It was enforced by bureaucrats and political soldiers upon citizens whose names were drawn from jury wheels without regard for their responsibilities to dependents and the economic life of the Nation. It was full of favoritism, graft, purchase of exemptions, bounties, and hiring of substitutes. That was military service enslaved by press gangs. It degraded the conscript, abused and affronted his family, and was a reproach to democracy.

Selective service is not conscription in any such sense. Recent political ballyhoo has been that it is a step toward dictatorship. If it were, I wouldn't be urging it. In 1917 there was no power in Washington or anywhere else in America with authority to take or defer the taking of any man—except the local boards of his neighbors on questions of dependency and the district boards on other questions. It was of the very essence of traditional American democracy in decentralized local self-government. I see no disposition in Congress or the Executive to depart from the proved perfection of the 1917 law.

Our need for men now is relatively so much smaller and the number of available men so much larger that if we register all those between 18 and 60 and then classify them according to their relative obligations to families and employment, our selection now can be made with no harsh invasion whatever of domestic, economic, and educational relations. We can get our men for training in the fairest, gentlest, and most humane and sympathetic system ever known on this earth.

I rub my eyes and look back at 1917 like a Rip Van Winkle waking from a 23 years' sleep. Every single one of these objections and all this political fenagling were tried then. Every hearer who is old enough to remember will bear me out that when this most democratic and scientific system of selecting manpower moved into execution before our people's eyes, that clamor died in a month. Selective service proved our most respected, popular, and successful effort of the World War. So great was the country's satisfaction and acclaim that I never expected to live to see the day again when its principles would even be questioned. It is a system not only for the protection of the country but for the protection of families, farms, homes, and factories from impulsive action by immature boys at the emotional pressure of fifes, drums, and eagle-screaming oratory on the one hand and sneers, innuendos, and the near blackmail of high-pressure recruiting drives on the other.

Another unbelievable outcome is that Congress and the country should demand the spending of unlimited billions for the new and horribly scientific weapons of modern mechanized war and then hesitate to man those weapons with the kind of specialists who can be trained and provided in this way and in no other. If we can't train the expert specialists we might as well save our money for the machines and sit here helpless—as Poland sat, or Belgium, and even France—and let Hitler's mechanical monsters roll and fly over us in the same blood bath of destruction. It is incredible folly.

That training is a protection to our country, but it is as vitally necessary for the protection of our soldiers. Sending untrained boys, with or without modern armored, motorized, and mechanized implements of war, against such specialists as Hitler has in such machines, is just like sending naked Indians in canoes, armed with bows and arrows, out against a first-class battleship—mass murder for them, certain disaster for their country.

We must lose no more time in political "monkey business" and legislative piffling. This is no experiment. We have the complete and successful 1917 and 1918 experience. It is only necessary to take up where we left off there.

As Woodrow Wilson said of that effort:

"It is a new manner of accepting and vitalizing our duty to give ourselves with thoughtful devotion to the common purpose of us all. It is in no sense a conscription of the unwilling; it is, rather, selection from a Nation which has volunteered in mass. It is no more a choosing of those who shall march with the colors than it is a selection of those who shall serve an equally necessary and devoted purpose in the industries that lie behind the battle line."

Let's not encourage Hitler's Nazi philosophy by any further fumbling with the established superior efficiency of America in both war and peace. Let's prove in 1940 against him, as we proved in 1918 against the Kaiser, that our democracy can defend against any form of autocracy on earth. Let's start now.

Senator Kenneth McKellar

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM STEWART

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, August 24 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

ARTICLE FROM THE ATLANTA JOURNAL

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, on August 6, Mr. Ralph Smith, veteran Washington correspondent for the Atlanta Journal, Atlanta, Ga., in his column in that paper, in speaking of my colleague [Mr. McKELLAR], made an interesting statement about length of service in the Senate. I ask unanimous consent to have this statement printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CRACKERLAND IN WASHINGTON—KENNETH M'KELLAR'S APPRECIATION

(By Ralph Smith)

It is less'n a cat hop from Georgia to Tennessee. Fact is, the line of demarcation isn't visible. It is with little difficulty and a great deal of pleasure, then, that this old Cracker invades the Volunteer State today for a few words about Senator KENNETH MCKELLAR'S fifth consecutive nomination. He won hands-down and handsomely last week, you'll recall, and herewith below you'll find his sincere expression of thanks. It is impressive and unusual, you'll agree:

"The action of the Democratic voters of Tennessee in renominating me for a fifth term in the United States Senate fills me with the greatest satisfaction. After serving them in the Senate for 24 years, to be chosen by them for another term is just about the finest thing that ever happened to me. I thank them from the bottom of my heart.

"My feelings are best described by the thoughts contained in the Twenty-third Psalm of David, when he spake of Jehovah. I hope it is not sacrilege to connect my thoughts of Tennessee at this time with David's thoughts of his God, when he said:

" 'The Lord is my Shepherd;
I shall not want.
He maketh me to lie down in green pastures;
He leadeth me beside the still waters.
He restoreth my soul; He leadeth me in the paths of righteousness for His name's sake.
Yea, though I walk through the valley of the shadow of death, I will fear no evil, for Thou art with me; Thy rod and Thy staff they comfort me.
Thou preparest a table before me in the presence of mine enemies; Thou annointest my head with oil; my cup runneth over.
Surely goodness and mercy shall follow me all the days of my life; and I will dwell in the house of the Lord forever.'

"God bless Tennessee and the Democratic Party. I can only hope that my services may remotely equal the confidence they have again placed in me. That will be my goal. To my friends throughout the State I give again my heartfelt thanks."

M'KELLAR'S UNRIVALED RECORD

MCKELLAR—and, by the way, he is a native Alabamian—even before he enters on the fifth term lays claim to a unique distinction never before conferred by Tennessee upon a Senator. Rounding out his twenty-fourth continuous year in the Senate, his service exceeds that of his nearest rival from Tennessee—the famous Isham G. Harris—by nearly 6 full years.

Further, it is pertinent to record when MCKELLAR shall have completed his fifth term he will enter that charmed senatorial circle reserved for only 15 Members of the Senate, and only 1 of them surviving today.

"The charmed circle, in addition to my colleague, Senator SMITH, of South Carolina, included 14 great Senators who have gone to their reward," said MCKELLAR today. "The list includes Francis E. Warren, of Wyoming; Reed Smoot, of Utah; William E. Borah, of Idaho; William B. Allison, of Idaho; John Sherman, of Ohio; Eugene Hale, of Maine; William P. Frye, of Maine; John P. Jones, of

Nevada; Justin S. Morrill, of Vermont; John T. Morgan, of Alabama; Henry Cabot Lodge, of Massachusetts; Francis M. Cockrell, of Missouri; Furnifold M. Simmons, of North Carolina; Shelby M. Cullom, of Illinois.

"Of the 15, it was my honor and my pleasure to serve with 6 of them—Smith, Warren, Smoot, Borah, Lodge, Simmons, and I knew Senators Morgan and Cullom."

Incidentally, your correspondent enjoys the distinction of having personally known all those named above by Senator McKELLAR and three others in addition—Senator Morgan, of Alabama; Senator Allison, of Iowa; and Senators Hale and Frye, of Maine, indicating, you'll infer, that I crashed the Senate press gallery before KENNETH McKELLAR crashed the Senate.

Acquisition of Foreign Island Possessions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ERNEST LUNDEEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, August 24 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

STATEMENT BY HON. ERNEST LUNDEEN, OF MINNESOTA

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD a statement prepared by me concerning foreign-island possessions in the Western Hemisphere.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Recent maneuvers to trade 50 United States destroyers for island bases in the Caribbean has brought the issue of old war-debt payments back to the American people. In the interest of American security, we must keep our Navy at home, in American hands. The question of acquiring the Caribbean islands does not involve giving away our Navy. The debts of the World War still remain unpaid. This Government has waited and negotiated for 22 years seeking a substantial payment from defaulting foreign countries. For 22 years the answer has been continued evasion and repeated attempts at cancelation.

Great Britain borrowed from the United States more than $4,000,000,000. Has Great Britain paid that debt? No. France borrowed $3,404,818,945; Italy borrowed $1,648,034,050. Have they paid? No. And 17 other countries received similar loans.

Giving Britain destroyers and underwriting the security of her empire with our Navy involves the United States in a war with Germany. It is an act of war. The security of America demands that we maintain our fleet at its present strength and render our coasts and the Panama Canal invulnerable to any combination of foreign powers by acquiring and fortifying strategic islands off our coast. Our fleet is now the greatest in all the world, but it must have secure bases in islands which form the outposts of our defense.

Maj. Fielding Eliot, Rear Admiral Yates Stirling, Jr., and many other military and naval authorities maintain that we must have fortified island bases off our coasts to protect the Panama Canal, the American life line.

The smoldering bits of Old World empires have studded the Caribbean. British and French islands extend like a great bowstring over those waters to control the Atlantic entrance to the Panama Canal. America has every right to ask that Britain and France liquidate their old World War debts by turning over these islands to us. They are not essential to British or French security, but they are essential to American security. At this very date these two countries owe the United States more than $10,000,000,000. After cutting the debt in half the United States allowed foreign countries to evade their legally contracted debts for more than 20 years. There is no evasion or cancelation of debt for evicted farmers, home owners, sharecroppers, and American workers.

Andrew Jackson set the course for us when he said in his annual message, 1834: "It is a well-settled principle of the international code that where one nation owes another a liquidated debt which it refuses or neglects to pay, the aggrieved party may seize on the property belonging to the other, its citizens or subjects, sufficient to pay the debt without giving just cause for war."

I am not the first to demand seizure of Bermuda and the West Indies. Andrew Jackson did that more than a century ago. James A. Reed advocated acquisition of these islands on February 20, 1923, when he said on the Senate floor: "These island possessions form a barrier which commands the Gulf of Mexico, the Caribbean Sea, the Panama Canal, and every trade route between North and South America. It is not too much to say that in the hands of a hostile power they could be so employed as to close the Panama Canal, rendering it practically useless, and that the Gulf of Mexico, including the mouth of the Mississippi River, would be placed under terrible menace. * * * These islands are of no substantial value to either France or England save as positions from which America may at some time be attacked."

While we were talking of moratoriums on the war debts in 1932, Representative Louis T. McFadden, Republican, chairman of the important Finance Committee, said that there was no logical reason why Great Britain and France could not turn over the islands to us in payment of the war debts.

And in 1935, Brig. Gen. Charles H. Sherrill, former United States Ambassador to Turkey, urged that the United States negotiate for European possessions in the Western Hemisphere, potential threats to the Panama Canal, these islands to be taken over in part settlement of the war debts.

It appears that I have not been alone in this idea of collecting that war debt through a logical and sensible way which has as its basic purpose the interest and welfare of the American people.

Former Senator William Gibbs McAdoo, who was Secretary of the Treasury during the first World War, wrote the Make Europe Pay War Debts Committee: "I have always favored acquiring the British West Indies and Bermuda in part payment of Great Britain's debt to the United States, and I have advocated it for more than 20 years. The first debt settlement was effected without any considerations of this important question by the United States representatives of the Debt Commission. I am frank to say that I can see no good reason why the British Government should not be willing to transfer these possessions to us in part payment of their debt. The advent of the airplane and its continuing development makes it more than ever important that the islands adjacent to our shores be wholly under American sovereignty."

Year after year, the United States keeps sending perfumed and perfunctory semiannual notices to its favored and kept debtors in Europe. It seems to me that it is high time that we followed a different course—we should make an immediate demand for cession of the British and French West Indies, naming a time limit in which a satisfactory answer must be received, and specifying that military action will be taken if such a response is not forthcoming.

The elimination of foreign control from countries south of us and islands in the Caribbean Sea and vicinity, as well as islands off the coasts of the two continents, will result in a union of the nations of North, Central, and South America in a close bond of friendship. The day will come when there will be no flags in the American skies but American flags, North and South. Every sovereignty will be an American sovereignty from pole to Panama and from pole to pole. It will be not only a Western Hemisphere; it will be the American Hemisphere.

Comment on Senator Pepper's Recent Speech

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, August 24 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

ARTICLE BY RAYMOND CLAPPER

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article by Mr. Raymond Clapper, published in the Washington News of August 23, 1940, under the heading "Abusing free speech." The article pays tribute to the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] for the remarks he made in the Senate in connection with the recent effigy-hanging incident.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Daily News of August 23, 1940]

ABUSING FREE SPEECH

(By Raymond Clapper)

So far as I know there is no handbook of etiquette that suggests appropriate remarks one might make after being hanged in effigy.

That long-felt want has now been admirably met by Senator CLAUDE PEPPER of Florida.

He has been advocating conscription and he was hanged in effigy on Capitol Hill by a crowd of angry mothers opposed to the draft. It was the first symbolic lynching that had occurred under the eaves of our citadel of democracy since the Civil War, so the oldest inhabitants hereabouts tell us.

This symbolic lynching was a symbolic disgrace, but it had a supreme and perhaps a slightly glorious climax when the notification ceremonies were held afterward in Senator PEPPER's office. The effigy, bearing its insulting placard, "Claude Benedict Arnold Pepper," was cut down and delivered to the Senator. If Wendell

Willkie was on a spot with his acceptance speech, it was a spot no hotter than that upon which the audacious young Senator PEPPER found himself on this occasion as he gazed at the noose-draped effigy of himself and bethought himself what he might say in acknowledgment of the unusual tribute.

Senator PEPPER'S speech of acceptance after being hanged in effigy was a brief gem. It breathed so deeply of the spirit of our free democracy that it deserves its place among the classic utterances of our history.

I quote it, and I hope that many others will quote it, too—now and for years to come—to shame those intolerant persons whose first impulse, whenever an issue arises, is to let go of the primary essential of democracy—tolerant respect for the opinions of others.

Senator PEPPER made this comment: "Knowing these women, like all other Americans, are sincere in their patriotism, placing America first and Hitler last, I feel that their hanging me in effigy is a splendid demonstration of what we are all trying to preserve—freedom of speech and freedom of action in the American way of doing things. I only hope that the spectators and those who hear about this business will feel that I also love America and that I am sincere in my daily efforts to defend the United States in liberty, the right of free speech and free action."

Lincoln could not have said it better.

One of the curious inconsistencies of this bitter fight over conscription that has shaken Washington to its roots is that those who oppose conscription as a threat to democratic institutions are themselves using the most intolerant tactics. They make the point that conscription would fasten the ways of dictatorship on us. But in so doing, they frequently desert the level of reason and stoop to the intimidating, smearing tactics of the Nazi Goebbels. They attribute the lowest motives to those advocating conscription and shower them with buckets of mud and threats of reprisal in the true Nazi style. They appear to respect free speech only by themselves.

Ambassador Bullitt, because of his experience in France, surely is entitled to be heard. But when he speaks he is denounced as almost a traitor. Demand is made that he be prosecuted for trying to influence Congress. A columnist who wrote a dispatch approving of Bullitt's position is denounced as an "obsequious lickspittle." A distinguished radio commentator who knows as much about the history of the last 2 years as any Senator is denounced as a propagandist who should be driven off the air.

Adequate defense of the United States and how it should be achieved is a question that rises supreme over all other considerations. The fullest discussion of it is warranted—discussion of the question, not of the personalities.

In 1917 it was not possible for the elder La Follette nor for Senator GEORGE NORRIS to get a hearing. Then the intolerance was on the other side. Opponents of conscription now are having their day in court, a field day, and it is not in the best interest of democratic processes that they should abuse their opportunity. That will only breed the intolerance and tend to incite the repressive tactics that we all are trying to escape this time.

William C. Bullitt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENNETT CHAMP CLARK

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, August 24 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

LETTERS FROM HON. WILLIAM C. BULLITT AND MRS. GENEVIEVE CLARK THOMSON

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, pursuant to the permission granted me, I offer for printing in the RECORD a letter dated August 17, 1940, from William C. Bullitt to myself; a letter dated August 23, 1940, from Mrs. Genevieve Clark Thomson to myself; and a letter dated August 22, 1940, from Mrs. Genevieve Clark Thomson to William C. Bullitt.

The letters are as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, August 17, 1940.

The Honorable BENNETT CHAMP CLARK,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR CLARK: My attention has just been called to page 5000 of the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, where, under the heading "Ambassador Bullitt—Extension of remarks of Hon. Bennett Champ Clark of Missouri in the Senate of the United States, Wednesday, August 14 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940" is an article by Genevieve Clark Thomson, your sister.

This article contains so many serious misstatements that I am sure you will wish to know the facts and will wish to have them published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Among the many misstatements the following are the most important:

1. "The country was startled about that time by the severity of Under Secretary of State Welles' castigation of Russia concerning its acquisition of Latvia, Estonia, and Lithuania. * * * It in no way lessens the consternation of informed people to learn that the broadside delivered by Mr. Welles was in fact drafted at Hyde Park, and that Ambassador Bullitt had a heavy hand in its drafting."

Not only did I not have a heavy hand in the drafting of this document but in point of fact, I had no hand whatsoever. I did not even know that such a document was being prepared. The document in question was prepared in the Department of State.

2. "About 6 weeks ago it was said in the United States that Mr. Bullitt had, in the course of his diplomatic and literary pursuits, written a letter to the then French Premier, Paul Reynaud, assuring him that if France went to war upon the invasion of Poland, she would be followed in a short time by the United States."

Paul Reynaud did not become French Premier until more than 6 months after France had gone to war upon the invasion of Poland. Never at any time, to any French Premier or to anyone else, did I write any letter indicating or intimating that if France went to war she would be followed in a short time by the United States.

3. "Some provincial Americans were rather shocked to learn that on occasion he actually sat in French Cabinet meetings."

This is, of course, fantastic nonsense. It would be as impossible for the American Ambassador in Paris to sit in a French Cabinet meeting as for the French Ambassador in Washington to sit in an American Cabinet meeting. I have never on any occasion sat in any French Cabinet meeting.

4. "When the tragic collapse of France came a few weeks ago Mr. Bullitt, contrary to orders from the State Department, remained in Paris, instead of following the French Government to Bordeaux."

I never received any orders from the State Department to follow the French Government to Bordeaux. It had been understood by the Department of State, the President, and myself that in case the Germans should reach Paris I should remain in the city in accordance with the long tradition which began at the time of the French Revolution, when Gouveneur Morris remained as the only diplomatic representative in the city, and was continued by Elihu Washburne during the seige of Paris and the Commune of 1870, and by Ambassador Myron T. Herrick in 1914.

5. "Without reporting to his supposed chiefs at the State Department, he went straight to the President. It is reported that the State Department is still as much in the dark as the general public regarding the events leading to and surrounding the death of the French Republic."

I reached Washington from Europe on a Sunday. The Secretary of State and the Under Secretary were absent from the city. I reported immediately to the ranking officer of the Department of State who was in the city—an adviser to the Secretary of State. I then reported at the White House, and after returning to Washington from Hyde Park, immediately reported to all the authorities of the Department of State.

6. "He is reported as urging the President to release to the Petain government the $2,500,000,000 deposited here by the French Republic for safekeeping. The Treasury Department had every intention of keeping this money frozen here, since, if it is released to Petain, it will find its way into Herr Hitler's hands. Consequently the Treasury is greatly upset by Mr. Bullitt's crusade for its release."

This statement, like those above, is totally untrue. I have never urged the release of the funds in question.

I am sure, my dear Senator, that your sense of fair play will cause you to have this rectification published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of next Monday.

Very sincerely yours,

WILLIAM C. BULLITT.

THE ITEM-TRIBUNE,
NEW ORLEANS, LA., *August 23, 1940.*

Hon. BENNETT CHAMP CLARK,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR CLARK: Thank you for permitting me to see the charges of misstatements which Ambassador William C. Bullitt lodged with you against me. I am at a loss to know why the Ambassador applied to you for redress when the New Orleans Item-Tribune was the source of the publication, and I was the author.

I am enclosing herewith my reply which I sent direct to Ambassador Bullitt, together with citations of the sources from which material was taken, which I think covers the case.

I greatly regret to have inconvenienced you in the matter, and my delay in replying was due to the fact that I had destroyed the clippings upon which that part of the article to which the Ambassador objected had been based, and it necessitated some searching of the files.

Sincerely yours,

GENEVIEVE CLARK THOMSON.

THE ITEM-TRIBUNE,
New Orleans, La., August 22, 1940.

Hon. WILLIAM C. BULLITT,
American Ambassador to France,
Department of State, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. AMBASSADOR: My brother, Senator CLARK, has at my request forwarded to me your letter of August 17, relative to an article appearing in the New Orleans Item-Tribune of August 11, and written by me.

If, my dear Mr. Ambassador, you have been misrepresented in this instance, I am the culprit, and if I have, to borrow the words of the redoubtable Mae West, "done you wrong," in justice to you and to myself I certainly wish to rectify it. I may say that as an American citizen who has been profoundly disturbed by some of your reported activities, I should be most happy to have you prove that these reports were erroneous.

Let me say also that I have followed your career for years with great interest and, believe it or not, in the friendliest spirit. I first became interested in you through my mother, who was your warm admirer. She had a brilliant mind and was a great liberal who, until her death at the age of 81, maintained a keen interest and a championing sympathy for oppressed peoples everywhere. She had an enormous interest in Russia and in the Russian experiment. And since in her later years she was an invalid, it was my pleasure to read to her for hours every day, whatever she chose to hear. And she chose to hear a great deal about Russia. She greatly admired John Reed, and Louise Bryant Reed, who was later, I think, Mrs. Bullitt. And she also held you in high regard, which I came to share. Because of this I have, as it were, kept a file on you for some years. So much for that.

In the second place let me say that the Sunday page which I edit in the New Orleans Item-Tribune is based on editorial opinion and news matter from other newspapers and periodicals, to which I write a lead. Please don't misunderstand me. I am in no way trying to shift the blame, if blame there be. I simply wish you to understand that I did not throw myself into a trance and produce a vision of you in an unfavorable light in the article under discussion. On the contrary, every observation of mine to which you object was based on published reports in American newspapers, which were never, to my knowledge, denied until I read your letter to Senator CLARK. American newspapers are not, of course, infallible, but in the main they strive, I think, to be both accurate and fair. Certainly that is the goal of the New Orleans Item-Tribune.

I have more sympathy than you might suppose with your irritation at what you consider unfairness on the part of the press. My father was long in public life, and my brother, as you know, is now in the Senate. And I am frank to say that I have at times been greatly irked by published criticism of them which I thought unfair.

As a matter of fact, some of the distinguished gentlemen, whose columns we print, are in my opinion studiedly unfair to my brother. Yet I have never once protested the publication in our columns of one of these criticisms. This is no evidence of nobility on my part. It is the way I think newspapers should be run, and I am in the newspaper business.

On the other hand, my dear Mr. Ambassador, I am sure you will agree that those in the public service must be prepared at all times to have their conduct of their public duties submitted to that "pitiless publicity" so strongly advocated by Woodrow Wilson.

Now, if you have not swooned before this, I will take up your complaints in the order in which you have stated them:

No. 1. Quoting from my page: "The country was startled about that time by the severity of Under Secretary of State Welles' castigation of Russia concerning its acquisition of Latvia, Estonia, and Lithuania. * * * It in no way lessens the consternation of informed people to learn that the broadside delivered by Mr. Welles was in fact drafted at Hyde Park, and that Ambassador Bullitt had a heavy hand in its drafting."

Your reply: "Not only did I not have a heavy hand in the drafting of this document but, in point of fact, I had no hand whatever. I did not even know that such a document was being prepared. The document in question was prepared in the Department of State."

My answer: It is not clear to me whether you question the accuracy of one of these statements or both. Concerning the first, "that the country was startled by Mr. Welles' castigation of Russia," I will say that is a matter of opinion. And without wishing to be presumptuous I think that it is a matter upon which my opinion would be fully as good as yours. If you don't think the country was startled it may possibly be because you don't read as many daily newspapers as I do, as part of my duty.

Regarding the "consternation of informed people" to learn that you had had a hand in drafting the document under discussion, I myself am fairly well informed and I come in contact with a good many very well-informed persons. That was their reaction, as it was, I say quite frankly, my own. This feeling was based on your well-advertised hatred of Russia. Perhaps you have been misrepresented in that. If so, it is an idea which has been allowed to prevail unchallenged for some years.

Now regarding your participation in the drafting of the document, the words are my own, but they were based on statements in the Washington Merry-Go-Round by Drew Pearson and Robert S. Allen, which appeared in the New Orleans States Monday, July 29, 1940, and many other newspapers throughout the United States, and was never denied by you or anyone in the State Department, as far as I know, until I read your letter charging me with inaccuracy. The column is given below:

"(By Drew Pearson and Robert S. Allen)

"WASHINGTON.—Inside fact regarding the scathing State Department blast at Soviet Russia for seizing the Baltic states was that it was drafted largely in Hyde Park, and that Ambassador William Bullitt had a lot to do with the drafting. Undersecretary of State Welles merely acted as the mouthpiece.

"The State Department had written a statement criticizing Russia's seizure of Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia, and sent it to Hyde Park for approval. Here Bill Bullitt, ex-ambassador to Russia who now hates everything about it, completely rewrote the statement, putting in some of its most pungent phrases.

"The incident is significant, for two reasons: First, it illustrates how the President and his favorite ambassador act as a super state department; and second, it indicates that despite the increasing belligerency of Japan, the Roosevelt administration is loath to warm up to its most logical ally in the Pacific, Soviet Russia.

"The closeness of the Bullitt-Roosevelt tie-up has become rather embarrassing to the rest of the State Department. For instance, following Bullitt's return from Europe last week he did not even visit the State Department. He went straight to the White House; and after a week end there, accompanied the President to Hyde Park.

"As a result, the State Department had no idea what Bullitt's views were on the Petain government. In fact, while he was issuing public statements approving the Petain regime, his alleged colleagues in the State Department were of the very positive opinion that the Petain government was a mere puppet for Germany, and that it would be replaced sooner or later by another puppet government under the ex-Communist, now Nazi, Jacques Doriot.

"Bullitt's last days in Paris and Vichy comprise one of the most important chapters in recent world history. But the State Department knows no more about it than the interviews which its ambassador gives to the press.

"JAPAN'S RAMPAGE

"United States intelligence reports from the Far East state that Japan will join the axis officially and actively just as soon as Hitler launches his big "blitzkrieg" on Britain.

"Meanwhile, the Japanese military have adopted the policy of causing as many incidents as possible to annoy the United States and to fan them up in the Japanese press. There is no question in the minds of the United States officials that this strategy is being worked out in cooperation with Hitler and has two ends in view:

"First, to keep the American public worried over the Far East, so that the White House cannot become too absorbed with the plight of England during Hitler's "blitzkrieg."

"Second, to convince the Japanese public that there is nothing to fear from the United States. The more the Japanese press attacks this country, and the more American citizens are beaten up in Shanghai, the more the Japanese public will be led to believe that the United States is powerless to send armed forces across the Pacific.

"Then when this conviction is thoroughly embedded, the military will make their long contemplated drive into the Dutch East Indies.

"Note.—Looking further ahead, United States observers in the Orient also are convinced that when Hitler gets ready for his drive into South America, Japan will strike toward the Pacific coast of South America simultaneously.

"RUSSIA-UNITED STATES ALLIES?

"All of this demonstrates the fact that the United States, if it is not to be left entirely alone in the Pacific, must move quickly and must secure friends. To date, there are only two potential friends worth worrying about.

"First is Great Britain, which in fact is America's first line of defense, and which might be saved if the United States gave major aid.

"Second is Russia, the natural enemy of Japan, whom Japan fears more than she fears the United States. A hook-up between Russia and the United States could hamstring Japan, keep her powerless in the North Pacific.

"That is why the Roosevelt-Bullitt statement denouncing Russia is so important. Bullitt was the man who persuaded Roosevelt to recognize Soviet Russia in the first place, and apparently he still has the last word on the country he now hates so bitterly.

"So probably there will be no warming up to Russia, no matter what Japan does in the Pacific.

"NEW ALLIANCE

"A new Workers Alliance (union of W. P. A. workers) is quietly in the making.

"David Lasser, former alliance president who resigned in protest against Communist and fellow-traveler domination of the executive board, has received so many pledges of rank-and-file support that he has undertaken to establish an entirely new organization. Three days after he quit, Lasser had received more than 1,000 letters from alliance members and local leaders urging a new union.

"Lasser's resignation apparently was a blow to the left-wing leaders. They had secretly planned to seize complete control of the alliance at its national convention, originally scheduled for July 11. But his bold and open charge that they were 'reds' upset this scheme, and they postponed the convention to August 28.

"MAIL BAG

"S. A. V., Atlanta—The most effective Negro in the A. A. A. service, according to officials here, is Jennie B. Moton, widow of the former president of Tuskegee University. She works in the field offices, handling complaints and explaining the program to Negro farmers. H. G., Washington—The job of assistant translator, for which Civil Service is now offering an exam, pays only $2,000, though the candidates are expected to have command of four languages—French, German, Italian, and Spanish. Result is that the Government gets mediocre people who have a smattering of all four languages, an expertness in none. K. S., Boston—It was in 1914 that

the Germans first gave assurances to the United States that they had no territorial designs in this hemisphere. Ambassador Bernsdorff, in a note to Secretary of State Bryan, used language strikingly similar to the language the Germans use today: 'I am instructed by my government to deny most categorically the rumors circulated by English agents to the effect that Germany, in case she emerges victorious from the present war, intends to seek expansion in South America.' J. L. C., Salem, Ohio—The United States makes no charge for carrying great quantities of Argentine mail to Chile and other South American countries on United States ships. Supposed to be a reciprocal arrangement, actually the United States gives extensive service free and gets practically nothing in return. It is a part of the good-will program."

No. 2. Quotation from my page: "About 6 weeks ago it was said in the United States Senate that Mr. Bullitt had, in the course of his diplomatic and literary pursuits, written a letter to the then French Premier, Paul Reynaud, assuring him that if France went to war upon the invasion of Poland, she would be followed in a short time by the United States."

Your reply: "Paul Reynaud did not become French Premier until more than 6 months after France had gone to war upon the invasion of Poland. Never, at any time, to any French Premier or to anyone else, did I write any letter indicating or intimating that if France went to war she would be followed in a short time by the United States."

My answer: Perhaps you were not aware of it, but such things were said in the United States Senate. In volume 86, No. 124, of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for Friday, June 21, 1940, pages 8791 to 8805, is to be found a debate on our foreign policy with particular reference to possible secret commitments on the part of the President of the United States and his Ambassadors, which was quite startling in character. On page 8795 Senator NYE was reported as follows:

"Mr. President, before I go further I should like to read a paragraph from the dispatch of Arthur Sears Henning of June 17, under a Washington date line:

" 'It already is known that Bullitt promised the French that the United States would get into the war if necessary to defeat Hitler. It was to ask the President to make good on this assurance that Lord Lothian, the British Ambassador, and Count de Saint-Quentin, the French Ambassador, called on Mr. Roosevelt last Saturday. They asked him to come through with the promised declaration of war.

" 'Mr. Roosevelt could not deliver. He was compelled to say in his cable to Premier Reynaud that only Congress can declare war.'

"One week ago yesterday an individual whom I shall under no circumstances compromise came to my office and wrote a memorandum. I could not doubt this man for one minute. In his memorandum he said:

" 'It was known'—remember, this was before the French surrendered—" 'It was known that France might definitely give in within 10 days, and that when it did the Government of France would release a letter from Bullitt, written on orders of Roosevelt, to Daladier, dated last August or September, stating the full support of the United States if it went to war against Germany on the basis of the Polish incident.'

"Three days later the editor-in-chief of a most eminent American news service, in a confidential letter to the editors who subscribe to his service, in a release of June 18, had this to say:

" 'Unless combined pressures are effective in changing Premier Reynaud's plans, he will drop a bomb soon with repercussions which may reach far over here. The expected separate peace to be made by the French will call for certain categorical explanations. These will include, according to a trustworthy report from France, the releasing of a letter written by Ambassador Bullitt just before the war started, giving the French assurance of our full cooperation with them if they would support the Poles.' "

"Mr. President, take all these things in combination and then look back over the whole performance. Before the war started the President of the United States, by act and by innuendo, made himself the leader of the 'no more Munichs' group. His Ambassador to France made a public speech to all intents pledging American aid. He was never reprimanded. Although the question of possible promises has been raised many times since, as well as the question whether Bullitt made private statements to French officials spelling out in detail what he meant by his public speeches, he himself has never answered the question, and has taken particular care to avoid having to answer it. The Senate will not quickly forget how Mr. Bullitt made his get-away from these shores last winter when the Senator from North Carolina introduced his resolution asking the Foreign Affairs Committee to inquire of Mr. Bullitt while he was here whether or not any commitments had been made in the name of the American Government. If I am not mistaken, the very next day after the introduction of that resolution Ambassador Bullitt was on his way to Europe. Yet, Mr. President, some such commitment of military assistance was made, or the dispute over Danzig and the Corridor would have led to quite a different result than has been reached."

It is true, as you say, that M. Reynaud was not Premier of France at the time of the invasion of Poland. It is true that it was M. Daladier who was then Premier, to whom the letter was said to have been written. In that detail I was in error, and I freely admit it, although it in no way alters the gravity of the charge. It was M. Reynaud in whose possession the letter was said to be, and who was said to have the intention of releasing it.

So far as I know, you have never made a denial of these statements, except in your letter to Senator CLARK complaining of my misstatements. As an American citizen who would feel at least my humble share of the responsibility for the result of such a dreadful indiscretion on the part of an American Ambassador, I have read your forthright denial with great relief. And I suggest that in justice to yourself and to the public, you make the news of this denial available to the whole Nation.

In passing may I say that you could yourself have a little more care in charging people with making misstatements. I did not say you had written such a letter. I said it was said on the floor of the Senate. And it was. So much for that.

No. 3 quotation from my page: "Some provincial Americans were rather shocked to learn that on occasion he actually sat in the French cabinet meetings."

Your reply: "This is, of course, fantastic nonsense. It would be as impossible for an American Ambassador in Paris to sit in a French cabinet meeting as for the French Ambassador in Washington to sit in an American Cabinet meeting. I have never, on any occasion, sat in any French cabinet meeting."

My answer: You say this is fantastic nonsense. It may be. Certainly it is fantastic and that was precisely the point I was seeking to make. That we were living in an age of fantastic happenings, some of the most fantastic of which had to do with our own foreign policy—whatever that is. Perhaps it never happened. If not, again as an American citizen I am heartily glad. But the point is that I am a rather matter-of-fact person, and did not conjure that fantasy from my own brain. Perhaps you didn't know it, but that statement has appeared in the public prints many times, and by writers who seemed most friendly to you, and who seemed to feel it an exploit very much to your credit, which I certainly did not.

On page 13 of that colorful pamphlet, An American White Paper, subtitled "The Story of American Diplomacy in the Second World War," by Joseph Alsop and Robert Kintner, are the following words:

"Bullitt who has so charmed the French as to serve occasionally as an unofficial Cabinet minister, is a romantic, Childe Harold sort of fellow."

And again it was restated, and amplified, in a column by Messrs. Alsop and Kintner, dated July 28, and herewith attached:

"WASHINGTON, July 30.—Mr. Bullitt's explanation of the mystery of Mr. Bullitt appears to be more confusing than explanatory. So far as can be learned from those who have talked with the returned Ambassador to France, Bullitt's main argument, supporting his stand in favor of the Petain government, is that Petain, Laval, Weygand and company have saved their country from the Communists.

"It is reported that Bullitt is extremely eloquent on the power of the Communists in Paris during the days of terror, on the elaborate organization of their activities, and on the serious threat which they constituted. Bullitt is an able observer. A large underground Communist movement still existed in France until the very end of the war. No doubt Bullitt is right that the Communists hopefully came out from their holes during the time when France began to disintegrate. Nor would a Communist threat impress any man more than Bullitt, who has been one of the most violently anti-Communist public men in the world ever since his bitter disillusionment in Russia.

"On the other hand, it is also reported that Bullitt is even more eloquent on the present threat of the Nazis to the world than on the past threat of the Communists to France. His antifascism is as nobly intense as ever. It is difficult to imagine that a Communist uprising in Paris or elsewhere in France would not have been cleaned up by the German Army and Gestapo in double-quick time. And thus Bullitt's plea on behalf of the Petain government is not explained logically, at least, by his talk of the Communist threat.

"Although the Petain government may have prevented a Communist uprising which the Germans would certainly have put down anyway, the crowd around Petain are themselves under the gravest suspicion of German domination. The plan to move the seat of government to Paris, now in the hands of the Gestapo, should be indication enough of the grounds for this suspicion. If it is not, there is the known character of Pierre Laval, long classed as a virtual agent of the Italian Government and regarded by all informed observers as no better than Georges Bonnet. There is the reputation of Adrien Marquet, a sort of French ersatz fuehrer. There is the policy followed by the Government with regard to the Navy, whose independent officers were being replaced by more biddable ones, when the English acted in fear of the new men taking the ships into French ports for German use. These items of evidence, plus the mere shape of the general situation in France, make it perfectly incredible that the Petain government can be independent in any true sense.

"Possibly some light may be cast on Bullitt's attitude by the peculiar character of his position in France. He is a romanticist, dashing, brilliant, excitable, given to magnificent hospitality, passionately fond of the stirring goings and comings of international politics. Being so colorful a figure, and known as one of the President's closest intimates, he was accorded a standing in Paris quite unlike that of any other ambassador. Both in the Blum and in the Daladier governments, he was an unofficial member of the cabinet. Ministers constantly asked his advice. He was given almost as large a voice in the proceedings of the French foreign office as in the debates of the State Department.

"Naturally a lover of good food, good living, and all things French, he could not help but grow more pro-French than ever under the influence of his very special relationship with the French Government. Occasionally, his Francophilism carried him into indiscretions. For example, in the period before the war broke out, he was sometimes given to telling French officials what the President wanted to do for France. The President, of course, wanted to do everything possible, except actually going to war. And the French officials frequently failed to understand the difference between what the President wanted to do and what the Senate, American public opinion, and all the other factors controlling policy would permit him to do.

"This same Francophilism undoubtedly influences Bullitt now, for unless the American people are willing to extend a helping hand, France, like all Europe, will have the most dreadful winter since the Thirty Years' War. It is still a question, however, whether natural American generosity or a hard-headed consideration of the fact that by helping the French we shall be extending indirect aid to Germany should control our decision.

"Possibly some light may also be cast on Bullitt's attitude by the conditions which prevailed in France during the last days. Tales that would be incredible if they did not come from such good sources have begun to trickle out. One, for example, is that in the last 4 days before his fall, Premier Reynaud was really out of touch with Prime Minister Churchill because, trusting no one else, he confided his telegrams for the English Prime Minister to Mme. des Portes, who was secretly an appeaser and did not send them. In an atmosphere where such things could happen, it does not seem unreasonable that the head of the French armies, General Weygand, now a leading member of the Petain government, should have fallen victim to a transport of mysticism. Apparently he combined the conviction that France must now suffer to expurgate her great sins, with a strong trace of defeatism and a violent fear of the Communist menace. Bullitt is said, perhaps wrongly, to have been much influenced by Weygand's views.

"Bullitt is a responsible official, with much that is excellent in his record, and certainly cannot be condemned out of hand. His stand is puzzling. But unless he is not ready to defend it in detail, it must be filed calmly in the 'fuller explanation' department until he does so defend it."

This may not be so, but I never heard of its denial by you or anyone else, and to contend that there is any essential difference between "actually sitting upon occasion with the cabinet" and "serving occasionally as an unofficial cabinet minister," is to make a distinction without a difference. In my humble opinion, and I believe that of most thoughtful Americans, either would be a highly improper role for an Ambassador of the United States.

Although I derived the distinct impression that Messrs. Alsop and Kintner were your great admirers, since they painted a charming portrait of you in the best rich young ruler style, I dare say that some provincial readers like myself, wondered if it was in the highest interest of the United States to have Childe Harold as our Ambassador to France.

Again I emphasize that I have nowhere seen this denied, except in your letter to Senator CLARK complaining of my misstatements. So much for that.

No. 4. Quoting from my page: "When the tragic collapse of France came a few weeks ago, Mr. Bullitt, contrary to orders from the State Department, remained in Paris, instead of following the French Government to Bordeaux."

Your reply: "I never received any orders from the State Department to follow the French Government to Bordeaux. It had been understood by the Department of State, the President, and myself that in case the Germans should reach Paris, I should remain in the city in accordance with the long tradition which began at the time of the French Revolution when Gouverneur Morris remained as the only diplomatic representative in the city, and was continued by Elihu Washburne during the Siege of Paris and the Commune of 1870, and by Ambassador Myron T. Herrick in 1914."

My answer: Unfortunately, before I knew that we were going to have all this shooting I threw away the clippings upon which I based my observations. Those from the columnists I have been able to recover from our files. The statement that you had acted contrary to State Department orders was taken from a straight news story which, I believe, appeared in the New York Times. If my memory, which sometimes is faulty, serves, it was in the same article in which Judge Hull was described as being vexed with you. Unfortunately, I have not a file of the Times in the office, and it may take me some time to locate this reference. However, I shall try to do so. But as I am accepting a good many denials on your part and on your word, I am sure that you will be fair enough to believe me when I say that I didn't gather that out of the circumambient atmosphere, but based the observation upon reports in the public press.

Again I am glad to know that you did not take your own head and go contrary to orders from the State Department.

It is my belief that, without regard to party, the American people have the same profound respect for the patriotism, intelligence, and integrity of Secretary Hull that I have and that it causes grave apprehension on their part when his supposed subordinates flout his authority or act in a way to warrant publication of a statement that he is vexed with them. And since from your letter it seems that you have been so consistently misrepresented, I venture to hope that Judge Hull was not vexed with you. He is a man whom I personally should not wish to vex.

No. 5. Quotation from my page: "Without reporting to his supposed chiefs at the State Department, he went straight to the President. It is reported that the State Department is still as much in the dark as the general public regarding the events leading to and surrounding the death of the French Republic."

Your reply: "I reached Washington from Europe on a Sunday. The Secretary of State and the Under Secretary were absent from the city. I reported immediately to the ranking officer of the Department of State who was in the city, an adviser to the Secretary of State. I then reported at the White House, and after returning to Washington from Hyde Park immediately reported to all the authorities of the Department of State."

My answer: The remarks are mine, based on the Merry-Go-Round, by Drew Pearson and Robert Allen, which I have quoted above.

No. 6. Quotation from my page: "He is reported as urging the President to release to the Petain government the $2,500,000,000 deposited here by the French Republic for safekeeping. The Treasury Department had every intention of keeping this money frozen here, since if it is released to Petain it will find its way into Herr Hitler's hands. Consequently, the Treasury is greatly upset by Mr. Bullitt's crusade for its release."

Your reply: "This statement, like those above, is totally untrue. I have never urged the release of the funds in question."

My answer: The words are mine, based on statements of Joseph Alsop and Robert Kintner, in the News Behind the News, printed in the New Orleans Item and other newspapers on July 27, herewith attached:

"(By Joseph Alsop and Robert Kintner)

"WASHINGTON, D. C.—The Treasury is grimly whistling in the dark about the problem of the French assets, which may turn out to involve the whole huge problem of the attitude of the United States toward all the German-occupied territories in Europe. The immediate reason for the whistling is the return to this country of Ambassador William C. Bullitt.

"The Treasury has followed a well-defined policy with regard to the American-held valuables of nations overrun by German arms. As each nation has been conquered, its assets have been impounded and held in escrow for the rightful owners—the theory being that citizens of conquered territories being in Germany's power could otherwise be fleeced of the gold, securities, and so forth they sent for safety to this country.

"RELEASE WOULD AID GERMANS

"The French assets were impounded like the rest. The total is now about $3,500,000,000, of which between $1,500,000,000 and $2,000,000,000 is French.

"The Treasury wishes to keep these huge sums under lock and key until further notice. To release them, the Treasury believes, may have the gravest results. For example, while Germany is not able to import much from abroad so long as the British blockade persists she could use a big sum of dollar exchange to buy South American surpluses, thus knocking spots out of the State Department's program for hemispheric unity.

"BULLITT IS EMPHATIC

"In truth, about the only advantage over her enemies and over this country which Germany now lacks is a shortage of liquid assets with value on the world money markets. And if Germany is allowed to get her hands on her victims' valuables, her world position will be incalculably improved.

"The official Treasury position is that the assets will not be released for any purpose. But Bullitt's return has caused a whistling-in-the-dark note to creep into the Treasury's assertions, because it appears to be Bullitt's purpose to change the Treasury policy.

"OFFICIALS DISCREDIT BULLITT STORY

"Ever since he landed in this country Bullitt has placed the strongest emphasis on the independence and non-Fascist character of the new French Government. He has talked, in large terms, of schemes of rehabilitation, and he has made no secret of his opinion that American policy toward France should not be altered by France's defeat. As yet the Treasury has not heard from Bullitt. But as he has been closeted with the President, the Treasury officials are momentarily expecting the worst.

"The Treasury fears being forced to change its policy by Bullitt's pleas simply because neither the Treasury nor many other American Government officials credit Bullitt's picture of the present situation in France. Both the character of the individuals composing the new French administration and the weight of the evidence that anarchy will come when the German Gestapo is withdrawn strongly suggest that calling Laval and his crowd independent and non-Fascist is extremely wishful.

"Unquestionably the situation is as thorny as any the President and his aides have ever confronted in the field of foreign affairs. Despite the general suspicion of Laval and his entourage, the French Government is still recognized by the Government of the United States. Being recognized, the French have a perfect right to demand the release of their assets. Strong representations to this effect have already been made."

In view of the fact that it seems I have based most of my observations in the article to which you object on the correspondence of Messrs. Pearson and Allen and Messrs. Alsop and Kintner, I suggest that if you wish to have yourself and your case "reported aright to the unsatisfied" you should take the matter up with them also. I should be particularly interested in any errors in the column of Messrs. Alsop and Kintner, as we print them and naturally have some concern with their method of reporting.

Since all the things you complain of have been said by bright luminaries of the newspaper profession, in which I am but a lowly

journeyman, I cannot but be flattered, although somewhat nonplussed, that it should be upon my head that you bring down your righteous wrath.

My mother used to say of me that I always told the truth—sometimes when it was unnecessary. I must say that the first person charging me with misstatements has done so in a wholesale fashion, and I have trespassed upon your time with a very lengthy letter in reply to your charges not only in justice to you but in justice to myself, because anybody who sat down and wrote as I did about you, without basing it on supposedly reputable authority, has no place in the newspaper business. They should go in for fiction. And if the gentlemen upon whose correspondence I based that part of my comment to which you object are not reliable newspapermen, it is of as much importance to the newspaper publishers who pay them for their work as it is to you to establish the fact.

I hope that I have made it clear to you that however profoundly I may disagree with you, I wrote the piece which so enraged you in perfect good faith, based upon statements made in the public press, and never to my knowledge denied by you or in your behalf.

I am sure, my dear Mr. Ambassador, your sense of fair play will cause you to accept this, as my reputation as a newspaperwoman is just as important to me as yours as a diplomat is to you.

Sincerely yours,

GENEVIEVE CLARK THOMSON.

If Germany Wins

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN R. AUSTIN

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, August 24 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

ARTICLE BY COL. JOSEPH FAIRBANKS

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, under the permission granted me today, I submit for printing in the Appendix the article by Col. Joseph Fairbanks on the subject If Germany Wins the War.

The article referred to is as follows:

IF GERMANY WINS

Back in 1914 an apocryphal story went the rounds in New England. On a sunny afternoon in early August of that year a farmer on his way back from the village called to a neighbor at work in the hay field, "Say did you know that England and Germany have gone to war?" The haymaker leaned on his pitchfork, cast a glance at the cloudless sky, and replied, "Well, they've got a good day for it."

To millions of Americans in that fateful month the news of foreign war brought no more feeling of personal concern than to our rural commentator. It was Europe's war, not ours, and would continue so. How complete the contrast when, in September 1939, word of another overseas conflict sped to every American city and farm. Instantly public opinion struck the dominant note of anxiety lest the United States become a participant. Many weeks have passed during which our legislative barriers have been strengthened, but still the dread of war absorbs our thoughts, even to the exclusion of domestic differences.

The passage of the Neutrality Act of 1939 and the admirably prompt adjournment of the Congress afforded a much-needed respite for the people of the United States to take new bearings, determine their true position, and chart their future course in the sea of international troubles. The atmosphere is clearing. Confronted on September 3 with the hard fact of a major war in Europe, our people as a whole leaped instinctively to the conclusion that the United States was in imminent danger of becoming a belligerent. We had not been able to keep aloof in 1917 and history was all set to repeat itself. This instant and emotional reaction quickly hardened into a firm determination to keep out of war—made vocal with a unanimity well-nigh unique in our annals. The debate by radio, in the press, and in the Senate centered on the choice of methods best designed to keep us free from present conflict. The net result is an act of Congress declaring in its preamble the desire of the United States "to preserve its neutrality in wars between foreign states and also to avoid involvement therein." With that done, the opportunity arises for a more dispassionate survey of the foreign policy of our country. It is time to take a longer look ahead.

We can see now that the imminency of war for us has been vastly overemphasized. The plain and fundamental reason is that we don't want to fight and no other nation wants to fight us. Even without the additional safeguards provided by the Neutrality Act, far greater provocation than ever before would be necessary to goad us to war. We are determined to stay out. On the other side there are only two possible opponents, Germany and Japan. Which of them amid their present involvements is likely to pick a quarrel with the United States? Germany knows better after having once taken on the whole world, and for Japan, embroiled in China, to challenge us now would be sheer folly. Russia by herself alone threatens us with her communistic doctrine, not with her armed forces. Nobody dreams of war with England or France. Where then, in the absence of some radical and unforeseeable change in the international picture, is the acute danger? As an earthquake breeds a tidal wave, so the shock of the present conflict overwhelmed the American people with a blinding dread of war for themselves. Slowly that emotional wave recedes and the true logic of the situation emerges. With it will come the conviction that we are going to keep out, and then we shall settle down to the far more vital problem of so directing our national policy that we may not only remain neutral in this war but may also promote an enduring peace for America when the present fighting subsides.

The current national debate has dealt far too much with temporary immunity from war and far too little with lasting security. Would that someone with the voice of leadership may arise to champion the conviction that our actions of today must be sighted at longer range to produce for America not merely continued neutrality but a future of peace and not of arms. An enduring peace is the deeper expression of our desire and the truer measure of our need.

Obviously, the basic condition for such a program is a frank and searching look ahead. We must test every step we propose to take now by relating it to our national interest in that post-war world which is just as certain to come sooner or later as the armistice of November 11, 1918. Common sense demands this.

It should be unnecessary to contend for a calm analysis of America's position at the close of hostilities, but attempts in that direction have been few. Even those speakers and writers who discern future danger to this country if the fighting ends in a victory for one side or the other are too much inclined to stop with the mere assertion of this belief, and every statement of that sort is promptly howled down with the cry that it is warmongering and rabble rousing designed to lead the country into the war we seek to avoid. That is purely an appeal to emotion, not to reason. No human being knows how the war will result, but no thinking American can be excused if he fails to visualize with the utmost realism the major contingencies as each may affect this country. No more dangerous sedative can be administered to our people than the idea that neutrality restricts free and candid public discussion of what will happen to the United States when neutrality ends by the cessation of hostilities in Europe. No obsession by the desire to keep out of war, no comforting feeling that United States territory is immune from invasion, and no preachment that European quarrels are not our concern can be allowed to befog the vision of our people or hinder them from a frank appraisal of their vital interests at every stage of events.

The military operations now being conducted in Europe may result in a clear-cut decision for one side or in some less conclusive manner. Of these numerous contingencies, all of which should be examined, I propose to consider only one, the possibility that Germany may be the victor. Whether we believe she will win is another matter. We must admit that it can happen. It is one of the major chances of which we must take reckoning in advance. No man drives an automobile looking always to the right and never to the left.

Let it be assumed that the United States has successfully maintained her neutrality and that Germany, by force of arms, has gained the power to dictate the terms of peace. What would probably be the nature of that peace treaty as affecting America? Then would be presented, in the words of Dr. Goebbels, "that rare moment for the redistribution of the world." The German theory of peacemaking was expressed by the official military publication Deutsche Wehr in June 1935:

"Totalitarian victory means the utter destruction of the vanquished nation, and its complete and final disappearance from the historical arena. The victor will not negotiate with the vanquished concerning the conditions for peace, because there will be no party capable of negotiations. He will impose whatever conditions he thinks fit. In reality totalitarian warfare is nothing but a gigantic struggle of elimination whose upshot will be terrible and irrevocable in its finality."

Shades of Versailles, thou art become a bedtime story. But let us be content with understatement and affirm the fact that German peace terms from first to last would be designed to place that nation in a position of world domination with respect to naval and military strategy and economic advantages. With the French Army beaten and the English Fleet eliminated, nothing less than such a far-flung readjustment has any basis in reason. It is hard to think in such terms, yet certain of the major conditions and their consequences can be stated with almost complete certainty. Some of those factors directly affecting America are as follows:

1. German naval, submarine, and airplane bases will be established and maintained all around the world. Most of these will be former British and French possessions. In the Western Hemisphere they will be just as near to the shores of the United States and to the Panama Canal as Germany dares to demand without provoking the United States to immediate war. Leaving Canada out of the picture, Great Britain now owns Bermuda, the Bahamas, Jamaica, Antigua, Barbados, Trinidad, and numerous other West Indian islands. On the mainland she owns British Honduras, bordering Mexico, and British Guiana, near Venezuela. Far to the south are the Falkland Islands. France owns Guadaloupe, Martinique, and other islands, together with the mainland colony of French Guiana. No transfer of title to any of these possessions

would infringe the Monroe Doctrine, unless restated for the occasion [it was restated by S. J. Res. 271. H. J. Res. 556, never passed by both Houses. Was there made a certain causus belli?—before or after peace], since all are now owned by European powers. Possibly Germany would not insist on such aquisitions, but the point is that as victor she would have the power to do so, restrained only by the United States, and the question of her intention would inevitably spring into the forefront of public discussion to become a living issue just as soon as hostilities ceased.

By far the shortest crossing of the Atlantic and the easiest for aircraft is from the present French and British colonies of West Africa to Brazil. This route would surely become German.

In the Pacific those South Sea islands formerly owned by Germany would unquestionably be restored to her and others acquired. Great Britain would not be allowed to retain the vitally important Singapore base, Australia would be helpless, and the entire Pacific Ocean front would assume a vastly altered aspect in relation to the interests of the United States. Whether the German gains in the Pacific prove a little less or a little more than here suggested is beside the point. At the very least, a German victory means that American national policy must relate itself to important German naval, commercial, and economic establishments in the Pacific Ocean.

2. A German-dictated peace will include provisions designed to place under German control the mechanism of international trade. This includes banking, foreign exchange, and insurance. A vital blow can thus be struck at the prestige of Great Britain. Large revenues will be secured for Germany and her facilities for trading with all nations will be vastly expanded and improved. Transfers of this nature can be arranged by way of payments on indemnities which Germany would have the power to exact. Thereafter every American exporter and importer would be faced with an altered pattern of international trade in which the purpose to make Germany the dominant commercial nation would be an ever-present and annoying factor. Close on the heels of this would come the new German merchant marine, composed both of ships transferred from the French and British flags and of vessels newly constructed. Just so far as Germany gains naval control, thus far she will be able also to absorb the carrying trade of the world's commerce.

3. A German victory and a German peace mean that Germany can and will create for herself a naval establishment equal to that of any other nation, including the United States. This can be done in 10 years or less. Her fleet may or may not include as many battleships as the present British Navy. Its strength may depend more upon fast vessels, aircraft carriers, submarines, and airplanes, depending upon the lessons of the current war, but she will see to it that her naval power is superior to any possible European combination and the equal of whatever America may build. As victor she can and will do this. Superior force brought success and will be continuously employed to maintain that success. No thinking American can fail to see that the United States will then be obliged to construct and maintain an equivalent navy based in the Atlantic Ocean [provided for since], in addition to our present fleet based in the Pacific. The two-ocean standard would become imperative. No British fleet would then offset German naval power. If anyone doubts that, consider what happened to the German high-seas fleet at the close of the last war. If and when the British Fleet is destroyed or towed captive into a German harbor, American isolation becomes a stark fact, to which the only possible answer of the peace-loving American people will be to pour out their treasure without stint to safeguard themselves. Whether the outcome be subsequent war or armed peace, we cannot have tranquility on those conditions.

4. A German victory will raise before the American people the specter of an alliance between Germany and Japan. I say "specter" because no such thing may happen. But a ghost can work a lot of mischief and this one would be sure to. A Japan consolidating its gains in the Far East and a victorious Germany trying on the shoes of Great Britain as a world power, both nations governed by a similar absence of morality, would inevitably suggest to American minds the idea of a partnership between these two aggressors. The potentialities of such a combination need not be developed. Whether or not a two-ocean war, testing the defenses of this country to the limit, ultimately came about, the realization that it could happen would be forced upon the American people if Germany dictates the next peace. A deep-seated feeling of alarm, working out in redoubled expenditure for national defense, would be inevitable.

5. If Germany wins, the commercial penetration of South and Central America, including Mexico, will proceed with German thoroughness, abetted by her newly acquired prestige. Expanding trade will open the door to encroachments far beyond ordinary competition. The German political propaganda will keep pace. Centers of German influence and population will develop, and any local restraints imposed thereon will be construed as persecution and used as stepping stones to more aggressive measures. If Germany is the victor, the fact of persistent penetration by German interests from Cape Horn to the Rio Grande will confront the people of the United States. How will Americans, who are practically a unit in their dislike of Teuton ideology, react to this situation?

WORLD REVOLUTION

6. If Germany wins, what of the effect within the continental United States? Unless one is simple enough to believe that German ambition will be satisfied with a military decision in Europe and the return of her pre-war colonies, a systematized effort to impair the morale of this Nation will be undertaken. If there be doubt about this, consider the fact that every forward step taken by Germany in recent years has been preceded by a campaign of the spoken and written word, broadly known as propaganda. This is basic policy. It has two objectives: First, to justify German intentions, and second, to soften opposition, generally by promoting internal dissension abroad. Under a dictatorship uncontrolled by morals, the use of these same methods in the United States will be regarded as a necessary means of defense to safeguard the dominant world position of the German race. No ocean barriers can prevent such internal meddling, and our own insistence upon the rights of free speech will make for difficulty in coping with the situation. For example, antisemitism is a cardinal point in Nazi doctrine. What could deter the German leaders from touching the match to anti-Jewish prejudice in this country? Any dissatisfied minority presents a similar chance to promote internal conflict of opinion and disturbance, thus diverting the attention of the people from external affairs. The system of German propaganda and espionage long existing in France and England is common knowledge. Under a German peace, the infiltration of the same methods in the United States will begin. Perhaps it has already begun. If this process is allowed to have its way, no limit to the resulting mischief can easily be foreseen. If repressed, the measures for its control are likely to be repugnant to the Bill of Rights, a result precisely in line with the totalitarian ideas we seek to exclude. The main differences between German propaganda of the first World War and of today are that its technique has improved and that its use in peace as well as in war has been developed. In due course hostilities will cease, but, if Germany prevails, the march of Teutonic ideology in the name of German racial superiority will not stop. Americans cannot be indifferent to this prospect.

Many well-meaning and eloquent Americans of late have pictured this Nation keeping resolutely aloof from the battles of Europe, prepared at the end of the struggle to act as a haven for the arts of peace. They see her, secure in her isolation, carrying on the torch of civilization which it is assumed will fall from the hands of other exhausted peoples. That conception of our future has validity only if general exhaustion of all major contestants actually occurs. That is one possible outcome and only one. Those who foresee America as a refuge for civilization invariably fail to consider that the expected general exhaustion may not take place. To the extent that they ignore other equally plausible contingencies, their hypothesis is devoid of realistic thinking. The chance that Germany may definitely win has just as good support from competent experts as the theory of a stalemate, the break-down of European civilization, or a victory for France and England.

Certainly it is unsafe to assume that a German conquest will leave her too exhausted for further aggression. In the second decade after the prostration of the World War, she again treads the paths of power. If defeat only gave her pause, it cannot be supposed that victory, however dearly bought, would prevent another resurgence.

All reasonable contingencies should be honestly examined as they affect America. In this spirit an attempt has been made to appraise the main features of a German-dictated peace. Whether or not all the foregoing conclusions are accepted, this much is certain: In a post-war world, dominated by a Germany flushed with success and guided by a philosophy abhorrent to the American people, the prospect for tranquillity and unimpeded pursuit of democracy will be nonexistent anywhere in the Western Hemisphere. To permit the American people to ignore that fact on the charge that to talk about it is unneutral and warmongering would be criminal negligence on the part of those who endeavor to guide public opinion. Ten, twenty, or thirty years might elapse before an acute crisis arose, but does anyone dream that a German Government victorious over England and France would vary its methods or mend its manners out of consideration or fear of the United States? Only wishful thinking can reach such a conclusion.

Nevertheless, if these views were broadcast some evening to Americans, I can hear murmurs of dissent and incredulity in the listening audience. "The Germans aren't that bad." "They only want elbow room in Europe and maybe a few colonies." "If they do win, they won't bother us any more than England bothers us now." "That is Jules Verne talk, he's just an alarmist." "It's British propaganda again." Thus speaks the easy-going American, slightly skeptical and thinking only of keeping out of war by the week or the month. There may be others who would reflect, "Can that happen here? Is not the picture overdrawn?" To all such who have open minds and are willing to use them, the most convincing answer comes from the lips of German philosophers, statesmen, and soldiers for the last 75 years. During all that period (except for a brief respite after 1918) the intelligent, energetic, but politically docile German people have been taught that they constitute a race superior to all others, that the highest good of civilization requires the German nation to attain world leadership, and that war is a legitimate, a noble, and a necessary means to that end. The Nazi doctrine of Aryan racial superiority and the earlier conception of the German superman stem from the same fountain head of philosophy. Wilhelm II and his generals with their "place in the sun" and Hitler with his "lebensraum" (living space) speak the same language. Bismarck preaching blood and iron and Goering with his lightning war of extermination proclaim the same theory of brute force. Such is the diet that for two generations has been fed unremittingly to the German people. If the bitter lesson

of defeat in the first World War did not rid Germany of this theory of national life, what limit to its practical application can be set if Germany emerges victorious in the present struggle?

It must not, however, be assumed that pan Germanism and present day national socialism are synonymous. There is evidence that the true Nazi movement is revolutionary beyond all precedent, and that its only fixed tenet is the pursuit of power in the hands of an inner group, whose members are free from the shackles of any political or moral code and therefore prepared to adopt any ideology suited to command the allegiance of the masses at home and to create a maximum of unrest in other lands. Dr. Rauschning, once a Nazi leader and president of the Danzig Senate, in his scholarly book The Revolution of Nihilism, writes:

"The National Socialist leaders concealed their true objectives so well that many members of the elite only realized after a considerable time that they had been drawn into a double existence, with fictitious spiritual, national aims and one very real one—the pursuit of power. The most outstanding quality of the elite is 'the accurately chosen and ruthless application of all the physical and material power at its disposal.' Here again the National Socialist leaders carried into practice the new doctrine of violence, the doctrine that spiritual assets are of value for the legitimation of political power and for nothing else; such things have no intrinsic authority, no value in themselves; there is nothing that counts except force; it is by force alone that an elite comes to the top."

If this view be accepted, the sudden fraternization between Germany and bolshevism presents no riddle. No inconsistency counts if it leads to power. But, regardless of sincerity, the doctrines of racial superiority and German destiny pressed upon the entire nation by Hitler and his party bear unmistakable affinity to the philosophic and political dogma upon which Germans have been reared ever since long ago the Prussian militarists joined hands with the intellectuals.

If there be those who believe that German ambition will be content with predominance in Europe, let the German leaders briefly state their own case.

In August of the present year, Hermann Goering, Hitler's chosen successor, made an important speech during which he allowed a few questions from his listeners. He passed in review the potential European enemies of Germany and gave assurance that her military power would subdue them. Then a voice cried, "What about the Americans?" "Sie werden kommen," answered Goering. Literally, "They will come." In other words, "They are on our list. We will deal with them in due time." Probably those were unguarded words, perhaps half in jest, but in uttering them at all Goering slipped and gave us a momentary glimpse of the future according to the gospel of the Nazi leaders.

If it be urged that this was only a straw on the wind of oratory and not entitled to weight, compare Hitler's statement in Mein Kampf (abridged ed., ch. XXVI), written about 1925:

"The 1914 frontiers mean nothing to Germany's future. They were not a protection in the past, and they would not mean power in the future. The distance to England would not be lessened, the size of the United States would not be equaled, nor would France be deprived of any political power.

"Any attempt to reestablish the 1914 borders would merely bleed our people; and if this small aim was achieved, the drunken joy of victory would weaken interest in greater goals."

If it still be felt that this is bombast which does not concern America, turn back to Heinrich von Treitschke (1834–96), the noted historian to whose lecture room at the University of Berlin young men flocked for more than 20 years. He said:

"Then when the German flag flies over and protects this vast empire, to whom will belong the scepter of the universe? What nation will impose its wishes on the other enfeebled and decadent peoples? Will it not be Germany that will have the mission to insure the peace of the world?"

The German press strikes the same note (Vossische Zeitung):

"As we are the supreme people, our duty, henceforth, is to lead the march of humanity itself. * * * It would be a sin against our mission to spare the people who are inferior to us."

Deutsche Tageszeitung:

"It is a crying necessity that German should replace English as the world language. Should the English language be victorious and become the world language, the culture of mankind will stand before a closed door and the death knell will sound for civilization. Here we have the reason why it is necessary for the German, and with him the German language, to conquer. And the victory once won, be it now or be it 100 years hence, there remains a task for the German than which none is more important, that of forcing the German tongue on the world."

In 1915, when victory hung in the balance, Maximilian Harden, journalist, wrote:

"Now strikes the hour for Germany's rising power. The terms of a peace treaty that does not insure this would leave the great effort unrewarded. Even if it brought dozens of shining billions into the national treasury, the fate of Europe would be dependent upon the United States of America."

In the same year a Manifesto of the Intellectuals, formulated by 352 leading German professors, 350 diplomatists, and 185 high Government officials, was presented to the Imperial Chancelor, setting forth Germany's war aims. Although it disclaimed the wish "to dominate the world," the following passages from this document are noteworthy:

"The German mind is, in our opinion, beyond all doubt our one supremely valuable asset. It is the one priceless possession amongst all our possessions. It alone justifies our people's existence and their impulse to maintain and assert themselves in the world; and to it they owe their superiority over all other peoples."

And again speaking of England:

"Undoubtedly it will be necessary to change the direction of a considerable part of our oversea trade; but we shall also have to conquer anew our old trade and shipping connections. Herein we shall in future stand upon our own feet, and shall, e. g., eliminate the hitherto customary mediation of English bankers and brokers, English arbitrage and exchange business, and the preponderance of English marine insurance companies. England has wantonly destroyed in us the trust and confidence which all such transactions require, and must pay the penalty by losing the profits which she has hitherto derived from them at the expense of German trade. * * *

"Further, we must break the chain of England's naval bases, which encircles the globe, or weaken it by a corresponding acquisition of Germany bases. * * *

"But England's power is also essentially based upon the overwhelming influence which she exercises on the governments and the press of the whole world.

"In order to remedy this state of affairs and to secure counter influence for Germany it is vitally necessary to destroy England's monopoly of the cable service and press agencies."

In 1913 the German headquarters staff, in a then-secret memorandum, wrote:

"Neither ridiculous shriekings for revenge by French chauvinists, nor the Englishmen's gnashing of teeth, nor the wild gestures of the Slavs will turn us from our aim of protecting and extending Deutschtum (German influence) all the world over."

Major General von Roehl spoke for the army:

"Only one people has the right to play a leading role in the political world, and that people is the German people."

And Kaiser Wilhelm spoke for himself:

"The ocean reminds us * * * that on it and beyond it no great decision may henceforth be made without Germany and the German Emperor."

Even religion fell into line with the statement of the Evangelical League:

"The King at the head of Prussia, Prussia at the head of Germany, Germany at the head of the world."

At all times the virtue and necessity of war are preached. Friedrich Nietzsche (1844–1900), whose brilliant and destructive philosophy molds German conduct to this day, wrote in his book, Thus Spake Zarathustra:

"Ye shall love peace as a means to new wars, and the short peace better than the long. * * * I do not advise you to work, but to fight. I do not advise you to conclude peace, but to conquer. Let your work be a fight, your peace a victory. * * * Ye say, A good cause will hallow even war? I say unto you, A good war halloweth every cause."

In 1935 Ludendorff modernizes this teaching:

"All the theories of Clausewitz have been turned upside down. * * * War is the highest expression of national life. Therefore politics must be subordinate to the prosecution of war."

In the same year the official Deutsche Wehr takes up the strain:

"War has become a form of national existence, with the same rights as peace. No human or social activity has any right to exist unless it serves the preparations for war."

Hitlerism is pan-Germanism equipped with a slightly different vocabulary and fewer scruples. It is idle at the present juncture to debate whether this Teutonic ideology is an outgrowth of social and economic factors, such as overpopulation. The continuity of the German pressure demands the attention of the American people. National defense will not permit that it be ignored. This fact rises supreme over all weak-minded complaints that as neutrals we should not talk of such things. The most ardent disciples of peace are precisely the people who should ponder what the dynamic ambitions of National Socialist Germany really are and what they portend for the future of America. Truth is dangerous only when it is ignored.

It is urgent that our citizens understand that the Imperial German Government under Wilhelm II and the German Reich under Adolf Hitler have the same objective, namely, to secure for Germany that preeminence in the world to which the superior qualities of the German race entitle her. Thus will the ultimate good of humanity be served. If the rest of the world does not see this, war is a justifiable and necessary means to bring conviction. Repeatedly Hitler reminds his followers of this mission:

"The National Socialist movement must, moreover, remain conscious that we are also obligated to a high duty as the guardians of the highest human race on this earth." (Mein Kampf, complete edition, p. 940.)

And this guardianship is to be governed by a philosophy which says:

"Since a view of life is never willing to share with another one, it cannot be ready either to cooperate in an existing condition it condemns, but it feels the obligation of fighting, by all available means, this condition and the entire hostile world of ideas; that means of preparing their collapse." (Mein Kampf, complete edition, p. 677.)

And again—"every attempt made for the sake of a world idea fails unless the struggle takes the form of a violent attack. The weapon

of ruthless, brute force is of greatest value in war between two diverse views of the world." (Mein Kampf, ch. V, abridged edition.)

The United States is regarded as a flourishing offshoot of the German race and the preservation of racial purity there is important.

"North America, with a population composed overwhelmingly of Germanic elements—which mingle very little with inferior, colored races—shows a higher humanity and culture than does Central and South America, where the Latin settlers had mixed with the aborigines.

"The German settler of the North American continent, keeping himself pure, has mastered the land; he will hold his position as long as he avoids blood defilement." (Mein Kampf, ch. XI, abridged edition.)

Is it not crystal clear that if this "superior" race imposes a Germanic peace on Europe, nothing will prevent closer attention to North America to the end that the elements of German culture in that area be protected from defilement? The Germanic racial crusade will discover a duty to save the United States from racial deterioration under a loose and demoralizing democracy.

Our thinking people must be made aware that the methods which they so heartily condemn when applied in Europe will not be confined to any one continent. They are essentially international in scope and will spread to other quarters of the globe just so soon as they are implemented with the necessary physical force. That day will be near at hand if England and France are defeated in the present war.

Rauschning, in his Revolution of Nihilism, says:

"At the back of this policy of stutzpunkte (key positions) lies the deliberate plan of promoting revolutionary dynamism all over the world. This is the actual plan of national socialism in foreign policy—universal political unsettlement. * * * And it is only by its ubiquity, its intereference in every problem of the world, that national socialism can attain the maximum of power and influence which is its aim."

The elements of danger to the United States in the contingency of a German victory are thrown into clearer relief by Hitler's extraordinary affiliation with Russia, permitting that Nation to advance into western Europe. He has thus closed the door to German expansion eastward so far as now discernible. Therefore, if Germany wins, she must glean the fruits of victory elsewhere, and there is no elsewhere except westward. Her compensation must come from France and England, on the high seas and the continents beyond. Since to all appearances the dream of an Eastern March (Drang nach Osten) has been abandoned, the peace treaty must provide equivalent gains in other parts of the world, including the Western Hemisphere. Apart from all question of military alliance with Russia lies the fact that the ambitions of a victorious Germany, voluntarily barred from overrunning the Ukraine and other eastern areas, will spread outward into regions where collision with the vital interests of the United States will become probable. The United States pays the penalty of its greatness. It cannot ignore the dangerous potentiality that lurks in the secretive dealings of the two dictators.

To every attempt, such as here made, to state in concrete terms the situation threatening our country if Germany wins, the inevitable response is, "Well, if England and France are really fighting our battle now, we should go to their aid at once by declaring war on Germany. Are you ready to do that?" It is obvious that this attitude does not refute the existence of the peril. It completely begs the issue by conceding the danger and suggesting a radical course of action to meet it. The foreknowledge that America is not willing to go to war under present conditions makes this evasion easy and safe. The inference is that, if the writer is not prepared to plunge the country into immediate war, then the dangers he depicts cannot after all be so serious. This is a complete non sequitur. If a fire is raging down the street from my house and I think that it may develop into a conflagration threatening my home, it does not follow that I am obliged to join the fire department immediately in fighting the blaze. But if I go inside my house, pull down all the shades and try to ignore what is happening a few doors away, I cannot justify my action. I should be out looking for sparks on my roof and planning what to do if things get hotter. But if in place of either course, I go out on the street and obstruct the firemen by turning off the hydrant or cutting the hose, then, if the fire spreads and my own house burns, I have nobody but myself to blame.

The United States is in very much this position today. A fire is raging in Europe. If it is not brought under control, it may spread to this country. That fire is not the war itself. It is the powerful flame of an alien philosophy of revolution (a view of life, in Hitler's words) destructive to our future tranquility and fanned by the winds of fanaticism. The war is the struggle between that flame and those who seek to extinguish it. England and France are struggling to subdue it, even though their carelessness may have contributed to the start of the catastrophe. We, the people of the United States, believe that our active participation on the side of the fire fighters would involve us in immediate sacrifices we are not prepared to make. We are practically unanimous on that point. But if, having decided not to engage ourselves actively, we go further and refuse to those nations engaged in subduing the conflagration the means to carry on the contest, we are hurting ourselves, we are endangering our own national structure without the shadow of an excuse. If, for the lack of a few thousand airplanes which we might have furnished, England and France are obliged to yield supremacy in the air to Germany, whereby she conquers, as may easily happen, we would be false to our own self-interest. This aspect of national security, although largely and perhaps wisely camouflaged, underlay the entire debate which resulted in the Neutrality Act of 1939. We can now thankfully acknowledge that this revision of our policy, by making available the material resources of the United States to England and France within our rights and obligations as a neutral state, materially strengthens our national defense against the spread of Teutonic power politics to the Western Hemisphere. Thereby the act contributes to the cause of lasting peace no less than to temporary neutrality.

Surely there is no longer any justification for camouflage. Term insurance, year by year, against war is not enough, and to provide protection for a longer period we must look the risks of later years squarely in the face. Americans do not hesitate to discuss and condemn communism. They freely analyze totalitarianism as a theory of government destructive to democracy. They score Hitler without mercy. But when it comes to a plain statement of the potential danger to this Nation if Hitlerian Germany wins the war, men hesitate, frown, and dismiss the topic by convincing themselves that anyhow Germany can't win.

America has been shell-shocked by the dread of war. Even while every Senator and columnist, whether for or against the arms embargo, exhorted us to shun emotion and let cool reason prevail, the hearts of the American people surged with a firm resolution to keep out of war, more nearly unanimous than any similar phenomenon for many a year. He who ventured to mention the aftermath if Germany should win was branded as a warmonger willing to send our boys again to die on Flanders fields. Thus, after all, emotion shut out realism.

As we regain our bearings, standing firmly on our neutrality, we shall scan the future for the path of enduring peace. With frankness befitting our strength we shall try to forecast what the world will be like when the present conflict ends, and among other conclusions we shall acknowledge the bitter truth that if Germany wins there can be no tranquility for America.

JOSEPH FAIRBANKS,
1001 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

Proposed Transfer of Destroyers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ERNEST LUNDEEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, August 24 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

STATEMENT BY HON. DAVID I. WALSH, OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement made in the American Forum of the Air by the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], chairman of the Senate Committee on Naval Affairs, and, I believe, our foremost expert on the Senate floor on our Navy. The statement is in answer to the question propounded in the forum, Shall the United States make available to England 50 of our World War destroyers?

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SHALL THE UNITED STATES MAKE AVAILABLE TO ENGLAND 50 OF OUR WORLD WAR DESTROYERS? "NO," SAYS SENATOR WALSH

(By DAVID I. WALSH, United States Senator from Massachusetts and chairman of the Senate Naval Affairs Committee)

There is a strong emotional appeal in the proposal that we help England in her present extremity by immediately putting at her disposal 50, or possibly more, naval vessels of the destroyer type now in commission under our flag in our fleet and on patrol of our coast.

Those who advocate this step seek to justify it on the ground that in assisting the British Navy we are really assisting ourselves; that if the British sea power with our aid is maintained, the danger of attack upon us from overseas is averted; that even if the final outcome be defeat for Britain and destruction of her navy, nevertheless, if our ships have served to postpone the catastrophe, thereby affording us more time to make ready our own defenses, loss of these ships will not have been in vain.

NOT GOOD TO DO

This proposal does credit to the hearts of its sponsors, but not to their heads. The suggested dispcsal of these naval destroyers is not, in fact, the best thing for us to do at this juncture, but the worst thing—viewed from the standpoint of our security and avoidance of war.

It seems to me that any realistic examination of the facts and appraisal of the consequences must lead to this conclusion. I say this with full recognition of the importance to us of British sea power and of our earnest hope that it may survive. But I do not favor and I am confident that the vast majority of Americans do

not favor going to war with Germany on that account, even were we ready for war, which we are not. Nor do I favor a course, the likely consequences of which would be the piecemeal dispersal and destruction of our present Navy.

Let us dismiss at the outset the notion that we possess a large number of destroyers that, as far as we are concerned, are "obsolete" and of no account, but which could be of immense service to Britain in her present fight for life. These vessels do not change their quality and value by a change of flag. The truth is that we have no "surplus" in the destroyer class, or indeed in any other class in our fleet. Three hundred or more over-age and once decommissioned destroyers have been put back into service—some of them being converted into fast mine layers, aircraft tenders, and anti-aircraft vessels, types of craft urgently needed in our Navy. Many of these older destroyers are now performing invaluable service on neutrality patrol. Others are being used to train officers and men of the Naval Reserve.

ALL DESTROYERS NEEDED

So to the question, Are all the destroyers which our Navy now possesses needed for United States defense now and later? the answer is most emphatically "Yes." There is no room for argument on that score.

But there are other and even more compelling reasons why we should reject this proposal for turning over to England a portion of our own fleet, unless we are ready and willing, with our eyes open, to enter the present war on the side of England.

The transfer of these destroyers from our flag and our fleet to the British flag and the British Fleet, no matter by what method or device or circumlocution, makes mockery of our declared policy of neutrality and nonintervention. It is an act of belligerency and of war.

The putting of a part of our Navy at the disposal of Britain is not a measure "short of war." It is an act of war.

The champions of this proposal contend that in moving to aid and to save the British Fleet we are serving ourselves and acting for our own protection. If we accept that premise, what is the conclusion? Is it that we should send our entire fleet to England in order to make an English victory so much more certain? I see no middle course, no halfway point. Either we should enter the war and give our all or we should stay out of war and retain our fleet intact for the defense of our own country.

Obviously the advocates of reinforcing the British Navy with some of our destroyers can offer no positive assurance that such a step will insure British victory or save the British Fleet. The most that can be said is that it might prove just enough to tilt the scales in Britain's favor.

It is said that risking 40 or 50 destroyers is a fair gamble that war can be kept on the other side of the Atlantic.

Let me inquire: If 40 or 50 old destroyers do not save the world, will we gamble 150 or 200 destroyers? And if they do not save the world, will we next gamble with our cruisers and our aircraft carriers, and then with our battleships, and then with our manpower?

GAMBLE ALWAYS GROWS

Why gamble with the United States Fleet—the only force in the world today that can keep war from our shores; the only force in the world that can prevent aircraft from beyond the seas from bombing our large cities, our industrial areas, and our civilian populations?

Of particular pertinency in the present discussion are the findings as to naval policy which were set forth in the report submitted to the Senate last May by the Senate Naval Affairs Committee in connection with the naval expansion bill then pending. This report reflected the composite views and considered judgment of the Senate committee after listening to the testimony of naval officers and experts. These conclusions (what follows is an exact quotation from the report) were:

FOR UNITED STATES DEFENSE

(1) "Our naval and air forces should be preserved for our own defense, if and when needed."

(2) "We are not prepared to participate in the European war and we do not possess the necessary weapons to make our efforts effective."

(3) "The assumption that British sea power may be destroyed implies that we should take our stand in the Western Hemisphere, where our military power can be applied effectively and efficiently; that our Navy should not be subjected to the hazards of short-range, shore-based aircraft, and small submarines based on the Continent of Europe."

(4) "It implies that our Navy should be retained intact to prevent ship-borne aircraft from directing attacks against our cities and industrial areas and prevent an enemy from establishing naval, air, or submarine bases in this hemisphere which would threaten our security by attacking in any manner our vital sea communications or our homeland."

I submit that nothing has since transpired to alter the validity of the foregoing conclusions.

KEEP OUT OF WAR

To be sure, France has fallen, and England's situation is more critical. The inadequacy of our own defenses is more apparent. Our own fears are greater. But these circumstances are no ground for a different policy or a different judgment. Instead they serve to reinforce and to underscore the advice to keep out of the war in Europe and keep all of our fleet for our own defense.

In conclusion, let me underscore the fact that disposal of these destroyers without affirmative action by Congress would be a violation of existing law. Legal hair-splitting will not suffice. It is also noteworthy that to date no request or recommendation has been forthcoming from the President or from the Navy Department. As recently as June 14, the Acting Secretary of the Navy, Lewis Compton, testified before the Senate Naval Affairs Committee concerning the disposal of destroyers: "If we were asked to do it, our answer would be 'No.'"

My answer is "No," I am for keeping out of war and for keeping our fleet intact.

Third-Term Menace—If Roosevelt Is the Indispensable Man, "God Save America"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. ROBSION

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 25, 1940

ARTICLE BY DAVID LAWRENCE

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to me by the House I am including in my remarks an illuminating article by the able and distinguished editor and writer, Hon. David Lawrence, of the United States News, under the caption, "The third-term scandal." Mr. Lawrence portrays most vividly the intrigue, deceit, and other questionable methods by which President Roosevelt secured this third-term nomination. It has been clear to many of us that Mr. Roosevelt has been an active and consistent seeker after this nomination for the past 2 years. Every subterfuge known to clever and skillful politicians has been resorted to by Mr. Roosevelt and his inner circle of New Deal appointees to gratify the wishes of our politically ambitious President.

THE THIRD-TERM MENACE

George Washington, the Father of his Country, "first in war, first in peace, and first in the hearts of his countrymen," with many years of successful and patriotic service to his country on the battlefield and in the councils of the Nation, did not claim to be the "indispensable man." He did not seek a third term. The American people with one heart and one mind urged him to do so. At that time there were wars raging in Europe. France, England, and other countries brought the wars to our shores, yet Washington did not consider himself indispensable. He wisely, unselfishly, and patriotically refused to set such an example.

Jefferson, the founder of the Democratic Party, followed in the footsteps of Washington. He declared if any President should be a candidate for a third election he should be rejected because such an act was a demonstration of such President's ambitious views.

President Andrew Jackson, the patron saint of the Democratic Party, in many messages to Congress urged that the Presidential office should be limited to one term. He refused to be considered for the third term. This was likewise true of two other great Democrats, Madison and Monroe.

The Democratic platform in 1896 declared unequivocally against the third term and strongly advocated a constitutional amendment making a President of the United States ineligible to be reelected after one term. The Democratic platform in 1912 declared that no man should be eligible for a third term. As late as 1928 the United States Senate adopted a resolution against a third term by an overwhelming majority, and practically every Democrat in the Senate voted for the resolution. Many of the Democratic leaders of the United States Senate today voted for that resolution. These include Senators BARKLEY, GLASS, SHEPPARD, HARRISON, PITTMAN, SMITH, WHEELER, TYDINGS, KING, MCKELLAR, THOMAS of Oklahoma, and others. Even the venerable Senator NORRIS, of Nebraska, voted for the resolution.

President Wilson made the positive statement, "There is no indispensable man in this country." President Roosevelt quoted this statement of President Wilson's with approval at New York City, November 3, 1932. Former Presidents, party platforms, and other great leaders have opposed a third term because it was a real threat to the freedom and liberties of the American people. This great office was considered by Washington, Jefferson, and Jackson as too powerful to be held by one man more than 8 consecutive years. If the power and influence of the Presidential office was dangerous then to our liberties, how much more dangerous is it today. President Roosevelt is the first American President to seek actively the nomination for a third consecutive term. President Grant, who had rendered unusual services to our country, was persuaded by some overenthusiastic admirers and friends to seek the nomination of the Republican Party for a third term, but it did not follow his 8 years as President. The Republican Party denied him that nomination. Another Roosevelt, the great "Teddy," sought the nomination of the Republican Party for a third term, but it was not consecutive. The Republican Party denied to him that nomination.

The American people can now more fully appreciate the warnings of Washington, Jefferson, Jackson, and other Presidents. We now see the present occupant of the White House using the great power of his office to whip into submission the lawmaking body. They have given to the President more than $22,000,000,000 in blank checks with dictatorial powers. With this he has created more bureaus and commissions than any dozen or more Presidents, and has increased the number of Federal officeholders from approximately 500,000 to more than a million. He has handed out great subsidies and bounties to numerous large and powerful groups. He has surrounded himself for the most part with "yes men," and with all of this influence and money, the efforts of every other Democrat to be considered for the nomination were frustrated. Garner, Farley, McNutt, Wheeler, and their friends were run over by the Roosevelt political machine and were clubbed into submission.

The President undertook to give the impression that he was not interested, yet Secretary Ickes and others went about over the country boosting the President, collecting delegates, and viciously assaulting other Democrats seeking this nomination.

The Roosevelt machine, the greatest political machine ever built in this country, was ruthless. There never was a convention so completely dominated by officeholders and political favorites as the Democratic Convention at Chicago that nominated President Roosevelt and Secretary Wallace. Mr. Roosevelt and his machine not only dictated his nomination, but they ran roughshod over the gentleman from Alabama, Speaker BANKHEAD, and others and gave the nomination for Vice President to Secretary Wallace, and some of the important cogs in this great machine were the corrupt machine of Kelly and Nash of Chicago, the Hague machine of New Jersey, the Pendergast machine of Kansas City, and others. Yet we are told that this third-term nomination came as a result of the overwhelming demand of the American people. What must be the all-consuming political ambition of President Roosevelt to cause him to attempt to destroy this third-term tradition, to fly in the face of the warnings of Washington, Jefferson, Madison, Monroe, Jackson, Wilson, and the platforms and resolutions adopted by his own Democratic Party through the years? Did any Hitler, Mussolini, or Stalin ever have a more consuming ambition for place and power? Mr. Roosevelt has forsaken the path of Washington; Jefferson, the founder of the Democratic Party; Jackson, its patron saint; and Wilson, the great war President. Is it little wonder that millions of patriotic Democrats refuse to follow him?

THE INDISPENSABLE MAN

It is urged that President Roosevelt is the indispensable man in this great country. Neither Washington, Jefferson, Jackson, or any one of the other great Presidents was, but Mr. Roosevelt is.

Mr. Roosevelt and his backers say that we have an emergency and no other American, however able, experienced, or patriotic, could meet the emergency. There were wars in Europe when Washington handed over this great office to Adams and when Jefferson relinquished control to Madison.

Hitler, Mussolini, and Stalin each for years has claimed and now claims that he is the indispensable man. They will persist in that claim until the people overthrow them.

What is this great emergency? We have now had nearly 8 years of manufactured emergencies. Mr. Roosevelt claimed it was an emergency that made it necessary to burn and destroy our pigs, hogs, cattle, sheep, and crops; it was an emergency when he insisted that Congress give to him the power to stack or pack the Supreme Court; it was an emergency when he insisted that Members of Congress should vote for unconstitutional measures. It was another one of his emergencies when the President forced through Congress the unconstitutional A. A. A., N. R. A., and other acts. It was another manufactured emergency when he embarked on the great folly of buying up all the gold and silver of foreign countries and paying them enormous subsidies and thereby increasing the tax burden and the national debt.

It was another manufactured emergency when he insisted that Congress give to him the power over our money and devalued the dollar from 100 cents to 59 cents when the Constitution as a matter of fact invests this great power in the Congress. By reason of several other manufactured emergencies, a subservient Congress gave to the President more than $22,000,000,000 in blank checks with unlimited powers. It was another emergency when the President increased the deficits by nearly $30,000,000,000, increased the amount of Federal revenues collected from the people more than 200 percent, and increased the national debt from a little over $20,000,000,000 to more than $50,000,000,000 now of direct and indirect debts and obligations of the National Government.

Under the claim of other so-called emergencies, he created more bureaus and commissions than any score of Presidents. He increased the number of Federal officeholders from approximately 500,000 to more than 1,000,000. Due to his emergencies, the cost of the Federal Government annually has increased more than 100 percent.

President Roosevelt denounced Hoover for having $4,000,000,000 of deficits in 3 years; however, by reason of his emergencies, the deficits of this Government for a single year has exceeded that sum, and this fiscal year will perhaps see that sum of deficits doubled. By reason of his emergencies he has forced through Congress one or more tax bills at every session, increasing the taxes of the American people.

The trouble with it all is that one of his emergencies creates several other emergencies. They are as prolific as guinea pigs. We have observed for several years that all of our money, resources, and credit are consumed by the emergencies created by the President and his unwise policies.

HIS NEW EMERGENCY—FOREIGN WAR

Mr. Roosevelt has made a failure of handling the domestic problems of this country. The American people have discovered that his policy to tax and squander, borrow, waste and spend, destroy our stock and crops, and regiment our people has ended up in dismal failure. In order to divert the minds of the American people, he now insists that the great emergency is a foreign war.

If there is a threat of danger from a foreign war and a real emergency does confront the American people, is Mr. Roosevelt the man to head this Nation at this time? Can we rely upon his judgment and wisdom in this hour?

It is urged that we do not have, perhaps, more than one friend among all the nations of Europe, Asia, and Africa. Is any person in this country more responsible for that condition than Mr. Roosevelt himself? If he had the wisdom of a Washington—who was not an indispensable man—and had followed the policy of the Father of his Country, would we not now have many friends among the nations of Europe, Asia, and Africa?

Mr. Roosevelt's vituperation has created a feeling of resentment against our Nation in many countries. And how much encouragement did he give these various countries to get into war? How much has he contributed by his acts to create another World War? Is there no other American who could handle our foreign policy with as much wisdom as President Roosevelt?

If such an emergency exists, then the important question is cur national defense. It is admitted by the President and we know that we are hopelessly unprepared to defend our own shores. We do not have the guns, planes, tanks, supplies, other equipment, or quarters.

The President says we could supply an army with underwear and shoes and declares to us that these BVD's and shoes could be bought in the stores and factories of our country. While BVD's and shoes are necessary and desirable in equipping an army, they would not be very effective against tanks, dive bombers, and machine guns. We see in the pictures and in the papers that they are using ice-cream trucks for tanks, empty beer kegs for bombs, wooden models and stovepipes for trench mortars and artillery. The President admits that we do not have the equipment and supplies or quarters for our meager Army. He has been telling the American people for 2 years now that we could expect a world war and that we would inevitably be drawn into it. He and Hitler came into power about the same time. He was in a better position to know than any other person in the United States the danger that confronted the country. He had over $8,000,000,000 placed in his hands by the Congress for the special purpose of defense and he had over $22,000,000,000 in blank checks. Much of it was spent for raking leaves, counting trees in cities, and other "boondoggling" projects. He could have used billions of this money to furnish jobs to the unemployed and buy naterials for our defense. He, being the indispensable man, must have known all these things. His assumption of being the indispensable man makes him wiser than Washington, Jefferson, Jackson, and our other great Presidents.

A nation fights not merely with men, ships, guns, planes and tanks. Important factors in fighting and winning a war are money and credits, a well-organized and prosperous industry with the workers employed at good wages, an agriculture that is based upon a policy of plenty and not scarcity, and a high morale among the people. Could Mr. Roosevelt have done more to weaken our preparedness and our national defense than to have piled up more than $50,000,000,000 of direct and indirect debts and obligations, to have increased the taxes of the American people more than 200 percent, to have placed on their backs more than 500,000 additional useless officeholders, to have disorganized and discouraged industry, to have given our rich American markets to the cheaply produced products of industry and agriculture of foreign lands, to have built up a policy of scarcity, and to have yet an army of 10,000,000 unemployed with 20,000,000 people needing some form of public relief in this country? That is what Mr. Roosevelt has done—not for this country but to this country; not to prepare us but to make us less able to defend ourselves.

Now, in order to drown out the noise and clamor of 10,000,000 unemployed and 20,000,000 needy and the criticism coming up from all quarters of the land, he proposes to conscript the boys, the young men, and the old men of the Nation, 42,000,000 in all. For what? Is it for defense or to involve us in another European-Asiatic-African war?

How can America believe that a man who has made such a dismal failure of our defense problem and our domestic affairs and thus far in our foreign affairs be the indispensable man to meet the crisis which he says confronts us?

Oh, but it is said you must not change horses in the middle of the stream. The trouble is that Mr. Roosevelt, so far as solving our problems, has never got his feet wet—he is still on the bank where he was in 1933. He has been marching to the rear, toward the land of deficits, debts, unemployment, poverty, and internal strife, and if something is not done we will finally reach war, inflation, and repudiation.

The great emergency before the people of the United States in November 1940 is to defeat the ever-increasing political ambitions of Mr. Roosevelt and his army of officeholders and restore the Government to the people. If Mr. Roosevelt is the indispensable man with the record he has made, God save America!

The article by David Lawrence is as follows:

THE THIRD-TERM SCANDAL

(By David Lawrence)

Sincere differences of opinion on the question of whether a President of the United States should be elected for a third term are understandable. This writer has said again and again during the last 3 years that the issue is one for the people to decide, and they may reverse or confirm any precedent. For the will of the majority is supreme.

But there can hardly be any honest difference of opinion on the proposition that no President of the United States shall use his office or the power of the public purse to bring about either a second or a third renomination. Woodrow Wilson condemned the "illicit means" by which Presidents secure continuance in office and not the indefiniteness of their tenure.

Franklin D. Roosevelt tells us he has searched his conscience and has come to the conclusion that he has been called not by his party but by the people to stand for reelection. Let us concede that he sincerely believes he is needed. What shall we say then of the process by which he has gotten the nomination?

The text of the President's acceptance which appears in full on pages 16 to 19 of this issue should be read by everyone. Then the question one may ask is whether there is a single line in it that could not have been uttered at any time since the outbreak of war last September and the first day of the Democratic National Convention, July 15, 1940.

Why were the American people not told what the President had in mind? Why did the President for several months permit his own Cabinet officers and lieutenants—persons on the public pay roll—to go about the country conferring about his candidacy with the key men and bosses in the various States who pick the personnel of the delegations and what were the high officials of the administration, including members of quasijudicial commissions, doing at the Chicago convention? The press records that they were engaged in controlling the whole action and procedure of the convention itself.

SPIRIT OF HATCH ACT NOT OBEYED AT CONVENTION

True there is no Hatch Act to forbid officials who are of the policy-making group, those who are appointed and confirmed by the Senate, from participating in politics. It is not the letter of the law, however, which has been violated but the spirit of the whole system which has governed the morality of the Presidential office.

Will the President search his conscience again and ask himself whether it was right for him to remain silent as his own employees, the men who are the beneficiaries of his appointing power, actually influenced delegation after delegation and thus prevented any real contest within the Democratic Party?

Was it in keeping with the spirit of fairness and sportsmanship toward the other possible nominees to remain silent about his intentions until the very night when the convention was ready to nominate and when it was obviously too late for the party to agree on any other man?

MUST REPUDIATE METHOD USED TO WIN NOMINATION

The record of history will condemn these sins of omission which persuaded Mr. Roosevelt to refrain from speaking. His argument that to speak out would have been unwise from a policy standpoint internationally has merit only if an expression of disinclination to run were to have been interpreted as meaning that American foreign policy would not be continuous. Everybody who is fair about it has known for months that on foreign policy the American people alone would decide the major points without partisanship.

We are forced to the conclusion that the President yielded to the temptation to use the war situation as an excuse to justify his breaking of the third-term precedent. He now has plunged the Nation into bitter partisanship. He will have caused a partisan debate to be held on the issues growing out of the war. The moment the President, for example, proposes conscription, he will be attacked as defying the Democratic platform and as intending to lead the Nation into war. Extraneous issues will develop. It is a most regrettable state of affairs into which the misguided ambition of one man has led us.

What other inference can we make about Mr. Roosevelt's conception of his own indispensability? In effect, he says no other man in his party was as able, no man in his party could carry on—neither Paul McNutt, whom the convention delegates at Chicago gave the greatest ovation in modern political history, nor Secretary Hull, who has the respect and confidence of all elements in the Democratic Party. Does anyone dare to say Vice President GARNER, who twice won the electoral vote of his party, could not have been counted on to see that the American people's desires on foreign policy were carried out?

What Mr. Roosevelt asks us to infer now is that nobody else in the Democratic Party could have carried on his leadership, and that the Republican nominee is opposed to the principles of the Roosevelt foreign policy. This simply is not true.

If the President really has in mind that he wants primarily to see the New Deal continued in power for domestic-policy reasons,

he did not say so forthrightly. Yet few will doubt that this is the fundamental reason for his willingness to accept a third nomination. Had he expressed candidly such a viewpoint instead of by indirection, the position of the Democratic Party in this campaign would have been much stronger. It could have been more readily defended.

For basically why shouldn't the American people elect a man three times if they wish to do so? It is their business and in a democracy the majority wish is law. In this instance there is no constitutional inhibition, moreover, no law against a third term. The custom of two terms is a wise one, to be sure, and should be embodied in a constitutional amendment, but there is no such legal barrier today. It is, therefore, on the firm ground that the third nomination was obtained in a manner incompatible with the American system of fair play and the principles of morality in the conduct of public office that Mr. Roosevelt's nomination must be repudiated by the American people at the polls.

SILENCE GAVE CONSENT SIGNAL TO PARTY BOSSES

There should be a law strictly forbidding the use by any public officers of public money or influence to affect the selection of delegates. The wickedness of Wall Street becomes relatively insignificant compared to the wickedness of the political monopoly in government which we have allowed to grow up as a totalitarian power in American public life.

If the Democratic Party is to survive, the rank and file must reject the action of the acquiescent delegates in Chicago, who were handpicked by the administration and its numerous henchmen in the various States. Every true Democrat must search his conscience and determine now whether government by the politicians, government by men who transgress principles of government sacred to the memory of Thomas Jefferson, the founder of the party itself, shall be tainted ingloriously with the blot of a selfishness which did not permit them to put their country's tradition above personal aggrandizement.

"THERE IS NO INDISPENSABLE MAN"—WILSON

It would be easier not to write these lines of criticism. It would be easier to assume that the President in his preoccupation with foreign affairs and with the intensity of the whole world situation has honestly felt he alone could carry on. But shall we in the midst of a challenge to democracy abroad confess that democracy does not work at home? Must we yield to the doctrine of the indispensability of a single leader as they do in Germany? It was in 1912 when Woodrow Wilson, referring to Theodore Roosevelt's third-term ambitions, said: "There is no indispensable man."

Mr. Roosevelt has made the major blunder of his whole career. He has repudiated the action of the Father of this Country. When the Republic was scarcely 8 years old, when there was a war raging in Europe and danger of American involvement was great, when everybody agreed that only one man had the united support of all factions, Gen. George Washington laid down the Presidential office after two terms and called for rotation in the Presidency.

Franklin Roosevelt's mistake in judgment can be corrected by the American people on election day next November.

Fortunately the country can turn at the polls to Wendell Willkie—an able man, a patriotic man, a man who saw service overseas in the last war, a man whose ideals are not less passionately American than those of the incumbent President.

Great Britain changed from Chamberlain to Churchill in the midst of battle.

America can change from Roosevelt to Willkie in time of peace.

For, if the war which must come 3,000 miles to reach our shores does come, we do not want in the Presidency any man who resorts to subterfuge to win a nomination. He should not be entrusted with the leadership of the Nation because such a man will not be able to organize either the material or the spiritual resources of America which are so vitally necessary to the effective defense of our liberties and our democracy.

Young Democratic Clubs of Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 26 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. CLAUDE PEPPER, OF FLORIDA

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask leave to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address by the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] before the Young Democratic Clubs of Pennsylvania on Saturday evening, August 24, 1940, at Wilkes-Barre, Pa.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, my fellow young Democrats, never in history have young men and young women been so important as they are today. Millions of young men under arms have been fighting the world's war, carrying on the burden of the world's work. In fact, the whole tempo of the modern world is that of youth.

Moreover, young men and young women, more than any other group, are concerned about the future of the world because that future is their inheritance. The future for the youth of this generation is a colossal legacy moving toward us on the wings of time. How that future comes to us, whether it is richly laden with all the good things which should be ours or whether is it a squandered and dissipated trust, or indeed whether it has become a brigand's loot forever denied to us—all this is to be determined by the momentous events now shaking the earth.

Young men and young women of the past have never faced quite the same problems we face now. Ours is a world of transition. The tremor in the social crust is shaking violently all those institutions, those concepts, and dogmas we thought permanent. Principles, faiths, philosophies, which we thought as enduring as the mountains which had lived out the erosion of all the tumultous past, are breaking and crumbling and collapsing fantastically before our very eyes. The things in which we put our security, which were the bulwarks of our safety, behind which we felt immune, have crumbled and broken away and left us exposed to all the horrible dangers that we ever contemplated.

Evils we thought forever crushed, sinister forces we deemed ever allayed, sordid aims we said were stifled forever, even upon the lips of the most brazen of men, are now shouted from chancelries and palaces as aims of great nations and the death words of legions of men. Those virtues which we were taught from infancy, which we deemed the immutable landmarks of civilization, we hear scorned, debased, denounced, as some shibboleth from a decadent past.

Those who dreamed dreams of a better world, a gentler and kinder world, of the brotherhood of man, the universal fatherhood of Heaven's God; those who could hear the anguished voice of the crying babe, the muffled sob of the sorrowing mother; those who needed no guide but the subtle pull of conscience, they now are driven out of the councils of men as unworthy and childish.

What a world! What a life! What a challenge for those who are yet young!

I suppose the whole struggle which is now going on not only abroad but at home, not only in international but in national affairs, not only in military but in political and economical circles, can be summed up in a simple statement—might against right. I suppose history leaves no doubt but that that struggle has been in progress since man raised his head from the ground and beheld the sky and the sun and his God. Stated another way, it is, What is to be the arbiter of man's actions—force or justice? By what standards shall man live? For what things shall men die?

From the time when man first became conscious of his power, since lusts and greed crept into his character and the pull of desire and the urge of want guided his hand, he has had to struggle with himself and men have had to struggle with other men over that issue.

Religion, atonement, sacrifice, penance, instruction, obedience, restraint, self-denial, kindness, generosity have been leavening man's spirit, and man has come more and more to be "one who no stunted ascetic is full of life and fire but whose passions are trained to come to heel by a vigorous will, the servant of a tender conscience."

It has been a long, hard struggle. The graves of the martyrs line every mile of its way. The battle waxes and wanes. The tide rises and falls. The struggle has soaked the earth in blood. It has broken countless hearts. It has strewn its wreckage in every fertile valley, by every river bank, by the foot of every mountain, in plain and forest, even in lonely places, of a scarred world.

Anyone who has read history, however, has read it hopefully, for he could see the light growing brighter; slowly, indeed, but considerably brighter, as he turned the pages. Right was gradually raising its head even among those distinctive entities we call nations.

A sense began to develop that what it was wrong to do to one family it was wrong to 10,000,000 families. If it were wrong to steal from one man, it was not right to steal from millions of men. If it were wrong to enslave one man, it could not be right to enslave nations of men. There came about a consciousness that something which was vital to a nation's people, like a nation's course, was to be decided by a nation's people and not by the arbitrary will of one vain man. There was discernible the feeling that amity and comity should prevail among nations as among men. There was evidence that the individual had risen to a new dignity so that even the state served him like a willing servant.

Nations solemnly covenanted that they would renounce war as an instrument of national policy; they would submit their differences to judicial tribunals; they would respect and observe those common principles of decency and fairness which had come to be known as the laws of nations. It seemed for a while as if the old ways were dead, never to rise again. In fact, it seemed they could not rise again, because men had become too sane, too civilized, even too self-centered, to condone their resurrection. Yet not one of you in this sad hour needs to be reminded of how all these temples have been pulled down; the dishonored fragments of those solemn covenants scattered over the earth; these new practices repudiated and scorned. The goddess of right and justice stands ravaged before the monster of might and force. The courts of nations have been disbanded. The tribunals

which were the arbiters of wrong driven out and the law of nations has become the law of the jungle—

"Because the good old rule
Sufficeth them, the simple plan,
That they should take, who have the power,
And they should keep who can."

God is dethroned for a pagan Wotan. Christ is spat upon as a despised Jew. Man is enslaved. Avarice, greed, and vanity shape the courses of great nations and despots use men for pawns and women for breeders, while they build towers of Babel.

Young men and young women are not all on one side in that struggle, for such is the plasticity of human character that it can be made to fit almost any mold. There have been sinister forces which reached out while the characters of millions of boys and girls were tender and brought them into the mold of hardness, where the gentleness was crushed out and the sensibilities of ordinary youth destroyed. To such youth the world is held up for exploitation as a great adventure. They are impregnated with the fascinating prospect of the mastery of the lands and the peoples of the world. So vital is the philosophy upon which they are nourished that it is to them no less than a religion. Even to die for it is a privilege.

Other youth, to such youth, can only repeat as sadly as He uttered them, the words of the Master to those who crucified Him, "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do."

Young men who dream of another kind of a world, who cherish those humane qualities that others scorn, who revere those principles that others repudiate, who honor those heroic sacrifices that others belittle, they must gird their loins for the long struggle, for they are the champions of right and justice. They wear colors more beautiful than those of any fair lady for whom brave and gallant knights ever jousted in the tournament; their rewards are more satisfying than any of the other experiences of men and those young men and women who fight in the hard contest for those principles though they fight on earth do not fight alone.

In domestic affairs, young men and young women have seen a nation settling into a more rigid economic maturity. They have seen the age of the pioneer, the age of the builder, the age of the exploiter and the buccaneer. They have seen deadly struggle, heartless contest, savage war. They have seen deceit, coercion, theft, robbery, and murder, all moving like ghosts among men who struggled in the fields, in the factories, in the market places, and the counting houses. They have seen the resources of a nation squandered; the inheritance of a rich people thrown away; human life, too, counted cheap, as the virgin forest or the fallow fields. They have seen the haste and the hurry and the heartlessness of our growth, and finally, they have seen the twisted pattern, the torn fabric of a great nation, the spotted security of a great people.

But again the light has grown brighter as the pages of a nation's history have been fingered and turned. The sentiments of morality and religion, codes of decency and ethics, have found their way into men's businesses and professions, into their commercial as well as their cultural contacts with one another. Some sense of obligation has crept gradually into the consciousness of even strong men, and, too, there has been a growing appreciation of what the larger number was entitled to enjoy, even at the hands of the powerful. Men began to be hailed before a nation's judgment, not only for violating their country's laws but God's laws.

Premiums which have honored piracy have fast been disappearing, and through their concerted will, through their only medium—their government—the citizenry of a great nation has been prescribing standards of conduct which the powerful and the strong, as well as the timid and the weak, were required to observe. Moreover, through that medium a citizenry has been striving for that rough justice, that crude right, which men felt in their hearts to be the due of their fellow men.

Some regard has been had for every class. The weak have been strengthened, the strong restrained. Natural resources have been conserved, latent forces have been stimulated, new horizons have been opened, new avenues and channels of opportunity have been dug ahead of those who could not progress rapidly. A new vision has been disclosed as to what a nation could be and men and women and children could have. A new confidence in the destiny of common men has been born. The vistas of a new life to submerged millions challenge and dazzle those whose eyes have been dulled by many disappointments. There is the exhileration that someone does care in the heavy hearts of men upon whom sadness has often fallen. There is the surge of expectant hope through the arteries of our Nation.

Of course, the strong do not like to have their strength impaired. Of course, they do not like the shackles of restraint. Naturally, they do not welcome aid to those whom they might otherwise readily overpower. It is to be expected that they yield reluctantly, if at all, even to the majesty of a nation's voice expressed through a nation's government and withhold their approval to a policy which dares to deprive the capable, the fortunate, and the well-circumstanced of the special privileges which they deem to be their birthright.

When, therefore, a hero rises up to lead the hampered champions of might to a new enjoyment, free and unrestrained, of their noble inheritance of strength, they shout in choruses that echo in the marble halls of business, down the long wings of whirling factories, against the high ceilings of palatial homes their stout approval. From mountain peak to mountain peak of privilege, from cavity to cavity of accumulated wealth, from earth to vaulted dome of vanity and greed, it is wonderful to hear the echoes of their rejoicing. Every Captain Kidd thinks he sees the Spanish Main, heavy laden and unconvoyed, bearing down upon the horizon. Every pirate chooses his cove in which to hide his spoils, and all lay in a full store for the feast when everyone of the favored strong shall eat, drink, and be merry, comforted by the further assurance that tomorrow they shall not die.

So even in your and my America does that age-old struggle between might and right continue. All young men are not on our side. Some of them, too, have been taken up on the mountain top and shown the green valley and they have been told they could satisfy every desire of their hearts. Indeed, it has been made to appear that the world was really theirs to take. That their very power to take it was an evidence of God's will that they should have it. The adventure of taking it has stirred their blood. They sense the thrill there is in riding after the hounds to the kill. It is all a great game, they think, this institution that holds out to men the hope that they may grow as big and great and powerful as genius, strength, and fortuitous fate will allow.

But young men who feel as you and I, who feel that all men, even the strong, have obligations; that all power is delimited with responsibility; that life is not just a game but a noble journey; that human beings are not slaves, either physical, political, or economic; that poor men dream dreams; and weaker men cherish ambitions; and timid men want to progress; and little men strive to grow; and bungling, awkward, slow-thinking, and thick-fingered men want to get above the hoe—such young men must carry on.

Young men and women of our generation are making a great decision as to which side they are on, as to what is going to be written in the book about their lives, of what debt they are going to put their generation under to them—whether they shall die indebted to their age or their age indebted to them. To young men who are strong but gentle minded, able but bred in honesty, tough but capable of being tender, determined but not stubborn, to young men who have an eye to see, to young men who like that coterie of young men, including JOE GUFFEY, of Pennsylvania, who held up the hand of Woodrow Wilson when he was struggling to hold up the hand of little men and just men everywhere; to young men who, like JOE GUFFEY, will forsake their class for their cause and throughout a long and useful life adhere to it against every temptation and the siren call of every intriguing appeal; to such young men and to like young women is given the saving of the future of all men and women, the saving of young people's inheritance, the conservation of the young's incomparable legacy. To such young men and young women is reserved the satisfaction of eventual victory, the consolation of a peaceful conscience, and the exhilaration that comes from having had one's part in a great and glorious battle when the stakes tipped the clouds and from every star and planet falls a divine benediction to the victor's brow.

Signing Investment Company and Investment Advisers' Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. WAGNER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 26 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement issued by the President of the United States on the occasion of signing the Investment Company and Investment Advisers' Act of 1940, dated August 23, 1940.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I have just signed the Investment Company Act of 1940 and the Investment Advisers Act of 1940; legislation which both houses of Congress passed unanimously. These acts give the Securities and Exchange Commission power to regulate investment trusts and investment counselors. They mark another milestone in this administration's vigorous program—begun in 1933 and supplemented in 1934, 1935, 1938, and again in 1939—to protect the investor. As the pressure of international affairs increases, we are ready for the emergency because of our vigorous fight to put our domestic affairs on a true democratic basis. We are cleaning house, putting our financial machinery in good order. This program is essential, not only because it results in necessary reforms, but for the much more important reason that it will enable us to absorb the shock of any crisis.

There is no necessity of reviewing in detail the many unhealthy practices which this legislation is designed to eliminate. It is enough to point out that the investment trusts have themselves

actively urged that an agency of the Federal Government assume immediate supervision of their activities. This attitude on the part of the investment trust industry and investment advisers is most commendable.

It is a source of satisfaction that businessmen have at last come to recognize that it is this administration's purpose to aid the honest businessman and to assist him in bringing higher standards to his particular corner of the business community. In the case of this legislation, it deserves notice that the investment trust industry insisted that the Congress grant to the Securities and Exchange Commission broader discretionary powers than those contemplated in the original regulatory proposals. Not only is this a tribute to the personnel of the S. E. C. and an endorsement of its wisdom and essential fairness in handling financial problems, but it serves well to indicate that many businessmen now realize that efficient regulation in technical fields such as this requires an administering agency which has been given flexible powers to meet whatever problems may arise.

This in itself is enough to demonstrate that we have come a long way since the bleak days of 1929, when the market crash swept away the veil which up to then had hidden the "behind the scenes" activity of our high financiers and showed all too clearly the sham and deceit which characterized so many of their actions.

The Securities and Exchange Commission has been established to protect the investor. Looking back at the various acts which have been passed and placed under the jurisdiction of that Commission, the breadth of this administration's program is apparent. In 1933 the Securities Act was passed, preventing misrepresentation and fraud and requiring full disclosure by those who wished to sell securities. In 1934 the Securities Exchange Act was passed, regulating stock exchanges, preventing market manipulations, and placing curbs on excessive speculation. In 1935 the Public Utility Holding Company Act was passed. In 1938 the Bankruptcy Act was amended to enable the Securities and Exchange Commission to participate in corporate reorganizations in order to act as technical adviser to the court and advocate for the best interests of the small and inarticulate security holders. Finally only last year additional legislation was passed requiring corporate trustees under indentures to assume true fiduciary obligations.

No better example of the true meaning of this program can be found than in the legislation regulating public-utility holding companies. During the 1920's these corporate monstrosities had been permitted to pyramid stock holdings on top of stock holdings until a few men at the top, with only a microscopic investment of their own, could control the smallest action of those who ran the far-flung operating companies at the base of the pyramid. Watered stock and high rates to consumers signified holding-company management. Those at the top juggled corporations for selfish purposes. This situation was contrary to the American way of life, and, had the holding companies not been checked, they would have threatened the very existence of our democratic processes. The Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1935 is designed to break down these top-heavy structures to the end that local operating managements will come back into their own and be given an opportunity to serve the immediate community without being subjected to the direction of an absentee and dictatorial holding company management.

In every direction a conscientious and successful effort has been made to require the investment banker, the broker, and the dealer, the security salesman, the issuer, and the great financial institutions themselves to recognize the high responsibilities they owe to the public.

We will continue to push our program for the protection of the investor on all fronts because we are convinced of its essential soundness. I have great hopes that the act which I have signed today will enable the investment-trust industry to fulfill its basic purpose as a vehicle to diversify the small investors' risk and to provide a valuable source of equity capital for deserving small and new business enterprises which the investment bankers have been unable to finance.

Tribute to Hon. John M. Coffee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEWIS B. SCHWELLENBACH

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 26 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

ARTICLE FROM COMMON SENSE

Mr. SCHWELLENBACH. Mr. President, I ask consent to have inserted in the RECORD an interesting article appearing in the September issue of Common Sense concerning JOHN M. COFFEE, Representative in Congress from the Sixth District of Washington.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Common Sense]

JOHN M. COFFEE UNDERSTANDS HIS JOB; THE CHAIRMAN OF THE CONGRESS LIBERAL BLOC

The hue and cry over national preparedness has obscured one of the most significant trends in national politics—the increasing prestige of the liberal bloc in the House of Representatives. War and Presidential politics hold the spotlight now. But the strength of the liberal minority in Congress, and its ability to keep its head in the present crisis, will be an important factor in determining whether or not we are able to stay out of war.

The House liberal bloc has received very little public notice recently. Its size has diminished in the last 2 years; almost half of the progressive Democrats in the lower Chamber were nosed out by Republicans in the 1938 elections, including such leaders as Maury Maverick, Thomas R. Amlie, Jerry O'Connell, John Bernard, and Byron Scott. Several other "liberals"—ALLEN of Pennsylvania, for example—jumped on the conservative bandwagon when they saw how things were going. The reduction of the New Deal forces was devastatingly revealed in the lack of opposition to the Dies committee. In 1939 43 votes were cast against the committee's appropriation; this year only 21 Congressmen registered their opposition to Mr. DIES. The solid core of progressives was cut in half.

Today there are signs of a come-back in the House. In this year's session the progressives mustered enough votes to boost the appropriations asked by President Roosevelt for the C. C. C. and N. Y. A. They rallied support for the President's request that the $975,000,000 appropriation for W. P. A. be spent in 8 months if necessary. Even in the excitement over national defense, the new billion-dollar tax bill showed the hand of the liberal bloc. It may not have been perfect from the viewpoint of the consumer; but considering the sales tax which the N. A. M. and other business groups would like to have fastened on us the new bill was surprisingly fair.

A large part of the revolt against the Woodrum-Taber block, with its false economy philosophy, was traceable to the increasing strength of the Democratic Party and to the fact that this is an election year. But to a considerable degree it was also directly attributable to the hard work and organizing ability of one man—Representative JOHN M. COFFEE, of Washington, chairman of the liberal bloc. In the months to come his leadership will be an important factor in the fight for the retention of New Deal social legislation and against involvement in the European war.

When the liberal bloc was first organized in 1937 Maury Maverick was its acknowledged leader. Colorful and personally popular, Maverick was an effective fighter for social legislation. When he was unseated in 1938 no one was able to step into his place immediately. The liberal bloc continued to meet occasionally, but under a rotating chairmanship its work was poorly handled and the progressives were routed on nearly every issue in the 1939 session.

Then last summer JOHN COFFEE was elected permanent chairman of the liberals. Not such an individualist and showman as Maverick, he has had less national publicity than the ebullient Texan. But for a year now he has been quietly rebuilding the crumpled bloc; the left-of-center House Members have been meeting more regularly under his leadership, and the voting has been more consistent. A new group sponsored by them—the "unemployment bloc," headed by JERRY VOORHIS, of California, and boasting 55 Members, including several Republicans—has made a serious study of unemployment in all its phases, and the reports of its various subcommittees helped to stimulate the growing opposition to the drive against the social services.

TWO DECADES OF ACHIEVEMENT

COFFEE is an exuberant 220-pounder in his early forties. His political career began when he was a student at the University of Washington in Seattle, where, with his debating coach LOUIS SCHWELLENBACH, he organized a Woodrow Wilson for President club. From Washington he went on to Yale, where he took a doctor-of-jurisprudence degree—a rare achievement for a Congressman. Back from Yale, he became a labor lawyer in Tacoma; and also served at attorney for the State Civil Service Employees' League. He wrote the law that gave Tacoma one of the most advanced civil-service systems of any city in the country.

On the side COFFEE dabbled in politics. In 1922 he was a campaign manager for C. C. Dill, one of the shrewdest politicians ever to come out of the West, who served two terms as Democratic Senator from Washington in a period when every other major office in the State was held by a Republican. Later COFFEE went to Washington, D. C., as Dill's secretary, and during 2 years on that job he stowed away a good deal of useful lore on the devious workings of national politics.

He entered politics on his own behalf in 1936, running for Congress in Tacoma. He was endorsed by the Washington Commonwealth Federation, a coalition of liberal-radical groups and a rising force in State politics. He skinned through the primaries, rode into office on the Roosevelt landslide. A week after the votes were counted, when most Congressmen were busily forgetting their pre-election promises, COFFEE voluntarily appeared before the State convention of the W. C. F. He startled the delegates by a forthright statement that he fully realized he would not have obtained a plurality in the primaries and would not therefore have been elected without federation support. "And," he added, "I will

promise you that as long as I am in Congress I will represent the principles for which this organization stands."

His record has proved his good faith. He has fought hard for the moderately "leftist" aims of the federation—public ownership of monopolies and utilities, consumer legislation, the protection of labor, civil rights, and relief. One of his first acts was to introduce the Coffee-Pepper Federal arts bill to put the W. P. A. arts projects on a permanent basis. Soon afterward he threw the Coffee pure food and drug bill into the hopper. This was an improved Tugwell bill with teeth in it, some provisions of which were incorporated into the Wheeler-Lea bill.

COFFEE also introduced legislation to authorize Federal purchase and ownership of natural resources—specifically oil, gas, coal, and power. Among his current bills is one prohibiting the use of the National Guard in strikes (which just now is pigeonholed by the Military Affairs Committee), and another making illegal the denial of citizenship to aliens who have been on relief. He is best known, however, for his eloquent battles on behalf of W. P. A.

Sometimes COFFEE has clashed with the administration, but his divergencies have always been in a leftward direction. He was bitterly critical of the neutrality law during the Spanish War. When last year's special session modified the law, he started working for an 80 percent excess-profits tax on war profits. He holds the opinion that the administration's oil policy is one of its greatest mistakes, and he waged a one-man "blitzkrieg" that almost killed the Connally Hot Oil Act last year.

PRACTICAL POLITICIAN PLUS

The portly westerner has an uncanny knack for winning the voters to his side in spite of his consistently left-of-center record. In 1938 when Maverick and so many other liberals were being knocked out of national politics, COFFEE not only got reelected but he got a larger vote than ever before. In fact he received the second largest majority of any Democratic candidate north of the Mason and Dixon's line.

The basic reason for COFFEE'S popularity is his understanding of elementary political principles. "Practical politics," says he, "can be reduced to rules almost as exact as those of medicine and law." His first axiom is to stand firmly for the things he believes in, thereby holding the support of the liberals who put him into office. At the same time, he has the happy faculty for forgiving his enemies once the heat of an election is over, and he rarely antagonizes the conservatives who voted against him. He keeps the liberals posted on public issues nad makes sure they know how he votes on these issues; but he doesn't attack the conservatives directly, and he doesn't flaunt his congressional voting record before him. Incidentally, while it has been charged that the W. C. F. is subject to considerable Communist influence, no such accusations have been made against the Tacoma Congressman.

KEEP COFFEE IN THE HOUSE

COFFEE'S second principle is to keep his political fences mended. It is probably the most important rule in his handbook. He doesn't neglect the pet wishes of his constituents. Within 2 years of his first election he had successfully promoted a number of ingenious improvements for Tacoma. He made friends on the Appropriations Committee. He got a bridge across Puget Sound west of the city, a bridge that the townsfolk had hankered after for 20 years. He got a weather bureau. He secured $12,000,000 to build one of the three greatest Army airports in North America—McChord Field—just outside Tacoma. And he saw to it that the voters knew all about his accomplishments.

COFFEE keeps his political campaigns on a popular level. He discusses international issues, for example, on the basis of how they will affect the average man, and the Capitol postman reveals that COFFEE is among the top five Congressmen in the amount of mail received. One of the best ways of making people feel friendly is to make them smile, and in 1938 COFFEE punned his way into the good graces of thousands in his district by distributing miniature cans of high-grade coffee labeled "Keep COFFEE in the House."

As chairman of the liberal bloc, a hard-headed politician with profound liberal convictions, and a noninterventionists who believes in strong defense, JOHN COFFEE'S voting record in Congress matches that of any progressive you can name.

AUDREY GRANNEBERG.

The Anthem, God Bless America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. MEAD

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 26 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

ARTICLE FROM THE EAST SIDE NEWS, NEW YORK CITY

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article on Irving Berlin's anthem, God Bless America, written by Harry H. Schlacht and published in the East Side News, New York City, issue of August 3, 1940.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the East Side News, New York City]

GOD BLESS AMERICA

By Harry H. Schlacht

"God bless America,
Land that I love,
Stand beside her and guide her,
Through the night with the light from above.
From the mountains,
From the prairie,
From the ocean white with foam,
God bless America,
My home, sweet home."

God Bless America, Irving Berlin's thrilling anthem, has stirred the hearts and hopes of all Americans. It is fearless and courageous, at once a challenge and a covenant, a prayer and a solemn warning.

From every whirling wheel in America, from every factory that turns, from every growing thing that breathes its prayer of plenty; from every quiet schoolhouse, from every crowded market, from every peaceful home goes up a song of praise and thanksgiving to hymn a Nation's tribute to Irving Berlin, East Side immigrant boy who hung the streaming emblazonry of the new national anthem from the very battlements of heaven.

Irving Berlin's immortal contribution epitomizes the majestic role played by immigrants in the establishment of our great Nation. All the races from the *Mayflower* down the corridor of time have marched to one measure—to one flag. There flashes upon the screen of our memory the embattled farmers at Concord; the barefoot suffering at Valley Forge; the sacrifice at Gettysburg, and the devotion and heroism of the World War. In all the wars of the Republic the immigrants and the sons of immigrants have written a glorious page in American history. They have kept the flag clean and unsullied. These noble men died and bled to perpetuate the American spirit of freedom. No greater dream ever rose in the minds of man than that which came to the founding fathers of the Republic. The basic idea was liberty. The glorious thrill of freedom spread until it attracted people from earth's remotest shores. This picture of consecrated zeal will never fade from the canvas of human memory. And out of this dream was born the American spirit which proved to be neither area nor population. It became the incarnate flame of freedom for the oppressed of the world.

God Bless America. Irving Berlin voices the feelings that are in our breasts. He has rendered an imperishable service to the land of his adoption. He has established a trust fund providing that all royalties from God Bless America be devoted to the youth of the country for patriotic purposes. He deserves a nation's salute.

Let us today fervently rededicate ourselves to the glorious traditions and principles by which our form of government has been consecrated to the cause of individual freedom. Let us give thanks that in this most vicious crucible in all history America has kept the stainless banner of the Republic flying with peace and honor. And let us offer a prayer to that infinite source of watchfulness which greater than all human agencies has been kind to our Nation.

God bless America .

Gloria in excelsis Deo et in terra pax hominibus bonae voluntatis.

The Young Democratic Clubs of Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 26 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY, OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by me at the convention banquet of the Young Democratic Clubs of Pennsylvania at Wilkes-Barre, Pa., August 24, 1940.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, fellow Young Democrats, although I am slightly past the maximum age for membership in the Young Democrats of Pennsylvania, I consider myself a young Democrat, because my beliefs and my political principles are the same as yours. I don't mind telling you that the older I get, the more liberal I become. The Republican Party failed the Nation because it did not stay young. It got old and rheumatic. Its

arteries were so hardened and it was so set in its ways that it couldn't meet the new conditions that faced the people. The Democratic Party has kept young because its principles have been young and vital, based upon the needs of a growing, changing America. In fact, some of the things Thomas Jefferson said more than a century ago are still looked upon as a trifle radical and ahead of the times by some of the reactionaries of the Republican machine.

As a young Democrat, I want to take this opportunity to pay my tribute to the new national chairman of our party, an old and good friend of mine, Ed Flynn of New York. Knowing his long and honorable record in politics and public affairs over a period of many years, I am certain that he will distinguish himself in his new position as a real two-fisted fighter for Democratic principles. I know he is going to put on a campaign this year that will bring him national recognition as a political statesman. I am certain that every Democratic leader in Pennsylvania will assure him the utmost loyalty and cooperation, and by that I mean nothing less than Pennsylvania's electoral vote for Roosevelt and Wallace this November.

We have been treated recently to the spectacle of Wendell Willkie, the Wall Street farmer, posing as a "holier than thou" who wouldn't think of working with or through a political organization or machine.

Wendell might as well come out of the cornstalks. We know him. For years he played Democratic machine politics because he thought it would serve his interests. At the same time he was working with and helping to develop one of the most ruthless political machines in America—the public-utility lobby.

Willkie came into public prominence for one reason only—he was the leader, the organizer, the brains behind that lobby. When he found that he couldn't get the Democrats to play the utility game, he went over to the Republicans, where he always belonged.

Don't let anybody kid you that the Willkie crowd was a gang of political amateurs. The utilities and the Wall Street financiers behind them have been playing cold-blooded, ruthless politics ever since Tom Edison invented the electric light. Before that time they were busy with railroad and streetcar franchises; there hasn't been a time in American history that the financial community hasn't been up to its neck in politics. With the development of utilities on a vast scale, with the development of the giant holding company with its complex interlocking directorates controlling from the Wall Street conning towers, it geared together a vast political organization on a Nation-wide scale. It developed some master politicians, and for years it has played a harder and faster game of politics than either Republican or Democratic leaders ever dreamed of playing.

That organization isn't exactly unknown to us here in Pennsylvania. We saw it lick Congressman Driscoll up in Elk County, because he fought for the holding-company bill and exposed the fake telegram barrage. We saw it go after the scalps of the Democratic Congressmen who defied the utilities in Washington. We saw it fight against the new Pennsylvania utility law. We saw it working with the James boys to get control of our own public-utilities commission and we saw the pay-off when the public-utilities commission budget was cut in half to hamstring its operations. If those fellows are amateurs, Babe Ruth was a sand-lot bench warmer.

The Wall Street organizations have always operated the Republican machines by remote control. This time they decided to do the job themselves. Willkie was told off to be the front man, a job he has been doing for years as a Washington lobbyist. When the regular Republican organization leaders objected Willkie was shrewd enough to make a virtue of necessity by publicly repudiating "machines." At the same time his Wall Street associates were busy whipping the machine leaders into line. We have already seen the result of this in Pennsylvania, where all the discredited and corrupt gangs which have been running Republican affairs for years are solidly supporting Willkie. My authority for this is Moe Annenberg's Philadelphia Inquirer, so-called bible of Pennsylvania Republicanism. I quote:

"You read that Mrs. Marion Worthington Scranton, a member of the Republican National Committee, has been assured by Mr. Willkie that he has no intention of 'slighting' the established party organization in this State. Why assurance of this nature should have been necessary is hard to comprehend.

"Regardless of what may be going on in other States, it is known that in Pennsylvania William H. Harman, chairman of the Associated Willkie Clubs, is working in complete harmony with the State organization headed by Jim Torrance and with Jay Cooke's city committee in Philadelphia."

We know what that means. It means that Willkie's political fortunes in Pennsylvania are bound up with those of Joe Grundy, representing the Pennsylvania Manufacturers Association, and its unsavory past record of opposition to every social and labor reform ever proposed, and with those of my opponent, Jay Cooke, head of America's most corrupt political machine. A fine lot of starry-eyed reformers. Just look them over, these "amateur" supporters of Wendell Willkie: Moe Annenberg, now in a Federal penitentiary for cheating the United States Government; Joe Grundy, who wrangled millions in tariff favors under Republican rule; and Jay Cooke, beneficiary of private profits from the Philadelphia gas-works deal his organization engineered. That's just in 2 of Pennsylvania's 67 counties, and doesn't even begin to tell the whole story.

The plain truth is that this Wall Street lawyer and utility lobbyist, in his new masquerade as a simple farm boy, is gearing together two of the most corrupt and unscrupulous political machines ever known in the history of the Republic. One is the political organization owned and operated by Wall Street; the other is its subsidiary operated by regular Republican machine leaders such as Grundy, Cooke, and their henchmen. Behind those machines is the economic might and financial power of the leaders of American industry and finance, the same leaders who are now on a sit-down strike against national defense, demanding exorbitant profits as the price of their help, stalling for time in the hope that they can elect Willkie and write their own ticket as to what taxes they will condescend to pay.

I think we may well warn the American people to look behind the tall corn that hides the real Willkie supporters, for they will find there the potential war profiteers, the politicians for profit, the same type of Fascist-minded reactionaries who led the great democracy of France to its destruction. There is no point in mincing words about Willkie. He is simply a false front. The Wall Street leaders behind him, by their greed, their selfishness, their complete lack of a single patriotic motive, represent the greatest menace that our democracy and our American way of life faces today. Don't be fooled by the American flag they wrap around them. Don't be deceived when they sing God Bless America louder than anyone else.

If anyone thinks Willkie is sincere, let them look at his public utterances. He proclaims that the New Deal falsely follows an economy of scarcity when America needs production to produce jobs and prosperity; yet he endorses in principle the New Deal farm program, an outstanding example of the economy of scarcity. He accuses Roosevelt, almost in the same breath, of being a warmonger and of failing to prepare our country for war. He echoes the appeasement policy of his major supporters by attacking Roosevelt for his anti-Nazi statements, then issues an inflammatory challenge to Hitler to come on and fight. Is this sincerity? Is this honesty? Of course not. It marks the political charlatan, the witch doctor who professes to drive off evils by magic words.

Enough of Wendell Willkie for the present. I'll have more to say about him before the campaign is over. Right now, since all of you are practical workers in the cause of democracy, I want to speak for a moment about the practical problems of political organization.

There are some who believe that political campaigns are won exclusively on the basis of patronage. Their conclusions are largely drawn from the fact that Republican organizations in large cities, such as Philadelphia, seem to maintain themselves in power through their patronage machine, even when the people are utterly disgusted with their record in office, failing to realize that big business finances them most generously. There are others who feel that political organizations are unimportant and that public sentiment is the main thing.

The answer lies between these extremes.

No election was ever won on patronage alone, nor on the other hand can any election be won without some kind of political organization. All of you know that for more than 40 years I have been a worker in the Democratic ranks, interested in advancing the principles of my party. I have always believed, and I believe now, that principles come first and political organizations second—and that both are essential to victory. Principles are the lifeblood of our party. They give it meaning and purpose. They give it a reason for existence as a force in public affairs. The task of a political organization is to educate the people in the principles it represents. That means our organization's job is primarily to enlighten the public, to carry the message of our party to every voter. If that task is well done the business of getting out the vote on election day, although necessary, is secondary. If the people are aroused and sympathetic to our cause, we don't have to fight to get them out to the polls. They will come out of their own accord, without urging—in fact no one could keep them away.

Our party has been very successful without patronage when it had the confidence of the people. Roosevelt carried the country in 1932 because public sentiment demanded his election, although the Federal patronage was entirely in the hands of the Republican Party. Our Pennsylvania victory in 1934 was a victory of public sentiment. The overwhelming Democratic victory in 1936 could not be considered in anyway a victory of patronage. It was a Roosevelt victory.

The Democratic Party is fortunate in having many thousands of supporters who give their efforts and their money as a public service, without hope of return, simply because they believe in the principles of our party. At the same time there are many, just as loyal in their devotion to Democratic principles, who cannot afford to devote their time and contribute of their funds unless the party can find some way to assist them. Insofar as they are concerned, patronage plays a part.

I say to you, frankly, that once a political organization begins to feel that it can win campaigns solely on the basis of patronage, it is headed for a downfall. Patronage all too often is a two-edged sword, for no matter how much many be available there is never enough to go all the way around. That brings disappointments.

This does not mean that I am opposed to the practice followed by political parties of placing their own adherents in political office. When a party's candidate takes office the party itself is responsible for the record he makes. The party can assure the success of the principles it represents primarily by giving the administration of its policies to persons sympathetic with its aims and objectives. To do otherwise is to court disaster—to encourage sabotage. But here again the purpose of patronage should be not to obtain it for itself alone, but through it to assure the proper fulfillment of campaign promises and thereby merit continued public support.

Any political leader who thinks solely in terms of patronage is blinding himself to the lessons of experience. In placing patronage before public sentiment he is placing the cart before the horse. If the people in any district can be educated to believe in the principles of the Democratic Party, the amount of patronage available to that district makes little difference; they will vote Democratic regardless. If you have observed recent Gallup polls in Pennsylvania, you will have noticed that Democratic sentiment has arisen steadily in recent months as a result of Roosevelt's increasing popularity and Governor James' complete failure as an executive. With all the patronage in the State government at his disposal, Governor James and his administration have far less political strength today than they had in the fall of 1938, when they had no patronage whatever.

For this coming campaign we have available two very necessary and valuable things—an important issue and a real candidate. We have the issue—the record the New Deal has made in the Nation, the record Roosevelt has made in foreign affairs. We have the candidate, the most outstanding and courageous defender of democracy in the world today, Franklin D. Roosevelt. In all the world he stands forth today as the greatest of all defenders of human liberty. America isn't just going to elect him; it's going to draft him—and I include Maine and Vermont. It's our job to go out and work for a straight Democratic ticket, for the election of every Democratic candidate high and low, so that Roosevelt will have support in Congress, support in the State legislature, and support in every city, town, and borough in Pennsylvania. The Nation has gone forward with Roosevelt; Pennsylvania has gone forward. Today, more than ever before, we must stand solidly behind him to defend our country and our liberties from aggression, whether from within or without. Pennsylvania will demonstrate to all the Nation at the November 5 election that it stands foursquare with the patriotic and humanitarian creed of our great leader, Franklin Delano Roosevelt. Our slogan is "Forward with Roosevelt" in the service of our country.

Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ERNEST LUNDEEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 26 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

EDITORIALS FROM WALLACE'S FARMER

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD five editorials from Wallace's Farmer on the foreign policy of the United States.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Wallace's Farmer of September 25, 1937]

HAVE WE LEARNED ANYTHING SINCE 1917?

Twenty years ago, the United States was pulled into a World War which cost us $60,000,000,000, killed and injured thousands of our people, damaged our foreign trade, made a few wartime millionaires and impoverished everybody else, and particularly the farmers.

Today, two wars are going on, one in Europe and one in Asia. Either may involve the United States unless we Americans show more sense than we did 20 years ago.

In Europe, Italy and Germany are unofficially lined up with the Spanish insurgents. Russia and--more mildly—France and Great Britain lean toward the Spanish Government. In Asia, China and Japan are fighting, with Russia sympathetic to China.

The two wars are linked together by the three-fold alliance between Italy, Germany, and Japan, and by the less formal alliance between France, Russia, and Great Britain.

In spite of the fact that no great power probably wants a world war, they may stumble into one. A submarine incident in the Mediterranean, another careless bomb dropped in China, may bring on the conflict.

Can the United States stay out?

Everybody says, "Yes." But some say, "Yes, but."

Among the enemies of neutrality in this country we have the folks who want the United States to punish the aggressors in these wars, to slap the wrists of Japan and Italy. They want us to "make the world safe for democracy" again.

Among the enemies of neutrality are the Americans who went abroad to make 15 percent on their money over there instead of 5 percent at home, and who want the Army and Navy to help collect their profits.

Among the enemies of neutrality are the devotees of "national honor," who want to send 3,000,000 boys to war every time a shell bursts near the Stars and Stripes.

And there are always those who want to make profits out of the war trade. Some of them are farmers.

Can the United States stay neutral, in spite of these influences?

Corn belt farmers can help decide that question. Let them use their influence to get the National Government to withdraw troops and warships from the war zones and to get American citizens out, too. Let them refuse to be excited over "insults to national honor" and over "crusades for democracy." Let them decline to risk their boys' blood for war profits for somebody else.

One more thing. We need to wage neutrality as deliberately as we wage war. The United States can properly compensate those businessmen, those shippers and those farmers who are injured by a policy of neutrality. Let's be willing to pay the costs of neutrality. They are heavy, but nothing to the costs of war.

This year is the anniversary of the entrance of the United States into one world war. Let us not permit it to mark our entrance into another.

We ought to be smarter than we were 20 years ago. But are we?

MEASURE COST OF WAR

The total cost of the World War to the United States would have paid for the following programs:

Thirty-year conservation program at $1,000,000,000 a year, $30,000,000,000.

Thirty-year tenancy program at $1,000,000,000 a year, $30,000,000,000.

[From Wallace's Farmer of March 26, 1938]

NO RETURN TO WARTIME HYSTERICS

As Congress debates the big Navy program and war talk becomes warmer, there can be seen in some quarters a revival of the "patriotic" hysteria of 1917, when everybody who didn't swallow the official propaganda 100 percent was accused of being a traitor to the Nation. It is cheering, therefore, to see two good blows struck just recently for sanity and good temper in public discussion.

In Minnesota, the university board apologized to Prof. W. A. Schaper for his unwarranted dismissal in 1917 on the charge that he was a "rabid pro-German." The board declared: "We cannot suffer a precedent to stand, under which, during periods of hysteria, honorable teachers are humiliated and dismissed in disgrace because their views happen not to coincide with the views of those in power."

In Kansas, Alfred M. Landon opposed a legislative investigation of so-called radicalism in the State educational institutions. He said:

"Freedom of speech must permit a man to say what he thinks, although we may not agree with his views, and academic freedom is essential to free speech. The true test of our belief in freedom of speech comes when we listen to someone who expresses views which we abhor and when we are willing to make the fight to permit the expression of such views. * * * A frank discussion of theories of government should always be free and unrestrained."

These are good words to remember as arguments get hot and as one side or the other attempts to stifle free speech.

[From Wallace's Farmer of February 26, 1938]

TO REPEL INVASION—AND WHAT ELSE?

Before we spend any more money on national defense, let's see what we are going to defend. That is the point Wallaces' Farmer and Iowa Homestead has been making about this billion-dollar budget for the Army and Navy.

We are pleased to see that hard-boiled Army officer, Maj. Gen. Johnson Hagood, now retired, say about the same thing in his testimony before a Senate committee. Listen to this:

"No one today knows for what purpose the land and naval forces are to be used. It seems to me that the time has come when Congress should perform its sacred duty to the people by clearly defining the purposes for which the land and naval forces should be used—to repel invasion, to protect American interests abroad, to enforce the Monroe Doctrine, to make the world safe for democracy, or what not. * * *

"And, so far as the Army is concerned, we could give the country a much better system of national defense at much less cost; that is, if we are to give our entire attention to the problem of repelling invasion and not be diverted by schemes to invade Europe or Asia."

We urge again that Members of Congress from farm districts do their best to get Congress to admit that national defense means just that, and not foreign adventure. If national defense means repelling invasion, then we agree with General Hagood that we can probably make some heavy reductions in our military and naval budgets. But if we insist on being able to lick anybody in the world on his own doorstep, then even a billion-dollar budget isn't big enough.

[From Wallace's Farmer of February 12, 1938]

BIG ENOUGH FOR DEFENSE

How big a navy does the United States, already defended by two great oceans, need to defeat an invading force? Although the chart below does not show the recently increased appropriations for the Japanese and British Navies, it does indicate that, for defensive

purposes, the Navy of the United States, operating in its own waters, is much stronger than any possible invading force.

	Tons
France:	
Being built	180,816
Already built	546,178
Japan:	
Being built	93,907
Already built	754,242
United States:	
Being built	336,655
Already built	1,062,878
Great Britain:	
Being built	288,215
Already built	1,232,854

The United States has at present 15 big battleships to Great Britain's 15 and Japan's 10, 17 heavy cruisers to Great Britain's 15 and Japan's 12. It is inferior to these 2 nations in aircraft carriers and light cruisers.

[From Wallace's Farmer of February 12, 1938]

THE "NEXT" WORLD WAR IS HERE

With one major war going on in Europe and another in Asia, nobody need ask when the next world war is coming. It is here. Only this time we are getting it in slower installments.

Every Corn Belt farmer wants the United States to stay out of the conflict. It is clear that no possible gains of any war, however successful in a military sense, could make up for the expenditure of lives and money and for the dislocation of economic affairs that such a war would cause.

How can we stay out?

We suggest three courses that the Government of the United States might properly follow, and which would aid in keeping this country out of trouble:

1. Enforce the Neutrality Act with regard to the war between Japan and China. We did this in the case of the Spanish War, but now our State Department is taking the ridiculous position that because war has not been formally declared between Japan and China, war is not going on, and therefore the Neutrality Act should not be invoked.

2. Withdraw our troops and our ships from China immediately. Assist American citizens in getting out of China. If necessary, make arrangements to compensate them for any monetary loss in leaving, but get them out. One of these days an American soldier or sailor or citizen will happen to be in the way of another bomb, and then there will be a new war spirit built up to "avenge" him.

3. Halt the increased appropriations for the Army and Navy until Congress has made a decision as to just what the meaning of "adequate national defense" is. The present regular Budget calls for an appropriation of $991,000,000, as against $600,000,000 in the period of 1923–25. President Roosevelt's special message calls for at least $30,000,000 more, and pledges the start of an $800,000,000 Navy building program. Before we spend any more money, let's decide whether we want to spend it to defend the United States or whether we intend instead to defend American investments all over the world, no matter where they may happen to be.

This is the work of Congress and the President. But farmers themselves have a task almost equally difficult and even more necessary.

Let them keep their shirts on.

Every time a Japanese soldier slaps an American consul or a Japanese bomb injures an American citizen, or some other incident reminds us that a war is not a tea party, all of us feel a natural impulse to strike back.

But why get excited? The fact that Japanese Army discipline is poor and that the high command can't make its soldiers behave is no reason for us to work ourselves into the kind of a passion that leads to war.

The United States bought a large chunk of the last World War. We paid for it in blood, in money, and in depression. Let's not buy any part of this one.

This time we ought to know enough to stay out.

The Hatch Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARL C. MICHENER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 26, 1940

OPINION OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF MICHIGAN

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, a short time ago Hon. Frederick B. Elliott, State Banking Commissioner of Michigan, addressed a letter to Hon. Thomas Read, the Attorney General of Michigan, asking for an interpretation of certain language found in the so-called Hatch Act. On August 13, 1940, the attorney general submitted an opinion to the State banking commissioner in compliance with the commissioner's request. Inasmuch as there is much discussion and conjecture in all parts of the United States at this time concerning the interpretation and applicability of the Hatch Act, and pursuant to the privilege heretofore granted to me, I include the Michigan attorney general's opinion, which is as follows:

Re Federal Hatch Act.

DEAR MR. ELLIOTT: You have submitted the two following questions, to wit:

1. May the counsel for the receiver of a departmental receivership, who is employed on a fee basis and who is appointed by the commissioner of the banking department, seek public office while serving as such counsel, assuming that the receivership in question is indebted to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation?

2. Will employees in general of departmental receiverships which are indebted to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation come under the provisions of the Federal Hatch Act?

The above questions involve the interpretation of the Hatch Act, so-called.

The Hatch Act is known as Public Act No. 252, Seventy-sixth Congress, and is entitled "An act to prevent pernicious political activities."

This is a new law upon a very old subject and usually the title of a legislative act is some indication of the object of the law, the object of the law at all times being the primary purpose to determine in construing a legislative act.

The original Hatch Act, so-called, consists of 11 rather short paragraphs and was approved August 2, 1939. It was amended by adding nine sections thereto, and section 12, subdivisions (a) and (e) of said amendment, is the only part of the Hatch Act that is relevant to the above-captioned subject matter.

Section 12, subdivision (a), as to so much thereof as is pertinent, is as follows:

"SEC. 12 (a). No officer or employee of any State or local agency whose principal employment is in connection with any activity which is financed in whole or in part by loans or grants made by the United States or by any Federal agency shall (1) use his official authority or influence for the purpose of interfering with an election or a nomination for office, or affecting the result thereof, or (2) directly or indirectly coerce, attempt to coerce, command, or advise any other such officer or employee to pay, lend, or contribute any part of his salary or compensation or anything else of value to any party, committee, organization, agency, or person for political purposes. No such officer or employee shall take any active part in political management or in political campaigns."

Subdivision (e) is as follows:

"(e) The provisions of the first two sentences of subsection (a) of this section shall not apply to any officer or employee who exercises no functions in connection with any activity of a State or local agency which is financed in whole or in part by loans or grants made by the United States or by any Federal agency."

It will be noted that said subsection (a) limits the officers or employees named therein to such officers or employees whose principal employment is in connection with any activity which is financed in whole or in part by loans or grants made by the United States, etc. Principal employment in this instance means that employment in which the officer or employee is engaged and devotes most of his time for or at, at the exclusion of any other permanent employment. It is better illustrated, perhaps, than defined, i. e.: An attorney's principal employment may be that of practicing law, yet at the same time he might temporarily be serving or representing a client whose activities might be financed in whole or in part by loans or grants made by the United States Government. But certainly it could not be said that the attorney's principal employment was in connection with any activity that was financed in whole or in part by loans or grants made by the United States.

In said section 12, subdivision (e), above quoted, it will be noted that the first two sentences of subdivision (a) above quoted shall not apply to any officer or employee who exercises no functions in connection with any activity of a State or local agency which is financed in whole or in part by loans or grants made by the United States Government or by any Federal agency.

Section 12, subdivision (f), subsections (1) and (2), defines what State or local agencies mean, and also states what the term "Federal agencies" means. Section 13, subdivisions (a), (b), (c), (d), and (e), declares what are pernicious political activities, but nowhere in the act does it determine the meaning of the word "functions" as mentioned and quoted in the above subdivision (e) of said section 12. The definition, or rather the meaning, of the word "function" in connection with the activity of a State or local agency is quite important, because the prohibition does not apply to any officer or employee who does not exercise functions in connection with such activities of the State.

Words and phrases do not give any citation or definition of the word "function" except in one instance, which is as follows, and I quote:

"Under the Reorganization Act, empowering the President to transfer 'functions' of any executive agency to any other executive agency, held that this power authorized the President to transfer the right to appeal."

The case of *United States* v. *Paramount Publix Corporation* (73 Fed. (2d) 103) is cited for the above authority.

Not much satisfaction is obtained from this opinion in aiding one in interpreting the meaning of functions as used in the above-quoted section. A reasonable interpretation, not only of the meaning of the word "function," but also of the intent of Congress in enacting the law, I think, is that it means to say that only such officers and employees as are acting in conjunction with other employees who are instrumental in carrying into effect the particular activities or purposes of the particular State or local agency which is financed in whole or in part by loans or grants, come within the prohibition. Here again the meaning can perhaps be better illustrated than a complete definition given. In reference to the banking department of the State of Michigan, the young man who runs errands, distributes mail, etc., in some degree functions with the activities of the banking department, but in no sense can it be said that he functions in connection with the activities of the banking department; again, secretaries, stenographers, and typists in the State banking department contribute immeasurably to the carrying on of the activities of the banking department; but neither the young man hereinbefore described nor the secretaries, stenographers, and typists come within the prohibition of subdivision (a) of section 12.

This last amendment was approved July 19, 1940, and from certain newspaper accounts, there may be other amendments between now and when election takes place.

From the above, it is my opinion that a lawyer who is actively engaged in the practice of law and whose principal employment is the independent practice of law wherein and whereby he maintains an office, holds himself out as a practitioner and represents such clients as he desires when given the opportunity so to do, is not barred from seeking public office because he happened to be the counsel for the receiver of a departmental receivership. His employment is no different than when he is employed by some other client. He is paid on a fee basis, but his principal employment is his own private practice of law. He certainly cannot be considered as an employee or officer within the meaning of these words in said above quoted section 12.

Employees in general of departmental receiverships, I take it, are employees who devote their entire working time, or at least the number of hours required by the Government to constitute a day's work, in these receiverships, and they receive compensation for their time. In other words, their principal employment is working for the departmental receiverships and wherever these departmental receiverships are indebted to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, certainly they would come under the prohibition in said section 12 above quoted.

Therefore, I come to the conclusion and it is my opinion that the answer to question No. 1 is, "Yes," and that the answer to question No. 2 is, "Yes."

Yours very truly,

THOMAS REED,
Attorney General.

The Anti-Poll-Tax Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEE E. GEYER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 26, 1940

ADDRESS BY MRS. WILLIAM T. GAYLE, JR., OF ATLANTA, GA.

Mr. GEYER of California. Mr. Speaker, in a ceremony at a very appropriate place, beside the statue of Susan B. Anthony, I had the pleasure of receiving a document from Mrs. William T. Gayle, Jr., of Atlanta, Ga. Mrs. Gayle, accompanied by a large delegation of southern women, presented to me a declaration signed by 100 outstanding women from the poll-tax States. These women, active in civic, political, and women's organizations, called upon the Congress of the United States to bulwark the women's suffrage amendment by removing poll-tax voting requirements.

As you know there is a petition on the desk, No. 34, which will make it possible for this body to bring to the floor of the House the anti-poll-tax bill. This bill, when passed, will be the first remedy toward alleviating the conditions deplored by these women.

I insert Mrs. Gayle's presentation speech in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

It is my great privilege on this twentieth anniversary of the nineteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States to bring from the South is a statement of 100 leading women of those States which yet require payment of poll taxes for voting. These women deplore the fact that although the nineteenth amendment has been in effect for 20 years, millions of women in their States are still virtually disfranchised because of this undemocratic requirement.

In the women's declaration they call on the Congress of the United States to take that step which is open toward remedying this situation—the removal of the poll tax as a requirement for voting in Federal elections. Quite properly this appeal is brought from the South to you, Congressman GEYER, in view of your untiring efforts on behalf of the voteless people of my region.

It is fitting that here beside the statue of Susan B. Anthony, author of the women's suffrage amendment, just 20 years after the proclamation of that amendment, we should meet to consider the appeal of women leaders who believe that the fight for women's suffrage must be carried forward, and that the women's suffrage amendment must be supplemented with legislation repealing poll-tax voting requirements.

The 100 influential women who have, as individuals deeply disturbed by the effects of poll taxes, endorsed this declaration are prominent in their communities and hold positions of leadership in such organizations as the League of Women Voters, Congress of Parents and Teachers, Federation of Women's Clubs, Federated Church Women, Junior League, Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Y. W. C. A. The declaration comes as an urgent plea from a group of women who are not themselves disfranchised, for they can well afford to pay poll taxes in order to vote. Their declaration represents a thoughtful and disinterested demand for removal of poll-tax requirements so that the nineteenth amendment can benefit all women of this Nation. From coast to coast there is clamor for removal of poll-tax restrictions on voting, that Representatives to the Congress be elected on the same basis in each State in the Union. The declaration which I hand to you adds the voice of women in the poll-tax States to this Nation-wide demand. In the face of this impressive document no longer can the criticism be leveled that responsible and thoughtful people in these States do not seek this extension of suffrage.

Congressman GEYER, as I place this women's declaration in your hands, may I commend you for the introduction of the anti-poll-tax bill and urge that you persevere in your efforts to have this fundamental piece of legislation enacted into law in order that we may more fully implement the democratic process in this country.

What Goes On in Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM J. MILLER
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 26, 1940

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. WILLIAM J. MILLER OF CONNECTICUT

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address which I delivered yesterday over the radio:

Good afternoon. Again it is my privilege to tell you of what Congress is doing, although any broadcast at this time, purporting to be a report of what is going on in Congress, will turn out to be a report of the steps being taken to strengthen our national defense. It is impossible in 30 minutes to adequately cover all the various proposals considered by Congress during the past month. Therefore, I will confine my remarks today to the most important bills yet considered by this Congress in its effort to make the United States strong against military or naval attack.

The Burke-Wadsworth bill, commonly called the compulsory military training bill, is entitled "A bill to protect the integrity and institutions of the United States through a system of selective compulsory military training and service."

If time permits, I will also touch on a proposal, not yet officially before Congress, in which many of my constituents are interested—the proposal to sell United States destroyers to Great Britain. No bill has been thus far introduced to legalize such sale or transfer.

If ever there was a time when frankness on the part of governmental officials was of vital importance, that time is now. Unless the citizens of the United States understand fully the problems faced by our Government, they cannot be expected to arrive at the correct decisions. I regret to state that all the information sent out through the country from Washington has not been as frank as it should have been. For example, on Thursday evening, August 8, members of the National Defense Commission informed the country via radio that the program was proceeding satisfactorily. Mr. Knudsen said that 900 planes a month are now being produced, but he did not say they were being produced for our Army and Navy. Anyone listening to that broadcast would not have realized that contracts cleared does not mean contracts signed or in the process of being fulfilled. The day after this broadcast by members of the National Defense Commission, Secretary of War Stimson painted a

decidedly different picture when he testified before the House Ways and Means Committee. At this hearing Mr. Stimson said—I quote: "Congress made available to the Army during the month of June approximately $400,000,000 for airplanes, engines, and accessories. Yet today, almost 7 weeks later, we have been able to sign contracts for the construction of but 33 of the 4,000 or more for which these appropriations were made." It is interesting to note that Mr. Stimson used the words "contracts signed" instead of "contracts cleared."

Before going into the terms of the Burke-Wadsworth bill, I would like to make a definite statement on the question of conscription or compulsory military training in peacetime. A few weeks ago I said that I was opposed to this bill as originally introduced and I want to say now that I am opposed to any proposal which will delay the making of a decision or the solving of this problem until after election. Hearings have been concluded on this bill before both the Senate and House Military Affairs Committees and, as I prepare my broadcast, the Senate was on its eighth day of debate and, as you know, is ready to vote on the bill. Printed reports of the Senate and House hearings are available to every Member of Congress, as well as the Senate debate itself. We have had time to discuss the problem with our constituents, the evidence is all in, and we should be prepared to write into law the necessary details. No one knows just what provisions the Burke-Wadsworth bill will contain after the Senate and House have completed consideration of the proposal. It may be a very different bill from the one introduced by Congressman WADSWORTH on June 21, but whatever it is, I say, very emphatically, that the bill should be voted up or down before election time.

I have spent more time studying the hearings on this particular bill than I have on any other legislative proposal; I have read the hearings on the 1941 Military Establishment appropriation bill, as well as the two supplemental national-defense appropriation bills, including the question of increasing the manpower of the Army by voluntary enlistment or conscription. Also, I have studied the hearings on the Burke-Wadsworth bill itself. My chief difficulty has been in deciding what testimony to believe and in trying to determine when such witnesses as General Marshall, Chief of Staff of the Army, was giving the Congress his own opinions or when he was being held down to testimony approved by the President and the Budget Bureau. It is tragic but true that the Chief of Staff of the Army cannot ask Congress for increases he thinks the Army should have in either manpower or material. I will prove this statement by quoting from page 69 of the hearings on the supplemental national-defense appropriation bill for 1941 when General Marshall was testifying before the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations. I quote:

"General MARSHALL. I have no authority at the present time to ask for the increase which, in my opinion, is a present requirement. I would like that clearly understood.

"Mr. WOODRUM. You have no authority from whom?

"General MARSHALL. From the Bureau of the Budget or from the President.

"Mr. WOODRUM. I was not asking you for that."

Just think of it, the Chief of Staff of our Army hasn't authority to ask Congress for the men he needs.

I have come to the conclusion that the sponsors of the Burke-Wadsworth bill have made the mistake of trying to solve two separate problems in one piece of legislation. The preamble to this bill states that it is a bill to set up a system of selective compulsory military training and service. I believe that conscripting men into the Regular Army in time of peace is decidedly different from conscripting men only for military training. Canada, at the end of a year, as a participant in the war has only recently adopted a compulsory military training program. Under the Canadian law a young man selected for training does not take the oath of a soldier in the Regular Army. His enlistment contract assures him that he will not be sent overseas without his consent or until Parliament enacts different legislation. Canada recognizes the difference between conscription for war service and conscription for training.

I have actually received hundreds of letters for and against the Burke-Wadsworth bill. A large number of these letters have come from young men between the ages of 21 and 31, and almost without exception they have said that they were perfectly willing to devote the time necessary, even though it be a year or longer, to preparing themselves for a possible defense of the United States. However, there seems to be a doubt in the minds of a good many of these young men as to whether this proposal will not lead to a great deal more than military training and there seems to be grounds for that fear.

For an example of grounds of mistrust, take the bill recently passed by Congress which was purported to be a bill to provide a year's extensive training for units of the National Guard. There was little or no opposition to that proposal as we all realize that the efficiency of the National Guard should be increased but, when the administration added to that proposal language making it possible to send the guard, after it was federalized, to any part of the Western Hemisphere, opposition did develop. The claim was made—and it was not denied by any proponent of the bill—that under that legislation the President of the United States could send units of the National Guard into Canada to do home duty, thus making it possible for Canada to release more of her soldiers for service in Europe. As I said a few minutes ago, the Burke-Wadsworth bill tries to solve two problems and I think it is admitted by all of those who have studied the present military situation that we face two distinct and separate problems.

Our first problem is, of course, to raise a strong, completely equipped standing Army. There seems to be a difference of opinion as to just how many men we should have in our standing Army, but I am willing to accept the testimony of General Marshall, who recently testified before the Senate Military Affairs Committee. This testimony was given before there was so much apparent hysteria. In response to a question as to how many men he felt we should have in the Army, the general replied that he thought the Army should have 375,000. He then used the figure of 500,000, with the following explanation: "Five hundred thousand is war strength," he said, "and I might inject here a comment regarding the proposal that has been made to increase the Regular Army to 750,000 men. If that were done two things would happen. We would have either to organize units from the ground up, without any trained personnel to leaven the mass, which would require about a year, or we would have to emasculate existing units in the Regular Army in order to provide nuclei for new units. I do not think that we should take such a hazard as this at the present time. Another and still more serious effect would be that we would have to emasculate the National Guard in order to find the necessary equipment for the new units. This would mean a complete alteration of the present system of national defense."

One understands in this connection that General Marshall was referring to wartime strength. I maintain that with the mobilization of the National Guard and making it a part of the Regular Army, as General Marshall has testified he will do, we have a standing Army of more than 500,000 men. To be sure, we do not have all of the needed equipment for this 500,000 men, but, according to testimony of Mr. Knudsen, a member of the National Defense Commission, we will have the completed equipment by January 1, 1942.

This Army of 500,000 men at the present time will be composed of 270,000 men who enlisted in the Regular Army plus the 242,000 men who enlisted in the National Guard and who will soon be federalized. In addition to that number we have approximately 116,000 Reserve officers who can be called into active service under the National Guard mobilization bill plus 38,000 enlisted men who are now in the Regular Army Reserves and approximately 3,700 retired officers subject to call for active duty. All of which means that we have well in excess of 500,000 men declared by General Marshall to be sufficient for war strength. We will also have a sufficient number of officers and enlisted men left over who can be used for training whatever reserve forces we may decide are necessary. It will be apparent to all my listeners that in order to obtain the 500,000 men desired we have not only used the National Guard but also practically every reservist. This certainly makes it necessary, in view of existing war conditions, that we immediately embark on a program to make certain that if we should be subjected to an attack from abroad that we will have the necessary reserve forces to man the billion dollars' worth of equipment that Congress has recently authorized, some of which has already been ordered.

The War Department apparently feels that it is necessary to train these reserve forces in groups of 350,000 and 400,000 which is, after all, the second problem that the Burke-Wadsworth bill seeks to solve. I doubt if any thoughful person will maintain that we can immediately enlist 400,000 men, even though the enlistment period was limited to 1 year, and the pay of the Army increased from $21 to $30 per month. I believe the suggested pay increase in the Army should be approved by Congress as I think $30 per month is really the minimum we should pay to a private soldier. However, I do not believe that the difference of approximately 30 cents a day is going to be the deciding factor as to whether or not a man will enlist in the Army. If the young men of this Nation are convinced that their services are needed, I believe that the difference of 30 cents in the day's pay will not prevent them from offering their services.

I will support a substitute for the Burke-Wadsworth bill that requires the registration of all male residents of the United States between the ages of 18 and 45. At the time of this registration I would have each person give all information that would help the Government to decide just where that person would be most useful in time of a war emergency. In this proposed substitute I should make it clear that those who are selected for military training will be taken into the Army, with a definite enlistment contract limiting them to training and forbidding the War Department from making use of them as part of the Regular Army, and most certainly forbidding the War Department from sending them outside of the continental limits of the United States, its island possessions, and the Panama Canal Zone. At least until such time as Congress has declared a national emergency to exist or until there is a declaration of war by Congress.

One serious objection to the Burke-Wadsworth bill, as introduced, is the fact that the bill gives the President power to conscript men into the active service. That is not necessary or advisable and it is potentially most dangerous, regardless of who happens to occupy the White House. It is not necessary to the purpose of the bill, which is supposed to be a speedy preparation of a sound national defense. Just as a declaration of war must rest with Congress, so should the calling out of all male citizens of the United States rest with Congress, as the true representative of the people. The reason the country puts major issues in the hands of Congress is due to the fact that it most directly represents the people and because such a large body cannot act as suddenly as an individual. In such a tremendous step as either a declaration of war or the conscription of men, a majority of Congress is more fit to speak for the people than is one single individual.

It will be noted that in the proposed substitute bill I suggested the registration age be reduced to 18 years. It seems to me that between the ages of 18 and 21 will be found young men who are

fine physical specimens without dependents or important responsibilities. In most cases young men of this age can be better spared from their civil employment than can older men who have assumed greater responsibilities. Judging again from letters I have received, and from the young men with whom I have talked, there would be little or no opposition to a form of selective service if the restrictions I have outlined—and undoubtedly others which would develop during the debate—were inserted in the bill. I also think it is important to limit the operation of even the substitute proposal to a period of 2 years. At the end of that time Congress could review the situation and determine in the light of existing conditions whether or not such a selective-service act should be continued. I want to make it as certain as I can that any legislation of this type be limited solely to the existing emergency.

It is my belief that the suggestion of separating the question of conscription for active military service and conscription for limited military training is worthy of serious consideration. The very essence of our form of government is that the people should know and understand what is being done, and in that sense, act willingly. In order to be effective, legislation of this type must be understood and concurred in by the majority of our people. Where there is misunderstanding, doubt, and objection, there will be passive resistance or grudging service—both of which are bad.

I was disappointed a week ago to hear Gen. William Shedd, Jr., assistant Chief of Staff, while testifying before the House Military Affairs Committee, inform the committee that men called into the service under the Burke-Wadsworth bill would not be called before December 1. This seemed to be another effort to postpone facing the task of securing the needed defense personnel until after election. You can be sure of one thing—that suggestion was not made by General Shedd without the approval of his superiors. The suggested delay brings to mind criticism that has been expressed in many of the letters I have received as well as in many newspaper columns. An effort is being made to accuse Congress of delaying the national-defense program. There may be some justifiable criticism that can be directed at Congress, when one remembers the disgraceful performance of Senators MINTON and HOLT during the first day's debate of the Burke-Wadsworth bill in the Senate, but to say that Congress is "fiddling while Rome burns" is unfair and untrue. If any criticism is to be directed at Congress it should be that things have been moving too fast and that legislation has been adopted, having far-reaching effects, without adequate debate. For example, the bill appropriating $5,000,000,000 for new equipment for the Army and Navy passed the House with only a couple hours of debate and not even a roll call, on its final passage. When General Shedd suggested that the conscription of men be deferred until December 1, he said that that was because of the delay on the part of Congress in passing the Burke-Wadsworth bill. As a matter of fact, the Senate was only then on its third day of debate when he made such a remark.

The hearings in both the Senate and House Military Affairs Committees were held with all possible dispatch; witnesses who had traveled great distances to represent organizations with thousands and, in some cases, millions of members, were limited to 5, 10, and 15 minutes in which to present their testimony. A member of the minority party can do very little toward speeding up legislation—that is the duty and responsibility of the majority party. That certain legislation to speed up the procurement program should be adopted by Congress is certainly true but the blame for that delay must also rest with the administration.

When I make that statement I have in mind the necessity of passing legislation that would provide for the amortization of funds invested in national-defense plant expansions, as well as the necessity of suspending the provision of the Vinson-Trammell Act which relates to the procurement of aircraft and the building of naval vessels. The uncertainty of what Congress will do in this respect has certainly interfered with negotiating contracts. I do not think we can rightfully blame industry. No private industry should be expected to spend from four to ten or fifteen million dollars in building additional factories without some assurance that they will be able to amortize the investment over a period of 4 or 5 years. The request for suspension of the provisions of the Vinson-Trammell Act is not because of a profit limitation contained in that act but because of an uncertainty of just what overhead will be allowed in the negotiable contracts.

Under some of the legislation passed by this Congress, we have actually penalized the two most important industries that will contribute most to the success of our national-defense program. They are the aircraft and shipbuilding industries. The President vehemently denied newspaper stories that the placing of contracts for aircraft and other defense material was delayed by legislation passed in June, lowering the profit limitation on aircraft contracts from 12 to 8 percent and by the vague talk of an excess-profits levy. I think my listeners would be interested if I read herewith a part of the testimony of Admiral John A. Towers, Chief, Bureau of Aeronautics, before the House Committee on Appropriations. I quote: "It is a fact that at the present time we are having great difficulty in placing contracts with the manufacturers. There was a law passed recently which greatly reduced the profit limitation on aircraft contracts. It was very materially reduced. Most of the aircraft manufacturers and all of the aircraft-engine manufacturers do a great deal of subcontracting and their contracts are placed, for instance, with a firm which forges crankshafts. That is the business of that firm. They will take a subcontract from an aircraft-engine manufacturer, and that probably represents a small percentage of their total business. This law limits the subcontractors to the same profit, and their new profit when they are working on a limitation of 8 percent gross profit is very small. They are not anxious to get the business, and they can fill up their plants, so they say, with business from other sources, including munition manufacturers which are not subject to the same profit limitations. That, coupled with the uncertainty about amortization of expanded plans and equipment, makes it very difficult to place those contracts."

Admiral Towers said he could cite a specific case in which a contract for 300 planes was awarded by the Navy to a very large, reputable company. Subsequently, legislation was passed cutting the profit limitation from 12 to 8 percent. The manufacturer called Admiral Towers stating that the various subcontractors who had previously agreed to do a part of the work were no longer interested in those contracts so the manufacturer just could not see how he could take the contract. The Admiral declared that this was a firm which had probably made the best record in aircraft production and has shown the most reasonable prices of any firm in this country in the last few years.

Gen. George H. Brett, Chief of the Matériel Division, Office of the Chief of Air Corps, War Department, was even more emphatic in insisting that profit limitations and legislative uncertainties were making it impossible for the Army to buy airplanes. Said the general, in testifying, and I quote: "We had $279,000 appropriated for the purchase of airplanes available the first part of June, and on the 15th of June our contracts were all ready to be signed, under the proposed law which would permit us to negotiate contracts. Those contracts were held up awaiting passage of the law, which was not signed until July 2. On June 29, however, there was a modification of the Vinson-Trammell Act which threw all of our contracts into the wastebasket, and we had to start all over again and negotiate those contracts.

"The negotiation had to be conducted on an entirely new basis. In the meantime, we went to the Treasury and we are getting a decision with regard to taxes on expansion. We are getting a decision with regard to what can be considered costs under the Vinson-Trammell profit limitation. But now another objection has been made because there has been an announcement to the effect that the Vinson-Trammell Act is likely to be repealed and that there will be a tax on profits. Today I am doing my best to have the contracts signed. The industry will not sign contracts because they do not know what the effect will be if they repeal the Vinson-Trammell Act. Therefore, we are now again in a quandary over it. I am ready to buy approximately 4,000 airplanes, and that is the situation."

Congress could and, I dare say, would pass the necessary legislation in a few hours to provide for the suspension of the Vinson-Trammel Act and the amortization of plant expansion investment, if permitted to do so. For some unknown reason, the administration has insisted in tying these two proposals up with the excess-profits tax.

Industry knows that there will be an excess-profits tax law passed this year. No one should or will be allowed to make unfair profits out of this national-defense program. Every responsible official who has discussed this matter has stated that industry has cooperated with the Government as it should.

In the remaining minutes I would like to discuss the proposal that we sell, trade, or give 50 reconditioned United States Navy destroyers to Great Britain. These destroyers are part of a large number we built during the World War and, inasmuch as they are now over 20 years old, they are considered as obsolete due to overage. Recently many of them have been overhauled, while others were made into mine sweepers and other types of service vessels. This expense was authorized by Congress long before anyone suggested that they might be needed by Britain. Representatives of the Navy Department, including Admiral Stark, Chief of Naval Operations, urged the reconditioning of these destroyers on the grounds that they were needed for our own defense. Admiral Stark recently said that not only do we need all of the destroyers we have but many more new ones as well.

This is no time for pussyfooting, evasion, or the issuing of statements having a double meaning. To say that you favor giving all possible aid to Great Britain, providing it will not violate international law or weaken our own defense, as an answer to a request urging your approval of the sale of destroyers to Great Britain, if, at the same time, you are convinced that the sale of the destroyers would weaken our defense and violate international law, is an effort to evade the question.

I do favor rendering aid to Great Britain within the limitations I have mentioned, but I am honestly convinced that it would be a violation of international law to make such a sale and that we do need all of our Navy equipment for our own defenses.

The sale of destroyers to a belligerent nation would not be a step short of war—it would be an act of war under international law, as accepted by every nation in the world. The question of sending 50 destroyers is not the real issue. England needs help of the entire Navy, and as much of our air force as we can spare, as well as men to fly the planes. No one would contend that international law would permit the sending of ships, planes, and men.

If, as Ambassador Bullitt says, the United States is going to be attacked by Hitler as soon as he disposes of Britain, should not the sale of destroyers be followed logically by our full and active participation in the present war? I distinctly remember hearing the same threat in 1916 and 1917. We were told then that when the Kaiser defeated France and Britain, we were next.

Rather than debate the question of sending 50 destroyers to Britain, we had better face the real issue and decide now whether or not Hitler can and will attack the United States, if and when he defeats Britain. While it is true that it is to our advantage to have Hitler decidedly defeated, I do not want a situation to go on whereby we are dependent on any other nation's army or navy to

protect us. That is the reason I voted for the huge naval expansion prorgam.

Ambassador Bullitt logically contends for American participation in the present war. That he reflects the views of the State Department and the President there can be no doubt. His address was really a plea for our naval participation, at least. The Capitol Parade, a daily column by Messrs. Alsop and Kintner, declares that the Ambassador consulted with the President during the preparation of his Philadelphia speech, and that the President approved it in every detail. It must therefore be accepted as the President's own views. Ambassador Bullitt said, "It is my conviction, drawn from my own experience and from information in the hands of our Government in Washington, that the United States is in as great peril today as France was a year ago." Perhaps he is right, but I insist that it is the duty of the President to make any such information known to the people and to the Congress. We have a right to have such information if for no other reason than that the Constitution places on the Congress the responsibility of providing for the national defense and, if necessary, the solemn duty of declaring war.

As a Member of Congress I demand to know what this information is, and when it became known to the President. It is my sworn duty to support all measures to provide protection for our country. No one can vote intelligently without all the facts.

It is a generally accepted fact that a naval fleet loses 25 percent of its power and effectiveness with each 1,000 miles it goes from its home base. Add to that the fact that we have, today, the greatest navy afloat plus every bit of information or knowledge which I have acquired from the testimony of high-ranking officers of the Army and Navy leads me to believe that successful attack on the United States is very remote. If I believed otherwise, I would vote to throw every resource we possess into the present war to defeat the forces that threaten us and I would do it now.

This issue must be faced in the near future, perhaps in the next 60 days. So far as neutrality is concerned, it has long since vanished, although we keep up the legal farce. We have gone beyond steps short of war; we have gone further than entangling alliances and, I fear, we may have gone into a military alliance in spite of the fact that our citizens, speaking through their elected representatives in Congress, have declared that the United States is neutral. The President still maintains publicly that the United States is a neutral nation.

I am not willing to consider our treaties as mere scraps of paper, no matter what other nations may do. I will not deliberately involve the United States in war until our territory is actually threatened with invasion or attack beyond a reasonable doubt. I believe that Congress and the American people should deal with the question of war or peace as prescribed by our Constitution.

In closing, let me assure you that I feel very humble as I strive to reach the right decisions to the numerous difficult questions now before Congress—questions that may mean peace or war, life or death, happiness or misery, to this generation and to generations yet unborn. I pray for divine guidance, wisdom, and strength during this perilous time.

I would advocate following the words of one of our greatest Presidents, Abraham Lincoln, who said, "Let the people know the truth and the country is safe."

The Defense Program

REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 26, 1940

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, ever so often when things go wrong in the affairs of our Government, the popular procedure is followed of blaming Congress for the mistakes of others. For several days there have been articles in various papers indicating that Congress is to blame for any delay in respect to national defense, and, by the way, it was pointed out on the floor of the House just a moment ago that there has been delay in connection with our national-defense program.

The American Congress is one of the greatest deliberative bodies in the world, and I include in that this body and the other body. Speaking with special reference to the House of Representatives, it is one group of men who respond to the wishes of the constituents and so far as the Congress is concerned, and so far as the House of Representatives in particular is concerned, it has cooperated almost 100 percent with every national-defense plan or program.

Mr. Speaker, I repeat that for some time impressions have been given publicity to the effect that Congress has been responsible for any delays in the legislative program having to do with national defense. I think we ought to keep the record straight, and I just want to call attention to some of the headlines which are intended to mislead and to "pass the buck" to the legislative branch of our Government. In one of the newspapers Saturday the National Defense Council is quoted as blaming delays in its program on Congress.

It ought to be a sufficient answer to this incorrect statement to say that the House of Representatives and, so far as I know, the other legislative branch of the Government have taken prompt action on every legislative proposal having to do with national defense.

In connection with pending legislative measures, press releases from the administration put the blame for delay on Congress.

People who want to be fair, of course, will not forget the facts. We have been in session continuously, and for the past 2 months numerous 3-day recesses have been taken in the House of Representatives and also in the other body. These 3-day recesses all represent delays, and this is a delay for which those in control of our Government are responsible.

It is unfair to say that Congress is delaying things when the very administration that has charge of the program is responsible for the 3-day recesses.

A very certain distinguished Senator expressed these facts in much better language that the legislative branch of the Government was marking time because it had no program submitted by the people in charge of national-defense measures.

If there is anyone who needs to speed up, those who are charged with the responsibility for national defense can issue their orders to the party leaders in charge of the legislative program, and quick results will follow. In the interests of straight thinking, it is well to remember that we have a party system of government, and that responsibility for delay rests with the leaders who are in control of the Government.

We ought to resent this campaign that is being carried on which has for its purpose to discredit Congress and to glorify other individuals and agencies in the same proportion that they can shift responsibility for their failure to other shoulders.

Mr. Speaker, I am not without support in the position I take, for a certain distinguished Democratic Senator only yesterday declared that Congress was not to blame for the delays in the national-defense program. He pointed out the slowness in production of war materials, including airplanes, and said that this called for an explanation. He raised the question as to whether or not red tape, or inefficient bureaucratic administration, was to blame. Further discussing the cause of delay, he queried as to whether or not business enterprise had refused to accept contracts from the Government. He pointed out that the country is entitled to know the facts. We all agree, I am sure, that the delays should be investigated, and until that is done there is no room for loose talk that Congress, which has been on the job and ready for business, is the cause of defense delays.

Conscription in the Light of Scripture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN G. ALEXANDER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 26, 1940

ARTICLE BY REV. C. O. STADSKLEV

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Rev. C. O. Stadsklev, of Minneapolis, Minn.:

TRUTH AND LIBERTY—CONSCRIPTION IN THE LIGHT OF SCRIPTURE

When Israel rejected the rulership of Samuel as recorded in I Samuel 8 and desired a king or a dictator, God said to Samuel,

"They have not rejected thee, but they have rejected me, that I should not reign over them * * * howbeit yet protest solemnly unto them, and shew them the manner of the king (dictator) that shall reign over them. * * * And he (Samuel) said, "This will be the manner of the king that shall reign over you: he will take your sons and appoint them for himself (note not for the nation but for himself). And he will appoint him captains over thousands, and captains over fifties. * * * And he will take your daughters * * * and he will take your fields * * * and ye shall cry out in that day because of your king (dictator) which ye shall have chosen you; and the Lord will not hear you in that day."

After the colonists under God had won the Revolutionary War, they established in this land a theocratic constitutional form of government. A theocracy is a rule by God, and, since the Constitution of the United States was patterned after the governmental statutes of the Bible, our form of government is a theocracy. Throughout the entire history of our Nation, a desperate battle has been raging between the internationalists who desire to set aside the United States Constitution and loyal Americans who desire to abide by our God-given constitutional form of government. Alexander Hamilton succeeded in saddling upon this Nation the old Babylonian money system which is unscriptural and unconstitutional. This struggle between the internationalists, chiefly the international bankers and the true American people has now become so intense that many are actually saying as ancient Israel, "Give us a king or a dictator." The first thing Samuel told the people that a dictator would do, would be to take their sons, not for the nation but for himself. Dictatorships are made possible by military rule.

England is the only nation that has ever attempted to invade the United States, and although the Colonies were few and unequipped, they defeated Great Britain. If Hitler should conquer the British Isles, he would have to keep in submission 46,000,000 Englishmen; 42,000,000 Frenchmen; 8,400,000 Belgians; 8,700,000 Netherlanders; 2,700,000 Norwegians; 3,700,000 Danes; 22,000,000 Poles; 9,500,000 Czechs; 6,500,000 Austrians; besides many war-weary Germans, before he could even begin to think of invading the Western Hemisphere. And military experts agree that we cannot be successfully invaded until our Navy has been sunk. Hon. HAMILTON FISH recently said that with the $4,000,000,000 appropriation our Navy will be twice as great as any other navy and larger than all other navies combined. In view of these and similar facts, millions of Americans are asking why conscription in this Nation 3,000 miles away from war-exhausted Europe. There is not a bomber in Europe that can fly 1,000 miles fully loaded, drop its bombs, and return to its base.

If we adopt conscription, then we, as ancient Israel, will have our fields and our property taken away from us by our dictator. The expense of training and equipping 1,000,000 men each year would be so great that we, too, will be made to cry out because of dictatorship and regimentation. We are all agreed that we must be prepared, but is there not a greater danger in applying the so-called remedy than in the evil we are attempting to eliminate? I believe 90 percent of the people of this Nation are in agreement with Hon. HAMILTON FISH when he said, "I am in favor of making America invincible on land, sea, and air, through the largest navy in the world and by increasing and modernizing our Army and National Guard. I am not in favor of copying the European war system of conscription in time of peace, although it may be necessary for defense if we are ever attacked.

A certain well-known writer attempted to prove that conscription was practiced by Moses, citing Numbers 31: iii. In this Scripture God spake unto Moses and said, "Arm some of yourselves." (He did not say conscript all.) This same journalist used Numbers 26: i and ii where God commanded Moses to count all the men from 20 years and upward that were able to go to war. To count the men of the nation and to conscript the men of the nation are two very different things. By knowing the number of able-bodied men in Israel, Moses would know how many volunteers he should have and how many to receive.

True on one occasion when Moses misunderstood the tribes of Reuben and Gad and thought they were refusing to fight for their brethren, he said that your sins will find you out. In other words there are times when it is necessary to go to war, and on such occasion God's laws relative to military service will provide all the fighting men necessary.

Conscription as it is now being introduced is unscriptural. In the twentieth chapter of Deuteronomy we find God's statutes relative to military service. While there were other exemptions, the one given in verse 8 makes military service a voluntary enlistment. Verse 8 says that if a man is fearful and faint-hearted, he should not go with his bretheren in war. Universal conscription at this time can be one of the most vicious attacks ever made on our constitutional form of government. If the money of the Nation was conscripted according to ability to pay and if volunteers were given at least $100 a month, we would have more volunteers than necessary, and as Gideon of old, men would have to be told to go back to their work in field and factory. However, with money conscription there would be no danger of war. Voluntary enlistment which would make a much better army and a much safer army has never been given a trial. One of the most disgraceful things in our history is the fact that while hundreds of men became millionaires in the World War, thousands of nobler men died leaving destitute widows and orphans. The struggle the soldiers had to get their bonus is another black spot which looms up before would-be volunteers.

It is high time that we challenge the propaganda that if a man refuses to be sacrificed by the priests of mammon on the altar of gold he is a traitor and a slacker. Those who are attempting to involve us in war in order to establish their dictatorship are the traitors that should be dealt with as such.

God Almighty has decreed that the gold standard money system which Scripture says is at the root of all evil is going out, and there is no power on earth that can stop it. No army or navy can ever be built that will be able to uphold this system which Scripture calls "Babylon the Great" full of martyr's blood. Speaking of our day in chapter 2 and verse 20, Isaiah prophesied, "In that day a man shall cast his * * * silver and his * * * gold * * * to the moles and to the bats." The gold is already in its grave. The Apostle James was inspired to write the following concerning the gold or the metallic standard, "Go to now ye rich men (that is money manipulators) weep and howl for your miseries that shall come upon you * * * your gold and your silver is cankered and the rust of them shall be a witness against you and shall eat your flesh as it were fire. Ye have heaped treasures together for the last day." Perhaps the Apostle James had a vision of the gold buried in the Kentucky mountains. In verse 7 the apostle says, "Be patient therefore bretheren unto the coming of the Lord." And in verse 8 he wrote, "Be ye also patient, stablish your hearts; for the coming of the Lord draweth nigh." The apostle foresaw what terrible distress would be caused by cankered gold and silver and warned us against two extremes. First we were to avoid becoming impatient or bitter, on the other hand we were to avoid grudging one against the other or blaming one another. There is only one who can establish our hearts and that is God. We will be strong and useful today only to the extent that we know and believe the Word of God.

Jesus said that they that take to the sword shall perish by the sword. We do not need conscription we need to return to the Scriptures.

Rev. C. O. STADSKLOV,
Minneapolis, Minn.

Compulsory Military Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. R. POAGE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 26, 1940

LETTER FROM A CONSTITUENT

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I desire to extend my remarks by inserting in the RECORD a letter I have received from a little-business man relative to the effect of compulsory military service. I do not do this as an argument against compulsory military service. The gentleman who wrote this letter has, himself, served in the military service of the United States. I know that he joins me in a common desire to do everything possible to protect America. One important factor in protecting our country is the avoidance of any unnecessary disruption of our economic life. This letter so clearly points out the position of the little man that I insert it in the hope that it may help in the shaping of a fair and constructive selective-service bill.

The letter is as follows:

CORYELL COUNTY NEWS,
Gatesville, Tex., August 18, 1940.

Congressman W. R. POAGE,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR BOB: I wanted to write you about this. The selective-service bill.

I believe it would be better, and I think a lot of others do, to take 'em all, from 18 to 65 or some similar brackets, and have more exemptions.

Too, in reference to the folks getting their jobs back. That's O. K. But listen:

There are probably thousands of corporations who probably, in the East and North, who employ even more thousands of people. They could probably run their businesses without the "head men." Many of these, too, will get large, liberal Government contracts for expansion, housing for workers, etc.

But the single proprietorship, like so very, very many we have in the South and West. Also, there are many small employers in the United States of America, probably tens of thousands, who employ more tens of thousands employees.

These single proprietorships, many of them, are managed by one man, and this one man is in the selective-service age. He may have as many as 50 or 100 employees, but most of them, like our little place, have 4 or 5, or even up to a dozen. If these go to take the training, their businesses will, 9 out of 10, fold up, and their

employees will be out of a job. Too, this same bracket of single proprietors or small businesses have no chance whatsoever of getting contracts for anything for the Government, and yet when the high taxes are passed around the bulk of the taxes will be paid by them. Of course, the "big boys" will pay a larger percentage each, but there are fewer of them. Many of them will have Government contracts, will have Government loans, and their profits on war orders will be plenty.

For the little man and for everyone, for that matter, why not have the draft from 18 to 65, and make more exemptions.

Yours very truly,

W. MAT JONES.

The Middle West and Defense Industries

REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE T. ELLIS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 26, 1940

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, on August 23 much publicity was given through an Associated Press story to a statement of the Pittsburgh Commission for Industrial Expansion charging "that political pressure was being used to obtain Government (defense) plants for nine Midwestern States unsuited to Industry."

Acting Manager Charles E. Robinson, according to the article, even went so far as to write Hon. W. S. Knudsen of the National Defense Advisory Commission protesting the actions of Arkansas, Iowa, Kansas, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, Oklahoma, North Dakota, and South Dakota in their efforts to obtain that same equitable distribution of new defense industries which they were assured in the beginning would be forthcoming.

Shame on you, Mr. Robinson, and your commission! Fortunately, the good people of Pittsburgh, through their able and esteemed Members of Congress, do not act that way.

Already Pennsylvania has received out of the vast billions we have appropriated for national defense $182,835,551. Pittsburgh alone has received $12,806,480. Arkansas has received exactly nothing.

We love you, Pittsburgh—marvel at your indeterminable industries. We are proud that we of these nine States constitute one-sixth of your domestic market.

You, too, were once a struggling small town "out west." But what have you that we have not? Coal and iron and oil and gas and waterpower. We have them all in unlimited quantities. To these my own State of Arkansas alone can add the strategic materials of antimony, manganese, and mercury and the critical material, aluminum, of which she has 90 percent of the Nation's deposits.

Here are some of the estimates for Arkansas alone:

Coal, smokeless, 1,510,003,844 short tons in 848 years.
Gas, 1,262,626,460 M cubic feet in 245 years.
Oil, 480,496,295 barrels a year, inexhaustible.
Water power, potentially 2,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours annually.
Antimony, 5,000 tons since its recent discovery.
Bauxite, 25,000,000 long tons in 162 years.
Lead, under 5 counties.
Manganese, underlies 10 large counties.
Mercury, underlies 6 counties.
Asphalt, vast deposits.
Barite, 430 years.
Chalk and chalk marls, underly 6 counties.
Clays, commercial, 13 counties.
Glass sand, throughout the Ozarks.
Gypsum, 2 counties.
Lignite, 44,019,000 short tons.
Limestone, unlimited.
Marble, including only black deposit outside of Belgium, unlimited.
Novaculite, unlimited.
Rutile, vast reserves.
Sand and gravel, unlimited.
Sandstone, unlimited.
Slate, unlimited.
Tripoli, vast reserves.
Zinc, vast deposits.
Forest products, 40,500,000,000 board feet annually.
Cotton, food products, and livestock—rank well among the State.

AGRICULTURAL?

Yes, Mr. Robinson, as you say, we are primarily agricultural. And may I list for you some of the reasons why we are:

Freight rates: Suppose you shipped us a stove on which the freight would be $5. Suppose we shipped the same stove back to Pittsburgh over the same railroad, same distance. The freight would be not $5 but $8.75. Can there be any justice in that? Our freight rates on manufactured products are 75 percent higher than yours over the same roads, same distances. Could any industry survive this?

Power rates: That infernal octopus known as the holding companies is bleeding my people of Arkansas today in overcharges on the electricity they consume; $5,000,000 annually. Can any industry stand this?

Favoritism to special interests: Practices of our Government in past administrations have resulted in unfair accumulations of vast fortunes in such families as your Mellons at the expense of the people of the Middle West. Can we long stand this?

My people have not forgotten how certain interests in New England became fabulously rich at the expense partially of the Middle West during the last war.

Industrial tariffs: We of the Middle West have long helped to pay for the high protective tariffs which most of your industries enjoy. We pay you a profit while making none ourselves. Of course, industries cannot prosper in a territory like this. Can we long survive under this unequal trade balance?

Low farm prices: Our farm prices today are only 79 percent of parity. That means that for every dollar's worth of food which you in Pittsburgh buy from us you give us only 79 cents with which to buy a dollar's worth of what you have to sell. No wonder some of your industries have until recently been running only part time. Can we in the Middle West or even you in Pittsburgh long survive under such conditions?

All this helps to explain the business chart reflecting new passenger-car sales of the Nation which by a strange coincidence appeared in the same papers that carried the Associated Press story. Your increase in Pennsylvania, as compared to the same period in 1939, was 41 percent. The increase for the United States was 28 percent. The increase for Arkansas was 3.6 percent.

MIDWEST STRATEGICALLY SAFER

Suppose we should be invaded. Military experts agree that your section and your industries would be the prize catch. Would not it be far better to take a lesson from France, decentralize our defense factories, and locate at least part of them in the invulnerable and impregnable agricultural areas west?

THE NATIONAL DEFENSE COMMISSION IS SYMPATHETIC

Mr. Gano Dunn, senior consultant for the National Defense Commission, wrote me on August 21 in part as follows:

> The National Defense Commission is in favor of as broad a distribution as possible of powder plants, munitions factories, and other national-defense activities. * * * They [the War Department] assured me that they had well in mind the availability of Arkansas for future plants and the fact that up to the present time none had been located there.

WHO WILL PAY THE BILL?

After all, will not we in these nine States help to pay the bill for these vast expenditures?

KANSAS CITY MEETING

Yes; we are having a little meeting out at Kansas City Friday. Practically every section of these nine States will be represented. Not only will we organize in an effort to convince the Government of the advantages of the Middle West for the location of some of the defense industries, but we are going to see if we can get together also in an effort to eliminate our freight-rate discriminations and to develop our natural water power.

Better pitch in, Pittsburgh, and help us pull. What is good for us is good for you for we are your market.

Importance of Government Stand-By Plants

REMARKS
OF
HON. JERRY VOORHIS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 26, 1940

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, the New York Times for August 19 published an editorial entitled "The State of Our Defense," which, after pointing with pride to our Navy, goes on to deplore the rate of progress being made in other branches of defense. Among other things the editorial points out with regret that: "Our gigantic 1918 production capacity of explosives has vanished and we must erect new plants altogether." Why? Because that capacity was not Government stand-by capacity; because it was not kept in readiness to meet an emergency like the present; because mistakes were made then as I am afraid they are being made now.

In the next paragraph the editorial states that "Our Government arsenals are the only ones that are ready to plunge ahead," and, overlooking the major conclusion to be drawn from this fact, criticizes the President because the 48-hour week was not instituted sooner.

Then the Times does what we would naturally expect. It says that the failure of Congress to enact amortization legislation is the cause of the defense program not having gone forward more rapidly.

Of course, everyone knows this amortization legislation is going to pass and in cases where it applies to corporations expending their own money for additional plants which is to be useful only during the emergency there should be little opposition.

It is a very different proposition, however, where a company gets a loan from the Government to build the plant, then the War Department adds enough to the price it pays for the material to liquidate the loan, then 20 percent of the cost of the plant is deducted from gross income every year as an amortization allowance, and then finally the company keeps the plant. This seems to me absolutely unjust. In such a case the plant has just been given away to the company and another 1918 experience is in prospect.

But the obvious moral to be drawn from these facts brought out in the Times editorial is that what is needed is more Government arsenals, more Government stand-by plants ready to be used for emergency defense production upon a moment's notice and available to do the kind of short-time peak-demand business which private industry cannot be expected to accommodate itself to unless unreasonable, costly, and time-consuming concessions are made by the Government. There is a clearly right way to meet the problem where additional plant or equipment is required. As a matter of fact, the R. F. C. is ready today to finance for the Government of the United States necessary plants in which immediately we could proceed with this defense program. Such plants or equipment could be leased to private manufacturers, who would run them. But all the fuss about amortization and risk of private capital would be avoided. And we would not be caught this way again. This is not a matter of interference with private business. It is a matter of having Government plants do the job that does not and never can fit with the methods private industry must follow.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein the text of this New York Times editorial in order that it may be fairly presented.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS]?

There was no objection.

The editorial follows:

THE STATE OF OUR DEFENSE

There are ample grounds for the dissatisfaction expressed by voters in the latest Gallup survey with the progress of our national defense program to date. As a result of a careful and itemized study, Mark S. Watson in the Baltimore Sun arrives at the conclusion that "for fully a year in the future the Army will remain tragically unprepared for any serious defensive endeavor against a powerful foe." The best situation exists with regard to the Navy, which "could go confidently into action tomorrow against a foe of its own size." But this is because the mere existence of the fleet and its constant assignment to sea duty have always compelled it to be fully armed and almost fully equipped, based, and manned. Our present fleet has 397 war vessels (including 15 battleships), with a total tonnage of 1,330,415. But though we are now building 136 more war vessels, totaling 890,690 tons, none of these is now at hand or coming right away. As for any of the ships in the vast 2-ocean Navy which has only just been authorized, few of them exist even on paper, and their construction will require 5 years or more.

Our airplane production is disappointing to those who believed that 1 manufacturer alone could turn out "1,000 planes a day," to those who talk of 50,000 planes a year or even of 25,000 a year—a rate which apparently cannot be reached until 1942. But Mr. Knudsen has made it known that our August deliveries of military and transport planes will total 895, of which 396 will be for our Army and Navy, 236 for Britain, 84 for South American countries, and 179 for commercial companies. The last have a potential military use. By November we shall be getting 1,000 military planes a month; by January, 1,500 a month.

It is difficult to sum up the state of our defense production in a few words because, as Mr. Watson points out, there are 70,000 items of Army supplies, of which no fewer than 1,200 are critical—i. e., not in commercial production and not available except from specifically equipped plants. This means that there are many possibilities of a bottleneck in one direction rendering futile great progress in another. Among the items in which we are far behind are heavy tanks, heavy machine guns, and antiaircraft artillery. We have only a start in the acquisition of 37-millimeter guns (for low-flying planes) and almost nothing in the way of 90-millimeter cannon (for high-flying bombers, particularly).

The difficulties of the problem are evident in connection with the fire-control mechanism, upon the perfection of which depends the precision of the entire antiaircraft gun. There continues a very grave shortage of craftsmen who can work in optical glass. On one of the orders sent through last month deliveries are not expected until 1943. Our gigantic 1918 production capacity of explosives has vanished, and we must erect new plants altogether. This the Government is doing. "But not a pound of powder has come from any new plant in 3 months, and not a pound will come from them until spring."

In view of this, it seems astonishing, as Mr. Watson remarks, that with full knowledge of our backward condition in ordnance, and with our Government arsenals the only ones of importance ready to plunge ahead, these arsenals, at the President's insistence, against the advice of his own Army and Navy officials, clung to a 40-hour week until only a week ago, when finally Secretary Stimson was able to put into effect a program calling for a 6-day 48-hour week and three shifts a day. And Congress has not yet passed essential amortization legislation to protect manufacturers against losses on specially created war plants that may suddenly become obsolete. Such political bottlenecks could easily have been avoided.

One moral stands out in this review of the actual state of our defenses. Time is vital to us to make our defense program a reality, to turn "on order" into "in hand." The one thing that can surely give us this time, against the one threat that brought our whole new defense program into being, is the continued resistance of Great Britain to the onward march of the aggressor nations. To fail to lend promptly to Great Britain the aid which both of our political parties have promised would be obvious folly. It would make our whole new defense effort itself illogical and pointless, for we should be refusing to reduce or delay the very contingency against which we are arming in a race with time.

Community Emergency and Defense Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY R. SHEPPARD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 26, 1940

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, none is wise enough at this hour to predict with confidence the immediate or future effect of war in Europe and the East

on our country and its people. Stark events of the past few months, however, do reveal the rapidity with which a nation may become engulfed in the mad struggle and the tragedy which befalls the unprepared. These same events have written in flaming words against a smoke-choked sky the need for understanding of the destructive forces loose in the world; the need for a direct, personal interest by each of us in the welfare of our own country.

I say this calmly and with resolution, because I am convinced that, both economically and physically, our country must prepare itself now, to meet any threat of these destructive forces. We have no assurance that in all the world we, alone, shall escape the impact of these destroying influences. We hope we shall not be called on to meet such a threat. If we are not, all of us shall rejoice. If we are, we shall be prepared.

This organizing and activating of our strength involves our military forces and our civilian population. Today, when a nation is threatened with war, or goes to war, its sole job is that of war. In the past when our soldiers marched away to battle, the issues were decided in comparatively distant or localized areas and at home life went on in fairly normal manner.

Under modern air attack, every village, every acre of ground is part of the battlefield; each living being is at war. We must realize that now some 75 percent, perhaps more, of our national effort in war would be civilian, leaving only 25 percent to be centered in the operations of our land, sea, and air forces. In the first World War, we needed from 6 to 10 workers at home for each soldier in the trenches. Our problem was increased then, since we were producing not alone for ourselves but for our Allies. The same situation again probably would arise. Whatever the exact ratio may be, we are forced to conclude that success in modern warfare is directly proportional to the morale and productive efficiency of the civilian population.

Our democracy must use its resources in the most effective way. A thoughtful study of economic planning in the last war reveals weaknesses which must be avoided. The problem today is not just economic. The world is smaller now than in 1917. Our shores no longer are invulnerable. We must be prepared not alone to resist economic warfare, but invasion, should it ever come.

The time to plan is before that crisis arrives. And no matter how efficient that plan may appear on paper, its value in operation hinges on the acceptance of it by each of us; our appraisal of its effect on us, on our safety and our civil rights. The surest safeguard against dictatorship, military or otherwise, is an enlightened and organized people.

We must visualize our Nation as a gigantic producing organism, a mighty business engaged in creating and distributing essentials of life at the same time it prepares for or prosecutes war. Because of the complexity of this business, it must be separated into various divisions and these must in turn be skillfully coordinated so that each fits into the other like geared wheels. In this perfect pattern, the organization of industry is a civilian task. The Army and Navy must determine what they require; civilians must see that those requirements are met and at the same time protect the economic life of the country. It was Woodrow Wilson who said, "The highest and best form of efficiency is the spontaneous cooperation of a free people." To get that spontaneous cooperation, the people must be informed and assured of that freedom.

Industrial coordination will demand use of such measures as priorities, classifications, ratings, allocations, licenses, embargoes, permits, warrants, control of prices, control of foreign trade, organization of Government corporations, and like means. Each of those will affect industry and civilian life. It is obvious that the more fully the civilian population is honestly informed, the more closely it is knit together, the higher will be the morale and the more secure the foundation of our Nation under stress.

Destructive forces overseas are centralized and directed. Human beings are utilized by such forces as productive and fighting machines. Every facility—material and human—is directed to the same destructive end. Confusion and horror and suffering come to those helpless civilians who, because they are not organized, were crushed and mangled beneath those juggernauts of war. The way in which valiant defending military forces were held back and handicapped by hordes of fleeing, bewildered civilians—those who have seen that chaos—know how vital is the need for careful, long range, and intelligent civilian planning and organization.

Civilians not only must support the men in the trenches, in the air, or in the sea—they must support and perhaps defend themselves. At the same time they must keep out of the way of military forces. They must leave to them the opportunity to move swiftly, strike hard, and not be hampered by civilian population. They must keep the highways open for military use, the rails free for guns and supplies and yet carry on.

We have never in our country gone through the hazards and horrors of extensive civilian evacuation. It is difficult to visualize the problems which large-scale movement of civilians requires in (a) self-defense, (b) food and water supplies, (c) adequate transportation, (d) mobile communications facilities, (e) policing, (f) routing to avoid conflict with or hampering of military movement, and (g) mobile hospital and medical services, sanitation and the like. These are problems to be met by the smallest village, the most densely populated city.

While the regular military forces are charged with the duty of military protection and action, at times civilians may be forced to protect themselves the best they can. With these regular forces engaged in military function, offensive or defensive, and the National Guard in active service away from their home bases, the necessity for civilian home defense is obvious. The result of the lack of such defense was pitifully and starkly portrayed in France, and the value of it is being proved at this hour on the British Isles.

Patriotic and clear-thinking residents in California have been busily perfecting their plans, under the leadership of a man who by personal experience knows the task ahead of us, a man who with his own eyes has seen these destructive forces in operation in Europe.

Leadership in civilian planning and organization work is valuable. It is a golden asset to our country. Fortunately, our way of life begets such leadership. In my district in California is a typical example of such vision and foresightedness, shown in a community plan which for its clarity, simplicity, and efficiency is outstanding.

In the hope that this work of my constituents may prove helpful to every community of our Nation, I wish to present to you, with the permission of the Veterans Defense Council of Redlands, Calif., and its chairman, Bruce McDaniel, an outline of that plan:

COMMUNITY EMERGENCY AND DEFENSE PLAN OF VETERANS' DEFENSE COUNCIL, REDLANDS, CALIF.

I. ORIGIN

The Veterans' Defense Council was created by Redlands Legion Post No. 106 following careful study and recommendation of its past commanders, some 25 in number, who are engaged in all types of business and professional activities in the community.

II. DIRECTION

Direction of the council is vested in a chairman, authorized to draft a plan and to select personnel from all civic groups to administer it. All reports are made direct to the chairman.

III. CIVIC RESPONSIBILITY

The council has requested each civic organization to designate a person for contact so that each civic group is kept fully informed respecting the purpose and operations of the council.

A coordination leader has the duty to keep this contact file up to date and representatives of the civic groups informed.

IV. OBJECTIVES OF PLAN

A fully informed and solidified community, prepared to act under emergency or defense conditions, is the basic purpose of the plan. It is developed in two phases: First, organization of the community as a unit to meet emergencies other than defense, and, second, for

defense action other than by established military forces but in coordination therewith. Both phases of the plan make provision for influx of residents from other areas and for evacuation of local residents to other areas.

V. COUNCIL

The council consists of 20 key men and women to whom specific duties have been delegated.

PHASE 1 (CIVILIAN ACTIVITIES)—VI. PRIMARY PROBLEMS

An experienced person (with authority to select needed assistants) is charged with the duty of being prepared immediately to handle each of the following vital problems:

1. Emergencies

A plan is devised for each separate type of emergency, both as to civilian defense and civilian security and evacuation. Each plan is based on the direction from which the danger arises, its nature and probable extent, and the method most effective to handle the civilian population under it. Since no plan can relate only to this community, adjacent areas must be contacted for coordinate action.

2. Community organization

(a) The community has been divided into precincts; precincts grouped into districts. A leader has been selected for each precinct. He or she is the contact for each precinct, the source of information.

(b) Such leader is charged with the duty to make a detailed analysis of each precinct to obtain the data set out in the attached information sheet.

(c) These data are segregated and consolidated in separate registers for immediate use of the person or persons selected to handle each problem, and for military authorities. It will be noted the data include:

(1) Location of possible gun emplacements.
(2) Reservoirs.
(3) Air-raid shelters.
(4) Strategic utilities.
(5) Special personnel.

(d) An extended map of all precincts, designating the location of the above data and strategic locations.

(e) District leaders are responsible for contact with their precinct residents.

3. Communications

(a) Protection: Plans are made for protection of telephone and telegraph communication, including possible emergency power in event the regular source is eliminated or reduced.

(b) Substitution: In event of disruption of regular channels of communication, provisions are made for courier service and two-way mobile radio communication between a central point and key points for each district.

(c) Communication contacts: Each district leader is a key contact man, must keep residents of his district together and informed, and responsible for courier and radio service for his district. These men must be trained by an experienced radio and signal communications person so that in event of evacuation (together with policing and evacuee registration) the civilian population will be kept informed; properly policed so as to avoid congestion and hysteria, and to keep major highways and strategic points free for military uses.

4. Water supply

(a) Protection: Provisions for policing sources of water for domestic use and power.

(b) Reserve supply: Data showing available reserve supply in event service is disrupted.

(c) Substitute power: Plans to substitute sources of power (such as tractors, etc.) for use on pumps in event power is disrupted. Previous plans to shift from one type of power to another are imperative.

5. Light and power

(a) Protection: Provisions for policing.

(b) Substitution: Substitute sources which are available must be available for immediate use. Previous plans to shift from one type of power to another are imperative.

6. Gasoline and fuel supplies

(a) A record must be made showing the normal supply of gasoline, oil, and Diesel oil which would be available to the community in event the source of supply is curtailed or stopped; plans for utilizing such supply to maximum advantage prepared.

(b) All persons engaged in distributing these products should be requested to keep their tanks filled to maximum volume. In connection with this survey, suggestion has been made that all plane location guides, such as direction arrows and town names, be removed from tanks and buildings.

7. Food supply

(a) Reserves: Analysis of reserve supplies in local stores to determine how long the average supplies will last. Stores are requested to keep inventories as high as possible of basic foods. Available livestock and poultry are noted for emergency food uses.

(b) Family supplies: Each family is being advised of the minimum requirements needed per person per day; of the type of food best suited for use in case a family is required to move, and requested to have available a minimum supply for a 10-day period.

(c) Supplies: Plans for best utilization of reserve supplies. These include policing of stores and food warehouses.

(d) Kitchens: Locations, equipment, and fuel for community kitchens. Trucks for moving and personnel for policing.

8. Registration and billeting

(a) Registrar: A registrar is responsible for registering civilian population in event of evacuation or if outside residents enter the community.

(b) Map: A precinct survey and city building map shows the location and extent of available billeting facilities. Billeting is under direction of the registrar.

9. Medical services and supplies

(a) Personnel: All available medical personnel is registered. They are directed by a medical leader. This includes nurses.

(b) Supplies: Normal available supplies in local drug stores and medical offices and hospitals are recorded as to amount and location.

(c) Hospitalization: Utilization of local hospitals and plans for field stations are under the same direction. Emergency power and light required.

Policing and transportation are assigned from the personnel pool.

10. Roads

Maps showing main and subhighways are prepared. Routes to be followed are numbered so that interference with military operations will be reduced to a minimum. District leaders are kept informed as to routes to be used.

11. Sanitation

(a) Local: In event of disruption of water supplies, instructions for sanitation are ready.

(b) Incoming: In event of movement of residents from other areas into the community, proper sanitation facilities will be available.

(c) Evacuation: Sanitation facilities en route will be directed by the sanitation personnel.

(d) Supplies: Required chemicals, etc., for sanitation use are recorded and available under control of sanitation personnel.

12. Policing

(a) Personnel for policing, in coordination with the regular police force, is registered and assigned to each type of service.

13. Transportation

(a) Civilian: Each precinct and district leader is responsible for the residents of his precinct and district. The number and capacity of automobiles and trucks per district are recorded. Needs beyond the facilities of one district are to be supplied (if available) from the nearest or other district. School busses, etc., are recorded and locations known.

(b) Supplies: Movement of supplies is anticipated and provisions made for assignment of trucks. In this connection, all draft horses in the area are recorded as well as wagons available.

(c) Fodder: Supplies of fodder for saddle and draft horses are recorded.

14. Arms and ammunition

(a) Arms: The number, location and caliber of arms in the community are recorded. This includes arms owned by civilians and available in local stores.

(b) Ammunition: Same as for arms.

(c) Such facilities will be collected and placed in central point for use under planned direction in coordination with military authority.

15. Rail facilities, bridges

Personnel is charged with protection of rail facilities, bridges, and roads.

16. Subversive activities

Residents are requested to submit all data respecting subversive activities to the chairman. Such data are routed to F. B. I. through established channels. Every effort is exerted to avoid independent action so as to have these matters handled by experienced personnel. The cooperation of everyone is solicited in reporting suspects, together with available data.

17. Fire protection

In cooperation with the fire department, personnel is registered for assignment to assist in fire-protection work.

VII. PERSONNEL POOL

All persons willing to serve where needed are registered, together with data showing type of service for which best fitted. Assignments to duty are made from the personnel pool.

PHASE 2 (DEFENSE)

1. It must be recognized that civilian defense must be coordinated with military operations. Utilization of the civilian defense mechanism depends on the conditions arising.

2. Arms and ammunition available should be registered; must be segregated for use of trained personnel and assigned only for specific use.

3. Personnel: Residents registered in the personnel pool are selected for the defense corps. Such personnel is restricted to men of previous experience; unquestioned loyalty to their country. Such personnel will cease to be active in event State or Federal Government furnishes such defense protection.

4. Organization: Local defense corps under direction of the chairman. Experienced men are designated for training and leadership purposes.

5. Plans: Point of defense and nature thereof must be planned for each anticipated type of emergency.

Benefits of the Social Security Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES F. O'CONNOR

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 26, 1940

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House, it occurs to me that this is an opportune time to take stock and to review the benefits received by the people of the Nation as a whole, and of my own State of Montana, in particular, as a result of the 5 years of operation of what is known as the Social Security Act.

I want to say in advance that no one claims perfection for this humane and necessary program. In addition, I maintain and have maintained that it is inadequate to meet the needs of the people which the program is meant to benefit. However, it is the first attempt—and we must crawl before we can walk—of the Federal Government to provide for Federal old-age and survivors' insurance, unemployment insurance, Federal-State public assistance, public-health services, vocational rehabilitation, maternal and child health and welfare, maternal and child-health services, services for crippled children, and child-welfare services. You will note that the blind and the unfortunate and the crippled children are included in this program as well as the health of children and their welfare.

FIVE YEARS OF PROGRESS UNDER THE SOCIAL-SECURITY PROGRAM

Increased security for Americans has been the result of 5 years of operation of the Social Security Act. The fifth anniversary of this far-reaching measure, observed on August 14 of this year, saw better than one in every two people in this country directly protected by its old-age and survivors' insurance, unemployment insurance, and public-assistance benefits, and every member of the population receiving indirect benefits in the form of protection of health and welfare and increased stabilization of purchasing power.

Over $3,000,000,000 has been paid out to individuals during these 5 years—$3,000,000,000 that, besides improving individual living conditions, has aided business and the community because it has been piped right back into the stream of business from which it was drawn. These $3,000,000,000 represent modest payments, usually weekly or monthly, that have helped families to pay for the things they must have—food and shelter, clothing, and other every-day household needs. In addition, expenditures made under the health and welfare programs—maternal and child health and welfare services, vocational rehabilitation of physically disabled adults, and public-health services to prevent and eliminate disease—total well over $100,000,000 from combined Federal, State, and local sources. Everybody is the beneficiary of these welfare programs which mean better health, less illness, and fewer individuals who cannot take their rightful place as productive members of society. Health is vital to security—a sick man or woman cannot earn his own support or add to the wealth of the Nation by his efforts; each individual who is kept healthy by these health measures or who is restored to productive channels by vocational retraining becomes thereby an asset to his community instead of a liability.

Money spent under the social-security program consequently not only makes for greater individual and family security but also represents one of the most worth-while investments for its own future that this Nation could make.

Let us examine each of the 10 separate measures set up by the Social Security Act to strengthen and extend social security for the American people. There are, first, two broad social-insurance programs which protect workers and their families against lack of income when loss of a job, death, or old age interrupts a man's earning power.

FEDERAL OLD-AGE AND SURVIVORS' INSURANCE

Federal old-age and survivors' insurance, under which 50,000,000 workers have social-security accounts, provides monthly benefit payments for life to qualified workers over 65 when they retire, and their wives of the same age, and for their children while they are young and dependent. It also provides broad insurance protection for the widows and young children or aged dependent parents of insured workers who die. These monthly benefits were begun in January of this year as a result of amendments adopted by Congress last year, and during the first 6 months of payments claims for such benefits had been approved for 102,941 people, amounting to $1,924,000 a month.

In my own State of Montana nearly 200,000 people, or one-half of the residents, have social-security accounts under this system. For each of these 200,000 account holders there is, in addition to individual protection for his own old age, protection for his family dependents. By the end of June 1,279 people in Montana were receiving monthly benefits, amounting to $5,370 a month.

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

The other insurance program, which provides a family income during periods of joblessness, is a cooperative Federal-State enterprise, now operating on a Nation-wide basis. Unemployment compensation laws in every State under which some 28,000,000 workers have earned wage credits toward unemployment benefits provide weekly out-of-work payments to the unemployed. The Federal Government pays the full cost of administering these State laws. By the end of June, over a billion dollars had been distributed to jobless workers since payments under this program first began, in many States a period of less than 2 years. In combination with the unemployment compensation program, the public employment services in every State which place workers in available jobs, free of charge, constitute an effective method of building employment security. Today, every State has a free employment service which provides placement for workers in all lines of work, whether or not they are insured under the State unemployment compensation law. Federal grants aid States to maintain such offices. These offices have filled nearly 20,000,000 jobs in the past 5 years.

In Montana 105,000 workers are covered by the unemployment compensation law. In the year during which benefits have been payable there, a total of $2,955,000 paid to those who became unemployed has helped to tide them over between jobs.

FEDERAL-STATE PUBLIC ASSISTANCE

The public-assistance program provides direct cash payments monthly through Federal-State cooperation to nearly 3,000,000 people—1,983,900 of the aged, 807,900 dependent children, and 48,000 blind. All States and territories now have plans for old-age assistance, and over three-fourths of the States have plans for aid to dependent children and aid to the blind. Total payments under these programs from Federal, State, and local funds, come to $1,899,154,185—$1,502,009,565 for the aged, $46,990,532 for the blind, and $350,154,088 for dependent children.

There has been spent for this purpose in the State of Montana alone $12,350,000. Of this total $10,240,000 went to the old folks, $73,000 to the blind, and $2,037,000 to dependent children. Currently, public-assistance payments are being made to about 18,200 people in Montana, including 12,200 aged, 200 blind, and 5,800 dependent children.

PUBLIC-HEALTH SERVICES

The public-health program provides for Federal grants to States to encourage and aid the adoption and strengthening of State public-health plans. Federal grants alone during this period come to $36,610,000, not including a large amount of money spent in the States drawn from State and local sources.

In Montana, during these 5 years, over $625,000 has been spent to develop and extend State public-health services.

This includes $229,000 in Federal money and $400,000 from State and local funds.

VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION

One of the most important of the programs from a social viewpoint is that for vocational rehabilitation. Also operated on a Federal-State basis, this program includes medical diagnosis and treatment, supplying of artificial limbs, and vocational training for physically disabled adults who can be fitted into normal productive work. Many of those who have received rehabilitation service are today earning more as a result of their training than they did before they became disabled.

Each year some 10,000 individuals are pronounced completely rehabilitated and restored to useful work. In a year between 40,000 and 50,000 individuals are in the process of receiving various rehabilitation services. All told, some 42,000 individuals were completely rehabilitated in the first 4 years after the Social Security Act was passed, and during that period rehabilitation services were provided for a total of nearly 180,000 disabled individuals. To provide these services cost the Federal and State Governments over $13,775,000.

Figures by States show a similar record of service. In my home State of Montana, more than $130,000 has been spent in 4 years for rehabilitation services to nearly 1,000 people. Some 240 physically disabled individuals have been completely rehabilitated during this period and placed in jobs they can do.

MATERNAL AND CHILD HEALTH AND WELFARE

The maternal and child health and welfare program includes three different services to help mothers and children—maternal and child health services, services for crippled children, and child-welfare services.

MATERNAL AND CHILD HEALTH SERVICES

The first of these—maternal and child health services—provides health supervision by doctors and public-health nurses for mothers and children, especially in rural areas and in areas suffering from economic distress. This health supervision includes the education of parents and others on the safeguarding of the health of mothers and children. In a few local areas medical care and home delivery nursing service are provided for mothers in families which cannot obtain such care unaided. Federal grants made to the States to foster the provision of these services total over $16,000,000 so far. Montana has received over $223,000 in Federal money under this program.

SERVICES FOR CRIPPLED CHILDREN

The program for the care of crippled children calls for locating crippled children and providing medical, surgical, and corrective care, diagnosis and facilities for hospitalization, and aftercare. Each State has a plan for providing such care and receives Federal grants to assist it in maintaining and extending its work. Nearly $12,000,000 has been granted to the States for this purpose. Federal grants to Montana for services for crippled children have come to more than $138,000.

CHILD-WELFARE SERVICES

Federal money is also given to the States to help them establish and extend, especially in rural areas, welfare services for the protection and care of homeless, dependent, and neglected children and children in danger of becoming delinquent. Over $5,500,000 in Federal grants has been given to the States for the development of child-welfare work. Under this program, Montana has received $70,000.

This imposing array of millions of people benefited and millions of dollars spent should not obscure the essential value of this program. All this money has been spent and all this activity has been directed toward one major objective: that of protecting and extending some measure of security to American families in all walks of life. The record of achievement in the first 5 years is a praiseworthy one, but we must not forget that continued and increasing effort is required if we are to reach the goal we have set for ourselves.

I might also state that it is our first line of defense to promote the health and welfare of our people. A healthy, strong, and vigorous Nation cannot and will not be overcome. I will at all times vigorously oppose the sending of our young men to fight in foreign wars, but I want to help prepare them from the standpoint of health and vigor to defend our country against all comers. One of my chief reasons for desiring to remain in Congress is to assist in perfecting, extending, and enlarging security to the American people regardless of occupation and also to bring about the enactment of legislation which will provide for a Federal old-age pension that will be sufficiently large to enable our aged people, in their declining years, to have a few of the comforts as well as the necessities of life. I want to assure the people that as long as I am a Member of Congress I will continue my efforts to increase the security and protection for the aged, unemployed, blind, dependent, crippled children, and the health generally of the public.

St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERNARD J. GEHRMANN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 26, 1940

RESOLUTION BY THE SUPERIOR (WIS.) FEDERATION OF LABOR

Mr. GEHRMANN. Mr. Speaker, I am asking for permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a resolution adopted by the Superior Federation of Labor, urging that immediate steps be taken by our Government to complete an agreement between the United States and Canada which would construct a deep seaway connecting the Great Lakes with the Atlantic Ocean by means of a canal along the St. Lawrence River route.

I have done all I could to bring this about as a member of the Wisconsin Legislature, when I was appointed as a delegate to represent the State at several national and international meetings. Since coming to Congress, I have been a member of a group of Congressmen that has worked untiringly to bring these two North American countries together with the hope that actual work on this most necessary project may soon be started. It seems to me that it is even more necessary now than ever that these two countries cooperate closer than ever for their mutual benefit. I hope that this agreement can be reached and confirmed by the Senate before this Congress adjourns.

The resolution follows:

Whereas for many years an effort has been made to obtain a deep seaway connecting the Great Lakes with the Atlantic Ocean by means of a canal along the St. Lawrence River route; and

Whereas various States not adversely affected by, nor concerned in the construction of the canal, have refused to support us in our desire and need to obtain this means of direct ocean transportation and cheap power therewith; and

Whereas our various Senators and Congressmen have during these many years assisted in or permitted the passage of legislation favoring those States whose Senators and congressional Representatives have wrongfully, willfully, and maliciously refused and denied us, without just cause, this much-needed national improvement and the benefits thereof; and

Whereas such shamefully unjust and detrimental action is now worthy of note and attention on the part of our honorable United States Senators and congressional Representatives, who favor this legislation and the creation of such a canal for the greater good of our country and its people; and

Whereas they have within their power the right to refuse and deny to such unjust Senators and Representatives in Congress, any further assistance in matters affecting the welfare of their States or until such time as such objection to the enactment of legislation favoring the deep seaway is withdrawn and enacted: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Superior Federation of Labor, That our various Senators and Representatives in Congress be requested to take im-

mediate steps to obtain for our Nation this much-needed improvement; and be it further

Resolved, That in the event of the failure or refusal of Congress to pass or favorably act upon the proposed canal and the required legislation therefor, that our United States Senators and Representatives in Congress, now favoring the same, be requested to oppose any and all legislation favoring States whose Senators and Representatives refuse or fail to cooperate and assist us; and be it further

Resolved, That they be requested to continue such opposition until such time as the proposed legislation for the deep-sea way be passed and the construction thereof assured; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to all parties of interest for consideration, publication, and display thereof; and be it further

Resolved, That a similar resolution be prepared for adoption by the Wisconsin Federation of Labor and presented thereto by our delegate at the next regular meeting thereof, and that the resolution so presented contain a similar provision for proper presentation to the American Federation of Labor at its next meeting.

The South Heard From Again on the Poll Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEE E. GEYER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 26, 1940

LETTER FROM MRS. WILLIAM T. GAYLE, JR., OF ATLANTA, GA., AND STATEMENT ON POLL TAX

Mr. GEYER of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert in the RECORD a letter from Mrs. William T. Gayle, Jr., of Atlanta, Ga., and a statement on the poll tax as a prerequisite for voting. This statement is signed by 100 prominent southern women from those States which have this voting restriction. We all recognize many of these signatures and are not surprised that these women are out in front working as usual for this extension of democracy even though they are able themselves to pay the poll tax.

Members of the House can assist these women in bringing a fuller democracy to their States by signing the petition, No. 34, on the Speaker's desk.

The letter and the statement with the signatures are printed below.

ATLANTA, GA., *August 24, 1940.*

Congressman LEE E. GEYER,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN GEYER: It is my privilege to send to you the statement of 100 southern women who deplore the virtual disfranchisement of countless women in those States which still require payment of a poll tax before voting.

These women, representative of many fields of activity and interest, are outstanding leaders in clubs and organizations in the poll-taxed States.

It is fitting that their expression of deep concern should come to the Congress on an anniversary marking the end of one great struggle to extend suffrage—the twentieth anniversary of the woman's suffrage amendment.

The expression of these thoughtful and influential women indicates the great sentiment rapidly developing in these States for the abolition of the poll tax.

Very sincerely yours,

Mrs. WILLIAM T. GAYLE, Jr.

STATEMENT OF 100 SOUTHERN WOMEN ON THE TWENTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF THE NINETEENTH AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES

Twenty years ago today, the right to vote was secured to the women of this Nation through the nineteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States. For years, America's women worked with devotion and courage toward this goal. We now realize that the victory was only partly won. We are gravely concerned that 20 years later countless thousands of women are still, in effect, disfranchised in those Southern States which require payment of a poll tax before voting.

We, the undersigned women of these poll-taxed States, are proud of our States and seek through the removal of this barrier a fuller development of the democratic process. Therefore, we call on the Congress, on this anniversary of the first great step toward woman suffrage, for legislation which will obviate for voting in Federal elections the requirement of payment of a poll tax.

Cornelia S. Adair, Richmond, Va.; Mrs. Theodore F. Adams, Richmond, Va.; Ruth A. Allen, Austin, Tex.; Jessie Daniel Ames, Decatur, Ga.; Eleanor Copenhaver Anderson, Marion, Va.; Mary Sanford Ault, Knoxville, Tenn.; Louise H. Ballerstedt, Elgin, Tex.; Mary C. Barker, Atlanta, Ga.; Gladys Boone, Sweetbriar, Va.; Mrs. Carl Brinkman, Lucedale, Miss.; Mrs. Ralph Butler, Dallas, Ga.; Nuwella Calvin, Galveston, Tex.; Mayola S. Center, College Park, Ga.; Louise O. Charlton, Birmingham, Ala.; Mrs. James H. Chesnutt, Hot Springs, Ark.; Mrs. Lawrence Coe, Memphis, Tenn.; Lillian W. Collier, Mumford, Tex.; Leny M. Comfort, Durant, Miss.; Clara C. Conroy, Albany, Ga.; Mrs. J. C. Cox, Chattanooga, Tenn.; Mrs. Henry W. Decker, Richmond, Va.; Martha Dodd, Round Hill, Va.; Mrs. Wm. E. Dodd, Jr., Round Hill, Va.; Mollie Dowd, Birmingham, Ala.; Virginia F. Durr, Birmingham, Ala.; Josephine F. Eddy, Montevallo, Ala.; Mary A. Elliott, Knoxville, Tenn.; Hallie Farmer, Montevallo, Ala.; Mrs. Laura Davis Fitzhugh, Augusta, Ark.; Bertha M. Fuller, Little Rock, Ark.; Lucy Gage, Nashville, Tenn.; Betty Gray Gibson, Richmond, Va.; Mrs. E. H. Green, Cleveland, Miss.; Evelyn Hanna, Thomaston, Ga.; Mrs. John M. Hanna, Dallas, Tex.; Lulu Daniel Hardy, Gulfport, Miss.; Julia Collier Harris, Chattanooga, Tenn.; Latham Hatcher, Richmond, Va.; Katharine H. Hawes, Richmond, Va.; Mrs. Albert E. Hill, Nashville, Tenn.; Mrs. Claude Hill, Austin, Tex.; Mrs. William H. Hogue, Houston, Tex.; Sarah H. Hood, Knoxville, Tenn.; Gertrude Horsley, Kingsport, Tenn.; Elizabeth Hughes, Houston, Tex.; Mabel Williams Hughes, Arlington, Tenn.; Ellen Atwood Ives, Atlanta, Ga.; Mrs. Louis Kaufman, Montgomery, Ala.; Mrs. Charles B. Kennamer, Sr., Montgomery, Ala.; Mrs. C. D. Killebrew, Fairhope, Ala.; Stella McGehee Landis, Mississippi; Stella Lanham, Weatherford, Tex.; Helen M. Lilienthal, Norris, Tenn.; Katherine D. Lindsay, Norfolk, Va.; Jean MacGillivray, Jackson, Miss.; Mrs. Delbert M. Mann, Nashville, Tenn.; Mrs. Julius Mark, Nashville, Tenn.; Mrs. John D. Marlin, Tullahoma, Tenn.; Mrs. L. F. Martin, Statesboro, Ga.; Lucy R. Mason, Richmond, Va.; Mrs. Devereaux F. McClatchey, Jr., Atlanta, Ga.; Mrs. W. P. McDermott, Little Rock, Ark.; Marianne E. Meade, Richmond, Va.; Mrs. Wm. Mitch, Birmingham, Ala.; Edwina Mitchell, Montgomery, Ala.; Myra Page, Norfolk, Va.; Medora P. Perkerson, Atlanta, Ga.; Thelma Stevens, Nashville, Tenn.; Anna Perlitz, San Antonio, Tex.; Mary Porter, Newport, Ark.; Martha Ragland, Chattanooga, Tenn.; Mrs. Homer P. Rainey, Austin, Tex.; Mrs. Arthur Raper, Decatur, Ga.; Evelyn Raskin, Lynchburg, Va.; Charlotte M. Rhorer, Atlanta, Ga.; Mrs. C. E. Rogers, Johnson City, Tenn.; Mrs. Wm. Cory Ross, Knoxville, Tenn.; Mary U. Rothrock, Knoxville, Tenn.; Constance Rumbough, Jackson, Miss.; Ina Scherrebeck, Nashville, Tenn.; Elizabeth Cecil Scott, Richmond, Va.; Mirth W. Sherer, Fort Worth, Tex.; Lillian E. Smith, Clayton, Ga.; Paula Snelling, Clayton, Ga.; Mrs. Alex W. Spence, Dallas, Tex.; Mrs. Frank W. Spencer, Savannah, Ga.; Mrs. Carl V. Stafford, Knoxville, Tenn.; Mrs. A. D. Stewart, Jackson, Miss.; Olive M. Stone, Richmond, Va.; Willie Hughes Tarpley, Birmingham, Ala.; Mrs. Angus M. Taylor, Birmingham, Ala.; Lucinda Lee Terry, Roanoke, Va.; Mrs. Albert Thomas, Auburn, Ala.; Mrs. J. D. Thomas, Atlanta, Ga.; Mrs. M. E. Tilly, Atlanta, Ga.; Mrs. R. L. Turman, Atlanta, Ga.; Mrs. L. O. Turner, Atlanta, Ga.; Bethann T. Van Ness, Nashville, Tenn.; Florence van Sickler, Atlanta, Ga.; May Cravath Wharton, Pleasant Hill, Tenn.; Josephine Wilkins, Atlanta, Ga.; Margaret D. Yates, Fort Worth, Tex.

AUGUST 26, 1940.

When War Comes—A Study of the Industrial Mobilization Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 26, 1940

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include this timely and enlightening study of the industrial mobilization plan.

WHEN WAR COMES

All over the world there are wars and rumors of wars. All over the United States there are anguished appeals to "keep us out of war." All over the United States there is an aroused defensive state of mind—determined to save America's constitutional government and individual liberty from the ravages of war.

With destructive armaments rumbling close to our American shores, the horrible consequences of war—individually, militaristically, and economically—are causing great anxiety in the hearts of American women. They are mindful that twice before European wars involving operations in the Atlantic have, sooner or later, drawn America into them.

It, therefore, is not amazing to find all over the United States a great stirring movement, with one objective—keep us out of war. It is not a sentimental peace-at-any-cost program. It cannot be construed as the hasty handiwork of a professional pacifist. It is supported by devout American women who believe that every effort should be made to prevent the seeming path of peace from leading us again to the field of battle.

The human and monetary costs of war are appalling. They penetrate deeply into the fiber of family life. In the widespread concern about possible American participation in the European conflict, American women cannot help but reflect gravely on the terrific costs of the last World War. Women know well these facts. They have not forgotten that in the last war more than 126,000 of their fathers, brothers, husbands, and sons died or were killed in action, and that more than 234,000 were wounded. They have not forgotten that our bills for medical and hospital care of boys who fought for American democracy 25 years ago still are staggering, and that Uncle Sam has spent approximately $425,000,000 for this post-war item alone. They have not forgotten that the total cost of the war, including all items up to the present time, has exceeded $63,000,000,000.

But the cost of war cannot be measured entirely in terms of either casualties or monetary losses. War's most far-reaching effects are upon the citizen population of a nation.

Involvement in war makes necessary the development of political institutions that inevitably lead to suppression of individual freedom. He who contemplates the possibility of the entry of this country into any form of hostilities must consider not only the losses that will be entailed in physical terms, but the losses of individual freedom that necessarily ensue.

From the history of events in Europe during the past few months, and from analyses of the problems involved, it is evident that the entry of any democracy into war will eventually disrupt democratic institutions. In this day of a complex industrial society, it is practically impossible for a democracy successfully to carry on armed hostilities without, temporarily at least, losing its democratic nature. The need for some form of centralized control of the national economy is apparent, and such control is dictatorship. These facts are not pleasant to contemplate. To disregard them is to close our eyes to realities.

Not only do these two facts obtrude themselves upon our attention at this time, but a further disquieting fact becomes apparent. Once we pass under the rigors and the controls of this absolute military dictatorship in this country, no one can say when, if ever, we would return to constitutional government and the Bill of Rights.

Under these circumstances it has become imperative that the women make a special study of the conditions which, it is now recognized, would obtain if we go to war, in order to determine what would be the situation of women and children in the event of our involvement in another conflict.

So it seems timely that we ask ourselves, if war comes, is dictatorship far behind?

1. WHAT IS THE INDUSTRIAL MOBILIZATION PLAN?

It is a study by the military and naval authorities of the financial, industrial, and human resources of the Nation, and a compilation of methods of assembling those forces for concerted effort in event this Nation should become involved in war.

After the last World War had ended, a study of its history revealed that the condition of unpreparedness in which the United States was caught when we went into the war resulted in a serious delay in our actual participation in the conflict; tremendous waste through lack of organization, inexperience, and duplication of efforts; and an enormous amount of graft and corruption due to the lack of any plans or organization for control of the financial, industrial, agricultural, and general civilian activities.

As a result of the studies by the military and naval boards it was seen that some adequate plan for the control and coordination of military and civilian activities would be necessary in advance of another war. The industrial-mobilization plan was the result of these studies. The preparation of this plan included extended hearings by the House Military Affairs Committee, further studies by the Army and Navy Boards until 1928, and the creation of the War Policies Commission in 1931. The Commission began extensive hearings on March 5, 1931. In May, General MacArthur, then Chief of Staff of the United States Army, appeared before the Commission and submitted the War Department's plan for industrial mobilization. As this plan also had the general approval of the Navy Department, and as it is the basis of all subsequent industrial mobilization plans, we may pause to note certain phases of it. The original intentions of the plan should be noted and compared later with certain provisions of the more recent plans.

Referring to the resolution by which the War Policies Commission was set up, General MacArthur said:

> The first objective given in that resolution is the promotion of peace.
>
> As a "practical step, then, in the promotion of peace the War Department strives to assist in impressing upon our own people the serious and terrible nature of modern war and the obligation devolving upon every citizen" and upon every resource to participate equitably in carrying the burdens it imposes. "A widespread knowledge of these fundamental truths," backed by a program to insure a proper distribution of war's burdens, cannot fail to have a sobering influence upon any group tempted from selfish motives to urge the adoption of national policies that might eventually result in international conflict.

The quoted portion of the above paragraph serves to show that the primary purpose of the War Department's industrial mobilization plan was to educate our people to the horrors and hardships of modern warfare in an effort to promote peace.

Among his conclusions and recommendations, General MacArthur listed as follows:

> Educational programs concerning the true meaning of modern war and its certain results in human and economic wastage are conducive to promotion of peace.
>
> The economic burdens must be equalized through: * * * (e) "Prompt resumption of normal peace conditions" upon the termination of war.
>
> Congress should satisfy itself at frequent intervals as to the progress of plans under development by requiring their presentation to appropriate committees of Congress.
>
> The War Department recommends * * * a joint resolution be adopted by Congress which will make public announcements to the Nation of the policies set forth in the following conclusions. It is believed that the announcement of these principles as approved policies of the Government will—(A) Have a serious sobering effect upon every man, woman, and child when he or she contemplates the possibility of war and will assure practical and efficient peacetime preparation for the emergency of war.

These were the purposes of the first industrial mobilization plan of 1931.

The plan was revised in 1933 and again in 1936. All three of these plans are written in great detail and explain fully the composition, scope of operation, and powers of the several boards, bureaus, and commissions to be set up during an emergency due to the imminence of war or in time of war. All three print as appendixes the bills to be rushed through Congress which would put the industrial mobilization plan in motion. The industrial mobilization plan of 1939, however,

is not a revision. It is a general summary of the much longer and more detailed plan of 1936. It is a carefully worded summary of the earlier plan, designed to conceal its full implications, and anyone not familiar with the 1936 plan, on which it is based, would feel little interest or alarm. In order to study the provisions of the industrial mobilization plan which will affect the civilian population in time of war we must study the 1936 plan.

II. WHAT ARE THE GENERAL PROVISIONS OF THE INDUSTRIAL MOBILIZATION PLAN?

A study of these plans discloses the different methods of control set up under various boards, commissions, and bureaus, to be effective upon the entry of the United States in a war and the enactment of the necessary enabling legislation. Under such circumstances the President of the United States, as Commander in Chief of the armed forces, would become in fact a military despot. His orders and proclamations would have the force of law.

Under the various controls provided in the mobilization plan, the control of finance, banking, industry, labor, agriculture, commerce, and the disposition of the persons and the activities of the civilian population would rest entirely in the hands of the Chief Executive and such subordinates as he would designate to carry out his will.

The President would act through or be advised by special boards and commissions, the composition of which in every case is set forth in charts in the mobilization plan. Generally speaking, the major boards and commissions would be as follows:

At the head, the President; subordinate to him, the existing Cabinet; the executive department, the independent establishments, boards, and commissions; the national service corporations; the Advisory Defense Council; the War Resources Administration; the War Trade Administration; the War Labor Administration; the Public Relations Administration; the Selective Service Administration; other administrations when and if necessary; the Price Control Commission; the War Finance Control Commission; the War Department; the Navy Department; the Joint Board; the Army and Navy Munitions Board; and other joint boards.

To reiterate, the President, when war seemed inevitable or after the outbreak of hostilities, would request of Congress the immediate passage of enabling legislation to put the industrial-mobilization plan into effect. The result of this act would be that the orders and proclamations of the Chief Executive would have the status and force of law. Thus the President, as Commander in Chief of the armed forces of the United States, would be clothed with full and complete dictatorial powers.

Not only would those general rights and privileges provided in the constitutional Bill of Rights, so cherished by all Americans, instantly be abrogated, but there would be an impact which completely would change daily life for every man, woman, and child. These constitutional rights would be suspended the moment the Chief Executive of the United States should declare that "an emergency due to the imminence of war" existed, and enabling legislation is enacted.

The anticipated pressure for validating legislation has begun. Congress hardly had convened on January 3 this year when the then Secretary of the Navy, Charles Edison, wrote the Speaker of the House requesting that the President's wartime powers of commandeering and procurement of ships, factories, and war materials be advanced so as to permit their exercise now in peacetime "under a proclamation of national emergency." This request was later withdrawn, but had Congress granted the request it would have meant that powers which the late President Wilson received a month before American entrance into the World War would have been given to President Roosevelt at that time.

Navy Department officials were quoted as stating the legislative recommendation was intended to "avoid confusion" and to serve as a precautionary measure. They went further and said the proposal did not mean that the Navy thought the United States would be engaged in war in the near future. Then why, ask intelligent observers, was there a move to seek wartime powers for the President, if, as he told the country on January 3, "nobody expects such an undertaking" as sending American youth to fight in Europe?

It should be borne in mind that the President is now operating under a proclamation, issued shortly after the outbreak of the European war, but described by him as "limited" in that he did not intend to invoke more than a few of the powers vested in him under the proclamation.

It is not possible in this study to go into all the provisions of the industrial mobilization plan, but the general purpose of the plan, as stated in the draft of 1936, is best indicated by the following paragraph:

The objective of any warring nation is victory, immediate and complete. It is conceivable that a war might be conducted with such regard for individual justice and administrative efficiency as to make impossible those evils whose existence in the past wars is well known. It is also conceivable that the outcome of a war so conducted might be defeat. In all plans for preparedness and policies to be pursued in event of war it must never be overlooked that while efficiency in war is desirable, effectiveness is mandatory.

In this paragraph is to be found the essence of the industrial mobilization plan. In other words, individual rights and preferences can have no place in the scheme of the Government during the emergency of the next war. Every citizen, of course, must subject himself to mandatory decrees of the military and administrative authorities.

The wording of the industrial mobilization plan on the question of which portions of the population will be required to register with the War Department when the enabling legislation should be enacted is not clear. Though all males between the ages of 18 and 45 are required to register for possible induction to the armed forces, it also seems apparent that all members of the civilian population, regardless of age or sex, who directly or indirectly could be used in the conduct of the war will also be required to register.

Though the following passage of the industrial mobilization plan is entitled "Industrial Management Provisions," it does not take much imagination to realize that regulation affecting management would also affect labor, agriculture, and the civilian population generally.

TITLE II. INDUSTRIAL MANAGEMENT PROVISIONS

This title authorizes a draft of industrial management. When in the opinion of the President the successful prosecution of the war requires it, he may establish rules and regulations for the registration of all persons in the management or control of industry. This is intended to apply to persons in executive positions who are unwilling to cooperate in the industrial war effort. In the discretion of the President registered persons in any industrial plant or industry may be brought into the service of the Government for the duration of the war and shall be subject to the jurisdiction of the War Department. However, the Secretary of War is not to interfere with the internal management of the industries. He may, in the public interest, transfer registrants to any civilian service within the jurisdiction of the War Department. The compensation of such persons industrially drafted will be paid by the Government at rates to be fixed by the President, and they may not accept any other compensation from any plant in which they render services during the war. Rules and regulations for the administration of this title would be made by the President, and penalties are provided in the bill for violations of such rules and regulations.

Note also title III:

TITLE III. WAR RESOURCES CONTROL

This title gives the President very broad powers to control all of the resources of the Nation by price fixing, licensing, rationing, requisitioning, priorities, and other measures for directing and unifying the industrial war effort.

The President, by this title, is granted discretionary wartime power and authority as follows: To fix prices; to regulate commodity exchanges; to establish a system of priorities or rationing in favor of users most vitally linked with the prosecution of the war; to provide a system of licenses for organizations or persons engaged in manufacturing, mercantile, or public-service industries; to regulate the sale, use, transportation, manufacture, or distribution of any product; to requisition any product and to sell or otherwise dispose of such products; to enforce regulations against waste, hoarding, speculation, and profiteering; to commandeer any manufacturing plant or other establishment.

III. WHAT ARE THE SPECIFIC PROVISIONS OF THE INDUSTRIAL-MOBILIZATION PLAN AFFECTING WOMEN AND CHILDREN?

These are so important that they will be reproduced verbatim from the plan itself. The bureau of women and minors is one of the 29 subdivision of the war labor administration.

The war labor administration is in turn 1 of the 5 departments of the liaison division of the War Resources Administration. The war labor administration is headed by an administrator and a deputy administrator appointed by the President.

The following passages are reproduced from pages 37, 38, and 39 of the industrial-mobilization plan of 1936:

SECTION I. BUREAU OF WOMEN AND MINORS

1. General: This bureau studies all problems peculiar to the employment of women and minors in industry and recommends regulations regarding their employment.

While the bureau is itself primarily an advisory rather than an administrative agency, the peculiar nature of its work will call for a comprehensive organization to be composed of specialists in their various fields. Both advisory and administrative agencies of the bureau will work in constant, though informal, contact with all other agencies of the War Labor Administration, particularly the employment service and the requirements and statistical bureau.

2. Advisory agencies: a. Council of housing and transportation: The council will keep informed of the progress of infiltration of women into industry and commerce, particularly where the migration of considerable numbers is involved. All migration involving change of residence is to be considered. The council's recommendations regarding the housing and transportation of these workers will consider their families also in cases where the welfare of children is involved.

b. Legal council: For several reasons, the statutes of the various States prescribe certain restrictions in the hours and conditions of employment of women and minors in industry. Other restrictions are brought about through regulations issued by various authorized Federal and State agencies, by agreements with trade unions, and in other ways. Many of these regulations and restrictions are expedient rather than necessary to the well-being of either the Nation or the workers. In a national emergency much of this expediency is lost and the operation of some of these regulations and restrictions may well be suspended.

This division has the double function of recommending in appropriate cases the suspension in whole or part of such restrictions and, with the cooperation of the division of public relations, of securing the approval of public opinion to the action taken.

3. Administrative agencies: a. Women wage earners' division: In normal times there are approximately 10,000,000 women and girls over 16 years of age employed in industry, commerce, and the professions. The specific mission of this division is to divert the greatest possible number of these, particularly those engaged in mechanical and correlated scientific work, to munitions and essential civilian industries. This task will be largely educational in cooperation with the division of public relations. The divison also must be prepared to undertake an active recruiting campaign in cooperation with the employment service for the securing, training, and infiltration of women, not gainfully employed, into industry, commerce, and auxiliary services to fill vacancies caused by the withdrawal of men to the colors and to provide for the labor expansion of many essential industries.

The work of the division will be divided among three sections:

(1) Section of women labor employed in commercial and routine office occupations: This section recommends methods to meet the needs of war and essential civilian industries for trained women. This includes the transfer of women factory workers from plants of lesser to those of greater essentiality.

(2) Section of highly trained women labor employed in administrative, professional, and scientific research positions: This section recommends methods to meet the needs of essential industries for women of exceptional training in highly specialized fields.

(3) Section of woman labor required for service with troops: This section is charged with locating women who comply with the occupational specifications of the War and Navy Departments, and aiding any agencies of these Departments which may be established for the purpose of recruiting women of such classifications for duty with the armed forces.

b. Social and economic welfare division: The accumulation of large numbers of women in restricted industrial areas to meet the labor demands of expanded essential industries presents serious problems in the maintenance of their social and economic welfare. This division through decentralized welfare units working under State organizations maintains social welfare agencies within the various industrial facilities as well as providing for social contact and aid during the leisure hours of employed women.

c. Minors division: While the employment of children under the age of 16 years in industry or agriculture will be avoided wherever possible, it must be recognized from the beginning that the nature of the emergency may require such employment in its later stages. In the earlier stages minors over 18 years of age, and in some cases over 16 years, can be utilized to advantage. The safeguarding of the morals and the physical health of such employed minors is the subject of the particular study of this division. This division further recommends regulation covering the employment of minors and their training for such employment, and lists classes of occupations from which they should be excluded.

The wording of the plan is in most cases so specific as to require no editorial comment, but we should note carefully the following salient points:

The purpose of the woman wage-earners division is to divert the 10,000,000 women and girl workers over 16 years of age from the work they are already engaged in (industry, commerce, and the professions) to work in munition factories and other industries necessary for successful completion of the war.

The woman wage-earners division has a subdivision called section of woman labor required for service with troops whose duty it is to "locate" women and "recruit" them for duty with the armed forces.

The social and economic welfare division, among its other duties, provides "for social contact and aid during leisure hours of employed women."

The minors division would be directed to take cognizance of the fact that the emergency may require the employment of children under 16 in industry or agriculture.

The legal council division of the bureau of women and minors would have a double function.

First. Recommending the suspension of legislation in various States which now restrict the hours and working conditions of women and minors in industry, which are referred to as "expedient rather than necessary."

Second. Securing approval of public opinion for such recommendation.

The Bureau of Women and Minors is one of several bureaus under the War Labor Administration. Its personnel is appointed by the President through the war labor administrator. In the words of the plan, "the bureau is in itself primarily an advisory rather than an administrative agency." Thus the provisions of the industrial mobilization plan which affect women and children will, in all probability, be administered by some other agency.

There is nowhere in the plan any provision that women will administer the details of the plan which deal with women and children, or that they will even act in an advisory manner in connection therewith.

There is no indication that women's organizations, welfare agencies, or individual women have been consulted on the details of the plan which directly affect women and minors.

IV. WHAT IS BEHIND THE SECRECY WHICH RECENTLY HAS BEEN THROWN ABOUT THE INDUSTRIAL MOBILIZATION PLAN?

The metamorphosis into a rare document of the original industrial mobilization plan, the purposes of which were to be public, educational, and to promote peace by the Nation-wide dissemination of the details of the plan to the people, has been a singular evolution. The details of the plan were recently refused the press by the Chief Executive (Wm. V. Nessly, Washington Post, Sept. 30, 1939).

On September 30 last, the President was reported in the press to have said that there would be no advantage in publishing the report of the War Resources Board, which had a brief existence following the President's declaration of a national emergency. At that time, he added, according to the press reports, that there would be no advantage in publishing plans that have been discussed for coordinating and making use of the Nation's resources in case of future emergency. In this same statement to the press, the Chief Executive stated that the last industrial mobilization plan he had seen was that of 1936.

Though it was in no way the original intention of the authors of the industrial mobilization plan to make its provisions difficult for the public to learn, there has been an apparent attempt on the part of the War Department, or the present administration, to draw attention from, rather than to, a plan which will vitally affect the daily life of every citizen of the Nation.

It might logically be supposed that there are details in the most recent drafts of the industrial mobilization plan which the War Department or the administration do not wish the general public to know. This would be understandable were the details in the nature of military or naval secrets; but as the industrial mobilization plan deals entirely with the controls which would be exercised over the civilian population, such an explanation is not valid.

V. WHAT IS THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE 1939 INDUSTRIAL MOBILIZATION PLAN?

As has been stated, the so-called 1939 industrial mobilization plan, revised, is not a revision. It would appear that the 1939 plan is an attempt on the part of the administration to cover up the alarming details of the earlier plan. But there is one significant addition in the 1939 version which does not appear in the 1936 plan. Whereas the 1936 industrial mobilization plan says specifically:

> The controls and functions under discussion are not and should not be exercised in peace. The emergency organization would automatically terminate after war.

The 1939 version says:

> The War Resources Administrator, as the termination of the emergency is approached, might well study the desirability of proposing the creation of a new and entirely separate agency to deal with the rehabilitation problem. On the other hand, it may be considered advisable, upon the termination of the emergency, to continue the War Resources Administration as a postwar readjustment administration. Decision as to the organization and composition of such an agency will depend upon personalities, the degree of rehabilitation required, and political and economic factors which would then obtain.

We cannot close our eyes to the implications of these paragraphs. Here are laid the foundations for the continuation, for an indefinite period after the war has ended, of these controls. Who is to be the judge of the period necessary for readjustment to a peacetime basis? The Chief Executive. Who is to be the judge of what is necessary for the rehabilitation of the Nation after the war is ended? The Chief Executive. Who will continue to wield these powers until such time as he voluntarily returns them to the Congress? The Chief Executive.

We must never forget that, although it takes only a majority of the Congress to validate the industrial mobilization plan and put it in force, it would take a two-thirds majority of the Congress, if the President chose to veto an act, to repeal the industrial mobilization plan.

The difference between a simple majority and a two-thirds majority in the Congress, or either House thereof, might very easily spell the difference between a return to a constitutional republic or the continuance of an American dictatorship.

VI. SHOULD THE WOMEN OF AMERICA QUESTION THE INDUSTRIAL MOBILIZATION PLAN?

The experiences of the last war in which the United States was engaged clearly show the necessity for prewar planning. No one should condemn the War and Navy Departments for their foresight in bringing to the attention of the Nation the first industrial mobilization plan, nor can anyone deny that a degree of centralized control is necessary for the successful prosecution of war. Whether or not it is likely that we will become involved in a war in the near future, it definitely is desirable to plan for such a possibility. There is need of an industrial mobilization plan; and for any such plan to be successful there is need, to a limited extent, for the exercise of emergency centralized control. But there are many features of the present industrial mobilization plan to which women of America should give careful thought and study.

It is highly desirable that everyone consider carefully what is involved in these mobilization plans so that they will be fully aware of the effects of a war on the national economy and on individuals not actually engaged in hostilities. These consequences are practically inevitable in a highly complex industrial society.

This analysis is not intended as a criticism of the industrial mobilization plan, as a whole. It is background material for the information of women. There are two features that require searching review. One is the efforts at secrecy that have shrouded the plan during the Roosevelt administration. War planning, originally, was conceived as an educational measure for making the population conscious of the consequences of war, but the New Deal apparently believes secrecy is more advisable. Secondly, it is now contemplated that the comprehensive plan of industrial control foreseen in the industrial mobilization plan will not terminate with hostilities, but that the President would continue to exercise such powers after the end of a war, and that he would be in a position to do so, so long as he desires.

The question then is Should the industrial mobilization plan as now proposed, be accepted as is, or should it provide definitely and conclusively for an end to such Executive powers when the reason for them no longer exists? That is a question to which women should give much thought.

To repeat, if war comes, is dictatorship far behind?

BIBLIOGRAPHY

United States Army and Navy Munitions Board. Industrial Mobilization Plan. Revised 1936. Washington, Government Printing Office, 1936.

United States Army and Navy Munitions Board. Industrial Mobilization Plan. Revision of 1939. A study of methods for the effective and equitable utilization of the industrial resources of the United States in time of war—October 24, 1939. Washington, Government Printing Office, 1939.

United States Congress. Senate. Special committee to investigate the munitions industry. Report on War Department bills S. 1716, S. 1722, relating to industrial mobilization in wartime. Washington, 1936. (74th Cong., 2d sess. S. Rept. 944, p. 4.)

Inaccurate and Unfair Criticism

REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 26, 1940

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, under the heading of "Words of Gold, or How Congressmen Waste Your Money Printing Political Material," the Washington News on its editorial page charges that Congressmen waste taxpayers' money by inserting in the RECORD articles which the News characterizes as "political material having nothing to do with business before Congress."

Evidently the writer of these editorials assumes that his judgment is infallible, for he states as a fact what is nothing more than an expression of his own opinion.

Mr. Speaker, if a Congressman were so unfortunate as to be married to a nagging, faultfinding wife, to a traditional "fishwife", and I am sure no Congressman is so joined, but if by any stretch of the imagination a Congressman had that kind of a wife and she were away out on the west coast or in the Philippine or Hawaiian Islands, the Congressman could not possibly feel lonesome here in Washington so long as our daily newspapers continue their present practice in their editorial columns.

Scarcely a day goes by but these editorial writers not only advise us and give us the benefit of their opinions; not only act as a monitor over Congress, but assume the role of commander in chief.

Perhaps it is regrettable from their viewpoint that they do not have the selection of Congressmen from all over these United States within their power. They are clamoring for representation in Congress but, as matters stand, through their commendation or their condemnation, through their opportunity each day, of which they frequently take advantage, to characterize Congressmen as nitwits, men of no standing, of little if any ability, and of being motivated usually by self-interest, they not only perform like, but have much of the influence of, a Simon Legree.

And please note that I have not the slightest intention of referring to the able and distinguished gentlemen who are members of the other branch of the legislative department as Eliza tripping lightly across the ice cakes.

Nevertheless, the comparison is not as farfetched as it seems, for none of us enjoy ridicule, the questioning of our motives, references to our lack of intelligence. Perhaps, too, we are susceptible to the flattery practiced by these eminent

writers, even though, in our contemplative moments, we discern the hook only partially concealed beneath the bait.

This is a two-party Government. Since when has the business delegated to Congress under the Constitution been other than partly political? Whether the Nation follows one political theory or another is an issue always before Congress. It is an issue on which editors, especially those of the four principal dailies in Washington, day after day attempt to tell Congress what should be done. This, under our theory of government, guaranteeing the right of a free press and free speech, is their right. Would it not be charitable for them to exercise that right without mud slinging, which they so often condemn when employed by those who differ with them? Let them concede to Congressmen, who, after all, are chosen in most instances by more than 300,000 people, at least an average degree of intelligence and patriotism.

One day praising Congressmen who agree with their at-the-moment political views, the next day damning them when they disagree, these editors should be not quite so cocksure that they are always right; that they alone are the possessors of a desire to serve the people. The attitude smacks altogether too much of the arbitrary left-wing New Deal theory. It leans toward the I-am-the-indispensable-man point of view.

Much of the material inserted in the RECORD by Congressmen is a reprint of editorials from various publications, inserted sometimes because the Congressman endorses the thought advanced in the editorial, sometimes to show the absurdity of the position taken by the editorial.

Editors do not hesitate to print their political opinions; and if subscribers would get news in which they are interested—as, for example, baseball scores or war news—the subscriber is forced willy-nilly, to pay for the printing of the editor's opinion, or for an article by Lippmann, or the carrying charges of My Day.

People at home, paying for the RECORD through taxation, have the right to political material, nor should they be forced to depend wholly upon private correspondence or the newspapers. They elect their Representative, pay him $10,000 a year, because they have confidence in his integrity and his judgment, and it is a little farfetched for the editor of a Washington newspaper to state, as a fact, that the Congressman is inserting in the RECORD material which has nothing to do with the business before Congress.

Some of us wonder what the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD would be like if the editors of the Washington papers had the exclusive right to determine what went into it.

At the present time the business before Congress is not only national defense, the many domestic problems which confront us, but also the question of whether we shall subscribe to the theory that there is in this Nation of more than 130,000,000 people but one man who can safely be trusted with our national destiny.

With the President traveling at public expense and making speeches advocating his own reelection, failure to give to the people, through the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and in every other possible way the other side of the issue would indicate that a Congressman was remiss in his duty.

A question now before Congress is that of amending the N. L. R. A. That question is also a political one. No doubt about it. Several times editorials from the News bearing on this question have been printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Here is another one. It reads as follows:

[From the Washington Daily News of August 22, 1940]

THE CERTAIN WAY

The term of J. Warren Madden, Chairman of the National Labor Relations Board, will expire on August 27. President Roosevelt is being urged, from some directions, to reappoint Mr. Madden.

We hope the President will not do that. Sixteen months ago, Mr. Roosevelt made good use of another vacancy occurring on the Labor Board to appoint Dr. William M. Leiserson, who had demonstrated his fairness and ability as a member of the National Mediation Board, which preserves peace between the railroads and their employees. It was hoped that Dr. Leiserson would be able to pull the Labor Board out of the morass of unfairness and incompetence into which it had sunk.

Dr. Leiserson has made valiant efforts, but they have been blocked by the other two members, Chairman Madden and Edwin S. Smith. These two men are responsible for the misguided zealotry which has brought the Labor Board into disrepute, infected its entire organization, and warped the National Labor Relations Act into an instrument of industrial disruption.

If the President will appoint a new member, as able and as fair-minded as Dr. Leiserson, the Board will then be controlled by a majority determined and competent to protect the rights of labor and to make the Labor Act serve the fine purposes that inspired it.

But what Mr. Roosevelt will do is uncertain. Therefore, we repeat what we have said many times before: The Senate should vote, at this session, on the proposed Smith amendments to the Labor Act. These amendments, passed in the House by a two-to-one vote many weeks ago, would abolish the present Labor Board and create an entirely new one, also of three members. They also would separate the prosecuting and judicial functions, which the present board has combined and misused. We believe the adoption of these amendments would accomplish certainly what we can only hope the President may accomplish when Chairman Madden's term expires.

Is it a waste of money to reprint what the erudite editor of a great national daily like the Washington News has to say on that subject? May not some wavering Senator, reading this editorial, be moved to patriotic action and follow the editor's suggestion?

If the editor has no influence on Members of the Senate, Members of the House, or on people throughout the country, he certainly has wasted a lot of good print paper and black ink.

Fledgling Pilots

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED BRADLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 26, 1940

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I do considerable flying around the country and I contact a great many pilots. Some of the stories that come to me about our airplane-pilot-training program lead me to wonder whether or not we are proceeding a bit too rapidly and whether perhaps we might not pay a bit of heed to that old adage that haste makes waste.

For instance, I talked to a veteran pilot the other day who had just returned from a number of weeks spent in Texas as an instructor in a long-established commercial air school. This was one of the number of commercial schools which has a contract with the Army to train Army fledgling pilots, and to give them the entire primary course of training, the acceptable graduates from which would qualify for the Army sceondary training schools. Under the terms of their contract, the Army agreed to supply them with the necessary training planes. This school at which he was stationed was running boys through in groups of 240 in a class, and each flight instructor had 5 boys under him. Some of these young boys, when they reported for training, had never even seen an airplane at close hand, and most of them had no previous aviation experience. The alarming thing to me was the fact that the Army had furnished this school with 14-year-old training planes commonly known in the Army as PT–1—primary training No. 1. The original engines with which these planes had been equipped had been removed and the old J–5 motor installed. These heavy craft have a speed of about 80 miles per hour, which is no faster than these small low-powered light planes which we see buzzing around every airport in the country today. The fabric was old and, if he wanted to, any 10-year-old kid could put his finger through the wings any place he desired.

Were they cracking them up? Of course they were, and I charge now, Mr. Speaker, that not one of those planes if owned by a civilian could pass the safety inspection of the Civil Aeronautics Authority. They are not safe airplanes in any sense of the word, and should be destroyed before they

destroy some of the flower of American manhood. These planes are not only used to teach these boys the fundamentals of flight but they are used to teach them aerobatics as well. About the only way that an instructor could teach these boys to loop these planes or to perform a simple Immelman turn, the elementary maneuver designed to avoid an opponent riding on your tail, was to teach the boys to roll them over on their back and dive them straight down until they gained sufficient momentum to make the necessary loop. These old crates cannot stand that punishment with any degree of safety. Mr. Speaker, these kids and these instructors are at least entitled an even chance to save their own necks.

Facilities on the Bonneville and Grand Coulee Dams

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEWIS B. SCHWELLENBACH

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 26 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

STATEMENT BY THE UNDER SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR

Mr. SCHWELLENBACH. Mr. President, yesterday's newspapers carried the announcement that the President of the United States had made available the facilities of the Bonneville Authority for the transmission and sale of electric power to be generated on the upper Columbia at Grand Coulee. This action is of extreme importance at this time when electric power is such an important factor in national defense. We in the Pacific Northwest feel that we can make an important contribution to the cause of national defense. Not only can we produce the necessary electric energy at a cost much lower than in the rest of the country, but we have the basic strategic minerals available which are so necessary in the construction of defense materials.

Because of these facts the statement issued Saturday by Under Secretary of the Interior Wirtz, jointly with Bonneville Administrator Raver, is of utmost interest to those engaged in the national-defense program.

I ask consent that this statement be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Large quantities of power to be available from the huge power facilities of the Bonneville and Grand Coulee Dams in the Pacific Northwest have been offered to the National Defense Advisory Commission in a conference at Washington with Defense Commissioner Edward J. Stettinius and Mr. Gano Dunn of the Commission.

Under Secretary Alvin J. Wirtz of the Department of the Interior and Bonneville Power Administrator Paul J. Raver informed the Commission that the rapid completion of transmission and generating facilities will make large blocks of power available for defense industries any place in the region.

The Defense Advisory Commission representatives told the Bonneville Administrator that large blocks of cheap power are essential for defense production. The Bonneville-Coulee ultimate power capacity will approach 2,000,000 kilowatts. During 1941 alone 540,000 kilowatts of capacity will be installed at Bonneville and Grand Coulee. The transmission and substation capacity is keeping pace with these installations.

Under Secretary Wirtz and Administrator Raver also discussed with the Commissioner the various deposits of strategic minerals in the Northwest available for exploitation, describing the increasing demands for power by important national-defense industries such as those for the production of aluminum, magnesium, ferro-alloys, nitrates, and other related products.

Administrator Raver told Commissioner Stettinius that approximately 300,000 kilowatts of capacity will be available on the transmission network within 12 months. This timely contribution to the power supplies of the Nation, he said, has been made possible by the recently completed interconnection of Bonneville with the huge Grand Coulee Dam, by the acceleration of the installation of additional generating capacity at both Bonneville and Grand Coulee, and by the speeding up of other transmission line and substation construction.

Under Secretary Wirtz and Administrator Raver also pointed out that the Federal Government's investment in power developments on the Columbia River has become an important investment for the Nation's security. The expenditure of public funds for these projects provides power that can be harnessed for defense industries and for the normal development of the natural resource wealth of the Pacific Northwest. The Federal Government now is in a position to obtain direct benefits from these expenditures, they said.

A complete study made by the Bonneville Power Administration of industries feasible of Northwest establishment and importance to the national defense was discussed with the Defense Commissioner by Administrator Raver at the conference. Administrator Raver emphasized the importance of the availability at this time of large blocks of continuous power for the immediate development of electrometallurgical and electrochemical industries. He reported that the Aluminum Co. of America would start aluminum operations west of the Mississippi in its new plant at Vancouver, Wash., powered with Bonneville electricity the first week in September. The aluminum thus produced will be available for defense airplane production in west coast factories.

The School Safety Patrol

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES O. ANDREWS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 26 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. CHARLES O. ANDREWS, OF FLORIDA

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. President, the School Safety Patrol is an organization of over 300,000 youngsters throughout the Nation.

The American Automobile Association sponsors and stages in Washington each year a great School Youth Patrol of around 15,000 members from throughout the United States. In the short life of this organization, the death rate for the 5 to 14 age school children has decreased 31 percent, while in the same period the rate for all age groups has increased 79 percent.

Last Sunday I spoke from New York over the N. B. C. red network on the program entitled "Sunday Drivers" sponsored by the National Broadcasting Co.

I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Over a long period of time the program Sunday Drivers has consistently endeavored to secure public cooperation in the traffic safety movement. They are to be congratulated on what they are doing to bring about better traffic conditions.

In sponsoring this program, the National Broadcasting Co. gives new evidence of the high order of public service being rendered by radio. The alertness of the radio industry to public affairs and its willingness to cooperate in movements in the public interest have done much to establish high traditions for this comparatively new means of public expression.

Today this program entitled "Sunday Drivers" is dedicated to the school safety patrols. This vast organization of some 300,000 youngsters in all parts of the country is sponsored by the American Automobile Association and its affiliated motor clubs in cooperation with schools and police. Organized primarily to safeguard school children from traffic hazards, the school patrols have also become units in a great national youth movement. It is a movement offering fine training in civic responsibility to many thousands of young Americans. It sets a fine example for many millions more.

The school year ahead will open under trying world conditions. No matter what may come in the way of new developments as a result of these conditions, it is already evident that we, as citizens, must face greater responsibilities. Our children must be given a better insight into our institutions and our ideals. They must be given a better understanding of what our institutions and our ideals mean in a democratic form of government. Our youngsters must learn the true meanings of sacrifice and discipline. Thus, organizations such as the school safety patrols have more than ordinary significance.

Since the first school patrol units were formed about 20 years ago, around 2,000,000 youngsters have seen service in this movement. Many thousands of these fine young Americans have now

reached the age when they are taking part in civic activities of all kinds. Many of them are in the military branches of service and others are ready to respond if and when they are needed. It goes without saying that the discipline, the respect for authority, the lessons in cooperative effort which they learned during their school days, will be valuable now and in the years to come.

At a time when the resources of our country are being mobilized for an emergency, we should not overlook what is being done in real youth training. I want to commend the American Automobile Association and its affiliated motor clubs for the great public service being rendered through the steadily expanding school patrols.

Aside from the civic training feature, which is doubly important under current conditions, the school safety patrols have made a real contribution to child safety. Since 1922 the motor-vehicle accident death rate for the 5 to 14 age group has decreased 31 percent. In the same period the rate for all age groups has increased 79 percent. It is evident, from these figures alone that the patrols have been instrumental in saving the lives of many thousands of school children. This protection to young Americans is the finest kind of public service.

Each year in Washington there is staged a great youth spectacle. It is the annual parade and demonstration of around 15,000 school patrol members from widely scattered States, including my own State of Florida. It has been my privilege on several occasions to review this parade. Each time I have been impressed with the spirit and the purpose of the school safety patrols. I have seen in this movement an undertaking which merits the gratitude of everyone. Gratitude not only for the quieting of fears of parents for their children in traffic; gratitude not only for the protection of schoolmates from the hazards of moving vehicles; but gratitude also for the splendid training being given these boys and girls in an organization of real service. The cooperation of youth and police officers in a common cause is in itself worth-while training for our citizens of tomorrow.

On the basis of the experience of the last 20 years, the school-patrol movement is well organized for the future. It will continue to have a far-reaching part in the protection of school children. It will also continue to give millions of youngsters new appreciation for individual care and caution. This, in turn, means the formation of valuable life-long habits.

It is a real opportunity to speak to you briefly on this interesting and entertaining radio program. I want to commend the American Automobile Association for its fine work in sponsoring the school patrols. I want to thank my friends, the "Sunday Drivers" and their sponsors, the National Broadcasting Co., for inviting me to appear on this program.

In conclusion, I urge parents everywhere to take a new interest in the school safety patrols, to see in it as a means of protection for their children and as a means of building real citizenship. With this new interest, I am confident that the 1940–41 school year will reach new peaks in public cooperation and enlarging the school-patrol movement and in attaining its fine objectives.

Sale of United States Naval Vessels

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. SCHAFER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 26, 1940

LETTER FROM HON. JOHN C. SCHAFER, OF WISCONSIN, TO WILLIAM ALLEN WHITE

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include the following letter written by me recently to Mr. William Allen White:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., August 19, 1940.

Mr. WILLIAM ALLEN WHITE,
Chairman, Committee to Defend America by Aiding the Allies,
8 West 40th Street, New York City, N. Y.

MY DEAR MR. WHITE: I acknowledge receipt of your propaganda in favor of active participation in the European war by sending the British a part of our Naval Establishment.

Please be assured that I do not look for the advice of old generals and admirals who have been retired because they are of no further use to our War and Navy Department.

If these destroyers are good enough to be used by a foreign country 3,000 miles across the sea, they are good enough to be used by the United States Navy.

Since those in charge of the United States Navy have indicated that it is too small to properly defend our country and requested the expenditure of additional billions of dollars from our almost bankrupt Federal Treasury to pay for a Navy expansion program, it is treason for anyone to advocate that we impair the effectiveness of our inadequate Navy at this time by selling or transferring a portion of it to any foreign nation.

The record seems to indicate that if President Roosevelt and his Department of Justice is sincere in their desire to apprehend members of a "fifth column" they should make a call at 8 West Fortieth Street, New York City, N. Y., where they will find the real "fifth column" aces who are operating in the United States today.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN C. SCHAFER.

No Conscription

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RUSH D. HOLT

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 26 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

EDITORIAL FROM AMERICA

Mr. HOLT. Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the August 24 issue of America, one of the leading religious weeklies of the country, entitled "No Conscription."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NO CONSCRIPTION

At a recent press conference the President said that the chance of the National Guard being sent on service outside the United States is not one in a hundred. In that case, it is proper to inquire what crisis faces this country, and makes the President insist upon authority to order the guard to the Virgin Islands, for instance, or to Peru, or the Philippines. As Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick remarked before the Senate committee, if the administration knows when war is going to strike, and at what point, Congress should also know.

When the proposition is made to call our young men to military service it is dangerous to rely on "chance," or the assurance of some official that this or that step will never be taken. If this military service is to be conscription, our vigilance must be redoubled. We do not know in detail what adaptations in our social and economic life will be compulsory under conscription, but what these may be we can conjecture from the experience of other countries. In England, for instance, the changes necessitated have completely destroyed democracy, and made that country as totalitarian as Germany.

In any case, "the present conscription plan before our legislators at Washington means the beginning of a regimentation such as our country has never known," writes the archbishop of Cincinnati. "Whether we like to admit it or not, compulsory military training is the beginning of a totalitarian form of government in our country." The reason for this statement, which will not seem in the least exaggerated to those who know the hunger of all politicians for power, is adduced by the learned prelate. "Once the Federal Government, especially Federal bureaucrats, experiences the thrill of controlling the youth of this country, reasons will always be found not only to continue but to extend that control." Archbishop McNicholas speaks the conviction of millions of Americans.

Fortunately, the vigorous opposition to conscription which exists all over this country will certainly oblige Congress to review the Burke-Wadsworth bill thoroughly. As former Secretary of War Harry Woodring wrote not long ago to Senator VANDENBERG, until the voluntary system of enlistment has been given a fair trial and found wanting, no need for conscription can be shown. In the pending bill Mr. Woodring sees "the influence of increasing tendency toward paternalism," which, if not soon checked, will make the young American "a regimented atom rather than a free being." Debate on this letter in the Senate indicated that the War Department had not given the voluntary system a fair trial, and that under the new Secretary it would not.

Were the enemy at our very gates, the demand of the administration for peacetime conscription could not be more imperative. New Zealand, Australia, and South Africa, component parts of the British Commonwealth of Nations, have not found recourse to conscription necessary, even in wartime, and our neighbor, Canada, has not gone beyond a system of mobilization for home defense only. When we, a Nation at peace with all the world, must perforce adopt conscription, while peoples at war need not, the reason must be so compelling and immediate that we ought to be permitted to know it.

Senator Wheeler's suggestion that conscription be submitted to the vote of the people is not without great merit. Since it is the people who must pay, and their sons who must die, it is altogether

proper that the people should be permitted to decide. Conscription is urged in the name of "democracy." It is dinned into our ears that democracy can be saved only by regimenting the whole country. But the warmongers will listen to no proposal to let the people rule on conscription. Their "democracy" does not go that far.

If the people wish to be in this European war up to their necks before many weeks have elapsed, they have only to permit the American war party to continue unchecked. One step to war is to put the National Guard at the disposal of the President for service in any part of the Western Hemisphere, or in Hawaii, and the Philippines. The next step is to provide him with an army, of a magnitude to be stated by him, picked from 10,000,000 American youths.

When that is done there will be no further step to war. We shall be in the war.

Keynote Address Before National Colored Democratic Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELMER THOMAS

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 26 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

ADDRESS BY ROSCOE DUNJEE

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, the National Colored Democratic Association recently held a national convention in the Eighth Regiment Armory in Chicago. The keynote address before this convention was delivered by Mr. Roscoe Dunjee, editor of the Black Dispatch and a highly respected citizen of my State of Oklahoma. I ask unanimous consent to have the address printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I understand that Oscar DePriest, a distinguished citizen of this community, has done us a great honor. I am advised he says that Negro Democrats are "foolcrats." I come today to beard the lion in his den. I want to devote a lot of my time today to the Negroes in America, who, like Oscar DePriest, assume the philosophy of Lot's wife, looking backward at the Republican ruins of Sodom and Gomorrah.

VOTE IN OKLAHOMA

I come from Oklahoma, that fair State where the Indian and the coyote used to roam. I come from a State where 40,000 Negroes now vote in the Democratic primary, and I come from below the Mason and Dixon's line to fling this challenge in the face of Oscar DePriest:

The 40,000 "foolcrats" down in Oklahoma, who have sense enough to be Democrats, are the black men and women who by their vision and good fellowship among the citizens with whom they live are going to politically liberate the millions of beleaguered members of our race now disfranchised in the far reaches of the Southland.

NEGRO ASLEEP

For 60 years the Negro laid down and went to sleep in the back yard of the Republican Party. He asked for nothing and got nothing; but we who are assembled here today have discovered the power in the ballot. We were dissatisfied with the crumbs that fell from the Republican table. Practically all of the older men of this convention are former Republicans and we left the Republican Party immersed in that philosophy expressed by the immortal Frederick Douglass when he said:

"Men have in their own hands the peaceful means by which they may put all of the moral, political, and economic enemies to flight, if they will faithfully, courageously, and valiantly use them."

L. K. WILLIAMS IN OKLAHOMA

Once before I have had to correct the thinking of one of the distinguished citizens of this fair city. He came down to Oklahoma during the last Presidential campaign admonishing an old colored lady whom he said symbolized all of the Negro Democrats in America. He said there was an old colored lady up here in Chicago who was singing a song entitled "Jesus Leads Me and Roosevelt Feeds Me."

Well, I am glad to come to Chicago today to say that in spite of the Reverend L. K. Williams, the great Republican leader, Jesus, still leads and Roosevelt still feeds the great American Nation.

Parties are nothing except that they represent principles in government. The principles for which the Republican Party first stood have my approval, but when parties change their principles we should forget party and follow principle. This is the grave error made by Negroes who belong to the Republican Party.

"LILYWHITE-ISM"

I was once a Republican. For 18 years down in Oklahoma I was the undisputed head of the Negro wing of the Republican organization. I sat in the Republican convention in Kansas City in 1928 where "lilywhite-ism" was florescent. I shall never forget that memorable and despicable scene when, in spite of the truth and the facts, the Republican Party sold the Negro down the river.

"Lilywhite-ism" drove me out of the Republican Party. I was wounded in the house of my friends. I was present when Gooseneck Bill McDonald, of Fort Worth, and Ben Davis, of Georgia, were given their walking papers, and I lived long enough to see that same "lily white" organization send Mable Willibrandt from the department of "injustice" down to Mississippi in an attempt to put Perry Howard behind prison bars. Perry Howard happened to be one of those fellows spoken of in the Bible.

Perry has eyes but sees not. He has ears but hears not. Perry was trying to and is still trying to stay in Sodom and Gomorrah. Perry Howard was still looking back toward Lincoln and to Frederick Douglass who said, "The Republican Party is the ship, all else the sea."

TOOK FRENCH LEAVE

Well, I come to Chicago today to say that the Democratic Party is the ship, all else the sea. I think I proved that rather conclusively to the Reverend L. K. Williams when he came down to Oklahoma 2 years ago. I think I'll take time out to tell you how I forced Reverend Williams to take French leave from our parts. I heard State Senator King and Reverend Williams were coming down to explain to us the "whereforeness of the which." I decided that Reverend Williams was one who needed an intelligence test, so I prepared examination papers for him.

I knew what Hoover prosperity had done for the American people and I thought that if Rev. L. K. Williams and State Senator King had not heard about it, I would treat them to a little information. You know there are still some mountaineers up in the hills of Tennessee who have not found out Lincoln is dead, and who come down into the valley each election to vote for him.

So with this in mind, and with the hope that these deluded individuals would see the light, I prepared a list of 13 questions and registered them special delivery to the temporary residence of Reverend Williams. I asked this distinguished churchman to answer these questions when he spoke to his Oklahoma City audience. I am here to say that he never answered a single one of those questions. He called me up and said he would prepare a statement regarding same when he returned to Chicago. Apparently, Lacy Kirk Williams has never gotten back home, for he still owes me a letter answering my questions.

Now here is the list of 13 questions I asked Dr. Williams:

QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Did you know that during the 10-year period ending with the Hoover administration, Negro farmers lost their rural holdings in the amount of 2,748,619 acres—an area almost twice the size of the State of Delaware? This happened under the Republican "old deal," did it not?

2. Did you know since President Roosevelt inaugurated the New Deal and organized the Agricultural Adjustment Administration, Negro farmers have been able to purchase 4,046 individual farms, representing more than 400,000 acres? Tell the audience how you account for this. (Negroes voted down South.)

3. Where are the mile-long soup lines and the hungry hordes who were breaking into food stores bequeathed to the Democratic Party by Herbert Hoover's "old deal"? Do you remember?

4. Why have the daily papers ceased to carry stories which tell of rich men jumping out of 20-story windows? (Even a few Negroes jumped.)

5. Did you know that the New Deal you lambast is furnishing money in the United States to give 5,057 Negro youths a college education; keeps 21,331 in high school and is giving 128 graduate work?

6. Did you know that more than 400 Negro youths are being educated by the New Deal in Oklahoma today? This is the direct result of assistance coming from the National Youth Administration. Do you oppose this Government aid?

7. When Republicans shout "constitutionalism" today, are they not in fact advocating State rights, the principle which in the South has given birth to Jim Crow, disfranchisement, and segregation?

8. Does not the Roosevelt New Deal seek to centralize government and give uniformity to national laws, which would rid the United States of sectionalism and finally southern prejudice?

9. Where are the highjackers and kidnapers of 1933? Do you feel that President Roosevelt's C. C. C. camps had anything to do with this?

10. Do you know that the C. C. C. camps removed from the highway that leads to lawlessness and crime 50,000 young Negroes, and that out of their Government checks these black boys are sending back home slightly more than a million dollars each month? Do you condemn this New Deal program? Did Republican administration ever attempt anything similar?

11. Why have the Liberty Leaguers and members of the anti-New Deal crowd sought to traduce and malign the wife of President Roosevelt? Is it because she has been friendly to Negro development and progress, or is it because she is an enemy of black folk? (I'd like to make Mrs. Roosevelt President).

12. Is it not true that the Republican Party "sold the Negro down the river" in the Kansas City convention, which nominated Herbert Hoover, when the "lily whites" ousted "Gooseneck Bill" McDonald of Texas, and the Georgia delegation?

13. What do you think of a remark made by Congressman Oscar DePriest, of your city, in the church where you now stand? Congressman DePriest said in that statement: "If I were a Negro and lived in Oklahoma, I'd be a Democrat." (Oscar himself would be a "foolcrat" if he lived in my State.)

NOTHING CONSTRUCTIVE IN REPUBLICAN CONVENTION

If you listened in on the Republican National Convention the other day, you noticed that the boys who gathered in Philadelphia were against something and for nothing.

Not alone in politics, but in all life we find people who knock every constructive program, and many people think knockers are extremely smart because they oppose what is being done. Usually, the only thing one has to do to expose such individuals is to ask them what they have to offer as a substitute for the present order.

BE HONEST WITH VOTERS

You hear Republicans orating against the New Deal, and the terrible expenditures being made in our relief set-ups. But why are they not honest or intelligent enough to tell the American people what it is they would cut out? Do the Republicans want to get rid of W. P. A.? Do they want to get rid of C. C. C.? Do they want to get rid of N. Y. A.? Do they want to scrap-heap the housing program or the farm-security program? What is the definite and positive change these fellows would make in the present governmental function?

Why great day in the morning! When my father died he left my mother and me in a dilapidated old house with which I was very much dissatisfied. It was an old unpainted structure, had no porch or foundation under it, and the ceiling was made of cheap canvas. I was utterly disgusted with that home, but I am here in Chicago today to tell you that I never moved out of that home until I was able to build a better one in which to live.

It seems to me that the Republican Party wants the American people to move out into the rain. I have read the speeches of Taft, Dewey, Vandenberg, and Willkie, and in each instance it is a statement of negation. I think that the greatest creation of the mind is expressed in the radio. One can back a $2 jackass up to the finest radio in the world and that jackass can kick the radio all to pieces, but the jackass cannot reconstruct this monument to man's superb mentality.

WARNING TO NEGROES

There is just one thing that has been said by Republican speakers that is perfectly understandable. I want to stop right here and call attention to it. I think Candidate Alf Landon expressed it very clearly 2 years ago during the campaign in a speech at Wichita.

Here is what Candidate Landon said:

"The Republican Party as a major reform proposes to return the administration of relief to the States. It will be possible for the communities themselves to determine just what form relief would take. They will determine what, if any, work-relief project will be started and continued."

I know every one of my listeners can understand that the Republican Party wants to take the administration of W. P. A., C. C. C., N. Y. A., and A. A. A. out of the hands of the Federal Government and place it in the hands of the State.

AM I MY BROTHER'S KEEPER?

I ask you in all sincerity whether or not you believe that the millions of black folk who live south of the Mason and Dixon's line would fare better or worse under such an arrangement. What would happen in Mississippi, Alabama, Georgia, and Louisiana? I stand here today shouting from the hilltops that age-old expression, "Am I my brother's keeper?" If you want to rescue and help the black men and women south of the border you'll never allow the Republican Party to reconstruct agencies of relief in any such manner.

PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT SAYS

At the same time that Alf Landon was making his memorable address at Wichita, President Roosevelt uttered this very significant statement:

"I do not believe that Kansas would have pulled through the difficult problems of the past 4 years as splendidly as it has, had it not been for Federal cooperation, and Federal assistance in many fields of your endeavor. If you think we were wrong to give this assistance, then, to be logical you must ask in the day to come every State in the Union shall set itself up as an individual entity for the solution of all the problems of the inhabitants."

PARTY CHANGES

I said a while ago that the Negroes in the Republican Party had gone to sleep in a political back yard. A man asleep is like Rip Van Winkle; he wakes up finally in a new environment and bewilderment. If the Negroes in the Republican Party had not been asleep, they would have known long before now that both the Republican and the Democratic Parties have swapped their party principles and that the Democratic Party and the New Deal now stand for centralization of authority and uniformity of laws.

In the days of federalism and antifederalism the same line of demarcation between political parties existed then as now. State rights was the rock upon which the Democratic Party rested and the Republican Party marched under the banner of central control.

STATE RIGHTS ISSUE

It ought to be perfectly clear to every Negro in America that State rights has been the vicious principle in government from which all our woes emanate. Jim Crow, segregation, disfranchisement, and mob violence are all made possible by special legislation and special sanctions in State-rights States. Central control and uniformity of laws would make it possible for America to have an even spread of democracy. There is no better way to identify Negroes asleep in the Republican Party than when we see the time-honored principles of the party abandoned and the party of Lincoln embracing the idea and notion of government as expressed by the Republican grass-roots convention held at Springfield, Ill., 2 years ago and the later statement of Alf Landon at Wichita.

CONSTITUTIONALISM MEANS SAME THING

Of course, the Republicans do not use the term "State rights." They shout about constitutionalism, which, when reduced to its meaning, is equivalent to the same thing. When President Roosevelt wanted to reorganize the Supreme Court the Republicans shouted "constitutionalism," even though they knew that the Constitution of the United States provided for the President doing everything he was attempting to do regarding the Supreme Court.

The remarkable thing about this changing of the Supreme Court rests in the fact that the Negroes in the Republican Party were imbued with the same thought and idea as their constitutional shouting white colleagues.

SACRED COW

Every Negro I met at that time in the Republican Party seemed to think that the Constitution of the United States is a sacred cow of some sort. They do not recall that the American people have written 21 amendments to that document, every one of which recognizes delinquencies and lack of vision on the part of those who first drafted it. Why the Constitution in its originally adopted form did not have a Bill of Rights, and I say here and now that without the Bill of Rights America would not have a democratic form of government. The truth is we are going to have to write a number of new amendments to the Constitution of the United States before democracy is more than a gesture at human rights in this country. But the most ridiculous position taken by the Republican Party results from attempts to prevent the President from reorganizing the Supreme Court. To kick men off and put new men on was characterized by Republicans as outraging that venerable document. They argued that it was not the American way and belonged to a Hitlerized form.

SUPREME COURT

Negroes who endorsed such views do not realize that Abraham Lincoln had to constitutionalize the emancipation of the slaves in identically the same manner as President Roosevelt attempted to make legal the various New Deal agencies of government. Lincoln knew when he wrote the Emancipation Proclamation the same was unconstitutional, but Lincoln did not stop there. In a conversation with members of his Cabinet he discussed the social and political outlook of members of the Supreme Court whom he was sure would declare unconstitutional the freeing of the slaves. Here's what Lincoln said:

"I must change the membership of the Supreme Court in order that I may constitutionalize the Emancipation Proclamation."

Lincoln had to do the same thing regarding paper money that is in circulation now. The Constitution of the United States does not provide for the making of paper money. But Lincoln put paper money in circulation during the Civil War. After the war, Lincoln had to change the complexion of the Supreme Court in order to have a judicial body that would declare paper money constitutional.

JUSTICE HUGO BLACK

Unquestionably about the dumbest human I know is the black man who will today follow the Republican Party in its mad witch hunt for a type of constitutionalism which if it had been followed in Lincoln's time would have reinslaved all black men. One thing we can thank President Roosevent for is that when he did get a whack at the Supreme Court he went out into the citizenship of this great Nation and found Justice Hugo Black.

For years I have berated the order of the Ku Klux Klan, but President Roosevelt has taught me that "good can come out of Nazareth," and I come to Chicago to say that if all klansmen are like Justice Hugo Black, let us have more and more klansmen.

DEMOCRATIC VIRTUES

And the Democratic Party under the New Deal has been busy with its searchlight finding the gold within the ranks of the Negro race. The Democratic Party located and found for the American Negro that incomparable statesman and valiant fighter for race rights, Congressman ARTHUR W. MITCHELL.

The fight that Congressman MITCHELL has made against lynching; his single-handed fight against the evils of Jim Crow transportation facilities and his ceaseless vigilance the past 4 years in

the halls of the Federal Legislature should forever endear him in the hearts of America's largest minority group.

The Democratic Party reached out upon the broad prairies of Missouri and found that able leader who heads their organization, Dr. William J. Thompkins. Surely those of us who have watched the movements of Dr. Tompkins in the office of Recorder of Deeds are proud that the great prairies of the West could offer to the Nation this unselfish and outstanding black man.

The New Deal located and found that diplomat and polished statesman from the great State of New York, who has made a distinguished record in the Republic of Liberia. I speak of none other than the Honorable Lester Walton, another boy who comes from the great plains of the West.

The New Deal reached out to find that spotless, matchless woman, who, as the bard sang, "is pure as the icicles that hung in the Temple of Diana and as chaste as the vestal virgins." I speak of none other than Mary McLeod Bethune.

I might go on and on to prove that the New Deal has placed emphasis upon intelligence and integrity within the ranks of Negroes. I might add to the list such brilliant sons of Jethro as Edgar Brown, Ambrose Caliver, Dr. Robert C. Weaver, Eugene Kinckle Jones, Joseph H. P. Evans, Maceo Smith, Lawrence W. Oxley, and many others too numerous too mention.

I don't know why they started designating the Roosevelt administration as the New Deal, but I will say for the American Negro that the selection of this vast array of eminent and prepared black men for administrative responsibility is unquestionably a New Deal for Negroes in America.

THE NEW PROGRAM FOR WHICH WE SHOULD FIGHT

Nothing I have said should cause the delegates assembled in this convention to feel that there is nothing left for which to fight. In fact the battle for the black man has just begun here in America. We must teach greater solidarity in voting and destroy vicious individualism that crops out every time an election is held. Unselfish leaders, interested in the common weal, is the crying need of the hour.

QUELL THE MOB

We should join the struggle for passage of antilynching legislation. I am proud to say that the present bill now before the Congress was drafted and introduced by Democrats. The Republican Party in its Philadelphia convention devoted three lines to a general statement against lynching, but that convention, in line with the attitude of the Republican Party through all of the years while in power, refused to declare itself for a definite proposal. The Republican Party lacked the moral courage to say it favored and endorsed the Wagner antilynching bill.

POLL TAX

We must join in the protest against the vicious poll tax which now strangles millions of poor whites and blacks in the Southland. I want to say here and now that if the unqualified right to the ballot is ever given to the black man in the South, there will be no need of an antilynching bill. Sheriffs and courts are unwilling to identify and prosecute members of mobs because the mob votes but the victims of mob and their relatives and friends do not vote.

We should battle within our party ranks for the right of the Negro to be integrated into every branch of the combat units of the American Army and we should insist upon a program that will in its finality deliver into the hands of every citizen of this Republic his civil rights.

Our ballots should secure for black men and women occupational opportunities, and the right to achieve in every avenue of life in our dynamic American society. If these are our objectives, if we struggle in this direction, we shall some day win our place in the sun, and this will indeed be a nation conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

I want to insist here and now that as American citizens we demand the right to be integrated into every branch of the American Army. Recently I appeared before the resolutions committee of the Oklahoma Democratic State Convention. White men who spoke before that body were in utter frenzy, asking that the convention virtually declare war on Germany. From what they said one would think that Hitler was going to sweep over the ocean and invade America within a few months.

When I did get an opportunity to talk I told that committee about the obvious discriminations in the American Army. I told them how Pat Hurley, from my State, who when Secretary of War under Herbert Hoover had practically demobilized all of the Negro combat troops of the Army. I told them that at Fort Sill, in my State, and at Fort Riley in Kansas, Negroes were nothing more than manure handlers. I told them that if Hitler was going to come over here, Negroes wanted to be armed with something else other than a mop and a broom.

The Republican Party under Herbert Hoover struck at the Negro's right to fight for this country and we want to ask our party convention this year to put a gun in the black man's hands. We want the right to fight in the Army, Navy, the air, and the National Guard. The Oklahoma Democrats wrote such a plank into our State platform and I believe the time is ripe for such a plank in our national platform.

LABOR

The most important fight which I believe we should launch during this convention is in relation to the problems of labor. I would be derelict in my duty here were I to paint a picture of satisfaction in which no account is taken of the toiling masses. Much has been done in New Deal legislation in the interest of the workingman, and many black men and women have benefited thereby.

But wage and hour laws exclude outside workers, agriculturists and domestics. I think we should insist that all such laws be amended in recognition of the fact that practically all Negro workers come within the classifications excluded from the wage and hour laws. We must cease emphasizing that a few Negroes get big jobs and remember that Booker Washington said, "We shall rise in proportion as we raise the standard of the common masses."

WE WANT ROOSEVELT

And finally, in the last analysis, we want this convention to nominate for the Presidency of the United States Franklin Delano Roosevelt. He is the only man who today seems to see the "sparrows" in American life. We want Roosevelt to continue as President because his social outlook has meant more to the downtrodden, and especially the American Negro.

Refugees De Luxe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RUSH D. HOLT

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 26 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

ARTICLE FROM MAGAZINE FRIDAY

Mr. HOLT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the August 30, 1940, number of the magazine Friday, entitled "Refugees De Luxe." The article contains numerous pictures which, of course, may not be printed in the RECORD, but I ask that the titles of the pictures be printed.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the magazine Friday]

REFUGEES DE LUX—THE TITLED ELITE FLEE THE RUINS OF THE OLD WORLD FOR SAFETY IN UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

"Give me your tired, your poor,
Your huddled masses yearning to breathe free,
The wretched refuse of your teeming shore,
Send these, the homeless, the tempest-lost to me."

These are the words carved at the base of the Statue of Liberty. They were written by Emma Lazarus. They have greeted newcomers for 150 years.

When the Duchess of Athlone, sister of Dowager Queen Mary of England, visited Palm Beach back in the happier days Mrs. Edward Townsend Stotesbury refused to curtsy to royalty.

"After all," said the queen of Palm Beach society, "this is America."

If the widow of Ned Stotesbury, self-made millionaire, still refuses to bend the knee, this is the year in which she can be adamant many times over. Europe's nobility is surging toward safety. There are so many titles on these hospitable shores that the social register might do its exclusive clientele a service by appending an Almanach de Gotha, directory of royalty.

Time was when every society writer blithely typed out "Countess Laszlo Szechenyi" without having to look up the spelling for Mrs. Cornelius Vanderbilt's sister-in-law, the American-born Gladys Vanderbilt. But today the society reporters and readers grapple with a whole new string of foreign names and genealogies. The House of Hapsburg, the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg, the Principality of Liechtenstein, Poland, France, and, of course, England—all are sending us their refugees. Like the millions they left behind in the war areas, they fled their homes. Unlike those others, they have no difficulty in finding wide-open doors here.

To many this is a home coming after years of lavish life abroad. Lady Mendl (Elsie de Wolfe, one time New York actress, international hostess and exponent of beauty-through-standing-on-one's-head), told reporters: "Through it all I didn't shed a tear until I felt my feet touch the ground at LaGuardia Field. Then I found myself sobbing."

"All" referred to the hungry children she saw sleeping in fields and roadsides at the Spanish frontier before she and her husband, Sir Charles, got to Lisbon for an American plane; to the flight from their Versailles home, the luxurious villa Trianon, with a stop at Biarritz; to 2 days of living on sardines and tea, sleeping in the two

cars they drove; to the landing in New York with a triple strand of pearls about her throat and runs in her stockings.

At the field, before leaving for the St. Regis Hotel, she said: "It's so foolish to cry for a home when so many are suffering. It's really so little to lose."

Like Lady Mendl, Lady Ribblesdale has come home. Vincent Astor's mother had renounced American citizenship in 1919 when she dazzled international society by her second prize catch. She had divorced John Jacob Astor in 1909 and 10 years later married Thomas Lister Ribblesdale, former lord in waiting to Queen Victoria, and master of Her Majesty's buckhounds. She had given up a career as queen of Newport society, but London more than made it up. Only once she was so deeply hurt that she left England for America "for good." That was in 1911 when Queen Mary, shocked at the close-fitting gown the dashing divorcee wore to a court ball, cut her dead in Hyde Park next day. Humiliated, the American expatriate decided to go to Philadelphia.

But she went back, married Lord Ribblesdale, lived to see both husbands die (Astor went down on the Titanic) and to see royalty shudder in a new era. Now, in her seventies, she is an American again. A month after she fled the war she took the oath of allegiance with 250 others in a hot, crowded naturalization bureau in New York. There was little red tape since she had been born an American, but she, of all the 250, had to take an extra oath renouncing a title of nobility.

The wealthy Earl of Carnarvon, who married dancer Tilly Losch last year, insisted that his countess go back where she came from for safekeeping. Because England restricts outgoing cash the countess said on arriving that she might have to dance again. She did, in a Lewisohn Stadium ballet. One gathers that dancing is a relief compared to living with the 100 evacuated children who shared Highclere, her husband's magnificent castle. She confided to reporters what a time she'd had teaching them to sleep in pajamas instead of underwear.

While the large-scale evacuation of children was held up by the cry of "no ships to spare," England's little lords and ladies who weren't sent to Canada find generous hosts here. J. P. Morgan took time off from international finance to receive the Earl of Rosebery's son, 11-year-old Lord Primrose (still clutching a gas mask), and George Vivian and Ann, two youngsters whose father, Baron Bicester, is a partner in the Morgan London banking house. They're at J. P.'s Locust Valley, L. I estate. Mr. Morgan also sponsored the visit of Queen Elizabeth' niece and nephew, Davina and Simon Bowes-Lyon, whose father is Her Majesty's brother.

Patricia and Pamela Mountbatten, daughters of the King's very wealthy cousin, Lord Louis, have, as patronesses, Mrs. Cornelius Vanderbilt, a sovereign in her own right—acknowledged queen of Newport. Cholly Knickerbocker, Hearst society gossip, suggests, however, that she was "done out of" one set of royal visitors. When former Empress Zita, who has spent a quarter century trying to put her son, Archduke Otto, on the nonexistent Austrian throne, came over with a squad of her children, most of the family went to "The Columns," a handsome estate at Royalston, Mass. This had been turned over to them by Calvin Bullock, president of the Nation-Wide Securities Co., and his wife.

Gleefully Knickerbocker wrote this of the Bullocks (who have been in the Social Register only since 1931): "They certainly put one over on Mrs. Cornelius Vanderbilt, who is rather inclined to think all visiting royalty are her special property. * * * I've tied a string around my finger so I won't forget to mail Mrs. Vanderbilt an auto road map showing the way from Newport, R. I., to Royalston, Mass."

Zita is a sister of Prince Felix, of Nazi-held Luxembourg. Felix, who has issued delighted statements on American hospitality, has had every reason to do so. Only portions of the press muttered when a warship, the United States cruiser *Trenton*, became a refugee boat for him and his six children, two retainers, and a nurse. They landed in Annapolis, received a 21-gun salute and four band flourishes, lunched in state with President Roosevelt, and then went to Hillwood, the Long Island estate of Mr. and Mrs. Joseph E. Davies. Mrs. Davies, who was Marjorie Post, heiress to breakfast food millions, and her husband, once Ambassador to Belgium and the Soviet Union and Minister to Luxembourg, hadn't occupied Hillwood for 5 years.

The press, incidentally, has been doing a bit of muttering on other aspects of the refugee problem. An editorial in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch complains that "English and French race horses, refugees from Europe's war, are winning handsome prizes on American tracks" while children wait their chance to come here. They can't be expected to win races.

And a tale, attributed by the New York Post to Edmond Taylor, former C. B. S. European reporter, relates that Lady Astor sent a dozen horses (passage $400 each) at a time when Britain said she had no ships to transport children. This, the story goes, was kept a secret by the British Government.

Among those who did make the crossing were various branches of the Rothschild family of bankers, en route from the ruins of international power to the havens of Canada and the United States. Baron Edward, once a director in the Bank of France, came on the Yankee Clipper with his wife and daughter, and a little black satchel holding a million dollars' worth of jewels.

As for the others nestling in American security, this is but a partial list: Count Haugwitz-Reventlow, Barbara Hutton's former husband; Lady Yule, who inherited some one hundred millions made by Sir David in India; Mrs. Joseph Beck, wife of Poland's pro-Fascist foreign minister, with their son; Countess Susanna Potocki, whose husband, Count Jerzy, Polish Ambassador to the United States, is a scion of an old land-owning family; Baroness Lili Hatvany, the literary beauty whose family for years controlled Hungary's beet-sugar industry.

An American frontier farmer named Creveceour wrote shortly after settling in this country in 1759: "The rich stay in Europe, it is only the middling and the poor that emigrate. In this great American asylum, the poor of Europe by some means have met together. * * * To what purpose should they ask one another, what countrymen they are? Alas, two-thirds of them had no country. Can a wretch who wanders about, who works and starves * * * can that man call England or any other kingdom his country? * * *."

But now the story is a new one. America's newcomers today have had a country, have owned a country, and have left.

[Captions on illustrations]

Britain's propaganda contact man and a favorite of Park Avenue, Noel Coward, is shown at a war benefit tea in England between visits to the United States of America. Actress Evelyn Laye is with him, signing autographs (center). Answering criticism in Parliament of the playwright-composer's presence in America because he does not "appeal to democracy in America and does not represent democracy here," the Ministry of Information said: "He possesses contacts among certain sections of American opinion which it is difficult to reach by ordinary means." Coward, now in New York City, is frequently mentioned in gossip columns.

Lady Yule, widow of Sir David, reputed to be England's wealthiest woman. She had nothing of interest to say to reporters on her arrival. She inherited a fortune said to total $100,000,000, which her husband made in Indian enterprises. It was increased recently by the sale of the yacht *Nahlin* to King Carol of Rumania. The Duke of Windsor used it for his Mediterranean cruise in 1936.

Count Kurt Haugwitz-Reventlow's latest trip to America was as a refugee instead of as husband. He has been divorced from Barbara Hutton, Woolworth heiress. Shown with Mrs. Margaret Drayton Vanlear, a divorcee, the handsome Danish nobleman denied the possibility of reconciliation with his ex-wife, denied also a romance with Mrs. Vanlear, being welcomed at pier.

Sir Charles and Lady Mendl, former American Elsie de Wolf, toppled from Hitler's French conquest from her throne as hostess to international society at the luxurious Villa Trianon in Versailles. With a full schedule of trips to the seasonal meccas planned, Lady Mendl hopes to forget the nightmare of her dash from Paris to Lisbon along refugee-packed roads where hungry children slept in ditches and fields. Lady Mendl herself lacked the usual conveniences in her flight, suffered great discomfort when runs developed in her only pair of stockings and when she had to live on sardines and tea for 2 days, but the three strands of pearls around her neck came through unscathed.

Patricia Mountbatten, believed to be England's "richest little girl," and her sister, Pamela, have been entrusted by their parents, Lord and Lady Louis Mountbatten, the King's cousins, to Mrs. Cornelius Vanderbilt during their wartime stay in this country. They will serve as consolation guests to Mrs. Vanderbilt who, according to Cholly Knickerbocker, Hearst society gossip, looked forward to entertaining Empress Zita and her royal brood, only to lose them to the Calvin Bullocks (in the social register "only" since 1931).

Former Empress Zita came, after 25 years of international scheming to restore the ancient Hapsburg rule in Austria, with her children, including Archduke Otto, pretender to the nonexistent throne and possessor of 17 names. Also with her are Archduchess Elizabeth and Archduke Felix. Zita and her 8 children now occupy the Royalston, Mass., estate of a broker. The royal prediction on war's victors: "Why, the democracies, of course."

Lady Ribblesdale is plain Mrs. Alva Willing Ribblesdale now, having regained her citizenship and renounced her title on returning from embattled England, where she spent 31 years. Widow of Lord Ribblesdale, and the farmer Mrs. John Jacob Astor, she came back only after urgent appeals from her son. She can, however, still pursue her British way of life at his Bermuda villa. Back in 1909 she was queen of Newport society.

With jewels worth a million dollars salvaged from one of the largest French fortunes, Baron Edward de Rothschild came with his wife and daughter. The baron, head of the French branch of the once powerful 140-year-old European banking family, pleaded ignorance when asked by reporters to discuss economic questions. A dozen other Rothschilds have found sanctuary from war in the United States and in Canada, where they may reunite.

J. P. Morgan took a morning off from his Wall Street banking house to greet three children of nobility for whom his Locust Valley, Long Island, estate is serving as a refuge. In her nurse's care is Ann Smith, daughter of Baron Bicester, a member of the Morgan London branch. Lord Primrose, II, son of the Earl of Roseberry, J. P., incidentally, was prevented by the war from going to Scotland for his annual grouse shooting. He is also sponsoring visits of other English nobles.

Prince Consort Felix and his six children far from the war-torn Duchy of Luxembourg, are sheltered on Long Island in a luxurious mansion lent them by Joseph E. Davies, former Ambassador to Belgium and the Soviet Union and Minister to Luxembourg. The children are Crown Prince Jean, Princess Alix, Princess Marie-Adelaide, Princess Elizabeth, Princess Marie-Gabrielle, and Prince Charles. Grand Duchess Charlotte-Adelgonde did not come.

Use of Food Stamps for Liquor and Race Bets by Persons on Relief

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 26 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

ARTICLE FROM THE WASHINGTON TIMES-HERALD

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the Washington Times-Herald of today, entitled "Reliefers Using Food Stamps for Liquor and Race Bets, Coast Officials Learn." This is a disgraceful proceeding. This money and these benefits were made available to aid the poor people of this country and their families. I certainly am shocked to find these funds going for liquor and betting on race tracks. I am glad those cases are being investigated, and I hope the persons involved will be punished.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Times-Herald of August 26, 1940]

RELIEFERS USING FOOD STAMPS FOR LIQUOR AND RACE BETS, COAST OFFICIALS LEARN

LOS ANGELES, August 26 (C. T. P. S.).—Federal investigators here are making an extensive inquiry into reports that reliefers who buy food stamps are using the stamps illegally to place bets on the races and buy liquor and tobacco. Some even sell the stamps to friends who buy automobiles with them, it was alleged today.

Already eight arrests have been made, and at least four more cases are to be placed before the grand jury after its recess. One woman, who represented herself as destitute bought $40 worth of stamps the day after she received her first relief check for $11.04, officials said. In her first month on relief she allegedly purchased $58 worth of the stamps, although $58 is the maximum possible dole for a month.

Officials also quoted the case of a man who received his first relief check of $29, and the following day bought $40 worth of stamps. Other similar cases are said to be under investigation.

Two former relief administrative employees, Boyd Robbins and Charles Thomas, said they believed persons who spent an unusually large proportion of their dole for food stamps were furnished the money by someone else, unless they had sources of income concealed from relief officials.

"A person on relief can get a $15 book of stamps for $10," Robbins said. "The $15 book is accepted by some bookmakers at face value. This enables a reliefer to place a $15 bet with a $10 outlay.

"While the stamps are supposed to be good only at groceries and for designated foods, some grocers accept them for liquor, tobacco, and even some poolroom operators accept them. All dispose of them by arrangement with some friend in a grocery."

Thomas stated that some used-car dealers accept the books at face value, making it "good business" for prospective purchasers to get reliefers to buy $15 books for them at $10 each.

School Teachers of Louisiana Are Patriotic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOACHIM O. FERNANDEZ

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 26, 1940

LETTER BY HON. J. O. FERNANDEZ, OF LOUISIANA

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR FRIEND: Throughout my public career I have always been interested in, and have demonstrated at every opportunity my friendship for the school teachers of Louisiana, particularly those in the teaching corps of the Orleans Parish schools. It has recently been my privilege to defend a cowardly attack made upon the school teachers of Louisiana in a radio speech by Mr. F. Edward Hebert, candidate for Congress, endorsed by Governor Jones. In my opinion this attack comes with bad grace from Mr. Hebert at a time when the school teachers are fighting for a living wage which they, until recently, had been led to believe by Mr. Hebert's chief backers would be assured during the next school term.

Mr. Hebert, in a radio address on Monday, August 5, announced as the ninth plank of his platform "No 'ism' but Americanism" and, in explaining this plank, made the following statement:

"I believe that the education taught in our schools should be based on the Constitution our forefathers fought to give us. I believe that legislation should be enacted curbing the teaching of some of our teachers in our public and parochial institutions."

As your Congressman, I could not but defend the honor and integrity of the many teachers who give up their lives for other people's children, and in my radio speech on August 6, I challenged Mr. Hebert to cite one instance in which there had been taught any "ism" but Americanism in the public schools in this district, and I called upon him to retract his false charge against the patriotic men and women who form the teaching corps of our public schools.

I had thought at that time that, if not through conviction, at least for political reasons, Mr. Hebert would retract his statements, but instead in his speech on August 9, Mr. Hebert reiterated his former statements and further aggravated his unjust attack by stating that he has no apologies to make to the teachers.

I believe I have correctly represented the views of the public-school teachers in the defense I have made in their behalf against Mr. Hebert's attack. However, I would appreciate your communicating to me your views in the matter so I can govern myself in accordance with them in my further activities.

I wish to assure you at this time that you may count on my assistance in any manner that I may effectively serve you, to insure the payment to you of the salary for which you are now fighting, and which you so richly deserve.

Sincerely,

J. O. FERNANDEZ, M. C.

Foreign Policy of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ERNEST LUNDEEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 27 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

EDITORIALS FROM WALLACE'S FARMER

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD 5 editorials from Wallace's Farmer, a periodical with a circulation of more than 260,000. These editorials are all remarkable for their clearly stated foreign policy, and are quite surprising in these days of interventionism.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Wallace's Farmer of May 6, 1939]

WE HAVE TO PAY TO STAY OUT OF WAR

As the Nation and the world hold their breath to hear the first shot that may plunge Europe into war, Iowa farmers may find it wise to consider two fairy tales that are likely to mislead us as we try to protect the welfare of our own Nation.

One fairy tale is that the United States cannot stay neutral in case of a European war, that it is bound to be dragged in. This is cowardly nonsense, of course.

We can stay out if we want to badly enough. Sweden, Norway, Denmark, Spain, Switzerland, the Netherlands—all on the edge of the era of conflict in the World War—stayed neutral successfully. The United States, an ocean away, can do as well.

In the Napoleonic wars, early in the nineteenth century, the United States was finally dragged into the conflict, but we stayed out successfully for nearly 12 years. That's longer than the next war will last.

The second fairy tale is that all we need to do to stay neutral is to mind our own business and go on as usual. Though it comes from the other side of the argument, this is just as pitiful nonsense as to say that we can't stay neutral at all.

The fact is that neutrality requires a policy almost as complicated and as expensive as that of war. We'll have to limit our freedom of action, keep our ships off the seas at danger spots, compensate shipowners and crews, suffer loss of exports, and work out ways of minimizing the losses to exporters and producers. Staying neutral is a hard job. We won't stay neutral just by saying we want to stay out of trouble. We'll have to sacrifice the things that lead to a loss of neutrality.

We hope farmers remember this: The United States can stay neutral in a world war if it is willing to pay the price in money, in self-control, in the use of brains in national affairs.

Don't believe anybody who tells you we can't stay out or anybody who tells you it will be easy to stay out.

[From Wallace's Farmer of June 17, 1939]

SHOULD WE SELL ARMS OVERSEAS?

The debate over neutrality legislation appears to be boiling down to one issue: Should the United States refuse to ship arms and munitions to nations at war, or should it sell such goods on a cash-and-carry basis to anybody who can pay for them and carry them home?

Both Secretary Hull and the isolationists seem to be fairly well agreed that we should keep American ships out of combat zones, keep American travelers out of combat zones, insist on a cash-and-carry basis for sales of goods to nations at war, and prevent loans to warring nations.

Where they differ is on supplying arms and munitions to fighting nations. Secretary Hull suggests that the cash-and-carry provisions apply to arms as well as to other goods. His opponents say that munitions should not be sold at all.

The arguments go something like this: Those who want this country to sell arms say that France and Great Britain are handicapped as against Germany and Italy unless they are permitted to buy here, that refusing to allow sales of arms will encourage Germany and Italy and make war more likely to come, and that for our own defense we need to build up an armament industry that can be shifted to produce airplanes, tanks, and other war material for our own Army and Navy, if needed.

Those who object to selling munitions claim that we got into the last war at least partly because we permitted an armament boom to develop and were afraid to risk depression by cutting it off, and that we would run the same risk if we permitted the munitions makers to run wild now.

Both sides have good arguments. It is largely a question of which course involves the lesser risk.

By permitting munitions sales we would strengthen our own defenses by having more factories ready to turn out goods for the use of our own Army and Navy. On the other hand, we would risk starting an armament boom that would make us want to help our customers rather than to see the boom end through their defeat.

Which risk is the greater? Wallace's Farmer and Iowa Homestead feel that the plan with the lesser risk is to prevent shipments of munitions to anybody. But we admit that the other side can make a pretty strong case for its beliefs, too.

[From Wallace's Farmer of August 26, 1939]

HOW MANY WANT WAR WITH JAPAN?

An American businessman in China is quoted as saying: "If Japan wins the war, we will be thrown out of China in 3 years. If China wins, we will be thrown out in 5."

He is probably right. No matter which crowd wins, the day of special privilege for the foreigner in China is over. Yet the United States still keeps warships and soldiers in war territory in China, has just ended a commercial treaty with Japan, and is generally trying to bump its nose into somebody's fist.

If we want to stay out of an Asiatic war, we had better get our sailors, soldiers, and civilians out of the fighting zone.

[From Wallace's Farmer of September 9, 1939]

WE CAN STAY NEUTRAL IF WE WANT TO

The United States has a far better chance of staying neutral in a new war than we had in the war that started in 1914. Or at least, we have a better chance if we retain and strengthen the present neutrality law.

That law is the product of experience in the 1914–17 period. It tries to remove some of the banana peels that made us slide into hell in 1917.

Those mistakes in 1914–17 policy which shoved us into war can be summarized as follows:

1. Loans to Great Britain and her Allies by American citizens. American banks pushed the sale of these foreign bonds and gave investors a stake in the success of the Allies.

2. Sales of munitions to the Allies. This helped the war boom and gave the whole Nation a stake in the continuance of sales abroad.

3. American citizens on ships of warring nations. The *Lusitania*, a British munitions-carrying ship, had Americans aboard when sunk. Indignation over this and other similar events helped bring the United States into war.

4. American ships took chances in trying to get shipments through blockades. When sunk or captured Americans were indignant.

We're in better shape now. No foreign nation at war can try to sell its bonds in the United States, and American citizens are barred from travel on belligerent ships. Sales of munitions are blocked.

We still need a cash-and-carry provision. If warring nations want our goods, let them come here, pay cash, and tote the goods home.

We still need a law authorizing the President to point out combat zones into which our citizens will not be permitted to go. And it is to be hoped that the President does a better job on that than he has done in getting Americans out of the danger zone in China.

The present neutrality law, with the improvements noted above, can do a great deal to keep us out of trouble, if we are sensible enough to remember that both sides are going to fill us full of propaganda and that nine-tenths of the "news" from abroad will be lies.

There is danger that some Americans who insist on meddling with European affairs will try to get Congress to repeal the Neutrality Act or to weaken it. Farmers might as well serve notice now on their Congressmen that anybody who weakens our chances of staying out of war might just as well cut his own political throat at once and be done with it.

[From Wallace's Farmer of November 4, 1939]

WHEN CASH RUNS OUT, THEN WHAT?

Congress and the Nation are apparently determined to keep war trade on a cash basis. If anybody wants to buy from us, let him put cash on the barrel head. Otherwise, no trade.

How much cash is there? Great Britain and France hold from three to four billion dollars' worth of American securities. If these are traded to us for goods (probably some will go elsewhere), it should keep the war export business going for from 1 to 2 years.

Then what? Late in 1915, when the Allies had come to the end of their cash, President Wilson was warned by Secretary Lansing that unless we allowed foreign nations to float loans here "they will have to stop buying and our present export trade will sink proportionately. The result would be * * * industrial depression * * * numerous failures * * * and general suffering."

In other words, the United States had let the Allies start a war boom here with their own cash buying, and then was afraid to end the boom when the cash ran out. So we began to lend money.

If this war turns out to be a long one, the real test will come when Great Britain and France begin to run short of cash. Then we shall be told that we have a war boom, that we dare not permit it to end, and that the only way to continue it is to lend money to Great Britain and France.

And if we do lend money, we shall be told later that the only way to make the bonds good is to see that Great Britain and France win. That was the story in 1917. We were urged to go to war, in part, to be sure of payment of a two-billion debt. We came out with those same countries owing us over ten billions. They still owe almost all of it.

Any kind of a war boom runs the risk of getting us into war and of getting us into a shell-shocked peace after the war is over. The less we can rely on exports now and the more we can rely on bigger business with our own people, the better we are going to feel when the shooting is over.

Aid Furnished by W. P. A. to Southern Negroes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES F. BYRNES

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 27 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

ARTICLE BY LAWRENCE M. PINCKNEY

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, recently there was inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article written by Mr. Archibald Rutledge and published in the South Atlantic Monthly which deplored the aid furnished by the W. P. A. to Negroes in the South. I ask to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a reply to that article written by Mr. Lawrence M. Pinckney, State administrator of W. P. A. in South Carolina.

There being no objection, the reply was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AUGUST 24, 1940.

The EDITOR, THE STATE,
Columbia, S. C.

DEAR SIR: I read with much interest the article appearing on the editorial page of your issue of Sunday, August 18, entitled "The Negro and the New Deal" by Archibald Rutledge in the South Atlantic Monthly.

It was rather amusing to note the different attitudes that Mr. Rutledge appears to take toward the W. P. A., because the records of W. P. A. which I will mention in detail in this letter, disclose that from September 1939 through May 1940, his attitude was one of applying to W. P. A. for assistance to Negroes in his rural section. In his article of the 18th he criticizes the W. P. A. for giving employment to Negroes in South Carolina. Then, on August 22, his attitude has changed again, for we received a letter from him again requesting us to give employment to Negroes in his rural section; yet he states in his article: "While I am not in

a position to discuss this question in its broader and more general aspects, yet I do know what the New Deal is doing, not for the Negro, but to the Negro, in my region of the rural South."

I am quite sure that in view of this statement of Mr. Rutledge, and the conflicting attitudes as expressed in his letters to the W. P. A., and his article of August 18, that it will be interesting to the public to read these letters in full—as well as a letter addressed to Mr. Rutledge under date of May 23, 1940, by our district manager at Charleston. These follow:

HAMPTON PLANTATION,
McClellanville, S. C., September 14, 1939.

EMPLOYMENT OFFICER, W. P. A.

DEAR SIR: James Frazer and Arthur Lawrence, who have been with you and have been temporarily laid off, came to me for work.

I was able to employ them here for a week, but now the job is completed, and I have nothing further to offer them.

These two good men have been known to me since boyhood. They are thoroughly reliable. Moreover, as they have large families they suffer great hardship when they cannot find employment.

Trusting that you will be able to reinstate them at an early date, I am,

Sincerely yours,

ARCHIBALD RUTLEDGE.

HAMPTON PLANTATION,
McClellanville, S. C., December 20, 1939.

GENTLEMEN: James Washington and Johnson Green, Negroes of the Collins Creek settlement near here, have asked me to beg you to reinstate them by January 1. They have been out of work since September.

They are worthy fellows, and in dire need.

I do not know that I am doing the proper thing in thus writing you, but promised them to call the matter to your attention. As you know, so many of the Negroes are helpless without the aid of a white man.

Very sincerely,

ARCHIBALD RUTLEDGE.

HAMPTON, *May 3, 1940.*

DEAR MRS. LESESNE: Can you do anything for Will Alston, George Boykin, John Small? All these are from Hampton, they have no work, and in the case of Will, his wife is dead, and he is trying to raise two children. These men are willing to go to Santee-Cooper.

Sincerely,

ARCHIBALD RUTLEDGE.

HAMPTON PLANTATION,
McClellanville, S. C., May 10, 1940.

MY DEAR MISS BERKMAN: Thank you for your kind note, which I am returning for the convenience of your reference.

James Kelly is worthy of your consideration. If, however, it is a question of putting one man back to work, Will Alston is the more needy. This is because he is a widower, with two babies to feed.

Would you consider making me your official agent in the region from Awendaw to the Santee? I know everyone, and I know individual needs. I now give a lot of my time to this work, but I should like to be able to cooperate with you in a more official capacity.

Would you mind calling Mr. Grice's attention to my proposal?

Sincerely,

ARCHIBALD RUTLEDGE.

[Post card]

MAY 23, 1940.

MRS. HARLESTON LESESNE,
W. P. A., Old Citadel, Charleston, S. C.:

Can you possibly lend a hand to Will Alston at Germantown? He is a widower with small children. This is a case of urgent need.

ARCHIBALD RUTLEDGE.

CHARLESTON, S. C., *May 23, 1940.*

Mr. ARCHIBALD RUTLEDGE,
Hampton Plantation, McClellanville, S. C.

DEAR MR. RUTLEDGE: Your letter to Miss Berkman under date of May 10 has been referred to me for the reason that Miss Berkman has been away from the office and will be away for about 10 days.

The spirit that motivates your offer of service to the W. P. A. is thoroughly understood.

Inevitably, where selections are to be made, and only some of those eligible for work can be worked, charges of partiality are almost inevitably made, and therefore I do not think that the Government should put you in that position with your neighbors.

The ramifications of accusations are really marvelous to behold.

Knowing of your sympathy with those, particularly the Negro race, in your vicinity, we would like to have the privilege of having our social worker discuss with you from time to time the real needs of those in the Awendaw-Santee section.

Unfortunately, at this time we have drastically reduced the number of those that we are employing, and until we get some work as to the provisions of the bill now pending in Congress effective July 1, we cannot make any definite plans for the future.

Yours very truly,

E. P. GRICE, Jr.,
District Manager, District No. 2, W. P. A.

HAMPTON PLANTATION,
McClellanville, S. C., August 22, 1940.

DEAR MRS. BERKMAN: The bearer of this letter is Sue Alston, the widow of Prince Alliston, who used to be my foreman.

Sue has three sons, Prince, Will, and Samuel. Prince, Jr., is now my foreman, and he is the only person now living on Hampton. I give him work and him alone. Will is a widower with two babies, one of them being blind. Sue is trying to raise them. Both Will and Samuel have long been out of work.

All the members of this family live at Germanville, adjacent to Hampton. From several of the families there, two members have gone to the Santee-Cooper. Yet in no case do I know a more needy family than the Alstons; a more worthy family also. And they have not been able to get one member to work.

I respectfully recommend that you give Will or Samuel some kind of work somewhere, and immediately, so that this widow may get some food and clothes for her grandchildren.

Sincerely,

ARCHIBALD RUTLEDGE.

I would like to emphasize some statements made by Mr. Rutledge in the above letters. Under date of December 20, 1939, he states: "As you know, so many of the Negroes are helpless without the aid of a white man," and again in his letter of May 10, 1940, he then goes further and asks: "Would you consider making me your official agent in the region from Awendaw to the Santee? I know everyone, and I know individual needs. I now give a lot of my time to this work, but I should like to be able to cooperate with you in a more official capacity."

These two statements, in my opinion, contradict his principal criticism of W. P. A. and what he feels it is doing to the Negro in his rural section.

In the above letters it will also be noted that Mr. Rutledge was seeking employment on the W. P. A. for the following Negroes: James Washington, Johnson Green, Steve Boykin, Arthur Lawrence, James Frazier, Will Alston, James A. Kelly.

Our records disclose that James Washington was employed on the W. P. A.; left W. P. A. to accept private employment and, when that was over, returned to W. P. A. and was reemployed. He left again, however, so we can only presume he has found employment elsewhere. The rest of the names mentioned are now working on W. P. A.

Mr. Rutledge mentions in his article a Steve Boykin. Our records disclose that Steve Boykin, whose address was Germanville, is working on W. P. A.; therefore, I presume it is the same Steve Boykin to whom he refers and whom he uses as a source of information to make charges against W. P. A.

One of the statements made is about pressure brought to bear upon him at certain stores. W. P. A. does not operate, nor has it any interest in stores. All W. P. A. workers are paid by the Disbursing Officer of the United States Treasury Department, whose office is located in Columbia. The checks are mailed direct to these workers at the addresses which they give as their proper addresses and which are shown on the pay roll.

Mr. Rutledge also states that Steve told him of suggestions being made that he contribute to the Democratic campaign chest. If Mr. Rutledge will advise me who made such suggestions, I shall be glad to have it investigated. I have never heard of any such suggestions being made to workers in any part of the State of South Carolina.

I think it was rather amusing for Mr. Rutledge to use Steve Boykin as his authority. If Steve Boykin is unable to count his own children and seemed to be only mildly interested in what had become of them—as related by Mr. Rutledge in his story about the alligator eating his children—Boykin would appear to be rather a poor witness.

Mr. Rutledge laments the fatal undermining of the Negro character which, from his article, he feels is being done by W. P. A. and charges that the Negro is losing his independence and with it his self-respect.

Does Mr. Rutledge object to the Negro working for his living? I think it is commendable in the Negro, when he is told by a plantation owner, or anyone else, that he has nothing for him to do, to go out and endeavor to get work elsewhere, where he can earn money to provide the necessities of life for his family.

The census of 1930 showed that South Carolina had the greatest percentage of illiteracy of any State in the Nation. Since W. P. A. took over the educational program, which was in January 1936, W. P. A. has taught over 60,000 adults to read and write, over 33,000 of these being Negroes.

Does Mr. Rutledge object to Negroes in South Carolina being taught to read and write?

Since the inception of the W. P. A. program in South Carolina, we have constructed in this State 479 new schools and have repaired and made additions to 1,442 schools. These schools are schools for both white and colored. Does Mr. Rutledge object to this work by W. P. A. because it will mean giving Negroes an education, which should enable them to take care of themselves in the future?

The accomplishments of W. P. A. in South Carolina are so numerous and diversified—both from the standpoint of greatly needed physical improvements and new facilities in the State—and from the standpoint of intangible benefits to the individuals by providing self-respecting work to the unemployed, that I shall not ask you, Mr. Editor, for space to list them in this letter, but if Mr. Rutledge desires to know what W. P. A. has done for the State of South Carolina as a whole, or in any part of it, I shall be glad to advise him on receipt of such a request.

I recall the incident that Mr. Rutledge relates when he requested the W. P. A to clear some land on his plantation to permit the Negroes to plant. Mr. Rutledge was not rebuffed but was informed that it would be a violation of the law for W. P. A. to clear his private property.

Mr. Rutledge makes the following statement in his article:

"Almost to a man, every able-bodied Negro man and boy of my acquaintance is on relief. The countryside is empty of its laborers. The little farms and gardens, the fences and the fields, the chicken yards and hog lots, the crops that would sustain life through the winter even though things from stores could not be bought—these are gone."

The W. P. A., under the regulations, can only give employment to one member of a family provided that family is in need, and then within quota limitations assigned to the State, and every available study—every known authority—points to the fact that there is considerably more food (crops, livestock, and poultry) produced in South Carolina now than before the W. P. A. began in this State in 1935.

I would appreciate your giving space in your paper for publication of this letter.

Yours sincerely,

LAWRENCE M. PINCKNEY,
State Administrator.

This Nation, of the People, by the People, and for the People, Shall Not Perish From the Earth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 27, 1940

ARTICLE BY CHARLES G. SAMPAS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Charles G. Sampas, which was published in the Lowell Sun for August 24, 1940:

[From the Lowell (Mass.) Sun of August 24, 1940]

SAMPASCOOPIES

(By Charles G. Sampas)

THIS NATION, OF THE PEOPLE, BY THE PEOPLE, AND FOR THE PEOPLE, SHALL NOT PERISH FROM THIS EARTH

This Nation, of the people, by the people, and for the people, shall not perish from this earth.

Shine, O brave sun, upon this great land of ours, pour your blessings on this America of ours, pour down on New England, old and ever new, radiate over the West and the Midwest's plains, beneficent sun.

You are the world's resurrection, America—the hope of the world.

Humble and proud America—strongest of them all—America.

Tyrants across the seas, America, say you shall die. They say, America, that the grave is ready for you, that the sun has set on America, that America is a tombstone over a decadent, dying people.

You are not afraid, America, because you know, America, that you have just been born, that you have just started to live. Laugh at tyrants and autocrats, America, because you are all there is to the world. There is nothing else left in this world—just you, America—the gladsome liberty and freedom and eternal democracy.

I sing and celebrate you, America, because I am one of your sons, and there are 130,000,000 more sons and daughters, America, who sing and celebrate you—who know that you will carry on, the greatest democracy the world has ever known, long after other nations have been buried, long after tyrants and dictators are dust, long after this current madness which has seized the world has subsided.

Land of energy and productivity, land of wheat fields unending, land of Virginia and Pennsylvania, land of the Mississippi, the Arkansas and the Missouri, land of California and Nevada, land of Manhattan and Chicago—America.

America, you are beyond European fakeries and phantasms—you are beyond secret diplomacies and chaotic madnesses; you, America, are not a skeleton of a nation France and all those European nations have been; you, America, are stoic, endurable, non-European; you are fresh and new and sincere.

You are America; you are our life, our liberty, our pursuit of happiness; you are the dawn's early light; you are land that we love; you are the home of the Pilgrim's pride; you are the land God shed His grace upon; you are Dixie, and land of the golden West.

This Nation, of the people, by the people, and for the people, shall not perish from this earth.

You are master of your machines, America—they are not your master; you are America, continent indissoluble; you are a land which cannot be undone, broken, or dissolved; you are the whole world, America; you are sleepy towns along the Mississippi; you are wide-awake metropolitan cities by Lake Michigan; you are a brotherhood of men, free and equal.

You are man's heaven on earth.

You are the average man, America! You are free-born, free-willed.

You are Thomas Jefferson, Thomas Paine, Adams, Washington, Lincoln, Lee.

You are "all men are created equal." You are humanity's conscience. You are, O America, sweat and toil.

You are American revolutionaries with bare feet in worn-out shoes. You are they, at Delaware, who cried out: "We are sick; our feet gone; our legs are sore; our bodies covered with torments; our clothes are worn out; we are broken, exhausted, thirsty, hungry; we are dying," and then went on, nevertheless, to win freedom from Europe.

You are the Constitution, America! "This is a government of the people, by the people, and for the people, whose just powers are derived from the consent of the governed; a democracy in a republic; a sovereign Nation of many sovereign States; a perfect Union, one and inseparable, established upon the principles of freedom, equality, justice, and humanity for which American patriots sacrificed their lives and their fortunes."

You are alive, breathing that pure air of democracy, O America. You are the new, the brave, the honest world.

You are just beginning. Europe's hour of death has struck. The Four Horsemen have come upon the Old Continent. They will not come to the new.

You are afraid of no one, and you are humble at the thought of your God.

You are not terrified, America, by the solid click of marching feet; you are afraid of no dictators.

You are the land God has been bountiful to, America.

Brutality has not secured a foothold upon you, America. You know no hate; you breed no contempt; you are not animated by spirit of revenge, lust, and selfishness. You are clean, O America!

You, America, are "of the people, by the people, and for the people," and you, America, shall not perish from this earth!

The dictators, America, say you must die; that the twilight of American civilization has come; that your day, O America, is over.

Envious are they of your happiness, America! Envious they are of your glory, America! Envious are they of your towering Rockies, your sweeping Kansas plains, your southern cotton fields, your Texas oil fields.

Those dictators, America, believe that no nation must live free; they believe that no nation is entitled to belong to its people; that democracy must no longer endure upon this world.

Those death-dealers, America, those scavengers, those carrion birds, want to eat you up, America. They are hungry for you.

But you, America, are not afraid of them; because, America, greater than all your natural resources, greater than your guns and your cannons, your airplanes, and your battleships are your own people. They are your greatest asset, because they are people born in freedom, ready to die for freedom.

It is your spirit, O America, that they cannot touch or approach. It is that spirit which came from blood and tears of revolution and civil war and a first experience with a European war.

It is the spirit of a George Washington, who, in the darkest night of adversity leaned in solemn faith on Him who is mightier than the mightiest. On Him who has been mightier than Hitlers, Mussolinis, Stalins, and Napoleons.

It is the spirit of a Thomas Jefferson, who said: "I want a bill of rights to guard liberty against legislative as well as the executive branches of government; to secure freedom in religion, freedom of the press, freedom from monopolies, freedom from unlawful imprisonment."

Yes; it is the spirit of a Thomas Jefferson writing, "Men are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. To secure these rights governments are instituted among men."

Hitler and his ilk cannot stand for any such beliefs: They are the megalomaniacs who set themselves above God, above all mankind; who would tear to shreds the dream of freedom for men upon this earth. They cannot stand, Hitler and his pack of wolves, the existence of men of good will upon this earth.

But this Nation of the people, by the people, and for the people shall not perish from this earth.

No, America, you shall not die. As long as you have that spirit of your great men you shall live on—unto eternity and beyond eternity and forever.

The tread of the goose step, America, does not set up fears in your heart. It only serves to gird your spirit.

The guns are plowing the earth—this is the red dawn's birth—and sowing a terrible seed and reaping the crop with speed: Why are the guns so greedy, why are the reapers so needy?

No, America, the guns are not going to plow America, the red dawn will not come upon you, there is no cannon fodder here for Hitler, he cannot touch us.

Because, America, you are great, you are the greatest nation the world has ever known; and, God willing, you will continue to be the greatest nation the world has ever known.

Because, America, you are decent and civilized and imbued with the spirit of liberty and justice and equality.

And those things are stronger than all the world's guns and cannons and planes, because the right shall always be stronger than might.

And so today, America, I sing and celebrate you. I am one of your sons, and all your sons and all your daughters sing and celebrate you: Because they know you, America, and they love you; because you, America, are 130,000,000 human beings who believe in God's will, and God's will is their will.

As long as we live and breathe, America, our dream is you; you are the guide of the world, America, you are the last beacon, you are the light of civilization, and your radiance, like that of the sun, beams down upon the whole world, the one hope, the one salvation.

They know, America, that the hope of the world is you, and they die with that thought in mind; with their guts shot out they dream of you, America, and your people; because, America, you are the one thing left in a world where all decency and conscience has gone.

They die with that little dream in them:

That America, a nation of the people, by the people, and for the people shall not perish from this earth!

You will keep faith, America!

Another Plea for an Investigation of War Propaganda Activities in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEWIS D. THILL

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 27, 1940

Mr. THILL. Mr. Speaker, on March 1, 1940, I introduced House Resolution 410 which proposes the appointment of a special committee to investigate war propaganda activities in the United States. Up to the present time the Rules Committee has not taken any action on this resolution. It is imperative that immediate steps be taken to squelch the activities of paid war propagandists. Many agents of foreign governments are registered with the Secretary of State under the alien-agent registration law. The activities of these individuals should be checked and examined. If their influence is inimical to the best interests of our country these agents should be summarily dealt with.

The mail of Members of Congress is filled with war propaganda of various sorts. Nazi propaganda is spread by the German Library of Information, 17 Battery Place, New York City. British propaganda is disseminated by the British Library of Information, 51 Rockefeller Plaza, New York City. Communistic propaganda is distributed and sold by Bookniga, Inc., 255 Fifth Avenue, New York City. It seems to me that the American people should not be subjected to Nazi, Fascist, Communist, and British propaganda which is deliberately used to distort the thinking of the citizens in the United States. Congress should proceed at once to investigate the dissemination of war propaganda in the United States.

Railroad Interest in Competing Water Carriers Through the Panama Canal and Elsewhere

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE F. LEA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 27, 1940

Mr. LEA. Mr. Speaker, the Panama Canal Act, enacted August 24, 1912, preceding the opening of the Canal, contained provisions against destruction of water competition by competing rail carriers. These provisions amended section 5 of the Interstate Commerce Act and are carried in the present law as paragraphs 19, 20, and 21 of section 5.

In substance, these paragraphs provide:

First—An absolute prohibition against railroads having any interest in competing water carriers operating through the Panama Canal; and

Second—A qualified prohibition against railroads dominating competing water carriers other than through the Panama Canal.

The law leaves it to the Commission to determine the facts as to whether or not such competition does or may exist.

Applications to the Commission are authorized for an order permitting (a) the continuance of vessels already in operation, or (b) the installation of new service.

If the Commission is of the opinion that the water service, other than through the Canal, is operated (a) in the interest of the public, and (b) is an advantage to the convenience and commerce of the people, and (c) that the extension will not exclude, prevent, or reduce competition on the route by water, the Commission may extend the time for operation of such services.

If such service is extended, the rates of the water carrier must be filed with the Commission, and are subject to its regulation.

AMENDED PROVISIONS

These provisions, as amended by the conference agreement on S. 2009, are renumbered as paragraphs 14, 15, and 16 of section 5 of the Interstate Commerce Act.

Paragraph 14 strengthens the present prohibition by extending it "to any person controlling, controlled by, or under common control with" a rail carrier.

Under the conference agreement, the absolute prohibition as to the Panama Canal remains as under the present law.

Under the conference agreement, the power of the Commission to permit the continuance or extension of service, or the acquisition of interests would be as follows:

First. The prohibition applying to water service elsewhere than through the Canal applies where the railroad "does or may compete for traffic."

Second. The Commission has power after hearing to determine the facts as to competition or possibility of competition.

Third. The Commission, after hearing, has authority to authorize a railroad to continue to hold an interest or to acquire an interest in a competing water carrier, or to install new water service if the Commission finds that the continuance or acquisition of such ownership, or interest, or the installation of such service will not prevent the water carrier from being operated (a) in the interest of the public, and (b) with advantage to the convenience and commerce of the people, and (c) that it will not exclude, prevent, or reduce competition on the water route.

It will be noted that on the enactment of the conference agreement into law, all but exempted water carriers will come under the regulation of the Commission as to rates without an order such as these paragraphs authorize.

The effect of the conference provisions is to clarify existing law. The changes made are in line with the actual operation of existing law since its enactment, and with the interpretations heretofore placed upon it by the Interstate Commerce Commission. See *Steamship "Great Northern"* (37 I. C. C. 260); *Ashtabula-Port Maitland Car-Ferry Service* (40 I. C. C. 143); *Southern Pacific Co.'s Ownership by Atlantic Steamship Lines* (77 I. C. C. 124); *Investigation of Seatrain Lines, Inc.* (206 I. C. C. 328). These interpretations of the Interstate Commerce Commission have not been reversed by the courts.

The administrative interpretation of these provisions is controlling unless overturned by the courts. The courts will not disturb such interpretations except for cogent reasons. See *McLaren* v. *Fleischer* (256 U. S. 477); *St. Paul M. & M. R. Co.* v. *Phelps* (137 U. S. 528).

The provisions of the present paragraphs contain ambiguities and uncertainty of language which, it is believed, are substantially clarified by the provisions of the conference agreement.

It will be noted that the power of the Commission to extend service elsewhere than through the Panama Canal remains as under existing law. The standards that are to control the determination of the Commission are the same in every case.

The standards under which new service is permitted are the same as applied to the continuance of existing service. The Commission has authority to make an order to install new service under the existing provisions. The extension of service under the conference substitute does not go beyond the present law as previously interpreted.

The existing service referred to, of course, applies to service existing at the time the order is made and not at the time of the enactment of the original act. There was no such service at that time, as the canal was not open.

Whether it be the continuance of existing service, an extension of service, the installation of new service, or the acquisition of new interests in water carriers the Commission has the same duty to determine the facts necessary for the protection of the public before the order of approval is made. In each case the dominating consideration is the protection of the public against the destruction of water competition by rail carriers. The provisions are logical, just, and equally applicable to their fundamental purpose.

The conference agreement makes no change as to the water service to which the prohibition and the power of the Commission apply.

The power to protect the public against the destruction of water competition by the rails under this law is dependent upon the action of the Commission. In a long course of years, during which the Commission has exercised that power, there is no known case in which it is claimed an abuse of such authority has been charged.

Conscientious Objectors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 27, 1940

LETTER AND RESOLUTION FROM CHELMSFORD (MASS.) POST, AMERICAN LEGION

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from the adjutant of the Chelmsford (Mass.) Post of the American Legion and the resolution referred to therein:

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
CHELMSFORD POST, No. 212,
Chelmsford, Mass., August 26, 1940.

Mrs. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS.

MY DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN: Here is a resolution that we of Chelmsford Post, No. 212, have accepted, and would like to have you put it on record. Thanking you for what attention you will give it.

I remain your servant.

NAPOLEON T. MANSEAU, *Adjutant.*

Whereas we American Legionnaires, both wartime and peacetime defenders of our Constitution, sponsors of the one "ism," "Americanism," find the story existing now as in 1917, namely, Excuse the Conscientious Objectors from the Draft.

Whereas there are certain individuals, cliques, religious sects, etc., who would not bear arms in defense of their country, but readily reap of its numerous benefits, and

Whereas there being at present a visible threat to our national independence necessitating the present draft law, where national unity must take its preeminent place, and there being no room in unity for objectors, therefore be it

Resolved, That Chelmsford Post No. 212, American Legion, go on record as opposed to objectors of the draft, conscientious or otherwise, that if there must be such reluctant patriots, they be made to serve their country as common laborers, road and airport builders, etc. Be it also

Resolved, That the so-called conscience of these objectors be thoroughly examined, and if found wanting, the holders of such conscience be placed in concentration camps or be deported.

War, Poverty, and Chaos for the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE HOLDEN TINKHAM
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 27, 1940

ADDRESS BY VIRGIL JORDAN

Mr. TINKHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Virgil Jordan, president of the National Industrial Conference Board, on the economic consequences of the war for the United States, before the Foreign Policy Association, Philadelphia, February 24, 1940:

In trying to discuss the economic consequences of anything these days I shall probably trespass freely on Mr. MacDonald's political territory, so I want to excuse it at the outset and assure him I shall not mind if he retaliates. If he says as much about economic consequences as I shall about the political I am sure we both will have done our duty by both subjects, and everyone should be satisfied. After all, there is something reassuring in the picture of the Foreign Policy Association neatly slicing chaos into two parts—the economic consequences and the political consequences—and assigning one to each speaker. It is good to know that there is at least one tidy mind like that in this messy world; but that is the only comfort we can get out of it.

In our time, at least, economics and politics are Siamese twins, and it is hard to imagine marrying one without becoming pretty familiar with the other. Politicians have become intensely economic, though not very economical; and economists have become quite political, though not always politic, as you will see before I finish. The reason is, of course, that both have become primarily concerned with ideology as an instrument of power, and are concerned to secure the acceptance of ideas by the largest possible groups of people, quite regardless of the facts and their consequences. This common purpose and its pursuit are quite all right if the ideas happen to be in accord with the facts, which is seldom the case. It is safer to leave the economist to pursue the facts as a check on the politician's pursuit of power, but this is no longer possible today. We now have only a vast political struggle for power in which ideas are weapons and the economist a conscript, and hence the economic and political consequences of anything are inseparable.

We see this more clearly when we ask ourselves what is this war whose economic-political consequences we are discussing today. We obviously can't even tie this war up in any neat package. We don't even know precisely whom it is between, who are the combatants or the neutrals from day to day, what it is about, when or how it started or will stop. Everything about it is shrouded in an impenetrable cloud of words which convey no meaning. There has never been an event in modern history about which the millions of people involved have been permitted to have so little information. Yet hour by hour men are dying in this mysterious shadowland, dying at the command and for the defense of the omnipotent states to whom they have given the power to plunge the minds of all their fellow men into practically complete darkness. One recalls the Biblical legend of the blind Samson, shorn of his strength, tearing down the pillars of the temple.

At least we all sense in some way that what is happening is no isolated event in our time or our world. We feel the universality of this mysterious tragedy, the fact that it ineluctably embraces the minds and hearts of millions beyond its immediate actors and their stage, on which they move so obscurely. We are aware, too, that it can no more be isolated in time than it can in space. We know that it is continuously linked with the ignored or forgotten past and with the unknown and unrealized future. Its roots reach back into the errors, weaknesses, and follies of years and generations that are gone, and its fruits must be eaten in bitterness by millions yet unborn. We can hope to understand the events that we call this war—or any of their consequences—only as an aspect or phase of the organic social life of our time, comprehensive in its scope and continuous with the past and future.

In this sense, the epidemic of systematic and mechanized murder, pillage, and destruction which has spread over Europe and Asia is the latest phase of the persistent process of social disintegration which has been under way in every important country during the quarter century since 1914. This process is another 30 years' war, on a larger stage and in modern dress. It is the inevitable expression of the expansion in the power of the State and the submergence of the individual which began with the World War. It marks the

relapse of a civilization from the spirit of liberal humanism to a mechanized feudalism, which is the kind of social organization, based upon the ownership and exploitation of men and resources by political gangs—religious, dynastic, ideological, or military—under which, except for a few brief periods, the human race lived from its beginning up to the nineteenth century.

This process of social disintegration always begins within each community, in those qualities, capacities, attitudes, and relationships of individuals which are the basis of the way in which peoples make their living and which we call their economic system. When people are persuaded by their political leaders to abandon their unconscious cooperative effort to produce and exchange their services among themselves or other peoples for what they are worth, and begin to depend upon promises of achieving prosperity and security by using the power of the state to rob, oppress, injure, or kill other people in their own community or other countries, they take the first step in the easy descent to the Avernus in which Europe lives today. Thus is forged the first link in that fatal chain of events which ends in the cold-blooded extermination of millions of people in Poland and China by machine guns and bombs. Once the political delusion of economic struggle between the "have nots" and the "haves" within and among nations is established, murder and pillage, or expropriation and persecution are legitimatized internationally and domestically.

The idea of prosperity by expropriation has infinite gradations and variations between, say, the principle of the progressive income tax and the systematic slaughter or starvation of Polish peasants and Czech citizens by German or Russian troops; but they are all of a piece. In their ultimate significance and consequences there is little essential difference between robbery by ballot and robbery by bayonets or bombs, though we may dignify and disguise one by calling it democracy and damn the other by calling it dictatorship.

The concept of economic or social progress as a process of aggression by those who haven't much or any property, or feel they haven't enough, against those who have more, or think they have, is much older than Alois Schickelgruber and his Third Reich. Mr. Hitler did not invent it or give it its wide currency. He only applied it to international affairs in a specially spectacular, painful, and shockingly frank way. Even in that field he had several distinguished practical predecessors; and the way has been unconsciously prepared for him by many academic disciples among the exegetes of international economic justice at Cambridge, Geneva, and elsewhere, who have expounded the doctrine of maldistribution of raw materials and preached the gospel of their redistribution for many years.

This extension of the root idea into international affairs is not so important in understanding the consequences of the war as its penetration of internal politics in every country, including our own. We need only remind ourselves of the currency of Marxian slogans about the class struggle in European countries and of the semantic manipulation of phrases about the underprivileged classes and the low-income groups by Mr. Hopkins and Mr. Roosevelt and their academic acolytes in our own to appreciate how persuasive the idea of "gleichschaltung" by expropriation has become in political thought.

Messrs. Hitler and Stalin have been applying in Poland, Bohemia, and Finland an economic ideology which has become the key principle of gang politics in every important country. The exploitation of human and natural resources by political gangs maintained by manipulation of aggressive mass emotion has not been going forward only in Europe. The same degenerative disease has infected the economic and political life of America as well. During the past 25 years the fundamental feudal principle of the use of political force for the exploitation, expropriation, and persecution of part of the community by the rest has gradually become an established part of American life for the first time in our history. In both domestic and international policies humanitarian impulses have been progressively mixed with political aggression. And, in fact, in recent years personal and group malice, envy, and vindictiveness embodied in governmental aggression have become the characteristic mode of expression of humanitarian purpose. According to this political principle, the only possible, or at least the preferable way to help the poor and protect the helpless is to harry, persecute, and rob the rich, the prudent, thrifty, industrious, or ingenious members of the community. This is called liberalism—perhaps the most amazing inversion or perversion of a political concept in history.

Let me emphasize that in the ultimate outcome of this process it makes no difference whatever from which direction the aggressive impulse emanates or by what political group it is mobilized. The events of the past year should have made it clear that aggression from the right and aggression from the left meet in the middle, on common ground, and come to the same end. The aggression of the many against the few is the same in its consequences as the aggression of the few against the many. Democratic aggression is just as destructive as any other kind. Ballots can destroy as many lives and waste as much wealth as bombs.

Written constitutional guaranties designed to safeguard all individuals against the state were the unique contribution of American society to the humanist movement in western civilization and represented its supreme achievement. These have been substantially destroyed in this country during the past 7 years through the subvention of voters by public funds, the delegation of lawmaking powers to bureaucratic agencies, and the degradation of the Supreme Court into a political-party instrument. The fact is that government in America has become an accepted agency of internal aggression. It is no longer expected, and it can no longer be depended upon, to perform its primary and essential function of protecting the life, work, and property of all individual citizens against attack by any of them. Though not yet expressed in military terms and in international action, the essential impulses which underlie the German ghettos, the Polish mass exterminations, and the Russian and Japanese devastation of Finland and China are already implanted in American life and need only the stimulation of circumstance and political cultivation to be developed in the same direction and to the same end. Aggression is the essential spirit of the modern state. It animates the atmosphere, morals, manners, and customs of every government today. Its character is most clearly expressed in the personalities in whom its power is embodied—all uniformly in every country warped, twisted, psychopathic personalities whose every word and deed is animated by malice, vindictiveness, hatred, and destructive impulse toward individuals and groups who disagree with or oppose them, and who in every official action and utterance are in one sense or another bombing and machine-gunning their enemies and seizing their property. Shocking as the realization may be to us, these things are as true in America and England today as they are in Germany, Russia, Italy, and Japan. They are the dominant factors that mold the internal economic life and international relations of every country.

The economic consequences of the war for this country can be comprehended only in the light of this background. All war is the ultimate and supreme expression of group aggression, stimulated, mobilized, and manipulated by political gangs, and based upon the disintegration of those processes of unconscious voluntary cooperative production and exchange of goods and services which normally sustain community life. Wars are therefore always a reflection of the internal social, economic, and political condition of the countries involved in them, and are always employed as an instrument of domestic policy of the political gangs that constitute the modern state.

Whatever their immediate and superficial effects may be, they are always ultimately destructive to the economic prosperity and progress of all groups and nations, whether engaged in them or not. External or internal aggression can never be a permanently successful way for any nation or any group to make their living in the modern world. Though, as in the case of Russia and Germany, Japan and Italy, enormous investments of capital secured by internal confiscation of social resources may be made in expectation of profit from the seizure of territory, the conquered populations can only be slain, supported, or enslaved by the conquerors. But slavery is no longer a paying institution, and both the labor and natural resources thus captured must be exchanged or validated in trade with other peoples before they can be of much use in supporting either the conquered or the conquerors. War thus inevitably involves an enormous wastage and dissipation of community resources, whatever the outcome, and impoverishes the whole world, victor, vanquished, and neutral alike.

In the case of our own country, our relationship to the war must be regarded as an expression of the internal situation and as an instrument of the internal political aggression which has developed during the past 7 years. Whatever the form and extent of our active participation may ultimately be, we are already inescapably involved in the war because what has happened in the United States is merely a part of what has happened in Europe and Asia, and our economic and political life are dominated by it today. We are, in fact, participating in the war now, and we will inevitably share its consequences, with special features arising out of our internal situation.

My personal opinion of what these consequences are may best be put in the form of the following forecast of events in the next few years, as I see them. I do so because when anyone discusses the consequences of anything now happening he is forecasting; and if one undertakes to forecast at all he should forecast. Everyone understands that the possible consequences of anything in human affairs are infinite, and any discussion of them must be a selection of those which seem to one most likely or probable in the light of all the facts one has. It is in accord with the indolence of human nature to select the easiest and most pleasant possibilities and to ignore or discount the facts with them. The American and many other people have been doing that since the World War, and that is why the facts have relentlessly overtaken them and why they are now finally faced with the difficult and painful possibilities which they have persistently ignored. On this basis, and in this sense, therefore, I say I think the following things will happen in consequence of the war, unless the war stops before the middle of this year, and unless a tremendous effort is made to prevent them from happening.

Within the next month the total phase of the war will begin in western Europe, with unrestrained bombing of civilian populations in the principal cites, and with efforts of Germany to flank or break the Allied lines, and of Russia to overrun and pillage the Baltic Peninsula, the Balkan States, and the Near East.

These expected events, which Mr. Sumner Welles has been sent abroad to confirm, will determine the President to announce his decision to run for another term on a platform of national emergency, hemisphere defense, and pacification of Europe. He will be renominated, and by November the situation of England and France will appear to the American people to be so serious that the present administration will be reelected. Within a year from now our Army,

Navy, and air forces will be actively engaged in hostilities in Europe, Asia, and South America against Germany, Russia, Japan, and Italy.

Such a war will continue through the forties under the present administration. Until we are actively engaged the Allies will be supplied through Government selling agencies and financed by Government loans. In the course of the war, after active participation begins, all manpower will be conscripted for domestic labor, as well as military purposes; the banking system will be fully nationalized; our gold reserves will be repeatedly revalued; the currency will be progressively depreciated; liquid private property will be confiscated by successive capital levies; all voluntary private saving and investment in enterprise will cease; prices and wages will be fixed; and the operation of all basic industries and of power transportation and communication systems will be conducted by political agencies. There will be increasing internal disorder due to sabotage and resistance by alien groups, unemployables, strikes, pacifists, political dissenters, and groups of property owners and taxpayers, which will be suppressed by armed force, espionage, censorship, and suspension of civic rights and civil processes.

This part of my forecast is fairly easy and obvious because all of the more immediate economic consequences which I have just mentioned have already occurred in some measure during what we have called peacetime. The production and sale of airplanes, and possibly other military supplies abroad, is now conducted by the Secretary of the Treasury. The resistance of China and Finland is already, or is about to be, financed through loans by Government agencies. The voluntary hiring or discharge of most employees is now subject to Government regulation and taxation. Our gold reserves have already been revalued and Executive discretion in revaluing them has been continued by Congress. The extent to which one believes the currency has already depreciated depends upon one's view of the normal price level; but, though so far unsuccessful, a primary purpose of Government policy in the past 7 years has been to raise the price level and reduce the purchasing power of the dollar; and I have no doubt that this will take place rapidly when the active phase of the war begins. Extensive capital levies on liquid private property have already been made by reducing the interest return on small savings, and by taxation which has continuously confiscated capital and depreciated property values. Voluntary investment in productive enterprise has already practically ceased and the securities markets have been killed. Wages, the prices of basic commodities and services, the financial management, administration of personnel, and the marketing practices of all basic industries, electric power, transportation and communication systems are already controlled by political agencies.

I have no doubt that the extension of these processes in consequence of the war will be justified, like the changes made during the past 7 years, as indispensable for the defense of democracy and the preservation of the enterprise system; and it must be admitted that one sure way of protecting both against the possibility of further damage is to kill them promptly and completely.

At the end of this period every important nation, including the United States, will be hopelessly insolvent and will have dissipated its private capital resources and repudiated its public debts. Most of Europe will be physically devastated; an enormous part of the population will have been killed by explosives, disease, and starvation; the rest will be ruled by the armed gangs upon which they will be dependent for a living, and which will control all economic resources and conduct all industry and trade. In this country all free enterprise of any importance will have disappeared; the standard of living of most of the population except political jobholders and dependents will be lower than it was at the beginning of the century; and our economic organization and political institutions will have been transformed into the current European form of mechanized bureaucratic feudalism.

I hope that these things will not happen, but I think they will because there are so few people in this country who now realize that they can happen and are happening, and who are now willing to make any personal sacrifice or take any risk to try to prevent them from happening. Most of the American people since the World War have become very sheepish in face of the increasingly aggressive trend of government. If they are fed and amused by their political gangs they are willing to be sheared and even occasionally slaughtered.

The proportion of private citizens who regard the conduct of their public employees with the relentless vigilence and persistent suspicion which has always been imperative in the preservation of human liberty has diminished almost to a vanishing point; and to the great majority the latter have become an indispensable source of entertainment and reverent awe, second in importance only to the transient stellar constellations of Hollywood, and equally worth paying any price for. Until some substantial part of our people regain through bitter experience a little of the profound distrust and aggressive resentment toward political power which was traditonal in American life for two centuries we need expect no great change in their taste for the gladiatorial games which their Government conducts in domestic and international affairs. Most of them will continue to feel that it is better to be a live sheep than a dead lion.

We need not believe that these consequences of the war will be necessary or permanent, or that they will be the only or final consequences, either for the United States or other countries. The chaos and suffering which the forties will certainly bring here and abroad in consequence of the war will evoke and stimulate the constructive and conservative resources of the community life which lie in the creative capacities and courage of individuals. These resources, latent and relaxed through a long period of political demoralization, are always very great, and are always ultimately revitalized and increased by danger and hardship. Though some of us will not be here to see it, we may be sure that before the last half of this century is far advanced, they will reassert themselves somewhere in the community life here and abroad, and begin the work of rebuilding what a half century of governmental aggression has destroyed. When this revitalization of the individual will come, I do not presume to prophesy. In these matters the wind bloweth where it listeth, and the spirit of men does not move according to the plan of any man.

Prepare for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 27, 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. COLGATE W. DARDEN, JR., OF VIRGINIA, BEFORE THE VIRGINIA STATE CONVENTION OF THE AMERICAN LEGION, NORFOLK, VA., AUGUST 26, 1940

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of my colleague from Virginia [Mr. DARDEN]:

Members of the Legion, it is with genuine pleasure that I also welcome you to Norfolk.

I am especially sorry not to be here tomorrow to listen along with you to one of the ablest men in the House of Representatives, my colleague on the Naval Affairs Committee, the Honorable MELVIN MAAS, of Minnesota. MEL MAAS is not only a fine person, he is unselfish and patriotic. With a district far removed from naval activities he has rendered invaluable service in developing the sea power of our Nation.

These are dark days in which we assemble, days in which great decisions must be made. There are in truth powerful currents underrunning these times, currents of such force and of such magnitude as to make it impossible for us to judge accurately of their direction or of their power. It is probable that in spending themselves they will reshape world history. It may be that tney will recaste western civilization. Whatever is done will depend to no small extent upon the toughness of the human fiber and the iron will of those who wish to live unshackled and untrammeled under free institutions rather than enslaved and oppressed under the bitter tyranny and despotism of those who seek to make themselves masters of the world.

I have no fear for human liberty over the broad reaches of time. The struggle for freedom is as old as mankind. Liberty may be abridged—it may be darkened for a time by the ominous shadows of dictatorship—it may even be eclipsed by the cruel oppression of a tyrant but it will not be destroyed.

So vital and so vigorous is this spirit in the breast of man that like a mighty torrent at full flood rushing on to the sea it will break asunder and sweep aside the shackles forged by those who would enslave it.

It is about the present that I am concerned because while human liberty may survive it is of vital importance that it not be lost to us. We must not run the risk nor have our children subjected to the hazard of living in the darkness of absolutism. This problem is one which we face today as we assemble here. In its solution all of us will play a part. It is on this difficulty that I desire to be heard very briefly.

Certainly there is nothing in recent years which would lead any impartial observer to believe that we desire anything other than peace. The history of this great democracy of the West, as in fact does the history of the other democracies of the world, points with an unerring finger at the efforts which have been made in the interest of world peace.

The guns had hardly grown silent on the western front in 1918 when we set about demobilizing our Army of over 4,000,000 men—and so rapid was the demobilization that in a comparatively short time it had dropped to approximately 125,000.

In 1916 under the pressure of events abroad the Congress authorized and appropriated for the greatest fleet ever laid down. Its construction was started and the powerful units which were projected for our fleet would have made it upon their completion the most formidable naval force afloat.

In 1921 President Harding called a conference in Washington to consider the possibility of limiting naval armament. To this

conference Great Britain, France, Italy, and Japan were invited and all of them accepted.

Notwithstanding the fact that we were incomparably the most able, both on account of natural wealth and great industrial power, to maintain a powerful fleet, we offered to scrap most of our great ships provided the other powers would join in a disarmament program.

It was finally agreed that there should be a 10-year holiday in capital-ship construction and a tonnage limitation on capital ships and aircraft carriers. Time does not permit me to set forth these categories. It is worthy of note, however, that no agreement could be reached on land armaments and light naval craft. We broke up and destroyed our magnificent ships, many of them nearly completed.

In the years that followed all the signatories, so far as I know, adhered to the terms of the treaty, but while the other powers continued as was their right to construct cruisers, submarines, and other light craft, we did not add to our naval forces. Relatively we became weaker.

In addition to the naval agreement the nine-power treaty was signed. This treaty guaranteed the territorial integrity of China. It was signed by Japan and eight other powers, including Great Britain and the United States.

In 1930 the same naval powers met again in London in an effort to further limit naval tonnage. Meanwhile a parley held at Geneva in 1927 at the invitation of President Coolidge had failed to accomplish anything.

The London conference accomplished little. France and Italy withdrew because they could arrive at no acceptable formula to cover naval strength in the Mediterranean. The agreement finally signed by Great Britain, Japan, and the United States provided for a very small reduction in naval strength in certain categories but in each situation escape was provided by means of an escalator clause which permitted any of the three to increase armaments in each category, should it be felt that building by a nonsignatory power endangered the national security of the signatory power.

Again, in 1935, the powers met in London, but already naval disarmament was on its deathbed, and the conference adjourned without agreement, and on December 31, 1936, the Washington and London Naval Treaties expired and the naval building holiday was over.

In 1925 at Locarno in Switzerland the Treaty of Mutual Guaranties was signed by Germany, France, England, Italy, and Belgium.

The treaty stipulated that the boundaries of Germany, France, and Belgium be safeguarded by mutual agreement, all disputes were to be arbitrated, Germany was admitted to the League of Nations and she renounced her claims to Alsace-Lorraine. France abandoned plans for a Rhineland buffer state.

Nineteen hundred and twenty-eight saw the Kellogg-Briand Peace Pact concluded at Paris in August by the delegates of 15 nations. By 1933 62 nations had subscribed to it. It provided for the renunciation of war as a national policy. It obligated the signers to arbitration and conciliation in the settlement of international disputes.

The economic collapse which swept the western world, starting in the United States in 1929, probably contributed to the failure of the London Naval Conference in 1930 and the World Disarmament Conference of 1932. General deterioration in both Europe and the Far East marked the close of the 1920's.

In the fall of 1931, notwithstanding the Nine Power Treaty, Japan struck in China, and tore away Manchuria, setting up a puppet government in March 1932. The other nations protested but they were not strong enough to make their protests effective. Since that time Japan, as you know, has made itself master of the richest area of China, including the sea coast. War still rages there. The Chinese resistance is stubborn and effective.

So much for the efforts which have been made in the interest of world peace—efforts which depended upon disarmament and treaties of mutual assistance. One by one they have failed. Unfortunately, in their failure they left the democracies weaker, and to this tragic weakness can be added the failure of the democratic peoples and their leaders to appreciate the catastrophe toward which they were drifting.

Free government was in retreat, abandoning in that retreat the only instrument which could effectively guarantee its survival—armed power. Notwithstanding the fact that they were without question the masters of most of the industrial machinery of the world, notwithstanding the fact that most of the strategic raw materials lay within their frontiers, they dropped asleep while ambitious militarists armed for their destruction.

We forgot that for centuries mankind had been forced to carry on trade behind fortified barriers and that only the democratic systems had attempted with any degree of success to sweep away the barriers of trade in the hope that disarmament might follow.

We did not grasp the necessity of arming speedily once we saw that our efforts for world peace were going for naught. We desperately hoped that another trial would bring success, and we failed to understand that only in our strength could we hope to succeed. Weakness in front of armed strength only invited disaster.

The early days of October 1935 saw Italy plunge into Abyssinia. While the League of Nations attempted to apply sanctions its effort was not effective, largely because the attempt did not have the wholehearted support of those involved.

In 1935 Germany remilitarized the Rhineland and in the spring of 1938 crushed Austria, notwithstanding the treaty of 1936 wherein Germany specifically recognized the independence of that country.

The fall of 1938 saw the Prime Ministers of France and Great Britain meet with Hitler in Munich, where the dismemberment of Czechoslovakia was agreed upon in an effort to avert war in Europe. Hitler, upon the conclusion of these conferences and on the eve of the occupation of the Sudeten area, announced that he had no further territorial ambitions in Europe. A few months later, in 1939, his armies overran the remainder of that gallant nation.

These melancholy developments on the Continent aroused both France and England to the necessity of speeding up the production of the materials of war. To a lesser extent the impact of those developments was felt on this side of the Atlantic and we began military preparations which have now reached gigantic proportions. The only question is how much time will be allowed us. This rests in large part upon events over which we have but little control.

September 1939 saw the outbreak of war in Europe. Hitler invaded Poland; and France and England, pursuant to their guaranties, declared war upon Germany.

The events of recent months are, I know, too familiar to all of us. The collapse of Poland; the overrunning of Denmark, Norway, Holland, and Belgium laid the foundation for the destruction of France with a suddenness that struck terror into the hearts of the world.

These swift-moving events have brought us as a nation into a position of great peril. Our problem must be faced with courage and decision.

We must, it seems to me, have done with appeasement and retreat. Peace and security for our people lie in strength—overwhelming strength—not in weakness and petition for consideration at the hands of the most ruthless militarist of our age.

Make no mistake about either the strength or the ability of the leaders of the great military machine which today dominates continental Europe. Its effectiveness has been demonstrated. The dream of world empire on the part of its leaders is as yet partly hidden by protestations and declarations wholly false and designed merely to lull us into an unwarranted sense of security against the day when we can be dealt with effectively.

Our only hope of survival is in armed power based upon an industrial machine capable of supplying our needs in any emergency.

We must be prepared to deal with enemies from without and on constant guard against enemies from within.

No surer method of making available the manpower needed for our defense can be found than in the selective-service legislation now pending before the Congress. The defense of America should not rest alone upon volunteers. It is a duty that falls with equal weight upon the shoulders of all of our citizens. This legislation which has for long had the active support of the Legion should receive early and favorable consideration. It is needed, desperately needed, not for tomorrow, but for today. It is at this very hour that action can be taken that may enable us to ward off effectively a catastrophe in the future.

No government has the right to subject its citizens to the dangers of modern war without affording them the training that at least will give them the chance of surviving in a struggle in which machinery now plays so dominant a part.

In these days of preparation we shall expect the support and loyalty of those within our borders. There is no room in the United States for either a party or an individual in the pay of a foreign power, where the party or the individual is engaged in attacking our institutions or conceptions of government.

We expect with every means at our command to protect individual liberty, but we shall not permit those who seek to destroy us to hide behind guaranties which they neither cherish nor respect.

At this critical hour in our history, we cannot permit the citizens of other lands to abuse the hospitality of our people.

I know of no group in America more interested in the welfare of our people than is the American Legion. Certainly at no time in our history are we more in need of our loyal and patriotic citizens. I am sure that you will meet the difficulties which confront us with courage and determination.

If we are to have the peace which all of us so genuinely desire, we must demonstrate to conquerors beyond the seas that we are prepared and willing to protect by force if need be our land and our people.

Slum Clearance

REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 20, 1940

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, the slum-clearance housing bill has been pending in this Congress now for over a year. Much has been said on the floor by Members, but it

seems that not much has been done. Whether the fault lies with the Rules Committee or with the committee having jurisdiction, I do not know, but having started a program of slum clearance it is my opinion that we should continue it. Something should be done to awaken Congress to the importance of this problem. [Applause.]

Some time has now passed since our Government entered into a large-scale program of slum clearance and housing. When the program was launched it was for the purpose of enabling the underprivileged one-third of our Nation to find adequate housing.

By now, while the United States leads all the nations in homes for every purse and condition, nevertheless we have as yet barely scratched the surface. While housing has been provided for a large number of people and while we have eliminated some of the slums which were such a eyesore to the inhabitants of the hundreds of cities in this country, nevertheless much more remains to be done. Slum clearance has resulted in better landscaping and a more adequate system of parks and public playgrounds, so that we can say now without fear of contradiction that our American cities have the finest system of public parks ever assembled together in any community in the world.

The one outstanding name, whenever housing is mentioned, is that of the senior Senator from New York [ROBERT F. WAGNER]. It was the enlightened vision of this eminent statesman which first translated into action the Nation's demand for adequate low-cost housing.

Having started this program of slum clearance and adequate housing, it would be folly to close the doors to any further developments and pat ourselves satisfactorily on the back with the conviction of duty well done. Slum clearance is a continuous process, and as has been shown in a dramatic sketch entitled "One-third of a Nation," slums have a tendency of developing after they have been cleared. The creation of better districts in the cities, districts which were heretofore on the marginal line, may revert to a slum condition; and if the tendency is not checked we shall have two slums where one grew before.

As a result, Congress must still proceed with its program of slum clearance and low-rent housing as established under the Housing Act of 1937. There is a proposal now pending before the Senate to assist in the undertaking of additional slum-clearance and low-rent housing projects through loans and annual contributions to the public housing agencies. The bill also seeks to create a comprehensive program for the assistance of farm and other families of low income living in the rural areas.

By the United States Housing Act of 1937, Congress initiated a program for providing financial assistance to States and their political subdivisions under which they could eradicate their slums and provide safe and sanitary housing for those who live in the slums and whose incomes are so low that private enterprise cannot provide them with decent housing. Under the act, the United States Housing Authority was created, and was authorized to issue its own bonds and to lend the proceeds thereof to public housing agencies to finance not more than 90 percent of the cost of slum clearance and low-rent housing projects. The United States Housing Authority was further authorized to make annual contributions to such agencies so that the rents in the projects might be reduced to an amount, which would be within the reach of the low-income families living under unsafe and unsanitary housing conditions. The locality was required to make local contributions equal to at least 20 percent of the Federal annual contributions.

Under the act as it was initially passed and approved in September 1937, the United States Housing Authority was authorized to issue bonds in an amount not to exceed a total of $500,000,000, $100,000,000 of which was to be available the first year and $200,000,000 the second and third years. That act also authorized annual contributions in an aggregate amount of $20,000,000, $5,000,000 to be available the first year and $7,500,000 the second and third years. In June of 1938, amendments were adopted which increased the bond authorization to $800,000,000 and made the full amount immediately available. The amendments increased the annual contribution authorization to $28,000,000 and made the full amount immediately available. This annual contribution authorization has, however, been sufficient to cover projects involving only about $650,000,000 in Federal loans, plus the 10-percent local capital participation, and the necessary allowances in estimates to cover possible contingencies.

It is now proposed to issue another series of bonds to the extent of some $800,000,000, the proceeds of which to be used in loans to local housing agencies for the purpose of enabling these agencies to launch into adequate housing slum-clearing projects. These loans, of course, will be simply advances to the local housing authorities, and it is proposed that these loans be repaid in annual installments over a period of 30 to 50 years. Eventually, the United States Housing Authority will not only receive back this money, but will be paid back with interest, so that the Federal Government by issuing these additional bonds is not going to increase our national debt by 1 cent.

In addition to these loans, the United States Housing Authority will be permitted to contract for the payment of annual contributions to housing agencies in a total sum of $45,000,000. These contributions will be necessary, since otherwise the housing agencies will not be in a position to establish low rents in their several projects. These annual contributions are intended to make up the difference between the rent which would be properly chargeable for such new construction and the rent which these poor families now living in slums will be able to pay. After all, it will be of no material use to any poor family living on a low income in slums to have good housing for which such family will be unable to pay. In the city of New York housing projects the average rent is at the rate of $5 per week for a unit consisting of four rooms, which of course, is far below the figure charged for similar "housing" by private landlords.

The principal extension of the Housing Act will be for rural areas. The sum of $200,000,000 is to be appropriated for the purpose of enabling rural districts to share in the benefits of low-rent housing, and it is expected that this sum will adequately meet the needs of rural communities. Again this is a loan and not a contribution, so that eventually this money will be repaid with interest.

To make it possible for the housing program to proceed in an orderly and continuous manner, more funds must be made available now so that the United States Housing Authority may continue its program and local public-housing agencies may be enabled to begin their planning and work on additional projects. In the construction of a project, there is of necessity a substantial period of time between paper planning and actual construction. Because of the lapse of time—which is necessarily involved as part of any program of permanent municipal improvements—between the availability of funds for housing, and the effect of these funds on reemployment and volume of business, it is necessary that additional funds be provided this year for the normal continuance of the program throughout the coming year, without any substantial interruption in employment and construction. The enactment of the bill is necessary to continue an effective attack on the problems of eliminating American slums and rehousing families in the lowest income groups.

It will therefore be seen that the interest which the Federal Government is taking in low-income housing projects is a very comprehensive one. The desire to aid families, who otherwise would have to live in slums is the principal consideration for this far-reaching proposed legislation.

Representing, as I do, a district where slum clearance should be undertaken on a very large and comprehensive scale, I shall do everything in my power to aid and assist in any project which will result in affording to the millions of our people adequate housing. New York City has always been in the forefront of giving advantages of good housing

to the masses of the people. The present administration, ever since President Roosevelt made his classic pronouncement about one-third of our Nation being ill-housed and underprivileged, has done everything in its power to reduce this condition. Thanks very largely to the close cooperation which exists between our national administration and the enlightened government of the city of New York, under its brilliant Mayor LaGuardia, which has been doing more than its share toward this goal. But more remains to be done. We must reach the situation where eventually there will be no slums and no person living in substandard dwellings. We cannot, however, expect any material success unless Congress, realizing its responsibility, will promptly act upon the bill. The bill will alleviate conditions to a very large extent, and while it will not completely solve the housing situation in our large cities it will be a tremendous step forward and a forerunner to the eventual solution of this grave problem for the benefit of the masses of our people and to the elimination of this stumbling block to progress.

Washington Affairs and National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. VORYS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 15, 1940

ADDRESS BY CATHRINE CURTIS

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address, entitled "Washington Affairs and National Defense," by Cathrine Curtis, national director, Women Investors in America, Inc., before a mass meeting of the Mothers of the United States of America at Detroit, Mich., June 13, 1940:

On my way here from Washington I passed through New York, where my home and our national headquarters are located. I learned there yesterday Wall Street is betting 8 to 1 we will be in Europe's war within 6 months. What information does Wall Street have, unknown to the rest of the country, that makes them willing to give 8-to-1 odds? Why did one of Wall Street's most capable men say to me yesterday, "Miss Curtis, the sooner we get into this war the better I'll like it"?

Most of my time is spent in Washington, where I have an opportunity to confer with Capitol Hill leaders, Democratic and Republican leaders, but not those of the new war party. These men are alarmed at the rapidity with which we are being pushed, step by step, into this European conflagration. They inform me without hesitation that, if this country keeps out of Europe's latest—her thirty-second—war, it will be due to the clear thinking and influence of the Middle and far West and deep South and because our women refuse to allow minority groups, no matter how loud-voiced or well-financed, to involve us, thereby taking not only our sons and resources, but also our liberty and constitutional Republic.

Make no mistake. If we become involved in this alien war it means just one thing for us—a military dictatorship. The more quickly our people realize that the more quickly they will be able to protect themselves from dictated destruction.

Some may ask why I, as national director of Women Investors In America, Inc., a nonprofit, educational, membership organization, formed primarily for the defense and protection of women's property rights and the free enterprise system, should be concerned over the possibility of our present form of government, a republic, being replaced by a military dictatorship. It is the combination of that form of government and the free enterprise system that has given our women their great spiritual and financial stake in our country, has made them the world's greatest capitalists and the envy of their sisters throughout the world.

True, once we are forced into this alien war, we will be told the military dictatorship will be only for "the duration of the emergency." But what of the unending stream of emergencies of the past 7 years? Have you heard anyone now in power declare any of those ended? Do you realize that, if we had a military dictatorship now, I would not be permitted to speak to you as I will tonight? That, under such a dictatorship, you could not discuss national problems—even among yourselves in your own homes—without danger of arrest for treason?

Do you know that in England today people are arrested without warrant—detained without charge—held incommunicado indefinitely? That one's home there can be entered and searched without even a search warrant? That authority for all this was provided in legislation passed quietly about 2 months before the present war was declared? One cannot help but wonder with all this demand in Washington to rush legislation without time to study it, if the same thing might not be happening here?

Women played a major role in establishing our Republic. But there never has been a time when they could serve her as they can and must serve her now. I am convinced that upon the shoulders of our women rests the grave responsibility of whether we will be forced under a military dictatorship by allowing ourselves to be pushed into this war.

Most of you recall the World War only too well. Some of you sent your sons to "make the world safe for democracy." Well, they made it safe for democracy—for dictatorships. For always in the wake of the march of democracy follows the dictator. It has happened in Russia, Mexico, Austria, Hungary, Italy, Germany, and Spain.

Always in that march comes a serious change in the position of women—a loss in the security and supremacy of the home and the protection of its children. In all those countries, youth is practically owned and controlled by the state and, from early childhood, trained to look on war as the great adventure—to consider their lives of value only if given to the state.

Those countries solved their unemployment problems by first creating a war economy, through which the blunders of government were concealed. Then the unemployed were drafted from government dole lists either into army training camps or munitions plants, or, if they objected, sent to concentration camps.

Think back to August 1914, when European politicians again had so muddled the economic affairs of their nations they could only hide their mistakes behind the smoke screen of belching war guns and battle. By 1915 England and France had declared they did not want us in that war. They wanted us to remain neutral, so that our productive machinery could supply them with war materials. We all remember the huge foreign war loans that private bankers floated here, to be repaid them later by funds raised in the first Liberty Loan. Although those countries had large amounts of their own money immediately available in this country—as they now have—it is apparent they not only wanted us to act as producer but also as banker.

You remember the 1916 Presidential campaign, when Mr. Wilson campaigned for reelection on the slogan, "He kept us out of war; reelect him to keep us out of war." We believed and did reelect him that November to "keep us out of war." Yet 5 short months later, at his request, Congress declared war on Germany. In 5 short months propaganda changed the majority of our country from believers in peace to seekers of war.

Why? You undoubtedly recall the collapse of Russia began in the early winter of 1916. Was it because, with the loss of Russia as an ally, England and France knew they must have another ally to supply the manpower they would need to win that war? All I can say in answer to that is what men now on Capitol Hill who were there during those memorable days of late 1916 and early 1917 have told me:

"The envoys of England and France told us it was not money, not munitions, they wanted; that they must have men or they were lost."

How many of you appreciate that those brave men and women who came to this country some 300 years ago preferred to brave the dangers of the broad Atlantic in their frail sailing craft to face the hardships of a new and unknown world rather than remain in the Old World and be forced to take part in its recurrent political and trade wars, with their continual destruction and resultant starvation? How many remember that those brave pioneers came here and founded this country so that we might know real freedom and liberty by keeping free of Old World intrigues, entanglements, and alliances?

George Washington and those other great Revolutionary heroes who helped found this Republic knew that. But, 23 years ago, when the propaganda machine was forced into high gear and we were told we must send our men to Europe to "make the world safe for democracy," we broke faith with those brave pioneers. Falling victims to Old World intrigues, we sent our men to Europe—returned to its political wars—and what did it cost us?

Three hundred and fifty thousand of the flower of our youth killed and wounded, many of them armless and legless, blind, or demented, still lingering in our Government hospitals.

Approximately $30,000,000,000 of our money spent to prosecute our part of that war, and approximately another $30,000,000,000 already paid out in bonuses, disability payments, operating and administrative overhead in caring for veterans, their hospitalization, and so forth.

And in addition we loaned our Allies billions of dollars. Today, they still owe us about $14,000,000,000, not considering the debt reduction we allowed them under the Coolidge debt conference. Yet, there are those among us who are agitating for repeal of the Johnson Act, so that our nonpaying debtors can borrow more of our money.

We emerged from that war not as a trusted friend or ally but with the nickname of "Uncle Shylock." Newspapers now inform

us it is already being said in London: "We'll hold out in this war as long as we can, then we'll let the two yellow races, Japan and the United States, fight it out."

What else did we get from the World War? A depression, the like of which this country has never seen before and directly traceable to the wholesale destruction of life and property during that war. This depression gave us our unemployed, our starry-eyed experimenters who would make America over, and that greatest socialistic experiment of all time, our New Deal.

France also was handed a new deal as a result of the World War, for Premier Leon Blum, on taking office in 1936, declared, "I am going to give France the Roosevelt New Deal!" Within a few months after taking office he had laws passed similar to our Wagner Act, Wage and Hour Act, A. A. A., and W. P. A. He also promoted centralized planned economy, assumed that prosperity could be achieved by heavy governmental spending, introduced controlled prices, gave France an unbalanced budget, and kept it unbalanced, revalued the currency, harassed and restricted private industry, and destroyed its morale by making it a public whipping boy to conceal the failures of his own administration—all resulting in lowered production, less jobs, and a lowered standard of living for his country.

In other words, Mr. Blum gave France the New Deal prosperity formula of less work, more pay, less production, more debt, and less liberty. Although France always had been basically nationalistic, he adopted internationalism—continual meddling in other nations' affairs—as the principal plank of his foreign policy. He courted Soviet Russia, gave aid to the Spanish Communists, and to the Communists and left-wing elements in his own country the right to operate openly under Government protection. In addition, he gave them Government jobs and furthered the communistic doctrines of worker-control of industry, riotous Government spending, and unbalanced budgets.

The Blum new deal gave the world the sit-in strike, which shortly thereafter raised its communistic head in this country as the sit-down strike—condoned and protected by our New Deal. I need not tell you what a sit-down strike means—you know only too well in Detroit. You saw it—and saw our Government refuse to protect property rights—saw the man that condoned that communistic practice here later awarded a place on our Supreme Court.

This is not the only parallel we find between the French new deal and our own. When facts began to leak out, as they will, relative to the weakening of France's national-defense forces and its economy, Mr. Blum went to the people and declared his new deal was giving France the best defense force it ever had in peacetime—particularly in airplanes and tanks. But in May of this year Premier Reynaud declared the rapid German invasion of France could only be attributed to his nation's pitiable weakness in air force and tanks.

The World War also gave England a "New Deal" where it was known as "Political and Economic Planning," commonly called there "P. E. P." It was introduced to England in March of 1933 by Israel Moses Sieff, vice president of the English Zionist Society, who announced that England's "political and economic machinery was breaking down and planning was necessary to eliminate waste and bring about prosperity for all." Doesn't that sound familiar?

Sieff and his associates gave England its Milk Marketing Board, Pig Marketing Board, Electricity Grid, Reorganization of the Electric Supply Committee, Import Duties Advisory Committee, Town and County Planning Board, Committee on National Housing, Retail Trading Standards Association, National Labor Committee and other similar groups—all of which you easily recognize as new names for our N. R. A., T. V. A., A. A. A., W. P. A., and so forth.

At the time this war was declared, Mr. Sieff and his "P. E. P.," associates were drafting legislation to give the Government control over all private investing, similar to our S. E. C. With the advent of the war, this was unnecessary, since the English Government almost immediately assumed control of practically every phase of that nation's economic life. In view of all this, one cannot help but wonder if England, having had its new deal and joined the march of democracy, also will have to pay the same price other nations have paid for joining that march.

While it is not widely publicized, we also have had our own "P. E. P.," since 1934—financed for the most part, I am reliably informed, by Whitney money and operating under the name of the "National Economic and Social Planning Association," with headquarters in Washington. This group states its objective to be "to bridge the gap between fact-finding and policy-making!" According to available information, it is almost completely manned by individuals trained in England and has played a major behind-the-scenes role in writing new deal must legislation.

However, I came here not to talk of European affairs, but of our own problems—particularly our economic situation and national-defense program. We all believe in national defense and certainly the United States could and should have the finest in the world—but do we have it?

Since it is evident there are among us some who would push us into Europe's latest war, we must give thought to the actual state of our national defense. While guns in Europe belch forth flame and destruction, our air waves crackle with belligerent words and our press is filled with pleas for aid to England and France. Last Monday, June 10, a great number of newspapers throughout the country carried a full-page ad titled, "Stop Hitler Now." It was sponsored by the Committee to Defend America by Aiding the Allies, and was signed by William Allen White, of Emporia, Kans.

We do not know yet what this advertising campaign cost, but you may be sure someone has given this group thousands of dollars for it. Would that someone would give our women funds to finance a similar campaign to "Save the United States, Now."

In considering this appeal to strip ourselves of our few airplanes, guns, and ships to aid England and France, it should be remembered that William Allen White who signs this appeal has been publicly listed as treasurer of the American Society for Cultural Relations with Russia, an organization described by the Dies committee as a Communist transmission belt group. That he is the William Allen White who, in writing under the title, "Moscow and Emporia," in the radical New Republic magazine for September 1938, declared:

"When anyone, for any reason, was forming any sort of society looking to a cultural alliance with Russia, or a group to promote the recognition of Russia, I joined. As a member of a small subcommittee on resolutions at the Republican National Convention of 1920, Senator Borah and I and two or three liberals on the subcommittee wrote in a phrase which justified America's recognition of the Soviets."

Mr. White and his two or three liberals may have written into the 1920 Republican platform that phrase "which justified America's recognition of the Soviets," but the bloody Soviet Government was not recognized by us until 1933.

What of this "fifth column" of which we hear so much today—the Communists, Nazis, Fascists, and the agents of other foreign governments secretly at work in this country? What is its objective? The Dies committee recently states a major part of "fifth column" activity has been to keep us soft—to see to it that we are economically unsound and—above everything—unprepared to defend ourselves. Can it also be that part of its objective is to prevent us from defending our Republic here at home by sending our troops off around the world defending some other form of government? Is it also to strip us of our few defense weapons and turn our eyes across the Atlantic in order to lay bare our backs for the dagger thrust by the enemy already within our gates?

But we are told we can afford to give away our "old" defense weapons, because we now have a real defense program with billions appropriated to put it into speedy effect. Therefore, we are urged to give away the "old" equipment to aid in "the defense of democracy." Blum and his followers made similar statements to the French people and they believed. They allowed their government to send "old" airplanes, tanks, artillery, and rifles to aid the Spanish Communists "defend democracy"—only to have that equipment captured by General Franco, turned over by him to Hitler and Mussolini and later used by them in their invasion of France!

The news already has leaked through the European censors that Hitler is using planes against France and England that were built in the United States for the Allies, shipped to Norway for their use—only to be captured there by the Germans! If there is any truth in the claim that we are facing danger of invasion—do we not also face the danger of having our own defense equipment used against us if we continue to ship it to Europe?

We have spent more than seven and one-half billion dollars on our national defense in the past 7 years. It would now appear that for this amount we did not get even the equivalent of a good 5-and-10-cent store. When Congress recently raised questions as to the actual state of our national defenses, the Chief Executive went to the people in a fireside chat and announced that under his leadership we have achieved the best defense force we have ever had in peacetime.

In attempting to prove that statement, he detailed the weapons we have on hand and the "paper" weapons we have on order. What a deplorable situation. The Commander in Chief of our armed forces publicly informing the entire world, including all possible aggressors, the pitiable condition of our national defense.

Let me say that if I know the women of this country as I believe I do from my continual contact with them over a period of many years, then I know they want every bit of national defense we need for the defense of these United States. But we women insist on knowing whether our New Deal is misleading us as Blum's new deal misled France. And, if that is the case, will we have to pay the same price the women of France now are paying?

Devising plans for national defense is one thing; coordinating our productive machinery so that it will produce our defense needs speedily, efficiently, and economically is another. Some may claim this is being done and point as proof to the recently named National Defense Commission. Does this newly named board have the power and authority to really coordinate our productive machinery? Let's look at the law under which it is created and ascertain its duties. It was named under a law passed in 1916, which sets forth the duties of the Council as follows:

"SEC. 3. Duties of the Council: It shall be the duty of the Council of National Defense to supervise and direct investigations and to make recommendations to the President and the heads of executive departments."

In other words, all this Commission legally is empowered to do is "supervise and direct investigations and make recommendations to the President," who will—or will not, as he sees fit—carry them out!

You have read the names of the individuals named to this Board, but two of them deserve your particular attention—Leon

Henderson and Sydney Hillman. Mr. Henderson formerly was secretary of the Temporary National Economic Committee, commonly called the monopoly committee, of which Senator JOSEPH O'MAHONEY, of Wyoming, who introduced the Federal licensing bill to place all private industry under a Federal license, was chairman. Mr. Henderson, formerly a director of the radical-supporting Russell Sage Foundation who entered Government service by way of the N. R. A. and W. P. A., is reported to have stated on various occasions that our capitalistic system is dead and we must develop a new economic system. He is in charge of raw materials and their prices for the defense program and since industry cannot function without a sufficient supply of raw materials, I ask you, if he is in control of raw materials and their prices, is he not actually in control of private industry, an integral part of our capitalistic system?

Now consider Sydney Hillman, who has been placed in charge of the labor supply and apprentice training for industry's needs in our national-defense program. Born in Lithuania, he came to this country when he was 20 and almost at once became associated with Leon Trotsky, cofounder with Lenin of Russia's bloody Soviet. He later married Bessie Abramovitch, protege of the Anarchist-Communist Emma Goldman, and quickly worked his way to the head of the clothing workers in this country.

He visited Russia to assist Lenin and Trotsky organize the clothing industry there, then went to Italy, which was under "worker control" at the time. On returning to the United States, he reported to his union, according to the official record of the 1922 Amalgamated Clothing Workers' convention, as follows:

"In Rome I was doubly welcome; the secretary of the metal workers' union gave me a letter, the only key to open the factory gates. With my Italian comrades, I landed in front of the factory, which looked attractive because of the fine 'red' flag which adorned the building and the 'red' sentinel who was keeping watch."

One cannot help but wonder if Mr. Hillman's appointment to control labor for the national-defense program eventually will mean that "the only key to open the factory gates" here will be a letter from some union secretary that "fine 'red' flags" will fly over our factory buildings and they will have "'red' sentinels" guarding their gates.

Considering this—and the present talk of aid to Europe and defense of the Western Hemisphere—there is one point the people of the Central and Northwest should carefully consider. That is the danger of invasion of our country by way of Alaska. Many do not realize that Russia's latest military and naval bases in the Pacific are but a few short miles from Alaska's coast. If our defensive forces are dissipated—first by sending our "old" planes, tanks, guns, and ships to Europe and next by shipping our troops to Mexico, South America, or elsewhere—what would happen to our North and Central West if an invader suddenly swooped down by way of Alaska?

It is time we faced the facts! I find our women are alarmed at the antagonistic attitude and belligerent words coming from some in our Nation—a Nation supposedly at peace and seeking the good will of all. We now realize our defense forces are woefully weak and if we send our few weapons out of the country, we will be unable to defend ourselves not only against external invasion but also internal "fifth column" attack. Yet many people here today seem concerned with but two things—sending money or other aid to Europe and electing a President in November! I have found but few who consider what will happen if martial law is declared here!

Do you realize that—under martial law—constitutional and statute law cease to exist—that you have a military dictator who may suspend elections if he so desires? But—you say—what situation could arise that would permit declaring martial law here. Suppose Harry Bridges—well-known west coast alien and citizen of Australia, a country now at war—who is in control of our shipping labor, should foment shipping strikes and simultaneously, strikes should occur in the steel and motor industries? Would not that be sabotage requiring drastic steps, such as martial law, to put through the defense program we are told we need for our protection?

Let me add this. I know many are looking forward avidly to war economy profits, but—mark my words—there "just ain't going to be no profits!" If we enter this European war, all there will be is taxes—then more taxes—then confiscation and finally regimentation under a military dictatorship!

Where do we stand? Apparently, whether we wish it or not, we are being pushed pell-mell along the road to war! Why? Does someone in this country desire to become "Dictator of the Americas?" Or is this drive toward war simply in keeping with the old European custom of making wars conceal political mistakes?

What can we do to halt this Washington "blitzkrieg" toward war that is threatening our Republic? Here are a few suggestions for the women of the country:

1. Petition Congress, as our elected Representatives under our republican form of government, to remain in continuous session representing us during this "war emergency."

2. Petition your Representatives in Congress immediately to adopt a policy of no more meddling by our Government in the affairs of other nations and to return at once to the policies set forth by George Washington in his Farewell Address, which may be briefly summed up as: "Minding our own business; solving our own problems first."

3. Petition Congress for immediate repeal of all laws contrary to the principles of our Republic that now are on our statute books, even if some term them "social-reform laws of democracy."

4. Insist there shall be no repeal of the Johnson Act.

5. Dedicate yourselves to preventing any other form of government being substituted for our Republic.

Can these things be accomplished? I say they can, by the women of the United States—united.

The organization which I head was founded 5 years ago on the slogan: "1 woman can be forceful; 100 women can be helpful; 1,000 women can be powerful; but 1,000,000 women, united, are invincible."

I say to you these United States can be preserved and our Republic saved by 1,000,000 women, united, in 1 mighty national campaign to save the United States now. Will you do it?

Public Versus Private Ownership of Electric-Power Facilities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 27, 1940

SPEECH DELIVERED BY HON. JOHN E. RANKIN, OF MISSISSIPPI, OVER RADIO STATION WOL AND THE MUTUAL BROADCASTING SYSTEM ON THE AMERICAN FORUM OF THE AIR PROGRAM AUGUST 18, 1940

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD I insert an address which I made over the radio on August 18 in reply to Senator BRIDGES, of New Hampshire, on the subject Public Versus Private Ownership of Electric Power Facilities, which reads as follows:

Mr. Chairman, the statement of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is one of the most amusing to which I have ever listened. [Laughter.] If the people I represent paid the exorbitant rates for electric lights and power now paid by Senator BRIDGES' constituents in New Hampshire, the annual overcharges alone would amount to the value of 2,000 bales of cotton, on an average, for every county in the district I represent.

The generation and distribution of electricity is a public business, and one in which the Government has the right to engage. Especially is this true when it comes to developing and distributing the hydroelectric power in our navigable streams, which is public property belonging to all the American people and should be used for the benefit of all.

Instead of the Government being engaged in the private power business, we have the private power companies engaging in a public business and attempting to monopolize it. They are exercising governmental powers by imposing taxes upon the unprotected users of electricity throughout the country in the form of overcharges that now amount to approximately $1,000,000,000 a year—wringing from the unprotected users of electricity every penny the traffic will bear.

As I have said before, electricity is the lifeblood of our advancing civilization. The cheaper the rates the more freely it flows, and the more freely it flows the greater are its benefits to mankind. It is now a necessity of our modern life, and it must be handled through some form of monopoly, since it would be too expensive for a half dozen or a dozen concerns to supply electricity to one community.

Since it is a necessity and controlled by some form of monopoly, it is essentially a public business in which the Government or the municipality not only has the right but the duty to engage.

Everyone who uses electric energy is entitled to receive it at rates based upon the cost of generation, transmission, and distribution. There is only one way in which this has ever been accomplished, and that is through some form of public ownership—governmental, municipal, or cooperative.

During the years immediately preceding the creation of the Tennessee Valley Authority there was very little reduction in light and power rates. But since the creation of the T. V. A., and the publication of its yardstick rates showing what electricity should cost, we have forced reduction in light and power rates throughout the country to the amount of $580,000,000 a year. I wish I had time to break those reductions down by States. The T. V. A. is the greatest development of ancient or modern times; it will take the name of Franklin D. Roosevelt down the centuries long after his present critics are gone and forgotten.

Users of electricity are saving more money every year as a result of the T. V. A. yardstick than the Tennessee Valley Authority will

ever cost them. Everyone who turns an electric switch is receiving a part of the benefits. Out of the T. V. A. has grown our rural electrification program that has electrified millions of farm homes for the first time, and through which we hope to finally electrify every farm home in America, at the T. V. A. rates.

We should develop every navigable stream in America, as we have the Tennessee, the Colorado, and the Columbia Rivers, in order to control floods, improve navigation, conserve the soil, protect our growing timber, and generate electricity to be distributed to the people in every nook and corner of the Nation at rates based upon the cost of generation, transmission, and distribution.

That would force further reductions in light and power rates amounting to approximately $1,000,000,000 a year, add billions to the Nation's wealth, and bring to the masses of the American people comforts, conveniences, and relief from drudgery such as they have never enjoyed.

During the year 1938 the people of this country used 94,832,867,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity, for which they paid $2,146,443,233. Under the T. V. A. rates the cost would have been $1,257,050,486—which shows that they were overcharged $889,392,747, according to the T. V. A. rates.

Tacoma, Wash., has one of the finest public power systems in America. Under the Tacoma rates the cost would have been $1,016,142,175, or a difference of $1,130,300,661.

Under the rates charged by the public power system in Ontario, Canada, the cost would have been $1,139,286,874, which shows an overcharge of $1,007,156,359, according to the Ontario rates.

Here are the residential rates, paid by the people in the T. V. A. area, in Tacoma, Wash., and throughout the Province of Ontario. I hope everyone who is listening will take these rates down and compare them with last month's canceled bill, and then he can tell how much he was overcharged.

Here are the T. V. A. yardstick rates:

First 50 kilowatt-hours per month, 3 cents a kilowatt-hour.
Next 150 kilowatt-hours per month, 2 cents a kilowatt-hour.
Next 200 kilowatt-hours per month, 1 cent a kilowatt-hour.
Next 1,000 kilowatt-hours per month, 4 mills a kilowatt-hour.

Here are the residential rates in Tacoma, Wash.:

First 20 kilowatt-hours, 4½ cents per kilowatt-hour.
Next 400 kilowatt-hours, 1 cent per kilowatt-hour.
Over 420 kilowatt-hours, one-half cent per kilowatt-hour.

Here are the average residential rates prevailing throughout the Province of Ontario:

First 60 kilowatt-hours per month, 3.3 cents a kilowatt-hour.
Excess, 9 mills a kilowatt-hour.

I am going to use the Tacoma, Wash., rates to make my comparisons; for the reason that the opposition is constantly bringing up the argument that these overcharges are absorbed by the taxes paid by private power companies.

The report of the Federal Power Commission for 1936 shows that the private power companies throughout the United States paid in taxes, cash contributions, and free services, only 13.2 percent of their gross revenues, while the Tacoma Electric System paid a little more than 16 percent of its gross revenues in taxes, cash contributions, and free services. Remember, the Tacoma system gets no subsidies from any source.

This record of the Federal Power Commission shows that during the year 1936 the private power companies and the public systems combined, throughout the United States, paid in taxes, cash contributions, and free services a total of $303,734,000. Although Tacoma pays a greater percentage of her revenues in taxes, cash contributions, and free services than the private power companies, let's just take this entire amount of $303,734,000 from the overcharges of $1,130,300,661 in 1938, according to the Tacoma rates, and it will still leave an annual overcharge of $826,566,000—after giving the private power companies credit for double the amount paid in taxes, cash contributions, and free services. I am conceding that they paid as much in 1938 as they did in 1936.

After deducting the amounts paid in each State for taxes, cash contributions, and free services by both private and public power systems, the net overcharges paid by the people of each State for electricity for 1938 were as follows:

In Alabama, $6,985,000; Arizona, $4,062,000; Arkansas, $5,561,000.

I wish I had time to translate the overcharges in every State into terms of the commodities upon which that State depends.

For instance, the overcharges in the State of Arkansas for 1 year equaled the value of 123,000 bales of cotton, or an average of 1,600 bales for each one of the 75 counties in the State. That is a fair sample of what these overcharges mean to the people in every one of the cotton-growing States.

In California these overcharges amounted to $35,552,000, and in Colorado, $7,921,000.

These overcharges in Colorado equaled the value of more than 13,000,000 bushels of wheat, or more than 200,000 bushels on an average for every one of the 63 counties in Colorado.

These overcharges in Connecticut amounted to $17,344,000; Delaware, $2,051,000; District of Columbia, $2,871,000; Florida, $12,429,000; Georgia, $9,886,000; Idaho, $2,743,000; Illinois, $60,313,000.

These overcharges in Illinois equaled the value of more than 100,000,000 bushels of wheat at the prevailing price that year. There are 102 counties in Illinois. It would have taken an average of more than 900,000 bushels of wheat to the county to pay these overcharges for electricity in Illinois for that 1 year.

These overcharges in Indiana amounted to $20,876,000. It would have taken more than 39,000,000 bushels of wheat, or an average of more than 420,000 bushels to the county, to pay these overcharges in Indiana during that 1 year.

These overcharges in Iowa amounted to $13,799,000; in Kansas, $9,841,000; Kentucky, $8,746,000; Louisiana, $7,695,000; Maine, $6,177,000.

Maine is one of the greatest potato-growing States in the Union. Potatoes sold that year for an average of 55 cents a bushel. These overcharges for electricity in the State of Maine in 1938 amounted to the value of 11,200,000 bushels of potatoes, or an average of more than 700,000 bushels to each one of the 16 counties in the State of Maine.

These are staggering figures that ought to bring to the minds of the American people the magnitude of the overcharges they are now paying for their electric lights and power.

These overcharges in the State of Maryland, after making these deductions, during the year 1938 amounted to $12,309,000; in Massachusetts, $34,697,000; Michigan, $38,769,000—or the value of more than 700,000 bushels of wheat on an average for every county in Michigan. In Minnesota, $15,200,000. It would have taken an average of more than 280,000 bushels of wheat for every county in Minnesota to pay these overcharges for that one year.

These overcharges in Mississippi amounted to $4,260,000. The annual overcharges in Mississippi, outside of the T. V. A. area, equaled the value of 1,500 bales of cotton to the county, on an average.

In Missouri these overcharges amounted to $21,034,000—or the value, on an average, of 360,000 bushels of corn to the county. In Montana, $6,231,000; Nebraska, $6,765,000; Nevada, $922,620; New Hampshire, $3,738,214; New Jersey, $24,488,000; New Mexico, $2,002,000; New York, $131,720,000; North Carolina, $10,318,000; North Dakota, $2,426,000; Ohio, $46,636,000.

It would have taken 77,726,000 bushels of wheat to pay these overcharges in the State of Ohio alone during the year 1938. Spread out over the whole State, that would have averaged more than 700,000 bushels to the county.

These overcharges in Oklahoma amounted to $7,971,000; in Oregon, $5,921,000; Pennsylvania, $81,478,000; Rhode Island, $8,152,000; South Carolina, $4,246,000; South Dakota, $2,909,000; Tennessee, $7,069,000; Texas, $35,147,000—or the value of more than 780,000 bales of cotton, an average of more than 3,000 bales of cotton to every county in Texas.

These overcharges in Utah that year amounted to $4,510,000; in Vermont, $2,340,000; Virginia, $10,737,000; Washington, $10,050,000; West Virginia, $9,643,000; Wisconsin, $17,960,000.

These overcharges in Wyoming for the year 1938 amounted to $2,083,000.

Wisconsin is a great cheese-producing State. Cheese sold in Wisconsin that year at a little less than 15 cents a pound. It would have taken more than 110,000,000 pounds of cheese, or an average for more than 1,500,000 pounds to the county to have paid these overcharges for electricity in Wisconsin in that one year.

By developing the hydroelectric power in our navigable streams and their tributaries in every section of the country, and distributing it at rates based upon the cost of generation, transmission and distribution, we can remove this burden of approximately $1,000,000,000 a year from the shoulders of the American people, electrify every farm home in America, and make our country a richer, a brighter, and a better place in which to live.

Refugee Children

REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 21, 1940

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I was hoping to be here when the bill H. R. 10213 was under consideration. I refer to the bill known as the Hennings refugee children bill. I wanted to be here for the purpose of offering two amendments. It seems to me that under the present set-up the Hennings bill would permit no children except English children to have the benefit of admission to the United States if and when clearance is obtained through the Department of State.

To overcome the situation my committee reported out a bill which, in my opinion, would give adequate protection not only to British children but to all children who are victims of the totalitarian war in Europe. This bill is H. R. 10323 and appears on the Union Calendar as No. 1046.

Under this bill it would not make any difference whether the children are refugees from Great Britain, France, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Finland, or any other European country which has been invaded by totalitarian aggressors and would save them from the fury of war and attacks from the air.

It is inconceivable why, if we are going to save human lives, distinctions should be made amongst children of European countries and why children of all countries should not be admitted to the United States instead of admitting and caring for British children only.

In the report which was made to the House of Representatives on H. R. 10323 this matter was gone into in great detail. The committee thought that Congress should be impartial on the question of the admission of children, particularly since there are enough homes in the United States to take care of all of these children.

Before the bill was reported out by the committee elaborate hearings were held and we had before us statements from representative citizens of the United States giving details of how this evacuation of these children is to proceed.

These children are to be found all through Europe and some of them have already been refugees from military invasion. They have lived through the tragedy of the destruction of Poland. They fled, without having any definite place of destination, to Rumania and Hungary, and then when they finally reached France in the hope to find a place of refuge the same story was repeated and the children are now along the border of Spain and Portugal.

Under the Hennings bill, these children are left positively stranded. No aid is given to them, and nothing is being done to bring them to the United States. I think that all these children should properly be made the object of our care and attention. They should not be left unprotected while Congress is passing legislation to protect British children. The important thing is to save victims of totalitarian invasion, and I do not believe it comports with the spirit of America to single out British children or children whose parents are wealthy instead of rescuing all children, irrespective of their origin, particularly when there are about 500,000 American homes which are suitable and willing to receive refugee children. It is pathetic to know that, under the Hennings bill, we would be helping only one group of children and that others like Belgian, Dutch, and Polish children, who happen to be in that area will not be able to be taken up because the present language of the bill does not cover them.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Pittsburgh District Has Men, Plants, and Materials

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS E. GRAHAM

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 27, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE PITTSBURGH POST-GAZETTE OF AUGUST 24, 1940

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette of August 24, 1940:

[From the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette of August 24, 1940]

PITTSBURGH DISTRICT HAS MEN, PLANTS, AND MATERIALS

It is unthinkable that log-rolling and pork-barrel politicians should be able to convert the necessity of national defense into an excuse for the forced redistribution of manufacturing areas so that their particular States will profit by new industries which the force of logic and of circumstance would locate elsewhere.

At a time when speed is essential, the place where private industry has elected to put its plants, on the basis of sound economy and availability of materials and labor, would seem to be the place to which Washington should first look for expansion. As Charles E. Robinson, head of the Pittsburgh Industrial Commission, wrote to Mr. Knudsen, our national-defense program will suffer if "we are unable to decide whether factories should be built in cornfields or where the natural facilities indicate."

Mr. Knudsen, chairman of the National Advisory Defense Commission, is not the man to be stampeded, even by 63 Congressmen bent on getting their States further industrialized, into sacrificing efficiency and speed for political expediency. It may be wise ultimately to scatter some key defense plants across the country, but the present need is for quick production, not for realinement of industries to make them safe from bombing attacks. And quick production can only come from productive areas each doing that, as Mr. Robinson says, for which it is best suited.

Western Pennsylvania is the region chosen by private enterprise for heavy industries. Labor is here, plant capacity is here, raw materials are close at hand, shipping facilities are ready. The value of manufactured goods produced in western Pennsylvania is greater than that of six of the nine States where the Government has been urged to establish new plants. The Pittsburgh district has more employees than seven of these nine States and a bigger pay roll than eight of them. It is the heart of the territory where the "fundamental requirements for low-cost production are located."

Those arguments, cited by Mr. Robinson, should carry weight with the authorities in Washington. Speed and efficiency in manufacture of defense equipment is a national necessity and is not to be hampered by local demands for preference in the spending of Federal cash.

Espionage, Its Detection and Prevention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES KRAMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 27, 1940

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. CHARLES KRAMER, OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. KRAMER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me over the radio on August 24, 1940:

During the past 7 years we have seen civilization crumble, freedom become enchained, and the lust for power become dominant. The events of the past year have made the issue confronting mankind unmistakably clear. The ultimate conflict of our day is a struggle between democracy and dictatorship, between enlightenment and humanity, on one hand, and darkness and despair on the other.

The dictatorships are one united menace to the civilized world. The American people, neutral though they should be and are in political action, cannot and will not be neutral in thought. They stand arrayed against aggression, eager to uphold the sacred obligations of preserving humanity and freedom. The majority of our people are strong in their opposition to our country making any move that is liable to expose us to conflict. Our people do not want war, and they shall not have it as long as we can stand and think as one people, the American people. Our people are determined to treat the present war in Europe objectively. They are refusing to become bewildered, confused, and misled by the devices and opportunities of those who wish to see this country participate in war. Our people are wary of foreign entanglements and insistent upon a real neutrality, and their sentiment shall reflect on the Congress of the United States, and with all high Government officials.

Congress has been quick to respond to this logical and patriotic sentiment of our people.

In my own humble capacity as one Member of Congress, I have urged many measures to stifle foreign propaganda.

The American people were apprehensive about the activities of a so-called Japanese fishing fleet, operating near the coast of California. We had good reason to believe that this fishing fleet was used by a foreign government for espionage and "fifth column" activities. Therefore I introduced a bill to so regulate the conduct and the ownership of these fishing fleets that they could not be of any dangerous import to this country. Due to conferences which I have held with the heads of our investigating agencies in connection with this bill, I have good reason to believe from

confidential information which I cannot divulge, that the dangerous activities of the Japanese fishing fleet have been checked.

Congress, sometimes by simply calling attention to a danger, and bringing it out in the open, can end it. This is again evidenced by my resolution concerning the conspiracy to destroy by sabotage the power and reclamation project at Boulder Dam. As soon as I first heard of this dastardly plot, I introduced a resolution calling upon the Secretary of State to report to Congress any information in the State Department concerning the same. Of course, the resolution was made public by our alert press and radio and the conspiracy was immediately abandoned.

Back in 1934, when Congress was in the forefront in the realization that there were dangerous organizations at work in America to undermine our democracy, other Members, and I, fought for the creation of a committee to investigate un-American activities. The committee was created, and I was appointed a member by the Speaker of the House.

The active part of the investigation as far as the most dangerous and insidious of these un-American organizations were concerned, was assigned to me. Many days were spent with the investigators of the committee to run down the obnoxious and poisonous organization known as the Silver Shirts, and so aggressive was our committee in pursuing this investigation throughout practically every State in our country that we brought about, through evidence secured by our committee the indictment and conviction of the national leader of this outfit by the State courts of North Carolina. This not only liquidated the national organization but brought about the complete demobilization and destruction of the storm-troop division of the Silver Shirts which was set up in San Diego and Los Angeles.

As a result of the study which was made by the Committee of un-American Activities, I introduced a bill which is now in principle on the statute books of the United States of America, to make it illegal for any person or organization to advocate the overthrow of our Government by force and violence. That Congress has been constantly alive to the menace is shown by many of the bills introduced by other Members and laws passed by the entire body.

Lately among other constructive legislation is found a bill which I introduced as chairman of the Committee on Patents and Copyrights, to remove any possibility of agents of foreign countries obtaining certain information from patents in this country which are necessary to our own national defense.

This bill has since been passed by the House of Representatives, also passed by the Senate, and the President has recently signed the bill which puts it into effect as existing law. The act is for the purpose of preventing publication by issuance of a patent in the United States on any invention, the information concerning which might be of assistance to the enemy.

One of the important activities of foreign agents residing in this country is to closely watch and make a report concerning all new inventions which might be utilized in time of war. Naturally our inventors should be protected, and it is believed the new law adequately protects their rights, while at the same time the patent does not immediately issue and thereby the information concerning the invention does not become available to the foreign agents. It is reported that in the past the issuance of patents has been carefully watched by agents of foreign governments and through the lead furnished by the issuance of the patent the foreign agent has endeavored to obtain more detailed plans and descriptions of our new inventions. It is reported that this has even gone so far as to encourage foreign agents in making visits to our industrial plants, seeking out the inventors, and endeavoring to purchase the invention by offering the inventor an attractive proposition in order that the full details of the invention might be learned. The new law contains a provision whereby the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy may enter into negotiations with the inventor to purchase the invention and thereby keep it secret for such period as may be necessary.

There has been considerable talk which has little or no foundation in fact concerning limitations on our Government with respect to using inventions which are allegedly in the control of foreigners. As a matter of fact, the present law is quite clear that our Army and Navy can purchase any materials they may desire regardless of who has the patent, and no one, whether a foreign government or a foreign nation, can prevent our Army and Navy from using what they desire to use. It often happens that some particularly effective invention used in warfare is made less effective or even rendered obsolete by a later invention. I am sure that our country has learned much from the present conflict and that our inventors are aware of their responsibilities.

The secret inventions contained in the files of our Army and Navy would indeed surprise some foreign agents in this country if they had the least idea what they were about. I believe that the inventive effort of our people should be stimulated and I do not hesitate to say that Yankee ingenuity will meet any so-called "secret" weapon about which any foreign nation may boast.

To encourage and protect the inventions made in our country is a very vital step in the direction of preparedness. It is possible for a consular officer in this country to transmit in his own confidential mail, information to his superior residing abroad, and it is our duty to see to it that he does not become aware of our inventions that are useful in national defense. The bill which I recently introduced and which has now become law, takes a necessary forward step in the right direction, but there is still more to be done. When the names and addresses of all foreign agents become known to us and in turn to the people of this country, I have no hesitancy in saying that I believe our industrial plants will be in a better position to cooperate with our Army and Navy and to keep our secrets for ourselves.

The dictatorship countries have been increasing the staffs of their consular officers here, to an extent which I believe is entirely out of line with the normal requirements of their consular offices. We well know this device of increasing personnel has been employed in other countries for the purpose of espionage and "fifth column" operations. On Thursday of this week, I introduced a resolution asking the Secretary of State to furnish to Congress information as to the increase in numbers of foreigners appointed in America to the consular staffs of the dictatorship countries. The report from the Secretary of State will, undoubtedly, startle this country.

When I learned that foreign consuls here were carrying on a private and secret mail service, I made certain inquiries concerning their other activities, and came across the dangers involved by the increase in the staffs of the consular agencies.

I also have been given reason to believe that the dictatorship countries have not only pooled their economic resources, their military strength, their naval forces, and their air fleets, but that they have as well pooled, as far as this country is concerned, their diplomatic and consular services, so that their consular services here have become a general intelligence service for all the dictatorship countries, and that information obtained by the consular staffs of any of them is cleared through Germany, which controls the combined services, although they are financed by contributions from all these countries. The German Foreign Office turns over to their allies such information as is gathered by this spy system as Germany thinks is necessary.

I am for spending billions for national defense and preparedness, not as a prelude to war, not for aggression, but as an insurance against invasion by any hostile nation, and a protection against sending any of our American boys to Europe. By being prepared to defend ourselves against a menace that overshadows and threatens the world, it will not be necessary to sacrifice a single life, nor will we suffer the fate of the people of Czechoslovakia, Poland, Finland, Norway, Denmark, Holland, Belgium, and France, all peace-loving citizens whose courage alone was insufficient to safeguard and protect them against aggression.

Let us band together in driving out the inner forces here that want us to sacrifice our freedom and liberty. "Isms" have no place in this land—the land that has been built by Americans, for Americans, shall ever be the shining beacon of democracy and liberty in the world.

We must follow a prudent and sensible course. We all desire world peace. We have shown evidence of that, since the close of the last war. Our Government stands ready to assist in attaining a just and enduring peace.

Our fathers have built our country well and have established therein the blessings of a free society and a productive economic system. It is our noble task to defend what has been reserved for us, and to go forward and keep building for those who are to follow.

Let us pray each day for the restoration of peace throughout the world. Let us pray for a thorough and everlasting peace. American democracy is our heritage; we are proud of its freedom, its rights, its sovereignty. These precious rights shall be preserved and we shall not become the subjects of dictators.

Let us thank God that we are Americans, and let us guard ourselves against any efforts to destroy or weaken our faith in the future of our country.

John T. Flynn and the Oil Prosecutions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 27, 1940

ARTICLE BY JOHN T. FLYNN

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herein an article entitled, "Plain Economics," by John T. Flynn, as published in the Washington Daily News of August 19, 1940.

Mr. Flynn ably discusses the pending civil prosecutions of major oil companies for conspiracy to violate Federal anti-trust laws.

I commend the reading of this article to those interested in breaking up monopolies, an objective sought to be obtained

by planks in both Democratic and Republican national platforms.

[From the Washington Daily News of August 19, 1940]

PLAIN ECONOMICS

(By John T. Flynn)

NEW YORK, August 19.—The Justice Department is all ready to go after the big oil companies for violations of the Sherman antitrust laws. Powerful interests insist the Department should not do this as it will prevent the oil companies from doing their bit in national defense. And now Senator GILLETTE jumps on the Department a little for not proceeding.

It is certainly a little early to criticize the Department. After a long slumber it has waked up to its responsibilities as an eforcement agent of the antitrust laws as well as all others. If it did nothing for nearly 6 out of its 8 years that was probably not the fault of the Department but rather of the President, whose administration began by sterilizing the antitrust laws.

But during the last 18 months Thurman Arnold has proceeded with vigor on as broad a front as his limited resources permit. If there is a law violation among the big oil companies it is difficult to believe that the Department will shrink from action on that sector.

Of course, it is natural, that the oil men themselves should use every influence they can command to block a legal attack. And, of course, now national defense is the favorite cloak for everybody who has an ax to grind or a position to maintain. However, this defense will hardly avail the oil people, assuming that they have broken the law.

What the Nation wants in its effort for national defense is production—and more production. The one contribution the oil industry can make to national defense is to produce all the oil the Army and Navy need. If the oil companies have violated the anti-trust laws it is not through combination to increase production. Their combinations are invariably to limit production, to keep down the flow of crude and refined oil in order to keep the price up.

If the Justice Department has a case against the oil companies it must be on the ground that they are in illegal combination to make gasoline scarcer and prices higher. Nothing could be more injurious to national defense than this. The way to aid national defense is to compel these gentlemen to compete with each other—to increase the flow of oil, to keep the price down, to enable the Government to buy it abundantly and cheaper, while at the same time enabling the citizen motorist to buy it more cheaply, which will increase national gas taxes.

In most other industries involved in national defense the great effort is to push production up as quickly as possible. That's what all the industries are attempting—seeking funds for new plants, battling for more machinery, etc. But in the oil industry the big companies have got all the plant capacity needed, and all the oil needed—and more—is there. They by agreement keep it down, is the charge. If the Justice Department does not push this prosecution it will not be its fault. The pressure will come from some higher force, we may be sure.

An Address to and for the Foreign-born

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. T. V. SMITH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 27, 1940

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. T. V. SMITH, OF ILLINOIS

Mr. SMITH of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted, I insert a speech which of late I made over the Mutual Broadcasting System to and for the foreign-born, as follows:

Foreign-born citizens and alien guests of America, a word now for the foreign-born, a word which I want native Americans to hear. A word also to native Americans, a word which I want the foreign-born to hear. We should be one people, not two. To both groups alike, therefore, I say this at the very beginning, if we be alike devoted to freedom, it makes little difference under what skies we were born. To bring Tennyson up to date—

"Howe'er it may be, it seems to me
'Tis only noble to be good;
Kind hearts are more than coronets,
And kindly faith than Aryan blood."

As President Roosevelt once put it, we Americans have come down from immigrants and revolutionists. Mr. Wendell Willkie, in his acceptance speech, also made himself of the greatest of these by linking himself with the immigrants who came here as refugees from earlier German tyranny. If all Americans had this spirit of Willkie and Roosevelt, no plea would be needed for native tolerance of the foreign-born, nor any friendly advice to the alien of loyalty to this land. But, unfortunately, there are Republicans less generous to the weak than is Mr. Willkie, and Democrats less tolerant of the different than is Mr. Roosevelt. And, alas, there are some aliens among us who sneaked from tyranny elsewhere to establish tyranny here.

AMERICA IS RICHER FOR ALL FRIENDLY VARIETY

I would not myself have my country less variegated in population, but I would have it more unified in spirit. Unity in variety, that's the kind of oneness we want from our manyness. E pluribus unum. The color, the difference of outlook, the richness of culture—it is these that any lover of mankind would proudly celebrate as a major glory of this free nation. All these together go to make America still the hope of the world. Ours is from of old a land in which all differences can live together and like it, or can live apart and like it. I celebrate you all; you, the sturdy Norwegians; you, the methodical Germans; you, the freedom-loving Greeks; you, the romantic Italians: All of you I celebrate. I salute you all; I honor you all; for it is your multitudinous presence which renders this formal federation of States a living league of precious peoples. For this prime reason America is the model of what the world must come to be, if peace is not utterly to perish from the earth.

Nearly all of you who are foreign born are here because, for one reason or another, you like this land better than the one from which you came. We like you, like you all, if that's the reason you came and the reason you stay. That's the reason that we are native born, the fact that our fathers liked this land better than other lands. If you daily demonstrate that liking which makes us one, you yourselves will have done more than we can do to guarantee to you the protection of fair treatment. We native born came by our loyalty the easy way; we inherited it. You came by your loyalty the hard way; you have created it by choice and labor. Prize your loyalty the more for what it has cost you.

To those of you who are alien guests rather than foreign-born citizens, I add this: Certain it is that you would not in any other land today be allowed such freedom as we have allowed you as guests. We have been a land of such reaches of space and such roominess of character that we have allowed all, have welcomed most, and have tolerated even enemies of our own way of life. But now we draw the reins upon our roominess, for a reason that you hardly need me to tell you. The nations that have allowed so little have taught us not to allow so much. If you have come here from a land that still tries to see how much liberty it can allow, you will be little touched by our new atmosphere of national discipline. But if you come from a land which seeks to see how little liberty it must allow, you will have to renounce that land or suffer growing inconveniences here. Homelands that specialize in enmity make enemies for their nationals. If you approve of their cruel outlawry of race or of their equally cruel liquidation of class, you'd better return and be friends with our enemies rather than remain here to be enemies among friends. This minimum we expect of all our guests, that they be friendly with our friendly way of life.

THE REGISTRATION OF ALIENS

I assume that only a small fraction of our foreign born merit such words of caution, and so I know that native loyal Americans still do well to assume innocence until disloyalty is proved. This is our ancient way of justice, and it ever adorns the fringes of mercy. For this reason I was myself one of the four Members of the House of Representatives who of late voted against the registration and fingerprinting of aliens. Since we are all in the boat together on a stormy sea, I preferred to treat us all alike as long as possible. But the majority decided otherwise, and it is our way here to abide by the majority decision. You will, of course, obey this law, and you may well submit in full confidence of secrecy and in fair expectation of justice.

This registration was brought upon you by a small minority of aliens who have not behaved themselves as either citizens or guests. It is necessary that I speak frankly to you, as a friend who is willing to speak fairly for you. You ought not to allow yourselves to be thus compromised by an unworthy minority among you. Nor ought we native-born Americans to make you suffer for what others do to you and to us alike. That's the right and wrong of it; but we are rapidly heading for a national state of mind in which you can ill afford to rest upon what is merely right. You are going to need all the commonsense and courage we both can command, especially if you come from nations that now glory in teaching the world the superior rightness of might. This teaching, alas, works both ways, and always works for ill. In this knowledge, I would now make a more systematic suggestion to both groups, to offset such odious teaching.

FRIENDLY ADVICE TO THE NATIVE-BORN

And first to my own group, the native born. You are worried about the "fifth column"? You think you ought to do something about it? You've appealed to me and to other Representatives to know what you can do. Let me now give you double advice, both negative and positive. Negatively, don't follow out your natural impulse to take it out on every foreign looking person you meet.

The probability is a thousand to one that you'll wrong a person as innocent as you and much more helpless. You don't want to be a bully. I know you don't, because you are an American. Those who make public excitement a personal excuse to take it out on aliens, legally our guests, will be among the first to show their hinderparts when the real enemy gets in sight; for vigilantism is mobocracy, and those who stoop to persecution of the weak are mostly individual cowards, however brave in the mob they may whoop themselves up to feel. They have already in heart joined the Nazis against the helpless Jews, they are already imitating the Fascists with castor oil and rail, they are already at one with the Communists, making themselves feel great through the drug of this or that cowardly collectivism.

But you still don't want to let the one guilty out of a thousand innocent get away. You love your country and you want to save it from the "fifth column," and from all alien influences. So far so good. But, honestly now, which has the better chance to get the one without injuring the thousand, you or J. Edgar Hoover? He has a big staff, you know. He's a clever fellow, you know, with long and wide experience in numbering enemies and in tracking them down. He's paid to distinguish between suspicion and proof, you know. All right, then, notify Mr. J. Edgar Hoover at Washington, and don't you yourself do anything more about it. If he doesn't act, take that as your best proof that you were merely jittery and let it go at that. You don't want to jump onto those more weak than you merely to relieve your jitters.

Of course, there's some danger that even Mr. Hoover might make the innocent suffer, through mistaken identification. But this danger is much less than that of your making the same mistake. The danger from him is greatly decreased by the full awareness of it on the part of him himself and of men high placed over Mr. Hoover. Attorney General Jackson in welcoming the Hoover staff into his Department, recently concluded with the statement that "protection of the legitimate rights of aliens may become as important a duty of this new unit in the Department as the enforcement of the law against them." Those words certainly narrow the opportunity for any scoundrelism that finds its first refuge in the prostitution of patriotism. Let this be such reassurance of justice to the aliens as their conduct permits.

FRIENDLY ADVICE TO THE FOREIGN-BORN

And now my word of advice to foreign-born friends of our democratic way. You can help repay the native-born for their abstention from action if you will. You are not in a position to help yourselves directly; but by helping their forces of caution, you can help yourselves indirectly. We can handle the criminal end of the matter through the Department of Justice as indicated. We can handle the more important civil end of sabotage best through you. Why do you not personally and collectively undertake the cautioning of your own more irresponsible members? Public opinion is a great corrective of extravagancies, and you command the public opinion most likely to be effective against your own unruly. To allow organizations with which you do not sympathize to get you into trouble is not the best that you can do on your own home ground. There are things which are not actually against the law but which so offend good taste as to lead to repression. These things you ought to be able to do something about. At least dissociate yourselves from all such and do it as publicly as they proclaim their offense to good taste.

I for one am surprised, for instance, how seldom I see in "Voices of the People" columns Italian names praising American institutions. I am pained, for instance, at how infrequently I hear voices with German accent lifting themselves over the radio against their organizations that misrepresent all that's gentle and good in the German character. That's a type of job for you, the foreign-born citizens to do, to divorce the noisy minority of renegades from your great majority of patriotic men and women. If you aren't afraid to do it, then do more of it—for your sake and for ours. If you are afraid of reprisals upon your relatives abroad or upon yourselves here, then turn confidentially to Mr. J. Edgar Hoover with such secret information as you have against those who would terrorize you even in this free land. Foreign-language groups, you know the renegades among you; and you ought to expose those who otherwise will bring you yourselves into disrepute. This is surely not expecting too much of you as the price of patriotism for this land so large with liberty.

A WORD OF WARNING FOR THE RECALCITRANT

For such as will not take their stand fully and finally in defense of our American way of life, hard days are justly ahead. We are done with irresponsible tolerance. When we were free of danger we could be free with the dangerous. But now we propose to seize the dagger before it stabs us in the back. All that's dear to us is at stake, all from decent trade relations to what most men count as the sacredness of their religion. Dr. M. Whitcomb Hess gives me permission to quote from the magazine, Spirit, four of her noble lines on the Christ of the Current Crossroads:

"Three ways His fearful followers flee:
One leads to Rome as Caesar's page,
The second to a hermitage,
And the third climbs to Calvary."

Now, frankly and finally, we native-born Americans do not propose to become Caesar's page nor yet to retire to a hermitage; and on the road up the steeps before us, those who are not for us will be put down as against us. We welcome all the foreign-born to go with us like brothers through toil and sweat, and if it must be so, through tears, up this Calvary not of our own choosing.

As Credo for that climb, I propose to substitute for Senator REYNOLD'S five-daggered program, written in the ink of suspicion, this three-pointed combination of common sense and sympathy:

1. Don't nobody do nothing mean against the foreign-born, not even a native-born United States Senator.

2. Don't nobody abuse the hospitality of no free land, not even German consuls.

3. Don't nobody spare no effort to insure through peace if possible a victory in which enemies at last can be friends rather than a victory in which friends must forever be enemies.

Small Business and the Democratic Platform

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COMPTON I. WHITE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 27, 1940

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, it is notable that for the first time in the history of this country, small business has received recognition in a plank in the platform of a major political party. At the recent National Convention of the Democratic Party in Chicago it was my privilege and pleasure as a member of the resolutions committee to submit for the platform the following provision which was adopted:

We recognize the importance of small-business concerns and new enterprises in our national economy and favor the enactment of constructive legislation to safeguard the welfare of small business. Independent small-scale enterprise, no less than big business, should be adequately represented on appropriate Government boards and commissions, and its interests should be examined and fostered by a continuous research program.

The welfare of small business is of great importance to the Nation; the survival of small business is especially significant in those areas where there is a paucity of population. The State of Idaho, with only 7 cities having more than 10,000 people, offers a striking example of the problems which face small business and demand a solution.

Agricultural prices affect the turn-over in the mercantile establishment of the small operator; wage and hour laws give him grief in arranging schedules, ever-raising tax rates eat into his earnings. In the mining and lumbering sections the 40-hour-week provision of the Fair Labor Standards Act has had the effect of the operators cutting production thereby decreasing the total amount of salaries paid; in the farming sections, the low price of the commodities the farmer has to sell leaves him without parity benefits for the manufactured articles which he must buy, so he buys less.

Small business is neither effectively organized nor adequately articulate. Without complaint "the butcher, the baker, the candlestickmaker" transfuses his earnings into the building of his community through the employment of local labor, the payment of his taxes, contributions to his civic clubs and charities, and promotion of the welfare of his locality. He does not discuss his altruistic endeavors, says little of his concept of a citizen's duty, and does not mention the insomnia he suffers from dwindling profits and threatened bankruptcy. In fact, it may be said that the small-business man does less bellyaching than any other class and he receives the least attention.

When economic advisers confer on the alleviation of ailments in the national structure, they diagnose capital's complaints but fail to look far enough into the case to find that the anemia of business on Main Street contributes to hysteria on Wall Street. Small business is that artery of our national life that functions while stock markets sicken, while credits contract with spasms, while depressions plague the body politic. The doctors of national economy know that the severance of this artery would so quickly sap the lifeblood of our democracy that no stimulant could shock it into activity

or restore its heartbeat, yet they do not prescribe for the economic diseases that affect the welfare of small business.

Private enterprise is inseparably linked with liberty in our history and it is of great importance in a democratic way of life. Small business has a part in the American way of life which represents the dominating ideals of democracy and its security must be recognized if a stabilized economic condition is to prevail in this country.

Who Owns the Federal Reserve Banks?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 27, 1940

EXCERPT FROM HEARING ON THE BANKING ACT OF 1935

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, frequently I have been asked whether it is really true that the 12 Federal Reserve banks are privately owned banks. People find it difficult to understand how this can be true, since these banks exercise the power of issuing the money and controlling the credit of this Nation. A careful reading of the following colloquy between Senator GLASS and Secretary Morgenthau will leave no doubt on this point:

[From Banking Act of 1935, U. S. Senate hearings, pp. 507 and 508]

Senator GLASS. Do you think the Government, without one dollar of proprietary interest in the Federal Reserve Banking System, should be authorized, without restraint, to loan the money of the System in open-market operations?

Secretary MORGENTHAU. Senator, I happen to belong to that school that thinks that the Government should own the stock of the Federal Reserve System; and then it would have that right.

Senator GLASS. That is a different proposition. I am asking you if the Government, which does not own a dollar of pecuniary interest in the System, with the assets acquired over a period of 20 years by the exercise of banking skill—that the Government which has no pecuniary risk at stake should be permitted to spend other people's money without any restriction?

Secretary MORGENTHAU. Well, Senator, I am very timid about putting myself up against your opinion, because you have lived with this thing——

Senator GLASS. I am asking you your opinion.

Secretary MORGENTHAU. I think that the Government has got everything at stake in this. This gets right down to the whole question of credit. After all, as I understand it, the Government is the people. And we have got everything at stake.

Senator GLASS. Does the Government own a dollar of pecuniary interest in the Federal Reserve System?

Secretary MORGENTHAU. No; but I think it should.

Senator GLASS. You are for a central bank owned by the Government, then?

Secretary MORGENTHAU. If I may put it this way: I would like to see, if Congress could work it out somehow, that the Government owned this stock and would surround the trustees of it with every possible protection and precaution; that they should not be subjected not only to political pressure but to that of private business and banking interests as well, and that they should keep just as independent as possible, and serve the financial and business interests of the country with only one motive in mind, and that is to serve them well.

Senator GLASS. And to absorb all of the individual banks?

Secretary MORGENTHAU. No; oh, no.

Senator GLASS. What does your central bank amount to if it does not absorb all the individual banks and use them as branches?

Secretary MORGENTHAU. You see, I came up to this position through Farm Credit, which is a pretty big institution, and we have a somewhat similar situation there, I believe. We have strong regional banks with directors. But the question of interest is fixed here in Washington. The question never has been raised that the control of the Farm Credit should be held by anybody else but the Government, and I honestly believe that the trust that the Farm Credit had for the farmers and the millions and millions of dollars which they handled have been handled without outside influence.

Senator GLASS. That was an emergency measure, was it not?

Secretary MORGENTHAU. I would not call it that.

Senator GLASS. I am not talking about the land-bank system.

Secretary MORGENTHAU. I consider farm credit a permanent institution.

Senator GLASS. I know you gentlemen consider everything that has been done as permanent, but it started out simply as an emergency.

Secretary MORGENTHAU. I look forward to farm credit as an institution which I hope will live to serve the farmers for a long time.

Senator GLASS. I can readily understand how one might advocate a central bank owned by the United States Government. We have had them. But I would like to get more definitely your judgment as to whether a government should have the right to loan somebody else's money without restraint or restriction.

Secretary MORGENTHAU. I think it should have that same supervision over the credit of the country that it has over inspecting the banks or anything else. After all, I cannot make a distinction between the Government and the people.

Is the National Defense Program Being Used as an Excuse for Postponing Prosecutions for Violations of Antitrust Laws?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 27, 1940

STATEMENTS BY HON. JOHN M. COFFEE, OF WASHINGTON, AND HON. JERRY VOORHIS, OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herein press statements issued at the offices of the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] and myself relative to a resolution recently introduced by me which directs an investigation by Congress as to the reason for any delay in prosecuting violations by the oil industry of Federal antitrust laws. Attached to the statement is a copy of the resolution.

PROTEST DELAY IN OIL ANTITRUST SUIT; PROPOSES SWEEPING INVESTIGATION

WASHINGTON.—Congressman JOHN M. COFFEE, of Washington, chairman of the "liberal bloc" in the House of Representatives, has today introduced a resolution calling for a sweeping investigation by a select committee of Congress into the interference by any Federal agency, official, or employee with the enforcement of the antitrust laws, particularly with reference to the petroleum industry. With the introduction of such resolution, the following statement was authorized:

"Congress has appropriated substantial funds for the enforcement of the antitrust laws. Without doubt, there is something radically wrong when the drive to enforce these laws is stopped immediately after many labor unions have been indicted and on the eve of a drive to bring the real monopolistic offenders before the bar of justice.

"It is the purpose of the proposed investigation to determine and disclose to the public the mysterious forces or persons that are meddling or scuttling the antitrust enforcement drive, which is the mandate of Congress by both regular statutes and appropriation measures.

"I fail to see anything in national defense which would seem to necessitate or require the dropping of civil actions against the oil monopoly, or any other industrial monopoly.

"If anything the pipeline and marketing-divorcement suit is in the direct interest of national defense. The suit should be instituted and pressed vigorously against the major oil companies on the Pacific coast and elsewhere. If there are 22 major oil companies leagued in conspiracy, as is indicated by the Attorney General's press release of August 1, just what are we waiting for?

"War-material manufacturers have recommended the conscription of youth for a peacetime army at $30 a month or less, yet they have urged committees of Congress to eliminate the Vinson-Trammell Act limiting profits to 10 percent, an act that was enacted to prevent profiteering in just such an emergency as this. Hence they would make the sky the limit. On top of this they have interceded for an amortization plan that in effect gives war profiteers a 'money-back' guaranty. Competitive bidding requirements have been waived.

"As to antitrust suits once instituted against industrial monopolies I am opposed to consent decrees and private and secret arrangements for 'no contest' pleas between the Government and defendants in either civil or criminal cases whereby large concerns may pay a nominal fine of $5,000 or less, and then repeat or continue their monopolistic practices. Any collusion between the defendants

and prosecutors is to be frowned upon. In enforcing the antitrust laws the 'deals' should be made in the presence of the district judge."

When asked for comment on Congressman COFFEE's resolution to inquire into the reasons for the delay in prosecution of antitrust suits, Congressman VOORHIS of California had the following to say:

"Price fixing and restrictions on production and distribution of important products are not going to help any with the national-defense program. On the contrary, it is now more important than ever to maintain the fullest possible production, the readiest distribution, and the freest market.

"Therefore it appears to me that abandonment or postponement of such antitrust actions as that in the case of the ownership and control of petroleum pipe lines by the major oil companies will retard the achievement of a strong, well-balanced defense program. To enable consumers to buy in a really free market and independent producers in this or any field to operate on a basis of full equality with the 'big fellows' would seem to be a distinct national asset.

"If consumers are overcharged for industrial products, they must, as a rule, reduce their food budgets to meet those charges. We need a well-nourished Nation and as full a market for our farm products as we can get. As I understand it, the Anti-Trust Division has no intention of instituting action in any cases where industrial combination contributes to the efficiency of production and distribution. Its work is aimed to prevent monopoly control from throttling competition, interfering with full production and distribution, or boosting prices. On this basis, the work of the Anti-Trust Division should certainly go forward vigorously."

[H. Res. 575, 76th Cong., 3d sess.]

Whereas the enforcement of the antitrust laws of the United States is of paramount importance to the general welfare; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States has appropriated substantial funds to the Antit-Trust Division of the Department of Justice for the purpose of enforcing the antitrust laws; and

Whereas the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice on July 24, 1940, has recommended that the Attorney General of the United States authorize the commencement of a comprehensive civil suit against 22 major oil companies and their subsidiaries and affiliated companies comprising a large part of the oil industry of the United States; and

Whereas the purpose of such suit is to compel these major oil companies to divest themselves of certain types of properties, such as pipe lines and tankers and marketing facilities, and to change the status of such companies so as to separate transportation and marketing from the production of oil; and

Whereas the filing of such suit is reported to have been abandoned or delayed: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Speaker is authorized to appoint a select committee of five Members of the House of Representatives and such committee is hereby authorized and directed to take testimony, investigate, and report to the House (1) whether the antitrust laws have been fully, adequately, and impartially enforced by the Department of Justice as to the petroleum and other industries; and (2) the extent of, and the persons responsible for, interference by any employee, official, or agency of the Government with the enforcement of the antitrust laws as to the petroleum and other industries.

The committee shall report to the House (or to the Speaker of the House if the House is not in session) the results of its investigation, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

For the purpose of this resolution the committee is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, whether or not the House is sitting, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, and to take such testimony as it deems necessary. Subpenas shall be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member designated by him, and shall be served by any person designated by such chairman or member. The chairman of the committee or any member thereof may administer oaths to witnesses.

Conscription

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 27 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE PHILADELPHIA RECORD

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Philadelphia Record of August 24, 1940, entitled "Blocking the Draft Is Blocking Defense."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Philadelphia Record of August 24, 1940]

BLOCKING THE DRAFT IS BLOCKING DEFENSE

President Roosevelt warns Congress, warns the Nation.

Further delay—a polite word for what has become serious obstruction of the draft bill—can only imperil the defenses of this Nation and thereby imperil the security of our people.

It might have been politically wise for Mr. Roosevelt to let the debate in the Senate over the draft bill run on until it was halted by public disgust and indignation.

But again the President puts patriotism before politics, assumes leadership of the forces dedicated to arming America while America has time to arm.

The conscription bill has been under congressional consideration for 63 days. France was conquered in much less time.

Strangely, there are men in Washington who seem utterly incapable of comprehending the time element in modern warfare—and the vital relation of success in such warfare to the time element in the governments behind the armies.

No army can move more rapidly than its government will permit.

The defense of the United States of America will move no more rapidly than the Congress of the United States of America will permit.

We are not at war. But much of the world is. And we live in the world, which means that we live under the constant threat of war.

Yet Nero's fiddling was no more contemptuous of stark reality than the present senatorial talking.

If we speak harshly, it is because the time has come to do so.

No one has sought to cut off or limit debate on the draft bill. To the contrary, from the extended sessions of the Senate and House subcommittees, at which all shades of public opinion were given hearing, to the present debates in the Senate, there has been free rein for free expression.

During the early days of debate, important points were brought out on both sides. But now the debaters are merely repeating themselves, hashing over the same old arguments until the tactics begin to take on the appearance of a filibuster.

We are confident that the draft bill will be enacted, as the President requests. In our opinion, the Maloney amendment to delay the draft until January is viciously unrealistic because it naively assumes that the tempo of world events will slow up accordingly.

The Record believes, with the President, that the time has come to take a vote to settle the issue—and move swiftly to build an army to defend our country.

We say again, in all earnestness, that the ability of Congress to meet the challenge of defense is one of the greatest tests democracy has had to face.

It may even be the test of democracy's survival.

Most of the success of Adolf Hitler to date has resulted from arming while his foes were content to talk. Necessity taught Hitler the value of time.

Observation should be enough to teach us.

Conscription is not something we want. It is something forced upon us by world events. Most Americans realize that, as the Gallup polls show. Most Americans understand that conscription is both the most efficient and most democratic way of building an army—in time.

The Senate obstructionists represent a small minority. They have had their say. The vote is long overdue. America must begin to prepare.

Let it never be said that America's defenders went down—talking.

Willkie and Real Americanism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN G. ALEXANDER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 27, 1940

ARTICLE FROM THE AMERICAN JEWISH WORLD

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, no matter how violently one may disagree with some of the policies or principles for which Wendell Willkie stands, as gathered from his recent utterances, there is one statement to which every real American can subscribe, and that is the one condemning anti-Semitism.

He is editorially quoted with much approval in the weekly American Jewish World, issue of July 12, which I append hereto, and to their statement might also be added that the preamble and creed of such organizations as the American Legion and other similar ones condemn the prejudice of race or color. Not only that but it is contrary to the principles originally enunciated in our great United States Constitution and forever jealously guarded since its adoption by millions of thoughtful, patriotic, and loyal Americans. The American Jewish World article is as follows:

[From the American Jewish World of July 12, 1940]

AN AMERICAN SPEAKS

That Wendell L. Willkie, Republican Presidential nominee, would condemn anti-Semitism, was to be expected. Not because he is a candidate for office. As he frankly stated, "I have spoken on the radio and clearly asserted my position against race hatred, bigotry, and Hitlerism. I did this long before I even thought of being a Presidential candidate. I did it solely because I wanted to express my protest against Hitlerism and against all fascistic persecution methods."

Mr. Willkie condemned anti-Semitism because he is a representative American, and the representative American is not fond of the Nazi-inspired Jew-baiting. In this respect Willkie expresses the will of the average American, and it is because it believes him to have this ability to express the will of the average American that the Republican Party nominated him for the Presidency. Anti-Semitism, thank God, is not an issue between the leaders of our great national parties. Both sides condemn it as un-American.

But when Willkie states that he considers "anti-Semitism in America as a possible criminal movement and every anti-Semite as a possible traitor to America," he is understating the dangers of this vicious movement. As he himself states in the same interview, "If anti-Semitism should spread its roots in the United States as it has done in most of the countries in Europe, then it would definitely be a calamity for the United States. It would mean that the main foundations on which our country has been built are beginning to shake."

If that be so—and those familiar with the history of the European countries know that it is so—then every anti-Semite is not a possible traitor; he is a real traitor. Some of them may not be conscious that they are undermining the very foundations of our country and our free institutions, but they are helping to betray their country just the same, and their ignorance of the consequences of their activities is in itself a result of a prejudice which is criminal in the critical times in which we live.

Anti-Semitism is not a partisan issue in America. It is not a mere Jewish problem. It is an American problem which all loyal Americans must face and fight. The survival of a free America depends on it.

Wendell Willkie

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 27 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

EDITORIAL FROM PHILADELPHIA RECORD

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Philadelphia Record of August 24, 1940, entitled "Dr. Wendell and Mr. Willkie."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Philadelphia Record of August 24, 1940]

DR. WENDELL AND MR. WILLKIE

Champions of Wendell Willkie say that whatever you think of their man you simply must admit that he is a personality.

We admit it, cheerfully. We go even further. We admit that Willkie is at least two personalities, perhaps more.

As the campaign develops, indeed, the split personality of Willkie becomes its most remarkable phenomenon. For example:

Willkie is both a conservative and a liberal.

He says he is the hope of conservatism and writes paeans to conservatism in the conservative Saturday Evening Post. He also says he is the hope of liberalism and writes liberal articles for the liberal New Republic.

Willkie is a farmer in the Midwest. In New York, he is what Ickes called "a simple barefoot Wall Street lawyer."

Willkie has a home near the Wabash where he's "just folks"; another home along the Hudson where he's "somebody," and he says his heart really belongs way down upon the Swanee River, or at least in Ten-Ten-Tennessee, where no doubt he's just a humble hillbilly.

Willkie says he is a champion of power consumers and boasts of lowering rates in his old Commonwealth & Southern territory (without mentioning how T. V. A. prodded him along), and up No'th, where the bankers and brokers are wont to congregate, he tells tall tales of how he got bigger profits for good old C. & S. out of those selfsame consumers.

So it goes.

Willkie wants to give England everything she wants to win—and insists that the United States keep strictly out of the war.

Willkie is 100 percent for peace—and 100 percent for licking Hitler.

Willkie praises the New Deal—and promises to tear it up.

Willkie is, he says, a Democrat—and also a Republican.

This record betters that of the god Janus, porter at the pearly gates, who was given two faces the better to catch people going and coming. Indeed, it is matched only by the speech of that venerable candidate who got his juleps mixed with his metaphors and shouted:

"Folks, I am neither on the one hand partial, nor on the other hand impartial, but, like Caesar's wife, all things to all men."

Mr. Willkie's Campaign

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PATRICK J. BOLAND

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 27, 1940

ARTICLE BY WALTER LIPPMANN

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Walter Lippmann, from today's issue of the Washington Post:

[From the Washington Post of August 27, 1940]

TODAY AND TOMORROW—MR. WILLKIE'S PROGRAM

(By Walter Lippmann)

Although a number of Democratic Senators, chiefly Mr. WHEELER, of Montana; Mr. CLARK of Missouri, and Mr. WALSH, of Massachusetts, are the advertised leaders of the opposition to conscription and to helping Great Britain, they draw their practical influence from the Republican Party organization in Congress. There are no signs as yet that Mr. MCNARY, the leader of the Republicans in the Senate and also Mr. Willkie's running mate, or that Mr. MARTIN, the leader of the Republicans in the House, and also Mr. Willkie's campaign manager, are prepared to carry out the pledges of Mr. Willkie's acceptance speech. Both Mr. MCNARY and Mr. MARTIN have, as regards foreign policy and national defense, consistently opposed the spirit and the letter of the Elwood speech, and on the record votes they have alined most of the Republican Party in the opposition.

It is from this Republican opposition that the small minority of Democratic objectors derive their effectiveness in delaying and obstructing the measures which both Mr. Willkie and Mr. Roosevelt have asked for. It is from the Republicans that the congressional opposition obtain most of the votes. But what is even more important, the fact that the official Republican organization in Congress takes an isolationist and more or less pacifist line, enables a minority of Democrats to frighten the Democratic majority with the continual threat of a party schism. Because the Republicans under Messrs. MCNARY and MARTIN do not support the national policy as formulated by the leaders of both parties, a relatively small group of insurgent Democrats are able to control the balance of power in Congress and thus to exercise and influence out of all proportion to their real strength. Their influence would decline and their power of obstruction would dissolve the moment Mr. Willkie was able to induce his running mate and his campaign manager to follow his leadership.

And so, until Mr. Willkie brings his own party to the support of his own pledges, he is plainly in no position to challenge the President on any issue or to criticize the efficiency of what is now being done for national defense. The first condition of leadership is to be able to lead one's own followers. We live under a system of party government, and before a Presidential candidate can challenge the other party he must have established himself as the leader of his own party.

For if he is unable to lead his own party and has quarreled with the other one as well, just how is he going to translate into reality all his excellent personal pledges, hopes, and ideals? A President without a party is, as we know from the sad histories of President Taft and President Hoover, hopelessly and helplessly stalled.

Nothing is to be gained, certainly not by those of us who hope to be able to support him, in concealing the fact that although Mr. Willkie was nominated as the result of a popular rebellion against the Republican Party machine, 2 months have passed without his becoming the actual leader of his party, for leadership does not consist in making speeches and giving out interviews. It consists in inducing other men to act. And there is as yet no indication that the Republican Party leaders in Congress have paid the slightest attention to Mr. Willkie's views on any great issue. The Republicans who are supporting conscription and help to Britain were supporting these measures before Mr. Willkie was nominated; the rest, and they include the official Republican leaders in Congress, either remain in opposition or are passively, like Messrs. McNARY and MARTIN, not giving their support.

In the fact that Mr. Willkie has let the summer go by without establishing his leadership of the Republican Party there is to be found, I believe, the real explanation for his failure to gain ground since his personal triumph at Philadelphia. The latest Gallup poll confirms what most experienced observers had already noted, namely, the momentum of the popular movement behind Willkie has become bogged down, and that, if he has not actually lost votes, he has not been gaining them. Gallup polls are not infallible, of course, and they do not measure the intensity of the support behind a candidate. But it is surely the fact that since June the enthusiasm for Willkie has been noticeably chilled as week after week, in the midst of the most critical period of modern history, Mr. Willkie remained remote from the scene of action, reserved on the great controversial issues, and personally isolated from the critical decisions which are shaping the destiny of the country. Crusades cannot be led by anyone reclining in an easy chair on the veranda of a summer hotel, and popular movements cannot be put in cold storage for 2 months and then be set moving again. It is especially difficult to do that when the leader of the crusade is running against a President who day after day is actually dealing with the real issues of the proposed crusade.

There is no use pretending, it seems to me, that the first 2 months of the Willkie campaign have not been worse than wasted owing to a fundamental misconception of the political situation. Mr. Willkie was nominated by a popular movement which overwhelmed the existing Republican Party organization. The vitality of the movement required that Mr. Willkie should at once translate his personal victory into effective leadership of his party. This required immediate action—with no time out in which the defeated party machine could recover and reestablish itself. The action required was to make the party leaders in Congress, especially Mr. McNARY and Mr. MARTIN, bring the party organization into line. This action would have been an immediate and decisive intervention by Mr. Willkie in the real events of the day. He would have been from the start of the campaign a principal participating as a statesman in events. But instead of recognizing his responsibility as the Republican leader and fulfilling it, which would have made him at once a great figure, he became bemused with the idea that he did not need to act and that he could win by talking. He forgot that he had not yet shown his prowess as a party leader and he founded his campaign on the notion that he could "outbox the champ."

But this is a radical miscalculation. For as long as Mr. Willkie is conducting a merely personal campaign, without loyal and wholehearted support from his party, he has no way of convincing the country that he can accomplish any of the things he says he means to do. His claim to be elected—and it is at bottom a substantial claim—is that he can do better the things that Mr. Roosevelt is doing. But that claim cannot be demonstrated by smart speeches, and it will be ruined entirely if the people come to feel that Mr. Willkie thinks he can run the country before he has shown that he can run his party.

For this is not a talking contest, and words have no credit unless they are issued against a reserve of acts. Mr. Willkie has not yet done anything. So Mr. Willkie's campaign has not been flourishing. For it has been based, thus far, upon an avoidance of those acts of party leadership which the practical situation requires. Until these acts have been performed, all the rest of the campaign will seem unreal because it is unreal, being, in fact, so much personal rhetoric and private oratory.

"Fifth Columns"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSH LEE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 28 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

ADDRESS BY IRA M. FINLEY

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD what I consider to be a very fine speech made by Ira M. Finley, president of the Veterans of Industry of America, to the Twenty-fifth Annual Conference of the Veterans of Industry of America, Oklahoma City, June 30, 1940, and printed in the Oklahoma Union Farmer of Monday, July 15, 1940.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Oklahoma Union Farmer of July 15, 1940]

"FIFTH COLUMNS" ABOVE AND BELOW

[Address of Ira M. Finley, president of the Veterans of Industry of America, to the Twenty-fifth Annual Conference of the Veterans of Industry of America, in Oklahoma City on Sunday, June 30, 1940]

Greetings: We have met here again today in the interest of better government, a more equitable, social, and economic order. We are here as sovereign rulers of a great republic. For 8 years it has been my duty from time to time to restate our aims and purpose.

The leaders of this organization throughout the State are not only trained and educated as to their duties and rights, but our committees and leaders are as well disciplined as a well-trained army—not disciplined by force—but it has been self-discipline.

THE "FIFTH COLUMN"

We are adding a new committee to each of our more than 300 local chapters. This committee will be known as a citizens' committee. It will be their duty to report to the proper authorities evidence of un-American or disloyal activities. It will likewise be their duty to see to it that no one is persecuted or embarrassed by false charges of disloyalty.

The recent Spanish revolution brought about the phrase "The fifth column." The "fifth column" was those who were undermining the very structure that they were supposed to support. The Veterans of Industry of America, the "VIA" (The Way), has pioneered in making the voiceless masses articulate. For 8 years we have waged a war for good government. From the beginning we have had a clause in the constitution of our organization that has barred "fifth columnists" from membership and a clause to expel any member who was unpatriotic enough to falsely accuse any public official, high or low.

A RELIEF POLITICAL MACHINE

While we have had to wage a continuous war against communist front organizations, we have at the same time opposed laxity, or corruption in our Government. We fought the use of W. P. A. as a political machine until we lost almost everything we had except our patriotism and self-respect. We took the position that those who used W. P. A. and other relief agencies as a political machine through which they coerced and intimidated our unemployed citizens were not one whit better citizens than a Communist or German bundist.

Those who used the State relief funds to purchase, intimidate, and otherwise control the votes of pauperized people along with the other gang who coerced the unemployed through control of W. P. A. should be compelled to take the oath of allegiance to our Government that they would have destroyed.

Then there are the leaders of so-called special interests. These leaders admitted that they could not win an election where the V. I. A. and farmers' union were taking the lead for economic and social reforms. By their own admission they have used their money and power to prevent the exercise of a free ballot.

WHEN NO ONE IS SAFE

Members of the State supreme court have allowed the leaders of special interests to interfere with the constitutional rights of the sovereign citizens of this great State. We will continue to fight the "fifth column" whether it be misguided, unthinking, ragged workers, marching to the tune of communism, or whether it be the hireling of special interests or a corrupt judge in his ermine robe.

Yes, we will continue to urge the masses to organize into the V. I. A. in order that they might know more about their rights as citizens; understand the blessings bestowed upon us by the Divine hand of Providence and that they might help to preserve and improve the greatest Government ever conceived by the minds of men. Let us not permit self-appointed bigots to use the charge of "disloyalty" against innocent people. When such things are done, we revert to the mob and no one is safe.

The man or woman who does such things is unworthy of communion with free people and should be locked behind prison walls or committed to a hospital for the criminal insane. It is only natural that this patriotic organization, composed for the most part of men and women who belong to the one-half of the population who are "ill-fed, ill-clothed, and ill-housed" should lead the fight for genuine democracy and unadulterated Americanism.

A SURE WAY TO A REMEDY

There is a sure way to kill communism. Let the Federal Government provide a work program that will give steady employment to every willing worker at decent wages. Provide adequate Federal pensions for the aged, dependent children, widows, and those incapacitated for work.

Make it unprofitable for anyone to own a lot of land that they don't use, but make it highly profitable for those who actually till the soil.

Yes; this would cure the cancerous sore of communism; but there are two other divisions of this "fifth column" that are probably more dangerous than the threat of communism—the special interests and their political henchmen. Let us, my coworker, keep our eyes upon the fundamentals that distinguish a free people from a slave people.

It is not enough to merely salute our flag or mumble our prayers; it is not enough to sing praises to our founding fathers. Our day calls for action and sacrifices as much as theirs. If we cherish free speech, free assemblage, freedom of worship; if we cherish the right of the writ of habeas corpus; if we love the right as sovereigns where, in this Nation, every man is a king and every woman a queen, we must be willing to sacrifice, to fight for their preservation.

THE WORST TYPE OF CRIMINAL

We must bring into our organization others who are willing to help keep a watchful eye upon our glorious democracy. We must understand that the scheming scoundrel who manipulates the markets, impoverishes and debases our citizens, is as much a dictator as the ones who have raped the democracies of Europe. Through our widespread committee system we should warn others that an unfaithful public official is the worst type of criminal; that waste of public funds is the most despicable of all thefts.

Today democracy is stumbling along toward Gethsemane with a battered cross upon her shoulders. I have heard the adept propagandists as they have asked the despondent unemployed worker, "What would you lose if we had a dictator of the proletariat?" "Just what does democracy mean to you?" Oh, yes; that question has been asked of millions in the past 10 years, and while the answer has not been audible, it has been answered, "I have nothing to lose" or "Democracy means nothing to me."

ONLY DEMOCRACY CAN SAVE

The bewildered, destitute citizen needs us to point out the fact that democracy only can save him, and that these subtle agents of destruction are employing democracy's strength (free speech) with which to destroy her. In this struggle no one has more to lose than the underprivileged poor. Under a dictator their economic lot would be no better; their bodies, yes, the very soul of themselves and loved ones, would be in chains.

Today they have the ballot; today they have the remedy in their own hands. Let no one fool you; democracy must be preserved by the toiling masses or we perish. I want to congratulate you for your patience, for your devotion, which has enabled you to surmount every obstacle. We must organize, organize, and organize or else all these blessings will soon be denied us.

In conclusion, let us repeat, the fight against the "fifth column" cannot be made by public officials or by those in high places. It must be made by the plain people, from whence every ray of liberty and freedom has sprung since the dawn of time.

West Point

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS LUDLOW

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 22, 1940

ARTICLE FROM COLLIER'S

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent of the House, I submit for printing in the RECORD extracts from an interesting article on the West Point Military Academy which appeared in Collier's for August 24, 1940, as follows:

[From Collier's for August 24, 1940]

WEST POINT?

(By Henry F. Pringle)

The United States Military Academy at West Point, N. Y., is one of the most beautiful institutions in the world. Its graduates have engraved their names high on the honor rolls of peace as well as war. Its cadets are youths of scrupulous honor, and they are intelligent as well as brave.

And yet, West Point elementary military training emphasizes greatly the formal parades and guard mountings. These require—for perfection of performance—that too much of the cadet's time be spent in shoulder-to-shoulder marching in ranks on foot. Emphasis on such training was necessary in Frederick the Great's day. But are not matters greatly altered now? Should not all the cadets spend much less of their 4 years in formal close-order marching? Should not the time thus made available be devoted to learning the simple elements of piloting an airplane, practice in simple parachute work and the use of other modern engines of war? Should not the exhibition during the graduating week show that the cadets about to graduate and become officers are proficient in the practical elements of such matters?

Look at one of the programs of exercises for graduation week at present. They consist of horse shows, formal close-order infantry parades on foot and drills in which horses are used. Necessarily the cadet maneuvers are elementary and mostly include only the 1,200 or so cadets. Also, the local terrain is not sufficiently extensive to permit much firing of modern artillery.

* * * * * * *

The high-ranking men of the graduating class—possibly 25 in all—are permitted to enter the Corps of Engineers, which is regarded as the most desirable arm of the service. About half the class enrolls in the Air Corps for a year of training, but only 50 percent of them qualify. The rest of the graduates are assigned to troops. After the young officer has obtained additional practical experience for, say, 2 years he is sent to one of the Army postgraduate schools, where he gets special training in cavalry, infantry, or whatever his branch happens to be. There, probably for the first time, he learns the details of modern warfare. In due course, if the officer is able enough, he will be sent to the General Staff School at Fort Leavenworth, Kans. A few years later, if he has shown still additional competence, he will take the course at the Army War College in Washington, which is the final postgraduate school. But that, if he is a West Pointer, will be 15 or 20 years after he has left the quiet campus of the United States Military Academy.

* * * * * * *

Naturally, West Point leans upon tradition and the past. The mission of the academy, the freshman cadets are informed, is primarily to "instill discipline and a sense of honor." Thus it has always been at West Point since the institution was founded in 1802. The system of instruction at the academy is, in its broad aspects, still the one established by Col. Sylvanus Thayer, the "father of West Point," when he became superintendent in 1817.

"We have made changes, of course," a high-ranking officer of the academy told me, "but we teach the same fundamentals—honor and integrity and discipline."

The honor and integrity of West Point men may be assumed. There isn't the slightest question about that. Doubt has been cast, however, on whether the West Point elementary discipline is the best for war of today, when nothing happens according to schedule.

* * * * * * *

In the face of these admitted facts the question is now being raised whether such luxuries as a 4-year course with hours upon hours devoted to English composition, English literature, French, Spanish, and ancient history can be afforded. The hours given to "cultural subjects," so-called, at West Point are greater than at such civilian technical colleges as the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and the engineering schools of Cornell University. For graduation from West Point 131 semester hours are required; that is, classes of 1 hour given a stated number of times each semester. Of the total of 131 during 4 years, hardly a third are courses directly related to being an officer in the Army. The rest are "cultural subjects," science, and engineering.

In the summer months, it is true, classes are suspended and the cadets learn something, at least, about work in the field. They go out on what are called cavalry hikes, expeditions of 20 to 25 miles a day on which cavalry problems are studied. They study such engineering problems as the building of pontoon bridges and they get some practical field-artillery training. Infantry maneuvers are also staged. A West Point cadet knows how to deploy troops. He knows the rudiments of infantry tactics.

* * * * * * *

A few West Pointers have themselves recently suggested some changes, and have been brushed aside on the ground that they are not familiar with the West Point of today. Occasional outsiders have had the temerity to suggest that radical changes should be made. Would it not be wise, they have asked, to make West Point a graduate school with enrollment limited to men with college degrees? Then the academic work could be curtailed, a thorough military education substituted, and commissions as second lieutenants awarded after 2 years. Twice as many cadets could thereby be graduated into the Army.

* * * * * * *

OUTSIDE CRITICISM MIGHT HELP

West Point might benefit from outside inspection. The United States Naval Academy at Annapolis is inspected annually by a Board of Visitors on which habitually serve such distinguished men as the presidents of Northwestern University, the University of California, the University of Wisconsin, and of Lafayette College. Also on the Board of Visitors are members of the House and Senate. To Annapolis journeys this distinguished body of men each year. It spends about a week in exhaustive inquiry and drafts a comprehensive report.

West Point, too, has a Board of Visitors, made up of a dozen or more Members of the Senate and House Military Affairs Committees. Two years ago three Members of the Senate appeared for the annual inspection and last year three Members of the House. They were tendered a luncheon by the superintendent, watched the glamorous dress parade and went home at the end of

the day. A report of a few hundred words was drafted and printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD where nobody saw it. The truth is that West Point has no desire for stringent outside supervision. A proposal by Senator SHEPPARD, of Texas, to add five educators to the Board of Visitors was opposed by the then superintendent, Maj. Gen. William D. Connor. Brig. Gen. Jay L. Benedict, now the superintendent, has said he would welcome investigation by any specially drafted commission, but that he has small faith in routine boards. Anyway, nothing is done. West Point still runs itself.

In theory, the academy is run by the Superintendent and his staff under the supervision of the War Department. Actually, I am convinced, it is run by a permanent group of officers called the academic board. This is composed of the heads of the various collegiate departments, the Superintendent, and two or three other officers. Their devotion to West Point is sincere and complete. So, I suspect, is their control. I don't think any superintendent, whose assignment to the institution is normally for 4 years, would cross swords with the academic board. I doubt that the War Department would oppose its will.

* * * * * * *

It is not unusual for men with 2 and 3 years of college to be admitted to West Point. College graduates sometimes become cadets. But so rigid is the academy system that men with degrees are forced to take the identical courses with boys who have just left high school. They must go back over all their French, their Spanish, their elementary English composition, and their mathematics.

German, incidentally, is not taught at West Point. Its authorities admit, somewhat lugubriously, that instruction in German might be a good idea and it is being considered.

AN EXPERT SPEAKS

I have encountered no West Point graduate, nor any outsider familiar with the academy, who casts the slightest doubt on the sincerity of its administrative officers.

The criticism of West Point rises from its distaste for change when warfare has changed. Modern warfare demands in young officers the highest development of personal initiative and resourcefulness. A method of training the cadets in excessive accuracy in shoulder-to-shoulder marching is not conducive to developing the type of officer now demanded.

Among the leading critics of some features of West Point's elementary training in discipline and in military affairs is Maj. Gen. William C. Rivers, now retired, who graduated with the class of 1887. General Rivers fought in the later Indian wars, at Santiago, and in the Philippines, and in France had a line-of-battle command in all our major combats.

When the name of General Rivers was mentioned at West Point there was a discernible tendency to belittle his knowledge of the academy and to discount his suggestions for change. But it seems to me, on the contrary, that the general has made a thorough and intelligent study of the institution, and that he is scrupulously fair. Before making any of his suggestions for changes at the Military Academy, General Rivers spent 10 days at West Point, in a quiet season, in order to freshen his knowledge of the school. He then went to Annapolis and spent a fortnight in detailed and careful study of the Naval Academy. General Rivers had the unusual privilege of being, as a young officer, twice ordered from the Indian country for duty at West Point. He has, therefore, passed 10 years of his life at his alma mater.

"Some things about West Point I believe we all agree on," he told the House Committee on Military Affairs a few years ago. "Among these are that it is one of the noblest and most valuable assets of America * * *."

But General Rivers believes, as he told the House committee, that the cadets "are too closely confined." He thinks they are not given enough vacations. The midshipmen at Annapolis "have perhaps double the vacation time in 4 years—aside from the cruises." Greater freedom "would result in better work and in better physical and general development."

"Too much segregation and too many rules and regulations," General Rivers added, "do not aid the development of character, in my opinion. These merely add unnecessarily to the nervous strain and to the minor frictions of cadet life. The best means for developing personal initiative and personal resourcefulness are of paramount importance since the World War."

In short, war had changed even in 1918 and West Point had not—or too little. General Rivers went on:

"Many of us graduates—who have had extended battle work in war—believe that it is important gradually to modify and rationalize West Point's method of elementary disciplinary training in order to meet the modern demand for officers possessing the highest degree of personal initiative."

It was "disturbing," he said, to see that none of the graduating cadets could execute "simple maneuvers with a training airplane, and that the chief daily military exhibition in June week remains the formal dress parade. Why not release the seniors from the ranks after 2 years shoulder-to-shoulder training, some of which is suited for mass maneuvers and for attacking hollow squares at close quarters?"

* * * * * * *

Abroad, the military schools are far more closely geared to the art of war. At England's Royal Military College (Sandhurst) and Royal Military Academy (Woolwich) the course is only 18 months and the education is strictly military and professional. It is idle, naturally, to speak of French schools today. They are doubtless what the Nazis have ordered. But until the collapse of France, the cadets spent only 2 years at the famous L'Ecole Spéciale Militaire at St. Cyr or at L'Ecole Polytechnique in Paris. Germany had five academies just before the war. Candidates for admission had to show, besides "proof of Aryan descent," that they had the equivalent of 2 years of college. The courses at all of them last about a year and a quarter. Italy has a 2-year course. West Point, as far as I can learn, is the only military school except the Royal Military College of Canada which gives a full collegiate education. At Sandhurst, indeed, the desperate exigencies of war have forced a reduction of the normal 18-months course to 16 weeks.

It was late afternoon as we prepared to leave West Point after our final visit and crowds were gathering to watch the dress parade, famous throughout the world. The sun was still hot. It was a warm day. I wondered, as the magnificent parade began, how the cadets could stand it in their high, tight collars and stiff uniforms. These, too, were a symbol of a day that has passed. They are fit young men, however. They gave no sign of discomfort or fatigue. Their ranks were mathematically precise. Near me stood an elderly couple who had obviously driven in from their farm to see the spectacle.

"How do they ever learn to do it so well?" I asked the man.

"I dunno," he answered. "The Rockettes at the Music Hall in New York are just as good, though."

IT DEPENDS ON WHAT YOU WANT

That, too, was an unfair crack. The Rockettes' precision dancing may be as accurate in its way as the dress parade at West Point. But the dress parade is only an outward symbol of what is wrong at the United States Military Academy. Is West Point any good? That depends on what you want. If it is an institution which turns out men of honor, men of intelligence, men who believe in tradition, men with cultural background, men who will do their duty, men who are brave—why, then, West Point is very good, indeed. West Point doesn't pretend to train for today's war. Possibly it doesn't even build men for tomorrow's war. It sends out men who, in the course of further training and years of service, will become competent officers.

"Every war," to quote again the official history of the institution, "has brought some disturbance to the normal tenor of the Military Academy's activities." If you want a West Point tuned up to immediate combat, to tanks and parachute troops and totalitarian efficiency and lightning thrusts and mechanization and horror and death—why, then, West Point is not much good.

Some statistics: The total number of the graduates of West Point from 1802 to date is 12,238. From 1802 until the Civil War the Academy turned out but 1,887 graduates. About 1,250 of these, of all ages, were living in 1861. There were about 100,000 officers on both sides in the Civil War. However, during the 4 years of conflict there were 445 general officers, on both sides, from the small number of West Pointers living in 1861. At the close of the Civil War all the armies on both sides were commanded by graduates of West Point. Also, the commanders of nearly all the corps and divisions in the Union Army and in the Confederate Army were West Point graduates. The above is a truly remarkable record of men who had no sort of political influence or prestige to aid them in being given army commands.

Appropriations for National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK B. KEEFE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 28, 1940

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, current discussion of national-defense problems has resulted in much misinformation as to the amounts appropriated and expended for the Army and Navy. In order that the Members of Congress and the country may have accurate and authentic information on the subject I have had a consolidated statement prepared of appropriations and expenditures for the Army and Navy for the fiscal years 1933 to 1941, both inclusive.

This statement will disclose, among interesting facts, that in the years 1933 to 1939, both inclusive, the Army and Navy were given $381,128,033.35 more than was expended in those years.

The entire statement follows:

Consolidated statement of appropriations and expenditures for the Army and [1] Navy, fiscal years 1933 to 1941, both inclusive

	Appropriations	Allotment of emergency funds	Total	Expended
1933:				
Army	$304,961,492.00		$304,961,492.00	$295,111,986.89
Navy	347,152,220.89	$238,000,000.00	585,152,220.89	342,176,417.52
Total	652,113,712.89	238,000,000.00	890,113,712.89	637,288,404.41
1934:				
Army	277,050,381.00	96,688,252.00	373,738,633.00	272,652,668.63
Navy	324,755,626.68	39,098,924.00	363,854,550.68	303,639,404.62
Total	601,806,007.68	135,787,176.00	737,593,183.68	576,292,073.25
1935:				
Army	280,848,897.00	8,857,678.00	289,706,575.00	364,859,410.07
Navy	314,567,433.52	40,993,440.00	355,560,873.52	440,604,669.56
Total	595,416,330.52	49,851,118.00	645,267,448.52	805,464,079.63
1936:				
Army	355,523,020.00	9,551,451.00	365,074,471.00	339,598,167.79
Navy	496,572,848.78	252,356.42	496,825,205.20	518,625,222.14
Total	852,095,868.78	9,803,807.42	861,899,676.20	858,223,389.93
1937:				
Army	388,244,859.00	18,069,820.00	406,314,679.00	362,005,183.59
Navy	597,567,939.89		597,567,939.89	539,030,790.85
Total	985,812,798.89	18,069,820.00	1,003,882,618.89	901,035,974.44
1938:				
Army	415,263,154.00	74,939,334.00	490,202,488.00	431,410,612.14
Navy	535,172,626.98	740,173.71	535,912,800.69	587,945,491.91
Total	950,435,780.98	75,679,507.71	1,026,115,288.69	1,019,356,104.05
1939:				
Army	460,201,254.00	31,097,625.00	491,298,879.00	495,671,698.17
Navy	642,511,999.27	35,984,134.05	678,496,133.32	660,206,184.96
Total	1,102,713,253.27	67,081,759.05	1,169,795,013.32	1,155,877,883.13
1940:				
Army	923,142,603.00	17,511,716.00	940,654,319.00	
Navy	943,363,289.78	9,999,995.00	953,363,284.78	
Total	1,866,505,892.78	27,511,711.00	1,894,017,603.78	
1941:				
Army	[2] 3,982,725,786.00			
Navy	[2] 2,439,377,748.00			
Total	6,422,103,534.00			

[1] Navy figures exclude Works Progress Administration funds. For the period commencing with the fiscal year 1935 and ending June 30, 1940, Navy allocations of such funds totaled $73,061,837.70, and expenditures totaled $71,712,224.45.

[2] Includes second supplemental national defense appropriation bill as passed by House.

Straits Bridge Financing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 28, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE ADRIAN (MICH.) DAILY TELEGRAM OF AUGUST 19, 1940

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Adrian (Mich.) Daily Telegram of August 19, 1940:

[From the Adrian (Mich.) Daily Telegram of August 19, 1940]

STRAITS BRIDGE FINANCING

A bill is moving through Congress giving permission for the construction of a bridge at the Straits of Mackinac. It has been approved in the House and sent to the Senate for concurrence in some minor amendments and will then go to the President for his signature. All this does not mean that the bridge is a Federal project. It simply means that Federal permission to cross navigable waters under Federal control is being granted.

Bridges cost money and the engineers estimate that the one proposed at the straits will cost $26,740,000. This money presumably would be borrowed from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation or raised through a bond issue. In any event interest payments would have to be met and some provision made for retiring the principal of the loan.

Assuming that 4-percent revenue bonds were issued, the interest costs the first year would be $1,069,600. The engineers estimate that administrative, operating and maintenance costs would be $160,000. Thus $1,229,600 would be needed the first year to pay interest charges and operate the bridge without making any provision for reducing the loan. The bridge proponents are talking about 40-year bonds. If such bonds are issued there would have to be provision made for raising $668,000 a year over the 40-year period to retire them.

The bridge would not be ready for use until 1947, and the engineers estimate that by then the traffic would have increased so that a revenue of $925,000 would be available. That sum, however, would be $304,000 short of the amount needed to pay the interest and operating charges without taking into consideration any payment on the principal of the debt.

It appears obvious that the bridge's revenues as estimated by the engineers would fall around a million dollars a year short of the requirements to pay interest and retire the bonds. Unless the State wants to take that amount out of its general revenues or highway funds, default on the bonds is inevitable. Of course, toll charges might be increased, but such a move defeats the very purpose for which the bridge is being built. Besides, increases high enough to make up the probable deficit would be altogether too high.

Approximately 280,000 vehicles used the ferry service last year. The charge for the average car and its passengers is about $1.75 a crossing. For 280,000 vehicles to raise $1,229,600 (the interest and operating charges of the bridge in its first year) the rate would have to be $4.39 a vehicle. To provide the $668,000 for the yearly installment on the sinking fund to retire the loan, the toll for the average car would have to be about 50 percent more than $4.39. Such tolls are out of the question; the traveling public simply would not pay them. Proponents of the bridge argue that the growth of Michigan's tourist business into a $400,000,000 industry makes the bridge necessary. Such tolls as are cited above would practically destroy that part of the tourist business crossing the straits.

The tourist business between Michigan's two peninsulas has grown under a system of ferry service across the straits. That service represents an investment of about $3,000,000 that is earning dividends. The service is capable of expansion. No conclusive proof is offered that the traffic across the straits is going to grow to such an extent that ferries cannot handle it. The growth between 1937 and 1939 was less than 5,500 vehicles. That growth in 2 years means only 91 trips across the straits for the smaller ferries carrying 60 cars and 55 trips for the larger ones carrying 100 cars.

But the men who want the bridge built propose scrapping a $3,000,000 investment that is earning dividends for one of $27,000,000 that is bound to operate in the red. It does not make sense.

The Third-Term Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 28 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

STATEMENT BY JOSEPH LEIB

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of the 1928 anti-third-term resolution adopted by the Senate and a reference to the Senators now in the Senate who voted for the resolution. It is in the form of a statement issued by Joseph Leib, founder of the first Roosevelt-for-President club in the United States.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THIRD-TERM ISSUE

(By Joseph Leib, founder of first Roosevelt for President Club in the United States)

On February 10, 1928, the Democratic United States Senators listed below, voted against a third term for any President of the United States, and approved the following Senate Resolution:

"*Resolved*, That it is the sense of the Senate that the precedent established by Washington and other Presidents of the United States in retiring from Presidential office after their second term has become, by universal concurrence, a part of our republican system of government, and that any departure from this time-honored custom would be unwise, unpatriotic, and fraught with peril to our free institutions."—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, February 10, 1928.

The following Senators voted for this resolution: ALBEN W. BARKLEY, Kentucky; HENRY F. ASHURST, Arizona; ROBERT F. WAGNER, New York; PAT HARRISON, Mississippi; WILLIAM H. KING, Utah; PETER G. GERRY, Rhode Island; MILLARD E. TYDINGS, Maryland; GEORGE W. NORRIS, Nebraska; KENNETH MCKELLAR, Tennessee; MATTHEW M. NEELY, West Virginia; MORRIS SHEPPARD, Texas; ELMER THOMAS, Oklahoma; BURTON K. WHEELER, Montana; KEY PITTMAN, Nevada; ROBERT M. LAFOLLETTE, Wisconsin.

But, where do these great patriots and legislators stand today?

If the third-term principle was bad in 1928, why is it good in 1940?

Engineering and Architectural Service Contracts, United States Navy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL VINSON
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 28, 1940

STATEMENTS FROM NAVY BUREAUS

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statements:

NEGOTIATED CONTRACTS

Contracts awarded by the Bureau of Yards and Docks, Navy Department, on a cost-plus-fixed-fee basis

Location, character, and cost of project	Fee		Contract officer	Contract dated
Kaneohe Bay, Oahu; Midway Island; Johnston Island; Palmyra Island; Pearl Harbor, T. H.; Pacific naval air bases; Hawaiian Dredging Co., Ltd., Raymond Concrete Pile Co., Turner Construction Co., 420 Lexington Ave., New York City. Estimated cost, $14,607,500.	$898,000	6.57%	Officer in charge, contract NOy-3550, Navy Yard, Pearl Harbor. Resident officer in charge, contract NOy-3550, Naval Air Station, Alameda, Calif.	Aug. 5, 1939
Kodiak and Sitka, Alaska; Alaska Naval air bases; Siems Spokane Co., Puget Sound Bridge & Dredging, Johnson, Drake & Piper, 2929 16th Ave. SW., Seattle, Wash. Estimated cost, $14,960,000.	850,000	6.02%	Officer in charge, contract NOy-3570, 2929 16th Ave. SW., Seattle, Wash. Resident officer in charge, contract NOy-3570, 2929 16th Ave. SW., Seattle, Wash.	Aug. 29, 1939
San Juan, P. R.; naval air base; Arundel Corporation, Consolidated Engineering Co., Inc., 608 Mercantile Trust Bldg., Baltimore, Md. Estimated cost, $8,475,000.	450,000	5.6%	Officer in charge, contract NOy-3680, naval air station, San Juan, P. R., P. O. Box 3944, Santurce, P. R. Resident officer in charge, contract NOy-3680, 608 Mercantile Trust Bldg., Baltimore, Md.	Oct. 30, 1939
Coco Solo, C. Z.; breakwater; Frederick Snare Corporation, 114 Liberty St., New York, N. Y. Estimated cost, $2,840,000.	160,000	5.6%	Officer in charge, contract NOy-4080, 15th naval district, Balboa, C. Z.	June 17, 1940
Naval air station, Corpus Christi, Tex.; air station; Brown & Root, W. S. Bellows Columbia Construction Co., post office box 866, Corpus Christi, Tex. Estimated cost, $23,318,000.	1,200,000	5.4%	Officer in charge, contract NOy-4090, naval air station, Corpus Christi, Tex., P. O. Box 66.	June 11, 1940
Navy Yard, Norfolk, Va.; Navy Yard, Philadelphia, Pa.; shipbuilding dry docks and accessories; Spencer, White & Prentis, Inc.; Foley Bros., Inc.; Merritt-Chapman & Scott Corporation; care of Dry Docks Associates, 10 East 40th St., New York City. Estimated cost, $17,000,000.	825,000	5.1%	Officer in charge, contract NOy-4100, Navy Yard, Norfolk, Va. Officer in charge, contract NOy-4100, Navy Yard, Philadelphia, Pa.	June 26, 1940
Naval Air Station, Pensacola, Fla.; aviation facilities; Hardaway Contracting Co., Columbus, Ga. Estimated cost, $4,000,000.	165,000	4.3%	Officer in charge, contract NOy-4130, Naval Air Station, Pensacola, Fla.	July 11, 1940
Naval Air Station, Miami (Opa Locka), Fla.; aviation facilities (Fred Howland, Inc., and Jack Quinn, Inc., of Miami, Fla., 1113-14 Postal Bldg., Miami, Fla). Estimated cost, $3,500,000.	157,500	5%	Officer in charge, contract NOy-4131, Naval Air Station, Jacksonville, Fla.	June 28, 1940
Naval Air Station, Jacksonville, Fla.; aviation shore facilities; Duval Engineering & Contracting Co.; George D. Auchter Co.; Batson-Cook Co., P. O. Box 1859, Jacksonville, Fla. Estimated cost, $12,786,000.	525,000	4.3%	Officer in charge, contract NOy-4132, Naval Air Station, Jacksonville, Fla.	Do.
Naval Proving Ground, Dahlgren, Va.; hangar, etc.; Jeffress-Dyer Co., 1719 K St. NW., Washington, D. C. Estimated cost, $235,000.	10,500	4.7%	Officer in charge, contract NOy-4134, Naval Air Station, Anacostia, D. C.	June 27, 1940
Naval Hospital, Norfolk, Va.; hospital wards; E. E. Weddle & Co., 207 Board of Trade Bldg., Norfolk, Va. Estimated cost, $175,000.	6,750	2.5%	Officer in charge, contract NOy-4154, Naval Hospital, Norfolk (Portsmouth), Va.	June 29, 1940
Naval Torpedo Station, Newport, R. I.; explosive-manufacturing building and storehouse; Tredennick-Billings Co., 10 High St., Boston, Mass. Estimated cost, $585,000.	22,500	4%	Officer in charge, contract NOy-4157, Naval Training Station, Newport, R. I.	Do.
Naval Air Station, Norfolk, Va.; aviation shore facilities; Virginia Engineering Co., 330 28th St., Melson Bldg., Newport News, Va. Estimated cost, $13,700,000.	575,000	4.38%	Officer in charge, contract NOy-4158, Naval Air Station, Norfolk, Va.	Do.
Naval Air Station, Guantanamo Bay; defense and aviation facilities; Frederick Snare Corporation, 114 Liberty St., New York, N. Y. Estimated cost, $5,190,000.	225,000	4.74%	Officer in charge, contract NOy-4162, Naval Station, Guantanamo, Cuba. Resident officer in charge, contract NOy-4162, care of Frederick Snare Corporation, 114 Liberty St., New York City.	July 1, 1940.
Navy Yard, New York, N. Y.; storehouse and accessories; Turner Construction Co., 420 Lexington Ave., New York, N. Y. Estimated cost, $4,000,000.	155,000	4.03%	Officer in charge, contract NOy-4163, Navy Yard, New York, N. Y.	July 11, 1940.
Coco Solo, Canal Zone; aviation facilities; Lindgren & Swinerton Inc., Hegeman-Harris Co., Tucker McClure, 220 East 42d St., New York, N. Y. Estimated cost $11,050,000.	550,000	5.24%	Officer in charge, contract NOy-4164, fifteenth Naval District, Balboa, C. Z. Resident officer in charge, contract NOy-4164, care of Hegeman-Harris Co., 220 East 42d St., New York City.	July 2, 1940
Naval Air Station, Alameda, Calif.; additional aviation facilities; Johnson, Drake & Piper, Inc., 1415 Lathem Square Bldg., Oakland, Calif., also 1138 Baker Bldg., Minneapolis, Minn. Estimated cost, $9,800,000.	410,000	4.37%	Officer in charge, contract NOy-4165, Naval Air Station, Alameda, Calif.	July 3, 1940
Naval Training Station, Newport, R. I.; barracks and mess hall, Platt Contracting Co., Inc., 169 Bridge St., Cambridge, Mass. Estimated cost, $400,000.	15,500	4%	Officer in charge, contract NOy-4166, Naval Training Station, Newport, R. I.	July 1, 1940
Western Pacific: (Pearl Harbor and islands in Pacific); aviation facilities, buildings, fuel storage, dredging, etc.; Hawaiian Dredging Co., Raymond Concrete Pile Co., Turner Construction Co., Morrison Knudsen Co., J. H. Pomeroy & Co., 420 Lexington Ave., New York City. Estimated cost, $30,870,000.	1,600,000	5.46%	Officer in charge, contract, NOy-4173, Navy Yard, Pearl Harbor, T. H. Resident officer in charge, contract NOy-4173, Naval Air Station, Alameda, Calif.	Do.
Naval Air Station, Quonset Point, R. I.; aviation shore facilities; Geo. A. Fuller Co., Merritt-Chapman & Scott Corp., 57th St. and Madison Ave., New York, N. Y. Estimated cost, $24,204,000.	1,050,000	4.54%	Officer in charge, contract NOy-4175, Naval Air Station, Quonset Point, R. I., P. O. box 230, East Greenwich, R. I.	Do.
Navy Yard, Philadelphia, Pa.; battery charging and overhaul building; Hughes-Foulkrod Co., 809 Schaff Bldg., Philadelphia, Pa. Estimated cost, $75,000.	4,000	5.6%	Officer in charge, contract NOy-4186, Navy Yard, Philadelphia, Pa.	July 3, 1940
Naval operating base, San Diego, Calif.; Marine Corps barracks, temporary housing; H. M. Hodges & Karn, partners, 4816 W. Pico Blvd., Los Angeles, Calif. Estimated cost, $1,630,000.	70,000	4.5%	Officer in charge, contract NOy-4187, eleventh naval district, San Diego, Calif.	July 6, 1940
Navy yard, Norfolk, Va.; extensions of machine-shop buildings; Rust Engineering Co., 902 Penrike Bldg., Washington, D. C. Estimated cost, $720,000.	32,500	4.7%	Officer in charge, contract NOy-4188, Navy yard, Norfolk, Va.	July 3, 1940
Naval operating base, San Diego, Calif.; additional aviation shore facilities; M. H. Golden and Walter Trepte, care of M. H. Golden, 531 Bank of America Bldg., San Diego, Calif. Estimated cost, $3,666,000.	145,000	4.3%	Officer in charge, contract NOy-4205, eleventh naval district, San Diego, Calif.	July 6, 1940
Navy Yard, New York, N. Y.; building ways and facilities for armored docks; J. Rich Steers, 17 Battery Pl., New York. Estimated cost, $1,775,000.	88,000	5.2%	Officer in charge, contract NOy-4206, Navy Yard, New York, N. Y.	July 8, 1940
Puget Sound area, Wash.; aviation, ammunition, and fuel storage facilities; The Austin Co., 16112 Euclid Ave., Cleveland, Ohio. Estimated cost, $7,300,000.	305,000	4.4%	Officer in charge, contract NOy-4210, Naval Air Station, Seattle, Wash.	July 11, 1940

Contracts awarded by the Bureau of Yards and Docks, Navy Department, on a cost-plus-fixed-fee basis—Continued

Location, character, and cost of project	Fee	Contract officer	Contract dated
Navy Yard, Charleston, S. C.; storehouse, cafeteria, locker facilities, and extension of pipe shop; Simons-Mayrant Co., 16 Broad St., Charleston, S. C. Estimated cost, $390,000.	15,750 4.2%	Officer in charge, contract NOy-4211, Navy Yard, Charleston, S. C.	Do.
Navy Yard, New York, N. Y.; Iona Island, N. Y.; power plant improvements; The J. G. White Engineering Corporation, 80 Broad St., New York, N. Y. Estimated cost, $740,000.	37,000 5.26%	Officer in charge, contract NOy-4216, Navy Yard, New York, N. Y. Officer in charge, contract NOy-4216, Third Naval District, 90 Church St., New York, N. Y.	July 10, 1940
Navy Yards, Philadelphia, Pa., and Charleston, S. C.; Marine Barracks, Parris Island, S. C.; improvement of power plants; United Engineers and Constructors, Inc., 1401 Arch St., Philadelphia, Pa. Estimated cost, $1,325,000.	65,000 5.15%	Officer in charge, contract NOy-4217, Navy Yard, Philadelphia, Pa. Officer in charge, contract NOy-4217, Navy Yard, Charleston, S. C. Officer in charge, contract NOy-4217, Marine Barracks, Parris Island, S. C.	Do.
Navy Yard, Boston, Mass.; Submarine Base, New London, Conn.; improvement of power plant; Stone & Webster Engineering Corporation, 90 Broad St., New York, N. Y. Estimated cost, $1,325,000.	65,000 5.15%	Officer in charge, contract NOy-4218, Navy Yard, Boston, Mass. Officer in charge, contract NOy-4218, Submarine Base, New London, Conn.	Do.
Marine Barracks, Quantico, Va.; aviation and Marine Corps facilities; John McShain' Inc., 3 West Franklin St., Baltimore, Md. Estimated cost, $1,460,250.	66,000 4.7%	Officer in charge, contract NOy-4229, Marine Barracks, Quantico, Va.	July 11, 1940
Submarine Base, New London, Conn., general improvements including waterfront, buildings, and new marine railway; F. H. McGraw & Co., 780 Windsor St., Hartford, Conn.; Spearin, Preston & Burrows, Inc., 50 Church St., New York City. Estimated cost, $2,303,000.	115,000 5.4%	Officer in charge, contract NOy-4230, Submarine Base, New London, Conn.	July 12, 1940
Marine Barracks, Parris Island, S. C.; water well; Layne-Atlantic Co., Norfolk, Va. Estimated cost, $40,000.	$2,000 5.27%	Officer in charge, contract NOy-4232, Marine Barracks, Parris Island, S. C.	July 12, 1940
Navy Yard, Portsmouth, N. H.; shipway, barracks, extensions of buildings; Aberthaw Co., 80 Federal St., Boston, Mass. Estimated cost, $1,085,000.	45,000 4.2%	Officer in charge, contract NOy-4236, Navy Yard, Portsmouth, N. H.	July 18, 1940
Navy Yard, Philadelphia, Pa.; additional pier; Kaufman Construction Co.; J. E. Brenneman Co., 1505 Race St., Philadelphia, Pa. Estimated cost, $800,000.	36,000 4.7%	Officer in charge, contract NOy-4242, Navy Yard, Philadelphia, Pa.	July 19, 1940
Navy Yard, New York, N. Y.; subassembly shop, improvements of shop buildings, and steel storage runways; Walter Kidde Constructors, Inc., 140 Cedar St., New York, N. Y. Estimated cost, $1,520,000.	70,000 4.9%	Officer in charge, contract NOy-4243, Navy Yard, New York, N. Y.	July 18, 1940
Naval Academy, Annapolis, Md.; additional buildings and accessories; McCloskey & Co., 1620 Thompson St., Philadelphia, Pa. Estimated cost, $1,210,000.	50,000 4.31%	Officer in charge, contract NOy-4250, Naval Academy, Annapolis, Md.	July 31, 1940
Marine Barracks, Parris Island, S. C.; temporary housing and storage and aviation facilities; Charles W. Angle, Inc., Greensboro, N. C., P. O. Box 1749. Estimated cost, $2,394,750.	110,000 4.8%	Officer in charge, contract NOy-4251, Marine Barracks, Parris Island, S. C.	Do.
Navy Yard, Philadelphia, Pa.; shipfitters shop and shipways Nos. 2 and 3 including runways, electric shop, and extensions to dispensary; Hughes-Foulkrod Co., 809 Schaff Bldg., Philadelphia, Pa. Estimated cost, $855,000.	37,500 4.58%	Officer-in-charge, contract NOy-4264, Navy Yard, Phila., Pa.	Aug. 3, 1940
Naval Training Station, Great Lakes, Ill.; improvement of power plant; Gibbs and Hill, Inc., Pennsylvania Station, New York, N. Y. Estimated cost, $450,000.	23,000 5.38%	Officer-in-charge, contract NOy-4277, Naval Training Station, Great Lakes, Ill.	Aug. 16, 1940
Naval Operating Base, San Diego, Calif.; Fleet operating base, San Pedro, Calif.; George Pollock Co., Sacramento, Calif.; Guy F. Atkinson Co., San Francisco, Calif. Estimated cost, $18,012,500.	800,000 4.65%	Officer-in-charge, contract NOy-4279, Naval Operating Base, San Diego, Calif.	Aug. 14, 1940

Engineering and architectural services contracts

Location	Character of project	Approximate construction costs	Approximate fee	Approximate percent	Contract No.	Date	Engineer or architect
New York	Turret and erection shop buildings	$2,571,000	$89,985	3.5	NOy-3523	June 26, 1939	Lockwood Greene Engineers, Inc., 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York City.
Newport, R. I.	Extension of assembly shop	390,750	14,000	3.5	NOy-3524	July 10, 1939	Chas. T. Main, Inc., 201 Devonshire St., Boston.
Norfolk	Relocation and modernization of switchboard for power plant.	400,000	16,000	4.0	NOy-3525	July 14, 1939	Arthur L. Nelson, 31 St. James Ave., Boston.
Pensacola	Aircraft storehouse, ground school building, and gymnasium building.	1,060,054	45,000	4.25	NOy-3539	July 29, 1939	Robert & Co., Inc., Bona Allen Bldg., Atlanta, Ga.
Do	Seaplane hangar building	383,000	13,400	3.50	NOy-3540	do	John F. Reynolds, Post Office Box 4442, Jacksonville.
Do	Design officers' apartment building	(1)	300		NOy-3557	Aug. 14, 1939	Do.
Mare Island Pearl Harbor	Graving drydocks	3,412,033	119,400	3.5	NOy-3561	Aug. 17, 1939	Frederic R. Harris, Inc., 27 William St., New York City.
Annapolis	Relocation of organ, changes—chancel	45,000	[2] 2,500		NOy-3592	Sept. 5, 1939	Paul P. Cret, Architects' Bldg., Philadelphia.
Pearl Harbor	Administration building, dispensary, and bachelor officers' quarters.	535,000	18,750	3.5	NOy-3593	Sept. 9, 1939	C. W. Dickey, Damon Bldg., Honolulu, T. H.
Pensacola	Boilers, wells, outside services, etc	90,900	[2] 9,500		NOy-3615	Sept. 25, 1939	Robert & Co., Inc., Bona Allen Bldg., Atlanta, Ga.
Do	Administration and operations building and recreation building.	131,250	4,725	3.6	NOy-3616	Sept. 22, 1939	Yonge & Hart, Thiesen Bldg., Pensacola.
Hawthorne	Additional magazine building and accessories.	(3)	[2] 500		NOy-3636	Sept. 7, 1939	Wm. P. Neil Co., Ltd., 4814 Loma Vista Ave., Los Angeles, California.
Black Point Mayport, Fla.	Naval air base and carrier base	(3)	25,000	(4)	NOy-3651, Supp. 1.	Oct. 17, 1939	Robert N. Angas, 420 Hildebrant Bldg., Jacksonville, Fla.
Quonset Point	Improve personnel buildings, etc	340,000	12,920	3.8	NOy-3692	Nov. 8, 1939	Jenks & Ballou, Industrial Trust Bldg., Providence.
Black Point, Fla.	Officers' quarters	125,000	4,375	3.5	NOy-3699, Supp. 1.	Nov. 10, 1939	Marsh & Saxelbye, Hildebrant Bldg., Jacksonville, Fla.
Do	General storehouse, aircraft storehouse, and procurement and ordnance storehouse.	654,564	18,300	2.8	NOy-3701	Nov. 15, 1939	Robert & Co., Inc., Bona Allen Bldg., Atlanta, Ga.
Banana River, Fla.	Aviation-patrol facilities	305,840	10,710	3.5	NOy-3702	Nov. 13, 1939	John F. Reynolds, Post Office box 4442, Jacksonville.
Charleston	Riggers and laborers shop, field offices	148,294	5,769	[5] 3.75 [6] 4.0	NOy-3713	Sept. 21, 1939	Simons & Lapham, 7 State St., Charleston.
San Juan	Temporary aviation patrol facilities	225,000	9,500	4.25	NOy-3724	Nov. 24, 1939	Robert & Co., Inc., Bona Allen Bldg., Atlanta, Ga.
Washington	Ward building, Nurses' quarters, Hospital Corps quarters, and officers' quarters.	980,500	[2] 42,500	4.35	NOy-3734	Nov. 27, 1939	Paul P. Cret, Architects Bldg., Philadelphia, Pa.
Key West	Naval aviation patrol facilities	340,000	12,500	3.6	NOy-3743	do	Russell T. Pancoast, First National Bank Bldg., Miami.

[1] Design change. [2] Lump sum. [3] Survey. [4] Cost plus 3 percent—salaries. [5] Rel. [6] F. O.

Engineering and architectural services contracts—Continued

Location	Character of project	Approximate construction costs	Approximate fee	Approximate percent	Contract No.	Date	Engineer or architect
Quonset Point	Dispensary	$50,000	$1,250	2.5	NOy-3763	Dec. 13, 1939	Chas. A. Maguire and Association, 630 Turks Head Bldg., Providence, R. I.
Do	Topographic and hydrographic surveys	Survey	[2] 12,575		NOy-3764	do	Chas. A. Maguire and Association, Providence, R. I.
Pensacola	Officer of the day building	30,000	[2] 1,200	4.0	NOy-3801	Dec. 27, 1939	Robert & Co., Inc., Bona Allen Bldg., Atlanta, Ga.
Newport	Rearrangement and extension yard service facilities.	110,000	4,400	4.0	NOy-3839	Jan. 12, 1940	Arthur L. Nelson, 31 St. James St., Boston, Mass.
Pensacola	Laundry and bakery buildings	64,000	2,000	3.1	NOy-3845		W. F. Jackson Co., Inc., Red Rock Bldg., Atlanta, Ga.
Kaneohe, Midway, San Juan, Kodiak, and Sitka.	Air bases	19,000,000	[7] 142,500 [8] 550,000	[7] .75 [5] 2.75–3.0	NOy-3560	Sept. 19, 1939	Albert Kahn, Inc., Detroit, Mich.
Various	Air bases (neutrality hangars)	1,500,000	[7] 5,625 [8] 30,000	[7] .375 [8] 2.0	NOy-3560	Oct. 20, 1939	Do.
Banana River, Fla.	Bachelor officers' quarters, barracks, and mess hall, etc.	165,000	5,800	3.5	NOy-3699	Nov. 13, 1939	Marsh & Saxelbye, Hildebrant Bldg., Jacksonville, Fla.
Do	Naval air station	Survey	[9] 10,000	(4)	NOy-3651	Dec. 16, 1939	Robert M. Angas, 420 Hildebrant Bldg., Jacksonville, Fla.
Jacksonville, Fla.	Assembly and repair shop	1,000,000	30,000	3.0			Robert & Co., Inc., Bona Allen Bldg., Atlanta, Ga.

[1] Lump sum. [4] Cost plus 3 percent—salaries. [7] Net. [8] Gross. [9] Supplemental.

Engineering and architectural services contracts with percentage completed by Aug. 31, 1940

Location	Character of project	Approximate construction costs	Approximate fee	Approximate percent	Contract No.	Date	Engineer or architect	Percent completion, Aug 31, 1940.
New York	Turret and erection shop buildings.	$2,571,000	$89,985	3.5	NOy-3523	June 26, 1939	Lockwood Greene Engineers, Inc., 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York City.	100
Newport, R. I.	Extension of assembly shop	390,750	14,000	3.5	NOy-3524	July 10, 1939	Charles T. Main, Inc., 201 Devonshire St., Boston.	100
Norfolk	Relocation and modernization switchboard for power plant.	400,000	16,000	4.0	NOy-3525	July 14, 1939	Arthur L. Nelson, 31 St. James Ave., Boston.	100
Pensacola	Aircraft storehouse, ground school building, and gymnasium building.	1,060,054	45,000	4.25	NOy-3539	July 29, 1939	Robert & Co., Inc., Bona Allen Bldg., Atlanta, Ga.	100
Do	Seplane hangar building	383,000	13,400	3.50	NOy-3540	do	John F. Reynolds, post-office box 4442, Jacksonville.	100
Do	Design officers' apartment building.	(1)	[3] 300		NOy-3557	Aug. 14, 1939	do	100
Mare Island, Pearl Harbor.	Graving dry docks	3,412,033	119,400	3.5	NOy-3561	Aug. 17, 1939	Frederic R. Harris, Inc., 27 Williams St., New York City.	95
Annapolis	Relocation of organ, changes; Chancel.	45,000	[3] 2,500		NOy-3592	Sept. 5, 1939	Paul P. Cret, Architects' Bldg., Philadelphia.	100
Pearl Harbor	Administration building, dispensary, and bachelor officers' quarters.	535,000	18,750	3.5	NOy-3593	Sept. 9, 1939	C. W. Dickey, Damon Bldg., Honolulu, T. H.	100
Pensacola	Boilers, wells, outside services, etc.	210,615	(2) 9,500	4.5	NOy-3615	Sept. 25, 1939	Robert & Co., Inc., Bona Allen Bldg., Atlanta, Ga.	100
Do	Administration and operations building and recreation building.	131,250	4,725	3.6	NOy-3616	Sept. 22, 1939	Yonge & Hart, Thiesen Bldg., Pensacola.	100
Hawthorne	Additional magazine building and accessories.	(3)	[3] 500		NOy-3636	Sept. 7, 1939	Wm. P. Neil Co., Ltd., 4814 Loma Vista Ave., Los Angeles, Calif.	100
Black Point, Mayport, Fla.	Naval air base and carrier base	(3)	25,000	(4)	NOy-3651 Supp. 1	Oct. 17, 1939	Robert N. Angas, 420 Hildebrandt Bldg., Jacksonville, Fla.	100
Quonset Point	Improve personnel buildings, etc.	340,000	12,920	3.8	NOy-3692	Nov. 8, 1939	Jenks & Ballou, Industrial Trust Bldg., Providence.	100
Black Point, Fla.	Officers' quarters	125,000	4,375	3.5	NOy-3699 Supp. 1	Nov. 10, 1939	Marsh & Saxelbye, Hildebrandt Bldg., Jacksonville, Fla.	100
Do	General storehouse, aircraft storehouse, and parts and ordnance storehouse.	654,564	18,300	2.8	NOy-3701	Nov. 15, 1939	Robert & Co. Inc., Bona Allen Bldg., Atlanta, Ga.	100
Banana River, Fla.	Aviation patrol facilities	305,840	10,710	3.5	NOy-3702	Nov. 13, 1939	John F. Reynolds, post office box 4442, Jacksonville.	100
Charleston	Riggers and laborers shop-field offices.	148,294	5,769	[5] 3.75 [6] 4.0	NOy-3713	Sept 21, 1939	Simons & Lapham, 7 State St., Charleston.	100
San Juan	Temporary aviation patrol facilities.	225,000	9,560	4.25	NOy-3724	Nov. 24, 1939	Robert & Co. Inc., Bona Allen Bldg., Atlanta, Ga.	100
Washington	Ward building, nurses' quarters, hospital corps quarters, and officers' quarters.	980,500	[1] 42,500	4.35	NOy-3734	Nov. 27, 1939	Paul P. Cret, Architects Bldg., Philadelphia, Pa.	95
Key West	Naval aviation patrol facilities.	340,000	12,500	3.6	NOy-3743	do	Russell T. Pancoast, First National Bank Bldg., Miami.	100
Quonset Point	Dispensary	50,000	1,250	2.5	NOy-3763	Dec. 13, 1939	Charles A. Maguire & Associates, 630 Turks Head Bldg., Providence, R. I.	100
Do	Topographic and hydrographic surveys.	(3)	[3] 12,575		NOy-3764	do	do	100
Pensacola	Officer-of-the-day building	30,000	[3] 1,200	4.0	NOy-3801	Dec. 27, 1939	Robert & Co., Inc., Bona Allen Bldg., Atlanta, Ga.	100
Newport	Rearrangement and extension of yard-service facilities.	110,000	4,400	4.0	NOy-3839	Jan. 12, 1940	Arthur L. Nelson, 31 St. James St., Boston, Mass.	90
Pensacola	Laundry and bakery buildings.	64,000	2,000	3.1	NOy-3845	Jan. 17, 1940	W. F. Jackson Co., Inc., Red Rock Bldg., Atlanta, Ga.	100

[1] Design change. [3] Survey. [5] Rel.
[2] Lump sum. [4] Cost plus 3 percent—salaries. [6] F. O.

Engineering and architectural services contracts with percentage completed by Aug. 31, 1940—Continued

Location	Character of project	Approximate construction costs	Approximate fee	Approximate percent	Contract No.	Date	Engineer or architect	Percent completion, Aug. 31, 1940
Kaneohe, Midway, San Juan, Kodiak, and Sitka.	Air bases	$19,000,000	[8] $142,500 [9] 550,000	[7] .75 [9] 2.9	NOy-3560	Sept. 19, 1939	Albert Kahn, Inc., New Center Bldg., Detroit, Mich.	100
Various	Air bases (neutrality hangars)	1,500,000	[7] 5,625 [8] 30,000	[7] .375 [8] 2.0	NOy-3560, supp. 2	Oct. 20, 1939	do	100
Banana River, Fla	Bachelor officers' quarters, barracks, and mess hall, etc.	165,000	5,800	3.5	NOy-3699	Nov. 13, 1939	Marsh & Saxelbye, Hildebrandt Bldg., Jacksonville, Fla.	100
Do	Naval air station	(3)	[9] 10,000	(4)	NOy-3651	Dec. 16, 1939	Robert M. Angas, 420 Hildebrandt Bldg., Jacksonville, Fla.	100
Black Point, Fla	Dispensary, commissioned officers' quarters and gatehouse.	215,000	6,000	3.5	NOy-3944	Mar. 22, 1940	Marsh & Saxelbye, Hildebrandt Bldg., Jacksonville, Fla.	100
Do	Overhaul and repair shop, bachelor officers' quarters, administration building, roads and services.	2,668,848	83,000	3.11	NOy-3945	Mar. 25, 1940	Robert & Co., Bona Allen Bldg., Atlanta, Ga.	90
Parris Island, S. C	Mess hall and galley building	270,000	10,800	4.0	NOy-4005	Apr. 29, 1940	Simons & Lapham, 7 State St., Charleston S. C.	95
Torpedo station, Newport, R. I	Explosive manufacturing building and accessories.	360,000	14,400	4.0	NOy-4091	June 12, 1940	Charles T. Main, Inc., 201 Devonshire St., Boston, Mass.	100
Fifteenth District, Balboa, C. Z.	Headquarters building	223,750	7,650	3.42	NOy-4092	do	Delano & Aldrich, 126 East Thirty-eighth St., New York, N. Y.	95
Hawthorne, Nev	Ammunition storage facilities		5,000		NOy-4101	June 10, 1940	Austin W. Earl, 51 Lopez Ave., San Francisco, Calif.	90
Navy yard dock, Norfolk, Va.	Extension of machine shop and relocation restaurant.	720,000	19,800	2.75	NOy-4155	June 4, 1940	C. A. Handeyside Co., General Motors Bldg., Detroit, Mich.	50
Naval air station, Coco Solo.	Breakwater	2,840,000	60,000	2.11	NOy-4156	June 26, 1940	Frederic R. Harris, Inc., 27 William St., New York, N. Y.	25
Naval ammunition depot, Hawthorne, Nev.	Surveys, additional ammunition storage facilities.		4,000		NOy-4161	June 7, 1940	Wm. P. Neil Co., Ltd., 4814 Loma Vista Ave., Los Angeles, Calif.	50
Naval Air Stations, Miami and Jacksonville.	Aviation facilities	8,982,000	315,000	3.5	NOy-4212	June 15, 1940	Robert & Co., Inc., Atlanta, Ga	70
Naval Training Station, Newport.	Extension of storehouse and accessories.	325,000	12,350	3.8	NOy-4213	July 8, 1940	Charles A. Maguire & Associates, 603 Turks Head Bldg., Providence, R. I.	40
Navy yard dock, Norfolk and Philadelphia.	Construction of shipbuilding docks.	15,421,000	350,000	2.27	NOy-4224	July 9, 1940	Frederic R. Harris, Inc., 27 William St., New York, N. Y.	25
Corpus Christi	Aviation facilities	13,028,000	450,000	3.46	NOy-4233	July 1, 1940	Robert & Co., Inc., Atlanta, Ga	25
Do	Floating docks *ARD-2* and *ARD-3*.		10,000		NOy-4227	July 9, 1940	Frederic R. Harris, Inc., 27 William St., New York, N. Y.	40
Navy yard dock, New York.	General storehouse and office building.		50,000		NOy-4228	June 8, 1940	do	80
New London	Supplemental department annex, repair shop, Diesel laboratory, etc.	640,000	25,600	4.0	NOy-4234	July 9, 1940	E. L. Scholfield & Arthur Deimel, Mercer Bldg., New London, Conn.	30
Charleston	Extension pipe shop	160,000	6,400	4.0	NOy-4249	July 10, 1940	William L. West, Jr., Myrtle Beach, S. C.	25
Naval Air Station, Norfolk.	Aviation shore facilities	3,680,000	120,000	3.25	NOy-4254	July 20, 1940	Giffels & Vallet, Inc., Detroit, Mich	20
Marine Corps Base and Naval Air Station, San Diego.	Post exchange, dispensary, overhaul.	390,000	21,000	5.38	NOy-4255	July 17, 1940	Kistner, Curtis & Wright, 665 Spreckels Bldg., San Diego, Calif.	20
Pensacola	Power plant, engine storage, A. and R. shop, roads, and services.	950,000	28,500	3.0	NOy-4258	July 25, 1940	Wyatt C. Hedrick, Fort Worth, Tex	15
Quantico	Bridge, extension of transport building, overhaul shop, etc.	700,000	32,459	4.5	NOy-4259	July 27, 1940	Francis P. Sullivan, Marshall & Gongwer, and Weschler & Cleary, Washington, D. D.	15
Charleston	Cafeteria building	125,000	5,000	4.0	NOy-4268	July 26, 1940	Simons & Lapham, 7 State St., Charleston, S. C.	15
Balboa and Coco Solo	Additional aviation shore facilities.	5,187,000	[7] 27,500 [8] 125,000	[7] .53 [8] 2.4	NOy-4281	Aug. 8, 1940	Jaros, Baum & Bolles, 415 Lexington Ave., New York, N. Y.	10
Naval air station, San Diego.	Seaplane hangar	750,000	30,000	4.0	NOy-4285	do	Roberts & Schaefer Co., 307 North Michigan Ave.	20
Pacific-Jack. Alaska-San Juan.	Air bases, distribution systems.	2,000,000	[7] 15,000 [8] 50,000	[7] .75 [8] 2.50	NOy-3560 Supp. 1	Sept. 19, 1939	Albert Kahn, Inc., Detroit, Mich	100
Mare Island and Pearl Harbor.	Graving drydocks (increase in depths).		33,150		NOy-3561 Supp. 1	Jan. 27, 1940	Frederic R. Harris, New York, N. Y.	90
Quonset Point	Additional surveys		3,200		NOy-3764 Supp. 1	Feb. 24, 1940	Charles A. Maguire & Associates, Providence, R. I.	100
Pearl Harbor	Shipfitters' shop, electrical shop, P. and C. shop, etc.	2,200,000	[7] 16,100 [8] 36,000	[7] .75 [8] 1.64	NOy-3560 Supp. 3	June 12, 1940	Albert Kahn, Inc., Detroit, Mich	100
Key West	Topographic and subsurface surveys.		2,500		NOy-3743 Supp. 1	May 22, 1940	Russell T. Pancoast, Miami Beach, Fla.	100
Quonset Point	Additional surveys		2,100		NOy-3764 Supp. 2	June 29, 1940	Charles A. Maguire & Associates, Providence, R. I.	80
Naval Air Depot, Iona Island.	Improvement of power plant	740,000	37,000	5.0	NOy-4216	July 10, 1940	J. G. White Engineering Corporation, 80 Broad St., New York, N. Y.	25
Navy yard dock, Boston, and submarine base, New London.	do	1,325,000	65,000	4.9	NOy-4218	do	Stone & Webster Engineering Corporation, 90 Broad St., New York, N. Y.	25
Navy yard dock, Mare Island.	Extension administration building, steam test plant, electric shop, extension building 382.	850,000	39,382	4.63	NOy-4297	Aug. 13, 1940	Austin W. Earl, 51 Lopez Ave., San Francisco, Calif.	15
Torpedo Station, Newport, R. I.	Administration building and extension to dispensary.	460,000	16,100	3.5	NOy-4307	Aug. 26, 1940	Charles A. Maguire & Associates, Providence, R. I.	10
Do	Torpedo assembly plant	700,000	24,500	3.5	NOy-4308	do	Charles T. Main, Inc., 201 Devonshire St., Boston, Mass.	10
Vallejo, Calif	600 low-cost housing units	2,000,000	32,500	1.62	NOy-4309	Aug. 17, 1940	Albert F. Roller, First National Bank Bldg., San Francisco, Calif.	15

[4] Cost plus 3 percent—salaries. [7] Gross. [8] Supplemental. [9] Net.

The Notification Ceremonies at Elwood, Ind.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 28 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

ARTICLE BY JAY FRANKLIN

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article by Jay Franklin, published in the Philadelphia Record of August 24, 1940, under the heading "Willkie ceremony at Elwood held by courtesy of New Deal."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Philadelphia Record of August 24, 1940]

WE THE PEOPLE—WILLKIE CEREMONY AT ELWOOD HELD BY COURTESY OF NEW DEAL

(By Jay Franklin)

As this column is written there is no reason to feel confident that Wendell L. Willkie may not be the next President of the United States.

Personally, I do not believe that he will be elected next November, but the issue can be decided only at the ballot box and in the minds of the voters, and until that issue is so decided it is my intention to regard him as our second most important public official—the man who, together with or in opposition to Roosevelt, has it in his personal power to determine our national destiny.

All I wish is that he will have the courage to sing bass, face the facts about the New Deal, and drop that tenor aria about candystick philosophy and the perils of big government.

After all, these high notes of opposition to social reform, however desperately needed, chiefly reflect the craven fear of taxes on the part of the upper bracketeers and the desire to treat labor as a commodity on the part of big business. This is not an issue which can be discussed in a vacuum. We face a world revolution as well as a world war, and any nation which depends on such motives is doomed in advance.

W. P. A. IN ELWOOD

Let us take the Willkie ceremonies at Elwood, Ind., on August 17.

That there was anything left of Elwood to stage the acceptance speech is due to the New Deal, to W. P. A., and to the methods of big government. Here I do not refer to the reports that 20 percent of Elwood's population is on W. P. A. or relief. I refer to the physical set-up of the city itself, on which the New Deal government has spent $500,000. The Willkie committee should have printed on its program and literature "By Courtesy of the New Deal" to do an honest job.

The streets, alleys, and sidewalks on which the Willkieites drove and parked their cars or strolled, represent a W. P. A. investment of $311,532, according to the official figures available at Washington. The very park where the acceptance speech was delivered was landscaped by the W. P. A. at a cost of $8,702, and the candystick theory also is responsible for repairing and beautifying and developing many of the other facilities which awaited the visiting Republicans: The armory ($12,841), the school (P. W. A. granted Elwood $43,536 for the purpose of building a new school).

It may be indelicate to mention water-supply and sewage systems in the presence of Republicans, few of whom needed to take baths in Elwood, but W. P. A. looked after that little detail, too, at a cost to Mr. Willkie's taxpayers of $71,730. The pleasant little creek that runs through Elwood was developed and beautified by big government at a cost of $10,651, school and playgrounds, recreation projects ($12,645), sewing projects ($14,784), and so forth, and so on.

KEPT TOWN ALIVE

To sum up, the fact that Elwood had the facilities (and the cash) to stage the Willkie acceptance speech is due to the New Deal.

Otherwise, when the Grand Old Party candidate revisited his boyhood home he might well have found it a ghost town like some of those desolate played-out mining cities which he visited in the high Rockies of Colorado. For big business picked up Elwood, used it, and then moved on, leaving behind a litter of aging houses and stranded people, and when Willkie was old enough to do so, he moved on, too, on the trail of big business and seems only to have remembered Elwood when he discovered that the fifth floor of a Fifth Avenue flat in New York City lacked the facilities for a front-porch campaign.

If, as he says, the story of Elwood is the story of America, the new city hall park ought to contain an inscription: "Used up by big business; restored by big government."

The time has passed when it is safe or honorable for the Republicans to say: "Oh, the W. P. A.—softens our moral fiber, a political racket, wastes public money, America wants jobs, not relief." The time has come for them to admit that the New Deal has saved the American people and that they want more, not less of it.

Conscription

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RUSH D. HOLT

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 28 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE POLITICAL DIGEST

Mr. HOLT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Goodbye, America!" from the Political Digest, published in New Jersey.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Political Digest for August 1940]

"GOODBYE, AMERICA!"

What's the great rush? Why all the hurly burly? Has the heat got them, or are they just plain scared to death?

We ask these questions about the state of nerves of the owners of our hired Brass Hats. They should sit down in the cool of their expensive Army posts and have the orderlies bring in the high, ice-filled glasses and think about Eskimos and igloos and polar bears.

The compulsory military service bill is an indication of an alarming national fever as plain as a chart hung at the end of the hospital bed of a delirious patient. It marks the triumph of panic, the victory of stampede.

That it should be seriously proposed to throw a million or more of our kids into uniform and barracks before the snow next flies and then "process" them, as "Colonel Twaddle," of the General Staff, who helped write the bill, so strikingly puts it, sends sanity shrieking to the cellar. That the bill should go on with provisions for militarizing 40,000,000 Americans within the next 3 years—well, that's so fantastic that we must have dreamed it. But no. Here it is in black and white, rushed through the committee and now being debated in the Congress.

The boosters for the bill have been yelling, "Wake up America." We say, "Goodbye America."

Good-bye to the America which until yesterday regarded with a lively and justified suspicion the boots and spurs of the military, preferring to trail with Madison when he groaned over an appropriation for army supplies: "This damned Army will be the death of us."

Good-bye to the America of men and women who still knew how to laugh at the absurdity of the military mind with its puerile worship of guns and battleships.

Good-bye to the America which so long served as sanctuary for the best men of Europe coming here to escape the bestialities of regimentation which this hateful measure imposes on all of us.

Good-bye to the America where democracy has at least a fighting chance for survival unringed by the bayonets of its own conscripts.

Good-bye to the ordinary decencies of American life if this sinister measure becomes law.

When you folks say good-bye to that boy who has had the bad luck to be called up in the first draft, say good-bye at the same time to the country you loved. Because once we hand over our youth to the tender mercies of the strutting "processors," the "Colonel Twaddles" and the rest of the bellowing herd of jingoes now running rough-shod over Washington, we are all washed up as far as any such "impractical" matters as life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness are concerned.

And when you have said good-bye, listen a moment to the sound of distant laughter overseas. It comes from the tight and twisted lips of the dictators rejoicing over their first major triumph over the people of the United States.—McAlister Coleman.

1936 Gallup Presidential Poll

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSH LEE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 28 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

LETTER FROM THE ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL OF OKLAHOMA

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter containing the Gallup poll of 1936, a week-by-week report. The letter is from the assistant attorney general of Oklahoma, addressed to the State chairman of the Democratic Central Committee of Oklahoma.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. FRANCE PARIS,
Chairman, Oklahoma Democratic Central Committee, 30 East Woodrow Place, Tulsa, Okla.

DEAR SIR: The Daily Oklahoman, and probably many other newspapers of the State, have just started running the current weekly Gallup Presidential poll. The August 4, 1940, poll shows 24 States for Roosevelt and 24 States for Willkie, with the electoral vote slightly in favor of Willkie and the popular vote slightly in favor of Roosevelt. In connection therewith reference is being made to the supposed accuracy of the 1936 Gallup Presidential poll and, by comparison, an effort is being made to convince the voters that Willkie is the likely winner this year. This studied propaganda is probably having considerable effect not only on the voters but on the small-town newspaper editors of this State, who are naturally in favor of a humanitarian and a Democrat for President rather than a public-utility corporation lawyer and a Republican. It is to combat this propaganda that the following suggestions are made:

As you know, the Republicans have their convention about 3 weeks to a month earlier than the Democrats, and hence get their campaign started about 3 weeks to a month earlier than the Democrats. This, taken in conjunction with the fact that approximately 80 percent of the metropolitan press and of the newspaper columnists writing in the same are Republican, naturally gives the Republicans a head start. However, during recent campaigns, especially since the radio has been in vogue, the Democratic Party, with its immeasurably better record and campaign speakers, have been able, in the latter part of the campaign, to offset the Republicans' earlier advantage, and thus to win.

With this in mind I examined the 1936 Gallup Presidential poll, as set forth in the Sunday issues of the Daily Oklahoman, and found the same as follows:

1936 Gallup Presidential poll

	States for Landon	States for Roosevelt	Electoral votes for Landon	Electoral votes for Roosevelt
Aug. 9	20	28	276	255
Aug. 16	20	28	276	255
Aug. 23	19	29	257	274
Aug. 30	19	29	257	274
Sept. 6	20	28	275	256
Sept. 13	20	28	275	256
Sept. 20	19	29	239	292
Sept. 27	19	29	239	292
Oct. 4	17	31	225	306
Oct. 11	17	31	225	306
Oct. 18	13	35	141	390
Oct. 25	12	36	141	390
Nov. 1	7	41	42	489
Actual poll	2	46	8	523

You will note that the August 9, 1936, Gallup poll, same being the proper comparative poll with the August 4, 1940, Gallup poll, gave Landon 20 States when he actually got only 2, and also gave Landon 276 electoral votes while he actually got only 8. Therefore, the 1936 Gallup poll gave Landon 10 times too many States and 34 times too many electoral votes. The above table shows that said advantage was held in August 16, 1936, poll, lost temporarily in the August 23 and August 30, 1936, polls and regained in the September 6 and September 13, 1936, polls. It was not until September 20, 1936, that the Gallup poll began to favor Roosevelt. By that time, of course, the Democratic radio and speaking campaign was in full swing and the tide had begun to turn.

It will be noted that the August 9, 1936, Gallup poll gave Landon 18 more States than he actually obtained. Therefore, if the August 4, 1940, Gallup poll is true to form—that is, equally excessive—Willkie will only carry 6 of the 24 States now given him by the Gallup poll. It will also be noted that the August 9, 1936, Gallup poll gave Landon 266 more electoral votes than he actually obtained. If the August 4, 1940, Gallup poll is equally excessive, Willkie will only receive a handful of electoral votes.

The August 2, 1936, Gallup poll stated that 55 percent of the voters throughout the country were of the opinion that President Roosevelt was leading the country into a dictatorship, but in November of the same year the people reelected him by the overwhelming vote of 27,476,673 to 16,679,583. The August 9, 1936, Gallup poll indicated that Landon would receive 59 percent of the vote of the State of Kansas, while Roosevelt would receive only 41 percent, but Roosevelt carried Kansas in November 1936 by 66,793. The August 9, 1936, Gallup poll also indicated that Landon would receive 51 percent of the vote of the State of New York and Roosevelt only 49 percent, but Roosevelt carried the State of New York by a vote of 2,041,347 to 665,951, or by a majority of more than 3 to 1.

The Daily Oklahoman in July, August, and September 1936, gave much space to the fact that many Landon Democratic clubs were being formed in this State and throughout the Nation, to the admitted fact that Landon was not only a man of great personal magnetism and charm but from a neighboring State, and to the fact that Al Smith, Bill Murray, and other so-called Democrats were supporting the Republican nominee. The leaders of said clubs in Oklahoma, as now, were wealthy oil men. However, the November 1936 vote clearly showed that said club members as now, were largely Republicans, who, for the sake of participating in Democratic primaries, had merely registered as Democrats.

It is my thought that a newspaper story, properly setting forth the above data and the comparisons made therein, might be profitably published, as soon as possible, in the Democratic small-town press, and hence I am submitting the same for your consideration.

Yours very truly,

FRED HANSEN,
Care Attorney General's Office.

Acceptance Speech of Hon. Charles L. McNary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 28, 1940

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable CHARLES L. MCNARY, recently selected by the Republican Party as its vice presidential nominee, is the leading citizen in my native State of Oregon. Senator MCNARY is not only beloved in our own State, which he has served so faithfully for many years on our own Supreme Court bench and as our Senator from Oregon, where he has served with great distinction for 23 years, but he has equally endeared himself to all of the people of the West and Middle West. He has been the spokesman through the years for fair treatment for our farmers.

Yesterday he delivered his acceptance speech in our capital city, Salem, and made an outstanding contribution looking toward a solution of our political, economic, and social questions confronting us today. I ask leave to include his acceptance address as a part of my remarks. The address is as follows:

I accept the nomination for Vice President so generously bestowed upon me by the Republican National Convention last June. I endorse the platform and renew my loyalty to the candidate for President, the able, magnetic, and forceful Wendell L. Willkie.

This is no ordinary campaign. The impact of the wars raging beyond both our oceans, together with our urgent concern for the peace of this hemisphere, surround the political decision we are about to make with a heightened gravity. Domestic issues, linked as they are with preparedness and foreign relations, take on enlarged significance in our present mood.

For more than 7 years we have lingered in a backwater, denying our destiny; neglecting our defenses, both spiritual and material. The great energies of America have been hindered—where not actually stifled. Some have lost faith in the future; faith in work, the

source of well-being. No party is solely responsible. We of the minority have perhaps failed in vigilance. But the overwhelming responsibility rests upon the party in power. They have the mandate.

This campaign is more than a mere contest between rival political parties. This campaign is a conflict between philosophies—philosophies of government and of action. We must choose in November whether America shall advance again along the path of her historic mission or retreat still further into the fields of futility.

I should be guilty of a narrow partisanship unsuited to the great West were I, however, to condemn the New Deal in its entirety. Candor requires me to credit this administration with certain social gains which have made the lot of the average man more secure—if not more fruitful and satisfying. I, for one, do not choose to relinquish these advances, where they are genuine; nor to detract from the humanitarian impulses actuating the President. In this campaign I shall not seek to indict the New Deal's motives. I shall, with all the force at my command, attack the New Deal's capacity to govern and the political and economic heresies which have deflected us from our courses.

Every administration since Washington has made progress toward fulfilling the American dream. The New Deal is exceptional in that it alone has sought to substitute new states of mind for old; to inculcate reliance on the Government in place of self-reliance and to supplant hope with fear of what lies ahead.

We may forgive the New Deal's incompetence in dealing with economic forces; its inability—or unwillingness—to further the employment of idle capital and idle hands. We might overlook the confusion in theory and practice that have curbed initiative, stalled the engines of production, and multiplied debt. We are still a rich country. What we cannot forgive is that the New Deal, finding itself unable to restore national vitality, fashioned its plan upon the thesis that America is finished, that our economy is inevitably contracting, that opportunity has been extinguished, and that hereafter we must look increasingly to the Government for jobs, for security, and for the oversight of our private lives.

CONCEPT HAS ITS FOUNDATIONS IN EUROPE'S RAMPANT STATISM

That concept, old as human pessimism, germinates now from a Europe which has been transformed—by poverty, political immaturity, and war—into a dismal despotism. That concept is statism—the doctrine of the ascendancy of the state over the individual. I deny its validity in terms of a youthful, vital America. I charge, moreover, that the diffusion of that concept has impaired the national spirit, and if persisted in, might well rob us in time of the will to be free.

What we need in times like these is more democracy not less. In an earlier period of doubt and dismay, Walt Whitman, the good, gray poet of a dynamic America, thus admonished his country:

> "Sail, sail thy best, ship of democracy,
> Of value is thy freight; 'tis not the present only,
> The past is also stored in thee."

The Philadelphia convention, meeting in the birthplace of our liberties, handed us our sailing orders, bidding us look to our vigorous past, reconstruct America and set her anew on her course. I accept those orders in full confidence that we shall triumphantly make port in November.

READING LESSONS IN THE OREGON TRAIL

This occasion is, in a sense, a personal dedication. I make no apology, therefore, for personal references. Lacking only 4 years, I have served my native State of Oregon in the United States Senate for a third of its existence. In that 23 years my record has been open to the view of my countrymen. I have supported progressive measures. I have sought to conserve and employ, for the benefit of all, our heritage of soil, water power, and forest. I stand on that record. Not one uttered word can be expunged, not one vote recalled; nor would I wish it otherwise, considering the light that then guided us.

I should be lacking in sentiment were I not gratified by the presence of the notification committee. Many of them crossed the continent to be with us. I hope they find compensation in the grandeur of our mountains and forests and the enchantment of the Willamette Valley. I hope they may be recompensed also by the opportunity of mingling with this assemblage of free citizens of the old Oregon country—the northwestern empire—which once embraced all of Oregon, Washington, and Idaho, and parts of Montana and Wyoming. This is pioneer country still. We here are pioneers and the sons and daughters of pioneers; of the stock that carried American sovereignty from the Mississippi across the magnificent Rocky Mountain region to the Pacific, conquering and subduing this rich domain for the Union.

Some of our visitors, flying here, crossed the old Oregon Trail in the air. Their passage across plains and mountains took only hours, instead of months. Others motored here. They reckoned traveling time in mere days. Accustomed to the ease of modern transport, it is hard to project our imaginations backward a century into the experience of the bearded men and the heroic mothers who rode uncomplainingly in covered wagons over the "iron road" from the Great Bend of the Missouri to the banks of the Willamette, following the valleys of the Kaw, the Platte, the Sweetwater, the Snake, and the lordly Columbia; fording icy streams, withstanding hostile tribes, suffering hunger, thirst, and sickness, aggravated by strange diets and exposure—and leaving thousands of unmarked graves beside the trail.

OREGON COUNTRY'S SETTLEMENT IS PART OF A PROUD EPIC

The settlement of the Oregon country remains one of our proudest epics. At the time of the Yorktown surrender, our frontier rested on the Alleghenies. Sixty years later, the surging genius of our ancestors had pushed our borders to the Pacific. The beginnings of Oregon lay in the imagination of Thomas Jefferson, the apostle of democracy, who served only two terms in the Presidency, frowning upon contemplation of a third term. It was Jefferson who, after purchasing the Louisiana country, sent Lewis and Clark to spy out the land beyond the Rockies. Their journals kindled the interest of colonial America in the far west. The explorer, the fur trapper, and trader broke the trail. Next came the missionary and, close behind, the housekeeper. If we pause, we may read in the old Oregon Trail lessons applicable to the problems besetting us now.

THE PEOPLE MOVE ON TO THE PACIFIC

Most Americans are familiar with the broad outlines of this vast migration. They are not so familiar with the fact that it was a people's movement. The Government at Washington, absorbed in the 1840's by the acquisition of Texas and the gathering clouds of secession, virtually ignored the trend toward the Northwest. In Congress, numerous voices were raised in discouragement. It was said that Oregon lay beyond our proper aspirations as a Nation; that the Rockies should mark the permanent boundary. Senator Thomas H. Benton, the Missouri giant, suggested erecting a statue of the Roman god Terminus on a peak of those mountains as a reminder of our natural limitations.

Fortunately, there were dissenters. The great Calhoun warned the Senate that, in spite of governmental objections, settlers were overrunning the Oregon country and—he suspected—the settlers, once established, would maintain themselves against the world.

No; the Government did not occupy the Oregon country. That job, thank God, was accomplished by the people. Americans had not then been instructed that they must look to Washington for inspiration and sanction for their every act. And when the pioneers found they needed to organize their rude society into lawful patterns, they made no appeal to the Government. They acted. They formed their own government.

LITTLE AMERICANS THEN AND NOW

The place where they met was Champoeg. A proud and happy sentiment encompasses me as I reflect that that hallowed place lies only a little distance from where we now meet. There, free Americans demonstrated the flexibility of the American political system; they proved that institutions forged on the Atlantic served equally as well on the Pacific and that, therefore, the continent could be welded into one Nation. Out of the bold and considered action at Champoeg sprang the assurance which fortified our diplomacy in acquiring title to the old Oregon country from Great Britain.

We can afford to smile at the timidity of the obstructionists who lived a century ago. In their day, they thought America finished. They belonged to the tribe, seemingly numerous in each generation, which holds that the limit has been reached. Little Americans they were; the type that advocated impeaching Jefferson for his purchase and derided Seward for buying Alaska.

In like manner, the little American of 1940 maintains that our race is run. The throb he hears is not the hum of America's dynamos, but the hardening of America's arteries. It is his despondent outlook that deflates the hopes of youth; insists that our industrial plant is overbuilt and that we must look forward only to a slippered senility.

We, of the old Oregon country, reject the hypothesis of the little American. We are optimists. We say that America is not yet half built. The little American dates the decline of American enterprise from the time when the last free land was thrown open for settlement. We hold that the theory of the last frontier is only figurative. Land, if you had to work it, never was free. Men paid for it in sweat and blood and loneliness, if not in dollars.

As long as great rivers run idly to the sea; as long as vast reaches of virgin soil await only life-giving water; as long as well-being is inequitably distributed, then we say that America is not finished. Our job is to work for an integrated self-confident country, ready to undergo the discipline of the pioneer to the end that we may not only survive in a threatened world but distribute our blessings more abundantly. The call is for a disciplined population. I prefer the self-discipline of the pioneer to the imposed discipline of the European autocracies. The pioneer tradition is strong in our blood. All of us, whether our ancestors crossed the Atlantic in the seventeenth century or whether we ourselves came in the twentieth, are pioneers, or the descendants of pioneers. The virtues of work, thrift, and self-denial for the common good are part of our tradition. We have the tools.

FULL USE OF OUR RESOURCES ESSENTIAL TO RECONSTRUCTION

What are some of the specifications for the reconstruction of America? Among the first is the preservation and fuller employment of the natural resources of soil, forest, and water power. Prudence dictates that we, at least, conserve those legacies for this and future generations.

The prosperity of agriculture should be the first charge on the attention of any administration. Not for sentimental reasons, although society owes a real debt to those who, year in, year out, supply it with its first essentials, food and raw materials. No; the

reason for our preoccupation with the farm problem is social and economic betterment. The farm stands somewhere near the center of our economy. For 75 years, the farms of America balanced our foreign trade and, through exportable surpluses, provided the foreign exchange that assisted in building our factories, mines, and railroads. The first World War disrupted the profitable trade and, for 20 years, we have struggled with recurring, unmarketable surpluses.

The farm problem is by no means the exclusive worry of the farmer. In a true and realistic sense, the problem is as national as the problem of national defense. Permit me to cite an example: Statisticians find an uncanny correspondence between gross farm income and industrial pay rolls in a given year. When, as in 1929, farm income rose to $12,000,000,000, factory pay rolls also were $12,000,000,000; and when in 1932, farm income dropped to $5,000,000,000, industrial pay rolls fell off similarly.

The New Deal has administered the farm problem for more than 7 years. What is the present state of the American farmer, who, with his dependents, make up a quarter of our population? In the year 1939, his share of the national income was the lowest since statistics have been kept. Moreover, his income during the 7 New Deal, or lean years, has averaged only $7,000,000,000; whereas, during the preceding 7 years, under Republican administrations, it averaged $9,000,000,000.

Bear in mind, if you will, that the New Deal totals include all the benefit payments from the Treasury of the United States—and that the 7 prosperous Republican years include the black year 1932, which marked the depth of the depression. Throughout this New Deal cycle we have been confronted with the related phenomena of depressed farm prices and industrial unemployment. With the farmer producing without profit, the city worker was idle, his consuming power diminished. I have long felt that these phenomena could not be separated; that a sound policy would work toward relieving both of these disorders.

I shall discuss the farm situation in detail later in the campaign. It is a subject near my heart. For 20 years I have sought means and measures to better the lot of the agrarian producer. For the moment, let me say that the Republican platform recommends a hopeful and affirmative farm program. It endorses the principle of parity. It advocates—and this is a departure—incentive payments to farmers willing to experiment with tillage of crops we now import. We stand pledged to continue soil conservation payments, commodity surplus loans; to encourage acquisition of farms by tenants and for research aimed at developing industrial uses for products of the soil. We favor continuing the food-stamp program, which serves the double purpose of assisting the needy and helping the farmer by reducing surplus crops. The platform offers no magic formula. The problem is far too complex for any all-embracing cure. It does constitute a promise that the Republican Party genuinely seeks solutions.

FARM PROBLEM ESSENTIALLY ONE OF REVITALIZING FARM MARKETS

A substantial solution of the farm problem may be resolved into a question of markets. Any rational plan must assign the American market to the American farmer. Beside being far and away the greatest market, it is the only one we may hope to control. The farmer is, at least, entitled to that, and no Treasury benefits can compensate him for its loss. Yet the New Deal, which, in 7 years, has failed to map out a long-range plan for reconstructing the agricultural empire, piles confusion upon confusion by following two contradictory policies at once. With one hand the New Deal pays farmers not to sow and reap; with the other it lowers tariff barriers so that foreign crops undersell our own in our market.

Secretary Wallace, a high-minded and sympathetic Secretary of Agriculture, may not be blamed for this second policy. Any Secretary of Agriculture would be hampered by the reciprocal-trade system, which, in the last 2 years, has admitted competitive farm products to the value of $537,000,000 a year. That sum, it is interesting to note, approximates what the Government has paid farmers to reduce acreage and production. Experts estimate that the 35,000,000 acres withdrawn through Government payments from production correspond closely to the acreage displaced by competitive imports.

I have always opposed reciprocal-trade treaties, as formulated by the New Deal. When I spoke against their renewal last spring in the Senate I charged that the treaties had failed to "dissipate, alleviate, or liquidate the uneconomic conditions" affecting agriculture. I hold to that opinion still. Moreover, as the war spreads the areas of closed trade I gravely fear that the effects on agriculture may grow worse, and we have no assurance that peace will restore foreign markets for our surpluses.

After 7 years we need a realistic reappraisal of the whole problem, and, whichever party assumes the responsibility next January, we should demand and have the formulation of a long-range policy looking to the restoration of our agricultural empire. The farmers do not wish to rely perpetually on subsidies which stop short of economic justice. They wish to reenter the economy as independent producers. They are entitled to the fulfillment of that wish.

For years I have advocated a two-price system; a system enabling us to export without injuring the domestic price level. The McNary-Haugen Act, which looked to that end, was twice vetoed by a President. Although conditions have altered radically since the bill was last rejected, I maintain with undiminished faith that some such formula must still be sought.

Farm recovery may well be part of a greater whole. The recovery of our whole economy hinges to some degrees upon removal of such obstacles to easy commerce as adverse Government policies, restrictive laws, burdensome taxation, and the uncertainties arising from pyramiding debt. The over-all solution may only await the installation of an administration which wholeheartedly wishes again to see the United States a going concern.

I come to a problem that profoundly touches my emotions. We stand today in the heart of the last considerable area of virgin forest left in the United States—the majestic remnants of nearly a billion acres of timber that clothed this country when the first Europeans saw it. I was born within sight of the great trees that characteristically dominate the western scene from the Rockies to the Pacific. In my lifetime I have witnessed the growth of the lumber industry to its present huge proportions and the expansion of the social and recreational value of our forests. It is but natural, therefore, that during my years in the Senate I have made legislation affecting the forests my special province.

Everyone knows that American timber resources are being swiftly depleted. We take assurance for the future, however, from the knowledge that they may, with care and wise governmental policies, be restored. Happily a substantial portion of our forest lands are being managed and utilized in ways that best safeguard social values, provide maximum employment, guarantee future supplies, stabilize streams and soils, and conserve our rich endowments of natural beauty and wildlife.

IMPROVED CREDIT, FAIRER TAXES WOULD HELP FOREST INTERESTS

Yet, much more can be done. The Government equitably could assume half the cost of abating loss from fire, insects, and disease to the desirable point where forests might become insurable risks. Credit facilities are rudimentary and inadequate. Forest taxation too often tends, by laying too heavy an immediate burden, to compel uneconomic exploitation and forced liquidation.

Unproductive areas increasingly should be acquired for public ownership and the exploration and research arms of the Forest Service should be expanded. Deserted villages and abandoned cut-over lands are the price society pays for wasteful nudations of our forest areas. The remedy for this ruthless policy is a Government-encouraged program of perpetuating this natural resource by regulating the volume of the crop that annually can be harvested. This means balancing the budget between the growth and the cut.

Power is the prime requisite of modern industrial existence. A measure of America's industrial magnitude may be found in the fact that one-half the installed horsepower in the world is developed within our borders. Steam power made England the industrial colossus of the nineteenth century; steam plus electrical power has made the United States the industrial giant of the twentieth. Yet America's water-power resources are still largely undeveloped. In the mountainous parts of the Pacific west, where strong rivers run unimpeded to the sea, a major portion of the country's potential hydroelectric power still waits to be harnessed. Fortunately, the principle on which this power may be made available has long been recognized. The Federal Government accepts the obligation to control floods and assure navigation. Out of these services flows the byproduct of power.

WATER POWER COMMON HERITAGE SHOULD BE FEDERALLY CONTROLLED

Unfalteringly the Congress has granted to the public preferential rights to power generated from navigable streams. Such power should be a common heritage. The Government, having made this power available, should have an indisputable right to control its utilization and distribution. Maximum benefits for domestic consumers, farmers, and small users of power should be the yardstick by which we measure the usefulness and serviceability of every Federal development. Moreover, rates should be maintained at the lowest level consistent with sound amortization. Where irreconcilable conflicts arise between public and private interests in the development and distribution of power, private holdings should not be confiscated; and we now have a working precedent for such fair treatment in the recent acquisition by purchase of private companies by the Tennessee Valley Authority.

From the standpoint of the Treasury, the records of the great public power projects at Boulder Canyon on the Colorado and at Bonneville on the Columbia are reassuring. Both are liquidating their commitments to the Government, as, no doubt, the mighty power and reclamation development at the Coulee Dam on the upper reaches of the Columbia likewise will do. The subject of hydroelectric power deserves fuller treatment, which I expect to give it in a later speech.

The resources we have been considering bear pertinently on a subject uppermost in our minds as we look across the Atlantic. I refer to preparedness for defense. The last war disclosed deficits in power and farm and forest products. A shortage of power in certain eastern industrial districts deprived domestic consumers of service. Food deficiencies caused meatless, wheatless days and the plowing up of the short grass prairies in what is now the Dust Bowl.

In common with what I believe to be the overwhelming majority of my countrymen I oppose involvement in foreign military adventures. America, as always, prefers peace. But America does not prefer the peace of appeasement nor the surrender of our national dignity, our independence of action, our political freedom, or the civilized values that we cherish.

The existence of aggressive despots in Europe is not new to our experience. We administered a lesson to George III. Napoleon inconvenienced our commerce. Monroe and John Quincy Adams effectually warned the Holy Alliance to keep its arbitrary hands

off this hemisphere; we helped bring Maximilian's imperial adventure in Mexico to an inglorious end.

NO DOCILE PEOPLE, AMERICANS WILL FACE DESTINY ON OWN TERMS

Nor have we failed to exercise our guardianship over countries within the scope of the Monroe Doctrine. Unless I mistake our temper, we are no less firm and positive today. We are not a docile people and we propose to work out our destiny on our terms. In the present world situation, we still have a choice. We shall be strong, in which case we shall deter our enemies at home and abroad; or, we may remain weak and thus invite their aggression. For my part, I prefer the part of strength. That has been the American choice.

In conclusion, may I remind you that the Republican Party this year lifts the standard of hope; a standard to which all men and women of courage and clear-sighted faith in our mighty traditions may repair. Everywhere we hear that our country faces greater perils than at any time since the Republican Party preserved the Union under Abraham Lincoln. In another hour of crisis, the Republican Party, cradled in a great tradition and seasoned in Government, offers to lead America out of doubt, negation, and disunity. Problems change, new dangers arise—yet remain the ancient virtues—self-reliance, faith, hope and courage—which animated and sustained the pioneer in his quest for a greater, ever greater, America.

With your cooperation, we shall renew that quest—setting our country again on the path of high adventure toward her true destiny. With your help, we shall not fail.

Foreign Policy of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ERNEST LUNDEEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 28 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

EDITORIALS FROM WALLACE'S FARMER

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD five editorials from Wallace's Farmer on the foreign policy of the United States.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Wallace's Farmer of March 13, 1937]

PLAN FOR PEACE THROUGH NEUTRALITY

Farmers who want this Nation to do all that is humanly possible to stay out of the next war will be pleased at the progress in the consideration of neutrality legislation. At present it seems likely that the final bill may contain the following provisions:

1. Placing an absolute embargo on loans and sales of munitions and implements of war to nations at war.

2. Permitting the President to declare the cash-and-carry rule in force against both sides whenever it seems likely that shipment in American vessels of other goods to belligerents may involve us in trouble.

3. Barring Americans from traveling on ships owned by warring nations.

Under the cash-and-carry rule, if warring nations had put lard, for instance, on the contraband list, and if the President decided that shipment of lard in American vessels to the warring countries would get us into trouble, he would have the power to declare, not an embargo, but a ruling that American interest in such shipments should cease at the water's edge. In other words, we would dump our lard on the seacoast; and if warring nations wanted the stuff, let them send their own ships for it.

We use lard as an illustration, because it is essential that Corn Belt farmers remember that neutrality will be bought with a price. Effective neutrality will interfere with exports and will hurt farm prices as well as prices of other things.

While we believe it is better to take the small losses of neutrality rather than the huge losses of war, we also are sure that Congress might properly go on to study ways to see that neutrality should not bear too hard on farmers. In case a cash-and-carry policy is declared on farm products, why not provide funds to distribute part of the surplus to the underfed of our country; why not store part of it for sale when the sea lanes are open again; why not give more financial support to substituting soil-conserving crops for crops that injure the soil and produce unneeded surpluses?

Neutrality has its costs as well as war. Let us plan for this and be willing to pay the bills.

[From Wallace's Farmer of July 17, 1937]

WAR-TRADE PROFITS COST TOO MUCH

The war in Spain, a European war on a small scale, is showing signs of turning into a European war on a big scale. And over on the Pacific, Japanese and Russian soldiers are shooting at each other in a boundary dispute.

It looks as if hell was getting ready to break loose again.

If the present fighting does expand to the size of another major war, farmers can expect two things: Higher prices for farm exports and a pressing invitation to join in a "holy" war to keep the world safe for something or other and to maintain wartime prices.

We suggest that this is a fine time to remember what happened to us in 1914. We got war profits; we let those profits drag us into war; and we threw all those profits—and a good many billions more—back into the pit of war.

If another war comes, farmers will be tempted, by the offer of high prices, to demand that the United States Navy clear the way for shipments of cotton, wool, lard, and wheat to blockaded ports abroad. A few months of that and we'll be in the war ourselves up to our necks.

Let's remember that it is better to let farm prices drop, and better to lose profits on wartime trade, than to get mixed up in another World War. Let's stay out and be willing to pay the cost of staying out. It's expensive to be neutral, but it's a lot cheaper than to get into a fight.

[From Wallace's Farmer of September 25, 1937]

HAVE WE LEARNED ANYTHING SINCE 1917?

Twenty years ago the United States was pulled into a world war which cost us $60,000,000,000, killed and injured thousands of our people, damaged our foreign trade, made a few wartime millionaires and impoverished everybody else, and particularly the farmers.

Today, two wars are going on, one in Europe and one in Asia. Either may involve the United States unless we Americans show more sense than we did 20 years ago.

In Europe, Italy and Germany are unofficially lined up with the Spanish insurgents. Russia and—more mildly—France and Great Britain lean toward the Spanish Government. In Asia, China and Japan are fighting, with Russia sympathetic to China.

The two wars are linked together by the three-fold alliance between Italy, Germany, and Japan, and by the less formal alliance between France, Russia, and Great Britain.

In spite of the fact that no great power probably wants a world war, they may stumble into one. A submarine incident in the Mediterranean, another careless bomb dropped in China, may bring on the conflict.

Can the United States stay out?

Everybody says "Yes." But some say "Yes—but."

Among the enemies of neutrality in this country we have the folks who want the United States to punish the aggressors in these wars, to slap the wrists of Japan and Italy. They want us to "make the world safe for democracy" again.

Among the enemies of neutrality are the Americans who went abroad to make 15 percent on their money over there instead of 5 percent at home, and who want the Army and Navy to help collect their profits.

Among the enemies of neutrality are the devotees of "national honor," who want to send 3,000,000 boys to war every time a shell bursts near the Stars and Stripes.

And there are always those who want to make profits out of the war trade. Some of these are farmers.

Can the United States stay neutral, in spite of these influences?

Corn Belt farmers can help decide that question. Let them use their influence to get the National Government to withdraw troops and warships from the war zones, and to get American citizens out, too. Let them refuse to be excited over "insults to national honor," and over "crusades for democracy." Let them decline to risk their boys' blood for war profits for somebody else.

One more thing. We need to wage neutrality as deliberately as we wage war. The United States can properly compensate those businessmen, those shippers, and those farmers who are injured by a policy of neutrality. Let's be willing to pay the costs of neutrality. They are heavy, but nothing to the costs of war.

This year is the anniversary of the entrance of the United States into one world war. Let us not permit it to mark our entrance into another.

We ought to be smarter than we were 20 years ago. But are we?

MEASURE COST OF WAR

The total cost of the World War to the United States would have paid for the following programs (each figure represents $3,000,000,000).

Thirty-year conservation program at $1,000,000,000 a year, $30,000,000,000.

Thirty-year tenancy program at $1,000,000,000 a year, $30,000,000,000.

[From Wallace's Farmer of August 27, 1938]

WE PAY IN BLOOD FOR WAR-TRADE PROFITS

Wars are still going on in Europe and Asia. Some time, perhaps soon, Japan and Russia may abandon the present skirmishing and begin to fight in earnest. Some time, perhaps soon, Germany may

attack Czechoslovakia and draw France, Russia, and possibly Great Britain and Italy into another conflict.

If this happens, what will the United States do?

We all want to stay home and keep out of trouble. Yet we wanted the same thing in 1914, and look what happened.

This is a good time to resolve that no loans will be made to warring governments, and that shipments of any kind to nations at war must be handled by foreign ships and paid for before they leave our coast. If our shipping interests object, pay them damages from the Treasury. That's cheaper than sending the Navy and Army across the water in order to let our merchant vessels through.

We can stay neutral in the next world war if we are willing to pay the costs of neutrality. But we can't have our cake and eat it, too. We can't make big profits from war trade and still expect to stay out of trouble.

And that statement applies just as much to wheat and pork producers as to munitions manufacturers.

[From Wallace's Farmer of May 22, 1937]

NEUTRALITY LAW JUST A GOOD START

The neutrality bill recently passed by Congress is a step toward keeping us out of the next war. However, we believe that Congress made a mistake in leaving too much power to the President.

Under the new law, in case war breaks out, shipments of munitions to the warring countries are to be stopped at once. But what about shipments of cotton, wheat, lard, trucks, and other things that are almost as important to warring nations as rifles and ammunition?

What happens to these shipments is up to the President. If he thinks that the transportation of such commodities by American ships will get us into trouble, he can stop our ships from carrying them. He is not to stop the trade entirely. If a foreign ship wants to come to our shores, pay for the goods and carry them back, that is all right.

Remembering that we got into the last war partly because of the stake supporters had in maintaining shipments abroad, these provisions seem helpful. But let's go back and see how the plan would work on cotton, lard, and wheat if war actually came.

Suppose a situation like the late war, with one group of nations led by Germany fighting another group led by Great Britain. Both want our lard and cotton. American ships are loaded heavily with these products. Some try to dodge the British blockade and get to Germany. If the British capture or sink these ships, we begin to dislike the British. If the German submarines sink ships going to Great Britain, we begin to hate the Germans.

Now suppose the President, seeing that these irritations are building up a war spirit, decides to use the powers granted under the law, and declares that American ships cannot carry wheat, lard, or cotton to either side. The trade in such products would not be ended. Some foreign ships would call at our ports and get supplies.

But the President, no matter who he was, would be damned for his action by several powerful groups. American shipowners would moan about the loss of freights. Cotton, hog and wheat farmers would complain because of the drop in prices. Partisans of one side or the other to the conflict would claim that the President's action would help one group of nations more than the other. The foreign nations who thought themselves injured would claim that the action was a breach of neutrality, rather than real neutrality.

It seems to us it would be safer to say flatly that when war breaks out, shipments of any commodity on the contraband list of either set of powers could not be made to these countries by American ships. Then the thing would be done automatically. Everybody would know what to expect. There could be no charge of partiality.

This may be a good place to add that a really effective neutrality measure should also see that special groups are not forced to pay all the costs of keeping the Nation out of war. If, to preserve neutrality, we injure the market for lard or handicap American ships, some way of compensating farmers and ship owners should be worked out.

The present neutrality law makes a good start at keeping the Nation out of trouble. But it can be and it should be greatly improved.

The Eagles' Pledge to America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL HINSHAW

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 28, 1940

COMMUNICATION FROM THE GRAND AERIE, FRATERNAL ORDER OF EAGLES

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following communication from the grand aerie, Fraternal Order of Eagles, signed by the grand worthy president, John A. Abel. It gives me especial pleasure to present this matter to the Members of Congress, as I am a member of Van Nuys District Aerie No. 2310, of Van Nuys, Calif.:

GRAND AERIE, FRATERNAL ORDER OF EAGLES,
Marion, Ohio, August 17, 1940.

Hon. CARL HINSHAW,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HINSHAW: In convention assembled at Chicago, Ill., August 15 to 19, 1940, delegates of over 1,100 subordinate aeries (local lodges) from all sections of the United States, including 22 in the Dominion of Canada, representing nearly 700,000 Eagles unanimously adopted—

(a) The Eagles' pledge to America;

(b) Resolution in relation to those members of the Fraternal Order of Eagles who enter the military service of their country.

In compliance with the specific direction of the convention that a copy of each of the above documents be sent to each Member of Congress, I enclose same herewith.

Respectfully yours,

JOHN A. ABEL,
Grand Worthy President.

THE EAGLES' PLEDGE TO AMERICA

Injustice and hatred have achieved their end. Over there, the fertile fields where grain should be growing are gashed with shell holes and wet with human blood. The soft clouds of midsummer are pierced with the bulletlike speed of death-dealing planes. And the quiet night shudders with the death cries of women and children.

Six of the seven primary powers of the world are at war. More men are under arms today than ever before in the history of the world. To build swift instruments of death, the blessings of science have been prostituted. The bones of boys and men who fell a quarter of a century ago have not dissolved into dust; yet over them, this very day, new bodies, distorted and mangled, rot by the roadside or lie twisted and misshapen upon the battlefield.

Ours is a country dedicated to the belief that men have certain inalienable rights. Among these are "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." To bring this Republic into existence, men and women suffered and died. Today, as never before, America is threatened by forces from beyond the seas and by forces from within.

To foreign armies that would desecrate our shores and to their leaders, we say: "America was built by men and women who crossed the seas to escape political and religious persecution. From the forests and rivers, from fertile valleys and plains, they built a nation dedicated to God and to the finest ideals alive in the soul of man. These ideals we hold more precious than life. Deprived of them, we count life not worth living. To our children, to the next generation, we have promised to hand down this heritage of freedom. No matter what the sacrifice, no matter what the suffering, we will keep the faith. No foreign army shall invade our continent so long as there are men and women in this country who find inspiration in American history and who deserve the privilege of living under the Stars and Stripes."

To those within our midst who would betray our country, who would seek to surrender the keys of America to those that hate our form of government, covet our wealth, and envy us the happiness that, through the grace of God, has found here its abiding place—to these traitors we say: "Take the first ship to the country whose government you serve. Take your crafty minds and Judas hearts to the dictators whose slimy gold supports you. Leave forever a country whose blessed soil is too decent to hold your faithless bodies."

For any of this treacherous group who are caught in acts or crimes harmful to our Government, we demand immediate and condign punishment. We have witnessed the successful invasion of peaceful countries that had been betrayed and weakened beyond hope of adequate defense by the creatures that, in paragraphs bitter with contempt, future historians will characterize as the "fifth column." And having witnessed the deeds of these traitors, we pledge our individual and group strength to the work of exposing their acts, both of omission and of commission, wherever opportunities present themselves to us.

Resolved, to the Governor of our State and to the President of the United States, we pledge, individually, and as a fraternal group that numbers almost three-quarters of a million men and women, our loyalty to the Constitutions of State and Nation. We pledge ourselves to the service of America. And, with the full understanding of what this vow entails, we pledge our willingness to give the priceless gift that men call life so that our children may inherit the blessings of freedom.

We dedicate, in this hour, ourselves and the Fraternal Order of Eagles to the preservation of America and for what it stands among peace-loving peoples of the world. May God and our fellow citizens help us keep this vow.

(Unanimously adopted August 16, 1940, by Annual Convention of Fraternal Order of Eagles.)

RESOLUTION IN RELATION TO THOSE MEMBERS OF THE FRATERNAL ORDER OF EAGLES WHO ENTER THE MILITARY SERVICE OF THEIR COUNTRY

You have just approved a resolution that has the fitting title, The Eagles' Pledge to America. The resolution is timely. It is

in keeping with the patriotic ideals of our order. We have again set forth in very definite terms the fraternity's loyalty to our country. Now, we must think of our obligations to those Eagles who have or will become a part of the Military Establishment of the United States and Canada.

We believe that the United States must be made so strong defensively that no power or powers on earth will seriously consider the invasion of the Western Hemisphere. We believe that our defenses must be built as rapidly as our citizens from all walks of life can achieve. We must have an adequate supply of airplanes and tanks and every necessary type of ordnance, from heavy artillery and antiaircraft guns to the most formidable machine guns, rifles, and all firearms between.

But the mechanical equipment of war must be directed and operated by Americans who understand the technique of the weapons they use; and who have had such invaluable hours of training on the ground, in the air lanes, and through the channels of the seas as to insure, in the event of war, ultimate victory.

Among Eagles the term "equality" has always had a special significance. For almost a half century we have obligated new members in the sunlight of this term. The worthy president of every aerie sits at the station dedicated to equality. For most of us the golden years of peace have meant equality of opportunity. But now, when our beloved land is facing the possibilities of a defensive war, we must understand and accept the equality of responsibility.

When the Congress of the United States and our brother, the President of the United States, have agreed upon the best way in which each of us can discharge his responsibility, we Eagles, loyal to the institutions of our country and to the principles of our revered democracy, must stand stalwartly behind this constituted authority.

Let us assure every Eagle in the military service of his country that his problems, his duties, his individual fate, is of concern to each of us. Let us so legislate that an Eagle who wears the uniform of his country shall have his name continued on the roster of his aerie, and that it shall be the duty of the aerie to keep him in good standing while he is in the military service.

His dependents shall have the services of the aerie physician as provided by law in those aeries that furnish such services, and they shall be entitled to such rights and privileges in the aerie home as they would have if he were there. And I recommend that the grand aerie remit the per capita tax on those in military service.

At the beginning of the World War, the Eagles were the first among all organizations to provide for the welfare of its members who were in service. I urge this grand aerie to be the first among the legislative bodies of national fraternities to make known to the world our attitude toward our country and to the members of our order who enter military service.

Resolved, That the Grand Aerie, Fraternal Order of Eagles, approve this statement and that the judiciary committee shall submit sometime during this convention, such recommendations as will give life to what I have read.

Let us increasingly insist that Eagles emphasize not only equality of opportunity in time of peace but equality of responsibility in time of war or possibly war.

(Unanimously adopted August 16, 1940.)

Federal Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. HOOK

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 28, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE NORTHWESTERN LUTHERAN

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Northwestern Lutheran:

[From the Northwestern Lutheran]

The text of bill No. 1305, known as an act for Federal aid to education and the report of the disposition of this bill in the Senate of the United States is not at hand. Senator DAVID I. WALSH, of Massachusetts, a member of the Committee on Education of the Senate, before which bill No. 1305 was being considered, however, went on record in the following comment relative to the proposed legislation: "I do not subscribe to the doctrine that because our public schools and our educational facilities are a vital element in our national welfare, that they thereby become the proper concern and implied responsibility of the National Government. Our schools are one of the few remaining bulwarks of local self-government and community enterprises. They should remain so.

"They have, on the whole, been well managed and generously supported. We have today too much centralization of control over the affairs of our cititzens in a Federal bureaucracy. We should not add to it by this new excursion into the field of education.

"We cannot undertake to subsidize our public schools with the Federal Treasury and still leave the schools free from the taint of Federal control. Federal domination of education will be the ultimate and, in my opinion, the inevitable consequence. The present bill is the opening we have. The camel's nose is under the tent. Let it be remembered that the most potent weapon of dictators and revolutionists is the control of the schools and the education of the youth.

"Let us be on our guard against putting the public schools in our own land under the yoke of a centralized bureaucracy and thereby provide the mechanism for possible abuse in the years to come."

From the remarks of the Senator, we gather that the designation of bill 1305, "An act for Federal aid to education," is in reality a misnomer and perhaps only a guise and camouflage to hide the real purpose of the proposed legislation, the centralization of education in the Federal Government. Senator WALSH warns against such legislation and has urged defeat of bill 1305 or any similar legislation. The alert Senator clearly sees that Federal control of education is an infringement on the rights and responsibilities of local self-government.

We are reminded of our Saviour's words, "The children of this world are in their generation wiser than the children of light." (Luke xvi: 8.) On the basis of Holy Writ as well as the constitutional rights of Christian parents, the education and training of their children is the duty and responsibility of the parents, and the Scriptures emphasize Christian education. "Ye fathers, bring up your children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord." (Ephesions v: 4.) We have only recently stated in these columns that parents cannot devolve this duty and responsibility upon the state or the church. Yet many Christian parents have yielded their God-given rights to the state by placing their children into the schools of the state, which can only educate and train children for this life and teach patriotism and loyalty to the Government. If an alert Senator warns against the Federal control of our public schools as an infringement on the rights of local self-government, why cannot Christian parents everywhere realize that the Christian training and education of their children is one of the few remaining bulwarks of Christianity against the surge of worldliness which threatens to overwhelm us?

In some instances Christian parents have, of course, no choice. If our congregations refuse to establish and maintain parochial schools to assist parents in the Christian training of their children—and in this light our parochial schools must be viewed, they shall assist the parents in their God-given duties—the parents have little choice and will, in some communities, be obliged to commit their children to the care of the state. Let the congregations everywhere come to the realization of their responsibilities.

The camel's nose is under the tent from our point of view also with reference to the expediency of accrediting our parochial schools. Such accreditation of our schools by the state may appear to be perfectly harmless and, indeed, an advantage. It does, however, yield to the state a prerogative to pass judgment on our Christian schools, our aims and ideals, to exercise supervision, and in a measure to dictate policies. The accreditation of some schools has not, it is true, resulted in the domination of these schools on the part of the state, but is this an argument for accreditation? Let us be on our guard against putting our schools under any yoke which might ultimately mean the forfeiture of Christian parental rights and responsibilities.

Some voices have also been heard advocating the financial support of our parochial schools from public funds. The argument is that our schools are saving the state thousands of dollars annually by educating our own children, and that we are entitled to a refund from the state. The argument, of course, again implies that the state and not the parent has the duty and responsibility to educate our youth. It has been answered.

A. P. V.

Just how secure are our Christian schools? We are not now thinking of the dangers that threaten them from within—the lack of interest and the apathy that our schools meet among the Christians themselves—but we are thinking here of the dangers that threaten the existence of our Christian schools from without.

Our schools have experienced much opposition. Repeated attempts have been made to kill them or make it impossible for them to exist by attempting to enact legislation that would sound the death knell of parochial schools. Granted that much of the antagonism was directed against the Catholic parochial schools, yet in its vice it would have snuffed out the life of our Lutheran day schools also. As early as 1888 legislation of this type was attempted in the city of Boston by the Committee of One Hundred—"inheritors of the faith"—who claimed as their purpose "to preserve our public schools and defend American institutions." This movement produced such legislation as the Edward's attendance bill in Illinois in 1889, the Pond bill, and the Bennet law in Wisconsin in 1889, the New York Compulsory Education Act of 1894, and subsequent legislation in other States.

Of these the famous Bennet law was a typical example. The Wisconsin Governor Hoard instigated the Bennet law when in his message to the State legislature he recommended that the county and State school superintendents be clothed with authority to inspect all schools and insist that only reading and writing in English be tolerated. On this the Pond bill was introduced and after ignominous defeat the Bennet law was enacted before the opposition could draw its breath. This law, however, was repealed by the next legislature under the pressure of a slashing defeat of the party that was responsible for the Bennet law and the election of those men who favored repeal. In the same year Illinois battled with a

similar situation when the Edwards law was enacted. In Minnesota they had the Stockwell and Knudsen bills and in South Dakota, New York, and many other States, the same unfriendly spirit toward our schools had to be met. And who could forget the general, Nation-wide, bitter antagonism against our Christian schools during the World War, beginning as early as 1915. It seemed then that the enemy had finally gained the upper hand. The moment was signally propitious to unleash their fury against the parochial schools, especially after America had entered the war. There were the councils of defense—county, State, and National—there was the general cry of "down with the slackers," and "One language for all Americans"—and that was the English language. But our schools survived those trying days and stand as a monument of God's grace today.

If God thinks so much of our Christian schools, ought we not, as a church, make a united and mighty effort to build, enlarge, and preserve them for the millions yet unborn called to inherit eternal salvation that they may see the works of the Lord and His wonders among the children of men? Verily it ought to break down every whit of opposition within the church and arraign everyone who calls himself a Christian on the side of our Christian schools to give to them every ounce of their support and loyalty.—W. J. S.

Good Neighbors at the Expense of American Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL HINSHAW

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 28, 1940

LETTERS FROM THE CALIFORNIA WALNUT GROWERS ASSOCIATION AND THE WALNUT CONTROL BOARD

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter from the California Walnut Growers' Asscciation asking that quota restrictions be placed upon the importation from Brazil of Brazil nuts, and a copy of a letter addressed to the Secretary of Agriculture by the walnut-control board:

CALIFORNIA WALNUT GROWERS ASSOCIATION,
Los Angeles, Calif., August 23, 1940.

Hon. CARL HINSHAW,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HINSHAW: May I refer to you for attention the attached copy of a letter sent to the Secretary of Agriculture by the walnut control board which represents 100 percent of the walnut industry of the Pacific coast. This letter gives rather complete data on the situation pertaining to the importation of Brazil nuts.

Briefly, the facts are that England usually imports more than half the Brazil-nut crop, the United States about 40 percent, and other countries 10 percent. Since the war England has embargoed Brazil-nut importations, forcing practically the entire crop on the American market at prices about half those usually prevalent (less than 5 cents per pound dried, delivered duty paid Atlantic and Pacific ports, for large washed Brazils, which is the highest quality).

This price is far less than the low current prices of domestically grown competing nuts such as pecans, filberts, walnuts, and almonds, and on the average less than half the cost of production, grading, and packing of these domestic nuts.

The threatened increased volume of imports of Brazil nuts at these sacrifice prices is certain to demoralize the market for the domestic-nut industries in which over $350,000,000 is invested by American farmers, and this excludes the large peanut industry which will also be adversely affected.

Brazil nuts are highly competitive with all the domestically grown nuts here mentioned.

The American nut industries are not asking our Government to prohibit Brazil-nut importations or to increase the already low duty which was cut in half by our reciprocal-trade treaty with Brazil.

We are simply asking that a quota equal to the average of the last 5 years' importations be invoked under the provisions of section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act and the Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended. These provisions authorize the President to restrict importations, not only when foreign commodities currently affect domestically produced crops adversely but also when such foreign commodities are "practically certain to be imported" in sufficient quantities as to threaten interference with the orderly marketing of the domestic production.

Certainly we have been modest and fair in not requesting an increase in the low duty or of restricting imports below normal.

The industry's application in this matter has been pending since last March, but so far no action has been taken by the authorities, who are apparently attempting to be a good neighbor at the expense of American farmers.

It would be deeply appreciated if you would aggressively wield the big stick with the Secretary of Agriculture. It might help to inform him that Congress does not pass these laws for the benefit of distressed agricultural industries just to have them ignored by our officials, and that immediate action is now demanded in this instance.

Whatever support you can conscientiously give us in this matter will be deeply appreciated.

Sincerely,

C. THORPE, *General Manager.*

WALNUT CONTROL BOARD,
Los Angeles, Calif., August 22, 1940.

Hon. HENRY A. WALLACE,
Secretary of Agriculture, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Under date of March 25 the walnut control board submitted an application for investigation and report relative to imports of Brazil nuts, the purpose of which was to invoke action under section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act and the Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, by imposing a quota on the importation of Brazil nuts that would confine the total importation to the average quantities imported during the past few years. The immediate occasion for the application was the fact that large quantities of Brazil nuts, normally shipped to England, which with the United States was the principal consuming market, were being practically embargoed by reason of severe restrictions imposed on their importation into the United Kingdom. It was feared that because of this condition excessive quantities of Brazil nuts would be dumped on the American market as the only outlet, to the great detriment of the growers of other edible nuts produced in the United States. This threat of increased imports of Brazil nuts continues in serious form and we again urge action pursuant to section 22 that will close the door to excessive imports before it is too late.

Of the total quantity of unshelled Brazil nuts exported in recent years, the United Kingdom has taken a large share and the United States has received most of the balance. For the 7-year period ending with 1936, the percentage was United Kingdom 59 percent, United States 30 percent, other countries 11 percent. We are unable to locate these figures for later years, but imports of unshelled Brazil nuts into the United States have not shown any tendency toward substantial increase until the war conditions caused restrictions to be placed on export of Brazil nuts to the United Kingdom.

A table is attached showing imports of Brazil nuts received by the United States during the past 11 years. These figures are on the basis of the year from July 1 to June 30. The 5-year average of unshelled nuts for the years 1929–30 to 1933–34 was 18,510,000 pounds; the average for the succeeding 5 years, 1934–35 to 1938–39, was 18,656,000 pounds. The 10-year average was 18,584,000 pounds. For the year 1939–40, 22,852,000 pounds were imported, this being the largest importation on record except for the year 1935–36.

The importation of shelled Brazil nuts has shown a tendency to increase substantially. The 5-year average for the years 1929–30 to 1933–34 was 5,420,000 pounds; the average for the succeeding 5 years, 1934–35 to 1938–39, was 8,434,000 pounds. The imports for the year 1939–40 were 9,810,000 pounds.

The foregoing figures are on a basis of a year beginning July 1 and ending June 30. Imports during the calendar year, however, are more significant in measuring the competition with domestically produced nuts. Brazil nuts are harvested during the winter months in the jungles of the Amazon Valley and brought down the river and exported from the Amazon River ports. Exports of unshelled nuts begin to be received in the United States in March or April, and from then on they arrive in increasing quantities until November, after which the imports decline. The largest receipts generally come in September and October. Many of these imports as received are placed in bonded warehouses, and imports entered for consumption appear in largest quantities in September and October, just ahead of the marketing of the new walnut crop. Pecans, filberts, and almonds also come on the market about the same time.

Another table attached hereto shows the imports, by months, for the year 1939 and for the year 1940 through June, which is the latest month for which figures are available. It will be noted that in 1939 substantial imports of unshelled nuts began in April and continued to arrive in increasing quantities for May and June. This year there were only a few imports in March, none in April, very few in May, and substantial imports did not arrive until June. This variation from normal is undoubtedly to be explained by the fact that restrictions on imports into the United Kingdom were lifted during March and April. During this period a general license was issued authorizing anyone to import Brazil nuts into the United Kingdom. That license was revoked effective May 1, and since then importation of Brazil nuts into the United Kingdom has been practically prohibited. During the period in which the general license was in effect approximately 9,000,000 pounds of unshelled Brazil nuts were exported to the United Kingdom. It is evident that exporters were concentrating their attention on the British market while permission to enter Brazil nuts into the United Kingdom was available, and exports to the United States did not begin in substantial quantity until the British restriction was reimposed. Something over 2,000,000 pounds were received in the United States in June, these evidently being shipped in May after the British general license was revoked. The American consulate at Para reported under date of May 9, 1940, that approximately 2,240,000 pounds of unshelled Brazil nuts sold to British buyers had not been

shipped before the general license was revoked. (See May 31 issue of Food Stuffs, at p. 8.)

For the foregoing reasons, the fact that imports of unshelled Brazil nuts to date have been relatively light is by no means indicative that the danger of excessive quantities of Brazil-nut imports does not exist. The American consulate report above cited indicated that as of May 9 exporters were contemplating the shipment of 30,000,000 pounds of unshelled Brazil nuts into the United States and Canada in 1940. Canada takes relatively small quantities. This would mean, therefore, that the United States is expected to take from 28,000,000 to 30,000,000 pounds in the current year, as compared with the 10-year average of 18,500,000 pounds and the previous record importation of less than 23,500,000 pounds.

Exports of unshelled Brazil nuts for the United States declared, as reported by the American Consulate at Para were 6,000,000 pounds for June and 3,700,000 pounds for July, a total of nearly 10,000,000 pounds for 2 months. This considerably exceeds imports of any 2 months of previous years (actual imports as distinguished from imports entered for consumption). If this increased rate of exports to the United States continues, and there seems to be no reason for believing otherwise as the British market is now completely closed, the total imports into the United States for the current year are almost certain to exceed any previous year and may well equal the estimate of 30,000,000 pounds forecast by the American Consulate report of May 9, above cited.

Shelled Brazil nuts are imported throughout the year, the largest quantities arriving in the fall and early winter months, but substantial quantities are received each month. The British market takes very few of the shelled nuts; most of the exports of shelled Brazil nuts go to the United States. However, the closing of the British market to unshelled nuts is resulting in an increased production of the shelled nuts in Brazil and consequent increase in the importations to the United States. The export of shelled nuts prior to May was unquestionably held down by the fact that the British market was open to imports of Brazil nuts until May 1, as mentioned above. However, for May and June imports of shelled Brazil nuts into the United States had exceeded the corresponding months of last year by more than double. Total imports of shelled Brazils received in May and June 1939 were 1,019,777 pounds, for the same 2 months of 1940 the total was 2,315,568. Exports of shelled nuts declared for June, which will probably arrive in July, are 1,300,000 pounds and exports declared for July are 1,700,000, a total of 3,000,000 for these 2 months. For the months of July and August 1939, imports actually received were only 1,563,827 pounds, approximately half of what the declared exports indicate will be received in these 2 months of 1940. The total shelled Brazil nuts received for the first 6 months of 1940, together with the declared exports for June and July, amount to 6,815,000 pounds. If the present rate of increase over the previous year's imports is maintained, and there seems every reason to believe it will be, the total imports of shelled Brazils for the calendar year 1940 will be 15,000,000 pounds. This will be more than 5,000,000 pounds in excess of the total imports of shelled Brazil nuts received in the calendar year 1939. This is an increase of more than 50 percent over the preceding year. The average of the 5 years preceding June 30, 1939, was 8,434,000 pounds. The anticipated imports for the current calendar year exceeds this average by more than 6,500,000 pounds, an increase of over 75 percent.

Huge surpluses already exist in the domestic production of walnuts, peanuts, and pecans. Programs for alleviation of these burdensome surpluses have been in effect almost continuously for each of these three nuts during the past 7 years, and there is every reason to believe that the production of these nuts will continue to be substantially in excess of the consuming capacity of the American market. Almonds and filberts have also been increasing in production in recent years and are meeting with surplus problems. With these large surpluses of domestically produced nuts, the American market cannot absorb an additional 5,000,000 pounds of unshelled Brazil nuts and an additional 5,000,000 pounds of shelled Brazil nuts, increases of 25 and 75 percent, respectively, over the importations to which the market has been accustomed in recent years, without greatly adding to the distress of producers of American nuts and particularly walnuts, peanuts, pecans, filberts, and almonds.

With the closing of the British market to Brazil nuts, prices of brazils dropped drastically and purchases have been made at the lowest figures for the past several years. Prices at the Brazil ports have gone as low as 1¼ cents per pound and most of the nuts purchased for export to the United States have been bought within a range of 1¼ to 2 cents per pound. While present prices at the Brazilian ports have firmed upward slightly, most of the purchases of nuts that will be imported during the current calendar year have already been made. The transportation rate from Para, Brazil, the principal port of export, to New York, is $1.10 per 100 pounds—out of which a rebate of 20 cents per 100 pounds is made to an advertising fund to promote distribution of Brazil nuts in the United States. There is some shrinkage in transit, estimated at 15 percent. Cost of warehousing and handling, however, are slight, and the import duty is only ¾ cent per pound. These prices in costs permit importers of Brazil nuts to bring them in, duty paid, at a total cost of less than 5 cents per pound, which is about half the normal landed cost.

With these exceedingly low costs and the enormous increases in importations that may reasonably be anticipated, the effect upon the price structure for domestically produced nuts when the new crops are marketed during the fall and winter months, will be exceedingly serious.

Prices of all domestically produced nuts have been considerably below parity for the past 7 years or more. Walnuts, since 1933 have averaged less than 60 percent of parity.

If these increased imports materialize as threatened, they will arrive certainly in the fall months. After they begin to arrive, there will be insufficient time within which to take action to protect the domestic nut growers. The amendment of January 25, 1940, to section 22 was designed to take care of a situation of this character. That amendment provides that when foreign shipments are practically certain to be imported in sufficient quantities to threaten interference with the orderly marketing of the domestic production, executive action may be taken to limit the quantity of imports. We are asking only for a limitation equal to the average quantity of the past few years; we are not seeking any limitation that will reduce the quantity of Brazil nuts which the American market has been accustomed to absorb in recent years. Our request is prompted largely by the conditions resulting from the war which have caused the closing of the British market to Brazil nuts and as that was the principal market other than the United States, the exports that would normally go to the United Kingdom are practically certain to be diverted to the United States.

For the foregoing reasons it is respectfully urged that your office take immediate action to bring about the establishment of a quota on both shelled and unshelled Brazil nuts which will limit their importation to an amount not exceeding the average imports of the past few years. This application was first formally presented on March 25, 1940, and has been pending in the Department of Agriculture since that date. The statute requires an investigation and report by the Tariff Commission before executive action can be taken. Such an investigation will not be instituted by the Tariff Commission without recommendation therefor by the Department of Agriculture through the President. This required procedure all takes considerable time. Therefore, if the nut growers of this country are to receive, in time to be of any value, the protection to which they are clearly entitled under the provision of section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act and the Agricultural Marketing Agreements Act of 1937, the necessary action to cause the institution of an investigation by the Tariff Commission must be taken at an early date.

Respectfully submitted.

WALNUT CONTROL BOARD,
W. E. GOODSPEED, *Secretary.*

Brazil nuts—imports

(By years, July/June basis)

July/June	Shelled	Unshelled
	Pounds	*Pounds*
1929–30	4,090,000	19,080,000
1930–31	3,174,000	22,730,000
1931–32	7,518,000	16,486,000
1932–33	5,296,000	17,462,000
1933–34	7,020,000	16,794,000
5-year average	5,420,000	18,510,000
1934–35	7,994,000	16,920,000
1935–36	10,150,000	23,386,000
1936–37	8,736,000	19,690,000
1937–38	6,526,000	12,698,000
1938–39	8,760,000	20,586,000
5-year average	8,434,000	18,656,000
10-year average	7,926,000	18,584,000
1939–40	9,810,000	22,852,000

	For consumption		Actual imports	
	Shelled	Unshelled	Shelled	Unshelled
1939:				
January	1,036,266		937,794	
February	653,538		545,694	
March	507,870	42,000	420,761	
April	478,370	2,050	500,019	1,241,470
May	405,604	148,000	391,721	2,273,670
June	415,711	265,920	628,056	4,508,340
6 months	3,497,359	457,970	3,424,045	8,023,480
July	461,340	541,473	634,952	3,336,470
August	607,035	920,437	928,875	2,566,429
September	1,228,984	6,234,696	638,889	3,512,593
October	1,492,916	11,108,273	1,411,184	4,958,892
November	1,337,480	2,652,733	1,303,989	1,243,955
December	1,026,210	932,921	959,217	366,600
Year	9,651,324	22,848,503	9,301,151	24,008,419
1940:				
January	696,785		781,230	
February	243,163	280,360	137,478	
March	237,088	5,230	123,898	109,400
April	529,494	22,000	457,092	
May	907,114	1,320	1,066,451	164,600
June	982,494	152,500	1,219,117	2,171,500
6 months	3,656,138	461,410	3,815,266	2,445,500

Source: Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce Statistics.

NEW YORK, *June 6, 1940.*

SUNSET NUT SHELLING CO.,
San Francisco, Calif.

GENTLEMEN: We offer for account of our principals in Brazil, subject to confirmation:

Brazil nuts in the shell: Jarys, at 2¾ cents per pound; large, washed Manaos, at 3 cents per pound; in bulk, cost and freight, Pacific coast ports for August shipment.

Shelled Brazil nuts: Mediums and midgets, at 10¾ cents per pound; chipped and pieces, at 9¾ cents per pound; cost and freight, Pacific coast ports, August to December shipment.

Trusting to be favored with your order, we remain,

Yours very truly,

A. E. RITTWAGEN.
F. V. RITTWAGEN.

The Bank of England and the Welfare of the British Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
JERRY VOORHIS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 28, 1940

ARTICLE FROM THE LOS ANGELES TIMES OF AUGUST 25, 1940

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, the following article, appearing in the Los Angeles Times for August 25, is too significant to require comment by me, except to say that the criticisms of the power of the Bank of England and of the debt-money system generally are exactly as true of our own privately owned Federal Reserve banks and our own debt-money system. It is impossible to exaggerate how very much it would mean to the United States if we corrected these things now instead of waiting until a real emergency overtakes us.

[From the Los Angeles Times of August 25, 1940]

INFLATION FEAR RISES IN LONDON—MOUNTING WAR COST SHOWS BUDGET TOO LOW; FINANCING METHODS HIT

LONDON, August 24.—Conclusive evidence of the expansion of the British war effort since the advent of the Winston Churchill government in May and Fuehrer Adolf Hitler's invasion of the Low Countries is provided by the national exchequer returns in recent months.

A comparison of recent monthly averages of the war expenditure with those of the early period of the war reveals some striking facts. War costs under the administration of former Prime Minister Neville Chamberlain were less than £50,000,000 weekly (about $200,000,000). A month after the Churchill ministry took over, the weekly war expenditure was stepped up to £60,100,000 (about $240,000,000), and in July reached £64,300,000 (about $257,200,000). The average for August to date, according to treasury figures, exceeds £70,000,000 weekly (about $280,000,000).

BUDGET OUTMODED

As a consequence of the sharp expansion in war spending Chancelor of the Exchequer Sir Kingsley Wood's budget, introduced less than a month ago, already is outmoded. According to financial critics, he repeated the error of his predecessor, Sir John Simon, in underestimating the financial effort needed for the war. If the war expenditure continues to average around £70,000,000 weekly until the end of the budget year, Wood's estimate of £3,467,000,000 (about $13,868,000,000) for the entire fiscal year will be exceeded by more than £100,000,000 (about $400,000,000), it is estimated.

The growing menace of inflation revised demands in financial quarters this week for another budget before the end of the fiscal year to bridge the gap between expenditures and revenues.

DEMAND FOR REVISION

The latest treasury statement shows Britain now has an excess of outlay over revenue of £843,617,000 (about $3,374,468,000), equivalent to a weekly deficit of £42,000,000 (about $168,000,000) for the 20 weeks since March 31.

The fact that the Government is resorting in a certain measure to inflationary finance to cover its huge deficit has given rise also to demands in Parliament for nationalization of banks and revision of the Bank of England charter.

Arguments stressing the "evil effects" of permitting a private concern to control Britain's finances, thus influencing both trading and production and even the foreign policy of this country, was developed in detail in the latest issue of the Weekly Review.

COMPLAINT MADE

This journal, basing its main article on a speech delivered in the House of Commons by P. C. Loftus, Conservative Party member of Parliament, during a debate on Kingsley Wood's supplementary budget, contended that ever since the capitulation of William III to the city money lenders the world has been increasingly financed with money issued by banks. This debt money, the writer explains, means the right to draw checks on a bank up to an agreed sum in return for securities up to the whole of this amount and additionally fixed annual payment of interest until the loan is redeemed.

"This interest," the Journal states, "is utterly disproportionate to the services done by the bank since the only expenses incurred by the latter are those of bookkeeping and administration."

POWER OVER COMMERCE

After pointing out the dangers of arming banks with selective power over commerce and production, the Journal charges the Bank of England was "the chief agent in financing the Prussian war machine, thus arming Germany against us."

It summarized a condemnation of the present system under four heads, as follows: (1) Irresponsibility of the agency by which debt money is created; (2) unjust distribution of such money; (3) the cramping effects of the gross overcharge of interest, and (4) the ultimate impossibility of finding means from the outside of continuing to pay tribute on loans that are unproductive or insufficiently productive of real wealth.

The transfer of the power of creating money from the banks to the Government, the article admits, would not necessarily cure the present evils but it would open the way to criticism being leveled against a responsible department and safeguard the country's foreign policy from men whose "knowledge of foreign affairs does not extend beyond an estimate of any nation's ability to pay."

CRITICISM IGNORED

The writer attaches significance to the fact that Government spokesmen in the House of Commons debate and the press generally ignored Loftus' criticisms. But he suggests that despite this a high-powered campaign in Parliament and elsewhere to induce the Government to curtail the Bank of England's privileges is under way, and he even traces the support for the changes advocated by Loftus to comments published by the authoritative and conservative London Times.

Draft Bill Opposed by Illinois Legion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAMILTON FISH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 28, 1940

ASSOCIATED PRESS DISPATCH

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following Associated Press dispatch, which was printed in today's issue of the Washington Evening Star:

DRAFT BILL OPPOSED BY ILLINOIS LEGION

(By the Associated Press)

DANVILLE, ILL., August 27.—A resolution approving current plans for the Nation's defense, including a two-ocean Navy and an adequate Army and air force, was adopted by the American Legion of Illinois today, but the delegates to the annual State convention rejected an amendment endorsing the Burke-Wadsworth conscription bill.

The amendment favoring the Burke-Wadsworth measure was voted down in a chorus of "noes."

Nazi-ism, Fascism, Communism, and Imperialism Are Foreign to Americanism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEWIS D. THILL
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 21, 1940

Mr. THILL. Mr. Speaker, the American way of life is not compatible with nazi-ism, fascism, communism, and imperialism. We fought British imperialism in the Revolutionary War. Our forefathers declared then that this was a land of liberty where freedom of speech, of the press, and of religion would be guaranteed. We see in Nazi Germany a denial of the freedom we Americans cherish. So, too, in

Fascist Italy and Communist Russia are the people enslaved by their Governments. I have on many occasions declared my opposition to nazi-ism, fascism, communism, and imperialism, and I do so now, because these forms of government are inimical to the spirit of free men and are foreign to our ideals and our mode of living.

So long as this Nation is not all-powerful, so long as we are not in a position to direct and control the affairs of the world, it is the better part of wisdom to "tend to our own knitting" and remedy conditions here at home, rather than to take part in wars throughout the world. We should prepare our own defenses so no aggressor or combination of aggressors dare attack us. If we develop a strong air force, an efficient mechanized army, and a powerful navy we need not fear attacks from overseas. We must set our own house in order by ferreting out "fifth columnists" and saboteurs who would wreck our country to further their diabolical schemes. If as Americans we do all in our power to promote our own welfare we shall preserve for posterity our heritage of liberty.

Shotgun Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 28, 1940

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, from a political independent publication, the Saturday Evening Post of August 31, 1940, comes the following editorial containing information which everyone should have:

Unity for the national defense is not the problem. Rarely if ever before in our history have people in that way been more united. On only the word of the President that the sums were needed, the Congress has made haste to write blank checks running now to ten billions; and the only serious criticism has been that the administration was not eager enough at the same time to lay on the taxes. Never for a moment was it necessary to sell an adequate defense program to the country; on the contrary, the country has demanded it and is willing to pay whatever it must cost.

Well, then, seeing that we have the money, the material resources, and the skill to prepare a power of defense equal to any power of aggression, and that we are united about it, what is the problem and why are there so many misgivings still?

The answer is implicit in the record; and it is the record we now offer, beginning not far back, nor touching in any way the controversy as to why we were unprepared, but only what has happened since terror of the "blitzkrieg" entered the American marrow.

May 16, 1940: Holland is conquered, Belgium is about to surrender, the doom of France is already felt, and the President reads his first extraordinary defense message to Congress. Events, he says, have made it necessary to reexamine our ideas of defense. For purposes of bombing, New England is only 6 hours from Greenland, Florida only 200 minutes from a base in the West Indies, or, if the aggressor were coming up from South America, there would be St. Louis, Kansas City, and Omaha only 2¼ hours from Tampico. Therefore he asks Congress for an addition of $1,182,000,000 to the Regular Army and Navy appropriations, half of this for the Army, a quarter of it for the Navy, and the rest for various works of industrial preparedness. He speaks of hemisphere defense and of 50,000 planes a year.

May 17 to May 21: Reactions to the President's message. Unless he has exaggerated the picture of danger, the extraordinary appropriation he asks for is a trifling sum, hardly more than the annual W. P. A. bill. His 50,000 planes alone would cost at least 5 times, maybe 10 times, that amount.

May 22: At a White House press conference the President says the labor laws shall not be relaxed for sake of the national defense, nor shall any of the New Deal's social gains be sacrificed.

May 25: Private Secretary Early issues a White House statement, saying the President is very anxious to avoid upsetting the American life.

May 26: The President delivers a fireside chat on the national defense. It is generally reassuring. Our defenses are not as weak as some people say they are; and, in any case, the Republican Party would be to blame if they were. His administration received from the Republican Party a shrunken Navy and a rundown Army. However, both have been very much strengthened. There is nothing in the present emergency, he says, "to justify a retreat from any of our social objectives * * * to justify making the workers of our Nation toil for longer hours."

May 28: At a White House press conference the President says there is no reason for the country to become "discomboomerated." Women will not have to give up their cosmetics or lipstick. "The whole idea was that the present troubled state of international affairs called for an outlay of about a billion and a quarter dollars over and above the two billion that was already being spent on the Naval and Military Establishments." (New York Times report.)

May 31: The President goes to Congress with his second extraordinary defense message. He asks that another billion be voted, part of it to be spent on a training program—training for the youth and training of skilled workmen for the national defense.

June 1: The Chief of Staff of the United States Army favors giving the President power to call out the National Guard, and it is understood that the War Department will ask Congress to authorize an increase of the Regular Army from 280,000 to 435,000 men.

June 4: The defense program is presumably complete. At a White House press conference the President says he sees no reason why Congress should continue to sit. "Sarcastically, he said the situation did not require Congress to remain in session, except for the laudable goal of delivering speeches." (New York Herald Tribune report.)

June 5 to June 15: Very wide popular protest against sending Congress home. Administration leaders in Congress are unable to put the idea of adjournment over.

June 22: The House of Representatives votes a two-ocean navy. It will cost four billions and take 6 years to build.

June 28: At a White House press conference the President indicates that he will be asking the Congress that wouldn't go home to vote three billions more for extraordinary defense.

July 4: The news from Washington is that the President is about to propose a supplemental defense program that will cost five billions more.

July 10: The President goes with his third extraordinary defense message to the Congress that would not adjourn. In this message he calls for "total defense." He says, "This Nation through sacrifice and work and unity proposes to remain free. * * * I believe that the people are willing to make any sacrifice." He asks for nearly five billion more, toward a two-ocean Navy, for an army of 1,200,000 men, and to provide equipment and facilities for an army of 2,000,000. Also, he endorses the idea of universal conscription.

We submit that no thoughtful person can examine this record without a sense of deep misgiving. It is too evident that the problem of extraordinary national defense has been attacked as the unemployment problem was, in a Harry Hopkins manner. First, vote a billion. Two billions. Hellzafire, let's lick this thing right. Two billions? Make it five and then we can do something.

What follows is very exciting and makes big headlines. The Army has never had as much money as it wanted. Now, suddenly, it is rich and can do everything it has ever wanted to do. Its goal is soaring. It goes from a streamlined army of 280,000 men to one of 435,000, and then to one of 2,000,000, for which conscription will be necessary. The Navy is in the same happy situation, all at once rich, with billions on the way. So now a two-ocean navy. That is sound and right. We should have had it long ago, at any cost. But it will take 6 years to build it. Therefore, it cannot be considered in relation to an emergency.

Is this an emergency or isn't it? If it is, and time is vital, a rational defense program would be sure to get the first things first. What are the first things? You cannot say what they are until you decide what you are going to defend and where the line is. No such decision has been made. We talk of hemisphere defense. We are in fact committed to it. But to make it good we should need many naval and air bases in Latin America. It would take years to get them by diplomatic persuasion and there is apparently no thought of taking them, by or without leave. What then?

An army of 2,000,000 men is not a very great army for a country of this size. But what are we going to do with it? Are we going to let the aggressor come ashore?

Suppose we should say that our first line of defense was one running from the tip of Greenland down our eastern coast, around the West Indies, through the Panama Canal Zone, around the Hawaiian Islands, and to Alaska. In one-third of the time it would take to build a two-ocean navy we could be so prepared to defend that line with the talons of an air force and the barracuda teeth of thousands of small torpedo motorboats that no aggressor from overseas could touch us. But who is to say that is the line? Or, let it be any other line, who shall say, "There it is, and now what shall we do to defend it?"

There is no line. There is no unified defense ministry. The President himself decides everything. It is apparent how his ideas evolve. They evolved from the abortive size of a little more than 1 billion for extraordinary defense, no "discomboomeration," and Congress go home, in May, to the magnitude of 10 billions, conscription and national sacrifice, in July. And still no line.

There is a National Advisory Defense Commission. It says the defense program is going well. Mr. Stettinius says it is. Mr. Knudsen says it is. But Mr. Stettinius is talking about raw materials and Mr. Knudsen is talking about the capacity of industry to produce what the Government calls for. They have nothing to do with the defense program until it is brought to them; their only responsibility is to translate it.

The truth is that there does not exist an intelligible defense policy. No such policy could exist or be conceived, until there was, first, a clear and hard foreign policy, and underlying that a positive economic policy.

What we are preparing, therefore, is a kind of shotgun defense. That means just to do everything we can think of, so that whatever

happens, give us time up to 6 years, we shall somehow be able to meet it. We shall probably waste billions on it. That is not the point. What we know is that the aggressor power against which we prepare has not that blunderbuss character.

It is but a soothsaying that parliamentary government must be inefficient. The President has been bringing that up. Dictatorship, he keeps saying, has the advantage of being able to move swiftly; what he calls the time lag is inherent in the democratic system.

But we have a record. During our exertions in World War I, by much trial and error, we arrived at a state of efficiency that was the marvel of the world. We saved that pattern. It is written in the textbooks of the War College. Efficiency, we command it. Efficiency, however, is the means to an end given. The trouble now is that we have no definite plan. And that is the fault of leadership.

If the foregoing statements are true, and of that be your own judge, then arises the question: If we as a Nation are riding a horse which is attempting to carry us across the seas into a foreign war, is it not time to change that horse for one whose paramount interest is at home?

A show-ring horse; one that can prance, has style; that can singlefoot, foxtrot, pace, gallop, and run; that is pleasing to the eye; may be all right at a horse show but if he has demonstrated that he is always breaking the harness, upsetting the cart carrying the load, when time of stress comes it is time to change to the sound, solid, reliable workhorse that has demonstrated his ability to haul the load over the roughest going.

Peacetime Conscription

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEE E. GEYER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 28, 1940

Mr. GEYER of California. Mr. Speaker, I have voted for every defense measure. I have always believed in strong national defense. Certainly, this Nation must have an army, a navy, and an air force so formidable that any aggressor will not dare to attack us. I do not believe that adopting a system of compulsory military service in peacetime is either necessary or desirable.

I have listened attentively to many of the arguments advanced by those favoring conscription. I have heard it said that the voluntary system of enlistment has failed. I have heard it said that compulsory military service is more democratic than the voluntary system of recruiting. I have heard it said that since we appropriated the money for guns and equipment it would be criminal waste not to provide the Nation with enough manpower to use those weapons. Finally I have heard advocates of conscription extol the character-building effects army discipline will have upon our young men.

I have listened to these arguments, but I have not been convinced, because I have found that they do not jibe with the facts. In the first place, the evidence shows that voluntry enlistment has not failed. In his testimony before the Senate Military Affairs Committee, General Marshall, Army Chief of Staff, said:

> In June we went ahead with enlisting the force without all the funds necessary, and had to be cautious until the appropriations bill was actually signed; but I think we secured 18,000 men in June. Our quota, which we assigned ourselves, was about 15,000 by the end of the month, and we reached 15,000 10 days before the end of the month. In other words, recruiting went ahead in good shape.

And now I quote the testimony of Rear Admiral Nimitz in regard to naval enlistments.

> We have today about 7,000 men on the waiting list waiting to go into training stations; about 2,500 of those are men whose papers have all been completed and they are just waiting the order to report.

Finally, I quote from ex-Secretary of War Woodring, a man who, above all others, should know whether the voluntary system of enlistment has failed:

> How any fair-minded Member of Congress could say that we have given the voluntary system of enlistment for the United States Army fair trial, and that it has broken down, and therefore we need compulsory military service, is beyond my understanding.

So much for the failure of voluntary enlistment. But what about that other claim by those favoring conscription, that compulsory military service is more democratic than the voluntary system of recruiting? If compulsion is the democratic way, why then do we not choose our carpenters by draft, or our lawyers, or our teachers, or even our Congressmen? Why do we not choose our unemployed by draft if the draft is the way of democracy? Why do we not have draft labor camps? Why do we not draft men and women for marriage if that is the way of democracy? Why do we not have compulsion in every phase of American life if the principle of conscription is democratic? Or do I hear voices saying that that would be regimentation, that that would be totalitarianism, that that would be Hitlerism? One thing is certain, it would not be democracy.

And now what of the argument advanced that since we have appropriated billions for arms and equipment, it would be a wasteful expenditure not to provide sufficient manpower to use those materials. Before the Senate Finance Committee on August 9, Mr. Knudsen, adviser on industrial production in connection with the defense program, stated that it would be 1942 before there would be available complete equipment for an army of 750,000 men.

In the Washington News of August 9, 1940, Secretary of War Stimson is reported as telling Congress that the War Department has been able to sign contracts for only 33 planes out of more than 4,000 provided for in the multibillion dollar defense program.

From a news item in the Washington Times-Herald for August 9, 1940, we learn of the training activities of the Two Hundred and Sixtieth Coast Artillery Regiment of the Washington National Guard and New York's Two Hundred and Twelfth Coast Artillery Regiment.

> Enemy aircraft, meanwhile theoretically wiped out the Two Hundred and Sixtieth Regiment because the unit was without ammunition. Afternoon maneuvers yesterday calling for fire with the unit's nine .50 caliber machine guns were called off because the 18,000 rounds of ammunition "on order" had failed to arrive.
>
> New York's Two Hundred and Twelfth Coast Artillery Regiment offered to lend the District guardsmen some shells so their guns would be placed in action, but this did not help because the New Yorkers could not spare the metallic links used in feeding the ammunition to the guns.
>
> The New Yorkers were having their troubles too. They had been supplied with old World War ammunition. Some of the shells were so badly cracked they were highly dangerous to handle and officers said they feared they would burst before they left the guns. Some of the shells would not even fit the guns.
>
> When the shells did fire they burst several thousand feet below their targets. Officers were bitter over the lack of equipment and the unsuitability of that which they had. A War Department investigation of the failure of ammunition to arrive on time is expected.

From this evidence and news-reel pictures showing our guardsmen using dummy wooden guns and stovepipe cannon, because they have no other weapons, it is apparent that there is not sufficient arms and equipment available even for the country's National Guard units, and yet there is talk of conscripting 2,000,000 men because we do not want to have arms and equipment lying idle. Well, do we want millions of recruits with no guns to man? Do we want millions of conscripts without proper hospital facilities? Without proper housing? Without sufficient shoes?

With the equipment ready for only 750,000 men by 1942, and our Regular Army and National Guard together totaling over 550,000, the cry that we must conscript men is in direct opposition to the facts. When more men are needed for the Army the voluntary system of recruiting will feed them into the service as rapidly as they can be efficiently handled, particularly if we make voluntary enlistment more attractive by shortening the term of enlistment to 1 year and raise Army pay until it is at least on a parity with the $30 paid to enrollees in the C. C. C.

Now let us examine the argument by the proponents of conscription that army life will be invaluable in the character-building of our youth. To assume that character can only

be built by the drill sergeant is to assume that the American mothers and the American fathers have failed in their responsibilities. It assumes too that the great American system of education has failed and that we are to repudiate the training methods of all the country's great educators who have spent years learning their profession.

What type of education is it that the Army offers as a substitute? Perhaps this statement of Capt. Marshall R. Diggs before the Senate Military Affairs Committee is an indication.

If we begin with the young men, there can be developed and encouraged the warrior temperament and disposition. This should be a first objective. It is rather a cold-blooded thing, without hate or fear, but with a desire to kill the enemy that is attempting to land on our soil, and to take his property, if he has any, with him in this country.

In conclusion, let me say again that I have always stood for a strong national defense, but in this Burke-Wadsworth bill, I see not only the attack on our first line of defense, the American way of living which abhors the thought of compulsion, but I also find that the bill has no relation to a proper defense program. Not only do we not have the equipment ready to train an army of 2,000,000 conscripts, but there is a question in the minds of many of us as to the advisability of such an unwieldly force.

The invasion of France showed us clearly that large numbers of conscripts were not the answer to an invader, but rather the emphasis should have been on small highly trained mechanized units besides a strong air force. In this time of crisis to break the training of our professional Army in the art of mechanized warfare by burdening them with the job of training raw recruits in the arts of drill seems to me to be a measure designed to weaken rather than strengthen our armed forces.

The Tax Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KNUTE HILL

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 28, 1940

STATEMENT BY EIGHT MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement with regard to the tax bill:

STATEMENT ON TAX BILL

We propose to do everything in our power to make the excess-profits tax bill a measure which will express the principle that the national-defense effort should not be used as an opportunity for enrichment by anybody.

We stand for and will attempt to have included in the bill a stiff rate in the upper brackets of excess profits. We do not believe 40 percent is enough.

We believe there should be an effective limit to the amount of excess-profits tax credit that can be claimed and will seek to amend the bill in this respect also, unless such a provision is included.

We shall not oppose the repeal of profit-limitation provisions of the Vinson-Trammell Act, we are ready to vote for reasonable amortization allowances to protect corporations which use their own money to construct additional plant, we are ready for the sake of speed to see the requirement for competitive bidding suspended. But after the whole manufacturing transaction has been completed, the goods delivered and paid for, and the profit realized then we believe no reasonable person can object to a tax program which will be in accord with the needs of this hour.

We further believe that now is the time when the Bone bill to tax the profit out of war should be brought before Congress. That bill, which would not become operative at all if we remain at peace but would really equalize sacrifice if we should be forced into war, was introduced 2 years ago into the Senate and House, 52 Senators and 7 Members of the House being joint authors.

Congress will be blind to its duty and to the actualities of these days and to the welfare of this country if Congress thinks, or permits itself to believe, that national defense can be developed solely through the building of equipment and the training of soldiers.

Congress now has its greatest national-defense problem before it—the problem of satisfying our people that this program of national defense is "of the people, for the people, and by the people," that it is fair to all; that its burdens shall be borne in accordance with ability to bear them and that first, last, and all the time, no one shall be encouraged or induced or permitted to bear the ignominy and the disgrace which must be accepted by those who would profit out of war.

Even the largest and finest army, navy, and air force in the world will not be adequate to defend America, unless the hope and faith of the people are kept strong and vigorous. Morale is more important than any other factor in a nation's strength. The morale of the American people will be high just to the extent that they know that Congress has not forgotten to work for economic justice at the same time it is planning for defense.

Above all things is it necessary that the Government of the United States in all of its branches should be free from dictation by any private special group. In our opinion, had a strong stand been taken in the beginning toward the demands of big business our defense materials would even now be in production in substantial volume. On the other hand, for Government to admit for a moment that private corporations are bigger than it is and that they are able to dictate without regard to the public interest the terms on which they will produce the materials of defense will be to deal the morale of our people a blow of the most serious character.

At a time like this we cannot afford to let anyone say they have the United States "over a barrel."

We regret to learn that many American corporations have declined to take Government orders until they could be assured of the most favorable terms for price, profit, and amortization, and of the lightest tax obtainable. We congratulate those who have gone vigorously ahead with such orders, and wish their number had been larger.

We voted 2 months ago for a tax bill broadening the income tax base and adding sharply to the tax burdens of the small taxpayers of the country. Those small taxpayers have shouldered this burden without complaint.

For well over a year now we have been advocating passage of an excess-profits tax bill—not so much as a revenue-producing measure but as a matter of simple justice, first to the people of the country who must bear the burdens of defense, second to the industries which cannot hope to share in the lucrative business of filling Government defense orders. We believe it is indefensible for anyone to make out of this national-defense crisis an opportunity to enrich himself and we know that it is of great importance to the morale of the people for them to be sure that no war millionaires are being created. Industry, of course, has a right to know as nearly as possible the situation which confronts it and we also recognize the necessity of sound amortization provisions in cases where industry actually risks its own money to provide facilities for defense production. We believe the really sound method of providing necessary additions to plants for emergency-defense demands is for the R. F. C. to build them, and for the Government to own them and lease them to those who can run them best. Nevertheless, we have listened to the arguments against profit limitation, against the requirement for competitive bidding and in favor of amortization provisions, and we understand the ground on which these concessions have been demanded. But we cannot understand or acquiesce in an insistence by industry upon low tax rates in an excess-profits tax, nor are we willing to see a bill passed containing great loopholes which will enable the very corporations who should pay most heavily to escape. We believe that every group in the Nation, including those with whom Government orders are to be placed, should be motivated to some degree at least by patriotism. It comes with poor grace indeed for these concessions to be demanded by the very people who insist most loudly on a balancing of the Federal Budget.

Unless some effective upper limit is placed on the amount of earnings in the past 4 years that can be counted as normal profits some of the largest corporations in the country will not pay any excess-profits taxes until their earnings exceed 20 percent or even 30 percent. This is clearly unjust and we will work for inclusion in the bill of a fair and reasonable limitation on the amount of excess-profits credit (normal profits) that can be claimed. Furthermore, we believe that in the upper brackets—say above 50 percent excess profits—the rates should be substantially more than 40 percent now proposed. We will try to amend the bill in this respect.

We hold that life is more important than property. And while we know that the American people stand ready to make any sacrifices that may be necessary in defense of their country we do not believe men, however humble, should be treated with less consideration than property, however mighty and however large.

The hope of America must be based upon unswerving adherence by the Congress to the principle of equality of sacrifice in proportion to ability to make sacrifice. We intend to work for as close an approach to exactly that principle as we can get.

We cannot but note an inconsistency between the drive to pass a conscription of manpower bill under pleas of desperate emergency and the readiness to yield to the demands of industry in order to induce its cooperation at a handsome profit in the defense effort. We are struck by the contrast between the refusal of many corporations to take Government defense contracts until every possible

risk has been removed and the insistence that the people of the country be selected to join the Army at $30 a month or even less than that. We can't help thinking about the risk that every soldier has to face.

The same emergency affects us all. Indeed, the more we have the more national defense should mean to us. If industry is to be induced with profits and amortization opportunities then recruits for the Army should be induced with higher pay, better opportunities for specialized training and better promotion schemes. If men are to be drafted on the basis of selective service, then a necessary amount of industrial plants should be similarly drafted to be available for full production of the material and weapons with which these men must defend themselves and the Nation. For we are told that modern weapons have been even more important than manpower in recent European campaigns.

We believe income and inheritance tax rates and rates in the higher brackets of the excess-profits tax should be sharply raised.

We believe the Bone bill to tax the profit out of war should be brought before the Congress now.

When these things are done it will go further in persuading the people that the emergency is real than all the oratory in the world can do. It is the American way of fair dealing for all, special privilege for none, that we are all ready to defend.

It is not our purpose to delay passage of important legislation for a single day. But we will work for inclusion in every bill of such provisions as we believe are a matter of simple justice to the American people.

FRANCK HAVENNER.
ED. IZAC.
KNUTE HILL.
JERRY VOORHIS.
JOHN M. COFFEE.
CHARLES H. LEAVY.
FRANK FRIES.
LEE E. GEYER.

Peacetime Conscription

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS E. GRAHAM
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 28, 1940

ADDRESS OF HON. CHARLES L. GERLACH, OF PENNSYLVANIA, BEFORE THE DOYLESTOWN PUBLIC FORUM IN THE COURTHOUSE AT DOYLESTOWN, PA., AUGUST 23, 1940

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address recently delivered by my colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GERLACH]:

Mr. Moderator, members of the chamber of commerce, members of the Doylestown Forum, Colonel King, citizens of Bucks County, a few weeks ago in my office in Washington I received a telephone message from the secretary of your chamber inviting me to appear here in this forum tonight. I was happy to accept this invitation, for I believe that the issue we are to discuss, that of peacetime conscription of our manpower, plays a very vital part in the state of our Nation today. At the outset, however, let me tell you that I will not be against a plan of conscription if the need for it is proven; but I am, first and foremost, interested in giving the volunteer system a fair and impartial trial for a period of from 60 to 90 days. I feel sure that everybody will agree with me that this is very fair.

I say to you that we should make the volunteer system as attractive as possible to the men of America. There should be a reduction of from 3 years to 1 year in the period of the enlistment, and there should be an increase in the monthly rate paid to the soldier. His pay is now $21 per month, and although the proposed conscription plan now increases this to $30, I believe that $40 would be more equitable. In comparison, the enlisted man in the Navy receives $21 for the first 4 months he is in the service, and then his pay is increased to $36. By the end of his first year in the Navy he is enabled to draw $54 a month. In the Army, however, the $21 a month figure is rarely increased within the first year unless the soldier attains some special rank, and General Marshall, Chief of Staff, has testified that many soldiers receive the $21 a month salary for an entire enlistment of 3 years. Even the young men in the C. C. C. camps are paid $30 a month. Surely no one can deny that, if an increased Army is so necessary to our national defense, then the men within that Army are of more worth to the Nation than the C. C. C. enrollees.

Many of the thousands of dollars that are being spent at this time to create the propaganda for peacetime conscription could better be spent to wage an effective campaign for volunteers. The hysteria and the fear of the people would be lessened; we would be engaging in a rational, not hysterial, plan; and we would have our desired Army strength within the 60- to 90-day period I have suggested.

Let me remind you that despite the fact that we have not given the volunteer system any publicity designed to encourage volunteers, despite the fact that we have not given that American system a fair chance, the Army volunteers in the past month of July totaled almost 32,000, a peacetime record. And bear in mind that these persons enlisted for 3 years and at $21 a month. From all over the country have come reports that Army quotas have been rapidly filled, and in many cases there remain huge waiting lists. Let us take for example the Fourth Corps Area, which comprises a large portion of our South. In the last week of July there were 2,033 voluntary enlistments in this area, a record-breaking total. And the average age of the volunteers was from 21 to 23. Why, therefore, does not the War Department allow larger quotas? If this was done, and the 8 other corps areas into which our Nation is sectioned maintained the same average as the Fourth Corps Area, we would have a total of approximately 75,000 volunteers per month, even at the 3-year, $21-per-month plan. No one can reasonably deny, in the face of this evidence, that a volunteer drive for 1-year enlistments, with increased pay, would bring the Army at least 150,000 volunteers a month, or 450,000 in 3 months, which is 50,000 more than the Burke-Wadsworth bill proposes to conscript in the same length of time.

This is but one example of the inconsistency of those who are attempting to urge this legislation upon our people. The truth of the matter is that the enlistment period for the Army need not be lowered to 1 year, for the law already allows enlistments for that length of time. Section 628, title 10, of the United States Code, specifically states that "original enlistments in the Regular Army shall be for a period of 1 or 3 years, at the option of the soldier." Under the law, then, volunteers may enlist for 1-year periods. A great many have tried, but the Army recruiting offices, deliberately flouting the law, have refused them. Major General Adams, The Adjutant General, recently advised one of my colleagues in the Congress that, "In recent years 1-year enlistments have not been encouraged since an efficient military force depends not only on the training of the individual soldier, but also, and to a greater degree, on the coordinated training of all combat units that make up the fighting force. The rapid turn-over and the short period of training that would result, should 1-year enlistments be general for the Regular Army of 370,000 men, would seriously hamper the development of efficient combat units in this component."

I admit there may be some logic to the reasoning of The Adjutant General; but if it is true of volunteers, is it not equally true of conscripts? The proposed conscription measure calls for 1-year service, with the idea of building an emergency force. Why, I ask, cou'd not these many volunteers who wanted to enlist for 1 year be accepted as an emergency force? It seems to me to be radically wrong not to accept an emergency or reserve force made up of 1-year volunteers while, at the same time, promoting a conscription plan to build such a force. The War Department, in this case, has been ignoring a law that has been bringing them volunteers while, at the same time, it has been advocating a compulsory draft that will bring the same volunteers into the Army.

The situation in the Navy is quite similar. There has been so much propaganda in our newspapers, over our radios, and all about us concerning the building of our Army that most of us have forgotten that the proposed conscription as set forth in the bill is for the land and the naval forces. As with the Army, the quotas for the Navy and for the marines are oversubscribed. The Navy has a waiting list numbering 7,000, from which it can take men as fast as new vessels are built for them to man. Furthermore, Navy recruits are coming in through voluntary enlistments at a rate of 25 percent more than the normal monthly quotas. There are more recruits than can be taken care of with available equipment, so the Navy, like the Army, is forced to send men home to await facilities for their care, paying them while they are at home. And Navy enlistments are for 6 years. Where, in the view of such figures, can we say that conscription is necessary?

General Reckord, of the National Guard, supplies the illuminating answer. "I cannot see why," he states, "it is necessary to register 12,000,000 men when less than 2,000,000 are needed. If you want my honest opinion, I think that by registering all of the men we will make all of the people of the Nation come to a realization of the world situation confronting us." And Henry Stimson, Secretary of War, adds: "Conscription is not necessary because of danger but only to impress upon the country the gravity of the world situation."

There you have the answer. Conscription is only necessary at this time because it is a good propaganda weapon for the war-minded administration to stampede the public into a militaristic state of mind, and then eventually get us into the European war.

High ranking Army officials, officers of the General Staff, who testified before the House Military Affairs Committee prior to the time when the administration advanced the hysteria with its endorsement of conscription, stated quite emphatically that if we had an army of 480,000 properly trained men, together with a two-ocean navy, all the nations of Europe combined could not

land one corps of troops on the American shore. The military experts of both Army and civilian life, who have been testifying on the Burke-Wadsworth bill, are in general accord with this view. The majority of them state that a Regular Army of between four and five hundred thousand would be sufficient for our defense in peacetime, provided the force was modernly and completely mechanized for land and air duties. The total force that would be needed, in their opinion, of all components of our armed force, would number 1,200,000 men. In view of this, let us look at the facts.

Today we have in the Regular Army, in round numbers, 265,000 men. We have in the National Guard another 225,000. The Officers Reserve Corps, the Regular Army Reserves and the enlisted Reserves total 157,700. Added together, we find that the Army of the United States now numbers 647,700 men. The voluntary enlistments that have been coming in, the quotas that have recently been filled, will bring the total of the Army of the United States to 757,700 soldiers within the next few weeks. Therefore, if the force the War Department feels necessary for our defense is 1,200,000, we actually need less than 450,000 men to reach that figure. The War Department states the figure will not be needed before January 1, 1941. Therefore, in the light of the figures I have previously stated, it seems to me that our volunteer system would provide the necessary soldiers in the remaining 4 months of this year, and there would be no need for the Congress to pass any conscription legislation.

Furthermore, it is well to remember that the Army figures are augmented by the Navy total of 170,000, plus 34,000 Marines and 14,800 Coast Guard men and officers.

Let us then ask the administration why it endorses the Burke-Wadsworth bill. The only war threat facing us at this time is that created by the President. I say to you that it is our task to stop this fear and expose the war propaganda of the interventionists who are trying to force us into the European war against the will of 95 percent of the American people. Let the American people ask the administration to take them into its confidence. Let them ask the President: "For Heaven's sake, if you have any secret information which causes your approval of the bill, please tell the people of this Nation."

I can remember a year or so ago when the late Senator Borah and the President were debating what was going to happen in Europe. The late Senator stated that he had information from reliable sources in Europe that there would be no war. The President answered that the Senator was wrong, for the President had under his personal charge 700 persons employed in the Foreign Service of our Government who were reporting to him daily the happenings in all the countries of the world and that he, therefore, knew much better than the Senator what would happen in Europe. I believe the President was correct and should have known under such conditions. Let me remind you also that whatever information he received, or receives, at any time, he keeps within the Executive and State Departments. He refuses to reveal it to the Military Affairs Committees of the Senate and of the House. He refuses to reveal it to the Naval or Foreign Affairs Committees of both Houses.

In this connection, a few weeks ago there was offered on the floor of the House a concurrent resolution by Representative ROGERS of Massachusetts which provided that any information received by the State Department and the President that was not compatible for public consumption, be turned over to the Senate and House Military Affairs Committees. When the vote was taken, this resolution was overwhelmingly defeated because the President convinced his rubber-stamp Congress that this all-important information furnished him daily by his foreign-service agents is only for his personal use, and that of a trusted few within the State Department.

I sincerely believe that all the committees of the Houses of Congress that are required to present sound legislation for the benefit of the American people should be given this information which he, and the State Department, refuses to give. I sincerely believe that the President's only reason for withholding such information is to further his own interventionist attitude and bring us to war through the fear and the hysteria so created. Otherwise, why are all the cards kept under the table, concealed from the duly elected representatives of the people; not to mention the people themselves?

We are not faced with any threat of war today except that which has been manufactured by the President and the warmongers with whom he deals. Some people will say, "Look at Holland, Denmark, Czechoslovakia, and Norway." They, fearful under the propaganda of the warmongers, say we should build our Army to great proportions in order to escape the fate that has befallen these countries. But the example does not fit us; we are not a small European nation situated close to a powerful dictatorship. So that, while the arming argument might fit such European nations, it does not fit us.

The condition that exists in Europe today does not exist here. Let me remind you that France has had a conscription law for more than a hundred years. Through this France built the largest standing army in the world up to the time the present war began a year ago. But her conscription, and her numbers, availed her nothing when the enemy, smaller in number, but armed with the latest mechanized devices, flame-throwing tanks, dive bombers, and other instruments of war against which no ill-equipped army could stand. Although France had the greatest infantrymen in the world, they could not stop the armor-plated instruments of war no matter how trained they were in infantry movements, nor how great they were in number.

Our great problem is, therefore, to supply the equipment of modern, mechanized instruments of war for the men we already have within our armed forces. William Knudsen, head of the Defense Commission, announced a few days ago that it would be 1942 before complete equipment for 1,200,000 men could be supplied. Why is it necessary to resort to peacetime conscription today if it will take 2 more years to provide the men with the necessary material? Why conscript men when the National Guard, now in its regular yearly training period, must train with broomsticks, pieces of iron pipe, and old trucks as make-believe tanks. If there is no equipment for proper service training in 1940 methods, why do we need a conscript force? General Marshall stated that the year's training of the proposed conscript army would consist of 3 months' rudimentary physical training, getting the men in shape; followed by a similar, in length, period of training in company formations. The balance of the year would be devoted to training in the use of great formations of troops. I say that we have seen how useless training in great formations of troops has been to France; let us not make the same error here. "Fifth columnists" did not defeat France; France lost because her soldiers could not withstand the onslaught of mechanized forces. Our need is thus exemplified: Not men for great troop formations, but mechanized material for our men.

If our need for men was so great, why has not the National Guard been quickly brought to its full strength? A high-ranking officer of the National Guard unit which comprises the Pennsylvania cities of Allentown, Easton, Bethlehem, Reading, Lancaster, Lebanon, and the surrounding territory, with headquarters in Allentown, has told me that prior to the start of the European war this unit numbered only 758 men. Since the war began the number has been increased to 1,178 men. But, said the officer, he could increase that number to 1,400, which is the peacetime strength of the unit, if the War Department gave him permission to do so, within 24 hours. And he could increase it to its full wartime strength of 1,800 men within a week to 10 days, if permission was granted him. With such being the case, where, I repeat, is there need for conscription?

Furthermore, the Congress has passed the National Guard bill, allowing the guard to be called for 1 year's training. The total number of men authorized to be called through this measure is 412,000, composed of the 252,000 National Guard officers and men and 116,000 other Reserves. Instead of calling them all out, however, the authorities have decided to call only 50,000. The remainder of the 412,000 are to stay "on order," like much of the military equipment we have today. If it is true, therefore, that we need 400,000 men in such haste, why not call the 412,000 partly trained men for whom authority has already been given? It is certainly not consistent to let this number remain uncalled while proposing to conscript 400,000 from another source.

Let us bear these facts in mind, and not let ourselves be fooled by the men who have been advocating compulsory military training for the past 20 years. Let us not be led into a system of militarism by the group of men who originated this bill in the Harvard Club in New York City this past May. They represent a group of interventionists who seek to foster upon our people the way of the dictatorships. Julius Adler, Grenville Clark, Kenneth Budd, Henry Stimson, now the Secretary of War, and Robert Patterson, now Assistant Secretary of War, were the ringleaders. These men have always been interventionists and internationalists. I can well remember when Stimson, as Secretary of State in the Hoover Cabinet, at the time when Japan invaded China, urged that the United States, Great Britain, and France, go to the aid of China to stop the Japanese. Since that time he has been continually approving the President's foreign policy, which certainly is not acceptable to many of us. And because of his sympathy with the warmongering tactics of the administration, he was added to the Cabinet.

These men have been spending enormous sums of money to falsely create hysteria in order that the conscription plan might become law. In their own words, they are propagandizing the people: "To arouse the citizenry to an appreciation of the grave dangers before us; to continue an adequate campaign of public education; to make articulate the large majority of the voters who believe in the adoption of compulsory military training now." Thus, through their plan, they hope to create enough war hysteria so that the next step will be the actual participation of our country solely for the sake of these internationalists and interventionists who have large investments in foreign lands.

They have captured the enthusiasm of the Army men who, despite the testimony before committees, are for the measure. Of course they are for it; it will make colonels out of captains, major generals out of colonels; and brigadier generals out of majors. They, too, are willing to take advantage of the fear and the hysteria which has swept over the country. And, as evidenced in their feelings toward the bill, these Army men realize that conscription will become a permanent part of our way of life.

The entire scheme, therefore, has nothing to do with this so-called emergency. To hide this fact they tell us that conscription is the only way, the American way, the democratic way to build an army because it will be imposed alike upon rich and poor. They would even hide behind the cloak of democracy to push conscription, unneeded, upon the American people. We have seen the nations that have adopted conscription. We have seen it is the way of the total-

itarian governments. If that is not evidence enough to silence those who claim conscription is the democratic way, let us take the statement of General Shedd, Assistant Chief of Staff, who said: "Under the voluntary system, you cannot pick out the unimportant man." The general, it seems, wants a plan of conscription which would allow him to pick out whoever seemed to him to be unimportant. Such a plan would most certainly be un-American and undemocratic. By this very statement against the voluntary system its democratic aspect is proven, for it shows that all types of men volunteer, and there is no reason to pick out for our Army only the "unimportant" man. Yet the newspapers and other sources favorable to conscription have been trying to impress upon the people that conscription is democratic and American because it takes all classes, rich and poor, important and unimportant. They have been unfairly criticizing the volunteer system, and doing their best to discourage it, while it should be encouraged. President Roosevelt last week showed conclusively that he did not favor the volunteer system when he told "college students and those who contemplate going to college" not to volunteer. This is the shameful procedure utilized to attain conscription.

Certainly we must be prepared to defend ourselves against any invasion. I favor a national defense built to its greatest possible strength in the least possible time. A part of that defense must be the willingness of every one of our 132,000,000 people to contribute to the national defense. That, however, is something very different than the conscription which means turning over to one man, the President, the power to compel free citizens to spend part of their lives in the Army. Paragraph (b), section 11, of the Burke-Wadsworth bill gives the President tremendous power for, as he controls the calling of the men, he is granted the additional objective that: "The provisions of this act shall be construed liberally to effect the purpose thereof, the spirit always controlling the letter, and any technical deficiencies therein shall be supplied by the reasonable intent of the act as a whole, in the light of national needs." Thus, this loosely drawn measure in fact gives the President the power to create an act of war, even though it is the Congress which must declare war. The President could send conscripts into Canada, Mexico, or across the sea because, "the spirit always controlling the letter," he may think this best "in the light of national needs."

This, to me, is virtual dictatorship. It is far from the democratic way. We have but to look across the Atlantic to see that such conscription is ennobled and glorified as the highest honor within the totalitarian countries. Where conscription is utilized to this great extent, there you have the complete stifling of democracy.

The measure goes further than this. I wonder if you who are here tonight realize that when the bill comes up in the House there will be an amendment proposed which will conscript the wealth of the Nation at the same time that it conscripts the manpower. This amendment provides that there shall be conscription of the wealth of the people in order to support the conscripted army. Incomes from $1,000 to $10,000 will be subjected to a conscript of 5 percent. Ten percent will be taken from incomes from $10,000 to $100,000. In this manner the scale is graduated until incomes of $100,000,000 or more will be required to pay 75 percent. Bonds will be issued by the Treasurer of the United States for all the money conscripted. These bonds will not be tax free, and will pay only 1-percent interest. In case of any person having difficulty in raising the cash necessary to pay his allotment, the Government will accept his personal note bearing 6-percent interest, secured by his personal property. Have those who have been spreading the propaganda in favor of conscription explained this? I sincerely doubt that they have, for they are interested, the administration is interested, only in seeing the measure passed.

Even this, to my judgment, is just the beginning, not only of a plan to regiment manpower and wealth, but of much more, for the administration has, in printed form, a plan that would regiment every man, woman, and child in this country. This plan, the industrial mobilization plan of 1939, was printed in March of 1939, months before the war started in Europe, and the administration awaits only the opportune time to put it into action. I say to you that this is further proof of the war-mindedness of the administration.

The Chief Executive not only endorsed the Burke-Wadsworth bill, but he went so far as to suggest, on June 18, the idea of compulsory service for all young men, and for all young women to aid in the program of national defense. And he replaced his former Secretary of War with the war-minded Henry Stimson. Harry Woodring, who preceded Stimson, was asked to resign because he refused to approve the sending of planes, mosquito boats, and destroyers to the Allies, in direct violation of international law; because he refused to approve of compulsory military training and of the President's foreign policy in general.

The speech made by William Bullitt, lately returned Ambassador to France, last week in Philadelphia gives further evidence of the high favor in which the administration holds its warmongers. No Ambassador, by rule of the State Department, may speak until the Department passes favorably upon the speech. The administration, therefore, approved the Bullitt speech, which was later characterized in the Senate of the United States as "very near to treason." Bullitt urged conscription, and not alone for our defense but in the hope that we might raise an army to send into the present conflict, for he is willing to sacrifice our blood and our men today. He attempted to lay the blame for our present state of defense upon the duly elected representatives of the people. He said: "We don't want any more politicians in Washington who are afraid of the next election and scared to ask us to make the sacrifices that we know are necessary to preserve our liberties." I want to say to you that such is an underhanded method of appealing to the emotions of the people, for if we followed the course suggested by Bullitt we would have no liberties left.

Let me say to you that the politicians in Washington, including the President of the United States, who has been continually playing politics with the question of our defense, are there because the contributions to campaign funds by such men as Mr. Bullitt and Mr. James Cromwell, who had to be recalled from Canada, helped put politicians there so that they might turn around and appoint such men as Bullitt to diplomatic posts in return for their contributions, even though they have neither training nor aptitude for foreign diplomatic service. These diplomats are not the chosen servants of the people, and so I ask, who are they to criticize? I speak not only for myself but for many of my colleagues in Washington, when I say that we are not afraid of the next election. We do not buy our positions; we are elected by the people, and it is the people whom we will serve. We will not be swayed by the propaganda of the warmongers and the interventionists whose voices and views have created the hysteria in the Nation today.

If there is blame to be placed, by Mr. Bullitt or anyone else, let them place the blame where it is due. The Congress of the United States has done its part. We have voted the administration over $7,000,000,000 within the past 7 years for the purchase of military and naval equipment. This year we have voted more than double that amount. And where, I ask you, is the equipment? As a matter of fact, we do not have enough material on hand to mechanize more than one division of our Army, and we should have at least 12 mechanized divisions. The War Department admits that men who have enlisted voluntarily the past few months and who have been assigned to Army posts have, due to lack of equipment, been ordered to remain at home until such time as there will be facilities ready to take care of them. And though we cannot equip volunteers they still insist on conscription.

Truthfully, the production of equipment for the Army has lagged far behind the voluntary enlistments. There are today more men available to the Regular Army and to the National Guard than can be equipped for some time to come. Because of this, because from the point of effective defense, an efficient, loyal, and highly trained army, highly mechanized, is many times more efficient than a sullen, ill-equipped, poorly trained army of three times the size, I say to you that conscription at this time would be a great waste of money and power.

Our immediate need, therefore, is not for men, but for planes, for tanks, for guns, for ships. They exist today chiefly "on order." One of the reasons for this is the sending of equipment to Great Britain as fast as it is completed within our country. While we agree with this to a certain extent, we should keep enough material here for the proper training of the men we intend to train. For this reason I say to you that the politicians of the administration are making a racket of conscription at this time. They seem more concerned with getting the names of from twelve to forty-two million people on a registration list, and their fingerprints on file with the F. B. I., than they are with providing modern equipment for the Army we do have. I feel sure that the American people will not forget this attempt by the administration to regiment them in the guise of a so-called emergency when it comes time to cast their ballots in November. We are tired of the useless waste of the people's money for purposes other than national defense; money which, due to the administration's political lust for power, has been spent, not for defense, but for the personal ambitions of one man's desire to keep himself in office.

These are the facts. I know that you are all familiar with my views on national defense. I have fought since I was elected a Member of Congress from this district for an adequate national defense. I believe this to be the greatest insurance for peace in America. I believe a national defense built to such a strength that all nations respect us will be our greatest assurance that we will keep war out of America and keep America out of war. But due to the conditions I have outlined I do not believe the conscription of our manpower is necessary. If we do need men, let us give the volunteer system a fair chance. It has proven adequate up to date. Let us, for a 90-day period, give it an impartial trial, properly publicized throughout the entire United States. Let us state the exact number of men we need, and I am sure that the necessary number will volunteer within the 90-day period. If it would fall short, then I would be happy to support the conscription of whatever number the Army needed. Meanwhile, let us not be fooled by the propaganda the metropolitan newspapers have been printing; let us think sanely; let us look at the program with common sense; let us remain cool, calm, and collected; and we will be able to build our defense to its greatest strength and assure for ourselves the peace we desire.

Let me offer, in conclusion, a more personal statement. Let me say that I have no sons, no near relatives, who would be drafted. I would not be conscripted. But if ever war should come to America, and if my services were necessary, I would willingly volunteer; and I would want to fight shoulder to shoulder, not with the so-termed "unimportant" men whom the advocates of conscription want to reach but with free men who serve gladly, willingly, to fight for the honor, the safety, and the perpetuation of our great Republic and its ideals.

I thank you.

The National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DAN R. McGEHEE
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 28, 1940

A DECLARATION TO PRESERVE OUR LIBERTY AND AMERICAN WAY OF LIFE BY THE REPRESENTATIVES OF THE AMERICAN LEGION, WORLD WAR VETERANS, AND CITIZENS OF MISSISSIPPI IN MASS MEETING ASSEMBLED AT JACKSON ON AUGUST 25, 1940

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including therein a resolution passed at a mass meeting of the American Legion, World War veterans, and citizens of Mississippi, held at Jackson, Miss., on August 25, 1940.

This resolution expresses the sentiment of a great majority of the people of my State and it gives me great pleasure to convey it to the membership of both branches of the Congress:

When in the course of tragic international events it becomes necessary for the only great democracy yet at peace to immediately rearm against the ruthlessness of Hitler and forces of revolutionary aggressors and to assume among the powers of the earth a military, naval, and air strength adequate to protect our country from invasion now or in the future, and when certain Members of Congress, by their indifference and complacency to an impending danger, procrastinate and delay the passage of legislation necessary to raise and procure an adequate army, matériel, and equipment, a decent self-respect and love of country compels us to action.

We hold these truths to be self-evident:

In 1 day, without a struggle, Hitler conquered Austria and its 30,000,000 people.

In 50 days he conquered and enslaved Luxembourg, Czechoslovakia, Norway, Holland, Belgium, and France.

Today he stands as the despot and tyrant over 250,000,000 people in Continental Europe.

Before the fogs come on October 1, his terrorism may destroy the British Isles.

He loathes American democracy. He may strike for our wealth and resources before we are prepared.

We also hold these further truths to be self-evident:

Our Congress, in lightning time, appropriated billions upon billions for defense. Money alone is not adequate defense. Since appropriating the tremendous sum, certain Members of Congress have resorted to politics and delayed 60 days discussing the selective draft bill. This is a longer time than it required Hitler to conquer all Europe.

Under the domination of Blum, the Socialist; Laval; Bonnet; and other politicians, France was paralyzed and blown into oblivion by the tremendous draft of Hitler's "blitzkrieg."

The appeasers, the Mosleys and the Nazis of the English Parliament, delayed rearmament of England until Germany gained supremacy in the air.

As a result, a future tourist viewing the ruins of Ancient Greece or Rome, in his travels, may "in the midst of a vast solitude, take his stand on a broken arch of London Bridge to sketch the ruins of St. Paul's."

Hitler talks and acts.

Congress talks and talks but doesn't act.

We agree with George Washington that an adequate Army cannot, and should not, be raised by the volunteer system.

The surest way to prevent Hitler and other world revolutionary aggressors from invading the Americas is to be adequately prepared at the very earliest moment with army, war materials, and equipment.

We, therefore, members of the American Legion and veterans of the World War, drafted under the Selective Service Act of 1917, and citizens from every section of Mississippi, demand that Congress bring to immediate vote and passage a selective service act to include men from the ages of 18 to 64, inclusive; that Congress immediately pass legislation that will compel the production of War materials and put our industries to work now.

That the national organization and State departments of the American Legion assume leadership to urge Congress to immediate action. We believe all Mississippi Members of the Congress favor the passage of the Selective Service Act. We challenge the Legionnaires and veterans of the World War in every State of the Union to let their voices be heard.

We declare our appreciation be expressed to Congress for liberal appropriations already made to cover, in part, the cost of national preparedness, for the enactment of legislation empowering the President to call into service the National Guard and Organized Reserves, and for such other legislation as has been enacted, designed to enable the executive branch of the National Government to make a start in the matter of the preparation of our national defense.

We deplore the dilatory tactics that savor of an effort to filibustering employed by sundry Members of the Congress, the effect of which tactics have been to delay action and to prevent the passage of legislation designed to properly and, in a democratic manner, provide adequate manpower for intensive military training.

We implore President Roosevelt and Hon. Wendell Willkie to arouse the constituents of their respective parties to urge immediate action.

We challenge every veteran and every State in the Union to follow Mississippi leadership, and recognizing that a free press is an essential bulwark of our democracy and one which, too, is now threatened by those nations in which no free press exists, we request the cooperation of the established press associations and the newspapers of the Nation in disseminating the report of this meeting, thereby aiding the cause of unity and action.

Let all Americans join us.

Some Defense Suggestions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VINCENT F. HARRINGTON
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 27, 1940

LETTER FROM MAYOR OF SIOUX CITY, IOWA

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include in the RECORD a letter addressed to me by Hon. David F. Loepp, mayor of Sioux City, Iowa. Mayor Loepp, in his capacity of chief executive of Sioux City, has had much experience. He is a veteran of the World War and served in France for many months. In conjunction with Capt. E. T. Munroe, of the Officers Reserve Corps, he has placed his recommendations and suggestions in the form of a letter to me, and I am pleased to call it to the attention of every Member of the House. The proposals are sound, logical, and workable.

The letter follows:

The Honorable VINCENT F. HARRINGTON,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I have observed that you have expressed opposition to the Burke-Wadsworth conscription bill which is now being debated in the Senate. I should be very reluctant to offer any suggestions or write any Members of the House or Senate regarding this but for some time Mr. E. T. Munroe, captain in the Field Artillery Reserve, and I have been discussing the various phases of it and after a good deal of deliberation, reluctantly decided to offer a few suggestions which we felt might be of some little benefit.

It seems apparent to me that there is a good deal of confusion in Washington on this subject and that although the administration would like to follow almost completely the suggestions of the Army and the Navy, the political situation is such that various elements enter into the matter, other than cold-blooded consideration of the facts.

Somehow, I feel that much of the comment that is issued from time to time, both for and against the bill, by persons generally, other than those in touch with it in Washington, shows that they do not appreciate what has been done and what can be done without going the full length of universal conscription. We, therefore, wish to call your attention to what would seem to us to be a reasonable method, short of conscription at this time, some of which is now being put into effect.

It seems to us that there is available to the authorities at this time for intensive training the following forces:

1. The Regular Army, 264,000.
2. The National Guard and Reserve officers, 351,300.

(We see nothing wrong with this bill in inducting into service at the present time the National Guard and Reserve officers.)

3. Civilian Conservation Corps, 250,000.

(That is about the number we understand are enrolled at this time.)

We feel the administration and Congress are in error in failing to require compulsory military training in these camps. I know the criticism is offered that this would be some type of discrimination

against these young men because as a rule they are from families on relief.

Captain Munroe has had charge of one of these camps and says that if they had military training, it would be possible to handle the camps more efficiently. I, personally, believe that these C. C. C. camps constitute one of the finest things which this administration has done. Through my experience and connection with relief problems it has long been quite clear that the class of persons who are not adequately protected by relief legislation are young and single men. Therefore, it would really be a favor to them to enlarge the enrollment in these camps so that more young men who are unable to find employment could be enrolled.

It does not seem to me that there is any discrimination in requiring military training of them, for the reason that they would not be under Federal oath. Neither would they be subject to call during peacetime. In other words, it would be similar to the training which is sometimes required of students attending land-grant universities.

4. Inasmuch as there seems to be so much objection to peacetime conscription, why not enact a law at this time calling for the conscription of all men between the ages of 21 and 31, or 45 if desired, and also granting power to the President to conscript, if necessary, and commandeer all necessary war industries to the extent that production in those necessary industries can be accomplished either with voluntary cooperation of the owner or with involuntary cooperation, this law to go into effect at the instance of the President only if war has been declared against the United States or war has been declared by the United States against a major power, or a state of war exists which constitutes a grave national emergency.

I know this proposition was considered to some extent, but it seems to me that the passage of such a law would meet with less objection than even the amendment proposed by the Senator from Wyoming; that it would greatly increase the voluntary enlistment; it would take away the stigma of peacetime conscription and no one could argue that compulsory training required of boys in the C. C. C. camp constitutes a discrimination, because it would then be obvious that all able-bodied men would be subject to call as soon as a national emergency arose. In fact, these boys would have an advantage, rather than a disadvantage, by having had the training.

Captain Munroe thinks my figures on the strength of our National Guard are low and also advises me that they have been conducting citizens military training camps in which were enrolled approximately 100,000 young men. This would mean that there are available at this time approximately 1,000,000 men for immediate intensive training. If one can believe the statements repeatedly contained in various reports emanating from Washington, there would be available all the men which our Army and Navy is equipped to train during the next 12 months. By that time we should know whether or not we will be involved in the current war.

Captain Munroe and I first discussed this matter because he was interested in organizing what one would describe as a home guard which would constitute largely ex-service men. It seems this has been done in the East. The idea there would be to encourage ex-service men and others to join in the organization which would train at home at regular intervals—say twice a week—so as to acquaint these men with modern weapons and modern methods of defense, the idea being that the Federal Government would perhaps extend a reasonable amount of support in the way of necessary equipment.

In regard to this matter Captain Munroe makes the following additional suggestions:

1. That the Mayor in each city would issue a proclamation calling for the organization, by volunteer method, of a home guard, special emphasis being placed upon the enlistment of American Legion members, Veterans of Foreign Wars and other ex-service men. The local posts would make excellent facilities to aid in accomplishing this.

2. At the first meeting of the home guard steps toward organizing the men into companies would be taken. Then at subsequent meetings the new drill regulations would be given. A minimum amount of time would be spent on these new drill regulations.

3. Organize the home guard into a motorized unit. There are sufficient automobiles in the United States to transport the entire population, if necessary, so why not utilize privately owned vehicles and make the home guard a modern up-to-date organization and thus get away from countless hours spent in nothing but squad movements' drill.

If the Government does not have sufficient guns to supply the home guard, then it is suggested that each individual bring whatever weapon he has in his possession and drill with it.

We suggest that the greater portion of the drill period be utilized by putting the men in their own automobiles and teaching them how to go from one place to another by map and then deploy near the theater of operation. We know from past experience that this type of modern home guard would appeal to the average cititzen to a greater extent than the constant squad drill. Such maneuvers and such training, of course, would have to take place proximate to the local communities involved and could take into consideration only the local situation and terrain.

The foregoing suggestions made by Captain Munroe and by me, jointly, are made with the idea of being entirely helpful and with no notion of finding fault with anyone.

A Declaration To Preserve Our Liberty and American Way of Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILL M. WHITTINGTON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 28, 1940

A DECLARATION TO PRESERVE OUR LIBERTY AND AMERICAN WAY OF LIFE, BY THE REPRESENTATIVES OF THE AMERICAN LEGION, WORLD WAR VETERANS, AND CITIZENS OF MISSISSIPPI IN MASS MEETING ASSEMBLED, IN JACKSON, MISS., ON AUGUST 25, 1940

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following Declaration adopted by representatives of the American Legion, World War veterans, and citizens of Mississippi, in mass meeting assembled in Jackson, Miss., on August 25, 1940, to wit:

When, in the course of tragic international events, it becomes necessary for the only great democracy yet at peace to immediately rearm against the ruthlessness of Hitler and forces of revolutionary aggressors and to assume among the powers of the earth a military, naval, and air strength adequate to protect our country from invasion now or in the future, and when certain Members of Congress, by their indifference and complacency to an impending danger, procrastinate and delay the passage of legislation necessary to raise and procure an adequate army, material, and equipment, a decent self-respect and love of country compels us to action.

We hold these truths to be self-evident:

In 1 day, without a struggle, Hitler conquered Austria and its 30,000,000 people.

In 50 days he conquered and enslaved Luxembourg, Czechoslovakia, Norway, Holland, Belgium, and France.

Today he stands as the despot and tyrant over 250,000,000 people in Continental Europe.

Before the fogs come on October 1 his terrorism may destroy the British Isles.

He loathes American democracy. He may strike for our wealth and resources before we are prepared.

We also hold these further truths to be self-evident:

Our Congress, in lightning time, appropriated billions upon billions for defense. Money alone is not adequate defense. Since appropriating the tremendous sum, certain Members of Congress have resorted to politics and delayed 60 days discussing the selective-draft bill. This is a longer time than it required Hitler to conquer all Europe.

Under the domination of Blum, the Socialist; Laval, Bonnet, and other politicians, France was paralyzed and blown into oblivion by the tremendous draft of Hitler's "blitzkrieg."

The appeasers, the Mosleys and the Nazis of the English Parliament, delayed rearmament of England until Germany gained supremacy in the air.

As a result, a future tourist viewing the ruins of ancient Greece or Rome, in his travels, may "in the midst of a vast solitude, take his stand on a broken arch on London Bridge to sketch the ruins of St. Paul's."

Hitler talks and acts.

Congress talks and talks but doesn't act.

We agree with George Washington that an adequate army cannot and should not be raised by the volunteer system.

The surest way to prevent Hitler and other world revolutionary aggressors from invading the Americas is to be adequately prepared at the very earliest moment with Army, war materials, and equipment.

We, therefore, members of the American Legion and veterans of the World War, drafted under the Selective Service Act of 1917, and citizens from every section of Mississippi, demand that Congress bring to immediate vote and passage a selective service act to include men from the ages of 18 to 64, inclusive; that Congress immediately pass legislation that will compel the production of war materials and put our industries to work now.

That the national organization and State departments of the American Legion assume leadership to urge Congress to immediate action. We believe all Mississippi Members of the Congress favor the passage of the Selective Service Act. We challenge the Legionnaires and veterans of the World War in every State of the Union to let their voices be heard.

We declare our appreciation be expressed to Congress for liberal appropriations already made to cover, in part, the cost of national preparedness, for the enactment of legislation empowering the President to call into service the National Guard and Organized Reserves, and for such other legislation as has been enacted designed

to enable the executive branch of the National Government to make a start in the matter of the preparation of our national defense.

We deplore the dilatory tactics that savor of an effort at filibustering employed by sundry Members of the Congress, the effect of which tactics have been to delay action and to prevent the passage of legislation designed to properly and, in a democratic manner, provide adequate manpower for intensive military training.

We implore President Roosevelt and Hon. Wendell Willkie to arouse the constituents of their respective parties to urge immediate action.

We challenge every veteran and every State in the Union to follow Mississippi leadership, and recognizing that a free press is an essential bulwark of our democracy and one which, too, is now threatened by those nations in which no free press exists, we request the cooperation of the established press associations and the newspapers of the Nation in disseminating the report of this meeting, thereby aiding the cause of unity and action.

Let all Americans join us!

The Negro and the National-Preparedness Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR W. MITCHELL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 28, 1940

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, recently I have received a great many communications from distinguished representatives of the colored race in various parts of the country making inquiry of the present status and future plans for the use of colored units of the National Guard in the present preparedness program. I am deeply interested in this matter, for it is my contention that racial prejudice in the Army and in the Navy—in fact, in all branches of our national defense—should be wiped out, and should be wiped out immediately.

On August 16 I had a conference with the President at the White House, at which time I took this matter up with the President. He was deeply interested in the communications which I had received on this matter and, through General Watson, requested the Secretary of War to clarify the situation. On August 22 I received a letter from the White House, signed by General Watson, secretary to the President, explaining the changes which are now taking place and stating definitely that colored units will be officered by colored officers and will take their appropriate places in division and corps organizations and will not be grouped separately. The following is the letter which I received on this matter:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, August 22, 1940.

Hon. ARTHUR W. MITCHELL,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: The President has asked me to give you specific answers to the questions asked by Mr. Matthew W. Bullock in connection with certain Negro units.

The War Department hopes, with the consent of the States concerned, to convert a number of surplus infantry units of the Massachusetts, New York, New Jersey, Maryland, District of Columbia, Ohio, and Illinois National Guards to antiaircraft artillery, field artillery, and engineers. These changes are necessary because the National Guard has more infantry units than are required for divisional organizations, and they involve such famous units as the Seventh Regiment of New York, which has recently been converted from infantry to antiaircraft artillery. Specifically the Third Battalion, Seventy-seventh Infantry, will probably be converted, if the State authorities approve, to a battalion of engineers.

When existing infantry units of the National Guard are converted to units of another arm or service, their commissioned officers are transferred to the converted units. Any additional officers required for colored units so converted will be colored officers. In the National Guard it has always been the policy of the War Department that colored units be officered by colored officers.

The War Department has no plan for the organization of a combat division composed exclusively of Negro personnel either in the Regular Army or in the National Guard. Colored units will take their appropriate places in division and corps organizations and will not be grouped separately.

Very sincerely yours,

EDWIN M. WATSON,
Secretary to the President.

During the 6 years I have been in Congress I have worked diligently to place competent colored boys in the Military Academy at West Point and in the Naval Academy at Annapolis. In fact, out of the many appointments I have made of colored boys to the Military Academy at West Point, two are making good—one will graduate this year. I have made several appointments to Annapolis, but have not yet succeeded in securing a colored boy who could stand the tremendous gaff and race prejudice encountered at the academy.

I should like to state that in my effort to place boys in these two Government institutions I have had the wholehearted support of the President. No one could have done more to aid me in my effort than President Roosevelt has done. I am still hoping that I shall yet be able to find at least two colored boys who will go to Annapolis and make history by remaining at that school and graduating, regardless of the hardships they will be called upon to suffer. The fact that we have not succeeded in the past is no reason why we should not continue in our effort to break down these racial barriers. This is the best time to do it, while we have an administration in power that is absolutely fair to us.

Central and South America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 28 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

ARTICLE BY JOHN T. FLYNN

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article from the pen of Mr. John T. Flynn, in relation to Central and South America.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PLAIN ECONOMICS

(By John T. Flynn)

NEW YORK, August 24.—The House having passed a bill to provide half a billion dollars for loans to South America, we may now wonder what will be done with the money.

After all, while South America is in difficulty, her troubles are not due to the war. They are accentuated by the war. And if we want to help South America, instead of just making her a pawn in the war game of Europe, we should proceed with a good deal more deliberation and study than we are doing.

South America's troubles are political, cultural, and economic.

First of all, the country has been the prey for many years of political and military dictators. There has been very little real democracy. The Latin has not lent himself to the democratic processes as his northern neighbors have done.

For over a century, these dictators have been the old-fashioned type, mere adventurers. More recently, they have tended to the Fascist type, which is something else again, and grows out of the continent's economic difficulties.

One of the grave dangers in South America is that most of its countries will move over to the Fascist model. This does not mean that they will be under the dominion of Hitler. Monarchist countries have fought each other as savagely as they have fought democracies, and Fascist may fight Fascist.

The Fascist threat in South America is an internal and indigenous one. Indeed, a sort of fascism had appeared there long before Hitler was heard of.

The next difficulty in South America is cultural. There is little we can do about that save to recognize it. It grows out of racial and cultural roots and tolerates a large mass of uneducated and poverty-stricken peasants at the base of the social pyramid.

The third and gravest menace is economic. These are commodity countries. Many of them are in the kind of trouble Kansas would have been in if it were an independent nation and dependent wholly on its wheat crop. The economic stability of the South American nations is at the mercy of the fate of single commodities. As long as this is true, nothing can be done for them.

What they need is diversification. And as part of this they need, not merely a variety of crops, but some form of industrialization. They have got to learn to create a larger part of their income within their own borders, so that they will not be reduced to penury by shifts in foreign trade.

All these together make up a collection of profound social problems which call for statesmanship of a high order. But we rush in

with scarcely a moment's thought, prepared to save South America by lending her money to increase the surpluses which are already ruining her, and to increase the debt which burdens her.

Of course, Jesse Jones says this money will be used partly to help industrialize South America. But everybody knows that is just talk, that there are no plans for it, and that not more than a handful of dollars will find their way to that objective.

German Propaganda

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 28, 1940

LETTER FROM THE NONSECTARIAN LEAGUE FOR AMERICANISM

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter from the Non-Sectarian League for Americanism and an editorial which appeared in the official publication of the German World War Veterans' Organization of Chicago.

NON-SECTARIAN LEAGUE FOR AMERICANISM
National Headquarters, Chicago, Ill., August 22, 1940.

DEAR SIR: We are herewith enclosing reprint of an editorial, together with a word-for-word translation, that appeared in Der Frontkamerad, which is the official publication of the German World War Veterans' Organization of Chicago.

Mr. Ernst A. Ten Eicken, former president of the German World War Veterans' Organization of Chicago, was one of the organizers and the first president of the German-American National Alliance. Mr. Otto Schwarck, who is also a past president of the German World War Veterans' Organization of Chicago, is acting president of the German-American National Alliance.

This particular issue was published on the occasion of German Day, a celebration dating back many years; which, however, during the past several years, has been used for dissemination of German and pro-Hitler propaganda.

In the interest of Americanism, we believe that this sort of activity should be called to your attention and to that end are enclosing these copies.

We would appreciate your acknowledgment of the receipt of this and any comment you may care to make.

Sincerely yours,

W. F. CLARKE, *President.*

[Der Frontkamerad, German Day ed., Chicago, July 1940 Official publication of the German World War Veterans Organization, 1914–18]

WE GERMANS—TO ALL GERMANS

As a result of the latest events in Europe, each and every German feeling and thinking individual abroad, should have reached the conviction that it is truly a special honor and distinguished privilege for a man in this world to be permitted to identify himself as a member of this (German) nation. Whom, however, in view of these occurrences, his conscience has not led to his German heritage is a traitor to his own people and a coward and a double-crosser (Schuft—also hoodlum)!

Never has the world seen greater events, never has an army achieved mightier successes than the present German military might (Wehrmacht). In reverence every German should bow his head to such grand heroic courage and loyalty displayed on all fronts by the German men. We are forced to admire the willingness to sacrifice and the solidarity of a people with their soldiers, and this is our own people in our fatherland.

Only through the spirit (Geist) at home could that be accomplished at the front which holds us in admiration and respect today. With special reverence, however, we must look upon the guidance of the German Reich under the leadership of its first front-line soldier, the leader Adolf Hitler. If there are still Germans today who do not dare to speak this name (Hitler's) and defend him against all reproaches, it is either (because of) fear or selfishness. Such individuals are not worthy to be identified as Germans. These cowards should rather identify themselves as Englishmen, perhaps then they will feel better. Why, in all the world, fellow German-nationals (Volksgenossen) abroad, is it not permissible that particularly the German man (Deutscher Mensch) who may justly claim to be first among all the nations of the world in view of his cultural achievements can identify himself all the time voluntarily with his nationality (Volkstum)?

This question is answered just as speedily as it is put. Through petty disagreements and jealousies and partly through selfishness, the German abroad cannot and will not become united. If, for example, someone claims to be a better German, there is, on the other hand, again someone else who thinks he could and may not declare himself in accord with the existing conditions in the old homestead (Heimat).

What the devil—what kind of arrogant presumption and excuses are these if it should be our primary purpose to work in unison for the good of the old fatherland.

If, in the beginning I used the words "cowards" and "double-crossers," I hold these expressions to be absolutely justified, for, if a man has sunk so far as not to be willing to identify himself with his own nationality (Volkstum), then the best place for him is where silence reigns.

Germans awake, come finally to the clear-cut understanding (Einsicht) that we cannot exist abroad (wordly transl.: we cannot be abroad) without uniting all those belonging to our people (Volkstums). The sad truth that particularly the German needs this admonition shows to a frightening degree to what (low) level our nationals (Volkstum) abroad can sink.

Many a brave fighter abroad has died of a broken heart in striving for the unity of the German race (Deutschen Stammes) and many have recognized the hopelessness of his plans to create this unity and has withdrawn himself with his disappointments to a quiet corner of the world. You took their lives from them and are responsible for their disappointments. Do you really want to continue on this path? Do you want to persist in this unheard of lack of interest?

In view of the great occurrences in his old home country (Heimat), every German should have retained at least enough self-pride to say: "I am a German, I belong to this (German) nation. My nation was able to perform the greatest and most glorious achievements and successes in peace and in war; I dedicate myself to my nationality (Volkstum), I am a German (Deutscher Mensch)."

If again today, as every year abroad, we gather here to celebrate a German Day, it is now the time for a free and open confession of every German to his nationality (Volkstum). Let us celebrate this day in solemn, unswerving loyalty to our nationality (Volkstum), let us celebrate this day in complete unity and remember our old home (Heimat) where today our fellow nationals (Volksgenossen), our brothers and sisters are fighting in the struggle for their, our lives. Then we will first have grasped the significance of what it means to be celebrating as Germans a German Day; only then we will have declared ourselves to be belonging to our nationality (Volkstum). Then the Germandom (Deutschtum) abroad can hold its place and be able to do his share (Einstehen) for the fatherland and for his own good as well. But only then * * *.

This Changing World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NOAH M. MASON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 28, 1940

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, once upon a time the American workingman was dominated, controlled, coerced, by big business into voting as the bosses dictated under penalty of losing their jobs. Representatives of the "boss" stood at the polls and checked the votes of every workman to see that he voted right—or else. The revolt against this type of tyranny brought about the Australian-ballot reform in 1888 providing a secret ballot.

Then came the period when big business made generous contributions to the campaign funds of political parties or candidates in order to buy up or influence the election. This method of controlling elections became so prevalent and so brazen that the public again revolted, and as a result another election reform took place, and Corrupt Practice Acts were put into effect by the Federal Government and also by practically every State to prevent the buying of elections.

Today many Americans see a real danger to a free and uncontrolled ballot box in the money power of "big Government" rather than the money power of "big business." The Government's power to influence elections has increased in direct ratio to the increase in the number of employees on the Government pay roll, as well as in proportion to the increased billions the Government now hands out to voters in the shape of Federal subsidies, such as unemployment relief, farm benefits, and W. P. A. jobs.

Two years ago the country was shocked by the revelations of the Sheppard congressional investigating committee concerning the widespread use of W. P. A. millions to buy up that

election; to influence the voters in favor of certain administration favorites, such as Senator BARKLEY, of Kentucky; or to influence voters against certain Democratic Senators that were in the New Deal "dog house" because of their opposition to the Court-packing bill. The Hatch law was therefore passed, and later strengthened and expanded, to correct this situation and to prevent undue political pressure or control over elections by Government agencies or the spending of Government funds to influence elections.

Whether the Hatch law will correct the situation concerning big government and big-government subsidies unduly influencing the ballot box remains to be seen. Candidate Willkie has called attention to the fact that in the election years of 1934, 1936, 1938 the relief rolls were greatly increased during the summer months of June to October, while in the off-election years, 1935, 1937, 1939, the relief rolls dropped decidedly during the summer months of June to October. This up-and-down tendency in the number on Government relief as between election years and nonelection years is significant, to say the least. It is particularly significant and interesting to note that in this election year of 1940, in spite of Government figures that show private employment rolls have been absorbing thousands of the unemployed of the Nation, yet we are now experiencing a decided increase in the number being placed on the relief rolls, some 90,000 having been added in July of this year. Can we have clean elections, uncontrolled by either big business or big government? Can we divorce control over the ballot box by big government as we have divorced control over the ballot box by big business? The answer to this question is one of the chief issues of the coming campaign, and it will be settled by the voters on November 5. When the ballot box is controlled either by big business or by big government, then our democratic form of government is lost.

Slum Clearance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. KEAN
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 28, 1940

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, the legislation providing further funds for the United States Housing Authority seems to have bogged down, chiefly, in my opinion, owing to the form in which the legislation is written and the reluctance of the House to believe that the present law is the best way to handle the situation.

I believe that there is a majority in the House which feel as I do, that further Federal aid for slum clearance in some form is advisable; though I do not believe there is a majority in favor of extending the present rather extraordinary legislation.

In order that the continuance of the program be not unduly delayed, I have introduced a resolution providing that the Banking and Currency Committee of the House, or a subcommittee thereof, be authorized to study the progress that has been made under the present act, to recommend what further provisions we should make to continue the program, and to see, after carefully studying the matter, if we cannot write a bill which will have the support of all, except those few who are opposed to Federal aid for slum clearance on principle.

This committee should consult with men who have both practical and theoretical knowledge of housing problems and who thoroughly understand the financial commitments involved—men such as Gerard Swope, chairman of the New York Housing Authority, former chairman of the General Electric Co.; and Gerald Lambert, formerly president of the Gillette Safety Razor Co.; and other civic-minded citizens who have shown their interest in the housing program, with the hope that a bill may be worked out which will give the best housing possible at the lowest cost to the taxpayers.

There have been no hearings before the Banking and Currency Committee on the subject since any of the United States housing projects have been completed. The proposed committee should visit these completed houses, study the records of employment and health of those living there, where these people came from, what were their living conditions in the past, what rent they were paying; in fact, the whole social results of the experiment.

They should compare the completed housing projects with other buildings erected at somewhat comparable expense, both as to cost and the improvements provided.

The committee should study the fantastic plans for farm slum clearance and decide if there was any excuse for this proposal, other than a desire to gain votes in Congress for the rest of the bill.

They should carefully investigate the various local housing authorities and see that every dollar of the taxpayers' money which has been spent has been used to provide cheap housing for those supposed to be covered by the bill, and has not been used for political sinecures or any other purpose foreign to the announced purposes of the bill.

We have now a case history, and it seems ridiculous to attempt to legislate further large sums of money without knowing what have been the actual results of the hundreds of millions already spent.

Though it was suggested by certain members of the Banking and Currency Committee that hearings should be called this year, no hearings were held. Is there some hidden reason why the administration does not want to bring into the light the actual results of the present law?

It would seem that passage of my resolution would be the best way to insure that the program of slum clearance be continued in an efficient way as soon as is practicable.

The Wool-Labeling Bill, H. R. 944

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CAROLINE O'DAY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 28, 1940

Mrs. O'DAY. Mr. Speaker, women throughout the country are showing an increasing desire that Congress pass this wool-labeling bill—the New York City Federation of Women's Clubs, which includes in its membership and affiliated groups some 250,000 women, women in other sections of the State, and women as individuals, clubs, State federations, from practically every State are urging the passage of this legislation.

These women have a right to be heard. We must remember that women buy 85 percent of all consumer commodities and the welfare and comfort of their families depend on the wise use of this buying power. But the task of buying wisely for household uses is not as easily performed as it was in the days of our mothers and grandmothers. They had to know four fibers—silk, linen, cotton, wool. The laboratory researches are giving us day by day new fibers and mixtures, all valuable for certain uses but we need to know what they are and we have the right to know. The Supreme Court of the United States in an opinion written by the late Justice Cardozo in the Algoma Lumber case has stated:

> The public is entitled to get what it chooses, though the choice may be dictated by caprice, or by fashion, or perhaps by ignorance.

Through many centuries virgin wool has established a reputation as a warmth-giving fiber which has served the human race well—that is one reason why women question the

intent of those who talk so much about inferior virgin wool. We know there is some inferior virgin wool as there are spoiled apples or vegetables—but we do not believe this can be more than a small percentage of the new wool or why would "wool" have the reputation which it has. We were glad to learn that Dr. W. E. Emley, Chief of the Division of Organic and Fibrous Materials, National Bureau of Standards, at the hearing before the subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, House of Representatives, made the following statement:

Let me put it this way: When the fabric is new, I wouldn't expect to find very much difference in the thermal conductivity of the fabric whether made of virgin wool or reclaimed wool, other things being equal, of course. But I would expect that virgin wool would stand laundering better and the service conditions better. So I think it would retain its properties longer than a fabric made from reworked wool.

We believe this statement is one very good reason why this bill should be passed.

It is possible for a purchaser of wool products to examine the weave and to tell whether it is loose or coarse or fine or close and strong, and so forth, but no purchaser today can tell what is woven into a piece of cloth. That is why we need the legislation. Then a woman can work out what her budget will permit her to pay for a given article or piece of cloth and determine whether the use for which the article is intended justifies the cost of virgin wool or whether a wool product which is partly virgin wool and partly composed of reprocessed or reused wool or other fibers will be the best buy for the given purpose. This is surely within the rights assured to the public in the opinion from the Supreme Court.

We are impressed by the fact that the favorable report on the bill by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce followed lengthy hearings, which afforded all opponents and proponents the opportunity to present their arguments and also the consumers' viewpoint. We believe that the committee has acted wisely in suggesting that the legislation be amended to provide for three classes of wool and for restricting the unqualified use of the word "wool" to mean new, virgin wool. This provision for reprocessed and reused wool will overcome any unfairness which might accrue from classing new factory clippings or waste in manufacturing with the wool derived from the rags the ragman gathers. We can see, however, that there is no chance the reprocessed wool will be as valuable as the wool from which it is derived because of the picking to pieces, even at times bleaching, to which it must be subjected. Still this classification of reprocessed and reused wool which was made at the hearings by the American Retail Federation is valuable, and we are glad the committee embodied the recommendations of the Retail Federation in its report.

The report of the committee also sustains women in their conviction that the Federal Trade Commission can enforce this legislation, basing its action upon the manufacturers' manufacturing specifications and that the old smoke screen that laboratory analysis was necessary for enforcement has been blown away. As one prominent woman has pointed out, "We do not need to resort to a microscope to find what is in a cake; we read the recipe." The same practical procedure will apply in the case of a wool product; the manufacturer's specification will tell what is in the wool product.

It is also very encouraging to read in the hearings that the Federal Trade Commission will not require additional appropriations and personnel for the enforcement of the legislation, but on the contrary expects a large proportion of voluntary compliance which would result in diminution of the types of complaints now required to be handled by the Commission, and even goes so far as to state:

This legislation, if passed, will so clarify the situation in respect to destructive or harmful practices in the marketing of wool products as to simplify the administration of the laws relating to the transactions in interstate commerce, thereby making possible a more effective use of the Commission's present facilities and tending to effect savings in the administration and enforcement costs in relation to the protection afforded to the public.

In conclusion, there is every reason to expect that the passage of this legislation will promote good relations among industry, distributors, and consumers, and prove a substantial aid to women in meeting their responsibilities as purchasing agents for their homes.

Willkie and McNary Run Full Speed in Opposite Directions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WADE H. KITCHENS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 28, 1940

Mr. KITCHENS. Mr. Speaker, apparently the Republican nominee for Vice President, Senator McNARY, has accepted the advice which Secretary Ickes gave Mr. Willkie. In his acceptance speech the nominee for Vice President opened debate with his running mate. One of the clear-cut points of difference between Mr. Willkie and Senator McNARY appears to be the Democratic administration's reciprocal-trade program.

The following is one of Mr. Willkie's favorable statements on this program:

Now obviously it will not do for one great nation to become a free-trade country by itself. For the United States to erase its tariffs all at once would be ruinous to our people and many of our industries. The present Secretary of State, Cordell Hull, who is wise and temperate, realizes this. And so he adopted the reciprocal-trade agreements as a step toward increasing our foreign business gradually. Under this policy the United States takes up the problem of tariffs with each country separately; lists the products that it would like to export; studies a similar list submitted by the other country; and then a deal is arranged, each country making such concessions as it can, with the least possible harm and the most possible benefit to its own people. This agreement is then extended to apply to other countries too. What could be simpler or more in accord with common sense? What could be better qualified to benefit us, the people, as a whole? Of course, we have to make sacrifices. But the point is that, owing to the way the agreements are negotiated, the sacrifices are always, and should always be, less than the benefits gained. That is, we, the people, profit. (Source: Fortune Magazine, April 1940.)

The following is Senator McNARY's reply to Mr. Willkie which was given in the Senator's acceptance speech:

I have always opposed reciprocal-trade treaties, as formulated by the New Deal. When I spoke against their renewal last spring in the Senate, I charged that the treaties had failed to "dissipate, alleviate, or liquidate the uneconomic conditions" affecting agriculture. I hold to that opinion still. Moreover, as the war spreads the areas of closed trade, I gravely fear that the effects on agriculture may grow worse and we have no assurances that peace will restore foreign markets for our surpluses.

The Washington Post of August 28, although complimentary to other phases of Senator McNARY's acceptance speech, had the following to say regarding trade agreements:

Much less can be said for some of Mr. McNARY's specific proposals for the benefit of agriculture. It is futile to denounce reciprocal-trade agreements and to propose a two-price system for agriculture under present conditions. Neither the Senator nor anyone else can foresee what machinery the United States will need for the conduct of its foreign trade a few months or a few years hence. Decisions on such issues must necessarily be postponed until the conditions to be met are far less confused than they are today.

Mr. Speaker, one cannot be on both sides of a fence at one and the same time, one cannot ride two horses going in different directions at the same time. The consequences will be disastrous. We have that situation among the leaders of the Republican Party. The Courant, a Republican paper of Hartford, Conn., in an editorial gives some good advice:

THE HULL TRADE AGREEMENTS

Although Congress has voted to extend for another 3 years the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements with foreign countries "for the purpose of expanding foreign markets for the products of the United States," the question may be expected to play an important part in the Presidential campaign. The debate in the Senate exemplified anew the truth of what General Hancock said back in 1880, "The tariff question is a local question,"

by which he meant that different sections of the country had an unequal interest in the enactment of tariff laws.

Opponents of the trade agreements gave lip service to the principle of reciprocity, so eloquently espoused by McKinley in the speech that he delivered at the Buffalo Exposition in 1901—a speech in which he said, "We must not repose in fancied security that we can forever sell everything and buy little or nothing. * * * By sensible trade arrangements which will not interrupt our home production, we shall extend the outlets for our increasing surplus." But while upholding the reciprocity idea, the opponents of the Hull program did not conceal their fears of its possible effects on local tariff situations. We shall hear a great deal more about that from now on, particularly in the agricultural States, where reciprocity has never been a popular issue.

Before the Republicans get too steamed up over the prospect of gaining votes by attacking the trade agreements they would do well to recall what they had to say about the tariff in their platform of 1932. They then declared that in attempting to fix duties on thousands of commodities it was unavoidable that some of the rates should, even at the time of their enactment, be too low or too high. Therefore, they renewed their faith in the policy of a flexible tariff, "giving power to the President, after investigation of an impartial commission * * * to modify the rates named by the Congress." President Hoover's veto of a bill, sponsored by the Democrats, which would have transferred from the President to Congress the authority to put into effect the findings of the Tariff Commission was strongly commended. Approval of that bill, it was asserted, "would have returned tariff making to politics and destroyed the progress made during 10 years of effort to lift it out of logrolling methods."

The Hull trade agreements are in reality little more than the application to the Hawley-Smoot Tariff Act of 1930 of the flexible tariff provisions which gave the President, with the consent of the Tariff Commission, the power to increase or decrease existing rates of duty by not more than 50 percent. The present law provides that no agreement shall be concluded without prior consultation with the Tariff Commission and the Departments of State, Agriculture, and Commerce, and until an opportunity has been given to interested persons to present their views. This procedure appears to have been followed by Secretary Hull, although it may be questioned whether any great amount of attention has been given to the views of "interested persons." In the main the program offers a practical method of overcoming barriers to trade with a minimum of disturbance to domestic production, although under war conditions its effects cannot be fully appraised.

Twentieth Anniversary of the Proclamation of the Nineteenth Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CAROLINE O'DAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 28, 1940

Mrs. O'DAY. Mr. Speaker, this week marks the twentieth anniversary of the proclamation of the nineteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which guaranteed to women the right to vote.

Very appropriately, each Senator and Member of the House of Representatives found on his desk on Tuesday a letter from Mrs. William T. Gayle, Jr., of Atlanta, Ga., an active participant in the movement for suffrage reform. Enclosed with this letter was a very impressive statement signed by 100 prominent women in the poll-tax States. These women are leaders in community, social, and political activities. Their declaration calls attention to the fact that 20 years have passed since women were given the right to vote, but that countless thousands of women are still, in effect, disfranchised in those Southern States which require payment of a poll tax before voting.

According to the Department of Labor, there are more than 4,000,000 American women who are still denied the right of franchise due to the voting levy.

Among lower-income families the right to vote must be exercised at a heavy price. The payment of the poll tax takes a relatively large toll from a tightly budgeted income. In such cases it is rarely possible for more than one member of a family to exercise the right to vote. It is usually the man who is permitted that precious right—precious to these people because it must be bought with much sacrifice. When the poll tax was abolished in Louisiana the number of men voting increased from 260,000 to 335,000 in 1936, an increase of 25 percent. However, the women's vote jumped from 135,000 to 260,000, an increase of almost 100 percent. Note the difference—25 percent for men, 100 percent for the women.

National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 28 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

ARTICLE BY GEN. HUGH S. JOHNSON

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article by Hugh S. Johnson on the subject of our national defense.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ONE MAN'S OPINION

(By Hugh S. Johnson)

A month-by-month recounting of War Department testimony as to our military requirements before the congressional committees would make a ludicrous showing—and it would be most unfair.

It started with preparation for an Army of about 400,000 and now has reached a projection of 4,000,000. In comparison with the cold precision of Nazi military planning, it makes our General Staff look like a bunch of bush leaguers.

The answer to that is this: It is not the business of a general staff to plan policy. When these military estimates were first made, our Government was giving no attention to hemisphere defense and the great "safety belt" around the Americas or the conventions of Panama or Habana.

Step by step, in the rapidly expanding policy of intervention everywhere, our General Staff has been confronted with new and lightning-like changes in policy. There is this difference between the harnessing of Nazi foreign policy with Nazi military preparation—that Hitler planned nothing on foreign policy that his general staff hadn't been told to prepare in military strength and wasn't given time to prepare it. In our case, the whole surprising brainstorm shift in a constantly increasing foreign policy of threat and aggression has proceeded with no regard whatever to our military preparation to make it good and with no sufficient allowance of time and money to do so.

General Marshall's talk about an army of three to four million men was wholly based on a new diplomatic theory that we are to police every American country from the North Pole to Cape Horn. That theory is utterly fantastic and impossible. We can't afford it, couldn't do it, and have no business indulging in any such popular deceits and ludicrous international posturing.

It's about time that this Government settled down and decided exactly what its foreign policy is going to be, and, more precisely, as controlling that, exactly what policy it can enforce, without absurdity and possible disaster, within the realistic and reasonable limits of its present and immediately potential strength on land, sea, and in the air.

In that connection the immediate controlling nubbin is naval and political policy in the Pacific. As between our necessary defensive policy of remaining dominant on both American coasts as far south as Natal in Brazil and the addition to that of maintaining a threatening attitude in Asia, Indochina, and the East Indies, there is a difference of unestimated billions of dollars of expense and of comparative safety as contrasted with sprawling all over the map and constantly risking not only our prestige, but our peace and even our existence.

This is a question that has been scarcely even debated. For what stake, reason, or obligation are we becoming so insecure in the Atlantic because the bulk of our fleet is in the Pacific that Mr. Bullitt can tell our people that we are in as grave a danger of invasion as was France a year ago?

The foundation of that part of our policy should be brought promptly into discussion and threshed out to some understandable and defensible conclusion. There is no space to discuss it in this

short column—or in a dozen columns—and continued columnar discussion just doesn't click. But, in all this dazzling confusion of kaleidoscopic change and mountainous expansion of debt and taxes, there is no fundamental of more importance or more poignantly needing the immediate attention of the American people than just why and how we have to defend the status quo in Asia as well as in the Americas.

Tribute to the Adams Family of Colorado

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON
OF COLORADO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 29 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

ARTICLE BY ALVA A. SWAIN

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, may I have the unanimous consent of the Senate to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a splendid historical editorial by the popular Colorado columnist, Alva A. Swain, paying a well-deserved tribute to the Adams family, to which my distinguished colleague, Senator ADAMS, belongs?

This article delves into the Colorado history of this family and will be, I am sure, of especial interest to the Members of the Senate and other readers of the RECORD.

No family has made a greater contribution to the growth and development of my State than has the Adams family.

I am happy that I am joined in my opinion by many Washington observers that few Americans are serving their country more effectively than is Senator ADAMS. Good men, it seems, come from good sires.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNDER THE CAPITOL DOME—THE NAME IS ADAMS

(By Alva A. Swain)

The influence of the Adams family, long confined to this State, is now being felt in matters national.

Amid all of the world news that covers the front pages of the papers and that goes out over the air, there has come to be almost daily some mention of Senator ALVA B. ADAMS.

More than any other United States Senator has he, the last few weeks, been in front-page headlines and in national editorial discussion. His name has thus been used just because he has tried to protect the credit, as he sees it, of the Federal Government. He has stood for what he thinks is the best interests of the Nation and does not care whether it suits or does not suit a single individual on earth, just so long as his conscience is clear.

THE PEOPLE OF COLORADO KNOW WHY

The people of Colorado know the answer to the question why this position has been taken by the Senator. They know the background of the man. They know that the Adams family has had more influence on the development and the growth of this State politically than any other family that ever called it home.

There has not been a moment since the State was admitted into the Union that the Adams family was not at the forefront of its political destiny. They have been whipped, thrown out of office, been successful, been everything that can come to a family through the years, but they always come back and come back until today they have the honor of having been in the midst of every political campaign for the last 60 years.

Previous to now theirs has been a local mingling. They have not gone outside of the State to wield their influence, but have wielded it here. Now, Alva B. has started out to be a national figure. What his father, his uncles, and his cousins have been in the State, he now is being to the Nation. Naturally the folks back home wonder if he will succeed.

When he was campaigning 8 years ago his platform was, "I will do my best to be of service to Colorado."

When his Uncle Billy was campaigning for the legislature and the governorship he would say, "I will do my best." He left off the last six words of the platform of his nephew.

THERE WERE FOUR BROTHERS

Originally, there were four brothers in the Adams family. Alva was the eldest. John was second. Frank was third, and Billy was fourth. These were the four men who kept the name of Adams in the front line of leadership in this State for over a half century. Alva was Governor two times. Claimed he was elected the third term, but was unseated. That never hurt him one bit politically, because the people generally think he was cheated out of the office. He was the father of the present Senator ALVA B. ADAMS.

John never participated in Colorado politics to any great extent. At least his name was never mentioned in political matters. He moved to California and was a power out there.

Frank was the controlier of Denver politics for years. He never gave out an interview and never abused any one, but he had his hand on the situation as perhaps no other man ever had in Denver, unless it may have been Bob Speer. In controlling the Denver situation he was a power in State politics. He was often credited with being the best political man of the four, but that honor was generally given to Billy, who still lives at Alamosa.

Billy was in public office in the State over 50 years. He was never defeated, and held, in addition to local home county positions, the office of State representative, State senator, and Governor. His term of office in the three positions covered a continuous service to the State of 52 years. No man in the Nation ever held that type of a continuous record of service to the people.

The three brothers were fought, maligned, abused, supported, befriended, praised, and condemned all through the years that they were before the public, either as officeholders or as "back of the curtain controllers," but they never completely lost their magnetic hold on the people of this State.

Somehow the people had faith in the Adams family and they returned them to power and to prestige.

That is the background that Senator ALVA B. ADAMS carried with him when he started out to have an influence on national matters. And it is not without the facts to say that the majority, and a big majority, of the people of Colorado still have faith in the Adams family as he is representing it.

WHAT HE PROMISED TO DO

When he was nominated the first time he said he would do his best to represent the people of Colorado.

A short time after he started to serve in the Senate he came back to the State and delivered a talk before a gathering of Democratic Federal employees in which he intimated that they were not doing their work as they should. He said that an employee of the Government should do his best to earn his salary, and that if he was not going to do his best he had better get out of the service. Some of them thought it a good speech, but did not follow what he advised. Soon they were out of the service. The others found out that he meant it.

Later he made another address in Denver in which he said the Federal Government has scraped the bottom of the financial barrel in its expenditures and that he for one, was going to try to stop waste. In a still later address he declared that the Federal Treasury could not go on and on in its expenditures, without something snapping in a financial way.

When he refused to put out the recent $5,000,000,000 defense bill he was but fulfilling the promises he had made the people of the State in his many addresses.

He gets his thrift from his parents. His father vetoed and vetoed appropriation bills. The father kept the expenses of the State within its income and he did not increase taxation. His father used to say: "If you cannot afford another pair of shoes, have the old ones repaired and make them do a while longer." His Uncle Billy and his Uncle Frank were of the same nature. They used the pruning knife on appropriations whether they were public or private.

He is not in good standing with some of the members of his party who feel that the wishes of the President should be followed. But somehow the people who are on the street, the people who have known the Adams family for years and who know its traditions and its general worth to the State, the people who want taxes held down and the people who voted for Senator ADAMS are still back of him, and cherish the worth of the family which he represents has been to Colorado.

Foreign Policy of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ERNEST LUNDEEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 29 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

EDITORIALS FROM WALLACES' FARMER

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD several editorials from Wallaces' Farmer and relating to the foreign policy of the United States.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Wallaces' Farmer and Iowa Homestead of July 27, 1940]

WHAT KIND OF A WAR ARE WE IN FOR?—GET READY FOR ECONOMIC WAR—NOT LIKELY TO HAVE "SHOOTING WAR"

(By Clifford V. Gregory)

GET READY FOR ECONOMIC WAR—NOT LIKELY TO HAVE "SHOOTING WAR"

(Cliff Gregory, associate publisher of Wallaces' Farmer and Iowa Homestead, has recently returned from conferences at Washington with members of the National Defense Council. He is a member of the Agricultural Advisory Committee, named by Secretary Wallace, and the farmer director of the Chicago Federal Reserve Bank. Mr. Gregory's recommendations in this article are based on unusually thorough knowledge of the national and international situation)

The American people are scared for the first time since the British burned the National Capital in 1812; we are afraid of invasion from abroad.

In many cases, this wave of fear that has swept over the country amounts to panic. It is time to snap out of it, and replace hysteria with common sense.

Let's see if we can't winnow a few solid facts out of the chaos, and use them as a foundation on which to build a sensible policy to meet whatever may lie ahead.

We need to remember first that there are two kinds of war:

1. Shooting war.
2. Economic war.

Two kinds of preparedness are needed for these two kinds of war. Just now we are shoveling billions into preparedness for a shooting war, and doing almost nothing to prepare for an economic war. Yet it is the economic war, not the shooting war, that we need to fear most, and for which preparedness is most important.

If we get involved in a shooting war in the near future, it will be our own fault. There are two ways in which we may do it.

1. By sending our Navy and air force to help England.
2. By sending our armed forces to suppress Nazi uprisings in Latin America.

Hitler is not likely to attack this hemisphere, lurid magazine articles to the contrary notwithstanding.

Even if he were to invade the British Isles successfully, the British Navy might escape to Canada. Until the British Navy is destroyed or captured, Hitler cannot possibly attack the Western Hemisphere.

Even if the Nazis should capture or destroy the British Navy, the task of defeating our Navy and air force and landing an army on this continent is almost impossible. And to keep it from being thrown back into the ocean would be still more difficult.

Don't forget that Hitler is not a superman. His brilliant successes must necessarily hide many strains and stresses and weaknesses at home.

With the continent of Europe won, and with a tremendous job of economic consolidation ahead of him, he is not likely to be crazy enough to risk everything on the doubtful gamble of an invasion of the Americas.

There is nothing in North America that would make the gamble anywhere near worth the risk. There is nothing in South America that he cannot get more easily without fighting, if he can get it at all.

Hitler's war on the Americas will not be a shooting war. It will be an economic war. That is as certain as anything can be. Some of our money and our frenzied preparations ought to be diverted into preparedness for that economic war.

It is highly probable that the shooting war in Europe will be over this year and that it will leave us to face one of the two following situations:

1. A Nazi Europe wholly under German control. An undefeated British Empire. A negotiated peace that will recognize Germany's control of Europe and Britain's control of the seas.

2. A Nazi Europe, including the British Isles and a considerable part of the British and French and Dutch colonies, all under German control, with the British Navy either destroyed or captured.

Now, let's see what these two situations may mean to us. In either event we will have lost most of the European market for our farm products.

For 6 months or a year after the end of the war we shall probably sell large quantities of farm products to Europe, because the immediate need will be so great. After that, Europe's agriculture, organized efficiently by Germany, will produce enough so that imports will be small.

Germany plans to organize Europe and all other territory under its control into an economic and trade bloc, with all imports and exports under rigid German control. If American exporters or American nations try to deal with the Nazi trade bloc individually, they will be sunk. That will be true not only as to exports to the Nazi bloc but will also apply to exports to any other part of the world where we may meet Nazi competition.

The only way we can hope to retain any export business at all in the face of this economic war will be to organize a trade bloc of our own. Present talk about a pan-American export cartel, to handle all exports of agricultural products from this hemisphere through one agency, is a step in this direction.

If Britain is undefeated, the pressure of events will undoubtedly compel us to join with it in the formation of a Western Hemisphere-British Empire trade bloc. Such a bloc will be even more powerful than the Nazi trade bloc. It will not be as ruthless, for we have not learned that yet, but under such a set-up we might hope to trade with and compete with the Nazi trade bloc on something like equal terms.

If Britain is defeated and the British Navy lost, all that would be left to us for sure would be North America, with the hope that at least the northern part of South America might go along with us.

In that case, we could depend on little or nothing in the way of farm exports to the rest of the world. At the same time, industry would be upset by the loss of its export markets.

The task of adjusting industry and agriculture to the North American market would be difficult, but no more difficult and less expensive than the task of rearmament.

Let's look at it this way. Suppose an earthquake should submerge all the world except North America. Would we sit and wail that we were ruined? Or would we set to work to build up a sound prosperity in what was left of the world? The latter would be our choice, of course, and we should undoubtedly be successful.

We can be prosperous and peaceful and safe here in North America without any intercourse with the rest of the world. It is not what we would choose, but if the choice is forced upon us that is no reason why we should fold up.

The biggest task will be a readjustment of our thinking. We have been taught that the only way we can be prosperous is to ship a lot of our goods abroad. Whether we get paid for them or not doesn't seem to matter.

We haven't been getting paid, in the main, for over 20 years—not with anything of value to us. During the twenties we were paid with worthless notes. During the thirties we were paid with gold for which we had no use.

Do we have to be poor during the forties because we must work to produce for ourselves, instead of working for nothing to produce for someone else?

To believe that is silly. A lot of readjustments must be made, of course, especially in agriculture. If our production is to be used here at home, we will have to produce the things our people want.

And we will have to arrange matters so that all our people have an opportunity to earn and buy more of the things they want. But that ought to be better for us, not worse, than producing things for Europe without getting paid for them.

A tightly organized Europe under Nazi management will be more prosperous than it has been for a long time. Freer trade inside the continent, a smaller burden of armament, and efficient German organization will see to that.

The danger to our democracy is that while Europe's prosperity increases ours will decrease. That is the only thing that will sprout any sizeable Nazi movement in this country.

So it is highly important that we should plan for prosperity during the post-war years, no matter how changed the rules may be. More planning will be necessary—more regimentation, if you want to call it that. But we can make it democratic planning and democratic regimentation.

We must be thoroughly organized to win the economic war. We can't blunder through it. But our organization need not be of the Nazi type, nor need it interfere with such important liberties as freedom of speech and thought. It can be the kind of organization that will create much wider opportunities for the young people of America than they have had for the past 10 years.

Agriculture should begin its program of economic preparedness right now. What adjustments in production will we have to make to meet the new situation? What is the best way to make them? What can we do to cushion the adjustments, so that farm income will not drop during the transition period?

Facts should be compiled to answer these and many other questions. Those facts, and their practical application to the problem that confronts us, should be discussed at farm meetings this winter.

Agriculture is better organized than it has ever been before. Let us use that organization to prepare for the new kind of economic world into which we are moving. The future for agriculture and for our country is not black. It is just different. Surely, we have enough courage and ability to meet and conquer any new situation which may confront us.

[From Wallaces' Farmer of June 29, 1940]

KEEP COOL AND STUDY NEW WAR FACTS

The rapid changes that are taking place over in Europe are so important to the farmer of the Corn Belt that he cannot allow himself to be fooled about any of the new facts that are being made clear. Here are several points to remember:

1. The Nazis are not likely to invade the United States—at least, not for a long, long time. The reorganization of Europe, the Balkan states, the new African colonies, and the handling of Russia would take up the energies of the Nazis, even if the British were out of it.

It is to be remembered that it took a month for the Nazis to get 60,000 men into Norway. The 26 miles of water which lie between England and the Nazi Army is still a difficult barrier. Our 3,000

miles of Atlantic Ocean, plus our Navy, plus our air force, plus our Army, make invasion impossible from the military standpoint.

2. If we send our Navy over to help out the British, or if we remove the Neutrality Act and permit American ships to be sunk while trying to run the blockade, or if in any other way we let ourselves be pulled into war with the Nazis, we will run the risk of a long war, and possible defeat.

Is it safe for us to risk a war in the Atlantic while we are still on bad terms with Japan, in the Pacific? Let's remember what it means to us to get into a war in Europe. We'd be spending twenty billions a year for arms—over one-fourth of our present national income—and raising huge armies for service overseas. Picture all the difficulties involved in making Europe do what we want it to do. The war might drag on for 5 or 10 years. The same facts that make invasion of the United States difficult or impossible make our invasion of Europe difficult or impossible.

3. Even a policy of defense of the Americas, while less difficult than intervention in Europe, demands a tremendous increase in economic and military planning. We shall have to take over British and French islands in American waters. We shall have to work with South American governments to see that no Nazi foothold is won there. We shall have to make peace with Japan, and forget about fighting naval wars in Asiatic waters.

But in doing this we have two new advantages. The present war is being won by machines, not mass armies. The United States can build and man airplanes with a relatively small professional air force, can build and man tanks with a relatively small professional army. The bomber has made defense of the United States much easier than in the old days of purely naval defense.

These are the things to remember when bombs drop on British cities and when all our sympathies incline us to help the victims of a cruel war. Americans must think of their own children in estimating the situation and do what is best for their own Nation.

[From Wallaces' Farmer of August 10, 1940]

IF OUR RUBBER SUPPLIES ARE TO BE CUT OFF

It may turn out that the most important part of our preparedness program is the work of the Department of Agriculture in increasing rubber production in tropical South America. For some time now, the Department has been helping South American planters to develop better strains of rubber trees, to overcome diseases, and to get production in the south in shape to supply our needs.

Now, of course, we get most of our rubber from the East Indies. That is our worst military handicap. To assure ourselves of rubber supplies, the Roosevelt administration is taking long chances—in a naval way—by trying to bluff Japan out of the Dutch East Indies.

The problem of national defense would be much more simple if we could get our rubber from South America. One queer thing about this vital program was that Congress tried to cut out the agricultural appropriations for this work before the May offensive, and only put them back in the bill after the "total" war was on.

We need the friendship and the business of tropical South America if we are to be in a position to defend the Canal Zone effectively and if we are to abandon our outposts in Asia. The Department of Agriculture has done some excellent pioneer work in this field, but will have to work faster now.

[From Wallaces' Farmer of July 27, 1940]

CENSORSHIP HIDES VITAL WAR FACTS

Americans still do not know what is going on abroad. In spite of the admirable efforts of news and radio men to get the news to the American public, the censorship in warring nations makes it impossible to get the real news through.

That is what the collapse of France has proved. Before the surrender, very few persons here in America had any idea that the French Army was both underequipped and badly led; that the conservatives in politics were more willing to let the Nazis win than they were to risk their property in a last-ditch fight, and that millions of workers and farmers thought their share of the national income was too small to be worth fighting for.

All of these things were true, however, but the censorship kept the United States from learning about them.

What we heard instead was a lot about the battle of the "democracies against the dictators." Now we realize that this was far too simple an explanation. Partly, the war is the revolt of a young, growing empire against the domination of an old empire; partly, it is a social revolution, with the Nazis upsetting the old masters of society and putting a new crowd on top; partly, it is a conflict between a regimented dictatorship on one side and on the other the so-called democracies that were never quite willing to give democracy a real trial.

If Great Britain beats off Nazi attacks now, it will probably try to develop an alliance with Russia and possibly later with Italy, in an attempt to defeat a Nazi-controlled western Europe. We may see even stranger things than the recent sinking of French ships by British gunfire.

But it will continue to be hard to find out what is really going on. Censorship, plus the incredible complexity of European politics, will keep Americans guessing wrong half the time on who is on what side, and which nation is going to double-cross what other nation next.

A Tribute to the Isolationists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 29 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

EDITORIAL BY RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, on August 9 of this year the Oregon Labor Press printed an interesting editorial, entitled "A Tribute to the Isolationists," written by Richard L. Neuberger. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Oregon Labor Press of August 9, 1940]

A TRIBUTE TO THE ISOLATIONISTS

(By Richard L. Neuberger)

Last week the Oregonian printed a communication from an English Army officer bitterly denouncing the leaders of the isolationist movement in America. "Isolationist" is a much-abused word, but the men ordinarily referred to as isolationists are among the noblest and most useful individuals in the country.

Perhaps the most famous isolationist in the recent history of our Nation has been a man from the Pacific Northwest, the late William E. Borah. President Roosevelt referred to him this year as "a very great American." Borah devoted his life to tolerance, peace, and humanity. In 1931 he prophesied that there would be terrible trouble in Europe if something were not done about the Versailles Treaty, reparations, and the Polish Corridor.

Senator Borah will be remembered and respected long after his present detractors are forgotten. He has not been the only noted isolationist. What about the late Harry Lane, great wartime Senator from Oregon, grandson of the first Governor of the Oregon Territory, many times mayor of Portland, leader of the Democratic Party in this State? He was an isolationist, and in 1917 he had the courage to predict the World War would not make the world safe for democracy.

Senator CHARLES L. MCNARY, of whom both Democrats and Republicans in Oregon are rightly proud, was recently referred to by Alsop and Kintner as an isolationist. Senator HOMER T. BONE, of Washington, who has fought a long fight to retain the water-power sites of the Northwest for the people, is an isolationist. So is Senator D. WORTH CLARK, of Idaho, one of the most distinguished graduates in the annals of Portland University.

A leader of the isolationists in Congress is Senator BENNETT CHAMP CLARK, of Missouri, one of the first national commanders of the American Legion. He is the son of a noted isolationist, Champ Clark, great Democratic Speaker of the House of Representatives, who was another in 1917 not afraid to say that the World War would fail to end war.

Probably the most outstanding isolationist today is BURTON K. WHEELER, senior Senator from Montana. He emerged from the recent Democratic Convention a great figure, having won against overwhelming odds a battle to write into the platform a pledge not to send American soldiers overseas. Last week the Democratic voters of Montana gave Senator WHEELER a decisive 3-to-1 endorsement at the polls. For the past 20 years he has been in the forefront of nearly every struggle for liberty, security, and democracy. Who looms more available as the Democratic Party's standard-bearer in 1944?

This list of illustrious American isolationists—or, I should say, of men regarded in the public mind and the press as isolationists—could be continued indefinitely. Let me name a few: Senator Hiram Johnson, Senator Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., Senator Sheridan Downey, Senator David I. Walsh, Oswald Garrison Villard, Stuart Chase, John T. Flynn, Col. Charles Erskine Scott Wood, Senator Robert M. La Follette, Jr., John Chamberlain, Harry Elmer Barnes.

Among these men are Republicans and Democrats, critics of the New Deal and stanch supporters of the New Deal, conservatives and liberals. By and large they are men who believe that resort to force and blood and thunder should be the last, rather than the first, resort of the great American democracy in which we live. They are men who would rather get a man a job at a living wage, find him a home and security, than make any plans to involve our Nation in foreign war.

The greatest of all American isolationists once said, "I have ever deemed it fundamental for the United States never to take an active part in the quarrels of Europe. Their political interests

are entirely distinct from ours. Their mutual jealousies, their balance of power, their complicated alliances, their forms and principles of government, are all foreign to us. They are nations of eternal war."

The author of those words, which are the creed of many American isolationists, was a very great man. His name was Thomas Jefferson.

Army Enlistments, Fiscal Year 1940

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MALCOLM C. TARVER

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 29, 1940

TABULATION BY THE LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE SERVICE

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement:

[The Library of Congress, Legislative Reference Service]

Enlistments, State of residence as tabulated from enlistment papers, fiscal year 1940

State	Number of enlistments	Number of enlistments per 100,000 population (census, 1930)
Alabama	4,545	172
Arizona	642	149
Arkansas	2,532	137
California	5,695	100
Colorado	1,892	183
Connecticut	1,376	86
Delaware	205	89
District of Columbia	413	81
Florida	2,085	142
Georgia	5,906	203
Idaho	723	187
Illinois	6,794	89
Indiana	3,189	98
Iowa	1,994	80
Kansas	2,304	122
Kentucky	7,326	280
Louisiana	2,519	119
Maine	1,268	160
Maryland	1,501	92
Massachusetts	4,268	100
Michigan	3,310	69
Minnesota	1,762	68
Mississippi	2,338	116
Missouri	3,149	87
Montana	664	125
Nebraska	1,633	118
Nevada	236	[1] 262
New Hampshire	497	108
New Jersey	3,007	74
New Mexico	553	131
New York	11,092	88
North Carolina	6,220	196
North Dakota	585	86
Ohio	4,326	65
Oklahoma	5,512	230
Oregon	1,574	165
Pennsylvania	14,586	153
Rhode Island	745	109
South Carolina	3,121	180
South Dakota	724	100
Tennessee	4,502	153
Texas	14,670	252
Utah	536	105
Vermont	427	122
Virginia	4,280	176
Washington	2,183	139
West Virginia	3,598	209
Wisconsin	2,973	101
Wyoming	451	205
Hawaii	122	34
Panama Canal Zone	25	[1] 83
Philippines	57	4.7
Puerto Rico	382	241
United States Army posts	2,353	
Alaska	33	[1] 66
Total enlistments	159,403	
Average per 100,000		133

[1] Estimate given on basis of 100,000 population; in this case below that figure.

Source: U. S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census: Fifteenth Census of the United States, 1930, Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C., 1933.

The Milk Trust Is Now Endeavoring To Nominate a Candidate for Congress in the Thirty-second New York District—Whom the Lobbyists Cannot Control They Seek To Eliminate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS D. CULKIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 15, 1940

Mr. CULKIN. Mr. Speaker, the bane of the dairy farmer lies in his difficulty in getting free and open access to the markets. During my 12 years' service in the House I have fought vigorously in and out of season to take the marketing chains off the dairyman. In doing this I have incurred the complete hatred of the middleman and the distributors, who are destroying the north-country farmer. Today I wish to discuss the present situation of the dairyman, our past attempts to improve his desperate condition, and the procedure which I believe should be followed to free him from his present economic servitude.

Mr. Speaker, American dairying is a major agricultural industry, and its chief product, milk, is absolutely essential to the growth of the young and the welfare of the people. The cow is, in fact, the "foster mother of the human race." Twelve million people within these United States are dependent upon dairying for their livelihood, and there are approximately 4,000,000 dairy units in America. Much of the wealth that is created in my district comes from the sale of products of the dairy farms.

THE DAIRYMAN'S CONTRIBUTION

Let me say primarily that no man in agriculture is performing a more important national function than the American dairyman. Despite the fact that the output of the dairyman is essential to national well-being, there is no agricultural group whose economic condition has been more depressed. There is no farming group whose situation has been more thoroughly exploited by the middleman or whose situation has been so outrageously manhandled by govermental experimentation. The dairymen have not worn a path to the Treasury and have not been on the firing line clamoring for governmental aid. But their situation is no less grevious, and the farmer is tied to the soil while his situation cries to heaven for relief. At the present time the dairyman's land is being sold for taxes with his mortgages growing bigger and while he is making a necessary contribution to the health of the people he finds himself without sufficient return to live comfortably, free from the stress of poverty.

I wish to review briefly the attempts that have been made during the past few years in Congress by myself and other Congressmen interested in the dairymen to alleviate and aid them to obtain a living price for their milk.

TRADE AGREEMENTS INJURIOUS

We sought to obtain an amendment to the Reciprocal Trade Agreement Act to provide no further reduction be permitted in the tariff structure on dairy products, and also that such agreements should be ratified by the Senate of the United States. In a speech some years ago Secretary Wallace eulogized the trade agreement with Canada which gives the Canadian farmer a reduction of 2 cents a pound on Cheddar cheese. Under this trade agreement Canada was also given a quota on cream and cattle. In treaties with France, Switzerland, and the Netherlands the duty on dairy products has been lowered from 20 to 35 percent, although production costs in these countries are less than half of what they are in America. The result has been that while the price of other farm products has been greatly increased, the price on dairy products remains static or depressed despite the greatly increased cost of production which has fallen upon the shoulders of the

dairymen. Importation of dairy products amounted to more than $16,000,000 in 1936. The Democratic leadership of the Ways and Means Committee of the House refused to give us a hearing on this proposition, despite the fact every other nation with whom treaties have been made, whether European, South American, or otherwise, requires the ratification of the treaties by their legislative assemblies.

DISEASE ERADICATION

We sought to obtain appropriations for the eradication of bovine tuberculosis and Bang's disease. The Democratic-controlled House committee, although they had voted some $2,000,000,000 for the wheat, corn, and cotton farmer, refused to give us adequate appropriations for that purpose. We sought an additional $11,000,000 and were given three and one-half after a protracted and savage struggle.

SANITARY CONTROL

We sought extension of the Lenroot-Taber Act, which prohibits the importation of cream and milk into the United States, to all dairy products unless such products have been produced by dairy herds under official tests for bovine tuberculosis. More than $300,000,000 have been spent in continental United States by State and Federal Governments for eradication of bovine tuberculosis. The farmer himself receives only nominal reimbursement for the loss of his cow and sometimes his whole herd and has contributed more than $100,000,000 to the purpose of insuring sanitary production of his milk. I know of no other country in the world, except New Zealand, where such regulations are enforced. The American span of life has been extended 10 years, and it has been said by reliable authority that this is largely due to the sanitary production of dairy products. Despite these facts, the administration-controlled committee of the House on Agriculture refused to even give us a hearing on the grounds it would be violating principles laid down in the trade agreements. To add insult to injury, the State Department wrote into these treaties the provision that we could not impose sanitary regulations without the consent of other nations, none of whom had made more than the first approach toward disease eradication and the production of dairy products by sanitary means. The dairyman is still being sold across the lakes and over the seas by the internationalists in charge of this program.

THE FIGHT OF OLEO

We sought to obtain an additional excise tax on foreign fats and oils. The chairman of the Democratic Ways and Means Committee refused to even give us a hearing on this proposition.

The last count in the indictment revolves around an added 5-cent tax on oleomargarine manufactured in the United States. The proposition did not even reach the hearing stage in the Agriculture Committee, as the cotton-oil group, who were, of course, interested in butter substitutes, were in command. We vainly called the administration's attention to the fact that while only $5,000,000 worth of cottonseed products went into the manufacture of vegetable margarine, the dairyman of the North and East was buying $40,000,000 worth of cottonseed byproducts as food for cattle. In prosperous years the purchase by the dairyman amounted to $1,000,000,000 a year. We vainly called attention to the fact that the profits from the sale of butter substitutes went largely to the Philippines or to the "packer kings."

We called attention to the finding of the American Federation of Labor, the largest body of consumers in America, that the use of butter substitutes was injurious to childhood and particularly harmful to eyesight. We called attention to the fact that while butter substitutes were synthetic, counterfeit food lacking in vitamins necessary to sustain life, they were also destroying the market for dairy products. We called attention to our neighbor, Canada, with 10,000,000 people in comparative modest circumstances, which had abolished the manufacture and sale of butter substitutes. I myself, introduced a bill patterned after the Canadian measure. These protests were all in vain. They conceded the justice of our demands in the interest of the dairyman and public health, but under the political lash and urge of loyalty refused to give us the relief asked. The opposition to our program went further. The Margarine Institute, financed by the "packer kings," caused to be introduced a bill that dignified oleomargarine by giving it a statutory name and abolished most of the present taxes on the nefarious product. The measures we proposed all died aborning, slaughtered in the House, always at the behest and command of the Department of Agriculture and Secretary Wallace. On all these matters I have fought shoulder to shoulder with the cooperative groups and have spent a great amount of time fighting their battles. In doing this I have cooperated with Mr. Fred Brenckman, the legislative representative of the National Grange at Washington, and Mr. Charles W. Holman, secretary of the National Cooperative Milk Producers' Federation. I refer the members of the cooperatives or members of the Grange to these men for an estimate of my services.

ORGANIZATION NECESSARY

The course I am going to suggest is obviously sound. It is taking a leaf from the book of the distributors and nimble middlemen. It is embraced in one word, "organize." Organize to the last man. Organize until it hurts. You must give up your ancient individualism and join up with the cooperatives or other organizations. I know there are two schools of thought in New York State on the proposition, and, so far as I am concerned, I care not which vehicle you ride in if you but present a united front to the enemy. Do not be too tenacious of your own views on organization. The evil condition of the dairyman has been due in considerable part to his unwillingness to join forces with existing organizations. Dairymen have been too prone to see the mote in the other fellow's eye and sometimes have hived with their oppressors. There are honest, sincere, and able men in all groups. Seek them out and join forces with them. Put away your phobias and hates and make a common stand against the oppressor. It was the Napoleonic conception to divide the enemy in two and then destroy each part in turn. The distributors in the past have taken a leaf from the book of Napoleon and you have been destroyed piecemeal. In the present hour of your distress I hope you can see the logic of my suggestions.

Labor in the industrial field has forged ahead of the farmer. Labor is in a fair way now to obtain a decent return for its skill and toil under the collective-bargaining principles. That is sound national procedure and applies to the dairyman. If you but organize under loyal, able, and honest leadership, you will come into your own and obtain a just and living price for your product. There are plenty of profits in the dairying game and the consuming public is paying adequate prices. The trouble is that the dairyman is not receiving his share of the returns. The great combinations of capital, including the Borden Co. and the Dairy Products' Corporation, hold you in the hollow of their hands.

ADMINISTRATION HOSTILE TO DAIRYMAN

I have come to believe that under the present administration the case of the dairyman will not be aided or advanced. The people of the district honored me by making me a delegate to the Republican National Convention at Philadelphia. Out of that convention came the nomination of Wendell Willkie for the presidency. I had the pleasure of meeting Mr. Willkie on several occasions and was greatly impressed with his sane, liberal viewpoint on all economic questions. He reminded me strongly of Theodore Roosevelt in his viewpoints and beliefs. The country is in desperate condition with President Roosevelt warmongering continually. I am certain that if Roosevelt is elected we will be in the war before the end of the year. Every dairyman, whatever his political affiliation, should support Willkie and McNary.

VAST PROFITS OF MILK TRUST

A recent and very able report of Attorney General Bennett of New York on the situation of the domestic milkshed showed that the Milk Trust was paying 108-percent profit on its manufactured dairy products and 24 percent on fluid

milk. The Milk Trust calls the milk that goes into manufactured products surplus and pays little or nothing for it. Despite the slight gains that have been made the dairyman is still far below the cost of production and as I have frequently said in 10 years they would be scattered to the four winds if the present evil marketing conditions continue.

ANTITRUST PROSECUTION

I have been somewhat instrumental in getting Attorney General Arnold, in charge of antitrust prosecution, interested in the milk situation in the New York milkshed. Mr. Arnold is an able public servant and has agreed to bring these malefactors to book. My efforts in this connection have not escaped numerous milk lobbyists in Albany and Washington, and they have been turning heaven and earth to get a candidate to run against me. Last spring in Albany these gentry endeavored to get several candidates to run against me, promising them unlimited and liberal financing. In other words, these bloated lobbyists, who are fattening on the toil and sweat of the north country dairymen, desire to name my successor in Congress. I am content to leave that issue to the people of the district.

During my service in Washington I have stood foursquare for the economic and personal rights of the people of the Thirty-second District. In doing this I have, of course, incurred powerful enmities who are bending every effort to eliminate me from the congressional service. I repeat that I am entirely content to leave that issue to the people of the district.

Registration of Aliens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 28, 1940

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. FRANCIS BIDDLE

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Hon. Francis Biddle, Solicitor General of the United States, delivered over the Columbia Broadcasting System, August 25, 1940:

When the Alien Registration Act was passed by the Congress of the United States this past June, I gave it as my opinion that the overwhelming majority of noncitizens in the United States were loyal to our traditions of liberty and freedom and that they were peaceful and law-abiding residents of the Nation.

Now, 2 months later, with the alien-registration program about to begin, I am even more fully convinced of the validity of that belief. During this preparatory period we have had the active cooperation of hundreds of organizations who are concerned with the welfare of our noncitizens; of practically all of the foreign-language newspapers published in the United States; and of thousands of individual alien residents. Because of this cooperation, I am certain that the alien-registration program will be carried out intelligently and efficiently.

I am obliged to the Columbia Broadcasting System for giving me the opportunity to talk personally to those who are required by law to register and to the citizens of the United States who can cooperate with the Government in putting into effect the alien-registration program. First, I will address my remarks directly to the noncitizen.

The provisions of the Alien Registration Act are fairly simple. The registration period begins on Tuesday, August 27, and extends through December 26 of this year. Registration will take place at all first- and second-class post offices and at all post offices located at county seats. Every alien in the United States who is 14 years of age or over must register in person and be fingerprinted. This applies to persons who have taken out their first naturalization papers but have not yet got their second papers. Aliens under 14 must be registered by their parents or guardians but will not be fingerprinted. However, when they reach the age of 14, they must then register in person and at that time be fingerprinted.

After you have registered, a receipt card will be sent you from Washington. This card will serve as evidence of your having registered.

In addition, aliens must notify the Immigration and Naturalization Service in Washington when they change their residence address. Such notification must be made within 5 days of the change. Change of address cards will be available at the post offices.

It is my duty to warn all noncitizens that the Alien Registration Act is not voluntary but compulsory. You must register. Failure to comply with the provisions of the Federal law calls for severe penalties. If you are not clear about the law, or if you are not clear about your citizenship status, consult the post office or the Immigration and Naturalization Service. Registration will not have any bearing whatsoever on your citizenship status.

You, as an alien, naturally want to know what questions the Government will ask you. You want to know why you are required to register. It may be that the Registration Act has caused you needless concern. You may think of registration as an ordeal inflicted upon you by a hostile Government.

If so, let me relieve you of those doubts and fears. If you are a loyal, law-abiding noncitizen, registration cannot harm you in any way. In fact, registration will serve as a means of protection for you. If you have nothing to hide, you have nothing to fear.

We have tried to make the registration process as simple as possible. No one need be embarrassed when registering. You will not be required to report at a police station; you will register at a post office. The average registration should not take more than 20 minutes. You will not be subjected to a hostile cross-examination; you will be received in a spirit of friendliness. Insofar as possible, registration will be private, and registration hours will be adjusted to suit local conditions.

You may obtain a sample registration form from your nearest post office and study the questions at your leisure. The questions are identical with those you will answer when you register. When you go to the post office to register, bring the prepared sample form with you. By so doing, registration will be much easier.

Should you have difficulty in answering any of the questions in the sample form, I suggest you consult your friends or relatives or anyone who may be of assistance. Frequently you may get the best assistance from a reputable and established social agency. It is perfectly legal to consult anyone you wish. The Post Office Department and the Immigration and Naturalization Service of the Department of Justice stand ready to be of every possible assistance.

What information are you required to give the registration authorities? Well, you will be asked the usual questions to establish your identification. You will be asked how and when you entered the United States and the method of transportation you used to get here. You must state the length of time you have been here and how long you intend to remain. If you have had any naval or military service, you will be asked to describe it. You must list the names of organizations, clubs, or societies in which you participate or hold membership. Your activities on behalf of any organization must be described, and you must state whether or not the organization promotes the interests of a foreign government.

You will not find these questions unreasonable. It is logical that the United States Government should know who and where its noncitizens are and what they are doing. Every nation requires such information; and in dangerous times such as these, it is imperative that we do likewise.

The information obtained through registration will be sent to the Department of Justice in Washington. Such information will be kept secret and confidential. No one will have access to the records without the express permission of the Attorney General of the United States. I can assure you that these records will not be used to compile blacklists. They will not be used to the detriment of law-abiding people.

I wish to call the attention of the alien to the fact that he must register in person. Fingerprinting is part of registration and all fingerprinting will be done at the post office when you register. No one can register for you. Exceptions will be made only for those people who are bed-ridden or who are confined to institutions. Also, there is no fee or charge whatsoever connected with registration. There are a few people who are trying to make a racket of registration. They are attempting to extort money from aliens for phony services. The Department of Justice will take care of them. Do not pay anyone for any service connected with registration. The Post Office Department and the Department of Justice will assist you for nothing in every possible way.

And now an additional word about fingerprinting. I understand that some aliens are worried about being fingerprinted. The Alien Registration Act calls for fingerprinting because it is the most accurate and dependable method of identification known to science.

Many people still feel that there is a stigma attached to being fingerprinted. It is true that criminals are fingerprinted; but it is also true that millions of law-abiding citizens have placed their fingerprints on record with the Government. I have been fingerprinted, as have millions of others who served in the armed forces of the United States. All Federal civil-service employees are fingerprinted. Even postal-savings depositors are fingerprinted. I assure you that there is no stigma attached to being fingerprinted in this day and age.

We who are citizens view the law-abiding noncitizen of this country as a guest of the United States. You who are not as yet citizens should not consider registration as an imposition, but as a measure vital to the security of the United States—a measure designed to safeguard the national household in which you and your family make your home and livelihood. Consider registra-

tion in this light and you will interpret it not as an ordeal but as a patriotic duty.

And now I wish to say a few words to those of you who are American citizens. The intention of the Congress in passing the Alien Registration Act of 1940 was to get full and complete information about the aliens residing in the United States. But it was not the intention of Congress to start a witch hunt or a program of persecution of peaceful and law-abiding aliens.

It is estimated that there are in this country some 3,600,000 aliens. Many of them are on the road to citizenship. An overwhelming majority of them, as I have said before, are loyal to our democratic traditions. Let us keep them loyal and let us help them to become good American citizens. That would be consistent with our American traditions.

It may sound trite, yet it is well to point out that every citizen of the United States was once an alien or is a descendant of an alien. This is true of the President of the United States, the Members of the United States Supreme Court, the Members of Congress, of me, of you, and of the man who became a citizen last week. I think it is well for us to remember that fact when we discuss the problem of aliens in the United States.

We should not forget, also, that, throughout our history, aliens or noncitizens have contributed in no small measure to our economic and intellectual development. Some of our greatest citizens were people who came to our shores from other lands. Alexander Hamilton, Carl Schurz, William S. Knudsen, the present Senator from the State of New York, ROBERT F. WAGNER—to mention but a few—came to us from other countries. Until they became naturalized citizens, they were aliens. And so today, of the 3,600,000 noncitizens in our country, many are destined to play important parts in our future development.

Let us not get overzealous or hysterical about the noncitizen in our country. Let us use the coming 4 months' registration period to assist him. If you have a relative or a friend or a neighbor who must register under the Alien Registration Act, perhaps you can help him. Whether or not you can help him, in a concrete way, to register, a friendly and hospitable attitude toward him will in itself be helpful.

I need not be reminded of the fact that there are some aliens in our country who are dangerous, who are anxious to undermine our form of government, who would bite the hand that is feeding and sheltering them. And, I am sorry to say, that subversive acts are not always confined to aliens.

We in the Department of Justice will apprehend such troublemakers, whether aliens or citizens. We will do so systematically, conscientiously, and legally. But we do not propose, and the great majority of American citizens agree with us, to tolerate the persecution of innocent and law-abiding noncitizens who are residing in our country. Let us help those noncitizens who are worthy of our help. Let us help them during this registration period, and let us help them to become enthusiastic American citizens.

In closing, on behalf of the Department of Justice, I wish to thank the various Government agencies, notably the Post Office Department, and the Government Printing Office, and the Work Projects Administration for their telling and unselfish help in preparing for the alien-registration program. And I also wish to thank the numerous private organizations—the social welfare agencies, the veterans' organizations, the patriotic and fraternal societies—and the thousands of patriotic men and women who have assisted us, for their unselfish and sympathetic cooperation.

Such assistance has made a very complex job considerably easier. I ask for their continued cooperation during the 4-month registration period.

Senator McNary Did Not Accept Mr. Willkie

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PATRICK J. BOLAND

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 29, 1940

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker Senator MCNARY's charge, in his acceptance speech, that the trade policies of this administration have been injurious to farmers is as completely at variance with the facts as it is with the pronouncements of his party's candidate for the Presidency, to whom he blandly pledges his allegiance in this campaign.

The utter falsity of the assumptions on which the Senator rests his case has been pointed out so many times in Congress and out during the past few years that further repetition has long since become monotonous. His primary assumption is that the American market has been taken away from the American farmer under the trade-agreements program and that farmers would be better off under embargo tariffs. With respect to this whole proposition, I should like to quote as follows from an address which Secretary Hull made before the last annual meeting of the American Farm Bureau Federation in Chicago on December 5, 1939:

If experience is any teacher at all, it should have taught every one of us by now that the notion that farmers can be saved by embargo tariffs is a snare and a delusion.

It is politically impossible to grant tariff embargoes to some groups and withhold them from others. When such embargoes are granted generally, the result, as was the case in 1930–32, is a collapse of our foreign trade, vanishing foreign markets for our farm and other surpluses, a prostrate agriculture, and a prostrate Nation.

It is not a question of giving the American market to the American farmer or taking it away from him. He has already got practically all of the American market, as he has always had it, except—as I have said—for a few types of products that we do not grow in sufficient quantities for our own needs even though we impose high tariffs on most of them. Nobody proposes to adjust any tariff rate in such a way as to diminish the sales of American farm products in the home market. The sole aim is, rather, to increase such sales in both the domestic and the foreign markets.

We all know that the home market just will not absorb our large surpluses of cotton, corn, and pork products, tobacco, wheat, and fruits of various kinds, not to mention other products. We must either find outlets abroad or else see these surpluses back up on us until we are overwhelmed by them.

It is idle for the Senator or any other like-minded person to try to dodge the issue by attempting to make an over-all comparison of the average conditions in agriculture during the past 7 years of this administration with the preceding 7 years under earlier administrations. It was the terrible conditions that prevailed in 1932, under Smoot-Hawleyism and other false policies to which the Senator would now have us return, that this administration had to contend with. If the trade policies followed by this administration have hurt farmers, how does it come that cash farm income, which in 1932 had fallen to the ridiculously low level of $4,700,000,000, rose by 1939 to $7,700,000,000, exclusive of benefit payments—at the same time that our total foreign trade was rising from the pitiful level of $2,900,000,000 to $5,500,000,000?

I suggest that the Senator examine the figures in the following table and then further explain his statement about the welfare of farmers under the Hawley-Smoot tariff and under trade agreements.

Average prices received by farmers

	Unit	1932, Hawley-Smoot	July 15, 1940, trade agreements
Wheat	Bushel	$0.382	$0.614
Corn	Bushel	.319	.631
Oats	Bushel	.157	.283
Tobacco	Pound	.105	.220
Cotton	Pound	.065	.095
Potatoes	Bushel	.392	.821
Hogs	Hundredweight	3.44	5.78
Beef cattle	Hundredweight	4.07	7.26
Veal calves	Hundredweight	5.00	8.56
Lambs	Hundredweight	4.40	7.85
Butter	Pound	.208	.256
Milk	Hundredweight	1.27	1.67
Sheep	Hundredweight	2.40	3.60

If the Senator, as his party's candidate for the Vice Presidency, had been as anxious to show his fealty to his party's candidate for the Presidency as he professed to be, he could have profited by reading what Mr. Willkie has said at numerous times in the past on this very subject, as, for example, the following in April 1940:

Now, obviously, it will not do for one great nation to become a free-trade country by itself. For the United States to erase its tariffs all at once would be ruinous to our people and many of our industries. The present Secretary of State, Cordell Hull, who is wise and temperate, realizes this. And so he adopted the reciprocal-trade agreements as a step toward increasing our foreign business gradually. Under this policy the United States takes up the problem of tariffs with each country separately; lists the products that it would like to export; studies a similar list submitted by the other country; and then a deal is arranged, each country making such concessions as it can, with the least possible harm and the most possible benefit to its own people. This agreement is then extended to apply to other countries, too. What could be simpler or more in accord with common sense? What could be better qualified to

benefit us, the people, as a whole? Of course, we have to make sacrifices. But the point is that, owing to the way the agreements are negotiated, the sacrifices are always, and should always be, less than the benefits gained. That is, we, the people, profit.

Not only are the Senator's views on this subject plainly at variance with those of Mr. Willkie, but in addition, in his effort to inject this issue into the campaign in the false hope of making political capital out of it, the Senator has chosen to ignore Mr. Willkie's statement on trade agreements on the eve of his nomination for the Presidency at Philadelphia, in which Mr. Willkie said, among other things:

In this new world and in these new conditions, for the issues before this convention to be determined on questions which have no relation to present conditions is pure shadow boxing. Republicans today must deal with the present situation, with something which is unique and with problems which have not yet been fully stated.

Today we must deal, not with the past and its dead problems, but with today with its live problems and with the future and its as yet unborn problems.

I do not change my position. I merely state to you that all old positions are obsolete, as dead as last week's newspaper, and that any man who aspires to leadership must think wholly in the present and its future and let the dead past bury its dead.

In other words, if Mr. Willkie is right, then the Senator is not only wrong, but "obsolete" as well.

Under leave to extend my remarks I include the following:

STATEMENT OF SECRETARY HULL

At his press conference today, the Secretary of State said that he had received a number of questions about some phases of Senator McNARY's address last evening in which he referred to commercial policy. The Secretary then made the following comment:

"I am sure that it will be a matter of disappointment to the country to see that Senator McNARY, instead of dealing with existing acute problems and conditions in a modernized and constructive manner which is so urgently demanded, complacently falls back on antiquated and discredited economic nostrums, such as the theory that the farmers can be saved by embargo tariffs. The Senator and his associates some years ago led the farmers into bankruptcy under the slogan of embargo tariffs.

"The farmers of the country will not soon forget that under this identical leadership the cash farm income of the Nation in 1932 had fallen to the ridiculously low level of $4,700,000,000, when our export markets had become restricted largely as a result of our own embargo policy. The American farmers will also keep in mind the fact that amidst every sort of impediment and difficulty growing out of wars and preparations for wars, cash farm income rose to $7,700,000,000 in 1939, exclusive of benefit payments. American farmers will of course take their choice of policies and of leadership. As against the only alternative policy of autarchy, the reciprocal-trade program and the policy on which it rests needs no defense.

"As to the misleading figures cited relative to the home market, Secretary Wallace stated the entire truth of the matter as follows:

" 'By all means, let us make the most of the home market. But I want you to think seriously about the fact that farmers have more to lose through nationalistic policies than any other group. In the present year, 1936, farmers are cultivating probably thirty-five to forty-five million acres that are going to produce things which will be sold abroad. The most additional land they could use by cutting out imports would be perhaps 10,000,000 acres. It just wouldn't be good sense to risk having to leave thirty-five to forty-five million acres idle in order to try to gain a market for 10,000,000 acres. I don't think farmers are foolish enough to trade dollars for quarters, no matter how strong the pressure may be by those who are busy grinding their own axes.' "

Take the Profits Out of War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED. V. IZAC

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 29, 1940

ON THE BILL (H. R. 10413) TO PROVIDE REVENUE, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. IZAC. Mr. Speaker, and my colleagues, I am sorry we have to consider this bill under a gag rule. I had intended offering an amendment to increase the excess-profits tax, but under the rule I am prevented doing so.

You will note the highest rate this bill provides is 50 percent. Let me call your attention to the fact that the present British excess-profits tax has a rate of 100 percent. In other words, the British refuse to permit anyone to get rich at the expense of their suffering country.

When we returned from the first World War we found a crop of millionaires who had blossomed forth as a result of war orders while many of us and our comrades suffered privations, wounds, and even death for a few dollars per month.

It was then a movement was started to enact legislation that would, in case of another emergency, draft wealth and industry, as well as manpower. All the veterans' organizations have for the past 20 years been urging this step as a means of preventing war by taking the profits out of war.

Here we have an opportunity by means of a tax bill to take the profits out of this present emergency, but unless we make the tax much more stringent than 50 percent we will find, I fear, a new and bigger crop of millionaires grown rich on the profits made from national-defense orders.

Next week we will be called upon to vote a selective-draft bill which will compel many of our young men to serve their country for a small monetary return. Let us not, while we draft the manpower of the Nation, permit the rich to become richer and the poor poorer. Recently our unemployment conference, while making a study of the tax structure, found that the peacetime tax in England on a net income of $25,000 per year was $7,600. At the rates we enjoy in the United States the recipient of a $25,000 net income could pay the Federal income tax, the State of California income tax, and the District of Columbia income tax, and still pay but one-half what the resident of London pays, or $3,800. With this disparity, it can readily be seen that we have barely scratched the surface on taxation. Our national-defense program is necessary for the safety of our people and the preservation of our American institutions. It must be paid for through taxes.

This is a job for us all. Let none get rich at the expense of others. While some bare their breast in actual defense, let industry be at least willing to serve without excess recompense.

When the opportunity presents, I intend to move for a higher rate on excess profits to the end that all profits shall cease if war comes.

Analysis of Voting Rights of Soldiers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 29, 1940

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, with tremendous interest growing in the forthcoming national election, probably intensified by the personalities of the two candidates for President and the third-term issue, the question of voting privileges of soldiers, National Guard men, and reservists which we have authorized called to service, and of draftees, if the conscription bill should pass, is being widely discussed.

Because there have been a number of conflicting reports published, I have asked the State law division of the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress to prepare for us a summary covering soldier voting in the States.

I am glad to note practically all States have some provision for soldier voting. It appears some which do not have absentee balloting provide for voting at the soldiers' camp.

The Library's summary follows:

Voting rights of persons in military service

[For citations and summary of provision see supplemental report of same date]

State	Special procedure for soldier voting	Absent voting outside of State, including soldiers	Absent voting inside of State, including soldiers	Voting before election at place of residence	Absentee registration
Alabama	No	Yes	Yes	No	No.
Alaska	No	No	No	Yes	No.
Arizona	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes.
Arkansas	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No.
California	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes.
Colorado	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes.
Connecticut	No	Yes	No	No	No.
Delaware	Yes	No	No	No	(1).
Florida	No	No	No	Yes	No.
Georgia	No	Yes	Yes	No	No.
Hawaii	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes.
Idaho	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes.
Illinois	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No.
Indiana	No	(1)	Yes	No	No.
Iowa	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes.
Kansas	Yes	Yes	No	No	No.
Kentucky	No	No	No	No	No.
Louisiana	No	No	No	Yes	No.
Maine	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No.
Maryland	Yes	No	No	No	No.
Massachusetts	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No.
Michigan	(2)	Yes	Yes	No	Yes.
Minnesota	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes.
Mississippi	No	No	No	No	?.
Missouri	Yes	(4)	Yes	No	Yes.
Montana	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No.
Nebraska	(2)	Yes	Yes	No	No.
Nevada	No	Yes	Yes	No	?
New Hampshire	No	Yes	Yes	No	No.
New Jersey	Yes	No	No	No	Yes.
New Mexico	No	No	No	No	Yes.
New York	No	Yes	Yes	No	No.
North Carolina	No	Yes	Yes	No	No.
North Dakota	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No.
Ohio	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No.
Oklahoma	No	Yes	Yes	No	No.
Oregon	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes.
Pennsylvania	Yes	No	No	No	No.
Puerto Rico	No	No	No	No	No.
Rhode Island	No	Yes	No	No	No.
South Carolina	No	No	No	No	No.
South Dakota	No	Yes	Yes	No	?
Tennessee	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes.
Texas	No	No [5]	No [5]	No	No.
Utah	No	Yes	Yes	No	No
Vermont	No	Yes	Yes	No	No.
Virginia	No	Yes	Yes	No	No.
Washington	No	Yes	Yes	No	No.
West Virginia	No	Yes	No	No	?
Wisconsin	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes.
Wyoming	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No.

[1] During active service.
[2] Probably dependent on place of encampment.
[3] Special provision but not special procedure.
[4] Soldiers only may vote outside of State.
[5] Doubtful as to persons in National Guard, etc.

VOTING RIGHTS OF PERSONS IN MILITARY SERVICE

ALABAMA [1]

"No person shall lose or acquire a residence * * * by being absent from his or her place of residence in the civil or military service of the State or the United States; neither shall any soldier, sailor, or marine in the military or naval service of the United States acquire a residence by being stationed in this State" (Code 1928, sec. 366). "Any qualified elector * * * who may at any general, special, or municipal election * * * by reason of his regular business and in the performance of his regular duties be absent from the State or from the county in which he is a qualified elector may vote [by mail]" (sec. 405). Registration must be in person but need not be renewed (sec. 385).

ALASKA

No specific reference to voters absent in military service found. "Any elector of the Territory who believes that he will be unavoidably absent from his home and more than 2 miles distant from the voting place in which he is qualified to vote, may vote [apparently within the Territory and before a commissioner] at any primary, special, or general election" (Laws 1939, ch. 82). No provision found for absent registration.

ARIZONA

"For the purpose of voting, no person shall be deemed to have gained or lost a residence by reason of his absence while employed in the service of the United States" (constitution, art. VII, sec. 3). "No soldier, seamen, or marine in the Army or Navy of the United States shall be deemed to be a resident of this State in consequence of his being stationed at any military or naval place within this State" (constitution, art. VII, sec. 6). A law "to enable qualified electors in the military or naval establishments of the State of Arizona or of the United States in any capacity to exercise the right of suffrage while absent from the State in such military establishments" approved June 20, 1918 (Laws 1918, extra sess., ch. 11) was apparently considered superseded by the general absent-voting law as it is not included in the 1928 Code. "A qualified and registered elector who is absent from the county of which he is an elector, or who expects to be absent from such county, at the time of holding any general or primary election" (Code 1928, sec. 1303) may vote by mail. "Electors of the State who are temporarily out of the State may, during the period of registration, be registered by writing to the recorder of the county wherein such elector has a legal residence" (sec. 1167).

ARKANSAS

"No soldier, sailor, or marine in the military or naval service of the United States shall acquire a residence by reason of being stationed on duty in this State" (constitution, art. III, sec. 7). Any soldier, sailor, or marine, being a qualified elector of the State unavoidably absent from the State on active duty at the time of a general or primary election may vote at an election to be held on the same day and in the same manner as elections in the State with each regiment, separate battalion, troop, or battery (Digest 1937, secs. 4785–4787). As the general absent-voting law provides that any person being absent from his regular voting place within or without the State may vote by mail (sec. 4782) and the specific provision for military voting applies only outside of the State, presumably a soldier within the State may vote by mail under the general law. Registration is effected by payment of poll taxes (Laws, 1939, No. 82).

CALIFORNIA

"For the purpose of voting, no person shall be deemed to have gained or lost a residence by reason of his presence or absence while employed in the service of the United States" (constitution, art. II, sec. 4). Any voter who expects to be absent from his election precinct on the day of any primary or general election may vote by mail (Laws, 1939, c. 26, secs. 5882, 5900, 5911). An elector absent from the county may file an affidavit as to his residence and forward it in duplicate to the county clerk of the county in which he claims to be an elector, who shall, if it is received within the time allowed for registration enter it in the proper register (Laws, 1939, c. 26, sec. 132).

COLORADO

"For the purpose of voting * * * no person shall be deemed to have gained a residence by reason of his presence, or lost it by reason of his absence, while in the civil or military service of the State, or of the United States" (constitution, art. VII, sec. 4). Any qualified, registered elector absent from his county on the day of a general or primary election may vote by mail (Comp. Laws, Supp. 1932, secs. 7727, 7729). "Any qualified elector may be registered by filing or causing to be filed with the county clerk a verified application for such registration" (Laws, 1939, c. 103, sec. 6).

CONNECTICUT

No existing provision has been found differentiating persons in military service from other voters of the State. A temporary law, approved March 21, 1918, provided that "every qualified elector of this State who is in the service of the military or naval forces of the United States, and in consequence thereof is absent from this State on the day of such election, shall have the same right to give * * * his ballot for candidates for offices voted at such election * * * as he would have if present at the time of voting in said election in the town in which he is a registered and qualified elector." Ballots were to be mailed to commanding officers who were to receive and mail the voted ballots (Laws, 1918, extra session, ch. 1). Presumably no specific provision is necessary since "any qualified elector of this State who shall be absent from the State during the entire day of any National or State election" may vote by mail (Supp. 1931–35, sec. 168c). There is no provision for absent voting within the State, nor for absent registration. However, registration need not be renewed.

DELAWARE

"Every person enlisted or engaged in any military or naval organization of this State or the United States and who prior to enlistment was a resident of any election district of this State shall not lose his domicile in such election district by reason of such enlistment" (Rev. Code, 1935, sec. 1734). "Whenever any of the qualified voters of the State shall be engaged in the military or naval service of this State or of the United States and as such absent from the election district of their residence on the days appointed by law for holding county, State, congressional, or Presidential elections within this State, or on the days appointed * * * for holding special elections to fill vacancies, such qualified electors shall be entitled at such time to exercise the right of suffrage as fully as if they were present at their usual places of election" (sec. 1926). A poll shall be opened in each company where those within 2 miles thereof shall vote—others at the most convenient poll (sec. 1935). There are additional statutory provisions for voting by mail by persons "in the public service of the United States" (sec. 1945) which have been held unconstitutional (*State* v. *Lyons*, 5 Atl. 2d 495). Citizens of the State engaged or enlisted in military or naval service are entitled to be registered in the district in which they resided prior to election (sec. 1735). Registrars shall visit each encampment "in whatever part of the world they may be located" who shall register voters of the State (secs. 1736–1740).

[1] 1939 session laws not available.

FLORIDA

The only specific reference to voting rights of persons in military service provides that "any soldier, sailor, or marine who returns to the State after the time for payment of poll tax or for registration has expired, may be permitted to vote in any municipal, primary, or regular election upon the presentation of his discharge to the election officers and establishing the fact that he is the bona fide holder of same and that he could have been duly authorized to vote in said election except for his absence from the State and the fact that he was engaged in the military or naval service of the United States" (Comp. Laws, 1927, sec. 249). Absentee voting by persons outside of the State was authorized by Laws, 1935, chapter 16986 and absentee registration by chapter 16987. In *State* v. *Page* (169 So. 854) the supreme court of the State held the absent registration law unconstitutional. The discussion and the declaration of unconstitutionality concern the registration law but as the ballots cast by absentees were thrown out and since the reasoning appears to apply equally to absent voting this decision has apparently invalidated both voting and registering from without the State. An elector expecting to be absent on election day may vote in person not more than 15 nor less than 3 days before an election (Comp. Laws, 1927, sec. 436).

GEORGIA

"No soldier, sailor, or marine in the military or naval services of the United States shall acquire the rights of an elector by reason of being stationed on duty in this State" (Code, 1933, sec. 2–602). "Any voter, when required by his regular business and habitual duties to be absent from the city and county, ward or district, in which he is registered may vote by registered mail" (sec. 34–3301). Prior to the passage of a general absent-voting law Georgia provided in 1918 (Laws, p. 238–246) until "12 months after the final declaration of peace between the United States of America and the Imperial German Government" for voting by mail by persons absent "in any enterprise connected with the prosecution of the war." Registration must be in person (Code, 1933, sec. 34–107) but need not be renewed. On application, persons discharged from the United States Army or Navy are listed in a "Discharged Soldiers' and Sailors' List" and "shall not be disqualified on account of nonpayment of poll taxes which may have accrued within 6 months previous to their entry into the service of the United States, during such service, or within 6 months after their discharge" (secs. 34–501, 34–503).

HAWAII

"No registered voter shall be deprived of his right to vote at any primary, county, or general election by reason of his absence from the precinct in which he otherwise would have the right to vote, provided such absence at the time of such election is held is caused by being called into the service of the Territory or the United States by virtue of orders issued by either the Governor of the Territory or the President of the United States of America. * * * all mobilization grounds of the National Guard of the Territory, or all places where such National Guard may be congregated on active service, are for the purposes of any primary, county, or general elections declared to be polling places. * * * Whenever the National Guard shall have been called into active service, or whenever volunteers have been called into service through proclamation of the President of the United States, it shall be the duty of the Governor to ascertain the places at which the National Guard or such troops at the date of any primary, county, or general election * * * will be stationed." (Rev. Laws, 1935, sec. 7696.) Voters expecting to be absent may leave their vote with the local officials, but this applies only within 5 days preceding elections (Laws, 1937, pp. 266–267). Absent registration is permitted (Rev. Laws, 1935, sec. 7649).

IDAHO

"For the purpose of voting no person shall be deemed to have gained or lost a residence by reason of his presence or absence while employed in the service of this State or of the United States" (constitution, art. VI, sec. 5). "Any qualified elector" absent from his election precinct may vote by mail (Laws, 1937, ch. 45), and any qualified elector "who is an officer, agent, or employee of the United States Government or of this State temporarily absent from his or her precinct" may register by mail (Code, 1932, secs. 33–715). While for others registration must be in person, it need not be renewed except on change of residence (Laws, 1939, ch. 1904).

ILLINOIS

"Qualified electors of this State enlisted in companies or regiments organized in this State and absent from their election precincts on the day prescribed by law for the holding of any general election because engaged in the actual military service of the State or of the United States shall be entitled to vote for all State officers and on all State-wide questions in any such election. The qualified electors of any such company or regiment shall vote as a group or unit" (Rev. Stat., 1939, p. 1518). Absentee voting is permitted to "any qualified elector" absent from the county on business (p. 1515). Absent registration is not permitted. Requirements as to renewal of registration vary in different localities.

INDIANA

"No soldier, seaman, or marine, in the Army or Navy of the United States, or of their Allies, shall be deemed to have acquired a residence in the State in consequence of having been stationed within the same; nor shall any such soldier, seaman, or marine have the right to vote" (constitution, art. II, sec. 3). "No person shall be deemed to have lost his residence in the State by reason of his absence, either on business of this State or of the United States" (constitution, art. II, sec. 4). Qualified electors absent on business may vote by mail, but if one's residence is outside the State, the law applies only to citizens of the State employed in State or Federal Government residing in the District of Columbia or other Federal Territory (Laws, 1935, ch. 316). Absent registration is not permitted, but registration need not be renewed (Burns' Anno. Stat., 1933, sec. 29–308).

IOWA

"No person in the military, naval, or marine service of the United States shall be considered a resident of this State by being stationed in any garrison, barrack, or military or naval place or station within this State" (constitution, art. II, sec. 4). Absent voting by qualified voters absent from the county is permitted at all elections (Code, 1935, sec. 927). The affidavit of an absent voter constitutes registration (sec. 954).

KANSAS

"For the purpose of voting, no person shall be deemed to have gained or lost a residence by reason of his presence or absence while employed in the service of the United States. * * * The legislature may make provision for taking the votes of electors who may be absent from their townships or wards in the volunteer military service of the United States, or the militia service of this State; but nothing herein contained shall be deemed to allow any soldier, seaman, or marine in the Regular Army or Navy of the United States the right to vote" (constitution, art. V, sec. 3). According to judicial interpretation, "if an officer of the Regular Army has a residence in the State, irrespective of his connection therewith, and is absent temporarily in the service, the provisions of the section do not extend to him" (*Hunt* v. *Richards*, 4 Kan. 476). "It shall be lawful for qualified electors of Kansas who may, on the occurrence of any annual election, be absent from their township or ward, employed in the militia or volunteer service of the State or the United States, to vote for county, district, or State officers, members of the legislature, and for Members of Congress and electors of President and Vice President of the United States, at the places where they may be stationed on the day of such election" (Gen. Stat., 1935, sec. 25–1201). Qualified electors outside the county but within the State may vote in person at general elections at the precinct in which they may be (secs. 25–1001, 25–1002). Those outside the State during primary or general elections may vote by mail (sec. 25–1101). No provision is made for absentee registration, but renewal is not required (secs. 12–904, 13–311).

KENTUCKY

"No person in the military, naval, or marine service of the United States shall be deemed a resident of this State by reason of being stationed within the same" (constitution, sec. 146). A statutory provision repeats this section of the constitution and adds "nor shall any such soldier, seaman, or marine have the right to vote" (Baldwin's Rev. Stats., 1936, sec. 1440). Neither absentee voting nor registration is permitted. An absent-voting law which specifically provided for persons absent in military service (Laws, 1918, ch. 37) was held unconstitutional (*Clark* v. *Nash*. 192 Ky. 594).

LOUISIANA

"For the purpose of voting, no person shall be deemed to have gained a residence by reason of his presence, or to have lost it by reason of his absence, while employed in the service, either civil or military, of this State or of the United States" (constitution, art. VIII, sec. 11). While a constitutional amendment was adopted in 1936 to authorize absent voting by mail, no legislation in furtherance thereof has been passed. Persons expecting to be absent at any election may vote not more than 10 nor less than 2 days prior to the election in the parish or residence (Dart's Gen. Stats. 1932, secs. 2686–87). There is no provision for absent registration. Voters must register in person every 4 years (sec. 2629). A temporary act of 1918 (Laws, No. 264) authorized registration by mail of persons in the service of the United States during the war.

MAINE

"But persons in the military, naval, or marine service of the United States shall not be considered as having obtained such established residence by being stationed in any garrison, barrack, or military place, in any town or plantation. * * * No person, however, shall be deemed to have lost his residence by reason of his absence from the State in the military service of the United States, or of this State" (constitution, art. II, sec. 1). Citizens of the State absent from the State in military service may vote for Presidential electors, State and county officers at "each regiment and battery without the State" (Rev. Stats. 1930, p. 192). Any qualified voter absent from the city or town of residence may vote at any election by mail (Laws, 1937, ch. 183; Laws, 1939, ch. 234). There is no provision for absent registration. The tax lists constitute the registration lists.

MARYLAND

When a state of war exists or circumstances occur to cause the Government of the United States to call the National Guard into service, any qualified elector absent in the military or naval service of the United States or the State may vote by mail (Bagby's Anno. Code, 1924, secs. 225, 227, 229). There is no general provision for absent voting nor for absent registration.

MASSACHUSETTS

When registered voters are absent in the military or naval service of the United States at the time of a biennial State election, the secretary of state is charged with the duty of sending them absent

voters' ballots (Gen. Laws, 1932, p. 617). They vote, however, under a general absent-voting law (pp. 616–622, as amended). "Any soldier or sailor in the service of the United States who had a legal residence in any city or town in the Commonwealth at the time of entering said service, who by reason of his being in the Army or Navy was absent from the city or town during the periods when sessions for listing and for registration were held, may appear, * * * prove his qualifications as a voter, * * * and be registered, if he so appears not less than 3 days before the election" (Laws, 1939, ch. 440, sec. 17). There is no provision for absent registration. Primary registration is as a taxpayer.

MICHIGAN

"No elector shall be deemed to have gained or lost a residence by reason of his being employed in the service of the United States or of this State" (constitution, art. III, sec. 2). "No soldier, seaman, or marine in the Army or Navy of the United States shall be deemed a resident of this State in consequence of being stationed in any military or naval place within the State" (constitution, art. III, sec. 3). "No qualified elector in the actual military service of the United States or of this State, or in the Army or Navy thereof, * * * or any regularly enrolled members of a citizens' military or naval training camp, held under the authority of the Government of the United States or the State of Michigan, * * * shall be deprived of a vote by reason of absence from the township, ward, or State in which he or she resides" (constitution, art. III, sec. 1). Persons absent in military service may vote under a general absent-voting law (Comp. Laws, 1929, secs. 3134–3147, as amended). Absent registration is permitted (sec. 2774).

MINNESOTA

"For the purpose of voting, no person shall be deemed to have lost a residence by reason of his absence while employed in the service of the United States" (constitution, art. VII, sec. 3). "No soldier, seaman, or marine in the Army or Navy of the United States shall be deemed a resident of this State in consequence of being stationed within the same" (constitution, art. VII, sec. 4). Any qualified elector may vote by mail (Laws, 1939, ch. 345, pt. 4). Absentee registration is permitted (Laws, 1939, ch. 345, pt. 2).

MISSISSIPPI

The special enactment for soldier voting (Laws 1917, ch. 184; Amended Laws 1918, ch. 184) has apparently been considered a temporary law, and subsequent provisions for general absent voting were repealed (Laws 1932, ch. 292). According to secondary sources (Harris, Joseph P., Registration of Voters in the United States, p. 205; Chaffee, A. E., Summary of General Election Laws, 1936 ed.), absent registration is permitted, but no statute has been found.

MISSOURI

"For the purpose of voting, no person shall be deemed to have gained a residence by reason of his presence, or lost it by reason of his absence, while employed in the service, either civil or military, of this State or of the United States" (Constitution, art. VIII, sec. 7), "Qualified electors absent from the State on military or naval service shall * * * be enabled by law to vote at general or special elections" (Constitution, art VIII, sec. 9. Electors absent from the State on military or naval service during a general election may vote by mail (Rev. Stat. 1929, secs. 10224–10231, as amended, Laws 1939, p. 383). The general absent-voting law of Missouri (Gillespie's Supp., 1937, secs. 10181–10188d) in its terms would appear to apply to voting without the State but is limited by the constitutional provision (art. VIII, sec. 9) authorizing the legislature to enable qualified voters (other than those in military service) absent from their counties but within the State to vote. Specific provision is made (Laws, 1939, p. 384) for absent registration of persons absent in military service.

MONTANA

"For the purpose of voting, no person shall be deemed to have gained or lost a residence by reason of his presence or absence while employed in the service of the State or of the United States" (Constitution, art. IX, sec. 3). "No soldier, seaman, or marine in the Army or Navy of the United States shall be deemed a resident of this State in consequence of being stationed at any military or naval place within the same" (constitution, art. IX, sec. 7). An absent-voting law applicable to persons in military service (Laws 1918, ch. 18) was repealed in 1935 (Laws, ch. 163). A general law (Rev. Codes 1935, secs. 715–735) authorizes any qualified elector absent from the county of his residence to vote by mail. Absent registration is not permitted.

NEBRASKA

"Every elector in the military or naval service of the United States or of this State may exercise the right of suffrage at such place and under such regulations as may be provided by law" (constitution, art. VI, sec. 3). "No soldier, seaman, or marine in the Army and Navy of the United States shall be deemed a resident of the State in consequence of being stationed therein" (constitution, art. VI, sec. 4. Persons absent in military service are specifically provided for under the terms of the general absent-voting law (Comp. Stat., 1929 and Supp. 1935, secs. 32–801, 32–816; Laws, 1937, ch. 79), but they vote as other voters. Absent registration is not permitted.

NEVADA

"For the purpose of voting, no person shall be deemed to have gained or lost a residence by reason of his presence or absence while employed in the service of the United States" (constitution, sec. 43). "The right of suffrage shall be enjoyed by all persons otherwise entitled to the same who may be in the military or naval service of the United States: *Provided*, the votes so cast shall be made to apply to the county and township of which said voters were bona fide residents at the time of their enlistment: *And provided further*, That the payment of a poll tax or a registration of such voters shall not be required as a condition to the right of voting. Provision shall be made by law regulating the manner of voting, holding elections, and making returns of such election" (constitution, sec. 44). Qualified electors may vote by mail (Compiled Laws, 1929, secs. 2553–2567). Registration of persons in military service would seem not to be required (constitution, sec. 44; Laws, 1917, ch. 231, sec. 2; Compiled Laws 1929, sec. 2566). According to Chaffee's Summary of the General Election Laws, 1936 edition, these provisions are interpreted as requiring registration by mail.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

"A residence acquired by any person in any town shall not be interrupted or lost by temporary absence therefrom, with the intention of returning thereto as his home" (Public Laws 1926, p. 105). A special soldiers' absent voting law (Laws, 1917, ch. 95) was repealed by a general absent voting law (Laws, 1925, ch. 20) under which absentees may vote by mail but only for Presidential electors (Public Laws, 1926, pp. 132–137; Laws, 1929, ch. 102). There is no provision for absent registration, but renewal during continuance as a voter is not required.

NEW JERSEY

"No person in the military, naval, or marine service of the United States shall be considered a resident in this State by being stationed in any garrison, barrack, or military or naval place or station within this State. * * * in time of war no elector in the actual military service of the State, or of the United States, in the Army or Navy thereof, shall be deprived of his vote by reason of his absence from such election district; and the legislature shall have power to provide the manner in which and the time and place at which such absent elector may vote, and for the canvass of their votes in the election district in which they respectively reside" (constitution, art. II, sec. 1). Soldier voting is restricted to "time of war," applies to any election, and is done by mail. An elector in the military service may file his name and address with the county board or any person having knowledge of the name and address of an elector absent in the service may file the name and military address of those to whom the act applies (Rev. Stat., 1937, secs. 19:35–1–19). "Any elector who has been in such service but who has been honorably discharged from such service subsequent to the last registration day for such election, may vote upon exhibiting * * * a certificate showing his discharge from such service, but in municipalities having permanent registration such elector shall first fill out an emergency voting form" (sec. 19:35–13).

NEW MEXICO

"No person shall be deemed to have acquired or lost residence by reason of his presence or absence while employed in the service of the United States or of the State" (constitution, art. VII, sec. 4). "Citizens of the State absent from their places of legal residence in the military or naval service of the United States or of this State, and being otherwise qualified electors, may be allowed to vote at any election for all State officers, Presidential electors, Representatives in Congress, and upon constitutional amendments, under such regulations and limitations as may be prescribed by law" (constitution, art. VII, sec. 6). The general absent-voting law was held unconstitutional (*Thompson* v. *Scheier*, 40 N. Mex. 199) and there has apparently been no enactment putting the constitutional provision for soldier voting into effect. Absent registration is permitted (Laws, 1939, ch. 152).

NEW YORK

"For the purpose of voting, no person shall be deemed to have gained or lost a residence by reason of his presence or absence while employed in the service of the United States" (constitution, art. II, sec. 4). "* * * in time of war no elector in the actual military service of the State, or of the United States, in the Army or Navy thereof, shall be deprived of his or her vote by reason of his or her absence from such election district; and the legislature shall provide the manner in which and the time and place at which such absent electors may vote, and for the return and canvass of their votes" (constitution, art. II, sec. 1). Qualified voters absent from their residences may vote by mail (Cahill's Constitutional Laws, 1930, pp. 819–821; Supp. 1935, pp. 248–249; Laws, 1936, ch. 705). A specific soldiers' voting law of 1917 (Laws, ch. 815) was repealed in 1922 (Laws, ch. 588). Absent registration is not permitted.

NORTH CAROLINA

No provision found specifically referring to voting rights of persons in military service. Any qualified voter may vote by mail (Laws, 1939, ch. 159). Registration in person outside of regular period for registration is permitted to those expecting to be absent (Michie's Code, 1935, sec. 5961) but absent registration is not.

NORTH DAKOTA

"No elector shall be deemed to have lost his residence in this State by reason of his absence on business of the United States or of this State, or in the military or naval service of the United States" (constitution, sec. 125). "No soldier, seaman, or marine in the Army or Navy of the United States shall be deemed a resident of this State in consequence of his being stationed therein" (constitution, sec. 126). County auditors are required to maintain a register of persons qualified to vote in the county who are absent in military service and to send them ballots and return envelopes on which postage is paid (Laws, 1918, ch. 6). Any qualified elector absent

from the county may vote by mail (Compiled Laws, 1913, secs. 992–1004; Laws, 1933, ch. 107). No provision for absent registration found.

OHIO

"No person in the military, naval, or marine service of the United States shall by being stationed in any garrison, or military or naval station within the State, be considered a resident of this State" (constitution, art. V, sec. 5). "Whenever in time of war any qualified voter of this State shall be in the actual military service of this State or of the United States, in the Army or Navy or militia thereof, and by reason thereof is unavoidably absent from his election district on election day, such absent voter shall be entitled to vote as fully as if he were present at his place of residence in the same manner herein provided for other absent voters. The secretary of state, in such cases, if the number of such voters exceeds 100, shall have authority to organize a staff to visit such headquarters and to care for the casting, sealing, and return of such absent voters' ballots to their appropriate counties" (Throckmorton's Anno. Code 1934, sec. 4785–141). Persons absent during the period for registration may personally register before leaving their precincts (sec. 4785–55).

OKLAHOMA

"For the purpose of voting, no member of the Regular Army or Navy of the United States shall gain a residence in this State by reason of being stationed in this State, nor shall any such person lose a residence in the State while absent from the State in the military or naval service of the United States" (constitution, art. III, sec. 2). A law specifically on soldier voting (Stat. 1931, secs. 5821–5833) was repealed by a general absent-voting law (Laws, 1937, pp. 139–142) which differs from the usual in that the ballot is sent to a proxy of the voter's choosing to be cast by him. Absent registration is not permitted. An extension of time after the regular registration period is made for persons absent during general registration (sec. 5654).

OREGON

"For the purpose of voting, no person shall be deemed to have gained or lost a residence by reason of his presence or absence while employed in the service of the United States or of this State" (constitution, art. II, sec. 4). "No soldier, seaman, or marine in the Army or Navy of the United States, or of their allies, shall be deemed to have acquired a residence in the State in consequence of having been stationed in the same, nor shall any such soldier, seaman, or marine have the right to vote" (constitution, art. II, sec. 5). Any elector absent from his county may vote by mail (Anno. Code, 1930, secs. 36–2210 to 36–2215; Laws, 1939, chs. 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 346). "Electors absent from their country may register before any notary public, or county clerk, in the county where they may be. * * * Any electors who may be absent from the State upon the business of the State or of the United States may be registered by subscribing to the affidavit required of a resident elector before a notary public and mailing such affidavit to the county clerk of the county in which said elector claims his residence" (code, secs. 36–106).

PENNSYLVANIA

"For the purpose of voting, no person shall be deemed to have gained a residence by reason of his presence, or lost it by reason of his absence, while employed in the service, either civil or military, of this State or of the United States" (constitution, art. VIII, sec. 13). "Whenever any of the qualified electors of this Commonwealth shall be in the actual military service under a requisition from the President of the United States or by authority of this Commonwealth, such electors may exercise the right of suffrage in all elections by the citizens, under such regulations as are or shall be prescribed by law, as fully as if they were present at their usual places of election" (constitution, art. VIII, sec. 6). Electors in actual military service absent on the days of general, municipal, or special elections may vote at polls to be opened in each military or naval unit containing Pennsylvania electors. "The right of voting shall not be affected by reason of the failure of any elector to have been registered in his place of residence" (Laws, 1937, No. 320, secs. 1301–1302).

PUERTO RICO

No provisions found.

RHODE ISLAND

"No person in the military, naval, marine, or any other service of the United States shall be considered as having the required residence by reason of being employed in any garrison, barrack, or military or naval station in this State" (constitution, art II, sec. 4). By a Civil War amendment of the constitution (August 1864, amendment No. 4) provision was made for soldier voting which is superseded by amendment No. 21, adopted November 1930, providing for absent voting generally. A provision "for the registration of citizens absent from the State in the actual military service of the United States" (Laws, 1918, ch. 1610) was repealed (Laws, 1920, ch. 1892) and the act putting the then-existing constitutional provision for soldier voting into effect in the World War (Laws, 1918, ch. 1657) was applicable only to the 1918 election. Electors absent from the State may vote by mail (Gen. Laws, 1938, ch. 319). There is no provision for absent registration, but apparently taxpayers are permanently registered.

SOUTH CAROLINA

There is no provision for voting by persons absent in the military service. An act so providing in 1918 (Laws No. 574) was declared to "apply only during the present war."

SOUTH DAKOTA

"No elector shall be deemed to have lost his residence in this State by reason of his absence on business of the United States or of this State, or in the military or naval service of the United States" (constitution, art. VII, sec. 6). "No soldier, seaman, or marine in the Army or Navy of the United States shall be deemed a resident of this State in consequence of being stationed therein" (constitution, art. VII, sec. 7). A specific law on voting by persons in military service (Laws, 1918, ch. 46) was apparently considered temporary. Any qualified elector absent from his home precinct may vote by mail (Code, 1939, secs. 16.0606–16.0609). A person not registered may "furnish to the judges of election his affidavit, stating that he is an inhabitant of the precinct, giving his place of residence, the time he has resided therein, and the reason why he was not registered" (sec. 16.0706).

TENNESSEE

No specific reference to voting by persons in military service found. Any voter whose business, occupation, or habitual duties requires absence from the city or county of residence may vote by mail (Code, 1932, secs. 2228–2256). Absent registration is permitted (sec. 2254).

TEXAS

"The following classes of persons shall not be permitted to vote in this State * * * all soldiers, marines, and seamen employed in the service of the Army or Navy of the United States. Provided that this restriction shall not apply to officers of the National Guard of Texas, the National Guard Reserve, and the Organized Reserves of the United States" (constitution, art. VI, sec. 1). Payment of poll tax constitutes registration.

UTAH

"A person shall not be deemed to have gained or lost a residence by reason of his presence or absence while employed in the service of the United States. * * * No officer, soldier, seaman, or marine in the Army or Navy of the United States shall be deemed a resident of this State in consequence of being stationed at any military or naval station within the same" (Rev. Stat. 1933, sec. 25–2–14). Any qualified elector absent more than 20 miles from his voting precinct may vote by mail (sec. 25–5–1; sec. 25–5–14). Absent registration is not permitted.

VERMONT

"A person shall not gain or lose a residence by reason of his presence or absence while in the service of the State or of the United States" (Public Laws, 1933, sec. 87). Legal voters absent at any election may vote by mail (secs. 91–108 amended Laws, 1935, No. 6, Laws, 1937, No. 4). There is no provision for absent registration but renewal is not required.

VIRGINIA

"No officer, soldier, seaman, or marine of the United States Army or Navy shall be deemed to have gained a residence as to the right of suffrage in the State, or in any county, city, or town thereof, by reason of being stationed therein" (constitution, sec. 24). Apparently citizenship in the State is lost only by definite act of relinquishment (Michie's Code, 1936, secs. 63–65). Any qualified voter may vote by mail (secs. 202–218). Absent registration is not permitted.

WASHINGTON

"For the purpose of voting * * * no person shall be deemed to have gained a residence by reason of his presence, or lost it by reason of his absence, while in the civil or military service of the State or of the United States" (constitution, art. VI, sec. 4). "Absence from State on business shall not affect the question of residence of any person" (Remington's Revised Codes, 1932, sec. 5111). Any registered voter absent from his precinct may vote by mail (Supp. 1939, secs. 5280–5282). Absent registration is not permitted but renewal is not required.

WEST VIRGINIA

"No person in the military, naval, or marine service of the United States shall be deemed a resident of this State by reason of being stationed therein" (constitution, art. IV, sec. 1). A soldiers' absent voting law (Laws, 1917, 2d Ex. ch. 13) is apparently considered merged in a general absent voting law under which any qualified elector absent from the State may vote by mail (Michie's Code, 1937, secs. 135–149). The right to absent registration is doubtful (see Chaffee, A. E., Summary of the General Election Laws, 1936 ed.).

WISCONSIN

"No person shall be deemed to have lost his residence in this State by reason of his absence on business of the United States" (constitution, art. III, sec. 4). "No soldier, seaman, or marine in the Army or Navy of the United States shall be deemed a resident of this State in consequence of being stationed within the same" (constitution, art. III, sec. 5). An act for field voting by companies of the National Guard in active service (Laws, 1916, Ex. ch. 2) has been superseded by a general absent voting law under which qualified electors may vote by mail (Stat., 1939, secs. 11.54–11.68). Absent registration is permitted (sec. 6.17).

WYOMING

"No elector shall be deemed to have lost his residence in the State by reason of his absence on business of the United States or of this State, or in the military or naval service of the United States" (con-

stitution, art. VI, sec. 7). "No soldier, seaman, or marine in the Army or Navy of the United States shall be deemed a resident of this State in consequence of his being stationed therein" (constitution, art. VI, sec. 8). Any qualified elector absent from his county may vote by mail (Rev. Stat. 1931, secs. 36–1401–1420, Amended Laws, 1935, ch. 30; Laws, 1937, ch. 7). Absent registration is not permitted, but apparently renewal is not required.

S. 3550–H. R. 10101

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN G. ALEXANDER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 29, 1940

MEMORANDUM ON S. 3550 AND H. R. 10101

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

MEMORANDUM ON S. 3550 AND H. R. 10101

The title of each of these bills is: "To make unlawful the transportation of convict-made goods in interstate commerce."

Their purpose would be more accurately described under a title: "To soak the farmers for the benefit of the cordage and the farm-machinery manufacturers."

These bills originated with a group of binder-twine manufacturers, members of the cordage institute, but have been paraded before Congress behind a labor mask. The real beneficiaries of this proposed legislation are not workers, but are binder-twine manufacturers.

The interstate transportation of convict-made goods in every line except binder twine and farm machinery has ceased because of legislation adopted by most of the States under authority of the Ashurst-Sumners Act in order to give effect to the Hawes-Cooper Act.

Eight State prisons manufacture binder twine and only one farm machinery. These eight States are Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, Wisconsin, Michigan, Missouri, Kansas, and Oklahoma. Minnesota is the only State prison manufacturing farm machinery.

Under the drive to make effective State inhibitions against open-market sales of convict-made goods, nearly all of the States have adopted legislation to prohibit transportation of prison-made goods into each such State. The law in a few States exempts binder twine and farm machinery from such inhibitions. Wisconsin is one such State.

For more than 20 years cordage interests have promoted national legislation to destroy State set-ups for production of prison-made binder twine. These cordage interests, like barnacles, attached themselves to the clothing, the shirt, the foundry industries in their fight to eliminate prison production from competition in these fields with free labor.

In this contest it was possible to show instances where, in some lines of manufacture, prison production was marketed unfairly in competition with like goods made in free industry.

No such condition exists as to prison-manufactured binder twine.

WHY WERE PRISON MILLS ESTABLISHED?

The establishment of binder-twine mills in the prisons of several of the States was made through efforts of grain-producing farmers to protect themselves against extortionate prices of the twine used to bind grain. These mills have made an outstanding record of attainment of the objective responsible for their establishment.

Without taking any unfair advantage of competing free industry, prison binder-twine mills accomplished their purpose.

These mills are an effective stabilizing influence upon the price of binder twine.

During the existence of N. R. A., a convincing demonstration of the fairness of the operators of these prison mills was made when under the codes they sat together with the code authorities of the free-cordage industry. The prison mills willingly, in fact, avidly, accepted the wage and hour conditions of free industry.

The only differential they asked, and the competing free industry readily considered it to be justified, was a price differential to cover the lack of efficiency in the prison-operated mills. This price differential varied from one-half cent to about one cent per pound on binder twine. No complaint was made by private manufacturers that prison binder-twine manufacturers had chiseled in any particulars.

It is true a decline in the amount of twine sold by the free manufacturers has been experienced in this country. The same applies to the prison mills. There are two reasons for this: one, the introduction of the combine harvesting machine, doing away with the need of binding grain; and second, the increase in imports of foreign twine. In this wartime this latter reason has almost been eliminated except for the stock of foreign twine carried over from the imports made prior to the beginning of this war.

The manufacture in prison of twine was undertaken in the first instance not for the main purpose of giving prisoners employment but to protect agriculture, the fundamental industry of this country, against exploitation by a handful of binder-twine manufacturers. The same condition that justified its establishment in the first instance exists today. There are fewer free manufacturing plants producing binder twine than were in business 15 years ago. Also, there are fewer State-operated binder-twine mills. The disappearance of some manufacturers from this field was not due to prison-made twine, but in large measure was due to the "squeeze" tactics of free industry to change in harvesting processes, and to the importation of foreign twine.

At the same time that these prison mills protected grain-producing farmers against extortion employment was furnished to prisoners. These prison twine mills have not only been a source of labor and income to prisoners but have produced substantial revenue to operating States. Through these revenues it has been possible in some instances, either wholly or in considerable part, to pay the cost of operating prison establishments.

Unfortunately for this presentation figures are not available from all States manufacturing binder twine to show what these publicly owned and operated prison activities have done for the States and for the prisoners.

In Minnesota, in 26 years, it is estimated that the manufacture of binder twine and of farm machinery in its prison has brought revenue to the State of $20,000,000, and that over and above the cost of maintenance of prisoners in the past 10 years, the earnings of prisoners averaged $150,000 per year, or a total of $1,500,000 in a decade.

In addition to a saving made through the revenue from these prison industries during the 26-year period, it is estimated that on the use of binder twine from its State-owned mill the farmers of Minnesota made an additional saving of $10,000,000.

In Wisconsin in a 25-year-operating period its prison binder-twine mill, a very modest mill compared with that of Minnesota, turned into the general fund for inmate labor $696,530, and from the binder-twine revolving fund, which is never permitted to exceed $600,000, the general fund has received $1,263,059.

In other words, the Wisconsin mill has brought into the Treasury of that State $1,959,589. This does not include sums paid to prisoners personally.

It is estimated the actual savings to Wisconsin grain-producing farmers through the operation of the prison binder-twine mill at a minimum is in excess of $100,000 per year, or for the period covered it would mean a saving to the farmers on their binder twine of $1,500,000.

So the experiences of these two States present the picture of benefits accruing from binder-twine mills operated in their prisons.

The picture of this industry and the social and economic effect it has in the giving of employment to prisoners and at the same time the giving of protection to farmers, places its value on an entirely different basis than that of any other prison industry disposing its products on the open market.

Wisconsin has no private manufacturer of binder twine within its borders. Every pound of the binder twine manufactured by the Wisconsin prison mill is sold within the confines of the State. Farmers in northwest Wisconsin, because located close to the Minnesota prison mill, buy binder twine from that mill, as the freight rate is less from Stillwater to points in the northwest of the State than from Waupun, Wis., which is situated a little south of the central part of Wisconsin.

To briefly present an additional picture of the benefits which prison industry confers upon the farmers, the Minnesota prison in 1940, has a wholesale price of $164, f. o. b. Stillwater, from its 7-foot binder. The competing machine sold by the International Harvester Co. is priced f. o. b. Chicago at $211, and by the John Deere Co., $211.25, f. o. b. Moline. This difference of $47 on each machine of this type is evidence that in those communities where the prison-made machinery is being shut away from the farmers, that the charge of extortionate prices and monopoly control is established.

The facts presented here establish that the prison production of binder twine and of farm machinery is an entirely different relationship than is that of the production and marketing of shirts and overalls and other articles of like character which were cited in the charge of unfair competition and wrong done to labor by prison manufacture. Similar wrongs were never successfully established in the case of prison production of binder twine or farm machinery, but on the contrary not only have farmers benefited, but the public has been protected, as the lower price of the binder twine and farm machinery must lower the cost of the production of grain.

Notwithstanding the plain implications of statements made here in Congress in support of this legislation, the language of the Hawes-Cooper Act or of the Ashurst-Sumners Act was not mandatory. Each was an act to provide certain rules with respect to transportation and sale of prison-made goods. These acts were to become effective only through the action of the States. Each State was free to adopt or not to adopt legislation to give effect to these acts of Congress. In the language of either of these statutes, there is no compulsion placed upon the States. The Hawes-Cooper Act divests prison-made goods of interstate character provided such goods made in one State are sent into another State which has enacted a statute to give effect to the Hawes-Cooper Act. The

Ashurst-Sumners Act provides penalties for the interstate transportation of prison-made goods or for offering for sale such goods on the open market, provided that such goods are received or offered for sale "in violation of any law of such State or Territory."

The Federal law imposing penalties only becomes operative through a local law enacted to make the Hawes-Cooper Act and the Ashurst-Sumners Act effective within that State.

States that have refused to enact such legislation are as clearly within their legitimate sovereign rights as are those States which have enacted legislation to make effective the provisions of these statutes.

Neither the Hawes-Cooper Act nor the Ashurst-Sumners Act in language or declared purpose were amendatory of any constitutional power of a State. These acts placed within the power of each State to determine for itself whether it desired to limit its own right to ship or receive or sell or permit the sale in the open market, within its own borders, convict-made goods. However, the legislation proposed in S. 3550 and H. R. 10101 is broader than any heretofore offered, in that it provides penalties for the transport of convict-made goods in interstate commerce.

VIOLATION OF STATE'S RIGHT

There is no reference to violation of a law of a State. This is as broad a prohibition as can be written into the statutes. It is not dependent upon the action of any State law. It is compulsory.

Heretofore legislation to limit prison industries was enacted with coating of honeyed words, which won acceptance because the right of the State to act upon the transportation and disposition of prison goods, whether made within or without its borders, was safeguarded. This legislation denies discretion to the State and arbitrarily imposes the will of Congress.

This legislation has been advanced by gum-shoe methods. The States concerned were without notice of it until after it had been sent to conference. In the turmoil of more important subjects of legislation, this was put through without the general hearings and complete consideration which should be given to any legislation which affects or modifies the program of a State in the handling of its penal-treatment program. That is the concern of all the people of the States. It should not be sacrificed to the cupidity, the greed, the selfish interest of any group or combination of groups.

Appropriations and Contract Authorizations, 1940

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN TABER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 29, 1940

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I submit herewith the amounts of money made available as a result of the passage of bills from the Appropriations Committee to the 29th day of August 1940:

TABLE 1.—*Appropriations and contract authorizations incurred by the third session of the Seventy-sixth Congress (1940)*

Agriculture and farm credit:		
Regular	$918,603,918.00	
Permanent	112,052,045.00	
Reappropriations	9,305,000.00	
R. F. C. funds	150,000,000.00	
		$1,189,960,963.00
District of Columbia:		
Regular	48,765,080.00	
Permanent	3,873,821.00	
Contract authorizations	600,500.00	
Reappropriations	17,500.00	
		53,256,901.00
Independent offices:		
Regular	1,120,240,528.00	
Permanent	279,027,166.00	
Contract authorizations	2,000,000.00	
R. F. C. funds	2,000,000.00	
Reappropriations	6,141,620.00	
		1,409,409,314.00
Interior:		
Regular	135,383,330.00	
Permanent	13,505,940.00	
Reappropriations	16,203,900.00	
Contract authorizations	10,220,000.00	
		175,313,170.00
Labor-Federal Security:		
Regular	1,023,282,690.00	
Permanent trust	140,176,723.00	
Permanent annual	9,550,000.00	
Special fund	15,869,750.00	
Reappropriations	41,406.00	
		1,188,920,569.00
Legislative:		
Regular	$23,671,220.00	
Permanent	608,600.00	
		$24,279,820.00
Military:		
Regular	1,499,323,322.00	
Permanent	18,799.00	
Contract authorizations	323,229,636.00	
		1,822,571,757.00
War Department civil functions:		
Regular	222,718,717.00	
Permanent	2,423,700.00	
Contract authorizations	103,500,000.00	
		328,642,417.00
Navy:		
Regular	1,308,171,138.00	
Permanent	2,430,000.00	
Contract authorizations	182,741,612.00	
		1,493,342,750.00
State, Justice, and Commerce:		
Regular	107,149,000.00	
Permanent	4,185,280.00	
Reappropriations	600,000.00	
		111,934,280.00
Treasury and Post Office:		
Regular	1,032,801,095.00	
Permanent	3,397,997,215.00	
Reappropriations	31,000,000.00	
		4,461,798,310.00
Supplemental deficiency:		
Regular	252,340,776.00	
Contract authorizations	2,450,000.00	
		254,790,776.00
Urgent deficiency, regular	57,541,300.00	
		57,541,300.00
First deficiency, regular	92,035,408.52	
		92,035,408.52
Second deficiency:		
Regular	85,891,777.23	
Contract authorizations	53,575,000.00	
		139,466,777.23
Relief:		
Regular	1,157,711,357.00	
R. F. C. funds	125,000,000.00	
		1,282,711,357.00
Supplemental national deficiency:		
Regular	1,479,777,147.00	
Contract authorizations	289,136,761.00	
		1,768,913,908.00
		15,854,889,777.75

This does not include amounts made available to the R. F. C. exceeding $1,000,000,000, and many smaller items from the claims committees.

I shall, after the last bill is passed, bring this up to date, complete with all items.

What Happens If Wealth Is Conscripted?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL HINSHAW

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 29, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON TIMES-HERALD

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Times-Herald of this morning:

[From the Washington Times-Herald of August 29, 1940]

George Washington said: "Excessive partiality for one foreign nation and excessive dislike for another cause those whom they actuate to see danger only on one side, and serve to veil and even second the arts of influence on the other."—From the Farewell Address.

WHAT HAPPENS IF WEALTH IS CONSCRIPTED?—WHAT DOES IT MEAN?

This red-hot slogan, "Conscript the wealth if you conscript the men," is just the kind of catchy business to lead a lot of good people into something they don't want.

Everybody knows what happens when a man is drafted into military service.

Have you done much thinking about what happens to conscripted wealth?

Conscripted wealth doesn't just mean conscripted money. After all, that is just a matter of taxation. The Government always gets what it is after in the tax line. Always has. Always will as long as there's anything to get.

So if the slogan is going to lead to anything, "Conscript the wealth" means that the Government will move in and take over industries lock, stock, and barrel, in the name of national defense.

Now, for the past several years the same kind of people who are now yelling loudest about conscripting the wealth have been yelling about the necessity to protect labor by higher pay and shorter hours of work. They have backed all kinds of law, State and Federal, to protect the working man against arbitrary treatment by his employer.

And the great weapon which they have forged to protect the workingman has been the strike. We have a multitude of laws today guaranteeing labor the right to organize for collective bargaining, to strike against what it considers abuse, and to punish the employer who behaves badly when he doesn't like the way things go.

THE EMPLOYER WILL GET BY

Now under this "wealth conscription" project many of these same advocates of labor reform are shouting for the employer would be kicked all the way out of his plant and the whole put into the hands of the Government to advance the national defense.

Forget about the employer. If he has anything at all saved up, he'll get by, even if the Government doesn't pay him off for his capital investment.

But what about the employees who have, these 5 years past, been enjoying the right to strike, the 40-hour week, the protected wage, and generally a stronger position opposite the table of authority?

Can you fancy a union business agent telling the Army officer in charge of a steel mill where to get off?

When the Government conscripts a chunk of wealth it conscripts all that goes with it, and that includes the filing clerks, the elevator boys, and the janitors as well as the lifters and pushers out in the mill.

Everybody, not just the men drafted into the Army, would be in the service of Uncle Sam.

YOU DON'T STRIKE ON UNCLE SAM

And do you think labor unions can do anything to protect wages, hours and working conditions when the Government is boss? If you do ask the boys in the W. P. A. union who tried to pull a strike in New York and another one here about a year ago. They got a message from 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue reminding them that nobody has the right to strike against the Government.

So they silently folded their tents.

If that isn't enough for you, consider the position of the labor unions in Germany. Or in Russia. They don't do much worth telling to protect labor against the Government there, do they?

MADE IN MOSCOW

There are some people in this country who would like to see the Government in charge of everything. That's because they figure they will then be in charge of the Government. But how anybody who claims to believe in the system of civilization under which most Americans were born and brought up, and which we are all supposed now to be preparing to defend, can fall for their racket is beyond our comprehension.

Every time somebody shouts "conscript the wealth" they are delighted. But there is no reason for the rest of us to be. That slogan was made in Moscow, if any ever was. The next time you hear it, ask the shouter just what it means.

You'll find out, sure enough, that he doesn't realize what he has been saying, or he is working straight toward Government-take-everything.

Modern Philosophy of Politics: An Appraisal of the Republican Nominee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 29, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE TACOMA LABOR ADVOCATE

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herein an editorial from the Tacoma Labor Advocate, of my home city of Tacoma, Wash. This is the official organ of the American Federation of Labor in my congressional district, and is an excellently edited and managed weekly publication. Its editor, John McGivney, is one of the most scholarly writers on labor matters in the United States. He has written an editorial in a recent issue which is so thoughtful and provocative that I am including it in my remarks for the benefit of the readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

[From the Tacoma Labor Advocate, Tacoma, Wash.]

MR. WILLKIE ACCEPTS

As we listened to the acceptance speech of Mr. Willkie, and later on read it again in the papers next day, we had the strange feeling that we wished he would make up his mind.

For the life of us we couldn't make out whether he was a liberal or a conservative, a new dealer or a Hooverite, and what sort of a witch's broth in the end he had mixed up for the workers of tears and sweat, for we never saw a businessman, especially a big businessman, in tears or sweating in all our lifetime, we could not determine at all.

We found ourselves sympathizing with Members of the House and the Senate, where even on the conscription question both sides claimed Willkie for one of themselves. The anticonscriptionists insisted he had not declared for anything like the draft, while supporters of the draft were equally emphatic that he had.

In the earlier part of his utterances he appeared to support in all its moods and tenses the New Deal, and the only objection he seemed to have to any of it was that President Roosevelt headed the administration. And we found also that he was in the same plight as to the foreign policy of this Government, which he was heart and soul supporting except that he didn't like Roosevelt's way of doing it. We gathered that the New Deal would be all right except for Mr. Roosevelt, and we began to wonder indeed how it was that Mr. Willkie ever allowed anyone to baptize him in the Republican faith, except that he was tempted by Wall Street, where he lived and fell.

We observe that the National Association of Manufacturers, the United States Chamber of Commerce, and various bitter anti-new-dealers are all for Mr. Willkie. We have noted in the city of destiny some of the most vehement opponents of the New Deal are proud to wear Willkie buttons, and we wonder why.

Mr. Willkie, in his acceptance speech, swallows the New Deal—hook, line, and sinker. He approves the right of collective bargaining for labor. He endorses with emphasis the wage and hour bill and even promised to increase wages and shorten hours. He approved the S. E. C., regulation of public-utilities corporations, which seems as near economic treason for such a one as a man can get, takes the foreign policy of the Democrats to his bosom, and says he can lick Hitler, giving him cards and spades and little casino.

But that's just why he hates Roosevelt's policy. He threatens, says Willkie, and Mr. Willkie then to show that he can out-rant all ranters does a bit of threatening himself.

We confess that while we found the acceptance speech of Mr. Willkie quite an intriguing effort, we didn't get the answer to some of the things that a labor editor should know. We didn't find out who is backing Mr. Willkie for that is quite important. There is no such thing as an independent politician. The men who pay the Republican piper called the tune. And we'd like to know who that was.

We don't know how there could have been in one short week such a demand for one that not one in a hundred ever heard of or if they did ever remembered. We would like to know who paid the claquers in the gallery of the Philadelphia convention, who shouted all through the day and all through the night, "We want Willkie," when they would not know Willkie from a crow. We would like to know who had the money and the foresight to give the delegates who came for Dewey and for TAFT the "bum's rush" and dumped them into the Willkie camp. We wonder what brought Lamont to Philadelphia and how he came to be mixed up in the shenanigan which swept the delegates for the native son of Pennsylvania not into the ranks of BOB TAFT but into the ranks of Wendell Willkie.

In fact we would like to know who discovered Willkie and how come he was to become so soon "a second" Lincoln and who in a single acceptance speech could make the second part nullify everything he said in the first part.

Candy for everyone, and then tears and sweat! Well we know who suffer tears and who are bathed in a bloody sweat of privation and misery. And we know it's not the Willkies nor the bosses for whom the Willkies as attorneys and managers are merely serving men.

Of course we know that Mr. Willkie consulted everyone. Taft, Dewey, Hamilton, Hoover, Landon. Most of these are men of different views. You couldn't reconcile one with the other if you tried. And they all tried to wind Willkie's acceptance speech over to their points and so inevitably there is hodgepodge which could be all things to all men—alike new dealers and old.

But as an acceptance speech it lacked one notable feature. It was not the voice of a fearless captain and full of humility, full of noble dread for the awful tasks which, if he were elected, fate would impose upon him. It was a mocking and ignoble state of mind which would challenge the President of the United States to exhibit himself and as our Chief Executive as a contentious rival, to a holding company charlatan while President Roosevelt is bearing the tremendous responsibility of this emergency on his shoulders. It was such an outrageous suggestion that we begin to suspect Willkie is a brazen fraud, for no man could mean to do any such

thing as that in this crisis of our Nation's history. Willkie promised everything to everybody. He is going to start the wheels of industry by free enterprise, but the mystery of his method is a secret apparently shared in only by names so august that he dare not utter them.

Frankly we are appalled by the amazing and expanded efforts to exploit Willkie. It began in Philadelphia. It is continued at Elwood, Ind., and at the latter place revealed such a mastery of showmanship that those in charge could have no aim but pretensions. We would like to compliment Willkie by saying that it must have been arranged for him, not by him. For we doubt if even the most arrant political humbug would go as far as that.

Yet we confess that the miracle of effort in an attempt to seat 150,000 people on 30,000 wooden seats must have rivaled or was intended to rival the miracle of the loaves and fishes that fed once on a time the hungry multitude. There was a peanut and popcorn vending machine at every corner and the streets bristled with ice cream and soda fountains for the honor of the nominee. It was to be a modern Cloth of Gold, and the wonder is, so far unanswered, who were the big boys behind the reckless spending.

It may have been political etiquette which forbids the nominee to indulge in any mention of his running mate. We don't know about that; but it would have been quite informative if Willkie had spent a brief space of time reconciling his own career as a private utility magnate and attorney with that of Senator McNARY who never avoided a fight for Bonneville and the T. V. A. Mr. McNARY never refused to vote for the New Deal and so his support of such as he finds favorable cannot be doubted. He is not suspect. But we wonder how this great landlord like Willkie, who enjoys the secure revenue from tenantry, can even come approximately close as such a landlord to the McNary-Haugen bill which with fine flourish of the veto power two Republican Presidents have killed because it was meant to help the small farmer and the plastered farm.

However, these things are beside the question. But there are other things which are not, and it is to them we would refer. This Nation is immersed deeply in a crisis. This is as inevitable as that night will follow day. The Nation's ideology will become a defense ideology or a war ideology. That is going to affect how men think, what men do, and what men will say. It will produce a more or less hysterical condition, wherein the profiteers will seek to eke out of the Nation's woes and worries greater and greater profits.

We see that condition coming down on us right now. We could not avoid it even if we would. But Willkie didn't mention it. He never showed it was even in his thoughts. He promised prosperity and work. He didn't tell us anything about the defense psychology which will be ours for the next 4 years. He said nothing about prices which even now are beginning to soar and that efforts to secure Government contracts with Government assuming the costs and responsibilities for industrial expansion.

Now, these things are of vital importance to us. They concern all our civil rights. They affect such freedom as we have. They will test our metal and we may realize profoundly then what Tom Paine meant when he said in another day and another crisis, "These are the times that try men's souls."

We are shocked to think that while Willkie could in such easy fashion dare to belittle the Presidency by attempting to drag it into the political slime of the hustings, he revealed no sense whatever of what is before this Nation. He spoke of tears and sweat. But tears and sweat are always the lot of most of the workers, and it is the trusts and monopolies and holding companies that have thrust so much of that privation upon them.

We are face to face with an emergency and its magnitude, its nearness, and its tremendous responsibilities that seem to have been ignored with or without deliberation by Mr. Willkie.

However, that will not matter. We are quite certain in our own mind that Mr. Roosevelt will be reelected. To Roosevelt's administration, rightly or wrongly, labor owes much. It has not confined itself to eloquent promises before Elwood crowds to be forgotten the next day. The Roosevelt administration has translated into deed what others have said might be done. His administration has helped the unemployed and all over this Nation has kept them at work who would otherwise starve. Every State is the richer for the Roosevelt administration: richer in new schools, richer in roads and bridges and public works, things that are lasting in their worth and which have relieved want and penury and privation that never would have otherwise been even palliated.

Roosevelt came in 1933 the great captain. He is still the great captain in 1940. He is the chief of a great Nation to whom the whole world of men has looked for inspiration, for hope, and for guidance. Confident, alert, determined, unflinching in will and purpose to make this America prove worthy of its great tradition of men and institutions. And we are quite certain that the people for whom Mr. Roosevelt has done so much and whose great humanitarian heart has been in evidence in everything he has done for them and who more keenly than any man since Lincoln has shown that deeds, not words, are what count, will be reelected.

Mr. Willkie, we judge, doesn't like that acceptance speech. He has since seemingly weighed it and found it wanting. Mr. Ickes' icy and acid criticism has made him wilt. Don't answer it, he wires his campaign manager. Perhaps already too much dirt has been shaken up to muddy the pool. "Let sleeping dogs lie" is a sound motto. And so we judge that Wendell L. Willkie, despite the big show at Elwood and the big promises of what Norman Thomas called a stick of candy for everyone, may find it harder to fool all the people some of the time or enough at least part of the time to elect the man who comes to claim the Republican Party as a Democrat through the grace of accentuated humbug.

Frankly, we had hoped that Wendell Willkie was a different sort of a man. We had believed that we saw in him a man free from political humbug and deadly in earnest. We had hoped that he was one at least who would not, like so many, attempt the impossible feat of riding two horses running in different directions. We had hoped he would not be emphatically a Mr. Facing Both Ways which excited the contempt of Mr. Bunyan. We had believed that he would have something to offer—not just as good, not more efficient, but something infinitely finer and franker and more assured than the New Deal. There are lots of things we don't like in the New Deal. But Willkie has nothing better and he seems to think that there should be reason and sense in our approving as he does New Deal doctrines and deserting the political fortunes of the man who gave it to us.

Well, there are all sorts of ingrates in this world, but we don't believe that any number can be found among the followers of Mr. Roosevelt. That we can safely leave to those who have already taken a walk and who find themselves much more at home in the ranks of special privilege and special interests. But they were never supporters of Mr. Roosevelt. They were silent servitors of reaction. They have always known on which side their bread was buttered, as the ox knoweth its owner and the ass its master's crib.

Sentiment Grows for Unified Air Force

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 29, 1940

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, on the evening of August 19, I had the opportunity of addressing a Nation-wide radio audience on the subject Aviation Progress and Problems. As a part of my speech I advocated a Department of National Defense, with Secretaries for the Army, the Navy, and the Air Corps. I placed that address in the Appendix of the RECORD of August 20. At this time I again call attention to the following two paragraphs:

In the President's Cabinet, instead of having a separate Department of War and a separate Department of Navy with military aviation scattered between them, there should be a single department of national defense under which the three great arms of our Nation's power may be coordinated on an equal footing. Our fighting forces by air, by land, and by water should, on an equal basis, find a place in a single great department with one coordinating head at the Cabinet table. Senator CLARK of Missouri and myself have introduced in Congress legislation which would make this a reality. This proposal will be vigorously pushed.

Again and again during the past year the power of aviation has been impressed upon us by a ruthless invader. May our country learn, while God gives us time, to so nourish our aviation that the Stars and Stripes will fly ever triumphantly over land and sea, over mountain and wave, supreme against the jealousy of unprincipled aggressors.

On Saturday, August 24, I read with interest and approval of the statement of the Republican candidate for President, Wendell Willkie, in which he advocated a unified air force.

In connection with this matter I include at this point editorial comment from the Washington, D. C., Daily News of yesterday:

Air power has dominated that war. Germany's preparations began with, and have adhered to, the principle that men who believe in air power and understand its uses should be free to develop it. France and Britain were forced to come to that principle, but belatedly. The United States, alone among major powers, still clings to the traditional practice that keeps air power divided into two branches, one subordinate to the Army and the other subordinate to the Navy.

Admirals have been trained to think first of battleships. Generals have been trained to think first of land armies. Both are necessary. But this country also needs men who will think first of planes and pilots, and whose authority in their field will equal that the admirals and the generals in theirs. And then, above them all, it needs a higher authority to balance the development of the three arms of national defense and to coordinate them if war comes.

This is what Mr. Willkie advocates. He would begin immediately with the creation of a new Cabinet post—a Secretary of the Air Force, with authority equal to that of the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy. His ultimate objective would be a single Cabinet officer in charge of defense, with under secretaries for the Army, the Navy, and the air force.

Until there is such an arrangement, American air power will continue to be the stepchild of the older services. There is little reason to hope that aviation will be given that emphasis to which, by its performance in modern warfare, it is entitled. There is much reason to fear that the tremendously costly defense program will be unbalanced by overemphasis on older weapons whose effectiveness has been lessened by air power.

Mr. Willkie has taken a bold stand on an issue about which much more should be heard in the Presidential campaign. It is an issue vital to the safety of the country.

This subject is not new, and many public officials and military authorities and observers have advocated that we give proper place to the air force in national-defense planning and preparation. It is not political. It is vital, as I see it, that we take action toward this highly desired end. For many years I have worked for such action. I shall continue my efforts.

Conscription

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RUSH D. HOLT

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 29 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

ARTICLE FROM AMERICAN FEDERATIONIST

Mr. HOLT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article entitled "Labor Weighs Conscription." This article is from the American Federationist, the official publication of the American Federation of Labor.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the American Federationist]

LABOR WEIGHS CONSCRIPTION

When the mailed fist of any enemy of the American people is thrust across the water to strike at the heart of world democracy, it will be crushed by the solid armor of impregnable military defenses backed by the united national will, the technical genius, and the rich resources of the people of the United States.

In modern warfare effective national defense rests upon three requirements essential to victory—determination, organization, and mechanization.

Determination, born of national unity and reinforced by the singleness of purpose and conviction that freedom shall not be destroyed, is the most powerful of our weapons.

The defense of the American soil means more than the defense of home and hearth. It is more than a defense of a way of life. It is the defense of basic human rights and of institutions which give meaning to these rights. It is the defense of that democracy which has given to every citizen in our community new stature, dignity, and scope for achievement, long sought by man but heretofore denied him.

KEY TO MODERN MILITARY STRENGTH

Organization is the key to military strength in modern warfare. Not only organization and coordination of military forces but organization of all resources is also of crucial importance to our defense. In taking stock of our strength we can count our ability to organize to be superior to that of other peoples, and with reason.

Over a brief span of 150 years, beginning with a meager seacoast colony, we have turned a continent untouched by civilization into a nation whose industrial supremacy and standard of living stand unchallenged today.

Our gigantic enterprises and great institutions bear convincing witness to our ability to organize, to undertake a big job, and do it quickly, efficiently, and thoroughly.

Mechanization is indispensable to modern defense. A technological revolution has swept the armies of the world and has made hopelessly obsolete the basic military strategy and technique of yesterday. In this, too, we shall be strong.

As a people we are mechanically minded. We have led the world in technological progress and mechanical advancement for the past hundred years. Our scientists have pioneered in technical discovery which our engineers have translated into miracles of steel, power, productivity, and made them part of everyday life.

In surveying our problem of defense we face the crucial fact that modern war is primarily a war of machines and no longer predominantly a war of men. The character of armies has always been determined by the weapons used. The gasoline engine has completely changed the scope and character of warfare and equipped us with new weapons.

It has made the airplane the foremost instrument of combat; it has given tanks, tractors, armored trucks, and other mobile equipment supreme importance on land; it has given armies speed and mobility they have not known before.

To man these weapons, to put this equipment to most effective use, we need a personnel in our armed forces of a type and character wholly different from those relied upon in the past.

We need skills more than we need numbers. Continued reliance on sheer numeric manpower can only lead to needless loss of human life and weaken rather than strengthen our entire defense.

THE INGREDIENTS OF VICTORY

The current war in Europe has demonstrated that quick, well-coordinated action, made possible by topnotch organization and maximum efficiency, plus mechanical superiority, are the qualities of victory. These have been the crucial secrets of success of Nazi invaders. We cannot hope to achieve these qualities within 1 year of compulsory training of 2,000,000 conscripts.

Throughout the battle of Flanders and the battle of France the invading German force was able to overwhelm armies possibly several times its size. Not all of this can be charged to treason and "fifth column" activity.

Relatively small contingents of Nazi troops were able to surround and down the great Allied force because of their superior skill in mechanized warfare, better coordination, and greater mobility.

We cannot afford to ignore this fresh and bloody lesson of the European war. We must put quality before quantity in shaping our own defenses.

It would be different if both could be achieved in a short space of time. We know this cannot be done. What our new recruits need, above all, is training. We have sufficient training personnel to handle some 300,000 men in one year—to give them thorough training and military discipline, develop their skills and make them into first-class fighters.

But if we bring under the colors five or six times that number of recruits, we would be forced to leave them for a long time not only without training but even without adequate supervision.

But the newly recruited Army personnel calls for more than training. The recruits need uniforms and shoes; they need housing and camp equipment; and above all they need rifles, guns, armored cars, and vast quantities of mechanical equipment so that they could be trained to handle this equipment, to service it and to fight with it.

This problem must be approached realistically. We know now that in the space of a few months we cannot hope to provide even 1,000,000 new recruits with supplies, ammunition, and mechanical equipment to justify their conscription into the active ranks.

Our present strength of the Regular Army is 283,000, with the authorized strength of the National Guard at about 235,000. The immediate defense need can best be met by doubling our present Regular Army strength in the next year.

It would be sheer folly to denude industry of workers essential to production of defense equipment and bring them into the Army ranks before we are ready to provide them with the necessary training and equipment. Every practical consideration dictates this realistic moderate increase in our defense force.

The analysis of every industrial, economic, and military phase of our defense problem indicates that the immediate quota for recruitment can and should be filled by voluntary enlistment.

Yet it has been proposed to raise by conscription, in a short space of months, a huge army of much the same type as the one with which we fought in the last World War. Peacetime conscription is the order of the day. Compulsory military training in peacetime for great numbers of our citizens is urged as essential to defense. With reckless haste and with a minimum of opportunity for calm discussion and competent criticism, a bill designed to raise through conscription a peacetime army of 2,000,000 men was being rushed through Congress as this issue went to press.

How did compulsory conscription originate? What has it meant in terms of offensive and defensive warfare? How would it affect our peacetime way of life? Let us first turn back a few pages of history.

Wartime conscription is not undemocratic, as has been claimed by some. Arguments that conscription is a totalitarian product are vicious attempts to confuse the real issues by historical falsehoods.

As the term is used today, conscription is a relatively recent development, dating from the French Revolution. In fact, it expressed the basic ideas of the French Revolution by requiring equality of service and giving substance to the fraternity of all classes of society in their responsibility for military service.

The Revolution of 1789 brought to an end the old royal army of France and made it necessary to raise a new army on a new basis. It was inevitable that the French Republic should adopt the principle of universal service.

EARLY FRENCH DRAFT RESISTED

In 1793 the first attempt to make the service truly universal by resorting to compulsory conscription proved extremely unpopular. Thousands of men liable to draft deserted their homes and uprisings took place.

After the initial successes of Napoleon in Italy, the renewal of the war with Austria appeared inevitable by 1798. In the latter part

of that year the law embodying General Jourdan's system of conscription was incorporated in the French Constitution.

This law, which furnished Napoleon with his armies of conquest, provided for five classes of conscripts in age groups between 20 and 25, each class being called out on an ascending scale to meet the necessity of Napoleon's "absolute warfare."

Napoleon's successes firmly established the principle of conscription in other European nations. Thus by 1808 Prussia accepted in full the principle of universal service without distinction of class or right of exemption by purchase. In fact, the application of compulsory conscription in Prussia, bringing all groups, classes, and ranks into the national army, was a tremendous force in the shaping of a united German Empire out of a patchwork of states and principalities.

It is probably fair to say that the triumph of a fully developed system of conscription was achieved by the Prussian military machine at the battle of Sedan in 1870, which brought victory over France. The evolution of the techniques of warfare from 1870 to date has proved conscription to be an increasingly costly device to nations at war.

The instruments of warfare available at the given time have always determined the make-up and size of armies in combat. In a primitive society in which simple agricultural implements were used as effective military weapons it was natural that every able-bodied man would be called upon to defend the community. It was the manufacture of armor and the gradual development of military inventions which gave rise to the professional soldier and changed the character of armies.

CHEAP GUNPOWDER CHANGED THINGS

Costly ammunition called for smaller and more highly selective armies.

This was the case in the Middle Ages when armor was of dominant importance, but with the advent of gunpowder, when ammunition gradually became cheap and easy to obtain, the use of mass manpower gained in importance.

Europe of the nineteenth century fought out its wars on the assumption that the numerical strength of the army is decisive to military success. Napoleon's belief that God marches with the biggest battalions held good through this time and its hang-over still overshadowed European military thinking through the last World War.

Warfare today is vastly different from that of 25 years ago. It has even less in common in its technique with the warfare of Napoleonic conquests. Modern war is chiefly a war of mechanical equipment.

Military power, which was once based on the number of yeomen who could be enlisted, today depends on the number of skilled mechanics needed, not only to manufacture war machines, but to fight with them.

Conscription is a military outgrowth of an agricultural democracy in which the vast reserve of manpower was derived from agriculture. An industrial democracy which no longer depends on crop-growing as its basic industry a totally different problem and finds that conscription saps its resources rather than adds to its strength.

These compelling conclusions have been forcefully stated by one of the foremost writers on military science and tactics, Maj. Gen. John F. C. Fuller, who was chief general staff officer of the British Tanks Corps in 1917–18.

His studies of recruitment and training during the last World War led him to the conclusion that the future use of conscription will be limited solely to the armies of aggression for the purposes of occupation. Writing as long ago as 1928, Fuller pointed out that "the theory of conscription has run its course, and is today growing out of date. A few years hence no conscript army will be able to face an organized attack by armed motor cars, let alone by tanks and kindred weapons."

"To those who can read the past and follow present tendencies," Fuller wrote 12 years ago, "the future development of recruitment is clear and certain. The advent of the motor-driven battle vehicle has introduced armor as an essential in tactical organization. Another armored age faces the great armies of the world, an age of costly machines in place of cheap muskets. The tendency is, consequently, one toward small armies in which quality will replace the quantity theory of the present cannon-fodder masses."

In his penetrating analysis of the World War tactics Fuller saw that "it was nothing less than a national, let alone military, crime to conscript all classes of men as if they were of equal value, and to fill the trenches which were little more than altars of human sacrifice to a discredited god, with highly skilled mechanics, miners, and professional men.

"Throughout the war it was scarcely realized by any of the general staffs that the one great tactical problem was not to increase fighting manpower, but as far as it was possible to eliminate the fighting man, the human slop-butt, and to replace him by a mechanic."

"In spite of tank attacks, air attacks, naval attrition, and chemical attacks, it was not realized that weapons give blows and men receive them and that the main problem in tactics is how to give blows without receiving them, and not a mere question of human tonnage."

It is ironic to consider today that Fuller held the key to the future course of events when he pointed out the fatal error made in 1919, when Germany was denied the power to maintain a conscript army and was compelled to establish a voluntary one—that is, to rely on quality—while France continued to adhere to bulk numbers.

FORESAW DEFEAT OF FRANCE

Though his warning went unheeded, Fuller foresaw the outcome many years ago when he suggested that the mechanical training and equipment of the Germans was bound to win over the sheer strength in numbers of the French.

A number of our own military experts have been giving increasing recognition to this view. Hanson W. Baldwin, military expert of the New York Times, points out in the August issue of Harper's that the maximum initial force which could be transported to the Western Hemisphere by an enemy power, "even if control of the sea were wrested from us" would not be much larger than 50,000 men.

To transport and supply an army of 1,000,000 men to this hemisphere would require at least 13,000,000 tons of shipping. Baldwin considers this economically impossible.

"Not even Britain, or a combination of Britain and Germany, has sufficient shipping to divert such an enormous amount of it from their ordinary and vital trade routes for military purposes," he says. "We do not, therefore, have to fear the employment of mass armies in this hemisphere; the most we have to guard against is the possible transportation of a small expeditionary force."

The important point in Baldwin's analysis is that, even if our defense extended to the entire Western Hemisphere, we need, in addition to our own home defense, "a field force, highly trained, fully equipped, instantly ready for transportation anywhere within the Western Hemisphere. Such a force certainly need be no larger than 150,000 men—perhaps half that number—about the number with which Germany, only 100 miles away, seized Norway." The entire enlarged Regular Army "need be no larger than 400,000 men, if that large."

Some experts place the maximum at 600,000. Some put it as high as 750,000. This is the largest professional army, the Regular Army, we can possibly need at the present time. And such an army can and should be raised by voluntary enlistment.

We have seen that mechanical warfare is the dominant characteristic of present-day defense. Having borne the brunt of technological displacement of manpower in our everyday life, it would be folly to ignore the fact that the bulk of our military manpower requirements have also been displaced by technological developments and that we must substitute mechanical strength for numerical strength in our defense force.

COMPLETE TRANSFORMATION

We must fully realize the revolutionary impact of the gasoline engine on our techniques. To the extent that the gasoline engine has given armies unprecedented mobility, it has completely transformed the scale and the scope of military activities.

If the United States is to be engaged in a defense war in the near future it will be engaged in a war of machines, airplanes, and armor plate, a war of rapid movement in which our mechanical dexterity will be pitted against the technological ingenuity of the enemy.

Such a war cannot be waged as effectively with a large army of conscripts, burdensome, immobile, and clumsy, as with a highly trained, compact force of skillful soldiers and skilled technicians.

We have seen that in the light of the training facilities as well as of military supplies and equipment which can be made available within 1 year, our Regular Army should not be increased beyond the maximum of 750,000 men which can be attained by voluntary enlistment.

Our total peacetime defense force should not exceed 1,500,000 if it is to be efficient and effective. Our defense production as well as defense itself would bog down under the weight of an excessive and unnecessary mass of recruits which the proposed conscription would bring.

We have also seen that the very nature of our defense requirements cannot possibly justify the immediate raising of an army of 2,000,000 conscripts in the space of a few months, even when we assume the defense of our entire hemisphere to be the immediate objective. The armed force that we do need, the force that can be properly trained, one which can be adequately clothed and properly equipped is of a size which can and should be recruited by voluntary enlistment.

The proposed peacetime draft would give us a large standing Army which, once established, would remain a burden upon the rest of the population, on our customs, and on our institutions. It would inevitably become a self-perpetuating force which would dominate the civil life of our Nation.

WHAT IT MEANS TO LABOR

What does the proposed peacetime conscription mean to labor? If approved, the draft would reach into every factory, mill, and mine, into every family and every home. For those who are conscripted it would mean a complete economic readjustment. For this, provision should be made.

Foremost in importance is the worker's equity in his job. Workers subjected to military service should be assured priority of reemployment without loss of senicrity rights. This cannot be enforced by a mere declaration but should be made mandatory.

Compulsory contribution to national defense on the part of the worker places a corresponding duty on the employer to do his part in safeguarding the economic security of those called to fight for their land and the security of their dependents.

For those dependents who are deprived of their means of support as the result of conscription, adequate provision should also be made. Adequate pay to the men subjected to military service is one

of the essentials in a program designed to achieve this by the most equitable means.

Employed wage earners have accumulated a stake under our social-security program. Under our contributory system of old-age benefits, provision should be made to preserve the accumulated equity unimpaired.

Although our system of unemployment insurance does not call for employee contributions, in reality the bulk of the unemployment compensation funds is derived from the wages of our workers, not only through direct as well as hidden taxes and higher prices, but also in lower wages resulting from the natural desire of employers to pass on the cost of social-security taxes.

Workers' equity in all phases of the social-security program should therefore be protected.

There is also the problem of adjustments in the obligations incurred by the workers and their families in their day-to-day struggle for existence. Payments on insurance policies and taxes, on homes, automobiles, and other necessities cannot be continued when men are torn away from their jobs.

Provision should be made to suspend the pressure of these obligations in an equitable way which would safeguard the interests of the worker and of his family, as well as protect those of his creditors.

Conscription which reaches into every sector of the community, and into every type and class of our labor force will disturb to the very foundations our entire employment structure. It will mean drastic readjustments in every phase of industry and the flow of production and distribution of those goods and services which go to make up the economic strength of the people of the United States.

Conscripted workers will have to be replaced, and replacement skills developed. In many occupations women will have to be brought into industry to take the place of the men called to take up arms.

Our industrial defense needs are as vitally important as our military requirements. Machinery must be perfected to achieve a balance in a way in which maximum industrial productivity, both in quantity and in quality, could be sustained.

Our employment services would have to be geared up to recruitment procedures to achieve this complex distribution of skills and manpower with the maximum of effectiveness.

LET'S BE EFFICIENT AT THE START

It would also be necessary to make provision for the cost of transportation of all workers from their homes to the places where their services are utilized. All industrial workers, skilled, semiskilled, and unskilled, who are called upon to serve in war manufacturing industries as well as in our armed forces should be provided transportation by the Government whenever their place of service or employment is away from their homes.

Congress has already made enormous appropriations for defense production purposes, but the billions thus far appropriated are small compared with the total price which will have to be borne by the entire Nation in perfecting its defenses.

The American people will pay this price willingly and patriotically, but in return they can justly demand that their contribution is not dissipated wastefully and extravagantly. If we are to do an efficient job of our defense we must begin to be efficient at the beginning. Compulsory conscription of an Army of millions of soldiers to be carried out at once is a wasteful and an extravagant proposal.

Nye Charges United States Gave War Signal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD KNUTSON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 29, 1940

ARTICLE FROM THE NEW YORK TIMES OF AUGUST 28, 1940

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Times of Wednesday, August 28, 1940.

NYE CHARGES UNITED STATES GAVE WAR SIGNAL—SAYS IN LETTER TO THE TIMES "SOLD OUT ENGLAND AND FRANCE" BY PROMISE OF AID—DOUBTS PERIL OF HITLER—QUOTES TIMES MILITARY WRITER IN SUPPORT OF HIS RETORT TO EDITORIAL CRITICISM

The New York Times has received the following letter from Senator GERALD P. NYE, of North Dakota:

WASHINGTON, *August 27, 1940.*

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

The New York Times in an editorial this morning entitled "Mr. NYE Finds It Funny," ridicules me for allegedly having ridiculed the idea that Mr. Hitler could successfully invade the continental United States.

This, if the matter were not so deadly serious, would indeed be funny, inasmuch as one of my authorities for my belief that Mr. Hitler would find such a program distinctly difficult, if not, indeed, impossible, is the military expert of the New York Times itself, Mr. Hanson W. Baldwin.

Mr. Baldwin has said, and I have quoted him, thus:

"The maximum initial force that could be transported (from Germany to the United States) even if control of the sea were wrested from us, would not be much larger than 50,000 men."

The transportation of such a force would require 375,000 tons of shipping, perhaps 40 ships, about the largest force that could conveniently be convoyed in a single operation.

"To supply such a force might require from 650,000 tons of shipping to 2,000,000 tons monthly; in other words, perhaps half of the tonnage of the German merchant marine would have to be devoted solely to the job of supplying 50,000 soldiers. If this force were to be doubled, the shipping tonnage necessary would be doubled; to supply an army of 1,000,000 men would require at the very least 13,000,000 tons of shipping.

"Economically and commercially, the problem seems impossible; not even Britain or a combination of Britain and Germany has sufficient shipping to divert such an enormous amount of it from their ordinary and vital trade routes to military purposes."

AS TO A SIGNAL FOR WAR

So said Mr. Baldwin, the Times' own expert, but the New York Times has, perchance conveniently forgotten about it, just as conveniently as it forgets to add that when it quotes me predicting about a year ago that there wasn't going to be a war in Europe, that I added that there wouldn't be unless the United States gave the signal to go. Which I am confident it did, and I think history will show that the administration gave England and France reason to believe that if they would declare war on Germany, help would be forthcoming.

I am not afraid to believe that some day history will show, as one of the blackest marks of our time that we sold out, by deliberate falsification, the two European nations with which we had the closest ties. We sent France to her death and have brought England perilously close to it. Had they stalled Hitler for a while, while they prepared to meet him, the story might have been different. Instead they plunged into it, unready as they were.

But the New York Times is anxious for national defense; no more so than am I, however. But it can see only conscription as the way to get it. I see conscription as a poor way to get it, but worse than that, the beginnings of a regimentation here which will have the New York Times eventually suffering from the very kind of dictatorial power to which newspapers have been subjected in Europe.

CALLS CONSCRIPTION A SUBTERFUGE

Conscription is a subterfuge, a complete subterfuge, a political subterfuge, and the Congress know it. If it were anything else but that, the issue would have been disposed of in a week.

The New York Times would like a better Army. So would I. Will it go along with me in an attempt to get one by means at our command already which do not involve blasting our own democracy and mimicking Hitler to stop a fear of Hitler? Will it go along a step further and caution Washington against more of the kind of foreign policy that has made hateful people abroad of those we ought to have as friends?

I am flattered and delighted at the personal attention of the New York Times in devoting its lead editorial of virtually a column length to me, but not because of the personal advertising it gives me.

ASKS WHY THE ATTENTION TO HIM

I am flattered and delighted only because it indicates that there must be a great many people who think as I do whom the New York Times is having a difficult time converting to its way of thinking. If the administration and its foreign-policy spokesman, the New York Times, are so certain that the great majority of people agree with them, why all this attention to a single individual?

Were I on the other side of the fence and enjoying the confidence which the New York Times and the administration exude, I would ignore such trifling hecklers as myself. If I and others who have cautioned against intervention in foreign affairs, who have fought determinedly every step toward war, are in such terrific minority, why are we worth bothering about?

Evidently our thoughts are being entertained by many Americans who don't like this march to war.

Conscription

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VITO MARCANTONIO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 29, 1940

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. VITO MARCANTONIO, OF NEW YORK

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address

delivered by me on Tuesday, August 13, 1940, over the National Broadcasting Co. network in behalf of the American Youth Congress against conscription:

"From the military point of view the United States must be considered as an insular Nation. We are separated from potential enemies on the east and west by broad and deep oceans. On our northern and southern borders are nations which have been friendly heretofore. Across these land frontiers could come no armies of sufficient strength to menace our security. Our situation is not similar to that of the British at the present time. Prior to the advent of air power the British Isles were insular countries. This complete insularity is now compromised in the military sense in that they are subject to damaging attack by aircraft based on the Continent.

"The armies of Europe and Asia do not menace us. To be a menace they must be transported across the sea in ships. Airplanes on the continents of Europe and Asia do not menace us. To threaten seriously our continental security they must be conveyed across the sea and operated from bases in or near this hemisphere.

"The armed forces of no foreign nation or group of nations can seriously threaten our continental security if we make sure that we command the seas which separate us from all potential enemies."

This statement was not made by those of us who are now opposing conscription. It is found on page 2 of a report issued by the Committee on Naval Affairs of the Senate of the United States on May 15, 1940. This report was the unanimous opinion of the members of the Senate committee which has made a thorough study of the problem of defense against invasion. Despite the fact that the press and others in authority have seen fit to keep the contents of this report from the American people, no one has as yet even attempted to refute the conclusions contained therein. Hence, the hysterical argument advanced by the proponents of the Burke-Wadsworth bill to the effect that we are in danger of successful invasion is not founded in fact, but is a lineal descendant of the war hysteria preparedness propaganda of 1916 and 1917.

A careful analysis of the events which have taken place since the President of the United States foresook the defense of the general welfare of the country for a war-armament program demonstrates conclusively that armaments and conscription are not being undertaken for defensive purposes, but constitute preparedness for active participation in an imperialist war from which the American people have nothing to gain and all to lose.

You cannot keep out of war when you become a military reservoir for one side of the belligerents as against the other.

You cannot keep out of war with a war-armament budget which will amount to $19,000,000,000 in less than 2 years.

You cannot keep out of war by forcing the youth of America into a Europeanized military machine.

The President of the United States is himself an authority for these contentions. During the winter of 1936 at Buenos Aires, the President stated that out of his wide experience and historical study, nations which spend heavily on armaments "inevitably face the day when their weapons of destruction must be used against their neighbors, or when an unsound economy like a house of cards will fall apart."

The President himself, on May 16, informed us that we had the biggest and best Navy in the world.

Hence the conclusion is inescapable. The program is armaments, not for defense, but for war; conscription, not for defense, but for war.

The similarity between 1916 and the war preparedness of today is so great that it is shocking and alarming, except that in 1916 no one dared to even suggest conscription.

We are preparing, not for a war in behalf of the American people and their interests, we are not preparing for a war in defense of men and women on W. P. A.; we are not preparing for a war in defense of the men and women in the shops and factories; we are not preparing for a war in defense of the interests of the men on the farms; we are not preparing for a war in defense of the men in the mines and in the mills, but we are preparing for a war to protect the stake of the American dollar in the British pound, and for a possible extension of our imperialism in South and in Central America.

Such a war is not a war of the American people.

Since such a war is not a war of the American people, it is only natural that the American people are overwhelmingly opposed to such a war. Therefore, it has become necessary by those who are conspiring to catapult America into war to destroy the civil rights and liberties of the American people and to substitute Nazi systems for American institutions. It is precisely because you are opposed to such a war that the war conspirators find it necessary to conscript, to draft, to forcibly take from the home your son, place him in a camp, militarize him, regiment him, knock out of his system every democratic concept which he had learned since childhood, and then send him to war.

This, and this alone, is the scheme of things behind the Burke-Wadsworth conscription bill now pending before the Senate of the United States. The Burke-Wadsworth bill now provides for the following:

1. Compulsory registration of all males between the ages of 21 and 31.

This feature, passed over lightly by the press, is the heart of the bill. It would, by requiring all registered persons to carry passports, set up a vast system of Nazi-like control over the lives of the millions of men and their families. It would wipe out at one blow the American way of life for which our forefathers fought.

2. Compulsory military training for a period of 12 months, to be extended indefinitely if the necessity exists.

The young men of America, once registered, lose their right to decide their own futures. They could be transferred to the Army or Navy without their consent for compulsory service up to 10 years. The bill is drafted so that those registered may be sent to the battlefields for war, at any moment.

3. Contrary to press reports, the bill contains no constitutional and enforceable provision which requires an employer to rehire a man after the training period is up. If the bill were to pass, thousands of men would lose their means of support, with no right to return to work afterward.

4. The President is empowered to use his judgment as to the number of men to be conscripted. Thus he is given unlimited power over the lives of millions of families. Treatment of married men is left to the judgment of the President and no part of the bill exempts them from service.

5. Once conscripted, a man has no choice of the branch of service to which he may be assigned. He can be sent to Army, Navy, or C. C. C. "occupational groups" by arbitrary decision.

6. The bill provides $30 a month pay, and makes no provision for the millions of families whose lives will be disrupted by the reduction in income. Leases, mortgages, debts, even starvation and urgent needs are ignored in the arbitrary wage.

7. Constitutional rights to fair trial would be eliminated for millions of citizens by the bill, which calls for trial by court martial of violations of the act. The Nazi rule of the firing squad would be substituted for the American system of trial by jury.

8. The call to active training can be made by a proclamation of the President. No written notice to enrollees is required. Failure to appear can be tried in military courts as a military offense.

An amendment has been proposed to charge a fine of $10,000 or a prison term of 5 years to any person who in speech or writing opposes conscription once the bill is passed. This provision would bring all the terror of nazi-ism to our land, allowing the round-up and arrest of millions opposed to war.

All this in the name of a false national defense.

We destroy democracy under the guise of protecting it. How much of our freedom which we seek to defend will be left in America after the enactment of this bill. It seems to me that we cannot consistently speak of going to war to defend freedom if we must begin by destroying it with our own hands, and we do this, how?

First, by setting up a terrific armament program and indulging in a military extravaganza for war.

Second, we destroy civil rights and freedom of the American people by the arousing of war hysteria and ruthless suppression of all individuals and groups that have dared raise their voice against war.

Third, by segregating and fingerprinting 3,500,000 noncitizens in America.

Fourth, by converting our F. B. I. into a gestapo; and

Fifth, by conscripting the youth of our Nation.

Armaments, conscription, war, and dictatorship. That is the path along which those who sit in the seats of the mighty of our Nation are leading us. The American people alone can stop it. The same spirit that guided us in 1776 and in 1860 is now awakening throughout the land. Millions of messages are pouring in on the Congress of the United States against this swift juggernaut propelling us into war and dictatorship.

This "blitzkrieg" against the peace and freedom of America must be stopped and it will be stopped.

I am happy to announce that people from all walks of life—labor, farm, youth, cooperative, fraternal, business, regardless of race, color, or creed—are sending their representatives to Chicago on August 31, September 1, and September 2, to unite to defend America by keeping America out of war and by keeping America a free and democratic nation.

My fellow Americans, let us meet this crisis as we have met those of the past, with the firm resolve to exercise our democratic rights, to the end that those rights shall not perish from our land.

Tributes to Hon. James A. Farley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. MEAD

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 29 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

RECENT EDITORIALS IN THE PRESS PAYING TRIBUTE TO POSTMASTER GENERAL FARLEY

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, under permission granted me to have printed several editorials recently published in the

press of the country paying tribute to Postmaster General James A. Farley, I present them for the RECORD.

The editorials are as follows:

[From the Postmasters' Advocate, Washington, D. C., August 1940]

POSTMASTER GENERAL JAMES A. FARLEY LEAVES THE CABINET AUGUST 31, 1940—PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT ACCEPTS THE RESIGNATION WITH REGRET

This announcement will bring most genuine and sincere regret throughout the ranks of postal employees. Believe the feeling is a general one, in and out of the service, that Mr. Farley will go down in the annals of postal history as one of, if not the most, popular Postmasters General ever to fill this important position. His square dealing, upright character of fairness, friendliness, and acknowledged efficiency in the performance of his duties as Postmaster General, brought the Postal Service to a new high level, never before attained. He can well feel proud of his accomplishments, and carry with him the assurance that he gained not only success but the affection of every postal group and individual employee. The National League of District Postmasters wishes for Mr. Farley the best of life's gifts in his new field of private business.

Following is text of letter of resignation and reply by President Roosevelt:

POSTMASTER GENERAL FARLEY'S LETTER TO THE PRESIDENT

AUGUST 7, 1940.

Hon. FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: In accordance with my several conversations with you wherein I indicated the necessity for my returning to private life, I tender you, with sincere regret, my resignation as Postmaster General of the United States, to become effective at the close of business on August 31, 1940.

I want you to know how much I appreciate the honor you conferred upon me and the trust that you placed in me when you appointed me to this important position in your Cabinet, when you took office on March 4, 1933.

Whatever success I may have had in the conduct of the affairs of the Postal Service is due in a large measure to the splendid assistance and cooperation which I have received not only from my associates in the Department here in Washington, but also from postmasters and postal employees in every branch of the service throughout the country.

During my two terms as Postmaster General we have succeeded in placing the Postal Establishment on a self-sustaining basis with respect to that part of the service that is rendered to the public for hire; we have reduced the hours of labor from 44 to 40 hours a week; we have extended the Air Mail Service by thousands of miles, including the inauguration of the trans-Atlantic and trans-Pacific services; we have supervised the erection of hundreds of new post-office buildings in every State and congressional district in the Nation; we have reduced postal expenditures by several millions of dollars while at the same time doing a record business in both volume and receipts, climaxed by a new all-time high of $766,000,000 in the matter of postal revenues for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1940; we have provided new and increased services and we have likewise performed several outstanding services for other Government agencies, such as the handling and payment of the soldiers' bonus, the registration of workers under the social-security program, the taking of a census of the unemployed, and the sale of millions of dollars of United States saving bonds for the Treasury Department.

These are some of the outstanding accomplishments of the Postal Service during my period of service as Postmaster General, but what has pleased me more than anything else is the manner in which the Department's relations with its employees in every branch of the service have been carried on. Through our cooperation with each of the employees' organizations, we have succeeded in bringing about a new spirit of friendliness and devotion to duty in the ranks of the more than 300,000 postal employees, and I doubt if the morale of the postal workers has ever been higher than it is at the present time.

The Department has also been particularly fortunate in its relations with the committees in the Senate and House of Representatives. Senator KENNETH MCKELLAR, chairman of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads in the Senate, has been extremely kind and helpful, and most efficient, and has aided the Department materially on legislation which is handled by his committee.

During the time that Senator JAMES M. MEAD was chairman of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads in the House of Representatives, we had extremely friendly relations with him and our relations with the present chairman, Congressman MILTON A. ROMJUE, have been extremely pleasant. All of the members of both committees in the Senate and in the House have been of great assistance to me and my associates in the Department.

During my lifetime I shall cherish the associations and friendships which I have made while serving as Postmaster General, both in the Postal Service and in the other departments and agencies of the Federal Government.

I know that it will please you to learn that I have made definite arrangements for my future in private business where I know I shall be very happy.

Again expressing my deepest gratitude at the opportunity you afforded me to serve as a member of your Cabinet, and with kindest personal regards, I am,

Faithfuly yours,

JAMES A. FARLEY.

PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT'S LETTER OF ACCEPTANCE

The Honorable POSTMASTER GENERAL,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR JIM: I accept, with real regret, your resignation as Postmaster General, to become effective at the close of business on August 31.

First of all, I want to tell you of my own sincere sorrow that we are losing you as a member of the official family. At the same time, as I have told you, I fully understand and appreciate the personal reasons which recall you to private business after all these unselfish years in the public service. I congratulate you on your new work and send you every wish that it may, in every way, be successful.

Under your administration the Post Office Department of the United States has made great strides in business efficiency, in service to the public, and in the outstanding morale of its more than 300,000 employees. That the post-office service is on a completely self-sustaining basis with respect to that part that is rendered to the public for hire is in itself a real tribute to you and your associates.

All of us in the administration will miss you deeply; we count on seeing you often, I especially count on this after all of our years of close personal association. Our friendship will always continue.

I need not tell you that you have always my affectionate regards.

Faithfully yours,

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

JIMMY DIDN'T WANT TO SLOP OVER—BUT THIS NOTED NEWSWRITER FOUND IT HARD NOT TO WHEN HE WROTE THIS TRIBUTE TO THAT STRANGE MAN IN POLITICS WHO ALWAYS KEPT HIS WORD, MR. FARLEY

(By James L. Kilgallen)

It's hard to do a story on James A. ("Genial Jim") Farley without slopping over.

For there's a man, a big man by any yardstick; a regular 100-percent guy, strictly on the level with everybody, including himself.

Newspapermen all say that, and they are a discerning lot. They can spot a "phoney" quicker than any class I know. Of all the men in the American spotlight today, I know of no man who holds the sincere respect and goodwill of the press to a larger degree than does Jim Farley.

Now, when you stop to think that Farley has been dealing with straight-away news reporters, Washington correspondents, and sports writers over a period of years, that's saying a great deal indeed.

Farley is a man with a million friends. And there's a reason. He instinctively accepts you the minute he meets you. Though the meeting be a casual one, he never forgets you—or the circumstances of the meeting.

Suppose you met Farley just once and, 2 years later, he suddenly encountered you and said something like this:

"Why, Hello Tom! How are you? And how's your sister, Mae? Is she still giving singing lessons?"

You'd first be surprised, then a bit flattered to think Farley remembered so much of that first meeting. Yet he does this all the time. It's one of the principal reasons why he's been such a standout success in politics.

It wasn't easy for Farley to shelve politics for private business. Farley had been in politics a long time and had almost made it his life's work. He loved the thrill of taking part in dramatic episodes, the uncertainty of a great political struggle, and the surge of pleasure that comes from an honestly earned victory over worthy adversaries.

He was a battler for someone else, and for the party, rather than for himself. He did more for President Roosevelt, politically, than any other person. Twice, in 1932 and in 1936, he triumphantly directed Mr. Roosevelt's campaigns for the highest office in the land. He will not, however, run the President's 1940 campaign for a third term.

Jim made it clear to President Roosevelt that he finally must do a little thinking for Farley, and for his family. The President realized the logic of this, and concurred—although reluctantly—for no one knows better than he what an astute, capable, and resourceful Democratic national chairman Farley was.

Farley has a wife and three children. Their home is at 1040 Fifth Avenue, New York City, and now that Jim is virtually through with politics he will see a lot more of his family. His wife, whom he affectionately calls Bess, is an attractive, frank-minded woman who talks straight and to the point. She has never been overenthused about her husband's political career, feeling he could have been a success in business.

It is no secret that Jim Farley, as honest a man as ever walked, pulls out of politics in need of money; in fact, in debt. His salary of $15,000 a year as Postmaster wasn't much, with the social obligations such a position entails.

Bess Farley, they say, didn't care much for Washington—or for Capital society. She preferred New York. She realized her husband was getting along in years. He's now 52. She knew, too, that if Jim accepted 1 or 2 of the many big-paying positions he was offered in private industry she'd see more of him. He no longer would be the star traveling salesman of the Democratic Party.

Many people believed that when Jim definitely decided he wouldn't run F. D. R.'s 1940 campaign, it was a victory for the spirited Bess Farley and naturally a distinct loss to Mr. Roosevelt.

The Farleys have two girls and a boy. The eldest girl, Betty, aged 18, is said to be Jim's favorite. She attended Wellesley College. Her younger sister, Ann, 15, goes to Mary Mount, a

Catholic convent in Manhattan. Jim Farley, Jr., aged 12, is a student at the New York Military Academy at Cornwall-on-Hudson.

They are a happy, closely knit family—a typical American family.

The dramatic highlight of Jim Farley's remarkable political career came at 1:37 a. m. Thursday, July 18, when he stood on the platform in the Democratic National Convention in Chicago and, giving up the 79½ votes that the delegates had polled for him for the Presidential nomination, moved that the nomination of President Roosevelt be "by acclamation."

Cheers from the throats of 25,000 men and women spectators in the flag-bedecked stadium shook the convention hall to the rafters.

Out in front with friends, in an inconspicuous seat, sat Mrs. Bess Farley. What her thoughts were must be left to the imagination.

Jim, a fine figure of a man, tall, strapping, florid-faced, and bald-headed, looked handsome in a white palm beach suit. His genial smile warmed every heart in the vast audience.

On the platform, a few feet back of Farley at this dramatic moment, sat his daughters Betty and Ann. Tears glistened in the light blue eyes of Betty, who looks so much like her father. Ann sat with bowed head.

I talked to Betty a few seconds after Big Jim Farley retired from the rostrum amid salvos of applause. Her eyes still were glistening and she said in a girlish tremolo: "I'm so happy—I'm so proud of Dad."

The delegates were proud of her Dad, too. Virtually every delegate in the stadium knew Farley personally, knew what he had accomplished for the party, and recognized that this was his political "swan song." Tears came into many an eye, a choke to many a throat, and even the small army of newspapermen and women, pounding away on noiseless typewriters, were not immune to the drama.

Farley, it can be ventured, emerged from the convention a bigger national figure than at any time in his long career as a politician. In a way, he almost "stole the show."

Analyzing Farley, newspapermen say he is a man who possesses qualities many politicians lack. Above all, he is true to himself, to his conception of right and wrong. He is a "square shooter," loyal to the core.

Farley, in all the years of his dealing with the press, has never "doublecrossed" a newspaperman, never denied a story he has given out, no matter how unfavorable the public reaction to the story might have been. He never played favorites. He always has treated writers on Republican papers with the same consideration as those employed by Democratic publications.

"I make it a policy to tell the truth," Jim once said. He has found it a good formula.

His word is no scrap of paper. If he promises to do something, it is a gilt-edged guaranty.

He is perhaps the most humane man in American public life today. I saw his humaneness illustrated during the recent Democratic National Convention. An 18-year-old, red-headed cub reporter, named Bob Kubicek, breezed into political headquarters looking for a press ticket so he could represent his weekly paper, the Oak Leaves, of Oak Park, Ill. The big-time correspondents had reservations long before.

Young Kubicek was eased out of the publicity department faster than he entered.

Farley happened to come along a corridor. He asked the boy, "What's the trouble, son?"

Kubicek, a bit awed, told him.

"Follow me," said Jim.

He led the cub to his own private office, opened a drawer, and came up with a book of tickets good for every session of the convention.

I have attended many press conferences with the big-wigs of politics, but I have never seen what I saw at Farley's press conferences in Chicago. I saw him applauded by 300 to 400 newspaper men and women when he came into the room, and heard his answers to questions applauded with equal enthusiasm.

It is interesting to watch him at a press conference. Not many in public life, not even President Roosevelt, surpass him in dealing with the press or foiling off cleverly put questions. Farley is a diplomat; he's keen and intuitive and has a lot of good common sense. And he's frank and open, which is what the press likes.

The press gave Farley a big party and several gifts, including a wrist watch and baseball glove—he likes baseball; once played first base—and they said a lot of nice things to him. He assured them they always treated him fairly. Why not?

As I said in the first paragraph, it's hard to do a story on Jim Farley without slopping over, as we say in the newspaper business.

[From the Beacon Journal, Akron, Ohio, August 9, 1940]

"DEAR JIM"

"Dear Jim," the President called him, and after August 31 he will be known as the former Postmaster General. The letter Farley sent to Mr. Roosevelt, along with its acknowledgment, makes Big Jim's departure from the Cabinet official.

But the exchange of letters doesn't explain the resignation. It would have had to explain the steps leading up to the third-term decision to have done a complete job. Fuller explanation will have to wait upon history—upon the new book Farley will write, for one part; upon Mr. Roosevelt's expanded explanation and the interpretation of historians for the rest.

[From The Sun, Baltimore, Saturday, August 10, 1940]

MR. FARLEY STEPS DOWN WITH UNIVERSAL RESPECT

In this year of tumultuous and bitter politics, James A. Farley is one of the fortunate men. For he has emerged from a difficult situation with an enlargement in every quarter of the respect given him and with unusual manifestations of affection in many and varied groups.

He has been a practical politician and, as a political manager, he has played the game to win. As the chief political marshal of the Roosevelt Administration, he has made full use of all the advantages that came to his hand in practical manipulations. He was eminently practical in dealing with other eminently practical men in the campaign which brought about the first nomination of Mr. Roosevelt. And he was eminently practical in using, in the administration's dealings with Congress and in the administration's appeals to the people in elections, all the political resources that lay in vast public expenditures and in a public pay roll that has been rapidly increased until, within little more than 7 years, it approaches double the total which Mr. Roosevelt found on assuming office. Mr. Farley had a part in the New Deal which invited criticism and received it.

Yet, he departs from his official duties as Postmaster General and from his political duties as chairman of the Democratic National Committee with the respect and affection of which we have spoken. One reason is that men in and out of politics have learned that, while he played politics up to the hilt, he is a man of personal and official integrity. Another reason is that men in and out of politics have learned that he is unfailingly loyal and straightforward. And still another reason is that, with serious personal and political differences arising between him and the President whom he had so long served, he has conducted himself with dignity and with a really fine sportsmanship. He has known how to break a long relationship without small and mean words—how to break a long relationship with an understanding of the obligations which are imposed by such a relationship.

In short, Jim Farley has proved himself to be very much of a man, and recognition of that fact, warm and hearty recognition, has come from those who have worked with him and from those who have fought him. He passes from official life, and he passes from the larger field of politics, with the best prize of all.

[From the Bangor (Maine) Daily Commercial of August 14, 1940]

MR. FARLEY'S DEPARTURE

It is a commonplace of life and a favorite device of fiction and the stage for two old friends who part under strained circumstances to talk about everything but what they are really thinking. So it must have been with President Roosevelt and Postmaster General Farley when the latter sent his letter of resignation and Mr. Roosevelt his reply of acceptance.

Mr. Farley was preoccupied only with leaving the Postal Service. It was divulged by his letter that during his two terms the system was placed on a self-sustaining basis, the air mail was extended, a record business was done, etc. All business. Mr. Roosevelt's response was in kind. He spoke of the success of Farley the Postmaster General, of the morale of the Service, the great strides in business efficiency.

In the minds of both these men there must have been countless thoughts that could not go into the letters, for their association is historic. In 1932 Farley was the incarnation of "Roosevelt-Before-Chicago." He delivered the convention votes that made the New Deal possible. He was out in front again in 1936 and made that amazing Maine and Vermont prophecy. It is idle to say that his passing somehow tears away the political past from Mr. Roosevelt. Things just will not be the same, third term or no third term.

That was the rock on which their political association, if not their friendship, broke. Jim wouldn't go along at Chicago in 1940. He wouldn't even pretend to go along. He was practical enough to know that he could not be nominated, practical enough to know there was no stopping F. D. R., but he stood up and had his votes counted, nevertheless. Then he quit as national chairman and as a member of the President's Cabinet. November will disclose the effect of his departure.

[From the Barre Daily Times, Saturday, August 10, 1940]

FARLEY RETIRING

It goes without saying that the United States Government can get a capable Postmaster General, and perhaps it does not need to be said that Franklin D. Roosevelt cannot get along well in his campaign without the services of James A. Farley as campaign manager. But Farley is out of the job as Democratic national chairman on August 15, and he will retire from the Cabinet on August 31.

There is no doubt about the sincerity of Roosevelt when he expressed regrets at the resignation of Farley as Democratic national chairman and as Roosevelt's personal campaign manager. Roosevelt and Farley have been linked up very closely in political maneuvers ever since the former's initial campaign for the Presidential nomination, and there is no doubt that Farley's keen political insight has been a very powerful factor in the political successes of Roosevelt ever since that time. Farley has built up a technique in politics which he turned to tremendous advantage for others but which failed him in his only quest for party preferment. He keeps in close

touch with political affairs in all of the 48 States; he knows human nature well; he has the capacity to remember names and faces (it is said he can call 50,000 persons by their first names and can ask a good many of them about their families); he is a good organizer. Those qualifications go to make an effective campaign manager. No one knows that better than "F. D. R." as Farley is wont to call Roosevelt.

Without a doubt Roosevelt would have been glad to retain Farley as national party chairman and as his personal manager. Whether Farley reads the political handwriting on the wall and wishes to get settled in business life before his political and official jobs come to a peremptory end is not known; but if Farley had felt assured that the third term program would go through, and if he himself had been in favor of it, he probably would have stuck to his post as Postmaster General and to the party chairmanship. At any rate, Farely can quit both places with a consciousness that he has been successful in both.

[From the Baton Rouge (La.) State-Times of August 12, 1940]

FAREWELL MR. FARLEY

At the end of this month Postmaster James A. Farley will retire from the Roosevelt Cabinet.

Previously he had notified the Democratic organization that he could no longer serve as its chairman, and Mr. Edward J. Flynn, of New York, has been named to succeed him as head of the Democratic National Committee.

Now, his retirement as Postmaster General imminent, his official connection with the present administration will come to an end.

Usual felicitations were exchanged in his correspondence with the President. The latter assured Mr. Farley that "all of us in the administration will miss you deeply; we count on seeing you often." Mr. Farley in turn told the President he knew it would please him "to know that I have made definite arrangements for my future in private business, where I know I shall be very happy."

Thus, an official connection severed, scarcely can the personal relationship continue in precisely the same way. However kindly the feeling on either side, and the regard for a long, long friendship, the new order brings a difference—as it always does.

As a fact, no matter how capable Mr. Farley's successors, he will be missed both in the Cabinet and as Democratic chairman. He is the type of friendly, wholesome, good-humored person who fits easily into the group and helps put all at their ease. When the members of Mr. Roosevelt's official family gather about the table for serious discussion, they will miss the cheerful presence of "Smiling Big Jim." And in the approaching campaign it will be strange for Mr. Rcosevelt not to have Jim around to untangle many a perplexity. He's been depending on Jim for a long time, through two previous campaigns. Though Mr. Flynn is the President's personal choice for new Democratic chairman, any such change naturally calls for some adjustment.

It is conceded that Mr. Farley has served faithfully the Democratic Party. He has shown himself an energetic and inspiring leader, ready to shoulder more than his share of any blame.

Also, as Postmaster General he has given efficient service. The volume of postal business has set a new record, and Mr. Farley cites that the part of the service for which the public pays has become self-sustaining. It was during Mr. Farley's postmastership that University, La., was established as an independent post office, after he had visited here and had delivered an address at a campus luncheon.

Mr. Farley is the type to throw himself with ardor into any task he undertakes. If he feels any lingering disappointment over the third term, he will doubtless laugh it off and go on about his affairs. Whatever his new business connection, the public will agree with his own prediction that "I know I shall be very happy."

[From the Beaumont (Tex.) Enterprise of August 10, 1940]

ANOTHER PILOT IS DROPPED

Cartoonists borrowed an idea from Tenniel's famous cartoon of the Kaiser and Bismarck to picture the parting of Mr. Roosevelt and James A. Farley. The former German Emperor may wonder to this day in his exile at Doorn, Holland, if he made one of the greatest mistakes of his life in dropping his pilot, that "Iron Chancellor" who was the creator of the German Empire.

In his way James A. Farley was a more efficient pilot for Franklin D. Roosevelt perhaps than Bismarck was for William II. Twice the personal devotion and political genius of James A. Farley raised Mr. Roosevelt to the highest office in the world. At least, Americans think so.

Louis Howe must be given some of the credit for Mr. Roosevelt's successful career in politics. But Mr. Farley deserves more credit. The gnomelike Howe did his work more or less behind the scenes. He was a fearless and able adviser to Mr. Roosevelt. According to report, Howe was the only man ever intimately associated with Mr. Roosevelt who dared to talk bluntly to him and did so whenever Howe thought Mr. Roosevelt had made or was about to make a mistake.

But Howe could never have made the friends for himself and for Mr. Roosevelt that Farley made for himself and the President. Mr. Farley went up and down the country meeting politicians and voters. He knew all the more prominent politicians by name and every one was his friend. There is no doubt that many Democrats worked for Mr. Roosevelt who did not like him particularly or approve of his policies, because they liked Jim Farley. It probably is true, as stated many times, that no other man in the country ever had more personal friends who would do anything they could for him than Jim Farley.

But the man who would be President and the man who twice made him President—with the aid and consent of a majority of American voters—came at last to the parting of the ways. It was a melancholy ending for what had been a "beautiful friendship." Mr. Roosevelt's epistolary cordiality does not conceal from any discerning eye the fact that James A. Farley was shabbily treated. He retires from the Cabinet and the chairmanship of the Democratic National Committee disappointed in the leader in whom he served with unwavering loyalty as long as his principles would permit him to do so and disappointed also in that his own political career did not reach the heights which, in moments of introspection, he hoped it would.

[From the Age-Herald, Birmingham, Ala., August 10, 1940]

JIM STEPS DOWN

Jim Farley's resignation as Postmaster General takes him one more step away from activity in national politics. Soon he will be occupying himself with pitchers and basemen instead of letters and ballots. But he will never be out of the political picture.

Even if Farley were not retaining the chairmanship of the New York State Democratic Executive Committee he could not quit politics cold. No man who genuinely loves politics as a game as he does could cut himself entirely away from politics at such an early age.

Big Jim will find that there are many little political debts he, in his generous spirit, will feel called upon to repay. And he will learn that thousands of men and women who owe Jim a political debt will insist on trying to repay him.

Mrs. Farley, who wants Jim to quit politics forever, perhaps is destined to disappointment. For Jim has stepped down for the moment—but not out. Baseball, we fear, will be too tame for the man who made a President and who managed the most successful campaign in the history of national politics.

[From the Birmingham News, Birmingham, Ala., August 9, 1940]

VALE, FARLEY

Not all men who have been in the forefront of political life for 8 trying years can step out as Jim Farley is doing with the good will and friendship of so many persons.

The national chairmanship of a political party is a post that carries many opportunities for making enemies. Likewise, a Cabinet position in an administration that has been the center of much controversy is apt to create many enmities for its holder.

But "Genial Jim" resigns as Postmaster General and as chairman of the Democratic National Committee with the good wishes of most Americans, regardless of their party affiliations. The tribute is due to Farley's friendliness, to his capacities for remembering people, and to his strict and unswerving integrity. Farley has been a gentleman in politics, and there are too few of his sort.

[From the Eagle, Brooklyn, N. Y., August 9, 1940]

FARLEY LEAVING THE CABINET

There was no element of surprise in the resignation of James A. Farley as Postmaster General, but the fact that he will step out of the Cabinet on August 31 is a major event in the history of the New Deal.

Jim Farley has occupied that post from the day that Franklin Roosevelt assumed the Presidency on March 4, 1933, and he has filled it with distinction. But more important is the fact that this move will sever his last direct connection with the national administration following his retirement on August 17 from the chairmanship of the Democratic National Committee.

The exchange of letters between the President and his Postmaster General contained even more than the customary expressions of regard. For Farley was in a real sense the king maker. He brought about Roosevelt's nomination in Chicago in 1932 and he was the man behind the ballots in 1932 and 1936.

So the President has good reason for expressing his "sincere sorrow" on the departure of his old friend. Farley leaves because of his plans to become president of the New York Yankees Baseball Club. But it is an open secret that the growing political coolness between the two was brought to a head by the President's determination to seek a third term.

[From the Boston (Mass.) Herald of August 9, 1940]

MR. FARLEY DEPARTS

It is not given to every chairman of a Democratic or a Republican national committee to withdraw with his reputation undamaged or enhanced. The late William M. Butler did, his management of the Coolidge campaign in 1924 winning him additional respect from each party. The retiring Postmaster General and chairman of the Democratic National Committee will also depart from national politics with a sweeter reputation and more prestige than he had when he first tried his hand at the game.

The Washington correspondents, who once made him the whipping boy of the administration, came to respect him deeply. They liked him for his human qualities and his complete absence of hypocrisy. Even the "irreconcilable rebel", Senator CARTER GLASS, of Virginia, an austere old boy, eulogized him warmly at the Democratic Convention. Mr. Farley's standing has never been

higher than it is today. If he does as much for the Yankee baseball team, which he is to administer hereafter, as he has done for himself, it will soon have a top standing in the American League.

The change in the public attitude toward him has probably been due to his wearing qualities, his bland good humor, his steadiness in fighting for a principle in which he believes, his loyalty to party traditions, and the conjecture of the public that he "took the rap" for the President on many occasions. His book, too, won him many friends. Here in New England, and especially in Massachusetts, he has been almost as great a favorite as Al Smith. If the Democratic Convention had been as democratic and as responsive to public opinion as the gathering at Philadelphia was, Mr. Farley would have received a great many of the New England ballots for the Presidential nomination.

Was he a masterful political manipulator? Possibly, even though circumstances were favorable to him. Probably any Democrat could have defeated President Hoover in 1932. Indulging in second guessing, one may surmise that an uninspired sort of chairman could have led the Democrats to victory over Governor Landon in 1936. But, according to the box score, Mr. Farley was the most accomplished Democratic national chairman in the history of the party.

[From the Standard, Butte, Mont., August 6, 1940]

JIM FARLEY STEPPING OUT

James A. Farley has washed his hands of the third term. His successor as national chairman of the Democratic Party has been named in characteristic Farley manner. Announcement of Edward J. Flynn's selection was made by Farley himself after a conference between the national committee's representatives, the President, and his friends.

The big, genial Irishman, who has held the post of national party chairman longer than any other man in modern American history, has gained a firmer hold on the affections of millions of voters than he ever had before. The courage of his stand during the national convention of the Democratic Party, when he insisted that democratic process should not be abandoned, proved his courage and his utter devotion to principle.

Farley had not a chance to win, and he knew it. He was aware also that there had been built by years of work on the part of the most astute politicians the party had ever known a third-term psychology with which the great mass of the delegates had been impregnated. And still Farley did not flinch in his position that democratic forms must be observed. He did more than that. He set the example. He said that he had become a candidate and that he would insist that all the forms and methods for candidates be left open and untrammeled. He made his own candidacy a guaranty of the Democratic Party's democracy.

And so, although President Roosevelt was nominated for a third term on the first ballot, American procedure and party forms did not collapse. Farley, alone, had saved them. It was an heroic action. Farley's friends, the convention delegates, the public at large, all realized his magnificent stand.

So Jim Farley steps out of politics this month holding an entirely unique relationship to the voters. He is more highly respected, better loved and admired than he ever was before.

But he will not long remain in private life. His party's call will be heard again. There is division within the ranks, and only men like Farley, who stand on their principles with even greater determination than on their friendships, can save it. Win or lose, the third-term campaign is bound to make a deep and grievous mark upon the party in every part of the country.

There is a strong sentiment in New York for Farley as the party's candidate for Governor. There are other Democrats who want Farley in the United States Senate. It seems doubtful that he will manage to continue in private life over the urgings of his friends.

He has been a powerful factor in the Government and the Cabinet. His loyalty to his chief was never questioned. So long as he served, he served with complete fidelity. Even when he disagreed, he preserved harmony and often helped to smother the kindling fires of dissension.

The President will miss Farley, not only in the campaign but in the operations of the Government, for there never was a more astute or efficient political fixer and smoother-out of differences than the man who led the fight under the Roosevelt banner through two campaigns.

[From the Charlotte (N. C.) Observer of August 10, 1940]

"BIG JIM" IS THROUGH

The final official separation between the President and his longtime and affectionate friend Jim Farley is terminated with the tender of the latter's resignation as Postmaster General.

Mr. Farley resigns in order to devote himself to business and make some money to cover up a leanness in his accounts due to his constant political activities during the past 8 years.

But behind this legitimate and honest reason for the retirement of "Big Jim" is unquestionably a feeling of deep resentment over what happened at the Chicago convention when Mr. Farley was virtually banished from the inside proceedings and the President's case handled by his young friend Harry Hopkins.

As a matter of fact, this attitude of estrangement has been in the building for the past year and only came to its head in connection with the proceedings at the convention.

As a result of Mr. Farley's feeling that the President had snubbed him, he resigned as chairman of the national committee and has now walked out of the Cabinet, manifestly bringing to a sharp and decisive end a long-standing intimacy with the President whose successes in two previous Presidential campaigns were in considerable measure due to the good offices of Jim Farley.

[From the Observer, Charlotte, N. C., August 12, 1940]

WHY THEY RESPECT HIM

Mr. Farley is being condemned by some of the ultra-Roosevelt partisans for having deserted the chief when the latter will probably most greatly need him.

It is an unfair and unwarranted criticism, we hold.

Whether he has quit as chairman of the National Democratic Committee and as Postmaster General with a sizable peeve, or whether financial considerations drove him out of political life, Mr. Farley retires with respect that is well nigh universal—the respect of friends who have been right along with him in party battles during the past two Presidential campaigns as well as the interims, and the respect of his political adversaries whom he always contested fairly and honorably and struck never below the belt.

Mr. Farley is a man of personal and political uprightness.

The Baltimore Sun thinks this is the first reason he has earned and enjoyed the respect of such a widespread part of the general public.

"Men in and out of politics," says that contemporary, "have learned that, while he played politics up to the hilt, he is a man of personal and official integrity."

Another reason, as that newspaper continues, is that Mr. Farley is unfailingly loyal and straightforward.

Often he has been compelled to swallow his pride during the past 7 and more years of New Dealdom.

He withheld his complete sanction to many of its enterprises, but he stood by those he so materially helped to enthrone, and so long as they observed the principles of honor and honesty and fair dealing, he defended them.

The last reason given by the Sun answers the critics of Mr. Farley who charge him with meanness in deserting the administration at this time.

"With serious personal and political differences arising between him and the President, he has conducted himself with dignity and with a really fine sportsmanship. He has known how to break a long friendship without small or mean words."

This is a very rich and deserved tribute to a public servant who moves back into private life with multitudes more of friends than he owned when he undertook the laborious political and official services laid to his charge, and with a public, not always fair and charitable in its appraisements, remarking upon the cleanness of the man and his high sense of honor and uprightness.

[From the Times, Chattanooga, Tenn., August 10, 1940]

MR. FARLEY RETIRES

Back in 1932, and still later when Mr. Roosevelt had been elected, it was the fashion in many quarters to describe Mr. James A. Farley as the "chief spoilsman" of the new regime. He was known to the country chiefly as a member of the New York Boxing Commission during a period when professional fighting in this country was far from savory. He was, moreover, a contractor and he labored under the handicap of widespread cynicism concerning the activities of "political contractors." He was, in short, a marked man.

A marked man who made his mark, that is "Big Jim" Farley. After approximately 8 years as Democratic national chairman and as Postmaster General, Mr. Farley is retiring from all but the fringe of the political scene. His resignation as Democratic national chairman became effective several days ago; he will step out of the Cabinet on August 31. The jovial big fellow with a host of friends takes with him a record for fair dealing, for hard work, for straight shooting that many other men in public life ought to envy. He has played the game. Many of the political crimes charged against him were committed by others. Many of the mistakes were not his.

As the executive head of the Post Office Department, Mr. Farley's administrative record will for some time be a subject for debate; the adaptation of double-entry bookkeeping by which he regularly showed a profit for that part of the Postal Service for which the public pays has been the subject of jibes and learned articles. But as to the morale of the Postal Service there can be no question; "Big Jim" is liked wherever he goes, and those who like him have learned to admire him. The New Deal has not produced a man with a larger number of friends, or one whose abilities are more widely respected. It is doubtful if in the country's political history there has been an abler party chairman, or one who, starting with as many handicaps, cleared them all by plugging at his job, by remaining steadfastly loyal to his "Chief" up to the very point where his conviction bade him leave.

Until Mr. Farley tells the story, the background and circumstances of his differences of opinion with Mr. Roosevelt will be shadowy. It is known that Mr. Farley does not like the idea of a third term. He will remain chairman of the Democratic State committee for New York, and he will support the Democratic ticket. He is not a "king maker." He is an able, likable, many-sided politician who takes into private life the best wishes of a great many Americans.

[From the Times-Star, Cincinnati, Ohio, of August 9, 1940]

A REAL MAN MOVES OUT

The ablest politician in the Democratic Party, and with one exception the ablest member in the Roosevelt administration, has stepped down from the party's national chairmanship and has resigned his position as Postmaster General, effective at this month's end.

James Aloysius Farley was one of two men who secured Mr. Roosevelt's nomination in 1932. JOHN NANCE GARNER was the other. Both men are through with political life. They knew that when they took at face value Mr. Roosevelt's personal assurances that he would not again be a candidate and carried their own candidacies into the Chicago convention. They realized that the White House had stacked the cards against them, but they held out because neither would countenance violation of what both deemed a basic American doctrine: That two terms should be the outside limit for any Chief Executive. In the sorry spectacle of a gathering of Lilliputians staged by the convention, they and their followers alone preserved the stature of men.

Jim Farley, once New York boxing commissioner, has exemplified in politics the code of the ring at its best. He has struck hard but fair, has taken punishment without outcries. Loyal, efficient, likable, he has more real friends in his party than any other man. We are inclined to believe that the President's growing coolness toward him has no better explanation than that Farley, on return from a western trip more than a year ago, talked straight to him. He told Mr. Roosevelt, so the accepted story goes, that he could be renominated but not reelected—which at present writing sounds like very valid prophecy. This was straight talk, and flattery was expected. What makes the story ring true is that the Cabinet officer who tells Mr. Roosevelt that he can be "elected and elected and elected," and that he is the greatest man on earth, is a permanent White House guest.

With Farley going, and Harry Hopkins burning incense daily at his chief's very feet, it is just too bad—that is, too bad for Mr. Roosevelt.

[From the State, Columbia, S. C., Thursday, August 8, 1940]

MR. FARLEY'S CRISIS

Some say President Roosevelt owes his political success to Postmaster General Farley. Others say Mr. Farley owes his high position as a national figure to President Roosevelt. There is truth in both statements, although neither is a well-rounded presentation of the truth.

For a decade these two men have come along together, each of incalculable assistance to the other. To attempt to measure the aid each has given the other leads into abstract opinions. But this is a fact:

The Democratic Party needs the combined and harmonized efforts of these two men in the course of the coming campaign. Again there is a chance for each to promote the other, and for both to serve party and country.

But Mr. Farley is hurt. He had hoped to win the Democratic nomination of President. Will the injury he now feels continue to give him pain throughout the remaining years of his life? The State believes that Mr. Farley, and only Mr. Farley, can determine the answer to that question. If he sulks he cannot be happy, now or later. If he rises magnificently above the plane of normal conduct, throws himself energetically into another campaign for the causes he has stood for, he may become radiantly happy again, as he has been in the past, and he may live on and on in that enviable state of mind and of spirit—a condition achieved by serving, not by sulking.

Mr. Farley is an old head in politics. He has seen others suffer and die of disappointment after hopes for the Presidency had been frustrated. He knows that Senator HIRAM JOHNSON, of California, never has recovered from his rejection of the Vice Presidential nomination later accepted by Calvin Coolidge. If JOHNSON had said "Yes," instead of "No," he would have become President on the death of Harding and thus attained the heights toward which his sharp ambition had been driving him since his young manhood. But he did not say "Yes." He said "No." And that fact has run around and around in his mind and perhaps in his spirit.

Champ Clark the elder—Mr. Farley knows how disappointment after the Baltimore convention crushed that lovable old statesman. He also knows that the father's chagrin seems to have come down to the son who now serves in the United States Senate.

Governor Ritchie of Maryland—Mr. Farley knew him, perhaps intimately. He thought he would be nominated, and the thought consumed him, confused him, injured him in politics, and in spirit. It may even have hastened his death.

Al Smith—he and Mr. Farley have been pals. Does Mr. Farley believe the once "happy warrior" is happy now? Or has sulking cut him down in political importance, and perhaps soured his once altruistic heart?

The list might be longer, with the conclusion always the same—sulking hurts the sulker.

For a number of years Mr. Farley has been growing in moral, intellectual and political stature. Whether he continues to grow depends, this newspaper believes, on his conduct within the next few weeks and months. If he is big enough to find his life by losing it, happiness and continuing growth are likely to characterize his career from now on, as they have from formerly up to now. Because of its belief in the causes represented by the Democratic Party, and its personal liking for Mr. Farley, The State hopes his geniality, generosity, and bigness will combine to win the critical spiritual battle now apparently going on within him.

[From the Columbus Evening Dispatch of Saturday, August 10, 1940]

FARLEY QUITS THE CABINET—HE TRADES POLITICS FOR SPORTS

A bit of news that the country has long known was coming has at last hit the front page. Jim Farley has resigned as Postmaster General in President Roosevelt's Cabinet. Thus, in addition to having lost an invaluable campaign manager when Mr. Farley resigned his chairmanship of the National Democratic Committee, the President has also lost a valuable official. Admired for his remarkable ability, respected for his integrity, and liked for his genuine friendliness, Farley steps down now from public life to be missed by millions of Americans.

Apparently, however, he will not disappear from the public eye. Mr. Farley, it is assumed almost without question, will, in addition to his new post with the Coca Cola Co., become president of the New York Yankees baseball team, and as such will still hold a place in the limelight and public affections. He will trade politics for sports. Both are spectacular activities with wide human appeal that demand a great degree of expertness for continued success. There is no doubt that Mr. Farley will shine in his new environment as he did in the one he is leaving.

There is a note of sadness in his change. A great deal of effort has been made on his part to make it appear that the sole reasons he is leaving his political connections are because he wants to recoup his fortunes and to spend more time with his family. These considerations obviously played a large part in making his decision. But the public cannot but believe that entering into his decision also is his deep patriotic regard for democratic government and his regret that his chief has seen fit to violate it by seeking a third term in office.

That indication of unworthy ambition, coupled with the vanity that has permitted Mr. Roosevelt to see himself as indispensable to the Nation, must have cut deeply into Jim Farley, who never yet has lost his head or his judgment. The parting of the two old friends, as one forges heedlessly ahead on a dangerous and needless pathway, rouses a feeling of pity for the injured faith which the other must be suffering.

[From the Dallas Journal of August 9, 1940]

FARLEY FIXES FAREWELL DATE

Sunny Jim Farley has set the date for his retirement from the Cabinet of Franklin D. Roosevelt. As August fades into September and the Presidential campaign steps up its tempo, the genial Postmaster General will turn over the key to the stamp box and all the other requisites of his office to another.

No longer will the fertile Farley brain devise new schemes to enrich the revenues of the Department and the collections of the world's philatelists. No longer will postmasters from Bangor, Maine, to Petaluma, Calif., look forward to visitations from this rotund, good-natured cabineteer. No longer will local politicians pleasantly anticipate the political conferences that attend such official business tours.

Jim is through on August 31. The third-term candidacy atop the New Deal finished him.

Smith, Roosevelt, and Farley—a one-time powerful triumvirate it was. Smith "took a walk" 4 years ago. Farley stuck it out with his friend Franklin D. till the third-term nomination came between them. It was too much. The Damoclean sword was held over his own ambition till the hour of nomination in the Democratic Convention. He saw it cut his hope of attaining the high office for which Al Smith reached and failed and which Franklin D. twice held and seeks to hold again. Jim Farley's mind was made up. His new connections awaited only his word of assent. He would have no more of politics.

The Democratic Party won't be the same with a Hopkins at the right hand of the title holder instead of a Farley. The Post Office Department won't be the same, whoever the new Postmaster General may be.

But the biggest drawing card the Yankees will have on tour next year will be their new president, Jim Farley.

[From the Dallas Morning News of August 10, 1940]

GENIAL JIM

Now that Jim Farley voluntarily removes himself from the scuffle of political battle, he must be pleased, if a little surprised, to note the almost universal good will and good wishes that go out to him from his fellow Americans.

As Postmaster General he gets the bulk of administrative credit for placing this great public-service branch of the Government on as sound a basis as at any time in its history. With the exception of the air mail and certain other subsidies which are thoroughly justified, the Postal Service is now on a paying basis.

Jim Farley's break with public office and national politics is complete. He has already severed his connection as chairman of the National Democratic Committee. It is noteworthy that the big, happy-go-lucky Irishman is loyal to the end. The turn of events both before and after Chicago (1940, of course) would have embittered a less sanguine friend. A true son of his faith, he must have been outraged by reports that even his friend in the White House feared that his catholicism ruled him out as a candidate for either

of the two highest offices. Yet time will bear out Genial Jim's conviction that religious belief should be no bar to this highest ambition. In the meantime he may retire with good conscience, knowing that he has done a good job sincerely and faithfully.

[From the Times Herald, Dallas, Tex., Friday, August 9, 1940]

FARLEY RETIRES

James A. Farley has submitted his resignation as Postmaster General, and it has been accepted with regret by the President.

In accepting it in this fashion, President Roosevelt speaks not only for himself, but he also expresses the sentiment of the people of the United States. They, too, are profoundly sorry that the man who for 7 years has headed that important Department of the Government has lain down his burden. His act deprives them of the services of an as able and competent Postmaster General as they have had; one who, in more respects than one, stands at the head of that distinguished list.

Mr. Farley has every reason to be proud of his record; of the many new post offices built, and other needed facilities provided for during his regime, of the new methods making for greater efficiency introduced, of the fact that the Department, under his leadership, has become self-sustaining in important parts of the service.

But, as he told the President, his greatest satisfaction comes from the "manner in which the Department's relations with its employees in every branch of the service have been carried on." In those words are revealed the essence of the man himself, for Jim Farley loves his fellow men. He likes to get along with them and to see them prosper. It is that quality that ties men to him, and makes them love him.

That the American people do love him is something that has become increasingly evident as the years of his service as Postmaster General, and as chairman of the National Democratic Committee gave them the opportunity to know him, and to take his measure, not only as an official, but as a man.

The retiring Postmaster General gives as the reason for leaving the need for devoting his full time and attention to his personal affairs, and despite the recent turn events have taken in phases of his relations with the administration, there is no reason to doubt its genuineness. Had his opposition to the third term been less adamant, he perhaps would have stayed on as chairman of the national committee. If he had felt that his duty demanded his remaining as Postmaster General, we may be certain he would not have given up that place.

So as he goes back to private life, this man takes with him the deep affection and every good wish of the people he has served so faithfully and well.

[From the Davenport (Iowa) Democrat and Leader of August 9, 1940]

JIM FARLEY'S CHANGE

Probably no American will retire from public life with more sincere regret on the part of millions than attaches to the resignation of James A. Farley, Postmaster General, who makes his exit from President Roosevelt's Cabinet on August 31.

President Roosevelt and Mr. Farley part company after 8 years of the closest association on the most friendly terms. They have been almost as brothers in public service, and although they have at times disagreed on public measures, nothing has been permitted to mar their friendship and devotion for each other. It is pleasing to see them part official company on such amicable terms. Undoubtedly their friendship will continue through the years although they will hardly see one another as often in the future as they have in the past.

Mr. Farley is one of few men who emerge from political life with a higher standing and a better rating than before they entered. He has been generally recognized as the best national chairman either major party has had in the last quarter of a century. The reason for his success is no secret. Honesty and sincerity has been his trade-mark. Added to that is his genial personality and his capacity for hard work. He was never known to betray a friend or to abuse a trust. Enemies were unknown to him for he possessed the rare faculty of enjoying the confidence and esteem of all peoples, of whatever political complexion or walk in life. He gave freely alike of his loyalty to friends and to party. His word was his bond.

Jim Farley is as mild-mannered as he is honest. The esteem and regard of those who know him best border on affection. In every way he is a great American, one of the greatest, and his unblemished record in public life will stand as a shining star in the political firmament of the Nation.

Entering business life as president of the New York American League baseball team he will carry with him the best wishes of millions of staunch admirers.

[From the Davenport (Iowa) Daily Times of August 12, 1940]

FARLEY'S NEW CONNECTIONS

All Americans, regardless of their politics, will wish Jim Farley well in his new undertakings. In addition to his Yankee ball-club interests he is to be head of the export division of Coca-Cola. Farley has the reputation of not drinking anything stronger than Coca-Cola, and he ought to be able to recommend the qualities of that beverage to the natives of Timbuktu as convincingly as he sold the New Deal to the people of the United States.

Jim is a master politician. The Roosevelt line-up will feel his loss keenly in the campaign now developing. But Jim had to go. He didn't like the third-term idea and anybody in that frame of mind must not be permitted to stay around the Roosevelt bailiwick. It was noteworthy that the exchange of letters between Roosevelt and Farley made no mention of the third term.

There is no question about it, Jim Farley was the most popular man in the recent Democratic National Convention in Chicago. Every time he showed up anywhere there were scores to shake his hand. The principal spontaneous applause from floor and from galleries of the convention was for Farley.

Mr. Roosevelt shoved Farley aside, and in the saddle for this campaign are Ed Flynn, a typical big city political boss, and Harry Hopkins, a starry-eyed new dealer who acted as Roosevelt's personal representative at Chicago and who lives at the White House.

When the Chicago convention had ended, it was certain that Mr. Farley would leave the national committee and the position of Postmaster General. So far as the latter position goes, Mr. Roosevelt might well follow the example set in naming Knox and Stimson, Republicans to his Cabinet. The Post Office Department could well use an outstanding businessman as its chief since it is one of the biggest business enterprises in the country. Can you think of a new dealer, off hand, who is well fitted for that post?

[From the Dayton (Ohio) Journal of August 9, 1940]

FAREWELL TO FARLEY

Now it has become obvious that the band leaders at the Chicago convention who insisted upon making Take Me Out to the Ball Game the theme song of Postmaster General James A. Farley must have possessed the gift of prophecy. Now the Postmaster General not only resigns from the Roosevelt Cabinet, but he becomes president of the New York Yankees baseball club. The resignation is to become effective August 31.

Farley held a peculiar position in the Roosevelt Cabinet. He was the President's political lieutenant; also the administration whipping boy whenever things went wrong. Being loyal to his chief, he exhibited a surprising capacity for punishment—even that which should have fallen to others. Furthermore, he was one of the frankest distributors of Government jobs the country has ever seen. It was Farley who filed and indexed jobs and applicants and saw to it that the latter had "political clearance" before going on the Federal pay roll. Also, it was Farley who did much of the "leg work" in connection with political campaigns.

It is a curious fact that Mr. Farley became ambitious after he went to Washington rather than before. Even as early as 1934 there were reports that he aspired to be either Governor of New York or a Presidential candidate in 1940. In both he was disappointed. In the matter of the Presidency he was blocked by no less a person than the chief to whom he had been so loyal for many years. Also, Mr. Farley's opposition to the third term and to some of the political purges made him most uncomfortable in a Cabinet position.

No doubt Mr. Farley's attitude is typical of that of many regular Democrats. Although opposing the third term he chooses to remain silent rather than support the Republican candidate. How far this will affect the result in November remains to be seen. However, with the departure of Mr. Farley from the Cabinet the "leftist" wing of the New Deal, the "palace politicians" will come into their own. They will hold undisputed sway—at least until next year. But the Roosevelt administration will miss the loyal, shrewd, and effective political services of the retiring Postmaster General who was useful to them although they never liked him.

[From the Detroit News, August 9, 1940]

THE FINAL PARTING

Following the severance of their still longer political association, official relations between President Roosevelt and James A. Farley are coming to an end. Their exchanges expressing warm personal esteem for one another as Farley submitted and the President accepted his resignation as Postmaster General, were obviously sincere. It could not be otherwise between two such men. Their success as a political "team" is assured of a permanent place in American history.

There is, nevertheless, another fact in their case, unmentioned in the letters, unconfirmed by any open expression by either, but clearly established by Farley's course during and preceding the Chicago convention. Farley was firmly opposed to the President's candidacy for a third term. At Chicago he insisted that an opposition to the President be recorded, preventing his renomination by acclamation.

Farley will not be among the Democrats deserting Roosevelt for Willkie, but it may be assumed with confidence that his opposition on principle to the third term contributed materially in forming his decision to become happily situated in private life as president of the New York Yankees.

When Farley quits as Postmaster General, August 31, he will have had an unusual tenure as head of the Postal Service. His record there is good, notwithstanding that all the while, since March 1933 until a few days ago, he also was the chairman of the Democratic National Committee, and, consequently, the chief patronage dispenser at Washington. After making thousands of postal appointments on the political basis, he probably did the utmost that could be done under those circumstances to get efficient results.

Having a far keener sense of financial responsibility than the New Deal elsewhere displayed, he sought to balance postal income and expenditures, and he took pride in the showings of success the yearly figures enabled him to make. The Air Mail Service was developed to its present extensive proportions under him.

[From the Dubuque (Iowa) Telegraph-Herald, August 11, 1940]

PARTING OF THE WAYS

In their exchange of felicitations and regrets, the President and Jim Farley studiously avoided any mention of the third-term issue, which brought about this severance of relations. But it might just as well have been mentioned, for it figured in every news account and comment on the event.

The final break is all the more dramatic in the light of earlier events. Here was "the man behind the ballots," as Farley was widely known, withdrawing from a political battle which will probably excel 1932 and 1936 in its intensity. He said he was going into new work "where I know I shall be happy."

We wonder if he'll be happy anywhere else—this master technician, who did the spade work which produced the greatest of American political landslides.

[From the Durham (N. C.) Herald, August 9, 1940]

BIG JIM QUITS

There isn't much to be said about Mr. Farley's resignation except that it was expected.

The exchange of letters, as anticipated, reflects the warmth of friendship that has existed between Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Farley these several years and in spite of much columnistic gossip to the contrary, we suspect the two gentlemen still cherish their comradeship.

It is fairly evident that Mr. Farley lacks enthusiasm for the third term and feels that Mr. Roosevelt sort of snubbed him on that issue. It is just as evident that Big Jim recognizes more fully than some of his recent boosters that he (Farley) owes something to Mr. Roosevelt the same as Mr. Roosevelt owes something to him, and that in or out of the official family he cannot well sulk in this campaign.

It is no secret that Mr. Roosevelt and his intimates beseeched Mr. Farley to stay on as party chairman and still hope to have him actively in the Roosevelt corner during the campaign.

It is not a foregone conclusion but a reasonable guess that Mr. Farley will leave most of the campaign management to others. First, because he has no enthusiasm for the task, and secondly, because he is dubious of the outcome.

But Jim Farley cannot cut loose from politics all at once if he wanted to and the fact that he is staying as New York chairman indicates that he has no desire to do so. And Jim, unlike Al Smith, knows well that the professional party man can't get far by "taking a walk."

So our guess is that Jim will put in some effective blows for his old chief ere the November deadline.

[From the Easton (Pa.) Express of August 9, 1940]

THE UNHAPPY WARRIOR

There is no reason, of course, why the friendship between James A. Farley and Franklin D. Roosevelt shouldn't "last" as the President put it in his letter accepting the resignation of the Postmaster General as of August 31.

Between the two men there ought to be a mutual affectionate regard which in the very nature of things arises out of long association.

But, if we could look into Jim Farley's heart we believe we would find a different tale to be told regarding whatever political friendship remains between the Cabinet officer and the man whom he twice aided in putting in the White House.

From a number of different authentic sources in Washington in recent months the report has been persistent that Roosevelt and Farley were not seeing eye to eye on many public questions—and that the greatest of these was the third term.

Certainly, by his actions in Chicago, reinforced by the words of CARTER GLASS, of Virginia, Mr. Farley showed his utter disapproval of the third-term bid and especially of the steam-roller tactics employed by his Chief.

Under the circumstances, it may well be said that Jim Farley represents the unhappy warrior—that is to say, a man who fought valiantly for one whom he long believed to be a political god, only to learn at long last that the said deity was made up of considerably more political clay than of the stuff of which statesmen are constituted.

It is a melancholy conclusion to an association which ought to have gone down in history as a historic one of mutual loyalty and regard.

[From the Elizabeth (N. J.) Daily Journal of August 10, 1940]

FARLEY OUT OF POLITICS

Not long ago James A. Farley resigned as chairman of the Democratic National Committee. This week he resigned as a member of the President's official family. He still retains his job, for a time at least, as chairman of the New York State Democratic Committee.

It must be something of a wrench of feelings for Mr. Farley to take himself out of politics, when he was so deeply immersed in politics. It has been said of him that he made Franklin D. Roosevelt President; yet it is quite well understood that his letter of resignation does not tell the whole story of his feelings regarding the end of their long, intimate association. Political ambition is far from being careful of friendships, and far from exhibiting full appreciation for favors and service rendered.

The Hatch law is intended to divorce public office from political activity. It has never reached the President's Cabinet nor had much influence on the members of his family of advisers. Mr. Farley will be remembered longer, it is likely, as the political manager of the New Deal party than as a postal administration statesman. Yet there have been many innovations in the Postal Service. No administration has ever thought out so many real or contrived reasons for making stamps and keeping the stamp engravers and printing presses busy.

Mr. Farley has won more actual admiration and respect in the past few weeks than ever before in his attitude toward the third-term candidacy of his former political associate. He took the failure of his own Presidential aspirations smiling, as seasoned politicians do, but has undoubtedly retained the memory of the treatment himself and other aspirants received.

[From the Fairmont (W. Va.) Times of August 9, 1940]

PROOF OF GREATNESS

Jim Farley cut his second and last official connection with Washington yesterday when he resigned as Postmaster General. At the end of this month he will be free to reenter the field of private enterprise, even though there is little likelihood that he will return to private life. For one so prominent, association with the New York Yankees can hardly be termed retirement.

The best proof of Jim Farley's great ability is to be found in the fact that he made a success of the two big jobs he tackled in the Roosevelt administration. Just a few weeks ago he retired as the Democratic Party's national chairman, acclaimed as one of the greatest political chiefs the party has ever known. Yesterday he resigned as head of a Federal department, leaving behind records which establish him as one of the most able executives ever to grace the Postmaster General's office.

If the point needs proving that a politician can also be a good businessman, Jim Farley has furnished the necessary evidence.

[From the Gadsden (Ala.) Times of August 9, 1940]

LOYAL DEMOCRAT TO RETIRE

The retirement of Jim Farley as chairman of the National Democratic Committee, August 17, to be followed shortly thereafter by his retirement as Postmaster General, will mark the exit of one of the most loyal and capable Democrats associated with the party during the past seven and a half years.

Indeed it may be said that Farley is one of the two Cabinet officers who have been more of an asset than a liability to the administration, the other being Secretary Hull. Farley's intense loyalty to his party and to the principles for which it has been committed in past generations won for him the respect and gratitude of millions of sincere party members, among many of whom will exist the feeling that his reward was scanty out of all proportions to its value.

Meanwhile it is to be hoped that there will be no hesitancy about appointing a Democrat to succeed Mr. Farley as Postmaster General. With four Republicans and one Socialist now in the Cabinet, it would put the Democrats in the minority were a Republican named to succeed Farley, and would look much like an invitation to turn the whole job over to the Republicans.

Besides, Farley deserves better than to be succeeded by a member of the party he has fought so shrewdly and successfully throughout the past two national elections.

[From the Greenville (S. C.) News of August 9, 1940]

THE POST OFFICE REPORT

For the past 6 years Postmaster General James A. Farley has been able to report a "net operating surplus" for his department. The fiscal year ending on June 30 ran true to form and his preliminary report shows a surplus of about $8,000,000 "with respect to that part of the postal services that are rendered to the public for hire."

When the Department's annual report to Congress is made in December, however, it is expected that the usual "gross" deficit will appear. These figures will include the air-mail subsidies and the estimated costs of handling free mail. These items in recent years have caused the Post Office Department to show gross operating deficits of around $45,000,000 annually.

Little criticism is heard of the Post Office Department. There is a general feeling that it is doing a good job and that it is operating efficiently. Yet every year when the public's attention is drawn to that item of free mail, a few squawks are heard. A great many citizens feel that several million dollars could be trimmed from this item without doing anybody any harm and without detriment to the service.

[From the Hamilton (Ohio) Journal-News of August 10, 1940]

JIM FARLEY BOWS OUT

Bowing out of the national political picture is James A. Farley, of New York. "Big Jim" has turned over the reins as chairman of the Democratic National Committee; he quits President Roosevelt's Cabinet as Postmaster General on August 31.

Farley will enter private business, if becoming owner of the New York Yankees baseball team can be called private business.

At the end of his political trail, for the present at least, Jim Farley leaves a twin heritage which might be described in these words: "He was honest; he was loyal."

Jim Farley was a hard hitter. Opponents early learned that. But he could take it as well as give it, and he never struck below the belt.

His loyalty, when historians get around to writing about it, probably will be pointed to as his outstanding characteristic. In the vagaries of a changing political scene, his loyalty often had been tested and never found wanting.

If Jim Farley is half as successful in his baseball connection as he was in politics, and friends both inside and outside the Democratic Party wish him well, the Yankees should have many more prosperous years ahead.

[From the Hartford (Conn.) Courant of August 10, 1940]

MR. FARLEY RESIGNS

In his letter of resignation as Postmaster General, Mr. Farley devoted himself chiefly to expressing his esteem for Mr. Roosevelt as a man and to describing with justified pride his accomplishment in the Postal Service. For his part, the President in reply also dwelt upon his great affection for the man who, more than any other, was responsible for his great political victories and upon the achievements of Mr. Farley in the Post Office Department. What neither could honestly do was to discuss the New Deal in its present manifestation; to do so would have been to cast a shadow over the whole occasion.

The personal friendship between the two gentlemen, who have gone through so much together, doubtless will endure. What is painfully evident is that in other respects they now have drifted far apart. A week hence Mr. Farley will no longer be chairman of the National Democratic Committee; 3 weeks hence he will have left the Cabinet. Even though long anticipated, the imminent dissolution of an extraordinary political partnership gives the situation fresh significance. Not only is the President deprived of his most accomplished political adviser, in addition, he loses the backing of a man whom many have come to respect deeply and to whom they look for political guidance.

Doubtless Mr. Farley will vote the straight ticket when he enters the voting booth in November, as his sponsor for the Presidential nomination, CARTER GLASS, has said that he will do. Maybe he will be inveigled into taking some part in the campaign before it closes. Yet the chances are that "Jim" will be a pretty silent man for the next few months, as he gets his new business venture under way. His silence will speak loudly, and it may make a deeper impression than all the speeches and parades of the oddly assorted cabal that has taken over his role.

[From the Hartford (Conn.) Times of August 9, 1940]

NO SURPRISE

Postmaster General Farley's resignation takes neither the country nor the President by surprise. It was definitely announced as forthcoming during the Chicago convention, the only question being when. As usual in such cases, Mr. Farley and the President exchange messages of good will, regret, and mutual admiration. Mr. Farley would be less than human, however, if his soul did not contain some bitterness over conditions under which he retires and which prompted him to carry his third protest to the length of a last-ditch candidacy.

The country has increased respect for the Postmaster General. It looks upon him as a man of sense, character, and courage. Modern times have furnished few more resourceful or more skillful political managers. The Democratic Party will indeed miss his hand from its helm.

[From the Houston (Tex.) Chronicle of August 11, 1940]

HE HAS LIVED UP TO HIS CODE

The retirement of Postmaster General James A. Farley to private business on August 31 removes from the Cabinet one of its most respected figures and one of the best-liked and most-useful public men of our period.

From humble circumstances Jim Farley came up through the routine routes of politics to the management of two Presidential campaigns, to 8 years as chairman of the Democratic National Committee and 7½ years in the Cabinet.

Yet never during his whole career has the finger of accusation been pointed at him with even a particle of success. He is no pretender and would never object to being called a politician. But he has always played the game squarely and by the rules as he understood them.

The necessity of making some money for his family is one of the reasons involved in Farley's retirement. The authentic story is told how, once before when Farley was talking of retiring in order to improve his financial status, another less scrupulous politician expressed surprise.

"A man who has been in his position," he said, "ought to be worth a million or two."

But Farley's wealth is in his friendships. These are extremely numerous as a result of a great capacity for friendship. He probably knows more people by their first names than any other American. He has traveled all over the country many, many times; and while he could and did say "No" when occasion demanded, he could never say "No" to a plea that he help out his friends who had charge of a program by coming to make a speech.

During his long career as political generalissimo he has often taken the rap for things done by others. But never has he complained. He is and always has been "Sunny Jim," proud that he plays the game as he thinks it ought to be played, proud that his word, once given, has always been kept, at whatever sacrifice was necessary, proud of the friendships he has made and the loyalties he has inspired.

As an organizer he will be difficult to follow in the national committee, and as an administrator it is one of his most cherished prides that he has been able to get the Post Office Department into the "black" after years in the red.

His capacity for detail has always been amazing, his policy of almost never going to a town without going to the post office, his tremendous capacity for remembering names and faces, his daily output of personal letters.

He has friends because he has always practiced Robert Louis Stevenson's formula: "The only way to have a friend is to be one." He goes back to private life with the respect of everyone because of the qualities of character he has shown and because he has never failed to live up to his code.

[From the Indianapolis (Ind.) Star, August 10, 1940]

"GENIAL JIM" DEPARTS

Resignation of James A. Farley as Postmaster General, effective August 31, removes the final link between this nationally popular Democrat and the Roosevelt administration. At the Chicago convention he announced his retirement as Democratic national chairman. Farley's letter to the Executive was somewhat formal. Thus ended the close relationship of the pair that has dominated party affairs for the last 8 years.

Mr. Farley was opposed vigorously to the Roosevelt ambition to shatter the third-term tradition. He also had disagreed with the Executive on other matters and the rift between the two gradually widened. The President will miss the guiding genius of the New Deal campaigns. Farley is by no means indispensable as Postmaster General, although his administration of that post has been satisfactory. This Cabinet berth usually goes to a political expert, however, with assistants handling most of the departmental routine.

The new dealers have suffered an irreparable loss in Farley's retirement as national chairman. He was marvelously effective as an organizer. This ability was due to a remarkably widespread acquaintance throughout the country and to unusual personal popularity. Few men in political life have known personally so many leaders in every town and hamlet. Edward J. Flynn, Farley's successor as chairman, is capable enough in a narrower orbit. He is handicapped, however, by inevitable comparison with rare qualities of "Genial Jim."

[From the Indianapolis (Ind.) Star, August 19, 1940]

FARLEY STEPS OUT

The retirement of James A. Farley as Democratic national chairman and his stepping out of the Cabinet post of Postmaster General, which is scheduled for the end of the month, take an interesting and colorful figure from the stage of national politics. He relinquishes those positions in order to accept more lucrative and permanent opportunities in the world of business. The record he has made in directing the affairs of his party and his capacity as head of the Post Office Department are assurance of success in his new undertakings.

Mr. Farley's attitude in opposition to the third-term nomination of the President was well known. He was insistent on the presentation of his name as a candidate for the nomination, at the Chicago convention, in order to register his conviction on the question of renaming the President. It was generally known he was anxious to return to private business, a determination that has been put into action. He is a good citizen and an American gentleman who served his party well as chairman and the public well as Postmaster General.

[From the Jackson (Miss.) Clarion-Ledger of August 10, 1940]

JIM FARLEY LEAVES A RECORD AS A TRULY GREAT POSTMASTER

Postmaster General James A. Farley formally resigns his post, as he had announced he would do, and thus ends his long political, personal, and official alliance with President Franklin D. Roosevelt, whose two campaigns he directed. He had earlier resigned as Democratic national chairman.

President Roosevelt accepted the resignation in what press dispatches describe as "an exceedingly friendly letter" in which he expressed "sincere sorrow that we are losing you as a member of the official family" and in which he testified to Farley's "unselfish years in the public service."

Some, remembering all the implications and facts of the story leading up to Mr. Farley's resignation, may question the full sincerity of the President's "sorrow" in losing him. But none can question the sincerity of the President's praise of Farley's services and accomplishments as Postmaster General.

"That the post office service is on a completely self-sustaining basis with respect to that part that is rendered to the public for hire, is in itself a real tribute to you and your associates," the President wrote. And he added that the Post Office Department, during Farley's administration, made great strides in business efficiency,

public service, and in the bettering of the morale of the 300,000 employees.

All citizens with any knowledge of the Post Office Department can and do endorse that tribute. "Big Jim" Farley, no matter how history treats him as a politician, will long have his place in the Nation's annals as one of the greatest, most efficient, most humane of the Nation's Postmasters. The Post Office Department will miss him as much or more than the President does.

[From the Jersey City (N. J.) Journal, August 9, 1940]

FARLEY STEPS ASIDE

James A. Farley has resigned as Postmaster General, and thus goes out of the New Deal picture the No. 1 man of all those who pushed Roosevelt up the political ladder. Farley now joins the growing company of those other early Rooseveltian Warwicks like Ray Moley, Lewis Douglas, Hugh Johnson, et cetera, et cetera, who have been dropped as the Kaiser dropped Bismarck.

The letters exchanged between Mr. Farley and the President regarding the resignation were extremely friendly—so friendly that both visibly overplayed the part. The honey was thick but transparent enough so that the public can perceive the underlying cause of the break—the third term.

Mr. Farley had a 3-way political tie-up for 8 years. He was Postmaster General, chairman of the Democratic National Committee, and chairman of the New York State Democratic Committee, all at the same time for 8 years. No amount of criticism could budge him out of any of those places. It remained for his chief to shame him out. Farley stood pat for 8 years, but that was all he wanted, or would take for himself, and was all he thought a President should take.

When Mr. Roosevelt branded himself as the "indispensable man" and headed himself for a third term, it was too much for Farley. "Big Jim" will have, and deserves, happier fields of endeavor.

[From the Lockport (N. Y.) Union-Sun and Journal, August 10, 1940]

WHY IS FARLEY POPULAR?

It appears that nearly all the nice things to be said about a national politician this year were reserved for Postmaster General James A. Farley. And why was that? He is not a scholar, great statesman, or an outstanding administrator of a Department of the Government. He is not weak, and he does not bend easily.

He is the one big man in the Government who never gets mad, never says unkind or hurtful things about anybody. He is a true gentleman of the finest type of Irish parentage. He is "Gentleman Jim" Farley, nothing more.

That explains why he is one of the country's most popular citizens.

[From the Lancaster (Pa.) Intelligencer Journal of August 9, 1940]

JIM FARLEY

The Honorable James A. Farley, Postmaster General, has resigned, effective August 31 to go into private business.

The American people thus lose from their service one of the ablest, most colorful, and most useful men in public life since the turn of the century.

Any man who can remember a million faces; who, in a short 7 years in public life can call a half million people by their first name, and who steadfastly refused to allow his business firm to take any Federal contracts, or any subcontracts on Federal work, when for years there was practically no work being done his firm could do except public work, not only has morale but morality that will always be a monument to his integrity.

It is a parody on public life that a man of the attainments of Jim Farley has to turn to a plaything like baseball in order to win a substance for a rainy day in life, instead of continuing to serve the people of a nation of 130,000,000 as it has never been better served than he has served and still has the ability to continue to serve it.

[From the Lincoln (Nebr.) Journal of August 10, 1940]

JIM FARLEY IS OUT

The political break that has been indicated for a long time has finally been made complete. Jim Farley has resigned as Postmaster General. The resignation is effective with the end of August. It has been accepted with "real regret" by the President. Discussing his future Mr. Farley says, "I shall be very happy."

Previously Mr. Farley had resigned from the chairmanship of the Democratic National Committee. It will be recalled that he was a candidate who was steam-rollered by Presidential forces in the Chicago convention. At that time both the President and Mrs. Roosevelt expressed their high regard for Mr. Farley and apparently went far afield to impress the public and the party concerning the high esteem in which they held the political manager who had much to do with placing Mr. Roosevelt in the White House. Another political manager has been named and is now officiating.

The Farley resignation was announced but a few hours before the President was to meet Secretaries Wallace and Hopkins in conference. Mr. Wallace is the President's political running mate. He aspires to the post now held by JOHN N. GARNER, of Texas. Mr. GARNER recently left Washington with the intimation that he might not return. So the designation "of Texas" seems fitting.

At the Chicago convention, Secretary Hopkins was the manager of the President's board of political strategy. The Wallace influences were favorable to Roosevelt. The President had indicated that he desired Wallace for a running mate. Secretary Hopkins went so far as to indicate to political workers that the President might not accept a third-term nomination if Wallace were not named for the Vice Presidency.

Political medicine mixing has been the order of the week at Hyde Park. Mr. Farley has had no part in it. He did aspire to the Presidential nomination. His defeat was made certain by the Roosevelt machine. He is a shrewd politician, however. He will go along. No such assurance has come from GARNER. Mr. GARNER has been remarkably reticent.

[From the Los Angeles Times of August 9, 1940]

FARLEY RESIGNS

Postmaster General Farley leaves the Cabinet August 31, but of greater moment to the administration is his departure from the post of chairman of the Democratic National Committee 2 weeks earlier. As Postmaster Generals go, in a department which mostly runs itself, Farley has made about an average record. As a political manager he has been outstanding, and the efforts of Boss Flynn, his successor, to keep at reasonable efficiency the organization which Farley built up are likely to be pathetic.

The public and Farley's numerous friends will not be seriously deceived by the mutual expressions of esteem and protestations of undying friendship in the exchange of letters between him and the President. The President's comments on Farley as a candidate and the shabby treatment Farley got at Chicago will be remembered for a long time.

It will be noted that Farley looks forward to his as yet officially unnamed private business venture "with great pleasure." The innuendo is not to be missed. He is sick of the New Deal.

[From the Lynchburg (Va.) News of August 10, 1940]

FARLEY RETIRES

James A. Farley has resigned as Postmaster General in the Cabinet of President Franklin D. Roosevelt, a post he has held since 1933, and will step down August 31. Effective a few days earlier he has already resigned as chairman of the Democratic National Committee.

Thus ends a political and administrative association of two colorful figures in American life that has continued for many years and has had great effect upon the political fortunes of both men. It has been a team that has written history in a way that neither could have written by himself.

Whether or not it means an end to a long personal association remains to be seen. President Roosevelt is warm in his expression of personal feelings in the letter accepting Postmaster General Farley's resignation, in accord with his temperament and practice, and though the retiring official is more restrained, he, too, voices personal regards of kind nature. It is not likely, however, that ties of personal nature will ever bind as closely again. That is not in the nature of things. Politics brought the two men together; political and official cooperation made them closer. When those ties are severed, the two men will go their own way and gradually, whatever their feelings now, they will drift apart personally. Moreover, there is evidence in the record and in the restrained nature of Farley's letter to the President that the rift has already been made. Friendly feelings may remain, but absence will hardly make hearts grow fonder in this instance and under existing circumstances. No Damon and Pythias, David and Jonathan relationship may be expected.

Whatever Jim Farley's personal feelings as he steps down, whatever his unrecorded disappointments and chagrins, Postmaster General Farley has the great satisfaction that he has performed the duties of a high public office well. It is not necessary to accept at face value his estimate of the financial condition of his Department and its achievements to give him credit for having made a splendid Postmaster General. Despite his occupation with political affairs and political activities, he has conducted that Department efficiently and has left it a smooth-functioning machine for his successor. He will be known not only as a master politician, not only as a loyal friend, and, what is greatest of all, as a man of convictions so strong as to make personal sacrifice in their behalf easy, but as one of the country's greatest Post Office Department heads.

Into private life Jim Farley will be followed by the good wishes of masses of people of all political faiths throughout the United States. Those who have fought with him, those who have fought against him, those who have criticized and censured, as well as those who have had praise only, will hope for him contentment and happiness and financial success, the deserved rewards of jobs well done at considerable personal sacrifices.

[From the Lowell (Mass.) Sun of August 9, 1940]

FAREWELL TO FARLEY

Now that James A. Farley has formally resigned from the Roosevelt Cabinet, the official family isn't going to seem the same. The Post Office Department will miss him, but, more than that, the everyday citizen, with whom he was always foursquare, will miss him.

In his dual capacity as Postmaster General and national chairman of the Democratic Party, Mr. Farley proved himself a top-flight executive. Until this year he was President Roosevelt's right-hand man, but the tossing he took at Chicago bore out the suspicion that dissension had arisen in the administration camp.

Despite the apparently sincere exchange of letters between Farley and Roosevelt in connection with the Postmaster's departure from the Federal service, there remains more than a faint implication that Jim leaves office with a broken heart.

Although they stripped him of his chances in the Presidential carnival at Chicago, however slim they might have been, they couldn't take from Mr. Farley his record of service in the leadership of his party for almost 8 years. His millions of affectionate and admiring friends will never forget.

Jim Farley could never be a nonentity. That perhaps explains his resignation from political life. He had been one of the most effective and most beloved national chairmen ever to serve the Democratic Party. He did the wise thing in getting out before the bosses placed him on the junk pile to gain their own ends.

[From the Macon (Ga.) Telegraph of August 12, 1940]

BACK TO PRIVATE LIFE

James A. Farley resigned as chairman of the Democratic National Committee immediately after the adjournment of the Democratic convention at Chicago. On Thursday of last week he submitted to the President his resignation as Postmaster General, effective August 31, and his consequent retirement from the administration's official family.

In his letter of resignation and in the President's acceptance of it there is little of a personal nature. Mr. Farley dwells at some length on the good record the Post Office Department has made under his regime and expresses his appreciation of the cooperation he has received from Congress.

Mr. Roosevelt takes note of the improvement in the Postal Department under Farley, voices his "sincere sorrow" at losing him as a member of the Cabinet and expresses the hope that "after all of our years of close personal association" members of "the administration hope to see you often."

Thus closes a career of unselfish service which finds few parallels in American politics.

Mr. Farley has made two important business connections which will help him to build up his private fortune, suffered to decline while he was chairman of the Democratic National Committee and a member of the Cabinet.

There is a general feeling that he is entitled to all the good things that may come to him in private station and that no man in public life was ever treated with greater ingratitude than when his ambitions were coldly strangled at Chicago.

[From the Meriden (Conn.) Record of August 15, 1940]

MR. FARLEY'S DEPARTURE

It is a commonplace of life and a favorite device of fiction and the stage for two old friends who part under strained circumstances to talk about everything but what they are really thinking. So it must have been with President Roosevelt and Postmaster General Farley when the latter sent his letter of resignation and Mr. Roosevelt his reply of acceptance.

Mr. Farley was preoccupied only with leaving the Postal Service. It was divulged by his letter that during his two terms the system was placed on a self-sustaining basis, the air mail was extended, a record business was done, etc. All business. Mr. Roosevelt's response was in kind. He spoke of the success of Farley, the Postmaster General, of the morale of the Service, the great strides in business efficiency.

In the minds of both these men there must have been countless thoughts that could not go into the letters, for their association is historic. In 1932 Farley was the incarnation of "Roosevelt before Chicago." He delivered the convention votes that made the New Deal possible. He was out in front again in 1936 and made the amazing Maine and Vermont prophecy. It is idle to say that his passing somehow tears away the political past from Mr. Roosevelt. Things just will not be the same, third term or no third term.

That was the rock on which their political association, if not their friendship, broke. Jim wouldn't go along at Chicago in 1940. He wouldn't even pretend to go along. He was practical enough to know that he could not be nominated, practical enough to know there was no stopping F. D. R., but he stood up and had his votes counted, nevertheless. Then he quit as national chairman and as a member of the President's Cabinet. November will disclose the effect of his departure.

[From the Miami (Fla.) Herald of August 12, 1940]

NOT AMONG JOBLESS

There is no depression for James A. Farley. He is not bothered by unemployment. It just shows what a bright young man can do when he gets cut and hustles. There is always opportunity in America, even for the boy from the big city.

Farley, you know, is quitting a paltry job that paid a mere pittance, $15,000 a year, as Postmaster General, but he did so well selling stamps, and votes, that he has been awarded a chance to sell Coca-Cola, but not exactly like the soda jerker.

He has been named a director right at the beginning, which saves the trouble of working up to that honor, and will have charge of exports. That does appear like a mean trick, asking him to ship "cokes" to the heathen in Europe and Asia when they are so busy blowing each other up and have no boats for soft drinks, or hard. Trying to build up an export business ought to be rather difficult at present, but you never can tell about Jim. He may induce the belligerents to call the whole thing off so they can quench their thirst with his product.

We understand that Jim also proposes to buy the New York Yankees, and then he can use their billboards to advertise his product and make the customers purchase it. It is a fine combination, and Farley ought to be a success. The next thing we know he will be complaining about restrictions on business and Federal taxes on excess profits.

[From the Middletown (N. Y.) Times Herald of August 10, 1940]

EMPTY COMPLIMENTS

When he accepted the resignation of Mr. Farley from the Cabinet the President paid compliments to the loyalty and fidelity of the man. He could have done no less.

Mr. Farley made Mr. Roosevelt President. His devotion received through a 7-year period of disappointment and disillusioning experience with the hypocrisy and essential fraudulency of self-professed idealists, a test of extraordinary character. Yet he remained faithful until the last measure of ingratitude was cupped for him by Mr. Hopkins at Chicago.

Compliments and praises are his as a matter of course. They cost a man nothing who scatters them profusely. They were nevertheless obtained at a price—a price that only Jim Farley knows.

For Mr. Farley there probably are no more idols. The one he had destroyed itself.

Every period in American public life culminates in the destruction of political idols. The wrecking in this instance perhaps will have more than ordinary effect, an effect, however, that may not become unmistakably evident until the votes of Mr. Farley's friends throughout the country are counted in November.

[From the Nashville (Tenn.) Banner of August 9, 1940]

THE FINAL BREAK

The resignation of Postmaster General Farley, to be effective August 31, 2 weeks after his retirement as chairman of the national committee, was a fulfillment of predictions generally made after the action of the Chicago convention. The amenities, and even cordial assurances, that usually accompany the severance of political ties between men whose relations have been even intimate were meticulously observed in the present instance; but they in no degree lessened the significance of the retirement of Mr. Farley from the Cabinet quickly following that as head of the national organization of the party.

The course which Mr. Farley has taken was the natural, indeed the inevitable, result of differences that have been developing for more than 2 years. The inner White House coterie—Corcoran, Hopkins, Ickes, Ben Cohen, Jackson, and several others of scarcely less intimate access to its occupant—have never liked Mr. Farley, and, indeed, have been at slight pains to conceal their antipathy. They could never forgive him for his independence, and his refusal to approve their tactics, such as the purge, which they had urged upon the President, and to which he gave ready and disastrous acquiescence.

Mr. Farley's loyalty to the President and to the party forbade him to make open dissent to a situation of steadily increasing embarrassments. Mr. Roosevelt's candidacy for a third term caused the open and final break which incidents at the Chicago convention accentuated and precipitated.

Mr. Farley was the most popular and able head that the Democratic National Committee has had for a generation. That he will vote for Mr. Roosevelt he has made certain by public assertion, but it is probable that his ballot will nearly compass the assistance which the ticket will receive at his hands. That he will be missed in the counsels of the party and from the front ranks of valiant party fighters as the campaign advances will scarcely be questioned.

[From the Newark (N. J.) News of August 9, 1940]

MR. FARLEY GOES

It is a commonplace of life and a favorite device of fiction and the stage for two old friends who part under strained circumstances to talk about everything but what they are really thinking. So it must have been with President Roosevelt and Postmaster General Farley when the latter sent his letter of resignation and Mr. Roosevelt his reply of acceptance.

Mr. Farley was preoccupied only with leaving the Postal Service. We learned from his letter that during his two terms the system had been placed on a self-sustaining basis, that the air mail had been extended, that a record business had been done, etc. All business. Mr. Roosevelt's response was in kind. He spoke of the success of Farley the Postmaster General, of the morale of the Service, the great strides in business efficiency.

In the minds of both these men there must have been countless thoughts that couldn't go into the letters, for their association is historic. In 1932 Farley was the incarnation of "Roosevelt-before-Chicago." He delivered the convention votes that made the New Deal possible. He was out in front again in 1936 and made that amazing Maine and Vermont prophecy. It is idle to say that his passing somehow tears away the political past from Mr. Roosevelt. Things just won't be the same, third term or no third term.

That was the rock on which their political association, if not their friendship, broke. Jim wouldn't go along at Chicago in 1940. He wouldn't even pretend to go along. He was practical enough to know that he couldn't be nominated, practical enough to know

there was no stopping F. D. R., but he stood up and had his votes counted, nevertheless. Then he quit as national chairman. November will tell the effect of his departure. Mr. Flynn, of the Bronx, may suit Boss Hague & Co., but he'll find it hard to fill Jim's shoes.

[From the New Bedford Standard-Times of August 8, 1940]

MR. FARLEY RETIRES

Postmaster General Farley's resignation, which has been accepted by the President, is taken to mean that he has retired for good from political life to devote himself to baseball and the Yankees. Long associated with politics in his own State of New York, it was not until he became manager of Franklin D. Roosevelt's campaign for the Democratic nomination in 1932, that he became a national figure. Successful in this assignment, he managed the election campaign, and won the reward that has often gone to campaign managers—a place in the Cabinet as Postmaster General. He scored another success in 1936, and his reputation as a shrewd politician was further enhanced by the uncanny accuracy of his prediction of the number of States Roosevelt would carry.

It was during Roosevelt's second term that Farley's relationship with the President began to undergo a change. He was not in sympathy with the more radical of the New Dealers. Moreover, he had an ambition to be President, only to find, as the choice of delegates drew near, that he was blocked by the President's silence as to his own plans. He knew, before the convention was held, that the nomination was not for him; but as an opponent of the third term he let his name be presented to the convention, and by so doing won commendation not only from his friends and members of his own party, but from political opponents.

So his political career came to an end, not the end he had desired, but one that did not impair, and on the contrary enhanced, the public's good opinion of him. His friendliness, his gift of remembering names and faces, and his loyalty to his friends, should stand him in good stead in his new undertaking which is, by the way, distinctly clothed with a public interest.

[From the Journal-News of August 13, 1940]

BUT NOT OUT OF CIRCULATION

Resignation of Postmaster General James A. Farley from the Roosevelt Cabinet, effective at the end of this month, brings to an end what might well be called an epoch in Rockland County because it marks the conclusion of the term of service of the country's first Cabinet officer. Mr. Farley has brought to Rockland County many firsts during his public career, and there are many other firsts probably to come before he retires permanently from the scene.

Rockland County in its long history has had a fair share of honors, but to none of its distinguished citizens ever came the recognition that has been accorded Jim Farley. For the first time in the history of the Democratic Party in New York State its chairman came from Rockland, for the first time the National Democratic chairmanship went to a native of Rockland Conty, for the first time a Cabinet officer was appointed from Rockland County.

There may have been and there may now be other Rockland County men and women who are nationally known, but there has never been a resident of the county better known the length and breadth of the land than the man who started his climb up the political ladder as town clerk of Stony Point. The rise was little short of meteoric, for it was accomplished in the short span of two decades. Other national figures have been known to spend their lifetimes before they have gained the same pinnacle of public prominence.

In his resignation from the Cabinet and from the national chairmanship Jim Farley takes from the administration campaign for reelection much solidity, a feeling that the party management is in safe hands. He was first, last, and always a politician, but in that lay his greatest strength. A party leader must be a great politician to be successful and nothing else.

As Postmaster General he proved himself also an able businessman, competent to run an immense business profitably and efficiently. He will be as difficult to replace in that post as in the national chairmanship, and it is safe to assume that his successors will not throughout their careers gain as much prominence in the national picture as has Farley.

Rockland County may indeed again be proud of its most famous son as he retires to private enterprise, and it seems evident that he will be as successful in his new endeavors as he was while in the national eye. Jim Farley is out of public life but not out of the public eye. That's a place he will hold for many years to come.

[From the Ottumwa (Iowa) Daily Courier of August 9, 1940]

GOOD LUCK, JIM

Postmaster General Farley is to leave the Cabinet August 31 and Mr. Roosevelt says they always will be friends. Mr. Farley says they will, too, so they probably will.

But it will be a different type of friendship than that of 8 years ago when Mr. Roosevelt first ran for the Presidency.

Mr. Farley, a master in the field of politics, was largely responsible for Mr. Roosevelt's election to his first term. Later solid advice from this source was not so well received in the Presidential office. A strange fringe of advisers had appeared. Mr. Farley had little in common with them. They were not of his kind.

Then came the Chicago convention and its preparations. There were others who veered away from being Mr. Farley's kind.

A man of his integrity, personal and party, no longer could be happy in such surroundings. So he seeks new fields. Success to him. He has earned it.

[From the Phoenix (Ariz.) Republic of August 13, 1940]

NEW DEAL LOSES ITS STRATEGIST

Irrespective of their party affiliations, citizens of the United States will wish James A. Farley, who has served ably for 7 years as their Postmaster General, success in his undertakings in private life. It probably depends upon how one views the New Deal as to whether one regrets his retirement from public life or not. Those who were politically opposed to Mr. Farley could not help admiring him as a skillful political organizer and campaigner.

Most Americans, we believe, are convinced that Mr. Farley has resigned from the President's Cabinet and has surrendered his portfolio as Postmaster General because he could not "go along" with Mr. Roosevelt on a third term. They admire Mr. Farley's reticence in not saying anything about his real reasons for leaving the official family of the President, thus leaving untold the story behind the story of his resignation.

To a few of the many friends of the Postmaster General, his resignation is clear and understandable. As early as 2 or 3 years ago, Mr. Farley confided to some of his friends that if Mr. Roosevelt chose to run for a third term, he would not be with him. He may have given his reasons to some of his confidants; but if he did, they have remained silent.

We do not believe that failure of Mr. Farley to obtain the Presidential nomination of his party had anything to do with his resignation. He must have given up any aspirations he may have had for the nomination some months ago when the "draft Roosevelt" movement was begun by Harold L. Ickes and other members of the President's Cabinet. It was evident some weeks before the Democrats met in convention in Chicago that only a miracle could prevent Mr. Roosevelt from being nominated.

The President is sincere in saying he accepted Mr. Farley's resignation with "real regret." It is very doubtful that the position of the Postmaster General as the director of successful campaigns can be filled. The genial chairman of the Democratic Party had a flair for organization, and when he decided he could not "string along" with Mr. Roosevelt for a third term, the New Deal lost its chief political strategist and its star salesman. The New Dealers may be able to fool themselves to the contrary, but it was Jim Farley who sold the Nation on Franklin D. Roosevelt in 1932.

[From the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette of August 10, 1940]

AN OLD ALLIANCE BREAKS ON THE THIRD TERM

James A. Farley has resigned his place as Postmaster General, severing his connection with President Roosevelt's Cabinet as he earlier had severed connections with the Democratic national organization; and when those two resignations become effective, that from the Cabinet on August 31, that from the national chairmanship a week from today, an episode in American political history will have ended.

The alliance between Mr. Farley and Mr. Roosevelt dates back to the earliest contemplation of Mr. Roosevelt's candidacy for President. That was in 1930, 2 years before the convention which nominated Mr. Roosevelt for the first time. Mr. Farley's autobiography reveals that shortly after the 1930 campaign Mr. Roosevelt, then Governor of New York, wrote to him, "I have an idea that you and I make a combination which has not existed since Cleveland and Lamont * * *." That combination has stood firm under every circumstance until now, and it fell apart on the issue of the third term. Meanwhile, Mr. Farley had engineered two national conventions which nominated Mr. Roosevelt, and his sound political advice had contributed greatly to keep the Democratic organization running smoothly during those years.

But Mr. Farley did not engineer the Roosevelt nomination last month. When Harry Hopkins and other New Deal advocates of the third term sought to avoid a roll call and force the nomination of Mr. Roosevelt by acclamation, it was Mr. Farley who stood in their way and successfully blocked that proposal. Mr. Farley insisted upon his own nomination, fully realizing it was hopeless but determined to preserve at least the appearance of democracy in a convention which he knew had been driven into line by the power of the New Deal.

And now Mr. Farley is through. The man who, probably more than anyone else, guided Mr. Roosevelt in the devious ways of politics will not pilot his party toward the goal of a third term. The combination of Roosevelt and Farley is broken, and it cannot be repaired again.

[From the Pittsfield (Mass.) Eagle of August 10, 1940]

FARLEY'S FAREWELL

"Mellifluence" is the only word that seems to fit, in a hurried reading of the dictionary. The Farley letter of resignation was all sweetness—and light. Jim told Franklin that he was now all done and was going back to private life. Jim expressed the added hope that, in business, he would find great happiness. The President said everyone around the shop was going to miss him greatly and hoped he would come up to see them sometime.

Up to now everyone thought the Postmaster General was one of the most noted of the trimmed, that he was the victim of the basest and blackest ingratitude. But no. That is the calumny of an

enemy. Jim implied he wasn't getting enough to live on and while he was a patriot and all that, he felt he just didn't belong. Frank was not in a position to pay him more, so reluctantly he had to look around for a successor. So that is apparently that! The correspondence has made it so simple one wonders how the public continues to countenance the hairbrained reports of the Washington reporters. It just seems to bear out, darn it, the mendacity and corruption of the press which Mr. R. is always hinting at.

En passant, it would be futile to deny that Farley has done an important job well, and it would be an abuse of gratitude not to assert that he has kept his Department on a high plane. In him the Executive found fortune throught the 7 turbulent years. It is to be hoped Franklin can locate another as good, don't you know.

[From the Plainfield Courier-News of August 12, 1940]

JUST PLAIN "JIM"

James Aloysius Farley, the boy from Grassy Point, N. Y., who rose from town clerk to President-maker and Postmaster General of the United States, will step from public life August 31.

His retirement will be only semiofficial as "Jim" still retains the chairmanship of the New York State Democratic Committee. He has shorn himself of the roles of chairman of the National Democratic Committee chairmanship and Postmaster General, however, and ceases to be officially a national figure for the time being.

From here on, President Roosevelt will be obliged to map his own election campaign strategy, with the help of those New Dealers and third-termers, Wallace and Hopkins. Mr. Roosevelt has written Mr. Farley, "All of us in the administration will miss you deeply."

These words may well be prophetic. Millions have learned to call Farley "Jim" and it is reasonable to believe many of these millions, who followed his advice in 1932 to elect Roosevelt President, will walk with him down a middle road next November. Farley may not come out in active opposition to Roosevelt's aspirations for a third term. He may even vote for his former chief at the general election but it is extremely doubtful if he will raise as much as a finger to ask his friends to break a tradition of 150 years.

After the votes are counted in November, Franklin D. Roosevelt, win or lose, will still be Franklin D. Roosevelt to 130,000,000 people, but the former Democratic chairman is now and will be then, just plain "Jim," a lovable American character, who made a President, pulled the Postoffice Department out of the red, and when he came to the fork in the road tipped his hat from his shining bald pate in graceful gesture and said to his Chief Executive, "This is where we part company."

[From the Pontiac (Mich.) Daily Press of August 12, 1940]

HAVE A COKE ON JIM

For nearly 8 years James A. Farley has been demonstrating the value of the old saw: "A soft answer turneth away wrath." Happily the Postmaster General clears his skirts of the Cabinet position and gets out from under the perplexities of the coming campaign just in time to accept an important position with the Coca-Cola Corporation. What more appropriate than that "Sunny" Jim should turn from soft answers to soft drinks?

The big Atlanta enterprise has been one of the conspicuous business successes of the last several decades. The officials of the company have been able to pick the winners when it came to putting men in key positions, and the selection of Mr. Farley is an evidence of their shrewdness in this respect.

Jim Farley has enormous capacity for work. He knows how to concentrate. He knows the value of long hours. Jim has grinned at the philosophy of the 40-hour week which has been so persistently touted by his fellow new dealers, but as far as he himself was concerned he would have none of it. Jim knew better. He was aware that if big things were to be accomplished it would take all the time there was and that is what the second violin in the Roosevelt administration has put into his assignment. Jim gets things done because he works like a horse himself, and expects those around him to do the same. He maps out a big program and hews to the line. A lot of men are hard workers but lack resourcefulness. That is where Farley passes less capable aspirants. He has imagination and ingenuity. If one plan does not work, he has a score of others ready to try out on the instant. No wonder the Coca-Cola board of directors selected the former Postmaster General to take charge of their foreign sales. They wanted a man who could bring a fresh viewpoint to his job with new ideas and plenty of steam. Jim doesn't intend to carry any mail routes after this month, but the business world is going to continue to hear from him.

[From the Portland (Oreg.) Journal of August 9, 1940]

FARLEY'S DEPARTURE LOSS TO ROOSEVELT

Jim Farley's withdrawal from President Roosevelt's Cabinet closes a New Deal chapter.

His geniality, method, optimism, courage, and honesty belong to 1932, where every one of these qualities was needed in the leadership of America back toward the way of life that we call normal, prosperous, and free.

He was indispensable in 1936, when the issue was the continuance of the recovery program.

But Jim Farley doesn't belong to 1940, and none realizes it more than he. He could not be a party to the third-term ambition. He could not concur in the unnecessary machine tactics of the Chicago convention. He was not in the picture which showed two political bosses—Mayor Kelly and Mayor Hague—seated at meat with members of the Roosevelt Cabinet, one of them, Mr. Wallace, now the Democratic Vice Presidential nominee.

Jim Farley goes back to private life without a smirch upon honor, judgment, or reputation. He is a bigger man than when he entered the national political arena, bigger in conscience as well as in ability. May he command for himself and his family the success that he won for the New Deal.

[From the Portland (Maine) Press-Herald of August 9, 1940]

THEY MISS JIM

The Democrats, so-called, unquestionably will miss Jim Farley as director of the campaign. They are missing him now. His successor, Edward J. Flynn, has already started blundering. Monday he sounded off about Mr. Willkie, "fugitive from Tammany Hall." Mr. Flynn's statement will create no concern in G. O. P. ranks. There is more joy amongst Republicans over 1 sinner who has repented than for the 90 and 9 that have remained faithful. For these strayed sheep will roll up a bigger plurality against the New Deal machine. Next time, louder, Mr. Flynn, and funnier and more convincing.

[From the Portland (Oreg.) Sunday Oregonian of August 11, 1940]

ACCEPTING JIM FARLEY'S RESIGNATION

Acceptance by President Roosevelt of the resignation of Jim Farley as Postmaster General, soon to become effective, as is also Mr. Farley's departure from the national chairmanship, inspired the President to write his friend and political associate a letter expressive of warm personal regard. Though this was the conventional thing to do, doubtless the President felt, as the bond of their long and intimate association was severed, a certain richly human sense of loss—attended, maybe, by some bewilderment. The President wrote Mr. Farley:

"All of us in the administration will miss you deeply; we count on seeing you often. I especially count on this after all these years of close personal association. Our friendship will always continue."

Yet we dare say that, had Jim Farley truly felt that his friends of the official family in the Capital, the President foremost among them, would miss him deeply, he must have put aside the temptation of returning to private life and endeavor. It is an open secret that for some months prior to the Democratic convention poor old Jim "wandered lonely as a cloud" in Washington. He was shunted, genially enough, oh, charmingly so, to the siding.

His chance at the nomination was obscured by the orblike radiance of the President's still unsatisfied ambition. It was even attempted to cajole him, when at the last they fawned upon this really fine comrade, to sacrifice his right to the honor of being placed in nomination in order that the luminous name of Roosevelt might be hailed with acclamation. But there Jim stood pat. His self-respect, in spite of the fortunes of politics, and the casually scurvy way in which he had been misused, was still intact. As for running the campaign for them, why should he? He had made the decision which every integrally honest and long-suffering man must somehow make in this time—enough was enough.

Much has been said of President Roosevelt's facile gift of making friends, but little of the almost equal facility with which he insists upon losing them. Big Jim Farley, wise and tolerant, a friend affectionate by nature, loyal to the limit of endurance, is not the first stanch friend the President has, at his urgent whim, driven from the Presidential side. Exchanges of mutual esteem at the parting cannot alter, and probably will only intensify, the disillusionment of Mr. Farley. If their secret minds were known, it is likely we should discover that the President thinks better of his retiring Postmaster General than this olden associate thinks of the President, and each private appraisal, we dare say, would have sound reason enough.

[From the Roanoke (Va.) Times of August 9, 1940]

FARLEY'S RESIGNATION

Two weeks after he ceases to be chairman of the Democratic National Committee James A. Farley will step out of the President's Cabinet. Farley's resignation as Postmaster General, effective August 31, was accepted yesterday by President Roosevelt. In accepting the resignation the President paid tribute to Farley's service and said their friendship would always continue. Thus the Chief Executive and his great political lieutenant come to a final parting of the ways. That they have done so without any public break is doubtless a matter of satisfaction and relief to both.

Jim Farley owes much to Franklin D. Roosevelt, undoubtedly, but on the other hand it is equally true that Mr. Roosevelt owes a great deal to Farley. He has been exceptionally fortunate in the complete loyalty and great skill with which Farley has guided his political bark since he first entertained Presidential ambitions. It may well be that without Farley at his side Roosevelt would never have succeeded in gaining the Democratic nomination at Chicago that started him on his eventful career in 1932.

It is no secret that relations between the two men have been growing steadily cooler for the past 2 years. Farley did not see eye to eye with many of Mr. Roosevelt's political policies, concerning which he was not consulted and about which he was not advised in advance. He was notably out of sympathy with the ill-fated "purges" which failed in 1938 and conveniently went on a trip to Alaska while the President was invading Georgia, South Carolina, and Maryland in an unsuccessful attempt to persuade the voters to deny renominations to Senators GEORGE, SMITH, and

TYDINGS, all three of whom are still Members of the Senate, notwithstanding Mr. Roosevelt's edict that they must be retired to private life.

Farley also was opposed in principle to a third term and emphasized his disapproval by becoming a candidate for the nomination himself, well knowing that he stood no chance of receiving it if the President decided he wanted the honor for himself. Farley's resignation as national chairman was announced before he left Chicago, and it was understood that he would not remain in the Cabinet very long after stepping out as party chief.

September 1, generally regarded as the date on which the political campaign will begin in earnest, will find Farley on the outside, a private citizen for the first time since March 4, 1933. He has been an able public servant and a political leader who has won the respect and admiration not only of his own party but of the entire country. The Roosevelt administration will be the loser by his departure from Washington.

[From the Roanoke (Va.) Times of August 10, 1940]

A WISE MAN

"The wise man," wrote James A. Farley in his autobiography, published in 1938, "steps down when he is at the top and before the going gets rough."

Mr. Farley had no way of knowing, when he wrote the foregoing words, that 2 years later he would act on the principle set forth. But in retrospect the statement has a prophetic note.

Jim Farley has taken his own medicine—something that physicians are said to be loath to do. He has stepped down of his own volition at a time when he was riding the crest of the wave. He could have continued in office as Democratic national chairman—in fact, he was urged to do so. But he said several months ago that he would not continue at the party helm in a third-term campaign, and he was as good as his word. A week from today Farley will turn over the chairmanship to Edward J. Flynn and march out of Democratic national headquarters with the respect and regard of all who know him. Three weeks from today he will retire from the President's Cabinet—also of his own volition—and step back into the ranks of the country's private citizens.

However rough the going may hereafter become, Jim Farley will not be affected. He quit while he was at the top. By his own code he must be judged a wise man.

Not all who are at the top are wise enough to step down before the going gets rough. By the same token, not all who are at the top are as wise as "good old Jim."

[From the Sacramento (Calif.) Bee of August 10, 1940]

FARLEY HAS DONE WELL AS POSTMASTER GENERAL

The reputation of "Genial Jim" Farley as a skilled political organizer has somewhat overshadowed in the public mind the work of James A. Farley as Postmaster General of the United States.

But it is the common opinion among the postal employees, from the postman on the beat to the top places in the service, that the Department never has had a head who was more intent on giving the American public the best possible service; on speeding up the delivery of the mails; on developing new sources of revenue; and on instilling the entire personnel with a sense of esprit de corps which any private business organization well might envy.

No man appreciated the quality of Farley's work as an administrator better than did Franklin D. Roosevelt. And the evidence is to be found in the letter the President wrote in accepting with real regret Farley's resignation as Postmaster General.

The resignation will become effective on August 31.

On that date, after seven and a half years in the public service, Farley will return to private life to accept a much more remunerative position as general director of the New York Yankees baseball club.

He thus will be able to do what he has stated publicly long has been in his mind—make better provision for his family than being a Cabinet officer permitted him to do.

The Nation generally heartily will second the hope expressed by President Roosevelt for every success for Jim Farley in his new niche in life.

Nor will his valuable services be entirely lost to his party as he has announced he will remain as chairman of the New York State Democratic Committee. Together with National Chairman Flynn, long his chief aide in Empire State politics, he can be counted on to give valiant service in keeping New York in line for Roosevelt and Wallace.

And, in the meantime, if his record in the Post Office Department is a criterion of the future, the fading Yanks will get a real shot in the arm when Jim Farley starts talking turkey to them. He is that kind of a man.

[From the Rome (N. Y.) Daily Sentinel of August 12, 1940]

JAMES A. FARLEY

Now that he is about to retire as Postmaster General and head of the Democratic National Committee, James A. Farley is receiving a collection of bouquets that would stagger any man who is not as sure-footed as he.

The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, when you get your copy (this RECORD issue is worth reading), will contain over 40 pages of newspaper articles praising the retiring genius in richly deserved language. Senator BYRD, of Virginia, in behalf of his colleague, Senator CARTER GLASS, obtained unanimous consent of the Senate to insert the 175 newspaper clippings in the RECORD. If there is any criticism of this it is that 175 clippings is a woefully small number to give more than a faint idea of the situation.

Farley leaves the national committee without one cent of indebtedness. A national committee without debt is a distinction like the United States would be without a national debt.

Moreover, through lean years, he has increased the cash business of the Post Office Department so that is out of the red for the first time, we believe, since George Washington's regime. Yet that Department has taken on extraordinary jobs such as registration under the Social Security Act, the census of the unemployed, and others, in addition to its regular business, while the mails have carried a tremendous volume of free official matter.

Farley has built up a big business by issuing commemorative postage stamps. Illustrious citizens in large numbers are in the collection, heroes male and female, geography represented, the world's fair, of course, and even the centennial of baseball. The business of philately has grown by leaps and bounds just when the country needed business. Young and old know about that. The Philatelic Agency is doing a business of about two million a year.

The least his successor as Postmaster General can do is to issue a new stamp bearing the cheerful, sincere face of James Aloysius Farley and make it legal tender for a bottle of soft drink, which is the only kind Farley ever used.

Remember what a time the late W. Pierrepont White had getting Fort Stanwix and Oriskany on a stamp? Farley would have settled that in a jiffy, and it would have been a beauty. But that was before Farley's regime.

Just look at the home run that man Farley is making as he lays down these official duties.

[From the Richmond (Va.) News Leader of August 9, 1940]

FAREWELL TO FARLEY

Jim Farley's resignation as Postmaster General, following his retirement as national chairman, probably eliminates him from American politics. He will keep his interest, of course, in what he considers a more interesting game than baseball, but politics are apt to be an avocation, not a profession. In the event Mr. Roosevelt is reelected, New Deal bureaucrats will regard Farley as a backslider. If Willkie wins, Farley will belong to the minority for a period long enough to make him a back number when the Democrats return to power.

He quits the stage amid more general applause than welcomed his first entrance. Then he was considered a sublimated "j'iner," a political smoothie whom Mr. Roosevelt would better have left alone. Scarcely one of the New Deal Cabinet members was regarded at the outset with more suspicion, more perhaps of open hostility, than was Mr. Farley. Now that he retires, he carries with him more of public regret, more widely expressed, than would attend the resignation of any Cabinet member except Mr. Hull.

What is the explanation? It is an old one, a simple one, but one that politicians who hope to continue in office never can afford to disdain: Jim Farley kept his word. He did not pretend to any code of political ethics superior to that of up-State New York Democrats. That code sometimes seemed to mock the implication of the word "up." According to the rough rules of a tough game, Jim Farley played; but he never violated those rules. Whether he made a promise to a friend, or struck a bargain with a foe, or entered into a compromise to prevent a party split, he would live up to it. He would not always answer questions, when political strategy called for secret movement; but when he did answer, he always was frank and truthful. If he said "Yes," one could pin to fulfillment. His "No" never meant "maybe."

This was an expression of Farley's innate honesty and no less an application of what he knew to be good politics. Selfishness may wreck the future of some politicians, poor judgment may, temper may, or liquor, or ambition, but any one, and perhaps any two, of these may be overcome. The one thing that is certain in the end to ruin the average man and to bring upon even the most powerful politician the detestation of his associates is failure to live up to his bargains. Some politicians do not realize this. They think they can be silent or tactful or evasive and still hold their following. They may go to their graves without perceiving that the reason for their failure was not the disloyalty of friends or the wiles of foes, but their own unwillingness to let conversation be yea, yea and nay, nay. Once a man gets the reputation of being unreliable in his promises, politicians say, "You can't tie to him," and from that day they will not work with him. When such a man falls, he falls, like Lucifer, never to hope again."

Farley knew that. He never took a chance that it could happen to him. It didn't. He goes out with flags flying.

[From the St. Louis Star-Times of Friday, August 9, 1940]

"DEAR JIM"

A strange atmosphere of unreality emerges from the letters exchanged between President Roosevelt and Postmaster General Farley on the latter's resignation.

Mr. Farley dwells in detail on the strides made by his Department—the increase of air-mail service, the post-office buildings erected, the improved morale of the workers. Mr. Roosevelt congratulates Mr. Farley on these achievements; he expresses "sincere sorrow" at "Dear Jim's" departure from his "official family." He

felicitates the Postmaster General on the latter's "definite arrangements" for his future in private life, about which Farley had solemnly informed him.

Never a syllable is uttered by the two men on the third-term issue or Farley's disappointment at failing in his Presidential and Vice Presidential ambitions, or the curious fact that Farley, the original Roosevelt man behind the ballots, finally insisted on having his own name presented to the Chicago convention in opposition to the President's.

Every anti-New Deal paper in the country, of course, can be expected to make much of these circumstances. They will talk of Mr. Roosevelt's "ingratitude" and speculate—with almost too transparent hopefulness—on the possibility that Roosevelt's luck will fail with the departure of his leading political strategist.

Granting the elements of tragedy in Farley's case, however, the sudden affection of Tory editors for the Postmaster General lacks something in consistency. Seven years ago they were calling Farley the President's "trigger man" and denouncing him for the doctrine that only Democrats who were "for Roosevelt before Chicago" in 1932 deserved Government jobs. Now they use him as a text for their attacks on the President. It is not, perhaps, that they love "Dear Jim" more, but that they still love Roosevelt less.

[From the St. Louis (Mo.) Post-Dispatch of August 9, 1940]

FARLEY LEAVES THE CABINET

A common criticism of the administration for years was that James A. Farley was Postmaster General and chairman of the Democratic National Committee. Now within about 3 weeks he has resigned both posts.

Mr. Farley has been a politician through and through; whatever else he did has been incidental to his practice of the art of politics. As the President's trigger man, he has taken a lot of blame that might have rested on more famous shoulders. That was part of the game as he played it.

As political Postmasters General go, he has been a good one. This great business department—the greatest the Government has—was no more political under him than under the Republican ax men of preceding administrations. In any case, he administered it well; the deficits were not due to faulty operation, but to the great amount of franked mail carried without charge and other classes of mail transported at exceedingly low rates.

The vacancy gives President Roosevelt the chance to do the startling thing of appointing a nonpolitical Postmaster General. He could hardly start his campaign for reelection better than by naming an outstanding business executive or a career man in the Post Office Department to the post traditionally farmed out to the winning party's chief spoilsman.

[From the St. Louis (Mo.) Globe-Democrat of August 9, 1940]

MR. FARLEY WAVES GOOD-BYE

Jim Farley has severed his last tie with the New Deal. He has resigned as Postmaster General, effective August 31. His resignation as chairman of the Democratic National Committee was filed 2 weeks ago and his successor will take over on August 17. Thus does companionable "Sunny Jim" pass out of the political picture to enter private industry.

His letter yesterday to the President and the latter's acceptance of his resignation from the Cabinet were effusive in their complimentary terms. This was to be expected. But the bald fact remains that Mr. Farley is quitting because he is not in sympathy with Mr. Roosevelt's acceptance of a third-term nomination. He has had many opportunities previously to quit the national committee and the Cabinet and engage in private business. But he stayed on because of loyalty to the President and because of his zest for the game of politics. Now he cannot in good conscience support Mr. Roosevelt for another term and he is getting out.

He is not "taking a walk" from the party, but the significance of his departure on the eve of a campaign which will subject the New Deal and Mr. Roosevelt to the severest test yet will not be lost on his friends. Had Jim Farley really wanted to "put over" Mr. Roosevelt this fall, he could easily have deferred this entry into private business for a couple of months.

[From the St. Joseph (Mo.) Gazette of August 10, 1940]

SO LONG, JIM

Jim Farley, the man who made millions of friends out of politics, steps out of the Cabinet the last of the month to seek the financial success he missed in the years he was building the political fortunes of his associates. Thus ends the alliance between the man who sold Franklin Roosevelt to the country in 1932 and stayed to help re-elect him in 1936.

Though the President is said to have sent an "exceedingly friendly" letter in accepting the resignation of his Postmaster General, it takes no gift of clairvoyance to know that both undoubtedly are relieved that they have come to the parting of the ways. Mr. Roosevelt because his one-time friend is utterly unsympathetic to third-term ambitions, and Farley because of the slights and affronts of recent months. Because of his unswerving loyalty to the man he once called Chief, and his present distaste for the maneuverings prior to and during the Chicago convention, Farley could do no less than sever their relationship. His conscience would permit no endeavors that were not wholehearted.

One thing can be certain. Farley will retire from the political stage with his chin up and a smile on his face. It is equally certain that he will not "take a walk," nor raise a finger to block the desire of Mr. Roosevelt to remain in the White House for 4 years more. He will vote the ticket bearing the Democratic label in November, for, as he said when the party's convention adjourned last month, "I've always been regular." He will go out with the reputation of being one of the most admirable figures in the political life of this generation, starting now on the task—important to any man at 52 who owes $100,000 and has three children to educate—of accumulating financial security for himself and his family.

[From the St. Paul (Minn.) Pioneer Press of August 9, 1940]

THE RETIREMENT OF FARLEY

The farewells with which President Roosevelt and James A. Farley took their leave of each other Thursday reveal the personal esteem in which they have held each other, and conceal much more. The retirement of Mr. Farley from the Cabinet, like his previous resignation as chairman of the Democratic national committee, merely puts the final seal to a parting that really took place not long after the election of 1936.

When Mr. Roosevelt was first elected in 1932, nothing would have seemed more unlikely than the breach of the association of these two outstanding figures. They seemed then the ideal partnership of the practical political organizer and the statesman with social vision. This friendly association endured through the first administration and the second campaign, but was not destined to outlast the second administration.

It requires an unusual combination of political agreement and personal devotion for a close relationship between a President and his political manager to persist. There is a natural conflict between the claims to fame of such men. Whatever credit falls to the political manager for the President's success, is so much detracted from the personal worth of the President in his own right as a statesman and campaigner. No President cares to believe that his political success is to be attributed to the fact that he has a miracle man as his manager.

In this particular association there were political disagreements that did not come to the surface until, following the election of 1936, President Roosevelt began to turn to the counsel of advisers belonging to the more radical wing of the New Deal, which he found more congenial than the advice of Mr. Farley. This difference led to the disagreement over the attempted purge of the conservative Democrats in the primaries of 1938. It became an open break when Mr. Farley was himself an opponent of the third-term nomination at the Democratic convention last month.

His own ambitions for the Presidency blocked by the third-term candidacy, the Postmaster General retires from the administration to become instead the president of a baseball team; and it is no secret that, despite the friendly postscript which he writes to his broken association with the President, he goes from public life with the feeling of one who has been denied his rightful due.

The President's new political manager, Edward J. Flynn, starts with various handicaps in the occupancy of the chairmanship vacated by Mr. Farley. He has a party to organize which is divided over the third term. He lacks the broad personal acquaintance in all ranks of the organization which his predecessor has. Like Mr. Farley, he comes to national leadership out of New York machine politics. Whether he has the personal attractiveness and the warm qualities which made it possible for Mr. Farley to overcome that particular handicap remains to be seen. Mr. Flynn has a very large order to fill.

[From the Saginaw (Mich.) News of August 10, 1940]

EXEUNT "GENIAL JIM"

And now comes word that Postmaster General Farley will retire soon from his post in the Washington scene. Although it was only last month at the National Democratic Convention that "genial Jim" indicated he no longer could carry the torch for Mr. Roosevelt and what has been termed the New Deal party, masquerading as Democratic, his decision to resign as Postmaster General will be felt by many as doubly regrettable.

Rival party chieftains and Government officials alike never doubted Farley's business ability and capacity for administration. Organization of Government mail service to its present state of development was one of his achievements.

Many will feel his retirement from postal duties was prompted fundamentally by a desire to escape association with New Deal administration, although unconfirmed reports credit him with an ambition to enter private enterprise as head of a baseball syndicate.

An old-line Democrat of the Jeffersonian type, Farley and his equally "old-fashioned" notion that a third term for Mr. Roosevelt was inconsistent with American traditions probably had no place in the Washington of today.

[From the Savannah (Ga.) Evening Press, Friday, August 9, 1940]

EXIT JIM FARLEY

James A. Farley, Postmaster General of the United States and national chairman of the Democratic Party, has left the Washington scene, having first given up the chairmanship and yesterday retiring from the Cabinet. His departure leaves a void in Democratic ranks that will be hard to fill, for few men, if any, enjoy wider acquaintanceship and higher confidence through the country than does Jim Farley.

Much water has run under the political bridges since Mr. Farley came to Washington in 1933 to take a place in the Cabinet of the

man he more than any individual had made President of the United States. Mr. Roosevelt would not have been the nominee of the Democratic Party in 1932 had not Mr. Farley during the preceding months gone about the breadth and length of the land gathering delegates for him, almost in fact ringing doorbells throughout the Nation in his round-up of convention votes for the man who was selected as the party's standard bearer. Those were the happy days for Mr. Farley and his chief responded with enthusiasm, conferring on Mr. Farley the party chairmanship and the honor of a Cabinet post. When 1936 and reelection time came around, Mr. Farley again did yeoman service for the man he admired and respected, and the record-establishing reelection of Mr. Roosevelt was the result.

This year of grace, 1940, finds new forces in control of the Democratic Party, forces which Mr. Farley, try as he might, cannot recognize as representing the factors which made the Democratic Party the great party which it was. The shattering of the third-term precedent was a severe blow to this Democratic leader, the fact that he permitted himself to be nominated in opposition to his former "chief" speaking eloquently on the score. Democratic eyes dimmed with tears at the almost pathetic position of Mr. Farley at the Chicago gathering when the party chased away after new gods and left him to admit he did not know what was going on at the convention.

And now he has left Washington, retiring to private life to pick up the threads of private business and family life which he had sacrificed for his party and Mr. Roosevelt.

The President writes to him: "All of us in the administration will miss you deeply." They will that and to an extent which even they themselves do not yet realize.

[From the San Diego (Calif.) Union of August 9, 1940]

DROPPING THE PILOT

Although it has been common knowledge for some weeks that Postmaster General Farley would step out of the New Deal picture before the campaign got under way, it was not until yesterday that his resignation from the Cabinet was announced. He previously had resigned as chairman of the Democratic National Committee, effective August 17. Now, with his resignation from the Cabinet becoming effective on August 31, it can be assumed that beginning September 1 the third-term movement will be on its own without the benefit of the great talents that guided the New Deal to success in two previous campaigns.

How great the loss will be only time will tell, but even the most ardent new dealers concede that it will be considerable. There have been few national chairmen in the Nation's political history with as great a capacity for making friends and winning votes as that possessed by Jim Farley. In 1932 he started the organization which he guided to success again in 1936. In the first 4 years of the administration he was the official patronage dispenser, and in that way his popularity and his power grew to amazing proportions. And, despite the matter-of-fact way in which he transferred personal and political friendships into loyal party support, he became known as an honest politician and as a man who never forgot a friend. The honesty phase became in time a rare quality, and his sincerity in opposing a third term is credited in a great degree for his final break with the President, which has existed covertly for the last 2 years. Little by little Jim has been losing favor with the more rabid disciples of the third-term idea, and his voluntary removal from the scene doubtless has caused a great sigh of relief in official quarters, despite the sentences of highest esteem that have been spoken in the last few days.

Despite Jim Farley's defeat in the Chicago convention, where he fought valiantly to retain its appearance of adherence to democratic processes, he emerged a bigger man than when he went into it. He lost, but he lost fighting for a principle.

[From the Schenectady (N. Y.) Union-Star of August 9, 1940]

FARLEY'S SECOND RESIGNATION

The resignation of Postmaster General James A. Farley was handed in yesterday to the President whom he twice put into the White House. Because he disapproved of the third term for Mr. Roosevelt—and undoubtedly for other reasons—Mr. Farley prefers to dissociate himself from the administration.

Thus are two of the ties severed which bound him closely to Mr. Roosevelt. As chairman of the Democratic National Committee and as manager of Mr. Roosevelt's campaigns, Mr. Farley has been more indispensable to Mr. Roosevelt than Mr. Roosevelt is to the country.

In these columns we too recently paid our sincere tribute to the high personal character of James A. Farley to make extended reference necessary at this time. We can only point again to the picture of Dropping the Pilot, and revert to what lengths ambition will lead a man who does not know when enough is encugh.

Mr. Farley is entering business. He is expected to retain his post as chairman of the New York State Democratic Committee. The country admires his sturdy adherence to his principles.

[From the Seattle (Wash.) Times of August 9, 1940]

LAST TIE SEVERED

In refusing to continue as chairman of its national committee, James A. Farley cut himself loose from the political implications and embarrassments of the New Deal. Resigning as Postmaster General, he severs the last official tie that had held him courteously subject to the wishes and the whims of Mr. Roosevelt. It is a sad sort of climax to a sagacious and sometimes brilliant career in political manipulation. Farley's friends feel he has been badly treated.

Should you ask Mr. Farley and find him in an easy mood, no doubt you would be told that he means to vote for Mr. Roosevelt just the same, despite declared antipathy to a third term and somewhat more veiled distaste for the New Deal in general. But it seems unlikely that he will manifest any more of that zeal and energy which made easy sailing for Roosevelt 8 and 4 years ago.

[From the Shelby (N. C.) Daily Star of August 13, 1940]

A MAN AND A BUSINESS

James A. Farley is about to leave public life, about to leave a field in which he reached the pinnacle of sacrificial success. For there is no doubt that Mr. Farley applied his genius to the successful administration of the Democratic Party at great sacrifice to his personal fortune. But Mr. Farley is that kind of man. His success in the field of politics has been outstanding in this century. That very success demonstrates to what extent he threw himself and his unsurpassed ability into his work.

As chairman of the national committee of the Democratic Party, as Postmaster General in the Cabinet of President Roosevelt, Mr. Farley will be sorely missed. There has not yet appeared within the Democratic Party or, indeed, on the American political scene a man who can replace him fully.

But the services of Mr. Farley are not lost to the Nation.

He has accepted a high post to direct the export business, particularly the expansion, of the Coca-Cola Co., a far-flung private business enterprise. In that post Mr. Farley can and will do much to further good will for America among other countries of the world, for good will is a habit with Mr. Farley. It is part of his nature. Therefore it is gratifying to observe that one of the greatest individual exponents of democracy will join with one of the greatest of business democracies. Doubtless the connection will be deservedly profitable to Mr. Farley.

Mr. Farley lost no popularity, lost no stature with the people of America when the National Democratic Convention at Chicago failed to nominate him for President of the United States. Indeed, in view of the sacrificial services of Mr. Farley to the Democratic Party and to his country during the last 8 years, failure on the part of political leaders to reward him in keeping with his services has added to rather than detracted from the high opinion of the people of the United States.

[From the Sonoma (Calif.) Index-Tribune of August 16, 1940]

CASUAL COMMENT

Postmaster James Farley is retiring from public life but leaves as fine a record as a man and as an official could ever hope to attain. The official journal, California Postmaster, of August 1940, said of Mr. Farley "a man among men—true to the convictions of principle though steadfastness meant severing ties most dear to him. He stood like a rock amid the ocean breakers as each succeeding wave rolled off and back into his course leaving the great man more firmly cemented in the hearts of his fellow men." Yes; and Postmaster Farley was an exemplary man who stood every test despite concerted effort to find something that political enemies could garble. His character, his everyday life, the official conduct of his office were above reproach. That is the kind of an American to which all good citizens point with pride.

[From the Sioux City (Iowa) Journal of August 10, 1940]

HE'LL BE HAPPY

James A. Farley, having resigned as Postmaster General and having received a "Dear Jim" letter from the White House, shortly will go where, as he told the Chief Executive, he will be happy. That's back into private life after years of as onerous a task as any man ever had to get as little out of it as Jim Farley got. One conclusion is that most of his pay for the loyal service to the administration and the Democratic Party was ingratitude.

In his letter to the President, Mr. Farley wrote that "I know it will please you to learn that I have made definite arrangements for my future in private business where I know I shall be very happy." That statement means far more than what it says. "Big Jim" might have underscored part of it for emphasis, but, perhaps, he did not think that would be necessary, since everybody including the President was aware of the fact that Mr. Farley had not been happy for years in his official position.

Mr. Roosevelt wrote that "all of us in the administration will miss you deeply; we count on seeing you often." Yet for the last 2 years Mr. Farley, a Cabinet officer and chairman of the Democratic National Committee, almost needed a "jimmy" to get into the Chief Executive's office in the White House. It is doubted that the White House will see much of Jim Farley for the remainder of this administration and probably not at all if there is to be a 4-year extension of the New Deal occupancy. In other words Jim knows when he has had enough.

[From the Springfield (Mass.) Daily News, Friday, August 9, 1940]

GREAT POSTMASTER GENERAL LOST IN RETIREMENT OF JAMES A. FARLEY

On the last day of this month the Roosevelt administration will lose one who has been one of its most important figures since it came into office in 1933 and the United States Government will cease to have the services of one who has been among the ablest and most efficient heads of a Federal department in the history of the Nation.

On August 31 James A. Farley will retire from the office of Postmaster General. In this action there will come a complete breaking of political ties which have formed a successful team unprecedented in this country. Mr. Farley's definite opposition to the principle of a third term has been made so well known that his continuance either as a Cabinet member or as chairman of the Democratic National Committee, a post he has resigned as of August 17, had been made impossible. His departure from the Cabinet, therefore, comes as no surprise. It will occasion regret that a highly competent official through the exigencies of politics feels that, following his well-defined principles, he must divorce himself from the public service.

Mr. Farley's early connection with the aspirations of Mr. Roosevelt for the Presidency, his invaluable work in lining up delegates for the Chicago convention of 1932, his later masterful conduct of the election campaign placed him in the minds of many of the voters, particularly those of the Republican Party, as just another politician, a good one if you will, but still just a politician. His appointment to the head of the Post Office Department was looked upon as in the nature of a reward for political services and not in any real sense as an expression of confidence in his executive ability.

Mr. Farley has been at the head of this important Department for nearly 8 years. His record of accomplishment in almost every feature of the administration of this great governmental agency, which comes closer to the everyday life of all the people than that of any other department, speaks for itself. The extension of the air mail, the reduction in the hours of labor, the development of an impressive esprit de corps among the Department's employees, the reduction of expenditures while doing a record business, the placing of the Postal Service on a self-sustaining basis, and the valuable services rendered to other branches of the Government, all these bespeak the directing hand of a man of outstanding ability. This the Postmaster General has. This he will take into private life in a business enterprise, already arranged, according to his letter to the President. The best wishes of all Americans will go wholeheartedly to one whose great abilities are equaled by that courteous geniality of manner toward all which has earned him the universally and sincerely affectionate title of "Jim" Farley.

[From the Springfield (Ohio) Sun of August 10, 1940]

MR. FARLEY RESIGNS

However important the duties of a Postmaster General may be in connection with the conduct of the United States Postal System, it has been recognized for many years that the man who occupies this place in the Cabinet is a sort of liaison officer between the administration and its leading local supporters the country over.

That Mr. Farley filled this position with exceptional ability is certain. It is equally certain that he was a highly efficient chairman of the Democratic National Committee and that he was a resourceful and successful director of Roosevelt's campaigns for the first and second terms.

Mr. Farley's resignation from posts which he filled so well and which, undoubtedly, the President would be very glad to have him continue in, is a matter of conscience, of sincere conviction that to seek a third term is not for the best interests of the country or of the party.

It is rarely that a man can step down from such positions under such circumstances and carry with him so fully and emphatically the high opinion and good will of his fellow party members, as Mr. Farley has been able to do. And the fact that this has been possible speaks in no uncertain terms as to the conviction of those who know him best of the sterling quality of his character and the complete integrity of his purposes.

[From the Tampa (Fla.) Morning Tribune of August 10, 1940]

FARLEY GETS OUT

James A. Farley has severed his last connection with the Roosevelt administration by resigning as Postmaster General, effective August 31. There was a cordial exchange of compliments incident to the resignation, and the President assured "Dear Jim" that he would be missed and that their "friendship will always continue."

The only political position Farley retains is chairman of the New York State committee, which he has promised to hold through the campaign. But, to all intents and purposes, the man who has been the foremost political figure of the Nation since 1932 is getting out of politics. He has not himself disclosed his new job, but the Washington Merry-Go-Round recently stated that it will be in the automobile business, with the presidency of the New York Yankees "on the side." Farley told the President, "I have made definite arrangements for my future in private business, where I know I shall be very happy."

Jim Farley deserves a good and lucrative job because he has practically sacrificed 8 years of his time to the service of the party, as its political manager, and of the Nation, as a member of the Cabinet. In those 8 years, however, Farley lived down the general impression, prevalent when he first appeared in national public life, that he was just a small-time State politician. He has proved himself to be a man of extraordinary ability, of keen political perception, a party executive of the highest type, and an all-round good and valuable citizen. His honesty has never been questioned. He has given the Post Office Department a sound and progressive, yet economical, administration. No man ever called the national election result as accurately as he did in 1936, when he predicted the phenomenal outcome of 46 States to 2. That was just a demonstration of his political acumen and his skill in sizing up a national election situation.

New Chairman Flynn has announced a plan to divide the country into geographical areas, with a district chairman for each, to direct the campaign. This, in itself, is a compliment to Jim Farley, confessing the need of additional organization and extra effort to do the work which he did in the last two campaigns.

The people of the United States, without regard to party lines, think well of Jim Farley. They wish him well in his future activities.

[From the Toledo (Ohio) Blade of August 9, 1940]

FARLEY'S GREAT ACHIEVEMENT

James A. Farley, when he leaves the office of Postmaster General this month, will retire with the great satisfaction of being held in the highest respect by members of both political parties. That is the most convincing praise that can be given a man who has served as national chairman and has fought hard for his party's success.

In the years Mr. Farley has been before the public, he has proved that he is a skillful politician. But at the same time he has built an equally sound reputation as a gentleman and as a fair dealer. The testimonial party given him by newspapermen at the recent Chicago convention was conclusive proof that in public and private life Mr. Farley has attained a distinction won by few in political life. Newspapermen are trained to detect deception. They must not be fooled by the "phonies," and they seldom are. They found in Jim Farley that personal sincerity and admirable manliness that mark him as exceptional.

In high office, Mr. Farley has had a record that will long stand as a shining civic example. Because he has so much of honesty and directness, he naturally takes his departure from the campaign for a third term.

[From the Topeka (Kans.) State Journal of August 12, 1940]

ONLY TWO JOBS FOR JIM

Distance seems to lend enchantment even in business. Here is Jim Farley, retiring Democratic chairman, who probably knows more Americans by their first name than any other person, taking charge of the export business for Coca-Cola. Instead of pushing its sales at home, where everyone knows him, his job is to increase them in other countries.

The export connection is a surprise. Previously it had been reported he would have other business interests in addition to the New York Yankees after he left the Cabinet. But that was to take him into the motorcar field. It is said now that he is to limit his activities to soft drinks and baseball. If he added motorcars it would be evident that he expected to work as hard for himself in the future as he had been working in the last 8 years in politics.

[From the Troy (N. Y.) Record of August 9, 1940]

FARLEY RESIGNS

Postmaster General Farley handed in his resignation to the President yesterday. The President accepted the resignation with "real regret"—which was his way of saying that, inasmuch as Mr. Farley would not play ball, he might as well go, for Farley no longer has a proper place in the Cabinet. General Farley is a Democrat; the Roosevelt Cabinet is not.

One can assess the services of Farley easily. As a Postmaster General he was not distinguishable from the rest of the line. For many years this portfolio has been a place for the chief pap man of an administration. And Farley, as chairman of the State and National committees, was naturally put there to attend to the tasks of patronage. These he performed admirably. He won votes and made friends in the usual way.

When it comes to the labors of his office, for which the Nation paid him, all one can say is that his outside duties presumably meant that the work was largely entrusted to deputies, after the manner of one sort of politics, prevalent at the present time. Therefore the deficits of the Department, haltingly excused or explained, were inevitable. Some day we will have a businessman in this job and will cut costs to something commensurate with the Service. But that time has not come yet.

The Postmaster General's retirement is due to a conscientious objection to third-term politics. Mr. Farley knows well that the President is aspiring to a dictatorship and that the third term he now is seeking is, in the Executive's mind, the necessary gateway to his heart's desire. And Farley, being a Democrat in both the philosophical and the party sense, will have nothing to do with it. One admires him for this.

One also admires him for his political skill—under rules of play, perhaps, of which many would not approve. As to his Department in Washington, he has carried on. He will be longest remembered there, unfortunately, for his commercialization of postage stamps for income from collectors, for the gifts of valuable stamps to the President, and for his cancelation of air contracts. As for the rest, we are constrained to believe that if he had dropped politics and attended solely to postal affairs he might have left as fine a record in the Department as he has left in his political party. And that is saying a great deal.

[From the Troy (N. Y.) Times Record, August 10, 1940]

EXIT JIM FARLEY

So much has been said and written concerning the coming resignation of Postmaster General James A. Farley that the actual resignation, and its acceptance with "real regret" by the President, have come as something of an anticlimax.

Little remains to be said about it, partly because the subject has already been pretty well covered in all its aspects by the press and partly because it speaks for itself.

Jim Farley loved the political game and over a period of many years he demonstrated a very unusual aptitude for it. As a Postmaster General he has not been particularly outstanding. His particular talents lay in another direction. It was his job principally to "win friends and influence people" and in this field of endeavor he made himself invaluable to the Roosevelt administration.

His resignation—and the acceptance of that resignation—have come because he was no longer in sympathy with the purposes of that administration and because he was no longer wanted in it.

Jim Farley, unlike many of the New Deal leaders, is a real Democrat. His conscientious objections to a third term are too well known to require comment. These things alone were enough to make him a misfit, so far as the New Deal leadership is concerned; and so, Mr. Farley is out.

He has not taken a walk, in the Al Smith sense. It can be depended upon, however, that many of his friends and admirers will get out their walking shoes. Some have already done so. In fact, there is already a pretty well-marked trail leading over the hills from the Roosevelt camp to that of Wendell Willkie. Needless to say, the footsteps all point in one direction.

[From the Vallejo (Calif.) News, August 8, 1940]

GOOD LUCK, JIM

Genial Jim Farley has set the dates for his resignation as chairman of the Democratic National Committee and as Postmaster General.

And when Jim steps out the Democratic Party will feel the loss. He has been the most valuable national chairman in so many decades that no one today can recall an equal.

During 8 long years in office his popularity increased. He wore well. There were so many things about Jim which the people of America liked.

He was an admitted politician. He made no bones about it. There was nothing of the hypocrite about him. It was his job to know people, and as a result he could probably call more persons by their first names than any other man in the country today. He became famous for his ability to recall faces and facts about those faces.

Furthermore, he was an honest politician. Throughout Washington he became noted for his integrity. Letters sent by him to his thousands of friends over the country bore 3-cent stamps. He did not take advantage of his Postmaster Generalship and the free mailing privileges that went with it. Personal mail called for stamps, he ruled.

He is going to try to recoup some of his financial losses caused by service in office, losses out of his own pocket.

For the Republicans, it is a good thing that the "General" is dropping the control of Democratic Party politics. He was the kind of a man the G. O. P. couldn't hate, even though he were on the other side. He was a tough opponent.

We wish Jim well in his new venture and hope he meets with the best of luck, realizing he deserves every bit of it.

[From the Ventura (Calif.) Star Free Press of August 9, 1940]

JIM FARLEY'S GOODBYE

Jim Farley, the man who has given a greater degree of service to the Democratic Party machine's organization work than any other man, will soon leave the President's Cabinet and will end his tenure as chairman of the National Democratic Committee.

Jim Farley did his job well, and his return to private life is a move he has wanted to make for a long time—in fact before the third term issue was more than a whisper.

His service to the Post Office Department has been good, too, and that branch of the governmental service will miss him as much as the democratic machine will miss him—but he leaves both organizations with good will on both sides.

It is significant to note, too, that Farley will retain the job of chairman of the New York State Democratic Committee and will work actively in that important State for the New Deal ticket in November.

Jim Farley is leaving his public jobs to adjust his financial condition through private industry. But in his work for the party in New York he will be continuing his work for the party that he helped raise to power.

[From the Washington (D. C.) Post of Saturday, August 10, 1940]

MR. FARLEY'S MANTLE

President Roosevelt will probably end his second term with only three of his original Cabinet members still on the job. Postmaster General Farley will take his official leave on August 31. Secretary of Agriculture Wallace will resign or go on leave without pay before his campaign for the Vice Presidency begins. Only Secretary of State Hull, Secretary of the Interior Ickes, and Secretary of Labor Perkins will remain.

Death claimed three members of the first Roosevelt Cabinet—Secretaries Woodin, Dern, and Swanson. Resignations were handed in by Homer S. Cummings and Daniel C. Roper, of the original New Deal Cabinet, and by several members appointed since 1933.

It is not surprising, of course, that many changes should be made in the President's official family during the course of 7½ years. Yet the trend of these changes is significant. The effect has been to weed out of the Cabinet every Jeffersonian Democrat, except Secretary Hull.

The resignation of Mr. Farley greatly emphasizes this fact. So long as the genial New Yorker remained a member of the President's official family he served as a binding tie between the old-line Democrats and the new dealers who took control when President Roosevelt was elected. His personal popularity and his tremendous political influence were factors of the greatest importance in keeping the two wings of the Democratic Party flapping harmoniously.

With Mr. Farley out, Secretary of Commerce Hopkins becomes the chief political influence in the Cabinet. Indeed, it was Mr. Hopkins and not the Postmaster General who served as a one-man steering committee, under direction of the President, at the Chicago convention. An ardent new dealer whose name is to Jeffersonian Democrats as is a red flag to a bull, Mr. Hopkins has no chance of healing the breach in the majority party's ranks with the same degree of success attained by Mr. Farley.

Thus at the beginning of his third-term race Mr. Roosevelt has lost one of his greatest political assets. And that loss is the more poignant because the President and Mr. Farley came to a parting of ways over the third-term issue. The man who led the 1932 and 1936 campaigns has walked out because he believes his chief is making a serious mistake. That decision will necessarily influence many Jeffersonian Democrats who have always been a little skeptical of the New Deal and hostile to the idea of a third term for any President.

As the contest is now shaping up, the President will have to rely far more upon his immediate followers, as distinguished from the old-line Democrats, than he has ever done before.

[From the Washington (D. C.) Evening Star of Friday, August 9, 1940]

RESIGNATION

It was inevitable that James A. Farley, retiring from the chairmanship of the National Democratic Committee, also should resign his position as Postmaster General. The announcement issued yesterday, therefore, was not unexpected. But it does not follow, necessarily, that the news was received by the public without regret.

Mr. Farley earned his place in President Roosevelt's Cabinet by political assistance rendered, then justified it by proving again as he had on several previous occasions the simple fact that he is a man of sound business acumen, skilled in the management of affairs and of people, efficient in the performance of administrative duty. His term as head of the largest organization of its kind in the world has been eminently successful. Understanding as he did that "the final test * * * for any official is the record of his service," he applied his "efforts and energies to the job of making substantial improvements * * * and to saving money for Uncle Sam rather than bothering about petty criticism in regard to details which, after all, were not extremely important."

Certainly there were mistakes during Mr. Farley's tenure. But of more lasting importance were such achievements as the inauguration of transoceanic air-mail, the development of a vast building program for the rehousing of postal facilities throughout the Nation and the gradual improvement of postal revenues for work done for hire.

Mr. Farley is honorably proud of his career in the Post Office Department. He has the right to look back upon it with satisfaction. The public in appreciation of his labors wishes him well in his new venture into private enterprise.

[From the Waterbury (Conn.) Democrat of August 9, 1940]

PRIVATE CITIZEN FARLEY

Announcement of resignation from the Cabinet by Postmaster General James A. Farley finally pins down to a definite date his return to private life. On and after the end of this month you'll still find Jim Farley in the ranks of stanch Democrats supporting the party and its candidates through thick and thin, but he'll be like most of the rest of us, reporting for work at 8 or 9 o'clock in the morning, out for lunch at noon, home for dinner at night. In short he'll have a regular working job for the first time in a good many years.

The Post Office Department is going to miss Farley. He may not have been the best Postmaster General we ever had. No one is going to make any such claims as that about him for he'd be the first to raise an objecting voice. But he ran the Department pretty well and saw to it that his assistants did their work properly. He managed to bring the Department's finances down to a point where you didn't have to whisper its deficit in a whisper. And he did sell stamps for Uncle Sam.

Philatelists will probably argue for years to come the value of the Farley regime in the Post Office Department. He gave them all sorts of new issues to add to their collections; he put stamp collecting on the front pages of all American newspapers. He played up the hobby for all it was worth, ably seconded by his stamp-minded boss, the President. As in almost every other job he accepted, he did a pretty thorough job of it. We'd call it a successful one. His private endeavors henceforth can't help but be similarly upward.

[From the Wheeling (W. Va.) News-Register, August 9, 1940]

A GREAT DEMOCRAT RETIRES

No Cabinet officer ever retired from his post with a finer record for service than Postmaster General Farley.

No national chairman served his party so conscientiously and effectively as Jim Farley. He knew more about politics than Edison did about electricity.

In a nation saturated with some of the good and much of the bad in politics, Farley stood out like the Koh-i-noor. His political record is as clean as a hound's tooth.

The Democratic Party owes Mr. Farley a great deal. It should value his counsels more than any other man in the country.

But Jim Farley may not take a very active part in politics in the future. He is going back to his first love—sport. He has been drafted to head one of New York's great baseball clubs.

Perhaps it was and still is his devotion to clean wholesome sports that made Jim Farley unique in the political vortex. He was a politician sincere in his convictions and above the machinations of the current school of politics.

America would not have much to worry about if it had more Jim Farleys.

[From the Wichita (Kans.) Beacon, August 8, 1940]

JIM RETIRES AFTER 8 YEARS

James A. Farley is retiring as chairman of the Democratic National Committee, ending a job that he took up after making the first succesful drive for the Democratic nomination in behalf of Franklin D. Roosevelt in 1932.

It was in the late fall of 1931 and the early spring of 1932 that the Nation at large began to know Jim Farley. The tall New Yorker went from coast to coast, from the Canadian border to the Gulf, interviewing political leaders, talking with party groups, contacting Democrats wherever he had the opportunity and selling to them the new leader of the party.

These trips accomplished one thing. They definitely stamped Jim Farley as the most widely acquainted political leader of the entire Nation. The intervening years have cemented that acquaintanceship into friendship that will far outlast any political relationship.

Jim Farley goes out of the national chairmanship highly respected for his ability in politics, his personal charm which has gained thousands of friends, and for his sincere character. It is difficult to follow any man into a job he has filled as long as Jim Farley has served as national chairman but the ball player from Grassy Point is leaving a vacancy so big that it will be doubly difficult to follow him.

The new national chairman, Edward Flynn, is an experienced and capable leader. He will have the advice and counsel of other leaders of the party and undoubtedly that of Jim Farley, but there will only be one "Genial Jim" in American politics.

[From the Watertown (N. Y.) Daily Times of August 10, 1940]

MR. FARLEY LEAVES WASHINGTON

Mr. James A. Farley came to Washington in 1932 as Postmaster General and chairman of the Democratic National Committee. He was the man who had made Franklin D. Roosevelt President of the United States. Next to the late Louis McHenry Howe, he was the President's closest acquaintance and confidante. This remarkable phase of his career now ends. President Roosevelt, in Hyde Park, has his resignation as Postmaster General. He resigned as national chairman on July 17.

Mr. Farley will be happier probably in private life than he has been during the last few years of his public life. He was not enthusiastic over the Court-packing bill. He considered the attempt at a senatorial purge, which followed, the poorest kind of politics. He said publicly many times that he did not believe in a third term. The New Deal lost its glitter before his eyes. In Chicago, at the Democratic convention, President Roosevelt, through his representative, Secretary of Commerce Harry Hopkins, went over his head, engineered the draft of the President and named Secretary Henry Wallace as the Vice Presidential nominee.

Jim has three lucrative jobs waiting for him, it is said. First, he will become president of the New York Yankees within a few days. This will pay him $25,000 per year. Second, he will be chairman of the board of the Coca-Cola Export Corporation. Third, he plans to complete the writing of his memoirs which will sell widely, without doubt. His "Behind the Ballots," the inside story of the 1932 Democratic Convention, was a best seller.

Jim Farley is a thoroughly capable man, a brilliant organizer, and a most pleasing personality. As president of the Yankees he may still be able to coax some base hits out of them and put them back in the pennant race. As board chairman of Coca-Cola's export corporation he should be able to sell plenty of soft drinks. And into his memoirs will go 8 years of intimate memories of political life carefully listed in the detailed diary which he has kept during his entire career in Washington.

[From the Wilkes-Barre (Pa.) Record of August 10, 1940]

FARLEY QUITS CABINET

The friendly tone of the letters exchanged between James A. Farley, as he retired as Postmaster General, and his Chief does not disguise the fact that Farley is quitting as a matter of principle. His leave taking from the Cabinet is a natural sequel to his relinquishing of the national chairmanship of the Democratic Party, and no matter what has been said on the subject for public consumption, there is a deep conviction that Farley no longer is the national chairman because he differed from "the Boss" on the third-term issue.

President Roosevelt in his letter to Farley gave him credit for improving the business efficiency and the public service of the Post Office Department, and for bettering the morale of more than 300,000 employees.

In his letter to the President, Mr. Farley pays a high tribute to those employees. He insists that whatever success he has had in the conduct of the affairs of the Postal Service was due to their assistance and cooperation.

Postmaster General Farley retires to private life respected for having had the courage of his convictions. Demonstrations of this is too often wanting in American life.

Less than 5 months ago he planted himself solidly in the fight for the Democratic Presidential nomination. He told newspapermen at Boston that his name would be presented to the national convention at Chicago. And it was, even after it became clear that Mr. Roosevelt wanted the nomination. Probably, under the circumstances, it wouldn't have been very pleasant for Mr. Farley had he elected to remain in the Cabinet.

[From the Worcester (Mass.) Gazette of August 9, 1940]

JIM FARLEY RESIGNS

On the last day of this month, at the close of business, James A. Farley will cease to be Postmaster General of the United States. He has resigned and the President has accepted his resignation. It is generally recognized today that Mr. Farley has been an excellent Postmaster General; and in winning that recognition, Mr. Farley had to overcome some rather discouraging odds.

When he took the post and at the same time held on to the chairmanship of the Democratic National Committee, it was the depressing expectation that, following an old political tradition upheld by Postmasters General for many years back, he would devote himself mainly to the dispensing of patronage to deserving Democrats and what time might be left over he would give to the post office.

Well, Mr. Farley dispensed the patronage all right, and in such a thorough manner that he evoked many outraged protests from the political purists in the administration; but he also proved himself to be an admirable and hard-working executive in the Post Office Department.

During the first few years of the New Deal opposition spokesmen were impressively eloquent about "Spoilsman Farley" and "Farleyism." They said he had dug up Adlai Stevenson's old ax and was ruthlessly chopping off the official heads of innocent and worthy Republican jobholders. But as the years rolled on the cries of anguish ceased, and Mr. Farley emerged in the public eye as a good and kindly man who, as it happened, was also a most thoroughgoing politician of the practical school.

Jim Farley has a positive talent for making friends. He is affable, equable, good-natured, and intelligent. Anyone who has read his autobiography must have sensed the instinctive decency of the man—and his sensitiveness. One of the most memorable episodes in the book has to do with a dressing down he once received from Alfred E. Smith, then Governor of New York.

Farley, a youthful county chairman, was delegated by his committee to ask a favor from the Governor. The request, as it turned out, was improper, but neither Farley nor the county committee realized that. Smith realized it, however, and he lit into Farley in raging style. Farley was deeply hurt. After recounting the episode in his book, he adds—and there is a plaintive note in it—that he has made many similarly improper requests, always unwittingly, of Mr. Roosevelt, and always he has been turned down but always in an amiable fashion which left no scars.

If it is true that Jim aspired to the Presidency or the Vice Presidency, it is apparent that once again he has been turned down by the amiable Mr. Roosevelt. One cannot but wonder whether this time the Roosevelt amiability was again nonscarifying.

At any rate, during this Presidential campaign Mr. Farley is going to be sorely missed at Democratic G. H. Q., and missed most sorely of all by the amiable Mr. Roosevelt, the expert in thistledown refusals. But, then, it doesn't matter much this year, from the looks of things. The New Deal seems due for an out, and it is not likely that even Mr. Farley's political generalship could save it.

[From the Wilmington (Del.) Journal-Every Evening, August 9, 1940]

JAMES A. FARLEY

With the letter of resignation handed to the President yesterday, Postmaster General James A. Farley has finally bowed himself out of the New Deal after 7½ years of service to the Government.

For Mr. Farley these have been years of growth—both in personality and in public stature. He entered the Cabinet with the reputation of a likeable, practical politician who had done a good job of getting his candidate nominated and elected. He had no pretensions to statesmanship and the public gave him no credit in this field.

During the early years of the New Deal, as the man chiefly responsible for the distribution of patronage he became the favorite "whipping boy" of the opposition and he cheerfully accepted all of the criticism for the vast spoils system instituted by the New Deal.

This month, as Mr. Farley leaves the Cabinet, it is safe to say that there are not many men in American public life who are more widely and genuinely liked and respected. He has given the Post Office Department a business-like administration which stands out in sharp contrast to much of the rest of the New Deal and is justly proud of the achievement. He has been modest, unassuming, and loyal to his chief as long as his principles would allow. He has stood up under snubs that would have deeply embittered a lesser man. And finally when the President's decision to seek a third term brought Mr. Farley's loyalty to Mr. Roosevelt and his deep personal convictions into irreconcilable conflict he stepped aside with dignity.

In the past this paper has said many things in disagreement with Mr. Farley. It deplores now, as it did then, the vast spoils system of which he was the visible head. It disagrees as firmly as ever with many of the things he and the Roosevelt administration have stood for. But it recognizes him as a man of courage and conviction and it wishes him well in his new fields of endeavor.

[From the York (S. C.) Yorkville Enquirer, Monday, August 12, 1940]

JAMES A. FARLEY

The resignation of the Honorable James A. Farley as chairman of the Democratic National Executive Committee, and his resignation as Postmaster General, which office he has efficiently filled for nearly 8 years, after twice directing political campaigns that landed Franklin Delano Roosevelt in the White House, reminds us very much of a political cartoon of more than 50 years ago in Puck.

The strong man of Germany 50 years ago was Bismarck, who served under Kaiser Wilhelm as Chancelor or Premier. He was a mental and political giant. As the Kaiser's chief adviser he steered Germany through many pitfalls. In time Kaiser Wilhelm reached the point in his career where success went to his head. He got to thinking that Germany's progress was entirely due to his own wisdom. It wasn't. Finally he did things that caused Bismarck to resign his portfolio, which certainly weakened the Government of Germany.

The cartoonist pictured the German ship of state, with Kaiser Wilhelm in command. Bismarck was pictured as climbing down a rope ladder on the side of the ship to get into a small boat. He was through. The cartoonist labeled his picture thus, "Germany loses its safe pilot."

Farley in his relations to the Roosevelt administration was much like Bismarck. He piloted Roosevelt through two campaigns and elected him President. When Franklin decided to offer for a third term, Mr. Farley became lukewarm to that proposition. He first resigned as national chairman and now has resigned as Postmaster General. To be sure it is possible that Mr. Rocsevelt may be elected for a third term, but of one thing we are sure, the Democratic Party has lost the services of a most efficient political pilot, and it is not at all uncertain that the third term urge of Roosevelt may prove to be his Waterloo. He would certainly stand a better chance if Mr. Farley were still at the helm of the Democratic political ship.

[From the Winston-Salem (N. C.) Journal of August 10, 1940]

FARLEY'S RETIREMENT

James A. Farley, who recently has resigned as chairman of the Democratic National Committee, now announces his retirement as Postmaster General on August 31. He retains only one political job, continuing as chairman of the New York State Democratic Committee.

The record of Mr. Farley as Postmaster General possibly is not as remarkable as that which he established as chairman of the Democratic committee. But by all standards of comparison, it measures up to the point of impressiveness. Under his direction the Post Office Department became largely self-sustaining, according to President Roosevelt, and it functioned throughout with efficiency. During his incumbency Mr. Farley also endeared himself to thousands of philatelists by causing many special stamp issues to be printed. In this field of governmental service, as well as in the office of Democratic national chairman, he showed outstanding ability as an executive.

With Mr. Farley retiring from the post-office portfolio on August 31, and Mr. Wallace probably resigning a few days or weeks from now, President Roosevelt will have two Cabinet positions to fill. His selections for these posts may have an important bearing upon the Presidential campaign.

In the meantime, the loyalty of Mr. Farley to the administration, which was so forcefully demonstrated at the Chicago convention, is expected to manifest itself in yeoman service among the voters of New York State, despite the obligations imposed by private business demands.

[From the Gopher (Minn.) Postmaster of August 1940]

GOOD-BYE, JIM, AND GOD BLESS YOU

Developments in Washington in the last month have made it impossible for our beloved Postmaster General to be with us at our convention, as he had anticipated. And it is safe to say that no one will regret James A. Farley's absence more than Mr. Farley himself. "Genial Jim" always made special efforts to attend State conventions, and the programs were always better because of his presence. News of his decision to enter private life came as a surprise to us all, but each and every member of the Department will wish him the best of luck. The eloquent tribute paid him by President Roosevelt in accepting his resignation gives ample evidence of his ability and integrity. And when he steps out of office on August 31 he will carry with him the best wishes of every postal employee in the Nation and a record of being the most successful and the most popular Postmaster General in the history of the United States.

[From the National Rural Letter Carrier, Washington, D. C., July 27, 1940]

POSTMASTER GENERAL FARLEY'S RETIREMENT CAUSING SINCERE REGRET

Postmaster General James A. Farley's impending retirement surely must be regretted by every postal employee, whose good will, respect, and affection he undoubtedly will hold throughout his lifetime.

During his more than 7 years' administration he not only has wiped out the postal deficit and placed it as one governmental function operating on a sound financial basis but he has molded a personnel imbued with an enthusiastic esprit de corps and efficiency without parallel in postal history.

It is most gratifying to observe the deserved enconiums being bestowed upon our Postmaster General by editorial writers and columnists throughout the country.

One able editorial writer, never given to fulsome praise, refers to him as "the greatest Postmaster General since Benjamin Franklin."

Rural carriers have particular reason to be proud that a man of Farley's stature, whose wholesome influence has stamped an indelible imprint upon the vast army of postal employees, should have passed along their horizon.

It was Postmaster General Farley's wise policy of "career appointments" that caused the appointment of a popular and trusted member in your ranks, Superintendent J. Ed Cooper.

It was your association's proud privilege to have Postmaster General Farley as a speaker at the Denver and Washington national conventions.

It was Postmaster General Farley's proud boast that there was an indefinable "something" about rural-carrier conventions that set them apart from others he attended and caused him to look forward to them.

Washington newspaper men and women have an uncanny ability to evaluate persons in high office.

That they hold him in their hearts as the noblest public personage in the National Capital is only natural because it is too seldom that they find a man who measures up to every high attribute of life.

Jim will take his deserved niche among other Postmasters General.

Jim will leave Washington as a man of intense loyalty and unswerving devotion to duty.

Jim will live forever in the hearts of the thousands whose good fortune it has been to relax under his sunny smile as a man who never violated his word and never let a friend down.

Jim is one man who will never receive as much as he has given.

C. C. McDEVITT, *Publisher.*

For Conscription—With Reservations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENJAMIN JARRETT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 29, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE OIL CITY (PA.) DERRICK OF AUGUST 28, 1940

Mr. JARRETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial appearing in Oil City Derrick, Oil City, Pa., August 28, 1940.

FOR CONSCRIPTION—WITH RESERVATIONS

Assuming that the war in Europe imperils the United States and that there is no way we can raise and train an adequate defense army without conscription, let us have conscription without hysterics.

But where will this army come from? Largely from the unskilled class of young Americans, from the high-school and college graduates of the past few years who have not been able to pick up jobs, and from other young men holding good jobs which are not necessary to defense.

But not many conscripts will come from the ranks of the saboteurs, from the ranks of the Communists, or from those 6,000,000 "fifth columners" who are said by Congressman DIES to be making good livings in the United States.

It might be dangerous to put these fellows in the Army, but there is lots of war work they can do under military direction and for military pay.

We have no idea how much sabotage is practiced in the United States, but we will say this: There is not another country on earth where it would have greater play. We have subversive aliens in this country that we cannot get out because the Government in Washington thinks deportation would be too rough on them. It may be the policy to reform these individuals through kindness, but the administration does not know the nature of the beasts.

There is entirely too much political pandering to these dangerous elements. It would be a crime to send some fine boy to a possible death fighting for his country while some saboteur drawing good pay in an airplane plant would tamper with an Army plane so it would fail in the second of stress.

The one arm of defense in this country which needs building up even more than the Army is the F. B. I. The process of checking up and branding those "fifth columners" and saboteurs should be under way in every community in the land. This is much more important right now that raising an army.

Probably one-third of the American people do not remember the draft in the World War, or, if they do, they were so young they cannot tell much about it. We saw a trainload of those boys, many of them without overcoats, pull out of a station one evening when the temperature was 10 below zero. The day coaches were crowded. They had to sleep sitting up. They did not know when or where they were going to eat next, and when they left there was a feeling in every mother's breast she would never see her boy again.

We remember all the miserable excuses which were set up by slackers. As we remember the going away, we also remember the coming home. Many did not come back. Many came back physical and mental wrecks. This is what war does to humanity.

Maybe we Americans are no better than the English, who may be facing annihilation, but we say our American boys are too precious to be sent into war lightly.

True, this draft is only for a year's training, but we know what the temptation is when dictators find themselves in possession of great armies. What do Hitler or Mussolini or Stalin care about cannon fodder?

We repeat that if the war in Europe makes it judicious or necessary for us to draft and train an Army, let us go ahead and draft it, but let us be sure that those 6,000,000 "fifth columners" that MARTIN DIES speaks of be made to do the rough work of the Army and for Army pay.

National Recovery and Preparedness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH O. BREWSTER

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 12, 1940

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. Speaker, during the World War in the decade of the twenties the production of material necessities and comforts in the United States steadily mounted until it reached a peak measured in terms of a national income of $90,000,000,000 in a single year.

Then came a world-wide depression in which the economy of the United States joined the general collapse. Other countries emerged more rapidly than did the United States. Our recovery lagged behind that of almost every other industrialized nation.

THE AMERICAN GOAL

Our national income has never reached much more than two-thirds of the mark attained in 1929. Yet the Brookings Institution, after a careful survey, finds American resources capable of producing a national income of $125,000,000,000 a year.

This is obviously our goal. Such an income would solve jobs for youth and ample provision for the older citizens of the United States and the end of that desperate struggle for existence that has affected workers everywhere, both in our factories and on our farms throughout recent years.

THE AMERICAN IDEAL

"Man shall not live by bread alone," but even this authority recognized bread as most desirable in our existence even while it emphasizes the prime importance of those spiritual values in liberty of life and conscience which we like to think of as characteristic of America.

The right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness is disappearing elsewhere in the world. The preservation of these hard-won rights in America is the clear responsibility of this generation.

AMERICA LOOKS AND LISTENS

America listens with concern to a constantly increasing rumble from the explosions across the sea. More and more America feels the impact of events outside our bounds. American resolution is steadily hardening to see that America is adequately prepared to meet any menace that may offer either from within or without.

Disruptive influences of any character are being more and more closely scrutinized. America must unite under the broad principles of the American Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States and on that platform presents a program that will not tolerate attack from outside our bounds nor submit to subversive influences operating from within.

America enters the valley of decision to determine how this unity may be achieved.

AMERICA SEEKS PEACE

America seeks no quarrel with any other nation on this earth. America simply wants to work out its manifest destiny within its ample bounds and to realize the unlimited supply of the good things of this life which its boundless resources so amply afford.

America stirs restlessly, however, as it realizes the threat to its liberties that are offered in doctrines that are gaining ever broader currency in other portions of the globe. America consequently decides it must be adequately prepared.

How to realize the fruits of our boundless resources by the normal, natural functioning of our national economy and at the same time prepare to meet the totalitarian threat is the challenge of this next decade.

Americans are realists and they are always ready to move in uncharted waters if necessity demands. The entire story of the amazing American progress of 3 centuries is written in the readiness for adventure characteristic of the pioneer.

AMERICAN TRADITION

This does not mean, however, that Americans abandon a trusted tradition without reason. The men who conceived this Nation in all the stress and strain of the struggle for American independence laid down also the protective principle that no man should hold the office of President for more than 8 years. Washington established the precedent. Jefferson enjoined it upon his fellow countrymen.

Their counsel born of a close acquaintance with the totalitarian systems of their day is not to be lightly cast aside.

Once again the world turns from democracy to seek solace in the theory of the indispensability of a man.

Germany, Italy, and Russia are all giving that ancient system another trial.

BY THEIR FRUITS

Today America cries out for a leader capable of coordinating the manpower and the machine power of America to bring about domestic recovery and to provide an adequate defense.

A great task lies ahead. Millions of idle hands are waiting to be put to work to build a better America.

No reflection is necessary upon the good intentions of these who in 7 years have had seventy billions of dollars and unlimited authority, and yet have not been able to bring about domestic recovery or an adequate defense.

"By their fruits ye shall know them." Ten million unemployed still stalk our streets in a vain search for jobs. One million boys and girls each year pour out of our schools ready and eager to work at jobs they seek in vain to find.

Seven years and seventy billions should give us more results.

Now it is time that America consider its next step. Time is running fast. The next few years must see American recovery or America will be profoundly changed.

A few years more of unbalanced budgets and America will go the way of the other democracies that have succumbed to a steadily mounting debt.

Is there no hope?

The answer is plain. America may still choose the better way and the hard way.

By the same path our forefathers trod we may still restore America.

The vast resources of America are still at the service of a people who are willing still to work. The ninety-billion income of 1929 may become the one-hundred-and-twenty-five-billion income of the 1940's.

AN ALL-AMERICAN TEAM

The only obstacle is our own failure to recapture American confidence and get an all-American team once again into the game.

A change of leadership would certainly seem warranted by the record of recent years.

Confidence is the keynote without which recovery can never be achieved. Confidence is the cornerstone upon which must rest the sound structure of that economic recovery that every American desires. The complicated framework of our modern American economy cannot be held together except by the cement of a mutual confidence in the sincerity of purpose of all those elements that make up our industrial machine. Recrimination does not develop trust.

A NATIONAL ELECTION

Maine is the first State to go on record in the campaign of 1940. In electing a United States Senator and three Members of Congress Maine must very definitely determine its viewpoint in national affairs. Maine will continue to play a part in the progress of America. No State has a finer record of steadfast devotion to principles that are fundamentally American. Maine citizens will ponder well their course.

WASHINGTON WATCHES MAINE

The first act of the gentleman from Massachusetts, Representative JOSEPH W. MARTIN, as chairman of the Republican National Committee, was to express the hope that Maine would give 75,000 majority to the Republican ticket on September 9. The gentleman from Massachusetts, JOE MARTIN, has been in politics too long to speak without taking thought. His amazing success has been a result of using words with care. This expression regarding the Maine election was not a random utterance but a carefully thought-out letter to the Republican State Committee as it started the campaign.

Back of this statement lay Joe's conviction that Maine must approximately double its majority of 4 years ago in order to give the Willkie candidacy significance. The 40,000 majority of 1936 would simply mean that Charlie Michelson would sharpen his poison pencil to tell the country the Maine election indicated that once again Vermont was going Republican.

To be sure it sounded rather cocky and self-confident to discuss a campaign so early in terms of so substantial a majority, but Joe decided in favor of nailing his banner to the mast.

Curiously enough the first Gallup poll gave some substance to Joe's hope by showing Maine at the head of all the Republican States in the Union with a Willkie lead of 2 to 1, which would mean a majority of 90,000.

With only a short time to go to the election, this would indicate that if the voters of Maine heed the appeals of Wendell Willkie and the gentleman from Massachusetts, JOE MARTIN, to roll up a record-breaking Republican majority on September 9, the country may see the start of a most impressive sweep.

Meanwhile, Mr. Edward J. Flynn, of New York, the new chairman of the Democratic National Committee, announces that this week he will turn his attention to the State of Maine to stop the Republicans at the very start of their national campaign.

Republicans may well ponder the meaning of this attention to Maine by the two national campaign managers in what seems likely to be one of the hardest-fought campaigns of this century.

Many new to politics have thought the talk of "as goes Maine" was simply an outworn shibboleth. Washington does not so regard it. Washington watches Maine.

The Maine barometer will surely be called into the picture by the opposition in case the Maine majority falls down. Local conditions will furnish no alibi so far as the Nation is concerned.

THE HISTORY OF PREPAREDNESS

The solid Maine Republican delegation in the Congress has stood firmly for a program that would contribute to domestic prosperity and the protection of the Americas from foes both from within and from without.

The situation this fall is very simple. In the past 7 years the present administration has spent $70,000,000,000. The American people now have the right and the duty to ask what have we to show for it.

Ten million are still unemployed. America is woefully unprepared. Certainly, Republicans are not responsible for the 7 long, lean years through which we have just passed. Certainly Republicans are not responsible for the tragic confession of the Chief of Staff before a congressional committee that America this spring had only 50 planes fit to go upon the western front, as all others were outmoded by the revelations of the current war.

Planes "on order" contain no terror for the disciples of Mr. Hitler. The 484 antiaircraft guns possessed by the American Army today are not sufficient to defend a single port in the State of Maine, according to the standards now prevailing in Europe.

During the 12 years of Republican control that followed the previous 8 years of Democratic administration the Army, the Navy, and the Air Corps were kept at all times adequate for any force with which they were at all likely to be faced.

DEMOCRATIC OPPOSITION IN 1920'S

It is interesting also to note that throughout that period the expenditures of the Republican administration for preparedness were constantly under attack from the Democratic Party, not because we were spending too little but because we were spending too much. This reached its climax in the Democratic platform of 1932 with a denunciation of "expenditures on armaments fast approaching $1,000,000,000 a year" as entirely too much of a burden on the people of the United States.

This record is of interest and value if anyone seeks to make a comparison between conditions of the 1920's and the 1930's.

THE RISE OF HITLER

Soon after the present administration came into power Mr. Hitler took over control of central Europe and has steadily expanded his influence in the world by military might.

Yet in 1938 the present administration proposed to limit naval airplanes to 3,000 although England already had 12,000 and other nations were spending 10 times what we were for experimentation in aeronautical defense.

Much of the campaign of the opposition rests upon the proposition that there is only one man today in America capable of coping with our problems in either domestic or foreign affairs. The trusted tradition of a century against a third term for any President must be violated because of the crisis with which we are confronted and the indispensability of a single man to cope with this crisis.

Certainly no one will contend that in 7 years any appreciable progress has been made in the solution of our domestic problems, but we are frequently told that in the field of foreign affairs the New Dealers present a leader with a most uncanny sense of timing.

THREE THOUSAND PLANES

Let us look at the record. The proposed limit of 3,000 airplanes for the United States Navy in 1938 seems incredible in the light of what has since been revealed. Yet it was only the protest of a militant minority of Republicans that prevented that limit from being imposed.

Today we talk in terms of 50,000 planes. Yet the failure to develop plane-building facilities in the past 2 years is now a most serious handicap both for ourselves and for those nations that are fighting for their liberties and their lives.

DEFENSE AT KITTERY AND BATH

In the same minority report of 1938, as a Republican member of the House Committee on Naval Affairs, I pointed out the continuing failure of the administration to provide 11 submarines and 34 destroyers in accordance with the then existing authorization. At that time the administration was decidedly battleship-minded. Events have changed all that.

The peril now to Maine shipyard employees is in the possible development of facilities elsewhere that may some day offer a competitive threat to Maine shipbuilders. We do not want to see again repeated the story of a feast and a famine.

Steady work at steady wages is the sound way to proceed. The country could easily bear the burden if a sound recovery were here.

As a Member of the United States Senate I should hope, because of my experience in the House, to succeed Senator HALE on the Senate Committee on Naval Affairs and thus have a definite voice in the development of our naval policy and program.

Maine was happy to welcome the President recently for an inspection of our submarine shipyard at Kittery. We shall hope that he noted the utterly inadequate condition of its defense—typical of the coast of Maine and of the New England area, which would be the first to invite attack if any European devotees of collective security should ever seek to extend their system to our shores.

THE LATEST RECORD ON DEFENSE

But let us come down to even more recent days. In June of this year the President publicly announced he saw no reason vital to national defense for Congress to stay in session except, as he cynically remarked, for the "laudable purpose of making speeches."

The gentleman from Massachusetts, JOE MARTIN, promptly declared that during the period of the current crisis he would oppose any attempt to adjourn the Congress, and he was joined in this position by all the Republicans and by a sufficient number of the majority party to defeat the Presidential proposal to send the Congress home.

What has happened in the 2 months that have since ensued? The Congress has made the following provisions for our defense:

First. Provided a $5,000,000,000 rearmament program which in July the President described as "essential to the preservation of our democratic institutions."

Second. Authorized the creation of a two-ocean navy although the creation of such a navy had not even been recommended to Congress in mid-June.

Third. The Congress has made provision for training the National Guard, without delay, for any emergency that may arise.

Fourth. The House has adopted an excess-profits tax designed to take some measure of the profits out of the preparations for war and to raise $300,000,000 to help meet the costs of the defense program.

Fifth. Congress is now considering proper provision to provide the men that are required to handle the billions of dollars of defense equipment that is now in process. This certainly seems vital to defense.

Can it not fairly be said that the determined attempt of the administration to adjourn the Congress in June did not reveal as much foresight as the determination of the gentleman from Massachusetts, JOE MARTIN, to keep Congress on the job?

RECOVERY AND DEFENSE

The relation between national recovery and national defense is all too often ignored.

While the Nation calls insistently for planes and for all the other instruments of a mechanized defense and for the facilities for their production, we yet recognize that the first essential of our defense must be a sound national economy with a Budget that is balanced and an industry that is geared to go. The first bulwark of our national security is to be found in a contented, happy people, old and young, ready and anxious to defend the things their country means.

There has been much discussion in recent years of old-age assistance. Two theories regarding this problem have definitely emerged.

RECOVERY AND RELIEF

One point of view urges a program which insists upon using the reserves paid in as premiums by one part of our population to pay benefits to another part of our population. This borrowing from Peter to pay Paul leaves no provision by which the reserves will ultimately be restored to pay the benefits to those with whom the Government has contracted. Such a program is doomed to failure because it violates every principle of honesty and fair play. Both the current contributors and the current beneficiaries are being deplorably deceived. Some day soon the day of reckoning must inevitably arrive. Discrimination is in determining the beneficiaries and the benefits since it all rests in the decision of a person rather than the determination of a law.

The other point of view urges an honest, simple system by which each year the budget will be balanced and current dollars honestly obtained and current benefits honestly bestowed.

Each generation each year will pay such benefits as it can afford. Each age group in succession will receive the benefits as they accrue.

One of these plans is the New Deal proposal to solve our social ills and can only mean the increase of these social and economic difficulties from year to year as the American people become more and more bitterly disillusioned with the entire working of the program.

The other program is sponsored by millions of Americans and is in essence the Republican proposal sponsored by the Republican platform of 4 years ago and by the Republican platform this year and offers the only sound basis on which assistance can be successfully carried on without disrupting our economic life. It rests upon the firm foundation of paying as you go. It offers no discrimination among our population on grounds of race, religion, or political affiliation. To this simple fundamental American program every American may cordially subscribe with the conviction that it will do justice to all Americans, young and old.

We shall no longer quarrel over a name, but recognize and apply sound principle as enunciated in the Republican platforms of 1936 and 1940.

The essence of this program is recovery rather than relief and that means opportunity for youth and adequate provision for the aged.

This program also provides ample for American defense, as only upon the basis of a sound national economy can a permanent defense be built.

THE REPUBLICAN OFFER

In this critical period in the affairs of mankind the Republican Party approached the problem of the nomination for the Presidency in a clear and simple spirit of placing patriotism above party.

In Wendell Willkie the Republican Party offers to the Nation a leader trained in the best traditions of America—a lifelong disciple of the principles of Thomas Jefferson, and a believer in their application to the conditions of modern life.

MAINE LEADS

Four years ago Maine seemed to be out of step with the majorities in most of our sister States, although 17,000,000 Americans even then agreed with us. Today there are constantly growing indications that the country is ready to fall in step with Maine. The stone which the builders rejected seems likely now to be the head of the corner. The Nation turns once again to follow the leadership of the land of the rising sun.

The motives of those in power for the past 7 years do not need to be challenged in order to justify a change of admin-

istration. Time is getting short to put America back on the track and start again upon the journey that in the last century made America the envy and the inspiration of the world.

Hard work and firm determination were the gospel of America throughout 300 years. Those same principles will prevail today as yesterday.

In this procession of principle Maine is privileged once again to play the part of a pioneer. Let us carry on worthily of our traditions by a resounding majority for sound American principles that will send ringing across this country the message of an America that is about to be redeemed.

The Government's Case Against the Lowell Sun

REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 29, 1940

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I trust every Member will read the editorial of the Lowell Sun of yesterday. It is a very vigorous editorial and is entitled "The Government's Case Against the Sun." The Sun has presented a strong case. It is a very severe arraignment of the administration of the Wage and Hour Act. I am puzzled, because hitherto I have had a high opinion of Colonel Fleming. I read in part from this editorial:

There is an answer to the question, "Why this attack?"

This attack represents in sugar-coated and easily digestible form the first concerted drive against the freedom of the press in the only nation on the face of the earth where a free press still exists.

Will freedom of speech and of assembly be the next targets? Every American might ponder his answer to that question, and begin on the premise that if they also are attacked it will be via some such similar exalted and praiseworthy channel as the Wage and Hour Act.

Mr. Speaker, that is the way the attack on the press which took away its freedom began in Spain and in other countries.

The editorial referred to follows:

THE GOVERNMENT'S CASE AGAINST THE SUN

The administrator of the Wage and Hour Act, Philip B. Fleming, has brought the Sun into court on the assumption that this newspaper has not fully lived up to the letter of that act.

NO INSTANCE OF VIOLATION CITED

In his court action Mr. Fleming has not given a single instance of where or how the act was violated by the Sun.

There is nothing whatsoever to indicate that any Sun employee has filed a complaint with the administrator.

The case has been continued to October 7. Until that date the Sun will not know the nature of the offense with which it is charged. And on that date it must be prepared to defend itself against that charge, whatever it may be, if indeed there be any.

Long before the Wage and Hour Act was even dreamed of, the average Sun pay envelope was far above the present requirements of the act. The many thousands of Lowell people who read the Sun made this possible for the many people who help print the Sun.

And during the entire depression not one Sun employee suffered a pay cut. This newspaper has always taken what it believed to be pardonable pride in this maintenance of a high wage and salary scale.

Now the administrator of the Wage and Hour Act brings the Sun into Federal court. Why?

He cites no instance of any violation of the act. Why, then, has he taken such court action? There is an answer.

The Administrator, or his representatives, apparently desire to conduct a fishing expedition through Sun employment records. He hopes he can find a violation of the act. If—we repeat, if—there has been any violation of the act the Sun likewise hopes he can find it so that the mistake may be corrected.

THIS IS NO ISOLATED ACTION

But this action against the Sun is no mere accident, no isolated effort. Nor can we believe that it came at this time of year and in this particular year by chance.

Two newspapers in Easton, Pa., are the objects of a similar attack by the Government in Washington.

Some few weeks ago a representative from the office of the Wage and Hour Administrator sought to go on a fishing expedition through the records of both of these papers. The management of each paper refused the demand. Today both newspapers are likewise in court defending themselves against the Federal Government.

The Dallas (Tex.) News was faced with a similar demand. It permitted the examination, believing—as the Sun believes today about its observance of the Wage and Hour Act—that its record was clean.

But the investigators from Administrator Fleming's office claimed they found the dirt they had been seeking, and forthwith ordered the News to dispense $3,000 in back pay.

Now, the Dallas News is one of the largest newspapers in the South. Three thousand dollars would hardly put it into bankruptcy. But it refuses to meet the $3,000 demand of the Administrator because it believes his charges to be groundless, and possibly even malicious.

The result is that the Dallas News is also now in court defending itself against the Federal Government.

WHY THIS SUDDEN ATTACK?

Why this sudden and below-the-belt attack against the press? Wages and salaries paid to newspaper employees rank among the highest in the land. If all employers paid the same high wages and salaries as do newspaper publishers, and if working conditions were on the same high plane in every industry, there would probably be no need for the Wage and Hour Act.

There is an answer to the question, "Why this attack?"

This attack represents in sugar-coated and easily digestible form the first concerted drive against the freedom of the press in the only Nation on the face of the earth where a free press still exists.

Will freedom of speech and of assembly be the next targets? Every American might ponder his answer to that question and begin on the premise that if they also are attacked it will be via some such similarly exalted and praisworthy channel as the Wage and Hour Act.

The press is now about to be smeared and coated with a choice selection of mud, unless the attack proves a boomerang. Because the attack is made through the Wage and Hour Act, the implication to be gained is that newspapers run sweatshops. Thus, the confidence of the people in their newspapers is supposed to be weakened. The calf is then considered well fattened and ready for the Government abattoir.

A DOUBLE-EDGED NEWS RELEASE

An interesting news release from the Boston office of the Wage-Hour Administration came to the Sun just yesterday. It told how a concentrated effort was going to be made in this part of the Nation to enforce strict observation of the Wage-Hour Act in five key industries. Concede that the motive behind this belated enforcement of a law which is almost 2 years old was altruistic despite the approach of November, and there is absolutely nothing wrong in this effort. In fact, it is only fair and proper, even if late in coming.

The newspaper business did not happen to be included in the five industries referred to, and probably therefore should not expect the civil treatment accorded the big five.

And now to the point we wish to bring out in this news release:

"A majority of the factories," reports the news release, "* * * are complying with the Fair Labor Standards Act, or have shown a willingness to do so as soon as inadvertent violations are pointed out to them by Wage and Hour inspectors."

The Sun has this comment to make: As soon as, and if, any inspector of the Fair Labor Standards Act points to a single violation of the Wage-Hour Act by the Sun it will be immediately corrected. The Sun has yet to be charged with a specific violation of the act. But it nevertheless has been brought into court on the charge that "the Administrator" has "reasonable grounds to believe" that the Sun has committed a violation of the act.

Further along the news release says: "The drives are not punitive."

In answer this newspaper might ask by what method of reasoning the Administrator's office feels it necessary to explain that the drives are not punitive. It may be that after all they are punitive.

CLAIMS LEGAL ACTION ONLY AS LAST RESORT

To quote again from the news release: "They (wage and hour inspectors) will first locate violations, and then by explaining to the noncomplying employer the requirements and purposes of the act * * * attempt to bring him into voluntary compliance. Legal action will be taken if necessary, but only in obdurate cases."

Well, nothing has been explained to the Sun, nor, we repeat, has any instance of a violation been pointed out. If this newspaper's attention had been drawn to any violation, its "voluntary compliance" would be immediate and apologetic for permitting such a violation to unwittingly occur. The Sun was at no time "obdurate," but is nevertheless the target of legal action. This newspaper's refusal to permit an investigator to fish through its records without complaint or charge of violation could hardly be called "obdurate." Or could it?

Why, may we ask in all fairness and sincerity of purpose, should the wage-hour enforcement office issue a news release which at best is certainly very misleading? Or are newspapers to receive special handling?

AN ATTACK ON ALL NEWSPAPERS

This drive is not only against the Lowell Sun, or the Easton Express, or the Easton Free Press, or the Dallas News.

It is a drive against all the newspapers in America, and if successful will quickly engulf all magazines, and then all radio stations which even now operate under very limited Government license anyhow.

It is directed at the heart of every newspaper in the United States which has had the courage to stand on its own two feet. If the Sun were willing to bend on both knees before the power

that cracks the whip it probably would not today be faced with the attack which confronts it.

The method of governmental attack on the press is well known. Fundamentally it has been the same everywhere. We saw it in Germany, and in Italy, and in Spain, and now in conquered France.

We also saw the result of it—a people fed on propaganda, half-truths, and even lies; a people that could read only what its government wanted it to read.

Other American newspapers are scheduled to be attacked soon. Indeed, the Sun takes pleasure in being the fourth choice in the Nation in the potentially historic war of the Government in Washington against a free American press. We only regret that we were not No. 1 on the list.

SUN STRONGLY FAVORS WAGE-HOUR ACT

In conclusion let it be said with all the emphasis at our command that the Sun is just as strongly in favor of the intent and purpose of the Wage and Hour Act as any agency or individual in the country. Undoubtedly every newspaper in the Nation is. In their own field the newspapers have generally far exceeded the minimum requirements of the act.

But when the enforcement of the act is used as a shield for an attack upon one of our constitutional liberties, that act becomes a powerful and destructive weapon in the hands of dictatorial-minded Government officials. This attack is not only directed against the newspapers, but against every man and woman earning a living by working on newspapers, and every man and woman who reads a newspaper.

Needless to say the Sun will meet this attack with every effort it can muster. It does so, encouraged by the belief that it has the moral support of the people of Lowell and northern Middlesex County.

Must We Sacrifice Another Generation of American Manhood Because of English Stumble-Bum Diplomacy?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEWIS D. THILL

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 26, 1940

Mr. THILL. Mr. Speaker, when England declared war on Germany she was unprepared for war. Why did the leaders of England thrust their country into the jaws of death at a time when they knew the Nazis were well equipped and well trained to fight a modern war? To say the least, British diplomacy has been weak during the last 8 years.

If England had prevented the rearming of Germany, the war in Europe would never have come. After the last war, after America had made the rescue, England was dominant in Europe. But the fatuity of English statesmen permitted a conquered Germany to rise up from the ruins and develop the greatest air force in the world. Now that England is being battered by the Frankenstein she nurtured, war propagandists, misguided zealots, and others are urging America's entrance into the war. Why must we sacrifice another generation of American manhood because of English stumble-bum diplomacy? The following news article discusses the problem:

[From the Washington Times-Herald of August 24, 1940]

THE CONSEQUENCES OF STUMBLE-BUM DIPLOMACY

We refer to British diplomacy. The expression we have used may be offensive to some Englishmen, but it is used because it describes British diplomacy with the greatest economy of words. Our sympathies, and those of the majority of Americans, are with England.

BRITAIN KNEW IN ADVANCE

What brings diplomacy to mind is that yesterday, August 23, marks the first anniversary of the Soviet-German nonaggression pact signed in Moscow by Von Ribbentrop for Hitler, and by Molotov for Stalin. On August 24, 1939, Sir Neville Henderson reported from Berlin to Lord Halifax in London that the pact had been made. Britain thus knew of this world-shaking agreement 11 days before she went to war. She went ahead, nevertheless, exactly as if hypnotized, as if moved by some strange nemesis.

The cards were stacked against Britain. This did not stop her diplomats. France followed—to eventual ruination. These two countries, holding the whole fate of Europe, were like two fluttering birds fascinated by a snake.

Now, there is danger that Britain is going down to destruction. We are called upon to underwrite this fatuousness, to spread the war to all corners of the world because Henderson, Halifax, Chamberlain, Daladier, et al. could not shake off their war hypnosis.

THE RULING HAND LOVES ITS MAGIC

The situation seems to be this: If Britain makes a mistake, it immediately becomes incumbent on us to pull her out, whatever the risk. We shall probably end up by attempting to do just that. It is tragically evident that the ruling class of Britain had lost its touch with realities before this war was brought upon the world. It isn't the same ruling class as in 1914, inept though those gentlemen seemed at the time. We question if it's the same Britain.

Win or lose, it can never be the old Britain again. The war has lowered, if it has not demolished, the old class barriers. If Britain wins, we cannot imagine its barnacled aristocracy being trusted once more with the conduct of foreign policy; at least, not without the working classes as kibitzers. If Britain loses, we don't know whether the King and ruling classes will move to Canada and try to give 'em what's left of the Empire from there.

COOPERATION? YES; TO A DEGREE

This is one reason why we can't bring ourselves to support the transfer of 50 destroyers to Britain, overage though they may be. Defense pacts, such as our agreement with Canada, make good sense because they are based on this hemisphere and its safeguarding. The transfer of destroyers, however, immediately mixes us up in Europe.

Prime Minister Churchill, in Commons the other day, spoke proudly and defiantly of the manner in which American-British interests were becoming intertwined. He is probably correct. Some joining of interests is essential. We question whether this jointure should go so far as to become well-nigh indissoluble. The transfer of destroyers would bring that about. Added to which is the well-known fact that such a transfer would be largely a gesture, a token of friendship. The big battle is under way; by the time these destroyers are reconditioned it probably will be over.

The prime mover of this war was the present Prime Minister of England, Winston Churchill. In his book, Step by Step, he proves that Britain was far outraced in armaments, woefully unprepared for war. Churchill was not then in the Cabinet; he was one of the loudest critics of appeasement. He urged Britain to back Poland on the Corridor question, even to the extent of war. So Britain did, knowing she herself was unprepared and where Russia stood. That's what we mean by stumble-bum diplomacy.

The Geyer Anti-Poll-Tax Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE E. GEYER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 29, 1940

EXCERPTS FROM THE HEARINGS BEFORE THE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE

Mr. GEYER of California. Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as the committee hearings were completed on May 17, 1940, and as yet they are not printed, it becomes necessary for me to get some of the testimony before the public in this manner. I have urgently been requesting that the complete hearings be printed in the usual way, but up to the present time the chairman of the subcommittee has not seen fit to order them printed.

The testimony used today is that of Mr. Paul Sharrenberg, legislative representative, American Federation of Labor, and that of Dr. Herman Nixon, visiting professor of history, University of Missouri.

The testimony follows:

FORBIDDING POLL TAX REQUIREMENTS

Wednesday, April 3, 1940

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 4 OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
Washington, D. C.

The committee met at 10 a. m., Hon. FRANCIS E. WALTER (chairman) presiding.

The CHAIRMAN. The hearing will please be in order. Is Mr. Scharrenberg present?

Mr. SCHARRENBERG. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Will you state your full name to the reporter?

STATEMENT OF PAUL SCHARRENBERG, LEGISLATIVE REPRESENTATIVE, AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR

Mr. SCHARRENBERG. My full name is Paul Scharrenberg and I am legislative representative of the American Federation of Labor.

The American Federation of Labor in its last annual convention, held in Cincinnati, Ohio, October 1939, by unanimous vote, "declared its approval of the principle that all citizens, regardless of color or race, should be equally entitled to the full rights of adult suffrage."

By virtue of this declaration and because of our knowledge that in eight Southern States payment of a poll tax or head tax is a prerequisite to voting we favor the enactment of H. R. 7534, introduced by Mr. GEYER of California.

While it is generally assumed that payment of the poll tax as a prerequisite for voting in eight Southern States is designed primarily to disfranchise the Negroes it has become evident that by the levy and manipulation of this tax white citizens, in the low income bracket, are being disfranchised in increasing numbers.

In evidence of this assertion the percentage of the total vote cast at the general election of 1936 in the before-mentioned eight Southern States, supplies its own highly illuminating comment. The percentage of the total normally eligible vote cast in these poll-tax States is:

Tennessee 33.5 percent; Texas 26.2 percent; Virginia 25.7 percent; Alabama 20.4 percent; Georgia 19.6 percent; Arkansas 18.5 percent; Mississippi 16.2 percent; and South Carolina 14.1 percent.

This is an average of about 22 percent for these 8 Southern States. The United States average is 64 percent and the average for the 40 States that do not use the poll tax as a prerequisite for voting is 72 percent.

In considering these percentages it should be borne in mind that since 1901, the percentage of Negroes in all Southern States has declined from 38.1 to 29.8. According to the 1930 census, only Mississippi has a majority of Negroes, and the new census will probably show this changed.

Just how difficult it is for the poor citizens of these eight Southern States to pay the poll tax is further illustrated by a 1935 tabulation of the per-capita income by States.

It shows that while the average annual per-capita income of the United States was $432—the per-capita income of these eight Southern States was among the lowest, ranging from $316 in Texas to $170 in Mississippi.

Mr. MURDOCK. The figure you quoted as the voting average for all States was 64 percent?

Mr. SCHARRENBERG. Yes, sir; that is the average for the entire United States.

Mr. MURDOCK. And that includes the Southern States?

Mr. SCHARRENBERG. All States.

Mr. Chairman, with your permission, I would like to file the tabulation for the record. I might say this was placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by Senator CONNALLY of Texas on August 5, 1939, showing the per-capita income by States for the year 1935.

The CHAIRMAN. Has it been brought up to date?

Mr. SCHARRENBERG. I haven't any later information.

Mr. MURDOCK. Could you give us the reason for or in what connection did Senator CONNALLY insert it in the RECORD?

Mr. SCHARRENBERG. Oh, that was an entirely different connection. Senator CONNALLY was talking about old-age pensions but nevertheless it is in the RECORD on his authority.

And so, Mr. Chairman, if your committee in its wisdom should deem it best not to report H. R. 7534, notwithstanding the evidence submitted, then it would appear to be your solemn duty to give serious attention to the fourteenth amendment of the Constitution of the United States.

Section 2 of the fourteenth amendment reads as follows:

"Representatives shall be apportioned among the several States according to their respective numbers, counting the whole number of persons in each State, excluding Indians not taxed. But when the right to vote at any election for the choice of electors for President and Vice President of the United States, Representatives in Congress, the executive and judicial officers of a State, or the members of the legislature thereof, is denied to any of the male inhabitants of such State, being 21 years of age, and citizens of the United States, or in any way abridged, except for participation in rebellion, or other crime, the basis of representation therein shall be reduced in the proportion which the number of such male citizens shall bear to the whole number of male citizens 21 years of age in such State."

Section 5 places a duty and an obligation upon Congress to enforce this amendment. To quote section 5: "The Congress shall have power to enforce, by appropriate legislation, the provisions of this article."

Mr. Chairman, there was a time in the history of our country when countless children were "too poor to attend school."

Today poverty is no longer an excuse for nonattendance at school, but millions of American citizens in eight Southern States are denied the right to cast their votes because they are too poor.

Surely the evidence is overwhelming that the poll tax requirement in the eight Southern States is deliberately intended to disfranchise the poor.

We therefore appeal to this committee either to report H. R. 7534, the bill introduced by Mr. GEYER, or else invoke the fourteenth amendment to the United States Constitution and reduce the representation in Congress from the poll-tax States that have so outrageously abridged the right of the poor to exercise their franchise as American citizens.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Scharrenberg, you, of course, examined the statutes in these eight States?

Mr. SCHARRENBERG. Only in part, but we have some witnesses on our side who are constitutional experts and will fully cover that subject.

The CHAIRMAN. Do all the constitutions prescribe that it is a prerequisite to the right to vote that all poll taxes be paid?

Mr. SCHARRENBERG. I am not sure. I could not answer that. I know the taxes are provided for in the constitutions.

The CHAIRMAN. Of course, that is the effect, but I am wondering whether the statutes themselves contain any such provisions?

Mr. SCHARRENBERG. I am sorry but I cannot answer that.

The CHAIRMAN. I would like to have somebody look into that.

Mr. SCHARRENBERG. As stated, Mr. Chairman, that will be done. That is all I have to say, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Any questions?

Mr. MURDOCK. I have none.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, Mr. Scharrenberg.

The next witness is Dr. Nixon.

Per capita income by States, 1935, submitted by Senator Connally, of Texas. Congressional Record, p. 11137, Aug. 5, 1939

United States	$432
New York	700
Connecticut	607
California	605
Delaware	590
Rhode Island	561
Nevada	545
Massachusetts	539
Wyoming	526
New Jersey	517
Illinois	500
Montana	482
Pennsylvania	478
Michigan	473
Maryland	473
Wisconsin	467
Ohio	460
New Hampshire	438
Washington	434
Minnesota	416
Maine	414
Colorado	406
Indiana	402
Arizona	401
Oregon	394
Iowa	370
Missouri	366
Vermont	366
Kansas	365
Nebraska	361
Florida	353
Utah	348
Idaho	344
New Mexico	322
West Virginia	318
Texas	316
Virginia	305
Louisiana	300
South Dakota	275
North Dakota	260
Oklahoma	259
North Carolina	253
Georgia	253
Kentucky	240
Tennessee	232
South Carolina	224
Alabama	189
Arkansas	182
Mississippi	170
District of Columbia	966

STATEMENT OF HERMAN C. NIXON, VISITING PROFESSOR OF HISTORY, UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI

The CHAIRMAN. Will you please state your full name for the record?

Dr. NIXON. Herman Clarence Nixon. I am visiting professor of history at the University of Missouri. I am a native of Alabama, with a permanent registration in Piedmont, Ala., in the Fourth Congressional District, where I am a landowner, and have been for some years since my father died.

I have been interested in this question particularly since I checked on the voting of 16 white men who were sharecroppers or share tenants on my father's farm in 1912.

Not over three of those men were voting and possibly one other might have voted but didn't. The others were not able to vote. These were white men. And this was a year before the comparative prosperity period or a comparative prosperity period for farmers, when everyone of these tenants had paid out the preceding year and had a balance. The minimum balance was $25 after he paid out his crop land debt and went home for Christmas. Some of them had $100 or $200. That sounded mighty good for tenants. They had not paid their poll taxes.

As I say, these were white men and there has been some connection between the rise of tenancy among whites and the rise of nonvoting among the nonwhites.

That gave me an interest in the subject and I also lived through, as a boy, the campaign for the present constitution of Alabama,

which was put in in 1901 and there was agitation over restricting the vote at that time.

That followed a period of Alabama history which I might go into briefly from the constitutional point of view just to illustrate what we have had.

Alabama came into the Union in 1819 with provisions in its constitution for general adult male white suffrage. There were no general restrictions or exceptions, I believe, except soldiers of the United States Army could not vote.

In the next constitution, 1861, when the South was getting ready for the Confederacy, that provision was repeated. They didn't worry about United States soldiers then but they did have provision for general adult male white suffrage.

In 1865 after, as we say down there, the "surrender"—after the surrender there was a new constitution adopted by and put in by southern whites. It came into effect, I believe, in December 1865.

This constitution practically repeated the language of the preceding constitutions as to the enfranchisement of adult male whites, barring the Negroes from voting.

Sometimes we overlook the point that in the series of mistakes in the Reconstruction Period the South really made the first move by declining to accept the outcome and undertaking to bar all Negroes from voting, which was really contrary to the advice of Lincoln and Johnson and we might say a few southerners like Lamar of Mississippi.

So that, coupled with what we still call black codes applying to Negroes, was a factor in bringing on what we still call the radical rule in the South, which was not completely gotten rid of until Hayes came to the White House.

Alabama had a new constitution, another one in 1868, and that reversed for the first time the suffrage provisions and provided for general suffrage including—I mean for males, particularly, including Negroes but, of course, barring a large group of whites, particularly important whites, as in line with the fourteenth amendment, which put a penalty on Confederate voting. That was the 1868 constitution.

In 1875 Alabama came through again with a home rule constitution, as we say in the South, and that constitution swung around to general manhood suffrage without racial discrimination.

That constitution was in operation then from 1875 to 1901. In the 90's we had spreading over the South pretty wide-sweeping agrarian unrest and a challenge to the conservative or reactionary government in the South, including some criticism of the L. & N. Railroad, which spent thousands and more of money for control of southern legislators and southern officeholders.

There was a populous rising within the Democratic Party in South Carolina succeeding under Tillman within the Democratic Party, in Texas led by Hogg who was elected Governor. First within and then without the Democratic Party in Alabama, really led by Rubin Cobb, who was not technically a Populist but endorsed as a Populist—as a farmer's alliance man. According to very good opinion, including my opinion, which may not be so good, he was elected Governor of Alabama and counted out in 1892.

The other side had control of the government, and there were no provisions for contesting unless the Governor would call a special session of the legislature to investigate the election to prevent the incumbent from succeeding himself. He did not call the legislature into special session and that led to no little agitation.

So Republicans were busy in the Southern States, as Democrats were in Northern States, lining up with this third party. Then the Cobb movement was defeated and when this was over they got busy to restrict the suffrage.

The convention of 1901 was carried on by delegates, the majority of whom were pledged to Negro disfranchisement; and it was stated rather generally in that State at that time that no white men would be disfranchised, and the constitution was ratified under that kind of an understanding.

That was widely preached, particularly in the hills. They put up two hurdles in that constitution. One hurdle was registration examination requirements by which the applicant should own $300 worth of property, as shown by the tax books, or his wife might own it for him, or 40 acres of land.

If he did not own property, then he had to show an educational qualification and also the names of his employers for the past 5 years.

He had to stand an educational test, an employment test, or property test in order to register.

Then there was a second hurdle, namely, the poll tax. The first hurdle was adequate to prevent the Negro from voting. The second hurdle to some extent, comparatively, was kept in the background and the third hurdle does not discriminate between races—it was a dollar and a half in that State, cumulative up to 45 years of age. So if a man, born and registered in the State, goes from 21 to 45 without paying his poll tax he is liable for a dollar and a half for the preceding period from 21 to 45. That was the poll-tax requirement with an exemption, however, for war veterans.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you the language of the statute?

Dr. NIXON. It is in the constitution. I don't have the language of the statute. I have paid the poll tax and I know that the probate judge has the registration lists turned over to him.

The CHAIRMAN. Do I understand you to say that that constitutional provision is in the present Constitution of Alabama?

Dr. NIXON. Yes, sir. It has not been changed except for a special exemption for war veterans, and that was made after the World War. That saved me, because I got behind with my poll taxes and did not get back until 1920, being with the Peace Conference. They helped us out by passing an exemption for war veterans' poll taxes.

The polling list is made up by checking the names that appear on two lists—the two lists being the registration and the poll-tax list. The two lists were sent to the probate judge's office. The probate judge makes a list of names that appear on both lists. A fellow has to be on both lists to be on the polling list. If you are not on both lists you are not supposed to vote, and generally they don't vote, because if there is any monkey work it is made up in making up the lists, and there is not much check on making up that list. That is the way it is in that State.

Now, this poll-tax requirement for voting is specified in the constitution in these eight poll-tax States. It is very definitely and very clearly in at least seven of them. In Tennessee it is not quite clear, because they rocked along for some time after the constitution without requiring it and then proceeded to require it and enforce it. Enforcement there, however, has varied. I believe theirs is the constitution of 1875.

Mr. GWYNNE. You mean seven of the eight States have these requirements in their constitutions?

Dr. NIXON. They are definitely in the constitutions and there is language in the other constitution in the other, but since they went 15 years without enforcing it and not being a lawyer, I don't want to speak categorically about it, but they do have the poll-tax requirement for voting in Tennessee and it is being enforced at the present time.

Mr. MURDOCK. I wonder, Mr. Chairman, if we could ask some witness, and ask Mr. Geyer to see that it is done, to put those different constitutional provisions in the record?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes. I think we discussed that at the last meeting. It was understood that that would be supplied the committee.

Mr. GEYER. Yes, sir; we will get that in the record. (See appendix 1 at end of hearing.)

Mr. MURDOCK. What about the Georgia Constitution?

Mr. GIBBS. It has been there since it was created.

Dr. NIXON. Yes, sir. Now, the constitution in the poll-tax States, with the exception of Tennessee, came in, roughly, between 1890 and 1910, and statutory enforcement and administrative enforcement came in Tennessee in 1890. One of the Arkansas statutes was held unconstitutional because there was some irregularity in the adoption of the statute—a technical irregularity. That was created, maybe, in 1908.

Two of these States' constitutions were not ratified. That is, the conventions were given power to adopt and, you might say, promulgate constitutions. I don't know of any other State in the Union that has, you might say, an unratified constitution today except Louisiana, which has just escaped the poll-tax column, but is not really completely moved over into the other column. I was 10 years teaching in Louisiana, in New Orleans. In that State a man, instead of paying a poll tax, gets a poll book. He signs it one year and gets a poll certificate and he signs it another year and gets a poll certificate and must have two separate certificates for the two preceding years prior to the time he votes. He also has a registration certificate and he must take these three pieces of paper to the polls, secured at three different times and at two different places. If I had not moved from Louisiana I could not have voted in the last election, because I don't remember where I put one of these certificates.

That is, incidentally, the limitation that the Long regime put through in Louisiana. It abolished a monetary payment but retained all the features of the red tape without minimizing it.

The constitution I am speaking of is the 1921 constitution in Louisiana——

The CHAIRMAN. Dr. Nixon, I am interested in a question and I am sure the other members of the subcommittee are. Perhaps you can throw a little light upon it. Do you think that Congress can by a statute nullify the provisions of a State constitution?

Dr. NIXON. I think that Congress has something to say about the election of Congressmen and Federal officers, according to the United States Constitution.

After all, I understand the proposed bill applies only to these Federal officers and Congressmen and Senators, and it seems to me that Congress has some power to provide a certain amount of democracy in the election of these officers and Senators and Congressmen.

The CHAIRMAN. Of course, it is understood that the bill we are considering will probably be redrafted and introduced in a different form, but in that bill, in the section that probably will be contained in any measure that is introduced, is this language on page 2, line 11: "At any election." That certainly means a primary election. I am just wondering whether or not we could, even assuming that the Congress had the right under the constitutional authority, make it unlawful to require the payment of poll taxes and extend that to the selection of candidates for national office.

Dr. NIXON. In the primary? Well, I believe you could find Supreme Court decisions both ways on that.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Dr. NIXON. You have the Newberry case which would work against your having power and you would have one or two of these Texas cases. Incidentally, there is an intelligent Negro over there by the name of Nixon. He got a case through the Supreme Court and he won, I believe once or twice, and finally they kept changing the tactics on him and he had difficulty in getting through, but there is a decision where it seems to me that something might be worked out.

The CHAIRMAN. I have in mind exactly that case and the Newberry case. I have been trying to read the two cases together and frankly I am confused. I would like to have somebody discuss it.

Dr. NIXON. Of course, the later cases are in your favor, if that means anything. The Newberry case is about 15 years old or something like that.

Mr. GWYNNE. Dr. Nixon, I think this whole question of how far the Federal Government can go in these elections some day has to be met and I think it would be a great service if someone during these hearings would go into that subject from a legal standpoint.

Mr. GEYER. We have planned that and we will have witnesses on that.

Mr. GWYNNE. I will be very interested in hearing that.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; there is confusion in the courts because of these two lines of decisions, and, just as Mr. GWYNNE has said, sooner or later the courts are going to be called upon to flatly decide the question.

Dr. NIXON. It started off in the beginning with Congressmen being picked by the States in any manner they wanted to and if they got any pay the States paid them. Then they moved over to a Federal system with a certain amount of Federal control, and, of course, the Congress certainly exercised a certain control over Southern States after 1865, not only on the theory of rebellion but on the theory, as I understand, of not having republican governments among the Southern States.

I might point out, and then I am through, that this expansion of suffrage in the United States, to a great extent, got its first impetus in the South, through Thomas Jefferson and his followers and his original party.

It is based on, as I see it, an acceptance of belief in the goodness of the common man, and we might include colored men. The majority of people are inherently good and the majority of people are competent to take education and participate in government. That was given a coonskin democratic meaning under Jackson, another President hailing from the South.

I think you will find from Jefferson to Jackson a development of democratic suffrage in the United States with a removal of economic limitations on suffrage, and we had by the time of the Jackson administration the emergence of the common man into the place of political power. I am not counting the colored man; and with the emancipation the South began to toy with the idea of limiting the vote, first to limit Negro voting, and they wound up by limiting white voting, illustrating the old saying of Booker T. Washington that you cannot keep a man down in the ditch without staying down with him.

We prevented Negroes from voting, and when we got through we found we were preventing the poor whites from voting, too. In most of the Southern States, except Mississippi and South Carolina, anyway, there are more whites of voting age unable to vote than there are Negroes, and the poll tax is a large item in that.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the poll tax in those States?

Dr. NIXON. It varies from $1 to $2 per annum. As I say, it is cumulative in Alabama and some other States. Two years must be paid before you can vote, and then some of them have penalties. I believe in one of the States it is doubled if you don't pay by a certain date. Anyway, it is a minimum of $1 if paid on time and in advance—you might say in time to vote—and some of them are cumulative and some of them limited cumulation and some of them penalties. A financial field chairman of the W. P. A. told me that in 11 Southern States we had 1,500,000 families in 1938 with incomes of $200 or less, including what was produced at home, as well as cash income. It is pretty hard for a family like that to vote.

Now, going back to my 16 white men. Of the 15, there were 12 who could not vote. Of the 16, there were 3 voters. There was 1 who might have been limited by residence, so we will count him as the fourth one. There were 4 voters out of the 15 families—between 20 and 25 percent. Of course, not all of them were of age. That was prior to women's suffrage, but that is a pretty small vote for that group of men.

Mr. GWYNNE. In the States that have poll-tax requirements do they also have educational requirements for voting?

Dr. NIXON. Yes, sir. It is generally educational or property requirements. Tennessee does not, I believe. Tennessee has no registration of property except residence, but there is a poll-tax requirement in Tennessee. I believe all these other States have some kind of educational requirement.

Mr. GWYNNE. If the poll-tax requirement is removed, would the educational requirement continue to restrict voting a great deal?

Dr. NIXON. It would. You would still have an educational requirement in Alabama and Tennessee, you would have it in Virginia, and you would have it in other States.

There were three Negroes in my community voting after the Alabama constitution of 1901 because they were landowners and they always voted, but no other Negroes in that precinct did vote, and somehow or another they paid their poll taxes, at least until they got to be 45. It is not required after you are 45, provided you have them paid up when you are 45. That is the way it works there. It all means a decline of civic interest in these rural communities. The political forums in the country stores disappeared because so few people were concerned with voting. They found other subjects to talk about.

I grew up in a country store behind a counter in this little possum-trot community where I got my real human evidence. That is all I have.

The CHAIRMAN. Dr. Nixon, you have testified as to the percentage of people who vote in the States where poll taxes are required. I wonder if you could throw any light on the question of what percentage would vote if that requisite were removed but the requisite as to education still remained.

Dr. NIXON. Well, we have three States which have removed it in the last 20 years, and there is an increase in the voting. North Carolina has no poll-tax requirement and neither has Florida.

The CHAIRMAN. North Carolina has no poll-tax requirement, but an educational requirement?

Dr. NIXON. That is it; but when they removed the poll tax they got an increased vote and they got a vote that is way ahead of South Carolina and Virginia. The vote moved up with the removal of the poll-tax requirement. The vote in Louisiana moved up, and the big vote in the last election can be partly explained by that. And the vote moved up in Florida. So at least we have that collateral evidence that the votes in these States run ahead of the votes in the neighboring States.

You have a direct comparison. There is a poll tax here and no poll tax over here. Of course, in Louisiana we were very much concerned at times about qualifying to vote—whether we voted or not. Sometimes we figured that the vote wasn't worth anything and that some of us were going to lose our votes anyway, as the saying goes, but we wanted to have a vote for civic purposes.

There is a connection between civil rights and the vote.

Incidentally, the same group that worked for expansion of the suffrage among the founding fathers also worked for the Bill of Rights amendment to the Constitution of the United States. There is a connection between those two points historically and constitutionally, you might say, and there is a connection between the vote and the protection of civil rights in all communities, including our own South. I am through.

The CHAIRMAN. Any questions? Thank you very much, Dr. Nixon.

Mr. GEYER. Mr. Chairman, I might state that Senator THOMAS will be here at one of our hearings to discuss the constitutionality of this thing—Senator THOMAS of Utah, so I think we will have a good discussion on that. Mr. Nixon has a few more words he would like to say.

The CHAIRMAN. Very well, Dr. Nixon.

Dr. NIXON. I have a little statement that I picked out of Constitutional Congress of 1901. May I read it?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Dr. NIXON. This is by one of the delegates to the convention. He says:

"There will be, Mr. President, when the battle comes between the Anglo-Saxons and Africans, things said here that we do not want to go before the court of the United States. We will say things down here in our own southern way and in the great old Commonwealth of Alabama that we do not read and criticize day after day."

Now, that is Judge Tom Heflin, a member of the convention, supporting a motion not to keep stenographic notes of the convention. The motion was defeated.

Mr. GEYER. Our next witness is Mr. Collins, if you will call him.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Henry Collins.

Mr. GIBBS. May I ask where you reside?

Mr. COLLINS. Byrn Mawr, Pa.

Acceptance Speech of Hon. Henry A. Wallace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 30 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. HENRY A. WALLACE

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask leave to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of the speech recently delivered by Hon. Henry A. Wallace accepting the Democratic Vice Presidential nomination.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Congressman JONES, Chairman Valentine, ladies, and gentlemen, you are officially conferring on me tonight the greatest honor of my life. The office of Vice President under the Constitution serves in a unique way as a link between the executive and legislative branches of our Government.

And it is an unusually great honor to be the running mate of the one man who, more than any other, represents security for democracy in the modern world.

For nearly 8 years President Roosevelt has battled for democracy and freedom, for their preservation at home and abroad.

Both Germany and the United States were shaken to the depths by the crisis of 1932. Germany met that crisis with dictatorship and Hitler. The United States met it with democracy and Roosevelt.

Hitler believed in government by a band of Nazi overlords, with Hitler himself as the dictator at the top. Roosevelt believed in government by the people and for the people.

Hitler believed in reducing the status of working men and women to that of serfs. Roosevelt believed in putting the common man first—improving his wages and working conditions and upholding in law the right of collective bargaining.

Hitler believed in dominating both individuals and nations by force. Roosevelt believed in the good-neighbor policy, among individuals and among nations.

Hitler believed in war through preparedness, that preparedness was meant for war. Roosevelt believed in peace through preparedness, that preparedness was meant for peace.

Hitler believed in barter deals, so as to fight his economic war preliminary to military war. Roosevelt believed in freer world trade and a higher standard of living for all nations.

Hitler believed that all freedom must be crushed. Roosevelt believed in freedom of speech, press, and religion—those safeguards of free men which we in America hold dearer than life itself.

HITLER AS ENEMY OF DEMOCRACY

Adolf Hitler was the implacable enemy of all democracy. Franklin Roosevelt was its eager servant and faithful defender before the whole world.

Tens of millions of Americans shared the Roosevelt belief in 1933. But not one in a million saw so early and so clearly as he the world-shaking significance of the Hitler doctrine.

Only Roosevelt had the unusual combination of many months spent as a boy in European countries, a comprehensive knowledge of history, experience as Assistant Secretary of the Navy in the first World War, access to the day-by-day information brought in by the trained observers in the State Department, and wisdom to relate that information to its significance for America.

Thus it was that Roosevelt, earlier than almost anyone else, saw that the dominating world issue was freedom and a higher standard of living versus slavery and a lower standard of living for all except the Nazi governing class. Week after week and year after year I have sat in Cabinet meetings and heard the complete accord between the President and Secretary Hull on this issue at a time when most Americans were not aware of the terrible storm cloud on the horizon.

Time after time the President voiced the broadest possible warnings to the public in an effort to stir our people from their slumber. For these efforts he was charged with being a warmonger. But the President kept on telling the truth as he saw it and events have proved both the sincerity of his warnings and the accuracy of his judgment.

Roosevelt has striven with greater vigor than any other President to build international good will, international trade, and a higher standard of living. In these efforts Adolf Hitler was stumbling block No. 1.

Roosevelt's task was rendered difficult enough by the opposition of Hitler abroad, but his handicaps were multiplied by a continuous and bitter partisan opposition at home.

The dominant leadership of this Republican opposition has never understood, and has apparently been unwilling to find out, what the rise of Hitler meant to farmers, workers, and businessmen in the United States.

This blind leadership believed that the United States could be prosperous, no matter what happened to Europe, no matter what happened to Asia, no matter what might be our relationship with Latin America. When Roosevelt tried to adjust the internal affairs of the United States to a sick world they fought him at home as Hitler fought him abroad.

Some of the bitter attacks on Roosevelt's program were directly inspired by agents of Hitler in this country. Others were merely blindly partisan. But, whatever the motive, the effect was the same—these attacks on Roosevelt and his program played into the hands of Hitler. Every evidence of opposition to Roosevelt within the United States has been reason for rejoicing in Berlin.

For more than 7 years Roosevelt has been working steadily to help the American people build an up-to-date democracy capable of bringing security to the families of this Nation. Farm income and factory pay rolls, the two strong legs of recovery, have both been more than doubled. Business profits have been restored and increased.

The danger to democracy from within, which threatened us in 1932, has been safely met. The Roosevelt remedy was not a resort to dictatorship, which so many conservatives were demanding in 1933, but simply more democracy. The Roosevelt programs gave more power to the people.

DEFENSE EFFORT IS SURVEYED

Now we have launched on a great national effort to build up our defenses against the threat from abroad. Under the leadership of Roosevelt this effort was begun several years ago. We now have nearly twice as many airplanes as in 1933 and double the tonnage of fighting ships afloat or under construction. We have more than doubled our Army. This is a splendid start, but it is only a start. It will be pushed until America is fully prepared to defend herself against any emergency.

Like the measures of economic adjustments, defense preparation also met with short-sighted obstructionist tactics. Why build so many airplanes? Why build another set of locks at the Panama Canal? Why spend Government money to store up strategic war materials? Why create a Tennessee Valley Authority to harness the power and water and soil resources of a great Nation against a day of military need?

To some extent those interests obstructing the national defense did have their way. They caused appropriations to be whittled down and brought needless delays. The T. V. A. was fought in Congress, in the courts and in the press. Even a few weeks ago this opposition was still trying to block the building of one more T. V. A. dam, the power which is needed to produce aluminum that is indispensable in our airplanes.

Fortunately that particular opposition has been overcome. But of the 93 votes cast against this measure in the House on July 30 every one was a Republican vote. Such resistance to our military progress was encouraging Hitler, but it was definitely injurious to our own welfare.

Now, at last, some of the Republicans are beginning to see that the Nation really is in danger. National defense is going ahead, and the whole country can give thanks that the program is in such wise and experienced hands.

The total defense of modern war requires thousands of officers and men skilled in the mechanics of the gas engine, the airplane and the tank. We must not only construct a giant air force but know how to operate and service it. We must protect the Panama Canal. We must enforce the Monroe Doctrine with an increased Navy, with air bases and through cooperation with Canada and the rest of the Americas. By preparing completely now, we shall have the best chance of keeping out of war.

But we must face the fact that the dictators have definite designs against this hemisphere. Their tactics here as in Europe are to divide and conquer. They hope by propaganda and bartering agreements to set one nation against another. They hope to set each class against another class. They inspire a multitude of angry voices in every democratic nation. Out of the confusion which they have created they hope to build political power and eventually military power.

The fact that our Presidential campaign and election come now is most welcome to the dictators. They hope to get rid of the unyielding Roosevelt. They know that a political campaign is distracting to our people. And they know that in the many months that would elapse before a new Administration could act effectively they might have their chance.

I do not wish to imply that the Republican leaders are willfully or consciously giving aid and comfort to Hitler. But I do want to emphasize that replacement of Roosevelt, even if it were by the most patriotic leadership that could be found, would cause Hitler to rejoice. I do not believe the American people will turn their backs on the man that Hitler wants to see defeated.

ROOSEVELT IS CALLED SYMBOL

In the opinion of the world—in the eyes of the Nazis and the stricken nations under their heel—Roosevelt has become the symbol of democracy. And more important, he is the symbol of democracy to all the nations of this hemisphere. He has proved his friendship for them by more than 7 years of fair dealing as a good neighbor. Hitler must not be permitted to break the solidarity of the Americas.

If the Americas present to the Axis powers the same divided front as the democracies of Europe presented to them we shall assuredly walk the same path of destruction and lost freedom. In the United States as well as in the other Americas we find certain men who for purposes of their own profit want England to give up her fight against Hitler and who are strong for economic appeasement between the Americas and a German-controlled Europe.

In that direction lies slavery, even though it is sugar-coated with promises of prosperity. Those who stand for business appeasement with Germany are the backbone, even though unwittingly, of the most dangerous of all "fifth columns." For the sake of profit in 1941, they would sell out their own future and their children's freedom.

The businessmen of western Europe followed this path to their sorrow. If we of the Americas are not made of sterner stuff, we shall go down as they have gone down. Our weapons are unity for total defense and a determination not to engage in economic appeasement.

Here in this country we are developing preparedness on all fronts.

On the agricultural front, we have stored in the ever-normal granary tremendous reserve supplies, while at the same time by commodity loans we have protected farm prices and the purchasing power of farmers for city products. We have increased our soil fertility. In every county and every township, there are farmer committees which are prepared to meet any defense need involving agriculture.

REPUBLICANS' VOTE CITED

The farm program has been such a success that Republican leaders are now commending it in the hopes of getting farm votes next November. But the real attitude of the Republicans, which for many years has been against farmers' interests, has been revealed anew by two things which have happened in the last few weeks, since the Republicans adopted their platform and nominated their candidate.

One is a selection of a Republican campaign manager who in 15 years in Congress has never voted for one vital and constructive farm law. The other is the vote in Congress 4 weeks ago on funds for commodity loans—the loans on corn, on wheat, on cotton, which bring about the storage of reserve supplies and protect farmers' prices and income.

Democrats voted 100 percent for these loans. Republicans, led by the personally selected Republican campaign manager, voted 106 to 38 against them. Mind you, this attempt to deal a mortal blow to the farm program was made only 5 weeks after the Republican Party in convention had solemnly pledged itself to help the farmer, including in such help commodity loans.

And it was made only 4 days before the farmers were given assurances by the Republican standard bearer right here in Des Moines that their program would not be harmed. The Republican leaders say nice things about the farm program to get votes from the farmer. But when it comes to voting for the farmer they just don't deliver the goods.

There are now enough Democrats in Congress to protect the farmers against attempts like this to hamstring their program. Those Democrats will be needed again and again after the November election.

HUMAN VALUES ARE STRESSED

On the social-security preparedness front, the administration has started the job of taking care of our aged and unemployed. Continually we have put human values first. We believe that no one who is willing to work should be allowed to starve. We have improved the health of millions by means of food-stamp and school-lunch programs.

We have stood at all times for national unity. To aid in our national defense we have called in the best men regardless of party. In terms of action, the National Defense Commission represents splendid cooperation between agriculture, labor, industry, and government.

We are obtaining national unity on the "fifth column" front by enlisting in a common-sense way the cooperation of local and State authorities. We are determined to break up the gigantic international conspiracy through which the Nazis are trying to subjugate our country.

A materialistic religion of darkness, based on force and lies and led by prophets of evil, is striding across the world. This war is more than a clash of rival imperialisms. It is a war to destroy freedom and democracy.

It is a war to prevent the people of North and South America from developing their resources without paying tribute to Europe and without being the victims of European secret police serving a self-appointed master race. There is no denying the strength and the fanatical zeal of this satanic doctrine.

It transcends economics and politics to invade the personal life. It proclaims might as the supreme god and the new Nazi master race as the mightiest of all, with a special destiny to direct and exploit and enslave every people in the world.

Against this dark and bloody faith we of the New World set the faith of Americanism, of Protestantism, of Catholicism, of Judaism. Our faith is based on belief that the possibilities in an individual are not determined by race, social background, or wealth.

We believe in the maximum freedom which can be obtained without anarchy or intolerance. Democracy is the very heart of the religions which have the largest following in the United States. Democracy and Americanism are identical.

Both are utterly opposed to totalitarianism, with its exaltation of might, its suppression of freedom, and its claims to racial supremacy.

PUTS FAITH IN DEMOCRATIC PARTY

I am happy to respond to the notification ceremonies this evening with an acceptance, because I believe the Democratic Party under the leadership of President Roosevelt is far better equipped than the opposition to preserve the freedom of the Americas. He has understood the Hitler menace from the start.

Powerful elements in our opposition will, if the Republicans come into power, force us to make one economic concession after another to the totalitarian countries. These appeasers will have their way if the Republicans win, because they will have contributed so largely, both politically and financially, to the Republican cause.

These people believe the Republicans in power would give them profitable business with a German-controlled Europe at the earliest possible moment. Most Republicans may not yet realize it, but their party is the party of appeasement in the United States today. It is the party which the totalitarian powers will back in every way possible. Of all the men in the United States, Roosevelt best knows the danger of making economic concessions to the dictators.

Between now and November I propose to do everything I can to arouse the American people to the need for peace through preparedness, to the importance of the solidarity of the Americas, and to the duty of businessmen, workers, and farmers to cooperate together for full employment and for the national defense.

For I sincerely believe that the Democratic Party under Roosevelt will best give us a higher standard of living, unity within our country, safety from external aggression, and freedom on this hemisphere for ourselves and our children.

United States Export Trade During European War Period

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK CARLSON
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 30, 1940

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following remarks and tables on the United States export trade during the European war period.

Hitler and the European war have prevented the further bogging down of the Roosevelt-Hull reciprocal-trade program as it affects our export trade. In comparing our export trade for the first 9 months of the European war, September 1939 to May 1940, with the corresponding months of 1938 and 1939, it will be seen that the trend of our export trade in the 1939 period was downward from exports of the 1938 period in all groups of exports. Then, in the war period of 1940, exports were somewhat stimulated in some groups due to war demands.

Wheat and other crude foodstuffs are the only export group not benefiting from the European war. (See table 3.)

Table 3 shows conclusively the serious loss of foreign markets by the farmers of the United States. You will note that in 1938 crude foodstuffs exported totaled $190,409,000, and this has been reduced to $65,230,000 for the same period in 1940. This table shows about a 66-percent reduction in exports of farm products from 1938 to 1940. Agriculture has already suffered a severe dislocation and inequality because of the present European war. The purchasing power of the farmer's dollar at the present time is 78 cents, using the 1910–14 period as a hundred. In my opinion, we will not have economic prosperity in the United States until agriculture is placed on a parity with labor and industry.

UNITED STATES EXPORTS OF RAW MATERIALS, FOODSTUFFS, AND MANUFACTURED PRODUCTS DURING THE FIRST 9 MONTHS OF EUROPEAN WAR, SEPTEMBER 1939 TO MAY 1940, BY WORLD TRADE AREAS

TABLE 1.—*Total domestic exports of United States*

[Source: U. S. Department of Commerce figures]

Exported to—	9 months ending May 31—		
	1938 (pre-war)	1939 (pre-war)	1940 (war period)
Total exports of United States	$2,590,636,000	$2,197,625,000	$2,928,674,000
Latin America:			
Mexico, Central America, Cuba, and West Indies	224,652,000	201,575,000	257,938,000
South America	257,992,000	210,476,000	332,839,000
Total, Latin America	482,644,000	412,051,000	590,777,000
Canada, etc.[1]	364,942,000	300,351,000	442,052,000
Europe	1,151,911,000	939,676,000	1,238,915,000
Asia	410,075,000	395,973,000	484,568,000
Oceania	75,898,000	61,804,000	72,547,000
Africa	105,166,000	87,770,000	99,815,000

[1] Includes Newfoundland, Labrador, Miquelon, and Greenland.

TABLE 2.—*Exports of crude materials (cotton, tobacco, crude petroleum, coal, phosphate rock, undressed furs, etc.)*

Exported to—	9 months ending May 31—		
	1938 (pre-war)	1939 (pre-war)	1940 (war period)
Total crude materials	$372,377,000	$400,369,000	$539,205,000
Latin America:			
Mexico, Central America, Cuba, and West Indies	6,702,000	4,625,000	7,239,000
South America	5,513,000	5,799,000	11,660,000
Total, Latin America	12,215,000	10,424,000	18,899,000
Canada, etc.[1]	84,687,000	72,785,000	106,922,000
Europe	382,616,000	242,070,000	300,244,000
Asia	84,248,000	74,400,000	103,918,000
Oceania	6,568,000	7,389,000	8,858,000
Africa	2,043,000	2,301,000	2,364,000

[1] Includes Newfoundland, Labrador, Miquelon, and Greenland.

TABLE 3.—*Exports of crude foodstuffs (wheat, corn, and other grains, apples, oranges, and other fresh fruits, potatoes and other fresh vegetables, etc.)*

Exported to—	9 months ending May 31—		
	1938 (pre-war)	1939 (pre-war)	1940 (war period)
Total crude foodstuffs	$190,409,000	$111,034,000	$65,230,000
Latin America:			
Mexico, Central America, Cuba, and West Indies	8,188,000	6,904,000	5,969,000
South America	3,948,000	1,663,000	2,058,000
Total, Latin America	12,136,000	8,567,000	8,027,000
Canada, etc.[1]	45,936,000	21,957,000	19,892,000
Europe	129,050,000	74,990,000	34,227,000
Asia	2,326,000	4,598,000	2,392,000
Oceania	309,000	274,000	206,000
Africa	652,000	648,000	486,000

[1] Includes Newfoundland, Labrador, Miquelon, and Greenland.

TABLE 4.—*Exports of manufactured foodstuffs (wheat flour, meats—Hams, bacon, pork, and canned meats—Lard, edible oils and fats, canned vegetables, fruits and fish, butter, cheese, sugar, oil cake and meal, etc.)*

Exported to—	9 months ending May 31—		
	1938 (pre-war)	1939 (pre-war)	1940 (war period)
Total manufactured foodstuffs	$144,113,000	$147,886,000	$170,124,000
Latin America:			
Mexico, Central America, Cuba, and West Indies	27,642,000	24,972,000	28,905,000
South America	7,479,000	8,737,000	12,020,000
Total, Latin America	35,121,000	33,709,000	40,925,000
Canada, etc.[1]	8,172,000	8,236,000	13,932,000
Europe	84,211,000	87,220,000	94,939,000
Asia	11,604,000	14,305,000	15,554,000
Oceania	1,742,000	1,914,000	1,963,000
Africa	3,263,000	2,502,000	2,811,000

[1] Includes Newfoundland, Labrador, Miquelon, and Greenland.

TABLE 5.—*Exports of semimanufactures (lumber and sawed timber, wood pulp, cotton yarn, naval stores, leather, gas and fuel oil, crude sulfur, scrap iron, ferro-alloys, aluminum, copper and brass, coal-tar and chemical products, pigments, etc.)*

Exported to—	9 months ending May 31—		
	1938 (pre-war)	1939 (pre-war)	1940 (war period)
Total semimanufactures	$445,411,000	$380,380,000	$624,343,000
Latin America:			
Mexico, Central America, Cuba, and West Indies	38,161,000	31,686,000	45,419,000
South America	32,969,000	25,960,000	74,585,000
Total, Latin America	71,130,000	57,646,000	120,004,000
Canada, etc.[1]	45,052,000	37,437,000	72,605,000
Europe	199,433,000	169,173,000	275,049,000
Asia	106,746,000	99,211,000	129,181,000
Oceania	10,029,000	7,788,000	11,104,000
Africa	13,021,000	9,125,000	16,400,000

[1] Includes Newfoundland, Labrador, Miquelon, and Greenland.

TABLE 6.—*Exports of finished manufactures (machinery, iron and steel-mill products, aircraft, motortrucks and passenger cars, explosives, firearms and ammunition, lubricating oil and gasoline, cotton and rayon goods, leather, rubber, glass, and paper products, etc.)*

Exported to—	9 months ending May 31—		
	1938 (pre-war)	1939 (pre-war)	1940 (war period)
Total finished manufactures	$1,238,326,000	$1,148,956,000	$1,529,772,000
Latin America:			
Mexico, Central America, Cuba, and West Indies	143,959,000	133,388,000	170,406,000
South America	208,083,000	168,317,000	232,516,000
Total, Latin America	352,042,000	301,705,000	402,922,000
Canada, etc.[1]	181,095,000	159,936,000	228,701,000
Europe	356,601,000	366,223,000	534,456,000
Asia	205,151,000	203,459,000	233,523,000
Oceania	57,250,000	44,439,000	52,416,000
Africa	86,187,000	73,194,000	77,754,000

[1] Includes Newfoundland, Labrador, Miquelon, and Greenland.

My Record in Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 30, 1940

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, the problems of the Fourth Congressional District of Louisiana are many and varied. Much study is necessary before one can be fully informed as to the nature and needs of all of the industries of the great section of northwest Louisiana, comprising this congressional district. For instance there is the agricultural industry, lumber industry, pulpwood industry, oil industry, gas industry, and innumerable other industries which require consideration in the handling of their affairs in Washington.

Flood control: I early sensed the necessity of aggressive action in reference to curbing the floods which almost yearly come down the Red River Valley, inundating our lands, destroying our crops, and injuring our people. During the time I have been in Congress I have worked aggressively to aid in bringing about the construction of the Dennison Dam, carrying with it an authorized appropriation of $54,000,000. During this same time I have worked to obtain the building of the Wallace Lake Dam and reservoir in Caddo and De Soto Parishes, at a cost of $812,000. Today I have assurances that actual construction of this dam will begin within 60 days and will be prosecuted to completion. As to the Bodcau Dam and Reservoir, I have appeared in Congress twice to obtain amendments to the law making the construction of the dam possible, and each time I have had to ask that the appropriations authorized for this purpose be increased—until now it is expected to cost three and one-half million dollars. Work has been delayed on this project because of the high flood waters this year, which prevented the beginning of actual work; but this work also will begin at an early date.

During the time of my service in Congress, I have obtained more than $100,000 for cleaning out and developing Bayou Pierre which runs from Broadmoor subdivision in Shreveport, La., south through De Soto and Red River Parishes into Natchitoches Parish. I have worked, and am continuing to work, to obtain the building of a levee along Red River in Red River Parish between Coushatta Bayou and Loggy Bayou, and for a dam on Black Bayou.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION

Farming is still the largest single industry in northwest Louisiana. For years my friends on the farms have lived without the opportunities that the city dwellers have. Within recent years good roads have been built throughout the countryside so that the farmers can bring to the market the products of the farm. Electricity, which is a God-given right of every man, has not kept pace with the progress of the building of roads. Hundreds of thousands of farms in Louisiana are not yet equipped with electricity and are without the aid of what is now a simple necessity of life. As a result of my work in Congress, almost half a million dollars has been allotted by the Rural Electrification Administration to the Fourth Congressional District of Louisiana. The valley membership corporation project from Grant Parish has been granted extensions through Red River and De Soto Parishes. The Panola County (Tex.) R. E. A. project, at my insistence, was brought into De Soto Parish and has been made to serve hundreds of farm people in this area. I have obtained funds for the beginning of the Bossier-Webster-Bienville project. Only a few days ago I obtained an allotment of $147,000 for extensions to the Claiborne project. I will continue to work until funds are available to build the lines necessary to place low-price electricity at the doorstep of every farmhouse which desires and wants a means of lighting the home at night and of furnishing power to operate the machinery of the farm during the day and all of the conveniences of a modern country home.

WORK FOR AGRICULTURE

The plight of the cotton farmers in the United States has been pitiful. It has been growing worse year by year. As I have lived on the farms in Louisiana and know the problems of the Louisiana farmer, I immediately went to work 4 years ago on behalf of our farming population. I have supported every appropriation for parity payments, soil-conservation payments, all appropriations for the purpose of controlling the boll weevil and other insects, and for the purpose of building up our farms and relieving suffering among our farmers. I have received letters from the Soil Conservation Service thanking me for speeches I have made on the floor of the House of Representatives, and for the active work which I have given to the cause of the Soil Conservation Service,

which, in my opinion, gives to our farmers invaluable assistance in restoring the soil, preventing wash and soil erosion, and putting into effect soil-conserving practices.

Since I have been Congressman more money has been appropriated for the farmers of the United States, and more money has been received by the cotton farmers of Louisiana than at any other time during the history of the United States from the Federal Government. The appropriation has gone as high as $1,250,000,000 per year for farm purposes, and I have voted for every dollar of this amount.

Oat loans: One of the things which I have accomplished and in which I take pride was the cancelation of the oat loans. In 1934 these loans were made to our farmers as relief loans. They were never intended to be collected, but year by year the Department of Agriculture constantly reminded our farmers of the fact that these loans were still owing and unpaid. Several thousand farmers in the Fourth Congressional District owed from $10 up to several hundred dollars, and could not pay these loans. In the State of Louisiana alone the sum of $980,000 was owed by our farmers under this oat relief loan. As a result of my efforts, these loans were canceled off the books of the Department of Agriculture, and notes returned to the farmers without charge. This saved our hard-pressed farmers hundreds of thousands of dollars.

Purchase of surplus commodities: When the farm commodities in north Louisiana ripened in the field and no purchasers were obtainable, I have gone to work to help our farmers. Twice during my tenure of office I have caused the Federal Surplus Marketing Corporation to purchase large quantities of tomatoes from all parts of the Fourth Congressional District, especially in the areas around Keithville and Logansport. I have also obtained the purchase of other farm commodities and have obtained widespread distribution of foods to hundreds of needy people in our midst.

W. P. A. and P. W. A. activities: I have placed my influence behind applications for W. P. A. and P. W. A. projects in every section of the Fourth Congressional District. As a result of my efforts, millions of dollars have been brought into the Fourth Congressional District, and countless numbers of projects have been approved and construction has begun, thereby giving relief work to thousands of our needy people. In almost every community either new school buildings have been constructed or old ones have been repaired with funds coming from these projects. Roads have been built, parks created and beautified, sewing projects established, and countless thousands of other projects have been placed in the Fourth Congressional District.

National defense: As a member of the Military Affairs Committee, the burden of the national-defense program has fallen upon the members of this committee. Every bit of legislation having for its purpose the expansion of the Army, to insure our national safety, has had the approval of this powerful committee. I can honestly tell the people of the Fourth Congressional District that I have had my full part in the writing of the national-defense program.

It is this committee on Military Affairs that has recently reported out the National Guard bill, which permits the President to call into active service for training purposes the entire National Guard of 342,000 men. This committee has before it now for consideration the bill to provide for selective military service as a further means of giving the Nation adequate protection against our enemies. If the Army now is beginning to have more airplanes, tanks, guns, motorized equipment, ammunition, searchlights, range finders, and all kinds of mechanism and equipment necessary for a highly trained modern protective force, it is due to the constant efforts of the members of the Military Affairs Committee who have not forsaken their post of duty in an emergency.

Barksdale Field: I have considered Barksdale Field as a Federal institution belonging to the entire Fourth Congressional District. Since I took office 4 years ago, the sum of $2,000,000 has been spent upon further expansion of the facilities of Barksdale. The War Department tells me today that within the near future the facilities of this great Army air post will be expanded fully 33 percent more in making it one of the prime keys in the air-defense system of America. We who live in northwest Louisiana take pride in the knowledge that we have in our midst such an important cog in the national-defense system, and I pledge my further efforts to the continued growth and expansion of this Army post.

For months I nurtured through the Military Affairs Committee the thought that the Fourth Congressional District of Louisiana should have an antiaircraft National Guard unit. This unit is now a reality, and it is a matter of pride to our people.

Army maneuvers: I have had my part in interesting the War Department in Army maneuvers in central Louisiana. The greatest Army peacetime maneuvers were held in April and May out of Camp Beauregard, near Alexandria, La. Almost equal in importance are the National Guard maneuvers, which are still continuing in central Louisiana at the present time. Louisiana has had its part in national-defense preparation.

Americanism: I have always believed that we in the United States have the finest land under the shining sun. An alien who comes to our shores should love and revere our institutions. A foreigner who comes to live among us, not intending to respect our laws, should immediately be returned to the land of his birth and be made to live in the land from which he came. With this in mind, I have always supported the Dies Americanism committee and have voted for every bit of legislation which will place a penalty upon disloyalty and a badge of honor upon patriotism. I have been instrumental in having many of my ideas written into laws of the United States, and these laws now serve as a means of protection to the God-fearing, law-abiding people of America, who love her traditions and glory in her institutions.

Conclusion: In this short summary I have omitted many of the important matters which I have handled for our people. It has always been my pleasure to hear from every constituent within the Fourth Congressional District and to handle any matter of Federal Government business which may be brought to my attention. I believe that your Congressman is your servant and that his office should be made to serve.

Just an English Lecturer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RUSH D. HOLT

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 28 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

ARTICLE BY HON. RUSH D. HOLT, OF WEST VIRGINIA

Mr. HOLT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by me entitled "Just an English Lecturer."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUST AN ENGLISH LECTURER

When Senator WHEELER told the story of Sir George Paish advising him that he was in our country to get the United States into the war, some of the critics stated that the English economist was here only as an English lecturer.

This is not the first experience that our country has had with English lecturers. One of the most tragic experiences we had with them was in 1915, 1916, and 1917, when the drive was being made to get America in the last World War.

When Sidney Rogerson wrote his now famous book on propaganda for Great Britain sometime ago, he told us that the Englishmen would be over here "just to lecture." The words of Sidney Rogerson are:

"We shall, as before, send over our leading literary lights and other men with names well known in the United States to put our point of view over the dinner table."

The procession has not only been large but regular since the beginning of the war. The New York Times of October 13, 1939,

notes the arrival of one of the more famous ones. It says: "One passenger was Lord Marley, deputy speaker of the British House of Lords, who is here to fulfill a lecture engagement arranged several months ago."

Ten days later, another famous Englishman arrived. The Times notes that: "Duff Cooper sees revolt ending war—ex-Lord British Admiralty here, predicts conservative insurrection in Reich—holds monarchy likely—Otto von Hapsburg may rule, he says upon arrival on the Manhattan to lecture." It states that he will go to the west coast to begin his lecture on the subjects The Survival of Liberty and The World We Live In.

But that ship did not bring Lord Duff Cooper, now director of the English propaganda, but the article says:

"S. K. Ratcliffe, British writer and lecturer, another passenger, said that fear of public opinion was dominating the strategy of the commands.

"Besides Mr. Duff Cooper and Mrs. Ratcliffe, there were four other visiting British lecturers aboard the Manhattan. The others were Cecil Roberts, former war correspondent and novelist; I. O. Richards, lecturer at Cambridge University; R. Ellis Roberts, journalist and author; and Miss Phyllis Bottome, novelist."

MY WAR WORK

It will be recalled that about this time Mr. Cooper's book, The Second World War, appeared on the scene. His wife advised reporters that her trip to accompany Mr. Cooper was "my war work." This was similar to the statement of the English actors who replied to a challenge of why they were not in England fighting with the words that they were of more value to England in the United States than they were fighting, and, furthermore, that Lord Lothian himself had advised their staying to be soldiers over the footlights.

Herbert Elvin, vice president of the British Trades Union Congress, was also a visitor to get the viewpoint over to the labor leaders. It will be recalled that similar representatives had come over for the same purpose before the previous World War.

Lord Marley came soon thereafter, as did many others. They were carrying out the work of Sir Gilbert Parker, who had been here 25 years before. Sir Gilbert said that these lecturers were not particularly in America "to make speeches or give lectures, but to meet people, particularly those connected with the universities, and explain the British case." It is interesting to note that one of the well-known English propagandists was using Harvard University as his post-office address to carry on his activities, but the officials of that university were willing and cooperative in the cause of getting America to agree with the British view.

The list of English lecturers and propagandists runs into the dozens. One of their best forums is the Pilgrims Club, where they can get the contacts with the financial circles and with the powerful eastern press.

The exposure of Sir George Paish has caused quite a stir in the English Embassy here. It was embarrassing that he got caught or that he was so indiscreet as to say those things to the wrong person.

LORD LOTHIAN ADVISED THEM NOT TO GET CAUGHT

Lord Lothian had been doing his best to keep the English propaganda activity under cover. He had written in the London Observer sometime before these words:

"If America became persuaded that the United States was being maneuvered into commitment to war by foreign intrigue or for reasons of politics and finance, it might swing back violently to the ultra isolationism of the Ludlow amendment."

Sir George had worked hard for the English cause. He wanted us to participate in the war, but he got caught doing it.

However, he will be safe from much publicity on his work, quite different than if he had been doing the work for another country. He will not be checked by the reporters of certain eastern newspapers. He will go back to England as a man who talked too much to the wrong person. Both the English Embassy officials and many of our high Government officials hope the matter will soon be forgotten and that in Sir George's place will be sent another English lecturer who will not get caught.

Army Construction Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN TABER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 30, 1940

STATEMENT FROM THE WAR DEPARTMENT

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement issued by the War Department on August 24, 1940:

ADDITIONAL CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS FOR ARMY SHELTERS

The War Department announced today that construction of cantonments in cold-weather climates and the establishment of tent camps in warm climates are being initiated in order to provide additional shelter for troops of the Regular Army and the National Guard under the present expansion program.

Due to lack of funds only a start on these camps can be made, and the full construction program to make them habitable must wait further appropriations which cannot be requested until full authority for calling the National Guard and legislation for selective service has been enacted.

In all cases existing facilities are to be utilized to their maximum capacity. Construction at the following listed locations is contemplated for units as indicated:

Location	Units to be provided for	Approximate strength	Type of construction
Fort Clark, Tex.	1 square division	18,300	Utilities and hospital facilities for tent camp.
	Miscellaneous troops	537	
Fort McClellan, Ala.	1 square division	18,300	Do.
Do	1 observation squadron	163	
Camp Jackson, S. C.	1 square division	18,000	Do.
Do	1 antitank battalion	547	
Do	1 Field Artillery regiment	1,245	
Do	Miscellaneous units	1,450	
Fort Sill, Okla.	1 square division	18,000	Do.
Do	1 observation squadron	163	
Do	1 Field Artillery regiment	1,448	
Do	Three Hundred and Forty-ninth Field Artillery.	1,194	
Do	Increase to present organization.	65	
Massachusetts Military Reservation, Falmouth, Mass.	3 regiments	5,625	Cantonment, with necessary utilities and hospital facilities.
Do	Coast Artillery (antiaircraft).		
	Later:		
Do	1 square division	18,300	
Do	1 battalion Infantry	700	
Total		24,625	
Harbor defense of Boston, Mass.	1 harbor defense regiment	2,319	Do.
Harbor defense of Long Island, N. Y.	do	1,798	Do.
Harbor, defense, Narragansett, R. I.	do	1,798	Do.
Harbor defense, Portland, Maine.	do	1,798	Do.
Harbor defense, Sandy Hook.	do	2,319	Do.
Harbor defense, Chesapeake Bay.	do	1,798	Do.
Fort Dix, N. J.	1 square division	18,300	Do.
Fort Bragg, N. C.	Ninth Division and miscellaneous troops.	11,050	Do.
Do	1,000-man recruit-reception center.		
Camp Custer, Mich.	Fifth Division and miscellaneous troops.	9,000	Do.
Do	1,000-man recruit-reception center.		
Fort Benning, Ga.	Armored division	16,000	Do.
Do	Fourth Division		
Virginia State Camp, Virginia Beach, Va.	1 Coast Artillery regiment (155-mm. guns).	1,986	Do.
Total		70,106	
Camp Blanding, Fla.	2 square divisions	36,600	Necessary utilities and hospital facilities for tent camp.
Do	2 Field Artillery regiments	2,800	
Camp Shelby, Miss.	2 square divisions	36,600	Do.
Do	Miscellaneous units	5,250	
Fort Monmouth, N. J.	First Signal Company (construction).	148	Cantonment with necessary utilities and hospital facilities.
	First Signal Company (repair).	134	
Fort Belvoir, Va.	Miscellaneous engineering units.	420	Do.
Fort Brown, Tex.	Increases to Twelfth Cavalry.	364	Do.
Fort Crockett, Tex.	Coast Artillery units	446	Do.
Fort Sam Houston, Tex.	Miscellaneous units, including recruit-reception center.	4,000	Do.
Normoyle General Depot.	Miscellaneous increases to garrison.	307	Do.
Fort Lewis, Wash.	Miscellaneous units	675	Do.
Do	1 square division	18,300	
Do	Recruit-reception center for 1,000 men.		
Camp Ord, Calif.	Seventh Division and miscellaneous units.	10,000	Do.
Total		34,794	

Location	Units to be provided for	Approximate strength	Type of construction
Camp McQuaide, Calif.	1 Coast Artillery Corps regiment (155 mm. guns).	1,986	Necessary utilities and hospital facilities for tent camp.
Camp Robinson, Ark.	1 square division	18,300	Utilities, hospitalization for tent camp.
Do	1 Infantry regiment	2,776	
Fort Devens, Mass.	1,500-man recruit-reception center.		Cantonment, with necessary utilities and hospital facilities.
Fort Sheridan, Ill.	1,000-man recruit-reception center.		Do.
Fort Snelling, Minn.	500-man recruit-reception center.		Do.
Total		36,294	
Fort Leavenworth, Kans.	do		Do.
Fort Benjamin Harrison, Ind.	1,000-man recruit-reception center.		Do.
Fort George G. Meade, Md.	1,500-man recruit-reception center.		Do.

Specific designation of the units which will occupy these camps will be announced at a later date.

Why Not Use All the Tax To Build Nation's Defense?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 30, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE RALEIGH (N. C.) UNION HERALD

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which was recently published in the Union Herald, of Raleigh, N. C.:

WHY NOT USE ALL THE TAX TO BUILD NATION'S DEFENSE?

America—man, woman, and child—is wholeheartedly backing the national-defense program, a program which will cost untold billions of dollars, but provisions which have been made for paying this staggering bill do not meet with general public approval.

John and Jane Public know that they, and they alone, in the final analysis, shall have to pay the bill. John and Jane, being Americans, would not for a moment consider avoiding their obligations of citizenship. They are ready, they have placed their shoulders to the wheel. That is the American way of doing things.

John and Jane feel, and rightly so, that Congress should build a national-defense tax structure so designed that every dollar paid by them as a direct result of the defense program shall go into the Federal Treasury to be used in building up the country's Military and Naval Establishments.

The citizens of this country have the right to resent the fact that the "defense tax" on beer is five-twelfths of a cent a bottle, and yet they, the consumers, have to pay a cent extra a bottle because of the tax.

Then take the tax on cigarettes. The defense tax on this item is half a cent a package. But the purchaser of a single pack must of necessity pay a cent extra per package. This means the consumer is paying the defense tax, and in addition a sum equal to the tax which is not going into the defense fund.

The smallest unit in our monetary system, of course, is the penny, and there is where the trouble lies. There is no reason to meddle with the monetary set-up to correct this evil. A simple amendment to the tax structure will solve everything and at the same time get the bill paid quicker.

All that Congress has to do is to enact into law a schedule providing that a tax of 1 cent shall be paid on each bottle of beer and on each package of cigarettes. And similar action should be taken on all other items coming under the defense tax where the single unit purchased by the consumer is taxed less than 1 cent.

In fairness to the consuming public Congress should take immediate action along these lines. Such an increase would cost the public no more than it is paying today, but—and this is important—it would add hundreds of millions of dollars to the fund being collected to bulwark the Nation's defense structure.

Those who framed the national defense tax structure did not contemplate that the manufacturer or the dealer would absorb the tax. That just isn't done. The ultimate consumer always pays the bill. That has been true in the past. It will continue in the future.

That fact being recognized and acknowledged, let's turn into the defense fund 100 percent of each penny now being paid by the consumer as "defense tax" instead of only five-twelfths or one-half of each penny as is the case where beer and cigarettes are involved.

And while the tax structure is being overhauled why not impose a defense tax of 1 cent a bottle on soft drinks?

Let's get this staggering defense bill paid. Soft drinks, like beer, whiskey, and cigarettes, are a luxury. They come well within the class of items upon which a tax for national defense can, and should, be imposed.

The nations of Europe in arming to the teeth, making necessary now the girding of our loins for defense of our shores, did so by forcing near unbelievable sacrifices upon the people. May the day never come when in America similar action will be necessary. Let's avoid this danger.

It can be avoided by building a tax plan which will bring into the defense fund every penny paid by the consumer "for defense," and by taxing luxury products which, if necessary, could be dispensed with entirely.

John and Jane don't want to be forced to do without any of the luxuries they have come to like so well. That is why they want to get the bill paid as rapidly as possible. Being intelligent, they know if only approximately one-half of what they pay for national defense goes into the defense fund, it will be a long time before "Paid in full" is stamped across the face of the bill.

It must be recognized that Congress, in enacting the defense-tax bill, was working against time. There was little opportunity for study and research. Something had to be done and done quickly. It was done. Now the time has come to perfect the emergency-builded patchwork. Congress should lose little time in accomplishing the task.

Machines, Not Men, Are the Country's Most Urgent Need

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL HINSHAW

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 30, 1940

ARTICLE BY MAJ. AL WILLIAMS

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Daily News of yesterday:

[From the Washington Daily News of August 29, 1940]

MACHINES, NOT MEN, ARE THE COUNTRY'S MOST URGENT NEED

(By Al Williams)

Air power smashed this war wide open, but the greatest casualty has been the collapse of the Army and Navy General Staffs of France, England, and the United States.

Not only has air power demonstrated that traditional machinery, such as infantrymen and the old-type sea power, cannot withstand air attack, but the men who refused to change their minds to conform to mechanized standards have proved their unfitness. General in their text, these indictments have a special place at this moment in this country.

Few, if any, high-ranking officers in our Army and Navy seem to have more than a vague idea of what modern air power or its organization means. Our experts have been caught flat-footed, having given only casual attention to all that has been happening in Europe in the last 5 years. They scoffed at the Italian conception of the modern air arm, modeled after the plan of General Douhet. They ignored the concentrated and sustained German program toward air-power domination, which got under way with the rise of Hitler in 1933.

COULDN'T BELIEVE IT

There never was any secrecy about the Germans' belief that air power would win the next war or about their gigantic plans for building air-war machinery. Our war experts just did not believe that the old order of things could or would be changed. And, since conscription is a great issue before the American public today, it is fitting that we consider why it happens to be an issue at all.

If our Army General Staff had kept itself thoroughly open-minded and alert, we would never have been caught short on antiaircraft guns of all calibers and on tanks, to say nothing of planes. Time and again American Army leaders talk and preach about the two and three million men required to defend America. They are still thinking in terms of the last World War requirements. They cannot get away from millions of infantrymen armed with rifles, bayonets, and hand grenades.

PRIMING CHARGE NEEDED

Despite all that has happened in Europe, they have not caught the basic formula for modern war power, and they may never change their minds until disaster forces them.

The way to forestall this dire eventuality is to create quickly a supreme defense council of outstanding American business executives who have proved their ability to get things done. The priming charge to change our military and naval oligarchies must come from outside the services.

But to cover up their delinquencies in vision, military leaders scream vaguely for millions of men and more planes and tanks. If we must rearm, and we certainly must, we should tackle the job in a sensible way. This, to my way of thinking, would mean immediately equipping the Regular Army with thousands of planes and tanks and antiaircraft guns and teaching that Army to use them. Next would come the National Guard, and then we might think of further expansion.

MACHINES, NOT MEN

Official Washington would not believe when flying men predicted the present type of war as a dead certainty, and forecast every development before it happened. We can't expect official Washington to heed insistence upon the necessity for modeling our national defense on the lessons of this war—that air power and mechanized forces are supreme, with foot soldiers only for policing.

When French resistance broke, American Army experts immediately asserted that millions of Germans, superior in number of the four or five million men claimed to be under arms for France, explained the catastrophe. I claimed that, when the truth was known, it would be found that not more than 500,000 German troops had been used in the continental campaigns.

Recently Col. William (Wild Bill) Donovan returned from Europe and stated that the German masses were not numerically impressive—that it was a "spearhead (operating airplanes and tanks) of 50,000 men that beat France."

The actual fighting force need not be huge; the job requiring the big use of men is construction and maintenance of machinery.

The Eagles' Pledge to America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 29, 1940

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, one of the most patriotic organizations in existence in America is the Fraternal Order of Eagles.

This patriotic fraternity has extended its influence through hundreds of American communities and has always fostered a program designed to promote the well-being of the citizens of this great Nation.

Commencing with a deep interest in the American home, and recalling the adage that "home is a brilliant setting in which the brightest jewel is mother," for years the Fraternal Order of Eagles has championed the idea of the annual observance of Mother's Day.

Credit is given this splendid organization for writing the first mother's pension law. It is interesting to note that the author of the first workmen's compensation law was a member of the Fraternal Order of Eagles. In like manner the first old-age pension law that was deemed constitutional was written by this great humanitarian fraternity.

Thus, through the years, love of God, country, and the American home have been a trinity of ideals to which the nearly 2,000 lodges of the Fraternal Order of Eagles in the United States have given forceful expression. Founded on such ideals, and fortified with a burning desire to promote the best interests of America, therein lies the cause for the constant growth of one of America's most favored fraternal organizations.

Through the frenzy and stress of 1917–18, when the whole Nation was united in an effort to save democracy, the Fraternal Order of Eagles, through thousands of members, enlisted in the fight to preserve the ideals of democracy by membership in either the military life of the Nation or in the many civilian tasks that counted so greatly in the effort to preserve world civilization.

As a member of the Altoona, Pa., Aerie of the Fraternal Order of Eagles, I am proud of the true patriotic fervor that dominated the national convention of the Fraternal Order of Eagles, and which inspired the following resolution adopted at Chicago during the period of August 15 to 19.

In conjunction with the resolution, the 1940 delegates to the convention, representing nearly 700,000 Eagles, adopted the Eagles' pledge to America, which is a forceful and inspiring message during these trying days.

The Eagles' pledge may well be recited in every school in the land, and uttered from the lips of every red-blooded American as a proper antidote for the poisonous stream of propaganda emanating from un-American sources in our fair land.

The pledge and resolution are as follows:

THE EAGLES' PLEDGE TO AMERICA

Injustice and hatred have achieved their end. Over there, the fertile fields where grain should be growing are gashed with shell holes and wet with human blood. The soft clouds of midsummer are pierced with the bulletlike speed of death-dealing planes. And the quiet night shudders with the death cries of women and children.

Six of the seven primary powers of the world are at war. More men are under arms today than ever before in the history of the world. To build swift instruments of death, the blessings of science have been prostituted. The bones of boys and men who fell a quarter of a century ago have not dissolved into dust; yet over them, this very day, new bodies, distorted and mangled, rot by the roadside or lie twisted and misshapen upon the battlefield.

Ours is a country dedicated to the belief that men have certain inalienable rights. Among these are "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." To bring this Republic into existence, men and women suffered and died. Today, as never before, America is threatened by forces from beyond the seas and by forces from within.

To foreign armies that would desecrate our shores and to their leaders, we say: "America was built by men and women who crossed the seas to escape political and religious persecution. From the forests and rivers, from fertile valleys and plains, they built a nation dedicated to God and to the finest ideals alive in the soul of man. These ideals we hold more precious than life. Deprived of them, we count life not worth living. To our children, to the next generation, we have promised to hand down this heritage of freedom. No matter what the sacrifice, no matter what the suffering, we will keep the faith. No foreign army shall invade our continent so long as there are men and women in this country who find inspiration in American history and who deserve the privilege of living under the Stars and Stripes."

To those within our midst who would betray our country, who would seek to surrender the keys of America to those that hate our form of government, covet our wealth, and envy us the happiness that, through the grace of God, has found here its abiding place—to these traitors we say, "Take the first ship to the country whose government you serve. Take your crafty minds and Judas hearts to the dictators whose slimy gold supports you. Leave forever a country whose blessed soil is too decent to hold your faithless bodies."

For any of this treacherous group who are caught in acts or crimes harmful to our Government, we demand immediate and condign punishment. We have witnessed the successful invasion of peaceful countries that had been betrayed and weakened beyond hope of adequate defense by the creatures that, in paragraphs bitter with contempt, future historians will characterize as the "fifth column." And, having witnessed the deeds of these traitors, we pledge our individual and group strength to the work of exposing their acts, both of omission and of commission, wherever opportunities present themselves to us.

Resolved, to the Governor of our State and to the President of the United States, we pledge, individually, and as a fraternal group that numbers almost three-quarters of a million men and women, our loyalty to the Constitutions of State and Nation. We pledge ourselves to the service of America. And, with the full understanding of what this vow entails, we pledge our willingness to give the priceless gift that men call life so that our children may inherit the blessings of freedom.

We dedicate, in this hour, ourselves and the Fraternal Order of Eagles to the preservation of America and for what it stands among peace-loving peoples of the world. May God and our fellow citizens help us keep this vow!

(Unanimously adopted August 16, 1940, by annual convention of Fraternal Order of Eagles.)

RESOLUTION IN RELATION TO THOSE MEMBERS OF THE FRATERNAL ORDER OF EAGLES WHO ENTER THE MILITARY SERVICE OF THEIR COUNTRY

You have just approved a resolution that has the fitting title, "The Eagles' Pledge to America." The resolution is timely. It is in keeping with the patriotic ideals of our order. We have again set forth in very definite terms the fraternity's loyalty to our country. Now, we must think of our obligations to those Eagles who have or will become a part of the Military Establishment of the United States and Canada.

We believe that the United States must be made so strong defensively that no power or powers on earth will seriously consider the invasion of the Western Hemisphere. We believe that our defenses must be built as rapidly as our citizens from all walks of life can achieve. We must have an adequate supply of airplanes and tanks and every necessary type of ordnance from heavy

artillery and antiaircraft guns to the most formidable machine guns, rifles, and all firearms between.

But the mechanical equipment of war must be directed and operated by Americans who understand the technique of the weapons they use, and who have had such invaluable hours of training on the ground, in the air lanes, and through the channels of the seas as to insure, in the event of war, ultimate victory.

Among Eagles the term "equality" has always had a special significance. For almost a half century we have obligated new members in the sunlight of this term. The worthy president of every aerie sits at the station dedicated to equality. For most of us, the golden years of peace have meant equality of opportunity. But now when our beloved land is facing the possibilities of a defensive war, we must understand and accept the equality of responsibility.

When the Congress of the United States and our brother, the President of the United States, have agreed upon the best way in which each of us can discharge his responsibility, we Eagles, loyal to the institutions of our country and to the principles of our revered democracy, must stand stalwartly behind this constituted authority.

Let us assure every Eagle in the military service of his country that his problems, his duties, his individual fate, is of concern to each of us. Let us so legislate that an Eagle who wears the uniform of his country shall have his name continued on the roster of his aerie, and that it shall be the duty of the aerie to keep him in good standing while he is in the military service.

His dependents shall have the services of the aerie physician as provided by law in those aeries that furnish such services, and they shall be entitled to such rights and privileges in the aerie home, as they would have if he were there. And I recommend that the grand aerie remit the per capita tax on those in military service.

At the beginning of the World War, the Eagles were the first among all organizations to provide for the welfare of its members who were in service. I urge this grand aerie to be the first among the legislative bodies of national fraternities to make known to the world our attitude toward our country, and to the members of our order who enter military service.

Resolved, That the Grand Aerie Fraternal Order of Eagles approve this statement and that the judiciary committee shall submit sometime during this convention such recommendations as will give life to what I have read.

Let us increasingly insist that Eagles emphasize not only equality of opportunity in time of peace, but equality of responsibility in time of war or possible war.

(Unanimously adopted August 16, 1940.)

For Democratic Debate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH B. SHANNON
OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 30, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW YORK TIMES

Mr. SHANNON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from today's issue of the New York Times:

[From the New York Times of August 30, 1940]

FOR DEMOCRATIC DEBATE

Surely some sort of happy medium, not to speak of mere sanity, is possible regarding the length of congressional debate. The usual practice under our present system is for the Senate to talk far longer than is necessary, and for the House, with more than four times as many Members, to talk far too little. Believers in the democratic system of parliamentary debate are made to feel something like lovers of sea food who are forced to choose between whales and minnows.

The conscription bill supplies one of the two latest illustrations. The text of the bill as drafted by the Senate Military Affairs Committee was published on July 27. Sporadic debate upon it began in the Senate on August 6 and formal debate opened on August 9. It continued with a few interruptions until August 28, when the bill was passed. As compared with this period of 20 days, it is planned to allow only 2 days for general debate in the House. Now, though the Senate debate was needlessly drawn out, particularly in view of the urgency of the conscription plan, the House will have too short a period to allow individual Members to express themselves on a question of such cardinal importance. If the time allowance were increased, the gain in democratic expression would be important enough to outweigh the loss of a few days.

A much worse example, however, is the excess-profits tax bill, under which the Rules Committee voted to limit debate for the entire House membership not to 2 days but to 2 hours, and which has now been rushed through on that schedule. In view of the circumstances such a rule and such hasty consideration were shocking. For the bill is a complicated and abstruse document of some 25,000 words. No copy of it was available until the day before the debate, so that even the most conscientious Congressmen who were asked to vote on it did not have a fair chance even to read it. It is no answer to say that most Congressmen would not be able to understand it anyway. Such an answer not only implies little respect for our Congressmen but it overlooks the fact that a congressional debate is never merely congressional. Surely several days ought to elapse between the first publication of a bill of such crucial importance and any final action on it by the House. At least such a period is required for persons directly affected and for expert opinion to call attention to possible ambiguities, jokers, or dangerous provisions.

Where Is the Recovery?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAUDE PEPPER
OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 30 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE TAMPA (FLA.) TRIBUNE

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from a recent issue of the Tampa (Fla.) Sunday Tribune, entitled "Where Is the Recovery?"

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Tampa (Fla.) Tribune]

WHERE IS THE RECOVERY?

In his acceptance speech, Candidate Wendell Willkie said:

"The New Deal believes, as frequently declared, that the spending of vast sums of money by the Government is a virtue in itself. They tell us that Government spending insures recovery. Where is the recovery?"

That question is answered by Alan Freeman, a member of the Ohio bar and a widely experienced businessman, now sojourning at Auburndale who recently gave, in this column, a thorough and convincing statement of New Deal principles and achievements.

Mr. Freeman referred to his up-to-date and authentic store of financial and business reports, and he fully and specifically answers Mr. Willkie's question, "Where is the recovery?"

First, dealing with big-business interests, he gives us this incontrovertible statement of fact:

"Comparative earnings of 12 of the largest and most successful industrial enterprises in America: Du Pont, General Motors, Chrysler, Republic Steel, Bethlehem Steel, Montgomery Ward, Goodyear, Goodrich, General Electric, Sears-Roebuck, Westinghouse, Penney. These 12 firms, employing billions of capital and millions of workers, made no profit or practically no profit in 1932. These same firms made a net profit of $554,000,000 in 1936, and these same firms made a net profit of $549,000,000 in 1939."

Mr. Freeman accompanies this assertion with the individual statements of the companies named—and that is the answer, in specific financial and industrial instances.

Then he shows where is the recovery in the various lines of national industry and activity, with the following verified comparative figures:

"Employment—1932, 37,704,000; 1936, 44,783,000.

"Unemployment—1932, 12,478,000; 1936, 7,568,000.

"Automobile production—Passenger cars, 1932, 1,186,185; 1937, 4,068,935. Trucks, 1932, 245,282; 1937, 947,502.

"Radio sets in use—1932, 18,000,000; 1940, 40,000,000.

"Iron (gross tons)—1932, 8,781,000; 1937, 37,137,000.

"Steel—1932, 13,681,000; 1937, 50,569,000.

"Electrical energy (kilowatt-hours)—1932, 82,376,772,000; 1937, 121,836,813,000.

"Building industry—Dwellings built, 1932, 27,380; 1938, 157,104. Value of all new buildings, 1932, $481,219,448; 1938, $1,175,841,359.

"Industrial stock prices—1932, low 41.32; 1937, high 194.40.

"Railroad stock prices—1932, low 13.23; 1937, high 64.46.

"Public-utility stock prices—1932, low 16.53; 1937, high 37.54.

"Prices received by farmers for various commodities—1932 compared with 1936. Wheat, 32.9 to 92; corn, 19.1 to 53; hogs, 3.8 to 8.91; beef cattle, 4.3 to 6.22; sheep, 2.5 to 4.34; wool, 12.5 to 24.1; cotton, 5.6 to 11.1; potatoes, 47.1 to 65.4.

"Rayon production—1932, 134,000,000; 1936, 277,000,000.

"Value of manufactured products—1935, $44,993,698,000; 1937, $60,993,600,000.

"Total foreign trade—1932, $2,933,790,000; 1937, $6,432,835,000.

"Total exports—1932, $1,611,016,000; 1937, $3,349,167,000.

"New and refunding capital issues—1932, $1,751,000,000; 1936, $6,214,000,000.

"New capital issues—1932, $720,000,000; 1936, $1,949,000,000.

"Bank failures—1930 to 1933, inclusive (Hoover administration)—5,730; total deposits, $3,619,000,000. Nineteen hundred and thirty-four to nineteen hundred and thirty-seven, inclusive (Roosevelt administration)—194; total deposits, $76,000,000. (Thirty times as many under Hoover as under the first 4 years of Roosevelt, with 50 times the amount of deposits.)

"Commercial failures.—1932, 31,822; liabilities, $928,000,000; 1937, 9,490; liabilities, $183,000,000."

Do we again hear from Indiana the plaintive inquiry: "Where is the recovery?"

There it is, in the plain, unmistakable terms of statistical fact.

Without exception, since the advent of the New Deal in 1933, in each and every essential item of national financial and industrial activity, there has been strong and substantial recovery. And the wonder is that many of the big business interests which have conspicuously benefited by that recovery are joining the Republican Party and its nominee in asking, "Where is the recovery?" when they know it and see it and feel it in their own businesses and all around them.

Mr. Freeman is justified in commenting: "There was absolutely no foundation for the claim made by Mr. Willkie as to the nonsuccess of the New Deal. It has worked and has worked magnificently, and if he thinks for one moment that this Nation would tolerate a Hoover again, serving as an adviser, a President emeritus, or perhaps in the Cabinet, he just doesn't know the American people."

Migratory Camps Are No Mystery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. REID F. MURRAY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 30, 1940

STATEMENT FROM UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, FARM SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement, issued by the Department of Agriculture:

Migratory labor camps—Expenditures by States and by fiscal years

States	1936	1937	1938	1939	Total cumulative as of June 30, 1939
Arizona			$2,638	$224,861	$227,499
California	$48,773	$577,429	847,062	999,274	2,472,498
Florida				11,451	11,451
Idaho				31,282	31,282
Oregon				7,200	7,200
Texas				12,792	12,792
Washington				32,201	32,201
Total	48,733	577,429	849,700	1,319,061	2,794,923

Mr. Speaker, from observing this table my colleagues will see the increasing public expenditures being made for these migratory camps. These migratory camps are the result of the land and loan policy of the New Deal. The New Deal is now appropriating millions to correct a condition they have squandered millions to create.

MIGRATORY CAMPS AND THEIR CAUSES

First. Thousands of farmers were driven from their homes by the New Deal, because the farmers could not pay $112 average annual interest.

The reasons why the farmers could not pay their interest was due to droughts and other adverse weather conditions, and also due to the low agricultural prices that prevail, due to the New Deal.

Second. The New Deal set up thousands of nonfarm-owners on new farms under the guise of help to the downtrodden, when at the same time they were driving thousands of the old farm owners from their homes and farms.

Third. The New Deal lowered the tariff on 167 farm products, and thus reduced the farmers' income by millions. The price of cheese was 17 cents per pound the 7 years before the New Deal and only 13 cents per pound the 7 years of the New Deal.

Fourth. After driving the farmers off their farms, they started to erect the migratory camps for them. Even Texas, that has had $365,000,000 in New Deal agricultural subsidies, or one-eighth of the total agricultural subsidies from the Federal Treasury, has had to have migratory camps. The New Deal land and loan policy drove people in great numbers from their farms, even in Texas, that in 1 year had 27 percent of the total parity payments of the Nation.

Fifth. After the New Deal had driven these thousands off their farms, and had built public migratory camps for them, the New Deal again appropriated thousands of dollars. This was appropriated for the Civil Liberties Committee so that the committee could go out and call on the people living in the migratory camps built by the New Deal to house the people that were driven from their farms by the New Deal. The committee spent the hard month of January in the California sunshine instead of being in Washington attending to the affairs of the people of the States they represented. The California farmer with New Deal farm prices could not pay a satisfactory New Deal wage. While this committee was so busy in 1939 making arrangements for the visit to the migratory camps, the New Deal drove more farmers from their farm homes in Wisconsin than had ever before been foreclosed on in the whole history of the Federal land bank. In other words, the new dealers shed crocodile tears and practiced fake humanitarianism.

Sixth. After all the foregoing cross-purposed schemes as followed by the New Deal, we now have another joint committee of the Senate and House appointed, and legislation with additional appropriations. The purpose of this committee is to find out why the farmers left their farms. It is not for the purpose of making a social call, as the Civil Liberties Committee evidently did. No legislation to help the unfortunate has resulted to date from the Civil Liberties appropriation.

So we have the New Deal driving the farmers off their farms, appropriating money to build migratory camps, appropriating more money to call on them and see how they are getting along, and then another committee to call on them to see why they left the farms in the first place.

The farm people of this Nation should remember that President Roosevelt has twice vetoed legislation to give the farmer the lower interest rate he now enjoys. I am pleased to say a Republican was able to further equalize and lower the interest burden of the farmers to an extent that it represents a saving of millions of dollars to the farmers of this Nation.

The New Deal causes more diseases than they can muster medicines to cure.

Hon. James A. Farley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MILTON A. ROMJUE
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 30, 1940

Mr. ROMJUE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to incorporate the following letter addressed by the special committee, in behalf of the Post Office and Post Roads Committee, to the Honorable James A. Farley, Postmaster General, which letter is as follows:

AUGUST 30, 1940.

The Honorable JAMES A. FARLEY,
Postmaster General.

DEAR MR. FARLEY: At its meeting on this day, August 30, 1940, the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads of the House of Representatives noted that tomorrow would witness your voluntary retirement from the office of Postmaster General of the United

States, and the chairman of the committee has designated the undersigned to draft this letter of resolution.

The 7½ years of your administration of the Post Office Department have been one of the four longest terms of office of any Postmaster General since this committee was established in 1808; namely, Gideon Granger, 1801–14; Return J. Meigs, Jr., 1814–23; Albert S. Burleson, 1913–21; and James A. Farley, 1933–40. Your administration of the Post Office Department has also been one of the most successful in history when measured by the standards of business management, the requirements of postal service to the people, and the conduct of public office.

The committee has noted with sincere appreciation the spirit of cooperation you have displayed, the support you have given to the committee's program, and your recognition and observance of the mutual relationships of the legislation and administrative functions to the benefit of the public welfare.

May your future endeavors be as pleasant as has our relationships.

A copy of this letter is being recorded in the permanent minutes of the committee.

Cordially and sincerely,

THOMAS G. BURCH.
NOAH M. MASON.
ALBERT E. AUSTIN.
CARL T. DURHAM.

As chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Post Roads, it gives me pleasure to most heartily concur in the sentiment and good wishes expressed by the committee in behalf of James A. Farley.

It has been my privilege and pleasure to have been associated with him in connection with the work affecting the Postal Service of our country. I have always found him, as have others who have worked with him, to be most helpful, generous, kind, and ready and willing to cooperate in every proper and reasonable manner with which the Post Office Committee has had occasion to work, and it has been a pleasure to cooperate with him at all times.

His voluntary retirement is a personal regret on my part. His untiring service to his country in this position is now a matter of history, and as time goes on the record he has made in the position of Postmaster General will be recognized by all thoughtful students of postal matters as one of outstanding achievement and brilliant accomplishment.

I wish him, along with the other members of the Post Office and Post Roads Committee, many years of continued happy and successful life.

Funds for the T. V. A.—A Peculiar Omission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAUDE PEPPER
OF FLORIDA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, August 30 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE TAMPA (FLA.) TRIBUNE

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Tampa (Fla.) Tribune, issue of July 18, 1940, entitled "A Peculiar Omission."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Tampa (Fla.) Tribune of July 18, 1940]

A PECULIAR OMISSION

The Tennessee Valley Authority has been a storm center of national politics. A lot has been said for and against it. It is scheduled for even more discussion, especially considering Wendell Willkie's nomination and his past record of fighting T. V. A.'s every move.

We thought a story the other day about T. V. A. made real news, but a check of several northern newspapers caused some doubt. That story concerned a request by Mr. Stettinius and Mr. Knudsen, members of the National Defense Council and two of the Nation's biggest Republican business leaders, for more funds for the T. V. A. They asked a congressional subcommittee for the immediate grant of $25,000,000 to add 300,000 kilowatts to the production capacity of the great project.

These men are interested in doing the best job for national defense. Yet a great portion of the American press either ignored the real news or deliberately soft-pedaled it.

Now, it is true that, under the free press we enjoy in the United States, newspaper editors have the privilege of selecting those items of news which they feel will be of most interest to their readers. But we wonder if some of these editors omitted the story simply because two outstanding business leaders gave supporting evidence to the fact that T. V. A., which Willkie and many Republicans have fought from the beginning, is proving of immense value to the industrial and national-defense needs of this Nation.

Addresses at Convention of the National Colored Democratic Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SHERMAN MINTON
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, August 30 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

ADDRESSES BY HON. HARRY S. TRUMAN, OF MISSOURI; HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY, OF KENTUCKY; HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY, OF PENNSYLVANIA; HON. SHERMAN MINTON, OF INDIANA; LAWRENCE W. ROBERT, JR.; WILLIAM J. THOMPKINS; AND ROBERT I. MILLER

Mr. MINTON. Mr. President, on Sunday, July 14, 1940, the National Colored Democratic Association met in convention at the Eighth Regiment Armory, Chicago, Ill. The Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], and I, myself, as well as Dr. Thompkins, the Recorder of Deeds of the District of Columbia, and Mr. Robert, secretary of the Democratic National Committee, and Robert I. Miller, a distinguished lawyer of Washington, addressed the convention. I have had an estimate made of what it would cost to print the addresses in the RECORD, which estimate accompanies the speeches. I ask unanimous consent that the addresses be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the addresses were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF HON. HARRY S. TRUMAN, OF MISSOURI

There is much being said these days about the Negro and what should be done with him instead of what should be done for him. Much is written about his rights as a person, but it has been up to the present administration to take the problem in hand and provide necessary measures for his life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness.

That the administration has already done much for the Negro is clearly evidenced by the results of recent elections in such cities as Kansas City, St. Louis, and Chicago. In these and other large cities, the Negro wards showed a much larger proportionate Democratic vote than in the white wards, and to my notion this is as it should be since the Negro race has received treatment at the hands of the present administration that should justify its continued support.

Up until the time of the emancipation Negroes were in an entirely different status from their fellow men in America. Besides the injustice of enslavement they were held far beneath the white population in almost every measure of modern civilization. This was anything but a reflection on the ability of the black men. With education positively forbidden to him and the fact that he was forced into a culture, civilization, and climate absolutely new to him, is it any wonder that his progression has been at times a disturbed one? Can any of you picture yourselves planted suddenly in the wilds of Africa and forced to make your own way in a hostile society utterly different from anything you have ever known? That has been the problem of our Negro population.

In the years before the Roosevelt administration, plotting politicians attempted to defeat Negro suffrage which was gained only after the toil and heartbreak of three constitutional amendments. First of all they imposed a property qualification for the privilege of voting, but the colored people acquired property so rapidly that the politicians were temporarily baffled. It was necessary to resort to other measures. They required educational attainments, but for once the demand was reasonable.

It was a double blessing to the Negro since it opened the way to the polls and inspired the colored people to learn at least the primary requirements of education. It was a wise provision insofar as a certain amount of learning should become a requirement of any American citizen. Of course, this also supposes that the means of education shall be provided. No citizen can fulfill his mission at the ballot box unless he is able to read and write to inform himself

about public men and measures. Naturally, the rule should apply to white and black alike. Here was the Negro's big chance to remove the last obstacle between himself and the polls as well as to advance in culture.

Up to the time of the Emancipation, the Negro's slavery forbade him education and kept him in a completely dependent state. During the period of freedom, he was almost equally handicapped. Being under servile conditions for over 300 years, and naturally, unused to constructive thinking, how could he be expected to have accomplished more than he has within a single generation? No one could hope that the Negro would become a nation-illuminating legal, industrial, or literary light the day following the Emancipation Proclamation. Notwithstanding, the Negro has done amazingly well.

That old time slave owner felt that an educated Negro would be a menace. If the slave knew too much it was feared he would learn to revolt and become haughty. We all know that the old-time slave owner was mistaken. The educated Negro learns quickly so that in order to protect himself, he must obey the law, not break it. He can only blunder in performing his civic duties if he does not understand them.

Fear that Negro education may menace the white race's conception of racial safety displays nothing more than a narrow conception of good citizenship and an amazing ignorance of Negro characteristics. Always, it is the uneducated person, regardless of color, who is the dangerous citizen. It is your ignorant class among the people that is the criminal class.

In this light, let us see what the present administration has done for the Negro. As I have stated, it has given him $2,000,000 for improvements at Howard University and Freedman's Hospital; $262,000 to Virginia State College; $87,000 for Lincoln University in Missouri; $500,000 for the Wendell Phillips High School at Chicago; $40,000 for West Virginia State College; paid $100 per month to 114 colored school teachers in Chicago engaged in the work of reducing adult illiteracy, and has extended this benevolent aid in many other directions.

Ignorance breeds all of the festering prejudices of our human family. The fraternizing sentiments of mankind are products of education. In my opinion, greater educational facilities for the Negro would be a blessing to him and at the same time a great boon to society at large. If white men wish to do better for themselves, it would be well for them to give more definite attention to the education of the Negro.

By this I mean not merely more and better buildings and equipment, but very careful attention to what is taught in these buildings. We exert no little care to see what white children are taught in our public schools, but seem to have little or no concern about what the Negro child is taught. Especially now right teaching on patriotism, morals, and race relationship in our schools, both white and black, is an essential element in any program for the solution of the Negro question. When we are honest enough to recognize each other's rights and are good enough to respect them, we will come to a more Christian settlement of our difficulties. Education of the Negro guarantees safety to the white people and certainly is to their interest. All dark people, except the Negroes, are against the white race.

Some say that the Negro is not capable of assimilating cultural study. I have always denied this and have studied the problem sufficiently to know that given an equal opportunity with white students, the Negro can more than hold his own.

Take for example, the story of Phyllis Wheatly, the first colored American poetess. When she was but 7 years old, she was captured in Africa and sold to a right Boston family named Wheatly. Mrs. Wheatly educated the girl and the development of her mind was phenomenal. This little waif from the African jungle was writing rhymes at 14, at 17 reputable verse, and at 20 published a book of poems. She visited London and was feted by royalty. It was she who originally spoke of George Washington, as "first in peace." When Washington died, Congress extended the phrase to read "first in peace, first in war, first in the hearts of his countrymen," but Phyllis Wheatly, who first gave birth to the idea was a Negress. Don't forget, too, that one of the world's foremost agricultural chemists who has done so much for the South is a Negro. George Washington Carver, of Tuskegee Institute, is a Negro and a fellow of the London Royal Society of Arts. He has done more for the welfare and upbuilding of his race than any living person.

I repeat, the Negro needs only the opportunity for cultural study. He has the ability.

Before I go further, I wish to make it clear that I am not appealing for social equality of the Negro. The Negro himself knows better than that, and the highest types of Negro leaders say quite frankly that they prefer the society of their own people. Negroes want justice, not social relations. I merely wish to sound a note of warning. Numberless antagonisms and indignities heaped upon any race will eventually try human patience to the limit and a crisis will develop. We all know the Negro is here to stay and in no way can be removed from our political and economic life and we should recognize his inalienable rights as specified in our Constitution. Can any man claim protection of our laws if he denies that protection to others?

Under the Roosevelt Administration, more has been done to give the Negro equal legal, economic, and cultural rights than has ever been done before. The Honorable JOHN M. HOUSTON, of Kansas, has said that President Roosevelt has appointed more Negroes to responsible governmental positions than the last three Republican administrations combined. While these things are individual honors, the colored people will benefit by the Roosevelt policies. Every law passed by our present Congress for direct relief or otherwise gives the Negro his equal rights. For the first time in our history, the administration has given us a colored man in the White House on the secretarial staff. This is absolutely unprecedented.

The colored man was taught through the years that the Republican Party, and that party alone, freed him from slavery. Naturally he felt grateful to that party and thought it no more than right that he should vote for it. He knows now that from the Civil War until the present administration he has been exploited by the Republican Party. During the campaigns, of course, the Republican candidates were the friend of the Negro and his greatest benefactor. Between campaigns, however, these fine "friends" forgot the Negro.

As the generations of Negroes went on and became better educated they began to sense that something was wrong. They began to wonder if their race still owed a "debt of gratitude" to a party which did nothing for them except in election year. Finally the Negro voters realized that with the Republican Party it was all "take" and no "give." In short, what the Negro was fighting for was his constitutional right of equal opportunity under law for himself and his children. He needed a redeal in the game of life.

That he got it, no one will or can deny. Doctor Thompkins, Recorder of Deeds of the District of Columbia, has said: "The administration has given us representation as economists in National Recovery Administration. It has given us several architects and engineers in the Subsistence Homestead Division of the N. R. A. It has given us representation on the legal staff of the Public Works Administration and in the Post Office Department; it has given us a representative in the Farm Credit Bureau of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration to look after the needs and opportunities of the colored farmers of the country; it has given us a clearing house in the Department of Interior, presided over by a highly efficient representative of the race, assisted by a competent staff to promote the economic status of the race; it has given us representation in the vast welfare operations of the W. P. A. under Colonel Harrington; it has given us significant representation in the Department of Justice and in the Office of the Recorder of Deeds of the District of Columbia; it gave us our first Federal judge in the person of William H. Hastie, and upon his resignation, Attorney Moore, of Chicago, was appointed as his successor; it has given us 25 outstanding high-salaried posts of distinction, including representation among the conciliators of the Department of Labor, and an adviser to the Secretary of Commerce on racial matters."

Who can look upon a record so humane and just and not thrill with pride at the very mention of the President and his entire administration?

The administration has also undertaken a far-reaching program of slum clearance to better the wretched living conditions of thousands of Negro families. I believe, and I think you will all agree, that one of the prime requisites of a sound democracy is good housing.

We must not forget that every community owes the Negro a fair deal in regard to public utilities, lights, and sewers, street improvement, and water mains. We owe the Negro legal equality and a fair chance in the world for several reasons, not in the least of them because he is a human being and a natural-born American. Because his political power is yet weak, he cannot be denied his rights. Never must we forget that if we sink the Negro to the depths of hopeless degradation and make no provision for his comfort in housing or any other necessity of life, the law of compensation will take effect and the whites, too, will go down with him.

The famous Booker T. Washington often said, "You cannot hold a Negro in the gutter unless some white man stays in the gutter to hold him there."

The housing project of the administration will not hold the Negro in the "gutter" but instead will remove him and the "gutter" too.

The final result of its program will be to provide modern, comfortable dwellings for these thousands of families so that their children may grow up to love their country in a decent environment with the modern conveniences and playground facilities so necessary to a happy and healthful life. And whenever it is possible, Negro managers will be employed in the housing projects tenanted mainly by colored people. Although our work has just begun, already we have completed or are working on, projects in such cities as Atlanta, St. Louis, Kansas City, Chicago, New York, Nashville, New Orleans, and others. Compare empty platform promises of the Republican Party with the real achievements of our administration and you cannot fail to see that the New Deal is the hope of the Negro as well as every other group or class in these United States.

That the Negro is entitled to every right under law is sometimes contested on the very weak grounds that he had no worthy part in American history. Turn to your histories then, and you will see the record of patriotism the colored man has written for himself in the pages of our Nation's development. The first American Negro to give up his life for our country's liberty was Crispus Attucks who was shot down in the Boston massacre of 1770. A Negro, Peter Salem, was the hero of the Battle of Bunker Hill and is credited with the death of the British commander, Major Pitcairn.

Gen. Andrew Jackson, in speaking to the Negroes after the Battle of New Orleans, said, "To the men of color—soldiers from the shores of Mobile I collected you to arms. I invited you to share

in the perils and divide the glory of your white countrymen. I expected much of you but you surpass my hopes—the President of the United States shall be informed of your conduct on the present occasion and the voice of the representatives of the American Nation shall applaud your valor, as your general now praises your ardor."

Commodore Perry spoke in high praise of his Negro sailors in the Battle of Lake Erie. Negroes distinguished themselves in the Spanish-American War at the battles of Guasimas, El Caney, and San Juan Hill.

In the World War, four entire Negro regiments received the coveted Croix de Guerre for heroism in action. Gen. John J. Pershing said of the Negroes' World War record:

"The only regret expressed by colored troops is that they are not given more dangerous work to do. I cannot commend too highly the spirit shown among the colored combat troups, who exhibit fine capacity for quick training and eagerness for the most dangerous work." The Negroes' flag is our flag, and he stands ready, just as we do, to defend it against all foes from within and without.

The Negro wants love, not compassion; human understanding, not abstract resolutions. He wants to be helped, not crushed. He wants opportunities to better himself, not relief. He wants just wages, not alms. He wants stability, security, and friendliness. He knows that the Roosevelt administration has been his salvation in these days of turmoil, strife, and depression.

He must not switch now from the Democratic Party, which has done so much for him and will ever continue to work in his best interests. He must not switch from the party which embodies every ideal upon which this country has been built to a party which thrives only on broken promises.

We must all love, honor, and serve our country together.
This can be done successfully only under the Democratic Party.
Thank you.

EXCERPTS FROM ADDRESS OF HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY, OF KENTUCKY

Dr. Thompkins, my friends, no Senator likes to speak when any other air mechanic is in progress; that's why I waited for that noise to cease.

I appreciate the invitation given me to deliver to you a word of greeting. When I had a letter from Dr. Thompkins I was unaware at that time that I was scheduled to be the permanent chairman at the Democratic convention. With my duties in the Senate during the last few weeks, it was even impossible for me to be successful in my efforts to prepare an address to deliver Tuesday night at the Democratic convention. I discovered, along with my other business, that I am a mere boy, as I have become sunburned, which resulted in blisters to my face, but this affliction is about to clear up now.

Well, I am glad to be able to come here and greet you, and I am glad to find that you are here today, and those whom we all represent are members of a political party of long standing. We are the political descendants of not only one of the greatest Democrats in history, but one of the greatest personalities, one of the greatest humanitarians. I speak of Thomas Jefferson. During the declaration of independence Jefferson uttered these immortal words:

"All men are created equal."

Not equal in physical strength; perhaps not equal in an intelligence sense, nor equal in the opportunities in grasping this world's goods. But all of us are equal in the opportunity, without race, creed, or color, to stand before a free and just Government without apologizing to any man.

It has been the history of the Democratic Party from Thomas Jefferson to Franklin D. Roosevelt that those who have paid the price, as the members of your race have, for you have shown your loyalty—from the Revolutionary War to the present time—and I can say without apologizing that we fear no "fifth column" activities among the Negro race, and they only demand what they are justly entitled to—freedom and equality under the law—and I say that they deserve it, and the Democratic Party will see to it that they get it. I can pledge that. It has been the policy of the Roosevelt administration not only to work for the colored men and women but for all the underprivileged citizens in the United States of America, and this we are pledged to see to it that all citizens have economic independence.

I was a member this morning of my own delegation who received your committee on resolutions. I was inspired by the representation made by the delegates you sent there, and I want to tell you right now that they acquitted themselves well, and I think that I can carefully say that the suggestions which they made will receive the very earnest and careful consideration of our national convention.

Reference has been made here with reference to the antilynching bill, and I certainly thank Dr. Thompkins for his words. Under the previous administrations it is true that legislation of this sort was sent by the House and Senate to committees, where it would remain and die, but not until the Democratic Party came into power was there an effort made to pass this bill. Unfortunately, in the Senate we were not able to bring it to a vote.

As the majority leader of the United States Senate, I think my record will show that I exerted every possible effort to bring that bill to a vote. Time after time I have asked for the vote. Now, understand, I am not criticizing any Senator, but when I found it was obvious that a vote could not be had, then I got a petition to circulate for cloture, which is, as you know, a motion to close debate, and even after a closed debate each Senator can speak for an hour if they so desired. The petition came up for a vote, but we did not get the necessary two-thirds, and it was impossible to bring the antilynching bill to a vote. It has now been reported by committee, and the reason why we haven't taken it up is because we have been concerned with our national defense; but I can say this, that this bill will be brought up, and it would not surprise me, in fact, it is my opinion that the bill may be voted upon before this Congress shall have adjourned.

I do not wish to indulge in any personalities, but last month in Philadelphia the Republicans had a meeting and selected a man to run for President—Wendell Willkie. I suppose they had to go back and take a former Democrat, if he (Willkie) ever was a Democrat in the real sense of the word. I think I will just give you my picture of the Republican nominee for President:

A wonderful bird is Willkie,
His body was bigger than his Bilkie.

He, Willkie, has said he wanted to fight the champion—which is the Democratic Party. So did Tony Galento want to fight Joe Louis, but, my friends, Joe Louis is still the champion. But I am not afraid of Willkie, who wants to fight, which is the only respect that he is like Joe Louis. For this Democratic Party with 150 years of democracy, is not afraid of anybody on earth.

We are living in trying times, and this is not a campaign for which "frivolity" can be the word. We have seen one democratic nation after nation go down. We have seen ideals of self-government and liberty-loving people destroyed; all because they were not prepared to meet the onslaught of autocracy and totalitarianism. Ours is a peace-loving nation—not unwilling to have peace, but we are resolved not to send our boys away from home, but we are preparing to the fullest extent to protect the United States of America—and Negroes must help. They deserve to serve in every branch of the armed forces of the United States. There shall be but one motto for the American people: All Americans for one America and for one conception of American democracy.

I am not welcoming one race or creed to participate in the American form of government, but like other people, the colored people, with all other races, must join hands with us to make America the beacon light to all the nations of the world. And we must have liberty and equality for all men, regardless of their color. I believe in that and I will fight for that.

There is a place and will be a place in the ranks of the Democratic Party for those who have the ability, and I honestly believe that when the Democratic Convention shall write its platform that your desires will be included.

When we write this platform it will be an honest platform that says what it means and means what it says—we shall write a platform for the American people—all races—and I know that the voters will go to the polls and give us 4 years more of American democracy.

I am reminded at this point of an employer who had a colored man working for him. The man had worked so well that the boss decided he would give him a quart of liquor. The next day he said:

"John, how was that liquor?"

"Fine," John said. "It was just right."

"What do you mean, it was just right?" inquired the boss.

"Well, boss, if it had been any better you wouldn't have given it to me, and if it had been any worse, I wouldn't have drunk it."

If the Republican Party had anything to offer they would have offered us something better, but the Democratic Party stands on its record. I am glad that I come from a State that has never disfranchised the Negro (Kentucky) from the right to vote, and I say that the Democratic Party has done a lot for the Negro and that we are going to do more. Our State does not exact the payment of any poll tax to aid in the disfranchisement of the Negro. Of course, I am not criticizing any State that does, but I stand on my record.

ADDRESS OF HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY, OF PENNSYLVANIA

My fellow Democrats, we meet at an auspicious moment. Within the next few days the Democratic Party will name a candidate for President of the United States, and its decision will have an important effect upon the future history of our country.

I'm for Roosevelt.

Some months ago I wrote a book on the third-term question. That there was no tradition in American politics against a third term.

In the months since that book was published, the people seem to have accepted that view.

The agitation against a third term was never anything more than political ballyhoo and they have seen through it.

More than 2 years ago I said that the people, and not Roosevelt, would decide the third-term question.

He had been placed in office practically as a receiver in bankruptcy to clean up the mess left by three preceding Republican administrations.

If your memory goes back to that tragic era between 1929 and 1932, you will remember just what a mess it was.

I felt then, and I feel now, that the people would not willingly see Roosevelt leave office until he had finished the job they gave him to do.

I saw that he was being hampered and hamstrung at every turn by powerful individuals and groups which were attempting to make either private profit or political capital out of the Nation's distress.

Had there been wholehearted patriotic cooperation with the President from the beginning, we would be much further ahead today than we are.

I felt then, and still feel, that the people were not going to place an arbitrary time limit on the job.

Since that time much has happened.

It was not our country's good fortune to be permitted to continue an uninterrupted program of internal reform.

Instead we were faced with the problem of war in Europe.

Any great eruption such as war anywhere in the world affects the tides of commerce.

We have all felt the impact of the "blitzkrieg." We all realize that American history, as well as European history, is being made on the foreign battlefields.

We know that international developments have created vast diplomatic problems for our President and his administration. We know they have faced those problems with courage and foresight.

We know that the President has handled crisis after crisis in a manner that has earned him the confidence and respect of the American people, Republicans as well as Democrats.

We know that after more than 7 years as President he is better informed and more familiar with the tangled cross-currents of dilpomacy than any living American.

We know that we need the best man we can find for the tough job that lies ahead.

We know that he saw further than any of us when he began fighting years ago for a more adequate national defense.

All of these things lead to only one conclusion so far as the Democratic convention of 1940 is concerned.

We must draft Roosevelt.

I have no doubt the President would like to retire to Hyde Park when his term is over.

He has worked hard for the past 7½ years at the biggest job in America.

During that time he has done more for his country and his fellow men than any other living American.

Under normal conditions he would be entitled to a well-earned rest, but conditions are not normal.

If there were only domestic conditions to be considered, it might be said that the New Deal program is sufficiently developed to be carried forward with someone else in the White House.

Yet we all realize that the New Deal is not the question at this moment.

The Republicans have admitted as much, for if you will examine the platform they drafted at Philadelphia you will see no criticism whatever of the broad basic measures of the New Deal.

This was a great implied tribute to the President, although the platform drafters probably never thought of it in that way.

It does show, however, that the great issue today is not so much the New Deal, which has already become a basic part of American life, but instead the broader questions of international policy.

The President is familiar with them.

It would be a sad comment upon our democracy if for purely political reasons we were to take our best man out of the game at a crucial moment and send in an untried, inexperienced substitute.

I feel that in this matter the President awaits the will of the people.

I am convinced that he does not seek a third term, but that the public interest and welfare demand it. It is up to the people to draft Roosevelt. It is up to the Democratic Party, representing the political majority in America, to draft him.

We have a duty to ourselves and our country.

We must, in our own way, with such wisdom as we can command, meet the immediate problems facing our Nation.

We owe that to those who have gone before us, those whose efforts and sacrifices through the years have made our Nation preeminent.

We owe it to history, because we must give to those who come after us an even greater democracy.

The responsibility rests heavily upon us.

It is not a partisan responsibility, but a patriotic duty.

I am entirely satisfied that we, as Democrats, will discharge that duty honorably and well within the next few days, and I call upon all Democrats to see that this duty is so discharged through the renomination of our greatest living American as the standard-bearer, not only in our party, but of our country, Franklin Delano Rocsevelt.

ADDRESS OF HON. LAWRENCE WOOD ROBERT, JR., SECRETARY, DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL COMMITTEE

Mr. Chairman, members of your association, and fellow Democrats, some few weeks ago when I received an invitation from your distinguished president, Dr. Thompkins, to appear upon this program today, my first inclination was to decline. Not because I did not value and greatly appreciate the invitation but because I knew the tremendous pressure every officer of our Democratic National Committee would find themselves under on this particular day. As you recall, the Democratic National Convention convenes here in your city, starting tomorrow, and already we have no less than 3,000 delegates and alternates and 10,000 camp followers on hand and on our necks, and I believe every one of them have tried to get in General Farley's office and my office this morning since 8 o'clock.

While I was in the very act of dictating my letter of regrets I read further in Dr. Thompkins' letter and noted that this meeting was scheduled to be the largest Negro political assembly ever gathered together in these United States. This in itself was of tremendous interest and caught my eye. Then, while still hesitating, I turned to a copy of the convention manual which Dr. Thompkins had enclosed in his letter and as I hesitated I commenced to read the foreword of this manual. I would like to stop here to say that I hope that every member of this association and every one of you gathered here in attendance have very carefully read this foreword and if you haven't you find a manual and read it thoroughly until you understand its import.

This foreword reads as follows: "The National Colored Democratic Association was organized and incorporated in 1892 by a group of far-sighted Negroes in Missouri who early in their political life came to the realization that the future and hope of the Negro race would not be advanced by mass membership in the Republican Party. It was organized by men of vision who could see the Republican Party handing out a few paltry plums as bait for the Negro vote, without doing anything materially to elevate the economic, social, or political standards of a downtrodden race."

When I got to that point I stopped and reflected how many times I had that same reaction in days gone by and wondered just when you people would wake up to these misleading and false promises which had so long been preached to you.

Reading further from the manual, which continued thusly: "There were many who scoffed at this assembly. They were rebuked and scorned by Negroes who termed as traitors any fellow Negro with the 'audacity' to desert the Republican ranks. It was very unpopular in 1892 and as late as 1928 to be a Negro Democrat. Those Negroes of yesterday and the Negroes of today who are following in their footsteps are today termed 'liberals' rather than 'radicals' and are being hailed today as the real carriers of the torch. The National Colored Democratic Association is proud that today it has grown from four or five men who founded it in 1892 to millions of Negroes in every State in the Union, with hundreds of clubs holding chartered membership throughout the Union."

When I had read this far I turned to my secretary and said, "Please change my letter and say to Dr. Thompkins that I will be delighted to attend this great meeting and to follow any schedule that he might lay out for me." After finishing my letter of acceptance, I took time out to read this convention manual thoroughly, and it left me with the profound reaction and impression that your leaders and your association have a sounder and more comprehensive program for the betterment of your race than anything I had ever seen promulgated before. I really was surprised at myself for not knowing more about the background and efforts of your association than I did, because for years and years I have taken a very particular interest in your people and worked diligently for them along educational lines in particular.

The founders of your group had seen the light and seen it clearly many, many years ago and to them goes the credit for the courage they had in facing false gods and laying down a doctrine which you people could follow out with a proud feeling of anticipation that it would lead to success.

The last 8 years under this administration have given a great impetus toward that goal. The sound doctrines of your founders are netting results. In my travels over the country—and I travel much—I see it on every side, and the great spirit and results of your success I believe is clearly exemplified by this audience here today and the convention it represents. I am sure that my great leader, General Farley, has made the same observation, because we have often discussed it.

I think it quite fitting at this particular time to pay my highest respects to the Rosenwall Foundation and the great work they are doing throughout my section of this country for the members of your race. I mention it particularly because it originated in this great city and operates from here as headquarters, and I only wish that there were a dozen other similar foundations who would conduct themselves on such a high plane and expend their funds and energy for the promotion of your people.

I wish every one of you could visit with me in the State of Georgia and see the work they are doing there. I happen to be a member of the board of regents of the university system of my State, and the Rosenwall Foundation has enabled us in the last 5 years to build up three complete units of junior college activities for the Negroes. They have further enabled us to expand every class of social and educational facilities which we had mapped out in our program. I mention this in passing because I wanted you to know that I especially appreciate the tremendous amount of constructive work there is to be done and that I can see so clearly how your great association can and will play a leading part in this work.

I am not here to make you an address, because the great chairman of our Democratic National Convention, Senator GUFFEY, and others will do that in a way I could not even approach, but I did want to come here (1) as a citizen of the United States and congratulate you and your leaders on the sound and sensible way in which they are approaching your problems. As a southerner, born and raised in the South, I have been traveling in every nook and corner of this country, and I think I can appreciate this work as much, if not more, than the average citizen.

(2) I am here as secretary of the Democratic National Committee to bring to you an added word of welcome and to let you know how much we value your efforts in our party and the great fight you are carrying on. I am well acquainted with many leaders of your group, and they well know that I am accessible at all times when it comes to you and your people.

You will no doubt find, if you will notice carefully, many honorary assistant secretaries among your group which very clearly should indicate how I feel.

I thank you again for having invited me here and for this opportunity to appear before you even for just a brief moment.

I thank you and again thank your able president, Dr. Thompkins.

ADDRESS OF HON. WILLIAM J. THOMPKINS, PRESIDENT OF THE NATIONAL COLORED DEMOCRATIC ASSOCIATION

Fellow Democrats, it becomes my pleasure at this time to bring you greetings from the President of the United States, his wife, Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, the chairman of the Democratic National Committee and Postmaster General of the United States, the Honorable James A. Farley, and a host of Members of both Houses of Congress.

I am happy to announce at this time that on Sunday afternoon at 3 o'clock the Honorable James A. Farley will be the principal speaker. He will be accompanied by the secretary of the Democratic National Committee, Mr. Lawrence Wood Robert, Jr., the majority leader of the Senate, Hon. ALBEN W. BARKLEY; the majority whip of the Senate, Hon. SHERMAN MINTON; those staunch new dealers, Senator JOSEPH F. GUFFEY, Senator HARRY S. TRUMAN, Senator ELMER THOMAS, Congressman JENNINGS RANDOLPH, Congressman JACK NICHOLS, and many others who have indicated that they would be present for our gigantic mass meeting Sunday afternoon.

We have come a long way since this organization was incorporated in 1892 by a group of Missouri Democrats. Our progress is indicated by the large number of delegates here in attendance, representing hundreds of clubs scattered throughout 37 States, having a total membership of 1,800,000.

We meet here in Chicago, one of the greatest and most liberal cities in the West, to think together, work together, and act together in an effort to adopt a great and liberal program which, if adopted and adhered to, will emancipate the Negro from economic and social slavery that is now common to him.

As is stated in your convention call and manual, when such a program is adopted by this organization, a delegation representing it will call upon the resolutions committee of the Democratic National Convention and seek to have our wishes incorporated in the great platform that it is expected the national convention will adopt. If we are successful in having incorporated into the Democratic platform a plank which sets forth the party's promises to the Negroes of this country it will be the first time this has been accomplished in the history of the Democratic Party. Indeed, it will be history for the National Colored Democratic Association. I am confident that this association will be successful in making that history, for we have demonstrated to the Democratic Party our political strength. We have demonstrated to them that we believe in party loyalty the same as any other group, and it is our belief that when the party platform is read to the convention for adoption it will have planks contained therein to safeguard the welfare and protect the interests of all races, all creeds, and all colors.

There are those of you with us today who are joining hands with us for the first time. We welcome you with outstretched arms. We stated in our call for this convention that our doors stood ajar to all Negro Democrats and urged all Negro Democrats to join with us in putting over a program which will reflect credit upon ourselves and upon the Democratic Party, of which we are an important part. We believe in the saying that more music makes the band play sweeter still.

No doubt some of you have heard it said, since you have been in Chicago, that this is a "Jim Crow" organization. This accusation is being perpetuated by a gentleman from Alabama whom we all know has never raised his voice to end segregation since he has been in a position of influence. We all know that it was this same Alabama gentleman who has repeatedly advocated a "Jim Crow" industrial commission; we all know that this same Alabama gentleman sponsored in Congress an appropriation bill of $75,000 for a "Jim Crow" expedition. This same Alabama gentleman was one of the directors of the Negro Democratic campaign in 1936, and I understand is an aspirant to direct the Negro campaign in 1940.

I would like to raise this question: When in this land of the free and home of the brave have Negroes reached the point that it is blasphemy for them to assemble themselves together to work out the problems most peculiar to them? By what other means can any minority group of any race, creed, or color, expect to aid their cause without themselves striking the first blow? No Negro, whether he be a Congressman, judge, recorder of deeds, or whatnot, can expect to bring economic, political, and social justice to his race by going off by himself, expounding what he believes, as an individual, will enhance the progress of 15,000,000 people. The problems confronting our race are not the problems of one man; and their solutions are not the responsibility of one man, nor can they be solved by one man. The strength of the wolf is in the pack; the strength of the Negro comes from organization. Through organization and only organization can the Negro hope to reach the degree of strength wherein he can demand equal civil rights.

Organization of all forces is what brought success to our great party in 1932 and again in 1936. Organization is the only thing that will bring success to the party in 1940. If a party can win by organization, so can a race.

Look at the condition of the Negro Republicans today. Due to their bickering, their selfishness, each thinking in terms of self rather than in terms of the whole, our race lost under Republican administrations every important position of trust and influence that Negroes ever held. The Republican Party was never able to get Negro Republicans to come together and agree on any one thing for the advancement of the race. Let not the Negro Democrats be guilty of the offense of selfishness; let us put up a solid and united front before our party for those things that will bring prosperity and civil rights to our race. Negroes are not foolish enough to believe that the solutions to the problems of a race of 15,000,000 people are held in the hands of one Alabama gentleman or any other individual.

In speaking of this organization by these critics, might we say that the pioneers of democracy have come up through the sweat of blood. We were down in Houston, Tex., in 1928 with three members and with the citizens of Houston furnishing the background, adhering to the tradition of holding our national quadrennial session while the Negroes who are complaining now were in the Republican ranks sponsoring the cause of Hoover and came over gradually to our organization as independents. We who went to Houston, Tex., remember that we were scoffed at by the Negro political leaders of New York, Philadelphia, and Chicago, who could not condescend to attend a National Democratic Convention in Texas, but we went and will continue to go. Wherever democracy goes we go.

Now that the organization has grown, we are to be criticized by those who attend Negro churches, Negro schools, Negro N. A. A. C. P.'s, Negro clubs, Negro bathing beaches, Negro Y. M. C. A.'s, Negro lodges, and Negro hotels. If the few of us had not formed the reception committee these 24 delegates who are here by our efforts would not have found their way into the Democratic Party. We shall continue our efforts to bring the Negroes of Mississippi, Alabama, Louisiana, South Carolina, Texas, and Arkansas into the folds, and we shall not pause; we shall not abdicate until black men of the South can share in every phase of enfranchisement, until peace and political tranquillity shall preside over every Negro fireside of the South, as well as the North. To this our association has dedicated itself. In this we shall not fail.

Through our organization we are constantly winning back the positions once held by us, but which were lost through the bungling of Negro Republicans. We are able to win them back because we are together and know what we want. Not only have we begun to win back our lost portfolios but we are gaining new ground.

For the first time in the history of this country a Negro sits on the Federal bench at a salary of $10,000 per year. We occupy positions of trust in every branch of the Government in larger numbers than ever before. Through our organization we have been able to win for Negro Democrats a Congressman, State senator, and alderman in Illinois; assemblyman and judges in New York; legislators, magistrates, and tax commissioner in Pennsylvania; State senator and representative in Michigan; representative and councilmen in Indiana; justice of the peace and constables in Missouri; justice of the peace in North Carolina; justice of the peace in Oklahoma; legislators in California, and numerous other positions, both appointive and elective, which attest the progress not only made by the National Colored Democratic Association, but also indicates the depth from which it has come.

Through our organization we have coming here to the Democratic National Convention two dozen Negro delegates and alternates; we have Negroes who have been appointed to positions in the convention of assistant to the secretary, assistant secretaries, doorkeepers, ushers, special officers, and every other position held by members of the other race. I ask you in all frankness and sincerity could one lone Negro Democrat have brought this to pass? No. It is the result of the joint effort of Negro Democrats from all over the country, who for the past 48 years have been meeting in quadrennial sessions just like this one, waiting for the day when it had grown to sufficient strength to merit the considerations which we are now enjoying.

None of us need be ashamed of our affiliation with the Democratic Party; as a matter of fact, we all should feel proud that we are members of a party that has given to this country a man of stature, a statesman, a humanitarian, a great benefactor—Franklin D. Roosevelt. No President since the administration of George Washington has kept the faith with the people as has President Roosevelt. Never before in the history of this Government has the Negro shared in the phases of the Government as he has under the New Deal administration of the Democratic Party.

Confronted with the worst depression and panic this country has ever seen, and brought about as a result of the horrible mistakes of three successive Republican administrations, our great President set about to bring calm out of chaos by every means at his disposal. With unlimited power granted him by the Congress, and with the universal approval of the citizens of this country, he began to use the Nation's credit to relieve the distressed, to feed the hungry, to clothe the naked, and to house the homeless. No one said anything then about the Budget; no one cared, not even the Republicans, because they were just as poverty-stricken and in need as anyone else. We were not as interested in a balanced budget as we were in a balanced ration. Our rations have been balanced; the hungry are being fed; the naked are being clothed; the homeless are being housed; the illiterate are being taught to read and write; the idle are being put back to work; the delinquent boys are being

given pensions; persons becoming unemployed are receiving unemployment insurance. The country has been removed from Wall Street and once again restored to the American people.

Are we going to return the Government back to the Wall Street gang, the utility magnates, and others of the group who are responsible for the mess that was dumped into the Democrats' lap in 1932. No. We are going to see to it that this country remains a country of the people, by the people, and for the people, and not a country of Willkie, by Willkie, and for Willkie.

Permit me to pay my respect to another great Democrat, who during the last two campaigns led this great party of ours to overwhelming victory—the Honorable James A. Farley. He is a man who understands the problems of all minority groups, and no one has done more than he to help these groups solve those problems. He is a man who graces every cause he espouses, dignifies every task he touches, ennobles every duty he performs—a man of vision, courage, and character. His realization of the part the Negro played in the two Democratic successes, his policy of being fair to all members of the party, his belief that the one who helps plow the corn should help eat it, is responsible for the thousands of Negroes now on the Government pay roll. Negroes have never had a better friend and Democrats have never had a better leader than James A. Farley.

Fellow Democrats, we have a great task before us. But there is no mountain that cannot be surmounted. There is no failure except in no longer trying; there is no defeat except from within; no really insurmountable barrier save our own inherent weakness of purpose.

Let us all rally together, work together, pull together for the good of our race, for the good of our party, for the good of our country. May God bless our great leader and give him strength to carry on his humanitarian fight of equal justice to all, special privileges to none.

ADDRESS BY HON. SHERMAN MINTON, OF INDIANA

Dr. Thompkins, distinguished guests, ladies, and gentlemen, there are two classes of speakers on the program today—those who have a prepared manuscript and those who are just to speak. I belong to the latter class, and it may seem strange to you to see a United States Senator who does not want to talk.

I am glad and delighted to have the opportunity to come here this afternoon and to meet with you in your convention and to greet you.

As Dr. Thompkins has told you, during my present service in the Senate of the United States I have supported everything that the colored people stood for—supported those measures because I wanted to, because I knew that what they stood for was right.

This morning when your own Earl Dickerson appeared before the resolutions committee and made his splendid statement on your behalf I was proud of him; he acquitted himself well, and I can say that the resolutions committee, of which I am a member, will give your request their earnest consideration. You asked no more than what you are entitled to; and I for one can assure you that I shall do everything within my power to see to it that you get what you ask for. There is no administration in the history of this great country of ours that has done so much for the colored people as the Democratic Party under this present administration. I am glad to be a member of that party and to assure you as a representative member of that party that the Democratic Party is not done yet. We intend to see that the colored man and woman is recognized and given the right of the ballot; we intend to see that they are given every opportunity to serve in the armed forces of this Nation. Why shouldn't you? Your are citizens. And the Democratic Party is proud to have your support.

This is a critical period in the history of our country. We do not know at what moment we may be challenged to take up arms in defense of our Nation; and I have been sitting as a member of the great committee of the United States Senate that has under consideration some of these problems. There are many persons who give excuses and apologies for not wanting to take up the arms of their country if the opportunity should present itself, but I can say that there has never been a member of your race who appeared before that committee and asked to be excused from bearing the arms.

We do not want war in this country, and we are not for war, if war will stay away from us; but we are definitely for defending the shores of America; and you are for that; you believe in being prepared to defend these shores. That is all that the Democratic Party is trying to do.

I am glad to be talking to Americans and I can say that if war should come, I and the American people will find as they have in the past the members of your race marching in the four columns and there will not be, nor has there been, any colored people marching in the "fifth column." You are loyal, and I say that the Democratic Party means to be loyal to you, and I believe that if one should peruse the record of this administration they would conclude that all citizens, regardless of race and creed, have been treated with fairness.

And so my friends I know you for what you are—as loyal American citizens who have done much for the life and welfare of the American nation and the principles of freedom, and if there is any one thing that makes the colored man stand out it is his loyalty to his country.

I know that you are going to rally around the standard of democracy because you people came from the common walks of life and I know the things that worry you and things that are of great concern to the colored people of this country. I know that you have a right to live as any other American citizen and the Democratic Party has tried to give you that right. And I know and you know that your race has the greatest friend that you have ever had in the White House today—the greatest friend to the colored people in the history of America. You are loyal to your friends and it is because of your honor and loyalty that I know that the colored man is not going to stand for the attempt to transfer the government of this country from Main Street back to Wall Street. We will have none of Wall Street Willkie.

Coming as I do from the State of Indiana, where Mr. Willkie lives, I know Mr. Willkie. I know him well. I went to school back in Indiana with Mr. Willkie; I was on the university debating team with him and I think some of my colored friends will remember Mr. Willkie. You know Willkie comes from Elwood, Ind., and you (colored people) have to have a special permit for colored people to come there—and that is the way the Republicans can conduct their town in Indiana. There is one thing that I can say and that is this—you do not have to have any visas on that permit to get to the Democratic nominee.

You know that I know Willkie; they call him Wendell Willkie—Willkie on the wrong side of everything. He can change his position as fast as Joe Louis can shift. This is the only respect in which he resembles Joe Louis: he is shifty, that's all—always changing. As I say, I know him, but when I knew him his name was Louis W. Wilkie and he spelled it with one "l" and now its Wendell Willkie—with two "l's". He has even shifted his name. When he was in school he was the leader of the antifraternity men. But what did he do later? He joined a fraternity—Willkie always changing.

I knew him when he was a Socialist and I have known him when he was a capitalist; I knew him when he was a Democrat and that was not very long ago—and he was not all right then. He was then as he is now—"A Wall Streeter." Then he was not all right and so I checked up with the papers the other day. They gave his religion as a Presbyterian, but when he lived in Indiana he was a Methodist—just on each side of each question, social, business, and political. He is therefore worthy to run on the Republican platform. They (Republicans) look in all directions and cover everything.

Now, Dr. Tompkins, I am delighted to be here this afternoon to assure you all my friendship and good will and I hope that with the support of your friends in Indiana that I may go back to the United States Senate and represent you for 6 more years.

ADDRESS OF ROBERT I. MILLER, PRESIDENT OF THE ROOSEVELT REPUBLICAN CLUB OF WASHINGTON, D. C.

Dr. Thompkins, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen of the jury, when I say ladies and gentlemen of the jury I mean that you are, this coming election, going to act as a part of the American jury to determine from the evidence whether or not our great President shall get 4 more years at Washington. I am satisfied that your verdict will be guilty and that each and every one of you will do all in your power to see that he stays in the White House.

It was very gratifying to me to hear General Farley, Senator BARKLEY, Senator MINTON, Senator GUFFEY, and Congressman RANDOLPH eulogize our great President. If time permitted, I could stand here on this platform and say many kind things about the President and his administration, but the speakers who preceded me have been clear, concise, and convincing in their remarks for President Roosevelt and his administration. I want you to know that there is someone else in Washington who deserves your utmost praise and support; that is our gallant lady, Eleanor Roosevelt. You know that when Marian Anderson, the nightingale of the air, was refused permission to sing at the Convention Hall and was snubbed by the Daughters of the American Revolution, that grand lady, Mrs. Roosevelt, through her fine efforts, arranged it so that she sang from the steps of the Lincoln Memorial. So you can see that the Lady of the Land deserves high praise for her fine efforts.

I have been a Republican all of my life and closely associated with the late Vice President Curtis for many years, and the last 3 years of his life I was associated with him in the practice of law. I have again organized the Roosevelt Republican Club to help the President this fall.

I could not be partisan from a political standpoint in these trying days of our country. We should all glory in the fact that we have a man in the White House whose experience is such that he can steer the ship of state from the rocky cliffs that are just ahead and bring it into waters of calmness, peace, and happiness. There were no partisan politics in 1776, and there should be none in 1940.

I therefore beseech all who believe in America, the America that brought forth the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution with its amendments, which gives to all the right of freedom of expression, the freedom of the press, and the freedom to worship an Almighty who guides the destiny of all, to reelect Franklin D. Roosevelt.

And in conclusion, I ask everyone of you in this audience to pray to the Almighty to give our great President his health and strength so that he may carry on the good and fine work he is doing for our country.

There Are No Islands Any More

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 30 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

POEM BY EDNA ST. VINCENT MILLAY

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a poem written by Edna St. Vincent Millay, entitled "There Are No Islands Any More."

There being no objection, the poem was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"THERE ARE NO ISLANDS ANY MORE"

Lines written in passion and in deep concern for England, France, and my own country

(By Edna St. Vincent Millay)

Dear Isolationist, you are
So very, very insular!
Surely you do not take offense?
The word's well used in such a sense.
'Tis you, not I, who insist
You are an Isolationist.

And, oh, how sweet a thing to be
Safe on an island, not at sea!
(Though someone said, some months ago—
I heard him, and he seemed to know;
Was it the German Chancelor?
"There are no islands any more.")

Dear Islander, I envy you:
I'm very fond of islands, too;
And few the pleasures I have known
Which equaled being left alone.
Yet matters from without intrude
At times upon my solitude:
A forest fire, a dog run mad,
A neighbor stripped of all he had
By swindlers, or the shrieking plea
For help, of stabbed Democracy.

Started, I rise, run from the room,
Join the brigade of spade and broom;
Help to surround the sickened beast;
Hear the account of farms fleeced
By dapper men, condole, and give
Something to help them hope and live;

Or, if democracy's at stake,
Give more, give more than I can make;
And notice, with a rueful grin,
What was without is not within.

(The tidal wave devours the shore:
There are no islands any more.)

With sobbing breath, with blistered hands,
Men fight the forest fire in bands;
With kitchen broom, with branch of pine,
Beat at the blackened, treacherous line;
Before the veering wind fall back,
With eyebrows burnt and faces black;
While breast in blackened streams perspire,
Watch how the wind runs with the fire
Like a broad banner up the hill—
And can no more * * * yet more must still.

New life!—To hear across the field
Voices of neighbors, forms concealed
By smoke, but loud the nearing shout:
"Hold on! We're coming! Here it's out."

(The tidal wave devours the shore:
There are no islands any more.)

This little life, from here to there—
Who lives it safely anywhere?
Not you, my insulated friend:
What calm composure will defend
Your rock, when tides you've never seen
Assault the sands of What-has-been
And from your island's tallest tree,
You watch advance What-is-to-be?
(The tidal wave devours the shore:
There are no islands any more.)

Sweet, sweet, to see the tide approach,
Assured that it cannot encroach
Upon the beach-peas, often wet
With spray, never uprooted yet.
The moon said—did she not speak true?—
"The waves will not awaken you.
At my command the waves retire.
Sleep, weary mind; dream, heart's desire."

And yet, there was a Danish king
Assured he governed everything
He bade the ocean not to rise.
It did. And great was the surprise.

No man, no nation, is made free
By stating it intends to be.
Jostled and elbowed is the clown
Who thinks to walk alone in town.

We live upon a shrinking sphere—
Like it or not, our home is here;
Brave heart, uncompromising brain
Couldn't make it seem like home again.

(There are no islands any more.
The tide that mounts our drowsy shore
Is boats and men—there is no place
For waves in such a crowded space.)

Oh, let us give, before too late
To those who hold our country's fate
Along with theirs—be sure of this—
In grimy hands—that will not miss

The target, if we stand beside
Loading the guns—(resentment, pride,
Debts town across with insolent word—
All this forgotten, or deferred

At least until there's time for strife
Concerning things less dear than Life;
Then let, if must be, in the brain
Resentment rankle once again,
Quibbling and Squabbling take the floor,
Cool Judgment go to sleep once more.)

On English soil, on French terrain,
Democracy's at grips again
With forces forged to stamp it out.
This time no quarter!—since no doubt.

Not France, not England's what's involved,
Not we,—there's something to be solved
Of grave concern to free men all:

Can Freedom stand? Must Freedom fall?
(Meantime, the tide devours the shore:
There are no islands any more.)

Oh, build, assemble, transport, give,
That England, France, and we may live,
Before tonight, before too late,
To those who build our country's fate
In desperate fingers, reaching out
For weapons we confer about,
All that we can, and more, and now!
Oh, God, let not the lovely brow
Of Freedom in the trampled mud
Grow cold! Have we no brains, no blood,
No enterprise—no any thing
Of which we proudly talk and sing,
Which we like men can bring to bear
For Freedom, and against Despair?

Lest French and British fighters, deep
In battle, needing guns and sleep,
For lack of aid be overthrown,
And we be left to fight alone.

Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ERNEST LUNDEEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 30 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

EDITORIALS FROM WALLACES' FARMER

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. President, I ask leave to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD five editorials from Wallaces'

Farmer on the subject of the foreign policy of the United States.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Wallaces' Farmer of June 18, 1938]

GET OUR PEOPLE OUT OF WAR ZONE

The United States is taking too many risks in the Chino-Japanese war. Those risks need not be taken. The fact that they are being taken is the direct responsibility of President Roosevelt and Secretary Hull.

Corn Belt farmers, like Wallaces' Farmer and Iowa Homestead, dislike to make such charges against the President and the Secretary of State. Both are good friends of agriculture. They have done much to raise and stabilize farm income since 1933. But even the best of men have their blind spots.

The Chinese situation seems to be the blind spot for the Roosevelt administration. Wallaces' Farmer and Iowa Homestead has pointed this out before.

The United States still has troops and warships in China and in Chinese waters. They run the risks that all innocent bystanders run who foolishly walk through a riot. The sinking of the *Panay* showed what could happen.

Our soldiers in China are too few to do any fighting and too many to be killed. Let's bring them home.

Our neutrality law forbids the shipment of munitions of war to nations at war. Certainly China and Japan are at war, even though Japan calls it something else. But the neutrality law has not yet been invoked to bar shipments of munitions to both countries.

It has been rumored that our State Department doesn't want to use the neutrality law because it might help Japan and might hurt China. What business is that of ours? We are not an ally of China nor an enemy of Japan. We are neutral. Let's put the neutrality law to work and stay neutral.

If we do not do this, a Japanese warship will sooner or later stop or sink an American ship loaded with contraband of war and bound for China. And the yellow press will howl about national honor and scream for war.

Under the Neutrality Act, properly enforced, no munitions would be sold to either Japan or China. And if there seemed danger to American shipping in handling other goods, those goods could be sold by us at the water's edge to whatever foreign shipper wanted to take the risk of transport.

Up to date, we have been very lucky in this Chino-Japanese affair. We have only lost one warship and a few men. We have had no merchant ships sunk.

But we can't trust that luck to continue. Unless we want an excuse to fight Japan, let's get our troops, ships, and citizens out of China. And let's enforce the Neutrality Act!

[From Wallaces' Farmer of November 4, 1939]

TO VOTE ON GOING INTO WAR

Iowa farmers are apparently friendly to the idea behind the Ludlow amendment, the plan to make a national vote necessary before the Nation engages in a war overseas. Our survey, reported on page 8, shows 57 percent of Iowa farm people in favor of it, 26 percent against, and 17 percent doubtful.

Wallaces' Farmer and Iowa Homestead would agree with Iowa farmers in a mild approval of the desirability of a referendum as a last-ditch defense against war. It might give the Nation a final chance to draw back from the precipice.

But actually we fear the issue of war or peace would be settled long before the referendum would be taken. The day-to-day decisions of the administration, the speeches on one side or the other, the warnings, the note-writing, the propaganda of the press, the impact of events overseas—all these things determine the mood of the country long before a vote is called for.

That is why the Neutrality Act seems to us so important. If we keep away credits from foreign buyers, if we keep our ships out of the war zone, and if we keep our citizens off belligerent ships and out of dangerous territory, there is a chance of avoiding the incidents that make nations see red.

We would do still better if we limited exports of all kinds to the amounts normally shipped in times of peace, and avoided any economic dependence on a war boom. And we would be particularly wise if we could bring ourselves to look on the war as just another struggle to see who is to run Europe, and not as another war "to save the world for democracy." We should have learned in 1918 that war doesn't save democracy; war ruins democracies and creates dictatorships.

[From Wallaces' Farmer of October 7, 1939]

WHAT ABOUT THOSE NINE BILLIONS?

How much do Great Britain and France owe the United States in unpaid debts hanging over from the first World War? The total is considerably over $9,000,000,000, with Great Britain owing us five and France four billions. Neither country has made any serious effort to pay on the principal, and both stopped paying even interest several years ago. American taxpayers are paying the interest on the bonds that financed these loans, and will eventually have to pay the principal.

There will be suggestions soon that the United States ought to lend these countries more money, or at least that these nations should be allowed to sell their bonds in the United States. It might be a good idea to wait until they pay off the old debts before handing over any more cash.

[From Wallaces' Farmer of February 11, 1939]

WHAT GUAM MEANS TO FARMERS

Iowa farmers will be seeing a lot in the newspapers about Guam shortly. From an insignificant little island part way from Hawaii to the Philippines, it has turned into a major issue in the congressional debates on war and neutrality.

The Navy board, in its report on naval bases, said quite properly that whether the United States fortified Guam was a question of national policy. But it intimated that a fortified Guam would help greatly in defending the Philippines, and would be a threat to Japan and to any expeditionary force from Japan headed toward the Philippines.

The question before Congress, therefore, really is not on fortifying Guam but on what we want to do about the Philippines.

The Nation is already on record for returning the islands to the control of their own people. The Philippines, by our own act, are on the way to independence.

Now what do we want to do? Four courses are possible:

1. Stand by Philippine independence and assume no responsibility for the defense of the islands.

2. Stand by Philippine independence but secure an agreement with Great Britain, Australia, France, and the Netherlands (all these powers are strong in that area), guaranteeing the independence of the islands.

3. Abandon Philippine independence, treat the islands as American soil, and prepare to defend them.

4. Permit the Philippines to be half-way independent, but be prepared to go to war to defend them if necessary.

The question really boils down to this: Is the United States ready to go to war to protect the Philippines if the islands are threatened by Japan?

From the naval standpoint, defense of the islands is a big order. It means a much bigger Navy than we have now. It means expensive naval bases, not only on Guam, but on the islands themselves.

A bill has been introduced in the House of Representatives which provides for additional defense of Guam. A fortified Guam is not needed to defend the United States. It is needed only if the United States has made up its mind to defend the Philippines as if they were American property.

But has the United States made up its mind? We think not. And we are sure it is ridiculous to start spending money for defense before we have made up our minds what we want to defend.

We all know that we want adequate defense for the continental United States and for the Panama Canal. Most people—including military and naval authorities—are doubtful about defending the Philippines.

Then why not spend our money where we are sure we want to spend it, and hold up appropriations for Guam and other far eastern points until the Nation makes up its mind whether it really wants to get ready for a war with Japan over the Philippine Islands?

[From Wallaces' Farmer of June 15, 1940]

DEFENSE TAKES MORE THAN GUNS AND PLANES

"Cut out all those farm appropriations." That has been the first response of some reactionaries to the movement to re-arm the Nation in accordance with the new methods of warfare uncovered in Europe.

We can expect to see a determined drive, not only to cut out farm appropriations, but to abolish Federal expenditures for relief, education, health, housing, and the like, and to abandon national planning for social ends.

Yet one of the important items in a defense program is to have a nation which affords such good opportunities for work and security that men and women will be willing to struggle and, if necessary, to die for it.

Take a man who has been out of a job for years, or a farm tenant who was crowded off his farm. They must see something better in store for their children before they can work and fight with spirit for the defense of our society.

Mr. Willkie's Stand on Draft

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SHERMAN MINTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 30 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

ARTICLE FROM THE PHILADELPHIA RECORD

Mr. MINTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article from the Philadel-

phia Record of Friday, August 30, 1940, under the heading "Wilkie's Stand on Draft To Aid F. D. R.—GUFFEY."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Philadelphia Record of August 30, 1940]

WILLKIE'S STAND ON DRAFT TO AID F. D. R.—GUFFEY—SENATOR SAYS POSITION ON PLANT SEIZURE ASSURES ROOSEVELT VICTORY

(By Thomas P. O'Neil)

Senator JOSEPH F. GUFFEY last night declared that Wendell Willkie's stand against conscription of industry assures the re-election of President Roosevelt.

GUFFEY, Pennsylvania's No. 1 new dealer, here for a political conference, said:

"There must be no draft-dodging dollars in America.

"If we can draft American boys to safeguard our liberties we can draft our American dollars to back them up."

GUFFEY FOR IT

"I voted to draft the boys and I voted to draft the dollars.

"Wendell Willkie, the wallflower of Wall Street, by his stand in favor of drafting American boys but not American dollars, has made the issue of this campaign clear. It is the old story: Human rights against property rights.

"I predict here and now that the Willkie philosophy will be repudiated in Pennsylvania by a margin of upward of 600,000 next November. In the Nation he will be another Landon.

"Wendell Willkie's policy of draft the boys but not the dollars assures the reelection of Franklin Delano Roosevelt."

STANDS ON RECORD

GUFFEY, who is being opposed for reelection by Republican City Chairman Jay Cooke, added that "on my vote on the draft bill, plus my 6-year record of 100-percent support of the Roosevelt New Deal, I am willing to stand or fall in my campaign."

The Senator said he will not open his campaign until mid-September, but will make an important political address tomorrow at Lakewood Park, near Pottsville, Schuylkill County.

GUFFEY conferred with his campaign manager, Luther Harr, at the Ritz Carlton Hotel, but had no comment to make on local or State political affairs. It was learned, however, that the Senator is in favor of withholding distribution of important Federal jobs in Pennsylvania, including the United States district attorneyship here, until after the November election.

DECISION DELAYED

"I may have something to say about the Philadelphia Federal prosecutor's place in Washington after the holiday," was all that GUFFEY would say.

Principal contenders for the position are State Senator Harry Shapiro and former United States Attorney General Gerald A. Gleeson, both of whom supported GUFFEY for renomination last spring when he defeated Turnpike Commissioner Walter A. Jones.

GUFFEY was the first nationally known new dealer to take a rap at Willkie's opposition to the industrial draft.

The Pennsylvania Senator was one of the first Members of Congress to openly declare himself against sending American soldiers to Europe.

NATION ACCLAIMS

In a speech at the Labor Lyceum here, April 9, he declared:

"I would never vote to send a single American boy overseas to fight in a foreign war."

His declaration won Nation-wide acclaim.

GUFFEY was a leader in the drive to include in the draft bill provision that service should be limited to the Western Hemisphere.

Plain Economics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 30 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

ARTICLE BY JOHN T. FLYNN

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, about 2 years ago, I began to feel that the time would come, the time being conjectural, when there would be another World War in Europe and great effort made to interest Americans to the extent of again participating in an affair that was no business of ours. As a result I thereafter from time to time took occasion to warn the American people that propagandists would simply flood this country with a view to getting us into a European war when it did come. Before and since September 3, 1939, when war was formally declared in Europe, we have been deluged with propaganda on every hand and from every direction—through the press, over the radio, by the newspaper columnists, radio commentators, organizations, and lecturers from foreign shores. They have put in their deadly work unquestionably. In this particular connection I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by the pen of Mr. John T. Flynn which recently appeared in the columns of the Washington Daily News under the heading of "Plain Economics."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Daily News]

PLAIN ECONOMICS

(By John T. Flynn)

NEW YORK, August 29.—There is nothing surprising in the declaration by Senator BURTON K. WHEELER that Sir George Paish boasted to him that he had helped to get America into the last war and was going to do the same thing now.

Sir George Paish is not unknown in America. He is one of a group of British economists—Sir Arthur Salter is another—who are continuously used as unofficial agents of the British Government whenever it has a bill of goods to sell to the United States.

This writer has been calling attention to the arrival and activities of these gentlemen for a number of years. There are four of them, and I have several times referred to them as the "four economic horsemen of the British Government."

England has had a number of requests to make of this country since the last war. A leading one, of course, has been cancelation of her $4,000,000,000 war debt to us. At intervals Sir George Paish or Sir Arthur Salter or several other British economists appear here. They never come as representatives of the British Government. They come as economists.

In America an economist is merely a poor student or teacher, with nothing but his professorial title to distinguish him. But in England an economist who has propaganda talents can be made a knight—"Sir George" or "Sir Arthur."

When he arrives here, thus decorated, he is promptly taken up, feted, dined, wined, introduced by American allies to the circles he wishes most to influence. He delivers lectures to colleges, chambers of commerce, business groups, learned societies, industriously infecting them with the particular virus he carries. One of these economist propagandists is Sir George Paish.

In the last war England spent $265,000,000 for propaganda in America. Does anyone suppose she is spending less now? And what she wants is, first, to get America to commit an act of war of some sort against Germany and to bring about repeal of the Johnson law, which prevents loans to debtors in default to the United States.

If the United States turns over part of her Navy—50 destroyers—to Britain now, that will be an act of war against Germany. That is being urged in Congress and on the President. Also, Congress is being asked to consider a plan by which Britain will turn over a group of bases in this hemisphere and we will cancel the war debt—$4,000,000,000.

Who do you suppose cooked up these two schemes? Does anyone suppose that they originated in the minds of American supporters of England? Or did they blossom in the minds of the British Government, to be planted in the minds of American statesmen by British agents like Sir George Paish?

This incident brings Sir George Paish into the limelight. Why not identify and expose all the other agents, British and German, who are trying to implicate us one way or another on their respective sides?

America Finances Japan's "New Order"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE E. GEYER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 30, 1940

ARTICLE BY HENRY H. DOUGLAS

Mr. GEYER of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I insert in the Appendix an article from Amerasia for the month of July 1940.

It is self-explanatory. The article was written by Henry H. Douglas, who is a student of oriental affairs.

The article is as follows:

[From the Amerasia for July 1940]

AMERICA FINANCES JAPAN'S "NEW ORDER"

(By Henry H. Douglas)

The United States has not only continued to send immense quantities of war materials to Japan for the prosecution of its war on China, but it may also be said that Japan's aggression has been largely financed by American money.

The gold and silver purchases of the United States Treasury have, in large measure, assisted Japan in her war on the Chinese people and in the financing of Japan's so-called "New Order in East Asia." Many millions of dollars worth of gold and silver have been converted into dollar balances here and used to finance purchases of arms and raw materials from the United States and Europe, principally from the United States. Not only have we furnished Japan the means with which to buy these war materials, but we have furnished them in unlimited quantities, even to the detriment of our own defense requirements. These war materials, in 1939, constituted over 70 percent of all our exports to Japan.

We have aided Japan by our gold- and silver-buying policies, by our wheat and cotton subsidies, by the acceptance of the Japanese valuation of cotton goods shipped into this country, and in other ways.

During the 3 years, 1937–39, the United States purchased $580,816,000 worth of gold from Japan at the very handsome price of $35 an ounce. The world price being $20.67 an ounce, Japan naturally was glad to sell all her extra gold to us. In view of the disparity between our price and the world price, in this item alone, we made an outright gift to the Japanese of $240,000,000.

The total silver bought directly from Japan during this same 3-year period was:

	Ounces	Amount
1937	2,872,000	$1,273,000
1938	6,887,000	2,929,000
1939	10,618,000	4,234,000
	20,377,000	8,436,000

As is readily apparent, there was a sharp rise in American silver purchases from Japan during this period, the 1939 figure showing an increase of 270 percent compared with imports for 1937, and 54 percent compared with imports for 1938. This increase coincides directly with the course of Japan's war on China and her increasing need for foreign exchange.

In addition to these direct imports, there were indirect purchases of Japanese silver by the United States via the London market. Handy & Harman, one of the foremost authorities on precious metals, estimates Japanese sales of silver to the United Kingdom at about:

	Ounces
1937	21,579,000
1938	18,500,000
1939	15,000,000
	55,079,000

No doubt a major portion of this silver was finally resold to the United States. In 1937, 43 percent of the total British silver exports went to the United States, in 1938 the proportion was 90 percent, and in 1939 it was 58 percent (the 58 percent being based on data for the first 8 months). Assuming that practically all the silver imports into the United Kingdom were finally reexported, as is indicated by a virtual balance between their imports and exports over the last 10 years, that part of the imports from Japan which was resold to the United States may be roughly calculated as approximately amounting to the same percentages as the above. The value of this Japanese silver resold to the United States by the United Kingdom would then have a value of $14,762,000, the yearly quantities being:

	Ounces
1937	9,279,000
1938	16,650,000
1939	8,700,000

Totaling the amount of silver thus bought from Japan by the United States, directly and indirectly, we have:

	Ounces	Amount
1937	12,151,000	$5,438,000
1938	23,537,000	10,126,000
1939	19,318,000	7,634,000
	55,006,000	23,198,000

It has been generally known that a goodly proportion of the silver sold by Japan during the past 3 years was of Chinese origin. This Chinese silver was acquired by Japan either through distressed selling by the Chinese, or by forcible seizure from Chinese banks, business houses, private homes, and peasants' farms in the occupied territories. This silver amounted to at least 12,000,000 ounces (U. S. $5,386,000) in 1937; 15,212,000 ounces (U. S. $6,575,000) in 1938; 15,118,000 ounces (U. S. $5,908,000) in 1939; making a total for the 3-year period of 42,330,000 ounces at a value of $17,869,000. These estimated figures have been arrived at by deducting from total Japanese silver exports to the United Kingdom and the United States the Japanese domestic mine production, as shown in the following table:

	Ounces
Total mine production, 1937–39	33,126,000
Exports to the United States	20,377,000
Exports to the United Kingdom	55,079,000
Total to United States and United Kingdom	75,456,000
Silver of Chinese origin:	
Excess of total exports over domestic production (value $17,869,000)	42,330,000

Quantity ratio of silver of Chinese origin to total exports makes an average, for the 3 years, of 56 percent.

It is also quite obvious, now that the Japanese and the British have come to an agreement over the 50,000,000 ounces of Chinese silver in the Tientsin banks, that the United States Treasury is going to pay the Japanese about $20,000,000 in valuable foreign exchange for the privilege of storing it in one of our fool-proof vaults. This silver-buying policy of the United States not only confers a gratuitous subsidy on Japan, but adds insult to injury to the Chinese, not to mention the insult to the sentiments of over 80 percent of the American people who have repeatedly expressed their opposition to any participation in Japan's aggression.

The injury to China resulted from America's buying policy which nearly doubled the price of silver. Though Chinese silver stocks were accordingly boosted in value, our policy at the same time raised the value, in China's silver money, of Chinese goods and, of course, of foreign money. This increase in price made it that much more difficult to sell China's goods abroad, with the result that China quickly became a debtor rather than a creditor nation, a factor which was largely responsible for China's going off the silver standard in 1935.

Now to sum up, in some very simple figures, the extent of the principal items in our policy of assistance to Japan from 1937 through 1939. Our total exports to Japan during this period were $759,625,000, while our imports were $483,044,000, giving Japan an unfavorable balance of $276,581,000. However, we more than compensated Japan for this unfavorable balance because during this period we purchased from Japan:

Gold	$580,816,000
Silver	23,198,000
Imports of goods	483,044,000
Total	1,087,058,000
Less our exports to Japan	759,625,000
Favorable balance for Japan	327,433,000

In other words, we not only completely financed Japan's purchases in this country during this period, but for the same period we provided them with a balance of $327,433,000.

Still further, Japan's world imports for 1937–39 were $2,431,000,000, while her exports were $2,333,000,000, giving Japan an unfavorable balance of $98,000,000. We enabled Japan to write off this deficit while still retaining a favorable world balance of $229,433,000.

The vast majority of our people deplore our continued shipments to Japan of war materials of direct use in the prosecution of her war, yet this material amounted in 1937 to $168,382,000, or 53 percent of our exports to Japan; 1938 to $165,247,000, or 63 percent of our exports to Japan; 1939 (9 months) to $96,577,000, or 71 percent of our exports to Japan, totaling over $450,000,000 for the 3 years.

We have also aided Japan in many other ways, the difference being merely one of degree. Some of the ways are briefly described in the following paragraphs.

Under the stimulus of our cotton export subsidy, Japan, in the latter part of 1939, stepped up her purchases of American cotton to over six times the amount of the purchases during the similar period in 1938. Thus this subsidy, during the 6 months of its operation, bestowed a bounty upon Japan of approximately $7,000,000.

Under the export subsidy policy, designed to increase foreign purchases of surplus American cotton, buyers abroad were able to purchase the raw fiber at prices about $7.50 per bale below domestic quotations, the American Government paying the difference.

Anticipating inauguration of the American export program, Japan, as well as other foreign users of American cotton, reduced their old stocks and replenished their supplies at the reduced prices offered under the United States subsidy program.

Not only did we sell this raw cotton to Japan at reduced prices, but by our tariff policy we have been making it possible for the Japanese to sell us the finished textiles in such a way as to undermine seriously, eventually, our economic structure and our standard of living. As Congressman JOSEPH R. BRYSON said in the House last February 12, "Attempts to equalize Japanese and American costs of production have failed because the Japanese have utilized the device of lowering the declared value of imports. The Japanese have found that they can defeat the purpose of our tariff restrictions by simply declaring lower values, and prices in Japan cannot be checked because these goods are practically all sold for export. * * * By declaring this lowered value on their cotton goods, the Japanese were able to ship into America over 1,500 percent more square yards of cotton cloth during 1939 than they shipped during 1932.

"It is obvious that we shall never be able to protect the American textile industry against this viciously destructive competition as long as we accept the values on cotton goods which the Japanese declare. The only effective way to deal with this problem is to base tariff duties on known American costs of production."

This practice which we have been following grants Japanese manufacturers a virtual subsidy on textile exports to the United States in competition with American textiles.

In addition to all the items I have already enumerated, American arms, ammunition, and materials of war can no longer be shipped to China on American ships, but they can be shipped to Japan. The only ports of entry to China are now through French Indochina and British Burma, since Japan has occupied all the Chinese ports, and the Neutrality Act provides that American ships cannot carry arms to belligerent ports anywhere in the world. The United States Maritime Commission also subsidizes American ships carrying on trade between Seattle, Tokyo, and other ports.

The United States grants Japan most-favored-nation treatment, but does not grant the same to China.

The United States allows tourists to visit Japan and spend valuable United States dollars there, but refuses tourist visas to China.

The Japanese authorities in China are now exacting "contributions" from American merchants for the release of goods purchased in the interior for shipment abroad. A flagrant case of this kind is reported by George E. Anderson in the New York Herald Tribune for February 18, 1940.

Up to the time of the present crisis one of the things that was holding up the more rapid manufacture of equipment for the Army and Navy was the fact that so many United States factories were sending machine tools to Japan.

Fortunately this condition has now been remedied, but the War Department recently completed a survey of the machine-tool industry only to find that most American plants were working on orders for the Japanese. Apparently, the Japanese have all the machine tools they need for the present, and are storing all they can get for future emergencies.

What has all this gracious assistance to Japan gained us? Has it brought us increased good will and a more solid basis for confidence? We have another lesson in Italy. It has been reported that one of the deciding factors in Mussolini's declaration of war was the fact that the Allies failed to stick to their original decision to ration his oil supplies, allowing him to accumulate oil stocks sufficient for many months.

Is the United States to continue this shortsighted policy of giving unlimited aid to a nation under the domination of unscrupulous militarists, who, even now, with our help, are building up the means by which they will eventually be able to dominate the whole Pacific area? We have now ceased to finance aggression in one-half of the world. How long are we going to continue to finance aggression in the other half?

NOTE.—The silver data in this article was compiled by the Chinese Council for Economic Research.

Acquisition of Air and Naval Bases

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 30 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW YORK DAILY NEWS

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, Let's Get the Title First is the subject of a most interesting editorial recently published in the columns of the New York Daily News. I direct attention to this editorial for its particular value in reference to outposts in the Atlantic. May I say in this connection that several years ago I advocated the securing of outposts in the North and South Atlantic for hemispherical protection. Later, I introduced a resolution authorizing the President of the United States to enter into negotiations with Great Britain and France with a view to acquiring these islands by way of agreeing upon a price and later crediting such price agreed upon to the billions that are due us from Great Britain and France, as a result of loans made during the World War, in which, unfortunately, we participated. We need outposts in the Atlantic, both north and south. We need them badly, but I contend that if we owned them outright it would be much better than leasing these bases, air and naval. If I were building a house I would rather build it upon land that I actually owned and had full control of rather than making construction of a dwelling upon leased property that belonged to someone else. The first would certainly be more satisfactory, particularly to the owner of the house. I ask leave that the editorial may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Daily News]

LET'S GET THE TITLE FIRST

The leasing of air and naval bases from Britain is a pretty hot topic right now. So is the proposed transfer of 50 over-age destroyers to Britain.

It might be possible for us to make a really good deal if we can swap those destroyers for long-term leases on bases in Newfoundland, Bermuda, Trinidad, etc. They ought to be very long-term leases, judging from past experience with Britain. The British are shrewd businessmen and even shrewder traders. They do not always keep their promises. As witness there is Lawrence of Arabia. At a time when the Allied cause in the Near East looked hopeless during the last war, Lawrence was dispatched to Arabia to bring Emir Feisal into line, avert an Arab revolt, and to push back the Turks. He did all these things by a combination of personality, savvy, and promises—among them a promise that Feisal would be given control over Syria. When the war ended, Feisal was euchered out of Syria, which became a French-mandated possession.

DOUBLE-CROSS; ITALY GOT THE SAME

Lawrence felt that his honor had been besmirched. He resigned his post, entered the British Army as a private, and died there, ashamed of his country's perfidy.

Mussolini and Italy felt the same way after the last war. To bring Italy in (she was pledged to stand by Germany) the Allies promised her a variety of concessions and possessions, none of which she got. Italy felt she had been made a fool of. She never forgot that double-cross. Which is one reason why she lined up with Berlin before this war.

In our own case, Britain promised to pay us some $4,000,000,000. She didn't do so, either because she couldn't or wouldn't. Instead she began to call us Uncle Shylock, a name which originated in France but which got there deviously from Britain. None of this sort of monkey business is calculated to increase confidence in the promises of Britain.

WE CAN USE THOSE BASES

From the practical standpoint, there is no doubt that we urgently need and can immediately use the bases the British are offering to us. Newfoundland, for example, has plenty of deep harbors for anchorage, plus good airport facilities already being used for war purposes. Newfoundland stands as our first line of defense against an invasion via the St. Lawrence and the Mohawk-Hudson Valleys. Ditto Bermuda, accessible from the Spanish (German?) dominated Canaries and only 700 miles offshore. Ditto Trinidad, protecting the southern entrance to the Caribbean and the Panama Canal. Ditto, to a lesser extent, Jamaica and British Guiana. Even if we don't develop bases at all these points, we most certainly should option some land at each place, just in case we need it later.

And, of course, we need some bases in the South American countries; perhaps one at Natal, on the bulge of Brazil; perhaps another across the continent in Chile or Peru; that is, assuming that we mean what we say when we talk of hemisphere defense. For that matter, a base or two in Mexico wouldn't be amiss; and if that country ever gets its affairs in order, perhaps this can be arranged. Hemisphere defense calls for cooperation from every country within the hemisphere. Such cooperation has been notoriously lacking from Mexico under its present Government.

From what we have said above about British promises, it shouldn't be inferred that this country is still mad at Britain. We're not; we're willing to let bygones be bygones.

But, if we intend to lend Britain 50 destroyers, which may be the prelude to our full-time entry into the war, let's get the title to those air and naval bases first; let's get the title and occupancy before we hand over the destroyers.

Inspection of Coal Mines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAVID J. WARD

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 30, 1940

Mr. WARD. Mr. Speaker, I have been asked to sign the petition on the Speaker's desk to discharge the Committee on Mines and Mining to permit the House to consider S. 2420, relating to certain inspections and investigations in coal mines for the purpose of obtaining information relating to health and safety conditions, accidents, and occupational diseases there, and for other purposes. My reason for not

signing the petition is that the objectives sought in the bill are now authorized by existing law—that is, the Bituminous Coal Act—and department practices. I am in accord with the report of the subcommittee appointed to consider the bill, in which it is stated that the subcommittee, limited by the bounds of proper legislative procedure, cannot recommend the passage of repetitious legislation which would only serve to confuse and duplicate existing legal authority.

Quoting from the report of the subcommittee:

Since it is the subcommittee's views that the provisions of S. 2420 are found in existing law, the arguments on the merits of the measure are purely academic and reference is made to certain objections to the measure only to acquaint the committee with some of the grave problems involved in its consideration. This bill would establish a dual system of inspection which would terminate only in the abandonment of the States' systems. It also gives rise to the problems of States' rights, expanding Federal bureaucracy, and to the constitutional rights of operators. The solution of these problems cannot be arrived at without careful deliberation and certainly not under the emotional pressure that follows disasters such as have been recently experienced. Yet the fact that these disasters do occur and the belief that it might be possible for the Congress of the United States to do something to lessen the possibilities of such disasters, prompts your subcommittee to refuse to dismiss this question simply because the instrument under consideration does not provide the proper remedy.

The hearings on this bill indicate that education and not inspection is the most effective preventive of accidents. I am in thorough accord with the recommendation of the subcommittee that the chairman of the committee be requested to introduce immediately legislation that would provide for a thorough and complete investigation by his committee or a subcommittee of the conditions existing in the production of coal in the mines in the United States, and for this purpose, that a sum of $10,000 be asked of the Congress to enable this body to make the proper field investigation.

I am also in accord with the further recommendation of the subcommittee that the committee petition the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives for a substantial increase in the appropriations for the Bureau of Mines so they may expand their educational program.

The National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 30, 1940

LETTER TO CONSTITUENTS

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter sent by me to residents in my congressional district:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., August 31, 1940.

DEAR FRIEND: I am making this final appeal to you. The Nation faces an appalling crisis today. The forces of bigotry, intolerance, and despotism are running wild in the Old World, threatening to extinguish democracy from the earth. It behooves us to get all of our defenses in perfect readiness for any storm which might occur.

I am a member of the Military Affairs Committee. Through the spring and summer months I have sat here in Washington at my post of duty, working on the expansion program of our national defenses. Congress has just passed the excess-profits tax, a new appropriation bill of $5,000,000,000 for further defense, the National Guard mobilization bill. Provision has just been made for the building of 19,000 new airplanes; work of building camps and cantonments to take care of the mobilizing troops is going forward; tanks, ammunition, uniforms, guns, and other equipment are now being turned out in sizable quantities; and the Nation is moving in a fair way toward complete preparedness. Even as this is written the House is getting ready to consider, and probably will pass, the selective military training bill, which will call into service 1,200,000 men between the ages of 21 and 45.

The Americanism program is approaching a solution. Already the registration of aliens has begun and many laws and regulations are being brought to bear upon the would-be spy, traitor, and hostile alien to give to him the treatment which he so justly deserves.

The program of national defense and Americanism is dear to the hearts of the American people. We who fought in 1917–18 know the horrors of warfare and do not want it visited on our own land and on our own shores. I am, therefore, appealing to you in this hour of crisis to set aside petty politics and give me your united support and cooperation. I am appealing to you to endorse the program which I represent in Congress and to at once go to work on its behalf.

Because I have been here in Washington, working on the preparedness program, I have not been able to get around and see and talk with you. To have been permitted to return home would have given me an opportunity of explaining many of these problems to you and showing you some of our difficulties. I have, therefore, been forced to write these reports from time to time to keep you informed.

If you endorse the program of national defense to the utmost, 100 percent Americanism, and to rid the country of all spies, traitors, and "fifth columnists," I claim your active support.

Yours for a safe and happy land,

OVERTON BROOKS,
United States Congressman.

New Frontiers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR.

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 30, 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON, OF VIRGINIA

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, by leave granted, I take pleasure in inserting in my extension of remarks, an address delivered by our brilliant and beloved colleague, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], which is aptly styled New Frontiers.

The gentleman's cogent and forceful analysis is representative of much thought and study and is an expression in luminous words of his idealistic philosophy and understanding of some of the aspects of the world of today.

The address of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] follows:

During the 8 years of my service in the Congress we have been faced with some serious domestic problems, largely growing out of the World War. Just 1 year ago today I had the honor of addressing the graduating class of the Woodstock High School, at which time I referred to the fact that in addition to paying for the last war the world was also paying for a war that had not yet been fought. That war is now being fought and as the German juggernaut has rolled over Poland, Norway, Holland, Belgium, and France, I have thought of the gloomy prediction of H. G. Wells who said, "Mankind, which began in a cave and behind a windbreak, will end in the disease-soaked ruins of a slum." In the face of such unparalleled destruction and of a barbarism unsurpassed in the period of recorded history no government and no social order can longer feel secure. Without seeking to minimize the gravity of the situation that confronts us, I come before you today to ask that you treat the present crisis as a challenge to your patriotism and to your creative courage.

FRONTIER FROM EDEN

In a recent round-table discussion at the University of Rochester, Owen D. Young said that the problem of new frontiers began with the exit from the Garden of Eden and will continue until the last survivor of man, like the dinosaur, through failure to adjust himself to new conditions shall have passed away. The early settlers in this country adjusted themselves to new frontiers of virgin land. Their problem was the annual production of farm crops and the building of sailing ships by which those products were carried to foreign markets. Let no one assume that the adjustment of the early settlers to new frontiers did not involve human qualities of the highest degree. The elements as well as the savages were threats to their personal and financial security. Those pioneers had courage, and no machine that man can invent is a substitute for that human quality. And with that courage they combined energy, vision, and a willingness to make sacrifices. Those are the qualities of character

to which we refer when we speak of the spirit of the pioneer; the qualities in any day or age which are essential to success.

The invention of the steam engine by James Watt in 1769 opened a new frontier both here and abroad. The early part of the nineteenth century saw the construction of railroads and of factories and the commencement in this country of the competition of industry with agriculture—a new frontier for the farm boy in the industrial city. In 1824 the struggle of industry for a protective tariff commenced in the Congress, culminating in 1827 in victory for the industrial interests although at that time there were only about 10,000 factories in the Nation and the value of farm exports far exceeded that of manufactured goods.

WON BATTLE; LOST GOAL

The battle between industry and agriculture over a protective tariff for industry continued through the intervening years until in 1930 industry won what it regarded as its biggest tariff battle, namely, the Hawley-Smoot tariff. But in winning that battle industry lost the economic war because in paralyzing the foreign outlets for surplus farm products industry lost its best customer, namely, 30,000,000 domestic farmers, and was plunged into the worst depression it has ever known.

There are those who believe that this Nation has reached a stage of matured economy to which our productive capacities must be geared. To accept that theory would be to admit the need for a planned economy and regimentation. It is my firm belief, however, that modern scientific research holds for us unlimited new possibilities and that there is no inherent reason why the frontiers of the future should not be broader and brighter than any of the past.

The new frontiers of the nineteenth century were marked by the development of transcontinental railway systems, the telegraph and telephone, the automobile and many other useful devices that grew out of the imaginations of practical-minded men. Railroads and factories not only drew men to the cities, they likewise drew the wealth of the country to the industrial centers as we began to tap our rich deposits of coal, iron, oil, and lumber. Under the stimulus of these devolpments the twentieth century was ushered in as the golden era, although sometimes referred to in this country as the era of dollar diplomacy.

RECALLS THOMAS EDISON

Many of you have no doubt seen the recent moving picture in which Mickey Rooney plays the part of the young Tom Edison, the boy who was considered to be too dumb to stay in school, but who turned out to be the greatest inventive genius of his age. In that picture the mother of Tom Edison defends the lack of her son's interest in what was recorded in his textbooks by saying: "Tom is interested in causes not in effects." Practical-minded men, like Edison, using the empiric technique, made up for what they may have lacked in scientific education by initiative, courage, and an inexhaustible capacity for taking pains. If the capacity for taking pains is not genius it is a good substitute for it. Last week a friend of Edison's was telling me of dining in the Edison home when Edison was working on his new storage battery. Edison came in, his clothes disheveled, his hands covered with grime. For 6 consecutive days and nights he had been in his laboratory with little food and still less sleep, dreaming, planning, working on his new invention. Finishing the first regular meal in a week's time, Edison arose to return to his laboratory. His wife begged him to rest and to get fresh clothes before returning to his work, but Edison's only reply was, as he went back to his workshop, "Froth may be good on beer, but not on my battery."

SACRIFICES KEY TO PROGRESS

That determination, that tireless energy, that willingness to make personal sacrifices was the key to the progress made in this country during the nineteenth century, the foundation upon which we proceeded to build a great edifice in the twentieth century. Viewing the progress made in the field of invention in the latter part of the eighteenth century and the early part of the nineteenth, Commissioner of Patents Carroll D. Wright stated in 1888 that he saw no hope for future inventions nor any chance for an advance in science in the next 50 years comparable to that of the previous half century. But the gradual shift in the twentieth century from the previous methods of trial and error to those of scientific research showed the smallness of Wright's horizon. Speaking of that change in method, David Sarnoff recently said:

"The foundation of our new industrial growth goes down to a bedrock of basic knowledge of the elements and forces that are the raw materials of modern industry and public service. Upon such a base can be reared a structure a hundred times loftier than one erected upon any foundation less deep and secure.

"Therefore," said he, "both in quality and quantity, the goods and services of this new age of creative science should far outstrip those of the preceding age, in which industry called in science only after the foundation had been built."

A recent Pathe News showed the finishing in California of a lense of a new telescope that is 200 inches in diameter, twice as large as any heretofore built, and to be mounted on a platform and carriage that weighs 500 tons. As I looked at that twentieth-century instrument with which man was to view a new horizon, I thought of Aristotle counting the stars with his naked eye and recalled the fact that the schools and colleges in the early seventeenth century taught that there were 1,027 stars in the sky because that was the number counted by Aristotle 1900 years earlier. But when Galileo prefected the telescope, he revolutionized the science of astronomy. And the scientist who developed the electron microscope found a new frontier in the field of what was infinitely small as Galileo did in what was infinitely large. By the combined use of such a microscope with photography bacteria can be enlarged 100,000 times, making visible bacteria, viruses, and other objects which are smaller than the length of a light wave. And by putting electrons to work in vacuum tubes, we have developed what is known as the electric eye, which will open doors, operate timing devices, ring burglar alarms, operate fire-prevention apparatus, count and sort merchandise, match colors, measure humidity, and control temperatures. A Persian rug can be scanned by an electric eye in Teheran, the instrument readings cabled to New York, and the pattern reproduced exactly, even though the American maker never saw the rug or a photograph of it.

BREAK-DOWN IN DISTRIBUTION

Time will not permit me to further elaborate the theory that the pessimistic view of some that there are no new frontiers and no new horizons, is not justified, assuming, of course, that the war now raging in Europe does not spread and continue until civilization itself be destroyed. It is true there are many who are unemployed; it is true that production appears to have outstripped consumption; and it is true there are no new frontiers of virgin land. Yet I tell you that those who disparage the opportunities for the youth of the present generation ignore the possibilities of scientific research, ignore the greatest accumulation in history of bank credit to finance new enterprise, and mistake a tragic break-down in the distribution of goods and services for overproduction.

After the World War we were living in a new world but many failed to see or refused to concede that fact. For over 20 years we have ignored the economic problems of other nations, forgetting that these are our economic problems as well. We have been so smug and complacent over our own progress that we have ignored the fact that laboratories and groups in widely separated parts of the world are largely responsible for our scientific growth. For instance, in 1939, five of the six Nobel prizes in science were awarded to Europe and only one to the United States.

We have paid lip service to the theory that liberty under law is the hope of the world, while totalitarian governments have been systematically crushing liberty not only at home but in adjoining democracies where it still survived. We have closed our eyes to the fact that new ideas were on the wing and that ideas laugh at boundaries. Last week a well-meaning but misguided woman in Illinois wired Speaker BANKHEAD, "Please save America. Let God save the King." Of course, the safety of America, the protection of our own firesides, will always be our primary concern, but we are living in an age in which we can see not 1,000 but 3,000,000 stars. In the new world in which we live we are not an independent, isolated, and self-contained unit. Many years ago it was recorded "None of us liveth to himself, and no man dieth to himself." Those words were spoken in a small world dominated by the Roman legions—in area and population about that of the United States. Science has brought the mighty nations of our modern world jostling together, and man's mastery of the air has given a new significance to the ethical teachings of the first century.

When Orville Wright, in December 1903, flew over the sand dunes of Kitty Hawk he envisioned a new horizon, he sought to open to the human race a new frontier. In the exultation of that first successful flight of a machine heavier than air, Wright no doubt felt that through his remarkable invention civilization could be lifted a step nearer to the New Jerusalem, where there is perpetual peace. Little did he dream that the invention intended for the benefit of man would in the short period of 37 years be turned into the most barbarous instrumentality of destruction in the history of civilization. "Let God save the King"—the king who represents the struggle of democracy against the blind and cruel forces of autocracy; the king who represents religious and political freedom and an economic system based upon personal initiative and free enterprise; the king who represents the destroyed homes of Poland, Finland, Holland, Belgium, France, and eventually those of the British Isles; and the millions of homeless refugees, bombed and machine gunned as they desperately struggle to escape from being crushed under the iron heel of war. In a word, the king who represents everything in government and society for which the decent Christian people of the Nation stand.

The barbarian, as well as the Greek, was told in the first century that a policy of isolation was not compatible with the ethical principles of the new dispensation. Lincoln gave national application to the principle when he said that a nation could not remain half slave and half free. But through the invention of the Wright brothers, the world of today is smaller than our Nation in Lincoln's day. Even if it were our disposition to be callous to the suffering of other nations, indifferent to their economic ills, unmoved by the destruction of democratic governments elsewhere in the world, we must realistically face the type of world in which we are living and calculate the impact upon our economic order, and our civilization, of disastrous world events.

It is the considered opinion of informed leaders in this country that if the democracies of Europe be destroyed our democracy will next be challenged and that those prophets who tell us otherwise are as false as those denounced by Jeremiah when Jerusalem was threatened by the Babylonian hosts. In such a contingency, the first move against us would be against our foreign trade. We would trade upon the dictator's terms or be driven from every market in Europe. One thousand and fifty economists in 1930 denounced the prohibitive rates of the Hawley-Smoot Tariff, but that

act merely restricted our foreign trade. It did not totally destroy it. A total destruction of our foreign trade would mean a depression in this country of unprecedented proportions. During the Napoleonic War, President Jefferson placed an embargo on shipments to Europe. In less than 6 months the value of farm products had dropped 50 percent and caused such a depression Jefferson was forced to lift the embargo.

DEPRESSION BREEDS REVOLUTION

In Russia, in Italy, and in Germany depression has been the seedbed for revolution, leading to a change in the form of government. The depression that started here in 1930 brought a change in government, but in a constitutional way through the ballot box and not by the bayonet. At that time, however, democracy in Europe still survived and totalitarianism was not a world force. Since that time we have had an opportunity to learn how totalitarianism operates. In its frontal attack it is the impersonation of imperial force and murder. And it operates behind the battle lines by means of the "fifth column." When one of Franco's generals, during the Spanish Revolution, was marching on Madrid, he made a radio address to the defenders of Madrid in which he stated that he was marching on the city with four columns and at a proper time would be joined in the city by a "fifth column." Unfortunately for that "fifth column," it was stood against a wall and shot by the Loyalists before the other four columns reached the city. But when Hitler moved into Austria, into Czechoslovakia, and into Poland, "fifth column" was there to cooperate with him to the destruction of those countries. When the orders to destroy a key bridge over the Meuse to delay the German advance into France were not carried out, there were those who wondered if the "fifth column" was likewise operating in France.

And there are those who wonder how much of a "fifth column" is operating in our country today, counseling us in the name of neutrality and peace to take no steps for our self-defense. No responsible leader in the Government has advocated more than an adequate defense program. The President and all other responsible leaders have promised to do what they can to keep us out of war. But a strict neutrality and a desire to stay out of war saved neither Holland or Belgium. They were not prepared to resist the invader and were overrun and destroyed, indicating that there are two ways of getting into a war—one by going to war and the other by having war brought to you.

At a meeting of international surgeons at Hot Springs last September I heard a great surgeon from Brazil say: "It is the destiny of the United States to preserve democracy for the world." We must meet that challenge. We must at home preserve American constitutional liberty, and from the standpoint of national honor, as well as of self-defense, discharge the obligations of the Monroe Doctrine.

Yes, young graduates, there are new horizons, there are new frontiers. When the future looks darkest to you remember that Thoreau said, "To him whose vigorous and elastic thoughts keep pace with the sun, the day is a perpetual morning." But if you are to see the new horizons and possess the new frontiers scientific aids will not be enough. The human equation will be as vital a factor now as in any previous period in our history. And possibly more so, if we are to believe Woodrow Wilson, who said in 1923, "If our civilization is to survive materially it must be redeemed spiritually." In other words, moral rearmament should be a part of our national-defense program.

May the crisis of the present hour be a challenge to your patriotism and to your creative courage for "who knoweth but that thou art come into the kingdom for such a time as this."

Total Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFTON A. WOODRUM

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 30, 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. CLIFTON A. WOODRUM, OF VIRGINIA

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the most important problem in the minds of the average American today is that of properly providing for our national defense. Much is being said and written upon the subject. Unfortunately, at times, an effort seems to be made to get this vital question mixed up in the current national political campaign. That is unfortunate. Coming generations will not likely be greatly interested in the more or less commonplace considerations that enter the political discussions, but let us realize fully that our whole course of life—indeed, our very continued existence as a great democracy—may be affected by what we do and what we fail to do in safeguarding our country in this tragic hour, when the forces of might are on the march. The defense of America—the Western Hemisphere—is the question of the hour. It overshadows all else.

As acting chairman of the committee that has handled in the House practically all of the defense appropriations, I have been in a position to observe the workings of our defense program. Naturally the American citizen is deeply concerned. On August 28 I addressed the Roanoke Kiwanis Club on the subject Total Defense. In these remarks I endeavored to give an up-to-the-minute picture of the program. Since this address, two important things have happened that measurably expedite our effort. On August 29 the House passed the excess-profits tax bill. We hope the Senate will act quickly. On the 28th, the day of my address, the Senate passed the so-called conscription bill and the so-called $5,000,000,000 appropriation bill. These vital measures now appear to be well on the road to final enactment. That will break the log jam and let our orders for equipment go forward, as well as the all-important process of recruiting our reserve forces.

Herewith is the address:

The people of America have watched with heavy hearts as our ideals of democracy and freedom have fallen in one country after another before the relentless and ruthless march of the dictator. With the fall of each succeeding democracy, the threat has been brought closer to the door of America, until today I believe we generally appreciate the fact that our heritage of liberty and freedom and the democratic way of life is gravely menaced. From the beginning of this world conflagration, President Roosevelt and Secretary Hull have steered the American ship of state through these troublous waters in a manner and on a course which is in accordance with the finest American traditions of peace and security. Time and again the political and economic influence of America has been brought into play in a manner consistent with our position as a neutral nation, in an effort to prevent this catastrophe and to stop the horrible economic waste and indescribable human misery that will follow in the path of this conflict. When it finally became apparent that the tragedy could not be averted, the President called Congress into special session for the purpose of repealing the embargo provision of the Neutrality Act. In addressing the joint session of Congress on the 21st of September 1939, he said as follows:

"I should like to be able to offer the hope that the shadow over the world might swiftly pass. I cannot. The facts compel my stating, with candor, that darker periods may lie ahead. The disaster is not of our making; no act of ours engendered the forces which assault the foundations of civilization. Yet we find ourselves affected to the core; our currents of commerce are changing, our minds are filled with new problems, our position in world affairs has already been altered.

"In such circumstances our policy must be to appreciate in the deepest sense the true American interest."

"THE LAST CITADEL"

Today we find ourselves as a Nation preserving on this continent and in the Western Hemisphere the last remaining citadel where there really and truly abides liberty and freedom of action and democratic government.

We, in America, cherish above all else our heritage of personal and political freedom. And what are the essential elements of this heritage which we prize so highly? First and foremost is the privilege of freedom of speech and freedom of the press; next the right of religious worship, that is, our privilege to kneel at an altar and worship God freely and in a manner and form of our own choosing; the right of assembly, to meet freely and openly discuss matters affecting our freedom and our individual rights; the rights of labor, the right to bargain collectively, and to have the protection of the law against exploitation; freedom of enterprise, the right of a citizen to engage in competitive business with the assurance from his Government, so far as that assurance can be lawfully given, that he will have a fair break in the scheme of things; individual liberty, the right to work, to labor, to acquire and own property, indeed the distinctively American right to start at the bottom and go to the top, and the crowning right of citizenship, to be governed and ruled by representatives of our own choosing. These are precious rights, but let us never lose sight of the fact that there are corresponding obligations and duties that go with these rights.

Here in our own country, as I have said, is the last altar under the shining canopy of heaven whereon there yet burns brightly the symbol of these rights and privileges. Someone has said, "He only deserves liberty who is prepared to win it for himself every day." We in America in these tragic days have had indelibly impressed upon our hearts the real meaning and value of these tenets of free men, and I think we have individually resolved that while we shall continue to respect our traditions as a peace-loving people, that yet never will we permit the iron heel of the dictator to press upon the soil of the Western Hemisphere. Americans have decided that this freedom and liberty of which we boast is well worth fighting to preserve.

I think perhaps sometimes we forget that the present struggle in Europe is not alone a contest between the German dictator and Great Britain, but that it is undoubtedly the part of a world movement wherein on one side are the forces of Christianity and democracy and on the other side are the forces of dictatorship and unbelief. If the time ever comes when America is seriously threatened, we will find allied against us most probably a combination of all of the dictators of Europe and Asia. It is well for us to realize clearly the implications involved in such a struggle.

The President appeared before a joint session of Congress on May 16, 1940, asking for approximately $5,000,000,000 for a gigantic defense program. In concluding his address he made the following memorable statement:

"Our ideals, our objective, is still peace—peace at home and peace abroad. Nevertheless, we stand ready not only to spend millions for defense but to give our service and even our lives for the maintenance of our American liberties.

"Our security is not a matter of weapons alone. The arm that wields them must be strong, the eye that guides them clear, the will that directs them indomitable.

"These are the characteristics of a free people, a people devoted to the institutions they themselves have built, a people willing to defend a way of life that is precious to them all, a people who put their faith in God."

DEFENSE NOT ALONE GEOGRAPHIC

Whether we are at peace or at war, we must be prepared on the economic as well as the military front. Total defense therefore is not confined to a geographic military defense. We must have within our control sufficient economic strength to be prosperous in peace, as well as impregnable in war. Military preparedness alone will not preserve us unless it is buttressed from within by an economic policy that is sound—a policy that will demonstrate to the world that Americans are not only politically free, but that democratic processes can and do operate to bring us economic security. What I am trying to say is that while our military preparations are of the most transcending importance at the moment, we are a foolish people if we do not constantly remember that a "house built upon shifting sands of economic instability" will surely fall. In these remarks I wish to confine the discussion to our military preparations.

HAVE WE NEGLECTED DEFENSE?

As the shadow of war falls nearer and nearer our door, we look with deep concern to our defenses. The statement has been made of late that somebody has neglected to provide an adequate defense for this country, and an effort has been made seriously to invoke political penalties against those responsible. In my 18 years in Congress, I do not remember when any gentleman or group of gentlemen ever arose in their seats to demand substantially greater preparations for defense. I do remember quite well however that little more than a year ago when the President sought to impress upon Congress and the American people the seriousness of the situation, and asked but that we repeal the embargo provisions of the Neutrality Act, that American industry might get in production, and that needed defense arms might be purchased by the Allies—I remember certain gentlemen promptly called him a warmonger and howled from one end of the country to the other that the President was trying to lead us into the war.

The embargo was ultimately repealed. The airplane industry went into production—at that time the output was about 200 planes per month. Today it is nearly 1,000. We have furnished much-needed assistance to Great Britain—have maintained our status as a neutral—and we have not been led into any war.

THE TASK OF PREPARATION

We are making very substantial and notable progress in our defense program. I do not for a moment say there have not been delays, snags, and bottlenecks, but considering the magnitude of the task, and what it involves, considering the further fact that we are functioning as a democracy and not a dictatorship, we have made and are making rapid strides. I wish I might entirely absolve the House of Representatives from all blame for delay, but I cannot. The tax bill, containing the excess-profits tax and provisions for the amortization of defense plant expansion, and so forth, is still tied up in the House. It is a difficult problem no doubt, but it should have been enacted before now. I think very shortly it will pass the House. With one exception, appropriations have been promptly provided. The so-called $5,000,000,000 bill for defense reached the House committee, of which I am acting chairman, on July 10 and on July 31 it had been reported and passed the House. We conducted exhaustive hearings on it, and also in that time was the recess for the Democratic Convention. That bill is still in the Senate.

BLAME ON CONGRESS

So there are the two principal causes for the delay. The American people are sick and tired of this "rag chewing." They want, and have a right to have action. Any reasonable person knows that there will of necessity be some delays in a matter of this magnitude, but there is absolutely no excuse for a failure to get this tax bill out, and for the dilatory tactics of the Senate which has not only delayed conscription but prevented the placing of orders for planes and other equipment by holding up this appropriation bill. I want to absolve the administrative branch of the Government. So far as I have been able to observe, they have been on their toes, and are most impatient over these delays.

THE DEFENSE COUNCIL

Here is what Mr. Knudsen, of the Advisory Council on Defense, had to say in a recent radio interview. Radio Commentator Baukhage was the questioner:

"Mr. BAUKHAGE. Is it true that not a single combat plane has been contracted for out of money appropriated by Congress up to August?

"Mr. KNUDSEN. No; it is not true. The Navy, for example, contracted for $7,000,000 worth of combat planes in July. But, more important than that, Mr. Baukhage, is the over-all picture. Take the money appropriated by Congress thus far for the defense program. They cover about four-thousand-two-hundred-and-odd planes. Money in the defense appropriation bill now before Congress will add 14,000 more planes to the total. We cannot make complete plans and arrange final details with the manufacturers until we know that the appropriations are passed. We won't know that definitely until the Congress passes the bill. However, we have received from the principal manufacturers complete estimates on the plant space necessary for the whole program. I would like to add that of money made available to us on July 1, 5 weeks ago, contracts have already been awarded for 45 percent of the entire Army funds and 75 percent of the Navy's funds."

On plane production, Mr. Knudsen replied to a question from Mr. Warner as follows:

"Mr. WARNER. There seems to be a difference of opinion, Mr. Knudsen, on the present production of airplanes. Can you tell us something about that?

"Mr. KNUDSEN. Present production, Mr. Warner, is approximately 900 planes per month. By January 1 the number will have risen to 1,500 planes, and the volume will increase steadily thereafter. You might also be interested in knowing that in January 56,800 people were employed in aircraft factories. Today the number is nearer 75,000."

On the question of raw materials, Mr. Edward Stettinius, of the Defense Council, answered Mr. Baukhage:

"Mr. BAUKHAGE. People are asking, Mr. Stettinius, why, with the billions of dollars available, these raw materials can't be gotten together more quickly?

"Mr. STETTINIUS. People who ask that question must realize that American industry cannot be completely mobilized and coordinated within a week or a month or several months. It is a long job. It isn't easy. It calls for full cooperation and, may I add, patience.

"It can be said, however, that no effort is being spared to serve them. We are assisted by the cooperative effort of industry and through the splendid aid given us by other divisions of this Commission, the Army, the Navy, and the various agencies of the Government."

You may comprehend something of the magnitude of the task of providing these raw materials and critical items when I remind you that there are 70,000 items of Army supplies of which no less than 1,200 are "critical," that is, not in production, and not available except from specifically equipped plants. This means in many instances that there must be not only great plant expansion but new plants. For instance in the matter of gunpowder. We must build new plants, hence the new plant at Radford. That project is going forward.

WHY HAVE WE WAITED?

Following the World War, a wave of sentiment swept over the world for peace. It was hoped humanity would profit by that sad experience and stop the tragic resort to arms. America took the lead in those efforts. I do not criticize them. They were well-intentioned. It was what the American people wanted. It culminated in scrapping our great Navy in 1922. We let our Army dwindle down to 75,000 men.

Now let us look at the record. During the 12 years preceding 1933 not a single battleship was laid down and only 20 other types of combatant vessels such as cruisers, submarines, and gunboats were constructed. Since 1936 we have completed 115 combatant naval vessels. We have under construction 188 vessels, consisting of 10 battleships, 5 aircraft carriers, 4 heavy cruisers, 17 light cruisers, 61 destroyers, and 41 submarines. In addition to that we have provided for additional craft to give us a two-ocean Navy by 1946, that can defend the Western Hemisphere against any combination of powers that may attack us.

Let us look further. In 1933 we had an Army of 75,000 men. Today we have equipped and under arms an Army of 241,000, and the present Congress is authorizing an increase to 1,200,000 with a possible ultimate Reserve strength of 2,000,000.

WHAT WILL WE HAVE?

Today we have a one-ocean Navy of 399 warships. In 1943 we will have 521 warships afloat, and in 1946 a two-ocean Navy.

Today we have 5,500 war planes (production 900 per month). Nineteen hundred forty-one production will be up to 1,500 per month. July 1942, 25,000 war planes will be ready. October 1943, 50,000 war planes will be on hand.

Today we have 500 tanks. Production is 3 light tanks daily. July 1941, 1,500 tanks will be ready. January 1943, 200 heavy 70-ton tanks will be ready.

By August 1941, arms and critical equipment ready for a million men. That's 1 year hence. October 1943, complete arms and equipment ready for an Army of 1,200,000 men, and a Reserve strength that will give us 2,000,000.

This is an ambitious program. It is in the hands of experts, and as one who has been intimately associated with its every detail I can say that there is harmony and coordination, and that red tape and departmental routine have been reduced to a minimum.

WE PREPARE FOR PEACE

It would be impossible to improve on Washington's formula for peace. "Prepare for war," said Washington. America prepares for peace. Americans do not wish to become involved in this European war. While we stand ready to do what we can to aid the fight to preserve democratic ideals, we must not depart from our traditional policy of noninvolvement. We must not become the aggressor. We must not in our emotion, and because of our sympathies, commit a thoughtless act that will plunge this country into war. Let us think calmly of all of the consequences of such hasty action. But, on the other hand, let us not be diverted from our firm determination to see to it that our defenses are impregnable, because only by so doing will our liberties be secure.

Our Relations With Latin America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 30, 1940

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD, OF MICHIGAN

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, under the unanimous consent granted me, I submit a radio address delivered by me on the National Farm and Home Hour on the subject Our Relations With Latin America.

South of the Rio Grande border and 30 degrees latitude lies our next great battlefield. I now refer to trade. The area is now to become the cockpit of the world where giants of commerce and industry will vie with each other for control. I would not, however, exclude the possibility of military action.

The total area to which I refer, constituting the 20 Latin American countries, embraces 8,000,000 square miles of territory. Here we find South America with 10 separate countries covering almost 7,000,000 square miles; Central America with 6 countries covering 218,000 square miles; and the West Indies consisting of Cuba, the Dominican Republic, and Haiti which, along with old Mexico, covers another 837,000 square miles.

It will interest my audience to know that the area of the 10 South American countries alone is about two and one-third times that of our own States. Brazil is 300,000 square miles greater in area than the United States, and she occupies nearly one-half of the South American Continent.

Latest population figures tell us that in these combined areas there are 130,000,000 people—about equal to the population of continental United States.

In the areas I have mentioned, let me remind you that I have not included those great momentary question marks about which we hear so much these days—the possessions of European countries—British Honduras, Jamaica, British and French Guianas, Trinidad, and the Netherlands West Indies, all occupying such important positions resting between the United States and South America.

There has been in operation during the last one-half century what is known as the Pan American Union. It is an international organization, created and maintained by the 21 American republics. The purposes of this Union are to promote peace, commerce, and friendship between the republics of the American continents by fostering economic, judicial, social, and cultural relations. The Union is supported by annual contributions from all the countries, in amounts proportional to population. Its affairs are administered by a director general and an assistant director, elected by and responsible to a governing board composed of the Secretary of State of the United States and representatives in Washington of the other American governments.

The Pan American Union serves as the permanent organ of the international conferences of American States. With a growing spirit of cooperation, the Pan American Union has been combined with a constantly strengthening unity of ideals and policies.

At four recently held conferences, the one at Buenos Aires in 1936, the Lima Conference of 1938, the Conference of Ministers of Foreign Affairs held at Panama in 1939, and at the conference in Cuba only last month, it was more evident than ever before that there is a unity of policy to a great degree to preserve and further develop democratic institutions on the American continents.

But world events crowd the 21 republics of the Western Hemisphere into closer cooperation. The time element becomes very important. We are forced to consider more details looking forward to the designing and execution of plans that have to do with economic, political, and military protection.

In addressing the conference at Habana, Cuba, only last month, Secretary of State Hull said:

"The war has brought a disruption in the channels of international commerce, a curtailment of foreign markets for products of the Western Hemisphere. This has meant to many American nations a loss of purchasing power sufficiently serious to place severe strains on their national economies. In some cases stagnant surpluses of commodities, the exportation of which is essential to the economic life of the countries concerned, have accumulated and continue to accumulate. * * * The nations of the Western Hemisphere should undertake the fullest measure of economic cooperation. Progress has already been made toward the forging of new tools to carry out certain phases of economic cooperation on an inter-American basis. The Inter-American Financial and Economic Advisory Committee, which was established last November pursuant to a resolution of the Panama meeting, has proven itself to be an efficient body for considering and working out such mechanisms.

It prepared the framework for the establishment of an inter-American bank to foster cooperation in the spheres of long-term development and for money and foreign exchange. The Government of the United States is taking steps to implement the Inter-American Bank Convention and urges that the governments of the other American republics give their cooperation so that this important institution may be placed into operation as rapidly as possible."

July 22 last, the same day Secretary Hull spoke the words I have just quoted, President Roosevelt placed before the Congress a special message dealing with part of the same subject matter, and in which he said:

"I therefore request that the Congress give prompt consideration to increasing the capital and lending power of the Export-Import Bank of Washington by $500,000,000 and removing some of the restrictions on its operations to the end that the bank may be of greater assistance to our neighbors south of the Rio Grande, including financing the handling and orderly marketing of some part of their surpluses."

Wednesday of this week the Banking and Currency Committee of the House favorably reported a bill authorizing the Export-Import Bank to proceed with an economic program in Latin America. This bill will be called up for approval by the House next Tuesday. With its enactment the United States Government will be implemented to proceed with economic penetration of the countries to our south.

Thursday of this week the House approved the National Guard bill. Previously approved by the Senate, it now goes to the President. It will authorize him in his judgment as Commander in Chief of the Army to dispatch our National Guardsmen to any and all points in the Western Hemisphere, which, of course, includes all of Latin America. To this extent, we have indicated to the people south of us that we are prepared to go along with them in helping to preserve our freedom from European domination in North, Central, and South America, Cuba, and Mexico. We should keep in mind that a vast part of Latin America is located in the tropical zone. Historically, temperate zones have almost entirely supplied tropical zones with their manufactured goods, and in turn, have drawn from the tropical areas certain fruits, sugars, oils, and other products. It is true that in parts of Latin America there are products grown which directly compete with many of the agricultural products of the farmers of the United States. For instance, certain of these areas rank high in importance in the production of cane sugar, cotton, beef and hides, wool, corn, and other grains. These particular areas have heretofore greatly depended upon western Europe for export markets for foodstuffs and fibers, shipped in exchange for manufactured goods from Europe. From Cuba and Brazil, the Argentine and Chile, we have taken a considerable volume of sugar, coffee, canned meats, and nitrates. On other areas we depend for our principal source of supply of tropical fruits such as bananas. With Latin American countries our Secretary of State has consummated many reciprocal-trade agreements in recent years.

In Europe we find 400,000,000 souls divided into hostile camps who have for centuries jostled one another about through internecine war. When we look to overcrowded Asia, we find more than 1,000,000,000—almost one-half the population of the world—going about silently, laboring the longest hours with a shortage of food and land area, eking out a bare existence, and with many millions facing actual starvation and disease all of the time.

Lying between these peoples of the European and Asiatic Continents, we today become conscious of our position here in the Western Hemisphere. In land area, in natural resources, in undeveloped riches, in our standard of living, in our progress in science, in agriculture, and in production, we hang suspended between the other continents as a luscious peach hangs on a tree, ready to be picked. The industrial "have not" countries of the world, particularly Germany, Japan, and Italy, have in years gone by depended greatly on the production of the Western Hemisphere for much food, fats, and fibers. In the years to come these same countries will again look to America for additional supplies.

At the moment, due to the loss of their European markets for exports and as a source of supply for manufactured goods in exchange for their raw materials, the Latin American countries are a prey to economic, political, and military penetration. Economic

conditions in those countries are rapidly deteriorating, due to the substantial loss of markets for their exportable surpluses because of the European war.

The administration takes the position that this situation offers the United States a golden opportunity to be of real help to Latin America and at the same time take a forward step in our defense program.

It is claimed that if we refuse to extend economic and military, and perhaps political help when desperately needed by Latin America, we can confidently expect many of the Latin American countries to fall into the laps of European and Asiatic dictators as soon as the war is over. In Latin America political and military penetration follows economic penetration very easily.

Thus the people of the United States, along with the Congress, must now make, in this regard, many decisions involving high policy of government. At this hour it appears that we can no longer live in the realm of fiction, insofar as the Monroe Doctrine is concerned. If our people believe in the doctrine, desire to enforce it; if they are now unwilling to withdraw from the area involved in favor of the European and Asiatic countries that are aggressively promoting their interests there, then we shall have to proceed without hesitation. World events have placed grave problems on our doorsteps. There is no simple or easy way out. The people and the Congress must now act.

At a time when we have vast stocks of foodstuffs, fats, and fibers in our granaries and warehouses we find world-trade channels destroyed. We have passed our market. The situation holds true with the Latin American countries. Furthermore, the whole Western Hemisphere has tremendous potential undeveloped productive capacity, and for this and for the goods we now have stored the balance of the world starves. With the agricultural efforts of North, Central, and South America about to be coordinated, the handling of the problem in a manner that will prevent disaster to our farm folks will require a degree of agricultural and economic statesmanship never before exercised by those occupying seats of responsibility in our Government, finance, and marketing activities.

Construction of Superhighways

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 30 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW YORK DAILY NEWS

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have published in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a most worth-while article in the form of an editorial from the columns of the New York Daily News, entitled "Let's Borrow This Back From Hitler." This article pertains to superhighways. I am highly in favor of superhighways from the Atlantic to the Pacific and from the North to the South. Such highways might be used as military highways in time of war and as commercial highways in time of peace. A network of highways of the super type would be of tremendous value to our Nation in solving its transportation problems and in providing rapid transportation of troops and supplies during time of war. In addition thereto, may I say that I advocated, a number of years ago, the construction of a highway from northern Washington, Seattle, directly north through British Columbia to Juneau, the capital of Alaska. At the time that I first made the suggestion it was not well received and, in fact, I was scoffed at by those who claimed that the idea was simply fantastic. However, I note that many of those who said that such an idea was merely visionary are now inclined to believe as I have for many years. Such a highway would provide intercourse between our last frontier and the United States proper, thus serving as a military highway in time of war, and in time of peace would serve commerce well and provide thousands upon thousands of American tourists the opportunity of viewing the most gorgeous scenery in all the world.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Daily News]

LET'S BORROW THIS BACK FROM HITLER

Superhighways were an American development. Hitler borrowed the idea, made it bigger and better in his Reichsautobahnen. These are high-speed parkways, double-laned, laid out for a speed of 60 miles per hour in the mountains, 100 miles per hour in the flatlands. In peacetime, these parkways were useful. In wartime, they have proved invaluable for the swift transport of troops. This country has continued to build parkways—but with emphasis on the "park" phase. We refer to the Westchester and Long Island parkways, in particular. They are marvelously scenic roads, bowered with trees to cut off the driver's vision on the corners, laid out to make it well-night impossible to travel at any really high speed. As military roads, they are impractical.

Pennsylvania, meanwhile, boasts the only superhighway in the Nation. We refer to the new soon-to-be-opened Pennsylvania turnpike from Pittsburgh to Harrisburg, a 4-lane divided road with no level crossings.

This 162-mile road, built at a cost of $70,000,000 with Government loans, is designed for speeds up to 80 miles per hour or higher. Its use will save the driver hours of time between New York and Chicago. Its cost is being absorbed by tolls.

THERE SHOULD BE MANY MORE SUCH

Unfortunately, the roads east and west of the turnpike are the same old winding, congested routes we have always known. From a military standpoint, the turnpike thus begins and ends nowhere. It should be extended east to Philadelphia and New York; west to Chicago. There should be many other such roads in the industrial East, notably from Washington through New York to Boston, and up the east bank of the Hudson along Lake Champlain to the Canadian border—the probable route of any enemy invasion. Plenty of spur roads for military shuttle service also will be essential.

These reflections are all based on an interview with Parks Commissioner Robert Moses, printed in one of the New York papers recently. He has one particularly significant thing to say, and we quote:

"What too many of our war planners don't seem to realize is that if we should clog the roads of the metropolitan section with mechanical equipment, moving trucks, and heavy trucking to supply them, we wouldn't be able to get food in for the civilian population or carry on our normal and necessary business operations."

Quite right. We need superhighways, and we think Moses is the man to build them. He isn't, however, the only man available. If Washington should rule him out, we suggest another candidate.

ST. LOUIS DOES A GRAND JOB

It's the man who designed the magnificent new Lewis and Clark Bridges north of St. Louis. The Clark Bridge crosses the Mississippi; then there's a 5½-mile speedway to the Lewis Bridge across the Missouri. By using a series of link roads it's possible to get on a superhighway that leads right to the edge of St. Louis. Across the town is another project, an express highway, something like our West Side Highway in New York, which cuts through the crowded sections below grade and eventually leads into another bridge across the river. St. Louis has done a grand job in bypassing and expediting traffic.

If we are going to build Nation-wide superhighways, let's not forget that we'll need something to travel on them. We refer to armored cars and other high-speed military equipment. We need more of these, and we need men to run them; that is, we need conscription now.

Failure of the New Deal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY SANDAGER

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 30, 1940

LETTER FROM WALTER I. HIRD

Mr. SANDAGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter I have received from Mr. Walter I. Hird, an independent voter from my home city of Cranston, R. I. The letter is as follows:

Hon. HARRY SANDAGER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Twenty-two miles northeast of Greenville, Maine, near the beautiful Lake Kokadjo, there is a signboard which reads, "This is God's country. Why set it on fire and make it look like hell."

At first the sign leaves but a slight impression on one's mind, but after a few days you begin to realize that it is God's country, quiet, peaceful, and calm. You awake in the morning midst the sound of wild canaries, the wind whispering in the pines, the smell of wood smoke mingled with that of boiling coffee and frying bacon. You feel just on the edge of civilization, wild and beautiful, which makes one think more dearly of God, and man's relations to man.

It is God's country, just one of the little spots that make up this great country of ours. For 7 years as an independent voter I have watched a New Deal try to set it on fire and make it look like hell. I am convinced that this year will tell the story whether the fire will start to burn and destroy all that past generations have built up.

We are living in a world of economic evolution, where one system of economics has broken down because of greed and ambitions, and another economic system must take its place. World history shows us that this has taken place before and will take place again until man learns to live with his fellow man. The New Deal has had its day and failed. Will this failure bring war, unbearable taxation, and economic ruin to cover up its imported philosophies? These questions must be answered this November. Let us read again the sign, "This is God's country. Why set it on fire and make it look like hell?"

WALTER I. HIRD.

CRANSTON, *August 18, 1940.*

World War Veteran Wendell L. Willkie

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 30, 1940

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, through the columns of the press, and by medium of the radio, the name of Wendell L. Willkie, Republican nominee for President of the United States, is on the lips of every man, woman, and child in America.

Aside from the politics involved when mere mention of his name is made, I want to briefly describe Wendell L. Willkie in another role as a World War veteran, serving his country as first lieutenant, Three Hundred and Twenty-fifth Artillery, Eighty-fourth Division, American Expeditionary Forces. Lt. Wendell L. Willkie's record as a soldier, taken from the files of the War Department, speaks for itself, and is as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
THE ADJUTANT GENERAL'S OFFICE,
Washington.

Wendell Lewis Willkie, first lieutenant, Three Hundred and Twenty-fifth Field Artillery, Eighty-fourth Division

The records show that Wendell Lewis Willkie, resident of Elwood, Ind., made application in April 1917 for a commission in the Officers' Reserve Corps and admission to attend a training camp for officer candidates. He reported on May 11, 1917, at the first Reserve officers' training camp, Fort Benjamin Harrison, Ind., organized under section 54, National Defense Act of June 3, 1916, and trained as a civilian candidate for a commission until the close of the camp on August 14, 1917. He was reported by the examining officers as fitted for a commission as first lieutenant, Infantry, and was commissioned a first lieutenant in the Officers' Reserve Corps, August 15, 1917. He was assigned to active duty the same date and, after a period of attendance at the training camp, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass., he joined the Eighty-fourth Division at Camp Zachary Taylor, Ky., and was assigned on September 15, 1917, to duty with Battery F, Three Hundred and Twenty-fifth Field Artillery. He was on special duty at the Infantry School of Arms, October 12 to 25, 1917, and commanded Battery F, Three Hundred and Twenty-fifth Field Artillery, January 24 to March 25, 1918. He attended the school of fire for Field Artillery at Fort Sill, Okla., from March 30 to June 7, 1918, when he satisfactorily completed the war course for Light Artillery (horsed), and returned to duty with the Three Hundred and Twenty-fifth Field Artillery, then at the Field Artillery firing center at West Point, Ky. He was transferred on June 28, 1918, to Headquarters Company, Three Hundred and Twenty-fifth Artillery. He sailed with the regiment on September 9, 1918, for France, where the regiment took station at Camp De Souge, and served again for a period with Battery F, and later as battalion adjutant, second battalion, returning to the United States, February 15, 1919, arriving at Newport News, Va., and proceeded with his regiment to Camp Sherman, Ohio, where he was honorably discharged, February 28, 1919, by reason of demobilization of the emergency forces.

The records further show that in letter of October 26, 1918, addressed to the commanding officer of the One Hundred and Fifty-ninth Field Artillery Brigade, Lieutenant Willkie was recommended by the commanding officer of the Three Hundred and Twenty-fifth Field Artillery for promotion to the grade of captain. This recommendation was approved and forwarded to the division commander, thence to general headquarters, American Expeditionary Forces. However, before final action was taken thereon the armistice was signed, when all appointments and promotions then pending were, by direction of the President, suspended. With reference to the recommendation for his promotion the division commander described Lieutenant Willkie as an efficient and capable officer. At the time of discharge Lieutenant Willkie's commanding officer recommended him for a subsequent appointment in the Regular Army or Reserve Corps and stated that he was "an excellent officer. Would be glad to have him in my command."

Official statement furnished to Hon. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, House of Representatives, with the consent of Mr. Wendell Willkie, on August 7, 1940.

By authority of the Secretary of War:

E. S. ADAMS,
Major General, The Adjutant General.

The records of the War Department fail to reveal the human side of Lieutenant Willkie. From the lips of his comrades who served with him overseas we learn that following the armistice and prior to his honorable discharge from the service Lieutenant Willkie, a lawyer, toured the United States Army cantonments in France defending his wartime buddies before general court-martial trials without fees. For days and days he devoted his time and ability to the cause of the common soldier. He fought to give the American doughboy a square deal and was successful because he talked and understood their language.

On February 28, 1919, Lt. Wendell L. Willkie received an honorable discharge from the armed forces of the United States after 23 months of service to his country. Returning to Akron, Ohio, to accept a position in the law department of the Firestone Tire & Rubber Co., he continued his service to his country and his fellowman by becoming a member of America's two great veteran organizations—the American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

As a charter member of Post No. 19, the American Legion, Akron, Ohio, which he joined in June 1919, his leadership was recognized by his fellow veterans when they elected him as a first vice commander early in 1921.

In a few months he was elected post commander and enjoyed the honor and distinction of being reelected, serving as post commander for two consecutive terms. As commander of Post No. 19, Wendell L. Willkie established a reputation as an all-round veteran, ready and willing at all times to further the program of his post.

On August 26, 1922, Wendell L. Willkie became a charter member of Post No. 967, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, at Akron, Ohio. Immediately his comrades who served with him overseas elected him as post judge advocate, in which position he served for many years. During this time he was elected repeatedly as a delegate to the Ohio State convention of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and in that capacity took an active part in the election of department officers and in the formulating of departmental policies in the State of Ohio.

As a member of his Legion and V. F. W. posts in Akron, he was an outstanding veteran and so recognized because of the great demand upon his time to address luncheon clubs, student assemblies in the Ohio schools, preside over patriotic gatherings, and serve with his other comrades in conducting military funerals for ex-servicemen.

This ability to serve in any capacity reveals the true character and congenial nature of Wendell L. Willkie.

There is an old saying that if you want to learn a man's true worth ask his neighbors and friends. Recently William P. Lockwood, of Frankfort, Ind., who served with Wendell L. Willkie overseas, said, "Willkie was a real soldier, and the men all loved him."

Robert M. Wiener, commander of Post 19 of the American Legion, Akron, Ohio, says: "Past Commander Willkie's comrades in post No. 19 feel that without him our post quite likely would have ceased to exist in June 1922. Aside from the fact that we love him as a comrade and respect him as a great American, we feel that we owe him a debt of gratitude for holding our post together during its most trying period."

Many similar praiseworthy remarks are being said of Wendell L. Willkie that reveals him as a lovable human being concerned with the welfare of his fellow citizens.

In concluding the presentation of Wendell L. Willkie as a World War veteran, it is interesting to note that for the first time since the signing of the Armistice on November 11, 1918, the American people on November 5, 1940, will have the opportunity of elevating to the highest office in the land a World War veteran who served his country 23 months, 10 months of which were spent on the battlefields of France.

Wendell L. Willkie served his country well during the World War and is ably equipped with a wealth of talent and ability to become this Nation's Chief Executive.

Is America in Danger of Invasion?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEWIS D. THILL

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 27, 1940

Mr. THILL. Mr. Speaker, we hear from many sources of the real or imagined danger of invasion. Now we all know about the difficulties involved in fighting a foe on his soil. The invader must sacrifice more men to gain his objective than the defender. The following news article discusses the problem of invading America at the present time. In the future, it seems to me, more reliance will be placed upon air transports than upon the Navy to carry troops.

The conflict in Europe has demonstrated that the belligerent who gains control of the air will, all things being equal, conquer his foe. We in America must build up our air force to a dominant position in world affairs.

[From the Washington Times-Herald of August 26, 1940]

HITLER CAN'T INVADE AMERICA FOR 2 YEARS, SAY EXPERTS—EVEN THEN HE'D PROBABLY FAIL, THEY CLAIM, IN CITING HANDICAPS

(By Walter Trohan)

Invasion of the United States would require the largest and most intensely organized military and naval effort the world has ever seen, and even in the face of the meager defenses America has today the chances of success of such an invasion are extremely remote.

This was the verdict of responsible Army and Navy officers and defense experts to whom was put this question: "Just what would it take to invade America with 500,000 or 1,000,000 men, and what chance would the invading force have?"

NO THREAT OF INVASION

Despite all the war hullabaloo in the country today, the experts agreed that America faces no serious threat to immediate invasion, because it would take upward of 2 years to prepare a force for invasion, and within that time the United States could make herself impregnable against any invader.

Germany spent 5 years preparing for her invasion of Britain by way of France and the Low Countries. Even at her present state of preparation for war—assuming she defeats Britain and wants to invade the United States—it would take at least from 2 to 3 years to get an invading armada organized.

ONE MILLION MEN NEEDED

In the sixteenth century Philip II of Spain spent 8 years in gathering together his Armada of 135 ships, manned by 8,000 seamen and 19,000 troops, which were to constitute the vanguard of an invading force against England. The Armada met disastrous defeat at the hands of a far smaller foe.

Experts fixed the need of a twentieth-century armada for a force of 1,000,000 men with ample weapons, ammunition, and merchant vessels. Any attempt at invasion with a smaller force would be absolute suicide, they feel. However, the needs of any army of 500,000 would approximate half that of the larger force. The greater army would have more corps and army weapons.

WHAT INVADER NEEDS

The experts fix the needs of the force of 1,000,000 as follows:

Weapons:	*Quantities*
Rifles	300,000
Pistols	100,000
37-mm. antitank	2,500
Machine guns	15,000
Mortars	5,000
105-mm. howitzers	3,000
155-mm. howitzers	2,500
155-mm. field guns	1,000
240-mm. howitzers	250
37-mm. antiaircraft guns	1,000
90-mm. antiaircraft guns	2,000
Tanks	1,500
Scout cars	1,800
Motor vehicles	200,000
Airplanes	7,500
Ammunition:	*In rounds*
Rifle	445,000,000
Pistol	50,000,000
Machine gun	200,000,000
37-mm. antitank	15,000,000
105-mm. howitzer	3,000,000
105-mm. field gun	2,000,000
155-mm. howitzer	2,000,000
105-mm. field gun	1,000,000
37-mm. antiaircraft	7,000,000
90-mm. antiaircraft	8,000,000
Mortar, ammunition	5,000,000
Bombs, tons (up)	100,000
	Average tonnages
Number of merchant ships:	
1,000 transports	10,000
2,000 freighters	5,000
500 supply ships	7,500
250 oilers	8,000

NEED HUGE WAR FLEET

Many of these vessels would turn to supply service to maintain the army should it get a foothold.

In naval craft the invading fleet must have a force equal to if not superior to the 400 ships in the American Navy, and because such a fleet would be operating far from home it would need a full complement of tenders and auxiliary craft of all kinds.

Granted a foreign invader had driven the American Navy from the seas—and that is quite a job, because it is acknowledged to be the best trained and best equipped navy in the world—experts say the invader would still face a mass of difficulty.

The Dominion-News Editor Writes Strong Editorial for Increased Air Force in National-Defense Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 30, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE MORGANTOWN (W. VA.) DOMINION-NEWS OF AUGUST 28, 1940

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, editorial writers of this country mold public opinion. In the present crisis a splendid public service is performed by those individuals who place before our reading public thought-provoking, factual, and challenging comment.

In this connection, I place in the Appendix of the RECORD portions of an unusually virile editorial, written by Walter Hart, editor of the Dominion-News, published at Morgantown, W. Va., which appeared under date of Wednesday morning, August 28.

NONE SO BLIND

Probably at this very moment the fate of England is being decided in the clouds over that island that for 1,000 years has been the symbol of the British Empire.

Admitted on all sides is the fact that the chances of Hitler succeeding in invading England would be reduced to the vanishing point if England had air superiority. Indeed, had England or France had air superiority last year there undoubtedly would have been no war.

Yet in this Nation, allegedly the most enlightened in the world, there are still far too many people who say we do not need a great air fleet nor do we need to prepare for any eventuality. There are those who believe that you can stop a raging animal by throwing meat to it; appeasement is the term used in statesmanship. France tried it when it permitted Hitler to rearm the Rhine; England tried

it when it permitted Hitler to take Czechoslovakia, Poland, and other nations.

We are still "appeasing" when we say we do not immediately need a great air force and a more adequate Army and Navy. Thanks to President Roosevelt's great devotion to the United States Navy, our sea fleet is in far better shape than when he found it upon taking office from Herbert Hoover, whose mistaken philosophy in life seems to be feeding everybody except Americans.

Right now every aircraft factory within the borders of the United States should be working 24 hours a day on coordinated designs to produce a few essential types of ships so badly needed for our own defense. Does any person realize that in all this Nation today we have only 30 up-to-the-minute combat airplanes? Think of that.

That does not mean that we do not have combat ships capable of doing much damage and capable of performing yeoman service in the defense of this hemisphere, but it does mean that our productivity is not being pushed, chiefly because of the appeasement and obstructionist tactics employed in and out of the Congress of the United States by many well-meaning persons who should know better.

This Nation, the United States of America, is the next on the list should England fall. It is now probably too late to do anything for England, and it may be too late for us to do anything for ourselves; but at least we have a fighting chance if we stop thinking in terms of hemisphere isolation and ox-cart means of transportation. There is no such thing as hemisphere isolation now, based solely on mileage, whether it be over water or over land. France tried the ox-cart method of fighting Hitler and everybody knows what happened to France; it was outflanked and crushed in such a startling short time that most of the citizens of these United States do not realize it today, months afterward.

Furthermore, we do not have the pilots to man our fighting ships, even if we had them. And we are not getting them fast enough simply because some mistaken people in and out of Congress are still yelling that we should give the volunteer system a chance to work. A chance to work? Why, for months on end the United States Army Air Corps, offering every sort of inducement, including money up to a $500 bonus for completion of the course, has had vacancies in every class going through its principal air schools. What is that but a chance for the volunteer system to work? In addition, some have deluded themselves into believing that these basically trained pilots could be used in case of war. Certainly, they would make excellent cannon fodder if they were able to get a fighting plane off the ground without killing themselves. The blunt truth is we do not have 500 pilots in this Nation who can safely fly P–36's. And this type of ship is four models behind the latest thing some of our factories could produce if they could or would. Some divisions of big business are as much at fault as the obstructionists in Congress. Big business, or a portion of it, is insisting upon knowing about profits when the very life of the Government under which it has prospered and grown strong and big is at stake.

* * * * * * *

Thousands upon thousands have been blown to bits in France and England because far too many people believed in those countries that somehow, some way, the war would not come, despite the fact that every day found Germany rolling out more war planes, training more pilots for 7 long years. Are we going to have the same blood upon our hands because we have permitted some persons in high or low office to continue to obstruct our program of defense? That is a matter for the American people to decide, because the force of public opinion in this Nation is the most powerful factor on earth.

Let us all hope that before it is too late we shall get the planes and the pilots and the ground crews in sufficient numbers to prevent the wholesale slaughtering of our citizenry, such as is occurring today in England because a few men thought you can stop a maniac by giving him a stick of striped candy.

Hopkins' Influence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR.

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 30, 1940

ARTICLE BY ERNEST K. LINDLEY

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted, I take pleasure in inserting an article by that distinguished commentator, Ernest K. Lindley, which appeared in the Washington Post of August 28, 1940.

No man who knows Harry Hopkins, can honestly question his sincerity, his ability, or his nobility of purpose.

He is, and has always been, frank and forthright of expression, and has been motivated by realistic altruism. He is in the highest concept of the term, a real humanitarian.

His name will live long after those of some of his traducers have been forgotten. I cannot add to his stature, nor can anyone detract from his greatness, by fulsome expression at this time.

However, Mr. Lindley, in this glowing tribute to Harry Hopkins, has expressed in part sentiments with which I am sure there is almost unanimous concurrence among the membership of Congress.

Upon his retirement from public service, we wish him godspeed and the continuance of a long, happy, and useful life.

Mr. Lindley's article follows:

[From the Washington Post of August 28, 1940]

HOPKINS' INFLUENCE—CHAMPION OF LOWER ONE-THIRD

(By Ernest K. Lindley)

The departure of Harry Hopkins from the Cabinet is being cheered, chiefly by people who never knew him and are still unable to accept the policies for which he fought. It would be deeply regretted by many others if it meant the complete loss of his influence on the course of public affairs. It will not mean that. His exchange of letters with the President hinted of the strong ties between them. He is, in fact, probably the President's most intimate friend. At the White House, at Hyde Park, and on week-end cruises, he has been almost continually at the President's side for many months.

The friendship between the President and Hopkins is relatively new, although they met in 1928. Three years later, when New York, under Roosevelt's leadership, became the first State to recognize an obligation to aid the unemployed, Hopkins was made head of the State relief agency. When Roosevelt set up the first Federal Emergency Relief Administration in 1933 he put Hopkins in charge of it.

Hopkins rapidly became one of the President's more important advisers, but this close official relationship did not at once develop into intimate friendship. At first Hopkins' best avenue of approach to the President was through Mrs. Roosevelt, whose deep sympathy for the underprivileged was in tune with Hopkins'. When the President's oldest son, James, came to Washington as his father's secretary in 1937, Hopkins took him under his wing and gave him much good advice. The tragedies in Hopkins' life—the loss of his wife and his own serious illness—brought him into even closer contact with the Roosevelts. By 1938 he was almost a member of the Roosevelt family.

His quick mind, gift for jaunty repartee, and good fellowship seemed to appeal to the President. Certain of his deep-seated convictions jibed with the President's. And he was unquestionably loyal; ready, when beaten in argument, to carry out the President's decision. Temperamentally he is not unlike the President; mercurial on the surface but consistent in his major purposes.

Few realize that Franklin D. Roosevelt is really a lonesome man. He talks much, but rarely unfolds himself to anyone. Hopkins seemed to suit him, although there is a trace of father-son relationship between them.

Hopkins and Robert H. Jackson were the protégés whom Roosevelt seemed to regard as best fitted to succeed him. Henry A. Wallace, with whom he was less intimate, was not far below them.

The influence of Hopkins has trickled into so many fields that it is difficult to trace. Always he has been a tenacious champion of the lower one-third of the population. He knew their problems as a welfare worker in the good old days when those problems were more largely individual than they became when the great depression struck. But when the times required it, he lifted his sights.

Hopkins was the head and symbol of the first great acknowledgment that the resources of the Nation, through the Federal Government, should be used to keep American citizens from starving. His own most notable contribution was the further idea that it was better to let them keep themselves from starving through useful public work than to hand them baskets of groceries or cash doles.

Hopkins fought incessantly for work relief. In 1933 he put across the civil-works program, which at its peak gave employment to more than 4,000,000 persons. When that was abandoned, he resorted to an emergency work program through the Federal Emergency Relief Administration. And in 1935 he ushered in the Works Progress Administration.

There were many faults in the execution of these programs—although probably no more than with other programs of comparable magnitude, including the mobilization and training of the United States Army during 1917–18.

Hopkins shares with the President the responsibility for making useful work, instead of idleness on the dole, the chief means of Federal aid to the unemployed. This was an important step toward the establishment of the fundamental principle of the right to work.

Hopkins was crucified in the press. The attack was more often on the performance than directly on the fundamental principle; but the most relentless attacks came from those who, in the last analysis, were opposed to the principle. It has not been openly

accepted even yet by the Republican Party or by its present nominee for President.

With all of his determination to help the under dog, Hopkins is not open to the accusation of inciting class consciousness. He was never much interested in the reform of business or financial practices. He saw much earlier than many of his New Deal colleagues, and advocated, a rapprochement with business leaders. That was one reason why the President made him Secretary of Commerce. It was an interesting experiment. If Hopkins had recovered his health, he might now be recognized throughout the country as a socially minded friend of business.

As a practical politician Hopkins is not much, although he may be useful in this campaign in mustering the progressive and independent vote for Roosevelt. His mark is registered at the higher level of national policy. It will be visible, I believe, long after those who have attacked him in recent years have been written off by their descendants as persons of unaccountable obtuseness.

When Will the President Be Entirely Frank With the Public?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 30, 1940

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, there has been a very great deal of confusion and misunderstanding concerning the preparation of the national defense.

Figures regarding the defense are so contradictory that nobody short of an expert accountant could make them jibe or translate them. The administration apparently is committed to the technique of mixing up in the most inextricable way the "on hand" figures, the "on order" figures, and the "contemplated" figures. In the finality, there is just one figure that has real significance to this Nation; there is just one kind of equipment that will be worth anything to an army, and those are the "on hand" figures covering "on hand" equipment.

The blame for this condition of affairs has been laid by the President at the door of Congress. Several Members of the Congress have laid the blame directly at the door of the executive department. Others have been inclined to blame business and to claim that there has been lack of cooperation; that business is more interested in making munitions and machines for Great Britain, on which there is no limit to the profit, than they are in making munitions and machines for the United States, on which there is a probability of a profit limit.

Of course, the country generally has been led to understand that the administration considers that the most vitally important thing to be done at this time is to provide Great Britain with all the help we can give her. The administration itself, from the President down, has urged that very thing. In fact, the President stated to the Congress that our program would not be permitted to interfere with deliveries to the Allies.

It is time, however, for us to look at this defense question squarely and to face some of the defects which are responsible for the situation as it exists today.

The President has insisted that this Nation faces an emergency. Now, is it an emergency or is it not? If we actually do face an emergency, if time is of the vital essence, then we ought to get about this business of the national defense in a sensible and orderly manner. We ought first to decide what we are going to defend and where the line is. Obviously, we cannot prepare a rational defense unless we know the scope and location of that defense. No such decision has yet been made.

We have been committed by the President to a Western Hemisphere defense. If we are to carry out such a defense, it is obvious we will have to have many naval and air bases in Latin America. As was recently pointed out editorially in the Saturday Evening Post, it will take years to get these bases by diplomatic persuasion, and there is apparently no thought of taking them any other way.

An army of 2,000,000 men under some circumstances might not be a big army at all for a country the size of ours. We have no definite specifications. We have no unified defense program. The President himself decides everything. His ideas seem to evolve, and they have evolved from a billion dollars for defense to fourteen billions of dollars for defense, and apparently the evolution of ideas is still going on.

The truth is there does not exist today an intelligent defense policy. The reason for it is because the President has led us into this activity by leaps and bounds and not by orderly, carefully considered steps. We are told by the administration that our defenses are not as weak as some people say they are; and that there is nothing in the present emergency to justify a retreat from any of our present social objectives.

On May 28, at a White House press conference, the President said there was no reason for the country to become "discomboomerated," whatever "discomboomerated" may mean in the New Deal language. But we hear from Secretary Knox that "it is later than you think." Assistant Secretary of War Patterson tells the Nation "a year is a luxury we may never enjoy."

It is time for plain talk from the President. It is time for candor in this question of the national defense. It is time for the administration to take some of the politics out of this defense question and inject more of the genuine defense of the Nation into it.

Henry A. Wallace Notification Ceremony

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. JACOBSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 30, 1940

LETTER FROM THE SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES AND ADDRESSES BY HON. MARVIN JONES OF TEXAS, AND HON. HENRY A. WALLACE

Mr. JACOBSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the addresses delivered by Hon. MARVIN JONES of Texas and Hon. Henry A. Wallace at the notification ceremonies at Des Moines, Iowa:

AUGUST 21, 1940.

HON. HENRY A. WALLACE,
Des Moines, Iowa.

MY DEAR HENRY: I was named by the Democratic National Committee officially to notify you of your nomination for Vice President on the national Democratic ticket. The request that I perform that happy mission was coupled with the suggestion that if it were found impractical for me to leave my duties here as Speaker of the House that I should designate some other person to act as chairman of the notification committee. My sense of duty to the country in these critical days of national legislation persuades me that because of my official position I should remain in daily touch with proceedings in the House of Representatives.

I have, therefore, designated Hon. MARVIN JONES, chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, to act in my stead at the notification ceremonies in Des Moines.

To use a farming term, you and MARVIN JONES have been yokefellows for over 7 years in working out and executing an agricultural program for the country that has been so sound and serviceable that even the Republican platform and their candidate for President unite in endorsing its unchanged continuation.

Please allow me again to express to you my most cordial and unreserved congratulations upon the high honor bestowed upon you by our party, as well as the assurance of my earnest desire to cooperate in every possible way to secure a great victory for the Roosevelt and Wallace ticket in November.

Sincerely your friend,

W. B. BANKHEAD.

ADDRESS BY HON. MARVIN JONES, OF TEXAS

Mr. Wallace, on July 18 the Democratic National Convention nominated you for Vice President of the United States. The Speaker of the House of Representatives, who has the respect

and affection of all who know him, has asked that I notify you of the action of the Convention.

It is altogether fitting and proper that you should return to your native State for this ceremony. It is in the center of a great producing area. It has been the home of the Wallace family for generations. Here you are closely linked to the soil in the conservation of which you have played so vital a part, and in which every man, woman, and child in America is interested.

The Government of the United States is not yonder in Washington. That is merely the machinery of government. The real Government of our country is here in Iowa and in the various communities that make up our land. What is the divine note that swells the chorus of the Union and makes of this a mighty Nation, respected throughout the world? Up amid the hills of New England, out on the prairies of the West where they grow corn, wheat, and livestock, and down in the South where cotton is king, are folk—just plain, honest, homespun people. In the heart, strength, and character of these, our citizens, is the true Government of America. Back of every form of government, that is of every free government, is the citizen. There can be no great government without a great people.

From the heart of these people came Henry Wallace. It has been my privilege to work with him for years. I know his motives. I have been impressed with his character, his sincerity, and his singular devotion to the public interest. He has that engaging candor that fits him always as a garment. You, the people of Iowa, have a right to be proud of your native son. He is a magnificent tribute to the manhood of the West, and is a worthy running mate for Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Industry and agriculture are the twin evangels of modern civilization. Their interests are mutual. Paralysis in one produces paralysis in the other. They should not fight each other, but work together in a closely knit harmony. The rights of labor are intimately linked with every form of American activity.

I salute you, Mr. Wallace, as one of the pioneers of this philosophy—the creed of fairness to all.

The implications of agriculture run into every part of the business structure. In the study of its problems, therefore, you have become a deep student of all phases of our national life.

At the close of the decade, ending with 1932, what did the farmers of America have? They had the Farm Board and the panic.

They now have soil and water conservation, low interest rates, rural electrification, marketing agreements, commodity loans, parity payments, the stamp plan, and distribution of surpluses.

The Democratic record of performance reads like a Republican platform of promises.

No one has advocated the repeal of any of these acts.

The same is true along other lines. Is there any man or woman with even a short memory who does not recall the dark days of chaos, despair, and bank failures that prevailed in the previous era?

The world has both critics and builders. It is easy to criticize. It is difficult to construct. We class Henry Wallace among the builders.

To him, more than to any other one man except the President himself, must go the credit for the great progress that has been made. He has shouldered the responsibility. He has faced the criticism that always comes with any new great undertaking. He has borne the brunt of the battle and has shown the courage of a deep conviction.

The granary or storage plan assures America an adequate supply of basic raw materials at all times. We all remember the times when the hot winds came and swept with blistering trail across the prairies of the West, when the heavens were brass and the earth was iron and the people were greatly discouraged. The stored reserves assure against the scarcity and suffering that such a period always causes. Agriculture is prepared to meet any national emergency.

Our chosen standard bearers have lifted up their eyes and have seen all the way across this broad, big country. They know that every portion of our country should share in the opportunities which our Nation affords. The principle of equality was written into the Declaration of Independence before our Nation was founded. It was carried forward into the Constitution. It is the heritage of every American.

Our President has done much to restore our Republic to this ancient principle, from which we had drifted far through legislation and business practices that had favored the few against the many. You have been associated with him in this great undertaking.

The New Deal is not simply a law. It is not even a series of laws. It is a movement. And the various enactments are but steps in the movement.

That movement has kept America a democracy when, under exactly similar conditions, many nations were turning to dictatorships. It has kept our country at peace when, under exactly similar conditions, many other great nations were plunged into war. At a time when brave people in many lands have lost their liberty, we have liberty, equality, manhood, fair play, and freedom from every form of New and Old World caste and privilege; and from the tyranny of wealth and birth. Freemen with free ballots will make a free choice of their leaders whom they feel best qualified to serve them during the next 4 years.

The Democratic Party was fighting for certain great principles of government long before any of us were born. It will be fighting for those same principles long after we have passed from the stage of action. There is, therefore, much at stake for our country. To be called with our great President and leader as one of the standard bearers, at an hour when knowledge born of experience is so vital to our national life, is a great commission.

That commission is not being placed in untried hands.

We have placed our faith in you, and we bid you Godspeed.

ADDRESS BY HON. HENRY A. WALLACE

Mr. Chairman and ladies and gentlemen, you are officially conferring upon me tonight the greatest honor of my life. The office of Vice President under the Constitution serves in a unique way as a link between the executive and legislative branches of our Government.

And it is an unusually great honor to be the running mate of the one man who, more than any other, represents security for democracy in the modern world.

For nearly 8 years President Roosevelt has battled for democracy and freedom, for their preservation at home and abroad.

Both Germany and the United States were shaken to the depths by the crisis of 1932. Germany met that crisis with dictatorship and Hitler. The United States met it with democracy and Roosevelt.

Hitler believed in government by a band of Nazi overlords, with Hitler himself as the dictator at the top. Roosevelt believed in government by the people and for the people.

Hitler believed in reducing the status of working men and women to that of serfs. Roosevelt believed in putting the common man first—improving his wages and working conditions and upholding in law the right of collective bargaining.

Hitler believed in dominating both individuals and nations by force. Roosevelt believed in the good-neighbor policy, among individuals and among nations.

Hitler believed in war through preparedness. Roosevelt believed in peace through preparedness.

Hitler believed in barter deals, so as to fight his economic war preliminary to military war. Roosevelt believed in freer world trade and a higher standard of living for all nations.

Hitler believed that all freedom must be crushed. Roosevelt believed in freedom of speech, press, and religion—which we in American hold dearer than life itself.

Adolf Hitler was the implacable enemy of all democracy. Franklin Roosevelt was its eager servant and faithful defender before the whole world.

Tens of millions of Americans shared the Roosevelt belief in 1933. But not one in a million saw so early and so clearly as he the world-shaking significance of the Hitler doctrine.

Only Roosevelt had the unusual combination of many months spent as a boy in European countries, a comprehensive knowledge of history, experience as Assistant Secretary of the Navy in the first World War, access to the day-by-day information brought in by the trained observers in the State Department, and wisdom to relate that information to its significance for America.

Thus it was that Roosevelt, earlier than almost anyone else, saw that the dominating world issue was freedom and a higher standard of living versus slavery and a lower standard of living for all except the Nazi governing class. Week after week and year after year I have sat in Cabinet meetings and heard the complete accord between the President and Secretary Hull on this issue when most Americans were not aware of the terrible storm cloud on the horizon.

Time after time the President voiced the broadest possible warnings to the public in an effort to stir our people from their slumber. For these efforts he was charged with being a warmonger. But the President kept on telling the truth as he saw it, and events have proved both the sincerity of his warnings and the accuracy of his judgment.

Roosevelt has striven with greater vigor than any other President to build international good will, international trade, and a higher standard of living. In these efforts Adolf Hitler was stumbling block No. 1.

Roosevelt's task was rendered difficult enough by the opposition of Hitler abroad. But his handicaps were multiplied by a continuous and bitter partisan opposition at home.

The dominant leadership of this Republican opposition has never understood, and has apparently been unwilling to find out, what the rise of Hitler meant to farmers, workers, and businessmen in the United States. This blind leadership believed that the United States could be prosperous, no matter what happened to Europe, no matter what happened to Asia, no matter what might be our relationship to Latin America. When Roosevelt tried to adjust the internal affairs of the United States to a sick world, they fought him at home as Hitler fought him abroad.

Some of the bitter attacks on Roosevelt's program were directly inspired by the agents of Hitler in this country. Others were merely blindly partisan. But, whatever the motive, the effect was the same—these attacks on Roosevelt and his program played into the hands of Hitler. Every evidence of opposition to Roosevelt within the United States has been reason for rejoicing in Berlin.

For more than 7 years, Roosevelt has been working steadily to help the American people build an up-to-date democracy capable of bringing security to the families of this Nation. Farm income and factory pay rolls, the two strong legs of recovery, have both been

more than doubled. Business profits have been restored and increased.

The danger to democracy from within, which threatened us in 1932, has been safely met. The Roosevelt remedy was not a resort to dictatorship, which so many conservatives were demanding in 1933, but merely simply more democracy. The Roosevelt programs gave more power to the people.

Now we have launched a great national effort to build up our defenses against the threat from abroad. Under the leadership of Roosevelt, this effort was begun several years ago. We now have nearly twice as many airplanes as in 1933, and double the tonnage of fighting ships afloat or under construction. We have more than doubled our Army. This is a splendid start, but it is only a start. It will be pushed until America is fully prepared to defend herself against any emergency.

Like the measures of economic adjustment, defense preparation also met with short-sighted obstructionist tactics. Why build so many airplanes? Why build another set of locks at the Panama Canal? Why spend Government money to store up strategic war materials? Why create a Tennessee Valley Authority to harness the power and water and soil resources of a great region, against a day of military need?

To some extent those interests obstructing the national defense did have their way. They caused appropriations to be whittled down, and brought needless delays. The T. V. A. was fought in Congress, in the courts, and in the press. Even a few weeks ago this opposition was still trying to block the building of one more T. V. A. dam, the power from which is needed in producing aluminum that is indispensable for our airplanes. Fortunately, that particular opposition has been overcome. But of the 93 votes cast against this measure in the House on July 30, every one was a Republican vote. Such resistance to our military progress was encouraging to Hitler, but it was definitely injurious to our own welfare.

Now, at last, some of the Republicans are beginning to see that the Nation really is in danger. National defense is going ahead, and the whole country can give thanks that the program is in such wise and experienced hands.

The total defense of modern war requires thousands of officers and men skilled in the mechanics of the gas engine, the airplane, and the tank. We must not only construct a giant air force but know how to operate and service it. We must protect the Panama Canal. We must enforce the Monroe Doctrine with an increased Navy, with air bases and through cooperation with Canada and the rest of the Americas. By preparing completely now, we shall have the best chance of keeping out of war.

But we must face the fact that the dictators have definite designs against this hemisphere. Their tactics here as in Europe are to divide and conquer. They hope by propaganda and bartering agreements to set one nation against another. They hope to set each class against another class. They inspire a multitude of angry voices in every democratic nation. Out of the confusion which they have created they hope to build political power and eventually military power.

The fact that our Presdential campaign and election come now is most welcome to the dictators. They hope to get rid of the unyielding Roosevelt. They know that a political campaign is distracting to our people. And they know that in the many months that would elapse before a new administration could act effectively, they might have their chance.

I do not wish to imply that the Republican leaders are willfully and consciously giving aid and comfort to Hitler. But I want to emphasize that replacement of Roosevelt, even if it were by the most patriotic leadership that could be found, would cause Hitler to rejoice. I do not believe the American people will turn their backs on the man that Hitler wants to see defeated.

In the opinion of the world—in the eyes of the Nazis and of the stricken nations under their heel—Roosevelt has become the symbol of democracy. And more important he is the symbol of democracy to all the nations of this hemisphere. He has proved his friendship for them by more than 7 years of fair dealing as a good neighbor. Hitler must not be permitted to break the solidarity of the Americas.

If the Americas present to the axis powers the same divided front as the democracies of Europe presented to them, we shall assuredly walk the same path of destruction and lost freedom. In the United States, as well as in the other Americas, we find certain men who for purposes of their own profit want England to give up her fight against Hitler and who are strong for economic appeasement between the Americas and a German-controlled Europe. In that direction lies slavery, even though it is sugar-coated with promises of prosperity. Those who stand for business appeasement with Germany are the backbone, even though unwittingly, of the most dangerous of all "fifth columns." For the sake of a profit in 1941 they would sell out their own future and their children's freedom. The businessmen of Western Europe followed this path to their sorrow. If we of the Americas are not made of sterner stuff, we shall go down as they have gone down. Our weapons are unity for total defense and a determination not to engage in economic appeasement.

Here in this country we are developing preparedness on all fronts.

On the agricultural front we have stored in the ever-normal granary tremendous reserve supplies, while at the same time, by commodity loans, we have protected farm prices and the purchasing power of farmers for city goods. We have increased our soil fertility. In every county and every township there are farmer committees which are prepared to meet any defense need involving agriculture.

The farm program has been such a success that Republican leaders are now commending it in the hope of getting farm votes next November. But the real attitude of the Republicans, which for many years has been against farmers' interests, has been revealed anew by two things that have happened in the last few weeks, since the Republicans adopted their platform and nominated their candidate.

One is the selection of a Republican campaign manager who in 15 years in Congress has never voted for one vital and constructive farm law. The other is the vote in Congress 4 weeks ago on funds for commodity loans, the loans on corn, on wheat, on cotton, which bring about the storage of reserve supplies and protect farmers' prices and income. Democrats voted 100 percent for these loans. Republicans, led by the personally selected Republican campaign manager, voted 106 to 38 against them. Mind you, this attempt to deal a mortal blow to the farm program was made only 5 weeks after the Republican Party in convention had solemnly pledged itself to help the farmer, including in such help commodity loans. And it was made only 4 days before the farmers were given assurances by the Republican standard bearer right here in Des Moines that their program would not be harmed. The Republican leaders say nice things about the farm program to get votes from the farmer. But when it comes to voting for the farmer, they don't deliver the goods.

There are now enough Democrats in Congress to protect the farmers against attempts like this to hamstring their program. Those Democrats will be needed again and again after the November election.

On the social security preparedness front the administration has started the job of taking care of our aged and unemployed. Continually we have put human values first. We believe that no one who is willing to work should be allowed to starve. We have improved the health of millions by means of food-stamp and school-lunch programs.

We have stood at all times for national unity. To aid in our national defense we have called in the best men regardless of party. In terms of action, the National Defense Commission represents splendid cooperation between agriculture, labor, industry, and government. We are obtaining national unity on the "fifth column" front by enlisting in a common-sense way the cooperation of local and State authorities. We are determined to break up the gigantic international conspiracy through which the Nazis are trying to subjugate our country.

A materialistic religion of darkness, based on force and lies and led by prophets of evil, is striding across the world. This war is more than a clash of rival imperialisms. It is a war to destroy freedom and democracy. It is a war to prevent the people of North and South America from developing their resources without paying tribute to Europe and without being victims of European secret police serving a self-appointed master race. There is no denying the strength and fanatical zeal of this satanic doctrine. It transcends economics and politics to invade the personal life. It proclaims might as the supreme god and the new Nazi master race as the mightiest of all, with a special destiny to direct and exploit and enslave every people in the world.

Against this dark and bloody faith we of the New World set the faith of Americanism, of Protestantism, of Catholicism, of Judaism. Our faith is based on belief that the possibilities in an individual are not determined by race, social background, or wealth. We believe in the maximum of freedom which can be obtained without anarchy or intolerance. Democracy is the very heart of the religions which have the largest following in the United States. Democracy and Americanism are identical. Both are utterly opposed to totalitarianism with its exaltation of might, its suppression of freedom, and its claims to racial supremacy.

I am happy to respond to the notification ceremonies this evening with an acceptance, because I believe the Democratic Party, under the leadership of President Roosevelt, is far better equipped than the opposition to preserve the freedom of the Americas. He has understood the Hitler menace from the start. Powerful elements in our opposition will, if the Republicans come into power, force us to make one economic concession after another to the totalitarian countries. These appeasers will have their way if the Republicans win, because they will have contributed so largely, both politically and financially, to the Republican cause. These people believe the Republicans in power would give them profitable business with a German-controlled Europe at the earliest possible moment. Most Republicans may not realize it, but their party is the party of appeasement in the United States today. It is the party which the totalitarian powers will back in every way possible. Of all men in the United States, Roosevelt best knows the danger of making economic concessions to the dictators.

Between now and November, I propose to do everything I can to arouse the American people to the need for peace through preparedness, to the importance of the solidarity of the Americas, and to the duty of businessmen, workers, and farmers to cooperate together for full employment and for the national defense. For I sincerely believe the Democratic Party under Roosevelt will best give us a higher standard of living, unity within our own country, safety from external aggression, and freedom on this hemisphere for ourselves and our children.

Connecticut State Democratic Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. SHANLEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 30, 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. PAUL V. McNUTT

Mr. SHANLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following keynote address of the Honorable Paul V. McNutt at the Connecticut State Democratic Convention on August 23, 1940, in New Haven, Conn.:

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen of the convention, I am happy to return to Connecticut and to this ancient seat of learning and to have the privilege of meeting with those who carry the banners and fight the battles of democracy.

Tonight an anxious world awaits the outcome of democracy's last stand in war-torn Europe. Tonight vast numbers of oppressed men and women, and even little children, are looking toward this Nation as the one haven of refuge still remaining in a chaotic world.

Therefore it is peculiarly fitting that we Democrats should assemble at a place which in 1640—exactly 300 years ago—was first named New Haven, the refuge of the oppressed.

New Haven itself has a story all its own. This story should mean much to Democrats, whose party 8 years ago, under a great leader, relighted once more the torch of liberty for all Americans—the torch of Washington and Jefferson, of Jackson and Lincoln, of Cleveland and Wilson.

Here, in April of the year 1638, came the Reverend John Davenport, who had been driven out of London because he believed that the underlying principles of government could be found in the Holy Scriptures.

The unusual feature of Davenport's government was that it was wholly independent of all other sovereigns. The "freeman's charge," which was a substitute for an oath, gave no pledge of allegiance to king or parliament, nor to any other authority on the face of the earth.

And so it has ever been in the grand old State of Connecticut. The "freeman's charge" has echoed through the years. And never did it sound louder than on that memorable evening in 1687 when the General Assembly of Connecticut refused to surrender the colonial charter to a royal despot, but hid it, instead, in the famous Charter Oak on the outskirts of Hartford.

In times of national crises, it is the lot of the Democratic Party to be called to power. Our party is the oldest continuously existing political instrumentality in America. It has played a potent part in every political and economic development since the end of the eighteenth century. It is the party of liberal tendencies and of progressive tradition. History has demonstrated conclusively that it is the only party from which action along those lines can be expected. The opportunity to serve when the need is greatest has been accepted as a high privilege by the party. Such service has demonstrated the genuine and indisputable greatness of Democratic principles, the value and essential soundness of Democratic doctrines, and the inspiring fineness of Democratic achievement.

This is not a static world. Our traditional political opponents thought it was. They held fast to old theories and were at a loss when the old theories did not meet the demands of the new day. They had not had a constructive or new idea in half a century. They were entirely unmindful of the factors which control our well-being. The people revolted and swept them from power.

Whenever the Nation has been confronted with unprecedented situations, calling for unprecedented willingness to consider unprecedented policies, it has placed the Democratic Party in the seats of government. In every instance the party has proved its capacity to meet crises, safeguard the liberties of all citizens, and provide a way of life congenial to our people. The last 7½ years give adequate proof. They have been long years to Republicans out of power. They have been short years to a grateful people on the road to recovery.

It was the immortal Woodrow Wilson, historian and prophet as well as statesman, who said: "Whenever the United States forgets its ardor for mankind, it is necessary that a Democrat should be elected President." A Democrat was elected President in 1932, overwhelmingly reelected President in 1936, and will be unanimously reelected President in 1940. Called upon during this critical period, the Democratic Party produced a valiant leader, the greatest peacetime President in the history of the Nation—Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

In that tragic year, 1932, all enterprise was paralyzed, all confidence was gone. So deep and so widespread was the demoralization that recovery by the old methods of individual initiative and piecemeal adjustments had become impossible. There was not merely a financial panic. There was a political and a moral panic. In every town the banks were closing. In almost every community the treasury out of which the unemployed had to be fed was empty. In Washington the Congress and the Executive were in a hopeless deadlock. Nowhere was there any organized power standing around which the people could rally.

It was under these conditions that a new leader took command. He made it his first business to prove to the people that they had in Washington a government that could govern. In the first 3 months he implanted that conviction in the minds of the American people and in the minds of all the world.

Our people had seen the Congress and the Executive so deadlocked that almost no measures could be enacted. They had lost hope not only in their own ability to meet the crisis but in the ability of anyone to do anything about anything. That was the very essence of the crisis. To overcome it the President, inspired as few men have been in our age, drove through a whole series of great measures in record-breaking time, thus serving notice on everyone that the Government was restored to full vitality.

Everybody knew that there was vigor where there had been weariness, unity where there had been disunity, and the power to act where there had been impotency. The impression was driven home that there was no vested interest so powerful that it could block the action of government; that there was no dogma so deep-seated that it could prevent bold action; that there was no important group of people whose problems the Government was not prepared to take in hand. A Democratic President and a Democratic Congress saved the day. In 1932 we found ourselves in disorderly, panic-stricken mobs and factions. By June of 1933 we had become again an organized nation, confident of our power to provide for our own security and to control our own destiny. It was a triumphant achievement under the leadership of one of the truly great men of the century—Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

The Republican theory of prosperity has been the reactionary code of privilege from the time of Alexander Hamilton to that of Herbert Hoover. It is a theory of pouring in prosperity at the top of the social structure and letting it trickle down to the bottom. It is the old story of Lazarus gathering the crumbs that fell from the rich man's table. The Republicans help Lazarus by piling more food on the table. The only economic program the Republicans have ever offered the country is a high tariff. That was their remedy after the war for independence, after the War between the States, and after the World War. It is the remedy they offer now.

With millions of unemployed, millions of unemployables, millions of victims of economic forces thrown out of balance by universal world unrest, the Republicans offer a higher tariff.

Jefferson and Jackson had a different theory. And so did Roosevelt. That theory requires that the hungry be fed, that the jobless be employed, and that those oppressed by the debts of an inflated credit structure have an opportunity to recover their economic stability. It is a program of direct action to create the conditions which will enable the farmers, the laborers, and the businessmen to help themselves out of the slough of despair and hardship. It is a theory which calls for the redistribution and extension of the purchasing power of the people. It is a theory which requires the Government to do something for the people it is supposed to serve. It is a dynamic theory of government as distinguished from a do-nothing theory. It calls for action rather than resignation to the havoc wrought by uncontrolled economic forces. It is a theory of courage and hope rather than of defeatism and despair.

The Democratic Party has always been a humanitarian party and it is still a humanitarian party. The Democratic view of government has always been a liberal one, and it is still a liberal one. Democratic leaders have always been the people's champions, and they are still the people's champions.

Who cared about the boys and girls who were out on the roads, sleeping in the hobo jungles, begging their food, and hoping against hope to find a job somewhere? Who was ridiculed when he proposed to set up the C. C. C.? Who cared enough to set up the N. Y. A. to help young people finish their school and find jobs? Was it a Republican? What have the Republicans to do with youth? It was the President and Mrs. Roosevelt who cared enough for youth to take their part and give them a chance in a bewildered world.

You and I know that the reason the vast majority of young people support the Democratic Party is because ours is the party of hope and courage. With this administration, for the first time since Woodrow Wilson, a generation of youth has known a Government that was truly concerned about the welfare of all the people.

What administration took thought for the old as well as the young? Was it the Republicans? Why was our country almost the only civilized Nation on earth that had failed to set up any system of old-age insurance? You know, and so do I, that we fell so far behind because the Republican cared more about saving the pockets of its largest contributors than about giving young boys and girls a chance in life, and creating security for old men and women. It was Roosevelt and the Democratic Party that first took action to start us on the long road to social security.

How can Americans be really free if they must face the terrors of helpless old age, or of blindness or sickness with no one to help them? The vitality and initiative of any people depend on their confidence in one another, in their moral duty to stand by those who get hurt and give them a helping hand. The cynical doctrine of Republican normalcy, with the spoils to the strong and the breadlines for the unlucky, had almost broken our courage, before we shook them off and put in a great humanitarian.

Even while they were complacently contemplating their fictitiously balanced Budget, the liberties of the American citizens were in peril. While they were counting their paper profits, an army of ragged veterans was marching on Washington and hordes of hungry men and women were losing their jobs, their savings, their homes, and, finally, their spirits.

And who worried about the gullies that ate the plowed fields in the South, or the dry lands of the Southwest? Not the Republican administration of the "roaring twenties." They were satisfied to get their profits, eating up the forests and the land, wasting the petroleum, the minerals, and the natural gas, living on capital and calling it income. Calling it economy to let the forests burn to save expenses, to leave the struggling scientists in the Department of Agriculture with no money to fight soil erosion and agricultural pests.

Then came the Democrats, with a President who has lived on the land and who loves the land. You know what has happened. The Government has set up demonstration projects, and has paid for machinery and engineers to show the farmers how to save their land. The Government has hired hundreds of thousands of C. C. C. boys to go on the land and stop the gullies, to go in the forests and stop the fires.

West of the Mississippi the Government has helped the farmers to plant shelter belts across the windy prairies where trees never grew before. The Republicans could sneer at Franklin Roosevelt for this foolish idea. But today the farmers have 11,000 miles of shelter belt growing. It takes courage to try new ways and assume the risk of failure. This administration has had courage, and most of its new ways are proving to be the right ways.

It wasn't the Republicans who gave rural areas a chance to build new schools and water systems and housing. It wasn't the Republicans who made a real attack on disease—who had the courage to go ahead with flood control—who set up power lines to the farmers and learned how to cut the cost of rural lines by half. No, it wasn't the Republicans who did these things.

It was the Democrats and Roosevelt who envisaged the development of great power projects and a program of cheap electricity that would make power available to small, as well as large, consumers, decentralize industry, and turn the stream of population away from congested urban centers.

When this administration set out to reduce the swollen mass of holding companies that had grown like a cancer into the public utilities, there was a prolonged howl. The Liberty League arose to denounce Roosevelt as a dictator. A dictator because he destroyed the freedom of high-powered manipulators to hoodwink the small investor. You remember that battle. Even the gravestones were made to send telegrams to protest against the holding-company bill. But the Democratic Party stood firm and the bill passed. It is no longer easy for unscrupulous operators to sell fake securities to unwary citizens.

And when the administration set out to clean up the whole game of high finance and threatened to establish the Securities and Exchange Commission, there was another howl. The Republicans said Roosevelt was fighting against business and destroying confidence. It is another fight for freedom, and, of course, there are howls at anyone who dares to fight for the people.

The Republicans accuse the Democrats of taking the Nation to bankruptcy. They have a short memory or they would not speak of bankruptcy. They forget what happened a few years ago. They do not seem to remember the sorry spectacle of a proud and rich Nation groveling in despair, helpless and frantic. They don't remember the financial crack-ups of 1929, the suicides of 1930, the bread lines of 1931, the closed banks of 1932, the food riots, the hunger marches, the evictions, the hardships, and the sufferings. All these things escape their memory in 1940.

Consider the incredible experience of those early years of the thirties. They called him a demagogue. A demagogue because he was rallying the powers of the people to fight for the interests of the people.

The Democratic Party is not against business—it has never been against business. I believe there are more businessmen in the ranks of Democracy than the Republicans ever had. I defy anyone to prove the contrary. You know and I know that the greatest enemy of business in America has been the unseen power of concentrated financial interest. It was this power that captured control of one business after another and so mismanaged and corrupted the natural course of all business that, in 1932, it had brought business to a standstill. This administration had to protect business against entrenched wealth, and that job is only begun.

Here is a land which by natural wealth and endowment is the most favorable place for man to live in all the world. It is not overcrowded. With only 6 percent of the world's population, it has 45 percent of the wealth of the world. It has 60 percent of the world's supply of monetary gold. It is able to and does furnish 62 percent of the world's oil production. It mines a third of the world's copper and a third of its coal. It possesses 30,000,000 of the world's 43,000,000 automobiles, 20,000,000 of the world's 40,000,000 telephones. It raises half the world's cotton, half its fruit. What is equally important, this Nation has an abundance of labor, skilled and unskilled. Our technical and scientific knowledge surpasses that of any people on earth.

In such a land and with such a people we were literally prostrate on March 4, 1933. Prostrate because of 12 years of bungling political mismanagement, the like of which has not been witnessed in modern times. Every financial institution in the Nation was paralyzed, the arteries of commerce were dried up, business was at a standstill. And the party which wrought this havoc now has the unmitigated and brazen impudence to charge that the Democratic Party has brought the country to bankruptcy.

But try as hard as they could, the Republican administrations of those roaring twenties could not produce a depression so big that the Democrats couldn't pull the country out of it. Since the nightmare year of 1932 our national income has leaped from $42,000,000,000 to $72,000,000,000 annually.

The increase in national debt about which the Republicans shed so many tears could be wiped out with the increased income of 1 year with $10,000,000,000 to spare, if the people choose to do it. The Republicans bequeathed us 18,000,000 unemployed. Half this staggering number have been put to work and in addition some 6,000,000 new employables have been absorbed into the industrial system. Legitimate business has increased to a point close to the prosperity of the boom years, and industrial activity has mounted from a small fraction of capacity in 1933 to near capacity in 1939 and '40.

And now let us look at the national debt which the Republicans say will break the Nation's back and bring it to ruin. Of this amount two billion was incurred by prepayments of war bonuses already obligated. That leaves eighteen billion.

We have two billion in the reserve account of the old-age insurance fund. That leaves sixteen billion.

In the Treasury of the United States there is three billion in cash, and another two billion in the stabilization fund, leaving eleven billion.

The Government's interest in proprietary corporations amounts to three billion, leaving at this moment, a net debt increase of $8,000,000,000.

This does not take into account the billions of dollars in physical, tangible assets which the Nation enjoys in the form of roads, bridges, dams, public buildings, and other construction.

Eight billion dollars to restore to millions of Americans hope, courage, and an opportunity to live decent, self-respecting lives. Eight billion dollars for the wealthiest Nation on the face of the globe to take feeble and aged citizens out of the poorhouse and to give young boys and girls a chance to live useful and healthy lives in school and in C. C. C. camps. Eight billion dollars to reduce by nine million the ranks of unemployed breadwinners and to provide some insurance against temporary loss of jobs. A net cost of $8,000,000,000 to do all these things and yet to raise the national income $30,000,000,000 a year and increase the national wealth by $100,000,000,000.

Last Saturday the Nation heard an amazing charge brought against the party which has thus served America so faithfully. The Republican candidate sought to accuse our party of neglecting the security of this country and of failing adequately to safeguard its interests. The Republican Convention incorporated in its platform the preposterous charge that the Democratic Party had handicapped the country with respect to its armaments, its productive powers, and its economic condition.

Nothing could more clearly demonstrate the utter inability of the opposition to grasp the fundamental issues of national preparedness than such an accusation.

Their candidate and their leaders appear completely unaware of the basic conditions which made possible the fall of French civilization and which threaten momentarily a blackout of the British.

It was not, as they suppose, the mere fact that the Nazis had built a few thousand tanks or a fleet of bombers which the French could not match. These facts were themselves the result of more fundamental causes.

A civilization is not snuffed out by sheer accident.

There is much talk of Munich, of Neville Chamberlain, of the mistake in Norway, and in Flanders.

But it is the flimsiest of superficial views that the collapse of a great, virile, and courageous people is brought about because somebody guessed wrong.

History will not attribute the fate of the Allies to the failure of their individual citizens. The French fought with valor as the German legions rolled relentlessly through Flanders. But that battle was lost, and it was lost before Hitler's march through the Low Countries was begun.

Something had already happened to France and it had happened to England. And that same thing was happening to the United States of America before 1932.

It was a subtle poisoning of the national life, a dulling of our collective perception, a weakening of the national will. It was an attitude of helplessness, a choking off of our national energies, a short circuit of our national power. It was an attitude of futility and a feeling of impotency.

That is why the richest Nation on earth, in 1932, was prostrate after 12 years of economic mismanagement and political blundering. America during those years had become selfish and crass. We had no national defense. We had lost sight of real values. We were drunk with the heady wine of a booming, roaring stock market. The Government was cold and hard. It had lost touch with the people and had abandoned the liberal, humanitarian traditions of our fathers.

The national character was slowly degenerating, getting soft with decay.

That is why we were as helpless before the economic "blitzkrieg" of 1929 as were the French before Hitler's waves of green-gray troops and roaring bombers.

But America was saved. It was saved by the Democratic Party, by Democratic leadership, and by a courageous, far-seeing Democratic President—Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

America was not dead. She was merely in chains.

In 1932 those chains were broken and the pent-up energy of a great people was unleashed to work out their salvation. There was in this land spiritual awakening. Courage replaced fear. Hope reappeared. And the Nation became strong where it had been weak and helpless. The Government became once more the servant of the people, dedicated to their welfare, responsive to their needs.

The years since 1932 have been years of rigorous self-discipline, years of hard work, and years of searching self-analysis. Old ways were abandoned and a selfish, greedy life given up. Americans began again to think about their country—began again to love their country, to love its forests, its land, and its rivers. And loving their country, started to take care of it, to build it up and make it fruitful and beautiful, to prepare to defend it.

These years have also been conscientious years. The callous shell has been removed from the great heart of America and we have once more become sensitive to human suffering, intolerant of injustice and hardship, and responsive to the call of fellow citizens in distress. The hard-boiled, brutal, and cynical attitude of the twenties has been cast off and the warm lifeblood of democracy has again surged through the arteries and veins of the Nation. We have seen on a national scale a return to the old spirit of mutual helpfulness that our pioneer ancestors knew. Like them, in the dangers of a new and more terrible wilderness, we have learned to stand together as comrades. This new sense of comradeship, this feeling that every American is a member of the family, will stand us in good stead as we face the dangers of the future. Let us thank God that we have made this progress toward national strength and unity.

This is what the Democratic Party has done for America.

Today we stand on the threshold of the unknown.

But we face the critical years ahead with restored confidence, with renewed determination, and with a supreme faith in our powers and in our destiny.

Our party has still a great mission to perform. America faces a threat to her freedom. The party of Jefferson and Jackson, of Cleveland and Wilson, and of Roosevelt, the great champions of liberty and justice and righteousness, is ready for that test and is prepared to meet that challenge.

At such times the people always look to the Democratic Party for leadership.

They will do it again in November.

God helping, we will not fail them.

Poll Taxes in the State of Tennessee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KNUTE HILL

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 30, 1940

ARTICLE FROM THE CHATTANOOGA (TENN.) TIMES OF AUGUST 18, 1940

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an Associated Press dispatch appearing in the Chattanooga Times of Sunday, August 18.

It will be seen from this article just how futile it is to expect the poll tax to be repealed by the States themselves. This should be an answer to all those who would have us believe that Federal legislation along this line is interference in local affairs. It is interesting to point out that in Tennessee alone of the seven States clinging to this outmoded system is there any question as to whether or not the removal of the tax by the States would require a constitutional amendment. All of the other seven States have the requirement firmly embedded in their fundamental document.

Again I suggest to the membership that all sign petition No. 34 on the Speaker's desk. The article follows:

[From the Chattanooga Times of August 18, 1940]

POLL TAX REPEAL ISSUE FOR SOLONS—PROBLEM TO FACE LEGISLATURE—BOTH PARTIES IN STATE HAVE CRITICIZED TAX

NASHVILLE, Aug. 17.—One problem with which the general assembly that meets next January almost certainly must deal is the old issue of abolition of the poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in Tennessee.

Governor Cooper campaigned for the Democratic nomination in 1938 on a platform advocating repeal of the tax requirement and E. H. Crump's Memphis organization also came out for its removal but three bills introduced in the senate and four in the house in 1939 died in committee after passing two readings.

This year both Democratic and Republican State conventions adopted platform planks advocating repeal of the tax and numerous organizations have made the issue one of their prime objectives.

Among these are labor unions affiliated with both the American Federation of Labor and the Congress of Industrial Organizations, the Tennessee League of Women Voters, the Southern Conference for Human Welfare, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, and others.

COOPER SILENT ON ISSUE

Cooper made no mention of the poll tax in his reelection campaign this summer against George R. Dempster, of Knoxville, other than to say he would "sign a poll-tax-repeal measure if passed by the legislature."

Dempster asked the Governor to call an extraordinary session of the legislature to repeal the act, promising to defray expenses of the session personally. Cooper ignored the demand.

Legal opinion varies as to the procedure necessary to eliminate the poll tax. One school of thought is that an amendment to the constitution is necessary; another holds that the legislature can remove the requirement merely by repealing the poll-tax law enacted in 1890, which requires payment of the tax—$1 State levy and $1 county—60 days before the general election.

Secretary of State A. B. Broadbent, himself an attorney, subscribes to the constitutional amendment theory, asserting:

"The constitution sets up the requirement in section 1 of article 4 and in my opinion this section would have to be amended to abolish the tax."

The section Broadbent referred to reads, in part:

"* * * And there shall be no qualification attached to the right of suffrage except that each voter shall give to the judges of election where he offers to vote, satisfactory evidence that he has paid the poll taxes assessed against him, for such preceding period as the legislature shall prescribe, and at such time as may be prescribed by law; without which his vote cannot be received."

OPINION IS SIDESTEPPED

The State attorney general's office has sidestepped an opinion on the issue, one official explaining that it poses a question which eventually may require a ruling by the supreme court.

Several attorneys, including Broadbent, say no amendment is necessary to remove the barrier as far as primary elections are concerned. This can be done, they assert, by amending the Primary Act.

But to amend the constitution—something which never has been done in its 70-year history—would require a minimum of 3 years and possibly longer.

First, the measure would have to be approved by both houses by a majority; then it would have to be passed by the succeeding legislature by a two-thirds vote, and finally submitted to the people in a referendum with the amendment to become effective on the date set out in the referendum.

In Tennessee a tax of $1 each by the State and county is levied on persons between the ages of 21 and 50. The law exempts deaf, dumb, and blind persons, National Guard men, and those incapable of earning a living.

Disposal of Destroyers to Great Britain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHAN GURNEY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, August 31 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. JOHN A. DANAHER, OF CONNECTICUT, ON THE AMERICAN FORUM OF THE AIR PROGRAM, AUGUST 25, 1940

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD the text of an address delivered by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER] on the American Forum of the Air program, Sunday, August 25, 1940.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The question before us for discussion is, "Shall the United States make available to England some of its World War destroyers?" The

immediate answer is, "Yes; if the United States wishes to engage in war." Let there be no mistake whatever upon that point. If the United States as a nation supplies war vessels to another nation at war, the United States will be in that war. England knows this, and what she desires really is the political commitment from us; not our old destroyers. In my 6 minutes tonight I approach the question as one whose first duty is owed to the United States of America as a nation, and I regard our own national interests as paramount.

On June 15, 1917, President Woodrow Wilson approved our statute which reads in part:

"During a war in which the United States is a neutral nation, it shall be unlawful to send out of the jurisdiction of the United States any vessel built, armed, or equipped as a vessel of war * * * with any intent or under any agreement * * * that such vessel shall be delivered to a belligerent nation * * * after its departure from the jurisdiction of the United States."

Obviously then at the outset, any attempt by anyone to send out such war vessels to a belligerent is unlawful—by our own declaration.

When we passed the Defense Act 8 weeks ago Congress said:

"Nothing herein shall be construed to repeal or modify" the statute I just referred to. Only 1 month ago Congress again said:

"No vessel, ship or boat * * * now in the United States Navy or being built or hereafter built therefor shall be disposed of by sale or otherwise, or be chartered or scrapped, except as now provided by law."

This is the law of the United States.

In the Hague Convention, which we signed, we as a Nation expressly agreed that the law among nations should read:

"The supply, in any manner, directly or indirectly, by a neutral power to a belligerent power, of warships, ammunition or war material of any kind whatever, is forbidden."

We have uniformly condemned those nations which have broken their treaties, and I believe our foreign policy should demand a longer view of world affairs than is to be found in advocating a breach by our United States of its own treaties and conventions.

During our Civil War Great Britain fitted out the *Alabama* and other war vessels for use against the North. After the war our claims against Great Britain led to a treaty concluded here in Washington on May 8, 1871, by which the United States of America and Great Britain solemnly bound themselves and agreed that:

"A neutral government is bound first to use due diligence to prevent the fitting out, arming or equipping, within its jurisdiction, of any vessel which it has reasonable ground to believe is intended * * * to carry on war against a power with which it is at peace; and also to use like diligence to prevent the departure * * * of any vessel intended to * * * carry on war. * * * And the high contracting parties agree to observe these rules as between themselves in future, and to bring them to the knowledge of other maritime powers. * * *"

The United States of America collected from Great Britain $15,000,000 in gold as damages for England's part in the affair.

Since the present war began our own Secretary of State called a conference at Panama, in which, on October 3, 1939, the Foreign Ministers of all the American republics in the Panama Convention resolved in part:

"* * * that with regard to their status as neutrals there exist certain standards recognized by the American republics applicable in these circumstances, and that in accordance with them they * * * (shall prevent) the setting on foot of any military, naval, or aerial expedition in the interests of the belligerents; the fitting out or arming * * * of any ship or vessel to be employed in the service of one of the belligerents, to cruise or commit hostilities against another belligerent * * *."

We called that convention. It was the United States who stimulated this agreement by which our American republics condemned the arming or fitting out of ships or vessels to be employed in the service of one of the belligerents. That is our own language. What status or standing will our word and our position have among these or any other nations if we were to violate what we ourselves said is the law? Suppose Brazil or Argentina turned over their warships to Germany?

No; in her own national interest the United States of America must regard principle even if she's all alone in doing so. Supplying any destroyers to England is a recognized act of war, and the American people should fully realize it.

There is many another reason why we should not send our destroyers to England, but let me read the warning issued by Thomas Jefferson, who said:

"I have ever deemed it fundamental for the United States never to take an active part in the quarrels of Europe. Their political interests are entirely distinct from ours. Their mutual jealousies, their balance of power, their complicated alliances, their forms and principles of government are all foreign to us. They are nations of eternal war."

It doesn't make any difference how old the destroyers are; they're in commission. We have no allies, not even one. Nobody is fighting our war. But if we make available to England some of our destroyers for use in her war, which she declared without conference with us, inevitably we enter that war. So I answer the question—absolutely, no. I believe our Nation should stay out of that war.

Conscription

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RUSH D. HOLT

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, August 31 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON TIMES-HERALD

Mr. HOLT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD an editorial from the Times-Herald of yesterday showing a comparison of editorial comment on the conscription of men as compared with the conscription of wealth.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Times-Herald of August 30, 1940.]

WHAT HAPPENS IF WEALTH IS CONSCRIPTED?—WHAT DOES IT MEAN?

This red-hot slogan, "Conscript the wealth if you conscript the men," is just the kind of catchy business to lead a lot of good people into something they don't want.

Everybody knows what happens when a man is drafted into military service.

Have you done much thinking about what happens to conscripted wealth?

Conscripted wealth doesn't just mean conscripted money. After all, that is just a matter of taxation. The Government always gets what it is after in the tax line. Always has. Always will as long as there's anything to get.

So, if the slogan is going to lead to anything, "conscript the wealth" means that the Government will move in and take over industries—lock, stock, and barrel—in the name of national defense.

Now, for the past several years the same kind of people who are now yelling loudest about conscripting the wealth have been yelling about the necessity to protect labor by higher pay and shorter hours of work. They have backed all kinds of law, State and Federal, to protect the workingman against arbitrary treatment by his employer.

And the great weapon which they have forged to protect the workingman has been the strike. We have a multitude of laws today guaranteeing labor the right to organize for collective bargaining, to strike against what it considers abuse, and to punish the employer who behaves badly when he doesn't like the way things go.

THE EMPLOYER WILL GET BY

Now, under this wealth-conscription project many of these same advocates of labor reform are shouting for, the employer would be kicked all the way out of his plant and the whole put into the hands of the Government to advance the national defense.

Forget about the employer. If he has anything at all saved up, he'll get by, even if the Government doesn't pay him off for his capital investment.

But what about the employees who have, these 5 years past, been enjoying the right to strike, the 40-hour week, the protected wage, and generally a stronger position opposite the table of authority?

Can you fancy a union business agent telling the Army officer in charge of a steel mill where to get off?

When the Government conscripts a chunk of wealth it conscripts all that goes with it, and that includes the filing clerks, the elevator boys, and the janitors as well as the lifters and pushers out in the mill.

Everybody, not just the men drafted into the Army, would be in the service of Uncle Sam.

YOU DON'T STRIKE ON UNCLE SAM

And do you think labor unions can do anything to protect wages, hours, and working conditions when the Government is boss? If you do, ask the boys in the W. P. A. union who tried to pull a strike in New York and another one here about a year ago. They got a message from 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue reminding them that "nobody has the right to strike against the Government."

So they silently folded their tents.

If that isn't enough for you, consider the position of the labor unions in Germany. Or in Russia. They don't do much worth telling to protect labor against the Government there, do they?

MADE IN MOSCOW

There are some people in this country who would like to see the Government in charge of everything. That is because they figure they will then be in charge of the Government. But how anybody

who claims to believe in the system of civilization under which most Americans were born and brought up and which we are all supposed now to be preparing to defend can fall for their racket is beyond our comprehension.

Every time somebody shouts "Conscript the wealth" they are delighted. But there is no reason for the rest of us to be. That slogan was made in Moscow, if any ever was. The next time you hear it, ask the shouter just what it means.

You'll find out, sure enough, that he doesn't realize what he has been saying or he is working straight toward Government take everything.

Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ERNEST LUNDEEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, August 31 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

EDITORIALS FROM WALLACES' FARMER

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD several short editorials from Wallaces' Farmer on the subject of foreign policy.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Wallaces' Farmer of May 4, 1940]

WHAT WAR DOES

Whatever happens in the war, there is trouble ahead for American agriculture. We might as well recognize it and begin to prepare for it.

For example, if we hold completely aloof from Europe and Asia after this war comes to an end, it is obvious that our exports will rapidly dwindle to the merest trickle.

That means Agricultural Adjustment Administration, Farm Credit, Farm Security, and all other agencies of the Department of Agriculture will have the biggest task on their hands they have ever faced.

If, because of unusual European buying of farm products, there should be a temporary agricultural prosperity, we must fight attempts that are sure to be made to destroy essential parts of our agricultural adjustment machinery.

For, after the war comes to an end, we will need this machinery more than ever. There must be agricultural preparedness as well as military preparedness. * * *

In any event, it is obvious that Agricultural Adjustment Administration, Farm Credit, and the whole farm program must be improved and not weakened.—Henry A. Wallace, at St. Paul.

[From Wallaces' Farmer of May 18, 1940]

THEY WOULD BE GIFTS AND NOT LOANS

The British have been getting around 400,000,000 pounds of cured pork a year from Denmark. They won't get this again for a good while. Even if the Allies win and Denmark is restored to sovereignty, the chances are that the hog population of that nation will be eaten down to nothing and that the farms will be unable to get back to normal production very soon.

What Corn Belt farmers are wondering is this: How much American pork will the British buy to replace the pork they can no longer get from Denmark?

American exports of cured pork to Great Britain have been only a little better than 40,000,000 pounds a year. If we filled up the gap left by the Danes, we would sell 11 times as much in the next year.

Nobody expects this to happen. The British may buy more American pork, but they are more likely to ration their own people and cut down consumption.

And very probably they will use the yawning British market as bait to secure loans. They will say: "We can't pay cash. But lend us the money and we'll buy a lot of pork and wheat and other farm products."

Farmers will be urged to ask Congress to repeal the ban on loans to nations at war, on the ground that such loans would boost farm income.

Of course, if such loans are made, they will not be loans. They will be gifts. Certainly, we help hog and butter and egg prices now by giving money through the stamp plan to our own people so that relief groups can eat more food. In a similar way, we could aid farm-product prices by giving money to the Allies with which they could buy farm products.

But let's not fool ourselves by talking about loans. The debts of the last war have not been paid. Any debts of the new war will be still harder to collect.

The United States can secure greater consumption of its food products abroad by giving them away. But we can do the same thing at home. Probably at least 11,000,000 families in the Nation are badly undernourished now. It might be well to feed them up first. Then come the victims of war in Poland, in Norway, in Spain, in Finland, in China. If we are going to give food away, they should come next.

After that, if we have any money left, we might consider the desirability of giving away food to the British and French Empires.

[From Wallaces' Farmer of May 18, 1940]

IF ENEMIES TRY TO INVADE UNITED STATES

Nervous Americans, picturing foreign navies landing hostile troops on our shores, may be comforted by what happened in Norway. It took the Nazis 4 weeks, even with the advantage of a surprise attack, and little defense against them, to put about 60,000 men across from 100 to 200 miles of air-protected sea.

And it took the British, with a navy in control of the North Sea, over 2 weeks to put 20,000 men across 800 miles. Both estimates may be high.

The American Navy, in its own waters, is strong enough to defeat the British and Nazi Navies put together. Our coast defenses are in fair shape, and the Army could probably mobilize 100,000 men on the coast in a week, 200,000 men in 2 weeks.

What chance would an invasion, coming over 3,000 miles or more, have against us?

So long as we stick to defending ourselves we can get along very well. Of course, if the British and French and Dutch want us to protect their Asiatic possessions against Japan, we aren't strong enough. But how many Americans really want to fight to help Europe run Asia?

[From Wallaces' Farmer of June 15, 1940]

KEEP SHIRTS ON

Remember the radio broadcast of The War of the Worlds, when a lot of folks thought the Martians had landed in New Jersey?

The same folks—and a few more—are now convinced that the Nazis will land next week in Mexico.

Let's remember that although it has shrunk a bit, the Atlantic is still quite an ocean. And that the Nazis, even if they should win completely, have a long job ahead in consolidating their gains in Europe, if they can consolidate those gains at all.

Hysteria about "fifth columns" and "Nazi spies" is especially to be deplored. Let the professionals do the spy-catching. Amateurs almost always chase the wrong man. Skillful spies have been known to head spy-hunting mobs, just as a horse thief sometimes used to manage the local vigilantes in order to set them on the wrong track.

Because your neighbor doesn't agree with you, it doesn't prove he's a "fifth columnist." He may merely be an American exercising his right of free speech under the Constitution.

The Army and State police forces can look after the spies. We had better keep the weeds out of the corn.

Labor Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFTON A. WOODRUM

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 3, 1940

RADIO ADDRESS BY ELECTRICAL TRANSCRIPTION OF HON. CLIFTON A. WOODRUM, OF VIRGINIA

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, on Labor Day, by means of electrical transcription, I addressed the citizens of Lynchburg. The address was carried over station WLVA. The address was repeated at Roanoke, Va., over station WDBJ the following day. The address follows:

LABOR DAY

There never was a truer statement than the one that "big oaks from little acorns grow." It was on a beautiful May day, the 8th of May 1882, 58 years ago, in the city of New York, and at a meeting of the Central Labor Union of New York City that Peter J. McGuire offered a simple resolution. It was, however, destined to be of far-reaching consequences. This resolution proposed that the first Monday in each September be set aside as a day to symbolize "the industrial spirit, the great vital force of every nation." The resolution was adopted, and New York and the Nation had its first Labor Day on September 6, 1882. It was a great demonstration—a mammoth parade—and followed by the traditional American picnic. Thus began the first national recognition of organized labor. Thus

came into existence the ideal of a day each year set aside in honor of America's workers.

The history of the labor movement in America is one of absorbing interest. Because of a diversity of interests, sometimes because of sectional differences, and sometimes because of unfortunate leadership, the going has not always been smooth. When one surveys the whole picture, I am sure that this movement has had a most notable effect in improving the lot of the workers of America. I think that there are a few outstanding facts that are self-evident. The first is that working conditions are more favorable, and standards of living higher in America today than in any other land. Second, there is less friction and a more cooperative spirit between the employer and the employed than in any other country. Like any other great movement, labor has had its trials and difficulties. At times it has been a house divided against itself. It has also had to fight to rid itself of subversive elements that sought to gain control in some of its branches.

Today, 58 years after that first Labor Day, we find much progress has been made in making easier and more bearable the lot of the man who toils. Great social and economic reforms have come. They have been universally accepted in principle. Among them can be mentioned: Social security, old-age pensions, unemployment compensation, railroad retirement, employee liability, the right to bargain collectively, and the principle of minimum pay and maximum hours, and many other protective measures.

UNEMPLOYMENT

Perhaps the biggest economic problem that faces our country today, and in which labor is so vitally interested, is unemployment. The acuteness of this problem may be temporarily alleviated by our huge defense expenditures, but these expenditures cannot keep up forever. We certainly cannot start out on the perilous path of supporting ourselves out of our war industries alone. Some day we will be back again face to face with the problem of trying to coordinate our national economy. The stability of our economic order depends upon an answer to that problem. The problem is a paradox.

IN A LAND OF PLENTY THERE IS WANT

Stated a little differently, it would seem as if God has blessed us with too much of everything. In a land with bursting barns of grain surrounded with fields ripe with golden harvest, there is hunger. Where fields are white with cotton, textile plants are idle and American citizens are naked. In a land of virgin forests and idle men, citizens are homeless. A land where there is much work to be done, and yet millions of our able-bodied citizens are unable to find employment by which to support themselves and their families. A land where our leaders in finance, industry, and commerce have dreams of great industrial and commercial expansion, and yet do not have the formula with which to carry these into effect. The greatest country in the world, and the finest people. Unlimited resources, indefatigable energy, and yet the brain and purpose of America have not been able to piece together this crazy quilt. We have not been able to solve this riddle. We have not been able to coordinate our economy, or to bring stability out of this chaos and confusion. Such is one of the major problems that confronts America today.

MEN MUST WORK

The world does not owe a man a living, but just as surely as the principles of right are essential to civilization the world does owe a man a chance to make a living. Under our system of government, we undertake to guarantee to our fellow citizens an opportunity to support himself and his dependents by honest toil.

May I quote to you a few paragraphs from an address that I made on the floor of the House of Representatives on May 16, 1940. We had under consideration an appropriation for unemployment relief. Here is what I said:

"May we indulge for a moment in a little homespun philosophy. In my judgment, one of the factors that have made America a great nation, a nation which we are proud of and that we like to boast about, is the individuality of its citizens, the individuality of their opportunity, the individuality of their responsibility. We are told that under our system of government there are certain great guaranties, one of the greatest of which is the guaranty of equality of opportunity

"It is the opportunity of an American citizen that our system of government guarantees to him the opportunity to work, to live, to support his dependents, to start at the bottom and climb to the top, to establish himself, to own his own home, to acquire and own property, to educate his children, to support his churches, and to hold his head up as the peer of every free man who lives on the face of the earth.

"Not only that, but he has a responsibility as a citizen, a responsibility to help support this Government under which he lives. He must obey its laws and institutions. He should subscribe to its philosophies and glory in its traditions.

"Bear in mind that this guaranty of equality is not a complete guaranty of property equality. It does not mean that if one man by brain or brawn succeeds in accumulating a few dollars some other less industrious or fortunate citizen has a right by, one way or another, to take half of that and divide it up because of the guaranty of equality of the Constitution. That is not so. That is not the guaranty at all. The guaranty under the Constitution is that under this great scheme of life it will be a fair, equal, open competition on the part of every citizen to work and to live and to acquire property and enjoy the good things of life, the great competitive scheme of America, where 'the race is to the swiftest' and the 'battle to the strong.' Such is the fundamental philosophy upon which our Government was founded, and it is upon that philosophy that it has grown to be the greatest government on the face of the earth.

"When we face realities, what do we find? We find that we cannot always live up to those high ideals. We find that because of a disjointed, illogical economic system which has fastened itself upon our country, this is not an open, fair, equal competition between men, where every man who has the power and the will has as much of a chance to win as every other man. We find that because of the system which has grown upon us we have permitted distinctions to arise, discriminations to creep in, handicaps to be imposed, favoritism to be fostered, until today we cannot say that it is a free, open race; and, therefore, we must try to set in motion, if we can, compensating influences which will seek to help make the race a little more fair, which will help to remove some of these artificial handicaps that have been placed upon some of the fine, splendid people of the country who do not have the open, free competition in this scheme of life.

"In this fierce battle we find that many men have not had their opportunity. There are some, I fear, who are not particularly anxious to enter into the heat of this competition. They are not new. They are not a product of the so-called depression or the New Deal. They have been here all the time. Instead of getting out in the heat of the noonday sun to win the race and to win the spurs that they wear by their brain or their brawn, they prefer to sit in the cool of the shade and let the world go by, hoping to grab something as it passes by. They are not a new element. They have been here all the time. [Applause.] But there are many others who in these last few years were under a definite handicap, strong, honest, fearless, brave American citizens who need a helping hand. I am glad that many of them received a helping hand, but many others who should have received a helping hand have been pushed out of that line by the very system that we set up to try to aid them. We must try to take away those discriminations; we must try to set these men on their feet so that they go forward under their own motive power. [Applause.]

"This should be the objective of this Government. This should be the objective of every relief program that we set up."

I readily recognize the duty of the Government to assist those who are deserving, and who through no fault of their own cannot find employment. I have voted liberal appropriations for such purposes; but I have insisted, and let me make it perfectly clear that I shall continue to insist, upon five things. Namely:

1. That the money appropriated be not squandered.
2. That the localities do their part, and not put it all on the Federal Government.
3. That the funds go to deserving unemployed.
4. That the program be rid of political racketeering, and
5. That the un-American element be driven out.

My experience with the great body of laboring people, certainly those in my "neck of the woods," convinces me that they do not want to receive handouts from the Government. What they want is an opportunity to work.

To secure a benefit of some sort out of the Federal Treasury seems to be the order of the day in some sections and from some groups, but let us remember, however, that the only stable social order, the only society that will stand the test of time, is the one built upon the principle of our ability to be self-sustaining—self-supporting. I repeat, our objective must be to help the unfortunate—to help themselves—and to make a go of it under their own power and by their own efforts.

COOPERATION

Fateful days lie ahead of the world. America is destined to play an important part in this world drama. We may be called upon to defend with arms our way of life. Indeed, now we rush our preparedness efforts. If we are to win in this great struggle, as win we shall, we must march hand and hand, and with a single purpose—labor, production, security, self-sufficiency, cooperation, unity. These must be our great watchwords, with all Americans united in a single cause, "All the forces of evil cannot prevail against us."

I thank you.

Jefferson Changed His Mind and Agreed That Long Terms for Congressmen Desirable and Also Decided One Term for President Not Enough

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 3, 1940

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting herewith a memorandum prepared by the Library of Congress, Legislative Reference Service, regarding the following:

First. President Hoover supporting Calvin Coolidge for third term.

Second. Mr. Justice Hughes supporting Coolidge for third term.

Third. Statements by Thomas Jefferson on the tenure of Congressman, and a statement by George Washington on third term, and my comments on the reason why Jefferson changed his mind about short terms in Congress and the White House.

STATEMENTS BY HERBERT HOOVER AND CHARLES E. HUGHES SUPPORTING THE CANDIDACY OF CALVIN COOLIDGE IN 1928

In answer to the question whether he would be a candidate for the Presidency, Herbert Hoover said, in the following interview, that he was not a candidate and that he intended to support President Coolidge.

[Excerpt from the New York Times]

"No, I will not be a candidate. I am for Mr. Coolidge, who, I am sure, will be our President for 4 more years."

(Hoover was asked if this were a correct notation of his Chicago declaration.)

"I said that. Of course, I am for Mr. Coolidge," he replied. "It would give offense to my sense of loyalty to say anything else."

New York Times, July 21, 1927, page 13, column 3. (The above statement was made at Rapid City, S. Dak.)

[Statement of Charles E. Hughes, September 1928]

"I am not very familiar with the political situation," Mr. Hughes said * * *, "but I am still of the opinion that Mr. Coolidge will be renominated and reelected and I am for that."

"I read the statement (Coolidge's statement that he did not choose to run) issued by the President while I was in Europe. I accepted it as a perfectly sincere expression of the President's own wishes. It may be that some further information has become available in some quarter regarding his attitude, but what I read led me to believe that the President did not wish or desire another nomination."

[Excerpt from Hughes' statement on his candidacy, 1928]

"I know nothing of the movement (to make Hughes President) to which reference is made. There should be no doubt as to my own attitude. I am for President Coolidge first, last, and all time, and I believe that he will be renominated and reelected. I do not wish my name used in any contingency. I am too old to run for President and I would neither seek nor accept the nomination." (New York Times, September 6, 1927, p. 1, column 3, p. 16, column 2.)

[M. H. Nipe, August 26, 1940]

STATEMENTS BY THOMAS JEFFERSON ON THE TENURE OF CONGRESSMEN

To prevent every danger which might arise to American freedom by continuing too long in office the Members of the Continental Congress, to preserve to that body the confidence of their friends, and to disarm the malignant imputation of their enemies: It is earnestly recommended to the several provinces, assemblies, or conventions of the United Colonies, that in their future elections of delegates to the Continental Congress, one-half, at least, of the persons chosen be such as were not of the delegation next preceding, and the residue be of such as shall not have served in that office longer than 2 years—(1776).

* * * * * * *

No person who shall have served 2 years in Congress, shall be capable of serving therein again, till he shall have been out of the same 1 whole year—(1777).

Source: John P. Foley, edition, Jeffersonian Cyclopedia, page 184.

GEORGE WASHINGTON ON THIRD TERM

As for George Washington, let us refer to his own serious and thoughtful words, written in a letter to Lafayette on April 28, 1788:

"As for instance on the ineligibility of the same person for President, after he should have served a certain course of years, I confess I differ widely myself from Mr. Jefferson and you as to the necessity or expedience of rotation in that appointment. There cannot, in my judgment, be the least danger that the President will, by any intrigue, ever be able to continue himself one moment in office, much less perpetuate himself in it. Under an extended view of part of this subject, I can see no propriety in precluding ourselves from the services of any man who, in some great emergency, shall be deemed universally most capable of serving the public."

This was the final judgment of the Father of his Country. This was the judgment that prevailed among the fathers when they established our Constitution. Purposely they did not place in that Constitution any restriction on the number of times a man might serve his country in the office of President. It is as if they foresaw just such an emergency that the Nation faces today—a crisis that calls for the man who has guided us through one great era of peril and now, with calm wisdom and a knowledge of international affairs not matched by any other leader in the world, is safely guiding us through another.

Perhaps some of those who have been so violent on the subject of a third term should have a little more of the faith of Washington that this democracy will live, that no man by intrigue could perpetuate himself in office. Perhaps we should get on a commoner ground and use a little sense to remind ourselves that we now are in the midst of a campaign in which the people themselves will vote as to whether or not they want Mr. Roosevelt to serve a third term.

JEFFERSON ON SHORT TERMS

No one reveres Thomas Jefferson more than I. That does not mean I accept every theory he had 150 years ago—and I advise my friends in Congress to be wary of their declarations of adherence in certain respects, too. For Thomas Jefferson not only did not believe a President should have a third term, but he did not believe in third terms for Congressmen and Senators, either. In fact, at one time he did not believe they should even stand for reelection—something that some congressional opponents of Mr. Roosevelt, now serving their fifth or tenth terms, might ponder before they use Mr. Jefferson's name again.

They also might ponder a remark of Mr. Jefferson anent a third term that there is a "circumstance which could engage my acquiescence in another election, to wit, such a division about a successor as might bring in a monarchist," and ponder whether today's menacing threat from the dictators might not be conceived by Mr. Jefferson much more critically dangerous than a monarchy.

JEFFERSON CHANGED HIS MIND

I believe it is now generally understood that although Thomas Jefferson opposed a second term for either a President or a Congressman, he later changed his mind. Not only did he himself accept a second term, but he suggested that there was a circumstance that could arise that would cause him to accept a third term. Not only that, but experience taught him that one had to learn, as the former Champ Clark, of Missouri, said, to be a Congressman; and that he not only changed his mind that no Congressman should succeed himself, but he actually advocated the candidacy of Members, who were running for reelection, who had served a number of terms in Congress.

The fact remains that experience is the best teacher, and a man as great as Thomas Jefferson could be mistaken the same as anyone else; but he was not too big to refuse to change his mind when he discovered that he was wrong.

Compulsory Military Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. C. ARTHUR ANDERSON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 3, 1940

Mr. ANDERSON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I stand here on the floor today in the capacity of an individual member of the Military Affairs Committee of this House to implore my colleagues to weigh carefully and consider calmly any measure that proposes to saddle compulsory military training upon the people of this Nation. Before we embark upon any such course, which by its very nature is inimical to democracy, let us ask ourselves a few pertinent questions. The first and greatest question is, What are we preparing to undertake? Is it defense or is it preparation to join in the folly of war? What more could we do than conscript our youth, if we were actually at war or imminently in danger thereof?

The second great question to consider is, Have we learned anything at all of military value from the war in Europe? It strikes me that the American people have learned a great deal from that terrible war that our military and naval experts cannot or will not see because their eyes are dimmed by tradition and their minds are adverse to progress.

If the men who dominate and control the policy of our military machine have given any thought to the military, and not the political, significance of the war in Europe they would

not be crying for conscription; for men and more men. They would, rather, be bending their every effort to properly equip and train the troops we now possess or have authorized. Anyone who will take the time to examine the records can see that the so-called progress in the manufacture of essential arms such as planes, tanks, large guns, and so forth, is not adequate nor is it proceeding with proper speed. Witness the maneuvers now being held, with trucks acting in place of tanks, and gunners practicing, schoolyard fashion, with cardboard and wooden guns. The men thus engaged are not conscripts nor raw recruits. They are trained soldiers of the Army and National Guard. The theorists at the War Department may feel satisfied with a truck with a sign on it, Tank, but before they come here and ask to conscript millions of young men, let them devote their energy to the task of equipping the forces we now have. Until that job has been done, the appearance of these men to plead for conscription strikes me as a deliberate attempt to direct the attention of the American people away from the fact from these gentlemen, up to now, have failed to provide our existing Army, including the National Guard, with the essential weapons of modern war. Do they propose to train the conscripts under the tutelage of an officer who has received his own training in a cardboard tank or with a wooden gun?

It seems clear that the dominant forces in our military set-up are still ignorant of the fact that the wars in Europe and in Asia have more than proved that manpower alone means very little to military success and that equipment, machines, real tanks, real airplanes, real guns, are what spell the difference between defeat and victory.

Let us not forget that France had a trained army of nearly 5,000,000 men. These men were not conscripts, but trained, hardened troops, said to be the finest in the world. Yet this supposedly greatest of armies, was utterly routed and destroyed by an enemy admittedly far less trained but one that possessed every modern weapon capable of production. Did our military experts learn anything from the destruction of the French Army? Do they still believe that men and more men are what makes an army? Can it be that they have failed to study the plight of China where manpower exists in its greatest abundance? Are they learning anything? Are they even trying to learn anything from the Battle of Britain? The boys and girls in the street who read the papers and listen to the radio know that the success of the British in defending their island will depend on how long they can keep about 5,000 airplanes in the air and how long they can keep a few thousand antiaircraft guns firing. If these planes are downed or the guns silenced by the enemy an invasion of England would be comparatively easy. All the millions of men in the British Empire will be of little avail unless their air force and antiaircraft guns can offer resistance to the enemy. Machines and equipment mean life or death in modern war. Men alone mean nothing.

Here in the United States we have authorized a Regular Army of 375,000 men. The National Guard number about 250,000 trained men. This number is augmented by the Organized Reserves and by partially trained men who have had C. M. T. C. experience. Together that is a fair-sized army. Properly trained and equipped with the tanks, planes, guns, and so forth, that American ingenuity is capable of giving them, they represent a force well-nigh invincible—if you are speaking of defending the United States.

If the Army we now possess, including the National Guard, was equipped with the necessary planes, with the necessary guns, antiaircraft and otherwise, with the all essential tanks, and with the other machines of modern war, and if that Army was trained fully in the use of such equipment, which it is not at present, then there could possibly be a sounder basis for considering conscripting additional men for military training. Until that point is reached and until a voluntary system of enlistment in both the Regular Army and National Guard has been given a fair chance, agitation for conscription can serve only to disrupt the proper training of a modern war machine, to weaken industry and agriculture by sapping it of the vigor of youth, and to dampen the faith of the people in the democratic form of government.

During my service in this House I have worked conscientiously for a modern and sufficient Army to defend this Nation and the principles for which it stands. I have pleaded for aviation and mechanization. I have supported every defense measure that has come before this House. I have studied every report I could get of the war in Europe for the purpose of being enlightened on the needs of our armed forces in the world of today. Everything that I have done and do now is with the firm conviction that this country will not participate in the European conflict. I have studied the problem from the standpoint of defense only. Having thus defined my course, I cannot conscientiously support conscription at this time.

With our present Army sadly lacking in proper equipment and in the training for use thereof, I cannot perceive a legitimate basis for conscription. I am ready to support any measure for the defense of my country. I am not ready to call millions of young men out of the factories and fields to be trained, if you can call it that, by men who have not had training themselves or very little training, in the methods and equipment that is all-essential in present-day war.

Until such time as we are prepared to train men in the use of modern equipment which is now sadly lacking even in the Regular Army, we are wasting time in talking conscription and we are jeopardizing the defense of this country.

Those who profess to have such great and boundless concern for the future of our Nation would do far better just now to exert their influence in the proper places to see that the Army we now have is equipped with the best planes, the best guns, the best tanks, and the best ammunition that America is capable of producing. Why sabotage the whole defense program by calling in millions of men when we are not yet prepared to school them in modern warfare?

Freedom and Liberty in Danger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 3, 1940

ARTICLE BY ADOLPH STARR

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, many of our people are frightened because they see their liberty and freedom slowly vanishing. They are not afflicted with any hysteria when they make their decision on that issue, because they well recall the various forms of regimentation which have been imposed upon the people of our country by the administration now in power; they have witnessed the rise of the "fifth column" until it is now a very serious threat in our land; they have learned that our flag has been disgraced and torn from its place in this Nation; they have witnessed the subversive activities within our borders; and it is time that these destructive agencies be abolished and good and wholesome patriotism instilled into the minds and consciences of our people. We must forever cling to our Constitution, and we must forever forbid the destruction of our liberty and freedom in this Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, and to include therein an article written by Mr. Adolph Starr, past national chaplain of the Navy Club, United States of America, which is enlightening, indeed, upon the subject of freedom and liberty in danger.

The article follows:

FREEDOM AND LIBERTY IN DANGER

(By Adolph Starr, past national chaplain, Navy Club, United States of America)

ACTING LIKE CHILDREN WITH NEW TOYS

To every fair-minded and decent person freedom and liberty are a priceless heritage. We Americans have gloried in our liberties and

the freedom of our lives, but many—and I must say even too many—have forgotten how much we have paid for our freedom and liberty and the many sacrifices with which they were purchased. We have been acting like a child with a new toy. We have enjoyed our freedom and our liberties just as though they were presents or gifts which carried with them no respect for obligation, and we have been the most careless and foolish spendthrifts of our inheritance, just like the prodigal son mentioned in our Holy Scripture.

OUR HUMAN GARDENS MUST BE WEEDED

Too many of us seem bored to stand at attention when "Our flag is passing by." Too many of us are reluctant to stand when the band plays the Star-Spangled Banner, and forget that it represents the greatest gift of civilization since the birth of Jesus Christ, that for which our forefathers died that we might live in the "land of the Pilgrims' pride." More than at any previous time in our history, yes, more than any other time since the birth of Jesus Christ, should we be thankful for our inheritance of liberty and freedom. Yes, we should be eager to stand when the band plays our national anthem and when the flag is passing by, and because of what Old Glory means to us. We should be more eager to learn from nature. Nature never pretends! When our flower garden is infected with weeds it is time to weed the garden before the infestation of poison weed destroys the flowers and we have nothing but the weeds left. And so it is with the flower of our manhood and our womanhood. We have been enjoying liberty and freedom without discipline, and if we do not weed our human garden we will, eventually, like the totalitarian countries of Europe, be subjected to brutal discipline without liberty and without freedom, and become systematically hardened to brutality.

Those totalitarian countries have been hardened for brutal combat and we of America have been softened through our self-indulgence and indifference and have been fast losing our respect for law and order, respect for civility, respect for our traditions, our Constitution, and the Declaration of Independence. We have been teaching our children disrespect for Americanism and have allowed the weeds of communism, fascism, and other "isms" to grow up among us without restraint. We have viewed with indulgence leaders of our educational and industrial systems create hatred and race prejudices in our beloved America, and have supinely accepted teachers and educators of subversive doctrines from totalitarian countries. We have accepted with condonation men in high public office who are too spineless, too weak, and too reluctant to protest against the subversive forces and are laying a foundation for the destruction of our democracy, our liberty, and our freedom. The very virtues by which our forefathers were dominated, who by their great sacrifice won for us the democracy with liberty and freedom, and which we still enjoy to some extent, have been depreciated and disparaged and replaced by wisecracking and ridiculed by ignorant sophisticators known for their chicanery and prestidigitation.

How To Insult the United States—By Henry A. Wallace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES SECCOMBE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 3, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE CLEVELAND NEWS

Mr. SECCOMBE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Cleveland News of August 30:

[From the Cleveland News of August 30, 1940]

"HOW TO INSULT THE UNITED STATES" BY HENRY A. WALLACE

A more arrogant and stupid speech has not been made in recent Presidential campaigns than that of Secretary Henry A. Wallace last night in accepting the Democratic nomination for Vice President, which had been voted him at Chicago by order of President Roosevelt and against the apparent will of the Democratic Convention.

It was also a dangerous speech politically. Mr. Wallace's late father could have told his bumptious son of a piece of American history, to the candidate's profit. The elder Wallace, a Republican editor, took part in the backfire to Woodrow Wilson's unhappy appeal to the voters in 1918 to elect Democrats to Congress, because they would prosecute the World War more vigorously than Republicans.

Few Presidents have been rebuked by the people as President Wilson was—the Republican landslide of 1920 really started with the victories in the 1918 Congress election. Or more deservedly rebuked, for patriotism in America has never been a party issue and, God willing, it never will be unless loud blunderers like the younger Wallace get into a majority.

For Secretary Wallace last night set up the theory that President Roosevelt really was running for this third term against Adolf Hitler; that the Republican Party represented appeasement to Hitler and was backed by the totalitarian powers of Europe. We predict the popular reaction to this insulting, un-American falsehood will be like the reaction to the Wilson folly of 1918.

Secretary Wallace has long been notorious for a fantastic mind. He is the great dreamer of our secretaries of agriculture. It never would occur to such a mind that, in this campaign, the Republican Party, by standing for individual rights and liberties against restrictions imposed by the New Deal, by standing for fiscal honesty, by standing for the democracy of the single citizen and against regimentation by classes, is closer to the pure democratic cause than the New Deal candidate or his record.

It is plain that this would not occur to him because of the long and unhappy comparison he made of the acts of Fuehrer Hitler in Europe and President Roosevelt in Washington. To anyone, many comparisons not voiced by Mr. Wallace spring instantly to mind:

Mr. Roosevelt took sweeping emergency powers over American life in 1933 just before similar powers were decreed to Hitler in Germany. Mr. Roosevelt has not yielded many of these powers, the first emergency grants of their kind in our peacetime history.

Mr. Roosevelt, so far as he could, reduced Congress to a rubber stamp to O. K. his exact will. What comparison does this suggest with the present Reichstag?

Mr. Roosevelt constructed a law to enable labor unions to organize the country and, to enforce it, set up a labor relations organization whose members have felt it their unswerving duty to punish American employers, suspend certain rights of speech and trial, and await with eagerness the coming socialist revolution. What comparison with Nazi Germany is possible here?

Mr Roosevelt in 1938 attempted to purge certain leaders of his own party who had refused to surrender all their independence to his wishes. Hitler would have approved these tactics.

Mr. Roosevelt still has fullest powers over American currency and banking, and through the N. R. A. he looked forward to the control vested at Washington over American business and industry. Is there a comparison with the Reich's economy here?

The awfullest thing Hitler has done was to pit class against class on a basis of race prejudice. That the President has not done; but how much less a wrong was it to cultivate the hatred of a class for another class in a democratic nation?

The misrepresentation in the Wallace speech was appalling at some points. His statement that the T. V. A. was set up for military need, for instance; the only purpose ever stated for it by President Roosevelt was yardstick regulation of private utility rates. If military need had been the necessity, why all the salesmen in the South peddling cheap T. V. A. power from door to door? Why couldn't it have kept books honestly if military need was the purpose?

Not a word from Secretary Wallace about the failures, the retreats, or the spending. A promise to the farmer that the New Deal would send him more checks than any Republicans would was the closest he came to one of the biggest issues, no matter who wins the election—economic recovery.

This speech must have had the Roosevelt approval. It sounds as if he had suggested many of the lines. He and his running mate will regret it if we know the American people.

Steps Toward British Union, a World State, and Internal Strife—Part VIII

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. THORKELSON

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 3, 1940

Mr. THORKELSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article entitled "The International Situation." This article appeared in the National Message, the official organ of the British-Israel World Federation, under date of November 23, 1925. It is also affiliated with the American-Israel Movement, located in Knoxville, Tenn.

The front page of this pamphlet shows the battle map of Egypt and Arabia, with arrows pointing from Ethiopia toward the Sudan; and with three arrows pointing from Persia, Siberia, and Tobolsk, toward Iraq and Arabia. There are also three arrows pointing from Moscow, central Europe, and southern Europe toward Syria, and one arrow from Libya, pointing toward Egypt. This map is therefore to show the direction of attack on these British Mandates, as prophesied by the British-Israel World Federation.

What is our position in this battle plan of British-Israel? Our position is supposed to be on the side of Great Britain, to war in the Sudan, Egypt, Arabia, Iraq, Palestine, and Syria,

against all the world powers. It will require a large army to fight the world, so I am not astonished when the Chief insists that we call out 40,000,000 men to fight for the British-Israel World Federation. All of this is to establish Jerusalem as the capital of the world and the center of this world government in Egypt and Arabia.

Our Army will travel by the way of the Pacific and Indian Ocean to India and the South African British possessions, such as Tanganyika and Rhodesia, from which attack will be launched against the forces that are supposed to attack this little parcel of land lying on each side of the Red Sea. This might seem like a crazy plan, but it is that which the British-Israel and Great Britain have in mind in this war.

I have described the map and shall now insert the article which appears on the other side of the pamphlet.

We come to the consideration of the international situation. The attention of the world has been drawn irresistibly to Italy by the movements of Italy. This is focused at the moment on the invasion of Ethiopia. We have not dealt at large with this matter, and we have avoided having much discussion on it in the National Message. It is important, and the events will be the measure of the importance. But, after all, it is but a detail of the larger plan. Italy is moving; Russia is quiescent, and Germany active only within her own boundaries. We consider that Italy is less of a menace to ultimate world peace than either Russia or Germany. We turn to our Book and there find our instructions. We give, in connection with this article, a map of the heart of the world. We call to mind that the city of Jerusalem is placed exactly in the center of the world's population. We further call to mind that the Great Pyramid is the center of the land surface of the world. Around those two centers, including them, we find the mandated territories and possessions of Britain. Taking Jerusalem as a center, and looking eastward and north and south, we have Palestine, Trans-Jordania, Iraq, Arabia. Again taking our stand at Jerusalem and looking southward, we have Egypt and the Sudan; with the countries beyond that we do not now deal; they do not come into the picture. The map shows the British mandated territories and possessions as the heart of the world, and this they are. Whoever possesses them a quarter of a century from now will dominate the world. God has said that Israel shall possess them. We believe that the Celto-Saxon world is Israel. Therefore, Israel, the sons of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, with Ishmael, will possess the land.

But Italy has announced the intention to regain that which once constituted the eastern part of the Roman Empire. That is plain enough and needs no explanation.

Russia has long announced her intention and has every plan made to take possession of the Euphrates Valley and Palestine, at the least. That also is historic, plain, and needs no interpretation.

Germany, in the last war, made a definite attempt to hold the land which, through Turkey, she had occupied. She lost the war, but not the cause, and has by no means given up hope or intention in regard to such possession.

The Bible takes knowledge of all this, and prewrites the history of the threefold attempt to obtain possession of the land. The thirty-eighth and thirty-ninth chapters of Ezekiel are very definite on the matter. We shall later quote the necessary passages to illustrate this. The minor prophets have had very clear vision of this upheaval, as they had very clear vision of that upheaval which ended in the destruction of Jerusalem. We recommend the reader to turn to Joel and read that wonderful prophecy. In my copy of the Oxford Bible it begins at page 1112. It embraces less than four pages, and can be read in half an hour. I would recommend then that the reader should turn to Zechariah, chapter XII, and read it to the end. In my copy it is page 1152, and two-and-a-half pages of the Bible embrace it all. In chapter XIV, verse 2, there is this statement: "For I will gather all nations against Jerusalem to battle." Now, this is a prophecy which would not have fitted any former period of world history. It is a prophecy which will fit no future period of the world history. It is a prophecy which will have fulfillment now.

All nations, then, are to be gathered against that territory now under the British throne, which has Jerusalem for its center. Three groups will move against this territory, with the intention of occupying the whole or a part thereof. First among them will be the chief prince of Meshech (Moscow) and Tubal (Tobolsk). The second group listed are Persia, Ethiopia, and Libya. The third group listed are Gomer (Middle Europe) and all his bands, the house of Togarmah of the north quarters, and all his bands, and many peoples with him. In the map on the previous page we have traced arrows to show the lines of approach by which the various peoples will invade the British territories, all aiming at Jerusalem as the central point. Here is the map:

Translated into modern phraseology, Central Europe, Russia, and that power which holds Ethiopia and Libya will be marching toward a common center with one definite purpose; namely, the seizing of the land. Those who would read what will be the final issue of the matter may read the passages already named in Joel and Zechariah and, more specifically, the thirty-eighth and thirty-ninth chapters of Ezekiel.

The following passages furnish those details:

"And say, Thus saith the Lord God; Behold, I am against thee, O Gog, the chief prince of Meshech and Tubal:

"And I will turn thee back, and put hooks into thy jaws, and I will bring thee forth, and all thine army, horses and horsemen, all of them clothed with all sorts of armour, even a great company with bucklers and shields, all of them handling swords:

"Persia, Ethiopia, and Libya with them: all of them with shield and helmet:

"Gomer, and all his bands; the house of Togarmah of the north quarters, and all his bands: and many people with thee."—Ezekiel xxxviii:3–6.

The Lord's army who shall oppose them are:

"Sheba and Dedan, and the merchants of Tarshish, with all the young lions thereof, shall say unto thee, Art thou come to take a spoil? Hast thou gathered thy company to take a prey? To carry away silver and gold, to take away cattle and goods, to take a great spoil?—Ezekiel xxxviii:13.

The gathering of the nations is expected and provided against by the Lord; the King of Israel:

"For I will gather all nations against Jerusalem to battle; and the city shall be taken, and the houses rifled, and the women ravished; and half of the city shall go forth into captivity, and the residue of the people shall not be cut off from the city.

"Then shall the Lord go forth, and fight against those nations, as when he fought in the day of battle."—Zechariah xiv:2–3.

Mr. Speaker, I shall make no comments on this article, except to say that this is a description of the coming war that is planned to take place in Egypt. I shall now include excerpts from other articles, giving the names of the magazines, so that those who read may be better informed of the most devilish plot which has ever been evolved by the brain of man.

I now quote from "The hand of God in the White House," by Edna Bandler:

Franklin D. Roosevelt, ordained and used by God to be His executive—to be the leader and deliverer of His people (like Moses) to deliver them out of the depression and out of chaos.

Only the hand of God could have delivered this man out of the net of the Chaldeans. But he stood alone like a Christian statesman and pleaded the cause of his people. Just he and God—no "party man" or organization could boast. Just the hand of God put him on the throne.

I have seen the hand of God in the White House. From the day the shield of David and seal of Solomon was discovered on the porte-cochere of the White House kitchen, President Roosevelt has been accused of placing the Jew sign on everything: The six-pointed star rightfully belongs to us, and George Washington ordered it on the White House pillar, and it was not an accident that Betsy Ross, whose father and family were the makers of the first Stars and Stripes; Betsy changed the star to the five-pointed star, but God meant it to be so. We, "the preserved of Israel," were lost and hidden until a time appointed to be revealed.

With the David shield, Solomon's seal, the great pyramid message, "A memorial forever," told in the book of Joshua, fourth chapter, and this pyramid coming out on the new $1 bill with the six-pointed star, all has great significance.

"All the shields of the earth belongeth unto Me, saith the Lord, and when the standard and the ensign is set up, ye shall know your redemption draweth nigh." The reason this obverse side of the seal is only on the $1 bill is because "Christ and His people are one." On our early coin with the 13 links of chain, and in the center of the coin "We are one," and on the other side it was written: "Mind your own business." Our shield and all the shields of the nation tell their story. In my new book, Unveiling of Israel, many startling things. A great prophecy has just been revealed.

I shall now quote from a book entitled "The House of Israel":

Much is made of the "perpetuity of the Davidic throne." If the Davidic throne was to be established forever, then it must be found somewhere now. The English throne must therefore be the throne of David, and King George the seed of David, for does not the Scripture say that "David shall never want a man to sit upon the throne of the house of Israel"? (Jer. 33: 17, 20–21.)

I shall now quote an excerpt from Time, of September 16, 1936, by Mrs. Edna Bandler, whose husband, I believe, was a prominent Jew:

"The coming of the Lord * * * Great confusion upon earth * * * September 16, 1936," was announced last year in Manhattan by a Mrs. Edna Bandler in volume 1, No. 1, of a magazine called the Prophet. Last week Mrs. Bandler turned up in the news again, conducting a "week of prophecy" in Town Hall daily, donning a white veil and prophesying for the 25 to 100 people who dropped in, admission free, to hear her.

Edna Bandler is the white-haired intense-eyed widow of a rich diamond merchant. Until 2 years ago she lived in a mansion, full of gilt and marble, which John D. Rockefeller built years ago in West Fifty-fourth Street for his son, John D., Jr. She now dwells and conducts prophetic services for a small band of followers in a lushly furnished duplex studio in West Fifty-seventh Street, a neighborhood in which flourish many swamis and faith healers.

Mrs. Bandler prophesies in a helter-skelter flow of words which many a listener last week found incoherent. Several of her ideas

accord with those of British "Pyramidologists," who believe that in the courses of masonry and many tunnels of the Great Pyramid of Cheops are to be found prophecies of the world's history until the year 2045. Pyramidologists thought September 16, 1936 was to be epochal for the world, but Prophetress Bandler now denies that she predicted anything like the world's end. She insists, however, that, known only to her, 300,000 people were slaughtered on Mt. Carmel on that date. Sample Bandler prophecies:

Fascists are the Philistines. Mussolini is the Biblical "beast of the iron teeth," and he will take over Spain.

The 12 most powerful nations on earth are the 12 tribes of Israel, of which Prophetress Bandler will identify only England (Ephraim), France (Reuben), the United States (Manasseh).

President Roosevelt, to be the last United States President, is God's anointed. Because he is divinely ordained, and also because man's span is 70 years, the President will be allowed to appoint as many Supreme Court Justices as he pleases.

The world's redemption will come through love. "I'm giving the last love-call for the world before the tribulation comes."

When all communications between the United States and Europe are cut off, when radios go dead, when we are forbidden by decree to speak the name of Jesus, when David, Duke of Windsor, takes an airplane to Jerusalem, then we will know the conflict is at hand.

This will give my colleagues an idea of the British-Israel World Federation, an organization which is widely distributed into every nook and corner of the Nation. These subversive teachings which have for their purpose the creation of a world government, with Jerusalem as the capital, should now be clear to all who read this message. This movement has infiltrated our churches, schools, and even the Army itself, as this quotation clearly reveals:

More than a year has passed, but at last we have secured, through the help of Mr. C. H. M. Foster, the honorary secretary of the Keswick convention, testimonials from several men of high rank in the British military and naval service, which we intend placing in the hands of every officer in the United States Army and Navy. As a foretaste of what our readers are to receive in the next months from the publication of these wonderful stories of God's dealing in the lives of great men of empire, we quote a sentence or two, from the letter from Admiral Sir Harry H. Stileman which accompanied the manuscript. "I send it with the earnest prayer that my experience as a reconciled sinner may help some brother officer in the United States Navy to lay down the arms of his rebellion at the feet of the Lord Jesus, the captain of the Lord's host, and accept from these pierced hands God's gift of eternal life." These admirals and these generals are men who won their promotions and highest honors in the Great War. Their testimonies are going to be of great interest, heart warming, thrilling words to put into the hands of young people.

This movement is very subtle, and on its face appears to be a Christian movement. We must, however, take into consideration that the people who fight and die in this war are not only Christians, but include other creeds and races as well. We will conscript an army today, not to protect America, for we are not threatened. We will instead organize an army to fight in the Holy Land on the side of the English. Can we hope to succeed in this war, facing as we will all nations in the world? The answer is absolutely "No." We should, therefore, make it our business to build the defenses of the United States, wash our hands of this deadly international intrigue that is enshrouding common sense and sound reasoning. And this may be done, as I have said many, many times, by returning to our fundamental teachings and to the principles set forth in the Constitution of the United States.

Draft of Wealth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LELAND M. FORD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 3, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE LYNCHBURG (VA.) ADVANCE

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Lynchburg (Va.) Advance:

[From the Lynchburg (Va.) Advance]

DRAFT OF WEALTH

Because consideration of human life should come before consideration of human possessions, many have long wondered why the emergency of war should be considered as justifying the conscription of manpower and not the conscription of wealth, why one man should be taken to struggle, to suffer, perchance to die, for the common good, while another is permitted to remain at home acquiring possessions.

Of course, wealth is conscripted, and not just during emergencies. Wealth is conscripted year in and year out during peacetime as well as during wartime. Taxation is nothing save conscription of wealth; and wartime, bringing increased public expenditure, brings also increased conscription of wealth.

The objection raised to Government taking over of industry during war is not actuated by any desire to save wealth from whatever amount of conscription is necessary. It is based upon the belief that power-loving bureaucrats at war's end would not demobilize industry, and during war's progress would operate it with that lack of efficiency which characterizes political bureaucracy.

Labor, too, finds a cause for objection. If factories are conscripted, obviously the labor to run the factories should be conscripted. To make conscription of industry work, it will be necessary that operatives in the factories be compensated at nearer 20 cents a day than the $20 a day many demanded during the last war. And under industrial conscription labor will make no demands. The laborer will be told where he is to work, when he is to work, and how long he is to work.

In this conscription of wealth business like in the "soak the rich" tax policies, it happens that the wealthy are not the only ones hit. The less wealthy and the poor get hit, too—and because there are more of them they get hit hardest. Maybe totalitarianism will come for us; certainly some New Deal policies have been in that direction; but the poor man who thinks it will injure only his rich neighbor, the laborer who thinks only employers need be concerned, the farmer who expects only the "city slicker" to suffer—all these and any like them will find they have been sadly mistaken.

Compulsory Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARL R. LEWIS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 3, 1940

LETTER FROM A CONSTITUENT

Mr. LEWIS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, today we begin consideration of a bill to provide for the first peacetime conscription of men for the armed forces of the United States ever to be enacted, if it shall be enacted, into law.

On this momentous proposal our people are radically divided. Today I have received a letter from a newspaperman in my district which shows a profound grasp of the fundamentals involved in this proposed legislation and intelligently constructive suggestions for its improvement. The letter, which I commend to your careful consideration, is as follows:

THE ST. CLAIRSVILLE GAZETTE-CHRONICLE PUBLISHING CO.,
St. Clairsville, Ohio, September 3, 1940.

Hon. EARL R. LEWIS,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Since conscription seems to be the keynote of Congress, I am making herewith a suggestion which might not have been brought to your attention before, but one which, I believe, is of sufficient importance to merit some thought.

As a thinker you have probably considered this bill from many angles. Have you thought, though, what these young draftees will do when they are released from 1 year of compulsory military training? Will they get their same jobs back if they are now employed? My best guess would be "No." Emphatically.

And what of the boy who is trying to learn a trade? Let us say he is a machinist or an apprenticed printer. What machine shop or print shop would attempt to hold a situation open for 1 year while Uncle Sam is making a lad learn the manual of arms? It would not be possible, and is, therefore, a hardship upon a lad with an eye to the future.

There are many other objections to conscription, but this one seems to me to be the greatest.

There is one solution to this problem. Recent figures show us that there are today in these United States some 10,000,000 unemployed and some 18,000,000 on relief. Now comes conscription to take a cross-section of this group, cutting likewise into that group of young men now gainfully employed. In a democracy such as

ours one cannot draw class barriers and say, "You have a job, so we won't take you; but watch us take your neighbor." Comes that day and you'll have riots comparable to those in New York during Civil War days when the rich were able to buy a substitute and the poor lads had to go. So we'll have to take them all, and in so doing, we'll hamper industry by taking young men trained in commerce and in industry that is of vital interest to any country in peace or war or in preparation for war.

Let us assume that in the next 2 years we still have a democracy or a quasi democracy. Without a dictatorship it will not be possible to place men mustered out of the Army back into industry without disrupting business, causing hard feelings among employees, and, in fact it could not be done without a direct order that would be a violation of the rights of any employer. Simply because a man walks up to the employees' entrance and shakes an honorable discharge under the nose of the boss does not mean he will be as welcome as the flowers of spring. And by the time this happens too often, organized labor will probably have something to say about it, too.

The only answer to a difficult—and one might add—embarrassing problem, is a well-paid professional army. It will be more efficient, less expensive, and certainly more to the public taste. Of course, this brings up the cost chart. Let's see what that might be.

What is the cost of a nonprofessional army? An army of some 4,000,000 men like that conscripted for service in the World War—the cost of the Army after it has been mustered out and sent back to civilian life?

We have spent nearly $9,000,000,000 for disability and pensions to World War veterans and their dependents. And in the next 20 years we shall have spent another $10,000,000,000, and in the succeeding 20 years, or 60 years after the armistice of 1918, the grand total of more than $25,000,000,000 will have been spent in wages and indirect subsidies to the conscripted men who carried rifles and fought in the trenches.

The cost of a conscripted army following the Civil War was staggering; even last year (1939) we paid over $33,000,000 to soldiers and their widows.

We are paying $125,000,000 for Spanish-American War pensions.

Since 1890, or the last 50 years, we have never had less than 500,000 pensioners on the public pay roll and many times it has been nearer to 1,000,000. And at no time during this 50-year period have we paid out less than $106,000,000. And at no time in the last 20 years has this cost been under $300,000,000 per year.

These expenditures are purely for paying for a war that has been ended. They do not include the wages of the Army under arms, nor the cost of building tanks, nor that of new mechanized units, nor the cost of rifles, machine guns, and sidearms. It does not include the cost of one Missouri mule. It is the cost of a war that is over, written off the books, closed to the pages of history. And yet it has cost millions of dollars. We have, in effect, been paying men for not fighting, for not carrying a rifle, for not running a machine gun, or steering a tank.

If it is so easy for us to pay men for not fighting, why cannot we pay them for being prepared to fight if the need arises?

It has been expressly stated that an army of 500,000 men, properly equipped with mechanized equipment, would be a sufficient number to insure this country against invasion, provided, of course, that an air corps second to none in the world were provided to work in conjunction with this army.

Such an army, assuming that all these men were to get $45 per month, would cost only $270,000,000 yearly in wages. Officers' salaries would, of course, be over and above this figure.

In other words, one-thirtieth of the cost of maintaining a conscripted army of 20 years ago. Would anyone object to a professional army, ready to fight, at 10 percent less than the cost of a conscripted army, fighting because it is forced to fight, often against its own will?

Since we must have an Army and we all assume rather belatedly that this is the case, what would be wrong with a professional army, bearing in mind the figures here set forth? Some of the greatest armies have been professional armies. Of course, there is always the argument that professional soldiers do not fight as well as those men who battle because of their patriotism. But, on the other hand, it goes without saying that in modern warfare few generals are taken from the clerk's desk or from the banker's cage. If professional leadership is good enough to entrust the future of a country's welfare to, why is not the professional cavalryman, airman, or buck private capable of following this leadership even if he is paid for fighting?

There is very little question in my mind but that if the foot soldier—and I mean the infantryman—were given a basic wage of, say, $40 to $45 per month, and others such as mechanics and skilled laborers paid in accordance, and a merit system with proper compensation for advancement installed, an Army of 1,000,000 men could be raised in a fortnight, signed for, sealed, and delivered postpaid.

With modern warfare what it is today, it seems to me that modes of procedure are outmoded overnight. Certainly tactics and probably even tank and motorized unit attack and deployment do vary from month to month as the present European war has conclusively proved.

If you were to have a tooth pulled or a finger amputated, you would most likely go to the dentist or physician with a steady, active practice. You would hardly go to the retired practitioner who was not right up to the minute. This is because a sore tooth or an infected finger are of vital importance to you. But when my life depends upon an army, I'd like to know protection was to be given by a general staff and an army that didn't have to think twice, or blunder through a second Bull Run to win a war.

You might throw up your arms in holy horror and say: "But this will cost a lot of money." Certainly it will cost money. War and armies always cost money. But this country has millions for the W. P. A. and the C. W. A. and the P. W. A. and the R. F. C., and every other alphabetical bureau in Washington. And yet, basically, none of these are relatively one-tenth as important as a modern, mechanized, highly mobile army of some 500,000 men—not 5,000,000 conscripts who are falling all over each other in an effort to get out of somebody else's way to get where they feel they have to go. And don't forget that we had millions for the Army in 1917, and millions more for the payment of the soldiers' bonus. Add it all up and you get the same answer—money.

My sole contention is that a professional army would give us more protection, less confusion, and would at the same time create more professional opportunities in the Army while at the same instant it would not disrupt occupational and professional employment in other fields. At the same time we could save our faces, and maintain our democratic standard of living by simply saying to the young and middle-aged man: "The Army will give you a job—yes; for the next 20 years and then a modest retirement. You protect us and we taxpayers will protect you."

And that, my dear Congressman LEWIS, is this country editor's idea of just what this might develop into, without confusion, without resentment, without placing democracy in jeopardy—but probably won't.

Sincerely yours,

I. A. FLUHARTY.

Bituminous Coal Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANTON J. JOHNSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 3, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE DAILY METAL TRADE

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, there has been so much opposition by the consumers, dealers, and many coal operators to the application of the proposed price schedules, that it has been deemed wise to again forego its autocratic imposition of coal-price regulations.

I submit an editorial on this subject from the Daily Metal Trade.

[From the Daily Metal Trade of August 20, 1940]

BITUMINOUS COAL ACT APPEARS TO HAVE STRUCK ANOTHER SNAG

The Bituminous Coal Act has struck another snag. Another postponement of the date of its effectiveness has moved it back another month nearer the November election day. Interior Secretary Ickes' Coal Division has just announced that, instead of the proposed minimum-price schedules taking effect September 3, they will not become effective until October 1. Some shrewd observers believe they never will be allowed to take effect—politics. At the same time Ickes also postponed the deadline for filing appeals from the price findings to August 30. In this latter case the Secretary appears to have overruled Director Howard Gray, of the Coal Division, who just the other day notified the Youngstown Chamber of Commerce that it is too late to file its proposed appeal against the price schedule, which would hog-tie the industrial Mahoning and Shenango Valleys and undo their years-old established ex-Ohio River coal rates. Gray said he had so ruled June 4—but nobody seems ever to have heard of it before this time.

So, now the Bituminous Coal Act, loaded with political and economic dynamite, has come out into the open for just what every well-posted man knew it was—another New Deal political football in the effort to garner votes among the union pressure groups. Senator GUFFEY had as little to do with his so-called act as any man in the street. He simply handed in the bill hatched by John L. Lewis, head of the miners' union and hatcher of that hermaphrodite C. I. O.-S. W. O. C. The stench of "pressure group" politics has never been wiped from the Coal Control Act by any number of New Deal apologies. Now it stands naked and exposed as merely a New Deal vote-getting adjunct—which it always has been. And no one knows that better than Senator JOE GUFFEY, of Pennsylvania, now vainly trying to cling to the outer rim of Pennsylvania New Deal politics.

Director Gray also, at the same time as Ickes' postponement announcement came out Friday, made public "findings of fact" upon which he based his price schedules for the sale of bituminous fuel at the mines. In his findings the Director announces the discovery that coal producers have charged lower f. o. b. prices as their coal moved farther away from the mines and met additional marketing competition from other fields. Which raises the question

whether the Director ever before had discovered that in marketing almost every line of produce or manufacture there is such a thing as "absorbing part of the freight" in order to meet fierce competition abroad. When Texas wheat meets Iowa wheat at Chicago, when Florida oranges meet California oranges at Cincinnati, when Chicago steel meets Pittsburgh steel at Detroit in days of keen competition, it is a safe bet there are freight absorptions." Gray calls this "lowering f. o. b. mine prices." Maybe it is, but the practice is older than Gray and as widespread as daylight. Well, what about it? Is competition actually become a New Deal cardinal sin?

Wendell L. Willkie Favors Drafting Youth, But Opposes Drafting Wealth

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 30, 1940

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday, Mr. Wendell L. Willkie, the candidate for President on the Republican ticket, came out in favor of drafting the young men but opposed to the drafting of the wealth of this Nation.

In that position he is supported by the Wall Street financiers and the munitions manufacturers throughout the land. They do not want this provision written into the bill, because it would be a powerful club in the hands of the Government to prevent such profiteering as we witnessed in the last war.

These munitions manufacturers, and these Wall Street financiers who are financing them, and who really own them, do not want this provision in the bill, because they want to be able to threaten the Government with a sit-down strike on their part if Congress attempts to make them pay their just proportion of the taxes necessary to finance this program.

Mr. Willkie says in his statement that this amendment, as passed by the Senate, "gives the President, whenever the Secretary of War or Secretary of the Navy is unable to arrive at an agreement with the owner of any plant or facility which is deemed necessary for national defense, power to acquire such a plant or facility."

"In addition," continues Mr. Willkie, "he—the President—may take immediate possession of the plant or facility and may operate it by Government personnel."

Mr. Willkie objects to this salutary provision of the Senate amendment which goes further toward protecting this Government and the American people against such a saturnalia of profiteering as we witnessed during the last war than any other amendment or provision yet proposed.

If we are going to draft the young men of this Nation, take them from their homes in the prime of youth, in order to prepare to defend this country against any eventuality, why not also draft the dollars, the wealth of these swollen fortunes that have been pyramided with every war in which the Nation has engaged?

We are told that we came out of the last war with 23,000 newly made millionaires, some of whom could not pay their grocery bills before the war began. They promised Woodrow Wilson that they would help pay for the war with their taxes, but as soon as the war closed and they could elect an administration to do their bidding, they had those tax laws modified or repealed. If the laws in force at the close of the Wilson administration had remained in effect, the national debt would have been entirely wiped out by 1932. But instead of that these war profiteers, who coined their multiplied millions from the blood and tears of the suffering men, women, and children of the world, managed to elect an administration that would do their bidding, take these taxes off their swollen fortunes and pile them onto the backs of the American people in the form of high protective tariffs that levied a tax upon everything the average American had to buy, from the swaddling clothes of infancy to the lining of the coffin in which old age is laid away. They even went beyond the grave and taxed the tombstone that marked his last resting place.

One of the ablest men who ever spoke on this question said during the mid-twenties that the tariff was then costing the unprotected masses of the American people $4,000,000,000 a year, of which amount $600,000,000 went into the Federal Treasury, and $3,400,000,000 went into the pockets of the beneficiaries of that law. But these war-made millionaires were escaping their just proportion of the burdens of taxation and passing their pyramided fortunes down to their posterity.

I wonder if that is what Mr. Willkie proposes to do this time, if he should be elected President of the United States?

Not satisfied with that, these war profiteers induced the party then in power to go back and return to them billions of dollars in taxes that had already been collected, and which they never even proposed to pass on back to the people from whom they had collected it.

There has not been such a concentration of wealth since the world began as that witnessed in this country from the time we entered the World War until the crash of 1929. We are told that today less than 5 percent of the American people own more than 90 percent of its wealth. That 5 percent is opposing the Senate amendment, but demanding that we draft the youth of the land.

Mr. Willkie even goes so far as to quote Woodrow Wilson in a statement in which he said, "the highest and best form of efficiency is the spontaneous cooperation of a free people." Of course it is, but who ever heard of war profiteers spontaneously cooperating in helping to bear the Nation's burdens, or to keep the country's wealth distributed?

What kind of cooperation did they give when Woodrow Wilson went out of office and they had the opportunity to remove this burden of taxation from their war profits and pass it on to the unprotected millions who bore the brunt of the war?

But Mr. Willkie says:

> It is said that if men are to be conscripted, wealth must be conscripted. If this statement is taken literally, if our assets and enterprises are to be taken over by the Government at its sole discretion, I cannot understand what we are undertaking to defend.

Mr. Willkie evidently thinks we are getting ready to defend the swollen fortunes of America and the utilities monopoly with which he has so long been connected. He knows, and every other intelligent man knows, that we are not proposing to take over all farms and factories as he intimates, but we are proposing to give the President, the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, the right to take over the munitions plants, those plants that manufacture our war materials, in case it is necessary to do so, to prevent such racketeering as we witnessed on their part during the last war.

But if we are going to take them over in order to protect the American Government, and the American people, then Mr. Willkie, according to his own statement, "cannot understand what we are undertaking to defend."

Does he think they are all there is in this country worth defending?

I will tell Mr. Willkie what we are undertaking to defend: We are undertaking to defend American rights; we are undertaking to defend our territorial integrity; we are undertaking to defend our way of life, and our form of government; we are undertaking to defend the homes from which these boys are to come; we are undertaking to defend the life, liberty, and property of all American people, and not just a few munitions manufacturers, utility monopolies, and the Wall Street bankers that own or finance them.

But Mr. Willkie undertakes to frighten organized labor with these words: He says:

> It will constitute a threat to American labor and particularly union labor, for the President of the United States sometime ago told American labor, "You cannot strike against the Government." Thus, those persons who become employees of the Federal Government would be deprived of the right of collective bargaining, another step toward what took place in Germany—industries conscripted, unions abolished.

Mr. Willkie knows that it would not be necessary for labor to strike if the Government were operating any of these plants, for the reason that the Government would give labor decent treatment. He also knows that the conscription bill provides

the drafting of men that can be put to doing any work the Government may require. It is not the men in whom those forces are interested that are opposing the Senate amendment, but it is the owners of these swollen fortunes who want to perpetuate them and to swell them further at the expense of the American people, and further concentrate the wealth of this Nation into the hands of the favored few.

While he did not say so in so many words, Mr. Willkie is evidently afraid this Government might take over some of these profiteering power utilities and stop them from burdening the American people as well as the American Government with their ruthless overcharges.

Mr. Willkie's statement is a great contribution and will have two effects if the American people and the Members of Congress thoroughly understand it: It will insure the adoption of this amendment and probably strengthen it in many ways, and it will also eliminate Mr. Willkie as a serious contender, if he ever was a serious contender, in the Presidential campaign.

There are living today more than 4,000,000 ex-service men of the World War, as well as the widows and orphans of the ones who have passed away. For more than 20 years they have expressed their resentment at the way these war profiteers were permitted to hoard and protect their enormous profits made out of the last war. Whenever they have spoken on the subject these veterans and their dependents have demanded that hereafter we take the profits out of war. For my part, I propose to carry out that mandate, and not only do my best to prevent the pyramiding of these swollen fortunes now, but I am ready to tax the profits of the last war by raising the inheritance taxes and the income taxes in the higher brackets in order to raise funds to pay for our national defense, to maintain the Government and to ultimately liquidate the national debt.

Mr. Willkie is opposed to the drafting of wealth, but he is in favor of drafting the youth of the land. Wealth does not have to face the enemy's guns, but soldiers do. Wealth does not have to stand in muddy trenches, or bear its dying comrades from the field, but soldiers do. Wealth is not slain upon the field of battle, to leave widows and children or dependent parents to face the wants of after years, but soldiers are.

They answer that by telling you that the sons of the wealthy go to war, that the sons of this 5 percent who own the 90 percent of the Nation's wealth will also be drafted. That may be true, but they will leave their growing fortune behind to take care of their loved ones, or greet them on their return home; while the young man who has nothing else to give, places not only his own life, but his fortune, which consists of the earning power of his hands and mind, upon the altar of his country. It is all he has.

Mr. Willkie would draft that willingly, but he is opposed to drafting the wealth of the Nation, or the passage of a law to prevent such profiteering as we witnessed during and after the World War.

If we pass a bill to draft the youth of this land, in order to build up our defense, we should also include this Senate amendment for taking over the war industries of the Nation, if necessary, and then provide for taxing, or drafting, the swollen fortunes of these profiteers in order to help pay the expenses. [Applause.]

What's Holding Up Printing of the Anti-Poll-Tax Hearings?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE E. GEYER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 3, 1940

Mr. GEYER of California. Mr. Speaker, the Judiciary Subcommittee finished the hearings on the Geyer anti-poll-tax bill on May 17, 1940.

To date these hearings have not been ordered printed by the chairman of the subcommittee conducting the hearings. He has been urged to do so many times. Witnesses came from long distances from the States suffering under this limited suffrage to testify at these hearings.

The Congress spent time and money to get facts that the Members and the Nation at large have a right to know.

I firmly believe that if the Nation knew the deplorable conditions that exist in the eight States that still cling to this relic of feudalism, the poll tax, it would demand that these States really give the vote to the three and one-half million Negroes and the 8,000,000 whites who cannot pay the tax.

Poll Taxes Breed Corruption—An Example

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE E. GEYER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 3, 1940

Mr. GEYER of California. Mr. Speaker, since it is impossible to obtain copies of the anti-poll-tax hearings yet—to date they have not been printed—I insert in the RECORD further evidence to prove that the poll tax is a source of corruption amounting to the buying of votes.

There will be found below a letter from a citizen of Arkansas and a political advertisement from the Northwest Arkansas Times, of Fayetteville, Ark. A glance at the ad will show plainly that the poll tax is being used as a racket to keep in office some people regardless of the true wishes of the people. What interest could the few who paid the poll taxes of others have except to control the votes of these people for whom they paid the tax? Please note the connection between those who paid the taxes and the man running for office.

Mr. Hudson, of Fayetteville, Ark., who furnished us with the information should be complimented on his patriotism and civic spirit. It was such persons as he who requested me to introduce the Geyer anti-poll-tax bill.

DISCHARGE PETITION IS AWAITING SIGNATURES

The petition on the desk to discharge the committee is No. 34. All Members will want to sign it after reading this letter and studying the table below.

FAYETTEVILLE, ARK., *August 28, 1940.*

Hon. LEE E. GEYER,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. GEYER: Being a citizen of a poll-tax State, I am deeply interested in your effort to liberate 10,000,000 citizens from political bondage. I am enclosing a single page of our local paper which is self-explanatory.

You will note that relatives and close friends of certain candidates bought poll-tax receipts in quantities and passed them to individuals who voted as instructed. This is equivalent to buying votes. This primary election was held on August 13, 1940.

The poll tax is supported by chronic politicians and political machines and on every election day they make raids on these defenseless disfranchised people to the extent of their ability to buy poll-tax receipts. The practice is un-American, unpatriotic, and dishonorable. In this State of Arkansas we have government by minority groups—it is oligarchical in practice and strictly machine controlled. It is little wonder that the eight poll-tax States represent economic problem No. 1. At least one-half of the voters have no voice in government. Various kinds of consumer taxes are imposed by minority groups. I truly hope you will succeed in getting your poll-tax bill before the House for discussion and passage.

Yours very truly,

W. N. HUDSON.

P. S.—The above-mentioned election was a State-wide primary including all State and county officers. It was vigorously contested and there were approximately 250,000 votes cast, including the bought votes.

W. N. H.

[From the Northwest Arkansas Times, Fayetteville, Ark.]

POLL-TAX RECEIPTS PURCHASED FOR VOTERS

For whose benefit were the following poll-tax receipts purchased? Check the results of the preferential primary and be your own judge! Evidence of the following may be found in the collector's office.

This is only four townships that have been covered by these poll taxes. Space will not permit a complete list that they will use as these were used in the past primary.

Name	Township	By whom purchased
Stanley King	Winslow	O. H. Chandler.
Maggie Dockery	do	Do.
Reginald Praley	do	Do.
Vina Praley	do	Do.
W. J. Dwyer	do	Paul Bogan.
Seth Hughes	do	Do.
Mrs. Seth Hughes	do	Do.
Mrs. Reece Watkins	do	Do.
Mrs. Hazel Watkins	do	Do.
Amos L. Watkins	do	Do.
Mrs. Louie Wells	do	Do.
Louie Wells	do	Do.
Mrs. W. J. Dwyer	do	Do.
Mrs. J. J. Foster	do	W. E. Langston.
J. J. Foster	do	Do.
A. L. King	do	Do.
Mrs. Amz I. Tomlinson	do	Do.
Ed Morgan	do	Do.
Mrs. E. Morgan	do	Do.
John W. Burnett	do	Do.
Mrs. Jeff Wolfe	do	Do.
Vera May Riddle	do	Do.
Mrs. Ethel Arnett	do	Do.
Mrs. A. C. Bogan	do	Do.
W. H. Donaldson	do	Do.
Mrs. Tula Nelson	do	Do.
Mr. W. A. Nelson	do	Do.
Grace Donaldson	do	Do.
Jim Smith	do	Do.
Desey Wright	do	Do.
Mrs. M. Godsey	do	Do.
Mrs. Lee Smith	do	Paul Bogan.
R. H. Godsey	do	W. E. Langston.
Leonard Loftin	do	Paul Bogan.
Mrs. Muriel King	do	O. H. Chandler.
Jewell Deen	do	Hoyt Hight.
Mrs. W. F. Price	do	Elmer Griffith.
W. F. Price	do	Do.
Mrs. G. C. Bogan	do	Paul Bogan.
Roger W. Ramey	do	Do.
Mrs. Carl Smith	do	W. E. Langston.
Hazel Hight	do	Hoyt Hight.
Opal Smith	do	Do.
Harry A. Deen	do	Do.
Lizzie Malone	do	W. E. Langston.
R. P. Purser	do	Paul Bogan.
Joseph F. Langlin	do	Do.
Claud Malone	do	W. E. Langston.
Mrs. Claud Malone	do	Do.
Edna Griffith	do	O. H. Chandler.
I. L. Beckett	do	
Lillie Beckett	do	
Mrs. George E. Tomlinson	do	Do.
Hugh Adams	do	Do.
Mrs. Hugh Adams	do	Do.
Clyde Lidywood	do	Do.
A. C. Bogan	do	Elmer Griffith.
W. E. McClelland	do	W. E. Langston.
Mrs. J. M. Jones	do	Do.
Mrs. C. F. Pennington	do	Do.
Joe Cherveny	do	Paul Bogan.
J. F. Smith	do	Omal Chandler.
Laura Langlin	do	W. E. Langston.
Dessie Caudle (Mrs. Eli)	do	Do.
Sam Deen	do	J. D. Smith.
Ruth Dockery	do	J. D. Hight.
Nellie C. Clark	do	Do.
H. B. Dockery	do	Do.
Don Hight	do	J. D. Smith.
Oliver McKenzie (J. W.)	do	
Lester Easter	do	W. E. Langston.
A. C. Yerton	do	J. D. Hight.
Alvis Reed	do	W. E. Langston.
Edmon Easter	do	Do.
Agnes Loftin	do	Do.
J. C. Hampton	do	Do.
Willie Hampton	do	Do.
Joe L. Evans	do	Do.
Leon Davis	do	R. A. Beckett.
Mrs. Leon Davis	do	Do.
J. A. Winn	do	Do.
M. C. Meadows	do	Do.
Mrs. J. A. Winn	do	Do.
Pete Cook	do	Do.
A. J. Smith	do	Do.
B. F. Arnett	do	Wilma Chandler.
Ada West	Crawford	J. D. Hight.
Henry Allen	do	Do.
Alma Huethens	do	Do.
Rhoda Hutchens	do	Do.
Raymond Smith	do	Do.
Oscar Hughes	do	Do.
Ruby Smith	do	Do.
Lillie Powell	do	Do.
Leo Osborn	do	J. D. Smith.
Juanita Duncan	do	Do.
Dorothy Meyer	do	Do.
Bertha Meyer	do	Do.
C. W. Timbrook	do	Do.
Mrs. C. W. Timbrook	do	Do.
Eleanor Ellyson	do	Do.
Harry Ellyson	do	Do.
Carson Duncan	do	Do.
W. L. Watkins	do	Charley Smith.
Mrs. W. C. Dennis	do	R. A. Beckett.
W. C. Dennis	do	Do.
Dewey Hoover	do	Wilma Chandler.
Minnie Johnson	do	Mrs. Orval Chandler.

Name	Township	By whom purchased
Charley Jenks	Crawford	Paul Bogan.
Lois Falley	do	Do.
Edith Watkins	do	Charley Smith.
Millard Watkins	do	Do.
Gladys Osborn	do	W. E. Langston.
Dewey C. Underhill	do	O. H. Chandler.
Hazel Underhill	do	
Chloe Isenhower	do	Do.
Mrs. W. H. Price	do	
Dessie Calhoon	do	Do.
F. G. Bills	do	Do.
T. J. Ripper	do	Do.
Flonce Ripper	do	Do.
Mrs. Joe Smith	do	Do.
Mrs. C. R. Talley	do	Do.
Thelma Stonesifer (Mrs. John)	do	Do.
John Stonesifer	do	Do.
Albert Smith	do	
Nell Smith	do	Do.
Mrs. Theodore Talley	do	Do.
Fay Bills	do	Do.
Mary Ramey	do	Do.
Henry Ramey	do	Do.
Earl Smith	do	Do.
Joe Smith	do	Do.
Mamie Hughes (Mrs. Oscar)	do	Do.
Dilford Hughes	do	Do.
Orin Hughes	do	Do.
Mrs. J. W. Hughes	do	Do.
J. W. Hughes	do	Do.
Mrs. J. E. Hughes	do	Do.
J. E. Hughes	do	Do.
Oral Hughes	do	Do.
Mrs. Emma Hughes (Mrs. Oral)	do	Do.
Mrs. Odus Jamerson	do	Do.
Odus Jamerson	do	Do.
J. P. Brown	Reed	J. D. Hight.
Loyd Stout	do	Do.
Thelma Stout	do	Do.
Wilburn Christison	do	Frank Doss.
Toy Shepherd	do	Wallace Pamell.
E. E. Starkey	do	Frank Doss.
Mrs. Elmer Stout	do	Wilma Chandler.
Elmer Stout	do	Do.
Earl Bogan	do	O. H. Chandler.
T. W. Ritter	do	Do.
J. D. Robertson	do	Do.
R. S. Hughes	do	Do.
Mrs. R. S. Hughes	do	Do.
Robert T. Hudspeth	do	Do.
Mrs. Ewell Napier	do	Do.
Sallie Evans	do	Do.
Albert Evans	do	Do.
J. F. Isenhower	do	Do.
Dillard Shepherd	do	Paul Bogan.
Lonnie Stout	do	O. H. Chandler.
Mrs. Sam Stout	do	Do.
Sam Stout	do	Do.
Silverster Stout	do	Do.
Mrs. A. C. Stout	do	Do.
Carl Smith	do	Do.
Ewell Napier	do	Do.
Nora Stout	do	Do.
Maudie Stout	do	Do.
D. O. Ritter	do	Do.
Mrs. T. W. Ritter	do	Do.
Lillie Stout	do	Do.
Littsie Stout	do	Do.
Chess F. Stout	do	Do.
Ida Isenhower (Mrs. Harry)	do	Do.
Mrs. Chas. Mitts	do	Do.
Chas. Mitts	do	Do.
Mrs. J. D. Robertson	do	Do.
Audie Smith	do	Do.
Mrs. Eare Sisemore	do	Do.
Eare Sisemore	do	Do.
W. O. Chandler	do	Do.
Jim Chandler	do	Do.
Mrs. Jim Chandler	do	Do.
Jim Dillard	do	Do.
Edd Dillard	do	Do.
Carie F. Fields	do	Do.
Mary Chandler	do	Do.
D. M. Chandler	do	Do.
Ermel Williford	do	Do.
Lula Chandler	do	Do.
Mrs. Alex Tout	do	Do.
Alex Tout	do	Do.

In 1936 there were 18 Democratic voters in Reed Township. In the past primary 50 people and very few of them Democrats, voted in Reed Township.

Name	Township	By whom purchased
Garland Parrish	Lees Creek	Mack Redfern.
Ova Southern	do	Do.
G. R. Booth	do	Do.
Sarrah E. Hill	do	Do.
Mrs. Glenn Booth	do	Do.
Mrs. Oval Tanner	do	Do.
Ida May Loftin	do	Do.
Mack Southern	do	Do.
Claude Redfern	do	Do.

Name	Township	By whom purchased
John Redfern	Lees Creek	Mack Redfern.
Mrs. Gravel Hays	do	Do.
Inez M. Murphy	do	Do.
Mrs. N. A. Hays	do	Do.
Granuil Hayes	do	Do.
Mrs. C. L. Loftin	do	Do.
C. L. Loftin	do	Do.
Francis Toon	do	W. M. Redfern.
Harry Isenhower	do	O. H. Chandler.
W. C. Redfern	do	J. H. Coker.
Mrs. Mary R. Flanary	do	Do.
C. A. Flanary	do	Do.
H. B. Wilson	do	Jim Coker.
Gertie Wilson	do	Do.
Ethel Toon	do	J. H. Coker.
M. S. Redfern	do	Do.
Bessie Redfern	do	Do.

Is this the proper way for home people to endorse a man—83 out of Mr. Davidson's 150 home-town voters may be on above list.

EXPLANATION

W. E. Langston, father-in-law of Arthur Davidson.

O. H. Chandler, strong supporter of Davidson and central committeeman from Reed Township.

J. D. Hight, nephew of P. B. Smith, county home superintendent.

J. D. Smith, brother of P. B. Smith, county home superintendent.

Paul Bogan, relative of Davidson.

Results of preferential primary in sheriff's race in above townships

Winslow:	
Davidson	150
Jones	3
LeMaster	0
Gulley	0
Crawford:	
Davidson	101
Jones	10
LeMaster	5
Gulley	6
Reed:	
Davidson	38
Jones	4
LeMaster	8
Gulley	5
Lees Creek:	
Davidson	57
Jones	10
LeMaster	6
Gulley	5
Total in four townships:	
Davidson	346
Jones	27
LeMaster	19
Gulley	11

Four hundred and three people voted in sheriff's race in past primary in above townships and 222 poll taxes are on the above list. Does this mean anything?

Again I say: For whom were these poll-tax receipts bought? I pledge if elected that my deputies will be men of known honesty and integrity and that no political clique or ring, past or present, will dictate my appointments or any of the policies of the office.

It is upon this basis that I solicit your support in Tuesday's primary.

CLINT JONES,
Candidate for Sheriff.

Nazi Envoys and Agents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES SECCOMBE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 3, 1940

ARTICLE FROM THE JEWISH VETERAN

Mr. SECCOMBE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article from the Jewish Veteran, which appeared in the issue of August, this year. This article, entitled "Nazi Envoys and Agents," is one of utmost importance and I hope will be read by every Member of this honorable body. It is especially timely at a time such as this, Mr. Speaker, and I trust our State Department will benefit by our experiences of the past and will deal with Nazi envoys and agents accordingly. I expect to introduce legislation within a few days to cover such a situation.

[From the Jewish Veteran of August 1940]

NAZI ENVOYS AND AGENTS

Baron Edgar Von Spiegel, German consul general at New Orleans, threatened that Germany would not forget the aid given its enemies by the United States. A spy carrying information to Costa Rica was recently caught, and implicated Hans Widmann, Nazi consul at Los Angeles. We read how German consuls and agents tried to influence representatives at the Habana Pan-American Conference. Recently, Dr. Gerhard Westrick, counselor of the German Embassy, arrived in New York, and has been seeing many prominent Americans. He has just been found guilty by the New York Motor Vehicle Bureau of falsifying several statements on an application for a motor license (incidentally, the car which he was driving belonged to the Texas Oil Co.). Many other consuls and attachés all over the country have been overactive in distributing Nazi propaganda.

Don't you think that this should now stop? What happened to our Ambassador and consuls in Poland? What happened to our Embassy and consulates in Belgium and France? They had to get out. Hitler won't even tolerate our diplomatic officers doing lawful duties, so why should we continue to knowingly permit Nazi officers to be active illegally? The State Department should have a list of each and every member and employee of every Nazi consulate in the United States of America and be permitted to check on their activities. There should be no immunity to anyone to undermine our Government or even our attitude. We should also demand the immediate withdrawal of those who have already been caught acting improperly. Let us not forget how Von Papen and Boy-ed of the Germany Embassy were the spy and sabotage leaders in 1916 and 1917.

Steps Toward British Union, a World State, and International Strife—Part VII

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. THORKELSON

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 3, 1940

Mr. THORKELSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article by the Reverend Dr. W. Pascoe Goard which appeared in the National Message, March 28, 1936, the official publication of the British-Israel World Federation. This article is entitled "British-Israel Is True."

We wish to speak a word of caution and expostulation to those of our brethren of the Christian ministry who are boldly challenging the truth of the British-Israel.

First, we may present our credentials to justify what we are about to say hereafter. The following has been written without particular consultation with our associates, but there need be no question that they carry the weight of the judgment of the clergymen and ministers, educationists, and other professional men, and of the laity, who stand with us in the many countries where our movement prevails.

What is the truth of the British-Israel? The truth is that the British-Israel is not a denomination and is not an ecclesiastic sect; but is instead a subsidized political organization. The question may then be asked, How can the British-Israel call the Christian clergy "brethren" when their organization is not ecclesiastic, but political, as I have stated?

It is generally stated, in order to give weight by comparison to the opposition, that there are no scholars in the British-Israel movement. No doubt those who make such statements think that they are strictly adhering to truth, and that this movement is one carried forward by those not qualified to judge.

The statement, however, is not only untrue—which is the negative form of the statement—it is positively untrue. A much shorter form of expression might be used. Facts will be desired to support this statement. Anyone who cares to search the literature of the British-Israel movement will be struck with the fact that among the small number who for many years stood together in defense of this truth a very large proportion of them carried the various degrees which our universities bestow. Such degrees were earned from Oxford, Cambridge, London, Birmingham, Durham, Trinity College, Dublin, Aberdeen, Yale, McGill, Toronto, British Columbia, and many other universities. We warn our opponents, if they have any respect for truth, to avoid circulating such misleading statements as these.

I do not believe anyone will deny that the British-Israel World Federation is well connected and well financed. The question is, Who are the financial promoters of the subversive movement to establish a world government? Can it be possible that the international bankers are the financial backers? Can it be possible that this movement is connected with the Grand Orient Lodge? Is it not true that the British-Israel and its proponents comprise the group now actively promoting war, and is it not true that the backers of this movement are those who control gold and international gold credit? We must recognize that the British-Israel world movement is anti-American and destructive to the principles of this Government.

Turning to standing and experience in the various churches: Within our ranks have been archbishops, bishops, well-placed clergy, ministers of high standing in the various churches, heads of educational departments and institutions, distinguished members of the bar, and so on. Such positions as have been occupied by many of those referred to have been achieved through merit in long and vigorous years of service in the various branches of the Christian church.

It is indeed unfortunate that many Christian churches Ministers should know that political movements within church organizations will destroy the church itself.

Of late a movement to bring forward such leaders as Dr. Goudge, Dr. Dimont, Dr. Campbell, and so on, heads of theological divinity schools, has evidently had as its object the forming of a ring around us of authority. We recognize the attainments and achievements of these highly esteemed men in other fields, but not in the one under consideration. Within our movement we can meet these gentlemen with men of equal attainments, of as wide experience; teachers and authors of equal standing. We cannot allow position or authority to weigh in a question of facts and have allowed the British-Israel in the church organizations. truths. That argument does not meet the point at issue. But if the argument continues to be advanced, we balance it as we have already said.

We respectfully ask of the rank and file, of those who oppose us—What is it you oppose? We recommend each opponent to face this question, lest in opposing us he may be found to oppose the very standard upon which the whole doctrinal structure of his own communion is based. We will state the things for which we stand.

Dr. Goard employs a subtle argument to disarm anyone who may take issue with his statements. The fact remains, however, that the British-Israel is to establish a world state with a David as King, and the capital of this state, according to their own publications, is to be Jerusalem. I am opposed to the British-Israel, because I am quite well satisfied with our own government and unwilling to crusade for the British Empire or for the real motivators behind this movement in Asia, Africa, Egypt, or anywhere else.

We accept the Bible as it stands. We are quite aware of the various approaches to the Bible and of the various criticism to which it has been subjected. We do not speak in ignorance of these things, but rather with the full knowledge of them as men who have been over the ground again and again for many years past. Our approach to the Bible is an intelligent one. Our acceptance of the Bible is confirmed by facts beyond counting. It is our considered opinion that with the facts in hand which we possess, it is impossible to do otherwise than accept the great, sequent, even consequent, development of facts and truth as it is presented in Holy Writ.

We believe the Bible as it now stands does not need any other interpretation than that which facts, history, and experience accord. The Bible carries information not otherwise possessed by humanity, and which must have had a source higher than humanity because its scope is wider than the sum total of unaided human knowledge. For instance, the Bible contains knowledge of the past before human history began, and knowledge of the future to which humanity has not yet attained but is from day to day attaining. We accept it in its spiritual revelations, in its contacts with natural science and history, and in its prophetic dealing with the future. We take the Bible to be what the Prayer Book assures us it is, namely, "The Word of God Written."

I shall not discuss the historical aspect of the Bible or its revelations, for I grant that education existed then as well as today. The point in issue is that the British-Israel have appointed themselves as the chosen people to sit in judgment on the throne of David in Jerusalem, and I do not deny the British-Israel such rights. Reserving my own rights, I object to giving my aid in this cherished desire, and I refuse to share any responsibility in establishing this world state.

The Bible deals with Israel as a continuous national entity, from Sinai to the end of the world.

The Bible deals with Judah as a separate national entity, from its organization as a kingdom under David to the coming again of our Lord Jesus Christ.

These two paragraphs are illuminating, for they reveal the real purpose of the British-Israel plan; and it is to establish Judah as a kingdom under David, and so stated in the latter paragraph. The British-Israel movement is, therefore, backed by those who are interested in a Judaic state, and they are not the gentiles or those which the British-Israel pretend they represent.

The Bible deals with the continental empires and nations, from the granting of the imperial charter to Nebuchadnezzar of Babylon and to his successors right down to that time indicated by Daniel, of which he said, "I beheld till the thrones were cast down * * *." Many scriptures show this to have been the ending of the Babylon succession, which took place A. D. 1918, 2,520 years after the granting of the great Babylon charter.

We see that these three participants in world history have been the chief actors on the stage. They have so monopolized the activities of world history that what has taken place outside of their scope has scarcely been worth telling.

Bible prophecy and secular history are now merged into one.

This is within the scope of our faith. What objection has any churchman of any denomination to make of the facts here given, and on what grounds can such objection be raised? Surely every Bible reader must know the truth of that which we have just stated. If not he can easily verify the truth.

We see and know that the general course of the history of each of these peoples is told in the prophetic scriptures. Further, by the interweaving of these lines of prophecy the general course of world history was foretold.

We take these lines of prophecy and we compare them carefully with world history. This is not an easy task. It takes much original research, which we have gone to the labor and expense of making. For instance, for years we have maintained a research department, the members of which have worked and still work in such institutions as the British Museum, and elsewhere, where the treasures of knowledge are deposited. As a result of the general scholarship of our leaders and the special knowledge thus obtained, we can give chapter and verse for much of the information required to establish the fact that history fully fulfills prophecy. A large and growing literature is produced and is still being produced in this field of research.

What a triumph that is for the Bible and for those who preach the Bible facts and truths. Dr. Driver was compelled by his lack of this special knowledge to admit what he believed to be a fact, that many of the promises made by God to the northern Kingdom of Israel and to the southern Kingdom of Judah had never been fulfilled, and that circumstances have so changed that they never can be fulfilled, but must be rather looked upon as ideals which God would fain see fulfilled in the life of His people. This is not a verbatim quotation, but whoever desires to do so will find the original statement in the introduction to Dr. Driver's Commentary on Jeremiah.

The fact that a scholarly wing of the British church, for whom Dr. Driver spoke as the regius professor of Hebrew at Oxford, should have found itself driven by the great atheist, Tom Paine, and his follower, Bradlaugh, to make such an admission, denotes a great tragedy for British Christianity.

The whole thing was a consequence of Dr. Driver's failure to read the continuous history of Israel and to identify it in its modern strength. Possessing this key to the knowledge of history, we are able to say that every covenant which God has entered into, every promise which God has made, and every prophecy which God has authorized concerning the northern Kingdom of Israel and the southern Kingdom of Judah have been and are being fulfilled to the letter up to date, and time only is the element required to complete the fulfillment of them all. Thus we bring triumph to the church; thus we restore shaken faith in the Bible and all its implications. Why Christian ministers should oppose us in making known this triumph is beyond our understanding.

This article which I am quoting is interesting, and I shall now requote a part of the foregoing paragraph:

Possessing this key to the knowledge of history, we are able to say that every covenant which God has entered into, every promise which God has made, and every prophecy which God has authorized concerning the northern kingdom of Israel and the southern Kingdom of Judah have been and are being fulfilled to the letter up to date, and time only is the element required to complete the fulfillment of them all.

In making this statement, Dr. Goard takes much for granted, and I am sure he will find many disappointments on the road he has selected to follow. I realize that he expects the armed forces of the United States to aid him so that his prophecies may be fulfilled, but the taxpayers of the United States, who pay the expenses of the Army, and particularly

the men in the Army who must give their lives to please Dr. Goard, might object to aid him in establishing a world state in Egypt.

It will be and is being objected to that we substitute the national and secular phases of the gospel for the spiritual evangel. We do no such thing, and we commend this fact especially to the judgment of our evangelical brethren. Speaking to the latter for a moment, we say that the evangelicals have rightly opposed with vigor and courage the mutilation of the Bible by the higher critical and modernist schools. We join with them heartily in this. But now we say in all kindliness, and with the seriousness which belongs to such a statement, that our evangelical opponents go much further than higher critics and modernists in determinately ignoring and often vigorously denying the whole of the kingdom message which deals with the state and its administration. To do this is to deny or ignore quite half of the Bible literature.

Further, we call the attention of our evangelical brethren to the fact that at every point the kingdom message, as it refers to the state, interpenetrates the evangelical message as it refers to the church of Christ.

The evangelical message cannot be given in its fullness nor in its full power if the kingdom message and its references to the state are eliminated. It would be foolish for either side to boast; it would be equally foolish to fail to estimate the work being done. Accordingly, we say that because we understand and use the national element as it penetrates the spiritual evangel, we not only preach the evangel as our evangelical brethren do, but we preach it in its fullness with the fullness of its power in a way that our evangelical brethren who disregard the kingdom message as it refers to the state cannot do.

The question is asked, What are the standards of doctrine recognized in the British-Israel movement? We make answer: We form no denomination; we are not an ecclesiastical sect; our members as a rule are members in good standing in their own communions. We send a constantly increasing army of members into congregations and churches. We take none out. We leave it to the membership and adherents of our movement to exercise perfect freedom as to the formula by which they express their faith. Among us we hold to the Apostles' Creed and the Nicene Creed. One wing of our adherents expresses its faith in the terms of the Articles of the Church of England. Another wing holds as the expression of its faith the standards of the Presbyterian, Congregational, and Baptist Churches. Still another wing holds the Methodist standards. These three great expressions of faith cover in general the same ground and may be considered as the basis of the faith of British-Israel. Further, as a body we hold and use the Book of Common Prayer, recognizing that that book in its entirety and in detail is compiled upon the assumption that the people who use it and hold it dear are the people of Israel and inheritors of the covenants made with our forefather Abraham.

These three paragraphs are informative, because we find that the British-Israel movement is not a Christian movement. It is not a denomination or church movement and it is not ecclesiastic, as I have already stated in discussing the first paragraph. The interesting part is this statement:

We send a constantly increasing army of members into congregations and churches. We take none out. We leave it to the membership and adherents of our movement to exercise perfect freedom as to the formula by which they express their faith.

This statement leaves no doubt as to this movement, for it is an organization which Judah is employing to destroy and upset Christian faiths in order to establish their own world state. The statement, "We take none out," is true, for these "fifth columnists" are sent into every church, and even into the Government itself, to spread British-Israel and world union now. This in itself proves clearly that all of these movements are un-American, anti-American and most damnably subversive. If we had a patriotic Justice Department and law-enforcement bodies that had the interest of the United States at heart, they would bring every one of these organizations before the bar of justice, because they are enemies of the United States and performing treasonable acts against our Government.

Stated briefly, the Bible, the prayer book, the great confessions of faith are ours. We are probably unique in this, that alone we hold what was generally held by the established church, the Covenanters, the Puritans, and all the great denominations up to a very recent period, namely, the fact that Britain and her associate nations are Israel. Consequently we hold the Bible in its entirety, both in its references to church and state; we hold the prayer book to mean fully what it says; we hold the great confessions of faith, with all the understanding of the fathers who produced them. We hold the state to be designed of God to be as holy as the church, and we believe the time is speedily coming when upon the holy vessels of the temple and the bells of the horses in the streets there will be inscribed equally, "Holiness to the Lord."

This paragraph also identifies the source of this movement in these words:

We are probably unique in this case, that alone we hold what was generally held by the established church, the Covenanters, the Puritans, and all the great denominations up to a very recent period, namely, the fact that Britain and her associate nations are Israel.

This statement reveals how deceptive this movement is, for Great Britain and her associates comprise Mongolians, Negroes, Australians, and many other racial types, who are not of the tribe of Israel. I may also say that no one would make such claim except the British-Israel; and the reason for that claim is due entirely to the fact that the background of this movement in Judaic.

Knowing these things, we know that we, as Israel, are subject to the Israel constitution, that in fact our kingdom is made up as of old of Jehovah, the King of Israel, represented on earth by the House of David, of the nation Israel, over which the King bears rule; and of the constitution, which consists of the commandments, statutes, and judgments of the Lord.

This paragraph lets the cat out of the bag, for Jehove, or Jehovah, is the God of the Jews and David is their coming king. Their constitution or laws is the Talmud, and their prophecy is taken from the Old Testament.

IS THIS AN AGE OF REASON?

Let us now be practical. The United States Army and the United States Navy, conscripts or no conscripts, are to crusade in a stupid war in Asia and Africa. Our young men are to give their lives—not in protection or defense of the United States, but for the sole purpose of establishing a kingdom in Arabia with Jerusalem as the capital, and with David as the king of the world.

I now conclude by quoting the last paragraph:

These are the things we hold; these are the things we teach. On what ground do Christian ministers oppose us? On what ground do they say that we are schismatic or heretics? Surely, if either ourselves or our opponents are schismatic or heretics, it must be our opponents, for we stand squarely for the faith which was first delivered to the saints.

Published by the Covenant Publishing Co., Ltd., 6 Buckingham Gate, London, SW. 1. Printed by the Stanhope Press, Ltd., Rochester, Kent.

I hope that Members of Congress will read this insert, entitled, "British-Israel Is True," and another insert entitled, "The International Situation," because both state the purpose of the British- and the American-Israel, as well as the Anglo-Saxon Federation.

The Union Label and Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 3, 1940

RADIO ADDRESS BY I. M. ORNBURN

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following Labor Day address by I. M. Ornburn, secretary-treasurer, union label trades department, American Federation of Labor, over the blue network of the National Broadcasting Co., September 2, 1940:

THE UNION LABEL AND DEFENSE

Every Labor Day definitely marks an advance in the steady progress of the organized labor movement in America. The rapid improvement in wages, hours, and working conditions is just one of the achievements accomplished by collective bargaining of labor unions.

It would be uncharitable even to compare the standards of American workers with those of the enslaved toilers of the Old World. Except in England, Sweden, and Switzerland, dictatorships have destroyed trade-unionism throughout Europe. That is why we believe it our sacred duty to preserve the great union between the United States and Canada—better known as America—because by

preserving this greatest of all unions, we shall, in turn, preserve labor unions and the democratic institutions which make them possible.

The American Federation of Labor always has loyally supported our Government in every crisis. In 1914, 3 years before we entered the first World War, the American Federation of Labor, under the able leadership of Samuel Gompers, gave its moral support to the Allies' cause. Many members of organized labor served in the American Expeditionary Force. Those who remained at home cooperated with the Federal Government by speeding up munitions of war and serving on important war commissions in order to bring that conflict to an early conclusion. Organized labor helped in every drive for Liberty Loans and the Red Cross. Labor worked overtime and cooperated with the Federal Government to insure industrial peace. That patriotic record of the American Federation of Labor is now a matter of history. So great was the support of the war by the American Federation of Labor that at a banquet given in London, in honor of Samuel Gompers, Premier Lloyd George of England addressed his remarks to the great labor leader and said: "You are the greatest contribution the United States can give to the Allies."

Modern warfare requires total defense. The old conception of preparedness was merely a well-equipped army with one or two men to furnish supplies for each soldier. Today, with the highly mechanized forces, it requires at least 12 men to furnish supplies. We must not only have a well-equipped Army, Navy, and air force, but we must also have industrial preparedness behind the lines. Economic warfare has become as important as military engagements. It is at this point that organized labor of America becomes a most vital and necessary factor.

The officials and members of the American Federation of Labor have pledged their unqualified support to the President of the United States for the defense program of America. In no better way can any group of our citizens create greater loyalty and patriotism for a nation than to urge better working conditions for the men and women who make the munitions of war. It will be the hands of skilled American workers who will actually turn out the weapons of defense.

Believing that the best preparation for war is based on a contented, self-supporting, and self-respecting citizenry, American labor desires to wipe out unemployment and place the 10,000,000 jobless, but willing workers, in essential industries to back up our total defense program.

While the military forces are being emphasized at this time, we must not overlook the essential factors of industrial and agricultural preparedness. Industry and transportation must be manned by well-paid workers so that the purchasing power will maintain an evenly balanced business economy. Any proposal to reduce the income of essential workers to the level of the soldier or sailor, who is furnished food, clothing, and shelter, would greatly jeopardize the prosperity of our Nation. It would decrease the total income of workers to a point where it would reduce purchasing power to a depression level. Industry would not have sufficient income to pay sufficient taxes required for the huge cost of our total defense program.

The union label trades department of the American Federation of Labor has constantly urged that American consumers buy American-made and union-label products. We believe this would create greater economic stability for American industries and at the same time sustain wage levels so there would be adequate buying power to maintain business and industry on an even keel of prosperity. If, on the other hand, all workers and farmers, for example, were paid at the same rate as the soldier in our Army, we would be thrown into a depression so panicky that it would endanger the economic security of America.

There are many reasons why American consumers should buy union-label products and use union services. The first and best reason is the union label is the best guaranty that the article is made in America. The second reason is that the purchaser of union-made goods stabilizes the labor standards established by the American Federation of Labor. These include the higher wages, shorter hours, and better working conditions of union and nonunion labor. By maintaining union labor's standard of wages, the consumer sustains the mass purchasing power of the buying public to such a high degree that our prosperity is assured.

One cannot mention the progress of American workers without pointing out the superior working conditions obtained for them by the American Federation of Labor.

For the past 60 years, the American Federation of Labor has consistently advocated the three basic principles which are now generally accepted as a foundation for permanent prosperity. Through labor unions, hours of labor have been reduced from 72 hours a week in 1880 to 40½ hours a week in 1940. By decreasing working hours more jobs are created, which is the only method through which America can reemploy its millions of jobless men and women workers.

The American Federation of Labor has been a pioneer in free education. It has been in the forefront of every battle for free textbooks in our public schools. It has always led in every fight to give the children of all citizens an equal opportunity to broaden themselves in both cultural and educational fields.

The American Federation of Labor has placed powerful protective legislation to safeguard the rights of both organized and unorganized workers on the statute books of our Federal and State Governments. Some of the earliest laws for workmen's compensation were sponsored by the American Federation of Labor. President William Green, of the A. F. of L., when senator in the Ohio State Legislature, sponsored the first compensation law, which has become a model for all other States in the Union. Among other acts which have become the law of the land is the Walsh-Healey law. This act protects workers who make and process all products purchased by the United States Government. It requires that decent wages be paid and all labor work reasonable hours and under humane conditions. The American Federation of Labor helped to pass the Social Security Acts, including old-age pensions and unemployment insurance. There is no reason why these beneficial measures to labor should be repealed on account of our defense program in peacetime or even in times of war.

While the American Federation of Labor has advocated protective legislation for workers, it has strong faith in its original purpose of privately reaching collective-bargaining agreements with employers in industry. A law may be ever so well written, but many times it is so poorly administered it loses its effect. It is not the use of a law but the abuse of a law that destroys its practical application.

For 60 years the American Federation of Labor has arranged collective-bargaining contracts with private industry, transportation, and all other business establishments without any interference from the Federal Government. We prefer to have the workers organized into labor unions and become so influential they can obtain their rights without Federal paternalism. If we do not stop somewhere in the regulation of labor unions by the Federal Government, we may reach the same stage in this country that they have reached in Nazi Germany and Fascist Italy. True trades-unionists will not compromise with politicians. They prefer to deal directly with private industry and not to be forced by Federal decree of some Federal administrator who has been appointed and not elected to his position.

The American Federation of Labor will give its unqualified support for total defense of America, but it is unalterably opposed to sending our Army, Navy, or air forces to any foreign land.

Why not keep our able-bodied men at home, working at decent wages and making the products America consumes instead of sending them to European battlegrounds again? America should not become involved in the Old World conflicts but should make our democratic institutions a shining example for the rest of the world. We must keep the torch of liberty aloft and lighted in the Western Hemisphere in order that it will be a beacon light for the other half of the world.

There is one other point I desire to make perfectly clear. It is that those skilled craftsmen and experienced technicians in industry, who are so essential to our defense program, should remain in their present positions and not be replaced by inexperienced and unskilled apprentices by unscrupulous employers who desire to decrease the wage scales in America. It is our understanding that it is the intention of the new draft law to exempt essential workers now employed in industry, but during the last World War there were many injustices. Men who could have done a better job making munitions of war were sent to the front and those who were not qualified to work in the necessary industries replaced the skilled and experienced workers.

So far as possible the American Federation of Labor hopes that the Government will follow the policy of encouraging private industry—especially when it has collective-bargaining agreements with American labor unions—rather than take over the plants and establish Government ownership with the ever-increasing industrial dictatorship which grows under Federal control. If we are to fight the totalitarianism theory of government we must not establish it in our own democracy. We sincerely believe private ownership under rigid democratic controls is more efficient than government ownership with enslaved workers as witnessed today in Germany and Italy.

At this time I wish to express the deep gratitude of the Union Label Trades Department of the American Federation of Labor for this time on the air so generously given to us by the National Broadcasting Co. on its national network. We also desire to express our appreciation to all members of labor unions, union label leagues, women's auxiliaries and their friends for their cooperation in our national campaign to promote the purchase of union-label goods and the use of union services. We assure the consuming public that this continual demand for the union label on articles will guarantee they are American made and of the highest quality. Union-label merchandise is produced by skilled workers under the most humane conditions in the United States and Canada—the greatest nations on the face of the earth.

The Union Label Trades Department also desires to assure manufacturers and other business firms that we have mobilized an army of 25,000,000 eager representatives of the most compact and unified purchasing market in the world. This vast consuming army has an annual purchasing power of over 6,000,000,000 union-earned dollars. This is an attractive market for all industries and business firms that are union.

In conclusion, I desire to appeal to all Americans to buy union-made and American-made products. If you should like to know how to create more jobs for American workers; if you should like to aid in raising wage levels of all American workers; if you should like to reduce taxes collected for workers on relief, and if you should like to assist in establishing economic security for America; then buy union-label, union-made products and use union services.

It's War—Not Short of War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT B. CHIPERFIELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 3, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE GALESBURG (ILL.) DAILY REGISTER-MAIL

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Daily Register-Mail of Galesburg, Ill.:

[From the Galesburg (Ill.) Daily Register-Mail of August 28, 1940]

IT'S WAR—NOT SHORT OF WAR

The efforts which many Americans appear to be making to carry water on both shoulders with respect to the national attitude toward the war in Europe are leading to more and more glaring examples of the inconsistency of their position. Their sympathies are openly with Great Britain and they say they would give practical expression to the sympathies by aiding that nation in its struggle "in every way short of war." In other words, they want to help Britain win the war and yet keep this Nation out of the struggle. But they give to the phrase "in every way short of war" such exceedingly elastic constructions that they reduce it, in effect, to the merest sophistry.

The country is being flooded with propaganda to the effect that this Government should turn over 50 or more of its "overage" destroyers, relics of the World War, not now in commission by the United States Navy, to Great Britain for patrol duty. This is to be accomplished by some sort of legalistic hocus-pocus, such as transfer of the vessels to a private corporation, which would in turn sell them to Britain. Others would have them a part of the price by which this Nation would secure from Britain and Canada naval and air bases in the Atlantic. Still others would have the Government give them to Britain outright, without thought of a quid pro quo. To make the transaction in any form more palatable to the American public, it is being argued that this step is justified on the ground of national security and national defense; that by providing Britain with extra means of defense of her home waters and home land we keep a potential enemy away from this side of the Atlantic.

But the trouble with all of this argument appears to us to be that in the history of our relationship with Great Britain we have furnished a well-established precedent that such a transfer of ships of war to a belligerent by any subterfuge constitutes an unfriendly act. During the American Civil War British shipbuilders constructed and outfitted a number of vessels of war for the Confederate States. Among these vessels was the famous privateer, the *Alabama*, which preyed upon upon American commerce and caused millions of dollars in loss and damage to shipping.

The Government of the United States protested to the Government of Great Britain against the release of these vessels to the Confederacy and when it protests proved ineffective, the American envoy to Britain, the redoubtable Charles Francis Adams, declared that the failure to detain these vessels constituted an act of war.

Following the cessation of hostilities the American Government made claim against Great Britain for damages resulting from this incident and after prolonged negotiations a treaty of arbitration was signed at Washington. The first rule adopted by the arbitrators in the proceedings was that a neutral government is bound to use due diligence to prevent the fitting out, arming, or equipping within its jurisdiction of any vessel which it has reason to believe is intended to cruise or carry on war against a power with which it is at peace, also to use like diligence to prevent the departure from its jurisdiction of any vessel intended to cruise or carry on war as above, such vessel having been in whole or in part adapted within such jurisdiction for warlike use.

This was the basis for arbitration upon which the American Government insisted, which it was successful in establishing, and upon which it won an award of millions of dollars from the British Government. It thus became a precedent in international law.

Now it is proposed by those who advocate aid to Britain "short of war" to turn over American war vessels for use against Germany, or, for that matter, perhaps against Italy, nations with which we are at least technically at peace, and in violation of this established principle of international law by which our own Government declared similar acts to be acts of war. To make the inconsistency of the thing complete, we are being asked to commit an act of war, to keep us out of war.

All this is not to say that the extension of this aid to Great Britain might not be desirable from the standpoint of national interest and national defense. But why hide behind sophistry and subterfuge to accomplish it? Why not be honest about the thing and do it in the full knowledge that by so doing we are committing what our own history has established as an act of war? Why not do it, if we do, in understanding of the consequences of such action and back our stand with the fullest aid? If we are sufficiently sympathetic with Britain to risk what this action entails and breach a principle our own Government has established, why limit our course to furnishing a half-hundred worn-out destroyers for patrol duty?

Whatever else they may be, the axis powers are not dense enough to let such a mere subterfuge pass unchallenged. They will be quick to point out the consequences and will regard it as an act of war, which, according to our own official action, this Government has so declared it. What then of keeping us out of war or protecting the national security? It does not seem to us there is any practical value in this "short of war" business. We have repeatedly overstepped the bounds of neutrality in thought and in the expression of responsible public officials. It is now proposed that we overstep by direct action. If the national interest demands that we throw our lot with Britain and fight the totalitarian powers, let's do it. But let us be honest and courageous about it, rather than devious and inconsistent. We certainly cannot presume to set ourselves up as judges of international morality and decency and condemn the axis powers for violation of international law when we ourselves are guilty of an offense which falls in the same category.

Compulsory Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 3, 1940

STATEMENT BY MOTHERS OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by the Mothers of the United States of America, giving their views on the bill now before the House:

THE BURKE-WADSWORTH BILL

MOTHERS OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

September 1, 1940.

On September 1, 1940, there appeared in the Times Herald a letter expressing sorrow for "those benighted souls, those 'Congress of Mothers of the United States of America.'" Because the writer represents a cross section of the citizenry, may we say to him (and others like him) that he does not understand us nor the issue. In order to clarify the misunderstanding, will he please take note of the following:

1. We are in favor of military training, but insist that such training shall be under the control and supervision of the United States Army.

2. We want adequate national defense. That means a strong Army, Navy, and Air Corps, completely equipped with guns (together with bullets which fit the bore), tanks, antiaircraft guns, etc., to be used "to repel invasion and suppress insurrection" (see Constitution).

3. Section 10 gives the President complete power to write the rules and regulations as he pleases. We have suggested that this section be amended as follows: In subsection A, strike out the words "the President is authorized" and insert the words "the Chief of Staff of the Army, by and with the advice of and consent of Congress." (For full details read testimony given by Rosa M. Faber, for the Mothers of the United States of America, before the Senate Military Affairs Committee, July 11, 1940.)

In other words, we prefer to leave the business of our corporation (the United States of America) to the board of directors (Congress), and not overload the general manager (the President) with responsibilities.

4. We object to being fooled and lied to. Compulsory military training is being sold to the public as a year of health building, discipline, straight shoulders, sun tan, and what not. We suggest the people stop believing such drivel and begin to ask intelligent questions.

5. Long before the Burke-Wadsworth bill was even introduced in Congress war plans were complete, draft boards set up in States, and personnel appointed. The War Department has asked for bids on thousands of coffins and coffin drapes (called interment flags.)

6. We refuse to be satisfied with an intimated threat to the integrity and institutions of the United States. We want Congress to specify the exact threat or threats which we supposedly face.

7. We ask that no exemptions be granted by reason of religious, political, or financial status.

To summarize briefly: we are not opposed to the principle of military training, but we are against certain specific sections of

the bill and the apparently cleverly planned regimentation of all of us under the European corporate-state plan.

May we remind the writer that we are not alone in the stand we take. Numerous organizations have expressed their opposition to the Burke-Wadsworth bill. They have presented convincing arguments. Where are they now? Or can it be that woman alone has the courage of her convictions and that her interest in future generations and the preservation of her country are the motives behind her action?

MOTHERS OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
MARY A. DECKER,
President.
ROSA M. FARBER,
Vice President and Chairman, Legislative Committee.

Administration of the Wage and Hour Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAMPTON P. FULMER
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 3, 1940

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting an address delivered by Col. Philip B. Fleming, Administrator, Wage and Hour Administration, United States Department of Labor, before the Southern Garment Manufacturers' Association, at their eighth annual convention, Biltmore Hotel, Atlanta, Ga., on Wednesday, August 28, 1940.

It is very necessary that something be done to secure for the wage earners of the South a fair wage for their labor.

It is my hope that, in that a great many industries in the South are of a small type, giving employment to thousands of people, with the possibility of tremendously increasing the productivity of these industries, as well as establishing additional industries, the Wage and Hour Administration will give serious, common-sense, businesslike thought to the real purpose and intent of the provisions of the Wage and Hour Act in writing their rules and regulations governing same.

Large industries, because of their monopolistic organizations, operating under, as a rule, associations, whereby they are able to thresh out their trade-practice rules and regulations, agreeing thereon as to their procedure in conducting their businesses, are able to take care of increased wages as well as any other items, including profit, because they are able to maintain fixed prices.

Smaller industries, being unable to organize, and, especially, independent concerns, represent an altogether different picture, and they should be considered as a different class and in line with all the circumstances connected with their various communities and various lines of business.

I am hoping that the time will come when something will be done to properly organize and assist farmers in controlling their production, marketing, and the distribution of their products, in line with that which is being done by these other groups, so that they may be able to eliminate thousands of parasites who are now marketing their products, which would tend to enable them to secure a fair price for that which they produce.

If and when this is possible, certainly wage earners on the farms in the South should be given fair wages.

The reason for farm wages being so ridiculously low in the South, as well as perhaps in other agricultural sections of the country, is because farmers operate on an independent basis, and they are only able to pay wages in line with the unfair prices received by them for their products.

I am glad to note that Colonel Fleming, according to his statements in his address, is going to do something about securing for wage earners, in connection with cutting and hauling the forest products of the South, especially pulpwood, a fair wage for their long hours and laborious work, the one thing that I have been trying to call to the attention of the Congress for some time.

I would be glad if Members would get a copy of House Joint Resolution 576, proposing an investigation of the pulp and paper mills, with the hope that I may be able to secure your assistance in the passage of this measure. This is a most important matter.

The address of Colonel Fleming follows:

Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, there is an unusual circumstance about the little talk I am going to give you this afternoon. It is not my intention to wax dramatic about it. But the fact is this: I am the defendant in a suit brought by your organization.

I hope you all notice that I am saying this with a smile. Not that I don't take your suit seriously. But I want to be sure you understand that I do not feel at all resentful about it.

The right to appeal to the courts is a democratic privilege, and democratic privileges are of special importance in these days. Courts are expensive. Their action often is slow. We might get along faster without the courts; but you are Americans, and I know how you would feel about taking orders without the privilege of asking the court to pass on their legality and reasonableness.

The wage and hour law, which I administer, provides a relatively quick method of court review. It is written right into the act. But, to quote the late Will Rogers, "I see by the legal papers" that when you utilize this procedure I am named as the defendant.

"It is just a legal formality," I told myself when the bailiff slipped me the papers. I said to myself, "I must get over this dislike of being sued, because it evidently goes with the job." Then I told myself—a bit hopefully—"This is probably what the lawyers call 'a friendly suit.'"

And that is where you fellows are so nice about it. While I am still holding to that thought, along comes a pleasant invitation to come down to Atlanta and be your guest at luncheon. It must be a friendly suit; and you know, I think it really is.

I think it is "not the money, but the principle of the thing," that is causing you to sue me. Why, just the other day, I picked up the Daily News Record and saw a little item from Martinsville, Va. It quoted the manager of a pants factory as saying the pay roll of his three factories had increased $75,000 a year, due to the apparel wage order. And it further quoted him as saying, "But I can't kick, with business the way it is." Well, $75,000 a year increase to one pants manufacturer sounds high to me, but he seems to like it.

But friendly suit or no friendly suit, there is something I can tell you. Perhaps some of you have never been sued. I can tell you how it feels to be a defendant. A defendant may put up quite a bluff about it, but the truth is, he feels he's on the spot.

Well, that's the way I feel. And right now I am asking myself: Did I do the right thing in rejecting my lawyer's advice? Am I taking a chance in coming here to talk things over with you while your suit against me is pending in the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia?

But even as the defendant, I can say a few things. In the first place, as you all probably know, I did not appoint Industry Committee No. 2 for the Apparel Industry.

What I did was this: I read the record of the public hearing on the recommendation of Industry Committee No. 2. That record contained all the evidence that was brought to the attention of the committee and all the arguments that were made on that evidence in the hearing, which lasted for 33 days.

The apparel committee was a big committee—48 members. It had a big job to do. Lumped together, the making of all garments worn by men, women, and children is a tremendous industry. It is carried on in some 15,000 establishments. Its annual value of product is $2,700,000,000.

About 650,000 persons, the majority of them women and girls, are employed by this industry. The definition was a fairly simple one. It included in the industry the making of practically every garment by cutting material and sewing it together again. Under N. R. A., 32 code authorities were set up for the industries included.

Yes; the job was a big one. I noted all the objections made at the public hearing. But I do not think anyone could read the record of the committee without concluding this: In carrying out a difficult assignment they had done a good job.

It is estimated that the wage increases starting July 15 will directly affect more than 200,000 workers. The industry is largely on a piece-work basis. This means that thousands of workers are now guaranteed more money than they were previously able to make at piece work. I have an idea that in the low-wage operations in this industry piece-work rates are going to be generally revised. Otherwise the incentive of piece work is going to be lost, because the Wage and Hour Division is going to see to it that the United States Government's guaranty of a minimum hourly wage payment prevails.

Here we are in Atlanta—right on Peachtree Street, so everyone in this audience has read Gone With the Wind. As you all know, Gone With the Wind took a lot of reading. Gone With the Wind was about an even thousand pages. The record of the public hearing on Industry Committee No. 2 was 5,000 pages. In addition there were 313 separate exhibits.

After reading a transcript of the record I heard the arguments on the disputed points. Then I approved the recommendation of

Industry Committee No. 2, except for two embroidery schedules which were unsupported by the evidence. I then issued the wage order to the apparel industry which your suit is seeking to set aside.

Nothing that has been brought to my attention since has caused me at all to regret my action.

Now, while I do boast a bit about having read the transcript of a 5,000-page record on wages paid and other economic and competitive conditions in the garment industry, you won't catch me making the mistake of trying to qualify as an expert in your industry. But I would like to remind you of a few things about the industry as a whole. There is one thing that is true of every division of the industry, true of the making of practically every garment worn by man, woman, or child: The cost of labor is relatively a large part of the value of the product.

I say relatively large in comparison to other important industries. For instance, the proportion of labor cost to value of product in the automobile industry is 10 percent, in the making of flour is 3½ percent, and in the making of cigarettes is 2½ percent. In your section of the garment industry that proportion is about 23 percent.

Other conditions being equal in your industry, the manufacturer who pays a lower wage can come out with a lower price. I had no acquaintance with your industry in the winter of 1931–32, after Great Britain went off gold; and in 1935, after the N. R. A. was invalidated. I was in the Army then. But from what some garment manufacturers have told me about those periods, the wage cutting and price cutting must have approached hysteria. A garment factory in one community would obtain orders by virtue of a lower wage and come out with prices which shut down factories making the same garments in two or three other communities.

I think everyone in the management side of the garment industry is going to appreciate the removal of the speculative element regarding the cost of labor. Management goes to great lengths to remove the speculative element in the purchase of commodities. That is why there is trading in cotton futures. Businessmen feel they cannot take a chance.

In low-wage industries, where labor cost is a big part of the cost of production, management has heretofore been unable to avoid one risk. This risk had to do with the cost of labor. If a competitor obtained labor cheaper, that competitor could make lower prices, could sell the market. Due to the apparel wage order, that isn't true today in the South, and it isn't going to be true any more.

I think you are going to be able to make a better approach to your problem of staying in business and making money. You are still going to encounter underselling in the markets. Competition is going to continue. But you will know that underselling is not made possible by wage cutting. Business may not continue to be good indefinitely. And if it is no longer good and you are forced to make economies to meet prices, you are going to economize—but not by cutting wages. You are going to seek economy by efficiencies, no matter how willing your own labor is to cut prices in order to meet competition.

I know that each one of you feels that you, individually, would be the last one to cut wages. You won't have to worry in the future about who is the first one or who is the last one. Nobody is going to do it. To cut wages in this industry would bring them below the legal minimum, and the legal minimum is going to be enforced.

I mean that when I say that the manufacturer will know that the underselling he encounters is not due to wage cutting. I mean that because this wage order is going to be enforced. No piece-work shop is going to be able to solve the minimum-wage problem by the simple subterfuge of dividing piece-work earnings by the minimum rate to arrive at the number of hours worked. That's falsification of records, and wage-hour inspectors have already shown how easy it is to detect such a fraud, and your southern judges have shown what they think of that type of violation.

As you know, we changed our regulations on keeping of pay-roll records, regulations applicable to all industries, on August 2, after the apparel wage order had been in effect about 2 weeks. The change was made in order to make legal record keeping which applied two or more minimum-wage rates to the hours worked by a single employee in 1 week.

By making the workweek the unit our record-keeping regulations had been kept fairly simple for the convenience of the employer before this. They can continue to be simple as the new regulations enabling payment at more than one minimum are optional.

Previously minimum-wage orders were so classified that it was almost inconceivable that a single worker should work under more than one wage-order rate in the same week. In the hosiery industry, for instance, we have rates of 40 cents an hour for full-fashioned and 32½ cents an hour for seamless, and I am told, in the few hosiery mills which house both types of machines, workers just don't transfer from one to another. The full-fashioned machine is too complicated for the seamless-machine tender and the seamless machine is beneath the dignity of a full-fashioned machine operator.

The industry based on the use of the sewing machine seems to be different. I want to thank those among you who have written us and called to our attention the details of your operation. It was the garment manufacturers themselves who showed us how we could regulate operation under more than one minimum.

The industry committee knew, and we knew, how difficult it would be to draw the lines between many of the garments listed for different minimum rates. The other day a trade association executive in your industry published a statement in the trade press advising his members to send us no more garments for our determination of what minimum applies. This was not done at our suggestion. We want the manufacturers to continue sending us garments. Some of these border-line garments are manufactured for highly competitive markets. Fair play demands that our construction of the wage order as to which minimum applied be followed by all manufacturers making such garments. We are going to make sure that our construction of the wage orders are enforced throughout the country. They are going to stand unless set aside by authoritative decisions of the courts.

So send us the garments in question. We will tell you which minimum applies and insure that the same minimum applies to every manufacturer making the same garment throughout the industry.

The cotton-garment industry has historically and traditionally been a low-wage industry. It is an old industry. The textile industry has been historically and traditionally a low-wage industry. It, too, is an old industry. In thinking about why some industries are low-wage, others high-wage, one might fall into an error of generalization. One might think that the low-wage industries are all old ones.

The low-wage industries are not all old. Let me tell you something about a low-wage industry which has been selling the South short, depressing the prices for landowner, contractor, and labor, a large industry which is a new one—in fact, is less than 10 years old.

This is the industry which optimistic southerners said heralded a new era of profitable industrialism. I wonder how many of you have arrived at the industry to which I refer; I mean the paper industry.

During the past 5 years about $165,000,000 has been invested in southern paper plants by northern financial interests. That sounds fine, but I really believe that the wage and hour law is the one thing that is going to get the South some real cash money out of this business. Its nice to have industries—for the money they produce—not for the privilege of driving by impressively big paper mills or through miles of denuded woodland.

The paper companies have been following the common business practice of buying in a low market and doing their best to keep the market low.

This is a big industry. The paper and paper-board output of the southern mills alone was $140,302,477 in 1937. It has been a very profitable operation. The annual report of one company shows a $5,000,000 profit in southern paper manufacture. It's a good business. Prices paid for wood are low; prices paid for labor are low; and the money obtained for the sale of paper can be distributed in dividends. That is a rough measure of the extent of the South's failure to participate in the income of this industry. Analysis of stock holdings, I believe, would show that dividends paid from that $5,000,000 of profits were not distributed to any great extent in the South.

The kernel of the matter is this: Landowner, contractor, and laborer in the South—all are pitifully eager to sell their goods or services for cash. All the paper companies needed to do to keep prices down was to divide up the territories and avoid bidding against one another in the purchase of pulpwood. They were buying stumpage at a rate that gave the farmers and other landowners an inadequate return for timber stands which will take another generation to replace. They had their contractors and subcontractors on a piecework basis which had them hustling to make any kind of a living out of it. But they went further, and that is where the Wage and Hour Division came into the picture.

They made a mistake. It is charged that they informed the contractors and subcontractors just what piecework rates in the woods they were using in calculating the price they intended to pay for the pulpwood. And that piecework price was far below 30 cents an hour. The Department of Justice brought the matter to the attention of a Federal grand jury in New York, and the grand jury did not hesitate to indict the 12 companies comprising the American Pulpwood Association. These companies have pleaded not guilty, and that is now an issue before the courts.

All this is not going on without protest from the South. There is a Congressman from South Carolina, a vice chairman of the Forestry Committee, who is making an issue of it. His name is HAMPTON P. FULMER.

Mr. FULMER has introduced a resolution in Congress asking for a thorough investigation of the "apparent monopolistic purchasing of pulpwood by pulp and paper mills under a contract system from farmers and other owners."

Congressman FULMER has been protesting this: Paper prices have recently increased from $65 to $85 a ton. But the advance has not been reflected in prices paid for stumpage and pulpwood. Southern landowners and farmers are not getting anything out of this increase. And Congressman FULMER has been further protesting that "wages paid for cutting and hauling pulpwood are on a starvation basis."

The wage situation is improving and is going to improve a great deal, due to the Wage and Hour Division. Perhaps you have read something about the program we have been conducting to obtain compliance in the pulpwood and lumber industry. In 2 months we inspected 3,412 pulpwood concentrations, lumber camps, yards, mills, and similar establishments. We arranged for employers to clear up their records and come into compliance with the law by paying a total of $300,000 in restitution. We are going to see to it that payment of at least 30 cents an hour prevails in the production of pulpwood or lumber for interstate commerce.

I have been told by those who have made a study of the paper industry that the resulting reallocation of the gross income will be quite important to the economy of the South. How important it is to some of the Southern States, which have the lowest per capita income of all the States in the Union, can be measured by this: The estimate of the amount of additional money which the minimum wage will cause to be annually distributed in the South comes to ten or twelve million dollars.

The laborer in the woods is not the only one who is going to benefit by this revised distribution of the money obtained from the sale of paper products. Once it is a general fact that the contractor's operation involves more money because he has to meet the requirement of the wage and hour law, he is going to be handling pulpwood purchased at a higher price. He is going to be able to get more for himself. And after the laborer has started spending his increased wage with the merchants, there is going to be more money in the community and it won't be so pitifully necessary for the landowners to obtain cash money that they will have to sell off 30 years' growth of timber at the buyer's price.

The South is trading up and styling up. I am certain that the wage and hour law is accelerating the pace of that movement. I have been through the South from time to time for years and I have never seen things looking better than on my recent trips.

Why, only a short time ago one of our lawyers, a young man from Atchison, Kans., Yale, and Cambridge, England, was here in Georgia on an assignment. He was taken on a fishing trip up in the Blue Ridge over Saturday and Sunday. Knowing that all Labor Department attorneys are socially minded, his host on Sunday afternoon drove him around the hill country in search of Tobacco Road. Well, as this young attorney later told me about the trip, "My Georgia friend just was unable to show me situations of distressing poverty. True, the shacks were unpainted. They looked as if they would not be any too warm in winter, even with plenty of wood for the stove. But it was Sunday, and every woman that came to the door to see us bump by on the rocky roads seemed to be wearing a new dress and I noticed that the pretty girls were wearing silk stockings."

Something is happening here. Something is bound to happen when the textile industry increases wages in the South by $10,000,000 a year to meet the requirements of the textile wage order, and increases them even further because of a concurrent boom. One hundred and twenty-five thousand cotton textile workers, all of them in the South, received wage increases from that order. The hosiery wage order must account for $2,000,000 or so increase in wages in the seamless-hosiery mills, most of which are in the South.

And now you are going to be called upon to make good in the matter of increasing pay rolls in this low-wage area. I think you will make good. I think that because of the type of men I have met as representative of your membership. It seems to me that you have the strength and resourcefulness of the typical American businessman; I mean the type of which the country is proud. Even if you lose this suit you are going to meet your pay rolls and you are going to stay in business.

And I think you'll be good losers. You see, I think you are going to lose. You may find it hard to believe, but these industrial wage orders seem to increase in popularity in their respective industries. Let me read you an editorial from a typical southern newspaper, The State, of Columbia, S. C.:

"The State does not know enough of the facts to pass intelligent judgment on the advisability of a 32½ cents an hour minimum for the textile industry. From what the State has heard the well-financed and larger mills scarcely would feel the increase, but that at the moment is not the point to which the State wishes to direct attention. There is another consideration of potential and perhaps great importance to the textile industry in the Southeast. It is this:

"The textile mills came southward years ago mainly because of low wages and other low manufacturing costs in the South. There was talk of 'cotton mills in the cotton fields,' and there were other sayings, no doubt, of equally logical sound. But low wages and costs were the determining factor.

"Now, consider certain broad facts of today. Textile wages in the Southwest—this appears generally to be true—are lower than in the Southeast. Perhaps other costs are also. And cotton, the crop, has been moving westward. To some degree the Southwest now occupies a textile position with reference to the Southeast that the Southeast formerly occupied with reference to New England.

"If low wages and costs siphoned the textile industry from New England, cannot the same forces siphon it again some years hence, from the Southeast to the Southwest?

"In the light of the conditions suggested in this discussion the State wonders whether the Southeast is wise in opposing a uniform standard of wages in the textile industry."

The southwestern, or Texas, cotton manufacturers had come to the textile committee and said that they would have to have a 5-percent differential in wages under the Southeast if they were going to be able to continue in business. So I was surprised this summer to get this telegram from the president of a large cotton mill in Dallas, Tex.:

"DEAR COLONEL FLEMING: I can see that considerable pressure is being brought to bear on you for the purpose of weakening the wage and hour law. The wage and hour law as it now stands is not a handicap to any manufacturer, large or small, North or South. It is the only protection we have against the notorious, unconscionable chiselers who formerly ran unbridled at the expense of his labor, his community, his stockholders, and his competitors. My feeling is violators of this law should be forced to serve sentence in a common jail rather than be permitted to pay a paltry fine.

"Sincerely yours,

"E. SHAW CUNNINGHAM,
"President, the Dallas Cotton Mills Co."

Let me say right here that Mr. Cunningham was not one of those Texas manufacturers who came to Washington to ask for a minimum wage 5 percent under the Carolinas. He did not undertake the management of the plant until the work of the Textile Industry Committee was about completed.

I replied to him as follows:

"DEAR MR. CUNNINGHAM: Thank you very much for your telegram of June 18, which I found on my return to Washington. Expressions like yours from manufacturers whose economy has been directly affected by the wage and hour law are very encouraging.

"May I have your permission to give your telegram to the trade press so that the cotton textile industry as a whole might know what one Texas cotton manufacturer thinks of the effect of the 32½ cents an hour minimum wage order.

"I think it is significant that most complaints about the wage and hour law do not come from low-wage industries, in which cut-wage competition influences prices at the market place. Those who have been loudest in their protest for the most part have not had to increase the wage rates of their workers to meet the requirements of this law.

"As to the administration of this law, I would appreciate very much any suggestions you may have on making it smoother. You may be assured that from an administrative standpoint, the future of the wage and hour law will be marked by more efficient enforcement, and that there will be no weakening of the act on the part of those to whom Congress entrusted it."

He came right back with:

"DEAR COLONEL FLEMING: Thank you for your letter of June 26 in reference to my telegram of June 18. Indeed you may use my telegram in any manner which you feel will be helpful.

"In my opinion, the wage and hour law is the greatest stabilizing influence the textile industry has ever had. As I see it, there are only three classes of manufacturers fighting the wage and hour law.

"1. The notorious chiseler who cannot operate his plant, except at the expense of his labor and competitor. A damn poor asset to any community.

"2. The manufacturer who sees his own failure ahead and is waging a fight on the wage and hour law merely as an alibi for his own incompetency.

"3. The manufacturer who is in a strong financial position, with a large, modern plant, and who is always howling about Government interference in business, which is merely an excuse to weaken Government regulations of any sort over industry, thereby permitting him to run unbridled as he was permitted to do in the past.

"When I came to this plant, March 1, 1939, I found it badly run down, with depleted working capital and old machinery. I am very happy to tell you that we are now making progress and that we have not experienced any interference by any Government agent.

"I judge the reason for this is that we comply with the law, and my orders are to all foremen in the plant, that the first one caught violating the wage and hour law will be fired on the spot, and I don't mean maybe."

That's how a manufacturer in one of the lowest-wage areas of the country feels about 8 months' operation under a wage order.

I think that I have reason to hope that 6 months after you lose your suit that you will feel the same way.

Is It Good Business To Demand Liens for Old-Age Assistance?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS H. CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 3, 1940

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, in the Seventy-fifth Congress, and again in this Congress, I have introduced bills designed dealing with the liens being taken in a few States when old-age assistance is granted. The number of the bill in this Congress is H. R. 8401. It simply provides that when a State receives grants for old-age assistance for the benefit of approved clients, that this payment by the United States will be in lieu of requiring liens from the recipient for the repayment of the assistance granted. A similar bill has been introduced by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ALEXANDER] as H. R. 8857.

The Federal Social Security Act, from its beginning, has provided that if a State did require liens and collected from the estate of the old-age assistance client, that one-half of the proceeds would be returned to the Federal Government. If all States had such a lien, it might work fairly among the States, regardless of the merits of the proposition from the standpoint of the old people. But only 14 States have such a law. The result is that these States, when and if they collect on their liens, will be contributing unequally to the other States. Either all States should take liens or none of them should. In some States it is a question whether the amount collected will compensate for the cost of maintaining a collection agency to say nothing of the multiplied losses in the forced liquidation and probate of estates, where the folks were temporarily hard up and needed a little ready cash at the time they applied for old-age assistance.

I recognize that there are many aspects to the question. Some people argue that the principal value lies in the fact that the law serves to discourage some people from applying for assistance. Naturally folks dislike to place a lien of high and absolute priority against what little frozen assets or lifetime savings they may have. They may prefer to go hungry and skimp along in some fashion or other.

There are some very cogent reasons for looking upon liens with a critical eye. Many of them have been forcefully presented in a recent statement by the Honorable Ernest F. Jacobsen, a Minnesota Republican, and under permission granted by the House, I include some of his remarks at this point:

THE HOMESTEAD LIEN LAW

The homestead lien law is a poor business proposition. It penalizes the aged and their heirs and makes no saving for the State.

It will require another bureau or bureaus to enforce the collection of these liens. That means putting the State into the real-estate business again, as it was when our rural-credits fiasco cost the State so many millions of dollars. It also means that lurking real-estate sharpers who already have their eyes fixed on this will lie in waiting for the opportunity to buy these liens, where they can make a good profit, and thus the political pilferers and not the pioneers are benefited.

There are only 14 States in the Union having such a law. At one time there were 17, but due to defeat, or the danger of defeat, its sponsors could not sustain it, and it was therefore repealed in 3 States—namely, Oregon, Kansas, and Florida.

Economy is meritorious, and all frugal citizens are for that and are interested in keeping down tax costs. The homestead lien law does not meet this test, but does the opposite, because it puts a penalty on thrift and discourages home ownership and will socialize the last thing you would expect to socialize—the American home.

If a renting family obtains $20 per month from the State, they will have to obtain additional help from relief or other sources in order to live properly, as this is obviously inadequate.

However, a home owner obtaining a like amount would have more to maintain himself, as his taxes would not be as high as rent, and he would therefore be able to apply more toward his personal needs, and he would require less supplemental aid from local communities.

Therefore it pays to encourage people to own homes, as in the long run they will require less relief aid than a renter. They also at the same time contribute to the building up of the State.

In the long run, which is smartest—to encourage thrift and home ownership or to encourage more tenancy and larger old-age assistance checks? Homeowners have a stake in good government and in lower taxes and in the community. Homes taken over on liens by the State go off the tax rolls, thus throwing a larger tax burden on the remaining privately owned property.

Remember this, too, it is not a Republican law. The Republican Party, as such, has never gone on record as favoring this kind of war on the aged—this policy of making them vassals of the State.

Aside from the question of the politics that is now being played with these unfortunate pioneers of 65 years or over, and aside from the graft and corruption and new State agencies that will have to be created, if any money is collected, 50 percent of it will have to be returned to the Federal Government for the amount it has contributed—for the Federal Government matches every dollar that the State expends in this relief, up to $20 per month, the Federal maximum—which, when returned to the Federal Government, will, of course, go in great part to the other 34 States having no mandatory lien law. This, in effect, is making the State of Minnesota a collection agency operating against our aged and their heirs for the benefit of people in those 34 States to whom we owe no such duty and whose State policy has been far-sighted and sound enough to not thus persecute them.

England's Parliament passed an old-age pension law in 1908. It entitled every British subject of 70 years of age, who had been a resident of the United Kingdom for 20 years, to a pension if his income was not sufficient to maintain an adequate standard of living. The law did not require the recipient to be a pauper nor did it require a homestead lien.

The amount that many of our aged receive today is inadequate for their needs. The average given for the month of March in the State of Minnesota was $20.84—and this, though the Federal Government will match every State dollar up to a total pension of $40 per month.

Neither do these aged fare as well as the veriest indigent stranger who comes into our State, under the so-called adequate relief budget, which is far in excess of that allowed to our pioneer aged, who toiled and sacrificed many years to make this a great State.

A citizen's committee made a survey of public relief in Minneapolis 1 year ago. The report of this committee shows that more than 1,400 direct relief cases cover individuals and families that have been citizens of Minneapolis less than 5 years. Approximately 800 cases represent persons that moved into Minneapolis from towns, villages, and cities in our State and the balance came from almost every State in the country.

This group of relief clients have been provided with a much greater relief allowance than have the old settlers of our State. There is no law requiring these people to mortgage what property they may have or will acquire, nor are they required to reimburse the Government from future incomes or earnings.

The present social-security law does not and will not afford security for the old-age-assistance group. The allowances now given is not adequate and falls below the budget allowance provided for direct-relief clients.

A Good Substitute for Conscription—House Adopts My Suggestion for Home Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN G. ALEXANDER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 3, 1940

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following as a memorial to the late Senator ERNEST LUNDEEN, as suggested in my earlier remarks today.

The ideas expressed in my open letter to the President of June 21 have now been adopted and approved by the highest naval and military authorities of the House of Representatives and given the unanimous endorsement of the Naval Affairs Committee, and finally by both the House and the Senate of the United States. Read the following colloquy which took place in the House on August 30, and then read my letter to the President, written 71 days previously. I quote from pages 11306–11307 of the RECORD:.

NAVAL RESERVE TRAINING CORPS

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 4272) to amend the act approved March 4, 1925, entitled "An act providing for sundry matters affecting the naval service, and for other purposes," and ask for immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, has the bill the unanimous support of the committee?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I may state to the gentleman from Michigan that the bill has the unanimous endorsement of the Naval Affairs Committee and has been reported to the House by direction of the Naval Affairs Committee, by the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE], a member of the committee.

It is a bill which permits the Navy Department to expand in the various colleges the Naval Reserve Training Corps. Under the law today, 11 universities have 2,400 students composing what is ordinarily referred to as the Naval R. O. T. C. This bill provides for the extension of this corps to include 7,200 students.

The money was made available in the Senate yesterday and there are some 16 more universities which will be permitted to have students in the Naval R. O. T. C.

These 13 universities that have made application are as follows: Holy Cross, Western, Brown, Temple, University of Pennsylvania, University of Virginia, Washington and Jefferson, Duke University, North Carolina State, University of Houston, University of Texas, Texas A. and M., and Carnegie.

Mr. MICHENER. That does not include Wayne University?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. That university has the right to make application. These are 13 universities only and 4,800 students will permit approximately 16 more universities to establish a Naval R. O. T. C. These universities have not been designated. They are merely applying to be designated just as soon as the Congress passes the authorization act to make it 7,200 instead of 2,400.

Mr. MICHENER. Then the determination has not yet been made?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The determination has not yet been made. It is up to the various universities throughout the country to qualify under the method now established by the Navy Department.

Mr. HINSHAW. I may say that I received word that the University of Southern California has also applied.

Mr. RICH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. Does not the gentleman believe that this is the best and cheapest way that we can train young men for the service of our country, and that we had better give these universities the opportunity to train these young men not only in the Navy but in the Army?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The gentleman is absolutely correct, and I call the attention of the Members of the House to the fact that there will be presented to the House in a few days a bill to commission the 2,400 boys who have already entered the R. O. T. C. and who have qualified after 4 years' training. This bill will give them a commission in the line of the Navy and in the Marine Corps instead of taking all of our officers in the Navy from the Naval Academy. It will help the Navy get the viewpoint of students in the line of the Navy, and it will enable the students to get the viewpoint of the Naval Academy.

HIGH RANKING MEMBER ON MILITARY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE ALSO ENDORSES IDEA

Mr. THOMASON. Does not the gentleman think that also ought to be extended to the Army R. O. T. C., because we have right now about 200 applications pending for R. O. T. C units, and not only that, but under the Reserve Officers Act there are also a few thousand young Reserve officers who are well qualified in the same way as the naval officers?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. What the gentleman says is correct, but my committee can only deal with naval matters. The Committee on Military Affairs, of which the gentleman from Texas is a distinguished member, should take that up.

Mr. THOMASON. What assurance has the gentleman that he will get the appropriation?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. It was put in the bill yesterday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON]?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

"*Be it enacted, etc.*, That section 22 of the act approved March 4, 1925, entitled 'An act providing for sundry matters affecting the naval service, and for other purposes' (43 Stat. 1276; U. S. C., title 34, sec. 821), as amended by the act approved August 6, 1927 (50 Stat. 563; U. S. C., supp. V, title 34, sec. 821), is hereby further amended by deleting the words 'twenty-four hundred' in the last line of the section, and by inserting in lieu thereof the words 'seventy-two hundred.'"

With the following committee amendment:

"Page 1, line 7, strike out '1927' and insert '1937.'"

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Now read my open letter to the President of the United States:

JUNE 21, 1940.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Why, if you feel it necessary to train the youth of America, do you not use the available local facilities first? It looks to me, and a lot of other people back home, as though your idea of compulsory military training would be a lot more practical and sensible, and a lot more American, as well as much less expensive, if you would start by using our facilities in each home community first.

As you know, many schools are standing by, waiting and anxious to institute R. O. T. C. units, but they are receiving no encouragement either from you or from the War and Navy Department.

In my own district our city vocational schools are waiting word from you to train 1,500 additional aviation and auto mechanics, electricians, machinists, blacksmiths, radio mechanics, cooks, etc.

One school alone, De LaSalle High School, has upward of 1,000 boys enrolled, and they have asked and are pleading for a Junior Naval or Army R. O. T. C. unit. Furthermore, the idea is supported by Archbishop John Gregory Murray, of St. Paul. Still a deaf ear is turned to their request here.

We have many other facilities locally, in the institutions of higher learning, in camps, and activities now set up and operating, so why look further, or why go to such radical extremes as proposed, until we have promoted the full utilization of our present local opportunities?

Reading my telegrams and mail, it is evident that sentiment is almost unanimously opposed at this time to compulsory military training and to the youth camps you have suggested.

Why take our youth from their homes and out of the wholesome environment in which most of them are living, and transplant them into the lonely, inhospitable, disturbing, and discouraging arena of a training camp? Their mental, moral, and physical well-being is too important to be disregarded in that way. We should keep our youth in their homes, and in their home communities just as long and just as far as possible, and this suggestion I make herein is in keeping with that idea and is a practical movement which will aid our need for preparedness and national defense, but at the same time be conservative of the best values of the Nation.

Mr. President: We want no foreign war, we want none of our American boys to fight in foreign lands or seas, we want only to prepare to protect and defend our own shores and border, and the ideas I have suggested are the ones best suited to attain that end.

Most sincerely yours,

JOHN G. ALEXANDER, M. C.

During the past several weeks I have been deluged with letters and telegrams asking how I stood on the Burke-Wadsworth conscription bill. In 95 percent of these communications the writers have urged me to take a firm stand against this bill. Because of the intense feeling aroused over the entire Nation by this contemplated legislation and knowing the widespread opposition of the people of the Third District of Minnesota to such a bill, I feel it my duty to state my position clearly and definitely on the matter.

Many sincere opponents are in this fight against the draft; in fact, opposition to conscription seems to be one thing upon which churches of almost every denomination agree. The clergy of the Catholic Church in every State in the Union have expressed their opposition to the bill. The Methodist Church, of which there are some 8,000,000 members, is vigorously fighting against passage of said bill. Bishop William A. Lawrence, speaking for the Federal Council of Churches in America, is strongly opposing this legislation.

Outside the church groups the Farmers' Union in a great number of States has registered opposition, as well as the railroad brotherhoods.

Also, this opposition to conscription is about the only thing John L. Lewis, of the C. I. O., and William Green, of the A. F. L., have agreed upon for months.

I feel that the size of our Army, Navy, and Air Corps should be increased to insure adequate defense in case of invasion by a foreign power, but increase these branches of the service by raising the pay for such service and cut the enlistment period to 1 year. Hold out some inducement and encourage voluntary enlistment. With the millions of young men unemployed, there should be no necessity for a draft, and there would not be if the Government would pay a decent wage and cut the enlistment period as suggested above.

On the other hand, what is going to happen to the young man of draft age who is now steadily engaged in private employment? Let us say he is earning $150 per month. Let us suppose this conscription bill becomes a law. This young man is required to report to some Army camp, where he will have to remain for the period of 1 year, and for this service to his country he will receive the salary of $21 or perhaps $30 per month. What about his employer? He loses the services of this particular young man and is forced to employ someone else to take his place. This new employee must be trained into the business, and when the year expires he is really familiar with the functions of his job. Now, the question arises, Will the employer rehire the young man who has just returned from his year's training with the Army, Navy, or Air Corps? That all depends on circumstances. Perhaps the employer is satisfied with the new man and does not want to discharge him to make room for the former employee. Or perhaps he will offer the returning trainee a job with less pay than he was receiving when he left for military training. All in all, a grave injustice and hardship results in such a case. This is just one instance of what might take place if the conscription bill is passed by Congress, and there is no provision in said law guaranteeing a trainee his job back after his year's training expires.

A conscription army might be used for purposes other than intended if controlled by irresponsible Government leaders. It might be used to interfere in labor trouble, and it might also be used as a threat to some of our South American neighbors in the event of trade wars.

The great danger is that a huge peacetime conscription army is the first step toward dictatorship.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the following letter from Paul Hanchett, which logically and clearly states the viewpoint of many citizens of my district and

which is also in keeping with the ideas I have repeatedly expressed on this subject.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., *August 28, 1940.*

Congressman JOHN G. ALEXANDER,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Please advise me at your earliest convenience about the following matters:

1. What your vote on the conscription bill will probably be.
2. How you believe the rest of the Minnesota Representatives will vote.
3. What chance there is that the present bill may be voted down.

I am strongly opposed to any peacetime conscription of our young men for the following reasons:

1. Conscription is not an important step in the improvement of our defenses (our greatest needs are for naval, aeronautical, and antiaircraft preparations).
2. Conscription is not a necessary step—for the voluntary system has far exceeded all expectations and Army quotas to date.
3. Conscription is not the best or even proper method of meeting our Army needs—we need a relatively small (perhaps 600,000) and permanent professional army serving at a rate of pay which will be attractive to capable young men.
4. Conscription will be grossly unfair to certain groups of our population—it calls on our young men for more than is being asked of the rest of our people; it asks of the young man with a good job more than of the unemployed or of those lucky enough to be exempt.
5. Conscription is a threat to our democratic way of life and to our civil liberties.
6. Conscription is not an insurance against war, but it invites our President to become aggressive and actually, perhaps, to start a war.

Please note that I do not say that we do not need adequate measures for defense, but am merely saying that conscription is not a desirable, efficient, or expedient means to defense. I strongly favor immediate air, naval, and antiaircraft preparations, both in the way of manpower and equipment.

I do not ask you to either think or vote in accordance with my wishes, but urge you to think carefully about these matters and then throw your influence toward that side which you believe to be the best one for our country as a whole. However, so that you may know definitely where I, as one of your many constituents, stand, I list the following suggested goals of legislative policy:

1. Absolute opposition to any peacetime conscription proposal.
2. Support for any amendments to include a wider age grouping. (If we must have conscription, the larger the age group included the more equitable the measure will be and the easier it will be to raise the required number of able men.)
3. Support for any amendments to include the conscription of wealth or industry. (If we have to confiscate the time and abilities of our young men, it is only fair to similarly call on our businessmen for their help, too.)

This business of conscription during a time of peace is a very serious matter. I invite your early answer to the questions which I have raised above and your most conscientious efforts during the debate and voting upon the bill.

Yours most cordially,

PAUL HANCHETT.

Taxpayers on the Warpath

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD KNUTSON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 3, 1940

ARTICLE FROM THE AMERICAN MAGAZINE

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the current issue of the American magazine:

[From the American magazine of October 1940]

TAXPAYERS ON THE WARPATH

(By S. F. Porter)

Billions for defense, but not one cent for official inefficiency or political extravagance.

That is the rallying cry of alert citizens over the country who are banding together in a swelling army to demand the slashing of every needless item from our enormous tax burden, to fight wasteful spending, and to put an end to expensive duplication in Federal, State, and local governments.

Every week adds new units to this army of more than 1,200 militant taxpayer organizations, whose members are determined to clear the Nation's decks for defense by protecting the sources of revenue needed for airplanes, tanks, and warships.

I have just traveled over the United States to survey this spontaneous, Nation-wide movement. I talked with housewives and businessmen, with tax experts, stenographers, and statisticians. And I found that, almost to a man, Americans are ready to make large sacrifices to speed up our national-defense program. They are prepared to pay their share of the new defense taxes. But they are equally determined that national defense shall not be jeopardized by a staggering weight of wastefulness.

Scarcely one of them grumbled about paying to defend our shores. But nearly everyone protested against tax money being frittered away by self-seeking politicians despite the national emergency.

The growing burden of taxes is one of the gravest problems confronting the next administration—Democratic or Republican. As I write, Congress has already appropriated $5,000,000,000 for defense, and experts agree that this figure will be more than doubled before we are adequately armed. To finance these huge expenditures, every executive, wage earner, pensioner, and high-school student across the Nation will pay new taxes, direct or hidden.

Yet in 1939, long before we started spending billions for defense, fully one-fifth of our national income went back to our governments in the form of taxes. In 1939 we paid $13,800,000,000 in taxes, almost 70 percent more than in 1932. Of this, $5,500,000,000 went to the Federal Government; $3,900,000,000 went to the 48 State governments; and $4,400,000,000 to the cities, towns, and counties.

These are startling figures, and the taxpayers I talked with are out to cut them down drastically, particularly those for State and local governments. When Germany entered the war, Hitler ordered all his provincial governments to reduce their expenditures by a specific percentage. That is the totalitarian method of assuring funds for a gigantic armament program. But America's taxpayer groups believe that the democratic way is to eliminate needless expenses by exerting the influence of the ballot, publicity, and eternal vigilance.

L. Richard Guylay, executive director of the New York State public expenditure survey, recently set the keynote for 1940's drive for economy in nonessentials:

"Battleships or 'boondoggle.' Airplanes or new post offices. What shall it be? We can't have both unless we sap the strength of our total economy. Shall we spend a million on antiaircraft guns—or on new buildings to house and flatter our mushrooming economy?"

In every section of the United States taxpayer groups are proving their ability to force the politicians to trim their sails. Not long ago, I was standing in the railway station at Albany, N. Y., when more than 6,000 New Yorkers descended upon the State capital to impress upon their legislators the meaning of a cent to a man who earns $15 a week. I watched 2,500 men and women tumble out of a 13-car train, watched leaders of 800 local organizations round up their members and pass out instructions. Hundreds carrying banners: "Make tax victims tax victors." "High taxes and disaster are twin devils." * * * More in colorful, elaborate uniforms. * * * More waving American flags. * * * Women in mink coats talking to girls dressed as waitresses. * * * New York Stock Exchange representatives joining ranks with members of the restaurant workers' union.

They marched through the streets, shouting, arguing, about one thing: New York State's proposed $396,700,000 budget. They filled every seat in a vast auditorium, fought for a chance to get to their feet and denounce the budget. They kept their legislators in session 13 hours—the longest public hearing and the greatest antitax demonstration in the State's history.

Since then I have heard housewives speak learnedly about the fundamentals of taxpayers' organizations. I have listened to businessmen discuss for hours the cost of fence posts, to determine where a little saving might be made. And I am convinced that we Americans at last are thoroughly aroused about a system that endangers our vital defense plans by forcing us to pay taxes to 161,144 overlapping political units laid out in the oxcart days of this Nation.

The revolt is being led by men who in some States are forced to pay taxes to as many as 10 separate government units. It's drawing in residents of Illinois, where there are 15,100 tax-levying counties, municipalities, and townships; residents of New York, where there are 10,191 of these units; of Minnesota, where there are 10,409; of Pennsylvania, where there are 5,586.

It is attracting tens of thousands of housewives and businesswomen who question where relief money is going today. It's attracting the wage earner whose union tells him that "hidden" taxes have been taking $1 out of every $4 he spends on goods, as compared with only $1 out of every $15.50 spent in 1913. And it's being backed by property owners and by industrialists, who fear that unless they fight they'll be paying more and more needless taxes every year.

In Massachusetts thousands of citizens, banded into a federation of taxpayers, are fighting local and State graft with spectacular success. The New England council started the movement in the depth of depression by sponsoring local taxpayers' groups. Tax associations were formed by small cliques of resentful citizens, spurred on by two men, Norman MacDonald, a former newspaperman, and Reginald W. Bird, retired business executive.

They studied budgets, uncovered amazing proofs of mismanagement, then began publicizing facts that the average person could understand * * * about public officials who turned in expense

accounts asking $1 for a one-block taxi ride, who bought waste-baskets at a cost of $10 a basket * * * about a man on the Massachusetts pay roll whose sole job was teaching housewives how to fry fish! * * * about an employee who was receiving $4,500 a year from the State to publish verses in praise of the division of marine fisheries. The local associations printed pamphlets disclosing astounding budget shortages in local communities, debts no one even tried to collect.

The publicity worked. When the 1936 election returns were counted, 17 out of 19 legislators whose records showed they stood for extravagance had been defeated. Just facts defeated them, facts reduced to the simplicity of the New England family.

Today there are 200 taxpayers' associations in the State federation. They hold mass meetings to which entire communities are invited. Active and militant, they have helped block State extravagances totaling $125,000,000, have initiated administrative improvements, better budgets, cut the municipal debt of Massachusetts from a 1931 peak of $316,000,000 to $287,000,000.

In Nebraska, Tax-buster Frank G. Arnold is leading a fight against prodigality that is arousing taxpayers' organizations. He, also, started in the depression—in Fullerton, Nebr., population 1,600. Head of a small taxpayers' organization, he advanced a plan so simple that it astounded the citizens. He just wanted to find out whether one community's expenses were reasonable in comparison with those of neighboring municipalities.

He discovered, among other things, that in one community bond paper cost twice as much as in the next; in one county Nebraskans had paid for a bridge that had never been built; in another an employee of the highway department, whose sole activity was to run a small car, bought, one day, 13 gallons of gas, 4 gallons of gas, 5 gallons of gas; another day, 5, 10, and 9 gallons; another, 15½, 6¾, and 10 gallons.

He concentrated on the small extravagances, listed misspent items ranging from $5 to $100—figures that any taxpayer could comprehend.

The Nebraska Federation of County Taxpayers' Leagues elected Arnold president, and he went to work. Thousands of citizens are now turning out for meetings to discuss prices of gravel, of sewage pipes, and paper clips. Nebraska hasn't levied any new taxes for years. It operates with a balanced budget; has no cigarette, no sales, service, chain store, or income taxes; no bonded indebtedness.

Arnold's group has cut $38,000,000 from county, city, town, and district bond issues in the last decade, has saved the State $140,000,000 in general tax levies.

Every month more tax organizations are being formed—in Ohio, in California, in North Dakota, in Kentucky. In addition to local groups organized mostly to fight real-estate taxes, there are 20 State groups, organized to fight State income and sales taxes, and national groups, concentrating on the Federal Government's tax structure. All have the same objective—to find out where the citizens' money goes, and to correct abuses that threaten national security.

In Watertown, Mass., the tax league found that the community was supporting 25 purchasing agents where only one was needed; that it was buying $1,000 worth of hardware every month from a store that charged 15 to 66 percent in excess of prices quoted by another dealer on staples; that a "fine fellow" was getting oil contracts at top prices. In Columbus, Ohio, an aroused group of taxpayers found that while their tax rates were soaring, State budget items were being based simply on amounts budgeted in previous years, not on amounts actually spent.

Fort Wayne, Ind., is the scene of one of the most significant upheavals. The revolt goes back to 1933, when the county tried to put through a tax-rate increase from $2.25 to $3.19. Hundreds of citizens who had previously paid no attention to taxes became vitally interested; housewives, businessmen, students invaded public hearings of the Allen County Tax Adjustment Board—Fort Wayne is the county seat of Allen County—to discover the reason for the sharp increase.

Crowded into a large assembly room, they listened to department heads who didn't know even their own budgets, heard board members feebly attempt to analyze various expenditures. When one department head asked $6,000 for gasoline requirements, not aware that in the preceding year his gasoline costs had been only $3,329, the board meeting degenerated into a verbal free-for-all, into disorder, booing, catcalls.

And so the Taxpayers Research Association of Fort Wayne was created. Within a year more than 700,000 items of expenditures were tabulated. When the board met again, the taxpayers had detailed records of governmental expenditures, were able to talk authoritatively, accurately. The people of the Hoosier State today know why State taxes go up and down.

The greatest value of the association is "to keep public officials on their toes, so they will watch their expenditures." Its survey showed no evidence of dishonesty in Fort Wayne, but it did uncover some ridiculously high expenditures. A county farm, for instance, equipped with an $8,000 pigpen, built of glazed bricks costing $180 a thousand.

Today Fort Wayne, with a population of 125,000, has next to the lowest bonded indebtedness of any city of its size. At the same time it has one of the finest park systems in the country, and considerably better-than-average municipal services and government.

In some States the movement is just getting under way. In Ohio, for instance, the tax revolt to stop waste, to eliminate graft, to reduce expenses only began late last year. The Citizens Tax League of Ohio is now holding meetings, calling on residents from all parts of the State to form "a bulwark against the demands of patronage and selfish lobbyists." It's campaigning for members with the slogan, "What are you doing about taxes—sitting back or striking back?" It's obtaining its money from the dollar bills paid by sustaining members, while accepting citizens as nonpaying associate members.

The same thing is happening in Kentucky, where a tax-reduction association is now being organized from Ashland to Paducah, intent on finding out the facts about the assessment and collection of taxes and the expenditure of public funds.

Tax revolts may start in a dozen ways. Some are spontaneous movements, such as the uprising of the "taxcentinels" against hidden taxes, engineered by students of Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, in Troy, N. Y.

Using their own and student union funds, 14 students spent a week end touring the city's banks and stores, collecting pennies in exchange for all types of money. The result was a corner on the penny market; the students owned some 250,000 of the coins.

Then, the "taxcentinels" announced their slogan: "We put the ax to the hidden tax with the accent on the cent." For every dollar's worth of purchases, members vowed to pay 25 cents in pennies—"representing the average hidden taxes involved in the manufacture and sale of any commodity."

Their object was to impress upon the average person the full amount of money he lost each day in buried taxes, and they succeeded so well that "taxcentinel" clubs were established in other communities, by other colleges and universities.

Some are revolts against basic tax philosophies, such as the growing antagonism to interstate tax barriers. Restrictions and duties enacted by States to develop or protect native industries are often so great that there is as much red-tape in passing many interstate lines in the United States as there is in passing a European frontier. The movement against these barriers is in its infancy, but is gaining headway fast.

Some are big-business campaigns, like the one waged by the Consolidated Edison Co. of New York, the city's biggest taxpayer. It has been using advertising as a weapon, to inform the public that it paid more than $1,000,000 a week in taxes in 1939; that it gave the city enough money to run its police department 6 months, to run its fire department 10½ months, to support parks and museums nearly 2½ years.

Some are "individual" tax revolts, such as that carried on by Maxwell M. Nowak, Chicago businessman, who liquidated his 35-year-old $1,500,000 livestock business with the statement, "I am quitting business because I am sick and tired of taxes." Or by Harry Lang, Evansville, Ind., factory man, who wrote a letter to President Roosevelt announcing that whoever would pay him in salary for 5 years what his business cost him in taxes could have his business free.

Wherever citizens are fighting, they are getting results. In Westchester County, N. Y., the Taxpayers' League of Larchmont and Mamaroneck last year forestalled a 22-percent increase in the county's taxes and actually had the budget reduced by $1,000,000. By a single move, an association consisting of aroused businessmen and housewives saved the residents of Westchester County $5,000,000. In South Bend, Ind., a taxpayers' group has slashed taxes 38 percent in 6 years.

You can't ignore a movement that is gaining strength against political power and public apathy, that is attracting tens of thousands from every State, from all classes. It's a revolt of the masses. Yet it's not anti New Deal, anti-Democrat, or anti-Republican. It's no anti-anything—except needless taxation at a time when every available penny is needed for an armament program that will mean security for American citizens.

Are Holding Companies Exempt From Excess-Profits Tax?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 3, 1940

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, when the omnibus amortization, profits-limitation repeal, and excess-profits tax bill was passed by the House under a drastic "gag" rule last week, I said that I believed it was absolutely wrong to pass so important a bill under circumstances like that.

I now find, on more careful study of the bill, than it was possible to give in the few hours that elapsed between the time of its printing and its passage, that apparently holding companies are wholly exempt from any excess-profits-tax payments whatsoever. The bill provides that in determining excess-profits net income a credit equal to the full amount of any dividends received shall be allowed.

The National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE B. BATES
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 3, 1940

RESOLUTION OF BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF MASON COUNTY (KY.) FARM BUREAU

Mr. BATES of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution of the Board of Directors of the Mason County (Ky.) Farm Bureau:

We, the board of directors of the Mason County Farm Bureau, wish to go on record as follows:

We believe that all available destroyers and other material aid should be sent to England at once, not next month or next year.

We are unqualified for the selective draft being put into effect at once.

We feel that any American manufacturer who will not willingly cooperate with the rearmament program should be forced to do so.

We favor immediate steps toward a motor road and a railroad through Canada to Alaska.

We believe it would be better to buy air and naval bases, if possible, instead of leasing them.

We are convinced it is foolish to permit foreign consulates to maintain excessive staffs manifestly kept up for purposes of espionage and propaganda. We suggest that the size of such consulate staffs be regulated by law.

This is a democratic country, based on free speech and free assemblage, but we feel that any government that tolerates alien agencies seeking to undermine it is worse than foolish. We feel that such activities should be suppressed at once.

We heartily commend the recent agreement with Canada and the Habanna agreement.

We feel that Congress is moving entirely too slowly in matters of national defense and that they should put their country ahead of their politics.

Unanimously approved by the board of directors of the Mason County Farm Bureau, August 28, 1940.

Exchange of Destroyers for Naval and Air Bases for National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SOL BLOOM
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 4, 1940

EDITORIALS FROM THE NEW YORK TIMES, NEW YORK HERALD TRIBUNE, AND THE WASHINGTON POST

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein the following editorials which appeared in today's issues of the New York Times, the New York Herald Tribune, and the Washington Post. All of these editorials are on the subject of the transfer of destroyers to Great Britain in exchange for air and naval bases in this hemisphere for national-defense purposes.

[From the New York Times of September 4, 1940]

DEFENSE OF THE ATLANTIC WORLD

President Roosevelt is right in describing as "epochal" the agreement announced yesterday between Great Britain and the United States. It is epochal in the sense that it marks the recognition by these two powers of a community of interest in the defense of the North Atlantic world. A way of life has grown up on the eastern and western shores of that ocean which the British people and the American people believe to be the only way of life worth living. Through the action of their Governments, they now place at the disposal of one another instruments of which each has special need in the defense of the Atlantic world against aggression.

The two halves of the agreement fit together logically. At this moment, the most pressing of all British needs is for destroyers which can be used in the narrow waters of the English Channel to repel invasion and in the Mediterranean to safeguard the lifeline of the British Empire. Britain now obtains 50 such ships—over-age, to be sure, but nevertheless in good fighting trim, and sufficient in number almost to double the squadrons of destroyers which the British Navy has been able to maintain in service recently in waters around the British Isles. On our side, it has long been recognized that the effective use of American sea power and air power for the defense of this continent is largely dependent on the possession of bases at a sufficient distance from our shores to enable us to strike at a potential enemy before he reaches our own coast and prevent him from establishing his own bases of operation on our side of the Atlantic.

The leases we have now obtained do not instantly and automatically give us additional protection. We shall first have to turn these leases into harbors, fortifications, shipyards, and air fields. But given enough time—and destroyers we have turned over to the British will themselves be operating in the channel to win us additional time—the leases can be used to strengthen our defenses greatly, and particularly to make a vital link in those defenses, the Panama Canal, all but impregnable.

During recent weeks, when reports from Washington have forecast an exchange of destroyers for bases, three chief objections have been made to such an agreement as has now been reached. In the first place, fear has been expressed that American destroyers sold or traded to Britain might eventually fall into German hands and in turn be used against the United States itself. On this point we now have the formal assurance of the British Government that its "settled policy" will be "never to surrender or sink the British Fleet" in the face of any attack that Germany may launch against the British Isles.

In the second place, fault has been found with the method of this agreement; that is, with the decision of the President to proceed entirely on his own initiative, to leave Congress out of consideration, and to confront Congress with a bargain already signed and sealed. Without going into the disputed question of the President's authority under existing law, it must be said that the present agreement would be even more desirable if it had the formal stamp of congressional approval on it. Perhaps the President, knowing the pressing nature of Britain's need of destroyers, feared the delay of a congressional debate which might have run a month. But it must be remembered that the British request for destroyers was made early in June—our own dispatches reported such a request under date of June 11—and in the period of nearly 3 months which has passed since then there was ample time for Congress to debate the whole matter, had the President chosen to ask Congress for its cooperation and had the President not chosen to give the impression that there was no connection between bases and destroyers.

Finally, concern has been expressed that the conclusion of such an agreement as this—either on Presidential authority or with the approval of Congress—would be interpreted by Hitler as an act of war. We do not fear this result. Hitler chooses his enemies regardless of whether or not they have given him the slightest provocation. But we do believe that this is a step in the direction of more active participation with Great Britain in the defense of a common stake in the Atlantic, and we think that in all frankness it must be recognized as such, both for the risks it holds and the advantages it offers.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of September 4, 1940]

THE AGREEMENT WITH ENGLAND

The two goals that President Roosevelt has achieved and announced together are in themselves wholly admirable and long overdue. It is greatly to be hoped that regret over his uniting them in one sensational bargain will not blind the country to the vital national importance of the agreement as to bases and the high desirability of the sale of the destroyers.

There is no logical relationship between the two projects. The latter is merely an extension of the broad endeavor of this country to aid the allies through the sale of war material. The former belongs in a far different category. Every military expert has been urging the acquisition of bases in the Atlantic for months. We are confident that Congress and the Nation would have welcomed such purchases much sooner and approved them in such fashion as to avoid any possibility of criticism on constitutional grounds.

But the President has now, belatedly and dramatically, accomplished these two ends as parts of one bargain. Moreover, he has persuaded his Attorney General to submit an opinion sustaining the legality of both items. We could never sympathize with Mr. Jackson's doubts as to the sale of the destroyers, and we are glad that he has resolved them in favor of the Executive.

There is no question about the urgency of the menace which Nazi Germany and her associates present to this country—or Congress would not be voting money by the tens of billions and marshaling all other national energies to repel it. There is no question about the critical importance of developed offshore bases in any scheme of defense, no matter how many billions are voted. And there is no question whatever about the indissoluble link which now binds the United States to the fate of the British Isles and the Royal Navy.

There is no doubt that if Britain stands much of our vast military effort can be abandoned, but that if Britain should go down the chances of successfully defending this continent or this country, whatever our efforts, would be halved or quartered overnight. Not the least impressive and valuable aspect of the agreement is the accompanying pledge from Mr. Churchill "never to surrender

or sink the British Fleet," doubly underlining the importance to the United States that Britain as a whole should survive.

The "isolationist" minority in Congress and outside of it will be heard, no doubt, in vociferous protest; it ought to be heard, and every argument it may advance deserves consideration. But it seems to us unthinkable that a comparatively small minority should be able to paralyze vital action by the methods of filibuster, division, and obstruction. The element of suddenness, drama, and Presidential dictation in the move is certain to arouse misgivings. But criticism of the manner of the achievement should not cause defeat of the solid gains achieved.

For the world has reached a point at which action is imperative to preserve the peace of the United States. These steps will not and cannot "put the country in the war." They are rather a kind of last chance for maintaining it at peace. It is incredible that the Nazis should respond with a declaration of war, thus in a hundred ways aggravating their difficulties while obtaining virtually no advantage they do not now have. But it is not incredible that this agreement, coming just at this moment when German prestige is already shaken by the delay in the attack on Britain, and lending in the 50 destroyers a very real material contribution to British victory, will so far tip the scales that a tolerable solution in Europe may yet be won and the United States spared the choice which Hitler has presented to every power he has confronted between surrender and the destruction of a great war.

[From the Washington Post of September 4, 1940]

BASES FOR DESTROYERS

In return for 50 over-age destroyers which Great Britain sorely needs at this time, the United States has secured the right to establish a chain of naval and air bases in British colonial areas in North America.

The transaction is rightly described by President Roosevelt as an "epochal and far-reaching act of preparation for continental defense in the face of great danger." Mr. Roosevelt regards it as "the most important action in the reinforcement of our national defense that has been taken since the Louisiana Purchase." He seems to forget the Panama Canal. But that does not minimize the significance of the step that has been taken.

The magnitude of the international emergency confronting this Nation and this hemisphere requires no elaboration at this time. It can be gaged by the vast and unprecedented sums which Congress has appropriated for the rapid building up of our armed forces. It is implicit in the circumstance that the United States is about to embark on a program of compulsory military service. It is the driving force behind increasing demands for speed and yet more speed in developing our armament industries.

Not since the days of Jefferson, Madison, and Monroe has the United States faced greater peril outside our own borders. Now, as during the period of the Napoleonic Wars and the Holy Alliance, the situation calls for bold and courageous action. It is to President Roosevelt's credit that he has seen fit to take such action. Attorney General Jackson's opinion is not likely to be accepted as the final word on the technical legality of the transaction, but the results will doubtless win the approval of the great majority of Americans.

The desirability of the naval and air bases which the United States is now in a position to build on British soil in this hemisphere is beyond dispute. The prospective sites extend all the way from Newfoundland to British Guiana. When developed they will serve as an additional protective barrier for the Panama Canal. They will be of incalculable value in the defense of the entire Western Hemisphere.

A ring of protective bases in the Atlantic will make the invasion of North America by a European aggressor more difficult and far more costly than would otherwise be the case. Through their possession the range and effectiveness of the United States Fleet and air force will very greatly be increased. That fact is of particular importance to the Nation at a time when the contemplated additions to the Navy are still largely in the blueprint stage.

The transfer to Great Britain of 50 over-age destroyers is a small price to pay for the advantages we gain from this transaction. Nor can it be forgotten that to the extent that these destroyers enable Great Britain to continue the war and thus possibly avert a Nazi victory; their transfer serves our national interest. Looking at the transaction in its entirety, our defenses, as well as those of Great Britain, have been very substantially strengthened.

There is the risk, of course, that Hitler may regard the transfer of the obsolescent destroyers to Great Britain as a hostile act by the United States. But as long as Great Britain remains in the field that risk is small.

On the other hand, if Great Britain goes down, the peril to the United States and the entire Western Hemisphere will enormously increase. But even in that event this country now has the solemn and twice-repeated assurances of Premier Churchill that the "British Fleet would in no event be surrendered or sunk but would be sent overseas for the defense of other parts of the Empire."

Great emergencies call for courageous action. In the present emergency the two great English-speaking democracies, one fighting for its very existence, the other girding its loins for the defense of a hemisphere, have shown that they possess the requisite vigor, foresight, and determination to act boldly and promptly.

An Open Letter to Hon. James A. Farley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN L. SWEENEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 4, 1940

LETTER WRITTEN BY JOHN O'CONNOR, OF NEW YORK, FORMER CHAIRMAN OF THE RULES COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an open letter to Hon. James A. Farley from John O'Connor, of New York, former chairman of the Rules Committee of the House of Representatives. Mr. O'Connor's letter expresses my sentiments and, I am sure, the sentiments of thousands of friends and admirers of Jim Farley. During his entire service to the Nation as Postmaster General, James A. Farley measured up to the highest standard ever set by the head of the Post Office Department. As a member of the Committee on the Post Offices and Post Roads of the House of Representatives and in close touch with the personnel of the Post Office Department throughout the Nation, I know that officials and employees of the greatest agency of our Government idolized Postmaster General Farley. Because Jim Farley was humane and on the level with his fellowmen, I often throughout the country, characterized him as the greatest Postmaster General in our history. Under his administration the 40-hour week for employees was secured. Recognition of the legitimate demands of the substitutes was made possible. His official protest stopped the passage of furlough legislation. These and other scores of beneficial laws will remain as monuments to Jim Farley's interest in the welfare of the postal employees. I join with thousands of his friends in saying Godspeed to a noble character. While I differed with James A. Farley politically at times, like John O'Connor, I could not understand why one has to be loyal to anyone who doublecrosses or kicks you without cause. Members of Jim Farley's clan do not ordinarily take it laying down, and if there are any exceptions, it must be those whose forebears came from some part of the "ould sod" remote from the ancestral home of the O'Connors, the Sweeneys, and the Curleys. Get that new book going Jim, and let us have nothing but the truth, the whole truth, so help my party.

The letter follows:

AUGUST 31, 1940.

Hon. JAMES A. FARLEY,
Hotel Biltmore, New York City, N. Y.

DEAR JIM: On this day, when you are retiring from the President's Cabinet, in the high honor and esteem of the American people, permit me to congratulate you on, at last, unloading the tremendous mental burden you have borne for several years. What humiliation you have suffered, only you yourself know. It has been my privilege to personally know some of the causes of the mental turmoil you have been undergoing for years, but in the face of which you have been superbly patient, though suffering keenly.

Your release from this mental travail should permit you to throw back your broad shoulders still further, take several deep breaths and say, "Well, thank God, I'm at last out of there. I should have walked out years ago."

Let's go back about 10 years, to the time when you got into this annoying situation. You were Secretary of the New York State Democratic Committee, and the Honorable M. William Bray, later Lieutenant Governor of New York, until purged in 1938 by President Roosevelt, was chairman. Bill Bray had a mind of his own, something Mr. Roosevelt, then Governor, has never been able to tolerate at any time. So Bill had to go. But Bill was a Catholic, and it would not rest well politically if he were thrown out and some non-Catholic put in his place. So you were drafted.

The same situation arose when you quit as national chairman. Flynn, boss of the Bronx, was drafted. Not measuring up to your shoe tops as a leader, he filled the politico-ecclesiastical void. As a leader he is about as big as the Bronx River is a river—not to mention the mud.

In 1930 you started out to make Governor Roosevelt President of the United States. You did not have carfare and could not even

afford to take a stenographer on your trips throughout the entire country. Tammany Hall and other Democratic leaders cautioned you to quit, that you were jeopardizing your own political future. But you stuck through it, despite the ridicule and abuse, and at Chicago in 1932 you were successful, in spite of the opposition of Tammany Hall, Hague, the Chicago crowd, McNutt, and so forth.

You will recall that then Hague, the Chicago crowd, and so forth, were publicly denouncing Mr. Roosevelt as "unfit to be President" and citing instances during his 4 years as Governor to prove that "he never kept his word" and always "double-crossed his closest friends."

You knew that Hopkins was referring to him as "a crooked politician, nominated on a corkscrew platform." A strange double turnabout is happening right now. Hopkins, the President's closest friend and roomer at the White House, is getting the same treatment you got. Hopkins does not want to leave the Cabinet. He is being pushed out for political expediency. "My friend!"

You knew that Berle was issuing communistic literature against your candidate, working with Knox and Stimson to defeat your idol.

You knew that Nathan Straus, now National Housing Administrator, was at Chicago, stamping his foot to "Stop Roosevelt."

You knew that the selection of JOHN N. GARNER for Vice President was against the wishes of Mr. Roosevelt, because all of us active there were well aware that the Governor had sent Judge Martin T. Manton to Chicago to prevail upon Mr. McAdoo to deliver the California delegation to Mr. Roosevelt in exchange for Mr. McAdoo's nomination as Vice President. And you knew that Judge Manton closed the agreement between California and New York in the same attitude that you were in at the White House on the day Flynn was drafted to succeed you. Patience was finally exhausted.

You recall how for years you had to make an appointment through one of his secretaries—no one of them a Democrat—before you could see the Chief Executive for a few minutes. Browder, Hillman, John L. Lewis, Stern, etc., could walk in unannounced.

You recall the President's New England campaign trip of 1936, on which I accompanied the President at his request, and that Gov. James M. Curley, of Massachusetts, an unsurpassed loyal friend of Mr. Roosevelt at Chicago, was running for United States Senator. You knew that Governor Curley was again being double-crossed by the Roosevelts and that "Jimmie" Roosevelt had called all the Democratic Congressmen to his house in Cambridge to order them to give Curley "the works." You also knew that on the night of Curley's defeat Jimmie said, "Well, we got rid of Curley. The next one we'll get rid of is Farley." Your reply to this was, "Oh, I know that's the way they feel, but I may beat them to it."

Like Caesar, you might well have said "Et tu Brute."

You know, as far back as 1938, when you were a logical candidate for President or Vice President, that day after day the President discussed the availability of candidates for those offices, to a total of about 13, without once mentioning your name. You were bravely amused at it, despite the White House sponsored digs in the Washington Merry-Go-Round that your handicap was that you were a Catholic.

You knew Ernest K. Lindley's newspaper story that the President had deprecated your chances of even being Vice President because you were a Catholic was true. Similar statements had been made to many others, including myself.

You know that the President had also said, "Jim Farley is a great guy, but the trouble with him is he tells the truth." That's what Senator GLASS had in mind when, at Chicago in 1940, he extolled you as "one man who never breaks his word." He could have quoted Pope's epistle to Mr. Addison:

> "Statesman, yet friend to truth! Of soul sincere,
> In action faithful, and in honor clear;
> Who broke no promise, served no private end,
> Who gained no title, and who lost no friend."

In 1938, you astounded me by stating that up to that time you had never been an overnight guest at the White House. If I did not know you as I do, and know you are incapable of stating an untruth, I would not have believed you, after 8 years of your devoted and unparalleled service to your idol. Even members of the Communist Youth Congress have slept there.

In all this, you were inspired by a very beautiful ideal. You expressed it when years ago, you said, "Most any day I may quit Washington, and, before I go, I'll have the satisfaction of telling several people, Hopkins, Ickes, etc., what I think of them, but one thing I'll never do—I'll never break with Frank Roosevelt after all these years."

Beautiful indeed, if it were reciprocated. But everybody knew it wasn't.

You became a candidate for President. You were a logical candidate in 1940. Early in 1939, President Roosevelt told you he would make a public statement that he would not be a candidate for a third term after Congress adjourned in the summer of that year. Everybody knows he did not. Then, he told you he would make the announcement after Congress convened on January 3, 1940. Everybody knows he did not do that either. From that time on you were never afforded the opportunity to discuss the matter with him, "face to face, across the table," until that Sunday at Hyde Park, just before the convention. As to what he told you then is clearly evidenced by your continuing to be a candidate up to and at the convention.

Some day—and soon—you should write another book of your experiences and reminiscences. Your diary will be an unequaled contribution to the literature of politics. Your first book, Behind the Ballots, was illuminative, but you pulled your punches. Your second one might well be titled "Behind the Scenes," now that you are foot-loose and a free man once more, in a land which used to be the home of the free. The public is entitled to know what went on daily "behind the scenes" of national political manipulation, and they are especially entitled to it from you because of the unusual high regard in which you are held throughout the length and breadth of this land, irrespective of creed or party.

I know how proud you are of your own loyalty in the fact of abject disloyalty. Loyalty has been uppermost in your code of life, despite the heartaches it has caused you and your family, and the let-down feeling you have now on going out. Some might say you had an exaggerated sense of loyalty, especially when you were well aware it was unilateral.

You could never bring yourself to say, like Emerson:

> "Goodbye, * * * I'm going home;
> Thou art not my friend; I am not thine."

Nor like Franklin, in his letter to William Strahan:

> "You and I were long friends;
> You are now my enemy, and I am yours."

May this rare and high ideal which you have so long nurtured, in pain, remain with you in your future ventures, and although you and I may differ as to the tongue belying the heart, or the Biblical admonition to "turn the other cheek"—the other fellow never did it—I need not assure you I am

Your affectionate friend,

JOHN O'CONNOR.

James A. Farley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 29, 1940

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, the unique career of James A. Farley is a phenomenon in American politics. This is the career of a man who, rising from the humble activities of a local political leader, reached the supreme pinnacle of political achievement by becoming both the State and national chairman of this body in the United States.

In the entire history of political parties no parallel can be found. The reason is obvious. It requires a different type of mentality to be a successful political leader in one's home town and still another type of mentality is required for political leadership of the State and Nation. James A. Farley was able to do both and to accomplish this miracle.

In addition to being a skilled and consummate statesman, James A. Farley was a successful businessman, and through his own efforts rose to leadership in business as well. The principal fact, however, which will be the outstanding achievement of James A. Farley's life will be his sponsorship of Franklin D. Roosevelt for the Presidency of the United States. It was James A. Farley who discovered the great talents of our President and who was able to carry forth his devotion and energy to the promotion of the election of our President in 1932 and in 1936. Farley and the President became thereafter inseparable companions and formed a team which was unique in history, and which gave the two administrations of our people a particular flavor of its own.

Farley represents the typical American who rises by his own efforts, achieves results by his own devotion to duty, and whose individualism is unmatched by any other people or nationality. It is only in the soil of America that a man of Farley's achievements could flourish and it is only in the soil of this country that a man like Farley can grow.

For generations Farley's achievements will be a tribute to the opportunities of America, and a beacon light to all those who love our traditions and our way of living.

I hope that the time will come when some gifted individual will take the pen into his hands and depict for the education of our young, and as a means of exemplifying the spirit of America, the career of James A. Farley.

James A. Farley is now concluding another milestone in his public career by relinquishing the Postmastership General of the United States. It was a unique career for Mr.

Farley, and he was able to give to this office not only his devotion as a public-spirited citizen, but also, which is more important, the energy of a businessman which was exemplified by his erection of many ornamental and beautiful structures for the post offices throughout the United States. These post offices will be forever a tribute to his ability and achievements. To use the words of a poet, his will be a fame expressed in granite and marble, and will be as imperishable as granite and marble can make it.

It is not only as a Democrat or statesman that James A. Farley has impressed himself upon the people of the United States. He has the love and admiration of every American, be he Democrat, Republican, or whatever political conviction he may follow. As a statesman, as a businessman, as a public official his fame and popularity will be forever enshrined in the hearts of the American people, and whatever his future may hold, he carries with him the best wishes of innumerable friends for his success and good fortune.

Our Army and Its Needs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAURENCE F. ARNOLD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 4, 1940

ARTICLE BY LAURENCE LANE ARNOLD

Mr. ARNOLD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article written by my son, Laurence Lane Arnold, a second lieutenant in the Reserve Corps, and who this year would have entered his senior year in Harvard Law School:

OUR ARMY AND ITS NEEDS

The events of the past few months have turned the minds of all thinking Americans to the state of our own national military preparedness. We have sat by our radios and newspaper racks and heard and read, many of us in amazement, of the quick defeat of France. We have witnessed the overwhelming defeat and collapse of a great French Army which only a year ago was deemed by military authorities the most thoroughly trained and best prepared of the armies of the world. We have seen the British Empire pushed suddenly into a corner from which even now it prepares with all energy to fight its way out. England itself is in great danger of being overrun by an invader, and we expect shortly to witness the some-time predicted Battle of England.

It is not the purpose of this modest article to analyze the causes of this surprising set-back to the nations we have come to regard, whether correctly or not, as our friends. That task is left to those more competent to deal with it; years may pass before the whole truth is known. But it is obvious that in part, at least, the defeat of France, the besieging of England at her own doors, have been due to the inability of the armies of those nations to cope with the new type of warfare that faced them in Norway, in Belgium, and in Flanders. Mechanized units, the panzer divisions, the use of vast numbers of tanks, bombing planes utilized in the attack with much greater effectiveness than the artillery that was formerly relied upon, have all been put together to form a new kind of army that can accomplish feats hitherto deemed impossible. No new weapons these, but a combination of known weapons which when combined with those two necessary military factors, thorough training and efficient use, has proven that the day of offensive combat is not gone. No longer can a nation hide behind defensive works, such as the Maginot line, and think itself safe. The new attack must be met with an attack of equal or greater destructiveness delivered by the same, or preferably better, weapons and machines. The old saying that "the best defense is a good offense" still holds true.

But now what of the United States? For years they have sat contented between the oceans, confident of the protection afforded by water and the British Fleet, which has served for sometime now, whether we realized it or not, as our Atlantic Fleet. Our own Navy has always served us well, and will do so again if called upon. But it is not enough. Without going into naval tactics or the possible movements of portions of our fleet to protect our entire hemisphere from attacks from the east and the west, let me simply reiterate what has been recently pointed out: If the Nazis succeed in defeating England and in gaining control of the ships now under command of the British Admiralty, an aggressive and potentially inimical nation will have not only a battle fleet considerably larger than our own but a shipbuilding capacity six times as great as ours. And then, who will say that the countries of Asia, to our west, will be forever friendly and peaceable toward us?

These are facts that have been pointed out many times of recent weeks. Their enumeration may bore the reader. But they have been repeated here to emphasize our own need of a strong army, equipped to fight almost anywhere in this hemisphere on the shortest possible notice, equipped to arrive at the scene of action quickly and, when there, to strike such a blow that any invading or enemy land force must either retreat from our shores or face annihilation.

Surely this need is present; surely most Americans see it. But have we such an army? It is contended that we have not, and I shall have to speak largely from personal experience as a member of the Officers' Reserve Corps to bear out the point. It is not the authoritative word of a military expert, granted, but the voice of one of the many who may be called to the defense of this country, who has spent some time in preparation for that defense, and who has every desire to see it carried out with the greatest possible effectiveness if the occasion arises.

Congress has recently appropriated sums of money sufficient, it is thought, to get us the latest types of weapons in sufficient numbers to equip in modern fashion a sizable United States Army. The weapons are ordered and will arrive, let us hope, in plenty of time. Certain it is that at present we lack enough of what might be called fundamental weapons. An experience of this summer at Camp Custer, where some of us were engaged in training the Citizens' Military Training Corps, is in point: One each of the new infantry howitzer weapons, the 81-millimeter mortar and the 37-millimeter gun, could not be obtained simply to show the trainees what they looked like; training in the use of these weapons for them was, of course, out of the question. But the need now is for men to be trained in the use of them. The day has passed when a war could be well fought by men who left their peacetime pursuits to pick up a rifle. The War Department, as an example, maintained for some time that 3 years were necessary to train a good infantry private. Now this must be whittled down, obviously, and much has been done to this end by simplifying the close-order drill and its movements, along with the movements into extended order, that is, actual combat formations. But counterbalancing this has come the need of machines of all kinds, and of men thoroughly trained to run them. Then, all this must be coordinated and synchronized; it must run like clockwork, as well as or better than the army of Europe that has lately wrought so much havoc. There must be no hitch when this army of ours goes into action, but to reach this end enough men to form a sizable army must be thoroughly grounded in the fundamentals of each arm (infantry, artillery, etc.), then when the whole thing is put together the wrinkles which will appear (for there have always been unexpected hitches in the operation of the simplest fighting forces), must be ironed out. All this must be accomplished before we actually fight.

Has it been done yet? Obviously not. Our Regular Army consists now of some 275,000. Even that force, incidentally, is underofficered at the present time. The National Guard can be counted on to augment that number considerably, but there we begin to run into units that are undertrained and underequipped. The two together will give us a force of about half a million, puny in numbers compared to the millions that were engaged in Europe last spring, that are ready to fight there now. England, for example, has two and a half million men under arms on the island now, and wonders if they are enough. And after we have added our National Guard we must draw mostly on young men who have had little or no military training at all. All these must be thrown together and made to work smoothly with weapons that have made the military one of the most difficult professions of modern times. And let us not forget that the stakes are high. The independence of our own country is one; but even if that is saved, there are lives to think of. It has been estimated that our A. E. F. of the last war, for all its bravery and energy, lost a third of its casualties because of inadequate training; this, of course, was the fault of no one in particular but due simply to lack of time to prepare.

And what of the officers, who will play an important part in this defense? The War Department must rely to a considerable extent on the Officers' Reserve Corps for these. Now, that corps is composed of men engaged in various civilian occupations, but who have been trained either by college R. O. T. C. units or by four summers' attendance at C. M. T. C. camps. A few members of the corps are veterans of the last war. In all justification, it must be said of them that they give generously of their time. During the winter they spend many nights studying or meeting together to hear a lecture on some military subject. In the summer they spend 2 to 4 weeks at a camp on active duty. Some I have met this summer were engaged during the past year in maneuvers with the Regular Army in South Carolina, Georgia, and Louisiana. One whom I know has taken the pains to attend the Infantry School at Fort Benning, Ga., and has come out a crack officer. There are good men in the corps and some not so good, who must be weeded out before our Army goes into action. But, be they good or not, their training has not been sufficient. Texts in the use of the latest-type weapons are not too available. The War Department has not made it altogether clear to us how we will combat the new attack which is called a "blitzkrieg." Speaking for myself, I might say that it has not been necessary that I learn a thing new in the last 6 years. We are prepared, in short, to fight a war of 1914–18

vintage, and that not too well, for most of us infantry officers do not know whether we will command rifle, machine-gun, howitzer, or tank units, all of them infantry weapons, and each requiring some degree of specialized knowledge. Indeed, one lieutenant I know who was assigned to a light-tank outfit admitted he had never seen the inside of one.

Now who is to blame? We can hardly lay the fault at the door of the War Department or our General Staff. Appropriations of money have been meager in years gone by; new weapons could not be bought in sufficient quantities to equip, until recently, even the small Regular Army. Hence, the weapons could not be tried out in vast scale maneuvers to develop their weaknesses and strengths, to find out the best means of employing them and of defending against them when used by others. Equipment, men, and experimentation have all been limited by lack of funds. The Army was for many years regarded as an expensive luxury, to be done away with if possible, and its most effective use was often thought to be in parades. Clearly, an undernourished child that has been allowed to show himself in a Sunday suit now and then cannot suddenly step forth a shining knight clad in impervious armor and prepared to defend us from any attacker.

Nor has the fault been that of Congress or of any administration. The government of any democratic nation can do no more than reflect and carry out the will of its people. And the attitude of our people has been one of general apathy toward their Army. Let us all realize that fact. The fault lies, then, with all of us, but the time for mutual recrimination has passed. Let us not look back but forward; it is a time that calls for action. The Army needs men and equipment as soon as it can possibly get them. It needs the weapons to fight with, the men to be trained in their use, and it needs both of them to develop the most modern type of tactics possible, to give us an army with striking power that is proven by actual physical practice and experimentation—not worked out on paper alone—striking power that will protect us from any form of aggression whatsoever. And we must have all this now, for it can't be put together and smoothed of wrinkles in a day or a month. A year may be none too long.

The Shipbuilding Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL VINSON

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 4, 1940

LETTER FROM HON. JAMES FORRESTAL, UNDER SECRETARY OF THE NAVY

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I recently submitted for the RECORD a complete list of contracts entered into by the Bureau of Yards and Docks of the Navy Department in connection with the Shore Establishment program of the Navy.

I am attaching herewith a letter from Hon. James Forrestal, Under Secretary of the Navy, which contains similar information in connection with the shipbuilding program which is now under way.

NAVY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, D. C., September 3, 1940.

Hon. CARL VINSON,
Chairman, House Naval Affairs Committee,
House Office Building.

MY DEAR MR. VINSON: I am enclosing herewith for your information a tabulation of awards made to private contractors and to navy yards for the construction of naval vessels and their propelling machinery since January 1, 1940.

There is also included a list of tentative "ceilings" for special facility authorizations at the various plants.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES FORRESTAL,
Under Secretary of the Navy.

Private contract awards

CONSTRUCTION

Name and type of ship	Contractor	Basis of contract	Cost	Profit
Aircraft carriers:				
Essex, CV9	Newport News Ship Building & Dry Dock Co.	Negotiated price	$40,170,700	$3,491,300
Bon Homme Richard, CV10	do	do	40,170,700	3,491,300
Intrepid, CV11	do	do	40,170,700	3,491,300
Heavy cruisers:				
Baltimore, CA68	Bethlehem Steel Co. (Quincy).	Negotiated price	$21,746,600	$1,871,400
Boston, CA69	do	do	21,746,600	1,871,400
Pittsburgh, CA70	do	do	21,746,600	1,871,400
St. Paul, CA71	do	do	21,746,600	1,871,400
Light cruisers:				
Cleveland, CL55	New York Shipbuilding Corporation.	Competitive bid	17,990,000	
Columbia, CL56	do	do	17,990,000	
Montpelier, CL57	do	do	17,580,000	
Denver, CL58	do	do	17,580,000	
Amsterdam, CL59	do	Negotiated price	17,164,500	1,493,300
Santa Fe, CL60	do	do	17,164,500	1,493,300
Tallahassee, CL62	do	do	17,164,500	1,493,300
Birmingham, CL62	Newport News Ship Building & Dry Dock Co.	do	17,730,000	1,542,500
Mobile, CL63	do	do	17,730,000	1,542,500
Flint, CL64	Bethlehem Steel Co. (Quincy).	do	17,101,400	1,471,600
Pasadena, CL65	do	do	17,101,400	1,471,600
Springfield, CL66	do	do	17,101,400	1,471,600
Topeka, CL67	do	do	17,101,400	1,471,600
Destroyers (2,100 tons):				
Fletcher, DD445	Federal Shipbuilding & Drydock Co.	Negotiated price	6,586,700	573,000
Radford, DD446	do	do	6,586,700	573,000
Jenkins, DD447	do	do	6,586,700	573,000
La Vallette, DD448	do	do	6,586,700	573,000
Nicholas, DD449	Bath Iron Works Corporation.	do	6,267,900	545,300
O'Bannon, DD450	do	do	6,267,900	545,300
Chevalier, DD451	do	do	6,267,900	545,300
Percival,[1] DD452	Federal Shipbuilding & Drydock Co.	do	7,240,715	[2] 545,000
Saufley, DD465	do	do	6,586,700	573,000
Waller, DD466	do	do	6,586,700	573,000
Strong, DD467	Bath Iron Works Corporation.	do	6,267,900	545,300
Taylor, DD468	do	do	6,267,900	545,300
De Haven, DD469	do	do	6,267,900	545,300
Bache, DD470	Bethlehem Steel Co. (Staten Island).	do	6,842,200	588,800
Beale, DD471	do	do	6,842,200	588,800
Watson,[1] DD482	Federal Shipbuilding & Drydock Co.	do	7,240,715	[2] 545,000
Destroyers (1,700 tons):				
Bristol, DD453	do	Competitive bid	5,277,000	
Ellyson, DD454	do	do	5,277,000	
Hambleton, DD455	do	Negotiated price	4,863,800	413,200
Rodman, DD456	do	do	4,863,800	413,200
Emmons, DD457	Bath Iron Works Corporation.	Competitive bid	4,898,000	
Macomb, DD458	do	do	4,898,000	
Laffey, DD459	Bethlehem Steel Co. (San Francisco).	Negotiated price	5,503,400	473,600
Woodworth, DD460	do	do	5,503,400	473,600
Submarines:				
Gato, SS212	Electric Boat Co.	Competitive bid	2,957,000	
Greenling, SS213	do	do	2,957,000	
Grouper, SS214	do	do	2,957,000	
Growler, SS215	do	Negotiated price	2,571,300	223,700
Grunion, SS216	do	do	2,571,300	223,700
Guardfish, SS217	do	do	2,571,300	223,700
Albacore, SS218	do	do	2,571,300	223,700
Amberjack, SS219	do	do	2,571,300	223,700
Barb, SS220	do	do	2,571,300	223,700
Blackfish, SS221	do	do	2,571,300	223,700
Bluefish, SS222	do	do	2,571,300	223,700
Bonefish, SS223	do	do	2,571,300	223,700
Cod, SS224	do	do	2,571,300	223,700
Cero, SS225	do	do	2,571,300	223,700
Corvina, SS226	do	do	2,571,300	223,700
Darter, SS227	do	do	2,571,300	223,700
Seaplane tender (large):				
Currituck, AV7	New York Shipbuilding Corporation.	do	13,019,800	1,240,700

Private contract awards—Continued

[1] Special type.
[2] Cost plus a fixed fee, all others base price plus 8.7 percent profit.

Private contract awards

PROPELLING MACHINERY

Type of vessel	Contractor	Basis of contract	Cost	Profit
For SS212-214	General Motors Corporation, Cleveland Diesel Engine Division.	Competitive bid	$2,317,857	
For SS215-227	do	Negotiated price	8,545,700	-$814,300

Private contract awards—Continued

Type of vessel	Contractor	Basis of contract	Cost	Profit
For SS228-230	Fairbanks, Morse & Co.	Competitive bid	$2,850,461	
For SS231-235	do	Negotiated price	3,971,550	$378,450
For SS236-239	Hooven, Owens, Rentschler Co.	do	3,583,100	341,421
Reconditioning SS167, SS168, and SM1	General Motors Corporation, Cleveland Diesel Engine Division.	Competitive bid	2,056,450	
For AM57	Fairbanks, Morse & Co.	Negotiated price	328,700	31,300
For AS12	General Motors Corporation, Cleveland Diesel Engine Division.	Competitive bid	1,358,169	
For AVP21 and 22	Fairbanks, Morse & Co.	do	1,435,350	

11-percent program

SPECIAL FACILITIES—TENTATIVE CEILINGS

	Ceiling
New York Shipbuilding Corporation	$3,000,000
Bath Iron Works Corporation	1,400,000
Bethlehem Steel Co.:	
Fore River plant	3,400,000
Staten Island	1,250,000
Union Iron Works	1,450,000
Electric Boat Co	1,500,000
Federal Shipbuilding and Drydock Co	2,000,000
Newport News Ship Building and Dry Dock Co	7,000,000
Total	21,000,000

Navy yard awards

CONSTRUCTION

Type and name of ships	Builder	Basis of contract	Cost
Battleships:			
Missouri, BB63	Navy yard, New York	Direct award	$50,700,000
Wisconsin, BB64	Navy yard, Philadelphia	do	50,700,000
Aircraft carriers:			
Kearsarge, CV12	Navy yard, Norfolk [1]	do	35,400,000
Destroyers, 2,100 tons:			
Guest, DD472	Navy yard, Boston	do	5,938,900
Bennett, DD473	do	do	5,938,900
Fullam, DD474	do	do	5,938,900
Hudson, DD475	do	do	5,938,900
Hutchins, DD476	do	do	5,938,900
Pringle, DD477	Navy yard, Charleston	do	5,938,900
Stanly, DD478	do	do	5,938,900
Stevens, DD479	do	do	5,938,900
Halford, DD480	Navy yard, Puget Sound	do	5,938,900
Leutze, DD481	do	do	5,938,900
Destroyers, 1,700-ton:			
Forrest, DD461	Navy yard, Boston	do	5,034,700
Fitch, DD462	do	do	5,034,700
Corry, DD463	Navy yard, Charleston	do	5,034,700
Hobson, DD464	do	do	5,034,700
Submarines:			
Drum, SS228	Navy yard, Portsmouth	do	3,256,000
Flying Fish, SS229	do	do	3,256,000
Finback, SS230	do	do	3,256,000
Haddock, SS231	do	do	3,256,000
Halibut, SS232	do	do	3,256,000
Herring, SS233	do	do	3,256,000
Kingfish, SS234	do	do	3,256,000
Shad, SS235	do	do	3,256,000
Silversides, SS236	Navy yard, Mare Island	do	3,256,000
Trigger, SS237	do	do	3,256,000
Wahoo, SS238	do	do	3,256,000
Whale, SS239	do	do	3,256,000
Submarine tender: Sperry, AS12	do	do	10,540,000
Seaplane tenders (small):			
Humboldt, AVP21	Navy yard, Boston	do	3,050,000
Matagorda, AVP22	do	do	3,050,000
Minesweeper: Auk, AM51	Navy yard, Norfolk	do	1,324,000

[1] Will probably be reassigned to a private shipyard.

Fears for Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FREDERICK C. SMITH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 4, 1940

LETTER PUBLISHED IN THE WASHINGTON POST

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter published recently in the Washington Post:

[From the Washington Post of August 31, 1940]

FEARS FOR DEMOCRACY

TO THE EDITOR OF THE POST:

SIR: "I never * * * uttered a word indicating the opinion that the supreme authority in a State ought to be entrusted to the majority of citizens * * * in other words, to the poorest and most ignorant part of society. I have long been convinced that institutions, purely democratic, must, sooner or later, destroy liberty, or civilization, or both."

The foregoing quotation might be from a source sympathetic to the nations under dictatorship rule, but it is from the well-known letter written in London, on May 23, 1857, by Lord Macaulay to Mr. Randall, of New York.

At this time, the quotation has a double significance to us. It calls our attention to the plight of democracy in Europe and to the most momentous test of democracy in the United States which our Government has ever encountered. Will it withstand the onslaught? Do the people grasp the influences which are attacking the foundation of democracy in the United States?

The most insidious and potent of these influences is the destruction of a sense of fidelity to the public trust of preserving the Treasury and solvency of the Federal Government. We pretend to heed the craving of the vast majority of our people to keep out of the European war, yet we propose to draft millions of our men, and we vote billions of our credit beyond all rational defensive bounds.

We subordinate the essential quality, which must be produced by physical and mental training, to a hysterical display of numbers and dollars. We play politics. We need promptly, within the bounds of time required for training, a highly trained, defensive army of manageable numbers; but every step beyond that requirement tends to defeat our needs and further violate the trust of preserving our solvency.

The mass idea must unceasingly be subordinated to the quality idea. Besides the disruption of our normal life, the attempt to draft and train too large an army will defeat or impair the effective training of the army which we really need.

It is unfortunate that this issue should be blended with the more domestic issue in our democracy of a third term in our Presidential office, which deserves the entire attention of our people. We would vote overwhelmingly against any proposal to subvert our democracy, by direct action, but that is not the way we may expect it to be assailed. What we have to fear is indirect, gradual destruction.

That is the kind of destruction of which Macaulay warned. We are not ready to despair of democracy, but there is enough in the situation abroad and at home to cause us concern and to arouse a craving to see the democratic zone clarified and purified by a breath of fresh air.

GEORGE MASON DILLARD.

SCOTTSVILLE, VA., *August 27.*

Compulsory Military Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM J. MILLER

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 4, 1940

ARTICLE BY MARK SULLIVAN

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, on August 7, while discussing certain provisions of the Burke-Wadsworth bill I pointed out that, in my humble opinion, the proponents of this bill made the mistake of trying to solve two separate problems in one piece of legislation in that they provided for the conscription of men for regular military service at the same time they were setting up machinery for the training of reserves which may or may not be needed in the future.

In the article of Mr. Mark Sullivan, well-known columnist, which appeared in the Hartford Daily Courant of September 3, this same fact is pointed out. I insert Mr. Sullivan's article in the RECORD at this point, hoping that his expression of opinion might influence Members of the House to a greater degree than they would be influenced by any remarks I might make.

[From the Hartford (Conn.) Daily Courant of September 3, 1940]

CONSCRIPTION BILL PURPOSE IS CONFUSED—TWO DIFFERENT PRINCIPLES INVOLVED; TRAINING SEEN ADVISABLE, SERVICE QUESTIONABLE

(By Mark Sullivan)

WASHINGTON, September 2.—In the House, the administration leaders intend to limit debate on the conscription bill. It is argued that there has already been 14 days of debate in the Senate. Even

if length of time were the measure of adequacy of discussion, 14 days would not necessarily be enough for a measure which involves departure from a national tradition, and carries momentous implications. But the true test of adequacy of debate is not the time consumed. It is whether the country has become fully informed.

At the very root of the pending bill is a condition about which the country is not fully informed. Not only the country. The condition is not clearly grasped by Congress itself.

The bill mingles two purposes. One purpose is: Immediate increase in the Army, for immediate defense of the country, against possible immediate emergency. The other purpose is long-term organization of the military arm of the country, the permanent basis for recruiting it. This permanent purpose exists in the bill, regardless of the fact that the bill is given a time limit of 5 years.

TWO DIFFERENT PURPOSES

With these two different purposes go two different principles. One principle has to do with compulsion of young men for training. The other principle has to do with compulsion of young men for service, for actual induction into the Army. The bill says training and service. Service is different from training, and much more than training.

There is a view which says that the two different purposes will be better served by two different processes. This view holds that the Regular Army should be built up to whatever is to be its permanent strength, by the ordinary process.

But back of the Regular Army, there must be a reservoir of trained men, from which can be drawn the additions that may be made necessary by emergency.

In the conscription bill as it now stands, the two different purposes and two different principles are inextricably confused. Separation of them would make for clarity and public understanding. There are additional needs for illumination.

One far-reaching, highly controversial feature of the bill was brought forward only a few hours before the Senate passed it. This is the amendment calling for the so-called conscription of industry.

Conscription of industry excites alarm now, because there is abroad in the world a movement for conscription of industry, not merely for the temporary purpose of war, but for the permanent purpose of government ownership of industry, for the purpose of totalitarian government.

Naval Aircraft Procurement Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL VINSON

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 4, 1940

MEMORANDUM FROM ADMIRAL JOHN H. TOWERS, CHIEF OF THE BUREAU OF AERONAUTICS

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I asked the Navy Department to prepare a complete statement showing the progress being made with reference to the procurement of aircraft, and am attaching hereto a memorandum which I have received from Admiral John H. Towers, Chief of the Bureau of Aeronautics, concerning the matter.

This information is complete and up to date as of September 3, 1940:

NAVY DEPARTMENT,
BUREAU OF AERONAUTICS,
Washington, September 3, 1940.

MEMORANDUM

Subject: Naval aircraft procurement programs, fiscal years 1940 and 1941—Data on.

Enclosure: (A) One list of airplanes and engines on order on September 3, 1940.

1. The amounts of cash and contract authorizations already appropriated for the fiscal year 1941 for new construction of aircraft are:

Cash	$101,088,562.00
Contract authorization	125,000,000.00
Total	226,088,562.00

2. Contracts for airplanes and engines have been awarded under these funds up to and including September 3, 1940, as follows:

1941 cash

AIRPLANES

Quantity	Model	Contractor	Amount (original contract price)
201	NP-1	Spartan	$1,859,880.80
509	N2S-1	Stearman	3,779,628.00
500	N3N-3	Naval Aircraft Factory	5,054,292.00
127 [1]	PBY-5	Consolidated	$13,328,841.60
10	JRF-1	Grumman	694,700.00
243	F4F-4	do	7,269,280.28
1	R50-1	Lockheed	114,235.97
100	NR-1	Ryan	1,110,264.00
Total			33,202,122.65

ENGINES

500	R-670	Continental	$1,442,275.00
433	R-680	Lycoming	1,527,084.80
400	V-770-6	Ranger	5,437,960.00
150	R-760	Wright	562,951.00
532	R-760	Naval Aircraft Factory	2,548,240.00
Total			11,518,510.80

[1] 127 PBY-5 airplanes ordered under 1940 contract authorization and charged to 1941 cash

3. The total amounts of cash and contract authorizations appropriated for the fiscal year 1940 were:

Cash	$69,419,000
Contract authorization	20,000,000
Total	89,419,000

4. Contracts for airplanes and engines were awarded under these 1940 funds as follows:

1940 cash "Aviation Navy" subhead 1 expenditures for planes and engines

I. AIRPLANES

Quantity	Model	Contractor	Amount (original contract price)
36	SNJ-2	North American	$676,400.00
50	N3N-3	Naval Aircraft Factory	595,250.00
1	XF4F-4	Gruman	2,629,260.00
2	XF4F-5		
78	F4F-3		
35	SBC-4	Curtiss	1,121,895.70
5	R3D-1, 2	Douglas	529,200.60
1	XR5O-1	Lockheed	117,668.05
3	GB-1	Beech Aircraft	66,554.41
73	PBY-5	Consolidated	6,687,858.00
57	SB2U-3	Vought-Sikorsky	1,998,420.00
100	N3N-3	Naval Aircraft Factory	1,109,500.00
158	OS2U-2	Vought-Sikorsky	3,928,352.65
87	SBD-2	Douglas	2,612,088.00
1	JO-2	Lockheed	58,286.75
25	SNJ-2	North American	458,104.56
5	JRB-1	Beech Aircraft	258,221.31
Total			22,847,060.03

II. ENGINES

48	R-1340-36 (SNJ-2)	Pratt & Whitney	$349,927.60
72	R-1830-76 (F4F-3)	do	1,448,977.60
36	R-1830-76 (F4F-3)	do	696,881.60
76	R-1535-2 (SB2U-3)	do	929,074.77
4	R-985-48 (GB-1)	do	20,563.40
560	R-1830-82 (PBY-5)	do	7,928,136.80
228	R-985-50 (OS2U-2, JRB-1, GB-1).	do	1,473,463.29
33	R-1340-36 (SNJ-2)	do	245,569.02
47	R-1820-34 (SBC-4)	Wright	505,186.88
116	R-1820-32 (SBD-2)	do	1,236,866.12
7	R-1820-44 (R3D spares)	do	95,135.84
2	XR-2600-8 (XSB2A-1)	do	36,304.80
1	XR-2600-10 (XTBF-1)	do	20,618.60
133	R-760-8 (N3N-3)	Naval Aircraft Factory	718,200.00
Total			15,704,906.32

5. A complete list of airplanes and engines on order for the Navy at this time is attached, marked "Enclosure (A)." This includes all airplanes and engines ordered and undelivered as of September 3, 1940. It also shows the delivery schedules of 1940 and 1941 contracts, and the deliveries which have been made under these contracts up to August 31, 1940.

6. Agreements preparatory to contracts have been reached with contractors as follows:

Pratt and Whitney Aircraft Division, United Aircraft Corporation, 17,000 engines.

Hamilton-Standard Propellers Division, United Aircraft Corporation, 27,000 propellers.

Vought-Sikorsky Division, United Aircraft Corporation, 1,006 observation-scout airplanes.

Brewster Aeronautical Corporation, 411 scout-bomber airplanes.

Brewster Aeronautical Corporation, 108 fighting airplanes.

Grumman Aircraft Engineering Co., 254 fighting airplanes.

Grumman Aircraft Engineering Co., 286 torpedo-bomber airplanes.

Grumman Aircraft Engineering Co., 144 utility airplanes.
Edo Aircraft Corporation, 1,362 float-type landing gears.
Douglas Aircraft Corporation, 252 scout-bomber airplanes.
Curtiss Aeroplane Division, Curtiss-Wright Corporation, 300 scout-observation airplanes.
Curtiss Aeroplane Division, Curtiss-Wright Corporation, 150 advanced training airplanes.

J. H. TOWERS,
Rear Admiral, U. S. N., Chief of the Bureau of Aeronautics.

Status of airplanes ordered, fiscal year 1940

Model	Contractor	Contract date	Number on order	Number undelivered
F4F-3	Grumman (2 in September 1940, subsequent deliveries contingent on receipt of engines).	Aug. 8, 1939	81	77
GB-1	Beech Aircraft	Sept. 1, 1939	3	0
JO-2	Lockheed	Mar. 26, 1940	1	0
JRB-1	Beech Aircraft (1 in September 1940, 1 in October, 2 in November, 1 in December).	June 12, 1940	5	5
N3N-3	Naval Aircraft Factory (remainder indefinite, pending delivery of oleo struts).	Sept. 19, 1939	100	62
N3N-3	Naval Aircraft Factory (16 in December 1940, 30 in January 1941, 30 in February, 30 in March, 30 in April, 40 in May, 40 in June, then 50 per month until completion of contract).	June 12, 1940	500	500
OS2U-2	Vought-Sikorsky (option exercised) (3 in October 1940, 22 in November, 24 in December, 34 in January 1941, 38 in February, 37 in March).	Dec. 4, 1939 June 1, 1940	100 58	100 58
PBY-5	Consolidated (1 in September 1940, 2 in October, 4 in November, 7 in December, 22 in January 1941, 12 in February, 12 in March, 14 in April, 16 in May, 16 in June, 16 in July, 18 in August, 20 in September, 40 in October).	Dec. 20, 1939	200	200
R3D-1 and 2	Douglas (4 in September 1940).	Sept. 5, 1939	6	4
SBC-4	Curtiss	Aug. 13, 1939	35	0
SBD-2	Douglas (exercise of option) (17 in November 1940, then 21 per month until completion of contract).	Nov. 15, 1940	87	87
SB2U-3	Vought-Sikorsky (1 in September 1940, 4 in November, 13 in December, then 15 per month until completion of contract).	Sept. 25, 1939	57	57
SNJ-2	North American	Sept. 28, 1939	36	0
SNJ-2	North American (6 in November 1940, 6 in December, 6 in January 1941; 7 in February).	June 21, 1940	25	25
XPBB-1	Boeing (April 1942)	June 29, 1940	1	1
XPB2M-1	Martin (June 1941)	Aug. 23, 1939	1	1
XR50-1	Lockheed	Nov. 13, 1939	1	0
XTBF-1	Grumman (2 in March 1941)	Apr. 8, 1940	2	2
XTBU-1	Vought-Sikorsky (March 1941).	Apr. 22, 1940	1	1
Total			1,300	1,180

Status of engines ordered, fiscal year 1940

Model	Contractor	Contract date	Number on order	Number undelivered
R-760-8	Naval Aircraft Factory (5 in September 1940, 25 in October, 26 in November, 26 in December, 21 in January 1941).	Sept. 20, 1939	133	133
R-760-8	Naval Aircraft Factory (40 in April 1941, 40 in May, 40 in June, 40 in July, then 50 per month).	June 12, 1940	532	532
V-770-6	Ranger (3 by Dec. 15, 1940; 75 additional by June 1941; 110 additional by September; 120 additional by December; remainder 20 per month).	June 20, 1940	403	403
R-985-48, P&W	Beech	Sept. 1, 1939	3	0
R-985-48	Pratt & Whitney	Oct. 3, 1939	4	0

Status of engines ordered, fiscal year 1940—Continued

Model	Contractor	Contract date	Number on order	Number undelivered
R-985-50	Pratt & Whitney (57 in September 1940, 33 in October, 10 in December, 20 in January 1941, 25 in February, 25 in March, 12 in April).	Dec. 4, 1939	228	182
R-985-50, P&W	Lockheed	Mar. 26, 1940	2	0
R-1340-36	Pratt & Whitney	Sept. 30, 1939	48	0
R-1340-36	Pratt & Whitney (10 by Oct. 31, 1940, 15 by Nov. 30, 8 by Dec. 31).	Apr. 8, 1940	33	33
R-1535-2	Pratt & Whitney (39 in September 1940, 9 in November).	Sept. 11, 1939	76	48
R-1820-30	Wright	July 11, 1939	43	0
R-1820-32	Wright (42 in September 1940, 20 in October, 10 in November, 16 in December).	July 26, 1939	144	88
R-1820-38	Wright	do	15	0
R-1820-40	Wright (4 in October 1940, 2 in November).	do	25	6
R-1820-40	Wright (5 in August, 6 in September, 1 in October, 3 in November, 8 in December 1940).	do	47	23
R-1820-44	Douglas (8 in September 1940).	Sept. 5, 1939	12	8
XR-1820-46	Wright (September 1940)	June 13, 1940	1	1
XR-1820-48	do	Apr. 15, 1940	1	1
GR-1820-G102A	Lockheed	Nov. 13, 1939	2	0
XR-1830-74	Pratt & Whitney (1 in January 1941, 3 additional by April 1941).	June 29, 1940	4	4
R-1830-76	Pratt & Whitney (4 in October 1940, 24 in November, 8 in December).	Apr. 1, 1940	36	36
R-1830-82	Pratt & Whitney (26 by Sept. 15, 1940; 18 additional by Sept. 30; 24 in October; 33 in November; 38 in December; 40 in January 1941; 40 in February; 44 in March; 50 in April; 50 in May; 50 in June; then 10 per month until completion of contract).	Jan. 2, 1940	560	526
R-2600-10 Wright	Grumman (2 in March 1941)	Apr. 8, 1940	2	2
R-2800-6 P. & W	Vought-Sikorsky (March 1941).	Apr. 22, 1940	1	1
XR-2800-6	Pratt & Whitney (December 1940).	June 13, 1940	1	1
XR-3350-8 XR-3350-10 Wright	Boeing (April 1942)	June 29, 1940	2	2
XR-3350-10	Wright (February 1941)	do	1	1
Total			2,359	2,031

Status of airplanes ordered, fiscal year 1941

Model	Contractor	Contract date	Number on order	Number undelivered
F4F-4	Grumman (1 in December 1940, 81 additional by August 1941, 80 additional by November 1941, 81 additional by February 1942).	Aug. 5, 1940	243	243
JRF-1	Grumman (1 in October 1940, 2 in November, 3 in December, remainder by February 1941).	Aug. 3, 1940	10	10
NP-1	Spartan (1 in December 1940, 3 in January 1941, 5 in February, 10 in March, 16 in April, 19 in May, then 20 per month until completion of contract).	July 10, 1940	201	201
NR-1	Ryan (15 per month starting December 1940, until completion of contract).	Aug. 19, 1940	100	100
N2S-1	Stearman (20 in September 1940, 40 in October, 65 in November, 80 in December, 50 in January 1941, 45 in February, then 40 per month until completion of contract).	July 1, 1940	500	[1] 500
R50-1	Lockheed	Aug. 1, 1940	1	1
Total			1,055	1,055

[1] Option for additional 100 not yet formally stated.

Status of engines ordered, fiscal year 1941

Model	Contractor	Contract date	Number on order	Number undelivered
R-670-4	Continental (60 in September 1940, 65 in October, 80 in November, 60 in December, 60 in January 1941, 40 in February, 40 in March, 40 in April, 40 in May, 15 in June).	July 1, 1940	500	[1] 500
R-680-8	Lycoming (5 in November 1940, 25 in December, then 25 per month until completion of contract).	do	433	433
R-760-8	Wright (8 in December 1940, 25 in January 1941, then 30 per month until completion of contract).	July 8, 1940	150	138
B-5 (Kinner)	Ryan (15 per month starting December 1940, until completion of contract).	Aug. 19, 1940	100	100
Total			1,183	1,171

[1] Option for additional 133 not yet formally stated.

BUREAU OF AERONAUTICS

Total number of airplanes on order and undelivered Sept. 3, 1940

F2A-2	43
F4F's	320
JRB-1	5
JRF-1	10
N3N-3	562
NP-1	201
NR-1	100
N2S-1	[1] 600
OS2U-1	42
OS2U-2	158
PBM-1	20
PBY-5	200
PB2Y-2	6
R3D-2	4
R5O-1	1
SBD's	137
SBN-1	30
SB2U-3	57
SNJ-2	25
XF5F-1	1
XFL-1	1
XF4U-1	1
XN5N-1	1
XPBB-1	1
XPB2M-1	1
XPBM-2	1
XSB2A-1	1
XSB2C-1	1
XTBF-1	2
XTBU-1	1
Total	2,533

[1] Exercise of option for 100 additional requested but not yet formally stated.

Total number engines on order and undelivered Sept. 3, 1940

R-670-4	[1] 633
R-680-8	433
XV-715-2	1
R-760-6	3
R-760-8	803
V-770-6	403
R-985-50	182
R-1340-36	33
XR-1400-2	1
R-1535-2	48
XR-1740-2	1
R-1820-32	88
R-1820-40	29
R-1820-44	8
XR-1820-46	1
XR-1820-48	1
XR-1830-74	4
R-1830-76	105
R-1830-78	28
R-1830-82	526
XR-2600-8	2
R-2600-10	2
R-2800-4	1
XR-2800-4	1
R-2800-6	1
XR-2800-6	1
XR-3350-4	5
XR-3350-8	1
XR-3350-10	2
B-5 (Kinner)	100
Total	3,447

[1] Exercise of option for 133 additional requested but not yet formally stated.

Renewal of Visas of Executives of the Bata Shoe Co.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 4, 1940

LETTER FROM LEO GOODMAN, OF UNITED SHOE WORKERS OF AMERICA TO ATTORNEY GENERAL ROBERT JACKSON

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from Leo Goodman, research director, United Shoe Workers of America, C. I. O.:

AUGUST 26, 1940.

Mr. ROBERT JACKSON,
Attorney General of the United States, Department of Justice, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am informed there is pending before your Department for your consideration a petition for the renewal of visas for specified executives of the Bata Shoe Co., in connection with the operation of their plant at Belcamp, Md.

In the recent past I have presented officials of your Department certain materials which indicate a definite connection between this company and the German economic war machine.

For your further information, I am enclosing copies of two documents which show the extent to which this company's officials will go to misrepresent the true facts regarding their affiliations.

Enclosure marked No. 1 is a capy of the amendment to the British statutory list (No. 854, issued June 1, 1940), which lists the affiliates of the Bata Shoe Co., which have been determined to come under the restraints of the British trading with the enemy act, 1939.

I call your special attention to the listing of Jan Bata, himself, under the country of Brazil, at which place he was located at the time the list was prepared. Mr. Bata is now here in Belcamp, I am informed, and is seeking an extension of his entry permit as a visitor on business.

I also call your attention to the fact that the Bata Shoe Co., Inc., which operates the plant at Belcamp, Md., is included on the blacklist both under entries for the countries of Haiti and Panama. This New York corporation, I am informed, is owned by three parties as follows:

1. Jan Bata.
2. Leader, A. G., of St. Moritz, Switzerland.
3. Trans-Oceanic Co., Luxembourg, Europe.

In addition to the listing of Jan Bata on the attached blacklist, you will find in the listing under Switzerland:

Leader, A. G., Aronstrasse, St. Moritz.

Thus two of the three owners are listed on this blacklist. The third final share in ownership is controlled by Trans-Oceanic Co., of Luxembourg, which is now part of Germany.

Enclosure No. 2 is a copy of press release issued by the Bata Shce Co., June 20, 1940, through their Washington propaganda office, 1055 Earle Building. This statement, issued to clarify press dispatches regarding the enemy blacklist, states that "none of this (blacklist) has anything to do with the Bata plant at Belcamp, Md., which is an all-American company, or with the Bata plants in several South American countries and in Haiti, which operate as independent units in the country in which they are situated."

I call your attention to the fact that the Haiti plant is specifically included on the so-called blacklist and is operated by the Bata Shoe Co., Inc., which also operates the Belcamp plant.

I also call your attention to the fact that while the press release states plants in South America were not included, the blacklist contains listings of Bata subsidiaries in Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Haiti, Panama, and Peru.

In view of the constant misrepresentation of the facts by agents of this company and the fraud practiced by this company on the several Government agencies with which it has had official contact, I urge that the Immigration Service of the Department of Justice should cancel forthwith the various visas and extensions which have been secured through fraud and further urge that all pending and future applications for extension be denied.

Respectfully yours,

LEO GOODMAN,
Research Director, United Shoe Workers of America, C. I. O.

Why I Am for Conscription

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. FLANNAGAN, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 4, 1940

RADIO ADDRESS OF HON. JOHN W. FLANNAGAN, JR., OF VIRGINIA

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me on why I am for conscription over the National Broadcasting Co. station, Washington, D. C., Friday, August 30, 1940, between 9:30 and 10 p. m.:

My friends, I want to speak frankly because I feel deeply about this piece of legislation. It involves things that are dear to my heart, it involves my home and my country.

To begin with I want to say that I am not interested in names. It matters little to me whether you call this legislation by the name conscription, or by the softer and more euphonic name, selective service law. When you are dealing with principles involving home and country, names mean very little, if anything. You cannot change principles by calling them by either soft or hard names any more than you can change the spots of the leopard by a coat of paint, because underneath the paint the leopard would still be spotted and underneath the name the principle would remain unchanged.

And to begin with I want to allay any suspicion that I am talking in a bold way because I will not be affected. I will be affected, directly and deeply affected. This piece of legislation, under any of the age limits suggested, will permit my Government to enter my home and take my only two boys. One is 21 years of age, the other 29 years of age.

These boys are as dear to me as it is possible for one human being to be to another. You know we just grew up together. We worked around the house together, played together, went to Sunday school and church together, hunted and fished and camped together, laughed together, cried together, and prayed together. We have just lived one simple, happy, old-fashioned American life together. I have tried to be open and frank with them, and they have been open and frank with me. We talk things over together, and we have talked conscription over. I find that they know as much, if not more, about this piece of legislation than I do, and that their convictions are as deep-rooted as are mine. Pardon me for bringing another member of the family into this discussion. She, too, is vitally interested. While the mother of my boys did not bring them up to be soldiers, she did bring them up to be God-fearing patriotic American citizens, proud of the freedom that that citizenship carries with it and willing to share in any sacrifice and assume any burden imposed by that citizenship. She, too, has convictions on this piece of legislation that are as deep-rooted as the convictions of our boys, as are mine. Yes, we are altogether on this piece of legislation. I would feel mighty bad if we were not. We are all in favor of conscription.

I said great principles are involved. They are. Two of the greatest of all governmental principles, the duty of the citizen to the state, and the duty of the state to the citizen. Let me state the first principle, as I understand it, in simple terms. The citizen that shares the benefits of government must assume the burdens of government. Now, let me state the second principle: The state, in order to protect the citizen, owes the citizen the duty of keeping in condition to protect, at all times, its sovereignty, this in order to safeguard the freedom and liberties of the citizen. The relationship between the citizen and the state can never be, in a democracy, a one-sided relationship. It is a mutual relationship, calling for mutual protection, mutual benefits, and mutual burdens.

Oh I hear some say:

"I believe in the principles you have enunciated. You are preaching good American doctrine, but——"

Well, but what?

And they answer:

"But conscription is undemocratic in that it is force, and a democracy never uses force. We must follow democratic processes and rely upon voluntary enlistments."

Moreover, some of these people tell you conscription will bring about a dictatorship.

Others answer with the same qualifying "but." This time the answer is:

"But there is no necessity for conscription; we are at peace, and it is only in case of necessity, such as war or some grave public danger, that the principle applies."

I want to answer these arguments and give my reasons for being in favor of conscription.

In presenting my arguments I want to deal with principles and facts. This is no time to become frightened or hysterical. The problems confronting us today not only call for a cool head and straight thinking, they call for action, immediate and definite action. The nation, in the hour of danger, that loses its head or hesitates, like the man who loses his head or hesitates, is lost.

Conscription undemocratic? Who said so? Oh, they tell you the founding fathers. But when I ask them to tell me which one of the founding fathers, they sidestep and say, "Well, we didn't resort to conscription in the Revolutionary War." No; we didn't. Not because there was any feeling or rebellion against the principle—as a matter of fact, we fought for the very principle—but for the very good reason it was not necessary to invoke the principle to raise an army. We had real patriots in those days. The patriotic fervor created by the spirit of 1776 was so intense, so overwhelming, that there were none left at home to conscript. Practically every man, old and young, kissed the home folks good-bye, picked up his squirrel rifle, and joined the battle for freedom, liberty, and equality.

Now, my friends, in the beginning let's get our democracy straight. Democracy is a living, growing, controlling, directing, restraining force. If it ever becomes static, it crumbles and falls. The trouble that has led to the downfall of so many democracies has been that they remained static and were unable to adjust themselves to new conditions, to set up the right kind of protective machinery in times of emergencies, and to properly coordinate their forces in time of danger. Now, with this principle in mind, let's go back to the founding fathers.

Oh, I know we like to go back to the founding fathers. It is right that we should. When the same set of facts, or the same circumstances, exist today that existed in their day, what they did to solve the problem should be persuasive and compelling. And while it is right that we should go back to them for fundamental principles, because it almost looks like they were divinely led in establishing those principles, we should not be so foolish as to go back to them for light and guidance in applying those principles to new and changed conditions of which they knew nothing about. This thing of trying to figure out what they would do today in a new world, brought about largely by science and invention, is all wrong. In the light of the knowledge and experience we have, ever keeping in mind the great principles they established and upon which this Republic rests, ours is the task of looking our problems right in the face and solving them in such a way as to make our democracy work under present-day conditions. And if we fail to meet this responsibility we are lost. I am not interested in indulging in fanciful speculation to find out what they would do today with respect to conscription or any other question that may arise. I know that they met the problems of their day, applied the principles of democracy to their solution, and made those principles work. Well, we know the principles, and what I am interested in is in meeting present-day problems as they arise and applying those same principles in the light of the present to their solution. The problem of the founding fathers was to make democracy work in their day and time. They were successful because they tackled the problems of their day in a common-sense, realistic way.

Ours, my friends, is the task of making democracy work in our day and time, and we are not going to be successful unless we face the facts and go about the solution of our problems in a common sense, realistic way.

Now, for a few minutes, let's get back to a few of the fundamental principles of democracy. Many, nowadays, who talk about democracy, I am afraid, have never really caught the true spirit of democracy. When faced with assuming distasteful governmental burdens or hardships, they like to harp upon freedom and liberty. Well, I believe in freedom and liberty, but I do not want any false notion about these great principles to liberate me from my freedom. They tell me that conscription will curtail their freedom. I answer, yes; that is true. What about it? A lot of liberties have to be curtailed in the name of the general welfare and the common defense. Oh, they say, it will never do to curtail the individual freedom of man, that they do not want their individual freedom curtailed. Neither do I. The only difference between us is I am willing to pay the price to keep my individual freedom from being permanently curtailed, they are not. Let me ask the opponents to conscription these questions: Don't you realize that there was a cost price for the freedom and liberties you enjoy—the toil, the sacrifice, and the blood of our ancestors. Don't you realize that the maintenance price is just the same as the cost price, and that unless we are willing to pay the maintenance price that, sooner or later, we will lose our freedom altogether? Well, whether you realize it or not, it is true. Ofttimes, my friends, in order to keep your freedom, to make it secure, you have to, for the time being, surrender, in the name of the general welfare, or the common defense, a part of that freedom.

Then, too, those who are against conscription overlook another fundamental democratic principle, the principle of equality. Democracy, it is true, means freedom and liberty, but it also means equality—equality of opportunity and equality of treatment.

My friends, in standing for conscription I am only applying in a common-sense and realistic way the great American principle of equality to present-day conditions. I am only asking that my Government in her effort to protect our freedom and our liberties place all citizens upon the same footing. Treat us all alike. When you call my boy, call the rich man's boy. When you call the laboring man's boy, call the industrialist's boy. When you call the Irish

boy, call the Jewish boy. When you call the Presbyterian boy, call the Baptist boy. That's democracy. Pure and undefiled democracy. It is the kind of democracy my forefathers died to establish, and it is the kind of democracy I am willing, if needs be, to follow in their footsteps and pay the same price to maintain and preserve.

Yes, my friends, protecting America is above and beyond race or creed, station or rank. It is a common duty that brings us all down to a common level. And in the discharge of this duty the burdens imposed should be, as far as possible, distributed equally among the citizenry of our country.

When we get away from the American doctrine of equality of treatment, we are treading upon dangerous ground. We are undermining, in the hour of stress, one of the foundation stones upon which the framework of our Republic rests. It is not right, because it is not distributing the burdens of government as far as possible, equally; it is not right because it is permitting some, while sharing the benefits of Government to shirk its responsibilities and burdens, to expect my boy, or your boy, to protect the freedom of the boy who, while anxious to enjoy the blessings afforded by this Republic in times of peace, in time of danger wants to hide behind his deluded conception of freedom. The citizen who honestly shares such an opinion needs to get his democracy straightened out. He needs to be taught that those who accept the benefits of government must assume the responsibilities of government.

And then, my friends, we have an element in this country—I grant you it is a small element—but nevertheless it is here, who are simply unwilling to assume their just duties and responsibilities when danger threatens and the security of our Republic is in jeopardy. These among our citizenry should be forced—I use the word advisedly—to assume their equal part of the burdens of government. A democracy that is not flexible enough to use force, when force is needed, will soon perish. We should never hesitate to use force when the security or well-being of our Republic demands force. Ofttimes we have to use force, even in times of peace, to compel men to share their equal portion of the burdens of government. Why, for instance, sometimes we have to force men to pay their equal and just part of taxes, to observe the laws of sanitation, and to assume other burdensome and distasteful obligations.

And if we conscript boys, I am in favor of conscripting dollars to back those boys up. We can take care of this through the taxing power. Those who unduly share in the blessings of a free country should not complain if they are unduly taxed, in the hour of emergency, to keep those blessings secure. And, if industry fails to show the proper cooperative spirit—and I do not believe it will—I am in favor of conscripting recalcitrant industries. I think so much of my freedom and liberty, and the equality that is mine, that I am willing to go the limit to protect that freedom, that liberty, and that equality.

Yes, my friends, if our democracy is to exist, we cannot get away from the proposition that the citizen that shares the benefits of government must assume the burdens of government.

Now, the Government, in return, owes the citizen the duty of protecting his freedom and liberties. The Government, no matter what the cost, cannot escape its duty, even if in the discharge of its duty it has to, for the time being, use force and curtail some of the freedom usually enjoyed by the citizen. And it is the duty of those in authority who, of course, are the representatives of the citizen, under the general welfare and common defense provisions of the Constitution, to see that the Government discharges its duty; and, in my opinion, if we the representatives of the citizen should fail in seeing that the Government promptly and unhesitatingly discharges its duty, in the event of disaster or threatened disaster, the first to complain of our neglect would be those who are today holloing the loudest against conscription.

Yes, my friends, the government that does not ever remain ready to protect its sovereignty, and thus be in position at all times to protect its citizenry, has failed in the chief function of government.

To those who seem to be alarmed because they think conscription will lead to dictatorship let me say that one reason why I am for conscription is the very opposite to the line of reasoning that prompts their alarm. Conscription, in my opinion, is not only one of the ways to keep down a situation that would likely create a dictatorship here in this country, but is one of the ways to keep the foreign dictator from setting his accursed foot upon American soil. Let me tell you why. If we neglect our defense and our people become frightened and alarmed and lose faith in the ability of their Government to properly function and protect them in the hour of danger they will turn to a dictator or anyone else for deliverance. And if the foreign dictators conclude that our democracy, like so many democracies, is unable to properly function in times of danger or threatened danger and build up an adequate national defense—and this can only be done by providing the manpower to operate our implements of war—our failure to function will be but an invitation to them to come over and set up a dictatorship.

Now, as to the second proposition that there is no necessity for conscription because we are at peace and conscription is only justifiable in case of war or some grave public danger.

While I cannot accept this doctrine, because I believe the Government can, in providing for the common defense and promoting the general welfare, have peacetime conscription, let us assume, for the sake of argument, those advocating this proposition are right, and that it is only in case of war or some grave public danger that we are justified in resorting to conscription. The question then is, Is the necessity, as they define the necessity, upon us? I think it is.

Peace! Do I hear someone say there is no necessity because we are at peace? Would to God that we were entering upon the dawn of the day when nations will not lift up the sword against nations, but will be engaged in beating their swords into plowshares and their spears into pruning hooks. While I believe in prophecy, I am more or less a realist, and today when kingdoms and democracies are tottering and falling like tenpins before the savage onrush of these mighty totalitarian monsters of force and tyranny, the cry of "peace, peace" sounds like the vaporings of the simpleton giving expression to some of his fantastic illusions. Let me call the roll of the nations that have already fallen prey to these totalitarian monsters of force and tyranny: Manchuria, Ethiopia, Austria, Sudetenland, Czechoslovakia, Memel, Albania, Danzig, Poland, Finland, Norway, Denmark, Luxemburg, Holland, Belgium, France, Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia. Behold the picture. Nineteen nations that but a few months ago enjoyed their national sovereignty now reduced to servitude, and their citizenry who but yesterday were freemen now the cringing vassals of these gods of force and tyranny.

Peace! Do I hear someone say there is no necessity because we are at peace, when at this very moment other nations tremble helplessly awaiting their turn of subjugation and their citizenry live in daily, nightly fear of this deadly totalitarian national blight? Let me call the roll of the nations that hover over the brink: Rumania, Switzerland, Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, Spain, Portugal, Turkey, Egypt, and Greece. Behold the picture! Nine sovereign nations living in fear and dread, knowing not what the tomorrow will bring forth.

Peace! Do I hear someone say there is no necessity because we are at peace, when England, excepting our own, the last great democracy, and who, whether we like to admit it or not has been our first line of defense, is this hour grappling for life with this totalitarian monster? Peace! When the next short wave length may bring the sickening news that England, proud, mighty England, is no more because she, too, listened to the siren's sweet song of peace until it was too late to properly prepare to meet the onslaught?

Oh, you say, all these countries are on the Eastern Hemisphere, and we are separated by 3,000 miles of water.

Well, then, let me bring the situation closer home.

As my first witness I call no other than Adolph Hitler himself. Hear the fuehrer:

"Mexico cries for a capable master. It is being ruined by its Government. With the treasure of Mexican soil, Germany could be rich and great."

Again hear him:

"We will create a new Germany in Brazil."

And again hear him:

"We have a right to South America for the Fuggers and Welsers (famous old German trade and banking houses) had possession there. These South Americans will need us. They are fed up with the United States. If there is a place where democracy is senseless and suicidal it is in South America. We must strengthen these people's clear consciences to throw their liberalism and democracy overboard. We shall not land troops. Our weapons are not visible ones.

"Our conquistadores are audacious youth—and not in the jungle but in good society."

Do you still cry there is no necessity because we are at peace? No necessity when the threat, the direct threat, of subjugation is made against our sister republics right here on the Western Hemisphere?

Well, then, let me bring the matter home.

Listen, my friends, while I again quote the words of Adolf Hitler:

"National socialism alone is destined to liberate the American people and sweep away all the falsities of liberty and equality."

* * * * * * *

"We will soon have storm troops in America. We will have men whom degenerate Yankeedom will not be able to challenge."

Listen to what Virginio Gadya, Mussolini's editor, said on July 13, 1940.

"Ten million Italians live outside of Italy. More than half of these may be found in the two Americas. Italy has the right and the duty to maintain moral contact with these Italians and, if necessary, to provide for their defense."

Is it further proof that you demand? Then listen to Yosuke Matsuoka, Foreign Minister of Japan, in an official speech delivered June 23, 1940.

"The day is dawning when Japan will divide the world only with Germany and Italy."

Peace! Do I still hear someone holloing peace? Let me tell you, my friends, there can be no peace as long as the totalitarian blight that has enthralled Europe casts its sickening, deathly shadow upon the Americas. Be not deceived, I pray you, by the seductive pleas and cries of the pacifist and isolationist. That they may be well intentioned does not lessen the fear that their leadership, in this hour of peril and danger, would bring about our undoing. If you have any doubt, if you think that the shadow is not ominous, if you think it is not portentous and full of ill omen, then go look beneath the shadow at the poisonous, viperous, slimy agents and hirelings of the Communist and Nazi organizations as they seek to work their serpentine way into the different social, fraternal, political, and church organizations, into the munition plants, into

the armies and navies, and into strategic positions of state, in the Americas, in their effort to weaken our resistance by poisoning the minds of our people by false and misleading propaganda, and thus make us, too, an easy prey to their craft and cunning.

Not since the plagues of Egypt has the world been cursed with such a plague as this totalitarian plague of force and tyranny. The only way to keep it from the Americas is to prepare to resist it by force of arms if it ever attempts to set its accursed foot upon our sacred soil.

Peace do I hear! When does the mariner prepare for the storm? After the storm has struck with all its fury and his ship, because the sails are full of wind, can no longer be steered, or when the signs of the storm appear and their distant rumblings put him on notice that trouble is in the air? When does the prudent farmer lock his barn? After the thief has entered and stolen his horse? Oh, no, he makes his barn secure so the thief cannot enter. And if our democracy is to be saved, we have got to make ready while there is yet time, and before the thief enters or the storm strikes. The cry upon every tongue, the prayer upon every lip, from now on until we are prepared to withstand the assault of any dictator, or combination of dictators, should be, Wake up America! Prepare! Prepare!

No necessity because we are at peace, do I still hear? Well, let me tell you this: If that is your plea, your past acts belie your present declarations. If that is your excuse, if that is your plea, then tell me why we voted $14,000,000,000 for defense purposes and the American people, as a whole, applauded every vote. Fourteen billions of dollars appropriated to build battleships, tanks, bombing planes, and other implements of war, and to increase the personnel of our Army, Navy, and Air Corps, and appropriated in the House with but one dissenting vote—and I wish to God I could blot that vote from the permanent records of the land I love—and then you tell me there is no necessity because we are at peace. Shades of Munchausen! In the light of our record, did anyone ever hear of such a preposterous plea. Would we, Democrats and Republicans alike—there are no politics in this matter—have appropriated, and would the American people, Democrats and Republicans alike, have approved the appropriation of $14,000,000,000, with our exchequer showing enormous bills payable, unless we thought there was not only a necessity but an urgent, imperative necessity? Would we, the chosen representatives of the people, during these days of stress, when we are called upon as never before to clothe the naked and feed the hungry, have been so reckless with the money of the taxpayers we represent as to have made the appropriation unless the necessity—yea, the gravity of the situation—was weighing heavily upon us? Oh, let's be honest about the matter. Of course, we recognized the necessity, and, like the true Americans that we are, resolved in our hearts that we would never let dollars stand between our Republic and safety.

Now, if the necessity exists to increase our battleships, our tanks, our bombing planes, our anti-aircraft guns, why would not the same necessity tell us we need additional men to man these additional armaments? If it doesn't, we were just fooling ourselves in making the appropriations, because it would be sheer nonsense to increase our armaments without providing trained men to man them.

Now, do you still ask why I am for conscription? Well, let me summarize and give you the A B C's of the question as I see it:

I am for conscription because I think that the necessity to provide for the common defense is upon us. I think that our freedom and our liberties are in jeopardy and that our Government would be derelict in its duty to its citizenry if it did not prepare to withstand any assault made upon us by any nation, or combinations. And while I am opposed to sending our boys to European soil, I think the duty resting upon our Government extends to the Americas because, in my opinion, if one of the dictators ever secures a foothold in one of the South American Republics and establishes a base, the next step would land him right in the middle of our Republic. Our own security today is, more or less, also wrapped up in the security of the South American Republics.

I am for conscription because I believe it is the fair way, the American way, to raise an army. It distributes the burden equally among our citizenry.

I am for conscription because I believe it would be sheer nonsense to build armament without providing the manpower. We cannot go halfway. We need total adequate defense. I further believe that, due to the fact that today war is largely mechanized warfare, that it would be criminal to send our boys to war without our adequate and proper training. They need to be trained, not only in the use of modern implements of war, but in the ways to protect themselves against modern implements of war. It would be too late to give this training after war begins.

And I am in favor of conscription because I believe total adequate defense is the one and only insurance policy against war we can carry. If we are prepared and the dictators know that we are prepared, then I firmly believe that we will be repaid, richly repaid, for our preparation, in that peace, glorious peace, will be our portion. In this belief, this hope, I know America joins. If she does, then let America act.

May God bless America.

Our Nation's Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. O. BURGIN
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 4, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE SANFORD (N. C.) HERALD

Mr. BURGIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Sanford (N. C.) Herald of August 28:

[From the Sanford (N. C.) Herald of August 28, 1940]

OUR NATION'S DEFENSE

On August 12, when I left Sanford to go to Camp Beauregard, La., to witness the maneuvers of the Third United States Army, I did so with two purposes in mind: (1) To see what was going on and to form some sort of conclusions from what I found, for my own information, and for others who might be interested; and (2) to give some publicity to the One Hundred and Thirteenth Field Artillery in general and tone of its units, Sanford's Battery E, in particular.

The whole idea, of course, was prompted by the acute situation toward which and into which this country has been propelled by the fast-moving events of the European war.

APPRECIATION OF THE GUARD

Taking up the two purposes inversely, I was able to give the 113th Field Artillery considerable publicity, not only in this paper but also in several other papers in towns in which units of the regiment are located. For some years I have had a feeling that the public did not fully appreciate the boys who belonged to the National Guard, including local and nearby units, and did not give them proper recognition for the time and effort expended in drilling, in summer encampments, and in preparing to cope with State and national emergencies that might arise. I believe that today the public in general is much better acquainted with, is much more sympathetic to, and is much more enthusiastic for the Guard units than ever before. Simple down-to-earth publicity has helped to bring about this situation, along with the general public realization that the National Guard has not only been the country's second line of defense but is about to be promoted to the first line with the Army, Navy, and other standing armed forces.

FINE SPIRIT EXISTENT

In riding around portions of the 2,800 square miles over which the 70,000 men involved were engaged in a simulated warfare between Blue and Red forces, I found a fine spirit among the men I talked to and a genuine eagerness to serve their country, but, as even the high-ranking generals who staged the maneuver pointed out, I found looseness, inefficiency, and general blundering.

NEED FOR EFFICIENCY

I came away with the impression that a great deal of this was caused by too much red tape in the Army, and to too many brass hats who were without authority or initiative to make decisions themselves. I had the impression that under a system where the buck is often passed to the officer next in command, there are too many points at which things might go wrong in actual warfare.

This might reasonably be expected to happen under a system when orders are relayed down from the top through a long line of subordinates, and where problems requiring a decision must also be relayed to the top through the same line of under officers. My thought on this is that the Army system of training should be adapted to allow officers to make more decisions and to allow the exercise of more initiative. Under the warfare of the present and the future—swift movement of positions rather than fighting in a fixed line of trenches—these would be most beneficial.

NEED FOR TRAINING

A second need, that for intensive immediate training of the National Guard, was and has been so apparent for some time that it requires little amplification. The members of the National Guard are hard workers, but they are soft and inexperienced, and the latter at least applies in no little measure to our standing forces. Only rigid training can cure this. The nation is glad that Congress has empowered the President to call the Guard into training for a year, and it is glad that substantial forces will begin this training next month.

A necessary part of the training to be given the Guard—and every citizen of this Republic needs it in liberal doses—should be lessons in appreciation of the rights which citizens enjoy under our form of government. This appreciation of American rights and American ways should be so thorough that our soldiers and our citizens will want to fight rather than relinquish it to dictators or foreign aggres-

sors. Our Nation must have iron in its mind and in its spirit, as well as steel in its collective muscles. Hitler has implanted in German minds a fire and a fervor that must be matched with a fire and fervor for our own scheme of living.

NEED FOR EQUIPMENT

A third need of our armed forces is for the very best equipment, including mechanized units. We need the most modern and up-to-date equipment that money can buy. We need far more mobile fighting equipment, ranging all the way from simple trucks to combat cars and motorcycles, and from tanks to airplanes. Congress has appropriated immense sums of money to make these things possible. No stone should be left unturned to make their production speedy. Our industry, during the present emergency, should be so geared that production of this equipment is not only on a must but also on a preferred list over everything else.

NEED FOR SELECTIVE SERVICE

A fourth need is for a selective service act—conscription—at once. Under the present system of voluntary enlistment the Southern States have led the Nation in enlistments. This is not fair to the South and is relieving other sections of the Nation of their fair share of the duties to be undertaken. Conscription would make every county in the Union, every State, contribute its just and proportionate share of men to the colors. It would not give an unfair advantage to those who did not enlist, because every person would be on the same footing. It would also give to our armed forces a representative cross-section of the country's abilities and intelligence, and a representative cross-section is practically impossible of achievement unless men are drawn from every kind and condition of life within the age groups called. And last, but not least, the boards which would and will administer the Selective Service Act when it is at last passed by the dodderers who are sitting in the Halls of Congress should be composed of highly patriotic men who will stay clear of politics.

RESULT: A REAL FIGHTING FORCE

If our Nation can at once attain more efficiency in its armed forces, give them better training in body and put iron in their spirit, furnish every piece of necessary fighting equipment at the place it is needed, and set a policy of recruiting its numbers by the democratic method of conscription, it can build a fighting force which will cause European dictators to lay off the American Hemisphere.

If any of these needs are overlooked or compromised with, our Nation is giving aid and comfort to the enemy, just as Congress is giving such aid and comfort by its habits of indecision and aimless meandering.—W. E. H.

Ask Exemption of Military Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES SECCOMBE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 4, 1940

RESOLUTION OF THE DUNKARD BRETHREN CHURCH

Mr. SECCOMBE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution of the Dunkard Brethren Church:

THE PRESIDENT.

SIR: The Dunkard Brethren Church, in annual general conference, Quinter, Kans., June 5, 1940, petition you to hear and consider the following:

"As a Christian people, throughout more than 200 years we have maintained nonresistance as an integral part of our faith; therefore we petition that we may be granted exemption from any and all forms of military service in case this country becomes involved in war.

"Since the National Constitution grants freedom of religious worship, and since we have no code or confession of faith other than the New Testament, we follow its teachings: 'If any man have not the spirit of Christ, he is none of His.' 'Recompense to no man evil for evil' (Romans 8: 9 and 12: 17). 'Dearly beloved, avenge not yourselves, but rather give place unto wrath: for it is written, "Vengeance is mine; I will repay" said the Lord.' 'Therefore, if thine enemy hunger, feed him; if he thirst, give him drink; for in so doing thou shalt heap coals of fire on his head. Be not overcome of evil, but overcome evil with good' (Romans 12: 19–21). The Saviour said, 'My kingdom is not of this world. If my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight' (John 18: 36). Romans 13: 9 renewed the command 'Thou shalt not kill. Ye have heard that it hath been said, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor, and hate thine enemy." But I say unto you, "Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, pray for them which despitefuly use you, and persecute you; that ye may be the children of your Father which is in heaven; for He maketh His sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust"' (Matthew 5: 43–45).

"'And behold, one of them which were with Jesus stretched out his hand, and drew his sword, and struck a servant of the high priest's, and smote off his ear. Then said Jesus unto him, "Put up again thy sword into his place; for all they that take the sword shall perish with the sword. Thinkest thou that I cannot now pray to my Father, and He shall presently give me more than twelve legions of angels? But how then shall the Scriptures be fulfilled, that thus it must be?"' (Matthew 26: 51–54).

"Our brethren are ready and willing to suffer for the cause of their faith, if need be, rather than be forced to bear arms, which they cannot conscientiously do. They are largely farmers; when manpower is in demand, as in wartime, it would seem more rational to permit them to remain at work on farms, or to place those not already in agriculture into that industry or into reconstruction work, rather than to penalize them for refusal to bear arms by placing them in camps or perhaps by imprisonment, thereby keeping them out of productive activity."

A copy of paper passed unanimously at general conference referred to.

Yours truly,

THEODORE MYERS,
North Canton, Ohio.

Transfer of United States Naval Vessels to Great Britain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD KNUTSON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 4, 1940

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, in commenting upon the transfer of our destroyers to Great Britain, in exchange for the island naval bases, the New York Times of today says:

The object of the arrangement with Britain is to build a 4,500-mile iron fence in the Atlantic to assure this country's safety for a century, an authoritative State Department source said.

Mr. Speaker, instead of characterizing this unprecedented action upon the part of the President as the building of an iron fence to assure the safety of this country, it should have been described as a 4,500-mile water gate, through which the taxpayers of this Nation will be forced to toss billions of dollars in the next century. This is just another step, Mr. Speaker, on the part of the New Deal in their effort to streamline the road to ruin for the United States.

[From the New York Times of September 4, 1940]

DICTATOR ROOSEVELT COMMITS AN ACT OF WAR

Mr. Roosevelt today committed an act of war.

He also became America's first dictator.

Secretly, his Secretary of State, Mr. Hull, entered into an agreement with the British Ambassador that amounts to a military and naval alliance with Great Britain. This secretly negotiated agreement was consummated yesterday, September 2.

Today Congress is informed of the agreement. Note well the word "informed." Although the President referred to his under-cover deal as ranking in importance with the Louisiana Purchase, he is not asking Congress—the elected representatives of the people—to ratify this deal. He is telling them it already has been ratified by him—America's dictator.

The President has passed down an edict that compares with the edicts forced down the throats of Germans, Italians, and Russians by Hitler, Mussolini, and Stalin.

He hands down an edict that may eventually result in the shedding of the blood of millions of Americans; that may result in transforming the United States into a goose-stepping, regimented slave state.

Under our Constitution, treaties with foreign powers are not legal without the advice and consent of the Senate. This treaty, which history may define as the most momentous one ever made in our history, was put over without asking the Senate either for its advice or its consent.

The authority which the President quotes for his fatal and secret deal is an opinion from the Attorney General. Whatever legal trickery this yes-man may conjure up, the fact is that the transfer of the destroyers is not only in violation of American law, but is also in violation of the Hague Covenant of 1907, solemnly ratified by the United States Senate in 1908. It is an outright act of war.

Undeterred by law or the most primitive form of common sense, the President is turning over to a warring power a goodly portion of

the United States Navy, against the repeated statements of Senators, Navy Department officials, and officers of the Navy that the ships are needed for our own defense.

But that is only one phase of this insane performance. We get in exchange leases on British possessions in this hemisphere—but only leases. What good will these leases be if Hitler should acquire title to these islands by right of conquest? There is even the possibility that, in the course of a negotiated peace, Great Britain might be forced to cede these islands to Hitler.

What, then, will become of Roosevelt's leases? Obviously, to avoid all sorts of possible complications, we should have full sovereignty over our own naval and air bases.

Of all sucker real-estate deals in history, this is the worst, and the President of the United States is the sucker.

Thomas Jefferson did not lease Louisiana from Napoleon Bonaparte. He acquired it outright, to have and to hold forever.

Woodrow Wilson didn't lease the Virgin Islands from Denmark, with the advice and consent of the United States Senate; he bought them.

In the case of Newfoundland and Bermuda, Mr. Roosevelt tells us that the right to bases "are gifts—generously given and gladly received." In other words, the great and rich United States is taking largess from a nation that owes us more than five and a half billion dollars! We are accepting a tip, according to the President.

For at least 10 years this newspaper has repeatedly called attention to the urgent desirability of acquiring Caribbean islands owned by Britain and France for our own defense purposes. In that belief we are ardently in agreement with Mr. Roosevelt.

No move was made to this end by Roosevelt or his predecessors, despite the fact that we had a trading argument in the billions of war debts owed to us by France and Britain.

No; Roosevelt saw France go down without negotiating for the islands in exchange for the debts; and only now, with Britain in the throes of a desperate war, does the President move to protect our shores.

But in doing so he commits an act of war. He strips our Navy of 50 valuable ships, and he enters into leases which might not be worth the paper they are written upon in a month's time.

And all this is done in utmost contempt of democratic processes and of the Constitution of the United States.

If this secretly negotiated deal goes through, the fat is in the fire and we all may as well get ready for a full-dress participation in the European war.

If Roosevelt gets away with this, we may as well say good-bye to our liberties and make up our minds that henceforth we live under a dictatorship.

If Congress and the people do not rise in solemn wrath to stop Roosevelt now—at this moment—then the country deserves the stupendous tragedy that looms right around the corner. —An editorial from yesterday's St. Louis Post-Dispatch.

Keep America Out of War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN L. SWEENEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 4, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE GAELIC AMERICAN (NEW YORK)

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Gaelic American of New York:

[From the Gaelic American (New York) of August 31, 1940]

KEEP AMERICA OUT OF WAR

The present administration at Washington is steadily and surely moving us toward war.

The President of the United States endeavored to transfer naval vessels to England. Legal restrictions prevented the President from carrying out his purpose.

Now, the desire is to classify certain of our destroyers as outmoded, and to let them go to England upon the plea of General Pershing.

Whether these destroyers be given or sold or traded to England direct, or whether they find their way to England by way of Canada, the net result is the same.

That is not the spirit of neutrality. That is not the spirit of the Constitution of the United States of America.

Article I, section 8, of the Constitution of the United States says that "Congress shall have power to provide and maintain a navy."

Article II of the Constitution of the United States defines the power of the President. There is nothing in article II which gives the President power to give that Navy, or any part of it away. Or to trade that Navy or any part of it away.

But the public utterances of the present administration have not been neutral utterances. The policy of the present administration is to hamstring one side in the present European conflict and to assist the other side.

If those utterances and those policies be long enough continued, then sooner or later the United States of America will be openly and officially in the war.

And the people of the United States of America do not want any part in this war.

Instead they want the bringing about of a just peace. That is the objective toward which every honest effort of a neutral administration at Washington should be directed.

Regretfully—almost shamefacedly—we are obliged, as Americans, to admit that President Roosevelt has disqualified himself for the role of peacemaker, for the role of arbitrator in the discussions which must necessarily take place before there can be any just peace.

It appears to be extremely unlikely that any contribution of naval destroyers from the United States to England can prevent Hitler from delivering the knockout blow to the present English Government.

If this be correct, what are the alternatives? Are we, the United States of America, going to go very much further in the effort to avert that knock-out blow? Or, are we going to suddenly reverse our administrative policy; refuse to go further; merely watch the delivery of the knock-out blow; and then sit idly by without anyone who would be accepted as a spokesman in the interest of a just peace to replace the tragedy of Versailles?

If the German people decide to avenge themselves for the injustices of Versailles, the retribution will be indeed terrible, and the men and women of England will have cause to curse until their dying day those leaders who have misled them for the past twenty-odd years.

But coming back to our own problems. As Americans, we want no part in this present war. We want defense, ample defense, for every square foot of the United States against any foreign aggressor. And we want defense, ample defense, for every American institution and for every American tradition.

The Senate and the House of Representatives have their duty to perform. They must hold the gap from now to November.

Then the people of the United States of America have their duty to perform. Like it or not, our system of Government can only be safeguarded by common sense, intelligence, and patriotism. The time has come to exercise that eternal vigilance which is the price of freedom. Let Congress know that you are unalterably opposed to the Old World's imperialist wars which are not worth the life of one young American.

James A. Farley

REMARKS

OF

HON. MATTHEW J. MERRITT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 30, 1940

Mr. MERRITT. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to be here again for the first time in 5 months [applause], not only happy to be back here but to be amongst the living; and I want to take this occasion to bring to the Members of the House the fact that we are losing tomorrow one of the finest men who ever graced the Cabinet of a President of the United States, the Honorable James A. Farley. In his resignation the country loses a very competent and able Postmaster General, and the national Democratic Party loses a very able and conscientious leader.

Many things have been said in just eulogy of this great outstanding American. Therefore I will not attempt to add or enlarge upon these well-deserved phrases and comments. But before asking the privilege of extending my remarks I just wanted to bring out one thought: My very dear friend the gentleman from New York [Mr. CROWTHER] at one time paid me a very high compliment when he said I was a hand-picked candidate of Jim Farley. Of that I am proud. If I have in any way emulated the practices and teachings of this great man, I am indeed happy. Therefore I trust that my services in this House have met with his entire approval.

It may also be said that those who disagreed with him politically were among the first to recognize his great ability, his conscientiousness, his straightforwardness, and, above all, his friendship. I know that he held in high esteem the members on both sides of the aisle.

Now for the more important part, the public role played by Jim Farley. From a career started in the humblest way at the lowest scale of the political ladder he has climbed rung by rung with a sure, steady step, never interrupted by dishonor or dishonesty—he has climbed to the topmost rung of the political ladder until at the peak of his career he has been the greatest, most beloved, and, as the record shows, the most efficient national political chairman ever known in the history of any party in our country.

This is material success in a political way in the highest degree. Yet there is something vastly more important; that is the spiritual success of this man Farley in his public life.

Never has the finger of suspicion been pointed at him. Never has the voice of the opposition been directed at him in a harsh way. Always has he been loved and respected by the opposition as well as by the members of his own party. His word has never been broken. Finally, when confronted with the question of career on one side and the sacrifice of what he considered principle on the other, he never hesitated, but, statesmanlike, chose to stand firm on the side of principle. I am speaking of a man who is supreme in the practical field of politics. Yet I make this one point for the RECORD that there is no higher degree of statesmanship ever exemplified in the history of our country than this one of a man who would sacrifice his career rather than sacrifice a principle. This is the true test of statesmanship which will endure long after the signs or records of material success have faded.

I have searched the records of history and can find no example to equal the one set by Jim Farley wherein he has combined the highest degree of political skill and his statesmanlike character and intelligence.

If I were given my choice of the privilege of returning here today for one purpose only I can think of no other purpose which would better serve my country than to bring to the attention of the youth of America the example of my chief, my friend, and my ideal, the Honorable James A. Farley, "Jim" to me and to millions of others like me. Thank you.

The March of Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 4, 1940

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, The Women Investors in America, Inc., headed by Catherine Curtis as national director and with offices at 535 Fifth Avenue, New York City, adopted as a slogan this truthful expression—We are all investors in America, whether we are stockholders, bondholders, jobholders, or husband-holders.

This organization of patriotic women have from time to time published their views on matters of national importance. Recently there appeared a timely article entitled "The March of Democracy," in the organization's bulletin of August 30 and which I wish to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this time.

With the word "democracy" and all it represents being threatened with extinction in the light of present developments abroad, it is refreshing to pause and realize that we in America have not yet lost our precious heritage and priceless blessing—a free democracy.

The Women Investors in America, Inc., and other patriotic organizations imbued with a burning desire to expose the pitfalls that obstruct this Nation's pathway to national unity, are to be warmly congratulated for their contribution to the cause of good government.

The article follows:

THE MARCH OF DEMOCRACY

Today, public officials and others in this country speak of our American democracy and state that—to protect it and our liberties—we must join in the defense of the democracies. The founding fathers evidently did not intend our Government to be a democracy—for that word is not found in either the Declaration of Independence or the Constitution. But they did specify a form of government for us in the Constitution in article IV, section 4, which states:

"The United States shall guarantee to every State in this Union a republican form of government."

What is a democracy? The United States Army Manual, 2000–25, on "Citizenship," states on page 91:

"Democracy: a government of the masses. Authority derived through mass meeting of any form of 'direct expression.' Results in mobocracy. Attitude toward property is communistic—negating property rights. Attitude toward law is that the will of the majority shall regulate, whether it be based upon deliberation or governed by passion, prejudice, and impulse, without restraint or regard to consequences. Results in demagogism, license, agitation, discontent, anarchy."

This same publication states on page 88:

"The Government of the United States is not a democracy but a republic."

United States Army Manual 2000–25 is no longer used in teaching our soldiers citizenship. It was withdrawn from use a few years ago as some of the matter contained was found to be of "a controversial nature," according to official statements.

That international authority on world revolution, the late Duke of Northumberland, in his book History of World Revolution, published in 1931, declared:

"The adoption of democracy as a form of government by all European nations is fatal to good government, to liberty, to law and order, to respect for authority, and to religion, and must eventually produce a state of chaos from which a new world of tyranny will arise."

But we were told we entered the World War "to make the world safe for democracy." Let us see what has happened to nations that adopted that form of government.

RUSSIA

Kerensky brought "democracy" to Russia with the revolution of February 1917. All power was centralized in Moscow. Lenin and Trotsky seized that centralized power in the bloody revolution of October 1917, and established the first Soviet Communist nation. They would have been unsuccessful had not Kerensky first centralized all government power.

Women were "freed" under Russian "democracy." Children became property of the State. Women were given equal opportunity to work beside men in factory, field, and ditch, while their children were cared for in state-controlled nurseries. Women were even "nationalized," all men being given equal right to them, with the husband having first choice providing he was a member in good standing of the state.

Family ties were broken. Divorce was simplified in keeping with the new "democratic" freedom, for marital ties could be broken by either party appearing before a public official and declaring the marriage ended. Is it any wonder Russian men flocked to its "democracy"? Liberty, such as it is in that country, is for members of the Communist Party only.

HUNGARY

With the collapse of Hungary in late 1918, Count Karolyi seized control of the government and established a "democracy." He offered the Allies more of his country than they asked in return for recognition of his regime. Son of a wealthy and aristocratic family, he suffered from physical impairment and was ignored by his own class. He entered politics to satisfy his ego and for political advancement; associated himself with the rabble in his country.

Under his "democracy" Hungary was thrown into chaos, governmental powers centralized, later to be seized by Bela Kuhn Cohen, Trotsky lieutenant operating under orders from Moscow. He established a Soviet state, resulting in the slaughter of 160,000 Hungarian men, women, and children in 9 months. The masses ran riot. Privileges and protection were only for those holding cards in workers' unions. Cohen and his associates, most of whom were imported from Russia, looted the public treasury and taxed wealth into poverty.

His regime continued until Cecile Tormay, noted Hungarian woman author, inspired and organized Hungarian women, revived courage and fight in Hungarian men, and drove Karolyi, Cohen, and their followers from the country. Admiral Horthy then took control of the government. He has continued as dictator. Liberty in Hungary at present is for members of Horthy's party only.

GERMANY

"Democracy" was established in Germany with the fall of the Kaiser after the World War. Again came complete government centralization and Hitler—slowly but steadily—marched to dictatorship. Long before this war, basic property rights were ignored.

Women were urged to bear more and more children for the protection of the state. "Liberty" in Germany is for members of the Nazi Party only.

MEXICO

Calles promoted "democracy" in Mexico. He centralized complete powers in Mexico City. He moved to the United States when his term of office ended. His successor immediately began to abuse the centralized powers. Calles returned to Mexico to end that abuse—was thrown in jail, his wealth confiscated—and eventually was expelled from his native land.

His successor seized American oil properties in Mexico. American investors in those properties do not know how much—if anything—they will salvage from their investments. But they do know investors in Russian properties seized by the Soviet "democracy" never salvaged a penny.

Newspaper reports of the recent election in Mexico claim citizens not members of—or in accord with the ruling party, were barred from voting. The present ruling party will continue in power—unless the opposition stages a successful revolt, with its usual destruction, suffering, and misery. "Liberty" in Mexico is for members of the Labor Party only.

ITALY

Following the World War, Italy limited the powers of her King and established a partial "democracy." The usual centralization of power followed—and eventually was seized by Mussolini. Without such centralization, Mussolini never could have become dictator. Property rights are negligible in Italy—were so even before the present war. Women have been granted "equal opportunities"—and "Il Duce" urges them to bear more and more children for the state. "Liberty" in Italy is for members of the Fascist Party only.

AUSTRIA

Following the World War, Austria became a Republic. Within a few years, it changed to a "democracy." Today, Austria is no more. It is part of Germany. "Liberty" in Austria is for members of the Nazi Party only.

SPAIN

Also, following the World War, Spain established a republic. Soon it too changed to a "democracy," followed by centralization of power in Madrid. The people discovered this centralization was leading to dictatorship, that a plot was well advanced to declare Spain part of the Soviet Union.

That discovery resulted in the most horrible civil war in world history. Spaniards revolted against the communistic plot. The internationalists—Communists, radicals, and liberals—rushed to its defense from all parts of the world. The story of that civil war is one of the most atrocious in the civilized world. While the internationalists were in control of the government, women were given equal opportunities, only to find themselves in the trenches, their womanly rights disregarded and assaulted. Russia, France, and other "democracies" sent arms and munitions to bolster the Spanish Internationalists' resistance, but General Franco's Nationalist army won. Franco now is dictator of Spain. Liberty there is for members of the Nationalist Party only.

FRANCE

For many years France was a republic, with nationalist policies. Following the World War, step by step, it abandoned its nationalism and republican form of government. Finally, under Leon Blum, called Father of the French New Deal, it adopted democracy and internationalism as its government policy.

Under Blum's regime France followed the usual trends of a democracy, centralized planned economy, government-controlled prices, unbalanced budgets, riotous government spending, currency revaluation, harassment and restriction of private enterprise with lowered production, less jobs, and lowered living standards for all except those in power.

"Sit-in" strikes originated in France under Blum, quickly followed by sit-down strikes in the United States. He led European democracies in aiding the Spanish Internationalists by stripping his country of defense weapons and sending them to Spain. These were captured by General Franco, turned over to Hitler, and used against France.

France, at war, found her industries in chaos due to Blum's social-reform laws; her munitions, airplane plants, railroads, and communications practically under control of Communists and internationalists who had risen to power under Blum's protection.

France is now a dictatorship—the result of joining the march of democracy. Liberty there is for members of the dictator's party only.

THE UNITED STATES

The trend toward more and more centralization of power in Washington has steadily increased during recent years. This has resulted in continual encroachment, bit by bit, on individual freedom and basic property rights. We have been forced to accept centralized, planned economy, currency revaluation, unbalanced budgets, and riotous Government spending. Private enterprise is harassed and restricted by government.

Today centralized Government control extends over our railroads, radio, utilities, banks, stock and commodity markets, agriculture, labor, and education. Under guise of emergency, we are asked to accept more and more centralized control.

But we have not quite reached the final stage of democracy where liberty in the United States is for members of the ruling party only.

* * * * * * *

Rarely in the messages or statements of our former Presidents do we find democracy mentioned until popularized by President Wilson during the World War. Since then our people have been insidiously propagandized to accept democracy and forget our guaranteed form of government.

Washington, Jefferson, Madison, John Quincy Adams, Jackson, Harrison, Lincoln, Garfield, Cleveland, and McKinley all spoke and wrote of our republican traditions and institutions. They termed to leaders of our War for Independence the "Fathers of our Republic."

The founders of our Republic purposely separated the functions of the executive, legislative, and judicial branches of our Government. Each was made independent of the other to protect the rights and liberties of all—minority as well as majority.

The majority of power was placed in the hands of the people's representatives in the Congress and the States. They intended we should look to our elected representatives for protection—not to any one individual in whom all power was centralized. They knew—from Old World experience—centralization would lead to dictatorship and loss of liberty.

In view of all this—it is time we gave careful consideration to the famous statements of two signers of the Declaration of Independence. The first is that of Samuel Adams, who declared:

"Remember, democracy never lasts long! It soon wastes, exhausts and murders itself! There never was a democracy that did not commit suicide!"

And the second is that of Benjamin Franklin who, when asked at the close of the Constitutional Convention what type of government we were to have—a monarchy or democracy—replied:

"A republic—if we can keep it!"

Will we continue to travel the low road of democracy to national suicide, or will we regain the high road of the republic and keep our independence?

* * * * * * *

The women of these United States must not forget the part their foremothers played in founding this country—those brave women who stood shoulder to shoulder with their menfolk against wilderness, redskin, and redcoat. Their determination, inspiration, and spiritual ideals spurred on their men to make the vast wilderness a great productive land. Those qualities gave our forefathers the courage to revolt against the tyranny of Old World centralized control and to establish our Republic.

As we salute our Stars and Stripes, we should remember with pride that a woman gave our Republic that flag—made by her own hands.

Therefore our women have three powerful investments in these United States—first, the spiritual, which conveys the right to preserve that inspired quality of citizenship directly responsible for founding this free country; second, the physical, which includes the right to a higher standard of living than that enjoyed by women in any other country; and, third, the financial, with the right to own property and freely invest their savings in the private-enterprise system for profit, security, and advancement.

Because of women's great contribution to our country—and the preferred position they have achieved under our Republic—I recommend they give serious thought to the facts set forth in this bulletin.

As has been pointed out—we have not yet reached the final stage of democracy.

However, I am convinced that unless our women revive the spiritual ideals and courage of our Revolutionary ancestors—organize as did the women of Hungary—we may well witness the loss of our liberty and independence, and the death of our Republic in the days that lie ahead.

Sincerely yours,

CATHRINE CURTIS,
National Director.

"Trust Buster" Thurman Arnold

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 4, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM COLLIER'S MAGAZINE

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, no one in the House is more opposed to monopolistic practices than I am. In my opinion the consuming public should always have protection against any practices that would tend to overcharge them

or discriminate against free and open competition. I have always been a supporter of the antitrust laws and expect to continue to support legislation of that character.

I want to say, however, that some questions arise in my mind as to the policy of the Department of Justice in carrying on a program of prosecution of American industry. My attention has just been directed to an editorial in a current issue of Collier's magazine, which has just been released on the newsstands. This deals with the question of tobacco and various companies that are engaged in its manufacture and distribution.

The editorial is as follows:

How now, whither are we drifting, what the blazes, and all that? We refer to the Sherman Anti-Trust Act criminal charges brought by Thurman Arnold's antimonopoly committee against the eight biggest tobacco companies operating in the United States—American Tobacco Co., British-American, Imperial, Liggett & Myers, P. Lorillard Co., Philip Morris & Co., R. J. Reynolds, Universal Leaf Tobacco Co.

Arnold charges these outfits with creating assorted tobacco trusts, then works around to this remarkable accusation:

"By Nation-wide advertising and sales promotion schemes the Big Four and Philip Morris & Co., Ltd., Inc., created such a perfect acceptance and demand for their major brands that—the offering of such products for sale being a necessary adjunct to the conduct of numerous wholesale, retail, and service establishments—such establishments are forced to handle the products even on unreasonable and arbitrary terms and at such prices."

In plainer English, the Big Four and Philip Morris build more attractive mousetraps, so to speak, than anybody else in the tobacco game, and let the world know they do, so the world beats paths to the doors of Camels, Chesterfields, Lucky Strikes, Old Golds, and Philip Morrises—and Arnold calls these typically American successes crimes. There can be no quarrel with legitimate Government efforts to stop actually unfair trade practices. But this particular squawk is absurd.

The tobacco companies don't force retailers to sell their cigarettes. The smoking public, because it prefers these brands, forces the dealers to handle them. And the cigarette business, far from being monopolistic, is fiercely competitive. These brands have battled for years. When Camels nose out Luckies for a quarter year, or Philip Morrises edge ahead of Old Golds, or Chesterfields outrun the field for a spell, it's news.

As for cigarettes' unreasonable prices, the Government certainly isn't doing anything to make them more reasonable. It now taxes popular-price cigarettes 6½ cents a package—meaning the manufacturers have become so efficient that cigarettes could retail at something under 9 cents per package of 20 with reasonable profits if it weren't for the taxes.

Sure, we take all kinds of reputable tobacco advertising, and are glad to have it, and Mr. Arnold is welcome to make what he can out of that. So what? So just the same, Arnold's committee has gone off the deep end on a cockeyed, fantastic prosecution, or else the Sherman Antitrust Act needs some drastic amendments. Probably a bit of both.

The Funeral of Senator Lundeen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN G. ALEXANDER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 4, 1940

ARTICLES FROM THE MINNEAPOLIS STAR-JOURNAL

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, the following articles taken from the Minneapolis Star-Journal of September 2 indicate the high esteem in which Senator ERNEST LUNDEEN was held by the people of our State, and I ask that they be made a part of the permanent RECORD in connection with the services following his death.

[From the Minneapolis Star-Journal of September 2, 1940]

LUNDEEN IS EULOGIZED BY TOWNSENDITES—PICNIC SPEAKING PRAISE SENATOR'S BACKING OF PENSION PLAN

Senator ERNEST LUNDEEN, killed Saturday in an airplane crash, was praised by speakers at a State-wide Townsend Club picnic at Excelsior Amusement Park Sunday for his efforts on behalf of the movement.

He was on his way here from Washington to be principal speaker on the picnic program when the crash occurred.

Dr. Paul Hartig, a friend of the Senator, called upon the several thousand Townsendites present during his memorial address to emulate Senator LUNDEEN's determination "which carried him forward in the face of discouragement."

He said, "Of all the men in public office none could come here with a clearer conscience than Senator LUNDEEN."

"The uphill road could have been smoothed had he been a little less sincere, a little less honest," Dr. Hartig said, "but he did not choose the easy way.

"He could have been more of a politician, but he was a statesman, living not for the next election, but for the next generation."

C. W. Smeltzer, Townsend State headquarters committee chairman, presented a resolution calling upon the Governor to fill the vacancy in the Senate by appointment of someone "who will work for adoption of the Townsend plan as did Senator LUNDEEN." It was adopted unanimously.

Herbert F. Haren, national Townsend representative for Minnesota, declared LUNDEEN fought in behalf of Townsend members and in behalf of "all the common people of America."

Glen S. Wilson, Chicago, Townsend club national director of visual education, declared the Townsend plan, for which Senator LUNDEEN worked, is necessary now to bring the Nation back to normalcy.

[From the Minneapolis Star-Journal]

LUNDEEN'S BODY WILL ARRIVE HERE TUESDAY—TO LIE IN STATE IN CAPITOL ROTUNDA UNTIL FUNERAL HOUR

The body of Senator ERNEST LUNDEEN, killed in an airplane accident near Lovettsville, Va., Saturday, will arrive at the Great Northern Station here at 9:35 p. m. Tuesday, accompanied by an escort of Senators and Representatives.

The funeral cortege was to leave Washington at 5:10 p. m. today.

Upon arrival here it will be met by three batteries of National Guard men and details of the State highway patrol and Minneapolis and St. Paul police.

It will proceed from the station up Nicollet Avenue to Tenth Street, then to Third Avenue South, and thence to the State capitol in St. Paul.

The body will be placed in the capitol rotunda to lie in state until the hour of the funeral services, 3 p. m. Wednesday.

Services will be conducted in the rotunda, with the Reverend George Mecklenburg, pastor of Wesley Methodist Church, officiating. Masonic services will be under auspices of Minneapolis Lodge, No. 19, A. F. and A. M.

These will be followed by full military honors at the graveside in the National Cemetery at Fort Snelling, conducted by veterans of the Spanish-American War.

Four Senators and four Representatives will form the congressional escort.

Senators HENRIK SHIPSTEAD, of Minnesota; RUSH D. HOLT, of West Virginia; EDWIN C. JOHNSON, of Colorado; and JAMES E. MURRAY, of Montana, will form the senatorial group. They were named by Vice President JOHN N. GARNER.

Speaker BANKHEAD, of the House, named Representative AUGUST H. ANDRESEN, of Minnesota, to head the House committee. Other Members are MELVIN MAAS, ELMER J. RYAN, and R. T. BUCKLER, all of Minnesota.

Veterans of the Spanish-American War, in which Senator LUNDEEN served, will be active pallbearers.

They will be Otto A. Zimmerman, 4242 Scott Terrace; Wirth H. Kelley, 3501 Twenty-fifth Avenue South; Guy Thompson, 400 Zenith Avenue South; William R. Ambrose, 3657 West Broadway, Robbinsdale; Ole Sandsted, Northfield; and John W. Milligan, Fairbault.

Honorary pallbearers will be—

Victor Lawson, Wilmar; Guy Alexander, Minneapolis; Mayor John J. McDonough, St. Paul; Mayor George Leach, Minneapolis; R. D. Cramer, Minneapolis; Nels A. Pederson, Milan.

J. B. Boscoe, Hjalmar Petersen, M. E. Jerdee, Andrew Hawkins, Col. Walter E. Downey, William T. Boyce, Tom Davis, Jacob Kunz, Frank Forestal, William DeParcq, and E. A. Rerat, all of Minneapolis.

A. F. Whitney, Cleveland; Judge J. B. Himsl, St. Cloud; Dr. O. W. Schlopp, Hutchinson; I. G. Scott, Minneapolis; Otto Bremer, St. Paul; Walter Heynacher, Minneapolis; Neil Messick, Minneapolis.

Gov. Harold E. Stassen, Congressman Richard T. Buckler; George H. Lommen; Edward Hagen, Milan; Hugo Koch, St. Paul; Robert J. Johnstone, St. Paul; George Hagen, Crookston; Judge George F. Sullivan, St. Paul; Paul Kvale, Benson; Joseph Wolf, St. Paul; Harry H. Peterson, St. Paul.

Judge Vince A. Day, Minneapolis, Judge John P. Devaney, Minneapolis; William Mahoney, St. Paul; Edward Chalgren, Minneapolis; John W. Graff, St. Paul; Julius Reiter, Rochester; Dr. Paul Hartig, Minneapolis; J. Fred Johnson, Minneapolis; Frank Osterlind, Afton; Charles Swenson, Minneapolis; Charles Lundquist, Minneapolis; C. L. Holt, Minneapolis.

Herman Aufderheide, New Ulm; Otto Baudler, Austin; Judge Mark Nolan, Gilbert; A. Lockhart, St. Paul; George Lawson, St. Paul; Robert Olson, Duluth; Gottfried Lindsten, Minneapolis.

Charles Munn, Osseo; Elmer Benson, Appleton; William Mee, Faribault; Lewis E. Lohmann; H. O. Peterson, Stillwater; Jack Lyons and Dewey Johnson, Minneapolis.

Officers of the Spanish-American Veterans and auxiliary asked members to be at Great Northern station at the time of arrival of the funeral party.

Senator LUNDEEN's body was identified at the accident scene by office attachés and taken to Washington Sunday. He had left Washington only an hour and 15 minutes before his death Saturday. He was to have kept a speaking engagement in Minneapolis.

President Roosevelt, in a wire to Mrs. Lundeen Sunday from his special train carrying him to Chattanooga, Tenn., expressed the sympathy of himself and Mrs. Roosevelt.

Tributes to Senator LUNDEEN continued to come from his colleagues and other sources. Senator CHARLES MCNARY, Senate minority leader and Republican Vice Presidential nominee, described his death as "a very great loss."

Paul J. Kvale declared: "His successive defeats never embittered him nor caused him to swerve from his principles. He was never more needed in the Senate than now."

Dewey Johnson declared: "The Nation has lost a leader who feared no issue or cause. He battled to preserve our democratic institutions and privileges."

In a resolution the Third District Farmer-Labor Women's Federation declared: "The passing of Senator LUNDEEN is that of one of the finest, bravest, and most patriotic Americans who ever lived. Let us hope all he died fighting for may yet be won."

The Senator's colleagues recalled today his last words in the Senate were:

"I am glad to know that for the next 30 days we shall be safe."

The words were spoken in debate with Senator NEELY of West Virginia on the Burke-Wadsworth conscription bill, which LUNDEEN opposed. The words were in response to a statement of NEELY'S that "I don't think we'll be invaded during the next 30 days, but beyond that I do not venture."

In his last Senate address, Senator LUNDEEN bitterly attacked the $5,000,000,000 defense bill, declaring such appropriations meant "panic, depression, and bankruptcy."

Senator SHIPSTEAD revealed today LUNDEEN loved to travel by airplane but that he had once warned his colleague to be careful.

Senator LUNDEEN is survived by his wife; a daughter, Joan Jessie; a son, Ernest, Jr.; three sisters, Mrs. C. J. Lagergren, Galesburg, Ill., Mrs. Otto Carlson, Oakland, Nebr., and Mrs. Edward Widen, Minneapolis, and two brothers, Joel and David, of Minneapolis.

Drive for Anglo-American Alliance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN L. SWEENEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 4, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE GAELIC AMERICAN (NEW YORK)

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Gaelic American of New York entitled "Drive for Anglo-American Alliance":

[From the Gaelic American (New York), of August 31, 1940]

DRIVE FOR ANGLO-AMERICAN ALLIANCE

The negotiations, at present, going on between the United States and Canada, for the acquiring of air and naval bases in the English-owned islands from Halifax to Jamaica, are a covert move for an Anglo-American alliance. More than once since the beginning of the century attempts to bring about such an alliance have been defeated by the United States Senate. The last attempt was in 1912 when Taft's treaty was so amended in the Senate that its author could hardly recognize it and he decided not to affix his signature to the revised version.

The English regard the air- and naval-bases proposal as a step towards a military alliance. An Associated Press dispatch, which is in part as follows, refers to the American-Canadian talks as preliminary steps toward a British-American alliance, offensive and defensive.

"London, August 21.—Unofficial but well-informed sources indicated today that the British Government is seeking a military alliance with the United States. Canadian-American discussions on mutual defense are considered in these quarters to be the opening wedge in a British effort to obtain a full military accord."

The full details of the new scheme have not yet been revealed. In well-informed quarters it is said that England refuses to sell outright any of the islands, but agrees to lease sites for the air and naval bases to the United States. This phase of the deal was revealed recently in the House of Commons by Winston Churchill, who emphasized that the bases would be leased for a limited period and that the outright sale of them could not be considered. No doubt he would be less specific in his statement if he had not already come to an agreement with the Washington Government. England will retain her sovereignty over the islands and the bases rented to America regardless of the fabulous prices that the United States may have to pay for them. A special dispatch to the New York Times, which is in part as follows, hints that the deal may cancel England's war debts to the United States:

"WASHINGTON, August 23.—One proposal which is before the President, with some congressional backing, would have for its ultimate objective a leasing deal which would cancel the entire British war debt to the United States. It would involve writing down the present book value of the British debt, which runs to about $5,650,000,000, with all accrued interest, to something like $2,800,000,000, by granting the British a retroactive interest rate of 0.42 percent instead of the 3.5 percent now applicable to the British debt, and by applying against the funded principal all amounts already paid, which total $1,469,000,000."

This is an exorbitant price to pay for air and naval bases in England's islands. A liberal price for their use would be about $50,000,000, and at this figure they would be far from being a bargain, even if permanent possession of them were assured. The whole scheme is questionable and seems designed to evade the Johnson Act and thus give England again unlimited credits and enable her after the war is over, even should she win out, to repudiate her obligations to America. Will a great part of the cost of the present war, like that of the World War, be shunted to the shoulders of the American taxpayers?

The American-Canadian negotiations recalls Carnegie's prophecy, made as far back as 1893, of a reunion between the American Republic and the British monarchy. Carnegie's prophecy was not at that time taken seriously and his suggestion of a title for the new state—the British-American Union—was regarded as the dream of an old man in his dotage. It is now evident that Carnegie had only given expression to the views and hopes of England's ruling caste. By accident or mischance we have at present Americans in key positions who are as pro-English as Churchill and as anxious as the late "iron king" to bring the United States back under the British flag.

The propaganda that a Hitler victory would menace America is not credited by any honest or well-informed American. Europe will always have troubles of her own to engage the attention of her big powers. No king or dictator will have the means, even if he had the desires, to attempt an invasion of the Americas. The Anglomaniacs shriek that if Hitler wins he will get possession of the English Navy and this added to his own will enable him to invade the American Continent. When the war ends the English and German Navies will be so crippled and battered that the combined remnants will be in no condition to venture 3,000 miles of the Atlantic in a futile effort to invade the United States or any part of the American Continent.

The danger to the United States is from within, not from without. With interventionists in high station, fired with zeal to save the British Empire, America is in danger of being pushed from the traditional moorings and the Anglomaniacs may engage in adventures which may establish a dictatorship or monarchy. A Carnegie-British-American Union may be established and King George VI installed in Ottawa from which he could bestow titles on his "fifth columnists" in the United States. Decorations and titles would be showered on the interventionists.

As Canada is a belligerent it is doubtful neutrality on the part of the United States to enter at the present time into a military defense agreement with a country at war. In an agreement for bases outside Canadian waters the negotiations will be directly with England. The main concern of some of our great statesmen is to safeguard the British Empire.

The time has come for Americans to snap out of their indifference. Let it be understood that the danger to American institutions comes from native not foreign dictators. Wake up, America.

Campaign Analysis by the New York Times

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN G. ALEXANDER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 4, 1940

ARTICLE FROM THE NEW YORK TIMES

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, does the following New York Times article by Arthur Krock, former ardent New Dealer, indicate a new trend of the Times? It is said that the New York paper is rapidly changing, hence this article by Krock, which a year ago would not have appeared in the Times. The article follows:

[From the New York Times]

DEMOCRATIC STRATEGY RISKS COUNTERATTACKS—HAZARDS OF THE PLAN OF CAMPAIGN AS NOW LAID DOWN MAY BE EXPLOITED BY AGGRESSIVE OPPOSITION—THE RECORD ON "APPEASEMENT"

(By Arthur Krock)

The pattern of the Democratic campaign, as the President departs to make speeches which he firmly labels "nonpolitical" and Mr.

Willkie's open and acknowledged drive for votes is about to begin, has been very clearly drawn. Unless some momentous event shall change them, the outlines will be as follows:

(1) The President will take every advantage of his incumbency in a critical time to emphasize that everything he does is official and designed solely to establish national security; that whatever his opponent offers by way of suggestion or criticism is mere "politics." A host of supporters, in and out of office, will fortify his position in every way they can.

(2) The President will comment freely on pending legislative or other questions when he chooses, giving the interest of national defense as his reason for deviation from the "1933 rule" that such is not his practice. When he chooses not to comment he will point to the "1933 rule." This was illustrated at two successive press conferences. A week ago Friday he registered opposition to the pending Maloney amendment to the Burke-Wadsworth bill. Last Friday he invoked the "1933 rule" against comment on the Overton-Russell amendment to the same bill, which would give the Executive unlimited powers to take over industrial plants and probably other forms of business.

(3) The President and his spokesmen will continue to urge that world conditions require the third-term tradition be broken to assure this Nation's safety, and that the same situation makes it either "bravado" or "disrespect" to ask Mr. Roosevelt to debate any issue. At the same time they will continue to point to the tradition, established in normal times, against a President undertaking joint discussion.

ATTITUDE TOWARD BUSINESS

(4) While making every official use of important businessmen in the defense commission and elsewhere in the Government, the Democratic campaign and congressional trend will continue to register and foster distrust of the attitude of industry and finance toward reforms and suggest the inability of the business community to forget profits and other selfish concerns for the general welfare.

(5) As emphasized by Mr. Wallace in his acceptance speech—an address which the President warmly praised on Friday—the effort will be made to show that appeasement of Hitler is an inevitable consequence of Republican victory because "appeasers have contributed largely * * * to the Republican cause" and will demand and receive what they want.

(6) By the automatic operation of this general strategy, Democratic discussion of domestic issues will be deprecated or declined.

It will be difficult to maintain that strategic front for various reasons. The aggressiveness and penetration of the Republican candidate himself form one obstacle. And this will be assisted by questionings and criticisms in the press and on the radio. The success of the venture depends on the impact of the foreign situation on electoral decision in this country and the skill of the President. If he is entrenched to the degree his more enthusiastic admirers believe he is, the program, despite its inconsistencies and its daring, will be ratified in November by Mr. Roosevelt's election to a third term. Then, indeed, a political miracle will have been accomplished. For not only is the project vastly difficult, this is the first occasion when an American President has sought a third term.

THE HAZARDS

Examination of the outlines of this campaign pattern makes its hazards readily apparent. They are not to be found so much in point 1; Presidents who are candidates have always sought to emphasize the office over its quest. But in point 2 they emerge. Anyone with good hearing or good eyesight knows Mr. Roosevelt has no fixed rule about comment on pending questions; that he comments when he sees an advantage in so doing and refrains when he doesn't. Point 3 is equally inconsistent, because if the times call for the disregard of the two-term tradition for a President they may also require that he cannot fall back on the fact that predecessors have refused to engage in discussion.

It will be up to the vast voting group, called the middle class for lack of a better term, to decide point 4. This group gains its living through private industry and has always seemed to prefer free enterprise to Government operation. It must be persuaded that while a draft from business and finance is indispensable to national security the same citizens cannot be trusted to subordinate their personal concerns to the national emergency. And this group must also be convinced that when the President's spokesmen in the Senate endorse a proposal like the Overton-Russell amendment there is still no truth in the repeated charge that Federal industrial ownership and control are eventual objectives of the New Deal.

APPEASEMENT CHARGE

Point 5—to convict the Republican Party exclusively as harboring appeasers of Hitler who will have their way if Mr. Willkie wins—is very vulnerable also. There is Mr. Willkie's acceptance speech to refute it, and the widespread belief that he was nominated without any obligation and is the type of man who would neither contract nor underwrite such commitments. And then there is the open record of the man who was the titular leader of the Republican Party until the hour of Mr. Willkie's nomination, former Governor Landon of Kansas.

It was as early as May 1938, in a speech to the Inland Press Association, that Mr. Landon condemned Hitler and all his works, and denounced any moves to try to reconcile totalitarian policy with our own. In December of that same year the President sent Mr. Landon to the Lima Conference as a delegate. Speaking over the radio from there, he said that the Americas as a unit could never maintain their system and its liberties and compromise with the Hitler way of life in any way.

Mr. Wallace's appeasement thesis is also complicated by portions of the President's own record. For a long time he was an "appeaser." His purpose was to avert the war that has come to the world, but the moves were "appeasement" moves. There was the telegram in September 1938 pleading with Hitler to take what Great Britain and France offered him at Munich and what they promised he should have in addition. In this telegram the President assured the Fuehrer that, if he would do this, he would earn the gratitude of mankind. Then, after Hitler had seized Czechoslovakia in violation of his Munich pledge, the President urged a peace conference, which in its essence was a move for "appeasement", too.

A ROOSEVELT HANDICAP

In view of this record, it may not be possible to charge the mood of appeasement to the political group in this country whose recent leaders have spoken so uncompromisingly of Hitler.

The last point in the outline, No. 6—to deprecate or decline effective discussion of the domestic issues—will be easier for the President himself to maintain. But if Mr. Willkie can sustain his argument that a sound domestic status is the base of any effective defense policy, Democratic spokesmen may find themselves forced to engage in the argument. The emergence of the Overton-Russell amendment should also assist in breaking down this point of campaign strategy.

National Defense Program Is Strengthened by Acquisition of British Islands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 4, 1940

EXCERPTS FROM EDITORIALS OF WASHINGTON NEWSPAPERS

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, in the first part of March I introduced a joint resolution which called for the President to enter into negotiations with Great Britain looking toward the acquisition of certain islands which we would use as defense bases. Yesterday Congress received a message from the Chief Executive explaining what had been done in the way of immediate acquisition of British island bases in exchange for 50 American destroyers. It is not my purpose at this time to discuss the merits of our trade but I do believe that these islands will be of real value to American defense. I quote from portions of the following editorials, all from National Capital newspapers:

[From the Washington Post of September 4, 1940]

PROTECT PANAMA CANAL

The desirability of the naval and air bases which the United States is now in a position to build on British soil in this hemisphere is beyond dispute. The prospective sites extend all the way from Newfoundland to British Guiana. When developed they will serve as an additional protective barrier for the Panama Canal. They will be of incalculable value in the defense of the entire Western Hemisphere.

A ring of protective bases in the Atlantic will make the invasion of North America by a European aggressor more difficult and far more costly than would otherwise be the case. Through their possession the range and effectiveness of the United States fleet and air force will very greatly be increased. That fact is of particular importance to the Nation at a time when the contemplated additions to the Navy are still largely in the blueprint stage.

The transfer to Great Britain of 50 over-age destroyers is a small price to pay for the advantages we gain from this transaction. Nor can it be forgotten that, to the extent that these destroyers enable Great Britain to continue the war and thus possibly avert a Nazi victory, their transfer serves our national interest. Looking at the transaction in its entirety, our defenses, as well as those of Great Britain, have been very substantially strengthened.

There is the risk, of course, that Hitler may regard the transfer of the obsolescent destroyers to Great Britain as a hostile act by the United States. But as long as Great Britain remains in the field that risk is small.

On the other hand, if Great Britain goes down, the peril to the United States and the entire Western Hemisphere will enormously increase. But even in that event this country now has the solemn and twice-repeated assurances of Premier Churchill that the "British Fleet would in no event be surrendered or sunk, but would be sent overseas for the defense of other parts of the empire."

Great emergencies call for courageous action. In the present emergency the two great English-speaking democracies, one fighting for its very existence, the other girding its loins for the defense of a

hemisphere, have shown that they possess the requisite vigor, foresight, and determination to act boldly and promptly. The position of each in its respective sphere of action has been notably strengthened.

[From the Washington Times-Herald of September 4, 1940]

LONG-RANGE VALUE

The North and South Atlantic air and naval bases will certainly be of great long-range value to us. We pick up some extremely valuable leased property by this deal—valuable from a strategic point of view, that is; in the world of today strategically valuable property is about the most valuable property a nation can have.

The island of Newfoundland (42,000 square miles; population, 300,000) is Great Britain's oldest colony, having been discovered by John Cabot in 1497, only 5 years after Columbus discovered America. It is by way of being a large and effective cork, militarily, for the St. Lawrence River—and the St. Lawrence River is a logical route for some would-be invader to take for a jump at the United States' industrial heart via the Hudson Valley.

Bermuda, a group of 360 small islands (20 inhabited) about 600 miles east of North Carolina, has a harbor which will take ships up to 22,000 tons in its inner reaches. Since 1934 Bermuda, with its excellent naval dockyard facilities, has been the British Navy's main Atlantic station.

The Bahamas string away from our Florida coast toward Haiti. The Windward and Leeward Islands, containing the above-mentioned bases at Santa Lucia and Antigua, respectively, are part of the ring of Caribbean ramparts which is completed by Trinidad and British Guiana.

Acquisition by lease of these strategic points means—if we take prompt advantage of it as part of our general defense program—that our North Atlantic and Caribbean defenses should be pretty well lined up against the ambitions of any and all comers from overseas.

We and the British, or maybe just we, might be wise to round out the job by seizing Martinique in the Caribbean and St. Pierre and Miquelon off Newfoundland from the French.

As for the Falkland Islands, strategically valuable British-owned group in the South Atlantic off the lower end of the Argentine, we can't imagine how they came to be overlooked in this 50-destroyers deal. Maybe they're in reserve for the next deal.

[From the Washington Daily News, of September 4, 1940]

BASES NEEDED NOW

"Time is the essence." And in terms of time alone, fortification of those island bases acquired in the deal with Great Britain may well prove, as President Roosevelt says, the most important national-defense action since the Louisiana Purchase.

Experts have estimated that such fortification is possible within 1 year. Naval construction to do a comparable defense job would take from 4 to 5 years. That might be too late. Nothing is certain, but 1 year as against 4 or 5 may mean the difference between disaster and safety.

When the fortification job is done, the air fields laid out, the underground airdromes, hangars, and machine shops constructed, and supplies laid in, a national Sigh-of-Relief Week should be declared. May our luck hold out?

Col. H. A. Toulmin, Jr., one of the experts, described picturesquely what is involved. We quote him again: "Nature has given us a whole series of aircraft carriers in the form of these islands. No fleet of an invading enemy or air corps would be in a position to attack the United States if we could use this chain of primary defenses."

To Puerto Rico, Guantanamo Bay and the Virgin Islands, huddled much too closely in the Caribbean, is now added a sweep of defense territory which extends from Canada to South America.

"In this tense international situation," says Brig. Gen. George V. Strong, Assistant Chief of Staff, United States Army, "the country cannot afford to wait until the completion of our Atlantic Navy. The equivalent of that Navy can be secured for defense purposes within a year."

[From the Washington Evening Star of September 4, 1940]

GAPS ARE PLUGGED

The base facilities granted to us by Britain for 99 years plug what might soon become dangerous gaps in our defenses, vast undefended stretches of water along what have been called the northern and southern highroads of invasion. In the past these deficiencies in outposts have not been considered vital, for we have depended to a large extent upon the friendly British Fleet for our security in the Atlantic. But if that fleet were to be destroyed, or even if it should be driven from its bases in the British Isles, our safety would be put in gravest jeopardy.

A study of the strategic importance of the prospective chain of naval and air bases across the two-thousand-odd miles from Newfoundland to British Guiana, on the South American mainland, will show convincingly how the security of the Western Hemisphere will be enhanced by the President's deal. The Monroe Doctrine takes on new force, for it will be implemented for the first time since its promulgation by a stationary "ring of steel" in the Atlantic Ocean of formidable defensive potentialities. The psychological effect of the very existence of such outer defenses should be considerable in this era of aggression on the march, of dictators looking for new worlds to conquer.

The proposed bases will strengthen our Atlantic defense system in its weakest points—the northern and southern flanks—and will provide a frontal outpost at Bermuda of incalculable value in an emergency, both as a listening station and as an intermediate supply base for warships and for planes. The Newfoundland base site was inspected recently by members of the joint Canadian-American defense board. The vulnerability of Canada—and hence of our northern border—to attack by way of Iceland and Greenland has been a matter of grave concern since the invasion of Norway by the Nazis. Canadian troops have occupied Danish-controlled Iceland for protective purposes, but if Britain fell, Iceland undoubtedly would have to be abandoned by the Canadians. Iceland is a stepping stone to Greenland, which, in turn, is only a short jump to Canada. Greenland must be considered as a part of the Western Hemisphere, and its invasion by a European power could not be countenanced under the Monroe Doctrine any more than an attack on Canada could be permitted by the United States. To forestall such a threat it is necessary that we should have not only a military understanding with Canada regarding joint defense, such as the joint board is working on now, but that we should have in the vicinity for our own self-protection a major operating base for fleet units and aircraft. Newfoundland is ideally situated for this purpose.

From Newfoundland the new defense line will extend southward to Bermuda, far off our bulging Atlantic coast line. It was indicated that two bases would be established in Bermuda, one on the east coast and another on the Great Bay, at the western end of the island. If Bermuda should be captured by a hostile power, bombing planes would have a convenient springboard for attacks on the populous Atlantic seaboard of the United States. Both Newfoundland and Bermuda are vital to the defense of Canada, and the British Government probably had this consideration in mind in making an outright gift of base sites in those locations.

The Bahamas are militarily important because they stand guard over the Florida Straits, between Cuba and the American mainland. This passage now is protected by a military station at Key West and by the big base at Guantanamo, Cuba. To the south of Cuba lies Jamaica. Bases in the Bahamas and Jamaica will vastly reinforce the security of the Greater Antilles. We have naval and air facilities in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, but the remainder of the Lesser Antilles group, bending southward to Venezuela, are now virtually unguarded and hence very inviting to an aggressor with an eye on the Panama Canal or on the Venezuelan and Colombian oil fields. This alarming gap in the Canal defense scheme will be closed when bases are set up in Antigua, St. Lucia, and Trinidad and on the coast of British Guiana. Antigua is less than 300 miles southeast of the Virgin Islands. St. Lucia is about 500 miles below Antigua, and Trinidad is another 500 miles to the south and close to the Venezuelan shore. The last fortified area in the great chain will be on the mainland, in British Guiana.

Other links may be added to this chain shortly. Mr. Roosevelt indicated that negotiations for several more bases are under way. The United States could use profitably an air base in Nova Scotia, where the British already have one. A base in Danish Greenland would be worth a flotilla of destroyers in time of war with a European foe. Naval stations and air fields are needed in Central and South American regions close to the Panama Canal, life line of the fleet. The American people are certain to view with satisfaction any further acquisitions which add to the impregnability of the continent and thus complicate the problem confronting a would-be invader.

The National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KNUTE HILL

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 4, 1940

RADIO TRANSCRIPTION OF HON. KNUTE HILL, OF WASHINGTON

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio transcription made by me:

Friends and fellow citizens, the present are the most critical days of this generation. Only twice before in our history have our people faced so serious a situation. First, during the Revolution, when we were struggling for independence, and the critical years following when it became necessary to form a permanent Federal Government out of our 13 jealous Colonies. Again, when a civil war shook the foundations of this Nation and threatened to forever shut the door against a real attempt at democracy.

Today the world is aflame with war, the Four Black Horsemen, death, disease, famine, and pestilence are again riding with

chacs in their wake, and even the Western Hemisphere is threatened with disaster. At such a time it is the duty of all elected servants of the people to remain at their posts no matter what the consequences to their political fortunes. In the past few months we here at the seat of our Federal Government have been building up an adequate defense against any attack, be it from Europe or Asia. We have no desire nor intention to take any part whatsoever in wars abroad. We joined once with the Allies in an attempt to make the world safe for democracy and failed miserably. So much so that dictatorship stalks abroad in Europe today, waging war on the helpless, and the specter of death, disease, hunger, and hatred hovers over a once prosperous continent.

We here in America must make this Western Hemisphere safe for democracy so that it will be a starting point again for civilization and Christianity when a war-weary and insane world is again ready to walk down the pathway to peace. This is not selfishness—it is self-preservation and a resulting preservation of democracy.

In this defense program it is necessary not only to build up an army and a navy and an air force to ward off any threat of a foreign invasion, but it is also our duty to so solve our own economic problems as to make this country a real democracy where all who seek employment and opportunity for work and advancement may not be denied that American right; where our youth, coming out of our high schools and colleges, may not find their ambition to serve their country and their fellow men frustrated at the very threshold of life; where justice and equity and fair play may prevail; and where freedom of speech, of press, of religion, and of peaceable assembly may always be maintained.

To this end if we in Congress conscript the youth and manhood of our land to leave their accustomed duties and make the sacrifice of serving their country for nominal wages, and, mayhap to risk their lives in its defense, so we must and shall conscript the industries to make a like sacrifice in defense of the country which protects them and make it possible for them to survive.

We must and shall refuse them excess profits when our boys are giving to the utmost. We must, and shall levy a heavy tax on those best able to pay (and that includes those of us right here in Congress), so that we may pay for this preparedness program as we go.

A definite and necessary part of this defense program is the permanent solution of our unemployment problem. Let it not be said that we who live in the land of opportunity shall deny anyone seeking a job the right to work; that we who live in the land of abundance shall permit hunger and want to exist in our great cities and even in the countryside; that we who boast of our genius and inventiveness, our public schools and colleges, our great laboratories of science and medicine, art, and economics, cannot solve the most important and most pressing problems of a democracy: the common good of all our people. We can do this, if we will, and we must, if we purpose to continue as a democracy and be a type and a guide to the peoples of all the world.

The present is no time for petty boasting on the part of those in authority nor for carping criticism on the part of those who seek high office. Least of all, is there any justification for either party to charge the opposite party with un-Americanism or the attempt to destroy democracy. Although we may have different methods of solving these problems we are all sincere in our efforts. We, who are for the time being acting servants of the American people, should earnestly search our past records and correct any errors which inevitably occur where something is really done and accomplished. On the other hand, the opposition should exercise the privilege and duty of constructive criticism. This, again, is the essence of democracy. Above all, we should and must unite our forces against the common foe.

We, your elected officials, respectfully submit that performance is better than promises. Our record is open for public inspection. Can the same be said for some of our opponents? Some even have no official public record, as for instance, the Republican candidate for President and the Republican candidate for Congress in the Fourth Congressional District. The latter proclaims vociferously that he secured by his very active campaign, a raise in the spray residue tolerance on apples. How can a mere novice in public affairs claim credit for such an accomplishment? All of you, my listeners, are intelligent enough to know that we who are here on the job, through our experience and influential contacts secure these important benefits. That it is we who through our incessant efforts, secured the adoption of the food-stamp plan and other good results. Far rather should credit be given to the many civic groups and organizations who have united to support such worth-while projects and are cooperating to make it a success.

Primary election comes next Tuesday. Let us thank God that here in the United States we still have the free ballot to express our honest conviction and choices—that we here peaceably abide by the will of the majority expressed at the polls. This is democracy in action, and no Stalin nor Mussolini nor Hitler shall ever be able to deprive us of this inalienable right. We are not only a free people but we have the courage of our convictions, and will defend them and our homes and institutions from any and all attacks from foreign foes. Let us also make our country the land of happy home owners and cheerful workers, of busy industry and prosperous agriculture. Then there can be no fertile field for subversive "isms" from within our gates. This is as necessary a part of our defense program as an army and navy and air force. For this reason, I repeat, it is incumbent on us to remain here as long as the emergency lasts, and to rationally solve the many pending problems that press for immediate solution. May we, each and all, here in Washington, D. C., and back there in Washington State, see clearly our duties, performing them to the best of our abilities and with full faith in our God, in our fellow men, and in our splendid democracy.

National Defense Materially Strengthened by Courageous Act of President Roosevelt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JED JOHNSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 4, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON EVENING STAR

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the very interesting and informative editorial from the Washington Star of September 4, 1940:

[From the Washington Evening Star of September 4, 1940]

HISTORY IN THE MAKING

President Roosevelt, in one courageous and far-sighted move, has written a new chapter in American history—a chapter whose full implications only the future can adequately appraise. But the immediate benefits of the trade with Great Britain, in which we acquire leases to eight vitally important naval and air bases at strategic points in the Atlantic Ocean and the Caribbean Sea in exchange for 50 over-age destroyers, are obvious.

The base facilities granted to us by Britain for 99 years plug what might soon become dangerous gaps in our defenses, vast undefended stretches of water along what have been called the northern and southern high roads of invasion. In the past these deficiencies in outposts have not been considered vital, for we have depended to a large extent upon the friendly British Fleet for our security in the Atlantic. But if that fleet were to be destroyed, or even if it should be driven from its bases in the British Isles, our safety would be put in gravest jeopardy.

One immediate result of the agreement reached between the President and the British Government, then, is to give us an opportunity to make ourselves strong where we have been weak. According to Admiral Stark, Chief of Naval Operations, the traded destroyers are not essential to the defense of this country, and, in his judgment, the "total defense" of the United States will be strengthened as a result of the transfer if Congress grants the funds for proper development of the new bases.

On the other side of the picture there is the strong probability that we also stand to gain in security from the uses to which Britain will put the destroyers received from us. If these old but still useful fighting vessels should enable the British to stand off the German assault, our security will be assured for years to come. But if that is not to be—if Britain is beaten despite this assistance—the newly acquired bases, properly developed, will be more useful to us in resisting aggression from across the Atlantic than would be the aging destroyers. And it is not inconsistent to expect that these ships—old though they are—will give a good account of themselves in convoy or combat operations, under the desperate circumstances prevailing in England; that if they should be lost in action, our potential enemies will be proportionately weakened in achieving their destruction.

The President will be criticized for concluding this agreement with the British through use of his executive powers instead of through the more formal treaty process, which requires ratification by a two-thirds vote of the Senate. It is, indeed, most unfortunate that circumstances made inadvisable the normal procedure of submission of the plan to Congress. But the President certainly considered that, and it is to his credit that he elected to assume possible political penalties in order to pursue a course he believed to be right rather than pass the responsibility of making the decision to the Senate, where, in all probability, a treaty covering the same matters would have been long delayed if not defeated. Mr. Roosevelt, in this instance, has taken a long look into the future. And, in the Star's opinion, the position of the United States in a turbulent world has been greatly strengthened by the decision he has made and acted upon.

A study of the strategic importance of the prospective chain of naval and air bases across the two thousand-odd miles from Newfoundland to British Guiana, on the South American mainland, will show convincingly how the security of the Western Hemisphere will be enhanced by the President's deal. The Monroe Doctrine takes on new force, for it will be implemented for the first time since its promulgation by a stationary "ring of steel" in the Atlantic Ocean of formidable defensive potentialities. The psychological effect of the very existence of such outer defenses should be considerable in this era of aggression on the march, of dictators looking for new worlds to conquer.

The proposed bases will strengthen our Atlantic defense system in its weakest points—the northern and southern flanks—and will provide a frontal outpost at Bermuda of incalculable value in an emergency, both as a listening station and as an intermediate supply base for warships and for planes. The Newfoundland base site was inspected recently by members of the Joint Canadian-American Defense Board. The vulnerability of Canada—and hence of our northern border—to attack by way of Iceland and Greenland has been a matter of grave concern since the invasion of Norway by the Nazis. Canadian troops have occupied Danish-controlled Iceland for protection purposes, but if Britain fell, Iceland undoubtedly would have to be abandoned by the Canadians. Iceland is a stepping stone to Greenland, which, in turn, is only a short jump to Canada. Greenland must be considered as a part of the Western Hemisphere, and its invasion by a European power could not be countenanced under the Monroe Doctrine any more than an attack on Canada could be permitted by the United States. To forestall such a threat it is necessary that we should have not only a military understanding with Canada regarding joint defense, such as the joint board is working on now, but that we should have in the vicinity, for our own self-protection, a major operating base for fleet units and aircraft. Newfoundland is ideally situated for this purpose.

From Newfoundland the new defense line will extend southward to Bermuda, far off our bulging Atlantic coast line. It was indicated that two bases would be established in Bermuda, one on the east coast and another on the Great Bay, at the western end of the island. If Bermuda should be captured by a hostile power, bombing planes would have a convenient springboard for attacks on the populous Atlantic seaboard of the United States. Both Newfoundland and Bermuda are vital to the defense of Canada, and the British Government probably had this consideration in mind in making an outright gift of base sites in those locations.

The Bahamas are militarily important because they stand guard over the Florida Straits, between Cuba and the American mainland. This passage now is protected by a military station at Key West and by the big base at Guantanamo, Cuba. To the south of Cuba lies Jamaica. Bases in the Bahamas and Jamaica will vastly reinforce the security of the Greater Antilles. We have naval and air facilities in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, but the remainder of the Lesser Antilles group, bending southward to Venezuela, are now virtually unguarded and hence very inviting to an aggressor with an eye on the Panama Canal or on the Venezuelan and Colombian oil fields. This alarming gap in the Canal defense scheme will be closed when bases are set up in Antigua, Santa Lucia, and Trinidad and on the coast of British Guiana. Antigua is less than 300 miles southeast of the Virgin Islands, Santa Lucia is about 500 miles below Antigua, and Trinidad is another 500 miles to the south and close to the Venezuelan shore. The last fortified area in the great dam wil be on the mainland side British Guiana.

Other links may be added to this chain shortly. Mr. Roosevelt indicated that negotiations for several more bases are under way. The United States could use profitably an air base in Nova Scotia, where the British already have one. A base in Danish Greenland would be worth a flotilla of destroyers in time of war with a European foe. Naval stations and air fields are needed in Central and South American regions close to the Panama Canal, life line of the fleet. The American people are certain to view with satisfaction any further acquisitions which add to the impregnability of the continent and thus complicate the problem confronting a would-be invader.

For legal authority to consummate the exchange of destroyers for bases by Executive agreement, the President relied on an opinion by Attorney General Jackson upholding his authority in this respect. In brief, Mr. Jackson held that the President derived authority to acquire the bases by Executive agreement from both constitutional and statutory sources, the constitutional authority being applicable because the agreement imposes no future obligations on the United States, but merely grants the privilege of developing the bases if Congress chooses to appropriate funds for that purpose.

In the more controversial matter of disposing of the destroyers, the Attorney General held that "the right of the President to dispose of vessels of the Navy and unneeded naval material finds clear recognition in at least two enactments of the Congress and a decision of the Supreme Court." One prohibitory statute, that of June 28, 1940, was eliminated when the Chief of Naval Operations certified that the destroyers were not essential to the defense of the United States, and another, enacted in 1917, was held by Mr. Jackson to be applicable only to armed vessels built with intent that they should enter the service of a belligerent.

The one remaining legalistic argument against the transfer—that it would be in violation of international law and an act of war—was rejected by Mr. Jackson, who cited authority which seemed clearly to support his position on this point. Certainly, to a layman, there does not appear to be any real difference between the sale or transfer of a destroyer to a belligerent and the sale or transfer of a military airplane or a field gun to the same belligerent. If the turning over of the destroyers to Great Britain is an act of war, then we have already committed acts of war in the past.

On the whole, it is more reasonable to believe that the transfer of the destroyers is not an act of war, and that it will not be interpreted as such by Germany, who went to much greater lengths on her own account in the Spanish civil conflict. With respect to the legality of the transfer by Executive agreement rather than by treaty, it should be conceded, perhaps, that Mr. Jackson does not make out an unanswerable case. It is seldom that that can be done in any legal dispute. But if his arguments in support of Mr. Roosevelt are not conclusive, they are at least strongly persuasive, and those who contend that the President has exceeded his authority have not as yet made out a stronger case in support of their position.

What's Happening in Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED BRADLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 4, 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. FRED BRADLEY OF MICHIGAN

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me before the Michigan Commercial Secretaries Association, Grand Hotel, Mackinac Island, August 30, 1940:

Mr. Toastmaster, distinguished guests, ladies, and gentlemen, I bid you good evening. I am indeed highly honored to have had your cordial invitation to visit with you for a few hours this evening. I hope none of you will fall asleep. After all, you selected this topic, not I.

Incidentally, I do not know what individual among you is responsible for assigning me this subject, "What's Happening In Washington," but I do know that Harvey Campbell is not guilty. He agrees with me that it would take a week to tell you all that's happening in Washington. That is if any of us actually know everything that's happening, including the under-cover stuff in Washington. But you picked the subject, and you will have to pay the penalty. After all, I must remind you that while the rules of the Senate permit Senators to talk as long as they can stay on their feet, our rules in the House limit us to 1 hour on any subject. For that reason some of us aspire to be Senators, and so I am going to try an experiment on you tonight. If you will bear with me, I will talk as long as I can stay on my feet. But do not misunderstand me, I am not in the market for Senatorial robes, not now nor in the future. Yet I do confess to enjoying my work in the House and I have great admiration for my colleagues.

Now you have asked me to tell you, "What's Happening in Washington." Well here is just one little item in which you secretaries ought to be very much interested. Whether because it's an election year, or whether because there is a war in Europe, the fact remains that we continue to pile bureaucrat upon bureaucrat—office upon office. Our Government in Washington owns and occupies within the District of Columbia blocks upon blocks of the most beautiful and huge office buildings in this Nation. Nevertheless, during the past 4 months Uncle Sam's local rent bill has jumped more than one-half million dollars per year. According to Government figures we learn that from May 1 to August 1 the total leased space for Government offices in Washington increased by almost one-half million square feet, or nearly 10 acres. In that same period the annual rentals increased from $3,866,000 to $4,393,000. And so we now find ourselves with over 21,000,000 square feet of leased office space or approximately 482 acres, right in the city of Washington itself. We pay for that space approximately $1.33 per square foot per year. Therefore, I humbly suggest to you secretaries that you should agree with us Republicans who advocate decentralization of government. Wouldn't it be fine to be able to rent Uncle Sam several thousand feet in your own city at $1.33 per square foot? Think it over.

Now to get back to the subject matter.

Of course, the all-important subject in Washington today is the war and what we may or may not do about it. War brings with it serious propaganda. Washington is flooded with it. By act of Congress, the State Department is supposed to register every foreign propaganda agent or agency in the United States. Much German, Italian, Japanese, and Chinese propaganda floods our offices daily. In addition to that we are subject to all sorts of propaganda in this entire Nation of a more subtle nature—that by word of mouth, through the press, and through the radio and motion pictures. It's the old story of the World War. We in this Nation must be constantly on the alert. There is no question in the minds of Congress as to the sympathies of the American people in this current war. They are overwhelmingly pro-British. Likewise in Congress there is an overwhelming feeling that the American people are determined to keep out of active participation in the war—at least we feel that the American people are determined that American blood shall not be shed across the Atlantic Ocean. We are told,

and many of us feel, that we may properly aid and should aid England and her colonies in every way "short of war." There comes a point, however, when one may justly question just how close he is approaching the precipice over which one more step will plunge us into the maelstrom of the European conflagration. We must be constantly on our guard lest clever propaganda create in American public sentiment a demand for that last unwise, ill-conceived, fatal step.

In his acceptance speech recently Wendell Willkie ably said—and I quote him: "No man can guarantee to maintain peace. Peace is not something that a nation can achieve by itself. It also depends upon what some other country does." I agree very much with that sentiment. We in Washington charged with preserving our peace for this Nation must beware of the actions of all nations—those presumed to be friendly as well as those presumed to be unfriendly. An incident which I witnessed in the Senate on Monday is illustrative. The able Democratic Senator from Montana, Senator WHEELER, told about a conversation he had in his office for several hours with a very prominent British statesman, Sir George Paish.

Sir George, incidentally, explained to him that the downfall of France had been caused by the fact that the French black colonial troops, upon whom they counted to stem the German advance in the front-line trenches, became panicky and ran before the dive bombers, tanks, and later, the foot soldiers armed with automatic rifles, and then he went on with the recital of such a serious conversation and made such alarming statements, that Senator WHEELER not only dictated these statements to his secretary, after the visitor had left, but likewise immediately discussed them with several of his colleagues on the Senate floor. Sir George told him that he had been sent over here in 1916 by the British Government, officially, to create a wave of sentiment in America which would lead us into the World War. He made this statement, and I quote him from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, "I am responsible for getting this country into the last war, and I intend to get it into this one." Senator WHEELER said to him, and I quote him, "That is a broad statement," and then he qualified it to the extent of saying, "Well, everything short of war." Sir George went on to say, and I quote him again, "I am over here now, and I am going to cross the United States on a speaking tour, and I am going to get this country into this war." When Senator WHEELER told him that he did not believe this country would go to war, he said, "Senator, the sentiment in this country is going to roll up, and roll up like the ocean waves. Regardless of what you want, you will be forced to vote for it."

That, gentlemen, is typical of some of the propaganda pressure we are up against. Of course, Lord Lothian, the British Ambassador in Washington, was very quick to deny, and I do not dispute his denial, that Sir George is over here simply as a private citizen, but I do say to you that I agree with the sentiment expressed on the floor of the Senate, that that gentleman, and others of his kind, should not only not be permitted entrance into the United States, but upon discovery should be sent back whence they came as fast as we can get them on the first boat headed eastward. America has no room for that type of propagandist.

Yes; war is the all-important topic in Washington and, indeed, in the Nation today. The war blinds us to our own internal difficulties. We must not forget that the greatest defense any nation can have is a strong internal economy. We must have internal unity.

We must have less internal hatred, less internal strife between capital and labor, between race and creed. We must have an end of class hatred. Above all, we must have internal unity, but that does not call for unity under a dictatorship of any form.

It calls for our traditional form of unity under our republican form of government.

When we are considering this very important question of rearmament and preparedness we must not lose sight of our internal weaknesses. These must be eliminated, because therein lies our greatest strength against enemies from within or enemies from without. Of one thing we must be certain, and we must not be afraid to face that fact with clear heads. When this war ends, America will find itself leading a different life. We are faced with a different economy both nationally and internationally. The whole world appears to be in the process of change and unquestionably we will have to rearrange our national economy accordingly. Just what the future holds in store for us no one can accurately predict at this moment. It is, however, a subject in which you secretaries of chambers of commerce must of necessity be as vitally, or more vitally, interested than the average person, because it is you who are, in large measure, charged with the economic welfare of your own community. If you are fortunate, and your town is prosperous, your job is safe. If your town is on the skids, you may be looking for a new job. You are very much like the coach of a football team. If the team wins, it's a great team; if the team, loses, it's a poor coach. And, therefore, if I can give you a little picture of the international situation as it looks to us in Washington these days and try to give you some of my own forecasts for the future, possibly that may give you some thoughts as to how to devise new plays for your team.

Speaking of teams and teamwork, I am reminded that some time ago, over my radio, I heard some remark to the effect that in our Government the executive and legislative departments were a team, and that teamwork must be the order of the day. That may be so over the radio, and maybe it makes good reading in newspapers, but in Washington we see little evidence of it. Maybe we in Congress are too stubborn, like Casey's mule, or maybe we are too dumb and, therefore, incapable of being taken into the confidence of the driver. In any event it has lately become necessary for us to await the news reports from foreign correspondents to learn what international agreements are being made between the United States and Great Britain. For instance, we recently heard a rumor to the effect that we were offering to trade some 50 old destroyers to Great Britain in exchange for 99-year leases on air and naval bases in British possessions in this hemisphere. When questioned about it, the President replied rather irritably but very flatly and emphatically that the reports were "just another story." And yet, 24 hours later, the Chief Executive announced the negotiation on British bases but still refused, and refused again, to comment on the trading of American destroyers.

Some weeks ago the New York Times came forward with an editorial advocating universal conscription. Senator PEPPER had introduced a resolution or made a speech about it. Senator PEPPER is generally considered the "trial balloon" spokesman for the White House. The President then said he had no comments to make and no thoughts about the question. Just a week ago, Senator JAMES W. WADSWORTH, of New York—now a Member of the House and a good friend of mine—told me personally that the President had never favored conscription, and yet, within 24 hours, the President came out in no uncertain terms and demanded that the Senate act promptly and put through the conscription bill immediately and that to do otherwise would be courting disaster.

Again a week ago, we in the House increased the lending capacity of the Export-Import Bank one-half billion dollars to make loans to the Latin-American countries. Now in the hearings before the House Committee on Banking and Currency, but one witness was permitted to be called, Jesse Jones, the Chairman of the R. F. C. Mr. Jones, you will recall, was a Hoover appointee when the R. F. C. was first organized. He has made a very enviable record. He has been quite properly called one of the outstanding and most astute bankers in the Nation. His record has been quite remarkable. And, therefore, when he asks for more money, based upon that record, he generally has very little difficulty getting it, although sometimes we have felt that he has had his tongue in his cheek when he has requested additional funds. Nevertheless, the House has felt that when Jones had money to lend, or "splend" as we call it, we had a reasonable chance of expecting the loans to be well supervised and with a reasonable chance of collection. What that much money in other, and perhaps irresponsible, hands might cost the taxpayers has always disturbed us. And hence, the committee members have always endeavored to have other witnesses called to substantiate Mr. Jones' requests. In this last instance, because of the fact that Secretary Hull may possibly have made some commitments at the recent Habana conference, the minority members of the Banking and Currency Committee—ably led by two of my Michigan colleagues, JESSE WOLCOTT, of Port Huron, and FRED CRAWFORD, of Saginaw, demanded that Under Secretary Welles or someone from the State Department be asked to testify. Majority members of the committee, however, denied this privilege and, consequently, the bill was rushed through and the funds voted by the House.

We were rather surprised then to learn on Saturday, out of a clear sky, that Harry Hopkins had resigned as Secretary of Commerce—he should have resigned months ago—and who, above all, was to be offered his post but Mr. Jesse Jones. Of course, the President has suggested that Mr. Jones occupy both duties, that of Secretary of Commerce and watchdog of the R. F. C. Whether or not the Congress will permit this, I do not know. But if it does, most assuredly he will be unable to personally supervise R. F. C. loans as closely as he has in the past. To handle both of these tremendously important jobs, I fear will sooner or later result fatally for him. Regardless of that, this Export-Import Bank bill only got by the House by less than 40 votes, and I know just as well as I'm standing here that had it not been thought by minority and majority Members as well that these loans would be personally supervised by Jesse Jones that that money would never have been voted, because in my opinion—and in the opinion of 144 Members of the House who voted against that measure—it is laden with dynamite and fraught with no end of possibilities for danger to this Nation.

For instance, we were told by its proponents that these loans would be made to the nations, or the banks or individuals thereof, in Latin America and in Canada. If in Canada, as a part of the British Empire, it is a direct violation of the Johnson Act, which is still upon our books, as well as our Neutrality Act.

We were told that some of this money would go to Latin America to purchase agricultural surpluses—which they have in abundance—in order to aid England in her blockade of Germany and prevent the central powers from purchasing these surpluses to feed their own nations and the occupied nations. Then some of the money will be loaned to buy American agricultural equipment to help improve their farming methods and indeed some of it is perhaps scheduled to go into some farm-subsidy program for South America to create additional surpluses which must either flow into European markets after the war or into American markets—in either case in direct competition with our already tremendous agricultural surpluses in this country. And so while we pay our farmers to kill little piggies, to plow under crops, and we subsidize our own surpluses, we again reach into the taxpayer's pocket and send more money into South America to create more surpluses in the world

market in which we ourselves are playing a pathetic part at this moment.

Then we were told that some of this money would go into the construction of huge industrial plants and in the exploitation of wonderful iron mines, ore deposits, etc., in Latin America. Now consider the menace in all this. We all know, of course, that the wage scale and, therefore, the standard of living in Latin America is very much lower than in the United States. There is nothing in this bill which would prohibit our own American citizens from borrowing this money and operating those plants in Latin America. Operating on the lower-wage scale and under standards of living to which those natives are accustomed—and in their ignorance they know no better—it certainly takes no Solomon to see that your money and mine can conceivably be going into Latin America to create manufactured articles for world trade—indeed, possibly for trade in our own country—again in direct competition with industry in this country. And so we find ourselves in this "picklement" as Andy Brown would say.

With a mountainous and rapidly increasing national debt on our hands, and a heavy defense program ahead of us, both of which must of necessity immediately tremendously increase our own taxes and therefore our cost of production, endeavoring to keep our own heads above water, nationally and internationally on the one hand, while at the same time paying money out of our own empty pockets to subsidize newly formed industries in Latin America to directly compete with our own industries within our continental borders.

And that's not all. Private American capital has been invested abroad for many years. As a matter of fact one and three-quarter billions of it has been invested in Latin America, of which some one and one-quarter billions is still in default—both in principal and interest. Many times in past years, our Government has been asked—and has—sent our armed forces to protect our foreign investments. Our marines have done yeoman duty in that service. In fact it has been their principal duty. In some other instances, we have not yielded to that investment-banker pressure and have seen hundreds of millions of dollars of property expropriated as recently in Mexico and in Bolivia; two countries for which these loans are presently intended.

Now to carry the picture a bit further. In the recent pan-American conferences, it was agreed not only that we would undertake the defense of the Western Hemisphere—the entire Western Hemisphere—but also that any nation could take such steps as it deemed necessary to prevent invasion, or to put down the threat of invasion, or to protect its own interests.

Now, we have long known of a tremendous infiltration of Germans and Japanese into South America. We just recently gave the President the power to call out the National Guard and Reserves and use them outside of the continental United States. I ask you, then, is there not the possibility that we might very shortly be expected to send a military force to police part or all of Latin America? If so, do you suppose that those nations are going to feel any more friendly toward us than they do now? We are told that they are democracies. There's about as much democracy in most of those countries as there is in Chicago or Jersey City. Instead, by reason of the very ignorance of the millions of peons living in those countries, they have of necessity, in fact, been autocracies throughout the years.

Oh, yes; we were told that those loans were necessary to build up good will in order to obtain naval and air bases. I was down in Panama last winter and I discussed this very subject at length with our high Army officials in the Canal Zone. They told me that we could have all of the air bases we wanted in any of those Central American countries in almost any strategic location we demanded, because they themselves realize that to keep from being totally overrun by any of the European nations they had to look first to Uncle Sam as the big brother to defend them in time of trouble. But I want you gentlemen to think over that Latin American picture. In my humble opinion, it is dynamite from the word "go." Is there no other method we know of obtaining good will in this Nation but the spendthrift method of a "good time Charlie"? After all, gentlemen, in my opinion, real, sincere friendship is never for sale.

Now I want to go into the highly controversial subject of compulsory training as opposed to voluntary enlistment. And I want to summarize if I can for you some of the arguments that are being used on both sides of this question. In the first place, by way of background may I say this. We have at present under arms in this Nation nearly 1,000,000 men. Our Army has at present 303,000 officers and men. Recruits are pouring in at the rate of 30,000 per month and the goal is set at 375,000. The National Guard with 237,000 men at the present time is up to its authorized strength. Our Navy which now has a total of 154,516, and which accepted 9,080 recruits in July, has an authorized strength of 170,000 men. The marines are almost at their authorized strength of 32,000, although they recruited 7,200 during July. We have in the Naval Reserve over 40,000 and in the Marine Reserve over 15,000. In addition to this, we have 120,000 Army Reserve officers and 17,500 Enlisted Reserves. Therefore, by the 1st of October—whether the conscription bill passes or not—we should have under arms in this country over 1,000,000 men.

It is now proposed to register all men between 21 and 31 to a total of about 12,000,000 men and to select therefrom by January 1, 1941, approximately 400,000 men presumably for 1 year's training.

The Army General Staff now estimates that for the protection of the entire Western Hemisphere, it will require at least 100,000 men to garrison the outposts in Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, Philippines, and Canal Zone; another 50,000 men for harbor defense to protect naval and airplane bases on American shores. Because of the importance of aircraft and defense, the Army now believes this country must have an air force of 150,000 men. And to back up all of these outposts, it is felt that an expeditionary force of at least 800,000 men should be subject to immediate mobilization. Therefore, the Army feels that it should have 1,500,000 trained troops under arms or subject to immediate call in order to adequately make good on recent commitments to defend the entire Western Hemisphere. Now that is all well and good, and I am willing to take their word for it. Meanwhile, we must not blame General Marshall nor the General Staff for stating, as they have many times previously, that a standing army of 350,000 is sufficient to protect this country and our own possessions. If the President and the State Department decide that the entire hemisphere is now the United States, that is a horse of a different color.

Now, when we talk about conscription, and an army to be trained for a 1-year period, many people seem to have the idea that it means we will put these boys into training camps and under some forced draft method of training as we did in the early days of the World War. This is not the present program.

We have not the commissioned nor noncommissioned officer personnel in the Regular Army, National Guard, or Reserve Corps sufficiently trained in modern warfare to handle an army of 400,000 trainees, as a separate group. Consequently, as fast as these boys are taken into the service, they will be assigned to regular units of the Army or National Guard to bring their integral units up to full wartime strength and they will be trained along with the seasoned troops wherever they happen to be stationed, be it Fort Custer, Fort Brady, the Philippines, the Canal Zone, Alaska, or perhaps in Bolivia. Theirs will be a selective service—so far as I can tell—only in that they will be inducted for only 1 year of training and at the regular Army base pay of $21 per month. On the other hand, 200,000 boys will remain home in the C. C. C. camps, undergoing no military training, but still enjoying the same clothing, the same or better food, and probably far better heat, comfort, and sanitation, while drawing down a base pay of $30 per month, and enlisted for only a period of 3 months, with the privilege of reenlisting for another 3 or 6 months. This latter thought, it strikes me, is perhaps one of the strongest arguments the opponents of this measure have when they say that voluntary enlistment has not been given a fair trial.

But now the question naturally arises, With what are these new troops to be trained? I do not have to dwell at length upon the state of our physical unpreparedness. I do not have to remind you that in all of these recent war games, we have been training our men with antiquated automobiles with a sign on them marked "Tanks," with machine guns that were a piece of stovepipe stuck into a board, antitank guns that were a piece of 2-inch gas pipe mounted on a tin plate and on bicycle wheels.

I do not have to remind you of those distressing pictures, but let's get down to a few cold facts and figures while we are considering this problem of conscripting the youth of America. According to the United States News of last week we then had this on hand: A one-ocean Navy of 399 warships, 5,500 airplanes for all branches of the service, of which much less than 2,000 are reasonably modern fighting craft. Our production rate was stated at 900 monthly. Of that, however, not 10 percent is going into the armed forces of this Nation, the balance going to England. We had 500 light tanks with the remarkable production rate of 3 per day. We had 52,000 Garand rifles, with a production rate of 250 per day. In this connection it is interesting to note that in a recent comment from Europe I learned that what terrified the Allies over in France was not entirely the aircraft or tanks, but the fact that every German foot soldier carried an automatic rifle. The old Springfield apparently is not much more valuable today against a modern foe than would a sawed-off shotgun be against a gangster with a tommy gun. In short, therefore, we now have arms and equipment of a modern nature for an army of 300,000 men. What are the prospects? By October of this year we will be producing 500 new Garand rifles daily. By November we hope to produce 1,000 war planes per month. By January next we hope to step this up to 1,500 monthly and 6 new light tanks per day. By July of 1941 we expect to have 1,000 new Garand rifles per day and 1,500 tanks ready. And by August we will have critical arms and equipment for 1,000,000 men.

By January of 1942 we hope to have 5,000 antiaircraft guns ready for action, and in July 1942, if England doesn't take them all, we will have 25,000 war planes, or exactly half of what the President mentioned in his last "fireside chat." And so it goes, until we find that by October 1943 we will have our 50,000 war planes ready, if enough of them are up to date, and we'll have complete arms and equipment for 1,200,000 men, whereas the Army now states they need 1,500,000 men ready today. And in 1946, if everything goes well, we will have our two-ocean Navy with a total of 701 warships.

And so I raise the question again. With what equipment are these young men to be trained? I appreciate that it can be argued they can receive discipline, become physically hardened, and still they can receive some actual training on what little equipment we have today. And the argument is also advanced, what good is the

equipment without men to man it? Well, in answer to the second argument, I dare say that England wishes she had in some hidden warehouse several thousand airplanes ready for pilots right at this moment. But on the other hand, if we do take these men into the service, as we are doing today, before we have the equipment with which to properly train them we may be killing off men as we are doing right now in Texas. My pilot has recently returned from Texas. He spent a number of weeks down there in a commercial air school which has a contract with the Government to train fledgling Army pilots in planes furnished by the Army.

He was taking these boys, many of whom, if you please, had never seen an airplane at close hand, and teaching them not only the rudiments of flying but aerobatics as well. He was teaching them the full prescribed Army primary training course. The airplanes that he was using were 14-year-old PT–1 Army planes equipped with J–5 motors, long outmoded, and with a flying speed of 80 miles per hour. No faster than any of these little "putt-putts" that you see around any of our airports these days with 4-cylinder 40-horsepower motors in them. In order to do a common Immelmann or loop with these planes, if you please, he had to teach the boys to roll them over on their back and dive them straight down in order to get sufficient momentum to bring them up into a loop and roll out on the top in an Immelmann turn which is an elementary maneuver for escaping an opponent who is riding on your tail. Cracking them up? Of course, they're cracking them up because any 10-year-old kid could put his finger right through the wings any place he chose. That's what we're doing with our boys right today, and yet there are many people crying for immediate conscription.

Well, the opponents to conscription have many additional arguments. Some of them point out that our good friends to the north, up here in Canada, have theoretically at least been at war for one year. They have not yet resorted to conscription. I understand that they have provided for registration and have provided for 30-day training, under some form of selective service, but none of their boys are required to serve overseas except on an entirely voluntary basis. Again we hear this argument. France conscripted 6,000,000 men and had them under arms at the time she capitulated to the blitzkrieg.

Did conscription save France? In fact, we learn in a dispatch from England that in the opinion of men like General DeGaulle, later of the French free forces, and Polish General Sikorsky that a whole nation may be mobilized and yet lose a battle. They have learned on the Continent that the old theory that victory is achieved by putting the greatest number of men in one place at one time is obsolete. The mobilization of industry is the first essential in modern warfare, with factories in isolated regions beyond the reach of the enemy, so that they can maintain a constant supply of airplanes, tanks, antiaircraft and antitank guns, secret weapons to combat secret weapons, and propaganda to encounter enemy-propaganda services. In England today the idea is expressed that the aim of modern warfare is to gain the maximum advantage with a minimum expenditure of manpower, with machines bearing the brunt of the battle. And they advise that until a nation grasps the full implications of this new theory of modern warfare its defeat is certain.

The Senate, possibly wisely, had this theory of mobilization of industry in mind when on Wednesday, by the overwhelming vote of 69 to 16, it adopted an amendment which provides for the conscription of "any existing manufacturing plant or facility necessary for national defense," and provided by order of the President the Government could immediately take possession of such industrial plants, to be operated either by Government personnel or by contract with private firms.

The Senate has finally passed the conscription bill with that amendment by a vote of 58 to 31, Wednesday night.

In addition to this conscription of industry the major provisions are, as you know, that it calls for registration of our manpower from 21 to 31 and calls for inducting into the service these 400,000 young men. They are limited to service in the Western Hemisphere only. Likewise, no more than 900,000 can be inducted into training in the armed forces of the Nation at one time. With those that we now have under arms, this time, at least, if those cards are in the deck that's about to be dealt, we will have the manpower under orders ready for shipment abroad if Sir George Paish's "wave of enthusiasm rolls on and on" and the Congress so decrees, but we still have to find out with what these boys are going to do battle. We in the House will probably start wrestling with this bill next week. What its fate will be there, or in what manner this bill may be changed in the House, I dare not predict. I believe it will have tough sledding to say the least. Nevertheless, there is this much to be said. There is unquestionably much merit in the argument that after all if it is honestly, correctly, and sincerely administered, conscription is probably the most democratic way to raise an army, because everyone should, and if properly administered would, be taken into the service if he were physically fit when his number came up.

If conscription does come to pass, let us hope that the question of exemption will be handled entirely by the local board rather than by bureaucrats in Washington subject to political domination. Local boards proved in the World War, in most instances, that they—because of their contact with local affairs—could differentiate between the conscientious objector and the slacker. In our next war there must be no Grover Cleveland Bergdolls.

Before I cast my vote for conscription—or against it—I want to know the answers to these questions:

1. Are we out to train young men or are we creating a standing army of over a million men for an indefinite period?

2. Is such an army necessary today before we have equipment and, at least, adequate housing facilities?

3. If our regular enlistment period is 3 years at a $21 base pay—why not try out 1 year at $30 pay as in the C. C. C.?

4. Where are these boys to serve—in possessions under our flag or in the entire Western Hemisphere—or elsewhere in the World?

5. What is our immediate danger of invasion—if not immediate just when? Let us be frank about that.

6. Is it contemplated that we will go now or later to England's aid.

7. By what authority does Sir George Paish speak when he says he's here to get us worked up into war fever as he did with England's sanction in 1916?

But remember this, when you conscript the manpower and industrial power of this Nation, you will next conscript the wealth of this Nation, and when you conscript all, America will go under a military dictatorship. And liberties once lost are seldom if ever regained. Believe me, you have not heard the end of the draft wealth amendment to this conscription bill, as recently proposed in the Senate. That Senate rejection came only on a technicality. At least two moves in that same direction are still to be made. It is expected in Washington that before the conscription bill is passed in the House, an amendment will be offered to register wealth and property. Its proponents will probably avoid any taxation proposal but merely ask for a complete survey so that the Government will know "who has it and where it is" in case of war. And, mark my word, most legislators in Washington, if they voted to conscript the youth and industry of this Nation, will find it very difficult to oppose such a wealth-conscription measure. It is also probable that after the conscription bill passes, and its proponents hope that it will be disposed of before the excise-tax bill comes up, it is proposed that some bill to conscript property will be tacked on to the excise-profits tax in the Senate. Now, what brings that about specifically? It has been said that many industrial corporations are refusing Army and Navy orders and aircraft orders because of the fact that an act of Congress limited profits on naval orders to 8 percent. But it is principally because of the fact that the British purchasing mission is willing to pay much higher prices for war matériel than that offered by the Army and Navy.

I have heard a number of the legislators feel that the public is becoming acquainted with these facts and the public opposition to the conscription of youth is demanding that adequate measures be taken to force the industrial giants and the international bankers, many of both of which groups they feel are forcing the issue on conscription, to carry their share of the burden rather than the mothers and youth of America carrying it all.

Well yesterday this tax bill was pushed through. It came out under a rule which was characterized in the press by Chairman SABATH, of the Rules Committee, as the most vicious gag rule upon which he had ever voted and no amendments whatsoever were permitted from the floor. We were given but 2 hours to debate this important measure before it was literally jammed through. Essentially it provides for the repeal of the Vinson-Trammell limitation of profits of 8 percent on aircraft and naval orders and permits industry to amortize plant expansions over a 5-year period. Consequently when, and if, this passes the Senate in this form, there could be no further excuse for delaying industrial rearmament orders. On the other hand, it is estimated that the bill will raise but $300,000,000 this year and perhaps seven hundred million next year and for the next 5 years. All of which is little more than a drop in the bucket when one stops to consider that we have already authorized some fourteen billions as the first expenditure for rearmament.

Aside from that argument, and with reference to the excess-profits tax question. Let me quote from an open letter by one of the members of the Ways and Means Committee: "When the hearings opened 3 weeks ago, we were assured that the administration's objective was to tax excess profits so heavy as to prevent another crop of war millionaires springing up. Practically all are in favor of that, but the bill finally worked out by the Treasury Department will have the very opposite effect, in that 1936, 1937, 1938, and 1939 will be used as the base years on which to figure normal income. That would be fine for United States Steel, General Motors, Chrysler, American Telephone and Telegraph, American Can, and many other industrial giants, all of whom had very satisfactory earnings during the depression years, but it is the little fellow who earned only 3 or 4 percent that will be hit, because everything he makes above those levels from now on will be taxed as excess profits. The big fellows would hardly be touched until their earnings exceed 10 or 12 percent. * * * The international banker continues to have his hooks in everything, but one of these days they are going to be pried loose."

And so, in conclusion, as it applies to you gentlemen in front of me here, let me again stress the fact that America apparently faces a changed world economy from here on. We must face the facts squarely and lay plans as to how best to meet the issue. As Wendell Willkie recently so ably said, and I quote:

"We shall not be able to avoid 'toil and sweat.'

"In these months ahead of us, every man who works in this country—whether he works with his hands or with his mind—will

have to work a little harder. Every man and woman will feel the burden of taxes. Every housewife will have to plan a little more carefully. I speak plainly because you must not be deceived about the difficulties of the future. You will have to be hard of muscle, clear of head, brave of heart. * * *

"The only soil in which liberty can grow is that of a united people. We must have faith that the welfare of one is the welfare of all. We must know that the truth can only be reached by the expression of our free opinions, without fear and without rancor. We must acknowledge that all are equal before God and before the law. And we must learn to abhor those disruptive pressures, whether religious, political, or economic, that the enemies of liberty employ."

And so, with those words of wisdom from a truly great American, and the next President of the United States, I bid you goodnight.

Compulsory Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. USHER L. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 4, 1940

RESOLUTION OF THE NATIONAL FARMERS' UNION

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution of the National Farmers' Union:

DENVER, COLO., *August 24, 1940.*

To the Honorable Members of the United States Congress:

The officers and executive board of the National Farmers Union, convened here in our regular quarterly meeting, reiterate the often-expressed opposition of the farmers union to compulsory military training and to the conscription of our young men in time of peace.

We favor adequate preparation for defense and stand ready to offer our lives if necessary in the service of our country and in the defense of our rights and liberties as American citizens. Because we value our liberties and our country's welfare so highly, we are opposed to any measure which we believe would tend to take from us those liberties which we are ready to defend with our lives. We and millions of our loyal American fellow citizens believe that the passage of the Burke-Wadsworth bill would be a long step toward the propagation within our country of the foreign dictatorships against the introduction of which from the outside we are appropriating billions of dollars.

The United States has attained its greatness without the use of compulsory military training or conscription in times of peace. The British Empire has reached the height of its power largely depending upon a volunteer army in times of peace and many times even during war. France, with one of the largest, and according to orthodox standards the best-trained conscripted armies in the history of the world, lasted only a very short time against the impact of the German mechanized forces. There is no inherent advantage in introducing conscription for the military forces of this country if past history is any criterion.

Before adopting conscription we would like you to give thorough consideration to the following questions:

Why not modernize our Army and our voluntary enlistment system?

Why not liberalize the promotion system in the Army so any recruit with ability could climb even to the top of the Army ladder?

Why not do away with the undemocratic advantages given the graduates of our military colleges?

Why not provide men in the ranks with adequate courses to qualify them for commissions and as pilots, instead of restricting commissions and pilot training so largely to that small minority fortunate enough to get 2 or 4 years of college education, on the doubtful theory that a college education is necessary and desirable for a good officer, pilot, or ensign?

Why not increase pay for all ranks and grades to equal the best pay in industry for similar skills?

Why not require all present officers to show that they are alert to 1940 methods of warfare, and not so fossilized as to preclude the recognition of a new age and new methods?

Why reject volunteers because of slight physical defects, when we could remedy those defects at slight governmental expense and benefit both the volunteer and the country?

Why not provide in the Army auxiliary training useful in civilian life, both as a basis for better mechanized soldiers and as an incentive for enlistment equal to that which is inherent in service in the Air Corps and the Navy, whereby their quotas have always been more than filled?

We feel that our Army must be modernized, its enlistment and promotion system rationalized and made more democratic, and the existing law providing for 1-year enlistments enforced, and that if these steps are promptly carried out there would be no shortage of desirable volunteers. We repeat again, we are all agreed as to the necessity of adequate preparations for defense, but we believe that under a liberalized volunteer system, with promotions possible for all regardless of whether or not they are college (or West Point) graduates, there will be as many volunteers offer themselves for military service as it is possible for our factories to equip with 1941 implements of warfare, and more than it will be possible for the officers to properly train and for the Army to properly house. May we add that we certainly do not want our boys crowded into unsanitary and insufficient barracks with all the attendant dangers of epidemics.

We respectfully request you, Senators and Representatives, to give this proposition your most careful consideration before you take the first step toward dictatorship in this country by voting for compulsory military training and service in time of peace.

Stop, reason, consider before you vote in favor of the Burke-Wadsworth bill.

Most respectfully yours,

Officers and Board of the National Farmers' Union, by John Vesecky, president, Salina, Kans.; H. G. Keeney, vice president, Omaha, Nebr.; J. M. Graves, secretary-treasurer, Oklahoma City, Okla.; Geo. A. Nelson, chairman, Board of Directors, Milltown, Wis.; Tom W. Cheek, director, Oklahoma City, Okla.; James G. Patton, director, Denver, Colo.; Glenn J. Talbott, director, Jamestown, N. Dak.; M. F. Dickinson, director, Little Rock, Ark.

Jeffersonian Democrat Says "No" to "Boss" Flynn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 4, 1940

ARTICLE FROM TYRONE (PA.) DAILY HERALD

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, during the present period of world unrest, people state their opinions in a sincere and frank manner.

This is especially true in the case of the Honorable William Robert Fuoss, of Tyrone, Pa., a noted platform orator and a close student of domestic and international affairs.

Recently, Mr. Fuoss, through the columns of the Tyrone Daily Herald, disclosed the exchange of correspondence between "Boss" Flynn and himself which is of interest to every right-thinking American citizen.

The newspaper article follows:

AUGUST 28, 1940.

Mr. WILLIAM ROBERT FUOSS,

1003 Lincoln Avenue, Tyrone, Pa.

MY DEAR MR. FUOSS: Four years ago your efforts did much to sweep our great leader, Franklin D. Roosevelt, into the White House. This year the cause is even more inspiring. America needs Roosevelt.

I invite you again to carry this message to your fellow citizens. Please fill out the enclosed sheet for the speakers' bureau and send it to me.

With kindest personal regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

EDWARD J. FLYNN, *Chairman.*

Mr. Fuoss' reply:

TYRONE, PA., *September 2, 1940.*

Hon. EDWARD J. FLYNN,

Democratic Chairman, Hotel Biltmore, New York City.

DEAR MR. FLYNN: Thanks for your letter of August 28 in which you invite me to serve during the current Presidential campaign as a party speaker. I cannot do so.

Like thousands of Jeffersonian Democrats who pride themselves in their political independence, I would remind, at the outset, that I approved of much that was done in Mr. Roosevelt's first term; of little in his second. I twice voted for him, but I shall not do so a third time. I know of no good or sufficient reason for any President seeking a third term because we would have no assurances, at the end of the third term, that his highly placed workers, in the Federal service, would not stack again the convention, as they did the most recent one, bringing about a fourth nomina-

tion for the ambitious Mr. Roosevelt. Once power is had it is rarely surrendered and it is so easy to increase this power to dangerous dictatorial proportions on the too flimsy pretext that the Executive holds a mandate from the people. It is not, I contend, in the best interests of the whole people to encourage the building of a powerful political dynasty within a democracy. This is fraught with greater danger for a free people than appears on the surface. This Nation is not bereft of potential leadership, outstanding men of inherent strength, indomitable courage, and great vision. The Presidency, moreover, is not the exclusive private property of any man or family, no matter how likable the man or splendid the family.

Moreover, it is difficult for those of my conviction to forget the attempted purge of Senators by Mr. Roosevelt, elective representatives of the people who felt it within their right to exercise that political independence which is a cherished and essential element of democracy. We need this type of Senator. There are already too many "rubber stamps." You may not have detected in this purge attempt the sinister design of the dictator, but thousands of Americans, one such myself, did detect it and were duly alarmed by it. These attempts were despotic and undemocratic, alien to our form of representative government. What is the more, I did not approve of the highjacking of the recent convention, for I regarded this as nonrepresentative of the great rank and file of the party of Jefferson, Jackson, and Wilson. Space does not permit of an enumeration of the astonishing incidents of that convention, the shabby treatment of the venerable CARTER GLASS when he dared place in nomination for the Presidency so able and capable a Democrat as James A. Farley; the even greater disrespect, if possible, shown the candidacy of Senator MILLARD TYDINGS, of Maryland, and the further thought that Speaker BANKHEAD was virtually obliged to forego his commendable Vice-Presidential ambitions for no reason save that Mr. Roosevelt wanted Mr. Wallace.

In his acceptance speech, Mr. Wallace attempts to divert attention from the real issues of this campaign. Fear cannot be substituted for thought and fact. Mr. Hitler's supreme joy is not in contemplation of the defeat of Mr. Roosevelt in November as Mr. Wallace would have us believe; rather, I fancy his supreme joy is in the knowledge that we have had in the White House, as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, one who, assuredly knowing the inadequacy of our defensive establishment, particularly our poorly equipped Army, persisted in giving to the world a display of the weak taunting the strong—the spectacle of illy prepared America engaging in a name-calling word battle with the creator and ruthless manipulator of the greatest, most modernized war machine the world has known. With what weapons were we to fight Germany? If it were not so tragic it would be amusing.

I shall, therefore, support Wendell L. Willkie in November. He believes in Jeffersonian principles and will cling to them after his election.

Very truly yours,

WILLIAM ROBERT FUOSS.

Anti-Semitic Groups Circulate False Document

REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 29, 1940

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, the United States mails are being extensively used by some anti-Semitic groups in this country who are circulating a document entitled "Special Notice To All Jews," in which they call upon all Jews to refuse to take part in the military service. I want my colleagues and the country to know definitely that this document is an outright forgery, and that its purpose is to stir up anti-Jewish hatred throughout this country. It is not even a clever piece of work. It bears the alleged signature of "Anti-Defamation League, B. B." and then calls upon the recipient of the letter to repudiate the letter itself. It urges Jews not to fight, and yet it urges the draft and the continuance of the war in the Jewish interest.

In other words, it has all the earmarks of that type of contradiction which Mr. Hitler and his cohorts have made familiar to the people of the United States, and the same type of reasoning which has become familiar to Members of Congress through publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I deem it my duty as a Member of Congress to call it to your attention, and denounce it as an out-and-outright asinine and ridiculous forgery.

Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LUTHER PATRICK
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 4, 1940

LETTER FROM MRS. ELIZABETH H. MORROW, OF NORTH BIRMINGHAM, ALA.

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, this letter from a mother, an Alabama mother whom I know very well, is such a fine and intelligent expression of true Americanism that I feel it deserves a place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of my country.

MUNICIPAL COURT OF BIRMINGHAM,
NORTH BIRMINGHAM BRANCH,
North Birmingham, Ala., August 5, 1940.

Hon. LUTHER PATRICK,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR LUTHER: I am writing you, as I feel that every American mother should, to express my sentiment in regards to the program for training our young people for defense of our country and our way of life.

I know you will remember your contacts with me sufficiently to know I have taken motherhood very seriously, and I adore my boy but am willing for him to have whatever training that may be necessary for his welfare and the defense of our country.

I am writing you this information because I am inclined to believe that those who protest let themselves be heard from but we who are willing are not letting our Representatives know our feelings in the matter.

I also favor what material help we can give England in defending themselves, as it not only helps a Christian nation but helps defend America.

Yours very truly,

ELIZABETH H. MORROW.

W. P. A. Appropriations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS A. FLAHERTY
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 4, 1940

Mr. FLAHERTY. Mr. Speaker, any effort made under the pressure of partisan politics to reduce the appropriations of the Works Progress Administration, in my judgment, would work a serious detriment not only to the people who have been employed on the many projects sponsored by the W. P. A., but also to the program of national defense which is now under way.

The criticisms directed against the W. P. A. have been, for the most part, of a destructive nature, while a fair and impartial study or investigation of the work done by it since its inception indicates millions of dollars spent without a taint of scandal and other millions of dollars' worth of constructive projects which have added to the wealth of the country.

The W. P. A. from its beginning in October 1932 has constructed thousands of miles of new highways, roads, and streets; thousands of bridges of practically every type have been erected and other thousands of bridges reconditioned. Drainage devices, such as culverts to prevent erosion and subsequent failure of roadbeds, have been built in the thousands. Landing fields, runways, air beacons, aircraft hangars, and hangar aprons, in addition, have been built, thus aiding the national defense and making air travel safer and more efficient.

Almost 60,000 buildings have been either constructed or renovated, and of this great number about 15,000 were built entirely by W. P. A. workers.

They included schools, libraries, recreational buildings, firehouses, garages, aircraft hangars, armories, and various other buildings. And I know you will be interested to learn that of the institutional buildings erected over a hundred were new hospital buildings of sizes ranging from those of 10 or 20 beds for small towns and rural communities to hospital groups of a thousand or more beds for large cities, while improvements were made in 1934 to other hospital buildings.

It is estimated almost 2,000,000 acres of irrigated lands were affected by the reconditioning of miles of canals, and facilities for the prevention of forest fires have been increased by the construction of fire and forest trails.

Many projects were designed solely to employ women and other persons not readily adaptable to heavy construction work and have served the double purpose of producing goods and materials for distribution and rendering service to the needy. Let me be specific: By October 1, 1937, women workers on sewing projects had made nearly 108,000,000 articles, more than 85,000,000 of which were garments. Other articles produced on these projects included bed clothing, towels, mattresses, rugs, dressings, and hospital supplies.

Projects devoted to the distribution to needy persons of food have handled up to 60,000,000 quarts of milk and over a half billion pounds of other food stuffs. Workers on canning projects canned 45,000,000 pounds of meat, fruit, and vegetables, part of which the workers themselves used—the balance being distributed among needy persons.

Shoe and furniture repair projects collected worn articles, repaired 600,000 pairs of shoes and over 700,000 piece of furniture which were subsequently used by persons on relief.

In addition, more than 128,000,000 hot lunches were provided to school children since the beginning of W. P. A. activities. Over 700 nursing schools were established and blind persons received over a million pages of Braille and over 40,000 Braille maps, while over 18,000,000 books were cataloged for existing libraries and nearly 30,000,000 public-school library books and others were rebound or renovated.

This is not, as the opponents of the W. P. A. would have you believe, money thrown down the drain, but capital assets created by the money of all the people of the Nation which provided employment for thousands, aided private enterprise, and increased national wealth.

I have consistently opposed every attempt to reduce the W. P. A. appropriations. I represent a heavy industrialized district that requires and knows the benefits of W. P. A. work as much, if not more, than any other section of the country and that is why I have consistently fought every effort to reduce expenditures of this kind, which I regard not as spending but as the creation of public wealth and the employment of thousands of unemployed for the purpose of so doing.

In 1939 I supported the Casey amendment which would have eliminated the 30-day furlough provision, the amendment which provided for 30-day furloughs of W. P. A. workers after 18 months' consecutive employment. This amendment was lost but I still feel that it was lost because those who voted against it have never stopped to realize the tremendous good that the W. P. A. has done and is doing for the country. For how can it be reasonably or truthfully said that the dollars spent on great public works, the miles of new highways, the new public buildings and schools and the hospitals, were ill spent?

In addition to that, it kept men working who, through no fault of their own, found themselves unemployed because of the collapse of an economic system in which their overlords had placed a misguided confidence. I do not say that the W. P. A. has been the answer to unemployment, but I do say that the psychology, the attitude, and the mental outlook of the American people as a result of the W. P. A. is a whole lot better than it was before the W. P. A. came into being.

My record on this great achievement of the Roosevelt administration is clear and I shall continue to vote for funds to be appropriated for the W. P. A. as long as they are needed, as a vote for the continuation of an administrative method that has done away with the necessity of the dole, giving millions of Americans not only in my district but in every congressional district throughout this country useful work and, in addition, has created great new assets to the public wealth. As I have said before, I have consistently opposed all attempts to reduce appropriations made for the W. P. A. and I shall continue to do so for the reasons I have briefly stated here today.

Naval Reserve Aviation Bases

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL VINSON

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 4, 1940

LETTER FROM ADMIRAL J. H. TOWERS, CHIEF OF THE BUREAU OF AERONAUTICS

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with a provision contained in section 2 of the act of June 15, 1940 (Public, No. 635, 76th Cong.), the Navy Department appointed a board known as the Mason board to investigate and report upon the need, for purposes of national defense, for the establishment of new Naval Reserve aviation bases within the continental limits of the United States and the necessity for the practicability of expansion of those bases now in existence.

In addition to the existing Naval Reserve aviation bases which are shown on the attached statement from Admiral John H. Towers, Chief of the Bureau of Aeronautics, the board has recommended the immediate construction of Naval Reserve aviation bases in the vicinity of Atlanta, Ga., New Orleans, La., and Dallas, Tex.

NAVY DEPARTMENT,
BUREAU OF AERONAUTICS,
Washington, September 3, 1940.

Subject: Naval Reserve aviation bases.

1. Existing Naval Reserve aviation bases are as follows:

Squantum, Mass., Brooklyn, N. Y., Philadelphia, Pa., Anacostia, D. C., Miami, Fla., St. Louis, Mo., Kansas City, Kans., Chicago, Ill., Detroit, Mich., Minneapolis, Minn., Seattle, Wash., Oakland, Calif., Long Beach, Calif.

2. Present plans call for the immediate construction of bases in the vicinity of Atlanta, Ga., New Orleans, La., Dallas, Tex.

J. H. TOWERS,
Rear Admiral United States Navy, Chief of the Bureau of Aeronautics.

Journalistic Gossip in the Congressional Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 5 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

LETTER FROM AMBASSADOR BULLITT

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a copy of a letter addressed to Mrs. Genevieve Clark Thomson by Ambassador Bullitt in reply to a letter from her to him regarding the matter involved in certain articles heretofore inserted in the RECORD by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] touching Ambassador Bullitt's speech in Philadelphia.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I join with that a request that I be permitted to insert in the RECORD a letter which Mrs. Thomson will write Mr. Bullitt, or a letter which I will write.

Mr. BARKLEY. I think the letter ought to be presented when it is written. It has not yet been written.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I assure the Senator from Kentucky that if Mrs. Thomson does not write Mr. Bullitt a letter, I will.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCHWARTZ in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky? The Chair hears none.

The letter is as follows:

AUGUST 26, 1940.

MRS. GENEVIEVE CLARK THOMSON,
The Item-Tribune, New Orleans, La.

MY DEAR MRS. THOMSON: I thank you most heartily for your letter of August 22. I appreciate its spirit and your feelings when you write: "I have more sympathy than you might suppose with your irritation at what you consider unfairness on the part of the press. My father was long in public life, and my brother, as you know, is now in the Senate. And I am frank to say that I have at times been greatly irked by published criticism of them which I thought unfair."

Your father was certainly most bitterly and unfairly criticized, and I for one resented the unjust criticisms. I have no doubt that your brother also has been the subject of unfair criticism. That is what one has to expect in public life, and when such criticisms are directed at me I try to remember that an essential part of the free political life of this Nation is the complete freedom of the press. I would rather have American journalists free to write what they please, however unfairly they may criticize me, than the slightest restriction on their freedom.

Personally, I have been the subject of so many stories that in one way or another were inaccurate that I have given up trying to correct stories—especially those in the so-called gossip columns—unless they seem to affect directly the public interest. I believe, however, that when an article is inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD it becomes an official record of such importance that it must be corrected if it contains misstatements. That is why I wrote to your brother and requested him to have my corrections of your article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD also published in the RECORD.

I am grateful to you for calling to my attention an allegation of which I was unaware, since I was absent from the United States when it was made. I shall attempt to inform you with regard to that allegation, as well as others which I have found in the RECORD.

1. As authority for your first statement to which I took exception, you give an article in the Merry-Go-Round, by Drew Pearson and Robert S. Allen. As I informed you, this article by Pearson and Allen was totally without foundation in fact. With regard to it, I wrote the following letter to Mr. Pearson:

"JULY 31, 1940.

"The President and I think you might be interested to know that the informant responsible for your article which appeared in the Monday morning papers (July 29) took you for a ride.

"Not only did I not rewrite the statement criticizing Soviet Russia's seizure of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, but also I did not even discuss this matter with the President, and I did not know that such a statement was to be made. The salient points of the statement were read to the President by the Under Secretary of State over the telephone when I was out swimming.

"The statement that 'the State Department knows no more about it (Bullitt's last days in Paris and Vichy) than the interviews which its Ambassador gives to the press,' is equally remote from the truth.

"On my arrival in Washington on Sunday afternoon, I attempted to reach various ranking members of the Department of State and was able to find the political adviser to the Secretary, Mr. Hornbeck, and had a long talk with him before going to the White House. On my return to Washington, I was able to see immediately the counselor to the Department, the political adviser to the Secretary, Mr. Dunn, and the economic adviser, Mr. Feis. I found that all the Assistant Secretaries were out of town. I requested an interview with Mr. Welles but his engagement book was filled for Saturday.

"When your article appeared, therefore, the State Department had full information with regard to my views on the situation in France.

"I think you ought to have your fingers crossed in the future with regard to information coming from the source that gave you this tale."

Upon receipt of my letter, Mr. Pearson telephoned to me and said that he had already been informed by the Acting Secretary of State, Mr. Welles, that his story was totally without foundation in fact. He added that he regretted greatly that he had published it.

2. I am most grateful to you for calling to my attention the statements by Senator NYE in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of volume 86, No. 124, for Friday, June 21, 1940. As I was in France, I had never seen any report that indicated that such statements had been made.

The first statement which Senator NYE quoted is one written by a newspaperman stating that:

"It is already known that Bullitt promised the French that the United States would get into the war, if necessary, to defeat Hitler."

This is the exact contrary of the truth. Both before the present war began and after I consistently stated to the French that the United States would not enter this war.

The second statement by Senator NYE is the following:

"An individual whom I shall under no circumstances compromise came to my office and wrote a memorandum. I could not doubt this man for one minute. In his memorandum he said 'it was known that France might definitely give in within 10 days, and that when it did the Government of France would release a letter from Bullitt, written on orders of Roosevelt, to Daladier, dated last August or September, stating the full support of the United States if it went to war against Germany on the basis of the Polish incident.'"

The assertion in this anonymous memorandum quoted by Senator NYE is totally and completely untrue. No such letter was ever written by me to anyone.

The anonymous person who wrote the memorandum for Senator NYE may have done so in good faith, or not in good faith, but his assertion was without the slightest foundation in fact. No such letter exists, but many documents exist which prove that the assertion in the anonymous memorandum is the exact reverse of the truth.

3. You quote another article by Messrs. Alsop and Kintner as your authority for your statement that, "He actually sat in the French Cabinet meetings."

I repeat that on no occasion have I ever "sat in the French Cabinet meetings," nor have I ever "sat occasionally as an unofficial Cabinet minister."

It is, of course, a fact that like all other ambassadors, in carrying out my normal duties as American Ambassador in Paris, I conducted many negotiations with members of the French Government, and it is equally true that these negotiations were invariably conducted on both sides in the most friendly manner. But there is a vast difference between sitting officially or unofficially as a Cabinet minister and maintaining negotiations between independent governments on a most friendly plane. I think that you will agree with me that your statement that I "actually sat in the French Cabinet meetings" puts the fact that our relations with the French Republic were most friendly, in an entirely false light.

4. I concur most heartily in your profound respect for the patriotism, intelligence, and integrity of Secretary Hull. I can assure you that I have never disobeyed any order from him, and that our relations are most intimate and friendly. With regard to the matter to which you refer—I could not, of course, disobey an order which I never received. Any statement in any newspaper indicating that I did receive an order to leave Paris was untrue.

5. Pearson and Allen are also given as authorities for your statement: "Without reporting to his supposed chiefs in the State Department he went straight to the President. It is reported that the State Department is still as much in the dark as the general public, regarding the events leading to and surrounding the death of the French Republic."

The answer to this misstatement is given in my letter to Mr. Pearson quoted above, as well as in my previous letter to you.

6. Another article by Alsop and Kintner is given as authority for your statement with regard to my urging the release of funds deposited here by the French Republic. I can only repeat that I have never urged the release of the funds in question. I may add that the Secretary of the Treasury and I are in entire agreement on this matter.

Before receiving your suggstion that I should take up these matters with Messrs. Pearson and Allen, and Messrs. Alsop and Kintner, I had already done so, not only by my letter to Mr. Pearson but also by personal conversations with Mr. Pearson, Mr. Allen, and Mr. Alsop. I think there is no doubt now in the mind of any of them, with regard to the truth.

It is, of course, difficult for journalists attempting to give "inside information" from Washington, to avoid errors. They are frequently misled by persons who have some ax to grind and pretend to know things they do not know. I think, however, that it is only fair to say that the gentlemen in question do their best to be accurate.

In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD I find also a reference by your brother, Senator BENNETT CHAMP CLARK, to a speech of mine at Bordeaux. That speech was correctly reported in every French newspaper except one and by all the American press services except one. The French journalist of the one French newspaper which reported my speech incorrectly was not present when I spoke. He did not take the trouble either to listen to my speech or obtain a copy of it. Unfortunately, he happened to be the local correspondent of one of the great American agencies. He wrote a sensational and utterly untrue story which can be compared by anyone interested with the text of the speech I made, which was a written text and was reproduced by every other French newspaper and by the other American news agencies. The agency in question later withdrew the story, and I am in possession of an affidavit from the American head of the agency in question in Paris attesting to these facts.

In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 19, 1940, there is another statement which merits correction. Senator WHEELER stated with regard to myself: "He predicted that his friend Molotoff would come in on the side of Britain and France. When talking with Daladier and others in France, he constantly talked about his 'friend Molotoff.'"

These statements are the exact contrary of the truth. Throughout last year I constantly expressed the opinion that the Soviet Union would make a deal with Germany and would not come in on the side of Britain and France. This may be proved from a large number of official documents. Never in my life have I referred to "my friend Molotov." Molotov had little or nothing to do with foreign affairs when I was Ambassador to the Soviet Union, and I knew him so slightly that during my entire stay in the Soviet Union I had but one important conversation with him.

In this day when there is a threat to our country, I feel that it is vitally important that all leaders of public opinion should attempt to stick as closely to fact as possible and, in their differences of

opinion, should avoid the imputation of low motives. This is a time when it is again true that "if we don't all hang together, we shall all hang separately."

I believe, therefore, that it is unwise to publish articles in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that are based on nothing more than journalistic gossip. But so long as corrections also are published in the RECORD there is doubtless little harm done.

There are questions of the utmost gravity to our country to be discussed and no one can object to honest disagreement and honest discussion, but I am sure you will agree with me that this is a time for scrupulous fairness between Americans.

Again my thanks for your letter and for this opportunity to give you the facts.

Yours very sincerely,

WILLIAM C. BULLITT.

Takes Exception to Editorial About Criticism of Willkie Speech

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 5 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

LETTER BY SECRETARY ICKES TO NEW YORK TIMES

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter written by Hon. Harold L. Ickes, Secretary of the Interior, to the editor of the New York Times. In his letter Secretary Ickes takes exception to an editorial in reference to his criticism of Mr. Willkie's speech.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times]

SECRETARY ICKES REPLIES—HE TAKES EXCEPTION TO EDITORIAL ABOUT HIS CRITICISM OF WILLKIE'S SPEECH

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

In the fashion that is characteristic of the New York Times you reproved me in a recent editorial for "throwing mud" at Wendell Willkie in my comments, on August 19, upon his speech of acceptance. You contrasted certain expressions that I used with Mr. Willkie's generous language about Henry Wallace when Mr. Willkie was in Des Moines, Iowa. You overlooked the fact that in several instances I complimented Mr. Willkie on points which I considered well stated.

Far more important, you chose to ignore Mr. Willkie's aspersions upon President Roosevelt in his speech of acceptance. May I remind you that Mr. Willkie accused the President of "unscrupulously" encouraging Great Britain to hope for more help than this country could give? He also accused him of inventing war scares for selfish political purposes and of manufacturing war panics. These charges were not only serious, they were highly personal.

These accusations against the President whom, whether we approve of him or not, we will have to follow during this grave international crisis, at least until January 20 next, were sufficiently grave to call for some comment from a newspaper that is so ready to point out supposed chinks in the armor of a man who does not conveniently come to heel whenever he is whistled thereto. On a purely comparative basis, even if I offended to the extent that you would have people believe, the offense of Mr. Willkie against the President far exceeded mine.

MR. ICKES DISSENTS

Perhaps you have sternly taken Mr. Willkie to task for his inappropriate and unpatriotic language; but, if so, I have overlooked it. Perhaps others of the press have likewise chided Mr. Willkie, but, if so, they have been few and far between. However, as was to be expected, practically the whole pack has been yelping at my heels ever since I failed to join in the general acclaim that Mr. Willkie was conceived in the womb of time so as to be the combination of George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, Andrew Jackson, and Abraham Lincoln that would be needed in this year of travail for America. Yet, presumptuous though you may regard it, I have the temerity to question the right of any fair commentator to write about my speech of August 19 as you did in the editorial referred to.

The New York Times has a great reverence for precedent and old-established customs. I share this feeling if the customs in question are a strength to us in our hours of need. I even reverence customs of and for themselves simply because they are customs, if adherence to them is not a disadvantage or a danger to us.

Take the custom of the acceptance speech. Except in the case of that former Wall Street candidate, John W. Davis, I wonder if the Times can cite any instance where the acceptance speech of one running for President has been given in any other than his local vicinage or before the convention that had made the nomination? Mr. Willkie has lived for a number of years in New York City. The fact that he proposed to give his acceptance speech in Indiana, where he was born and lived a long time ago, was a matter of news. It was a matter of significant news, calling for comment, in addition to stories in the news columns. Yet the whole matter was passed over by the press as if it were a usual and customary thing.

THE QUESTION OF RESIDENCE

The reason for Mr. Willkie's going to Indiana for his acceptance speech was perfectly clear. He wanted to get away from his New York setting. He did not desire to be associated in the mind of the people either with Wall Street or with Fifth Avenue. Yet practically all of the newspapers, including the New York Times, were ready to aid him in what amounted to a deceit upon the people. You were willing that he should set up props as a background for this speech which would give the voters an altogether erroneous impression.

It was my purpose in my speech to penetrate through the fog of deceit and hypocrisy for which Mr. Willkie and the newspapers were responsible. In doing this I was well within the bounds of reasonable and legitimate political controversy. Mr. Willkie, with your aid, was trying to give the impression that he was a simple man of the people who still lived in his barefoot-boy environment.

I chose to point out that Mr. Willkie's actual residence was at 1010 Fifth Avenue, New York City. I chose to dispel in the minds of my hearers this barefoot-boy illusion; to remind them that Mr. Willkie is, in fact, a New Yorker, since it is in that city that he has for many years conducted his operations in high finance and public-utility management.

Mr. Roosevelt does have a house in a New York neighborhood, as you say. Significantly, however, you do not disclose that his voting residence and customary home has been at Hyde Park, N. Y., for many, many years. If Mr. Roosevelt had not accepted his nominations in a straightforward and simple manner before the conventions that nominated him, he would, naturally, have accepted them at Hyde Park. If you were trying to infer that Mr. Willkie was justified in not accepting his nomination at 1010 Fifth Avenue because Mr. Roosevelt had not accepted his in the same city, then, at the very least, you were being disingenuous.

THE CHALLENGE TO DEBATE

In an editorial published August 18, almost a column in length, although you uttered no word of criticism of Mr. Willkie's outrageous characterizations of the President the preceding Saturday afternoon, you did comment approvingly upon Mr. Willkie's proposal to meet the President on the platform "in the tradition of face-to-face debate that is justly honored among our political traditions."

Let us examine this glib statement. What about this "tradition of face-to-face debate"? For one I would like to know where and when it originated, especially with respect to the Presidential office, and who have contributed to its upbuilding? When this question is asked we are told about Lincoln and Douglas. Mr. Willkie subsequently added Webster to the list without specifications. Lincoln did debate with Douglas when both were running for Senator from the State of Illinois, but as a candidate for President, Lincoln did not debate with his opponent on either occasion, nor has any other candidate for President before or since, so far as I can remember. Do you remember any such instance? And, if not, where do you get your "tradition of face-to-face debate that is justly honored among our political traditions"?

In my own experience I have known of many challenges from one candidate to another to debate, but of very, very few acceptances. Frequently the man who does the challenging is sure in advance that his proposal will not be accepted. That is the reason that he issues the challenge. He hopes for some advantage from the declination. In this connection, may I remind you that the President said in his message of acceptance to the Chicago convention that he would do no campaigning? Can it be that this clear advance knowledge made Mr. Willkie so bold?

A MATTER OF TASTE

No candid mind can dismiss lightly the thought that, in challenging the President, Mr. Willkie was guilty of a trick which is well recognized among lawyers and which has a particular characterization that carries an unpleasant taste. No one can convince me that the New York Times when it printed this editorial believed or now believes that if President Roosevelt should accept Mr. Willkie's challenge to debate, it would be in "the tradition * * * that is justly honored among our American traditions."

I think that this offense against good taste on the part of Mr. Willkie showed his willingness to descend to pretty low levels. But not low enough to call for a rebuke from the New York Times. Personally, I do not recall any instance in which two candidates for President have met in joint debate, and certainly the record does not show any occasion on which the incumbent of our highest office joined in joint debate with a challenger. Do you happen to? I will be glad to be corrected if I am in error, because, frankly, I am relying entirely upon memory.

One thing is quite clear from the editorials so far printed in the New York Times, and that is that it is willing to lend the cloak of its somewhat frayed respectability to any ill-smelling or pettifogging political enterprise that will mean votes against President Roosevelt.

HAROLD L. ICKES,
Secretary of the Interior.

WASHINGTON, *August 27, 1940.*

National Association of Rural Letter Carriers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. MEAD

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 5 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. SMITH W. PURDUM

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Hon. Smith W. Purdum, Second Assistant Postmaster General, at the annual convention of the National Association of Rural Letter Carriers, at St. Louis, Mo., on August 21, 1940.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Chairman Benson, Congressman ROMJUE, reverend clergy, distinguished guests, ladies, and gentlemen, it makes me very happy, indeed, to be able to be with you this evening. I consider it not only a pleasure but also an honor. I want to express my sincere gratitude for the very kind invitation extended me by your national president, Mr. Raymond H. Combs, and his colleagues and coworkers to attend this national convention of the National Association of Rural Letter Carriers and the Ladies' Auxiliary.

It is always with great pleasure that I anticipate a visit to St. Louis, a most splendid city, having a fine and efficient postal service, which is so ably conducted by that man whom we highly regard and dearly love, Hon. W. Rufus Jackson.

Down through the years it has been my good fortune to attend some of the conventions of your State associations, but this is the first opportunity afforded me to attend your national convention. I am very grateful that this opportunity was afforded me to be here.

We are gathered here in this great city of St. Louis at one of the most momentous and critical stages in world and, in fact, American history. It is for that reason that I believe that this 1940 convention of the National Association of Rural Letter Carriers may well be termed the most important and significant in the history of your association. Postal service has rightfully been termed the mightiest of all implements of human democracy, and you good men and women are gathered here today as devoted public servants in the service of the United States Post Office Department. I doubt if there can be found anywhere in this great Nation a more representative group of upstanding American citizens than is here in this convention hall tonight.

For nearly 40 years I have taken an interest in the rural delivery service of the Post Office Department. Since becoming Second Assistant Postmaster General I have a very particular interest—official and personal—in the rural delivery service, and the men and women who are doing the work. So tonight I keenly appreciate the fact that I can stand here and look into the faces of the men and women who work with me and with my associates in a sincere effort to serve faithfully and well.

When I was appointed to the office of Second Assistant Postmaster General it made me very happy to be directly connected with one of the most far-reaching and beneficial activities of our great postal establishment—the Rural Delivery Service. When sitting in the chair at my desk I constantly keep in my mind the fact that that chair has been occupied by such splendid and intelligent and humane officials in the persons of William W. Howes, and Harllee Branch, and Ambrose O'Connell. Many of you men and women here personally know those gentlemen; and I feel that you hold them in the same high regard as I do; those men were able administrators and had a humane understanding. They have been helpful to me, for which I am very grateful.

You have a very splendid organization, one in which you can rightfully take great pride.

The officials of the National Organization of Rural Letter Carriers and of the ladies' auxiliary are a splendid lot of men and women who are devoted to their duties, and who put forth intelligent effort not only in your behalf but also to improve the service to the people. These men and women are very helpful to us at the Department and our relations are very pleasant, and we appreciate the cooperation and assistance given us.

At this juncture I want to pay tribute especially to the head of your organization—a man devoted to the duties of his office, a man who fully realizes and appreciates his responsibilities, a man who is always courteous and considerate and wants the right to prevail; for him I have high regard and affection, and it gives me great pleasure to be here tonight and pay tribute to my good friend Raymond H. Combs.

There is also an added pleasure to be here with two good farmer friends of mine. These are plain persons, direct in their dealing—there is elegance in their simplicity, courteous and kind and spreaders of good cheer—the publishers of your splendid national organ, The National Rural Letter Carrier, our mutual friends, Martha and Cleland McDevitt—Martha and Mac.

One's coworkers in a bureau are very important factors in administration. I have stated that when I entered upon my present duties, it made me very happy to be directly connected with the Rural Delivery Service, and it was especially pleasing to me to find the supervising head of the Division of Rural Delivery Service a man who enjoyed the experience of having been a rural letter carrier, who knows the problems of the Rural Delivery Service, and who knows in a minute degree our responsibilities to the public; one who has reflected great credit on the Service, a fair man, a courteous gentleman, a loyal public servant, your friend my good friend and able coworker, J. Ed Cooper.

The Rural Delivery Service was inaugurated as an experiment in 1896 during the second administration of President Grover Cleveland, at which time the Honorable William L. Wilson, of West Virginia, was Postmaster General. I believe that the first appropriation authorizing the Service was secured through the untiring efforts of Hon. Thomas E. Watson, who was at that time a Member of Congress from the State of Georgia.

The first rural routes were established from Charles Town, Uvilla, and Halltown, W. Va., and they began operation on October 1, 1896. In the beginning there was considerable opposition to the establishment of this service from many sincere lawmakers, who regarded it as fantastic in the extreme and who felt that the cost would be out of all proportion to the benefits derived. It is said that one distinguished legislator observed that to provide free mail delivery to the rural districts would greatly embarrass the Government financially. Many country merchants were opposed to it because they feared the loss of business to mail-order houses, and postmasters at many small offices were apprehensive that their offices would be discontinued and their earnings adversely affected. These objections were no doubt factors accounting for the very frugal manner in which the service was administered in the early days, although they were soon overcome, for the people in the rural sections of our country insisted that this service be extended to them.

From a modest beginning, with three routes established in the State of West Virginia on October 1, 1896, the service has extended and grown until at the end of the last fiscal year there were in operation 32,646 routes, serving approximately 7,000,000 families. During the same period salaries of the carriers have been advanced from $200 per year to an average of $2,021 per annum.

Although the rural service is now costing in excess of $91,000,000 a year, no one would be so reckless as to declare that it should be abandoned or curtailed. As a matter of fact, the annual cost of operating the Rural Delivery Service is now more than $2,000,000 less than it was when Mr. Farley assumed the office of Postmaster General in 1933, while at the same time rural mail carriers are now serving 3,000,000 more persons than they did in 1933. In that year rural carriers provided service to 25,713,000 people while at the close of the last fiscal year there were 28,974,000 receiving this service.

The aggregate length of rural routes in the United States is now at an all-time high, amounting to 1,401,690 miles at the close of the fiscal year ended June 30, 1940.

To my mind it is one of the most appreciated and indispensable branches of the Postal Service.

Having been born and reared on a farm, it is but natural that I should be deeply sympathetic with every plan and every movement which tends to elevate and improve country life. Many of you men and women here tonight had not seen the light of day in the early period in the history of the Rural Delivery Service and perhaps are not familiar as to the work and manner in which rural routes were laid out in those days, especially in the mountainous sections of some of the States in our country. Many of these routes were laid out by agents of the Department who rode on horseback, carrying a board to which drawing paper was attached, in the crutch of their arms. The agent also carried a compass and as he rode along the road, he would sketch the line of travel and note the houses on the paper. In many sections there were no milestones or mile posts along the roads. The distances would be estimated by the agent after having traveled on his horse a known mile, and in timing the horse at a regular gait in covering that mile. Many years ago, I had considerable actual experience in laying rural delivery routes, on horseback.

At that time in many sections of the country, especially throughout the mountainous regions, in going over a route 20 to 25 miles in length one would find scarcely more than two or three families who received daily newspapers, but a very short time would elapse following the establishment of the service before the greater part of the families in the territory served would be receiving daily newspapers and other publications. And to suggest to them a withdrawal of such service would bring violent protest. In fact, I recall an instance down in the mountain country of Virginia where one of the farmers said, "If anyone should attempt to take this service away from us, we surely would oil up our shotguns." So, today, my friends, if one observes carefully, he will find that the people in the rural sections of our country, on the farms and in the hamlets, are just as well read and well versed in current affairs as those residing in the large cities, and I believe in many instances they are more so.

The duty of each and every rural carrier is a very important one. We should think from day to day of its great importance to our people and to our Government. In the performance of your official duties, you come in daily personal contact with many men, women, and children. It is therefore incumbent upon each carrier

to render the very best possible service, to be courteous, and to be careful at all times in speech and action.

These men, women, and children on your respective routes place an evaluation upon you, so do your duty and conduct yourselves to the end that this evaluation may be a high one. By giving to them the best you have, it will redound to your credit and to the credit of our Government. In no wise do I attempt to make any criticism, for in this great army of men and women who are carrying the mail on our highways the transgressors in your body personnel are very few indeed. I regard you as a most splendid lot of men and women, who have pride in home and family and respect for the Divine Providence, and who are intensely loyal to our Government and its institutions. Let these attributes continue with you in every moment of your lives. The reward will be yours while you live, and, when you are no more, your children and children's children will revere their memory of you with the highest respect.

At this period more than any other time during my travel along the highway of life I believe it is more incumbent upon you and upon me to appreciate in the very highest degree the privileges we have in living in America, in the greatest country and under the most humane and just Government in the world.

The postal establishment is one of the strong arms of the executive branch of the National Government. It is more closely related with the daily lives of our citizens than any other governmental activity. Therefore, it must be a service of integrity and high character. Our founding fathers in article 1, section 8, of the Constitution, said that the Congress shall have the power to establish post offices and post roads. All down through the years, regardless of administration, the Congress has been jealous of that prerogative granted in the Constitution and has seen to it that the growth and development of the Postal Service keep pace with the growth and development of our country. Yes, in some instances, has even gone further. It has blazed the trail, it has pioneered through legislation and appropriation. The framers of the Constitution were men of great vision and saw in the distant future a mighty Nation and realized the vital importance that the postal establishment would have in connection with the daily lives of the people. We should all realize that we have no authority except that which comes to us from the Congress, who are the direct representatives of the people and that we are the people's servants. If we constantly bear those thoughts in mind and perform our work as we should, we will have the approval of our fellow man, of the Congress of the United States, of our Postmaster General, and of our President.

To you men and women here and those carriers who were unable to attend this convention, I express my sincere appreciation for the splendid assistance and valuable cooperation that have been given me. My friends, no man and no woman stands of himself or herself alone. Without the help of our fellow men, not a single person could progress very far. I want to take this opportunity to testify to the positive fact that any success which may have come to me in my work all down through the years, has not been due to my efforts alone, not by far, for it is a great pleasure for me to state that I have always had cooperation from the postmasters, the rural carriers, and all those employed in the various branches of the postal establishment, in the field, and at the Department. I have found that practically every man and every woman is honest and that if you will treat them fairly you will get like treatment in return. So I am grateful for your help and for the help of others.

At this juncture I wish to make reference to those very important committees—the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads of the United States Senate. Both the majority and the minority members of those committees in the House and in the Senate are able and sincere. Their tasks are heavy; those men appreciate their great responsibility to the Postal Service and to the public. All the members of those committees have been considerate of and helpful to me in my work, for which I am very grateful.

The chairman of the Senate Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads labors diligently and intelligently in the handling of the work of his committee. He is a deep student of the Postal Service in all of its branches and activities; he is highly informed as to its operation, needs, and responsibilities; he is a great friend of the Service. I consider it an honor to enjoy his friendship and assistance; one of Tennessee's great men, who is personally known to thousands of men, women, and children throughout that splendid Commonwealth, its senior Senator, Hon. KENNETH MCKELLAR.

There is another man who, with the exception of our Postmaster General, is personally acquainted with as many postal employees I believe, as any man in the United States. This man is now in the United States Senate and is a member of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads. For many years he served as chairman of that committee in the House of Representatives, performing his duties ably and intelligently and with a keen and thorough understanding of the Postal Service. I am very grateful for the assistance so freely given me in my work by that splendid man, the junior Senator from the great State of New York, Hon. JAMES M. MEAD.

My friends, there is another to whom I am very happy to make reference. It is almost like home to me to be here tonight in his State—the great State of Missouri. Hardly a week passes that we, in the Department, do not have personal contact and business transactions with this man. It is always a sincere pleasure for me when he comes into my office, or when I go into his office; he knows the Postal Service; he knows the postal employees—their duties, responsibilities, and problems; he knows our duty to the public, all of which is so clearly shown in his work as chairman of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads in the House of Representatives. I am deeply grateful for the assistance and cooperation given me by that splendid son of Missouri, Hon. MILTON ANDREW ROMJUE.

My friends, the postal establishment of our country is in a high state of efficiency. The postal revenues for the past fiscal year were greater than ever before in its history, being $766,000,000. There is good feeling and splendid cooperation all down the line throughout the length and breadth of the Service; and, in this connection, I think it is proper to say that no great organization of any kind can be truly successful and highly efficient unless it has an able and understanding directing head. We have been extremely fortunate, and are fortunate at this particular moment, in having at the head of this great agency of Government, the Post Office Department, a man of splendid administrative ability, a man of humane understanding, and a man whose daily walk of official life is along the pathway of right and duty; he believes in the brotherhood of man and the fatherhood of God. I am grateful indeed to have been afforded an opportunity to share in an administrative capacity under the direction and leadership of a great Postmaster General, a great and true American, Hon. James A. Farley.

My friends, we Americans have a blessed and priceless heritage which has been handed down through generations to us by our forefathers. That heritage grows of greater value from day to day. We must not for one moment be unmindful of those brave men and women in this country who builded for us. They builded wisely and well and today we enjoy the benefits of their wisdom and the fruits of their labors. Let us not surrender one iota of that heritage. Let us not surrender one iota of our right to live the American way. Let us not grow passive for a moment. In realizing our responsibilities to protect our country and its institutions, there is no room in America for any ism except one ism, and that is Americanism. Every inch of our land is dear to us. There is not an inch of our land to hold the foot of the aggressor; and when we leave here and go to our respective homes and we may be sitting on the porch, under the shade tree, or wherever we may be, let us utter that solemn prayer, "God bless America, my home, sweet home."

Situation in the East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD P. NYE

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 5 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

ARTICLE FROM NEW YORK TIMES

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article appearing in the New York Times of September 1, 1940, entitled "Situation in East," by Maj. Gen. William C. Rivers.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of September 1, 1940]

SITUATION IN EAST—WE ARE ACCUSED OF IGNORING SOME PRACTICABILITIES

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

Admiral Stirling, now retired, an authority on the Far East, writes in the New York Times: 'It seems evident that unless the United States and Japan can compose their ever-mounting differences, the war in the Pacific, long prophesied, is inevitable." And, "Japan's naval advantage over us lies principally in having her fleet concentrated where she has decided all her wars will be fought—in the Orient, where Japan has many outlying island bases to aid her defense." Admiral Stirling says also that a Japanese-American war would be a naval war, fought mostly in the Orient, and furthermore that the United States would have an initial disadvantage, but not necessarily a fatal one.

Given the distances across the Pacific, the shape of the curved coastline of northeastern Asia and the location of Japan—and of her encircling chains of defensive islands running from the Arctic to the Equator—I doubt that the United States could fight a successful war with Japan and defend the Philippines 7,250 miles from our west coast and 5,000 miles west of our nearest base at Hawaii. A war of attrition could be fought for a number of years, but a war which brought definite conclusions could hardly be fought over such distances.

MANY SHIPS NEEDED

To calculate the number of merchant ships that would be needed to accompany or follow the fleet would stagger the imagination. It would much exceed the number of merchant ships in all our foreign service. Building a fortified base at Guam would take several years and cost far more than our total stake in the Far East, in-

cluding American investments in Netherlands East Indies, the Philippines, and China. A base at Guam, in the midst of so many Japanese islands, could not be made tenable.

Two illusions often creep into discussions about the Far East. One is that a base can be made at Guam to maintain communication with the Philippines. Congress can in reality make at Guam only a distant and lonely, untenable salient. Another illusion is concerning Singapore and the aid of the British Fleet. We are all aware that Britain has had no battleships east of the Mediterranean since the bomb explosion at Agadir in 1911—and the conferences about Morocco.

Then there is the grand new war scare—that we actually haul tin and rubber from the Dutch East Indies. We buy rubber from men who have stocks of it at Singapore and elsewhere. Tin we buy from people who have smelters mostly in western Europe. But we could send steamers actually to haul tin and rubber from Java—by way of the Atlantic, and without the need of leaping Japan.

ADMIRAL LEAHY'S OPINION

Admiral William D. Leahy gave to the committees of Congress 2 years ago his judgment in the most thorough discussion of the North Pacific Ocean we have had in 40 years. His opinion was definite and emphatic, as follows: "The Navy which America now has, and the Navy which it will have when it is increased by the authority in this bill will be seriously inadequate to the task of sending a naval force to the Philippines. I said it would require at least 3 times this amount of increase of our Navy, and I doubt if we could (send a naval force to the Philippines) with 3 times the increase."

The admiral said also: "The defensive line of the American Navy at the present time reaches from the Aleutian Islands to the Hawaiian Islands, to Samoa and to the Panama Canal."

The following brief quotations are from Professor Griswold's able article in Harper's for August, on Our Policy in the Far East: "We have failed, as a people and a Nation, to discover in the Far East a region of vital interest to our strategic security and domestic welfare," And, "Geography is perhaps the strongest deterministic agent in international relations."

Dr. Griswold believes there is reason for trying to improve our relations with Japan. Also, that there exists a reasonable basis for such action.

NEW TREATY ADVISED

My own conviction is—after 10 consecutive years' service with the Philippine Government—that we ought to make with Japan a new treaty of trade and friendship. That the treaty should contain clauses indicating Japan's interest in the continued independence of the Philippines after 1946. Japan will not try to annex the republic of the Philippines. She will not make a division of her fleet and armies with Soviet Russia so near at the north. Many Japanese have left the Philippines to return to Japan since the start of the war in China. In any event, Japan will have much of the trade with the Philippines. Japan has not the power or the desire to attack the United States. The distances are too great.

I hope the Filipinos will obtain the independence they have so long desired and which we have so long promised them. I have affection and admiration for the Filipino people. But their country is too far from my country for continued political relations. The inevitable logic of geography is that we should control from the mid-Atlantic westward to the mid-Pacific, a matter of great expense. If we endeavor to maintain a Navy large enough to try to defend the indefensible Philippines, and to aid the defense of South America, it will fetch financial ruin to my own country.

Statements to the effect that the Filipinos no longer desire independence are erroneous. They are, I believe, put out by people who desire our permanent control of and responsibility for the distant Philippines.

WILLIAM C. RIVERS,
Major General, United States Army, Retired.

NEW YORK, *August 28, 1940.*

Preparedness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. D. WORTH CLARK
OF IDAHO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 5 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

EDITORIAL FROM SATURDAY EVENING POST

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a brilliant, and to my mind conclusive, editorial appearing in the Saturday Evening Post of September 7, 1940, entitled "White Yet There Is Time To Think."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From The Saturday Evening Post of September 7, 1940]

WHILE YET THERE IS TIME TO THINK

In a kind of hypnosis, produced partly by propaganda designed for people who believed themselves to be cynical and immune, partly by a sincere crusading evangel carried on by those whose emotions, as we think, have overcome their reason, but mainly by a Government whose foreign policy, to call it such, has been compounded of a spirit of moral grandeur, international heroics, delusions of a military power not in being, false premises and panic, this country now goes where it does not look and looks where it does not go.

If it should come awake one morning to read in the newspaper headlines, or hear by the radio, that it had walked backward into war, it would take it no doubt as having been somehow inevitable from the first, and yet nobody would be able to say quite how or why it happened.

As the hagfish enters the body of its victim unawares and slowly displaces it by devouring it, so it is that ideas that were clear and virile in the beginning have been devoured by new meanings, with no change of the word shells, until now you may be called anti-American, a "fifth columnist," or an appeaser if you doubt that the only way to keep America out of the war is to get into it, that to save ourselves we have first to save the British Empire, or that our first line of defense is and always has been the English Channel.

The Post's position cannot be misunderstood. Before the "blitzkrieg" started, we said: "What we need for practical security is first of all a new word. The word is impregnability, or state of supreme defense. We need more than a bigger Navy. We need two, one for the Atlantic and one for the Pacific, each incomparable. We need an impervious antiaircraft wall. We need to be able to meet not any aggressor, but any combination of aggressors. Then we may be sure that the principle of free institutions as a basis of modern civilization shall have, beyond the solace of words, a time yet to live in this world."

And that is our position still.

Now the Congress has voted a two-ocean Navy; for this proper sea power, for an approach to adequate air power, and for an army of 2,000,000 men, it has voted in a few weeks extraordinary appropriations rising to ten billions of dollars. We are not interested in the sums. We shall have to spend a great deal more than ten billions to create a power of defense equal to the power of aggression that has made this all at once a pirate world without law, the lean and hungry nations, as Mussolini says, out to take what they can from the fat ones by force. That, too, we have said.

It is defense we are thinking about, not war. And what concerns us now is that this distinction is becoming blurred.

What are we preparing for—defense or war?

Either the Executive Government itself does not know or it is unwilling to clarify the situation with a few positive words. We suppose the reason why it cannot do this is that it is already too much involved in its own confusions. Pursuing the insidious formula of measures short of war, conceived to begin with, on a gross underestimate of the aggressor's power, it was carried headlong into acts of physical intervention for the consequences and implications of which the country was in every way unprepared, to say nothing of the fact that it acted without the consent of Congress and beyond the awareness of the people.

In his message to France on June 15, the President said: "The Government of the United States has made it possible for allied armies to obtain, during the weeks that have just passed, airplanes, artillery, and munitions of many kinds, and * * * this Government, so long as the Allied Governments continue to resist, will redouble its efforts in this direction."

That was the United States Government speaking, acting, pledging itself to assist in the war against Hitler to the utmost, short only of an actual declaration of hostilities. It was already too late to save France. Moreover, nothing we had been able to send her, even our total military power, including the Navy, could have saved her, which was a trifling reality the Government was unable to comprehend.

Only 6 weeks later the Secretary of War is saying to the House Committee on Military Affairs, in support of the conscription bill, that there is very grave danger of a direct attack upon the United States by Hitler. He is asked how long it will take to prepare a suitable defense. He says: "We will not have it in time to meet the first possibility of invasion."

The Secretary of War, of course, is speaking directly for the administration. He is saying what it thinks. The administration thinks there is very grave danger of an invasion of this country by Hitler before we can be ready to meet it. But this is the same administration that stripped the American defense of rifles, artillery, munitions, and airplanes and sent them to the Allies. It is the same administration that would have delivered to the British Admiralty the whole of our mosquito fleet in building if the Congress had not found a law to stop it. It is the same administration that has ever since been trying to find a way to deliver United States Navy destroyers to the British. If what it thinks is true—that there is grave danger of an invasion of this country by Hitler before we can get ready—then we have not a rifle, a gun, an airplane, or a rowboat to spare, nor any industrial capacity. On the day the Secretary of War was making his statement before the House committee the New York newspapers carried pictures of National Guard men training with imaginary machine guns devised by plumbers out of gas pipe.

We can imagine circumstances in which the highest strategy would call for taking the war to the enemy. We cannot conceive of circumstances in which it is permitted in sanity to slap danger in the face before you are ready to meet it—to name an enemy

who has not named you, to attack an enemy who has not yet attacked you, before you are ready to fight him.

Our enemies, the administration keeps telling the people, are Germany, Italy, and Japan, naming them. Not one of them has made a gesture of war toward us. For all we think and feel about Hitler, he has not attacked us. He says he does not intend to. We do not believe him. Nobody in the world now believes him. Very well. But the American Government has attacked Hitler, first by words, then by measures short of war, then by giving pledges to his enemies to assist them by all physical means to the utmost.

In June, the American Government entered the war against Hitler by acts of physical intervention all the worse because they were futile.

In July that same Government is telling the people they are in grave danger of being attacked by Hitler before they can get ready to meet him. "Hitler does not wait," said the Secretary of War to the House Committee on Military Affairs—and the National Guard men in New York training with gas-pipe guns!

What a triumph for statecraft! What strategy! What a face for a great nation!

These are the conditions under which there has been created in the country a war psychosis, misled by cries of "Stop Hitler Now!" and "Defend America by Aiding the Allies." We had nothing to stop Hitler with in Europe. A Government that either did not know that, or made believe it was not so, now is saying that if he decided to invade the United States soon, as there is very grave danger that he may, we are not ready to stop him here. Nevertheless, it goes on to declare against him an economic war—a Pan-American economic bloc against his European bloc—for which also it is unprepared, not having thought it through, not having calculated the cost.

We do not believe that an invasion of the United States by Hitler is among the imminent possibilities. The word of the Government for it does not greatly impress us. A Government that had been so wrong about his power to overcome in Europe and about the power of France to resist could very well be wrong again. Nor do we believe that 50 or 60 destroyers from the United States Navy would save the British Empire. That would be but another futile act of futile intervention, much more likely to infuriate an enemy we are not prepared to meet than to save a friend.

We are bound to be emotionally torn by the spectacle of the British Empire fighting for its life. That is a feeling that lies deep in us and is shared even by those who still can think in a realistic manner. The fall of the British Empire would be a mighty human disaster. Yet we part with those who say, or who believe, it would mean the end of American civilization, and part with them again when they would in any degree weaken the American defense to repair the weakness of Great Britain's, for which Great Britain, not we, are responsible. We add here two reflections—first, that Great Britain would be stronger if she had stood alone; second, the enemy is governed by logic, not emotion.

We stand, therefore, in our first position. Let us jealously mind our own defense in the great manner of a great people, resolved to be let alone. Let us build at any cost a dreadnought defense power such as no aggressor, nor any combination of aggressors, will dare to challenge. Thus we forfend war.

And meanwhile, for this will take some time, let us look very hard at a state of facts. The German thing has conquered Europe. That will be still true whether the British Empire stands or falls.

Who is going to put the German thing back? The British? They are not able.

Shall we do it? Unless we are willing to go to Europe and destroy it there, we may as well make up our minds now that we shall have to live in the same world with it, maybe for a long time, whether we like it or not. Nonetheless, for that reason, only all the more, we should, we must, create on this continent the incomparable power of defense. After that we shall see. For after that we shall be again as we once were, safe and free and dangerous.

Issues of the Campaign

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY S. TRUMAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 5 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON TIMES-HERALD

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial published in the Washington Times-Herald of September 3, 1940, under the heading "Mr. Willkie."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Times-Herald of September 3, 1940]

IS THERE AN ISSUE?

Mr. Willkie now says that the Roosevelt administration is bearing down too hard on organized labor. It seems that Mr. Willkie detects a drift under the New Deal toward Government control of labor unions, and that if he is elected he hopes to stop this drift and make labor even stronger and more independent than it is now.

We would have thought that the bulk of Mr. Willkie's before-Philadelphia supporters felt just the other way about labor—that the Roosevelt administration and the Wagner Act had done too much for labor, not too little.

Well, the campaign seems to be settling down to the main question of who is the better fitted to carry out the Roosevelt policies, Mr. Roosevelt or Mr. Willkie.

Mr. Willkie is for the New Deal's farm program; he's for social security, relief, conscription, and the Roosevelt foreign policy of all possible aid to England short of war. Mr. McNary is for the public-power policy; and now Mr. Willkie comes out for making the Wagner Labor Relations Act favor labor even more than it does now.

Instead of a knock-down and drag-out political fight, this is getting to be a love feast. What important national or international issue do these two candidates differ on, anyway? Or is the only real issue simply that one of them believes he ought to be in the White House while the other one believes he ought to stay in it?

Wage-Hour Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 5 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

ARTICLE BY JAY FRANKLIN

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article by Jay Franklin, under the heading "Vindication of Wage-Hour Law a Factor in Defense Called Big Victory for Labor," published in the Washington Evening Star of September 3, 1940.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Evening Star of September 3, 1940]

WE, THE PEOPLE—VINDICATION OF WAGE-HOUR LAW AS FACTOR IN DEFENSE CALLED BIG VICTORY FOR LABOR

(By Jay Franklin)

Labor Day, 1940, witnessed one of labor's greatest victories, won—as the most complete victories are won—in silence. This is the complete vindication of the wage and hour law as a vital factor in national defense.

When the war crisis began there was a wave of business sentiment in favor of setting aside the restrictions of this law in the sacred name of the national emergency. Yet it has proved impossible for at least one nationally known radio forum to find big business representatives who are willing publicly to debate on this issue. Not one of them is willing to stand up on his hind legs and argue for longer hours for industrial labor or for lower wages at a time when the Government is spending lavishly for defense.

The truth is that the evidence points to the unsuspected fact that there is a limit to the productivity of labor in terms of hours per day. The stretch-out and the speed-up are both apt to lead to botched workmanship.

In 1918 Mr. Henry Ford, acting as umpire for the National War Labor Board, ruled on this issue: "I cannot refrain from expressing my very deep conviction that the straight 8-hour day is much better practice than the so-called 8-hour basic day, where the latter is continually and almost uniformly being practically exceeded in the number of working hours.

"My experience, and also my reason, teaches me that very few emergencies ever exist in a manufacturing business justifying the practice of exceeding 8 working hours per day. The strain of 8 hours is enough, and the hours should never be increased except under the most extraordinary circumstances. I cannot dwell too much on this. For the good of the men, for the good of the employer, and for the general results I would admonish those interested to adhere to the straight 8-hour day."

SUPPORTED BY EXPERIENCE

Thus spoke an expert in industrial production who has never been accused of undue tenderness toward the rights of organized labor.

This principle is supported by the experience of nations at war. The Manchester Guardian of July 18, 1940, writing of the British

war effort, observed: "* * * There comes a time when the spirit of patriotic resolve can drive the tired body no farther. That time is here. Mr. Bevin said that the long working hours were already causing production to decline rather than to increase, and that the suspended factory acts must come back into force on August 1. This does not mean that armament production must fall still lower; reduced hours, in the last war experience, should soon send it up again, besides preserving stores of energy and enthusiasm for future urgencies."

FLEMING REPORT CONFIRMED

All of this confirms the report made to the President by Col. Philip B. Fleming, Administrator of the Wage and Hour Act, on July 11, 1940. In this report Colonel Fleming cited the report of the British Munitions Commission of the 1914–18 war, General Order No. 13 of the Chief of Ordnance, U. U. A., on November 15, 1917, and the German experience with an attempted 60-hour week for labor beginning on January 1, 1938. The result of this effort to make labor lay more golden eggs was that "production began to fall off rapidly, accompanied by such an alarming increase of industrial accidents and stoppages as to attract the serious attention of the Government authorities."

In other words, experience in three countries and two wars proves that it is bad for production to try to work labor longer hours than industrial management has found effective. Neither higher wages in America, patriotic spirit in England, nor Nazi regimentation in Germany, has been able to evade this law of supply and demand in efficient effort by individual workers.

So American labor enters the crisis with this lesson learned by the employers of labor. It is unlikely that the wage scale of industrial labor will be attacked, so long as the corporations involved are operating on the copious flow of Government funds. This is the greatest vindication of the New Deal's social program since the inauguration of work relief in 1933.

Transfer of Destroyers to Great Britain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD P. NYE

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 5 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE BOSTON POST

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial appearing yesterday in the Boston Post, entitled "An Imperious Act."

The Boston Post has been a stanch supporter of the administration. It is a Democratic newspaper supporting the administration's foreign policy, including its wishes in connection with the peacetime conscription program. The editorial to which I refer is thus made of larger meaning than might otherwise be the case. I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Boston Post of September 4, 1940]

AN IMPERIOUS ACT

The giving of our destroyers to Great Britain in return for rights to fortify certain points was done in a manner far removed from our rightful democratic processes.

None of us know what immediate effect this act will have in putting us in the war.

But we do know now, finally, that the people of the United States have been committed by Franklin D. Roosevelt to preserve the British Empire, its rights and dominions, all over the earth.

Her war is our war.

The bases we shall establish on her islands and subject countries will protect her as well as ourselves.

For her we will keep free a place of refuge, so that her Government can still function if it is driven from the British Isles.

If we were a British colony we could not do more. Most of them are doing less.

Legally the deal was as raw a piece of chicanery as has been yet foisted upon a trusting people in the more than 150 years of our history.

The interventionist lawyers dug back into moldy legislation to find a forgotten statute to enable the deal to be put over.

The Congress was flouted; due process of deliberation was debauched.

Perhaps the President feels that he is doing the popular thing. Perhaps we Americans are willing to be led into another of Europe's wars.

But the swift, subtle, and adroit action was not according to the canons of Americanism that we learned at the knees of our mothers, from the lips of our preceptors, or have heard repeated from the mouth of the man who now sits in the President's chair.

We now know that it is all right for Congress to deliberate on the lives of men, as in the Conscription Act, but an international swindle like this is too deep, too incomprehensible for their combined intellects.

Else why was the deal put over in the undercover way that it was?

Many a mother will rise this morning with an ache at her heart for the sons whole lives are the pawns in this gigantic game.

Many a man will wonder where his right as an American citizen has gone to voice his protest at such imperious action.

No ballot box in November, it is apparent, will save the peace of the land now. By that time we should be wholly in the war.

For by hauling down Old Glory from those destroyers we have cut adrift from the splendor of our vaunted independence.

No raising of the Union Jack over their decks will or can replace it.

Wendell Willkie

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. SMATHERS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 5 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

LETTER AND ARTICLE BY JUDGE FRANK SMATHERS TO EDITOR OF ASHEVILLE (N. C.) CITIZEN

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have published in the Appendix of the RECORD two articles clipped from the Asheville Citizen, Asheville, N. C., written by my brother, Judge Frank Smathers, of Miami, Fla., who is spending the summer at his summer home in Waynesville, N. C.

There being no objection, the letter and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Asheville (N. C.) Citizen]

WHAT WOULD ANSWER BE?

WAYNESVILLE, N. C., *August 26, 1940.*

EDITOR OF THE CITIZEN:

I note that Mr. Willkie continues to fling his challenge at the President for a joint debate.

Evidently Mr. Willkie thinks he has found something the President is afraid of and that the public is proud of that discovery.

If Mr. Willkie continues to banter the President with that challenge he will soon make two other discoveries.

One will be in November when he begins to dig himself from beneath a Roosevelt landslide. The other will follow Mr. Willkie's next challenge when Mr. Roosevelt will be forced to write Mr. Willkie somewhat in this fashion:

"DEAR MR. WILLKIE: I hear you want me to tour the country with you for the purpose of putting on a big show—a joint debate. If I had the time, and if I were not President of a great Nation, I'd accept, as that would afford me much personal fun. But, the affairs of state and the pressing official duties of my office compel me to regretfully decline your thoughtful invitation. I feel though, that it is your right and my duty to inform you of the reasons that impel this important decision."

"To me, Mr. Willkie, these are perilous times, the like of which the world has never witnessed before. In fact, I feel that a world revolution is upon us right here in America; forced upon us, it is true, and from which we cannot flee, however desirable that may be. We must stand and face it with a stout heart and an unflinching spirit, or we, too, will fall before its crushing force. Already the fine culture and centuries of freedom enjoyed by the many, mighty nations of Europe have been completely destroyed by this evil force within the short space of a few weeks. England alone stands between us and that deadly, dreaded evil. She alone is valiantly fighting to save freedom and civilization from the savage oppressors of Europe. England is battling today, not only for her own life and liberty, but also for the preservation of those priceless privileges and liberties so dear to the hearts of all the Americans.

"Already that Battle of Britain has alarmed and startled the people of this hemisphere as they have never been stirred before. Already our European trade and overseas possessions and rights have been lost or wantonly destroyed or brusquely denied.

"Moreover, and far more serious, our national life and our domestic business economy have been totally disrupted by Europe's dictators, and while we in America are today endeavoring to readjust our business economy to the new world conditions, our American way of life and free democratic institutions are being assailed from without and undermined from within, and by that same insidious and baneful force that crushed and subjugated Belgium and France.

"Confronted with these perilous, imperative, and paramount problems of national life and national defense and national safety, I cannot, therefore, see, Mr. Willkie, either the need or the propriety for wasting precious time debating the wisdom of New Deal policies, the core of which you already accept and promise publicly to support.

"Respectfully yours,

"FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT."

If such a letter as the above should be sent by the President to Mr. Willkie, would Mr. Willkie desist in his challenges or would he go back to Elwood for further study and inspiration before formulating his reply?

FRANK SMATHERS.

TOPICS OF THE DAY—WENDELL WILLKIE—THE ELECTION AND THE WAR

(By Judge Frank Smathers)

When Mr. Wendell Willkie was first nominated, I feared for the Democrats—I feared for Mr. Roosevelt, but not for the Nation. I thought the Republicans had at last selected a winner, a wise statesman. I was sure they had chosen a successful businessman with sufficient personality and pep to attract and persuade the masses as well as the classes. I was convinced that a real national champion had been born to the Nation overnight, equipped for any emergency, fit to fight on all fronts, to master all issues, and eminently equipped to lead and defend a great Nation, a great people in a world raked with unrest and wild with revolution.

I continued to think and feel this way about Mr. Willkie until he went back home and began to unbosom himself before his homefolks in Elwood, Ind. There he became quite talkative and revealed his inner thoughts. Lots of people were there to see and hear him, more than will ever go there again.

The speech itself—well, that was not so hot as the weather. Some Republicans thought it great, others were disappointed, but all the Democrats, save those taking a walk with Mr. Al Smith, were perfectly delighted. They felt relieved.

Personally, I was disillusioned, disappointed, and in this depressed mental mood I felt like writing Mr. Willkie as follows: "Dear Mr. Willkie: Why didn't you specify and stress 'national defense' as the most pressing and vital need of the Nation? You know that it is. Why, therefore, didn't you say so, frankly, fearlessly, and specifically, and urge all your followers to demand an immediate passage of the conscription bill without further debate and delay? Also, Mr. Willkie, why didn't you shout: 'Down with the dictators; Long live democracy, and to this end and to this ideal I hereby pledge and dedicate my all, even my life.'"

Such a patriotic declaration and demonstration on your part, Mr. Willkie, would have been a great inspiration and encouragement to the American youth now asked to lay his life on the altar of freedom, and the American mother about to sacrifice her only son and life savings in order to save democracy and the cherished liberties of America.

Instead, Mr. Willkie, you chilled and discouraged your many admirers by your repeated cries: "Down with the New Deal. Death to the New Deal, and I am brave enough to here and now challenge the champion new dealer to a joint debate."

Moreover, Mr. Willkie, you know there is, at least, one thing the President has done wisely and well, and that is the handling of our foreign policy. That policy, all intelligent and fair-minded men freely admit has been masterfully and magnificently done by our President in the true American fashion, and with the same devotion, courage, and wisdom that actuated and inspired our great Presidents of the past when America's safety was in jeopardy. So right here and there, Mr. Willkie, you had the excuse and the occasion to be more patriotic than political by publicly acknowledging your thanks for the manner in which our foreign affairs have been conducted by our President and your rival. But, instead, you saw fit to brutally and brusquely rebuke him. Yes, belittle and depreciate his best and most unselfish efforts. You even ascribed "unscrupulous" motives to all his fine official acts on foreign affairs.

Therefore, is it any wonder, Mr. Willkie, that some of us feel disillusioned about your sportsmanship and statesmanship? I hope, however, I have misjudged you through your acceptance speech. For the sake of the Nation we all love, I would like to think and I shall still hope that my first estimate of your ability and character was the correct one.

New Deal Policies Incompatible With Democratic Philosophy of Former Years

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK B. KEEFE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 5, 1940

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, as an indication of the tremendous change in policy of the New Deal from the Democratic philosophy of former years, I quote from the Democratic platform of 1900, adopted at Kansas City, Mo., with William J. Bryan as the Democratic candidate for the Presidency:

The origin and powers of government: We declare again that all governments instituted among men derive their just powers from the consent of the governed; that any government not based upon the consent of the governed is a tyranny, and that to impose upon any people a government of force is to substitute the methods of imperialism for those of a republic. We hold that the Constitution follows the flag and denounce the doctrine that an Executive or Congress, deriving their existence and their power from the Constitution, can exercise lawful authority beyond it or in violation of it.

We assert that no nation can long endure half republic and half empire, and we warn the American people that imperialism abroad will lead quickly and inevitably to despotism at home.

The Democrats who assembled in that convention at Kansas City on July 4, 1900, surely reflected in their platform ideas wholly incompatible with the present trends of the New Deal. I again quote from that platform:

Militarism opposed. We oppose militarism. It means conquest abroad and intimidation and oppression at home. It means the strong arm which has ever been fatal to free institutions. It is what millions of our citizens have fled from in Europe. It will impose upon our peace-loving people a large standing army and unnecessary burden of taxation, and will be a constant menace to their liberties. A small standing army and a well-disciplined State militia are amply sufficient in time of peace. This Republic has no place for a vast military service and conscription.

The National Guard. In time of danger the volunteer soldier is his country's best defender. The National Guard of the United States should ever be cherished in the patriotic hearts of a free people. Such organizations are ever an element of strength and safety. For the first time in our history and coeval with the Philippine conquest has there been a wholesale departure from our time-honored and approved system of volunteer organization. We denounce it as un-American, undemocratic, and unrepublican, and as a subversion of the ancient and fixed principles of a free people.

The Democrats of the Nation again assembled in convention at St. Louis on July 6, 1904, nominated Alton B. Parker, of New York, for its candidate for the Presidency and adopted a platform which it might be interesting for the New Deal Democrats to read. I quote from that platform and ask reasonable men to apply that indictment to the New Deal:

The Republican administration. The existing Republican administration has been spasmodic, erratic, sensational, spectacular, and arbitrary. It has made itself a satire upon the Congress, the courts, and upon the settled practices and usages of national and international law.

It summoned the Congress into hasty and futile extra session, and virtually adjourned it, leaving behind in its flight from Washington uncalled calendars and unaccomplished tasks.

It made war, which is the sole power of Congress, without its authority, thereby usurping one of its fundamental prerogatives. It violated a plain statute of the United States as well as plain treaty obligations, international usages, and constitutional law; and has done so under pretense of executing a great public policy, which could have been more easily effected lawfully, constitutionally, and with honor.

I quote further from the platform:

Fundamental principles. The application of these fundamental principles to the living issues of the day is the first step toward the assured peace, safety, and progress of our Nation. Freedom of the press, of conscience, and of speech; equality before the law of all citizens; right of trial by jury; freedom of the persons defended by the writ of habeas corpus; liberty of personal contract untrammeled by sumptuary laws; supremacy of the civil over military authority; a well-disciplined militia; the separation of church and State; economy in expenditures; low taxes, that labor may be lightly burdened; prompt and sacred fulfillment of public and private obligations; fidelity to treaties; peace and friendship with all nations, entangling alliances with none; absolute acquiescence in the will of the majority; the vital principle of republics—these are doctrines which Democracy has established as proverbs of the Nation, and they should be constantly invoked and enforced.

The Democratic Convention of 1908, held at Denver, Colo., nominated William Jennings Bryan as its candidate for the Presidency. It adopted a platform on which that candidate sought the highest office in the land. Let us refer to it for inspiration. I quote:

Increase of officeholders: Coincident with the enormous increase in expenditures is a like addition to the number of officeholders. During the past year 23,784 were added, costing $16,156,000, and in the past 6 years of Republican administration the total number of new offices created, aside from many commissions, has been 99,139,

entailing an additional expenditure of nearly $70,000,000, as against only 10,279 new offices created under the Cleveland and McKinley administrations, which involved an expenditure of only $6,000,000. We denounce this great and growing increase in the number of officeholders as not only unnecessary and wasteful but also as clearly indicating a deliberate purpose on the part of the administration to keep the Republican Party in power at public expense by thus increasing the number of its retainers and dependents. Such procedure we declare to be no less dangerous and corrupt than the open purchase of votes at the polls.

Economy in administration: The Republican Congress in the session just ended made appropriations amounting to $1,008,000,000, exceeding the total expenditures of the past fiscal year by $90,000,000, and leaving a deficit of more than $60,000,000 for the fiscal year just ended. We denounce the needless waste of the people's money, which has resulted in the appalling increase, as a shameful violation of all prudent considerations of government and as no less than a crime against the millions of working men and women, from whose earnings the great proportion of these colossal sums must be extorted through excessive tariff exactions and other indirect methods. It is not surprising that in the face of this shocking record the Republican platform contains no reference to economical administration or promise thereof in the future. We demand that a stop be put to this frightful extravagance and insist upon the strictest economy in every department compatible with frugal and efficient administration.

I quote further:

Misuse of patronage: We condemn as a violation of the spirit of our institutions the action of the present Chief Executive in using the patronage of his high office to secure the nomination for the Presidency of one of his Cabinet officers. A forced succession in the Presidency is scarcely less repugnant to public sentiment than is life tenure in that office. No good intention on the part of the Executive and no virtue in the one selected can justify the establishment of a dynasty. The right of the people to freely select their officials is inalienable and cannot be delegated.

The Democratic convention of 1912 held at Baltimore, Md., nominated Woodrow Wilson, of New Jersey, for the Presidency. It adopted a platform upon which the nominee was elected President of the United States. In view of the present record of the New Deal, I think it proper to refer to that platform. I quote:

Rights of the States: We believe in the preservation and maintenance in their full strength and integrity of the three coordinate branches of the Federal Government—the executive, the legislative, and the judicial, each keeping within its own bounds and not encroaching upon the just powers of either of the others.

Believing that the most efficient results under our system of government are to be attained by the full exercise by the States of their reserved sovereign powers, we denounce as usurpation the efforts of our opponents to deprive the States of any of the rights reserved to them and to enlarge and magnify by indirection the powers of the Federal Government.

We insist upon the full exercise of all the powers of the Government, both State and national, to protect the people from injustice at the hands of those who seek to make the Government a private asset in business. There is no twilight zone between the Nation and the State in which exploiting interests can take refuge from both. It is necessary that the Federal Government shall exercise the powers reserved to them, but we insist that Federal remedies for the regulation of interstate commerce and for the prevention of private monopoly shall be added to, and not substituted for, State remedies.

The Democratic convention of 1924 held at New York City nominated John W. Davis, of West Virginia, for its candidate for the Presidency. It adopted a platform signed by Homer S. Cummings, chairman, and KEY PITTMAN, secretary. In view of the tendencies of the New Deal, I quote from that platform:

The rights of the States: We demand that the States of the Union shall be preserved in all their vigor and power. They constitute a bulwark against the centralizing and destructive tendencies of the Republican Party.

We condemn the efforts of the Republican administration to nationalize the functions and duties of the States.

We oppose the extension of bureaucracy, the creation of unnecessary bureaus and Federal agencies, and the multiplication of offices and officeholders.

We demand a revival of the spirit of local self-government essential to the preservation of the free institutions of our Republic.

The foregoing citations of solemn covenants contained in various Democratic platforms of the past clearly demonstrate how far the present administration has drifted from the fundamental principles of government set forth in those platforms.

The Gentleman From Oregon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 5, 1940

ARTICLE BY S. EUGENE ALLEN

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, the Oregon Labor Press is the voice of the American Federation of Labor in my State of Oregon. In its recent fortieth Labor Day edition it carried an article over the signature of its editor, Mr. S. Eugene Allen, discussing my distinguished colleague, Senator CHARLES L. MCNARY. I ask to include this article in the extension of my remarks. It is as follows:

[From the Oregon Labor Press of August 30, 1940]

THE GENTLEMAN FROM OREGON

(By S. Eugene Allen)

A historic occasion was observed last Tuesday at the State fairgrounds in Salem. The distinguished senior Senator from Oregon, CHARLES L. MCNARY, was officially notified that he is the Republican nominee for the Vice Presidency of the United States. This is the only time that such an honor has come to Oregon. It is—really—the only time that such an honor has fallen to any State west of the Mississippi River. For Hoover, though claiming California residence, is not truly a westerner.

But "Charlie Mac" is a westerner and an Oregonian in the truest sense of the word. He was born on the farm he now owns near Salem. He loves this western country with its tall fir trees, its lovely lawns, and its cool breezes. He is happiest when he may cast aside the cares of state and come home to Oregon—and to Fir Cone, his home.

Fir Cone. How appropriately named is this natal place and home of our distinguished MCNARY. The modest farm cottage in which he lives nestles under the towering firs that are patriarchs of the forest. The filbert and prune orchards are neatly kept and well cultivated. Fir Cone is a typical western Oregon farm home.

Agriculture has always been the first love of Senator MCNARY. For years he has been identified with every piece of legislation having as its purpose the relief of oppressed agriculture. In his speech of acceptance Mr. MCNARY pointed out a fundamental truth. He said that without a prosperous agriculture there could be no prosperity for the workers of the Nation and that pay rolls would drop and unemployment would overtake us. He said that the interests of the Nation's workers and its farmers were inextricably bound up together and that they must both be prosperous together or that both would fall into economic chaos. This is the sheerest common sense.

But MCNARY has not confined his interests to agriculture. He has been a stanch champion of labor. Organized labor has appreciated his support of the interests of the working people of America. He has been endorsed by labor in his election campaigns in this State. Labor is confident that it can depend upon Senator MCNARY to continue to insist that its interests be protected and its rights strengthened.

Typically Oregonian, Mr. MCNARY has never been a hidebound partisan. He has supported liberal and progressive legislation for many, many years. He supported the initiative and the referendum when the party politicians were attacking them. He has stood up and fought the seizure of the vast waterpower resources of this Nation by private and predatory interests. He has consistently fought for low-cost distribution of public power and for public ownership of power whenever that seemed desirable and feasible.

MCNARY has been distinguished by his good judgment and by his political acumen and statesmanship—not by long speeches. In the 23 years that he has served the State of Oregon in the Senate of the United States he has made very few speeches and those that he has made have been brief and precise. He has come to be highly respected by both political parties for his sage advice and his kindly tolerance of differing viewpoints.

Mr. MCNARY's speech in Salem was a good speech. It was a progressive speech. He did not condemn the New Deal except in its obvious shortcomings. He candidly stated that important social gains had been made under the New Deal administration. He urged a strong program of conservation. As to forests he made it clear that we must balance our cut and harvest of timber with new planting and reforestation. On the question of power he said:

"Unfalteringly, the Congress has granted to the public preferential rights to power from navigable streams. Maximum benefits for domestic consumers, farmers, and small users of power should be the yardstick by which we measure the usefulness and serviceability of every Federal development. Moreover, rates should be

maintained at the lowest level consistent with sound amortization. Where irreconcilable conflicts arise between public and private interests in the development and distribution of power, private holdings should not be confiscated and we now have a working precedent for such fair treatment in the recent acquisition by purchase of private companies by the Tennessee Valley Authority."

GEORGE NORRIS could do no better nor more clearly define a fair and sensible policy.

Mr. MCNARY said that he "opposes involvement in foreign military adventures. America, as always, prefers peace. But America does not prefer the peace of appeasement; nor the surrender of our national dignity, our independence of action, our political freedom or the civilized values that we cherish." And who could better define American opinion with respect to foreign affairs?

There are many who believe that such views on the part of "CHARLIE MAC" are incompatible with those of Wendell Willkie. That is a matter of conjecture. But it is certain that the people of Oregon and of the West are proud of Senator MCNARY. They know he is one of them, that he understands and is sympathetic with their problems. The western folks have confidence in MCNARY because for a quarter of a century he has rendered yeoman service to them and has represented them well in the National Capital.

The people of Oregon know that should their native son be elevated to the Vice Presidency they will suffer an almost irreparable loss in the Senate but will have a friend near the White House. Oregon labor respects and honors MCNARY. Oregon agriculture looks to him as its leader. Oregon industry has unbounded confidence in him.

The citizens of Oregon wish him well in this new cause into which he has been drafted.

Where the Compact Failed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN J. KENNEDY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 4, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW YORK SUN

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Sun:

[From the New York Sun of September 4, 1940]

WHERE THE COMPACT FAILED

Notwithstanding his disappointment because so many of the signatories of the Briand-Kellogg compact have violated their covenant outlawing war as an instrument of national policy, Secretary Hull asserts that the soundness of its underlying principles in no wise has been impaired. Undoubtedly that is correct. The trouble is not with the principles of the Kellogg Pact but in failure to live up to them. What has happened did not mark the first time—as we fear it may not prove the last time—that sinners have thronged the mourner's bench to avow repentance and amendment, only to become backsliders when the next robust temptation came along.

The Secretary's comment does not mean that he is an incurable optimist; it means only that he is still a little romantic. As so many others do, he wishes to dwell in such a realm as that portrayed by the seer of Patmos, where everybody loves everybody else and nobody means his neighbor harm. But the seer of Patmos foresaw certain conditions precedent. He foresaw the necessity of laying hold on the dragon, that old serpent which is the devil and Satan, and chaining him up for a thousand years in a bottomless pit before loosening him for final rebellion and catastrophe. St. John understood what so many other wishful ones seem to forget—that before human nature acquires perfection it will have to be made over in blood and tears and sweat and penitence.

There are a good many notions about this ancient enemy. Some personify it as Satan; others think of it as meaning the innate obstreperousness and cantankerousness of human nature itself. In either case, its subjection seems essential to any workable millennium. Evidence is still wanting to show that it has been immured in any pit for the 12 years since the Briand-Kellogg compact was signed, to say nothing of a thousand years. But even after 12 years the compact has taken on a quaint flavor of antiquity. It survives mainly as a reminder of an age of sweet credulity when so many believed that human nature could be made over by passing laws, that force could be abolished from the relations of nations by the simple process of getting a few statesmen to agree that force is a dreadful and deplorable thing. Secretary Hull's nostalgic affection for it may be attributed rather to the goodness of his heart than to an exercise of his really respectable power of ratiocination.

Compare Our Problems With England's Problems—Part I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. THORKELSON

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 4, 1940

Mr. THORKELSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following excerpts from the Alien Menace.

Mr. Speaker, the author of this book is Lt. Col. A. H. Lane, of the British Army, a gentleman who I am sure, knows what he is talking about. The reader will find that England's problem is practically our problem, and I have inserted these excerpts so that the Members may read and inform themselves as to the conditions which exist in England.

From informative sources, which I have been able to contact, I have come to the conclusion that the English people were opposed to the present war. These patriotic English citizens, realizing what is happening in the British Empire, have become closely united, and in this strength have formed a formidable front against the British Government which, like ours, is international. It was in order to stop this movement, as much as anything, that Great Britain, out of a clear sky, declared war, and this declaration forced France to do the same. It was a mistake, as we now know, yet it was a case where the Government did not listen to the people.

The people of the United States, knowing this, are now demanding that Congress listen to the people of this Nation, so that our institutions and Government may be preserved, as it was originally given to us. Our people, like the English people, have this right and it is in defense of these rights that people from every State are now in Washington for the purpose of expressing their wishes to Congress, and their wishes are that this country remain at peace and stop provocative acts that are bound to lead us into war.

ALIENS AND REVOLUTION

That strange alien influences exist in England is obvious; and I propose, as far as possible within the limits of this book, to examine one or two aspects of this particular menace to the nation.

First, we have to remember that, despite their pious protestations, the so-called British Labor Party is pledged, through affiliation with the Second International of 1923, to remove even our present ineffective restrictions in relation to alien immigration. They commenced to redeem that pledge in 1924, as is proved by no less an authority than Mr. Ronald McNeill, now Lord Cushendun, who, speaking in the Canterbury division on October 24, 1924, said that the Socialist government had withdrawn control of aliens and any number were now coming into the country. He did not suppose that these even required to go to Germany for forged passports. So easy was it for them to come to this country under our present system that probably at this moment, in the country, hidden away in London, Manchester, Glasgow, and in places of that sort, were men—they could not tell how many—of exactly the same class as the men who had produced the horrors in Russia.

And during 1929–31 these regulations were further relaxed.

Why this tender regard for the foreigner? What is the driving force behind it? Why is the foreigner always conspicuous in all movements of a subversive nature? Is he a welcome guest, or has he behind him a power that forbids any attempt to oust him from the deliberations of any of these associations? On Sunday, December 4, 1927, I attended a meeting at the Albert Hall, London, organized by the International Class War Prisoners' Aid, when those well-known Communists, the late A. J. Cooke and J. T. Murphy, were the chief speakers. After carefully examining the audience from points of vantage in the hall, and again at an exit, when it dispersed, it was obvious that about 50 percent were aliens of a low, dark type. And there immediately arose in my mind the question, "Why should we, and why do we, harbor these foreign parasites whose chief object, judging by the speeches at this meeting, is revolution?" It was not without purpose that the doctrine of "Liberty, equality, and fraternity" was proclaimed by the alien instigators of the French Revolution. When accepted and acted

upon it admitted an alien influence and alien agents into every French institution, which until then were in the main the preserve of Frenchmen. The French subversives in 1789 were but the vanguard movement of an alien invasion that ultimately spread to every European country, including England.

The Hyde Park meetings, especially on May Day and on Sundays, show the type of alien revolutionary in this country. Few of these aliens do any honest work. Some beg doles, others live by crime, and most of them get Moscow money.

When we talk of the doctrines of Moscow, we do not always realize that we have actually imported the teachers of these doctrines, with apparent willingness, if not pleasure. Many of them have come here definitely to extend the Moscow and other equally subversive and pernicious movements, and, as for the remaining aliens who may not actually be active, it must not be expected that they have a love for Britain implanted in their hearts on landing. They are aliens, and aliens they will remain, no matter whether they change their nationality or not.

How was it that noted alien revolutionaries were allowed into this country under the socialist and Baldwin governments? Here are the names of some of them.

Bukharin, the great brain of Moscow, came here in July 1931 "as a scientist," as the socialist government have been at great pains to explain. How long did he remain? He is well known as one of the chief Soviet organizers. He is joint author of the A B C of communism, which has been so much used by our Socialist politicians, and he was Lenin's "pen."[1]

Gustav Sobottka is secretary of the International Miners' Committee of the Red International of Labor Unions of Moscow. He was in this country for some months at the end of 1930.

Ossipoff and Stoutsky, of the central committee of the Miners' Union of the U. S. S. R., landed in Great Britain on September 28, 1929, and remained several weeks, during which they addressed miners in various parts of England and Scotland. So anti-British and Communist were their speeches that the Miners' Federation of Great Britain raised complaints.

Helmuk Oppermann, who admitted he had been 18 months in the British Isles when examined (December 28, 1928), was found to have a forged German passport and to be carrying arms.

Eduard Soermus, a Russian revolutionary, after preaching his dangerous doctrines in South Wales and other places for several months after the war, was deported; but the Socialist Government of 1924 allowed him to come back.

Isidore Dreazon, a naturalized American of Polish birth, arrived in England, January 29, 1930. He was found at the end of April, hiding in the headquarters of the Communist Party in Ancoats, Manchester. The police described him as the most dangerous man in England today, and as an important member of the Executive of the Third International of Moscow. He had visited every Communist center in England where there was industrial unrest and was said to be behind recent strikes. This man had been in England at an earlier date and on May 1, 1930, he was sentenced to a month's imprisonment and recommended for deportation. On June 6, 1930, he was sentenced to 3 months' imprisonment; but he did not leave this country until October 22, 1930.

Xaver Franz Kugelmann, a German, landed here in March 1929, for a limited period. Then he was granted three extensions by the Home Office up to December 3, 1929. He was stated to be a member of the Communist Party. But he was still here on August 22, 1931, and a quantity of Communist literature was found at his lodgings. (See Cases in the Courts, Appendix II.)

And how many other dangerous alien revolutionaries in this country have not been arrested but are secretly at work in these islands? The author knows of some of these and has tried in vain to get the authorities to take action about them.

On November 27, 1930, Mr. Henderson stated in the House of Commons that members of the Ogpu (the terrorist Moscow Soviet police) would be permitted to enter this country.

Moses Roisenman arrived in England in June 1930, under a false name. He is chief of the foreign section of the Ogpu. He is known to have been in touch with a number of military spies, English and foreign, in order to obtain information re latest type of tanks, armored cars, and big guns. (Daily Mail, July 5, 1930.)

Moscow transferred the Communist International Western Bureau from Berlin to London in 1930.

"It is of importance that the amazing network built up by the Bolshevists for world propaganda for communism should be fully realized. They have set up organizations, similar to the Western European Bureau, all over the world.

"The Western Bureau covers this country, Ireland, France, Portugal, Spain, and Belgium.

"In addition to other European branches, there are also the Indian Bureau, the Latin-American Bureau, the South African Bureau (with headquarters at Cape Town), the Far Eastern Bureau, which includes Australia and New Zealand, and the North American Bureau, which includes the United States, Canada, and Mexico." (Morning Post, May 12, 1930.)

It is evident that Moscow knew that this Bureau could plot with greater freedom under our socialist government than in Berlin.

"In the House of Lords on November 17, 1931, Lord Bertie of Thame drew attention to the activities of the expert Soviet agent, Klyshko, which have been described by the Morning Post. This useful revolutionary was deported with Litvinoff (Finkelstein) in 1918 and returned with diplomatic immunity in 1920; but was withdrawn by his masters in 1923, at the instance of Lord Curzon, after it had been discovered that a number of £100 bank notes, passed to him through Lloyds Bank and the Russian Commercial Bank in London had been cashed by a Punjabi revolutionary in India. He was evicted from China in 1925, having conspired with the Jew Borodin. Lord Lucan gave an account of his recent visits to this defenseless country—once in 1930 and twice this year. He said that the Home Office 'have the situation well in hand'; but, in reply to Lord Newton, he added that Klyshko 'has to get a visa to come to the country,' and 'is backed by individuals or firms' wanting to do business with the Soviet. 'I understand that there is no objection raised.' Could there be any better proof of the necessity for promptly clearing out the 'nests of conspirators,' enjoying the hospitality of this country and entrenched behind diplomatic immunity?" (The Patriot, November 26, 1931.)

In May 1930 a significant visit to England was paid by Herr Everlein, one of Moscow's big men. He is a member of that mysterious and all-powerful body, the I. C. C. (International Control Commission of the Communist International). He is Controller of Finance. Thus is revealed the link between the money of Moscow and the British Communist Party.

These alien anarchists waited until the socialist government was in office before coming, or returning, to this country. The facts set forth above show the long red arm of Moscow in our midst.

"Pussyfoot" Johnson, of the United States of America, who more than once has been in England endeavoring to put prohibition over on us, is another example of alien interference in our national interests. We do not want the state of affairs here which prohibition has brought about in the United States of America. Had not the visits of this mysterious man, not only in England, but also in India twice, and in Egypt, some ulterior object beyond that of prohibition? The inhabitants of Egypt are Mohammedans, and most of the inhabitants of India have no interest in prohibition as they do not drink alcoholic liquor. Whence did the money come to pay Mr. Johnson's heavy expenses when traveling in so many countries?

After reading this chapter, doubtless the reader will wonder why a British Government should go out of its way to admit these dangerous alien revolutionaries.

And these are some of the gang to which trade credits have been given, to which this country has been supplying munitions of war on credit, including tanks, guns, etc. No one who has studied matters of late years expects these credits, which now run to several millions, to be honored by this Moscow Soviet.

In his book, An Expert in the Service of the Soviet (Benn, 1929), Mr. M. J. Larsons, a mining engineer and a well-known businessman, relates how he was sent by the Soviet to Berlin in 1918 to assist Menshinsky, then consul general of the Soviet Republic in Berlin, in negotiating large credits. Mr. Larsons tried to impress on Menshinsky and his colleagues that they should be careful as to declarations and promises to the Reichsbank. Menshinsky smilingly observed: "I do not understand you. As long as there are still idiots to take our signature seriously and to put their trust in it, we must promise everything that is being asked and as much as one likes, if we can only get something tangible in exchange."

But the point of this story is that Menshinsky was the most powerful member of the Moscow Soviet in 1929 when Dovgalevski

---

[1] Nicolai Ivanovich Bukharin is one of the most inveterate foes that the British Empire has known. Beside him the notorious Zinoviev, of red-letter fame, pales. Until recently Bukharin was the official propagandist in chief of the Soviet Government, and his last post was that of president of the Third International, from which he ousted Zinoviev. In that capacity he directed all anti-British propaganda. The claim that Bukharin is a scientist is devoid of all foundation. True, he graduated at the Moscow University, but he has never engaged in any branch of scientific work or study. He has always been and is a red revolutionary politician, whose pamphlets, theses, and speeches emphasize world revolution in general and the overthrow of the British Empire in particular. For years he has abandoned himself to a fury of bitter hatred toward Britain and the British Empire, and he is the coauthor of a plan of colonial wars, the idea of which is to reduce Britain, the "bulwark of capitalism," to dust. He has always sought to undermine British prestige, and he has devoted most of his time to writing anti-British diatribes, to preparing catechisms and instructions, and to lecturing at propaganda schools for agents destined to be sent to India, China, and other parts of the "zone of British influence." In fact, one of the leading schools is named after him. During the last 6 months he has been lecturing to agitators and teachers of agitators from every part of the British Empire. And he is inordinately proud of being the compiler of the so-called Policy of the Indian Communist Party pamphlet, which demands the expulsion of every British man and woman from India. I cannot quote any scientific theories propounded by Bukharin, but I can give one or two examples of what the gentle scientist has said in the past. 1926: The British miners' strike and the Chinese revolution are two gains due to Communist activities. British capitalism, more than other capitalism, is on the eve of its final downfall. * * * This strike is one of our battles, which will in time multiply. (Daily Mail, June 30, 1931.)

was in England negotiating trade credits with Mr. Henderson, our foreign secretary.

All this substantiates what the author and his colleagues have been pointing out for several years, viz, that the MacDonald Cabinet were not their own masters in dealing with Moscow.

It is well known that many British men, especially Welshmen, are in the pay of the Moscow Soviet. Here is one case out of several; it is these Communist agents who have done so much to destroy the Welsh coal trade:

"Twenty-nine persons, who had been found guilty of unlawful assembly at Mardy, a mining township known as Little Moscow, were brought up for sentence at Cardiff Assizes yesterday.

"The case arose from an attempt to prevent a distress for rates from being levied on a miner's house.

"Police Inspector William Rees said that the ringleader was Arthur Horner, who had assumed the role of a 'dictator.' During the coal strike of 1921 his conduct was most revolutionary, and he terrorized the officials. On one occasion he compelled the stove workers at a local colliery to withdraw the fires, thereby flooding the pits.

"'Horner,' continued the inspector, 'has paid frequent visits to Russia, and it is assumed that he is being well paid by Russia for his efforts to destroy the peace of this country. Before his advent Mardy was a prosperous industrial mining district. The collieries employed 2,500 men, of whom the majority earned £9 a week. Now the place is almost derelect.

"'Respectable miners have been compelled to dispose of their houses, which cost £250 to £300, for £5. This is all attributed to Horner and a few of his disciples.'

"Horner was sentenced to 15 months' imprisonment; the others to lesser terms.

"Referring to some of the other defendants, Inspector Rees stated that Jesse Sweet, who was described as a dangerous agitator, after a visit to Moscow, attempted to join H. M. Forces with a view to spreading disaffection among the troops. He had never been down a pit in his life." (Times, 25 February, 1932.)

In the House of Commons (12 February, 1932) Sir Herbert Samuel, Home Secretary, stated that 36 persons connected with the Soviet Embassy in London, including 2 members of the Trade Delegation, enjoy diplomatic immunity. Foreigners who possess this privilege can enter this country with an unlimited amount of baggage which the customs officials cannot examine.

The Morning Post (February 20, 1930) published the following:

"Nothing could better illustrate the utter worthlessness of the Soviet promise to Mr. Henderson, the Foreign Secretary, to cease Communist propaganda in Britain than an institution in London's Dockland.

"Posing as an innocent club, this institution is actually the clearing house in Great Britain for inflammatory literature of all kinds.

"It consists of a couple of small rooms in a house, and the officials in charge have been entrusted, among other things, with the work of fomenting revolution among ships' crews.

"The 'club' is also one of the principal agencies by which 'Red' gold is smuggled into Britain. Advantage is taken of the fact that the crews of Russian ships visiting London are allowed ashore, while British crews in Russian ports also obtain shore leave.

"The money is handed to trusted emissaries of the Communists and brought to England in sailors' pocket cases and belts. Afterward it reached, in devious ways, the headquarters of the Communists in Britain.

"The club officials are in correspondence with extremist movements in every part of the world, and recently a large batch of letters was received from India announcing the advent of what was described as a 'blood bath.'

"Seamen visiting this club are supplied with every sort of revolutionary literature, and are given introductions to clubs in various ports. By this means young British seamen fall into the clutches of the worst kind of international political scum to be found in towns such as Buenos Aires, Barcelona, Marseilles, and Hamburg.

"Strenuous efforts are being made to establish these clubs in other British ports. The London center is the clearing house for the despatch of the worst type of Communist literature. This is received from Russia, translated into English, printed at a press in the home counties, and distributed everywhere."

About 30 to 40 years ago thousands of miners were imported into Scotland from eastern Europe and since then more have come over on various excuses as relatives, and so forth.

The following, from the Evening News of October 2, 1931, is interesting:

"Why there are so many Communists on Clydeside is explained by Mr. Bain Irvine in the Scots Yearbook for 1932. He says: 'Large and ever-increasing numbers of Poles have settled in the mining districts of the west of Scotland.'

"They are largely responsible for the great sympathy with the Communist movement for which such a town as Motherwell, for example, is noteworthy. And the woldsmen of the Clyde owe their following largely to the Bolshevik doctrines which have been so assiduously preached by those strangers in our midst.

"'Now these Poles are, one by one, dropping their original names and assuming those of their Scottish wives, or they are altering their own so that it has more of a Scottish flavor. Thus Simski becomes Simpson and Watski alters readily to Watson.'"

The large proportion of aliens or children of aliens in the Glasgow area is mainly the result of this large immigration.

"P. S. S.," in a letter in The Patriot of October 8, 1931, said:

"Sir: The disturbances in Glasgow draw attention again to the number of aliens to be found in some of the Scottish coal fields and in other industries.

"It was my duty as a railway employee at a remote village in a beautiful part of Ayrshire regularly to handle large sacks of black bread which were sent in for the use of the Polish community, whose presence seemed incongruous to the Scots, who resented the policy of a large colliery company in employing such labor at the pits.

"These aliens naturally make pliant material (as do types of Irish revolutionaries, advocates of 'home rule' for Scotland under Irish dictatorship) for the advocates of sedition and mass disturbance, knowing and caring nothing about the solid traits of Scottish and British life.

"One cannot, of course, blame these aliens for everything, but the effect of them is as a boomerang to the proprietors who encourage them as some protection against the ruinous policy of trade-union bosses to prevent profit-earning in the coal industry."

The Daily Mail (September 19, 1929) says:

"Pravda of September 12 states that two Soviet delegates are leaving Moscow for Scotland to take part in the Scottish miners' conference which is to take place on September 28.

"The paper says that the delegates are going at the invitation of the Scottish Miners' Union, which is affiliated to the Red Trade Union International.

"The two delegates are members of the international miners' committee of action and propaganda."

In Ireland the new organization, Saor Eire, is believed to have directed affiliation with the Bolsheviks.

The Dublin correspondent of the Daily Mail reported (October 17, 1931), regarding the situation in Ireland, that the Irish Cabinet was seeking from the Irish Parliament stronger powers. This had been made necessary by the discovery of a scheme by those who are at the dictation of Moscow to kidnap or intimidate the Deputies and so bring to naught the plans of the Government. Since then Mr. De Valera has ousted Mr. Cosgrove from office.

The Morning Post (October 27, 1931), said "Many people are lulled into a false sense of security by the apparent quiet on the revolutionary front, the minority movement (formerly the Red International) is very busy in the trade-unions.

Our last Socialist government seem to have been associated and cooperating with anti-British elements all over the world.

In October 1931 M. Chiappe, prefect of the Paris police, visited London. One of his objects was the development of a scheme he had formulated for international action to combat Communist agitation and political crimes. It is clear that police cooperation is desirable on a more comprehensive scale than at present.

It is significant that M. Chiappe did not come on this mission until the Socialist ministry had fallen. No doubt the French Government knew fully about the revolutionary activities of our Socialist gang and that it would be useless to send such a mission whilst they were in office.

In the winter of 1930–31 the United States of America held a Government commission on the alien question. On the recommendation of this commission the United States of America decided to deport about 120,000 undesirable aliens. Most of these people were anarchists or criminals in their native countries. It was therefore impossible for them to return home. Whither did they go? As other countries, except the British Isles, have a thorough system re immigration or registration of aliens, many of these undesirables naturally made for this country. No doubt many knew that under the Socialist regime regulations re aliens had been further relaxed. Did Bukharin come here in July 1931 to help to organize these anarchists?

This Commission reported that 70 percent of the advocates of revolution, in the United States of America, were aliens. The Commission highly praised the American Federation of Labor for repulsing all Communists' attempts to bore from within and for frustrating completely all subversive efforts. (Daily Mail, New York correspondent, January 19, 1931.)

This is a fine example to our labor leaders and Socialist politicians who have been acting for several years past under the dictatorship of Moscow.

When all the above facts have been considered by readers who take an interest in the affairs of our unfortunate country, they will not be surprised that there has been so much unrest in the British Isles of late; not only labor strikes and a great increase of crime with violence, but such serious matters as mutinies in our Navy. It would be interesting to know how many of the rebellious convicts in Dartmoor were aliens.

And it is not fair to other countries, who deal with anarchism within their own territories in a drastic manner, to allow this large and well-organized center of anarchism to be here, not only unmolested, but even encouraged and financed while it plans in a thorough and masterly but sinister manner the destruction of civilization.

It is greatly to be regretted that so many clergy of the Church of England show their sympathy with the Moscow gang. To give

one instance out of many: On June 27, 1931, a garden party was given in the grounds of King's College, London, W. 8, to Mme. Sokolnikov, wife of the Soviet Ambassador. This was organized by the Society for Cultural Relations With Soviet Russia, whose parent society is in Moscow. This body was established by the Soviet Government for promoting communism among the "intellectuals." The garden party was attended by several well-known foreign anarchists and the Dean of Canterbury. Dr. Hewlett Johnson presided at the function.

Did this leader of our church realize that he was supporting an organization responsible for one of the greatest campaigns against Christianity that the world has known?

In December 1939 Lord Glasgow and that great patriot, the late Prebendary Gough, with the aid of the Morning Post, inaugurated the National Christian Protest Movement against the Soviet destruction of the Christian religion in Russia and the Bolsheviks' war against God in other countries. It is difficult to understand why our church did not wholeheartedly support this fine effort.

The Soviet of Moscow are destroying all religions in Russia and Turkey, and their agents, who have now seized the government in Spain, are doing the same thing in that unfortunate country.

Regarding Australia, in the second edition of this book, published January 1929 I wrote:

"The serious communism and unrest in Australia has been fomented in much the same manner by aliens and renegade British, mostly Irish, supplied with alien money. Theodore, of Polish extraction, late premier of Queensland (now in New South Wales), Johannsen, a Dane, and others of alien origin, have, by their Communist schemes and intrigues, brought about a very serious state of affairs in that country. Should Australia experience any sort of set-back, such as drought, there will probably be a financial crash, which would be the opportunity for the financiers of Berlin and New York to come forward with some of their surplus money, and so get Australia well in their grip."

How true this has proved can be gathered from private letters received by the author from leading men in Australia. The Melbourne Argus (November 8, 1929) states that Australia is determined to protect herself from Bolshevist propaganda. This is not an imaginary danger. There is abundant evidence to prove that Moscow has well-defined channels of communication with agitators in the Commonwealth who are in touch with Russia and have taken an active part in the promotion of disastrous industrial strife.

The special correspondent of the Daily Mail (July 7, 1928) stated that Mr. Brodsky Marlen (or Marx-Lenin) had founded in Sydney the International Seamen's Club.

The Morning Post Australian correspondent said (October 24, 1931) that the government's appeal to the men to man the ships and a statement that the government would support the police forces of the states to protect volunteers, brought bitter attacks from Garden, Johannsen, and other extremist leaders.

The Daily Mail (October 30, 1931) stated that Communists, many of whom were foreigners, took charge of a meeting of the Seamen's Union at Sydney and, despite opposition by officials, decided on a strike at all ports.

The Daily Mail correspondent at Sydney reported (December 12, 1931) that with reference to Communist meetings "Mr. Scullin declared last night that the Communist theory was all right and refused to consider the organization unlawful."

But Canada is handling the Communists in a practical manner. By law in that country they are an unlawful association.

"At Toronto yesterday the Supreme Court of Ontario dismissed an appeal by eight members of the Communist Party of Canada from conviction and sentences on charges of acting as an unlawful association. The court, however, ruled that a charge of seditious conspiracy could not be upheld, but declined to interfere with the sentences, which range from 1 to 5 years' imprisonment. All the prisoners save one, who is a native-born Canadian, will be deported at the end of their sentences." (Times, February 20, 1932.)

In India the gigantic network of Communist centers and propaganda has been shown up in the press. These Soviet agents are mostly natives of India who have been educated at the School of Oriental Propaganda in Moscow.

As to the Far East, one of the avowed aims of the Moscow Soviet is to destroy British trade in China. Karl Radek, in his England and the East, said: "English imperialism is forcing us to look for a place where it is most vulnerable. This place is Asia. Soviet Russia will be able to inflict more harm upon British imperialism in the East than British imperialism could inflict on us in the West."

Bukharin said (1926): "* * * our immediate task in China is to defeat the imperialist enemy."

More than one Chinese general has during recent years been subsidized by Moscow. One of the leading Communists is Feng Yu Hsiang, the so-called Christian general, who was educated at Moscow, and is at present back there.

Finally, it must not be forgotten that the revolution in the Rand mines in South Africa, 1922, was organized by aliens. Most of these revolutionaries were described as Russians. But the Government there, knowing the kind of people with which they had to deal, took strong and effectual measures. Thousands of troops were used and the Communist centers were shelled with field guns. Several of these alien leaders were killed and the remainder hanged. Many of the less prominent aliens were deported.

Conscription

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE HENDRICKS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 5, 1940

STATEMENT BY MRS. G. WALTER WILLIAMS, PAST PRESIDENT OF THE AMERICAN GOLD STAR MOTHERS

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, recently I had the honor of discussing the conscription bill with Mrs. G. Walter Williams, immediate past president of the American Gold Star Mothers. Mrs. Williams' discussion of this measure was most enlightening. She left a statement with me at the time which I am delighted to insert in the RECORD for the benefit of the Members and for the public in general.

The statement follows:

Gentlemen, I come to you, not as a representative of a committee or group which seeks a spotlight in the public eye or self-glorification for personal or political reasons, but simply as an American mother who lost her son in the World War.

I think it fair and right that those of us who went through the Gethsemane of 1917 and 1918 should pass on to the mothers of 1940 anything of the faith and anything of the experience we gained through suffering which might prove useful and helpful in alleviating the suffering of tomorrow.

It is a fine thing for you gentlemen to give me some of your time. You are busy, I know, and harassed by the pressure of various schools of thought on the momentous question you are about to decide upon. Conscription is a harsh word. Conscription is a word we Americans have usually associated with the tyrants of Europe and with the endless wars of that unhappy continent.

Because the word conscription has had these associations in our minds, perhaps it would have been better to have termed the bill which you gentlemen are considering by some other name.

But before I tell you of my feelings on conscription I would like to identify myself.

I am Mrs. G. Walter Williams, wife of a retired high-school principal of New Bedford, Mass. In June I retired as national president of the American Gold Star Mothers, a national organization of mothers who lost sons in the World War. Officially I still represent the Gold Star Mothers at important meetings.

In times of crises Americans have always found strength in the solidarity with which they approach the tumult.

We need more of that solidarity today.

The citizenry of America recognizes the crisis at hand.

The mothers of America are afraid, not only for our own loved ones but for the very way of life we hold so dear.

Motherhood, after all, is but a part of womanhood. Motherhood is a very wonderful part of a woman's life, to be sure, but it is not all of life.

As women, we mothers cannot but realize the wonderful position of women in America as compared with women in many other nations. And as women we mothers cherish the privileges and the happiness which have been permitted and freely given us under the American way of life.

So dearly do we regard these privileges and the Nation which makes them possible that to preserve them we'd freely, if sadly, give our loved ones and ourselves as well in any way the leaders of this Nation decide to call upon us.

Conscription, gentlemen, is not the end of everything. It seems to me as a mother well past the halfway mark of life that American mothers and American sons will welcome conscription now as the sane and logical means of building an army to fight the armies of those who would tear down the things we hold so dear.

We should have learned many lessons from the mistakes of 1917, gentlemen. And perhaps we did learn some military lessons and some lessons in international diplomacy.

But most mothers are not much interested in those things. We learned some more simple but nonetheless important lessons. It might be that in the pressure of considering this problem of conscription you gentlemen have overlooked some of the things no mother who lost a son in the World War can forget.

My son did not die a hero's death on Flanders fields.

He was not the victim of a cowardly submarine's torpedo on the way to France.

He did not get to France to fight.

I have often wished he had been able to give his life on the battlefield with the boys rather than die the way he did.

But he was nontheless one of America's boys who gave his all "to save the world for democracy."

January 30, 1918, he died in the Chelsea, Mass., hospital of influenza.

Shame of it all, he was one of the victims of unpreparedness, rather than of the disease, which took the lives of so many thousands of our sons who had enlisted to fight bullets, not germs. We were not prepared or equipped to care for the boys who were stricken.

Preparedness does not alone mean training boys to carry guns, to use bayonets, to man tanks, or fly planes.

Preparedness first means getting our boys and men ready to change their way of life. The American way of life is a soft life, physically.

Preparedness through conscription, then, means the hardening of our men in a physical way—getting them ready for things to which they have never been accustomed.

This takes time.

I am informed that the haste with which our men were rushed through training in 1917 was responsible for at least as many, if not more, deaths than were the German bullets, shells, and gas.

A boy or man trained to practice law or to be a bookkeeper cannot become a hardened soldier in 3 months or 6 months.

I look upon conscription as the means of preparing our men for what is to come, in order that they may have a chance to live, not in order that they know how to die. That they know already—there has never been a question about the courage of American manhood.

But a trained soldier—a man skilled in the ways of war—has an infinitely better chance of living to fight on, than the raw recruit with the heart of steel who fights, but dies.

The mothers of America in 1940 do not believe you gentlemen of the Congress have any thought of sending our boys to fight on a European battlefield. They know that England does not want our men—England wants and needs our matériel.

Many mothers feel that the hue and cry about conscription being the first and longest step toward sending our boys across to Europe is a straw man built up by those who either can't or will not see the menace Hitler has become to America itself.

Gentlemen, as a Gold Star mother I favor conscription immediately because it would be a major step in preparedness—not only of our men and boys to be soldiers, but of the women of America and of American industry to learn the lessons so necessary if our soldiers are to live to fight.

I do hope the Congress will forget the side issues which have been thrown in our way on this question. I want the mothers of 1940 to know that the mothers of 1917 hope that today's soldiers are made ready in every way that, if necessary to fight, they fight and live—not fight and die.

Gentlemen, this Gold Star Mother feels sure that conscription is an American procedure, because it is the only way America can be prepared to defend the American way of life. And there should be no delay in putting into effect this vital measure for our defense.

"The success of tomorrow depends upon the preparation we are making today."

Thank you.

The Country Needs John J. O'Connor Back in Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN L. SWEENEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 5, 1940

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I am confident that the entire membership of this House of Representatives will be pleased to hear that there is every expectation that our former distinguished colleague, John O'Connor, of the Sixteenth New York District, will be a Member of the Seventy-seventh Congress, which will convene on next January 3. As you all know, he is a candidate for reelection.

The great majority of the Members here who served with John O'Connor during his 16 years of membership in this House know of his great capacity for leadership. His absence during the Seventy-sixth Congress has caused universal comment as to how much he has been missed from these halls.

Those Members serving their first term in the Seventy-sixth Congress know of John O'Connor because of his Nation-wide reputation as a courageous statesman. All will recall that in the election of 1938 he was purged because of his independence of thought and courageous stand on great national issues, which position he took in accordance with what he thought was for the best interests of the entire country. The Communists and all the un-American and subversive groups joined in that purge to cause his defeat by a very narrow margin, but he went down a bigger man than he had ever been before, because of the enemies he had made.

One of the first men in public life to broadcast nationally against the menace of communism, he was branded as enemy No. 1 at the national convention of Communists in 1938.

All will recall him as a leader in this body—acting as majority leader for a long time. His 16 years' service on the Rules Committee equipped him as one of the outstanding parliamentarians in the Congress and in the country. As chairman of that powerful committee for 4 years, he was a respected leader of this House.

Every Member who ever served with him, irrespective of their party affiliations, was his personal friend. They all respected him for his fairness in debate and the courage of his honest convictions. Few sought to cross swords with him in debate—in which he never lost his smile.

For years he devoted his entire time to the duties of his office. He was even here during all vacations of the House, performing his duties as a member of the House Building Commission.

John O'Connor came to Congress in 1923 exceptionally equipped for his distinguished career in this body. Born of poor parents, he had gone through the mill—newsboy, school teacher, working his way through Brown University and Harvard Law School to become one of New York's outstanding trial lawyers.

For 3 years before coming to Washington, he served in the New York State Legislature, where he distinguished himself as a leader and orator.

His four boys, now in college, glory in the wide esteem in which their father is held.

Mr. Speaker, in these critical days, when our United States appears to be traveling the road to dictatorship, courageous men are needed in Congress more than at any hour in our history. That is why we look forward to the return of our distinguished former colleague, John O'Connor.

National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED L. BULWINKLE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 5, 1940

EXCERPTS FROM SPEECH OF GOVERNOR HOEY, OF NORTH CAROLINA

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following excerpts from the speech of Governor Hoey, of North Carolina, on the occasion of the dedication of the Great Smokies National Park:

North Carolina wishes me to pledge her 3,500,000 people in unbroken solidarity to the cause of real Americanism. The people of North Carolina believe in full and complete national defense on land and sea and in the air. They believe in requisitioning the necessary men and means to accomplish the desired end of maintaining our own freedom and independence and saving our land from the blight of war and the destruction of the American way of life. In order to achieve this result they are willing to travel the pathway of sacrifice.

North Carolina also believes that we have temporized with disloyal elements too long already. My personal view is that the time has come when the Congress of the United States ought to outlaw the Communist Party, the Nazi bund, and every other organization which seeks the overthrow of our Government. I believe in free speech, but that freedom should not extend to organizations which admittedly owe first allegiance to a foreign power and seek the destruction of the Government under which they claim protection.

We hate war. We believe in peace and love it. We love peace so well that we are willing to fight to preserve it, if need be. We

believe the best security for peace is full and complete preparation for national defense.

"I covet for America the moral and spiritual leadership under God for the distracted peoples of the earth and a major share in the task of rebuilding the wrecked civilization of the world."—Clyde Hoey, Governor of North Carolina, preceding the President at the exercises Monday to dedicate the Great Smoky Mountains National Park.

Roosevelt Is Running Against Hitler

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. KUNKEL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 5, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE ST. PETERSBURG (FLA.) EVENING INDEPENDENT

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, one of my good friends of some years standing is the editorial writer for the St. Petersburg Evening Independent, one of the outstanding Florida papers. He has always been a strong advocate of the New Deal policies, and we have frequently disagreed on questions of public policy in domestic affairs. He has usually favored everything advocated by Mr. Roosevelt, while I have, of course, felt that many New Deal policies were either wrong, or badly administered, or both. At the same time I have always had a very high opinion of his analyses and his arguments in support of his positions. Consequently, I was very surprised and pleased to read his views as expressed in the following editorial comment on the recent speech of Candidate Wallace. In my opinion this editorial comment on the subject of Candidate Wallace's address offers more stimulating food for thought than any which has as yet appeared anywhere. I also feel that the next time I have the pleasure of seeing my friend, Lee Morris, that we will not argue quite as vehemently as we have in the past. Perhaps Mr. Morris, like Saul, has seen the Light of Damascus.

The editorial follows:

[From the St. Petersburg (Fla.) Evening Independent of August 31, 1940]

ROOSEVELT IS RUNNING AGAINST HITLER

Before this war broke out in Europe, even before the appeasement at Munich, we outlined for our readers the policy which would have to be adopted—if indeed it were not already too late—to keep Germany from becoming a menace to the peace of the world. We believed them and we believe now that this policy, if it had been adopted in the twenties, would have kept the peace of the world. We believe now that this policy, whether Germany wins or loses against England, must be adopted after the armistice, if there is to be no third World War. It was by no means original with us, but merely a restatement of the only policy which has kept great competing powers at peace for any length of time. It has been and is the policy of the United States toward most of the nations of the world, whether they be dictatorships or democracies. And before commenting on the acceptance speech of Secretary Wallace we should like to review this policy.

It is simple enough: No concessions to force; fair dealings with nations which offer to deal fairly.

This is the policy which today is often labeled "appeasement." It was never that. If Chamberlain and Daladier had adopted it at Munich, the four-power pact would never have been signed there. If England and France had adopted it in the twenties, Hitler would never have become the leader of Germany.

The policy we mean takes a middle course.

At one extreme is a policy of no compromise—Germany is rotten through and through, and punishment for the Kaiser's guilt must be inflicted on men and women who in 1914 had not yet been born. No matter how willing Germany may be, under her new leadership, to do the right thing her people must be kept underfoot.

At the other extreme is the policy adopted in the thirties, an abject policy of surrender to the least sign of force—appeasement, in short. Germany under the Nazis committed one illegal act after another. She rearmed; she fortified the Rhineland; she annexed Austria; she helped overthrow the legitimate government of Spain; finally she took Czechoslovakia—and all with the tacit consent of Britain and France. That was real appeasement.

The ideal policy would have been one which permitted Germany to become economically strong and contented on the one hand, but which forbade her to rearm and menace the peace of the world on the other. That would have been the wise middle course before this war; it will be the wise middle course after it.

Translated into concrete terms, this policy would mean that if Germany should lose this war, she would have to give up her domination of non-German peoples, get rid of her Nazi rulers, disband her military forces, and hand over her arms; but it would mean also that when she had done those things she would be treated fairly and honorably.

If Germany should win this war, this policy would mean that no slightest concession should be made by the United States to the threat of force; but it would also mean that if by any chance Germany were willing to deal fairly with us, we should offer her the same fair treatment in return that we now offer to such offensive powers as Japan and Russia.

This middle course, in our opinion, is the only one which would not lead us into certain war if Germany won. We have seen the results of appeasement. And history is full of examples of the disastrous result of a no-compromise policy which says, in effect: "The world isn't big enough for the two of us."

How do the two political parties line up on these three possible choices? Despite Wallace's indictment of the Republicans, it is clear that neither party favors a policy of appeasement. And Wallace's speech made it clear that the Democratic Party favors, not the middle course, but the other disastrous extreme of no compromise. Where the Republican Party stands is, on this issue as on most others, not yet clear.

We have written this lengthy introduction to our comment on the speech of Secretary Wallace because we do not believe the speech can be discussed intelligently unless the underlying assumptions and principles are clearly defined.

The Wallace speech started quietly enough, with an expression of appreciation for the nomination. Well, we were glad to see him get it, though we didn't like the way it happened. Henry Wallace is a good man, able, intelligent, earnest, and hard-working—the last man in the world from whom we would have expected such a speech as followed.

Suddenly he launched into a diatribe against Hitler, and he made it strong. Apparently under the mistaken impression that Hitler was running for the Presidency on the Republican ticket, Wallace contrasted him with Roosevelt. Hitler, he said in measured periods, stands for dictatorship, wage slavery, force, barter, war, and oppression; Roosevelt for democracy, the rights of labor, the good-neighbor policy, peace, free trade, and freedom.

But doesn't Willkie stand for those good things too? Wallace didn't admit it. The Republican Party, he said, is the party of appeasement. Not only the national-defense program but nearly everything in the New Deal had been "planned that way" as a bulwark against Nazi designs which Roosevelt foresaw long ago—and the Republicans had provided most of the opposition to it all. Moreover, the myrmidons of big business would force a Republican President to appease Hitler whether he wanted to or not; isn't Willkie their candidate? Finally, Hitler wants Willkie elected.

The Republican Party, of course, is not the party of appeasement. There is no such party in the United States, outside the "fifth column." The charge was unworthy of a man of Wallace's caliber.

We hope that whoever is elected in November will avoid war with Hitler, unless war cannot be avoided without appeasement. After hearing Wallace's speech, however, we are convinced that Roosevelt has deliberately turned his back on that middle course. (It is only fair to add that Willkie has shown no sign either of realizing that a middle course exists.)

Wallace enlarged on another of the favorite themes of Democratic orators today. The President, he said, saw all this coming at a time when not one in a million had his vision of the truth. He repeatedly warned the public what to expect. He and Secretary Hull sat in cabinet meetings and year after year told their colleagues what was going to happen.

Frankly, we think Mr. Wallace exaggerates. The rise of Hitler made the President uneasy, as it made millions of Americans, and he said so. But there is the trite saying that actions speak louder than words, and the President did not act as if he saw what was coming.

Why, if the veil of the future was unrolled before his eyes, did he permit help to be withheld from Spain when she was fighting Germany and Italy?

Why is it that today, almost a year after war was declared, the United States Army has not—so far as we can learn—a single complete, fully equipped and mechanized division it can put in the field?

Let's give Mr. Roosevelt credit for his sound guess that war would break out last September. (We said at the time that Senator Borah was taking a big risk in flatly denying the possibility.) But let's not give him credit for an omniscience which has not expressed itself in deeds.

Another oft-repeated fallacy to which Wallace gave further currency was the implied statement that we should determine our foreign and domestic policies by finding out what Hitler wants and then doing the opposite. Hitler, said Wallace, wants Willkie elected; he wants us to have a Presidential election; he wants

to see opposition to Roosevelt; he wants us to ask questions. Therefore, we should call off the election; establish concentration camps for the opposition; and ask no questions.

Fiddlesticks! The best policies for the United States cannot be determined so simply. Hitler wants us to stay out of war, therefore we should go to war. Hitler wants us to send the American Legion by a safe route, therefore we should send her by a dangerous route. Hitler doesn't want Roosevelt to be a dictator, therefore we should make Roosevelt a dictator.

No; Hitler wants what is best for Germany, regardless of whether it helps or harms the United States. We should want what is best for the United States, and the heck with whether Hitler likes it or not.

Is President Roosevelt aiming at a dictatorship? We have been hearing this charge for nearly 8 years, and we have always, until now, felt that it was nonsensical. Dictatorship can only exist in a war economy, and the President, until now, has shown no disposition to establish a war economy in the United States. Therefore, we concluded, he had no intention of setting up a dictatorship. Even the defense program did not change our opinion, since despite its faults, it was a sound response to changing world conditions.

But there were parts of Secretary Wallace's speech (which, by the way, we are sure he didn't write) that set us to wondering. He implied that we should not be having a national election now, because Hitler wanted us to have one. He implied that there should be no opposition to any of the President's policies (just vote "ja") because it led to rejoicing in Berlin. He spoke scornfully of those who asked why—which seems to imply that no questions should be asked and the people had no business asking the Government to explain anything.

Thomas Jefferson would have turned over in his grave if he could have heard such statements made in the name of democracy.

President Roosevelt's Labor Day Message Discloses 9,000,000 More Have Jobs Than in March 1933

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 5, 1940

PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT'S LABOR DAY STATEMENT

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the President's Labor Day statement contained valuable information. It was as follows:

Labor Day, which we observe as a national holiday, has for more than half a century been the day set aside in recognition of the millions of wage earners whose labors have contributed so largely in making this Nation what it is today.

This year, embarked as we are on a necessary program of national defense, the day calls for a more than ordinary observance. It demands the dedication of labor, management, farmers, and government to a common purpose, so that this great democracy which is our heritage shall be protected and its continuation be insured for our children and their children.

As loyal Americans, always placing the welfare of the Nation first, we shall, through this dedication and this cooperation, carry on successfully the task we have set in the common interest. In its accomplishment wage earners, well aware of the great economic and social gains they have made in the last 7 years, may be assured that their contribution will not be at the cost of lowered labor standards or impaired social advances.

On this Labor Day of 1940 not only the Nation's wage earners but farmers and business also can look with satisfaction on the improvement in their lot and that of our Nation in the last 7 years, largely as a result of a far-reaching economic and social program conceived in democratic principles and dedicated to the common good.

RISE IN EMPLOYMENT STRESSED

More than 9,000,000 men and women have jobs in nonagricultural employment now than had them in March 1933, and this great increase does not include more than 2,000,000 additional persons having work on W. P. A., C. C. C., and N. Y. A. tasks. In this same period pay rolls in manufacturing industries alone increased by the enormous weekly total of $110,000,000.

Cash income of American farmers was more than $3,000,000,000 greater last year than it was in 1932, exclusive of $307,000,000 in benefit payments, and this year it promises to show a further increase.

Business, like farmers, also benefited through the rise in employment and wages, as shown by reports which revealed that combined net profit for 400 leading industrial concerns for the first 6 months of this year amounted to $648,928,000—a very large gain over last year. In 1932 most corporations were showing little or no profit.

These are material gains of which we may well be proud and they have been accompanied since 1933 by such social advances as are embodied in the social security program, for which this and future generations will always be thankful.

They have been accomplished in a democracy, for a democracy and by a democracy, and they can only be retained and expanded through a continuation of the principles and practices to which we as a Nation have always been committed and which we are determined shall be unchanged.

Conscription and the Economic Condition of Our Country

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 5, 1940

LETTER FROM J. B. LAUBY, OF NEZPERCE, IDAHO

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I submit a letter from J. B. Lauby, prominent businessman and farmer of Nezperce, Idaho, which deals comprehensively with conscription of the Nation's youth, and bespeaks greater attention to conditions aggravating the economic situation in this country.

NEZPERCE, IDAHO, *August 16, 1940.*

Hon. COMPTON I. WHITE,
United States Representative, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WHITE: I noticed by recent press reports that you are opposed to conscription of our young men for military training. I find that most of the people here feel that you are right.

I hold that conscription without a more reasonable compensation for our boys results in a feeling of resentment against the Government not only from the boys themselves, but also from their parents and relations and friends, and which will be highly detrimental to our democracy.

The behavior of the recent Youth Congress in Washington, D. C., should be a lesson to our officials. Conscription without a better compensation will aggravate the matter.

We must remember that it is very difficult to get a start in life under our present system, and now the Government is going to impose upon these boys by taking away 2 to 3 years of their prime of life in which they would otherwise at least have a chance of making a start, and they are wasting this time to become able to fight the battles for the rest of our citizens.

Wouldn't it be better to offer them some inducement to take this training by connecting with it a higher education to give them an easier start in life, or for those who care not to study and prefer farm life the Government should buy them a farm, all equipped, to be paid for in easy payments extending over a period of years at a rate of interest not to exceed 2 percent.

Or the Government should promise them a position after the term of training so they would have the opportunity to start family life and become good citizens.

I hold that if these boys are to defend our country we should give them a start in life after their training. They are absolutely entitled to it. You cannot make loyal citizens and good soldiers out of our boys when you coerce them into military training and not give them a living chance for a future.

Such a democracy cannot endure. It is doomed. This sequence is inevitable.

I am willing to admit that the present administration has done a lot for the common people. But it has to do a lot more to reduce the number of the poor people. In fact here their number is increasing. A few large farmers are grabbing all the land with their large allotment checks and the poor sharecropper is rapidly losing out. There is absolutely no more land obtainable on a rental basis.

Even a number of businessmen in the cities are buying land as an investment, for the allotment checks pay for the tillage of the soil and the proceeds from the crops is practically a net profit. But the poor sharecropper loses his home.

The richer are getting richer, and the poorer are getting poorer, and that leads us into the same trouble that Europe is experiencing today. No government can endure under such conditions. Unless we remedy the condition, America will soon become a fertile field for a dictator. We are supposed to be neutral in the European conflict, and as such we have no right to openly criticize one or the other unless we are ready to back it by declaring war. We wasted billions of dollars at one time to set them aright. But it was an utter failure and even aggravated conditions. Henceforth let us spend the billions on our own people, providing the poorer families with small farms and homes on the easy-payment plan with a low rate of interest. The Government does not lose in such a proposition.

Very truly yours,

J. B. LAUBY,
Secretary, Nezperce Grain Growers, Inc.

Americanism in Peril

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 4, 1940

ARTICLE BY J. EDGAR HOOVER

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, for nearly two decades we have permitted a form of hypnosis to creep upon our Americanism and a semblance of hibernation to be attached to our patriotism. Now, with European nations found crushed as grain between the millstones, we rouse from our lethargy to face the cold facts.

There has never been a time when there was greater need for a revival of the fires that burned in the hearts of the founders of the Nation than today, if we are to preserve our democratic institutions, religious freedom, and respect for our form of government.

Hon. J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, brings the issues squarely in front of this Nation in an article entitled "Americanism in Peril" in the current issue of Signs of the Times, a widely read religious publication. His article, presented here with the unanimous consent of the House of Representatives, follows:

[From Signs of the Times magazine]

AMERICANISM IN PERIL

(By J. Edgar Hoover)

This Nation's present position of prominence did not result from accident. As a Nation we became great through thoughtful planning for the future and through an invincible determination to translate those plans into action. The time has now come when we must plan anew, otherwise hordes of schemers with fantastic ideas that sprang from unworkable and alien philosophies from abroad will eat away the otherwise firm foundations upon which our Nation is built. Vile and vicious forces are today seeking to tear our America asunder—killing freedom, ravishing justice, and destroying liberty. The one achievement above all others which America must preserve is that of good citizenship. By this I mean a preservation of our democratic institutions, freedom, liberty, respect for country, and better government through the efforts and will of all our people.

Without a superior stalwart national citizenship everything is insecure. The ideas which international propagandists would foist upon us are the very antithesis of American citizenship. Churches have been closed by the mere whim of a dictator; the members of the clergy have been humiliated. As has been the case in other lands, homes can be wrecked, businesses ruined, jobs lost forever, and personal security relegated to fearful outrages of secret police more criminal than even the worst murderers they can accuse.

Some of our dangerous gangsters have come from foreign shores. The worst of these, however, are not the murderers or racketeers. Far more dangerous are those who advocate revolution under disguise. Such masqueraders have not as much respect for constituted authority as has the average robber, highwayman, or murderer; at least the latter admit their crimes and, in many cases, accept their punishment as just and due. Those who would subvert liberty meanwhile shout most loudly for the protection of the Constitution while seeking to destroy its sacred guaranties. There is no such thing as liberty unless it is liberty under law.

A great many false notions of liberty are now quite common, due to plausibly worded propaganda designed by the seducers of our liberties to mislead Americans.

The notion is prevalent in too many communities that liberty means, "Do as you wish, as long as you don't get caught." That is why 4,067 serious crimes are committed every 24 hours. That is why a human life is sacrificed on crime's altar every 44 minutes, and that is why a robbery occurs every 9½ minutes, a larceny every 36 seconds, and a burglary every minute and a half.

Because of misdirected energy and perverted teachings, we have in the F. B. I. today the fingerprints of some 5,000,000 persons who have been arrested for an offense more serious than a traffic violation. Before this year comes to a close, approximately 1,000,000 persons will have heard the clanging doors close behind them as they enter jails, prisons, and reformatories, and all because they had not been properly schooled in the true meaning of liberty.

Because of misinterpretation of liberty, often deliberately brought about by inciters of violence, the Nation is paying a crime bill which in 3 years would equal our national debt. Hence every decent citizen should rededicate himself to a furtherance of liberty in its truest sense, defined by our democratic traditions. There is only one way to insure liberty to all peoples. That is by a firm adherence to justice, such as has been provided and established in our American heritage, and in our Constitution which we must preserve for the future at all costs.

America's duty to the future demands that the cherished principles of liberty be preserved for all time. We can do this best by striking at the forces which assail liberty—the lawless, the thoughtless, and the exponents of totalitarian serfdom and slavery.

We must and shall cope with this effort to enslave us through perversions of the truth. The first line of defense is the home, with its all-important atmosphere of expectations and fond hopes for the future and the training so necessary to develop future generations of Americans.

Modern law enforcement has demonstrated its ability to cope with the hardened criminal, but at best that is only first-aid treatment. The only permanent cure lies in killing the infectious and deep-seated germs of lawlessness with a thorough prophylactic, which is best administered by proper home training and environment.

Sinister forces of the underworld constantly seek new places to work their evil. Youth, more youth, are sought for this purpose. We must inoculate our young against such treacherous germs. This means proper home training, proper precept, and proper example. We can prevent more crime in the high chair than in the electric chair, whether that crime be against property or against our Nation.

Youth must be told about the slime and dirt that infest the underworld. Dishonesty is one common denominator found in all criminals. It must be met with the daily teachings of the virtues of honesty. In teaching honesty, you are also teaching Americanism. You are piercing smoke screens of falsehood and subterfuge thrown up by enemies of America.

The corruption of our youth by subversive activities is a violation of our American liberties and is an attempt to lure us into the fear, the injustice, and the slavery of totalitarian barbarism. And this is so regardless of the high-sounding names of hypocritical "front" organizations. Our greatest asset is intellectual freedom. Our worst menace is intellectual debauchery, which is as rotten and untenable as the filth from which it springs. Certainly we have a right to inquire into the character of our children's education. We have the inalienable right to see that they are taught the true principles of Americanism and nothing else. If young Americans are to be educated for the future, parents must accept the responsibility of seeing that this education is properly given for a better and safer Nation.

What are you doing to make your child recognize his good fortune in living in this favored land? Are you teaching him a respect for his country and its institutions? Does he respect the American flag as a symbol of liberty? Does he respect honorable forces of law and order? Have you compared his plight with that of boys and girls in other lands? Does he go to church, and is he taught that he is responsible to God rather than to some dictator who denies even the power of the Deity and charges that religion is the opiate of the people?

A flood of vilification has recently been loosed upon all things American by scandal sheets which espouse the cause of foreign isms. We must counter with a constant program of education, designed to penetrate this thinly veiled propaganda.

We must learn to judge people by what they think. These totalitarian tricksters are the very first ones who would introduce un-American, violent, murderous types of spy systems into our country. They desire to break down true law enforcement in every part of America under the guise of the protection of alleged civil liberties, so that they may, in turn, destroy the very things that they pretend to revere. Then they seek by a type of confidence game to steal away your liberty, your home, and your constitutional rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

These perverted people scream about the denial of civil liberties in this country, although nowhere on earth is there less liberty, civil or of any other nature, than under the foreign governments they so vociferously champion. It has been proved time and again that here they have every civil liberty which possibly can exist; that they possess in America more honest safety in life, liberty, and the pursuit of hapiness than in any other nation in the world. And when their rights allegedly are violated, the courts of a free land are open to them. Their rights are as closely guarded here in America as the rights of subjects are defiled in the countries whose views they espouse. Therefore what these people want is not civil liberty. They already have that. They are demanding, under a pretense of misapprehension and deliberate falsehood, nothing more nor less than licentiousness—the right to take what they will of our possessions and our traditions and desecrate them.

It is America's duty to perpetuate a heritage that will continue to be a beacon light of freedom and equality to oppressed peoples the world over.

We must ever be on the alert to protect our democracy from the bacteria of barbarism. We need to stand firmly and fearlessly on democratic principles, and upon no other foundation.

Our task requires patience and forbearance. It requires the faith of our fathers and the courage of present-day pioneering.

The motivating spirit of America must ever be justice. We need have no fears so long as justice reigns. May we consecrate ourselves to this sacred cause in order that our Nation may retain its supremacy as the exemplification of true democracy.

Three Classes of People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. T. V. SMITH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 5, 1940

LETTER FROM A CONSTITUENT

Mr. SMITH of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I have the honor to insert in the RECORD a letter from a constituent that seems to me to be filled with good sense well expressed, Mr. H. J. Rickert, of Chicago:

THREE CLASSES OF PEOPLE

Hon. T. V. SMITH,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: It has often been said, and I believe it to be true, that to find a solution to any problem, we must first thoroughly understand the problem itself. But no matter how pithy a saying may appeal to us, it serves no worth-while purpose unless we can apply it as a factor in the development of a better understanding of life and its multicolored expression in those by whom we are surrounded.

Today events and situations change with rapidity as humanity takes action or refrains from action, while striving to learn what action to be undertaken, and action to be not engaged in, and distinguish these two from inaction.

However, the judgment day is now upon us. Humanity is coming of age—the child stage is over for weal or woe, for good or ill. Men must decide for themselves the way that the world, their governments, and their social order must go. This decision will have to be made by those of us whose normal inclination and natural tendencies are on the side of law and order, and whose will to do good is directed toward right human relations and true human welfare.

It is therefore essential that such enlightened people back their judgment with a focused will to bring in the era wherein such values will dominate and take such necessary measures to make these values possible.

I am sure we all recognize at this time of world crisis the three groups of people who embody the three major points of view of the whole of humanity, plus the unthinking masses swayed by propaganda, controlled by their governments and the prey of the loudest voices. These three world attitudes are to be found in every nation as well as in the consciousness of every single individual.

GROUP NO. 1

The ancient entrenched forces of aggression, of material acquisition and pure selfishness, working out through a pronounced cruelty which reaches out and grasps what it wants irrespective of any other rights, historical, legal, or the will of anyone.

Every nation has these selfish, aggressive people, who believe that might is right, and that man must be governed by the law of the jungle, taking what he wants, no matter at what cost to others. Civilization, however, is a universal human right and not the prerogative of one nation or one group.

GROUP NO. 2

The forces of spiritual purpose, embodied in the will to protect the rights of others along with individual rights; to end aggression and its consequent fear and to throw the weight of their combined influence on the side of the more spiritual values, of human freedom and the right to think, and of kindness; the will-to-good and peace.

Every nation also has those within its borders who see the vision of right human relations—who seek to live by the law of brotherhood; who desire peace, kindness, and good will to rule world affairs and control the policies of the governments. Liberty, however, is a thing of the human soul and is found throughout the entire human race.

GROUP NO. 3

The forces of mass negativity, as expressed today by the dominated people in the strongholds of aggression and by the neutrally minded people everywhere. These are all colored by racial fear, by the instinct to self-preservation and by short-sighted, selfish interest.

Every nation has also within itself these neutrally minded people who fail to think clearly, who seek to place the blame upon the shoulders of all except themselves, who theorize and speculate, advise, and assign responsibility, but who refrain from any active participation in the process of adjustment from reasons of pride or unwillingness to pay the price.

No nation or group is exempt from this triplicity. It is human and that is why this conflict is a strictly human conflict and not a European war.

I bring you these contrasts in all simplicity and in an effort to enable you to choose right action, since the "effort to synchronize effort" does not relate so much to the time element as it does to the unity of interest and purpose.

In closing let me deal openly and frankly with the purpose of this letter by requesting you to recognize your responsibility to stand behind those who fight for liberty and to end the activity of those who are the enemies of all human freedom. As a voting citizen, I also feel justified in requesting you to tell me where you stand. You can be sure I shall not accept an evasive reply. The enclosed self-addressed envelope is for this purpose.

That strength and enlightenment may be yours and the power to stand and the ability to fight for the release of humanity is my prayer and appeal.

Cleveland Citizens Protest Conscription

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARTIN L. SWEENEY
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 5, 1940

RESOLUTION AND TELEGRAM OF PROTEST

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a resolution adopted and telegram sent to me by prominent citizens of Cleveland, Ohio. I know many of these individuals personally, some are active leaders in the organized labor movement and outstanding in the protection of the civil rights of our people. They are all, I am sure, good Americans.

CLEVELAND, OHIO, *August 31, 1940.*

Congressman MARTIN L. SWEENEY,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Request you introduce into RECORD following resolution adopted overwhelmingly Thursday night at anticonscription meeting:

Whereas peacetime conscription as embodied in the Burke-Wadsworth bill passed by the Senate is a menace to the great democratic liberties and traditions of America, and threatens to smash the last vestige of our democratic institutions, and

Whereas peactime conscription will thrust upon America many of the worst aspects of a Fascist dictatorship, and

Whereas peactime conscription is not necessary for the defense of our homeland, but is another and perhaps final step down the road to war, and

Whereas peacetime conscription will bring about a great dislocation in the lives of millions of our citizens, therefore be it

Resolved, That we 900 citizens of Cleveland herein assembled at the Public Auditorium on August 29, 1940, do urge the Representatives of Cleveland in the United States House of Representatives, to vote against the Burke-Wadsworth bill or any other form of peacetime conscription.

CHICAGO, ILL., *September 1, 1940.*

Congressman MARTIN L. SWEENEY,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

The undersigned do hereby assert our opposition to any form of conscription in times of peace, believing it is menace to American democracy.

Please insert this petition in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Chicago Peace Mobilization, Clarence O. Felilliaber, Lee Varm Siagle, Edward Crudele, Mary Keiba, Russell, Chase, Joe Mijic, Bernard V. McGroarty, Fred Krizan, Cecila Stefek, Irene G. Miller, Herbert H. Reid, Lawrence L. Miller, Mrs. Herbert Reed, T. C. Lawrence, Katherine Goodell, Jessie F. Sichonberg, Lee Grilith, Matthew Oroctin, Al Balint, Hanna R. Blumenthal, Giles McClincey, Walter Bacon, Al Skimus, Ethel Beach, Betty Baric, Herbert Siens, Theresa Kamen, Helen Carson, Irwin Barkain, Margaret Berry, Beatrice Dunn, John H. Davis, Ed. Edmiston, Bert Sharper, M. Edlston, Jack Perloff, Ruth W. Perloff, Barbara Jeanne Lumbard, Don Rodgers, Helen Siagle, E. J. Tubman, J. Plumba, S. Kalamos, H. W. Thorpemin, Henry Sigel, K. W. Palmer, R. E. Fisher, George Fuchills, Ann Marsh, Joseph Davidson, Minnie Horvic, Kenneth Stone, Wm. Sengel, S. Bartell, John Acocilla, Edward F. Kluge, Margaret Lamargart, Otto Lamargart, Lucy Zimmerman, Naomi Dunison, David C. Mitchell, David Robbins, Helda Locklin, Dorothy Boynton, Leon B. Sigler, Dora Adler, Lucille Streem, Joe Kraus, L. E. Marquis, Dejarmin, Sreve

Tatler, Floid Haynes, A. Louis, Elma Hemierch, Frances Pellegerino, Glenn F. Martin, Raymond Prido, Dr. J. N. Simmons, Eva Simmons, Ira J. Gillin, Ben Stutsker, Sid Jacobs, Lucie Thomas, Virginia Taylor, Forrest Malone, Andrew Miller, Herman Shaffer, Albert Kaushick, Albert Kautzman, Virgil Odenell, John Brickley, Mrs. J. Marschik, Frank Bucar, Pearl Fridman, Leonard Brooks, Irene Zsengeler, Jos. Bernstein, Jas. Smid, C. I. Shaniff, Ailene Eckles, Chas. Paranin, Rose Tapercin, Margaret S. Toth, Jessie Josephson, Hannah Kurtz, Freida Katz, Rita Glass, Lawrence Miller, Sidney W. Levine, Billy Ehrhardt, Mr. and Mrs. Robert Ley, Morris Perparty, Irving Block, Frank Snik, Goldie Blank, Frank E. Tweek, Mary Tweed, Thomas Bradley, Mary Bradley, Tony Nicholis, Paul Shepard, Gerry Ehrman, Bernard Marks, Ruth Miles, Charlotte Sarns, Isadore Melick, Frances Curtis, James R. Gebie, Natalie Laibman, Marjorie Dowers, Thomas Dowers, Mike M. Raoirich, Florence Thomas, Paul M. Jones, Steve Turner, Anna Morgan, Dora Adeler, Fred Walchlie, Adolf Allenberod, Louis Petrigini, Bette Iananalli, Louis Petrigini, Joseph Lepo, Mark Hopkins, Opal Bassore, Natalie Laibman, Anna Glauser, Eddie Weipgundt, James Balogli, Math Miovac, Jacob Miljack, J. Barsick, B. Garday, Andy Baithy, Milton Mandell, Frank Falkowski, Antonio Palusci, Charlotte Sarnes, Dora Weinberg, Katharine Moore, Lawrence Moore, C. T. Carlton, Alma Pollock, J. O. Sumer, Mary Petringi, M. Weinberg, Clarice Shores, Leo Feuster, George Friedman, Basil Ganit, Ted Novak, Mary Helen Walch, Chester Witkowski, Frances Mareoni, Doris Bernbaum, Gretchen Thornsted, John Stample, Phillip W. Dunn, Bob W. Grobelny, Arthur J. Scabo, Geo. J. Thornsted, Herman Wolfram, Mrs. John Perry, John Perry, Roy Mraz, Opal Basore, Carl Basore.

What Mr. Willkie Accepts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS A. FLAHERTY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 5, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE SPRINGFIELD (MASS.) DAILY REPUBLICAN

Mr. FLAHERTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Springfield (Mass.) Daily Republican of August 19:

[From the Springfield (Mass.) Daily Republican of August 19, 1940]

WHAT MR. WILLKIE ACCEPTS

Mr. Willkie accepted much besides the Republican Presidential nomination at the Elwood notification exercises. He accepted the main structure of the New Deal, as it survives today. He also accepted the essentials of the President's foreign policy.

The issue of a third term seems almost to be a fadeaway, in view of the utter neglect of it by Mr. Willkie until the closing paragraphs, when he incidentally and briefly referred to it merely as one of the questions he would like to discuss with the President in a series of joint debates to be conducted in person by the candidates from coast to coast.

The joint debate challenge seems to have attracted more attention in the headlines of the Sunday papers than any other feature of the address, except Mr. Willkie's ambiguous stand on conscription. The point of the challenge is rather obscure, but Mr. Willkie said he was in dead earnest. Frankly speaking, a man so heavily burdened by official duties and difficult problems arising day by day as the President is, in this period, would undertake such an activity as a joint transcontinental debating tourney only at the risk of his health, if not his life.

Mr. Willkie's stand on conscription is ambiguous and the proof of this may be found in directly contrary interpretations by Republicans. Mr. Willkie said that he favored "some form of selective service," omitting all reference to compulsion. The country has a form of selective service already, for every recruiting office applies tests to candidates for voluntary enlistment and only those meeting the tests are selected.

Senator TAFT, of Ohio, an opponent of the compulsory service bill now pending in the Senate, has promptly announced that he was satisfied with Mr. Willkie's statement because he had not used the word "compulsory" in his discussion of the subject. Yet the Boston Herald declared yesterday that Mr. Willkie "did advocate compulsory conscription clearly and unmistakably," thus revealing himself as "unmindful of the little political expediencies of the hour."

Mr. Willkie's only criticism of the President's handling of foreign affairs, whether in relation to the Far East or Latin America or the European war, concerns the way he has talked. The Republican agrees with Mr. Willkie in this particular. The President has at times been guilty of utterances indiscreet and even mischievous and provocative. But nothing the President has done, or has proposed to do, arouses Mr. Willkie's opposition. He quotes the President as having laid down certain fundamental policies regarding aggressor nations, and then he declares, "I am glad to pledge my wholehearted support to the President in whatever action he may take in accord with those principles." Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Willkie are on the same limb; for, if Mr. Roosevelt "courts war," as charged, so does Mr. Willkie by favoring all measures helpful to Britain "short of war."

Recently, when Mr. Willkie announced at Des Moines his acceptance of the New Deal farm program, the Republican mentioned specifically nine other features of the New Deal, comprising in the main the heart of it, which he "need not hesitate to approve" also.

At Elwood Saturday, Mr. Willkie pleased this newspaper by accepting them all, in substance. He is even for collective bargaining with no "ifs" or "buts" in what he said—which will hardly set well in certain circles. For at least 10 paragraphs, beginning with his attack on concentrated, unregulated, and uncontrolled private wealth and enterprise, as it functioned prior to 1930, Mr. Willkie, at Elwood, made a first-rate New Deal speech. Later on, he revived the New Deal theme by endorsing, unqualifiedly, Federal unemployment relief for "those whom private industry cannot support," and Federal assumption of unemployment relief, from States and municipalities, is largely the explanation of the increase in the national debt.

In accepting, as a Republican candidate for President, what most new dealers think is the heart of the New Deal, Mr. Willkie builds up a mystery. He now ascribes to the New Deal a spurious "distorted liberalism." Yet he approves its works, at least in large measure. If these achievements constitute a meritorious record, why couldn't a liberal Democrat be proud enough of them to stay in the party responsible for the program's accomplishment, notwithstanding crudities and faults inseparable from pioneering and the bitter feeling that usually is engendered in all reforms by embittered obstruction?

Mr. Willkie says he hopes to rebuild American democracy. The New Deal has been rebuilding it in a dozen specific ways, and upon them he now places the imprimatur of his approval, as he accepts the Presidential nomination of the opposition party. Mr. Willkie is late.

Mr. Willkie may be elected President. Perhaps the best interests of the United States demand his election. Yet how late he is. He fought the T. V. A., trying to destroy it also on constitutional grounds. For years he gave the best he had—and he had great abilities as a lawyer-executive to give—to the Commonwealth & Southern Corporation, which symbolized the high integration of capital and financial power. Yet, at Elwood Saturday, he said the concentration of private financial power had gone too far, and "we all know that such concentration of power must be checked." When, however, the New Deal tried to check it, Mr. Willkie burned with indignation over the New Deal's creation of class feeling and abuse of all businessmen.

Mr. Willkie is late in his crusade for private enterprise. He had a glimmer of this fact himself in saying, in connection with the war: "If we had to trade with a Europe dominated by the present German trade policies, we might have to change our methods to some totalitarian form." Mr. Willkie, surely, cannot expect to see the old economic or political order restored in Europe during his incumbency in the Presidency. How far totalitarian would he go?

Even in Britain, a revolution has taken place. The Wall Street Journal's London correspondent, last week, said in a dispatch:

"It must be realized that Britain is going through a social revolution as well as the temporary upheaval caused by the war. This revolution was already in progress before the war and as always war speeds up existing trends. The wartime urge of the community to give its services to the state is bringing to the surface an already existing tendency to replace the profit motive in industry by the service motive. * * * But, whatever the outcome of the war, there is little doubt that many social changes are certain and that the community as a whole is ready to accept many modifications of the capitalist regime."

If that be true—and the witness belongs to the conservative school—Mr. Willkie's crusade for nineteenth century individualism, private enterprise, and less Government interference with it, is so belated that it is difficult to rationalize it in harmony with his own acceptance of so much of the New Deal's accomplishment. For the United States has embarked on an economic venture in national defense, or military preparedness, so vast that it changes the whole scene of American life and makes futile any attempt to restore the simpler individualistic economy of yesteryear.

An acceptance speech of this character from such a source necessarily invites polemical discussion. All can agree, however, that Mr. Willkie's description of his family background is moving and convincing. There should be no covert efforts, no "whispering campaign" designed to discredit him because of his German ancestry. The elder Willkies belonged to the generations and the times that gave to America that stream of German liberals of the later nineteenth century whom Carl Schurz inspired and led with distinguished patriotism in many a crusade for reform and the reinforcement of democratic ideals.

Compare Our Problems With England's Problems—Part II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. THORKELSON

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 5, 1940

EXCERPTS FROM THE ALIEN MENACE

Mr. THORKELSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include excerpts from the Alien Menace.

Mr. Speaker, the author of this book is Lt. Col. A. H. Lane, of the British Army, a gentleman who, I am sure, knows what he is talking about. The reader will find that England's problem is practically our problem, and I have inserted these excerpts so that the Members may read and inform themselves as to the conditions which existed in England.

ALIEN INFLUENCE IN INDUSTRY AND FINANCE

Patriotic Englishmen often ask themselves, How is it that all political parties seem incapable of defending vital British interests? In preceding chapters it has been shown that since the end of the Great War there has been an almost continuous series of surrenders to the demands of foreign persons and organizations, and these surrenders have weakened the Empire and diminished Britain's influence and prestige abroad. The latest and most disquieting example of this policy of retreat is the Statute of Westminster—a statute based upon a compromising formula devised by the late Lord Balfour and endorsed by the conservative leaders. Under this statute, the dissolution of the Empire is possible whenever some determined faction in Ireland, South Africa, or elsewhere decides to end the connection with the British Crown. It is the sort of thing required by the anti-British elements to give their demands the appearance of legal and constitutional sanction.

As I have already stated in another chapter, we are not surprised at Socialists and Communists acting subversively, because, as we know, they are affiliated to all kinds of anti-British organizations, both at home and abroad. The information I have given in chapter XI, "The Hidden Hand," confirms what Captain Howard wrote in the North China Daily News, January 17, 1927: "Bolshevism is in reality the agent of a power working for world revolution and the destruction of our Christian civilization." But events since the war have linked not only the Socialist Party but all other parties with organizations outside this country. As I wrote in the second edition of this book:

"The headquarters of all these bodies are outside the British Isles. In fact, the British Isles (and the British Empire) are now to a great extent governed by parliaments and councils which meet in foreign countries. We have become subject to a supergovernment (the League of Nations), manned mainly by aliens sitting at a spot far removed from England."

I believe it is this foreign supervision of British policy that is responsible to a very large extent for the peculiar anti-British deviations of all political parties. But there is evidence of a still closer and more effective connection between the politicians and alien financiers than those already mentioned. Under the modern conditions of industry and finance, parliaments have become occupied more and more with economic questions and industrial legislation. And if there is a world-wide financial power directing revolutionary and subversive movements like bolshevism, we may be sure that this power will also influence the industrial and legislative policies of governments, and will make the politicians of all parties serve the aims and purposes of international finance. A financial disturbance, or the control of essential national industries, may be as valuable and as necessary to the unseen alien directors of subversive movements as strikes and riots or Socialist victories at the polls. If the alien financiers can devise plans to control and direct all parties, then their interests will be served, no matter how the people vote or what changes in party government may take place.

It is generally admitted by students of politics that whoever controls industry and finance controls governments. The magnitude of modern industrial undertakings has made large financial resources a necessity. The industrialist is now almost completely dependent upon those who can grant or withhold the money and credits he needs for the maintenance and development of his business. The creation of large associations of employers and workpeople and the national issues raised by their activities and conflicts have also compelled the State to interfere to an ever-increasing extent with private enterprise and to regulate productive methods and business procedure. Moreover, the growth of combines and mergers with interlocking directorships, and their agreements and important industries, into close contact with governments and politicians. In Parliament today the members of all parties represent big industrial and commercial and financial interests. In the present Parliament (1932) there are 646 companies represented by 601 directors, while in the last Parliament 546 companies were represented by 581 directors. And if we look at the 1924–29 Parliament we find that 694 companies were represented by 766 directors. Parliament is rapidly being transformed into a system of representation for business and vocational interests, but this transformation is disguised by the retention of the illusory democratic and geographical system of election.

From these facts it will be readily seen that all legislation must be viewed from the standpoint of the interests represented in Parliament. Under these conditions the relations between leading politicians and the leaders of commerce and finance are bound to be close and intimate. In fact, the director of some big industrial or financial concern today may be a Cabinet Minister tomorrow, or vice versa. It is, therefore, not surprising to find that men who have held high office in the State, either as Cabinet Ministers or as civil servants, are eagerly sought after on retiring from office and offered positions as directors of great industrial and financial concerns. This, in recent years, has become quite common. Ex-Cabinet Ministers and ex-civil servants have obtained very lucrative appointments in the city, especially in firms dominated by aliens. The business relations of these alien-controlled concerns with governments are now so constant and important that it is obviously a distinct advantage for these concerns to have leading politicians and ex-civil servants on their boards of directors or as advisers.

In this way much valuable information may be gained and many useful concessions obtained. This is, no doubt, the explanation of how aliens who control large companies and combines have, especially during the last decade, exercised a sinister power on the governments of this country. These aliens move in all circles—social, political, and diplomatic. They find out which of our leading men or rising politicians are pressed for money and, gradually approaching them, offer them jobs or directorships.

No doubt these Englishmen accept the offers in good faith. They at first think that they can do this financial or commercial work without it interfering with their political duties. But later they discover their mistake. They cannot give up their lucrative job or jobs. Incomes have decreased and taxes are very heavy; they have wives and families and positions to keep up. So the political work becomes subservient. They must sink their patriotism, their traditions, and their code of ethics which have been handed down to them by their fathers and grandfathers. They must sell their birthright as Englishmen.

It is no secret that some of our leading men who have been in Parliament for years have been subsidized directly or indirectly by aliens, from the time they entered the House of Commons, and in some cases before that time, for no ostensible reason. This, to a great extent, explains the extraordinary happenings so markedly evident, especially during the past decade, which have so puzzled those who take an intelligent interest in the affairs of our unfortunate country. It also explains, in a great measure, why England, which has always been looked up to as the Mother of Parliaments, finds parliamentary government more and more difficult.

How many of our members of Parliament have gone there for purely patriotic motives? How many have gone there to make a living, for their own aggrandizement, to get jobs, directorships, etc.?

The various happenings, especially since 1918, which have brought our country and most of our Empire in such a short space of time to the verge of ruin have not been merely coincidences without apparent connection as most of the public think. These happenings were so cunningly planned that in many cases they seem to have deceived some of our ministers; but in most cases, sooner or later, directly or indirectly, they tended to wreck our country and break up our Empire. Looking back it can be seen that there has been distinct coordination.

Those who have knocked about the world and studied affairs know that the extraordinary sequence of blunders and conspiracies in our Government are the outcome of a world-wide organization run by a collection of extremely clever, ruthless, and in many cases fanatical people, few of whom are of British blood.

Our leaders (so-called), men who have scarcely ever been outside the British Isles, have been bluffed, fooled, or bribed at almost every turn by "the hidden hand." Some of our so-called leaders have been led away by an insane ambition and desire for power. The combination of Lloyd George and Mr. W. Randolph Hearst, that very dangerous anti-British United States of America citizen and newspaper magnate, has played a great part in bringing about our perilous position.

When our greatest modern historian, Mrs. Nesta Webster, named her devastatingly instructive book, recently published, The Surrender of an Empire,[1] the title chosen gave a true interpretation of what has really happened.

The increasing control of national industries by international financiers is a most serious and difficult problem for many countries, especially in Europe. Britain, before the war, was the financial center of the world and this gave her not only world-wide influence and prestige, but it also gave the nation and its industries security and independence. The war, by impoverishing all European countries and leaving them burdened with debts, opened the way for the international financiers to control world finance and to influence the policies of governments by the exertion of financial and eco-

[1] Publishers: The Boswell Printing & Publishing Co., Ltd., 10 Essex Street, London, W. C. 2. Price 15s. net.

nomic pressure. As Sir Arthur Michael Samuel, M. P., has said, the finance houses of the United States of America have "pushed loans on nations, cities, and commercial enterprises far beyond the limits of economic justification," and have "unloaded at a profit the paper certificates of those loans on the investing and speculating public." By these methods the United States of America finance houses, says Sir Arthur, have wrecked "a large part of 'impecunious' Europe."[2] Associated with this plan to place whole nations under the control of international money lenders are various schemes to form gigantic industrial mergers, financed and controlled by New York bankers and finance houses. Already this plan has been successful in Britain and other European countries, and some of our most important industries, especially electrical, films, aircraft, and so forth, are now wholly or partly controlled by German-American Jewish interests, though the names of the companies and the nominal directors may be British. It is these alien-controlled concerns that seem to offer the most attractive and lucrative jobs to ex-Cabinet Ministers and ex-civil servants. The appointment to the boards of directors of a few men who have held high rank in British Governments or in the civil service does undoubtedly provide excellent cover for the aliens who really own and direct these British industries and does enable them to camouflage their exploitation of the British people.

To expose this alien control of British industries in detail is impossible within the space at my disposal. The reader who wishes to obtain fuller information should read America Conquers Britain: A Record of Economic War, by Ludwell Denny. This book contains a mass of information and is well documented. Mr. A. N. Field, whose book, The Truth About the Slump, should also be read, says of this American work:

"In this book, which is little more than a thinly disguised paean of triumph over the creation of huge American-controlled (or in reality German-Jew controlled) international combines to the detriment of Britain, Mr. Ludwell Denny tells the whole story. His book is worth the closest study of all who desire to see civilization freed from its present domination."

Mr. Denny does not refer to the Jewish part in the financial operations he describes, but most of the industrial and financial concerns he mentions are included in the Report of the Pujo Commission (1913) on the Money Trust in the United States of America, and they are quoted in full in Mr. Field's book.[3] The American concerns that control many British industries today were then and are still in the Money Trust of the United States of America. In 1913 the dominant influence in this trust was J. P. Morgan, Sr., but, as our Ambassador, Sir Spring-Rice wrote, "Since Morgan's death the Jewish bankers are supreme." This means Messrs. Kuhn, Loeb & Co., and the Warburgs and their allied concerns, including the Federal Reserve Bank. At this point I interpolate a very important article which appeared in the Patriot of March 31, 1932:

"Mr. Eugene Meyer, whose appointment as Governor of the Federal Reserve Board necessitated two resignations, having become Chairman of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, the particulars of his career published by the financial editor of the New York Journal on 19 January are of more than American interest. Mr. Leslie Gould wrote that:

" 'For the first time since the days of Alexander Hamilton the United States will have a financial czar. The czar will be Eugene Meyer. His power will be wielded through the Reconstruction Finance Corporation when it is finally approved and set up by Congress, and the land-bank system and the Federal Reserve. All three will be identically controlled, and Meyer will be the power on or behind the throne. Meyer is already Governor of the Federal Reserve. He is the father of the Reconstruction Corporation, which is being patterned after the War Finance Corporation. Meyer was head of the War Corporation. The land banks came in through the Treasury. Meyer for a time headed the land-bank system. Meyer, who is 56, inherited a fortune from his father, Eugene Meyer, Sr., who was a successful Jewish exchange broker in California.'

"He graduated at Yale in 1895 after his father had become a partner in the international banking house of Lazard Freres, where he served a 4-year apprenticeship.

"In 1901 the stock exchange firm of Eugene Meyer, Jr., & Co. was born, when he had just turned 25. Although known as the smart Frisco banker, Meyer in reality was never more than a large-scale stockbroker and market operator and statistician.

"Between 1901 and 1917 he had made a fortune of his own, and

" 'His first Government appointment was adviser on nonferrous metals to the National Council of Defense. Later he filled a similar role to the War Industries Board, headed by his Democratic friend, Bernard M. Baruch.'

"He then became managing director of the War Finance Corporation, which, against his wishes, was suspended in May 1920, by President Wilson's Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. D. B. Houston. He returned to the corporation when it was revived in 1921 at the time of the slump which he had foretold. After the final disappearance of this corporation he was appointed in 1927 Farm Loan Commissioner and a member of the Farm Loan Board of this period, and he reorganized the land banks, which were in difficulties. Resigning when Mr. Hoover took office, he has again been recalled to Washington in most important capacities. Among outstanding financiers, few have had such remarkable a career as Mr. Eugene Meyer."

[2] Times Trade & Industrial Supplement, March 4, 1932.
[3] The Truth About the Slump, pp. 78–82.

Going back to the report of the Pujo Commission on the Money Trust, that report is worth quoting because its statements are more true today than when written in 1913, and the dangers described are now greater, especially for Great Britain. The Commission said:

"The powerful grip of these gentlemen is on the throttle that controls the wheels of credit and on their signal those wheels turn or stop."

The report goes to show how, through "the vast ramifications of this group" of financiers in the United States of America and in foreign countries, the financing of enterprises not approved by the group can be prevented.

"Therein, said the Commission, lies the peril of this money power to our progress, far greater than the combined danger of all existing combinations."

This group of international financiers through their control of the Federal Reserve Board and their world-wide ramifications in industry, can and do exert a tremendous influence upon world affairs. Sir Josiah Stamp has stated in an interview with the New York Evening Post:

"Never in the history of the world has so much power been vested in a small body of men as in the Federal Reserve Board. These men have the welfare of the world in their hands and they could upset the rest of us either deliberately or by some unscrupulous action."[4]

Mr. Ludwell Denny says:

"Many nations may laugh at our State Department but all must tremble before our Federal Reserve Board.

"High money rates in the United States early in 1929, for instance, forced an increase in official discount rates almost at once in England, in 10 European countries, in 2 Latin-American countries, and 2 in the Far East. And in almost every case that action restricted business and brought suffering to millions of foreign workers."[5]

Mr. Denny adds that this blow to trade "hit Britain hardest of all," and checked our trade revival. This is true. But Britain had been badly hit by these financiers before 1929. The preparations, begun in 1921, for Britain's premature return to the gold standard in 1925, necessitated the adoption of a deflation policy. In 1920 the Lloyd George government, in which, as Mr. Field says, "Jewish financial influence was very strong indeed," announced through the Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. (now Sir) Austen Chamberlain, that the Government "had set its heart on deflating the currency." This was the beginning of the prolonged trade depression and unemployment in Great Britain. This policy of deflation was undoubtedly due to New York influence in the city of London. In 1925 Mr. Winston Churchill, Chancellor of the Exchequer, in the conservative government, restored the gold standard, and was complimented for doing so by a number of financiers and economists in London, whose names do not suggest British origin. Mr. Reginald McKenna, chairman of the Midland Bank, condemned this policy of monetary deflation and warned the nation of the consequences. Subsequent events have justified Mr. McKenna's warnings and have disproved the predictions, accepted by the conservative government, of the Schusters, Schroeders, Niemeyers, and Gugenheim Gregorys, who urged deflation and congratulated Mr. Churchill on his acceptance of their advice.

It was also in 1920 that the shareholders of the Bank of England appointed Mr. Montagu Norman as governor of the bank. Since his appointment as governor, Mr. Norman has paid frequent visits to New York, but his efforts to improve British trade do not appear to have been successful. His evidence before the Macmillan committee on industry and finance shows that he possesses the international mind and wishes to shape British financial policy in accordance with the needs of international finance. We do not, of course, question the good intentions and sincerity of Mr. Norman, but we think his point of view and his close relations with New York financiers have not produced the most happy results for Great Britain.

One of the officers of the bank is Sir Otto Ernst Niemeyer, ex-Controller of Finance in the Treasury, and here I would observe that among the high officials of our Treasury today is Sir E. J. Strohmenger.[6] Sir Otto in 1922 accompanied Mr. Bonar Law to the Paris Conference on Reparations. At this conference Mr. Bonar Law proposed a 4-year moratorium for Germany. The French refused to agree. After the failure of this conference the German mark depreciation began, and Germany defaulted on her payments. Sir Otto also accompanied the Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Stanley Baldwin, to the United States to arrange for the funding of the American debt. It is not necessary to comment on the consequences to Britain of that unfortunate "settlement." (See chapter XVIII of this book.) In 1923 Sir Otto Niemeyer was one of the experts on the Exchange Committee set up at the Imperial Economic Conference. This committee, says M. Field:

"Declared that the Australian and New Zealand exchange, then standing at 30s. percent, would automatically right itself to the pre-war figure of about 17s. 6d. percent as soon as the gold standard was resumed. We know how incorrect that has proved."[7]

[4] Reprinted in National City Bank monthly circular, February 1926.
[5] America Conquers Britain. (Knopf, 1930.)
[6] Another high financier of curs and apparently a persona grata with the powers that be is Sir H. Strakosch.
[7] The Truth About the Slump, pp. 107–108.

This financial expert was also a member of the Treasury Committee, 1924, which reported in 1925 in favor of the immediate return to the gold standard. The benefits predicted by this committee have been falsified by subsequent events. Mr. Field remarks:

"So far as the writer can discover, pretty well every financial step of importance taken by Britain in recent years which has tended to make money dearer, to increase the dead weight of the national debt, and generally to depress trade, increase unemployment, and break the backs of the British producers and manufacturers has been distinguished by the support of Sir Otto Ernst Niemeyer." [8]

During 1930 Sir Otto and another distinguished authority on finance, Professor Theodor Emanuel Gugenheim Gregory, of the London School of Economics, visited Australia and New Zealand to advise on the finances of those two Dominions. While in New Zealand, Sir Otto Ernst Niemeyer stated in a press interview at Christ Church that:

"If the United States would lend money more readily to foreign countries it would help the situation greatly."

And when he returned to Australia he repeated this advice.

This statement seems to mean that the United States of America should lend to the Dominions. Why? Many countries, including the British Dominions, are already suffering from the readiness of New York financiers to make them the debtors of the United States of America.

The visits of these experts and advisers did not please many Australians and New Zealanders. Mr. Hughes, ex-Premier of Australia, protested strongly against the acceptance of their financial recommendations, and Mr. Field, in his book, expresses the views of many New Zealanders when he says:

"What it cost to bring Sir Otto Ernst Niemeyer and Prof. Theodor Emanuel Gugenheim Gregory to New Zealand has not been disclosed. Perhaps the good people in Christ Church who pressed for the invitation will tell us what we have gained by the visit of these two distinguished Englishmen—if that description is considered correct." [9]

Mr. Field's remarks remind us that Englishmen with foreign names are to be found at the Bank of England, both as its directors and official advisers. During the financial crisis in 1931, when this country was negotiating for loans from France and the United States, the British representatives at a conference in Paris were Sir Frederick Leith-Ross, deputy controller of finance to the treasury, and Mr. H. A. Siepmann, of the Bank of England.[10] I do not know who Mr. Siepmann is, and he may be a great financial expert; but I do wonder how it is that the Bank of England seems to prefer gentlemen with foreign names to represent it at important conferences to consider vital British questions. In January 1930, it was announced in the press that Dr. O. M. W. Sprague, professor of banking and finance at Harvard University, had been appointed as economic and statistical adviser to the governors of the Bank of England.[11] Dr. Sprague's predecessor at the bank was a Mr. Walter Stewart—appointed in 1927—who before coming to London, was formerly head of the Statistical Division of the Federal Reserve Bank in Washington, and had been special adviser to the New York banking firm of Case, Pomeroy & Co.

These American experts may be most efficient and admirable persons. I am not questioning their abilities or qualifications. I am only expressing surprise that an institution like the Bank of England should apparently be unable to discover persons of British origin and citizenship to fill such important positions in the bank. Nor can one avoid wondering whether this noticeable preference for American advisers and for persons whose names suggest at least alien extraction, has any connection with American—that is, New York—financial dominance in British industry and finance.

This American control of British industries has become very conspicuous in recent years. Attention to this fact was called by the Sunday Sun (Newcastle) on November 17, 1929. Below are extracts from its article:

"One great menace to British industry in general and to vital, basic industries of the north in particular, is the growing amount of control which foreign finance is securing over British industry. It is a movement which has been going on for years, but so stealthily that only those in close touch with the inner councils of business have been aware of it.

"If this insidious canker is not arrested, we shall before long find that the greater part of our most important productive industries and our public-utility services are under the direction of the foreigner.

"But the ultimate control must remain in British hands, no matter how great the amount of foreign funds which come here. That is the point of paramount importance. Yet, as things are today, there are abundant signs that British industries are ceasing to be British in everything but name."

The above protest is exactly my case against this alien control of our industries. The Sunday Sun goes on to show how even the processes for the liquefaction of coal are covered by world master-patents, and, almost without exception, those "rights are held by foreign corporations. * * * The result is that every ton of coal treated by one or other of those methods pays a royalty which goes to swell the profits of other countries, and which puts a further tax upon an already overburdened industry."

The article on this foreign control of our vital industries ends with this statement, which is absolutely true:

"The maze of 'agreements,' 'understandings,' 'associations,' and so on today in international finance is so intricate that it is sometimes difficult even for those in the stock markets to decide who or what is the ultimate controller. It is no wonder, therefore, that so few realize how much we are now dependent upon the foreigner."

The Newcastle paper refers to the American control of our electrical industries. We have not space for a full account of this control by the Money Trust of New York, but complete details will be found in Mr. Ludwell Denny's book, America Conquers Britain, especially in chapter 6, Dollar Versus Pound. I can quote only one or two extracts. Describing the world-wide ramifications of the American General Electric, Mr. Denny says:

"Meanwhile the American General Electric stockholders, besides large holdings in British General Electric, have become the largest stockholders in a giant merger of other British electrical companies which drafts British General Electric. American General Electric (through the International General Electric Co.) for many years had controlled British Thomson-Houston. Then it bought large holdings in Metropolitan-Vickers Electrical, Edison Swan Electric, and Ferguson Pailin. Early in 1929 those four were fused in a holding company, Associated Electrical Industries, representing 'the largest combination of undertakings engaged in electrical manufacture in Great Britain.' At the time of fusion American General Electric was the largest individual shareholder, though lacking a majority of the shares in value or in voting power.

"Negotiations are under way to merge Associated Electrical Industries and British General Electric into one complete British manufacturing monopoly, in which American General Electric interests would be the chief and perhaps the majority shareholders." [12]

Mr. Denny states that the American General Electric is one of the largest and most powerful "international trusts and combinations of international trusts in the world," and it now has partial control of the famous German General Electric—"A. E. G." (Allgemeine Elektrizitaets Gesellschaft).[13]

Continuing his account of the penetration of Britain by American finance, Mr. Denny writes:

"Utilities Power & Light Corporation (an American concern with assets now approaching $475,000,000) in 1929 acquired the entire common stock of Greater London Counties Trust, one of the largest British utility corporations. This London corporation controls the 7 chief British power companies, which operate on a monopoly basis in 95 cities in England and Scotland, and also controls the Edmundson Electrical Corporation, which owns 12 electrical supply companies. The deal whereby American capital acquired the entire common stock of this supertrust, dominating such a large portion of the British utilities industry and so many British cities, was investigated by the British Government. The Minister of Transport, Colonel Ashley, on February 18, 1929, told the House of Commons the Government had decided that efficient operation was of more consequence than 'whether the capital happens to be British or American.'" [14]

The chairman of this huge American combine was the late Earl of Birkenhead, who resigned his position as secretary of state for India in order to take up this appointment. Other Conservative ex-ministers also joined the board of directors of this American combine. Lord Birkenhead, in an explanation of his position, said that although the organization was associated "with the Clark interests in the United States," it was British, and would employ British labor and use British material, "and its entire staff will remain British." He added:

"So far as finance is concerned this has been found up to the present almost entirely through Clarke interests in America, but the broad policy of the trust is to obtain money in the cheapest market, and it is within its province to obtain funds in Britain if it is possible to do so at a cheaper rate than elsewhere." [15]

Mr. Denny makes the following rather caustic comment on this explanation:

"The language of a great legalist cannot obscure the fact that the Americans own this huge semi-monopoly, but it apparently indicates that the owners have agreed to use British materials and labor and retain, nominally at least, a British board of directors. Obviously such an arrangement is a happy one for the Americans, who own and control the trust—especially if such an arrangement will quiet British opposition to American financial and industrial penetration." [15]

I cannot give more space to further examples of this foreign penetration in other industries, including our air services and radio. But sufficient has been quoted to show how deeply alien financiers now control vital and essential industries. If these alien influences in British industries are traced to their financial sources in New York, we are brought around once more to the German-American Jewish financiers whose many and peculiar interests have already been described in another chapter. We also see in the above extracts the importance, even the necessity, of these alien financial operations being disguised by the appointment of British directors to the boards of these American-owned trusts. If these directors are ex-cabinet ministers and ex-civil servants so much the better. Under these circumstances the government—even a conservative government—can reply to questions that the

[8] Ibid., p. 108.
[9] The Truth About the Slump, p. 108.
[10] Daily Express, August 28, 1931. There was or is a Mr. C. A. Siepmann on the staff of the B. B. C. See p. 89.
[11] Daily Express, January 29, 1930.
[12] America Conquers Britain, pp. 143–144.
[13] See ch. XI, The Hidden Hand.
[14] America Conquers Britain, p. 146.
[15] America Conquers Britain, p. 147.

foreign finance—and therefore control—in British industry does not matter. Such an answer is not consistent with the claims of an ultra patriotic party—the party that tells the people to Buy British, yet admits its indifference regarding whether the capital in vital British industries is British or foreign, and shows no resentment when its leaders forsake imperial politics to become city directors of alien financed and controlled concerns. In this foreign control of our industries and financial institutions we have the alien menace in its most acute and dangerous form, and unless we end this alien control we shall pay a big price for our folly and indifference.

Labor Day Address of John P. Frey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 5, 1940

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, on Labor Day, John P. Frey, president of the Metal Trades Department of the American Federation of Labor, delivered a Labor Day address at Toronto, Canada.

There are many other Members of Congress besides myself who believe John P. Frey is one of the outstanding labor statesmen today. His speech delivered at Toronto had so much sound philosophy and good sense in it that I think it is well worth a place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD as a part of my remarks this speech delivered at Toronto, Canada, by John P. Frey:

It is always a privilege and a pleasure for a citizen of the United States to address an audience in the Dominion of Canada. There is so much which we hold in common in our fundamental conceptions that the citizen of one of these great nations always feels at home when visiting the other.

The form of government which each nation has established, the free institutions which have been fostered and developed, the conception that governments should only exist through the consent of the governed, have created an understanding and a friendship which has left the long boundary line between the two countries without a single fortification.

As a trade-unionist, interested in the celebration of Labor Day, I feel at home on Canadian soil, for the development of international trade-unionism, so far as the Dominion of Canada and the United States are concerned, antedates the organization of the American Federation of Labor itself.

In 1859 several local unions of iron molders in Ontario, affiliated with the Iron Molders' Union of North America. It was the birth of international trade-unionism, in the sense that those working at the same trade or industry in two countries, believed that their interests made it advisable that they should be members of one organization without a national boundary line to divide them.

The principles and policies of the American Federation of Labor are identical as applied in both countries. Canadians and Americans alike are delegates to their organizations' conventions, participating in making their constitution, in determining what the organization's policies shall be, electing officers to carry out the organization's purposes. There is but one vital point where the international relationship is not parallel.

There exists in Canada the Dominion Trades and Labor Congress, chartered by the American Federation of Labor, so that trade-unionists in Canada will have at their service a Nation-wide trade-union organization of their own, through which to secure the legislation which they desire.

In the United States the American Federation of Labor is the representative legislative body for Americans.

Neither of these legislative bodies interferes with the legislative program and legislative activities of the other.

Under this broad and sound understanding, international trade-unionism between the two countries has developed without in any manner interfering with the loyal devotion of trade-unionists to their flag, their country, and its free institutions.

It is well that these facts should be thoroughly understood, and particularly in this critical hour when the very existence of free institutions in the world is being jeopardized by the savage attack of the totalitarian countries.

Trade-unions and free institutions are interdependent: the one could not exist without the other. Unless there is freedom of speech, freedom of the press, and the right to voluntary association for lawful purposes, the parliamentary form of representative government could not exist, for this form of government ceases to function when the fundamental rights of a free people are denied.

Modern trade-unionism had its common origin in the mother country where, in 1824 and 1825, the British Parliament repealed all of the accumulated conspiracy laws aimed at labor which had grown from the time of Edward II. In Great Britain the trade-union movement developed until it became a definite part of the parliamentary system. At present some of its outstanding leaders are playing a leading and heroic part in their nation's defense as members of the British Cabinet, and in other important national offices.

Trade-unionism in Canada and in the United States has been influenced by the membership of those who learned their trade-union lessons in Great Britain and other European countries; yet, as a whole, it has been quite definitely a Canadian and American development. As one valuable result we have seen the development of the American Federation of Labor as the first and only international trade-union movement of its kind.

In their understanding of fundamental principles, there has been far-reaching accord between the trade-unions of Great Britain and the American Continent, but in its policies and its programs the American Federation of Labor has been wholly self-contained and self-governed.

In the form and the method of self-government within the American Federation of Labor, a structure of organization was developed which seemed best adapted to deal with the particular and peculiar industrial problems which developed on this continent.

Industrial and political conditions on the other side of the Atlantic, and particularly those on the European continent, in many respects have differed widely from those we are forced to consider in Canada and the United States.

Forms of government on the European continent, in many instances, have differed basically from those institutions of freedom which were erected by the founders of the Dominion of Canada and of the United States of America. The continental conception and belief that the people existed for the State to control or dominate, has never been accepted on our part, for we have been convinced that governments should exist only for the people; that they are the people's servants instead of the people's masters.

Years before the first World War certain European intellectuals had advocated drastic changes in the social and governmental structure which were in direct opposition to those which we hold to so firmly as free men. It was recognized by the British and the North American trade-union movement that changes were necessary, but not through the method, the policies, and the purpose which these intellectual revolutionists advocated.

Far-reaching efforts were made to propagandize within the unions affiliated with the American Federation of Labor in both countries to so shape the policy and the purpose of our trade-union movement that it would conform to the implications of the so-called materialistic conception of history. All of these efforts—and they were many and persistent—failed to alter the fixed purpose of the American Federation of Labor to build up a trade-union movement which would be based upon the principles, the structure, and the form of government established by the citizens of Canada and the United States.

After the first World War the dictator-controlled Government of Russia launched a widespread propaganda campaign with the object of creating world-wide revolution and the overthrow of all other forms of government, including those which we had established. In turn, Italy, Germany, and some of the other countries of Europe set up this new form of the state's arbitrary control over all citizens and the destruction of free institutions, of the right to voluntary association, of a free press, of free political and religious institutions, and the regimentation of the lives of everyone under the dictator's control.

Every totalitarian government in Europe launched a systematic attack against all democratic forms of government. They pictured the domination of the dictator as the only way by which nations could work out their internal and external problems. They endeavored to lead free peoples to believe that their very freedom and the free institutions they supported worked to their injury instead of their benefit.

They enthroned might as the only influence and force to respect. They scorned government by law as it was maintained by free peoples. They ridiculed the standards of truth, morality, and justice which the free peoples had adopted as their guide and standard.

These totalitarian countries maintained their propaganda agencies in every parliamentary-governed nation and made use of their embassies and their consular representatives to direct this subversive and poisonous propaganda. They endeavored to convince the people of the parliamentary-governed nations that they were incompetent to govern themselves, that free institutions were incompetent, and that self-government by the people was a delusion.

The world is now in the throes of the most horrible conflict in the history of modern civilization. The outcome of the present savage, brutal struggle will determine whether free institutions and self-government are to continue or whether they are to be destroyed for the present generation. In this life and death contest for the perpetuation of liberty, justice, and government by law under free institutions, the American Federation of Labor finds itself definitely and basically involved.

Under the foundation principles which guide the trade-union movement, there had developed a clearer understanding of unity through federation of purpose. It led to the organization of national federations of labor in the principal countries of Europe. As time passed these were organized into an international federation of labor. This great representative body met in convention once a year, and through the methods of open debate and majority vote, decided what policies would be most helpful in

assisting the wage earners in every country to protect their welfare and advance their interests. The International Federation of Labor survived the shock of the first World War.

Through the genius and statesmanship of that great labor leader, Samuel Gompers, the International Labor Office was created, the principal nations of the world becoming members. The International Labor Office proved itself to be one of the most valuable federated efforts which the nations of the world had made for a better understanding and adjustment of industrial problems arising within the realm of labor legislation.

Neither of these great international bodies are of much avail today. They have greatly suffered as a result of the ruthless military attacks which, in rapid succession, led to the German rape of Czechoslovakia, Poland, Denmark, Norway, Holland, Belgium, and the annihilation of French resistance. The Nazi policy that might, and might alone, makes right, that military powers alone should determine the government of the people, destroyed the national trade-union movements of the invaded countries.

Labor Day this year brings to the forefront an international situation more ominous than any which has ever arisen in the past.

When the Bolsheviks succeeded in their revolution, one of their first steps was to assassinate the officers of the Russian trade-union movement and enforce their edict against the right of voluntary association to exist in the field of labor, religion, or politics.

The trade-union movement of Italy was uprooted and destroyed as soon as Mussolini had gathered the power of a dictator into his hands.

The German trade-union movement, which was one of the most effective and best led, was annihilated in a single day by Hitler and his henchmen, and in turn a number of the outstanding trade-union leaders of Germany were assassinated.

Within recent months we have witnessed the German military machine rolling its brutal, crushing force over Czechoslovakia, Poland, Norway, Denmark, Holland, Belgium, and France. We are witnessing Hitler's present attempt to conquer England, from whom we inherited so many of our conceptions of human freedom, human justice, and a parliamentary form of government.

In the countries which have been ground under the ruthless savagery of Hitler's legions trade-unionism has ceased to function. Hundreds of thousands of those who but a few months ago were protecting their rights as wage earners through their trade-unions are now prisoners of war, compelled to work for Germany under such conditions as a brutal, arrogant dictator imposes—compelled to work in the production of war material to be used for the purpose of dealing a deathblow, if Hitler can have his way, to the free institutions of the parliamentary-governed countries.

Aside from Sweden, Switzerland, and Great Britain, trade-unionism has practically ceased to function in Europe.

From the reports received from Europe it has been made evident that a "fifth column" played a prominent part in Hitler's tactics, through the infiltration of emissaries into each country which was to be made the victim of Hitler's legions.

The beginning of Hitler's attack was not the movement of armed troops; the first attack came through the subversive activities of the "fifth column." The invading war hordes did not move in until the "fifth column" miners and sappers had prepared the way.

In a definite measure both Canada and the United States have already been attacked. "Fifth columns" have been busily at work within our borders. Representatives of the Italian and the German dictators have been active in their subversive activities, but so far as labor is concerned, they have made no effective progress.

The most dangerous of all "fifth columns" in North America is the one controlled and directed by Moscow. Since Lenin conceived his scheme for a world-wide revolution, American Communists, following the detailed instructions received from Moscow, have labored actively and ceaselessly to infiltrate into our trade-union movement. The immediate menace to Canada and the United States and their institutions comes principally from this Communist "fifth column," a "fifth column" which was unable to infiltrate into the ranks of organized labor until it succeeded in capturing a controlling position within the C. I. O.

As citizens we must be constantly on guard against "fifth column" activities within our country. As trade unionists we must be actively on guard against the Communist "fifth columns" working to secure a controlling position in our trade unions. Those who direct them from Moscow and those who carry out Moscow's instructions on the North American Continent, are cruel, cunning, treacherous, and without conscience.

The Communist who secures membership in our local unions is not interested in trade-union problems and policy. His sole purpose is to shape the activities of the local union and its international organization, so that policies will be adopted and programs carried on which will be in line with the purpose of the Russian-controlled Communist movement in North America.

Because of the grave national emergency which has been created as a result of the onslaught of Germany upon the free peoples of Europe, we must be on vigilant guard day and night so that no representative of a foreign country will be permitted to in any manner influence trade-union policy.

In Canada and the United States, trade-union principles and policies as compared with those of communism, are as far apart as honesty and dishonesty, justice and injustice, patriotism and treachery. There is and can be no place in our free institutions for the Communist, his polices, his so-called ideologies, or his tactics and his treachery.

As citizens of our respective countries, and as trade-unionists, there should be no question as to where we stand, in this grave hour of the world's history, this contest between the principle of control by dictatorship or government by law under free institutions.

Our trade-union movement has invariably indicated its stand whenever the Nation's welfare has been imperiled by war or otherwise. In the present conflict it will be our trade-union purpose to so conduct ourselves as to win the thorough-going confidence of our fellow citizens and of our respective countries.

As trade-unionists we have witnessed the destruction of the national trade-union movement in every country overrun by Hitler's ruthless followers.

We will not, and we cannot, sit idly by while Hitler, Stalin, and Mussolini plan to convert the members of our unions into prisoners of war, compelled to forge the chains which would shackle them to existence under a totalitarian form of government.

We are now facing the greatest menace which has thrown its sinister shadow over the self-governing civilizations developed in Western Europe and the North American continent.

Our duty as trade-unionists is clear. There is no confusion in our minds as to our responsibility.

I cannot conceive of a member of one of our organizations as a good trade-unionist, unless he is equally a loyal and patriotic citizen of his country, prepared to assume his full share, and more, in defending the Nation from the brutal, destructive, godless forces which brought on the present World War.

Dedication of Wilbur and Orville Wright Memorial at Dayton, Ohio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY N. ROUTZOHN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 5, 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. JAMES M. COX, OF OHIO

Mr. ROUTZOHN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address by the Honorable James M. Cox, one time a distinguished Member of this House of Representatives, former Governor of Ohio, and Democratic Presidential nominee in 1920, at the exercises dedicating the Wilbur and Orville Wright Memorial at "Wright Hill," Dayton, Ohio, Ougust 19, 1940.

The address follows:

The first impression one gets of this memorial site is of its poetic beauty. One would go far to find views like this one here, with the spires of the city of Daytor on the west, and the Mad River Valley before us to the east. Nature has been abundant in her provisions. On watch are giant oaks that sheltered aboriginal tribes and which now for the coming century must measure their endurance with the works of man.

The red man was not without his poetic sense. When possible he erected memorial mounds on majestic heights. Here he builded for his dead a testimonial of primitive reverence, presumably for his own who had played conspicuous parts in their day. Now we superimpose upon the sacred place of his plodding life an enduring tribute to two courageous men who dared defy accepted scientific dogmas and even death itself to bring to humanity the wings of the bird.

One cannot but link together here the symbols of these two periods of man's existence: the Indian traveling slowly by canoe and wearily by foot; his successor soaring as majestically as the eagle through the air. It took the better part of a day for the Indian to drift down the Mad River from his villages in what are now Champaign and Clarke Counties to this Indian memorial hill. Now by the lift of the clouds the distance is covered in a breath.

Today we merely add to the historic wealth of this pinnacle of moraine and rock and tree and shrub. It was long since marked as a memorial place. Tecumseh, the greatest of all Indian chieftains of whom we have any report, stepped out of his dug-out canoe and stopped here on his trips from Old Piqua, a little to our east, to the Indian village, now Dayton, at the confluence of four streams: the Mad River, Wolf Creek, Stillwater River, and the Great Miami. With good visibility one can here see the heights about Old Piqua. His eye catches, too, the Indian mound near Miamisburg, whence signal lights were flashed to the mound near Jacksonburg in Butler County. To the eastward were vast prairies, one of the few tracts

of its kind in this State. Here the battle for supremacy between the white man and the red was waged, culminating in the victory by George Rogers Clark at a site, now historic, jetted in the horizon from this view.

The second thing that arrests attention is the chaste and artistic beauty of this memorial. It expresses the quiet dignity of the Wright brothers, whose words have never gone beyond the implied importance of their achievements. Next to their genius for invention, this fact will be handed to history as the finest quality of their characters.

It is appropriate that this proceeding be presided over by Col. Edward Andrew Deeds. His devotion to Wilbur and Orville Wright, when dishonest persons attempted to deny them fame, has been as solid as the granite in this shaft. Here we see the great air fields, instruments of a nation's defense, sweeping over distances as level as the sea, as if cast by nature for the uses of aviation and the final setting of this scene. But it remained for Colonel Deeds to see it all, and then to help in constructively rounding out this most important center for development in the science of flying. In these times when local communities expect everything from Government, it is an inspiring tribute to the Miami Valley that these great flying fields, as they now are, were presented without cost to become a part of a nation's resource. The records of this day would be incomplete without a reference to the happy culmination of events as conceived, shaped, and directed by Colonel Deeds.

We stand in awe as we reflect upon the first flight in yonder fields, and its tremendous results. It was short but epochal. The secret, stored in the mysteries of centuries, was out at last. Wings driven by the power of an engine soared through the air, and the door opened upon a vastly changed world. The miles flown in this country alone last year were more than 87,000,000 by transport alone. That is equivalent to flying 10 times around the world at the Equator every day of the year. The task with the Wright brothers was not only sustained flight of the machine, but with the weight of man also. The first ship built weighed but a few hundred pounds. Now we find, as the progeny of this ancestor, ships weighing 50 tons. Height flown then was not great. Now as gracefully as a whale in the sea, great transports swim in the heavens, above the moods and storms of nature. It was the vital beginning. The idea born and demonstrated is still the base. Blueprints of gigantic liners are grounded in the simple machine the Wrights flew here.

For a comparatively long time the flights of the Wrights were encompassed within the narrow perspective in front of us. Now there are almost 40,000 miles of established air lines in this country alone. This mileage, added to that in foreign countries and territories operated by American capital, amounts to almost 50,000 miles, or twice the length of the Equator. The streaks across the skies have grown into vast arteries, veins, and capillaries—a new organism in a world transformed.

The world is smaller, distance means little any more. Contacts that were remote and impossible are now made easy. The poles are within the areas of our scientific surveys. Into the darkness of the Antarctic night come the rays of the sun, gathered and transported by the hand of man, by the genius of Edison and the Wrights.

If there had been ample commercial and social intercourse between our sections in the middle of the nineteenth century there would have been no war between our American States. The soil of earth has been soaked by the blood of man for centuries because of the divisive effect of the frontiers of mountains, lakes, rivers, and the seas. Masses of men were drawn into war and death because they did not know the world beyond their narrow walls. A lack of understanding led to enmity. Provincial customs and languages kept peoples and nations apart.

The gifts of the sun and the clouds bring life abundant. That is the way of Nature and of the divine source of Nature and of the soul of man. In the universal scheme of things it must be intended that there be interchange of the produces of soil, of mind, and mill, and, above all, of mind; that understanding contact of soul and spirit with spirit which makes for peace and a tranquil world.

If all of this be logical, then the airplane enters in a major role. The cynic may say that navigation of the air has brought a menace to man and the world would be better off without it. Let us here and now nail this fallacy down, lest it take root and travel far.

We deal here with the broader, more permanent aspect of the thing. We view the part which aviation will play in that better world which must lie somewhere ahead. There are the gains already felt—the faster transportation, the magically speeded mail service, the vast relief to isolated places when food, serums, and any manner of help can be had through the air.

But what of these destructive sights we see? With every gain through his genius of a new power for good for man there has been, inescapably, an equal power for harm. Franklin was warned against playing with lightning. Let it be left in the skies, where nature intended it to be. There were public meetings in protest against railroads. The automobile spurred the heedless spirit of man and its abuses trouble us still. Who would be without it, for all that?

The airplane has added to the destructiveness of war. Yet even as the invention of modern firearms, with their pitiless deadliness, brought an end to private duelling, so the airplane may well be the means of ending war. In this world matters must often grow much worse before men can be stirred to better them. Man does not go cold because the fire which he discovered may burn his houses and ravish his fields. No; the almost divine new power which the Wright brothers bestowed upon their race will not be rejected or condemned because of its abuse by man not yet worthy of their strength.

We, in the Miami Valley, take great pride in this day—proud of those we honor, proud of their achievements, and proud of their careers as men separate and apart from their genius. There come into our minds the day of long ago when two serious-minded youths in their plodding efforts excited more tolerance than confidence. We read with understanding a book of 10 years ago in which this passage stands out: "The Wrights kept a relative silence and tolerated a partial eclipse, because they were shy by nature and upbringing; they became reticent to protect an invention that half the world laughed at, and the other half tried to steal. They had no gift for publicity, and shrank from clamor."

When the tremendous hour in their life came, and the eye of the whole world was upon them, they demeaned themselves as they had before. Naturally, there was great curiosity—two brothers working secretly and alone had made one of the greatest discoveries of all time.

Europe seemed to be more air minded then than our own country. Demonstrations of the machine there were sought with a persistence that could not be denied. They were proclaimed everywhere as the men of the hour. Kings and queens unbent to the common impulse. The monarchs of England, France, Spain, Italy, and Germany, eager to know of the ship itself and its possibilities in use, sought and had interviews with the Wright brothers. Statesmen talked with them in chancelleries where great men of history had been. They were honor guests at royal state dinners with the social elite of the times. The crown jewels of the ages glistened under the lights in the palaces. Truly these were gorgeous scenes. And yet in the midst of them the most striking thing was the quiet, simple dignity and self-possession of Wilbur Wright, Orville Wright, and their sister, Miss Katherine Wright. With that inherent refinement born of spiritual ancestry and matured in the religious home of their parents, they brought to crowned heads an appreciation of the glories of a free country that could produce men like these.

We see the Wrights when they came home to receive in the White House at the hands of the President the Medal of Honor that had been awarded by the Congress of the United States. We see them at the great homecoming in Dayton, one of the most magnificient spectacles of our time. We see them turning back to their shop and their labors, to the fields of their early pursuits, training men to fly. We see them called upon to defend their rights when others were seeking to take them away. This was a trying experience. They met it with their characteristic calm. They never sought to try their case in the press. They brought it to the bar of justice, and the highest courts in the land decided there was no question about priority of patent. They were the pioneers. We walked with Orville Wright to the bier of his brother, and I have always felt he would have survived the final illness if his strength had not been taken in the grueling ordeal of defending their interests in the courts.

That ended a most strikingly happy and mutual relationship. Each supplied at need what was necessary in the solution of many problems. Comparisons as between them have often been attempted, since men of rare accomplishments have always been an interesting study. The result of this always confirmed what the sister many times said to me, that there could be no preference given to either brother without unfairness to the other. Their talents and labors were supplementary and indistinguishably intertwined. We are still thrilled as we recall the day in the autumn of 1918 when Lord Northcliffe came to Dayton as the representative of the Royal Society of Arts of London, England. He brought as an award of the historically distinguished organization the Albert Medal. The final verdict of the world was thus formally rendered. The gentlemen of the Royal Society of Arts, famous for their conservatism and impeccable honesty, made their findings after a most thorough and painstaking investigation. Every fair-minded scientist in the world accepted as conclusive the engraved words on the English medal: "In recognition of the value of the contributions of Wilbur and Orville Wright to the solution of the problem of mechanical flight."

It is a sad commentary that the only taint on honor so meritoriously won has been cast in the name of an American institution by a small group of bureaucrats, the type that has so often done discredit to our Government. The pettiness of a few officers in the Smithsonian Institution is to be regarded more in pity than bitterness. It is an important fact that the Smithsonian, founded by private benefaction, derives funds from our Government for part of its support. It is a private institution when its agents seek to serve their private ends; a member of Government when Government aid is asked.

It is high time that the Congress of the United States inquired into the scandalous conduct of this quasi-official department. Driven by the irresistible force of fact it recedes little by little toward the truth. But it still stands guilty of distortion of the facts. The day, we trust, is near when Orville Wright in self-respect can restore to the Nation as a priceless heritage the old Wright machine, the instrument of man's first flight, and now under shellfire in England.

The Roosevelt Party Is the War Party

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HOLDEN TINKHAM

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 5, 1940

ARTICLE BY DAVID LAWRENCE

Mr. TINKHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Evening Star:

[From the Washington Evening Star of August 31, 1940]

WAR ISSUE RAISED BY WALLACE—SPEECH IS SEEN PUTTING FOREIGN AFFAIRS INTO POLITICS

(By David Lawrence)

Is President Roosevelt planning to plunge the United States into the European war if he is reelected in November? This question may have been academic heretofore but now that the President has publicly approved the amazing speech of Secretary Wallace accepting the vice presidential nomination, the point becomes very concrete and alive.

Mr. Wallace says, "Most Republicans may not yet realize it, but their party is the party of appeasement in the United States today."

From this it could be inferred that the administration is not interested in peace in this world but must needs bring American participation in the war to bear on the whole European problem before it can be settled satisfactorily. Such an interpretation would mean that the Democratic Party intended to become the war party. On such an issue the Republicans should welcome the debate.

Mr. Wallace did not draw a distinction between the use of the word "appeasement" in the sense of trafficking with aggressor States and appeasement in the sense of trying to keep peace in the world once a military decision has been reached. He insisted, in effect, that the United States could not conceive of any way of beating Hitler except by war.

ROOSEVELT THOUGHTS SEEN

The amount of space devoted by the Secretary of Agriculture to foreign affairs, with which he has had relatively little contact since he has been preoccupied with the tasks of the Agriculture Department, would seem to indicate that the Wallace address was really an expression of Mr. Roosevelt's future policy.

It is important that issues be made clear early in the campaign. Under the Wallace doctrine, American businessmen—assuming an armistice or a peace treaty—must continue to be hostile to the government which may happen to control the whole Continent of Europe. Even the prospect that the people may overthrow a totalitarian government abroad and thus bring a change which might make it possible for the United States to support democracies abroad is not envisaged by the Wallace speech. The Secretary rattles the saber and presupposes a world of continuous warfare in which evidently the United States is to play a leading part.

Such a conception of a third term for Mr. Roosevelt has not been widely held heretofore. This correspondent and others have repeatedly dismissed as absurd the idea that Mr. Roosevelt would lead this Nation into war either for the purpose of bringing on a crisis through which he might win reelection or to secure vindication for his previous policies. But the Wallace speech leaves every disinterested observer puzzled. The address was not an impromptu affair. It was premeditated attack on the Republican Party as the party of peace and can leave the inference that the Democratic Party is unashamed now boldly to consider itself the war party.

"Powerful elements in our opposition," said Mr. Wallace, "will, if the Republicans come into power, force us to make one economic concession after another to totalitarian countries."

RAISES WAR-PEACE ISSUE

There is absolutely no basis for such an assumption. Wendell Willkie in his acceptance address expressed his belief that America would beat Hitler on her own economic terms and there wasn't the slightest suggestion of yielding to the aggressors any advantages in trade.

It is surprising, therefore, notwithstanding the existence of the Willkie statement, for the New Deal strategists to decide to make a political issue out of foreign policy—the Wallace speech sets off the fireworks and from now the question of war or peace will become the livest issue of the campaign. Does Mr. Roosevelt intend to go to war after November? Why is he so anxious to call the Republican Party a party of "appeasement"? Is this intended as a means of inflaming public opinion and whipping up a war hysteria? The Wallace speech certainly opens the way to such an interpretation of the New Deal's political strategy in this campaign.

BUSINESSMEN COOPERATED

Any other explanation would seem illogical, for there isn't the slightest evidence that the businessmen of America believe in totalitarianism or that they would welcome Hitler's victory. On the contrary, businessmen are here in Washington with the Government to speed up defense, and businessmen, moreover, if the administration would tell all the facts to the public, have cooperated secretly to withhold munitions and byproducts from all countries which the administration thought should be deprived of sinews of war, and this happened when "moral embargoes" were applied without the sanction of law.

Secretary Wallace has libeled millions of large and small businessmen in this country. He has accused them of wanting to see Hitler win. He owes an apology to them all or he owes it to candor to name a half dozen American businesses composed of Republicans which have in any way indicated their desire for Hitler's conquest or for the making of post-war deals with the Nazis. A few more political speeches covering clumsy areas entered by Mr. Wallace and the Vice Presidential nominee of the New Deal will become more of a handicap than a help to the third-term cause.

Conscription

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE E. GEYER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 5, 1940

Mr. GEYER of California. Mr. Speaker, both of my grandfathers came to America to escape the Prussian military dictatorship of conscription slavery. It is not strange then that I fail to see any connection between this violation of personal liberty and the American way of life. This bill is not democracy. It is Fascist regimentation. Is there a man in this House that will tell me that conscription has done anything for the democracy of Japan, Russia, Germany, or Italy or that it has preserved the democracy or done away with disloyalty in France, Belgium, or Holland?

Can you call this bill democratic when it provides for the selection of the unemployed and leaves to the employer the decision as to who shall or shall not be deferred among those that are employed?

LABOR

Has anyone noticed many really interested in the cause of labor coming out for this bill? Wall Street Attorney Clark, who wrote the original bill, is a member of the reactionary Economy League, and has no trace of sympathy for organized labor that anyone has ever discovered. The authors of this measure in the two Houses have never been accused of being over-sympathetic in labor's cause. Every labor-hating employer in the Nation is strongly behind this measure. The chambers of commerce approve it. Does this mean anything to you friends of labor? I believe this bill, to be passed under a hysteria of war fever, is nothing more nor less than a bill to bring labor to its knees. This bill will do what its proponents cannot and dare not do openly—rub out all the gains that labor has made in the last 7 years. What employee that loves liberty and desires to stay with his family will dare to take the lead in organizing or perpetuating a labor union when he knows that to get a deferment from service, he must get an affidavit from his employer that he is essential to the industry? Few employers would deem him to be essential if he was interested in any kind of a union other than a company union. Yes; this bill is a bill to break the back of the labor movement. This is why the A. F. of L. and the C. I. O. are both violently opposed to it.

These great organizations have never been lacking in patriotism. They know the dangers of a bill like this in time of peace. They know the volunteer system has not failed, in fact has not even been tried. They know also that this will be a step toward war and that it will take the unemployed away from a $52 job and put him on a $25 one, thus saving a few paltry dollars for those with already swollen fortunes. Yes, all labor, church groups, and liberal organizations all over the Nation are opposing this European innovation. These are the reasons and many others. I, too, oppose it.

Dr. Hans Zinsser

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARTIN J. KENNEDY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 5, 1940

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday at a hospital in my district one of America's most gifted sons, Dr. Hans Zinsser, passed to his eternal reward.

Born in New York City of German parents, he was a shining example of the culture, refinement, and brilliance of mind which characterized my neighbors of German birth and descent with whom I have lived all my life.

To his many honors, professional and civil, was added his own Government's much-coveted Distinguished Service Medal.

The story of this remarkable man's last days upon this earth is told in the following article which was published this morning in the New York Times:

[From the New York Times of September 5, 1940]

Dr. Hans Zinsser, the world's leading authority on typhus, who in the last 5 years also achieved prominence in letters, died of leukemia at 4:30 o'clock yesterday morning at the Memorial Hospital for the Treatment of Cancer and Allied Diseases, at the age of 61.

He had known for 2 years that he was suffering from a fatal malady against which the best of medical knowledge was of no avail. Two weeks ago he entered the hospital fully aware that he had only a very short time to live.

Dr. Zinsser spent what he knew were the last 2 years of his life in writing a unique autobiography in the form of the biography of a third person—a friend whom he knew very well. It was published June 25 under the title, "As I Remember Him," with the subtitle, "The Biography of R. S.," and became a nonfiction best seller. The initial R. S. stood for Romantic Self, it was learned yesterday through the Book-of-the-Month Club, which made the book its selection for July.

WROTE OF OWN DEATH

The news of Dr. Zinsser's death made it clear that in the description of the death of R. S. in the final chapter of the book the author actually was writing about his own death, which he knew was only a few months off.

"Something took place in his mind," he wrote, "that he regarded as a sort of compensatory adjustment to the thought that he would soon be dead. In the prospect of death, life seemed to be given a new meaning and fresh poignancy. From now on, instead of being saddened, he found—to his delighted astonishment—that his sensitiveness to the simplest experiences, even for such things that in other years he might hardly have noticed, was infinitely enhanced.

"As the disease caught up with him R. S. felt increasingly grateful for the fact that death was coming to him with due warning and gradually. So many times in his active life he had been near sudden death by accident, violence, or acute disease, and always he had thought that rapid and unexpected extinction would be most merciful. But now he was thankful that he had time to compose his spirit and to spend a last year in affectionate and actually merry association with those dear to him."

Hans Zinsser first became known to the public in 1935 with the publication of Rats, Lice, and History, in which he weighed lice, rodents, and human beings in the balance and found the first two more respectable, inasmuch as they had failed as yet to evolve into political animals. His Biography of R. S. brought him further fame as a literary man.

Long before he became known to the public as a literary figure, however, Dr. Zinsser had gained a reputation in the scientific world as one of the foremost bacteriologists of his day. He was recognized among his colleagues as a leader in the fight against typhus, the plague that perhaps had played a greater part in history than any other disease. Largely as a result of his work, it may be said that man is now well on the way to conquer another of his great plagues.

KNOWN FOR VERSATILITY

Dr. Zinsser was in addition a philosopher, historian, poet, and wit, who blended all these qualities in an unusual personality. Those who knew him described him as one of the most versatile of men, who could converse as fluently about Arabian architecture and French literature as he could about politics, history, and bacteriology.

In the last pages of his autobiography Dr. Zinsser gave the views of a dying philosopher-scientist on the current scene.

"He was not sure," he wrote, "whether the world that was rushing by was going forward or backward. He wondered whether he had not, perhaps, been born a little too soon and remained unable to catch up with his time. * * * Scientific progress had brought as much sorrow as happiness. With immensely enhanced powers of production, millions were out of work and starving. Ideas of democracy and individual freedom which he had accepted as the gradually evolved goals of centuries of struggle were not only being denied, but entire nations were frantically intent on destroying them. * * * At the time of his death he was as thoroughly bewildered as any thoughtful individual of our time is bound to be."

Dr. Zinsser was born of German parents in New York City, November 17, 1878, son of August and Marie Theresia Schmidt Zinsser. His parents were Rhineland Germans who came to America because they loved the things America stood for. As a child, he wrote later in his autobiography, he spoke English with a German accent and lived in the cultural tradition of the Rhineland and the Black Forest, which, as he said, "had long been under the influence of French thought and political doctrine." While on trips abroad as a child, he related, he was taken to so many galleries in Italy that his feet hurt whenever he thought of an Italian primitive.

He was graduated from Columbia University in 1899 with the degree of A. B., and then continued with his studies at the College of Physicians and Surgeons, Columbia, from which he was graduated with the degree of M. D. in 1903. That same year he also received the degree of A. M. from Columbia. He served his internship from 1903 to 1905, and then began his career as bacteriologist at the Roosevelt Hospital and the College of Physicians and Surgeons.

HE TAUGHT BACTERIOLOGY

During the next 5 years he served as instructor in bacteriology and hygiene at the latter institution and as assistant pathologist in St. Luke's Hospital, when he was called to the post of associate professor, and then full professor of bacteriology at Stanford University, Calif. In 1913 he returned to Columbia as professor of bacteriology, a post he held for 10 years, when he joined the staff of the Harvard Medical School as professor of bacteriology and immunology, a position he occupied until his death.

Dr. Zinsser began his international career as an epidemiologist during the World War when he went to Serbia in 1915 as a member of the American Red Cross Sanitary Commission. During that excursion he related in his autobiography "he took care never to sleep in a bed. He carried a Red Cross blanket, an extra suit of underwear, a beer bottle full of kerosene and another of chloroform. Upon arrival almost anywhere at all he would strip to the skin, hanging his outer clothes upon a hook and packing his discarded underwear into his boots.

"Then he would pour a teaspoonful of chloroform into each boot and tie a string tightly about the tops, thus executing the day's accumulation of vermin. Next came a thorough wash. Then, sprinkling the floor with kerosene, he would climb into his extra underwear, wrap up in his blanket and sleep."

Dr. Zinsser served first as a major in the United States Army Medical Corps when this country entered the war and later was promoted to the rank of colonel. He was sanitary inspector of the First Army Corps and of the Second Field Army of the A. E. F. in France, as well as assistant director of laboratories and infectious diseases for the A. E. F.

In the summer of 1923 he went to Soviet Russia as sanitary commissioner for the League of Nations Health Section. He also served as exchange professor in Paris in 1935 and at the Peiping Union Medical College in 1938.

RECIPIENT OF MANY HONORS

Professor Zinsser was the recipient of many high honors. The United States Government awarded him the Distinguished Service Medal. The French Government made him a member of the Legion of Honor, and the Serbian Government decorated him with the Order of St. Sava. He was president of the New York Pathological Society in 1915 and of the Association of Immunologists in 1919.

He was a member of the National Academy of Sciences, American Philosophical Society, American Association for the Advancement of Science, American Academy of Arts and Sciences, Harvey Society, Society for Experimental Biology and Medicine, Association of Pathologists and Bacteriologists, Society of American Bacteriolcgists, American Cancer Society, and American Association of Experimental Pathology. Dr. Zinsser also was a member of the American Medical Association, American Academy of Tropical Medicine, American Association of Immunologists, American Birth Control League, American Committee for the Control of Rheumatism, American Epidemiological Society, American Public Health Association, Association of American Physicians, National Research Council, Leonard Wood Memorial for the Eradication of Leprosy, Alpha Omega Alpha, Nu Sigma Nu, Sigma Xi, and Zeta Psi.

He was a member of the Columbia University, Century, Harvard, Tavern, and Groton Hunt Clubs. His scientific writings included Textbook of Bacteriology (1911), Infection and Resistance, and Resistance to Infectious Diseases (1935).

SERVED SEVERAL HOSPITALS

Professor Zinsser was awarded honorary degrees of doctor of science by Columbia, Western Reserve, Lehigh, Yale, and Harvard. At the time of his death he was chief of the bacteriological service at the Children's Hospital and Infants' Hospital and consulting bacteriologist at the Peter Bent Brigham Hospital in Boston.

The outstanding scientific achievement of Professor Zinsser was the development under his direction at the Harvard Medical School of a method for preparing a vaccine and a serum against the

organisms that cause typhus, the scourge that had taken millions of lives, particularly in times of war. In January 1940 Professor Zinsser announced the development of a method, after more than 15 years of effort by himself and others, that made possible for the first time the mass production of a vaccine against typhus fever of the European type, a development of enormous importance to armies and civilian populations in times of war.

Mr. Speaker, I would conclude with this brief quotation:

But life is sweet, though all that makes it sweet
Lessen the sound of friends' departing feet;
And death is beautiful as feet of friend
Coming with welcome at our journey's end.

Exchange of Destroyers for Naval and Air Bases for National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SOL BLOOM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 4, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE CHICAGO DAILY TRIBUNE

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein the following editorial which appeared in today's issue of the Chicago Daily Tribune, on the subject of the transfer of destroyers to Great Britain in exchange for air and naval bases in this hemisphere for national-defense purposes:

[From the Chicago Daily Tribune of September 4, 1940]

WE GET THE BASES

President Roosevelt notified Congress yesterday of the agreement between the United States and Great Britain which gives this country leases for naval and air bases in British-American possessions.

Lord Lothian, British Ambassador, in a note to the State Department, said the leases would apply to the eastern side of the Bahamas, the southern coast of Jamaica, the west coast of St. Lucia, the west coast of Trinidad in the Gulf of Paria, to the island of Antigua, and to British Guiana within 50 miles of Georgetown.

The Tribune rejoices to make this announcement, which fulfills a policy advocated by this newspaper since 1922. In spite of much discouragement, the Tribune persisted, month by month and year by year, in calling for these additions to the national defense. It may be found, as we think it will be, that this is the greatest contribution of this newspaper to the country's history since the nomination of Lincoln.

The agreement is not in the terms the Tribune would have preferred. Nevertheless, any arrangement which gives the United States naval and air bases in regions which must be brought within the American defense zone is to be accepted as a triumph.

Go to Fort Knox and See a Mechanized Army Unit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. BUELL SNYDER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 4, 1940

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, accompanied by my colleagues the gentleman from Alabama, the Honorable JOE STARNES; the gentleman from Arkansas, the Honorable DAVID D. TERRY; and the gentleman from Texas, the Honorable GEORGE H. MAHON, I took off from Bolling Field at 7:30 a. m., eastern standard time, August 3, 1940, with the primary objective of inspecting Army Air Corps bases in the Territory of Alaska. Certain key Army posts were inspected en route to and from Alaska.

The first stop of the subcommittee was made at Fort Knox, Ky., where we landed at 9:45 a. m., central standard time, August 3. I was amazed and pleased to note the tremendous improvement in the airfield—Godman Field—which had been made since my last visit some 2 years ago. At the time of my last visit it was possible to use this airfield only during good weather. During wet weather, and particularly in winter, it was necessary for airplanes to use Bowman Field, Louisville, Ky. Now, however, as a result of working night and day for over 2 years, during which time over 1,000,000 cubic yards of earth have been moved, about one-half the runways of a fine airfield, which will accommodate the largest, heaviest, and fastest airplanes, have been practically completed. There remain, however, some half million cubic yards of earth yet to be moved before the entire airfield will have been brought to the desired grade. Because of the appropriation of $740,000, contained in the Army Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1941, these funds will make possible the construction of a large hangar, necessary appurtenant buildings, concrete aprons, and runways, thus finally completing this splendid airfield, which is so strategically well located and so important to the national defense. All of the preliminary work on the airfield, including hauling thousands of tons of dirt, has been accomplished by the local authorities by using a minimum of appropriated Air Corps funds, thus releasing the $740,000 of Air Corps funds for necessary permanent construction which could not be done by the W. P. A. When this airfield is completed and the addition to Bowman Field at Louisville, Ky., has been secured, it will be possible to locate units of combat aviation at Fort Knox and at Bowman Field so that combat aviation—particularly bombardment squadrons—may train with Fort Knox units of the armored force and thus perfect that essential coordination of airplane, tank, and gun which played such an important part in Hitler's recent European conquests.

During my visit to Fort Knox I saw evidences everywhere of the tremendous expansion in manpower, in material, and in facilities of the units of the armored force. In many places tent camps had been erected to take care of the overflow of soldiers from the permanent and cantonment type barracks. To house this overflow and to house the large increase in the garrison of Fort Knox, incident to the creation of the armored force and the stationing at Fort Knox of the armored force school and replacement center, General Headquarters tank battalions, the First Armored Division, and other units, it will be necessary to build more than 350 temporary buildings of the cantonment type. I am informed that the lay-out plan for these buildings has been approved, that proposals for bids have been circulated, and it is hoped to let necessary contracts in the near future. Contracts will contain the proviso that these buildings must be completed within 90 days after contracts are awarded.

I was informed that shortly it was expected that there will be stationed at Fort Knox some 15,000 to 18,000 troops of the armored force.

The intensity of training activities now in progress at Fort Knox was reminiscent of the scenes of 1917. I was impressed by one outstanding difference, however—the much faster tempo of this modern tank center.

It has been necessary to build temporary barracks for the following units and installations: First Armored Regiment (L), Sixty-ninth Armored Regiment (M), Sixth Infantry (armored), Twelfth Observation Squadron, Forty-seventh Signal Company, Armored Force School and Replacement Center—which includes radio, motor, and other schools—Quartermaster, Ordnance, and Medical Detachment units; additional hospital technical buildings, Quartermaster, and Ordnance maintenance shops and warehouses.

I found that in order to house the additional hospital facilities which are required, about one-third of the permanent barracks of the First Armored Regiment (L) will be preempted for hospital ward space. This procedure is in accord with present policies of the War Department to utilize existing structures for hospitals without building additional permanent buildings at this time. The enlisted men displaced will be housed in temporary cantonment-type barracks to be built nearby.

Also, it has been necessary to build of temporary construction a cantonment to house approximately 2,000 W. P. A. workers who are transported by rail from western Kentucky

to Fort Knox for work on Federal and State projects. The cost of transportation and of meals while at Fort Knox is borne by the W. P. A. workers, who return home with a substantial check in their pockets as pay for their labor. These cantonment barracks will be available for troops when the necessity for use of W. P. A. workers in large quantity has ceased.

I wish to comment particularly on the employment of W. P. A. workers at Fort Knox. I found that W. P. A. workers were operating a large rock quarry on the reservation which is the sine qua non of the comparatively low cost of Fort Knox construction projects. By working day and night shifts, this quarry is providing, at a minimum of expense, all of the rock used in the runways and aprons of the airfield, on the roadways, in motor vehicle parks, and in the manufacture of concrete blocks and pipe by the thousands. This post has a concrete-block and pipe plant which is operated by the W. P. A. workers, and by means of which the foundations and basements of many permanent buildings and many semipermanent buildings in their entirety have been constructed. I was impressed with the efficient organization, skillful supervision, and direction of the W. P. A. workers at Fort Knox. It is my belief that nowhere is the Government receiving a higher return for the money invested in W. P. A. projects than at Fort Knox, Ky.

I found that although the present Fort Knox Reservation consists of approximately 33,000 acres, 10,000 acres are northeast of Salt River and are of little maneuverable value, but are necessary as an artillery backstop. The remaining 23,000 acres are too small to accommodate all of the many activities, including firing practice of four field artillery regiments of the Regular Army, and six field artillery regiments of the National Guard, which heretofore have come to Fort Knox in summer for their training. In addition, the armored regiments and G. H. Q. tank battalions of the armored force will have need of extensive firing ranges for moving combat fire, mortar, and other types of fire. The reservation is the normal summer training place of the Thirty-eighth Division and the One Hundred and Twenty-third Cavalry Brigade of the National Guard. Also, some 1,800 to 2,000 Reserve officers, and some 800 R. O. T. C. students train at Fort Knox each summer. This reservation in the past has been crowded from one end of the year to the other. The Congress has recognized the need for additional land at Fort Knox, and authorized by the act approved July 26, 1939, the acquisition of 51,342 additional acres at an estimated cost of $1,600,000. The present session of Congress has given effect to this authorization by appropriating approximately $667,000 of the estimated amount required. This current appropriation will permit the acquisition of approximately 15,000 or 20,000 badly needed additional acres. With the creation of the armored force, and its subsequent great development and expansion, there should be placed in first priority the appropriation of the additional $1,000,000 for the purchase of the remaining authorized acreage which must be acquired in order to provide units of the armored force the maneuver area which, because of the large number of tanks, armored cars, motorcycles, and motor vehicles of all kinds, and the speed and radius of action of these units, is absolutely necessary.

All construction provided for Fort Knox in the Public Works Act of fiscal year 1939 has been completed. An immense program of rehabilitation, repair, and minor construction has been and is being carried on currently with W. P. A. funds, both Federal and State. Such projects have included work on the airfield, the construction of roads, walks, sewers, construction of basements of permanent buildings, construction of 62 semipermanent noncommissioned officers' quarters, construction of latrines, mess halls, and tent floors in the concurrent training camp, construction of a post signal building, ordnance magazines, roads and trails on the reservation, moving and rehabilitating quarters for officers and noncommissioned officers, rehabilitation of the cantonment barrack areas, and innumerable other projects.

I was informed that construction of an ordnance automotive shop, ordnance shops for small-arms repair and ordnance storehouses and magazines, which has long been a necessity in this large mechanized garrison, are to be built from funds recently made available by the War Department.

Based on my observation, I strongly urge that the acquisition of all the additional land for Fort Knox, totaling 51,342 acres, authorized by the act of Congress approved July 26, 1939, be placed in first priority.

Next to the acquisition of additional land, the most pressing needs now are:

a. Cold storage and ice plant	$400,000
Ice-making machinery	75,000
Total	475,000

I noted that the present ice plant of World War construction is delapidated, worn out, and entirely inadequate for present-day needs. It must be replaced to meet the needs of the vastly increased garrison of this post.

b. Laundry, total cost	$400,000

I found that the present laundry is greatly overtaxed and overburdened and inadequate to provide laundry service for the present garrison. The existing laundry plant will be entirely inadequate to serve the needs of the expanded garrison.

I observed that the United States post office at Fort Knox was housed in a small, old, and run-down building of cantonment type. This building is a disgrace to the Post Office Department and to the Federal Government. I urge that the Post Office Department undertake the construction at Fort Knox of a suitable post-office building at the earliest possible date.

The Air-Base Agreement and Dictatorship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 5, 1940

ARTICLE BY DAVID LAWRENCE

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by David Lawrence appearing in yesterday's Evening Star:

[From the Washington Evening Star of September 4, 1940]

AIR BASE DEAL HELD AKIN TO DICTATORSHIP—PRESIDENT'S FAILURE TO CONSULT CONGRESS SHARPLY CRITICIZED

(By David Lawrence)

While the acquisition of a ring of airplane bases in mid-Atlantic in exchange for some outworn naval destroyers gives the United States much the better of the trade and a defense asset of incalculable value, the method by which President Roosevelt handled the transaction is open to the severest criticism.

Instead of trusting to the Congress of the United States to share with him the responsibility of an epoch-making transaction, the President has decided on the basis of a technically worded opinion from his Attorney General to consummate the deal and let the matter be debated afterward.

This is precisely the manner in which the heads of totalitarian states function and it is the first evidence that the President of the United States is truly distrustful of the democratic process. There is some justification for his belief that if he had put the matter before Congress it might have been filibustered to death in the Senate or blocked by other legislative means exercised by a minority of Members. But to refuse to put the question to a test and to assert his leadership at this time and let the Congress decide the matter is to concede a fear of the minority rule in the National Legislature.

The rules of the Senate in March 1917, permitting unlimited debate, blocked an effort by President Wilson to secure authority to arm American merchant ships—a step which he believed would avert war—but since then cloture has been adopted and the rules permit two-thirds of the Senate to compel termination of debate. If two-thirds of the Senate wanted to approve the exchange of destroyers for bases, there would be no filibustering.

AUTHORITY AT ISSUE

Thus it is apparent that Mr. Roosevelt feared he could not command two-thirds of the Senate for a treaty for the passage of a cloture rule which would force quick action on a joint resolution approving the exchange of air bases for destroyers.

In any event, the Attorney General's opinion alleging that the President has power virtually to do anything he pleases with the property and territory of the United States under the broad constitutional authority which the President possesses as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy is so startling an interpretation that it transcends in importance the acquisition of the air bases themselves.

It is not a matter of neutrality, for that word has become virtually obsolete with the financial aid already given by the American Government to American manufacturers of airplanes and war supplies for British use. It is much more a question of domestic statutes and constitutional authority to surrender American naval property to foreign governments in accordance with Executive agreements.

Although the object in this case is a desirable one—and it is not infrequently that a desirable objective is claimed in Washington to justify any means however illegitimate—the scar left by the refusal of the President to lay the matter before Congress in advance of consummation will not soon be removed.

QUESTION OF DICTATORSHIP

For one thing, in the middle of a Presidential political campaign in which Mr. Roosevelt has done an unprecedented thing in accepting a third-term nomination, it will raise the question of dictatorship in a new form. It will also tend to emphasize what Secretary Wallace's recent acceptance speech left the public to infer, namely, that the President and the New Deal party have become the war party and are ready evidently to go to the polls with that issue clearly established.

The entire executive branch of the Government and the New Deal leaders in Congress are behaving as if the United States is already in war and as if the President should have the power to use any form of coercion he may desire to attain anything he may choose to characterize as a national-defense objective. The Russell-Overton amendment of the Senate has now been matched by an amendment passed by the House Military Affairs Committee, which enacts word for word a statute hitherto used only in wartime to commandeer plants and factories. The logical corollary to this is the future passage of a measure to conscript labor and force the American workingman to give his services at Army pay, if necessary, to achieve defense objectives.

Totalitarianism came to both the peoples of Germany and Italy in a cloak of beneficence. Everything that was done, even the abrogation of constitutional guaranties, was accomplished by following the alleged forms of constitutionalism. The document in which the Attorney General justifies the transfer of 50 naval destroyers for air bases is typical of the logic used by foreign dictators and their spokesmen in making seem legal that which was flagrantly illegal.

PUBLIC APPROVAL SEEN

There is no way that the acts of a President can be subjected at this time to court review, but quite apart from the technicalities involved, the question which remains for the American people to decide at the polls this autumn is whether they want the Chief Executive to take steps of such a far-reaching nature without permitting the Congress as a coordinate branch of the Government to express itself at the same time. The superficial excuse is that Congress might have delayed action and that time was of the essence. But the present administration has jammed through legislation in 24 hours of much less consequence. The real reason, of course, is that the President did not wish to risk his leadership at this time because he is a candidate for a third term and the administration did not relish debate. Had he decided to take the risk, the President would have won hands down, for the trade of the destroyers for the air bases will be approved by public opinion, irrespective of party. Unfortunately a precedent has been set for specific future actions which may not have congressional approval but which a President may feel justified for vague reasons of national defense in putting into effect without the approval of either House of Congress. Thus does one of the most important elements of the democratic process disappear overnight from the Washington scene.

Steps Toward British Union, a World State, and Internal Strife—Part IX

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. THORKELSON

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 5, 1940

Mr. THORKELSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include certain excerpts from the magazine Prophecy, monthly—current events in the light of Scripture, June 1936.

I am endeavoring to shed a little light on the British-Israel World Federation and the Anglo-Saxon Federation, for both of these movements are not, as I have said, in the interest of the United States.

Unfortunately, members of these groups—and I believe many of them are innocent members—are going hand in hand, supporting a plan which is undermining our churches, changing our educational system, so as to prepare the public to quietly accept a colonial status in the British Empire.

This movement is carried forward, as I have said, by the various endowment foundations and by the many pro-English organizations, such as the Overseas Club, the Pilgrims, American-Canadian Clubs, and Anglo-American Clubs, and even the Octavia Society of England. All of these have many branches throughout the United States, and are in reality as subversive as the communistic party itself. The only difference is in that the membership of these upper-strata organizations occupy a social status, which leaves them more or less immune from criticism. However, it is important that light be shed upon their activities, so that we may know them for what they are.

The first article concerns Bishop William T. Manning, and is evidently a criticism of statements which he has made. Bishop Manning is well known and no doubt the walls of his church carry many secrets that in themselves would be a revelation. I shall now quote this article:

[From Prophecy Monthly—Current Events in the Light of Scripture of June 1936]

WORKING TOWARD THE ONE VISIBLE CHURCH

"Mystery, Babylon the great, the mother of harlots and abominations of the earth" (Revelation, 17: 5).

The Episcopal bishop, William T. Manning, who a few years ago had something of a testimony for orthodox Christianity, is now campaigning for a great religious federation to include everything Protestant and Catholic. In an essay being distributed in several nations he decries the "sin" of disunion of Protestantism and Catholicism.

He calls for "true and full conversion to Christ" in Protestantism of all sects and Catholicism, whether Roman, Anglican, or otherwise.

The essays are to be the subject of discussion and questionnaires among these Anglican communicants during the next 4 years to obtain a statement of essential principles, or a platform on which the reunion of Christendom may be approached by Anglicans.

This platform will be presented at an international convention in London in June 1940, to which three representatives from every Anglican diocese in the world will be invited.

"In the great task of reconciling Protestantism and Catholicism," he said, "it seems that God has set the Anglican communion in the middle place for the very purpose of reconciliation."

We can never believe that when our Lord prayed that His people "might be one" that He contemplated that the desired unity should be manifested by one comprehensive religious corporation. Where will we find in the church epistles any intimation that God recognizes in any way the existence on earth of one visible church under the authority of one ecclesiastical organization? God recognizes only the mystic church, comprised of born-again persons, wherever they may be, and God's purpose requires no tinkering at the hands of schemers to repair its unity, for it has never been broken. The unity for which our Lord prayed (John, 17: 21–23) is a unity of life in the Father and in Himself.

If the good bishop is working for such a unity, produced only through the regeneration of individuals, we are with him. A church that is the creation of the Holy Spirit must be a church founded on the eternal rock—the deity and atoning work of Jesus Christ. The apostate denominations can never be brought together on such a basis. Any vast human organization such as is proposed can be brought into existence only through compromise. It would be the counterfeit of the body of Christ, the prophesied federation of apostate sects which is to mark the days of the age end. With such a movement, we would have no part whatever.

The words of the risen Christ recorded in Revelation should be sufficient guidance as to His mind in this age. Here He addressed each of the several churches of Asia and His appeal at the close of each is: "He that hath an ear, let him hear what the Spirit saith unto the churches." His appeal is to the individual believer in respect to His Word and He holds each individual church responsible directly to Himself.

My opinion is that the people should be left free to worship as they please, within the rights and liberties of the Constitution. For anyone to attempt to establish a monopolistic church, as advocated by Bishop Manning, is as unsound as monopoly in commerce and of the gold which is now in the Treasury of the United States. All of this is a part of the

British-Israel plan to undermine the United States. I shall now quote an article from the same magazine entitled "Proofs of British-Israel Trickery," on page 21:

PROOFS OF BRITISH-ISRAEL TRICKERY

If it seems to some of our readers that we have much to say on the subject of Anglo-Israelism, they should understand that our mail is flooded with letters and literature from readers who are taking up with these ideas, and our increasing conviction that this is one of the latter-day deceptions, leads us to repeat our warnings.

We sometimes receive letters from premillennial ministers defending these doctrines, and remonstrating that we have no right to term this a heresy for it is being preached by many who are true to the fundamentals of salvation. This we do not doubt, yet we are certain that these sincere men do not realize to what extent they have been imposed upon by official literature of the movement, or to what port they are being led. It may be true that some advocates of Anglo-Israelism preach "Christ and Him crucified," but it is equally certain that some of the outstanding writers on the subject have no place for this message but preach legalism in its full potency. In all the literature, it is the peculiar "gospel of the kingdom" which is given prominence, and this is a doctrine of the supremacy of the Anglo-Saxon people and their calling to reform the world.

One of the most startling exposures of the official literature that we have seen in small form is a recent booklet by Rev. Roy L. Aldrich, of Detroit, entitled "Anglo-Israelism Refuted." Mr. Aldrich dated the subject with Howard B. Rand, general secretary of the Anglo-Saxon Federation of America, in a high school auditorium in Detroit. Mr. Rand utterly failed to answer the propositions stated by Mr. Aldrich.

In the booklet mentioned, Mr. Aldrich gives numerous quotations taken from the best known books of the movement, showing how the writers have deliberately misquoted Scripture or omitted portions of verses which would have ruined the argument. He shows how they have also misrepresented the position of other writers. But if one wishes conclusive evidence of the fallacy of the thing, he should read the quotations as to time reckonings and the setting of dates based upon pyramid measurings and the year-day theory. He quotes again and again from positive predictions of officially recognized leaders, showing how their dates brought forth nothing, and how subsequent issues of the books dropped these references and substituted references to dates still in the future.

Anglo-Israel literature has been saturated with predictions that Armageddon would take place in the years 1928 to 1934. In this period was included the seven times for Judah's trouble, the gathering of all nations against Jerusalem, the repealing of all man-made laws by Britain and America, the adoption of the constitutional law given to Moses and the assumption of Authority by Christ. We were to see in 1934 the last war for 1,000 years. It was flatly stated that if these things did not come to pass as scheduled, it would be the first time that the revelation of the Sone Bible (pyramid) had ever failed. One of their most cocksure writers, W. C. McKendrick, went so far as to say: "You can depend upon it that every divinely inspired prophecy from 1917 to 1936 will come true at the allotted time. Armageddon will be upon us 11 years from the time we took Jerusalem."

Those who are sincere seekers of truth should accept our challenge to read Mr. Aldrich's booklet and check his quotation with the standard books from which they are taken. They will find that they are following blind leaders who have not hesitated to employ trickery in their efforts to maintain a following. We do not question the sincerity of many who have accepted and are teaching these doctrines, but we do pray that they will let the sure Word of Prophecy be their guide. When the books of men become essential to one's maintaining of a system called Christian, we have reason to suspect that we are off the main track.

I have taken the liberty of including this article, in order to show that British-Israel is suspected by many people, who know the real background of this movement. My reason for inserting these articles is to bring to light the fact that there is a movement on foot to try to establish authenticity, or to prove the prophecies of the Old Testament. We have no need for occultism, or for astrology, or for phrenology—feeling the bumps on the head, and such hocus-pocus. What we need is good, sound statesmanship, that is based upon the Constitution of the United States. What do we care about Moses, and what do we care about the prophecies of the Old Testament? What interest can we have in the people who are trying to interpret these prophecies in order to compel us to enact these mysteries in a real world war, which can only end in the sacrifice of millions of lives. Let us get back to sound reason and common sense, and forget all of this soothsaying, legerdemain, and phophesying. Our Nation cannot be guided by astrological predictions or by any other mystic procedure, for such entertainment is fine in the parlor but has no place on the ship of state.

I shall now quote another short article from the same magazine:

THIS IS JERUSALEM SPEAKING

"Then will I turn to the people a pure language." (Zeph. 3: 9.)

It is interesting enough to find that a language for centuries considered dead, should be suddenly revived and spoken by 90 percent of the Jews in Palestine, but doubly striking to learn that within the last few months, a Palestine Jew, Jacob Maimon, has adapted the international stenographic system to the Hebrew language, achieving the maximum of efficiency required. Maimon and his adept students are a familiar sight at meetings of the Zionist General Council and the Zionist Congress, compiling complete records in Hebrew. Classes were started some time ago in Tel Aviv, and the first shorthand writers are on the staff of Daver, the Hebrew labor daily.

On March 30 Hebrew made its world debut as a radio language, when the Palestine broadcasting service was inaugurated, with addresses by Sir Arthur Wauchope and members of the Jewish and Arab community.

"This is Jerusalem calling" were the words that opened the station in English, Hebrew, and Arabic, and introduced the speech of Postmaster General William Hudson.

In various parts of Jerusalem, crowds thronged the outside of radio stores listening as the radio loud speakers broadcasted the country's first program.

We read in a Jewish paper that a serious disturbance threatened as Arabs warned the Palestine Broadcasting Co. that a national issue would be made of it, if the new broadcasters dared to refer to Palestine as "Eretz Israel." Use of the phrase, which is the Hebrew for "the land of Israel" has already caused the resignation of the Arab section of the broadcasting station.

It is quite evident, after reading this article, that the Arabs did not like the Jews to say, "Eretz Israel." The Arabs no doubt look upon Arabia as their own home, which is proper and right, because they have lived there longer than anyone else.

This article also calls attention to the split in the false and true Semitic ranks, for the Arab, we must confess, is a true Semite.

I wish to quote still another article from the same magazine, which is in regard to a manifesto, which the editor received:

We who have subscribed our names hereto declare that we are opposed to anti-Semitism in whatever form it may take, as inconsistent with our heritage of liberty and fair play as citizens of America, and as unworthy of those who bear the name of Christian. We further declare that any attempt to use the Scriptures as an excuse for an anti-Semitic attitude is a perversion of God's Word and irreconcilable with the spirit and teaching of the Lord Jesus Christ. * * * We wish our lives to be worthy of the gospel of Christ so that the Jew may differentiate between the gentile who is a Christian and the one who is not. And wherever there are those seeking to make the Jewish people acquainted with the contents of the Christian message, we wish to uphold their hands in prayer and sympathy. * * * To the Jewish people we declare: We have for you a heart full of sympathy. * * * We have no part in the stirring up of base passions against you, and we want you to know that those who are thus guilty do not express the love which the Lord Jesus Christ has commanded us to show you.

Among the many signers are Dr. George W. Arms, Brooklyn, N. Y.; Dr. Arthur I. Brown, Bible lecturer; Dr. Oliver Buswell, Wheaton College; Dr. Herbert W. Bieber, Philadelphia; Dr. O. F. Barthoiow, Mount Vernon, N. Y.; Dr. H. A. Ironside, Chicago; Dr. Howard A. Kelly, Baltimore; Dr. Fred Melday, Denver; Dr. Lewis Sperry Chafer, Dallas; Dr. Robert Evans, Pasadena; Dr. Otis Fuller, Grand Rapids; Dr. Albert G. Johnson, Portland; Dr. Cortland Myers, Pasadena; Dr. Wm. Pettingill, Wilmington, Del.; Dr. Herbert Booth Smith, Los Angeles; Dr. John Bunyan Smith, San Diego; Dr. W. H. Rogers, New York; Dr. W. P. White, Los Angeles; Dr. Harold Strathearn, Rochester, N. Y.; Dr. Theodore Taylor, New York; Dr. Frank Throop, Columbus, Ohio; Dr. I. L. Yearby, El Paso, Tex., and many others.

People like the signers of this manifesto are responsible for anti-Semitism, for it is they who designate the anti-Semite and who raise the question so that it becomes an issue. These gentlemen who signed the manifesto must be Semites themselves, or else why would they go into battle against an enemy of their own selection and designation? Surely no one bears any enmity toward the Semites as long as they are willing to conform to the same rules and regulations that all Americans have obligated themselves to do. A citizen of the United States, however, has the right to speak in defense of his own Government, without having his life threatened by those who employ the term anti-Semite, and who are Semitic; and I include the gentlemen who signed the manifesto in that category.

Would it not be more honorable if the same gentlemen said, if they are not Semites themselves, that they are supporters of the Semites; that they believe in extra constitutional rights for them; that they believe they should own and control all the gold; that they believe they should own all the business and means of communication in the United

States; that they believe the so-called anti-Semitic, or gentile American should work with a pick and shovel while the people they support, the Semites, should be lords over the land? Should these gentlemen come out like this, we would know where they stand; but they, like the others, hide behind a screen of deception.

From now on I shall assume that all who use the designation anti-Semitic are Jews or close associates of the Jew. I believe the gentlemen in question will concede this point to me, and in doing that they have also classified themselves.

The so-called anti-Semites, or gentile Americans can then meet this unfair designation as a clear-cut issue.

I was indeed astonished to hear the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] denounce those of his own race of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob for having besieged him in his office, to express their views on a critical piece of legislation. They, of course, acted within their constitutional rights, in seeking this audience; and, more than that, they acted within the provisions of a resolution passed by a conference of rabbis, who, in 1936, went on record as claiming military exemption for conscientious objectors of their own race.

I can well understand the Member's embarrassment, particularly in view of the position he has taken in regard to the conscription bill; yet these people are, as I have said, clearly within their constitutional rights, to express their opinion; for it is the people of this Nation who must fight and die in defense of their own rights. I take it that these people do not object to service within the United States, but they do object being conscripted into service and then sent to the Far East to fight for a nation and for a cause in which they have little interest.

As a Representative in Congress, I have given audience to many people who are not residents of my own State, but I look upon this as a public duty to treat all people with consideration and courtesy—no matter who they may be. After all, it is the people who are the power in this Nation, and we Members of Congress are elected to protect their rights; and when we fail in this worthy object they must, in view of our failure, act in their own behalf. It is because of this that these people are here in Washington to protest against the conscription bill.

I wish to further quote from the Prophecy magazine:

Can it be that the modernists sense the need of a revival and of getting back to the great commission?

Let us read on:

That Protestantism is not as potent as it once was is hardly a matter for dispute. Our denominations mean less and less to us. They represent no important convictions on the part of their membership, and would visibly collapse were it not for their vested interests and the spirit of fellowship sustained by a common tradition.

Yes; all this we can follow if the writer is thinking of the results of a denatured gospel, with its resultant loss of a missionary incentive. Surely there are many churches where the pulpit stands for no positive convictions, and membership in them amounts to little more than belonging to a social club. But perhaps we have not caught this editor's drift. He proceeds:

"It is high time the churches and leaders who sense the weakness of our sectarian missionary structure should come together in a missionary project which is independent of denominational control. An ideal alternative would be for the Federal Council of Churches to take over the missionary enterprise of such denominations as would transfer their present responsibilities to it. It is both logical and urgent."

And why, pray tell, should we hand over the management of missions to this troup of Modernists?

"The primary reason," says the Christian Century, "is that denominational agencies do not and cannot express the conception of Christianity which is taking form among us today. The goal should be nothing less than the reorientation of the Christian Church in respect to the world mission of Christianity. It is probable that the very word 'missions' would have to be abandoned for a more Christian term."

The cat is cut of the bag. It is not a revival of the old-time religion that these gentlemen are desiring. New emphasis upon the marching orders given by our Lord, is not in their thoughts. No; they would even rid the church of the word which implies that men without Christ are lost and needing the good news of salvation. Instead of going forth "to seek and to save that which is lost," they would instill into the church the "new conception of Christianity's social responsibility."

No longer are we to regard missionaries as saving brands from the burning. Under the direction of the Federal Council of Churches, we would delegate them to put out the conflagration by introducing modern scientific methods and mass social reforms. As Dr. Shailer Mathews once put it: "The church should be less concerned in rescuing people than in educating them to keep out of danger."

But if we are to set aside completely the fundamental basis of missions as given us by the Lord Jesus Christ; if the church is no longer to hold convictions based upon a divinely inspired Christian revelation—one wonders why we should trouble ourselves to maintain such an organization as the Christian Church, or what need we have of a Federal Council of Churches of Christ? "Woe unto them, for they have gone in the way of Cain."

In concluding this speech, may I say that the Federal Council of Churches is a subversive organization, the members of which are clothed in garments of pink, red, and scarlet, all the colors of radicalism and communism. It is now well to take heed, for this movement is carrying this Nation into trials, tribulations, and war. No nation can survive unless it maintains Christian morals and believes in the teachings of the Man who came from Galilee. It is this faith that has carried people on, and it is this faith which has built up the Christian civilization, a civilization which cannot survive when we deny Christian teachings.

I have included these articles in my remarks because they are self-explanatory and more or less in line with the position that I have taken as a Member of Congress. No nation can survive that foregoes the teachings that gave it life and security, and these teachings cannot survive if we destroy the Nation that gives the people an opportunity to express and fortify themselves in the comfort that such teachings give them.

We must, therefore, as I have said before, return this Nation to those sound and fundamental principles upon which it came into life, namely, the Constitution of the United States.

Acquisition of Naval and Air Bases

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSH LEE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 6 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

ARTICLE BY WALTER LIPPMANN

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Walter Lippmann in which he draws a most interesting parallel between the Louisiana Purchase, and other historical events of that day, and the events of today.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TODAY AND TOMORROW—THE GREAT PRECEDENT

(By Walter Lippmann)

The negotiations now under way between the British Empire and the United States demonstrate how permanent and continuous, in spite of changing circumstances, are the fundamental lines of American foreign policy. To those who have forgotten or have never learned the tradition in which American foreign policy was formed, it may seem novel and therefore surprising for the United States to negotiate an understanding with Britain in the midst of a great imperialistic revolutionary war. But as a matter of historic fact the basic foreign policy of the United States, which gave this hemisphere a century of security, independence, and freedom, was shaped by just such understandings with Great Britain during the great wars of Napoleon and the threatened wars of the despotic Holy Alliance.

Jefferson, Madison, and Monroe would have recognized these negotiations as a continuation of their own, as dictated by the same necessity, as actuated by the same vital interests, as inspired by the same instinct of self-preservation. The negotiations between Jefferson and the government of Pitt which preceded the Louisiana Purchase and the negotiations between Monroe and Canning which led to the Monroe Doctrine were two decisive chapters in the same story which is now continued in the negotiations between Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Churchill.

The analogy is not apparent and superficial. It is real and it is organic. The foundations of our foreign policy were laid by necessity in the tremendous upheaval of the Napoleonic era. That same foreign policy is being developed by necessity in the tremendous upheaval of our own era.

On February 15, 1798, while Great Britain was at war with the revolutionary imperialism of Napoleon Bonaparte, the American Minister in London had a conversation with Lord Grenville in which he learned that Napoleon might obtain control of Spain, and through Spain of "the resources of South America." Shortly afterward it was learned that Spain had secretly ceded to Napoleon the great region of the Mississippi Valley known as Louisiana. When Jefferson became President he took the position that while the United States could tolerate Spanish possession of this territory because Spain was "feeble" and pacific, it could not tolerate its possession by Napoleonic France because of "the impetuosity of her temper, the energy and restlessness of her character."

He then went on to say that "the day that France takes possession of New Orleans fixes the sentence which is to retain her forever within her low-water mark. It seals the union of the two nations who, in conjunction, can maintain exclusive possession of the ocean. From that moment we must marry ourselves to the British fleet and Nation. * * * This is not a state of things we seek or desire. It is one which this measure, if adopted by France, forces on us as necessary as any other cause, by the laws of nature, brings on its necessary effect."

The Louisiana crisis was settled by purchase and not by war. It was settled that way because Napoleon lost command of the seas and could not, therefore, maintain his empire in this hemisphere. But Jefferson, unlike the latter-day isolationists who cite his words without studying his acts, had no illusions on three fundamental points. The first was that revolutionary imperialism must not be allowed to establish itself on this side of the Atlantic. The second was that this could be prevented only by Anglo-American control of the ocean. The third was that to preserve the "exclusive possession of the ocean" he would, if necessary, "marry ourselves to the British Fleet and nation." Jefferson took this position on April 18, 1802; 13 months earlier in his first inaugural he had coined the historic phrase warning us against "entangling alliances."

It is evident that in his mind an understanding with Great Britain for the joint control of the Atlantic ocean was not an entanglement but the very basic condition of American security. So what Mr. Willkie said at Elwood about our relations with Britain and what Mr. Roosevelt is doing in his negotiations with Mr. Churchill is in the direct line of descent from the founders of American independence.

That Jefferson's views about Anglo-American relations at the time of the Louisiana Purchase were no passing notion is clear from the fact that 20 years later, in the crisis which led to the announcement of the Monroe Doctrine, he repeated them no less emphatically.

In 1823 the Continent of Europe was in the grip of four despotic monarchies bound together in the so-called Holy Alliance. They turned their eyes to this hemisphere. The Russian Empire began to move down the west coast from its base in Alaska; the other European despotisms began to formulate plans to reconquer Spanish America, which had rebelled and become independent. Again as in the case of Louisiana 25 years earlier Great Britain and the United States began to negotiate and in these negotiations between Canning and our minister in London, Benjamin Rush, an agreement was reached to forbid, if necessary by war, the conquest of Spanish America. The agreement was reached in London on August 23, 1823, and the papers were received in Washington by Secretary Adams and President Monroe on October 9, 1823. A week later the President sent the papers to Jefferson, asking his advice.

Within a week Jefferson replied, urging acceptance, and said that while "Europe is laboring to become the domicile of despotism, our endeavor should surely be to make our hemisphere that of freedom. One nation, most of all, could disturb us in this pursuit; she now offers to lead, aid, and accompany us in it. By acceding to her proposition, we detach her from the bands, bring her mighty weight into the scale of free government, and emancipate a continent at one stroke, which might otherwise linger long in doubt and difficulty. Great Britain is the nation which can do us the most harm of any one, or all on earth; and with her on our side we need not fear the whole world. With her, then we should most sedulously cherish a cordial friendship; and nothing would tend more to knit our affections than to be fighting once more, side by side, in the same cause. Not that I would purchase even her amity at the price of taking part in her wars.

"But the war in which the present proposition might engage us, should that be its consequence, is not her war but ours. Its object is to introduce and establish the American system, of keeping out of our land all foreign powers—of never permitting those of Europe to intermeddle with the affairs of our nations. It is to maintain our own principle, not to depart from it. And if, to facilitate this, we can effect a division in the body of the European powers, and draw over to our side its most powerful member, surely we should do it. But I am clearly of Mr. Canning's opinion that it will prevent instead of provoking war. With Great Britain withdrawn from their scale and shifted into that of our two continents, all Europe combined would not undertake such a war, for how would they propose to get at either enemy without superior fleets? Nor is the occasion to be slighted which this proposition offers of declaring our protest against the atrocious violations of the rights of nations by the interference of anyone in the internal affairs of another, so flagitiously begun by Bonaparte, and now continued by the equally lawless alliance calling itself holy."

At President Monroe's request, Jefferson sent the papers to Madison, who replied on November 1, saying, "I return the letter of the President. The correspondence from abroad has gone back to him, as you desired. I have expressed to him my concurrence in the policy of meeting the advances of the British Government, having an eye to the forms of our Constitution in every step in the road to war. With the British power and Navy combined with our own, we have nothing to fear from the rest of the world; and in the great struggle of the epoch between liberty and despotism, we owe it to ourselves to sustain the former, in this hemisphere at least."

It was after this consultation by the most eminent living Americans, themselves the founders of the Republic, that the Monroe Doctrine was promulgated one month later in the form, be it noted, not of a treaty but of a Presidential declaration. Yet there are men today who dare to charge that a negotiation based upon recognition of the vital connection between American security and British sea power is "un-American."

But Mr. Roosevelt need have no doubts and Mr. Willkie need have no doubts that they are walking on the main highway of American foreign policy and that they are following the greatest precedents of American history.

As We Remember Him

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN J. KENNEDY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 6, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW YORK TIMES

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, it was refreshing to find the following editorial in the columns of the country's leading newspaper. Too often the passing of a great personage receives scant notice from the press.

[From the New York Times of September 6, 1940]

AS WE REMEMBER HIM

Hans Zinsser was of fine old German stock. His father, August Zinsser, none the less German because he found in America (as his son said) "the promised land where there was still room for all the free spirits whose wings were clipped at home by bigotry and political oppression," was a true child of the idealistic tradition of the old Fatherland. Hans Zinsser, who in boyhood spoke English with a German accent, carried the tradition on, wedding it to science, finding it in no way inconsistent with America's democratic hope. His scientific achievements won him respect among his colleagues long before the general public heard of him. He was a bacteriologist who went where the bacteria lived, risking with philosophical composure the ugly death from which he was trying to save others. In the laboratory and out his findings were regarded as sound by those who know about such things.

But he was more than a man who got things done. Aside from his output, scientific and literary, he was a remarkable individual. His friends knew this at first hand, his readers at a very good second hand. His two popular volumes, "Rats, Lice, and History" and this summer's disguised autobiography, "As I Remember Him," were abiding literature because they were such good, offhand, honest, humorous talk. The whimsicality that he couldn't indulge in his scientific reports came out in them like a wandering breeze over hay fields after a late mowing.

Much has been made, and should be made, of the gay and wistful courage with which he faced the knowledge that he would surely die. There is brave comfort in As I Remember Him for those who fear sickness and the final pangs. "From now on," he wrote, knowing that the doctors could do nothing for him, instead of being saddened, he found—to his own delighted astonishment—that his sensitiveness to the simplest experiences, even for things that in other years he might hardly have noticed, was infinitely enhanced. Perhaps this wasn't courage, after all. Perhaps it was a discovery of a principle, open to a man who had rebelled against many things, great and small, but never against Nature herself. It was at least a nobler, a more heroic, attitude than that of the fanatic rushing to some flaming death, ignorant of its meaning, because a leader sent him.

Hans Zinsser's life and death have profound meaning at this very time. Those Americans who, like him, have German blood in their

veins may well ponder the meaning. For here was a man molded in the Teutonic culture whose interests were universal, whose pity was in acts rather than words, who loved wine and gayety and women's smiles, who did not aspire to power but to understanding. There are such men in Germany still, let us not doubt; there are such German souls waiting to be born; out of them can still come a Germany that will be humane and splendid.

Ambassador Joseph P. Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS T. MALONEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 6 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

EDITORIAL FROM BOSTON POST

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be published in the Appendix of the RECORD editorial comment referring to Ambassador Joseph P. Kennedy.

I am asking the insertion of this comment, which appeared in the Sunday Post, of Boston, on August 25, 1940, because of my own admiration for our Ambassador to Great Britain and because the editorial comment refers, in part, to the outstanding abilities and accomplishments of this distinguished gentleman, who has represented our Government so well on this important assignment, as he has served his Government so well in other extremely important places.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Boston Post of August 25, 1940]

KENNEDY'S PLACE IS HERE

Many people are beginning to wonder why it is that Ambassadors Bullitt, Biddle, Cudahy, and Phillips are safely in America while Joseph P. Kennedy, one of the outstanding Americans of our time, is still kept in the obviously perilous post at London.

Of course, we all realize that Mr. Kennedy's job is one of the most important in the world at present.

He is tremendously active in reporting trends, opinions, and other vital information to the President. He does an ocean of work which does not show publicly.

But affairs have taken such a turn that the President himself is directing our relationships with England and her dominions.

The recent conference with Prime Minister Mackenzie King of Canada shows this. The speech of Prime Minister Winston Churchill before the House of Commons openly reveals the fact that he had been in constant and perhaps direct touch with the President.

Two facts are evident lately. One is that Ambassador Kennedy would naturally like to come home. After all, he is a devoted family man and his wife and children are here in this country. Secondly, the original task for which he was sent to England has long since been supplanted by newer labors.

England is now a nation in a state of siege. One of the most important things to be reported to Washington is the result of the actual fighting.

We have sent over a large and sagacious delegation of naval and military men for just this purpose.

With this duty being cared for by the men who have made a life study of it, and the President himself attending to the important details of diplomatic relations, it is about time that Ambassador Kennedy was brought home to extend his talents to the utterly vital problem of national preparedness.

In Washington, we have a committee of high industrial leaders, called to the service of their country to shape the defense program. Knudsen, Stettinius, and the rest are engaged in a task gargantuan in its proportions. It involves billions of our dollars and requires speed, decision, and cooperation.

The present set-up has the President himself acting as coordinator of the work.

But, surely, no American wants to see Mr. Roosevelt risking his health in trying to accomplish all these tremendous tasks.

The hours are not long enough, nor the days, for a President to do all of these jobs. For a long time we have heard that the physical demands upon the Presidency, even in times of peace, are superhuman.

Many trace the illness of Wilson, the deaths of Harding and Coolidge to overwork in the White House.

This job of coordination should be done by a man who has the keenness and the experience, and he should do nothing else.

There is no one man in the country as well fitted and potentially able in such a position as Ambassador Kennedy.

He has been the Hercules of the Roosevelt administration.

The jobs that none of the brain trust could handle were given to him. He is used to vast transactions and quick decisions. He has tackled the securities problem, the maritime problem, and diplomatic relations with England in quick succession. His success has been phenomenal, and now he should go to a bigger field or should be given a rest. * * *

Kennedy has no place in the path of bombs and the "blitzkrieg." He is worthy of higher honors—fuller recognition.

Compulsory Military Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE S. WILLIAMS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 6, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM WILMINGTON (DEL.) MORNING NEWS

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wilmington (Del.) Morning News:

[From the Wilmington (Del.) Morning News of September 5, 1940]

BEHIND THE DRAFT BILL

Opponents of conscription in the House are under no illusions about the possibility of defeating the measure. They expect to be defeated on the final vote, and they frankly say so. Since that is their attitude, they almost certainly will be in a minority when the test comes.

Realities are realities, and opponents of the draft are not to be too sharply criticized for facing them. Nevertheless, they have an opportunity in the debate in the House to pose some questions that should be answered before the bill is passed.

One such question could be based on the point made by William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, in his Labor Day speech at Denver. Mr. Green declared that it is the duty of the President to "send a message to Congress stating the manpower needs of the Nation's military forces, and recommending a definite program to fill those needs." He added that the Federation will oppose conscription until it can be shown that the voluntary system of enlistment has failed.

This is to say that Congress is about to pass a selective-service act without ever having heard from the President how many men are wanted for defense. Army heads have furnished some information, it is true, but when figures varying from 1,200,000 to 4,000,000 are flying around it appears that Congress is being asked to write a blank check to permit the President to draw on the Nation's manhood as it suits him.

Members of the House should also demand more light than has yet been forthcoming on whether the men to be drafted are to be called merely for training or are to be welded into a permanent conscript army. If the idea is that the men inducted are to become a reserve against a possible emergency, that is one thing. If the aim is to merge the Regular Army and the drafted men into a huge military establishment of the European type, that is another.

Certainly the purposes of the administration have not been made clear. What is behind this bill? At least the minority in the House can demand a full disclosure before throwing up the sponge.

Transfer of Naval Vessels to Great Britain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 6, 1940

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the methods by which President Roosevelt secretly traded off 50 so-called over-age destroyers, important to our own national defense, for naval and air bases leased to us by Great Britain, were the methods of a dictator. Regardless of the results of the deal, whether we become involved in war because of it or not, it remains a fact that Mr. Roosevelt showed his distrust and his contempt for constitutional methods. He showed his contempt for the Congress—the people's representatives. He

showed that he considers any end which he desires to justify any means he may choose to adopt to achieve that end.

There is no question but that Mr. Roosevelt deliberately misled the American people, Congress, and the press in this matter. At a press conference 2 weeks before he informed the Congress of this fait accompli, he had assured the representatives of the press not once but three times, and with emphasis, that Great Britain's request for American destroyers was in no way to be associated with the acquisition of naval or air-base rights from that country. Any citizen may draw his own conclusions as to whether Mr. Roosevelt knew, 2 weeks in advance of the consummation of this deal, that he did intend to trade these destroyers to Great Britain.

There is little point now in arguing whether or not the President's act was a flagrant violation of our neutrality. It was. But the President has committed so many other acts in violation of our neutrality that one more or less does not make a great deal of difference.

The important point about this deal is that the President was grossly unfair to the press, and to the public, and to the Congress as well. He showed in this, as in many other acts, that he has little respect for the public intelligence; that he has either a deep suspicion or a great contempt for democratic methods; and that he does not hesitate to do surreptitiously those things which he believes the American people do not want done, and which he believes the Congress would not agree to do.

We are now face to face with the warning that was voiced years ago by James Bryce, who was a great British student of American Government, when he said:

> If a nation desires perfect stability, it must put up with a certain slowness and cumbrousness; it must face the possibility of a want of action where action is called for. If, on the other hand, it seeks to obtain executive speed and vigor by a complete concentration of power, it must run the risk that that power will be abused and irrevocable steps taken too hastily.

The press reported that President Roosevelt referred with pride to the fact that one of his relatives, Robert Livingston, was one of the two commissioners who carried through the Louisiana Purchase for President Jefferson. There was another Livingston, Edward Livingston, also a great man, who said something that applies with peculiar force to Mr. Roosevelt at this time. It was this:

> The gloss of zeal for the public service is always spread over acts of oppression, and the people are sometimes made to consider that zeal as a brilliant exertion of energy in their favor, which, when viewed in its true light, would be found a fatal blow to their rights. In no government is this effect so easily produced as in a free republic; party spirit, inseparable from its existence, aids the illusion, and a popular leader is allowed in many instances impunity—and sometimes is rewarded with applause—for acts which would make a tyrant tremble on his throne.

The American people had better put an end to this growing dictatorship next November, if they wish to protect our constitutional Republic and to keep the Bill of Rights in force.

The Swiss System of Universal Service Is True Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KNUTE HILL

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 6, 1940

ARTICLE FROM THE WASHINGTON TIMES-HERALD

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, the following article from the Washington Times-Herald for Thursday, September 5, is such a splendid exposition of the Swiss system of universal service in a republic so similar to ours that it is worthy of the study of all Americans, and especially the Members of the United States Congress.

This system is really democratic, is popular with the Swiss people, and is effective.

[From the Washington Times-Herald of September 5, 1940]

IN THE NEWS—THE SWISS SYSTEM OF UNIVERSAL SERVICE IS TRUE DEMOCRACY

Citizens, let us make one last appeal to the United States Congress to continue this country as a democracy and not transform it into a militaristic state.

Let us endeavor to persuade the Congress to adopt the defensive system of Switzerland, a true and enduring Republic, instead of the systems of the totalitarian powers.

Let us try to secure for the defense and perpetuation of our American liberties a citizen soldiery, instead of a great standing army.

The present Burke-Wadsworth bill before Congress provides for continuous service in the Army of not less than 1,000,000 men.

It proposes to take a million young Americans from productive and acceptable employment and by compulsion to make professional soldiers of them for a period not to exceed 5 years.

The number of men under arms and at the command of the Executive may at any time be increased, however, by subsequent measures, when the principle of a great standing army is established.

The force necessary to compel acquiescence with such a demand, or any other demand of an autocratic government, is fully provided, once a great standing army under the control of the government is created.

Democracy is not necessarily a permanent form of government.

From the time of ancient Greece and Rome, we have seen democracies disappear and tyrannies take their places.

All that we can say of democracy is that it is the noblest form of government, the happiest form of government, the freest form of government.

But to preserve democracy a people must deserve democracy.

They themselves must be noble and worthy of the liberties they enjoy.

They must appreciate their happiness, rejoice in their freedom, and realize that the price of liberty is eternal vigilance.

They must certainly have the simple intelligence and the common knowledge to know that militarism is the most usual means of corrupting and destroying democracy, and that universal citizen service, in defense of a free country by a free people, is the surest and safest way of preserving democracy.

What system, then, of citizen soldiers, of giving protective military service while remaining free and unenslaved citizens, is the best and most effective means of both defending and preserving the Republic?

What system has been in operation in a free republic for the longest period of time, and with the greatest measure of success?

What system now operates with the highest success in a republic most nearly like our own free land?

What system has been amply proven to protect a free people in their rights and liberties, and is so popular with the people that enrollment in it is sought as an honor and benefit as well as a civil duty?

There is only one answer—the Swiss system of universal popular military service.

What is it?

First, we must remember that Switzerland is a republic exceedingly similar to our own, that it has a free government like our own, and that it is divided into Cantons or States, each with a measure of self-government like our own.

Second, we should remember that Switzerland is inhabited by a virile people like our own who cherish freedom and who have fought for it, secured it, and preserved it.

Third, that Switzerland in the midst of the clash of arms which continually surrounds it on every side has so remained free—and neutral—that its national emblem, the Red Cross, has become the insignia of peace and neutrality and freedom throughout the world.

The complete analogy between the Swiss people and nation and Government and our own having been established, the appropriate application to us of the military system they have found most desirable to defend such a people, nation, and government, becomes apparent.

In the Swiss system every citizen is a potential soldier; but no soldier ever ceases to be a free and productive citizen, residing in his own home and pursuing his chosen occupation.

A limited but adequate military training is merely a part of his life and his duty—his pursuit and his pleasure.

At the age of 14, a reasonable physical and military training begins in the schools.

At the age of 20 to 21, 3 months of active military training and practice is given the youth as an introduction to his duties of citizenship.

After that the field military training is confined to 1 month of each year—or even less—and all in addition that is demanded of soldierly duty from the citizen is that he take his equipment home with him and keep it in good condition for the field practice of the coming year.

The physical training for boys is provided by the Cantons (or States) under the supervision of the Federal Government.

The military training of adults is carried out entirely by the military department of the Federal Government.

Officers are trained in cadet schools, as in our United States.

Service is compulsory, but desired and sought for.

Moreover, it is not accepted unless the candidate for the military honor is qualified physically, mentally, and morally, as determined after authoritative examination.

Those who are unable to pass the examination are rejected, and rejection is regarded as a humiliation and misfortune.

A candidate may be reexamined in subsequent years.

If unable to pass examinations, he pays a special tax in lieu of military service.

The amount of the tax depends upon the citizen's income and property.

All successful candidates are assigned to the branches of military service for which they are best suited, as determined by the occupations, professions, or businesses which they habitually pursue.

So that for the 1 month or less that a citizen performs his military practice in the field he still adheres to the general line of occupation which he follows during the 11 months of his regular business.

There is no more a policy of depriving a citizen of his habitual and sustaining occupation in the Swiss system than there is of depriving him of his home and his family life or of transforming him from a creative, free man into a military robot.

Indeed, the period of 14 to 30 days yearly military practice is regarded as a pleasurable and beneficial outing, and enjoyed not only as a patriotic obligation gratefully performed but as an agreeable vacation.

Nevertheless, the citizens while performing their military duties receive pay, and furthermore their families are aided by the Government if any inconvenience is suffered through the temporary absence of the head of the family on his military outing.

The Swiss system of universal military service preserves the family life of the citizen, preserves the occupational productivity of the citizen, preserves the rights and liberties of the citizen, and maintains the Republic in the full military strength and in the firm affection of its people.

Why should not the United States adopt such a provenly successful and effective system instead of a system so dangerous to democracy as forced conscription in a great standing army?

* * * * * * *

Why should we experiment in doubt and danger when we can adopt a proven program with certainty and security?

Why should we become the military autocracy we are presumably organizing to oppose?

Why should we adopt any autocratic system when there is a democratic one ready to use at our hand?

A popular system, a democratic system, and a more effective system—more effective because under the system of Switzerland we could have in the same proportion as to population an army of 10,000,000 free men to save the Republic instead of a bureaucratic standing army of a million men to menace it.

Let us have an effective army adequate for our defense, but let us remain Americans and continue to be free.

The Measure of Wendell L. Willkie

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 6, 1940

ARTICLE COMPILED BY JOE SMITH, OF SEATTLE, WASH.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Joe Smith, of Seattle, Wash.

At the time of his nomination for President, Wendell L. Willkie was the president of the Commonwealth & Southern Corporation of Delaware. The Commonwealth & Southern is a holding company for the securities of public-service corporations. It owns a controlling interest in the securities of corporations serving 2,760 communities in the States of Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Ohio, and Pennsylvania.

In a radio debate with Willkie on January 6, 1938, Robert H. Jackson, now Attorney General of the United States, said:

"Mr. Willkie is a good operator—especially with the T. V. A. alongside of him to strengthen his resolve to be good. But Mr. Willkie represents control of utility companies in six States, through one great holding company. It is the democratic instinct of our people that arises in the holding-company law. People would feel more comfortable if Mr. Willkie could control only two or three States."

During the Hoover administration one of these Willkie companies made a contract under which it purchased the power from the Government's Muscle Shoals power plant for less than 2 mills a kilowatt-hour. This current was resold to residence consumers in sight of the dam for 10 cents a kilowatt-hour. Under this arrangement the corporation was selling for $100 electric current it purchased from the Government for $1.56. (Testimony before the congressional committee to investigate the T. V. A., p. 5455.)

The Tennessee Valley Authority Act was enacted during the early days of Roosevelt's first administration. Its purpose was to provide for the orderly development of the power, navigation, flood control, forest and agricultural resources, and the conservation of the human resources of the Tennessee Valley.

Quoting now: "Norris Dam was completed by the T. V. A. on August 3, 1936. Commonwealth & Southern was still the only purchaser of the bulk of the Authorities' power * * * Mr. Willkie demanded immunity from competition in territories where he was to operate * * * The Authority suggested a plan for a southwestern power pool offering a uniform pool getaway rate to all distributing systems, public and private. * * * A conference was held at the White House September 30, 1936, resulting in an agreement to explore the possibilities of a power pool." (T. V. A. Committee's report, p. 204.)

While these negotiations were pending a group of Willkie's utility companies went into court, challenged the constitutionality of the T. V. A. Act, and secured an injunction forbidding the T. V. A. from negotiating any other power contracts, or even from carrying out the contract it had with the Willkie interests.

Which recalls one of the famous remarks of the Abe Potash in the Potash and Perlmutter stories:

"For what good, Morris, is a lawyer who cannot tell you how to break a contract which he wrote himself."

Thereupon President Roosevelt, on January 25, 1937, advised the Commission to discontinue negotiations for new agreements with interests which had asked the courts to forbid them carrying out of their old ones. President Roosevelt said:

"The securing of an injunction of this broad character, under the circumstances, precludes a joint power facility arrangement and makes it advisable to discontinue these conferences." (T. V. A. Committee's report, p. 204.)

"All told the constitutionality of the T. V. A. Act has been raised in 37 actions between 1933 and June 1, 1938. In 38 of these actions injunctions were sought, effecting the activities of the board. In all of these suits appealed to higher courts the injunctions were dissolved and the validity of the act upheld, or the case decided in favor of the Authority on other grounds." (T. V. A. Committee's report, pp. 7 and 8.)

Up to June 30, 1938, the T. V. A. had expended $518,159 in defending these actions. It was estimated in evidence taken by the committee that it cost the corporation and other plaintiffs, $600,000 of their own, their stockholders', and their customers' money to prosecute these suits (T. V. A. report, p. 9).

It was estimated in evidence given to the committee that these suits caused the T. V. A. losses, on power contracts suspended, a total of $5,325,644, losses to its municipal and cooperative customers on the resale of power they were not able to purchase, a total of $7,702,000 (T. V. A. committee's report, pp. 65–66).

In all of this litigation Wendell L. Willkie, the president of the Commonwealth & Southern was the moving spirit. He and his associates waged war all along the line, in the courts, in friendly newspapers, in magazine articles, over the radio, and in politics.

"The committee finds that the private power companies have made efforts to effect the decisions of municipalities and farm organizations with respect to the purchase of electric power from the Authority by the expenditure of money, the use of misleading propaganda, the construction of spite lines, and the institution of a multiplicity of vexatious legislation" (T. V. A. committee's report, p. 8).

The most disruptive of these suits was that of the Tennessee Electric Power Co. (a Willkie corporation) and others. From the number of plaintiffs joined in this suit it came to be known as the 18 Power Companies Case. It raised the question of the constitutionality of the T. V. A. Act, and under it the trial court enjoined the T. V. A. from carrying out its contracts or making new ones. The decision of the trial court was reversed by the district court of appeals but from that judgment the power companies took appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States (T. V. A. committee's report, p. 205).

It was while this case was wending its way through the courts and the whole T. V. A. program was tied up that Willkie and his fellow corporation representatives discharged their heaviest propaganda and political artillery. There came a rift between members of the T. V. A. commission. One of them made charges against the others, but first declined to substantiate them and then withdrew them. He was removed by President Roosevelt and replaced by another appointee. And Congress ordered a comprehensive investigation of the T. V. A. and all the charges against it.

This investigation was ordered in 1938. It took 600,000 words of testimony, and made a report in April 1939 fully exonerating T. V. A. of all the charges made against it.

The chairman of this committee was Senator VIC DONAHEY, of Ohio, and the Republican Members were Senator DAVIS, of Pennsylvania and Congressmen JENKINS of Ohio and WOLVERTON of New Jersey. The committee employed Francis Biddle, of Philadelphia, as its counsel to conduct the investigation and hearings.

The report of this committee, and the testimony taken by it, is available at the Seattle Public Library for anyone wishing to consult it. It is chiefly from this record that I have compiled this information.

The committee soon discovered, if its members did not already know, that the moving spirit in this campaign against the T. V. A. and the Government's whole public power program was Wendell L. Willkie. It is impossible to read the report and the testimony without coming to the same conclusion.

"The committee finds, that the activities of the private power companies in attempting to prevent the board from executing the provisions of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act, the public interests have been injured by the retarding of the Authority's power program, the loss of large amounts of revenue to the Authority, the loss of savings to consumers, the expenditures of public money to defend the unnecessarily large number of suits, and the economic waste of spite lines." (Report of the T. V. A. committee, p. 8.)

There is a harsh word in the lawbooks which would seem to have been invented to describe one of these offenses. It is the word "barratry." Barratry is defined by Webster as "the persistent incitement of litigation." It is a charge sometimes made against ambulance-chasing lawyers. I do not recall ever having heard it made against attorneys for great corporations.

Mr. Willkie was called as a witness before the committee, and his sworn testimony of some 50,000 words may be found in part 10 of the hearings.

Mr. Willkie in his opening statement proclaimed his opposition to the Government's public power program, and his opinion that that program is unconstitutional. He said:

"Of course, it is my personal belief that the T. V. A. should go out of the power business and confine itself to its functions of flood control, navigation, and soil conservation. I have always been convinced that the activities of the T. V. A. violate the Constitution by putting the Federal Government in a business it is not authorized to engage in, thus destroying the property of its citizens. It is my view that the soundest solution, both for the Government and the utilities, would be for the T. V. A. to dispose of power generated by it to the utilities at the switchboard. The utilities could then distribute it under Federal and State regulation." (Testimony before the T. V. A. committees, pp. 4226 and 4227.)

This statement is of vital interest to the people of Washington. If we had a President who "has always been convinced that the activities of the T. V. A. violate the Constitution," we would have every reason to fear the abandonment of the Government's power program at Bonneville and Coulee. What this would mean in dollars and cents to customers in Washington is shown on page 5478 of the testimony. It is there shown in tables compiled from reports to the Edison Electric Institute. The figures are for 1936. In that year there were in Washington 454,936 customers for electric current who paid $30,735,476 for the current purchased by them. If this current had been distributed at the yardstick rates announced by the T. V. A., which correspond roughly to the yardstick rates of the Bonneville and Coulee, the savings to customers in this State would have been $12,615,661.

This yardstick rate for retail distribution by the utilities, however, does not please Mr. Willkie. His view is expressed in these words in the testimony, page 4279:

"Question by Mr. BIDDLE. You make the suggestion that your company buy the power at the [T. V. A.] switchboard?

"Mr. WILLKIE. Yes.

"Mr. BIDDLE. Under the present law the provision now is that the resale of this power must be made by the municipalities and cooperatives at the rate fixed by the T. V. A. and those municipalities?

"Mr. WILLKIE. And to which I do not agree under the law."

Mr. Willkie declared in his original statement before the committee that his motive in opposing the T. V. A. was a selfish one. On page 4226 of the hearings he says:

"It is obvious that I have a selfish interest in eliminating this Government competition because it would remove the 'stop' sign from our business and permit it to expand our operations and prepare to meet the demands of the future."

This statement was volunteered by the witness, not then under cross-examination, and apparently prepared in advance. While it is not difficult to determine what the witness was trying to say, the writer submits that the sentence will not stand grammatical analysis.

Before the committee Mr. Willkie was an evasive witness. This appears in many places. I cite but one example.

On page 5455 of the testimony Congressman THOMASON tried to get him to tell the committee about the resale rates charged by his company for Muscle Shoals current. He asked:

"Mr. THOMASON. You operated under that contract for more than 5 years and you bought the juice at the Muscle Shoals gate for less than 2 mills, and sold it right at the dam for 10 cents?

"Mr. WILLKIE. That is not correct, sir, and in addition——

"Mr. THOMASON. What did you sell it for?

"Mr. WILLKIE. You take the average rate for domestic energy in the city of Sheffield and in my judgment it was never 10 cents, but let me tell you something else——

"Mr. THOMASON. How much was it?

"Mr. WILLKIE. That is just a question, Mr. THOMASON, that doesn't have any soundness to it on your part but——

"Mr. THOMASON. I just wanted to get the facts."

Then after about a page of argument between them and other members of the committee occurs this:

"Mr. THOMASON. The power you bought for less than 2 mills at Muscle Shoals before the T. V. A. Act went into effect, for what price did you sell it at Florence and Sheffield?

"Mr. WILLKIE. We sold it at Florence and Sheffield at just the same price we sold it for all over the State of Alabama."

In his anger over the T. V. A. power program Mr. Willkie repeatedly denounced the Federal Government. Members of the committee usually took him to task for this and he sometimes modified his charges to say that he meant the agencies of the Federal Government. As for instance on page 4270 of the testimony:

"Question by Congressman BARDEN. I notice that you get just a little more indignant when you get on this subject of the trade (referring to the efforts of the T. V. A. to purchase the corporation's electric properties) than you do at any other time.

"Mr. WILLKIE. If you were in my position——

"Mr. BARDEN. Your voltage goes up a little higher.

"Mr. WILLKIE. If you were in my position and for 5 long years had the Federal Government do this to you every day, had——

"Mr. BARDEN. Well, just a moment. Let's amend that now to this extent. You don't want to sit down here and abuse the Federal Government?

"Mr. WILLKIE. I will say the agencies then."

In its report the congressional committee finds that Mr. Willkie is a boodler. The committee does not use that harsh term. Webster's dictionary defines boodle as "money paid or taken for votes or political influences, bribe money, graft." It gives the word "boodler," but does not define it. I submit that if boodle is money paid or taken for votes or political influence, then boodler is one who pays or takes money for votes or political influence.

The committee, in its report, on pages 198 and 199 says:

"In January 1935 the Tennessee State Legislature passed a statute authorizing Chattanooga to construct a municipal distribution plant, providing the voters should approve of the project in a referendum. The referendum was held on March 12, 1935, and by a vote of about 19,000 to 8,000 a bond issue to finance the proposed municipal system was authorized.

"Prior to the referendum the Commonwealth & Southern, and its operating company, the Tennessee Electric Power Co., carried on an active though unsuccessful campaign to defeat the bond issue. A so-called Citizens and Taxpayers Association was formed. The total funds used by the association against the bond issue amounted to $22,265.45. Of this sum $20,000 was contributed by the Commonwealth & Southern."

Further light on this transaction is thrown in the testimony of Paul S. Mathis, an employee of the Tennessee Electric Power Co., and treasurer of the Citizens and Taxpayers Association. On page 2667 and succeeding pages of the evidence, Mathis testified that prior to the bond election Commonwealth & Southern had contributed $10,000 to the campaign. After the election the association found itself in the hole $10,856.89. Apparently confident of Willkie's interest Mathis wrote Willkie for the money. This letter is given in the testimony. From it I quote:

"I am asking your company, as a large stockholder of the Tennessee Electric Power Co., for some further financial assistance.

"We are all very sorry that our campaign was unsuccessful. However, we feel that the fight has just begun."

Apparently Willkie felt the same way. Here is how it appears in the testimony:

"Question by Mr. BIDDLE. Did Mr. Willkie come through?

"Mr. MATHIS. Yes, sir.

"Mr. BIDDLE. How much did he send you?

"Mr. MATHIS. $10,000."

Again on page 2688 of the testimony occurs this passage:

"Question by Senator SCHWARTZ. Do you understand that they have a statute in Tennessee that makes it an offense for a Tennessee corporation to contribute funds to control or effect an election?

"Mr. MATHIS. Yes, sir."

But Mr. Willkie and Commonwealth & Southern were immune from prosecution under the Tennessee law. Willkie's address was 20 Pine Street, New York City, and his crime, if any, was committed there. And the Commonwealth & Southern is a Delaware corporation.

But there is a Federal law which those dealing with the matter have apparently overlooked. In the Tennessee Valley Authority Act, section 20 (C), occurs this provision:

"Any person who * * * shall enter into any conspiracy, collusion, or agreement, express or implied, with intent to defraud the Corporation or wrongfully and unlawfully to defeat its purposes, shall, on conviction thereof, be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both."

After his long years of fighting the T. V. A., with all sorts of weapons, Willkie finally sold to it the distributing plant of the Tennessee Electric Power Co. At one stage of the negotiations the parties agreed upon the employment of expert accountants to ascertain the cost price and depreciated value of those properties. These accountants reported a cost price of about $81,000,000, depreciation about $24,000,000, and present depreciated value of $57,000,000 (T. V. A. report, p. 206).

The T. V. A. offered Willkie $67,000,000, or $10,000,000 more than the accountants' estimate of its value. Willkie held out until finally agreement was reached on a purchase price of $76,600,000.

At this price there was more than $12,000,000 loot for the companies, as indicated by the behavior of the stock of the Commonwealth & Southern on the stock market when the deal was announced. The deal was announced on February 6, 1939. The following day the Post-Intelligencer said in its stock-market report:

"Over the week end the T. V. A. ended its long-drawn-out dispute with the Commonwealth & Southern by paying close to $76,000,000 for the utility properties in Tennessee, and sent a wave of buying into the utility and electric shares at the opening. Commonwealth

& Southern preferred was the individual star, soaring 7⅛ at one time and closing at 62½. Elsewhere plus and minus signs were about equally divided at the final bell."

An increased market price of $7 a share for the preferred stock means about $10,500,000. But Commonwealth & Southern owned only three-fourths of the preferred stock of the Tennessee Electric. Adding the increase of the other one-fourth to $10,500,000 makes the gamblers' estimate of the amount of loot for the corporations in the purchase price about $13,800,000.

The committee had completed its hearings, but it said in its report, page 205:

"Immediately before this report was filed the attention of the committee was called to rumors of speculation on the stock exchange of the Commonwealth & Southern Corporation and the Tennessee Electric Power Co. during the negotiations for the purchase of the Tennessee Electric Power Co.'s electric system by the Authority. No facts were presented to the committee regarding these rumors. The committee, however, calls this to the attention of Congress for any action Congress may wish to take."

The committee had completed its work. Here is a comment on the speculation, however, by Jay Franklin, taken from his book The Future Is Ours, page 131:

"Willkie accepted; then, for the first time since his long duel with Lilienthal [T. V. A. Commissioner] began, he outsmarted himself. He chortled, he gloated, and boasted of his success, which was only human, and Wall Street, pathologically, boomed him for the Presidency as the only man who could out-foe Dave Lilienthal in a business deal.

"The deal boomeranged. T. V. A. went to Congress for authority to complete the deal. The Senate promptly granted the request. The House however * * * delayed action. There was a time when it seemed the T. V. A. would be compelled to complete a duplicate distributing system. This brought Willkie to terms. The original authorization was pushed through Congress, and the deal renegotiated. This time there was no gloating at the pay-off. It had been too narrow a squeak all around."

Which brings us to the end of the trail—or does it? Thus far this narrative has dealt with the measure of Wendell L. Willkie as it is shown in congressional reports. But there is another authority, the Supreme Court of the United States. Through all these months the "18 Power Companies Case" which had tied the T. V. A. up in a hard knot, had been wending its weary way toward that tribunal. The original trial court had tied up T. V. A. by an injunction. The district court of appeals had reversed this decision. The power companies had appealed to the Supreme Court. The Supreme Court spoke in January 1939. It spoke, not through one of the Roosevelt appointees to the court, but in an opinion written by Judge Roberts, who had been appointed in 1930 by the former President Herbert Hoover.

In effect, the Supreme Court in this decision kicked Mr. Willkie and his whole caboodle of fellow corporation conspirators down stairs. It is not necessary to quote the decision at length. In its final paragraph the decision says:

"In no aspect of the case have the appellants (the power companies) standing to maintain the suit and the bill was properly dismissed (by the circuit court). (Sup. Ct. Repts. 305–7, p. 366.)

Here at long last is the full measure of a man who aspires to be President of the United States, expressed by the Supreme Court of the United States, from whose judgment, under our Constitution, there is no appeal.

And this is what Willkie, since he became a candidate (article in Fortune for April 1940) says about the Supreme Court:

"In former days the people could protect their enterprises by resort to the courts. Today the highest court of the land cannot be relied on for that purpose."

Some of our conservative friends call this "seeking to undermine confidence in the courts." But of course Willkie wouldn't do that.

The facts herein cited regarding Mr. Willkie were well known in higher political circles at the time of Willkie's nomination for President. Most of those who nominated him were familiar with them. He is the kind of a President they want. That's the reason they nominated him.

Wheeler-Lea Transportation Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN G. ALEXANDER
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 6, 1940

LETTER AND RESOLUTION OF CITY COUNCIL OF MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and resolution:

CITY OF MINNEAPOLIS,
OFFICE OF CITY CLERK,
September 4, 1940.

Congressman JOHN G. ALEXANDER,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Attached you will find copy of action of the City Council of the City of Minneapolis, Minn., at a meeting held August 30, 1940, memorializing the Senate to refuse to pass the Wheeler-Lea transportation bill.

Very truly yours,

CHAS. C. SWANSON, *City Clerk.*

Resolution by Alderman Robb memorializing the Senate to refuse to pass the Wheeler-Lea transportation bill

Whereas the Wheeler-Lea omnibus transportation bill nullifies and repeals the purposes for which subsections 19, 20, and 21 of section 5 of the Interstate Commerce Act (Panama Canal Act) were enacted into law, insofar as they apply to water carriers operating on waters elsewhere than the Panama Canal; and

Whereas this bill as amended and passed by the House of Representatives makes it possible for railroads to own, lease, and operate water carriers with which they may now or in the future compete upon the Great Lakes, the inland rivers, and the coastal waters of the United States; and

Whereas the Wheeler-Lea bill as amended emasculates the existing law and destroys the protection which it has afforded during the past 26 years; and

Whereas the passage of this amendment will result in nullifying decisions of the Interstate Commerce Commission protecting and making effective transportation of property through the great inland waterways; and

Whereas the passage of the amendment to the Wheeler-Lea bill is inimical to the interests of the city of Minneapolis: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the City Council of the City of Minneapolis, That the city heartily disapproves of the passage of this bill, and respectfully requests the Senate to refuse to concur in the House recommendation that this bill be passed: Be it further

Resolved, That the city clerk of the city of Minneapolis be and is hereby instructed to transmit a copy of this resolution to the Honorable Franklin D. Roosevelt, President of the United States, and to each Member of the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States from the State of Minnesota.

Preparedness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSH LEE
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, September 6 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

LETTER FROM RUTH GOBER

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter from one of my former students. It is a most remarkable letter, and one which I believe, because of its literary merit, appropriateness, and timeliness deserves a place in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AUGUST 31, 1940.

JOSH LEE,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Am leaving for Blackwell and another year as teacher of speech in the high school there. Also, have the added responsibility of serving as vice president of the Central States Speech Association which is composed of the 13 Central States of the Nation. Was sent as president of the Oklahoma Speech Association last year to represent our group at Minneapolis and invite the association to meet in Oklahoma City. They will be there in full force in April 1941. Think bringing so many national speech authorities to our State will mean much to speech education in Oklahoma.

I learned much about speech by attending every session of the National Democratic Convention in Chicago. Learned a few new things about parliamentary procedure in the Oklahoma caucus there.

Was in Canada recently and felt the impact of the war upon those people. That Canada's danger is our danger seemed suddenly real to me.

A few summers ago, with a group of five friends, went into England, Scotland, Ireland, Wales, Belgium, Holland, Germany (was a guest in the Alois Lange home during the three hundredth anniversary of the Oberammergau Passion Play), Austria, Italy, and France, and Switzerland.

One day as we were leaving Nuremberg, another American tapped my friend, Mrs. R. L. Jones, of Bristow, on the shoulder and whispered in a tense manner, "Did you hear that Dolfuss has been murdered?"

"No. When?"

"Yesterday sometime. Haven't been able to learn more."

All day Americans tried to find out just what had happened. The German papers told very little. The German people told less, except when beyond the hearing distance of another German. We were scheduled to return to Nuremberg. That night in the hotel, the five of us tried to decide just what was best to do. There was tenseness in the air. We had felt it several days. * * * The next morning as we checked out from the hotel we noticed a number of books for sale. Among them was Mein Kampf by Adolf Hitler. A member of the party remarked, "Well, now, I suppose that this man whose picture we see every time we turn around has taken up writing. Wonder if his book will find any buyers."

That was in the summer of 1934. Just 6 years later I sit in the Senate gallery and hear it said over and over again, "There is no danger from Hitler. He can never cross the ocean * * *," and then they quote facts and figures. One man bursts forth in praise of a certain presidential candidate who says something about how undemocratic it is to draft men in peacetime. As I recall, in no daily papers have I read that war has been declared upon any nation by Germany. On the desk next to that of the Senator who is speaking, from my place in the gallery, I can read the headlines in the evening paper which say, "Rumania gives in."

A young man tells me there is no need for a draft. There is no danger. "If there is a danger we will volunteer."

"What would cause you to think that there was a real danger to our Nation?"

"If England should give up—then I'd be ready to be drafted."

"It doesn't take long to train an army." I wonder.

Here is what we saw in Cologne 6 years ago.

Hitler youth marching shoulder to shoulder, row after row, every lad in step with every other lad, singing, holding high lighted torches, little lads stumbling along but holding torches proudly, smiling up at the older boys, spires of that masterpiece of architecture, Cologne Cathedral, luminous as a giant taper against the blackness of the night sky; a little old German woman finding us, five Americans, somewhat uneasily looking on at the parade. We were far back in the crowd, the voice of the little woman saying, "Come on up in front where you can see." We hesitated; we remembered the "purge of blood" which had happened in Germany just a few days earlier. The voice of the little woman reassured us with friendly, confident tones, "Come on, I won't let anything happen to you."

Memories of other marching youth, youth of other years who marched no more, seemed to fill the mind of the little old lady. These boys were marching toward something, they were symbolizing something to the older Germans who stood along the crowded street.

"See, just a few more years and they'll be soldiers. Yes; just a few more years and they'll be soldiers!" said the old German woman with a look of exultation on her face.

A middle-aged German, away from the hearing of others, told us one day, "The German youth had an inferiority complex because their parents had lost the World War. It was unsafe for a man to be on the streets after 10 o'clock at night, there were so many rival parties trying to gain control of the government. No one was strong enough to have the respect of a majority. Street fights were common. Now all that is changed. Hitler came along. He put the young boys in uniform; he gave them songs to sing. They became a part of something—they belonged. Now everything has changed. We have one party—one leader."

The youth of Germany as they were symbolized in the Hitler youth who marched along, holding high lighted torches that night, are now the men, who soaring above the European countries, are dropping flaming death from the sky.

For 12 years, as a teacher in high school and junior college and Hi-Y summer camps, I've had a special interest in the youth of Oklahoma and consequently all youth. I am for peace if possible, but I still believe in the philosophy my father used when he said to my three brothers, "Never pick a fight. Get out of it if possible, but if you see that there is no honorable way to escape be certain that you are well prepared and then get in the first lick."

And that leads up to the idea of being well prepared.

Belleau Wood, at a distance, was a beautiful forest of fresh, green trees.

"That doesn't look like the scene of a fierce battle. I thought there would be only ugly stumps of trees left standing."

That was said as we neared the woods. Once within those woods the scars of battle were glaring. For 16 years younger trees had been growing to conceal the destruction left by the war. Pieces of barbed wire; the rusting bits of old guns, now nearly covered by drifted sand; bushes filled with wine-red berries; the ghostly trunks of trees long dead, but which, like the soldiers who refused to lie down in their graves, they, too, stood as grim reminders of the death left in the path of exploding shrapnel. The pent-up emotions of international hatreds are symbolized in the many balls which fill a shrapnel—and are set off by the bursting charge of war.

Just as a new generation of youth filled the homes and the streets of the various war-torn European nations, so a new growth of trees had served as camouflage among the tree stumps.

In the nearby museum of relics of the battlefield the guide pointed to a machine gun and spoke of the shells which were linked together at regular fractions of a foot and which when passed before the trigger rhythmically belched forth death.

"See that steel linking holding the bullets together? When the war first began—you are an American, aren't you?" asked the French guide. "Well, then, you have a right to know the truth—those bullets were not linked with steel * * * it was costly. They were linked with a fiber; threads would cause backfire. Dozens of gunners lost their lives because of that imperfection in the linking of the shells; but the manufacturers made many dollars by risking human blood. Finally, when the United States joined the Allies, the quality of ammunition was slightly improved. But we often captured guns made in Great Britain."

Shrapnel wounds in trunks of trees, deeper wounds in the souls of men. * * * That was my impression of Belleau Wood.

The Russell-Overton amendment to the conscription bill will do much to save human life.

Let us not become as Austria and the other European nations who were unable to protect themselves.

In Austria, on the streets, in the cathedrals, at the opera, among those drinking beer, one was strangely conscious of the fact that there were present young men and there were elderly men; but scarcely ever did one see a middle-aged man. It was like looking at an orange tree and seeing only blossoms and ripe fruit, fruit that had been hanging so long that the fruit was beginning to loosen its hold upon the tree of life. What had happened to the in-between ages? They had become white crosses.

An Italian paper can be very confusing when one translates slowly and inaccurately and when those foreign words may hold the answer to the puzzling question, Who killed Dollfuss?

As we had gone from Austria into Italy the Italians were guarding their border. Trainload after trainload of Army trucks, guns, implements, and supplies were going toward the border line between Austria and Italy. The trains were always on schedule. The speed at that time was probably surpassed by that of no other nation. As the train rushed through the forests a shout of voices of many men went up in greeting. Looking closely, one discovered camouflaged encampments of Italian soldiers. Italy was taking no chances.

So here in Venice we were trying to find out about Dollfuss. Days had passed and still very little information had been given to the public. An Italian saw us laboring to read and came to our rescue.

"Would you like me to translate the news for you? Oh, its this article you want to read?"

So the secret was revealed. The murderer had been brought to justice. "Heil Hitler" were the last words which he had spoken just before he died for his crime. The translator turned to us with an expression of distrust and hatred in his eyes as he said in a low voice, vibrant with emotion, "'Heil Hitler.' See, it was a German who did it. We don't want those Germans on our border line."

Later we discovered that the man who had read the story was a member of the Black Shirts. * * * Now they are fighting side by side with the Germans. Something happened inside of Italy. It happened through intrigue probably.

In Washington, D. C., this week, in the halls of the Capitol, I was waiting for the door to open that I might hear congressional discussion. A woman rushed up when she saw me reading a paper and asked:

"Is the picture in there? Is the picture in there?"

Later I learned that she was interested in a picture which was taken of her "mourning veil group." Suddenly there are five women surrounding me telling me that the draft bill is unnecessary. I mention the danger from Canada and am met by a hollow, mocking laugh and the remark:

"When did you begin to think that there was danger from Canada? Germany can't get to Canada and, besides, who ever tried to take anything from the United States but Great Britain?"

Here is something I need to know more about; I appear interested. The story is told. One woman produces a map of Hungary from 1896–1940. She pushes a small wheel, the country moves apart. She tells, with rancor in her voice, how Hungary was broken up; what was hers was taken away; here was Poland and the other small countries.

There came reeling through my thoughts all that I had seen, and felt, and heard in Europe. Nations whose beauties I had loved so much 6 years ago now are no more. Here are these same elements, like insects working at the heart of another great oak. From the surface all seems well. When the enemy works long enough to sever the roots of a tree from the trunk and branches and limbs which they nourish, and a storm comes, the tree crashes. Let's continue, as you are now so ably doing, Senator Lee, to be on guard and outplay them at their own game.

In Flanders Fields one Sunday afternoon we saw crosses—row on row of crosses. The poppies were blowing blood-red in the wind among the rows of white crosses. If war must come—as we of America pray that it may not—but if come it will, then let's see

that our soldiers are given every opportunity to do their best, then success will be theirs as always. Let there be as few white crosses for American lads as possible.

As I listened to the junior Senator from Oklahoma this week there came to my mind the story of a buddy to whom he had vowed that if he ever was in a position to tell the Nation a few things about war he would do it in no uncertain terms.

Senator LEE, you are keeping that vow. The opposition of money against human blood conservation is great, but right will win! From what I have seen in Europe and from what I have known to be true in America (and I sat under the hot sun in Soldiers Field in Chicago recently to hear Lindbergh speak—because what is happening in this Nation is vital to the lives of the youth in whom I am interested and with whom, beginning in September, I'll be working daily—because it is so vital to their future welfare, I feel it my duty to know as much about it as possible), it is because of these things that I so earnestly appreciate what you are saying and doing as our United States Senator from Oklahoma.

Sincerely, a former student,

RUTH GOBER.

Wanted: A Plan for Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROSS A. COLLINS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 6, 1940

ARTICLE BY HANSON W. BALDWIN

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, the article by Hanson W. Baldwin, military and naval critic for the New York Times, appearing in Harper's magazine for August 1940, presents in an intelligent way the problem of the defense of the Western Hemisphere. The article as a whole is so full of good common sense that I feel every Member of Congress should have the privilege of reading it.

[From Harpers magazine for August 1940]

WANTED: A PLAN FOR DEFENSE

(By Hanson W. Baldwin)

On May 10 Germany commenced her long-awaited and long-expected bid for victory.

As the German legions swept through the Netherlands and Belgium and on into France the great American capacity for fevered thinking—largely latent during the war's months of "sitzkrieg"—started to manifest itself. Our emotional pendulum swung from boredoom to excitation. Congress and the public, stirred by the possible implications of a German victory, became more defense-conscious than at any time since the war to end war, 22 years ago.

In itself this was a healthy reaction in a world racked by war in which we have seen the impossible become history. The defense services of the nation have been too long closely held private corporations, their actual balance sheets hidden in a maze of carefully chosen statistics, their assets known only to a few, their liabilities to still fewer. And the sincere efforts of some conscientious and balanced individuals to improve, modernize, reorganize, and strengthen what are, after all, public corporations charged with the public good have been too long met by public complacency and indifference.

Not that the public has been antagonistic to defense. Not that it has ignored it. Not that the administration has failed to recognize the fundamental importance of national security amidst international chaos. The facts refute all such contentions. This is a campaign year. We must, therefore, expect footless statements. But it is not necessary to believe them. The facts are shown in the accompanying table.

At Pine Camp Army maneuvers in 1935 I saw a lamentable spectacle. The United States Army then had some 7 usable tanks, of which we were very proud. Military attachés of many foreign nations were invited to view some of these tanks in action. Four started to cross a dreary, stump-pocked field and charge up a sandy bank where the military attachés were standing. Two broke down. One "bellied up" on a stump, its tracks working helplessly like a crab out of water. One charged gloriously up the sandy bank to demonstrate the might of Uncle Sam to the representatives of foreign powers there assembled.

Costs of defense

	Fiscal year	
	1934	1940
Cost	$580,689,784.00	[1] $1,900,000,000.00
Per capita	$4.58	$14.61
Percent of Budget	9.7	20

[1] Approximate.

Total amount appropriated for national defense, 1934–40, $7,307,936,466.

The Army

	1934	1940
Officers and men (Regular Army)	134,000	242,648
National Guard	189,000	251,000

The Navy

	1934		1940	
	Number	Tons	Number	Tons
Ships under age	84	708,550	134	929,070
Building	47	152,760	77	488,860
Ships overage	288	330,110	235	328,290

The air forces

	1934	1940
Navy	933	1,765
Army	1,497	2,800

This fiasco probably represented the nadir of our post-war preparedness. About a month ago, in the Sabine River area of Louisiana and Texas, the Regular Army put almost 400 tanks into action. It is obvious that the funds appropriated for defense in the past 7 years have not been "poured down a rat hole"; it is also obvious that the administration of President Roosevelt (an administration that has happened to coincide with the era of Hitler, of rampant Japan, of expanding Italy, of aggressive communism) has done more for defense than any other administration since the World War.

But it is also obvious that neither the results achieved nor the programs planned meet our present defense needs, and it is altogether questionable whether the modernization of our defenses has been properly directed. We have got too little for our defense dollar. Red tape and inefficiency have caused delay and waste. At least 40 of 107 naval vessels commissioned in the past 7 years have had initial defects or mistakes in design which have cost millions to rectify. It takes us 4 or more years to build a battleship; Britain in peacetime requires about 4 years. So dim has been our military vision that we have had to buy the basic design for our antitank gun (a weapon still unavailable in any quantity) from Germany, for an aircraft cannon from France. We have but recently begun the manufacture of new and more powerful antiaircraft guns (37 mm. and 90 mm.), although such weapons have been in service in European armies for years.

Jealousy and conflict between the Infantry and the Cavalry have materially hampered the development of mechanized forces such as the German Panzerdivisionen, and have led to such absurd extremes that the Cavalry, which uses almost precisely the same type of light tank as the Infantry, cannot call their tanks "tanks," but must designate them "combat cars." Last summer the National Guard units engaged in the maneuvers at Plattsburg faced Army tanks for the first time in their experience. And last winter a special program of field exercises ordered by the President to bring the Regular Army to a high state of efficiency was emasculated in one unit by a general officer who displayed a meticulousness for whitewashed tent pegs and an insistence upon the "spit and polish" of housekeeping duties rather than upon the more onerous and far more important duties of the field.

It seems evident, therefore, that past expenditures have not bought present security and that the problem of defense is much more complex than the passage of legislation. In the past 7 years the taxpayer has been willing to see Congress appropriate substantial sums for defense; but that done, he has washed his hands of further responsibility. Neither Congress nor the people have manifested much intelligent interest in the all-important task of transmuting dollars into guns, with the result that much has been done that ought not to have been done and much has been left undone that ought to have been done.

II

The Nation has now, however, swung to the other extreme. All sorts of interest—intelligent and half-witted—has been displayed in our defense problem since the Germans marched on May 10. The pendulum has swung with startling rapidity. The danger now is not indifference but hysteria. There seems little sanity in the land. Wall Street (and no matter how you damn it, Wall Street is a barometer of the Nation) fears a German invasion of the United States this summer. Even the President talks about 50,000 planes, more than in all the combat air forces of the belligerents put together. Organizations called "sixth columns," that are little more than thinly-veiled vigilantes, are sprouting in the sunshine of unreasoned fear. We are talking blandly about the suppression of hard-won civil rights in the interest of national security. In early June the Nation—spy conscious, fearful—was almost poised and ready for a "witch hunt," for a repetition of the execrable Palmer "red raids." In seeking methods to strengthen the defense of democracy we may be in danger of sacrificing that democracy.

The times call for balanced thought, sane judgment, and the floodlight of fact. Any defense program must have the close and careful supervision not alone of the administration but of the taxpayer. For the taxpayer, the man in the street, must do the dying if war comes; he is not only entitled to but should participate in defense planning; for in essence defense planning is merely planning for the defense of the citizen's own life, for his family's security, for the ways and things which are dear to him, for the democracy and freedom which are more important than himself alone. But in doing it he must be careful that he does not lose those things—intangible, but real—which he is trying to defend.

All of this is a necessary preface to any discussion of our present and future defense needs. For our defense program must be based upon the starkest sort of reality, not upon bogies of our own creation, not upon complacent indifference. In the past 10 months we have seen the Allies come tumbling out of a world of dreams and mistaken theories; we have read the record of their mistakes, perhaps fatal mistakes, emblazoned in newspaper headlines. The cold truth is, in summary, that Germany prepared for this war, France prepared for the last war, Britain prepared for no war. Today we stand somewhere between France and Britain. Too many of our preparations have been for the last war, too many for no war of reality.

Now, any defense program must be bedded deep in the virile soil of realism. We must get away from out-worn concepts, from the "spit and polish" school, the "Colonel Blimps," the political admirals. We must recognize, as the Germans have done, that the gasoline engine, in the air and on the ground, has revolutionized the art of war. We must study the lessons of this war, digest them, and apply them to our defense. This is fundamental in any approach to a sound defense.

The major lessons of the war are not many. First and most important must be the renewed and emphatic stress laid upon the basic truth that the fighting individual is nowhere near as strong as the fighting team. The Germans owe much of their success in war to this principle and to the failure of their opponents to recognize it. The German command is unified, their strategic planning and tactical training unified, their operations coordinated and directed to a common end. Their fighting machine is more of a team than that of any other nation; there is little room in it for temperamental individuals. Their complete coordination of ground and air has been exemplified over and over again—in Poland, in Norway, in the Netherlands, Belgium, and France. Similar cooperation between naval units, ground forces, and air forces was demonstrated in the Norwegian campaign. Such coordinated effort is essential, not alone to the winning of a war, but to the rounding out of a balanced defense program.

Our defense forces suffer from its lack. Our officers stand too much upon pomp and prerogatives of rank. We have no unity of command, no unified planning, no higher war college where strategic planning by all arms is possible, as in France, no group or general staff of experts who know the capabilities and limitations of armies, navies, air forces, who understand the finely articulated integration of all these arms into a fighting machine.

The Germans, moreover, have had military vision. They knew the machine gun had stabilized the lines in the past war; they sought for its answer. They found it in the plane in the air, mechanized forces on the ground. The world saw a rehearsal of the German tactics in Spain, where the plane was used somewhat like artillery for bombardment of front lines, strafing of ground troops. It saw a full-dress rehearsal in Poland. France and Britain paid it scarce heed; we paid it less. It is a curious commentary too that, though the German air force is the world's largest, it is not designed or organized primarily to fight in the air. Rather is its every effort directed to one end—the common end toward which the sea and land forces of Germany are also directed. Its objectives are ground targets or sea targets; it will fight in the air if it has to, but that is incidental to its purpose.

Understanding the importance of the gasoline and Diesel engines in the air, the Germans have also recognized their capabilities—when armor protected—on the ground. The tank and the armored motor vehicles, infantry in trucks and soldiers on motorcycles, artillery towed at 30 miles an hour have made time a paramount factor in war; such mechanized and motorized units combine the functions of cavalry with the World War function of the tank—that of the battering ram. Infantry has not been abandoned; it is still the essential mass of all armies; it is recognized that in the last analysis the man in the shell hole is the one who must consolidate control of conquered territory. But the modern army that has not a considerable proportion of its strength harnessed to the motor and protected by armor is an obsolete army.

The struggle at sea has shown that for our purposes the fighting ship is of more importance than ever. The influence of air power upon sea power is evident; in narrow waters operations of fighting fleets will be circumscribed and hampered by air power; the menace of the plane must be reflected in greater deck armor and more adequate protection for exposed personnel, perhaps in the development of new types.

The epic of the Allied retreat from Flanders—one of the greatest rear-guard actions in history—illustrates most vividly the fact that, despite the importance of machines, the fundamental worth of trained and intelligent men is one of the most important elements in any recipe for an adequate defense. Contrary to most suppositions, the German doctrine also stresses this; Truppenführung, the German field-service regulations, specifically states that "in spite of technique the worth of man is the decisive factor." Indeed, man must be more finely trained than ever if he is to handle the terrific engines of destruction which the mind of man has conceived. To achieve the impact of material mass it may be necessary in our manufacturing processes to sacrifice some degree of quality for quantity, to build, for instance, aircraft engines which have lives of 30 to 100 hours, instead of 2,000; but if we sacrifice the training of the individual, we shall pay for it in blood in the next war.

Such are the broad general lessons of the war, lessons upon which we must predicate our defense program if we are to prepare, not blindly, but intelligently. But if we are to have a defense program that is more than the blind appropriation of dollars we must first define what we are prepared to defend, and we must know, second, against whom we are to defend it.

III

Neither task is easy. For no definition of defense will ever satisfy all of the vocal pressure groups of this country, much less public opinion as a whole. Nor is it easy to delimit our vital areas. Are the East Indies, for instance, with their supplies of rubber and tin—strategic raw materials which we lack—vital to us? And should we build up a defense organization capable of defending the Philippines, even though we are now legally committed to withdrawal from those islands in 1946? Must we attempt to defend our commercial shipping and interests everywhere, as the naval policy enunciated by the Navy Department would imply, or should we, on an even broader basis, prepare to defend that philosophy which President Roosevelt described as "a way of life not for America alone but for all mankind"? Is our frontier in France or on the English Channel?

There has been no unanimity on these questions, and where there is no reasonable public agreement no reasonable defense program can be developed. But there can be, and is, virtual unanimity of public opinion on hemisphere defense, which is simply a strategic way of describing the Monroe Doctrine, the most firmly rooted foreign policy in our history. The American people seem determined that the Western World is for the Western nations; this, they say, we defend; upon this concept of defense can be built a program.

Strategically, hemisphere defense does not mean what it implies geographically. There is no need for a rigid attempt to defend every bit of the land mass of the Western Hemisphere—first, because not all of it is worth defending strategically; second, because all that is required for effective defense is sufficient control of strategic points within the hemisphere to enable our planes and ships to guard any vital areas and to prevent any enemy from establishing "bridgeheads" in the west.

Practically this means perhaps that our supervision should extend over that area bounded by the international date line from northern Alaska to the vicinity of Canton Island, thence eastward to the Galapagos; thence southward to the vicinity of 40 degrees south latitude; thence eastward again to the Atlantic and northward on a line running roughly through the Brazilian island of St. Paul and through the Azores to Greenland.

This seems like a large order—and it is; but it can be simplified. For a relatively few bases, properly situated, organized, defended, and garrisoned, and with the proper forces operating from them, or ready to be sent to them, can for all practical purposes insure our control.

But bases are the first, and perhaps the most important, of our problems of hemispheric defense; regardless of who our potential enemies may be, we must have bases if hemisphere defense is to be more than a phrase on Capitol Hill. Bases—air, naval, and military—within the continental United States, in Alaska and the Aleutians, and in the complex of islands radiating round Hawaii have been, or are being, satisfactorily provided, though the Laocoön coils of red tape which have delayed construction progress need to be completely severed. Such bases effectively cover the continental United States, Alaska, western and northwestern Canada,

and our mid-Pacific possessions. Farther south, near the Canal Zone, agreements similar to the understanding with Nicaragua, which allows us use of the Gulf of Fonseca, should be reached which would permit our use of the Galapagos and Cocos Islands in case of war. Some similar understanding—in return for economic or other concessions—might be reached with Chile, which would allow us the limited use of Valparaiso in case of a threatened attack against any western South American countries. However, the geography of the Pacific, with its great distances and the remoteness of any great power from the southern portion, would seem to preclude any serious attempt against western South America, particularly if we had the use of the Galapagos Islands.

In the Atlantic the real defense of southern South America must begin at the shoulder of Brazil, which juts far out into the ocean, although the richest and most industrially developed part of that continent—the only part not within our continental purview in which important alien base areas would be likely to be established—extends from south-central Brazil to the River Plate and the Montevideo-Buenos Aires area. Agreements with Brazil (tacit ones probably already exist) which would permit our use of Brazilian airports and harbors such as Rio de Janeiro, Pernambuco, Belem, and the island of St. Paul, should be definitely reached. Farther north in the West Indian-Caribbean area Aruba, Curaçao, Trinidad, and air bases in Venezuela would be of considerable utility in extending our hold upon the Caribbean and the approaches to the Panama Canal. We should at this time settle definitely any speculation as to the future status of Dutch, British, or French possessions in the West Indies or Central or South America by announcing that these possessions will be taken under our protection, if necessary, and that no change in their status quo will be permitted regardless of developments in Europe. Bermuda, most particularly, should be included in such a category, and we should also declare that any change in the status of the Azores would concern us.

Coast Guard cutters, a squadron of patrol planes, and a few submarines should cruise to Greenland occasionally, and a seasonal base might well be established there by arrangement with local authorities. And finally, definite talks with Canada and Newfoundland should be started, looking toward the use by us of their air bases and harbors (particularly Botwood, Newfoundland; St. John's, Newfoundland; Cartwright, Labrador; St. John, New Brunswick; Halifax, Nova Scotia) in case of war with any non-American power.

IV

But preceding and accompanying any such program must be the promotion of political, economic, and cultural rapprochement with all other nations and dependencies of the Western Hemisphere. We must make it worth those nations' while to be on our side; we must make it worth their while to maintain systems of government friendly to our own; we must foster pan-Americanism to the point where general staff talks and definite understandings are possible.

Once political, economic, and cultural ties have linked the hemisphere, once understandings have been reached in regard to bases (and it is important to remember that the first must precede the second), then we can staff those bases with the necessary men and guns and equip them with the long-range planes and fighting ships necessary for effective hemisphere defense.

Yet the implementation of those bases must depend upon the answer to another question, Who are our enemies? Nor can we lightly shunt aside this question or answer in the ambiguous language of diplomacy if we are to build a realistic, an effective, defense. We must know against whom we may fight, since our military strength is relative—not absolute—to that of our potential enemies.

There is no question but that the vast majority of the American people consider Germany as our No. 1 potential enemy. There is no official unanimity on such a subject; many naval officers feel that Japan is a more dangerous menace. Others think there is little to choose between communism and fascism and that we may have to face a Europe and Asia dominated by the totalitarian powers—Germany and Japan, Russia and Italy. Even to Army and Navy experts, paid to imagine the worst possible contingencies and to prepare against them, such a combination, particularly one intent upon conquest in the Western World, seems most unlikely. But it is a possibility, no matter how faint or remote, and it is against possibilities that national defense—a form of national life insurance—is designed to protect us.

Now, insofar as hemisphere defense is concerned (and the scope of this article is limited to that alone) it is perfectly clear that there is no problem whatsoever unless Germany wins the war. For without a victorious Germany, no combination of powers can be imagined that could challenge our predominance in the Western Hemisphere. And there are no nations, or combinations of nations within the hemisphere which could threaten us—even should they wish to do so.

	Armies (maximum effectives)	Navies (ships built and building)		Air forces (total planes of all types, combat training and reserve)
		Number	Tonnage	
Germany	3,500,000	140–180	500,000–550,000	10,000–20,000
Japan	2,000,000	249	1,007,416	3,000–5,000(?)
Russia	4,225,000(?)	218	326,313	5,000–10,000
Italy	1,500,000	318	760,803	4,000–6,400

The 10 nations of South America could mobilize among them only 5 battleships—all of them old and obsolescent—3 modern cruisers, and a few destroyers and submarines. Their combined armies total only 290,000 men, very poorly trained; they have between them only 500 to 600 planes; their industries are in no sense adequate for the strain of war, and the war matériel they possess is almost entirely foreign-bought.

V

The increases in our defenses requested by the President in May are therefore primarily insurance against a victorious Germany. But the character of our defense problem in such an event would depend upon the character of a German victory.

This writer, for one, cannot accept easily the contention that the German conquest, if achieved, will be complete and overwhelming. We may well be facing another Napoleonic era; the odds of victory are at the present writing heavily on Germany—but not for the kind of victory that Washington is talking about. Nazi-ism, fascism, and communism have, indeed, considerable in common, but wolves do not for long lie down with lions. It seems to me to be self-evident that if Germany wins she will reap bitter crops—mistrust and fear by Russia and Italy, the necessity for constant surveillance, and uneasy domination over conquered peoples, the exhaustion consequent to any major war. Nor does it seem at all probable, even if Britain is conquered (an easy assumption, but far from an easy task), that the British Fleet will be surrendered to Hitler. It is far more likely that if Britain is defeated the British Fleet will have gone to the bottom of the sea defending England or will have retired to Canada or other Empire points.

If Germany wins we must anticipate increased power and influence and arrogance among those German and Fascist minorities which are now only irritants within the body politic of the Western Hemisphere. But our first battles—if indeed, we should ever come to such a clash of arms—would not be military or naval or air, but economic and political. For we cannot, of course, escape the effects of a German victory; our standards of living are almost certain to be reduced if autarchy stretches across Europe; we shall have to wage a fierce economic war for our markets in South America.

It will be at first an economic war, not a war of bullets, and it is possible that a military clash might never develop. But we must nevertheless—for the sake of our security, and because modern instruments of defense are not built in a day—initiate now preliminary steps to dampen the effects of any German victory. We must gage our defenses against the strengths of the totalitarian powers. In the accompanying table their standings are given.

None of this strength, or at most an inconsiderable portion of it, is now in the Western Hemisphere. (There are about a dozen old commercial transport planes of German make and possibly of German ownership in northern South America—about which so many headlines have been written—within flying distance of the Panama Canal, which is now defended by 200 to 300 planes and scores of anti-aircraft guns. If anything happens to the Canal because of those dozen German planes somebody is criminally negligent.) And none of that military strength of our potential enemies can be put into the Western Hemisphere except by sea or through the air.

Now the normal combat plane uses from 40 to 60 gallons of gasoline per hour; the pay load of the Clipper ships, for instance, that now fly the Atlantic, is only about 34,000 pounds. From 8 to 15 men are required—pilots, mechanics, ground crew, etc.—to keep 1 plane in the air, and it must have bases from which to operate, with a vast complex of fuel tanks, machine shops, ammunition and bomb dumps, food and water supplies, antiaircraft guns, etc. Mass bomber squadrons of Europe today have comfortable operating radii of 500 miles (500 miles out, 500 back), while the effective limit (and that for only a handful of planes) is not much more than twice that figure. It seems obvious, therefore, with the distances on the map in mind, that although mass bombardment, the transportation of troops by air, and parachute troops have proved of great effectiveness in the European war, we have little to fear from any of them—unless an enemy can establish bases within this hemisphere. And the plane alone cannot transport the vast matériel required for such bases over the great distances involved. There is only one carrier with cargo capacity and radius of action sufficient to do the job, one means of transportation by which the force and supplies necessary for a serious attack upon this hemisphere can be brought to this hemisphere—and that means is the ship. Yet we must remember that 7½ tons of shipping are required, on the average, for every soldier (and his equipment) transported. * * * It is obvious, therefore, that since it is only by sea and by air that an offensive force can strike at the west, ships come first, planes second, in considering the strength of our defenses.

The public has rightly been impressed with the achievement of air power in the European war. But nothing that has occurred in that war has invalidated the basic concept of sea power. German sea power put the German forces of occupation into Norway and German air power kept them there. Yet probably no more than 150,000 German troops were ever in Norway; they were transported over sea and air routes only 100 to 300 miles long. Nor has British sea power, as such, been defeated by German air power. Germany almost controls the continent of Europe because of her land and air power; yet the British blockade still cuts her off from the rest of the world. The British Navy put British troops into Norway and took them out again, with minor losses, when German air power forced their retreat. The British and French

Navies successfully evacuated 335,000 men from Dunkerque in the face of the most intensive air and land attacks ever known.

If so important in the scheme of Europe's war, sea power is therefore all the more important to us, separated as we are from potential enemies by 3,000 to 7,000 miles of ocean—ocean that can be dominated by ships alone.

The strength of our Navy, therefore, is still of primary consequence. That strength today consists of about 446 ships totaling 1,746,000 tons, built and building. The extraordinary funds requested by the President will provide moneys to lay down during the 1941 fiscal year 87 new vessels, which will increase our grand total to 2,212,070 tons. And, at writing, 84 fighting ships of 399,600 tons had been requested of Congress, bringing our potential total to 2,611,670 tons—by far the world's greatest fleet.

Compare these figures with the naval statistics of our potential enemies. The combined sea power of all four states is somewhat superior to ours in total tonnage, but in so small a ratio as to offer no danger to our security. This becomes all the more evident when one goes beyond the facade of statistics. For Russia is negligible as a sea power; her submarines could be, at worst, an irritant in the northern Pacific; it is extremely doubtful if her principal units are seaworthy enough to cross the oceans. Italy's fleet is composed of high-speed but short-range ships for Mediterranean service; some of Germany's ships have small cruising radii designed for duty in the North Sea; Japan's Navy has been built primarily for service in the Far East; our fleet is really the only blue-water navy. Today the totalitarian powers could muster against us a tenuous and theoretical superiority only if their own waters were entirely stripped of all naval protection, and a weird conglomeration of ill-adjusted fighting ships sent 3,000 miles across the seas on a mission for which they were never designed and never intended. Even then, our own fleet, a tactical, unified whole, fighting in close proximity to its own bases, aided by shore-based aircraft, would have an insuperable advantage over a conglomeration of ships operating thousands of miles from bases and constantly subject to air and submarine attack.

But our fleet has certain weaknesses. Most of it is concentrated in the Pacific. The Atlantic Squadron—which, contrary to general belief, would not be a "push-over" for any power—is an integral part of the United States Fleet, and is under the direct command of Admiral James Richardson, commander in chief of the United States Fleet, who flies his flag in the Pacific. Naval forces in the Atlantic comprise three old but still serviceable battleships, with thick deck and side armor but inferior range and slow speed; an old battleship converted into a training ship which might again be made into a fighting unit; an aircraft carrier; 5 swift, modern cruisers (plus others temporarily on this coast), more than a match for any ships of their type in the world; and a torpedo fleet of very considerable strength and mobility consisting of 40 destroyers and 20 or more submarines; and a growing "mosquito" squadron of motor torpedo boats—all backed up by the Navy's long-range patrol bombers. These Atlantic forces should be strengthened by 2 or 3 more battleships, another aircraft carrier, and some more cruisers, and will undoubtedly be so strengthened when ships of these types now building are completed.

Both the fleet in the Pacific and that portion of it in the Atlantic are deficient in mine layers—most useful for defensive purposes—and both coasts should have a larger number of long-range submarines. Greater attention should also be paid to the development of ships for specialized purposes—mine laying and anti-aircraft cruisers, net layers, and so forth.

These are, on the whole, minor weaknesses. So long as our present naval strength relative to the totalitarian powers is maintained—and this is the crux of our naval preparedness problem—we have little to fear from attack by sea. The present ratio of naval strength can change only if we neglect our own building program, if the totalitarian powers outbuild us, or—the final possibility—if the bulk of the Allied fleets should fall into German hands. Only the latter contingency could change the present ratio of naval strength overnight. The other possibilities would present a picture of gradual change, a picture to which we could adapt our own actions in ample time to conform with that change. If the swastika were raised to the gaffs of the *Nelson*, the *Rodney*, and other British and French vessels—and as we have said previously, this can be considered a most unlikely possibility—our building program would unquestionably have to be increased. But we cannot in reason attempt to outbuild the world and to prepare to the fullest against every faintly possible contingency, for to do so would be irremediably to weaken our economic and perhaps our political structure before we even entered a war. We have already taken reasonable precautions against the possibility that the British Fleet might fall into German hands by appropriating funds to start construction as soon as the ways are available of 171 new men-of-war. Our plans are therefore made and our dollars appropriated; what we need now is not further naval appropriations but the proper transmutation of dollars into fighting ships.

And that brings us to the shore organization of our Navy. We cannot maintain our present relative naval strength, vis-à-vis other powers, unless we can build good ships as rapidly as other powers, and this our Navy has not satisfactorily demonstrated that it can do. The reorganization of the Navy Department, partially carried through in recent months, should be completed; design and procurement methods altered; red tape sliced; our navy yards shaken up; new shipbuilding ways provided.

In fighting efficiency our fleet probably equals any when its actions are limited to purely naval operations; it still has a lot to learn, however, about combined operations—that type of naval, land, and air force action which requires to the highest degree coordination of all fighting services and which is the type of operations most likely to occur in any defense of the hemisphere.

VI

The German air force is a separate air force—organized, trained, and equipped under a ministry separate and distinct from the army and navy ministries. So is the French air force; so is the British. But it is obvious that the German air force has developed the use of air power to a far higher degree than either the British or French. We do not have a separate air force; our Army and our Navy control their own air forces. It ought to be evident from the lessons of the war that the type of organization doesn't matter. What does matter is the coordination between surface and air units—so marked in the case of Germany, so lacking in the case of Britain and of France.

The outstanding air lesson of the war is that air power is most effective when used in close and intensive support of naval units and ground troops—in cooperative action. Acting independently on long-range missions, it has sometimes achieved successes, but its record has been at best spotty and its success has been almost directly proportionate to the distance of the targets attacked from the home bases and to the number of planes used in the mission.

Applying these lessons to our problems we find, therefore, need for planes designed, organized, and trained to cooperate in close support of Army and Navy, and a need for powerful, long-ranging bombers capable of carrying out strategical missions in considerable mass at considerable distance from base. Our strategical problem, as has been pointed out, involves distance and bases. Given the bases—and we must have them then—we then require planes of long enough range (longer than the range of any enemy planes—and this is a challenge to our technicians) to cover all overseas approaches to those bases and to guard all vital areas of the hemisphere. But the training and operations of these long-range bombers should be closely integrated with the operations of our fleet, for the first line of defense of the Western Hemisphere is primarily a water line.

The Navy's long-range patrol bombers—great flying boats which can carry several tons of bombs and some of which have radii of 1,000 to 1,800 miles—are ideally suited for this job. But we have not enough of them. The Army's Boeing flying fortresses, faster than the patrol planes but with less range—are also well-equipped for this work.

For close cooperation with the fighting fleet and the battle line are the scout bombers, fighters, and torpedo planes of the aircraft carriers, and the catapulted seaplanes of the cruisers and battleships. We shall require from 75 to 100 more of the former types for each new carrier we put into commission, from 2 to 6 of the latter for each battleship and cruiser. We now have by far the largest ship-based air force in the world; there is no necessity for any great increment of this strength, merely the addition of sufficient new planes to provide air equipment for the new ships we build.

The Army, however, has no such closely integrated and well-knit air forces to support its ground forces. Observation planes are the only type closely attached to the individual ground units. The Army has no dive bombers; the Air Corps virtually gave up the attack plane—a type which it first developed and perfected—some time ago because some of our pilots were so bemused with the vision of an independent air arm winning wars by itself that we neglected the proper development of types to cooperate with ground troops. Dive bombers like the famous German Stukas, attack planes, and medium bombardment and pursuit types should be developed and merged into an instrument devoted to one end—support of the ground forces.

Here, then, is our air problem defined. How many planes do we need? An exact definition of our needs must depend upon an exact location of the bases available to us, but it can be said with some confidence that we do not need and should not attempt to maintain an air force of 50,000 planes. Indeed, the actual requests of the fighting services seem to be somewhat more realistic, and it is likely that the goal of 50,000 planes mentioned by the President in his defense message must have been intended to convey his conviction that our air forces should be greatly strengthened rather than to set any such figure. The Navy has asked for 10,000 planes, 16,000 pilots; the Army's exact requests at writing have not been finally determined, but apparently will be about 11,000 planes. Unless a considerable proportion of these planes are to be training planes or held in reserve (as now seems likely) these figures appear excessive, for we have nothing to fear in the air from Japan, who is a weak air power, and even Germany, the world's greatest air power, probably does not maintain in active operating combat squadrons more than 4,500 to 8,000 planes, and only a handful of these would have range enough to cross even the southern Atlantic—from French West Africa to the hump of Brazil.

The Navy could utilize effectively about 1,500 to 2,000 patrol bombers scattered throughout the Western Hemisphere. The Army should have 700 to 1,000 or more long-range bombers—most of them organized in a centralized group, such as our present General Headquarters Air Force, but ready to be immediately transferred en masse to any threatened sector. These planes should have the protection of a small force, say 200 to 400 long-range pursuits or destroyers. The Navy must maintain the strength of our ship-based aircraft; when our present building program is completed that strength will probably reach 1,500 planes. The Army must immediately build up a force of 400 to 800 planes—dive bombers, attack planes, medium bombardment and pursuit—designed for one purpose, to act as an attack instrument of the ground forces and to be under the command of whoever is assigned to command our field army. In addition, reserve fliers or civilian pilots should

be organized in auxiliary fighter and interceptor squadrons, their duties the air defense of certain territorial and industrial areas in the United States. The total combat-plane strengths of both Army and Navy (including perhaps 800 planes earmarked solely for the defense of such points as the Panama Canal, Hawaii, etc.) need not be more than 7,000 to 10,000 planes, plus perhaps 25 percent reserve, plus training planes—of which a considerable number will initially be required.

For our immediate problem in the air is threefold: (1) devising the proper organization upon which our air strength can be built and achieving the maximum possible coordination of effort of Army planes with naval planes, of both with the surface forces; (2) speeding up and increasing the supply of trained pilots; (3) increasing, not so much the capacity of our aircraft factories, which even today is large, but increasing their actual production rate, which today is no more than 8,000 to 12,000 annually, and which ought to be, at least for the duration of this present international crisis, perhaps 24,000 to 36,000 annually.

VII

The Army is this Nation's and this hemisphere's third line of defense. It is an important element of that defense (we should not make the mistake of thinking that wars can be won by sea power and air power alone), and some of its functions are particularly vital. In the past we have been committed to the principle of a small citizens' army, rather than the maintenance of a huge standing army which can be utilized effectively, not in this hemisphere, but only on European or Asiatic battlefields, where the borders of hostile nations crowd across the map and mass is still hurled against mass. The mass armies of Europe or Asia cannot easily be transported to this hemisphere—can never be so transported provided we retain control of the seas and maintain a proper air defense. A small army could be transported, might elude our fleet or take advantage of its presence in another ocean to establish some beachhead in a remote area. But probably the maximum force that could be so transported—the maximum initial force that could be transported even if control of the sea were wrested from us—would not be much larger than 50,000 men. The transportation of such a force would require 375,000 tons of shipping, perhaps 40 ships, about the largest force that could conveniently be convoyed in a single operation. To supply such a force might require from 650,000 tons of shipping to 2,000,000 tons monthly; in other words, perhaps half of the tonnage of the German merchant marine would have to be devoted solely to the job of supplying 50,000 soldiers. If this force were to be doubled, the shipping tonnage necessary would be doubled; to supply an army of 1,000,000 men in this hemisphere would require at the very least 13,000,000 tons of shipping. Economically and commercially the problem seems impossible; not even Britain, or a combination of Britain and Germany, has sufficient shipping to divert such an enormous amount of it from their ordinary and vital trade routes to military purposes.

We do not, therefore, have to fear the employment of mass armies in this hemisphere; the most we have to guard against is the possible transportation of a small expeditionary force.

There are now pending various proposals for the increase in size of our Army—some of them involving relatively small but necessary numerical increases, others a basic change in the whole fundamental structure of our defense forces, a basic change indeed in the concept of our democracy. In the latter category falls the suggestion, now vigorously pressed, for conscription. Conscription in time of war can be justified. But at a time like the present it cannot be justified on a basis of hemisphere defense, for no such mass of men as conscription would provide can effectively be used in this hemisphere—with one possible exception: If we were preparing for a death struggle with a Japanized Asia and with a completely Germanized Europe in which all the navies and merchant marines, and shipbuilding facilities of the Continent were in German hands—a possibility which we have previously discussed and considered to be most unlikely.

Events do not warrant the painting of the international picture in such black overtones as this. But whether or not conscription is genuinely needed, it should never be endorsed except after careful consideration and with an understanding of the basic change in our lives and our customs that it will entail. Invocation of a compulsory-service act has many arguments in its favor, but it should be clearly understood that its adoption would create a profound, lasting, and inescapable change in the economic, social, and political life of our country and might well retard the growth of our civilization. A measure of such consequence if enacted in time of peace may become a permanent part of our institutions; it should not, therefore, be considered by Congress in this era of hysteria, but, if intended as a permanent measure, only in a time of calm calculation. On the other hand, if conscription is needed merely as a temporary-emergency measure to last for the duration of the emergency, then the emergency ought to be defined; if the international picture is black enough to warrant conscription then the President should declare a state of national emergency or Congress should declare a state of war.

And if the Army can fill its minimum needs in men without conscription there are still some valid arguments for it—but the most important, the need for manpower, falls by the wayside. And we have not yet even had a chance to try to fill our requirements by voluntary recruiting.

What are those requirements? The functions and responsibilities of our land forces are several. First, our Regular Army must provide garrisons and defenses for Army, Navy, and air bases now established, or to be established. This may require eventually 125,000 to 150,000 men, with the most heavily guarded points the Panama Canal, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and several points in the Alaskan-Aleutian area. Second, the Regular Army must provide the nucleus or cadre for coast defense and antiaircraft troops to make our continental base within the United States secure; it must have 8 to 15 men per plane to operate its air force; it must provide officers and instructors to train the National Guard and to form the skeletal structure upon which a large mass army may be built up in case of necessity after M day. And, under our broadened responsibilities of hemisphere defense, it has another function of recent development. It must provide a field force, highly trained, fully equipped, instantly ready for transportation as an expeditionary force anywhere within the Western Hemisphere—to quell, with the help of the Navy and air force, alien-inspired revolutions, to seize an advanced base, to repel an attack or hold an area, until larger forces are transported, if necessary, to assist it. Such a force certainly need be no larger than 150,000 men—perhaps half that number—about the number with which Germany, only 100 miles away, seized Norway. Adding to this the numbers required for the Army's other functions, the Regular Army, even to fulfill its broadened responsibilities, need be no larger than 400,000 men, if that large. Our present enlisted strength is about 228,000; authorized strength is 280,000; a further increase is indicated, but it should not be hard to fill the necessary quota by voluntary recruiting.

The National Guard should be reorganized and its duties redefined. Those duties should fall into 2 distinct categories. First, the guard should furnish the major portion of the forces which would provide coast and antiaircraft defense for this country. Home-guard units—some of them composed of older men—ought to be created to provide such protection for their own localities. And the other part of the guard, consisting of younger men selected for their physical fitness, should be organized and trained in peacetime to provide a field force of perhaps 9 to 12 divisions to replace the Regular Army field force if that force should be sent out of the country, to supplement it, if required, for continental defense. The authorized strength of the guard today is about 235,000 men. No increase is contemplated under the President's present plans; it should, however, have an increment of strength, primarily to furnish very considerably expanded forces for antiaircraft and home-defense purposes.

This reorganized and strengthened army needs above all to be a balanced army, with the proper number of antiaircraft units, the proper number of mechanized divisions, etc. Despite the graphic lessons of the war there is as yet no indication that our future plans have been altered to fit those lessons; there is as yet no evidence that the importance of the gasoline engine in war has been fully realized.

Hemispheric defense, it should be obvious from a study of our geographical position, from even a cursory examination of the capabilities and the limitations of the fighting ship and the fighting plane, is primarily a problem for sea power, secondarily for air power. But it is not a problem which can be solved by any one service alone, or, for that matter, by the defense forces alone. Political and economic planning within the hemisphere must precede strategical planning; the diplomatic and financial branches of government should be even more immediately interested in this problem than the military. And an integrated defense must be a defense into which each element of the fighting services, its supporting arms, and the other branches of government are nicely articulated, in which each service works, not on its own but as part of a machine.

There seems to be no such unity of concept or unity of planning in Washington. Our defense forces are, like Topsy, "jest growin'." Wanted above all is a plan for defense, a military policy, a directive, a definition of what we must defend and against whom, and the organization to carry out the plan.

We intend to spend more than $4,650,000,000, perhaps $5,000,000,000, or about $36 per capita, 42 percent of the National Budget, in this fiscal year of 1941. The dollars are flowing. But is there a plan?

The Burial of Senator Lundeen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN G. ALEXANDER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 6, 1940

ARTICLE FROM THE MINNEAPOLIS STAR-JOURNAL

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, under the privilege of the House for the extension of my remarks I insert herewith an article from the Minneapolis Star-Journal, under date of

September 4, describing the funeral and burial of Senator LUNDEEN, which is as follows:

[From the Minneapolis Star-Journal]

THOUSANDS AT CAPITOL RITES FOR SENATOR—FULL MILITARY SERVICE GIVEN LUNDEEN AT FUNERAL

Final rites for Senator ERNEST LUNDEEN, victim of the Nation's worst air-liner crash, were held late today in the flower and fern-banked rotunda of the State Capitol in St. Paul.

He will be buried in Fort Snelling National Cemetery, the "Little" Arlington created by a bill he introduced in Congress.

Thousands of persons paid their last tribute at the flag-draped sealed casket, surrounded by a military guard of honor.

Mourners included State and city officials and a special delegation of United States Senators and Representatives.

The courthouse chimes were to play Senator LUNDEEN's favorite airs.

Services in the capitol, with Dr. George Mecklenburg, pastor of Wesley Methodist Church, in charge, were broadcast over WCCO, KSTP, and WDGY.

Dr. Mecklenburg paid tribute to Senator LUNDEEN's courage in standing out "against the forces of wrong."

"Today we are in one of the major crises of history," Dr. Mecklenburg said.

"Therefore, the loss of Senator LUNDEEN just at this moment seems irreparable, and we can only pray that God again will raise up more strong and fearless leaders in Congress for days like these."

Senator LUNDEEN, he said, "worked sincerely for that which he believed. It mattered not what the popular clamor of the moment might be. He was not an ordinary politician.

"We might call him a statesman. It would, perhaps, be more true to call him a prophet, a secular prophet of our times * * *.

"If the time ever comes that our prophets are under the thumb of some totalitarian party, then pity civilization."

Senator LUNDEEN, he pointed out, voted against entrance of the United States in the World War.

"Before he voted, though he knew it was hopeless, he cried out like a prophet in the wilderness against it.

"He was implacably against war because he said the poor pay the price of war. He believed in preparedness for America, but America only."

A string trio from Minneapolis Symphony Orchestra, a quartet from Wesley Methodist Church, and a vocal solo by Reuben Holmquist, will be the only music.

Dr. Mecklenburg will conduct the graveside service and there will be Masonic rites by Minneapolis Lodge 19, A. F. and A. M., with military honors by United Veterans of the Spanish War, in which the Senator served.

Gov. Harold E. Stassen and Maj. Gen. Ellard Walsh headed the official delegation which met the casket at the Great Northern Depot here last night.

The casket was rolled behind a slow marching color guard of World War and Spanish-American War veterans and honor guard from Russell Gaylord Post 159, Veterans of Foreign Wars, through a silent, bare-headed crowd that jammed approaches to the station.

Behind the honor guard, marching to muffled drumbeats, the procession went up Nicollet Avenue to Tenth Street, across to Third Avenue and thence to University Avenue and the capitol.

Mrs. Lundeen, prostrated, was unable to take part. She sat in a room in Nicollet Hotel as the procession passed by.

Among mourners were the Senator's son, Ernest Ward Lundeen; two brothers, David, of Minneapolis, and Joel, of Aberdeen, S. Dak., and a sister, Mrs. Edward Widen, of Minneapolis.

Accompanying the body on the train was a special delegation including Minnesota Representatives, and United States Senators HENRIK SHIPSTEAD, of Minnesota, RUSH D. HOLT, of West Virginia, EDWIN C. JOHNSON, OF COLORADO, and JAMES E. MURRAY, of Montana.

Mark Trice, deputy Senate Sergeant at Arms, also was in the group.

At the capitol, the procession was received by a guard of honor from the Two Hundred and Sixteenth Coast Artillery Regiment, members of which stood guard all night over the casket.

State offices, and St. Paul city offices were closed today in tribute to the Senator.

Is America in Immediate Danger?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE E. GEYER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 6, 1940

Mr. GEYER of California. Mr. Speaker, on the sea we have about 446 naval vessels today with a total tonnage of 1,746,000 tons. By 1941 we will have approximately 533 ships with a total of 2,212,070 tons. Eighty-four more fighting ships have been requested of Congress, bringing our potential total to 2,611,670 tons—by far the world's largest fleet.

At present the combined tonnage of the German, Italian, Russian, and Japanese Navies just slightly exceeds our own, but when the ships on order are built it will equal only approximately 2,584,532 tons. The Russian fleet is a negligible one, consisting of many old ships of czarist days and many boats fitted only for Arctic duty or else Black Sea service. Italy has a high-speed fleet, but her boats are short-ranged for Mediterranean service, and her submarine fleet, the strongest arm of her Navy, has inadequate cruising range for service against the United States. Although Germany has raiders, like the pocket battleship, the *Deutschland*, some of her ships have small cruising radii, designed only for duty in the North and Baltic Seas. As to Japan, her Navy, while formidable, has been built primarily for service in the Far East. Our fleet is really the only blue-water navy.

Today the totalitarian powers could muster against us a tenuous theoretical superiority only if their own waters were entirely stripped of all naval protection and a weird conglomeration of ill-adjusted fighting ships sent 3,000 and 7,000 miles across the seas on a mission for which they were never designed or intended. Even then, our own fleet, a tactical, unified whole, fighting in close proximity to its own bases, aided by shore-based aircraft, would have an insuperable advantage over a conglomeration of ships operating thousands of miles from bases and constantly subject to air and submarine attack.

There is, of course, for us the problem of a divided fleet; but even with the bulk of our Navy in the Pacific, our Atlantic Squadron cannot be considered a push-over, consisting as it does of 3 battleships, an aircraft carrier, 5 cruisers, 40 destroyers, 20 submarines, a fast-increasing fleet of mosquito boats, and aided by many long-range Navy bombers. Strengthened by 2 or 3 more battleships, another aircraft carrier, and some more cruisers, as the squadron will be under the present building program, it will by itself give pause to any aggressor.

Britain has assured us that her fleet will not be surrendered to the Nazis and, if necessary, will take refuge in the dominions; however, even if the remainder of the British Fleet, after the battle of Britain, becomes German, our naval supremacy will not immediately be challenged, as it would take 2 years at least for the Germans to learn to man their captured ships. After 2 years' time the Nazis, if they combined their forces with Russia, Japan, and Italy, a most remote possibility, would have a fleet about double ours; however, it would not be greatly superior to our fleet in fighting strength, and we would have the added advantage of fighting in home waters while the enemy fleet operated far from any of its bases.

IN THE AIR

We are 3,000 miles from Europe and 7,000 miles from Japan. Most of the German air force consists of Stuka bombers with a flight range of not more than 300 miles. The longest-range German bombers have a range of about 2,640 miles, which no more than insure their crossing the narrowest point of the South Atlantic without a cargo of bombs. Japan's distance from the United States makes bombing raids an impossibility except by a long flight over the Arctic route, where ice on the wings and other uncertain weather conditions would make carrying a load of bombs impractical. Then, each flight would be a suicide affair, as no return to Japan would be possible.

To operate against the United States from South America, say Brazil, Germany would have to establish air bases in Brazil, build munitions factories, provide oil supplies, establish machine-parts and overhauling plants, and transport a ground crew of 15 men to care for each plane. Such an undertaking would require a constant stream of ships to maintain supplies, and could not possibly be kept secret. Even supposing such a base to be established, then would come the precarious and lengthy flight from Brazil to the United States, with but sporadic bombing possible.

ON THE LAND

The maximum initial expeditionary force that could be transported against the United States, even if control of the seas were wrested from us, would not be much larger than 50,000 men. The transportation of such a force would require 375,000 tons of shipping, perhaps 40 ships, about the largest force that could be conveniently convoyed in a single operation. To supply such a force would require from 650,000 tons of shipping to 2,000,000 tons monthly; in other words, perhaps half the tonnage of the German merchant marine would have to be devoted solely to the job of supplying 50,000 soldiers. If this force were doubled, the shipping tonnage necessary would be doubled; to supply an army of 1,000,000 men in this hemisphere would require at the very least 13,000,000 tons of shipping. Economically and commercially, the problem seems impossible; not even Britain, or a combination of Britain and Germany, has sufficient shipping to divert such an enormous amount of it from their ordinary and vital trade routes to military purposes.

Other factors detering an expeditionary force are the difficulty of landing troops under fire, our coast defenses, the superiority of shore-based aircraft over aircraft carrier planes, the necessity confronting any invader of clearing away any harbor mines which have been laid, the fact, as Major General Hagood points out, that there are not more than five harbors in the United States at which an enemy could find the harbor equipment necessary to unload the huge artillery, the great combat tanks, the vast amount of ammunition for the artillery, and the other implements of modern warfare. Finally, after all the difficulties of landing, there is the problem of facing a fresh United States Army, fighting on familiar terrain, and backed by an unlimited amount of supplies and ammunition.

The difficulty of attack against the United States does not make necessary a large United States Army. For a regular army to make our continental bases within the United States secure we need an army of, at the outside, 400,000 men. Then to garrison our Army, Navy, and air bases, now established and to be established, we need 130,000 men. In addition, for a permanent expeditionary force, ready at any time to move to any danger spot in the Western Hemisphere, we need a force of not more than 150,000 men. This would mean a grant total of about 680,000 men for the most adequate hemisphere defense.

Today our National Guard and Regular Army, between them, total approximately 675,000 men. We have another 107,000 Reserve officers. Altogether we have over a hundred thousand more men in our armed forces than is adequate for secure national and hemisphere defense; and yet there is proposed calling 2,000,000 or 3,000,000 more men into the Army because our country is said to be inadequately defended.

It is true that many of the men who are in our armed forces are not adequately trained, but to attempt to strengthen our defenses by conscripting more men into the Army, rather than by training thoroughly the establishment that we already possess, seems extremely foolish and dangerous proceedure.

Many have been the "ifs" and "buts" of the alarmists who see America invaded within the month. Never have their arguments been based on reality, but rather they have frightened their fellows by painting them pictures of the future which can only be believed if you play the same rules of the game that they do; that is, to grant the validity of every "if" and "but" that they utter. The time has come when Americans must use their reason instead of their imagination in dealing with the foreign situation. If this pointless hysteria keeps up, it will be but a short time before we are preparing to resist an invasion from Mars because some hysterical citizen happened to find a piece of meteor in his back yard one morning.

If the issue between the friends and foes of the Burke-Wadsworth bill has narrowed down to one point—is America in danger or is it not?—the answer is "No," at least not in any danger that conscription will remedy. The most paramount and important task that confronts American defense at the present time is the training and equipping for modern war of the men we already have in uniform.

[Figures and other military data taken from an article by the New York Times military expert, Hanson Baldwin, appearing in the August Harper's. Additional information from Our Military Chaos, a book by Oswald Garrison Villard, noted authority on military affairs.]

Is It Necessary To Draft Men?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. HESS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 6, 1940

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. ROBERT A. TAFT

Mr. HESS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address delivered last night by Senator ROBERT A. TAFT.

The Senate has passed and the House is considering the Burke-Wadsworth bill to draft men into the Army in time of peace. Sentiment is divided, and both the advocates and opponents of the measure are violently intolerant of those who disagree with their position. There has been more invective than argument. I am strongly convinced that the best interest of the country demands the defeat of the Burke-Wadsworth bill, and this evening I will try to state calmly the reasons which have led me to that conclusion.

We face today not one emergency but two. The first is from abroad; the second is from ourselves. While I do not agree with those who think that Hitler is about to attack the United States, nevertheless we must all recognize that for the next 10 years we face a new kind of world. The development of the totalitarian nations, their effective war machines, and their complete lack of regard for international morals have created this new condition. We cannot rely on the sanctity of any treaty or any promise which may be made by the German Government and perhaps by other governments. I believe that the same condition will exist whether the German attack on England succeeds or fails. England can hardly hope to overwhelm Germany for years to come. There will always be the possibility of the destruction of the British fleet and of the breaking up of the British Empire. We must provide for that possibility. I have voted for all the various appropriations increasing the size of the Navy and of the air forces. We are agreed that we must have a navy able to defend both the Atlantic and Pacific coasts. But surely it is the duty of Congress to consider as respects each measure brought before it the character and extent of the emergency. We must fully consider whether the tremendous expense involved in each bill is necessary. Because we favor a two-ocean navy, we may not necessarily find justification for an army of 1,300,000 men or the conscription of men in time of peace.

For we face another kind of an emergency at home. We have steadily drifted toward centralized government. We have vastly extended the activities of the Federal Government. We have given it power to regulate everything and everybody. There is a bill pending in Congress to give the President power to take property of any kind; to fix all prices; to assign every man to a designated position. There is a bill pending providing for a capital levy, taking a large proportion of every man's property in exchange for 1 percent Government bonds. In short, proposals made by responsible men, if added together, would create exactly the kind of Government in this country which exists today in Germany. There are many who urge with the proponents of the Burke-Wadsworth bill that the emergency requires a complete recasting of American life, a dedication of our entire energies to defense alone, and a subordination of every principle on which the American Republic is based.

With that point of view I emphatically disagree. We are not at war. I am confident that we can maintain the kind of Army and Navy we now must maintain and still keep alive the individual liberty and the system of free enterprise which have glorified the United States. The total cost of the new Army and Navy should not exceed three and a half billion dollars a year. Surely we can pay this out of a national income in excess of $70,000,000,000. Surely the manpower required need not upset our constitutional liberties. A million men may have to be permanently employed in the Army and Navy and Marine Corps, and a million and a quarter more, perhaps, trained for the Reserve. We have 42,000,000 men between 18 and 65 and over 5,000,000 of them are out of work today and looking for jobs. We can do the job without regimentation.

It is said that in time of war we have not hesitated to establish a dictatorship. I am afraid we would do so again, whether it it

necessary or not. But that is a very different thing from establishing a dictatorship in time of peace on the ground that an emergency exists. In wartime it is frankly done for war purposes, and when the war is over the people know it is time to reassume their powers. While the power is exercised, most of those exercising it are intensely inspired by patriotic motives, and politics is largely adjourned. But no one knows when a peace emergency is over. We have been enjoying a continuous emergency for the last 7 years. The present emergency may well last for 10 years without war reaching our shores. Arbitrary powers granted today may never be resumed.

It is just as dangerous to exaggerate the emergency as it is to underestimate the emergency. When an emergency exists it is all the more important that we retain our respect for the principles of constitutional American government, and that we go no further in modifying them than is absolutely essential.

It is not necessary, to save ourselves from Hitler, that we plunge the country into debts and deficits so great that we bankrupt the Nation and destroy the whole financial structure on which our happiness and security are founded. It is not necessary that we set aside the right of free debate, and a free press, and free speech. It is not necessary, to avoid regimentation by Hitler, that we forget all the Bill of Rights and the protection of minorities and authorize some Executive to conscript men and conscript property.

In working out an adequate defense, I am convinced it can be worked out under a democratic form of government if we try, if we pay some attention to that principle. I am convinced it can be worked out under an economic system in which initiative and free enterprise still provide the energy and force which have made this country the powerful Nation which we are, if we try.

I am convinced that it can be worked out, retaining the principles of individual liberty for which it was founded, if we try. I am convinced that to meet the threat of a totalitarian nation we need not make ourselves totalitarian. I shudder when I hear the words "total defense." I do not know what "total defense" means, unless it means the subjugation of every other principle of our life to the one subject—military defense. If the words mean anything, they mean that the energies of every individual shall be devoted to defense, and that we shall wipe out from our minds every other goal. That is not true today; I hope it may never be true. At a time like this it is peculiarly necessary that with every measure we take we see that the principles of American freedom are guarded well. Never has the American way of life been in such danger—danger as much from within as from without.

The issue presented by the Burke-Wadsworth bill, therefore, is whether the draft of men in time of peace is necessary. There is a good deal of misunderstanding about what the bill does provide. Many of the letters which I receive advocate the bill on the ground that it imposes universal compulsory military training on all the youth of the United States; that such training is good for American boys; that it teaches them discipline and hardens their character. I think we should understand clearly that this bill proposes no such system. It is not going to take the boys as they graduate from high school or college and give them a year's training. Most boys graduate from high school at 18, and only a small proportion go to college. This bill takes men between 21 and 31, and is intended to draft them into the Army for at least a year, and I think probably 2 years. There are approximately 11,300,000 men between the specified ages. A vast registration system will be set up employing perhaps 200,000 persons to be appointed by the President. About 65 percent will be placed in deferred classes, leaving about 4,000,000 men in the first nonexempt class. Apparently about 80 percent of the 11,300,000 are employed; about 2,000,000 unemployed; 300,000 are in college or professional schools. In other words, the great bulk of these men have finished their education and have started on their life work, from which they are now to be taken for at least a year.

We should certainly avoid any such dislocation of individual lives as is provided by this draft, if we possibly can. Senator SHEPPARD, of Texas, chairman of the Military Affairs Committee, justified the bill on the ground that it was a tragic necessity. In wartime it might be necessary, but I agree with him that it is tragic to permit the Government to take a man already well established in his life work, and compel him to give up that work and serve for a year or two in the Army in time of peace. This is certainly not liberty or freedom as America has understood it. The basis of our system has been the right of individuals to choose their own way of life; to find the niche they fit in; to rise to positions of interest and power, no matter how humble their beginnings may be. Probably no quality is so essential to success as steady, serious application to a job. Yet when a man has gotten well started, and perhaps has acquired the confidence of his employer, this law will compel him to be absent for a year, and undo all the progress he has made in his chosen occupation. It is all very well to say that he must be given back his job, but someone else will have had to fill the place he has made for himself. His set-back may affect unfavorably his whole future life.

It is said that a compulsory draft is a democratic system. I deny that it has anything to do with democracy. It is far more typical of totalitarian nations than of democratic nations. It is absolutely opposed to the principles of individual liberty, which have always been considered a part of American democracy. To choose 1 man in 10 by lot and require him to leave his home against his will is more like roulette than it is like democracy. Many people came to this country for the single purpose of avoiding the requirements of military service in Europe. This country has always been opposed to a large standing army, and it has been opposed to the use of the draft in time of peace. I shrink from the very setting up of thousands of draft boards, with clerks and employees and endless paper work and red tape; from the registration of 12,000,000 men and the prying into every feature of their lives, their physical condition, their religious convictions, their financial status, and even their hobbies.

The draft is said to be democratic because it hits the rich as well as the poor. Since the rich are about 2 percent of the total, it is still true that 98 percent of those drafted are going to be the boys without means. It doesn't make much difference to the poor boy whether the other 2 percent go or not. To be snatched out of his life work may be a tragedy for a poor boy, but the rich boy will have no trouble finding another job if he is any good at all. As a matter of fact under the volunteer system you would probably get a greater percentage of wealthy boys than under the draft. This is because the wealthier boys all go to college, and the percentage of enlistment from the colleges has always been higher. The need for the defense of this country against nations thousands of miles distant is brought home to those in the colleges more forcibly than it is to the boy who is employed locally, to whom international affairs are a long distance off. Under a volunteer system the poor boys who already had good jobs would not have to go.

It is said that under the draft the slacker will stay at home and leave the burden on the patriots. But in the first place, the number of real slackers is negligible in the whole picture, and under the bill any real slacker has an easy "out." All he has to do is marry a lady who has no other means of support. The number of marriages in recent weeks has increased by thousands.

The principle of a compulsory draft is basically wrong. If we must use compulsion to get an army, why not use compulsion to get men for other essential tasks? We must have men to manufacture munitions, implements of war, and war vessels. Why not draft labor for those occupations at wages lower than the standard? There are many other industries absolutely essential to defense, like the utilities, the railroads, the coal-mining industry. Why not draft men for those industries, also at $21 a month? If we draft soldiers, why not draft policemen and firemen for city and State service? The logical advocates of the draft admit this necessary conclusion. Senator PEPPER, of Florida, has said that he believes the President should have power to draft men for munitions plants. Mr. Walter Lippmann says that if the conscription bill is to serve its real purpose it must not be regarded as a mere device for putting 1 man out of 25 into uniform but must be regarded as a method of mobilizing the men of the country for the much larger and more complicated task of industrial preparedness. In short, the logic behind the bill requires a complete regimentation of most labor and the assignment of jobs to every man able to work. This is actually done today in the Communist and Fascist states, which we are now apparently seeking to emulate.

There has been, very properly, a great outcry against the action of the Senate in authorizing the Secretaries of War and Navy to seize any industrial plant needed for the manufacture of munitions. I voted against that amendment because I do not see the necessity for that any more than for the drafting of men and because it gives uncontrolled discretion to the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy. But at least the owners of such plants are to be fully compensated for their property, while men who are drafted may be forced to give up jobs paying $50 a week to receive a soldier's pay, at most equivalent to $15 a week. Their time is conscripted without compensation.

The argument in favor of conscription proves too much. If the emergency is as great as alleged, then we should adopt a completely socialized state and place ourselves and our property at the disposal of the Government. That is fascism. It could only be justified if it were the only possible alternative to the subjugation of the United States by fascism from without.

Is it really necessary to take this long step toward a system in which the state is everything and the individual is nothing? What kind of an army do we want? The developments of the present war have shown that great numbers of men in the trenches are no longer the prime requisite for success. France had universal conscription, but it did them no good against a highly organized, modern, mechanized army. According to all the best military advice, what we need today is an army of experts. We have all kinds of estimates of the number needed in the United States, but the best opinion is that an expert army of not more than 750,000 men would serve every purpose of defense. In January the President only requested funds for an army of 227,000 men. Even on May 31, after the Germans had broken through in France and France was collapsing, the President was satisfied with an army of 280,000 men, and General Marshall himself testified on June 4 that an army of 400,000 would avoid the necessity of mobilizing the National Guard and give a reasonable liberty of action up to January. Now the "ante has been boosted" to 1,200,000 men. This bill has put the cart before the horse. It is trying to provide a method of raising men before anyone has decided how many men should be raised. Up to this time the Army has had no authority to recruit men in excess of 375,000 plus the National Guard of 225,000; has had no authority to invite boys into training camps for military training.

As far as the Regular Army is concerned, conscription is the poorest possible method of getting it. Men are chosen at random from all kinds of occupations, mostly unrelated to the Army. After 1 year they naturally return to the jobs which they were forced to give up. Someone else equally unwilling and equally inexperienced

has to be given a year of partial training. There is only one way to get the kind of Army we need today—that is to make the Army an occupation sufficiently attractive so that men will go to it as a matter of choice. Why should we expect men to accept pay equivalent to approximately $15 a week? Privates in the Army get board, lodging, and clothes, equivalent perhaps $40 a month, plus $21 in cash, a total of $61 a month. They should certainly get the equivalent of $100 a month. The Army does not want a lot of men who leave at the end of 1 year or even of 3 years; they want men who are sufficiently satisfied to stay indefinitely.

It is said that the voluntary-enlistment plan has broken down. Of course that is utterly untrue. In spite of inadequate pay and in spite of 3-year enlistments, from which a man cannot escape if a better job is offered, it has accomplished everything which has been asked of it. Men are enlisting today at a rapid rate—40,000 enlisted in the month of August. Yet there has been no really serious effort to enlist men, and no call by the President for volunteers. In fact, he has publicly discouraged college boys from enlisting.

Men are looking for jobs with reasonable pay. In New York City this year it was necessary to fill a position as sanitation man at a salary of $1,800 a year, which, considering the cost of living in New York City, is not very much more than Army pay plus support. There were 84,000 applications from New York City alone.

Of course the men who enlist in the Army, like the men who get jobs in any industry, are those who at the time are out of work. There are more than 5,000,000 men out of work today, looking for jobs. There are over 1,700,000 on W. P. A., and over 200,000 in the C. C. C. camps. The Government is paying these men in a way which makes W. P. A. and C. C. C. more attractive than the Army. We have not the right to require these men, as a condition of Government aid, to accept employment in the Army; but surely, if we make the Army only reasonably attractive, many of them will prefer the Army to W. P. A. or C. C. C

How utterly ridiculous it is to make 700,000 men give up good jobs at a time of life when they are first making real progress, while many millions of men out of work, and 1,200,000 boys coming of age every year, are looking for jobs. The idea that the Army is the most unpleasant occupation in the world, into which men must be forced against their will, is archaic and fallacious. In time of war Army service is dangerous, but if we prepare adequately, we should not be at war, and the Army for the most part is a peacetime, highly specialized occupation with only a chance of danger. Experience shows that men do not avoid an occupation because there is a chance of danger. There are dangerous civilian occupations—work with high-tension wires, work in tunnel construction, work in coal mines; and there is never any difficulty in finding men interested in those occupations.

The Air Corps is the most dangerous part of the Army, but more men want to enlist than can be accepted. The Army has many advantages, a clean and regular life without great responsibility, an attraction in the very discipline and order which appeals to some men and offends others very greatly. The Navy always has a waiting list because they pay their men more adequately to try to make their service attractive. The Army should be just as attractive today. We already have 650,000 men available under existing law. We will have no difficulty in getting 750,000 or 950,000 or 1,200,000 under the volunteer system, if the Army is made as attractive to the average man as many other jobs furnished by industry.

As for the Reserve, we have never tried getting men for military training camps. No such camps are in existence except for Reserve officers. Of the 1,200,000 boys who graduate from high school or college every year, a large proportion could be persuaded to take a year in the military training camps at the Government's expense before starting on their life work. Within a very few years we would build up all the Reserve we could possibly need. An attempt to raise whatever Army is necessary by a volunteer appeal will unquestionably meet with success if that attempt has the wholehearted cooperation of the administration and of the Army; that it will furnish 400,000 men if that many are needed, before the complicated draft is working.

There are some who have felt that the emergency is so immediate that only the draft will meet it. Obviously that is not today the official view. The President has just transferred 50 destroyers to England in exchange for bases which will not be ready for a year. If Hitler were about to overwhelm England and attack the United States, the President obviously could not weaken our Navy by depriving it of 50 destroyers now in active service. The alleged need immediately for a huge Army is based on the theory that our Navy is inadequate. The President has just determined that the Navy is completely adequate and can even afford to surrender 50 of its fighting craft. What has happened to the emergency supposed to justify this drafting of men, so complete a departure from American tradition and so long a step toward dictatorship? No; we obviously have a reasonable time before Mr. Hitler can possibly organize an attack on the United States. It is no easy task to transport an army across 3,000 miles of water while our Navy is in existence. We have time to do our job in the right way. We have time to get the kind of voluntary expert mechanized Army that we really need. We have time to do the job without upsetting and perhaps wrecking hundreds of thousands of lives. We can do it without excitement and hysteria, without breaking down the fundamental principles of the American Republic. We can do it without overestimating the emergency, and sinking all the principles we love in the slough of total defense.

Free men, free enterprise, free speech are the cornerstones of the American Republic. If the Burke-Wadsworth bill should become law, we will have to accept that limitation of freedom. But we should be all the more vigilant to oppose the further limitations on freedom which are bound to follow. For the more we yield to the demand for arbitrary power, the more power will be demanded, until individual freedom will be as nonexistent in America as it is in Germany today. In fact we may even be turning over these destroyers to Germany to be used against us, for the British may have to surrender their fleet, according to the William Allen White Committee. Of course, in case of British defeat any pledge of the present British Government would be worthless, for the Government would not be there. Obviously the President must consider our fleet more than adequate for defense.

Address of President Woodrow Wilson at St. Louis, Mo.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED L. BULWINKLE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 6, 1940

SPEECH DELIVERED SEPTEMBER 5, 1919

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, 21 years ago yesterday President Wilson made a memorable address in St. Louis. I wish that every person would read this great speech.

The speech follows:

Mr. Johnson, Your Honor Mr. Mayor, ladies and gentlemen, it is with great pleasure that I find myself in St. Louis again, because I have always found it possible in St. Louis to discuss serious questions in a way that gets mind in contact with mind, instead of that other less desirable thing, passion in contact with passion. I am glad to hear the mayor say, and I believe that it is true, that politics is adjourned. Party politics has no place, my fellow citizens, in the subject we are now obliged to discuss and to decide. Politics in the wider sense has a great deal to do with it. The politics of the world, the policy of mankind, the concert of the methods by which the world is to be bettered, that concert of will and of action which will make every nation a nobler instrument of Divine Providence—that is world politics.

I have sometimes heard gentlemen discussing the questions that are now before us with a distinction drawn between nationalism and internationalism in these matters. It is very difficult for me to follow their distinction. The greatest nationalist is the man who wants his nation to be the greatest nation, and the greatest nation is the nation which penetrates to the heart of its duty and mission among the nations of the world. With every flash of insight into the great politics of mankind, the nation that has that vision is elevated to a place of influence and power which it cannot get by arms, which it cannot get by commercial rivalry, which it can get by no other way than by that spiritual leadership which comes from a profound understanding of the problems of humanity. It is in the light of ideas of this sort that I conceive it a privilege to discuss the matters that I have come away from Washington to discuss.

I have come away from Washington to discuss them because apparently it is difficult to discuss them in Washington. The whole subject is surrounded with a mist which it is difficult to penetrate. I brought home with me from the other side of the water a great document, a great human document, but after you hear it talked about in Washington for a while you think that it has just about three or four clauses in it. You fancy that it has a certain article X in it, that it has something about Shantung in it, that it has something about the Monroe Doctrine in it, that it has something about quitting, withdrawing from the League, showing that you do not want to play the game. I do not hear about anything else in it. Why, my fellow citizens, these are mere details and incidents of a great human enterprise, and I have sought the privilege of telling you what I conceive that human enterprise to be.

The war that has just been finished was no accident. Any man who had followed the politics of the world up to that critical break must have known that that was the logical outcome of the processes that had preceded it, must have known that the nations of the world were preparing for that very thing and were expecting it. One of the most interesting things that I realized after I got to the other side of the water was that the mental attitude of the French people with regard to the settlement of this war was largely determined by the fact that for nearly 50 years they had expected it, that for nearly 50 years they had dreaded, by the exercise of German force, the very thing that has happened and their constant theme was, "We must devise means by which this intolerable fear will be lifted from our hearts. We cannot, we will not, live another 50 years under the cloud of that terror." The terror had been there all the time and the war was its flame and consummation.

It had been expected, because the politics of Europe were based upon a definite conception. That conception was that the strong had all the rights and that all that the weak could enjoy was what the strong permitted them to enjoy; that no nation had any right that could not be asserted by the exercise of force, and that the real politics of Europe consisted in determining how many of the weak elements in the European combination of families and of nations should be under the influence and control of one set of nations and how many of those elements should be under the influence and control of another set of nations.

One of the centers of all the bad business was in that town of Constantinople. I do not suppose that intrigue was ever anywhere else reduced to such a consummate art or practiced with such ardor and subtlety as in Constantinople. That was because Constantinople was the key to the weak part of Europe. That was where the pawns were, not the kings and the queens and the castles and the bishops and the rest of the chess game of politics, but the little pawns. They made the openings for the heavier pieces. Their maneuvers determined the arrangement of the board, and those who controlled the pawns controlled the outcome of the whole effort to checkmate and to match and to capture and to take advantage. The shrewdest politicians in the diplomatic service of the several nations were put at Constantinople to run the game, which consisted in maneuvering the weak for the advantage of the strong, and every international conference that preceded the conference at Paris, which is still in process, was intended to complete and consummate the arrangements for that game. For the first time in the history of mankind, the recent conference at Paris was convened to destroy that system and substitute another.

I take it, my fellow citizens, that when you look at that volume, for it is a thick volume, that contains the treaty of peace with Germany, in the light of what I have been saying to you, you will read it with greater interest than you have hitherto attached to it. It is the chart and constitution of a new system for the world, and that new system is based upon an absolute reversal of the principles of the old system. The central object of that treaty is to establish the independence and protect the integrity of the weak peoples of the world. I hear some gentlemen, who are themselves incapable of altruistic purposes, say, "Ah, but that is altruistic. It is not our business to take care of the weak nations of the world." No, but it is our business to prevent war, and if we do not take care of the weak nations of the world there will be war. These gentlemen assume the role of being very practical men, and they say, "We do not want to get into war to protect every little nation in the world." Very well, then. Let them show me how they will keep out of war by not protecting them, and let them show me how they will prove that, having gone into an enterprise, they are not absolute, contemptible quitters if they do not see the game through. They joined with the rest of us in the profession of fine purpose when we went into the war, and what was the fine purpose that they professed? It was not merely to defeat Germany. It is not a handsome enterprise for any great nation to go into a war merely to reduce another nation to obedience. They went in, and they professed to go in, to see to it that nobody after Germany's defeat should repeat the experiment which Germany had tried. And how do they propose to do that? To leave the material that Germany was going to make her dominating empire out of helpless and at her mercy.

What was the old formula of pan-Germanism? From Bremen to Bagdad, wasn't it? Well, look at the map. What lies between Bremen and Bagdad? After you get past the German territory, there is Poland. There is Bohemia, which we have made into Czechoslovakia. There is Hungary, which is divided from Austria, and does not share Austria's strength. There is Rumania. There is Yugoslavia. There is broken Turkey; and then Persia and Bagdad. The route is open. The route is wide open, and we have undertaken to say, "This route is closed." If you do not close it you have no choice but some day or other to enter into exactly the same sort of war that we have just gone through. Those gentlemen are dreaming. They are living in a past age which is gone and all but forgotten when they say that we can mind our own business.

What is our own business? Is there any merchant present here or any manufacturer or any banker who can say that our interests are separate from the interests of the rest of the world—commercially, industrially, financially? There is not a man in any one of these professions who does not admit that our industrial fortunes are tied up with the industrial fortunes of the rest of the world. He knows that, and when he draws a picture to himself, if he is frank, of what some gentlemen propose, this is what he sees: America minding her own business and having no other—despised, suspected, distrusted, and on the other side of the water the treaty and its operation—interrupted? Not at all. We are a great nation, my fellow citizens, but the treaty is going to be applied just the same whether we take part in it or not, and part of its application, at the center of its application, stands that great problem of the rehabilitation of Germany industrially. I say the problem of her rehabilitation because unless she is rehabilitated she cannot pay the reparation. The reparation commission created by the treaty is created for the purpose of seeing that Germany pays the reparation, and it was admitted in all our conferences that in order to do that steps must be taken to enable Germany to pay the reparation, which means her industrial and commercial rehabilitation. Not only that, but some of you gentlemen know we used to have a trade with Germany. All of that trade is going to be in the hands and under the control of the reparation commission. I humbly asked leave to appoint a member to look after our interests, and I was rebuked for it. I am looking after the industrial interest of the United States. I would like to see the other men who are. They are forgetting the industrial interests of the United States, and they are doing things that will cut us off, and our trade off, from the normal channels, because the reparation commission can determine where Germany buys, what Germany buys, how much Germany buys; the reparation commission can determine in what instruments of credit she temporarily expresses her debt. It can determine how those instruments of credit shall be used for the basis of the credit which must underlie international exchanges. It is going to stand at the center of the financial operations of the world. Now, is it minding our business to keep out of that? On the contrary, it is handing our business over to people who are not particularly interested in seeing that it prospers. These are facts which I can appropriately address to a chamber of commerce because they are facts which nobody can controvert and which yet seem often to be forgotten. The broad aspects of this subject are seldom brought to your attention. It is the little picayune details here and there.

That brings me, my fellow citizens, to the guaranty of this whole thing. We said that we were going to fight this war for the purpose of seeing to it that the mothers and sisters and fathers of this land, and the sweethearts and wives, did not have to send their lads over on the other side of the sea to fight any more, and so we took part in an arrangement by which justice was to be secured throughout the world. The rest of the world, partly at our suggestion, said "Yes" and said it gladly; said "Yes, we will go into the partnership to see that justice is maintained," and then I came home and heard some gentlemen say, "But will we?" Are we interested in justice? The treaty of peace, as I have just said to you, is based upon the protection of the weak against the strong, and there is only one force that can protect the weak against the strong, and that is the universal concert of the strength of mankind. That is the League of Nations.

But I beg that you will not conceive of the League of Nations as a combination of the world for war, for that is exactly what it is not. It is a combination of the world for arbitration and discussion. I was taking the pains the other day to make a sort of table of contents of the covenant of the League of Nations, and I found that two-thirds of its provisions were devoted to setting up a system of arbitration and discussion in the world. Why, these are the facts, my fellow citizens: the members of the league agree that no one of them will ever go to war about anything without first doing one or another of two things—without either submitting the question to arbitration, in which case they agree to abide by the decision of the arbitrators absolutely, or submitting it to discussion by the council of the League of Nations, in which case they agree that, no matter what the opinion expressed by the council may be, they will allow 6 months for the discussion, and whether they are satisfied with the conclusion or not, will not go to war in less than 3 months after the rendering of the opinion. I think we can take it for granted that the preliminaries would take 2 or 3 months, in which case you have a whole year of discussion even when you do not get arbitration; and I want to call you to witness that in almost every international controversy which has been submitted to thorough canvass by the opinion of the world it has become impossible for the result to be war. War is a process of heat. Exposure is a process of cooling, and what is proposed in this is that every hot thing shall be spread out in the cooling air of the opinion of the world and after it is thoroughly cooled off, then let the nations concerned determine whether they are going to fight about it or not.

And notice the sanction. Any member of the League which breaks these promises with regard to arbitration or discussion is to be deemed thereby to have committed an act of war against the other members of the League; not merely to have done an immoral thing, but by refusing to obey those processes to have committed an act of war and put itself out of court. You know what then happens. You say, "Yes; we form an army and go and fight them." Not at all. We shut their doors and lock them in. We boycott them. Just as soon as that is done they cannot ship cargoes out or receive them shipped in. They cannot send a telegraphic message. They cannot send or receive a letter. Nobody can leave their territory and nobody can enter their territory. They are absolutely boycotted by the rest of mankind. I do not think that after that remedy it will be necessary to do any fighting at all. What brought Germany to her knees was, not only the splendid fighting of the incomparable men who met her armies, but that her doors were locked and she could not get supplies from any part of the world. There were a few doors open, doors to some Swedish ore, for example, that she needed for making munitions, and that kept her going for a time; but the Swedish door would be shut this time. There would not be any door open, and that brings a nation to its senses just as suffocation removes from the individual all inclination to fight.

That is the League of Nations, an agreement to arbitrate or discuss, and an agreement that if you do not arbitrate or discuss, you shall be absolutely boycotted and starved out. There is hardly a European nation, my fellow citizens, that is of a fighting inclination, which has enough food to eat without importing food, and it will be a very persuasive argument that it has nothing to eat, because you cannot fight on an empty stomach any more than you can worship God on an empty stomach.

When we add to that some other very interesting particulars I think the League of Nations becomes a very interesting thing, indeed. You have heard of article X, and I am going to speak about that in a minute, but read article XI, because, really, there are other articles in the Covenant. Article XI says—I am not quoting its language, but its substance—that anything that is likely to affect the peace of the world or the good understanding upon which the peace of the

world depends shall be everybody's business; that any nation, the littlest nation at the table, can stand up and challenge the right of the strongest nation there to keep on in a course of action or policy which is likely to disturb the peace of the world, and that it shall be its friendly right to do so. These are the words. It cannot be regarded as a hostile or unfriendly act. It is its friendly right to do that, and if you will not give the secret away, I wrote those words myself. I wanted it to be our friendly right and everybody's friendly right to discuss everything that was likely to affect the peace of the world, because that is everybody's business. It is everybody's business to see that nothing happens that does disturb the peace of the world.

And there is added to this particular this very interesting thing: There can hereafter be no secret treaties. There were nations represented around that board—I mean the board at which the commission on the League of Nations sat, where 14 nations were represented—there were nations represented around that board who had entered into many a secret treaty and understanding, and they made not the least objection to promising that hereafter no secret treaty should have any validity whatever. The provision of the Covenant is that every treaty or international understanding shall be "registered," I believe the word is, with the general secretary of the League, that the general secretary shall publish it in full just as soon as it is possible for him to publish it, and that no treaty shall be valid which is not thus registered. It is like our arrangements with regard to mortgages on real estate, that until they are registered nobody else need pay any attention to them. So with the treaties. Until they are registered in this office of the League nobody, not even the parties themselves, can insist upon their execution. You have cleared the deck thereby of the most dangerous thing and the most embarrassing thing that has hitherto existed in international politics.

It is very embarrassing, my fellow citizens, when you thought you were approaching an ideal solution of a particular question, to find that some of your colleagues had given the whole thing away. And that leads me to speak just in passing of what has given a great many people natural distress. I mean the Shantung settlement, the settlement with regard to a portion of the Province of Shantung in China. Great Britain and, subsequently, France, as everybody now knows, in order to make it more certain that Japan would come into the war and so assist to clear the Pacific of the German fleets, had promised that any rights that Germany had in China should, in the case of the victory of the Allies, pass to Japan. There was no qualification in the promise. She was to get exactly what Germany had, and so the only thing that was possible was to induce Japan to promise—and I want to say in fairness, for it would not be fair if I did not say it, that Japan did very handsomely make the promise which was requested of her—that she would retain in Shantung none of the sovereign rights which Germany had enjoyed there, but would return the sovereignty without qualification to China and retain in Shantung Province only what other nationalities had already had elsewhere, economic rights with regard to the development and administration of the railway and of certain mines which had become attached to the railway. That is her promise, and personally I have not the slightest doubt that she will fulfill that promise. She cannot fulfill it right now because the thing does not go into operation until 3 months after the treaty is ratified, so that we must not be too impatient about it. But she will fulfill that promise.

Suppose that we said that we would not assent. England and France must assent, and if we are going to get Shantung Province back for China and these gentlemen do not want to engage in foreign wars, how are they going to get it back? Their idea of not getting into trouble seems to be to stand for the largest possible number of unworkable propositions. It is all very well to talk about standing by China, but how are you standing by China when you withdraw from the only arrangement by which China can be assisted? If you are China's friend, then do not go into the council where you can act as China's friend. If you are China's friend then put her in a position where even the concessions which have been made need not be carried out. If you are China's friend, scuttle and run. That is not the kind of American I am.

Now, just a word about article X. Permit me, if you will, to recur to what I said at the opening of these somewhat disjointed remarks. I said that the treaty was intended to destroy one system and substitute another. That other system was based upon the principle that no strong power need respect the territorial integrity or the political independence of any weak power. I need not confine the phraseology to that. It was based upon the principle that no power is obliged to respect the territorial integrity or the political independence of any other power if it has the force necessary to disregard it. So that article X cuts at the very heart, and is the only instrument that will cut to the very heart, of the old system. Remember that if this covenant is adopted by the number of nations which it probably will be adopted by, it means that every nation except Germany and Turkey, because we have already said we would let Austria come in (Germany has to undergo a certain period of probation to see whether she has really experienced a change of heart and effected a genuine change of constitutional provision)—it means that all the nations of the world, except one strong and one negligible one, agree that they will respect and preserve against external aggression the territorial integrity and existing political independence of the other nations of the world. You would think from some of the discussions that the emphasis is on the word "preserve."

We are partners with the rest of the world in respecting the territorial integrity and political independence of others. They are all under solemn bonds themselves to respect and to preserve these things, and if they do not preserve them, if they do not respect them, or preserve them, what happens? The Council of the League then advises the several members of the League what it is necessary to do. I can testify from having sat at the board where the instrument was drawn that advice means advice. I suppose it did before I returned home, but I found some gentlemen doubted it. Advice means advice, and the advice cannot be given without the concurrent vote of the representative of the United States. Ah, but somebody says, "Suppose we are a party to the quarrel." I cannot suppose that, because I know that the United States is not going to disregard the territorial integrity or the political independence of any other nation, but for the sake of the argument suppose that we are a party. Very well then, the scrap is ours anyway. For what these gentlemen are afraid of is that we are going to get into trouble. If we are a party, we are in trouble already, and if we are not a party, we can control the advice of the Council by our vote. To my mind, that is a little like an open and shut game. I am not afraid of advice which we give ourselves; and yet that is the whole of the bugaboo which these gentlemen have been parading before you.

The solemn thing about article X is the first sentence, not the second sentence. The first sentence says that we will respect and preserve against external aggression the territorial integrity and existing political independence of other nations; and let me stop a moment on the words "external aggression." Why were they put in? Because every man who sat at that board held that the right of revolution was sacred and must not be interfered with. Any kind of a row can happen inside and it is nobody's right to interfere. The only thing that there is any right to object to or interfere with is external aggression, by some outside power undertaking to take a piece of territory or to interfere with the internal political arrangements of the country which is suffering from the aggression; because territorial integrity does not mean that you cannot invade another country, it means that you cannot invade it and stay there. I have not impaired the territorial integrity of your back yard if I walk into it, but I very much impair it if I insist upon staying there and will not get out, and the impairment of integrity contemplated in this article is the kind of impairment as the seizure of territory, as an attempt at annexation, as an attempt at continuing domination either of the territory itself or of the methods of government inside that territory.

When you read article X, therefore, you will see that it is nothing but the inevitable logical center of the whole system of the Covenant of the League of Nations, and I stand for it absolutely. If it should ever in any important respect be impaired, I would feel like asking the Secretary of War to get the boys who went across the water to fight together on some field where I could go and see them, and I would stand up before them and say, "Boys, I told you before you went across the sea that this was a war against wars, and I did my best to fulfill the promise, but I am obliged to come to you in mortification and shame and say I have not been able to fulfill the promise. You are betrayed. You fought for something that you did not get." And the glory of the armies and the navies of the United States is gone like a dream in the night, and there ensues upon it, in the suitable darkness of the night, the nightmare of dread which lay upon the nations before this war came; and there will come sometime, in the vengeful providence of God, another struggle in which, not a few hundred thousand fine men from America will have to die, but as many millions as are necessary to accomplish the final freedom of the peoples of the world.

Columbus University Junior College, Washington, D. C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH E. CASEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 6, 1940

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a pleasure to pay public tribute to the Columbus University Junior College, Washington, D. C., on its recent accreditation by the District of Columbia Board of Education. The Columbus University Junior College, only 2 years old, was the first junior college in the District of Columbia to be accredited by the local board of education which acted under powers granted by Congress several month ago.

Under terms of this power the Board of Education approval carries the same force and effect as accreditation of junior colleges by the State boards of education in the various States. It is therefore a singular honor that has been bestowed on the local institution.

The rapid growth of the Columbus University Junior College and its early recognition by an accrediting agency was not an accident. It was the result of a 10-year dream of John R. Fitzpatrick, dean of Columbus University Law School and provost of the university. His tireless efforts and incessant labors in behalf of the university have brought it to the forefront in the field of adult education, or education for hundreds and hundreds of young men and women who otherwise would be denied the right to attend academic institutions of higher learning. Courses in Columbus University, including the departments of law, accounting, and junior college, are conducted at evening sessions, thus affording opportunities for education to men and women employed during the day.

Under the aegis of Dean Fitzpatrick, the law school today ranks third in the country in the point of enrollment, being topped only by Harvard Law School and St. John's College in Brooklyn, according to official statistics compiled by a recent law journal.

Having erected the law-school structure to its present eminent position, Dean Fitzpatrick turned his attention to the establishment of a junior college, one which meets the ever-growing demands of a local community to which thousands of men and women poured in during the last 8 years. Hundreds of these newcomers desired higher education at evening sessions since most of them were employed in the daytime. It was this opportunity for further public service in the District of Columbia that prompted Dean Fitzpatrick to direct his energies toward the establishment of the junior college.

It was no easy task that Dean Fitzpatrick set before himself. There was the question of funds, of selecting an adequate staff of competent professors and scores of other details concomitant with the achievement of such an ambitious program. But success, while moderate, has finally been achieved as is evidenced by the recognition of the Board of Education. Dean Fitzpatrick himelf knows only too well that there still lies much work ahead and I am sure the Board of Education approval will give added incentive to his zealous labors.

The Columbus University Junior College, while rounding out only its second year, already is equipped as well as any junior college of its size and age in the country. I am glad to see the junior college branching off into the fields of secretarial sciences which will equip the student for the struggle of life immediately upon graduation. These courses, in addition to the regular so-called cultural courses, supply a fitting background for the student desirous of later entering an accredited law school or of further higher education.

I am sure my colleagues join with me in wishing the Columbus University Junior College the great future of public service it is so well equipped to contribute to the school-going public of Washington. I am sure, too, they join with me in congratulating Dean Fitzpatrick on his splendid accomplishment and in wishing him the health and the strength to attain the goal he has set before himself.

American, Not European, Teachers for American Youth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILL M. WHITTINGTON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 6, 1940

TIMELY AND CONSTRUCTIVE ARTICLE BY MRS. FLORENCE S. OGDEN, WRITER AND COLUMNIST, OF ROSEDALE, MISS., IN OPPOSITION TO EUROPEAN SCHOLARS AND PROFESSORS TEACHING IN AMERICAN SCHOOLS, COLLEGES, AND UNIVERSITIES

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, my gifted friend and patriotic constituent, Mrs. Florence S. Ogden, of Rosedale, Miss., edits a column in the Sunday Delta-Democrat Times, of Greenville, Miss., one of the best edited and most progressive daily newspapers in Mississippi, entitled "Dis an' Dat." The contributions of Mrs. Ogden are often unique and quite original, and are always entertaining and instructive. This accomplished daughter of Mississippi is fast making a name for herself among the leading writers of the South.

Many new and complex issues and problems during the existing second European war are confronting the American people. These problems often bring dangers. They will be followed by other issues after the war. One of the present dangers arises from the teachings of European and refugee scholars and professors in American institutions. I am not an alarmist, but this danger was recently brought forcibly to my attention by the account of a dinner in the home of an acquaintance of mine. One of the guests was a German scholar, now teaching in one of the leading universities of the United States. This professor had been highly commended to the hostess by a friend of hers who had met him in Germany. The German scholar monopolized the conversation of the dinner, very much to the chagrin of the hostess, by brazenly proclaiming and advocating nazi-ism, criticizing Americanism, and praising Hitler and Hitlerism. I was astounded that an American university would not only tolerate but invite professors who advocated such un-American and subversive doctrines. It is time for America and Americans to be on guard.

In the Delta Democrat-Times of Sunday, September 1, 1940, Mrs. Ogden contributed a most helpful and thought-provoking article in opposition to European scholars and European professors in American schools and universities. Under leave to revise and extend my remarks I include this article, to wit:

DIS AN' DAT

(By Florence S. Ogden)

I am worried about my country—about America. Not by the fear of Hitler; not by the cry of battle; not by the drone of airplanes, nor the crash of bombs, but by the philosophies of other lands, other peoples, being brought to our colleges.

For what profit it us if we gain every victory, win every battle, and lose our own country?

Why drill our youth for combat, see them die in the battle line, and then give our country away—make a Europe out of America?

For that is what we will do if we bring the philosophers and scholars of Europe here to teach the youth of America. Misguided American college presidents and educators are opening the doors of our colleges to the refugee scholars of Europe, offering them our most precious gift, the charge of molding the minds of American youth.

According to Time, 200 are already here. There are 3,800 on the waiting list. College officials are being urged to create special professorships for them. Says Time, "Not since the fall of Constantinople in 1453 drove eastern scholars into western Europe has there been such a wholesale migration of culture." Says Dr. Alvin Johnson, of the emergency committee in aid of displaced foreign scholars, "for the next generation the natural home of scholarship and science must be America."

But with Dr. Johnson, I, a plain country woman, beg to disagree.

According to Time, among those who have sought or are seeking United States citizenship are ex-German Albert Einstein and Thomas Mann. At Harvard are ex-Chancellor Heinrich Bruning; famed architects Walter Grapius and Marcel Breuer; eminent classical scholar Werner Jaeger. The University of Chicago has Nobel-prize winner James Franck; Eduard Benes; Italy's famed physicist Bruno Rossi, and novelist Guiseppe Borgese; art teacher Ulrich A. Mideldorf. Score, five for Chicago. At California Tech, German-born Dr. Spiro Kyropoulos. At University of California, Los Angeles, famed composer Arnold Schonberg. At Columbia, renowned Viennese neurologist Otto Marbur. And on and on, ad infinitum.

The teachers in our schools and colleges hold in their hands the future of America. They mold the thought of the youth who will in their time become our leaders. Shall it be American or European?

Now is the time to decide. Not next year, next month, next week. Not tomorrow, but today.

No matter what a teacher teaches his students, be it architecture, science, art, music, or civics, if he be a good teacher he leaves with them his philosophy of life. That is a known truth.

European philosophy of government has nothing to offer us. It has been a failure, as witness the Europe of today. Though they have boasted the broadest culture, the deepest scholars, their world, their very civilization, lies in chaos.

If the 3,800 scholars waiting to come to America are worth their salt, they will stay in their own country and try to rebuild it. They will be needed there. If the best brains of the South had fled the country after the Civil War it would have taken a longer, harder travel to have restored her to her own sunny self.

We do not need Europe's scholars here. We produced an Edison without them, a Robert E. Lee, an Abraham Lincoln. We have

many more in the making if we do not allow them to be marred by alien thinking. We already have here in America a large European-born citizenship. But we still have our American philosophy of life. Are we to chuck this, too?

To those of us "horse and buggy" people, old fashioned enough to cling to the precepts of our fathers and to the old America in which we grew up, American America belongs to the American people. We believe in the ideals and traditions bequeathed to us by the men and women who marched ahead of us, carving from the wilderness a peaceful, happy home—a great country.

You know and I know that 10 years ago, 5 years ago, 2 years ago, it was not popular to be proud of your American descent. It was the smart thing to scoff at patriotism, if American. But it was all right for the German-born American to prate about "the fatherland"; for the Italian-born American to sentimentalize over "the mother country"; for the Chinese-born American to hoard his dollars and send them back to China; for the Polish-born American to continue to speak his native tongue, to print his newspapers in his native language; for the Russian-born American to crusade for his isms.

Yet the American-born American did not dare lift his voice to proclaim a pride in the race of men who gave him birth, endured hardships, and made sacrifices to create a magnificent Nation. Those who did so dare had hurled at them such epithets as "ancestor worshipers," "snob," and so forth. Yet it was these early American men and women who gave us our way of life—the American way, if you please.

It was not given to use by the pedagogs of Europe. It was not given to us by the millions who have come battering at our shores since 1890. No; it is the other way around. To them we have given freedom, home, peace, opportunity.

In return they have contributed their share of art, music, science, literature, labor. But to our philosophy of life, our freedom of government, they have contributed not one iota. It was here before they came: our heritage, born of an English-speaking people, nurtured and developed by those home-loving, liberty-seeking men and women, the early Americans.

If we are to keep our country to ourselves, for our children and our children's children, we must guard our principles of government with a jealous eye. We must hold high the ideals upon which this democracy was founded. We must revere its traditions, review its history, uphold its religion, and remember that it was not founded upon European philosophy, but upon a philosophy conceived by Americans, born of a spirit of freedom and a hope of happiness.

No Nietzsche, no Marx, no Francois Villon, no Anatole France, no Zola, no Tolstoy, no Lenin, no Trotzky, no Hitler laid out the principles of American democracy.

It was made by men who rode horses, fought Indians, hewed forests, tilled land, and marched to battle that America might be free. It was founded by red-blooded men of action, not by scholars, shrouded in caps and gowns; not by theoretical geniuses; not by scientists lost in thought and in the search of new truths; not by poets who would steal from the rich and give to the poor; not by writers who ended their lives in the madhouse.

No, America was founded by men who dared to give their lives that liberty and justice might not perish from the earth.

Such a country does not need the European philosophers, the refugee scholars of a war-torn continent to teach the youth of the land.

We have thousands, millions, of European-born citizens, European-born youths. What we need in our schools and our colleges are American-born teachers, Americans who love our country, understand our background, revere our history, respect our ideals and philosophies. Yes, more than ever we need good old red-blooded American teachers for the youth of our land. European democracy is not American democracy and never will be.

We have a trust, a great responsibility. It is to teach the millions of youths coming to this land, and our own youth who seem to be forgetting, American precepts. We cannot do it through colleges manned by European scholars and philosophers, no matter how brilliant.

I would rather leave as a heritage to my children the free, happy American way of life than all of the art of Italy, all of the music of Germany, all of the culture of France, all of the architecture of Greece, all of the isms of Russia, Poland, and Czechoslovakia rolled into one.

The Parting of the Ways

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 6, 1940

ADDRESS OF HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by the gentleman from Massachusetts, Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr., delivered at a Republican mass meeting on the evening of August 24, 1940, at Peoria, Ill.:

Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, it is a pleasure to be here tonight to speak to you on a question which I believe presents the gravest problem ever faced by this Nation since its beginning except, perhaps, during the Civil War.

America is at the parting of the ways.

Two roads lie before us.

There is the right road. It is the way to responsible liberalism. There is the wrong road. It is the way of irresponsible radicalism.

The right road is a continuation of our historic Government by laws. The left road leads to a government by men.

The Nation next November will make its choice. It will go forward with "Right Way" Willkie, or it will go astray with "Wrong Way" Roosevelt. After 8 years of the kind of administration Mr. Roosevelt has given us, I think there is no doubt in your mind—and I am sure there is none in mine—as to which choice America will make at the ballot boxes next November.

Our American system of government has for 150 years been the marvel of mankind. The American way has brought to our people, as a whole, the broadest spiritual and cultural values; the highest living levels; the richest material resources; the finest churches, and schools, and railroads, and highways; the most automobiles, and the greatest scientific achievements ever attained by any people. To keep on in that American way of government, we must, next November, part company with Mr. Roosevelt and the New Deal.

If we are going to return to thrift and frugality in government; if we are to reawaken the pioneer spirit which originally created this Nation out of the primeval forests and the unwatered plains; if we are to renew the faith of our forefathers who, with ax, squirrel rifle, and their self-reliance, made homes and a living for themselves and their loved ones, then we are, next November, going to part company with the wasters and the spenders and the bureaucrats, and the defeatists of the New Deal.

If we are to return to integrity in government, to that kind of government which the people support, instead of a government which pretends to support the people, then we are going to part company next November with Mr. Roosevelt and his motley crew of anonymous advisers and experimenters.

If we are going to build an adequate national defense without being made bankrupt, without being rendered so weak and impotent financially we will not be able to use the defense after it is created, then we are going to part company with Mr. Roosevelt and his New Deal alarmists next November.

If we are ever to repeal the oppressive taxes which have proved so harassing and dangerous to private initiative, if we are to relieve the American people, especially the poor people, of the crushing burden of hidden taxes concealed in the prices of all necessities and luxuries they buy—then we are going to part company with the New Deal tax wasters next November.

If we are ever to repeal the dangerous and deadening discretionary powers the President now holds over the Nation's monetary system, over agriculture, and over business, we must part company with the New Deal next November.

If we are ever to amend the National Labor Relations Act to clarify the mutual obligations of workers and employers, and the duties of both toward the public, in order to end irresponsible and paralyzing discord, then we must part company with the New Deal next November.

If we are going to define the area of governmental competition with private enterprise, and clarify Federal rules and regulations so industry and business may know what to expect, and may be able to create jobs with some certainty as to the future, then we must part company with the New Deal next November.

If we are to be able to reject all experimental legislation which is not clearly helpful in promoting national defense and recovery, or which would subject agriculture, labor, or industry to compulsory decrees of a Federal bureaucracy, then we are going to part company with the New Deal and with Mr. Roosevelt next November.

If the American people want to restore sanity, morality, economy, efficiency, and high integrity in Government, then they will with Willkie, but they won't with Roosevelt.

If America should by some incredible chance, decide to turn down the other fork of the road, we would then part company with our historic and traditional government of laws, and turn to a government of men. We would continue with Mr. Roosevelt and his New Dealers.

We can expect to see the national debt continue to rise from $45,000,000,000 to sixty-five or seventy-five billion dollars, if we take the left-hand fork of the road next November with Mr. Roosevelt and his jolly spenders.

We may expect more regimentation, a continuation of an economy of scarcity, recurring deficits, mounting taxes, broken promises, contradictions of policy, and brazen inconsistencies, if we go down the leftward road next November with Mr. Roosevelt and his army of political bureaucrats.

Now, my fellow citizens, the New Dealers say these are generalities; they claim we blueprint no details of how we Republicans are going to achieve recovery and a return to these necessary and desirable objectives in government and in the industry of this Nation.

Well, after there has been a hurricane, the first constructive job is to clean up the debris, to clear the ground of the wreckage and rubbish, so we may get ready intelligently to rebuild.

The first step the Republicans must take will be to survey the damage that has been done by the New Deal and determine what action is necessary to remedy the situation.

Let me now state a proposition and leave the answer to your own common sense and fair judgment.

The New Deal administration has been in full and complete command of the destinies of this Nation for practically 8 years. Mr. Roosevelt has been vested with more discretionary power than was ever given any President in the history of the United States. He has been given vastly greater sums of money to spend at his personal discretion than were ever given to any other President of the United States.

For nearly 8 years Mr. Roosevelt has controlled a majority of both Houses of the Congress. For at least 4 years of his administration he had the hopeful and overwhelming support of the citizens of this country. When Mr. Roosevelt came to power in 1933 he was faced with certain fundamental problems. What one of these problems has he solved? His administration has doubled the national debt, and we now do not know how much higher the $45,000,000,000 debt will go before we shall have built an adequate national defense.

The New Deal administration has had an alarming deficit every year it has been in power. Taxes have gone up constantly and will have to continue to rise for some time to come because of the mistakes of the New Deal administration in these last 8 years. It has cost the Nation all this to achieve—failure.

I want to give full credit to Mr. Roosevelt for everything he has accomplished in his administration.

When he came to power there was a panic in this country. That panic was the culmination of forces and effects which had been building up for several years as a result of the first World War and because of conditions in other parts of the globe. Mr. Roosevelt, by brave words and glowing promises, did lull the panic. He did reassure the people. He did prevent a disastrous stampede into the depths of fear.

But now let's call the roll on the other issues and see what the New Deal administration has accomplished in these 8 years of its complete power over the public purse, the Congress, and business.

There was serious unemployment in this Nation when Mr. Roosevelt took office. There has scarcely been a time since, in spite of the billions piled upon billions the New Deal bureaucrats have poured out in wasteful and extravagant experiments, when we have not had at least 10,000,000 wage earners out of work. That is the case now.

When Mr. Roosevelt took over in 1933 American agriculture was in distress. Prices of farm products were below parity. Mr. Roosevelt promised that without regimenting the farmers he would raise prices to parity. He has not solved that problem.

Mr. Roosevelt promised to reduce the expense of the National Government 25 percent. Did he do it?

When the New Dealers assumed the reins of government, they promised to balance the Budget—indeed, Mr. Roosevelt promised 11 different times to balance the Budget. But he didn't.

Mr. Roosevelt in 1932 went up and down this country preaching that taxes were too high; he said they "are paid in the sweat of every man who labors because they are a burden on production and are paid through production." He solemnly promised the American people to lower them. What did he do? From 1933 to 1939 Federal tax collections increased 195 percent.

Mr. Roosevelt insisted in 1932 that an excessive share of the tax burden was falling upon the poor people as consumers' taxes, which are hidden in the prices of necessities and luxuries. He promised to reduce consumer taxes. Has he kept that promise? In 1932 the percentage of taxes falling primarily but not exclusively upon the low-income groups was 39.4 percent. By Christmas of 1939 the same taxes had gone up 60 percent. They are now about 52.4 percent.

Mr. Roosevelt declared again and again that relief money must not be used for political purposes or to influence elections. The New Deal administration has had a black record of increasing the relief rolls from June through October of every election year. Let me give you a few figures on the W. P. A. situation and let you decide if this chain of circumstances is mere coincidence.

In 1933, a nonelection year, the number on Federal relief declined 15.4 percent from June through October, although the index of industrial production, reflecting employment, also declined 16.5 percent in the same period.

Yet in the election year of 1934 the Federal relief rolls increased 11.6 percent from June through October.

In 1935, a nonelection year, the Federal relief rolls showed a decline of 9.6 percent from June through October.

But in 1936, an election year, they increased 14.4 percent, although unemployment declined 13 percent.

In 1937, when there was no election, the Federal relief rolls showed a decline of 16.9 percent from June through October, although the index of industrial production declined 10.5 percent in that period.

In 1938, an election year, the Federal relief rolls showed an increase of 19.2 percent, although unemployment was reduced 9 percent from June through October.

In 1939, when there was no election, the number on relief declined 25.5 percent for the months preceding November.

Now, in this election year of 1940 we again hear that W. P. A. jobs are to increase. This in the face of a rise already under way in industrial activity due to the building of the national defense. This spending for work relief will go hand in hand with the spending of vast sums for armament.

Congress appropriated $975,000,000 to support W. P. A. this year, with the provision that this sum may be spent in 8 months instead of 12. The indications are it will be so spent. There are at present working on W. P. A. jobs 1,700,000 persons. The monthly bill for this work is $100,000,000. Beginning in September, these costs will rise to $140,000,000 a month. A peak of 2,300,000 jobs may be reached.

This juggling of relief money by New Deal bureaucrats for election purposes has shocked the conscience of the Nation. No one for a moment believes that any man, woman, or child in need of relief should be deprived of it or should be permitted to suffer. But the use of money for relief purposes—the very figures which I have quoted to you—tend to discredit relief and to make more difficult the extension of relief to those who really merit it. What we need and what we must have with relief is the most rigid economy and the highest possible efficiency, in order that every relief dollar shall go the furthest toward easing the situation of those who are still unable to find employment by which to maintain themselves.

When the New Deal administration came to power in 1933, Mr. Roosevelt promised the country that by devaluing the content of the gold dollar and by raising the price which we were willing to pay for gold from $20.67 an ounce to $35 an ounce he was going to rescue the world from most of its troubles, and he was surely going to help the United States exports. We now have a gold bear by the tail and can't let loose.

Mr. Roosevelt in 1932 argued that the country had been thrown into a panic by synthetic fears manufactured by those who generated those fears for their own selfish purposes. Mr. Roosevelt's administration has been filled with more alarms and more fears than any administration this Nation has ever known. In less than 8 years we have had 67 or 68 crises and emergencies declared by the administration. Every emergency and every crisis was put forward as an argument for more and more power to be vested in the Chief Executive.

I shall not go on detailing the failures of the New Deal, but I want to put this proposition:

"What can the New Deal do in the next 4 years to solve any of these grave fundamental problems, domestic and foreign, that it has not done in the last 8 years?"

If the New Deal in power for 8 years with all of these tremendous controls at its command has failed to do something that it can do in the next 4 years, then it has been criminally negligent. If, on the other hand, the New Deal has done everything it could do in the past 8 years to solve these problems then, I ask you, What claim has it to another 4 years of power on the ground it can solve some of these problems? How can we judge what to expect under 4 more years of the New Deal?

We cannot judge by the 1932 Democratic platform; because Mr. Roosevelt, after declaring that platform to be a sacred covenant with the people, proceeded to disregard it completely as soon as he was elected. The same thing happened again with the 1936 platform. Therefore, we may expect the same thing to happen so far as the 1940 platform is concerned.

Now, we Americans judge each other by the way we keep our promises. We judge a man by the validity of his pledged word. We judge a business by the way it keeps its promises to its customers. That is the only way we can judge an individual or a business or a public official. On that basis, what is to be said of a President who has made and broken 57 major promises in 8 years?

Now, a word as to our national defense. A good many of the New Deal spokesmen have attempted to charge the sad state of our national defense to the Republican administration preceding the New Deal's accession to power. Let's see about that.

The threat to the security of America arose, if there is any such a threat, in 1933. Every need for a national defense for the United States of America on the scale proposed now by Mr. Roosevelt, has arisen within his own administration. He has been in complete control of Government during that time. He has known, or has claimed to know, world conditions during that time. If these are facts, then to the administration and to none other is chargeable the blame for the dangerous state of our national defense today. To the New Deal administration and to none other is chargeable the waste and the superexpense now necessary to create in haste a defense that should have been in the making for the last 6 years. If Mr. Roosevelt knew that these conditions existed in Europe, then why did he not begin years ago to tell us about it and to advocate the building of a national defense? Instead of that, he and Mr. Hull urged reciprocal-trade treaties which they said would benefit American agriculture and American wage earners and which have not done so. They were entering into these trade treaties with all the nations of the world except Germany at a time when, if they knew what the situation was, they must have known we should be building a defense, and tightening our domestic economy to get ready for a situation which they now say they knew was inevitable.

America is at the parting of the ways.

If, next November, America should decide at the ballot boxes to continue on down the road to the left with Mr. Roosevelt and his New Deal administration, then we face the grave danger of the loss of our personal liberties, the extinction of the Bill of Rights, the paralysis of the Constitution, and a change in our whole form of government, with a probable end to our free constitutional republic as such.

As I said a while ago, the first thing the Republican Party must do when it returns to power will be to clean up the wreckage left by this hurricane of New Deal waste and spending and experimentation.

That means repeal and reverse such acts and policies as have produced that wreckage. Such a program does not include any intent whatsoever to permit one man, woman, or child in this Nation to suffer from lack of merited relief.

Labor will not be deprived of one single advance it has gained in the last decade.

This program will mean, however, relief conducted on the most efficient, practical, and economical basis possible.

It will mean to build our national defense on the most efficient, practical, and economical basis possible.

It will mean to weed out of every governmental department unnecessary and political expenditures which have been instituted and carried on for these several years by the vast New Deal bureaucracy.

It will mean a return to State's rights.

It will mean a return to the kind of government which was instituted with the writing of the Constitution at Philadelphia.

We must no longer continue to have this Nation divided by sectional and class prejudices, hatreds, and suspicions. We must unify our people for their own common defense and prosperity.

It is true we face the probability of completely altered conditions in other countries, which will require adjustment of policy on our part.

The business of administering our Government is the biggest business in the world. The last 8 years have demonstrated the utter, absolute, and inescapable necessity for a business administration.

We have had 8 years of groping.

We have had 8 years of spending.

We have had 8 years of boondoggling. They must have been a boon to the doggiers but they certainly haven't been to the taxpayers.

America must have a business administration if we are to avoid national bankruptcy; if we are to escape inflation or repudiation which would ruin every man, woman, and child in this Nation.

We must put America back to work in private industry at decent wages. This means a business administration that knows what is necessary to encourage the proper expansion of business; it means an economy of plenty instead of scarcity.

We must have an administration that will speak softly and carry a big stick, rather than talk big, and carry a swagger stick.

We must have a business administration which will take the American people into the confidence of its Executive; whose diplomacy will be a part of the people's business, and not the private affair of the little White House clique of schemers.

We must have a business administration which will recognize that the foreign policy of the United States does begin right here in our own land.

We must have a business administration that will actually turn to the task of finding a sound solution for agricultural problems and not mere temporary expedients and palliatives.

It is vitally important for us to regain control of the House of Representatives, and to elect as many Republican Senators as possible. Obviously, Mr. Willkie, as President, will have to have a sympathetic House, and help in the Senate, to translate his business policies into effective measures of government.

I assure you we will take control of the next House of Representatives, and we will increase our membership in the United States Senate.

We have a hard fight ahead of us. We are assured of victory if we will continue to fight right up to the day of the election. But we Republicans must not for a single instant forget that the administration has the patronage. It has the spending of the money. It has a tremendous bureaucracy which reaches its tentacles into every precinct in the United States. We must offset those advantages by hard work

Let me say, my friends, that America has not reached the limit of her development. America has not reached her maturity and started down the hill toward decay. America is not hopeless. Unemployment has not come to stay. The specter of poverty and want and hardship does not hover over this country, permanently to darken the skies of our future. America is a young Nation, a vigorous Nation, a courageous Nation.

The Republican Party has given to the Nation a man whose outstanding—I may say remarkable—ability will assure this Nation of the kind of a business administration in Government we must have. That man was chosen in an unparalleled political action by the national convention of the Republican Party at Philadelphia. He was chosen in the typical American fashion, by a convention of unbossed delegates, who heard the call of millions of Americans, "We Want Willkie!"

Those of you who listened to Wendell Willkie's acceptance speech at Elwood, Ind., and those of you who have since read it, can begin to understand the remarkable character of the man who has risen with the necessity of his Nation. It is said that "the times always produce the man." This certainly is true in the case of the Presidential nominee, Wendell L. Willkie.

Mr. Willkie is not glib. He is not a professional spellbinder. He is a plain, common man of the plain people. He is an amateur in politics. But he is a veteran in business and he is a veteran in his knowledge of what the plain people want, of what the plain people need, and of what the plain people must have.

He reached the top the hard way. He harvested wheat in Minnesota. In his young days he dressed tools in the Texas oil fields. He operated a cement block machine in Wyoming. He puddled steel outside of Chicago. He shucked corn in Iowa. He milked cows in Wisconsin. He picked vegetables in California. He operated a tent hotel in Colorado. He taught school in Kansas. He has lived in Ohio and Indiana and New York. He has traveled over practically the whole of these United States and he knows at first hand the agricultural problems as well as the industrial problems which confront this Nation.

Wendell Willkie himself owns several farms, but he is perfectly honest in saying that he is a talking farmer instead of a working farmer. Nevertheless he does know agriculture from the practical side.

This vastly diversified experience, and his intense temperament, his geniality, his freedom from what is called side, and his deep friendliness for his fellow men make Wendell Willkie the ideal man to take over the White House next January and to clean up the wreckage that has been caused by the New Deal.

Wendell Willkie has called the Nation to sacrifice and achievement, to struggle and accomplishment.

He has given us no glowing promises of livelihood without work, or of fortunes with leisure. Instead he has said plainly and bluntly there is no successful substitute for perseverance and perspiration. The call is to the courage of America. It is the call to the spirit of America. It is the call to the Nation's will to dare and to do.

America is at the parting of the ways.

It is a grave decision we must make. It is a decision which will affect not only the future of our Nation and our own children, and our children's children; it is a decision which will unequestionably have a great effect upon the destiny of the whole civilized world.

There is no doubt in my mind but that America next November will choose to go down the right road with Willkie.

Compulsory Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. C. ARTHUR ANDERSON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 6, 1940

LETTER FROM THE MISSOURI UNITS OF THE STEUBEN SOCIETY OF AMERICA

Mr. ANDERSON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, one of the most patriotic groups I know of is the Steuben Society. This great organization, taking for its guiding beacon the life and acts of General von Steuben, one of the great heroes of the American Revolution, has sent me a letter on the subject of compulsory military training which I commend to the attention of all my colleagues. I ask unanimous consent to conclude my remarks by including at this point the aforementioned letter.

The letter follows:

ST. LOUIS, MO., *August 27, 1940.*

HONORED AND RESPECTED SIR: In a spirit of love for country and its ideals and institutions we petition you, as there are proposals afoot that may become the turning point in the destiny of our land and its people.

After sober deliberation as a result of experiences of the World War, Congress passed a law forbidding direct or indirect transfer to any power or powers at war of any of our implements or munitions of war, this being to assure our people peace at home and freedom from entanglement in foreign squabbles.

There are those in Washington who seriously advance a proposal to violate this law, and even believe that we, a nation of 130,000,000 souls, should heel into the miserable mess over in Europe, due, as heretofore, to jealous lies, hatred, and greed, and the conduct of petty tyrants of all cocky nations, who, as Antony stated in his oration, good may be buried with their bones but the evil they do lives after them.

Lack of vision of European statesmen during the past 30 years belies the statements we have heard often that European diplomacy is far superior to that of our diplomats, and up to this time we do not agree in principle with those statements. Should the question of transfer of ships, planes, or other military creations be requested, we ask, please, that your influence and vote be offered against. When our forbears from all points of Europe set up a new order and conception to govern America they definitely turned their backs on the old order. Any visit to the old birthplace was friendly and any kind of intervention never occurred to them. We feel that still is very good politics. Our interests are best served by minding our business and setting a good-neighbor policy that pleases, most of all, the American people.

Statements are freely made that we have no friends. Position and ownership of wealth rarely begets real, sincere friendships, and arbitrary interference and superior attitudes do not better our already bad situation; and, further, violation of American ideals which served well through long years of practice is not helping our cause, for which it seems our Creator ordained the American Republic into existence, to the end that we help humanity by example.

If by negation of good law and sound American horse sense, we persist in a dangerous practice and sneak into the house of carnage by a side or rear window, compelling the dictators to join up against us, we have only our lack of good sense to blame if our exposed and highly respected carcass be thoroughly riddled, and probably a bill for unlawful entry presented for immediate payment, or else. And they would be absolutely within their rights if we do not get away with what we tried to do; and as conditions now are, may come to pass.

To arm to protect our people is proper, and aids in a measure to replace lost market conditions; but we feel that forced draft of young men just getting started in life after years of hard study is unwise, and will breed contempt for our conception of law and liberty, as did the prohibition law until it was rescinded. It will demoralize their futures and family life.

We are advised that 3 of 5 white, and 7 of 10 colored applicants are rejected by Army and Navy rulings, largely due to malnutrition and causes that in most cases could be corrected.

It seems advisable to place willing applicants in separate divisions, build them to fitness for service, rather than let them leave with an inferiority complex and depressed spirit. In any event, all yearly men will greatly profit by serving and return benefited by their training. The backflow will become an asset to our country and should have a better influence for greater good.

From the heart of our beloved country comes this plea to you for your support for measures that really are short of war, and in this we know we express the thoughts of citizens who never flinch responsibilities and who feel as we do.

Please keep their and our faith in you. Keep America at peace and Americans at peace with each other.

Yours respectfully,

THE MISSOURI UNITS OF THE
STEUBEN SOCIETY OF AMERICA.
LOUIS E. ALEWEL,
Chairman of the Committees.

Compulsory Military Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEE E. GEYER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 6, 1940

TELEGRAM FROM A CONSTITUENT

Mr. GEYER of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert in the RECORD a wire from organizations in California opposing the draft.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., *September 6, 1940.*

Representative LEE GEYER,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Please insert following in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and show to California Congressmen: We cannot defend democracy by sacrificing democracy. Conscription would bring to America the very type of regimentation, militarism, and destruction of freedom that we are trying to avoid. We urge you to stop the un-American Burke-Wadsworth bill. We, your constituents, are united in opposing its passage.

Dorothy Handy, National Council, Y. W. C. A. Business and Professional Girls; Bill Belton, citizenship chairman, San Francisco Christian Endeavor; Charles Rosenthal, chairman, California Youth Legislature; James Dickerson, United Auto Workers, Local No. 76; Homer Alderman, chairman, Northern California Baptist Young Peoples Union; Ellsworth Replogle, Miscellaneous Employees Union, Local No. 110; Leonard White, president, Fairfax Young Democrats; Leonard Newman, chairman, U. C. L. A.; Ruth Maso, secretary, Los Angeles Eastside Youth Council; Leon Frieden, president, Huntington Park Junior B'nai B'rith; Jean Lacouer, student's nonpartisan committee; Lee Feskin, president, Tau Alpha Epsilon; Jack Chasson, secretary, Los Angeles American Student Union; Frank Lopez, vice president, Los Angeles C. I. O. Council; Mayer Frieden, president, West Adams Young Democrats; Mary Roster, president, Santa Clara County Epworth League Alliance; Doris Havermal, Southern California Baptist Young Peoples' Workers; John Quon, Chinese Worker Mutual Aid Association; Grace McKay, chairman, San Francisco Youth Council; Bessie Mendleson, United Office and Professional Workers; Ruth Church, secretary, San Francisco Young Democratic Club; Thelma Lemon, San Francisco Youth Council; Frank Hickman, San Francisco Christian Endeavor.

One Hundred and Nineteenth Annual Conference of the A. M. E. Zion Church

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH A. GAVAGAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 6, 1940

ADDRESS OF MOST REVEREND BISHOP LYNNWOOD WESTINGHOUSE KYLES

Mr. GAVAGAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following Episcopal address delivered by Bishop Lynnwood Westinghouse Kyles at the one hundred and nineteenth annual session of the New York annual conference, A. M. E. Zion Church, Yonkers, N. Y., on June 26, 1940:

Colleagues, general officers, presiding elders, pastors, and Christian workers of the African Methodist Episcopal Zion Church, and friends, the First Epistle to the Thessalonian Christians begins with this salutation: "Grace be unto you and peace from God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ." These words are followed immediately by an expression of a deep sense of gatitude to God for their Christian conduct in the following words: "We give thanks to God always for you all, making mention of you in our prayers; remembering without ceasing your work of faith and labors of love."

In these words, addressed originally to the Thessalonian Christians, I greet you, my colleagues, presiding elders, pastors, and Christian workers of the New York annual conference, who are assembled here as witnesses of the same power of the gospel of Christ. In addressing you on this occasion, I am conscious of the fact that but for the blessings of the Almighty we would not be enjoying the rare privilege which is ours today.

This conference marks not only the closing of the one hundred and nineteenth annual session of the New York conference, but the beginning of a new year and a new quadrennium. As we look back upon the quadrennium which closed a few days ago in the city of Washington, D. C., we have many things to be grateful for, among them are the fine fellowship and the splendid cooperation of the members of the New York conference, to say nothing of what we have been able to accomplish through such fellowship and cooperation in a material and spiritual way. For all of this we are profoundly grateful to God.

As we assemble here today in the one hundred and nineteenth annual session of the New York conference my heart is filled with a feeling of dreadful foreboding and hopeful expectancy. This is a time for deep concern for those who are still privileged to be of the family of the church of Jesus Christ. When we realize that there are now millions on the earth who are positively helpless and unable to live a life of freedom and peaceful procedure, there is a serious foreboding. There is a feeling of hopeful expectancy in the hearts of those who still possess faith and who, like the believers of old, maintain a trustful waiting on the Lord, believing that if we keep the faith all things can be done through Jesus Christ who strengtheneth us, and that all things will "work together for the good of them that love the Lord."

The theme of our conference, The Call of the Christian Church, should touch and awaken to consciousness every person who is here today. Never has the Christian church faced such a period of conflicting ideologies and such apparent success of extraneous, paganistic doctrines in lands formerly called Christian.

Today a godless generation is growing up in Germany which actively and relentlessly seeks to destroy religion. All Christians should see the evil inherent in the philosophy taught by the Nazi leaders, but we must recognize that the Christian church, whose leadership we represent, is charged with the responsibility of salvaging not only the youth of America and closely guarding their spiritual development, but those adults whom we have neglected. Indeed it is the time of which the ancient prophet spoke, "Watchman, what of the night?"

Rosenberg, one of the chief lieutenants of Hitler, portrays Christianity as the cause of a deep-laid plot to overrun the world, and by race degeneration to completely enslave a people. German blood and Christian baptismal waters are completely irreconcilable. Contrary to Christianity in Germany, race is to the ordinary man the most holy thing. There can be no compromise here, but a decisive break with Christianity. This time the break must be at the expense of Christianity, not at the expense of our race.

It is a life and death contest. The issues are too sharply drawn, the spiritual stakes too high, for any lasting compromise. Either Christianity will reconquer its independence in matters of human spirit, or it will be effectively wiped out.

The Christian cross and the Nazi swastika are locked in a combat which when the history of this epoch is written will probably be its most important event.

The great question before the church is, Can Christianity survive? The issues are moral and religious. A neopaganism is being substituted for the Christian way of life. There is a definite effort to establish a standard of human conduct and a system of human relationships which involve a complete repudiation of the New Testament and make a deliberate mockery of Christ.

The paganism with which Hitler would supplant Christianity is not to be confined to Germany. He aims to paganize the western world. His missionaries are in every section of the world and they are disbursing their propaganda like violent disease germs until they are able to render their victims helpless and dependent. The Christian church has never had a more direct challenge. The answer that the church gives is likely to determine the status of the Christian religion through the next period of world history.

One cannot but see the logical, scholarly, practical, workable declarations included in this faith movement of the Nazi regime. As church leaders we have refrained from careful study of reading the publications and documents sent forth by the leaders and propagandists of his movement. It calls your attention to Mein Kampf, which one cannot read without feeling the power of master minds, scholarly and direct behind this philosophy. I have been amazed recently by a publication by Stanley High, which is a compilation of original German documents, which the leaders of this paganistic movement are teaching their own people and with which they are destroying the other people.

The Christian church leaders have laughed at Hitler as though he were a bad boy, but I am willing to believe with Carl Billinger, a young German writer, who has written a book entitled "Hitler Is No Fool."

I repeat, my heart is filled with foreboding, for I realize that the representatives of the Christian church have been guilty of many things that this philosophy accuses the Christian church of propagating. If we would only review the history of the world for the last 20 years, we will find that such a crisis as this had to come because of our own failure to take advantage of opportunities to be Christian and represent the Christ whom we declare to follow. We have to a large extent betrayed the Christ.

Let me take you back to the halls of Versailles in 1918, where England, America, and France, the three great democracies, the greatest representatives of the Christian church, sat in judgment upon a defeated nation. We do not dare to go into the questions of the rights of the victor and vanquished! But, we do call your attention to this one thing, first, we missed our opportunity to be Christian when the representatives of these three great Christian democracies, not only recognized their own colonial system of government but disbursed the colonies of the vanquished nation among themselves to be ruled and governed for their own economic benefit. How then would one judge a Christian nation except as a force which imposes over the weak.

Look at the next 10 years following the Versailles Treaty and watch the history of India and the movements of Ghandi. Great Britain, a Christian democracy, instead of sending Christian missionaries to preach the gospel of liberation, if her intentions were only for the development and good of India, sent military Governors and strengthened her control of home rule for her own imperial control.

Again we will notice the history during the last 20 years of the Negro. The black man returned from Europe where he had fought and bled to make the world safe for democracy, and where he had gone to defend his country. This he did in spite of the fact that the following condition as set forth by the French military commission stationed with the American Army, existed. I quote from a document which was sent to all the Governors and mayors of France and reprinted in the May issue of the Crisis magazine for 1919, which issue was barred from the mails:

"The French public has become accustomed to treating the Negro with familiarity and indulgence. * * * This indulgence and this familiarity are matters of grievous concern to the Americans.

"Although citizens of the United States, the black man is regarded by the white Americans as inferior beings with whom relations of business or service only are possible."

There were three recommendations: "First, that there should be no undue familiarity between French and Negro officers; second, that the American Negro troops should not be praised too highly by the French military officials; third, that the French population * * * should be warned against the 'spoiling' of the Negro soldiers."

And, again in this crisis when a national-defense program is being launched, the Negro is being enlisted in the United States Army in segregated units only.

Again, America in her program of Christian brotherhood has much to explain to paganistic people who deny the unity of races when one reads the report of Senators WAGNER and CAPPER and Representatives GAVAGAN and FISH, entitled "Lynching Goes Underground." In spite of the opinion expressed in the Collier's magazine of February 10, 1940, that since there had only been three lynchings in the whole Nation in 1939, there was probably no need for antilynching legislation, and goes on to state that this had been accomplished by education of public opinion. But the Collier's magazine did not go deep enough into the situation and did not realize that we have reached the point only where lynchings are "done quietly" so as not to attract attention or draw publicity. In some lonely swamp a small body of men do the job that was formerly done by a howling, bloodthirsty mob of men, women, and children.

Then one has only to read the recent novel, entitled "The Native Son," and study the Social Action magazine for 1940 on Negro housing in Chicago, or peruse a cheap little magazine called Look, for May 21, 1940, showing the situation here in New York, to realize what this part of the Christian family has been forced to endure on the question of brotherhood in a Christian nation today.

Again, while Germany, Russia, and Italy, the great representatives of the paganistic movement of the world under their totalitarian governments, have been commandeering every man, woman, and child, supplying them with work, keeping them busy, feeding them with a purposeful program each day, consolidating their economic life for the good of the whole, according to their philosophy, until today they stand ready internally as a solid group, fed, clothed, and armed to carry forward their war of conquest, our Christian democracies have been concerned only about money. We have permitted capitalists to dictate the policies of our procedure and while some grew rich, others grew poorer; while some have more houses than they can ever live in, others have no place to live. While some have been urged to plow under their cotton in order that the prices might go up, others have no garments to wear. While wheat has been burned that some may profit, others have had no bread. While some were fighting and struggling for larger wages and fewer hours, we have here in our own country, according to reports of the National Industries Board of February 1940, after billions have been spent for employment, 9,436,000 still unemployed and the masses have been demoralized by the dole and relief.

While church leaders have preached peace, they winked at the fact that our institutions of learning and our charitable institutions were being supported by revenue derived from the manufacture and sale of war implements to belligerent nations who needed only to be armed to declare war.

While the doctors of learning and the great mental forces of the totalitarian states have been educating and corralling their youth into a solid phalanx against the Christian religion and building them up on the paganistic philosophies by word and deed, carefully guarding against any interference by those who would upset their teaching, we have welcomed into our halls of learning, not only in our State but in many private institutions of learning supported by our churches, the "fifth column" ideas. These ideas of totalitarianism and these paganistic philosophies have found a fertile ground, because beginning with the first grade, up through college, there is no inclusion of the principles of the teachings of Jesus Christ nor the use of the Bible as a part of our school curriculum.

Dr. Luther A. Weigle, dean of the divinity school of Yale University, in an address delivered before the annual meeting of the National Council of Religious Education in February 1940 said:

"Yet when all is granted that may be affirmed of the influences making for sound character and religious faith in the best of our public-school systems, the fact remains that religion and education are rather sharply divorced in most American communities, and that we have departed far from the early conception that religion should be an integral part of public education."

In the nineteenth century this "secularization" of public education, as it has come to be called, was incidental rather than purposed. It was a byproduct of the working out under the preservation of our liberties. These are the principles of religious freedom and the principle of public responsibility for education and for citizenship in a democracy.

One result of this religious freedom has been the perpetuation of distinct religious groups and the multiplication and growth of separately organized religious denominations. Another result has been to make easy withdrawal from church affiliation or the refusal to ally one's self with any organized religious group. Yet the great majority of American citizens support the churches and synagogues of the communities in which they live; and the total number of those who are church members in their own right, is more than one-half the population of the country.

The principle of public responsibility for education for citizenship in a democracy was conceived in New England and became the general policy of the country toward the middle of the nineteenth century. The main arguments then used in behalf of free public schools, supported by taxation, were the necessity for education as a qualification for the rights and duties of citizenship in a democracy; the need of public schools as a means of Americanization, transmitting a common heritage and begetting a common loyalty within the children of different racial and lingual groups; the need of public provision for education as a means of equalization of opportunities for rich and poor. Education, as contrasted with propaganda or mere conditioning by training, is of essential importance to a democracy. The precise form in which the state may best fulfill its responsibilities for the education of its citizens may vary, but the responsibility is inescapable.

The separation of religion and education into which we have drifted in America was not a necessary or logical result of either of these two basic principles, or of the two taken together. It has occurred because of certain conditions, certain factors of circumstances and trends of events, which characterized our life in the nineteenth century.

The most important of these factors of circumstance, is the sectarianism of our religious organizations, and the fact that we have held our diverse religious beliefs in so jealous and diverse a fashion. It is not infidels or atheists or free thinkers who have come most to take religious elements out of the life and curriculum

of the public schools. It is the people who have spoken in the name of religion.

Quoting further from Dean Weigle we continue:

"To omit religion from the public schools is to convey to children a negative suggestion. Such a policy is bound to discredit religion in their minds. It would lead them to conclude that religion is negligible, or unimportant, or irrelevant to the real business of life."

The whole of the religious education of American children obviously cannot be undertaken in the public schools. That is the responsibility of the family, and of the churches and synagogues. We need more, not less, emphasis upon the sound home training of children and upon the well-organized, effective service of the Sunday school, vacation church school, and week-day school of religion.

But the public schools can and should include in their life that basic, elemental faith, which is deeper and more fundamental than any of religion's institutional or sectarian forms, the faith that relates human life to God. Let the public school exclude sectarianism but make explicit its belief in God; let it leave to the family and to the church or synagogues the responsibility for education in the whole range of religion, but let it keep in its own life provision for the education of children in due reverence for God and faith in God.

In the outset I stated that my heart was filled with expectancy and that is the only position for a true Christian to have at a time like this.

We are faced with a responsibility and a challenge which afford a great opportunity for the church. This situation demands a vigorous faith and a buoyant hope. A great expectancy.

If we would but listen today, O men of God, we would hear the Psalmist saying as of old—Psalm 37: 3:

"Trust in the Lord and do good; so shalt thou dwell in the land, and verily, thou shalt be fed."

It is not too late but it is the time for Christian demonstration. We can only have faith in the future and trust in the Lord when we have clean hands and a pure heart. * * * When we do good.

In the recent study conference on the churches and the international situation which met in Philadelphia sponsored by the Department of International Justice and Good Will of the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America, the following declarations represent to a large degree the answer of the church today which gives us faith that we can hope:

"Many hold that the time has come for the churches to declare their commitment to the principle of freedom for subject peoples which involves the ultimate freeing of colonies and the drastic modification of the whole colonial system. The abolition of chattel slavery was one of the great steps forward in human society. Should not this same principle be applied to groups of men?

"We believe that the principle of eventual freedom for all peoples is not only the recognition of an essential right but is also a prerequisite to the creation of that sense of justice and good will without which we cannot hope to rid the world of war.

"Again, domestic policy is related to foreign policy and world peace. This fact is often overlooked. Social and economic justice; tariff and trade relations; Army and Navy appropriations; racial and religious attitudes; these are among the interests of a domestic character which bear upon the peace and war problem.

"It is impossible wholly to divorce foreign policy from domestic policy and any comprehensive program for peace must contain a synthesis of both.

"A constructive, creative policy can stem only from a domestic policy which is firmly rooted in democracy and which provides for adequate social security."

As church leaders we have as our task the challenge to use every opportunity to do good to the souls and bodies of our fellow men, not only to pray but to work that His will be done on earth, in the same trust.

Let the church be militant about the affairs of government and society. Liberty and justice for all, means every human person. Even black Africa, brown India, the American Negro, and the underprivileged everywhere.

"Trust in the Lord and do good and there will be an opportunity for all to live abundantly."

Again, we hear the Psalmist say: "Wait on the Lord and He shall exalt thee to inherit the land; When the wicked are cut off, thou shalt see it" (37: 34).

As members of the Methodist Church and professors of the doctrines of John Wesley, we have a great heritage. Methodism has stood for free church—never under any state control but always free to make the citizens and policies of a state Christian. It has been the mission of the Methodist to spread scriptural holiness through the lands.

It has been well said in a recent book on Methodism, The Highroads of Methodism, that one of the greatest glories of Methodism has been its attitude toward all races and colors of mankind. Its activities in all its history have not been restricted to people of one color or tongue.

The individual gospel that has been stressed by Methodism necessarily has a social implication. There can be no completely individual gospel that does not become social in its functioning. Those Methodists whose hearts were "strangely warmed" ever since the days of John Wesley have industriously ministered to the physical, intellectual, and spiritual needs of the people in joyous expectation, that His kingdom may come on earth.

In conclusion, we turn again to the psalmist as he gave the triumphant example of our attitude and position at this time: Psalms 37: 37, "Mark the perfect man, and behold the upright, for the end of that man is peace."

The answer is the enthronement of Jesus Christ as Lord and Saviour—the perfect man * * * the great example.

As Christians and particularly as Methodists, it has been our mission from the beginning to lead men to Christ—to enthrone Christ: "That in all things He might have the preeminence." Col. 1: 18.

Where have we been in recent years? If Methodism alone would gird on its armor now, and suffer, strive, and endure for the great cause, there would be created even yet enough tension to stop the world catastrophe in many places.

The World Council of Churches making Christ supreme Lord over race, creed, nation, and tongue today there would be peace.

My appeal to you as members of the Methodist Annual Conference is to remember that we face disaster and defeat only because we do not realize that this day and generation demand of any form of religion or civilization a program that comprises the whole life. We have been lukewarm and compromising, and the result is threatened destruction. Therefore, we must go forth insisting that there be a complete surrender to the totalitarian claims of Christ into the way of peace.

Compulsory Military Service in Massachusetts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH E. CASEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 6, 1940

SECTIONS OF THE ANNOTATED LAWS OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following sections of the Annotated Laws of Massachusetts, indicating that for many years the Governor of the Commonwealth has had the power to draft men in times of threatened invasion of the imminency of war:

ANNOTATED LAWS OF MASSACHUSETTS

Chapter 33, section 5. Organized and unorganized militia: The militia shall consist of two classes, namely, the organized militia, to be known as the Massachusetts volunteer militia, composed and organized as provided in this chapter; and the remainder, to be known as the unorganized militia. The unorganized militia shall be subject to no active duty except in case of war, actual or threatened, invasion, the prevention of invasion, the suppression of riots, and the assisting of civil officers in the execution of the laws. (P. S. 14, sec. 6; 1887, 411, sec. 6; 1893, 367, sec. 6; R. L. 16, sec. 7; 1905, 465, sec. 7; 1908, 604, sec. 7; 1917, 327, sec. 5; 1924, 465.)

Chapter 33, section 8. Calling out of unorganized militia: When necessary to call out any part of the unorganized militia for active duty, the commander in chief shall direct his order to the aldermen or to the selectmen, who shall forthwith, by written order or oral notice to each individual, or by proclamation, appoint a time and place for the assembling of the unorganized militia in their town, and shall then and there draft as many thereof, or accept as many volunteers, as are required by the order of the commander in chief, and shall forthwith forward to him a list of the persons so drafted or accepted as volunteers. (P. S. 14, sec. 9; 1887, 411, sec. 9; 1893, 367, sec. 9; R. L. 16, sec. 10; 1905, 465, sec. 10; 1908, 604, sec. 10; 1917, 327, sec. 8; 1924, 465.)

Chapter 33, section 9. Muster of same, etc.; deserter, who deemed: The part of the unorganized militia so drafted or accepted shall immediately be mustered under the orders of the commander in chief into the service of the Commonwealth for 3 years, or for such less period as he may direct, and shall be organized into new units, or assigned to organizations of the volunteer militia then existing. Such new organizations shall be officered, equipped, trained, and governed according to the laws for the government of the volunteer militia. In such new organizations, the commander in chief may detail officers to train and command them until their officers shall have qualified. Every member of the unorganized militia who volunteers or is detached or drafted, who does not appear to be mustered in as required by the orders of the commander in chief, or does not produce a sworn certificate, from a physician in good standing, of physical disability so to appear, shall be taken to be a deserter. (P. S. 14, sec. 10; 1887, 411, sec. 10; 1893, 367, sec. 10; R. L. 16, sec. 11; 1905, 465, sec. 11; 1908, 604, sec. 11; 1917, 327, sec. 9; 1920, 127, sec. 1; 1924, 465.)

Conscription in Peacetime

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 6, 1940

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I have given the present legislation and the entire question of peacetime conscription as much time and consideration as I have any legislation that has come up since I have been a Member of Congress. I realize that there are sincere differences of opinion on the matter. My thought is that conscription at any time, either in war or peace, should be used only as the last resort. We have never before found it necessary to use conscription in peacetime. We have not always found it necessary in time of war. To enact conscription legislation at this time would be to depart from a tradition which has been maintained since the beginning of the Republic. If we adopt it now in peacetime there certainly is some question as to whether we will ever get rid of it. I do not like to think of the America of the future as a country where men are conscripted in time of peace.

Furthermore, the conscription of men for military service is only one phase of the matter. When this measure was before the Senate an amendment was adopted, providing for conscription of industry in such broad terms as to bring about the establishment of a dictatorship. Whether this legislation in its final form will contain this provision is not so material. The chances are that it will be retained, but whether or not it is a part of this particular bill, we are in the end going to conscript industry and labor and bring about a complete military dictatorship in this country. We might accept something of this kind in time of war as a matter of necessity, but certainly it should not even be considered in time of peace, unless considerations affecting our national safety make it imperative.

Just what is there in our present situation which makes it necessary for us to enact this legislation? What is it that requires us to build up a conscripted army of 1,000,000 men or more in addition to the more than 900,000 men who are now serving in the United States Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, either actively or in reserve? Up to now, at least, the theory of all military experts has been that our main line of defense is our fleet. We are a naval power separated from our potential enemies by 3,000 to 7,000 miles of water. We already have a more powerful Navy than any country other than England, a friendly nation. We have authorized and have under construction additional Navy units which will more than double the strength of our forces. We have just acquired sites for naval and air bases far out into the Atlantic, thus tremendously increasing the effectiveness of our defense. We have authorized and are now building the greatest air fleet in the world. It is true it will take time to complete our naval preparations. It will take time to build our air force, but both arms are growing stronger every day and within the next 2 years we should have the greatest air force in the world and our Navy will be vastly strengthened. Likewise, within that time, we will have developed our newly acquired naval and air bases.

To supplement these great defensive forces we need a comparatively small mobile Army. One which is equipped with the most modern type of weapons, strong coast defenses, and anti-aircraft guns, and thoroughly mechanized. We can easily recruit such an Army by voluntary methods and conscription is most certainly not necessary. Conscription is only necessary if we are going to raise an Army of from 2,000,000 to 4,000,000 men.

The only reason for even considering the creation of such a tremendous army is that there are fears that Hitler may conquer England, capture the English fleet, and attack this country within the next few months. In that event it is argued that we will not be able to prevent the landing of an army on this hemisphere and we must, therefore, be prepared to fight it out with land forces.

Such an argument might much better have been made 3 months ago, or even 2 months ago, than today. The victorious march of Hitler had not been interrupted up to that time and the confused and perplexed military experts of the world were in more or less of a state of panic. They envisioned the conquest of Britain as the next inevitable step and the capture and the destruction of the British fleet as a logical consequence. Granting that there was some justification for such a belief 2 or 3 months ago, there is no justification for it today. The likelihood of invasion is growing less every day, and if there is to be an invasion this fall—or ever, it must come within the next 3 weeks. Hitler is now talking about a 5-year war instead of being in England by August 15, as he promised his people a few weeks ago.

Furthermore, if England should be defeated and invaded, we have the assurance of Winston Churchill that the British Navy will not be surrendered or otherwise be permitted to fall in the hands of Germany. Therefore, at this moment it seems extremely improbable that a German attack can be expected any time soon. The same thing applies to the other totalitarian powers, for all of whom our Navy is a match under present conditions.

Even assuming that we should lose entirely the protection of the English Navy and the very improbable situation should develop whereby we might lose control of the sea, it requires a tremendous stretch of the imagination to envision the landing of any troops in this hemisphere. As the well-known military writer, Hanson W. Baldwin, has recently stated in Harper's magazine, the maximum force that could be transported, even if we lost control of the sea, would be 50,000 men and that the transportation of even this small number of men would require 375,000 tons of shipping, and that, once they landed, half of the tonnage of the German merchant marine would be needed to supply them. Mr. Baldwin further states that to supply 1,000,000 men on this hemisphere from Europe would require at least 13,000,000 tons of shipping. An impossible quantity even if there were a combination of Germany and Britain against us. Certainly no combination of nations could transport and supply 1,000,000 men on this continent any time short of 2 or 3 years, even assuming the war in Europe ended tomorrow, and that we had no naval protection whatever.

A recent article by Walter Trohan in the Chicago Tribune of August 26 contains a further discussion of what would be required for an invasion of this country. This article, which was written after consulting many military and naval experts, states in effect that any attempt of invasion with a force of less than 1,000,000 men would be suicidal, and that to equip such an army would require 1,500 tanks, 1,800 scout cars, 200,000 other types of motor vehicles, and 7,500 planes. At sea such an army would need 1,000 transports of an average of 10,000 tons, 200 freighters of an average of 5,000 tons, 500 supply ships of an average of 7,500 tons, and 250 oil tanks of an average of 8,000 tons. No country or group of countries in the world could within a reasonable period of time furnish such an amount of supplies or shipping. In addition, any country or combination of countries attempting such an invasion would have to have a fleet sufficiently prepared to drive our Navy from the seas.

No, it is not necessary for us to have conscription for self-defense, or for the defense of the Western Hemisphere. The only possible excuse for building up a large conscripted army is for offensive use elsewhere. In other words, it means that we contemplate getting into the war. There can be no other possible justification. The American people are willing to spend whatever may be necessary and to make whatever other sacrifices that may be necessary to defend this country. I do not believe, however, that they are willing to have peacetime conscription and dictatorship foisted upon them, perhaps forever. I, therefore, expect to vote against the bill.

S. 1610

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS A. FLAHERTY
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 6, 1940

Mr. FLAHERTY. Mr. Speaker, I am greatly concerned with the discrimination by certain departments of the Government against graduates of certain schools. This practice is so general and so unfair that a bill is now pending in Congress to eliminate the condition. The bill I refer to is S. 1610, which has passed the Senate and is now pending on the Union Calendar of the House of Representatives. I hope that the legislation proposed in this measure will become law before the present Congress adjourns.

I have been disturbed by the latest evidence of the prejudice of department officials, which was brought to my notice in a letter which I have received from President Gleason L. Archer, of Suffolk University, Boston, Mass.

The letter is as follows:

SUFFOLK UNIVERSITY,
Boston, Mass., September 4, 1940.

Hon. THOMAS A. FLAHERTY,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLAHERTY: An unfortunate situation has arisen in the first naval district due to departmental regulations barring applicants for officers' training except graduates or undergraduates of accredited colleges and universities.

I think you are familiar with the fact that the college department of Suffolk University is too young to seek accreditation. Its faculty, however, is composed of experienced day university teachers drawn from the faculties of Harvard University, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Tufts, and other colleges.

It seems to me manifestly unjust both to our men and to the Nation itself that naval "red tape" should bar able and patriotic young men from service in this emergency. Trained lawyers and men academically trained under veteran teachers should not, in my judgment, be humiliated by rejection simply because their institution is too young to be on the accredited list.

Recently I went to Washington and consulted the Department. I have since written a complete statement of the case. Today I am in receipt of a letter from Rear Admiral C. W. Mintz, Chief of the Bureau, who writes as follows:

"The Navy Department would be glad to consider applicants from Suffolk University as soon as it is listed by one of the recognized accrediting agencies."

As you are perhaps aware accrediting is a lengthy process which we could not hope to complete within 3 years. Please see if you can't do something to overcome this intolerable situation. Incidentally, we have about 3,500 graduates, most of them lawyers.

Many of them are already holding important Federal positions—as for example, James J. Caffrey, 1923, regional director of the Securities and Exchange Commission in New York City. Men of this type should not be required to wait until conscripted as privates.

Why not take up and pass S. 1610 that prevents discrimination of this nature in other fields?

Cordially yours,

GLEASON L. ARCHER, *President.*

Mr. Speaker, the custom now in vogue is most undemocratic in that it excludes the attorney or physician who acquired his training the hard way from consideration for appointment in the several administrative agencies of the Government. Furthermore, this type of professional man cannot be selected for appointment in the commissioned service of the Army and Navy of this country. I do not share the views of these departments that only the sons of the rich, the graduates of Harvard, Yale, and Columbia are capable of leadership, or qualified for these honorable positions in the service of our country.

I urge upon this Congress to put an end to this policy of special privilege once and for all, and in my honest judgment, we will find ourselves better equipped to meet the serious days that appear to lie ahead.

The 5-Day Week in the Federal Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 6, 1940

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, there is now pending in the Congress the McCormack-Mead 5-day week bill (H. R. 9655) which would authorize the President to establish the 5-day week for all or any agency in Washington for all or any part of the year, providing no extra costs to the Government are entailed.

It is my position that if this bill is enacted into law that such a work-week could be installed without added cost to the Government.

According to a statement by the Civil Service Commission, it was estimated in 1937 that the installation of the 5-day week would cost $56,700,000 or 6.6 percent of the aggregate pay of the employees affected. Apparently this was computed in a purely mathematical way. Though it may be true that figures do not lie, there are times when they do not tell the truth and this is an instance of it.

There are certain intangible but nevertheless very important factors which the Commission did not take into consideration. The Commission itself states that—

> An uncalculated but substantial amount that would be saved in the cost of heating, cooling, and general maintenance of buildings and equipment should be deducted from the $56,000,000 estimate.

It admits, too, that "an uncalculated but substantial amount" should be deducted from this figure for such savings as improved management and administration would make.

But it makes no allowance whatever for stepped-up production brought about because of heightened employee morale or the improved health and added vigor which an additional half-day's rest and vacation would mean. There should be a very heavy deduction for this factor. It may be uncalculated but it is not incalculable.

This proposal to institute the 5-day week in the public service is not a novel undertaking. As you know, the 5-day week is well established in private industry and in several governmental agencies, Federal, State, and municipal.

I have scanned the reports of those who have installed the 5-day week, the reports of men who are in a position to have been able to watch it operate and to note its results. Here are some of these findings and some of the results from a standpoint of cost and production, which after all should be the primary concern of any employer, be he private or public.

The Government Printing Office was the first major Government agency to be placed on a 5-day week. This was done on July 2, 1932. In his annual report of 1932 the Superintendent of Accounts states that installation of the 5-day week stimulated production to such an extent that output increased from 4 to 10 percent in the various departments. He also indicates that production for the 4-hour period on Saturday was low and did not compare with proportionate periods on full working days.

Though this same report shows an increase of 234 employees during the fiscal year of 1932, this cannot be attributed to the 5-day week. Prior to this there had been considerable overtime and there was an overload of work. At that time there were 2,133 printing and binding jobs that had been at the Printing Office for more than 60 days after order. But by November 28, 1932, there were only 30 such jobs pending.

If the Commission must use mathematics, let it compute this: The 4-hour half day is one-eleventh of the 5½-day

week, or slightly more than 9 percent. Yet we have an increase of 10 percent in many G. P. O. departments, plus the "uncalculated but substantial" savings mentioned by the Commission for heating, cooling, maintenance, and so forth. Now, let them turn loose the slide rules and tell us how much the 5-day week in that agency cost the Government. And, mind you, the one-eleventh, which is the half day, has consistently been shown to be an unproductive period, and it would not be accurate to say that half as much work is turned out on this half day as is produced in a full day.

On October 17, 1939, the former budget commissioner and personnel director of the State of Minnesota, which has instituted the 5-day week for State employees, made this statement, based on his observations:

> There was no increase in the pay roll of the respective State departments to indicate that additional employees were added because of the 5-day week, and in recommending appropriations for salaries the departments in most instances did not increase their appropriations requests because of the installation of the 5-day week.

The commissioner pointed out that it did require—

> More accurate and detailed planning of the work of the office on the part of the executives, and that the employees worked more efficiently as a result of the shorter working week.

If this is possible in Minnesota, it ought to be possible in the Federal Government.

Charles J. Fox, city auditor of Boston, on December 6, 1939, wrote:

> Establishment of the 5-day week in the printing department has meant no additional expense to the city. So far as I can ascertain, neither has it resulted in any loss of efficiency.

This statement applied to only one group of employees who were on the 5-day week the year round. In Boston, which is a much cooler city than Washington, D. C., as every Member of this House knows only too well, virtually all city employees work the 5-day week during the summer months.

The following is Mr. Fox's experience on this score:

> By executive order, city departments have been manned by skeleton forces on Saturday mornings. In this way the bulk of employees have been excused from duty. There has been no extra expense involved in this procedure, and there certainly has been no loss in efficiency in the operation of city departments, since Saturday mornings in general throughout the summer are not busy days. * * * In fact, I feel this statement is correct for all Saturdays throughout the year, with the possible exception of the winter months.

Here is another person who ought to know, who emphasizes the unproductiveness of the Saturday half day, and emphasizes that the 5-day week entails no extra expense.

The 5-day week is in force in the navy yards, the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, the Post Office, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and certain other field establishments. New York City has adopted it, too, as have other State and municipal governments. I do not have the figures on these agencies.

Now, let me turn to some results and findings in private industry. Perhaps the most scientific study of the 5-day week was conducted in the Boots Pure Drug Co., Ltd., in England. The structure of the company—if it is still standing—is comparable to our Federal Government. It is engaged in the production and distribution of over 2,000 items in the drug and toiletry line. Because of its location, units had grown up "in patchwork rather than on any comprehensive scheme embracing the works as a whole," in the words of the production director of the company, although some years later coordinated units were built to house production activities.

This company is a very big concern. Except for raw materials, it is a self-contained business in that it manufactures as well as distributes its products. It is comparable in size to the A. & P. chain stores in this country, or, to make its structure even clearer, it is akin to a combination of Park & Tilford Drug Co. and the Whelan Drug Stores. In short, it is an organization of sufficient size and diversity to make its 5-day-week data significant.

In 1934 the company decided to experiment with the 5-day week from April 30 to September 22. The directors then asked the Ministry of Labor to appoint an investigator to determine the cost of the 5-day week to the company. Sir Richard A. S. Redmayne, of the Institution of Civil Engineers, was appointed to make the study on August 13, 1934. Although hours were not made standard for all departments, the total number of weekly hours declined in all departments. Redmayne termed the experiment a success.

He found that in general the number of employees did not change for the whole company despite the shorter week. To quote the office manager of the company:

> We employed one or two extra people in one or two sections in anticipation of the 5-day week, but experience showed us we did not need them.

It is clear therefore that costs did not increase.

Did production decrease? Redmayne found that production did not suffer materially. It was discovered that tardiness and absenteeism were greatly reduced and health much improved under the 5-day week. It was generally agreed that the improvement in attendance and promptness helped considerably in running the plant smoothly and in increasing efficiency of operation. It was noted that the production and efficiency of employees who were not wholly dependent on machines stepped up more than that of those who were—and it should be emphasized that very few Government workers are wholly dependent on machines in their jobs. There was a marked enthusiasm among workers when they reported for work Monday morning which was not notable before.

Redmayne came to the conclusion, too, that Saturday was an unproductive day. It is, he said, a short day and the cost of starting operations and the low morale of workers outweighs the output. Repairs to machinery and buildings was also speeded up and did not interfere so much with the work because it could be performed on Saturdays when the plants were clear.

It is very significant to note that there was complete agreement that no reduction in personnel would be possible if a return to the 5½-day week were made.

As to overtime, which had been prevalent prior to the experiment, it was virtually eliminated and management let it be known to supervisors that they would regard most overtime as maladministration.

Interestingly enough, Redmayne's report gives large credit to management also for making the 5-day week operative in that there was careful planning and streamlining prior to its establishment.

It should be clear from this study of the Boots Drug Co. that the 5-day week is beneficial to employer as well as employee, for no report can give weight on paper to increased loyalty and appreciation.

The Harvard School of Business Administration conducted an interesting study of the 5-day week at the Hawthorne plant of Western Electric, in which they observed groups at work. A group of 5 girls was observed and their output continually increased, which gave rise to the conclusion that, having a feeling of obligation and usefulness, they put more effort in their work.

In 1929, the National Industrial Conference Board, Inc., of New York City, made a thoroughgoing study of the 5-day week. One hundred and twenty-seven concerns replied to queries sent them.

Conclusions from this undertaking indicate that Saturday is recognized as economically unsatisfactory and the Board learned that "companies operating on the 5-day week did not, as a rule, find overtime work necessary."

In general it was discovered also that "the fewer the days into which production can be compressed the smaller will be the proportion of nonproductive work," or wasted time.

The conference board concluded that the 5-day week makes for efficient operation because—

First. Overhead is cut;

Second. Inspection and repair of machinery on Saturday cuts down on the number of break-downs during the week;

Third. Punctuality and attendance of the workers improve.

Note the third item. Where in the Civil Service Commission's report is an "uncalculated but substantial" allowance made for this very important item?

Samuel Crowther, in his interview with Henry Ford, which was written up in World's Work for October 1926, says:

> Now we know from experience in changing from 6 days to 5 and back again that we can get at least as great production in 5 days as we can in 6, and we shall probably get a greater, for the pressure will bring better methods. A full week's wage for a short week's work will pay.

Mr. Crowther makes out a case from a switch from the 6-day week to 5 days. I am speaking only of a reduction from 5½ days to 5 days.

To get back to the Commission's report, they appear to be not only misinformed as to the effects of the 5-day week but in unwarranted opposition to such a proposal for some reason or other.

A provision of the bill calls for time and one-half for overtime, and this the Commission feels will run up the costs. This provision is placed in the bill so that the Congress may, very much like the directors of Boots Drugs, Ltd., indicate that they frown upon overtime, and it is meant to be a penalty for maladministration.

Under date of July 11, 1940, in a letter to the President of the United States, Col. Philip B. Fleming, Administrator of the Wage and Hour Division, Department of Labor, made these germane observations:

> As a soldier, the Nation's defense is my primary interest. Were there any defense need in certain industries for abrogation of the time and one-half rule (referring to overtime) nothing could keep me from so reporting. In my contacts with industry no such need has yet been demonstrated to me.

Colonel Fleming goes on to cite the wartime report of the British Munitions Commission which covered observations over a 13½-month period. That document, gentlemen, shows that a reduction of working hours of munition workers was associated with an increase in production.

Quoted also in the Fleming letter is General Order No. 13, issued by the Chief of Ordnance, United States Army, on November 15, 1917, which, as Colonel Fleming states, was "7 months after the declaration of war when the United States was at the height of its procurement effort." The order stated:

> In view of the urgent necessity for a prompt increase in the volume of production of practically every article required for the conduct of the war, vigilance is demanded of all those in any way associated with industry lest the safeguards with which the people of this country have sought to protect labor should be unwisely and unnecessarily broken down. It is a fair assumption that for the most part these safeguards are the mechanisms of efficiency. Industrial history proves that reasonable hours, fair working conditions, and a proper wage scale are essential to high production. During the war every attempt should be made to conserve in every way possible all of our achievements in the way of social betterment. But the pressing argument for maintaining industrial safeguards in the present emergency is that they actually contribute to efficiency. To waive them would be a shortsighted policy, leading gradually but inevitably toward lowered production.

In another statement the Commission makes the point that it would be unfair to give one group of Government workers a 35-hour week when others are working 40 hours. Is the Commission making a plea for uniform hours? If so, why is it that thousands of Government workers are now working more than 40 hours a week and in many instances more than 50 hours a week? Why has not the Commission done something or asked that something be done to bring them down to 40 hours?

It states further that in recent legislation Congress has favored the 40-hour week. I am forced to point out that 40 hours is the maximum number that Congress will permit all industries over which they have jurisdiction to work most of their employees. It has not stipulated that they cannot work less. Because Congress has passed legislation involving the 40-hour week, it is not for the Commission to make the interpretation that Congress is opposed to less hours when such will not involve further costs.

The 35-hour week is in effect in many private industries and there is no reason why the Government should lag behind as an employer. We want the Federal employee to have a sense of loyalty, to feel that this Government is a fair and considerate employer. I am not implying that we shall purchase loyalty through the gift of a shorter workweek. But we can win appreciation, understanding, and gratitude, something that is important indeed in these days of betrayal and disloyalty. With unity and national defense now topics of household discussion and of the utmost importance, there is a duty imposed upon this body to go behind the lines—to see that morale in the Federal service is brought to the highest level and kept there. It cannot be a one-sided proposition. The management of Government administration must give crystal-clear indication that it is cooperative and not abusive—that it is not acting in bad faith—that the Government of these United States is not a bad employer.

I have here pledge petitions initiated by the United Federal Workers of America, a Government employees' union, which bear the signatures of nearly 30,000 Government workers employed in the District of Columbia. These employees pledge the fullest cooperation in making the 5-day week operative. They pledge their unconditional loyalty to the Government. They want to be useful to their country, but they want their country to give them standard working conditions. Every single one of them is an American citizen. I maintain that this Congress ought to enact this measure and by so doing generate a spirit in the public service which will make the Government impregnable against the stabs of America's enemies.

Conscription

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK O. HORTON

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 6, 1940

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Chairman, I am going to vote for H. R. 10132, not because I believe in peacetime conscription but rather because the adoption of this bill will serve notice on Hitler that our entire resources are pledged to stop him dead in his tracks if he dare start anything on our side of the Atlantic.

I must confess that my support is given with fear and trembling because of the President's insistence for a third term, with all it implies, as well as his dictatorial and war-provoking action in disposing of 50 destroyers. These actions show his utter disregard of precedence and the law, as well as his willingness to willfully violate the sacred treaty of The Hague and flaunt and defy the right and will of Congress.

No wonder that the Congress is fearful of delegating additional authority when authority already given is so grossly abused.

I am not a bit sure but what the instrument that we think we are welding for our defense may not well be the instrument that will be used for our destruction.

I realize as fully as anyone that the threat from within, brought about by the failure of this administration to solve domestic problems and willingness to permit all kinds of reds and various shades of pink to honeycomb this Government, is even greater than the threat from without.

But just because we have a dangerous wild bull running amuck in our herd is no reason why we should not protect our herd from a pack of wolves.

We must protect ourselves against both threats, and I believe that the instrument offered in this bill is the best instrument that is available at this time.

We are not building our Army, Navy, and air force for war, but rather to prevent war. I want our armed forces to be so infinitely superior to any other combination of powers that when we say "stop," they stop. You do not see anyone pushing Joe Louis around, nor do you see Joe Louis bullying anyone.

None of us like conscription. I have three boys, all in their twenties. They do not like conscription. This thing comes as

close home to me as it does to any man in this House. As a kid, 10 years younger than the youngest man in this House, I volunteered and served in the Spanish-American War. I do not like conscription.

But even less do I like the shadow of Hitler, with all of its implications.

The cost is stupendous, the discomfort tremendous, the break in our daily lives pretty awful, but not comparable in misery to what might happen if we fail to get the big club ready in time.

War will not come because of preparedness.

If war comes, it will come through some such fool stunt as was the routing of the *American Legion* through a known German-mined sea. Had that boat, bent on its voyage of mercy, been sunk through any cause, the indignation and blind fury of the people of this country would have forced us into war.

Despite all sane arguments as to why this bill should not pass—and there are many—I am still voting "yes."

I do not care to retard preparedness, and in my opinion failure to pass this bill will do just that.

Labor Day Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL J. KIRWAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 6, 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. MICHAEL J. KIRWAN, OF OHIO

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address, which I delivered at a Democratic gathering in Youngstown, Ohio, on Labor Day, September 2, 1940:

Ladies and gentlemen, in the Archives Building in Washington, where all of the records and history of the United States is housed, two of the cornerstones are inscribed: "What Is Past Is Prologue" and "Study the Past."

I am asking all of you gathered here this evening in the interest of democracy, to take a stroll with me down Memory Lane, while we reminisce and study the past history of the United States during the last 21 years.

Twenty-one years ago, the last group of soldiers to march up Broadway on their return from the battlefields of France, were greeted by the cheers of millions of people who were shouting "President Woodrow Wilson and a third term." On that day, everywhere in America, civic organizations were naming parks and boulevards in honor of this greatly honored and beloved President of the United States. America was being proclaimed the greatest nation in the entire world, and the people wanted Woodrow Wilson to carry on. Alas, however, a tradition that the President of the United States could not run for a third term stood in his way. As we all remember, despite his ill health, President Wilson traveled across the country, carrying the message to the people stressing the importance of America taking its proper place around the table in the League of Nations. He very definitely felt that the United States of America should have a voice in the affairs of the entire world in order to make certain that those gallant men that we had sent abroad to preserve democracy had not made the supreme sacrifice in vain. He wanted to make certain that the ideals for which they gave up their lives would be carried on. Today, historians and practically every other person in America admit that President Wilson was correct in his demand that we join the League of Nations.

In 1920, the Democrats nominated the Honorable James Cox of Ohio and Franklin D. Roosevelt to carry on the ideals and the policies that the beloved Woodrow Wilson advocated and for which men gave up their lives in Flanders fields. The Republicans nominated Warren G. Harding, also of Ohio. As we recall, the people of the Republican ranks wanted Leonard Wood to be nominated as their standard-bearer, as he went into the convention with 388 delegates pledged to him, while Harding had but 52.

History as recorded tells us that a group of men met in a back room. On that day oil was king, and the men in that back room who drove over the nomination of Warren Harding, despite the voice of the people back home who wanted Leonard Wood, were to be paid for their efforts in the Government holdings of Teapot Dome and the naval oil reserve.

The America of that day was the most prosperous we had ever known. Every person was working and labor was receiving time and a half for all time over 8 hours. Prosperity was in abundance and happiness was in every home. However, the press and billboards, instigated by the Republican Party, were screaming, "Back to normalcy." We remember all too well what happened—the people went off to the polls in November of that year and swept Warren G. Harding into office as President of the United States.

Many here in this gathering tonight well remember the morning after that election. The news of the election results was slow, because radio had not been developed as it is today. At the change of mill turns men rushed to the bulletin boards set up around the downtown section of the city to announce the returns. When the results of the landslide were known many jeeringly wended their way to the office of the late Ed Moore, who had nominated James Cox at San Francisco to be the standard bearer of the Democratic Party. Ed had been in his office all through the night awaiting news of the election. He put his head out of the window of his office, raised his hand to silence those gathered on the outside and said: "I can see the soot and sweat of the steel mill on your brows—dinner pails on your arms, indicating that you are workingmen. I can see and hear you jeering me. All the message I have for you, my friends, is—if you can stand Warren Harding to serve as President of the United States for the next 4 years, surely to God I can."

The archives tell us that one of the first appointments made by President Harding was that of George Harvey, of Harpers Weekly fame, to the Court of St. James. When he was presented to the court he wore knee breeches, and from that time on he wore them so much around London that when pictures of him came back home we couldn't distinguish whether he was the town crier or a lamp lighter. Unfortunately for us, he stayed there long enough to help negotiate the destroying of the fine new Navy that this country had under construction.

Can we forget Forbes, who robbed and looted the Veterans' Administration even to the extent of selling the sheets and bandages that were badly needed in the veterans' hospitals throughout the country? Can we for a minute forget the Alien Custodian of the Harding administration who sold back to the German Government ships worth hundreds of millions of dollars for the paltry sum of three million? The retention of these ships by the United States could have started us well on the way to being the best merchant marine in the entire world. Can we forget the mail contracts and the scandals they created, and how the general policy of that day seemed to be to rob and loot like pirates? Everyone seemed to have his own department and his own part of the country to loot.

Can we forget that one of the first things that was done to the laboring man under the Harding regime was to give him two drastic cuts in wages and the time and a half for overtime was done away with? It seemed that America ran wild without a leader.

The pay-off came, however, in 1929—and what a cruel paymaster America had during the years 1929 to 1933. What untold suffering the people of this great Nation, with its stock of fine resources, endured during that period we all know only too well. Do you remember what the best-paying industries were? I'll tell you: Jigsaw puzzles and apples. Remember how people sat up all night and worked jigsaw puzzles and then swapped them with their neighbors? Putting jigsaw puzzles together kept the mind away from the empty stomach and cupboard. Don't you remember how President Hoover urged the people to buy apples from the man selling them on the street corner in order to bring back prosperity? Just imagine how low America, the richest Nation in the world, had fallen and how awfully good God was to us. Just supposing that a heavy frost in the spring of 1932 had hit the apple blossoms.

Yes, the archives tell us about the soldiers at Valley Forge leaving their footprints on the snow. They were trained, as soldiers, to endure that kind of suffering and hardship. But how about the women and children that not only left their footprints on the snow for 4 years—from 1929 to 1933—but also on the burning sands? Remember the testimony that went on before the Dewey investigating committee in New York in 1935? A hundred good mothers, representing thousands of mothers from all over America, testified that they had sold their body and soul to hell in prostitution during those lean years in order that their children might have a little food.

I am not one who believes that Paul Revere's ride saved the Nation. It is much easier for me to believe that it was that group of noble Americans attending the World Series game in Philadelphia, in 1931, saved America. Remember how they booed President Hoover? They booed him out of the ball park. But this booing gave him something to think about, because when he returned to Washington he asked for the release of one of his so-called stars on his own ball team—the Cabinet—Andrew Mellon. He not only waived Mellon out of the Cabinet, but out of the country—to the Court of St. James.

It is my hope that when the Mellon Art Gallery, now under construction in Washington is completed, that the Art Board judges will not overlook giving some of our own American art pictures the most conspicuous locations. They say that art is judged by its age and the money that is spent for it. Surely then, the pictures "Old Overholt" and "Green River" should receive first recognition, because they both realized more money from 1921 to 1933 than any other paintings in the history of the world. They were able to turn back to this Government $40 000,000 to build the beautiful new art gallery to house the Mellon art possessions. Too, I would like to see in another prominent location a painting of the "Battle of Anacostia" depicting those brave soldiers who went to France and fought to preserve democracy, coming to Washington to ask and plead for bread, but instead, were showered with bullets and gas bombs.

Then came November, 1932: The banks were practically all closed, homes were being foreclosed, people were being set out on the street

because they could not pay the landlord. Chaos, despair, fear, and discouragement filled the heart of every man, woman, and child in America. If they were not in immediate need themselves, they witnessed what their relatives, neighbors, and friends were enduring. The people felt certain that their savior had come at last, and they overwhelmingly placed their confidence in Franklin D. Roosevelt at the polls. From the day that he took office, people began to have confidence in America—in their leader and in themselves.

Then came November 1936. The people's spirits had risen—they were on the way back to normalcy indeed. What did they do—thousands that had never cast a vote in their lifetime went to the polls and paid Franklin D. Roosevelt the greatest respect that had ever been showered on an individual. In 1937 we enjoyed the biggest business volume that America has ever known. The people had confidence in their leader.

Now comes 1940. Because of the unsettled conditions abroad and our own domestic problems, which are nil beside those of 1932, the people of this Nation are eager to retain the leadership of that same person in whom they placed their confidence in 1932 and 1936 and who did not fail them. Practically every one of the 48 States sent delegates to the National Democratic Convention at Chicago pledged to Franklin D. Roosevelt, despite a third-term tradition. The voice of the people was adhered to by the delegates, and the nomination of Franklin D. Roosevelt was overwhelming. If ever America needed a great leader it is now, and we are fortunate indeed to have confidence in the fact that for the next 4 years we will have the same fearless, courageous, and qualified captain at the helm of that good and sturdy ship, America.

Twenty years ago, as I said earlier, the rank and file of Republicans sent delegates to their convention at Chicago with a majority pledged to support their choice, Leonard Wood for the Presidency. In June of this year, the rank and file of Republicans sent the majority of their delegates to Philadelphia pledged to Thomas Dewey. They were again denied their privilege.

Twenty years ago oil was king, but today it is electricity. Twenty years ago the Government had billions of dollars in oil reserves at the Teapot Dome and naval oil reserves. Today the Government has billions of dollars in T. V. A., Boulder Dam, and Bonneville. Instead of the oil crowd, it was a power crowd that met in the back room in Philadelphia. They printed 5,000 extra tickets for the convention gallery and hired people on the street corner to go in and shout "We want Willkie."

It is true that Indiana has produced some great sons. The whole world loved one of them, Paul Dresser, who shared his dream about the Moonlight On the Wabash and the Candlelight was gleaming bright through the sycamores" with every one who wished to sing or play it. One of her other sons is also interested in light, but he wants to share it only with those who can pay plenty for the privilege of "receiving the light."

I thank you most sincerely for the stroll which you have taken with me down Memory Lane. You have listened most attentively to the history that the archives has housed for the past 21 years and to the inscriptions that are chiseled into this most beautiful building without a single window in it, which read: "What is past is prologue—Study the past." It behooves each and every one of us, then, to take this warning and to heed the message they give us.

Thank you.

Compulsory Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. JACOBSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 6, 1940

Mr. JACOBSEN. Mr. Speaker, while the question of compulsory training and the recruiting of our manpower for the national defense is under consideration, I believe it appropriate to call attention of this body to the appalling percentage of rejections in both arms of the service who have volunteered. These rejections are due almost entirely to a lack of physical fitness which disqualifies these men.

The experience of the last war demonstrated very definitely the need for a program of development of physical well-being in our Nation, and apparently we have not profited well by that experience. Because a large part of the defense of any nation is dependent upon healthy personnel, I should like to suggest that it is now time we ought to give consideration to some well-planned program of providing physical and health training for our young people.

I realize that our schools have long advocated programs of physical training in connection with their regular curriculum. However, there has been no program of this kind sponsored by our Federal Government. It seems to me that there is an obligation upon our Government to be vitally interested and concerned with the health and physical well-being of our people as a consideration for our national welfare. I do not advocate such a program of training primarily for the purpose of national defense. However, its part in this is important and not entirely incidental.

It is true that totalitarian governments have long emphasized such programs and have thereby provided for their armies physically fit manpower. In a democracy such as ours necessarily such an extravagant program could not be put into operation, yet a program could be sponsored and fostered which would pay dividends in better health and a more virile manhood and womanhood in our country. I believe the old principle of a sound mind in a sound body is as necessary and true today as it was centuries ago when practically all emphasis was placed upon physical well-being.

I should like to suggest for your consideration a program sponsored by our Federal Government in cooperation with our schools throughout this Nation by which such training in health and physical development should begin in the earliest stages of education and continue in a progressive manner throughout the school life of every child. We have the machinery already set up in our schools for such a program. Unfortunately, in its present use this machinery, because it has emphasized sports such as baseball, football, basketball, and so forth, has failed to reach the larger percentage of our young people and for that reason has not attained the ends for which it was theoretically designed.

I believe a system of physical education can be designed and carried out so that it will produce the desired results and be a genuine contributing factor to the welfare of our Nation, if such a program is sponsored and aided by our Government. Certainly the result of such sponsorship in vocational education in schools and health programs of various kinds through other local organizations has met with splendid success. I see no reason why a program such as this could not be established and carried out so that we shall have as a result young manhood physically fit to contribute to the needs of our Nation in a time of emergency.

Opportunity it seems to me should be offered every boy and girl in our Nation wherever he or she lives to learn thoroughly, appreciate, and be enthusiastic about whatever makes for physical fitness. Whether or not military training as such should be a part of this training is a question which could at any time be determined by the needs of our Nation. If necessary it could be worked in easily and appropriately without disturbing in any degree the primary objectives sought.

While I am not proposing any specific or particular manner of accomplishing these purposes, nevertheless I feel that some thought and consideration on the part of the Congress should be given to these suggestions and, if it is found desirable, that such a program should be inaugurated and appropriate legislation be prepared to carry it out.

Thanks, Friends

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. HOOK

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 6, 1940

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this occasion to thank hundreds of Members of Congress, both Republicans and Democrats, which includes practically every Member of this body. You good gentlemen have come to me personally and assured me of your confidence in me. I thank all of you from the depth of my heart for your kind offers of assistance to help me fight this cheap attempt at political blackmail that has recently been made upon me.

I am pleased beyond words for your sincere assurance and faith in my character and integrity. Your offers to testify

and give testimonial to my good character and integrity at any time will be long and happily remembered by me. Mr. Speaker, I am duly grateful for the thoughtfulness of Rev. J. Frederic Wenchel, of Christ Lutheran Church here at Washington, and under leave to extend my remarks I include his letter to me:

CHRIST LUTHERAN CHURCH,
Washington, D. C., September 4, 1940.

Hon. FRANK E. HOOK,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Mrs. Wenchel and I have just returned from a vacation in Canada and were shocked at the effort being made to besmirch your good name. Coming just at this time the despicable purpose is only too evident. We do not believe it. You and Mrs. Hook have our sincere sympathy, as well as our prayers that God may sustain you in this terrible ordeal. If I can be of any help I shall be only too glad to be able to give it. With kindest regards from house to house.

Yours very sincerely,

J. FREDERIC WENCHEL.

Improved Rural Mail Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY
OF VERMONT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 6, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE BURLINGTON (VT.) FREE PRESS

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to include a very worth while and appreciative editorial with respect to improvements which have been made along the line of service to rural communities.

The editorial, which appeared in a recent issue of the Burlington Free Press, Burlington, Vt., follows:

[From the Burlington (Vt.) Free Press]

R. F. D. IMPROVEMENTS

Thirty towns in the Alleghanies, without airports, are the beneficiaries of an air-mail experiment outlined in the current Business Week. With an experimental appropriation of $200,000, Uncle Sam is demonstrating the dropping and pick-up of mail by plane in rural regions.

The first year's handling of 75,000 pounds of nonstop pick-up air mail in all weathers with 91.6 percent performance shows that our Air Mail System will soon have many healthy tributaries. The next air mail R. F. D.'s should be in Vermont, where the original R. F. D. got its start.

Vermont, too, sees continued improvements in rural mail with the use of speedy truck facilities. When the Rutland Railroad dropped train 50, some years ago, a star-route truck gave speedier, more flexible, more economical service for about 80 miles between Burlington and Rutland.

The discontinuance of Central Vermont trains 305 and 306 this coming week has long been foreshadowed by dwindling traffic. Day mails from St. Albans to White River Junction and return will shortly be handled by star-route trucks. A speedy and more flexible service will result, with probable Post Office Department economy. R. F. D. patrons in the Winooski, Dog River, and White River Valleys will get their important mail earlier under new arrangements in most instances.

While we lament the necessity of losing trains which for two generations or more have meant much to several dozen Vermont communities and their business life, motor transport can and will replace their functions to the satisfaction of rural postal patrons. Important long-haul mails for an indefinite time to come will be tied to night trains like the Montrealer, Washingtonian, and New Englander, it would appear. This latest rail change may make it necessary to tie the Mad River Valley and Hancock and Rochester postal services to Montpelier as have been long discussed. Such a 12-trip star route would bring modern mail service to these valleys comparable to that achieved by Stowe and Morrisville in the past 2 years.

Montpelier is apt to become the most important mail distributing center in the State, since it receives such superb night train service and has so many tributary valley highways. Only lethargy of patrons has prevented a good early morning and late evening Montpelier, West Danville, and St. Johnsbury star route with return trips. Here a 12-trip star route would brighten the lives of many communities, especially in the upper Winooski, Lamoille, and Passumpsic Valleys.

The New European Explosion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN LESINSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 6, 1940

EDITORIAL BY MARTIN HIMLER FOR THE ASSOCIATED HUNGARIAN WEEKLIES

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial written by Mr. Martin Himler for the Associated Hungarian Weeklies, composed of the following newspapers, by request of Dr. A. S. Gondos:

Hungarian Miners Journal; Martin Himler Weekly; Detroit Hungarian Journal; Flint Hungarian News; American Magyar Journal; Bethlehem Herald; Buffalo Herald, western New York; Cleveland Hungarian News, Ohio; Hungarian Herald, southern Ohio; Independence, Trenton, N. J.

THE NEW EUROPEAN EXPLOSION

There cannot be any controversy between Rumania and Hungary as to logic and justice, as far as Transylvania is concerned.

It is simply a question of disgorging one more piece of the Versailles (Trianon) spoils, and no matter how painful it may be for Rumania, eastern Europe will be a healthier place when Transylvania will be regained by Hungary.

Transylvania was part of Hungary (some time with some political autonomy, but always in economic unity) for over 1,000 years.

The population of Transylvania is mixed, solely because Rumanians were escaping into Hungary (Transylvania) during centuries of Turkish subjugation, in great numbers, and Hungary permitted them to develop their own language and culture unmolested throughout these same centuries.

As a reward for this tolerance, Rumanians suddenly discovered, about 50 years ago, that they were "oppressed," and have succeeded in "sudating" Transylvania. At the end of the World War, Clemenceau's imperialism was running amuck, and Hungary was dismembered to build the artificial Little Entente.

Were it otherwise, logic and sanity would still compel that Transylvania should be regained by Hungary, it is geographically a part of Hungary, and completely separated from Rumania proper by the steep Carpathian Mountains.

Hungary needs her wood, salt, and other minerals; Rumania does not. Transylvania needs the Hungarian market for these products, while they cannot stand the expensive haulage to Rumania over the Carpathian Mountains.

Hungary is culturally centuries ahead of Rumania, on a par with western Europe, and it was a monstrosity to subjugate over 2,000,000 Magyars to backward and 35-percent-illiterate Rumanians.

The origin of the present war may be found in the insane Versailles treaties, and the sooner the illogical, arbitrary boundaries will be adjusted, the nearer Europe will be to peace.

Reenact Provision of 1918 for Draftees Regarding Mining Claim Assessment Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. MURDOCK
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 6, 1940

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, when we reach section 9 in reading H. R. 10132 for amendments under the 5-minute rule, I propose to offer an amendment in line 4, on page 27, as follows: After the last semicolon, insert "section 500 of" before the words "article 5."

Mr. Speaker, the effect of this amendment will be to reenact into law by including in this bill a part of Public, No. 103, Sixty-fifth Congress, namely, section 501 of article V of the Soldiers and Sailors' Civil Relief Act, approved March 8, 1918.

I have taken this question up with the chairman and several of the ranking members of the committee and believe

that the committee will probably accept it as a committee amendment. The Small Mine Operators Association of Arizona has suggested this amendment as a protection for any young men who may be called into the service under this measure for 1 year or more and who may have unpatented mining claims on which they would be otherwise required to do $100 worth of work.

It seems only fair to men called into training or service, since the bill aims to protect the draftees from certain other financial obligations, that the Government should make this provision when it costs the Government nothing and yet is a requirement of Federal law which does not deprive any creditor of anything of value. I trust that the amendment will be adopted and that the conferees will insist on its inclusion in the final enactment.

We Are in the War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW C. SCHIFFLER
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 6, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE WHEELING (W. VA.) INTELLIGENCER

Mr. SCHIFFLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wheeling Intelligencer, Wheeling, W. Va., of September 5:

[From the Wheeling (W. Va.) Intelligencer of September 5, 1940]

WE ARE IN THE WAR

To all intents and purposes the United States is at war with Germany. The exchange of destroyers with England for naval bases takes care of that. Only the refusal of Germany to recognize us as an enemy can stand in the way of our physical participation.

No thinking person can doubt that Germany now has ample cause to declare war or wage war on this country. Whether she does or not will depend solely upon whether or not Hitler thinks it would be wise to do so. But the provocation is there, and such consequences as flow from it will be upon our own heads.

This momentous step has been taken on the responsibility of a single man—President Franklin D. Roosevelt. It was taken without even the knowledge, much less the consent of Congress. It was taken in violation, not alone of the spirit of international law, but, in the judgment of this newspaper, in violation of the very letter of our own law.

No other President in the history of the Republic ever even remotely approached this tremendous assumption of authority. It climaxes a career chiefly notable for this quality. It is the culminating step in a campaign which, if not deliberately intended to involve us in foreign war, has at least been most effective in heading us that way. From the time of the intemperate quarantine speech at Chicago right down to the present moment, virtually every word and action of Mr. Roosevelt dealing with foreign wars has been provocative and disposed to establish this country as the definite foe of certain nations.

The cumulative result of all of this has been to bring us to the point where the decision as to the actual shedding of American blood has been taken out of the hands of Americans.

There are those who hold that we ought to be in the war; that England's fight is our fight; that if England loses we will have Hitler to fight alone. Very well. If this be true, then we should openly declare war in the regular way provided by the Constitution, and go into the thing wholeheartedly. Instead of that, we have officially proclaimed our neutrality, we have enacted legislation implementing this neutrality, we have declared our peaceable intentions, and have repeatedly rejected proposals which seemed to endanger our peace. Yet all the time, the President individually has been carrying us closer to the brink of war, while professing his own devotion to the cause of peace.

The whole thing has been a shocking manifestation of deceit and usurpation of authority. Even the legal opinion relied upon as justification for the exchange was arrived at by a trick interpretation of language. In 1917, Congress enacted a law which provided this among other things:

"During a war in which the United States is a neutral Nation, it shall be unlawful to send out of the jurisdiction of the United States any vessel built, armed, or equipped as a vessel of war, or converted from a private vessel into a vessel of war, with any intent or under any agreement or contract, written or oral, that such vessel shall be delivered to a belligerent nation."

What that language says to the normal reader is that it shall be unlawful to turn over any war vessel to a belligerent nation when this country is at peace. What Mr. Jackson says it means is that we shall not turn over to a belligerent any war vessel built for the purpose of being thus turned over. And so, he says, inasmuch as the destroyers in question were built for the use of this country many years before the present war broke out, it cannot be that they were built with the intent of having them delivered to England.

This is, we repeat, a far-fetched interpretation, one rendered for the sole purpose of giving the color of legality to an act that common sense dictates is illegal.

What the ultimate result will be, nobody can foresee. It seems clear, however, that the rejoicing in England over conclusion of the agreement is based more upon its implications than upon acquisition of half a hundred over-age destroyers. After all these vessels, which are classed as obsolete, will not mean the difference between victory and defeat for England. They will, as a matter of fact, exert relatively little influence in the war. But the implications of our release of these destroyers, and perhaps other weapons, are of tremendous importance. The British consider us now their ally. They naturally will look to us for more definite assistance than this. To them this is but the opening act, the first step in our active participation in the war at their side.

Maybe it is right and proper that we do go to war at England's side. Maybe Hitler is our common enemy. But in this country, Congress is supposed to decide such things.

Congress didn't deside this time. Mr. Roosevelt did.

Is that what we want in the United States?

Our National Government—What Is it? How Does It Function?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 12, 1940

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, permission having been granted, I am inserting herewith 138 questions and answers on the National Government, and especially Congress, which I have prepared during the past 12 months by compiling 2 or 3 each week. They have been carefully checked and I believe that you will find them to be accurate. They are as follows:

1. Question. What is the National Government?

Answer. The National Government is divided into three branches—the legislative, executive, and judicial. It is headed by the President, who is the chief of the executive branch. Congress forms the legislative branch. The judicial branch, controlled by the Supreme Court, is the third branch. The preamble of the Constitution states its purpose:

We the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect Union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America.

2. Question. What is the Congress?

Answer. The Congress of the United States is the legislative branch of the National Government, in effect the National Legislature, and consists of two branches—the Senate and the House of Representatives. Its existence, authority, and limitations are provided by the Constitution, article I, which begins as follows:

All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.

3. Question. How long have we had a Congress?

Answer. The first Congress dated from March 4, 1789, to March 3, 1791. It had no practical existence, however, until April 30, 1789, when the presence of quorums in both Houses permitted complete organization. Travel was not as easy and fast then as now.

4. Question. What is a Congressman?

Answer. A Congressman is a Member of either the Senate or the House of Representatives. However, a Member of the Senate is usually referred to as a Senator and a Member of the House as a Congressman. The official title of a Member of the House is "Representative."

5. Question. How many Members constitute a Congress?

Answer. There are 96 Senators and 435 Representatives. Each State is entitled to elect two Senators and the number of Representatives depends upon the population of the State, with at least 1 to each State regardless of population. The apportionment is made after each decennial census.

6. Question. What oath is taken by Members of Congress?

Answer. The oath taken by both Senators and Representatives is as follows:

I do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion, and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God.

This same oath is taken by all persons elected or appointed to any office of honor or profit, either in the civil, military, or naval service, except the President of the United States.

7. Question. What oath is taken by the President of the United States?

Answer. The President, before he enters on the execution of his office, shall take the following oath or affirmation:

I do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will faithfully execute the office of President of the United States, and will to the best of my ability, preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States.

8. Question. How are Senators and Representatives elected?

Answer. By popular vote, on the day provided by law.

9. Question. What is the length of a Congress?

Answer. A Congress is elected for 2 years. It commences January 3, every odd-numbered year, and continues for 2 years. It has two regular sessions, the second one commencing January 3 of every even-numbered year and as many special sessions as are called by the President. The next Congress, the Seventy-seventh, will convene January 3, 1941.

10. Question. What is the length of the term of office of Senators and Representatives?

Answer. The Senators are elected for a term of 6 years and the Representatives for a term of 2 years. With only one-third of the Senators subject to reelection every 2 years, it is assured that there will always be a quorum in the Senate and at least 64 Senators will be experienced in national legislation in every Congress.

11. Question. What are the qualifications of a Member of the Senate?

Answer. A Member of the United States Senate must be at least 30 years of age, must have been a citizen of the United States for 9 years, and must be a resident of the State from which he is sent to Congress.

12. Question. What are the qualifications of a Representative in Congress?

Answer. A Member of the House of Representatives must be at least 25 years of age, must have been a United States citizen for at least 7 years, and must reside in the State—and usually, though not necessarily in the district—from which he is sent to Congress. (A President must be 35 years of age.)

13. Question. When does Congress meet?

Answer. Until the twentieth amendment was ratified the Congress met on the first Monday in December each year. This amendment is known as the "lame duck" amendment. It provides that Congress will meet the 3d day of January unless another date is provided by law.

14. Question. What is the twentieth amendment?

Answer. This is the so-called "lame duck" amendment, which changes the time for the beginning of the terms of the President, Vice President, and the Members of Congress. The term of the President and Vice President begins on January 20, and that of Members of Congress on January 3. It was adopted upon the ratification of the thirty-sixth State, January 23, 1933, and certified in effect on February 6, 1933.

15. Question. Why was a constitutional amendment necessary to change the date of the beginning of the terms of President, Vice President, and Members of Congress?

Answer. The Constitution fixes the terms of President and Vice President at 4 years, of Senators at 6 years, and of Representatives at 2 years. Any change of date would affect the terms of the incumbents. It was, therefore, necessary to amend the Constitution to make the change. This shortened the terms of President Franklin D. Roosevelt and Vice President John N. Garner and all Senators and Representatives.

16. Question. What about special, or extra, sessions of Congress?

Answer. Congress can be called into special session by the President at any time he thinks the interests of the country justify it. A session of Congress usually means that both the House and Senate are in session; however, the Senate may be called in extra session without the House to consider treaties, try impeachments, and confirm appointments, all of which are considered exclusively by the Senate. The impeachment must first be made by the House of Representatives before the Senate may act.

17. Question. How are the activities of Congress controlled?

Answer. The activities of Congress are largely controlled by political parties. The principal ones are the Democrats and Republicans. The party in power controls the Houses, and their committees by means of conferences and caucuses, which are private. The Democrats have a majority in both Houses at this time. Preceding the meeting of Congress, the Democratic Members of the House had a caucus and agreed on their candidates for all of the different offices of the House. When the House met to organize at the beginning of the present Congress, the names of the candidates were presented. The same thing was done by the Republicans. A vote was taken and the Democrats, all voting together, elected their ticket.

Democrats have a party caucus and may bind the Members to vote a certain way on a bill, if two-thirds vote in favor of being bound. However, a Member may recuse himself if he has a good and sufficient reason, such as having committed himself to a contrary position when seeking election or on constitutional questions.

The Republicans have a party conference instead of a caucus, and their Members cannot be bound except pertaining to matters of party organization.

18. Question. How are the rules of procedure determined?

Answer. The Constitution provides each House may determine the rules of its proceedings.

The parliamentary practice of the House of Representatives emanates from four sources: First, the Constitution of the United States; second, from Jefferson's Manual; third, from the rules adopted by the House itself from the beginning of its existence; and, fourth, from the decisions of the Speakers of the House and from decisions of the Chairmen of the Committee of the Whole.

Hinds' and Cannon's Precedents are used.

19. Question. Who presides in the Senate?

Answer. The Vice President of the United States presides in the Senate. He is referred to in that body as "Mr. President," because his other title is President of the Senate.

20. Question. Who presides in the House?

Answer. The Speaker of the House presides in the House. He is nominated at the party caucus. He is chosen in the manner described in answer to question No. 17.

21. Question. Does the President appear personally before Congress?

Answer. Only to deliver a message, usually at the beginning of each session of Congress, and such other messages as the President believes to be of sufficient importance to justify his personal appearances. Many messages are delivered in writing, and they are read to each House by the reading clerk. The President's office is in the White House, 1 mile away from the Capitol.

22. Question. Do the Members of the House have individual seats?

Answer. No. Formerly they did, but now any Member may sit any place he chooses. Those who are in charge of a bill on the Democratic side and on the Republican side have special places provided for them at tables, which are accessible to a public-address system. The Speaker of the House

occupies a rostrum on the south side of the Hall and faces north. In the Hall to his right and on the east side the Democrats sit, and the Republicans occupy the side of the Hall to his left.

23. Question. Do the United States Senators have individual seats?

Answer. Yes. The Vice President, the Presiding Officer of the Senate, occupies a seat on the north side of the Senate Chamber and faces south. To his left the Republicans, Progressives, and Independents sit; and to his right the Democrats sit. Each Senator has an individual desk and chair.

24. Question. Has the House of Representatives always been composed of 435 Members?

Answer. No. Under the first apportionment in 1789, there were only 65 Members of the House. The number was increased each decade along with the increased population until, in 1840, the number of Members totaled 232; whereas, in 1880, the House increased to 332, and in 1910 increased to the present Membership of 435.

25. Question. Does the Federal Government or Congress determine a district line of a congressional district?

Answer. No. Congress apportions to each State the number of Representatives that may be elected from that State to the House of Representatives. If the legislature desires, it can divide the State up into the number of congressional districts equal to the number of Congressmen that may be elected from that State. After each decennial census, the legislature of a State, which is given an increase in representation, usually redistricts the State. However, if the State is not redistricted and there is an increase in representation, the increase will be made up from the State at large. In other words, Texas has 21 Congressmen at this time. If the census that has been taken this year discloses that Texas is entitled to another Member of Congress and is given the increased apportionment, the Texas Legislature will likely change the congressional district lines in Texas, but if for any reason it does not, the additional Member will run at large from the entire State, and will be known as a Congressman at large.

26. Question. What is the population of the average congressional district?

Answer. Under the census of 1910, each Congressman represented an average of 194,182 people, as compared with 279,712 for the census of 1930. Under the recent census, in view of a law which will keep the House membership at 435, each Member of the House will represent approximately 304,000 people.

27. Question. Do all congressional districts have approximately the same population?

Answer. Theoretically, they should have, but in practice they do not. It is due, in part, to the fact that congressional districts usually follow county lines, town lines, or ward lines in cities, so that the population cannot, therefore, be divided with exactness.

28. Question. What is "gerrymandering"?

Answer. The practice was named for Vice President Elbridge Gerry, its inventor. If the Republicans happen to control the legislature of a State when a redistricting bill is pending, they crowd as many of the Republican voters into one district as they can and vice versa. This results in what are termed "shoe-string districts," this term having been applied first to certain districts in Mississippi following the Reconstruction Period. At one time, a district in Missouri extended in a narrow line through the State from one border to the other. Today a study of the map showing congressional district lines reveals some peculiar formations representing the exigencies of politics. In one district in North Carolina, "gerrymandering" resulted in an odd formation resembling the salamander of Gerry's time, from which was derived in the Old Bay State the paraphrase "gerrymander." The Federal reapportionment law requires districts to be compact and composed of contiguous territory, but as to the compactness, the law is honored in some States more in the breach than in the observance. For instance, Congressman SAMUEL DICKSTEIN of the twelfth district in New York City, only has 90,671 people in his district, whereas Congressman DONALD O'TOOLE, of the eighth district of New York, has 799,407 people in his district.

29. Question. How many Members has each State in the House and Senate?

Answer. Each State has two Senators and the following number of Representatives (the figures in parentheses represent the number of Democrats from each State, the other figures, or the first ones, represent the total number of Representatives in each State): State—Alabama, 9 (9); Arizona, 1 (1); Arkansas, 7 (7); California, 20 (12); Colorado, 4 (3); Connecticut, 6 (2); Delaware, 1 (0); Florida, 5 (5); Georgia, 10 (10); Idaho, 2 (1); Illinois, 27 (17); Indiana, 12 (5); Iowa, 9 (2); Kansas, 7 (1); Kentucky, 9 (8); Louisiana, 8 (8); Maine, 3 (0); Maryland, 6 (6); Massachusetts, 15 (5); Michigan, 17 (5); Minnesota, 9 (1); Mississippi, 7 (7); Missouri, 13 (12); Montana, 2 (1); Nebraska, 5 (2); Nevada, 1 (1); New Hampshire, 2 (0); New Jersey, 14 (3); New Mexico, 1 (1); New York, 45 (25); North Carolina, 11 (11); North Dakota, 2 (0); Ohio, 24 (8); Oklahoma, 9 (9); Oregon, 3 (1); Pennsylvania, 34 (15); Rhode Island, 2 (0); South Carolina, 6 (6); South Dakota, 2 (0); Tennessee, 9 (7); Texas, 21 (21); Utah, 2 (2); Vermont, 1 (0); Virginia, 9 (9); Washington, 6 (6); West Virginia, 6 (5); Wisconsin, 10 (0); Wyoming, 1 (0); total, 435.

Classification by political parties in House in 1940: Democrats, 262; Republicans, 168; Progressives, 2; Farm Labor, 1; American Labor, 1; vacant, 1; total, 435.

Classification by political parties in Senate in 1940: Democrats, 69; Republicans, 23; Progressive, 1; Farm Labor, 2; Independent, 1; total, 96.

Senators whose present terms of service expire in 1941—32 Senators in this group: Democrats, 23; Republicans, 7; Progressive, 1; Farmer-Labor, 1.

30. Question. When Congress passes a reapportionment act, are the States compelled to divide themselves into representative districts?

Answer. No. They are not compelled, although nearly all do so. In the early years of the Republic most States elected all their Representatives at large. In the 1932 election, Virginia, Kentucky, Missouri, and Minnesota having suffered losses in Members in the apportionment, elected their Members en bloc, which resulted in solid delegations of one party being chosen, except in the case of Minnesota, and in effecting the defeat of many a Member who had long been in Congress from a district strongly attached to its party. Some States, rather than redistrict, in the event of being allotted larger memberships, elect the additional Member or Members at large—New York electing two that way in 1932. Of course, where a loss has occurred, there must be a redistricting or the Members be elected at large.

31. Question. When Congress is in session what time of the day does the House meet?

Answer. The House meets every day at 12 noon when it is in session. It usually remains in session until 5 or 6 o'clock in the afternoon. The Senate also meets at noon—12—each day it is in session.

32. Question. How is a bill presented to the House for consideration?

Answer. It is presented by the committee that has conducted hearings on the bill. If, however, a committee does not give consideration to a bill, the Member can, by obtaining the signatures of 218 Members, or a majority of the Members of the House, force consideration of a bill in the House of Representatives. This is a very rare proceeding, but it has been resorted to in a few cases.

33. Question. How many standing committees of the House, and name them?

Answer. There are 47 standing committees of the House. Each committee has a chairman and is composed of Democrats and Republicans. If the House is divided by a ratio of twice as many Democrats as there are Republicans, the committees will have twice as many Democrats on them as Republicans. In other words, the number of members, Republicans or Democrats, on a committee bears a direct ratio to the number of Democrats and Republicans in the House. The

names of the committees are (the figures in parentheses indicate the number of members on each committee): Accounts (11); Agriculture (26); Appropriations (40); Banking and Currency (25); Census (21); Civil Service (21); Claims (21); Coinage, Weights, and Measures (21); Disposition of Executive Papers (2); District of Columbia (21); Education (21); Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress (13); Elections No. 1, No. 2, and No. 3 (9 each); Enrolled Bills (7); Expenditures in the Executive Departments (21); Flood Control (21); Foreign Affairs (25); Immigration and Naturalization (22); Indian Affairs (22); Insular Affairs (22); Interstate and Foreign Commerce (25); Invalid Pensions (21); Irrigation and Reclamation (21); Judiciary (26); Labor (21); Library (5); Memorials (3); Merchant Marine and Fisheries (23); Military Affairs (27); Mines and Mining (22); Naval Affairs (27); Patents (21); Pensions (21); Post Office and Post Roads (25); Printing (3); Public Buildings and Grounds (21); Public Lands (22); Revision of the Laws (13); Rivers and Harbors (27); Roads (22); Rules (14); Territories (23); War Claims (21); Ways and Means (25); World War Veterans' Legislation (21).

34. Question. What are the names of the standing committees of the Senate?

Answer. (The number in parentheses immediately following indicates the number of members on that committee): Agriculture and Forestry (20); Appropriations (24); Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate (4); Banking and Currency (20); Civil Service (10); Claims (12); Commerce (20); District of Columbia (15); Education and Labor (13); Enrolled Bills (3); Expenditures in the Executive Departments (7); Finance (21); Foreign Relations (23); Immigration (14); Indian Affairs (14); Interoceanic Canals (8); Interstate Commerce (21); Irrigation and Reclamation (17); Judiciary (18); Library (10); Manufactures (13); Military Affairs (18); Mines and Mining (13); Naval Affairs (17); Patents (7); Pensions (11); Post Offices and Post Roads (19); Printing (7); Privileges and Elections (17); Public Buildings and Grounds (14); Public Lands and Surveys (15); Rules (13); Territories and Insular Affairs (17).

35. Question. Who are the officers of the House?

Answer: The present officers of the House are: William B. Bankhead, Speaker; Lewis Deschler, Parliamentarian; Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., chaplain; Sam Rayburn, majority floor leader; Joseph W. Martin, Jr., minority floor leader; South Trimble, Clerk; Kenneth Romney, Sergeant at Arms; Joseph J. Sinnott, doorkeeper; and Finis E. Scott, postmaster. Majority and minority leaders are not officially officers of the House or Senate, but they have been recognized as officers of the House through appropriations made by Congress to provide for their extra office expense. Neither House can perform properly and efficiently without a good parliamentarian, and each House has the best.

36. Question. Who are the officers of the Senate?

Answer. The present officers of the Senate are: John N. Garner, President of the Senate; Charles L. Watkins, Parliamentarian; Rev. ZeBarney Thorne Phillips, D. D., LL. D., S. T. D., chaplain; Alben W. Barkley, majority leader; Charles L. McNary, minority leader; Edwin Alexander Halsey, Secretary; Chesley W. Jurney, Sergeant at Arms; and Jack W. Gates, postmaster.

37. Question. What are the most important committees of the House?

Answer. All committees of the House are important, but the "big six" may be listed as Appropriations, Banking and Currency, Interstate and Foreign Commerce, Judiciary, Rules, and Ways and Means.

There are 11 exclusive and major committees of the House, including these 6, and Agriculture, Foreign Affairs, Military Affairs, Naval Affairs, and Post Office and Post Roads. An exclusive committee takes up all the time that a Member has at his disposal after attending the sessions of the House and conducting his office.

38. Question. How are the Members of the standing committees of the House selected?

Answer. The Democrats at a caucus preceding the meeting of Congress nominate their Members for the vacancies that they are entitled to fill on the Ways and Means Committee. These recommendations are then presented to the House and adopted. The Democratic Members of the Ways and Means Committee act as a Committee on Committees for the purpose of nominating the Democratic Members to fill the vacancies on the other standing committees of the House. The recommendations of this committee are presented to and adopted by the House.

The Republicans in the House have a Committee on Committees to make recommendations, which are adopted by the House, to fill vacancies that they are entitled to fill.

39. Question. What arrangements are made for a meeting of a standing committee of the House?

Answer. Each committee has a large committee room, its size and accommodations depending upon the importance of the committee. Each of the major committees of the House has a large meeting room that is equal to the size of the average United States district courtroom. The members of the committee have individual seats in a semicircle behind individual desks. A witness appearing before this committee in support of or in opposition to a bill is usually given time to make his own statement and then the committee members are privileged to cross-examine him. The usual time of meeting is 10 o'clock in the morning and sometimes in the afternoon and night when the House is not in session. The power and influence of a Member depends partly upon his committee assignment. The seniority rule generally obtains, that is, Members of long service work up to chairmanship and ranking positions, while the new Member must start at the foot of a committee.

40. Question. Why are congressional standing committees necessary?

Answer. Congress has so many Members it is necessary for each House to organize committees to study and act upon bills before they are considered on the floor of the House or Senate. Each committee has a chairman as presiding officer and a clerk to keep the records. Committees have often been called small models of the House and Senate. Committees hear witnesses for and against bills, which neither the House nor the Senate can do.

41. Question. How does a bill reach the proper committee for consideration?

Answer. The Member drops the bill "in the hopper," which is a box on the Speaker's desk, when the House is in session. The Parliamentarian examines the bill and determines which committee it should be referred to and so indicates. The bill is then numbered and sent to the Government Printing Office for printing. All bills are printed and a copy of any pending bill may be obtained upon request. The committee receives the printed copies of the bill the next morning after it is introduced, as the bills and the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD are printed at night.

42. Question. How can any citizen get his views considered by Congress?

Answer. The Constitution of the United States provides that "Congress shall make no law respecting * * * the right of the people peaceably to assemble and to petition the Government of a redress of grievances." A special place is set aside in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD each day for petitions which may be filed by a Member and referred to the appropriate committee for consideration. The notation in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD recites the name of the Member offering the petition, the name of the one sending it to him, and a brief summary of what the petition contains.

43. Question. Are all bills heard by the committees?

Answer. No. It is the view of many chairman of committees that any Member who insists on a hearing on any bill should have it, but all chairman of committees do not entertain this view.

44. Question. What are the stages of a bill of the House?

Answer. 1. Introduction.

By a Member by placing the bill "in the hopper," a small brown box on the Speaker's chair. A Member sometimes

introduces a petition only, leaving to the committee the drawing of a bill, such a petition referred to a committee having jurisdiction of the subject giving authority to originate a bill. Sometimes communications addressed to the House from the executive departments or from other sources are referred to committees by the Speaker and give authority for the committees to originate bills. Messages from the President also are referred by the Speaker or the House and give jurisdiction to the committees receiving them to originate bills.

2. Reference to a standing or select committee.

Public bills are referred under direction of the Speaker; private bills are indorsed with the names of the committees to which they go under the rule by the Members introducing them. Senate bills are referred under direction of the Speaker. A bill is numbered and printed when referred.

The average bill dies in the committee. Only those bills of importance are considered; hundreds die in committee to every bill considered and reported. The committee invites witnesses to testify on the bill, including the outstanding experts on the subject covered by the bill. This testimony, often taking weeks and amounting to several volumes when published, is necessary to work out the fine points in the proposed legislation. After completing committee hearings a vote is taken, and the bill, if approved, is reported to the House of Representatives with the recommendation that it "do pass." The House usually abides by the committee decision, but reserves the right to amend, approve, or reject the bill as reported.

3. Reported from the committee.

Committees having leave to report at any time make their reports from the floor; other committees make their reports by laying them on the Clerk's table informally. The bill and the report are printed when reported. A written report is made to the House and it often occurs that a few of the Members will file minority views against the bill in which their objections are stated.

4. Placed on the calendar.

Occasionally a privileged bill is considered when reported, but usually it is placed with the unprivileged bills on the calendar where it belongs under the rule by direction of the Speaker.

5. Consideration in Committee of the Whole.

Public bills which do not raise revenue or make or authorize appropriations of money or property do not go through this stage. All other bills are considered in Committee of the Whole. The stages of consideration in Committee of the Whole are: General debate; reading for amendment under the 5-minute rule; order to lay aside with a favorable recommendation, or to rise and report; reporting of to the House.

One hundred Members constitute a quorum in the Committee of the Whole. No record vote can be taken in the Committee of the Whole. The presiding officer is a chairman selected by the Speaker.

When a bill is taken up in the House for consideration, every Member of the House is furnished a printed copy of the committee hearings which disclose all the testimony and other information that the committee considered in its deliberations. A record very much like a court record is made by the committee.

The first standing committees were adopted in 1803. Before 1803 every bill was discussed in the Committee of the Whole House and then referred to a select committee for the bill agreed upon to be drafted.

6. Reading a second time in the House.

Bills not requiring consideration in Committee of the Whole are read a second time in full, after which they are open to debate and amendment in any part. Bills considered in Committee of the Whole are read a second time in full in that Committee and when reported out, with or without amendments, are not read in full again, but are subject to further debate or amendment in the House unless the previous question is ordered at once.

7. What is the previous question?

If a motion for the previous question is made and it is ordered by a majority of the Members voting, if a quorum be present, it has the effect of cutting off all debate and bringing the House to a direct vote upon the immediate question or questions on which it has been asked and ordered.

8. Engrossment and third reading.

The question on House bills is taken on ordering the engrossment and third reading at one vote. If decided in the affirmative, the reading a third time usually takes place at once, by title. But any Member may demand the reading in full of the engrossed copy, in which case the bill is laid aside until it can be engrossed. Senate bills come to the House in engrossed form, and the question is put on third reading alone. When the question on engrossment and third reading of a House bill or third reading of a Senate bill is decided in the negative the bill is lost as much as if defeated on the final passage. The question on engrossment and third reading is not made from the floor, but is put by the Speaker as a matter of course.

9. Passage.

The question on the passage of a bill is put by the Speaker as a matter of course, without awaiting a motion from the floor.

10. Transmission to the Senate by message.

11. Consideration by the Senate.

In the Senate, House bills are usually referred to committees for consideration and report, after which they have their several readings, with opportunities for debate and amendment. The same procedure takes place in the House as to bills sent from the Senate. It often happens that the bill loses all resemblance to the House version of the bill before it emerges from the Senate. These variations between the House and Senate views of the bill must be compromised in the conference committee.

12. Return of, from the Senate without amendments.

If the Senate passes a House bill without amendment it returns it to the House, where it is at once enrolled on parchment for signature. A bill thus passed without amendment goes into possession of the Clerk, and is not laid before the House prior to enrollment. If the Senate rejects a House bill the House is informed. Similar procedure occurs when the House passes a Senate bill without amendment.

13. Return of, from the Senate with amendments.

House bills returned with Senate amendments go to the Speaker's table. If any Senate amendment requires consideration in Committee of the Whole the bill is referred by the Speaker informally to the standing committee having jurisdiction, and when that committee reports the bill with recommendations it is referred to Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, to be there considered and reported to the House itself. When no Senate amendment requires consideration in Committee of the Whole the bills come before the House directly from the Speaker's table.

14. Consideration of Senate amendments by the House.

When a bill with Senate amendments comes before the House, the House takes up each amendment by itself and may vote to agree to it, agree to it with an amendment, or disagree to it. If it disagrees it may ask a conference with the Senate or may send notice of its disagreement, leaving it to the Senate to recede or insist and ask the conference.

15. Settlement of differences by conference.

When disagreements are referred to conference, the managers embody their settlement in a report, which is acted on by each House as a whole. When this report is agreed to the bill is finally passed, and is at once enrolled for signature.

Every major law represents a compromise of view or sacrifice of opinion on the part of practically every Member of the two bodies. Members must give and take, they must compromise. Otherwise, such a large number could not legislate.

16. Enrollment on parchment.

The House in which a bill originates enrolls it.

17. Examination by the Committee on Enrolled Bills.

While the Committee on Enrolled Bills is described as a joint committee, each branch acts independently. The chairman of each branch affixes to the bills examined a certificate that the bill has been found truly enrolled.

18. Signing by the Speaker and President of the Senate.

The enrolled bill is first laid before the House of Representatives and signed by the Speaker, whether it be a House or Senate bill, after which it is transmitted to the Senate and signed by the president of that body.

19. Transmittal to the President of the United States.

The chairman of the Committee on Enrolled Bills for each House carries the bills from his House to the President. In the House of Representatives a report of the bills taken to the President each day is made to the House and entered on its Journal.

20. Approval by the President.

If the President approve, he does so with his signature.

21. Disapproval by the President.

When the President disapproves a bill he returns it to the House in which it originated, with a message stating that he disapproves, and giving his reasons therefor. The President, before he signs or disapproves a bill, refers it to the department affected for recommendation.

The President may veto the bill, sign it and thereby convert it into law, or may refuse to sign it. If he takes no action on the bill, it becomes law without his signature after 10 days have passed, excluding Sundays. If he does not sign it and the Congress has adjourned, the bill is pocket-vetoed after the expiration of 10 days. For many years some Members of Congress believed that the pocket veto did not kill a bill, but the Supreme Court decided in the famous Pocket Veto Case (279 U. S. 655) in 1929 that all such bills are dead.

22. Action on, when returned disapproved.

The House to which a disapproved bill is returned has the message read and spread on its Journal. It may then consider at once the question of passing the bill notwithstanding the President's objections, or may postpone to a day certain, or refer to a committee for examination. The vote on passing the bill notwithstanding the President's objections must be carried by two-thirds on a roll call vote. If the bill fails to pass in the House to which it is returned, it remains there; but if it passes, it is sent to the other House for action.

23. Filing with the Secretary of State.

When approved by the President, a bill is deposited in the office of the Secretary of State; and when the two Houses have passed a bill notwithstanding the President's objections, the presiding officer of the House which acts on it last transmits it to the Secretary of State.

45. Question. Are many bills introduced at each Congress?

Answer. During this, the Seventy-sixth Congress, which convened January 3, 1939, to date, 15,717 bills and resolutions have been introduced in the Senate and House. Committees of the House and Senate have favorably reported 2,934 of the bills and resolutions favorably. To date 1,432 of these bills and resolutions have become laws. Many of them, however, are private laws, which affect individuals. The others are public laws affecting the Nation at large. On September 7, 1940, there were pending on the House Calendar 210 bills and resolutions and on the Senate Calendar 189, making a total of 399.

The largest number of bills introduced during one Congress was 33,015, in the Sixty-first Congress, 1909–1911. Of that number 810 were passed and became law—public and private.

The largest number of laws passed during any Congress was 6,940, during the Fifty-ninth Congress, 1905–1907—25,897 bills were introduced.

46. Question. What is a veto?

Answer. The word "veto" was derived from the Latin and means "I forbid."

The President is authorized by the Constitution to refuse his assent to a bill presented by Congress, if for any reason he disapproves it. He writes a veto message and sends it with the bill back to the body from which it came.

47. Question. Are many bills vetoed?

Answer. Not very many. During the 8 years President Wilson was President he vetoed 33 bills; President Harding vetoed 5; President Coolidge, 20, and President Hoover, 20. President Cleveland vetoed more bills before President Franklin D. Roosevelt than any other President, but the bills were mostly private pension bills.

During President Cleveland's two terms, he vetoed 471 bills (128 of these were pocket vetoes). During President Franklin D. Roosevelt's terms of office, he has vetoed 473 bills (239 of them being pocket vetoes).

48. Question. Are bills often passed over the President's veto?

Answer. Not very often. Bills passed over Presidential vetoes are usually of interest to a great many people over all the United States and consequently brought prominently to the attention of many Members.

During President Wilson's administration three bills were passed over his veto. They were:

1. Repeal of the daylight saving law.
2. The Volstead Act.
3. To cease enlistments in the Army.

Four bills were passed over President Coolidge's veto. They were:

1. The so-called bonus or adjusted-compensation bill.
2. The emergency officers' retirement bill.
3. The bill to provide a differential in pay for night work in the postal service.
4. Granting allowances to fourth-class postmasters for light, rent, fuel, and equipment.

President Hoover had three bills passed over his veto:

1. Spanish-American War pension increase.
2. Philippine independence.
3. Increase of the loan basis of adjusted-service certificates.

49. Question. Has President Roosevelt's veto been overridden in many instances?

Answer. Comparatively few. During his 7 years as President, he has vetoed 473 bills. Seven bills have been passed over his veto, by the House and the Senate overriding his veto by a two-thirds majority in each House. They all relate to either veterans or farmers, except one bill involving bridges over navigable streams. The first involved the independent offices appropriation bill in 1933, wherein Congress thought that veterans and their dependents should not have their compensation so drastically reduced. The second was the so-called bonus bill, which he expected to be passed over his veto, but he could not consistently sign it. The third related to giving veterans 5 more years in which to apply for term insurance. The fourth and fifth reduced interest rates on Federal land bank loans to 3½ percent and commissioners' loans to 4 percent. The sixth granted subsistence allowance and travel pay to Spanish-American War veterans, and the seventh related to constructing railroad bridges over navigable streams.

50. Question. What are the salaries of the Representatives and Senators in Congress?

Answer. Representatives and Senators receive the same pay, $10,000 a year each.

51. Question. What allowances do they have to assist them in serving their constituents?

Answer. Each Representative is allowed $200 a year for stationery and office supplies and an allowance of $6,500 a year for a secretary and other clerical help, but no one person can receive more than $3,900 per year. The Senators are allowed a much greater allowance for all these purposes, but with the same limitation that no one person can receive more than $3,900 a year. Both Senators and Representatives are allowed 20 cents a mile for travel allowance.

52. Question. Do Representatives use all their $200 for supplies and stationery?

Answer. All of them use at least that much and many of them spend twice that much in 1 month. It depends upon how active a Member is.

53. Question. Why is 20 cents a mile allowed to Members for travel allowance instead of the 3 cents or 3½ cents per mile charged by the railroad companies?

Answer. Most Members have families. Congress is usually in session about 6 or 7 months during the year. They must leave their homes and move to Washington for the session and then move back. It is intended for the family as well as

the Member and is paid only one time a year or for a session, whereas, the average Member makes several trips to and from Washington a year. This has especially been true during the recent years when local constituents called upon their Congressmen to help them with matters before the Department of Agriculture, Veterans' Administration, Public Works Administration, Work Projects Administration, Social Security Board, National Youth Administration, and many other boards and commissions. It pleases a Member very much to know that he is really doing something worth while for the people he has the honor to represent and very few of them spare any expense in doing it.

54. Question. Do Members of Congress become wealthy by reason of their service?

Answer. Members do not accumulate very much, if anything, by reason of their service. Representatives every 2 years and Senators every 6 years are usually called upon to spend quite sizable sums for campaign expenses. In addition, living expenses in Washington are high. Besides a home must be maintained in the District.

55. Question. What is the salary of the President of the United States?

Answer. The President is allowed $75,000 per year salary, which cannot under a constitutional provision be increased or decreased during his term of office. He is also allowed $25,000 a year for traveling and official entertainment expenses, which is invariably used for that purpose. The first President, George Washington, said that no conscientious, aggressive public official greatly increased his wealth by reason of his official office because the temptation to spend it in properly serving the people was too great.

56. Question. What is the salary of the Vice President and members of the Cabinet?

Answer. The Vice President and members of the Cabinet receive compensation of $15,000 a year.

57. Question. In the event of the death, resignation, or inability of both the President and the Vice President, what would be the order of succession to the Presidency?

Answer:

1. Secretary of State (Cordell Hull).
2. Secretary of the Treasury (Henry Morgenthau, Jr.).
3. Secretary of War (Henry L. Stimson, who succeeded Harry H. Woodring).
4. Attorney General (Robert H. Jackson, who succeeded Justice Frank Murphy).
5. Postmaster General (Frank C. Walker, who succeeded James A. Farley).
6. Secretary of the Navy (Frank Knox, who succeeded Charles Edison).
7. Secretary of the Interior (Harold L. Ickes).

The law of January 19, 1886, giving the order of succession, makes no mention of Agriculture (Claude R. Wickard, who succeeded Henry A. Wallace), Commerce (Jesse H. Jones, who succeeded Harry Hopkins), and Labor (Miss Frances Perkins). Therefore, neither could succeed to the Presidency.

58. Question. What are the duties of the Speaker of the House?

Answer. He presides over the House, appoints the Chairman to preside over the Committees of the Whole, appoints all special or select committees, appoints conference committees, has the power of recognition of Members, makes many important rulings and decisions in the House. The Speaker may vote, but usually does not except in case of tie. He may appoint a Speaker pro tempore but not for more than 3 days at a time without the consent of the House. The Speaker and the majority leader determine administration policies in the House, often confer with the President, and are regarded as spokesman for the administration in power.

59. Question. What are the duties of a Member of Congress?

Answer. They are many and manifold. He should study legislation and attend the meetings of his House. He should listen to a good deal of the debates, but not all of them by any means. Many Members are kept in committee meetings many hours of many days of every session. The average Member develops a large office business. This is particularly true of western Members. Their constituency is far away from Washington, so many problems are referred to the Congressman for assistance. The Members get a vast amount of mail. This requires much study, dictation of replies, and often visits to different executive departments downtown. The departments are far away and often far apart. Many ex-service men bring their problems to their Congressman, and he is always glad to help them out when and wherever he can, although he has not the power always to do as much as he would like.

A Member will get a thousand letters or maybe several thousand letters in a session from citizens advocating or opposing proposed legislation. Usually a Congressman answers every letter, though he cannot tell everybody what he thinks about every bill that has been introduced. He must await development through committee hearings and give thought to those measures that are being brought forward by favorable committee action.

60. Question. Is legislation much influenced by oratory?

Answer. Not much. The real work and the most effective work for or against a bill is in committee. The House is a forum for debate upon the merits of the many bills. Very few bills that are brought up in the House for action under general or special rules are defeated. I think more than 95 percent of bills thus brought up are passed, despite the forensic display of oratory that may be directed against them, and usually is by the minority or the opposition. Hardly one amendment in forty offered to bills on the floor is adopted unless offered or accepted by the committee reporting out the bill up for consideration.

Legislation enacted by any Congress is largely that originating with or sponsored by the majority party. Important measures brought up have had thorough scrutiny and a favorable report by a well-organized committee. They have probably had strong backing from the country. Some have had the approval of the steering committee and some have been reported out by the Rules Committee. Such measures are on the program for passage, and long debates and much oratory cannot defeat them. On the other hand, bills that are not slated for passage do not often get up for action in the House. There are exceptions when a cause is sold to the country and the people demand it; for example, so-called veterans' bonus bill.

Committee responsibility is great and committee action influential. On most amendments and on most bills a majority of the Members vote most of the time with the committee—and it is difficult to break into that influence even with fine, fervid oratory.

61. Question. What is meant by the "seniority rule"?

Answer. It is a rule whereby the member of a committee who has served longest on the majority side becomes chairman and otherwise acquires additional influence. Members are ranked from the chairmanship according to length of service. It takes time for one to become familiar with the rules of the House and to receive sufficient recognition to enable him to be effective.

Champ Clark, who served in the House from Missouri 26 years and was elected Speaker four times, once said:

> A man has to learn to be a Congressman just as he has to learn to be a blacksmith, a carpenter, a farmer, an engineer, a lawyer, or a doctor. A new Congressman must begin at the foot of the class and spell up. Of course, the more brains, tact, energy, courage, and industry he has, the quicker he will get up.

The seniority rule allows Members who have long service to hold positions of leadership and power in the House. The rules in Congress are as valuable to a Member as a carpenter's tools are to the carpenter, since they are the only tools he has to work with. Shrewd parliamentarians are often able to expedite or block the passage of legislation. Many rules and customs, including the seniority rule, seem unreasonable to many people, but they have grown up through the method of trial and error over a period of 150 years, and there is no likelihood of substantial changes being made during our lifetime.

The gentleman from Texas, Congressman MARVIN JONES, recently stated that—

> Under any system ability plus experience is better than ability without experience.

62. Question. What are the duties of the whip of the House?

Answer. The whip keeps track of all important political legislation and endeavors to have all members of his party present when important measures are to be voted upon. When the vote is likely to be close he checks up, finds out who is out of the city, and advises absentees by wire of the important measures coming up.

63. Question. What is a party leader?

Answer. There is a majority leader and a minority leader. In talks on the floor we do not refer to Democrats and Republicans usually. It is more dignified, it seems, to refer to the majority and the minority. The majority leader now, the Honorable SAM RAYBURN, of Texas, is a Democrat; and the minority leader, the Honorable JOE MARTIN, of Massachusetts, is a Republican. The majority leader has the more influence, of course, since he has the majority of the membership back of him.

The leader is all the title implies. He leads in party debate. In cooperation with the Speaker, he brings forward party programs and policies. His advocacy of or opposition to proposed legislation indicates the party preference. The majority leader has much control over what comes up and when, of the legislative program from week to week. When he makes a motion it is almost always carried. He usually makes the motion to adjourn, and it always carries. If someone else, not authorized to do so, makes a motion to adjourn it is nearly always defeated.

64. Question. How are votes taken?

Answer. Four different ways. Usually the Speaker puts the question in this form: "As many as are in favor [of the motion] say 'Aye,' " and then, "as many as are opposed say 'No.' " In most instances the vote taken is decisive enough to satisfy. But if the Speaker is in doubt, or if it sounds close, any Member may ask for a division. In this case the Speaker asks those in favor to stand up and be counted. Then those opposed to the proposition to stand up and be counted. The Speaker does the counting and announces the result. But if he is still in doubt, or if a demand is made by one-fifth of a quorum—that is, 20 in the Committee of the Whole or 44 in the House—tellers are ordered. The Speaker appoints 1 gentleman on each side of the question to make the count. The 2 tellers take their place at the head of the center aisle. All Members favoring the proposition walk through between the tellers and are counted. Then those opposed walk through and are counted. This vote settles most questions.

But a roll call may be demanded by any Member on any question in the House, and if supported by one-fifth of those present it is ordered. This privilege is guaranteed by the Constitution. The Clerk reads the names of the whole membership, and as his or her name is called the Member answers "aye" or "no." The names of those not voting the first time are read a second time, so that all Members in corridors, cloakrooms, committee rooms, or offices, who have been notified of a roll call by signal bells, may come in and vote.

Roll calls are ordered sometimes to get a full vote on a measure, because of a lack of a quorum, sometimes because Members want to be on record on a measure, and sometimes to put the other side on record against the measure for imaginary political advantage. The roll calls are published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and are sometimes quoted to a Member's advantage or disadvantage, as the case may be.

Many bills of lesser importance and some of greater importance are passed without a roll call. This can be done if a quorum is present when the vote is taken and as many as one-fifth of those present do not demand a roll call. This is often done to save time and sometimes to save Members the embarrassment of having to be recorded for or against a measure.

65. Question. What is a quorum?

Answer. Everybody who ever attended a literary society knows that it requires a quorum to do business. In the House of Representatives a quorum is a majority of the membership. When there are no vacancies in the membership a quorum is 218. There are usually a few vacancies—Members who have died or have resigned and their places yet unfilled. So an actual quorum is usually a little under that figure. Much business is transacted without a quorum. But no business of any character, except to adjourn, can be transacted without a quorum present if any Member objects. All any Member has to do to get a full House is to arise, address the Speaker, and make the point of order that "no quorum is present." The Speaker says, "The Chair will count." If he cannot count a quorum present, the doors are closed, the bells are rung in the corridors and House Office Buildings, and the roll is called. This usually produces a quorum and business proceeds.

66. Question. Were political parties contemplated under the Constitution?

Answer. The framers of the Constitution tried to avoid having political parties control the election of a President. They provided that each State should choose as many electors as it has Congressmen and Senators by whatever method the legislature might decide. These electors then were to select the President and the Vice President.

In the first election in 1789 there were no parties because everybody turned to Washington. He favored Adams for Vice President, so Adams was chosen. The second election in 1792 brought the same result.

67. Question. What was the result of the bitter fight between Adams and Jefferson?

Answer. When Washington retired, a bitter fight developed immediately between Adams and Jefferson. The Adams men called Jefferson a demagogue. The Jefferson followers denounced Adams as a kingly despot without sympathy for the people.

Adams won by 71 to 68, because two electors from Jefferson States voted for Adams. Virginia's vote was, Jefferson 20 and Adams 1. North Carolina's vote was, Jefferson 11 and Adams 1.

Both Virginia and North Carolina were strong for Jefferson, but there was only one set of electors in each State. Electors were not pledged, but they were expected to vote for the man who was most popular in their respective States.

68. Question. What caused the formation of political parties?

Answer. The independent action of these two electors in 1796 brought two lists of party candidates for electors in the next election. Thus that provision of the Constitution, which was intended to prevent political parties, actually caused the formation of political parties. Instead of the electors choosing our Presidents, the electors have been little more than puppets to register the vote of the people of their State.

Since then, all electors have been pledged to the Presidential candidate of their respective parties. The voters know the candidates. So in effect the people elect our Presidents, regardless of the constitutional provision that requires them to vote for electors.

69. Question. How did the congressional caucus originate?

Answer. In 1800 both the Adams men and the Jefferson men held meetings of Members of Congress to plan the campaign. This was called the congressional caucus. Adams and Pinckney were the Federalist candidates and Jefferson and Burr the Republican candidates. The Republican Party then became the Democratic Party in the days of Jackson. The present Republican Party was not created until 1856. At first the Jackson men called themselves Democratic Republicans, and after Jackson became President, they used the term "Democratic."

70. Question. How did President Andrew Jackson revolutionize the Presidency?

Answer. As President he revolutionized the method of administering the Government. It has been said that "To the victor belongs the spoils" as a slogan was not literally put into effect until Taylor became President. Jackson selected personal advisers in addition to his Cabinet. They were called the Kitchen Cabinet, because he was so familiar and informal with them.

Theodore Roosevelt 75 years later had a small crowd of advisers from certain departments in addition to his regular Cabinet. They were called the Tennis Cabinet, because most of them were tennis players. Under President Franklin D. Roosevelt they are referred to as the "brain trust."

71. Question. Who started national conventions and why?

Answer. In 1832 Jackson called the first national political convention at Baltimore to nominate candidates for President and Vice President on the Democratic ticket. For several years the congressional caucus had been unpopular. Jackson knew, too, that he could not control the Congressmen, so he called a national convention to be made up of delegates to this convention who were to come straight from the people. He said the people should choose the delegates to nominate their candidates for President. This made the President the nominee of the people instead of the nominee of the Congressmen. Ever since that convention, political parties have nominated all our Presidents by that method.

72. Question. When will the people pass on the nominee for President of the Democratic and Republican Parties this year?

Answer. The Republicans nominated as their candidate at the national convention in Philadelphia, Pa., in June 1940, the Honorable Wendell L. Willkie.

The Democrats nominated as their candidate at Chicago, Ill., in July 1940, the Honorable Franklin D. Roosevelt.

The election (general) will be November 5, 1940.

The inauguration will be January 20, 1941.

73. Question. Was there anything unusual about the inauguration of Andrew Jackson?

Answer. When he was inaugurated President the plain people came to Washington by the thousands for hundreds of miles. After the inauguration the men rode their horses down Pennsylvania Avenue to the White House with Jackson on horseback leading the parade. They used hickory stirrups on their saddles, hickory-bark bridles on their horses, and carried large hickory clubs.

The women wore hickory-nut necklaces and hickory-nut shells for earrings. The eating places served hickory-nut cakes.

It was said 20,000 people passed through the White House at the President's reception. They said that at last the people have one of their own folks as President. They called him the people's President, and the day of his inauguration people's day, and the White House the people's house. Muddy boots ruined the White House furniture and particularly the fine chairs.

74. Question. When Greece was a pure democracy and all people voted, why was a halter put on one who proposed a new law?

Answer. The people of ancient Athens seem to have had the same idea. When all the people met together on certain days to pass laws, they had a requirement that any man who came to the platform to propose a new law must wear a halter around his neck. This requirement was to impress each would-be lawmaker how easy it would be to hang him if he proposed a new law that would be harmful to the people.

75. Question. What are the customary proceedings when the House meets?

Answer. The Speaker calls the Members to order and the Sergeant at Arms places the mace on the pedestal at the right of the Speaker's platform. It is the symbol of authority of the House. Then the Chaplain offers prayer. Next the Clerk reads the Journal of the preceding day's activities. Members of the committees make reports of bills and then the House is ready to consider the bill left unfinished the day before or take up a new bill on the calendar, if there be no unfinished business.

If the mace is on the pedestal, the Speaker is presiding and the House is in session. When the Committee of the Whole is in session, the mace is off the pedestal and a Chairman of the Committee of the Whole is presiding.

76. Question. Are the proceedings in Congress published and preserved?

Answer. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is the daily published report of all that Members of the House and Senate say on the floor. It contains also the roll calls on all questions. Expert shorthand reporters take down every word as Senators and Congressmen speak. Then it is typed and sent to the Government Printing Office where it is printed in the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and immediately distributed. During each session, the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is edited, revised, and then made up into volumes and printed, bound permanently and distributed to the Government Departments and many of the libraries throughout the country.

The daily RECORD has been printed since 1848. Before that the reports of speeches were short and incomplete, but they were printed in the Annals of Congress, Congressional Debates, and Congressional Globe.

77. Question. How may the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD be obtained?

Answer. Each Congressman and Senator receives a copy of the RECORD each morning following a meeting of the House or Senate. Each Member of Congress has a limited number of daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS, which may be distributed free; they are usually sent to libraries, schools, or other places where they will be accessible to the public. Anybody may subscribe for the RECORD by writing to the Congressional Record Clerk at Washington, D. C. The subscription rate is $1.50 per month.

78. Question. Why are the Capitol and the White House a mile apart?

Answer. Many visitors to Washington wonder why the Capitol is more than a mile from the White House. George Washington arranged them so.

He knew the King of England was always trying to control Parliament. He wanted to make it difficult for the President to do that, so he located the Capitol and the White House on two elevations with a large swamp between them.

This made it necessary to travel nearly 2 miles around by higher ground, and thus made daily contact and association of the President and Members of Congress quite difficult.

79. Question. How long has the White House had that name, officially, and how was it officially acquired?

Answer. The building was painted white to conceal smoke stains when it was burned by the British in 1814.

80. Question. Is it difficult, at the present time, for the President and Congress to confer?

Answer. No. Streets and pavements, the telephone, and the automobile have changed all that. Long ago Pennsylvania Avenue, the broad, open, direct thoroughfare from the Capitol to the White House, covered and overcame all traces of the swamp. The telephone has for years enabled the President and Members of Congress to talk as if under the same roof. The automobile travels so rapidly that the distance between the two buildings is no longer a hindrance to daily association between the President and Members of Congress.

81. Question. Have these changes destroyed the independence of Congress?

Answer. All of these changes, however, have not destroyed the independence of Congress. When Congress and the Presidency are controlled by the same political party, Congress generally passes the bills the President recommends, but not always. Sometimes so many Members of the majority party refuse, that Congress fails to pass the President's bills or passes bills to which he is opposed. If the President vetoes a bill, enough Members may disagree, to override his veto by a two-thirds vote.

Two-thirds of Congress so seldom vote to override a veto, that the President's signature to a bill is considered necessary to pass most legislation.

82. Question. What really makes the bill a law?

Answer. The President's signature makes a bill a law. Ordinarily he signs bills without any particular attention being given his action.

Sometimes when the President has a bill of special importance to sign, he arranges a ceremony for the occasion.

83. Question. What occurs at a ceremony when the President signs a bill?

Answer. Sometimes the President uses two or three different pens to sign a bill, using one pen for the first part of his name and another pen for the latter part. Then he gives these pens to those who have been most interested in the legislation.

In some instances organizations interested in the legislation have furnished the President with a gold pen and fancy penholder to be used in affixing his name. Afterward the organization frames the pen and keeps it as a souvenir.

84. Question. What becomes of the bill after it is signed?

Answer. After signing a bill, the President sends it to the office of the Secretary of State. That official gives it a number as a public law and publishes it as one of the laws of the land. It is then included in the lawbooks found in law libraries and the offices of lawyers throughout the country.

85. Question. Can the President of the United States veto a constitutional amendment?

Answer. The President of the United States has nothing to do with the adopting of constitutional amendments, and accordingly he has neither the power nor the opportunity to veto a resolution passed by Congress proposing such amendment. Such a resolution, however, must pass by a two-thirds vote of both Houses.

86. Question. Does the Constitution limit a President to two terms?

Answer. The Constitution of the United States does not limit the number of times a duly qualified citizen may be elected President, and no Federal law on the subject has ever been enacted.

87. Question. Does the President ever wear a uniform?

Answer. Although the President of the United States is Commander in Chief of both the Army and Navy, he is a civilian. American tradition does not permit him to wear a uniform representing any branch of the military or naval service.

88. Question. Can a President adjourn Congress?

Answer. In the case of a disagreement between the Senate and the House of Representatives with respect to time of adjournment, the President "may adjourn them at such time as he may think proper," according to section 3, article 2, of the Constitution. Thus far no President has ever exercised this power, and many claim it applies to extraordinary sessions only.

89. Question. Can a President veto a declaration of war?

Answer. Under the Constitution, the President has the power to veto an act declaring war, and Congress has the power to pass it over his veto.

90. Question. Why is our Government referred to as one to abolish classes?

Answer. For these reasons they created some entirely new provisions of government. Under the governments of the Old World at that period the people were divided into classes. One consisted of the nobility—that is, the class with power and wealth; another was the middle class—that is, the owners of small homes, small farms, and small business establishments; while still another class consisted of the laborers, the tenants, and the servants.

If a boy's parents were of the nobility, then he might become a lord, an earl, a duke, or a noble and own great tracts of land. If a girl's parents were of the nobility, she might marry a prince, a lord, a duke, an earl, or a noble.

If a boy's parents were laborers, servants, or tenants, then he must remain in the working class. If a girl's parents were laborers, servants, or tenants, she must not marry into the nobility.

The children of the middle class were supposed to remain within that class by marriage, occupation, and by their social connections. It was almost impossible for the children of parents in one class to become members of a class higher than their parents.

The colonists had already abolished this class system here in the New World before the Revolution began, except as to the representatives of the English King. After the Revolution the King had no representatives here. Then the colonists determined there should never be such a system in the United States. So they created a government under which every citizen has equal rights and equal opportunities under the laws.

91. Question. What has made this Nation great?

Answer. All boys and girls can do whatever they desire to do when they are grown. They are American citizens. They can enter any profession, engage in any kind of business, or hold any office they can persuade the people to elect them to fill.

It makes no difference under our Government whether a child's parents are rich or poor, wise or ignorant, famous or unknown, that child can succeed or fail, rise or fall, on his own merits. All through our history thousands of men and women in every activity of life have proved this by beginning life in most humble circumstances and rising to the highest positions.

Monopoly and special privilege interfere with these rights of American boys and girls. Therefore we should be on the alert as American citizens to prevent any one person or corporation from obtaining too much control either in business or in government.

92. Question. Who became known as the people's President?

Answer. Because of our kind of a government, Andrew Jackson, the son of a poor immigrant, could carve a career for himself in the backwoods of the Alleghenies, lead an army of Kentucky and Tennessee crack-shot riflemen at New Orleans to defeat the best British regiments on earth in 1815, then go to the United States Senate wearing his coonskin cap over his pigtail braided hair, and later be twice elected to the White House as the "people's President."

93. Question. Who was the most loved and most hated American man?

Answer. Jackson was the most loved and most hated man of his generation. His enemies claimed he was born on a ship at sea before his parents reached America and therefore was not eligible to be President. His admirers were so enthusiastic in both North Carolina and South Carolina that they erected a monument in each State to mark his birthplace, one north of the State boundary line and the other south of it.

The soldiers who fought under him in the Battle of New Orleans held annual reunions for years afterward. They were expert riflemen of Kentucky and Tennessee. All of them had his picture above their log-cabin fireplaces. They taught their children, "That's the picture of old General Jackson, the greatest general that ever led men into battle."

94. Question. Where did Andrew Jackson acquire the nickname, "Old Hickory," and by whom was it conferred?

Answer. Jackson, because of his indefatigable constitution on the march was considered by his soldiers as "tough as hickory," from which they drew the name "Old Hickory."

95. Question. What two ex-Presidents served in Congress?

Answer. Six years after President Andrew Johnson went out of office as President, he was elected to the United States Senate from Tennessee and served in that body. John Quincy Adams has been the only ex-President who served in the House of Representatives. He served in that body 17 years after he was President. Adams had never previously served in the House, but he had been a Senator from Massachusetts prior to his election.

96. Question. Who was the first woman elected to Congress?

Answer. The first woman to become a Member of Congress was Miss Jeannette Rankin, of Montana. She was elected in 1916. She was a Republican and served one term. Miss Alice M. Robertson, of Muskogee, Okla., was the second woman who served in Congress. She also was a Republican and served one term—1921 to 1923.

97. Question. How many women are Members of Congress at this time?

Answer. One in the Senate; seven in the House.

98. Question. What Presidents were born in log cabins?

Answer. Jefferson, Jackson, Buchanan, Lincoln, Fillmore, Garfield, and Arthur.

99. Question. How many Presidents' fathers were preachers?

Answer. Three. Wilson, Arthur, Cleveland.

100. Question. What two Presidents were bachelors when elected?

Answer. Two Presidents of the United States were bachelors when elected—James Buchanan and Grover Cleveland. During his first term, however, the latter was married to Frances Folsom, daughter of his former law partner at Buffalo. Therefore Buchanan, the only President who was never married, is known as the Bachelor President. He was the fifteenth President and was Lincoln's predecessor in the White House.

101. Question. How many of our Presidents were slave owners?

Answer. Ten men who have occupied the Presidency were owners of slaves at one time or another during their lives. They were Washington, Jefferson, Madison, Monroe, Jackson, Tyler, Polk, Taylor, Johnson, and Grant.

102. Question. What President hanged two men?

Answer. Grover Cleveland, the twenty-second and twenty-fourth President of the United States, when he was sheriff of Erie County, N. Y., in 1872 hanged two men.

103. Question. What President was drafted for military service?

Answer. Grover Cleveland was drafted for service in the Federal Army during the Civil War, but he availed himself of his legal right of hiring a substitute to serve in his place.

104. Question. Is an Indian eligible to the Presidency?

Answer. In June 1924 Congress passed a law making all Indians citizens. This means that all Indians born in the United States after that date are natural-born citizens and hence eligible to the Presidency so far as citizenship is concerned.

105. Question. How do dictatorships govern?

Answer. A dictatorship is a government ruled by a dictator. A man who becomes the head of a government by force and rules the people according to his own will is a dictator. Sometimes a prime minister or a president will persuade or compel the parliament or congress to give him supreme power. By this method he attempts to make his dictatorship lawful.

Dictators sometime exercise the powers of government without removing the king. They permit the king to retain his title without any power. This is another method of attempting to make a dictatorship lawful.

106. Question. How do dictatorships end?

Answer. No dictator has ever been able to devise any plan for his heir to succeed him. A dictatorship generally dies with the dictator. If a new dictator seizes control of the government he rules as he desires regardless of what his predecessor may have done.

Sometimes the people overthrow a dictator by a revolution. Then they choose a new ruler to run the government in accordance with the constitution and the laws.

107. Question. Is it possible for a dictator to get control of our country under our Constitution?

Answer. Dictatorships are not new. Ambitious military leaders in one nation after another have established them all through history. Some nations have dictators today. Others will no doubt have dictators in the future.

The Roman Senate had power to elect a dictator whenever it became deadlocked and could not agree on a national policy. Electing a dictator, though, was such serious business that the senate always met secretly in the dead of night when it was to elect a dictator.

Napoleon proclaimed himself a dictator and emperor, but died an English prisoner on the island of St. Helena.

It was to make a dictatorship impossible in the United States that the people of the Thirteen Original States wrote into the Constitution so many guarantees of individual rights and personal liberties which no ruler can override without destroying that document.

108. Question. What is a totalitarian state?

Answer. During recent years we have been using a new word to describe countries with dictators. It is "totalitarian." It comes from the word "total." Countries with dictatorships are called totalitarian states.

In a totalitarian state the government acts for the total of the people, that is, for the whole nation instead of for separate individuals. This means that individuals in totalitarian states have no rights or liberties not allowed by the ruler of the country whether he be a dictator, king, or emperor.

In some countries this system of government is called communism, and in other countries, fascism or nazi-ism. Although different in some respects, all such governments override those rights and liberties of the people which are guaranteed to all of us as American citizens under our Constitution.

109. Question. How many times has Congress declared war?

Answer. Congress has passed and the President has approved only five acts formally declaring the existence of a state of war between the United States and a foreign nation. June 18, 1812, against the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland and the dependencies thereof. Our Government never formally declared war against Mexico, but on May 12, 1846, the Senate passed and the President approved a House bill entitled "An act providing for the prosecution of the existing war between the United States and the Republic of Mexico." It was equivalent to a formal declaration of war. April 25, 1898, our country declared war on the Kingdom of Spain. April 6, 1917, Congress declared a state of war to exist between the United States and the Imperial German Government. December 7, 1917, our Government declared that a state of war existed between the United States of America and the Imperial and Royal Austro-Hungarian Government. Our country has been engaged in numerous wars that were not formally declared or formally declared to exist. War was never formally declared against the Confederate States. There were, of course, numerous Indian wars within our boundaries.

110. Question. Can Members of Congress be impeached?

Answer. No; they are not subject to impeachment, but each House is judge of the qualifications of its own Members and can with concurrence of two-thirds expel a Member. Each Member, in fact, takes the oath of office at the beginning of his term with the consent of all the other Members elected. In other words, if any other Member-elect should challenge his right to take the oath for any reason in the world, the Member would have to step aside until the complaint or charges had been disposed of. It is the usual practice for a resolution to be adopted, authorizing the Speaker of the House to administer the oath to the Member-elect, who has been challenged, by referring the question of the final right of the Member to his seat to the proper committee for consideration and report.

111. Question. What was the first act of Congress?

Answer. The first law enacted was an act to regulate the time and manner of administering certain oaths and it was approved June 1, 1789, in President Washington's period. The second bill passed by both Houses was "An act for laying a duty on goods the merchandise of which was imported into the United States," and it was approved by Washington on July 4 of the same year. The first session of the first Congress opened in New York City. Therefore, the first law relating to the economic welfare of the people of the Nation was one in favor of a tariff duty.

112. Question. What President first had an automobile?

Answer. William Howard Taft was the first President to make regular use of an automobile while he was Chief Executive. It was purchased in 1909. Harding was the first man elected President who had driven a car himself.

113. Question. Has a President or a Vice President ever resigned?

Answer. No President of the United States thus far has resigned. Only one Vice President has resigned—John C. Calhoun.

114. Question. Which Presidents were related?

Answer. John Quincy Adams, the sixth President, was a son of John Adams, the second President. Benjamin Harrison, the twenty-third President, was a grandson of William Henry Harrison, the ninth President. Zachary Taylor, the twelfth President, was a second cousin of James Madison, the fourth President. Madison and Taylor were the great grandsons of James Taylor and Martha Thompson. Our present President, the Honorable Franklin D. Roosevelt, is a fifth cousin of a former President, Theodore Roosevelt; Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt, the First Lady, is a niece of former President Theodore Roosevelt.

115. Question. Why is the President's wife called the First Lady?

Answer. The President's wife is called the First Lady of the Land because the Presidency is regarded as the highest position any man can attain in this country, and his wife is given social precedence over all other women. When the

President is not married, the woman who presides socially over the White House is called the First Lady of the Land.

116. Question. Why are most of the bills that become law in the name of a comparatively few Members of Congress?

Answer. When the committee has hearings on a bill, usually all of the bills introduced by the Members of the House on that subject are considered at the same time in the committee. In the House, a bill cannot bear the name of more than one Member as the author. Therefore, it often happens that the same or a similar bill is introduced by a large number of Members. When hearings have been completed and a bill has been agreed upon by the committee, a new bill is usually introduced, referred to as a "clean bill," in the name of the chairman of the committee and no reference is made to the other Members who have introduced similar bills. When the bill has finally passed, it only bears the name of the chairman. Furthermore, all administration bills are introduced by administration leaders and these bills usually take precedence over all others. In the Senate, any number of Members may join in the introduction of a bill. It has happened that the Member of Congress responsible for the passage of a bill does not have his name connected with it in any way when it becomes a law.

117. Question. What is "pairing" in Congress?

Answer. If a Member of the Senate or House of Representatives wishes to be absent during a meeting of Congress, he often asks a Member of the opposite party to refrain from voting on important measures. He is then said to be "paired" with so-and-so, or to have a "pair." Thus, the result is not affected and the relative strength of each party remains unchanged. On a particular question, the Member desiring to be absent will seek a "pair" from one who expects to vote contrary to the way that he would vote if present. It is, in effect, a Member casting an absentee vote. It is called a "live" pair.

118. Question. What business can be transacted by unanimous consent?

Answer. Practically anything can be done in either House by unanimous consent. Except where the rules specifically prohibit the presiding officer from entertaining such a request; for example, admission to the floor of persons not included in the rule on the subject; the introduction of persons in the galleries, and so forth. A famous Speaker of the House once said "You can drive an elephant through the House of Representatives by unanimous consent." A majority of the bills are passed by unanimous consent. Sometimes a leader will ask unanimous consent to bring up for immediate consideration a certain bill. If any Member objects it cannot be brought up in that way. However, the Rules Committee can immediately present a special rule for the immediate consideration of the bill and when a majority of the Members of the House vote for the rule the bill is considered under the terms of that rule, which can suspend all other rules.

Members are permitted to address the House and extend their remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by unanimous consent. If a Member abuses any privilege that is granted to him by unanimous consent, such as putting too much extraneous matter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, any Member can stop it in the future by objecting to his requests. However, the Member whose request is objected to can retaliate by objecting to all unanimous-consent requests until his request is granted; or if a Democrat objects to a request made by a Republican, the Republican will sometimes object to all requests made by the Democrats only until his request is granted, and vice versa.

119. Question. Why are Congressmen elected in the State of Maine in September instead of November?

Answer. The Constitution provides that unless Congress directs otherwise, the time of holding elections for Senators and Representatives "shall be prescribed in each State by the legislature thereof." During the early days of the Federal Government no law on the subject was passed. In 1845 Congress fixed the first Tuesday after the first Monday in November as the day for choosing presidential electors and that day is still national or general election day. The same day was designated for the election of Representatives, but an exception was made in the case of those States in whose constitutions a different day was specified. Accordingly, for many years, three States, Arkansas, Oregon, and Maine, elected their congressional Representatives earlier than November. Arkansas and Oregon later changed their constitutions to conform with the act of 1845. Maine is the only State in the Union which continues to hold these elections on a different day. Election day in Maine was placed in September during the early days of the Republic, when traveling facilities were poor and when bad roads and cold weather frequently would have prevented the rural inhabitants from going to the polls late in the fall. All the States, including Maine, elect Presidential electors on the first Tuesday after the first Monday in November.

120. Question. Why must tax bills originate in the House?

Answer. After the Revolution, it was decided that officials of our Government, who pass tax laws, should be directly responsible to the people. So they provided that only Congress should levy and collect taxes and that all laws to raise revenue, that is, to tax the people, must originate in the House of Representatives. It was also provided that the Members of the House of Representatives should be elected every 2 years. If Congress raises taxes too high, the people can elect new Members of the House within 2 years to repeal or change those taxes.

121. Question. What are the functions of the House Rules Committee?

Answer. It has more power over legislation than any other committee of the House. It considers only bills that some other committee has reported. Most of its work is to decide whether or not to grant special consideration for bills which otherwise might be long delayed on the various calendars of the House. When the Rules Committee reports a special rule to the House it is usually adopted. When it is adopted, the bill to which it refers is considered under the provisions of that rule.

122. Question. Is smoking permitted in Congress?

Answer. By the rules of the Senate and the House of Representatives, Members are not permitted to smoke while on the floor.

123. Question. Is there a bar in the Capitol?

Answer. No; the last saloon bar was taken out of the Capitol in 1903.

124. Question. Is a filibuster possible in Congress?

Answer. It is possible for a filibuster to be conducted in the Senate because of the liberal rules, which provide that a Senator may speak as long and as many times as he desires. A few Senators can hold up a vote indefinitely in that way.

In 1917 the Senate adopted what is called a "cloture rule" as a part of the Senate rules. It provides that the Senate may end debate by a two-thirds vote. When 16 Senators file a petition with the clerk of the Senate, asking to end debate, the Senate must vote on the petition at 1:00 p. m., the second calendar day thereafter. If two-thirds vote for cloture, then no Senator may talk longer than 1 hour on the bill. So long as one-third of the Senate is opposed to cloture, it is impossible to end a filibuster if enough Senators are willing to talk in relays.

Forcing roll calls is about the only method of filibustering left under the rules of the House, and when the Rules Committee brings in a drastic rule prohibiting the offering of amendments or considering the bill for more than a certain number of hours, even that method of filibustering is impossible.

125. Question. Are visitors and representatives of the press allowed to listen in on the proceedings?

Answer. Yes; in both Houses places are provided for them in the galleries. A special place is set aside for accredited members of the press and is referred to as the "press gallery."

126. Question. Are eating places provided in the Capitol for Members and their guests?

Answer. Yes; in both the Senate and House wings of the Capitol meals are served at prevailing prices. Meals are not

served free to anyone. It is a quarter of a mile from the Houses of Congress to the nearest private restaurant off the Capitol Grounds. Since Congress usually meets at noon, the Members obtain their noonday meal when it is convenient for them to do so during a lull in the proceedings or while something is being considered which does not require their attendance. If a vote is called for during their absence, the bells are sounded and they can return to the floor in plenty of time to vote.

127. Question. Are the Members provided with offices in which to conduct their business?

Answer. The 435 Members of the House have offices in two buildings about 150 yards south of the Capitol. When the weather is bad or when traffic is too heavy on the streets, they can reach the Capitol Building through a subway.

The 96 Senators are provided offices in a building about 150 yards northeast of the Senate wing of the Capitol. The Senators are provided with a one-rail electric train in a subway for quick transportation from their building to the Senate floor.

128. Question. How should one address a Member of Congress if he desires to communicate with him?

Answer. Example as follows: Hon. John Jones, M. C., House (or Senate) Office Building, Washington, D. C.

If Congress is not in session, the communication should be addressed to his home town.

129. Question. Who has custody and use of the seal of the United States?

Answer. The Secretary of State. He affixes the seal to all civil commissions for officers of the United States appointed by the President.

130. Question. What is the flag?

Answer. The United States statutes provide that: "The flag of the United States shall be 13 horizontal stripes alternate red and white and the union of the flag shall be 48 stars, white, in a blue field."

131. Question. How is the number of stars in the flag determined?

Answer. By the number of States. And on the admission of a new State into the Union, one star shall be added.

132. Question. What is the pledge to the flag?

Answer.

"I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America,
And to the Republic for which it stands,
One Nation, indivisible,
With liberty and justice for all."

This pledge is widely used in the public schools of the United States.

133. Question. Who wrote the pledge to the flag?

Answer. The pledge to the flag was written by Francis Bellamy, Boston, Mass., in August 1892. It was first repeated at the exercises in connection with the celebration of Columbus Day (October 12, 1892).

134. Question. What is the approved ceremony for use in schools when pledging allegiance to the flag?

Answer. If it is customary to have a flag hanging in the front of the schoolroom, it is left in its regular position for the ceremony. Otherwise a pupil is appointed to hold a flag before the school, a medium sized flag on a short staff being preferable. At a signal from the teacher, the pupils arise in their places and stand erect. They then bring the open right hand, palm downward, to a line on a level with the forehead, the thumb just touching the right eyebrow. Standing thus they slowly and distinctly repeat the pledge in concert. At the words "to the Flag of the United States of America" each pupil extends the right hand, palm up, toward the flag, the hand remaining in that position until the pledge is completed, when it is dropped to the side. This ceremony is generally followed by a patriotic song.

135. Question. What are some of the improper uses of the flag?

Answer. It is unlawful to use the flag for advertising purposes or to mutilate, defile, or contemptuously treat it, but it is no disrespect to wash or dry clean an American flag. It is also proper to mend the flag when torn, unless it is in such bad condition that it would be a discredit to the owner if displayed.

136. Question. What was the original name of our national anthem? When did it become our national anthem?

Answer. Defense of Fort McHenry.

By an act of Congress approved by the President on March 3, 1931, the words and music of The Star-Spangled Banner were designated as "the national anthem of the United States of America."

The words were written in 1814 by Francis Scott Key, 1780–1843, a lawyer, of Frederick, Md., and Washington, who, as a visitor on board a British vessel in Baltimore, had witnessed the British bombardment of Fort McHenry.

The words were sung to the air of Anacreon in Heaven, and gained at once popularity as a national lyric.

Whenever the national anthem is played on board a vessel of the Navy, at a naval station, or at any place where persons belonging to the naval service are present, all officers, and enlisted men not in formation shall stand at attention, facing toward the music, except at colors, when they shall face toward the colors. If in uniform, covered, they shall salute at the first note of the anthem, retaining the position of salute until the last note of the anthem. If not in uniform and covered, they shall uncover at the first note of the anthem, holding the headdress opposite the left shoulder and so remain until the last note of the anthem, except that in inclement weather the headdress may be slightly raised.

137. Question. What kind of an oath is an alien required to take before he becomes a naturalized citizen of the United States?

Answer. The laws of the United States provide that before such a person "is admitted to citizenship he must declare, on oath in open court, that he will support the Constitution of the United States and that he absolutely and entirely renounces and abjures all allegiance and fidelity to any foreign prince, potentate, state, or sovereignty, and particularly by name to the prince, potentate, state, or sovereignty of which he was before a citizen or subject; that he will support and defend the Constitution and laws of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic, and bear true faith and allegiance to the same."

138. Question. What is the American's creed?

Answer. The American's creed was written by William Tyler Page, former Clerk of the United States House of Representatives, in 1917 and adopted and promulgated by the Government's Committee on Publication. It was accepted by the House of Representatives on behalf of the American people April 3, 1918. It is as follows:

I believe in the United States of America as a Government of the people, by the people, for the people; whose just powers are derived from the consent of the governed; a democracy in a republic; a sovereign Nation of many sovereign States; a perfect Union, one and inseparable; established upon those principles of freedom, equality, justice, and humanity for which American patriots sacrificed their lives and fortunes.

I therefore believe it is my duty to my country to love it; to support its Constitution; to obey its laws; to respect its flag; and to defend it against all enemies.

Compulsory Military Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARY T. NORTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 7, 1940

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, in considering what my stand should be with respect to this measure, which proposes to conscript the youth of the Nation for military service, I have prayerfully asked for divine guidance. I am not insensible to the grave responsibility that is before me. And I suppose my mental processes have reacted to the problem in

much the same manner as have those of all Americans, who are striving to find the solution most compatible with the welfare of the Nation.

No proposed legislation, during the period of my service in the Congress, has consumed more of my time and attention. My desk literally is piled with letters and telegrams, urging me to take one side or the other. People here in Washington and back home in New Jersey importune me to vote both for and against the measure. I have followed the Senate debates with profound interest. I have read, and in some cases reread, articles on the measure by newspaper and magazine writers, by military experts and by others who must be presumed to know whereof they speak. And I have endeavored, to the very best of my ability, to piece together all of this information, into the pattern that will present an answer consistent with the welfare of my country. And in weighing the evidence on both sides of the issue, I have tried to have special regard for the source thereof, because I think it of vital importance that before we shape decisions in matters of this character we know definitely that the sources of our information represent people and organizations that are interested solely in the national welfare. Modern propaganda approaches an objective by trails that are as devious as they are numerous, and it is well to remember that some of the nations abroad are spending millions of dollars to disseminate information designed to keep us divided, and thereby impotent defensively. And obviously, a measure of this nature, designed as it is to strengthen our defensive forces, would not be in harmony with plans of nations that contemplate acts of aggression against any of the nations of this hemisphere.

I am not unfamiliar with war. I know from experience the tragic consequences thereof. During the last war it was my privilege to serve in a capacity that brought me into intimate association with participants that seldom make the headlines, women and children of the underprivileged class, whose husbands and fathers were overseas. I know their privations and sufferings. After the war when I came to Congress my work on the Veterans Committee carried me to veterans' hospitals, where I observed at first hand the horrible grist that came from the mills of the war god. And knowing and seeing all of this, I never could bring myself to cast my vote for a measure that would lead to another war, or would prove the means of sending one single American boy to fight in foreign battlefields. And being a woman, and knowing that in the final analysis it is the members of my own sex—mothers, wives, and loved ones at home—who are the real sufferers I am opposed to legislation that carries potential steps toward war. But I am not opposed to legislation that will provide the means for keeping the Nation out of war. For these reasons then, I have approached the problem before me with a great amount of deliberation, and my decision is predicated upon a sincere and genuine desire to act for the best interests and welfare of my country.

I believe that the measure under consideration should be regarded in the light of what has transpired and what is transpiring abroad. To disregard or attempt to waive aside this background is folly. No nation can afford to isolate itself from a threatened danger by turning its back to it. Forces are abroad in Europe and Asia that champion an ideology of government that is diametrically opposed to ours. They are striving, with the fervor of fanaticism, to uproot the last vestiges of democracy from the soil of Europe. They are powerful, aggressive, ruthless, and bent upon world-conquest. And when they finish the job in Europe, their attention will be focused upon the Western Hemisphere. Already their advance agents are busily at work in South and Central America, paving the way by propaganda, by espionage, and by other means for the show-down that will come when the work in Europe is completed.

Let us try to divest ourselves of wishful thinking and regard the problem confronting our Nation realistically. South America is a veritable treasure house of natural resources. It is fabulously rich in the things that the totalitarian nations need badly and do not possess. It holds forth for the plucking, raw materials, agricultural products, and mineral wealth, as well as acres and acres of fruitful land for colonization. Can anyone in their right senses imagine for a single minute, in the light of what has transpired in Europe and Asia, that Hitler and his partners in international crime will be bothered about the Monroe Doctrine when abundant plunder beckons? And suppose an expedition were landed and took possession of one of the southernmost republics. From what our military experts tell us, we are in no position, at the moment, to successfully resist an invasion of our own shores, to say nothing of transporting troops to expel totalitarian invaders from South America. And bombing bases in any part of South America could wreak havoc with the Panama Canal, our Caribbean possessions, our eastern seaboard cities, and our large industrial areas that are the lifeblood of our national industry.

I feel that much of the opposition to this measure is the result of wholesale misinformation. Many people throughout the Nation—honest, patriotic people—have been led to believe that it constitutes a serious threat to their tranquillity and welfare. I believe that most of these people, knowing the situation as it really is, would regard the measure in a more favorable light. One statement oft repeated in debate and in other channels against the bill is that which claims the measure will lead us to war. That assertion, to me, is a "bogeyman" that is the progeny of honest but impractical pacifists and dishonest "fifth columnists." The Nation stands committed to a policy that definitely and absolutely negatives the possibility of a war of our own making, a war of aggression, and the Nation is unanimous in the determination to send no soldiers to fight on battlefields beyond the Western Hemisphere. And it always has been my idea that the Congress, which is the representative body of the people of the United States, is the war-making body. How, then, can the force to be made available under this proposed law be the power that will motivate war?

Dictators seldom, if ever, make war against nations that can meet them on equal terms—nations that can match their military prowess. That isn't the way of the bully. It was the small, helpless, little nations that fell by the wayside in Europe and Asia. Let us run down the list of the fallen and the conquered—Ethiopia, Austria, Norway, and Denmark were hopelessly unprepared; Poland, Czechoslovakia, Finland, Holland, and Belgium were small and inadequately prepared. France was inadequately prepared and internally disorganized. And England, now in a most difficult position, was likewise inadequately prepared.

Among the suggestions advanced by those opposing passage of this bill is the one that the so-called volunteer system should be given a fair trial before going to the extent of conscription. There are many convincing answers to that suggestion, but the most conclusive is that the volunteer system has been given a fair trial and found wanting. In our own time the Army, if my memory serves me correctly, has made two concerted and genuine efforts to enroll troops by that method, with very unsatisfactory results. In one of these instances the number sought was less than 100,000 as against the 900,000 or more required in the present instance. The volunteer system places the fate of the Nation in the hands of but a small percentage of the Nation's manpower, whereas every man and woman in the Nation should be in a position, by adequate and systematized training, to do his or her share in a national emergency.

Opponents of the measure either possess an overwhelming confidence in the honor and character of dictators, or visualize an era when a few patriots, armed with only a musket, could stem the tide of an invading host from behind hedge fences and stone walls. The war of today is a highly mechanized business and victory rides with the force that is prepared, and prepared by careful, systematized training, and training that is a matter of months and, in some cases, years.

The tragedy that stalked the battlefields of Europe and Asia has demonstrated that any other alternative means slaughter and devastation.

If we are to prepare so that we may avoid war—and if my memory is correct most of my colleagues voted for preparedness after the invasion of the Low Countries last spring—if we are to prepare, let us do it the American way, and leave nothing to chance or to wishful thinking. Let us see to it that our armed forces have all of the equipment and all of the manpower that will place us in a position to assert our rights in this hemisphere when and if the show-down comes.

I favor this measure because I am convinced that it is an integral and necessary part of the preparedness program; because I am convinced that it is the very best insurance my country can have against war; because I am convinced it is the only democratic way of placing the burden of defense of the Nation and the hemisphere on the shoulders of everybody in the Nation; because I feel that it will take our youth and improve it physically and morally, and teach it obedience and discipline; and because, as an American, I feel that my Nation should be ready to take up any challenge from any nation on the face of the earth that places at issue or in jeopardy the lands and the sacred principles that are the heritage of generations of free men, our forefathers.

Compare Our Problems With England's Problems—Part III

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. THORKELSON

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 4, 1940

EXCERPTS FROM THE ALIEN MENACE

Mr. THORKELSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting a series of excerpts from the Alien Menace, by Lt. Col. A. H. Lane, an officer in the British Army, who is more interested in England's welfare than he is in political expediency. He, like many in America, tells the truth. He hits the nail on the head, and he sets a good example for Members of Congress of the United States.

In reading this series, the Members will find that the same insidious influences, which are undermining England, are also undermining the United States—so it behooves us to protect ourselves before it is too late.

The excerpts follow:

ALIENS AND THE FILMS

The immense power of the films to educate and influence the public does not seem to have been studied by our successive Governments, and this great menace of propaganda has been neglected by our ministers in a manner which is difficult to understand.

What has been the influence during all these years which has prevented the formation of a well-organized Government film censor's department?

Statistics show that in England alone some 7,000,000 persons attend the films every week. Information is largely conveyed to the brain by eye, and impressions thus produced are generally lasting, and this is more especially the case among uneducated and uncivilized peoples. The talking film appeals to both eye and ear, thus having two avenues of approach to the mind instead of one only, as is the case of the wireless loudspeaker.

Our enemies, almost at once, realized that in the film they possessed, perhaps, the most powerful instrument for propaganda that the world has ever known. Even before the Great War they were using it against us, and since August 1914 it has been their most potent means for disseminating information calculated to injure us. Wherever, as in India, the masses are illiterate, or, as in England, credulous, our enemies' films have done an incalculable amount of harm.

Most of the films shown until comparatively lately have been foreign films. A large proportion of these have been demoralizing, and many are directly or indirectly anti-British and subversive in character and have been forced upon the long-suffering British by some of the aliens who control and direct the vast film industry in this country, our Dominions, colonies, India, and the Far East. Moscow films, having sown the seeds of revolt in Egypt, India, China, South America, and other disturbed centers, are now being shown here with ever-growing freedom.

Now, as to the propaganda value of a film. On November 5, 1926, I was one of a deputation to the Home Secretary, Sir William Joynson-Hicks, which protested against the general management of films in England, a large proportion of which were antipatriotic, and in particular a strong protest was directed against the exhibition in England of an American film, entitled "The Unknown Soldier," which portrayed an American in the title role and on that account alone was an outrage to British feelings, having regard to the revered grave in Westminster Abbey. On that occasion I said to the Home Secretary, inter alia:

"The British public do not sufficiently realize that the foreign film producers have captured the cinema business of the British Isles, not only for the money to be made in it but also for propaganda purposes. These foreign film producers, backed by foreign financiers with unlimited money, are aiming at destroying our patriotism, our traditions, and our ideals. They are educating our people downward and not upward. The Government should appoint a censor of films—to have the same powers as the censor of plays—as is done in Australia."

In his reply the Home Secretary expressed his sympathy with the deputation, especially with the remark that our people were being "educated downwards and not upwards." But he made the amazing statement that in regard to the films he had no legal power to interfere. It is worthy of mention, however, that following on press reports concerning this deputation and the subsequent public outcry, "The Unknown Soldier" was withdrawn.

On December 12, 1926, the Daily Mail published a lengthy article describing the United States film-makers' grip of the British cinema industry. It quoted a statement by one of the officials of the Cinematograph Exhibitors' Association that American film companies derived an income of something like $6,000,000 a year from British cinemas, and paid no income tax here on that account—certainly an example of profitable propaganda. What was the political influence behind this?

I now propose to prove how, instead of preventing the dissemination of subversive propaganda on the films, we encourage it through lack of proper Government censorship. A great parade is made in the cinemas of the "Passed by the British Board of Film Censors" certificate, which used to bear the signature of Mr. T. P. O'Connor, M. P., but now is signed "Edward Shortt." This certificate is misleading, since it deludes many to believe that there is a Government censorship. The film censors—whoever they are—are neither appointed nor paid by the Government, but by the producers themselves, many of whom are aliens. This is a Gilbertian state of affairs, and it is on a par with a criminal paying his judge. But in spite of every effort made by patriotic societies and others to effect an alteration in the form of censorship, nothing effectual has been done up to date, and thus the greatest propaganda medium for evil remains to a great extent in the hands of German-American financiers.

It was not a coincidence that Mr. T. P. O'Connor, who was no lover of Great Britain—and whose wife was an American—was appointed censor. It may also be mentioned that Mr. T. P. O'Connor's eyesight was very weak during his later life. Since Mr. O'Connor died, Mr. Edward Shortt has been appointed censor, but the harm has been done.

Twelve years of films—many of which were propaganda—designed, if only by suggestion, gradually to destroy the patriotism, ideals, and traditions of our Nation, have had their effect. They have, with considerable success, achieved their objective.

Certain films shown in India and the Far East, especially since the War, have been purposely made—in the United States, Germany, and so forth—with the definite idea of ruining British prestige among the natives of these countries. The harm these films have done is enormous. They appeal to millions who cannot read.

The Daily Mail (June 2, 1930) throws some light on this subject:

"Surprise has been caused among cinema goers by a film interview with Mrs. Sarojini Naidu, the poetess and follower of Gandhi, which was shown in London last week and is to appear at provincial theaters this week.

"Mrs. Naidu is serving a term of imprisonment for her part in the raid on the Government-controlled salt depot at Dharasana, near Bombay, and a number of people who have seen the talking film have suggested that the screen should not be used for the propaganda of revolutionary leaders.

"The showing of this film, which is included in a news reel, raises in an acute form the question of censorship of such films.

"It was explained to a Daily Mail reporter on Saturday by Mr. J. Brooke Wilkinson, the secretary of the British Board of Film Censors, that news films are outside the jurisdiction of the censorship. The subjects are left to the discretion of the editors. Mr. Wilkinson explained. 'The Government, the licensing authorities, and the trade,' he said, 'have always opposed a censorship of topical films.'"

It is significant to recall here an interview which the correspondent of the Jewish Guardian had with Mr. E. Godal, managing director of the British and Colonial Kinematograph, in May 1921. The Jewish Guardian, May 27, 1921, stated that when Mr. Godal was

asked: "You have no fear, then, for any invasion of anti-Jewish films?" Mr. Godal replied: "Impossible; remember that our people are in the unique position of being their own censors, their own judges of what fare they shall offer their patrons from the miles of films with which they are tempted."

Considering that since 1921 films have become more degrading, anti-British and more harmful generally, besides much greater in number, it would seem that these alien cinematograph "bosses" have continued to be their own censors.

It is true that local committees have been formed to deal with films. And in January 1932, Sir Cecil Levita, chairman of the London County Council, 1928–29, was elected chairman of the home office advisory committee on film censorship. But it must be remembered that when chairman of the L. C. C. Film Committee, this K. C. V. O. obtained official recognition for the so-called British Board of Film Censors which has proved such a dangerous farce. Following this step the home office ordered all local authorities to adopt this censorship. Judging from many of the films shown of late years in London, this appointment does not hold out much hope of improvement in censorship.

France has a Government censor department with strong powers, which sees all films before they can be shown. No films of a subversive nature are passed.

Doubtless the reader will remember the great effort that was made at the end of 1927 to bring in a bill to promote the manufacture of British films, the basic idea being to place the British films in a position of equality with the foreigner and to insure our having all-British productions.

This bill was passed and is now in operation under the name of the Cinematograph Film Act, 1927. But readers of it will notice an extraordinary omission. As introduced, the bill provided that in order to qualify as a British film not only the author of the scenario and the maker of the film but the producer should be British subjects. Yet when the bill was being discussed on the report stage in the House of Commons on November 17, 1927, Colonel Applin, Member of Parliament, brought in an amendment—which was carried—to permit foreign producers being employed, although, as I have explained, the bill was intended to foster British productions. Now, as the chief authority and power is the producer, this amendment nullified the whole aim and object of the bill; consequently German-American producers can carry on as before with their pernicious propaganda, some of which is indirect and subtle, but nearly all designed to destroy British ideals.

The effect of this amendment has been most serious and far-reaching not only in the British Isles but in every country where these films are shown. Our prestige in India and the Far East has been seriously damaged by this means.

From a financial point of view the practical destruction of the bill was worth large sums to the alien film producers.

The Sunday Express (December 15, 1929) stated, "The quota act is dead."

"The 'quota' companies cannot get any more capital."

"American distributors in this country are wriggling out of their quota obligation."

"The British film is betrayed at home and boycotted abroad."

It would seem that anti-British managers deliberately show poor British films in juxtaposition to high-class foreign ones, in order to belittle this country and bring contempt upon the real British product.

In proof of this assertion that there is a conspiracy to belittle the British product the Daily Telegraph of June 22, 1931, drew attention to this matter. The film critic, discussing the poor quality of many of the British films shown here, explains their origin thus:

"Many of the films of which complaint is made are produced here by American companies for the purpose of technical compliance with the quota regulations. They are legal rubbish, made with the minimum of money and efficiency for the purpose of casting discredit on the British film industry."

The Australian Board of Film Censors, in its report published February 12, 1932, "deplored the 'moral tone' of British talking pictures." (Daily Mail, February 13, 1932.)

The Times (February 15, 1932) stated that the commonwealth film censor reports that the tone of films in general in the last year has not improved.

The machinery for talking films was made in the United States of America, chiefly by the Western Electric group with the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. ($200,000,000 capital reserve) behind them. The machinery has been supplied on the installment system. This scheme has given these American combines a great control over our film and cinema companies not only in the British Isles but in our Dominions and colonies.

The enormous profits thus made in this country by these United States of America companies are not subject to English income tax.

From the above will be seen some of the extraordinary developments by which the alien controls our cinemas. These alien schemes have gained great impetus during the past 3 years, what time our "labor" government was in office.

The Sunday Dispatch (September 13, 1931) stated that within the next 12 months the American motion-picture industry will have invested nearly £5,000,000 in film production in the British isles.

FILM SOCIETIES

It is difficult to overestimate the great moral wrong which has been done and is being done to the British Nation by the film society which was founded in 1926 by the Honorable Ivor Montagu (brother of Lord Swaythling) and Mr. S. Bernstein.

Mr. Montagu has been associated with Serge Eisenstein in the production of some subversive films. Serge Eisenstein has been for several years Moscow's chief film propagandist, and has declared revolutionary propaganda to be "the first task of Soviet dictatorship" (Daily Express, October 18, 1930).

"The members of the film society are drawn chiefly from influential and well-to-do people whose interests are best described by the word "cultural," and from university lecturers, school teachers, educational publicists, and others connected with the instruction of youth, the result being that its performances have a propaganda value far beyond that which would be attached to ordinary film exhibitions" (Daily Telegraph, April 4, 1931).

The film society, in common with all other private film societies, is understood to be party to an undertaking not to show subversive film propaganda. This society showed how censorship could be evaded by not charging for admission. Our weak laws and administrations seem unable to control these shows.

The success with which the film society has evaded the law and has not been interfered with, especially under the Socialist Government, has led to the formation of the London Workers' Film Society which, with Mr. Montagu and other members of the film society on its executive, produces most dangerous Communist and anti-British propaganda films that have not passed the censor. Branches of this society have also been formed in many of our large towns.

The Federation of Workers' Film Societies has been formed at 74 Old Compton Street, W. 1, and publishes a paper called the Workers' Cinema, a subversive monthly publication which would not be allowed in any other country.

These societies obtain their films through the Soviet organization Mezhrabkom (Workers' International Relief). The transmission of money to them has been facilitated by our Socialist Government's political trade arrangements with Moscow through Arcos. The Blue Express, the most vindictive of all Moscow's anti-British propaganda films, also the Storm of Asia, etc., have been obtained in this way. With one exception these films have been banned by the British Board of Film Censors. There seem to be considerable funds at the disposal of these societies. Large audiences attend the shows of the workers' film societies. Hundreds are brought free in motor coaches, and the International is often sung (Daily Mail and Morning Post, June 16, 1930).

The Soviet Union last year produced 232 propaganda films. This year the number will probably be doubled. It is chiefly these films which have done so much harm to British prestige in India and the Far East. Large film studios are being constructed in central Asia and eastern Siberia. One of the great aims of these films is representing Czarist Russia as a hell and bolshevized Russia as a paradise.

With regard to the evil influences exercised by many films shown in this country, the following impartial opinion is of considerable interest.

On November 11, 1931, Capt. A. B. Moore, inspector of police for the State of New York, staying in London, told a Daily Mail reporter:

"You people see too many films about gunmen. My censorship department would not allow the films to be seen in New York that you have advertised all over the west end of London. They are produced by men of no responsibility but unlimited money. They are produced simply to make money, and they don't care what it costs America in reputation" (Daily Mail, Nov. 12, 1931).

It is useless to deny—as the late Sir Israel Gollancz, professor of the English language at the University of London, did—that these American talking films are seriously affecting the language of our people, especially the younger generation.

FILM PRODUCERS

A great deal has appeared in the press lately regarding the great British film combine, the Gaumont-British Corporation. This corporation now controls 350 cinemas in the British Isles. Three million people are said to attend these cinemas each week. This corporation is arranging to spend £1,000,000 per annum in talking pictures. The chairman of this corporation was Col. A. C. Bromhead, and his brother, Mr. R. C. Bromhead, was managing director. In August 1929, Mr. Isidore Ostrer was appointed chairman and Mr. Mark Ostrer vice chairman. Mr. C. M. Woolf was then appointed managing director, Mr. Michael Balcon was made the production supervisor.

In an authoritative article in The Sphere, December 28, 1931, it is pointed out that 49 percent of the shares are held by the Chase National Bank of New York, while 49 percent is the property of the Ostrer interests acting on behalf of the Fox Film Corporation, United States of America, according to the Daily Mail, June 6, 1930.

The Ostrer brothers have lately bought a controlling interest in the Baird Television Co.

The following information may be of interest to the reader as regards the various groups of film producers and cinema owners and the persons who control them.

Mr. Sidney Lewis Bernstein is a director and the chairman of Bernstein Theatres, Ltd.; a director of the Capital and Counties Electric Theatres, Ltd.; the managing director of the Charing Cross Road Theatre, the Denman London Cinemas, Ltd., Empire Kinemas, Ltd., Film Agencies, and the Kinematograph Equipment Co., Ltd., and a director of the Shrewsbury Empires, Ltd.

Dr. Rudolph Becker is the managing director of British Sound Films Productions, Ltd.

Mr. Ludwig Blattner is managing director of the Ludwig Blattner Picture Corporation, Ltd., of Boreham, Elstree. His codirectors include Mr. H. Darewski.

Mr. Harry Day (formerly Levi) is the chairman of the Theatre Securities, Ltd., a company which controls the Bedford Music Hall (Camden Town), Empire Theatre of Varieties (Bristol), Harry Day's Amusements, Ltd., and King's Hall (Dover).

Mr. V. H. C. Amberg is chairman of the British Talking Pictures, Ltd., and a director of the Associated Film Industries, Ltd.

Mr. P. Huams is chairman of the Metropolitan Cinema Investment Corporation, Ltd. His codirectors include Messrs. S. Hyams and L. Benvenisti.

Mr. Julius Hagen is the general manager of the Twickenham Film Productions.

Mr. Alfred Levy is the managing director of the Claughton Picture House, Ltd.; joint managing director of the Futurist (Liverpool), Ltd.; director of the Greater Scala (Birmingham), Ltd., and Liverpool Cinema Feature Film Co., Ltd.; managing director of the Scala (Ashton), Ltd.; director of the Scala (Birmingham), Ltd., and the Scala (Leeds), Ltd., and joint managing director of the Scala (Middlesbrough), Ltd.

Sir Frank C. Meyer is the chairman of the Tivoli Cinema, Ltd.

Mr. Hyman Marks is a director of the Scala (Ealing), Ltd.; Scala (Kiburn), Ltd.; Scala (Maida Vale), Ltd.; and Scala (Notting Hill), Ltd.

Mrs. Joseph Davis Marks is a director of Butchers Film Service, Ltd.

Mr. Isidore Ostrer, who controls the Sunday Referee (Sunday newspaper), is chairman of the Albany Ward Theatres, Ltd.; Associated Provincial Picture Houses, Ltd.; Denman Picture Houses, Ltd.; Gaumont-British Corporation, Ltd.; Gaumont Co., Ltd.; General Theatre Corporation, Ltd.; and Provincial Cinematograph Theatres, Ltd. Mr. Ostrer's codirectors include Mr. Charles M. Woolf, Mr. M. Woolf, and his two brothers Mark and Maurice Ostrer. The last named is a director also of the B. B. Pictures (1930), Ltd.; Birmingham West End Cinema, Ltd.; Classic Cinemas, Ltd.; Davis Theatre (Hammersmith), Ltd.; Denman (Midland) Cinemas, Ltd.; Electrical Fono Films, Ltd.; Film Clearing Houses, Ltd.; Gainsborough Pictures (1928), Ltd.; Haymarket Capitol, Ltd.; Ideal Films, Ltd.; International Acoustic Films, Ltd.; Leeds Picture Playhouse, Ltd.; National Electric Theatres, Ltd.; New Century Pictures, Ltd.; North of England Cinemas, Ltd.; Scala (Leeds), Ltd.; Societe Francaise des Filmpariants; Theatres Services, Ltd.; Tivoli Palace, Ltd.; and W. & F. Film Service, Ltd.

Mr. E. Pinto is chairman of the Electric Theatres (1908), Ltd. His codirectors are Mr. E. Hakim, the managing director, and Capt. R. J. Pinto.

Mr. David Roth is a director of the Amusement Securities, Ltd.; Doncaster Majestic Cinema, Ltd.; Leeds Picture Playhouse, Ltd.; Payne-Jennings Theatres, Ltd.; Trocadero Super-Cinema (Liverpool), Ltd.; and the Vigo Productions, Ltd.

Mr. J. W. Schlesinger, of Johannesburg, is the chairman of the Associated Sound Film Industries, Ltd. His codirectors are Mr. V. H. Amberg, Dr. F. Bausback (Berlin); W. H. Eeghen (Amsterdam); Dr. R. Frankfurter (Berlin); W. W. S. C. Neville, Dr. E. Noelle (Berlin); and D. P. Out (Amsterdam).

Mr. Jonas Wolfe is a director of the Camberwell Pictures Theater, Ltd.; Dundee Cinema Palace, Ltd.; East London Pictures Theater, Ltd.; Futurist (Liverpool), Ltd.; Her Majesty's Theater (Dundee), Ltd.; Langfier (Finchley Road), Ltd.; London Palace (1921), Ltd.; London Proprietary Company, Ltd.; Paisley Picture Theater, Ltd.; Regent (Stamford Hill), Ltd.; St. Enoch's Picture Theater, Ltd.; Scala (Ealing), Ltd.; Scala (Kilburn), Ltd.; Scala (Notting Hill), Ltd.; Streatham Cinema, Ltd.; and Streatham Hill Picture Theater, Ltd.

Mr. C. M. Woolf is managing director of W. & F. Film Service, Ltd.; joint managing director of the Albany Ward Theaters, Ltd., and the Associated Provincial Picture Houses, Ltd.; director of the B. B. Pictures (1920), Ltd.; chairman of the Classic Cinemas, Ltd.; director of the Davis Theater (Croydon), Ltd.; chairman of the Denman (London) Cinemas, Ltd.; director of the Denman (Midland) Cinemas, Ltd.; deputy chairman of Denman Pictures Houses, Ltd.; chairman of the Gainsborough Pictures (1928), Ltd.; deputy chairman and joint managing director of Gaumont-British Picture Corporation, Ltd.; director Gaumont Co., Ltd.; deputy chairman and joint managing director of Leeds Picture Playhouse, Ltd.; director, National Electric Theaters, Ltd., and New Century Pictures, Ltd.; chairman of North of England Cinemas, Ltd.; joint managing director, Provincial Cinematograph Theaters, Ltd.; chairman of Scala (Leeds), Ltd.; director, Sheffield Music Hall Co., Ltd.; joint managing director of Tivoli Palace, Ltd., and the United Picture Theaters, Ltd.

AMERICAN COMPANIES

The leading American companies and corporations whose films are shown in this country include Columbia Pictures Corporation (Harry Cohn); Fox Film Corporation (Winfield Sheehan); Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer Pictures (Louis B. Mayer); Modern Film Productions (James Cruze); Paramount Famous-Lasky Corporation (B. P. Schulberg); Pathé Pictures (W. Sistrom); Raditone Pictures (F. J. Balshover); Mack Sennett Pictures (Sennett and Klinger); Tiffany Productions (P. Goldstone); Universal Pictures Corporation (Carl Laemmle); Warner Brothers' Pictures (Warner and Marks); Alexander Film Co. (Alexander and Morris); Weiss Brothers' Pictures (Louis and Max Weiss).

A Productive Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. OLIVER
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 7, 1940

ARTICLE BY WILLIS A. OVERHOLSER

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted to me to extend my remarks, I am pleased to incorporate herewith an article written by Mr. Willis A. Overholser, of Libertyville, Ill., entitled "A Productive Nation" which was inspired by the acceptance speech of Wendell L. Willkie, Republican nominee for the Presidency of the United States. I wish to take this opportunity to commend Mr. Overholser for his clear, concise, and able comment in this day and hour of the Nation's history when constructive suggestions are so necessary. I concur with Mr. Overholser in his observations:

The attention of the country has been focused upon the speech of acceptance of Wendell L. Willkie as the Republican candidate for President. In considering his speech as a whole, it seemed to me that the keynote of the speech rested in his emphasis upon the importance of our being a productive nation. The following words, taken from the speech, are in point:

"It is from weakness that people reach for dictators and concentrated government power. Only the strong can be free.

"And only the productive can be strong."

In some of the first of this series of articles an attempt was made to emphasize this point by stating that it is not so much a case of sharing existing wealth as it is a case of bringing about a greater production and of providing pensions and relief needs out of the increased production. It was furthermore asserted at the beginning of this series that while the problem of production, as a major economic problem, has largely been solved (insofar as the ability to produce is concerned), nevertheless, it should be apparent that we cannot correct errors of distribution by pursuing a course of destruction, such as the killing of little pigs, the plowing under of cotton, and the making of rich men poor. The real income of the country is the wealth it produces. General prosperity will come only when we are a productive people and a fair distribution is made of the products after they are produced.

WILLKIE'S PROGRESSIVE VIEWS

The following, although a bit lengthy (yet only a small portion of the speech), are quoted from Mr. Willkie's acceptance address because of the importance and bearing that they have upon the principal matters herein referred to. In these views the candidate shows that he recognizes the need for a broader and better distribution:

"I am opposed to business monopolies. I believe in collective bargaining, by representatives of labor's own free choice, without any interference and in full protection of those obvious rights. I believe in the maintenance of minimum standards for wages and of maximum standards for hours. I believe that such standards should constantly improve.

"I believe in the Federal regulation of interstate utilities, of securities markets, and of banking. I believe in Federal pensions, in adequate old-age benefits, and in unemployment allowances.

"I believe that the Federal Government has a responsibility to equalize the lot of the farmer with that of the manufacturer. If this cannot be done by parity of prices, other means must be found—with the least possible regimentation of the farmer's affairs. I believe in the encouragement of cooperative buying and selling and in the full extension of rural electrification.

BETTER DISTRIBUTION OF BUYING POWER

"The purpose of all such measures is, indeed, to obtain a better distribution of the wealth and earning power of this country. But I do not base my claim to liberalism solely on my faith in such reforms. American liberalism does not consist merely in reforming things. It consists also in making things.

"The ability to grow, the ability to make things, is the measure of man's welfare on this earth. To be free, man must be creative.

"I am a liberal because I believe that in our industrial age there is no limit to productive capacity of any man. And so I believe that there is no limit to the horizon of the United States.

"I say that we must substitute for the philosophy of distributed scarcity the philosophy of unlimited productivity."

Those, indeed, are inspiring and encouraging words. In commenting on the New Deal, Mr. Willkie stated:

"It does not preach the doctrine of growth. It preaches the doctrine of division.

"We are not asked to make more for ourselves. We are asked to divide among ourselves that which we already have."

ECONOMICS IN TERMS OF ARITHMETIC

In the field of economics the New Deal has taught us a few things in regard to division and subtraction, with entirely too much emphasis on subtraction (destruction). When it has come to multiplication (production) it has taught us virtually nothing, and in giving too much consideration to subtraction it has even failed to do a very good job of teaching us much about the art of distribution. As previously pointed out, prosperity is primarily concerned first with production (multiplication), and then secondly with distribution. Also, as already noted, with modern inventions of labor-saving devices, etc., we have the facilities for an abundant production.

As a result of our failure in the field of distribution, however, we have balled up the works, so to speak, in the field of production. Probably the main explanation for this is that there is a lot more to distribution than bare division. One of the most important factors in distribution is proper monetization (a proper money system). Large numbers of people completely overlook this. The New Deal in largely overlooking this went up the blind alley of subtraction (destruction) through plowing under cotton, killing little pigs, etc.

Candidate Willkie, in his acceptance speech, did not go into much detail, and it will be necessary for him to say and do more before we can draw any very definite conclusions as to most things of public importance. Great detail, of course, is not to be expected in such a speech. However, there is a great deal in his words of acceptance to indicate a more liberal and progressive trend than has been displayed by any Republican administration within the memory of the average American citizen.

BIG OBSTACLE TO PRODUCTION

Having emphasized the need for greater production and having recognized the necessity of various progressive steps toward better distribution, he will do well to take a few pages from Henry Ford and the late Thomas A. Edison. It, of course, is not sufficient to merely talk about being productive. We must get at the causes for nonproduction, and Mr. Ford and Mr. Edison have pointed out the major cause. Mr. Ford has stated:

"Here is a nation that might be the richest nation in the world when actually we haven't enough of anything because there is not enough production. The need is here; the ability to produce is here; the stoppage is in the system that puts profits before production—and that is the money system. * * *

"Money is just part of society's transportation system for moving goods from man to man; it breaks down so often that it is time our financial engineers developed a better 'model.' * * *

"I am convinced that our money system is antiquated. We have plenty of men. We have plenty of material. But money, which is not so important as men or materials, is holding up progress. This must be changed."

Mr. Edison, during his later years, stated: "I think we are getting a sound idea on the money question. The people have an instinct which tells them that something is wrong and that the wrong somehow centers in money." After calling attention to certain improved monetary practices which should be, but have not been, adopted Mr. Edison asserted that if those changes are placed into effect that "then you will see an era of progress and prosperity in this country such as never could have come otherwise."

Political Campaign Letter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOACHIM O. FERNANDEZ

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 6, 1940

LETTER BY HON. JOACHIM O. FERNANDEZ, OF LOUISIANA

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter addressed by me to the voters of my district:

To the Voters of the First Congressional District:

As you undoubtedly know, I am a candidate for reelection to Congress from the First Congressional District of New Orleans, an office I have held for the past 10 years. During that time I have given faithful service to the people of my congressional district, my city, my State, and my Nation.

My record is one of tremendous accomplishment, due solely to my own ability and initiative. I am a member of the powerful Appropriations Committee. The importance of this committee is realized when you consider that not one dime of the billions of dollars the Federal Government spends each year can be expended until this committee, of which I am a member, approves the appropriation of that money.

I am a member of the Naval Appropriations Subcommittee, ranking next to the chairman of that committee. I have taken a most influential part in guiding the national-defense program of our country. My speech before Congress on May 4, 1939, advocating the expenditure of $770,000,000 for the Navy was the first congressional proposal for a two-ocean Navy. It was my speech before Congress on June 4, 1940, that influenced Congress to adopt the present system of training of naval pilots, by the establishment of auxiliary naval aviation schools, one of which is to be established right here in New Orleans at the site on the shores of Lake Pontchartrain I suggested in that speech.

I have been instrumental in having millions of dollars of Federal money spent in New Orleans and the First Congressional District. The construction of the new Federal Building facing Lafayette Square, at a cost of $2,500,000; the new post-office building at Arabi, at a cost of $100,000; the initial allotment of $10,000,000 to New Orleans as one of the first slum-clearance projects in the country; the construction of the Agricultural Research Laboratory in New Orleans, at a cost of $2,000,000; the appropriation by Congress of $650,000 for the construction of a new customs building and appraisals stores in New Orleans; the appropriation by Congress of $400,000 for the construction of a new Coast Guard station; Federal aid of $500,000 granted to the fur trappers; and further aid to the extent of $1,000,000 presently in process—all are among the tremendous sums of Federal money I have secured for New Orleans.

The construction of the Federal Lighthouse Supply Depot at North Galvez Street on the Industrial Canal; the rehabilitation of Fort Pike at the Rigolets; the deepening of the bayous and streams of St. Bernard and Plaquemines Parishes, and the placing of beacons and lights thereon, at a cost to the Federal Government of several hundred thousands of dollars; the recent approval of my request for the expenditure of large additional sums for further improvement of the bayous and streams of those parishes—all are among the accomplishments for which I alone can take credit.

The Public Works Administration and the Works Progress Administration have likewise spent millions of dollars of Federal money in New Orleans in the First Congressional District, largely by reason of my personal influence in Washington. Such structures as the new Charity Hospital; new schools in New Orleans, particularly the Francis T. Nicholls High School; new fire-engine houses; the new branch library on Alvar Street, opposite McCarthy Square; the Florida Avenue Bridge; the widening of St. Claude Avenue; paving of North Claiborne Avenue, of Franklin Avenue to the lake, of Canal Boulevard to the lake, and of Marconi Drive; the development of the New Orleans Airport; the concrete stadium in City Park—all are among the many projects financed from those funds for which I interceded in Washington for the benefit of New Orleans.

I have voted for every labor bill presented to Congress in the past 10 years. I am endorsed by President Green of the American Federation of Labor, by the Central Trades and Labor Council of New Orleans, and by every labor organization in the present campaign.

I earnestly solicit your vote for my reelection and ask you to go to the polls on Tuesday, September 10, and vote for me so that I may continue my work for my congressional district.

Sincerely,

J. O. FERNANDEZ.

Why Kelland Is for Willkie

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOAH M. MASON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, September 7, 1940

STATEMENT BY CLARENCE BUDINGTON KELLAND

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, the other day I had placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a short statement giving my own appraisal of Wendell Willkie. Today I am placing in the RECORD a statement from one of our noted American authors, Clarence Budington Kelland, telling very briefly and pointedly why he is for Willkie for President.

I consider this a literary gem worthy of a place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The statement follows:

WHY KELLAND IS FOR WILLKIE

(By Clarence Budington Kelland, Noted Author)

NEW YORK.—I am devoting my time and efforts to bring about the election of Wendell Willkie because:

1. I believe in his integrity and ability. I believe that he will fight to the last ditch to preserve and to maintain the Constitution of the United States, and to make secure to the people those essential rights and privileges under which America has thrived.

2. I am opposed to the reelection of Mr. Roosevelt because I believe that a third term is not merely a threat of dictatorship, but is dictatorship itself.

3. I believe that Mr. Willkie will quicken and revive the self-respect of the American people, which has been seriously undermined by the New Deal.

4. I believe that opportunity for all, which has been stifled for 7 years, will come to life again only if Mr. Willkie is elected and Mr. Roosevelt is defeated.

5. Because a vote for Mr. Roosevelt is also a vote for Mr. Ickes, Mr Corcoran, and that curious little coterie of men who have been, with Mr. Roosevelt's consent, the rulers of America.

6 Because I believe that under Mr. Willkie's administration a decent, lawful, solidly grounded prosperity will be reestablished in this land, with a new and better understanding between employer and employee; and because that malignant New Deal policy of setting class to hating class will be abolished from this land.

7. Because with all the strength of my heart and soul I do not believe our revered American institutions and our peace and our home life can survive dictatorship—a preview of which was given in the recent convention in Chicago which nominated Mr. Roosevelt and was compelled to swallow Mr. Wallace.

8. Because Mr. Wendell Willkie has always been loyal to those who deserved his loyalty.

9. Because I believe firmly that Mr. Willkie has been raised up in this emergency to lead this people wisely and equitably to safety and to sanity; because he has been chosen spontaneously by the voices of the people to be their leader in a holy war to preserve the United States and its free institutions.

The Drift Toward War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 6, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON DAILY NEWS

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, throughout the past year there has been a war hysteria created in the minds of the people, which is highly dangerous to our national safety. The people can determine the policy of this country; they can determine whether we will engage in war or whether we will remain at peace. The voice of the people, in time of national crisis, will largely serve as the guiding hand which controls our destiny. We must keep out of this war. We do not want any part in it. We have our own economic problems which must be solved. These cannot be solved now if we are forced into a war.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial which appeared in the Washington Daily News of very recent date, which expresses my views upon this highly important subject, except I cannot subscribe to the policy of approving a compulsory conscription of our men and boys in time of peace and when war is not imminent. This editorial follows:

[From the Washington Daily News]

WE'RE STRAYING TOWARD WAR

We think a dangerous thing is happening. It is hard to define because it falls within that all-inclusive area called national psychology. It is a matter more of omission than of commission; something more sensed than seen; hard to pin down. We'll try to describe it this way:

As we read the newspapers and the magazines, listen to public speeches and radio commentators, and talk with people, we find peace mentioned less and less and war more and more; what-shall-we-do-if-we-get-in taking precedence over what-shall-we-do-to-keep-out.

A year ago this month, when the President made his fireside speech and a few days later his address to the extraordinary session of Congress, all emphasis was on how to avoid being drawn in. That emphasis—that tone—characterized practically every written or spoken word in those days. It was as nearly unanimous as anything could be in a nation of 130,000,000 people.

We had got into one war. Our fingers had been terribly burned. We wouldn't let that happen again. The main job was to prevent. Every effort should be pointed up to that single purpose.

Gradually, subtly, not deliberately but, rather, subconsciously, an inevitability school began to develop. The emphasis started to shift. "We'll have to get in if this lasts very long" began to be heard here, there, and yonder.

As the Hitlerian conquest spread, particularly when the Low Countries were invaded and then France fell, this new tempo stepped up. The inevitability school gained enrollment. As the realization grew that we were in danger greater than we had dreamed, that it must be billions for protection, and conscription to man the equipment those billions would buy, the emphasis shifted still more and with increasing momentum. The problem grew to look more like a war problem and less like one of merely staying out. National expression moved from negative to positive. So, as the months sped on the national effort lost its unanimity, ceased to point to a single purpose. Still more joined the inevitability school. Either by silence they gave consent, or in what they did say was of war, not its avoidance.

All this without Lusitanias, without our ships being driven off the sea, without those innumerable overt acts which whipped up the war spirit back in 1914 to 1917.

We say this is a dangerous state of mind. "Vice is a monster of so frightful mien, as to be hated needs but to be seen; yet seen too oft, familiar with her face, we first endure, then pity, then embrace."

What to do?

We believe right now is the time to back up for a reappraisal of our national attitude, to take a new look at our hand, to reacquire a perspective we had once and then lost.

As for this newspaper, we are for the billions, we are for the selective draft, we are for the island bases, we are for everything it takes, but all to get ourselves strong for defense—to keep out, not to get in. All to ward off, not to repeat, the loss of life, the 126,000 dead, the 234,000 wounded, the billions spent, the ingratitude, the Uncle Shylock stuff, the double cross and the hangover we got out of the last one.

If you think the same as we do maybe it would be well for all of us to visit some of the veteran hospitals, to call on some of the sick and the crippled and the insane, and then rededicate ourselves to the proposition we saw so clearly 1 year ago this month.

The Fish Amendment to the Military Training Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHIL FERGUSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, September 7, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON POST

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post for today:

[From the Washington Post of September 7, 1940]

A POLITICAL TRICK

Representative FISH'S amendment would write one word in large letters across the military training bill. That word is "politics."

There is a great deal of confusion as to whether this amendment would actually delay the training of men for military service. Its supporters insist that it would not postpone by one day the actual induction of men into the Army. Registration under the draft would go forward immediately upon passage of the bill, they say, and if the number of volunteers at the end of 60 days were fewer than 400,000, conscription would be used to make up the difference.

Congressman WADSWORTH, joint author of the conscription bill and a vigorous opponent of the Fish amendment, complained that if a call for 400,000 volunteers during the next 2 months should be successful, the Army would be unable to care for them. If the compulsory training bill is enacted without the Fish amendment, tentative plans call for the induction of 50,000 men during the first part of November, 60,000 after November 15, and larger groups in the following months.

So the strongest argument against the Fish amendment is not the possible delay it would entail. More serious would be the psychological effect of a decision to postpone application of the draft until after election.

Congress has already voted approximately $15,000,000,000 for defense preparations. It has recognized that we are unprepared for self-defense in a world where military conquest is running riot. Yet our Congressmen have voted to postpone the operation of an effective military training program until after they have completed their political campaigns.

In other words, the House is willing to falter and fumble because this happens to be an election year. The vote on the Fish amendment thus becomes a grave confession of weakness. It reflects discredit upon the quality of statesmanship in the House. What is far more serious, it suggests that our democratic system is not equal to the stern task of preparing the Nation for defense in the present emergency.

Even though the Fish amendment might not seriously delay the induction of trainees into the Army, it would make hash out of the careful plan represented by the Burke-Wadsworth bill. No one should forget that under this bill voluntary soldiers would still be sought. Many thousands of men are needed to bring our professional Army up to its full authorized strength. These must be obtained through 3-year voluntary enlistments.

The Fish amendment would cut off the flow of 3-year recruits into the Regular Army. Its adoption would bring a drive for 1-year enlistments. We would thus acquire a reserve army composed of both volunteers and drafted men. And the Regular Army which must train these 1-year recruits would be denied the essential increase in its professional personnel.

In approving this bungling proposal House Members were probably swayed by the appeal that the voluntary system be given a last trial. That system is already being used for the only purpose to which it is adapted. Actually the House voted to upset the voluntary 3-year enlistment plan without removing the necessity for conscription.

It appears, moreover, that the Fish amendment would limit the total number of men to be drafted or accepted as volunteers to 800,000. That number is far below the Reserve force which the Army believe to be essential to national defense.

Enactment of this amendment would be inevitably regarded as a cheap political trick. Does the House want the country to understand that it is afraid to take a stand for effective national defense until the campaigns are over? If not, it will hasten to reverse this thoughtless vote and send the military training bill to the President.

Compare Our Problems With England's Problems—Part IV

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. THORKELSON

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 6, 1940

EXCERPTS FROM THE ALIEN MENACE

Mr. THORKELSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting a series of excerpts from the Alien Menace, by Lt. Col. A. H. Lane, an officer in the British Army, who is more interested in England's welfare than he is in political expediency. He, like many in America, tells the truth. He hits the nail on the head, and he sets a good example for Members of Congress of the United States.

In reading this series, the Members will find that the same insidious influences which are undermining England are also undermining the United States—so it behooves us to protect ourselves before it is too late.

The excerpts follow:

ALIENS AND THE BRITISH BROADCASTING COMPANY

Apart from the presentation of patriotic movies and talkies in cinemas, talks by patriots to the millions who are daily and nightly listening in are obviously the most effective means for counteracting hostile film propaganda. Unfortunately, no such talks can be delivered without the permission of the small group of men and women constituting the British Broadcasting Corporation whose citadel towers up today in Portland Place.

This most formidable body, the British Broadcasting Corporation, with an income derived from license for radio sets amounting in 1930 to over £1,000,000 and another income of £160,000 or so from profits on the sale of its publications, received a royal charter in January 1927, when Mr. Baldwin was Prime Minister. At that date it took over the entire staff of the British Broadcasting Corporation, Ltd., a company promoted by the late Mr. Godfrey Isaacs, brother of Lord Reading, and incorporated in 1922. The company, of which Mr. Isaacs was then a director, had in 1922 appointed Mr. (now Sir) J. C. W. Reith to be its general manager. To it had been granted a monopoly of broadcasting by the Postmaster General, Mr. Lloyd George's friend, Mr. F. J. Kellaway.

In the spring of 1928 the British Broadcasting Corporation published New Ventures in Broadcasting, which embodied the conclusions arrived at by a committee of inquiry "set on foot by the joint action of the British Broadcasting Corporation and the British Institute of Adult Education," which institute had for its honorary life president the late Lord Haldane, for its president the Socialist Lord Sankey, for its chairman Dr. Albert Mansbridge, and its vice chairman Prof. H. J. Laski. From those names it will readily be surmised that the Institute of Adult Education, founded in 1921, was and is socialistic.

What did the committee of inquiry set on foot by it and the British Broadcasting Corporation do? It proposed, we learn from New Ventures in Broadcasting, that a "Central Council for Broadcast Adult Education should be created," which council was promptly formed. The council—it contained no clergyman, priest, or woman on it—met with the Socialist Lord Sankey in the chair and appointed an executive committee to assist the British Broadcasting Corporation in preparing its future adult educational program. On the committee was the Guild-Socialist, Mr. G. D. H. Cole, who, with his wife, has frequently broadcast.

Later the Archbishop of York replaced Lord Sankey as chairman of the central council and listening groups of adults were organized. By the end of 1929 the British Broadcasting Corporation was in touch with well over 200 of such groups. It was mainly for the "benefit" of the listening groups that Prof. John Macmurray, a Balliol man, now Grote professor of the philosophy of mind and logic at London University, was in 1930 broadcasting certain shocking ideas (see p. 95) on a "Philosophy of freedom." Among other serial talks arranged by the Central Council for Broadcasting Adult Education for 1930 were "The World and Ourselves—a series of international conversations in which representatives of Great Britain discussed national differences, habits, and political outlook with representatives of * * * Germany * * * Russia, Turkey."

In 1929 a Central Council for School Broadcasting was established. Its chairman was Mr. H. A. L. Fisher, friend of Professor Laski. During 1929 lectures—some of them such lectures—were broadcast to thousands of our schools and over 500,000 pamphlets were issued in connection with the various courses of study. The B. B. C., therefore, aspires to educate not only adults but pupils in schools and, through its Children's Hour, very young boys and girls. In addition to this, it competes with booksellers and with publishers of books and journals. It issues three illustrated weekly journals, the Listener, Radio Times (since September 28, 1923), with a circulation in 1930 of over 180,000 copies, and World Radio, the net sale of whose Christmas 1930 number reached 236,408. In World Radio are given both the broadcasting programs of the Bolsheviks and the wave-lengths from Bolshevik wireless stations.

Unlike the films, the matter broadcast and published by the B. B. C. does not appear to be now censored in any way. According to the B. B. C. Handbook (1929), the post office in January 1927, ceased to exercise any censorship functions over the corporation and, since March 5, 1928, the government has permitted it to broadcast statements involving matters of political, religious, or industrial controversy. The result, as even Mr. Baldwin might have anticipated, has been that subversives of the most dangerous type have been poisoning the minds of the millions possessing radio sets and listening in. For example, in 1929 H. G. Wells and Bernard Shaw were broadcasting their Points of View.

Thus, from January 1927, onward, the B. B. C. has been censoring itself. That the censorship exercised over it by the Post Office before that date was hopelessly ineffective, listeners-in will remember. Why, for example, did the Post Office permit, in the early part of 1923, a wireless debate on Communism?[1]

In January of 1925 an incident occurred which showed that the B. B. C., under the management of Sir John Reith, was leaning heavily toward the left. At the instance of the British Empire Union, Mrs. Nesta Webster, who is a public speaker of the first order, was requested by the company to broadcast. She selected for her subject the French Revolution, on which she is our leading authority. She sent to the company notes which were, as she said, "calculated to offend nobody except the exponents of bloody revolution." She was, however, refused leave to broadcast because her notes, in the opinion of one of the company's omniscient officials, had "the air of an ex parte statement." Mrs. Webster thereupon proposed that she should talk on "Women in Public Life." The company consented to this and, at great trouble to herself, she prepared a talk which "could not appear to be on party politics," and submitted it. This seemed to be acceptable to Sir John Reith and his coadjutors and she was expecting to deliver her talk when, the day before it was due for delivery, she received the following letter from a woman employed by the company:

"DEAR MADAM:

"The Director of Education has handed me your MS. on "Women in Public Life," as being more suited to the women's hour, but I regret that it is too controversial in tone to be permissible, and, moreover, I have had a series of talks on women in Parliament given under the auspices of the National Union of Societies for Equal Citizenship. I regret therefore that I have no alternative but to return your MS.

"Yours faithfully,

"ELLA FITZGERALD,

"Central Adviser, Women's and Children's Sections."[2]

The National Union of Societies for Equal Citizenship advocated votes for flappers.

While objecting to Mrs. Webster's ex parte statements, or rather to her telling the truth about the Jacobins, the company appears to have had no objection to statements of an ex parte nature about

[1] Statement of Mr. (now Sir John) Reith in Radio Times of November 30, 1923, p. 329, col. 3.

[2] A letter from Mrs. Webster from which I have quoted, together with Mrs. or Miss Fitzgerald's letter, was published in the Patriot of March 12, 1925.

the Bolsheviks. On March 25, 1925, a Dr. L. Storr-Best broadcast from Sheffield a roseate account of Bolshevized Moscow and advised his hearers who wished for more information to apply to the secretary of the Society for Cultural Relations Between the Peoples of the British Commonwealth and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics,[3] as to which pernicious society see Mrs. Webster's The Socialist Network (Boswell). Among the more prominent supporters of that body are, or were, H. G. Wells, Bernard Shaw, Mr. Bertrand (now Lord) Russell, E. F. Wise (at one time paid servant of the Bolsheviks), Mrs. Sidney Webb, Leonard Woolf, and Michael S. Farbman, some of whom at any rate would be classed as subversives. Questioned as to the character of the S. C. R., the company in its reply is reported to have said, i. e., "We are assured that the Society for Cultural Relations Between England and Russia has no political intentions."[4] By whom was the company assured? Shortly before, a delegation of Bolsheviks, headed by Tomski, had, owing to the stupendous folly of our Government, been permitted to come to England and to prepare with the general council of the Trades Union Congress a general strike. That the Bolshevik delegation was in close touch with the S. C. R. may be reasonably presumed. From the Blue Book, Communist Papers (1926, Cmd. 2682, p. 132), we learn that the S. C. R. has a curiously mixed membership of intellectuals, persons of "left" sympathies, and members of the Russian organizations in this country and of the Communist Party of Great Britain and that the Communist international favors it as fertile ground for Communist propaganda of the intellectual variety.

Continuing the narrative, a little over 2 months or so before the general strike of 1926 there appeared in the broadcast programs for February 24:

"8.50–9. Speeches at the special general council of the Trades Union Congress in connection with the handing over of Easton Lodge, as a center of working-class education under the control of the general council, relayed from Easton Lodge, Dunmow, Essex. Speakers: The Countess of Warwick and Mr. A. Pugh, chairman of the Trades Union Congress."[4]

A patriot like Mrs. Webster had been debarred from broadcasting, yet the British Broadcasting Corporation relayed the speech of the Socialist Countess of Warwick.

From the above examples it is apparent that the British Broadcasting Co. was not unsympathetic toward left wingers. Before considering the misdeeds of its successor, the British Broadcasting Corporation, it will be well to inspect the latter's personnel in January 1927.

The director general with the very high salary of £6,000 a year was, as now, Sir John Charles Walsham Reith.

He was aided by a board of governors. The chairman of the governors of the British Broadcasting Corporation was a conservative, the Earl of Clarendon, with a salary of £3,000, and the vice chairman a liberal, Lord Gainsford (a Pease), with a salary of £1,000 a year. Lord Clarendon has since been succeeded in his post by a liberal, the Right Honorable J. H. Whitley, ex-Speaker of the House of Commons, whose first wife was Marguerita Virginia, daughter of Giulio Marchetti. The other governors of the corporation in 1927 were the Socialist Mrs. Philip (now Lady) Snowden, Sir J. Gordon Nairne, a director and formerly comptroller of the Bank of England, who married a daughter of the late Baron da Costa Ricci, and Dr. Montague John Rendall, late headmaster of Winchester. Each of them was paid £700 a year.

On the rest of the personnel of the British Broadcasting Corporation, the public has very little information. On March 27, 1929, I, as chairman of the London Council National Citizens' Union, addressed a letter to Lord Clarendon asking him to inform me where I could see a complete list of the staff of the British Broadcasting Corporation, and of the persons employed by it in editing the Listener, Radio Times, and its other publications."

Lord Clarendon did not answer my letter but Sir John Reith, on behalf of the British Broadcasting Corporation, under date of April 4, 1929, wrote to me, as follows:

"Lord Clarendon has sent me your letter to him of March 27.

"While we may regret that you should object to the composition of any of our committees, or question the political impartiality of our work, we cannot agree the rationality of such objection or doubt, and in view of the tone of your letter do not feel called upon to make any further reply. We might, however, refer you to the third paragraph of clause 6 of the corporation's license."

I imagine that Russians asking, if any of them dare do so, for similar information from the broadcasting commissars in Bolshevia receive replies not unlike the one received by me from Sir John Reith. My letter to Lord Clarendon had contained, in addition to that already given, other questions:

"The British Broadcasting Corporation has apparently on its staff a Mr. C. A. Siepmann. Is he a British-born subject, and were his parents and grandparents British-born subjects? Who recommended that Ludwig and Feuchtwanger should broadcast? Why, within a few weeks of the general election, are the Socialists, Mrs. Sidney Webb, Mrs. Barbara Wooton, and Prof. P. J. Noel Baker broadcasting; while, so far as I can see, no prominent anti-Socialist, e. g., Mrs. Nesta Webster or Professor Hearnshaw, is doing so? You may reply that Conservatives have taken part in some of the topical talks or discussions. In that case, I would ask you who selected * * * Mr. Ponsonby's daughter to discuss the political parties with her pacifist and Socialist father?

"In conclusion, I would remind you that on the 8th ultimo, I sent you a report, which I presume you read, dealing with the activities, and containing some of the ultra-socialist utterances of Prof. H. J. Laski. From it you must have gathered that Professor Laski was unlikely to deliver impartial judgments on political subjects. Judge then of my surprise when, on opening the Listener of the 6th instant I found that a broadcast talk by Professor Laski[5] on the 25th ultimo was published in it, the subject of such talk being, of all things, the autobiography of the late Lord Haldane.

"That a Socialist and internationalist professor without any expert knowledge of military affairs should have been chosen by the B. B. C. to review the autobiography of a politician who was Minister of War, who put the nation unwise as to Germany's attitude toward it, and who from a Liberal Imperialist became a follower of the pro-German and pro-Bolshevik, Mr. Ramsey MacDonald, is to my mind conclusive proof that the conduct of the B. B. C. has passed into the hands of Socialists and internationalists.

"If under a Conservative Government the B. B. C. behaves in this fashion, what, my Lord, are we to expect from the B. B. C. in the event of the Socialists obtaining an independent majority in the next House of Commons?"

With regard to Mr. Siepmann or another person of the same surname: The Evening Standard of December 12, 1928 (p. 15, col. 1), published correspondence between Sir John Reith and an aggrieved broadcaster, Mr. E. N. Da Costa Andrade, professor of the University of London. The professor alleged that a member of the B. B. C.'s announcing staff—one Colonel Brand—had been rude to him. Sir John Reith's answer was:

"While I regret the occurrence, I am afraid no good purpose would be served in pursuing further your complaint referring to Colonel Brand. On the occasion of your future talks, Mr. Siepmann or his assistant will meet you."

Siepmann and Da Costa Andrade are not British surnames. If I may venture to make a suggestion, it is that some patriotic peer or M. P. should force the National Government to procure from the B. B. C., and publish a list of the names and addresses of all persons employed by it as broadcasters or in any other capacity, changes of names and nationality by employees being notified on the list. That Bolsheviks under real or assumed names may be lurking in the Portland Place citadel is not an unreasonable supposition. If the B. B. C. is to be judged by the performance of one of its star broadcasters, the Honorable Harold Nicolson, one would not be astonished to learn that Bukharin himself was on the B. B. C.'s premises. Son of that patriotic diplomat, the last Lord Carnock, but educated at Balliol College, Mr. Nicolson on February 21, 1930, in his talks on Persons and Things, said:

"The Moscow Government can scarcely be said to 'persecute' religion in the historical sense of the term. They make fun of it and they render it highly inconvenient and irksome. They persecute individual religious leaders just as they persecute other elements in the state. But the man who wants to worship in his own way is still, I am told (told by whom?), at liberty to do so."[6]

On March 7, in his talk, this peculiar person deprecated all protests against the infamous behavior of the Bolsheviks toward Christians, Moslems, and religious Jews.

"To put it quite badly, if we intervene in the internal affairs of Russia, the Russians (sic) would feel justified in intervening in the internal affairs of the British Empire."[7]

The Bolsheviks, as he was perfectly well aware, had from the outset and were at that time "intervening in the internal affairs of the British Empire."

Thus much, or, rather, thus little, about the personnel of the British Broadcasting Corporation. I will now, by means of a few salient examples, show what the trend of its policy has been. On January 12, 1927—at the time when it received its charter—Prof. Gilbert Murray was "talking on 'The year's work of the League of Nations' (under the auspices of the League of Nations Union)."[8] The professor and the League of Nations Union, of which he is the chairman, are apparently on very intimate terms with the British Broadcasting Corporation, just as the League of Nations Union is on very intimate terms with our Labour Party.[9]

The League of Nations Union's Annual Report for 1920 showed that among the large subscribers to its funds were not only the Peruvian Government and the Zionist Organization, but also Barons E. B. and F. A. d'Erlanger, M. Embiricos, His Excellency Etats Raad H. Anderson, Mr. Gluckstadt, Sir Basil Zaharoff, M. Madsen-Mygdal, H. W. A. Deterding, F. Eckstein, Sir Carl Meyer, and other men and women whose names suggest a foreign origin. See also The Origin and Development of the League of Nations Union (Boswell, 4d.), a documented pamphlet proving, amonst other things, that the League of Nations Union is attached to the World Alliance for Pro-

[3] Patriot, April 2 and 9, 1925.

[4] Patriot, March 4, 1926, p. 204.

[5] An account of Professor Laski's activities will be found in Potted Biographies (Boswell, 6d.).

[6] Morning Post, February 25, 1930, p. 11, col. 7.

[7] The Listener, March 12, 1930, p. 468.

[8] Radio Times, January 7, 1927, p. 66.

[9] The League of Nations Union's Leaflet No. 6 contained a manifesto signed by Mr. Ramsay MacDonald and other Labour leaders boosting the L. N. U. The manifesto stated that: "The League of Nations will not supplant the Labour Internationale (a Socialist body dominated by aliens), but will supplant it."

moting International Friendship through the churches, a body which emanated from a conference of German and other pastors held at Constance on August 2, 1914. Lord Dickinson (father-in-law of Mr. Baldwin's fidus Achates, Mr. J. C. C. Davidson, M. P.) has helped to organize both bodies.

Shortly after Prof. Gilbert Murray broadcast his address Prof. P. J. Noel Baker, a cosmopolitan and another light of the L. N. U., was discussing Foreign Affairs and How They Affect Us,[10] over the wireless. Later in the year the communistically-minded German Jew, Ludwig, and another German Jew, Feuchtwanger, author of Jew Suss, were pouring their ideas into the ears of listeners-in.

After the triumph of Labor at the polls in May 1929—in fact, on May 31, the day after the general election—the mischievous and well-advertised crank, Mr. Osbert Sitwell, was permitted to broadcast eulogies on the American-born Jewish sculptor, Epstein's abortion of a statue, Night. He said:

"A statue (Night) of real interest and beauty has recently been erected in London, and, as usual, the man in the street has expressed the utmost horror. This is only to be expected, however, for a multitude of bad statues jostle him at every turn, and when confronted with a genuine work of art he is by now incapable of any other emotion. Public taste has been degraded to a depth to which it has never fallen before."[11]

The belauding of Night was followed, on July 10, by the first appearance of H. G. Wells in front of the microphone. The topic of his talk was World Peace. In the course of it Wells said:

"World controls of the common interests of mankind, world controls leading to a world government, to a world state, to Cosmopolis, that is the only way to enduring peace in the world. * * * Let us set our faces hard as learners, as teachers, as parents and rulers, as people who talk and influence others, against the teachings of patriotic histories that sustain and carry on the poisonous war-making tradition of the past. * * * And let us discourage the emotions and hysteria of patriotism. Let us check patriotic cant and bear ourselves with a certain critical detachment on the face of patriotic symbols. * * * Patriotism has become the enemy of civilization."[12]

Wells could not have failed to notice that millions of men—and in Russia also, thousands of women—on the Continent were being trained to fight and that our Army, in comparison with continental armies was a tiny one. His unpatriotic balderdash was not rebuked in The Listener. A verbatim report of his talk filled the first three pages and half of another page of its issue of July 17, and in a leading article the public was informed that:

"Men who can see into the future, and who can describe what they see as clearly as Mr. H. G. Wells, are all too rare in this world, and it would be a calamity were they not to hand on their message by means of the microphone" (p. 84).

On August 7, 1914, in the Daily Chronicle, the seer of Dunmow had prophesied that within 3 months from then "the tricolor would be over the Rhine."

On October 21, 1929, Wells was again broadcasting. Among other things, he stated that:

"Militarism and warfare are childish things. * * * They must become things of the past. They must die. Naturally my idea of politics is an open conspiracy to hurry these tiresome, wasteful, evil things, nationality and war, out of existence, to end this empire and that empire, and set up the one empire of man."[13]

A week before, on October 14, Bernard Shaw, in a broadcast talk beginning, "Your Majesties, Your Royal Highnesses, Your Excellencies, Your Graces and Reverences, my Lords, ladies and gentlemen, fellow citizens, of all degrees," had said:

"I must conclude by warning you that when everything has been done that can be done, civilization will still be dependent on the consciences of the governors and the governed. Our natural dispositions may be good; but we have been badly brought up and are full of antisocial personal ambitions and prejudices and snobberies. Had we not better teach our children to be better citizens than ourselves? We are not doing that at present. The Russians are. That is my last word. Think over it."[14]

I invite the reader to look at Shaw and the "Russians" in the photograph opposite, reproduced from one taken at Petrograd (Leningrad) in July 1931. Observe the face of Lunacharsky, the atheistic Minister of Education in Soviet Russia.

As has been seen from the talks of Messieurs Shaw and Nicolson, the British Broadcasting Co. is very indulgent toward the Russians.

Just as in May 1930, the British Broadcasting Co. refused to broadcast the appeal of the late Duke of Northumberland in favor of ex-service men in Southern Ireland, the British Broadcasting Co. in the preceding February refused to relay speeches at the Christian protest meeting (against anti-Christian atrocities in Russia) held in the Albert Hall.

"Shielding," as Mr. Ramsay MacDonald would say, the Bolsheviks "from the blasts of criticism," has not, however, been the only good service done them by the British Broadcasting Co. At the beginning of August 1930, the Bolsheviks' very active ex-servant, Mr. E. F. Wise, C. B., then M. P., who, like Mr. George Lansbury in 1920 and 1926, had been on a visit to the burglars' mecca, broadcast a talk entitled "Try Russia for a Holiday." He said:

"I stayed in a small but comfortable little hotel (in the Caucasus), but most of the accommodation is in holiday homes belonging to the various trade unions. * * * Russians are generally friendly and sociable and, though some of them will be critical at times of England, just as people in England are sometimes critical of Russia, they seldom bear any ill-will at all toward English men and women. * * * Of course, there are risks and difficulties about traveling in Russia, as there are in most other foreign countries. Criminals are to be found in all countries, but my own experience and that of many friends who have enjoyed delightful holidays in Russia is that the long arm of the Government authority (the Moscow murder-gang) maintains (by massacres and torturings) peace and order even in the remoter places on its distant borders. * * * If you are interested in seeing at close quarters an experiment in national reorganization * * * of vast world importance, a visit to Russia is one of the most interesting and novel of holidays."[15]

An honest Socialist M. P., Mr. Joseph Toole, who had also visited Russia, in an article published in the Daily Herald of August 28, 1930, flatly contradicted Mr. Wise.

"I have returned profoundly shocked. From the time I embarked on a Russian ship * * * to the day I crossed to Poland I could see nothing but incompetence, insecurity, insanitation, disease, and want * * * The State there is held by the sword and the rough brutal bludgeon. No personal liberty exists: there is only room for one view, the Soviet view."

The facts adduced and the quotations would suggest that the British Broadcasting Corporation, like its parent, the British Broadcasting Co., is being directed by "pinks" or "reds." How else can it be explained that Prof. John Macmurray, educated at Balliol College, was permitted to broadcast this?

"Our current morality may quite well be a false morality. * * * There is no such thing as a moral law * * * the more law there is in our lives the less morality there is."[16]

Sir John Reith was surely speaking ironically when, on January 2, 1930, he said in the Daily Mail:

"Wireless can broadcast friendship, for it is a very friendly thing. * * * Wireless can broadcast peace. * * * World unity is realizable chiefly because broadcasting is a mighty coordinating force. Imagine * * * if the Wise Men had broadcast to the world: 'We have seen His star in the East.'"

It is more easy to imagine King Herod broadcasting that he had massacred the innocents.

[10] Radio Times, January 21, 1927, p. 161.

[11] Though even the Observer commented adversely on Mr. Sitwell's insolent rigmarole, The Listener of June 12 published his talk as its first article.

[12] The Listener, July 17, 1929, p. 106.

[13] The Listener, October 30, 1929, p. 594.

[14] The Listener, October 23, 1929, p. 559.

[15] The Listener, August 6, 1930, p. 206.

[16] The Listener, June 25, 1930, p. 1132.

War, Conscription, Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DUDLEY A. WHITE
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, September 7, 1940

Mr. WHITE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, there is a feeling on the part of Congress that voluntary enlistment should be given a fair trial before our Government resorts to peacetime conscription which runs far in advance of defense equipment or training facilities.

The administration proposal is not the same as universal service.

Universal service commends itself in that it would, at all times, provide for a limited period of military training of every young man at a given age. It means a continuous plan of developing trained manpower as a safeguard for any and all emergencies. It is based upon the principle that every man owes 1 year of military service, in or out of peacetime, as his contribution to national security.

The pending conscription bill is a horse of a different color. Since at this moment it cannot be considered apart from the warlike flourishes of the New Deal or their insatiable lust for power, I fear its purpose places warlike intention ahead of full peacetime preparation, whereas this country should be bending effort toward preparedness and peace.

War profiteering should never again be countenanced by the American people. Socialization or nationalization of American enterprise is no less vicious. What happened in

France on the latter score should be a grave warning to our Nation.

The French Government assumed supreme power over production and distribution. Those great essentials of defense became political footballs for persons desiring continued political power. The whole world saw the result. Production for defense evaporated. Political lollipops tasted good, but they did not stop Hitler. They brought destruction and defeat.

We have been passing out a great many political lollipops in this country. They are easy to take, but Hitler has not built up his war machine with the German people sucking on a sweetened stick, or by taking the easy road. Sooner or later we will have to face the fact that even the United States, great as she is, cannot compete with Hitler's system unless we are willing to lay down some of the political lollipops and put our hands and hearts to the work and sacrifices by which we can build more and better planes, more and better tanks, more and better defense production. Reform legislation enlarging our ease and comfort, as desirable as it may be, fails to serve the most important needs of our Nation when it jeopardizes American lives, American homes, and the preservation of the American system of government.

Coming back to conscription, I would vote for the pending bill if it preserved the fundamentals which represent the American way of life and also eliminated war profits through taxation or otherwise; but I must vote against it, as one who has no political consequence at stake and desires only to keep faith with the ideals and future of the United States, because it makes possible the socialization of American enterprise and creates a needless sweep of power fashioned by power-loving provocateurs and smashes the very rights and liberties which make the United States a republic of free people.

Conscription of both men and resources, in keeping with the American principles, is one thing; needless concentration of power and socialized dictatorship is another. An ever-strong and ready defense is one thing; invited warfare is another. Military training for the defense of our own country is one thing; manpower to be sacrificed to the false gods of secret diplomatic commitments is another. We should sweat and sacrifice for the former; we should shun and fight the latter. I am in favor of complete defense preparation. I refuse to be a party to the encouragement of those in power; to believe that that means they have been given the "green light" to travel the road of intervention.

Harry Renton Bridges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LELAND M. FORD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, September 7, 1940

LETTER BY HON. LELAND M. FORD, OF CALIFORNIA, TO THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter which I wrote recently to the Attorney General:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., August 31, 1940.

The Honorable ROBERT JACKSON,
Attorney General of the United States,
Department of Justice, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR GENERAL JACKSON: I am enclosing herewith a copy of the marriage record of Harry R. Bridges, together with the dates of his various applications, in which he gives this record.

Bridges makes conflicting statements with reference to the same item, which, upon its face, must be perjury. My understanding is that these statements were made under oath on United States Government forms requiring affidavit.

You will note, at the bottom of letter, the registrar of vital statistics of the State of California, filed on December 19, 1938, the following statement:

"There is no record in California of Harry Renton Bridges and Agnes Brown (or McCley) having been married either on December 2, 1923, or May 1, 1934, nor on any other date between July 1905, and June 30, 1938."

It appears to me that perjury has been committed. Will you please advise what steps your office is going to take in the face of these statements?

Very truly yours,

L. M. FORD.

Burke-Wadsworth Compulsory Military Service Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, September 7, 1940

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, at no time during my service in this House have I ever given more serious, conscientious and deep study to a pending measure than I have given to the bill now before this House, the purpose of which is to provide a system of compulsory military service.

During the past few months there have been numerous and varied bills presented to Congress to strengthen our national defense. I have given my support to all such measures, including appropriation bills and authority to the President to call the National Guard and all reserve components into service. But, after careful study, and a consideration of all available information, I am of the opinion that the present bill to provide a system of compulsory military service in peacetime is not necessary at this time and is such a fundamental departure from the established tradition of this Nation that it should not be adopted at this time, but instead a voluntary system of enlistment should be given a trial.

AMERICAN TRADITION IS OPPOSED TO PEACETIME CONSCRIPTION

To change one of the most basic principles of democracy, upon which this Nation was founded and has existed, and which has had the support of our people through all the years of our national life, from the beginning until the present time, is a serious matter and should not be done except in case of the greatest and most certain necessity.

For more than 150 years this Nation has stood against compulsory military service in time of peace. In this we have stood almost alone among the great world powers. Nations of the Old World have struggled along during all these years chained and bound to the age-old system of supporting large and expensive armies. But in this New World we turned our back on this old order of things and devoted our attention to more peaceful pursuits. We have prospered and grown in power and influence. Our people have enjoyed a standard of living that has far exceeded that of any other nation. Our youth has had the opportunity to enter peaceful occupations without restriction. Our system of government has encouraged them to advance, and in no time of peace have they been compelled to give themselves up to military service. Those who have done so have acted upon a free and voluntary choice. This is democracy as we understand it in America. Any other system is not in accord with our American way.

During the debate on this bill it has been frequently urged that conscription is the democratic way to raise an army. Is it? It is my opinion that conscription in peacetime is far removed from the principles of democracy. Instead, it has the stamp of totalitarianism, and I am convinced that the principle which underlies it is foreign to our American democracy.

The basic idea that supports conscription or compulsory military service in time of peace is the same premise upon which totalitarian states are founded. It assumes that the

individual is but a pawn in the hands of the state. Such conscription in time of peace has always been objectionable to free men. Millions of Europeans have left their native countries to avoid compulsory military service in times of peace and have become loyal and devoted American citizens, to enjoy, among other privileges, our freedom from such conscription.

A totalitarian government can compel men to enter the army. It can make them work at jobs they do not like. It can make them worship as they do not choose, and it can tell them that because compulsion applies to all alike democracy has been achieved. This kind of government in other countries, however, is called variously nazi-ism, fascism, or communism.

It has been a glorious tradition of American democracy that never in the entire history of this Nation has it been necessary to resort to peacetime conscription for the purposes of defense. It is a tradition in which we can take just pride. And I am not convinced on the evidence that was produced before the Military Affairs Committee, either House or Senate, that it is necessary at this time to reject or destroy the glorious American tradition of peacetime voluntary service and in its place adopt the worst feature of the totalitarian form of government, namely, compulsory military service.

VOLUNTEER SYSTEM HAS NOT FAILED

The testimony before the Military Affairs Committees of both Houses of Congress leaves no doubt that, notwithstanding the claim that is so frequently made that the voluntary system of enlistment has failed us in this emergency, the facts prove the contrary to be the case.

In support of my statement that the volunteer system of enlistment has not failed I direct attention to the testimony of Gen. George C. Marshall, Chief of Staff of the United States Army. Before the Military Affairs Committee of the Senate he said:

> In June we went ahead with enlisting the force without the funds necessary and had to be cautious until the appropriations bill was actually signed, but I think we secured 18,000 men in June. Our quota, which we assigned ourselves, was about 15,000 by the end of the month, and we reached 15,000 10 days before the end of the month. In other words, recruiting went ahead in good shape.

Subsequent to this testimony it appeared that more than 30,000 enlisted in July, again exceeding the quota fixed by the Army; and in August more than 40,000 enlisted. This number again exceeded the quota that had been fixed. And, in this connection it must be remembered that the term of enlistment was 3 years and at the Regular Army pay of $21 per month. It would be interesting and informative to learn what would be the number of enlistments if the time of service should be reduced to 1 year and the pay raised to at least $30 or $50 per month. There is no doubt in my mind that the volunteer enlistments would rise so rapidly that the Army would have difficulty in finding enough equipment with which to clothe and equip them for training.

The testimony of Rear Admiral Chester W. Nimitz, Chief of the Bureau of Navigation of the United States Navy, also refutes the idea that the volunteer system has failed. In his testimony before the Senate Military Affairs Committee, he said, in answer to questions propounded by Senator REYNOLDS, as follows:

> Senator REYNOLDS. You do not experience any difficulty in getting sufficient voluntary enlistments, do you?
> Admiral NIMITZ. So far we have not. We have today about 7,000 men on the waiting list, waiting to go into the training stations. * * *

I also wish to direct attention to a portion of the testimony of General Shedd, Assistant Chief of Staff of the United States Army, when he appeared before the Senate Military Affairs Committee. Among other questions, he was asked by Senator THOMAS of Utah, as follows:

> Senator THOMAS. You have never tried to recruit men on a yearly basis, have you?
> General SHEDD. No, sir.
> Senator THOMAS. So that is a very important factor. There is a difference in a young man's thinking about himself if he can go out and train for a year and make himself a Regular Army man for 3 years; there is quite a difference.
> General SHEDD. There is a difference there.
> Senator THOMAS. And I was pleased to learn—General Marshall informed us today—that the application for enlistment in the Army was greater than we were told in the press. We have been informed that we were having difficulty in meeting the quotas that the Army is planning for. Now that is hardly true, is it?
> General SHEDD. We are getting them faster than we thought we would. That is correct, sir.

The statements I have read, taken from the testimony of the highest ranking officials in the War and Navy Departments, refute the claims that have been made that the volunteer system cannot be depended upon, and corroborate the claim that has been made that if given a chance, under favorable terms of enlistment and pay, the traditional volunteer system will more than justify itself again by measuring up to the demands of the present.

There is also a further bit of evidence that I wish to bring attention to in this connection. It is a statement made by former Secretary of War Woodring, who occupied that post until a few weeks ago. He said:

> How any fair-minded Member of Congress could say that we have given the voluntary system of enlistment for the United States Army fair trial and that it has broken down, and, therefore, we need compulsory service, is beyond my understanding.

Our danger from invasion is not so imminent that we cannot take the necessary time to give our time-honored system of volunteer service a chance to show its worth. Do not let us adopt the methods of totalitarian states until the situation would leave no alternative. We should try the democratic method first.

If invasion of our land was threatened, or danger was imminent then the situation confronting us would be entirely different. Today, there exists a war hysteria built up by one means or another and based upon the atrocities that other nations have suffered. There has been created a fear upon the part of many that not only is this Nation to be similarly dealt with, but that the danger is at our very door. Present conditions do not justify any such conclusion. On the contrary the Nazi forces have their hands full trying to cross 22 miles of water to invade the British Isles. After 2 months of effort, and with the use of vast numbers of airplanes, it has so far failed in its objective. When we increase the distance to the 3,000 miles that separates this Nation from them and add to it the strength of our Navy, and realize that the Nazis would not be able to use airplanes against us as they are now doing against the British, then it can be realized how unlikely it is that we will be called upon to face any invasion of our shores by Nazi forces. In addition to all this would be the impossibility of finding sufficient ships to transport an invading army with its necessary equipment, that would have any chance to succeed.

The best evidence that there is no real or immediate danger is the fact that up to this present time no Army or Navy officer, nor other competent military authority, has expressed any fear of an immediate invasion, or that it is even remotely possible in the near future.

Further evidence of the lack of immediate necessity to raise a vast army by conscription is the fact that as late as January of this year the President only requested funds for an army of 227,000 men. Even on May 31, of this year, after the Nazi forces had broken through the French lines and France was collapsing, the President expressed satisfaction with an army of 280,000 men, and General Marshall, Chief of Staff of the United States Army, on June 4 testified that an army of 400,000 would avoid the necessity of mobilizing the National Guard, and give reasonable liberty of action up to January 1941. But notwithstanding, legislation has already been passed by Congress that would increase the Regular Army up to 375,000 officers and men, and authorize the calling out, by the President, of the National Guard with its 225,000 officers and men, and the Reserve components of 120,000 men, making a total of over 700,000 officers and men, and for all of which I voted, we are now faced with a demand for conscription of 1,200,000

more men and the registration of from 12,000,000 to 23,000,000 men, according to whether the age limit shall be 30 years or 45 years of age.

All of this indicates a serious lack of knowledge as to just what is necessary. Either the President and General Marshall were wrong in their first estimate or they are wrong now. Certainly, the European situation is no worse than it was in June when General Marshall fixed 400,000 as all that would be necessary until at least January. By legislation already enacted we have nearly doubled his estimate to more than 700,000. Under the present plans of the Army for mobilization this would probably be as many as could be properly housed, clothed, and equipped by April or May of 1941.

Thus it cannot be said that there would be any danger in holding off conscription until that time and thereby give the American peacetime way of voluntary service a chance to demonstrate whether the spirit for the ways of democracy still prevails in this land. The idea of giving a 60-day breathing spell, during which conscription would be withheld to give the volunteer system a chance, while better than no recognition at all of the volunteer system, is entirely unsatisfactory as a substitute or excuse for a system of conscription.

I am definitely of the opinion that if the enlistment period was reduced to 1 year and the pay increased to not less than $50 per month, which, together with clothes, food, shelter, and medical attention, would approximate a total wage of $90 to $100 per month in private life, there would be no difficulty in raising as large an enlisted army as would be desired. And it may be that such a result would be attainable with a pay basis of $30 per month. Until we make peacetime service in the Army to reasonably approximate service in civil pursuits we cannot expect young men to rush into the Army. Make inducements that are worth while and there will be a waiting list of those anxious to serve in the Army, as there is now a waiting list for the Navy. The waiting list for Navy service is definite proof of what can be accomplished when proper pay and other conditions exist.

NOT SUFFICIENT EQUIPMENT FOR PROPER TRAINING

Aside from the principle involved in this proposed legislation, that has created such widespread criticism because of its departure from American traditions, and, the practical situations that justify opposition to the bill in its present form, there is a situation that arises that should have careful consideration; namely, how, when, and where are we going to train this vast Army to be created almost overnight? At the present time the Army has neither sufficient housing facilities, clothing, weapons, or equipment for them. The maneuvers recently held at different places throughout the country demonstrated how woefully lacking the Army is in the ordinary equipment that is necessary for a combat unit. It has been said that at the present time we do not have more than enough equipment to supply a complete combat unit of 75,000 men. This is deplorable if true. Certainly we are all familiar with the fact that gas pipe was used to similate antiaircraft guns, stove pipe for machine guns, and beer cans to represent shells, with no tanks, other than motor trucks marked as tanks, for maneuvering purposes. This is only a small part of the story of unpreparedness with respect to weapons of war. And, notwithstanding the driving force that comes from large appropriations and civilian production managers it is stated that in most cases we will not have the weapons available for training purposes before 1942, and, in the case of ships it will be a much later date. The same is true of airships. We have not sufficient airships available to begin any considerable training of pilots commensurate with the need. Yet, in the face of all this we rush ahead a conscription of men instead of taking the time, necessary to have our volunteer system function in the American way.

What we need today is not men so much as war equipment. Our real weakness today is lack of proper equipment for our men. Until we have it there is little worth-while training that can be given our men. Our energy and planning should be toward procuring war equipment. The necessary number of men to man it will be ready and willing under a volunteer system of enlistment long before the equipment is ready for their use.

NEED IS FOR TRAINED MECHANICS AND TECHNICIANS

Furthermore, as a result of the lessons learned in the war now raging in Europe, it is also plain that what is needed is not so much men who know "squads right" and the other movements learned on the parade ground, as it is for highly trained permanent forces sufficient in number to man expertly the new weapons as they are produced—aircraft, tanks, ships, antiaircraft guns, and all the other intricate weapons of war, new and old. I am of the opinion that our most immediate need today is for trained technical men. Men who know machines. These men are in our shops and factories. They should be kept there and more and more men put there at wages that would attract them to this type of service. Such a plan would be based on a recognition of the military lesson being taught on European battlefields—that comparatively small forces of highly trained soldier-mechanics properly equipped can defeat many times their number of partially trained civilian conscripts, regardless of how courageous the latter may be.

OBJECTION TO PEACETIME CONSCRIPTION IS WIDESPREAD

The opposition to the adoption of the conscription method of raising an army at this time is widespread. Objection has come from every type and kind of citizens and from every walk of life. Church groups, labor and farm organizations, leaders in education, religion, labor, and agriculture have all expressed opposition to this un-American method that sweeps aside all American traditions.

These groups and the representative men and women who have spoken for them are not un-American, they are not "fifth columnists." They are sound, substantial, loyal, and patriotic citizens who love America and who want our country to continue to travel the paths that have been trod by our forebears who helped make America great and not depart into the ways of totalitarian governments. They only ask that if it is necessary in time of peace to raise an army for defense, that then it be done in the American way—by a volunteer, rather than a conscription, system. This is not unreasonable. If it should fail to produce the desired results as quickly as is deemed necessary, then Congress can consider other ways and means. But until it is demonstrated that the volunteer system will not work, there is no excuse or justification for adoption at this time of the conscription system of compulsory military service.

To illustrate the substantial character of the opposition to the conscription method of raising an army in peacetime, I wish to set forth a few of the statements that have been made by leaders and groups already referred to by me.

William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, said:

> In providing an adequate army for defensive purposes, the American way should be followed first. A voluntary enlistment program should be launched by the Government designed to create an army of 1,500,000 men. This would be putting voluntary action before compulsion. American labor would respond to such a program wholeheartedly and enthusiastically.

John L. Lewis, president of the Congress of Industrial Organizations, said:

> I wonder if in our zeal to protect our country from the shadow of Hitler we are not using some of Hitler's methods that will in the end proscribe our civil liberties and create social confusion and unrest to the point that will bring about the very conditions we are trying to escape.

The Railway Labor Executives Association, representing 1,000,000 railway workers, issued a statement opposing conscription at this time, in which it was said:

> There has been no demonstration that the voluntary method will not furnish the necessary manpower.

Speaking for the archbishops and bishops of the Administrative Board of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, Monsignor Michael J. Ready told the House Military Affairs Committee:

> This legislation is too important to be rushed through Congress until all other possible programs have been examined.

The Methodist World Peace Commission, representing 8,000,000 members, said:

Military conscription at this time is not essential to national defense. We refuse to believe that the United States, in order to preserve its own way of life, must cease to be a democracy and become itself a totalitarian regime.

Many more extracts from testimony, statements, and similar expressions of opposition to conscription could be given. But those already given are sufficient to establish the substantial and widespread opposition that exists among all classes of citizens.

TEN YEARS OF MILITARY SERVICE MAY BE REQUIRED UNDER TERMS OF BILL

Proponents of conscription have sought in many ways to sugarcoat the compulsory features of the bill now before us and thereby diminish the opposition against the bill. One of the most common misstatements is that the service provided for in the bill is limited to 1 year. This is not so. But it has been so frequently repeated and so widespread that people generally are of the opinion that the required service is limited to 1 year. As a matter of fact the plain provisions of the bill can require as much as 10 years of service from those who are selected under its terms.

Section 3 (c) of the bill reads, in part, as follows:

(c) Each man, after completion of his military training period, shall be transferred to a Reserve component of the land or naval forces of the United States, and until the expiration of 10 years after such transfer or until he reaches the age of 45, or until he is discharged, whichever occurs first, he shall be deemed a member of such Reserve component and be subject to such additional training as may now or hereafter be prescribed by law.

Thus it can be seen that for the next 10 years, or at least until the draftee becomes 45 years of age, he is subject to be called out for further service. Surely there is nothing now so vital to our immediate defense as to require the extension of what has been termed 1 year of training service into 10 years of service. This illustrates that once this Nation starts down the road of conscription, or compulsory military service in time of peace, there is no saying how long it will remain with us. In this bill it is not limited to the emergency which is presently alleged to exist, nor is the extended service of training confined to the continental limits of the United States or its possessions, nor even to the Western Hemisphere. There is no limitation whatsoever. Nor do I know who will be President of the United States 4 years, 8 years, or 10 years from now. I am unwilling to place the young men of today, by conscription, into military service for the next 10 years without knowing what the conditions may be for which they may be called into service by some President, unknown to any of us at this time. It is a leap in the dark I am not willing to take in a matter so vital to the future welfare of our young men and this Nation.

It is also evident to me that the proponents of this bill have in mind some possible additional military service to be rendered beyond mere training. If such is not the case, then what is the reason for insisting that the field of training may extend to anywhere in the Western Hemisphere? Surely, if training is the only purpose of the bill, it could be accomplished within the continental limits of the United States or its possessions. The fact that an amendment that would have so restricted the training area was opposed by those who favor the passage of this bill creates in me a doubt that will not down that we are getting these boys into something far more serious than mere training. I sincerely hope that subsequent events will not develop to make necessary any more serious service than that which the face of the bill purports to provide for.

PROPOSED COMPULSORY TRAINING UNFAIR IN OPERATION

Furthermore, it is said that this bill is democratic because it acts equally toward all. This is as far from the truth as the allegation that the bill only provides for 1 year of service, the fallacy of which I have just shown. If the age limit is fixed to apply to those between 21 and 45 as provided for in this bill or from 21 to 31 as in the Senate bill there will be, it is estimated, 23,000,000 and 12,000,000, respectively, subject to be conscripted. Of these approximately one-half will be exempted because of dependents or otherwise. Thus, 6,000,000 to 12,000,000, according to age limit adopted, will be subject to conscription. It is stated that not more than 1,200,000 will be called into service at this time. Thus, 1 out of 6 or 1 out of 12 will be called according to whether the age limitation is 31 years or 45 years. What happens to the other 5 or other 11, as the case may be? They are not called for service and therefore are permitted to go on their way and pursue their studies, business, or other occupations, get married and live the life of a normal citizen. Whereas, the 1 boy selected gives up his usual vocation, goes into the Army for 1 year, and remains subject to call for 10 years. Where is there any equality in such an arrangement as that?

Furthermore, it can be readily seen that with discretion lodged in some board, appointed under political influence, that it would be easy to grant favors without doing any great harm to the national defense because only one is to be selected and therefore the others are discharged. If we had not had the sorry experience of W. P. A. being used for political purposes it may be this thought would not have entered my mind. But, having seen human misery utilized by politicians for political purposes, and, work denied to some and given to others solely because of party affiliations, I feel justified in presenting this thought in order that if the bill should pass that the proper administration of the draft shall not become an adjunct to a political machine.

CONSCRIPTION OF MANPOWER LEADS TO CONSCRIPTION OF INDUSTRY AND WEALTH

Permit me to also make reference to another question that is entitled to the most careful consideration. It relates to how far the principle of conscription is to be carried in times of peace. Already we have seen how easy it is to extend the scope of conscription once the principle is adopted. This bill established it with reference to a portion of our manhood, and immediately the demand arose to conscript industry. If the lives of our boys are to be conscripted for military service, then there is no excuse to leave industry in a preferred class, but until it has been more certainly demonstrated that the necessity exists to change our tradition against conscription in times of peace I shall vote against any type of conscription. The Senate responded to this demand and included industry within the provisions of the bill. It is only another step to conscription of labor and wealth. The principle that underlies conscription of manhood as provided for in this bill can readily be extended to all the others that I have mentioned, including agriculture, and then we have a totalitarian state. Now is the time to stop, look, and listen and avoid the danger that will be upon us as a nation and people if we continue to pursue the course that is set before us. It is a course once started upon you cannot easily stop.

If subsequent events should make danger more imminent, and the voluntary system of enlistment failed to produce the necessary men, then is the time to turn our attention to some other system to insure an adequate defensive force and the same with reference to industry. But we should not admit defeat of the American way until it has had a trial. No military authority in this Nation has placed himself on record to say that our danger is so immediate that the trial of the volunteer-enlistment system for the next 3 or 4 months, nor failure to conscript industry at this time, would imperil our national safety. This bill is drawn upon the theory that the American volunteer system cannot succeed. I am not willing by my vote to agree to that assumption without giving the American way a trial. I still have confidence in the patriotism of our people. I believe they will respond in the hour of need. Again, I caution to stop, look, and listen before we discard the American way and adopt the way of totalitarians.

Compare Our Problems With England's Problems—Part V

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. THORKELSON

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 6, 1940

ARTICLE BY LT. COL. A. H. LANE, BRITISH ARMY OFFICER

Mr. THORKELSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting an article by Lt. Col. A. H. Lane, an officer in the British Army, who, like many in America, tells the truth.

The article follows:

ALIEN INFLUENCE IN POLITICS

Before the World War the alien penetration of our political parties had become very noticeable, and it will be remembered how alien financiers in the city of London urged the liberal government in August 1914 to remain neutral during the German attack on France and Belgium. The Liberal Party was then supported by many politically minded aliens and some of them proved during the war to be most undesirable persons. Sir Edgar Speyer, Bart., and Ignatius Timothy Trebich Lincoln, son of Nathan Trebich, both persona grata with the liberal leaders, maintained relations with the enemy during the war. Lincoln was an active and clever spy. He was by birth a Hungarian and a British citizen by naturalization. A clergyman of the Church of England and later secretary to Mr. B. Seebohm Rowntree, he had been, in 1910, elected a Member of Parliament (Liberal) for Darlington.[1] Then some years before the war, at a dinner given in London by free traders in honor of Mr. Lloyd George, a list of those present included a considerable number of rich aliens and persons of recent alien extraction. This alien influence in the Liberal Party and the great financial support the party received from foreign sources explains the hostility of the liberal government and the Liberal Party to all proposals to restrict alien immigration.

But it was after the Great War and during the peace conferences at Paris that this alien influence in our politics became not only conspicuous but dangerous to British interests. Whatever may be said for the conception of a league of nations, the peace conference, out of which the Covenant of the League was evolved, was dominated by interests hostile to the British Empire. The economic consequences of the peace are in a large measure the result of alien intervention in the framing of the peace treaty. The policy enunciated by President Wilson was in some of its main aspects not unlike the policy of the Bolsheviks. Both desired the international control of the world. President Wilson wanted this to be through the League of Nations; the Bolsheviks through the Third (Communist) International. Both used similar slogans, such as "no annexations," "no secret diplomacy," and "the right of self-determination." The "self-determination" slogan has been well described as having the effect of dynamite upon the British Empire. It has done great harm in many countries, but in none more than in the British Empire. These disruptive proposals and slogans provided common ground between Washington and Moscow, though on other matters there might be considerable differences.

In the chapter on The Hidden Hand it is shown how international financiers in Berlin and New York helped Lenin and Trotsky to enter and conquer Russia. The same alien financial influence is to be found behind President Wilson in his League of Nations. This connection was well known in Paris during the peace conference, and Pertinax, writing in the Echo de Paris of April 28, 1920, described this financial influence as follows:

"M. Max Warburg is the chief of the banking firm Max Warburg & Co., of Hamburg. He is the principal shareholder in the Hamburg-American and German-Lloyd Steamship Lines. His two brothers, Paul and Felix Warburg, married, respectively, to the sister-in-law and the daughter of Jacob H. Schiff (born at Frankfurt), are the associates of the latter at the head of the Kuhn, Loeb & Co., of New York. Here we have a financial group which up to the declaration of war by America, in April 1917, was the most powerful link between the politicians of Washington and those of Berlin. From 1914 to 1917 this powerful syndicate showed itself extraordinarily active against the Entente."

Before the war Mr. Schiff was the great financial supporter of the Mural Society of German Jews, and this society had close relations with high German circles. During the war, before America intervened, Mr. Schiff, says Pertinax, "founded the American Neutral Conference Committee, which took upon itself the task of bringing about peace with a victorious Germany. Then appeared for the first time all the formulae of the League of Nations, the anathemas launched against the old diplomacy, which was said to be responsible for bringing about the war. On this point consult the work, How the Diplomatists Caused the War, written by Mr. Heubsch, the colleague of Mr. Schiff on the neutral conference committee."

More light on this alien influence behind President Wilson, the peace conference, and the League of Nations is provided by M. Charles Maurras, in his book Les Trois Aspects du President Wilson. He refers to:

"The decisive influence exercised on Mr. Wilson by a very small company, financiers by profession, domiciled between Hamburg, Frankfort, and New York. They were identified with the Association for the League of Free Nations, with its seat in America, and including among other people, Mr. Felix Frankfurter, president of the War Labor Policies Board; a great banker, Jacob H. Schiff; the Cohens; the Blumenthals; the Chapiros, not to speak of Mrs. Mary Sunkovnich."

Dr. Dillon, in his book on the Paris Peace Conference, also alludes to this alien domination of Mr. Wilson and remarks:

"Of all the collectivities whose interests were furthered at the conference, the Jews had perhaps the most resourceful and certainly the most influential exponents. There were Jews from Palestine, from Poland, Russia, the Ukraine, Rumania, Greece, Britain, Holland, and Belgium, but the largest and most brilliant contingent was sent by the United States."[2]

Dr. Dillon seems to be surprised at the influence these aliens of many lands had over the American President. But if Dr. Dillon had read the Intimate Papers of Colonel House he would have known that the Schiffs, the Warburgs, and other great international financiers of New York had succeeded in 1913, by means of confidential negotiations conducted through Colonel House, in persuading Wilson to accept and support in Congress their Federal Reserve bank scheme. It was therefore not so surprising as Dr. Dillion imagined to find those international financiers, with great interests at stake, in the Peace Conference, keeping in close and constant touch with President Wilson.

These facts give force and meaning to a letter sent by the late Israel Zangwill to a banquet given by the Maccabeans in London in 1920 in honor of the late Mr. Lucien Wolf, "the man who fought for Jewish rights at Versailles last year." Mr. Zangwill wrote:

"The minority treaties were the touchstone of the League of Nations, that essentially Jewish aspiration. And the man behind the minority treaties was Lucien Wolf." (Jewish Guardian, June 11, 1920.)

These minority treaties have caused much trouble and friction in many countries, and British Governments have had more than their share of trouble and expense in attempting to satisfy the "aspirations" of the alien promoters of those treaties. British money, arms, and prestige have been used to protect interests that were and are a menace to the British Empire. (See Alien Control in Palestine, p. 162.) The success of alien intrigue and wirepulling at the Peace Conference, and the way in which British rights have ever since been sacrificed to comply with the demands of alien minorities, justify the comment of Dr. Dillon in the book quoted above. "Large numbers of the delegates at the conference," Dr. Dillon wrote, "believed that the real influence behind the Anglo-Saxon peoples were Semitic" and that the alien formula was: "Henceforth the world will be governed by the Anglo-Saxon peoples, who in turn, are swayed by their Jewish elements."

This criticism of Jewish influence is not anti-Semitic. The critics quoted above are, on the whole friendly to the Jews, but they recognize that this persistent attempt to dominate and control the financial and political policies of the nations of the world and to make them serve the interests of a minority possessing much power, especially in world finance, must create friction and disturbances.

This criticism would apply with equal force to Germans, Dutch, Italians, French, or any other race if they attempted by similar methods to impose their will upon other peoples and to make those peoples more or less subject to their domination. As stated in the preface to this book, I do not approach this subject from a sectarian point of view but from the point of view of an Englishman who believes in "Britain for the British," and who strongly objects to alien interference, irrespective of the faith or nationality of the alien. If the Jews are mentioned frequently, especially in quotations from books, reports, and other documents, it is because they have the fortune or misfortune, according to the point of view, to be more active and more successful than any other aliens in influencing and controlling British affairs.[3]

With this evidence of alien interference at the Peace Conference it is not surprising to find British policy constantly deflected from

[1] In the early hours of Christmas Eve, 1925, one of Lincoln's sons, calling himself John Lincoln, then bombardier in "E" Battery, Royal Horse Artillery, murdered a brewers' traveler. He was convicted of the murder, sentenced to death, and hanged. This throws light on the way in which our armed forces are penetrated.

[2] These quotations are taken from The Cause of World Unrest, pp. 176–183 (Grant Richards, 1920).

[3] Much valuable information on this alien influence at the Peace Conference, and its effect upon British and allied interests, will be found in Mrs. Webster's book, The Surrender of an Empire, chapter II, The Sabbotage of Victory.

British interests, and British Government becoming more and more subservient to alien influence. Conservative and socialist governments have been mysteriously committed to policies and acts fundamentally at variance with the true interests and needs of Great Britain and of the Empire overseas. The coalition government, after the war, began this policy of surrender to foreign interests. Our troubles in India started with Mr. Edwin Montagu's efforts, as Secretary of State for India, 1917, to disturb "the placid pathetic contentment" of the Indian masses. Since then, successive governments have pandered to the revolutionary and alien elements in India, and today the Conservative no less than the Socialist Party is committed to the granting of dominion status to India; though most Conservatives know that India is totally unfitted for dominion status. How is this acceptance of an obviously wrong and mischievous policy for India to be explained? It can only be explained by the evidence submitted in this book, namely, alien control and direction of British political parties and governments.

Other examples of this surrender policy include the termination of the Anglo-Japanese alliance, to please the financial powers of the United States; the abandonment of our naval supremacy at the Washington Conference for similar reasons; the "surrender to murder" in Ireland, where we permitted what is practically a republic to be set up in southern Ireland in order to placate a gang of murderous revolutionaries, and to win the good will of our American cousins. The recently enacted statute of Westminster is but the latest and perhaps the most complete instance of the triumph of the alien forces that are working for the dismemberment and destruction of the British Empire. In this latest example the Conservatives, Liberals, and Socialists of the "National" Government, supported by the Socialist opposition, are to be found passing a measure that actually makes it easy, if desired, for any constituent part of the British Empire to repudiate the British connection and to set up a separate and independent republic. Only aliens and revolutionaries have ever demanded this concession, and it is, as Carlyle would have said, "significant of much," that even the conservative champions of patriotism and imperialism have readily conceded this thoroughly disruptive and anti-British demand of a comparatively small body of aliens and revolutionaries.

These illustrations of policies that are alien and dangerous to British national and imperial interests justify the late Leo Maxse's criticism of the Conservative Government of 1923. Speaking in London on April 12, 1923, on the failure of the conservative government to stand by France rather than Germany, Mr. Maxse commented on the strong family likeness between the machinations of our parliamentarians although bearing different and distinctive labels, "so that if one read the public utterances on international affairs of the present Prime Minister (Mr. Bonar Law) or either of the ex-Prime Ministers or the official leader of the opposition (Mr. Ramsay MacDonald), they would hardly know whether it was Mr. Bonar Law, Mr. Asquith, Mr. Lloyd George, or some labor leader, who was speaking." Mr. Maxse ended by asking what was the "intangible, invisible influence in the background bringing pressure to bear on British statesmen, which must ultimately involve them in political catastrophe."

In the chapters on alien revolutionaries and alien influence in industry, will be found further evidence of how aliens endeavor to direct political policies by (1) creating revolutionary situations within the Empire, either through political rebellions, as in Ireland and India, or by causing industrial disputes, strikes, etc.; or (2) by obtaining control of financial and industrial concerns, through which they are able to bring pressure to bear on all governments, especially since the recent practice was adopted of appointing ex-civil servants and ex-Cabinet Ministers to directorships in concerns that are financed and controlled wholly or partly by aliens.

Finally, it may be pointed out that for a long time past the nominal rulers of our Empire have been allowing persons of alien extraction, on our behalf, to undertake diplomatic and financial negotiations of the utmost importance. Two examples of this leap to the eye. During the Great War the Liberal, Lord Reading, a lawyer who for a brief period had been on the stock exchange, was sent to the United States of America to arrange gigantic sums of money for us. In September 1929 our delegates to the conference at Geneva, which was held to decide what financial assistance was to be given to small nations in the event of war were Sir Otto Ernst Niemeyer and Sir Henry Strakosch, whose nephew, as reported in the press, is a certain Baron Georges Strakosch von Feldringen, of Vienna.

Is Our Nation Inviting Disaster?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LEMKE

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, September 7, 1940

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Speaker, the world is afflicted with war insanity. Our Nation is mentally sick—sick with depressions and recessions, sick with farm deflation and unemployment, sick and tired of war hysteria, sick and tired of those who would sell this Nation's honor, credit, domestic market, and manhood on foreign auction blocks and battlefields. In fact, we are suffering from all the diseases that destroy nations. But there is hope that from our present mental slump we will arise a greater, stronger, and better nation than ever before.

In our bewilderment we seem to become pro-everything—pro-Italian, pro-German, pro-Russian, pro-British, and God knows what not. We are pro everything except the real thing—pro-America. Of course, it is not yet too late to save this ship of state. Surely there are enough Members in this House, together with patriotic men and women of vision and intelligence, to steer this Nation through these troubled waters. The time for calm reasoning has arrived. We have acted too long upon our emotions, emotions fanned into white heat by falsehoods.

We have been the prey of designing foreigners and foreign agents. We have been deceived and defrauded by men in high governmental positions who are more interested in kings and queens and dictators abroad than in our own people. We have been deceived and tricked into selling our national defense to foreign nations. We have been fooled into believing that other nations were fighting our battles—into believing that other nations' wars were ours, forgetting that when the crucial hour comes, if it ever comes, we ourselves must defend our Nation—we ourselves will be its defenders or its destroyers.

In a world of confusion and human suffering we forget that our spiritual well-being is unalterably interwoven with our material well-being. Without spiritual progress there can be no material progress. The two go hand in hand. Christianity, home, and security are the very foundation of our civilization.

This year a lot of things have happened that we could but wish had not happened. Europe has gone insane. War brutality and war hysteria are at large. Small, innocent nations have been crushed by brute force. These nations wanted nothing but to be left alone. Three or four million young men have given their lives on the field of battle within the last 12 months. They have drenched the earth red with blood, and millions more have been maimed and disabled for life. May we ask what for?

These young men had nothing to say about it. They were given a uniform and a rifle. If they refused they were put in concentration camps. As Senator WHEELER so ably has said, "Those who do the fighting and the dying never have anything to say in the making of war." Read Mark Twain's Mysterious Stranger and you will learn how a loud-mouthed few, aided and abetted by the war profiteers, plunge nations into war.

We were deceived into the World War in 1917. Undisputed documents now within the reach of every Member of Congress show that Ambassador Page did not represent the United States, but represented Morgan & Co. These documents show that Mr. Page wrote to Secretary of State Lansing, informing him that Great Britain had defaulted in paying an overdraft of $400,000,000—that she had no cash with which to pay—that she needed huge credits.

Mr. Page then stated that he knew that the American people would not stand for such huge credits unless we first declared war. In other words, send our sons first to European battlefields and then the American fathers and mothers will stand for the huge credits to pay the overdraft to Mr. Morgan. This same Mr. Morgan and his kind are again on the job. We are sure that the fathers and mothers will not again be fooled with Mr. Morgan's philosophy—the making of millions out of human blood.

Out of the first $500,000,000 Liberty bonds we bought, with which to help our boys win the war, $400,000,000 went to Morgan to take care of this overdraft. That was Morgan's patriotism. Unfortunately, the war that we entered to take care of Mr. Morgan's $400,000,000 overdraft has cost us over $65,000,000,000 to date. That $65,000,000,000 is responsible

for the depression and the recession—responsible for all the homes and businesses that have been wrecked—responsible for thousands of suicides.

And so, today our prayers go out for France, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Finland, Norway, Denmark, Holland, and China, where millions of innocent men, women, and children have been made homeless and hungry by war's brutality and insanity. Our hearts bleed for all the nations that want to live in peace and be left alone, but whose territories are being so ruthlessly invaded and their people so cruelly dealt with by brute force.

But we cannot change the ways of Europe. They have had wars there for over 3,000 years. They will have wars there until their people have the intelligence and the courage to form the United States of Europe. Then and then only will Europe be able to wipe out the religious and racial hatreds that breed war. We cannot do this for them. They must do it for themselves.

We have furnished the allied nations everything that we have except our young men. These we will not again give them. We are sorry if unauthorized promises were made to these nations. Such promises should never have been made. No one man in this Nation has a right to pledge the lives of our sons on foreign battlefields. We have not yet knowingly consented to a dictatorship in this Nation.

Let us not permit ourselves to be swept off our feet by war hysteria, by false propaganda. The penalty will be too severe. It may cost the lives of millions of our sons. In the World War 126,000 of our sons were killed and died on the field of battle, another 234,300 died from injuries, and a million have died since from diseases contracted while in service. Surely we do not wish to repeat that experience. If we again permit ourselves to be deceived into this war it will be the rock upon which our form of government will perish. We will emerge with a full-fledged dictator.

As I listened to the war-mad psychology of the people in Italy when they cheered the declaration of war by Mussolini, I wondered whether the mothers and the fathers who were cheering so madly had gone insane. I wondered if they knew what it all meant. I wondered whether when they receive word that their son is no more, they will continue to cheer. I am very much afraid that in their madness they forgot all about the realities of war.

We are all shocked that the demons of war have again been let loose in Europe and Asia. We must keep these demons out of the Western Hemisphere. These are trying times even for our own country. We still have millions unemployed. We still have hunger and want in the midst of plenty. Last but not least, we again have a few superpatriots who again would wrap the flag of glory around themselves and grab everything in sight. They would again monopolize the patriotism of this Nation that is common to us all.

These are the real traitors. They would divide our people when all should be united. It is to be regretted that these profiteers and patrioteers have gained a considerable camp following—politicians who have nothing to recommend them to the public confidence except the false issue of national defense. These politicians in their ignorance forget that the American people have not yet been swept off their feet by emotionalism, by war hysteria.

National defense is not an issue in this campaign. These politicians will not be permitted to ride into office on that kind of a false issue. We are all for adequate national defense. Since 1920 Congress has appropriated about $31,000,000,000 for the War and Navy Departments—for national defense. This, if equally divided, would give $238 to every baby, every boy and girl, and every man and woman in the United States.

These appropriations were made in accordance with the evidence presented at hearings before the Military and Naval Affairs Committees of the House and the Senate. If that was not enough, then it was not the fault of Congress. I have never opposed any appropriation for national defense. I have opposed appropriations for national aggression, for foreign nations' defense.

But remember that more than mere appropriations of money is necessary in order to get real national defense. There must be a national-defense policy. Also remember that the money that Congress appropriated the American people will have to pay. Therefore it is up to Congress to see that they get their money's worth of defense. Just blindly pouring money out of the Treasury will not provide us with national defense.

During this Congress, the Seventy-sixth, we have appropriated about $14,500,000,000 for national defense. This is an added indebtedness of $110 for every man, woman, and child. This $14,500,000,000, if equally divided, would make 14,500 millionaires. It will have to be paid back by the taxpayers with interest. It will not be paid by us nor by our children, but sometime in the future by our great-grandchildren. When it is finally paid with interest it will have amounted to many times $14,500,000,000.

We are told that it will take about 3 years to spend this money—that we will not be able to equip a large Army before 1943. We are informed that we have only a few first-class fighting planes, but that many more have been and will be ordered. Congress appropriated money and ordered over 6,000 airplanes during the last 4 years. The President says they are "on order." The truth is they have been "on order" but as fast as they were built they were turned over to foreign nations.

While we sympathize with some foreign nations our national defense should come first. No other nation will or can fight our battles. Nor are we foolish enough to ever entrust our safety to any other nation. Poland, Holland, Belgium, and France did that to their sorrow. That stupid doctrine is not the doctrine of pro-Americans. We are not here interested with the propagandists and paid agents of other nations.

Let us use common horse sense. Let us never depend upon George to defend us or to fight our battles. Let us have our own national defense and be prepared to fight our own battles if war comes. The time has come, as the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], chairman of the Senate Naval Affairs Committee, so ably stated over the radio, that we should provide our own national defense and depend upon ourselves to defend ourselves. Otherwise we may come to grief.

Again we must decide what we want to defend. Do we want to defend the United States alone? That is one kind of defense. Do we want to defend the Western Hemisphere? That is another kind of defense. I favor and always have favored a national defense that will include the entire Western Hemisphere. But let us not imitate Europe and turn this hemisphere into another armed camp.

Our international bankers tell us that we should police the whole world. This would include protection for their foreign investments. Our answer to these is that we are not big enough to do it—it would be beyond our power even if we wanted to. If we protect the Western Hemisphere from European and Japanese aggression, we will have plenty to do. We will have to leave Europe to clean up its own house.

I am also interested in the human as well as in the material side of national defense. I am interested in the soldiers, the sailors, the marines, and the aviators. These, after all, are our real national defense. Without soldiers, sailors, marines, and aviators, there can be no national defense. Without them, the warships, submarines, and airplanes will be at a standstill, and cannon, machine guns, and rifles will remain silent.

Because of this I have always been interested in the veterans of all wars—in the flesh and blood of our national defense. I feel that if the Nation wants able-bodied, patriotic young men with strong nerves and keen intellect for

national defense, it will have to compensate the veterans who have fought its wars. Therefore I opposed the so-called Economy Act that deprived the disabled veterans of their just compensation. I felt that the President's frequent vetoes of veterans' legislation were unjustifiable. I voted on every occasion to override such vetoes.

It was because I believed in the human as well as in the material side of national defense that in 1919 I drafted the first State World War veterans' compensation bill in this Nation. Under this bill, North Dakota paid the veterans of the World War an additional compensation of $25 per month from the day that they enlisted until the day of their discharge. It was because of this same reason that I have voted for and supported all veterans' legislation sponsored by the American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, and other veterans' organizations since I have been a Member of Congress.

We all realize that in order to have real national defense we must have a united patriotic people back of our soldiers, sailors, marines, and aviators. Patriotism does not grow in seedbeds of filth, slums, poverty, want, hunger, and rags. It grows only in seedbeds of hope, aspiration, and opportunity. I have always supported liberal legislation to prepare proper seedbeds for real patriotic Americans to grow in.

The nation that does not protect its protectors cannot long endure. No nation on earth is great enough to ignore the appeals for help of its citizens. There are times when a nation must protect its citizens from misfortune in order to preserve its nationalism. Patriotism is the feeling that you are a somebody. It is the feeling that you belong to a nation that is not only powerful, but that is interested in your welfare.

Without this feeling of security and reciprocity, there can be no true patriotism on the part of the individual—there is no nationalism. The 10,000,000 unemployed and the one farmer out of every five who lost his farm are more dangerous to our democracy than the combined armies of Hitler, Mussolini, and Stalin. Real national defense consists in making these people again self-supporting and home owners.

It is for this reason that I have worked for and am supporting H. R. 8748, known as the Farmers Union debt-adjustment bill. This bill would refinance those farms that are mortgaged for more than they are worth by reducing the amount of the mortgage to the productive value of the farm. It would permit an adjustment of the feed and seed loans. They should be canceled. These farmers fed the Nation below the cost of production while they were losing their farms.

During the discussion on this bill we heard a great deal about soft credit and soft money. Of course, these expressions are just repeated parrot-like by those who know nothing about money or its functions. These individuals do not understand that the difference between soft money and soft credit and hard money and hard credit is the same as that between a soft-boiled and a hard-boiled egg. If you get the egg you can live. If you do not you may starve.

It is for this same reason that I have consistently worked and urged Congress to pass the Frazier-Lemke refinance bill—a bill that, if passed, would have saved hundreds of thousands of farm homes. This bill would refinance existing mortgages on farms and homes at 3 percent per annum. The interest rate would be 1½ percent and the balance of each payment would be applied on the principal on the amortization plan. The stability of our Government depends upon homes.

When I became a Member of Congress 8 years ago, the farmers were paying 5½ percent interest on their Federal land-bank loans. This has now been reduced to 3½ percent, as a direct result of the fight that we made for the Frazier-Lemke refinance bill. This was the compromise between 1½ percent and 5½ percent. We will ultimately get the Frazier-Lemke Refinance Act.

It is for the same reason that I have consistently urged Congress to pass the cost-of-production bill. This cost-of-production bill would have increased the farmers' yearly income $7,500,000,000. Since every dollar of farm cash income increases the national income by $7.55, therefore the national income would have been increased by $56,625,000,000. That would have meant prosperity by "plenty" and not starvation by "scarcity"—by the curtailment and the destruction of agricultural wealth.

This bill would give 100 percent parity—cost of production on 70 agricultural products in place of 75 percent of parity on only 5. When this bill becomes a law the Government will no longer have to bail out the farmer—the farmer will then bail out the Government.

Again, it was for this same reason that I sponsored a bill to the effect that the unconstitutional hog-processing tax be paid back to the farmer. The evidence shows conclusively that the farmer paid this tax in lower prices. But Congress has not yet had the decency to pay back this tax illegally and fraudulently extracted from the hog producers. Oh, yes, we paid back all other unconstitutional taxes to the railroads, to the processors, to the packers, and to the cotton and tobacco growers; but the plea of the hog-producing farmer has been consistently ignored. They say the amount is too large. Query: If one steals enough, does that make it legal?

For the same reason I opposed the reciprocal-trade agreement law. In the last 7 years we have imported from foreign nations $8,373,652,981 of agricultural products, substitutes, and manufactured products thereof. That is the foreign valuation. The domestic valuation would be over $16,750,000,000. That is what the consumer paid. That is what our own people should have received instead of foreigners. In place of the stupid curtailment and destruction of agricultural wealth, it would require an additional 87,237,280 acres to produce sufficient agricultural products for our own people.

This would have been sufficient to have handed to every head of our 6,000,000 farm families a check for $2,790. That money would have done billions of dollars' worth of business in our own country. It would have kept the idle employed; it would have given buying power to the Nation.

During the 5 years that this reciprocal-trade agreement law has been in effect we have imported $6,189,997,000 worth of agricultural products and substitutes from foreign nations. Again, that is the foreign valuation. The domestic valuation would be $12,379,994,000—equal to a check of $2,063 for every one of our 6,000,000 farm families.

During the same 5 years we have imported 2,335,273 head of cattle and 758,466,496 pounds of meat and meat products. This was equivalent to another 1,896,166 head of cattle—making the total importation of meat equivalent to 4,235,439 head of cattle in 5 years. These our own people should have raised, not foreigners.

About a year ago 7,000 foreign geese were goose-stepping to United States dinner tables. They were driven 750 miles from Prince Edward Island to Mansfield, Mass.

On July 20, 1940, Argentine corn was sold in Boston in competition with American corn, although our Government and our farmers had millions of bushels in storage.

On September 7, 1940, Dr. Leopoldo Melo, chairman of the Argentine delegation to the Pan-American Conference in Havana, informed the American Chamber of Commerce that after the November election the United States would import Argentine meat. He stated:

> I am going to be indiscreet. Mr. Roosevelt told me that the present hour of political struggle is not propitious to raise this issue because some western Senators are possibly more inclined to listen to the aspirations of their voters than to the facts of the case as explained by the President.

Yes; more interested in American than in Argentine citizens.

Another way to serve the farm problem would be for the Government to encourage a 10-percent alcohol-gasoline blend. I have consistently supported and advocated this legislation. Some foreign nations use as high as 20- to 30-percent alcohol-gasoline blend. If we would require a 10-percent blend, then there would be no further question of an agricultural surplus. The surplus could be used in producing the alcohol. It is now admitted that a 10-percent alcohol-gasoline blend is just as good if not superior to the

regular gasoline. Eventually Congress will have to give us this legislation. Why not now?

Another factor in national defense is water. Our Nation has been going dry. I am glad that the Members of the semiarid States have consistently supported water conservation. Through the efforts of the North Dakota delegation the Buford-Trenton and the Lewis and Clarke projects in my own State are a reality. In addition, the Bowman-Haley, the Bismarck, and many other small irrigation projects are now being surveyed and investigated as to feasibility. These projects, I hope, will be granted by the Federal Government in the near future.

Over 5 years ago I introduced a real water conservation bill. This bill provides for a standing appropriation of five hundred million. This bill has for its object the creation of five hundred thousand to a million water holes, lakes, and water basins in the interior of the United States. Our water levels have fallen 52 feet since 1878. This bill will restore the water to its original levels—that will be real national defense.

Finally, as part of our national defense, let us give an assurance of security to all. Let us enact into law the Townsend national recovery plan. I cannot understand why some Members of Congress are so afraid that the people who have created the wealth of this Nation may get too much of it back. Old-age pension should be called old-age compensation, because any person who has worked at a useful occupation from the age of 20 to the age of 60 has produced enough wealth to take care of himself for the rest of his life.

This is not a pension; it is not charity; it is compensation for useful labor performed or for wealth actually created or produced. Owing to mechanical inventions and chemical discoveries we find that we now have an abundance for all. Our problem is no longer to produce more for fear that the morrow may not bring plenty, but rather how to distribute the things that we have and that are essential to our well-being.

The Government pensions its old mules at a dollar a day. It does not require the mule to sign away his birthright or stall, manger, or home as security so that when he goes to his reward the Government may get the dollar back. Neither does it ask the mule about his relatives and why they do not take care of him.

That same Government allows only 67 cents a day for its old people. But in many States before they can come under the Social Security Plan they have to sign away their homes and either prove that their relatives are unable to take care of them or that they are so mean and brutal that they will not do so. And this is the year 1940, and in the United States of America.

In conclusion, if the President and Congress want real national defense let them enact the program I have outlined above and this Nation need fear no other nation or combination of nations. We will then have a united, self-supporting, self-sustaining, and self-respecting people. No one need then question their patriotism.

Compare Our Problems With England's Problems—Part VI

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. THORKELSON

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, September 7, 1940

EXCERPT FROM THE ALIEN MENACE

Mr. THORKELSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting a series of excerpts from the Alien Menace, by Lt. Col. A. H. Lane, an officer in the British Army, who is more interested in England's welfare than he is in political expediency. He, like many in America, tells the truth. He hits the nail on the head, and he sets a good example for Members of Congress of the United States.

In reading this series, the Members will find that the same insidious influences which are undermining England, are also undermining the United States—so it behooves us to protect ourselves before it is too late.

ALIEN INFLUENCE IN EDUCATION

Our British educational institutions have been undermined by alien influence. Many of the professorial chairs and lectureships are held by men of alien race, while quite a perceptible proportion of the students are of alien blood.

We opened our educational institutions (many of them endowed by old benefactions and more recently subsidized by the British Exchequer) to all comers, irrespective of age or sex, race or creed. Age and sex matter little, but race and creed are fundamental. And now, alike among the teachers and the taught, an alien influence boding ill for English traditions, customs, and codes has long since sprung into existence and is making its presence felt. None of these elements loses any opportunity to abuse the tolerance which we have accorded them; their influence and activities are devoted to the promulgation of disloyal, seditious, and revolutionary teachings. They are eternally seeking to replace patriotism and nationalism by pacifism and internationalism. Alien people are corrupting our young, and they constitute a dangerous and weakening element in our midst.

Old foundations endowed for the purpose of teaching Christian children are passing into the hands of those who will use them as instruments by which the alien shall benefit and the native shall suffer.

But the subversive movement is not limited to the higher educational institutions; it embraces the elementary schools and (what is more alarming) our spheres of entertainment, particularly the films. As to the schools, the reader may perhaps remember that in a recent case reported in the press (in which a school teacher took action against a number of people for libel and won his case) we read that portraits of the King and Queen Victoria were removed from the school; a wooden model of the Cenotaph had also been removed; a number of boys from the Socialist Sunday school objected to singing Rule Britannia; and that the whole idea of Empire Day celebration by the school as a whole was given up. A report of the case appeared in the Times of July 17, 1928, and I recommend the reader to study it closely. It is illuminating as an example of the trend of political thought fostered in the minds of the young today.

The "red" schools—Socialist, Communist, or proletarian—are of alien birth and are maintained by alien funds and influence. The proletarian schools in our large cities and towns are blatantly blasphemous, filthy, and revolutionary in their teaching. They extol the Russian murderers as heroic figures. The Communist schools have been replaced by nuclei, on instructions from Moscow, which has adopted the newer doctrine that is to infect masses. Mass work is the new Communist creed, for it was found that the schools were insignificant and only helped those already converted to communism. The schools have disappeared to give way to the nuclei—the cells within the State schools, factories, and so forth—a method by which 2 or 3 Communists can scatter, day in and day out in worktime, in mealtime, and in playtime, the evil seed of communism, which later is to produce the bolshevisation of Britain.

The Socialist schools, now about 35 years old, are merely seedground for communism—the shadow before the substance. There are about 150 in number, and the teaching is watered communism, with a mild form of class hatred, and a set of prima facie altruistic precepts, only to be applied to fellow Socialists. There is generally a mass of doctrine leading the children to grow up to hate and despise their fellows; children (easy prey) whose nature and outlook become distorted—Communists in embryo.

The whole plan of these schools, nuclei, and so forth, being alien in origin, is fed by alien teachers, who give regular or occasional lectures of an un-English type, always antipatriotic, if not always openly disloyal. The British children are encouraged to correspond with Soviet children, and very evil are most of the replies coming here. They see plays and playlets with titles such as "Mr. God is not at Home," and altogether are cunningly made familiar with atheistic and anti-British ideas at every possible opportunity. And wherever one finds socialistic or communistic work proceeding, one will also find an alien in charge, or in close counsel with those conducting the diabolical work of poisoning the decent British child at its most impressionable age.

In 1861, a systematic attack was begun on our great public and our endowed schools. The Public Schools Commission investigated the condition of Eton and Winchester Colleges and the schools of Harrow, Shrewsbury, Rugby, Westminster, Charterhouse, St. Paul's and Merchant Taylors', while in 1864 the Taunton Commission, on which sat Dr. Jowett's friend, Frederick Temple, set to work to report on the other endowed schools. It is noteworthy that the former commission "received a memorandum on higher education in Prussia," furnished by Bethmann-Hollweg.[1] The commission's

report adversely criticized Eton College and the other public schools, and in 1868 an act radically "reformed" them.

Similarly, the very voluminous report of the Taunton Commission, which, according to Professor Adamson, was "greatly impressed" by the "example of Prussia with reference to the administrative side of their problem,"[2] was followed by drastic legislation in 1869. That both sets of schools needed remodeling cannot be gainsaid, but why the commissioners paid such attention to Prussian precedents it is difficult to understand. What suited militarized and despotic Prussia was not likely to suit pacific and democratic England and Wales. It is also, a most illuminating fact that the one wholly laudable thing in Prussian education, viz, the inculcation of patriotism, was not thought worthy of imitation here. In neither our public, endowed, nor our state schools have pupils, as in the United States been obliged daily to salute the national flag. Moreover, owing to Greek and Latin remaining compulsory subjects at Oxford and Cambridge Universities, the teachers, mostly classical men, in the public and endowed schools continued, as a rule, to look down on modern languages, with the result that the number of Britons who, before the Great War, could read, write and speak German and French remained very small, which distinctly benefited polyglot aliens and prevented any considerable section of our upper and middle classes properly observing the maneuvers of the House of Hohenzollern. Some hidden hands protected the Greek and Latin industries at Oxford and Cambridge.

Meanwhile politicians and agitators were clamoring loudly for State education, some of the serious objections to which were overlooked. In 1870, W. E. Forster, a Quaker, married to a sister of Dr. Jowett's friend, the Balliol agnostic, Matthew Arnold, who was an apostle of Kulture, spelt by him "Culture," passed an education act revolutionizing our system of elementary education. Accompanied by the foundation of the National Union of Elementary Teachers (later the National Union of Teachers), which has today such a stranglehold on our Government, it brought into existence school boards and board schools. In the new schools no religious catechism or religious formulary distinctive of any particular denomination was to be taught. At Forster's elbow was his brother-in-law, the poet Matthew Arnold.

"The bulk of the pioneer work which led to the act of 1870 was done by Matthew Arnold * * *. For the State control of education in Prussia he had nothing but praise * * *. On the whole, the example of Prussia in educational matters, as reported by Arnold, was one of the main causes of the passing of the act of 1870."[3]

At Forster's elbow, also, stood Anthony John Mundella. He was son of Antonio Mundella, an Italian refugee from a village near Como. In 1848 Mundella had been taken into partnership by Messrs. Hine & Co., hosiery manufacturers in Nottingham.

"His business took him to Chemnitz (in Saxony), where his firm had a branch factory; what he saw there led him to study the educational systems of Saxony, Prussia, and other States."[4]

Returned to Parliament in 1868, Mundella had become a prominent advocate of compulsory education for all, and "none" we are told, "rated more highly than Forster his (Mundella's) share in procuring the Education Act of 1870."[5] Appointed by Gladstone in 1880 vice president of the committee of the council for education, he was responsible for the act of 1880 making attendance at school compulsory.

The next great step in our elementary education, the unstatesmanlike Balfour Act of 1902, appears to have been the outcome of intrigues by the proalien Fabians.

"In May 1899 * * * a member's meeting (of the Fabian Society) was held to discuss the Educational Muddle and the Way Out in the form of 16 resolutions, 6 on General Principles and the remainder introduced by Sidney Webb (now Lord Passfield) and the General Principles, advocating the transfer of education to the local government authority and the abolition of school boards, were adopted. * * * At the adjourned meeting in November 1899 * * * a draft tract was submitted * * * and with minor amendments the scheme was adopted. It is unnecessary to describe the Fabian plan, because it is substantially the system of administration established by the act of 1902, under which present-day education is organized. * * * The scheme proposed by Mr (A. J.) Balfour followed almost precisely the lines laid down in our tract, which was published in January 1901. * * * Our support of the conservative Government in their education policy caused much surprise."[6]

Mr. (afterward Lord) Balfour abolished school boards, placed elementary education in the hands of municipal councils (i. e., of demagogs), and put denominational schools on the rates. Nothing did more, as Webb and his friends had doubtless anticipated, than did the act of 1902 to cause the electorate to reject the conservatives at the election of 1905. But worse for the nation was yet to come.

During the Great War, Mr. Lloyd George, to the amazement of everyone who knew Mr. Fisher's record, appointed Mr. H. A. L. Fisher president of the board of education. In the latter's education bill of 1918, which added hugely to the burdens of the taxpayers, there was no mention of science—the Great War apparently had not convinced Mr. Fisher of the importance of science—and Lord Sydenham's amendments to introduce elementary science into the curriculum, to fix the minimum hours for physical exercises, to embody training of the Boy Scouts and Girl Guides type, were, of course, rejected by the liberal pandit. Had those amendments been accepted it might, however, have given great offense to the aliens and the pro-aliens who, in 1918 were, as now, orienting the policy of our Government.

That aliens have gained control of our elementary education was forcibly brought home to me, personally, in 1928 in connection with an item before the London County Council meeting on February 7, 1928.

In the agenda there was a recommendation by the education committee to amend the standing order, which states that: "No persons other than natural-born British subjects shall be taken into the employment of the council either in a permanent or temporary capacity," by the inclusion of the words, "and naturalized British subjects."

Immediately I heard of the matter I communicated with several friends and well-known people on February 6 (the day before the meeting), and letters were sent to individual members of the council with the result that the amendment was not moved at the meeting "in deference to the adverse opinion expressed beforehand," as one member stated later. It was thought then that we, who had taken such energetic measures with conspicuous success, had no further need for troubling ourselves over this particular matter. We had, however, overlooked a mysterious influence and underrated the pertinacity of the promoters of the amendment. On December 4, 1938, the London County Council, without any adverse comment in the press, amended standing order 382 (which lays down that no persons other than natural-born British subjects shall be employed) so as to permit naturalized aliens to be employed in any capacity by the council. This means, of course, that German teachers can be employed in our schools and, as is well known, according to the law of the Fatherland, a German does not lose his nationality by becoming naturalized outside his country. "Once a German, always a German."

When the amendment was brought before the general purposes committee of the London County Council there was put forward as a reason for the amendment the fact that the recently naturalized aliens—Poles, Germans, Russians, etc.—who failed to secure employment, "would have to be given public assistance or charitable doles." This, to me, is a futile excuse, and it leads me to ask why should we allow these people to come to this country at all; and why naturalize them if, by so doing, we are compelled to find them employment to prevent them becoming a charge on the public?

Strong protests have been made against this unnecessary action by the council, and it was hoped that the decision to amend the standing order would be reversed, especially since it was pointed out to that body—if its members did not already know—that there was a long waiting list of British-born and fully qualified teachers seeking employment, and that there were 700,000 unemployed ex-service men. Seeing, however, that the London County Council each year is getting more and more under the control of people of recent alien extraction, I am afraid the hope is illusory.

Does not the above incident show how easily offical people may be induced to acquiesce in the relaxations of regulations? Moreover, what can one think of an education committee which, knowing that large numbers of British-born teachers are out of work, recommend aliens—who observe the mere formality of naturalization—to enter an already overcrowded field of our public service? Is it likely that they will teach their pupils from a British standpoint? It is now well known that the Communist Party do not concentrate so much on their "Red" schools, but rely on the Socialist teachers of council schools.

The vast majority of the teachers in our elementary schools are members of the N. U. T.; a considerable number of them belong to the Educational Workers' League, formerly the Teachers' Labour League, affiliated to the Educational Workers' International, an International formed in 1919 and manifestly designed for the purpose of bolshevising teachers.

The hub of academic socialism is the London School of Economics, founded in 1894 by the Fabirns, Mr. and Mrs. Sidney Webb (Mr. Webb had been educated in Switzerland and Mecklenburg-Schwerin), with the aid of the late Lord Haldane. Prof. J. H. Morgan, K. C., has thrown a flood of light on the aims of that institution's founders and endowers.

"When I once asked Lord Haldane why he persuaded his friend, Sir Ernest Cassel, to settle by his will large sums in trust on a certain educational establishment, the London School of Economics, of a peculiar type, six of whose teachers stood at the last general election as labor candidates, * * * he replied, 'Our object is to make this institution a place to raise and train the bureaucracy of the future Socialist state.'"[7]

Who were in 1929 at the London School of Economics "training the bureaucracy of the future Socialist state"? In that year

[2] Adamson's A Short History of Education, p. 313.
[3] Ibid, p. 390.
[4] The Encyclopedia and Dictionary of Education (Pitman), vol. II, p. 695.
[5] Dictionary of National Biography, Supplement, article Mundella.
[6] Ibid.
[7] Pease's History of the Fabian Society, 2d ed., pp. 143–146.
[7] Quarterly Review, January 1929, pp. 187–188.

among its appointed and recognized teachers were—nearly one-third of them—the following:

Frederick Rudolph Mackley de Paula, O. B. E., Sir Ernest Cassel professor of accountancy and business methods.

Edith Verena Eckhard, sociology.

Herman Finer, public administration and political economic science.

Morris Ginsberg, reader in sociology.

Theodor Emanuel Gugenheim Gregory, professor of banking and currency.

Harold Joseph Laski, professor of political science.

Hersh Lauterpacht, international law.

Bronislaw Malinowski, professor of anthropology.

Alexander Feliksovich Meyendorff, reader in Russian institutions and economics.

Charles Gabriel Seligman, professor of ethnology.

Sir Henry Herman Slesser (Schloesser), K. C., M. P., industrial law.

Edward Alexander Westermarck, Martin White professor of sociology.

Abraham Wolf, professor of logic and scientific method.

On the competence and patriotic sentiments of the above gentlemen and the lady I make not the slightest reflection, nor, of course, do I say that these teachers are aliens or naturalized aliens. Their forebears may have been here for generations, but the names do inevitably lend a foreign color to this educational institution.

There have been, also, citizens of the United States of America among the appointed and recognized teachers in this institution which receives from the British Government a grant of 40,000 pounds a year.

Since 1929 Sir Henry Slesser has been raised to the bench and made a Lord Justice of Appeal. But Messieurs Finer, Ginsberg, Gregory, Laski, Lauterpacht, Malinowski, Meyendorff, Seligman, Wolf, and the lady are there, while Mr. G. L. Schwartz, Mr. M. M. Postan, Mr. Emile Cammaerts, Dr. F. A. Hayek, Mr. J. C. Flugel, Dr. Margaret Posthuma, Mr. S. P. Turin, Mr. Jules Menken are professors or teachers at it, and, among the instructors with English names are the Socialist ex-Member of Parliament, the Right Honorable Hastings Bertrand Lees-Smith, reader in public administration, and the Balliol Socialist, R. H. Tawney, professor of economic history. The director of the London School of Economics is another Balliol man, Sir William Beveridge, whose anxiety, with the assistance of the British Broadcasting Corporation, to obtain an insight into the private affairs of his fellow countrymen and countrywomen, has recently brought him into the limelight.

At the London School of Economics an important pandit is the Mr. Harold Laski already referred to. He is a friend of Mr. H. A. L. Fisher, contributor to the Daily Herald, an instructor especially favored by the British Broadcasting Corporation and the most influential person on the education committee, London City Council, on which he was co-opted five years ago. Mr. Laski's record will be found in Potted Biographies, which shows his very revolutionary outlook.[5]

Born in 1893 and educated at New College, Oxford, he went in 1914 to America and was lecturer at universities there. When at Harvard from 1916 to 1920 he was assistant editor of the New Republic (New York), a subversive journal. During the Boston police strike he is alleged to have addressed and encouraged the strikers. In 1921 he and Mr. Tawney contributed an introduction to Lord Haldane's Problem of Nationalization. Five years later he was appointed professor of political science [sic] at the London School of Economics. His inaugural lecture was published with a dedication to his "friend Mr. Justice (now Lord) Sankey with enduring affection." Here are two extracts from his writings. The first is from his Karl Marx (1922), the second from his Communism (1927), a work in the Home University Library, two of the editors of which were in 1927 and are now Mr. H. A. L. Fisher and Prof. Gilbert Murray.

The Daily Express, October 30, 1931, reports that Mr. Lazarus Aaronson is lecturer in economics at the London University.

"Marx is, in fact, a noble but not an attractive figure. * * * When the roll of those to whom the emancipation of the people is due comes to be called, few will have a more honorable and none a more eminent place" (p. 46).

"Those who represent the Bolshevists as a set of unprincipled adventurers in German pay do sorry service to the understanding of the greatest event in history since the Reformation. * * * Most of their leaders, and notably Lenin and Trotsky * * * had dedicated their lives to the service of their cause. * * * It is illegitimate to question either their honesty or their idealism" (p. 45).

When we have a national government immune from alien influence one of its first actions should be to anglicize the London School of Economics. As at present constituted it is, in the opinion of many, a danger to the Empire, and I consider it to be a most unfortunate circumstance that Sir Otto Ernst Niemeyer in his tours through Australia and New Zealand was accompanied by one of its professors, Mr. Theodor Emanuel Gugenheim Gregory.

Mr. Gugenheim Gregory may be a most estimable individual, but patriots would have preferred that two other persons should have been sent on this important mission whose names would have recalled the old country to Australians and New Zealanders.

The author has had several letters from both these Dominions, some from leading men, deploring that these two men should have been dispatched. This mission was received with a good deal of suspicion, especially when Sir Otto Ernst Niemeyer advised the Dominions to borrow from the United States of America.

In conclusion, it should be pointed out that one of the greatest educational influences in this country is the press. Certain newspapers and periodicals, controlled by aliens or by people of recent alien extraction, have taken full advantage of this, especially since 1918. By a process of suggestion—clever, very gradual suggestion—these publications have reeducated a large proportion of our people, destroyed their patriotism and made them international and pacific.

[5] Potted Biographies, Boswell Publishing Co., 10 Essex Street, W. C. 2. Price, 6d.

Industry as Well as Men Must Hereafter Help the Nation Prepare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, September 7, 1940

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, there is nobody in this country who can truthfully imply in the slightest degree that I have not at all times shown appreciation of what this great country has done for me and millions of others; or that I have not at all times fought to the very utmost of my strength for the preservation of our free institutions and our democratic form of government as guaranteed by the Bill of Rights and the Constitution. I have left no stone unturned to oppose every effort of reactionary vested interests to infrange upon the individual civil rights of the people.

UNITED STATES STILL MIGHTIEST NATION OF FREE MEN ON EARTH

No one appreciates to a greater degree than I the advantages and blessings we enjoy in this free country of ours. Though not perfect it is still beyond any doubt the best and the greatest nation of free men on earth. The people have not been shorn of their rights, but for 150 years have enjoyed freedom of speech and freedom of action to an extent unknown in any other country on earth. These liberties I hope and pray will be theirs and their children's forever, and it is the determination they shall be preserved for posterity that is the motive that has inspired me to espouse the cause of selective training as an essential and absolutely necessary unit of our preparedness program. I consider this imperative upon me as a Member of the American Congress; I feel that I have no alternative.

It is my conviction before God that were I to hesitate in this it would mean that I had betrayed the people who have trusted me, and to whom I owe the responsibility of doing everything I can to prevent this country from being deprived of its liberties, yes, destroyed, as have been Austria, Poland, Czechoslovakia, France, Denmark, Belgium, and Norway, with Great Britain's fate still in doubt.

REAMS OF FALSE PROPAGANDA CIRCULATED AGAINST SELECTIVE-TRAINING BILL

These being my feelings and convictions, you will be able the better to understand, Mr. Speaker, how sincerely and deeply I regret that some of our young men and women are being misled by the shrewd, subtle, lying Nazi propaganda aimed at causing discord and disaffection in our country over this matter of selective training. Exactly the same tactics were used by the Nazi spies and provocateurs just preceding the use of armed force in the countries that I have enumerated and that are today no more. The dastardly lie that is being broadcast is that this bill is subtly aimed to deprive the people of their liberties, their rights, and their privileges as free citizens.

The truth is just the exact opposite of what the master Nazi propagandists are trying to make the American people believe. Instead of trying to take liberties away from the

American people, we are trying to fortify the Nation so that this madman Hitler cannot do that very thing himself.

NO PRICE IS TOO HIGH TO PAY FOR THE PRESERVATION OF OUR NATION

Mr. Speaker, the United States is a nation worth training our young men to save. It is worth spending every last dollar in the Treasury to protect. It is the duty of Congress to do it, and we intend to, criticism or no criticism, appreciation by those who have been deceived as to the real condition of affairs or no appreciation.

Mr. Speaker, this country, our own beloved United States of America, is the last bulwark of real democracy in a world controlled by dictators bent on destroying every remaining nation that dares to stand for the principle of government of the people, by the people, and for the people.

DICTATORS FROM BEYOND THE SEAS WILL FIND US PREPARED IF THEY COME TO OUR SHORES

Hitler, Mussolini, and the Japanese war lords do not want peoples to control their own governments through the ballot box because they want to control them all themselves—for themselves—through coercion backed by swords and cannon, spies, plots, intrigues, and "fifth columnists," bombers and submarines, wholesale death and destruction of men, women, and children; by murder itself, Mr. Speaker, whenever considered in the least essentially important in the plans of the dictators.

But they shall not get the United States of America, Mr. Speaker, not if under heaven this administration and this Congress can prevent it.

SELECTIVE-TRAINING BILL ENDS OLD LIE THAT INDUSTRY IS MORE SACRED THAN HUMAN BEINGS

I regret exceedingly that any discourtesies have been shown to the young men and women who have come here to protest against this bill. I can understand their viewpoints, especially in view of the countless misrepresentations that have been made about it by subversive agitators. But I cannot overlook or forgive the hostile attitude of big business toward the proposal to take over even under proper safeguards industrial plants refusing to cooperate with the Government. In a recent editorial in the Wall Street Journal, for instance, I noted the following:

> Because there is a selective-service bill before Congress, there is some loose talk to the effect that consideration should be given also to a draft of capital.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, Wall Street wants all the protection that will come to it and the country as a result of selective training, but it considers it mere "loose talk" when the great industrialists are asked to do their part and share responsibility in the preparedness program that is necessary to make this country safe from invasion and disaster.

Such an attitude is repulsive, reprehensible, and indecent when the young people are asked to be ready and prepared to give with their lives if necessary.

That is why, Mr. Speaker, I worked and voted for the Smith amendment, which I am glad to say was adopted and will require that American industry, unlike during the World War, must hereafter and forever do its full share along with the youth of the land.

Is Charles Fahy Qualified for the Position of Assistant Solicitor General?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT J. ENGEL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, September 7, 1940

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I desire to comment upon the appointment of Mr. Charles Fahy, former General Counsel of the National Labor Relations Board, to the position of Assistant Solicitor General of the United States.

I had the privilege of listening to Mr. Fahy's testimony and of cross-examining him at the hearing before the Labor-Federal Security Agency Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee on March 1, 1940. I am forced to the conclusion that Mr. Fahy's legal judgment is either badly warped or he deliberately misconstrues laws, permitting his prejudices to sway him.

Shortly after the World War Congress, and the Appropriations Committee as an agency of Congress, attempted to save the taxpayers of America money by discontinuing temporary wartime agencies. The result was the sending of bushels of telegrams and letters to Members of Congress and members of the Appropriations Committee by various people, protesting against the discontinuance of such temporary agencies. An investigation disclosed that these telegrams and letters were at least partially instigated by the agencies which Congress sought to discontinue, such agencies, using public funds to send telegrams, and so forth, to various people, getting them to write Congress. The result was the enactment of section 201, title 18, of the United States Code, Annotated, making such actions illegal. The Labor-Federal Security Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee asked the National Labor Relations Board to furnish the committee—and there will be found on pages 600–601 of the subcommittee hearings a table showing the telephone and telegraph charges month by month, region by region, both fixed and long distance, from July 1, 1938, through December 31, 1939. No one can examine this table without coming to the conclusion that the telegraph and telephone messages increased materially during the sessions of Congress and particularly during the months that the National Labor Relations Board appropriation or legislative bills were before the House.

The subcommittee went into this matter carefully and Mr. Madden and Mr. Fahy held that such action was not illegal and not a violation of the criminal law. I call attention to the following testimony found on pages 597–598:

> Mr. MADDEN. Just let me say, Mr. Congressman, that the evidence which we gave the Smith committee does indicate the fact that in 1937 there were some telegrams and telephone conversations from Washington and there were some made from some of our regional offices to outside people, a good many of them labor unions, pointing out to them that on a certain day in August the House Committee on Appropriations reported out a bill which had reduced the estimate of the Bureau of the Budget by 50 percent.
>
> * * * * * * * *
>
> Mr. SHEPPARD. Do you think it is a good policy for your organization to spend money indirectly or directly to attempt to influence the Appropriations Committee or its members in their judgment of what should be done with appropriation bills?
>
> Mr. MADDEN. I think there is a very serious question as to whether it is a proper policy or not.
>
> Mr. ENGEL. Was not that procedure a violation of criminal law, Mr. Fahy?
>
> Mr. FAHY. I do not think so.
>
> Mr. ENGEL. Is there not a law on the statute books which provides that the using of any funds for or by a department or by Government employees which are appropriated by Congress from public funds to influence Congress is a criminal law violation?
>
> Mr. FAHY. I am familiar with the statute to which you refer. It was passed in 1919 and is section 201 of title 18 of the United States Code, Annotated. That section does provide that none of the money appropriated by any act shall be used directly or indirectly to pay for personal services, telegrams and telephones, advertisements, or other devices designed or intended to influence a Congressman in connection with his vote on legislation.
>
> Mr. ENGEL. That is right; that is the law I refer to.
>
> You mean to tell me that the Board could use these public funds legally to send telegrams to the American Federation of Labor units all over the United States or the C. I. O. or other organizations trying to get them to influence Congress to increase your appropriation and do it legally?
>
> Mr. FAHY. I do not think the statute I referred to covers that situation.
>
> Mr. ENGEL. I do not want to go into detail——
>
> Mr. MADDEN. Would it be fair for me to ask you a question as long as this has been brought up?
>
> Mr. ENGEL. I am asking the questions and you are answering them.

I wish especially to call attention to the comment by the gentleman from Georgia, Judge TARVER, Democrat and chairman of the subcommittee upon this subject:

> Mr. TARVER. Let me submit this observation for the record. I think the position which has been taken by Mr. Fahy here is absolutely untenable and that the language in the code section which has been

discussed expressly prohibits the use of any fund carried in any appropriation bill passed by the Congress by the agency to whose use it was appropriated for the purpose of trying to influence the judgment of Congress with regard to any matter of appropriation. And if that is not sufficiently clear to Mr. Fahy and to the Board, I certainly feel that this committee should make it sufficiently clear and doubtless will, in language which will be incorporated in this pending bill.

Judge TARVER is a former judge and one of the ablest chairmen that I have ever served under. His fairness and the nonpolitical way in which he handled his bill was outstanding. His legal knowledge and his ability to analyze and bring out facts is clearly demonstrated by the pages of testimony of the hearing.

It is noted that he differed entirely with Mr. Fahy's conclusion and takes the position, and properly so, that the sending of telegrams to organizations to get such organizations to influence Congress to increase their department's appropriation is absolutely illegal and violates that provision of law which provides, according to Mr. Fahy's own testimony, that—

None of the money appropriated by any act shall be used, directly or indirectly, to pay for personal services, telegrams and telephones, advertisements, or other devices designed or intended to influence a Congressman in connection with his vote on legislation.

Mr. Fahy has either deliberately misconstrued an act of Congress in order to help a department of this Government to violate the law of the United States or he has displayed a colossal ignorance of the plain and simple rules of statutory interpretation. He has shown himself to be absolutely unfit to occupy the position of Assistant Solicitor General of the United States. I further respectfully submit that the testimony of former Chairman Madden, in effect, constitutes a confession that he and the Board violated a Federal criminal statute. There are those who feel that, instead of having been made Assistant Solicitor General, Mr. Fahy and the National Labor Relations Board might well have been indicted for violating a criminal statute of the United States.

War If Roosevelt Wins

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEWIS D. THILL
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 7, 1940

ARTICLE FROM WASHINGTON TIMES-HERALD

Mr. THILL. Mr. Speaker, the actions of President Roosevelt point clearly to war. Disregarding the desires of the people in this country and contrary to the expressed opinion of Members of Congress, Roosevelt is taking those fateful steps which can only lead to war. Just recently he transferred destroyers to England in direct contravention of law and without any authority except specious legal reasoning of the Attorney General to back him in his action.

The following newspaper article is worth reading:

[From the Washington Times-Herald of September 6, 1940]

WAR IN 2 WEEKS IF F. D. WINS, JOHNSON SAYS—GENERAL CHARGES PRESIDENT PLANS HITLER-LIKE RULE

PHILADELPHIA, September 6.—Gen. Hugh S. Johnson declared here last night that if President Roosevelt is reelected he will take the Nation into war within 2 weeks and will set up a wartime dictatorship as drastic as Hitler's.

He made this prophecy to reporters a few minutes after he had delivered a Nation-wide radio address launching the "Defend America First Committee," which he has helped to establish to oppose the powerful "Defend America by Aiding the Allies Committee."

PRAISES WILLKIE STAND

"I believe already he has reached an understanding with Great Britain that those 50 destroyers he has given them are only the beginning," said Johnson. "Everybody in Washington who is in a position to know takes you by the lapel, crosses your heart and makes you promise to die if you ever tell, and whispers that we're on our way to war. You can bet your life it's the truth."

General Johnson then said that the election of Wendell Willkie will insure that "whatever actions are taken they will be taken by legal means."

"Willkie stands for aiding England, but not if we have to twist and dodge and break laws to do it. He stands for defending America first," he said.

FLAYS FLEET POLICY

General Johnson's radio address was a blistering attack on both President Roosevelt and the Aid the Allies Committee. He charged that:

1. Roosevelt ought to move the United States Fleet into the Atlantic to "face Hitler," but instead is keeping it in the Pacific to "protect the British Empire." That policy, he said, may get us into war any day with Japan.

2. The United States is trying to keep out of war by "getting into war" and to "save our democracy by giving up our democracy."

Compare Our Problems With England's Problems—Part VII

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. THORKELSON
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 7, 1940

EXCERPTS FROM THE ALIEN MENACE

Mr. THORKELSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting a series of excerpts from the Alien Menace, by Lt. Col. Q. H. Lane, an officer in the British Army, who is more interested in England's welfare than he is in political expediency. He, like many in America, tells the truth. He hits the nail on the head, and he sets a good example for Members of Congress of the United States.

In reading this series the Members will find that the same insidious influences which are undermining England are also undermining the United States. So it behooves us to protect ourselves before it is too late.

THE HIDDEN HAND

Most investigators of the Bolshevist revolution in Russia have observed a close connection between the leaders of bolshevism and certain groups of international financiers. A full and complete record of the part played by certain eminent international financiers of Berlin, London, and New York in the Russian revolution of October 1917, and in the subsequent extension of Bolshevist propaganda, especially within the British Empire, would throw a flood of light upon many otherwise inexplicable events since the end of the Great War. In the second edition of this book brief reference was made to this connection between international finance and bolshevism, but it is now necessary with more information available and with increasing evidence of alien interference with and control of British finance, industry, and politics, to discuss this connection more fully.

To my mind there is no doubt that bolshevism is controlled by a combination of internationalists in which those of the Jewish faith predominate. In 1919, a section of the Jewish press in London openly encouraged bolshevism and Bolshevist propaganda in this country, and so strong was the advocacy that the Morning Post had to give wide publicity to the whole matter until it drew a letter (which appeared on April 23, 1919) signed by Lionel de Rothschild, Lord Swaythling, Sir Philip Magnus, Sir Marcus Samuel, Harry S. Samuel, Leonard L. Cohen, I. Gollancz, General Sir John Monash, Claude G. Montefiore, and Isidore Spielmann, in which these gentlemen admitted with deepest concern and sincere regret the publication of Bolshevist propaganda in sections of the Jewish press, and welcomed the suggestion that British Jews should disassociate themselves from a cause which is harmful. Prior to this letter there had not appeared any expression of Jewish disapproval of bolshevism.

A statement in the Times of March 29, 1919, shows that of the 20 or 30 commissaries, or leaders, who provide the central machinery of the Bolshevist movement, not less than 75 percent are Jews. * * * Among the minor Soviet officials the number is legion.

It is generally known that when Lenin and Trotsky went to Russia in 1917 to start the Bolshevist revolution, the way for which had been prepared by the Kerensky revolution of March in

the same year, they received large sums of money from Germany. This fact has always raised the more important and interesting question: Who enabled Germany to provide the money for this sinister gang of revolutionaries? It is now known and clearly proved that the money was provided by a group of international financiers with headquarters in Berlin, Stockholm, and New York. Quite apart from the desire of the German militarists to force Russia out of the war and their readiness to employ Lenin and his associates for this purpose, the international financiers of Berlin, London, and New York, for their own private reasons, also wished to destroy the old regime in Russia. For this purpose they naturally availed themselves of the opportunity provided by Germany's military situation and needs; and in anticipation of their ultimate aims, selected and financed members of their own race to carry out their plans in Russia. While Lenin took with him from Switzerland a number of alien revolutionaries collected from all parts of Europe, his chief lieutenant, Trotsky, brought with him a horde of aliens from the United States. Most of these aliens had in previous years been forced to leave Europe on account of their revolutionary and criminal activities, and had in the meantime found a temporary place of refuge in America. A considerable number of them were ex-convicts. Trotsky himself was in prison in Halifax, Nova Scotia, when the call came for him to join Lenin in Russia. His release from prison so that he might assist Lenin in organizing the Bolshevist revolution is a mystery that has never been explained. What powerful influence compelled the British authorities to order his release and to grant permission for his transport to Russia? While there have been rumors that the order for his release came from a responsible person in the British Government, no authentic explanation has ever been published concerning this act of treachery to both Britain and Russia.

This alien attack upon Russia was not unpremeditated. It was part of a considered plan that had been maturing for many years and in which leading Jewish financiers had displayed much interest. Mr. Wickham Steed, in his book, Through Thirty Years, states "that the late Jacob H. Schiff, the well-known American banker, was known to be anxious to secure recognition for the Bolshevists, among whom Jewish influence was predominant." This is the Jacob Schiff who financed Japan in her war against Russia in 1904–5. He was then head of the banking firm of Kuhn, Loeb & Co., New York, and in the Jewish Encyclopedia, 1906, we read: "It (Schiff's firm) subscribed for and floated the large Japanese war loan in 1904–5, in recognition of which the Mikado conferred on Schiff the second order of the Sacred Treasure of Japan."

This reference to the help given to Japan in the Russo-Japanese War by this firm of international financiers—and a firm whose ramifications are today almost world-wide—recalls the 1905 revolution in Russia. In that revolution a worker's soviet was formed with Leon Braunstein (now known as Trotsky) as its leader. When Braunstein had the misfortune to be arrested his place in the Soviet was taken by another member of the same race who is almost equal in fame as a revolutionary. This was a Dr. Helphand, whose literary pseudonym was "Parvus." He was the mysterious possessor of considerable wealth, and he appears to have found that the advocacy of communism could be combined with the acquisition of riches. This man was an ideal person to act as go-between for the financiers and the German militarists in their relations with Lenin and Trotsky. Valeriu Marcu, in his biography of Lenin (Victor Gollancz, London, 1928) says (p. 38):

"Parvus, a friend of Trotsky as far back as 1905, had set out to prove that the master's (Lenin's) theories could also bring good fortune to the individual in business life, and accordingly had speculated during the war, as a true internationalist in Berlin, Copenhagen, Vienna, and Constantinople; now hoping for political laurels, he advised the foreign minister at Berlin to let Lenin 'pass through.'"

This internationalist, who appears to have enriched himself by his contacts with many countries, made Stockholm his chief center of operations, both financial and socialistic, during the war. Here he established a Socialist bureau, and from this bureau he arranged the abortive Socialist peace conference in 1917. This conference would have been attended by certain British Socialist leaders who were then on intimate terms with Parvus, but they were, it will be remembered, prevented from reaching Stockholm by the action of the late Havelock Wilson and his patriotic seamen. At that time persons who were secretly meeting the enemies of our country, were not as popular as they are today; they were regarded as traitors. Associated with Parvus was a friend named Ganetsky-Furstenburg, whose international financial interests were as extensive and as mysterious as those of Parvus. Mrs. Harold Williams, in her book, From Liberty to Brest-Litovsk (Macmillan, 1919), says that it was through this mysterious person that "the Bolshevists used to obtain large sums of money from an unknown source abroad." She quotes the Russian Socialists (not Bolshevists) Plekhanoff and Pankratieff, who stated that they had "documentary proofs that the Bolshevists had received money from Berlin, through Stockholm. Even the banks were named: The Disconto-Gelleschaft, Nya Bank, the Siberian Bank. The names of the intermediaries were also given: Parvus, Ganetsky, Summonson, and Kozlousky" (p. 144). Similar information, Mrs. Williams adds, was given by the Procurator of the Kerensky Government in documents published, August 3, 1917, in which it was shown that large sums of money had reached Petrograd from Dr. Helphand (Parvus), a Russian Jew, who is described as an obscure international speculator who acquired an enormous fortune, and styled himself as the ideal inspirer of bolshevism.

How these subsidized alien revolutionaries, having invaded Russia, proceeded to murder and rob on a wholesale scale has been recorded by many persons who had the misfortune to be in Russia during the Bolshevik Revolution. All are agreed that the leaders of the revolution and the persons responsible for the most brutal and revolting murders were Jews. No more terrible account of the horrors of this Jewish invasion and conquest of Russia has been written than that of Mr. Robert Wilton, Times correspondent in Russia before and during the Great War, and during the first and second revolutions. In his book, The Last Days of the Romanovs, Mr. Wilson shows from personal investigations that the foul murder of the Czar and his family was arranged and carried out by Jews.

"The Germans," says Mr. Wilton, "knew what they were doing when they sent Lenin's pack of Jews into Russia. * * * The whole record of Bolshevism in Russia is indelibly impressed with the stamp of alien invasion. The murder of the Tsar, deliberately planned by the Jew Sverdlow (who came to Russia as a paid agent of Germany) and carried out by the Jews Goloshchekin, Syromolotov, Safarov, Volkov, and Yurovsky, is the act not of the Russian people, but of this hostile invader."[1]

For the crimes and horrors of the Russian Revolution the Germans, and their financial backers in the Great War, are morally responsible.

I have not the space for further details of this plot of alien financiers to organize a world revolution, beginning with the Bolshevist Revolution in Russia. Those who wish to go further into the history of this plot against civilization should consult the books from which I have quoted; also the Russia's Ruin, by Wilcox (Chapman & Hall, 1919). The study of this financial aspect of the Bolshevist Revolution of 1917 can only lead to one conclusion, namely, that the revolution could never have been achieved by Lenin and Trotsky without the aid of considerable financial resources. As Mrs. Williams says, page 291 of her book:

"One is forced to draw the conclusion that the hundreds of thousands, or rather millions, spent by Lenin and his followers were furnished to them from some exchequer which had millions at its disposal. Only banks and the state exchequers have the possibility of subsidizing propaganda on such a scale."

The most complete record of these financial arrangements made with Lenin and his associates is the Sisson Report, published by the American Committee on Public Information. This report gives in Document 28 full particulars of the millions received by the Bolshevist leaders from the German Imperial Bank via Stockholm. In Documents 10 and 11, extracts are published from a resolution sent by the German commercial banks to the chairman of the Bolshevist Central Executive, declaring that "the German banks after the war were to control Russian industry." This is important, because the post-war relations of the German financiers and their associates in New York, London, and Stockholm, with Soviet Russia, tend to confirm this resolution. Keeping this resolution in mind, let us now turn to post-war bolshevism.

One of the post-war links between international finance and bolshevism was the late Leonid Borisovitch Krassin, a native of Siberia. Krassin, who in his student days had been a revolutionary, was an engineer, and, like Parvus, had combined revolutionary activities with a successful business career. After taking part in a revolutionary plot in Russia in 1907, he escaped to Berlin where he obtained employment in the firm of Siemens Schuckert, which was affiliated to Allgemeine Elektrizitats Gesellschaft. In 1909 he became a director of the St. Petersburg branch of this firm. Early in 1917 we find him in Stockholm in association with the mysterious friend of Parvus—the German-Jewish financial agent, Ganetsky-Furstenburg, to whom I have already referred. With this financial agent Krassin traveled to Berlin. As it was at this period in 1919 that the financial arrangements were made in Berlin for the transfer of Lenin and his alien gang of conspirators and cut-throats to Russia, it is not surprising to find Krassin, after the Bolshevist coup d'état, resuming his old position in Russia as the representative of Siemens Schuckert. Among Krassin's most powerful supporters in Germany were the international financiers—Hugo Stinnes; Felix Deutsch, manager of the A. E. G.; and Walter Rathenau, president of the same concern. As Mrs. Nesta Webster says in The Surrender of an Empire, page 107:

"Krassin thus played a dual role, on one hand representing the interests of the great German-Jewish capitalists and on the other acting as the lieutenant of Lenin, whose avowed aim was to destroy capitalism. If any further evidence was needed of the connection between bolshevism and international finance, the case of Krassin would provide it."

In 1921 Krassin came to London as leader of the Soviet Trade Delegation—the negotiations for which had been initiated by persons in the city of London with powerful international financial interests behind them. Some of these same Anglo-German interests in the city had been mixed up in the Marconi scandal of 1912, and now they found in Krassin the man to further their scheme to link this country with their Germano-Russian enter-

[1] Times articles by Robert Wilton, August 1929. The book is now out of print. Long extracts from the book were published in The Patriot, April 10 and 17, 1930.

prise. This enterprise was in accordance with the resolution of the German Commercial Bank quoted in the Sisson Report, to secure, after the war, the exploitation of Russian resources by the international financiers of Berlin. To further these aims, Stinnes, Felix Deutsch, and Walter Rathenau, the A. E. G. chiefs and friends of Krassin, came also to London in 1921. The object of their visit was to open negotiations to form an international syndicate to undertake the reconstruction of Russia. It is known that these visitors had private and confidential interviews in London with politicians and financiers, and the Vossiche Zeitung stated that the visit "was for the purpose of arranging with the British Government a project for the combined exploitation of Russia by Great Britain and Germany." (See The Surrender of an Empire, p. 121. Also Morning Post, December 16, 1921.)

The Evening News (London) reported on January 11, 1922, that Krassin was again in Berlin conferring with Rathenau. All these negotiations after the war were consistent with the policy and intentions of the international financiers, with the German group at their head, who had established bolshevism in Russia. Having succeeded in destroying Russia and in placing it under the corrupt and despotic rule of an alien oligarchy, it only remained, as the Morning Post, March 19, 1921, had said, "for the international capitalist, who is the paymaster, to exploit Russia." And it added: "It is well known that there are certain syndicates in this country, mainly Jewish, that have long been willing to trade with Russia." This connection between bolshevism and international finance is very clearly shown by M. Andre Cheradame in his book La Mystification des Peuples Allies, in which he asserts, on the evidence he had obtained, that the communists had been backed up throughout by the Deutsche Bank, which maintained relations with German-Jewish financiers, naturalized as English or American in London and New York.

"Bolshevism," he states, "leads necessarily to the exploitation of Russia for the profit of a syndicate of supercapitalists, of which the real leaders are Jews and Germans."

This statement supports Rathenau's own declaration that "300 men, all acquainted with each other, control the economic destiny of the continent."

At that time Rathenau was one of the 300 and was associated with 84 large concerns. Mrs. Webster, reviewing these facts, says: "Viewed from this angle the trade agreement with Great Britain and Russia in 1921 takes on a different aspect. No longer a compact with a derelict empire, but with the most formidable power in the world, the power of international finance, it is seen not as an act of folly but as a surrender to forces with which it authors were either unable or unwilling to contend."

That Mrs. Webster is right is proved by more recent events. The Bolshevist danger to this country lies not so much in Communist propaganda per se, but in the fact that bolshevism is one of several weapons employed by alien financial interests to bring Britain and the British Empire under their control and domination. What they have done in Russia they may do here by similar methods. I shall deal more fully with this influence of alien finance in Britain in another chapter. But before concluding this survey of the relations of alien financiers with bolshevism I will quote some recent evidence to show that this connection still exists and is in some measure responsible for the financial crisis in Europe, and threatens the security and solvency of our own country. Our financial crisis in July 1931 was largely due to the international financiers in the city of London having granted large credits to Germany, which Germany declared herself unable to repay. The newspapers described these loans or credits as being "frozen" in Germany. This statement was not strictly correct. Germany had passed on these loans or a good portion of them to Soviet Russia, and it was in Russia where they were—or are still—"frozen." The financial collapse of Germany, or even of Great Britain, would not necessarily mean any loss to the international financiers who wrangled our money into Soviet Russia. The money is at least in the keeping of members of the same international family. The following extracts from recent statements on this question of "frozen" credits not only prove that the relations between international finance and bolshevism continue, but they suggest that these relations may have serious consequences for this country.

On September 18, 1931, Mr. James W. Gerard, American Ambassador in Berlin during the war, after returning from a visit to Europe, declared that Germany "did not need any financial assistance and that a large percentage of the loans from the United States was lent to Russia." He added: "If we're going to do business with Russia, let us do it directly and not through Germany, which has arranged to give Soviet Russia millions of dollars' credit to purchase commodities in Germany." [2]

Mr. Gerard does not mention the fact that the American financiers who arranged the American loans to Germany have both blood and business relations with the German financiers who passed those loans on to other members of the same fraternity in Russia. This story of Germany passing loans received from England and America to Russia has been told many times in the socialist journal Forward, and the story is now confirmed by a paper closely associated with Soviet interests. The British Russian Gazette and Trade Outlook, December 1931, said in an editorial article:

"It must be ironic for them [British manufacturers] to view the forced cessation of work on the giant Cunard liner, which is attributed to this country's 'frozen' credits in Germany, credits which have been used in great part by Germany to finance orders from Russia. During 1931 orders amounting to over £45,000,000 have been placed with German firms by the Soviet buying organizations."

Further information on these credits was given by Lord Beaverbrook in an address at Lincoln, reported in the Daily Express, January 16, 1932. Speaking on German reparations, Lord Beaverbrook said: "It is true that Germany owes our international financiers in the city of London £50,000,000. * * * Our international financiers in the city borrowed that money from France and America and paid 2 percent for the accommodation. They lent it to Germany for 8 percent. And what did Germany do with the money? She lent it to Russia for 15 percent interest. That is what became of the money."

Lord Beaverbrook added that "these buck-jumping financiers * * * have ramifications all over Europe. We need not worry ourselves about them." While Lord Beaverbrook is correct in his account of the operations and ramifications of these international financiers, he is wrong in saying we need not worry about them. We have every reason to be concerned over this alien control and direction of our finances, politics, and industries, as I shall show in another chapter. How, for instance, can Lord Beaverbrook's Empire Free Trade proposals be fully adopted while Britain and a large part of the British Empire are dominated by powerful alien financiers, whose interests are not reconcilable with the national and imperial interests and needs of this country?

In this chapter I have shown how international financiers, working through their German connections, have supported bolshevism in Russia. I have also shown that even now the connections between these financiers and Soviet Russia continues and is, by means of credits, obtained from England and America, enabling a corrupt alien oligarchy to maintain its control in Russia and to extend its demoralizing influence far beyond the frontiers of the Soviet Union. Though the Communists profess to hate capitalism and order their paid agents in England to cry "Down with the capitalists," the leaders in Russia never fail to give the international financiers a hearty welcome whenever they visit the U. S. S. R. When Felix M. Warburg, of New York, visited Russia in 1927, he had a great reception, and the speeches delivered on that occasion indicated that the Bolshevist leaders and the leaders of world finance understood each other very well, that their aims were not dissimilar, and altogether they were a united family working in their respective ways for a common end.[3]

Felix M. Warburg, and his brother, the late Paul Warburg, both of New York, came to the United States of America from Hamburg and belong to the German banking firm of that name. They became partners of Jacob H. Schiff in the firm of Kuhn, Loeb & Co., and Paul, who organized the Federal Reserve Bank, became the dominant force in New York banking and finance circles. That certain financial groups in the United States had, and still have, close relations with the German financiers who found the money for Lenin's adventure in Russia, is a well-known fact, and that one or more of these American groups assisted the same adventure through Trotsky is more than probable. Trotsky, we know, was mysteriously released from prison at Halifax (Nova Scotia) and provided with the means to enable him and his associates from New York, mostly very undesirable aliens, to proceed to Russia.

The facts submitted in this chapter leave little room for doubt concerning the financial backing of bolshevism not only during the Great War but right down to the present time. Not only is Russia today governed and ruthlessly ruled by an alien gang but this gang has been, from the very beginning, financed and maintained by a group of international financiers who are also aliens in the sense that their aims and objects are inconsistent with the national desires and purposes of the countries and peoples they dominate. Knowing what we do today of the power and ramifications of these international financiers, who exploit all nations, can we say England is not under their control and direction?

[2] See National Review, January 1932.

[3] See The Patriot, June 9, 1927, and La Croisade (Paris), April 1931.

The Burke-Wadsworth Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONARD W. HALL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 7, 1940

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL. Mr. Speaker, my statement shall be brief. I have already indicated that as an inexorable need I would support the Burke-Wadsworth bill, with or without the Hayden-Fish amendment. And I think we have precisely

that sort of need today. And also I have indicated that in any measure of this kind I would work for and support, as an amendment, the principle of giving the volunteer system a clean-cut opportunity to prove its merits.

When the Hayden-Fish amendment was brought before the House I supported it. It is true, it hems in the volunteer system within an obviously narrow and rigid period, 60 days. But this is the first opportunity we have had to impress our views on this vital subject. The administration for months and months has elected, for its own good reasons—or, more probably, lack of foresight—not to give a real volunteer system a chance. Consistently, even from the beginning of the European war, it has held stubbornly to the 3-year enlistment period, and on the inducement to enlistment of a pay of $21 per month. And to volunteers who offered themselves, even at this pay rate for service of 1 year, recruitment in the Army was shut; they were told they were not wanted.

But the House has now adopted the amendment, and I think it is a most salutary contribution to the bill. There are some who dare say that its term will delay a proper assembly of men, in quantity and in quality. These statements, however, come from the leaders of this administration, who vote on orders, anyway. The fact of the matter is that the Hayden-Fish amendment will not delay the draft—and that is what induction into the service is—one single minute. It will not delay registration, classification, or the act of induction itself. If I thought that it would, and obviously in view of my announced position to support this bill, naturally I would have been against the amendment. And on the other side of the Capitol, many of those in favor of the Burke-Wadsworth bill, including one of its strongest advocates, the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], likewise supported the Hayden amendment. And in the House, the author of this measure, the esteemed gentleman from my own State, Mr. WADSWORTH, in explaining the operations of the draft machinery and indicating the time that actual inductions would be made, in effect conceded that there would be no delay by operation of the Hayden-Fish amendment. It is true he opposed it on other considerations, but he made no charge that this amendment would in any way delay the draft.

This amendment simply extends the permission, the encouragement, and the right to enlist under our traditional volunteer system. It is intended to give that system a fair chance. The Army wants 400,000 men by the 1st of January of next year. If the volunteer system does not produce that number within the 60-day period provided then the conscription machinery will operate. And do not forget that, according to the author of this bill, the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH], actual inductions into the service may absolutely not be expected until immediately around the 15th of November. The 60-day period would be over by that time. So much for the charge that to give American boys a chance to enlist in line with our best traditions and ideals is delaying national defense.

I hope that the membership of the House will keep crystal clear the fundamental, the underlying, purpose of this bill—the assembly of qualified men, in the numbers admitted to be necessary, to assure our Nation of a defense system that cannot be successfully assailed. It is the need for men that is the mainspring for the consideration of this measure. Men and time, both.

I think it has been made perfectly obvious here that if these were half normal times we would not even receive for consideration in the House a bill providing for compulsory military service in peacetime. I know I would not. And if we had the confident choice from an ability to predict our precise situation at any time, and in relationship to any part of the world, I also feel that we would come to compulsory service only as the result of our participation in war.

But we cannot predict our precise situation in the world of tomorrow. These are simply unpredictable times. Part of the world today is being consumed by the flames of war. Whether those flames will spread or subside, nobody knows. But simple realism dictates that in a world enguifed in war we must take every needed step that common, unadorned, everyday prudence, dictates. And that is that we shall have a defense system that will be strong enough to safeguard our security, our welfare, and our destiny.

There are many people in our country who do not strain at conscription in peacetime, whether there is an emergency or not. They are not bothered whether the volunteer system can produce the men needed. They prefer the conscription system on many considerations. I do not. But I shall embrace it if there is no other way out. The need is for men, and we must get them, and in the time shown to be necessary, under either of the alternatives.

In the perfection of this bill we cannot give too painstaking efforts. I have in mind especially consideration of all those parts of the bill bestowing power on the Executive. I hope that he will not be given one single grant of power that is not necessary as an essential of national defense.

This is a peacetime measure, to help assure by the creation of an unassailable defense system, the peace of America. To such an objective, there can be no objection. There are those who fear that it is really intended for aggressive war by us.

I simply want again to make the statement, that I am as strongly opposed to involvement in this war as I have always been, and that if I thought this measure was a will toward our involvement in war I would be bitterly opposed to its enactment. My convictions have not changed. Our happiness, our security, and the perfecting of our American civilization will be served best by noninvolvement in the tragic conflict in Europe.

Farm Imports From Foreign Countries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK CARLSON
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 7, 1940

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. Speaker, the American farmer is suffering from increased farm imports and decreased farm exports. The Hull trade program lowered farm tariffs and opened our home market to the advantage of foreign farmers with low wages and cheap lands. Our farmers are asked to curtail their production and when they do their market is given to foreigners. The American farmer is entitled to the American market.

Total United States agricultural exports and imports

	January-June, 1938	January-June, 1939	January-June, 1940
Total agricultural:			
Imports	$476,534,000	$519,662,000	$641,258,000
Exports	412,763,000	268,179,000	352,664,000
Excess of imports [1]	63,771,000	251,483,000	288,594,000

[1] This trade balance benefits the farmers of foreign countries.

The following table shows value and increase in farm imports. These may greatly increase if we vote a $500,000,000 loan to Latin American countries to be used in financing competitive farm crops:

United States imports of certain competitive agricultural products for the 6 months ending June 30, 1938, 1939, and 1940

[Source: U. S. Department of Commerce figures]

Import items	Unit	6 months ended June 30—		
		1938	1939	1940
Cattle	Head	242,584	486,497	366,784
Cattle hides	Pounds	18,033,000	68,297,000	73,303,000
Beef, canned	Pounds	38,947,000	40,996,000	38,075,000
Mutton, fresh	Pounds	43	30,035	39,403
Tallow, inedible	Pounds	695,000	452,000	789,000
Silver foxes (live)	Number	13	1	240
Silver-fox fur skins	Number	9,310	40,089	54,277

United States imports of certain competitive agricultural products for the 6 months ending June 30, 1938, 1939, and 1940—Con.

[Source: U. S. Department of Commerce figures]

Import items	Unit	6 months ended June 30—		
		1938	1939	1940
Oats	Bushel	4,995	1,006,696	7,255,629
Wheat (all)	Bushel	227,000	5,632,000	4,977,000
Wheat byproduct feeds	Tons	6,566	192,102	217,586
Hay	Tons	11,196	22,645	39,195
Cottonseed cake and meal	Pounds	2,543,000	6,596,000	32,429,000
Alfalfa seed	Pounds	2,236,000	1,896,000	2,096,000
Alsike and crimson clover	Pounds	943,000	160,000	725,000
Potatoes, white or Irish	Pounds	29,437,000	44,482,000	63,073,000
Beans, green and dried	Pounds	8,498,000	6,168,000	6,902,000
Lentils	Pounds	6,927,000	4,936,000	6,911,000
Tomatoes, fresh	Pounds	50,843,000	40,359,000	70,994,000
Apples, fresh	Bushels	9	20,734	81,900
Cherries, fresh	Pounds	262,450	93,771	704,452
Grapefruit, fresh	Pounds	1,760	None	305,852
Brazil or cream nuts	Pounds	3,084,000	3,955,000	4,118,000
Filberts	Pounds	914,000	807,000	1,157,000
Pecans	Pounds	None	55,000	115,000
Molasses, edible (table)	Gallons	7,634,138	4,708,549	7,471,631
Molasses, inedible (blackstrap)	Gallons	95,350,546	95,603,823	144,993,931
Milk, fresh	Gallons	4,949	7,309	7,592
Milk, dried and malted	Pounds	40,306	8,431	262,839
Casein	Pounds	158,000	299,000	11,817,000
Wool, unmanufactured	Pounds	25,418,000	116,806,000	180,291,000
Cotton, unmanufactured	Pounds	51,580,000	48,297,000	58,594,000
Tobacco, unmanufactured	Pounds	32,665,000	37,317,000	35,601,000
Castor beans	Pounds	62,069,000	83,102,000	116,940,000

Proof of Authenticity of British Secret Document

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. THORKELSON

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 4, 1940

Mr. THORKELSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks, quotations from magazines, the press, and to include exhibit 125, I shall attempt to prove that the contents of the British secret document, which I inserted in the RECORD on October 11, are true.

This report, as you know, was investigated by the Senate committee on the alleged activities at the Geneva Conference, and is an exhibit in those hearings.

EXHIBIT NO. 125—BRITISH SECRET DOCUMENT

Comprises 27 pages, 8 by 5½ inches each, photostats, and is a duplicate, line for line, of Exhibit No. 126, without the cover sheet and the foreword of the publishers inside the cover sheet; the first page of Exhibit No. 125 being page 3 of Exhibit 126, which first page of Exhibit No. 125 is also numbered 3.

As placed with the committee, Exhibit No. 125 has the following memorandum accompanying it:

"NAVY DEPARTMENT,
"OFFICE OF NAVAL INTELLIGENCE,
"*Washington, February 9, 1929.*

"Memorandum for the director:

"With reference to a document recently obtained from Mr. W. B. Shearer, which purported to be a confidential letter from Sir William Wiseman to Mr. Lloyd George, I wish to submit the following comment which I believe is convincing that the document is not authentic. The information which disproves the direct statements made, was obtained in New York by Lt. Comdr. Paul Foster, who conducted a personal investigation."

Please note that exhibit 125 is not the report rendered by Lt. Comdr. Paul Foster, but is instead an abstract of his report which Mr. A. S. Merrill furnished the Senate committee. The report is ambiguous and incomplete, and therefore of little value. As a matter of fact, it appears to be an attempt to shield the British Consulate and the British Military Intelligence Department.

1. Without question the original of this document was printed and not typewritten. Obviously such a letter as this purports to be would never have been printed by Sir William Wiseman or any other man writing from New York a letter of such a confidential character and addressed personally to Lloyd George, Prime Minister of England. In evidence that this letter was printed are the following:

To say that the original was printed is silly, because originals of printed documents are written in long hand, typed, or recorded. This should be obvious, for no one dictates a lengthy report to a linotype operator. However, let me say here and now that the author of the British document, whoever he was, knew what he was talking about, because the contents of the letter are only too true. Dr. William J. Maloney, a former English citizen, but now a naturalized citizen of the United States, graciously accepted the blame of authorship, to whitewash the responsible parties who wrote the document. He was not even familiar with the document, as his testimony revealed when he appeared before the Senate committee. I shall now reproduce a small part of his testimony:

Senator SHORTRIDGE. Who prepared the words which are found on the first, or outside page?

Dr. MALONEY. I don't remember his name, sir. He was a journalist who had been employed in Mr. Creel's bureau. He read the pamphlet and made this cover for it. I do not remember what his name was.

Senator SHORTRIDGE. So that is a fact, is it, Dr. Maloney, that you wrote this document?

Dr. MALONEY. Yes, sir.

Senator SHORTRIDGE. And caused it to be published?

Dr. MALONEY. Yes, sir.

Senator SHORTRIDGE. Was there a publishing house known as A Gordon Brown & Co.?

Dr. MALONEY. No; that was just a name.

Senator SHORTRIDGE. One hundred and sixty-four East Thirty-seventh Street, New York?

Dr. MALONEY. That was just the name adopted for putting that out.

* * * * * * *

Senator ALLEN. When the State Department had this hearing in New York touching this, what was their purpose? Were they objecting to the promulgation of this pamphlet?

Dr. MALONEY. I refused to attend that hearing. It was scheduled for a Friday morning at 10 o'clock; and about 9 o'clock I sent a telegram to Br. Bannaman, saying I regretted if I inconvenienced him but that I would not attend the hearing. He did not then either arrest or subpena me.

Two Secret Service men came around and told me this was a matter of 20 years; and they fixed the date for another hearing the following morning. I had not asked for any postponement; and, again they did not compel my presence; so I ignored them.

Senator ALLEN. What did they allege as the nature of the offense which you had committed in promulgating this?

Dr. MALONEY. They did not allege anything, sir.

Senator ALLEN. And was it dropped?

Dr. MALONEY. It was dropped. I heard no more about it.

* * * * * * *

Senator SHORTRIDGE. While you may have answered this question, why did you pursue the matter in the way you have just stated? What was the motive?

Dr. MALONEY. I wanted to show the ramifications, as I saw it, of British propaganda in this country.

Senator SHORTRIDGE. I think you said you were then opposed to our country entering the League of Nations?

Dr. MALONEY. Yes, sir.

* * * * * * *

Senator ALLEN. Did this circulate in Great Britain in any form?

Dr. MALONEY. We got a number of orders from Great Britain for single copies, from members of Parliament and others, who seemed to think it was an amusing thing.

This testimony of Dr. Maloney is illuminating, for he could not remember the name of the printing company, nor the name of the journalist who prepared the words on the front page of the pamphlet. He admits, however, that the document was written—which is contrary to the statement in the report by Mr. Merrill. Then, again, he ignored the request of the State Department to appear before it, by refusing to attend such hearing. The State Department made no effort to have Dr. Maloney testify. He furthermore states that two Secret Service men informed him that the authorship of the document was a matter of 20 years. That, in itself, is interesting, for what right had our Secret Service officials to threaten him with 20 years for publishing this document. Surely it was no offense against the United States. So it appears to be another form of coercion in order to protect the British Government.

The doctor was, however, interested in exposing British propaganda, and he makes the statement in his testimony that he exposed only a part of it; and he is right.

Let me again quote from the testimony:

Senator SHORTRIDGE. May I ask you why you wrote it? You may now enlarge or answer briefly or fully as is necessary.

Dr. MALONEY. Lord Northcliffe, at that time the proprietor of the London Times, the London Daily Mail, and a great number of other English newspapers, was over here in charge of the British propaganda in America. I used to read his newspapers and follow his boastings as to what he was doing to put us into the League, and I was opposed to the League. I heard, about May 1919, that his campaign had reached a crisis in an issue of the London Times of July 4. He was going around getting articles from various Americans friendly to England and friendly to going into the League at that time, and he was telling in his papers about the numbers. I think he said he had 8,000 purchasing agents. He had a club over here of 100,000 which he called the Overseas Club. He ran a magazine for their special benefit. He was very busy in interchanging preachers, and I think he claimed he had arranged 1,260 meetings for British preachers to address in the United States. He was also interchanging newspaper correspondents, and so forth. So I thought that if I prepared a skit on all he was alleged to be doing, or said he was doing, when he published his account of his stewardship on July 4, it would not have the effect that he anticipated, particularly if I could spread this all over America and show them just what he thought he was doing.

* * * * * * *

When Mr. Northcliffe published his report on July 4 he had much of what is in here. He had more that is not in here, and some of the things in here he had not. I thought we had rather brought his campaign to an anticlimax.

In his testimony, Dr. Maloney makes the statement that the English and Canadian people thought the British secret document was amusing. I do not question the amusing part of it, for they must indeed have looked upon us as the biggest suckers in the world in allowing ourselves to be used and abused and ridiculed by a power we helped to win a war which they would have lost.

It is particularly tragic, in that it has not only brought about another war, but has in addition to that provided a wide dissemination of socialistic and communistic doctrines which are now destroying our own Government. It also authenticates a part of the letter which I inserted in the RECORD on October 11, 1939. No one can fail to recognize the effort which was made by the committee, innocently or otherwise, to cover up the authenticity of this report, for it is absolutely clear that the real author was whitewashed by the committee, in not trying to establish the identity; and by Mr. Merrill in obscuring pertinent matter which should have gone into the record.

I. Subparagraphs (a), (b), (c), and (d):

(a) The paragraph headings indented into the left margin are of a different kind of type than other capital letters shown in the document. Two typewriters would be necessary to effect this variety of capital letters.

(b) Both the right and left margins throughout are perfectly uniform. No typist would be able to attain such perfection.

(c) There are no typographical errors or erasures.

(d) The individual letters examined under a microscope show different characteristics, in itself conclusive proof that the document was not typewritten. For instance, to follow the letter "e" throughout a sentence: In the first case, the loop at the bottom might be indistinct and in the second it might be heavier at the bottom, an inconsistency that is not found in typing.

Mr. Merrill's report on these subparagraphs is ambiguous, immaterial, and not pertinent, as to proving or disproving the authenticity or correctness of the British secret document. He reports on a printed pamphlet and not on the original report. As a matter of fact, he has not even taken the original report into consideration.

I shall now quote subparagraph (e) of paragraph I.

(e) The letterhead reads British consulate. This is incorrect, as the office in New York is a consulate general.

The statement in this subparagraph is also incorrect, for the office is the British consulate, and the official in charge of it is the British consul general. This is a designation used by all governments.

Referring again to paragraph I, wherein the statement is made that messages of such confidential character were not addressed to Prime Minister Lloyd George personally, is another error, for Sir Gilbert Parker did render a weekly, personal report to the Prime Minister of England, as this paragraph I now quote will show:

(By Rt. Hon. Sir Gilbert Parker, Bart.)

I was in the United States for some months on this trip. I have been from New York to San Francisco. I was at Washington when President Wilson dismissed Count Bernstorff and heard him do so, and I am firmly convinced of this—that President Wilson committed his country to this war at the right moment—neither too soon nor too late. He had stopped up every avenue of attack by the pacifists and the jurists and the pedants and the pettifoggers.

Perhaps here I may be permitted to say a few words concerning my own work since the beginning of the war. It is in a way a story by itself, but I feel justified in writing one or two paragraphs about it. Practically since the day war broke out between England and the Central Powers I became responsible for American publicity. I need hardly say that the scope of my department was very extensive and its activities widely ranged. Among the activities was a weekly report to the British cabinet on the state of American opinion, and constant touch with the permanent correspondents of American newspapers in England. I also frequently arranged for important public men in England to act for us by interviews in American newspapers, and among these distinguished people were Mr. Lloyd George (the present Prime Minister), Viscount Grey, Mr. Balfour, Mr. Bonar Law, the Archbishop of Canterbury, Sir Edward Carson, Lord Robert Cecil, Mr. Walter Runciman (the Lord Chancelor), Mr. Austen Chamberlain, Lord Cromer, Will Crooks, Lord Curzon, Lord Gladstone, Lord Haldane, Mr. Henry James, Mr. John Redmond, Mr. Selfridge, Mr. Zangwill, Mrs. Humphrey Ward, and fully a hundred others.

Among other things, we supplied 360 newspapers in the smaller States of the United States with an English newspaper, which gives a weekly review and comment of the affairs of the war. We established connection with the man in the street through cinema pictures of the Army and Navy, as well as through interviews, articles, pamphlets, etc.; and by letters in reply to individual American critics which were printed in the chief newspaper of the State in which they lived, and were copied in newspapers of other and neighbor States. We advised and stimulated many people to write articles; we utilized the friendly services and assistance of confidential friends; we had reports from important Americans constantly, and established association by personal correspondence with influential and eminent people of every profession in the United States, beginning with university and college presidents, professors, and scientific men, and running through all the ranges of the population. We asked our friends and correspondents to arrange for speeches, debates, and lectures by American citizens, but we did not encourage Britishers to go to America and preach the doctrine of entrance into the war. Besides an immense private correspondence with individuals, we had our documents and literature sent to great numbers of public libraries, Y. M. C. A. societies, universities, colleges, historial societies, clubs, and newspapers.

It is hardly necessary to say that the work was one of extreme difficulty and delicacy, but I was fortunate in having a wide acquaintance in the United States and in knowing that a great many people had read my books and were not prejudiced against me. I believed that the American people could not be driven, preached to, or chivied into the war, and that when they did enter it would be the result of their own judgment and not the result of exhortation, eloquence, or fanatical pressure of Britishers. I believed that the United States would enter the war in her own time, and I say this, with a convinced mind, that on the whole, it was best that the American commonwealth did not enter the war until that month in 1917 when Germany played her last card of defiance and indirect attack. Perhaps the safest situation that could be imagined actually did arise. The Democratic Party in America, which probably would not have supported a Republican President had he declared war, were practically forced by the logic of circumstances to support President Wilson when he declared war, because he had blocked up every avenue of attack.

This is conclusive proof that confidential messages were sent to Lloyd George, and not only prove that the report by Mr. Merrill is in error, but it also substantiates the contents of the letter which was in the RECORD of October 11.

I shall now continue to quote from exhibit No. 125, British secret document:

2. The office of which Sir William Wiseman was in charge, although he worked in close harmony with the British consulate general, was never directly connected with it and the consulate letterhead was not used. The headings used by Sir William were invariably "MI–c, Report No. —."

Paragraph 2 is immaterial, for it does not prove or disprove this report.

3. Sir William Wiseman was relieved by Colonel Thwaites in 1918 and left the United States shortly afterward. During June 1919, when the subject document was supposed to have been written in New York City, Sir William was actually in Paris attending the peace conference as an advisor to the British delegation on American affairs. In March 1919, Colonel Thwaites was relieved by Captain Strath-Gordon. He was in charge on the date of the document.

This paragraph is immaterial, because it again deals with an issue that has no bearing on the authenticity of the document.

4. Neither Sir William Wiseman nor Captain Strath-Gordon were friendly to Lloyd George, either in a political or personal way. Even had they been, such a report as this would have been addressed to the head of the intelligence service in London, thence to the central offices of the various branches of British intelligence (the Foreign Office, the Home Office, the Colonial Office, the Military Office, the Naval Office, etc.), which are directly under the Prime Minister.

This paragraph is, if I may use the word, silly, or even childish, for it assumes an impossible situation. It would be ridiculous should anyone take this seriously and believe that the Prime Minister of England would send people unfriendly to himself to America to take charge of the consulate, of the British propaganda service, and of the British military service. Such things never happen in any government, particularly in such important organizations.

5. It is difficult to believe that anyone would attempt to figure out the average time and cost of "Anglicization" to the penny and minute, as mentioned on page 4.

It may be a little difficult to figure out how anyone would sit down and estimate the cost of "Anglicizing" Americans. However, it is not difficult to imagine that the British Government would engage in such tabulation, for they look upon us as sheep, as one of their nobility has already stated. Looking upon us as sheep, they will, of course, count us like sheep; and that is what they did in the British secret report.

6. On page 9 mention is made of a dope scandal in the family of Lord Reading. It is hardly conceivable that such reflections on a prominent member of the English Government would be made in an official document, especially if such references were irrelevant.

This also has no bearing on the authenticity of the letter which was in the RECORD of October 11, but inasmuch as it is mentioned, let us bear in mind that there was a dope scandal in England and a Marconi scandal which nearly disrupted the British Parliament.

7. There are repeated references to Messrs. Pierpont Morgan & Co., whereas the firm name is always referred to as J. P. Morgan & Co. and the individual as J. Pierpont Morgan. A man of Sir William Wiseman's intelligence and experience in New York would not make such an error.

Mr. Merrill takes exception to the fact that the author of the British secret document interchanged the name of J. P. Morgan &. Co., and J. Pierpont Morgan, and states that no one connected with the British Government would make such a mistake. This statement is also immaterial, for it is quite likely that a Britisher or an American might use one name when he referred to the company and the other name when he referred to Mr. Morgan personally.

8. On page 12 the work of F. Cunliffe-Owen is spoken of in a commendatory way, whereas at this time he was under the surveillance of the British Secret Service, as he had been reported on adversely.

Again Mr. Merrill draws a very peculiar deduction, when he refers to Mr. F. Cunliffe-Owen. I am sure the gentleman in question was not adverse to the British Government, and that there was not reason why the British Secret Service should watch Mr. Cunliffe-Owen. It would be much more sensible if he and other Englishmen were watched by the American Secret Service.

9. On page 16 references are made to the Morgan firm, regarding the loan to Japan, and to the statement that the greater part of that firm's capital is invested within the British Empire, both of which statements Sir William Wiseman would have known to be incorrect.

Page 16 of the British secret document refers to a loan of $200,000,000 made by the United States Treasury, through J. P. Morgan & Co., to the British Government. This statement is absolutely true, for I have photographs of two checks issued by the United States Treasury, one for $200,000,000, drawn to the order of Sir Cecil Arthur Spring-Rice, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, and the other for $30,000,000, drawn to the order of Colville Barclay, Minister Plenipotentiary of the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland.

This is, therefore, sufficient proof that the author of the British secret document knew what he was talking about when he wrote that report. I now quote from the New York American of Sunday, February 22, 1925:

April 25, 1917: The famous $200,000,000 check issued against this warrant was promptly endorsed to J. P. Morgan & Co., British fiscal agents, to cover an overdraft which Morgan and the banks allied with him had granted Great Britain before our entrance into the war. This $200,000,000 of the United States Government got to Morgan just in time, as is evidenced by Walter Hines Page, then American Ambassador to Great Britain, in his authoritative Life and Letters.

"In April 1917 the British balances in New York were in a serious condition. By April 6, 1917, the date of America's entrance into the war, Great Britain had overdrawn her account with J. P. Morgan & Co. to the extent of $400,000,000 and had no cash available with which to meet this overdraft. The money was now coming due; if the obligations were not met the credit of Great Britain in this country would reach the vanishing point. The American Government finally paid the overdraft out of the proceeds of the Liberty Loan. This act saved the credit of the Allied countries."

Thomas W. Lamont, of the Morgan firm, has made the proposition that we cancel half the allied indebtedness to us, now totalling $12,000,000.

May 15, 1919: Thirty million dollars of Liberty Loan money handed to Great Britain without legal warrant after the war was over. American diplomatic and consular officials abroad were complaining at this time that Great Britain was spending millions to get a monopoly of the oil resources of the world and to recover her pre-war trade supremacy. The total sum unlawfully advanced to Great Britain after the armistice was $330,000,000.

The endorsement of Colville Barclay, Minister representing the British Government, on the back of the $30,000,000 check paid to Great Britain 6 months after the war was over.

On December 5, 1918, after the war, Norman H. Davis, special representative of the Treasury Department abroad, wrote to the Assistant Secretary of the Treasury Albert Rathbone as follows:

"From the Treasury standpoint it is advisable, of course, to cut off as soon as possible all advances to the Allied Governments. But, on the other hand, from a political standpoint, it may be advisable not to cause too much anxiety just before the peace conference.

"As I have already advised you, the British Treasury has notified the French and Italian Treasuries that they are through making advances to them. They have either done this in order to force them on us or for political reasons in order to force their opinions at the peace conference in consideration of them agreeing to additional advances."

Loans unauthorized: The secret correspondence carried on by cable, courier, and sealed diplomatic pouch, and thereafter carefully guarded in the archives at Washington, discloses that the officials on duty in Washington, having applied to Congress for authority to make these loans, and having been refused such authority, thereafter continued to make them without legal authority. These amazing documents, whose authenticity is beyond question, prove that the Treasury Department, in making these unwilling advances, was yielding to a contention of the President, then in Paris negotiating the Versailles Treaty, that the success of his policies—the League of Nations—depended upon liberal advances to the countries upon whose representatives at Versailles he counted for support.

For example, Secretary Glass, on January 14, 1919, cabled President Wilson in Paris, promising a new loan to Rumania, and containing the sentence:

"Appreciate importance of food supplies in relation to your policies and anxious to use powers of Treasury to support them."

A judicious interpretation of the mass of data now available can lead only to the conclusion that both the representatives of the American Government and the representatives of foreign governments knew that there was no authority under the law to make post-war advances for European reconstruction and relief.

The language of the law, the successive Liberty Loan Acts clearly provided that credits should be advanced to the Allies only for the purpose of prosecuting the war against our public enemy.

The record further shows that Secretaries of the Treasury McAdoo and Glass, realizing their inability legally to make further loans after the war ended, sought authorization for such loans in Congress in December 1918 and February 1919.

The books of the Treasury Department show that, specifically denied this power by the Congress, Treasury officials then proceeded to disburse to the Allies $15,000,000,000 more of American public moneys.

The foregoing quotations should be sufficient evidence to show that Mr. Merrill's report is wrong and the British secret document to Lloyd George is correct.

10. On page 13 there is a reference to Kuhn, Loeb's entry into the motion-picture field and acquisition of the Players-Lasky-Hearst motion-picture concerns. The consolidation occurred in December 1919, while the date of the document is June 1919.

This statement by Mr. Merrill is also wrong, for the Famous Players-Lasky was acquired by British interests in May 1919 and not, as he states, in December of the same year.

The following quotation from the New York Times, May 16, 1919, is in proof of this:

EUROPE, THE FIELD FOR ITS PICTURES—FAMOUS PLAYERS-LASKY AND BRITISH INTERESTS IN A $3,000,000 CORPORATION—AMERICAN-FOREIGN ACTORS—CONSTRUCTION OF BIG STUDIOS TO BE BEGUN AT ONCE—THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS THE FIRST FILM

The formation in London of a corporation capitalized at $3,000,000 to produce motion pictures against European backgrounds was announced last night by the Famous Players-Lasky Corporation. The name of the corporation is the Famous Players-Lasky British Producers, Ltd.

The construction of studios and plants on a large scale will be started immediately, according to C. A. Clegg, business manager of the international enterprise. American and European actors will take part in photoplays staged in the Alps, the devastated areas of France and Belgium, Wales, Scotland, Spain, and other famous and picturesque parts of the Old World.

The Americans chiefly interested in the venture are Adolph Zukor, president, and Jesse L. Lasky, first vice president of the Famous Players-Lasky Corporation. Among those representing British interests are Maj. David Davis, M. P., Maj. Norman Holden, Alexander Nisbet, W. J. Burdon Evans, Albert Hirst, A. W. Keeley, Thomas Wrigley, J. H. Kippax, J. G. Thompson, George Isaac, and Abraham Collins. Most of these men are already identified with banking, manufacturing, and theatrical institutions in England.

Mr. Merrill concludes his report with the following statement:

11. The above, to me, is quite convincing that the document is a fraud.

Mr. Merrill makes a statement which I flatly contradict, because his report is wrong, and the British secret document is correct.

There is much more evidence to be had to prove the authenticity of the British secret document, that was sent to Lloyd George on June 10, 1919, and which I hope to have time to submit before this Congress adjourns.

Compulsory Military Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH W. BYRNS, JR.

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, September 7, 1940

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago I made a speech on the floor of the House in opposition to the so-called conscription bill as it was then drawn. I stated in the course of my remarks that unless changes were made in the bill as then presented I would be forced to vote against it. I made the speech purely from my study of this question and from testimony before my committee and the result of personal investigation, which convinced me that our needs were far greater for equipment than for manpower at the present time. Changes have been made in the bill as it was reported out of my committee. I am not yet firmly convinced that we are ready for conscription of personnel until such time as we have the matériel with which to adequately equip and train them. However, there has always been a school of thought that under our American system of government the Representative of the people should reflect the sentiments of his constituency, bowing if necessary to their combined judgment even in instances where this conflicts with his own individual opinion. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I propose to vote for this bill as amended.

Texas State Convention of American Legion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MORRIS SHEPPARD

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 9 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. JOSEPHUS DANIELS, AMBASSADOR TO MEXICO

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD extracts from an address by Hon. Josephus Daniels, American Ambassador to Mexico, at the Texas State Convention of the American Legion, at Laredo, Tex., on Monday, August 19, 1940.

There being no objection, the extracts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXTRACTS FROM ADDRESS BY HON. JOSEPHUS DANIELS, AMERICAN AMBASSADOR TO MEXICO

A score and three years have passed since you and your comrades and shipmates responded to the call of your Commander in Chief to bear "without rancor and without selfish object" a distinguished part in "the most terrible and disastrous of all wars." You responded in the faith that you were enlisting in a "war to end war." In the aftermath of that first engagement of American troops on European soil many books have been written and various views advanced as to the reason that impelled you and your fellows to offer upon the altar of your country all you had and all you hoped to be. You have been told by slanderers in high places that you were prompted to the sacrifice by the desire to "save your skins"; by hatred of the people against whom you fought; by the altruistic purpose of making the world safe for democracy; to obtain revenge for ruthless submarine warfare; to secure possessions and colonies for your America. These and other incitements have been declared to have induced you to cross the Atlantic to engage in the cruelest war in history. But you know and I know, and we must make history speak the truth, that the one and impelling motive (others may have contributed) that carried America into the World War was the overpowering conviction that participation in that struggle and the peace conference following the fighting would insure the goal of all the ages—a warless world, wherein the arbitrament of the sword would be replaced by the arbitrament of reason and justice by the nations of the earth. It was to usher in centuries of peace that you took up the sword. And when it was "over, over there," the soldiers and sailors of our country recrossed the Atlantic, confident that the peace won by sacrifice would be insured by the wisdom of diplomats and statesmen. The fact that you have been disillusioned because the chancelleries failed you and mankind in neglecting to translate your courage into permanent peace neither in the least impairs your consecration to the high endeavor to remove the curse of war for all time on the face of the earth nor lessens the lasting gratitude of your Government and your fellow countrymen for the victories achieved by your valor.

As the Legionnaires of the great State of Texas—as great in patriotism in peace and war as in its far-flung territorial expanse—assemble in this hospitable city where the good-neighbor doctrine is in flower, I feel commissioned to bring you posthumous honors from your great Commander in Chief, Woodrow Wilson, and your illustrious Secretary of War, Newton D. Baker. If it be given to those who have preceded us to the Better Land to know what is transpiring on this sphere, these two sun-crowned leaders would bid me say to you in the immortal words of Woodrow Wilson after the armistice:

"I am proud to be the fellow-countryman of men of such stuff and valor. * * * What we all thank God for with deepest gratitude is that our men went in force into the line of battle just at the critical moment when the whole fate of the world seemed to hang in the balance and threw their fresh strength into the ranks of freedom in time to turn the whole tide and sweep the fateful struggle—turn it once for all, so that henceforth it was back, back, back, for their enemies, always back, never again forward."

I am humbly grateful, as the survivor of the three civilian officials charged with the direction of the military forces of your country in the crucial and high days of 1917–18, to be honored by the privilege of bringing in person my greetings as your Secretary of the Navy in that heroic era forever illumined by the nobility of your high courage. As we foregather today and recall the experiences of the World War, we are truly looking back to glory."

In all the years since the Senate jettisoned the garnering of the peace which your valor brought within reach, there has been one and only one consistent and persistent voice raised by a great organization for continued and efficient preparedness on land, on the sea, and in the air. And that one voice, sometimes crying in the wilderness where blind were leading the blind, has been the clarion voice of the American Legion. At every gathering, local, State, and national, of your organization you have been the one agency with vision born of knowledge attained by suffering in the tragedy of war-slaughter, crying out in the spirit and in the very words of America's most illustrious victor for independence and liberty: "In time of peace, prepare for war." While others have poohpoohed the possibility of the calamities that now affright the world, you have not failed to warn of the perils of unpreparedness. In this course the American Legion has been no war-monger, no alarmist, no militarist, no agent of predatory manufacturers of munitions. Its prophecies and warnings have been well founded. Its utterances have not been made in glittering generalities. A perusal of the resolutions of the American Legion, from the day it was organized in Paris by forward-looking members of the American Expeditionary Force, evidences that you early saw the dangers and pointed the way to prevent the menace to desired peace. In every resolution adopted, Legionnaires have called upon those in authority to avoid the mistakes disclosed in former wars by keeping in readiness the agencies to defend their country. You have demanded the calling to the colors, in any future war, of the accumulated dollars and the reserve manpower to the last penny and the last drop of blood for national defense. When there has been advocacy of conscription of men to fight and die for their country, the Legion has pointed out the injustice of sacrifice by courageous youth while permitting wealth to escape. It has demanded alike the draft of money and industry and labor in any future war. It is no fault of the Legion that in the present crisis provision is lacking to make immediately available every man and every dollar in the event America is threatened with invasion.

Your countrymen—many noble and patriotic men who thought peace would be unbroken—sometimes derided your leadership for preparedness—and you will be the last to claim that all your recommendations were the perfection of wisdom. There have been many since the armistice so engrossed in their own private interests that they were indifferent to your annual iteration and reiteration of the need for readiness for defense. In all the years, the American Legion has cried out and spared not in its insistence upon national preparedness when those in authority said the Legionnaires saw peril where no peril existed. Today, all who have been deaf to the entreaties of the Legionnaires owe an apology for their criticism or neglect of your now-proved wise foresight. You knew better than those who stayed at home in 1917–18 what war was. You knew, as your comrades died on the battlefield, that giant fortunes were being piled up by those who never exposed their precious bodies to shot and shell. And you highly resolved, as you said "Never again," in disembarking after the armistice, that, so far as in you lay, your country should never lack the agencies of protection and defense in the event of another war, or permit the piling up of fortunes by munition makers and others for national preparedness or in war.

When the only plan of peace by cooperation of the nations was rejected in Washington, you and your Commander in Chief and your Secretary of War and your Secretary of the Navy declared in unison of spirit, if not in exact words: "With our refusal to take a seat in the League of Nations, the imperative duty of maintaining the most adequate navy in the world and a strong army rests upon us." Your organization was the one large body that supported the position taken by your Secretary of the Navy, with the approval of President Wilson, when he recommended another 3-year program of naval construction, along plans taught by the experience of war, declaring: "If the United States does not enter the League of Nations we shall require for our safety incomparably the greatest navy in the world."

Other counsel prevailed in that period. We witnessed the destruction of mighty naval ships, partly completed, decreed by the abortive Washington Conference, its action sugar-coated by the Nine Power Treaty to preserve the intergity of China—a promise made to the ear and broken to the hope. No member of the Legion was responsible for the miscarriage of the good purposes of that well-intentioned conference. No Legionnaire can be charged even with participation in the abandonment by the Government of its armor-plate plant at Charleston, W. Va., or the nonproduction of planes at the naval-aircraft factory at Philadelphia, or other examples of continued neglect of the Army and Navy in the years following the World War.

* * * * * * *

If I were commissioned to issue any command to my countrymen in this critical hour in world history, it would be "Eyes south." Too long have we in the United States looked too exclusively to countries across the Atlantic. Likewise, if I might venture to issue a command to our sister republics south of the Rio Grande, I would say "Eyes north." Some of them, like our Republic, have looked too exclusively to European countries. The manifest destiny, welfare, protection, and safety of this hemisphere from outside permeation lies in friendly continental solidarity. The barrier of language, the lack of communications, and transportation have militated against that understanding and cooperation essential to advance and preserve the economic and political independence of pan-American nations. The brightest silver lining in the clouds in the skies of today is the recognition by all the countries on the Western Continent that "the injury of one is the concern of all." From the day that Bolivar sought the unity which has now been achieved and Wilson declared that never would the United States add a foot of territory to its domain by force, and Roosevelt enunciated the good-neighbor doctrine—these high-visioned acts and declarations culminating in the declarations of Montevideo, Buenos Aires, Lima, Panama, and Habana—we have been moving toward the goal of American peoples animated by the common resolve to vaccinate this hemisphere against the introduction of any "ism" contrary to the tenets of democracy and political and economic independence. Habana marked the realization of a long-cherished dream—an American Continent unitedly resolved to uphold the ideals that caused its peoples long ago to throw off Old World domination. If there is any such thing as manifest destiny, it is that present disturbed world conditions demand the cementing of American strength to preserve American freedom.

* * * * * * *

It is fitting in your reunions to recall the experience of the high days when you worthily wore the uniform of your country. In another period of world convulsion, what you achieved in 1917–18 is an inspiration to younger men faced with serious decision. Though you fought across the seas, the spirit that animated you was the same which sent your forebears into all the wars in which America has been engaged. They came to these lands to find spiritual and material freedom and have never taken up arms except in defense of the ideals of our homeland. It "satisfied the fathers of this land—and has always been their satisfaction" to fight for our flag and die for our flag "when reason primes the rifle, when honor draws the sword, when justice breathes a blessing on the standards they uphold."

A fine young man said to me a short time ago, "Providence has been unkind to me by bringing me to maturity at a time when all the world has gone crazy and the opportunity of living my own life as I had planned it is imperiled by causes beyond my control." Such American youths, tempted to blame providence for the perils of their day, forget their blessings. They truly have reason to fear for the future, but they should always remember that the law of compensation works, and that they possess a homeland, a place to hang up their hats with none to say them nay, the right to think and speak and write and worship where no overlord can deny that their home is their castle. There was a time when those of us who are older lightly esteemed the possession of citizenship in a democracy, with the protection incident thereto. I confess to growing up in an American home where these inherited rights were so common I little understood the proud boast of the Apostle Paul when he declared "I am a Roman citizen." Citizenship and the right to have a home seemed as inherent to living as the air we breathe, something so universal and free that it is only recently that I have felt, night and morning, like getting on my knees and thanking God for the simple right to live where I could say with pride, "This is my own, my native land."

We must learn to appreciate and understand just what our country is. What it means to us and does for us, and what may be its services to humanity. We must bend every effort to maintain our homes, and to better our land, and to preserve America against the encroachment of systems of "isms" contrary to the spirit handed down to us by our forefathers when they created this our country—these efforts we must make that our land may remain that of our hearts.

The preservation of America—this is also our duty to humanity and civilization. In years to come, when peace and reason shall have returned to the earth, the traditions and the spirit which are ours today will prove to have been vaults wherein will have lain preserved spiritual treasures now fast disappearing from the homes of many of our suffering fellow men in other countries. In years to come, if we have fulfilled our duties, our land will have preserved unto us and unto humanity a store of wisdom and tolerance which will serve upon which to rebuild civilization.

Some Americans rail against taxation, which compared with that in other lands affords no justification for complaint. They denounce self-imposed regulation in wages and hours, enacted to preserve the dignity and health of men who toil. Many, indeed, prate upon the woes and ailments of our economic life. And yet is this our economic life so poor, indeed, when the national income has grown by leaps and bounds? Our people do not starve; if they are ill, they may find comfort and medical attention. We have economic problems—of that let there be no doubt—but there is even less doubt that these problems are not only less acute than those afflicting other continents, but are also more susceptible of solution. In our own hands lie the powers of remedying our woes, and the powers given to us are mighty indeed. Things that to us are but common, nonluxury articles are jewels beyond price to many of the war-racked peoples of this earth. We can buy gasoline for our cars, whether they are to be used for business or pleasure, in quantities and qualities unknown to peoples beyond the seas today; our foodstuffs may be used freely. Butter, eggs, fats, and meats across the seas are

not only limited but even unobtainable in many regions. In the wake of war disease is rearing its ugly head in certain regions beyond the seas; the disease cannot even be controlled, for they have not the men, the money, the time, or the supplies necessary to stop it. We can not only control but even abolish disease in our own land.

The problems in many countries are not left to the judgment of the individual—rather are they for the decision of an autocratic minority. A man overseas who speaks his mind, who offers his own solution for the problems which beset his life, he is a man in danger indeed and usually does not last long in our world. But a man in our country speaks as he will, acts as he will, provided always his neighbor is not damaged by his words or his action. Ours is still a land where whatever good, no matter how infinitesimal, that may lie within a man's heart is given full and free opportunity to share in the betterment of our homes.

We can criticize those who are responsible for our national destinies, and such criticism will not lead us into immediate elimination. If we disagree with those who steer our ship of state, the remedy lies with us; we can make known the will of our people, and that will cannot be disobeyed. Do these peoples beyond the seas have any recourse against totalitarian rulers? None, save the negative and fruitless recourse of flight or death.

Across the seas we find men whose home life is lost to them. Either are they forced to leave what they have for years known as their country; what for years has been their home; what for years have been their lives, their neighbors, their work, their amusements—or is it that they cannot continue to live under the constant pressure of a system which leaves them no room to live? Those who are forced, unwillingly, to leave their homes and to wander through the world seeking a happiness denied them in far too many climes; men, the very fabric of whose existence has been torn asunder to make room for the texture of a state-planned and disciplined race of unimaginative slaves, are possibly those whose plight is the more tragic. Those who have left because the spirit of their self-consciousness impels them to escape from the shadow of systems where self is to be abolished and where the state, not the soul, is the all-wise—they are men who carry with them the spark of redemption, the spark which will aid in relighting the fires of warmth and human kindness through our world. Tragic is their fate, for they are not driven animals, but rather are they men who know the limits of man's fate are not imposed by an autocratic minority riding roughshod over man's creative soul, but rather limits imposed by the creative and imaginative powers of that same soul. They are not men to be pitied, for one does not pity a man who carries in his heart the essential spark of what has created our civilization; rather are they men to whom our hearts should incline in sympathetic admiration, captains of souls whose vessels plow uncharted and storm-tossed seas, but captains whose lives shall serve to pilot their comrades into the lee shore of a better life. They carry within their hearts the spirit of their homes; yet, brave and strong though they may be, they are still men floating in an unresisting medium wherein they cannot now find that firm support of permanence wherewith to rebuild their homes. It is only by reflecting that today there are millions of our fellow beings who are wanderers upon the face of the earth with no place whereon to lay their heads that Americans can fully appreciate the heritage. In Mexico refugees, particularly those from Spain, who organized and fought for the republican government which for the time being was overpowered, have found welcome in a country whose language they speak. Thousands driven out of their native land are trying to begin life over again, some expecting to become citizens in an adopted country and others awaiting the hour which they believe will strike when they can go back home to live in a resurrected republic. These and men from other war-torn nations are indeed men without a country. I have talked with some fine spirits from Iberia whose hearts bleed as they have no permanent land on which to stand.

Not long ago I talked with one of the most distinguished exiled patriots of Spain, whose friendship I had enjoyed when his heart was aflame as he helped to fashion what he believed was a permanent democracy in this country. Today, like a wounded bird, he has no place of abode, no homeland, no country in which to abide. His heart is in his homeland, as in a sense he is a wanderer upon the face of the earth. He told me the story of the man without a country in the year 1940—a true story that moved me to deepest sympathy. When he had completed his recital, and confided to me his heart's desire to live in his native land and help his countrymen in their aspiration for self-government, there were tears in his eyes—and in mine, too—as he sadly said, "My dear friend, I hope you will never know the agony of experiencing what it is to be a man without a country."

A man without a country. Sorry, indeed, his lot, for he is an automaton—he eats, sleeps, wakes, breathes—and yet he is not alive, for he has no home—no anchor in heart, in life, in his fellow man—he is not a being but an unfortunate robot. He cannot say, "If my bark sink, 'tis to another sea," for he has not the living support of self-understanding, comprehension of his fellow man, and the realization of the eternal cause underlying all of life—his bark neither floats nor sinks; his bark needs no tiller nor keel, no supporting element, no balance, no sails, for it wanders aimlessly in an eternal vacuum, where there are neither rocks nor friendly lee shore, neither North Star nor southern cross, nor any of the heart-warming landmarks familiar to those who follow the sea.

Particularly today should our minds dwell on those who now have neither country nor home, and it is only through appreciation of what our homeland means to us that we may begin to understand the misery and the tragedy that overwhelms many homes today.

Our country is based on our homes, and home to us is a theme running in a deep and steady dominant through the pattern of the lives of Americans. Our songs, our poems, our literature, our achievements, our work, our amusements—through the very core of the lives of those who have been, who are, and who will be Americans—the deep chord of the American concept of what is home has been and, God willing, will continue to be the basic melody of our country.

The basic spirit of those who came from across the seas to build their homes has built us into a Nation where the aspirations of men, through hard work and creative ability, continue to reach satisfaction of fruition. The American home is the symbol of our ideal—a haven where the individual, self-respecting, yet respectful of the needs of his fellowmen, may by himself, yet with the help of his neighbor, work out the ways of a life where his own ideas may find materialization.

The totalitarian home is an incubator where, irrespective of the self-respect of the man, the plans and the purposes of the state administer and determine how the man shall develop along the set lines, he and his home shall be destroyed as having failed the state. Such a home is far from being a place where the man may work out his destiny; rather is it a place where his destiny must be worked out for him. It is an attempt to destroy the very thing for which the first thinking men strove—a place where he would be at home, where his family and he could find safety and comfort.

Man, in this our world, travels uncharted seas, seas of darkness and dread. He needs a ship wherein to ride the billows, a sail to carry him on his way, a compass, a keel, and a rudder so he may steer toward the lee shore of his dreams. The ship must be based on the soul of the man, the sail must find its impulse from the wind of his strivings, the compass must show him a path free from the rocks of misunderstanding, and a rudder that with his own hands he may determine whither he should go. The man and his ways should not be molded into the build of the ship. The man should be free to allow full play, tempered by the rights of his neighbors, to the chart-market trail of his aspirations. Today the homes of many other lands beyond the seas are but strait jackets wherein the souls of men are confined and molded to set specific actions.

As I have reflected upon the stout heart and faith of my distinguished Spanish friend, who is today an exile from the land of his heart's desire, my mind has reverted to the favorite classic of my youth, Edward Everett Hale's Man Without a Country, and the equally soul-stirring story by Mary Raymond Shipman Andrews of the American who vainly thought love of his native land was dead until it was awakened as he heard the Star-Spangled Banner in the country of his adoption. It stirred his early patriotism to the depths, and he laid down honor and fame to once again drink from the spring of patriotism which had nourished him in his youth. In these drifting days of tragedy, I venture to advise as the true and living fountain of patriotism the placing of these two stories in the hands of every American youth, and their re-reading by every American citizen. The American Legionnaires and others can find no higher inspiration toward a noble patriotism than is found in the realization by two men who learned the lesson of love of country in lands far from home. As the closing sentiment for this hour let me offer the noble words of the Man Without a Country, when he came to himself:

"For that flag, the Stars and Stripes, never dream a dream but of serving her as she bids you, though the service carry you through a thousand hells. No matter what happens to you, no matter who flatters you or abuses you, never look at another flag. Remember that behind all these men you have to do with, behind officers and government, and people, even there is the country herself, your country, and that you belong to her as you belong to your own mother."

Freight Rate Discrimination

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 9 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. LISTER HILL, OF ALABAMA

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the conference report on the transportation bill just adopted by the Senate contains the provisions embodied in the joint resolution introduced by

myself in the Senate and by Representative RAMSPECK, of Georgia, in the House. This joint resolution was considered by a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce composed of the Senator from Florida, Mr. Andrews; the late Senator from Minnesota, Mr. Lundeen; the Senator from South Dakota, Mr. Gurney; and the Senator from New Hampshire, Mr. Tobey; and myself as chairman. After extensive hearings by the subcommittee the resolution was favorably reported to the full committee and written by the full committee in the form of amendments into the transportation bill.

Under these amendments any undue or unreasonable preference or advantage of one region, district, or territory over another region, district, or territory is made unlawful and prohibited and the Interstate Commerce Commission is directed to investigate immediately and upon finding such undue or unreasonable preference or advantage to exist to enter such orders as may be necessary for the removal of same. Under these amendments now to become the law of the land the unjust and unfair discriminations between sections in freight rates should be removed and all sections of our country permitted to enjoy that development and prosperity to which the character and genius of their people and their natural resources entitle them. I ask unanimous consent to place in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by me before the Atlanta Traffic Bureau on freight-rate discriminations on March 29 last.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The history of the Atlanta traffic bureau is a most interesting and enlightening one. Organized nearly 40 years ago by a small group of far-sighted progressive merchants and industrialists, it has achieved notable results, the benefits of which have not been confined alone to the metropolis of Atlanta. Indeed, its accomplishments have substantially advanced the best interests of the entire South. Under its able leadership it has grown in strength and prestige until today the Atlanta traffic bureau is recognized not only in the South but throughout the country as an outstanding champion of the rights of southern shippers and southern industry. At the same time it has won an enviable reputation for its fair attitude toward our important transportation agencies.

Since 1854, when the railroad, The West Point Route, was completed from Atlanta to my home city of Montgomery, our people have been bound to you by social, economic, and transportation ties which have meant much to our respective communities. We have learned much in the past from our social contacts and business intercourse with you. Beginning, as you did, at such an early date, to secure for yourselves reasonable, equitable, and nonprejudicial transportation charges, it has seemed wise for us to follow as nearly as we could in the direction which you were so successfully going. Indeed, your accomplishments served as an inspiration to great leaders in Alabama like the late former Governor, B. B. Comer, who after heroic efforts secured for us in Alabama equitable rates in line with those you had secured and were then enjoying in Georgia.

The first I learned of the importance to the people of reasonable freight rates was when as a boy I happened to listen to a discussion by my elders about the activities going on in our neighboring State of Georgia by such distinguished men as Gov. Hoke Smith, Little Joe Brown, Bolling Jones, your own late lovable Harry Moore, Judge Wimbish, and others. Since then I have followed with more interest than you would imagine what you have been able to accomplish in the way of securing equitable transportation charges, which have contributed so effectively to the upbuilding of this great city of yours.

You have every right to be proud of your association's historic past. From my experience in Washington both as a Representative in the House and as a Member of the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce I can testify you have continued to carry forward in a successful and outstanding way the torch handed to you by your distinguished predecessors who gave birth to this organization. I say this because it seems at times that John Cooper and Gene Hart are as active in Washington before committees of the House and Senate and before the Interstate Commerce Commission as they are in Atlanta.

I have been closely associated during the past 10 years with your distinguished and brilliant Congressman and my warm personal friend, BOB RAMSPECK, who labors unceasingly and with marked success for the best interests of his district and of the entire South and the entire Nation. I rejoice in the fact that he and I have cooperated and collaborated in bringing about some very important amendments to the Interstate Commerce Act which have passed both Houses of Congress. I am confident these amendments will soon be approved by the President and become the law of the land.

Under these amendments any undue or unreasonable preference or advantage of one region, district, or territory over another region, district, or territory, is made unlawful and prohibited and the Interstate Commerce Commission is directed to investigate immediately and upon finding such undue or unreasonable preference or advantage to exist to enter such orders as may be necessary for the removal of same.

The necessity for the writing of these provisions into the law for the removal of unfair interterritorial freight-rate discriminations constitutes one of the most compelling and challenging problems before the country today. Transportation is a vital necessity to our civilization. It is as much responsible for the economic and social development and for the political unity and solidarity of the United States as any other single factor. The future growth, development, and destiny of our country will depend in large measure both upon the adequacy of our transportation facilities and upon the efficiency, economy, and uniformity with which such facilities function in the interest of the country as a whole. Attainment of a sound national economy demands equality of opportunity for all parts of the United States to develop in a manner and to an extent justified by the human and natural resources present in the various regions. To have a full and fair opportunity to participate in the commerce of the entire Nation in a Nation-wide market on a basis of free and fair competition to all concerned is a right that not only belongs inherently to all the people of all the States and to all the regions of the country, but unless such a right is accorded their necessarily follows a denial of a free flow of commerce, which immediately retards the social and economic growth of certain sections of the country, and eventually retards the economic growth of the whole country. Business expansion, the unemployment problem, the problem of wage equality, the farm problem, the development of our national resources, the attainment of a sound and balanced national economy are involved and interwoven in the matter of freight-rate inequalities. These inequalities constitute a key log in the economic jam which is holding back our national recovery and progress.

Our railroads, which have been and still are the dominant transportation agency, are entitled to great credit for their part in the amazing economic growth and power of the United States; but as important as this contribution has been in the past we are now able to perceive certain uneven results and unbalanced conditions that ought to be corrected in the public interest, which of course, includes the welfare of the railroads themselves.

Through the development of engineering skill railroad service, as evidenced by the physical ability and capacity to move goods from place to place over the country, has been nationalized. Every citizen who has to wait at a railroad crossing for the passing of a freight train witnesses, in the variety of cars from different railroads which usually make up the train, a visual demonstration of this nationalized service. It is, indeed a great achievement. The economic side of railroad transportation, however, has not kept pace with the physical and technical developments. The freight-rate structure of the country, which epitomizes the economic phase of railroad operations has, in fact, followed a contrary trend to the growth of service. On the one hand, uniformity and standardization of service on a national scale appears to have been the ultimate goal, while on the other hand regionalization has been the outcome, whether by design or circumstance, in freight-rate structures.

Today we have no national freight-rate structure. We have five separate regional or territorial freight-rate structures, namely, eastern or official, southern, southwestern, western trunk line, and mountain Pacific. Present railroad-rate territories were not fashioned according to any predetermined plan. They are simply the outgrowth of tradition. The rate structures within them grew up topsy-turvy. The aim of the railroads was to get the traffic and they got the traffic by meeting competition. The railroads from the very beginning have paid little attention to costs, equality, and relativity in fixing their rates. The Interstate Commerce Commission in readjusting those rates and taking the basic railroad patterns has largely disregarded transportation costs. It has proceeded on what is called the value of the service theory of rate making rather than the costs of service. As a result, the Commission has felt itself compelled to endorse as reasonable a rate on comparative noncompetitive traffic which may be four or five times as high as a rate which they likewise endorse as reasonable on what is called competitive traffic.

In the official territory we find greater consideration given to the manufacturer and his freight than to the producer of raw materials and his freight. Railroads in the official territory naturally established their rate structure with the idea of moving the existing traffic and serving the manufacturers as they predominated in furnishing the traffic. From the very beginning it has been the policy of the eastern railroads to bring in from the outside essential industrial raw products to the manufacturers at favorably low rates and to carry the finished products at low rates, as compared with the southern and western sections of the country. The southern and western railroads did not have manufacturing and were not much concerned with the building up of manufacturing in their territories. On a whole their policy was to keep rates as high as possible where competition did not compel reductions and to put them as low as possible where competition required it.

Because rates have been made on the basis of competition and of all that the traffic will bear rather than on a basis of cost and of the economy and well-being of the entire nation, we find shocking disparities as between the rates in the different regions. Class-rate levels in official territory established and maintained by the railroads

are on a much lower level than the class rates in the West and in the South. As a result, the shipper outside of official territory is tremendously handicapped as compared with any competitor located in that territory and the consumers in official territory are denied the right to purchase goods and commodities at the lowest and most reasonable costs.

Even shippers in Canada enjoy a material advantage in shipping into the official territory over shippers in the other territories of the United States and the very protection supposed to be given under our tariff laws to American industry is defeated and denied. For example, it is exactly 657 miles from my home city of Montgomery, Ala., to Springfield, Ohio, from Ottawa, Ontario, to Springfield, and from New York, N. Y., to Springfield, and yet the first-class rate from Montgomery to Springfield is $2.02 per hundred pounds, from Ottowa to Springfield $1.60, from New York to Springfield $1.41. The rate is 42 cents higher from Montgomery to Springfield than it is from Ottawa to Springfield and 61 cents higher from Montgomery to Springfield than it is from New York to Springfield. We could go on indefinitely with such comparisons and I do not know of a single one that can be made in favor of the western and southern territories over the eastern territory on manufactured commodities ready for use by the ultimate consumer.

The effect of the regionalization of freight-rate structures has been to localize commerce by hampering a natural flow of goods across the artificial boundary lines. A continuation of divergent systems of rates may result in making a workshop of one region of the country and raw material producers of another region, with all the economic and social consequences which flow out of such disparities.

Exactly this situation has developed in this country. In the area of our country extending from Boston on the north to Baltimore and Washington on the south the average density of population runs well over 1,000 people per square mile. This is the area of heavy manufacturing and the area where freight rates are holding industry and pulling more industry to it. In contrast, the average density of population throughout the United States is only some 41 people per square mile. In the great western section of the United States, comprising 70 percent of the country's area, the average is less than 10 persons per square mile. In the southeast the average is about 50 persons per square mile. So long as competition makes freight rates it is obvious that the areas that now have the lowest freight rates will continue to have them. They had them originally and they have them now, as all transportation agencies in these areas compete for the heavy volume of traffic from the manufacturing plants that keep the millions upon millions of people occupied supplying themselves and the rest of the country.

While we speak of manufacturing it is interesting to note the distribution of manufacturing plants in the United States by counties. We find that 25 percent of the manufacturing plants of the country are located in 7 of the more than 3,000 counties of the United States. We find that another 25 percent of the manufacturing plants of the country are located in 46 counties. In other words, in 53 counties of the more than 3,000 counties, 50 percent of the manufacturing plants of the United States are located today. Of these counties 41 are in official territory, 2 in southern territory, 4 in western trunk-line territory, 1 in southwestern territory, and 5 in Pacific territory. The official territory has 71.65 percent of the manufactures of the country and three-fourths of the purchasing power of the Nation.

These figures show one of the results of interterritorial freight-rate discriminations based on the competitive theory of rate making. They show how these discriminations tend to concentrate plants in greater and greater degree where they already are and prevent development of those parts of the country that have little in the way of competitive force to bring down freight rates. They show how regions rich in raw materials have a serious if not fatal handicap when they undertake to convert their raw materials into finished goods and market them in the face of the existing regional discriminations in freight-rate structures. They show how one region of the country may be an empire while other regions of that same country may be but satrapies of that empire.

The discriminations cannot be justified by any differences in the cost of the transportation of freight in the different regions. This is clearly shown by the reports of the Bureau of Statistics of the Interstate Commerce Commission, and particularly the report entitled "Territorial Variation in the Cost of Carload Freight Service on Class I Steam Railways in the United States for the Calendar Year 1936." This latter report shows that there is no controlling reason from the angle of costs of transportation service for higher rates to be charged on traffic between western-territory points or between southern-territory points and the official territory points than the rates charged between points in the latter territory. In fact, the cost in the area south of the Ohio and Potomac Rivers has been clearly shown to be less than the cost in official territory for the same service.

The interest of the East and the official territory as well as the interest of the South and of the whole country demand that there be an end to the gross and unjustified inequalities in freight rates and that the country be permitted to develop and progress on natural lines.

One may ask, What of the railroads of the South and West if rates are to be reduced? A revision of freight levels would give the railroads in and between each of the territories a greater volume of traffic and would result greatly to the benefit of western and southern railroads. The railroads of the South and of the West need business and this business can only come through the development and industrialization of these sections based upon a better and wiser utilization of their natural resources.

If the South is to enjoy the rich advantages of her natural resources and that happy and prosperous civilization to which the character and genius of her people entitle her she must gain an economic balance between agriculture and industry.

Several years ago Dr. H. A. Morgan, the present chairman of the Tennessee Valley Authority and former president of the University of Tennessee, made a study of the value that comes from the decentralization of industry. He compared the States of Mississippi and Ohio. In Ohio he found industry distributed almost ideally. Mississippi has practically no industry. In Mississippi he found only 13 percent of the population urban. In Ohio he found the population is 63.8 urban. Dr. Morgan asks, "And what of agriculture?" Mississippi with an area larger than that of Ohio and with farming practically its only occupation, produces annually agricultural products to the value of only $965,000,000. Ohio, a smaller State with less land in agriculture and fewer farmers, produces for the comparable year $3,096,000,000 in agricultural products, nearly three and a third times as much in value as Mississippi. Dr. Morgan asks, "Do you see what industry does for agriculture?" Industry does two important things for a locality. It decreases the tax rate of the farmer; it produces an industrial wage to buy diversified farm products and thereby increases farm income and the purchasing power of the locality.

The development of industry in the South and West does not mean to rob the East of industry. The development of industry in the South and West means to give a higher standard of living to the people in those sections and to increase their purchasing power for the products of eastern industry. If we can raise the income of a farmer in the South or the West from an 80-cents-a-day income to the $3-a-day income of the industrial worker, we have furnished a consumer with a new purchasing power for the products of the work of a high-priced mechanic in the East.

In analyzing the treatment of our natural heritage of land and raw materials we have come to realize that permanent differences in freight charges as between regions accelerate the removal of products and materials without just or adequate return to the regions which furnish them. In the light of our experience of more than a century with organized transportation service, we ask that each region be given freight rates that do not confine the means of livelihood of the people of such region to the depletion of its soil and the exploitation of its essential raw materials primarily for the enrichment of another region. May I quote here the words of the illustrious Henry W. Grady, of Georgia, spoken in 1887, the year the Interstate Commerce Act was passed. These words are as true today as they were the day they were spoken 53 years ago. Mr. Grady said:

"But agriculture alone—no matter how rich or varied its resources—cannot establish or maintain a people's prosperity. * * * No Commonwealth ever came to greatness by producing raw materials. Less can this be possible in the future than in the past. The Comstock lode is the richest spot on earth. And yet the miners, gasping for breath 1,500 feet below the earth's surface, get their existence out of the splendor they dig from the earth. It goes to carry the commerce and uphold the industry of distant lands, of which the men who produce it get but dim report. Hardly more is the South profited when, stripping the harvest of her cotton fields, or striking her teeming hills, or leveling her superb forests, she sends the raw material to augment the wealth and power of distant communities."

And yet this is exactly what the West and the South have been doing ever since this country was founded.

And as a result of this economy the East owns between 80 and 90 percent of the man-made wealth of the United States, if not more. Its proportion of ownership is increasing each year. The East has this enormous ownership and control of the wealth of the Nation, although the South and the West together have 79 percent of the land of the country, produce all its gold and silver, 95 percent of its oil, 90 percent of its lumber 63 percent of its agricultural dollars and, on the basis of yearly production, have practically a monopoly on the natural wealth of America with the exception of coal and iron. The time has come when there must be an end to this condition if the Nation is to endure. The Omaha World Herald sounds the clarion call in the following editorial of August 29 last:

"THE MIDWEST MUST FIGHT

"The Middle West, laggard in growth, needs to face facts squarely.

"There is a wall around it, restricting its markets to local areas, binding its towns and cities, limiting the profits on its farms, keeping its population, in comparison with more favored regions, stagnant.

"It is the wall of discriminatory freight rates.

"It was built when the railroads, competing with the Panama Canal, began to bid for business against coastwise water carriers. They were permitted by the Interstate Commerce Commission to extend favors to east and west coast centers at the expense of the land-locked Midwest.

"Then the Midwest began to slow up. The process was gradual, and only the passage of the years has made clear how heavy the blow has been.

"By inequitable freight rates the Midwest's agriculture, its business, its industry, are being constantly constricted and restricted, its growth stunted, its opportunities narrowed.

"And in the process the railroads themselves that serve this territory are drifting into insolvency.

"A crazy freight-rate structure with reference to livestock and dressed meats is building up packing centers on east and west coasts, although their natural home is the Midwest. Iowa hogs are shipped through Omaha to Los Angeles to be slaughtered and dressed. Western Nebraska cattle seek distant markets instead of the home market. It is cheaper to ship livestock, in spite of the expense of handling en route and the shipment of water, than to ship dressed meat.

"Sugar is produced by the ton in western Nebraska. But an Omaha factory, using sugar, was forced to move to Chicago to gain lower freight rates.

"The whole freight-rate system is based upon precedents established in the days of rebates, bears little or no relation to actual traffic costs, and is marked by discriminations against the Midwest in favor of the coasts.

"And we take it. We take it although it has blocked the natural growth of this vast and fertile area, with even, in many places, a dwindling of the population.

"We take it, although it penalizes our farmers and cripples our industries.

"We take it, although in the end it means doom of the railroads themselves.

"But we need not take it passively and without effective protest. This western empire must band together to fight for a fair deal in freight rates.

"It must fight with the railroads and the Interstate Commerce Commission in one field. And it must fight for river service and barge-rail competition in another field.

"If we don't fight and fight hard, we accept death by attrition."

If the West dies, if the South dies, then the Nation dies. Once again, a house divided against itself cannot stand; we cannot remain half rich and half poor; once again we cannot remain half slave and half free. If our Nation is to endure there must be that unity of our people which alone can come from all regions growing and becoming richer in all those things which please and prosper humankind. We must be a nation in our economy as well as in our geography.

During the past few years we have won notable victories for the removal of the interterritorial discriminations. When President Roosevelt became President the South had only 1 member of the 11 members on the Interstate Commerce Commission. President Roosevelt has given the South 4 members on the Commission and has publicly declared a deep interest in the removal of the discriminations. It was with sore regret that I witnessed the resignation of Mr. Marion Caskie from the Commission, but you may be assured that we, your Representatives in Washington, are insisting that the vacancy be filled by the appointment of a southern man who understands the interterritorial problem and who will be absolutely fair to the South. I have faith to believe that such a man will be appointed.

Recent decisions of the Commission, in which your association was an active participant, involved fundamental questions of the greatest importance to us and resulted in the prescription of equitable interterritorial rates on some of our most important commodities such as coke, sugar, stone, marble, coal and wood stoves, furnaces, cast-iron pipe, iron valves, fire hydrants, brass pipe fittings and valves, soapstone and talc, enameled iron and steel plumbing goods. As a result of these victories the manufacture of kraft paper, paper bags, wrapping paper, has become a major southern industry, and only recently the Commission approved, over the protest of northern manufacturers, a basis of interterritorial rates on these new southern products which were satisfactory to the southern manufacturers. The Commission declined to suspend a new and reduced basis on rates on lumber and other forest products, one of our basic industries, from all producing points in the South to all consuming points in the North, which did not exceed, distance considered, the rates within the North, although these rates were vigorously protested by northern producers. At present we enjoy equitable interterritorial rates on southern brick and clay products, lime, coal, and industrial alcohol.

The Commission in the so-called Governors' case decided that rates on certain articles from points in southern territory to points in official territory were unreasonable and unduly prejudicial to the extent that they were upon levels higher than would result from application of approximately the same levels of rates as apply on similar traffic within official territory. This decision of the Commission follows and affirms the principle which the amendments offered by Congressman RAMSPECK and myself wrote into the law.

Under these amendments requiring immediate investigations by the Commission and removal of the discriminations, if we of the South are diligent and faithful in the pursuit of our cause, we may look forward to the day when interterritorial discriminations will live only in the memory of the past.

If we will but continue to battle for the South, her economic shackles may be stripped from her; she may be permitted to enjoy the rich advantage of her natural resources; to gain economic balance between agriculture and industry; the damages and ravages of generations of adversity may be repaired; her land and her people be restored and the South in truth become the fairest and richest domain on the earth.

Praying for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 9, 1940

EXCERPTS FROM A SERMON BY RT. REV. JAMES E. FREEMAN, BISHOP OF WASHINGTON

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following excerpts from a sermon preached in Washington Cathedral by the Right Reverend James E. Freeman, D. D., LL. D., D. C. L., S. T. D., Bishop of Washington, on Sunday, September 8, 1940, on a day set apart by the President:

In the ancient prophecy of Jeremiah, the sixth chapter, fourteenth and sixteenth verses, are these words: "They have healed also the hurt of the daughters of my people slightly, saying 'Peace, peace,' when there is no peace. Thus saith the Lord, 'Stand ye in the ways, and see, and ask for the old paths, where is the good way, and walk therein, and ye shall find rest unto your souls.' "

We assemble today under extraordinary conditions and in response to the President's call that this Sunday be set apart as a day of national prayer for world peace. The call implies that a stage has been reached in the life of the Republic that makes such a day indispensable. Extraordinary as the need for this day of prayer may be, it is but the normal way of men and nations to seek divine guidance in the time of emergency. Of old the psalmist said, "In the time of my trouble I sought the Lord." Men may forego prayer and be unmindful of God or the need of His direction in days of quiet and peace; they will inevitably turn to Him when human wisdom and strength fail and are of no avail. This, let us be reminded, is one of the weaknesses of our mortal nature. A nation called to prayer must be a nation sobered and made reflective.

We are compelled to inquire as to the cause or causes that have forced us to pray for peace. The tragic happenings of life proceed from conditions largely of our own making. There is logic in events, and what men sow they inevitably reap. Without due reflection upon the causes that have brought the world to this tragic impasse, or the recognition of the evils that have effected such a dire condition, our prayers must prove futile, even though they be sincere and reverent. We of America, in our cloistered security, freed from the horrors of the European strife, may not with smug complacency acquit ourselves of all blame for what has come upon the world. We are not impeccable, nor are we so blameless that we can think ourselves wholly immune to the ills that afflict the nations of the elder world. Any consistent appraisal of our life as a people discloses sins and weaknesses that, unchecked, must inevitably lead us to misfortune and disaster. Privileged and secure as we seem to be, such a day as this makes us conscious that we have departed from paths that were paths of rectitude, and from ways and practices that were wholesome, decent, and virtuous. Individuals and nations do not grow strong and survive because of their genius, their skill, or their prowess. They do not guarantee to themselves security and peace because of their strength in men and armaments. These latter have their place, and physical fitness and preparedness bespeak the wisdom of a statesmanlike course. We may consistently have a well-ordered constabulary on land and sea; this has been made more evident to us during these recent days; but something more is needed.

There are threatening evils in our world that must be resisted and repelled and it would be the part of folly to regard them with carefree indifference. On the other hand, it would be a greater folly to believe that men and armaments alone guarantee peace and security. There is such a thing as morale that plays a conspicuous role in the life of the individual or the corporate body. Without a sustained morale, without moral and spiritual courage, in fine without the strength that comes from deep religious convictions and a way of life in consonance with such convictions, we face a grave situation, unequipped and unready.

There is a widespread tendency today to hasty and unreflected action. We are in a mood to be stirred by our emotions and our fears. The atmosphere is charged with elements that tend to panic and to actions that are unreasoned, hasty, and hence without plan and design. It may be that a day of prayer, nay, days of constant prayer, may clarify our vision and free us from the nervous tensions that issue in the following of paths that are unjustified, unwise, and wholly foreign to our truest and best interests. We must not lose our poise or our capacity to decide our wisest course because of conditions that lie outside our own borders. We will reckon with them but we will not abandon the ways and practices that have led us to our present place of privileged distinction. This world cannot long be dominated or controlled by brute force. It takes

something more than mechanized armies and arrogant dictators to change the whole course of nations and peoples. Life cannot be sustained by agencies, however strong, that lack moral strength and moral courage. A Godless crew cannot long occupy the place of power.

We of this great Nation may have our days of prayer, but they must be supplemented and made effective by consistent penitence and a resolve to return to ways that in our mad haste we have abandoned. "Where will God lead us?" asks Viscount Halifax, of England. "Not, we may be sure through easy or pleasant paths. That is not His way. He will not help us to avoid our difficulties. What He will do, is to give to those who humbly ask, the spirit that no dangers can disturb. The Christian message to the world brings peace in war; peace when we most need it; peace of soul. If we can really do our work, whatever it is, as well as we can in God's sight, it will become His work, and we can safely leave the issue in His hands. We shall go forward, seeing clearly both the splendor and the perils of the task, but strengthened by the faith through which, by God's help, as we try to do His service, we shall prevail."

Brave, heartening words these. They bespeak a quality of character that make a people who heed them, strong and invincible. It is such qualities as these words suggest that we of America need today. Beyond all that we may do to add to our armed forces on sea or land, we have a task here within our own confines, to which we must address ourselves with zeal and determination. It concerns our moral and spiritual life; our resources in men and women of high moral worth; our fitness to meet within our borders, evil tendencies and conditions that may prove more threatening than any armed forces from without. Internally we are not prepared, and no glamour of wealth or conceits of genius, or weight of arms can make us fit to stay maladies that may prove more harmful than a foreign enemy.

A day of prayer; yes, both wisdom and experience approve it, but more than prayer is needed. A strong, steady, persevering determination to better our way, to reform our habits, to bring more of consistency, and honesty and decency, and self-respect into every department of our life; these are resolves that will give warrant to a day of prayer. To ask for the old paths, where is the good way, and to walk therein—this is to find the true and enduring satisfactions of life, and to set forward the day of peace.

Latin America Ponders the Anglo-American Deal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. SHANLEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, September 7, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE BALTIMORE SUN

Mr. SHANLEY. Mr. Speaker, in my unanimous consent to speak on the conscription bill I am taking the opportunity of placing in the RECORD a splendid editorial in the Baltimore Sun of September 7, which ought to prove a convincing argument against the statements that have been made about South America's reactions to recent events. I think this is a splendid editorial and further evidences the power of the good-neighbor policy in the nations south of the Rio Grande.

[From the Baltimore Sun of September 7, 1940]

LATIN AMERICA PONDERS THE ANGLO-AMERICAN DEAL

The excerpts quoted in the Sun yesterday from the comment of the South American press on the recent American agreement with Britain for Western Hemisphere naval bases indicate that Latin American opinion is beginning slowly to crystallize, though it has by no means yet arrived at anything like a clear and settled judgment. According to the New York Times correspondent who collected the quotations, the predominant feeling in South America is that the new arrangement will have "far-reaching effects for all the American republics." Some editors, he says, express a certain apprehension as to the effects, but the majority are content simply to point out that the United States action is certain to influence foreign policy in Latin America.

It is Argentina, the most powerful of all the South American countries, which appears to be the most cautious in its discussion. And its press spokesmen are particularly interested in emphasizing the unilateral character of Washington's dramatic move and the corollary that "consequently the other American nations are in no way bound or obligated." This, of course, is an important point which our own State Department, as well as the Latin American foreign-affairs ministers, will have to take into account in future diplomatic dealings. It is linked with this country's recent efforts, especially at the Habana consultative conference, to collectivize the basic principles of the Monroe Doctrine, in short to gain Latin America's collaboration in making that doctrine a multilateral understanding. It is linked also with the reservations which Argentina made at the time and which Buenos Aires now reiterates as "justified" by recent events.

Of course, the South American nations will probably recognize in sober realism that the new agreements with Canada and with Britain constitute an implementation, a logical extension of the Monroe Doctrine's cardinal point regarding the defense of the New World's political and territorial integrity. They will realize that America's new position in the Caribbean strengthens the shield covering Central America and part of the southern continent.

At the same time, however, these nations clearly see that because of their special relationship with the United States and the United States' new relations with Britain (some of the South American papers call it an "axis," some an "alliance"), their own position in foreign affairs will be affected.

In brief, South America is pondering the many ramifying implications—for South America—of this new instrument of American hemispherical defense. And while our neighbors have not yet come to any final conclusion or defined their attitude we can be sure that their ultimate reaction, whether unanimous or divided, will, in its turn, have important implications for us and for our program of cooperation in the New World and mutual protection of its interests.

What Price Conscription of Wealth?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LELAND M. FORD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 9, 1940

ARTICLE FROM SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA BUSINESS MAGAZINE

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Southern California Business magazine, issued by the Chamber of Commerce of Los Angeles:

[From Southern California Business magazine]

WHAT PRICE CONSCRIPTION OF WEALTH?—WHAT DOES IT MEAN?

(By Dr. V. O. Watts)

If men are to be conscripted, why not wealth?

At first thought this seems a fair question. But to answer it one must ask: What is meant by conscription of wealth?

Does it mean:

(1) Conscripting wealthy men for the Army? or

(2) Paying for armaments and war by taxes on the wealthy? or

(3) A general property levy? or

(4) Government confiscation of mines, factories, farms, and equipment needed for producing war materials?

CONSCRIPTION OF WEALTHY MEN

There is no argument here. Rich and poor will be treated alike by any conscription plan adopted by the United States.

CONSCRIPTION OF LARGE INCOMES

Conscription of income, with specially heavy levies on the well-to-do, is an old story. Already tax rates in the United States are at wartime levels and further increases seem to be on the way. To what extent can this financial burden be placed on the rich?

Nearly 80 percent of the million-dollar incomes is now taken by direct taxation in the United States. Philanthropies and investments, which, like taxes, return money to the general public, reduce still further the share of the large incomes which the wealthy keep for their personal consumption.

According to United States Treasury Department figures for 1937, therefore, taxation of these incomes, even if carried to the point of complete confiscation, would yield no more than one-five-hundredth part (0.2 percent) of the cost of the present Federal Budget.

Or suppose we taxed away every cent of income over the $75,000 salary fixed by law for the President of the United States and taxed at present rates even what was left. The total yield of such taxation in 1937 over what we actually did get would have amounted to about 3 percent of the present Federal Budget. It would have made up only about one-fifteenth (7 percent) of the expected Federal deficit for this year.

If, in 1937, we had conscripted all incomes beyond the $10,000 salary of a United States Congressman, the total revenue obtained would have been about $2,400,000,000. Such taxation would mean a degree of communism which has never prevailed in any civilized country, not even in semicivilized Soviet Russia. It would constitute a Communist revolution with all of a revolution's conflict, chaos, and relapse into barbarism. Yet the revenue obtained would make up only about one-half of the Federal deficit this year, or less than one-fourth of the total Budget.

The Federal Budget should be balanced and balanced soon, by greater economy or increased taxes, or both. But insofar as increased revenue is needed, most of it must come from people of moderate and small incomes.

Approximately 80 percent of the national income goes to persons getting less than $3,000 a year, 85 percent to those getting less than $5,000, and 95 percent to those getting less than $25,000. After account is taken of taxes the proportion left to these lower income groups is even larger.

Therefore persons of comparatively moderate incomes must bear the principal financial burden of the United States arms program.

Virtual conscription of large incomes we already have. The next step must be a considerable advance toward conscription of small and medium incomes.

CONSCRIPTION OF PROPERTY

Some hopefuls believe, however, that costs of war or a defense program could be paid for, not out of income but out of property. They propose that the well-to-do should turn over to the Government, in proportion to their property holdings, large sums of money.

But where would this money come from? Most property does not exist in the form of money. Bank deposits cannot be greatly reduced without paralyzing business operations. And if every important property holder, in order to get money to meet the property level, had to sell part of his holdings—bonds, stocks, land, mines, or factories—who would buy?

Obviously, to prevent a disastrous panic and to keep up the value of the property, the Government would have to step in and do the buying. It would print money or give credit to pay the property-owners and the property-owners would immediately return it to the Government to meet the property levy.

In the end, therefore, the Government would merely have taken, not money, but the factories, mines, lands, and shops of producers.

CONSCRIPTION OF INDUSTRY

This would be the result of a general property levy. Many of those who advocate such a levy know this. Their purpose, therefore, is not to raise funds for Government expenditures. Instead they really intend that Government shall seize and operate the mines, factories, farms, and other means of production.

In this case conscription of wealth is merely another term for Russian communism, or state socialism.

When the American people realize this fact they will speedily repudiate both the proposal and its sponsors, for they know that such conscription of wealth also involves conscription of labor. Capital by itself produces nothing, just as labor by itself produces nothing. Capital and labor must work in combination with each other. To conscript a factory is a futile gesture unless labor and management are also conscripted. That is why communistic conscription of capital has destroyed all human liberty wherever it has been tried.

COMMUNISM IS INEFFICIENT

Much could be said for conscripting producers and commandeering their equipment if this were the most efficient way of getting things done.

All human experience, however, shows that conscription of producers brings only stagnation and inefficiency.

Soviet Russia has tried this slavery for 20 years. And Russia is the only important nation in the world which has made no economic progress during that period. Forced increases in production achieved in a few industries like steel and munitions were more than offset by decreases in other essential lines, such as food, clothing, and shelter.

France, under the radical "popular front" government, nationalized its aircraft and munitions industries before the beginning of the war. The result was that production was cut in half.

Germany and Italy have partial conscription of labor and capital. But this is not the secret of what military successes they have so far achieved. These successes have been due primarily to the fact that for the last 5 years Germany spent almost twice as much on armaments as Great Britain and France together.

The purpose of Nazi and Fascist conscription of industry is political rather than economic. It is a means not of securing efficiency in production but of suppressing opposition and sabotage. Far from increasing efficiency, regimentation has had the same depressing effects in Germany and Italy as elsewhere. For the sake of a brief spurt of political and military success, the totalitarian powers all alike are sacrificing the enterprise and creative genius necessary for lasting national greatness.

Such political suppression and industrial regimentation is totally unnecessary in the United States. The Nation's producers have shown their readiness to support an adequate defense program—the world's largest Navy, the greatest air force, and an enlarged and well-equipped Army. They need no dictatorship to compel what they are already volunteering.

PRIVATE ENTERPRISE WORKS!

The record of the aircraft industry in Los Angeles County demonstrates, moreover, the speed with which voluntary enterprise can achieve the defense program if given the green light.

Growth of aircraft manufacturing, Los Angeles County, 1939–40

Size of Fixed Plants

January 1, 1939, 2,000,000 square feet.
January 1, 1940, 2,714,000 square feet.
August 1, 1940, 3,836,970 square feet.

Number of Employees

January 1, 1939, 15,930.
January 1, 1940, 26,274.
August 1, 1940, 41,756.

Monthly Pay Roll

January 1, 1939, $2,000,000.
January 1, 1940, $3,638,000.
August 1, 1940, $6,175,280.

For the next 4 months, and again for the following 4 months, the expansion will be greater than the gains for the whole 12 months of 1939 and greater than the gains of the first 7 months of 1940. This expansion is now under way and proceeding on schedule.

Along with this expansion of output there has been a rapid improvement in quality unmatched by regimented producers in any other nation. Our planes are the world's best, and the same is proving true for other forms of equipment as we increase production. This superiority will continue, moreover, as long as producers possess the freedom and encouragement of voluntary enterprise.

Government can remove various obstacles to enterprise. It can and should stimulate greater competition. But a bureaucratic, dictatorial administration of industry paralyzes enterprise and stops progress.

The proposal for wholesale Government seizure of the means of production should be recognized for what it is. It is an attempt to establish Communist dictatorship under cover of a war emergency. In such a guise "conscription of wealth" would mean the betrayal of all that our Nation stands for.

Let's preserve intact America's greatest economic asset—the ingenuity and efficiency of a free people.

The National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW EDMISTON

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 9, 1940

ARTICLE FROM THE WASHINGTON DAILY NEWS

Mr. EDMISTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Daily News of September 6, 1940:

[From the Washington Daily News of September 6, 1940]

HERE'S WHERE WE STAND—CONTRACTS WORTH TWO BILLIONS SIGNED TOWARD ARMY OF 1,200,000 MEN

(By Mack Johnson)

United States defenses are stronger than they were a year ago, but real rearmament by 1940 standards—the $10,000,000,000 program for 35,000 airplanes and a modern Army of 1,200,000 men—will take well into 1942, and a two-ocean Navy will take 5 years.

Those are the basic facts that stand out in this detailed survey.

The story shows volunteers joining the colors in unusual numbers for peacetime, but still in numbers too small to fit the Army's views of what is needed.

It shows haggling over some contracts and on the other hand of contracts worth $2,187,312,000 approved by the Defense Commission (which handles contracts in excess of $500,000) since the first half of the ten billions was appropriated in June. In addition, the Army and Navy have awarded hundreds of smaller contracts.

PROGRAM

Congress was working on Regular Army and Navy appropriation bills when Germany invaded the lowlands and France in May. They were record peacetime bills.

Then, at the President's request, they were doubled to a total of approximately $5,000,000,000. That money became available in June.

UPPED TO TEN BILLIONS

In response to another White House request, a bill carrying another $5,000,000,000 plus is now nearly ready for the President's signature. Over-all total is $10,496,000,000. Roughly, two-thirds of it is for the Army, one-third for the Navy.

Big contracts for airplanes, tanks, and munitions are among those awarded. But that does not necessarily mean quick production. Existing airplane factories, for instance, already are working to capacity on both foreign orders, as well as planes ordered with money voted by Congress in 1939. Design and construction of new plants to handle the big present and impending orders take time.

INDUSTRIAL

The Army has a program for construction of a chain of about 60 crucial munitions plants, costing approximately $700,000,000 and capable of supplying a force of 2,000,000 men. Funds already have been appropriated for some of these, as indicated below. Private

industry will operate the plants on a fixed-fee basis, but title will be held by the Federal Government.

New arms plants

The War Department has contracted for a $25,000,000 smokeless-powder plant at Charlestown, Ind., to be operated by E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co., Inc.; a $25,000,000 powder plant at Radford, Va., to be operated by Hercules Powder; and a $14,215,000 ammunition-loading plant at Ravenna, Ohio, to be operated by Atlas powder. The War Department also has arranged with Chrysler Corporation to build and operate a $20,000,000 tank arsenal in the Detroit area. Negotiations are virtually complete with North American Aviation Corporation to build and operate a $6,500,000 plane factory at Dallas, Tex.

Defense plant loans

The R. F. C. has made loans totaling $409,538,000 to 21 concerns to help finance plant expansion, etc. Largest, $92,000,000, went to Wright Aeronautical Corporation to finance expanded aircraft-engine production.

Navy employment

Ten navy yards and seven private yards are working on warships. Navy yards reported employment on warship construction at 59,971 on July 1, 1939, and 87,181 on July 1, 1940.

Private yard employment was 24,490 on July 1 as compared with 16,073 on the corresponding day last year.

PRESENT STATUS OF ARMED FORCES

Here are figures that provide a quick survey, obtained in most instances from official sources; where exact data were withheld, best estimates by informed sources were used.

Army Air Force: Planes on hand, July 1, 1939, about 2,000; on August 15, 1940, about 3,200. Planes on order, 5,245.

Naval Air Force: Planes on hand, July 1, 1939, 1,648; on August 15, 1940, 1,897. Planes on order, 2,429.

Army: Regular enlisted strength on July 1, 1939, 174,074; on August 16, 1940, 289,000.

Navy: Combatant ships in commission on July 1, 1939, 364; on August 15, 1940, 408 (of which 50 destroyers are being turned over to the British). Warships under construction, 132. Enlisted strength on May 23, 1940, 136,164; on August 15, 1940, 147,513.

AIR FORCES

On August 15 the Army and Navy had approximately 5,079 planes on hand. Sometime in 1942 this figure is expected to be 35,000 (25,000 Army, 10,000 Navy). Planes on order under signed contracts total 7,674, distributed in this manner:

Army: Trainers, 2,731; combat, 2,514. Total, 5,245.

Navy: Trainers, 1,401; combat, 1,017; miscellaneous, 11. Total, 2,429.

In addition, 2,967 planes are considered tentatively on order, because manufacturers have assured the Federal Government of intention to make contracts as soon as the manufacturers are satisfied with congressional action on taxes and related matters.

On hand now

Of total planes on hand August 15, approximately 3,200 are Army craft, 1,897 Navy. The impending supplemental defense appropriation bill provides money for an additional 14,394 planes for the Army and 4,028 for the Navy.

Plane orders to date have been concentrated on training craft, so that the Army and Navy can have pilots to man the combat craft to come.

Production

Aircraft production rate now has reached 10,000 annually. It is expected to be 13,000 to 14,000 per year by January 1941; 24,000 by mid-1941; and 36,000 by early 1942.

Engines

Engine experts estimated the annual engine production rate (1,000-horsepower motors or larger ones) was 7,270 in January 1939; 19,280 in March 1940; and probably will reach 29,280 by the end of this year.

The Defense Commission has approved 7 aircraft-engine contracts. Largest is $160,000,000 for 17,000 Pratt & Whitney Wasp-type engines. A $44,000,000 order for 3,000 engines was given to Packard Motor Co., Detroit. In addition, the War Department has arranged to obtain 20,000 engines from Wright Aeronautical Corporation.

Pilots

The Navy is increasing its training facilities to build up a force of 18,500 pilots by July 1, 1942.

The Army has contracted with private schools for preliminary training of 7,000 pilots annually and is expanding its own training centers. The Army program also envisages training of 3,600 bombardiers and navigators.

NAVY

Until this week, the Navy had a total of 408 combatant warships totaling 1,344,000 tons. Before the deal turning 50 destroyers to the British Navy for naval bases, the Navy had 15 battleships, 6 aircraft carriers, 37 cruisers, 201 destroyers, 46 old destroyers that have been converted into different types of craft, and 103 submarines.

Warships ordered

Since May 10, the Navy has awarded contracts totaling $1,140,000,000 for 87 combatant ships aggregating 478,285 tons and 5 auxiliaries totaling 21,150 tons. The new contracts call for two 45,000-ton battleships, 15 cruisers, 4 aircraft carriers, 38 destroyers, and 28 submarines.

Since July 1, 1939, the Navy has commissioned 41 new ships—1 cruiser, 1 aircraft carrier, 19 destroyers, 9 submarines, and 11 auxiliaries. It has also put into service 110 World War destroyers for neutrality patrol and other work, and converted 31 privately owned ships into patrol boats, transports, and auxiliaries.

Navy speed-up

The following tabulation, showing the number of ships under construction, discloses the speed-up which has taken place in expanding the Navy during the past few months:

	May	August
Battleships	8	10
Aircraft carriers	2	5
Cruisers	8	21
Destroyers	40	57
Submarines	19	39
Total	77	132

The new appropriation being completed this week contains funds to start construction, as soon as facilities can be found, of 200 more warships to make a two-ocean Navy in 5 years.

Marine Corps

The Marine Corps now has 31,469 men, about 3,500 below authorized strength, as compared with 25,045 on May 23. Four highly mobile defense battalions of 750 men each have been organized. Two more are being formed. These are designed for quick transportation to any point of trouble in the Western Hemisphere. They are being equipped with special light tanks, antiaircraft guns, machine guns, landing boats, and other materials. Six destroyers are being converted into high-speed transports for them.

ARMY

The Army, which has an authorized strength of 375,000 enlisted Regulars, now totals about 298,000 men, as compared with 230,772 in May and 174,074 in July 1939.

Recruits are averaging about 8,000 per week.

Total force 672,772

If all the existing Reserve branches, including the National Guard, were mustered (the President now has the power to do so), the Army would have a total force of 672,772.

There are 120,000 Reserve officers, of whom 8,000 are on duty with the Regulars. The National Guard numbers 235,000, of which 60,500 have already been called for September 16. It is planned to increase the Guard to 325,000 through enlistments and eventually bring it up to full strength of 410,000 by adding conscripts. Four hundred thousand conscripts are due to be inducted in service by January.

The goal

The present Army consists of nine streamlined infantry divisions; two newly formed armored and wholly mechanized divisions; one complete and one partly complete cavalry division. When the goal of a 1,200,000-man army is reached, there will be 10 armored divisions using 700 tanks each, and 45 infantry divisions.

Can train million now

Gen. George C. Marshall, Chief of Staff, believes the Army has sufficient weapons on hand at least to train the projected 1,200,000-man army, but materials now available are largely old.

The Army is far deficient in new-model antitank guns, large caliber antiaircraft guns, new-type howitzers, ammunition, tanks, and aircraft-detection devices. The appropriation bill now being completed provides funds for complete equipment of a 1,200,000-man army with the most modern weapons of war, according to the Army.

Here is a tabulation of essential equipment on hand and on order:

	On hand	On order
Garand semiautomatic rifles	42,000	198,000
Springfield and Enfield rifles	2,000,000	
.50-caliber antiaircraft guns	1,014	1,362
90-mm. antiaircraft guns		1,612
77-mm. artillery	3,000	
75-mm. howitzers	60	120
Tanks	500	2,200
Armored cars	485	861
Combat cars	114	100
Motor vehicles	32,792	36,970
Gas masks	407,696	361,000

Plan 6,000 tanks

Largest tank now in service weighs 22 tons. The Army is hustling toward a goal of 6,000. It has ordered 1,000 from Chrysler, 1,156 from American Car & Foundry, and an undisclosed number from other sources. Baldwin Locomotive recently was given an order for heavy tanks believed to be 70 to 80 tons each, similar to the German land battleships.

SPENDING

Here is a compilation of actual military expenditures for the fiscal years 1914 through 1940, based on official figures:

Fiscal year:	*Expenditures*
1914	$253,000,000
1915	257,000,000
1916	277,000,000
1917	658,000,000
1918	7,014,000,000
1919	11,217,000,000
1920	1,657,000,000
1921	1,070,000,000
1922	794,000,000
1923	596,000,000
1924	573,000,000
1925	589,000,000
1926	580,000,000
1927	584,000,000
1928	624,000,000
1929	678,000,000
1930	701,000,000
1931	667,000,000
1932	664,000,000
1933	633,000,000
1934	494,000,000
1935	663,000,000
1936	880,000,000
1937	895,000,000
1938	980,000,000
1939	1,056,000,000
1940	1,558,000,000

In the fiscal year 1941, which began July 1, 1940, the Budget Bureau estimates that $5,000,000,000 actually will be disbursed out of the more than $10,000,000,000 voted by the present Congress.

Postscript: New statistics on the aircraft situation became available last night, showing the Navy now has 2,833 planes on order compared with 2,429 August 15.

A special memorandum on aircraft procurement prepared by Admiral John H. Towers, Chief of the Naval Bureau of Aeronautics, for Chairman CARL VINSON, of the House Naval Affairs Committee, showed that on September 3 the Navy had 2,533 planes on order and undelivered. Late yesterday the Navy ordered 300 scouting observation planes from Curtiss-Wright Corporation.

At the same time Gen. George C. Marshall, Army Chief of Staff, shed more light on the combat status of the Army air force. He told a press conference that the Army has about 1,500 tactical planes which could be used in war, although but 500 of them are up-to-the-minute designs with armor protection and self-sealing gasoline tanks. Of the 500, he explained, 300 are the "most modern combat types of bombers and pursuit ships."

How Much Per Vote?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SOL BLOOM
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 9, 1940

ARTICLE BY GEORGE W. GRUPP

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by George W. Grupp, which appeared serially in the New York Post of August 22 and 23, 1940, entitled "How Much Per Vote?"

[From the New York Post of August 22 and 23, 1940]

HOW MUCH PER VOTE?

(By George W. Grupp)

Now that a political campaign contribution by a corporation, individual, or organization is limited to $5,000, and the total expenditures of a national committee must be kept within the bounds of $3,000,000, some may ask if the 1940 Presidential campaign will be less colorful than those when larger total expenditures were permissible.

The drill squads and torchlight parades of 1896 will not be repeated in 1940. A revival of such methods was a failure in 1916. However, there will be plenty of fish frys and large mass meetings where the air will vibrate with serious and amusing words, with brass-band music, with community singing, and with unrestrained shouting.

Most of the people, one must not forget, will be amused, educated, and persuaded by use of the press, radio, and television. These latter methods are less colorful than parades, but they do possess the advantage of reaching more people at a reduced cost.

Wendell L. Willkie made it known that he does not want direct or indirect corporate contributions or large contributions from individuals who wish to be rewarded with appointments to high public offices. Willkie is of the opinion that his nomination is a people's movement which should be supported by a large number of small contributions. He wants to keep his campaign costs at a minimum. All this is commendable, good business practice, effective campaign propaganda, and sound political strategy.

The Democratic National Committee failed to elect Douglas with an expenditure of $50,000 in 1860, but it did reelect Franklin D. Roosevelt at a cost of $5,651,118 in 1936. The Republican National Committee suceeded in electing Lincoln at a cost of $100,000 in 1860, but failed to elect Landon at a cost of $8,892,971 in 1936.

A study of past national campaign costs reveals that the national committee with the largest total campaign fund, and the committee which spent the most per voter, won every Presidential election from Lincoln down to the present, with the exception of Wilson's reelection and Franklin D. Roosevelt's first and second elections. And the national committee which spent the most per vote received by its Presidential candidate won every election since the time of Lincoln, except both elections of Woodrow Wilson and Franklin D. Roosevelt.

The cost per voter of the Republican Party fluctuated between the low of $0.02138 in 1860 to the high of $0.2425 in 1896. In comparison the Democratic National Committee cost per voter fluctuated between the low of $0.00773 in 1872 and the high of $0.1951 in 1892.

With the exception of the Presidential campaigns of 1884, 1892, and 1912 the Democratic National Committee cost per voter lagged behind the Republican National Committee cost per voter.

An examination of the cost per vote received by the Democratic Party reveals that it rose and fell between the low of $0.0176 in 1872 and the high of $0.4230 in 1892. On the other hand, the cost per vote received by the Republican Party Presidential candidates during the period 1860-1936 fluctuated between the low of $0.0497 in 1868 and the high of $0.5331 in 1936. It was only in 1884, 1892, and 1928 that the cost per vote received by the Democratic Party exceeded that of the Republican Party.

No one should be shocked or amazed by these costs. Millions of dollars are spent each year to sell and advertise commercial services and commodities. Millions of voters cannot be cultivated, educated, and persuaded to vote for a particular Presidential candidate on the budget of a push-cart merchant.

The following table shows the record of Republicans and Democrats since 1860:

Year	Republican			Democratic		
	Total amount spent	Cost per voter	Cost per vote received	Total amount spent	Cost per voter	Cost per vote received
1860	$100,000	$0.0213	$0.0535	$50,000	$0.0106	$0.0363
1864	125,000	.0310	.0564	50,000	.0124	.0276
1868	150,000	.0262	.0497	75,000	.0131	.0276
1872	250,000	.0386	.0695	50,000	.0077	.0176
1876	950,000	.1129	.2355	900,000	.1069	.2100
1880	1,100,000	.1194	.2472	355,000	.0385	.0799
1884	1,300,000	.1294	.2681	1,400,000	.1393	.2850
1888	1,350,000	.1186	.2479	855,000	.0750	.1543
1892	1,700,000	.1411	.3275	2,350,000	.1951	.4230
1896	3,350,000	.2425	.4761	675,000	.0488	.1043
1900	3,000,000	.2148	.4155	425,000	.0304	.0668
1904	2,096,000	.1549	.2747	700,000	.0517	.1376
1908	1,655,518	.1112	.2155	629,341	.0422	.0981
1912	1,071,549	.0712	.3075	1,134,848	.0754	.1805
1916	2,441,565	.1317	.2863	2,284,590	.1232	.2507
1920	5,417,501	.2028	.3355	1,470,371	.0550	.1617
1924	4,020,478	.1383	.2556	1,108,836	.0381	.1323
1928	6,256,111	.1696	.2926	5,342,350	.1448	.3557
1932	2,670,000	.0670	.1693	1,708,000	.0428	.0748
1936	8,892,971	.1948	.5331	5,651,118	.1238	.2036

Reasons Why I Opposed Peacetime Conscription

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARTIN F. SMITH
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, September 7, 1940

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I have voted for every national-defense measure requested by President Roosevelt, including authority to the President to mobilize the National Guard. The Burke-Wadsworth bill provides for peacetime conscription and if I thought it was necessary or advisable, I would not hesitate to support it. However, after

giving the proposal deep study and thorough consideration, I am convinced that it is neither necessary, nor advisable, and I desire to state briefly the reasons for the conclusions I have reached:

First. I consider this legislation a step toward entry in the war to which I believe our people are as much opposed as I am.

Second. It is very significant to me that neither Canada, nor any of the British Dominions have resorted to conscription, even after having been at war with Germany for a year. Canada is now putting into effect very limited compulsory military training for 30 days only and calling only 30,000 men per month, and the law specifically provides that they shall not be required to serve outside of Canada. We now have in our military forces 919,807 men, and by the close of this year they will approximate 1,000,000 men. The Navy does not need additional manpower; in fact, has a waiting list of 7,000 and volunteer enlistments far exceed the requirements. Pursuant to the law we recently enacted, authorizing mobilization of the National Guard for a year of active service with the Regular Army, the size of our Military Establishment will be doubled. According to the testimony adduced before the committees of Congress, the Army cannot properly equip, train, and coordinate the first body of 400,000 men proposed to be drafted within the next 12 to 18 months. Indeed, William S. Knudsen, of the National Defense Council, testified before a Senate committee: "It will be 1942 before there will be complete equipment for 750,000 men." Gen. George C. Marshall, Chief of Staff, has testified that these men will be without proper housing, that barracks have not been built; that they will be without Army overcoats or blankets this winter, that there will not be enough tanks, antitank guns, mortars, combat planes. I, therefore, conclude that this measure is unnecessary and premature, especially in view of the fact that men are now volunteering at the rate of over 40,000 per month, much faster than they can be armed, trained, and equipped.

Third. I reiterated to my constituents, as soon as this bill was proposed, my pledge, which I have repeated in every campaign during the past 8 years, that I would never vote to conscript, even in wartime, manpower and the flesh, blood, and immortal souls of our young men, unless we, at the same time, conscript corporations, profits, property, and wealth. We do not do that under this bill or any other measure likely to be enacted in this session. The Smith amendment offered by our colleague from Connecticut, which is preferable to the Vinson amendment, as well as the Russell-Overton amendment adopted in the Senate, are merely gestures in that direction, but do not begin to accomplish the purpose I have in mind. In the last World War we lost the lives of 120,000 young men, and gained 40,000 new millionaires—one new millionaire for every three young men who made the supreme sacrifice. We do not want to repeat that crime and tragedy in the next war in which we are called upon to participate, and I intend to keep my pledge to the people who have elected and reelected me to Congress.

Fourth. I voted for the Fish amendment, calling for voluntary enlistments of 400,000 men during a period of 60 days, and if the number called did not respond, conscription to go into effect. I voted for this amendment in order to render the bill less objectionable if passed, and then voted against the bill on final passage. I wish to point out the fact that the drive for voluntary enlistments started in the middle of May 1940. Only the records of 2 complete months are available. In June, there were 23,400 voluntary enlistments, and in July, 31,400. According to incomplete returns, the number was 35,633 in August. It is estimated by the War Department that it will be the middle of September before the returns for August are complete, but it is expected that they will exceed 40,000. If this proves to be correct, then the voluntary enlistments in August 1940 will be higher than in any single month in the history of the United States, either in peacetime or wartime. Bear in mind that this is in peacetime. What would they be in the event we were threatened by invasion, or in wartime?

Fifth. I call attention to a very dangerous proviso in this legislation, which is urged as an emergency national defense measure and that is the proviso that it shall be in effect for 5 years; and it further provides for 10-year service in the Reserves. It lays down a permanent policy for our Republic and is contrary to our American traditions for 150 years. In an effort to discredit peacetime volunteering, the false claim is asserted that volunteering failed in the Civil War and in the World War. The truth and historical fact is that over 2,000,000 volunteers served in the Union Army and only 46,347 conscripts. In the last World War, despite the fact that volunteering was rendered practically impossible after the draft went into effect, 1,163,048 volunteers served. The proponents of peacetime conscription as a new national policy for the United States contend that we should profit by the example of the democracies in Europe. Their contention is untenable, for France, Belgium, and Holland had peacetime conscription and utterly collapsed in the war. Great Britain, which alone is withstanding magnificently the onslaught of the axis powers, abhorred peacetime conscription. I, therefore, question very seriously the need and certainly the wisdom of our fastening for a period of 5 years, probably permanently, enforced military training in peacetime upon the free and liberty-loving people of the United States.

Sixth. To some it may seem a matter of minor importance, but to me it is not entirely without consequence. I voted for the Schaefer amendment to include Members of Congress, the State legislatures, and other public officials under this legislation, so that they would be subject to draft the same as anybody else and not be exempted. It seems to me that this is only plain consistency, for if we are convinced of the need and advantages of this legislation, we ourselves should be subject to its provisions. I cannot consistently vote to conscript my constituents, their sons, brothers, and husbands, and vote to exempt myself and my colleagues in public life.

Seventh. Briefly stated, the foregoing are the main reasons why I voted against the peacetime conscription bill, known as the Burke-Wadsworth bill. As I stated at the outset, I have given this entire matter deep, earnest, and serious thought and consideration, and, as a result, reached these conclusions. I am confirmed and fortified in my belief that I have reached the correct conclusion by the fact that some of the largest and most important groups of citizens in the land and their leaders have also expressed themselves in opposition to this legislation. I have time to quote only a few of them.

Raymond J. Kelly, national commander of the American Legion, whose loyalty and Americanism is beyond question, has stated that "conscription should not be put into effect until all other avenues have been exhausted." As we have already noted, all other avenues have not been exhausted, and more volunteers are enlisting in the Army and Navy now than can be readily assimilated.

Harry H. Woodring, former Secretary of War, under President Roosevelt, states:

> I am an advocate of adequate defense, but I will never stand for sending American boys into Europe's shambles. There is a comparatively small clique of internationalists who want the United States to declare war and get into the European mess with everything we have, including our manpower.

William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, said:

> In providing an adequate army for defensive purposes, the American way should be followed first. A voluntary enlistment program should be launched by the Government designed to create an army of 1,500,000 men. This would be putting voluntary action before compulsion. American labor would respond to such a program wholeheartedly and enthusiastically.

Dr. Francis E. Townsend has denounced peacetime conscription as "unnecessary at this time, and un-American."

John L. Lewis, president of the Congress of Industrial Organizations, said:

> I wonder if in our zeal to protect our country from the shadow of Hitler we are not using some of Hitler's methods that will in the end proscribe our civil liberties and create social confusion and unrest to the point that will bring about the very conditions we are trying to escape.

The Railroad Labor Executives Association, and 4 standard railroad brotherhoods, representing 1,000,000 railway workers, issued a statement opposing conscription at this time, in which it was said:

There has been no demonstration that the voluntary method will not furnish the necessary manpower.

Speaking for the archbishops and bishops of the administrative board of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, Msgr. Michael J. Ready told the House Military Affairs Committee:

This legislation is too important to be rushed through Congress until all other possible programs have been examined.

The Methodist World Peace Commission, representing 8,000,000 members, said:

Military conscription at this time is not essential to national defense. We refuse to believe that the United States, in order to preserve its own way of life, must cease to be a democracy and become itself a totalitarian regime.

Many more extracts from testimony, statements, and similar expressions of opposition to peacetime conscription could be quoted. But these will suffice to establish the substantial and widespread opposition that exists among all classes and groups of citizens.

Old-Age Pensions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 9, 1940

RESOLUTION OF THE GENERAL WELFARE FEDERATION OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to have printed in the RECORD with my remarks the following resolution of the General Welfare Federation of Southern California:

HUNTINGTON PARK, CALIF., August 25, 1940.—Our President of the United States, Hon. Franklin D. Roosevelt, in one of his recent national broadcasts, said:

"There is nothing in our present emergency to justify a breaking down of our old-age pensions or unemployment insurance. I would rather see the system extended to other groups who do not now enjoy them."

The Honorable ROBERT L. DOUGHTON, chairman of the Congressional Ways and Means Committee, has been quoted as recently saying:

"I agree fully with my associates on the committee, Mr. MCCORMACK and Mr. DINGELL, in their statement to the effect that the bill you are pressing, the General Welfare Act, H. R. 5620, is by far the best pension bill in the field. What we members of the committee appreciate about it the most is that it has been handled as a piece of legislation and not as a political football for vote-getting purposes."

Believing that these two endorsements of the fundamental principles of a sound, common sense, adequate national old-age pension, backed by the signatures of 201 Congressmen and a congressional steering committee of 80 Congressmen, this act, H. R. 5620, is worthy of the most earnest consideration of every Congressman of the 48 States; this southern California general welfare mass meeting, representing all of the congressional districts of southern California assembled this 25th day of August 1940 hereby

Resolve, That we sincerely and most earnestly appeal to every Congressman who has not yet signed the Magnuson petition, No. 15, to bring H. R. 5620 out of the Ways and Means Committee to the floor of the House for a full discussion and a vote, to immediately sign this petition as one of his duties in advancing the cause of national defense by insuring to the citizens of this Nation the moral and economic stability necessary for the fullest possible support; and be it further

Resolved, That in the name of the millions of elderly citizens who have spent their lives in helping to build this United States of America to its present world supremacy, in the name of the millions of the mothers and grandmothers, in the name of the millions of the youth of the Nation who are now without employment, and in the name of the millions of innocent young children, and the millions yet to be born, we appeal to you from the very depths of our hearts and souls to do this patriotic duty and sign this discharge petition today.

Passed by unanimous standing vote and a heartfelt prayer that the good Lord will answer this appeal.

Signed by:

THOMAS C. ROBERTS,
President, Southern California General Welfare Mass Meetings, South Gate, Calif.

S. HOWARD LEECH,
Secretary and Publicity Director, Baldwin Park, Calif.

C. ROBERT WEBER,
Chairman of the Day, El Monte, Calif.

The Postal Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE WILLIAMS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 9, 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. MILTON A. ROMJUE, OF MISSOURI

Mr. WILLIAMS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith a copy of an address made by Hon. MILTON A. ROMJUE, of Missouri, chairman of the Post Office and Post Roads Committee of the House of Representatives, at St. Louis, Mo., August 21, 1940, before the national convention of rural letter carriers, at which convention there were in attendance representatives from 46 of the 48 States.

The address is as follows:

Mr. ROMJUE. Mr. Combs, gentlemen of the convention, and members of the Rural Carriers Association, it is indeed a pleasure for me to be here this afternoon and to have this opportunity to meet you. Many of you I know personally. Some of you I have known for a great many years. I wish I could know you all personally, and I wish I could have the opportunity to sit down and visit with you individually.

I want to take this opportunity to say that I appreciate the very kind remarks which your chairman has made in regard to myself and to your post office committee. I have known Mr. Combs quite some time. I have found him a very excellent gentleman, a man of good, sound judgment, a man who always approaches the problems that he presents with reason—and that is the only way to approach any problem—and it has been a delight to know him and to work with him and to help him and those whom he represents whenever your committee has been able to do so. I do not claim the credit which he seems to give me. We have a wonderfully fine committee of about 25 members, some Republicans and some Democrats. When I became chairman of the Post Office Committee I conferred with each of these members individually, many of those who knew me before, had served on the committee with me for some years, but to the new Members coming in, I said very frankly to them, "Without regard to your politics, even though you may be a Republican and I be a Democrat; even though I might feel like you ought not to be a Republican, that is perfectly all right and your privilege, but in this committee our business is to legislate for the best interests of our country, dealing fairly on all problems that come before the committee for consideration." And I feel that there is no committee in the House of Representatives that has a finer membership than the Post Office Committee, the chairmanship of which I happen to hold at this time. I have found the Republican members working diligently, member by member, like the Democrats, interested in solving the problems in what we believe to be the fairest and most reasonable way. So it happens that a very distinguished Congressman from Alabama, who does not happen to be on the Post Office Committee, but who is very familiar with its work, during this session paid our committee a very high compliment, in which he said: "Whenever any legislation comes out of the Post Office Committee, you can be assured of this, that it has had a most careful study and analysis." Fortunately, and due largely to the sound judgment of my fellow members on that committee, more so perhaps than to myself, they have been ready to counsel on any problems, and during the last regular session of Congress, of the 18 bills that have come out of that committee, every one of them had a unanimous report, no division, no political, and no party division. Which would indicate to you that our members without regard to politics were trying as best we knew to solve these problems right. During this session of Congress I am not quite sure just how many we have reported out, possibly 12 or 15 bills, and every one of them up to this time has had a unanimous report of the committee. When we found that we sometimes differed on minor problems, we held the matter up and conferred further until we finally found that we were all in accord.

I am very grateful to be here this afternoon, and I appreciate the fine work that Mr. Combs has been rendering to the Post Office Department, and especially the Post Office Committee, and I would be remiss in my duty if I did not avail myself of this opportunity to say to you that I regret very much that General Farley is to leave as head of the Post Office Department. [Applause.] My work as chairman of the Post Office Committee during a large part of the time that he has been at the head of the Department has been most pleasant and most excellent from his standpoint. I wish I could tell you people and impress upon you how highly he regards the individual rural carriers of this country. He understands much better than you know how well you men have been discharging your duties. He believes, as I believe, that there is no finer body of men in the world than the rural carriers of this country. [Applause.]

I came in here yesterday afternoon quite tired. Last night I came down and mixed around among the crowd and met a good many people. A great many of them I did not know, and I am going to tell you the truth, I have got this sort of philosophy of life: A man should always tell the truth or not say anything. If that don't solve his problems, go to asking questions as fast as you can. That will get you along very well. But you know, Mr. Combs, I was delighted when I looked over in the lobby of this hotel yesterday evening and saw this fine body of men. I knew a lot of them were fine fellows, but I hadn't seen you all, and when I went back up to my room I said to my wife, "I don't believe I ever attended any convention, political or otherwise, where there was a finer looking lot of men than I see here in this rural carriers' meeting." She agreed with me. [Laughter.] Of course, the first thing I was doing was looking you men over, you understand, because I knew you were the carriers, you were the men in the service, the men behind the gun, so to speak, in this great service. Then this morning I went down and I looked around and my wife was with me, but I began looking at the women [laughter], and, bless your soul, I want to confess to you it was a surprise to me, after looking you fellows over and making up my mind like I had, as good looking as you were, intelligent as you seemed to be, when I went back to my room with my wife, I said, "How in the devil did those fellows get as good looking women as they have got?" [Laughter and applause.] But here was the evidence which I cannot dispute. Well, there is no better class of people than the rural carriers, and among them I have had a lot of wonderfully good friends.

I want to say in addition to what I have said about General Farley—and I can't emphasize too much what a great service he has rendered this country—he has made the best Postmaster General this country ever had [applause], but he would not claim that he had made that all by himself. I have talked with him on many occasions, and he knows it has only been possible for him to do that because of the fact that he had a very efficient Postal Service from the top to the bottom, all the way down the line Of course, once in a while rural mail carriers go wrong, like a Congressman does. [Laughter.] They make mistakes now and then. But the Postmaster General has always had a sympathetic heart, has had good men under him, Mr. Purdum, Mr. O'Connell, Mr. Black, and all of them have been very efficient in their procedure. I understand Mr. Purdum is here at this convention, or will be before it is over, a most excellent gentleman who has been promoted to Second Assistant Postmaster General. By the way, a man that many of you know, Mr. Myers, has been made Fourth Assistant Postmaster General. I do not know Mr. Myers so well yet, but I am sure he is wise enough to get along all right. I was thinking about him last night. A few days ago he went into a restaurant there in Washington and bought himself an order of oysters, and in eating those oysters he found a pearl in one of them, which I understand, if the newspapers are to be believed, he sold for $200. Well, when I read that, I thought to myself, a Congressman has got just as much right to find a pearl as an Assistant Postmaster General, so that afternoon I went downtown and I ordered 18 oysters. I commenced on those little blue points, which are small, as you know, the smallest oyster there is. I chewed those oysters up, but I didn't find any pearls. Another Congressman was with me, and I said to him, "I haven't found any pearls yet. I believe I will get the next biggest oysters." So when the waiter came up I said, "What is the next largest oyster you have to these? I haven't found any pearls in these." He said, "The next ones are what we call Chincoteagues." So I said, "Bring me half a dozen Chincoteagues." He brought them in and I ate those, and still I didn't find any pearls. After a while the waiter came back and said, "Do you want any more?" I said, "Yes; bring me half a dozen of the biggest you have got." So he brought me in what they call Lynhaven, pretty nearly as big as your hand. I got about four of them down and that was about as far as I could go, but I didn't find any pearls. So I took a paper napkin and wrapped up the other two and put them in my pocket. [Laughter.] Then I went over to the Post Office Department to see Mr. Myers. I figured I couldn't eat the other two, and I thought I would take them over for him to eat and see if he couldn't find a pearl.

Unfortunately for me, perhaps, he was not in, so I couldn't give them to him. Well, anyway, I am not telling this to you folks in order to get you to eat more oysters. That is entirely with you, but I want to say that every once in a while I get a letter from somebody who is not a rural carrier, who will write me and say: "Our rural carrier here is drawing down big pay. He is not earning what he gets. I will take that job a lot cheaper than he is doing it, and I want to get a bill passed through Congress so you can let this out at public bidding and let the lowest bidder have the job. Our carrier is a very nice fellow, I guess, but he has been drawing a pretty good salary, and I don't think it is worth that." Then he will point out some sunshiny day when you fellows go around in your automobiles and get back a little early, and he argues that that shows what an easy job you have. But he never says anything about the snowstorms that you get caught in, and he never says anything about the mud that some of you have to go through. Then, of course, he will point out that you have hard-surfaced roads to travel over all the time, which is true, of course, to a considerable extent. Well, I remember a few years ago when they had that proposition up, some fellows were advocating that the rural carriers are getting paid too much money, and some of them were before our committee testifying that all you fellows did was to get out and drive around for 3 or 4 hours and come back on hard-surfaced roads. I listened to a few statements of that kind and then I said: "Did you ever stop to think about this, my friend, that the hard-surfaced roads don't run in circles?" [Laughter.] Well, he looked at me in amazement and he said, "How's that, Mr. Congressman?" I said, "Did you ever stop to think—now you are charging that these rural carriers ride on hard-surfaced roads all the time, but did you ever stop to think that the hard-surfaced roads don't run in circles? They build hard-surfaced roads through States on the most direct line. They try to find usually the shortest distance between two points. It is true that sometimes some of these carriers have a little more hard-surfaced road than others, but while I haven't stopped to figure it up I think I can take my district in northeast Missouri, and I will venture to state that the rural carriers of my district don't travel over 3 or 4 miles on hard-surfaced roads in that district." That was about 4 years ago. I checked up on it after that and I found that the actual figure was about 3 miles or 3½ of real hard-surfaced roads. That is all that the rural carrier has to travel on. He crosses hard-surfaced roads. Sometimes he follows them for a mile or two and then off he goes. Well, this critic hadn't thought about that, and after the hearing was over he came to me and said: "Congressman, you told me something I had not thought about. I never thought about the hard-surfaced roads running straight through a State." I said, "They certainly do. In Missouri, route 36 starts at Hannibal and goes right directly across to St. Joe. It don't deviate more than a couple of miles on the whole way. So if you have got the idea that a carrier starts out and travels halfway to St. Joe, and then comes back [laughter], you just don't understand the job that the carrier has got."

Sometimes I wonder if the most difficult problem we have in this life is to see the other man's problem. If we could ever stop to think about what the other fellow has got to do, and try just for a short time to put ourselves in his place, we would be more sympathetic with his viewpoint. I suppose it is all right that the Creator made us so that we would be more or less selfish. I think that is all right, to be somewhat selfish, because if some people are not made a little bit selfish, they would be too lazy to do anything. [Laughter.] That is a fact, they would not do anything. So God Almighty was rather wise after all. He kind of fixed it up so we would all be a little selfish. It puts us on the road to success, to try to do something.

I remember very well the first term of school I taught, I taught for $20 a month and rode 14 miles every day And those were the happiest days of my life—that is, till after I got married. [Laughter.] Everything has been going all right since then. Of course, I started out early in the morning and got there in time to perform what I thought was my duty. Well, in the afternoon after school was out, when I got home I had nothing to do, so I always carried a good book with me, which is about the best companion any young man, or women either, for that matter, can have, and I always carried a good book with me, and as I would ride along coming back the 7 miles home, I would read that book. I didn't have anything else to do, and I was just getting myself a little better prepared for the problems I would meet in future life. And, as I say, a man never had a better companion, perhaps—that is, in material things, outside of human individuals—than the companionship of a good book.

Now, I am not going to talk a great length of time because I know you have got quite a program here. How long have I got to talk?

President COMBS. Go right ahead, Congressman.

Mr. ROMJUE. Two hours? I never talk over 2 hours. [Laughter.]

I have had a lot of experience with rural carriers. I have a lot of good friends among them, and I appreciate them. Of course, sometimes a rural carrier will go wrong. The Post Office Department is very generous but always demands good service, looks into any complaint very carefully and acts firmly as it ought to, but you know you would always rather—that's human nature, you know—you would always rather see your enemies suffer than your friends. That is natural.

A few years ago I had a very delightful carrier friend—he is retired now—a very delightful, very intelligent fellow, a very fine fellow, I think. He was carrying the mail on a rural route, and while he was not supposed to take a hand in politics, he would always kind of nose around and try to help me. Of course, I didn't have anything against that. [Laughter and applause.] Well, one day he wrote me a letter, or rather, one of his friends who knew him perhaps better than I did wrote me a letter and said: "This fellow"—I would call him "Smith," but I am afraid there are too many of you fellows here by that name, so I will call him "Mr. A." Some of his friends wrote me about Mr. A. and they said: "Mr. A is your friend. He is a rural carrier and is a good fellow. Everybody likes him except one or two. He is in a little difficulty, and if you can help him out, we will appreciate it."

Then as they got a little further along in the letter, they told me what the trouble was, that he had been charged with getting tight. Of course, you fellows can figure out what that means. [Laughter.] Well, I don't know. I never saw him take a drink of liquor in my life, and I wondered when I came in here and saw this sign up here "Milwaukee," I wondered how you fellows came to put that up there. [Laughter.] When we all know what made Milwaukee famous. [Laughter.]

Anyway, getting back to Carrier A, he wrote me about it, and I went down to see about it. I knew this fellow, knew he was a fine chap, knew that everybody loved him except probably one or two. Maybe somebody wanted to get his job. I understand that once in a while they try to do that. Well, I went down to the Post Office Department and they got out the papers and I saw what they had him charged with—which I already knew—and they said, "We have got him charged with getting tight." Well, I said, "I never heard of it until I got this letter. If he gets tight, I don't know it, and what about it? Have you ever had any trouble with him before?" "No; this is the first charge we have had." We talked it over and I said, "Well, I'll tell you, I've got a lot of letters from his friends, and they finally sent me a long statement signed by everybody on his route, I think, but two, endorsing him." They said, "In view of that, of course, we will have to reprimand him." I said, "That's all right. He had no business getting caught." [Laughter and applause.] So they reprimanded him, but they said they were going to let him stay, but he had no business doing that. Of course, I don't know whether he did or not, but suppose he did just this once, every man is entitled to one mistake. Every dog from a legal standpoint is entitled to one bite, and a man ought to have the same rights, until he gets to be a nuisance, and then you have got the right to sue a man to make him pay for it. Well, they said, "We are going to excuse him this time, but we are going to admonish him."

That was all right. When I got back home he came to see me and told me more details about it, and I told him: "Now, listen, I'm not going to lecture you at all, but if you must get a little tight, don't get tight on duty. Don't get tight any time, for that matter. And if you do, do it in a place where you are not going to get caught." [Laughter.] I just told him what I thought about the plain horse sense of it. Time went on and he performed fine until next election, when he would get out, you know, and work for me. I didn't have to ask him to do it. And then after 2 or 3 years they charged him again with getting tight. I looked up the file, and I says, "Well, this is the second time the old boy has got tight." Maybe he had got tight more than that, but this was the second time he had been caught at it [laughter], so I went down. I wanted to help him, of course, for two reasons: First, everybody in the neighborhood nearly was his friend, and, most of all, he was my friend. [Laughter.] So I talked to him again, and, of course, the Post Office Department talked pretty straight to me and said, "Now, Mr. Congressman, this is the second time for this same offense." I said, "Well, if he ever took a drink, I don't know it. Maybe he did. And, of course, as I said before, he is entitled to one mistake." "But," they said, "this is twice." I said, "Now, wait a minute. Most every man in his lifetime makes two mistakes." [Laughter.] Most everybody does. I don't know whether you ever did or not, but awhile back I was driving down Pennsylvania Avenue in my car, driving faster than the law allows. They didn't pinch me, didn't stop me, but I came to the realization myself that I was violating the law. I have done that several times, but fortunately the policeman never caught me at it.

"Well," I said, "can't you look over it again with this fellow? Everybody likes him. Everybody is for him out there except one or two." You know, I never did know up to that time what one of these fellows was sore about. I found out later, but I didn't know it then. Well, they said, "Now, Congressman, we can't tolerate that." I said, "I'm not trying to find fault with the way you run the Post Office Department, but if, in view of the fact that everybody on his route is for him and everybody likes him except one or two men, I wish you would not hold this against him. Give him one more chance, and I will never come back to you again on this proposition. I won't approach you again on it." "Well, then," they said, "in view of that, we are going to keep him in." So they did, but they said they were going to reprimand him stronger this time than ever, and they said, "If this ever occurs again, he is going out." They wrote me a letter on the subject and I sent it to him.

Well, when I came back home my friend came in to see me. In the meantime another election had come on and he had gone out and worked for me. So I told him, "Now, listen, I can't go with you on this any longer, because I promised them this time, in order to keep you in, that it wouldn't occur again, so you will just have to cut it out, because I'm not going on with a proposition like that any more, so don't ask me." He said, "I won't ask you again."

Well, time went on, 3 or 4 years, and then they sent in another complaint against him. In the meantime he had gotten up to pretty nearly where he lacked about a year of being retired. Some of you old fellows are about up there now; some of you are trying to get up there—not that you are trying to get old faster, but you are getting up there anyway. Well, about 3 years went by and this carrier wrote me a letter and said: "It looks like I'm up against it this time. I hoped to never have to appeal to you again for help, but this is pretty serious. They have got me charged with kissing a widow [laughter] and if you can only help me out of this, I will promise you I will never bother you again. As a matter of fact, I told you I would never appeal to you any more, but of course, they had me charged then with getting tight. This is different." [Laughter.] Well, pretty soon here comes a long petition signed by everybody on his route except two. So I took the petition, stuck it in my pocket, and walked down to the Post Office Department. They got out their files and they said: "Congressman, we can't do anything about this." I said, "What's the matter?" They said, "Well, don't you remember, we talked about this before, and the last time you were in here, 2 or 3 years ago, you said you would never approach us on this matter again?" I said, "That's right. I'm not denying it nor excusing it. That is the truth, but you must remember no charge like this has ever been brought against him before. I am seeing you now on an entirely new case." [Laughter.]

Well, they wouldn't promise to do anything except hold it up a while. I said, "Won't you investigate it? I will investigate it, too, and if you will hold it up till I get back home and find out the real truth about the matter, I will write you or come and see you." They promised to do that and they did.

Well, I came back home and got hold of my friend and talked with him, and he said, "Now, I'll tell you the truth about that. Of course, you may not believe it," and he looked at me and grinned, and of course, you can interpret it like you please. "I did stop at this widow's house. It was snowing like the dickens, and blowing, and the thermometer was down to zero, and people on my route often give me a cup of coffee in bad, cold weather." I expect lots of you fellows have had a cup of coffee on a cold day on your route. [Laughter]. Whether it went any further than that I don't know. [Laughter.] That's none of my business, and I don't care.

Well, he says, "You have been mighty kind to me, and I wouldn't lie to you, so help me God, and all there is to that is that when the weather was cold, down to zero, that woman always when I come with the mail calls me in for a cup of coffee. Other people on my route do the same. Sometimes I drink 8 or 10 cups of coffee on one round [laughter], and I'll tell you what the real truth is. You will observe that that petition was signed by every patron on the route except 2. These two fellows are old bachelors. They have about lived their time out without marrying, and they are jealous of me. They want the widow. Of course, I haven't got any use for her. I have got one wife, but just because I stop there and drink a cup of coffee with her on a cold day they think I am courting her, which I am not."

So I was armed with that statement, and I believe he told the truth. I went back and talked to the Post Office Department, and I said, "I have investigated this and here is the story the man tells me, and everybody on the route except two old bachelors are his friends, and these two old bachelors are jealous of each other and both of them are jealous of anybody that stops at this widow's house." [Laughter.] And I said, "Of course, I will admonish him, if you keep him in the Service; I will admonish him that he ought to be awfully slow about drinking coffee at a widow's place." [Laughter.] "Well," they said, "in view of that, Congressman, we will excuse him this time, but don't come back to see us any more, either about a drink or a widow." [Laughter.] Anyway, about a year after that he was retired and I have never heard any complaint one way or the other since.

Well, anyway, we have got a lot of problems to think about in this country. The Post Office Department is registering the aliens in this country. I don't know of any law against any of you fellows furnishing the Post Office Department with any information about aliens. You don't have to register. I have got great respect for an alien that is a gentleman and comes to our country and conducts himself properly, but, of course, I am an American and couldn't be anything else, because in my family on both sides of the house all the way back my ancestors were here before any government was established, before the Revolutionary War was fought. I don't descend from anybody that came to America after the Government was first founded, so I suppose I might be called an American. Anyway, we can treat other people right, but this country belongs to Americans. [Applause.] We hear a lot of people talk about free speech. That's all right, but the man that is most insistent about having free speech, and the newspapers that demand free speech, always want to criticize everybody else. Once in a while we have a bunch that bobs up in the United States Senate or in Congress and raises the devil if the President says one word that they think he ought not to. Well, fortunately, or unfortunately, this country provides for the election of only one President at a time, and about the biggest job any man has got when he is elected or appointed to any office, just like a rural carrier has got, is to attend to his own business first. That is his job. Not try to run everybody else's job; not try to be President, United States Senator, and Congressman all at the same time. No man can do that.

Well, anyway—how many minutes have I got left?

President COMBS. Go right ahead, Congressman.

Mr. ROMJUE. I enjoy being here with you people, but I am not going to talk much longer. I would be very glad to hear from you any time on any problem in which you are interested. I have known Mr. Combs so long and so well; I know his standing in the Post Office Committee up there, and I know that any problems in which you are interested always receive most careful and prompt attention. I want to thank you rural carriers for the fine spirit which you have shown since the European war broke out. You realize, as well as I do, what great problems we have to deal with at this time. As I said a moment ago, I suppose it is all right for people to be a little bit selfish, but, unfortunately, what is troubling us most now is that so many people in the world, not only in Europe but elsewhere, have got so selfish that they have adopted the rule that they want to do something to somebody instead of doing something for somebody. [Applause.]

I grew up a poor boy. I haven't got much yet, but I have always petition signed by everybody on his route except two. So I took been busy and always worked. Three or four days ago I went over to the office of another Congressman in the House Office Building, and after I had left the Congressman's office I started down on the elevator, and a stranger had stepped up and rung the bell to go up just before I rung the bell to go down. I didn't know him, but, of course, when I got on the elevator the elevator boy knew me but he didn't know the stranger, and he said to me, "Mr. Congressman, did you say go down?" I said, "Yes; but take this gentleman up first." Well, he didn't know the stranger, and I didn't either. It might have been his first visit to town, so far as I know. The stranger said nothing, and I said, "Take this gentleman where he wants to go first." The elevator boy said, "I thought maybe you might be in a hurry. Of course, this office building is your office building for you Congressmen." But I said, "Go ahead and take him up," and he did take him up, and coming down he said to me, "I would have been glad to take you first," and I said, "No; I didn't want you to do that. If it had been an emergency, if someone in my family had been sick and I was hurrying for a doctor, I would have told you to take me down quick, but that was not the case and I was not in a hurry." "Well," he said, "you are different from some people." I said, "I don't know whether I am or not, but it is perfectly all right with me, and it didn't take but a minute of my time." And I said, "Young man, I appreciate the fact that you talk to me like you do, and let me tell you something. You are a young man working here on this job and no doubt going to school." He said, "Yes; I'm going to night school, trying to get an education." I said, "That's fine. Now, always remember this, that the cheapest thing you can have, that costs least and pays the biggest dividends is kindness and courtesy." [Applause.] Nobody in the world knows that better than you rural carriers, especially if you have been on your route very long. Everyone of you have got some people on your route that you couldn't satisfy at all, no matter what you did, but I am sure most of the people are not that way.

Now, I am not going to take any more of your time. I am glad to be here, glad to meet you. I wish that I knew you all individually, and personally I want you to know that when any problem comes before the Post Office Committee in which you are interested I will make it my duty to give it special attention. I will be glad to hear from you and help you whenever I can. [Great applause.]

Feeding America First

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 9, 1940

SPEECH OF MILO PERKINS

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, no man is thinking more clearly today on the whole matter of real national welfare and on the practical solution of the apparent problem of so-called surpluses than Mr. Milo Perkins, Director of Marketing of the Department of Agriculture. It is with a great deal of pleasure that I include his speech herewith:

It doesn't mean much any more to say that a person is a liberal or a conservative. In all America today there are only two kinds of folks; those who know they're living in a new and utterly different sort of world, and those who do not. Those who do not still speak in nineteenth-century platitudes; those who do have little time to speak. They are engaged in action to meet the difficult problems of a world which has been shaken to its very foundations.

We all know that good wages in the cities mean broader markets for the American farmer; and we also know that a prosperous agriculture means greater rural power and more employment in the towns. That basic interdependence is so well recognized that it's a waste of time to do more than mention it.

The problem, of course, is what each group can do to lift the living standards of the other. As a beginning, labor leaders can't do too much by way of informing farm groups of the special problems facing workers in this new world situation. Similarly, farm leaders can't do too much by way of informing labor groups of the special problems facing agriculture because of war in the world. Before they can work together, they must understand each other.

In agriculture alone, for example, an export market which has been running $800,000,000 a year for the last 10 years, is now virtually choked off by war in the world. Thus far farm income has been protected by commodity loans and surplus purchases; more important than that, however, is the fact that we've got the machinery to use most of those surpluses right here at home if any sizable part of the foreign markets remains lost to us. Through our cotton-mattress program, our food-stamp plan, our cotton-stamp plan, and our school-lunch program, the low-income folks of this country now have a chance to use the surpluses pending the time they can get work and buy them.

That's important for national health defense. If we want to know just how important it is, we can ask our local recruiting officers about the thousands of boys from relief and other low-income families who are unable to qualify for military service because of health reasons. They've been living on an average of a nickel a meal at retail prices, and many of them are physically unable to defend their country. By way of contrast, the Army has a food allowance of 15 cents a meal a person at wholesale prices. If civilians in low-income families had half that much to eat, the surplus problems of the American farmer would be solved overnight for all but a few of our crops. We'd have to produce more dairy products, more poultry products, more meat products, and more of most of the fruits and vegetables to meet the demand. Better than half of the farm problem stems from underconsumption in our cities.

Underconsumption, in turn, is primarily due to a lack of purchasing power.

In 1936 two-thirds of our families—comprising 80,000,000 persons—were living on an average cash income of only $69 a month for a whole family. They couldn't buy enough to give the wheels of industry more than a turn or two, and they couldn't buy enough in many cases to give our farmers the cost of production.

They needed at least twice that much income for a minimum American standard of living. There's mighty little skimping the Nation can expect of our housewives and our mothers who are trying to bring up children at any such level of income. As a matter of fact, skimping would injure farm income. Our farmers need broader markets, not narrower ones; and our growing children in these families need more food and a greater variety of it—not less.

It's worth while to figure what would have happened to farm income in 1936 if every family making less than $100 a month had made $100 a month. We won't try to estimate the indirect benefits, but we do know in terms of simple arithmetic how much additional food the farmer would have sold. It would have added $2,000,000,000 a year to the national food bill. Farmers would have spent their part of that money to buy city goods, and a great many of the unemployed would have gone to work.

The real reason that farmers and factory workers have not gotten closer together in the past is because both of them have had to get along on too little. They'll never get as close as they should be as long as 80,000,000 people have to live in families whose average cash income is only $69 a month. The reasons are obvious. The city family might want to see farm prosperity, but there's so little in the family budget for food that it must be bought as cheaply as possible. Even though the food dollar goes 20 percent further than it did in 1929, there's still not enough for food for growing youngsters, and that's that.

The farm family might want to see city prosperity, but crops are selling for considerably less than they did in 1929, and there's so little in the family budget for city goods that they must be bought as cheaply as possible, even if it means low wages in our factories. Farmers bitterly resent the injustice of their getting only 11 percent of the national income when they make up 25 percent of the population—and there we are.

The root of the trouble, of course, lies in the fact that the pie has been too small. Now that we're moving toward fuller employment under the stimulus of the defense program, however, there ought to be a bigger pie, a bigger national income, and more nearly enough for everyone. That will give farmers and laborers a chance to get closer together than they ever have been in the past. It's the chance of a lifetime. If both groups take advantage of it, if they honestly fight each other's battles for higher real income, and not only their own, they can build up a joint purchasing power which will be great enough to keep our factories running full time. Along that road lies a more industrious and a more prosperous America for everybody.

The Nation is buckling down to the job of national defense. Both labor and agriculture may well be proud of the fact that they are fully prepared. We might almost say that they are overprepared. Our farmers are ready for any emergency. They have built up great reserves of food and fiber in their ever-normal granaries. They have also built up the fertility of their lands and can quickly meet all production demands.

Labor also is ready—more than ready—with a great reservoir of manpower prepared to staff industrial production. In fact, millions in its ranks are standing by, waiting eagerly for the word to report for work. It has been estimated that the Nation is losing 80,000,000 man-hours of productive labor every day simply because these men cannot yet find jobs. The dictators learned 10 years ago that the one thing they dared not waste was their manpower. We're beginning to learn that it's the key to Budget balancing, among other things; that, as a matter of fact, the Budget can't be balanced until we have full employment.

If industry can gear itself up to meet our immediate and extraordinary defense needs and then stay geared up to meet our full needs for consumption for the long pull, we can have the balanced economy so necessary to our national welfare. Wages must be high enough to absorb the output of a technological civilization, however, and farmers must have a profit over the cost of production. In no other way can we preserve industrial capitalism. Labor will then be able to earn and buy; agriculture will be able to sell at a

profit and buy; business will be able to run its factories full time and make money; and taxes will be easier for all of us to pay. Otherwise they will be intolerable.

We are going to hear more and more during the next year about solving the surplus problems of the American farmer by feeding and clothing the unfortunate peoples of continental Europe. So far, most of the discussion has been on a charity basis. Later on it may even be proposed that we lend money to make such purchases possible. Appeasement proposals will be sugar-coated, of course, to make them as palatable as possible. After the last World War we made such loans, but that was before we had machinery like the stamp plans and the school-lunch program through which we could distribute our surpluses right here at home. Most of the loans were not repaid, and the sales turned out to be gifts. America is not likely to forget that lesson.

All of us are horrified at the possibility of starvation abroad. I hesitate now, as I did 6 months ago, to suggest that charity should begin at home, because I agree that it should not end there. If we have tears to shed for the hungry of the world, however, we ought to shed them first in our own back yard. After that, we can cry to our hearts' content about the tragedy of hunger in other lands, and I, for one, intend to be concerned about it.

Nine million under-nourished children right here at home, however, are eligible for our free school lunches. Last year we provided lunches made in whole or in part from vitamin-rich surplus foods for 3,000,000 of them. This coming school year we hope to reach 6,000,000. The following year we ought to reach all 9,000,000 as a matter of national health defense, and I believe the Nation will want it done. If we can afford several hundred dollars a year to educate a child, we can afford $10 a year to keep that child physically fit for study. A full stomach is the best possible personal defense against "fifth column" poisons.

Today, more than 2,000,000 members of low-income families are eating farm surpluses which they get at their corner grocery store through the Department of Agriculture's food stamp plan. Their food-buying power has been increased by 50 percent; they have 7½ cents to spend for each meal rather than the 5 cents a meal they were spending before. That's less than half as much as the Army ration, but it's half again as much as they formerly got, and that helps a lot. The splendid and unanimous support of merchants throughout the country has made this work an outstanding success We expect that 5,000,000 persons will be receiving the benefits of this program by Christmas. About 20,000,000 persons, however, are getting some form of public assistance, and would be eligible to eat these surpluses if we could expand the stamp plan to reach all of them.

Before we look at this problem of continental European hunger through a telescope, therefore, we ought to look at the problem of under consumption right here at home through a microscope. The remaining 15,000,000 persons should have their chance to eat the surplus through the food-stamp plan pending the time they can get jobs in private industry at good pay and have a decent diet. It's a matter of building up a country strong enough to defend itself before we build up a continental Europe strong enough to attack us. At the moment, of course, the British blockade prevents our sending food to the Continent anyway, and a final British victory naturally would modify our position.

We've got to think in terms of a Hitler victory as well as in terms of a British one, however. After the last World War, thousands of underfed and half-starved German boys were brought back to health in Dutch and Scandinavian homes. Under a Nazi leadership which gave them no alternative, they returned in less than 20 years to conquer the very countries that gave them life itself when they were helpless children. We in America must remember that. Our heads must rule our hearts. So long as the German people are enslaved by the Hitler regime, we must not repeat the mistake of the Dutch and Scandinavians. This is a new and utterly different kind of world, and parts of it are unbelievably brutal.

We are spending billions to defend ourselves with guns so that we can have peace through preparedness. We can afford the extra few hundred millions it will take to build up our health defenses. After that, and not before, we can see how charitable we dare to be with a potential enemy. After that, and not before, we can see to it that we get as much foreign trade as world conditions permit. Even then, we should see to it that it is profitable to us and that it is conducted on our own terms, and not on those of Mr. Hitler. We can be attacked more successfully by economic weapons than by military ones; especially in the beginning. We're going to need old-fashioned Yankee horse trading more in the next few years than we've ever needed it in our whole history.

This does not mean that we should permit starvation abroad if we can stop it safely, nor that we should turn our backs on foreign trade if we can make money out of it. Quite the contrary. It only means that internal strength must come before external generosity and that we must put first things first in a world where the strong are cruel to the weak. If we ourselves intend to survive, we must be hard-headed enough to make our own health defenses impregnable; only then we can safely help to lift the heavy burdens of those who are suffering because of Nazi brutality in other lands. Self-protection is a basic instinct of peoples as well as of individuals.

We have machinery now that we didn't have in 1919 to distribute our sorely needed surpluses right here at home. We've got the programs going now through which we can feed and clothe America first. That kind of action, improving diets and agricultural income at the same time, will do more to bring about unity between farmers and workers than a thousand well-intended speeches.

The permanent prosperity of the American people depends upon a full utilization of our resources. We're moving toward that now and toward fuller employment. While we're reaching it, however, it makes sense to use the surpluses that nature has given us; it makes sense to keep them moving into consumption so that huge inventories will not wreck producer income. It makes sense to expand work like the cotton mattress program, the food-stamp plan, and the cotton-stamp plan and the school-lunch program so as to cushion the shock of lost foreign markets. An adequate diet for our low-income families is the very cornerstone of national defense. Fortunately, it's the least expensive part of it.

Higher living standards, however, won't just happen because we're American citizens and believe in the American way. They can only be brought about by direct and concrete action which deals with specific problems by definite programs. We've got the programs going under which we can feed and clothe America first. We intend to expand them. The Congress has appropriated money for that purpose. Business, labor, and agriculture want it done and we are going to do it.

America Will Never Be Conquered, but America May Commit Suicide

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL T. CURTIS

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 9, 1940

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, serious-minded men and women in all parts of the country and in every walk of life are today concerned for the future of our Republic. As we see the lights of liberty and freedom go out in many places in the world, our appreciation of the great heritage that is ours increases.

In the past several months every Member of Congress has given serious attention to the national defense of our country. That is desirable; it should be improved. We are for national defense. In this study of national defense no military expert has appeared and contended that an invading army could conquer continental United States. Yet our Republic is in danger, and that danger is from within.

Let us consider some of the trends wherein the danger lies. In the first place there has been a definite trend in the last 7½ years toward a centralization of power in the Federal Government and toward a one-man government. Let us look at what one-man governments have done for Europe. If there were no one-man governments in Europe it is doubtful if there would be any war there now. Here in this country a subservient majority in Congress has made our Government a one-man government. That man made a desperate effort to destroy the third branch of our Government—our Supreme Court. No party, whose leadership would destroy or dominate the courts of the land, where the rights of free men are determined and protected, is worthy to rule. That party moved further toward a one-man government by violating that American tradition and nominating a man to serve more than two terms as President.

In the second place, we must realize that foreign communistic elements have destroyed great countries. During the past 7½ years communism and other subversive doctrines have been enthroned in the United States. Adherents to those foreign philosophies hold high positions in our Government, and none of them have been discharged. This one-man government refuses to clean its own house.

A third evil that besets us is a growing class consciousness. In the last 7½ years the Government of the United States has by overt actions set class against class, thereby destroying both liberty and equality.

A fourth point to be remembered, is that if our Republic becomes bankrupt, there is great danger that inflation, bloodshed, and revolution may follow. Other forms of government have been totally destroyed in this manner. America can

afford to take care of her worthy destitute and to spend for sound internal improvements, but she cannot afford a huge, costly, bureaucratic government, corruption, waste, dishonest bookkeeping, and unsound fiscal policies.

In the fifth place, it is well for us to remember that the doctrine that the State is supreme is absolutely contrary to the American idea that a government exists only with the consent of the governed. During these last few years our Government at Washington has tried to assume a position of being omnipotent, all powerful, all wise, and supreme. The individual has been regimented and debased. God has been pushed into the background and the laws of nature flagrantly defied. An eminent divine in the city of Washington has declared, "We have supplanted the word government instead of God in the twenty-third Psalm." We have been taught, "The Government is my Shepherd, I shall not want." Instead of boasting that "We planned it that way," we should return to the admonition of William McKinley who said, "Our faith teaches us that there is no safer reliance than upon the God of our fathers, who has so singularly favored the American people in every national trial, and who will not forsake us now so long as we obey his commandments and walk humbly in his footsteps."

Aside from any theorizing that we might do, the proof of the pudding lies in the eating. After this period of wild experiment and blind trial and error we find that the depression is still with us. Millions of young men and women throughout the United States have never known what it is to have a job in private enterprise. The American people must turn aside from one-man government, radicalism, class hatred, the road to bankruptcy, and the pagan doctrine that the State is supreme.

These are the things that are shaking the very foundation of our Republic. If we are strong within no nation can conquer us, but unless we place our own house in order America may commit suicide. Individual American citizens must give time and attention to the problems of maintaining good government.

Fritz Julius Kuhn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LELAND M. FORD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 9, 1940

LETTER FROM HON. LELAND M. FORD OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., September 9, 1940.

Mr. RALPH L. EMMONS,
United States Attorney, Northern District of New York,
Binghamton, N. Y.

MY DEAR MR. EMMONS: I beg to refer to previous correspondence with you in respect to affidavit filed by me under date of June 5, 1940, calling for the revocation of citizenship granted to Fritz Julius Kuhn. I have received several mere acknowledgments, but in no letter written by you have I received any information as to what action has been taken on the affidavit proposing the revocation of citizenship granted to Fritz Julius Kuhn under fraudulent and perjurious statements.

It is now September 9, over 3 months since this affidavit was filed, and I therefore think the time has come when we should receive some information as to action on the affidavit in the United States courts. I therefore will appreciate hearing from you on this matter.

I shall also appreciate your giving me the date on which Fritz Julius Kuhn's prison term expires. I shall await hearing from you.

Very truly yours,

L. M. FORD.

The Flood-Control Program Should Move Forward

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL T. CURTIS

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 9, 1940

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, there is considerable domestic legislation that should have the attention of Congress. One of the more important items that ought to be considered and passed is the 1940 omnibus flood-control bill. This is an authorization bill for flood-control works in all parts of the United States. This bill has been favorably acted upon by the Flood Control Committee of the House of Representatives but has not been called up on the floor of Congress because it is waiting the "Go" signal from the President of the United States.

The Army engineers; the Flood Control Committee, of which I am a member; and the individual Members of Congress have done all they could do to advance this bill. The responsibility now lies with the administration that controls the program of this House. This bill has been before the House since May 7, 1940.

Included in this bill is an item for the construction of an on-river dam on the Republican River near Republican City, Nebr. This item for the Republican City Dam was placed in this omnibus flood-control bill at my request. This was done early last spring. I am for this dam. It is very important that this dam be constructed. It will bring flood protection to a great territory in Nebraska and in Kansas. It will provide irrigation for portions of the counties of Harlan, Webster, Franklin, and Nuckolls in Nebraska, and in some portions of Kansas. The irrigation provided for by this construction is of supreme importance in view of the persistent and severe drought that has prevailed throughout that territory.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the leadership in this House can prevail upon the administration to give this most worthy bill an opportunity on the floor of the House.

The Free State of Maryland Is Determined To Rid Itself of Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 9, 1940

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, the time has come in America for Americans to awake to what is going on about them. We who love freedom of opportunity, religious liberty, and political rights must realize that within and without there stands powerful forces that would destroy our American institutions. Little do some of us realize the insidious foreign influences and propaganda that are active all about us. The Communist Party, professing Americanism, but accepting its orders and instructions from Moscow, has been boring from within. The Communists have entered the teaching role in our schools and colleges. Diligently the "red" agitator has been spreading his teachings of class hatred and strife.

Everything that we have been taught from infancy to hold dear is held up to scorn, ridicule, and hatred. The family and the home, the Communist would destroy. Were the Soviet to succeed from without, or triumph by a successful revolution from within, Christianity would be banished from American life. The religions of our fathers—Catholic, Protestant, and

Jewish—would meet the fate religion has met in Soviet Russia. The churches would be turned into halls for riotous living. The holy men and women of religious vocations would be violated and butchered.

In the words of a distinguished religious leader and citizen of Baltimore, the purpose of communism is not to keep the poor contented and happy but to create discontentment and to keep it steadily growing. The worst possible thing in the world for Communists is contentment. They breed on discontent.

There is no room for communism or any other "ism" in America but true patriotic Americanism. I am happy to say that the Free State of Maryland is making strenuous efforts to rid the State of the Communist Party, as shown in the following articles from the Baltimore Sun:

[From the Baltimore Sun of August 24, 1940]

LEGION GROUP VOTES BANS ON REDS, BUNDISTS—MOTIONS SEEKING DISFRANCHISEMENT OF BOTH PASSED UNANIMOUSLY—HARMAN AND TABLER VIE FOR DEPARTMENT COMMANDER POST

(By John C. A. Watkins)

CUMBERLAND, August 23.—Resolutions seeking the disfranchisement of both Communists and Nazis in Maryland were approved unanimously here this afternoon by the resolutions committee of the American Legion's twenty-second annual State convention.

Both resolutions, one aimed directly at the Communists and the other at "certain semimilitary organizations designated as bunds and otherwise," will be submitted to the convention as a whole at its final business session tomorrow morning. They are expected to pass without difficulty.

The anti-Communist resolution incorporates an original recommendation calling for the barring of the Communists from the ballot and a later suggestion by William C. Walsh, the attorney general of Maryland, that the purpose might be achieved more definitely by a law requiring publication of the names and addresses of signers of petitions for the appearance of candidates on general election ballots.

MAY BE UNCONSTITUTIONAL

Mr. Walsh had suggested that legislation aimed specifically at the Communists might be unconstitutional, and that a general law requiring that all political groups publish their petitioners' names and addresses would be legal and would do the job just as well. In other words, that the light of publicity would bar the timid from the Communists' petitions and would expose the forgeries that the veterans charge have been committed in their petitions.

The resolutions committee, headed by Benjamin Wolfson, decided it would make certain that the anti-Communist legislation would be put across one way or the other by incorporating both ideas in the one resolution, and then approved still another aimed specifically at Nazi sympathizers in the State.

The anti-Communist resolution says that "the Communist Party in the United States is understood to be sponsored and controlled by a foreign power" and that its "avowed purpose is to change our form of government and that it advocates the use of force and other unlawful means to accomplish this."

BANS RECOMMENDED

So, says the committee's Communist omnibus bill, the Maryland department of the Legion "recommends that legislation be passed prohibiting the placing of the names of members of the Communist Party and of similar organizations on the ballot in Maryland as candidates for any elective office; we further favor the passage of legislation making it illegal for any Communist or member of any similar organization to hold any office by appointment or otherwise in the State of Maryland."

Since this was the part that Mr. Walsh thought might be unconstitutional, the committee added for good measure the following:

"*And be it further resolved,* That should such legislation be found to be unconstitutional, or its constitutionality seriously questioned, legislation be passed requiring that the names and addresses of all persons signing petitions for the nominations of any candidates for public office under the laws of the State of Maryland be published."

JUST TO MAKE SURE

That takes care of the Communists and the bundsmen alike so far as politics is concerned, the veterans feel. But, just to make certain there will be no misunderstanding about its attitude, the committee recommends the adoption of a resolution requiring the publication of the names of all members of the "certain semimilitary organizations designed as bunds and otherwise and having sympathies with foreign powers whose systems of government are opposed to the American system of government."

Officers of the Legion say that the convention will adopt both resolutions without serious question. The temper of the delegates is running high on the question of the loyalty of certain groups toward the United States. As was indicated clearly this afternoon by the experience of a peddler of patriotic pins and other souvenirs of the "God bless America" type on Baltimore Street, the main thoroughfare.

USHERED OFF STREET

This man was wearing a costume which resembled that of the Legionnaires as closely as he could legally and is a member of a group of traveling peddlers who work, what the Legionnaires call, "a racket" all over the State. They received a license to ply their trade here through an oversight on the part of the city government, and their presence is meeting violent objections from the delegates to the convention.

Any way, this particular member of the group apparently had "one too many" this afternoon and began forcibly halting people on the street. If they refused to buy his 10-cent pins, he made scurrilous remarks about the Legion and finally began shouting anti-Semitic accusations, directed toward the organization of which he was pretending to be a member.

He was ushered off the street by a couple of Gentile Legionnaires. He barely escaped arrest. As a matter of fact, a non-Legionnaire resident of Cumberland already had called the police and was preparing to charge him with disorderly conduct.

Other than the routine sort of resolutions usually recommended, there was little business today of more than a purely technical nature, except the drum and bugle corps contests in Fort Hill Stadium and the big parade held tonight before cheering thousands from several States.

DRUM AND BUGLE CONTEST

Baltimore outfits won five of six cash prizes in the contests.

Top prize of $200 was won by the Baltimore District Drum and Bugle Corps in the senior division. It also won the senior color-guard contest and the James Bruce trophy that went with it.

The Baltimore Drum and Bugle Corps was unopposed, as the Francis Scott Key Post Drum and Bugle Corps had non-Legionnaires in its membership and could not compete. The latter group, from Frederick, was awarded $125 in a special contest, however.

The Hamilton Post No. 20, of Baltimore, won the drum and bugle corps contest in the junior division, and received $165. The corps scored 94.3 points on a basis of appearance and performance.

It won fifth place in the national championships at Chicago last year and will go to Boston next month to compete again.

TAKES SECOND PRIZE

Maccabean Post No. 32, of Baltimore, scored 88.6 points and took second prize of $103.

Dundalk Post No. 38 took third place money, $80, with 87.4 points, and Flanders Post No. 65, Baltimore, scored 84.8 points for fourth place and $52 prize money.

Hamilton Post No. 20 also won the junior color-guard contest and the Harry Nice trophy. It scored 191.3 points to beat Flanders Post No. 65, which finished second with 179.3 points.

Federal Post No. 19, of Baltimore, won the silver trophy offered by the Fort Cumberland Post No. 13 for the best Negro drum corps.

Tomorrow is the last day, but practically all of the important business, including that of the election of officers and the approval of the anti-Communist, and so forth, resolutions has been deferred until then and will take place in the morning.

Robert McCullough, of the Snyder-Farmer Post, No. 3, of Hyattsville, withdrew his candidacy tonight for department commander. It was understood his support was thrown to George Harman, member of the Baltimore & Ohio Post, No. 81, of Baltimore, and vice commander of the Baltimore district, giving considerable impetus to the latter's campaign.

Only other candidate for the office is W. Ray Tabler, of Jeff Davis Post, No. 18, Centreville, and past department vice commander.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEEMAN

For national executive committeeman the candidates are:

J. Bryan Hobbs, the incumbent.

Godfrey Child, past department judge advocate and member of Worchester Post, No. 93.

Other candidates may be renominated from the floor in the morning, since the Legion has not gone through the nominating formality. The auxiliary finds itself with only two candidates for the office of department president to succeed Mrs. Joseph C. Shallenberger. These are:

Mrs. William Goldman, of Maccabean Unit, No. 32, of Baltimore, now junior rehabilitation chairman.

Mrs. George Rodock, Jr., of Frederick, a member of the Francis Scott Key Unit, No. 11, and vice president of the auxiliary's western Maryland district.

The auxiliary did its nominating this morning.

[From the Baltimore Sun of August 29, 1940]

FRAUD EVIDENCE FOUND BY DIES GROUP AGAINST BALTIMORE COMMUNISTS—MANY "SIGNERS" OF BALLOT PETITIONS DISAVOW SIGNATURES, WHILE OTHERS CHARGE REDS MISREPRESENTED FACTS TO OBTAIN THEIR NAMES

WASHINGTON, August 28.—Evidence purporting to show widespread fraud and misrepresentation by the Communist Party of Baltimore and its officials in the preparation of petitions to put its candidates on the Maryland ballot in November was disclosed here today in the records of the Dies committee investigating un-American activities.

This evidence is embodied in several hundred letters—mostly from Negroes—some flatly denying that their authors had ever signed the petition and others asserting that the writers had put their names on the document because they were told dozens of varied stories about its purpose.

SUBMITTED OVER SWORN STATEMENTS

The original of the petition in question is on file in the office of the Secretary of State at Annapolis, and was submitted over the sworn and notarized statements of Baltimore Communists and party officials that they personally knew the signers to be registered voters, and that they personally saw these signers whom they knew inscribe their names.

The petition, which contains approximately 2,200 names, has been photostated by the Dies committee for inclusion in its files. It pledges the signers to vote for the Communist candidates the petition puts in nomination.

In its investigation of the petition, which produced the alleged fraud and misrepresentation evidence, the Dies committee wrote to every person whose name was signed to the document.

ONE HUNDRED AND FORTY-EIGHT DENY SIGNATURES

The results of these inquiries up until a few days ago were:

Of 2,180 letters addressed to the supposed signers of the petition, 186 were returned to the committee as unclaimed.

Of 302 replies that were received, 148 persons denied that they had signed any such petition.

Sixty-seven said the petition had been misrepresented to them.

Twenty asserted the purpose of the petition either had been misrepresented or their names appeared without their consent.

Twenty-nine said they signed because they believed the Communists had a right to appear on the ballot.

Thirty-two said they had put their names on the petition without reading it.

Four said they had signed it as a favor to a friend.

Two of those who replied said their names had been obtained while they were intoxicated.

WOMEN AS WITNESSES

A majority of the signatures, according to the records, were submitted and sworn to by Sophie Kaplan and Mrs. Dorothy Rose Blumberg, wife of Dr. Albert E. Blumberg, Communist candidate for the Senate, against whom charges of being in contempt of the House of Representatives still are pending in Washington. Dr. Blumberg was cited for contempt for refusal to answer questions before the Dies committee.

The Kaplan woman's address is given as the Free State Book Shop, 207 West Franklin Street.

Others who took oaths that the signatures were those of persons known to them as registered voters included Sam Banks, regional secretary of the Young Communist League; William C. Taylor, State chairman of the Communist Party; Richard Broune, Paul J. Jarvis, Dora Braverman, Minnie Stambler, Oscar Rabovsky, Elmer French, Joseph Kralik, Walter Potrzuski, Benjamin Davis, Alexander E. Munsell, Louise Ellen Munsell.

The affidavits of all who took oaths that they personally had solicited and obtained the signatures were taken by Florence K. Schwartz, a notary public, whose address is given in the Maryland State Manual as 1905 Eutaw Place. The various pages of the petition bear dates in March 1940.

The oath to which they subscribed before the notary was as follows:

"I, ——, do solemnly declare in the presence of Almighty God (or affirm) that each of the persons whose names are signed to the above certificate of nomination are known to me to be registered voters of the district or precinct in which they respectively reside, and that I personally saw each of said signers sign such certificates of nomination."

CRIMINAL LIABILITY

Maryland's election laws hold the person who subscribes to the oath criminally liable for the veracity of the petition.

This section of the law (art. 33, sec. 85) which permits State-wide candidates to be placed on the ballot upon the filing of 2,000 or more bona fide signatures of registered voters, reads, in part:

"Each signer shall append to his signature his residence, occupation, and place of business, and every such paper shall be accompanied by an affidavit or affidavits made before a justice of the peace by one or more persons known personally to the justice and so certified by him and signed by the affiant or affiants to the effect that the signers are known to such affiant or affiants to be registered voters of the district or precinct in which they respectively reside and that the said affiant or affiants personally saw the signers, in regard to whom he or they make oath, sign such paper, and any willfully false statement in such affidavit or affidavits or affirmation shall be deemed a misdemeanor and shall subject the person making the same to the fines and penalties prescribed by the law of this State for the crime of perjury."

TEXT OF PETITION GIVEN

The text of the petition, as it shows on the copies filed with the secretary of state, reads as follows:

"We, the undersigned, voters in the State of Maryland, do hereby certify that we do nominate Earl Browder, who resides in the State of New York, whose address is 7 Highland Place, Yonkers, N. Y., whose occupation is a journalist, for the office of President of the United States of America; and we do further certify that we do nominate James W. Ford, who resides in the State of New York, whose address is 35 East Twelfth Street, New York, N. Y., whose occupation is a building-trades worker, for the office of Vice President of the United States of America; we do further certify that we nominate Albert E. Blumberg, who resides in the State of Maryland and whose address is 2523 Forest Park Avenue, whose occupation is a teacher, for the office of United States Senator for the State of Maryland; we do further certify that we do nominate the following eight voters of the State of Maryland, to wit: Alexander Sylvester, who resides at 127 Aisquith Street, whose occupation is a clothing worker; Alexander Boone, who resides at 1416 Division Street, whose occupation is a laborer; Sam Banks, who resides at 115 West Mulberry Street, whose occupation is a food worker; Dorothy Rose Blumberg, who resides at 2523 Forest Park Avenue, whose occupation is a typist; Walter Potrzuski, who resides at 406 South Regester Street, whose occupation is a clothing worker; William C. Taylor, who resides at 1525 Druid Hill Avenue, whose occupation is a writer; Alexander Munsell, who resides at 919 North Charles Street, whose occupation is a technician; Isadore Samuelson, who resides at 3942 Reisterstown Road, whose occupation is a woodworker, as the Presidential electors for the Communist Party of the State of Maryland.

INTENT TO VOTE ASSERTED

"We do further certify that we and each of us intend to vote for the said persons nominated hereby; we do further certify that the said candidates so nominated are hereby the candidates of the Communist Party."

The law requires that a nominating petition be filed with the Secretary of State at least 10 days before the primary preceding the general election in which the candidates are to appear on the ballot. In the case of the election to be held November 5, a valid nominating petition must have been on file at least 10 days before May 6 in order for the candidates nominated in such a manner to appear on the ballot.

VARIOUS GUISES CITED

In addition to those who flatly denied ever having signed any paper at any time, and who expressed surprise at receiving a "follow-up" letter from William C. Taylor, State party chairman, many whose names were on the petition informed the committee of many guises under which they say the document was presented to them.

Several wrote that they were told it was a petition to get a traffic policeman stationed at a particularly dangerous school crossing.

Three informed the committee that they were led to believe they were signing a protest against the showing of Gone With the Wind, because it pictures Negro people in an undesirable manner.

FROM LYNCHING TO JOBS

Others revealed that they were advised the petition was in support of antilynching legislation, better housing, jobs for unemployed, getting Negro candidates on the Maryland political tickets and for the commutation of the death sentence of a Negro woman murderer to life imprisonment.

A few of those who acknowledge having signed something protested that they did so believing they were joining the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People; there were others who asserted they were told the petition had to do with the establishment of a new church in their neighborhood.

One man said he had signed "for peace and old-age pensions." Another said he had been told his signature was to get his "relief" stipend increased.

THOUGHT IT WAS CENSUS

A great number, since the senatorial primary campaign was in progress when they were approached, were led to believe, they said, that the person soliciting the signatures was taking a census of voters.

Virtually everyone who denied being a signer, and those who said they had signed because of misrepresentation, urged that their names be stricken from the petitions.

Some promised cooperation in the prosecution of those responsible for the unauthorized use of their names.

BLIND WOMAN "SIGNS"

One elderly Negro woman told the committee in a letter written for her by someone else that she was blind and did not see what she placed her mark on; another said she could neither read nor write and had only made her mark.

Similar charges of fraud made against the Communists of Pittsburgh and in two adjoining Pennsylvania counties—Beaver and Westmoreland—are being investigated by the Dies committee.

So far the committee has not indicated whether it will—because the petition involves a Federal election—seek any action on the evidence it has with regard to the Baltimore Communists, or simply make what data it has available to State officials.

Prosecutions in Pennsylvania were undertaken by State officials following publication of the names of signers of nominating petitions and the subsequent denial of persons who were listed that they had signed the document.

In Allegheny County (Pittsburgh) 43 Communists are under indictment for fraud in connection with the Pennsylvania petition. They will be tried next month.

In Beaver County two Communists were found guilty of fraud and conspiracy by a jury and sentenced to jail as the result of the investigation.

Four others have been charged with fraud in Westmoreland County.

UP TO THE COURTS

Under the procedure that has been followed in Maryland, the State law department, unless the validity of the nominating petitions are questioned, is called upon only to pass upon the legality of the form of such documents.

Only the courts in Maryland are competent to pass upon the facts of such petitions.

Any voter, however, may bring the matter before the courts on allegation of fraud, or the State, through an executive order of the law department, may take the petitions into court to test their validity.

[From the Baltimore Sun of August 30, 1940]

MANY "SIGNERS" DENY AFFIXING NAMES TO COMMUNIST PETITION—DIES COMMITTEE MAKES PHOTOSTATS AVAILABLE FOR STATE ACTION—GOVERNOR REQUESTS PROSECUTORS TO INVESTIGATE ALLEGED FRAUD

Photostatic copies of all the evidence in the files of the Dies committee purporting to show fraud on the part of the Communist Party in Baltimore in the preparation of nominating petitions will be turned over today to the State's attorney's office.

Arrangements for the copies of the evidence were made last night with Representative MARTIN DIES (Democrat, Texas) by Thomas N. Biddison, assistant State's attorney.

Meanwhile, more than a score of persons whose names were turned in at Annapolis by the Communists as signers of the nominating petition—and previously had advised the Dies committee that they had not signed the papers—reiterated their denials.

ALMOST ALL NEGROES

A check of the Dies records in Washington disclosed that nearly 100 percent of the names listed on the petition filed with the secretary of state were Negroes.

Governor O'Conor took the initiative in requesting the State's attorney not only of Baltimore but also of Anne Arundel County to make an immediate investigation looking to the prosecution of anyone responsible for fraud in the preparation of the petition.

WELLS CUTS VACATION TO ACT

J. Bernard Wells, the State's attorney, of Baltimore, cut short a vacation in order to confer with Mr. Biddison and dispatch him to Washington. Marvin I. Anderson, who is State's attorney of Anne Arundel County, was asked to cooperate, since the petition was filed in that county.

The Governor also asked the two State's attorneys to take the matter up with Bernard J. Flynn, United States attorney, to discuss possible Federal angles involved in the probe.

Through its treasurer, Sam Banks, the Communist Party issued a statement denying any fraud in the petition and asserted that the party will "take all necessary action to defend our place on the ballot."

TWO THOUSAND TWO HUNDRED SIGNATURES

The petition, supposedly bearing about 2,200 bona fide voters' signatures, was filed before the May 6 primary to get the names of the Communist candidates for President, Vice President, and that of Dr. Albert E. Blumberg, senatorial candidate, on the November ballot.

Banks alleged that the Dies revelations concerning the Maryland petition are part of a Nation-wide campaign to discredit the Communists and keep them off the ballot.

Under the Maryland law, responsibility for the factual veracity of the petitions is placed upon persons who attest, under oath, that they personally know the signers to be voters and personally saw them inscribe their names on the document.

TWO WOMEN ATTEST MOST

A majority of the names on the Maryland petition were attested to by Mrs. Dorothy Rose Blumberg, wife of the Communist senatorial candidate, who still faces charges of contempt for refusing to answer questions of the Dies committee, and Sophie Kaplan, who is listed as the manager of a bookstore at 207 West Franklin Street.

Others who subscribed to the oath on the petitions included William C. Taylor, secretary of the party, and Banks.

Violations of the petition statute of the elections law are punishable under the law on perjury.

The comment of some of the persons whose names appeared on the petition yesterday denied that they had ever signed any document to put the Communists on the ballot—or pledged themselves to vote for the Communist candidates so nominated—follows:

"I'M A REPUBLICAN"

Mabel Cromwell, Negro, 1108 Sarah Ann Street: "I wouldn't sign that Communist petition for anything. I'm a Republican, and I mean to stay one!"

Sarah Frey, Negro, 1110 Sarah Ann Street: "I didn't sign—no, indeed! There were two men here a long time ago—a white man and a colored man—but I told them I didn't know anything about it. They said they would fine me if I didn't sign, but I didn't think that was right."

E. T. Kennedy, 3328 Frederick Avenue: "I absolutely did not sign it. I have never even seen this petition, but I would like to get a look at it to see how they got my name on it."

SHE WAS THANKED FOR JOINING

Ella Jennings, Negro, 1034 Sharp Street: "I have never signed anything to do with politics in my life, but one week I got a letter thanking me for joining the Communist Party and inviting me to a party. I don't know where they got my name. No; I didn't go to the party."

Sarah Farrington, Negro, 1133 Sharp Street: "I didn't sign anything. A letter from Washington was the first I heard of it."

Ella Thompson, Negro, 816 Sharp Street: "A man came around about a month or two ago with a petition, but I wouldn't sign it."

"I DIDN'T SIGN ANYTHING"

Julia Mitchell, Negro, 802 Sharp Street: "I don't know what all this Communist stuff is. I didn't sign anything."

Isabella Hall, Negro, 811 Sharp Street: "I don't fool with that kind of stuff; no Communists for me. I never put my name on it."

Susie Douglas, Negro, 909 Leadenhall Street: "I don't know where they got my name from, because I didn't sign any petition."

Samuel Hall, Negro, 837 Leadenhall Street: "No, indeed, I didn't sign it or know anything about it. They had my name as 'Harry' and that proves that it wasn't me who signed."

Fredel Johnson, Negro, 1122 Leadenhall Street: "I haven't signed anything for the Communists. I don't know where they got my name."

DOESN'T REMEMBER IT

Johnnie Pearson, Negro, 155 West Cross Street: "If I did sign it, I don't remember anything about it."

Harry Hall, Negro, 1113 Race Street: "Just like I told 'em at Washington; I didn't sign anything. A man came around and asked my wife to sign something to keep her out of slavery but she didn't sign it, either."

Bertha Thompson, Negro, 103 West York Street: "Somebody asked me to sign a children's playground petition. I didn't sign because I couldn't read it. I haven't signed a thing."

Julia Harmon, Negro, 624 West Lee Street: "It must have been somebody else. I have never signed anything like that in my life."

"DON'T KNOW ANY COMMUNISTS"

Warner C. Jones, Negro, 2432 Madison Avenue: "I don't know anything about the petition. I never signed it, and I would like to know who put my name on the list. I never heard of it until I got the letter from Washington. I don't even know any Communists that I know of. I don't belong to any organization of any sort, not even a union."

Harold E. Thompson, Negro, 2323 Madison Avenue: "I don't know anything about it, if I signed it it was done under false pretense. The only thing that I signed was a petition to bring the antilynch bill up again. It was someone on the street who was going around to get people to sign this paper to bring up the antilynch bill. I think it was a woman, but I did not read the paper. I certainly wouldn't sign any such Communist petition, since I work for the Government."

Adelaide Jenkins, Negro, 2527 Salem Street: "Some white woman came around and said there was a bridge that they had just completed out in Chicago, and they wanted to get up a petition to have some man go to the convention at the opening of the bridge. The writing at the top of the page was just the same as the story she gave me, and I signed it when I saw that other people had too. The top just said where the convention was to be held."

FOR THE SCOTTSBORO BOYS

Margaret Carter, Negro, 815 Forrest Street: "Two men came by one Sunday morning talking about the Scottsboro boys and told us they had saved the Scottsboro boys, and we signed the paper. I just signed the paper because I was busy cooking breakfast, and I thought they were just people doing something for the colored race. I didn't know who they were until a neighbor told me that they were Communists. Neither my husband nor I read the petition—we just signed it. After we got the letter from Washington, we got a letter from the Communist gang on St. Paul Street asking us to pay no attention to it, if we got a letter from Washington, and not to let anyone do us out of our rights, and to come to a meeting. My husband wrote right back and asked them to scratch our names off, that neither of us were Communists."

DENIES SIGNING PETITION

Harry E. Cook, Negro, 927 Rutland Avenue: "A lot of people around the neighborhood said they talked to a man circulating a petition to sign, but I did not see him. When a letter from the Dies committee came, I wrote back that I had signed nothing like they talked about."

Lillian Kittrell, Negro, 1729 East Eager Street: "A man came to see me one night last winter. He asked me if I believed in stopping lynching and mobbing. I thought it was a good thing to stop, but I did not know he was a Communist. It was dark, and I can't see good enough to read after dark, so he explained what I was to sign, only about lynching and mobbing, and I signed it because I thought it was good. The Government wrote me a letter and I wrote them back that I hadn't signed anything about communism. I am the mother of an 18-year-old boy, and I am against lynchin' and mobbin', because if he gets in trouble I don't want him to be lynched. I'm in favor of the law. The only thing I belong to is the church."

Michael Kublitzky, 129 North Lakewood Avenue: "I don't belong to any organizations, nor did I sign any paper circulated by the Communist Party. That's all I will say."

CAN'T WRITE ENGLISH

George Paidas, 1724 Eastern Avenue (through his waitress, Miss Katie Pappas, acting as interpreter): "I did not sign any paper. I don't write or read English. A letter came from the Government, and Mr. Paul Farb, a painter, who lives next door replied to the letter for me, saying that I had not signed anything of that sort. Someone else must have signed my name to the petition."

Mammie Haines, Negro, 408 South Dallas Street: "I don't know nothing about no paper or communism business. I can't read or

write. I can't spell my own name. I got a letter from the Government and I sent it back."

Mrs. Estelle Novak, 2008 East Lombard Street: "I don't believe in that sort of stuff—communism. I'm sure I did not sign any petition of any sort. I received a letter from the Dies committee, but I don't know how they got my name."

Lloyd Hazleton, Negro, 643 George Street: "I didn't sign any petition, and I'm against communism."

Agnes Nance, Negro, 505 North Pine Street: "I never signed any paper since I been here, except for the Housing Authority."

Loma Hawkins, Negro, 557 Dolphin Street: "A man asked me would I sign a paper to save Axe Rosie from hanging, and I did. He didn't say anything about communism."

Cora Boyd, Negro, 511 Dolphin Street: "I signed a paper to support an antilynching bill, but I never signed a Communist petition."

Carrie Hill, Negro, 1207 North Stricker Street: "I don't know anything about the Communist Party, I'm not interested in politics, and I never signed anything."

Rev. Helen Brown, Negro, 1015 Argyle Avenue: "I haven't signed anything. A lady came here one night and asked me who lived here—that must be where they got my name."

FOR GOVERNOR NICE

Annie Wise, Negro, 813 Harlem Avenue: "After registration a man and a woman came around, asking if I were going to vote for Governor Nice, and I gave them my name."

Leanora McGuire, Negro, 1311 Riggs Avenue: "I don't know anything about the petition, and don't recall signing anything. I wouldn't sign for the Communist Party."

Effie Chapelle, Negro, 1417 West Lanvale Street: "A man came around and asked me if I would sign a petition for an antilynching bill. He didn't say anything about the Communists. After I got a letter from Mr. DIES, a Mr. Taylor and another Communist came to see me. And after I had signed the antilynch petition, I got a letter from Mr. William C. Taylor, which thanked me for signing the Communist petition, and inviting me to a picnic at Liberty Park on July 4. That was the first I knew that it was a Communist petition."

Mary Moorehead, Negro, 2232 Druid Hill Avenue: "A woman came here pretending to have a petition for freeing the Scottsboro boys. I signed this, and then I got a letter from the Communist Party thanking me for signing the petition to put their candidates on the ballot. That was the first time I knew that it was a Communist petition."

"TO GET A POLICEMAN"

Grace Buchanan, Negro, 2405 Etting Street: "Just after I moved into the neighborhood a lady came around and asked me would I sign a petition to get a policeman on the corner of North Avenue and Cumberland Street. I signed it, but there was no writing on the paper. The lady said they would get the names together and then put the petition in above them. I didn't know nothing about it being a Communist petition."

Phillip Vaughn, Negro, 1939 Madison Avenue: "I don't know anything about any petition. Nobody called on me."

Hattie Roane, Negro, 320 West Preston Street: "I never signed any Communist petition. A lady came here just before election and asked me to register at City Hall. I never did, but I gave her my name. I guess that's where they got it."

Gladys Lee Halley, Negro, 2455 Druid Hill Avenue: "I never signed a Communist petition that I know about. A woman came by who told us (she and her mother) that they wanted to get some colored men in office. She had another petition about a picket line in Washington on the movie Gone With the Wind, but I didn't sign it because I never saw the picture. I signed the other because I thought she was doing something to help the colored people. I am a registered Republican. My mother, Lee Halley, signed the same one as I did. Later on I received a letter from the Communist Party asking me to a meeting July 4. I didn't pay any attention to it."

Elizabeth Henson (Negro), 2521 Salem Street: "I never signed any sort of petition that I know of. A white woman came around, and I signed my name, but I don't know what it was for. She was going from door to door. I generally read things, and I don't know what made me sign my name without reading it first. I'll never do it again."

Joseph Renaudo, 330 North Gay Street: "I didn't know anything about it. When I got that letter from the Dies committee I was the most surprised person in the world. I thought somebody was playing a joke on me. I've got three children and I don't want to be implicated in anything like that."

"BUNCH OF DAMNED 'REDS'"

Oscar Wiley, 4018 Evans Chapel Road: "I never signed any sort of a petition and I haven't any idea of how they got my name. I am a painter by trade, but not even a member of a union, so they couldn't have gotten my name from an organization. I've been a Democrat all of my life. They're just a bunch of damned 'reds.'"

Charles C. Hall (Negro), 730 Dolphin Street, chairman of the executive board of the City-Wide Republican Club: "I never signed a Communist petition. The first I knew of it was when the Communist Party wrote me a letter thanking me for signing their petition. I represent Americanism. I think a neighbor, who is a Communist, must have put my name on the petition. I was a delegate to the State Republican Convention on May 18. The Communist representatives came to see me after I wrote a denunciation in reply to their letter thanking me and I denounced them personally. For 35 years I have been active in the Seventeenth Ward Republican Club."

Matthew H. Carter (Negro), 556 Dolphin Street: "I didn't sign anything."

SIGNED FOR PLAYGROUND

Annie Dennis, Negro, 540 Johannsen Street: "A man came here one day and he wanted to know if I would sign to make safe playgrounds for the children. He said the Governor wanted to get names of people who want safe playgrounds. I was dumbfounded when I got a letter from Washington. I don't know anything about the Communist Party. I've always been a Republican."

Joseph Trubman, 2120 North Pulaski Street: "I'm well known where I live and there are a great many Communists around there. They must have used my name. I never signed any petition and I am not in any way sympathetic with their cause."

FOR PRESIDENT

Wilma Graham, Negro, 603 North Bethel Street: "Last fall a woman stopped at my house. She asked me to sign a petition for the election of somebody for President, I don't remember who. She said everyone was signing. I told her she could put me down. I did not sign the paper."

John Washington, Negro, 17 North Washington Street: "One morning last March, I was coming from an employment office when a man stopped me and said he was starting a labor party. A lot of people around there were signing and I signed, too."

Charles Williams, Negro, 1134 East Lombard Street: "I know just what you're after. I ain't no Communist and I ain't signed nothing, but I know who did. It was that man from the Daily Worker. He said he had a petition and that he was going to put my name down. I told him not to, but he laughed and went out."

SHE IS SURPRISED

Alice Kane, Negro, 1729 East Preston Street: "I was really surprised when we got the letters from the Dies committee. Neither I nor my mother (Addie Skurry) signed any papers. I don't know how the committee got our names."

Ella V. Ellis, Negro, 1017 North Washington Street: "I received a letter from the Dies committee about me signing a petition about communism. I have never heard anything about any petition and so I didn't sign anything. Naturally I wouldn't sign a Communist petition because my husband works on W. P. A."

Osie Hersey, Negro, 1643 Barnes Street: "The only thing I remember signing was for the antilynch bill. A man came around to the house with a paper. The letters from the Dies committee must have referred to that."

REGISTERED DEMOCRAT

Annabelle Lee, Negro, 1008 North Gay Street: "No one has ever asked me to sign anything. I am registered as a Democrat and, of course, would not sign anything like a Communist paper."

Grace Chappell, Negro, 1427 East Biddle Street: "I haven't any connection with the Communist Party and I don't want any. Of course I haven't signed anything. I can't imagine how the Dies Committee got my name unless somebody maliciously gave it to them."

Mary Kelly, Negro, 864 Vine Street: "I don't remember signing anything. I don't know anything about the Communist Party. When I vote, I vote Republican."

Irving Gaby, 2210 Presstman Street: "The only connection I ever had with the Communist Party was when I tried to sell them a typewriter in February. I don't know anything about any petition."

Legal Basis For Conscription

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EWING THOMASON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 9, 1940

ARTICLE BY MAJ. CLAUDE B. MICKELWAIT

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from a recent issue of the American Bar Association Journal:

[From the American Bar Association Journal for September 1940]

LEGAL BASIS FOR CONSCRIPTION

(By Claude B. Mickelwait, major, United States Army, Office of the Judge Advocate General, Washington, D. C.)

The story of the Selective Draft Act of 1917 as recorded by the decisions of the courts now draws to a close. (See *United States ex rel. Bergdoll* v. *Drum*, 107 F. (2d) 897, December 1939.) However, the interest of the public in the general subject of compulsory military service has been aroused by the recent introduction in Congress of the so-called Burke-Wadsworth bill for selective service. Although the political aspects of this subject are the principal items of current debate, nevertheless, an examination of its

legal aspects is regarded as timely. Whether we speak of conscription, draft, or selective service, we have in mind, in this discussion, the compulsion of service in the land and naval forces, as contrasted with voluntary enlistment therein, and it is in regard to the compulsory feature of past laws and of the current proposals that the debates, legal as well as political, are chiefly concerned. In like manner, this discussion of the legal basis for conscription will deal largely with the compulsory feature of that subject.

The conscription of manpower for military service is not to be regarded as a modern invention of sovereigns, be they kings, dictators, or the rulers of democracies. Many examples of the antiquity of this device could be given, but it is sufficient to note the following views of publicists as an indication of its past recognition in the field of customary and appropriate methods for raising military forces:

"Every citizen is bound to serve and defend the state as far as he is able. Society cannot be otherwise preserved; and this union for common defense is one of the first objects of all political association. Whoever is able to bear arms must take them up as soon as he is commanded to do so by the one who has the power to make war." (Vattel, Book 3, ch. 2, sec. 8.)

"Since every citizen or subject is obliged to serve the state, the sovereign has the right, when the necessity arises, to conscript whom he pleases." (Vattel, Book 3, ch. 2, sec. 9.)

"In a word, we must give him [the sovereign] the power of levying troops, enlisting soldiers, and obliging them to perform the most dangerous duties even at the peril of their lives." (Burlamaqui, The Principles of Politic Law, ed. 1791, pt. IV, ch. 1, sec. XII.)

Considering briefly the history of compulsory military service in the United States, it may be pointed out that, prior to the adoption of our Federal Constitution, the drafting of men for military service was sanctioned and practiced both in the Colonies and, after the Declaration of Independence, in many of the States. The constitutions of nine States during the Revolutionary War period recognized the principle of universal military service.[1] An equal number of States enacted draft laws to recruit the Continental Army. However, it is well known that, under the Articles of Confederation, the National Government was limited to making requisitions upon the States for military personnel. These requisitions were fortified upon several occasions by resolutions recommending drafts by the States from the militia.[2] However, the impotence of the National Government in its dependence upon the whims of the States was recognized by the Commander in Chief, and on August 20, 1780, in a letter to the President of Congress, General Washington stated that a peremptory draft was the only method of providing soldiers.[3] Hamilton also recommended that for common defense the Nation should have power to raise armies without limitation since experience had shown that the Articles of Confederation were defective in this regard.[4] Proposals restricting the national power to require military service of citizens were offered by several States[5] in the Constitutional Convention, but were uniformly rejected. The rejection of these limitations indicates that the makers of the Constitution intended to include in that instrument the power to draft. It may, therefore, be concluded that the principle of compulsion was recognized in this country prior to the adoption of the Constitution and, further, that the lack of power in the National Government under the Articles of Confederation to raise armies and provide for defense was a defect intended to be remedied by the Constitution itself.

The legal questions involved in present-day conscription by the National Government arise, therefore, from a consideration of the constitutional powers of the Federal Government rather than from a general denial that the power of conscription for military service is inherent in the sovereign. Implicit in the question of the constitutionality of Federal statutes providing for conscription are those clauses of the Constitution which give Congress the power "to declare war," "to raise and support armies," "to provide and maintain a navy," and "to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces." And to this enumeration must be added the general authority of Congress "to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers."[7] Furthermore, one of the stated purposes of the Constitution is to "provide for the common defense" (preamble).

The first Federal statute involving the application of the principle of conscription was enacted during the Civil War.[8] It may be noted, however, that during the War of 1812 Mr. Monroe, the Secretary of War, recommended to Congress the enactment of a law providing for compulsory military service under the Federal Government.[9] A bill was introduced for that purpose, but the advent of peace eliminated the apparent necessity for such a measure, and it was never enacted.[10] Following the Civil War no statute involving Federal conscription is to be found until the enactment of the so-called Selective Draft Act of 1917.[11] This statute, with amendments, like the Civil War Draft Act, was a wartime act, effective during the then existing emergency. Thus it appears that during two wars in which this country has been engaged Federal troops have been raised by conscription, and, as may be expected, the constitutionality of these laws has been considered by the courts.

Concerning the constitutional validity of these wartime conscription laws it may be said at the outset that, so far as the writer is aware, no decision of a Federal or State court has held that such laws are beyond the power of the Congress. The specific clauses of the Constitution set forth above are generally regarded as basis for this power although the general obligation to serve expressed by writers and other authorities has supported the favorable construction of these clauses. For example, in the Selective Draft Law Cases supra, the Court said, at page 378:

"It may not be doubted that the very conception of a just government and its duty to the citizen includes the reciprocal obligation of the citizen to render military service in case of need and the right to compel it."

Similar views were expressed in *United States* v. *Schwimmer* (279 U. S. 644, 650).

Proceeding from this general duty of the citizen toward the sovereign the validity of conscription when authorized by the Congress as a necessary and proper measure in the exercise of its enumerated powers has been sustained in numerous cases. An early elucidation of this principle is to be found in *Kneedler* v. *Lane* (45 Pa. St. 238), where Justice Agnew expresses the court's views in the following passage at page 322:

"The constitutional authority to use the national forces creates a corresponding duty to provide a number adequate to the necessity. The duty is vital and essential, falling back on the fundamental right of self-preservation, and the powers expressed to declare war, raise armies, maintain navies, and provide for the defense. Power and duty now go hand in hand with the extremity until every available man in the Nation is called into service, if the emergency require it; and of this there can be no judge but Congress."

See also *McCall's Case* (Federal Cases No. 8669, p. 1225 (1863)), to the same effect.

In passing it may also be noted that the draft laws of the Confederate States, enrolling the citizens directly into the service of the National Government, were likewise held to be valid, the courts relying upon constitutional provisions similar to those of the Federal Constitution. The specific grant of power to the Congress of the Confederate States "to raise and support armies" authorized the conscription of national forces as distinguished from the militia of the several States, without limitation as to the mode or manner of exercising the power.[12]

In like manner the general validity of the Selective Draft Act of 1917 as a constitutional method of raising armies was upheld by the courts. Any doubts on this score were effectively dispelled by the Supreme Court in the Selective Draft Law cases, supra, and later cases affirming the views expressed in that case.[13] Later it was said in *United States* v. *Macintosh* (283 U. S. 605, 622–623), a naturalization case, that the power to raise armies "necessarily connotes the like power to say who shall serve in them and in what way," and that "whether any citizen shall be exempt from serving in the armed forces of the Nation in time of war is dependent upon the will of Congress and not upon the scruples of the individual, except as Congress provides." We may, therefore, conclude that it is the settled law of this Nation that compulsory military service is a constitutional method for raising armies in time of war.

Current consideration of a conscription law, involving, as it does, the question of enforcing military service in time of peace, suggests the question whether the powers of the Congress in this regard are lessened by the fact that the country is not at war. So far our national experience has brought forth two conscription laws, each enacted in time of war and each limited to the duration of the emergency. It does not seem open to serious doubt, however, that peacetime conscription is equally valid. The underlying necessity of national self-preservation exists in time of peace as well as after war has been declared. In fact, the current trend as evidenced by recent events in Europe and Asia indicates a tendency to engage in war without the customary notice of a declaration. In such a case we ought not to lose our ability for self-protection by any rigid or mathematical determination that conscription is based principally or solely upon the constitutional power of Congress to declare war. Certainly there are other enumerated powers, equally efficacious, even if we fail to perceive the necessary connection between preparation for war in time of peace

[1] Pennsylvania Constitution (1776), art. 8: Thorpe, American Charters, Constitutions, and Organic Laws, vol. 5, 3083; Vermont Constitution (1777), ch. 1, art. 9, 6 id. 3740, 3747; Vermont Constitution (1786), ch. 1, art. 10, 6 id. 3753; Massachusetts Bill of Rights (1780), art. 10, 3 id. 1891; New Hampshire Bill of Rights (1784), art. 12, 4 id. 2455; New Hampshire Constitution, Bill of Rights, art. 12, 4 id. 2471, 2472; New York Constitution (1777), art. 40, 5 id. 2637; Constitution of Delaware (1776), art. 9, 1 id. 562, 564; Maryland Constitution (1776), art. 33, 3 id. 1686, 1696; Virginia Constitution (1776), Militia, 37 id. 3817; Georgia Constitution (1777), art. 33, art. 35, 2 id. 777, 782.

[2] Journals of Congress (Ford's Edition, Library of Congress), 262–263; 10 id. 199, 200; 13 id. 299.

[3] Sparks, Writings of Washington, 7, 162, 441–444.

[4] Federalist, Nos. 22, 23.

[5] Virginia, 3 Elliott's Debates, 659; North Carolina, 4 Elliott's Debates, 242, 244, 251, 252; Rhode Island, 1 Elliott's Debates, 336.

[6] Art. I, sec. 8.

[7] Art. I, sec. 8.

[8] Act of March 3, 1863, 12 Stat. 731.

[9] Niles' Weekly Register, vol. 7, p. 137 et seq.

[10] *Selective Draft Law Cases* (245 U. S. 366, 385).

[11] Act of May 18, 1917 (47 Stat. 76).

[12] *Ex parte Coupland* (26 Tex. 387 (1862)); *Jeffers* v. *Fair* (33 Ga. 347 (1862)); *Burroughs* v. *Peyton* (16 Gratt. 470 (1864)).

[13] *Goldman* v. *United States* (245 U. S. 474); *Kramer* v. *United States* (246 U. S. 478; *Ruthenberg* v. *United States* (245 U. S. 480); *McKinley* v. *United States* (249 U. S. 397); *O Connell* v. *United States* (253 U. S. 142).

and the power to declare war. In the course of his opinion in the case of the peacetime enlistment of a minor, Justice Field said:

"Now, among the powers assigned to the National Government, is the power 'to raise and support armies,' and the power 'to provide for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces.' The execution of these powers falls within the line of its duties; and its control over the subject is plenary and exclusive. It can determine, without question from any State authority, how the armies shall be raised, whether by voluntary enlistment or forced draft, the age at which the soldier shall be received, and the period for which he shall be taken, the compensation he shall be allowed, and the service to which she shall be assigned." (*Tarbles Case,* 13 Wall. 397, 408.)

Justice Harlan spoke in similar language in *Jacobsen* v. *Massachusetts* (197 U. S. 11, 29):

"* * * and yet he [a person] may be compelled, by force if need be, against his will and without regard to his personal wishes or his pecuniary interests, or even his religious or political connections, to take his place in the ranks of the army of his country, and risk the chance of being shot down in its defense."

Other cases of like tenor involving peacetime service may be mentioned:

In re Grimley Petitioner (137 U. S. 147, 153).

United States v. *Williams* (302 U. S. 46, 48).

In the last cited case the court said, at page 48, "In virtue of its power to raise and support armies, to provide and maintain a navy and to make rules for the government of the land and naval forces, the Congress may require military service of adults and minors alike."

The foregoing views, when considered in conjunction with the decided cases upholding the validity of the wartime conscription acts, justify, it is believed, the prediction that a law providing for peacetime compulsory military service will, if the occasion arises, be regarded by the courts as within the power of Congress.

Before leaving the general subject of constitutionality of Federal conscription laws, certain features of the principal argument against the validity of such laws are of interest. This argument proceeds from the militia provisions of the Federal Constitution which give the Congress power "to provide for calling forth the militia to execute the laws of the Union, suppress insurrections and repel invasions," and "to provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining, the militia and for governing such part of them as may be employed in the service of the United States, reserving to the States respectively, the appointment of the officers, and the authority of training the militia according to the discipline prescribed by Congress."[14] It was thought by some that the grants of power to the Congress in respect of declaring war, raising armies, etc., were modified by the foregoing provisions thus requiring the exercise of the war powers by way of calling forth the militia. Undoubtedly, this view grew out of the restrictions upon national power in this regard in the Articles of Confederation, and the subsequent laws of Congress providing for the training and organization of the militia, of which the act of May 9, 1794,[15] is an early example. That this question had not been settled when the Civil War Draft Act was passed is illustrated by the views of the various justices in Kneedler against Lane, supra, which were largely directed toward resolving the troublesome question of whether the Federal Government was supreme in the field of providing Federal forces or must exercise this power through the States by a call for the militia. Likewise, in the draft cases arising in the Confederate States the principal argument against the national power was based upon the supposed limitation derived from similar constitutional provisions relating to the militia. However, the courts of both the Northern and Southern States were unanimous in refusing to recognize the militia clauses as a limitation upon the power of the Nation to raise armies by conscription or draft. Finally, in the selective draft law cases, supra, the Supreme Court of the United States held that, despite the militia clauses of the Constitution, the Congress has complete and dominant power to raise armies, saying, inter alia, at page 381:

"When the Constitution came to be formed it may not be disputed that one of the recognized necessities for its adoption was the want of power in Congress to raise an army and the dependence upon the States for their quotas. In supplying the power it was manifestly intended to give it all and leave none to the States, since besides the delegation to Congress of authority to raise armies the Constitution prohibited the States, without the consent of Congress, from keeping troops in time of peace or engaging in war" (art. I, sec. 10).

Further consideration was given this question in *Cox* v. *Wood* (247 U. S. 3), where the contention was made by Cox, a soldier drafted during the first World War, that in view of the restrictions upon the employment of the militia, i. e., "to execute the laws of the Union, suppress insurrections, and repel invasions," the petitioner was not liable to serve in a foreign country. Again the court said that the plenary power of Congress to declare war and to raise armies was not subject to the limitations of the militia clauses and "knew no limit deduced from a separate, and for the purpose of the war power, wholly incidental, if not irrelevant and subordinate, provision concerning the militia, found in the Constitution." Thus did the highest court of our land settle, in no unmistakable terms, the time-honored argument concerning the supremacy of the independent and plenary Federal power to raise armies and use them according to necessity.

[14] Art. I, sec. 8.

[15] 1 Stat. 367.

In numerous cases suitors made specific constitutional objections to the Selective Draft Act of 1917 and the courts uniformly dismissed these contentions as untenable. For example, the act authorized the President to prescribe regulations which, from necessity, were numerous and detailed. Accordingly, the objection was made that the act was void for unwarranted delegation of legislative authority. This contention was rejected by the courts.[16] Similarly, it was held that the act did not deprive the conscript of his liberty without due process of law, there being no universal right to the judicial process,[17] nor of his property since a person has in a proper sense no property right in his office or employment.[18] Nor was the requirement of compulsory service in contributing to the defense of the Nation regarded as the imposition of involuntary servitude.[19]

Any law affecting the lives and fortunes of large numbers of our residents is bound to raise interesting and vital questions concerning specific classes of persons. In our discussion thus far we have proceeded upon the assumption that the laws relating to conscription subject citizens to liability for military service. The essence of the obligation is undoubtedly the tie of allegiance binding the citizen to the sovereign.[20] Out of this allegiance arises the duty to his country when called.[21] If the duty is based upon allegiance, it ought to adhere to the citizen wherever he may be. Apparently the Congress in 1863 as well as in 1917 was of this view since the liability of citizens to serve was not specifically qualified by any reference to place of residence.[22] Although the writer is not aware of any decided case which may be regarded as a complete answer to this question, it is of interest to note the case of *United States ex rel. Feld* v. *Bullard* (1923) (290 F. 704, cert. den. 262 U. S. 760), wherein the petitioner, a citizen of the United States, after registration under the 1917 act, sailed to Brazil in July of that year and remained there until July 1919. During his absence he was drafted by virtue of a notice mailed to him at his address in this country, which he failed to answer although a partial reply to the questionnaire of the local board was submitted by his father. Upon his failure to report as required in the notice he was recorded as a deserter. After his return to the United States he was arraigned for trial by court martial for desertion, and his petition for release from the Army authorities was denied in the case just cited. Certainly the decision is authority for the view that the liability to serve of a citizen who has registered is not terminated by his absence from this country when called. In this connection the following quotation is of interest:

"Every sovereign has a right to call home those of his subjects who are in an enemy's country, or in any other country, when he thinks their presence necessary to the defense of the state" (Von Martens, book VIII, ch. II, sec. 6).

Note also the strength of the tie of allegiance announced by our Supreme Court in *Cock* v. *Tait* (265 U. S. 47) (power to tax a citizen resident in a foreign country) and in *Blackmer* v. *United States* (284 U. S. 421), wherein it was said, at page 437:

"Nor can it be doubted that the United States possesses the power inherent in sovereignty to require the return to this country of a citizen, resident elsewhere, whenever the public interest requires it, and to penalize him in case of refusal."

Consider also the case of an alien in respect of liability to serve. Reference is made to the pertinent provision in this regard contained in the Civil War Draft Act, "persons of foreign birth who shall have declared on oath their intention to become citizens," and the similar provision in the Selective Draft Act of 1917, "male persons residing in the United States, not alien enemies, who have declared their intention to become citizens." That a declaration of intention does not change the status of an alien to that of a citizen seems clear.[23] Nevertheless, an alien, whether or not he has declared his intention to become a citizen, may be subjected to compulsory military service by the country of his residence.[24] However, the force of municipal law, which is the basis of this power, is naturally confined to the jurisdiction of the enacting sovereign unless another tie than mere physical presence gives it strength.

What is the rule under international law as to subjecting aliens to military service? It is generally said that military service is a duty incumbent upon citizens alone,[25] and that an alien may not be compelled to render military service without violation of international law.[26] This view was also expressed by Mr. Bayard, Secretary of State, on February 3, 1888, in a communication to Mr. Bell, Minister to the Netherlands, with the qualification that in times of social disturbance or of invasion the services of aliens in

[16] *Selective Draft Law Cases,* supra; *Angelus* v. *Sullivan* (246 F. 54); *Franke* v. *Murray* (248 F. 865).

[17] *Angelus* v. *Sullivan,* supra.

[18] *United States* v. *Olson* (253 F. 233).

[19] *Selective Draft Law Cases,* supra; *Angelus* v. *Sullivan,* supra.

[20] *In re Siem* (284 F. 868).

[21] *Selective Draft Law Cases,* supra. See also quotations from *Vattel and Burlamaqui,* supra.

[22] Act of March 3, 1863, 12 Stat. 731; act of May 18, 1917, 40 Stat. 76.

[23] *Johnson* v. *Nickoloff et al.* (52 F. (2d) 1074); *Petition of Sproule* (19 F. Supp. 995).

[24] *Napore* v. *Rowe* (256 F. 832); *United States ex rel. Koopowitz* v. *Finley* (245 F. 871); cf. *In re Siem,* supra.

[25] 4 Davis, Elements of International Law, 154.

[26] *In re Siem,* supra.

police or home guards may be exacted.[27] It should be noted, however, that certain writers in the field of international law have recently expressed doubt that the liability for military service is limited to citizens[28] upon the basis of certain obligations of resident aliens with particular reference to declarant aliens.[29] Be that as it may, the diplomatic correspondence of the United States reveals a general attitude of conceding a right of exemption to aliens, particularly upon appropriate representations by foreign countries or upon renunciation of declarations of intention.[30]

Despite the apparent recognition by our Government of the qualified right of aliens to exemption from military service the fact remains that aliens were drafted during the first World War and further, as noted above, that courts were disposed to uphold the legality of this compulsion. The basis for these decisions was that the Selective Draft Act of 1917 made persons of the prescribed ages subject to draft unless exempted or excused by the designated authority. Accordingly, it was necessary to claim and receive exemption from the local board and if a fair hearing had been granted by the board the decision of that body was regarded as final.[31] Although the statute limited the liability to serve to declarant aliens, nevertheless nondeclarant aliens were held to service.[32] In the case last cited it was said that limiting liability for military service to citizens and declarant aliens did not exclude from the draft any who were not so obligated but were, nevertheless, required to register.

At this point it is interesting to observe the attitude of the courts as to treaties exempting aliens from military service. For example, in *Ex parte Larrucea* (249 F. 981) four citizens of Spain who had filed their declarations of intention to become citizens of the United States sought release from detention for evading the Conscription Act, claiming that the treaty between Spain and the United States proclaimed April 20, 1903,[33] exempted them from compulsory military service in the United States. Certainly the words of the treaty were apt to confer exemption. Nevertheless, the court held that these aliens were not entitled to release on the basis of nonliability and grounded this decision upon the recognized judicial rule that a treaty occupies no position of superiority over an act of Congress but is, under the Constitution, on a parity with other expressions of legislative will and in the event of inconsistency the latest in time will control.[34] Accordingly, the claimants were remitted to the political head of the Government for appropriate relief under the treaty. For similar conclusions under the Selective Draft Act of 1917, as to nondeclarant aliens, see *Summertime* v. *Local Board, Division No. 10* (248 F. 832); *Ex parte Blazekovic* (248 F. 327).

In the administration of any law for compulsory military service perplexing problems are bound to arise. The Selective Service Regulations of 1917 provided for the mailing of a notice to the selected registrant requiring him to report to the local board or, in special cases, to report to the Adjutant General of the State. The notice specified the day and hour the registrant would be in the military service. Suppose the registrant failed to report as required. Actually he had never served in the military forces. However, the effect of law and regulations transformed the recalcitrant registrant into a deserter under military law. Section 2 of the Selective Draft Act of 1917 provided, in part:

"All persons drafted into the service of the United States * * * shall, from the date of said draft or acceptance be subject to the laws and regulations governing the Regular Army."

Of course, the laws governing the Regular Army included the Articles of War which then provided in article 2 thereof[35] that the following persons, among others, shall be subject to military law:

"* * * all other persons lawfully called, drafted, or ordered into, or to duty or for training in, the said service (military service of the United States), from the dates they are required by the terms of the call, draft, or order to obey the same."

Hence, the registrant was subject to punishment as a deserter if he refused to obey the summons.[36] Furthermore, the use of the postal service in giving notice by mail was deemed sufficient in law, actual personal notice not being required.[37]

Finally, it is of interest to note that the latest case involving the validity of the Selective Draft Act of 1917 and the regulations issued pursuant thereto reaffirms the previous decisions of the courts that the act in question was a valid and constitutional method for filling the ranks of the military forces of the country.[38] With the denial of certiorari in this case by the United States Supreme Court on June 3, 1940 (No. 974), we see at once the conclusion of a case of long standing interest and an indication of the current views of the highest court of our land on the legal basis for conscription.

[27] 4 Moore's Digest, 62.
[28] Borchard, Diplomatic Protection of Citizens Abroad, 64; Hyde, International Law, vol. II, 244, et seq.
[29] Hyde, International Law, vol. II, 247.
[30] Hyde, International Law, vol. II, 248, et seq.
[31] *Napore* v. *Rowe*, supra; *Ex parte Beales* (252 F. 177).
[32] *Napore* v. *Rowe*, supra; *Ex parte Lamachia* (250 F. 814).
[33] Stat. 2108.
[34] Citing *Cherokee Tobacco Cases* (11 Wall. 616); *Head Money Cases* (112 U. S. 580).
[35] Act of August 29, 1916, 39 Stat. 651.
[36] *Franke* v. *Murray* (248 F. 865); *United States ex rel. Feld* v. *Bullard* (290 F. 704; cert. den. 262 U. S. 760).
[37] *Ex parte Bergdoll* (274 F. 458).
[38] *United States ex rel. Bergdoll* v. *Drum, Lieutenant General, et al.* (107 F. (2d) 897).

Bonneville-Coulee Transmission Line Appropriation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER M. PIERCE
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 10, 1940

STATEMENT BY HON. WALTER M. PIERCE, OF OREGON, BEFORE HOUSE DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement which I made yesterday before the House Deficiency Appropriations Subcommittee:

Mr. Chairman and members of the House Deficiencies Appropriation Committee, I appear in behalf of the pending Bonneville-Coulee Transmission Line appropriation in order to give some basic information on the Budget submission before you.

You, no doubt, remember that both Bonneville and Grand Coulee were initiated under P. W. A. grants. A short time thereafter the United States Supreme Court handed down a decision in the Parker Dam case, which in effect stated that constitutional dams had to be covered by congressional authorization. As a result of this decision Congress authorized both dams, and in the act authorizing Grand Coulee (49 Stat. 1028, act of August 30, 1935) it was stated that the operation of the Grand Coulee project was entrusted to the President acting through such agents as he might designate. By letter of January 29, 1936, the President designated the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Bureau of Reclamation, as his agent for this purpose.

Within the past few days you may have noticed that the press release given out by the White House covered an amendment to the original agency designation. This recent amendment embodied in an Executive order coordinates the power facilities at Grand Coulee and Bonneville by designating the Bonneville Power Administration as the agency for marketing the power generated at Grand Coulee.

Further authority is given under section 2 (b) of the Bonneville Act of August 20, 1937, which I quote, as it contains broad provisions of congressional policy:

"(b) In order to encourage the widest possible use of all electric energy that can be generated and marketed and to provide reasonable outlets therefor, and to prevent the monopolization thereof by limited groups, the Administrator is authorized and directed to provide, construct, maintain, and improve such electric transmission lines and substations, and facilities, and structures appurtenant thereto, as he finds necessary, desirable, or appropriate for the purpose of transmitting electric energy, available for sale, from the Bonneville project, to interconnect the Bonneville project with other Federal projects and publicly owned power systems now or hereafter constructed."

It will be noted in this section of the Bonneville Organic Act that Congress directs the Administrator to interconnect the Bonneville project with other Federal projects and publicly owned power systems now or hereafter constructed in order to encourage the widest possible use, to provide reasonable outlets and to prevent monopolization by limited groups.

THE COLUMBIA RIVER

Your committee has been considering appropriations in connection with other rivers and I think it advisable for purposes of record to point out the reason why the Columbia River is in a class by itself as a power producer. Forty-five percent of all the charted, potential prime hydro power in the United States is found within the area marked by the Columbia Basin.

The average river, which has been discussed before you has certain characteristics which may be briefly stated in terms of seasonal flow and fall.

These rivers have high peak spring flood flows and low summer flows during the crop-growing season, tending to make what the hydrologists call "flashy streams." The ratio of water volumes occurring during the peak and low periods and the average practical fall determines the economic power possibilities of any stream.

Nature is compensating in the distribution of its benefits. Sections of our country rich in fuels generally have extremely flashy streams with flat gradients. Those sections devoid of natural fuels have been given streams with either low-cost storage reservoir sites, steady high flows, or great falls. The Columbia is a natural power producer with high volumes, great falls, and low-cost reservoir sites.

With these characteristics the Columbia can produce the lowest over-all cost power in America. This Columbia power, due to its location; does not come in competition with fuel-burning generators, or affect fuel-producing employment. The Columbia power fits into our Nation's picture as a conservation measure. In House Document 103, first session of the Seventy-third Congress, the Army engineers

reported that the Columbia River and its tributaries were capable of being developed into the greatest low-cost power system in America.

RIVER FLOWS

Aside from the Mississippi at its mouth, the long-time record shows that the Columbia drops more water into the sea than any other river on the North American Continent. Its mean long-time annual flow exceeds the Mississippi at St. Louis, the Ohio at Paducah, the Missouri at its mouth, and the St. Lawrence at Ogdensburg. This mean annual flow is much more than the Colorado, the Tennessee, or the Yukon. It has a greater fall than any of our sizable streams—about 1,400 feet from Coulee Lake to Bonneville. The mean annual flow at Coulee is five times as great as the Colorado at Boulder Dam.

In addition to these large volumes and the high heads, the Columbia is a remarkably steady-flow stream. This results from the heavy snowfalls on the Rockies, the Selkirks, the Bitter Root, Blue, and Cascade Ranges.

In steadiness it is only exceeded by the St. Lawrence, which owes its small range of flows to the balancing effect of the large reservoirs of the Great Lakes. The heavy moist clouds from the Japan current and the Pacific drop their burdens on these mountain ranges, which cover a wide range of climatic changes extending from British Columbia to Utah, Nevada, and Wyoming. The high flows of the Columbia resulting from melting snows occur during the summer months or growing season when most of our other rivers are at their lowest stages. Widely distributed snow storage is similar to the balancing effect of the Great Lakes.

THE COLUMBIA RIVER DRAINAGE BASIN

This drainage basin covers an area of 259,000 square miles, or about 4 times the size of all the New England States, and includes parts of British Columbia, nearly all of Oregon and Washington, and substantial parts of Montana, Wyoming, Utah, and Nevada. It rises in the Columbia Lake in southeastern British Columbia at elevation 2,650. The upper Columbia above Coulee has a drainage area of 74,100 square miles, of which 39,000 square miles is in Canada. The Clark Fork originates on the west side of the Rockies near Butte, Mont. Its largest tributary, the Snake, rises also near the same source, which is close to the headwaters of the Missouri. The high and deep mountain snows, glaciers, and lakes, under a wide seasonal temperature range, have a remarkable regulatory effect, causing high flows in the months of June and July, which condition is particularly advantageous, both to irrigation and power.

The Grand Coulee Lake will have a storage capacity of around 10,500,000 acre-feet, or one-eighth of the mean annual river flow at the dam site. This is 4¼ times the volume behind Norris Dam. Out of the 80,000,000 acre-feet flowing annually at Coulee, the estimated maximum irrigation diversion, with 5 feet depth on each acre irrigated, will only amount to 6,000,000 acre-feet, leaving the balance for river regulation and power. Coulee Reservoir will double the low flow below the dam site. All of these facts will show why the Columbia is in a class by itself, and cannot be directly compared with other average streams.

SUPPLEMENTAL USE OF BONNEVILLE AND COULEE

Bonneville is a run-of-the-river hydro, without storage. The water flowing at the site, with the exception of pondage, either goes through the turbine or flows unused to the sea. Bonneville plant has been sized by the Army Engineers to use the lowest regulated flow. Its maximum construction has been substantially set by minimum flows. I covered this phase over 3 years ago before the Rivers and Harbors Committee at the time the Bonneville Act was under consideration. Power reduction at Bonneville results from head decreases resulting from high tail water during floods. Approximately this head loss, during very short periods, represents about one-third of its installed capacity. During these short periods Coulee is at maximum production and when tied into Bonneville will "firm up" its capacity. Bonneville's maximum production occurs when the natural flows at Coulee are at the lowest point.

At Bonneville alone this "firming up" represents about 155,000 kilowatts, with 10 units installed. The difference in sale price between primary and secondary power is $5 to $8 per kilowatt-year. At Bonneville alone this "firming up" represents about $850,000 per year increased revenue. If the increase at Coulee is added plus peak sales possible due to water storage and keeping irrigation pumping off the daily peak, the revenues will be increased over $1,000,000 per year. It is good business to tie these plants together to secure maximum utilization and power revenues. One plant supplements the other. Columbia power, unlike T. V. A. power, does not require steam auxiliaries.

AVAILABLE PLANT CAPACITY

Six units have been authorized at Bonneville. Two totaling 86,400 kilowatts are in service and are loaded, without the Aluminum Co. load which starts up next month. To satisfy the Aluminum Co. the dump-power loads will have to be temporarily dropped. Two more units totaling 108,000 kilowatts will be operating in December of this year and units 5 and 6 will be brought in during the latter part of 1941. At that time Bonneville capacity will be 302,400 kilowatts. Coulee unit No. 1 of 108,000 kilowatts is scheduled for operation in the early summer of 1941. No. 2, of the same size, will be in operation in September 1941, and No. 3 in the latter part of 1941. Aside from the existing 100,000-kilowatt transmission tie between Bonneville and Coulee no outlets have been provided for this large amount of Coulee power available next year.

DEFENSE POWER SHORTAGE

It will be remembered that Congress failed to enact the Bonneville organic legislation early enough, and two generation units were completed without outlets, which resulted in 2 years' delay in marketing Bonneville power. I interpret the request before you as a move to prevent the repetition of such a condition.

On March 3, 1939, I anticipated the present load conditions and possible defense requirements and addressed the House at length and in detail on this subject. A late check of data from the Power Commission and other reliable sources confirms my early prediction.

Let me stress this point, which I have made a matter of record. One of the serious bottlenecks of our defense program will be a power shortage in large sections of the country. Modern warfare is founded on an adequate supply of electrolytic metals, which require large quantities of electricity. The Northwest has the largest pool of available low-cost power in America. It has the strategic and necessary ores. In these critical times Congress cannot afford to take the responsibility of making such power ineffective.

POWER COSTS

There has been considerable confusion injected into the controversial power question as to the relative costs of steam and hydro power. I have spoken at length on this subject and I might summarize a few factual conclusions.

Niagara, as we all know, is also a natural power producer. On June 15, 1939, I pointed out the actual industrial billings of the Niagara Power Co., which averages 3.1 mills per kilowatt-hour. Boulder power is contracted on a falling-water basis for 1.63 mills per kilowatt-hour, and when the plant amortization, maintenance, and operating charges are added the bus bar cost is about 2.1 mills per kilowatt-hour. Delivered at the concentrated load center, 270 miles from Boulder, the current costs about 3.7 mills per kilowatt-hour.

The lowest over-all-cost steam plant in America, as far as I know, is the Long Beach plant of the Southern California Edison Co., which is located on top of gas and oil wells, and is free from coal handling, first and operating costs. Scattergood has testified that the over-all costs of this plant, from which his system buys power, is over 4 mills per kilowatt-hour. The private and public systems are buying Boulder power. The contracts speak for themselves and show that delivered Boulder current is below the lowest cost steam power. The Pennsylvania Railroad, the largest coal hauler in America, operates its electric trains with 3 mills Susquehanna hydro power. If steam power could be produced lower with its natural transportation facilities, the Pennsylvania would not be using Susquehanna power.

The over-all steam costs here in Washington in the new Buzzards Point steam plant is close to 5 mills per kilowatt-hour, derived from data furnished by the District Commission. Most large metropolitan steam plants produce current from 5 to 7 mills per kilowatt-hour. For example, the official over-all steam costs of the Hell Gate Station, New York, is about 7.7 mills per kilowatt-hour. Bonneville delivered current sells for 2 mills, and bus-bar current for 1.65 mills. Coulee costs will be a trifle less.

Let us translate these costs into metal prices. It takes about 22,000 to 24,000 kilowatt-hours per ton of aluminum, or 11 to 12 kilowatt-hours per pound. One mill difference in current price makes a difference of 1.2 cents per pound of metal. Steam power costs will add 3 to 4 cents per pound to the cost of such metal. Unless we want to penalize the taxpayers for this metal-price difference we cannot afford to use steam power for such electrolytic metal production. Let me emphasize this point. When we authorize costs above 3 mills per kilowatt-hour we are penalizing the taxpayer. This is the breaking point. Is it not obvious that both economics and necessity demand early utilization of this largest pool of low-cost power we have? No private company in the country can deliver such quantities of power at double the cost of the Columbia power. Bonneville is selling delivered power to the Portland General Electric Co. for a price lower than bare fuel costs at their steam plants.

JUSTIFICATION

I need not go into the details and justification of the request. These have already been presented. There is enough flexibility in the items presented to make an initial start on defense connections. I will venture a prediction and that is new defense industries will go east of the Cascades.

POWER SHORTAGE

There is a definite power shortage in the Northwest. Aside from the Diablo plant of Seattle there has been no new plant construction since the depression while usage has increased approximately 50 percent. Price determines usage. Lower the price, greater the use. If current price levels were reduced to the Tacoma base increased normal consumption would soak up this authorized capacity, regardless of any defense industries. For example, Spokane is larger than Tacoma, and both cities use nearly the same kilowatt-hours per year. From official reports for the same use Spokane citizens pay about $900,000 more per year to the Washington Water Power Co. than the people of Tacoma pay to their city plant for equal amounts of current. Tacoma has operated for years under the lowest rates in America and under these rates has paid for or paid off over 80 percent of its actual plant cost. If rates were lowered to Tacoma levels consumption would increase 25 percent. Under such an increase eastern Washington and Oregon could early use up the output of one Coulee generator.

By 1945 the Spokane area alone will be short nearly 100,000 kilowatts in capacity, the Puget Sound area 130,000 kilowatts, the Portland area 270,000 kilowatts, and the western Montana area 175,000 kilowatts.

REPAYMENT

The Bonneville Act requires repayment on all power facility investment, with interest, and, to insure this, rates are required to be revised every 5 years. The interest rate has been set at 3½ percent and the amortization period 40 years. Any defense transmission expenditures will be repaid fully with interest. This request is strictly a business proposition and involves no donation or subsidy.

Support of President Roosevelt by Albert H. Ladner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, September 10 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

ARTICLE BY THOMAS P. O'NEIL

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a newspaper article under the heading "Ladner Supports Roosevelt—Hits Willkie on draft."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LADNER SUPPORTS ROOSEVELT—HITS WILLKIE ON DRAFT—G. O. P. PRIMARY CANDIDATE URGES VOTERS TO REELECT F. D. R.

Albert H. Ladner, who polled 230,000 Republican votes in the Pennsylvania senatorial primary in the spring, last night announced his support for the reelection of President Roosevelt.

WILLKIE'S ACTION A FACTOR

Wendell Willkie's opposition to the conscription of industry for national defense was a major factor in Ladner's decision to bolt the G. O. P.

"Though an independent Republican of long standing," he said, "I announce my support of President Roosevelt for reelection. This action is taken only after giving serious consideration to the great crisis which now faces the United States.

"I am a parent, like many of the millions of Americans who must make a vital decision on November 5. I have two sons, both of whom hold commissions in the National Guard of Pennsylvania. I am willing, and I believe it to be just, that if my country needs my sons—and I expect them to be called—they should and will be ready to make whatever sacrifices are necessary. How, then, can I conscientiously give my support to a candidate for the Presidency of the United States who places more value upon the dollars contained in the money bags of Wall Street than he does in the value of the blood that flows through the veins of my children?

YOUTH VS. MONEY

"Those are but a few of the pertinent facts I have pondered over for many weeks. As an American interested in the future of our country and as a parent, I cannot and will not support the candidacy of Wendell L. Willkie.

"He cares not how many of the youth of America are sacrificed in the defense of the country as long as its vested wealth is left alone. His idea of prosperity would be a repetition of the World War days of profiteering.

"Moreover, it would be most tragic to change administrations at Washington during this historic and critical period. President Roosevelt has demonstrated his capacity for leadership. He is the one real figure in all the democratic countries who has stood up as a great leader. We can thank God for that leadership.

"Every clear-thinking, honest, and liberal-minded person, whose vote is not controlled or directed blindly by a political machine, should work unceasingly between now and November 5 to defeat the forces of reaction which have seized control of what was once a people's party—the Republican Party—and selfishly used it for the realization of their desires and profit as opposed to the interests of 130,000,000 decent American citizens.

URGES PEW-COOKE PROTEST

"The more than 230,000 men and women who supported my candidacy for the United States Senate in the recent Republican primary registered their protest against the Pew-Cooke leadership. I am certain that most of these 230,000 independent Republicans in Pennsylvania will join with me in a concerted movement in support of the candidacy of President Roosevelt and the repudiation of the present Republican machine leadership.

"We cannot intelligently, and should not be bound by narrow party lines at a time when the world is crumbling about us. Political creeds never have been nor ever should be set above the good of the Nation.

LEADER OF PEOPLE

"Franklin D. Roosevelt even though he be the leader of the Democratic Party, has shown by his actions that he is the President of all the people of the United States. He has not bound himself by the limits of party lines in his choice of those best equipped to properly prepare our country for the shocks which are spreading about us today. We, too, must approach this problem in just as broad and intelligent a manner.

"We must reelect Franklin D. Roosevelt as President and elect those who we are confident will support him in his endeavors to keep the terrors of war from approaching our shores."

Federal-Aid Highway Apportionments for 1942 and 1943

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILBURN CARTWRIGHT
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 10, 1940

TABLE PREPARED BY PUBLIC ROADS ADMINISTRATION

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following table prepared by the Public Roads Administration showing the approximate amounts of Federal-aid highway and grade-crossing funds which will be apportioned to each State under the Hayden-Cartwright Act of 1940 (H. R. 9575), for each of the fiscal years 1942 and 1943:

Approximate apportionment of funds authorized for each of the fiscal years 1942 and 1943 in H. R. 9575, approved Sept. 5, 1940

[Based on factors used in apportioning the 1941 authorizations]

State	Regular Federal aid	Secondary or feeder roads	Grade crossings	Total
Alabama	$2,070,000	$362,000	$393,000	$2,825,000
Arizona	1,423,000	249,000	128,000	1,800,000
Arkansas	1,700,000	297,000	340,000	2,337,000
California	3,798,000	665,000	741,000	5,204,000
Colorado	1,809,000	317,000	251,000	2,377,000
Connecticut	625,000	109,000	166,000	900,000
Delaware	488,000	85,000	97,000	670,000
Florida	1,347,000	236,000	278,000	1,861,000
Georgia	2,509,000	439,000	489,000	3,437,000
Idaho	1,226,000	215,000	162,000	1,603,000
Illinois	4,044,000	708,000	1,030,000	5,782,000
Indiana	2,425,000	424,000	506,000	3,355,000
Iowa	2,535,000	444,000	546,000	3,525,000
Kansas	2,589,000	453,000	504,000	3,546,000
Kentucky	1,820,000	319,000	356,000	2,495,000
Louisiana	1,437,000	251,000	310,000	1,998,000
Maine	872,000	153,000	135,000	1,160,000
Maryland	821,000	144,000	200,000	1,165,000
Massachusetts	1,375,000	241,000	407,000	2,023,000
Michigan	3,014,000	527,000	647,000	4,188,000
Minnesota	2,697,000	472,000	522,000	3,691,000
Mississippi	1,754,000	307,000	310,000	2,371,000
Missouri	2,983,000	522,000	594,000	4,099,000
Montana	2,027,000	355,000	264,000	2,646,000
Nebraska	2,025,000	354,000	348,000	2,727,000
Nevada	1,271,000	222,000	97,000	1,590,000
New Hampshire	488,000	85,000	97,000	670,000
New Jersey	1,322,000	231,000	390,000	1,943,000
New Mexico	1,603,000	281,000	166,000	2,050,000
New York	4,845,000	848,000	1,334,000	7,027,000
North Carolina	2,324,000	407,000	503,000	3,234,000
North Dakota	1,526,000	267,000	308,000	2,101,000
Ohio	3,581,000	627,000	833,000	5,041,000
Oklahoma	2,323,000	407,000	457,000	3,187,000
Oregon	1,639,000	287,000	223,000	2,149,000
Pennsylvania	4,220,000	739,000	1,127,000	6,086,000
Rhode Island	488,000	85,000	97,000	670,000
South Carolina	1,329,000	233,000	297,000	1,859,000
South Dakota	1,610,000	282,000	268,000	2,160,000
Tennessee	2,080,000	364,000	373,000	2,817,000
Texas	6,229,000	1,090,000	1,087,000	8,406,000
Utah	1,125,000	197,000	129,000	1,451,000
Vermont	488,000	85,000	97,000	670,000
Virginia	1,814,000	317,000	372,000	2,503,000
Washington	1,573,000	275,000	300,000	2,148,000
West Virginia	1,083,000	190,000	261,000	1,534,000
Wisconsin	2,410,000	422,000	484,000	3,316,000
Wyoming	1,252,000	219,000	131,000	1,602,000
Hawaii	488,000	85,000	98,000	671,000
District of Columbia	488,000	85,000	98,000	671,000
Puerto Rico	488,000	85,000	149,000	722,000

Conscription and the Clergy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. SHANLEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, September 7, 1940

Mr. SHANLEY. Mr. Speaker, one of the noblest of historical writers has said that—

> It was the Stoics who emancipated mankind from its subjugation to despotic rule and whose enlightened and elevated views of life bridged the chasm that separates the ancient from the Christian state and led the way to freedom.

It was they also who taught that there is a will superior to the collective will of man.

In the reverse of this, the dignity of man and his pursuits, the humblest of men said on His last visit to the temple, 3 days before His death, "Render to Caesar the things that are Caesar's and to God the things that are God's."

It has been said that this divine utterance gave to the civil power, under the protection of conscience, a sacredness it had never enjoyed, and bounds it had never acknowledged. It was the repudiation of absolutism and the inauguration of freedom.

Under that philosophy civilization has made its most important gains. Under it the most forceful member of the Ghibeline Party, Marsilius, of Padua, was later able to say in thoughts that sound like an American statesman:

> Laws derive their authority from the nation and are invalid without its assent. As the whole is greater than any of its parts, it is wrong that one should be bound by laws made by another, but in obeying laws to which all men have agreed, all men, in reality, govern themselves. The monarch, who is instituted by the legislature to execute its will, ought to be armed with a force sufficient to execute its will, to coerce individual, but not sufficient to control the majority of people. He is responsible to the nation and subject to the law; and the nation that appoints him, and assigns him his duties, has to see that he obeys the constitution, and has to dismiss him if he breaks it.

With all these advances it seems utterly incongruous and equally at variance with our history to see the method of handling the church in the Burke-Wadsworth bill. It seems to me that we are surrendering a heritage in attempting to place the church and its eligible individuals under military control.

I note with delight a press report that the other body has wiped out that thought and we will not revert to our traditional practice. These clergymen and their friends who championed this method of approach may rest assured that they have obtained a victory for a principle broader than life itself.

Christopher Dawson has said in the introduction to his Religion and the Modern State:

> Christianity is bound to protest against any social system which claims the whole of man and sets itself up as the final end of human action, for it asserts that man's essential nature transcends all political and economic forms. Civilization is a road by which man travels, not a house for him to dwell in. His true city is elsewhere. Yet for all that Christianity does not maintain, like some oriental religions, that life has no meaning—that man is caught in the endless round of time and change, like a mouse in a wheel. It asserts that there is a purpose in history and that this purpose is a social one. Against the cities and empires of man which are founded in violence and injustice and have no end but their own power and wealth, it stands for a spiritual society, a divine commonwealth, which is founded in faith and built up in charity, until it realizes all the spiritual possibilites that are latent in the life of humanity.

Poll Taxes and School Revenue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE E. GEYER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 10, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE NASHVILLE TENNESSEAN

Mr. GEYER of California. Mr. Speaker, oftentimes one will hear the poll tax as a prerequisite to voting defended on the grounds that it supplies revenue for the schools. It is an old American custom to tie an unpopular tax up with a worthy cause in order to make it more palatable to those who must swallow it. By this device all the teachers of the State who see their salaries and the chances of education for the young threatened, they think by talk of abolition of this source of revenue immediately rise in defense of another wise, vicious system. They are usually joined by parents and others, uninformed, who believe in a good public-school system.

The Tennessean, published at Nashville, Tenn., prints a timely editorial debunking the sort of propaganda we have described above. We must compliment this publication for its patriotic stand on this all-important question.

We might add that much such information is contained in the hearings on the Geyer anti-poll-tax bill that were held before a subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee. To date, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Congressman WALTER, chairman of the committee, has not had these hearings printed. As he ordered this to be done once and then recalled them from the Government Printing Office, we wonder what prompted the change of heart. It is hoped that these will soon be available to all.

All will be interested in reading the fine editorial that follows:

[From the Nashville Tennessean]

EDUCATION FOR WHAT?

The editor would like to reply to a letter to the Tennessean. The letter was printed in the forum Sunday over the signature Wanta Noe, which to us suggests a person seeking information. Wanta Noe is a young person, not old enough to vote and hence has made acquaintance with the poll tax only through hearsay. Wanta Noe does not believe the poll tax is such a much as a menace. Wanta Noe believes it goes to pay for the education of the young. Wanta Noe wonders why anyone should object to paying the poll tax that is used for the education of the young.

This young person deserves an answer.

Well, Wanta, for 60 years the politicians behind the poll tax have been kicking up this same smoke screen about the poll tax paying for the education of the young. The screen has become more and more transparent as the population of the State has grown. Don't let anyone kid you.

The poll tax provides in Tennessee something less than 3 percent of what it costs to run our schools. It would provide just about what the W. P. A. provides in hot lunches. As a revenue producer it is a shame and a sham, and it was never intended to be a revenue producer, no matter what the history books record or the benighted apologists say.

It was intended to disfranchise, and that it does to perfection, commonly turning two of every three of our adult people from the voting place. It is waiting to turn you away, Wanta, as soon as you bump into it.

They will tell you, dear correspondent, that everybody should pay some taxes to support the schools, and hence the poll tax. You can throw that one back in their teeth with the percentage just cited. For additional force to your fling you could point to the obvious fact that not one person in ten against whom the law lays the poll tax ever pays it anyway. (They surrender their franchise instead.)

We always are going to pay taxes to support public education, and, of course, we should and do not begrudge it. But, in the name of democracy, let's not defend on these grounds a tax which deprives

the man of the right of citizenship for whose proper exercise our educational efforts are supposed to train the child.

In Davidson County poll-tax revenues add up to approximately 4 percent of the elementary school fund. They will tell you, Wanta, that the percentage is much higher in smaller counties—that loss of the poll-tax revenue would seriously embarrass the schools.

Robertson County, Wanta, has no metropolitan area; yet its population is not sparse. Of the school funds in Robertson County, 4.5 percent come from poll taxes. Note that Robertson annually levies about $14,000 in poll taxes but never collects more than $4,000. This means (1) that the majority of the people of Robertson County don't give a hang whether school keeps or not, or (2) that the majority of the people know danged well school is going to keep whether or not they or anyone at all pays the poll tax, and/or (3) that there is flagrant nonenforcement of the poll-tax law.

Of course, there is flagrant nonenforcement. You pay the poll tax if you own real property because you have to, and few others ever bother.

Incidentally, Wanta, in Smith County, where the population is sparse, the poll tax supplies approximately 1.5 percent of the school fund.

Dear friend, the Tennessean has declared war to the end on the poll tax for the simple and sustainable reason that we believe in democracy and want to see popular rule restored in our State. We believe the ballot is too precious to be hawked at a price—even at the insulting bargain price of $2 a head. Generations of men fought and died to wring from tyrannical masters the right to cast the ballot freely, as they pleased, and without let or hindrance of color, race, creed, or property qualification. We are for the free ballot because we believe the decision of the majority will be in the long run sanest, wisest, and best for our cities, counties, States, and Nation. Hence we denounce the poll tax which delivers us to the rule of only a majority of a minority.

Above all, it is difficult for us to understand how any true believer in democratic rule can countenance the poll tax because it extracts a pale fraction of the funds that support our schools. Even if it supported the schools entirely it should not be tolerated. The poll tax was tied to the schools by clever politicians who knew that some day people like you would rise to defend it for that very reason. It was and is a base trick.

The schools don't need the poll tax, and its existence defeats the very purpose of education in a democracy.

Kill the poll tax.

Petition by Mothers of Minnesota

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN G. ALEXANDER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 10, 1940

LETTER AND PETITION FROM MRS. V. GORDON

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, last evening when I reached my office after the close of yesterday's session, I found the enclosed letter from Mrs. V. Gordon and the following resolution which supports and further carries out the statements made in my radio address entitled "Conscription," and which is carried in today's proceedings in the House.

The letter and petition follow:

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., *September 5, 1940.*

JOHN G. ALEXANDER,
Representative, Minnesota.

DEAR MR. ALEXANDER: Enclosed please find copy of a resolution drawn up by the presidents of five units of the Mothers of American Sons at a joint meeting. We would like to have it brought out on the floor of the House if it can be done. We mothers feel it is very necessary at this time. We wish to commend you on your stand.

Sincerely,

Mrs. V. GORDON,
President, Unit No. 2.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., *September 1, 1940.*

DEAR SIR: We the Mothers of American Sons of the State of Minnesota, meeting on this 31st day of August 1940, do hereby submit the following resolution to the several Members of the House of Representatives:

"Whereas we feel that under article 14, section 1, of the Constitution of the United States, the present conscription bill really abridges citizenship privileges accorded citizens of said State; and

"Whereas we feel peacetime conscription is a despised form of regimentation; and

"Whereas war should be initiated by public authority, and not by any private person; and

"Whereas America has no moral right to engage in war with any nation because a war declared for expediency is an immoral war and no Christian citizen could in good conscience take any active part in such a war; and

"Whereas Christians should be horrified at the mere suggestion to be called into a human slaughter on fields of battle; and

"Whereas up to this time neither the President of the United States nor any officer thereof has definitely told the people that we are in imminent danger of invasion, expediency being the only reason given us for this conscription, which constitutes an immoral war; and

"Whereas mothers constitute the greatest institution in this Nation under God for its welfare:

"*Resolved*, That ours being a representative form of government, our Representatives in Washington, D. C., whom at a great sacrifice are paid, through taxation, individually a salary of $10,000 a year and a possible upkeep of $20,000 to $25,000—a total of $35,000 in all—is a definite reason why they should represent the people on this issue instead of listening to a voice from without to deprive our boys of their citizenship rights, which all agree the conscription bill definitely does."

Mrs. ELISABETH WEST.
Mrs. KATHRYN MCGEARY.
Mrs. G. C. KNOLL.
Mrs. ELLEN CANNON.
Mrs. VICTOR GORDON.
Mrs. ELLA STREATER.
Mrs. LULU AVERY.
Mrs. ELIZABETH MCCONVILLE.

While Yet There Is Time To Think

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DEWEY SHORT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

EDITORIAL FROM THE SATURDAY EVENING POST

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Saturday Evening Post of September 7:

[From the Saturday Evening Post of September 7, 1940]

WHILE YET THERE IS TIME TO THINK

In a kind of hypnosis, produced partly by propaganda designed for people who believed themselves to be cynical and immune, partly by a sincere crusading evangel carried on by those whose emotions, as we think, have overcome their reason, but mainly by a Government whose foreign policy, to call it such, has been compounded of a spirit of moral grandeur, international heroics, delusions of a military power not in being, false premises and panic, this country now goes where it does not look and looks where it does not go.

If it should come awake one morning to read in the newspaper headlines, or hear by the radio, that it had walked backward into war, it would take it, no doubt, as having been somehow inevitable from the first, and yet nobody would be able to say quite how or why it happened.

As the hagfish enters the body of its victim unawares and slowly displaces it by devouring it, so it is that ideas that were clear and virile in the beginning have been devoured by new meanings, with no change of the word "shells," until now you may be called anti-American, a "fifth columnist," or an appeaser if you doubt that the only way to keep America out of the war is to get into it, that to save ourselves we have, first, to save the British Empire, or that our first line of defense is and always has been the English Channel.

The Post's position cannot be misunderstood. Before the blitzkrieg started we said: "What we need for practical security is first of all a new word. The word is 'impregnability,' or state of supreme defense. We need more than a bigger Navy. We need two, one for the Atlantic and one for the Pacific, each incomparable. We need an impervious antiaircraft wall. We need to be able to meet not any aggressor but any combination of aggressors. Then we may be sure that the principle of free institutions as a basis of modern civilization shall have, beyond the solace of words, a time yet to live in this world."

And that is our position still.

Now the Congress has voted a two-ocean Navy; for this proper sea power, for an approach to adequate air power, and for an army of 2,000,000 men, it has voted in a few weeks extraordinary appropriations rising to $10,000,000,000. We are not interested in the sums. We shall have to spend a great deal more than ten billions to create a power of defense equal to the power of aggression that has made this all at once a pirate world without law, the lean and hungry nations, as Mussolini says, out to take what they can from the fat ones by force. That, too, we have said.

It is defense we are thinking about, not war. And what concerns us now is that this distinction is becoming blurred.

What are we preparing for—defense or war?

Either the Executive Government itself does not know or it is unwilling to clarify the situation with a few positive words. We suppose the reason why it cannot do this is that it is already too much involved in its own confusions. Pursuing the insidious formula of measures short of war, conceived, to begin with, on a gross underestimate of the aggressor's power, it was carried headlong into acts of physical intervention for the consequences and implications of which the country was in every way unprepared, to say nothing of the fact that it acted without the consent of Congress and beyond the awareness of the people.

In his message to France on June 15, the President said: "The Government of the United States has made it possible for allied armies to obtain, during the weeks that have just passed, airplanes, artillery, and munitions of many kinds, and * * * this Government, so long as the allied governments continue to resist, will redouble its efforts in this direction."

That was the United States Government speaking, acting, pledging itself to assist in the war against Hitler to the utmost, short only of an actual declaration of hostilities. It was already too late to save France. Moreover, nothing we had been able to send her, even our total military power, including the Navy, could have saved her, which was a trifling reality the Government was unable to comprehend.

Only 6 weeks later, the Secretary of War is saying to the House Committee on Military Affairs, in support of the conscription bill, that there is very grave danger of a direct attack upon the United States by Hitler. He is asked how long it will take to prepare a suitable defense. He says: "We will not have it in time to meet the first possibility of invasion."

The Secretary of War, of course, is speaking directly for the administration. He is saying what it thinks. The administration thinks there is very grave danger of an invasion of this country by Hitler before we can be ready to meet it. But this is the same administration that stripped the American defense of rifles, artillery, munitions, and airplanes, and sent them to the Allies. It is the same administration that would have delivered to the British Admiralty the whole of our mosquito fleet in building if the Congress had not found a law to stop it. It is the same administration that has ever since been trying to find a way to deliver United States Navy destroyers to the British. If what it thinks is true—that there is grave danger of an invasion of this country by Hitler before we can get ready—then we have not a rifle, a gun, an airplane, or a rowboat to spare, nor any industrial capacity. On the day the Secretary of War was making his statement before the House committee the New York newspapers carried pictures of National Guard men training with imaginary machine guns devised by plumbers out of gas pipe.

We can imagine circumstances in which the highest strategy would call for taking the war to the enemy. We cannot conceive of circumstances in which it is permitted in sanity to slap danger in the face before you are ready to meet it—to name an enemy who has not named you, to attack an enemy who has not yet attacked you, before you are ready to fight him.

Our enemies, the administration keeps telling the people, are Germany, Italy, and Japan, naming them. Not one of them has made a gesture of war toward us. For all we think and feel about Hitler, he has not attacked us. He says he does not intend to. We do not believe him. Nobody in the world now believes him. Very well. But the American Government has attacked Hitler, first by words, then by measures short of war, then by giving pledge to his enemies to assist them by all physical means to the utmost.

In June the American Government entered the war against Hitler by acts of physical intervention, all the worse because they were futile.

In July that same Government is telling the people they are in grave danger of being attacked by Hitler before they can get ready to meet him. "Hitler does not wait," said the Secretary of War to the House Committee on Military Affairs—and the National Guard men in New York training with gas-pipe guns.

What a triumph for statecraft. What strategy.

What a face for a great Nation.

These are the conditions under which there has been created in the country a war psychosis, misled by cries of "Stop Hitler Now" and "Defend America by Aiding the Allies." We had nothing to stop Hitler with in Europe. A government that either did not know that or made believe it was not so now is saying that if he decided to invade the United States soon, as there is very grave danger that he may, we are not ready to stop him here. Nevertheless, it goes on to declare against him an economic war—a pan-American economic bloc against his European bloc—for which also it is unprepared, not having thought it through, not having calculated the cost.

We do not believe that an invasion of the United States by Hitler is among the imminent possibilities. The word of the Government for it does not greatly impress us. A government that had been so wrong about his power to overcome in Europe and about the power of France to resist could very well be wrong again. Nor do we believe that 50 or 60 destroyers from the United States Navy would save the British Empire. That would be but another futile act of futile intervention, much more likely to infuriate an enemy we are not prepared to meet than to save a friend.

We are bound to be emotionally torn by the spectacle of the British Empire fighting for its life. That is a feeling that lies deep in us and is shared even by those who still can think in a realistic manner. The fall of the British Empire would be a mighty human disaster. Yet we part with those who say, or who believe, it would mean the end of American civilization, and part with them again when they would in any degree weaken the American defense to repair the weakness of Great Britain's, for which Great Britain, not we, are responsible. We add here two reflections—first, that Great Britain would be stronger if she had stood alone; second, the enemy is governed by logic, not emotion.

We stand, therefore, in our first position. Let us jealously mind our own defense in the great manner of a great people, resolve to be let alone. Let us build at any cost a dreadnought defense power such as no aggressor, nor any combination of aggressors, will dare to challenge. Thus we forfend war.

And meanwhile, for this will take some time, let us look very hard at a state of facts. The German thing has conquered Europe. That will be still true whether the British Empire stands or falls.

Who is going to put the German thing backs? The British? They are not able.

Shall we do it? Unless we are willing to go to Europe and destroy it there, we may as well make up our minds now that we shall have to live in the same world with it, maybe for a long time, whether we like it or not. None the less, for that reason, only all the more, we should, we must, create on this continent the incomparable power of defense. After that we shall see. For after that we shall be again as we once were, safe and free and dangerous.

A Mississippian's View of the Chicago New Deal Convention—History Repeats Itself

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 10, 1940

ARTICLE BY CLAYTON RAND, OF GULFPORT, MISS., AUTHOR OF "INK ON HIS HANDS"

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following interview with Mr. Clayton Rand, of Gulfport, Miss., which appeared in the Bethesda Journal, of Montgomery County, Md., on August 30, 1940, as follows:

[From the Bethesda (Md.) Journal of August 30, 1940]

Clayton Rand, country editor from Gulfport, Miss., dropped in this week on his way to New York to read proof on his new book on country journalism, Ink On His Hands.

The talk led from one thing to another until it reached the Chicago convention which nominated Mr. Roosevelt. We were surprised to hear a Mississippian's comment that any good historian of Roman times, or even William Shakespeare, three centuries ago, wrote up the Democratic convention in Chicago last month. He said that a study of Caesar is timely right now. Caesar was born in wealth. His mother was of a distinguished family, and when his father died his mother trained him for a political career. Caesar was a pampered child, reared in the lap of luxury. He was celebrated for his extravagance and political intrigues. When the masses were enfranchised, Caesar played to the crowd and became a popular idol. He joined forces with radical parties, and as soon as he came into full power the Roman Constitution ceased to exist. Caesar spent tax money lavishly, providing public entertainment and sponsoring many projects to "relieve unemployment."

Caesar proposed a digest of all laws, founded libraries, drained marshes, built dams, enlarged harbors and dug canals. He made financial proposals for the relief of debtors and in "a great emergency" he took steps to restore agriculture. He even changed the calendar. As his spoils system spread throughout the republic, he became so popular with the people that the Roman Senate granted him the sole right of disposal of funds from the public treasury—blank checks as it were—and finally gave him full power to declare war and make peace.

Caesar preserved his writings for posterity in a special vault. He feasted and feted the people with prodigal extravagance until they called him "the great humanitarian of his country." Caesar's person was declared to be sacred and even divine and, of course, he could not appear in public debate with any common mortal.

In Caesar's fifty-seventh year, he aspired to be king in name as well as in fact. As Shakespeare described it: Antony set a crown upon his head. When Caesar put it by, Antony offered it to him again; then he put it by again. But there was a columnist present named Casca who was keen sighted, and Casca reported: "To my way of thinking he was very loath to lay his fingers off it. And then it was offered the third time and as he refused it again the rabble shouted, and clapped their chapped hands, and threw up their sweaty nightcaps." And Casca went on to say that he durst not laugh out loud.

We made a resolve to read our history and Shakespeare again.

Some Inside Information About the 1916 Campaign

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS LUDLOW
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 7, 1940

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I was not present when two of our congressional brothers—the gentleman from Ohio, Brother SWEENEY, and the gentleman from Kentucky, Brother VINCENT—mixed it up on the floor of the House the other evening, but if I had been I would have said to them, "Shake hands, boys, you are both right." If I understand the controversy that led to this spectacular exhibition of polemics, the gentleman from Ohio, Brother SWEENEY, declared that President Wilson was reelected in 1916 on the slogan, "He kept us out of war," and in the following April he—the President—led us into war, in which categorical asserveration the gentleman from Ohio, Brother SWEENEY, was factually, chronologically, and eminently correct.

If, furthermore, I understand the cause of the disturbance of the peaceful equilibrium of the gentleman from Kentucky, Brother VINCENT'S ordinarily placid mind, it was what he construed to be the implied intimation that President Wilson deceived the American people by pitching his campaign on the "he kept us out of war" issue in 1916, when it was his intention and forethought to lead the country into war after the election.

In this connection, I desire to tell a story which has never been told and which shows that President Wilson had nothing to do with adopting "He kept us out of war" as the slogan of his party in 1916, and that, as a matter of fact, it was adopted over his strenuous and unyielding opposition.

In 1916 and 1917 and for many years before and after, I was a member of the press gallery at Washington. The string of daily newspapers I represented was a long one, stretching from the Atlantic to the Pacific, or 14 to be exact. Jim Preston, superintendent of the Senate press gallery in those days, used to wise-crack that I represented all of the papers in the United States the Associated Press did not. Among my favorite connections was a newspaper in Louisville, Ky., presided over by that brilliant journalist of the South, Richard W. Knott. That connection drew me into very close and intimate relationship with Senator Ollie M. James who, in addition to being America's premier political orator, was Woodrow Wilson's most intimate friend and spokesman on Capitol Hill. I was an habitue of Senator James' office on the first floor of the Senate Office Building, just off of the northwest entrance, and many were the Sunday afternoons, as well as weekday occasions, I spent with him there, listening to his charming conversation and enjoying the brilliant radiance of his remarkable mind. On these occasions it frequently happened that President Wilson's intimates and members of his kitchen cabinet also were present. When Senator James liked a person very much, indeed, he called that person "Old Feller," never "Fellow," but "Feller." I was in the "old feller" class. Whenever he wrote a speech for a momentous occasion he "tried it on the dog" before delivering it. I had the honor and distinction of serving as "the dog."

In due course of time and in the selective process of eliminating others who stood high in the list of availables, Senator James was chosen as the permanent chairman and keynoter of the Democratic National Convention that was to renominate Woodrow Wilson for President at St. Louis the coming June. No better selection could have been made. Senator James was a giant, weighing more than 300 pounds, with a leonine head, a booming voice, and a gift of real eloquence that made him the leading platform orator of his time. From the standpoint of popular appeal, I doubt whether America has ever produced a greater.

Meeting Senator James in the marble room one day, he asked me to join him at his office at 4 o'clock that afternoon, as he had something he wanted to talk over with me. I had an intuition that I was to serve again as "the dog," and the intuition was correct. At the appointed time I was at his office, and he produced from his desk a mass of typewritten sheets, which proved to be the keynote speech he intended to deliver in opening the Democratic National Convention. He read it to me, with all of the beautiful periods and climaxes delivered and stressed just as he would on the rostrum. When he had concluded he said:

Well, what do you think of it, "old feller"?

It is great—most impressive. It will sweep the convention off its feet—

I said, and indeed I thought so, for it was truly a remarkable effort.

Now I am going to tell you something that will surprise you—

The Senator said—

I took this speech to the White House and read it to the President, and he doesn't want me to deliver it. He doesn't want me to give him so much credit for keeping America out of war. He doesn't want the campaign pitched on that issue, and he is emphatic about it. I can't understand him.

I told the Senator that in my opinion his speech was sound, sensible, and politically wise; that the people of the United States certainly were not war-minded; and that I believed his address would make a tremendous appeal to the voters.

"I am going to make this speech nevertheless and notwithstanding," he said.

And he did. He delivered it with such artfulness and effect that to the survivors of those who were assembled in the St. Louis Colosseum on July 15, 1916, when he took over the gavel, it will always be an indelible memory. When he told the convention how the Wilson administration had kept the country out of the bloody war raging in Europe the vast audience went wild. The climax came when he said:

Without orphaning a single American child, without widowing a single American mother, without firing a single gun, without the shedding of a single drop of blood, he wrung from the most militant spirit that ever brooded above a battlefield an acknowledgment of American rights and an agreement to American demands.

"Repeat it! Repeat it!" roared the frenzied audience. The Senator repeated the sentence with magnificent impressiveness. What happened then is stated in a note in parentheses in the official report of the convention proceedings, as follows:

Tremendous outburst of applause and cheering, the parading of delegates with the standards of many States around the hall for 21 minutes.

There was another enormous demonstration when the Senator a little further along in his speech—

In the bloodiest crucible of all history he has kept the stainless banner of the Republic flying above 100,000,000 people in peace and in honor. * * * Around 20,000,000 happy firesides the fathers of America will gather this night with their unbroken family circle, with their children upon their knees and their wives by their sides, happy and prosperous. Contrast this with the fathers, husbands, and brothers of the Old World dying in the ditches, with the gloom and mourning in broken family circles, where hunger crouches and disease treads.

Then, drawing a vivid picture of the President as a lover of peace in a world of brutal and heartless dictators, the Senator proceeded with a eulogy that was interrupted at almost every sentence with tumultous acclaim:

He has struggled for peace. His fondest hope, his most fervent prayer, is for the peace not only of his own beloved country but of the world. When the last great day shall come, and before the court of God the nations of this earth shall march in judgment

review, the monarchs of the Old World shall have to answer for this awful carnage, this heartless orphaning of millions of children, this cruel widowing of millions of mothers, this brutal turning of a once happy land into a place of mourning, and on the last day I can see our President holding in his hand the accusing picture of Henri Danger, of Christ upon the battlefield, with the dead and dying all about him, with the roar of cannon, the scream of shrapnel, the wail of the dying, and above his head written these words: "And He said unto them, love one another." When that day shall come, who is it that would have our President exchange places with the blood-bespattered monarchs of the Old World? I can see him with the white light streaming upon his head and hear the Master say, "Blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called the children of God." The Democratic Party is proud of the achievements of Woodrow Wilson.

In strange contrast with Senator James' keynote speech the platform adopted by that historic convention which renominated President Wilson, asserted no claim for credit due him for keeping America out of war. Whoever takes the trouble to read the platform will find no such claim in it. I have always believed it was kept out of the platform because Woodrow Wilson's influence controlled the platform makers, whereas it could not control Senator James. And I venture to say that a careful reading of all of President Wilson's speeches during his campaign for reelection will show that he never asserted such a claim. Perhaps he could see far enough through the dark crystal of fate to know that the time was coming and not far away when he would feel that it was his duty to lead America into the war. The slogan "He kept us out of war," which determined the nature of the Democratic presidential campaign of 1916 was invented, not by the platform committee nor by the President, but by Senator James over the positive opposition of President Wilson. The Senator from Kentucky acted in the best of faith and with a very practical idea of the value of the slogan he was creating.

British Propaganda and Subversion of Textbooks in American Public Schools—A

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. THORKELSON

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 9, 1940

REPORT BY DAVID HIRSHFIELD, COMMISSIONER OF ACCOUNTS OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK

Mr. THORKELSON. Mr. Speaker, I have taken the liberty of marking these articles, in which I am discussing changes in school histories, A, B, C, D, and so forth, and my reason for so doing is not to evade the regulations of the House concerning printing but simply to identify these articles.

Each article is complete in itself; and while publishing them may entail some cost, there should be no objection, inasmuch as we have appropriated fourteen and a half billion dollars to launch this country into an unnecessary war, which will, if we enter into it, cost millions of lives and billions in property.

My remarks are inserted in the RECORD for the sole purpose of informing the people of the actual conditions that exist today, so that in the knowledge of these facts they may demand that this Nation remain at peace. The cost of the printing therefore is not an expense, but it is, instead, an investment which I hope will lead toward national security. All information which I have inserted in the RECORD is authenticated and based upon facts, much of which is in my possession or in the Congressional Library, where Members of Congress may verify my statements.

My interest in the matter which I have placed in the RECORD is not political but is, instead, to shed light upon those whose interest is in foreign nations instead of the United States.

I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include a report by David Hirshfield, commissioner of accounts, city of New York, on investigation of pro-British history textbooks in use in the public schools of this city.

Mr. Speaker, I have included these articles with my remarks in order to call the attention of Members of Congress and the parents of our American boys and girls to these changes in our textbooks, as I am sure all patriotic citizens are interested in retaining the true American history in our public schools.

REPORT ON INVESTIGATION OF PRO-BRITISH HISTORY TEXTBOOKS IN USE IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK, AT THE DIRECTION OF HON. JOHN F. HYLAN, MAYOR

(By David Hirshfield, Commissioner of Accounts, City of New York)

OFFICE OF THE COMMISSIONER OF ACCOUNTS,
City of New York, May 25, 1923.

Subject—Investigation of pro-British history textbooks in use in the public schools of this city.

Hon. JOHN F. HYLAN, *Mayor,*

DEAR SIR: On December 6, 1921, I received from Your Honor a letter, of which the following is a copy:

DECEMBER 6, 1921.

DAVID HIRSHFIELD, Esq.,
Commissioner of Accounts.

DEAR SIR: I wish you would make a thorough investigation and report to me with regard to the new history readers and textbooks alleged to contain anti-American propaganda, which have been introduced in the public schools of this city.

It would be interesting to learn why the standard works have been supplanted, if such be the fact; who are the authors of the new books; and what influence is back of the change.

This administration has done more than several past administrations combined to provide adequate accommodations for school children, and our total program calls for 95 school buildings and additions.

Having made ample provision for school facilities, it is our intention to see that the buildings are devoted to the purposes for which they were erected. There is no room in any of our schools for anti-American propaganda or anything which would besmirch American traditions and the glory, renown, and good name of our American Republic and its founders.

America has given to the world great fundamental truths in government of the people, for the people, by the people. These truths have been woven in the warp and woof of our social, economic, and political fabric. Many nations, some centuries older than our own, have profited by our example.

We have never forgotten our debt to early patriots who bequeathed to us the beneficent institutions of free government. At the risk of their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor, our forefathers committed themselves to the cause of human liberty. It was an experiment, pure and simple, but a successful one.

It is amazing to think that any publication intended for the use of school children should refer to our early patriots as "hot-headed mobs," "smugglers," and "pirates." The fortitude, supreme common sense, and sagacity of Washington and the other patriots have always been a never-ending source of inspiration, and it will be a sad day if alien propaganda is permitted to alter the enviable record of their service and patriotism.

The school children of this city must not be inoculated with the poisonous virus of foreign propaganda which seeks to belittle illustrious American patriots. What our school children are taught to believe about America and its founders becomes the spirit of America in the future. Let these children continue to be taught the truth as they have in the past, and we need have no misgivings as to the future welfare of the Republic.

Very truly yours,

JOHN F. HYLAN, *Mayor.*

Pursuant to this request, I made a study of the American history textbooks in use in the public schools of the city of New York, against which complaints have been made.

In addition to having read and examined the history textbooks complained of and having done extensive research work, I held five public hearings during the period from February 3 to April 18, 1922, to which all those interested were invited.

These hearings were well attended and the following-named persons appeared and spoke against the use of the un-American textbooks in our schools:

Col. Alvin M. Owsley, national commander, the American Legion.

Mr. Charles Grant Miller, author of Treason to American Tradition.

Col. H. B. Fairbanks, chairman, executive committee, Veterans of Foreign Wars.

Mr. Joseph T. Griffin, principal, public school 114, Manhattan.

Mr. Julius Hyman, representing National Security League and Jewish Welfare Board.

Mrs. John Jerome Rooney, chairman, district school board No. 15, Manhattan.

Mr. William Pickens, field secretary, National Association for Advancement of Colored People.

Mr. F. E. DeWees, 31 East Twenty-seventh Street, New York.

Judge Wallace McCamant, president general, National Society Sons of the American Revolution.

Maj. David Banks, secretary general, Military Order of Foreign Wars.

Mr. Thos. P. Tuite, executive secretary, the Star-Spangled Banner Association, and secretary, Vanderbilt Post, Grand Army of the Republic.

Mr. William M. Van Der Weyde, president, Thomas Paine National Memorial Association.

Mrs. Marie J. Stuart, National Association for Advancement of Colored People.

Mr. John A. Carrigy, commander, Nathan Hale Post, the American Legion, Brooklyn.

Mr. Warren B. Fisher, representing United American War Veterans.

Miss Dorothy Burns, 616 West One Hundred and Sixteenth Street, New York.

Mrs. Caroline C. Sperry, Mountainview, N. J.

Mr. Philip Leonard Greene, international president, Pan-American Student League.

Capt. Walter I. Joyce, national chairman, Americanization Committee, Veterans of Foreign Wars.

Mr. Charles Edward Russell, author, diplomat, and publicist.

Mr. George E. Morrison, managing editor, The Historic Hudson.

The following-named persons appeared and spoke in defense of the histories complained against:

Mr. Francis M. Kinnicut, member, advisory board, the English Speaking World.

Mr. Telfair Minton, secretary, the Loyal Coalition.

While none of the authors of the complained-of textbooks appeared at these hearings, I am told that several representatives of the textbook publishers attended, but none spoke.

From the examination of the textbooks and a study of the whole subject and from the testimony given before me, it appears that standard American school histories have been largely supplanted in the New York City public schools by eight texts recently revised, so far as they relate to the Revolution, the War of 1812, and other Anglo-American differences.

Under the specious pretense of "promoting more friendly relations" and "mutual understanding" with Great Britain, our school children are now being taught not the consecrated maxim, "Taxation without representation is tyranny," but, quite to the contrary, that "In England's taxation of the Colonies there was no injustice or oppression," and that the real reason independence was sought was because after England had at great cost crushed out autocracy in the Western Hemisphere the colonists no longer needed the protection of the mother country and were unwilling to pay their fair share of the costs incurred.

Faneuil Hall, "the cradle of liberty," is of no consequence in these new histories, nor is the Mutiny Act, the Stamp Act, or the Boston massacre, which the colonists deemed important causes for resentment.

The martyrdom of Nathan Hale, whose only regret on the British scaffold was that he had but one life to give to his country, is in all of them ignored. In most of them there is no mention of Joseph Warren, Ethan Allen, Anthony Wayne, Paul Revere, Molly Pitcher, and Betsy Ross. In one there is a page of praise for Benedict Arnold.

Such important battles as Bunker Hill, Bennington, Oriskany, and Kings Mountain are omitted.

Such decisive victories as Ticonderoga, Saratoga, New Orleans, and the capture of the Serapis are belittled.

The inspiriting slogans, "We have met the enemy and they are ours," "Don't give up the ship," and "I've not yet begun to fight" are either omitted or discredited.

French aid in the Revolution is by all, but one, of these authors attributed to shameful motives.

As a result of these new texts the children are now being taught in our public schools misrepresentations such as the following:

That the American Revolution was merely a "civil war" between the English people on both sides of the sea and their "German" king;

That Magna Carta is the real source of our liberties, while the Declaration of Independence exerted no vital force;

That such patriots as Samuel Adams, John Hancock, and Patrick Henry were mere disreputable characters;

That Thomas Jefferson deserved a halter;

That Alexander Hamilton denounced the people as "a great beast";

That the United States Constitution and most of our free institutions were borrowed from England;

That the War of 1812 was "a mistake," "disgraceful," and "unfortunate";

That the Mexican War was a grab of territory;

That the North saved the Union only through England's "heroic support";

That our War with Spain was won because England prevented Germany and all Europe from taking sides against us;

That our country's history has been "hitherto distorted through unthinking adherence to national prejudices";

That it is now being "set right" through "newer tendencies in historical writing" and "methods of modern historical scholarship."

It would seem as if these authors wanted to convey the impression that our history, our Government, and everything else American is all wrong, and that the sole hope for American progress lies in our renouncing our American traditions, surrendering our American spirit, and becoming again an integral part of the British Empire, as Cecil Rhodes directed in the first draft of his will, quoted in Basil Williams' life of Cecil Rhodes:

"Directed that a secret society should be endowed with the following objects: 'The extension of British rule throughout the world, * * * the colonization by British subjects of all lands where the means of livelihood are attainable by energy, labor, and enterprise, and especially the occupation by British settlers of the entire continent of Africa, the Holy Land, the valley of the Euphrates, the islands of Cyprus and Candia, the whole of South America, the islands of the Pacific not heretofore possessed by Great Britain, the whole of the Malay archipelago, the seaboard of China and Japan, the ultimate recovery of the United States of America as an integral part of the British Empire.' "

And also making a reality of Andrew Carnegie's fondest dream, set forth in his Triumphant Democracy in 1893:

"Time may dispel many pleasing illusions and destroy many noble dreams, but it shall never shake my belief that the wound caused by the wholly unlooked-for and undesired separation of the mother from her child is not to bleed forever. Let men say what they will; therefore, I say that as sure as the sun in the heavens once shone upon Britain and America united, so surely is it one morning to rise, shine upon, and greet again the reunited state, the British-American Union."

The texts which I have specially examined are:

An American History, Revised, 1920, by David Saville Muzzey;

History of the American People, 1918, by Willis Mason West.

School History of the United States, Revised, 1920, by Albert Bushnell Hart.

A History of the United States for Schools, Revised, 1919, by McLaughlin and Van Tyne.

Our United States, 1919, by William Backus Guitteau.

Burke's Speech on Conciliation, 1919, by C. H. Ward.

Short American History by Grades, 1920, by Everett Barnes.

American History for Grammar Grades, 1920, by Everett Barnes.

All on the list of authorized texts of the New York City public schools, selected by William L. Ettinger, superintendent of schools in the city of New York.

It appears that from among the 10 texts complained of, the 8 worst offenders against America and Americanism were selected for use in the New York public schools.

At the time this investigation was called for by Your Honor an inquiry into similar complaints had been going on for some time by a special committee of 21, consisting of superintendents, principals, and teachers, appointed by Superintendent Ettinger. This committee thereafter, in May 1922, made its report, in which certain passages in seven of the complained-of texts were criticized, but not a word was said against the Muzzey history.

Of one of the authors the New York Public School Special Committee's report says:

"No Wedderburn, no crown advocate, could plead the British cause in a more bitterly partisan spirit than West has done."

As to all the accused authors, excepting Muzzey, the school committee reported:

"The paragraphs complained of in their books indicate an attitude of mind toward the founders of the Republic which, in our judgment, is entirely reprehensible."

The report of this committee was accepted by the board of superintendents May 15, 1922, and the committee members were thanked by Superintendent Ettinger for their "excellent work."

However, for some unexplained reason, the list of textbooks authorized to be used in the public schools of New York City issued in February 1923 continues to include every one of the histories that had been investigated and condemned by the superintendent's own investigating committee.

As I understand it, while all books for use as textbooks in the public schools of this city must be selected from the list of authorized texts promulgated by the superintendent of schools, the principals select for use in their respective schools such books on the list as they choose; but, owing to refusal of information by the principals and various other school authorities, by order of Superintendent Ettinger, it has been impossible to obtain information to what extent these texts are now in use in our schools.

During the progress of my investigation, and apparently as a result thereof, the Guitteau history and the two Everett Barnes histories were revised. In these re-revised textbooks, though many offensive passages have been corrected or removed, the texts still show their authors' apparent want of true American patriotic appreciation.

Patriotic protest has forced the Muzzey history out of the public schools in many States, but in the New York City school system it seems to be especially favored. Thirteen hundred and fifty-six copies of the Muzzey history were purchased and placed in the public schools of this city in 1922, and already in 1923 there have been added eleven hundred and fifty more.

President-General McCamant of the National Society Sons of the American Revolution, in a statement, said, in part:

"There is a great abuse in the matter of the adoption of school books. The representatives of the publishing houses spend money lavishly in the entertainment of teachers and school superintendents and secure favors from the latter which ought not to be granted.

"In my attack on the Muzzey history in my home city, Portland, Oreg., I was unable to get anywhere in that jurisdiction until we got rid of a school superintendent who was too friendly to Ginn & Co., the publishers of the book, to be willing even to consider its displacement.

"Every one of the publishing houses has a force of smooth promoters, selected because of their personality, who go about the country bringing about the introduction of textbooks, not on their merits but on the popularity and other persuasive qualities of the men who promote them."

The young should receive patriotic enlightenment and be taught loyal citizenship. The quality of the history teachings to the school child largely determines the patriotic character of the future citizen and the destiny of the Nation. Too great care cannot be taken to protect the impressionable minds of our school children against improper history teachings.

The prime essential of history teaching to our children is to inculcate wholesome appreciation of the heroes, ideals, and achievements of our country's past and to stimulate right aspirations as to its future.

The teaching to American children of the revised and much-complained-of history textbooks can have but one result, and that is to depreciate American patriotic thought and degrade national spirit.

It appears, however, and is shown in detail in this report that organized English and American financial influences insidiously pervade the scholastic circles of our country, with the result that American school histories are so rewritten as "to give the emphasis to the factors in our national development which appeal to them as most vital from the standpoint of today."

The aim of this "standpoint of today" seems to be to discredit the American Declaration of Independence and the American Constitution in the minds of the American children, as not being the real foundation, bulwark, and inspiration of our rights, liberties, and ideals and thus undermine their love for our country and sow seeds of disrespect for our sacred institutions.

In every school history, the story of the American Revolution ought to be told with emphasis on the righteousness of the cause for which our forefathers fought.

The men of the Revolution are no longer here to defend the righteousness of their cause and we owe a duty to their memory to see that our school histories shall teach that they were right in what they did and what they fought for, and any history which, after 150 years, attempts to teach our children that the War of Independence was an unnecessary war and that it is still a problem as to who was right and who wrong should be fed to the furnace, and those responsible for these books branded as un-American.

I do not for one moment contend that everything contained in our American history textbooks prior to the pro-English propaganda in America was absolutely true. However, those American histories were written from the American point of view, intended to awaken love for America and for everything American, to instill patriotism in the breasts of the young and excite their admiration for the heroic men and splendid women who laid the foundation of our independence and made this Nation a fact.

If any of the old-line history textbooks contained any inaccuracies of particular events, they erred in favor of Americanism, and I, for one, would rather have it that way.

Under the protection of the State educational laws, the superintendent of schools in the city of New York reigns supreme in our elementary and high schools, while the college officials have absolute sway over their respective city-owned and city-supported higher educational institutions.

In the past any suggestion from the city authorities in connection with the method and kind of education to be given to our children has been met with an outcry of "politics" and "political interference" from those who are suspected of being beneficiaries of the various existing funds and foundations used to promote a certain brand of education and to mold public opinion. Nevertheless, these textbooks should not be permitted to be used in our schools.

It's a Wonderful Privilege To Be an American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. F. MACIEJEWSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 10, 1940

NEWSPAPER ARTICLE ON AMERICANISM

Mr. MACIEJEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article:

IT'S A WONDERFUL PRIVILEGE TO BE AN AMERICAN

Today much of the world faces the grim specter of famine. But here in the United States we still have the blessing of plenty.

A Department of Agriculture survey shows that abundant supplies of nearly all foodstuffs will be available for the coming year. Increases in production of edible fats and oils are expected to continue. The fresh-fruit supply will be slightly above last year, and large wheat and rice crops are anticipated. In the case of most foods, there will be enough to meet all domestic requirements, and to provide surpluses for export.

Other surveys indicate that the demands of war-material production in our factories will not seriously dislocate production of consumer goods. We may have to do without a few manufactured luxuries as time goes on, but there will be plenty of the necessities.

If our productive facilities are to prove of maximum benefit to the consumer, another factor must enter in—and that factor is the distributor. Abundance on the farm is wasted unless the crops can be delivered to the buyer at minimum cost. And efficiency in the factory can be offset by inefficiency and waste in distribution.

But the consumer need not worry. The American distribution machine, like the American production machine, is the most efficient in the world. Our competitive system, with all kinds of distributors seeking to outserve each other, must be given credit for this. When you enter a store and make a purchase you're getting more for your money, all things considered, than the buyer in any other nation.

It's a great privilege to be an American citizen.

Conscription

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN G. ALEXANDER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 10, 1940

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, early Sunday morning, a few hours after the passage of the Burke-Wadsworth conscription bill, I prepared the following address on conscription, which was carried last night in a Nation-wide broadcast over the blue network of the National Broadcasting Co.

In its first paragraph I stated that its adoption by Congress is one of the last three steps to war, the other two being the election of a President November 5, and the other, the decision thereafter by the man so chosen of the particular time and spot where the actual starting of hostilities is determined to have occurred. Now read my remarks and then the clipping from the Washington Post appended thereto, which confirms the statement made by me in paragraph 1:

CONSCRIPTION

Two hundred and sixty-three Members of Congress having voted for conscription at the week's end, an interesting question arises as to whether the Representatives elected by the people to Congress really represent the people. If a vote could actually be taken as to conscription by every United States citizen, male and female, 21 years of age or over, would the result be the same? I doubt it, for conscription is the road to war and the people never want war. In fact, by the passage of this bill by Congress we are mighty close to the take-off point. Trained observers know there are but two more steps. First, the selection of a man for President on November 5, and the second step is the decision shortly thereafter by this man as to the exact time and place where the overt act, starting hostilities, will occur. That will doubtless be a historic day and spot, for it will mark a long, drawn-out contest lasting undoubtedly for from 5 to 6 years while the war of all wars rages all over the world, in every hemisphere, on every continent, testing and determining what—determining whether we the people want economic imperialism in the name of capitalism or whether we want state imperialism in the form of fascism or nazi-ism or its sequel, communism? And when the war is over and the appetites of everyone, warmonger and innocent bystander alike, have been satiated, those who are left will undoubtedly decide they want neither of these. And so the war will be won, not, of course, by the promoters and instigators of today, but by the power of truth and by the strength of the principle of the universal brotherhood of man, applied to world politics, which, as all rational and clear-thinking and healthy-bodied persons know, is the one and only ultimate answer to the question of how to get peace and stop war.

I went into this topic in some detail in my address entitled "After the War—Peace," of November 2, last, following the vote on the revision of the Neutrality Act. (I wish at this time to say that requests for that address are still coming in from all over the Nation, and I shall be glad to supply them in any quantity to everyone interested in solving war. The expense of that will be a contribution by me to a real and lasting peace.) Those who have already read this speech will recall that I pointed out in those remarks that the real result of the revision of the Neutrality Act would not be that which was pictured and promised by its proponents. They said it was needed so we could end the war and save ourselves from war and assure peace. Let me ask one question now, 10 months later, Has it worked to end war, to save ourselves from war, or to bring peace? No; nor will this Conscription Act serve us any better, notwithstanding the false and misleading promises held out by its promoters. Nor will the mere winning of this war by either side, if that were possible, result in stopping war any more than the Armistice of 1918 did, unless it is accompanied by a removal of those men from positions of power and trust who are either of themselves or by others inspired to selfishness, to hypoc-

risy, and greed; and also unless accompanied by the removal of the causes of rivalry, ultranationalism, mistrust, hatred, and other incentives to war, such as trade barriers, exchange manipulation, and all other restrictions to the free flow of trade and commerce and to all forms of travel and communication, individually and collectively.

Oh, my friends of America, can you not see this? If your Congressmen fail to grasp this great and fundamental truth, then may it not be because you have failed to be an inspiration to them, because you have failed to read your Bibles, because you have failed to search the heart of God, and, also, because you have failed to study the lessons of history? And what is more you have failed to catch the vision and the idealism of the heroic, Christian founders of our great Nation, and of the honest, conscientious framers of our matchless Constitution. If Congressmen fail in this great crisis, may it not be because you the people have failed to go along with the wise, foresighted signers of the Declaration of Independence for their pronouncement said, "All men are created equal." Analyze that "all," meaning every; "men," meaning humans everywhere. Seventy-five years ago we fought a bloody Civil War to prove we still believed it and meant it as to colored men, but today we are being asked to fight a still worse, more bloody and more destructive war, to disprove its truth, and in its place we are being asked to prove that some men are created to have and others to have not, that some are to be favored above others, and that all men everywhere are not created equal with certain inalienable rights, but that they are created unequal and that their rights in and to the bounties of nature, the favors and benefits of an all-wise Creator are to be denied certain races and groups and nationalities because they happen to be born in or forced by economic misfortune and circumstance to live at a certain spot or part of the globe, or to have a certain color.

No wonder we have wars, no wonder we can be so misled, when we so forget the original, sound, and fundamental tenets not only of our Government but also of our religion!

I am glad of one thing, however, in this most disheartening hour and era in our national history and that is that there were 149 of our members representing a little over one-third of our Nation who still keep the vision of the founding forefathers. That one-third is the heart of America, not only geographically speaking, coming mainly as they do from the Midwest area, but also figuratively, for from them not only their own constituency but patriots everywhere can take courage and gain hope. As long as you back them, and they stand here to safeguard American and Christian principles, not only this Nation, but even the world itself will be saved from the horror which would be resultant from complete destruction of these eternal truths and American standards of human conduct and civic relationship.

On that basis, I bespeak hope and courage to all lovers of peace. So strong is the sentiment against war and against this current conscription bill in the midcontinent States, that there is already talk of civil revolt and opposition if an attempt is made to take boys from their homes, although, of course, no such unwise thing should happen.

It is hard for our Midwest people to understand how anyone could vote for this conscription bill, much less a Congressman. It is well that the varying factors be made clear to them, lest they be misled by the strength of the conscription vote in the House of Representatives. In the first place politics played a strong part. Many Members pursue a definite policy of "follow the leader," and as long as the administration forces were charged with the job of putting over conscription in the name of preparedness, you can be sure that they pulled all political wires to effect its passage. This is always worth several dozen votes. Then there are those like Mr. WADSWORTH himself, who subscribe to the policy of compulsory military training at all times. Here was their golden opportunity and they grasped it. Others were influenced by the fact that war industries or training camps and facilities are concentrated in their districts thus involving not only profits, but work, and labor, and real-estate values, and all that goes with that activity or any industrial activity for that matter. And also I suppose we might add a class for those Members whose people are unable to think constructively or have been misled in their thinking by propaganda of one sort or another, perhaps into a pro-British point of view, or into believing mistakenly that this conscription bill is really going to help the Nation and give us real preparedness for modernized warfare. There are also a few Members whose vote could be expected to be influenced by considerations of nationality or race, and some by straight business influences such as Members whose constituency have their vocations centered about Wall Street.

A man-by-man review of these various groups would indicate that personal and business elements were largely responsible for the votes of the majority of those voting for conscription, and that the profit element had a place in the decisions. This being the case, I do not feel that the opponents of the bill need have any discouragement or misgivings as to their position but rather should continue their stand and keep up their fight to take the profits out of war.

Also, I should add, this is a much larger question than is covered in the Smith amendment to draft some industry and which was adopted by the House in place of the Russell-Overton amendment in the Senate. The Smith amendment was evidently quite acceptable to industry as evidenced by the overwhelming vote for its adoption, so it can hold little hope as a deterrent or remover of the war-profit element.

Now, I don't want to preach, and I hate to appear in a sanctimonious role, but I have given this problem long and serious study and, to sum up, my advice to the mothers, fathers, sons, and daughters of America is that if you really want to solve the problem of war and enjoy peace, that you spend 15 minutes a day with your Bible, and then that you daily study the problem of war, keeping in mind your discoveries of the eternal truths contained therein and especially Christ's doctrine, and that you seek to bring peace to the entire world instead of just to America. By this means you will then unlock the door to a real and lasting peace, and without it, I am afraid your search will have been in vain. With this advice, I bid you, Godspeed and good night.

Mr. Speaker, imagine my surprise on reading the Washington Post Sunday afternoon after preparing the above speech to find the following copyrighted article from the New York Times by Robert P. Post, dated London, September 8, quoting the dean of all British publicists, J. L. Garvin, in the London Observer as confirming my conclusion regarding the next two steps to war.

[From the Washington Post of September 8, 1940]

UNITED STATES WILL ENTER WAR AFTER ELECTION, SAYS LONDON WRITER

(By Robert P. Post)

LONDON, September 8.—In a long article discussing the Anglo-American destroyer-bases deal, J. L. Garvin, in the London Observer, says the United States, when the Presidential elections are over and the clouds of controversies are cleared away, will become a mighty belligerent at the overwhelming demand of her people, irrespective of party.

This opinion, he declared, is based on two reasons.

"First, that British sea power is the bulwark of America's security, no less than her own navy. It is we who are the great outpost of the American defense. By comparison, the new chain of small outposts which Washington has leased are bagatelles for the purposes of this war, however effective they may become later.

"Second, the United States must come in for the wider reason which equally concerns ourselves and the conquered nations, including France. No sufficient securities for future world peace can be wrested out of the worst of wars unless America came in to clinch the total victory for freedom to assure the solidity of a just peace."

Thus the dean of all British publicists wrote tonight. He is probably not speaking officially but is undoubtedly voicing the opinion of many here.

It is emphasized tonight in official circles that Garvin was writing entirely on his own and had not submitted his story or consulted any members of the foreign office before he wrote it.

Mr. Speaker, I am sorry to have to quote such statements or to say such things, but I think, in the interest of the lives and safety of the youth of America, we might as well face the facts and to speak out the self-evident truth, much as it hurts and unpleasant as it is to all of us.

My suggestion, in addition to those contained in the above broadcast, is, if we want to save ourselves from the impending holocaust, we had better start preparing personally and individually. It is my purpose to make another broadcast in a couple of weeks at about the time when the draft law will go into effect, for the purpose of going into more detail on that subject of self-preparedness and also to give some timely advice to the youth of America, who will be called on to make the sacrifice. Yes; in many cases even the supreme sacrifice. From the experiences of myself and others in the World War of 1917-18, perhaps we can give some helpful advice and suggestions for the guidance of our youth of today and for their immediate and future protection.

British Propaganda and Subversion of Textbooks in American Public Schools—B

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. THORKELSON

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 9, 1940

EXCERPT FROM REPORT BY DAVID HIRSHFIELD

Mr. THORKELSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include a report of David

Hirshfield commissioner of accounts, city of New York, on British propaganda agencies are active in America.

Mr. Speaker, I have included these articles with my remarks in order to call the attention of Members of Congress and the parents of our American boys and girls to these changes in our textbooks, as I am sure all patriotic citizens are interested in retaining the true American history in our public schools.

BRITISH PROPAGANDA AGENCIES ARE ACTIVE IN AMERICA

There is striking significance in the uniformity with which these revisionists proclaim their purpose to rewrite American school history from a new viewpoint. A comparison of their statements in their prefaces reveals that they all seem to be subject to the same influences.

It is well known that children are highly sensitive to the spirit of an author. This is why in the writing of school history the prime essential is a true and virile patriotic spirit in the author. If this be wanting, his history, however precise it may be as to specific facts, is only a bulb without a current.

Charles Grant Miller, in the course of his testimony at one of the hearings, said:

"The history that truthfully presents our Nation's annals in such sympathetic, virile, patriotic spirit as to inculcate in our children pride in the birth and development of our Republic, honor to its heroes, devotion to its principles and progress, and zest in its ideals and purposes—this is a true history. But the history that creeps along the verge of falsehood, alien in spirit, snarling in self-defense that it is 'not actually untrue,' and inoculating the children with suspicion of the Nation's founders, doubt as to its cardinal principles, and indifference to its democratic ideals—that history is false."

And I agree with him.

It may all be accidental; nevertheless, no one can fail to note the complete accord in which all these school-history revisionists have shifted their standpoint, and the striking similarity of their statements proclaiming their new attitude.

Col. Alvin M. Owsley, national commander of the American Legion, in his statement at a hearing in my office, said:

"We must keep on the alert and not let this protest that has been so well started dwindle away into nothing for want of the real facts about the hostile forces at work. Let us find out just who or what influence it is that has undertaken to rewrite our history, to underestimate the value of our national characters, and to undermine the fixed principles upon which our Nation was built."

There are certain recognized influences which have been working long and powerfully to this end.

There never has been any secret about the underlying purpose in the Cecil Rhodes scholarships. Cecil Rhodes was no idle dreamer and his far-seeing genius and practical methods added vast domains to the British Empire. Few of his plans failed.

As already stated in this report, one of the objects of Rhodes was "the ultimate recovery of the United States of America as an integral part of the British Empire."

Cecil Rhodes laid his ambitious plans to that end, and by heavily endowing with British gold and backed by the British Government, created agencies for their working out. Under the ingenious Rhodes scholarship scheme the best of our American young men, selected from the colleges of all our States, especially for their required "qualities of leadership," are taken to England and placed in Oxford University for 3 years, with an allowance of £300 English money a year, and are then returned to us perfect English gentlemen, advocating British-American union.

These former American young men have formed a Rhodes Scholars' Alumni Association of America. This association has been openly active in defense of the Anglicized school histories.

When Cecil Rhodes dreamed his dream of "the extension of British rule throughout the world" and "the ultimate recovery of the United States of America as an integral part of the British Empire" he was obsessed of ambition less for political than for financial and commercial dominance. Since then the money power has shifted its seat, but the dream of world dominance remains, and the British Government is still its most effective instrument.

The money superpower is now on this side of the Atlantic, and, according to the English historian, John Richard Green, "the main current of the history of the English-speaking peoples must run along the channel not of the Thames or the Mersey but of the Hudson and the Mississippi." But in all the intriguing pleas for an "English-speaking union" those active in the movement do not seek an extension of the area of freedom under the American Constitution but always an extension of British trade and power.

So it is easy to see why our fundamental principles are being discredited, our history rewritten, and our ideals destroyed at behest of a superpower which is neither British nor American, knows no patriotism, and recognizes no country except as subject for exploitation.

This international money power is constantly seeking to persuade the American people to surrender their inherited sources of inspiration, strength, and guidance, and does now largely control the governmental policies of the United States as well as of England and other foreign countries.

America is safe only if her people will see to it that the historic truths, principles, ideals, and purposes that have served them unfailingly through a century and a half of unprecedented progress and to unparalleled prestige, be preserved unsullied in our own generation and transmitted unimpaired to our children. The antidote to the propaganda poison lies in patriotic teaching in the public schools.

Educational foundations, which have come to exercise immeasurable influences upon the scholastic and public-school systems of the United States, are offsprings of the international banking power, as a glance at their interlocking directorates and a sane thought as to the habitual practices and intuitive purposes of their founders clearly reveal.

Elihu Root, chairman of the Carnegie council, illustrates at once this directness of connection, and the completeness of design of the superpower.

Andrew Carnegie was another, Britisher through and through, who could dream grandly and had power to make his dreams come true. He endowed the multiform Carnegie institutions from motives which he never sought to conceal. His fondest dream was to bring about a "reunited state, the British-American union."

The spirit of this finds expression and fruition through the Carnegie Libraries, Foundation for Advancement of Teaching, Division of Intercourse and Education, Aid for Vocational Education, Association for International Conciliation and, by no means least seductive, the Carnegie Pension Fund for American professors and even American judges.

Direct and vital effects of these organized influences for Briticization of our scholastic and public-school systems are readily detected and clearly identified in utterances of innumerable teachers' associations in the last few years. These are fairly typified and summarized in the following excerpt from the report of the American History Teachers' Association, submitted to the United States Congress October 22, 1918:

"Attention is directed to the old charge that the study of the American Revolution in our schools tends to promote an anti-British state of mind. It is a natural reaction to demand revision of our textbooks with a view to the cultivation of a pro-British state of mind; and that reaction is now actually in evidence."

Other influences that have been directly at work to bring about the emasculation of American history and the destruction of our national spirit and morale are not only recognizable but confessed and in some cases even boasted.

Sir Gilbert Parker, professional British propagandist, in an article in Harper's magazine, March 1918, outlined some of his methods of "putting it over" on the American people, as follows:

"Practically since the day war broke out between England and the Central Powers I became responsible for American publicity," Parker wrote "I need hardly say that the scope of my department was very extensive and its activities widely ranged.

"Among the activities was a weekly report to the British Cabinet upon the state of American opinion, and constant touch with the permanent correspondents of American newspapers in England. * * * Among other things, we supplied 360 newspapers in the smaller cities of the United States with an English newspaper.

"We advised and stimulated many people to write articles; we utilized the friendly services and assistance of confidential friends; we had reports from important Americans constantly, and established association by personal correspondence with influential and eminent people of every profession in the United States, beginning with university and college presidents, professors and scientific men, and running through all the ranges of the population. * * *

"It is hardly necessary to say that the work was one of extreme difficulty and delicacy."

The propaganda that Parker boasts he was putting over was sixfold:

That the Revolution was a contest between the German George III on one side and the English people and American colonists on the other.

That "many Americans regret the War of 1812 as most Britishers regret the acts of George III."

That "the greatest enemy of American development was Napoleon," but Great Britain saved us from conquest by him.

That it was the British Foreign Minister Canning who gave us the Monroe Doctrine and made it an accepted fact.

That "the British Navy and behind it the Britsh Government has been the best friend that the United States ever had in its history."

And "that next to Great Britain, the best friend the United States has today is Japan."

Ten of our school historians promptly began repeating to American school children these new theories which Sir Gilbert has frankly boasted as his official British propaganda.

When Lord Northcliffe had completed his propaganda organization in this country during the recent World War, and was returning home, it was announced that he was leaving behind him $150,000,000 (our own money, of course) and 10,000 trained agents to carry on the work. His London Times in the issue of July 4, 1919, rendered account of the efficient propaganda which he had inaugurated here and was being "carried out by those trained in the arts of creating public good will and of swaying public opinion toward a definite purpose."

Among the methods, stated by the London Times, to be then in operation or in prospect in this country were:

"Efficiently organized propaganda to mobilize the press, the church, the stage, and the cinema; to press into active service the whole educational system, the universities, public and high schools, and primary schools; to provide for subsidizing the best men to write books and articles. * * * Histories and textbooks upon literature should be revised. New books should be added, particularly in the primary schools. Hundreds of exchange university scholarships should be provided. Local societies should be formed in every center to foster British-American good will, in close cooperation with an administrative committee."

This same Fourth of July issue of the London Times contained a signed article by Owen Wister, American-born, in which he said:

"A movement to correct the schoolbooks of the United States has been started, and it will go on."

George Haven Putnam, a prominent New York book publisher, born in England, and high official in the English-speaking union, made a Fourth of July address in London in 1918 before the Anglo-Saxon Fellowship. In the course of his address Mr. Putnam gave his English conferees this assurance:

"I want to see not a Declaration of Independence, but a Declaration of Interdependence—an acknowledgment that the two peoples belong together."

He also told his audience on that occasion that:

"Textbooks are now being prepared which will present a juster account (in the United States) of the events of 1775–83, 1812–15, and 1861–65."

All this might mean much, or nothing, according to the results. The fact is that we now find a half-score altered textbooks in our schools, in which American history is grossly distorted and de-Americanized, in the interest of British-American union.

In addition to the elaborate and admittedly well-oiled British propaganda machine, established in our country by Sir Gilbert Parker and the late Lord Northcliffe, the output of which still flows steadily through newspaper syndicates, magazines, and motion pictures, there are at least a full dozen of strong propaganda organizations, all British or pro-British, busily at work Briticizing American public opinion.

The stated purposes of these propaganda organizations range all the way from specious cultivation of "more friendly relations between Great Britain and the United States" to fulfillment of the Carnegie prophecy of "the reunited state, the British-American Union" and the Cecil Rhodes design of "the recovery of the United States as an integral part of the British Empire."

The Sons of St. George, an old organization of British-born residents of this country, was Tory during the Revolution and is Tory still. Within the last few years it has emerged from obscurity through a Nation-wide hard drive for increased membership and vigorous assertion of British spirit.

The English-speaking union is made up of British and pro-British advocates of what its name indicates—Anglo-American union. It is an international association of British and pro-British enthusiasts, the object of which is to foster pro-British sentiment throughout the United States by influencing statesmen, authors, lecturers, preachers, editors of magazines, newspapers, and syndicates and school historians to disparage American annals, ideals, traditions, policies, achievements, and institutions and exalt those of Great Britain.

This organization is amply financed from sympathetic sources, and for the last 3 years has been conducting, regardless of expenses, a tremendous drive for membership. Branches have been established in New York, Boston, Philadelphia, Washington, Baltimore, Richmond, Buffalo, Cleveland, Chicago, St. Louis, Lincoln, Nebr., and San Francisco.

The English-speaking union issues to its members a magazine, the Landmark, which has bitterly attacked as "demagogic" and "narrow-minded" the popular patriotic protest against Anglicized history textbooks in our public schools.

The American president of the English-speaking union is John W. Davis, a lawyer for J. P. Morgan and the international banking interests.

George W. Wickersham, another Morgan lawyer, is chairman of the American board of directors.

George Haven Putnam, New York publisher, who in 1918 boasted in London that American school histories were being rewritten, is its chief promoter.

Prof. Matthew Page Andrews, of Baltimore, Md., is a director. Professor Andrews is the author of American History and Government, in which he teaches that our Civil War was caused by perfidy and broken promises on the part of President Lincoln.

This hostile theory, as well as the argument, and to a large degree the exact words, appear to have been lifted bodily out of Greg's British History of the United States, which is so bitterly anti-American throughout that it never has been offered for sale in the North.

In his school history, Prof. Matthew Page Andrews teaches:

That Lincoln was called the Slave Hound of Illinois.

That not slavery but the tariff divided the North and South.

That secession was a northern principle.

That slavery was discontinued in the North only for economic reasons.

That most southerners desired and many tried to free their slaves, but northerners would not permit them to do so.

That the condition of the slaves of the South was far better than that of factory workers of the North.

And that, finally, the Emancipation Proclamation was a mere political play and moral pretense, as it could have no possible application except to slaves over which President Lincoln had no jurisdiction.

The English-speaking union, of which this Anglicized historian is a director, and the Morgan lawyers, Davis and Wickersham, are the highest American officials, arranges for special social attentions in England and for the granting of degrees by English universities to American collegiates and historians.

With respect to this phase of English propaganda, Charles Edward Russell, distinguished American diplomat and author, in a statement made at one of my hearings, gave some first-hand information concerning it. Mr. Russell said, in part:

"About 10 years ago I happened to pick up one of these school histories, written by two of the greatest revisionists; and reading it carefully I was astonished to see what changes had been made in the story of the Revolution—how the Revolution was belittled, and also how the history of the War of 1812 had been turned around. It just said that the War of 1812 was a foolish, unnecessary, and insignificant war and the United States regretted having taken part in it.

"In 1918 I was commissioner for the United States Committee on Public Information to the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland. I was there 5 months in that capacity in their offices in London. My operations in that position brought me in close connection with the interests of the British Government, and I observed many astounding things.

"While I was there in that capacity there came to London one of the authors of this very history that I had read some years ago with so much astonishment. He was a gentleman that in our own country had gotten very little attention. I was surprised to see, the moment he landed, evidently by some preconcerted plan, he was taken possession of. He was interviewed at great length in all the newspapers. He was invited daily to luncheons and dinners. He was lionized socially, and he was taken to Oxford and endowed with the greatest honors that Oxford could pay to anybody, and he was made a figure of very great importance, all based upon the fact that he was a friend of Great Britain. This was his reward apparently for writing such a history.

"Those of us who know the social forms in Great Britain know quite well the very delightful generosity and hospitality of the English homes, and the wise manner in which the English make use of their social advantages. It is only a very natural thing that the author in this country who thinks he has never secured the recognition he deserves at home, goes abroad, and he is immediately swept off his feet."

I asked Mr. Russell whether in order to get that recognition on the other side it was necessary for such author to have first served England in America, and he answered that it was, "except in a case where a man may be useful in future services of this kind."

The present reception to President Butler of Columbia University throughout England, where he is being feasted, toasted, and exalted for his pro-British propaganda, is a striking confirmation of Mr. Russell's statement.

The Sulgrave Institute is another "hands-across-the-sea" organization composed of British and pro-British. The Sulgrave big idea is founded upon the realization that George Washington has loomed large throughout the world and so must be claimed as an Englishman who established in this Western World, English freedom. Like designs are working regarding Lincoln, for whom there is now being provided an English lineage and an English ancestral home, as another shrine where expatriate Americans may bend the sycophantic knee in foolish worship of supposed English influences that are said to have freed our slaves and saved our Union.

The Pilgrim Society, in connection with its manifold other activities, is busily disseminating the doctrine that all American institutions that are good came over in the Mayflower and that the time is near at hand for the Mayflower to reembark its cargo of a mighty nation and return it to the "mother country."

The Church Peace Union has a $2,000,000 Carnegie fund, "to pay the expenses of English and American ministers of note to cross and recross the Atlantic, to occupy famous pulpits, to speak before ministers' meetings and to receive honorary literary degrees at universities." The idea is thus to utilize preachers and pulpits to develop "the international mind."

The World Alliance for Promoting International Friendship Through the Churches has as its stated purpose, "To organize the religious forces of the world so that the weight of all churches and Christians can be brought to bear upon the relations of governments and peoples." The Most Reverend the Lord Archbishop of Canterbury is president, and the Right Honorable Sir William H. Dickinson, K. B. E., London, is the first secretary. This alliance has established local committees in 500 American communities, and it works in close cooperation with the Church Peace Union and its $2,000,000 Carnegie fund.

George W. Wickersham, American chairman of the English-Speaking Union, is also a high official in the World Alliance. A score of eminent American clergymen, always conspicuously demanding American policies in the interest of Great Britain, are directors. Among these are Bishop James Cannon, Dr. James L. Barton, Dr. Henry Sloane Coffin, Dr. Charles E. Jefferson, Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick, Dr. Charles S. McFarland, Dr. Frederick Lynch, Dr. Sidney L. Gulick, and Dr. Hamilton Holt. Every one of these in their preachings and in their zealous pleas to President Harding and Secretary Hughes recently demanded that the American Army and Navy be rushed to the aid of Great Britain at the Dardanelles.

"Peace Union" and "International Friendship," as interpreted by these propaganda organizations, financed with Carnegie funds, have but one purpose, and that is "a reunited state, the British-American Union."

The American Association for International Cooperation has recently started a circularizing campaign to build up an influential membership. Its character, connections, purpose, and financial backing may be surmised from the fact that its chairman, George W. Wickersham, is also chairman of the English-Speaking Union and a high official of the World Alliance.

The Magna Carta Day Association advocates our national observance of June 15, as the natal day of free government, instead of, or at least in eclipse of, the Fourth of July.

The official pronouncement of this association declares:

"Magna Carta is the great outstanding event in the history of world liberty.

"The Magna Carta Day Association seeks to develop a greater sense of unity of thought and purpose of the seven nations.

"It is important to have in mind the essential and actual solidarity of the seven nations—the United States and the six nations of the British Union—Great Britain and Ireland, Newfoundland, Canada, South Africa, Australia, and New Zealand."

As outlined, the purpose of this association is "by means of Magna Carta Study Clubs to encourage the widespread study of the origin and development of our liberties," and "to promote an annual day of commemoration by the seven nations."

If all this means anything at all, it means British-American union.

The British committee at the head of this association consists of Lady Astor, a former American, the Right Reverend J. E. C. Weldon, and the Right Honorable Sir Gilbert Parker, Bart.

The executive secretary and treasurer of the American branch of this Magna Carta Society is J. W. Hamilton, who is a member of the editorial staff of the English-Speaking World, published monthly in New York as the organ of a dozen British propaganda agencies.

Among the American committeemen of the Magna Carta Day Association are more than a score of college presidents, professors, other educators, and preachers, who readily are traced into other British propaganda organizations and as being officially identified with various British services in this country. The name of Prof. Matthew Page Andrews, traducer of Lincoln, stands at the head of the list of American committeemen of this association, and results of the activities and influences of these propaganda organizations may be traced in the Anglicized school histories.

For instance, in the McLaughlin and Van Tyne school history in 1911, there was no mention whatever of Magna Carta. In their revised edition of 1919, however, a full new chapter of 15 pages is devoted to the Magna Carta and very little space is given to the Declaration of Independence.

George E. Roberts, another American committeeman of this society, is vice president and publicity manager of the National City Bank, New York, a director and the propaganda expert of the International Banking Corporation and also, in association with Henry S. Pritchett, president of the $200,000,000 Carnegie Foundation, conducts a correspondence school in economics for executives. This shows the international bankers, the foundations, and the pro-English propagandists pretty closely together, in fact, too closely for the comfort of security of America and the good, plain, honest American.

The British propagandists, besides being supplied with money, may also be supplied with certified associates out of a long list of American college presidents and professors, teachers, preachers, lawyers, and judges, endowed or expecting to be subsidized into sympathy with the Carnegie design of the reunited state, the British-American union.

The National Security League is now sending letters into the Wall Street section, asking for a fund of $25,000 a year, for the special training of school teachers to interpret the United States Constitution in the public schools, and to secure legislation in the various States which will make this teaching compulsory throughout the country.

I do not think that it will be hard for anyone to guess the character of the special training for interpretation of the Constitution, to be provided for with funds from Wall Street. The three eminent attorneys for Wall Street interests whose signatures appear on the letters of appeal for funds decline to disclose this phase.

A hundred and fifty American educators are listed as favorable to this special interpretation movement. More than half of them are found to be members of one or another or several of the British propaganda organizations.

When investigated by a committee of Congress, during the war, the National Security League was found to have $50,000 of Carnegie money. With its funds sufficiently augmented from Wall Street and its large force of British propaganda operatives organized in our colleges and schools, this organization may soon be expected to make the same stealthy assault upon the American Constitution as already has been made upon American school history.

I believe that it is now clearly apparent that the concerted revisions of the 10 offending American school histories did not come by chance coincidence, but as the result of thoroughly organized and heavily financed activities. Also that "the international mind," sought to be established through these influences, is always the British mind.

For any further evidence of the determined purpose to disregard the Declaration of Independence, breed disrespect for the Constitution of the United States and American institutions, and belittle the great men and women responsible for the establishing of the United States of America, one only has to read the address made by Dr. William Allen Nielson, president of Smith College, before the English-Speaking Union, at a dinner at the Hotel Astor, New York City, a few days ago, at which dinner former Ambassador John W. Davis presided and Sir Percy Fitzpatrick and Sir Eustace Finness, Bart., spoke.

After asserting that the world had "gone to pieces, like a broken bowl," and that the English-speaking peoples were the great pieces that remain unbroken, Dr. Nielson said that the difficulties involving the English-speaking peoples were due chiefly to "miseducation." "The histories studied in this country have been getting better and better * * *."

"But the fact must be faced that within the last few years this progress has been checked. There has set in a wave of reaction, and in almost every State of the Union there is going on an agitation for the reintroduction of parochial patriotism into the histories and colleges.

"The scholars of this country, then, ask no support in the pushing of particular views. They ask and all they need is to be let alone, and our watchword in this part of our activity is to leave the writing and the teaching of history to the scholars and demand that the politicians keep their hands off."

The good president of Smith College deplores the fact that there still are men and women in America whose patriotism cannot be purchased with British gold and who insist upon preserving America for those who love and admire America and cherish her traditions and institutions.

To my mind, the gravest menace to the friendship between America and Great Britain lies in the pernicious and persistent British propaganda maintained in the United States, through which not only our history but our financial, industrial, governmental, and political institutions are misrepresented to our people.

That this is not without recognition even in England the following editorial utterance of the New Statesman of London shows:

"Many American people who, from the beginning, have been ardent supporters of the Allies' cause are concerned, not with the eagerness but with the lavish unintelligence of the publicity methods we have adopted. They doubt the wisdom of our elaborate pretense of doing nothing officially, when evidences of an extensive activity are everywhere apparent.

"They suspect the existence of British control of certain American newspapers. They criticize a certain kind of English speaker and journalist. Much of the writing and speaking in behalf of England has been of a kind which would be condemned by anyone possessing a fair knowledge of the American mind and temperament."

The methods thus criticized in England are increasingly put into force throughout America. A vast amount of this propaganda, steadily flowing through our newspapers, magazines, movies, books, lecture platforms, and pulpits, bank and commercial circulars, and countless other channels is unsuspected and fully effective. There can be no doubt in any sane and fair-thinking mind that this propaganda is responsible for the stealthy but concentrated movement to alter and denature American history texts used in our public schools, and thus poison the source of our national pride, inspiration, and morale.

But that is not all. A bold attempt is being made in the light of day to tie up for good the United States with England.

The international bankers, having apparently succeeded in gaining control of certain American Ambassadors, United States Senators, Congressmen, Governors, legislators, judges, political leaders in both major parties, and others high in councils of the Nation, no longer attempt to hide their true purpose of bringing about a British-American union to be controlled by England. Their advocacy of the League of Nations, of the Four Power Treaty, and now of the World Court has, in my opinion, no other meaning than their willingness to subordinate American interests to those of England.

Lord Robert Cecil's recent presence in this country, to spread English propaganda in America in behalf of the League of Nations, although the people in the last Presidential election in no uncertain terms declared themselves against entangling alliances with England or any other foreign country, was the boldest act of a foreigner imaginable.

But what are we to expect of a British subject propagandist, when an American citizen, former President Frank A. Vanderlip of the National City Bank of New York, after a visit with the English bankers abroad, is proposing that instead of the duly elected President and his Cabinet, a council of foreign relations, composed of 25 members elected for a long term of years, and at least 30 percent of them always abroad, should pilot the destinies of this country in relation with foreign governments.

In conclusion, I wish to recall the wise advice of George Washington, the Father of his Country, to the American people, wherein he adjured them to observe good faith and justice toward all nations and cultivate peace and harmony with all, but neither seek nor grant exclusive favors nor preferences to anyone; to constantly keep in view that it is folly for one nation to look for disinterested favors from another, because it must pay with a portion of its independence for whatever it may accept under that character.

It is my firm conviction that General Washington must have been inspired when, in 1796, he warned the American people that it was easy to foresee "that from different causes and from different quarters, much pain will be taken, many artifices employed, to weaken in their minds the conviction of the truth."

This prophecy has come to be too true, and only a reawakening of the love for America, her institutions, her ideals, and traditions in the breasts of her citizens, by birth and choice, will save our country from paying with a portion of her independence for the follies and, in many instances, willful un-American acts of some of her high officials and of those who bow to god Mammon or succumb to foreign flattery.

During the hearings before me and since then a number of patriotic societies have adopted resolutions demanding that the use of the hereinbefore-referred-to history textbooks be discontinued. Copies of these resolutions filed with me are hereto attached.

Respectfully submitted.

DAVID HIRSHFIELD,
Commissioner of Accounts.

Peacetime Conscription in America Is a Revolutionary Step in Our Form of Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. RICH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, September 7, 1940

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, as a Member of Congress I have been very much interested in doing everything that it is necessary to do and that it is possible to do to have America adequately prepared for any eventuality. I am for the protection of the United States 100 percent against any invading army and will do anything to that end to see that we have adequate preparedness. Furthermore, I am interested in looking after the requirements laid down by the Monroe Doctrine of giving a guiding hand and a helpful attitude in every way possible to all of the North and South American countries.

We Members of Congress have not been informed of any particular reason why we should go to the great extent in becoming a militaristic Nation that we have assumed in the past 60 days. Two years ago all we talked about was a Neutrality Act, of keeping our fingers out of the other fellow's business and remaining neutral. Last year the act was changed, giving the President greater powers. Now the propaganda that is going on in this country, trying to get America into the European war, is the greatest I have ever seen in my life. In my judgment it is not our duty to police the world. It could not be done if we wanted to do it and there is no use in trying to do it. We could lend our good office for peaceful settlement of disputes if possible any place in the world and wherever practical if our peaceful counsel is needed and we are invited to participate. I am trying my best, and will continue to do so, to keep this country out of any European entanglements and certainly out of foreign wars. I will not vote to send our soldiers across the seas. We did that in 1918 to make the world safe for democracy, and we are worse off today than we were previous to that time. We have no business, as I said before, in meddling in the affairs of Europe. Regardless of what my feelings might be toward one country or another, our first line of defense does not hinge on any particular country. With an ocean 3,000 miles wide between here and Europe and 4,000 miles wide between here and Asia and Africa, airplanes and tanks are of no avail. Lindbergh gave us assurances on that from the airmen's standpoint, and we have a right to believe him, and we certainly know that tanks cannot come across the ocean. And to bring an army of 500,000 men and land it in the Western Hemisphere will take more vessels than there are in all Europe and Asia combined; that has been brought out in the testimony before the committees of Congress.

If we start peacetime conscription without giving the volunteers of America at least 4 months' opportunity, we are only becoming a militaristic Nation and I do not believe in that. If you will give the patriotic men of this country an opportunity to jon the Army for 6 months or even 4 months and pay them $30 to $40 a month, with the idea that they only have to enlist for 1 year, you will get more men twice over than we can house, feed, and clothe properly. Then why try to get an Army of 1,000,000 men when you cannot take care of it? Furthermore, our mechanized units and our airplanes will not be sufficient to give them proper training. This has been brought out in the testimony before the Military Affairs Committee as well as in the debates here on the floor of the House. Why peacetime conscription then, I am unable to understand. I do not fear Hitler or any other powers coming over to attack us for 10 years at least, and then I do not expect it. He will have his hands full in policing Europe for years to come. If we go at the building up of our military forces in a sane, sensible, sound way we will be able to take care of any emergency and the waste that is now going on will be very materially decreased.

Let us look at the history of the countries which have started peacetime conscription. Democratic Athens had it and gained a tyrant. The Roman Republic had it and became an empire. Republican France enforced it in 1793 and got Napoleon. Germany practiced it after 1806, and Bismarck followed, then Hitler.

History teaches that peacetime conscription cannot guarantee the defense of a country, but that successful, efficient, peacetime compulsory service means military imperialism for the State and loss of liberty for the citizen. That is the result of peacetime conscription. Do we want that in America? Certainly not. There have been millions and millions of dollars poured into this country trying to scare the American people into getting into this war; I am convinced of that, and if we keep on 6 months longer the way we are going nothing will stop it. And if we get into a war with the present administration at the head of our Government we will be getting into a dictatorship, and I do not want that.

Regardless of what I might have thought of the advisability of trading 50 over-age destroyers to Great Britain for 99-year leases on air bases, to do so without the consent of "the Senate and/or the House of Representatives" is the greatest step in dictatorship that has yet been taken. Why do we want 99-year leases? Do we not expect this country to live beyond the next 99 years? We have had a democracy for 150 years, and I say let us give our children and our children's children the same advantages that we have had by retaining our form of government indefinitely. Why limit our improvements for our protection for only 99 years?

Peacetime conscription, in my judgment, is not necessary from the evidence that has been given before the House in connection with this bill. Even though the Fish amendment giving 60 days' time has been added to the bill, and which I voted for, I am convinced that because of the great pressure brought by the administration this amendment will be quickly thrown out of the window before the conferees of the Senate and the House have finished with the bill, and we will have immediate conscription. As an American citizen and a Member of Congress for American peace and American safety and American independence, I did not support peacetime conscription. I certainly am of the opinion that whenever we conscript the manpower of this Nation we have every right to conscript industry as well.

WE ARE NOT HANDLING OUR WAR PREPAREDNESS IN A BUSINESS WAY

I feel I would be derelict in my duty to my country if I did not at this time call attention to some of the apparent abuses of executive power, to the favoritism displayed and to the gross mismanagement in our rearmament and national defense program.

The failure of steps this Government so far has taken in its defense efforts is generally recognized by military experts. The industrial mobilization plan drafted in 1933, designed to eliminate the waste and graft that occurred in 1917 and 1918, and which had been revised by experts, apparently has been junked for a nebulous plan hastily thrown together by men who have little faith in the ability of constitutional government to function and a free people to defend themselves.

Speaking of today's efforts, Gen. Hugh S. Johnson, on Tuesday, September 3, said:

> The present industrial mobilization, in the sense of relative comparisons with our own past experience, or the present experience of other nations is a miserable failure—a complete flop.
>
> The reason for that is not that it follows any "old" plan or any kind of "new" plan either—it just doesn't follow any plan at all. The mistakes of bewildered 1917 are being followed and repeated with nauseating regularity and consequently hopeless delay.
>
> They are being repeated because the President and his administrative family were so fascinated with their habit of "brilliant experimentation" that they don't want anything to interfere with it.
>
> Above all, they don't want to have any other influence in government; the President wanted to be the central figure in any war effort.

The various spending agencies wanted to roll their own.
The only outside aid they would suffer had to be completely without authority, working in merely an "advisory" capacity.

Mr. Speaker, what will this junking of our industrial mobilization plan probably cost the Nation's taxpayers?

Listen to this, Congressmen.

In 1917 and 1918, we spent a billion dollars for aircraft. Yet not a single fighting plane ever reached the western front.

We spent $60,100,000 on a powder plant at Nitro, W. Va. Not a pound of powder was produced from that plant during the war.

A total of $116,194,974 was spent on four nitrate plants at Muscle Shoals, Ala.; Sheffield, Ala.; Toledo and Cincinnati, Ohio; from none of which a single pound of nitrate was produced during the war.

We spent $264,955,387 for 155-millimeter shells. No shell ever reached the firing line in France. The story could be continued almost endlessly.

All of this waste came from lack of plans. Now the plans that were prepared by experts has been junked, and we are embarked upon the road of experimentation.

Contracts have been let, and when a study of their distribution is made it is apparent that sectional favoritism has been shown. On May 29 of this year, the Wall Street Journal in a feature story said:

Authority to allocate Army contracts and certain Navy contracts on a negotiated-price basis, without competitive bidding is said by officials to be contained in national-defense legislation now pending before Congress.

At the time this item appeared, the President was quoted as saying:

The Government is not now considering the drafting of men, women, or money, but simply trying to spend $1,250,000,000 more than normal.

That statement reminds me of the formula laid down by Harry Hopkins, "Spend and spend and elect and elect." Spending seems to be the keynote of this whole program.

We now find ourselves spending not the $1,250,000,000 mentioned by the President in the last days of May, but over $10,000,000,000 to defend the United States from its illusionary enemies.

And now, only 90 days later, we find the Executive has changed his program and we are about to draft men and conscript industry. If we draft men, we have every right to conscript industry if need be for it.

The "spend and spend and elect and elect" program is getting under way with a full head of steam.

And while the program is getting under way the spending agencies are dispensing propaganda to influence the public.

Frankly, Mr. Speaker, there is something wrong with our defense program. We ought to find out what is wrong now before we waste our money in fruitless experiments.

A study of the reports of various governmental agencies throws considerable light on the present situation. In his annual report to the Secretary of War for 1939 the former Assistant Secretary, Col. Louis Johnson, said:

During the year, in order to gain first-hand information about the activities of my office, as they appear to industrial America, to observe at first, to question, and second, to learn of the problems affecting our allocation plants, Government arsenals, air fields, and airplane factories, I have traveled approximately 100,000 miles by air and 35,000 miles by rail.

To familiarize our citizens with the aims, plans, and definite objectives of my office I have delivered 102 formal and 22 impromptu speeches before industrial, patriotic, military, and social groups.

Where is Mr. Johnson's plan today, and where is Mr. Johnson?

The activities of Mr. Johnson is another example of how the galloping hounds of waste have squandered the taxpayer's money that was appropriated for national defense. Johnson is out and so, too, is Mr. Woodring, who in the same annual report said:

Between March 4, 1933, and June 30, 1938, a powerful striking arm, definitely defensive in purpose—if offensive in tactical and strategic employment—has been instituted in the form of the general headquarters air force.

Within the last few weeks we learn that this powerful striking arm consists at the most of but a few hundred modern fighting and bombing planes.

Mr. Speaker, there was, however, one outstanding statement in this annual report, and that came from the pen of a great soldier, Gen. Malin Craig, then Chief of Staff. In a forthright and soldierly way, the general said:

Military planning is one of the most serious responsibilities that can confront a people or a group of men. The plans deal with the Nation's future, with hundreds of thousands of lives and untold wealth.

They must be coldly and painstakingly considered in the light of intense realism as the basis of all future military strategy and tactics.

Mr. Speaker, those of us who oppose conscription do not believe that this, our present course, our present problem, is one that has been submitted as a result of careful study in the light of intense realism. We do not believe in good faith that the avenues heretofore used in the defense of our country should be lightly cast into the discard. We do not believe the system of voluntary enlistments has failed. We do believe that today a call for a million volunteers for a 1-year course in military training will be quickly met by the manhood of this country. The torch of liberty will never illuminate the world—it never has and never can—in the hands of an unwilling conscript. Freemen alone can successfully defend the Republic and everything it represents.

British Propaganda and Subversion of Textbooks in American Public Schools—C

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. THORKELSON

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 10, 1940

EXCERPT FROM REPORT BY DAVID HIRSHFIELD

Mr. THORKELSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include articles from the report of David Hirshfield relating to books by William Backus Guitteau, director of schools, Toledo, Ohio, and O. H. Ward, Taft School, Watertown, Conn., entitled "Our United States," and "Burke's Speech on Conciliation," respectively.

Mr. Speaker, I have included these articles with my remarks, in order to call the attention of Members of Congress and the parents of our American boys and girls to these changes in our textbooks, as I am sure all patriotic citizens are interested in retaining the true American history in our public schools.

OUR UNITED STATES, 1919—REVISED, 1923

(By William Backus Guitteau, Ph. D., director of schools, Toledo, Ohio)

In the announcement of the 1919 edition of this textbook its publishers stated:

"This book has been written in the light of recent events in which a new atmosphere has been created for the study of our national life.

"The Revolutionary War and subsequent Anglo-American difficulties, hitherto distorted in our schoolbooks as a result of national prejudice, have been restated by Dr. Guitteau. * * *

"Many events involved in the history of our foreign relations, hitherto distorted in our schoolbooks through an unthinking adherence to traditional prejudices, have been restated by Dr. Guitteau in their true light."

Professor Guitteau, in his preface, elaborated upon this promise to correct in our school children the "unthinking adherence to traditional prejudices," as follows:

"The momentous events of the last 5 years have demonstrated conclusively that our history textbooks must be written from a new viewpoint. * * *

"The American Revolution, for example, is no longer to be studied as an isolated event resulting from British injustice. * * *

"So with the War of 1812, which takes on a new aspect when viewed as an incident in the Napoleonic Wars rather than as a British-American contest.

"Throughout this book, therefore, special emphasis has been placed upon the relation of the United States to other countries,

in order that the young citizens who study it may realize more fully the importance of our world relations and our world responsibilities. * * *

"In this way an impartial judgment may be passed upon our international relations" (p. V).

Accordingly, throughout this text for the instruction of American school children the long-accepted versions of the treatment of the Colonies by England and the inspiring references and descriptions of our national heroes, ideals, and achievements are eliminated, and matters more in harmony with the "light of recent events," intended to wipe out "unthinking adherence to traditional prejudices," are substituted.

To the credit of Professor Guitteau, it must be said that, like Prof. Everett Barnes, he has seen a new light since my investigation of his history has been made, because in his 1923 edition he has revised his textbook.

I do not wish to be understood as stating that because Professor Guitteau has so completely changed his proclaimed purpose his 1923 revision is wholly free from criticism, for many passages complained against in the 1919 issue have not been corrected in the 1923 book.

The reversal of Professor Guitteau's attitude can only be appreciated through comparison of the two prefaces:

THE 1919 PREFACE

"The momentous events of the last 5 years have demonstrated conclusively that our history textbooks must be written from a new viewpoint. The history of our national life should not be told as a narrative separate and distinct from that of the rest of the world. The American Revolution, for example, is no longer to be studied as an isolated event, resulting from British injustice. On the contrary, it should be placed in its true light as one phase of a larger revolution against kingly usurpation. In this revolt, Englishmen living in the New World played a leading part, encouraged and sustained by the knowledge that their action was approved by many of the foremost British statesmen of the day. So with the War of 1812, which takes on a new aspect when viewed as an incident in the Napoleonic wars, rather than a British-American contest. Throughout this book, therefore, special emphasis has been placed upon the relations of the United States to other countries, in order that the young citizens who study it may realize more fully the importance of our world relations and our world responsibilities. * * *"

THE 1923 PREFACE

"Recent events have demonstrated that our teaching of history should emphasize more than ever before the peculiar and characteristic genius of American institutions, and the permanent and outstanding assets of American democracy. In this textbook the author has kept in view the purpose in present-day teaching of history and government; that is, the preparation of pupils for intelligent, helpful citizenship, through the study of our country's history, its ideals, and institutions. History teaching worthy of the name no longer tolerates the mere recital of facts, dates, and names or the answering of stereotyped questions at the end of the chapter. Rather, our teachers of history will draw from the events of the past their underlying significance; and they will relate the past to the present in such a way as to create in the minds of the pupils high ideals of American citizenship and political conduct, and to foster loyalty to the best American traditions. * * *"

The promptness with which "modern historical scholarship" may shift itself to any attitude required is truly amazing.

In his 1919 edition Professor Guitteau had made no mention of the martyr patriot, Nathan Hale, whose last words on the British scaffold were, "I only regret that I have but one life to give to my country"; but of Major Andre he did say, on page 196:

"The unfortunate young officer was promptly hanged as a spy."

In his new 1923 edition Nathan Hale is reinstated and accorded three-quarters of a page in a picture and appreciative account; while the comment on Major Andre is changed to read:

"He was condemned to death as a spy because of his disguise and the concealed papers."

The fact is also brought out that Nathan Hale was "promptly hanged, without trial, while Major Andre was given a fair trial."

On page 188 of his 1919 text this author was teaching:

"It is estimated that at least one-third of the colonists remained faithful to the King."

In the new book this is changed to read:

"It is estimated that at least one-third of the colonists remained faithful to the King or at least failed to support the Revolution."

Again, on page 273, of his 1919 history, in connection with the War of 1812, Professor Guitteau wrote:

"Apparently our war hawks forgot that upper Canada was settled largely by loyalist refugees from the United States. These loyalists and their children had not forgotten their treatment by the American patriots during the Revolution. They were not likely to ally themselves with the people who had driven them from their homes and confiscated their property."

This remains unchanged in the new book. The New York School Committee condemns this statement in its report, as follows:

"The statement that 'our war hawks' had apparently forgotten that the loyalist refugees had settled upper Canada and that they and their children had not forgotten their mistreatment by the American patriots, and were not likely to ally themselves with those who had driven them from their homes and confiscated their property, is partisan and uncalled for."

Elsewhere in its report, the school committee says of other statements still remaining uncorrected:

"Guitteau's account of the treatment of the loyalists is prejudiced."

For the burning of Washington, Professor Guitteau advances the same justification for the British that is urged in their behalf by the other historians who wrote the American history "in the light of recent events," and that is that:

"The British claimed that their action was justified on account of the burning of York (now Toronto) by the Americans" (p. 280).

This, too, remains unchanged in the 1923 book.

Another stock slander of the "new atmosphere" history writers with "newer tendencies," which Professor Guitteau had repeated on page 242 of his 1919 text, was:

"Hamilton distrusted the masses, and once exclaimed at a public dinner 'Your people, sir, is a great beast!' "

Whether or not Hamilton made use of that expression, it is of no educational value, and its repetition can have only one purpose. While it is conceded that Hamilton lacked confidence in the masses, it is unfair to single out this weakest point in an eminent character and stress it in a history which fails to give him adequate credit for his invaluable services to our country.

Professor Guitteau must have recognized the justness of the complaint, because in his 1923 text he omits the offensive passage and refers to Alexander Hamilton as having been:

"Brilliant in intellect and a genius in finance."

Of Benedict Arnold, Professor Guitteau, in his 1919 history, said, on page 195:

"Unfortunately, Congress was slow to recognize his services, while promoting other officers far less deserving.

"However, Congress failed to give him the promotion to which he believed himself entitled, and this injured his pride."

I am sure that no one will for one moment urge that either version was an excuse for treason.

Of President Jackson, Professor Guitteau, on page 327 of his 1919 text, and left in his 1923 book, said:

"He could not spell correctly or write good English."

A letter concerning the dangerous power of the Bank of the United States, written in President Jackson's own hand, has recently been discovered and is now in the Library of Congress. This letter reads in part:

"A corporation of individuals deriving its powers from Congress, pervading every section of the Union, will in the general, by controlling the currency and leading men of the country, be more powerful than the Government and may seriously thwart its views and embarrass its operation. This is one of the dangers of the present bank. But any substitute which should concentrate the same or a like power, and be put entirely under control of the General Government, might by the union of the political and money power give the administration of the Government more influence and the Government itself more strength than is compatible with the safety of the States, the liberties of the people, and the purity of our republican institutions."

Here is spelling correct enough and English good enough for any language purist, clearly expressing political sentiment good enough for any American patriot of any period.

Of Washington, too, some revisionists teach that he could not spell. However, he, too, managed to express himself and wrote "liberty" and "democracy" correctly and plainly enough to be read into the language of every civilized people of the world.

A description of Lincoln which Professor Guitteau still presents to school children in his latest edition, is as follows:

"Tall, gaunt, and awkward, wearing ill-fitting clothes, his voice high and shrill, his dark, wrinkled face clouded by a look of habitual melancholy, Lincoln suffered in comparison with his brilliant adversary" (p. 393).

Professor Guitteau in his latest text devotes pages 618 and 620 to argument in favor of the League of Nations. This, I am told, is a distinct violation of one of the first principles of ethics of the teaching profession. The League of Nations is still a subject of political partisan contention and will be an issue in some form or other in the coming Presidential campaign. I am of the opinion that no unsettled political question should be taught in the public schools from a partisan viewpoint. If any controversial matter is to be treated, it should be by a presentation of the facts on both sides, impartially.

BURKE'S SPEECH ON CONCILIATION—1919

(Edited by O. H. Ward, Taft School, Watertown, Conn.)

This text is proclaimed to be in its preface and introduction a new portrayal of the forces for freedom in the period of the American Revolution.

The author of this work announces that:

"Never did a school classic carry such a present-day message or furnish so definite an answer to a national demand."

This must be taken in reference not to Burke's part of the book, for that has been a fixed classic for nearly 150 years, but to Professor Ward's portion, which he says has been written directly in view of "the common peril of 1914."

In the preface of this textbook the author proceeds to speak of himself as follows:

"I feel touched and grieved because editors have never given so much as an inkling of the vital fact. * * * It needed only the common peril of 1914 to show both countries how deep was our mutual desire for English freedom."

And refers to our "emotions of new-found gratitude to England."

Apparently the worthy professor's emotions of his boyhood have undergone a change, and he set out to rewrite the American history to conform to his new emotion, that is, to revamp old facts to fit new ideas.

As forces for freedom, innumerable theories of liberty, and rights applicable to America, as discussed by Englishmen, are given in this book, but not a word is said of the great American patriotic speeches, the Colonial Declarations of Rights, or even the Declaration of Independence.

Indeed, Professor Ward frankly declares it as his opinion that:

"An understanding can be gained only by reading what typical Englishmen said while the American Revolution was being fomented."

Among the advocates of American freedom more than a score of Englishmen are copiously quoted, but the names of Jefferson, Hancock, Adams, Otis, and Paine are omitted. Among the forces for liberty repeatedly mentioned are Henry III and Henry VIII, but never Patrick Henry.

From a study of Professor Ward's part of this book it would never be suspected that the American Revolution marked an epoch in the advance of liberty. According to this author, the main current of democracy was steadily flowing in the channel of the British Constitution, and is flowing there still.

Professor Ward says further in his preface:

"As long as there lurks in the back of the American consciousness a suspicion of English tyranny in 1775, so long will misunderstanding prevent the English-speaking nations from working in accord to develop Anglo-Saxon freedom."

Of the American objection to "taxation without representation," which the colonists resisted with arms, the professor teaches that England "was in financial straits and needed revenue. A very natural way of adding to her income was to tax the colonies. "This purpose was quite honest."

That the Stamp Act "measures were normal methods of finance and were passed with few dissenting votes. Few people in England suspected that there was anything momentous about the Stamp Act."

Of the tax on tea, Professor Ward says:

"The one duty retained was so slight that tea could be bought cheaper in America than in England."

He omits, however, to state that this small tax involved a great principle.

Rare ingenuity is shown by Professor Ward in stating historical facts to fit his purpose. After establishing to his satisfaction that England was blessed with a high degree of freedom which the colonists gladly shared, that there was no oppression in the Stamp Act, or in the tax on tea, and that there was no tyranny at all, nor even any just "suspicion of tyranny," the Professor says:

"What has brought about this disastrous change? The German king of England, George III.

"The American Revolution was not an attempt of England to tyrannize over her colonies, but was a quarrel fomented by a Hanoverian king as part of his program of despotic ambition."—Page 3.

Professor Ward in seeking to excuse the English for the uprising of the colonies, endeavors to transform the English king into a German.

Macaulay, the great English historian, in writing of George III, said:

"The young king was a born Englishman. All his tastes and habits, good and bad, were English."

George III, in his first speech in Parliament, said of himself:

"Born and educated in this country (England), I glory in the name of Briton."

Professor Ward blunderingly mentions the English historian Lecky as his authority on George III. He must have meant Trevelyan, revised, 1917. What Lecky said of George III, on his accession to the throne, is this:

"The new sovereign came to the throne amid an enthusiasm such as England had hardly seen since Charles II restored the monarchy. By the common consent of all parties the dynastic contest was regarded as closed, and after two generations of foreign and unsympathetic rulers, the nation, which has always been peculiarly intolerant of strangers, accepted with delight an English king."

Professor Ward concedes that George III was not the first "German king of England," but neglects to remark that neither was he the last. As a matter of fact, George III was no more a "German" king of England than is the present King George V. George III was no more German than the former Kaiser Wilhelm is English.

However, having settled to his own satisfaction that King George was a German, author Ward sums up the subject as follows:

"So the American Revolution was a contest between German tyranny and English freedom, although neither party in the struggle knew that this was the issue. After war has been declared people cannot examine causes; they have to fight" (pp. 36–37).

What the lineage of the king may have had to do with it all, is perhaps not a matter properly to be imposed upon the minds of school children whom he endeavors to impress with the idea that the fathers of our country did not know what they were fighting about; that they were not oppressed; that their protests and declarations were tissues of falsehood; that our Nation was founded in blunder and is perpetuated in error; and that we have groped in darkness and ignorance for a century and a half, until given the great light through Professor Ward's "emotions of new-found gratitude to England."

As a matter of fact, what difference did it make, so far as American history is concerned, whether George III was a German or an Englishman? All the laws of oppression which the colonists complained of and finally rebelled against were enacted by the English Parliament in London, and no one will dispute that the members of Parliament were all Englishmen and represented English thought, English sentiment, and the desires of the English people.

The following passage, in the first page of the preface of Ward's book, sounds distinctively like wartime British propaganda:

"Not until the younger generation has learned to distinguish between the English freedom of 1775 and the slavery that they may have from Prussia, will America return to that unsuspecting confidence in the mother country which is vital to the future progress of democracy throughout the world."

I am told that it has been charged, and not denied, that the preface and introduction to this Ward's history were not written in 1919, the year of its publication, but during the feverous British war propaganda period of 2 or more years before, and that the manuscript was actually prepared in a propaganda factory of England; and it may well be argued that in writing of Gen. George Washington in his 1919 edition:

"If you had called him an 'American' he would have thought you were using a kind of nickname. He and his fellow colonists were proud that they were Englishmen; they gladly and loyally served an English king because he represented the freedom without which they thought life not worth living" (pp. 9–10).

Professor Ward, if not intentionally, as a matter of fact did aid pro-English propaganda in America.

For "some of the best descriptions of the nature of the American Revolution" Professor Ward does not refer the student to Bancroft, Hildreth, Lossing, or any other standard American authorities, but only to the English historians, Trevelyan, Green, and Lecky, and to the British Dictionary of National Biography, the Encyclopedia Britannica and the Parliamentary History—all British.

Congress Must Not Adjourn Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERNARD J. GEHRMANN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 10, 1940

Mr. GEHRMANN. Mr. Speaker, there is talk about Congress adjourning in a couple of weeks, or as soon as some of the important pending legislation is disposed of. I feel certain that the vast majority of the people in my district feel very strongly that this is no time to run out on them.

All of us are anxiously watching the progress by the most ruthless dictator, Adolf Hitler, and his other allies in their desperate attempt to subdue and smash London and the English Isles from the air so that he may land his forces there and take possession. England is not as easy to conquer as some of the other countries, including France, were, because their love for democracy is evidently too deep-rooted to permit of many Englishmen turning traitor to their country. I feel confident that these ruthless dictators have found their match, and that they will soon see their mistake and stop this terrible slaughter of innocent human lives.

But there is the danger that events may turn against England, and that their Government might be forced to flee to Canada.

I do not believe that the English Fleet would ever surrender, but would also seek refuge in the North Atlantic. But if the worst should come, and a part of the English Fleet fell into the hands of the dictators then the war might be brought to this continent. I do not believe that with those possibilities confronting us, that Congress should adjourn and run out on the people simply because it is election time.

I, for one, will vote against recess or adjournment as long as conditions in Europe are in this uncertain state.

I realize that those of us who have opponents would like to be back home to answer some of the charges and accusations either false or true that are bound to be made in the heat of a campaign. But the people have elected us to represent them, and certainly we could not blame them very

much if they ran out on us on election day if we desert them in this time of danger. My duty compels me to do what I am elected to do first, and look after my own interest when that is done. The welfare of our country is far greater and more important than my reelection. I will trust my people to be the judge and do what they feel is best for our country.

Labor Offered Life or Death in the Choice of Roosevelt or Willkie

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HAMPTON P. FULMER
OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 10, 1940

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting an editorial carried in the State Paper, a South Carolina daily, quoting Woodruff Randolph, editor and publisher of the Typographical Journal, wherein this editor states:

Organized labor is being offered life or death in the choice of Roosevelt or Willkie.

This is a very timely editorial, and I am sure will be read with a great deal of interest by the readers of the RECORD.

In the next place, if there are any labor groups or any individual wage earners or organized laborers of this country who have not made up their minds as to their choice between life or death as applied to their economic welfare, they should read this item and think seriously before casting their vote on the 5th of November.

AS THEY ARE SAYING TODAY—WOODRUFF RANDOLPH, EDITOR AND PUBLISHER, THE TYPOGRAPHICAL JOURNAL

Organized labor is being offered life or death in the choice of Roosevelt or Willkie. There is no doubt about it. The past performances and the mental attitude of Roosevelt means life more abundantly while the past performances and mental attitude of Willkie means death to the hopes of the millions who yet seek the benefits of collective bargaining and retrogression until death of many unions now organized.

Those are strong words and, of course, need substantiation. Refer again to Roosevelt's first fireside chat of 1936:

"Labor Day symbolizes our determination to achieve an economic freedom for the average man which will give his political freedom reality."

That is an ever-living statement, but one that causes gnashing of teeth of those economic royalists whose every effort and unlimited dollars have been directed toward preventing the average man from organizing so as to get a start toward an economic freedom.

Roosevelt gave you the National Labor Relations Act (Wagner Act) to give legal protection to the already long-established right to organize and bargain collectively through representatives of the union's own choosing. Administration of the act has been remarkably fair.

Willkie is the candidate of and has been the highly paid representative of those economic royalists who have opposed organization at every turn. His party is demanding amendment of the National Labor Relations Act. These objectors want the old and efficient intimidation and terrorism again in their hands to prevent organization of workers. Roosevelt promised to help labor achieve its legitimate and proper purposes. He made good on his promise. Willkie promises to give labor "amendments" and will make good his promise. Destructive amendments have already been introduced in the Congress.

Both are honorable men who believe in the things they advocate. They are symbols of two conflicting theories as to who should rule the country. Roosevelt believes in the people—in seeking, through their elected representatives, proper regulation and restraints in the interests of all the people. Willkie believes (as the leader of the Republicans must) that the business interests of the country are paramount and that legislators must look only to the dictates of businessmen (employers) for advice as to what is good for the country. That is the old deal—the Republican deal—illustrated by the tin dinner pail and square paper hat atop overalls and square shoes as a symbol of the American workman.

Roosevelt's New Deal introduced other principles of government for which Willkie's old deal will never forgive him. The New Deal promised that American citizens would not be permitted to starve because the old deal had allowed or compelled complete collapse of our financial and industrial enterprises. The old deal had always disclaimed national responsibility and "passed the buck" to the States and charity. The New Deal realized such a course was impossible and with Government spending saved the people, and business interests as well. Another principle the New Deal established as the law of the land was that the Nation had a right to legislate maximum hours of work and minimum wages for workers engaged in products of interstate commerce. Willkie's old deal frothed at the mouth over this and made every effort to kill any such legislation.

Old-deal lawyers (en masse) even stepped over all bounds of ethics and decency when they attempted to decide unconstitutionality of New Deal legislation before the Supreme Court had ruled thereon. The Court finally ruled it was constitutional.

The Social Security Act was one more New Deal law which is unforgivable by the old deal. This national law of so much importance to the people may go the way of other New Deal legislation if the old deal again gets power. The old deal has not given up its aims and purposes. It has not yet recognized the Wagner Act and is fighting it at every opportunity.

The old deal screams at the billions of dollars spent on behalf of the farmers and therefore can only be expected to revert to the old-deal policy of letting the farmer starve if he couldn't get a break from the speculators who gambled on the results of the farmer's labor.

The old deal represents profits first, last, and all the time, and "the public be damned." It represents "big business" as a supergovernment bullying our legislators—and delegates to the Republican convention.

The old deal is criticizing Roosevelt for not spending billions on defense sooner, forgetting that Borah, the Republican chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate, publicly stated his opinion there would be no war in Europe.

The New Deal demonstrated its interest in the people and proved it can work in their behalf. Do not let the old deal sidetrack the real issue by bellyaching about a third term. It is plain from votes of the people in all States where his name appeared that the people want Roosevelt for a third term to continue the work yet to be done.

RALPH INGERSOLL IN PM

The obvious argument for Mr. Roosevelt is that while the country has run up the bill for his mistakes, it has yet to cash in on his more constructive policies, to reap the real benefit from such programs as rural resettlement, the T. V. A. empire, the dams and ditches that the W. P. A. has labored on, the long-term benefits of social security. We have sat through a confusion of shorts and news reels. We might as well stay for the main picture.

That's the obvious argument, but not necessarily the best.

The Roosevelt conception of a socially conscious Federal Government, bargaining as an equal with the practical producers of the country—the manufacturers and the industrialists and the money men—has failed dismally in the encouragement of production and the creation of employment. It has failed because industrialists and manufacturers and money men have not played ball. You can say Mr. Roosevelt made it impossible for them to play or that they just didn't want to. But either way, they didn't.

Mr. Willkie testifies to this when he points out the huge reserves of unused capital in this country. You can say the industrialists are logical or illogical, right or wrong, but the fact is the show hasn't come off. Under New Deal rule the capital hasn't been invested, production hasn't expanded, and people haven't been employed.

So, the best argument for continuing the New Deal is the hope that when the industrialists lose their third election in 12 years they will finally get it through their heads that times have changed. There will be no talk, as there was in 1936, of leaving the country if "that man" gets elected. Because now, there's no place else to go. The choice will be put up fair and square: learn to live by and with this kind of Federal administration, which presumes a public interest not only in how industry's profits are spent, but in the wages and working conditions of its employees—or perish. Perish slowly by having their money taxed away and handed out by politicians, or fight, in a revolution in which they try their strength against the Government. But perish either way.

Mr. Speaker, I am also inserting a short editorial entitled "The Historical Roosevelt."

It is my firm belief that if Mr. Roosevelt is permitted to continue as President of the United States for a third term, which he is clearly entitled to serve because of his past accomplishments and experience and because of the present emergency, it is my belief, as stated, that history will record this outstanding American citizen next in line with the Father of his Country, George Washington.

We will hear much in this campaign from the so-called Jeffersonian Democrats, big business, stand-pat Republicans, the haters of Roosevelt—who represents the great masses of the people—about a third term.

The following statement, taken from a letter written by George Washington to Marquis de Lafayette April 28, 1788, should unquestionably overcome the efforts of the people to

whom I have just referred in trying to muddy the water with a campaign issue which should, because of the splendid record of President Roosevelt and the serious present emergency, not be a factor in the campaign.

Listen to the Father of his Country:

Under an extended view of this part of the subject—

He was writing about a third term—

I can see no propriety in precluding ourselves from the services of any man who on some great emergency shall be deemed universally capable of serving the public.

I predict for President Roosevelt and the Democratic Party the greatest victory on November 5 ever in the history of this party.

THE HISTORICAL ROOSEVELT

Week by week, for better or for worse, the Roosevelt name becomes more important in American history and in world history. No one can foresee all that will happen as a result of his extension of the Monroe Doctrine, of his defensive arrangements with Canada, of his leasing of naval and air bases from Great Britain.

No one can foretell which philosophy will win in the present terrific wrestling between democracy and forces that scorn democracy. But if democratic political philosophy wins—we pray that it will—the Franklin D. Roosevelt figure may stand out before the Nation even as the Statue of Liberty stands out in New York Harbor. Today, President Roosevelt is more than a man: he is a symbol; and if what he stands for is victorious, he is likely to remain a symbol.

Of course, this is speculative. No one—certainly not this one—can appraise for all time a contemporary, or assess with certainty contemporary activities. Yet there is strong evidence the Roosevelt name will be a big name in history. He represents, dynamically, a political philosophy, and applies it when he can. He is bold. He stretches executive authority (the destroyer deal, for example) as did Jefferson, Lincoln, and other great Presidents who found themselves confronting dangerous crises. He foresaw the character of the Nazi revolution before other leaders did, and he realized the fight is one that cannot be settled by compromise. He trusts the common people, as have other Presidents now rated great. And he is hated. Other Presidents of unusual ability and usefulness also were hated by social and economic groups roughly comparable to the groups that dislike Roosevelt. (This comment is not meant to apply to any individual in any group.)

Federal-Aid Highway Programs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILBURN CARTWRIGHT
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 10, 1940

LETTER OF HON. WILBURN CARTWRIGHT, OF OKLAHOMA, TO GOVERNOR PHILLIPS

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and include a letter I wrote last week to the Governor of Oklahoma.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMITTEE ON ROADS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, UNITED STATES,
Washington, D. C., September 2, 1940.

Hon. LEON C. PHILLIPS,
Governor of Oklahoma, Oklahoma City, Okla.

MY DEAR GOVERNOR PHILLIPS: I was surprised and greatly disappointed that any Governor of a great State, and particularly of my own great State, would use the profane, abusive, and unjustified language you did to me in our long-distance telephone conversation last Wednesday.

Among other things you said:

"I notice by the papers that you say our highway program was political. What did you say it for? Which road is political? You are just a ——— ——— liar! You don't care anything about Oklahoma. You don't care anything about your district. That bunch of ——— ——— liars up there told you to say that. Just a bunch of ——— ——— liars. Who told you to say that was political? Did Carmody? I want you to tell me which one is a political road. You haven't got the guts. I am taking this down; I want the people down here to know just what kind of a man they have up there. You joined in with that gang up there and said this road program is political. Now, which road is political? What did you say it for? You have accused me of it! Which road is political? I am going down in your district and tell them what kind of a ——— ——— liar you are. Now have enough guts to tell the truth. Where did you see the program? When did you see it? You are a sneaking liar. You don't care anything for Oklahoma. You don't care anything for your district. You must be afraid of Carmody. Who let you see it? Now you just admit you are either ignorant or a ——— ——— liar. You took a turn at me through the newspapers, thinking you could get away with it. What did you do it for? When did you get the idea that it was political? Did Carmody tell you to say it was? Oh, you said it on your own—well, thank you."

Governor, it doesn't take a brave man to call another ugly names over the telephone from a distance of more than a thousand miles. Of course, that is a game that two can play. But I have been taught from childhood that gentlemen should behave like gentlemen, even when dealing with others who do not.

I think it is better to call a man's bluff than to call him names.

I did say that your proposed 1941 Federal-aid highway program was political, and I challenge you to spot those 28 proposed projects on a State highway map and justify them to the people of Oklahoma on any other basis.

I have delayed writing to you until I could see the newspapers from Oklahoma and see what I had been quoted as saying about your proposed highway program which could have brought forth such an outburst from you.

Somewhat to my surprise, in view of your angry explosion, I find that the reports in all the papers I have seen are fairly accurate and present the situation about as it is. Several editors and reporters outspokenly agree with me that political considerations evidently played a big part in making up the program submitted by your State highway commission. It must have been the truth that hurt.

Apparently you just saw a newspaper headline and jumped at the conclusion that I was in some way responsible for your proposed program not being approved by Public Roads Administration officials.

I am writing this on Labor Day, near the end of August and the first of September, and am reminded of the little dog named August. August was always jumping at conclusions. One day a big 4-year-old mule came by and August ran out and jumped at the mule's conclusion. The next day was the first of September, because that was the last of August.

At the very moment you became Governor you jumped at a conclusion, went off half-cocked, and devoted half of your inaugural address to ill-founded condemnation of the Durant-Denison Dam on Red River, a strictly Federal $50,000,000 flood-control and hydroelectric power project in my district that I have worked for for years. In spite of all your efforts to stop it, thousands of men are at work now day and night on this dam and reservoir, the greatest public development in the history of Oklahoma.

Later, apparently jumping at another conclusion and again going off half-cocked, you called out the National Guard to stop construction of another hydroelectric power project by your own State Grand River Dam authority, and thus made yourself the laughingstock of the Nation.

Then you seem to have jumped at the conclusion that by delaying construction of much-needed roads in the Grand River Dam area you could force the Federal Government to dismiss an injunction suit which has no relation to roads and over which roads officials have no jurisdiction.

By these delays you have thus far succeeded only in adding greatly to the costs of construction.

As a legislative official, of course, I don't have anything to do with the submission or approval of Federal-aid highway projects, but naturally I am interested in road improvements in my State and took advantage of the first opportunity to look over your proposed program.

Your attitude toward the Federal Government and certain Federal officials is unjustified and very unfortunate for the State of Oklahoma.

So that you may know the real facts, I am glad to tell you that no administrative official, in Washington or elsewhere, asked or suggested that I say anything with reference to highway programs or projects in Oklahoma, and I have made no planned or prepared statement. Last week, after your proposed program had already been made public in Oklahoma, an Oklahoma newspaperman casually asked me what I thought about it. I had seen a copy of it and gave him, offhand, my impressions. He asked me if I thought any of the proposed projects were political, and I said that I did. Evidently he thought they were, and I haven't heard of anybody who doesn't. Have you?

As to Federal Works Administrator Carmody, it happens that I haven't seen him or talked with him about anything for several weeks, and I have never at any time discussed Oklahoma road programs or projects with him. Frankly, I doubt that he knows that you have submitted a program. And if Mr. Carmody wanted something said about anything, he is the kind of man who would say it himself.

It seems hard for you to realize, Governor, that public business can be and often is conducted without personal spite or political motives entering into it.

Something that you, and apparently some members of your State highway commission, need to learn is that the Federal-aid highway program, since the original Federal Aid Act was passed in July 1916, has been kept on a very high plane, remarkably free from partisanship, politics, or favoritism of any kind. Every employee of the Public Roads Administration (formerly Bureau of Public Roads) is under civil service, including the Commissioner of Public Roads,

who has served under five Presidents; and there has never been a scandal or a serious charge of inefficiency or maladministration against this agency, which has expended billions to aid in building better roads in the United States.

The main difficulty your proposed Federal-aid program met was its failure to include any improvement on any of the 625 miles of highways in our State which are designated by the War Department as of primary military importance.

And on the 435 miles of class 2 military roads throughout Oklahoma there are only 2 projects, out of a total of 28, or less than 6 percent of a $5,000,000 program. It may be just a coincidence that both of these projects are near Okemah, one on either side of the Governor's home town.

For your information, the Hayden-Cartwright Act of 1940 authorizes the Commissioner of Public Roads, "in approving Federal-aid projects to be carried out with any unobligated funds apportioned to any State," to "give priority of approval to and expedite the construction of projects that are recommended by the appropriate Federal defense agency as important to the national defense."

I had the "guts" to help make this law, applying to our State and every State. And I have the "guts" to urge, if necessary, that it be observed and enforced in my State when Federal-aid funds are involved. I believe that an overwhelming majority of the people of Oklahoma, in all parties and all sections, are in favor of at least the Federal highway funds apportioned to our State being used at this critical time on highways that are most important for national defense.

I noticed the papers quoted you last week as saying that you did not know until after the 1941 Federal-aid program was submitted that there was a designated system of roads specially important for national defense. I am sure, though, that members of the Oklahoma Highway Commission did know, because I saw them at the annual meeting of the American Association of State Highway Officials in Richmond, Va., in October 1939, when a special highway map of the War Department was on display, and I know that detailed information about highways of military importance has been available to all State highway officials at least since that time.

You may be interested to know also that on June 3, 1940, the President of the American Association of State Highway Officials sent the following telegram to the President of the United States, from Chicago, where the association's executive committee was meeting:

"Hon. FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT,
"President of the United States,
"The White House, Washington, D. C.:

"The American Association of State Highway Officials hereby tenders the full services and facilities of its membership for any services we can render in any capacity and on any undertaking in the present emergency.

"The State highway departments have highly trained technical and mechanical staffs located in each of the 48 States. We have available large quantities of construction and maintenance equipment. Following the precedent established in 1917 and 1918 we again offer our services.

"HENRY F. CABELL, *President.*

"By order of the executive committee."

On the following day I placed that message in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD under the heading, "Highway officials offer services in emergency."

I assumed, of course, that it represented the sentiment of highway officials of my own State as well as of such officials in the other States of the Nation, and I still hope and believe that other considerations will not be permitted to prevent the preparation and submission by the State of Oklahoma of a Federal-aid highway program, including improvements most important from a national-defense standpoint, now that this oversight in the preparation of the program you originally proposed has been called to your attention by public-roads officials.

I am sure that the Federal Government is not trying to take away from the State its authority to initiate and submit projects eligible for Federal aid. And I hope that you will yet realize that Federal funds pay considerably more than half the cost of all Federal-aid highway projects in our State, so that this aid is really quite substantial.

The Federal requirements are reasonable, in the public interest, and apply uniformly to all the States. Of course, it is optional with the people of each State whether or not they take advantage of the Federal-aid funds made available to them for highway improvements, under legislation which for years I have introduced and sponsored.

In this connection, out of my ignorance about highway matters, let me call your attention also to the fact that the Federal Highway Act of 1921 provides that "in approving projects to receive Federal aid under the provisions of this act preference shall be given to such projects as will expedite the completion of an adequate and connected system of highways interstate in character." Can you honestly say that all the projects submitted in your recent proposed Federal-aid program meet even this fundamental requirement of the basic Federal highway law? This original purpose of Federal aid has now been extended by the newest Hayden-Cartwright Act to place special emphasis on "adequate," "connected," "interstate" roads "important to the national defense."

You say that I don't care anything about Oklahoma and have never done anything for our State. It just happens that on the very day you called me and denounced me so furiously last week I secured final passage by the Congress of a bill I introduced early in this session which makes available to Oklahoma about $6,500,000 for construction of roads and highways in the fiscal years 1942 and 1943, the first apportionments to be made and become available on December 31 this year. This sum includes $4,646,000 for regular Federal aid; $814,000 for secondary, feeder, and farm-to-market roads, including rural mail and school-bus routes; $914,000 for elimination and protection of railroad grade crossings; and smaller amounts for public land roads, Indian roads, and forest highways and trails. More than $1,000,000 of this amount will not require matching with State funds. Incidentally, I secured the first authorization of Federal funds for building rural secondary roads, in the Hayden-Cartwright Act of 1936.

I believe many good citizens of Oklahoma appreciate, if you do not, the fact that I introduced and secured passage of legislation directing that continuous highway-planning surveys be made in every State. This has resulted in official data and factual information being assembled, available to State highway officials and the Public Roads Administration, showing impartially where road improvements are most needed, and providing a basis for fair and judicious expenditure of available road-improvement funds. In most States highway officials welcome the opportunity to plan their construction programs in accordance with the findings of accurate traffic surveys and scientific studies of road uses, rather than on personal and political influences, and this policy is receiving general public approval and support. My understanding is that one of the objections of Public Roads Administration officials was that your recently proposed Federal-aid program apparently did not attempt to serve the State's most urgent road improvement needs as shown by traffic counts and planning survey factual data.

I was glad to hear you say that you are going down in my congressional district and talk with the people. They probably won't care what you say about me, for most of them knew me before they ever heard of you. But they will be greatly interested if you will explain and justify your "nonpolitical" highway programs, and tell them, for example, just why out of a total of $2,671,591 Federal-aid highway funds apportioned to our State, you proposed to expend less than $100,000, and less than 4 percent, in the 11 counties in the Third Congressional District. There are 8 congressional districts in Oklahoma, and if the Third District received one-eighth of the funds programmed it would amount to 12.5 percent of the total. My district contains one-seventh of the 77 counties of the State. One-seventh of the program would amount to more than 14 percent of the total.

Of the total of about 275 miles of highway you proposed to build or improve with the aid of Federal funds, about 8 miles, or about 3 percent, are in the Third Congressional District. This is about one-thirty-fourth of the total mileage you proposed to improve, for approximately one-seventh of the State, which has close to 1,000 miles of roads under the jurisdiction of the State highway commission, and about 150 miles of highway of class 1 military importance, with many deficiencies. I know the people of southeastern Oklahoma will be glad to have an opportunity to discuss things like this with you.

Governor, I don't know why you want to be antagonistic to my part of the State, or why you seem to delight to attack me personally at every opportunity. It may be because I don't "cuss" loudly or recklessly, or because I don't react very well to bullying tactics. But I have tried to cooperate with you and your administration in every reasonable way, and have never done anything to try to injure or embarrass you. I am sorry that you seem to want to continually take a belligerent and antagonistic attitude toward me, for no good reason.

I repeat that I am shocked and shamed that a Governor of my State will go into profane tirades unjustifiably as you did in your 'phone conversation with me last week. And I think you ought to be ashamed of yourself.

Very sincerely yours,

WILBURN CARTWRIGHT.

British Propaganda and Subersion of Textbooks in American Public Schools—D

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. THORKELSON
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 10, 1940

EXCERPT FROM REPORT BY DAVID HIRSHFIELD

Mr. THORKELSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include an article from the report of David Hirshfield, relating to a book by Albert Bushnell Hart, LL. D., Professor of Government, Harvard University, entitled "School History of the United States."

Mr. Speaker, I have included these articles with my remarks in order to call the attention of Members of Congress and the parents of our American boys and girls to these

changes in our textbooks, as I am sure all patriotic citizens are interested in retaining the true American history in our public schools.

SCHOOL HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES—REVISED, 1920

(By Albert Bushnell Hart, LL. D., professor of government, Harvard University)

This book is said to be among the history texts most extensively in use throughout the United States, and it is one of those most seriously complained against.

"Why should a new school history of the United States be written?"

This is a pertinent query. Professor Hart has recognized it as such; he has asked himself that question in the opening sentence of his preface, and answers it as follows:

"Chiefly to put at the disposition of the upper grades a book embodying a broadly national point of view and presenting adequate treatment of certain topics which hitherto have been too little stressed in the study of American history.

"The European background of our history is clearly sketched, with due recognition of our inheritance of language, law, and political methods from England. Due attention is also paid to other influences from overseas."

The objection to Professor Hart's book is that in it he has given entirely too much attention to the influences from overseas and very little to American influences.

In Professor Hart's "certain topics which hitherto have been too little stressed" appears such as these:

"The colonists liked to think of themselves as part of the British Empire. * * * They were proud of being Britons. * * * They were as well off as any other people in the world" (p. 120).

"The colonists were not desperately oppressed. They enjoyed more freedom and self-government than the people in England" (p. 126).

"The real reason for the Revolution was that, since the people were more used to free government than the English at home, they looked upon every effort of Parliament to tax them as an effort to deprive them of part of their freedom" (p. 126).

"Thousands of good people sincerely loved Great Britain and were loyal to King George. * * * The loyalists were harshly put down" (p. 145).

During the height of the official British propaganda campaign in this country, in 1916–17, designed to draw us into the World War, Professor Hart, in his New American History, edition of 1917, was teaching of the colonists that:

"They professed and doubtless felt the warmest attachment to the King, whom God and Parliament had provided for them. * * *

"The great reason for the division of the British Empire into two parts seems to be that the colonists were so free and did so many things for themselves that they could not see why they should not be relieved from almost all restraints" (p. 126).

The worthy professor seemed to overlook the fact that the real reasons for the Revolution were clearly set forth by the colonists themselves in the Declaration of Independence, and that to the remedy of these grievances and to the cause of liberty they pledged their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor.

Although writing 145 years after the signing of the Declaration of Independence, Professor Hart and his "modern" contemporaries claim that because of their advantages of "modern historical scholarship," of "the newer tendencies in historical writing," and of "other influences from overseas," they are in a better position to know the conditions of the colonists and the causes which led to the War of the Rebellion than were the colonists themselves.

The American Declaration of Independence, which has been accepted by the world and is consecrated in the minds of the American people, must stand as the truth, at least until there shall be presented against it far better evidence than the unsupported assertions of apparently Anglicized American history revisionists.

Professor Hart in his book not only discredits the cause of the patriots, but he sweepingly defames their characters.

Samuel Adams, Alexander Hamilton, and Thomas Jefferson are slurred, and the soldiers of the Revolution are maligned, while the Tories Hutchinson and Galloway are called honest men.

Of the soldiers of the Revolution, whose patriotic zeal, devotion, and courage through terrible hardships and suffering have always been the pride and inspiration of American youth, Professor Hart tells American children that:

"Many served from the purest motives of patriotism, but others were drawn into the army by money, bounties, and promises of land" (p. 134).

Of Samuel Adams, Professor Hart teaches:

"He was a shrewd, hard-headed politician" (p. 125).

This is the only reference in the book to the personal character of the man who was the greatest single factor in bringing about the Revolution.

Professor Hart joins with Professors Muzzey, McLaughlin, and Van Tyne in teaching of Alexander Hamilton that he "is said once to have exclaimed: 'Your people, sir, is a great beast.'" (p. 151).

In referring to Thomas Jefferson, Professor Hart states that Jefferson's political opponents, the Federalists, "looked upon him as an athiest, a liar, and a demogog" (p. 190).

The professor then proceeds to state that Jefferson, however, was not an atheist, because "he liked to read the New Testament"; but as to his being "a liar and a demagogue," the author answers by explaining of Jefferson that:

"He was a reserved man and did not tell everybody all that he knew, and hence some thought him false."

The unfortunate part of all this is that the professor's first reference to Jefferson will stay in the child mind and not his explanation. That this is the main thing even in the mind of Professor Hart appears in the first of his questions at the end of the lesson, which reads:

"What did Jefferson's enemies think about him?" (p. 203.)

Such defamation of these great patriot leaders appears all the more reprehensible when brought into contrast with the same author's laudation of prominent Tories. On page 127 of his text, Professor Hart teaches that:

"Some honest men, like Governor Hutchinson, of Massachusetts, thought the colonists ought not to insist on their rights. Others, like Joseph Galloway, of Pennsylvania, were in favor of protesting and then accepting whatever decision might be made in England."

These two whom Hart sets up as "honest men" were not so regarded by the colonial patriots. Both were Tories, and it was said at that time that Hutchinson was a hypocrite and Gallawoy a spy for the British. There is abundant evidence to sustain that contention, and only historical rewriters, confessing due attention to influences from overseas, would have the nerve to transform Hutchinson and Galloway from hypocrite and spy into honest men.

Of the Battles of Lexington and Concord, where was "fired the shot heard round the world," Professor Hart tells in a single paragraph; and although all authorities are to the effect that the British fired first at Lexington, the professor in his history states that:

"A shot was fired, probably by the English" (p. 131).

The great American historians, Bancroft, Hildreth, Higginson, and Lossing, are of one mind that the British fired first, and the British historians, Green, Lecky, and Trevelyan, concur. Many good authorities are to the further effect that the British commander, Major Pitcairn, himself fired the first shot.

Fiske, who in his masterly work has summed up the facts and opinions presented by all preceding American historians concerning the beginning of the fight at Lexington, says in his account:

"'Disperse, ye villians!' shouted Pitcairn, 'Domn you, why don't you disperse?' And as they stood motionless, he gave the order to fire. As the soldiers hesitated to obey, he discharged his own pistol and repeated the order, whereupon a deadly volley slew 8 of the Minute Men and wounded 10."

In his New American History, published in 1917, Professor Hart cites the following authority for his statement that the first shot at Lexingtcn was probably fired by the English:

"It is uncertain how the fight began; an English officer who was present at the battle says: 'On our approach they dispersed, and soon after the firing began; but which party fired first I cannot exactly say, as our troops rushed on shouting and huzzaing previous to the fighting.'"

So it is solely the word of a British officer, who confessed he did not know, which Professor Hart has set up against the words of scores of American patriots who did know, and against all American historical evidences and authorities.

At the time Hart's New American History, 1917, quoting his British officer, was issued, Sir Gilbert Parker had been more than 2 years in America, with a large organized staff of British propagandists, and this was a part of their propaganda. Parker has since stated in a Harper's Magazine article (March 1918) that his work of pro-English propaganda was particularly effective in universities and colleges. The saddest part of it all is that what Parker then put over as British propaganda, many college professors still go on teaching as solemn truth.

However, at best, there is no educational value in speculation and controvery as to which side fired first. The value all lies in a vivid and stirring picture of the brave stand taken by a half-hundred undrilled minutemen against several hundred trained British troops, and not dispersing until they had paid blood tribute to the patriot cause.

To the Battle of Bunker Hill, Professor Hart gives only six lines, and these are so utterly lacking in patriotic spirit that the word "patriots" appears in quotation marks.

This first set battle of the Revolution is one of the most dramatic and decisive events in world history. The intense spirit of resistance it exemplified and engendered fused all the Colonies into one common cause. To the American writer of American school history this is the best topic afforded for inculcation of patriotic pride, devotion, idealism, and aspiration. Professor Hart dismisses it as an incident of no importance.

Professor Hart joins with other revisionists in belittling the Continental Congress. On page 150, he teaches:

"Not until after Burgoyne's army was captured did Congress pluck up courage to complete the form of union."

A state of mind is a matter, not of ascertainable fact, but of mere inference, and this particular inference, being derogatory, is improper for school history.

Concerning the causes of the War of 1812, Professor Hart teaches that the Indian outbreak in the Northwest was mistakenly supposed to be stirred up by British agents. And the finally impelling motive for the American declaration of war in 1812 is interpreted by him as follows, on page 205:

"Madison still wanted peace and so did his Secretary of the Treasury, Gallatin. * * * However, they could not stand out against the 'War Hawks,' a group of young men * * * who proposed to conquer Canada and insist on terms of peace at Quebec or Halifax. Nothing seemed easier, for by this time there were about 7,000,000 Americans and the whole population of Canada was not more than 450,000. In June 1812, therefore, war was declared by about two-thirds majority of Congress."

The indisputable fact is that Gen. William Henry Harrison, Governor of the Northwest Territory and in command on our western border, had written President Madison that he found the hostile Indians fully supplied with British army muskets and with military stores bearing the name of the British Government. Unless this official testimony of "Old Tippecanoe" is to be discarded as worthless, the Indians were not "mistakenly supposed" to be incited by the British.

The insinuation that the disproportion in population between the United States and Canada rendered the odds strongly in American favor is misleading. It was not Canada alone, but the whole powerful British Empire, with which American went to war. Canada was not won, it is true, but the whole force of the British Empire was whipped, with Jackson's glorious victory at New Orleans thrown in for good measure.

Referring to the state of the American militia during the War of 1812, Professor Hart says, on page 207:

"The crowning disgrace was the landing of a British force of about 5,000 men on the coast of Chesapeake Bay and their march overland, as though they were going to a picnic, till they captured Washington (1814). Within a circle of 60 miles from the Capital lived not less than a hundred thousand able-bodied Americans accustomed to the use of a gun, but the British were allowed to burn the public buildings and to return to their fleet almost without losing a man.

"What was the matter? Not lack of men, for in the course of the war about 500,000 different Americans were enlisted as soldiers, mostly for brief service. There was no shortness of funds, though the Government had to pay high for what it borrowed. The trouble was that Madison and his military advisers were weak and incapable. The Secretary of War, John Armstrong, was the man who was responsible for the loss of Washington. To be sure, the roads were bad and it was hard to send men and supplies to the front, but somehow the Canadians marched over just as bad roads and managed to reach the desired places."

All the so-called modern revisionists, in excuse for their omission or minimization of American victories and heroic incidents, plead that there is not enough space in school history for "battles, marches, and seiges" and for discussion of movements which belong to the science of war. Yet they seize upon every opportunity to expatiate to the derogation of America. Professor Hart in this instance devotes twice as much space to discussing a controversial question, which belongs exclusively to military science, as he gives to Lexington and Concord together, and more than three times what he gives to Bunker Hill.

It is true that the burning of Washington was "a crowning disgrace" but the disgrace rests not upon the Americans, as Professor Hart would have children think, but upon the British. The English historian Green, in his History of the English people, says of it:

"Few more shameful acts are recorded in our (British) history; and it was the more shameful in that it was done under strict orders from the Government at home."

The well-organized British force, acting under definite orders, knew exactly where it was going and what it was going to do. The unorganized American militia could not have known what was being attempted until after it had been done. It was a matter not of cowardice or incompetency on the one side, but an undreamed-of return to practices of barbarism on the other.

Lossing, in his Pictorial Field Book of the War of 1812, in writing of the British outrage of all rules of civilized warfare in burning Washington, says:

"Up to this time, the conduct of the British had been in accordance with the rules of modern warfare. Now they abandoned them, and on entering the National Capital they performed deeds worthy only of barbarians. They wantonly destroyed the public edifices having no relation in their structure to operations of war, nor used at the time for military annoyance, some of these edifices being also costly monuments of taste and of the arts, and others depositaries of the public archives, and only precious to the Nation as a memorial of its origin and its early transactions, and interesting to all nations as contributions to the general stock of historical instruction and political science.

"The British Annual Register for 1814 denounced the proceedings as 'a return to the time of barbarism.' 'It cannot be concealed,' the writer continued, 'that the extent of devastation practiced by the victors brought a heavy censure upon the British character, not only in America, but on the continent of Europe.'

"To the credit of General Ross be it said that when he was ordered to destroy the public buildings at Washington, he demurred, saying that they had carried on the war on the peninsula and in France with a very different spirit, and that he could not sanction the destruction of public or private property with the exception of military structures and warlike stores. It was not until he was warmly pressed that Ross consented to destroy the Capitol and the President's house. 'Fortunately for Ross' sensibility, there was a titled incendiary at hand in the person of Admiral Sir George Cockburn, who delighted in such inhumane work, and who literally became his torch bearer.'"

Professor Hart and several other school-history revisionists seek to excuse this English act of vandalism and shift the odium upon the American militia. In doing so they defy the facts which have been accepted on both sides for more than a century.

Professor Hart's textbook can only have a most baleful influence upon school children, for it is destructive of patriotic pride and tends to deaden patriotic spirit.

The New York City public-school committee condemned many passages in this book, but the book remains on the list of authorized texts for use in the public schools of the city.

Public Salary Tax Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS H. CASE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 10, 1940

LETTER FROM JOHN L. SULLIVAN

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, Sept. 9, 1940.

DEAR MR. CASE: This is in reply to your letter of August 31, 1940, inquiring about the effect of the Public Salary Tax Act of 1939 on State employees paid directly or indirectly by the Federal Government.

As you doubtless know, the Public Salary Tax Act of 1939 expressly provides that the compensation of State and local government officers and employees shall be subject to the Federal income tax. However, title II of that act was designed to avoid the retroactive taxation of the compensation of State and local government officers and employees in cases where, at the time such compensation was earned, it was thought to be exempt, but which was found to be taxable because of the decision of the Supreme Court in *Helvering* v. *Gerhardt*, 304 U. S. 405 (1938). Since the Federal Government had not previously sought to tax such compensation, it was considered inequitable to apply the income tax on such income retroactively.

However, these considerations do not apply in the case of State officers and employees whose compensation was paid directly or indirectly by the United States or any agency or instrumentality of that Government. Beginning with Regulations 86, issued under the Revenue Act of 1934, the Bureau of Internal Revenue consistently took the position that such compensation was taxable. That position has been sustained in the case of *Hanson* v. *Landy*, 24 F. Supp. 535 (D. Minn., 1938). In 1935 the rule was expressly made applicable to the officers and employees of State emergency relief administrations paid directly or indirectly from funds granted to the States by the Federal Government (I. T. 2859, C. B. XIV–1, 101 (1935)).

It can be said, therefore, that State officials and employees receiving all or part of their compensation from the Federal Government or some instrumentality of that Government, had notice, prior to the enactment of the Public Salary Tax Act, that they were bound to pay Federal income tax on that part of their compensation paid by the Federal Government. The Congress has always considered such compensation taxable. Accordingly, section 205 of the Public Salary Tax Act provides that compensation of State officers and employees paid directly or indirectly by the United States or any of its agencies or instrumentalities shall not be considered as compensation within the meaning of those sections which exclude from the retroactive application of the Federal income-tax provisions the compensation of State officers and employees.

When the revenue bill of 1940 was under consideration in the Senate, an amendment was proposed and adopted which would have provided that no income tax should be assessed or collected which was attributable to compensation received prior to January 1, 1939, for personal services as a State officer or employee even though such compensation was paid directly or indirectly by the United States. However, that amendment was stricken by the conference committee and a substitute amendment was proposed and enacted. That amendment, found in section 401 of the Revenue Act of 1940, provides that, if the amount of deficiencies in income tax which is attributable to such compensation is paid with interest on or before March 15, 1941, no civil or criminal penalties shall be imposed on account of such failure to pay such amount or make return of such compensation.

As the law now stands, therefore, State employees who are paid directly or indirectly by the Federal Government are liable to pay

Federal income tax on such income earned in past years. However, if such taxes are paid before March 1, 1941, no civil or criminal penalties will be imposed on the taxpayers on account of failure to pay or make return of such compensation.

I trust that the foregoing adequately answers your inquiry.

Sincerely yours,

(Signed) JOHN L. SULLIVAN,
Assistant Secretary of the Treasury.

HON. FRANCIS CASE,
House of Representatives.

Our United States in This Backward-Moving World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SOL BLOOM
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 10, 1940

ADDRESS BY DR. NICHOLAS MURRAY BUTLER, PRESIDENT OF COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler, president of Columbia University, delivered at the Parrish Memorial Art Museum, Southampton, Long Island, September 1, 1940:

The human race is witnessing the greatest and most far-reaching revolution which history records and is in large part under its control. This revolution, which is primarily the outgrowth of economic problems and economic ambitions, has for more than a quarter century involved the whole world. It took on violent military form with the declaration of war on August 1, 1914. It is that war, checked for a time by an armistice and by a treaty of peace that looked backward instead of forward, which is again raging, and in far more cruel, inhuman, and destructive form. It is in every sense of the word a war of real revolution.

Whether it be generally recognized or not, what we call the civilized world, which for 700 years has been moving steadily forward in the spirit of liberalism and toward liberalism's high ideals, has now turned suddenly and violently backward. The guidance of reason and of understanding, of moral principle and of religious faith, has been shockingly and cruelly displaced by the rule of brute force. Our literally stupendous achievements in literature, in philosophy, in the arts, in the sciences, and in the comforts and conveniences of life count for nothing in the control of national policy and of national conduct, and by far the major portion of the world is now under the rule of brutal compulsion. Such portion of the world as is not in that condition may soon be struggling for its life.

Had anyone ventured a generation ago to predict that a great and highly civilized people like the Germans, with their magnificent record of accomplishment and influence in every aspect of the intellectual life, could have been reduced to mere blind and unreasoning instruments of torture and of brute force, he would have been thought quite mad. Nevertheless, just that has happened. So appalling a set of conditions and circumstances must be examined with dispassionate care in order that we may have something to guide us in judging what may be the meaning of it all and what will be its possible effect upon that which we Americans hold most dear.

One of the most influential happenings with which we have to deal and which is but little recognized is an effect on public opinion of the outstanding excellence of contemporary journalism, particularly in these United States, and of the world-wide news spread hour by hour through the radio. These powerful agencies, the press and the radio, have substituted information for knowledge. The steady flow of that information which they give so absorbs the attention of tens of millions of human beings that they have no opportunity and little temptation to give to this mass of information that critical interpretation and reflective understanding which might transform it into knowledge. We are therefore, in very large measure, living on the surface of the world's happenings. Few indeed are those who have the capacity and the ability to go beneath that surface and to grasp the real significance of the knowledge which information might, but often does not, involve and convey. It is of vital importance that we learn to look beneath the surface of things.

As a matter of fact, the path which the constructive thought of the world was treading from the beginning of the twentieth century down almost to the outbreak of the World War of 1914–1918 was the most hopeful and progressive in all modern history. Signs multiplied that statesmen and the people for whom they spoke had gained the vision of a prosperous, a contented, and a peaceful world, organized for the preservation and protection of law and order in a way that would promote all those inspiring ideals which we recognize as the spirit and guide of liberalism.

What happened? Why was this progress, so full of promise and satisfaction, brought suddenly to an end; and why were reactionary and abhorrent forces set loose, to meet with so little effective opposition that they bid fair to control the world for generations and to put it back, as no one of us had ever believed possible, to a condition which is essentially one of barbaric rule by sheer force?

Bluntly, the answer must be that the democracies, foremost among which were France, Great Britain, and the United States, showed themselves incompetent and unable to understand the new economic and political forces at work in the world, and to cooperate for their control and direction in a manner which would preserve and protect the democratic system of economic, social, and political order, as well as those free institutions which had, we thought, been safely and permanently built upon that order. During these critical years the democracies have conspicuously lacked the able, constructive, and courageous leadership which was so sorely needed. They were allowed to drift onto the shoals of disaster.

Consider for a moment the progress which was made from 1898 to 1920 in the building of a system of world organization and international cooperation that should control and guide the new economic forces which the industrial revolution had set at work. The purpose, of course, was to increase prosperity for all peoples, great and small, and to protect the foundations of international peace through international cooperation. The first note of progress in this movement was struck by the noteworthy rescript appealing for international cooperation to promote peace, issued by the Czar of All the Russias in 1898. Immediately, the progressive and liberal forces of the world rallied to respond to that appeal. It will always be a matter of pride to many of us that the Government of the United States took the lead in that great movement for world organization. It was the influence of the American delegation which gave to the First Hague Conference of 1899 the measure of success which it attained. From the speech of President McKinley made at Buffalo on September 5, 1901, containing the striking sentence, so often quoted, "The period of exclusiveness is past," down to the formal declarations by the two great political parties in the Presidential campaign of 1920, American opinion showed itself ready to take responsible leadership in guiding the world toward a peaceful solution of all international differences and difficulties. It had grasped the fact that the only possible way to avoid war and to keep out of war was to unite to remove the causes of war. The policies of Presidents Theodore Roosevelt and Taft, of Secretaries of State John Hay and Elihu Root, all reflected and expressed this spirit of world leadership. Then came, as I have often pointed out, the epoch-marking joint resolution passed in June 1910 by both Houses of the American Congress without a single dissenting vote, authorizing the President to begin negotiations with other governments in order to bring about a world organization which would establish and protect peace through the aid of an international police force composed of the combined navies of the world. How many of those who profess to represent public opinion in the United States today have ever heard of that joint resolution or know that it was passed without a dissenting vote?

The persistent assertion that the traditional policy of the United States is one of national and international isolation is contrary to every fact in our history. No people in the world have had more intimate, more constant, and more influential relationships with other peoples than ourselves. Outstanding and distinguished examples of this international relationship and international influence are Benjamin Franklin, John Adams, Thomas Jefferson, John Jay, John Marshall, John Quincy Adams, Ralph Waldo Emerson, and James Russell Lowell. The steady flow of immigration from one European country after another gave to our population long ago the many-sided character and intellectual interest which will always mark the American people. We required the military cooperation of the people and the Army of France in order to win the War of Independence. We found a way to take part in the war between Napoleon and Great Britain in what is called the War of 1812, against the protest of so outstanding a statesman and leader as Daniel Webster. Our country was invaded and public buildings at Washington were burned. When that war came to an end and the Treaty of Ghent was signed, not the slightest reference was made to those matters which had been alleged to have caused America's participation in the war. The war with Mexico was undertaken against the protest of Abraham Lincoln who, as Representative in Congress from the State of Illinois, voted against it. The Spanish-American War in 1898 was absolutely unnecessary, and if it had not been insisted upon by the belligerent press, aided by numerous influential leaders of opinion, including Theodore Roosevelt, Cuba would have become free through diplomatic arrangement with Spain and without any armed hostilities whatsoever. The cost to the people of the United States of that unnecessary war is quite appalling, since highly organized and efficient lobbies have provided for a system of pensions to persons whose relation to the war was only nominal, which have already amounted to tens of millions of dollars and will continue yet for a long generation.

Isolation is the last thing of which the American Government and the American people can be accused. Millions of American people are day by day and almost hour by hour informed and deeply interested in news from other peoples in every part of the world. No other people manifests a like international in-

terest. American agriculture, American industry, American commerce, and American finance have penetrated and influenced the life of every nation on the globe. Moreover, it must not be forgotten that it was an American, Commodore Perry, who in 1852, under the express instructions of President Fillmore, to all intents and purposes discovered Japan and introduced its people to world trade and world relationship.

Unfortunately, the World War of 1914–18 broke before the European nations had been persuaded to accept the proposals of the American Government made by President Taft pursuant to the joint resolution of 1910. But President Wilson had a great vision, and he offered a system of world organization similar to that proposed by the American Congress, to be effective when the Great War should come to its end. Unhappily his temperament was such that he permitted personal frictions and dislikes to guide his public statements and his policies in a way which greatly weakened his influence and his leadership. Nevertheless, when the American people chose their President in 1920, they did so having before them the definite pledges of both great political parties to support an agreement among the nations to preserve the peace of the world. The statement contained in the Republican national platform was particularly clear and definite.

It is therefore obvious and of record that the American people were betrayed by the failure of those who were chosen to public office in 1920 to carry out the pledges so definitely made to them. Indeed, it is just at this point that a beginning is to be found for the causes of those appalling happenings which have in 20 years succeeded in revolutionizing so large a portion of the world. It needed the votes of but a very small group of Members of the United States Senate to deprive the American people of the safety, the benefit, and the world leadership which they had then been pledged. The construction of a world of cooperating nations should then have gone forward under American inspiration and American leadership. Had this been done, we might well be living today in a far different world from that which confronts us.

With this record of promise and with these explicit pledges before us, it may again be pointed out what nonsense it is to speak of our having had a traditional policy of isolation, and of our having no interest in what happens to our fellow men in other lands. The truth is the precise opposite. We had offered leadership to the world, and both political parties had pledged it to the American people. It was the petty politicians at Washington and their shocking disregard of moral and political obligation which threw away the great opportunity which our Government had envisaged and of which both political parties had pledged themselves to take advantage. If there be one definite cause, more explicit and more obvious than any other, of the weakness, and it may even be the downfall, of the democracies, it certainly finds expression in this disastrous record of the faithlessness of the small-minded American politician and officeholder, who had in his power for the time being the control of great public policies.

But even so, since a plan of world organization was accepted and entered upon through the establishment of the League of Nations at Geneva, there still seemed opportunity for readjustment of a constructive and progressive character in the field of international relations. But neither the Government of France nor the Government of Great Britain stood firm on the new platform which had been erected. Both consistently backed and filled and compromised and hesitated, lest some gain-seeking undertaking might be interfered with if the high ends for which the League of Nations had been organized were vigorously and courageously pursued. Nevertheless, under the inspiring leadership of M. Briand, 15 governments ratified in 1928 the famous Pact of Paris for the renunciation of war as an instrument of national policy, and no fewer than 63 governments had signed and ratified this pact by 1934. Many of us then thought that the end of war was in sight. We little realized the faithlessness of the signatory governments and that they would at once begin to prepare for war on an unprecedented scale of expenditure. Those who, in every land, had been at work for a generation upon these plans to end war by removing the causes of war, were profoundly grieved and shocked as they saw one happening after another which meant the weakening and the eventual tearing down of the structure which was then building.

Even as late as 1931, if the Government of Great Britain had supported the protest of the Government of the United States against Japan's invasion of China, much of the worst which has taken place during the past 10 years might never have happened at all. Since the Government of the United States did not then have the support of the British Government, the leaders of Nazi Germany saw no reason why they should not violate their pledges and take possession of the east bank of the Rhine, and the Fascist Government of Italy saw no reason why it should not violate its pledges and proceed to the conquest of Ethiopia. Then all barriers were down and the way was opened to the spread of the rule of brute force without the slightest regard for international law, for formal treaties and pledges or for human feeling. What has happened since is so clear and so obvious that it need not be dwelt upon.

The question which presses for an answer is why were these great democracies so incompetent? Why were they so lacking in vision, in courage, and in a spirit of cooperation? Why was it practicable for a small group of members of the United States Senate to make it impossible for the Government of the United States to carry out the pledges which had been made to the American people? What was it which to all intents and purposes paralyzed the Governments of France and of Great Britain in their support of the organized society of nations and prevented them from going forward with eagerness and vision on the constructive path of progress which had been pointed out?

The answer in the case of Great Britain may be found succinctly stated in two extraordinary volumes, one of which is a collection of speeches made during the years 1932 to 1938 by Winston Churchill, the present Prime Minister in the Government of Great Britain. In the case of France, political and economic disintegration had been proceeding at a rapid pace after the death of Briand, apparently without any effective and constructive leadership to prevent it or to save the great people of France from the literally appalling fate which has now overtaken them. Plainly, what France has lacked in recent years is constructive and courageous moral and political leadership. The French people have unfortunately been divided into economic and social groups or classes which contested with each other for the control of the government and which apparently were unable or unwilling to work together for the good of the French people as a whole and for the glory and honor of France. The result has astounded the whole world. Nothing has been more staggering to us than to watch the 42,000,000 French people sitting silently and in coma while a small group of their fellow Frenchmen signed away not only the Government of the Third Republic but that great declaration for liberty, equality, and fraternity which sounded the note of the French Revolution a century and a half ago. In each and all of the democracies there have been and are forces at work which have gravely interfered with the effectiveness of these democracies. But it is difficult, if not impossible, to look upon democracy in France as dead. It is certainly in prison at the moment; but some of us, at least, will not give up the hope and the faith that it will find a way to reassert itself in the spirit of the truly great France of bygone days.

So outstanding a scholar and statesman as the Marquess of Crewe feels that liberalism is everywhere under an eclipse, and his discussion of the subject is highly illuminating. He points out that it was in England that the plant of liberalism first took root and that its growth there was slow and intermittent. Party politics played their part sometimes in encouraging liberalism and sometimes in hampering it, but all through the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries it never died down. Then came the day when the French Revolution brought a new atmosphere to Europe and gave to liberalism the new impulse and effectiveness which lasted for a full century. Lord Crewe suggests, however, that liberalism by its very nature lacks cohesion. It promotes and invites differences of opinion and frequently calls upon public opinion to wait and see, rather than to reach a definite conclusion as to action to be immediately taken. The economic influences which began to play so large a part in national and international policy a hundred years ago gave liberalism in England its new opportunity to build itself upon a wider and more effective democratic basis in the shaping of public policy and upon freedom of international trade for the quick promotion of industry and of commerce. Toward the close of the nineteenth century, the weakening of liberalism in England began, and, as Lord Crewe points out, its eclipse has continued until this day.

Liberalism in England has certainly been able to stir the mind of the people to influence and to shape legislation in many most important ways, yet there have been forces at work, partly national and partly international, the effect of which has been to limit liberalism's power to guide and to express British public opinion. As Lord Crewe states, the present is a most harassing period for liberals, especially for those of the younger generation, who find themselves forced into the political background during their best years and to whom the prospect of political influence and political leadership seems dark indeed. Nevertheless, the closing words of his analysis are these: "But let us conclude with a confident Sursum corda."

It is in this spirit of sursum corda that we Americans must approach the grave problems which stare us in the face. We dare not be discouraged or lacking in faith, for should we be, there would be little left to hope for in the world of today.

It is perfectly evident that all those important problems and policies which we have looked upon as national or domestic are now absorbed into and made part of the world revolution. The ordinary processes of trade and commerce no longer exist, and huge expenditures are making for purposes which we had thought belonged to the past and would never again be necessary. Armaments and preparation for military war have become the dominant note in our public life. This means, of course, the diversion of labor and savings from those purposes for which we would wish to use them, to ends which are of necessity wasteful and destructive. Moreover, military war on the stupendous scale on which it is now being waged destroys in a few days the earnings and the savings of men for generations. The disastrous effect of this upon the accumulated wealth of our people will, one of these days, be quite obvious to everyone; but there is no alternative.

Indeed, so absolute and so complete is this revolution that we are yet unable fully to visualize or understand it. What are we Americans to do in order to protect and to save our own beloved institutions and the historic foundations upon which they rest? We have had ample warning of these problems and dangers, but we have paid little attention to them. It is two generations since Herbert Spencer wrote a famous essay entitled "The Coming Slavery," in which he predicted that tyranny would succeed liberty in England and probably elsewhere. He certainly did not have in mind the totalitarian state in the form in which it is now presented to us by Russia, by Germany, and by Italy, but he did have in mind

a state of affairs in which the Government would control the life and occupations of the people, instead of the people controlling the policies of the government.

If we look frankly and fairly at the facts of our country's history, we cannot fail to see that there have been many signs during the past generation that all was not well with our political thinking and our political policies. So long as we had the leadership of our first six Presidents, each one of whom was an outstanding statesman of competence and of independence, the foundations of our Government and political life were unshaken. After their time, however, we entered upon a period of political and partisan struggle the effects of which, while sometimes relatively harmless, were often definitely harmful. Finally, there came the climax of our great Civil War, which apparently was unavoidable. When that was over and the country's unity permanently established, then our problems became primarily economic and social. Whenever we were given opportunity to approach these problems in a spirit of understanding and detachment from group or sectional interest, our public opinion responded to the demands made upon it with reasonably good results. But increasingly, our public opinion and our elected political representatives came under the pressure of closely organized and most persistent minority groups. These minority groups were not concerned with principles nor with the public welfare. They were concerned simply with that particular end upon which they had set their hearts and which appealed either to their imagination or to their personal or group interest. Unfortunately, the activity and influence of these minority groups have become stronger year by year at Washington and at several of our State capitals and today they are a genuine danger to our public welfare. Minority groups are able to exist and to succeed only because the majority group is indifferent and inattentive to them. Every once in a while we have evidence that American public opinion is sound and healthy and can be reached by the highest type of appeal. We have had several instances of this during the past two generations, but in every case grave damage had been done by the minority groups before public opinion effectively asserted itself.

Public opinion is the unseen product of education and practical experience. Education, in turn, is the function, in cooperation, of the family, the church, and the school. If a family fails in its guiding influence and discipline and if the church fails in its religious instruction, then everything is left to the school which is given an impossible burden to bear. It is just this situation which has arisen in the United States during the generation through which we are still passing. In overwhelming proportion the family has become almost unconscious of its chief educational responsibility. In like manner the church, fortunately with some noteworthy exceptions, has done the same. The heavy burden put upon the school has resulted in confused thinking, unwise plans of instruction, and a loss of opportunity to lay the foundations of true education, the effects of which are becoming obvious to everyone. Fundamental discipline, both personal and social, has pretty well disappeared, and without that discipline, which develops into self-discipline, education is impossible.

What are the American people going to do about it? If they do not correct these conditions, they are simply playing into the hands of the advocates of a totalitarian state, for that type of state is at least efficient, and it is astonishing to how many persons efficiency makes stronger appeal than liberty.

Then, too, we have many signs of an incapacity to understand and to interpret liberty, or to distinguish it from license. It is a long time since Moses came down from Mount Sinai bearing the Ten Commandments, the sixth, seventh, eighth, and ninth of which forbade certain human conduct. Those commandments have become part of the moral law of civilized peoples, and governments treat as crimes the practices which they forbade. This means that there is a limit to liberty and that liberty ends where license begins. It is very difficult for many persons to understand this fact or to grasp its implications. If we are to have freedom of speech, freedom of thought and freedom of the press, why should we not be free to say and think and print whatever we like? The answer is that the limit between liberty and license must be observed if liberty itself is to last. To suppose, as many individuals and groups seem to do, that liberty of thought and liberty of speech include liberty to agitate for the destruction of liberty itself, indicates on the part of such persons not only lack of common sense but lack of any sense of humor. If liberty is to remain, the barrier between liberty and license must be recognized and observed.

In this backward-moving world, it may well be that leadership toward return to a new and forward-moving world is to rest with the United States. Despite our shortcomings and failures, we have written a record on the history of the last 150 years which is not only of outstanding importance, but full of promise for the future.

We have established the oldest form of government now existing in the world and we have shown its capacity to continue to exist, unaltered in principle, through all the stupendous changes of a century and a half.

We have established in permanent form the federal principle, and it is that principle which must be applied if a new, a forward-facing, a prosperous and a peaceful world is to be built upon the wreck and the ruin of that backward-moving world at which we now look.

We have established freedom of trade among these federal units and have given to each unit fullest opportunity to develop its resources and the capacity of its population. This, again, is a principle which must be recognized and accepted in a contented and a peaceful world composed of nations, some great and some small, but all proud of their independence and of their capacity for human service.

We have established the authority of an independent judicial system, which means that not force nor the gain-seeking impulse, but right and justice, shall be accepted and enforced as ruling principles of human intercourse, whether personal, group, or national. This, too, is a principle which must dominate a newly organized and a forward-moving world.

The great progress which had been made in applying these fundamental principles to world organization and world life has been, for the time being, completely stopped, but there are those of us who have faith that it will not be long before those principles will again be turned to as fundamental and controlling.

It must be remembered that the peoples held for the moment under brutal dictatorship are each and all highly civilized. They have, each and all, made literally great contributions to literature and to science, to art and to industry. Who can possibly believe that when the emotional spasm is over—and that may be earlier than we now think—they will fail to assert themselves in terms of their old ambitions and their old principles? When that time comes—and may it come soon—where can these peoples turn save to the United States, to see at work, and on the whole successfully at work, those underlying principles of government, of life, and of conduct which are the outgrowth of liberty and which alone make the continuance of liberty possible? All that we need to do is to make sure, always and everywhere, that gain seeking, whether for individuals or for groups, is subordinated to public service. Would not Washington and Hamilton, Jefferson and Madison, Webster and Lincoln, and our other great national leaders of the past, looking down from their home in high heaven, let their faces shine with contentment as they saw those principles and habits of life which they did so much to establish gaining control over what has become a wrecked and a backward-moving world, in order to turn it into a new, a contented, a prosperous, and a peaceful organized family of nations, world-wide in scope and safe beyond peradventure from the despot of tomorrow?

We may take encouragement from the little-remembered happenings of nearly a century and a half ago. For some 20 years Napoleon Bonaparte dominated by force the greater part of Europe and part of Africa and set his heart on the subjugation of liberty-loving Great Britain. To the statesmen of that day, the world upon which they looked seemed very much like the world by which we ourselves are confronted. It was liberalism which was struggling for its life and which was so gravely threatened that there was general despair concerning it. Hear these words spoken in the House of Commons by the younger Pitt on April 25, 1804, when Great Britain was arming itself to resist the invasion which Napoleon had planned, and see how absolutely they apply to what is now happening in the world:

"I need not remind the House that we are come to a new era in the history of nations; that we are called to struggle for the destiny, not of this country alone, but of the civilized world. We must remember that it is not for ourselves alone that we submit to unexampled privations. We have for ourselves the great duty of self-preservation to perform; but the duty of the people of England now is of a nobler and higher order. We are in the first place to provide for our security against an enemy whose malignity to this country knows no bounds; but this is not to close the views or the efforts of our exertion in so sacred a cause. Amid the wreck and the misery of nations, it is our just exultation, that we have continued superior to all that ambition or that despotism could effect, and our still higher exultation ought to be, that we provide not only for our own safety, but hold out a prospect to nations now bending under the iron yoke of tyranny, what the exertions of a free people can effect; and that at least in this corner of the world, the name of liberty is still revered, cherished, and sanctified."

It was 11 years later that Waterloo brought Napoleon's despotic career to an end and paved the way for the progress which European nations have since made.

May we not hope and pray that a twentieth century Waterloo is not far distant? Let us so act that when it comes the newly freed world will cry out with one voice: "God bless the United States of America and its people."

British Propaganda and Subversion of Textbooks in American Public Schools—E

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. THORKELSON

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 9, 1940

EXCERPT FROM REPORT BY DAVID HIRSHFIELD

Mr. THORKELSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include an article from the report of David Hirshfield relating to a book by Andrew C.

McLaughlin, head of the Department of History, University of Chicago, and Claude H. Van Tyne, head of the Department of History, University of Michigan, entitled "A History of the United States for Schools."

Mr. Speaker, I have included these articles with my remarks, in order to call the attention of Members of Congress and the parents of our American boys and girls, to these changes in our textbooks, as I am sure all patriotic citizens are interested in retaining the true American history in our public schools.

A HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES FOR SCHOOLS, REVISED 1919

(By Andrew C. McLaughlin, A. M., LL. B., head of the Department of History, University of Chicago, and Claude H. Van Tyne, Ph. D., head of the Department of History, University of Michigan.)

Objections submitted and sustained against the McLaughlin and Van Tyne text are that it teaches:

That there is little use trying to learn whose fault it was that the Revolutionary War began;

That the Declaration of Independence was largely plagiarized from English writings;

That the United States Constitution was copied after the British Constitution;

That many of the long-cherished stories in American history are "yarns";

That many revered patriot leaders were disreputable characters;

That many of our most inspiriting slogans are not genuine;

That "we can afford now to laugh at our forefathers."

Objection has been made that in this textbook the British oppressions of the American colonists are so plausibly condoned or completely suppressed that no ground is left which seems to justify the statement of grievances in the Declaration of Independence or the armed resistance in Revolution.

It has been further charged that the history of the American Revolution is in this text reshaped to conform with definite British propaganda for the cultivation of the "international mind" in behalf of imperialistic interests and that its teachings to American children are poisonous to their patriotic spirit.

In the preface these authors proclaim:

"We make no apology for the omission of many of the 'yarns' of American history. * * *

"By means of this elimination we have secured space for fuller explanation and interpretation of really important events."

They omit mention of Nathan Hale, Faneuil Hall, the Green Mountain Boys, Betsy Ross and the birth of the flag, the quartering of troops, and the British attempts to bribe, and they minimize the patriot valor at Lexington, Bunker Hill, and New Orleans.

These "yarns," now omitted, have always heretofore been deemed important in American school history. They are as important now as they ever were—perhaps more important now than ever before, since the stanch national spirit they helped to engender is being insidiously undermined.

The "really important events," for which these authors secure space by omitting what they term "yarns" are such as these:

"England was, on the whole, more generous to her colonies than were other nations to theirs" (p. 139).

"Though the country must have been almost equally divided, the Whigs were most active, and succeeded in electing a Congress bent upon defending 'American liberties'" (p. 156).

"As a Tory wrote, in Washington's camp the soldier had 13 kings and no bread, and it seemed better to serve 1 king and have plenty of bread" (p. 178).

"It is from a study of this struggle between Whigs and Tories that we see the American Revolution to have been a civil war in America as well as a war between England and her rebellious colonies" (p. 183).

It is difficult to understand how any mind, or any pair of professorial minds, can regard such things as more "really important events" in American history than the inspiring incidents and heroic characters which have been omitted to make space for them.

McLaughlin and Van Tyne appear to have been the first of the Anglophile revisionists. The first edition of their school history, issued in 1911, distorts many truths regarding Anglo-American relations, to the disparagement of America and exaltation of Great Britain.

In their 1919 revision McLaughlin and Van Tyne have a complete chapter of 15 pages on How Europe Influenced America, 1607–1815, which did not appear in their 1911 edition.

In this new chapter opportunity is taken—

1. To set up Magna Carta as the chief source of our liberties;
2. To discredit the Declaration of Independence as a plagiarism;
3. To contend at length that the United States Constitution is a mere written copy of the unwritten British Constitution.

These authors devote a great deal of space in stating in detail how John Locke, an Englishman, had written about liberty long before the Declaration of Independence was formulated; that in his writings "Locke expressed essentially the same ideas" and that the same sounded "very much like what we read in the American Declaration of Independence" (p. 199).

The United States Constitution, according to this school history, differs from the English Constitution only "in that most of it is included in a single document, while the English Constitution is made up of many laws, court decisions, and customs," etc., etc. (p. 197).

The argument in support of this theory, taking up a page and a half in the new chapter, is a mere restatement of Sir Gilbert Parker's official British propaganda material with which our country has been flooded in recent years.

The chapter on the War with Spain has been revised and the 17 lines of tribute to Dewey's victory and Hobson's heroism, which appeared in the 1911 edition, were removed in 1919 to make space for the moot Diederichs incident in Manila Bay, and to expatiate how "Thus British friendship saved us."

Comparison of the two editions discloses many other alterations in the text, all conforming to up-to-date British propaganda.

Leading founders of our liberties are characterized as follows:

"It is hard for us to realize how ignorant and superstitious were most of the early colonists of America" (p. 134).

"Patrick Henry, a gay, unprosperous, and hithertc unknown country lawyer" (p. 141).

"Smuggling was so common that even a leading Boston merchant was known as the prince of smugglers" (p. 140).

"As the British soldiers who had left Boston at midnight neared Lexington in the early morning of April 19, 1775, Adams and Hancock stole away across the fields" (p. 153).

"Independence was not seriously thought of, except by a very few men like Samuel Adams. Great men and good patriots like Washington and Franklin were loath to think of such an outcome of the quarrel' '(p. 162).

"Hamilton is said to have exclaimed at a banquet once, 'Your people, sir, is a great beast'" (p. 238).

"On the 4th of July 1801 voters of a town in Connecticut drank to the toast: 'Thomas Jefferson: May he receive from his fellow citizens the reward of his merit—a halter'" (p. 249).

"We can afford now to laugh at our forefathers" (p. 262).

It is not to be denied that these great and good men, who here are so flippantly defamed, were human and had their human faults and limitations. However, it is not their personal faults that are most important to us. In their faults there is little educational value, but their transcendant virtues, heroisms, sacrifices, abilities, and achievements, peculiar to themselves, and outstanding above those of any other set of men of any period, constitute vitalizing and inspiring educational material.

Nearly all of the herein mentioned historical revisionists are found to be at every opportunity harping upon the faults or failures of American leaders. This is naturally to be expected in British histories in relation to American affairs, but its transfer from British histories to American school histories is not natural and should not be tolerated.

The truth regarding the noble characters, exalted ideals, immortal words, and heroic deeds of the founders of our Republic, as it has been handed down to us through honest American historians, is the most precious possession of any people on earth and should be transmitted unsullied to posterity.

Jackson, Monroe, Clay, and other great leaders have not escaped criticism in this McLaughlin-Van Tyne history book.

Of Jackson they teach:

That he was rough and uncultured.

That he disliked the bank because its stockholders and managers were his political enemies.

That he put the public moneys into pet banks.

That Jackson was rough and uncultured is not as important in educational value as that, despite educational limitations and handicaps, he was a great soldier, a good statesman, and a model patriot. In his force of character, directness of methods and freedom from conventionalism he was a new type, and has been well described as the first genuine representative of democracy. Jackson's intense earnestness and strict honesty have been securely woven into the very fabric of our Republic. His noble qualities of mind and heart, his unselfish purposes and his lasting achievements will fill to overflowing all the space that can be found for him in any school history.

Another of the great makers of America whom these authors "damn with faint praise" is James Monroe, twice elected President, the second time by every vote in the electoral college but one. Of him, on page 272 they say:

"He was only a gallant officer of the lower rank in the Revolution, a fairly good diplomat who happened to have a hand in the Louisiana Purchase, and only an ordinary Secretary of State under Madison, but he was the choice of the Republican Party leaders, Madison and Jefferson."

The name of Monroe, for a hundred years, has been known and respected in every civilized country, and had President Monroe never done anything else than promulgate the Monroe Doctrine he still would stand out as one of the greatest constructive forces in our national life.

Monroe was a mere boy in the Revolution, and at 18 was promoted to a captaincy because of his bravery. He was twice Governor of Virginia, Minister to England, to France, and to Spain. He was Secretary of State and later Secretary of War through the War of 1812. These facts are better fitted for school history than is a sneering comment.

Regarding Henry Clay these authors are teaching as follows:

"There had been a deal, they asserted, and Clay, 'Judas of the West,' had sold his influence to Adams for the office of Secretary of State" (p. 286).

Party strife was bitter in the days of Clay, and extremely harsh words were often used by partisans against opponents. No public character, of that, this, or any other period, is justly described in a

heated phrase of a bitter opponent. Yet these authors and other history revisionists show a peculiar fondness for this unfair method of estimating the characters of American leaders. It is by this method that Thomas Jefferson is presented to school children as deserving of "a halter."

Not content with disparagement of heroic characters, these co-authors proceed to discredit their immortal words. Maxims and slogans with which every school child has been familiar in the past are now pronounced as not authentic.

Of Lawrence's last brave words, "Don't give up the ship," these authors say:

"'Fight the ship until she is sunk' seem to have been his real words, and the others are the words of the boy who took his message on deck."—Page 265.

The authenticity of this slogan was accepted by Commodore Perry when he had it emblazoned on his battle flag at the victory of Lake Erie, and this is one of the most fondly cherished slogans in the United States Navy still. No educational advantage is gained by questioning its genuineness, and the only effect on the school child's mind of such petty caviling is to weaken confidence in any truth of history.

Of Ethan Allen's demand upon the commanding officer at Ticonderoga to surrender "In the name of the Great Jehovah and the Continental Congress," these authors remark in a footnote, page 157:

"So Allen afterward declared. He had no right to demand the fort in the name of the Continental Congress, for his commission was from Connecticut."—Page 157.

Here they quibble over trifling points, to the obscuration of the splendidly dramatic manner in which Allen and his men, without firing a shot, won a fort which cost the British eight million sterling, a succession of campaigns and many lives. Allen's demand was made in the hearing of many men who confirmed all that "Allen afterwards declared."

The causes of the Revolution are in this textbook obscured, and the student seeking here the principles and motives of the colonists will find only omissions, contradictions, and confusion.

On page 144 these historians state that:

"The great objection raised by the Americans was that they were taxed by the Parliament without being represented in it."

On page 146 they go on and say that:

"The King and his obedient ministers now thought that they must crush what they considered to be a spirit of rebellion. * * * A second mistake was the sending to America of an inadequate force of soldiers, which only irritated and did not cow the colonists."

The authors frequently tell what the King thought, how his ministers felt, and what his generals hoped. In this instance the word "mistake" has application only from the British standpoint. What the authors clearly mean to teach is that if a larger British force had been sent the colonists might not have been irritated but would have been cowed.

In their endeavor to define the causes of the Revolution these authors state:

"There is little use trying to learn whose fault it was that the war began, for, as we have seen, such a long train of events led to disagreement between England and America that we should have to go back and back to the very founding of the Colonies. As in most quarrels, the blame for beginning is laid by each party on the other" (p. 152).

It is amazing that men who confess they do not know why the American Revolution began should have felt themselves called upon to write American school history.

McLaughlin and Van Tyne attempt to extract the glory from the Fourth of July. On pages 163–4 they teach:

"The reason we celebrate the 4th instead of the 2d of July is that most men thought more about the day Congress voted to accept a declaration drawn up by Thomas Jefferson explaining to the world the reasons for making the resolution of independence.

"A list of 27 grievances was given, some of which seem unreasonable now, but others constituted real wrongs."

The enthusiastic jubilation of the patriots following the declaration, July 4, 1776, is thus referred to:

"Among the Whigs, or Patriots, the news was joyfully received. Some thoughtless people went too far and did foolish things, like burning an effigy of the king or burning his portrait in a public square. In New York City the American soldiers pulled down a leaden statue of George III and melted it into bullets" (p. 164).

It was peculiarly proper that the statue of King George was turned into bullets to shoot his oppression and sovereignty out of this land. No better use for a king's statue ever was found in America.

Of France's motive in coming to the aid of America, on pages 175–6 they say:

"England and France had long been enemies. Many bitter wars had been fought between them but none more bitter than that for ownership of America, which was decided in England's favor when Wolfe captured Quebec. From that hour French statesmen watched for a time when England should be weakened and when France might avenge her shame and regain her power."

Regarding the War of 1812 these authors teach, on page 261:

"To make war on England, however, was, in fact, to join Napoleon, her implacable enemy, so that the world witnessed the strange alliance of James Madison, lover of peace, and Napoleon Bonaparte, the genius of war."

In their summary of the results of that war they state, on pages 270–271:

"Of the War of 1812 one feels like asking with Little Peterkin, 'What good came of it at last?' Some 30,000 men had been lost and about $200,000,000 had been spent on wasteful war. America's shipping was almost destroyed and trade had suffered great losses, and yet no principle for which she had fought was settled."

The fact of the matter is that the result of the War of 1812 settled forever the British claim of its right to impress American seamen. The British encouragement of Indian outrages upon our western border was ended.

Results even more important than the foregoing are cited by Carl Schurz in his Life of Henry Clay:

"The War of 1812, with all the losses in blood and treasure entailed by it, and in spite of the peace which ignored the declared causes of the war, transformed the American Republic, in the estimation of the world, from a feeble experimental curiosity into a power—a world power, full of brains and with visible claws and teeth. It made the American people, who had so far consisted of the peoples of so many little commonwealths, not seldom wondering whether they could profitably stay long together, a consciously united Nation with a common country, a great country, worth fighting for, and a common national destiny—nobody could say how great—and a common national pride, at that time filling every American heart brim-full."

The justice of the American cause in the Mexican War is more than questioned in this book. In a footnote on page 323 these authors say:

"There is still room for question as to whether we were right in fighting Mexico, and scholars differ. Our patience was sorely tried, but a little fairness, a little more patience, and a little more generosity might have made war unnecessary. Polk's method of blaming Mexico reminds one of the soldier who came into camp with a dead sheep over his shoulder, though foraging was forbidden. 'No sheep can bite me and live,' he said."

Time and events have amply vindicated the justness and necessity of the Mexican War, and the mere fact that "scholars differ"—as it ever is their chief vocation—furnishes no reason for shadowing with doubt the true motives and actions of our fathers in the minds of our children.

Space which these authors say they have secured for "really important events," by omitting old inspiriting "yarns," is lavishly devoted to a half-page reproduction of a British cartoon of the Revolutionary period, caricaturing America as a rattlesnake.

Another half-page cartoon ridicules Lincoln as being ridden on a rail.

A cartoon of Woodrow Wilson's "wonderful control" on affairs still current and controversial, occupies one-quarter of page 457.

The patriots frequently used the rattlesnake as an emblem, and their own applications of it formerly appeared in school histories. The revisionists substitute for it a hostile conception.

These cartoons, feebly conceived and crudely drawn, have no educational values. Such use of space, which has been gained by ruthless elimination of patriotic characters and incidents, would be incomprehensible but for the fact that it is in perfect accord with the Anglicized spirit and purpose, shown by these authors throughout their book, to distort, belittle, and ridicule the great leaders and vital truths in American history to the minds of American school children, the American citizenry of the future.

Acquisition of Naval and Air Bases

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SHERMAN MINTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 11 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

ADDRESS BY JAMES W. RYAN

Mr. MINTON. Mr. President, on September 10, 1940, before the American Bar Association's Section of International Law, meeting at Philadelphia, Pa., a distinguished international lawyer, James W. Ryan, Esq., of New York, delivered a very interesting and informative address on the action of the President in taking necessary measures to acquire nearby naval and air bases and the legality thereof. I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I shall endeavor to answer the criticisms that have been made of the so-called "method" and the legality of the President's action in acquiring the naval bases in exchange for the destroyers.

The discussion of the Hague Conventions of 1907, and particularly of articles 6 and 8 of Hague Convention XIII, is beside the point,

because those conventions, and particularly Hague Convention XIII, contain an express general provision in article 28 that "The provisions of the present convention do not apply except between contracting powers, and then only if all the belligerents are parties to the convention." The conventions are therefore obviously inapplicable because one of the belligerents, England, is not a party to them. The Supreme Court of the United States decided in the case of *Littlejohn & Co.* v. *United States* (270 U. S. 215), where two articles of the Hague Conventions of 1907 were relied on, that as they were inapplicable to the United States during the World War, "In the absence of convention every government may pursue what policy it thinks best" unless there is a "uniform or commonly accepted rule of international law" on the point. There has been no such uniform or commonly accepted rule with respect to a neutral selling warships, for an adequate or equivalent consideration to a belligerent because Germany herself as late as the year 1905 was following a practice, while neutral, of selling warships to one of the belligerents (Russia) in the Russian-Japanese War. In *The Santissima Trinidad* (7 Wheat. U. S. 283), the sale of an armed ship was considered a simple sale of contraband.

England, in the *Alabama* claims case, was held liable solely because of the arbitrators' application of a special new rule to which she agreed as the basis for the arbitrators' decision, and she always maintained, and others have supported her, that that special rule did not represent actual international law or practice (United States, Papers Relating to the Treaty of Washington, vol. II, Geneva Arbitration, 1872, pp. 217–218). The gift of warships by a neutral to a belligerent, without adequate consideration, such, as I understand, General Pershing suggested, would under international law and in fact be aiding the belligerent and a violation of a neutral's duties, although as late as the end of the eighteenth century "it was considered permissible for a state to assist one belligerent without abandoning neutrality" (Jessup and Deak, "Neutrality: Its History," vol. I, p. 24 ff.), and as late as the World War the United States declared to Austria-Hungary that it was not lacking in impartiality in supplying the armed forces of England and not those of Austria-Hungary (United States Foreign Relations, 1915, Supp., p. 795); but, on the facts, that question does not arise here. Indeed, none of the questions arise here which are suggested by the President's critics and which are based on isolated, special, and subordinate rules with respect to transfer of warships to a belligerent, because underlying all of those rules and all of international law is the primary and basic principal rule that every nation in a time of national emergency may properly take necessary measures for self-protection by increasing its national defense and military strength, and that is the substance of what the President did in acquiring the naval bases in exchange for the destroyers. Even the critics have to admit that the net effect of the transaction was to make a vital and urgently necessary increase in our means of national self-protection against a danger presently threatening us.

In determining whether Congress intended by section 5 of the act of March 3, 1883 (U. S. C., title 34, sec. 492), section 3 of title V of the act of June 15, 1917 (40 Stat. 217, 222), section 14a of the act of June 28, 1940 (Public, No. 671), or other act of Congress to restrict the President's action in acquiring necessary naval bases in exchange for destroyers, there are two main questions to be considered. The first is whether Congress intended to restrict the President's powers in connection with increasing our country's national defense when in his judgment, as the Chief Executive or as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, such increase could be effected and had become urgently necessary. The second question is whether, even if such intention of Congress did exist, such statutes purporting to restrict the President's constitutional powers and action in protecting the country by action of an Executive nature in the military field and in the field of foreign relations would be valid. Those questions are the substance of the matter; and after careful consideration of the law and of the various criticisms made of the President's action, it seems to me that they must both be answered in the negative. The fact acknowledged by everyone is that the President's action was necessary to our national defense and would increase our national military strength. The statutes mentioned were limited to Congress' field of domestic relations and were intended by Congress merely, during a war when we were neutral, to prevent private citizens, subordinate officials, or aliens in this country from sending vessels equipped as warships to belligerents. Those statutes nowhere mention the President or Chief Executive, and were not intended to restrict the official or governmental acts of our Government through the Chief Executive, acting vicariously as the technical sovereign in the field of foreign relations, and were merely an incidental aid by Congress to him in prohibiting, as a matter of domestic or municipal law, private individuals from invading the constitutional field of foreign relations, in which he determines and carries out our country's policies. Those statutes had as their historical origin the efforts of countries after the Declaration of Paris in 1856 to prevent privateers or privately owned and controlled warships from participating informally for profit in a war to which their countries were not parties. They are more matters of domestic prohibitions or municipal law in this and certain other countries rather than rules of international law or settled and uniform international practice.

It is an elementary canon of legal interpretation that the Government's own executive officers are presumptively not intended to be bound by a statute unless named in it (*Guarantee Title & Trust Co.* v. *Title Guaranty Co.*, 224 U. S. 152; *United States* v. *Herron*, 20 Wall. 251; *In re Fowble*, 213 Fed. 676). As said by Mr. Justice Story in *United States* v. *Hoar* (26 Fed. Cas. 329, 330):

"In general, acts of the Legislature are meant to regulate and direct the acts and rights of citizens; and in most cases the reasoning applicable to them applies with very different and often contrary force to the Government itself. It appears to me, therefore, to be a safe rule founded in the principles of the common law that the general words of a statute ought not to include the Government, or affect its rights, unless that construction be clear and indisputable upon the text of the act."

The rule is the same in England—that the Crown is unaffected by acts of Parliament not specifically directed against it (*Dollar* v. *United States*, 19 Wall. 227, 239). And even though the statute were clearly applicable to all Government officials functioning in the field of domestic affairs, and therefore within Congress' jurisdiction, it would still not be applicable to the President when functioning as the technical sovereign or Government representative plenipotentiary in his supreme and exclusive constitutional field of foreign relations. (See *United States* v. *California*, 297 U. S. 175, 186; and *Nardone* v. *United States*, 302 U. S. 379.) The statutes must, under the settled legal rules of interpretation, be read in the light of the fact that Congress' power in the field of foreign relations is limited by the Constitution to declaring war and regulating foreign commerce, and, in the case of the Senate, to ratifying treaties entered into by the President. Anything in the field of foreign relations short of actually declaring war, and short of making effective without Senate ratification a treaty incorporating a rule for future activities of the countries (and of their subjects) signing the treaty, is exclusively within the province of the President according to the constitutional distribution of governmental powers as determined by the Supreme Court of the United States, and every act of Congress must be interpreted accordingly and in the light of that lack of constitutional jurisdiction and power of Congress in the greater part of the field of our country's foreign relations. Congress merely possesses rule-making powers bearing incidentally on our foreign relations which are "cognate to the conduct by him (the President) of the foreign relations of the Government" (*Panama Ref. Co.* v. *Ryan*, 293 U. S. 388, 422). In the case of *United States* v. *Curtiss-Wright Corporation*, 299 U. S. 304 (at pp. 319 and 320), decided on December 21, 1936, the Supreme Court said:

"Not only, as we have shown, is the Federal power over external affairs in origin and essential character different from that over internal affairs, but participation in the exercise of the power is significantly limited. In this vast external realm, with its important, complicated, delicate, and manifold problems, the President alone has the power to speak or listen as a representative of the Nation. He makes treaties with the advice and consent of the Senate; but he alone negotiates. Into the field of negotiation the Senate cannot intrude; and Congress itself is powerless to invade it. As Marshall said in his great argument of March 7, 1800, in the House of Representatives, 'The President is the sole organ of the Nation in its external relations, and its sole representative with foreign nations.' Annals, Sixth Congress, column 613. The Senate Committee on Foreign Relations at a very early day in our history (February 15, 1816), reported to the Senate, among other things, as follows:

" 'The President is the constitutional representative of the United States with regard to foreign nations. He manages our concerns with foreign nations and must necessarily be most competent to determine when, how, and upon what subjects negotiation may be urged with the greatest prospect of success. For his conduct he is responsible to the Constitution. The committee consider this responsibility the surest pledge for the faithful discharge of his duty. They think the interference of the Senate in the direction of foreign negotiations calculated to diminish that responsibility and thereby to impair the best security for the national safety. The nature of transactions with foreign nations, moreover, requires caution and unity of design, and their success frequently depends on secrecy and dispatch.' United States Senate, Reports, Committee on Foreign Relations, volume 8, page 24.

"It is important to bear in mind that we are here dealing not alone with an authority vested in the President by an exertion of legislative power, but with such an authority plus the very delicate, plenary, and exclusive power of the President as the sole organ of the Federal Government in the field of international relations—a power which does not require as a basis for its exercise an act of Congress, but which, of course, like every other governmental power, must be exercised in subordination to the applicable provisions of the Constitution."

The President's action in acquiring the naval bases by Executive agreement, expressly purporting to be of final character, was a "governmental act" (*Banco de España* v. *Federal Reserve Bank, United States* (C. C. A. 2, July 8, 1940)) of this country which is binding, and which requires no approval by Congress or ratification by the Senate on any theory that it was a treaty or rule-announcing convention rather than an Executive agreement. The transaction was merely a purchase of leaseholds as a site for naval bases, for a consideration consisting of destroyers or property within the President's control, and no funds were required to be appropriated by Congress to make the agreement effective. Congress was therefore not a necessary or proper party in the matter. It was simply a functioning of the Chief Executive in his proper field of foreign relations. The difference between a treaty and an Executive agreement is, in substance, the same as the difference, often pointed out by the Supreme Court, between a rule, regulation, or law within Congress' jurisdiction, and an administrative act or Executive functioning within the President's exclusive jurisdiction. *Panama Ref. Co.* v. *Ryan* (293 U. S. 388, 421–423); *Schechter Corporation* v. *United*

States (295 U. S. 495, 530); *United States* v. *Shreveport Grain Co.* (287 U. S. 77, 85). Congress, under the Constitution, is merely a rule-making body, and it is only when the President is agreeing on rules with foreign countries that congressional approval, through the Senate, becomes proper or necessary. This limitation exists on Congress even in domestic affairs, as the Supreme Court has many times pointed out.

On the question whether a prohibition by Congress directed against acts of private citizens or aliens in sending warships from this country is intended by Congress to also prohibit the executive officials of the Government from using their best discretion in performing their duties, several analogies suggest themselves. For instance, it is a crime to assault or attack a man. The statutes prohibit it without qualification. Yet it is no offense for a public official to use necessary force in making an arrest or otherwise performing a public duty and the general criminal statute is inapplicable to him because, as the courts put it, the legislature did not intend by the unqualified language in the general prohibitory statute to prevent the public or police official from using such force as he finds necessary to make the arrest and thus protect the community from a danger threatening it. It is also a violation of law to take money from a man without his consent. It is larceny or theft. Yet public officials take money from persons in this country without their consent in collecting taxes in the ordinary performance of the governmental function, and these taxes are collected because they, in the Government officials' opinion, are necessary to protect the community by employing policemen or firemen, or acquiring police stations, jails, fire houses, or other bases for the performance of public functions.

Nor was, as I have already indicated, the President's action in violation of international law. The Hague conventions have nothing to do with the question here involved because those conventions expressly provide that the new rules incorporated in them were not to be followed, excepting during a war in which "all the belligerents are parties to the convention." Article 28 of Hague Convention XIII of October 18, 1907, 36 U. S. Stats. at Large 2415, provides:

"ART. 28. The provisions of the present convention do not apply except between contracting powers, and then only if all the belligerents are parties to the convention."

The same provision is in article 20 of Hague Convention V of October 18, 1907 (36 U. S. Stat. L. 2310). It is common knowledge that during the present war all of the belligerents are not parties to the Hague conventions. Great Britain, one of the two principal belligerents, is not a party to any of them. By special agreement during the last war, Great Britain became a party to article 6 of Hague Convention VI of 1907 (*The Blonde*, L. R. (1922), 1 App. Cas. 313, at p. 325), but before the present war began it denounced that and the other articles in the Hague conventions (*The Pomona*, Lloyd's Reports of Prize Cases (second series), vol. 1, p. 1).

So far as evidence of what the rules of international law were preceding the Hague Conventions of 1907, and still are, the best statement of the vague and unsettled condition of those rules was made after the Hague Conventions of 1907, by William I. Hull, professor of History in Swarthmore College, who attended the conventions, and who stated at page 479 of his treaties on "The Two Hague Conferences and Their Contributions to International Law" (Ginn & Co., Boston, 1908), as follows:

"The regulation of warfare on the sea was a task full of difficulties both technical and delicate. The questions discussed were burning ones which recent bitter events had made prominent, and every one had to be considered from the point of view of both belligerent and neutral, while the interests of both continental and maritime powers had to be reconciled.

"The Congress of Paris of 1856 and the Peace Conference of 1899, with their handful of rules, were the only precursors of the Second Conference in the vast task of regulating naval warfare. To the four or five former rules, the Second Conference added a full score; and its deliberations upon questions still unsolved will undoubtedly become the basis of the future solutions of several other knotty problems."

In the recent treatise on international law by Oppenheim (Oppenheim International Law, 5th ed., vol. 2, sec. 334, pp. 574–576), it is stated that the rule of international law is that a neutral nation shall not permit its subjects or other persons within its territory to aid one of the belligerents by manning a warship with a fighting crew, "so that she can commit hostilities at once after having reached the open sea." He states that such manning with fighting crews is the test under international law of whether or not a neutral nation is permitting its ports to be used as a base of naval operations for one of the belligerents. There is no such question of "manning" involved in the present situation with respect to the destroyers. Congress, therefore, was not required by international law to enact the statute prohibiting the mere building and sending of warships to belligerents by private individuals. In this instance, as in the Neutrality Act of 1939, it went further in giving up our national rights as a neutral than it was required to do by international law. But because it did so is surely the most tenuous of grounds for contending that it was trying to hamstring the President in the performance of his constitutional functions in the field of foreign relations and in the military field in increasing our national defense to protect us from existing threats or dangers.

The President's action was both necessary for our national defense and did have the effect on the whole of greatly increasing it. The intention of the President's action, therefore, from a legal and realistic point of view was to do what he did do, namely, take necessary measures for our national defense and not merely to aid one of the belligerents. The popular conception that any action taken by a neutral which incidentally aids one of the belligerents is a violation of international law is clearly wrong, as an examination of the rules of international law in any of the leading treatises or reported court decisions will show. A notable instance of this is the fact that international law permits the citizens of neutral countries to carry on commercial trade in arms or armaments with one of the belligerents and not with the other. This was all gone over in the debates in connection with enactment of the Neutrality Act or Arms Embargo Repeal Act of 1939.

The propriety of the action of the President as the Executive or Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy in acquiring title, of a leasehold nature or otherwise, to new possessions in foreign countries for purposes of national defense or national self-preservation cannot seriously be questioned under either international law or our own Constitution and laws. And if the predominant intention was to make a necessary increase in our national defense in an emergency, the fact that the price paid for acquiring the leaseholds consisted, not of moneys, but of certain old destroyers not an essential part of our Navy, would not constitute an unneutral act under either international law or our national laws. There is no rule of international law prohibiting a nation from taking necessary action for its self-defense in a time of national emergency. Self-preservation is, in the field of international law as elsewhere, the primary law to which all other rules are subordinate. The only real question, therefore, is whether or not the action taken by the President was, in this time of emergency, necessary for our national defense and did increase our national strength. If it was necessary, and did increase our strength, then it was proper under international law.

The question whether the President or Congress is the one charged with the jurisdiction of determining whether or not the action is necessary for national defense is a mere question of domestic or local law. This point was recently reaffirmed by the United States Circuit Court of Appeals at New York, on July 8, 1940, in the case of *Banco de Espana* v. *Federal Reserve Bank of New York*. The court said: "By a 'governmental act' is meant no more than a step physically taken by persons capable of exercising the sovereign authority of the foreign nation. The officials of the then recognized Spanish Government possessed such authority. If they purported to act in their official capacity, that physical fact precludes us from examining the validity of their acts under local law." The rules of international law with respect to the duties of neutral nations and belligerents are concerned only with governmental acts.

On this secondary question, the President under our Constitution, as the representative of our country in its dealings with foreign nations, and as the Commander in Chief of our military and naval forces charged with the duty of taking action necessary for national defense, is the proper person to determine what is urgently necessary for national defense and take the necessary steps accordingly. This is, of course, unless—as is clearly not the case here—the action involved is of a treaty nature, such as an agreement with respect to future activities of a general character of the citizens or governments of both countries.

On analysis, it is evident that what the opponents of the President's action are really contending is that it is a violation of international law for a nation to take necessary steps in self-defense when danger of war and attack are threatening it. This is, I submit, an absurd position to take and wholly without foundation in international law or reason. There is no rule in any field of jurisprudence prohibiting a country or an individual from taking necessary steps in self-protection to ward off danger of attack. Nor is there, except in the case of Denmark, any instance in history in which a country has intentionally refrained from maintaining a reasonable and necessary amount of military strength because of lack of intention to resist any unwarranted attack on it by other nations. Denmark did so because of a belief that she could not make herself strong enough to successfully resist unwarranted attack by Germany. Surely our country can make itself strong enough to resist unwarranted attack and should do so in view of what we have learned of the fatal results of Denmark's policy.

The proposition that a nation which is merely making a necessary increase in its national defense in the face of imminent danger is violating international law is simply untenable, and those criticizing the President's action because of supposed violation of certain acts of Congress are really saying in substance that Congress intended to prohibit the President from making necessary increases in national defense when danger of war was threatening. There is no such language in any of those acts of Congress, nor did Congress, as a matter of historical fact, have any such intention, or even discuss that matter, unrelated to what it was doing, in the committee hearings or in the debates in Congress.

Even when setting up the Constitution of the League of Nations and the rules to be followed by nations belonging to it, it was agreed by everyone that the primary right of self-defense by each country must be preserved and wars declared for self-defense were excluded from every one of the prohibitions in the League of Nations set-up.

If the President had need of congressional action, such as an appropriation of money in order to take the action that he did, then it might be argued with some plausibility that he should have consulted with or obtained the approval of Congress because of the necessity of obtaining a congressional appropriation. But there was no such appropriation necessary here, and, furthermore, Congress had already appropriated money for a general purpose for increasing our national defense, to be expended in the President's discretion, which, if money was necessary, could properly have been used to meet our Government's needs in completing any leases to the United

States of naval bases so as to make them immediately available to us. The fact, moreover, is, as reported in the press, that both the minority leader of the Senate and the minority leader of the House, as well as the majority leaders, did have actual knowledge of the executive agreement before it was effected. Furthermore the suggestion that a long delay should have been arranged, awaiting committee hearings and protracted debates in Congress so that congressional approval could be obtained in advance, assumes what is evidently not a fact, that such delay would not have deprived our country of the opportunity of effecting the agreement.

The action of the President, therefore, in acquiring the naval bases in exchange for the destroyers was proper and necessary, and did not conflict with either international law or our own Constitution and laws.

The Two Conventions, the Two Platforms, and the Two Candidates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 11, 1940

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the 1940 Presidential campaign will be very unusual in many ways. This will be the first time any man ever asked the people to elect him to the Presidency for a third successive term. This will be the first time that any candidate dictated his own nomination although he claimed he did not want it. This will be the first time a Presidential nominee said he would refuse to accept the nomination which he had gotten for himself unless the convention would nominate his individual choice for Vice President. This was the first time that the wife of a sitting President addressed the convention in her husband's interest. And this is the first time in the history of the Nation that the people openly expressed fear that if the third-term President is elected they may never have another Presidential election.

THE TWO CONVENTIONS

Because of the distrust of political bosses the people demanded the direct primary system. Despite much agitation for a national Presidential primary, sentiment favoring it has not crystallized sufficiently yet. The recent New Deal Convention in Chicago has stirred up animosities that may be the necessary impetus to provide some system that may prevent the repetition of another such political fiasco. Honeyed words and cryptic wise cracks by Mr. Roosevelt will not assuage the wounded feelings of the Jeffersonian Democrats between now and November. The Chicago convention brought to all of us the solemn warning that the usurpation by the Executive of the powers of the other branches of our Government is becoming dangerous. Fear of another 4 years of reckless executive usurpation by Roosevelt gives justification for the fears of those who think that they may not again be permitted a free selection of candidates for the Presidency. Laying aside all consideration of partisanship and considering only the indisputable facts it must be said that the Democratic Convention at Chicago was completely dominated by one man. I repeat, one lone man many miles away controlled every action of that convention. He not only dictated his own nomination but defied the overwhelming wishes of the delegates and compelled the nomination of Mr. Wallace for Vice President. His threat of refusing his own nomination unless his wishes in this respect were granted sounded like Hitler. And this is the same man who upon the occasion of his entering upon his second term said:

I am by no means satisfied with having twice been elected President of the United States by very large majorities. I have an even greater ambition. My ambition relates to January 20, 1941. My great ambition on January 20, 1941, is to turn over this desk and chair in the White House to my successor.

Such shocking insincere usurpation has not been matched by any high public man in the history of the Republic. Such supine and abject surrender by one of the leading political parties of the United States has never before disgraced our political life. The new dealers of pink and various hues captured the citadels of democracy.

The Chicago convention was a terrible experience for the Jeffersonian Democrats. Silently, one by one, these once bright stars in democracy's brilliant firmament fade out. Silently they are placed on the shelf of history. Cactus Jack rides silently to the last round-up. No more shall his sharp commanding sentences be heard in Democratic councils or in the National Capitol. Jim Farley—genial Jim—has been purged out of the party by political paregoric prescribed by "Harold the Ick" and "Harry the Hop." But when the spotty new dealers shall have passed off into the graveyard of political pirates Jim may be heard of again. Call the roll of other Democrats who could not stomach the New Deal—John Hanes, Lew Douglas, the best financial brains in the Democratic Party; President Charles Seymour, of Yale, a great scholar, has learned a new lesson in political science; also George White, ex-Governor of Ohio, a Democrat respected by all Ohio Democrats. All these illustrious men and thousands of others to whom the New Deal is political anathema, are taking their places in the ranks of the Republican Party headed by Wendell L. Willkie, who, like themselves, is striving to unify our people and to restore America to the high estate from which she has descended through New Deal fantastic and foolish experimentation. My views as to the Chicago convention are approved by practically all the great news writers of the day. Frank Kent says:

It is certainly true that not in a generation has there been a convention of either party in which the fake was so thinly disguised. Perhaps the American people are not very discerning in these matters. Slow to suspect their heroes of duplicity, they are apt to accept at face value the statements and postures of popular men in high positions. Unquestionably they do swallow an almost incredible amount of demagogic junk. But so crude and rancid was the article served in Chicago that it seems impossible they should not at least have smelt it, even if they did not wholly understand it.

Elmer Fries, of the Columbus Dispatch, said:

And make no mistake about it. Mr. Roosevelt's contemptuous disregard for the third-term tradition, and the conspiracy of administration saboteurs in Chicago to deprive delegates of freedom of action, mean just that—the first unconcealed step on the road to dictatorship.

For superlative hypocrisy and consummate perfidy Roosevelt's message poll-parroted to the convention and the country through "Dear ALBEN" BARKLEY was the climax. It broke all records. This message is in itself so unusual as to be beyond description. Here it is:

I and other close friends of the President have long known that he has no wish to be a candidate again. We know too that in no way whatsoever has he exerted any influence in the selection of delegates or on the opinions of delegates to this convention.

Tonight at the specific request and authorization of the President I am making this simple fact clear to this convention.

The President never has and has not today any desire or purpose to continue in the office of President, to be a candidate for that office, or to be nominated by the convention for that office.

He wishes in all earnestness and sincerity to make it clear that all the delegates to this convention are free to vote for any candidate.

That is the message I bear to you from the President of the United States by authority of his word.

Of this message Raymond Clapper says:

Up to the time of that message I have had faith in Mr. Roosevelt. I have so no longer.

Of this message Hugh Johnson said:

Maybe it is possible to ride a lie to victory. Hitler says it is and seems to have proved it for the moment. If political position, patronage, and favor could pervert all delegates to a great convention, perhaps it could pervert a majority of the voters of a great people. I don't believe it.

And Frank Kent says:

The hypocrisy of that message establishes a record. * * * In view of the absolutely known facts, the falseness of the message was shocking. Not even a President should be privileged to perpetrate so obvious a fraud without having it branded.

THE PHILADELPHIA CONVENTION

The Philadelphia convention stands in striking contrast to the Chicago fiasco. No convention in the history of the

Republic was more free from bossism. Everything was open and aboveboard. A few days before the convention a new name was occasionally suggested. Willkie was comparatively unknown. He had for years been a voice, crying in the wilderness, against the ruthless destruction of his business by the Government in its socialistic experiment known as the T. V. A. Congress heard his voice and in 1938 appointed a committee to make an investigation of this new experiment. This investigation brought to light some of the facts in this controversy and Willkie felt encouraged to talk back to the President. The businessmen of the country recognized Willkie as the Moses who could lead them out of their tribulations. He spoke fearlessly when others almost feared to breathe. Timorously at first they encouraged his candidacy. But when the common people began to find out about the strong warm personality of this man Willkie and to sing from every corner of the land "we want Willkie," these businessmen from all sections, especially the small-business men came forward with a rush. This momentum plus the enthusiasm of the common people, met in Philadelphia in an irresistible confluence that carried Willkie to the crest of the wave and brought him the nomination for the Presidency. So compelling was this victory that those contesting with him and their adherents, overwhelmingly convinced of the fairness of his victory unanimously accorded him the plaudits due a worthy victor. There, in that convention, well after midnight, with the whole Nation listening in, Wendell Willkie was proclaimed as the Republican nominee amid scenes of joy and friendliness that bespoke determination on the part of the people to change things in Washington. No candidate for the Presidency ever launched his campaign with a more united support of the people and of his party. The people love a fair, open contest.

THE TWO PLATFORMS

The political platforms are usually too long. Having been a member of the platform committee at the Philadelphia convention I am not surprised that it is difficult to write a brief platform. Platforms are written under pressure and are fearfully and wonderfully made.

THE NEW DEAL PLATFORM

The New Deal platform for 1940 is a picture of the legislative career of Senator WAGNER, of New York, who no doubt wrote it. It deals practically altogether with social-welfare legislation and seeks to give credit to the New Deal party for all the social advancement of our country. It fails to give credit to the many progressive social advancements made under Republican administrations. It fails to note the terrible fact that there are many millions of young men and women in America today between the ages of 20 and 28 years who came to maturity during the New Deal administration and who never at any time in their lives have had a regular job. It fails to bring any hope to those on the relief rolls who would again like to take their places in the ranks of those who enjoy the freedom of having a real job. All it promises them is a continuation of dependency. The war scare may take many thousands of the young men into the Army and the defense spending may put some men to work. But it will be remembered that history proves that dictators plunged their people into war in order to cover up their own shortcomings. War is not a prosperity that enriches.

The New Deal platform recommends a way of life similar to that advocated by Hitler and Mussolini, yet admonishes us against results such as obtain in these nations. In effect they want Hitler's power but they deny any intention to bring about Hitler's results.

In capital letters the platform claims that it is proud of the New Deal record in providing defense against outside aggression. In this it cannot be sincere. Witness the terrific expenditures for defense purposes during the past 6 years for which practically nothing by way of defense can be shown. Practically no airplanes, no tanks, no equipment of any kind. Witness also the fact that in this the present session of Congress, which convened last January, we have appropriated over $14,000,000,000 for defense. We are so far behind that we will not be able to put 2,000,000 men in the field fully equipped until the middle of 1944.

The New Deal platform has in it many very amusing sentences. It says:

We have revived confidence, opened the road to all honorable business. We have given the ordinary citizen a chance to go into business and stay in business. We promise to safeguard the farmers' foreign markets and expand his domestic market.

Past experiences have shown that platform promises mean nothing to the New Deal. In 1932 they promised:

An immediate and drastic reduction of governmental expenditures, by abolishing useless commissions and offices, consolidating departments and bureaus, and eliminating extravagance, to accomplish a saving of not less than 25 percent in the cost of Federal Government.

They did the opposite—

Maintenance of the national credit by a Federal Budget annually balanced on the basis of accurate Executive estimates within revenues, raised by a system of taxation levied on the principle of ability to pay.

They did the opposite—

A comparative tariff for revenue, with a fact-finding tariff commission free from executive interference.

They did the opposite. In 1936 they said:

We shall continue just treatment of our war veterans and their dependents.

They did the opposite—

The farmer has been returned to the road to freedom and prosperity.

This is not true—

The worker has been returned to the road to freedom and prosperity.

This is not true—

The American businessman has been returned to the road to freedom and prosperity.

This is not true.

THE REPUBLICAN PLATFORM

The Republican platform was not intended to be a catalog of alluring promises. Rather was it intended to be a fair statement of conditions and to point a fair, reasonable, and constitutional way out of our terrible economic and financial dilemma. The Republican candidate will stand on this platform. He will run on this platform. He will chart his course by this platform after he is elected. It is hoped that this platform will be like the tree that was "planted by the rivers of water" and will be "for the healing of the Nation."

The Republican platform was written before the New Deal platform. The New Deal party from the standpoint of sportsmanship at least should have been courageous enough to have made good on its boasts and to have called its convention before the Republican convention and courageously given to the world a recital of its accomplishments, if any, with a foreword for its future. It left it to the Republican Party to lay down the gage of battle.

Without equivocation the Republican platform meets the great war issue in a frontal attack. In the first paragraph, after the introduction, we say "The Republican Party is firmly opposed to involving this Nation in foreign war." The New Deal platform says:

The American people are determined that war raging in Europe, Asia, and Africa shall not come to America. We will not participate in foreign wars and we will not send our Army or Navy or air forces to fight in any foreign war outside the Americas, except in case of attack.

This statement was prepared to match the frank statement in the Republican platform but when it is considered in the light of Mr. Roosevelt's conduct of international affairs it rings of insincerity. Whatever words they employ must be interpreted in the light of Mr. Roosevelt's actions. The American people know that the President's actions have been boastful, reckless, and dangerous to our national safety.

LET US COMPARE THE PLATFORMS FURTHER

The New Deal platform says:

We pledge to continue our fair treatment of American war veterans and their dependents.

The President has always been hostile to the cause of the veterans, and the New Deal has refused to enact any legislation favorable to veterans. This platform promises to do no more than the President has done, which is to be hostile.

The Republican platform speaking on this subject says:

We pledge adequate compensation and care for veterans disabled in the service of our country and for their widows, orphans, and dependents.

The Republican Party has traditionally been the friend of the veteran.

The new dealers dispose of unemployment—one of our most important problems—by drawing around them the cloak of self-satisfaction with what they have done. They say "we have rescued millions from idleness," meaning that they put them on W. P. A. "We shall continue to recognize the obligation of government to provide work," and so forth. They then promise that they will call under the direction of the President a "national unemployment conference." If the solution is that easy, why was not such a conference called years ago? They then throw out this sop which is too childish to deceive. They say, "There is work in our factories, mines, fields, forests, and river basins, on our coast, highways, railroads, and inland waterways." Where is this work? Ten million idle persons would like to know.

Contrary to this typical New Deal view of the terrible plight of the unemployed of this country, let me read what the Republican platform says. It makes one think of what happened in America when McKinley was elected after the terrible panic during the previous Democratic administration. It says:

We propose to re-create opportunity for the youth of America and put our idle millions back to work in private industry, business, and agriculture. We propose to eliminate needless administrative restrictions, thus restoring lost motion to the wheels of individual enterprise.

This is a forthright promise to get rid of New Deal threats to business and New Deal wastefulness and give business a chance to go ahead and give employment to millions who are tired of the present system.

The Republican platform speaks out clearly on the labor question. It recognizes the great progress made by those who work in industry in advancing their economic welfare and promises to maintain that progress. It encourages collective bargaining so that those who employ and those who work may settle their own differences "directly and voluntarily across the table." The New Deal platform, in a flood of long sentences and beautiful words, makes it appear that all labor problems have been solved and that there is not much left to do. I wish the miners and many others in my district felt the same way about it. Let us not be deceived by high-sounding phrases. There are millions in organized labor out of employment and there are millions outside of organized labor who are unable to earn enough upon which to live. One-third of the workers in America live on less than $500 per year and two-thirds live on less than $1,000. Many of these are not within the protection of organized labor. They suffer just because the economic structure of our Nation has been torn down by New Deal theorists.

Promises of the new dealers to agriculture fall on deaf ears. The farmers know that their plight is a serious one, brought on by foolish experiments such as plowing up the crops and slaughtering the pigs and cattle. Mr. Wallace's doctrine of scarcity will be the mark of disgrace that time and history will put on the New Deal administration. How silly and unreasonable it is to pay for not raising a crop when millions are in dire need.

The Republican platform promises to provide employment to those millions who now are half fed and thereby stimulate the demand for the farm products. Give the consumer something with which to buy sufficient food, and the situation of agriculture will be greatly improved. The Republican platform says that—

The Republican Party will put into effect such governmental policies as will create increased consumer buying power for agricultural products.

It is common knowledge that the New Deal has its knife out for the insurance companies of the country. It wants to bring them, with their enormous resources, away from State supervision and under the supervision of the Corcorans and Cohens of the New Deal. Hidden away in the platform are these words:

We favor strict supervision of all forms of the insurance business by the several States for the protection of the policyholders and the people.

This means that they want to put insurance companies under the New Deal. They scent a chance to destroy the competition that insurance companies are giving to New Deal Government insurance of all kinds.

Contrast the forthright statement of the Republican platform. It says:

We condemn the New Deal attempts to destroy the confidence of our people in private insurance institutions. We favor continuance of regulation of insurance by the several States.

So on down through many instances that we could cite it can be seen that the New Deal platform is typically New Deal: It seeks to regiment the every activity, financial, economic, and physical, of our people.

The New Deal platform fails to mention the terrible debt under which the Nation is operating. The new dealers do not see anything worthy of mentioning in the fact that the receipts into the Public Treasury are only about sixteen million per day, yet the Government is spending nearly forty million per day. To owe the greatest debt that ever staggered any nation in the history of the world means nought to them.

Neither the international relations nor the great unemployment nor the terriffic debt worry the new dealers. Their minds are set on taking from him who has and giving to him who has not, without regard to the rights or responsibilities of either. Individual effort, individual courage, individual genius, individual thrift and sacrifice, according to the New Deal, have ceased to be American virtues. Stronger and stronger grows the Government in its power to control the every action of the individual. The New Deal platform seeks to give the individual a sedative and then to take from him his individual liberty.

THE TWO CANDIDATES

National campaigns are sometimes waged on issues and sometimes on the personality of the candidates and sometimes on both. The campaign of 1940 will have plenty of issues and plenty of personality. In 1920 when Harding and Cox, both from Ohio, waged their campaign, the personality of either was not stressed. The whole battle was waged on an issue of whether the United States should join the League of Nations. The people decided against joining the League of Nations and Harding won. The campaign of 1928 between Hoover and Al Smith was one of personalities. The people weighed the two men and appraised their character and availability. They chose Mr. Hoover not so much because of what he stood for politically as what he stood for personally. So in this campaign we will find two men with very unusual personalities. Both have charm and magnetism. Roosevelt has suavity and political cunning. Willkie has the vigor of youth, natural courtesy, warmth of personality, and a forcefulness begotten of courage and convictions.

There will be the third term, and the record made by Roosevelt, and the war situation with its future uncertain developments. Willkie will assail Roosevelt's record in many respects. Willkie's forceful character, aided by the vulnerability of the New Deal record, will put Roosevelt on the defensive. In attempting to explain his usurpation of the functions of the Government Roosevelt will be put to the limit of his sophistry. An explanation of how and when he expects to pay the colossal debt will probably require more than his usual expression "my friends." How he will remove from the minds of the people that he is, and has always been, for war, and that he has always been for universal

conscription of boys and girls, will test his capacity for composing happy ambiguities. The New Deal "brain trusters" who have provided the strategy and ideas for the Roosevelt administration will be expected to furnish to their chief their best. Theorists thrive best when they are holding the political telescopes on calm water. There is where they can dream dreams and see visions. But when they are faced with stern opposition, where the waves beat high and the lightning flash and no theoretical stars can be seen, then they do not do so well. The campaign may bring Mr. Roosevelt to the realization of what a dollar means, and that the things that are are more realistic than the things that might be. This battle of personalities and issues will be one where beautiful phrases melodiously spoken must give way to sharp, short, meaningful words. Where the man on the white horse must get off and walk with the crowd. Where the chart and compass of certainty must displace the dreams of wild-eyed theorists. Willkie will demand to know by what witchery and legerdemain the New Deal has operated heretofore. The acid arrows of Ickes will not dent the shield or daunt the determination of this man Willkie who will push him back into obscurity, from whence he came. Neither the hand-picked Supreme Court nor the servile Morgenthau nor the Frankfurters nor the Altmeyers will prevent Willkie from showing the people just how the Government has been operated.

My friends, get ready for the greatest campaign of the century. A strong young man, with the convincing oratory of a Bryan, with the smashing personality of Teddy Roosevelt, is leading millions of Americans in a battle to return the Government to the people. Insincerity and excuses will not suffice. Usurpation of power and abandonment of priceless traditions of government must cease. Defiance of those homely virtues of thrift, decency, and common honesty have been carried too long and too far. Punitive government by threats and by encouraging class against class must be supplanted by a spirit of unity which will make America feel that we are again a Government of the people whose sole aim is to do what is best for the people.

Two conventions: One, with the freedom that marks things typically American, nominated the man that the delegates thought the people wanted. The other, reminiscent of Europe, listened to dictation. Who nominated Mussolini? Mussolini did. Who nominated Hitler? Hitler did. Who nominated Stalin? Stalin did. And who nominated Roosevelt? Roosevelt did. Will the analogy carry through? The fear it might is the principal reason why it will not.

The platforms: One without boasting or bombast promises to recapture the Government and restore it to the people. The other with boastful egotism justifies every act of the New Deal and promises more New Deal.

The candidates: One with a Messianic complex, from his pinnacle of power, looks down the corridors of the past and fails to see Washington or Jefferson or Jackson. He looks forward through the corridors of the future and thinks he sees himself as the indispensable man, the greatest man who ever lived.

The other, a typical country boy, who because of industry and character has been elevated to a high place in the professional and business world, having no illusions of greatness only those which may come to any American boy.

They match their wits in what promises to be a great conflict. "Mene, mene tekel upharsin." "Thou art weighed in the balances and art found wanting" once wrote the moving finger. So might it be to him who feels greater than Washington or Jefferson or Lincoln. The young man with a conviction that his cause is just has gone forth to battle. A feeling that he must save his country is his shield, and a confidence that the people expect him to champion their cause is his sword. May he remember that the strong do not always win the battle and neither do the swift always win the race, but that to the true and the faithful victory is always promised.

Allegiance to America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE L. HERRING
OF IOWA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 11 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

ARTICLE BY HON. GUY M. GILLETTE, OF IOWA

Mr. HERRING. Mr. President, I ask leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial embodying an able article written by my colleague, the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], appearing in the Geode Echo, a C. C. C. camp publication, New London, Iowa.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Geode Echo (C. C. C. camp publication of New London, Iowa)]

We wrote a letter to Hon. GUY M. GILLETTE, United States Senator from Iowa and an ex-service man, for an article for the Geode Echo. We are pleased to publish in this issue one of the most stirring articles that we have read in a long time. This article should have a wide circulation.

"WE ARE AMERICANS

"(By U. S. Senator GUY M. GILLETTE)

"In these troublesome times, it is well for each of us to remember that the struggle for freedom dates back through the years. Our own Nation won its independence late in the history of the world. We are the youngest of nations, and yet, we are the oldest democracy. For over 150 years our people have had great national problems and out of this fire of trouble, we have forged a great Nation. A great man wrote our Declaration of Independence, but he was only putting into written form the aspirations, hopes, struggles, and sufferings of millions of men and women with the spark of liberty in their hearts and souls. It has been the determination of our people to preserve, at any sacrifice, this heritage that has made our Nation great.

"Washington faced a seemingly hopeless struggle with his starving army at Valley Forge. Andrew Jackson had the difficulties of serious national problems. Abraham Lincoln was called to serve them when his own people were in armed conflict of brother against brother. Time and again in our short national history our people have faced grim problems. Only the courage, faith, and confidence of noble citizens prevented our ruin. Patriotism is not the voice of one man or one group. It means the contributions that you and I and every other true American make to the cause.

"As individuals we have serious problems. I have spent sleepless nights of worry. Day after day, I have listened to the sad stories of fine people; a farmer losing his homestead after a lifetime of hard work; an honest laborer with family trying vainly to find a job; a businessman forced to abandon his factory with hundreds depending upon its operation; young men full of ambition and hope stifled in their effort to find a place in life. All of us have faced these conditions. We have tried to solve our problems and we must continue to do so.

"Taking our current problems with all the courage and confidence with which Americans of the past faced their difficulties, we have made tremendous strides in the direction of full solution and the betterment of the condition of all classes of our citizens.

"As individuals we have the right to protest against incompetency, indifference, and dishonesty of our officials. As individuals we have the right of free speech, freedom to write what we please, and privileges of petition to duly constituted authority. In our individual distress, we may cry out against conditions. Yet, as individuals we must realize that enjoyment of these rights demands full allegiance to the country that makes them possible. This allegiance must be complete in action, sympathy, and loyalty.

"On many an occasion in the past few years, I have tried to emphasize this complete and undiluted allegiance to our democracy and way of life. Regardless of our forefathers, we are now Americans. It is natural that we should remember the traditions and customs of the land of our forebears, but today we cannot let even a taint of that memory interfere with the good of America. There is no such hybrid as an English-American, German-American, Irish-American, or any other kind where there is even a partial conflict in loyalty.

"Each one of us enjoys 100 percent of all the rights and privileges of an American. There is no qualification to these rights. There can be no less than 100 percent loyalty to our country. With an American there cannot be even a small corner of our heart pledged to any other land. There is no such thing as dual allegiance. In

these days of conflict we must all be American in the complete sense of the word. The Stars and Stripes form the banner representing American traditions, American heritage, and American institutions and our way of life. Any citizen who permits partial allegiance to any other symbol to even subconsciously influence his action is doing himself and his country a disservice. Any man, group, or party that even by inference suggest the solution of our American problems by appeal to racial or national loyalties other than our own in these days, treads the dangerous ground of treason. Every drop of our blood must be undiluted 100 percent American. Our heritage of freedom that we now enjoy is not ours to defile. These inherited rights and liberties must be maintained and passed on to another generation of American children."

Labor and the Preparedness Program—Conscription

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENNETT CHAMP CLARK

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 11 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

LABOR DAY ADDRESS BY JOHN L. LEWIS

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by John L. Lewis on Labor Day. In the past I have very frequently disagreed with Mr. Lewis on public questions, and doubtless will frequently disagree with him in the future; but on Labor Day I happened to tune in on a superb address on the subject of the relationship of labor with the preparedness program, and also on the subject of conscription, which I think is one of the most masterly addresses to which I have ever listened. I am glad to take this opportunity to request that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am happy to extend greetings and my sincere good wishes to the hosts of labor who are assembled in countless gatherings throughout the country today.

Labor Day in 1940 finds labor and the things in which labor believes more in jeopardy than at any time during the history of the modern labor movement. The fears and tensions created by the wars in Europe have stirred to new effort the traditional enemies of labor. Some who have called themselves labor's friends are, through fear, scurrying to join the enemies of labor, hoping to gain for themselves a sort of dubious security.

I am glad to report that the Congress of Industrial Organizations and its affiliates are stronger than ever. I am cheered by that fact. I have just returned from a trip which took me to the far corners of the country. I was deeply impressed by the growing strength of the C. I. O., by the eagerness for organization on the part of those workers who have not yet had the opportunity to organize, and by the unanimity with which the common people of the country look to the C. I. O. for leadership in these trying days.

The C. I. O. has many hundreds of thousands of new members added to its ranks since last Labor Day. Each day brings new information of workers organized, of unions created, of elections won.

It is a high tribute to the common sense and intelligence of American workers that the campaign of vituperation and false attack against the C. I. O. has failed to dim their conviction that their needs will best be served by organization into industrial unions.

The few remaining bastions of antiunionism in American industry are under fresh attack. Let me cite examples—the magnificent Steel Workers Organizing Committee is concentrating fresh efforts against that violator of workers' rights, the Bethlehem Steel Corporation. When the Bethlehem Steel Corporation finally is brought to the point of recognizing that it does not stand above all men and above all government, that phenomenon will have been brought about, not by the Government, not by the courts, but by the strength of the organized workers alone.

The great United Automobile Workers' Union, revitalized and unified, now stronger than it ever was, is joining the C. I. O. in its efforts to bring the benefits of organization to the aircraft workers of the Nation. In the aviation industry, one of the richest and most pampered of our growing industries, the workers are working 50 and 60 hours a week for hourly wages that are one-third less than those earned by their brothers at the same work in the automobile factories. Already several great aviation companies are dealing peacefully with our unions. Many more will soon be doing so. The C. I. O. will extend every effort to bring organization to the aircraft workers without interruption of production. We ask only that the aircraft companies also cooperate to this end.

The great majority of workers in the construction industry, long unorganized and neglected, are being offered the opportunity for a great industrial union by the United Construction Workers' Organizing Committee, which has just celebrated its first anniversary. That union is moving forward with increasing strength. Its success will not only benefit the workers of the construction industry, but will unloose the genius of this Nation for efficient production in the building field. Already, as the result of this union's existence, improvements in technique have taken place in building construction, which promise better and cheaper homes for the people of the United States.

I could give you the same account for a number of other unions, steadily and faithfully pursuing their aim of bringing the benefits of organization to American workers. The national C. I. O has an enlarged and strengthened headquarters staff for organization, and it is devoting all of its increased income to the work of industrial organization, so that no man or working woman of these United States who wants to be in a union with his fellow workers may go without that opportunity.

With this new and growing strength, the C. I. O. confidently offers to take its place in the national defense of the Nation. It has publicly and officially declared its desire to add all strength to sound efforts to preserve our democracy and our Nation. Our people have worked diligently that American industrial workers should play their part in effective production.

There are men in high places in the Nation today who do not want labor to participate in the national effort. They do not want labor to participate because they know that labor's voice will be raised against their efforts to pervert the idea of national defense to the service of private greed.

One cry these persons raise is the accusation that in the Republic of France, it was labor and labor's influence in the Government which prevented the effective production of war material. This falsehood has been repeated in many places. It is used to hint or to say outright that similarly in this country labor is responsible, or will be responsible, for delays in national defense.

The circulation of this vicious falsehood should be stopped now. French labor was not responsible for France's failure to arm adequately, no matter what may be the wishful thinking of some millionaire ambassadors. The French financial powers and armament kings deliberately sabotaged French arms manufacture to destroy the gains of French organized workers, and to preserve their own profitable privileges. With the connivance of the financial powers of Britain, they deliberately destroyed a government in France in which labor had a voice, heartlessly turning their nation and the working people of their nation into the hands of the French politicians who betrayed the nation to the Nazis. At the height of French preparation, only 49,000 workers were employed in the vital aircraft industry, as contrasted with the 200,000 men employed in German plants in similar production.

In Britain, too, certain arms manufacturers have refused to expand their facilities or to extend their efforts for the armament of Great Britain, because such action might disturb their easy profit. Until the Nazi Army stood on the shores of the English Channel and leaders of labor were put in the Cabinet to speed the production of arms, the British financial powers and arms manufacturers pursued their leisurely way, uninterested in anything but the most effortless profit.

Today, in the United States, the financial powers and the arms manufacturers are beginning to pursue the same course. Their agents have been placed as the responsible representatives of government and the people have no check-up on them.

For months now, large and key industries of the Nation have refused to accept national-defense orders and to expand their manufacturing facilities—because it might not be profitable enough. They have demanded of this administration and of Congress that just and proper taxes be put aside. They have served notice that they require that new plants be given to them free. They have turned aside from national-defense orders, upon which profit was limited to a meager 8 percent, that they might accept 18-percent profit upon orders from Great Britain. Openly and boldly they have served notice upon the Government that they do not intend to manufacture for national defense until their conditions are met.

Today the Government of the United States continues to enrich by extensive Government contracts many of the corporations who have most outrageously violated the law of the United States, the National Labor Relations Act. It is most incredible to me that this Government should continue to provide aid and comfort to the very violators of the laws which it is under obligation to enforce.

Your representatives have gone to the United States Congress, where three times the Senate has passed measures to end this abuse, and three times the measure has been scuttled by a small group of leaders in the House of Representatives. We have appealed to

the President of the United States, asking him to take, upon what we are convinced is a sound legal basis, the proper Executive steps to prevent Government contracts being given to law violators. There has been no action from that quarter. We have called upon the National Defense Commission to rectify this continuing injustice.

It passes my understanding by what logic corporations who have boldly and openly violated the law of the United States continue to receive profitable national-defense contracts, while labor's rights are trampled underfoot.

Last year, on Labor Day, I warned our people that the Nation was drifting toward war, because the Nation's leadership, political and industrial, was too bankrupt of idea and energy to meet our domestic problems face to face. Within the year, we have moved farther down the same path, and now we stand closer to the brink of involvement in war, an involvement which labor abhors.

Labor recognizes that there are dangers abroad in the world, against which we must be prepared to defend ourselves. Let there be no doubt that American workingmen will be in the front lines against any who seek to attack the integrity of our Nation.

We believe there is now no cause for hysteria, and that those who seek to create hysteria do it for no good purpose. We can arm ourselves and train ourselves properly without excitement and without chaos. The purpose of excitement is to put over on the American people things they would never accept after calm examination. The purpose of excitement is to withdraw the minds of the people from their overpowering domestic concerns and to get them to turn their faces abroad.

One of the purposes of creating hysteria is to pass a bill providing for peacetime military conscription. All labor, church people, and the common people of the country are unified in opposition to such a measure. The proponents of such conscription knew that only through the creation of hysteria could they guarantee the passage of the bill.

The auspices under which the proposals of peacetime military conscription have been raised are very doubtful. Those who initiated the bill, and who have introduced it in Congress, are persons whose record of opposition to measures for the welfare of the people generally is consistent. Peacetime conscription has become one of the major planks in the platform of reaction, standing beside calls for repeal of the Fair Labor Standards Act, for the scuttling of the National Labor Relations Act, for the destruction of our civil liberties.

Opposition to peacetime military conscription does not mean opposition to adequate national defense. We can, in this country, with some effort and some reasonableness, establish conditions for enlistment which would guarantee an army suitable for our needs. For example, the period of enlistment should be shortened to 1 year. The pay should be raised at least to compare with that of a self-respecting workman. The right to return to private employment should be protected. Provision should be made for the continuation of social-security protection during the period of enlistment. Private debts should either be assumed or suspended. The upper ranks of the Army should be opened more freely to the ranks of enlisted men, so that an Army career is open to a private. Under conditions like these, there is no question in my mind that the young men of the country would provide by enlistment an Army sufficient to our needs. There has been no proper trial of enlistment, and the Army has made no proper attempt to make the voluntary method a success.

Military conscription now would establish the principle in this country that the lives of our young men are less privileged than the profit rights of dollars. The present program seems to call for the conscription of men while wealth retains its privileges.

Organized labor knows better than any other group in the population how quickly peacetime military conscription would break down our civil liberties. It would immediately establish the principle of compulsion by government, and in effect make opposition to government policy a crime. That would be the beginning of the end of our democratic way of life.

There is further something sinister about the attempt to force conscription upon our Nation, with no revelation of the purposes for which conscription is sought. What kind of a foreign policy, what kind of a military and naval policy demands an army of four million? The American people want to know whether the plans behind the conscript army provide for an expeditionary force.

Labor believes that national defense is more than building great armories of airplanes, tanks, and guns. Labor believes that national defense means the creation of a nation of strong, healthy, and happy people, dedicated to the belief that the democratic way is the best way of living. An army of 4,000,000 conscripts cannot save our Nation if the people doubt whether it is worth saving. Two million automatic rifles and 50,000 airplanes cannot make a nation strong whose heart is weak.

The building of arms alone will not solve our problems. There are 10,000,000 people unemployed today. The present program of arms would employ at best two or two and one-half million within the next year. Meanwhile the pressure of technology goes on apace with machines replacing men. The steel industry has reported making five and one-half million tons of steel in June 1940. In August 1937 they produced five and one-half million tons of steel. But in 1937 there were 603,000 employees; in June 1940, 535,000, fewer workers by 68,000. The building of arms will not end unemployment.

This Nation is the richest in the world, and it could be much richer if its people had their share of its riches. Last year the Nation produced a national income of $69,000,000,000. We could, with our unemployed labor and with our industrial capacity, produce at least $100,000,000,000. We could, in short, produce $6,000,000,000 of arms and still raise the national income $25,000,000,000. And next year we could increase it. A program to accomplish this end is the kind of program labor envisages for real defense of the Nation.

Our unemployed are not all going to be busy building barracks for the Army. Our industrial plants are not going to be operating at full capacity making arms. All of our vast idle farm lands are not going to be occupied growing beans for Army chow. We have the power and the capacity to be a richer nation next year, even if we have to pour 10 percent of our national income into arms.

There are plenty of men and women in this Nation who need and can well use the things that our idle men and plants and farms can produce. We must not forget that two-thirds of all our American families are receiving less than $1,500 a year, and the average of these families is only $826. Four million families in these United States received less than $312 a year. That is only about one-half of what it costs the United States Army to keep a private in the Army.

There are at least five and one-half millions of old people who have spent their lives in honest toil, and who now have earned a decent and secure old age. There are, too, four or five million young men and women out of school and eager to work, but with no opportunity offered them.

Millions of our people lack health service or proper housing, or even adequate food.

These are the holes in our national defense. In the hearts of these people are the vulnerable spots of our fortress. Let us give our people strength to fight off the invader.

Labor, too, does not forget that not from the ranks of labor in the European nations have come the traitors who aided the Fascist countries.

It requires no stupendous intellect to understand that the total defense of our Nation and its free institutions requires enthusiastic participation and cooperation of all segments of our population. Obviously, a defense program which ignores the rights of labor and fails to give its leaders adequate participation in the Nation's defense councils will be less than efficient and will contribute to the increased jeopardy of the Nation.

A defense program administered solely by profit-mad millionaires will be a failure. If our seat of government at Washington is to become a Mecca for the avaricious in finance and in industry, and if rapacity and greed in defense expenditure is to be unrestrained, then confidence will be struck down and despair and bitterness will become the portion of the people. It is time for Americans to cooperate, each with the other, upon a basis of good faith and common objectives. It is time for our statesmen and our Government to recognize the rights of labor and the common people in the emergency which is here. It is time for the Government to avail itself of the great strength of the democratic instrumentalities of our community life.

Labor demands adequate representation upon the policy-making agencies of government. Labor demands adequate representation and not on the basis that now exists of 1 lonely representative of labor to 100 millionaires. The ancient and puissant British Empire found it necessary to invoke and accept labor's aid, labor's policies, and labor's statesmen. Why should the combined forces of wealth and politics in our own land cling to the pitiful belief that they can do any less?

Within the coming months and years, labor and the common people of the country, the aged, the youth, the Negroes, have several choices to make about their leadership. They must decide whether the two major political parties, constituted and directed as they are, can fulfill the Nation's needs. These decisions will be made upon the basis of what our present political leaders do to meet the needs of our people.

Our great domestic problems remain unsolved. Unemployment, which is the greatest of the questions which confront us, still menaces our prosperity, our security, and our happiness. For years labor, farmers, and others have unceasingly called for a national conference on this subject. No steps have been taken, and no plans have been made for the abatement of this monstrous evil. Those who believe that the making of guns will solve the question of national unemployment have little comprehension and smaller understanding of the play of the world's economic forces.

With the coming of peace between the warring nations will also come a new and terrible depression of catastrophic proportions. We cannot wait until its arrival to lay plans and devise measures to meet it. It is time for Americans to take counsel. It is time for American statesmen to give some attention to their own Nation and its own problems. It is time for all Americans to become articulate and to demand consideration of American problems if America as we know it is to be preserved.

Comment by Mr. Villard on Speech of Secretary Wallace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD R. BURKE
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, September 11 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

ARTICLE FROM OMAHA WORLD-HERALD

Mr. BURKE. Mr. President, I ask leave to have printed in the RECORD a newspaper article under the heading "Villard Says Wallace Speech Is New Low in United States Politics," written by Oswald Garrison Villard, appearing in the Omaha (Nebr.) World-Herald of the 8th instant.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Omaha World-Herald of September 8, 1940]

VILLARD SAYS WALLACE SPEECH IS NEW LOW IN UNITED STATES POLITICS—CALLS "US OR HITLER" TALK DISGRACEFUL

(By Oswald Garrison Villard)

Two weeks ago I told a group of friends that before this campaign was over, probably in October, the President would set afloat the slogan that "a vote for Willkie is a vote for Hitler." They were not convinced, but here we have Henry Wallace in his acceptance speech actually stooping as low as to utter what amounts to that. It seems to me a new low for American politics, and I am astounded that as fine a man as Henry Wallace has been would lend himself to anything of the kind.

Of all the proofs that we have had that the United States has lost its balance, none can be more convincing than that. It is hitting below the belt. It shows that the camp of the third-termers is badly frightened, since it proves they have thrown over their last vestige of sportsmanship. They seek to identify an honorable opponent with the most utterly despicable man in the world—Hitler—and if there is any sense of fair play left among the American people it will recoil upon the heads of both Mr. Wallace and Mr. Roosevelt.

PROVOCATION NO EXCUSE

Nor can it be excused because Mr. Willkie had the bad taste to charge the President with having "unscrupulously encouraged" other countries to expect more help from us than we can give. That phrase is one of the defenses advanced by Harold Ickes in a letter to the New York Times for the violent and abusive language which he used about Mr. Willkie.

If your opponent has been guilty of bad taste, that does not excuse your doing the same thing. But Mr. Wallace's offense goes far beyond bad taste. It is also an inexcusable attribution of motives for which there is not the shadow of a reason. To assert that the Republicans are the party of appeasement and that Berlin will rejoice if Roosevelt is defeated is to make a statement for which Mr. Wallace can give no basis of fact as to his first statement, and no ethical reason for the second.

BOTH OPPOSE HITLER

Undoubtedly Hitler will be glad to see Roosevelt defeated, but to say that for the purpose of misleading the American people, in order to tie Mr. Willkie up with the Nazis and distract their attention from the domestic issues upon which they should decide the election, verges on the disgraceful.

Hitler is not the issue. Both candidates are against him, and Mr. Willkie has declared he will beat him if he comes this way. Both are for preparedness and for conscription. Mr. Willkie has been as outspoken against Hitler as Roosevelt. That he should be charged in the face of that with being a front for Hitler is to me evidence that Mr. Wallace and his partner in the third-term venture realize they have a most vulnerable front to present to the voters—that at any cost they must keep their fellow citizens from appraising their record, from objectively assaying the worth of their contributions to American life and where Mr. Wallace's farm policies from pig killing up have landed us all.

WHAT WILL EUROPE THINK?

What will Europeans think of such an exhibition? If there ever was a year in which the debate prior to the election should be on the highest plane, this is it. Never was there a better or a more needed chance to show to the despots abroad the dignity, the reasonableness, the calmness of our great people in a historic emergency—democracy at its best. Yet the welkin rings with fierce personal denunciations.

The committee headed by the venerable and once kindly William Allen White advertises all over the country that anyone who dares to doubt its belief that Hitler intends to attack the United States is "either a fool or a traitor!" One must believe absolutely with them or be branded. They alone know the truth and just what Hitler has in mind.

Well, one must, I suppose, expect that sort of thing from some of the passionate individuals who compose that committee, but that Henry Wallace should place himself on their level remains for me one of the saddest of spectacles. And I must add that the effect upon me has almost been to make me finally decide to vote for Wendell Willkie. One or two more such speeches, and I most certainly will.

Communism in the Entertainment Unions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM P. LAMBERTSON
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 11, 1940

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, since my explanation on July 4 of the fundamental reason for the demise of the Federal theater project, I have received a volume of protests, commendations, and some information. I believe it is only fair that the denials and protests of those persons I named as being Communists should go into this RECORD. As mentioned in my last remarks on this subject, Mr. Alan Hewitt protested, as did Robert E. Sherwood and S. N. Behrman in his behalf. These protests follow:

PRINCETON, N. J., *July 9, 1940.*

Representative LAMBERTSON,
House Office Building:

I deeply resent your allegation in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that I am a Communist. Nothing I have said or done at any time in or out of meetings of the Equity Council could possibly be construed to indicate even the remotest sympathy with communism. I think I am entitled to know what were the sources of your completely erroneous information, since the Nation-wide publicity which has been given your statement has done enormous injury to my professional reputation and personal integrity. As a loyal American citizen who believes and supports the Constitution with the fullest measure of devotion, I request an immediate apology and a public retraction of your unjust, unfounded, and untrue charge.

ALAN HEWITT.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *July 12, 1940.*

Representative WILLIAM P. LAMBERTSON,
House Office Building:

We know Alan Hewitt and can say positively that the charge of communism against him is unjust. He has never attended a Communist meeting and feels the reverse of everything implied by the term communism.

For further confirmation we can be reached at the Playwrights Co., 630 Fifth Avenue, New York City.

S. N. BEHRMAN and ROBERT E. SHERWOOD.

My reply of August 28 to Mr. Hewitt follows:

DEAR MR. HEWITT: I wish to acknowledge your protest of my characterization of you as a Communist. I have received many protests in your behalf, some from people of doubtful affiliations and many from true Americans of unimpeachable loyalty to their country.

As I have already stated in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, if I have done you an injustice, I will publicly acknowledge my error gladly. My present information, however, shows you have consistently followed the Communist Party line in your conduct as an Actors' Equity Association councilor, and if you are an "innocent" in these actions, I am forced to believe you are an innocent stooge at best.

One recent example will suffice to show to what I refer.

My investigation of the Actors' Equity Association meeting of May 24 shows that a so-called neutrality resolution was introduced by William E. Watts, of the Group Theater and the Theater Arts Committee, two Communist-front organizations.

The official report of the meeting comments on this resolution: "* * * the Chair (was sustained) in its ruling that a resolution which would have committed Equity to nonparticipation in any aspect of the war, or preparation for it, was out of order."

Paul Turner, Actors' Equity Association council, said the resolution was out of order. Frank Gillmore, president emeritus, gave his opinion that the resolution was out of order. Bert Lytell, president, ruled it out of order. Then Robert Reed and Harold Bolton, known radicals, moved to overrule the president.

There were just two votes by council members in favor of this motion to overrule the president. Those two votes were Philip Loeb's and yours. I would be interested to learn why you thus voted alone among the councilors with Philip Loeb, about whose

affiliations and loyalties there can hardly remain any intelligent doubt, to besmirch the name of your organization by recording it in favor of an obviously Moscow-inspired resolution.

Sincerely,

W. P. LAMBERTSON.

Mr. Hewitt probably has not had time to reply to my letter as yet. If he has an explanation I shall be glad to put it in the RECORD.

Miss Edith Van Cleve has sent me no denial of my charge of her communistic leanings. I did read in the newspapers a statement from her similar to that of Mr. Hewitt. I should like to repeat, once more, Mr. Speaker, my belief that Miss Van Cleve and Mr. Hewitt are what the Communists themselves call professional stooges. The records show that Miss Van Cleve has consistently supported the Communist element in Equity over a number of years. I am not for one moment maintaining that all members who ever supported the Forum in Equity are tainted with communism. As in all these "boring-from-within" fractions, the Communists attract and deceive and use for their own ends many liberal Americans. However, when we find a certain individual supporting Mr. Philip Loeb on purely political questions, as did Mr. Hewitt, or when we find another individual supporting Mr. Loeb, Mr. Heller, et al., on every important issue, without deviation over a long period of time, as has Miss Van Cleve, to my mind there is definite evidence of the same slavish following of the party line that is so obvious in every Communist-front group or organization.

And at this point, Mr. Speaker, I should like to say that I am sick and tired of the quibbles over the exact classification of Communist Party members, Communist fellow travelers, and Communist professional stooges. They themselves purposely create these various classes as part of their obscuration tactics. As a matter of practical effect to the people of the United States, there is no difference whatsoever in the harm that all three classes inflict on us.

AN ACHIEVEMENT IN EVASION

On August 5, when I last spoke on this subject, I had been given the impression that the entire matter was to be brought to the attention of the membership of Actors' Equity Association through the pages of Equity, the official magazine of the union. I had informed the officers that if it was not desirable to give it space in Equity, the Government Printing Office would reprint my remarks at very small cost, and thus they could be sent to the membership. I received the following letter dated August 7 from Mr. Paul Dullzell, executive secretary:

DEAR MR. LAMBERTSON: At a meeting of our council yesterday, all of the correspondence between us, and the letters which our council member, Miss Maida Reade, received from you, were read, together with the opinion from our legal department concerning the material you requested to be printed in Equity magazine.

The opinion of our legal department is that as the Equity magazine circulates outside of our membership, an untrue statement or a statement which we may not be able to prove, published by us, that any of our members are Communists, which may result in some special damage suffered by such members, would lay the association open to lawsuits and claims for damages. As we read your own letters we find at least a doubt that we may publish this material with impunity, if not a direct intimation that we may be held accountable for it in an action for publishing libelous matter.

Our council, therefore, determined that it would not be wise to publish this matter at this time. After the investigation by Representative DIES or any other duly constituted agency, we will undoubtedly take the matter up again for consideration by our council.

Sincerely yours,

ACTORS' EQUITY ASSOCIATION,
By PAUL DULLZELL.

I replied as follows to Mr. Dullzell on August 13:

DEAR MR. DULLZELL:

In answer to your letter of August 7, I would appreciate a copy of the opinion from your legal department which you mention. In view of the fact that my statements were published in the New York Times, the New York Herald Tribune, Variety, and many other newspapers and periodicals, the decision puzzles and interests me. Apparently your magazine Equity is the only publication which fears to mention in print the names of your council members I have charged with communism. This seems very strange indeed.

Such lawsuits as you fear might result from your publication of my statements could only be started, if at all, by your councilors I have named; and a simple release from them would protect the Actors' Equity Association. Please inform me which of your councilors involved refused to give a release to your association.

The entire conduct of your council in this situation appears to me to be an achievement in evasion. Therefore I have concluded it of utmost importance to make my material available to your membership. As your council did not reply to my offer contained in my letter to you of August 2, to have the material reprinted by the Government Printing Office, I have decided to have this done myself and to mail it to your membership. I would therefore appreciate receiving from you a mailing list of the members of the Actors' Equity Association.

Although I sent you with my letter of July 26 a copy of my letter of July 11, I have not yet received a reply to that letter. As I had not, in my original comment, stated that the Actors' Equity Council is "dominated and controlled by Communists," I could not and do not now understand your resolution so quoting me. However, the council's action in reversing its decision to print my statements in Equity and thus attempting to conceal my charges from the membership would lead anyone to believe the council is dominated and controlled by those councilors charged with communism.

In this connection and referring to my request for the names of the councilors voting for and against your resolution of July 10, would you kindly explain the following quotation from your letter of July 25? You state as a reason the vote might not be given me "inasmuch further as these discussions made it evident that the vote was determined by matters not pertinent to the issues involved." Is this the customary method of arriving at decisions of such importance to your organization?

Please acknowledge receipt of this letter and advise me whether you will bring it to the attention of the council, and if so, when.

Sincerely,

W. P. LAMBERTSON.

Having received no acknowledgment or reply from Mr. Dullzell, I wrote the president of Equity August 21, stating that fact and enclosing a copy of my August 13 letter, asking Mr. Lytell if he would answer it and take the entire episode up at the next meeting of the council.

At the same time I wrote Actors' Equity Association headquarters enclosing a copy of the August 13 letter and asking that it be brought to the attention of another Equity official, in case Mr. Dullzell should be away, and also to the council at its next meeting.

Mr. Speaker, on this 11th day of September, I am still awaiting an acknowledgment or reply to any of these three letters. And I wish to call particular attention to the fact that in my letter of August 13 I again requested a reply to a letter of mine of July 11, a copy of which I had sent Mr. Dullzell on July 26, because he had said he had not received the original.

I have requested the postal authorities to investigate this nondelivery of my letter of July 11 to Mr. Dullzell. Since that time I have received letters from two officers of Actors' Equity Association, which may or may not be of some significance in this situation.

This is an excerpt from one letter:

I found your letter, addressed to me care of Equity, had been forwarded to my hotel; and, strange to say, it had been opened. This is the first time any of my mail has been so treated. The explanation being that it was not marked "personal"; so I would suggest that in any future correspondence you write me to the above (hotel) address.

The other letter contains this sentence:

I would suggest your writing to me at my home address.

To complete this picture, permit me to read a statement in my possession made by George Kondolf, former director of the W. P. A. Federal Theater Project in New York City:

GEORGE KONDOLF,
New York City, August 12, 1940.

On January 27, 1939, following an appearance by me at a meeting of the Council of Actors Equity Association, I wrote a letter to the association requesting that a certain committee from the council be set up to investigate and report back to the council on what to me was a serious political situation involving Equity on the Federal Theater Project of which I was the local director. When, after several days had elapsed and I had received no answer, I learned from two members of the council that they had been told the letter was never received. This in spite of the fact that I had personally verified the mailing of the letter from the project office as I felt its receipt by Equity to be most important.

On February 8, I again wrote to Equity and enclosed a copy of my original letter. This letter was acknowledged promptly.

GEORGE KONDOLF.

To go back to August 13, I wrote on that date to Mr. Bert Lytell, president of Actors Equity Association, in response to a letter from him which he asked me to keep confidential.

Since my letter raises a few questions which I believe are also in the minds of my colleagues in Congress I introduce it here:

DEAR MR. LYTELL: Thank you very much for your letter of August 8 and for the encouragement it gives me. Our conversation the other evening was also appreciated. I do believe that if the entertainment field can be rid of subversive elements in important positions, there is a good chance of the ban against a Federal theater being removed. That makes it worth while to me to carry on.

I note that you represent the Actors' Equity Association on the A. G. V. A. board, and you, no doubt, are informed regarding the resignation of eight members on that board mentioned in Variety July 24, page 37. In this connection I am enclosing a copy of a letter I have written Hoyt Haddock. I should like to know if the Council of the Actors' Equity Association is informed of this situation in A. G. V. A., as I understand the Equity Association sponsored this organization.

I appreciate your explanation of the American Jubilee matter. I was not under the impression this was a leftist quarrel. I deplored the very bad reception the Equity Association received from the press and the public in this situation. This, I think, was due to the numerous communistic controversies in which the Equity Association had figured, such as the drive against Finnish relief benefits.

Regarding your remarks on the Finnish relief benefits, I have never doubted, and have so stated many times, the patriotism and generosity of the great majority of the members of your profession. Nevertheless, as you will recall, being in the forefront of the fight, the few actors and actresses you mention who took the obviously Communist-inspired position against these benefits were able to smear the whole profession and stir up a disgraceful battle on the subject.

Your executive secretary, Mr. Paul Dullzell, expressed Equity's sentiments against the Finnish relief benefits repeatedly in the press at that time, although he was opposed by almost every reputable theatrical leader. It seems to me that in this case, which caused great trouble and attracted great attention, your executive secretary, Mr. Paul Dullzell, was fighting the battle of the Communists. I understand he has great influence in your organization. I hope to hear from you in reply to the above and also regarding the further matter you mention.

Sincerely,

W. P. LAMBERTSON.

VAUDEVILLE ACTORS TOSSED FROM WHITEHEAD TO COMMUNISTS

Mr. Hoyt Haddock was appointed executive secretary of the American Guild of Variety Artists in February of this year, over the protests of William Green and Matthew Woll of the A. F. of L. My understanding is that the American Federation of Radio Artists sponsored Mr. Haddock through its attorney, Henry Jaffe. Mr. Haddock took exception to my pinning a "red" tag to him, as follows:

AMERICAN GUILD OF VARIETY ARTISTS,
New York City, July 9, 1940.

REPRESENTATIVE LAMBERTSON: I understand that your statement of yesterday, "Hoyt Haddock, a former C. I. O. organizer of distinct Communist sympathies," while wholly untrue, is not a libelous statement; and if it were libelous, that you, because of your Congressional immunity, cannot be sued irrespective of the complete falsity of your statement and the unfair advantage which you as a Congressman can take by circulating false rumors about American citizens.

For your information, I was never a C. I. O. organizer and have never been a functionary in any C. I. O. union. With regard to the second part of your statement, I am neither a Communist nor a Communist sympathizer, and I never have been.

It is regrettable indeed that in America, where democracy is now withstanding a tremendous onslaught from foreign dictators, an official who is charged with the duties of upholding our democratic processes takes such cowardly advantage of any citizen by attempting to besmirch his character.

Since your statement is wholly unsupported in fact, it is indeed puzzling to understand how a man in your position can utter such untruths. If you are an American, and if you believe in democracy, you will publicly state that your statements are incorrect. If, on the other hand, you remain silent, you will have demonstrated that in this instance you have little respect for the truth.

Very truly yours,

HOYT S. HADDOCK,
National Executive Secretary.

Now he says that my charges are wholly unsupported in fact and charges me with uttering untruths; so, in his case, I thought it would be best to go rather fully into details. I wrote him as follows:

AUGUST 2, 1940.

Mr. HOYT S. HADDOCK,
National Executive Secretary, American Guild of Variety Artists, 1650 Broadway, New York City.

DEAR MR. HADDOCK: I have your protest of July 9 against my characterization of yourself as a Communist, and if I am in error will naturally be glad to offer a public retraction.

According to the records of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, under the chairmanship of Hon. MARTIN DIES, you have participated in, sponsored, or were otherwise identified with the following:

National Congress for Unemployment and Social Insurance.

Petition to grant pardons to McNamara and Schmidt.

Trade Union Sponsoring Committee for a Labor Party Conference.

National Council, American Youth Congress.

I also quote from the hearings of the Dies committee, pages 6525 and 6526, as follows:

"Mr. MCCUISTION (after examining). Yes; at the extreme right of the picture is Jack Lawrenson, the only Communist that was on the Marine Firemen's, Oilers', and Watertenders' strike committee, who is at present an official of the N. M. U.

"The next picture is of Hoyt Haddock, former president of the American Radio Telegraphists' Association, and a member of the Communist Party. I recruited him into the Communist Party myself years ago, and he is at present still a Communist and the marine personnel manager for the Standard Oil in New York, working in that job now. * * *

"In connection with this * * * They made a tour of all Gulf ports and all tanker ports of the country together. That is Haddock's job; he is more or less simply a trade-union adviser.

"Mr. THOMAS. He is a sort of contact man, then, rather than a personnel man?

"Mr. MCCUISTION. He is. He is called "personnel man," but he is a contact man for the Standard Oil.

"Mr. THOMAS. Is he on the pay roll of the Standard Oil?

"Mr. MCCUISTION. He is on the pay roll of the Standard Oil admittedly, and he deals with the unions as an official of the Standard Oil. I have talked with him myself as an official of the union.

"Mr. THOMAS. You said he is a member of the Communist Party?

"Mr. MCCUISTION. Yes; an admitted member of the Communist Party.

"Mr. THOMAS. What is his full name? Give his full name, please.

"Mr. MCCUISTION. Hoyt Haddock. The Standard Oil knows it, too, because he has never denied he is a member of the Communist Party."

I should be pleased to consider any explanations you may wish to offer in connection with the above quotation.

Another reference to yourself is to be found in We Accuse, published by Jerry King, et al., and from which the following is taken:

Page 123.

"Charge No. 3: Wherein Joe Curran alleges that I accepted money from the Standard Oil to 'sabotage the oil agreement.' That is a lie. In my opinion, if any sabotage existed, it was planned and executed by some of the chief negotiators of that agreement, a self-admitted Communist, Jack Lawrenson, and Hoyt Haddock—who was formerly head of the A. R. T. A., and who was working for the Standard Oil Co. at the time.

"It seems more than peculiar, to say the least, that Haddock found it necessary to associate with members of union's negotiating committee so frequently at the union hall. The fact that he found it necessary to frequent the company of Tommy Ray, Al Lannon, and other well-known members of the Communist Party together with some members of the negotiating committee so often during this period should be significant, to say the least, to even the most casual observer. Why Haddock should have found it necessary to go about circulating the 'whisper' that I was a 'superlabor spy' as far back as that time—during these negotiations—also puzzles me very much, I must confess. Dozens of radio operators can verify that statement."

Pages 175–176. Hoyt Haddock:

"Comrade Hoyt Haddock, formerly president of the radio operators' A. R. T. A. now the A. C. A. has been actively associated with C. P. figures for years though carefully denying he is one of them. However, a former party member testified before a congressional committee, that he had joined Haddock up in the party several years ago."

* * * * * * *

"Esso made a very juicy investment by hiring Haddock as its 'labor consultant' as resulting events proving him a 'laborer worthy of his hire.' When he had served his purpose, they let him go. However, you can't keep a 'good' actor down. Haddock is now the executive secretary of the American Guild of Variety Artists.

"From union official to company man to union official is quite some transition, however."

* * * * * * *

Your comments on the above would also be appreciated.

Sincerely,

W. P. LAMBERTSON.

When I had received no reply to this letter by August 15, I wired Mr. Haddock. I received the following note from his secretary:

AMERICAN GUILD OF VARIETY ARTISTS,
New York City, August 19, 1940.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LAMBERTSON: In answer to your wire of last week requesting a reply from Mr. Haddock to your letter of August 2, please be advised that Mr. Haddock is out of town at present and will answer your communication on his return.

Yours very truly,

JOSEPHINE SAVAGE,
Secretary to Mr. Haddock.

However, I noticed in the August 21 issue of Variety that they were able to obtain information from Mr. Haddock on this matter at about this time.

Hoyt Haddock, who was likewise accused of communistic activities by LAMBERTSON, has drawn up a new letter to the Congressman, but will not send it until the A. G. V. A. attorney, Henry Jaffe, has gone over it for possible libel.

To date, September 11, 1940, I have received no further communication from Mr. Haddock.

DECENT A. G. V. A. MEMBERS RESIGN IN PROTEST

Another issue of Variety, July 24, 1940, carries this following statement from three of seven board members resigning from A. G. V. A.:

Three of the resigning seven board members, Dick Barclay, Ben Haskell, and Fred Pisano, submitted a signed statement explaining their reasons for doing so. It reads:

* * * * * * *

"On Thursday, July 18, we attended our regular weekly meeting of the board. Again the obstructionist tactics of the subversive element was at work. The main object of their actions seemed to be to retard progress, cause dissension, and keep the board from disposing of its duties; which is in strict accordance with the Communist Party line to create chaos and havoc in industry and labor ranks.

"We are accused of hiding behind the guise of patriotism because we cannot have our way. Yet, at a recent joint national and local board meeting Hal Sherman made a motion that the American Guild of Variety Artistes go on record as being opposed to communism, nazi-ism, and fascism. Instantly a furor was raised by this self-same element in a body who definitely opposed A. G. V. A. taking such a stand, thereby killing the motion.

"DIFFICULTY GETTING FLAG

"Since its inception the A. G. V. A. office has not had an American flag. Six weeks ago we put through a motion to buy one and display it in a prominent place in our reception room. When Fred Pisano, a board member, went to hang a borrowed flag, one of the C. I. O. office staff said, 'Why do you want to spoil the wall?' To which he replied he never knew of the American flag spoiling anything, anywhere, any time. The flag now hanging in the office was not bought by union funds, but loaned by Arthur Shields, organizer who was fired and remains fired contrary to the rule of a majority of the board to reinstate him since the records prove him totally competent and 100-percent American. To date regardless of our motion a flag still has not been purchased.

"We realize it is an awful thing to put the stigma of communism on anyone, but since we can only judge people by their actions and their affiliations this is the only conclusion we can come to.

"We, therefore, after due deliberation and consideration, have decided to follow your suggestion 'that both sides can end the battle by leaving the battlefield,' and have this day resigned from the New York local board. Having the welfare of A. G. V. A. at heart we tendered our resignations and demand the subversive element to do likewise. We also ask the A. A. A. A. if they want A. G. V. A. to prosper to give the actor the American Guild of Variety Artistes, run by American actors for American actors."

In the story accompanying this statement, Variety states:

It had been suggested that the entire local board and all local officers resign or submit to a recall vote by the membership for the sake of harmony, but thus far the remaining faction has made no such move.

Another one of the resigning board members of A. G. V. A. wrote me as follows:

NEW YORK CITY, *July 23, 1940.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LAMBERTSON: You will note by the enclosed that I am keenly interested in preventing communism in the Variety field. I have been told that you have CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS containing data regarding Hoyt Haddock. I would be delighted to receive same. Also your article "Theater must be purged," in the Appendix of the RECORD, page 4452.

Thanking you in advance, from one who more than appreciates your efforts.

Yours sincerely,

ARTHUR WARD.

THE LAST STAND

As a member of the national board of A. G. V. A. now resigned, I am appealing to you, brother performers, you men who have labored years to achieve the cherished position you hold in this once great vaudeville profession.

James Barton, Milton Berle, Eddie Cantor, Edward Dowling, George Jessel, Ben Blue, Alan Cross, Bert Frohman, and J. C. Flippen, president of A. G. V. A.

Your names are being used on the stationery and on the Actors' News (the A. G. V. A. newspaper).

You have never attended a meeting, you do not know what is going on, yet you permit the use of your names, and they are and have been used. To the nonmember it naturally becomes an incentive to join when they read that the leading men and women are on the board of an organization; it must surely be a worthy one. And it would be if you had been there in person instead of by proxy.

I deeply regret that you have not attended, for the clique headed by Hoyt Haddock have practically grabbed the organization, and not for the benefit of the performers, but to use it as a springboard for political purposes; and, as you know, in the event of war the theatrical profession is a powerful machine for propaganda.

In subversive hands—dangerous and traitorous. Several months ago I discovered H. Haddock was hiring men as national local organizers, who had no theatrical background, but were good party men. I mentioned this to several members of the board, and they reminded me that H. Haddock had carte blanche. Plenary powers, the right to hire and fire. At the following meeting, which happened to be a New York local one, I proposed a resolution which was duly seconded and passed.

THAT ONLY A BONA FIDE PERFORMER COULD BE AN ORGANIZER

However, according to our Constitution, such a resolution must be ratified by the national board, but the national executive board controlled by Haddock took care of it, and it was revoked.

At a special joint meeting of the national and local boards, on June 24, I moved that the carte blanche plenary powers be taken from Hoyt Haddock, as he lacked the necessary and essential theatrical experience. It was seconded but did not pass. I had advocated the same at other meetings, also stressing the fact that it made the board a dummy board.

And as I had predicted time and again, it has now borne fruit. Haddock has placed his men, G. Dolan, in Chicago; Ken Howard, in Los Angeles; L. Litomy, in Pittsburgh; B. Edwards, in Cincinnati—all good party men.

They are the local executive secretaries. All they need now is to take over Philadelphia, Boston, and San Francisco, and it's their organization.

Hence I resigned not wanting to participate, and help mislead my brother and sister performers.

So again I say, act before it is too late.

Yours sincerely and fraternally,

ARTHUR WARD.

CROSS SECTION OF PROFESSIONAL OPINION

Mr. Speaker, I had not expected to devote to this question the time or energy that has been required. I had believed that merely a statement of the feeling in Congress which prevented the lifting of the ban against the Federal Theater would inspire a thorough house cleaning by a concerted effort of all members of the profession. However, the following letters, as a small cross section of the many I have received, will illustrate the varying points of view in the acting profession. Many prominent people seem amazingly uninformed on a matter that affects them vitally.

NEW YORK CITY, *August 20, 1940.*

DEAR MR. LAMBERTSON: I find that the test I personally make today in forming an opinion as to whether people are sympathetic or not to what I conceive to be a fundamental understanding of America is this: Those who fail to express sympathy for Finland or those who fail to repudiate Moscow since Stalin's alliance with Hitler are the ones who I feel do not understand America. It is in this latter group that I place the members of the Theater Arts Committee; but such inquiries as I have been able to make among the members of my profession have convinced me that you have done an injustice to certain of the people whom you have branded as Communists.

May I point out to you that world events have moved so swiftly within recent months and that the issues have been so clearly drawn that many people who were sympathetically interested in the Russian experiment have withdrawn that sympathy entirely, and that it is very dangerous to classify people today according to their affiliations of only a few years ago? I very much doubt if the Members of the Congress of the United States wish to be judged today by statements that they made as recently as 1938.

I know that my profession and the association which represents us in our business relations is sound at heart and as patriotic as any organization in the United States.

We in America are facing a critical period in which we must use all our courage and all our vision. We must look to the Congress of the United States for our leadership. It is possible that the Members of Congress do not realize that during the past several years they have been losing some of the respect of the American citizens because they have, under their legal protection, indulged themselves in making irresponsible statements and allowing irresponsible statements to be made under their auspices. At this particular time, when the emotions of the American people are being deeply stirred, when our faith in our leaders must in no way be shaken, it is of the utmost necessity that the Members of our Congress command our respect and be absolutely certain of the factual truth behind every utterance they make.

Sincerely yours,

HOWARD LINDSAY.

AUGUST 26, 1940.

DEAR MR. LINDSAY: I wish to thank you for your letter of August 20. I am in agreement with much of what you say and most particularly as to the conduct of Congressmen and other Government officials.

I think moreover that in these critical times American citizens also have an especial duty, and as always this duty falls largely on the leaders of any group.

Specifically I think you as one of the leaders of your profession owe it to your country to see to it that foreign "isms," the influence of which proved so disastrous for France, are stamped out of your organization, the Actors Equity Association.

To use only your own narrow tests, are you familiar with the numerous objections of the executive secretary of the Actors Equity Association to Finnish relief? I understand he is an authorized spokesman of the association. His objections were freely printed in the New York newspapers. Did he do this on his own responsibility or did these statements to the press by your authorized official have the support of some of your governing council? If so, which ones?

Did you attend the last quarterly meeting of your association on May 24 at which Philip Loeb made a spirited defense of the Theater Arts Committee? Your association's magazine, Equity, in its June issue has something to say about this, reporting Loeb as resenting "the ruling adopted by Equity in April, forbidding the Equity membership to resort to other organizations and specifically T. A. C., on matters of obtaining Federal relief for actors."

Loeb is further reported in this article in your association's official publication to have declared: "I do not think it incompatible to be a good member of T. A. C. and a good member of Equity."

Are you aware of the fact that right now some members of your governing council are members of T. A. C.?

As to certain people I have named who hold important positions in your association, whether or not they hold Communist membership cards and pay dues, they have seldom deviated far from the Moscow-dictated party line. You as a prominent member of the Equity Association should be more familiar with this than I. However, from data presently available for publication, I can unqualifiedly state that if there are any "innocents" among them, they are "innocent" stooges at best.

In this connection I have received many letters in defense of Alan Hewitt. Possibly he has unwittingly given his support to Communist forces. I am writing Mr. Hewitt and shall place my letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. This explains my present position in his case.

In closing I wish to urge that if you are not informed regarding this situation that you lose no time in making a thorough investigation and that you then do something about it. You owe it to your country as well as to your association.

Sincerely,

W. P. LAMBERTSON.

NYACK, N. Y., *August 24, 1940.*

MY DEAR MR. LAMBERTSON: I was naturally appalled at what I read in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD about communistic activities in the theater. If it is true, then of course I am behind you wholeheartedly in your battle to rid us of such a destructive force.

However, I can't help wondering if many of these actors who are suspected of communistic leanings are merely guilty of the outstanding fault (and virtue as well) of our profession. I mean, the unquestioning willingness to help the underdog. Tell an actor a hard luck story, and he will dig in his pocket or join a cause without asking questions. This habit, I know, is careless, but that is the worst that can be said of it.

I have an uncomfortable feeling that my name even might have been included on your list, as at one time I believe I was a member of the Theatre Arts Committee, and may still be, for all I know. I remember when the organization was started that I had high hopes of its helping the theater both artistically and economically, but I am ashamed to say that I haven't followed its activities closely for the last 2 or 3 years. That, I know, has been careless of me, and I tell it to you as an example of what might have happened to some of the rest.

If there are any real Communists among those you mentioned, I hope you smoke them out.

But please do be careful.

Sincerely,

HELEN HAYES.

SEPTEMBER 5, 1940.

DEAR MISS HAYES: Thank you for your letter of August 24. You imply a point of view which I believe is held by many good Americans and seriously retards the work of cleaning out subversive organizations.

Let me quote from the testimony given before the Dies committee by Mr. J. B. Matthews:

"There are four orders of individuals who make up a Communist united front. First, there are the Communist Party members. * * * Party members invariably occupy strategic positions of control. * * * Second, there are fellow travelers who, as a rule, go along as faithfully as if they were actually party members. * * * Third, there are the stooges. These are persons of prominence whose names have considerable publicity value. They are the real decoys whose names do the work of covering up the Communist control of the united front. Finally, there are the innocents, originally called so by the Communists themselves. The innocents are supposed to make up the overwhelming number of the adherents to the united front * * *.

"When you see the denials of Communists control of these united-front organizations made by Communists or fellow travelers, you must simply note it is the perfectly natural thing for that denial to be made. The beans would be spilled if they admitted the true character of the organizations.

"On the other hand, when you find the stooges and the innocents denying the Communist control of these organizations, you must conclude that that also is natural, on the whole, because if they admitted that they had been dupes, they might look rather silly in the public mind. So there is nothing to be surprised at, whatever in this great chorus of denial of the Communist control and decisive influence in these organizations. * * * That, you see is one of the problems we face in this whole situation. There are so many Americans who are willing to put their signatures to those papers.

"Mr. STARNES. Is it another example of what you have testified to previously, that men and women of high repute are used as a front to act for them in their designs? And to decoy other decoys, or to lead millions of otherwise good, sound-thinking American citizens into a path that they would not knowingly pursue.

"Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes, sir. The League of Women Shoppers boasts of the membership of Miriam Hopkins and Bette Davis. A list of such persons could be expanded almost indefinitely. No one, I hope, is going to claim that any one of these persons is a Communist. The unfortunate fact, however, remains that most of them unwittingly serve, albeit in this slight way, the purposes of the Communist Party."

You say, Miss Hayes, "An actor * * * will join a cause without asking questions. This habit, I know, is careless, but that is the worst that can be said of it." I think you might have been right a few years ago. But in the present crisis of "mobilization" in our country, and in the light of world history of the past several years, it is a neglect that may almost be criminal.

You were the chairman in charge of the theatrical Finnish relief benefits. You were, I understand, out of New York City at the time of the opposition raised by Soviet sympathizers to those benefits. But you can hardly be unaware of the really terrific battle waged by Mr. Bert Lytell, president of Actors Equity Association; Mr. Louis Schaeffer, of Labor Stage; several managers and several members of your council to save the benefits from complete sabotage.

The Theatre Arts Committee, Miss Lillian Hellman, Mr. Paul Robeson, Mr. Robert Reed, and Mr. Herman Shumlin were among those leading the battle to stop the benefits. All were quoted in the newspapers, and the publicity was very widespread.

The most careless and uninformed must certainly have suspected the political affiliations of these who fought so determinedly against aid to the Finnish people while they had so actively urged aid to the Spanish Loyalists (not the whole Spanish people, you will remember). This controversy raged through the last week of January 1940, and yet Miss Hayes, on August 24, you inform me that you may still be a member of the Theatre Arts Committee for all you know.

In the March issue of Tac, published by the Theatre Arts Committee, I find your name heading an open letter sent out by the American Rescue Ship Campaign for Spain's Refugees, along with the names of Paul Robeson, Elliot Paul, Lillian Hellman, Rockwell Kent, widely known Communist sympathizers.

Signed to that same letter are names such as Paul Muni, Philip Merivale, Dorothy Canfield Fisher, and yours. I do not question for one moment the complete loyalty to American ideas and institutions of such people. But it has been common knowledge for several years that one of the most powerful weapons employed by the Communist Party in this country is the use of well-known liberals as a front for their organizations. I quote again from volume I, page 918, hearings of the Dies committee:

"Mr. MATTHEWS. The Communist Party relies heavily upon the carelessness or indifference of thousands of prominent citizens in lending their names for its propaganda purposes.

"Here I think you have another good example; and again I am not trying to make these persons' names stand out in any odious manner whatsoever. The Communist Party owns outright the newspaper which is regarded by many as the swankiest newspaper published in France at the present time. The name of the newspaper is Ce Soir. It is little more than a year old. On the occasion of its first anniversary recently this Communist newspaper featured greetings from Clark Gable, Robert Taylor, James Cagney, and even Shirley Temple."

This is the verbatim report of the famous Shirley Temple incident which the Communists distorted in their attempts to discredit the Dies committee.

The scream of "red" baiting is a well-known tactic, which unfortunately has succeeded only too well with thousands of people like yourself. Only a slight study of the innumerable Communist front organizations, manifestos, and open letters enables one to separate well-meaning but uninformed liberals from Communist sympathizers. What I cannot understand is your neglect to give that slight study before you give your name, your money, or your time to them.

As to your own organization, your own back yard, I enclose a copy of my letter to Mr. Alan Hewitt referred to.

I have written at this length to you, Miss Hayes, as one of the most prominent members of your profession and well known as a sponsor and worker for many worth-while causes. Do you not feel that you, with many other members of your profession, have been guilty of a very grave neglect of duty? Your obvious ignorance of the situation in your own organization, a situation which has existed for the past 8 years, can only indicate an indifference on the part of American citizens which is frightening when we consider the fate of Austria, Spain, and France.

May I ask that you call this letter to the attention of such of your friends who may have been persuaded of the "irresponsibility" of Congressmen, congressional committees, or good citizens

who are fighting hard to bring into the open the great danger of communistic penetration into American institutions.

Sincerely,

W. P. LAMBERTSON.

Miss Helen Hayes, in common with many fine American citizens who have been persuaded to lend their names to cleverly concealed Communist fronts, is terrified lest she be accused of communistic sympathies. Mr. Speaker, it is a very simple matter to discover, with just a little research, who are professional party stooges, and who are warm-hearted liberals who have been deceived. However, I do believe it is the duty of every American to scrutinize all causes and make sure he is not being used to further un-American activities, as I have written Miss Hayes.

CANNONDALE, CONN., *August 29, 1940.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LAMBERTSON: Thank you very much for sending me the material from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I am very definitely against Communists and Communist sympathizers in Equity or in any other organization but I am also opposed to the sort of thing that has happened recently in Hollywood, where a number of prominent members of my profession were falsely accused, given very bad publicity, and later given a clean bill of health by the Dies committee, when it was too late to undo a great deal of damage. I feel it is very important to be sure that the people you are accusing of being Communists are really Communists, otherwise it weakens your distinguished position.

I am not a very prominent member of my profession, but I shall nevertheless do what I can to stop Communist penetration in Equity.

Thanking you for bringing the matter to my attention I remain,

Very sincerely yours,

ARMINA MARSHALL (LANGNER).

This letter is discouraging. Here is a lady who quite properly advises caution to avoid falsely accusing anyone of communism and yet she, herself, has not been sufficiently painstaking to inform herself about the incident she gives as an example. For Miss Marshall's enlightenment, I reproduce here a news clipping from the New York Herald Tribune of August 28, 1940:

After hearing the categorical denials of the Hollywood actors of all association or sympathy with the Communist cause charged against them by John L. Leech, a California Communist organizer, Mr. Dies told a press conference: "The evidence is quite clear, however, that these people have permitted their names to be used, or have contributed money, or have spoken under auspices of organizations which the committee has found to be under the control of Communist leadership. While there is no evidence that their cooperation was for any other purpose except humanitarian, it is nevertheless true that these organizations used these people and their money not for the professed purposes but for purposes inimical to the best interests of this country.

"It is an illustration of how a foreign government is taking advantage of certain gullible American citizens. Among the list of such gullible persons will be found a number of government officials holding positions in high places."

NEW YORK, N. Y., *August 29.*

W. P. LAMBERTSON,

House of Representatives:

Katharine Cornell has been away for entire summer although she has the greatest concern about un-American element in the organization embracing her profession she doesn't feel sufficiently informed to express definite views against these members for publication.

However, she does feel it is the duty of all actors, including herself, to rid their organization of subversive elements and can only regret that our Government doesn't make this easier by refusing to recognize Communists as a legal political party.

GERTRUDE MACY,

Manager for Katharine Cornell.

HARRISON, MAINE, *August 22, 1940.*

Hon. WILLIAM P. LAMBERTSON,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

Emphatically endorse your position on communism in Equity Council, and membership at large, about which I am afraid there is no doubt. Greatly regret my absence from council due to touring. Definitely disapprove recent council action rescinding vote to print entire issue in August number Equity Magazine. Will get personally active immediately on return New York City.

FLORENCE REED.

NEW YORK CITY, *August 6, 1940.*

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN LAMBERTSON: Thank you so much for your letter and the enclosed CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I speak not only for myself but for all the real Americans of Equity in thanking you for bringing to light the canker in our midst. You have done us a great service, and I am very honored that you mentioned my name in such a complimentary way.

I think it too bad that certain well-meaning members, in trying to protect their organization, should have tried to whitewash the guilty ones, and I wrote them to the effect that if we wanted our house put in order we should certainly substantiate and be grateful to Congressman LAMBERTSON for helping us to expose this situation.

I know that you have many vital issues at hand, but I beg of you to keep the American actors' interest at heart.

Kindest regards.

Yours sincerely,

TALLULAH BANKHEAD.

NEW YORK CITY, *August 13, 1940.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LAMBERTSON: As a member of Actors' Equity Association, I wish to thank you for the courage and tenacity of your effort to expose and thereby force us to rectify the communistic infiltration in our organization.

I hope you will not be too discouraged by the reaction of the council. They wish sincerely to do their very best for Equity, but it is very difficult for many honest, liberal councilors to see clearly through the smoke screen of specious argument, and to maintain a firm and courageous stand against the threats and really horrible invective hurled by these apologists and/or agents for Soviet Russia.

However, I firmly believe that the membership of Actors' Equity will deal adequately with this situation, if they can ever be fully informed on it. The full and complete story of the charges and the full and complete defense of those charged, which was promised to the membership in their magazine, Equity, has now, as you undoubtedly have been informed, been censored in true totalitarian fashion, because some of the members you named refused to release Equity from the threat of libel suits. I hope that the Dies committee may find it possible to start an investigation of the theatrical unions in New York as speedily as possible, since it is only through such an investigation that the true and complete picture will ever reach the membership.

And I for one believe sincerely and completely, that the complete picture can do only good to Equity and its membership of loyal, generous, and patriotic citizens. It will help to rid them of the Muscovite incubus that obscures every policy and every issue in Equity today. It will clear, I believe, one or two of those you named, who in my own opinion have been stooges, more or less innocent, for the others. And it will open the eyes of all of us to the dangers and the wickedness of complacency in the face of the power wielded by Soviet sympathizers and supporters.

In conclusion, may I ask a favor of you? If you could assure us of your support in repealing the prohibition against a theater project when the next W. P. A. bill comes up, provided the members of council you name resign or are removed from office, it would help us greatly to clean house. We should be very grateful to you.

Again my sincere thanks to you.

Sincerely yours,

WINFRED LENIHAN.

AUGUST 19, 1940.

DEAR MISS LENIHAN: Thank you very much for your letter of August 13. You are very kind in your expression of appreciation of my effort to assist the theatrical unions and particularly the Actors' Equity Association to rid themselves of the subversive influence of communism.

As I have already written the president of your association, I sincerely believe there is a good chance of the ban against a Federal theater being removed, providing your association and the other theater organizations sincerely clean house, and no chance otherwise.

I do not hesitate, therefore, to assure you of my wholehearted support if this is done.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

W. P. LAMBERTSON.

NEW YORK CITY, *August 22, 1940.*

MY DEAR MR. LAMBERTSON: As a third-generation American, I share your desire to restore Americanism to its rightful dominant place in our life, our professions, our business, and our Government.

As a member of the Actors' Equity Association, I thank you for the backbone you have put into our resistance to communistic penetration, which gained such headway under Hallie Flanagan's administration of the late Federal theater, and which is now being carried on indefatigably by the Theater Arts Committee.

As a member of the A. E. A. council, I deplore the ungracious and ungrammatical letter from our executive secretary which was our first official communication to you, and which is now spread on the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, to the lasting embarrassment of the Equity membership. I resent the temerity of the executive secretary in presuming to speak for a membership which at that time he had not consulted, and which to date has had no information on this controversy through the columns of our official organ, the Equity magazine.

But, I ask in all seriousness, what can Equity do?

You fling "Stalin's 'Fifth Column' on Broadway" at us. I fling back The "Fifth Column" in Washington, a book dedicated to Franklin D. Roosevelt, to "help him discover the borers from within his own official household, before it is too late." Help him discover? Does Mr. Roosevelt need MARTIN DIES to discover, as of today, that Harold Ickes and Frances Perkins "should be driven from the Cabinet unless they change their attitude toward Trojan-horse organizations"? What has the Dies committee been doing but discover, and discover, and discover, and what has been done about it?

Again I ask, What can the Federal Bureau of Investigation do? They can investigate alleged violations of law. But it is no violation of law to be a Communist, to be a member of the Communist Party, or to engage in the activities of a communistic organization as such. Once the F. B. I. has assured itself that the agent of a foreign power has complied with the requirements of the Registration Act, it can do no more. Once registered, The Daily Worker remains The Daily Worker, to quote today's Herald-Tribune.

You are demanding, and very justly, that Equity clean house. We can, with equal justice, demand that the United States Government clean house, starting where the cleaning is most needed, and where cleaning will do the most good, with the official household in Washington.

Do you gentlemen in Congress think for a moment that Canada will conclude any joint defense agreement with this country which does not include the demand that we follow Canada's example and outlaw the Communist Party? You have had the example. Must you wait for a demand from the outside? Why not accede to the demand of thousands of 100-percent Americans within the country? If the Government doesn't do it, the people will.

I am happy to note that you have had letters of thanks and commendation from many representative Equity members. I predict that you will receive many more.

With every possible assurance of my gratitude, and of my willingness to help in every way, I beg to remain,

Faithfully yours,

CLYDE FILLMORE.

I have received denials of Communist affiliation from Messrs. Loeb, Heller, Sherman, Jaffe, and from Emily Marsh, and some interesting correspondence from the theater arts committee. I shall in the near future present these letters, together with a condensed account of my evidence as to the affiliations of these individuals and this organization, for the greater knowledge and education of the members of the Actors' Equity Association.

With other unions affiliated with the A. F. of L, such as the New York State Federation of Labor, Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen, barring by formal resolution Communists from seeking or holding office in those unions, it seems to me that Equity certainly should fall in line.

If any doubt exists as to the justification of my charges, it should be dispelled by reading the following article from the Daily Worker of July 13, 1940, sent me by Mr. Horace Casselbury, of 45 West Forty-seventh Street, New York City, the address of Actors' Equity Association:

CONGRESSMAN ATTACKS THE BROADWAY THEATER

(By Ralph Warner)

Broadwayites were literally shocked out of their senses this week by the anti-Communist blast of Kansas Congressman LAMBERTSON, who charged Actors' Equity Association is run by Communists. LAMBERTSON, who has never had any contact with theatrical unions or theatrical life, not only attacked Equity but also slashed at the American Federation of Radio Artists and the American Guild of Variety Artists—thus proving that the intent of his blast was to pave the way for a grand-scale attack not upon Communists but upon unions in the entertainment field.

The shock to Broadway workers resulted from their own knowledge of the fact that certain Equity stalwarts have indulged in "red baiting" in recent months. Here was an example of a classic political truism of the present period: "Red baiting" by misguided liberals or trade-union misleaders always comes home to roost. Only a few months ago "red baiting" Louis Schaffer succeeded in injecting the Communist issue into the theater via the benefits for the Finnish White Guards. Actors who refused to join in these affairs, which were for the purpose of supporting Czarist, antiunion, anti-Semitic, antidemocratic, antieverything forces—such actors were called "reds." The I. L. G. W. U. Social-Democrat, supposedly representing a trade-union theater, was bellwether to the Fascist-minded sheep as he continued his attack with a venomous slander of the Theater Arts Committee.

LAMBERTSON'S attack, with its mention of Miss Bankhead's defeat, shows that this group, having been rejected by a majority of the membership in a democratic election, would like to destroy Equity's democracy by calling seven of the most active Equity officials Communists. This is the usual method of those real "fifth columnists" who, working within labor organizations and democratic governments, seek to weaken democratic organizations and trade-unions by disruption and splitting.

In point of fact, the LAMBERTSON attack, like MARTIN DIES' generalized assaults on the theater and stage, are part of the grand offensive of reaction now under way, concealed behind the smoke screen of war hysteria. LAMBERTSON and other reactionaries, aided as always by such pseudo laborites as Louis Schaffer the social democrat, seek to penalize anyone who differs from them.

Clearly the answer to such attacks as those by Lambertson & Co. is unity, unity, and more unity. The individuals attacked can best reply to LAMBERTSON by joining hands to rally together with the dispossessed actors, technicians, stage hands, and other workers who have been shut off from work relief by the Woodrums, the Dies, the Schaffers, Peglers, the Bankheads, and all those who, masking their purpose behind "red" baiting and warmania., seek to wreck the theatrical trade unions. Unity of all workers is the prime need of the theater. The answer to LAMBERTSON is to fight ever more energetically for actors' rights and a job, for a Federal Theater Project and for the end of "red" baiting from within and without the profession.

The familiar cries of "red baiting," "fascism," "antiunion," "censorship," the frantic plea for "unity," are invariably the answering scream of anguish whenever the hidden, festering sore of communism is prodded or exposed. I may say that I am proud to be the object of so much invective in the columns of the Daily Worker, registered organ of the Soviet Union in the United States.

At the last moment, as I completed the preparation of this statement, I received the following letter from Mr. Bert Lytell, president of Equity:

NEW YORK, N. Y., *August 30, 1940.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LAMBERTSON: To answer the request of your last letter, I telephoned Dullzell, who has been away on a vacation, and he informed me that he had answered the letter you mentioned. As to what his answer is, I, naturally, do not know; but I will be back in town for next Tuesday's council meeting and request him to read your communication to the members.

As you have seen, no doubt, in the papers, I have had a most satisfactory visit with Congressman DIES, and I think we will get very quick action.

Sincerely,

BERT LYTELL.

Nothing has yet been received from Dullzell. I was anxious to know what happened at Tuesday's council meeting and what happened to the disappearing and unanswered letters, so phoned Mr. Lytell yesterday. He was greatly surprised to know the letter from Mr. Dullzell he mentions had not been received. And I was greatly surprised to learn from him that my letter of August 13 had not been presented to the council, as he had promised.

I think the record may be allowed to speak for itself.

British Propaganda and Subversion of Textbooks in American Public Schools—H and I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. THORKELSON

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 11, 1940

EXCERPTS FROM REPORT OF DAVID HIRSHFIELD

Mr. THORKELSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include articles from the report of David Hirshfield, relating to a book by Willis Mason West, sometime professor of history and head of the department in the University of Minnesota, and an article entitled "Resolutions of Patriotic Organizations."

HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN PEOPLE—1918

(By Willis Mason West, sometime professor of history and head of the department in the University of Minnesota)

The complaints against this text from many sources are that its author is an outright propagandist, endeavoring zealously to promote the British design of an Anglo-American union.

The New York City school committee, in its report of this author, says:

"Mr. West presents only the views of the counsel for the crown.

"The writer is constantly finding defense for the course of action taken by the British Government. The American side of the argument is entirely ignored. * * *

"No Wedderburn, no crown advocate could plead the British cause in a more bitterly partisan spirit than West has done."

Notwithstanding, West's book continues on the authorized list for use in the New York schools.

Professor West proclaims in the preface to his book that the feature he has aimed first to emphasize is:

"the historical grounds for friendship between America and England, in spite of old sins and misunderstandings.

"Throughout I have not hesitated to portray the weaknesses, blunders, and sins of democracy."

He, in my opinion, herein pleads guilty to the charge of being an English propagandist.

Some of the un-American teachings running through this textbook are:

"Most of the settlers were 'servants,' and a rather worthless lot" (p. 67).

They were "a bad lot, with the vices of an irresponsible, untrained, hopeless class * * * Cheats and drunkards from this class * * * led to crime or suicide" (p. 72).

Democracy—"the meanest and worst form of government" (p. 80).

"Many of them paid themselves indirectly for their devotion to public service by what would today be called graft" (p. 132).

"Especially was the public land a source of private riches" (p. 133).

"Pettiness and ignorance on the part of the colonists" (p. 141).

"Wolfe had only 700 Americans, whom he described as 'the dirtiest, most contemptible, cowardly dogs. * * * such rascals are an encumbrance to an army" (p. 182).

"Washington declared that he would have been wholly helpless for a long time, had he not had under his command a small troop of English soldiers" (p. 183).

"Colony after colony, for time after time, had been guilty of sacrificing the safety of a neighbor to sordid parsimony or to mean jealousy" (p. 189).

Those who took part in the Stamp Act protests, the Boston Tea Party, the Boston Massacre, and the capture of the *Gaspee* are referred to as mobs.

Some of the Colonial leaders are called patriots, but the word is derisively saddled with quotation marks.

The colonists who resisted British tyranny are repeatedly called radicals.

At Valley Forge, "nearly a fifth of a starving army deserted to the well-fed enemy in Philadelphia" (p. 236).

"The Tories, on the whole, represented respectability and refinement" (p. 230).

"It has been said that at important periods more Americans were under arms against independence than for it" (p. 237).

In referring to the early struggle of the Colonies for independence, the book bristles with such sharply denunciatory phrases as "the most horrible form of mob violence," "corruptly managed sales," "Congress and the Federal bunch," "scoundrels graduated into national politics," etc., etc.

Professor West deplores the American Revolution as a calamity which "split the English-speaking race," and on page 178 of his book he says:

"The conquest of Canada removed the most pressing need of English protection. Farsighted men had long seen that the Colonies might be less true to the mother country if the dreaded French power should cease to threaten them from the north."

What seems to be the only hope Professor West holds out for America he expresses on page 243, in the following language:

"Now, after a century and a half, the two great divisions of the English-speaking race are coming together once more in sympathetic friendship again to 'double their influence.'"

In Professor West's recital of the causes of the Revolution the colonists are generally made to appear in the wrong. Their grievances are belittled; the British oppressions are smoothed away; the great patriot speeches of protest and the Declarations of Rights are omitted, and the high-minded resistance to English tyranny is pictured as mere ruffianism.

The influences which united the patriot colonists are presented on pages 211, 213, and 215 of this remarkable history text, as follows:

"Tar and feathers and the 'birch seal' became common means of persuasion; and moderates complained bitterly that, in the name of liberty, the populace refused all liberty of speech or action."

"The radical patriots were probably a minority; but they were aggressive and organized, and eventually they whipped into line the great body of timid and indifferent people. On the other hand, many earnest patriots of the preceding period now became tories from repugnance to armed rebellion or to mob rule.

"Of course, the tories had refused to pay any attention to the illegal elections of such provincial conventions. Indeed, in some cases, they were even excluded from voting by test oaths. In this way the radicals came to control the only governments in existence.

"The loyalists early began to accuse the patriots of aiming at independence. But, until some months after Lexington, the patriots vehemently disavowed such villainy, protesting enthusiastic loyalty to King George."

The following extracts are fairly illustrative of the impressions which Professor West desires to make upon the plastic minds of school children concerning the causes of the American Revolution and some of the patriots involved in that great struggle for American independence:

"The English colonial system had guided and guarded the colonies while they needed help and protection. It was not tyrannical. * * * Many shrewd observers believed that the Revolution was caused largely by dread of ecclesiastical interference" (p. 185).

"In growing up, America had grown away from England. * * * By 1775 European English and American English could no longer understand each other's ideas. * * * Both sections of Englishmen clung to the doctrine 'No taxation without representation,' but these words meant one thing in England and a very different thing in America" (p. 187).

"The problem, however, was not merely about taxation; it was a question, also, of maintaining the unity of the British Empire—the greatest free state the world had ever seen" (pp. 188–189).

"The American Revolution is seen imperfectly, if it is looked upon solely as a struggle between England and America. * * * It was a part of a thousand-year contest between the English-speaking people and their kings for more political liberty. * * * In many ways the Revolution was a true civil war."—Page 191.

"Englishmen of that day believed sincerely that the Revolution was the work of a group of soreheads. George Washington as a youth had been refused a coveted commission in the British Army, Sam Adams' father had been ruined by the wise British veto of a proposed Massachusetts land bank. The older Otis had failed to secure an appointment on the Massachusetts bench. Alexander Hamilton was a penniless and briefless law student, with no chance for special advancement unless by fishing in troubled waters" (p. 195).

"In the Stamp Act period the honest purpose of the English Government had been to protect the Colonies, not to oppress them" (p. 200).

Of the Boston Massacre: "The troops were subjected to constant and bitter insult. * * * The mob, no doubt, deserved blame" (pp. 201–202).

Those who studied their American history in days when it was taught for its patriotic truth, even if they have since forgotten most of it, must readily sense the purpose of the foregoing.

Of the Bills of Rights of the Revolutionary period, Professor West teaches, on page 219:

"Such as those against excessive bail, cruel or unusual punishments, arbitrary imprisonment, and the like, go back to ancient English charters, even for their wording. * * *

"About 1760 this same democratic English literature began deeply to affect a few French thinkers like Rousseau, the prophet of the later French Revolution. These men stated the old English truths with a new French brilliancy; and it is sometimes hard to say whether the American leaders drew their doctrines from the French or the older English sources."

This is quite different than what formerly was taught in American school history and at variance with the well-substantiated facts.

In a study of the sources of American institutions, Holland looms larger than England. It was from Holland that the fathers brought the town meeting, the written ballot, the self-government of towns, and their representation in a general legislature. It was from Holland whence came the doctrine of freedom of speech and worship and the separation of church and state.

In his book of more than 700 pages Professor West devotes only 47 scattered lines, equal to one page and a quarter, to the entire military and naval movements of the Revolutionary War. The space generally given to this topic in school history is about 40 pages. Even Professor Muzzey gives to it nearly 10 pages.

In his page-and-a-quarter account Professor West necessarily avoids, rather than treats, the vital subject. Most of the great characters and events are omitted.

Bunker Hill is not mentioned.

Yorktown is given a scant paragraph.

But, brief as it is, this account would have been better if briefer still, for in it the colonists' glorious deeds are eliminated, and the defamations take their place. He says:

"Among the Americans the war developed some excellent generals of the second rank—Greene, Arnold, Marion—but many officers were incompetent or self-seeking or treacherous" (p. 231).

"A terrible feature of some raids was the use of Indian allies by the English; but it must be remembered that the Americans had first tried to secure such allies" (p. 237).

"Campaigns in Europe and the West Indies drained England's resources, glorious though the results were to her arms against those tremendous odds. Meantime, in America, Congress kept its sinking finances afloat by generous gifts and huge loans from France. The Army, however, was dangerously discontented. Desertions to the enemy rose to a hundred or 200 a month" (p. 238–239).

While there was some treachery in the army, in my opinion, it is infamy to name Greene and Marion with Arnold in one connection.

To argue as to which side "first tried" to use Indians as companions in arms would only lead to aimless controversy. There can be, however, no dispute as to which side did actually make use of the Indians. According to Bancroft, as early as September 1774 the president of King's College, now Columbia, an Englishman, published the threat that if the colonists did not submit to the English there would be war and the Indians would be set upon the frontier settlements, murdering and scalping. Thus we find that in teaching early American history from the pro-British "viewpoint" and in bending his energy to direct American thought toward—so-called—"Anglo-American understanding," Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler, the present president of Columbia University, is only following the footsteps of his English predecessor.

Judge Wallace McCamant, president general of the National Society of Sons of the American Revolution, made this statement concerning the use of Indians against the white settlers:

"The George Rogers Clark expedition does not stand forth pictured in all its true colors until we learn that Col. Henry Hamilton, the British commander at Detroit, had heavily subsidized the Indians on the frontier, from the Lakes to the Gulf; that it was his plan to let loose on the frontier these barbarous warriors, to the end that in 1779 men, women, and children in our frontier settlements might perish. This was the disaster averted by the heroism of the 'Hannibal of the West' and his little band of riflemen, which is not mentioned in any of these revised histories."

No one who reads the horrors of Cherry Valley and other revolting massacres of most barbarous character committed by Indians armed and encouraged by the British and Tories, and, in many instances, said to be under command of British officers, can have patience for controversy on the subject in a school history.

There is no question that large bribes were offered by the British for deserters. Gen. Joseph Reed spoke of the sentiment of the American Armies when, on receiving an offer of $50,000 if he would forsake his country's cause, he sent back the noble answer:

"I am not worth purchasing, but such as I am the King of Great Britain is not rich enough to buy me."

Sir George Otto Trevelyan, whose British history of the American Revolution is so greatly admired and so largely copied by the modern revisionists, fails them on this point, for Trevelyan in volume IV, on page 52, says:

"British veterans sorrowfully counted the handful of Americans who were attracted by the secure pay and the smart uniform of the royal service, as compared with the tens of thousands who did not shrink from the starvation and the threadbare misery which awaited them in the Continental Army."

It is worthy to note that, although Professor West has no space in his book for mention of Bunker Hill, or for Saratoga, he gives a half-page to a picture of Colonel Tarleton, whom he proclaims as "the commander of 'Tarleton's Legion,' the most famous of all the loyalist regiments" (p. 238).

"Most infamous" has always fitted better into American history. Tarleton was known in his time as the "Butcher." He desecrated a flag of truce, disregarded the rules of civilized warfare, and his bloodiest victories were over unorganized men and helpless women and children. He achieved nothing but obloquy. In an American history, Tarleton manifestly has no place with Gen. Nathaniel Greene, who crushed him, but in the West book General Greene is scarcely mentioned.

In this text Andrew Jackson, who as a captive lad was wounded by Tarleton because he would not black his boots, is pictured only in two derisive cartoons, while Lafayette, John Stark, Paul Revere, Nathan Hale, and a host of other patriot heroes are not even mentioned.

Whatever inspirational effect may be intended by this exaltation of Tarleton, is wholly misdirected. It is of a class with the praise of Benedict Arnold by another of these revisionists. Since their stated purpose is to bring about friendlier relations between America and Great Britain, it were better for them if such infamous names as that of Tarleton, instead of being exalted in our school histories, were obliterated and forgotten.

In the same manner as have the other "modern" historians whose texts are complained of, Professor West speaks disparagingly of France and her aid to the colonists. He says:

"To the despotic French Government the alliance was purely a 'League of Hatred'" (p. 235).

"To large numbers of patriots even the news of the new ally was of doubtful cheer. Many began to fear that they had only exchanged the petty annoyances of English rule for the slavery of French despotism and of the Spanish Inquisition" (p. 236).

Whatever ulterior motives, if any, may be imagined to have been hidden in the backs of the heads of the French ministers, it is beyond dispute that the assistance of France, generously given the colonists, helped incalculably toward our independence; and it is not fair to the French people of the past and of the present, nor to our own people of the present and of the future, to attempt to minimize our gratitude and friendship for France, much less destroy it by means of propaganda for British imperialism, inserted in American school history.

The great significance of the War of 1812, which completed American independence, secured undisputed standing to the United States as a nation and gave definite impulse to Americanism is grossly distorted in this book in some of the following passages:

"Our foreign relations from 1806 to 1812 were disgraceful" (p. 395).

"Our Government shilly-shallied, in impotent indecision, until the energetic part of the Nation rose wrathfully to demand that we fight someone at once to win back self-respect. Then we chose the wrong time and apparently the wrong foe. Unfortunately, too, our choice of a foe arrayed us on the side of the European despot against the only hope for European freedom" (p. 395).

"Young Republicans, or War Hawks, finally brought Madison to their side. * * * It was said that Madison yielded to secure necessary War Hawk support for his reelection in 1812" (p. 398).

"The War Hawks expected to end the war in one glorious campaign of conquest" (p. 399).

"One disgraceful episode of the war calls for mention. In 1813 an American raid burned Toronto (then York), the capital of lower Canada. A British force off our eastern coast retaliated by a raid against our capital" (p. 400).

"The war originated in blunder. It was conducted discreditably. And it was ended without mention of the questions that caused it" (p. 409).

Perry's victory is mentioned only in a one-line footnote.

The Battle of New Orleans is belittled to seven lines.

Professor West quite magnanimously excuses Great Britain and accuses the United States. America is accused of picking the wrong foe and arraying herself on the side of despotism and fighting against European freedom. This is not revision but reversal of facts. It is not history. In my opinion, it is nothing but British propaganda.

Professor West, like some of the other latter-day American historians, so-called, offers excuse for the burning of Washington in the burning of York. It never has been ascertained who fired the government buildings at York, but it is known and agreed upon by all historians, Canadian as well as American, that, while the British were evacuating York and the triumphant Americans were entering there came a terrific explosion of a British powder magazine, the location of which had been unsuspected by the Americans, and that 52 Americans were killed and 180 wounded. On the other hand, it is confessed that the burning of Washington by the British was done "under strict orders from the Government at home."

The Canadian historian, Murray, in his Historical and Descriptive Account of British America, in volume 1, page 230, says, concerning the firing by the English of the powder magazine at York:

"The firing of this mine was undoubtedly a most barbarous and unjustifiable act on the part of the British. Their defeat was already inevitable, and they knew the explosion could not affect the result. It was, therefore, a wanton destruction of life, as cowardly as it was cruel, without any expectation of benefit to themselves."

Before the destruction of York the British had destroyed Frenchtown, Frederick, Georgetown, and Havre de Grace and had committed outrages at Hampton.

There is, perhaps, no good reason why outrages should be dwelt upon in school history. There is certainly no good reason for them to be excused or for shifting the long-settled odium from the British to the Americans upon no better authority than British propaganda.

As to America's motive in the War with Mexico, Professor West teaches, on page 515:

"The West was eager for more territory and had few scruples against fighting Mexico to get it."

In an attempt to teach American children that our war for the preservation of the Union could not have been won but for English friendship, her commercial sacrifices, and "heroic support," Professor West devotes three times as much space as he does to all the military movements of the Revolution.

One sentence is expressive of the spirit of five pages:

"The North, then, had great cause, not always duly recognized, for deep gratitude to the sound heart of the English masses, who felt dimly that the Union was fighting slavery, even while Unionists denied it loudly, and who, therefore, gave the North a heroic support through cruel privations—in many ways as severe as those borne by Americans" (p. 577).

Our War with Spain, Professor West teaches our children, was won not through American strength and valor, but through the friendship of England, which prevented Germany from enlisting all Europe on the side of Spain.

Our motive in that war, as given by West, was not the liberation of Cuba, but because (p. 633):

"American capitalists had large interests in the sugar industry in the island and used powerful influences, open and secret, to secure American intervention with a view to subsequent annexation."

As to our country's safe survival of the first 3½ years of the World War, Professor West gives this familiar British explanation:

"Our fancied security, unprepared for war as we were, was due only to the protecting shield of England's Fleet" (p. 720).

From all this it appears to be Professor West's fixed purpose to imbue American school children with the idea that America is a wayward, wandering, weak, and helpless child which must return to the loving-mother arms of the British Empire.

RESOLUTIONS OF PATRIOTIC ORGANIZATIONS

Resolutions adopted unanimously by the national congress of the Sons of the American Revolution, May 15, 1922:

"The Sons of the American Revolution in national congress assembled express their deep interest in the subject of textbooks on American history in use in our public schools. We protest against the use of any textbook which lauds the tories and censures the patriots, which maligns the memory of any of the great men of the Revolutionary period or undervalues the services and sacrifices by which our national independence was won.

"Textbooks on American history should be written only by those who are in sympathy with the principles for which our forefathers fought. Every such history should adequately stress the story of the American Revolution, portray in colorful outline the heroic incidents of the struggle, and teach the priceless value of the institutions which we inherit from our forefathers.

"We protest against any textbooks which teach socialism, bolshevism, or class hatred. The committee on patriotic education is instructed to carry out this resolution and is authorized to take all needful measures to eliminate from our schools all textbooks objectionable on the above grounds."

By the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States the following resolution was unanimously adopted in the national encampment, August 24, 1922:

"The Veterans of Foreign Wars, in national encampment assembled, recognize that grave charges have been made, and proven to be true, that American history textbooks in use in public schools have lately been revised in un-American spirit.

"We indignantly protest against the use in schools of those histories which defame or ignore our Nation's founders, falsify the causes of the Revolution and the War of 1812, discredit the statement of grievances made in the Declaration of Independence, belittle the heroism, sacrifice, and idealism of our forefathers, and misinterpret the principles and purposes upon which our Republic was founded and for which it has stood.

"We declare that the whole noble history of the founding and vindication of free government on this continent has a fixed, distinctive, and exalted meaning, not only for Americans, but for all mankind; that the precepts and traditions descending to us from

that heroic period are a precious heritage which we generously have shared with the whole human race, and which heritage must not now be denied to our children.

"We demand that the treason texts be thrown out of the public schools of every State, and that truthful histories be substituted instead, and we pledge our unflagging efforts to that end.

"We feel that to Charles Grant Miller, through whose patriotic service a sinister attempt to degrade our country's history has been exposed and checked, is due the gratitude not only of the members of this organization, but of all Americans of the present and future.

"In this connection your committee recommends that the national patriotic instructor, the department patriotic instructors, and post patriotic instructors be instructed to investigate the report to the chairman of the Americanization committee upon the histories now in use in the schools of the several States, and that in all States where histories are in use which do not conform to the true ideals of Americanization, the matter be taken up by the Americanization committee with the superintendent of public instruction in the several States with the view of having approved editions of American histories adopted for use in such schools."

Resolution unanimously adopted by New York State Department, Grand Army of the Republic, in annual encampment, June 7, 1922:

"Whereas the sympathetic teaching of true American history in the educational institutions of our country is essential to the retention and strengthening of our patriotic spirit and ideals; and

"Our Nation's true annals have been unfailing sources of pride and inspiration which have prompted us as a people to stanch character, unparalleled achievement and unprecedented prestige among the powers, and to world-wide influence in liberation and elevation of mankind;

"*Resolved*, That we condemn as unfit for school use or teaching any history, textbooks, or other books, plans, pictures, or persons which defame our Nation's founders and defenders, misrepresent the ideals and causes for which they struggled and sacrificed, or misinterpret the principles and purposes upon which our Republic was established and for which it has stood.

"We demand that our annals be preserved unimpaired as the rightful heritage of posterity, and as guaranty that the future of our Nation shall be as glorious as its past.

"We demand that our Nation's true history be presented to rising generations with a view to wholesome cultivation of patriotic spirit, solidarity, and morale, based upon right conceptions of the doctrines and traditions of American democracy.

"We protest against any school or other teachings which advance class interest, create class distinction, or inculcate class hatred."

Resolution adopted by Seattle Chapter, Sons of the American Revolution, January 27, 1922:

"Whereas, The free public school, originating and developing in America, giving American youth the education and training so necessary to a life of usefulness and good citizenship, is one of the most valuable of all American institutions, and one of the principal bulwarks of liberty and independence, and

"Whereas national safety and national unity demand the maintenance of our public-school system free from the influences, whether foreign or domestic, which tend to degrade American ideals and to corrupt our national traditions; and

"Whereas among America's richest treasures are its Revolutionary history—the Boston Tea Party, Paul Revere's Ride, Putnam leaving his plow in the field, Lexington, Bunker Hill, Patrick Henry's speech, Valley Forge, Saratoga, Yorktown—great landmarks of a heroic race, as daring in conception, as thrilling in execution, as momentous in results as anything in ancient romance, the divine birthright of every American child, in which he absorbs and lives and breathes the very spirit that made these United States; and

"Whereas indisputable evidence proves an insidious and treacherous propaganda in operation to place in our public schools American history textbooks designed to destroy faith in the forefathers and respect for American history and institutions: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That Seattle Chapter, Sons of the American Revolution, realizing that eternal vigilance is the price of peace, freedom, and security, regards with grave concern this condition in our schools, and urges upon our educational authorities (school boards, superintendents, supervisors, principals, and teachers) the vital need of a careful review of American history textbooks, that steps may be taken to bar obnoxious books from our schools, and that only such textbooks be permitted therein as teach the simple heroic truth of American history, and written not by aliens but by American historians."

The Descendants of the Signers of the Declaration of Independence, in their national congress in Independence Hall, July 4, 1922, unanimously adopted this resolution:

"It is resolved as the sense of this meeting of the Descendants of the Signers of the Declaration of Independence that, while the members would view with apprehension any tampering with the histories of the United States used in the public schools, in the interest of any country, people, races, or policies, at the same time they cannot believe that what is falsely called a truthful presentation of the other side of the case demands that the histories put in the hands of American children should boldly misrepresent the men and measures, manners, and methods and the great events of the Revolution and the subsequent periods leading up to the Constitution of 1787.

"This misrepresentation and misinterpretation being accomplished (1) by the belittling of the significance of the Declaration of Independence itself; (2) by disparaging and ridiculing signers of the Declaration and leaders in the Revolution, impugning their motives, holding them up to contempt of the youth of today as patriots and statesmen; and (3) by ignoring some of the most celebrated of our Revolutionary heroes who gave all, even life itself, for the country's great cause."

The New Jersey State Council of the Junior Order United American Mechanics, representing 80,000 members, in its 1922 convention, unanimously adopted this resolution:

"It is by the light of true American annals, ideals, principles, policies, and purposes that liberty-seeking people of all climes, all races, all religions, all colors, and all classes have in our country united together in solidarity, singleness of aspiration, and splendid morale as a Nation.

"We demand that our Nation's true history be taught to rising generations in the public schools, with a view to wholesome cultivation of virile patriotism.

"We demand that American history be preserved unimpaired, as the rightful heritage of our children and as guaranty that the future of our Nation shall be as secure and glorious as is its past.

"We pledge our hearty cooperation with the Patriot League for the Preservation of American History in the coordination of plans and activities of all patriotic organizations in driving all treason texts out of the schools of our country."

The State Council of Pennsylvania, Order of Independent Americans, in convention September 1922, unanimously adopted this resolution:

"*Resolved*, That the textbooks in the public schools which teach sectarian and Anglo-Saxon propaganda must be removed therefrom."

Resolution unanimously adopted by the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, in their annual congress held April 9, 1923:

"The National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, in national congress, recognize that the true history of the birth of our Republic, handed down through successive generations upon the sacred word of honor of our fathers, has been unfailing source of the splendid patriotism, solidarity, morale, and peace spirit of the American people.

"This heroic story has been the strongest inspiration throughout our past, as it is at present, to 'cherish, maintain, and extend the institutions of American freedom, to foster true patriotism and love of country, and to aid in securing for mankind all the blessings of liberty.'

"We demand that our country's true annals, ideals, and principles be preserved unsullied and transmitted unimpaired to our children in the public schools, as their rightful heritage, and for the perpetuation of wholesome national spirit based upon right conceptions of the vital doctrines and traditions of American democracy.

"We condemn as unfit for school use those history texts which defame or ignore our heroic forefathers, misrepresent the consecrated causes for which they struggled and sacrificed, and misinterpret the fundamental principles upon which they established our liberties and our Nation.

"We declare that the teaching of true American history in the public schools of our country is vitally essential to the inculcation of our distinctive national spirit and ideals in our future citizenry.

"We pledge our ready cooperation with other patriotic bodies in practical measures for cleansing the public schools of false and unpatriotic teachings."

Democratic Campaign in Maryland Opens With Enthusiasm

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 11, 1940

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, cheering Democrats last night packed the Lyric Theater in Baltimore, Md., to the doors to hear their State campaign open in a blaze of oratory and song. There was enthusiasm aplenty, enthusiasm that was dampened for awhile when it was announced from the platform that the Speaker of the House of Representatives, Representative BANKHEAD, who was expected to give the principal address, had been taken ill at the Emerson Hotel, to the regret of the entire country.

About everybody who counts in Maryland democracy, together with many Congressmen from other States, was in the throng.

Harmony was proclaimed by every speaker. Governor O'Conor, who delivered not only his own address, as chairman of the rally, but also read that of Speaker BANKHEAD for the benefit of the Nation-wide radio hook-up, called Mayor Jackson and Senator RADCLIFFE his friends and comrades, and they returned the compliment. He urged the election of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, Henry A. Wallace, Senator George L. Radcliffe, and David Ward, William P. Cole, Jr., Thomas D'Alesandro, Jr., John A. Meyer, Lansdale G. Sasscer, and William B. Byron to the House of Representatives.

Mayor Jackson told the audience that he was present to urge upon the people of Maryland and the whole country the election of all Democratic candidates. He said that the democracy of Maryland is united and factional differences have been buried. "We will march forward in an overwhelming number behind our party and the leader of our Nation, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, and the national Democratic candidates, Roosevelt and Wallace, will carry Maryland, and with them we shall reelect GEORGE L. RADCLIFFE to the United States Senate and once more return a solid Democratic delegation to the House of Representatives."

Below is a copy of the speech prepared by Speaker Bankhead:

Governor O'Conor, Members of the congressional delegation of Maryland, and fellow citizens, I am deeply honored with your invitation to deliver a short address at the opening of the Democratic campaign in the great State of Maryland. It is always an honor to appear in this great State whose people have played such a conspicuous and distinguished part in the development of our Nation from colonial days on down to the present time and who are still carrying forward the noble traditions of their ancestors.

Within the time limit allowed me on the radio it will, of course, not be possible for me to attempt to make any extended argument on the vital political and national issues involved in this campaign and my observations will necessarily be limited to a very few of the pending issues.

I rejoice to be in the presence of this magnificent gathering of the democracy of Maryland and among the audience I trust there may be many independent voters and possibly some who have heretofore voted the Republican ticket. There has never been waged within this generation a political campaign of more profound significance to the present and future happiness and safety of the American people. I am, of course, here to present mainly the Democratic side of this issue. I am always happy to embrace an opportunity to speak in behalf of that great political organization which, since the very founding of our Republic, has played such an active and conspicuous part in the destiny of our Nation. I am also glad that in presenting the Democratic cause, particularly with reference to the record and achievements of the present Democratic administration at Washington, that I can bring to the people of Maryland, as well as to those of the country, the assurance that in all executive and legislative efforts under this administration, we have not departed from, but have adhered to, the basic and fundamental principle upon which our party was founded, "Equal rights to all men and special privileges to none."

In order to have a fair appraisal of the record of this administration and to determine whether or not, upon the whole, it has done a good or an evil job, it is, of course, only fair that we should reconsider the condition of the country when we took over the Government in 1933. It is not necessary for me to recall in detail the disastrous and calamitous state of our entire country at the close of the Hoover administration when everywhere there was the universal cry of distress, impoverishment, fear, poverty, bankruptcy, a collapsed banking system, twelve to fifteen million unemployed and hungry people walking the streets and the countryside crying for bread and clothing and shelter. It was a situation which demanded the instant exercise of vitally courageous action. For 12 years our people had endured a Republican leadership that either did not have the capacity to conceive adequate measures of relief and reform or else totally lacked the courage to sponsor and execute them, and, under such circumstances, the people of this country for their own salvation, called back into power for the first time in many years a Democratic administration. As its leader and chieftain they chose a man of great vision and courage; a man who was totally unwilling to close his eyes to the facts of a new order of conditions which had grown up in our country in the last generation and which needed drastic remedial action; a man who was wise enough to know that if our country were to survive and its basic institutions preserved, some major reforms were imperative; a man daring enough to venture into new fields of legislation to cure obvious evils; a man who, despite much bitter and vindictive criticism and hatred, despite occasional errors of action or of policy, by every present poll of public opinion, still holds the personal affection and respect of a great majority of the American people—Franklin D. Roosevelt.

In order to avert a further fall into the abyss when, as I have suggested, "unmerciful disaster followed fast and followed faster" upon the homes and hopes of the American people, it was necessary for the Congress, with the President's approval, to enact a series of beneficent laws.

I cannot in this period even attempt to catalog all of them, nor to argue their merit and necessity. In the main, they were laws to restore our national and private credit and the confidence of the people in their banking institutions, and the heroic and effective manner in which this was accomplished after the bank holiday must yet be fresh in the minds of our people, especially the bankers of the country, who at that time were sorely pleading for assistance, but many of whom are now the bitterest enemies of this administration.

Incidental to the collapse of more than 5,000 National and State banks during previous Republican administrations, we enacted the law for the guaranty of the safety of all deposits of our National and State banks which were affiliated with the Federal system up to $5,000, constituting 98 percent of the total deposits, which, of course, means that if any such bank now fails its depositors will receive 100 cents on the dollar.

Reference has been made to the orgy of rampant and unbridled speculation of former years. Under former Republican administrations the license and freedom of action was allowed promoters, stock jobbers, and gold-brick syndicates. The American people had been swindled out of billions of hard-earned savings in the purchase of securities foisted upon them by these evil combinations, who operated without conscience and without restraint. To eradicate such indefensible activities we passed the Security Exchange Commission Act, under the operation of which no fly-by-night speculative enterprise can now mulct the investing public. Every security now offered for purchase must pass the scrutiny of the Commission, which passes upon its solvency and soundness. That was a type of legislation that was conceived totally to end evil and vicious practices that an aroused public conscience was not content longer to endure.

We broke up for all time the ruthless and unconscionable holding companies allowed to flourish in all of their ugly and wanton plundering of the stockholders of their subsidiaries under former administrations, of which the infamous Insull utility empire in the Midwest was a conspicuous example and of which the Commonwealth and Southern Corporation was a smaller prototype, and it will be remembered that when this bill was pending before the Interstate Commerce Committee of the House of Representatives the plans and strategy of the opposition to the legislation was furnished by none other than the Honorable Wendell Willkie, now the Republican nominee for President.

We established the Civilian Conservation Corps. We have provided adequate temporary relief for millions of men and women out of employment and without any opportunity to secure jobs. Through the agency of the Public Works Administration we have added to the permanent wealth of the country in every single community in America by the construction of permanent utilities for their comfort and happiness.

One of the greatest achievements of this administration was the financing and foundation of the Tennessee Valley Authority, which, as a yardstick for the control of power and light rates since its establishment, has already resulted in the reduction of charges to consumers in the United States of a half billion dollars, and that enterprise was one that seems to have particularly touched the sensitive corporate nerves of the private utilities of the country and especially of the Republican nominee.

In this connection a great deal has been said about the challenge which Mr. Willkie issued to the President for a series of joint debates in the country and, in my opinion, it has been well said that the most appropriate parties to have a joint debate with reference to their respective opinions upon questions of public policy, would be the Republican nominee for President, Mr. Willkie, and his running mate, Senator MCNARY, of Oregon. Speaking to the Economic Club of New York on January 21, 1935, Mr. Willkie said:

"No duty has ever come to me in my life, even that in the service of my country, which has so appealed to my sense of social obligation, patriotism, and love of mankind as this—my obligation to say and do what I can for the preservation of public utilities privately owned."

In this speech he described Mr. Samuel Insull as a "forceful, dynamic, and attractive figure." Speaking of public ownership and the right of the people to operate public service, Mr. Willkie said:

"All I have observed, all that I know and all that I read teaches me that I could do nothing nobler for the future financial stability and political good of my country or the social and economic well-being of my fellow citizens than to stand firm and unafraid against this foolish fad and fancy of the moment."

Now here is what Senator MCNARY, Mr. Willkie's running mate, said in his speech of acceptance:

"The Federal Government accepts the responsibility to control floods and assure navigation—out of these services flows the by-product of power. The Government having made this power available should have an indisputable right to control its utilization and distribution."

He further added that the big Federal power projects were liquidating their commitments to the Government. I am wondering how on this vital problem Mr. Willkie as President would control his unregenerate running mate who would then be Vice President of the United States.

Getting back to the legislative program, I mention without elaboration the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, with its tremendous benefits to the American people, and the Federal Housing Administration giving credit to hundreds of thousands of people to finance their own homes. We guaranteed for the first time in history by law the fundamental right of labor in this country to organize and bargain for the betterment of their wages and working conditions. We established a decent wage-hour law so that men and women who toil should not be forever exploited merely as human commodities. We have helped the impoverished youth to secure opportunities for high-school and college education; and, above all else, by our remedial program we have saved the farmers of the country from absolute destruction and bankruptcy by a series of wise and provident laws, including the soil- and water-conservation program, the lowest farm interest rates in our history, rural electrification, marketing agreements, commodity loans, parity payments, research into new uses and new markets, the stamp plan, and distribution of surplus commodities. Six million farmers are voluntarily cooperating in the various wings of the program.

After a very brief and fragmentary summary of the legislation enacted by this Democratic administration, we are now confronted with one of the most remarkable phenomenon in the history of American politics. After all of the long and bitter criticism of the opposition party and its leaders of the social, economic, and agricultural program of this administration, and after a 2½-year microscopic examination of that record by Dr. Glenn Frank, we naturally supposed that when the Republican National Convention at Philadelphia adopted its platform that they would attempt to tear the Democratic record limb from limb and at least have the temerity to suggest the total repeal or substantial modification of what they were so fond of calling New Deal vagaries. But, lo and behold, when the Republican platform was agreed upon and adopted, that great party no doubt reluctantly admitted and proclaimed that they approved in principle the Democratic legislative program of this administration, after which startling confession the only leg that they have to stand on in an appeal to be placed back in power is that they could administer these laws in a better fashion. There are some who believe that the major incentive to a return to power by the G. O. P. is the jobs, the patronage, and the power. The truth of the business is that the old Republican elephant, the symbol of their party, has grown extremely cadaverous for lack of adequate political hay.

A great deal has been said already in this campaign and much more will probably be said with reference to the third-term issue, which I desire to discuss for just a moment. I contend that there is absolutely no shred of political philosophy or sound analytical reason why a President of the United States should not be reelected for a third term. The whole argument against it is based entirely upon a so-called accepted tradition or unwritten law. When one begins to seek any real or persuasive reason for such a tradition, he will find, if fairly intentioned, that none exists. Whenever I am in doubt about the basic philosophies of our Constitution and way of life, it is my habit to revert to the discussions in the Constitutional Convention which drafted our Federal organic law, and upon such recent research I find that this was a matter that was fully, fairly, and at much length discussed in the Constitutional Convention. Every possible phase of a third term, or indeed a second term, was fully analyzed and debated by those great intellects and logicians who constituted the personnel of that Convention. Their wisdom and foresight as expressed in their finished work is one of the marvels of political action for all time and although many proposals were made for limitations of the term of the Presidency and after every possible angle of the matter was thoroughly explored, it was the final wisdom of those great men to place no limitation upon the number of terms that a President should be elected. They evidently were not impressed with the argument that more than two terms would lead to a dictatorship and they most wisely left the determination of the number of terms that a President could serve to the final decision of the people themselves. We are confronted with exactly that situation in this campaign.

The opponents of a third term usually refer to the attitude of George Washington upon this question and his refusal to accept a third term. The truth is that that decision was based entirely upon personal reasons and his desire in his old age to retire to the comforts of Mount Vernon. His real sentiments were expressed in a letter to General Lafayette, from which I take the following quotation:

"Under an extended view of this part of the subject, I can see no propriety in precluding ourselves from the services of any man, who on some great emergency, shall be deemed, universally, most capable of serving the public."

The patron saint of all Democrats is, of course, Thomas Jefferson, and some Democrats who are bitterly opposed to President Roosevelt for other reasons are now declaring that they can support no Democratic candidate for a third term. While it is true that Mr. Jefferson did, in general terms, oppose the election of a President for three terms, nevertheless, we find that it was not a matter of such profound conviction with him that he would make no exception, because when Mr. Jefferson was being implored by his political friends to run for a third term, he wrote to John Taylor and declared, "I had determined to declare my intentions, but I have considered to be silent on the opinion of friends who think it best not to put a continuance out of my power in defiance of all circumstances." Undoubtedly, if circumstances had warranted, he would have accepted a third term; and if living now, it is my opinion, holding the views that he did with reference to the rights of the average man in this country, he would declare that the present circumstances justify and demand that President Roosevelt be given a third term.

I have reserved for conclusion the supreme and paramount problems now weighing most heavily upon the hearts and homes of the American people, namely, foreign affairs and our national defense. Although studious and at times vindictive efforts have been made to impress the country with the fact that President Roosevelt and Secretary Hull have gone out of their way to indulge in so-called meddling in the foreign affairs of other nations, the whole record disproves such contention and definitely establishes that although they have from time to time made vigorous protests against the action of some foreign governments that were in contravention of the laws of Nature and humanity, nevertheless, the whole undertone and substance of their appeals to the world has been for the good-neighbor policy, for peace in the world, and against the spread of war. I will give only one instance of that consistent record. When the President signed the first neutrality resolution on August 31, 1935, he did so with this statement:

"I have approved this joint resolution because it was intended as an expression of the fixed desire of the Government and the people of the United States to avoid any action which might involve us in war. The policy of the Government is definitely committed to the maintenance of peace and the avoidance of any entanglements which would lead us into conflict."

And this was followed just a few weeks before the Chicago Convention with the following statement by the President:

"That we are opposed to war is known not only to every American, but to every government in the world. We will not use our arms in the way of aggression, we will not send our men to take part in European wars."

In addition to all this, he called a special session of Congress last year after the war broke out in Europe, recommended, and the Democratic Party passed, amendments to the existing neutrality law which prohibited the shipment in American vessels of cargoes into the waters of the belligerent nations, which, if it had not been done, would doubtless long before this have inevitably drawn us into the conflict for the same reasons which induced America to go to war against the central powers in 1917. On the vote in the House of Representatives on this most vital proposal for keeping out of the European war, on the final roll call on the conference report of the neutrality bill, there were—yeas, Democrats 223, Republicans 18; nays, Democrats 29, Republicans 141.

Another matter of the most supreme and vital importance to our people in view of the threats and power of the totalitarian powers in Europe is the matter of adequate national defense for the United States and the Western Hemisphere. It is not necessary for me to go into detail or statistics with reference to the earnest efforts of this administration to prepare for any eventuality that may be thrust upon our people, but Herr Hitler has sworn that this is a world revolution and that no democracy upon the face of the earth will ultimately be spared. It is no easy thing for a great Nation like this to adequately prepare against the terrific power of the Nazi war machine, but this administration and this Congress are taking every needful step to see to it that at the earliest possible moment we will be prepared in all fields of action to preserve the integrity of the Monroe Doctrine and to safeguard at all hazards our priceless heritage of liberty and free way of life. To give assurance to our people on the preparedness program I quote the following figures prepared by Congressman CLIFTON WOODRUM of Virginia of the Appropriations Committee:

"In 1933 we had an Army of 75,000 men. Today we have equipped and under arms an Army of 241,000, and the present Congress is authorizing an increase to 1,200,000, with a possible ultimate Reserve strength of 2,000,000.

"Today we have a 1-ocean Navy of 399 warships. In 1943 we will have 521 warships afloat, and in 1946 a 2-ocean Navy.

"Today we have 5,500 war planes (production 900 per month). Nineteen hundred and forty-one production will be up to 1,500 per month. July 1942 25,000 war planes will be ready. October 1943 50,000 war planes will be on hand.

"Today we have 500 tanks. Production is 3 light tanks daily. July 1941 1,500 tanks will be ready. January 1943 200 heavy 70-ton tanks will be ready.

"By August 1941 arms and critical equipment ready for 1,000,000 men. That's 1 year hence. October 1943 complete arms and equipment ready for an Army of 1,200,000 men, and a Reserve strength that will give us 2,000,000."

Proof of Authenticity of British Secret Document—Part II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. THORKELSON

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 30, 1940

Mr. THORKELSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include excerpts from magazines, press, and other publications, I shall now pro-

ceed to discuss the British Secret Document, which was addressed to the Right Honorable Lloyd George, and dated June 10, 1919. The second paragraph of this document, entitled "Preliminary Consideration," deals with Anglo-American alliance, which will eventually result in a peaceful return of the American Colonies to the dominion of the Crown of England. This has been discussed in the articles entitled "Steps Toward a British Union, World State, and International (should be Internal) Strife," August 20, parts I II, III, and IV, and August 21, parts V and VI, and September 3, parts VII and VIII, and September 5, part IX. In these remarks the reader will find much evidence to substantiate the letter sent to Lloyd George June 1, 1919. Further evidence may be found in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, under the title "Proof of Authenticity of British Secret Document," page 5547.

I shall now proceed with further discussion of this most despicable letter; a letter which holds American people to ridicule and shame by those who are now dragging this Nation into a war that the people do not want and which will, if the warmongers do not desist, lead this country into internal strife. The greatest threat to this Nation will come when the English Government moves to Canada. It is then that the various groups such as the British-Israel, Anglo-Saxon Federation, and various endowment organizations and international bankers will become the real "fifth columnists" and crusaders for Britain, to incorporate the United States in the British union. In this attempted sabotage of the Republic, the Communists will be used as they have been to date, only to be liquidated when they have served their purpose to those in power, who have bribed them and paid their way.

The New Deal is copying the political coups of South American republics, and the President no doubt hopes to establish himself as a dictator by the aid of the Army, Navy, and intelligence units in the United States, which means, of course, that there may be no election if this "coup militaire" is accomplished.

Cecil Rhodes is the Britisher, the internationalist, who supported and gave his aid to the Anglo-Saxon movement for the reunion of this Republic and the British Empire. Let me call your attention to the undermining of America, which actively began when Cecil Rhodes, in 1877, left money to establish scholarships at Oxford for the purpose of training diplomats to foster such re-union.

In the first draft of his will, which is quoted in the book Cecil Rhodes, by Basil Williams, and the book Cecil Rhodes, by Sarah Gertrude Millin, he stated:

"* * * directed that a secret society should be endowed with the following objects. 'The extension of British rule throughout the world; the colonization by British subjects of all lands where the means of livelihood are attainable by energy, labor, and enterprise; and especially the occupation by British settlers of the entire continent of Africa, the Holy Land, the Valley of the Euphrates, the islands of Cyprus and Candia, the whole of South America, the islands of the Pacific not heretofore possessed by Great Britain, the whole of the Malay Archipelago, the seaboard of China and Japan, the ultimate recovery of the United States of America as an integral part of the British Empire.' The foundation of so great a power as to hereafter render wars impossible and promote the best interests of humanity.

A new will was made:

"He substituted English-speaking peoples for actual Britons; he came to realize his limitations and reduced his scheme to a mere beginning of it, the scholarships; but yet the thought behind each successive will remained the same—the world for England, England for the world." (Cecil Rhodes, by Sarah Gertrude Millin.)

Other quotations:

"* * * but the essence of the will, as the world knows, is the Scholarship Foundation. In the end all that Rhodes can do toward extending British rule throughout the world and restoring Anglo-Saxon unity and founding a guardian power for the whole of humanity is to arrange for a number of young men from the United States, the British colonies, and Germany to go to Oxford. There are, accordingly, rather more Rhodes scholars from America than from all the British dominions put together.

"If the Union of South Africa could be made under the shadow of Table Mountain, why not an Anglo-Saxon union under the spires of Oxford?"

This also clarifies much of which is stated in the British Secret Document to Lloyd George. This movement of anglicizing America was continued by Andrew Carnegie, a Britisher who made his money in the United States, only to sell the country that made him into the hands of our greatest enemy. The author of the British Secret Document calls attention to the fact that the last chapter in Andrew Carnegie's book, Triumphant Democracy, was published in the North American Review in 1893, and now I quote from that volume. This chapter is entitled "Looking Ahead," and I may say at this point that this same chapter was removed from the 1932 edition of Triumphant Democracy.

If Britain, America, and Canada were to reunite today, the population of the reunion would be one hundred and eight millions. All other parts of the English-speaking race would not number five millions. It is into such a complete race reunion of her people that the door is now wide open for the parent land to enter and take first place—first among equals * * *

Readers will kindly note that this is a look ahead—how far ahead I shall not attempt to guess—nevertheless it is ahead, and sometime, somehow, it is to come to pass. I see it with the eye of faith, the faith of the devotee which carries with it a realizing sense of certain fulfillment.

Time may dispel many pleasing illusions and destroy many noble dreams, but it shall never shake my belief that the wound caused by the wholly unlooked for and undesired separation of the mother from her child is not to bleed forever.

Let men say what they will, therefore, I say that as surely as the sun in the heavens once shone upon Britain and America united, so surely is it one morning to rise, shine upon, and greet again the "Re-united states," British-American union.

(Signed) ANDREW CARNEGIE.

This movement of anglicizing America began with Alexander Hamilton, when he, by trickery submerged the United States Treasury under the domination of the Bank of England. It was first a British movement, but is now international, and is financed by the international bankers, who are the real rulers of England and the United States. Those who preach world union or world federation are in the pay of some of the organizations to which I have already referred in my previous remarks, the object of which is to destroy the Government of this Republic and to enslave the American people under the domination of the British rulers.

The arrogance of the British is unbelievable, and the low estimate in which we are held by these dukes and "ducklings" creeps in, I may say, in every statement which they make. As an illustration, let me again quote Sir Gilbert Parker, who, as the letter to Lloyd George states, was in charge of the British propaganda machine in the United States. (Harper's magazine, March 1918.)

Also, it should be remembered that the Society of Pilgrims, whose work of international unity cannot be overestimated, has played a part in promoting understanding between the two peoples, and the establishment of the American Officers' Club in Lord Leconfield's house in London, with His Royal Highness the Duke of Connaught as president, has done, and is doing, immense good. It should also be remembered that it was the Pilgrims' Society, under the fine chairmanship of Mr. Harry Brittain, which took charge of the Honorable James M. Beck when he visited England in 1916, and gave him so good a chance to do great work for the cause of unity between the two nations. I am glad and proud to think that I had something to do with these arrangements which resulted in the Pilgrims' taking Mr. Beck into their charge.

I may say that they did take Mr. Beck into their charge, for he was a most abject worshiper of England ever since that time.

Then Mr. Parker continues:

Then it was that the Monroe Doctrine became an accepted fact, but the United States could not have made it a fact unsupported and unprotected by the British Navy. It is no exaggeration to say that the policy and prosperity of the United States had a free and fair run for over the last 90 years, because Great Britain, which had learned her great lesson in the American Revolutionary War, made her Navy the defender of the Monroe Doctrine.

No one, not even a Britisher, could have uttered a greater falsehood, for the British Government, has never been an aid to the United States, and the British have never protected our interest in South America; but have, instead, destroyed our interest by undermining American commerce in that Southern Hemisphere. This should be clearly evident to anyone, when he takes into consideration the effect upon our foreign trade when we observe the British blacklist, which is

handed to us by the British Government. A statement of this kind simply makes me boil, and should start the blood surging in the arteries of every American who has the interest of this Nation at heart. However, this, as I have already said, shows the contempt in which we are held by those who are now crying for help, and whose Navy is not even able to protect the insignificant area contained within the British Isles. How is it possible for such Navy to give any aid in the protection of the Monroe Doctrine, a doctrine which we could never enforce with an Army of 5,000,000 men; yes, and with three navies as large as the one which we now have.

It is well to bear in mind that the Central and South American Republics are sovereign governments within themselves, and it is within their rights to do as they please in regard to admitting foreign people within their borders. Should we foolishly attempt to enforce an arbitrary doctrine upon them, we will in such procedure invite war with these Republics. When this war is over, we will be a nation without a single friend, either in the western continent or in any part of the world. Yes; even England herself, will give us "thumbs down" as she has always done when such necessity suits her own purpose.

The letters of Sir Cecil Spring-Rice to Balfour and others, which were published in the Saturday Evening Post, July 13, August 3 and 24, 1929, reveal, if nothing else, the manner in which our Secretary of State, Hon. William Jennings Bryan, and the President of the United States, Woodrow Wilson, were taken into camp by the British. The Secretary of State is treated with contempt in Sir Cecil Spring-Rice's correspondence, and our President, Mr. Wilson, was not treated any better. It is well to read these letters, for I believe they will be useful in reestablishing patriotism in those of our people who are now vacillating between the British Empire and the United States. I may say at this point that I have inserted some articles from the Report on Investigation of Pro-British History Textbooks in the Public Schools of the City of New York, in the RECORD. This report also authenticates the secret British document in its reference to change in our educational system and pro-British propaganda in our educational institutions and in our churches.

The author of the British document thanks Mr. Taft and Mr. Polk; and he should, because Mr. — was on the board of the League to Enforce Peace. In fact, he was the president of the league, and therefore, guilty or innocent, a tool of the British propaganda service. Mr. Frank Polk was a member of the Pilgrim Society, and so recorded in its membership list. Mr. Baker, whom the author of the British secret document also mentioned, was trustee of the Twentieth Century Corporation.

Mr. Edward Filene, of Boston, an internationalist, set up the Twentieth Century Fund, Inc., and by interlocking directorates has control over 124 trust funds, together totaling nearly a billion dollars. Included in this control are: The Carnegie, Rockefeller, the Duke and Russell Sage Foundations from which funds go subsidies to subversive communistic, socialistic and all peace movements, as well as the cooperative movements. Among activities of Twentieth Century Fund, Inc., are the following: N. R. A., S. E. C., Wagner Labor Act, International Labor Office (affiliated with League of Nations), Foreign Policy Association, Credit Unions, Cooperatives, League of Women Voters. (See Red Network, published by Elizabeth Dilling, 53 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill., for communistic activities of these groups. Also see Yearbooks and American Foundations and Their Fields, published by Twentieth Century Fund, Inc.)

It is well to note that Messrs. Pierpont Morgan, Rockefeller, Insull, can be found among the "Pilgrims," while Cleveland Dodge belongs to the Carnegie clan.

In the London Times, July 4, 1919, appeared an article entitled, "Insurance of Peace," from which I now quote:

NEED OF PROPAGANDA

By efficient propaganda, carried out by those trained in the arts of creating public good will and of swaying public opinion toward a definite purpose, not only the natural and proper competition of interest between the two countries would be robbed of the poison of ignorant resentment, but also the malign influence of existing and potential propaganda antagonistic to British-American good will will be nullified.

What is now needed—urgently needed—is to make a beginning. Efficiently organized propaganda should mobilize the press, the church, the State, and the cinema; press into active service the whole educational systems of both countries, and root the spirit of good will in the home, universities, public and high schools, and primary schools. It should also provide for subsidizing the best men to write books and articles on special subjects, to be published in cheap editions or distributed free to classes interested. Authoritative opinion upon current controversial topics should be prepared, both for the daily press and for magazines; histories, and textbooks upon literature should be revised. New books should be added, particularly in the primary schools. Hundreds of exchange university scholarships should be provided. Local societies should be formed, in every center to foster British-American good will, in close cooperation with an administrative committee. Important articles should be broken up into mouthfuls for popular consumption, and booklets, cards, pamphlets, etc., distributed through organized channels to the public. Advertising space should be taken in the press, on hoardings, and in the streetcars, for steadily presenting terse, easily read and remembered mind-compelling phrases and easily grasped cartoons, that the public may subconsciously absorb the fundamentals of a complete, mutual understanding.

EFFORT MUST BE UNITED

This work cannot be efficiently done by individuals or by small independent societies. It must all be coordinated into one great, steady, efficient effort, and the execution of it be under the direction of men in both countries who are qualified by capacity and experience to sound exactly the right note and to employ the right media to interest the section of the public to which any particular appeal is made.

The whole expense for carrying out this enterprise in both countries should immediately be budgeted for and the necessary funds secured, to be administered by one strong administrative committee of eminent men in the United States and one in the United Kingdom. These two committees should be coordinated in one international supervisory committee. Literary matter should be secured by subcommittees of British and American journalists and publishers who know the capacity of all of those writers competent to assist in the work of interpreting one country to the other, to establish the mutuality of British-American international interest, and to impress the entire public opinion of both countries with the advantage, nay, the necessity for a world-wide unity of British-American peace effort. Ambassadors of good will should be exchanged, to meet the public in our pulpits, on our lecture platforms, and to preside in the lecture rooms of our colleges.

In the words of a great American patriot, "We must all hang together, or assuredly we shall all hang separately." If there be one who still doubts this axiomatic truth, let him carefully consider the blood-red future of the world with the British Empire and the United States in active hostility, or even engaged in consuming their existing and potential material and spiritual resources in bitter Anglo-American controversy, quarrel, and intrigue.

In reading the foregoing can anyone close his eyes to the evil effect of such propaganda, and particularly when nearly all American publications are controlled by an alien power, the interests of which are only in the conquest of America. Where are the loyal Americans who should, first of all, guard this Republic with their very lives? Where is the patriotic press that prides itself on truth? The press that should rally to the defense of America and give full support to those who, back to the wall, are fighting alien influences to save what is left of our Republic. I am astounded and shocked by public apathy and by the attitude of the American press, which is pro-English, proforeign, and prointernational; a press which has forsaken our country in its greatest hour of need.

In order to reveal the attitude of some deluded Americans, I shall quote Owen Wister, so that he may be regarded correctly as he was—pro-British (from the London Times, Friday, July 4, 1919):

The truth of it was, you had been driving us colonies with such light reins for so long that directly you tightened them we took the bit between our teeth and bolted. We mean to be our own nation and not your colonies, no matter how easy with us you might be. And you were easy, very easy, until quite late in our Revolution. So our school histories had to make out a case. They played up George III and Lord North strong, and they suppressed Burke and Pitt and the whole liberal element in England that was in sympathy with us; thought of us as free British brothers over the water who were insisting on our British rights. In short, they painted a distorted picture of England's political condition at that time.

INFLUENCE OF SCHOOL BOOKS

Generations of American schoolboys have studied this picture. To fathers and grandfathers all over our States, the names Concord, Bunker Hill, Valley Forge, mean resistance to the tyrannical enemy of liberty, England. England is still that to our schoolboys of today, though not so many. A movement to correct the school books has been started and will go on. It will be thwarted in every way possible by certain of your enemies. These will busily remind you that you burnt our Capitol in the next war we had; that you let loose the *Alabama* upon us during our Civil War; they will never mention the good turns you have done us. They would spoil, if they could, the better understanding that so many of us are striving for. They would pry us apart, if they could.

They will fail. Our dead over whom you strewed flowers on May 30 will help us living to defeat them. Could I name all the matters wherein we have varied much or little from you since that original Fourth of July, 143 years ago, a teeming page would be compiled. In truth, a whole book devoted to these differences, with the history of such divergence, would have that same light-throwing quality which is possessed by any great dictionary giving the evolution and successive uses of words. We vary from you, for instance, in our Protestant Episcopal prayer book, here and there; in our vocabulary, written and spoken; in the custom of primogeniture, the rule of the road, coinage, spelling, pronunciation, enunciation. Many of us speak through our noses, none of us drop our h's; omission of the g, as in shockin', denotes mostly the 'umble with us, the 'aughty with you. And so forth, and so forth.

This confirms the statements made in the letter to Lloyd George in which the author of it brags how the British changed our history in order to destroy patriotism.

To establish more indisputable evidence as to the authenticity of this document, and to the importance of the author, I shall quote a brief excerpt from the letter itself:

Suggestions for the visit: His Royal Highness, the Prince, should have a brilliant entourage of our American-born nobility. About the time of his coming the Grand Fleet might make a demonstration in American waters, preferably off Newport, R. I., so that Lady Gerard, Lady Sims, Lady Strauss, Lady Rodman, and the wives of our other knights may participate. And Field Marshal Haig, with Sir John Pershing, might review the American forces. During the visit special courtesies should be shown to the presidents and professors whom I have listed in appendix 23. I would also suggest that a complete programme of social favours be arranged for the parsons, editors, and newspaper proprietors in appendixes 20 and 26. A new order might be created to reward the celebrants of the visit, the Royal Order of the Pilgrims. It should have three degrees, Knights Grand Cross, Knights Bachelor, and Commanders. With respect to the knighted classes we could, of course, reassure the suspicious by Mr. A. Maurice Low's patent device, first described in the New York Times, August 15, 1918 (appendix 44), which safeguard the democracy of the knighted by the withholding of the accolade. Would you, however, kindly give instructions to the publishers of Whittaker's Almanac, and of the official registers, to delete, in their next issue, from their lists of British Knights, the name of Sir John Biddle, Sir Tasker Bliss, Sir P. D. Lechridge, Sir Peyton March, Sir John Pershing, Sir Hugh Rodman, Sir William Sims, Sir Joseph Strauss, and the other American knights, as their inclusion in the 1919 issue has tended to shake American faith in our Mr. Low's ingenuity?

The foregoing paragraph is correct, for the 1920 edition of Whitaker's Almanac listed the following Americans as Sir Knights:

Fershing, Gen. John, G. C. B. (U. S. Army).
Rodman, Rear Admiral Hugh, K. C. B. (U. S. Navy).
Biddle, Maj. Gen. John, K. C. B. (M) (Hon.) (U. S. Army).
Bliss, Gen. Tasker, G. C. M. G. (U. S. Army).
Marsh, Gen. Peyton, C. M. G. (U. S. Army).
Sims, Vice Admiral William Snowden, G. C. M. G. (U. S. Navy).
Strauss, Rear Admiral Joseph, K. C. M. G. (U. S. Navy).

Let me also call attention to the fact that the author of the British secret document, or letter to Lloyd George, suggested that inasmuch as these titles had shaken the confidence of the American people, that their names should be removed from the Almanac and deleted from the Royal Register. Did the Prime Minister of England comply with this request? He surely did, for the names were removed from the very next issue of the Almanac. Surely, anyone with such entree to the British Prime Minister must have been important, and particularly so when the Prime Minister of England complied with his request. His reference to Mr. Low is also correct, for in the New York Times of August 15, 1918, appears an article entitled "British Decorations," from which I shall quote a few lines:

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

So many persons have written and asked me about the decorations conferred by King George on American generals and admirals, and there is evidently a fear in the minds of some Americans that the acceptance of these decorations may insidiously sap American democracy by creating a titled class, that perhaps you will permit me to quiet their fears and explain what these appreciations signify.

Knighthood is an honor dating back to feudalism. It is conferred by the sovereign in person, who dubs his kneeling subject—the posture indicating allegiance, submission, and fidelity—by touching his shoulders with a drawn sword, and saying: "I dub thee knight; arise, Sir John," and the man who 30 seconds before knelt down as plain John Smith arises Sir John Smith. (A. Maurice Low, Washington, August 11, 1918.)

The only difference in this initiation, if I may so designate it, is in the fact that our Sir Knights were not dubbed as is the customary procedure with British subjects.

This, Mr. Speaker and Members of Congress, further authenticates the British document which some Members refused permission for insertion in the RECORD. There is not one paragraph in this letter that is not absolutely correct, and the letter was, in spite of opinions to the contrary, actually sent by some one to the Prime Minister of England. This should be clear, as one reads the evidence I have produced in order to prove this document.

Poll-Tax Regulation by Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERRON PEARSON
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 11, 1940

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. Speaker, the Congress of the United States is being asked and urged to legislate upon the qualifications for voters in the election of a President, Senators, and Members of the House of Representatives in the States and to prohibit any sovereign State from requiring the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in the election of either of these officials. Such a proposal is contained in H. R. 7534, introduced by the gentleman from California, Representative GEYER, now pending in the House Committee on the Judiciary.

This bill would only apply to the States of Tennessee, Texas, Mississippi, Alabama, Georgia, Arkansas, South Carolina, and Virginia.

It is unfortunate as well as passing strange that one so far removed from these States and so obviously uninformed as to conditions in them has assumed to himself the task of attempting to solve all the alleged social and political problems existing in these States while his own district, the home of Harry Bridges and many who subscribe to his philosophy, is being neglected. He could render the Nation and certainly his district a far greater service if he would evidence more concern over conditions at his own front door and busy himself in expressing at home his profound anxiety about the failure of those about him to aid in preserving and protecting those democratic principles and institutions in which he professes such an abiding interest.

I am offering no brief for requiring all voters to pay poll tax as a prerequisite to vote. In fact, I have no objection to removing it as a legal requirement, but I maintain that the States not only have the right but are charged with the responsibility of determining the qualifications of their voters, and Congress has no constitutional right to legislate upon the question.

By what constitutional provision could Congress be said to have a legal right to enact this bill?

The only provisions of the Federal Constitution directly or remotely dealing with the subject are as follows:

ART. I. SEC. 2. The House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen every second year by the people of the several States and the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature.

Amendment XVII: The Senate * * * shall be composed of two Senators from each State, elected by the people for 6 years; and each Senator shall have one vote. The electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature. (Adopted April 8, 1913.)

ART. I. SEC. 4. The times, places, and manner of holding elections for Senators and Representatives, shall be presented in each State by the legislature thereof; but the Congress may at any time make or alter such regulations, except as to the places of choosing Senators.

Amendment XIV: All persons born or naturalized in the United States and subject to jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside. No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.

Amendment XV: The rights of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.

Amendment XIX: The rights of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or any State on account of sex.

One or more of these provisions of the Constitution must form the basis for this bill if it has any legal or constitutional justification. I propose to show conclusively that it is in contravention of all of said constitutional provisions and that the Congress of the United States has absolutely no right to say to the States what they can or cannot do with reference to the qualifications of voters in any election whether State or Federal. It is a question which can only be determined by the legislatures of the several States. We may not like what they do in this regard, but there is nothing we can do about it unless and until we amend the Federal Constitution.

Let us take the six provisions listed above in the order named, analyze them, and determine what they mean in the light of the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States construing them.

ARTICLE I, SECTION 2

Under this section of the Constitution its authors provided specifically that the States should have the right to fix the qualifications of those who voted for Members of the Federal House of Representatives by stipulating that electors in such elections shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature.

Certainly no one will contend that any legislative body except a State legislature has any right to say what the qualifications of a voter shall be in elections to determine who shall serve in said State's legislative body except the State legislature itself. It is a right reserved to the States and over which the Federal Government has no control. If the States have the unquestionable right to fix and determine qualifications for those voting for members of the State legislature the Congress has no power to curb or interfere with the action of these States in imposing poll-tax payment as a voting qualification. If such is made a condition precedent to voting for these State officials, under the Federal Constitution, it shall likewise be a condition precedent to voting for Federal officials. Congress cannot prevent it by mere legislative act saying that it cannot be done.

If the Congress is to assume the right and power to prevent the States from requiring the payment of a poll tax as a voting qualification in electing Federal officers, then it must be done by a constitutional amendment to the Constitution and separating the power of the State to fix qualifications of the electors of the members of its most numerous branch of the State legislature from that of fixing qualifications of those voting to elect Members of the Senate and House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States. It cannot be done in any other way.

So long as State legislatures require those who vote for members of such legislatures to pay poll tax in order to vote they must require such tax in electing Federal officials. So long as States have the right to fix qualifications for voters in elections to select members of State legislatures, just so long will they likewise determine who can vote for Members of Congress, and the Federal Constitution provides that such qualifications, when determined by the State legislatures, shall also obtain in electing Members of the House of Representatives of the Federal Congress. States are vested with the indisputable right to fix the qualifications in both State and Federal elections.

In connection with the language used in article I, section 2, I call attention to the fact that when the seventeenth amendment was adopted directing the election of United States Senators by popular vote of the people the same language was used with reference to the qualifications of electors in such election and again the States were left with the right to determine what those qualifications should be.

This is especially significant, because when this amendment was adopted many of the States were then—1913—and for 50 years prior thereto had been requiring the payment of poll tax as a prerequisite to the right to vote in choosing Members of the House of Representatives. The amendment was submitted to and adopted by the States in the light of all these years of experience and no effort made to change the language used in article I, section 2, or to apply a different rule.

These are not just dogmatic, categorical statements of mine but are legal principles firmly established by decree of the United States Supreme Court nearly 60 years ago and never questioned since.

In 1883 the Court in the case of *Ex parte Yarbrough* (110 U. S. 663), with reference to article I, section 2, of the Constitution, said:

> The States in prescribing the qualifications of voters for the most numerous branch of their own legislatures do not do this with reference to the election for Members of Congress. Nor can they prescribe the qualification for voters for those eo nomine. They define who are to vote for the popular branch of their own legislature, and the Constitution of the United States says the same persons shall vote for Members of Congress in that State. It adopts the qualification thus furnished as the qualification of its own electors for Members of Congress.

For the Federal Congress to say by legislative enactment that the States shall not and cannot require payment of a poll tax to vote for Members of Congress would be tantamount to forbidding such States to control the qualifications of their citizens who vote for members of State legislatures. Where can be found anyone who will contend that Congress has any constitutional right to dictate to the States how they shall qualify electors in choosing any State official?

In the case of *Wiley* v. *Sinkler* (179 U. S. 63) the Court upheld the right of South Carolina to prescribe qualifications for those voting for Federal officials and reiterated with approval the construction of article I, section 2, as set out in the case of *Ex parte Yarbrough*.

ARTICLE I, SECTION 4

The author of the bill under discussion has insisted that Congress has the power to enact this bill under article I, section 4, of the Constitution which provides that the States shall prescribe the time, place, and manner of holding elections for Senators and Representatives through their legislatures but that Congress may at any time make or alter such regulations.

To say that the words "time," "place," or "manner" of holding elections mean or include qualifications of voters, such as length of residence, registration, and poll-tax payments certainly strains one's conception and understanding of these words in their common and accepted usage. It is a meaning which the Supreme Court has never given these words, and all the decisions construing this section hold that the power given Congress by the language used is to protect the act of voting, the place where it is done, and the man who votes from personal violence or intimidation.

See the following cases for a full discussion of this section and its meaning, to wit: *Ohio* v. *Hildebrant* (241 U. S. 565); *Smiley* v. *Holm* (285 U. S. 355); *Koenig* v. *Flynn* (285 U. S. 375); *Carroll* v. *Becker* (285 U. S. 380); *In Re Coy* (127 U. S. 731, 752); *Ex parte Siebold* (100 U. S. 371); *Ex parte Clark* (100 U. S. 399); *United States* v. *Gale* (109 U. S. 65); *United States* v. *Moseley* (238 U. S. 383); *Newberry* v. *United States* (256 U. S. 232); *United States* v. *Wurzbach* (280 U. S. 396).

It is unnecessary to review separately this long line of cases. Suffice it to say that they leave no doubt about the exclusive rights of all States under article I, section 2, and article I, section 4, of the Constitution, to fix and determine the qualifications of electors in all elections and make it

absolutely clear that Congress cannot interfere with this right.

I only call especial attention to the case of *Newberry* v. *United States* (256 U. S. 232), decided in 1920, in which Justice McReynolds reviews and discusses every phase of this subject. A casual reading of this opinion will convince anyone that it is assinine for Congress to consider any bill having as its objective curbing, restricting, or interfering with the rights of sovereign States to say what shall be required of electors naming State or Federal officials.

I quote in part from that decision sections bearing on the principle involved in the Geyer bill:

We find no support in reason or authority for the argument that because the offices were created by the Constitution Congress has some indefinite undefined power over elections for Senators and Representatives not derived from section 4 (of art. I of Constitution). "The Government, then, of the United States can claim no powers which are not granted to it by the Constitution, and the powers actually granted must be such as are expressly given, or by necessary implication" (*Martin* v. *Hunters Lessee*, 1 Wheat. 304). Clear constitutional provisions also negative any possible inference of such authority because of the supposed anomaly "if one government had the unrestricted power to control matters affecting the choice of the officers of another" (256 U. S. 249).

Our immediate concern is with the clause which grants power by law to regulate the "manner of holding" elections for Senators and Representatives—not broadly to regulate them.

* * * * * * *

Who should participate in the specified elections was clearly indicated—members of State legislatures and those having "the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature." Who should be eligible for election was also stated. * * * Subject to these important limitations Congress was empowered by law to regulate the times, places and manner of holding the elections. * * * These words are used without any veiled or obscure significance, but in their natural and usual sense.

Many things are prerequisite to elections or may affect their outcome—voters, education, means of transportation, health * * * but authority to regulate the manner of holding them gives no right to control any of these (ibid., pp. 256 and 257).

The plain words of the seventeenth amendment and those portions of the original Constitution directly affected by it should be kept in mind.

* * * * * * *

As finally submitted and adopted the amendment does not undertake to modify article I, section 4, the source of congressional power to regulate the times, places, and manner of holding elections. That section remains intact and applicable both to election of Representatives and Senators.

* * * * * * *

Its authority would be expressly restricted to regulation of times, places, and manner of elections. The qualifications of the persons who may choose, or be chosen, as has been remarked on other occasions, are defined and fixed in the Constitution and are unalterable by the legislature. The history of the times indicates beyond reasonable doubt that, if the Constitution makers had claimed for this section the latitude we are now asked to sanction, it would not have been ratified (ibid., pp. 254, 255, and 256).

AMENDMENT XIV

The author of this bill, the gentleman from California [Mr. GEYER], was quoted in a recent edition of the Townsend Weekly as saying that State poll-tax requirements are a violation of the fourteenth amendment to the Constitution which prohibits the States making any law abridging the privileges of citizens of the United States.

This insistence by him only goes to show that he has made no investigation of the meaning of this amendment or of its application to his bill.

As late as 1937, Mr. Justice Butler, speaking for the Supreme Court in the case of *Breedlove* v. *Suttles* (302 U. S. 278), involving the validity of a Georgia statute levying a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting, said:

To make payment of poll taxes a prerequisite to voting is not to deny any privilege or immunity protected by the fourteenth amendment. Privilege of voting is not derived from the United States but is conferred by the State and save as restrained by the fifteenth amendment (right to vote regardless of race, color, or previous servitude) and nineteenth amendment (woman suffrage) and other provisions of the Federal Constitution, the State may condition suffrage as it deems appropriate. (Citing 21 Wall. 162, 110 U. S. 651, 146 U. S. 1, and 238 U. S. 347.) The privileges and immunities protected are only those that arise from the Constitution and laws of the United States and not those that spring from other sources (citing 293 U. S. 245).

The question to which this discussion is directed was met foursquare in the Breedlove case and was definitely settled without equivocation or reservation.

I desire to say again that I am not presenting an argument in favor of the States continuing the levy of poll taxes as a necessary qualification to vote. As a matter of fact, I am not here voicing any objection to the repeal of such laws. I am simply saying that whatever is done about it is a question for each State to settle and determine for itself and that Congress has absolutely no constitutional right to act on the question. I have been cheerfully paying poll tax for nearly 30 years. In my State the revenue thus derived, though comparatively small, is used in our educational program and serves a useful purpose. If the State legislature deems it wise to repeal this tax and permit voting without such a prerequisite, I have no quarrel to find with such a course. On the other hand, I do not expect to sit idly by and permit the gentleman from California to prevail upon Congress to unlawfully attempt to meddle in the affairs of my State and take from it a right reserved to it under the Federal Constitution.

I think the State of California would have less of "ham and eggs" and E. P. I. C. programs if the gentleman who is so interested in reforming the customs of the South would apply his efforts with equal diligence to doing something about his situation at home. Perhaps a poll-tax voting qualification might save his own State from financial disaster. Who can tell?

The Minority Leader—Joe Martin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS H. CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 19, 1940

SPEECH OF HON. CHARLES A. HALLECK, OF INDIANA

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted by the House, I submit for the RECORD, the speech of the Representative in Congress from the Second District of Indiana, the Honorable CHARLES A. HALLECK, introducing our minority leader, the Honorable JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr., of Massachusetts, at the Willkie notification meeting in Elwood, Ind., August 17, 1940.

Members of the notification committee of the Republican National Convention, distinguished guests of Indiana, and my fellow Hoosiers, Indiana is proud of the place destiny has given to her today—proud that there has been called to lead this mighty Nation to safety, happiness, and prosperity a son of Indiana, Wendell Willkie.

Eighty-five years ago, the Republican Party was organized to rescue America from a tragic crisis. Today, the party is again called to service to save a Nation of 130,000,000 resourceful, energetic, and courageous people from the ravages of continuing depression within and the threat of aggression from without.

The torch of liberty, freedom, and opportunity has been handed to a native son of Indiana. He will hold it high, leading this new crusade of American principles in government and for the reestablishment of law as the ultimate guaranty of both individual and national security.

America wants to resume the march of progress. The Republican Party is the instrument through which the American people have determined to work for the reestablishment of enlightened patriotism in the administration of national affairs. Beneath our banners are rallied members of all parties. They are determined that this country shall prosper and progress according to the skill and resources with which it is blessed.

Some weeks ago it was my high honor to present the name of Wendell Willkie to the Republican Convention at Philadelphia. I nominated him with heartfelt enthusiasm because I know him to be a great American who understands the problems of all of our people—because he is a capable administrator of clear vision and great ability, and a citizen of unlimited patriotic devotion.

After the Philadelphia convention had named Wendell Willkie for the Presidency and CHARLES MCNARY for the Vice-Presidency, it passed unanimously a resolution of thanks to Congressman

JOSEPH W. MARTIN for his able and fair direction of the convention as its chairman. A week later Joe was named by Wendell Willkie to direct the Republican National Committee.

This appointment and high responsibility came to JOE MARTIN after almost 30 years of continuous service to the Republican Party. He began as a precinct worker in his native town of North Attleboro, Mass. He served in the State legislature and was in the State senate with Calvin Coolidge. He was, for a time, secretary of the Republican State Committee of Massachusetts. He next advanced to Congress, where he is now serving his sixteenth year.

Throughout the New Deal years JOE MARTIN has been a stalwart American. He served on the Rules Committee in those trying days when a New Deal majority lost all sense of responsibility and allowed the Congress to become a mere rubber stamp. But Joe never gave up the fight for constitutional principles and orderly procedures.

In 1937 he was elected chairman of the National Republican Congressional Committee, and in that capacity directed the 1938 campaign, which resulted in doubling the number of Republican Members in the House of Representatives and marked the turning of the tide which already signalizes a national triumph next November.

When the Seventy-sixth Congress assembled in January 1939 JOE MARTIN was unanimously elected minority leader. In that capacity he has done more to restore balanced constitutional government than any other individual in the United States. To work with him and for him has been a real privilege.

To JOE MARTIN now has been given the direction of this campaign to restore American government to the American people—to turn out an administration which has wasted billions during the last 7 years while neglecting the urgent problems of national defense—to place in the White House a man who has worked with his hands, who has won success by his own efforts, and whose heart and spirit are in tune with the aspirations of the American people for progress, security, and real recovery.

I present to you the man who will direct our victorious campaign, the Honorable JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., of Massachusetts, Republican leader in the House of Representatives and chairman of the Republican National Committee.

Keep Out of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHIL FERGUSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 9, 1940

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. Speaker, in the next few days the Congress of the United States will have done its job and done it well. When the House sends the selective-service bill to the President without the Fish "delay" amendment, the Congress will have completed the enactment of President Roosevelt's defense program. Members of Congress can truthfully return to their districts with the comforting thought that every step has been taken to prepare this Nation against any attack. The Congress, in enacting President Roosevelt's program, has written in boxcar letters, the words "Keep Out of America," in letters that dictators can understand, and dictators can only understand "keep out" signs that are backed by real strength and preparedness.

There is no interval today between peace and war. Poland, Denmark, Holland, Norway, Belgium, were at peace one night to be destroyed by war with the dawn. There was no exchange of notes, no ultimatums, no warnings. The countries' only warnings were the bombers flying overhead. This Nation is taking no chances with an overnight destruction of its peace.

EIGHTY-SEVEN PERCENT OF REPUBLICANS FOR FISH "DELAY AMENDMENT"

I am sorry to say that a majority of the Republicans in the House in an effort to discredit our President and this administration, so vigorously opposed this last step in our defense machine, the selective-service bill. During the consideration of the bill the Republicans fought valiantly for the adoption of the Fish amendment which in my opinion destroys the effectiveness of the bill by depending on volunteers, depending on patriots alone to defend this Nation, not the democratic method of taking those best equipped and best financially able to go. One hundred and forty-three Republicans or 87 percent of those voting were in favor of delaying the training of adequate reserves for the defense of this Nation. That was not the most disheartening thing. After they were able to write this amendment into the bill they proved their insincerity by 112 or 68 percent of the Republicans voting against any measure that would provide the necessary men for our Army. To me this was purely political. How could any man vote for $10,000,000,000 as most of them did to provide equipment for an army and then refuse the legislation to provide the men and to provide the Government with the power to make the industries that refuse to cooperate, cooperate in the defense program.

COUNTRY WILL SOON BE PREPARED

The President to meet the great expansion program passed by Congress has appointed a Defense Advisory Council, headed by Mr. William S. Knudsen. Mr. Knudsen today on his return from an inspection of airplane factories had this to say:

> In spite of tremendous expansion there has been no decline in the quality of the airplanes.

After quoting figures to show the increase of production he ended with saying:

> Everybody agrees the American planes are the best in the world. I believe now we can build the most planes as well.

Equipment is being turned out and orders are being placed for complete equipment for 2,000,000 men. The Army in the last year has been almost doubled and, with taking in the National Guard, will be trebled. At the present time the Army and Navy have over 5,000 planes ready for action. Huge orders are now being built and the prospect of 35,000 planes for 1942 is almost sure to be a reality. The pilot-training program is keeping up with the production of planes.

Our Navy, already the biggest in the world, is being added to every day by new construction. New ships are completed weekly. We are making great progress toward a 2-ocean navy of 800 ships. This Navy is a personal tribute to President Roosevelt, who started with a mere skeleton in 1933 and has constantly worked for its construction, preparation, and training. The criticism of why we do not have more planes can well be answered in that the Army and Navy have been experimenting, every year making better and better planes until now military experts say that our planes that we are building and ordering now, due to these years of experimentation, are the fastest, have the longest range, and are the best-armed planes in the world.

FERGUSON SPONSORS DEFENSE BILLS

I am glad to say that I have had a small part in sponsoring this defense program in Congress. On April 10 I pointed out how fortunate the Nation was under the leadership of President Roosevelt and Secretary Hull to have realized what the world situation was, to have made friends with South America, and to have started our defense. On April 17 I pointed out to the Nation what had happened by inserting the famous Leland Stowe Trojan horse story into the RECORD, pointing out what can happen to a nation from within. On May 7 I urged the Nation to adequately equip and expand our armed forces. This has been done. Every step has meant that we are that much further away from war by invasion.

On May 24 I offered an amendment to the Military Affairs Committee bill that would have provided military training for the C. C. C. camps and training of mechanics in our schools. This amendment was rejected and I introduced a separate bill to provide training in the C. C. C. camps and the training of mechanics in our schools. The work of training mechanics is now being undertaken by the National Youth Administration, and I am still advocating military training in the C. C. C. camps.

On June 18, I believe, I was the first man to openly advocate a conscription bill on the floor of the House, and I want to quote briefly the statement I made at that time:

> Thanks to our President we have an adequate Navy or will have as soon as we can build it. Every day new ships are launched or near completion. This is the backbone of our defense to preserve the Monroe Doctrine. I hope the Members who today have urged us to vote for this measure will be as ready to vote for conscription when we are presented with that inevitable vote in the near future. By that I mean conscription of industry and resources as well as men.

FERGUSON FIGHTS DELAY ON LAW

Three months before Congress took action on this vital bill I was urging its passage. I am very grateful that its final passage will become a reality this week. On August 7, a month before the passage of the bill, I made this statement:

I hope and pray that no Member of this House in close districts will play politics with our national defense and let the political future of Members delay consideration of the vitally necessary conscription bill. Those who say they want to proceed with caution, I feel they want to see the insignia on the invading boats or airplanes. They want to see whether they are bearing the Nazi, Fascist, or some other foreign emblem on the wings of the attacking vessel before they start preparation to repel such an invasion.

My fears that some Members would play politics with the bill were borne out by the vote on the measure in the House, 87 percent of the Representatives voted for the Fish "delay amendment."

To me, no better proof could be asked of the President's wise course in acquiring the naval bases from England by trading destroyers. The men who played politics with the conscription bill would have delayed for an undetermined period the acquisition of these naval bases. No Member of Congress has opposed the acquisition of the bases, but many Members have questioned the method, and if the measure had been before the House they may have questioned the method until it was too late and those same bases were in the hands of an enemy power.

REPUBLICANS PLAY POLITICS WITH DEFENSE

Proof, the best proof I know, that the Republicans played politics in sponsoring the Fish amendment is borne out by the fact that the Republican standard bearer, Wendell L. Willkie, in yesterday's newspapers was reported as saying he was opposed to the Fish amendment and hoped it would be taken out of the conscription bill. I do not question the patriotism of the rank and file of the members of the Republican Party. But I do feel that their representation in Congress in their attempt to discredit a great President to bring about his defeat in November, have tried on this conscription bill to make it a political issue.

In my mind there is only one issue; that is, retain the prosperity of this great Nation, defend it against the world, keep the last stronghold of democracy alive in this dictator-ridden world and that job can best be done under the leadership of President Roosevelt, his great Secretary of State, Cordell Hull, and a Democratic Congress that will cooperate with the President in this defense program.

George Nicholas Seger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. KEAN
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 11, 1940

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, the memory of our beloved friend and colleague, the late Representative GEORGE NICHOLAS SEGER, was paid a most fitting tribute at services held in the First Presbyterian Church of his home city of Passaic, N. J., on Sunday night, September 8. The services were held under the auspices of the veterans' organizations of the Eighth Congressional District. The eulogy was pronounced by Rev. George H. Talbott, pastor of the church, a veteran of the World War and a dear friend of Mr. SEGER. More than 1,000 veterans and other sorrowing friends heard Dr. Talbott speak, as follows:

The sudden death of Congressman GEORGE NICHOLAS SEGER at the United States Naval Hospital in Washington, early in the morning of August 26, this year, said Dr. Talbott, has cast a cloud of sorrow that has been most deeply felt in this city, but the darkness which burdens us has been felt throughout the entire congressional district, and has extended itself in varying degrees throughout our State and Nation.

Naturally his passing is most deeply mourned here in the city of Passaic, for while he was known and loved throughout the congressional district, it is here in this city where he made his home, where his children grew to maturity, where he labored in the early years of his business and political career, and it is here where he wanted to spend those sunset years of honorable retirement from public service.

It is altogether fitting and proper that this memorial service should be under the auspices of the Veterans of American Wars, and no one more than they realize that while they have taken upon themselves the responsibility for conducting a public memorial, there are truly thousands in various communities in no wise allied with veterans' organizations whose sentiments they are feebly trying to express.

BESPEAKS VETERANS' SYMPATHY

On behalf of the veterans of the Eighth Congressional District of New Jersey, said Dr. Talbott, who served overseas as a lieutenant of infantry in 1918, I convey especially to his daughter and sons our deep and heartfelt sympathy in the passing of their father. His accomplishments in public life must not in our mind overshadow the fact that above all position and beyond all honor he was a kind and devoted husband to his wife, who preceded his passing by 6 years, and although his duties as a public citizen necessarily occupied a vast amount of time, he was an affectionate and gracious father.

There are two schools of historians in the world, and these two schools have been from the beginning of time. One school of historians lays heavy emphasis upon dates and times and facts and figures. We may call this the factual school of history. There is another school that veers more toward the philosophical interpretation of those facts. This school of historians is not primarily concerned with the minute accuracy of dates and places but attempts to weigh effects and to view events in their ultimate impact upon life. It is in keeping with the second view of history I shall attempt to appraise the public life of our departed friend.

HIS SERVICE TO CITY AND NATION

After valued service to his city as a commissioner and mayor, he sat for 18 years among the leaders of our Nation and deliberated upon questions that concern our beloved land and have much to do with the course of world history in our time and in the future. In his record here and there one may find something with which to disagree, for disagreement on political matters is, I take it, still one of the few remaining rights which we have in America; but, nevertheless, the broad appraisal of his career shows the outlines of a sound statesmanlike understanding of the social and political problems that play such an important part in our workaday life. Throughout these 18 years in the Nation's service he had the advice and fidelity not only of his family but of his faithful secretary, Mr. Gordon Canfield. To him at this time I express the sympathy of the veterans.

NOT AN ORATOR OR TRICKSTER

What was there about GEORGE N. SEGER which made him Passaic's first citizen—one of the outstanding men of this State? Let me immediately dispose of some things. GEORGE N. SEGER was not an orator of the first rank. Many men have achieved political fame, and have made their contribution in history for good or ill primarily because of their gift for oratory, but GEORGE SEGER cannot be placed in that company. He spoke in plain understandable language and never indulged in fancy phrases that are designed to tickle the ear and deceive the soul. GEORGE N. SEGER was not what the public understands as a clever politician. He had no tricks—he never held before his people the glittering light of false hope. I have never heard he ever made a promise in the ear and broke it in the heart. He was not possessed of that undesirable quality, known as political necromancy, which gains a man temporarily, and in some instances a lifelong preference, only to be fully exposed at the time of his death.

It sometimes happens—in fact, it very frequently happens that while men are alive and in the full and flood tide of their power, they are able to submerge incidents and pervert the truth of their public life, which if known at the time, would have brought about universal condemnation, but which arises like spirits from the nether regions to plague their memory after death.

HE HAD NOTHING TO HIDE

No biographer, however scurrilous his character, or deep his venom, can now go from post to post, and gather bits of unexposed scandal about his life and parade them out for public consumption.

There are no stories about GEORGE SEGER that need to be covered with the remark, "Let nothing but good be said of the dead." No political chicanery comes to light. His record in death is what it was in life. He was a plain, honest, clean, sincere public servant, who was guided by his conscience and common sense, and did that which he thought was best for his district and his Nation.

Some men who aspire to serve the public believe in order to be successful they must resort to promises which they cannot fulfill and which they make only in order to secure their own personal advancement. GEORGE SEGER was successful in the realm of politics, and I challenge any man to accuse him of resorting to deceitful practices in order to secure his advancement.

MEN CAN LIVE CLEAN

We have been told, and it is quite deeply seated in the public mind that public service is of necessity laden with uncleanness and these who serve become unclean. The life of GEORGE SEGER is a standing and irrefutable argument against those who believe that. It has been said, and in some quarters it is widely believed, that in order to be a successful public servant, a man must consort with those elements in our life which are mean and vicious, and must pass on ribald stories and salacious tales to impress the man on the street that he is a regular fellow. The cleanness of GEORGE

SEGER's life and his cleanness of speech, brought him respect, admiration, and confidence amid all sections of society, and his life is a standing rebuke to those who feel that it is necessary to stir up the foul in order that they may perchance accomplish a little good.

HIS TOLERANCE

Some people believe it is necessary to arouse religious and racial and class hatred in order to advance themselves politically. Those who believe that can justly point to some who occupy high places in the world and have built themselves up in just that manner, for probably at this very hour in which I am speaking, there is more racial and religious hatred in the world than at any time within the memory of any living citizen. In truth, competent historians tell us that the waves of social and religious and class hatred, which are now engulfing the world, are greater at this time than at any time within the history of what we call modern civilization. We love and we admire GEORGE SEGER's life because no word of racial hatred, religious intolerance, or class antagonism ever escaped his lips. That is a broad statement. It is not made idly—it has been fully weighed but I challenge any man to show where he ever advanced himself politically by stirring class hatred, racial misunderstanding, or religious bigotry.

GEORGE SEGER, as near as any man I have personally known, incarnated within himself the essence of the American ideal of democracy. For many, democracy has been a hollow truth and the very word itself too often has become a platitude, but now when democracy is being challenged on all sides and important statesmen in the world are calling it the philosophy of degeneracy, it comes as a healthful breeze to realize that although our departed friend is no longer able to defend the fundamental truths of democracy as he exhibited them in his words and acts, it can be said in the language of the Scripture, "that he being dead, yet speaketh."

LOOKED TO HIS CONSTITUENTS

With GEORGE SEGER, public office was not a device to catch votes nor a means to attain power. He was a representative of his district. He heard the voice of constituents. He had confidence in the judgment of his constituents. He did not believe he was infallible. He believed that although he was intimately connected with affairs of the Nation that his own constituents, no matter how humble a station in life they held, were able to give him information and insight on national conditions that affected them vitally.

We in America today need to do much serious thinking regarding our democracy. We need to thoroughly weigh in the balance with calm, dispassionate reasoning the pros and cons of our constitutional democracy. We must be on our guard that the birthright for which our ancestors fought and for which some of us have offered our services, is not taken from our hands because of selfish motives on our part or because we have refused through laziness to guard that sacred treasure handed down to us and fragrant with the blood of many martyrs.

GEORGE SEGER AND THE VETERANS

That is the reason why veterans were dear to the heart of GEORGE N. SEGER. They stood ready to die for their country, and to him pure democracy is one of the gifts of God that may require life itself to preserve. He was not a military man. His philosophy of life had no place for force used as a means of international exploitation, but he firmly believed that the heritage which is to use one of our God-given rights was ours because men had been willing to lay down the tools of secular life and to temporarily take the instruments of war in order to guard and perpetuate those things which are dearer to us than life itself. That is the reason why it is that every veteran in this congressional district found in GEORGE SEGER a friend. It was not because at one time we veterans had belonged to the military but that we belonged to the military only because that was the means found necessary to preserve the God-given rights that we Americans want to be ours.

The strong winds of life in a very short time blow away from the memory we leave the superficial things of our character. The memory of all of us within a few short years will be bleak and gaunt. The harsh winds of life beat about our memories as the sands beat against the sphinx of Egypt, leaving only the rugged outlines which are strengthened by masses of stone.

WHAT WILL VERDICT BE?

What will be the verdict of the history of this community of the life of GEORGE N. SEGER as he lived among us, as a businessman, as a member of the board of education, as a commissioner, and mayor of our city, and as our Representative in the National Congress? It has only been a short time since his death. In fact it has been so brief that his name is spoken in the hushed tones that mark places of bereavement, but even now the permanent outlines of his character are engraving themselves upon the public mind.

I do not wish to assume the role of a prophet, but I do venture to say that the enduring memory of our friend will be the outline of a man whose outstanding characteristic was a rugged honesty, a deep devotion toward public service, a statesman of sound judgment, not carried away by every will-o-wisp of strange economic fancy, nor swayed by the breezes of false political philosophies. In a day when many brilliant men are being carried away by political ideas that history proves to be disastrous and futile, GEORGE SEGER stood out like a rock for soundness, sobriety, honesty of intention, and deep integrity.

The fact that he had but 4 short months before he would have voluntarily retired from elective office in nowise dims the glory of his achievements. It was his fond desire to retire and spend the sunset days of his life amid the scenes where his heart had its deepest attachment, with and among his friends in Passaic, and in and through this congressional district, where older men regarded him as a brother, younger men regarded him as a father, and children regarded him with honor and pride.

NO WASTE-AND-SPEND MAN

I have been told that when he superintended the construction of our high school he turned back to the city some $7,000. If the spend-and-waste philosophy of finance and economics be the true one, his act is not to his credit for he was a saving man. But, if thrift, honest wages, and honest work still are the fundamental stones of any true national economy, then let us place in that school a plaque to his memory with the words inscribed:

"To the memory of a just man, who believed you cannot secure national prosperity by national waste."

He wished to retire and pass on to younger shoulders the spotless mantle of public service he wore with such joy to himself and such honor to his district. In the providence of God, "man proposes but God disposes," and the retirement that he desired for himself has been translated by the heavenly angels to the request to come hither and higher.

The literature of this world is rich in expression of beauty of those who face the eternal with stout heart and uplifted face. From the storehouse of precious memory, what shall we choose? Shall it be Horatio's farewell to Hamlet:

"Now cracks a noble heart. Good night, sweet prince, and may flights of angels sing thee to thy rest."

Shall it be Donald Hankey's farewell to the beloved captain, dear to the heart of every veteran:

"But he lives. Somehow he lives. And we who knew him do not forget. We feel his eyes on us. We still work for that wonderful smile of his. There are not many of the old lot left now; but I think that those who 'went west' have seen him. When they got to the other side I think they were met. Someone said, 'Well done, good and faithful servant.' And as they knelt before that gracious pierced figure, I reckon they saw nearby the captain's smile. Anyway, in that faith let me die, if death should come my way, and so, I think, shall I die content."

Methinks the most appropriate leave-taking is Bunyan's death of Valiant-for-truth.

"After this it was noised abroad that Valiant-for-truth was taken with a summons and had this for his token, that the summons was true, 'That his pitcher was broken at the fountain.' When he understood that, he called his friends and told them of it. Then, said he, I am going to my Father. My sword I give to him that shall succeed me in my pilgrimage, and my courage and skill to him that can get it. My marks and scars I carry with me, to be a witness for me, that I have fought his battles who now will be my rewarder. When the day that he must go hence was come, many accompanied him to the riverside, into which as he went he said, 'Death, where is thy sting?' And as he went down deeper, he said, 'Grave, where is thy victory?' So he passed over, and all the trumpets sounded for him on the other side."

"Wherefore by Their Fruits Ye Shall Know Them"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHIL FERGUSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 9, 1940

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. Speaker, while not what some might call a religious man, I am a member of the church and do feel there has been no greater masterpiece than the Bible. To me one of the most pertinent phrases in the Great Book is found in St. Matthew, chapter 7, verse 20: "Wherefore by their fruits ye shall know them."

As a member of the Agriculture Committee I have had a part in forming what I consider a great Democratic farm program. Before Franklin D. Roosevelt and the Democratic Party took charge, in 1932 what did the farmers of America have? They had the Farm Board and the panic. They now have soil and water conservation, low interest rates, rural electrification, marketing units, commodity loans, parity payments, the stamp plan, and the distribution of surpluses.

Before I get through with my speech today I want to point out clearly to the farmers of this Nation what part a majority of the Republicans have had in shaping this program. It had never occurred to me to have so closely observed the Re-

publican votes on this program if the Republican convention had not practically endorsed the farm program and if the Republican candidate for the Presidency, Wendell L. Willkie, had not made this statement, as quoted by the New York Times of August 11, 1940:

I do not favor changing the present farm program unless a better one is gradually evolved. I wish to repeat that, if elected President, I will not take away any of the farm benefits gained by agriculture during the last few years.

I want you to particularly note the language used by Nominee Willkie:

I will not take away any of the farm benefits gained by agriculture during the last few years.

Of course, Mr. Willkie has never had any experience with a Republican Congress, and what a sad experience it would be for Mr. Willkie and for the farmers of the United States.

REPUBLICAN LEADERS AGAINST FARM PROGRAM

The important committee in supplying funds to carry out the agriculture program as written by the Agriculture Committee is the Committee on Appropriations. If the Republicans should elect a majority of the Congress, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] would be chairman of that powerful Committee on Appropriations. When the bill providing parity payments for the farmers was before the House this year, Mr. TABER made the following statement:

I rise to say to the gentlemen and to the membership of the House that I am opposed to parity payments, and I am going to urge every Member of the House to vote against it.

Note his language well. He urges every Member of the House to vote against this bill that provides the money for parity payments. Allow me to quote the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LAMBERTSON] another Republican member of the Appropriations Committee that provides funds for the farm program. On March 28, Mr. LAMBERTSON said:

I am going to vote against this increase of parity payments. Agriculture is not going to come into its own through parity payments. Let's vote against all of these things.

The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LAMBERTSON] was as good as his word. He voted against every appropriation that would provide for carrying out the farm program, against the money for farm tenancy, against the money for soil conservation, against the money for the development of our water resources, against the money for parity payments. These two men at the head of the Appropriations Committee, to their tender mercies, would be thrust the fate of the American farmers' program. There could be but one answer if the farmers of this country elected a majority of Republicans to the House of Representatives. There would be no farm program, in spite of the fact that Mr. Willkie would, with generous promises, lead the farmers into the Republican fold.

I cannot overestimate the effect Republican leadership would have on farm legislation. For 12 years the Republicans controlled the House and passed not one single constructive farm bill. Now, if by chance the farmers of this Nation vote against their interests and elect a majority of Republicans to the House, the gentleman from the industrial State of Massachusetts, JOSEPH C. MARTIN, will become Speaker of the House. He is Mr. Willkie's campaign manager. He was chosen for that position undoubtedly because he represents the views of the majority of Republicans. In the 15 years, the gentleman from Massachusetts, JOSEPH MARTIN, has served in Congress he has never voted for a single vital farm measure. He would occupy the position of Speaker of the House in a Republican Congress with almost virtual control of what legislation can come before the House. Do you think any farm legislation would be favorably considered with the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], in the Speaker's chair?

GREAT MAJORITY OF REPUBLICAN MEMBERS AGAINST FARM PROGRAM

In case you think that I have selected a few Republican leaders that happen to be opposed to the farm program, let me give you the record of the Republican membership of the House during the last session of Congress.

In the Seventy-fifth Congress, although 70 percent of the Republicans voted against most of the farm measures, they did not have enough votes to be of serious threat.

But when the number of Republicans was increased from 90 to 169 in the Seventy-sixth Congress they began to be a threat to agricultural legislation and I want to warn the farmers that an increase of 30 or 40 Republicans in the House would give them sufficient majority to strangle farm legislation.

Let me give you the votes on measures affecting agriculture in this Seventy-sixth Congress.

1. On the first vote providing for parity payments the vote was 135 Republicans against the measure. Eighty-nine percent of the Republicans in Congress opposed parity payments on a record vote.

2. The vote on crop insurance—111 Republicans voted against, or 92 percent of the voting Republicans registered their opposition to this program that has been the salvation of many wheat farmers. On the other hand, only 1 Democrat voted against this measure.

3. On the vote to extend the activities of the Extension Department which goes into the homes of many farmers, 106 Republicans voted against, or 92 percent of the Republicans voting.

4. When the House again had a chance to vote on parity payments, 131 Republicans voted against, or 85 percent of their membership still voted against equality for the farmer.

5. I want to call to your attention when money was proposed for the stamp plan 130 of the Republicans voted against, or 89 percent were opposed to giving American agricultural surpluses to the undernourished unemployed of this Nation.

6. On May 14 for the sixth time the Republicans expressed their contempt for the farmers by voting against the Bankhead-Jones farm-tenant money; 132 of the Republicans voting said "no" to the tenant farmers of America in their effort to get farm homes; 96 percent of the Republicans voting said, "We are opposed to giving the tenant farmers of the Nation a chance to own their own homes."

7. The seventh demonstration of the Republican opposition to farm aid came very close to my heart and to the hearts of the people of the western section of my district. Provisions had been made for the construction of water facilities and small irrigation projects in the semiarid sections. On June 19, 113 Republicans, or 87 percent of those voting, said to the farmers in the Panhandle of Oklahoma, "We are not in favor of developing the proper use of water that you may raise crops in dry years to care for your cattle and livestock." If the Republicans had been able to gain a few more seats in the last election, as they are striving so hard to do at this election, there would have been no such program in the Panhandle of Oklahoma.

8. And now I come to the vote on the proposition that really shows what little interest the Republicans have in the welfare of the farmer. Every wheat farmer knows today without the ever-normal granery, the plan that allows the farmer to store his wheat and get a Government loan on it, this year would have seen 25-cent wheat. The farmer would have been unable to hold his product and the speculator would have bought it at his own price, to reap a rich harvest later in the year, at the expense of our farmers.

Just before Willkie had promised the Republicans would keep the farm program, his adopted party, led by that seasoned campaigner against farm legislation, the gentleman from Massachusetts, JOE MARTIN, voted to place a dagger in the heart of American agriculture by withholding money for loans on wheat and other farm products. One hundred and six Republicans voted against providing funds for these loans. Not a Democrat voted against the loan provision.

Mr. Speaker, you can see why I turn to the Scriptures to find a passage in which the American people can put their faith. Certainly they can have no faith in Republican campaign promises and they should think very clearly, very thoughtfully, and very prayerfully about the results of a Republican victory that would place enough votes in the House of Representatives to defeat their farm program.

Farmers are not easily fooled. They will judge the Republican farm promises by the fruits of the Republican Party in the past and will take no chances on a Republican majority strangling the farm program and placing the farm industry back in the panic of 1932. We who have written the Democratic farm program realize its imperfections, but it can best be perfected in the hands of its friends, not in the hands of its enemies.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States Advocate Adequate National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 11, 1940

RESOLUTION OF THE FORTY-FIRST NATIONAL ENCAMPMENT, VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, at the request of Millard W. Rice, legislative representative, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, I am inserting a copy of the resolution on national defense adopted at the Forty-first National Encampment of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, held at Los Angeles, August 25 to 30, inclusive.

The contents of this resolution will make clear the stand taken by the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, whose membership is comprised of veterans with overseas service.

Whereas the happening of the events across the seas during the past year in particular, has clearly demonstrated the utter hopelessness of unprepared nations to withstand the onslaughts of powerfully prepared totalitarian nations which force their might against the principles of right; and

Whereas it is a well-known fact that our own country is not now sufficiently prepared properly to defend its national integrity; and

Whereas it is almost axiomatic that military, industrial, and financial preparation for war is the best assurance for the preservation of peace and our national integrity; and

Whereas the policies of aggressor nations—based on power—demand that our armed forces be promptly increased sufficiently to withstand any possible aggression against the United States, or any part of the Americas; and

Whereas it is very uncertain that reliance on voluntary enlistments can provide an adequate number of trained men quickly enough to meet the urgent need for enlarged defensive forces; and

Whereas we, as Veterans of Foreign Wars, well know that the lack of adequate military training resulted in needless sacrifice of American lives in the World war: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Forty-first National Encampment of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, That—

1. We reiterate the long-established policies of the V. F. W. vigorously advocating specific increases in trained men, and in scientifically developed, modernized, mechanized, motorized material—such as tanks, airplanes, battleships, antiaircraft guns, and other armament and equipment—for the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard of the United States, and for the National Guard, the C. M. T. C., the R. O. T. C., and various other reserve components, by liberalized authorizations and increased appropriations of sufficient magnitude to withstand any possible aggression against the Western Hemisphere.

2. We favor (a) the immediate adoption of a system of compulsory military training during time of peace, for all physically fit young men, after the completion of which they shall be transferred to a reserve component, subject to call to active duty in the event of national emergency, and (b) the adoption of a system to be applicable during time of war of universal, selective, compulsory military service as to all physically fit men, when needed.

3. We advocate that those who actively serve, and those who shall have actively served, in any compulsory military training, or compulsory service unit, be extended the same rights, privileges, benefits, and emoluments as may be provided for those who serve, or have served, in the regular armed forces of the United States, and for their dependents, and also such protection as to reemployment, seniority rights, and such other rights as may be found practicable.

4. We do hereby emphatically reaffirm our advocacy of legislation to tax the profits out of war and the preparation for war, by steeply graduated personal and corporation income taxes, so as more nearly to equalize the burdens of war.

5. The National defense committee and the national legislative committee of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States are hereby directed to make careful study as to the need for additional legislation to provide for the effective and speedy mobilization of manpower, capital, transportation, communication, and material resources, in order to be able successfully to resist aggression against the United States, or any part of the Americas, and that upon the conclusion of such study, the national legislative committee is hereby authorized and directed to sponsor, support, and cooperate with others in securing the enactment of legislation to provide for such objectives.

Far Eastern Triangle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL HINSHAW

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 11, 1940

ARTICLE BY K. K. KAWAKAMI

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, under authority granted to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I submit an article entitled "Far Eastern Triangle," written by Mr. K. K. Kawakami, a Japanese who for many years has been the Washington correspondent of the Osaka Mainichi and the Tokyo Nichi-Nichi. Mr. Kawakami is also the author of several important books, among them being Japan Speaks, Manchoukuo: Child of Conflict, and Japan in China. This article appears in the July issue of Foreign Affairs, an American quarterly review (vol. 18, No. 4, pp. 632–645).

This article by Mr. Kawakami is most significant. Couched as it is in diplomatic language, a type of language most difficult for the average American reader who is accustomed to the newspaper and magazine style of the times, it is difficult to understand. Consequently, in reading the article every word and phrase must be studied carefully for its meaning and its import. In fact, this article is so carefully written that one could conceive of its having been written by the Japanese Foreign Office. But in any event, in all probability it had the approval of the Japanese Foreign Office before it was released.

This article evidently presents the Japanese position in respect to the present situation in the Orient. I call your attention, especially, to its reference to and explanation of the persistent difference in treatment of the situation in the Orient by Great Britain and the United States, respectively, and the fundamental difference in objective of these countries. Students of American foreign relations will recognize the lack of harmony between these objectives and the reason why British policy in the Orient continues in some respects to run counter to and afoul of the policy of the United States. This fact, coupled with the current international situation and the activities of our own Government, indicate that we may be perilously near a serious break, and if it occurs we must expect to go it alone. If this break should occur, and it is then necessary for us to go it alone, subsequent events are not likely to be brought to a conclusion in the near future, but might well run into a long period of time and end in a stalemate, which could not be to the advantage of either Japan or the United States. I believe this, although opinions differ materially on this subject. The question remains, however, are the respectively desired results worth the cost to either side?

The article by Mr. K. K. Kawakami follows:

[From Foreign Affairs for July 1940]

FAR EASTERN TRIANGLE

(By K. K. Kawakami)

Ever since the demise of the Anglo-Japanese alliance after the Washington conference of 1921–22, the far eastern policy of the United States has apparently been based upon the assumption that British and American interests in China are identical. For this reason Washington has taken it for granted that in the Orient

London will pursue a policy parallel to that of the United States. But this assumption has in fact not always been justified by events during the last 18 years, for Britain's Far East policy has often run counter to the wishes of the American Government. True, the present war in Europe has momentarily given added support to the American theory of parallel action now that Britain finds it imperative to retain the good will of the United States. Yet the irony of fate is such that the same war is bringing about England's reconciliation with Japan.

After the World War, British opinion was divided as to whether or not the Japanese Alliance should be terminated. The British people in general, and Downing Street in particular, were in favor of keeping it alive. Several leading statesmen—notably Mr. Lloyd George, Mr. Arthur Balfour, Lord Curzon, and Lord Lee of Fareham—were also of this opinion. At an imperial conference held at London in 1921, India, Australia, and New Zealand expressed themselves against the abrogation of the alliance, though Canada, presumably under American influence, insisted upon its termination. Meanwhile Washington had made up its mind to break up the alliance by any means. Secretary Hughes even intimated to the British Ambassador in Washington that if England refused to part company with Japan, Congress might register its displeasure by passing a resolution recognizing the Irish Republic.

The American Government took this firm stand against the alliance in spite of assurances from both Japan and England that under no circumstances would it be invoked against the United States. As revised in 1911 the alliance absolved England and Japan from any obligation to go to the other's aid if one of them were involved in a war with the United States. This provision was embodied in the following terms: "Should either high-contracting party conclude a treaty of general arbitration with a third power, it is agreed that nothing in this agreement shall entail upon such contracting party an obligation to go to war with the power with whom such treaty of arbitration is in force." Unfortunately, the American Senate failed to ratify the arbitration treaty which Britain concluded in order to give effect to this article of the alliance. Nevertheless, both Tokyo and London made it clear that they considered its provisions fully effective, since they held that the Bryan Peace Commission Treaty of 1914 was a general arbitration agreement. Yet this explanation did not satisfy Washington.

Why did Britain continue to desire the alliance even after the German menace had been eliminated? The answer is that England was now faced with a totally new danger, that of Communist revolution along the Asiatic fringes of her empire in Afghanistan, India, and China. In order to cope with this new peril Britain maintained friendly relations with Japan. She knew, of course, that Japan herself had become a rival, a dangerous rival, in China; but that was only added reason for regarding the alliance as essential to British interests. This reasoning was not paradoxical. England believed that she could restrain Japan's ambitions in China by befriending her. Up to the very eve of the Washington Conference, Britain and the Dominions, except Canada and South Africa, hoped the alliance could somehow be saved. With that hope in mind they proposed that an international conference convene at London to discuss the Far Eastern situation prior to the meeting at Washington. This plan was vetoed by the United States, which suspected that it was conceived in a desire to preserve the alliance. In the end the American Government scuttled the alliance at the Washington Conference and substituted the so-called Four Power Pacific Treaty.

The termination of the alliance left Japan in no happy mood, for she had come almost superstitiously to rely upon British cooperation. In China, especially, she had regarded British support as essential for maintaining her political and economic position. Quite naturally she felt as though the keystone had fallen out of her diplomatic arch when the Washington Conference tolled the knell of the alliance.

But Japanese statesmen, though they knew that the American Government was responsible for the end of the alliance, nonetheless adopted a policy of friendliness toward the United States and guided public sentiment so as to promote that policy. As they saw it, the World War had shaken the British Empire to its foundations, while the United States, on the other hand, had emerged as the greatest power in the world. Japan had to face this fact in reorienting her diplomacy. They also knew that her growing influence in China might conflict with Britain's vast interests there, while she could foresee no such conflict with the United States, whose Chinese interests were small. It was no doubt these considerations which persuaded Tokyo to pursue a policy of friendliness toward Washington in preference to London.

The Japanese public was not fully informed as to the part played by Washington in terminating the Anglo-Japanese alliance, but was allowed to gain the impression that England, having got all the good out of it, had then left Japan in the lurch. This widespread belief, coupled with a rising anti-British sentiment in China, rendered England's position increasingly difficult. Britain had consented to abrogate the alliance in the hope that China, which had vigorously opposed it, would become more friendly. She had also hoped that should her Chinese interests be seriously menaced by China or Japan, the United States, which had offered its cooperation in place of the Anglo-Japanese alliance, would come to her rescue. Neither of these hopes was fulfilled.

By the beginning of 1925 it was evident that a putsch against British interests was about to take place in China. In the fall of 1926 the Chinese Nationalists—partly financed by Moscow and guided by Borodin, Galen (later known as General Bluecher), and other Bolshevik emissaries—surged through South China and established themselves in the Yangtze Valley, long Britain's exclusive sphere of influence. They flaunted such slogans as "Down with the British," and "Away with British exploitation." Indeed, the success of the Nationalists' campaign was primarily due to their anti-British propaganda promising the masses that if British imperialism were put to rout all would be well with China. Downing Street sounded out Tokyo and Washington for help, but in vain. That Japan should be cool to the British request was understandable enough; but many Englishmen, remembering the American promise of cooperation at the Washington Conference, were disappointed with the aloofness of the United States. Under these circumstances Britain could only retreat before the Nationalist onsloughts.

And so His Majesty's government, on December 18, 1926, proposed to the powers signatory to the Washington Treaty that certain surtaxes which the Nationalists had levied on foreign trade in violation of treaty obligations be recognized and regularized. To this friendly gesture the Nationalists responded in January 1927 by forcibly seizing the British concessions at Hankow and Kiu-kiang. In March, Nationalist agitation against the British in Nanking led to the looting of several foreign consulates and many foreign firms, residences and missionary institutions, and the murder or serious injury of several prominent foreigners. The situation became so deplorable that on May 9, Sir Austen Chamberlain admitted in the House of Commons that "the Nationalist government have neither observed the spirit of the agreement signed at Hankow, nor have they made any attempt to reciprocate the friendly attitude which we have displayed toward them." And yet "His Majesty's government are," Sir Austen declared almost in the same breath, "unwilling, even under such provocation as they have received, to abandon their hope that this friendly policy will presently evoke an equally friendly response from a Chinese Government freed from foreign domination and thus, enabled to devote itself to the single-minded service of the interests of the Chinese."

Hitherto English businessmen in China had assumed that the Anglo-Japanese alliance served to advance Japanese interests at their expense, and that once this pact was dissolved, British influence and trade would again have smooth sailing. Now, however, they were sadly disillusioned, some of them frankly admitting their blunder in casting aside Japanese friendship. Boycotted by the Chinese singled out for attack by "red" agitators, and uncertain of the value of American friendship, these Britishers began to advocate a pro-Japanese reorientation in London's foreign policy.

In England, too, this sentiment found sympathizers, especially in conservative circles. Although the Government itself had no intention of reversing the policy adopted at the Washington conference, it nevertheless felt that Britain's termination of the alliance with Japan had placed her in no bed of roses. This feeling was the more poignant since the American attitude towards the English in China seemed to be one of rivalry rather than of cooperation. When Downing Street made its proposal that the powers should regularize the nationalists' illegal levy of surtaxes upon foreign imports, Washington felt—at least it was so stated in American newspapers—that Britain had stolen a march on the United States by attempting to play the big brother to China, a role it had long considered an American monopoly. In any event, Secretary of State Kellogg, in a public statement on January 26, 1927, went much further than the British in this Chinese tariff question. Mr. Kellogg emphasized American solicitude for China's "unity, independence, and prosperity," and declared that "the United States is now and has been ever since the negotiation of the Washington treaty prepared to enter into negotiations with any Government of China or delegates who can prepresent or speak for China not only for the putting into force of the surtaxes of the Washington treaty, but entirely releasing tariff control and restoring complete tariff autonomy to China." It looked as though the winning of Chinese goodwill had become a matter of rivalry between Washington and London. And indeed, on July 25, 1928, Secretary Kellogg surprised the world by making public the text of a brief treaty which had been hastily signed by Mr. T. V. Soong, the Nationalist Finance Minister, and Mr. John V. A. MacMurray, the American Minister at Peiping, and in which the United States recognized "the principle of complete national-tariff autonomy" for China—a recognition which Britain was unwilling to grant.

Such was the history of the divergences between British and American policies vis-à-vis Japan and China during the decade following the World War. These differences were thrown into still clearer relief by the Manchurian "incident" of 1931. To frustrate Japan's designs on Manchuria, Secretary of State Stimson repeatedly urged the League of Nations, whose interest in the crisis seemed only half-hearted, to take measures strong enough to check Japanese aggression. He also made several direct approaches to Downing Street. His final proposal was that England and the United States jointly invoke the Nine Power Treaty, because—as Mr. Stimson says in his book, The Far Eastern Crisis—economic sanctions against Japan "would have more chance of being adopted by Congress if it were recommended following the invocation of the Nine Power Treaty than if it had been recommended solely by the League of Nations." Several times Mr. Stimson called Sir John Simon on the trans-Atlantic telephone, and each time the British Foreign Secretary's reply was so lukewarm and uncertain

that Mr. Stimson had to admit that "my plan was blocked" and that "the British nonjoinder obviously killed the possibility of any such démarche." In the British view, Manchuria was merely an outlying territory of China where British interests were small and from which England could gracefully retreat with no vital sacrifice. British statesmen believed that the part of wisdom for Britain was to keep Japanese friendship in order to preserve their much larger interests in China proper during the years to follow.

Under its nonrecognition doctrine the United States treated Manchukuo as if it were an outcast. The English, on the other hand, in 1934 sent there an economic mission led by Lord Barnby and representing the powerful Federation of British Industries. The mission was "unofficial" and "nonpolitical"; but no one, reading its highly favorable report on Manchukuo, could help attaching to it a greater significance than met the eye. A year later an American economic mission made a tour of the Far East, but studiously avoided Manchukuo and in its report said not a word about the economic prospects of that area. It is hard to believe that American businessmen could have been so sentimental except under political influence.

On April 18, 1934, the Japanese Foreign Office, through Mr. Eiji Amau, Chief of the Information Bureau and so-called spokesman, issued a statement enunciating a principle which was regarded abroad as an imitation of the Monroe Doctrine. Its English version, as given out in Tokyo, was vague in meaning and very clumsy in phraseology. The translation published the same day by the British Foreign Office was much clearer. It said in part: "* * * supplying China with war airplanes, building of aerodromes in China, and detailing military instructors or military advisers to China, or contracting a loan to provide funds for political uses would obviously tend to alienate friendly relations between Japan, China, and other countries and to disturb peace and order of Eastern Asia. Japan will oppose such projects. The foregoing attitude of Japan should be clear from policies she has pursued in the past, but on account of the fact that positive movements for joint action in China by foreign powers, under one pretext or another are reported to be on foot, it is deemed not inappropriate to reiterate her policy at this time."

The Japanese were moved to make this declaration as a result of several alarming rumors. For one thing, it was reported that powerful American interests had been supplying China with military planes and pilots and had even obtained a concession to build an airfield at a point on the Fukien coast 80 miles from a Japanese naval harbor off Formosa. For another, Sir Frederick Leith-Ross, Financial Adviser to the British Government, had been evolving a plan to give China considerable financial aid. Then, too, the League of Nations had been sending various experts to China to find out how best it could help the Nanking Government.

On April 30, Mr. Hull issued a formal statement, of which the tenor is indicated by the following sentence: "In the opinion of the American people and the American Government, no nation can, without the assent of the other nations concerned, rightfully endeavor to make conclusive its will in a situation where there are involved the rights, the obligations, and the legitimate interests of other sovereign states." The American Ambassador at Tokyo was instructed to reiterate these views to the Japanese Foreign Office.

The British Foreign Office, however, talked in another language. On May 18, 1934, Sir John Simon told the House of Commons that the Nine Power Treaty contained no provision whereby "this country undertook to respect and preserve the integrity of Chinese territory." 'It is not true," he declared, "that we have ever signed, or * * * anyone has signed, a treaty with China in which we have pledged ourselves to use all our forces to preserve the territorial integrity and political independence of China including Manchuria." Furthermore, the British Foreign Office seems to have inclined to the belief that the activities of Sir Frederick Leith-Ross in China were inimical to England's friendly relations with Japan. An Associated Press dispatch, dated London, November 26, 1935, reported that the "British Foreign Office disapproves his [Sir Frederick's] whole mission and particularly disapproves the wordy exchanges * * * between him and the Japanese," and that while his activities were supported by the Treasury the "Foreign Office believes * * * that any attempt to restore China's finances is doomed until there is political agreement between China and Japan."

All this seems to justify the assumption that the abrogation of the Anglo-Japanese alliance did not change the basic principle of British policy towards Japan—that an aggressive Japan could best be restrained, not by fault-finding and nagging, but by friendliness and conciliation. Since the outbreak of Sino-Japanese hostilities in July 1937 this policy has been put to a severer test than ever before. The sinking of the British gunboat *Ladybird* in the Yangtze and the bombing of the motor car in which the British Ambassador to China was traveling from Nanking to Shanghai, even though accidental, taxed British pride. The Japanese blockade of the British concession at Tientsin caused Mr. Chamberlain to say in the House of Commons on August 4, 1939, that "it makes my blood boil to hear and read some things that have been happening there." And yet, in spite of all the exasperating things which have been happening in China, the indications are that England, following her traditional policy, will eventually come to terms with Japan.

At the Brussels conference, called in November 1937, to condemn Japan's acts in China, Mr. Anthony Eden, the British Foreign Secretary, was obviously content to play second fiddle to the American delegate, Mr. Norman H. Davis. The resolution adopted by the conference was mainly the work of the American delegation. The Japanese interpreted these facts as another evidence of Britain's reluctance to make herself the butt of Japan's enmity, a reluctance that became more and more pronounced as the European situation deteriorated.

On July 15, 1939, the British Ambassador at Tokyo, Sir Robert Craigie, opened conversations with the Japanese Foreign Minister, Mr. Hachiro Arita. The British authorities at Tientsin had rejected a Japanese demand that four Chinese terrorists, who at a point inside the British Concession had assassinated the pro-Japanese superintendent of the Tientsin Customs, be handed over to the local Chinese court for trial. The Japanese had replied on June 15 by blockading the Concession. In reality, England hoped that the settlement of the Tientsin affair would prove a starting point for the improvement of Anglo-Japanese relations along broader fronts.

By July 24 the conferees had agreed upon general principles applicable not only to the Tientsin imbroglio but to the Chinese situation as a whole On that day Sir Robert therefore signed the following memorandum:

"His Majesty's government in the United Kingdom fully recognise the actual situation in China where hostilities, on a large scale, are in progress, and note that, as long as that state of affairs continues to exist, the Japanese forces in China have special requirements for the purpose of safeguarding their own security and maintaining public order in regions under their control and that they have to suppress or remove any such acts or causes as will obstruct them or benefit their enemy. His Majesty's government have no intention of countenancing any act or measures prejudicial to the attainment of the above-mentioned objects by Japanese forces and they will take this opportunity to confirm their policy in this respect by making it plain to British authorities and British nationals in China that they should refrain from such acts and measures."

When the British memorandum was made public, Washington was agog. Outwardly the State Department maintained a decorous silence. Nevertheless, on July 26, 2 days after the Craigie-Arita understanding had been made public, it notified the Japanese Embassy of its decision to abrogate the American-Japanese Commercial Treaty of 1911. Was there any connection between this sudden American move and the Anglo-Japanese agreement at Tokyo? In Tokyo, at any rate, the American notification has been interpreted as a move to bolster the wavering British. The Japanese Foreign Office, in response to persistent public clamor, let Mr. Seijiro Yoshizawa, chief of the American Affairs Bureau, explain the American move over the nation-wide broadcasting system. "On July 26, at 4 p. m. (July 27, 5 a. m. Tokyo time)," he said, "the State Department handed to the Japanese Embassy a very brief note for treaty termination with the verbal advice that the document spoke for itself, that no further explanation was necessary, and that it would be given to the press at once. Only at the Embassy's request was its publication withheld for a few hours to give the Tokyo Foreign Office just enough time to receive the note before it was flashed across the Pacific by the press." Why, asked Yoshizawa, was the abrogation done so suddenly? "Perhaps," he suggested, "the American move had something to do with the Anglo-Japanese conversations which had been in progress in Tokyo."

The Craigie memorandum of July 24 was duly communicated to Washington by the British Government. To the questions which the State Department doubtless asked, the British apparently replied with assurances that though no change was contemplated in their policy of Anglo-American cooperation, they regretted that the European situation did not permit them to pursue in China a course exactly parallel to that of the United States. This much at least was gathered from Mr. Chamberlain's address before the House of Commons on August 5, 1939, when he declared that "if the British Government says it does not regard this formula (the Craigie-Arita memorandum) as making any change in our policy, as indeed it does not, that is much more important than the alteration of words in a formula which has been arrived at after much difficulty and hours of discussion." In reply to a question as to why Britain could not follow the American example and denounce her commercial treaty with Japan, Mr. Chamberlain pointed to the "fundamental difference of the United States of America and its isolation from Europe and this country," and said that "we would much rather settle our differences with the Japanese by discussion and negotiation." The Prime Minister concluded with these words: "We shall endeavor to show patience and to exercise reasonable moderation, recognizing that behind all these outrageous things (done by the Japanese) there may be some genuine suspicion on the part of the Japanese in China about our treatment of them, but above all let us not forget that there may be even graver and nearer problems to be considered in the course of the next few months."

Besides the threat of war across the Channel, Downing Street had to consider the possibility, even probability, of Japan's joining the Berlin-Rome axis, not only to combat the Comintern but to form a united military front against England and France. Even while Mr. Chamberlain was uttering the above-quoted words, Berlin and Rome were moving heaven and earth to obtain a quick and favorable decision from Japan. In Tokyo too a powerful group had been vigorously working to push Japan into the projected triple alliance. What would become of Hong Kong and of Britain's tremendous investments in China, were Japan to ally with Germany? Worse, what would happen in India if Japan were to sweep British influence from East Asia? Would not Australia, New Zealand, and the British possessions in the South Pacific be opened to an attack by the Japanese Navy? Certainly these questions re-

ceived a most serious consideration at Whitehall during the critical days of August 1939.

Hitler's scuttling of the anticomintern league by joining hands with Stalin made the situation even more ominous, for Berlin now urged Tokyo to come to terms with Moscow so that a great bloc extending from the Rhine to the Pacific might be created. This, coupled with the abrogation of the American commercial treaty with Japan, was a portent which England could not ignore. Indeed, history does not lack instances in which American pressure or antagonism drove Japan into Russia's arms. Secretary Knox's famous Manchurian railway scheme to "smoke Japan out," as he expressed it, led to the Russo-Japanese Convention of 1911. The hostility of the United States toward the Sino-Japanese agreement resulting from the so-called "twenty-one demands" was largely responsible for the virtual alliance between Tokyo and Moscow in 1916. The enactment in 1924 of the American immigration law with Japanese exclusion clauses was followed by Japan's recognition of Soviet Russia.

The Anglo-Japanese conversations at Tokyo were suspended soon after the United States notified Japan that it was terminating the treaty, largely because—so the Japanese believed—Downing Street was momentarily heartened. But the suspension was short lived, for following the outbreak of the European war in September 1939, England has felt more keenly than ever the need for better relations with Japan. But before Britain can establish such relations she must meet Japan half way in the spirit of the Craigie-Arita memorandum of July 24, even if this runs counter to American wishes In July Britain had already consented to hand over to the native police the four Chinese terrorists and had also agreed to certain measures of cooperation between the British concession police and the Japanese authorities at Tientsin. What remains for further discussion is the Japanese demand that the silver worth about £8,000,000 held by a nationalist bank in the concession be turned over to the Japanese sponsored new Chinese Government at Peiping and that the fapi. or legal currency of the Chiang Kai-shek regime, be prohibited within the said concession.

At this writing both the silver and fapi questions seem about to be settled. And when these matters are out of the way the blockade of the British and French concessions will be lifted, even though the Japanese forces on the spot may prove recalcitrant.

On March 28, 1940, only 2 days before the inauguration of Wang Ching-wei's secessionist government at Nanking, Ambassador Craigie surprised the Japanese—and the Americans—by making a very significant speech, plainly bidding for Japan's friendship. Said Sir Robert:

"Bearing in mind the declared intentions of the Japanese Government and the measure of success already achieved, I have a definite feeling of confidence in the future of Anglo-Japanese relations. * * * Japan and Great Britain are two maritime powers on the fringe of great continents, and they are vitally concerned with the covenants in those continents. * * * Methods may differ but both are ultimately striving for the same objective—a lasting peace and the preservation of our institutions from extraneous and subversive influences. It is surely not beyond the powers of constructive statesmanship to bring the aims of their national policies into full harmony."

Again there was a stir in Washington. What a difference, in tone and implication, between Sir Robert's address and Ambassador Grew's famous "straight from the horse's mouth" speech delivered in Tokyo the previous October. But London took pains to explain that the Craigie speech had no political significance. Lord Halifax, in the House of Lords, and Mr. Butler, in the House of Commons, stated that there was no question of any change in British policy in China, though they added that this attitude was not incompatible with a wish to see an improvement in Anglo-Japanese relations. Nevertheless, neither Sir Robert nor his government could have failed to foresee that the Japanese were bound to read political significance into such a speech. Three days after it had been delivered Secretary Hull issued a statement denouncing, in language more vigorous than he had used in any of his previous statements on China, the inauguration of the Wang Ching-wei regime. Meanwhile, Downing Street was eloquently silent on the advent of the new Nanking Government. Here was a clear indication of the relative position of London and Washington vis-à-vis the Sino-Japanese situation.

Today, while the United States is buzzing with talk of an embargo against Japan, the British are thinking of extending their trade with her. The Anglo-Iranian Oil Co., whose stock is mostly owned by the British Government, has agreed to sell Japan a million barrels of crude oil—an agreement likely to be expanded. The British Foreign Office may be cautious in taking advantage of the American abrogation of the commercial treaty with Japan; but the Treasury and the Ministry of Economic Warfare are understood to be in favor of developing trade opportunities in and with Japan and China. It is considered quite possible that Britain will increase her purchases of Japanese foodstuffs and also reduce tariffs on Japanese textiles imported into India, thus giving Japan the necessary exchange to purchase cotton, oil, machinery, and other goods from the British Empire.

Many Americans may regard Britain's concessions to Japan as shocking, as a betrayal of her promise to cooperate with the United States. They have been wont to believe that British and American interests in China were identical. It has seldom occurred to them that this community of interests is subject to severe restrictions. Great as is Britain's stake in China, it sinks to relative insignificance when compared with her infinitely greater stakes in other parts of the world, above all, in Europe. The position of the United States is quite different. Free from European entanglements and blessed with an advantageous geographical position, it can concentrate its attention upon the Far East.

Yet the United States has no stake in east Asia other than the Philippines and the open door in China. Neither of these interests is vital to the United States; but because it has no other interests in the Far East, it can, if it wishes, devote an undivided attention to them. Particularly in regard to China, it can take vigorous measures against Japan as a sort of hobby, confident that no matter what the Japanese do in retaliation, none of its vital interests will be hurt. On the other hand, England's interests in China are of such magnitude that she cannot apply pressure upon Japan without exposing them to grave danger.

Both the Japanese and the Wang Ching-wei Governments have repeatedly promised to respect the legitimate rights and interests of third powers in China. Much significance attaches to the qualifying word "legitimate." Is extraterritoriality legitimate? Are foreign settlements and concessions legitimate? Even if the Wang Ching-wei regime considers them illegitimate, it will take no precipitate action to abolish them, but will allow time for readjustment. Are not the powers themselves, including the United States, committed to the termination of these imperia in imperio within a reasonable time? As for Britain, she evidently believes that her purely or essentially economic interests can best be served by friendliness toward Japan Take, for instance, the British attitude toward the Yangtze River trade. There were 35 British ships, totaling 68,000 tons, engaged in that trade, as compared to 8,400 tons of American, and 35,000 tons of Japanese shipping. Yet England has never protested to Japan against the temporary closing of the Yangtze as a military measure so vigorously as has the United States. Washington received from Japan prompt apologies and a check for $2,214,007 for the sinking of the gunboat *Panay* and for the damage done to 3 Standard Oil ships by Japanese bombers along the Yangtze on December 12, 1937; London is still waiting for a settlement due for the sinking of the gunboat *Lady-bird* on the same occasion.

On Japan's part there is now a perceptible tendency to appreciate the British attitude, particularly as she feels that her traditional policy of preserving American friendship has proved futile. For economic and other reasons Japan's natural preference is for American rather than for British good will. Since the beginning of the hostilities in China she has endeavored to respect, as far as practicable under the exigencies of military operations, American property and American rights, while she has shown no such solicitude for British interests. Now she feels herself forced to reorient her course. If her relations with England improve, the latter's vested rights in China will be treated with more respect. For one thing, vast British railway loans to China which have been in default for many years will be resuscitated if the railways, with the assistance of Japanese technicians and experts, emerge from chaos. England no doubt finds encouragement in this respect in what the Japanese have done for the British-financed Mukden-Skanhaikwan Railway in Manchuria. For many years prior to the creation of Manchukuo under Japanese guidance, the income of this railway had been misappropriated by the local warlords, leaving nothing for interest or sinking fund. Promptly upon the appearance of Manchukuo in 1932, the new Government, acting upon Japanese advice, paid all back interest and has since been punctually paying the sums necessary to service the British loan.

Japan, though discouraged by the United States' adamantine attitude toward her, still sees a ray of hope in the statement made by Secretary Hull on March 30 of this year. This statement, while it condemns the inauguration of the Wang Ching-wei regime, contains a significant sentence: "This Government again makes full reservation of this country's rights under international law and existing treaties and agreements." This idea is the leitmotif running through all of Mr. Hull's pronouncements on the Sino-Japanese situation. It is not a new idea; it simply follows America's traditional policy of the open door in China enunciated by John Hay 40 years ago. That policy looks upon China's open door and territorial integrity as a means to an end—and that end is the preservation and promotion of American commercial interests. Secretary Hay himself raised no objection to spheres of influence already established as long as they did not prejudice the equal commercial opportunity of other nations. Japan believes that if American policy can be made to conform to this tradition there is still hope, given reasonable time, for a rapprochement with Washington.

Transfer of Military Equipment to the Allies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 11, 1940

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, many inquiries have been made to Members of Congress soliciting information

as to the amount of military equipment sent the Allies since the outbreak of the present European war.

On August 22, 1940, I requested by letter from Gen. George C. Marshall, Chief of Staff, United States Army, the amount and type of critical military equipment turned over to the Allies and Great Britain since the beginning of the war September 5, 1939. I received the following reply dated August 30, 1940:

The War Department had withheld the information requested in your letter of August 22, 1940, because its release is believed to be contrary to the public interest. The arms made available for transfer to the Allies were not classified as critical. They consisted in general of nonstandard or obsolete types of equipment. For example, the rifles were the substitute World War type, inferior both to the Springfield and Garand and surplus to our probable requirements for training and mobilization. The machine guns were principally caliber .30 Lewis and Maxim guns, nonstandard types procured during the World War and surplus because our supply of standard caliber .30 Browning machine guns is adequate to meet our needs.

The attention of the membership of the House is directed to the above letter in which General Marshall analyzes the type of equipment but refrains from showing the amount of such equipment "because its release is believed to be contrary to public interest."

Realizing that Members of Congress as Representatives of the American people are entitled to know the amount of equipment sent the Allies, the following information was developed from authoritative sources:

Materials sent to Allies since September 5, 1939: Planes—1,700 planes including trainers remain for use of United States Army after shipment of above number—2,200 (from Army, Navy, and Marine Corps); .30 caliber rifles (Lee-Enfields), 500,000; .30 caliber ammunition (Lee-Enfields), 150,000,000 rounds; .30 caliber machine guns, 70,0000; 75 millimeter field artillery guns, 600.

England until a few days ago had 7,000 first-line planes while Germany has between 16,000 and 17,000 first-line planes.

The above information indicates that the United States has been aiding the Allies in a practical way and refutes the assertion often heard that America is merely extending sympathy to our British neighbors.

Our Pacific Frontier

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL HINSHAW

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 11, 1940

ARTICLE BY JOHN GUNTHER

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, under authority granted to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I submit an article entitled "Our Pacific Frontier" by Mr. John Gunther, which appeared in the July issue of Foreign Affairs, an American quarterly review, volume 18, No. 4, pages 583–600. Mr. Gunther is a noted former correspondent in Europe of the Chicago Daily News, and is the author of two recently published books Inside Europe, and Inside Asia.

This article by Mr. Gunther presents a summary of statistical and tactical information which should be of considerable interest to the readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and particularly so during these troubled times.

The article by Mr. John Gunther follows:

[From Foreign Affairs for July 1940]

OUR PACIFIC FRONTIER

(By John Gunther)

Where is the American frontier in the Pacific Ocean? What are our vital interests in this vast region? How adequately are we prepared to defend them? What is our present policy in regard to them? These questions are of peculiar urgency at a moment when warfare is lacerating both Europe and Asia. In a way, these two wars are the same war, and it is our great good fortune that this continent stands apart, guarded by two oceans. But modern warfare can expand unpredictably, and there are times when fire jumps over water.

As these lines go to press the full weight of the Nazis' furious "total war" has been unleashed against France and Britain in the west. For the moment we cannot foresee the outcome. Yet, obviously, the measure of German success already achieved makes it doubly imperative that we in America survey our national-defense problem with stern, relentless realism. More than ever before it has become necessary for us clearly to determine just what our interests and commitments are; in other words, to see where our frontiers really lie. In this article we shall take only the Pacific area for our immediate province, though, of course, Pacific problems are necessarily interlocked with others farther afield.

The Pacific is the greatest of the world's five oceans. It measures almost 10,000 miles from east to west at its broadest point and about 7,000 from north to south. It has an area of, roughly, 68,000,000 square miles, or nearly one-half of the total water surface of the globe. Along its northern rim the Soviet Union and the United States are less than 60 miles apart. It is flanked by 3 British dominions, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand; by 11 American republics in addition to the United States; by the 4,072 volcanic islands that form the Japanese archipelago; and by China, the Philippine Islands, and the Dutch East Indies. It is a tremendous repository of wealth and commerce, the crossroads of a dozen trade routes, the scene of multitudinous adventures in national policy, and a possible nexus of future conflict.

Before we proceed, let us define very briefly what we mean by "policy." In the abstract, one might say, policy is merely the defense and furtherance of "national interests." But this term "national interests" must also be broken down. It can include anything from a missionary stranded in a Chinese village to a corporation worth a hundred million dollars. It comprises sympathies, aspirations, atavisms, phobias, as well as concrete items like geography, military establishments, and cold dollars and cents. American foreign policy, especially in regard to the Far East, has traditionally been based on two general concepts. First, we sympathize with the right of nations to preserve their independence. Second, we maintain and support the right of our citizens and our commerce to equal treatment everywhere.

More specifically, our attitude toward far eastern and Pacific problems is dominated by three explicit policies, each of which is so familiar that we need merely mention them: (1) The open-door policy enunciated by John Hay in 1899. In its simplest definition this means equality of opportunity for citizens of all nations to trade at will in China. (2) The Washington Treaties of 1921–22. Under the terms of the Naval Treaty the principal maritime Powers of that time agreed to maintain certain naval ratios. The United States also promised in the Four Power Pact not to alter the status quo in regard to fortifications and military bases in the western Pacific, while in the Nine Power Pact signed at the same time Japan undertook to respect the territorial integrity of China. Though this treaty has, as everyone knows, been flagrantly violated by Japan, we still adhere to it. (3) The Stimson doctrine of nonrecognition. This policy, enunciated following the Japanese occupation of Manchuria in 1931, states that we refuse to recognize "any situation, treaty, or agreement which may be brought about by means contrary" to the Kellogg-Briand Pact.

To support its policy, to protect its frontiers, a nation has to maintain diplomatic, military, and naval establishments. Every country, we might say, has four or five different frontiers. First, at home, its actual geographical frontier. Then, either coterminous with this or beyond it, depending on the size and power of the nation, comes the military frontier, the specific line which it is prepared to defend with its military and naval forces. Third, there comes what might be called the economic frontier. For instance, our economic frontier certainly includes coffee in Brazil and tin in Bolivia. Fourth, a diplomatic frontier, which presumably protects our interests and explores any possible danger to them in areas considerably beyond the geographical frontier. Fifth comes the moral frontier, as is suggested by such a phrase as the "white man's burden," or for that matter the "open door." Viewed from this angle, the whole world is everybody's frontier.

Generally speaking, the diplomatic frontier of a country roughly represents its policy at a given moment, while the military frontier represents its power to defend that policy. The purpose of this article is to discuss these two frontiers in regard to American interests in the Pacific. What are these interests, and how well are we prepared to defend them? Where is our diplomatic frontier? Where is our military frontier? Obviously, they do not correspond. Should, then, our diplomatic frontier be pulled back? Or should our military frontier be pushed forward? Or is it unnecessary that the two frontiers coincide?

II

First, let us outline our interests in the Pacific area. These we may classify into several fields.

1. Territorial. We own various Pacific islands, like the Hawaiian group, Guam, Midway, Wake, and part of the Samoan group. (The Commonwealth of the Philippines is not included in this list because our control over it is to end in 1946, according to the Tydings-McDuffie Act.) Recently we embarked on a system of joint control

with Great Britain over Canton and Enderbury Islands, in the Phoenix group below Hawaii.

2. Nationals: About 7,000 American citizens live in China, some 8,000 in Japan. There are also many Americans in the Philippines, and smaller numbers in the Netherlands Indies (625), and the Straits Settlements (525). Of our nationals in the Orient, those in China cause our State Department the most worry. Presumably, it is the duty of every civilized nation to give protection to its nationals. If we permit traders and missionaries to go abroad, we cannot avoid a certain responsibility for their welfare. Yet in recent years we have become much less assiduous in bearing this responsibility and our neutrality legislation seeks to reduce the number of Americans who live or travel in agitated countries.

3. Investments: Figures are difficult to procure, and they differ widely. A reasonable estimate would put our investments in China at about $250,000,000, those in Japan at perhaps $350,000,000. But as Japan pushes forward in China, our opportunities for investment in the Orient will become increasingly limited. However, the approximately $750,000,000 which we have invested throughout the Far East represents only about 6 percent of our total foreign investments.

4. Trade: In 1938 American exports to China amounted to about $35,000,000, our imports to $47,000,000. Our exports to Japan were very much greater, almost $240,000,000, and our imports—mostly silk and cotton goods—were $126,820,000. Much of our export trade to Japan consists of potential war material like machinery, scrap iron, and petroleum. That we thus help to make Japan's war against China possible is a glaring anomaly in view of our traditional friendship for the Chinese people. Our trade with the Philippines is considerable, amounting to $86,000,000 in exports and $94,000,000 in imports.

5. The air factor: Civil aviation not only follows established trade routes but opens up new ones. It unlocks the door to future trade. Pan-American's air route across the Pacific is important both for its commercial and its prestige value. It also constitutes a distinct American military interest, since pilots obtain training over Pacific waters as well as valuable information on weather conditions and the like. The bases built by Pan-American along the Honolulu-Midway-Wake-Guam-Manila run are of potential military importance.

6. Beyond these categories is another which can best be termed cultural. In China, particularly, we have important interests represented by such educational institutions as Yale in China, Peking Union Medical College, and the multifarious smaller schools, missions, hospitals, and so on, which have done so much to give America a good name in the Orient. The United States could not withdraw its political influence from the Far East without sacrificing this important and valuable, even if intangible, interest.

7. Finally, politics. The world is interlocked, and events in Finland or in the Low Countries have repercussions in Singapore, Java, or Honolulu. All over the world, and particularly in the Far East, the United States carries a political burden based on its power and prestige. By protecting that prestige in the Far East and in Pacific waters, we contribute to political stability throughout the world. If the United States should, for instance, surrender its far eastern position, it would cardinally weaken Great Britain vis-à-vis both Japan and Russia. Our status and our policy in regard to Japan and China will, moreover, inevitably be decisive factors in our future relationship to Europe, and in particular to Germany if she is victorious.

III

All this, then, is what we have to protect. In what position are we to protect it?

To answer this question one must first discuss the putative enemy. In the present state of world politics, as far as the Far Eastern and Pacific areas are concerned, this can only be Japan. Should Germany win the European war, the situation might radically change. Then indeed we would have to alter all our defense conceptions. We might find Japan confronting us in one ocean, while a greatly expanded and strengthened Germany confronted us in the other. But at the moment the only possible antagonist we have to fear in the Pacific is Japan. This is not to say that Japan intends at some future date to make war on the United States. Most sane critics regard the possibility of any such adventure as still remote. Nevertheless, every country, when planning its national defense and its ultimate political aims, must take account of whatever potential enemy is in the field. Under present circumstances Japan is the only nation that can possibly threaten our Pacific interests, the only power—with or without allies—with whom a Pacific war is conceivable. Therefore American military and naval policy in the Pacific is predicated on the assumption that Japan is the principal "enemy" to be faced.

Should, in fact, war unhappily occur between Japan and the United States, the Japanese would presumably strike first at our exposed outposts in China. Our forces there are isolated from any possibility of substantial defense. We have 1,100 marines in Shanghai, which since 1927 have cooperated with the troops of other nations to defend the International Settlement. In northern China we have another 500 marines, divided between Peiping and Tientsin. We have 4 gunboats in the Yangtze area and 1 near Canton. The Asiatic fleet, based on either Shanghai or Manila, depending on the season, consists of only one 10,000-ton cruiser, one old 7,000-ton cruiser, a dozen over-age destroyers, 12 submarines, and a few small auxiliary ships. We do not station any capital ships or aircraft carriers in the Far East. In the past we have not even based our fleet on Hawaii, its natural pivot, because we did not wish to annoy Japan. If it is now stationed at Pearl Harbor, the obvious reason is that we are using its presence there to help persuade Tokyo not to attack the Netherland East Indies. In any event, our fleet stays well this side of the one hundred and eightieth meridian, which bisects the Pacific.

The Philippines might very well be the first object of a Japanese attack if war should come. The question of our capacity to defend these islands has been hotly debated by many experts. The majority opinion is that they could not be held against a sustained or large-scale Japanese assault. Gen. Douglas MacArthur, head of the Philippine military establishment, holds naturally enough a contrary view; he makes an elaborate case with particular emphasis on the growing strength of the Philippine Army, which is training 40,000 recruits a year. But most observers in the United States sharply disagree with General MacArthur. Few of our generals and admirals think we could hold the Philippines; most of them do not think we should even make the attempt.

Their arguments are as follows. First, the Philippines are in effect located in Japanese home waters, whereas our nearest base for serious operations, Pearl Harbor, is about 5,000 miles away. Second, our present armed force in the islands is exceedingly small. On land we have perhaps 4,500 regular troops, including Philippine scouts, and on the sea only the minuscule Asiatic fleet. Third, our coastal defenses are inadequate, although Corregidor in Manila Bay is heavily fortified, and some experts hold that Manila itself could hold out 30 days. But it would be extremely difficult to prevent Japanese landings at several points.[1] Fourth, the Philippines have no munitions industry sufficient to maintain warfare for any length of time. Fifth, the Philippines—as at present defended—provide no satisfactory base for major operations by the United States Fleet. Cavite, near Manila, has scarcely been improved since the Spanish-American War and has no repair facilities for big ships. There is a good natural harbor at Olongapo, in Subic Bay, some 60 miles north of Manila, but it is not adequately fortified. We keep there a floating drydock, the *Dewey*, because Cavite is too shallow to hold it. Although the *Dewey* has been in Philippine waters for 30 years, it is still in operating condition. But it will not dock ships exceeding 10,000 tons; in other words, it could handle a damaged cruiser, but not a big aircraft carrier or battleship—vessels of this size would have to go back to Pearl Harbor or borrow Singapore.

To make the Philippines impregnable would probably cost at least $1,000,000,000, a sum that no American Congress in present circumstances would dream of appropriating for such a purpose. Our best experts say that, in order to make the islands even reasonably possible of defense, we should have to maintain there a garrison of 100,000 men, amply protected by at least 500 aircraft, and with a substantial naval force. In the event of war, it is estimated that we should need 3,000,000 tons of merchant shipping—roughly one-quarter of our entire merchant fleet—to keep the islands in steady and effective communication with the American mainland. We should also need a much more powerful navy, since doubtless we would be risking important ships close to Japan.

Under the terms of the Tydings-McDuffie Act, which will presumably liberate the Philippines in 1946, we are bound to give up the Cavite and Olongapo bases. The question of American naval bases (Cavite and Olongapo are technically defined as military bases) in the islands after we withdraw is left open by the act. One school of American naval opinion feels very strongly that we should reserve the right to build future bases at three or four strategic points after we leave the islands. These points, it is suggested, should be held in perpetuity as "restricted but undefended areas," somewhat on the model of Guantanamo in Cuba, which we hold but do not fortify. Such suggested points, outside of Manila Bay, are Dumanquilas Bay in Mindanao, Coron Bay, Malampaya Sound, the Tawi-Tawi area, and Polillo on the east coast of Luzon. The Japanese are, on their side, very quick to see the potential importance of bases of this sort. For instance, they have occupied an atoll called Pratas Reef, just north of Luzon, where they are reported to have established a radio station.

So much for our comparatively weak position in China and the Philippines. It is quite clear that in case of war with Japan our main reliance would have to be on our line of defense in the mid-Pacific. That line of defense is, and must always be, the United States Navy

IV

As of January 1, 1940, the comparative naval strengths of the United States and Japan—insofar as we know what Japan has been building—were the following:

	United States		Japan	
	Number	Tonnage	Number	Tonnage
Battleships	15	464,300	9	272,070
Aircraft carriers	5	120,100	6	88,470
Heavy cruisers	18	175,200	12	107,800
Light cruisers	19	157,775	15	97,555
Destroyers	182	236,070	84	113,476
Submarines	63	71,175	35	52,432

[1] The Japanese, incidentally, have a remarkable facility for landing operations. In August 1937 they got 75,000 troops to Shanghai in 10 days, a feat most military experts thought would have been impossible.

It should be understood that of these ships, one of our battleships, 2 light cruisers, 115 destroyers, and 32 submarines are technically listed as "over-age," i. e., nearing obsolescence. Of the Japanese total, 1 battleship, 5 heavy cruisers, 8 light cruisers, 36 destroyers, and 19 submarines are over-age.

American ships under construction on January 1, 1940, include 8 new battleships (300,000 tons estimated), 2 aircraft carriers (34,700 tons), 6 light cruisers (44,000 tons), 1 large mine layer, 31 destroyers (49,980 tons), and 15 submarines (20,820 tons). The building program of the Japanese is unknown in its complete details; they make a fetish of naval secrecy. But, as far as we can tell, it consists—including ships building and appropriated for—of 4 battleships, 2 aircraft carriers, 5 light cruisers, 9 destroyers, and 3 submarines. The new Japanese battleships will apparently average around 40,000 tons. In fact, our naval experts are convinced not only that the new Japanese ships are of this unprecedented size, but that Japan may have 4 or even 8 of them under way.[2] The United States has replied to this challenge in kind. Of our new ships, six will displace 35,000 tons, two 45,000 tons. These are bigger than anything we now have afloat. They will also be faster and more powerful. Moreover, as quoted by the New York Times, Admiral Stark stated that the two additional battleships provided for in the 1941 appropriations may be "somewhat larger," possibly reaching 52,000 or even 55,000 tons. There is, however, a limit to the size American ships can reach, a limit imposed by the 110-foot width of the present locks in the Panama Canal.

Late in April 1940 the Senate passed a $963,797,478 Navy bill, the largest in our history except for the war years 1918 and 1919. The bill, which provided for an 11-percent increase in the Navy, was approved by the Senate by a vote of 63 to 4 after only 4 days of debate. Eleven percent is a considerable augmentation, but the Navy does not consider it enough. Admiral Stark thinks that we need a flat 25-percent increase not merely to achieve security, but actually in order to reestablish the old 5–5–3 ratio which collapsed when the Japanese began their heavy secret building in 1936. As these lines are written, President Roosevelt, under the shattering impact of Hitler's "blitzkrieg," has asked Congress to vote an additional billion and a half dollars for the Navy.

If war should come between Japan and the United States, the giant navies of the two countries would be somewhat like two heavyweights sparring but unable to come to grips. It is almost inconceivable that the Japanese would risk a fleet action in American waters or that we would send our fleet to attack Japanese home stations. Presumably the Japanese plan of campaign would be to seize the Philippines and perhaps the Netherland Indies, and to harass American merchant shipping in the Pacific. If this effort were successful, we would probably lose most of our imports from the Indies area. Our most serious losses would be rubber, tin, quinine, and coconut shell, which provides the best charcoal for gas masks. Rubber we could manufacture synthetically, but only at an uneconomic cost. The production of raw rubber in South America might be increased; however, at present that continent supplies only about 2 percent of the world's output. Tin we could obtain from Bolivia, though here again there would have to be a drastic speeding up of production, since the present output of that country is less than half the American demand. Meantime the Japanese could pinprick our advanced forces from bases in their mandated islands. Conceivably, they might attack the Panama Canal with aircraft based on carriers, though that possibility is remote; they might even, by going around Cape Horn, establish commerce raiders in the Atlantic. Beyond this, it is difficult to see what Japan could do, unless she were to have the active support of "fifth column" elements in one of the small republics near the Canal. Any frontal attack by her on Hawaii or our Pacific coast is considered by most military experts to be literally impossible. Nor could an assault on Alaska promise greater success.

The American forces, on their side, would in the first instance attempt to frustrate these Japanese designs. We have submarines capable of cruising from American bases to Japanese waters and back, and presumably we would attempt to cut the absolutely vital Japanese imports of oil from the Netherland Indies. American warships based on the Philippines could attack and destroy Japanese commerce in this and other areas, and by so doing enforce a virtual blockade against Japan. The Japanese could, it is true, import enough foodstuffs from China and Manchuria to keep from starving; an effective blockade, however, would in time very seriously cripple—if it did not completely crush—Japanese economy. We could meantime proceed cautiously to the laborious and dangerous task of mopping up the Japanese mandated islands and thus expand the area safe for American naval operations. Until these islands had been made innocuous, we would find it extremely difficult to send our capital ships much beyond the one hundred and eightieth meridian. Our activity beyond Hawaii would, at least in the opening stages of the war, consist mostly of commerce raiding.

The Japanese mandated islands, formerly belonging to Germany, cover a vast area in the southwestern Pacific. They consist of 4 main groups, the Palaus, the Marianas, the Carolines, and the Marshalls, and there are 1,400 of them. But the total land area of all is only 829 square miles. Most of them are quite insignificant coral atolls; only a few have any military importance. One group, that centering on Truk, has a good harbor and is believed to be fortified; another potential or actual base is at Saipan, north of Guam. In 1939 the Japanese opened a commercial air service from Yokohama to Saipan and on to the Palaus. For years Japan has stringently forbidden foreigners to visit these islands, or to traverse the area; consequently very little is known about them, especially whether or not they are being fortified. To attack these islands, which even unfortified afford excellent hide-and-seek facilities for submarines, would obviously be no easy matter.[3]

In essence, then, two probabilities seem implicit in a war between the United States and Japan. First, we would have, in time, a chance of blockading Japan to her knees. Second, Japan would have very little chance of blockading us or causing us deep injury. If, however, the Japanese took the Philippines and then, as it were, called off the war by simply suspending further hostilities, a long deadlock might ensue. If we were to break it by trying to reconquer the Philippines, we would find ourselves launched on a long and arduous campaign.

▼

Our strength in the Pacific, in any war now foreseeable, is dependent not only on the Navy but on the bases from which the Navy functions. Therefore we are building bases as well as ships. The American defense line in the Pacific is being erected on these bases. When they are completed they will form a massive irregular triangle, from Alaska to Hawaii to the Panama Canal, and will effectively deny this part of the Pacific Ocean to any enemy force. Subsidiary to the three dominant points of this triangle are other bases, such as Midway and Wake Islands, which form a kind of protective apron in front of Hawaii, and the islets south of Hawaii—like Johnston, Palmyra, and Canton—which are potentially a screen covering the sea between Hawaii and the Canal Zone. Farther south is American Samoa, which is not yet a base, but could be made into one.

Modern conceptions of warfare, as revised by the lessons of the present war in Europe, demand active as well as passive systems of defense. Our chain of Pacific bases is, first of all, intended to be a great patrol line for the protection of the eastern Pacific and, if necessary, our own shores. It will be patrolled by the Navy's new scout bombers—powerful planes easily capable of the long jumps necessary in that area. The major portion of our fleet will center, of course, on Hawaii, the geographical and military keystone of the whole system. The smaller bases will be useful for protecting Hawaii and as headquarters for auxiliary ships and squadrons of bombing planes.

Let us begin with Alaska and the Aleutian area. Bases here are important because they guard the great circle route between Japan and the United States, which is by far the quickest path across the Pacific. In the Alaskan region our plans include a naval station at Dutch Harbor and bases for naval aircraft at Sitka and Kodiak Island. Kodiak (on Unalaska Island) is to be the Navy's main headquarters in Alaskan waters, and $8,570,000 has been appropriated for work there. The Army, too, is interested in Alaska and has airfields at Anchorage and Fairbanks. The War Department asked for $12,734,000 to improve the Anchorage base, but the House of Representatives refused to grant it.

Our military and naval program in Alaska is predicated on fear of a conflict with Japan. Nevertheless, it may also have a possible relevance to Soviet Russia. American and Russian territory almost meet, not only at the Bering Strait but also at the end of the Aleutian Archipelago. In fact, strange as it may seem, Russia is our nearest neighbor, Canada and Mexico excepted. Today few people anticipate war between the United States and the Soviet Union. American authorities nonetheless follow Russian activities near Alaska with close attention. The Soviets are understood to be fortifying two islands of the Komandorskie group,[4] which lie close to the Aleutians east of Kamchatka. A submarine base is said to be in construction on Bering Island, one of this group, and German experts are believed to have visited it and to have given technical advice. At present Soviet military activity in the Kamchatka region is almost certainly directed not against the United States but against Japan, with whose fisheries Russian submarines could play havoc. Nevertheless, such activity is not without indirect interest for us.

Proceeding southward from the Alaskan zone we come to Hawaii. Here, on the island of Oahu, we have built what is incontestibly the strongest fortified position in the world—Pearl Harbor. It has cost $700,000,000 thus far, and next to the Panama Canal is America's most important and ambitious military-strategic establishment. Pearl Harbor compares to the Alaskan bases as a mastodon compares to mice. It has a submarine base, a drydock, a navy yard, fuel and ammunition depots, a naval station big enough to handle the entire American fleet, a fleet air base, an important military garrison, and 50 days' supply of food. Nearby are other airfields, and $5,800,000 was recently appropriated to improve airdrome facilities at Kaneohe, also on Oahu Island. Kaneohe is to house five squadrons of long-range planes.

Screening Hawaii are Midway Island, 1,315 miles to the northwest, and Wake Island, 2,315 miles almost due west. Midway, which lies just within the one hundred and eightieth meridian, is definitely inside the American defense scheme; while Wake, just out-

[2] Testimony of Admiral Harold R. Stark, Chief of Naval Operations, to the Naval Affairs Committee of the U. S. Senate. The New York Times, April 19, 1940.

[3] North of the mandated islands are the Bonins, Japanese property since 1861, in which there is a naval base at Port Lloyd.

[4] The New York Times, March 19, 1940.

side of it, is a bit beyond our theoretical limit for operation by capital ships. Midway was allotted $5,350,000 in the last appropriations; Wake, $2,000,000. Improvements are to consist of dredging channels and building better facilities for big planes. Later, submarine bases may be constructed. Both Wake and Midway are, it should be repeated, regular stops on Pan American's air route across the Pacific.

When we turn to the small islets hidden below Hawaii we reach virtual terri incognita. Naval plans call for the earliest completion of bases for aircraft at both Johnston and Palmyra Islands and later completion of similar bases at Canton Island and Rose Island (adjacent to Samoa). Johnston Island is approximately 800 miles southwest of Hawaii, and Palmyra and Canton are roughly 2,000 miles southeast of Wake. All are almost inconceivably remote and tiny. They are atolls barely rising above the surface of the sea, uninhabited for the most part and visited only occasionally by fishing vessels. The sum of $1,100,000 has been appropriated to improve Palmyra, which was privately owned by American citizens in Honolulu until acquired recently by the Navy. It consist of a chain of 52 islets, surrounding a lagoon that can be turned into a satisfactory seaplane station; the whole group measures only 5 miles by 1½. Canton was so inconspicuous that until last year no one knew clearly whether it belonged to Britain or to the United States. However, on April 6, 1939, an arrangement was made setting up a joint administrative control by both countries. The agreement runs for 50 years, and in it the United States promises to allow British aircraft to utilize the base we build.

Finally we come to the Panama Canal. Though a detailed description of that vital waterway is hardly within the province of this article, there are three details which we cannot overlook. First, most of our experts consider the Panama Canal to be almost immune to an attack from the Pacific due to the tremendous distances involved. Japan is almost 8,000 miles away, and any Japanese aircraft carrier which might attempt a bombing foray against the Canal would have to be protected so heavily that the venture would be almost out of the question. Second, the Senate has recently voted $15,000,000, plus $99,000,000 for future work, toward the immediate construction of a third series of locks in the Canal, not only independent of the present ones but wide enough so that ships with a beam greater than 110 feet can utilize them. At present our biggest aircraft carriers can only just scrape through. Third, there is considerable sentiment in American naval circles for the purchase of the Galapagos Islands from Ecuador and Cocos Island from Costa Rica. If fortified, these would serve as a protective curtain for the Pacific entrance of the Canal.

This program for improving and expanding our bases took concrete form in what is known as the Hepburn report, a document prepared by Rear Admiral Arthur J. Hepburn and his staff following authorization by the Naval Expansion Act of 1938. Admiral Hepburn and his advisers proposed that the United States create a defense chain of 41 bases—not all of them, however, new or in the Pacific. (Naval authorities have declared that we should maintain 400 long-range patrol planes—as against a present strength of 285—so that the bases may be properly and permanently linked.) So far Congress has appropriated $65,000,000 toward the realization of this program.

The Hepburn report further recommended the creation of an air and submarine base at Guam. This provoked the liveliest dispute that has taken place between Congress and the Navy in recent years. Congress has thus far refused to appropriate the $5,000,000 requested by the Navy for preliminary work at Guam. In January 1940, Admiral Stark, the Chief of Naval Operations, reopened one phase of the controversy by asserting to the House Naval Affairs Committee that the Navy might, if it wished, withdraw $4,000,000 from its budget for the Hawaiian district and apply it to Guam without specific authorization from Congress. Meantime, within the Navy itself, and among military experts generally, the Guam dispute continues to blaze fiercely.

So let us therefore turn to Guam. It admirably illustrates two rival theses in regard to American Pacific policy.

VI

An island 250 square miles in extent and populated by 21,000 natives known as Chomorros, Guam lies far beyond the one hundred and eightieth meridian, far outside the inner sphere of American Pacific interests. It is about 3,300 miles west of Honolulu, 1,500 miles east of Manila and about 1,350 miles from Yokohama. It is thus much closer to Japan than to the United States. Except for the Philippines, it is the most westerly of our possessions. Moreover, it is completely surrounded by a veritable shoal of Japan's mandated islands. The Japanese base at Saipan is only 100 miles away.

Until 1898, Guam was a nominal possession of Spain, but no Spaniards lived there and it was quite undefended. An American cruiser steaming toward Manila called at its main harbor, Apra, in 1898, and planted the American flag there without opposition. Then by the Treaty of Paris which concluded the Spanish-American War, we formally annexed it. We did not, however, take the other Marianas, an archipelago which Spain proceeded to sell to Germany. Germany held them until 1919, when they were mandated to Japan along with the Carolines and Marshalls. Guam has been administered by the United States Navy since 1899. We fortified it in a somewhat sketchy fashion, but these fortifications have since been dismantled and at present Guam has no defenses except a detachment of some 500 marines.

Some of our naval experts, doubtless influenced by Admiral Mahan's dictum that Guam should be made into a "Gibraltar of the Pacific," want to turn the island into an elaborate advance base, comprising both submarine and aerial units, and capable of being the spearhead of the American position in the Pacific. A more modest school of opinion asks merely that we spend perhaps $5,000,000 for dredging Apra harbor and building breakwaters and ramps for seaplanes. Guam is, at present, an essential link in Pan American's trans-Pacific air route and can hence service ordinary peacetime aerial traffic. The harbor, however, could be used for military purposes only after being considerably improved. Still other experts, the most modest of all in their demands, merely hope that the harbor will be improved for civil and commercial purposes, with the idea that eventually this improvement may serve a military end. They point out that Japan, in nearby islands, is carrying out a similar plan of development.

There are several reasons why opposition to the Guam project has been so fierce. First, Guam is in an exposed and isolated position in the very heart of an important Japanese-controlled area; therefore it will be extremely difficult to defend. Second, if Guam actually is to be developed into a first-class base—whether or not war with Japan ever comes—the cost will be tremendous. Reliable estimates put it at $200,000,000 at least. Coast defenses and antiaircraft guns will be necessary; so will beach defenses and at least three airfields; so will measures for the provisioning of the local population; so will a garrison of perhaps 20,000 men supported by at least 1,000 airplanes. Third, many experts say that creation of an important base at Guam is at complete variance with our traditional Pacific policy. If we fortify Guam, they assert, we shall be leaving the one hundred and eightieth meridian far behind, we shall be penetrating for the first time into purely Japanese waters with a base that has offensive as well as defensive potentialities. It might be justifiable, they hold, to make Guam merely a secondary base, useful perhaps as headquarters for a few submarines (which would, indubitably, be of great value if an attack were ever necessary on Japanese shipping in this area). But to make the island a primary base would, they maintain, be a needless and wanton affront to Japan, one that would be bitterly resented. Fourth and finally, some circles maintain that full-dress fortification of Guam is completely useless unless we are prepared to fight for and hold the Philippines. If so, Guam has cardinal importance. If not, it is an expensive nuisance.

VII

To recapitulate, our policy in the Pacific has consistently been defensive and peaceable. We have a tremendous Navy and we are in the process of creating an important triangle of defense from Alaska via Hawaii to the Panama Canal. So far we have been content—as have most countries—to allow our diplomatic frontier to remain ahead of our military frontier. We stand at the one hundred and eightieth meridian; no one can easily menace us behind this line; we have no wish to proceed beyond it. As reflected in the reacttion of Congress to the Guam proposal, this policy seems to be supported by most of the American people. It is a compromise policy. But it has worked so far.

It is a characteristic of liberal, democratic states—especially if they are world powers with far-flung interests—to compromise, to permit their interests and commitments to advance beyond their immediate capacity to defend them. Totalitarian states do not compromise; they adopt, by and large, a policy of active coalescence among geographic, diplomatic, military, and strategic considerations. They have only one frontier. But the United States, so far as we can now know, is in a peculiarly advantageous position in the Pacific. It is almost inconceivable that Japan alone could destroy us, whereas we alone could destroy Japan. However, should Germany win the war in Europe, we might then have to reckon with more than Japan.

Which brings us, as is inevitable, to considerations of higher international policy. Obviously, the present explosive state of Europe makes any reasoned calculation almost impossibly difficult. But one thing may be said with complete assurance: If the British and French should lose the war, our entire national-defense problem, in the Pacific as well as the Atlantic, will have to be sharply altered. We shall have to adjust to quite a different scale our attitude in regard to our frontiers and our means of defending them. The frontiers themselves may change. Suppose, for instance, that the British lose Singapore. This would all but wreck American conceptions of Pacific strategy, since we practically take it for granted that in a war with Japan we should have to borrow Singapore's facilities. Singapore under friendly British rule is almost as important as Pearl Harbor in our presumptive Pacific operations, should we have to carry them into Japanese waters.

Much loose talk exists about our need for a two-ocean navy. As a matter of fact we have a two-ocean navy now. Our Navy is perfectly capable of efficient operation in both the Atlantic and Pacific at the same time, and will continue to be as long as the Panama Canal remains intact. (To people impressed with the destructive power of modern saboteurs and "fifth columns" this may seem like a large "if.") When people talk about a two-ocean navy, what they usually mean is a two-fleet navy—that is, a navy big enough to maintain independent and unrelated operations in both the Atlantic and Pacific without regard to the Canal. To create and to maintain such a navy would cost a great deal—in money, effort, time, and national will. But if the Allies lose the war in Europe and if the British Fleet disappears, we might find that we needed a navy bigger than all the other navies in the world combined.

Not War, But World Revolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN G. ALEXANDER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 11, 1940

ARTICLE BY DR. GEORGE MECKLENBURG

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Dr. George Mecklenburg:

NOT WAR, BUT WORLD REVOLUTION

(By George Mecklenburg)

We hear it on every hand. This is not a war, but a world revolution. What do we mean by that? Is revolution worse than war? Do you not feel that it is time now that we clarify these loose questions and phrases that we so glibly enunciate these days? A clarification of what we mean by war and revolution seems to be needed at the moment.

We have been during the past few weeks discussing the meaning of what is really going on. We have tried to point out that right before our eyes in quick and bold strokes four new empires are being carved out, emerging before us in less than a year's time. Brand new world alinements are coming into view. Just the way the map of the world has been twisted and chopped up and remade might be said to be revolutionary.

That the world is facing one of the supreme crises of history is indisputable. We undoubtedly live in one of those ages of profound transvaluations—an age like the Renaissance or the Reformation. All this is world-wide, amazing, unbelievable, and unprecedented in its dangers.

Now, we know what war is. We exhaust our language in describing the hell of war. It is Satan set loose on earth. But usually war was not revolution. The first world war was a war for power and property. But both sides in the conflict had the same ideology. Whichever side won, the world would go on as usual. That is not true of the second world war.

We in America are beginning, vaguely perhaps, to sense that we are about to enter an entirely new universe of life. It would seem that we are not very anxious to know all about it. We should be sitting up nights studying the revolution that we are right in now. How will it affect us? How much do we want to spend to resist it here in America? Are there any good points to this revolution? Is it inevitable and irresistible and the result of the sins of the past?

NEW UNIVERSE OF LIFE

We call it a Fascist revolution. What do we mean by that? Are we ready to go back and study the roots of fascism in the writings of Machiavelli, Fichte, Hegel, Nietzsche, Sorel, Pareto, and Spengler? Are we aware now that fascism is no longer a philosophy of these writers? That it is now a revolutionary war? Fascism today is 100-percent militaristic in character. Mr. Otto D. Tolischus interprets fascism as follows:

"In actual practice all Germans have quickly discovered that national socialism is no respecter, much less representative, of persons, classes, or class interests, that on the contrary, it is a semimilitary organism determined on totalitarian mobilization of the entire nation in order to enable Germany to make a new bid for a 'place in the sun,' and that in the service of that mobilization it has clamped an iron rule on all classes and interests, most especially labor and capital. * * * Business and private property thereby become not an instrument of private 'egoism' but 'functions of the people.' They remain private wherever and so long as they fulfill their 'functions.' Wherever and whenever they fall down, the state steps in and either forces them to fulfill the functions or takes them over entirely."

DEEP MALADY OF FASCISM

As I listen in to conversation in America today I get the impression that we have not begun to fathom the deep malady of fascism. We merely think ordinarily of fascism as being antidemocratic. Often we express fear for democracy. We point out how degenerate it is. How it was found wanting in France and had we not better adopt some totalitarian fascism here in America, too. Then we ask, Why do we not work for appeasement with Hitler and his revolutionary policy? Why fight this efficient new governmental organization? May it not be just what modern civilization needs?

Because of this inadequate conception of the terrible satanic darkness of fascism we need to look deeper. We must get behind the scenes. Fascism is a violent revolution against civilization; against intellectualism; against capitalism; against Christian life and love of humanity.

1. In the first place I would call totalitarian fascism a revolution today because it is a flight from reason. Our present civilization is founded on reason. The minds of millions of people have been so violently shaken that their whole manner of thinking has been disturbed. Under the circumstances men are bewildered and take flight from reason. Fascism is the embodiment of this tendency.

One writer says: "Fascism is real insurrection—an insurrection of feeling—a mutiny of men against the conditions of the modern world." From this naturally follow the regimentation of thought and the regimentation of all life. Those who know the nature of fascism are not surprised that the 100 top scientists and thinkers of Germany have been driven out of the land. Men must not think. They must blindly follow. Even science must be regarded as a means of promoting racialism and pride. There is no such thing any more as truth for truth's sake. Science becomes propaganda, too. The concept of scientific objectivity is entirely foreign to totalitarian thinking.

Dr. Ernest Krieck, professor of philosophy at Heidelberg, said in 1937, "We do not recognize truth for truth's sake, science for science's sake." My party in 1937 visited Heidelberg and heard a lecturer expound the new philosophy that education and thinking are subservient to politics. They said: "We renounce research for its own sake. We teach and learn history not to say how thinking actually happens, but to instruct the German people in what they ought to think. We teach science not to discover abstract laws but to sharpen the implements of the German people in competition with other peoples."

Now this certainly is serious and most revolutionary. Democracy is the product of the scientific spirit. It is truth itself and righteousness. Democracy is a heritage from Greece and Judea. Therefore, I feel that fascistic irrationalism is a revolutionary assault on the very foundations of democracy. The world cannot go on as a civilized world ignoring truth. The flight from reason is a flight into barbarism.

2. Then I feel that fascistic totalitarianism is a revolution in fundamental values. Democracy has always taken the Christian view that supreme values reside in persons. "What shall it profit a man if he gain the whole world and lose his soul?" On the basis of that kind of teaching a government is for people. It must minister to individuals. It can be made and unmade by the people. This democracy that we have enjoyed during the last 300 years might be said to be a combination of the Greek ideal of inquiry and the Christian ideal of kindliness. They believe in using the full resources of intellect for the welfare and happiness of mankind. Fascism exalts the strength of will and emotional bias and attacks free inquiry and international brotherhood. Fascism is revolutionary because it denies everything that the world has been standing for in values. It exalts the state as the only real value.

Prof. Otto Koellreutter, one of the Nazi theorists, says: "In every case, the fundamental principle in present-day world of states is that the national interests of individual states always precede international interests, that the nation comes before humanity."

Mussolini agrees to that same idea. "As in the well-ordered and powerful days of the First Empire, Rome must again become the marvel of the world."

Likewise Japan agrees to this same thought about the state. One of the Japanese writers says: "The center of the world is Japan. From this center we must expand the Great Spirit throughout the world. The expansion of Japan throughout the world is our urgent business."

Fascism is, of course, extreme nationalism and this is related to racial bias. Personally I can tell you a dark story of racial bias as I witnessed it in Vienna in the summer of 1938. I saw it in its horrible ghastliness. Human beings were being treated worse than animals. Just at the point in history when we thought and preached that God had made all nations of one blood this nasty racialism breaks out.

3. Totalitarian fascism is a revolution today because of its unblushing use of force. Heretofore all nations have used force. We have had wars and rumors of wars down through the ages, but during the last 100 years while we used war as a method we apologized for it. We dreamed of international peace. We prayed for peace. We worked hard for a warless world. We believe in world brotherhood. But fascism stands for just the opposite. It does not apologize for going to war. It glories in the cruelty of war. It does not believe in a warless world. It presses world conquest. It does not believe in world brotherhood.

It believes in a superrace that must govern the inferior races as slaves. Peace, to fascism, is an effeminate weakness. War is virtue. The cruelty of the strong is glorified. The doctrines of violence that now completely dominate Germany, Italy, Russia, and Japan can best be studied in the following statement by F. T. Marinetti who greatly influenced the thought of Benito Mussolini. "Who can deny that a strong man breathes much more freely, eats much better, and sleeps much more soundly after having slapped and knocked down an enemy? Who can deny that the word 'man' and the word 'fighter' are synonymous? Hence we conclude that when we speak of war it is the better part of our blood, the futurist part that speaks in us.

"Violence has today become the best condition of real health for a people. Order, pacifism, moderation, the diplomatic and reformist spirit, are they not perhaps arteriosclerosis, old age, and death? * * * For to the present esthetics of filthy lucre we oppose—and let it come, let it come—an esthetics of violence and blood."

Likewise Hitler has again and again in his speeches expressed his ambition to make Germany the supreme lord of the earth. Real peace, he announces, can only be achieved by the German conquest of the world.

I maintain that this new philosophy of force and the actual use of it to conquer weaker nations without even an excuse is revolution, to say the least. It would be more accurate to say that it is the emergence of black Satan on earth again.

4. The fascistic concept of the relation of the state and the race to the individual is completely revolutionary, it seems to me. Mussolini again and again speaks of the state as having a will and being self-conscious. Mr. Rocco has declared that the State is an organism distinct from the citizen's and has its own life and ends rather than those of individuals. But in Germany, while the state is glorified, it is thought of as having a racial basis. The Nazi state, it is declared, rests on ties of blood.

How different that is from the thought of democracy. For fascism, society is the end—individual, the means, and its whole life consists of using individuals as instruments for its social ends. In democracy the individual is the end and society the means.

Mussolini accepted from the beginning Spengler's philosophy as expressed in the Decline of the West: "Humanity is still and always an abstraction of time and space. Men are still not brothers; do not want to be and evidently cannot be. Peace is hence absurd, or, rather, it is a pause in war."

This same philosophy has entered into the controversy between the church and the state, especially in Germany. Bishop Muller, who was elected the state bishop of the Lutheran Church, in a sermon March 14, 1937, said, "Christ was by no means filled with love and pity, but with wild wrath against the Jews. He never thought of founding a church. A church is a foreign body against the German people. My aim is to promote general religiosity. I shall build a new German church with the help of those 80 percent of the German people who reject present-day Christianity."

Melvin Rader in his book, No Compromise, a perfectly fearless analysis of fascism, speaks in chapter 9, as follows:

"We are living in a mad age. The shock of crises has torn impulses loose from their moorings. The gloomy prophecy of Oswald Spengler is not unduly alarmist. A world revolution is on."

Not to be too unduly alarmed and not to be too discouraged it is well for us to read the literature that analyzes other ages. During the transition from the Middle Ages to the Rennaissance a French poet cried out:

"Time of mourning and of temptation, age of tears, of envy and of torment, time of languor and of damnation, age of decline nigh to the end, time full of horror which does all things falsely, lying age, full of pride and of envy, time without honor and without true judgment, age of sadness which shortens life."

However, it is without overdue pessimism that we now know that this is not a war of power politics between the nations of a grasping wicked Old World. It is by the proclamation of the National Socialists' regime a world revolution, in which are to be laid the new foundations for the next millennium.

Hitler has said in effect to the German people and is now saying to the world, "Surrender to me your liberty, your personality, your right to think for yourself, even to decide for yourself between right and wrong, and I will give, in return, security for your family as long as you serve me faithfully and blindly—food enough to keep you from starving, a place to live, work to do, and the satisfaction of being a part—however unimportant—in a great and successful machine."

Strong for New Deal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE B. CROWE
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 11, 1940

LETTER PUBLISHED IN INDIANAPOLIS STAR

Mr. CROWE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter which was published recently in the Indianapolis Star:

STRONG FOR NEW DEAL

To the EDITOR OF THE INDIANAPOLIS STAR:

If the money that was worse than wasted in the last 20 years had been invested in some good life-insurance company, very few in this country would be needy. I "read" the tobacco bill is over $9,000,000,000, the booze bill $5,000,000,000, and the pleasure bill just between these two. Possibly all of this foolish money spent would pay our big debt in about 2 years. In 1932 when 10 cents was all I could sell my corn for we used this corn in cook stoves and in the furnace for fuel. Corn was less than $3 a ton. In February 1937, when we had our farm sale, 100 bushels would have more than paid the tax on same farm and personal property 1 year. Tax was down from $182.50 to $121.65, corn up from 10 cents to $1.25 a bushel.

In my township not far from our home 2,900 acres of land were lost in Harding, Coolidge, and Hoover administrations. Yes; I voted for all three of them. Not 1 acre of land in Richland township, Rush County, has been lost in the last 7 years. I think three life-insurance policies were what saved us. One $2,500 policy had a 10-year accumulated dividend.

Through the three administrations I had voted for Harding, Coolidge, and Hoover, the best offer we could get on our 80 acres was $4,800. In August 1936, I priced it and in less than 2 hours it was sold for $9,235, $4,435 profit; should have asked $10,000. Why should I go back on the New Deal program?

VERN E. LEWIS.

RUSHVILLE, IND.

Will Hitler Attack America?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN G. ALEXANDER
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 11, 1940

SERMON BY DR. GEORGE MECKLENBURG

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following sermon by Dr. George Mecklenburg:

WILL HITLER ATTACK AMERICA?

(By Dr. George Mecklenburg)

"I will shake the heavens and the earth; and I will overthrow the thrones of kingdoms." Haggai 2:21, 22.

Again and again kingdoms have been overthrown. For two centuries Nineveh had been the capital of Assyria and the center of business, fashion, and religion for the surrounding country. It had acquired to itself the reputation as the center of world wisdom. Nahum comes along and denounces her militarism that creates no spiritual wealth. Today all there is left of Nineveh is dusty ruins, a mute symbol of the fate of all godless empires. Brute force has no permanence. The God of righteousness has decreed that right makes might.

I believe that we are again in times when we will turn to the Old Testament texts. We, ourselves, in America may soon be in a position to understand how the people felt in Old Testament times when they were attacked by brute forces.

Ambassador William Bullitt said the other day, "The United States will not go to war—war is coming toward the Americas."

Hendrik Willem van Loon, in a book, Our Battle, written in 1937, said:

"If you and I live another 10 years, I feel convinced that the British Government will experience what the Roman Government experienced in the fifth century when she was transferred from Rome to the city Ravenna. The London of the twentieth century is quite as vulnerable as the Rome of the fifth century. Only this time the danger will come from the air. Nazi flying machines will take the place of the horses of the Vandals.

"Therefore there will be no other way out but to remove the Government from the Thames to the banks of the St. Lawrence River as the Roman Government fled to the banks of the Tiber.

"Incidentally, this would put the United States face to face with a complicated situation. We can hardly welcome such close proximity to a city which will be the natural target for all German attacks. It will bring the European war disagreeably close to us."

Does not that seem like a prophecy?

PROPAGANDA TODAY

It is very difficult to discuss the question of tonight dispassionately. We have been bombarded with headlines and frenzied appeals have been made to our emotions. We are near hysteria. But that is all the more reason why the pulpit must deal with our times and the state of mind of the people. Modern propaganda is designed to influence public opinion and governmental policies. It utilizes every facility of communication and distribution—newspapers, magazines, radio, motion pictures, the theaters, churches, forums, clubs, business meetings, books, news letters, and conversations.

Since last April it has been pointed out by keen observers that 10 major appeals have been aimed at the American public: "All neutrals are in danger"; "the Allies are our first line of defense"; "increased preparedness in the United States"; "danger from a 'fifth column' "; "Greenland and Iceland"; "Tokyo and the Netherlands Indies"; "danger of invasion of Canada"; "United States cannot

let Germany win"; "what shall we do if war comes?"; and "the United States is totally unprepared."

Now we should recognize definitely and clearly that all this is prepared propaganda; but that does not mean that we should not read it. We should carefully consider it. We have no means of knowing anything about the world except through propaganda channels. We cannot lean backward and refuse to believe anything. Norway did that. Norway pooh-poohed every warning of danger. Now she is a vassal to Germany. Our problem is to be intelligent enough to read propaganda and pick out the truth.

At last America is beginning to think seriously about her safety. Have we done anything to deserve our preferred position on the globe? May we not have to arouse ourselves and sacrifice something to hold that which we cherish? A very thoughtful layman said the other day:

"The point I am making is this; that in this modern, streamlined, close-knit, complicated world of ours, it may not perhaps be enough to guard one's own liberty, to clean one's own house, even generously to provide money and relief for the victims of aggression. Perhaps in this world of ours today with its blessings of material miracles in transportation and communication and all the rest, a wider vision is required of us, if we are to guard even our own liberty; a deeper sense of obligation. One wonders what the good Samaritan would have done, if he had come upon the man who fell among thieves while the thieves were still attacking him. If he had stood aside until the thieves had completed their foul work, and the victim was crushed, would that have been enough to protect him in his turn from the thieves? Would it have been noble pacifism, or blind cowardice? One wonders if international selfishness, like personal selfishness, is in the end even intelligent—if isolationism, personal or national, ever ends in any other result except to leave him who practices it completely isolated."

Justice Holmes said: "I think that, as life is action and is passion, it is required of a man that he should share the passion and the action of his time at the peril of being judged not to have lived."

CHURCH MUST WAKE UP

The story is told of a church in New York that has made the building soundproof against the outside world. Nothing gets into that church from the outside world. I am fearful that too many churches are soundproof. But it seems now that the world is fairly breaking into the soundproof, complacent church. The most terrible fact of our times is this new World War. No Christian has the right to shut that out. The prophets of God in past ages always interpreted the mind of God in time of crisis and war. These are times for great thinking on the part of Christian people.

A year ago this morning I woke early, 5 a. m., in my hotel in Paris. I had strange premonitions that something ominous would happen that day, so I could not sleep. I went down to the hotel desk of the Lutetia Hotel. There stood a dozen hotel men, "their wings drooping." "What has happened?" I asked. "Germany fired on Poland at 5 a. m. this morning. That means war. That means the end of our civilization."

I was then the guide of 26 Americans who had just come from Palestine and Egypt and had zigzagged and wigwagged across the Mediterranean Sea on an Egyptian ship. We were on a race to get to the Atlantic Ocean ship before the "blitzkrieg" would break and engulf us. I rushed out to the crowded streets of Paris. The people were rushing up and down, weeping and shouting. I ran one and a half miles without getting out of breath to the steamship office. A sign in big letters over this office read, "British ships to America canceled." I rushed to the American Embassy. One thousand Americans had preceded me. The Embassy workers stood on chairs shouting to the crowd, "Get out of Paris because the report is that we will be bombed tonight. Go to Le Havre. Take an American ship home."

Then comes weeks of waiting for an American ship. In the meantime we saw how a nation starts a war. We learned what war means to the common people. We experienced the screeching sirens and the gloom of blackouts and the chill of dugouts. We sensed the discouragement of the people and the unpreparedness of the French. We noted the incomprehensible dullness of the English who told us that the German people were on the verge of a revolution, that the engines in the German airplanes would fall out, and that there was not gas enough in Germany to carry on the war for 3 weeks. Now we know that much of this was German propaganda, skillfully dished out to England by "fifth columnists."

Yes; we saw two nations go to the front. Thousands of soldiers marched by our hotel in a constant tramp, tramp, tramp. By day and by night, week in and week out; it was the tramp of troops who felt that they were being led to the slaughter. There were no flags, no fanfare, no music.

A YEAR OF WAR

Now we have been crucified in 1 full year of war. Civilization is shocked to deeper depths than ever before. Prophecies of military experts are all disregarded and discredited. Maps of the world are remade. Eight nations are blotted out after selfishly clinging to neutrality, each for each. Hitler has risen up from a psychopathic myth to the greatest world conqueror of all times. Napoleon beside him is a child. The Axis arrangement of Germany, Italy, Russia, and Japan seems to hold strangely together, bound in an inglorious bond of gory blood and power.

The English Government is now struggling for its very existence. Nonbelligerents of the Western Hemisphere are fast coming to the conclusion that peace can only be maintained by selling our coats and buying a sword. At the beginning of this year our great concern was to keep America from going to war in Europe. Now our great concern is to keep Europe from coming to America.

And now I come before my congregation as a voice in the wilderness crying out the one question asked by all thinking Americans: "Will Hitler attack America?" This is the supreme question. This is the question that will determine not only our national affairs but our local and personal affairs for the coming years. Surely if anybody has even the beginning of an answer to this question, he ought to come forward with it. If he is not coming, then surely we have no right to appropriate $20,000,000,000 for defense and draft 4,000,000 men into the Army.

As it seems to me, this question involves three points: (1) The military strategy of it; (2) the statements of Hitler and his Nazis; (3) the revolutionary nature of nazi-ism and its ambition for world empire.

1. The military experience of the past year leads us to hesitate to utter the word "impossible." We do not know that anything is impossible any more. A thing might be possible without being probable. We know that Germany will not attack us unless England collapses. England has for a century and more been our first line of defense. When that defense is down, then what will happen? According to what the Nazis say, they are bent on blotting out the entire English Empire, root, branch and all.

Now, is it possible for Germany to successfully attack the United States? Some military experts say that if she can find a landing place in Newfoundland and on the Caribbean Sea, she cannot only attack us but she can conquer us if we are unprepared. Nazi-ism has only the utmost disgust for the race mixture called the American melting pot. We are classed as an inferior race and therefore should be subservient to Germany. When we went into hysteria last winter over a radio program on the end of the world, the Germans said: "Well, those imbeciles can easily be conquered." I would say that unless we become stronger than we are, it is not only possible for Germany to attack us, but it is very probable that she will, if England collapses.

2. The world has learned to pay a lot of attention to what the Nazis say. During the past year they have done just what they boasted they would do during the past years. They are not given to waving an empty gun like our administration at Washington often does. The Nazi guns are loaded. We will do well to pay attention to what they say. They are so fanatical and believe so much in their program of world empire that they boast of it night and day. Every one of the Hitler threats today reads like an understatement. Hitler said the other day: "There will be a Nationalist-Socialist civilization for the next 10 centuries, or there will be no civilization at all." If Germany is to be defeated, she will leave behind a world in ruins.

A few weeks ago when it was pointed out to Hitler that America was helping England, he said: "America had better keep her nose out of German affairs. For I have it in my power to plunge the United States into chaos and civil war by merely pressing a button on my desk."

3. The doctrine, the faith, or the religion of the Nazis is so revolutionary and so unlike what Christian civilization has been thinking about that it is difficult for us to realize that any man would seriously think of world dominion. Goebbels said the other day, "We have crucified Judea. Now we will scour the stink of Galilee from our souls."

What men will do under the urge of the pride of race and the hegemony over inferior races is beyond our comprehension today.

Europe has been overrun by a vibrant faith in race superiority. It has been conquering a Europe without faith, a cynical, pleasure-bent Europe could not stand out against Nazi faith. Decaying democracies have bowed to rejuvenated autocracy.

I am as sure as the sun will rise tomorrow that our only assurance of the continuance of a liberal, individualistic Christian democracy is to make our Christianity vital, believing, and sacrificial. We must again have the courage to sing, "Onward Christian Soldiers, Marching as to War." We will entirely succumb to barbarism or we are on the threshold of higher forms of civilization. I do pray the democratic countries will awaken from idle stupor and complacent steam-heat comforts to take up the rugged vigors necessary to maintain a free civilization.

And God is on our side. "He will shake the heavens and the earth." He is shaking the earth now; perhaps Hitler is one of His tools shaking the earth. The heavens will respond as soon as we do our part. It takes the cooperation of heaven and earth to maintain Christian civilization.

"Fifth Columns"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. WILLIAM DITTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 11, 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. J. WILLIAM DITTER, OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address de-

livered by me at the Thirty-third Annual Convention of the Pennsylvania Electric Association, on September 6, 1940, at Bedford Springs, Pa.:

When the Great Giver of All Light summoned Thomas A. Edison to eternal rest a few years ago it was suggested that all electric current in the United States be turned off for 1 minute in final tribute to the great genius to whom this Nation owes so much.

The suggestion struck a responsive chord in the hearts and in the imagination of an appreciative people. Yet it was never carried out. For sober reflection brought overwhelming realization that so indispensable had electricity become in the ordinary routine of our everyday life that to be without it for even 1 brief minute would be to invite serious consequences.

So while many lights were dimmed throughout the Nation, power lines were kept in service that railroad trains might move; that the wheels of industry might revolve; that the hands of clocks might measure the time of day and night; that scientific laboratories might continue their research; and that the skillful hands of hundreds of surgeons might minister their healing touch to the maimed, the halt, and the blind.

To me that was an impressive and unforgettable lesson of the transcendent importance of the industry in which you men and women are engaged and which your genius for expansion has transformed from a luxury to a vital necessity of life.

It seems scarcely credible that any industry could have gone so far in so short a time. For February 4, 1882, is well within the memory of many living men. Yet that was the day when the first dynamo began to turn in the world's first central electric station, located on Pearl Street in New York City.

This first Edison central station had 59 customers. Last year the industry for which it broke the ground had 29,104,185. When that first station was started, it took 10 pounds of coal to generate 1 kilowatt-hour of electricity. By 1939 this had been cut to less than a pound and a half. In 1882 the average selling price of electricity for household use was 25 cents per kilowatt-hour. By 1939 it was only slightly more than 4 cents.

In these few simple figures, it seems to me, lies the clue to the amazing growth of the electric industry: increasing service at decreasing cost through scientific research.

But figures alone do not tell the whole story. Other forms of energy are deaf, dumb, and blind. But electricity has been made to hear, to feel, and to see. One of the Nation's newest strip mills is operated and controlled automatically by electricity. Ali Baba's "Open sesame!" swung wide a cavern door. But your photoelectric cell not only opens doors but sorts colors, detects flaws in merchandise, and even turns on the lights when darkness falls.

The actual achievements of your research engineers surpass the wildest flights of fancy of the Arabian Nights. They dwarf the creations of unleashed imagination in Greek mythology. Compared with electric power, the fabled might of the Titans is puny; Vulcan's forge a toy. Aladdin's lamp never conjured up enchanted vision half so wondrous as the coruscating panorama of light and color that is New York at night. Stand on an outlying hill of any American village as night creeps down the valley until finally only the white spire of the church stands out like a ghostly finger pointing skyward. And then behold the transformation into fairyland as the village lights blink on, one by one, like fireflies, quivering in clusters.

Again it was your industry that made it possible to fling a thought across a stretch of sky—

> "Some weighty message, or a yearning cry,
> It matters not; the elements rehearse
> Man's urgent utterance, and his words traverse
> The spacious heav'ns like homing birds."

It is your industry that has given us the magic carpet which takes us in a flash to the great capitals of the world to hear the momentous words of statesmen as they are spoken; takes us, too, far beyond the most distant outposts of civilization so that we may even hear Byrd's intrepid men in the darkness and the icy wastes of Antarctica.

For centuries men listened in vain for the music of the spheres. But from the unseen air above us your engineers have snatched the majestic symphonies of Beethoven, the thunderous counterpoint of Wagner, and the gossamer delicacy of Chopin to pour them in a torrent of harmony into our homes.

To you was passed the torch of Volta, Galvania, and Marconi; of Faraday and Davy; of Edison and Steinmetz. You have kept it burning bright. You have made easier the work of the housewife, lightened the burden of toil of the factory worker, and have put to shame false prophets of disaster who babble poisonously of vanished frontiers.

You and those who labor with you in your industry do not talk despairingly of vanished frontiers. Instead, you have opened up to this Nation vistas such as no man dreamed of only a few short years ago. You know that today's frontiers are not physical frontiers but mental frontiers—frontiers that know no limit save the bounds of the knowledge, the imagination, the daring, and the initiative of the human mind. And you know, too, that electricity can be the mother of countless industries as yet unborn.

How shallow and cowardly does talk of vanished frontiers sound when your engineers tell us that although two-thirds of our urban population live in homes wired for electricity, only in half of the homes so wired is electricity used for anything except for lights, for doorbells, and for flatirons; that although there are as many as 200 possible farm uses for electricity, the great majority of farms in the United States have no electric power available other than lighting plants.

And in these dark days of world chaos and upheaval, it is heartening to learn from C. W. Kellogg, president of the Edison Electric Institute, that no country in history has ever been so well equipped with power for the production of munitions as is our country today.

Mr. Kellogg tells us that at the end of 1939 installed generating capacity in the United States exceeded the sum of the noncoincident demand of our power stations by more than 40 percent. In the industrial areas where the munitions of war will be produced, the margin was 39 percent. Today the electric-power industry has three and a half times as much generating capacity and an annual output of electric energy four times as great as in 1917, the year in which we entered the World War. Moreover, I am told that it will add a total of 1,640,000 kilowatts of generating capacity this year and plans to add 1,250,000 more next year. That is a record of achievement and a program of expansion of which you and the entire Nation have every reason to be proud. I congratulate you.

Preparedness for national defense prompts me to present a live and vital subject to you tonight. It is "fifth columns." I use the plural advisedly. Not one, but many "fifth columns," are active in this country. And, strange as it may seem, it is not about the "fifth column" of which you hear most that I want to talk. You hear about that particular "column" almost every day over the radio; and you read about it in the newspapers. It is the "fifth column" of agents of foreign governments and their willing henchmen or unwitting dupes, whose instruments of subversion are sabotage and propaganda. It is the "fifth column" composed of such as Shakespeare calls—

> "Most smiling, smooth, detested parasites,
> Courteous destroyers, affable wolves * * *"

I do not minimize the threat of danger from this particular "fifth column." But furtively as it operates, it is more easily recognized than others equally dangerous and damaging to national defense. And the more easily recognized, the more easily dealt with. Appropriate agencies of the Federal Government are giving it their attention. I believe they will do a good job.

The "fifth columns" with which I am concerned are the concepts and dogmas of alien and subversive philosophies, both political and economic, which have received widespread endorsement in recent years. Masked with such labels and catch phrases as "liberalism," "humanitarianism," and "social ideals," they have insidiously insinuated themselves into the minds of millions of our people and permeate to an alarming extent much of our national thinking. With millions of Americans they have gained not only respectability but credibility.

They have been embraced with enthusiasm by many of our most promising youth. They have been given an honored place in some of our great seats of learning. They have been accepted to a dangerous degree in official circles, not by evil-minded men but by well-meaning men. Indeed, some of these well-meaning men have come to regard them as a fundamental basis for building government policy. Therein lies their menace. Of that danger former Supreme Court Justice Brandeis warned us long ago when he said:

"Experience should teach us to be more on our guard to protect our liberties when the Government's purposes are beneficent. * * * The greatest dangers to liberty lurk in insidious encroachments by men of zeal, well-meaning but without understanding."

These "fifth column" pragmatic philosophies suggest that there are no eternal verities, no immutable principles of truth, and no established standards of morality. No longer do our time-honored traditions deserve our respect, but, on the contrary, they had better be cast aside in this new world order. Our form of representative self-government, with its system of checks and balances of three coordinate branches—executive, legislative, and judicial—according to these "fifth columnists," is outmoded, outworn, and that its usefulness has been outlived.

They tell us we require a stronger, a more centralized form of government, and that the need of the time is to concentrate more and more power in the Executive at the expense of the court and the legislature. They tell us our old frontiers have vanished, industry is slowing down, the age of invention is dead, and the doors of opportunity are closed forever; individualism must give way to collectivism, free enterprise to a regimented economy, self-reliance to dependability on government, resourcefulness and hope to defeatism and despair.

That philosophy is the negation of the American spirit, the denial of the American dream. As one deeply saturated in the American tradition, as one who believes that under our Constitution and our guaranteed liberties there lies ahead of this country a future even greater than its glorious past, I challenge that philosophy of fear and futility.

Inherent in these "fifth column" philosophies are the gravest dangers that have ever threatened self-government everywhere. The mere fact that laws may be made by the people, or their elected representatives, is not in itself sufficient guaranty for the preservation of free institutions. Our form of government is no exception to the rule that all forms of government possess and have frequently exercised the powers to destroy themselves. Nor can even a written constitution such as ours permanently insure the survival of free institutions. It can and does provide protection for the citizen against other citizens, a defense of the individual against the arbitrary oppression of the State, and, finally, it guarantees a period for free debate and discussion of any proposed legislation which is incompatible with fundamental law. But, in

the last analysis, in any republic the people have the power to perpetuate their faith in their capacity for self-government or to poison the source from which that faith has sprung.

It is for this reason that intelligence, understanding, and observance of all the standards of decent conduct are vitally necessary to the successful operation of a system of government such as ours in which rules of conduct are made by the people through their responsible representatives. Our ablest political thinkers have long recognized this to be true. It is what Justice Brandeis meant when as far back as 1923 he said that our American political system "demands continued sacrifice by the individual and more exigent obedience to the moral law than any other form of government." It means for us today that the crying need of the hour is for the rededication of every citizen to the traditions and the ideals of our Republic.

After all, there are really only two kinds of government, despite their various forms and names. One or the other of the two encompasses republics, democracies, monarchies, socialism, communism, fascism, nazi-ism, and all others. The one based on coercion; the other on the free consent of the governed. The one represents a society controlled by the exercise of arbitrary power and the imposition of outward discipline; the other a society of free men entrusting their future to their own intelligence and their own conscience. The one stems from the ancient despotisms of the Near East and is as old as the pyramids; the other flows from the teachings of Christianity of the dignity and responsibility of the individual which came to political fruition in the revolutions in this country, in England, and in France in the eighteenth century.

The one rests on force; the other on the concept that every human being is, and of right, ought to be free. The one crushes individuality; the other exalts it. Under the first, the citizen exists for the state; under the second the state exists for the citizen. During recent years we have been edging closer and closer to the first concept by a wider and wider, if unconscious, acceptance of the unsound conclusions of the philosophy of Rousseau which holds that all wisdom lies in the mass mind, and argues therefrom that the most democratic of all governments is the one in which the mass mind, changeable as it is and much given to hero worship, finds freest expression and exercises unrestrained political control.

This, too, is a negation of the fundamental concepts on which our Government was built—liberty without license, authority without despotism. As we talk glibly of democracy, we often forget that our Government is not a pure democracy, but a republic; not a government in which the people themselves vote directly on every issue, but a representative government in which the people entrust to their chosen representatives a large share of the responsibility for conducting their affairs. Read the deliberations of the Constitutional Convention and you will find that no tyranny was more greatly feared by the founding fathers than the tyranny of the people themselves. For therein lie the seeds of destruction of all government; the warfare of class against class, which first brings confusion, then chaos, then anarchy, and finally totalitarianism.

We who remain firm in our belief in the wisdom of the founders of our country, we who cherish its traditions and respect its laws, we who believe with the colonists of Virginia in the first legislative assembly held in America, that all just powers are derived from the consent of the governed, must be on guard against the seductive philosophy, that under the cloak of exalting the rule of the people conceals the skull and cross bones of arbitrary government. It seems trite to repeat that "eternal vigilance is the price of liberty." The pity is that it needs repeating.

All of us here in Pennsylvania, and especially you of the electric industry, have special reasons for remembering Benjamin Franklin. And let me remind you that none better than Franklin appreciated the urgency of being eternally on guard against arbitrary government, although a lasting victory over despotism seemed to have been won. The record shows that he recognized with crystal clarity that science knows no vanishing frontiers and that a dynamic America knows no bounds to its possibilities. When Houdon modeled a bust of Franklin, Turgot wrote for it this inscription:

"He snatched the thunderbolt from heaven, the scepter from tyrants."

The grandiloquence of this phraseology amused the level-headed and practical-minded Franklin. With a rare sense of humor, Franklin wrote Nogaret:

"Notwithstanding my experiments with electricity, the thunderbolt continues to fall under our noses and beards; and as for the tyrant, there are a million of us still engaged in snatching away his scepter."

Let me tell you another story of the great philosopher and statesman to illustrate my point. It affords a needed lesson to anyone who may be faint of heart in these critical days and is a suitable rebuke to the prophets of the "fifth column" philosophy of defeatism. The incident occurred when the Constitutional Convention was closing its great work by the signing of the historic document which was to become the Constitution of the United States. On the back of the chair on which Washington sat was painted a half disk of the sun. Drawing the attention of his colleagues to it, Franklin said:

"I have often and often in the course of the sessions and the vicissitudes of my hopes and fears as to its issues, looked at that disk behind the President without being able to tell whether it was rising or setting. But now I have the happiness to know it is a rising and not a setting sun."

Have we become so weak and so soft; so blind to the eternal truths embodied in the traditions handed down to us by Washington and Jefferson; so insensitive to the priceless worth of our heritage of liberty that we have become allergic to "fifth column" philosophies of opportunism and to their deadly dogmas of stultifying sophistry? In a time of crisis are we to rush for cover in the storm cellars of defeatism? Or will we stand firm and weather the conflict? Does there live in us yet that calm courage and fearless outlook which enabled Franklin in the critical days when this Nation was born to see only a rising and not a setting sun? "O Lord of Hosts, be with us yet; lest we forget, lest we forget!"

I do not need to point out to you how false are those "fifth column" philosophies which scorn all tradition and deny the existence of fixed eternal truth. You know that the patient research workers in your industry derive their inspiration from the traditions of the great scientists and inventors who laid its foundations. And you know, too, that the pioneers in the field of electricity not only left behind a noble tradition but a set of facts, a body of truth so eternal, so changeless, so immutable that they are known as the laws of science. You can ignore them only at your peril.

These eternal truths have put no bounds upon your creative imagination; no limitations upon your urge to penetrate far and wide into unexplored fields. On the contrary, they have given you a firm base from which to start all of your many experiments; the rock-ribbed foundation on which your industry has built so well. Had you scorned them and sought to build on unproved hypotheses, had you sought to rear the great edifice of the electric industry on fantastic theory instead of time-tested fact, it would have come crashing down upon your heads.

As all progressive industry and enduring government must be founded on truth, so must the exercise of government authority be grounded in fair play and integrity. We look askance at a government which preaches the gospel of fair-trade practice and at the same time engages in unfair competition with private industry. You in the electrical industry know something about that.

You have a right to expect integrity in government, and there are many in your industry who have had some experience with that, too. I recall an incident which illustrates the point. It was about 5 years ago, before the Congress had passed the Wheeler-Rayburn bill. That, you know, is the utilities-regulation measure which contains the so-called death sentence for holding companies.

Investigators for a Federal agency were sent to the New York offices of a large utility corporation. Its name was Commonwealth & Southern. Its president at that time was a man named Wendell Willkie.

After the Federal investigators had spent several weeks in the company's offices making an exhaustive study of its books and business methods, one of them, in course of conversation with Mr. Willkie said:

"I want to congratulate you on the openness and the frankness with which your organization is giving us information, and also on the way your business is being conducted. The elimination of your intermediate holding companies was splendid. The methods of your supervision and your interest in the constructive help given your operating companies are matters for commendation."

Of course, Mr. Willkie was pleased. Who wouldn't be? Smiling, he asked the investigator why he couldn't put what he had just said in his report, to which the now somewhat flustered investigator replied:

"I should be severely criticized if I put anything favorable to a utility holding company in my report."

So, you see, I have not been guilty of overstatement in the emphasis I have been placing here on the importance of morality and integrity in our form of government. The preservation of basic liberties under a republic depends not alone upon the conscience and the intelligence of its citizens but upon the integrity and impartiality with which its laws are administered, or, as Justice Cardozo said "the conscience of the sovereign."

And now let us consider the "fifth column" philosophy which places economic security above liberty. If we examine it critically, we find that it offers no sure prescription for economic security. But it does distill a poison that might well be fatal to liberty. This "fifth column" philosophy is known as economic determinism and was first propounded by Karl Marx.

Its central theory is that every move a man makes from a social and political viewpoint is actuated by his economic self-interest. Hence, Marx concluded, a stable society is achieved primarily by satisfying the material appetites of man. Of course, there is an element of truth in this, as there is in all the other "fifth-column" philosophies. Did they not contain some truth, they would not be so dangerous and seductive. The grain of truth in this theory of economic determinism is that economic maladjustments stir political unrest.

The fallacies of this theory, as it appears among us today as a "fifth-column" philosophy, is that man has no hopes or aspirations above his material appetites; that it is the function of the government to satisfy these material appetites, and that once the government has done this, all will be well with the state. These are old fallacies. They were recognized and pointed out thousands of years before Marx enunciated his doctrine. Indeed, much that passes today as advanced thinking is nothing more than old concepts, recognized as false and discarded ages ago, which present-day "liberals" have dug out of the limbo of forgotten things, given new names, and dressed up in fancy furbelows of attractive verbiage.

The plain truth that man does not live by bread alone is as old as the Bible. Polybius, the Greek historian, told his contemporaries 2,000 years ago that "when there has been created among the masses an appetite for gifts and the habit of receiving them," democracy in its turn is abolished and changed into a rule of forces. Plutarch observed "that there is no doubt that the real destroyer of the liberty of any people is he who spreads among them bounties, donations, and largesses," and Plato warned that "democracy contains no long-range force which will check the constant tendency to put more and more on the public pay roll."

Do not mistake me. I am not contending that help should not be extended by government to all who are needy to the full measure of their need. What I do not contend is that the economic security of the individual is not a thing which can be sought as something which stands apart by itself; something that is to be found at the end of the rainbow. The economic well-being of the individual is dependent upon the sound economic condition of the political group of which the individual is a part. From the point of view of the individual it is, and must always be, not something that can exist alone, but a byproduct of general prosperity. At best the richest nation can provide only a bare subsistence for only a small proportion of its people.

Never in all history has state largess ever produced either plenty or freedom. Instead of enriching, it impoverishes. Instead of strengthening, it weakens. Instead of freedom, it brings dependency. It satisfies neither material ambitions nor spiritual longings. Only freedom produces plenty. Only under a system of free enterprise can a people satisfy their instinctive urge to worthwhile achievement and realize to the full the spiritual ideals of their dreams.

Already our system of free enterprise has been impaired by the undermining of "fifth column" philosophies. All of them have one idea in common—that the field of government activity must be extended; that the power of government must be increased. But you cannot extend the field of government activity without limiting the field of private enterprise. You cannot give more power to government without taking from the power of the people.

I am not one who believes that our rights of free speech, a free press, or freedom of worship are in immediate danger. Nor do I fear a possibility of personal dictatorship. The issue is not so simple as that.

For the first time in our history the number of individuals who make up that vast and complex machine which we know as the Federal Government has just passed the 1,000,000 mark. This great machine has grown so intricate that some of its functioning has become difficult to understand—even more difficult to check upon. And never before did it reach into so many nooks and crannies of our business and our private lives. It is a mighty instrument for good or for evil.

Among the more than a million who operate it are many disciples of the "fifth column" philosophies. Not only do many of them occupy key positions, but their counsel is a powerful influence in the shaping of far-reaching policies. Some of these "men of zeal without understanding" sincerely believe that our present form of government cannot survive. Nor do they care. In their evangelistic fervor, they would prefer to build another form of government on alien idealogies from the blueprints of Marx and others of his ilk.

If our traditional form of representative government is to survive, if we are to escape the fate that has overtaken so-called democracies abroad, our Government machine must be energized by men not only strong of faith in our institutions but by men who are equally devoted to the preservation of our cherished traditions.

You and I want those institutions and those ideals preserved. Ours is essentially a nation of what, for want of a better name, we call plain people—the kind of people Lincoln affectionately spoke of as "the common people." In proportion to our population, only a very few enjoy great riches; only a very few suffer the hardships of extreme poverty. Our national sport is baseball, not polo; our favorite form of entertainment is the movie, not grand opera; our national dish is ham and eggs, not caviar. Most of us read the newspapers and magazines, and few of us read Karl Marx, John Maynard Keynes, and other prophets of kindred ideologies. Most of us, like you and me, have to work for our living, try to balance our personal budgets, pay our debts, live in modest homes, and save a little against old age.

All of that bespeaks our national strength and virility. If there is one lesson that history teaches plainly it is that freedom has never come to a people through the efforts of men of great wealth or through the discontent of the impoverished. Wherever freedom has come in all the world through all the ages it has come through the efforts of the great body of average citizens. It was so in Athens before Pericles. It was so in Rome before Marius and Salla. It was so in Florence under the early Medici. It was so in the free cities of the Hanseatic League, in Switzerland and in Great Britain. It was so in France and Holland before the great tragedy of our day.

Upon you and upon me and upon the millions of others like us rests a great responsibility. It is not going to be an easy task to overcome internal corrosion from the "fifth column" philosophies and, at the same time, prepare to meet any danger that may threaten from without. It is a difficult situation but one that must be met fearlessly. It cannot be better put than it was by Wendell Willkie, who in accepting the Republican nomination for President said:

"When Winston Churchill became Prime Minister of England a few months ago he made no sugar-coated promises. 'I have nothing to offer,' he said, 'but blood, toil, tears, and sweat.' Those are harsh words; brave words; yet, if England lives, it will be because her people were told the truth and accepted it. Fortunately, in America we are not reduced to 'blood and tears.' But we shall not be able to avoid the 'toil and sweat.'

"In those months ahead of us every man who works in this country—whether he works with his hands or with his mind—will have to work a little harder. Every man and women will feel the burden of taxes. Every housewife will have to plan a little more carefully. I speak plainly because you must not be deceived about the difficulties of the future. You will have to be hard of muscle, clear of head, brave of heart."

Those are words which could only have been spoken in a time of crisis. But let me remind you that from the wisdom of centuries the Chinese devised a symbol for the word "crisis" that is composed of two characters. One of them signifies disaster; the other, opportunity. The implication is obvious; if in every crisis there is a possibility of disaster, there is an equal measure of opportunity.

Churchill spoke of "blood, toil, tears, and sweat." Those who built our Nation knew them all. They braved the perils of unknown seas, faced famine and pestilence on inhospitable shores, hewed their way through trackless forests and conquered a wilderness that there might be brought forth on this continent a new Nation conceived in liberty and dedicated to the principles of self-government.

They left footprints of blood in the snow of Valley Forge; they left us the memory of Nathan Hale, calm and unafraid on the gallows, speaking the brave words, "My only regret is that I have but one life to give for my country."

Greater devotion than this we cannot give. But we can so live that when this era shall have become only a chapter in a history book; when most of us shall long have been forgotten; when the difficult problems we face today will have been permanently solved; when a new and free Europe will have risen from the shambles of the old; when "fifth columns" will be things unknown in America—then may some generation as yet unborn have reason to give to our generation the same veneration we accord to those that have gone before, and, thinking of us, to feel as did Webster when he dedicated the shaft at Bunker Hill:

"Thank God, I—I also—am an American!"

Labor Union Endorses Destroyer Trade; Ask Provision Guaranteeing Jobs of Workers Called to Military Service Be Included in Conscription Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR.

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 11, 1940

RESOLUTIONS OF CENTRAL TRADES AND LABOR UNION OF ST. LOUIS

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, out of the welter of discussion of the destroyer trade and the selective service act come two patriotic and lucid resolutions, succinctly stating the views of an intelligent governing body of St. Louis workers. It is with pleasure and concurrence that, by leave granted, I insert them in the RECORD of today's proceedings of the Congress.

Whereas President Franklin D. Roosevelt has transferred to the British Government 50 over-age destroyers in exchange for certain strategic naval and air bases which would be vital elements of defense should invasion of American shores be attempted by any foreign foe. Just as we lock our homes against night prowlers, so must our country make every possible preparation to defend herself while the clouds of distress and uncertainty engulf most of the world in the gravest crisis in the history of civilization. It would be too late to prepare after invaders were upon us. The lovers of human justice and peace must strengthen the hands of our great President as he labors to keep us out of war and at the same time to make our Nation safe from the threat of totalitarian madness and to perpetuate our great Republic as a nation in which all the children of men enjoy the blessings of liberty and democracy; and

Whereas it is now known that many of our large metropolitan daily papers, irrespective of their political background, and many of our leading statesmen representing all shades of political faith favor the President's program, with the exception of a very few who are lukewarm because they were not consulted: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Central Trades and Labor Union of St. Louis and vicinity, in regular session, this 8th day of September 1940 does

hereby heartily endorse and commend President Franklin D. Roosevelt's transaction with the British Government as above outlined as an act of aggressively brilliant statesmanship, as a great forward step toward making our United States safe from attack; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to President Franklin D. Roosevelt, to our United States Senators and our Congressmen, and to the press, and that same be spread upon the official minutes of this meeting.

Whereas there is now pending before Congress legislation known as the Burke-Wadsworth bill, a law which if enacted, and which at this time from all appearances will be enacted, will provide for the conscription of men into the military service of the United States Government; and

Whereas this law contains a provision which guarantees to all workers called into the military service the security of their job upon their return from military service. The failure of any employer to reinstate such a man will subject him to prosecution under the provisions of the National Labor Relations Act, or as it is commonly known, the Wagner Labor Act; and

Whereas at this particular time it appears that the conscription bill will undoubtedly be passed by Congress and its provisions become effective shortly after its enactment into law; and

Whereas no doubt many members of our affiliated local unions will be called for military service, which will necessitate their leaving their positions: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Central Trades and Labor Union, in meeting assembled this 8th day of September 1940, goes on record demanding that all workers who must join the colors shall be restored to their former positions after being released by the Government; and be it further

Resolved, That the Central Trades and Labor Union urge its affiliated local unions to demand of their employers that their present contracts and agreements or future contracts and agreements be amended to contain a provision to protect their members who may be called into military service.

British Propaganda and Subversion of Textbooks in American Public Schools—F and G

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. THORKELSON

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 11, 1940

EXCERPTS FROM REPORT OF DAVID HIRSHFIELD

Mr. THORKELSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include articles from the report of David Hirshfield relating to books by David Saville Muzzey, Ph. D., Barnard College, Columbia University; and Everett Barnes, A. M.

AN AMERICAN HISTORY—REVISED, 1920

Excerpts from report of David Hirshfield relating to book by David Saville Muzzey, Ph. D., Barnard College, Columbia University)

This history is subject to severe criticism from many sources and many viewpoints. The opening sentence of the preface is as follows:

"The present volume represents the newer tendencies in historical writing. Its aim is not to tell over once more the old story in the old way, but to give the emphasis to those factors in our national development which appeal to us as most vital from the standpoint of today."

It was contended by the critics who appeared before me, that "the newer tendencies in historical writing," proclaimed and followed by Professor Muzzey, are pro-British. Many passages were cited in this book to prove that the author has no abiding conviction in American fundamentals, or in the just causes of the Revolution, nor any wholesome veneration for the great men who founded our Republic.

On page 90 of his history, in treating of the American Revolution, Professor Muzzey says:

"This great event has too often been represented as the unanimous uprising of a downtrodden people to repel the deliberate, unprovoked attack of a tyrant upon their liberties; but when thousands of people in the Colonies could agree with a noted lawyer of Massachusetts that the Revolution was a 'causeless, wanton, wicked rebellion,' and thousands of people in England could applaud Pitt's denunciation of the war against America as 'barbarous, unjust, and diabolical,' it is evident that, at the time at least, there were two opinions as to colonial rights and British oppression."

Most adult Americans were brought up in the belief that the American Revolution was rather a glorious affair, that Burke's characterization of the "fierce spirit of liberty" that animated the forefathers of the Republic was no mere figure of speech, and that Abraham Lincoln spoke the truth when he described it as a "nation conceived in liberty." Our children, however, if permitted to gain their knowledge of the early history of their country from textbooks such as Muzzey's, will learn something quite different than did their parents.

In that "there were two opinions" the author is unquestionably correct, but in presenting the issues upon which opinion was divided, he teaches (p. 106):

"When we review, after a century and a half, the chain of events which changed the loyal British-Americans of 1763 into rebels in arms against their King in 1775, we see that the cause of the Revolution was a difference of opinion as to the nature of the British Empire."

Again, on page 115, he states that it was "a debatable question, namely, whether the abuses of the king's ministers justified armed resistance."

This attempt to turn into a "debatable question" the hitherto clear and incontestable truth that the colonists were right and their oppressor wrong, strikingly exemplifies "the newer tendencies in historical writing," against which patriotic protest is properly directed.

Objection is made to Professor Muzzey's characterization of those who engaged in demonstrations against the Stamp Act as "the mob" (p. 97), because to the minds of school children, or even of adults, this is either derogatory of the patriots or vindictive of mobs.

On page 102 Professor Muzzey refers to Hancock, Warren, Otis, and the Adamses as patriots, but ironically puts the word patriots in quotation marks.

In connection with the Revolution he wholly omits mention in his text of Nathan Hale, Generals Anthony Wayne, Putnam, Sumter, Pickens, Marion, Stark, Sullivan, Knox, Light Horse Harry Lee, Gansevoort, Commodore Barry, Sergeant Jasper, Mollie Pitcher, Betsy Ross, and the birth of the flag, the Battles of Bennington and Stony Point, and many other heroic characters and events that have thrilled and inspired the school boys and girls in the school history of the past.

The Battle of Lexington is inadequately and inaccurately presented.

The taking of Ticonderoga is related without detail or spirit.

The story of Bunker Hill is disposed of in 17 words.

All mention of Brandywine, Germantown, and Valley Forge is embraced in two sentences.

The glorious career of John Paul Jones is given one sentence.

In fact, the entire account of the military and naval actions of the Revolution is compressed into less than 10 pages, in a book of more than 500 pages.

It is true that Professor Muzzey twice in his book avows it to be his theory that "military history is useful only for the special student of the science of war." However, it is interesting to observe that in the same book the author gives a full page and a half of space, with a full-page map and a footnote, to a detailed military history of the "British victory" at Quebec in 1759.

According to Professor Muzzey those nations which gave aid or friendly recognition to the Americans in the Revolution were actuated by mean, selfish motives, and France assisted only after she saw that—

"The American revolt was a weapon strong enough to use in taking revenge on England. * * * Spain joined England's enemies with the hope of regaining the island of Jamaica and the stronghold of Gibraltar; Holland, England's old commercial rival, came into the league for the destruction of Britain's naval power and the overthrow of her colonial empire.

"Thus the American Revolution, after the victory at Saratoga, developed into a coalition of four powers against Great Britain; and the American continent became again, for the fifth time within a century, the ground on which France and England fought out their mighty duel" (pp. 118–119).

Complaint is also made that in Professor Muzzey's text American children are taught that in the negotiations for peace France sought to betray the interests of America, and that America actually did violate her compact and betray the interests of France. On pages 127–128 the following appears:

"It soon became evident to the American diplomats at Paris that France was planning to find consolation for her defeated ally, Spain, at the expense of her victorious ally, America.

"The commissioners, following Jay's advice, disobeyed Congress, violated the treaty of alliance with France, and concluded the peace with England alone, thereby securing the whole territory from the Atlantic to the Mississippi."

This has been a matter of long controversy. The best authorities have it that France asked nothing for herself, but did want concessions for her other ally, Spain. A provisional treaty, which was directly negotiated with Great Britain by the American Commissioners, was accepted by France as a signatory party.

"But," says Professor Muzzey, on page 128, "it took all the tact and shrewd suavity of Benjamin Franklin to make the French ministry accept the terms of the treaty with even tolerably good grace."

As a matter of truth, the attitude of France toward America throughout the Revolutionary period was friendly and her assistance was very helpful, and the good grace of the French ministry in agreeing to the treaty was shown by a new loan of 6,000,000 livres to the United States within a few days after the signing of the treaty.

Muzzey, in striving to discredit the whole inspiring story of French aid, tells with apparent pride (p. 130) that while all

other nations were plotting and scheming for advantage in the peace terms, England alone was unselfish, upright and generous and that:

"Europe was amazed at England's generosity. * * * It was a complete if a tardy triumph of that feeling of sympathy for men of common blood, common language, traditions, and institutions, across the seas."

It is true that the French minister, Vergennes, wrote in elation: "The English buy the peace rather than make it. Their concessions as to boundaries, the fisheries, the Loyalists, exceed everything I had thought possible." The same joyous feeling prevailed in America. But the concessions were granted by England, not through sympathy and blood affection, but through stern necessity. Professor Muzzey in his account seems to be setting forth his own feeling, rather than historic fact.

Among the causes leading to the War of 1812, Professor Muzzey relates (p. 183):

"The next move of the (American) administration was an attempt to bribe England and France to bid against each other for our trade."

To my mind this is a most ungraceful form of a very doubtful statement. It is not true American history, but typical British propaganda.

As to the War of 1812, Professor Muzzey, on page 184, refers to it as:

"The unfortunate war between the sister nations of the English tongue."

The first sentence in Professor Muzzey's account of that war reads as follows (p. 180):

"The unholy ambition of one man kept the civilized world in a turmoil during the first 15 years of the nineteenth century and stirred war from the shores of Lake Erie to the steppes of Russia."

The plain import of this is that our "second war for independence" was a mere incident in European conflicts.

We, on the other hand, have been taught that the War of 1812 was an American struggle for freedom of the seas, for the protection of our seamen from English impressment, and for the defense of our frontiers against Indian allies of Great Britain, armed and urged on to murderous outrages. Every American believes that the War of the Revolution won American independence and that the War of 1812 confirmed that independence in the eyes of foreign nations and aroused in our own people a true national consciousness.

Many other inaccuracies, indicating inattention to real facts in American history, have been pointed out in the Muzzey text.

On page 110 of his book Professor Muzzey refers to Patrick Henry's liberty-or-death speech as having been delivered in the Virginia House of Burgesses (at Williamsburg), when, according to authentic records, it was delivered before the Virginia convention in a church at Richmond.

This author, page 117, speaks of Cornwallis, instead of Mawhood, as the British commander at Princeton.

On page 120, Ferguson's force at Kings Mountain is described as "some 1,200 Tory militiamen collected by Colonel Ferguson," when all early histories tell us that he had well-disciplined troops and 200 of them were British regulars.

The author says, on page 152: "Few Americans have been in the habit of following the daily business of Congress as Englishmen follow the debates of their Parliament." The liberal space given in our daily newspapers to the happenings in Congress is evidence of the very general interest taken by our people in congressional proceedings.

On page 188 is described the Battle of New Orleans "as one of the bloodiest battles ever fought on American soil." While it is true that the British loss was 700 killed and 1,400 wounded, the American loss in that battle was only 17, and it is absurd to speak of this battle as bloody in any such sense as Antietam, Fredericksburg, Chancellorsville, Gettysburg, The Wilderness, Spottsylvania, Cold Harbor, and Chickamauga.

On page 323 the author says that Breckinridge was nominated for President in 1860 at Richmond, whereas the nomination was made at Baltimore.

With reference to the Presidential election of 1860, on page 325, Professor Muzzey writes that Douglas "would have easily won with the support of the united Democratic Party." As a matter of fact, Lincoln's vote exceeded that of the combined opposition in all of the States which he carried, except New Jersey, California, and Oregon.

It is not for the inaccuracies pointed out in the Muzzey text, but because of his apparent intentional misstatements with respect to the establishment of our great Republic and her early period, that Professor Muzzey's work is condemned as utterly unfit for use in the public schools of New York City.

It was expected that owing to the exposure and to the vigorous protest on the part of American patriots and American patriotic societies, Professor Muzzey would rewrite his 1923 edition and make it a history of America. The latest 1923 printing is out, and after reading it I regret to be compelled to state that it is unchanged in any important respect from the 1920 edition.

"A debatable question" has been modified to "a much-debated question." Quotation marks have been removed from the word "patriots," when referring to American Revolutionary leaders. Apparent unintentional inaccuracies regarding the place of Patrick Henry's liberty-or-death speech, the character of Ferguson's forces, the nomination of Douglas, and the vote for Lincoln have been corrected.

SHORT AMERICAN HISTORY BY GRADES (PTS. I AND II)—REVISED, 1920; REREVISED, 1922

AMERICAN HISTORY FOR GRAMMAR GRADES—REVISED, 1920; REREVISED, 1923

(Excerpts from report by David Hirshfield relating to book by Everett Barnes, A. M.)

Since the complaints against the Everett Barnes texts were filed with me at the first hearing, each of these texts has been rerevised by its author, and he seems to have shifted from the "modern historical scholarship" point of view to its direct opposite.

Both these texts have been so completely rewritten that in this rerevised edition most of the passages which were complained against are corrected or eliminated.

The additions which were severely criticized dealt with affairs as late as the Presidential election of 1920. The new edition of Short American History, though bearing later copyright date, stops at the same period. The only apparent purpose of the new edition, therefore, was to correct certain passages which had been complained of as anti-American and pro-British.

In the main the complaints against these texts were much the same as those against the other histories, and it must be pleasing to every American that this author and his publishers have confessed their guilt of having offended against America and everything American.

In his later texts it is no longer stated that "in all the unfairness that had been shown it was not England that oppressed the Colonies"; that "the disputes were not between the colonists and the English at home, but between the Tories and the Whigs on both sides of the sea, neighbor against neighbor"; and that "had there been no war this great country would probably still be a great branch of the British Empire"; but in the place of all that, patriotic recital of real facts are substituted.

In these rerevisions John Hancock is no longer "a smuggler," but once more a "sterling patriot."

The portrait of Lord Cornwallis has given way to a full-page portrait of Nathan Hale and an appreciative account of his martyrdom.

Of Lexington, Professor Barnes no longer teaches that—

"It was a fight of Briton against Briton; on one side Britons fighting for liberty, on the other Britons fighting because ordered to by their King." He now teaches in the same line, on the same page:

"Poorly armed, untrained American farmers could make the veteran British regulars run."

That "the worst traitor of the war was Charles Lee" is recanted in the re-revised book. This rank is now bestowed upon Benedict Arnold, and he is no longer the injured hero, "whom the Congress also had not treated fairly."

Faneuil Hall, "the cradle of liberty," which in the revised history had been consigned to oblivion, is now in the re-revised edition, restored with a picture and an account of great Revolutionary meetings there.

A year ago Professor Barnes, following "the newer tendencies in historical writing," announced by the revisionists, was teaching:

"What folly it was for the three-fourths of England in the British Isles to make war on the one-fourth of England in America."

He has changed this to:

"What folly it was for the people in the British Isles to make war on the colonists in America."

Phrases such as "English liberty," "Englishmen in America," and "Britons fighting for liberty," ceaselessly reiterated throughout the Anglicized volumes, have disappeared, and instead are phrases such as "new ideals of freedom," "the American colonists," and "patriots of the Revolution."

Professor Barnes' characterization of the Continental Congress in his 1920 edition has given way in the 1922 edition to an account quite different, as does appear from the following:

FROM THE REVISED HISTORY OF 1920	FROM THE RE-REVISED HISTORY OF 1922
"It was hard for the colonists to learn that in union there is strength. From its beginning in doubt and fear to its ending in victory, all through the 6 years of its course, the Congress was a scene of petty bickerings and schemings, through which single Colonies sought to make gains for themselves. The little Colonies wanted to have as much power as the big ones and the big ones wanted to control the little ones. There was a scramble for honors and offices. In that Congress were selfish, unworthy, short-sighted, narrow-minded, office-seeking, and office-trading plotters, just as there have been in every Congress ever since.	"The colonists had now learned that in union there is strength. The Congress met soon after the commencement of the war, and for 6 years, until its close, the conduct of the war was guided by its action, under the leadership of such sterling patriots as John Hancock, Samuel Adams, Benjamin Franklin, John Adams, and others. It was an advisory body, working without the aid of any written constitution.
"So many petty wranglings stood in the way of wise measures to help the Army that it suffered much and the cause was set back for years. Such union as there was among the Colonies during the war came from the	"It was, however, the best means the colonists had at the time of bringing about cooperation. It afforded the opportunity for all the Colonies, instead of any single Colony, to be represented in its counsels. It, for the colonists, was a time of common danger from without, and this, together with a common interest and patriotic zeal to carry to a successful issue the great cause which the battles of Lexington and Concord stood

FROM THE REVISED HISTORY OF 1920—continued

outside pressure of a great common danger more than from a brotherly spirit within. They were united because they dared not be otherwise. For a time it was left for each Colony to do what it pleased in fighting the King, but at length Congress acted as though there were a union, and voted to raise an army of 20,000 men," etc.

FROM THE RE-REVISED HISTORY OF 1922—continued

for, united the colonists for the struggle upon which they were entering.

"While the Congress may not always have done those things which at times appeared to be advisable, yet the colonists never lost confidence in the wisdom, patriotism, and patience of its great leaders. This Congress voted to raise an army of 20,000 men," etc.

Since these events are nearly a hundred and fifty years in the past, and there are no new facts available concerning them, it is manifest that this alteration of version by Mr. Barnes in his 1920 text was due, apparently, solely to his change of viewpoint. He has learned that his viewpoint was wrong and unfair to America, and like a man has acknowledged his error.

Many heroic characters and events, unmentioned in the 1920 text, now crowd into the made-over pages of Barnes' 1922 history. He has learned, evidently, that in the writing of American school history for American children there can properly be none but the American attitude.

Leading merchants of the Colonies are no longer declared criminal smugglers, but instead, he asserts that this smuggling was open and patriotic defiance of tyrannous English laws which forbade the colonists to trade with the world, or even with one another, except in English ships.

James Otis is presented as a patriot instead of loyalist.

The battle of Stony Point reappears as an important event.

Anthony Wayne is resurrected.

John Stark comes in for credit.

Commodore John Barry is justly cited.

Francis Scott Key is referred to as the author of The Star-Spangled Banner.

The courage shown on both sides at Bunker Hill, but which Professor Barnes in his revised history had stressed entirely on the side of the British, is now properly stressed on the side of the thousand undrilled patriots who so gloriously resisted three times their number of the best-trained British regulars.

Here are the old and new accounts:

1920

"The courage shown on both sides was wonderful. To march, as those British soldiers did up to the works, so near that each one felt that the man who was aiming at him could not miss, required a nerve as steady as was ever shown on battlefield since men began to kill each other."

1922

"The courage shown on both sides was wonderful. 'Don't fire until you see the whites of their eyes,' said the American commander, who knew that their supply of ammunition was small, and that his men did not have enough bayonets to be used successfully in meeting the charge of the British."

The typical British assertion that during the Revolution England was fighting single-handed against three nations has been removed.

The sympathetic account of the Tories and their Indian allies, whom the patriots "raided" and drove off to Canada, dwelt upon in the 1920 text, is not mentioned in the re-revised books.

Professor Barnes has also materially altered his account of John Paul Jones' glorious capture of the British ship *Serapis*.

In his 1920 edition he said:

"The *Serapis* had the better of the fight and would have won had not a sailor of *The Richard* happened to throw a hand grenade down a hatchway of the *Serapis*, where in exploding it fired a large lot of powder, which blew up the ship and killed many of her men."

In his 1922 edition he says:

"The *Serapis* had the better of the fight until a sailor of *The Richard*, fearlessly lashed in the rigging, far out over the deck, threw firebrands into the magazine hatchway of the *Serapis* and finally ignited the powder, which blew up the ship and killed many of her men."

The one account is substantially the one given by the British captain after Jones chivalrously had landed him in England; the other is the version given by John Paul Jones and his men. Jones' account has, however, always been the accepted American version, although for his valorous story telling the British captain was knighted and his version became emblazoned in British history.

In his 1920 text Historian Barnes was impugning the motives of France in aiding the colonists to secure independence, as follows:

"France had fought England, not so much from a generous wish to help the Colonies as from hatred of England, and at the end France wanted her share of the spoils."

In his 1922 text he has amended this to read:

"France had given generous help to the Colonies."

Professor Barnes' distortion of the causes of the War of 1812 had been severely condemned, and, heeding the voice of the American people, he has rewritten that, as will be seen from the following:

In his 1920 text he wrote:

"It was a mistake. It was a case in which righteous anger overcame judgment. Some hot-blooded young statesmen from the Southern States, among whom were Henry Clay, of Kentucky, and John C. Calhoun, of South Carolina, urged that war be declared, and they had their way. Much against his wish, Madison yielded, and the War of 1812 against England began. Had there been less haste it would have been better, for, no doubt, a peaceful settlement could have been made. Older men with cooler heads, though angry with England, felt that it would be wiser to wait, and were much in doubt as to the outcome."

In his 1922 text he writes:

"The impressment of our seamen by England interfered with our trade, as ships were searched upon the high seas, and Henry Clay, a statesman from Kentucky, who afterward went to the Netherlands to help make the treaty of peace, insisted that war must be declared to protect American commerce. He was supported by John C. Calhoun and statesmen from other sections of the country. It was also generally believed that the English in Canada were arming the Indians of the Northwest and encouraging, if not actually directing, the raids of Tecumseh and other Indian chieftains."

The 1920 account reads like British propaganda; the 1922 statement is American history.

The justification for the British in burning Washington, offered by Professor Barnes, in his 1920 books, was practically the same as given by several other pro-British American history revisers. The account of the destruction of public buildings and records has also been partially corrected in the re-revised history.

1920

"Then they burned the President's house, the Treasury Building, and other Government buildings. They said that they destroyed these Government buildings to punish the Americans who had early in the war burned some public buildings in Canada."

1922

"Then they burned the President's house, the Treasury Building, and other Government buildings. This was one of the great misfortunes of the whole war, since many records and collections of art were destroyed which could not be replaced."

Undoubtedly, due to strong complaint directed against Professor Barnes' 1920 version of the Battle of New Orleans, he has wholly rewritten that story, as shown in the two accounts:

1920

"The war, as it went on, became more and more burdensome. The cost of carrying it on was very great. Many of the American people believed it to be a needless war, into which the country had been drawn by those who had not had the foresight to count the cost or judge of the outcome. Many who had been keen for a fight at first, had now tired of the strife, and there was a general desire for peace. * * *

"Very bad management, as a rule, had been shown by the leaders of the American Armies. Badly commanded, as they were, the American soldiers had been unable to hold their own against the troops of the enemy. In but one instance did the Americans win a glorious victory, and that was so late in the war that peace had been concluded before the battle was fought. It was the Battle of New Orleans. * * *

"All that it was necessary for the Americans to do to win a victory was to hold their ground. * * *

"The invaders came on like British soldiers, and like British soldiers they came, again and again, those that were not dead. For 3 hours they endured that deadly fire and offered up their lives for their King. Then they gave up the hopeless task, for they saw that to perform it was beyond the power of man. The British lost 2,500 men and many officers, among whom was the gallant General Pakenham, their commander. The American loss was very small.

"It was a wasted battle; it was a needless victory; it counted for nothing, for the war was over."

1922

"The war as it went on became more burdensome. The cost of carrying it on was great and both sides became anxious for peace. * * * Andrew Jackson, a young lawyer, had settled at Nashville, Tenn., and was soon made a judge. He made himself famous by enforcing law and order in the wilderness country.

"The Creek Indians, under the leadership of Tecumseh, had captured Fort Mimms, about 50 miles from Mobile, and massacred about 500 men, women, and children. An army was raised with Jackson in command and marched against the Indians. A battle was fought at Horseshoe Bend, in which the Indians were completely defeated. The British, not knowing of this battle, came on to New Orleans, and Jackson was there to meet them. * * *

The invaders came on again and again, the front ranks carrying short ladders with which to scale the earthworks. These were the best-trained soldiers in the world, but Jackson's Kentucky and Tennessee riflemen were the best marksmen in the world, and in the 3-hour battle 2,500 men and officers, including the British commander, General Pakenham, were killed. The American loss was very small. Although at the time this battle was fought the treaty of peace had already been signed at Ghent, it was of utmost importance, as it had a marked effect in creating in Europe a great respect for the valor of the American Army."

The mobility of Professor Barnes' judgment is remarkable. Just so long as it appeared to his advantage to write in harmony with the "newer tendencies in historical writing" with "the methods of

modern historical scholarship" and the "other influences from overseas" this author was apparently not adverse to misrepresenting and minimizing American characters and their achievements; but now that he has heard the rumblings of the storm of American patriotic protest he reverses his attitude and turns his facts roundabout.

An elemental complaint against these revisionists is that they are not faithful to the facts as facts, but have adjusted their attitude in submission to influence brought to bear upon them. Here is one of them who surely presents striking illustration of the justice of this complaint.

Professor Barnes, by restoring American teachings into his Short American History by Grades, issued in two volumes, and rerevising in 1923 his American History for Grammar Grades, issued in one volume, practically a replica of his Short American History by Grades, admits that he must have been led astray by someone. Barnes, however, is only a Brooklyn school principal and is not considered in scholastic circles of colleges and historical associations, like some of the other complained-of historians who have been seduced into a sycophantic acceptance of English authority on all things American.

It is remarked, however, that although the Barnes History for Grammar Grades had not been rerevised when the authorized 1923 list of textbooks used in the New York City schools came out, it was nevertheless on the authorized list.

Compulsory Military Service in Switzerland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. SHANLEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, September 7, 1940

ARTICLE FROM AMERICANA

Mr. SHANLEY. Mr. Speaker, it certainly seems apposite to include in the many remarks on conscription the very successful procedure which has been followed in Switzerland. I am indebted to Americana for this article, which I think will be of interest to everyone.

The article follows:

[From the Americana, vol. 26]

SWITZERLAND—ARMY

Compulsory universal service has been the root-principle of Switzerland's military system for centuries. Since the reorganization completed in 1912, the army has been brought to a high state of efficiency. The striking force of the Swiss Army consists of about 300,000 men, divided into the Elite (20 to 32 years), the Landwehr (38 to 40), and the Landsturm (40 to 48), which number respectively, 117,530, 108,900, and 68,000 men. The supplementary services (men of from 20 to 48, who for various reasons are not entirely fit), number 205,000, and the grand total of the whole army is slightly under half a million or one-eighth of the entire population. There are few exemptions except for physical disability, and those excused or rejected pay certain taxes instead of rendering service. Liability extends from the 20th to completion of the 48th year; service is distributed as follows: Twelve years in the Elite or "Auszug," 8 years in the Landwehr, and 8 years in the Landsturm. The longest periods of training are the recruits' courses which every man goes through in his first year of service—65 days for the infantry, 75 for the artillery and 90 for the cavalry—besides which there are compulsory courses in shooting. The younger men (the first line) do 7 other annual trainings of 11 days each (14 days in the artillery) before passing into the Landwehr, when they are called out for 11 days every 4 years; the Landsturm are only called up in time of war. Men convicted of grave offenses are not allowed to join the army and officers and men whose private life is unworthy of their rank and standing are court-martialed and dismissed. In the strictest sense a democratic service, the Swiss Army is a model institution, unique in that every would-be officer starts as a private with the ordinary recruits' course, and promotion to the commissioned and noncommissioned ranks is by merit and not by seniority, except that it is conditional on 4 years' service in each rank.

Although officers naturally have to do more work and pass through longer courses of training than the privates, instances of shirking in order to escape promotion do not occur. On the contrary, all through the Army both officers and men do a large amount of extra voluntary work. In peacetime there are no generals; these are appointed only on mobilization or outbreak of war. The system of promotion from the ranks has the advantage that it obviates any danger of militarism, which always springs from antagonism between people and officers as a class; in Switzerland officers as well as men either belong or feel that they belong to the people and there is consequently no friction between them. The system also makes physical training obligatory, for it is preceded by compulsory gymnastic training in all the schools and supplemented by a large amount of voluntary gymnastics, drill, and shooting practice, which last is the principal cause of the high standard of marksmanship throughout the Swiss Army. But apart from target exercise (which is encouraged, while at the same time mobilization is accelerated by the fact that every soldier when he is not out training keeps his rifle and equipment in his own house) the institution of annual trainings tends to produce a high state of physical efficiency throughout the Nation.

The composition and organization are thoroughly modern and complete. The infantry (traditionally known as fusiliers and carabineers, but for practical purposes are divided into field and mountain infantry) is the main arm. The cavalry consists of dragoons and guides, the former being ranged in independent divisions under the direct orders of the commander in chief and the latter brigaded with those divisions. There are altogether 114 battalions, 84 field batteries, 12 howitzer batteries, 10 mountain batteries, 6 cavalry regiments, and 12 squadrons of guides, besides the usual accompaniment of engineers, cyclist, railway, and pontoon corps, telegraph section, etc.

The fortifications on the southern frontier for the defense of the St. Gothard Pass and the Rhone Valley are manned mainly by the landwehr, which is organized in 56 battalions and 36 squadrons. There are 6 divisions in the army, each of which belongs to one of the 6 divisional districts into which the country is divided and each can be worked as a separate army corps. The first consists entirely of French-speaking Swiss recruited from the Cantons of Geneva, Valais, Vaud, and Neuchatel. In the second section three-quarters of the men are French Swiss, from Fribourg, Neuchatel, and the French Jura. The third, fourth, and fifth divisions consist entirely of German-speaking Swiss from the Cantons of Bern, Lucerne, Soleure, Casel, Argovie, Saint Gall, Zurich, and Schaffhausen. The sixth division (Italians and Rumonsh) is recruited from Ticino, the Grisons, and Saint Gall. At the beginning of the European war all 6 divisions were mobilized so rapidly that in the first week of August 1914 Switzerland was able to post on its frontiers over 250,000 fighting men, well armed and well drilled. The infantry are armed with the Swiss repeating rifle. The field artillery is armed with a Q. F. shielded Krupp 7.5 cm. caliber. The "position" artillery has batteries of 8.4 and 12 cm. guns. The aviation service had 60 fighting and 120 scouting airplanes in 1930.

The national militia is partly under the Cantons, who have authority to promote officers up to the rank of captain. The higher appointments rest with the Federal Government, which has charge of all general matters of importance. The Swiss consider it an honor to serve in the army and a misfortune to be rejected. Considering its efficiency and the fact that it is raised by conscription, the Swiss Army is a comparatively cheap one. The expenditure is 21 francs ($1.05) per head of the population, while twice as much per head is spent on education. All men rejected on account of physical defects are exempted (as are teachers, clergymen, police, etc.) and pay a military tax according to income up to the age of 40. Service being the same for all, it is therefore a handicap for none. It interferes neither with personal liberty nor with the country's prosperity; it imposes little burden on the national treasury and no burden at all on the national content. In proportion to population Switzerland is one of the richest countries, although it has not an inch of territory beyond its borders. The yearly value of Switzerland's commerce amounts to about $350 per capita of the population, as compared with $290 in England, and the country not only bears the compulsory system but regards with pride and affection the army which is its result. Owing to its inland position Switzerland has no navy, and no need of one. Yet a "Swiss admiral" did once exist, an Englishman named Colonel Williams, who in 1799 was in the service of the Zurich government and commanded a small fleet on Lake Zurich, with which he was ordered to oppose the French Army. When the latter under Massena, routed the Austrians and Russians Williams calmly watched the battle from the lake. Then, enraged at his own inaction, he discharged his crews, scuttled his vessels, and took to flight.

W. P. A. Accomplishments in Spokane County

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES H. LEAVY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 11, 1940

REPORT BY CARL W. SMITH, ACTING STATE W. P. A. ADMINISTRATOR

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am glad to make a part of the RECORD the history of the unusual accomplishments of the W. P. A. in the most

populous county of my congressional district, to wit, Spokane County. The report follows:

A huge program of permanent Spokane County improvements, created through the diligent labor of hundreds of Work Projects Administration workers, has brought benefits to this county that it otherwise would have taken years to achieve, according to Carl W. Smith, acting State W. P. A. administrator.

Smith listed W. P. A. accomplishments in Spokane County yesterday as a part of a national survey covering W. P. A. projects from its inception 4½ years ago to January 1, and pointed out that employment of otherwise unemployed residents in the many useful W. P. A. undertakings has helped the county keep pace with the rapid growth of the inland empire.

During this period Spokane County has acquired through W. P. A. 550 miles of roads and new or greatly improved streets, 85 new or modernized public buildings, 27 miles of new or rehabilitated irrigation canals, flume or pipe line, watering over 25,000 acres; water and sewer systems, athletic fields, parks, playgrounds, and essential services such as surveys, research projects, and social, health, and educational assistance.

Each day almost every resident of the county enjoys some improvement effected by the extensive W. P. A. program.

The modernization and extension of the road system of the county consists of 460 miles of farm and mine-to-market roads. These roads were newly built or straightened, graded, drained, and gravel-surfaced to make them safe for passage in wet weather. Many dangerous curves were eliminated. The best-known road project was the relocation of the first 10 miles of the Palouse Highway running south from Spokane toward Latah. During operation of this job 2,000 degrees of curvature were eliminated. The road now has no curve over 6 degrees and no grade of more than 6 percent.

These improvements have included the laying of over 139 culverts, mostly metal, and the landscaping of more than 125 acres of roadside.

At present W. P. A. is operating a county-wide road-improvement project to realine highways, do away with narrow places and curves, and grade and gravel more than 140 miles. Of this distance approximately 42 miles will be oiled. The project is already over 80 percent complete.

In addition to road work nearly 90 miles of streets were graded and graveled under a series of W. P. A. projects, principally in the city of Spokane. Largest of these jobs called for 100 miles of street work and 6 miles of curbs in Spokane. Sixty miles of the undertaking have been completed. This project was suspended last May but recently reopened. In Deer Park and Medical Lake 2 miles of streets were improved. Nearly 6 miles of roads were constructed in parks near Spokane.

One of the most important fields of W. P. A. assistance in Spokane County has been irrigation rehabilitation. Prior to W. P. A., irrigation systems of the county had fallen into disrepair and few extensions had been made. To remedy this Federal funds were allocated to assist the various districts. In the W. P. A. of 4½ years 17 miles of new canals, pipe-lines, and flume have been constructed, watering 7,280 acres. More than 10 miles of existing ditch and canal systems, serving 16,850 acres, were rehabilitated and improved.

There were 5 W. P. A. irrigation-system projects in the Greenacres district. Flumes were built, canals lined, ditches cleared, wood pipe replaced with concrete, irrigation devices installed, and dikes constructed at Otis Orchard, East Farms, Carnhope, Trentwood, Dishman, Pasadena Park, Veradale, and Spokane Valley irrigation districts. At Lake Newman a mile and one-half of dike was built impounding a lake of 25,000 acre-feet. Outlet channels were cleared for the district totaling 6,000 feet.

At present there are eight W. P. A. projects in operation, bringing still further improvements to the various Spokane irrigation districts. These include canal and some pipe-line improvements for Otis Orchard, Spokane irrigation district, Greenacres, East Farms, West Farms, and Trentwood. Dishman and Pasadena Park have irrigation and domestic water projects.

Few cities have had more extensive rehabilitation by W. P. A. of water and sewer systems than Spokane. During the first 2 years of W. P. A. 42 miles of sewers were laid to meet an acute situation threatening civic development. At present two projects are in operation; one to provide lateral and the other intercepting sewers totaling 25 miles. Another similar project has been approved by W. P. A. for future operation. A total of 70 miles of sewers, 248 service connections, and 749 manholes and catch basins had been constructed up to January 1 in Spokane County. All of the work was done in Spokane and its suburbs, except a few miles in Cheney.

Water mains totaling 25 miles with 28 consumer connections were laid in the county. These projects likewise were all in Spokane, except for a few miles in Latah, various school districts, and irrigation domestic-water systems. Five miles of the mains were new construction.

In Spokane W. P. A. is now laying approximately 12 miles more of water mains. W. P. A. crews constructed an overflow basin of 4,750,000 gallons for the Spokane North Hill Reservoir to protect property lying below it and to permit efficient reservoir cleaning.

The city's pumping station was also improved.

Almost every child in Spokane County has benefited by the extensive school construction and rehabilitation work of W. P. A., supported by the various school districts. Two new schools were constructed and 52 repaired, painted, enlarged, or otherwise improved. Playgrounds, athletic fields, and other facilities were provided or enlarged.

New schools were erected by W. P. A. at Five Mile Prairie for 80 pupils and at Glenrose for 50 pupils. Neither district was able to afford the urgently needed new construction without Federal assistance.

Forty of the improved and rehabilitated schools are in the city of Spokane. These projects were sponsored by School District 81. The work consisted of refinishing, varnishing, painting, and calcimining interiors and equipment. For the majority the grounds were graded and improved. A survey project by W. P. A. for the school board completely mapped all school properties.

Other school-repair projects were for districts near Greenacres, and at Millwood, Elk, Milan, Chatteroy, Spangle, Colbert, Medical Lake, Opportunity, Deer Park, and Otis Orchards.

The work consisted mainly of remodeling, painting, constructing fences, digging wells, laying sewage and drainage facilities, and building foundations and gymnasiums. Under one project 8,000 desks were repaired and refinished in 8 districts. School books were repaired and indexed by W. P. A. workers in 15 districts. Additions were completed for the schools at Greenacres and Millwood and a teacher's cottage was erected for the school near Chester.

Eleven playfields were enlarged, graded, and improved for county schools. Two other school playfields were improved in Spokane. This work included repairing playfield equipment or placing new equipment.

Twenty-two new public buildings have been erected by the Work Projects Administration in Spokane County. W. P. A. crews have repaired, remodeled, and modernized 59 more buildings and enlarged 4. At Deer Park a new city hall was erected with quarters for the local municipal offices, library, and jail.

At Fort George Wright W. P. A. has furnished important aid in increasing Army facilities. A post exchange and a barn were erected. An athletic field was laid out and a new field house constructed. The interior of the fort hospital was renovated.

In Spokane the Grace Campbell Memorial Building was rehabilitated. New cabinets were constructed, floors renewed, fixtures modernized, and buildings painted and calcimined. W. P. A. clerical experts were brought in to rearrange and index the exhibits. At the Spokane armory W. P. A. crews completed general improvements for storage of machine-gun equipment and erected a small-bore target range.

Extensive W. P. A. construction work has materially improved the recreational facilities of the county. A new gymnasium was built at Waverly. Repairs were made to the gymnasium at Medical Lake. Two field houses were erected at Central Valley High School and at Greenacres. A new W. P. A. built community building now serves Milan, Elk, and Chatteroy districts. Community centers were reconstructed at Deer Park and Millwood.

At Indian Canyon the residents of Spokane were provided, through a recent W. P. A. project, with a complete park, including a bathhouse, field house, two shelter houses, and a garage.

Spokane was without an adequate recreational baseball park until W. P. A. constructed a diamond and covered grandstand at the fair grounds. The grandstand seats 4,500 persons and is equipped with dressing and shower rooms. General improvements were made on the 25-acre grounds. Another grandstand was erected at Millwood, seating 700.

W. P. A. expansion of Spokane County's recreational facilities includes 10 new athletic fields, 24 improved athletic fields, 5 new handball courts, 11 new tennis courts, and 1 new and 1 improved golf course.

New athletic fields were built at school district 409, Medical Lake, Millwood, Deer Park, Fairfield, the fair grounds, Spokane, and at Union High School near Mead. Football and baseball fields have just been completed with tennis courts and a water system at the high school near Mead. Twenty-two of the W. P. A. improved athletic fields are in Spokane. The others are at Millwood and Spangle.

A new public tourist park was created by W. P. A. at Deer Park. Park development was done at Camp Garden Springs, Spokane. Park improvements were made at Garland, Manito, Liberty, Indian Canyon, Down River, and Deer Parks, Spokane.

At the 235-acre Felts Field, W. P. A. made major improvements. Over 260,000 cubic yards of earth were handled by W. P. A. crews in completing two oil-surfaced runways. One measures 200 by 4,800 feet and the other 200 by 3,000 feet. W. P. A. crews also laid out five 200- by 200-foot oil-surfaced warming blocks. The service platform was enlarged and parking areas and general leveling completed.

Building construction by W. P. A. at Felts Field included a new 5-plane hangar and improvement of the 12-plane hangar of the Forty-first Aviation Division of the State National Guard. The headquarters building of the division was enlarged with a brick addition, providing space for a radio control tower and class rooms. W. P. A. crews also helped restore the partially destroyed administration building of the One Hundred and Sixteenth Observation Unit. Floodlights for the field were erected by W. P. A. and general improvements completed only a few months ago.

At Deer Park, W. P. A. cleared and leveled the 70-acre flying field, removed hazards and old orchards, and set up six field boundary markers.

Several W. P. A. projects operated at the Griffith Springs fish hatchery, a few miles north of Spokane. Under one project W. P. A. crews constructed nine large, circular, concrete rearing ponds. A second project resulted in extensive general improvements in facilities. The result is that now the hatchery has the huge annual output of 4,800,000 fingerling fish to maintain the interest of anglers all up and down the streams of eastern Washington and the inland empire. Three-car garages were also built for the United States Bureau of Fisheries and for the State department of game.

An essential improvement for flood and fire control at the game refuge was the 125-foot dam constructed by W. P. A. This dam impounds 10 acre-feet of water. It is equipped with spillways and gates. The project also included 1,400 feet of dike and ditch. Thirty acres were cleared and 50 fenced.

Other W. P. A. projects for the county included 182 acres of general landscaping for roads, schools, and public buildings, 2 miles of guard rails, 10 miles of fire breaks, and 485 sanitary units for the protection of health and prevention of stream pollution in rural areas without sewage facilities.

A skeet and target range was laid out north of Felts Field, and a refuge for ducks, geese, and other migratory birds was provided near Cheney.

All of these permanent accomplishments for Spokane County were effected by W. P. A. labor. Federal funds were allocated to cover the cost of labor and some materials. The county, city, or other governing body in the county provided all or almost all materials, equipment, and supervision.

Added to these physical accomplishments are the other services of W. P. A. Free hot lunches are being served by W. P. A. women to the children in 31 schools of Spokane County. Two W. P. A. sewing rooms in Spokane are manufacturing clothing to be distributed to needy families of the county and State.

The housekeeping aid project provides experienced, middle-aged W. P. A. women to assist in motherless homes or where the homemaker is temporarily incapacitated. At a W. P. A. household demonstration center in Spokane, W. P. A. trains girls in a 3-month course for efficient household employees.

W. P. A. survey projects have also been operated for the cities and county. The records of the sheriff's and prosecutor's offices were indexed. Photographs were filed and identification data coordinated. Hillyard's records were cataloged, as were also those of the county engineer and the county school superintendent.

To permit traffic improvement a W. P. A. check of origin and destination of vehicles was made. New building codes and zoning ordinances were coordinated with the past records of the department of public works, including all permits as far back as 1875. A Negro survey was made. Historical records were assembled and indexed. The Spokane City Library was assisted. Deer Park and Milan School files were brought up to date.

To determine the type and extent of the mineral resources of the county a W. P. A. survey with a field camp was operated. Experienced professional and clerical workers were used.

These achievements in Spokane County are a part of the national W. P. A. program under which the otherwise unemployed have been given an opportunity, through security employment, to create needed improvements and carry on important public services.

In the country as a whole W. P. A. workers have constructed 400,000 miles of roads and 50,000 miles of streets. They have constructed 23,000 new public buildings and rehabilitated 62,400 more. About 9,600 miles of water mains and 15,000 miles of new sanitary sewers have been laid in the Nation under this program. New W. P. A.-built airports total 197; improved airports, 337.

In the State of Washington these totals run 7,447 miles of roads and 1,496 miles of streets, 555 new public buildings, 880 rehabilitated public buildings, 478 miles of water mains, 264 miles of sewers, 5 new airports, and 7 improved airports.

All of these huge undertakings and many more, combined with the social, educational, health, research, and conservation services of W. P. A. make it one of the largest businesses ever undertaken, and effecting directly or indirectly every citizen of the United States.

National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED L. BULWINKLE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 11, 1940

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE EARL HORTON POST, NO. 122, OF THE AMERICAN LEGION, AT BURNSVILLE, N. C., ON AUGUST 27, 1940

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert the following resolution:

Whereas the greater part of the world is at war and the armed minions of a despotic government already have covered the face of continental Europe like a scourge; and

Whereas there remains but one nation striving in mortal combat to preserve the principles of democracy, of right and justice, and of individual freedom, and to save the world from domination by a totalitarian state; and

Whereas our President and Commander in Chief has declared that a limited emergency exists in our country and has created a national commission with extraordinary powers to direct the activities and industries of our Nation in its war-defense program, upon which Board he has chosen to place a citizen of our own State; and

Whereas it is timely and necessary that all organizations, groups, and individuals cooperate to the fullest extent in the furtherance of national preparedness: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That these organizations do earnestly commend and approve the actions and deeds taken and done for the protection of our Nation, our State, and our community, and for the everlasting preservation of our national prestige and integrity; and in recognition of the existence of a grave emergency, do hereby pledge and undertake to render to our Government our utmost help and assistance in the advancement of the cause, plans, and works of and for a speedy, adequate, and complete preparation for the defense of our home and country.

Conscription

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 12 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, JR., OF WISCONSIN

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD a very eloquent address delivered by the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] last evening, under the auspices of the America First Committee, on the subject of "Are We On The Road To War?"

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

One reason I feel so strongly about the course on which our country has embarked is that I have seen this tragedy before. I feel as though I had walked into a movie only to discover that I had seen the picture years ago, under a somewhat different name and with a different cast.

During 1916–17 I was one of my father's secretaries. As many of you remember, he fought to the last ditch to prevent the involvement of the land he loved in the European war of his generation. Fortunately for my education, I was close to the historic battle which raged in Washington. Its full, tragic meaning burned into me for life.

As I sit in the United States Senate today, the words that are spoken and the things that are done here in Washington have a tragic ring of familiarity. Some of the words and slogans are different. But in spite of new phrases cooked up by the best propagandists in the business, we are going, step by step, down that same road we took in 1916–17.

You and I love our country. The overwhelming majority of us want with every fiber of our being to do what is best for this Nation. We sense with that true instinct which God has given to people in times of great crisis that the decisions we make will be of world-shaping importance. This is the reason why we are more worried and our sculs are more harrowed than ever before in our lifetimes. We want above all else to choose the right course.

We have a fundamental and catastrophic decision to make, and we must make it now.

We must decide whether or not we are going to war in the Old World.

It is tragic that we cannot make the most important decision in the history of our country with clear heads and steady hearts. But our emotions are aroused because deep down inside of all of us, save for a few Bundists and Communists, there is a natural loathing and aversion for the brutality of the dictators, red, black, and brown. We detest their methods and their objectives. We are shocked by the horrible ruthlessness of total war.

Propaganda, in the movies, over the radio, in the press, and by word of mouth seeks to play upon our emotions and to shape our decision. For various reasons fear and hysteria are being fomented. Jitters are being cultivated in the hope the people will not be able to think straight.

These efforts we must resist, for they are designed to becloud our reason and if successful will end in disaster for our country. I appeal to the people who do not want our Nation plunged into the holocaust, not to be sucked along the road to war by easy stages and false reasoning.

The process of switching the signs on the road to war began a year ago when the people were told that repeal of the arms embargo would make our neutrality more secure, although the interventionists knew it could only have the opposite result.

Once the interventionists got the arms embargo repealed they were not satisfied with opening our munitions markets to the Allies. The next step in their program was to turn over arms, ammunition, planes, and implements of war from our own Army and Navy These included latest deliverable types of war equipment.

Their most recent move was the famous destroyer-base lease deal revealed when the administration generously notified the Congress that it had traded 50 American destroyers to Great Britain. And we could have had these bases in exchange for the old war debt.

The hocus-pocus under which American destroyers, equipped with the latest protection devices and armament, become obsolete and overage should not deceive us. Under the definition, 50 percent of the combat vessels in the United States Navy could be declared overage and yet we know that our Navy is our first line of defense.

Unless we stop in our tracks there will be no end to the policy of taking everything that Britain wants and labeling it surplus or overage and obsolete. The next step after overage destroyers will be middle-age battleships. Then it will be youngish cruisers. In the end, they will be calling for our right-aged sons.

You and I have been told for months that this Nation must strengthen its defenses, must build an impregnable military machine capable of protecting ourselves from any aggressor or combination of aggressors. And you and I have agreed wholeheartedly. In this session of Congress alone I have voted for more than $15,000,000,000 for the up-building of our national defense.

But all the while we are voting more money to prepare to defend this hemisphere against all comers, we are dissipating strength by sending huge quantities of guns, planes, and warships across the ocean. Now the interventionists are demanding that the latest type planes and tanks, our secret bomb sight, and other indispensable war material be sent abroad.

There are tragic lessons written over the ravaged soil of Europe—lessons which we must learn if we hope to escape the fate of the conquered democracies abroad. And the most powerful lesson of all is this: National defense does not consist alone of arms, munitions, and trained manpower. It requires just as much a nation and a people whose social, economic, and spiritual house is in order.

And ours is not.

We would do well to remember that communism, fascism, and nazi-ism did not rear their ugly heads in Europe because the people of Russia, Italy, and Germany wanted to live under barbaric despotisms. This trilogy of totalitarianism came and conquered because the people of those countries were desperate, poverty-stricken, hungry, and without hope. The germs of these parasitic "isms" thrive and multiply in the stagnant pools of unemployment, poverty, and hopelessness.

How can we best prepare to meet the menace of totalitarianism? We cannot do it, as we are now, by handing over desperately needed implements of defense to the British. We cannot meet the menace of dictatorship by coddling and appeasing the profiteering minority of industrialists into making guns and tanks and planes and ships for us only when they think the profits will be high enough.

The way to meet the challenge of brutalitarianism is to buckle down to the job of strengthening our own defenses, internal as well as external, social and economic as well as military.

Here in America agriculture is entering the third decade of depression. Ten million men remain unemployed. The needy aged struggle along with a pittance which denies self-respect, and youth, the Nation's most precious asset, has little to look forward to beyond enforced service in the Army.

A young man who earns $30 a week will have to take a 75-percent cut in pay during his year of compulsory military service, but some businessmen are demanding and getting a higher and higher ceiling for profits arising out of defense orders. Such a distorted method of dealing with two groups in society will play a powerful "fifth column" role in lowering our national morale and weakening our resistance to attack.

These are problems which confront America and confront us today and here. They are more real, more menacing to the future of democracy and our way of life than all the propaganda scares of imminent invasion.

Our patriotic course is clear. We must set ourselves resolutely to the task of building an impregnable America, with military might, economic security, and spiritual well-being.

But we cannot do these things if we allow ourselves to be whipped and buffeted about by hysteria. We cannot make ourselves strong internally by shutting our eyes to the problems at home. We cannot make ourselves strong militarily by stripping our own defense in order to support the interventionists' vague and shifting frontier in Europe. We cannot preserve our American freedom by participating in war because, as soon as we do, we will become a dictatorship, just like the dictatorships abroad, whose destruction would be our announced war objective.

A subtle, diabolically clever, and powerful effort to sneak up on our blind side has been going on for long weary months. We are told in forty-eleven different ways that we can have our cake and eat it, too. We are asked to believe that we can play with fire and not get burned. We are assured that there is a halfway house on the road to war. This is false doctrine. It violates every rule of straight thinking and it flies in the face of history. Unless the citizens of America wake up quickly and exert their influence to stop our progress toward war, it will come.

It is my unshakable conviction after weighing all the facts, that we must stay out of war in Europe and Asia, if government of the people, by the people, and for the people is not to perish from this earth.

The people of America can still win this fight for peace and freedom. They will win if they will notify their Senators and Representatives that they are no longer fooled by trick phrases like "steps short of war," that they are committed to preserving and strengthening democracy by building an impregnable military defense and a dynamic social and economic order.

The two old parties have evaded this momentous issue in their platforms. Their Presidential candidates see eye to eye on foreign policy. This deprives the people of an effective choice in the Presidential campaign on the supreme issue. But the people can express their will on the question of going to war in Europe or Asia by electing men to the House and Senate who will vote against a foreign overseas war.

If we succeed, we can make democracy function in the last great area where it still lives, and by our strength and our success assume a position from which we can offer hope and leadership to the war-weary peoples of the world.

I ask those who are interested in the fight to stay out of war in the Old World to write to the America First Committee, Chicago, Ill.

Activities of War Industries Board During World War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES F. BYRNES

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 12 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

LETTER BY BERNARD M. BARUCH

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter which appeared in the New York Times on September 10, 1940, addressed to the Editor of that publication by Mr. Bernard M. Baruch, and referring to activities of the War Industries Board during the World War.

There being no objection the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

SEPTEMBER 9, 1940.

The EDITOR,
The New York Times, New York, N. Y.

DEAR SIR: Your editorial on Results of Plant Seizure quoting my testimony before the War Policies Commission in 1932, permits the conclusion that commandeering—the right to take materials or facilities—was "unnecessary in war. The method of dealing with the situation which you so generously praised, would have been impossible without it. Commandeering is a right that may be required to club into line a small group, always existent, which is seeking selfish gains in selfish ways. In the last war such recalcitrants knew there existed the power to commandeer plus the power of priority on transportation, coal, oil, materials, capital, etc. This knowledge kept them in line. That will be true today.

In war, the Government must have the right to conscript or commandeer (even to take over) any thing or facility necessary for its defense.

To get coordination, the President finally directed that no commandeering or taking over of materials or facilities should be done without the approval of the chairman of the War Industries Board.

Agreements were thus concluded with manufacturers for what the Government wanted, with price and deliveries included.

This, as you said in your editorial, is the best way.

In normal peacetime it would be abhorrent to give any such power to the Government. The results might well be as depicted in your quotation from something Senator Borah said.

Even admitting procrastination in amortization and expenditures, and the lack of vision in seeing the present situation brought about much of our present jam, we are now faced with the necessity of an enormous, hurried outlay.

But we are not now in ordinary peacetime. We have suddenly voted billions of dollars for defense. Increased taxes (although not enough) and the Selective Service Act are being passed.

Should Government in these circumstances be left powerless to enforce its orders and leave facilities for its defense in the hands of those who profit from nonwar business, by the very appropriations which the Government is forced to make?

Decidedly not. The commandeering of specific properties in the interests of national defense should be permitted, with proper compensatory provisions, the property to be returned to the owners at the end of the emergency.

In peacetime, radio, the press, and labor should be excluded from conscription or commandeering. Greatest care should be taken that this power is not abused, either in peace or in war, and that it should cease immediately after the emergency has passed.

We are facing momentous decisions already too long delayed. The shortage of machine tools causes a conflict between our defense, the British, and our own industrial needs. Our war needs come first. If the shortage is as stated, from what industries must we take the required tools; which ones must be denied new machines intended to produce new goods, when the old ones will do, if necessary, to help the national program? This is no game, but a preparation for our life and survival. This decision will go to the roots of our entire production capacity.

The Germans were asked whether they wanted butter or guns. We must decide if we want business as usual or armaments. The answer can only be the latter.

The necessity for sacrifices is before us and we must make them gladly and promptly.

I saw the temper of civilians, capital, and labor in the World War. Show them the reason and the way and we will prove again that "the highest form of efficiency is the voluntary cooperation of a free people."

Sincerely yours,

BERNARD M. BARUCH.

Sale of Destroyers to Great Britain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENNETT CHAMP CLARK

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 12 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE ST. LOUIS POST-DISPATCH

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial appearing in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of Saturday, September 7, 1940, entitled "A Demolishing Indictment," in regard to the recent raid on the United States Navy by the sale of 50 destroyers to a foreign power.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of September 7, 1940]

A DEMOLISHING INDICTMENT

How did the administration achieve "legality" for its dark-lantern destroyer deal? By "suppression of pertinent evidence, misrepresentation of facts, and distorted and strained interpretations." So wrote Dr. Herbert Whittaker Briggs, professor of government and specialist in international law at Cornell University, in a letter to Chairman WALSH, of the Senate Naval Affairs Committee, August 17.

Dr. Briggs' judgment obviously was not based on the completed deal between Secretary Hull and Lord Lothian, for the transfer of the 50 destroyers for the naval-air bases was not announced by President Roosevelt until last Tuesday, September 3.

What he did base it on was the tortured opinion of four New York lawyers, which appeared in the New York Times, August 11—the opinion which Attorney General Jackson adopted in his amazing about face on the legality of the deal.

Before the deal or after, it is all the same so far as the question of the law is concerned. Everything which Dr. Briggs—an editor, incidentally, of the American Journal of International Law—said in condemnation of the transfer in advance of its consummation stands up now that it has occurred.

We quote directly from his memorandum for the force of his own utterance:

"It is shocking to find four distinguished members of the bar (Burlingham, Thacher, Rublee, and Acheson) preparing a brief to facilitate the sale of part of the United States Navy to a foreign power without congressional approval.

"They fail to prove that any law authorizes such a sale. Ostensibly they prove only that there is a loophole in the law through which the United States destroyers could be slipped to Britain. Their conclusion is reached:

"By suppression of pertinent information (par. 2, sec. 14, act of June 28, 1940, H. R. 9822); the full text of rule 1 of the Treaty of Washington of 1871; and the Hague Convention, XIII, section 6;

"By misrepresenting the purpose of section 14 of the act of June 28, 1940, and of section 7 of the Naval Act of July 9, 1940 (H. R. 10100);

"By obfuscating the legal issue through an irrelevant discussion of a ruling of the Attorney General of June 24, 1940; and

"By distorting the plain meaning of section 3 of title V of the act of June 15, 1917.

"Unfortunately for their efforts, no such alleged loophole exists, and the proposed sale would be illegal."

Expanding each of his indictments, Dr. Briggs showed how the obvious intent of section 14 of the act of June 28, 1940, was to restrain the Chief Executive from transferring our naval vessels to a foreign power. The administration, he points out, had been "caught red-handed in a scheme to release torpedo boats to Britain on the ground that the vessels were surplus or obsolete, although none of the boats had as yet been delivered." In the light of that situation, Congress decided to establish the safeguard of appropriate notice to the technical heads of the Army and Navy and provision for attendant publicity.

But that is only the first legal obstacle. Paragraph c of the same section, Dr. Briggs proceeds to demonstrate—and this paragraph was conveniently omitted from the letter of the four New York lawyers—provides that "nothing herein shall be construed to repeal or modify sections 3 and 6, title V, of the Act of June 15, 1917."

And this is the statute which not only says that "during a war in which the United States is a neutral nation, it shall be unlawful to send out of the jurisdiction of the United States any vessel built, armed, or equipped as a vessel of war," but goes on to make violation punishable by a fine up to $10,000 and imprisonment up to 5 years.

Dr. Briggs then takes up the hair-splitting distinction between vessels made for transfer to a warring foreign power and vessels already in existence before the transfer is proposed. Here he shows that the four lawyers and the Attorney General misread section 3 of the 1917 law.

For that section, based on the first rule of the Treaty of Washington of 1871, establishes "an obligation not only to use due diligence to prevent the fitting out for belligerent use, but also to use like diligence to prevent the departure from its jurisdiction of any vessel intended to cruise or carry on war as above, such vessels having been specially adapted, in whole or in part, within the jurisdiction, to warlike use."

Indicting the administration's lawyers for "suppressing this vital clause in order to prove its point," Dr. Briggs says, "There is no use for this sort of deception."

Finally, Dr. Briggs turns to international law, where he shows that the transfer is in direct violation of article 6 of the Hague Convention of 1907, which has been cited in the current war by the United States, Great Britain, Germany, Russia, and Norway as controlling international law. Pointing out that the lawyers' letter also failed to take notice of the Hague Convention, Dr. Briggs concludes his memorandum:

"In his public utterances, Secretary of State Cordell Hull has seldom failed to pledge the United States anew to the observance of international law. Even if acts of Congress are repealed, the destroyers cannot be transferred to Britain without violation of international law. Do we, in the United States, want our country to adopt Hitler's and Stalin's tactics of tearing up treaties like scraps of paper?"

The administration was not without benefit of this demolishing criticism of the reasoning—if so inappropriate a word may be used—on which it was to base the transfer. Chairman WALSH put the revealing letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for August 20 and there it may be found in its entirety on page 10560.

Dr. Briggs was right. This important issue was "not settled on its legal merits." But the legal argument did not go altogether by default. We honor him for his devotion to principles of law and order.

At the moment ours is a Government not of laws, but of men. When we return to the historic opposite in a saner day, the record will show that Cornell's professor of international law had the courage to stand up and tell the truth.

International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Stablemen, and Helpers Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 12 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered in Washington last evening by the President of the United States before the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Stablemen, and Helpers.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Tobin, members of the convention, during the past weeks, in several sections of the East, I have been inspecting the progress of our national defense. I have gone through navy yards and private yards to watch the building of destroyers, submarines, and aircraft carriers; I have visited aviation units to see our modern fighting planes; I have been in our great gun factories, where I have seen the most modern guns of all types swiftly being molded into shape; I have visited camps where young Americans are receiving training and instruction in the tactics of the warfare of today. Through it all there was the impressive conviction that America is rising to meet the ever-growing need for an adequate physical armed defense of the country.

Tonight in a very real sense I feel as I stand here that I am visiting another type of national defense, equally important in its own way in meeting the needs of the times. Enduring strength to a nation and staying power in an emergency definitely call for an efficient and determined labor force carrying on the processes of industry and trade. And when I speak of a "labor force" I very definitely include those who toil in their fields as well as those who toil in industry. Teamsters will be the first to assert that farmers labor too.

It is one of the characteristics of a free and democratic modern nation that it have free and independent labor unions. In country after country in other lands labor unions have disappeared as the iron hand of the dictator has taken command. Only in free lands have free labor unions survived. When union workers can assemble with freedom and independence in conventions like this, it is proof that American democracy has remained unimpaired—and it is symbolic of our determination to keep it free.

Yours is now one of the great international labor unions of America. You can remember, however, other days—days when labor unions were considered almost un-American by some individuals in our land. You can remember when it was rare indeed for an employer even to consider collective bargaining with his workers; when it was the common practice to discharge any worker who joined a union. You can remember when employers sought to meet threatened strikes by demanding that their Government—Federal or State—call out armed troops. You can remember when many large employers resorted to the un-American practice—still unfortunately followed in some sections of the country—of hiring labor spies and setting up private arsenals to ferret out members of a union.

The cause of labor has traveled forward since those days, over a road beset with difficulties, both from within its membership and from without. Your own organization is an outstanding example of the progress which has been made. By 1933 your membership had dropped to 70,000. Within the last 7 years you have grown to a membership of 500,000.

In those same 7 years organized labor as a whole has become stronger in membership, in influence, and in its capacity to serve the interests of the laboring man and woman and of society in general, than at any other time in our history. Much of this progress has been due to the one thing which this administration, from the very beginning, has insisted upon—the assurance to labor of the untrammeled right to organize and to bargain collectively with their employers. That principle has now become firmly imbedded in the law of the land; it must remain as the foundation of industrial relations for all times.

The principle has the support today not only of organized labor as a whole, but also of hundreds of thousands of decent, practical, forward-looking employers. A decade ago a minority of employers were willing to accept the principle of collective bargaining; today the majority of employers gladly adopt it.

And with that foundation, the last 7 years have seen a series of laws enacted to give to labor a fair share of the good life to which free men and women in a free nation are entitled as a matter of right. Fair minimum wages are being established for workers in industry; decent maximum hours and days of labor have been set, to bring about an American standard of living and recreation; child labor has been outlawed in practically all factories; a system of employment exchanges has been created; machinery has been set up and strengthened and successfully used for the mediation of labor disputes. Over them all has been created a shelter of social security—a foundation upon which is being built protection from the hazards of old age and unemployment.

This progress of the last 7 years has been difficult. It has been beset by obstruction and by bitter propaganda from certain minority groups in the community who had been accustomed for too many years to the exploitation of the great mass of people who worked for them. It was the same type of opposition to which I had become accustomed during my entire public career, dating back to my first election to the Senate of the State of New York 30 years ago this autumn, continuing through my service for nearly 8 years as Assistant Secretary of the Navy, and my service during 4 years as Governor of the largest labor-employing State in the Union.

You will remember that kind of opposition in the campaign of 4 years ago when certain employers, politicians, and newspapers—all of whom are now active in this campaign—in an effort to mislead and intimidate labor, went to the extent of putting untrue electioneering notices in pay envelopes in order to smash the new Social Security Act and force its repeal by electing its enemies.

That kind of opposition comes only too often from those who regularly for 3 years and 8 months block labor's welfare, and then for 4 months loudly proclaim that they are labor's true friends—from those who love the laboring man in November but forget him in January.

In spite of that opposition the vast majority of our small businessmen have now become convinced that the gains of labor are the gains of the entire interdependent community, and that the welfare of labor is indispensable to the welfare of all. They know now that their best customer is a satisfied, adequately paid worker with a feeling of security against unemployment and poverty in his old age.

We are still, however, quite distant from the objective which we seek—the security and the high standard of living for every man, woman, and child which the resources and manpower of America make possible.

Our advance has been accomplished with patience and deliberation. That is the democratic way; that is the road which leads to lasting results. Here in America we have kept our feet on the ground; our progress has been steady and sure; we have not been misled by illusory promises.

Events abroad have shown too late the result of the other kind of methods—promises of swift, revolutionary relief; seductive pictures of panaceas; short cuts to prosperity and plenty, pictured as simple and easy—all of these have led to the same cruel disappointment. For these promises people yielded up their liberties and all that made life dear. In exchange they have received only the rationing of their news, the rationing of their religion, the rationing of the clothes upon their backs, and the rationing of the bread upon their tables.

Our progress must continue to be a steady and deliberate one—we cannot stand still, we cannot slip back. We must look forward to certain definite things in the near future. For example, the benefits of social security should be broadened and extended; unemployment insurance should cover a larger number of workers. Our old age pension system must be improved and extended; the amount of the pension should be increased, and, above all, these pensions must be given in a manner which will respect the dignity of the life of service and labor which our aged citizens have given to the Nation.

It is my hope that soon the United States will have a national system under which no needy man or woman within our borders will lack a minimum old age pension which will provide adequate food, clothing, and lodging to the end of the road—without having to go to the poorhouse to get it. And I look forward to a system which, in addition to this bare minimum, will enable those who have faithfully toiled in any occupation to build up additional security for their old age which will allow them to live in comfort and happiness.

The people must decide whether to continue the type of government which has fostered the progress to date, or whether to turn it over to those who by their action, if not always by their word, have shown their fundamental opposition to the main objectives toward which we have worked in the past and to which we are definitely committed for the future.

There are some who would not only stop now the progress we are making in social and labor legislation, but would even repeal what has been enacted during the past 7 years—all on the plea that an adequate national defense requires it. They would seek unlimited hours of labor. They would seek lower wages. They would seek the cancelation of those safeguards for which we have all struggled so long.

I still believe, however, as I did when I said on May 26 last: "We must make sure in all that we do that there be no break-down or cancelation of any of the great social gains which we have made in these past years. * * * There is nothing in our present emergency to justify a retreat from any of our social objectives—conservation of resources, assistance to agriculture, housing, and help to the underprivileged."

Our mighty national-defense effort against all present and potential threats cannot be measured alone in terms of mathematical increase in the number of soldiers and sailors, or of guns or tanks or planes. Behind them all must stand a united people whose spiritual and moral strength has not been sapped through hunger or want or fear or insecurity. The morale of a people is an essential supplement to their guns and planes.

I am convinced that a break-down of existing labor and social legislation would weaken rather than increase our efforts for defense. Continuance of them means the preservation of the efficiency of labor. It means the return to work of several millions still unemployed.

The employment of additional workers and the provisions for overtime payments for overtime work will insure adequate working hours at decent wages to do all that is now necessary in physical defense. We will not overlook the lesson learned in Europe in past years.

At times, internal obstacles to the growth of labor unions have come in those rare instances where the occasional scoundrel has appeared in position of leadership. Labor unions are not the only organizations which have to suffer innocently for the crimes and misdeeds of one or two of their selfish and guilty members. The rule applies to all organizations, to all trades and professions alike.

I cannot add to the terms of condemnation which your President, my old friend Dan Tobin, included in his report to your convention in which he said:

"It is, indeed, pitiful and heartbreaking and seriously depressing to find that amongst our enormous membership, composed of clean men, fathers of families, Americans of the purest type—to find amongst this membership some creatures so bereft of decency and honor as to bring disgrace upon the international union."

Labor knows that there is no room in the labor movement for the racketeer or the strong-arm man. Government is determined to help labor unions clean their house of those few persons who have betrayed them.

In this great crisis has come proof that organized labor, as well as all other groups of our citizens, is aware of its own responsibilities. I have called on representatives of labor to serve, and have placed them in responsible positions to take part in, the defense work of their Government. From the very start representatives of labor, including your own distinguished president, have shared in formulating and administering the program.

I am particularly glad to be able to say that the A. F. of L., the C. I. O., and the railroad brotherhoods are all loyally cooperating in this effort with the National Defense Commission and with the Army and Navy. This cooperation in the task of national defense will, I hope, encourage closer and more friendly relations between these great labor organizations.

I know that America will never be disappointed in its expectation that labor will always continue to do its share of the job we now face, patriotically and unselfishly.

In our search for national unity as the basis of national defense, it is necessary and it is fair that every human being in the United States contribute his share. This applies both to those who train in the fighting forces and to the forces of workers behind the lines.

It is equally necessary and fair that every dollar of capital in America also contribute its share. Just so long as we continue to call upon men to train for combat, and for service behind the lines, will we also continue to call upon the industrial plants of the Nation for the service which they can give.

Capital and industry, as well as labor and agriculture, are responding, and I know will continue to respond.

The Nation, through its elected representatives, is now adopting the principle of selective universal training of its young men. On the same principle, no reasonable person can object to giving the Government the power to acquire the services of any plant or factory for adequate compensation if the owner refuses to make its services available to the defense needs of the Nation. This is nothing new in American life. The principle of eminent domain or eminent use is as old as democratic government itself. It merely permits government to acquire or to use, for a fair and reasonable price, any property which is necessary for its proper functioning.

The overwhelming majority of our munitions and other defense requirements are now manufactured by private enterprise under private management. We continue that process. It is only in the rare, isolated case that the owner of a plant will refuse to deal with his government in a fair way.

But if and when such case does arise, the Government cannot stand by helpless in its efforts to arm and defend itself. No business is above its government, and government should be empowered to deal adequately with any business which tries to rise above its government.

In all of these plans for national defense only those who seek to play upon the fears of the American people discover an attempt to lead us into war. The American people will reject that kind of propaganda of fear as they have rejected similar types which are occasionally spread at election time. They know that against the raging forces loose in the world the best defense is the strongest preparedness—fighting men and equipment in front and fighting industry and agriculture behind the lines.

Weakness in these days is a cordial invitation to attack. That is no longer theory; it is a proven fact—proved in the past year.

I hate war now more than ever. I have one supreme determination—to do all I can to keep war away from these shores for all time. I stand, with my party, upon the platform adopted in Chicago:

"We will not participate in foreign wars, and we will not send our Army, naval, or air forces to fight in foreign lands outside of the Americas, except in case of attack."

Let us have an end to the sort of appeasement which seeks to keep us helpless by playing on fear and by indirect sabotage of all the progress we are making. "Appeasement" is a polite word for misdirected partisanship.

In our efforts for national defense, fine teamwork has been developed—and you teamsters know what that word "teamwork" means.

The continuance of this teamwork, after the present emergency is over, will have consequences of lasting good to the Nation as a whole. It will enable us to enjoy an internal security transcending anything heretofore known.

Ours is a great heritage; we are determined with all our effort and might to keep it intact. The workers in the factories, the farmers on the land, and businessmen in plants and offices are awake to the perils which threaten America. No selfish interest, no personal ambition, no political campaign can sway the majority will of our people to make America strong—and to keep it free.

Senator Ashurst

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM CONNALLY

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 12 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON DAILY NEWS AND AN ARTICLE FROM THE CHATTANOOGA TIMES

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix an editorial appearing in the Washington (D. C.) News of Thursday, September 12, 1940, entitled "Mr. ASHURST Bows Out"; also an article written by William Pinkerton, published in the Chattanooga Times of Sunday, March 17, 1940, entitled " 'Moving Speech Will Never Die,' ASHURST Says; 'Microphone May Aid.' "

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Editorial From the Washington Daily News of September 12, 1940]

MR. ASHURST BOWS OUT

Gallant as ever, HENRY FOUNTAIN ASHURST stood on the floor of the Senate and paid tribute to the processes of democracy which have relegated him to retirement:

"A man only moderately versed in statesmanship, and with only a small degree of sportsmanship, is bound to admit that in a free republic, in a government such as ours, it is the undoubted right of the people to change their servants, and to remove one and displace him with another at any time they choose, for a good reason, for a bad reason, for no reason at all.

"It is the duty of the public servants not grumpily and sourly to accept the verdict of the majority, but joyously to accept the verdict of the majority if we are to have a free people. * * * I should be disingenuous if I failed to say that they (the people of Arizona) probably had some reasons for displacing me."

Toward those who had voted him out of office, he displayed not bitterness, but gratitude—gratitude because "they allowed me, during my entire service, to do as I pleased and to say what I pleased."

Thousands of editorial columns will be written of the eloquence, the erudition, the statecraft, the brilliance, the humor, the punctilicusness of the gentleman from Arizona. And in all those deserved tributes we wish to join.

But the one fine human characteristic of Senator ASHURST to which we would now address ourselves is this: He can take it.

In a country where today so many have grown soft and petulant, here is a man who meets vicissitude with high heart and gay smile. Where so many "small men of brief authority" are crying that they

alone are fit to rule, HENRY ASHURST bows gracefully out of public life.

He served in the Senate 28 years. He served with distinction, and he won wide acclaim. But his shirt was never stuffed.

[From the Chattanooga Times of March 17, 1940]

"MOVING SPEECH WILL NEVER DIE," ASHURST SAYS; "MICROPHONE MAY AID"

WASHINGTON, March 16.—Oratory, says Senator HENRY FOUNTAIN ASHURST, an orator's orator, will never die.

The microphone—forever pushed in front of the modern Cicero by newsreel, radio, and public-address men—may even nourish the old art of moving speech, he says.

Senator ASHURST is the pride of every speaker in Congress.

"The microphone," he said today, "has transformed many men of sloppy, snippy, slovenly speech into superb speakers. In the past 15 years it has made scores of thousands of excellent speakers.

"The microphone has seemed to eliminate those great banes of public speaking—overtone and overstatement.

"Superlatives in speech are usually evidences of a weary man or sometimes of an indolent man who does not seek a more nearly exact medium of expression."

ASHURST, who rose on a ladder of wondrous prose from cowhand to a leader's role in the Senate, admitted today that he had delivered only six or eight orations in his 28 years of public service. But he has made 4,000 speeches.

The Arizona statesman confessed, with candor, that his style of speech may be passing.

"I've long cultivated flaming, brilliant, rotund, gorgeous sentences," he explained. "But I would advise speakers of this era to use short, lance-like sentences."

This new hard-hitting manner is called forth, he explained, by the demands of the microphone, the need for simply put speech.

ASHURST has "studied oratory" for 45 years, reading over and over the great speeches of the past—Pitt, Demosthenes, Cicero, Webster, Clay, Calhoun, Douglas, Lincoln.

"And mark this well," he said, "the eloquence of Demosthenes (an early Greek) stands unapproachable, and has so stood for 2,300 years."

Friends visiting him at night still find the Senator "studying oratory." But he has passed on his learning to others, giving free-of-charge lessons in radio speech to younger statesmen and ambitious youths of the Capital.

Oratory, says this connoisseur, is not a studied art, but a wonderful thing that happens when the man and the occasion meet.

"In certain circumstances, most any citizen may make an eloquent and moving speech," he explained. "A fisherman, a sailor, a flock master, a cowboy, a mechanic who communicates to someone else his views, may be making what would be called an oration.

"I have heard men deliver powerful orations in the Senate—men who were not polished speakers, but who were moved by deep emotion of the moment. And some of our most moving speeches have been so because of the speaker's contempt for 'art.'

"Eloquent speech is more or less an outburst of sincere thought or emotion.

"When Cicero spoke," the Senator declaimed, "everybody said, 'how well Cicero speaks.' When Demosthenes spoke, everybody said, 'let us go against Philip.' That is oratory—speech so sincere that it moves people to join the speaker's cause."

The flailing arms, the pounding fist, and waving forelock that most persons think of as the sign of oratory have no fascination for ASHURST. He often has stood calmly in the Senate Chamber, quietly tearing an issue apart with cadenced humor.

"It is unnecessary to use gestures to attain great oratory," he declared. "In fact, I tell the young men who come to me it is better not to.

"A mere recital," he went on, "be it never so beautiful and artful; if involving no vital thing—it might be art, be beautiful—but it could hardly be an oration.

"Above all things," he added, "it is most important to be absolutely fair—fair, truthful, with as near an approach to accuracy as may be possible.

"Any departure from this rule, and the audience loses confidence in the orator, which, of course, is fatal to any hope of moving anybody."

ASHURST was sent to the Senate by the first legislature of Arizona and has been there ever since. But his fame as a master of good-tempered yet effective speech rose in recent years.

His orations have ranged from praise of Woodrow Wilson and condemnation of Huey P. Long to discourse on "the care and feeding of politicians" and eye-watering eulogies of the American cowboy and the old Palace saloon in Prescott, Ariz.

To tone up his voice for a major speech, ASHURST often sings a few verses of that old ballad, Abdul Abulbul Ameer. He chooses Abdul because of its vowels.

"In speaking, you need not worry about your consonants," he says. "Sound your vowels clearly and your speech will be understood."

Temporary National Economic Committee Has Not Proposed Regulation of Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES F. BYRNES

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 12 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, OF WYOMING

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an interesting and timely address delivered by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], who is chairman of the Temporary National Economic Committee, to the Section of Insurance Law of the American Bar Association at Philadelphia, Pa., on September 11, 1940, and which definitely lays at rest unfounded reports with respect to the insurance industry.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Let me begin this morning by making clear that neither the Temporary National Economic Committee nor any agency connected with it has ever recommended or suggested any legislation providing for Federal regulation of insurance, and that in participating, at the invitation of the officers of the section of insurance law, in this symposium, I do not appear in any sense whatsoever as an advocate of Federal regulation.

It is necessary for me to make this disclaimer because the country has been filled with rumors and reports ever since the beginning of the study of insurance for the Temporary National Economic Committee by the Securities and Exchange Commission that the secret and hidden purpose of the whole proceeding was to lay the basis for some law or laws cutting down the present power and authority of the States. As Chairman of the Temporary National Economic Committee, I have been obliged for more than a year to make denial of such purpose or intent, but my voice has apparently never caught up with the rumors and I have no doubt that this symposium today is the result of the same current of misunderstanding which has attributed to this committee intentions which it has never entertained.

As long ago as November 14, 1939, I wrote a letter to be read at a meeting of the Massachusetts Insurance Society, in which I stated explicitly that "there isn't the slightest basis for the intimations appearing in certain insurance journals that the committee, or any member of its staff, is promoting any scheme for Government competition with the insurance industry."

On February 1, 1940, on the floor of the Senate, in answer to an inquiry directed to me by Senator BYRNES, of South Carolina, "as to whether or not the Committee intends to recommend to the Congress that legislation be enacted providing for Federal supervision of insurance or for some agency of the Government going into the insurance business," I stated explicitly:

"I can say without reservation or qualification of any kind that the Committee has never met to consider recommendations with respect to insurance and no member of the Committee has ever suggested to the chairman that either of the policies which the Senator has just mentioned should be adopted or that any recommendation of that character should be made."

T. N. E. C. HAS NOT RECOMMENDED REGULATION

These are only two of many similar statements which I have made, but because of the persistence of the reports, I venture once again to declare, in the clearest and most emphatic terms, that the Temporary National Economic Committee has never entertained any proposal and the Securities and Exchange Commission and none of its staff has ever presented to the Committee any suggestion for Federal regulation of insurance, for the institution of any plan of Government competition with any branch of insurance, for any law respecting the agency system of selling insurance, or for any program for acquiring insurance company assets. All such reports are fantastic and baseless.

The interest of the Temporary National Economic Committee in the insurance industry has not proceeded from any desire to expand the power or authority of the Federal Government, but has resulted solely from its pursuance of the instructions which were laid upon it by the joint resolution which brought it into existence, to make a full and complete study of the concentration of economic power in and financial control over production and distribution of goods and services in order to determine the causes of such concentration and their effect upon competition.

There never has been the slightest cause for any misunderstanding of this purpose because in the message of President Roosevelt presented to Congress on April 29, 1938, urging the economic study; in the joint resolution which set up the Committee, and in repeated statements by the chairman of the Committee, it has been made clear over and over again that the primary objective of the whole proceeding is the stimulation of our traditional system of free, private enterprise. Never was there greater need in the history of civilization than there is now for united action in defense of the system of private enterprise because it has never stood in greater danger than it does now. With the leaders of the totalitarian states declaring their purpose to destroy both democracy and capitalism in words that cannot be misunderstood and by actions that are even more convincing, with practically all of Europe already subjected to their theory of political and economic government and with Great Britain almost beaten to her knees, certainly it must be clear to us that we cannot permit ourselves to give way to emotional misunderstanding or, I might say, misrepresentation of the purposes of any agency of our Government with respect to the fundamentals of human freedom and private enterprise.

I take the liberty, therefore, in this distinguished company of lawyers, to point out the specific proof of my statement that in its conception and in its whole procedure the Temporary National Economic Committee has devoted itself to the defense of free enterprise because I want no one to go out of this meeting without knowledge of this most important and fundamental fact.

PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT DECLARES FOR PRIVATE ENTERPRISE

In his message to Congress on April 29, 1938, urging an investigation of the concentration of economic power, President Roosevelt left no doubt of his purpose:

"If you believe with me in private initiative," said he, "you must acknowledge the right of well managed small business to expect to make reasonable profits."

Again he said:

"But generally over the field of industry and finance we must revive and strengthen competition if we wish to preserve and make workable our traditional system of free, private enterprise."

I could quote many other extracts from this message, but will content myself with the following sentence from the President's description of the fundamental purpose of the study he was recommending:

"It is a program to preserve private enterprise for profit by keeping it free enough to be able to utilize all our resources of capital and labor at a profit."

As already indicated, the resolution which created the Committee placed special emphasis upon the necessity of maintaining competition or, in other words, private enterprise, and finally, as chairman of the Committee, I have never lost an opportunity to state over and over again my deep conviction that the solution of the economic troubles of our people and of the world does not lie along the road of expanding government activity or government control over private enterprise, but upon the reduction of such control to a minimum and upon the stimulation and encouragement of free enterprise on the part of the people.

How does it come, therefore, that there should be so widespread a misunderstanding both of the purposes of this Committee and of the problem that confronts the world? A discussion of insurance and insurance law affords a convenient opportunity for suggesting the answer and I welcome the opportunity to participate. There could be no more appropriate forum in which to develop the subject than this, because, curiously enough, while the Temporary National Economic Committee has never suggested Federal regulation of insurance, the American Bar Association Committee on Insurance Law has definitely done so, and in times past it has been at great pains to try to prove that the business of insurance is in fact a part of interstate commerce and should be regarded as within the regulatory powers of the Federal Congress.

AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION RECOMMENDED FEDERAL CONTROL

In 1905 the predecessors of the gentlemen who make up this "Section of Insurance Law of the American Bar Association" to whom I am now speaking, concluded a very exhaustive report with this clear declaration:

"Your committee (of the American Bar Association) therefore recommend:

"1. Legislation by Congress providing for the supervision of insurance.

"2. The repeal of all valued policy laws.

"3. A uniform fire policy, the terms of which shall be specifically defined.

"4. The repeal of all retaliatory tax laws.

"5. Stricter incorporation laws in the several States as they affect the creation of insurance companies; and a Federal statute prohibiting the use of the mails to all persons, associations, or corporations transacting the business of insurance in disregard of State or Federal regulations" (Reports of American Bar Association, 1905, vol. XXVIII, p. 516).

If this recommendation had proceeded from any member of the Securities and Exchange Commission or of the Temporary National Economic Committee instead of from the American Bar Association, I shudder to think of the charges that would have been leveled at our heads.

But your predecessors were not alone in this position. The truth is that every specific suggestion for the expansion of Federal power over the insurance business with which I am familiar has proceeded either from the Bar Association or from the insurance companies themselves. In the Insurance Blue Book, published in 1877 from the offices of the Insurance Monitor and the Insurance Law Journal at 176 Broadway, New York City, I find on page 32 this interesting bit of history:

"The natural result of Federal success (in the Civil War) was the centralization of governmental authority. * * * Not alone was the concentration of power at Washington shown in political acts, in the control of the conquered territory, and the management of the national finances, but in the jurisdiction assumed by the Federal courts, and the whole spirit of their decisions. * * * It is no wonder that, under such circumstances, the attention of the agency companies was turned to Washington for protection against the aggressive acts of hostile legislatures. Relief from this source was strongly agitated during 1865 and 1866. In November 1865 the companies appointed a committee to draft a suitable national law and secure its passage by Congress. * * * An act was prepared accordingly providing for the appointment of an insurance commissioner by the President and the establishment of a bureau at Washington, where all deposits, fees, and other expenses of agency companies were to be exclusively paid, and their returns made for all other than local business."

INSURANCE COMPANIES SOUGHT FEDERAL REGULATION

The proposed bill was not enacted, but the effort of insurance companies to secure Federal regulation of insurance did not end. In 1892 there was introduced into Congress another bill to provide for Federal supervision. This bill was drafted at the direction of John M. Pattison, president of the Union Central Life Insurance Co. Again, in 1897, United States Senator Orville H. Platt, of Connecticut, a State which was the domicile then, as now, of some of the most important insurance companies in the country, introduced a Federal control bill substantially in conformity with the proposal of President Pattison, of the Union Central, and, curiously enough, the Supreme Court cases which are now cited by representatives of the insurance industry to deny the Federal power over insurance were brought at the instance of insurance companies for the express purpose of escaping State regulation and substituting Federal rule of insurance in its place.

In order that there may be no misunderstanding of my own position, I want to say at this juncture that I would not give my support to any legislative proposal which would have the effect of weakening the power of the States in the field of insurance law, and when I cite these instances of the activity of insurance companies to broaden the Federal power over insurance I do it for the purpose of making clear the unfortunate confusion of thought and purpose which beclouds our present-day approach to the modern economic problem.

From the very beginning of our history Americans have always sought to reduce Government interference with the activity of the citizen to a minimum. It is a normal and proper attitude of mind, and one with which I completely agree, for the supremacy of the natural person is fundamental to our way of life. As individuals we do not like to have the Government regulating or controlling what we do and as organizations of individuals we feel exactly the same way. But as organizations grow in power, the problem of government in its relation to them becomes increasingly more difficult, for organizations always tend to subordinate the individual. The history of our governmental establishment shows a clear parallel between the growth of the business organization and the growth of the Federal establishment in Washington. Precisely in the same degree that business organizations become national rather than local in their scope, the Federal law regulating business has been enlarged and this enlargement has proceeded at all periods, under all administrations, and without regard to mere political argumentation or aspiration.

HOW INSURANCE COMPANIES OPPOSED STATE REGULATION

I doubt if a more illuminating decision upon the problems of Government and business was ever written than that of Justice Field, in the case of *Paul* v. *Virginia* (8 Wall. 168), the first of the Supreme Court tests initiated by the insurance companies for the purpose of escaping further regulation and establishing the principle that Congress has the power, under the commerce clause, to regulate insurance. It is not necessary for me to tell this audience that the State of Virginia had passed a law requiring insurance companies incorporated in other States to make deposit with the treasurer of the State of certain bonds before a license to do business would be issued; that Paul, an agent for certain New York companies, made application for his license, refused to deposit the bonds and proceeded to engage in the business of selling insurance so as to provoke his arrest and throw the question into the courts. The brief filed on behalf of the insurance companies in their attack upon State regulation was based upon three contentions:

1. That a corporation created by the laws of a State is a citizen within the meaning of the Constitution.

2. That the constitutional power of Congress "to regulate commerce" does not exclude commerce carried on by corporations.

3. That the business of insurance is commerce, and that it is not within the power of a State to pass any law regulating insurance carried on among the States.

I need not here mention that Justice Field, in this case, ruled that a contract of insurance is a personal contract, and does not constitute that intercourse among the States which constitutes the commerce over which Congress has jurisdiction.

It is interesting to note, however, not only that this interpretation was rejected by the insurance companies, but that the committee on insurance of the American Bar Association in 1905 also argued that the business of insurance actually is interestate commerce, the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding. The following quotation from the 1905 report of the American Bar Association committee on insurance law is of interest:

"In view of the fact that in England insurance is regulated by the Board of Trade; in France, by the Minister of Commerce; in Norway, by the Commercial Registrar; in Austria, by the Tribunal of Commerce; and in the German Empire, by the Central Government, it is fair to affirm that insurance is commerce and has from the beginning been treated as such except in the cases in which the question has been incidentally discussed by the Supreme Court of the United States. It is, however, significant that the majority opinion in the lottery cases makes no reference whatever to the line of cases known as the insurance cases, and the reasonable deduction from this is that their authority has been weakened." (Reports of American Bar Association, 1905, vol. XXVIII, p. 507.)

Returning, however, to the case of *Paul* v. *Virginia*, we find the insurance companies arguing that in the interests of efficiency the Federal power should be supreme. "It cannot be supposed," says the brief, "that the Constitution—one of whose objects was to secure a more perfect Union—was intended to be less efficient in these respects than the Articles of Confederation had been. The defect in the Articles of Confederation was not that it imposed too great restrictions upon the powers of the States, but that it was wholly without the protection and support of a supreme Federal power."

This again was the tenor of the contention of the New York Life Insurance Co. in the case which it brought to decision in the October term of the Supreme Court in 1913 against Deer Lodge County, Mont. (231 U. S. 495). In that case counsel for the insurance company, which included Dean Roscoe Pound, of the Harvard Law School, went to great length to prove that a tax levied by the Montana county on certain assets of the company was "illegal, unlawful, and void, for that said defendant was without jurisdiction to levy or collect said tax, and the levy and collection thereof was and is a burden upon interstate commerce contrary to section 8, article I, of the Constitution of the United States." Seemingly, nothing was left unsaid to support the contention that the business of insurance, as carried on by the New York Life Insurance Co. in Montana, was interstate commerce. Special emphasis was laid upon the allegation that all decisions were rendered in New York, that the authority of the Montana representative was strictly limited, that applications were received solely for the purpose of transmission to the home office, and that the use of the United States mails was essential to practically every step in the transaction of the insurance business. It is appropriate to remark here that Justice Charles Evans Hughes, now Chief Justice, and Justice Van Devanter dissented from this decision.

In another case, *New York Life Insurance Co.* v. *Cravens* (178 U. S. 389), the company pointed out that it is a mutual company, and as such "was the administrator of a fund collected from its policyholders in different States and countries for their benefit," and it was pointed out not only that the modern business of life insurance had taken on a national and even an international character but that when *Paul* v. *Virginia* was decided insurance was "to a great extent local." The brief continued the argument, saying: "The great and commanding organizations of the present day had hardly begun the amazing development which has made them the greatest associations of administrative trusts in the business world." And for these reasons the insurance companies over a period extending from 1868 to 1913 have argued in the Federal courts for Federal supervision of insurance, while they have promoted until as late as the early years of the present century the introduction in both Houses of Congress of bills expanding the Federal power over the insurance business.

CORPORATIONS DO NOT HAVE RIGHTS OF CITIZENS

My purpose today is not to play upon the change of attitude by insurance companies but to survey these cases and these arguments in an effort to discern the nature of the economic problem with which we are contending. It is because, in my opinion, the case of *Paul* v. *Virginia* is explicit upon this point that I regard it to be of primary importance, not so much upon the question of whether insurance is or is not commerce within the meaning of the Federal Constitution but because this case clearly defines the difference between a citizen and a corporation. It was the contention of the insurance companies at a time when State regulation was felt by them to be too onerous that corporations were citizens under the Constitution and thus entitled, under section 2 of article IV, "to all privileges and immunities of citizens in the several States." In rejecting this argument, Justice Field reasserted the principle the violation of which through the world has been the chief cause of the distress and disorder that afflicts our era, namely, that the citizen for whom the Declaration of Independence was written and for whom the Constitution was drafted is the natural citizen, and not the artificial person created by law to carry on commerce.

Every lawyer in America well grounded in the history of his Government and in the development of our institutions must know this to be the fact. I have been proud to find it written in the Constitution of the State of Wyoming, which declares, in article I, section 33, that:

"Corporations being creatures of the State, endowed for the public good with a portion of its sovereign powers, must be subject to its control."

We have lost sight of this distinction and have persisted in treating the corporation as though it were a natural person, and in extending to it the very privileges and immunities of citizenship which under the decision of the Supreme Court it does not possess. The result has been that with the constantly growing power of economic organizations which have spread their realms across State lines, across oceans and continents, the natural person in the economic field has found himself outmatched and overpowered.

I think the language of Justice Field in Paul against Virginia should be read over and over again by every lawyer and every legislator in America. Let me read it to you who have gathered here:

"Now a grant of corporate existence is a grant of special privileges to the corporators, enabling them to act for certain designated purposes as a single individual, and exempting them (unless otherwise specially provided) from individual liability. The corporation being the mere creation of local law, can have no legal existence beyond the limits of the sovereignty where created. As said by this court in Bank of Augusta against Earle, 'it must dwell in the place of its creation, and cannot migrate to another sovereignty.' The recognition of its existence even by other States, and the enforcement of its contracts made therein, depend purely upon the comity of those States—a comity which is never extended where the existence of the corporation or the exercise of its powers are prejudicial to their interests or repugnant to their policy. Having no absolute right of recognition in other States, but depending for such recognition and the enforcement of its contracts upon their assent, it follows, as a matter of course, that such assent may be granted upon such terms and conditions as those States may think proper to impose. They may exclude the foreign corporation entirely; they may restrict its business to particular localities; or they may exact such security for the performance of its contracts with their citizens as in their judgment will best promote the public interest. The whole matter rests in their discretion.

"If, on the other hand, the provision of the Constitution could be construed to secure to citizens of each State in other States the peculiar privileges conferred by their laws, an extraterritorial operation would be given to local legislation utterly destructive of the independence and the harmony of the States. At the present day corporations are multiplied to an almost indefinite extent. There is scarcely a business pursued requiring the expenditure of large capital, or the union of large numbers, that is not carried on by corporations. It is not too much to say that the wealth and business of the country are to a great extent controlled by them. And if, when composed of citizens of one State, their corporate powers and franchises could be exercised in other States without restriction, it is easy to see that, with the advantages thus possessed, the most important business of those States would soon pass into their hands. The principal business of every State would, in fact, be controlled by corporations created by other States."

THE GROWTH OF ORGANIZED BUSINESS

This decision was prophetic. The condition Justice Field feared is now a reality. The principal business of every State in the Federal Union is today controlled by corporations created by other States not because of any change of principle and law but because modern business has taken on an increasingly national aspect. Nay, more than that, a large portion of the business of the world is now controlled by such corporations and, in my opinion, it was precisely because the statesmen and lawyers of Europe had completely lost touch with their inherited social wisdom that the present world crisis is upon us. Political freedom is being undermined because economic freedom has been lost. The economic state, outgrowing the geographical boundaries of the political state, has had effects upon the economic life of the people which the political states have not been able successfully to regulate in the public interest because economic organization and political organization are wholly out of adjustment. The consequence has been the growth of the totalitarian or socialist states and the attack upon both capitalism and democracy which now threatens civilization itself.

The rapid expansion of economic organization has been a world development to be noted here in America as well as in Europe. There is nothing hostile to the insurance industry or to those who are engaged in it in the fact that the studies of the Temporary National Economic Committee have demonstrated beyond cavil that a high degree of concentration of economic power and wealth exist in this industry. When this study began, Justice Douglas, then Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission, asserted that no policyholder need be concerned that the facts to be brought out in the testimony would in any way jeopardize the protection which he counts upon, and when the hearing was drawing to its conclusion I made an opportunity to say that "I am personally satisfied that there is not a single responsible official of any of these companies who is not as sincerely interested in restoring and promoting economic prosperity in the United States as is any public official." With respect to certain testimony that was produced to show that in the huge mutual companies policyholders exercise no function in the selection of their officers, I was careful to say, "So far as any testimony produced before the committee is concerned, all of these companies are operated in full compliance with the laws of the State by which chartered and in which they operate."

Ours was not another Armstrong committee, such as was led by Chief Justice Hughes a generation or more ago, to ferret out

wrongdoing by insurance executives or to pillory the insurance industry, individually or collectively. It was solely a study to determine the facts with respect to the effect upon our economic system of the concentration of assets which now are controlled in this business.

THE MAGNITUDE OF INSURANCE-COMPANY ASSETS

It is known, for example, to every inhabitant of this country who is alive to conditions that the problem of small business is one of the most serious with which we have to deal. Of almost two and one-half million business units in the United States, more than 90 percent have assets amounting to less than $250,000 each.

These units have difficulty in obtaining both credit and venture capital and the insurance companies to whom, through the payment of premiums, the savings of the people flow, can be of little help to them. The directors of insurance companies are trustees and when they invest the company assets they must place those assets in investments which they regard to be sound and in which the investment of insurance funds is permitted by law. They are not interested in providing venture capital and their size is so great that they are not interested in providing the small credit loans which small business requires. It is the securities of large industrial and commercial organizations or the securities of Government that appeal to the administrators of insurance-company assets, and our study showed that as of December 31, 1938, the 49 largest, legal, reserve life-insurance companies owned 11 percent of the direct and guaranteed debt of the United States Government; 9.9 percent of all State, city, and municipal and political subdivisional debt; 22.9 percent of all railroad bonds; 22 percent of the entire public-utility debt; 15 percent of the industrial debt; 11 percent of all farm mortgages; 14 percent of all city mortgages.

It is significant that of investments in which individuals are the borrowers, except in the case of policyholders borrowing on their own policies, only farm mortgages and city mortgages attracted insurance-company funds. In many instances city mortgages were taken out by large organizations, but in the case of both urban and rural mortgages, in which the natural person was a contracting party, the security was tangible real property.

The assets of insurance companies increased in the period between 1910 and 1938, less than 3 decades, from $3,867,000,000 to $27,755,000,000, or almost sevenfold, and the annual income of these companies now exceeds $5,000,000,000, thus approximating the annual receipts of the Government of the United States itself. To put it in another way the annual income of the companies today is greater than all the assets were 28 years ago. The striking fact is that the 5 largest life-insurance companies own more than half of all insurance-company assets. Of equal importance is the fact that 16 companies which are domiciled in New York, and in New England, hold 74.1 percent of all insurance-company assets. It is true that these assets are invested all over the country and premiums which are paid in by policyholders in every State, find their way back, in one way or another, into the individual States. Approximately 21 States receive in investments more than they contribute by way of premiums, but these investments, for the most part, are Government bonds, railroad bonds, utilities, and other industrial bonds and stocks of what we call big business, mortgages, real estate, and policy loans.

Thus do we find in the economic story of the insurance companies the reflection of our economic condition. This study is not an argument for any particular form of legislation. It is a part of the diagnosis of economic conditions or, in other words, the revelation of economic facts without which no sound judgment can be pronounced upon any program for the restoration of prosperity. There is nothing in this study, so far as I am aware, that is of any importance at all as turning upon the question of State control or Federal control of insurance or of any other industry. The significance goes much deeper. Indeed, it plumbs the depths of our modern dilemma for it has shown in a striking way the relation between the citizens as a natural person and the organizations which are created to serve the citizen and which ought to promote his individual and social welfare.

PROSPERITY OF PEOPLE COMES FIRST

If there is one thing clear to me as a result of this study, it is a very simple fact which no one will deny, but which we seldom take time to consider, namely, that the prosperity of any corporation or of any government depends first, last, and all the time upon the prosperity of the individual. The success of the insurance industry has been a result of the fact that the commodity which it has to sell is security and safety for the natural person. If the natural person is not safe and secure, if he is without property, if he is without employment, if he does not know where his next meal is coming from, he is a source of danger to both business and government and the salvation of democratic institutions depends entirely upon the degree to which economic and political organizations make it possible for natural persons to have jobs, to own property, and to pursue their happiness in peace and security.

There never has been a time in the history of our Government that this has not been the fundamental concept of our people, nor has there ever been a time since the Constitution was drafted that, as a Nation, we have failed to place the interests of people first. In both sectors of our dual Government, through the State legislatures and through the Federal Congress, we have pursued an undeviating course of legislation upon the principle that human rights come before property rights. We have tried to keep authority local because we believe in the freedom of the individual, but when local authority has proved to be inadequate for the protection of human rights, we have not hesitated to turn to Federal authority.

The Congress of the United States has been reluctant to use the commercial power to impose rigid regulation upon the business activity of the citizen, either as an individual or in groups, and laws have been enacted only when abuses became so great that they could no longer go without a remedy. In the courts, as well as in the legislatures, we have preferred to keep our governmental functions as close to the people as possible.

This explains decisions like Paul against Virginia and New York Life Insurance Co. against Deer Lodge. In each instance a State statute was being construed and the court was not oblivious of the fact that to invalidate the statute would mean to destroy a regulation in the public interest which the States had deemed it wise to impose in a field in which the Federal Government had not yet acted. The fact that the Federal Government does not exercise a power granted to it by the Constitution does not, of course, deprive the Federal Government of that power and the history of our business legislation demonstrates conclusively that as business becomes more and more concentrated, as it becomes more national and international in its scope, the inevitable result is the expansion of the Federal power.

We have seen the steady extension of this power since the Civil War keeping pace with the national growth of commerce and industry. We saw the National Bank Act in 1864 followed in due course by the Interstate Commerce Act, by the Federal Trade Commission Act, the Securities and Exchange Commission Act, the Radio Commission Act, and the like, each a direct result of a growing need for the protection of the individual in an increasingly complex economic world. Even today in the field of insurance there is, for example, no effective State power to regulate the sale of insurance by radio or the sale of insurance by mail. In these as in many other instances, the expansion of business has followed in the wake of scientific progress. This illustrates how the adjustment of State power and Federal power is constantly changing its forms and why it is difficult, if not impossible, to draw the line of demarcation anywhere in the field of commerce between State power and Federal power.

DEMOCRACY NEEDED BOTH IN BUSINESS AND GOVERNMENT

This distinction is not in fact of any great importance as long as the Government belongs to the people. The important distinction is the line which divides the rights of the individual from the collective power of groups of individuals, whether that collective power is exercised by business or Government organizations. When it is oppressively exercised by business organizations it takes on the vices of monopoly. When it is arbitrarily exercised by Government it assumes the vices of tyranny. The mistake which is being made in the totalitarian states of Europe is the belief that only arbitrary government can furnish an antidote for the failure of huge business organizations to provide social justice. Arbitrary government is not the remedy for arbitrary economic power. It is not necessary to substitute collectivism in government, run by political dictators, for collectivism in business, run by economic despots. It is only necessary to learn how to adjust the huge economic power represented in the modern corporation to the social needs of the natural person.

The whole purpose and function of the Temporary National Economic Committee has been to marshall the significant facts of our modern organized economy in order that the patriotic good sense of our leaders in business and in government may assert itself in such a way as to preserve democracy and the right of private property, to keep people free, and to keep business free, and to guarantee to the natural persons who compose the population of America the prosperity and happiness for the achievement of which we certainly have the resources if only we have the intelligence and the tolerance to use them for the benefit of all. Thus can we continue to make government in America an instrument of liberty.

Is Constitutional Government On Its Way Out?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 9, 1940

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, President Roosevelt and his chief political spokesman, Henry Wallace,

the candidate for Vice President, as well as other supporters of the New Deal administration, are striving their utmost to make it appear that Mr. Roosevelt is running against Adolf Hitler in the campaign.

Of course, the technique of the New Deal administration is unchanged. From the day it went into power the scheme of the New Deal has always been to kick up so much dust, to create so much fear and excitement, and to put so many issues before the people that they would be blinded to the fallacies and the failures of the administration.

It has now become perfectly obvious that the administration is entirely willing to use the war issue and to involve us in controversies with foreign nations in order to divert the attention of the people from the gross and insolent violation of the anti-third-term tradition; and from the failure of the administration to solve the unemployment problem, the farm problem, any problem that faced the Nation at the time the New Deal went into power.

It is, of course, understandable that the new dealers would thus attempt to divert the attention of the people from the real domestic issues of this campaign and from this constant drive toward a totalitarian government in this country. Nobody, from President Roosevelt down, dares go before the people on the issue of a third term, or on any issues of solving the domestic problems which are vastly more immediate and more dangerous to this Nation than is that of any invasion by a foreign foe.

If constitutional government goes down in the United States, and the liberties of our people are lost, it will be by assault from within and not by assault from without. If our economy disintegrates, it will be from failures of the administration, in the last 8 years, to solve those problems and to relieve those stresses which tend toward disintegration of our economic system, and not from any pressures from without.

If this Government fails, if this Nation loses its liberty, it will be because of an arrogant political bureaucracy built up by the New Deal; because of a national debt driven through the roof by the extravagances of this arrogant and all-powerful bureaucracy; because of the discontent of millions of Americans to whom the New Deal has offered the W. P. A. as a permanent way of life; because of the manufactured fears and the simulated panics, and the fictitious emergencies that have been brought up 67 or 68 times in the last 8 years, in order to frighten the people of this Nation into consenting to clothe Mr. Roosevelt with dictatorial powers.

Put the third-term issue alongside the method of trading off the 50 destroyers and see what sort of a prospect it gives this Nation under 4 years more of the New Deal. Mr. Roosevelt seized an occasion to present to the Congress and the people an accomplished fact—a fact established under the most un-American secrecy, and by the most un-American dictatorial means. If the gentleman gets 4 years more in the White House, there will follow inevitably a whole flock of faits accompli, achieved in exactly the same way—by secrecy and by dictatorial methods.

There are two great issues now confronting this Nation. One is Mr. Roosevelt's brazen demand for perpetuity in office. The Chicago convention did not draft Mr. Roosevelt, Mr. Roosevelt drafted the Chicago convention. The second great issue is whether or not the people are to say whether their Navy is to be traded off, whether their tanks—obsolete though they be—and our best airplanes and guns essential to our national defense are to be secretly dickered away, and finally as to whether or not the President shall have the power sooner or later to declare our whole Army obsolete, and turn that over to some foreign ally.

And back behind that stands a third issue—the issue of solving our domestic problems which threaten the peace and security of this Nation. The people will have a chance to make their decision at the ballot boxes next November.

Aid by the United States to Great Britain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAUDE PEPPER
OF FLORIDA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 12 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

RADIO DISCUSSIONS ON THE FORUM OF THE AIR

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two discussions which took place on the American Forum of the Air dealing with the subject of aid to Great Britain by the United States, one discussion taking place on August 25, 1940, the other on September 1, 1940. The first discussion dealt with the subject, Shall the United States Make Available to England Some of Its World War Destroyers, and the second discussion dealt with the subject How Far Shall the United States Aid Great Britain? Several Senators participated in the discussion.

There being no objection, the matters referred to were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[The American Forum of the Air, August 25, 1940]

SHALL THE UNITED STATES MAKE AVAILABLE TO ENGLAND SOME OF ITS WORLD WAR DESTROYERS?

(Senator Claude Pepper, of Florida; Senator Gerald P. Nye, of North Dakota; Senator John A. Danaher, of Connecticut; Col. Henry Breckinridge, noted lawyer and formerly Assistant Secretary of War)

Announcer Stephen McCormick. Listeners from coast to coast are invited to hear the American Forum of the Air. We bring you another program presented by WOL in cooperation with WOR, emanating from the Willard Room of the Willard Hotel, in Washington, D. C.

Information on how to obtain a copy of tonight's proceedings will be given at the conclusion of the broadcast.

Tonight the American Forum of the Air will be presented in two parts. First you will hear prepared statements. This will be followed by an informal panel discussion.

This series of educational discussions now in its twelfth year is arranged and directed by Theodore Granik, founder and director of the American Forum of the Air and of the American Forum, a nationally syndicated newspaper feature. Mr. Granik presides as chairman and moderator.

Mr. Theodore Granik. Thank you, Mr. McCormick. As the world awaits the long-heralded battle of Great Britain, America is faced with a vital decision—upon which may depend the fate of the British Empire—and perhaps our own national defense and safety.

Some say that England has lost heavily in destroyers; and if she loses more, say military experts, she may lose control of her coastal seas, a vital blow to the heart of her empire.

In a dramatic radio broadcast to the Nation and to the world, General John J. Pershing, World War commander of the American forces, recently made a strong appeal for immediate action to aid the British Fleet. He urged the United States to help Great Britain by making available at least 50 of our overage destroyers left from the World War.

Similar appeal was made by William C. Bullitt, Ambassador to France, who urged the transfer of these destroyers to Britain on the grounds that Germany is certain to attack the United States if Britain is defeated.

These appeals have aroused widespread controversy. Supporters of these views describe Great Britain as the only nation left to defend democracy and liberty in Europe, and maintain that the way to defend the American heritage is to do everything within America's power to aid Great Britain.

Opponents, however, stress the need of doubling the size of our Navy, point to the appropriations that have passed Congress to make it so, and ask how much we can spare out of a navy that's only half big enough—especially if the emergency confronting the United States is as serious as some maintain?

And while William Allen White, noted Kansan editor and chairman of the Committee to Defend America by Aiding the Allies, claims that if Britain falls, the United States is left overwhelmed in naval strength, standing alone and friendless in the world; others charge that such transfer makes mockery of our declared policy of neutrality and nonintervention and that it would be an act of belligerency and of war.

As the Nation ponders this vital question, the American Forum of the Air presents a discussion on the subject tonight.

We are privileged to have as our speakers Senators Claude Pepper, of Florida; Gerald P. Nye, of North Dakota; and John A. Danaher, of Connecticut; and Col. Henry Breckinridge, noted lawyer and formerly Assistant Secretary of War.

Following short prepared statements by each of our participants, they will engage in an informal, extemporaneous, round-table panel discussion.

We cordially invite our listening audience to send us their letters and comments on tonight's presentation.

And now our opening speaker, Senator PEPPER.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR CLAUDE PEPPER

"The time has come when we must rise up as a united people to make secure our country's independence and our great inheritance of constitutional liberty. If the destroyers will save the British Fleet, they may save us from the danger and hardship of another war." In those moving words, the greatest soldier of our time, General Pershing, to the American people appealed, as I am appealing tonight to send to Britain the aid which she needs and which we can spare.

We have 236 destroyers, more than 100 of which, built for the World War, were condemned as obsolete and selling for $5,000 apiece until the war broke out, when, under the state of limited emergency, the Secretary of the Navy undertook to recondition them. Upon Britain's much-reduced number of destroyers has fallen the heavy and crucial task of guarding the entire sea lanes that lead to England and convoying the ships that bring to England the food and the materials that enable her to continue the fight. Submarines, dive bombers, and now shore batteries have taken heavy toll of those destroyers. Today Great Britain may have no more than 100 destroyers in active service. The addition of 50 of ours, which can be in Britain's hands in 10 days, added to their present small force, may be the difference between victory and defeat.

Misguided men who argue we are endangering our safety by abandoning vessels necessary to our safety entirely misunderstand the role of the American Fleet. Destroyers, like all other warships, are not built to keep at home. They are built solely to keep the enemy from our shores. These 50 World War destroyers could be of no higher service to their country's safety than if by maintaining England's naval supremacy they can keep England's enemy and our own from the shores of the United States. The destruction of the British Navy would be the turning point of our Atlantic Maginot Line. As Admiral Stanley said, the Atlantic is our protection only so long as the control of that ocean rests with us or our friends. When the control passes to an enemy, this ocean becomes a broad highway by which the enemy can throttle and destroy us.

The destruction of the British Fleet even without its addition to that of the dictators would leave us faced in each ocean with a navy superior to our own or any that we can built in the next 5 years. With the British Fleet making common cause with us, ready to aid us in the defense of our country and our continent that might be attacked, there is no navy or combination of navies in the world which can put an enemy upon our soil.

As has been pointed out, we have not really had to defend the Monroe Doctrine with a navy of our own for over a hundred years, because no enemy could get through the British Navy to this hemisphere from the exits of Europe. The American Continent cannot be defended by one navy of less than colossal proportions, because, although you may not realize it, there are 43,000 miles of coastline around the Western Hemisphere from Iceland, by Cape Horn, to Alaska. It is only 1,600 miles from a great harbor on the west coast of South Africa which, with the British Fleet out of the way, will fall into German and Italian hands, to the bulge of the east coast of Brazil, while it is 3,300 miles from the United States to that point. It will not take two navies to defend this continent if the British Navy is out of the way, even considering it is not in German hands; it will take three navies, one to watch the Japanese in the Pacific, one to patrol this continent, and another to stop an enemy on the other side of the Atlantic. Of course, if the British Navy were to fall into German hands, as the French Navy did, as the German Navy fell into the hands of the Allies in 1918, we would be so overwhelmingly outclassed in naval strength that our enemies in combination could land an army upon this continent, if not upon this country, at any time they chose to do so.

Of course, at colossal expense, we are almost doubling the American Navy, and justly so; but it takes 4 years, even if our yards were not crowded, to build a battleship, 3 years to build a cruiser, 1 to 2 years to build a destroyer.

Hitler, in possession of all the shipyards of Europe from Norway to the Mediterranean, and certainly if he had the great shipyards of England, would be able to outbuild us at least three to one in naval construction. These are not fancies—they are facts which responsible leaders and statesmen must take into account in the formulation of national policy and national defense.

Listen to these words of Hitler: "Each country will imagine that it alone will escape. I shall not even need to destroy them one by one. Selfishness and lack of foresight will prevent each fighting until it is too late."

Day by day increased evidence comes to hand that the destruction of the United States is part of Hitler's plan. His book, Mein Kampf, makes it clear. Rauschning, once his lieutenant, has added that, "In the National Socialist view, the political situation in America is unstable and can be developed into an outright revolution; to do this is both a tactical aim of national socialism, in order to hold America aloof from Europe, and a political one in order to bring both North and South America into the new order. But it is tactics of universal menace national socialism is preparing to occupy the key possessions for colonial domination, for domination of the great sea routes, and for the domination of America and the Pacific.

When Hitler gathered his forces to strike at Czechoslovakia in the fateful summer of 1938, Chamberlain turned away speaking of Czechoslovakia as "a far-away country of which we know nothing."

Britain today is paying dearly for that mistake.

When Hitler gathered his forces to strike at France in the spring of 1940, the French people waited, secure in the belief that the Maginot Line was an impassable barrier.

France today is paying dearly for her mistake.

Today some people in America are still referring to Britain as "A far-away country of which we know nothing." Some people still see in the rapidly narrowing Atlantic Ocean an impassable barrier, as the French people saw the Maginot Line.

Tomorrow we may pay dearly for that mistake.

Chairman GRANIK. Thank you, Senator PEPPER. Our next speaker, Senator JOHN A. DANAHER, of Connecticut. Senator DANAHER.

ADDRESS OF SENATOR JOHN A. DANAHER

Thank you, Mr. Granik. Good evening, friends, both seen and unseen.

The question before us for discussion is, Shall the United States make available to England some of its World War destroyers? The immediate answer is, Yes, if the United States wishes to engage in war. Let there be no mistake upon that point. If the United States as a Nation supplies war vessels to another nation at war, the United States will be in that war. England knows this, and that is why she really desires a political commitment from us, not our old destroyers.

In my 6 minutes tonight, I approach the question as one whose first duty is owed to the United States of America as a nation, and I regard our own national interests as paramount.

On June 15, 1917, President Woodrow Wilson approved the statute now on the books which reads, in part: "During a war in which the United States is a neutral nation, it shall be unlawful to send out of the jurisdiction of the United States any vessel built, armed, or equipped as a vessel of war, or converted from a private vessel into a vessel of war, with any intent or under any agreement or contract, written or oral, that such vessel shall be delivered to a belligerent nation * * * after its departure from the jurisdiction of the United States." Obviously, then, at the outset any attempt by anyone to send out such war vessels to belligerents is unlawful by our own declaration.

When we passed the Defense Act 8 weeks ago, Congress said: "Nothing herein shall be construed to repeal or modify the statute" I just referred to. Only 1 month ago the Congress again said: "No vessel, ship, or boat now in the United States Navy or being built, or hereafter built therefor, shall be disposed of by sale or otherwise, or be chartered or scrapped, except as now provided by law." This is the law of the United States.

In the Hague Convention which we signed, we as a nation expressly agreed that the law among nations should read: "The supply, in any manner, directly or indirectly, by a neutral power to a belligerent power, of warships, ammunition, or war material of any kind whatever, is forbidden."

We have uniformly condemned those nations which have broken their treaties, and I believe our foreign policy should demand a longer view of world affairs than is to be found in advocating a breach by our United States of its own treaties and conventions.

During our Civil War Great Britain fitted out the *Alabama* and other war vessels for use against the North. After the war our claims against Great Britain led to a treaty concluded right here in Washington on May 8, 1881, by the terms of which the United States and Great Britain bound themselves, and they agreed—and I quote: "A neutral government is bound first to use due diligence to prevent the fitting out, arming, or equipping, within its jurisdiction, of any vessel which it has reasonable ground to believe is intended to cruise or to carry on war against a power with which it is at peace; and also to use like diligence to prevent the departure from its jurisdiction of any vessel intended to cruise or carry on war. * * * And the high contracting parties agree to observe these rules as between themselves in future, and to bring them to the knowledge of other maritime powers."

The United States of America collected from Great Britain $15,000,000 in gold as damages for England's part in the affair. Why, since the present war began our own Secretary of State called a conference at Panama in which on October 3, 1939, the foreign ministers of all the American republics in the Panama Convention resolved—and I quote, in part: "That with regard to their status as neutrals, there exist certain standards recognized by the American republics applicable in these circumstances, and that in accordance with them, they shall prevent the setting on foot of any military, naval, or aerial expedition in the interests of the belligerents, the fitting out or arming of any ship or vessel to be applied in the service of one of the belligerents, to cruise or commit hostilities against another belligerent."

We called that convention. It was the United States who stimulated this agreement by which our American republics condemned

the arming or fitting out of ships or vessels to be employed in the service of one of the belligerents. That is our own language. Suppose Brazil or Argentina turned over their warships to Germany—one of the very things the convention conceivably was designed to prevent. What status or standing will our word and our position have among these nations if we are to violate what we ourselves said is the law?

No, my friends; in our own national interest the United States of America must regard principle even if she is the only Nation in the world doing so.

Supplying any destroyers to England is a recognized act of war, and the American people should fully realize it.

There is many another reason why we should not send our destroyers to England, but let me read the warning issued by Thomas Jefferson, who said: "I have ever deemed it fundamental for the United States never to take an active part in the quarrels of Europe. Their political interests are entirely distinct from ours. Their mutual jealousies, their balance of power, their complicated alliances, their forms and principles of government, are all foreign to us. They are nations of eternal war."

It doesn't make any difference how old the destroyers are. They are in commission. We have no allies, not even one. Nobody is fighting our war. But if we make available some of our destroyers for use in her war, which she declared without any conference with us, inevitably we enter that war. So I answer the question, absolutely no. I believe our Nation should stay out of that war.

Chairman GRANIK. Thank you, Senator DANAHER. And as our third speaker we present Col. Henry Breckinridge, noted lawyer and former Assistant Secretary of War. Colonel Breckinridge.

ADDRESS BY HENRY BRECKINRIDGE

The United States should make available to England some of its World War destroyers.

An increasing number of Americans are coming to realize that they are not watching a thrilling movie but are in the midst of the greatest human crisis since Genghis Khan and his Mongol horde ravaged nearly all the known world and perilously threatened the utter destruction of western civilization. In treachery, terror, and tyranny, Hitler with his jackal Mussolini are the greatest threat ever made to civilized man in the annals of modern history.

For weal or woe, during a century, consciously or unconsciously, the peoples of the Western Hemisphere have builded their policy and their armament on the fact that the Atlantic is controlled by the British Fleet. Whether or not we like the English is beside the point. For the last quarter of a century the United States has maintained its fleet in the Pacific for the security of our defenses in that ocean. To build a gigantic navy adequate for our protection in both oceans, to munition it, to man it with trained personnel would take at least from 5 to 7 years, and cost prodigious sums, and then not give security even if we are not attacked before that time. For if Britain falls, Hitler comes into control of a shipbuilding capacity six to eight times our own.

Unless the Munich umbrella has become the immutable symbol of the dying democracies of the world, the United States will not permit the conquest of the British Isles without doing everything in its power to prevent it. It is my profound conviction that the conquest of Britain by the tyrants will spell the doom of American liberty, if not the actual destruction of its independence. In case of that catastrophe, survival alone can be obtained by America concentrating every dollar of its income over the bare cost of subsistence on creating an invincible armed camp.

Fifty destroyers to England today may be worth five hundred to us 5 weeks from now. They may turn the tide of battle against our declared enemies. If Rauschning can be believed, Hitler has already outlined to him in the past his plan for the destruction of America. Hitler's even less discreet jackal, Mussolini, in his very formal declaration of war, indicated the United States as one of his enemies.

Let us be realists and look the facts in the face. In the Pacific the only potential enemy with a great sea power is Japan. We have no intention of waging offensive war against Japan. Fifty World War destroyers turned over instantly to Great Britain will not affect seriously the defensive power of the United States against the Japanese Fleet. Our preponderant strength in capital ships, our heavy and light cruisers, our other destroyers and submarines are by wide margin sufficient to keep the Japanese Navy west of Hawaii. Fifty destroyers added to the British defense forces this moment may well avoid the necessity some day of sustaining united attack upon us by the German, Italian, and Japanese Navies, reinforced by the captured remnants of the British and French Navies.

Britain needs no more capital ships. They are virtually useless in the narrow waters where the vortex of the battle now rages. Large ships must have room for maneuver with advance elements, cruisers, destroyers, and submarines. Small craft are the vital necessity in the present stage of the battle in the English Channel.

Send the destroyers, and send them now. In conjunction with other elements of the British Fleet and the British air power, they will take their toll of the enemy of mankind. Let us not be deluded by the American counterpart of the men who brought to ruin every free nation of western Europe, and led a sleeping Britain to the verge of the abyss. Let us not leave to historians the task of analyzing the cause of our downfall, but let us take every practical step to avert it. The immediate essential is to send these destroyers to Britain in the hour of her need. No greater service to the security and interest of the United States ever can be rendered at so small a cost. Beyond the considerations of materialism and security we shall make a vital contribution to the freedom of mankind.

This is a war of annihilation. Starting with the blinding and enslavement of their own peoples, Hitler and Mussolini are on the march to destroy free civilization. Only their own destruction can accomplish the resurrection of the peoples who lie stunned and crushed under their iron heel. If America, confused by a Babel of tongues, divided by fallacy and sophistry, fails to act, it will court and suffer calamity.

Chairman GRANIK. Thank you, Colonel Breckinridge. And as our concluding speaker we present Senator GERALD P. NYE, of North Dakota. Senator NYE.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR GERALD P. NYE

My answer to the question is most emphatically "No!"

To sell, lease, give, or trade destroyers belonging to the United States to Great Britain or any other party to the present wars would be to plant ourselves in the middle of war as an actual belligerent and to seriously weaken our own defense.

For the very first time in our life, as a Nation, we are being told that our very existence is dependent upon the British Navy and the British Empire, the only power that has ever openly threatened the Americas, the only European power that has ever brought aggression to the Americas.

This is but a continuation of that campaign of fear which can push us further into Europe's war.

What we are urged to fear is that the downfall of Britain will be followed by a Hitler conquest against America. Those who plant fear in the public heart about the inadequacy of our defense are quite the very same people who advocate dispensing with such defense as we already have in the name of helping the Allies with acts short of war, selling or giving them our guns, our destroyers, our planes, these things we need in our own defense.

These destroyers proposed for sale to England were built during the last war. This present emergency has caused them to be reconditioned and recommissioned. They now are ready as a mighty weapon in our hands in the event of attack from abroad, an essential part of our defense. If the worst that fear advocates fear is to come out of the present war against Britain, and Hitler is to be free to concentrate against us, that fleet of destroyers, not the British Navy, are going to be our grand friends and possessions.

We are told each day that our great danger lies in the surrender of the British Navy to Germany if and when Britain is defeated. Now then, what rhyme or reason is there in a program that makes available to Germany our own ships to use against us when she takes over the British Fleet? Are we going to repeat everlastingly that folly and policy that found France surrendering to Germany many American-made planes for use against England?

Grave fear is expressed lest a victorious Hitler would blow up the Panama Canal while a considerable part of our fleet was over in the Pacific. Such would leave us without sufficient naval resistance on the Atlantic coast, it is argued, largely by the same people who insist that we give England a substantial part of that naval strength we do have on the east coast—these destroyers. But these possibilities do give us an obligation. We must keep and afford an adequate preparedness. The last thing we can afford to do is to lose what we already have for use in such an event, these destroyers and more.

It is argued that we should send our destroyers to England to help her resist invasion, beat Hitler, and thus serve and insure our own national security.

Now then, if our own security and interest requires the sending of 50 or more of our destroyers to England, why not send enough to make certain that invasion is resisted, even though it might require our entire Naval Establishment with our men. Why, in the name of a national interest, send just old ships, why not send them the newest and the best that we have? If there is undertaking to honestly answer that question, the answer will be mine to the question: "Shall we make available to England some of our World War destroyers?" If it were true that we should aid England because she is fighting our war, we would do better to get into it with all we've got rather than a few destroyers. We'd be in a sorry state indeed if England not only lost the war but our destroyers too.

Suppose, now, that with our 50 or more destroyers England successfully resists invasion. Will these destroyers then be turned to another task and be used in a British invasion of Europe to accomplish the obliteration of that constant threat of totalitarian powers? Ah, think what more than destroyers will be necessary to accomplish this—tanks, material, planes, and landing forces. To insure this freedom, will we then follow through and furnish that more that is needed? Mr. Churchill says this war is only a continuation of the last, which it is indeed. Mr. Churchill, of course, would wish us to make common cause with Britain to the extent of furnishing the destroyers, at this time. But what besides destroyers when destroyers are not enough to finish in a full way this continuation of the last war?

We need not be foolish however blind we may be to the real purpose behind this British appeal for our destroyers. The military demonstrations abroad, the invitation-to-trouble conduct of our foreign policy by this administration, and plain common sense

dictate our need for an improved defense. We have appropriated billions to provide additions to our existing defense. Our destroyers, all of them, new, old, and on order, are a part of that defense. Those in authority who dare speak, like Chairmen WALSH and SHEPPARD, of the Navy and Military Affairs Committees of the Senate, insist that we cannot spare one of these destroyers, that we need them ourselves.

To be sure, we can feel much more secure if Britain wins her continuation war against Hitler. Quite aside from that element of security for ourselves, we all want Britain to win. But we owe another consideration, a first consideration, one to ourselves, to our own country. We owe America the kind of defense that we can meet the worst that might result from Europe's war and the war in Asia, the most complete defense we can afford. We are certainly not going to be affording that by going on with a program that finds us dispossessing ourselves of that part of our defense which is ready at hand and placing our dependence alone upon the defense that is still "on order."

Chairman GRANIK. Thank you, Senator NYE.

And this concludes part one of tonight's American Forum of the Air presentation. And now as part two we present an informal, extemporaneous, round-table panel discussion.

Senator PEPPER, will you open the discussion?

Senator PEPPER. Mr. Granik, as I have listened to the discussion of these gentlemen who take the negative, I have been impressed by the fact that they seem to regard this struggle that is now going on in Europe as another world heavyweight champion fight, or perhaps a world series baseball game. They indicate they have some inclination to prefer one over another, but they don't seem to think that the issue of this war is going to have any more to do with their lives and their country's future and its destiny than perhaps a baseball game or a prize fight would.

On the contrary, this is one of those revolutionary movements which come along in an age of history and must either embrace or destroy everything that lives in the same world with it. This is not just a contest between two nations or groups of nations for territory in Europe. If it were, we really wouldn't care who won the war. That is a matter not of our concern. But if a nation and a group of people for 7 years before the whole world declare to the world that they are determined to make over that world and to destroy every democratic and religious and spiritual concept that world has, and they destroy in the course of a few months 7 nations of the civilized world, and announce from platforms that they are going to destroy the rest of it if they can, and then people talk about nice technicalities and about not venturing or hazarding to do this, that, or the other, you wonder whether or not people are dreaming or whether they are awake to what is going on in their world.

The whole point of the controversy is that the United States must either embrace Hitlerism, must agree to its possessing the earth, or it must put itself in front of its own shores and say, "Thus far shalt thou go and no farther." What the United States wants to do, therefore, is with the least possible expenditure to do that. If we can do it by 50 destroyers, it means we don't have to spend the rest of this money; it means we don't have to add more billions to the taxpayers' burden; it means we don't have to conscript your boy to leave your home and go into the Army; it means that life in America doesn't have to be regimented, that it keeps on being the kind of a world we know.

Now, what is that worth paying?

Chairman GRANIK. Senator DANAHER.

Senator DANAHER. Of course, when my colleague implies to the listening audience that the conscription measure and its passage or its rejection by the Congress depends upon whether we do or don't send destroyers to England, you, I am sure, are sufficiently well advised to realize that that is wholly specious. There is no proposal before the Congress emanating from administration sources with reference to disposing of destroyers to England, but there is a bill providing for conscription of the American youth, and it is represented that the emergency confronting our country is so great that we must undertake hemispheric defense.

Indeed, Secretary Hull, who is Secretary of State, and who presumably has a fair idea of what he is undertaking to do, whether or not his objectives are publicly stated, this morning authorized the statement, the text of which points out—and I quote: "I feel constrained to reemphasize the view expressed upon my return from the Habana conference that the possibilities of danger to the American republics are real, that a threat to any important part of the Americas means a threat to each and all of the American nations. The conclusion is, therefore, inescapable that full and adequate preparations for hemispheric defense cannot be completed too soon."

But Mr. Churchill, addressing the Parliament a few days ago, pointed out that England entered this war, as he put it, "with its eyes wide open." He said, "We entered the war upon the national will." He said, "There seems to be every reason to believe that this new kind of war is well suited"—and I am quoting—"to the genius and resources of the British Nation and Empire, and that once we get properly equipped and properly started a war of this kind will be more favorable to us than the somber mass slaughters of the Somme and Passchendaele." And let me conclude with one other excerpt from the address to the Parliament: "We hope our friends across the ocean will send us a timely reinforcement to bridge the gap between the peace flotillas of 1939 and the war flotillas of 1941."

But Canada has sent only two squadrons of airplanes, and Canada adopted a conscription bill under the terms of which no Canadian can be sent except with his consent overseas, and my friend, the Senator from Florida, would make it appear that the conscription bill and the possibility of our American boys being taken to war, depend on whether we do or don't send destroyers. If we are going to send them at all, why not send them good ones, not a lot of old World War destroyers.

Chairman GRANIK. Colonel Breckinridge.

Colonel BRECKINRIDGE. I am extremely interested in the reasoning of the two distinguished Members of the Senate on the negative. I should be glad to debate conscription but I understand it not to be included in the question tonight. Now the burden of the argument of the distinguished Senator from Connecticut in his original presentation was as to the law of this matter. I don't think that that is vital, though it is important. We have the four great lawyers led by Mr. Charles Burlingham stating that it is legal to give these destroyers; others may say it is not. It is certainly within the province of the Congress of the United States to make it legal, and under the leadership of these and other such gentlemen, that can be done.

As to the distinguished Senator Nye and his argument, which is from as great a love of country and interest as mine or yours, it is a weighing of dangers, the dangers of giving these destroyers, the dangers of having them fall into the hands of the Germans after the capture of Britain and its destruction. You may take your choice. For me, I would prefer to run the risk of those 50 destroyers being added to the sea power of Britain and hoping that they would destroy the might of Hitler, than take the chances of the British Fleet going down without any interposition of those destroyers and facing eight times our sea power in the world.

Chairman GRANIK. Senator Nye.

Senator NYE. Colonel Breckinridge very forcefully expresses a view or a gamble, a wish if it is a gamble, that we might gamble by giving these 50 or more destroyers to Great Britain. For my own part, thinking primarily of the issue of national security, I am going to gamble on that side that dictates that we maintain a rigid—as rigid a state of defense as we know how.

My colleague from Florida, Senator Pepper, has suggested that some of us are looking upon this thing going on over in Europe today as a world series. Incidentally, it isn't going to be a world series until we get into it.

He speaks of it in that light. Might I suggest that if it isn't a world series or anything resembling it, then it is at least a return engagement of a performance that has been playing on the European stage for every generation since the beginning of time. It isn't particularly a new experience. It isn't altogether so revolutionary as some would have us believe it to be.

Just one more thought. I remember when we started breaking the way, a year ago this time, with the urging of the repeal of the arms embargo, when the argument was made again and again and again and again that if only we would repeal the arms embargo, that would constitute the difference between victory and defeat for the Allies. Then a little later they had to have airplanes, and if we would only furnish the planes for them, that would constitute the difference between victory and defeat for France and England. And now it is destroyers. What will it be next? Need any of us have any doubt as to what it will ultimately be, if only this process carries on far enough?

Senator DANAHER. Mr. Chairman, let me point out there is one possible fallacy in the statement just uttered by my colleague from North Dakota when he said next airplanes and then destroyers. The planes were and are being sold by private contractors and private manufacturers, and are not being transferred by the United States Government.

Senator NYE. Quite true.

Senator DANAHER. It is understood, in this question presented to us tonight, that this is a transfer by the United States Government, and there is a very real and essential difference which is covered both by the statutes I cited and the international law, and our treaties, let me add.

Senator PEPPER. Of course, at this time we can't go into the ramifications of the technical legal article. Suffice it to say that nothing will be done by the executive branch of the Government to consummate this transfer unless it is approved by the legal division of the Government, that is, the Department of Justice. I could go on and make a legal argument, which in my opinion is a complete answer to what has been said by the able Senator from Connecticut, but let's just accept it as a premise that it will not be done unless a legal opinion is given to the President of the United States which will stand up, in the opinion of the Department of Justice, in any court of law.

The second question: There are a good many gentlemen who speak of anything we may do in this contest as a voluntary participation on our part in this controversy. I wonder if they are forgetting that we signed, along with other nations, every nation that is now involved in this war, a pact called the Kellogg Pact, or the Pact of Paris, and by that pact every nation now included in this war, and particularly Germany, obligated itself not to make war upon other nations. We are a signatory power to that pact. That is a solemn treaty—if my friend wants to talk about keeping treaties and living up to our obligations. That is one we undertook. Now then, if a signatory power to the pact can, without justification or excuse, attack another signatory power the way Germany attacked Belgium and Holland and Denmark, and if

I may include them, Great Britain and France, and the other signatory powers that are parties to it simply fold their hands or wash them, as Pontius Pilate did, and say, "I have nothing to do with this matter," then what becomes of law-abiding peoples? And what of our fulfillment of our treaty obligations in that case?

Now, that doesn't mean, of course, that we are obligated to take any affirmative part that will amount to a declaration of war. There isn't any prescription in that treaty of what the signatory powers must do in a case like that. It is up to their individual judgment and conscience, but if the power does nothing whatever, I submit that it is denying its obligation under that pact and its obligation in a decent world.

Senator NYE. Senator PEPPER, counting the existence of such a pact as you refer to now, are we doing a graver injustice to any civilization by withholding now any fulfillment of any obligation that might be ours under that treaty? Would we be in any worse fix, in any worse light than Great Britain was when she refused to go along with the United States when the United States wanted to enforce another pact in China some years ago?

Senator PEPPER. Well, the Senator is assuming, of course, that Great Britain did refuse to go along with the United States in that situation——

Senator NYE (interposing). I think it is considerably more than an assumption.

Senator PEPPER. About which there is a very great difference of opinion in fact, but I will say to the able Senator that if Great Britain had been listening to some of the debates in the United States as to what the legislative branch of this Government would let the Executive do, I don't much blame them for not wanting to get into partnership with us and enter upon any enterprise.

Senator DANAHER. Mr. Chairman, I woud like to ask the Senator from Florida to make clear one thing. He pointed out, and quite correctly, that there is no obligation on the part of the United States to go to war and to enforce the Kellogg Pact, which was a peace pact. He is quite right in that. Does the Senator think we ought to go to war?

Senator PEPPER. I do not. Neither do I think we should be foolish enough not to do what we can short of war to keep Hitler, a beast, from getting out of Europe.

Senator DANAHER. But, Mr. Chairman, may I point out to the Senator—and I am sure he will recognize it as so—that if we furnish naval vessels in contravention of all our treaties, it is an act of war. The Senator knows that.

Senator PEPPER. I deny that unequivocably, and it is based upon this. The Senators and those who cite international law, it will be recalled, don't cite any text writers or any authorities on that subject writing of a period since the Kellogg Pact came into existence. When they cite old authorities on international law they are talking about a time when a country was under no contractual obligation, as every country now is, not to make war upon its neighbors, so that nowadays you not only violate what might be called the criminal law of the world if you make war, but you violate your own solemn contract with other nations that you will not make war.

Now, then, in the protection of that immunity of signatory powers to that pact, under the Budapest interpretation of the Pact of Paris (100 or more of the most eminent international lawyers of Europe gathering together to make that declaration), under the Harvard research group's interpretation of the Kellogg Pact, I believe the most eminent authorities in the United States today on the subject of international law, like Quincy Wright, of Chicago, all concur that we do, without violating any treaty and without violating any law and without going to war, have the right to do what we desire to do defensively against the party that breaks the pact in that way.

Chairman GRANIK. We have a question from the floor.

Question. I just want to re-ask the same question that was asked by Senator NYE and which has not been answered, and I would like to do this to stress the question and so it will be answered. Senator NYE has pointed out that within the last year, by pretty smooth propaganda, we have gone from the point of absolute neutrality to the point where we want to commit an act of war. I would like to ask Senator NYE just how much further we will continue to go.

Chairman GRANIK. To whom do you address the question?

Question. To anyone who cares to answer.

Senator PEPPER. I will be glad to try to answer that. As to how far we go depends essentially, my friend, on how willing we are to let the beast get out of the cage of Europe. I prefer to save anything at the cheapest possible expense. If we can do it by 50 destroyers, I say do it that way, and try. If it would take 75 destroyers, being manned by British sailors and soldiers, I would be willing to let them have 75. Just think for a minute what the alternative is. You will recall we have appropriated some $15,000,000,000 in the last 2 months. We are about, if we can pass the bill over the protests of Senator NYE and some other Senators who are trying to keep us from passing it, to pass the conscription bill to defend America; and by the way, my able friend from the Dakotas has opposed every one of these acts, not just the sale of the destroyers. He is against conscription, he was against the modification of the Neutrality Act, he was against all of them, and so he just——

Senator NYE (interposing). And incidentally, Senator Pepper, when it comes, as I am so afraid it is coming, to a demand for a declaration of war, the Senator from North Dakota is going to continue a very consistent record and vote "No."

Senator PEPPER. There are people who always have voted "No" when their country was in danger.

Senator DANAHER. Mr. Chairman, I want just a moment to make a comment about the observations of the Senator from Florida with reference to the situation in Europe. Remember that even if England resists successfully the invasion now threatening her—and I certainly hope she does—are we, if we enter it to that extent, bound and will we be committed to maintain her status from now on? Will we permanently, in other words, after we have been drawing down all the gold in the world at $35 an ounce and forcing a barter system on nations, when we have done nothing to eliminate the overpopulation problems in many nations, when we find our own President only a year ago saying this to Hitler—let me read what he said. He said it and you all heard it over the air on April 14, 1939: "The Government of the United States would be prepared to take part in discussions looking toward the most practical manner of opening up avenues of international trade, to the end that every nation of the earth may be enabled to buy and sell on equal terms in the world market as well as to possess assurance of obtaining the materials and products of peaceful economic life." That is what our President offered to this same man only a year ago.

Chairman GRANIK. Excuse me, I see another question from the floor.

Miss MIDDLETON. I would like to have a paradox explained to me, Mr. Granik. First, we are told these are old ships, they are obsolete, they are not much good; then we are told by a speaker on the affirmative side that these ships may save England, they may turn the tide of war. Then we are also told that these 50 ships are not really needed by us here in America for our defense, and yet we are asked to rush forward a program for a two-ocean navy. If they are no good but they will save England, yet we don't need them but we must have a two-ocean navy, it doesn't seem clear to me. Will the affirmative explain it, please?

Colonel BRECKINRIDGE. I don't know that I can explain it to your satisfaction, but as we have been talked to in terms of paradox by the questioner, I think we may answer in terms of analogy. If the distinguished Senator NYE were attacked by Al Capone and Dutch Schultz and they were armed with hundreds of guns and I had 12, and I thought 2 of them would save Senator NYE's life. I would let him have them and take my chance on what I would do with Schultz and Capone afterward.

Senator DANAHER. Of course, the real point about it, let me say to Miss Middleton, is that they don't care whether we give them 50 old destroyers or not. The question before us tonight, and on which they are arguing in the affirmative, is, shall we send "some"? The reason is that if we send any, we are committed politically to that war, and they know it.

Miss MIDDLETON. That is what I was waiting for. I thought we would have to send more, and finally men. Thank you.

Senator PEPPER. Let me say this: If that good lady felt that some of us over there who are willing to send those destroyers wanted to keep ever from sending any men, perhaps she might be a little bit more sympathetic to it. But I will tell you this. We are at least going to have to do one of two things. We are either going to have to make it possible for Great Britain to keep Hitler in Europe or we are going to have to prepare to meet him over here or somewhere in this universe, and that means that your life is going to be changed from anything you have ever anticipated in all your career. It means that the burdens of taxes to be paid by the citizenry of this country, it means that the standing Army of this country, that the Navy of this country will be more colossal than you ever imagined in your life. It isn't a question of either taking sulfapyridine or not taking it. It is a question of taking sulfapyridine or having pneumonia and taking the chance on what pneumonia may be.

Mr. P. D. SCOTT. First, I want to mention I am not a "fifth columnist" because I am colored.

Chairman GRANIK. Please put it in the form of a question. We have only a few minutes left.

Mr. SCOTT. Is it not true that for the last year, factually, we have plenipotentiarily and diplomatically been unneutral, and therefore I agree with Senator PEPPER in all of his opinion that because of the fact——

Chairman GRANIK (interposing). Please put it in the form of a question.

Mr. SCOTT. That democracy is at stake—and the tribute to democracy is the fact that I am able to speak here now; and is it not a fact that since we have taken the step to be unneutral up to this point, why shouldn't we send everything possible over to England and protect, not England specifically, but democracy of the world and the civilization that democracy and white people have brought us today?

Senator PEPPER. I was interested awhile ago when Senator NYE spoke about this proposal being first made now. In the New York Times of today I read the following which was a statement made by James Madison in 1823, which is as follows: "With the British power and Navy combined with our own, we have nothing to fear from the rest of the world, and in the great struggle of the epoch between liberty and despotism we owe it to ourselves to sustain the former in this hemisphere at least"; and that was just a few years after the British had burned the Capitol while he was the President of the United States, and yet James Madison was urging that we cooperate with Great Britain in trying to preserve the peace of this hemisphere, and the premise of that cooperation was the maintenance and preservation of the British Navy.

Senator DANAHER. Mr. Chairman, let me point out that one of the chief difficulties confronting the people of the United States today—and heaven knows they are vitally interested in this and every other problem and every question raised here, and they are sincere and they are earnest, and I hope in fairness they will realize that we are, too; but the problem actually turns on this, that there has been no public definition of our objectives. What do we really seek? Where do our national interests lie? What are we going to do with reference to the situation in the Pacific? They talk about a two-ocean navy when we have it within our power to remove the need for a two-ocean navy by being friends with the only threat we have in the west. Where, in other words, are we going to go? Are we continuously to maintain an avenue for the lamps of China? Are we continuously going to maintain any and every barren island in the Western Hemisphere? Are we permanently to be committed to the maintenance of the British Isles as the gateway of Europe?

I don't know what the objectives of our diplomacy may be, and if we knew all that I am certain that American people would view every one of these problems in a more understanding way and be better able to appraise them. Right now they are afraid, and I don't blame them.

Colonel BRECKENRIDGE. It is not my function but that of others, including the Senate, to declare the foreign policy of the United States, but for a personal objective which I wish my Nation would have I would say everything it does at this time is to preserve the freedom of mankind in the world, and avert the menace of the conquest of the free peoples of the world by the tyrants.

Senator NYE. Even if it calls for going to war?

Colonel BRECKENRIDGE. Yes. Yes.

Senator NYE. Thank you. That clarifies many of the issues in this discussion tonight.

Colonel BRECKENRIDGE. For myself, for my own part, I think that Hitler, as he now goes day by day to the slaughter and murder of all the free nations of the world except this, bringing his death upon the defenseless women and children of the world, must satisfyingly have the laugh of a hyena when he listens to the niceties of legalistic discussion that goes on here, as with the pre-Munich minds of England and France which brought them to ruin.

Senator DANAHER. Mr. Granik, that is the real purpose of the force behind this movement.

[The American Forum of the Air, September 1, 1940]

HOW FAR SHALL THE UNITED STATES AID GREAT BRITAIN?

(Senator Josh Lee, of Oklahoma; Senator Edwin C. Johnson, of Colorado; Edgar Ansel Mowrer, correspondent of the Chicago Daily News; Frederick J. Libby, founder and head of the National Council for Prevention of War)

Announcer STEPHEN MCCORMACK. Listeners from coast to coast are invited to hear the American Forum of the Air. We bring you another program presented by WOL in cooperation with WOR, emanating from the Willard Room of the Hotel Willard in Washington, D. C.

In formation on how to obtain a copy of tonight's proceedings will be given at the conclusion of this broadcast.

Tonight the American Forum of the Air will be presented in two parts. First you will hear prepared statements by the participants. This will be followed by extemporaneous discussion of the subject at hand.

This series of educational discussions, now in its twelfth year, is arranged and directed by Theodore Granik, founder and director of the American Forum of the Air and of the American Forum, a nationally syndicated newspaper feature.

Mr. Granik presides as chairman and moderator.

Mr. THEODORE GRANIK. Thank you Mr. McCormick. One year ago today Europe was plunged into war. After 12 months of bloody conflict, with its bitter toll of lives and property, with its ruthless destruction of great civilized areas, a conquering nation has revised the map of Europe, as never before. Not since the conquests of Napoleon has one man been the master of so much of the continent.

But as the war moves into its second year, Great Britain bars the way to Germany's final victory—with other nations humbled and beaten, England alone stands in the Nazi path to complete European domination.

The world awaits the outcome of the great battle of Britain—a new phase—and perhaps the most decisive of World War No. 2. With the everchanging cycle of events, it is difficult to predict what will have passed in review by the next anniversary—in fact, what might happen within the next few weeks.

As America rushes its own gigantic national-defense program, we ponder how the fate of Great Britain will affect us. What, if anything, should America do in this grave crisis?

There are, of course, two opinions, well supported in this country, about the duty of the United States. While one group believes we should let Europe absolutely alone, and not become involved any further in foreign entanglements, the other opinion is that this is not just a war between Germany and England, but a revolutionary movement which challenges everything that Americans hold vital in civilization.

Some of these arguments were presented in last Sunday night's American Forum of the Air discussion on the question, Shall the United States Make Available to England Some of Its World War Destroyers?

We received thousands of letters and comments in response to this forum from listeners in all parts of the country, many requesting that the subject be explored further. And so tonight, complying with these requests, we present as our subject for discussion How Far Shall the United States Aid Great Britain?

Our speakers are: Senator Josh Lee of Oklahoma; Senator Edwin C. Johnson of Colorado; Edgar Ansel Mowrer, noted newspaper correspondent of the Chicago Daily News, and coauthor with Colonel Donovan of the recent newspaper series sponsored by Secretary Knox; and Dr. Frederick J. Libby, founder and head of the National Council for Prevention of War.

We cordially invite our listeners to send us their letters and comments on tonight's presentation.

And now our opening speaker, Senator LEE.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR JOSH LEE

It is my purpose to do everything within my power to preserve peace for America. But it will take more than wishful thinking to achieve that goal. We cannot preserve peace by merely denouncing war.

We cannot depend upon neutrality, because neutrality failed to protect the nations of Europe.

We cannot depend upon disarmament because weakness invites attack.

We cannot depend upon appeasement, because it is Hitler's most effective method of undermining the loyalty of a nation before he invades it.

Then from a hard-headed, practical standpoint what can we do that will most effectively decrease the danger which threatens America?

Before we answer this, let us decide what danger threatens America. There is but one answer—Hitler.

Why has Congress voted $14,000,000,000 for national defense? Because of Hitler.

Why is it necessary for the United States to have compulsory military training? Because of Hitler.

Why is it necessary for us to increase taxes for armament? Because of Hitler.

Therefore, if the Nazi war machine could be stopped in Europe tomorrow, we could repeal appropriations for armament, adjourn Congress, and return to normal, peacetime pursuits, but as long as Hitler is on the loose liberty itself is threatened.

The most practical method then by which we can safeguard American peace is to help England stop Hitler in Europe. England has not asked for men but she has begged for ships and planes. A few ships and planes now added to England's force would be worth many times that number if England falls.

Three years ago, President Roosevelt warned that the aggressor nations should be quarantined. Had the democracies of Europe heeded that warning and joined their forces to oppose Hitler, no doubt there would be peace in Europe today. But lulled to sleep by Nazi propaganda, they waited their turn to be destroyed.

There is no use to deceive ourselves. The war in Europe is more than a conflict for territory. It is a revolution. Democracy is at death grips with despotism.

The totalitarian powers are on the march. If England falls before their drive, America will then stand alone in their path.

Those who oppose material aid to England claim that it involves danger. Perhaps it does, but failure to give material aid to England involves greater danger.

This is not a situation where one decision leads to absolute peace and security and the other decision leads to involvement and war. There is danger either way. But to refuse aid to England involves greater danger than to give aid, because the longer England is able to hold out the more time we will have to arm. And if we get strong enough, soon enough, we shall escape war.

Therefore, I believe we should give England, not men, but every material aid possible within the law and not inconsistent with our own defenses.

The blood of American youth is so much more precious than the material wealth of the Nation that there should be no question about using that material wealth in order to prevent war from coming to America.

Last week we placed an amendment on the draft bill providing for the conscription of those industries which refused to cooperate for national defense. Immediately the spokesmen of wealth in America unleashed a violent attack on those of us who had sponsored and supported that amendment.

These same spokesmen of Wall Street were loud in their declarations for drafting men but when we extended the same power to property they said that we were trying to set up a dictatorship and destroy the liberties of America. They have even tried to make it appear that we would destroy freedom of the press, free speech, and private ownership of property simply because we have urged a speedy mobilization of industry as well as manpower.

It is because I cherish the freedom of the press, the freedom of speech, and all of the other glorious liberties guaranteed in the Bill of Rights that I want to safeguard these liberties from the Gestapo of a Nazi world.

These spokesmen of wealth were perfectly willing that Congress should draft the young men of America and, if need be, send them to their death in battle for the defense of America. But, when we undertook to require the same cooperation and patriotism from industry, they felt that property was too sacred for compulsory mobilization.

I believe that our very liberty is in danger and that danger will be greatly increased if England falls before the Nazis. Hitler's mass bombing of England, which is taking place at this very hour, is but the terrible prelude of a determined effort to land troops on the island.

The transfer of 50 or more destroyers from the United States to England might make it possible for England to prevent that invasion and thereby stop Hitler in Europe. Thus, by helping England, we would help America more.

Announcer McCORMICK. Thank you, Senator LEE.

You are listening to the American Forum of the Air, presenting a discussion on "How Far Should the United States Aid Great Britain?" You have just heard Senator JOSH LEE, of Oklahoma.

And now we are pleased to present Senator EDWIN C. JOHNSON of Colorado. Senator JOHNSON.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR EDWIN C. JOHNSON

Ever since the War between the States, the United States has been a most helpful and cooperative friend to the British Empire. At times Old England has leaned upon us heavily, but we have always responded magnificently. She has a vast empire and is constantly in trouble. The powerful nations of the Old World have turned against her and today she is begging for more and more of our assistance. We spared her from a military debacle with our finances and our men 23 years ago. Last year we changed our laws to become her arsenal. All of our private munition-making industry is now at her disposal. Her current needs are very great, and her demands upon our generosity are for more, and more, and more.

How far shall we go? I am strongly of the opinion that we have already gone as far as prudence and good judgment will permit, and that we owe it to humanity to remain neutral and hold ourselves in readiness to minister unto a stricken world when hostilities finally cease.

American manufactured munitions going to England are increasing rapidly month by month. During the last 7 months these shipments totalled $63,500,000 and consisted of powder, shells, rifles, machine guns, cannon, engines, airplanes, and other war material; 236 planes will go forward in August and the number will increase until we reach the goal set of 3,000 a month. Truly we are England's best neighbor. All of this is being done in accordance with our law.

The extraordinary proposal to transfer 50 or 60 United States destroyers to the war zone does have a strong emotional appeal to warm-hearted Americans, but the proposition is neither legal, logical, nor safe. It is not good military strategy; it is very poor military strategy. Not only would it constitute an outright act of war, but it would constitute a piece-meal disintegration of an indispensable arm of the United States Navy—the light fighting craft arm, already woefully weak. The replacement cost of the 50 or 60 destroyers is approximately $300,000,000, not a serious financial problem, but a most serious replacement problem is involved nevertheless. We must keep in mind that 2 years are required to build a destroyer and, since every shipbuilding facility in the United States has orders sufficient to keep it fully occupied during the next 5 years, the actual replacement of these vital ships cannot be undertaken until 1946.

It has been the wise practice of the Navy to convert, as they are replaced, the older destroyers into badly needed fast mine layers, aircraft tenders, and antiaircraft vessels. The 60 destroyers under consideration are all now in vital service, some being in neutrality patrol service, while others are used for training purposes. Not one of them is in drydock, not one of them is surplus, and not one of them is obsolete in the sense that it is useless. Many of them are over-aged, but they cannot safely be spared until they are replaced. On July 5 of this year we had 61 destroyers under construction, and the 2-ocean Navy program now getting under way calls for the construction of over 150 additional destroyers. Would these facts not prove conclusively that we are extremely short on such craft?

The term "obsolete" in connection with combat ships is confusing. A ship can be obsolete and at the same time vital and that paradox precisely states the situation relative to our need for these old destroyers. On March 1 last the United States had 301 combatant vessels in commission and out of that total 150 were over-age or obsolete, yet all of them were in vital service. The very fact that obsolete ships are being retained in the service proves their indispensability beyond any argument. If they were obsolete and not needed, they would be decommissioned, but not one of the 60 destroyers under discussion is decommissioned.

England, in the dark hour of her efforts to hold her Empire together, needs every ship which we have afloat, and she needs the men to man those ships; she needs every war plane in the United States, and every pilot and groundman that we have to operate those planes. In fact, she actually needs skilled pilots now more than she needs additional planes. In the battle of Britain her dauntless and inspired pilots are giving a good account of themselves. Such daring, dogged fighting has never been surpassed in all of the world's military history. Against superior numbers, they are more than holding their own, but right now every one of her pilots is fighting twice as many hours as he should be fighting. England's need for more pilots is very grave indeed, the 50 destroyers which she is now seeking will not be more than a "token offering to British aid." No one understands better than England that the proposed transfer is tantamount to a declaration of war against her enemies. I do not blame English statesmen for wanting us in the war. I admire them for their boldness and their cunning. I do not blame clever English statesmen for coaxing us in the back door, step by step, if we hesitate to come in the front door. It will be a great thing for the British Empire the day we enter the war, but it will be a day of sorrow for the American people.

Mr. GRANIK. Thank you, Senator JOHNSON.

You have just heard Senator EDWIN C. JOHNSON of Colorado in tonight's American Forum of the Air discussion, "How Far Should United States Aid Great Britain?"

Our next speaker is Edgar Ansel Mowrer, noted newspaper correspondent, who spent many years in Italy, Germany, and France, and whose recent newspaper series with Colonel Donovan has attracted international attention. Mr. Mowrer.

ADDRESS BY EDGAR ANSEL MOWRER

After a great many years as a foreign correspondent, I have just returned from European battlefields.

Events of the last few years in Europe have no sense except as horrible examples of what happens to peace-loving countries which refuse to believe ill of predatory neighbors and which refuse to help each other against aggression when it starts.

Denmark, Norway, Belgium, the Netherlands trusted to their neutrality to protect them. And where are they? France refused to help Czechoslovakia—and later succumbed. Britain, as punishment for its hesitancy, is today defending itself alone against a coalition monstrous in power and intent.

It has been my job to watch all this. Moreover, Adolf Hitler and Benito Mussolini were at one time among my personal acquaintances. So I am well vaccinated against any twaddle about their "friendship for America." I know that they will go for us—when they dare. Directly or indirectly. But surely.

For they, with the Japs, are already at war with us spiritually. They hate our guts. They are seeking to break down our morale and lull us to sleep. Yet actually nothing stands today between the United States and open attack but the British Navy and the British Air Force. This is not "scaremongering." It is an understatement of a simple fact.

Now whether we admire the British or hate their guts they will never attack us and we ought to assist them were they a nation of cannibal Hottentots. They are not. Indeed, we share with them a common set of values. If they go down we remain alone.

Today they may easily go down. They counted on France and France cracked. Almost complete loss of material in Flanders left them temporarily very weak.

The defeat of Britain would leave an appalling situation—for us. Hitler becomes a leader of a world alliance. Through Japan he rules the Far East; through Soviet Russia the vast Asiatic steppes; India falls to him as a matter of course; Africa he divides with Italy and conceivably with Spain.

Nothing remains between him and the world power he covets but the Western Hemisphere—which means for fighting purposes the United States. With the passive cooperation of the British Fleet this task would remain possible for us. Without that cooperation it is almost surely impossible. Good as our own fleet is, it will for a long time remain a one-ocean fleet up against a two-ocean coalition. With Britain subjugated the way is clear in any case for the totalitarian economic and political offensive in this hemisphere. To prevent actual attack, we should, with Britain knocked out, be forced to adopt intensive militarism. If we do, our living standard will slump terrifically; our economic life will undergo real regimentation; our easy-going ways will give way to an almost iron discipline. Yet we shall have to—or submit. By this effort, we shall, if the dictators wait, eventually build up an adequate two-ocean air and water and land defense, and become immune to attack. Before that Britain's defeat is mortal danger for us. If Hitler, in addition, manages to seize all or even most of the British Fleet, then immediate attack on this hemisphere becomes a practical proposition. Not against the United States proper—not immediately. More likely against our outposts—Greenland, Nova Scotia, Bermuda, the Caribbean Islands, and South America. Possession of a couple of these makes preparation for a real offensive against our territory comparatively easy.

It isn't a pretty situation. It leaves a pretty choice: Either we help the British sufficiently to prevent their defeat now—or we watch in relative impotence while our avowed enemies destroy our own conceivable friend.

Admittedly the British are not beaten yet—thank God. For each day they hold finds us a little better prepared. Recently I talked with Churchill and Halifax and Earnest Bevin. Their spirit seemed unconquerable. It is their army that is weak, largely owing to the material lost in Flanders. At best, military students give Britain only a 50-percent chance of holding out. If Britain succumbs, the victors have a very good chance of seizing the British Fleet for use against us.

What therefore is wisdom—to sit apart in the illusion of isolation and allow the totalitarian world conquest to proceed piecemeal until it reaches us, or, by an infinitely smaller effort than the one we should ultimately make, save ourselves now by saving Britain. As a witness of Hitler's might and malevolence, I am aghast at the extent to which many of our best citizens ignore or underestimate the danger.

Many argue that giving decisive aid to Britain involves the risk of war. But if we are already on the aggressors' list as the next victim, where is the greater danger? Will we take a slight war risk now beside a still powerfully ally, or face certain conflict a few months hence, still far from rearmed and utterly alone?

Hitler counts on our doing nothing. He counts on his friends here, on the natural desire of a commercial nation to do business with him, on the natural pacifism of a prosperous and free people. Can it be that he is right? I cannot believe it. For if through shirking our responsibilities today we turned out to have opened the door on national disaster a year from now, the very sons we thought by our inaction to save, would curse us.

The right course is: All necessary aid to Britain—now.

Announcer McCORMACK. Thank you, Mr. Mowrer.

And now as our concluding speaker in tonight's American Forum of the Air, we present Frederick J. Libby, founder and head of the National Council for Prevention of War. Mr. Libby.

ADDRESS BY DR. FREDERICK J. LIBBY

How far should the United States aid Great Britain?

My answer is this:

"All the material aid at our command, consistent with law and not inconsistent with the interests of our own national defense."

I have followed the wording of the Democratic platform, but the Republican plank is almost the same:

"Such aid as shall not be in violation of international law or inconsistent with the requirements of our own national defense."

The preceding planks of both platforms are equally a part of my answer:

"The Republican Party is firmly opposed to involving this Nation in foreign wars."

The Democratic plank is more specific:

"We will not participate in foreign wars, and we will not send our Army, naval and air forces to fight in foreign lands outside of the Americas, except in case of attack."

These planks are what 1,000 or more delegates at each convention believed their neighbors and friends want done. Even if the Presidential candidates should repudiate their platform and the platforms should be forgotten after election, the fact remains crystal clear that the similarity of the platforms shows two things: First, that the country is determined to stay out of the wars of Europe and Asia; and second, regardless of our sympathies, our aid to Great Britain should be held within legal limits and the requirements of our own national defense. This position seems to me sound.

I shall not be able in 6 minutes to do more than show what the legal limitations are which forbid the sale of destroyers and other current proposals. I hope that Senator JOHNSON will discuss the requirements of our national defense.

Our statutes so clearly forbid the transfer of armed vessels to Great Britain that the Law Journal, a leading American law publication, in an editorial which appeared on August 7, spoke categorically as follows:

"The provisions of the statute of June 15, 1917, would equally prevent both transactions (that is, the transfer of the mosquito fleet and the transfer of destroyers). The prohibitory provisions follow: 'During a war in which the United States is a neutral nation, it shall be unlawful to send out of the jurisdiction of the United States any vessel built, armed, or equipped as a vessel of war, or converted from a private vessel into a vessel of war, with any intent or under any agreement or contract, written or oral, that such vessel shall be delivered to a belligerent nation, or to an agent, officer, or citizen of such nation, or with reasonable cause to believe that the said vessel shall or will be employed in the service of any such belligerent nation after its departure from the jurisdiction of the United States.'"

Could the law be clearer or more unequivocal? It is unlawful to send out of the jurisdiction of the United States, any vessel of war with any intent that such vessel shall be delivered to a belligerent, or to an agent or citizen of such nation, or with reasonable cause to believe that the said vessel will be employed in the service of such belligerent nation after its departure from our jurisdiction. As long as that law is on our statute books, and our neutrality law remains in effect, those destroyers cannot be transferred legally to Great Britain. The law further provides that whoever "authorizes" the taking of any such vessel out of port or from the jurisdiction of the United States shall be subject to $10,000 fine or 10 years' imprisonment, or both.

Our Government is not going to resort to the tricks of shyster lawyers to get around its own laws.

Now, then, suppose this statute should be repealed by Congress. What then? Then you find yourself confronted with an equally clear and unequivocal prohibition under international law. The Hague Convention of 1907, of which the United States and Germany are signatories, reads thus:

"The supply in any manner, directly or indirectly, by a neutral power to a belligerent of warships, ammunition, or war material of any kind is forbidden."

Secretary Hull as late as last Wednesday took his stand again on the sanctity of international law. Regardless of what other nations do, we all support Secretary Hull in refusing to make us lawbreakers.

But there is another reason why we must be scrupulous in this matter. We study in our school textbooks the famous case of the *Alabama* claims when we were awarded $15,500,000 in gold because of the depredations committed by a British armed vessel, the *Alabama*, and two other ships. We won that case of the basis of three principles for the government of neutrals. The first of them bears directly on the point of issue:

"A neutral government is bound to use due diligence to prevent the fitting out, arming, or equipping within its jurisdiction of any vessel which it has reasonable ground to believe is intended to cruise or to carry on war against a power with which it is at peace, and also to use like diligence to prevent the departure from its jurisdiction of any vessel intended to cruise or carry on war as above, such vessel having been specially adapted in whole or in part, within such jurisdiction, to warlike use."

These destroyers have without question been armed and equipped within our jurisdiction. If transferred to Great Britain, there is certainly reasonable ground to believe that they will carry on war against a power with which we are at peace. Therefore, again, by our own principles, for which we have stood for 70 years and on which we won the *Alabama* claims, we are forbidden to make this transfer. As long as our neutrality law remains on our books our statutes and international law alike prohibit the unneutral action now proposed.

So we come to the question of neutrality itself. Shall we retain our neutrality law? Or shall we declare war on Germany? Do the American people want to declare war? To raise this question is to answer it. Both party platforms have so interpreted the public will. The Gallup poll likewise shows an overwhelming majority opposed to such rash folly.

Therefore we believe we represent the considered judgment of the American people in supporting neutrality as against a declaration of war or the illegal waging of war, and in limiting aid to Great Britain to that which can legally be extended.

Announcer McCORMICK. Thank you, Dr. Libby.

And this concludes part 1 of tonight's American Forum of the Air presentation.

Mr. GRANIK. This concludes the first part of our radio presentation.

Announcer STEPHEN McCORMICK. Immediately following station identification we shall continue with the extemporaneous discussion. This is the Mutual Broadcasting System.

This is the American Forum of the Air, emanating from the Willard room of the Hotel Willard in Washington, D. C., and presented over the Mutual Broadcasting System by WOL in cooperation with WOR.

We return you to the chairman, Mr. Granik.

Mr. GRANIK. And now as part 2 of tonight's American Forum of the Air presentation, How Far Should the United States Aid Great Britain? we present an informal round-table panel discussion by our speakers, whose opening remarks you have just heard. They are:

Senator Josh Lee, of Oklahoma; Senator Edwin C. Johnson, of Colorado; Edgar Ansel Mowrer, noted newspaper correspondent; and Dr. Frederick J. Libby, founder and head of the National Council for Prevention of War.

Senator LEE, will you open the discussion?

PANEL DISCUSSION, AMERICAN FORUM OF THE AIR, SUNDAY, SEPTEMBER 1, 1940, 7 P. M.

Members of the panel: Senator Josh Lee, Oklahoma; Senator Edwin C. Johnson, Colorado; Edgar Ansel Mowrer, newspaper correspondent; Dr. Frederick J. Libby, National Council for Prevention of War.

Senator LEE. Mr. Granik, if you will allow me a little longer than the usual question just now, I will give more time to the others later, but I wish to put this hypothetical question: Suppose you were Hitler. Suppose, like Hitler, you were ambitious to dominate the world. Suppose you had under your control all of the food, manpower, factories, shipyards, tanks, guns, planes, and other war materials of Italy, Ethiopia, Albania, Austria, Hungary, Rumania, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Denmark, Norway, Holland, Belgium, Luxemburg, France, and Germany. Then suppose you defeated England and thereby added to your power all of the resources of the British Isles, Australia, and India, and also the British Navy; and suppose that the Nazis, with the usual German thoroughness, already had complete blueprints and charts of every British man-o'-war and had trained crews ready to take over and operate these battleships without delay; you would then have the combined sea power of the British, French, Italian, German, and all other dominated nations' navies, which would be several times greater than the United States.

Then, suppose the actions of Japan made it necessary for the United States to keep most of its fleet in the Pacific Ocean; and suppose you realized, as Hitler has already stated, that the Panama Canal is a vulnerable thing and one well-located bomb would render the Canal useless; then suppose you had thousands of Nazi agents in all the Latin American countries and for a few million dollars you could start revolutions in several of those explosive countries; and suppose, as in the case of Spain, you aided one side and by aiding one side you could gain control of the governments of those countries; then suppose you were crowded from behind by a nation on the march, and tempted from in front by the treasures of the western world, and you realized the United States is inadequately prepared for war now, but you knew that she was getting under way with a powerful defense program. I say, under circumstances like these, if you were Hitler, flushed with victory,

strengthened by acquisition, and mad for power, what would you do? Would you wait and give the United States time to arm, or would you move at once?

Senator JOHNSON. Is that question—or speech—directed to me, Senator?

Senator LEE. To anyone.

Senator JOHNSON. If I were up against a proposition like that, Senator, I would certainly keep all my defenses at home, and I would build them just as fast as I could. I wouldn't be peddling them to England or anybody else. I would keep them right here in the United States and get ready for an emergency as serious as that. I don't think I would sleep nights. I would keep on working day and night.

Mr. MOWRER. Certainly we ought to keep right on working day and night, but if, as many of us believe, the British willy-nilly are fighting our war, by the same argument, the Senator would not risk our war material once it is made. If he considers by risking any of our war material in our defense somewhere, let us say in the English Channel, we should be doing our country a disservice, then by risking the same ships off the South American coast we probably would be injuring the country just the same way. The result would be we would work day and night and create a powerful fleet, a powerful air fleet, and a marvelous Army with all the new gadgets and tanks, and so on, but never risk any of it for fear if the thing went on we should be caught without adequate defense.

Senator JOHNSON. Mr. Mowrer, I would like to have you make it clear to all of us just what aid you would give Britain. Do you want to go to war? Is that the thing you are talking about? Do you want to violate our laws, or do you want to live within our laws and give such aid as we can within our laws? Your first statement was very confusing. You wound up with a gesture here. You said, "All necessary aid to Britain now." What do you mean by that—going to war? What do you mean?

Mr. MOWRER. I wouldn't violate any of our laws. I would like to see them changed so we can make the necessary sacrifices to give the aid to Great Britain as soon as possible. By saying "now," I mean we should start about it now.

Senator LEE. England has never asked for men, has she?

Mr. MOWRER. No; and I don't think she would.

Senator JOHNSON. England needs men more than anything else, skilled men, pilots.

Mr. MOWRER. They need a few skilled pilots, or as many as they can get. When we say "men," we primarily mean infantry divisions, the sending of an expeditionary force to Europe. As you, Senator, well know, there are now a great many American pilots—I say a great many; several hundreds—flying for Great Britain. Would you recall them?

Senator JOHNSON. They are violating our laws if they are flying for Great Britain. Naturally, I don't think that that enters into the matter at all. But you may be talking about our Nation's breaking our own laws. That is what I would like to know. I would like to have you be a little more explicit about the aid that you are going to give to Great Britain.

Senator LEE. I don't want to take any more time, if Dr. Libby will speak, but the gentlemen have made two points. One is that the transfer of these destroyers, for instance, would weaken our own defense, and second, that it would be a violation of law. In the first place, I don't believe it would weaken our defense because used with England it would be stronger. What we have alone isn't enough, just like what each of the countries of Europe that was overrun had alone was not enough; but if they had pooled their strength and military equipment that would have been enough to stop them, and that is why a few destroyers now in England's hands would be worth many more for us later if we were facing the Nazis alone.

Dr. LIBBY. Senator, what about this question? You said you did not want to go to war. If we start lending or sending or giving illegally, contrary to our own laws and to international law, our destroyers, why do you want to stop there, and how can you stop there? Is that like the American people to go into a war half way and then say, "I don't like this, I'm going home"?

Senator LEE. We are the first and only country that has voluntarily gotten off the high seas and placed a neutrality law over ourselves. Other countries have taken the attitude of a non-belligerent and left them free to furnish all the food and fighting materials they wanted to. So far as the law is concerned, I believe we can still transfer the destroyers within the law. Four good lawyers from New York came out in support of that and wrote a letter to that effect. I certainly am not one, when a thing allows of two interpretations, to take the interpretation which is against our own interests.

Dr. LIBBY. Mr. Senator, I saw that letter, and I saw the comment that you will find in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the next day from a lawyer at Cornell who said that they had left out pertinent facts, that they had left out part of the laws, and that their statement was shocking, and there has been no one come forward in the Senate to reply to that letter.

Chairman GRANIK. May I interrupt for a moment? I see a question from the floor.

Mrs. NORRIS. Mr. Granik, gentlemen of the panel: Will the illustrious war correspondent who has just spoken of the intestinal fortitude of the British, which I think isn't superior to that of the United States, please tell us why you call this our war?

Mr. MOWRER. I called it our war because I believe that the British are standing between us and an attack on the part of Germany, with such confederates as it can muster. It was not our war in inception. It became our war when it became clear to those of us who had any contact with the people across the water that what the man in Berlin was after was world empire, that he particularly disliked us and hated us as a democracy, and that he intended to clean us up if he could. As long as the European powers have been capable of looking after this war, I certainly would have been in favor of our doing nothing about it; now that it becomes evident that they may not be capable of doing it, now that at least half of those nations upon which we thought we could count have gone down, are under Hitler's boot, it seems to me we ought to look up and, if our laws stand in the way of doing what we ought to do, we ought to change the laws That is what we have Senators and Congressmen for.

Senator LEE. I want to make another comment on the legality of the situation. Of course, it could be held that it is unlawful, but it has not been stated, that I have seen, that it would be unlawful for the United States to sell or transfer these destroyers to a private company or corporation and they in turn then sell them to England. Now that is within the law, and here we are splitting hairs on technicalities in order to hide behind a law and lose an opportunity to save America from war. If Hitler comes over here, what good would it do us to stand on the coast and say, "It is against international law for you to do this"?

Chairman GRANIK. We have another question from the floor.

Miss FRANCES O'DONNELL. A question to Senator Johnson, or a request for a comment by Senator LEE: Please explain why it would take 2 years to replace one of these over-age destroyers when it could be constructed and put into service within 3 months during the World War, 41½ days having been the record launching time, as I was told at the Navy Department. Why would it take 2 years to replace a vessel that could be built originally in 3 months?

Senator JOHNSON. The Navy Department must be putting out conflicting information. According to the information that the Senate Naval Affairs Committee have—and they received it from the Navy Department—it takes exactly 2 years to build one of these destroyers. Now it is a fact that during the World War they built some sort of a small launch-like boat; I don't know very much about the boat, but they did build them very rapidly, but these destroyers are not a small boat. They are 1,100 tons, they are good-sized boats and it takes 2 years to construct them. They are not the kind of vessel that you think they are at all.

Miss RABORI. Was it only when England stood a 50-percent chance of losing that it became our war?

Mr. MOWRER. It becomes our war when the result of England's losing it is going to affect us. I have been taking, like the rest of the people in this country, a rather selfish view of this war, hoping that we could stay out of it and that other people would fight our battle. If it becomes apparent that they cannot fight our battle, then I think we should do something about it.

Senator LEE. In other words, it is our war once removed; the next step will be the United States.

Senator JOHNSON. I am trying to get Mr. Mowrer to tell what he would do that we are not already doing. I have already stated to him, and he hasn't disputed the fact——

Senator LEE (interposing). Transfer the destroyers.

Senator JOHNSON. That our munitions industries are at the disposal of England, that we are making everything they want as rapidly as we can make it, and we are neglecting our own orders in order to supply England with the munitions of war. Our private industry is doing that, and what else is it that you want to do? I want you to make an explicit statement of what you want us to do.

Mr. MOWRER. I would be delighted to answer the Senator's question as soon as he answers mine as to what he would do, if he could, toward the American pilots now flying for England and breaking our law.

Senator JOHNSON. There isn't anything we can do. They are violating our law. They are not under our control. What do you want us to do, try to go after them and extradite them and bring them back here and try them? They have given up their citizenship.

Senator LEE. Listen, Senator JOHNSON, why do you think we couldn't transfer those destroyers now? Couldn't we sell them to a private individual and let him sell them to England?

Senator JOHNSON. Oh, we could beat the devil around the bush, but that doesn't make it legal.

Senator LEE. We will have the devil to beat if England is defeated.

Senator JOHNSON. That is no way for a nation to act. Folks can do that, maybe, and get away with it privately, but great nations that are trying to build up respect for law——

Senator LEE (interposing). You are trying to play a game with two sets of rules, decency on one side, and on the other the violation of law, of the sanctity of human beings, the murder of human beings, the invasion of territories and the violation of every law that ever existed, man and God, and we are trying to split hairs over the technicalities of a law when we could do it within the law of our own country and aid them materially without violating our law.

Dr. LIBBY. Senator LEE, I don't believe emotion is going to enable us to evade the plain law. I read the law. It is not legalistic. The question is whether, as our colleague here, Mr. Mowrer, suggests, the law shall be repealed or not. The law is there and this idea that you have is incorrect. We cannot sell those destroyers to a private individual and sell them to some other country. That would still be a violation of the law, and the Attorney General takes the same position.

Senator LEE. He hasn't so stated with respect to the destroyers. With respect to the "mosquito" fleet, yes; but they were built since the law was passed. The destroyers were built before the law and the law says they must not have been built with the intent of transferring them to some belligerent. Certainly no one could say that the destroyers built back at the time of the World War were built with that intent.

Senator JOHNSON. They have recently been reconditioned and rebuilt.

Senator LEE. But the law doesn't say anything about reconditioning and rebuilding.

Mr. FREDERICK C. KRUG. I want to know what assurance we have that if we loan planes to England now, and England should lose, that England won't use them against us and we would be in worse shape.

Senator LEE. That same argument could be applied that we shouldn't use our ships against anybody because they might be captured. If England were fighting only half-heartedly that might be true, but they are fighting like grim death.

Senator JOHNSON. But you said a while ago Germany was going to get all of England's ships. If they are fighting so strenuously, I don't think Germany——

Senator LEE (interposing). I said if they did. I didn't say they were going to. I said "if."

Senator JOHNSON. I am glad you said "if."

Senator LEE. The ships would be used against the same power that threatens America and the same power against which we are arming, and to say we shouldn't transfer them because they might be captured would be to say we shouldn't send our own men out with them because they might be captured.

Senator JOHNSON. I want to ask Senator LEE one question. He made a very courageous statement in his opening remarks. I thought he was going to be courageous all the way, but when he got right down to the point, he said, "Oh, I wouldn't send men. I wouldn't send men. I wouldn't declare war. I wouldn't do anything like that"—and the facts are that Great Britain right now needs skilled men, and the only place in the world that there are any skilled men that she can get is right in the United States of America. If you are going to help England, why not do it honorably and out in the open? If you want to fight Hitler, why don't you do it, not on the floor in debate, but why don't you to war with him, if that is the way you feel?

Senator LEE. I don't want to fight him; that is the reason I want England to whip him.

Mr. OWENS. I would like to ask Mr. Mowrer a question. You state if the Germans attempt to get possession of the British Fleet, the danger of invasion is very great over here. When the British have possession of the British Fleet and they are not able to get to Norway, France, or Holland, how do you think the Germans can get over here with it?

Mr. MOWRER. The French had possession of the French Fleet and the British had a promise from the French that the ships would never be put in a position where they could conceivably fall into the hands of Adolf Hitler. Nevertheless, there is a great chance today that a large proportion of the French Fleet will fall into the hands of Hitler. Why? Because a government that preaches resistance, that carries on resistance to the last moment, that has no intention of allowing the fleet to come into the hands of the the enemy falls. Winston Churchill fights to the last and he is thrown out and his successor, conceivably, let's say, Oswald Mosley, the head of the British Order of Fascists, orders the fleet to submit to Hitler. Conceivably the British Fleet does.

Mr. OWENS. That doesn't answer the question.

Senator LEE. Let me have a crack at that question. In the first place, in England the war is concentrated in a very limited area, and it is much less difficult there, where they know where the attack will come, where they will try to land and they can concentrate their forces and fewer men can give greater resistance on a smaller area than they could with the whole coast, the Atlantic coast of America, particularly with our fleet in the Pacific, where it must stay on account of conditions over there, and with a bomb in the Panama Canal it would take a long time for the fleet to go around into the Atlantic. Besides, if Hitler had the British Fleet, he would have the Italian, German, and several times larger fleet and a coastline from the North Pole to the South Pole on which he could land.

Dr. LIBBY. Senator LEE, you have evaded the question, it seems to me; still I am not satisfied at all with your evasion of the legal question, both from the standpoint of our law and the standpoint of international law. You are suggesting that we apply some subterfuge which is still illegal, and then what do you do about international law? Do you really want us to follow the example of Hitler, or do you want to stand by Secretary Hull's defense of the integrity of law? Now, I would like a "yes" or "no" answer.

Senator LEE. Yes. [Laughter.]

Dr. LIBBY. That is precisely what you have been saying.

Senator JOHNSON. I am still anxious to find out what we are going to do for England that we are not already doing. These 50 destroyers are only a gesture, after all. Suppose that we do gamble with them and furnish them to England, and then suppose that Hitler overcomes England, anyway. Are either of you gentlemen certain that the transfer of these 50 destroyers will save England? And if they will not save England, what do you propose to do next? What is your next step?

Chairman GRANIK. Mr. Mowrer, do you want to take that?

Mr. MOWRER. Yes; I will take that. Senator JOHNSON asks two questions. He says what are we going to do for England that we are not doing now. The Senator is in the Senate, and he ought to know a great deal better than I do. I hope most of us will agree he ought to get on doing something as soon as possible.

Senator JOHNSON. You want to know what we are doing. In May our private industries sold England 23 airplanes, war planes; and in this last month the number was close to 300. Just as fast as our production picks up we are letting England have our war planes—war planes that our own Army and Navy ought to have—but that is all being done within the law. What else do you want to do?

Mr. MOWRER. The Senator asked whether I thought the 50 destroyers would conceivably or surely save Great Britain. Conceivably, they would save Great Britain. Surely no one can say. But, in any case, if they serve to prolong that struggle by a few months, they will have served us in very good stead, because those few months of rearmament may make a very great difference in the defenses of this country.

Senator JOHNSON. Do you know England wants those destroyers to carry the blockade to innocent women and children of Europe?

Mr. MOWRER. Yes, sir.

Senator JOHNSON. That is what she wants those 50 destroyers for—to carry out her blockade of starvation.

Mr. MOWRER. Precisely—and I wish her blockade of starvation could be made effective from tonight.

Senator JOHNSON. That is a pretty heartless way to look at it.

Senator LEE. It is much more heartless to go against the democracy that is fighting over there for the principle in which we believe. If we go over there and feed Hitler's victims, why, we just are helping break England's only weapon, the blockade, and I think that is wrong.

Dr. LIBBY. Senator, there was a time when we were interested in France. Now you want to starve France.

Senator LEE. France gave up because she was undermined inside by the "fifth columnists" and preachers of appeasement.

Dr. LIBBY. But do you still want to starve her?

Senator LEE. I don't want to starve France, but I don't want to feed her and release the other food to go to Germany over there, so Germany's morale will be kept up.

Mr. MOWRER. Isn't it a little vicious to say "want to starve France"? I don't think anybody wants to starve anybody.

Senator LEE. I don't want to starve anybody.

Senator JOHNSON. If you let them have the destroyers, that is what they are going to do, and they would do it with our vessels.

Senator LEE. But it will help stop Hitler, and so help save us.

Senator JOHNSON. There are lots of things you can do to stop Hitler besides starving innocent women and children.

Mr. MOWRER. I wish you would suggest those things. You will have plenty of opportunity on the floor of the Senate this coming week, and if you do it and it is accepted, you can be sure of my admiration and support, and I think that of most Americans.

Mr. GRANIK. Thank you, gentlemen.

You have been listening to the American Forum of the Air presentation, How Far Should United States Aid Great Britain?

Our speakers were Senator JOSH LEE of Oklahoma, Senator EDWIN C. JOHNSON of Colorado, Edgar Ansel Mowrer, noted newspaper correspondent and coauthor with Col. William J. Donovan of the recent newspaper series sponsored by Secretary Knox, and Dr. Frederick J. Libby, founder and head of the National Council for Prevention of War.

And now for a final word from Mr. McCormick.

Announcer STEPHEN MCCORMICK. Thus, we conclude another broadcast in this series of the American Forum of the Air, presented by WOL in cooperation with WOR.

This series is arranged and directed by Theodore Granik, founder of the American Forum of the Air and of the American Forum, nationally syndicated newspaper feature. In the interest of education there are printed and distributed free of charge, the entire proceedings of these broadcasts which are recorded by stenotype.

When requesting copies by mail kindly enclose 5 cents to defray mailing expenses. Address your requests to Station WOL, Washington, D. C.

The American Forum of the Air emanated from the Willard Room of the Hotel Willard in Washington. You are cordially invited to witness these broadcasts.

This program originated through the facilities of WOL in the Nation's Capital. Stephen McCormick speaking. This is the Mutual Broadcasting System.

A History of Disaster; the Roosevelt Administration Has Failed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS D. CULKIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 12, 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. FRANCIS D. CULKIN, OF NEW YORK

Mr. CULKIN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the permission heretofore granted in the House, I am placing in the RECORD a speech delivered by me at the Hotel Pontiac, Oswego, N. Y., before the Republican County Committee of Oswego County.

Mr. Chairman, the chairman desired me to speak to you today in regard to the national issues. I fully realize that most of you, in common with all citizens, were glued to the radio during the convention at Philadelphia and that you heard the able, carefully prepared speeches of ex-President Hoover, Joe Martin, and Governor Stassen, of Minnesota. These speeches summarized the failure of Democratic leadership at Washington and the crying need for a change in our Government. It is impossible to add to the effectiveness of these several indictments. However, if you indulge me for a brief period, I will endeavor to show to you in my own way the complete poverty of the Roosevelt administration in the field of national achievement.

I have, of course, been in close touch with the affairs at Washington during the 7 years of the present administration, and as time passes, I become more and more alarmed at what Webster called "the state of the Nation." Our national economics fall roughly into four subdivisions: First, labor; second, agriculture; third, capital; and fourth, administration. With your permission, I will discuss them briefly in that order.

LABOR AND THE ADMINISTRATION

The present hour finds labor demoralized, with 12,000,000 citizens, who desire to work, unable to find employment. The principle of collective bargaining, which to my mind is the Magna Carta of labor, has been used to destroy one branch of labor and to build up another. The National Labor Relations Board, which had a magnificent opportunity for service to labor, has gone out of its way to foment strikes and to destroy labor solidarity. These left-wingers, all of whom hate the profit motive, took over this Board in toto. The controlling influence in the Board is Dr. Saposs, whose writings indicate that if he is not a Communist, he has much affection for their principles

The leader of the C. I. O., John Lewis, condemned the administration's labor policies vigorously at Philadelphia last week. William Green, the head of the Federation of Labor, has likewise been severe in his expressions of disapproval. The attempt of the administration to make labor and all of its branches an arm of the administration has brought disaster to labor, industry, and the country at large. The administration, instead of solving the problems of labor, has only added to its difficulties and those of the Nation.

AGRICULTURE DISTRESSED

The administration sought to Tammanyize and take over national agriculture. The fact is that agriculture is no nearer parity than it was in 1933, despite an expenditure of some $5,000,000,000 to that end. The doctrine of scarcity, which to my mind is a sin against God, has been one of its features. The administration has ignored the right of the American farmer to the American market. In writing the trade agreements, the administration has placed the agriculture on the altar of foreign trade. Under the soil conservation plan, it has retired 40,000,000 acres of land from production, and at the same time these trade agreements have let in the products of 40,000,000 foreign acres. The President and the State Department were going in one direction and the Agriculture Department in another. The fact is indisputable, and the Democratic leadership of the House virtually admit that agriculture, due to these contradictory policies, is worse off than it was in 1933.

CAPITAL IN HIDING

We are living under the capitalistic system. That, to my mind, when coupled with a sane, progressive liberalism and free institutions, is the best system yet devised by man. Today capital, an essential branch of our economy and industry, is in hiding, not daring to show its head. The President has subjected it to demagogery without end; he has arrayed class against class and has dried up the sources of capital by his endless demagoging. The scolding fish wives of the administration, Ickes and his like, have baited and maligned the industrialists, who have had a large part in making America the great country it is. In every branch of the Government are left wingers, Communists, and near Communists, who are continuously endeavoring to tear down the present system and substitute in its place something akin to the Russian ideology. This miserable performance in Washington will go on until this group of radicals are hurled from high places.

ONE-MAN GOVERNMENT

The spectacle presented by the executive branch of the Government is a most extraordinary one. It is one-man government and that goes largely by hunch and personal predilection. Theodore Roosevelt, when he was President, surrounded himself with such men as Charles Evans Hughes and Elihu Root. The present occupant of the White House has surrounded himself by a race of coffee coolers and courtiers, not one of whom has an idea to market, and if he did have one, he would not dare express it in the august presence of the boss. I make an exception of Hull, who is an able, sincere man, but he has done tremendous damage to agriculture, industry, and labor by his attempt to put these American groups on the same plane as those in other countries living under substandard conditions and receiving not more than one-tenth of the pay the American worker gets. The policy of the administration is confused and changes from day to day. From whatever angle the executive branch of the Government is viewed it spells disaster to the American people.

NATIONAL DEBT

During the tragic years since the present administration took office twenty-eight billion has been added to the national debt. It has been a period of endless waste and extravagance, when at least $10,000,000,000 was poured down political rat holes. I cite the case of the Grand Coulee project, in the State of Washington, where half a billion dollars is being spent for the purpose of bringing one and one-half million acres of land into production and to artificially create a horsepower five times greater than the American side at Niagara Falls. This despite the fact that there is no market for this power except the rattlesnakes and the coyotes, who are not outstanding consumers of electricity. Political dams, costing many millions of dollars, have been built in areas where the evaporation exceeds the rainfall and the rivers flow upside down. The administration has raided the Public Treasury repeatedly on behalf of its favorites. This, to my mind, is the most shameful performance of all and reminds one of the last days of the Roman Republic.

It is a matter of record that $25,000,000 of public money was spent to nominate Senator BARKLEY in the State of Kentucky, $25,000,000 of public money was spent to purge Senator TYDINGS in Maryland, and a similar sum was allocated to defeat Senator GEORGE in Georgia. Every close congressional district in the county was loaded up with useless projects costing hundreds of millions of dollars for the purpose of putting over the Democratic candidate. To my mind, unless this performance is stopped, we might as well half-mast the flag and bid adieu to free institutions. The administration has added 600,000 political proteges to the public pay roll and now has an army of political shock troops numbering over a million. While all this has been going on, the unemployed on relief have been refused a decent living and have been manhandled by a stupid arrogant bureaucracy.

ONE-MAN POWER AND BANKRUPTCY

For 7 years, lulled by the golden voice sounding off through the medium of ghost-written demogagic utterances, we have been drifting into one-man power and national bankruptcy. These two, history tells us, are the parents of fascism. The impartial student of history will record that the administration has, from every viewpoint, been a complete failure in the field of domestic economy.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Fumbling and hopelessly inept in internal affairs, the distinguished occupant of the White House has now turned to the foreign scene, where the most tragic events of all history are happening. I speak but the truth when I say that the President is using the sad condition of France and the dire predicament of democratic England for the purpose of distracting the American people from their own bankrupt and unhappy condition. In the Presidential press conferences spouting whales become submarines, and a rock at low tide in the Caribbean or the Bay of Fundy become alien battleships.

He and his coffee-cooler columnists and radio stooges, most of them on the public pay roll, are proclaiming a holy war to be fought with a bankrupt Treasury and at a time when we have few planes and fewer tanks, which, under modern tactics, are the chief weapons of offensive or defensive warfare. It should be remembered that those Presidential satellites, Hopkins and Ickes, have thrown to the winds and wasted at least $10,000,000,000 in the past 7 years. During that period, in common with some of my Democratic and Republican colleagues, I endeavored to get some of this money for military housing and defensive purposes. It was all in vain, for these gentlemen, and all the other "left wingers" who constituted the Presidential staff, refused to allocate money for this purpose. They built marble dog pounds and similar structures without limit, but national defense was not in their cosmos. The President was in sympathy with this attitude and out of this vast spending made no provision for the emergencies that are already present by reason of the German and Russian conquests.

During the same period the President, by his international fumbling, has repeatedly brought us to the verge of war. He now proposes to spend nine and probably eleven billion dollars ostensibly for planes, ships, and other equipment under the joint auspices of himself and Harry Hopkins. Mr. Hopkins, who is the greatest spender of all history, was seriously ill, but the thought of seven billions to spend has brought him back from the grave and he has now taken up his residence at the White House. Hand in hand with Hopkins comes Leon Henderson, a wild-eyed hater of the profit

motive. Also comes one Sidney Hillman, who under the Presidential ukase, is to have charge of the training of the boys and girls of America.

A brief word about Mr. Hillman. This gentleman has been famed for his assistance to the aspirations of Soviet Russia, and his organization loaned a million dollars to that country. He is in deep sympathy with the Russian scheme of things. The President knows his record and despite that fact has placed him in charge of the organization of the youth of America. This, to my mind, means the spread of communism in America during the years to come. He is the type that bores from within and is more dangerous than Earl Browder. The fathers and mothers of the country should know that this is the type of man who is to train their children. It is all typical of the inner workings of the administration in Washington. The naked fact is that the President of the United States is either in sympathy with this crowd, or is afraid of them.

It will be claimed that the National Defense Board will be under the direction of those great industrialists, Knudsen and Stettinius. We at Washington know that the duties assigned to Knudsen and Stettinius give them but small influence in this situation. It is a fair inference at this time that the President intends to run for a third term and to use this vast sum allocated for national defense for the purpose of breaking the sacred third-term precedent and promoting his own election and the election of a Democratic Congress. It is also a fair inference that this money will be used between now and election in doubtful States for the purpose of electing his hand-picked Democratic nominee for the Presidency. This is the President's program, and based on past experience, everyone knows that the case of national defense will go hand in hand with political advantage.

I am strong for national preparedness, but I am not for the shedding of American blood on European soil. A canvass of the House of Representatives showed that 400 Members were opposed to an entry in the war, but 1 Member of the House favored it. So you can put your mind at ease on that issue. Practically every Member of the House favors aid to England within the scope of international law. Practically every Member of the House is completely out of sympathy with the President's postering bellicose attitude toward other countries. It comes to me with good authority that the President unofficially gave word to France and England that we would intervene. The record shows that our playboy representative at Paris, Mr. Bullitt, discouraged peace and advised the continuance of the war. Mr. Bullitt was in daily telephonic communication with the President and he was the President's spokesman.

May I say in this phase of my discussion that every man on both the Republican and Democratic sides of the aisle believes that the United States must be made impregnable on the land, on the sea and in the air. All of us believe that we must keep the western continent, including Canada, free from the control of Communist or Fascist influence.

I have endeavored to sum up the situation nationally and at Washington. I do not believe that it is time to speak softly. I do believe that by proclaiming from the housetops the facts about the debacle at Washington, that we will rally all good Americans, regardless of party, to the Republican standard in November.

REPUBLICAN CONVENTION AT PHILADELPHIA

When you honored me last April by electing me a delegate to the National Republican Convention, it was my fixed belief that the vast majority of the Republicans of the district favored Tom Dewey for the Presidency. In common with all Americans, I greatly admired Dewey's magnificient service to decency in government. I greatly admired the gallant, effective canvass he made for the nomination. His speeches throughout the country carried conviction to the people that the New Deal has failed, and that we were in the midst of a grave emergency. Then came those tragic happenings in Europe in which one free people after another were ground under the brutal heel of Hitler. Then came the conviction to the American people that war had changed its rules; that it was no longer a matter of individual courage and initiative, but rather a war of machines on sea and land, and in the air. It became apparent that we would have to be ready to defend not only the United States but all of the Americas. It became apparent that there was needed at the head of the Government a business and industrial genius; a man imbued with purely patriotic, nonpolitical purposes, to lead the country out of the economic wilderness in which we have been wandering for 7 years.

One man seemed to answer this complete purpose. His fine personality, his great ability, his outstanding achievements in the business field, seemed to be the answer to the prayer of a country bogged down in the slough of despair. That man, by the grace of God, became the Republican nominee at Philadelphia. His name is Wendell Willkie and he will be the next President of the United States. Like Lincoln, he comes from the plain people and fought his way up through the school of hard knocks, working his way through college. As I size him up, he is an ardent believer in the destiny and worth of the man who toils, whether he is on a farm or in a factory.

I met him three times while I was at Philadelphia and was much impressed by his personal charm. We have been under the control of charm and the golden voice during the past 7 years, and it would not be well to underrate it. Willkie, however, has more than charm. Let me give you a brief verbal picture of him. He stands over 6 feet tall, with a strong body, and a magnificient head rising from powerful shoulders. He has a manly face, every line of which shows sincerity and power. He is frank and open in speech, and is a born orator of the realistic school.

The morning after I arrived at Philadelphia I met a friend of mine, a veteran newspaper man, who had just come from a press conference given by Willkie. He told me that over 100 reporters fired questions at Willkie for over half an hour, and that some of these questions were not too friendly. There is no type of man living who can detect fraud or the commonplace quicker than a newspaper man, and it is remarkable to state that at the conclusion of the press conference the reporters gave Willkie three rousing cheers.

Wendell Willkie, to my mind, is an extraordinary composite of Jackson and Theodore Roosevelt. He had campaigned for but 45 days and his only disbursements were for traveling expenses. In the convention he had the disfavor and opposition of the old-time bosses. His nomination was pursuant to a strong popular demand that America should get away from organized politics and nominate a man who could carry the burden of government and the salvation of popular institutions to a real consummation.

Willkie will give force and validity to collective bargaining for labor. I met William Green, the president of the American Federation of Labor, after he had appeared before the Resolutions Committee at Philadelphia. I asked him what Willkie's standing was with labor. He said that Willkie's 40,000 employees were all organized either in the Federation or C. I. O., and that they were among the most contented and the best-paid labor groups in America.

Willkie will give the American market back to the American farmer. He was brought up on a farm and now actively engages in farming himself. His recent reception in the West was most remarkable. He took the farmers by storm.

Willkie's election will set the wheels moving all over America. He will clear out the left wingers, who are boring from within the Government, and under his auspices, America will go full steam ahead. There will be a job, at living wage, for every man willing to work. He will provide for the rearmament of America along nonpolitical lines. He stands for the enforcement of the Monroe Doctrine and keeping the American Continent free from foreign influence. He is a noninterventionist, and does not believe that American blood should be shed on foreign soil. He stands for aid to England in its present situation, so long as that does not actually embroil us in the conflict.

He is for a sane, rational system of old-age security. He will salvage the savings of labor and the contributions of industry to this program. It is now being used by the administration as current assets, and in the event of national bankruptcy, which now seems to impend, these savings of the people will be lost.

He stands for vigorous enforcement of the antitrust act. His sympathies are as broad as those of Lincoln and he believes that this great country should give adequate and proper relief to the unemployed.

In conclusion let me sound a warning. This campaign is going to be a real battle. This committee and similar committees all over the country must carry the fight to the people. If that is done, victory is certain. America is now at the crossroads of destiny. To continue the present administration in power would mean the destruction of popular government in America and certain bankruptcy. The election of Willkie means the preservation of democracy and will insure that the blessings of liberty, both economic and spiritual, guaranteed by the Constitution, will be handed down to our children and children's children to the latest generation.

The National Labor Relations Board

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY S. TRUMAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 12 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE ST. LOUIS POST-DISPATCH

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix to the RECORD an editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch. It is a very great pleasure to find this great antiadministration daily on the right side of a political question.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of September 2, 1940]

THE FUTURE OF J. WARREN MADDEN

The term of J. Warren Madden as Chairman of the National Labor Relations Board expired last week. So far there has been no intimation from President Roosevelt that he is to be reappointed or

that a successor is to be named. This is, of course, a thorny matter, involving, as it does, the whole dispute over the Wagner Act and the Board.

Therefore it should be said now that Mr. Madden has done a good job under the most difficult circumstances. The strength of his record—and its weaknesses, too—stem from his views of the Board's function. To him this has been primarily legal. In passing the Wagner Act Congress outlined a broad policy. It was the duty of the Board, in Mr. Madden's belief, to implement that policy, to create a body of ruling labor law. With the Board's chief counsel, Charles Fahy, this has been done beyond all expectation. No matter how old, there is not a single Federal agency that can boast of as victorious a record before the Supreme Court.

Naturally, this has been an ivory tower job of crossing every "t" and dotting every "i." It was and is necessary in cases that go to trial examiners and the courts. But these represent less than 10 percent of the complaints filed with the Board. It is in the other cases—whether they are withdrawn, dismissed or end in mutual agreement of union and employer—that a more flexible touch is needed. If a regional director has settled a nasty matter—probably at the cost of plenty of sweat—only irritation is caused if the agreement is sent back from Washington because it is not quite in the exact form desired by a punctilious lawyer. A different example of this lack of realism was the Board's effort to keep Government contracts from violators of the law.

Such situations call for the hearty "let's get together, boys" attitude of the Board's newest member, Mr. Leiserson. He may be an old school fire-eater, but he knows what corners can be cut.

The obvious answer is that both attitudes must be represented on the Board—that of the lawyer and that of the conciliator. It would be difficult to find a man who can represent the former as well as Mr. Madden. It is impossible to find another man with his experience. Further, he labored in the vineyard when the work was at its hardest and the sun at its hottest. His record does not deserve dismissal.

Senator Ernest Lundeen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN J. MAAS

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 9, 1940

Mr. MAAS. Mr. Speaker, it is hard to believe that one who was so strong and vigorous yesterday is gone today. The sudden departure of a colleague with whom you have associated and worked closely is, indeed, a sad and mournful occasion. Friendships are life's greatest rewards. Their loss is irreplaceable.

The tragic and shocking death of Senator LUNDEEN has taken from public affairs an unusual political figure.

Senator LUNDEEN above all else was always a crusader. He was most generally found on the unpopular side of public questions and fought vigorously for his convictions. He was one of the first public officials in the country to advocate the acquisition by the United States of naval bases in the European-owned islands off the Atlantic shores of the Western Hemisphere.

Senator LUNDEEN was himself a veteran of the Spanish-American War. Because he was opposed to our involvement in foreign wars, he was considered an isolationist. Perhaps he was. A common error has arisen that all isolationists are pacifists. This mistake probably arises due to the fact that frequently isolationists found pacifists advocating the same course.

However, Senator LUNDEEN was no pacifist. He was an active advocate of a powerful national defense. He supported naval expansion and all our moves to increase the air forces of the United States. He was an active member of the Senate Military Affairs Committee.

Senator LUNDEEN was a great enthusiast of aviation. He not only supported the development of aviation in the Congress but he himself was one of the most prominent and frequent users of air travel. He had flown to Europe and back, and to and from the Hawaiian Islands, as well as all over this country. The more he flew the more his enthusiasm for flying grew.

Senator LUNDEEN was a vigorous public figure, and he was a devoted husband and father. While his death is an irreparable loss to his family, it is also a real loss to the Nation, as he had a distinct place and great usefulness in our democratic system.

Vindication of Carl Byoir

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES P. McGRANERY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 12, 1940

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES ON THE INVESTIGATION OF CARL BYOIR

Mr. McGRANERY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following report of the Committee on Un-American Activities on charges made against Carl Byoir released for publication on Tuesday, September 10.

Carl Byoir, president of Carl Byoir and Associates, public relations counsel, of New York City, was accused on the floor of the House on May 27 and June 4 of being chief of the Nazi spy ring in this country, of having had something to do with the disappearance of M-day plans from the War Department, which were later supposed to have showed up in the possession of the German Government, and was further accused of being engaged in the business of infiltrating German spies into large business organizations which Mr. Byoir represents.

It will be noted that the Dies committee report refers to an investigation made by the McCormack committee of a certain contract entered into by Mr. Byoir with the German Federal Railroads in 1933 for the promotion of trade and travel and canceled by him in 1935. The vice chairman of the committee, Hon. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN, when he reported to the House, stated that Mr. Byoir was to be commended for his patriotic attitude on the matter. I congratlulate Mr. Byoir on his vindication and further congratulate the Committee on Un-American Activities on this demonstration of its ability to clear the innocent as well as turn up the guilty.

REPORT OF THE FULL COMMITTEE OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES, CONGRESSMAN JOE STARNES PRESIDING, ON THE CARL BYOIR MATTER

On June 6 last this committee initiated an investigation with respect to allegations of un-American activity which had been made against Carl Byoir, president of Carl Byoir and Associates, by WRIGHT PATMAN, a Member of Congress, on the floor of the House of Representatives.

The chairman of the committee, Mr. DIES, appointed Mr. DEMPSEY, of New Mexico, Mr. CASEY, of Massachusetts, and Mr. MASON, of Illinois, as a subcommittee to investigate the matter. Competent investigators of this committee were assigned to make a thorough investigation of all of the charges. At the same time the Federal Bureau of Investigation of the Department of Justice undertook a separate and independent investigation. On July 16, 1940, the Department of Justice issued the following statement:

"The investigation by the Federal Bureau of Investigation concerning allegations against Carl Byoir disclosed no evidence whatsoever that he has engaged in any un-American activity. No basis for departmental action has been found, and the case is regarded as closed."

The subcommittee also had for consideration all of the evidence presented before the McCormack committee with respect to a contract made by Mr. Byoir with the German Federal Railroads for the promotion of trade and travel in 1933, which was canceled by him in 1935. The committee does not believe that it is within its province to go behind the findings of fact nor the recommendations of the McCormack committee in this matter. The committee, therefore, has confined itself to events subsequent therto. It might be mentioned in this connection that the evidence shows that the contract was entered into for the promotion of trade and travel at a time when our Government was doing everything possible to promote trade relations with Germany.

On July 15, 1940, the subcommittee, after a study of all of the evidence, unanimously submitted to the chairman the following report:

"The subcommittee you appointed to investigate the charges of un-American activities made against Carl Byoir after carefully going over the report by Mr. Stedman and also after consulting the files of F. B. I. in the case find nothing to justify the charges made, nor any evidence that could possibly form a basis for such charges. We therefore find satisfaction in clearing Mr. Carl Byoir of the charges made against him and recommend that a resolution covering a complete exoneration of Mr. Byoir be voted by the full committee as soon as possible, such resolution to be based upon the subcommittee's report. We also believe in fairness to Mr. Byoir immediate publicity should be given to the subcommittee's findings."

Subsequently, Mr. PATMAN registered a complaint on the floor of the House to the effect that he had not been heard by the subcommittee, although his charges had been set forth in three addresses on the floor of the House, all available to the subcommittee. Accordingly Mr. PATMAN was given an opportunity to be heard before a meeting of the full committee held on Thursday, August 29. He made a complete statement of his position in this matter. Mr. PATMAN presented no new material evidence. Mr. Byoir appeared and was examined concerning the charges made against him.

The full committee adopts the report of its subcommittee fully exonerating Mr. Byoir of any charges reflecting on his Americanism or loyalty to the Government of the United States.

The Courage of Henry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFF CLEVENGER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 12, 1940

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, as the days of my youth were spent in part on a Warren County, Iowa, farm, the following editorial, The Courage of Henry, is particularly interesting, coming as it does right from the home grounds. My friend the editor certainly is kind to killer of the little pigs. Think what a story he could make of it if he just took his hair down and went to town with the protagonist for the ever-normal granary, as Henry so blithely denominates the 450,000,000 bushels of stored corn hanging over the bumper crop Iowa now has coming on. I would set up straw man Hitler and knock the tar out of him also if I were in Henry's uncomfortable shoes. Time to call this stored threat "Agriculture's part in our preparedness for war."

A review of the last century under Democratic Presidents does bear out the prophecy of Bruce Barton's letter from the cook:

Every time we gets a Democrat, we gets a war.

As my memory serves me, there were six of them and only one had placid sailing in his foreign relations.

Polk, the first of them, took us into the war with Mexico.

Pierce, the second, had a tranquil term as to wars, but he led us into the most disastrous financial panic of our history.

James Buchanan left us with Fort Sumter fired upon and the War between the States in progress.

Grover Cleveland, the strongest and soundest of them all, was fortunate in his just quarrel with England over Venezuela and avoided a war.

Woodrow Wilson kept us out of war in 1916 until after election and we hope the present one can give us a like respite before we are called upon to make good on our present British alliance with Canada.

Does rather seem we ought to O. K. her wars before we are called upon to fight them, does it not?

[From the Indianola (Iowa) Record]

THE COURAGE OF HENRY

The acceptance speech of Henry Wallace is not to be taken lightly. When an old acquaintance, who used to be noted for his carefully weighed sentences, resorts to strained comparisons to get effects, it is time for his friends to stop and think.

Those who have maintained their confidence in Mr. Wallace despite political differences will note with sadness that he seems to have degenerated from an economist into a demagogue. If the Republican Party can be criticized on no more points than the far-fetched subjects for which Henry took it to task, then it is a better party than the Record thought it was. If there is nothing wrong with it except that it is a party of "appeasement" (an utterly silly accusation), and that its national chairman has not voted for all the farm legislation (fortunately for Henry's attempt at argument the Democratic chairman is not on record), then this show is about over.

Everybody understands, of course, that Henry was nominated by farm leaders. There is Farmer Flynn, Tammany boss of New York and now Democratic national chairman, and Farmer Hague, boss of Jeresey City, and Farmer Kelly, mayor of Chicago, whose political record would stink a dog off a gut wagon and drive a skunk to the open for air, not to mention Leased Farmer Hopkins, who wants his mare mules in foal, and, over and above all, Farmer Roosevelt, who was sailing yachts when Wendell Willkie was shocking wheat and herding sheep.

Keep in mind that Henry was not nominated by the free choice of the Chicago convention, but by the two-gun methods of the above-named "damfarmers."

Seriously, the Record, hardboiled Republican as it is accused of being, has in the past pointed out more genuine serious flaws in the Republican Party than Mr. Wallace could find to kick about. Under the prodding the party has had from Alf Landon for the past 4 years, and the present inspiring leadership of Wendell Willkie, the Record sees republicanism rising above its most serious past errors and becoming a reborn force for American ideals; but we didn't suppose, until last Thursday night, that it was so good the cheer leader of the new dealers would have to fake charges on which to condemn it.

Well Henry, old neighbor, here's hoping you succeed in arousing the people to an adequate hatred of Hitler. By gosh, it took guts to stand up in public as you did and denounce Hitler right there in Des Moines where everybody loves him so much—so much. If you had only attacked the Mohammendan religion and exposed polygamy in the island of Sulu, the evening would have been complete.

Seriously and confidentially, Henry, it did take a peculiar brand of courage—or something (were it not for your superb reputation for clean living we would say five fingers of gin)—at any rate some extraordinary daring for you to tell the world that anybody who would replace Mr. Roosevelt "would cause Hitler to rejoice."

The whole world knows that Wendell Willkie was in the front-line trenches fighting Hitler and his ilk while your man was safe in a marble office in Washington. Perhaps your man was doing his full part; but it hardly seems your part now to level the charge of disloyalty against the man who was doing the more hazardous job then.

After all, your man is running against a man who fought Hitler first. You seemed to think you could make the people believe your man is running against Hitler now.

You are in a tough spot, Henry, put up to give respectability to a cause that badly needs it. If your acceptance speech is all that you can say for the gang of political bosses with which you are associated, then you had better walk out on them to save your own reputation and the grand good name of your family. Moley walked out. Johnson walked out. Douglas walked out. Stanley High walked out. Garner as good as walked out, and Farley was pushed out. A grandson of Uncle Henry and a son of Henry C. is left in strange and polygot company.

Surely, Henry, you didn't write that speech. You could have done better. Honestly, now, wasn't it handed to you by the boys higher up who are using you as "bait for the farmers?"

The Need for Corn and Livestock Feed in Nebraska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL T. CURTIS
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 12, 1940

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I have had presented to me a petition which is as follows:

Whereas the ravages of drought have swept over a large portion of Nebraska for what is, in many cases, the seventh successive year, destroying our crops to such an extent as to eliminate not only all hope of selling grains for cash, but also destroying all vegetation to the point where, in many cases, we do not have food of any kind for our hogs, cattle, poultry, or other livestock and, therefore, making it necessary for us to dispose of these animals which are our only hope of gaining enough to sustain us during the winter and, inasmuch as in most cases we have exhausted our credit through the regular channels and also through the governmental channels, and whereas our plight has reached such a point that further borrowing of money is merely adding to the weight that pulls us under, therefore

We urgently plead that the Congress take such action as is necessary to provide, out of the huge stocks held by the Government, for farmers in the drought area, 10 bushels of corn for

every acre of corn planted during this growing season with provision that it be repaid any time within the next 5 years, in kind, with no other charges to be assessed to the recipients.

The situation in Nebraska is a study in striking contrast. Part of the State bears promise of bountiful crops but in our section the situation is desperate and action is needed to keep farmers on their farms and to enable them to carry through their livestock and poultry with the resulting products which are absolutely necessary to keep enough activity in our small towns to sustain the merchants and townspeople who are directly dependent upon the products of the farmers for their living.

Mr. Speaker, the above petition has been signed by 3,350 residents of my congressional district. Due to a drought lasting 7 years the situation is most tragic. I hope the Members of Congress will assist me in having the Department of Agriculture do something about this very perplexing problem.

If the Government would release corn into that area now owned by the Government it would mean a great deal. At the same time the Federal Government would save about 10 cents a bushel per year storage charges and these distressed farmers could return bushel per bushel at a later time.

Conscription

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN J. MAAS
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 7, 1940

Mr. MAAS. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to peacetime conscription; and to begin with I could not see the necessity for the Burke-Wadsworth bill. However, I am now convinced that these are no longer normal peacetimes. Recent events, particularly in the last few weeks, have shown that our danger of involvement in a world war is very real. Our only hope of avoiding involvement is to immediately become so strong that no one will risk a war against us. I have always been an ardent advocate of full preparedness. I have always hoped that this could be accomplished without the conscription of either men or industry.

Events are moving with such lightning-like rapidity now, however, that in these abnormal times we must take drastic measures to insure at once our total defense.

While it is regrettable that conscription is necessary in this country, it is folly to longer ignore the necessity of immediately building up the most powerful defenses possible for this country. Whether right or wrong, we have chosen up sides in the European war, which may easily become a world-wide war at any moment.

It can hardly be expected that our aid to one belligerent will not ultimately involve us in either the war itself directly or an attempt at reprisals by the other belligerents when the present European war is over. If we are to be drawn into the war, regardless of what draws us into it, we must be prepared to successfully defend ourselves. This requires the marshalling of industry and the mobilizing of our manpower in advance. It is too late to do these things once you are at war.

If we are to avoid attempts being made to take reprisals against us, if they can be avoided, it will be only because we have made ourselves so powerful that no other nation will dare challenge our strength. If reprisals are actually attempted, we must be so well prepared that we can successfully counter those reprisals.

While it is true that we do not have all of the military equipment necessary at the present time to fully equip an army of two or three million men, it is still necessary that we start the training of those men at once.

Equally important with the training of soldiers in the use of modern military weapons is the necessity of giving civilian soldiers a "hardening up" process of months of rigid training in military discipline and army routine. The best mechanic in the world, for instance, cannot stand up under battle conditions without having gone through this process of toughening and hardening up, no matter how well he understands the mechanical operation of a tank or an armored truck. Once a battle starts, it may be days before there is a moment's let up. Men, as well as machines, must be able to stand up under such conditions. Only rigid camp life and military routine can give this training, which is fully equal to the technical training in its importance. With the example of unprepared France and England before us, it would be foolhardy for us, in the light of present world conditions and developments, to longer remain less than totally prepared ourselves.

If war can be avoided, it will be avoided only because we are so strong and so well prepared that no one will dare make war upon us. The Congress has authorized and appropriated billions of dollars for the procurement of a vast armada on the sea, in the air, and on land. These airplanes, ships, tanks, and guns must have trained human beings to man them. It would seem the height of folly to spend these billions and procure all these defense weapons without training the men in their use. An airplane on the ground, a troop truck in a garage, a gun in its shed, are of no value in resisting attacks.

In mobilizing a large army, the most orderly, efficient, and fair way is by selective service. This insures that the Nation will be defended by the rich and poor alike, by equal representation according to population from all communities and sections of the country.

We do not permit volunteering in the paying of our taxes to provide for the cost of the defenses of the Nation. We no longer even permit volunteering in business and industry in the producing of the weapons and supplies necessary for our defense. There is no more reason why we should depend entirely upon volunteering for the men to defend this country. Any man who is willing to accept the benefits and opportunities of this country should be willing when necessity arises to defend the country that makes those benefits possible.

All Americans have an equal opportunity in this country, and they should all be willing to share equally in the obligation of defending this Nation.

Congress To Abdicate?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 10, 1940

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, the people of this Nation are greatly worried over the European situation, and justly so. There has been much discussion throughout the length and breadth of our land respecting the duty of the Congress in the face of the war in Europe, and the vast majority of the people, from every section, are clamoring that Congress remain in session throughout this very unsettled condition. The people of my congressional district are insisting that the Congress stay here and continue in session throughout this critical period in order to aid in safeguarding the peace and security of our Nation. May I say that I am in full accord with the wishes of the people of my district, and I am ready and willing to remain in Washington during this entire critical period in order to assist in every possible way to keep our country out of this war.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, and to include therein a very illuminating editorial which appeared in the Washington News, on the subject Congress To Abdicate? The editorial follows:

CONGRESS TO ABDICATE?

It was on June 4 that President Roosevelt expressed his opinion that Congress might as well adjourn in a couple of weeks. National defense, he said, would not require the presence of the law-

makers in Washington. Nor, he said, could they serve any purpose except, perhaps, the laudable one of making speeches.

Since the date of that smart crack, Congress has passed 12 appropriation bills, totaling fourteen and one-half billions of taxpayer money and credit. It has authorized construction of a two-ocean Navy and has given the President authority to call the National Guard into service. It has enacted the alien registration law, the second Hatch Act, a law to regulate investment trusts, and has adopted a bristling restatement of the Monroe Doctrine. It has confirmed the appointments of a new Secretary of War and Secretary of the Navy, and has before it for confirmation the appointments of a new Secretary of Commerce and a new Postmaster General. It has passed a billion-dollar defense tax bill, and is at work on a new excess-profits tax. And, most important of all, it is completing action on a bill to conscript manpower.

Mr. Roosevelt, notwithstanding his "indispensable" foresight, could not foresee the necessity for these far-reaching measures back on that June day when he blithely bade Congress pack its grip and leave the Nation's defense problem with the executive department.

All this is reviewed because talk of adjournment again is in the air—most of it, as usual, coming from administration sources. Administration Leader SAM RAYBURN proposed that Congress adjourn sine die at the end of this month, which would mean that there would be no Congress in Washington in October, November, and December—not until the new Congress convenes in January.

Minority Leader JOE MARTIN says he favors 3-day recesses, but not adjournment.

A recess longer than Mr. MARTIN proposes—say for as much as a month, covering the last part of the campaign season and giving the lawmakers a chance to get in personal touch with their constituents—might be all to the good. But for Congress to adjourn—to walk out on what gives every indication of being the most vital quarter of a year in the Nation's history—is, we think, too preposterous even to be seriously considered.

To leave to the Executive at a time like this the responsibility for such action as the fast-moving and tragic events may call for would be just another and a very spectacular evidence that we, like France, have gone soft; that purely political considerations have submerged and smothered our sense of duty; that the first Tuesday after the first Monday in November has become der Tag with our so-called statesmen, and to hell with what may happen otherwise.

It is herewith recommended that Congress remember that it is hired by the year; and, further, that every Senator and Representative dust off and read the Constitution under which they serve; that they reorient themselves to the realization that our system of Government involves three equal and coordinate branches, of which they add up to one-third.

Particularly we would suggest that they read (under the heading "Powers of Congress") those constitutional passages which have to do with declaring war, the raising and supporting of armies, the providing and maintaining of navies, the suppression of insurrections and the repelling of invasions, the arming and disciplining of the militia, and the borrowing of money on the credit of the United States.

Also, that they realize that we are drifting rapidly toward war, though the purpose of our vast defense program, including conscription of our young men, is to keep out of, not to get into, war—and that Congress, with its oftentimes irritating speechmaking, is by its very nature the great restraining influence against war, as distinct from the executive department which, by its very nature, is the department of action.

Lastly, as the preachers say, we throw in this thought—that if Congress should adjourn it is very probable that the folks back home, come election day, will decide to keep at home permanently those who vote to abdicate.

Congress To Abdicate?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT K. GOODWIN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 12, 1940

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, I call to the attention of the House the following editorial appearing in the Washington Daily News of September 11, 1940, which is entitled "Congress to Abdicate?"

Gentlemen of the House, if there ever was a statement of fact that goes directly to the heart of a situation and lays it out cold in plain everyday language, a language we all can understand, this editorial is such a statement. It speaks directly for the people and their interests.

I include this editorial with the full permission and knowledge of Mr. John T. O'Rourke, executive editor of the News:

It was on June 4 that President Roosevelt expressed his opinion that Congress might as well adjourn in a couple of weeks. National defense, he said, would not require the presence of the lawmakers in Washington. Nor, he said, could they serve any purpose except, perhaps, the laudable one of making speeches.

Since the date of that smart crack, Congress has passed 12 appropriation bills, totaling fourteen and one-half billions of taxpayer money and credit. It has authorized construction of a two-ocean Navy, and has given the President authority to call the National Guard into service. It has enacted the alien registration law, the second Hatch Act, a law to regulate investment trusts, and has adopted a bristling restatement of the Monroe Doctrine. It has confirmed the appointments of a new Secretary of War and Secretary of the Navy, and has before it for confirmation the appointments of a new Secretary of Commerce and a new Postmaster General. It has passed a billion-dollar defense-tax bill, and is at work on a new excess-profits tax. And, most important of all, it is completing action on a bill to conscript manpower.

Mr. Roosevelt, notwithstanding his "indispensable" foresight, could not foresee the necessity for these far-reaching measures back on that June day when he blithely bade Congress pack its grip and leave the Nation's defense problem with the executive department.

All this is reviewed because talk of adjournment again is in the air—most of it, as usual, coming from administration sources. Administration Leader SAM RAYBURN proposed that Congress adjourn sine die at the end of this month which would mean that there would be no Congress in Washington in October, November, and December—not until the new Congress convenes in January.

Minority Leader JOE MARTIN says he favors 3-day recesses, but not adjournment.

A recess longer than Mr. MARTIN proposes—say for as much as a month, covering the last part of the campaign season and giving the lawmakers a chance to get in personal touch with their constituents—might be all to the good. But for Congress to adjourn—to walk out on what gives every indication of being the most vital quarter of a year in the Nation's history—is, we think, too preposterous even to be seriously considered.

To leave to the Executive at a time like this the responsibility for such action as the fast-moving and tragic events may call for would be just another and a very spectacular evidence that we, like France, have gone soft; that purely political considerations have submerged and smothered our sense of duty; that the first Tuesday after the first Monday in November has become der Tag with our so-called statesmen, and to hell with what may happen otherwise.

It is herewith recommended that Congress remember that it is hired by the year; and, further, that every Senator and Representative dust off and read the Constitution under which they serve; that they reorient themselves to the realization that our system of government involves three equal and co-ordinate branches, of which they add up to one-third.

Particularly we would suggest that they read (under the heading "Powers of Congress") those constitutional passages which have to do with declaring war, the raising and supporting of armies, the providing and maintaining of navies, the suppression of insurrections and the repelling of invasions, the arming and disciplining of the militia, and the borrowing of money on the credit of the United States.

Also, that they realize that we are drifting rapidly toward war, though the purpose of our vast defense program, including conscription of our young men, is to keep out, not to get into, war—and that Congress, with its oftentimes irritating speechmaking, is by its very nature the great restraining influence against war, as distinct from the executive department which, by its very nature, is the department of action.

Lastly, as the preachers say, we throw in this thought—that if Congress should adjourn, it is very probable that the folks back home, come election day, will decide to keep at home permanently those who vote to abdicate

Proof of Authenticity of the British Secret Document—Part III

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. THORKELSON

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 3, 1940

Mr. THORKELSON. Mr. Speaker, my object in having inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD evidence to prove the authenticity of the British secret document, or the letter which was sent to Lloyd George, is solely for informative purposes.

The substance matter which I have inserted in the RECORD is to identify this letter as a true report sent by a British

official to the Prime Minister of England. Everyone who has the interest of our country at heart, should demand that this letter be republished in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, for it is Exhibit 126 of the Senate hearings on the alleged activities of the Geneva Conference. No objection should be raised in having this document printed, unless the suppression of it is for the purpose of protecting officials in the British Government.

The letter, as I have already said, is contemptible, as it treats all Americans as inferiors to self-anointed upper strata in English society. It follows, therefore, that if the withholding of publicity on this document is of value to Great Britain, the cost of reproducing it is of much greater value to the people of the United States.

I shall now quote excerpts from the British secret document, so that they may be compared with the articles I have inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on September 10 and 11, entitled "Proof of Authenticity of the British Secret Document" and "British Propaganda and Subversion of Textbooks in American Public Schools."

EDUCATION

For many years we had trained the inhabitants to view native culture with disdain and disgust. Real culture was produced only "on the other side." Americans such as Henry James, Whistler, Sargent, and Edwin Abbey were conceded domestic recognition only after they had received our imprimatur. Before the war we had created a considerable demand for British-born and trained men to fill positions of intellectual control here. During the war we added thousands to the number of these men by substituting them for hostile natives, teachers, preachers, professors, and lecturers who were dismissed for our sake by patriotic authority. We organized our thought controllers into British schools and universities' clubs; and we are now nearing the point where, through their concerted efforts, we shall control from the cradle to the grave whatever mind this Nation possesses.

HOSTILE NATIVE TENDENCIES

On the Irish-American situation here, Sir Horace Plunkett has lately reported. There is no German-American situation; it is considered near treason to use German silver, to hear German music, or to have German measles. German we have managed to bar from so many schools that we need no longer fear either intellectual or commercial competition from Germany in America, or commercial competition from this country in Germany. And we are rewriting the school history books in order to make King George III, of glorious memory, a German king so that our late enemies may be penalized for the wrongs which the Colonists fancy they received at his royal hands and ours.

PUERICULTURE

We are at present engaged in a campaign to Americanize the schools, to make obedient loyal little Britons out of the undisciplined native young. School books now refer to the 1776 revolt as an unfortunate and senseless family quarrel, which has been given regrettable publicity by the vulgar and scandalous. With votive wreaths we laid the ghosts of the foolish fathers. The Child's Book of Knowledge and similar works, which we have tactfully introduced, enable the young to anglicize their parents. There is a growing tendency on the part of the wealthy to seek exclusively English schools, such as St. Bernard's in New York City, for the education of their children. This tendency should be fostered by Foreign Office subsidy, if necessary.

We are replacing with the song America the scurrilous Star-Spangled Banner, which, after expurgating, we socially ostracized. America, which has the same air as God Save the King, is usually played and not sung; so in effect, we are conferring on this colony the imperial anthem.

These excerpts from the British secret document are self-explanatory, and the claims made are confirmed by the articles to which I have referred.

Was the author of the letter to the Honorable Lloyd George correct when he asserted that attempts would be made to remove The Star-Spangled Banner as our national anthem? The answer is "Yes," as the articles I now quote will reveal:

The spiritual union of England and America—and there is no other union—is God-made. Its attempted disruption through the insistence on the perpetuation of The Star-Spangled Banner is German propaganda, and it must and shall cease. It had not occurred to me that this was German propaganda to keep up a former animosity which existed between England and America, or Ephraim and Manasseh, until it was told me by those highest in authority.

The Star-Spangled Banner is not our official anthem, and therefore is not a national institution. It is an excrescence—an illegitimate branch that has been engrafted on the holy roots of our national consciousness. It is a blot on our escutcheon and in no way represents us in this momentous hour. A supreme power has evidently prevented the authorization of a hymn which does not express American democracy.

Lloyd George emphasized the same sentiment in the press today (September 12, 1918): "This must be the last war. * * * There is no compromise between freedom and tyranny, no compromise between light and darkness. I know that it is better to sacrifice one generation than to sacrifice liberty forever. That is what we are fighting for, and Heaven grant that we fight through to the end."

It would interest you to know, no doubt, that I am in receipt of a letter from Queen Mary of England, in which she states that she has read my pamphlet, Words and Music of The Star-Spangled Banner Oppose the Spirit of Democracy, Which the Declaration of Independence Embodies, and assures me of her interest in it, and also her interest in the words of the new national anthem, Our America.

This is the standard around which I am rallying my spiritual, mental forces. The insistence upon perpetuating darkness and schism, which The Star-Spangled Banner represents, is, I have been told by some in the highest authority, nothing more nor less than German propaganda, working to keep alive the spirit of animosity between England and America. It must and shall cease. True Americans are demanding and taking possession of their spiritual birthright of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness and will share eventually this birthright with their Anglo-Saxon brothers, who, with them, will lead all nations out of the misery and darkness of hatred and animality into the light of life and love, the source and supply of man's real spiritual individuality.

These excerpts are from a book entitled "Words and Music of The Star-Spangled Banner Oppose the Spirit of Democracy Which the Declaration of Independence Embodies." A protest, by Kitty Cheatham, which was copyrighted in 1918.

I now quote from the New York Times, August 5, 1925:

The Star-Spangled Banner, with its words breathing hatred of our Anglo-Saxon brother, Britain, and its music borrowed from a foul English drinking song, To Anacreon in Heaven, can never become our national anthem. Never has Congress and never will Congress legalize Francis Scott Key's ballad, which voices "bombs bursting in air," "blood," "the terror of flight and the gloom of the grave," "foul footsteps' pollution," and refers to our Anglo-Saxon brother, Britain, as "the foe's haughty host."

---

880 ST. NICHOLAS AVENUE,
New York City, August 1, 1925.

Mrs. AUGUSTA E. STETSON,
7 West Ninety-sixth Street, New York City.

DEAR MRS. STETSON: I have just been reading your book, Sermons Which Spiritually Interpret the Scriptures, published by G. P. Putnam's Sons. The article which engaged my attention at this time is entitled "The Star-Spangled Banner Can Never Become Our National Anthem," which you first published in the press of New York, Washington, and Baltimore, in June 1922. In this article you protest against the song, both words and music, which you characterize as being un-American, unauthorized by Congress, and which you prophesy will be erased from America's historic record by fiat of God.

For years I have been aware of the subtle, un-Christian influence of this song, The Star-Spangled Banner, and of the very evident use which is made of it to stir up sentiments inimical and hurtful to every ideal which Americans cherish. The fact is that each time a bill has been introduced in Congress seeking to legalize The Star-Spangled Banner as our national anthem Congress has refused to give its sanction.

Allow me to relate two incidents which occurred in my experience recently. At a large public gathering, held near New York City early last month, The Star-Spangled Banner was played by the band as a prelude to the addresses and exercises of the evening. I was seated in my car, but I did not remove my hat, as this would have been equivalent to my acquiescence in the vicious sentiments and ribald music of this song, which I repudiate, as well as an acknowledgment of its legality, contrary to Congress' attitude.

A man came running toward me, excitedly waving his arms, and demanding that I remove my hat, but I paid no attention to him, and the music ceased before he reached my car.

On a similar occasion, a few days later, the band again played The Star-Spangled Banner. This time I was one of the throng about the platform, which was brilliantly lighted; but I again kept my hat upon my head. A lady, a member of a group standing near, said, "Take off your hat to our national anthem." I replied, "Madam, The Star-Spangled Banner is not the national anthem of America, for it has never been authorized by Congress." She expressed surprise. At that moment a gentleman approached me from behind, tapped me on the shoulder, and said, "Excuse me, sir, you have forgotten your hat." I said, "No, sir; I have not forgotten my hat. This song is not our national anthem."

I longed to tell these people, who were the ignorant mouthpieces for vicious, un-American sentiments, the truth about this song and its foreign, ribald musical setting, but the time was not opportune. Therefore, dear Mrs. Stetson, I feel that your article on this subject, if reprinted in the press at this time, will do a great work in enlightening the people of America as to a phase of the hidden, secret, alien warfare which is today being fiercely waged against our beloved country, America, as well as against the God-ordained and predestined unity of the two great Anglo-Saxon peoples, America and Britain, under the rulership of Christ. Will you republish your valuable article now? With much respect,

Sincerely yours,

J. P. BLAIR.

I have taken the liberty of quoting these excerpts, in order to show that the author of the British secret document was not given to idle speculation. He knew that our schools, colleges, and churches were undermined with British-Israel and Anglo-Saxon federation propaganda, and that an attempt would be made to exchange The Star-Spangled Banner for a song, entitled, "Our America," a verse of which I now quote:

America, America, in thee is found
Manasseh's tribe, to Ephraim bound.
By Israel's vow,
Whose destiny is heaven-sealed:
Far-spreading vine in fruitful field.
God's planting, thou!

From Words and Music of The Star-Spangled Banner Oppose the Spirit of Democracy Which the Declaration of Independence Embodies; a protest, by Kitty Cheatham, which shows the hand of the British-Israel World Federation.

In contrast to this, it is to the everlasting credit of the Committee on the Judiciary, House of Representatives, Sixty-eighth Congress, which came valiantly to the defense of The Star-Spangled Banner, as our national anthem. Much credit for this must be given to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] and to former Representative Linthicum from Maryland, whom I now quote:

STATEMENT OF HON. J. CHARLES LINTHICUM, MEMBER OF CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF MARYLAND

Mr. LINTHICUM. I introduced a similar bill to the one under discussion today, No. 6429, on the 1st of April 1919, and on the 2d of April 1921.

We feel that though the Army and Navy have issued rules and regulations for the adoption of Key's anthem, The Star-Spangled Banner, it should have recognition by Congress itself. We feel that the Congress, with the approval of the Executive, should promulgate this as the national anthem of our country, just as many other countries have adopted and approved national anthems for their respective countries.

There are many songs which are perhaps easier sung and some people who think that perhaps The Star-Spangled Banner is a little hard to sing that therefore it should not be the national anthem. But while there are many songs, there has never been in the history of this country a song which sprung from the hearts of the people as did The Star-Spangled Banner, and at a time when the destiny of the country weighed in the balance.

I do not want to go too far into history, because with this committee it is like carrying coals to Newcastle.

But we can readily realize the condition of our country when in August 1814, the National Capitol had been destroyed, the White House in this city had been destroyed, and British vessels with 7,000 troops under their control were leaving it in this devastated condition, having in a great measure dispensed practically the National Government and were then proceeding on to Baltimore.

It was the intention, as stated in the London Times on that occasion that troops should come down from Canada, that troops should proceed from Washington on to Baltimore, then to Philadelphia and New York, and there to meet the troops from Canada and thereby capture the entire eastern coast of our country, which was practically the whole of our country.

It was the indomitable courage of the men of America at North Point and at Fort McHenry who met General Ross and his troops on that memorable day on the 12th of September, at North Point, which defeated him, though the American troops were less than 3,000 only 1,700 of which went into action, while the British troops numbered somewhere around 7,000, trained and picked men from the battlefields of Europe, men who had fought Napoleon under the great General Wellington, and had now been released because Napoleon had been sent to the island to Elba, the war having practically ceased in Europe.

Those were the men who were sent to capture America and those were the men whom the patriotic Americans defeated at North Point and Fort McHenry.

That was the condition of this country, the Capitol and buildings destroyed, the White House destroyed, the Nation's Capital under the heel of the British. They were leaving this section, going from Upper Marlboro. Dr. Beanes, who had protested against their actions in his little town, had been captured, had been put aboard one of the British boats and carried to Baltimore, where the British were to attack Fort McHenry.

Francis Scott Key, who lived in this city, right here where you have established and built the great Key Bridge—in a small house recently razed, just this side of that—a member of the bar, born in Frederick, Md., proceeded to Baltimore with orders from the President, asking to have his friend, Dr. Beanes, released.

He was taken aboard the ship *Minden*, where he went to consult with the British commander and, owing to the attack which was to be made, he was kept on that ship all night pending the attack on Fort McHenry.

There, during the night, he witnessed these bombs flying from the British ships to the fort, 400 of which are said to have reached the fort. From that comes that immortal line, "Bombs bursting in air."

So, in suspense, he remained there that entire night, listening to the bombardment of a city where his friends lived, where his relatives lived, listening to the bombardment of a city which, if it fell, he knew meant the proceeding of the British on to Philadelphia, New York, and perhaps the capture of the entire country.

There, in great suspense, was born this great anthem, The Star-Spangled Banner. In the early dawn we can imagine him looking to that little fort to see if The Star-Spangled Banner yet waved. I can imagine him almost trying to pierce the darkness to discover whether the little fort had fallen or not. Seeing that "Star-Spangled Banner yet waved," he took a pencil and jotted down this immortal anthem, which has stood as the great anthem of the people for more than a hundred years.

And today, we come to ask the Congress to recognize, in its official capacity, something which should have been done more than a hundred years ago. It was not only the birth of this anthem, the sentiment surrounding it, but what it meant to the people. At that time our people were somewhat divided. The war had not been prosecuted with the vim and courage with which the recent war was conducted by our country. People were doubtful whether we ought to have declared war. People were doubtful about whether it had been the proper policy and they were somewhat divided on the issue. The war therefore was not pressed as it should have been pressed.

But, when that national anthem burst forth and the people began to sing throughout our land, it was worth more than 100,000 bayonets, because it united our people in one solid phalanx for the prosecution of the war.

Not only that, but the battle at North Point and Fort McHenry was the decisive battle of the War of 1812. We have histories which describe the great decisive battles just as much as the great Battle of Waterloo or the Battle of Gettysburg.

It is true that there were not so many troops here, but the troops who were there won that battle and that discontinued the war and the Treaty of Ghent soon followed.

General Ross, who did not believe the American patriots would come forward to meet his invincible forces, rode ahead and met his death at the Battle of North Point and was carried from there to Quebec to be buried. There stands a monument in Baltimore to the boys who fired the fatal shots, Wells and McComas.

From that time on there were no battles which influenced the writing of the treaty. We have the Battle of New Orleans, of course, and a great battle it was, but the fact is that battle was fought after the treaty had been signed.

News traveled slowly in those days and Jackson fought his battle and won it—the great Battle of New Orleans—after the Treaty of Ghent (hearings before the Committee on the Judiciary, House of Representatives, 68th Cong., March 20, 1924).

I shall now quote another excerpt from the British secret document, in which reference is made to British control of the Boy and Girl Scouts:

EXTRASCHOLASTIC EDUCATIONAL BODIES

We have spread everywhere the Boy Scout movement and placed the 1,000,000 American Boy Scouts under the headship of Gen. Sir Baden-Powell. Through the good offices of a British subject, Mrs. Juliette Low, and of Mrs. Arthur Choate we have enrolled 60,000 in the Girl Scout movement under the headship of Lady Baden-Powell. And the Chief Scouts now propose a periodic interchange of Scouts between England and America at the expense of some American millionaire. We have, moreover, linked the Scout movement with the varied patriotic organizations for maidens and for youths, and with the school system through the loyalty of Dean Russell, of Columbia University. In his case a degree from one of our universities is already overdue.

For the young over Scout age we have the Y. M. C. A., Y. W. C. A., and kindred organizations, financed by our auxiliaries, and directed by gentlemen such as the Reverend Drs. Mott and Speer, who hold degrees from the University of Edinburgh, and who are imbued with our culture. These organizations have directorates interlocking with the Scout movement and are affiliated with the organizations of the same name in England. As the style here has it, they are internationalized. We are arranging further to link up all these extrascholastic bodies and to correlate them through Teachers College, Columbia University, with the school system, so that we may remove the mind of the young from prejudicial family influences and peculiarities to the custody of a series of organizations which will exert a continuous standardizing influence during the formative years. Quantity production of thought-proof, disciplined, evangelical, uniformed colonists is thus insured to the Empire. I cannot too highly commend the financial support which Messrs. Dodge, Pratt, Macy, and Rockefeller, together with Messrs. Warburg, Schiff, Morgenthau, and Rothschild have given to this standardizing campaign. President and Mrs. Wilson have graciously bestowed their patronage upon it; Miss Wilson has aided it with song; the Presidential sons-in-law, less tuneful, have been no less helpful; and all the official family, male and female, have been zealous even where they have proved expensive.

The statements made by the author of the document are substantiated by many newspaper articles, from one of which I now quote:

[From the New York American of November 20, 1932]

LEAGUE OF NATIONS IN DRIVE TO LURE CHILDREN FROM UNITED STATES IDEALS SEES INTERNATIONALISM BEING IMPLANTED WITH JUNIOR RED CROSS AND GIRL SCOUTS

(By Willis J. Ballinger, formerly assistant professor of economics at Williams College, Williamstown, Mass.)

This is a story about forced friendships—the kind that is manufactured on a large scale and pumped into the bosoms of gentle, unsuspecting natures. It is a little insight into a powerfully organized European love call that has been heard in America of late with increasing volume and soulfulness.

I stated in the last article that the League of Nations is the hope of the distracted Old World merchants, but that its mercantile designs are cleverly masked behind an ingenious pother about loving the peoples of the world—loving them so well that nationalistic boundaries, governments, tariffs, immigration bars seem un-Christianlike and absurd.

In the center of the spider's web are the astute trade interests of Europe led by international bankers waiting patiently for the feast when the evangelism of good will has betrayed our resources into the hands of a world league controlled by European powers. Such is the chief ballot box bait of League City—Geneva.

So the League makes a terrible fuss over little children—ballot-casters in the making. It adores tots—from the cradle to the polling booth. American children are particularly esteemed, for these children will some day come into a great inheritance—the United States, with its enormous natural wealth.

It is all-important that these future owners of America be properly trained in sound international sympathies, the soundest one of which is to make them so humanity-conscious that they will entrust their inheritance to the legislative care of the League.

Observe how the Junior Red Cross hotfoots is after our kids for the league. This is a British initiated organization. In an incredibly short space of time it has established a tutelary influence over 12,000,000 children. George Milsom, the director of the society, writing in the Educational Survey (league publication) for January 1931, leaves no doubt that this organization is an auxiliary of League City. He says:

"It does seem fairly reasonable to hope that children who, during their years of mental development have learned to sympathize with their fellows will, when they have reached manhood, be determined to fight for the removal of every obstacle separating them from their fellows in far-off lands. This is the goal toward which we strive."

Interpreted this means that children properly trained will on maturity hate nationalism and vote fervently for league control of America. The juveniles of the Junior Red Cross are put through an excellent course in sobbing. They are trained to correspond with foreign children, to write them kiddie notes of consolation over any misfortune they have experienced. Thirty-eight publications (see Educational Survey, January 1931) keep up an incessant campaign aimed at internationalism. Their mental outlook is saturated with the misery of children in far-away lands. And Mr. Milsom kindly informs us that the material is carefully "selected." Thus the hearts of our children are being skillfully cultivated to produce crops of league votes.

* * * * * * *

"First, the Girl Scouts were founded under British auspices. At the offices of the Manhattan Girl Scouts I was told that Sir Baden Powell often talks to Girl Scouts on scouting and international problems.

"Baden Powell is the founding father of the organization and a rabid leaguer. Then I discovered that the American Girl Scouts had been internationalized in the last 10 years, and that in 1930 at Foxlease, England, a world flag was adopted. * * *

"After the French good-bye song each delegate took from the fire a half-burned brand—a symbol of world sisterhood.

"Now I read through 6 years of the American Girl, George Washington's Birthday is commemorated with an editorial that calls him a good man—but his role as a patriot, his philosophy of American-mindedness, his warnings about European wiles and cunning were carefully omitted.

"This is all very strange deletion, considering that each Girl Scout taken an oath to 'do my duty to God and my country.'

"How can this be done without any mention of patriotism or American-mindedness it is difficult to conceive. Of course, the truth is that that oath has lost its original meaning since league doctrinaires got busy with our foremost juvenile orders."

I have taken the liberty of quoting excerpts from the press, in order to show that the author of the British secret document knew what he set down in that report, and in the knowledge of that, he shows beyond question of doubt that the British propaganda machine was in control of the Boy and Girl Scout movement in America. This is what the author claimed, and the inserted matter proves that he was correct in his supposition.

Keynote Address Before the Young Democratic Clubs of Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HAROLD FLANNERY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 12, 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS, OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. FLANNERY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the keynote address of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Congressman FRANCIS J. MYERS, before the Young Democratic Clubs of Pennsylvania, Wilkes-Barre, Pa., August 23, 1940, as follows:

It is a great privilege to join and participate with the Young Democratic Clubs of Pennsylvania in their fourth biennial convention in this historic community of Wilkes-Barre. But to be invited to address such a splendid gathering of young men and young women who represent the youth of our Pennsylvania Democracy is, indeed, a high honor, and an unmerited privilege, which carries with it a solemn responsibility and a heavy duty.

In the titanic struggle in which we have been engaged for the past 7½ years, to save the Nation from moral depravity and economic bankruptcy, there has been a real need for trained public servants; young men and young women, who by their training, education, and moral concepts are capable of applying correct ethical principles to the affairs of government; men and women who know the truth and are ever willing to preach it.

Trained, eager, and enlightened men and women, stalwart men, devoted women, young men and young women such as you, are the hope of the America of today and tomorrow. Public service should be looked upon as a career, just as medicine or law or engineering, but, unfortunately, it is not so regarded, despite the efforts of our President to make it so.

In the fateful struggle which has already enveloped all of Europe, in which the destiny of civilization will probably be determined, courageous, fearless, intrepid youth is the great force which can overcome the intolerance, the hatred, the deceit, and hypocrisy which the godless dictators of Europe have fostered and written into their way of life.

In the gigantic task which is before us in America to preserve and protect our cherished liberties, we must have, we depend upon, young men and women such as you, of valor and quenchless enthusiasm, who work and serve, not from cupidity, or greed, or for the foolish prizes of a material world for which some of the office seekers of today are wasting their effort and their energies.

This young generation of today is working, and will work for finer things and from nobler motives, they will labor for a free and greater America.

When the present Democratic administration assumed office in 1933, all classes of society, and all the people of America, including the youth of the Nation, were sorely distressed in body and mind.

Local charity and relief had collapsed; countless numbers of American citizens had become apple vendors and beggars; soup kitchens had become part of the American way of life and the bread lines were the daily rendezvous of the youth and the aged and the unemployed of this land.

The entire economic system was in a tailspin.

Every bank was closed; 15,000,000 unemployed were staring into a black and empty future, hopeless and helpless; homes and farms were being snatched from our citizens and the sheriff's hammer was like the crack of doom for those who had made America great; the life savings of millions of Americans had melted away under the prosperity of the last Republican administration; their economic independence had slipped away and they were sinking under the flood of worthless securities, including many utility securities.

Our frenzied financial system which Herbert Hoover lauded, the system which he claimed had destroyed poverty for all time, collapsed like a house of cards and spread misery and suffering through the land.

Youth was prostrate; someone had to do something, and do it quickly. The giant minds of America offered no solution. The great engineer who occupied the White House gave us the comforting expression, "Let no man tell you it could not be worse."

Bankers and brokers, utility lawyers and lobbyists, businessmen and industrial executives, had no program nor plan. Everything had failed, and they ran to the Federal Government for help. The whole structure was tottering, and those who today hiss the President in the moving-picture houses of the Nation, who are bellowing about liberty and taxes, dictatorship and class hatreds, were silent and afraid.

These were the conditions which faced the youth of our country a few short years ago; this was the wreckage of a proud people and a

great nation after 12 years of Republican administration which they willingly and gladly delivered into the hands of President Roosevelt, who had promised to use the power of government to lead us out of the deep pit into which we had fallen.

He threw himself into the fray. Active leadership replaced the "around the corner" peeping and the "tombstone sitting" of the Hoover regime. The engine began to move forward again, and there was little protest from anyone. Gradually Americanism returned to America.

Fear and hunger were banished from the land. Hope reappeared on the horizon, and confidence arose in the hearts of those who had known only black night and grief and sorrow.

And what of the youth?

From the bread lines and the soup kitchens, from the poolrooms, from the dark, bleak alleys, and dreary prairies, from freight cars and boxcars, from transient camps and hobo cities, from the street corners, came disillusioned young men, unemployed, undernourished, and discouraged; yes, they marched in all the nakedness of their wasted lives into the vision of their President, and before his first day in office was over he took the initial step to lead them back to the America which they had forgotten and which had forgotten them.

Eighteen days later he requested Congress to assist and help these young men and Congress immediately vested him with authority to bring them security, to rehabilitate them by giving them an opportunity to learn how to work so that they might take care of themselves.

This was the Civilian Conservation Corps and in the past 7½ years this Federal agency has brought comfort and happiness to more than 2,200,000 young men and some 200,000 war veterans.

I wonder if Mr. Willkie ever heard of this great work when he had the brazen effrontery in his acceptance speech to point "to the millions of our young men and women who have been deliberately disillusioned by the political influences I now oppose; to the millions who no longer believe in the future of their land."

Who is he to indict the youth of America, how dare he blacken the vision, warp the soul, and question the very patriotism of millions of Americans?

Is the C. C. C. some of the "candystick" government which he condemns?

Where was this trapeze-swinging liberal who prates so much about the unfortunate plight of the youth of today when the National Youth Administration was established in 1935?

This agency has since given employment to more than 500,000 young men and young women each year and expects to employ 500,000 students and 273,000 out-of-school youth in the present fiscal year, nearly two-thirds of whom are under 21 years of age. This is the agency which in 1938–39 made it possible for nearly 400,000 young people from 16 to 24 years of age to continue their school, college, and university education, students who came from low-income families, the average being less than $1,200.

What does the Republican candidate know or care about low-income groups? Did he ever hear of the N. Y. A.; does he pay it lip service or give it heart service; does he look upon it as "candystick" government; does he dare to announce that it has "deliberately disillusioned" the youth of today who "no longer believe in the future of their land"?

The Roosevelt haters have forgotten the storms and turmoil of yesterday because the ship of state is now safely back in port.

The haters and would-be dictators who hurried to Washington in the days of their distress with a dog, a tin cup, and a pair of black glasses, and begged for help and salvation are now striving to recapture your Government and return it to the captains of industry and the sound-money bankers who all but destroyed it a few short years ago.

They hate Roosevelt because he actually went ahead and did something. This is the unpardonable sin. He really took them seriously.

Neither they nor their glamor-boy candidate dare oppose the great social reforms of the Roosevelt administration, so they endorse them in principle, and the sole contribution of their knight errant is "We will administer them more efficiently."

But we know that behind the scenes, in its heart of hearts, in its unwritten platform, the Republican high command, its financial angels, and Mr. Willkie do oppose the social reforms of the last 7½ years, they are all "candysticks" to them.

It is still a party of raucous, grumbling noises, sunflowers, and pious generalities, a party which wraps its avarice in the mantle of the Constitution, a party which has striven to emasculate, sabotage, and destroy the social legislation which the Republican candidate haltingly endorsed last Saturday afternoon.

The Republican candidate brings to mind an old song which suggests the parody, Waltz Me Around Again Willkie.

I surely trust that he will not have the opportunity to waltz the American people down the road to ruin and despair where we were led by the last Republican President.

Mr. Willkie believes in governmental "efficiency" that does not give "sticks of candy." Does he believe in his implied criticism of the New Deal, that it has been a "candystick" government?

If so, what are precisely the "candysticks" given by the Democratic Party which he would not have given?

Does he regard W. P. A. as a "candystick" that his type of "government efficiency" would not tolerate? Or does he agree with the Democratic Party that jobless and helpless citizens are entitled to aid from the Government, no matter how efficient it may be? It would be good to know just how Mr. Willkie stands on that point. He never mentioned W. P. A. on Saturday last.

And how about the S. E. C.? Is that, too, just a "candystick" doled out to an interesting public which has been cheated and deceived at every turn of the road?

How about Federal Housing—U. S. H. A. and F. H. A.? Just a "candystick" donated to the thousands of dispossessed home owners and millions of tenement dwellers to "keep them quiet"? Is that how Mr. Willkie regards this type of Government endeavor?

What about Social Security? Another "candystick," another sop to millions of wage earners who ask only a modicum of security? Or would Mr. Willkie's type of "efficiency" disregard it?

What about Federal Deposit Insurance? Just another indication of "weakness" in the New Deal's concept of government?

Would Mr. Willkie be tough and efficient on the matter of the F. S. C. C.'s food-stamp plan? True, he has publicly endorsed Secretary Wallace's farm program, but isn't the food-stamp plan just another sop—a "candystick" to the underprivileged? Mr. Willkie wouldn't be so soft-hearted an efficiency expert as to retain that, would he?

The record is too long, although it might be noted in passing that this sunflower from Wall Street deliberately and painstakingly avoided making labor any commitment or guaranty against employer interference in collective bargaining.

The poor fellow was bought at an auction in Philadelphia and doesn't know it. Even Mr. Hoover told that Republican Convention to hold an election and not an auction.

Nor does he appear to realize that he is the cat's-paw of those who were energetically engaged in seeking refuge in the storm cellars in 1932, the party that fed mules but refused food to human beings, a fact that he hopes a great many people may have forgotten.

Certainly nothing constructive has been advanced by this Horatio Alger who devoted one-fourth of his acceptance speech to an autobiography, whose whole campaign centers today on the hurling of abuse and false and foolish charges.

Mr. Willkie charges we have become stagnant, much of our industrial machine has become obsolete and the national standard of living has declined. This is the same old tripe Landon tried to sell the American public and at that, I think he made a better attempt than did the gentleman whom Governor James called Willie Winkie.

He might be somewhat enlightened if he would read an article by Robert P. Vanderpoel, financial editor of the Chicago American of August 5, 1940, which contains factual material giving the lie to the foul charge of economic disintegration and is irrefutable proof that the administration of President Roosevelt has assisted rather than injured business and industry.

Mr. Vanderpoel points out that the leading industrial corporations in the Nation, totaling 334, comprising more than one-fourth of the total industrial wealth of the Nation, earned an average return on net worth of 11.4 percent during the first half of 1940. The same corporation in the first half of 1939 earned an average net return of 7.2 percent.

It would seem that we could stand a bit more of this kind of economic distintegration.

Particularly is this so when one recalls that in the good old days before Mr. Roosevelt assumed office industrial production had declined 53 percent and the wheels of productive industry almost came to a complete standstill.

The Republican Party of 1940 offers the unfortunate reliefer, whom Mr. Willkie called the forgotten man, the privilege "to take part in our great American adventure."

I wonder if a bingo set will also be included to comfort him along the adventurous highway?

Now, by all that is right and holy, can you imagine such a demagogue being President?

Why, until the Republican Party was chased out of office, millions went hungry in this country while their bellies were full of watered stock and bright, red apples at a nickel a throw.

"The great American adventure" came under Roosevelt, a period in which we met the threat of disaster, stagnation, and moral disintegration by giving a helping hand to the jobless, maintaining a parity for farm prices, saving the homes of our people, rebuilding our banking structure and securing its deposits against failure, establishing a floor for wages and a ceiling for hours of work, protecting the investing public against thieves, bucket-shop operators, and corporate manipulators.

But the opposition would not consider that adventure. No, they regard it as dictatorship, or Communism, or an attack on the American way.

The gallant knight also joined with the forces of reaction who accuse the President of stirring up class hatred. But, my friends, if there is any class warfare, class hatred, or class unity in this country, it will be found in the circles of the prosperous and the wealthy, and not in the homes of the unfortunate. It is stylish to hate the President and it is a deep, bitter, insane, personal hate.

"He is a dictator, he is godless, he is a 'red,' he is a demagog, he is a Communist, he is un-American, he is a tyrant, he has destroyed our liberties and robbed us of our government."

Maniacal and vicious abuse, old shoes and decayed vegetables are hurled from most of the largest homes and by some of the "first families" in America.

Yes, it is fashionable to accuse the President of stirring up class hatred, but no class, no group of our people are so united as are the Roosevelt haters. Such actions are not causing class hatred, they constitute class hatred.

Abuse has frequently been one's reward for service to the Nation; Washington, Jefferson, Lincoln, and Wilson, all suffered from it, but it always came from small men and small minds.

But don't mistake me. Many others have joined the Willkie parade; groups which thrive and exist on prejudice, hatred, and intolerance have rallied to his support.

His standards are being carried today by the Ku Klux Klan, the German-American Bund, by every Fascist and Nazi group, and crackpot organization in America, and I have yet to hear him disavow their support. These groups hate Roosevelt just as much, and probably more, than the contented rich, and I also understand that the Communists hope for appeasement under a Republican administration.

What a motley crew to be gathered under one tent; what tender hope they offer to the youth of today and tomorrow.

I believe it is high time to throw off the cloak of complacency, forego our smug security, and cease minimizing the dangers of hatred, intolerance, and appeasement on this side of the Atlantic.

Why? Because there is a very real danger, a living, actual menace.

Don't disregard the vivid lessons taught by recent European history. Don't say, "It can't happen here." It can.

In Europe, democracy, the kind of democracy so sacred to us in America, is dead as a doornail—gone with the wind.

If Britain falls, America is democracy's last fortress, its final safeguard.

The foreign policy adopted by the Democratic administration has been predicated upon such premises.

We desire, and we hope to maintain, peace in this Western Hemisphere and we have not been blind to the forces of war and destruction that have been let loose upon the world. We are building our defenses strong and impregnable so that we will be secure from any attack. And let no political charlatan tell you that we have not prepared, that we wasted time and money.

Our Navy today is the strongest it has ever been in times of peace, both in ships, equipment, and personnel.

During the last 3 years of the Hoover administration not one keel for a vessel of war was laid down.

During President Roosevelt's term of office there have been laid down 8 new battleships, 12 new cruisers, 2 new aircraft carriers, 65 new destroyers, and 36 new submarines.

The same is true of our land forces.

In 1932 the authorized strength of our standing Army had declined to 118,000 men.

Under President Roosevelt it has been increased to 375,000 men and the National Guard 251,000.

In the air, we have likewise gone forward and are striving at present for a goal of 50,000 planes.

All this has been accomplished despite terrific opposition from the Republicans.

Today all the armed forces of the United States are being strengthened and builded to outstrip the mighty legions of Europe.

President Roosevelt has become the world's hope that democracy will continue to live and breathe and flourish; he is the spokesman for liberty and religion and right, as against tyranny and might and intolerance; his is the voice which carries comfort and faith to peoples all over the earth who still cherish and believe in the democratic way of life.

One of the characters in Henry Martin's Song of Years, standing by the plow, on hearing of Lincoln's death, says:

"There was never anybody like him. He was different from all other men. I tell you something set him apart. I don't know what. I doubt if anybody knows, or ever will—they's something about him that sets him apart. Next year won't make any difference—10 years—50—a hundred maybe—don't make no difference how many * * * Abraham Lincoln."

That, my friends, is how countless millions look upon Franklin D. Roosevelt today.

The Republican candidate follows the President on matters of principle, in the field of foreign affairs as he does on domestic issues, because he knows the President is right and there is nothing to debate. Witness his stand on selective military training and aid to Great Britain.

However, he must have been behind the door when they were passing out tickets to those wishing to aid in the national-defense program where he follows the lead of his adopted party, since all he can think of to say now is that President Roosevelt is trying to get us into war.

He began the campaign by stating at Elwood, Ind., he would not fight on the basis of "hate, jealousy, or personalities."

He then got into his speech, and we get these references to President Roosevelt:

"He has dabbled in inflammatory and manufactured panics."

"He has secretly meddled in the affairs of Europe."

"Shouted insults."

"Unscrupulously urged others to hope for more help than we are able to give."

In my vocabulary such statements are scurrilous and abusive; but how thin-skinned is the Republican candidate when anyone dares point out his own shortcomings.

Willkie seems to be obsessed with the idea of picking up votes, and he doesn't hesitate to reach into a garbage pail to further his political ambitions.

He did not dare to be specific, and no one yet knows what speeches he refers to in his harangue.

However, to catch votes both ways, he challenges Hitler to a contest in this year of 1940 at a time when he himself states we are woefully weak and unprepared.

I am afraid of such a man, afraid he would lead us back to 1932, afraid he will plunge us into war merely to keep the date he made with Adolf.

Long after the name of Willkie has faded and been erased from the minds of men, when history no longer records his deeds or even his existence, the name and accomplishments of Franklin Roosevelt will be imperishably inscribed in the hearts of mankind.

The President has been laboring to avert a tragedy in the western world and the Republican Party engages in a phony battle.

Again and again the President endeavored to warn the American people of the smoldering fires abroad and of the need for adequate defense, only to have the Republican Party accuse him of warmongering.

If they should win next November, Congressman HAMILTON FISH, of New York, would become chairman of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. Listen to his utterance in a radio address on January 19, 1939, 9 months before the war, in which he had the following to say about war and America's defense.

"The New Deal warmongers, hysterical internationalists, war profiteers, superpatriots, and Communists—are all hell bent on arming the United States to the teeth for the purpose of acting as a policeman for the entire world—the contention that the country is in danger of foreign attack is sheer political bunk—it is nothing but a smoke screen to obscure the depression."

Then Mr. FISH said he was opposed to the air-expansion program—that we did not need even 6,000 planes.

To hear him today, to hear Mr. Willkie and the Republican Party today, one would believe they had been valiantly fighting for a huge defense program during the last 7 years.

The President told his friends in Georgia early last year he would be back if there was no war. Never was the "freedom of the press" more disgracefully abused than in its denunciation of that statement.

He asked for a revision of the neutrality law last year, before the war, but the Republican expert on foreign affairs said there would be no war and Congress adjourned without acting on his recommendation.

War came, Congress was called into special session, and after a terrific fight finally accepted the President's views and passed legislation to keep our ships out of all belligerent waters.

This bill has kept us out of war and at the same time enabled the democracies to purchase supplies in this country, on a cash-and-carry basis, to withstand the terrific onslaught of the Nazi hordes.

But, mark you this, 141 Republicans voted against the legislation while only 18 voted in the affirmative. With the Republican dissenters marched the Bund, the Communists, every Fascist, and un-American group; yes, every "fifth columnist," too.

When the French Government was secretly investigating new airplanes last year with a view to buying here, how the Republicans screamed and raved that the President had committed the United States to an ironclad military alliance with Great Britain and France.

When the President was erroneously reported to have said our frontier was on the Rhine he was accused of meddling, of dabbling in inflammatory statements.

Would to God it were still on the Rhine today.

When he asked for a 25-percent increase in the Navy he was refused and the recommendation was termed gross extravagance. Later Congress admitted he was right and we have now authorized a 100-percent increase.

When he appointed two outstanding Republicans to head the defense forces of the Nation, the chairman of the Republican National Committee excommunicated them, as traitors to their party. I am wondering who are the real traitors to our country today.

The people will soon have an opportunity to express their judgment. Could it be the candidate's own friends who are holding up the defense program by refusing to sign contracts unless they be permitted to determine their own profits and name their own price, who are engaging in a sit-down strike in a national emergency for their own gain, who are willing to conscript the youth of our country but boldly refuse to give up any profit, in the race to preserve and defend America?

With what joy Hitler must witness such attacks on the leader of the world's greatest democracy for speaking the cause of decency, religious freedom, and natural rights.

What large comfort Mr. Willkie's derogatory and abusive attacks upon the President must be giving Hitler, for it plays right into his hand.

Hitler doesn't want Roosevelt, and neither does the Republican Party. Hitler joins with them in the struggle to purge President Roosevelt and soften America.

Yes; the President's enemies here and in foreign lands have prepared a swastika of hatred for his crucifixion. May the young Democrats of Pennsylvania, may the youth of the Nation, and all lovers of freedom rally to him.

May God give him strength and courage to carry on; may his ringing voice continue to sound the clarion call to the pure of heart of all lands; may he be spared to keep us at peace and lead us all out of this maze of world confusion, this valley of death and tears, into the bright sunlight of hope, faith, and contentment.

My friends, I am quite confident that Democracy is on the march to victory, for I can see countless millions of patriotic Americans holding high the flying banners of faith and loyalty and courage, sure of the nobility of their cause, sincere in their devotion to principle, who have willingly joined hands, who are standing shoulder

to shoulder in this glorious crusade for the preservation of our beloved country under their gallant and courageous captain and leader, Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Listen, my friends, listen, and you can hear the thunder of their steps.

Government Publicity Bureau

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. JONES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 12, 1940

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I call the attention of the House to a statement attributed to Dr. Archibald MacLeish, Librarian of Congress, which distresses me very much. He is reported in the Charlotte Observer and the Washington Post as saying that the Federal Government should have a publicity bureau similar to those maintained by the totalitarian countries.

Dr. MacLeish is in one of the most strategic positions in our Federal Government. The Congressional Library is used by more people than any other library in the world. Dr. MacLeish should champion the cause of unbiased information as his sacred obligation to the public. Obviously a propaganda machine of any administration would attempt to sway the public toward the belief in the indispensability of the party in power. Paid publicity experts of any administration would dramatize the worth of the party in power, tell half truths of its virtue, black-out criticism and blaspheme the constructive critic.

Propaganda machines in every totalitarian country have preceded the loss of the liberties of their people.

There is something wrong with the thinking of Archibald MacLeish that runs counter to the free institutions of America. To my mind this statement betrays a mental quirk that makes Archibald MacLeish unfit for the high position he holds.

[From the Charlotte Observer]

DOZENS OF THEM

Archibald MacLeish, Librarian of Congress, advances the proposition that the Federal Government should have a propaganda bureau similar to those maintained by the totalitarian countries.

The gentleman is away behind the times if he does not recognize the fact that the Federal Government not only has one propaganda agency, but dozens of them—in fact, practically one for every bureau that exists in Washington.

Whether the public is aware of the existence of such agencies, the newspapers of the country are every day brought face to face with the reality by having to pitch bundles of the stuff into the wastebaskets which the janitors haul out almost by the truckload.

St. Lawrence Seaway Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 12, 1940

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, world developments happen with great rapidity. On August 23, 1940, the newspapers carried a story to the effect that on the day before, the President had named six men to represent the United States on the Canadian-American Defense Board which had been created 5 days previously.

Prior to the creation of the Board, no one expected any progress at this time in efforts to have Canada and the United States deepen the St. Lawrence River so that ocean-going vessels could travel this river and the Great Lakes to Duluth, Minn.

On September 11, 1940, the Evening Star carried a story that the President had conferred with Assistant Secretary of State Adolph Berle and Leland Olds, member of the Federal Power Commission. It was indicated that this conference had something to do with the St. Lawrence waterway project.

Today in the Washington Post, September 12, 1940, there is an account of the meeting of the Joint Canadian-American Defense Board in Washington, and Board members admitted that they had discussed the St. Lawrence waterway project.

Friends of the waterway, which is a great transportation and power contribution, will rejoice to know of these developments.

On August 26, 1940, I addressed a letter to the President urging that this St. Lawrence waterway question be taken up by the Joint Canadian-American Defense Board, and I pointed out the reasons for such procedure, and the advantages of the seaway.

The letter follows:

The Honorable FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: This letter refers to your action jointly with Prime Minister Mackenzie King of Canada in establishing a permanent Joint Board of Defense for the United States and Canada.

This action is of direct and compelling interest to the people of Duluth and the entire Eighth Congressional District which, as you know, borders Canada along more than half the northern boundary of Minnesota.

The people of this congressional district have shared richly in the benefits accruing to the American people and the Canadian people for a century and a quarter because of peaceful relations between the two nations.

It is to our mutual interest that prompt and effective steps be taken to safeguard both nations against danger from any other power. I believe the people along the entire northern boundary of the United States appreciate the possible future usefulness of the step which has been taken.

I wish to inform you, however, that in my judgment the people in my congressional district, in common with all others in the northern tiers of States, will be deeply interested not only in a general plan but in the taking of specific and significant steps to carry out the plan of joint defense between Canada and the United States.

I have devoted the closest scrutiny to all reports in the public press concerning the definite projects which the Joint Defense Board may take up. I noted one suggestion, for example, of hastening the construction of a highway linking the United States and Alaska.

I hope you will agree with me that large-scaled projects for improvement of transportation, particularly of bulk commodities which are vital to national defense, rank among the first in importance among the possibilities for improving the defenses and the strategic power of two nations.

I wish to point out with all the emphasis of which I am capable that the greatest of all pending projects in this category is the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway project. This project is of the greatest interest to 40,000,000 people in the landlocked inland empire flanking the Great Lakes in the United States and the millions of people in Canada, as well. As you know so well, the Great Lakes comprise the largest and most navigable inland body of fresh water in the world. It is almost incredible that after they have been found perfectly feasible from an engineering point of view, and when their enormous value to navigation and power production is established, that this seaway connecting the St. Lawrence with the Great Lakes has not yet been built. In fact, this project has been hanging fire through three national administrations, including two of your own.

I wish to urge you to take immediate steps to bring this matter promptly to the attention of the new Permanent Joint Defense Board to the end that construction of this project can begin without any further delay, since construction after it begins is a matter of a few years, it seems to me that we can not afford to delay any longer plans to build this project when the national defense is at stake.

Can you please inform me by letter, Mr. President, whether you agree with my point of view.

Sincerely yours,

W. A. PITTENGER.

Under date of September 5, 1940, the President wrote me acknowledging receipt of my communication and expressing the view that the Joint Defense Board should consider the matter.

His reply is as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, September 5, 1940.

Hon. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: I have your letter regarding the improvement of transportation, and in particular the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway project.

I have given this the most serious consideration and agree with you that the matter should at the proper time be considered by the newly appointed Joint Defense Board. I want to assure you of my appreciation of your thoughtful letter.

Very sincerely yours,

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

We voice the gratification of several millions of people in the great Midwest in these developments. The need of the waterway so that vessels may travel from the Atlantic Ocean to our inland cities on the Great Lakes is now realized by the officials of the two countries, if their national-defense program is to be fully carried out. We express the hope that negotiations may soon be carried to a successful conclusion.

Compulsory Military Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 12, 1940

LETTER FROM NEW BEDFORD CHAPTER, AMERICAN GOLD STAR MOTHERS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from the New Bedford Chapter of American Gold Star Mothers:

NEW BEDFORD CHAPTER, AMERICAN GOLD STAR MOTHERS,
New Bedford, Mass., September 9, 1940.

Mrs. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MRS. ROGERS: At the regular meeting of New Bedford Chapter, American Gold Star Mothers, the resolution approving the conscription bill was unanimously adopted.

Our former president, Mrs. G. Walter Williams, has ably presented her views in this matter before the committee, and we fully concur in all that she has said. We know that this bill has already passed the Senate, but we have written to Senator PEPPER, advising him of our action, as we wished the committee to understand our position in this matter. We also wrote to Congressman ANDREW J. MAY, urging its immediate passage in the House.

We Gold Star Mothers, realizing the seriousness of the menace confronting our country, in order to safeguard the sons of other mothers, urge the immediate passage of this bill, so that this country may be fully prepared to meet any emergency that may arise.

Very sincerely,

LYDIA T. BAYLIES,
Corresponding Secretary.

Further Evidence of British Propaganda to Undermine America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. THORKELSON

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 21, 1940

THE FIRST DAVID BROOKS ANGLO-AMERICAN PRIZE ESSAY

Mr. THORKELSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the first David Brooks Anglo-American prize essay.

These essays hold Great Britain up as a benefactor and the United States as a recipient of favor from Great Britain. This is the method used in all British propaganda; always belittling the United States and always boring in, trying to obtain greater and greater British influence over the destiny of America. This, as I have shown, has already reached in our schools, colleges, and churches; and is just about on the verge of undermining the principles upon which this Government came into being. It is this we must fight, in order to restore the patriotism we have lost because of indifference to our own traditions.

THE FIRST DAVID BROOKS ANGLO-AMERICAN PRIZE ESSAY

(Written by Oliver Burgess Meredith, age 16, of Hoosac School, with a foreword by Paul Van Dyke. Issued by Florence Brooks Aten, 59 East Fifty-sixth Street, New York City, United States of America, June 1924)

NOTE: Herewith is the first David Brooks Anglo-American prize essay. This essay contest is confined to secondary schools. Its object is to impress upon the minds of the youth of the English-speaking world the desirability of a close and intimate understanding between the British Empire and the United States of America. Its scope and purpose are fully described in the foreword and afterword.

The founder of this movement, Mrs. Brooks Aten, 59 East Fifty-sixth Street, New York City, would appreciate having those into whose hands this phamphlet may fall, and who care to do so, communicate with her expressing their opinions. Also she would be glad to have any suggestions as to its future development or any criticisms that may seem pertinent.

THE DAVID BROOKS CUP

The David Brooks Anglo-American Prize Essay Cup presented in perpetuity to Lawrenceville School by Florence Brooks Aten in memory of her great great-grandfather, David Brooks, W. E., a clergyman and a soldier of the Revolution born at Brooksvale, Cheshire, Conn., 1744, died at Brooksvale December 22, 1801, graduated from Yale College in the class of 1768. To be awarded annually to that scholar who shall write the best essay on the subject, The Benefit to Christian Civilization From a Complete Understanding and a Friendly Relationship Between the United States of America and the British Empire.

Any scholar in the four upper forms may compete. The name of the winner shall be engraved each year on the cup and a small silver cup, properly engraved, shall be given to the winner, which he may retain.

The essays shall, subject to the discretion of the head master, consist of not less than 1,500 nor more than 3,000 words.

The merits of the essays shall be determined by such person or persons as the head master may appoint.

The name of the winner shall be announced at the Washington's Birthday ceremonies each year.

FOREWORD

The original David Brooks cup was made by a London silversmith in 1801 and was presented to Hoosac School. It gets its name from David Brooks, a clergyman and a soldier in the armies of the American Revolutionary War. Six models of this cup have been made by Crichton and presented to six other leading schools of the United States, Hill, Kent, Lawrenceville, Mercersburg, Pomfret, and St. Paul's, Concord, N. H.

In each of these schools a contest is to be held every winter to determine which of the pupils can write the best essay on the following subject: The Benefit to Christian Civilization From a Complete Understanding and Friendly Relationship Between the United States of America and the British Empire. The name of the winner of the contest in each school is to be engraved on the school cup and he is to receive a smaller copy of it. The award in these scholastic contests will be made on Washington's Birthday. An interscholastic prize is also to be presented to the best essay among the winners of each year. This latter prize is to be awarded to the boy winning it at the prize-day exercises of his school.

The people who have made this beginning of getting American schoolboys to think seriously of the advantages to the world of "complete understanding and friendly relationship" between the two great English-speaking nations, are broad-minded friends of world peace. They have no intention of trying to further any narrow or exclusive friendship from which any other nation should be shut out. On the contrary, they wish to do a little to further a broad and generous friendship whose circle is open to all other peoples who may wish to enter it. There is in their minds no touch of the arrogant idea of so-called Anglo-Saxon supremacy. On the principle of "the little leaven that leaventh the whole lump" they simply wish to suggest to the minds of a certain number of our educated young men in the early days of their education, the solid and enduring reasons for unbroken good feeling between us and the mother country, as an expression of a friendship full of good will toward all the world and always ready to be active in the cause of peace.

We Americans are a very mixed race. Some of the blood of most of the peoples of the world is now mingled in our national stock, and among our early settlers were Dutch, Palatinate Germans, French Huguenots, Swedes, English, Scotch, and Irish. But the dominant speech marks the dominant blood. Our colonial institutions grew on the roots of English political experience, and when the fathers formed our young Republic the prevalent political ideas in their

minds were the ideas of Locke. Other peoples have contributed in many ways to our growth and development. Our debt to France is very great. Without her help we could never have won that war for independence which gave us the right to manage our own life, and without that liberty our growth would have been warped and stunted. But all origins have, after all, permanently conditioned our character. We are and must always remain a great branch of the British race.

The War of Independence was a civil war. Those who began it were hailed in the British Parliament as champions of liberty. English historians in sympathy with modern English institutions consider that it did great service to the development of the British Constitution by checking the successful absolutist reaction of George III. For generations its result has been accepted as beneficent to both Nations. To dwell upon it as a reason for an unfriendly attitude toward our mother country is to surrender to a narrow prejudice and to cherish a malice that ought to have been buried years ago. The two great English-speaking peoples are called to a deep friendship fruitful for themselves and for the world.

PAUL VAN DYKE.

PRINCETON, N. J., *May 22, 1924.*

DAVID BROOKS' ANGLO-AMERICAN PRIZE ESSAY

Subject: The Benefit to Christian Civilization From a Complete Understanding, and Friendly Relationship Between the United States of America and the British Empire.

When about to write a composition on such a tremendously important subject as this, the first thought that enters the author's mind, is how pathetically puny his efforts are. Many books have been published concerning this topic, without avail. People have acquired the habit of reading the matter over, and other than feebly agreeing that this complete understanding ought to exist, do nothing to bring it about. It is indeed a crisis when the world arrives at such a lax stage as this. It reminds one ominously of Rome before its fall.

Still we are not all so indifferent. Surely there are some of us who realize how critical the situation now is. We must in part realize that unless we do something constructive to find a solution, and that soon, we, even we of this generation, will live to see such a catastrophe as will surpass the late World War to an unconceivable degree of horror and butchery. Nor is this a pessimistic prophecy, it is the inevitable. We have all heard of the cunningly fashioned man-destroying machines which nearly every government is developing. I need not delve into the discussion of those newly discovered chemicals which when dropped from a plane can completely annihilate a fair-sized city. This is not what Christianity stands for, and Christian civilization if there remains a spark of life in it, ought to rebel at the thought, and look for a solution. But where? A most plausible is "friendly relationship and complete understanding between the United States and England."

Right here, however, the question arises as to what right have I, or anyone else, to assume this. How can such an understanding stop the inevitable. That, of course, is the subject of this theme, but first let us briefly investigate the possibilities of such a relationship and understanding. Is it possible, or will material jealousies down any attempt to bring it about? A most simple answer is to read the parallel histories of the two countries. For some 35 years they have, when occasion demanded, "come together" in a most praiseworthy manner. Nor does this seem strange. Both have practically the same language and customs. There is no reason why this friendship and complete understanding should not be brought about quite beyond all expectations. If it were but so, the benefits to Christian civilization would be innumerable.

The very first benefit would be that people would forget such material greediness and jealousy as at present hinders this understanding between the two countries. A great amount of the present bickering between the merchant and industrial classes would stop. This would be a benefit to all of us. With the merchants of England and America pulling together, clothing, imported food, and other commodities would of necessity decrease in price and increase in abundance, a change very much needed at the present time.

Another obvious, yet important, advantage would be in the missionary field One of Christianity's biggest tasks is her extensive missionary work. Our missionaries, however, are continually complaining that those Buddhists, Mohammedans, or whomsoever they try to convert, cannot understand why the two largest Christian nations of the world are in such a state of misunderstanding and inimicality. This is an impossible question to answer.

Now if the nations were brought into friendly contact and understanding, then, truly, could our missionaries answer: "Look, the two most influential nations of the world, working in unison for the same cause."

Greece, after the Great War, was granted a certain territory in Asia Minor. Dissatisfied, however, with this and believing that Turkey was weak in that spot where the allotment of territory ended, she began to encroach rapidly on Turkish territory. We all know what happened in the needless contest which ensued. Thousands of Christians were massacred, innumerable homes were burned, and the flower of Greece annihilated.

When the two great Christian nations of the world saw this calamity approaching, they did nothing to prevent it. Looking helplessly at one another, they sat by while their Christian brothers of Greece marched to the massacre. And why? Because each feared that in her present divided condition, she was not strong enough to run the risk of another war by attempting to stop the "petty affair." "Besides," Britain argued, "Why doesn't the United States do it; she has the money." The United States sheepishly pointed to the Monroe Doctrine and to England's naval force.

In fact, during the past 30 years, this sort of thing has been going on. Innumerable and needless wars have been fought. Nations have crushed nations. Atrocities that we think were only committed in the age of barbarism, have been executed in a most heinous manner. Indeed, the most alarming fact of all is, that these crimes are not only of the past 30 years. They are being actualized in all their horror now, and are becoming worse every moment. Things have come to a head, a head which if it bursts will mean the complete desecration of Christianity's teaching. Again we look for a solution. Again we can find a possible one in this hoped-for relationship between England and the United States.

If only there were some great influential power to set things in shape. If only there were some powerful, and if need be, mailed fist, that could stop with ease the bloody wars that are now threatening and reddening the earth. But where could one find such a power? One looks instantly to the two richest and strongest nations of the world.

This power would have to be neither tyrannical nor altogether martial. However, there are bound to be times when another nation will try to stir this power from its stronghold and disobey those Christian ideals for which it stands. When this happens, then that nation who attempts to disturb the peace will see, to its dismay, a mobilized force of several million men ready to fight to the end for the just cause of Christianity. The very thought of such a force will discourage any attempt to defy it. Moreover, it will cause nations to see how much farther peace could get them than war. It would ultimately bring about world peace by encouraging peace and setting a good example. World peace, this benefit alone, could justify its existence.

It has been said that this age is tremendously lacking in its production of classical artists. The classics or arts of the last 50 years are not to be compared with those of the ancient and medieval world. The perfecting of esthetics is one of man's noblest deeds, and should be continued.

It is true that in science we have made some remarkable advances, but history proves that artistic achievements show more clearly than scientific how advanced a civilization is morally. Therefore it would seem that we have slumped considerably in our morals, a condition which sharply contradicts every phase of Christian teaching.

To trace the "slump," we find it is because the world has become too materialistic and as a result has become involved in greed, jealousy, and war. Let us assume, reasonable, that this friendly relationship between England and the United States would bring about at least some degree of tranquillity in the world. In that case we could turn our efforts toward practicing the Christian religion. We would have more time to untie the entanglements now strangling the world. Then would be seen how quickly the morals of the people would rise, and simultaneously esthetics would be revived.

Yet another critical situation in the world at present is the crime wave which has engulfed every country. For the last half century the statistics show that crimes have increased shamefully. Moreover, smuggling of dope, the most dreaded atrocity of all, has become quite a profitable and flourishing business in the underworld. The police magistrates themselves are beginning to admit that "the whole crime affair" is getting quite beyond them. When a police magistrate admits this, it means that things are very serious, indeed.

Until a year or so ago the prohibition agents had no right to stop even a small rowboat from paddling out to the 3-mile limit and there being stocked with liquor from a British schooner. As a result, the attempt to enforce prohibition was a farce. In desperation the United States sought aid from England, who, in acquiescence to our plea, extended the international 3-mile limit to 12 miles.

Thus, by simply coming to an understanding with Great Britain, the United States is able to cope more easily with the prohibition problem. This is only an example of what could be done to prevent the smuggling of dope and to forestall other crimes. A complete understanding between the two nations could bring about more efficient and concerted action against lawbreakers of both countries.

So, as I stated before, innumerable volumes have and could be written about these benefits without avail. The few more important benefits that I have outlined are only a minority to still more and scarcely less notable ones. But what good does it do as long as the majority of people do not respond? It remains for those of us who realize the situation more clearly to help the majority to understand.

Let me end with a little episode which happened about the time of the Spanish-American War. This little story explains how a needless war between the United States and Germany was forestalled, because of an understanding with Great Britain.

This is the story as nearly as I can recall it.

* * * * * * *

Not many years ago during the Spanish-American War it happened that the United States, Great Britain, and Germany each had a fleet of warships stationed near the Philippine Islands. Due to the fact that the American admiral defied some command of the Germans, the latter threatened to fire on the United States fleet unless she did as she was bid. The admiral, realizing what a shot from either fleet would mean, quickly telegraphed to the British

flagship and explained the situation. Britain quickly took action by informing the German admiral that if Germany fired but one shot on the American fleet she could consider herself firing on Great Britain. The German commander could do nothing but sail away.

OLIVER BURGESS MEREDITH.

HOOSAC SCHOOL, WASHINGTON'S BIRTHDAY, 1924.

AFTERWORD BY WAY OF EXPLANATION

It is always interesting to know of the ideas and moving causes that lead to the beginning of any movement of note or merit and it is the enthusiastic reception with which the David Brooks Anglo-American prize essay contest has been received by the leading educators and other prominent men of this country and Great Britain that prompts this word of explanation.

Indeed, so genuine and spontaneous has been the welcome given it, far beyond the greatest expectations of its founder, that it promises to become an international movement spreading over the entire English-speaking world.

Mrs. Brooks Aten, having had a son in the Great War and having worked unremittingly for the alleviation of the suffering of the soldiers, could not dispel from her mind the horror of it all nor eliminate the idea of its stupidity and foolishness.

She, therefore, wished to contribute, even in the smallest way, what she could to prevent the recurrence of such a cataclysm. Her mind being practical, she had no quiet and alluring dreams of a world of peace being held together in amity and friendship by the power of love alone. That is a wonderful desideratum, but in the present stage of human development she knew that there must be power and sanction to enforce any law or edict. Her vision reached still further and she saw in the great English-speaking nations not only the necessary power but the natural friendship and understanding that should exist between them. If this could be brought about, much would be done toward stabilizing the peace of the world. Whether they wish it or not, destiny has placed in their hands the safekeeping of Christian civilization, and they will be held to strict accountability for the way they administer this trust. While the English-speaking peoples live in all quarters of the globe, in various environments, and their day-to-day lives may differ, fundamentally the same current runs through them. They derive their laws, their customs, and their traditions from the same source. The same ideals govern their actions.

Having arrived at this conclusion, Mrs. Brooks Aten, with counsel and advice, looked carefully into the various movements tending in this direction and found them all worthy and excellent, but there existed a most lamentable deficiency. In our youth is our hope and the foundation of our future greatness, and they were left without a proper guiding hand. All the movements appealed only to the adult mind, and the youthful mind, before its complexes had been formed and in its prejudices deeply rooted, must reach its conclusions in many cases from incorrect and distorted histories. She is, therefore, confining her efforts to this neglected and fertile field.

The first cup was presented to Hoosac School in December 1923, and the essay herewith published was awarded the prize at that school on Washington's Birthday, 1924.

In addition to the cups that have been presented as mentioned in the foreword, voluntary applications for cups have been received from a number of other schools. These applications are being examined to ascertain whether or not the applicants appreciate fully the true significance of the cup. The cup itself is only the symbol of a great ideal.

David Brooks, the donor's great, great grandfather, in whose memory these cups are being given, is a particularly happy selection, as his life and works lend themselves most admirably to the carrying out of the idea. He was a straight-thinking, high-minded, clean-living country gentleman, and one of the first to espouse the cause of the Colonies against the unjust oppression of George the Third and some of his Ministers. As Dr. Van Dyke has so aptly said in his foreword, the American Revolution was really a civil war and did much to curb the absolutism of the then reigning British monarch. The best thought of that day both in England and in America was in favor of the Colonies.

David Brooks was born on his ancestral estate of Brooksvale, Cheshire, Conn., in 1744, his grandfather having settled there after his arrival in this country from Cheshire, England. He was graduated from Yale College in 1768, and shortly afterward studied for the ministry and was licensed to preach. He never had a permanent charge, but preached at various churches in his vicinity, and his services were much in demand, as he was known as a preacher of great power. Two of his sermons were particularly well known and had wide circulation at the time. One of them was The Religion of the Revolution and the other was on Wealth Without Character.

Whenever there was fighting to be done this staunch old patriot did not seek glory or acclaim, but, although a college graduate and a man of standing in his community, simply put his musket over his shoulder and went into the ranks to fight the foe. There are records of his enlisting and reenlisting. Whenever the enemy proved troublesome David Brooks was there to help quell the disturbance. He was in the battles of White Plains, Fishkill, Crown Point, and Fort Montgomery. He was also a member of the Connecticut Legislature which ratified the Constitution of the United States.

After this David Brooks retired to his estate where he followed the peaceful pursuits of farming and preaching until he died December 22, 1801. His son, Micah Brooks, was a major general in the War of 1812, and was a Congressman from New York State from 1815 to 1817.

Mrs. Brooks Aten is deeply appreciative of the interest and cooperation shown by Prof. Paul Van Dyke, of Princeton University; Prof. Bliss Perry, of Harvard University; Andrew Keogh, Esq., the librarian of Yale University; and Clarence Blair Mitchell, Esq., of New York City. She wishes also to thank the various speakers who have officiated at the formal presentations of cups. They are the Honorable Robert Underwood Johnson, former Ambassador to Italy; Percy Sutherland Bullen, Esq., of the Daily Telegraph (London); Prof. J. Tucker Murray, of Harvard; Prof. George van Santvoord, of Yale; Bishop Lloyd, of New York; and Angus Fletcher, Esq., of the British Consul General's Office in New York City.

In expressing her appreciation she is not unmindful of the services rendered by Messrs. Crichton & Co., Ltd. Not only does she appreciate the exquisite workmanship with which they executed the reproductions of the cup and the engrossing of the scrolls, but their wholehearted cooperation and courtesy at all times evinced far more than a mere business interest in the project.

JOHN E. J. FANSHAWE.

NEW YORK CITY, *June 3, 1924.*

Japan Near Sea Parity With the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN Z. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 12, 1940

ARTICLE FROM THE NEW YORK HERALD TRIBUNE

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Herald Tribune of September 3, 1940:

[From the New York Herald Tribune of September 3, 1940]

JAPAN NEAR SEA PARITY WITH UNITED STATES; EXTENDS POWER IN FAR PACIFIC BY FORTIFYING MANDATED ISLANDS—TOKYO SECRETLY BUILDS NAVAL, SUBMARINE, AND AIR BASES ON ROUTES TO PHILIPPINES, INDIES, AND CHINA; GUAM'S VALUE TO AMERICA STRESSED

(By Henry H. Douglas)

At the present writing Japanese naval strength closely approximates that of the United States in some categories.

Since 1934 Japan has had a policy of strict secrecy with regard to her naval construction, and so far has been unusually successful in keeping her building a secret. Her shipyards are cities of silence, surrounded by high walls and charged wire, from which no workman ever emerges, into which no foreigner ever goes.

In spite of this secrecy it has been recently ascertained from reliable sources that in the 3½ years since the beginning of 1937 Japan has commissioned:

Three 10,000-ton cruisers.
Two 7,500-ton cruisers.
Twenty-two 1,600-ton destroyers.
Twelve 1,600-ton submarines.

These additions to Japan's Navy, since the end of the Washington naval treaty at the close of 1936 because of the denunciation of the treaty by Japan, place the comparative st.ength of the two fleets as follows (United States figures are from the Navy Department):

	Number		Tonnage	
	Japan	United States	Japan	United States
Aircraft carriers	11	6	146,520	134,800
Battleships	10	15	301,400	464,300
Cruisers, heavy	20	18	183,000	171,000
Cruisers, light	24	19	144,515	157,775
Destroyers	141	201	190,148	260,600
Destroyers, converted		46		52,620
Submarines	74	102	102,063	102,060
Total	280	407	1,067,646	1,343,155

This table brings out the fact that while we exceed Japan in number of submarines the submarine tonnages are almost exactly equal. Also, to be added to the Japanese submarine tonnage is their fleet of midget submarines, not included in the present

figures, and concerning which a brief report recently appeared in the press. Our destroyer tonnage is considerably greater than that of Japan, while Japan has 44 cruisers to our 37, with the tonnage practically equal.

EIGHT BATTLESHIPS BUILDING

The above figures include only vessels actually completed and commissioned for service. No information is available on the number of Japanese vessels building and appropriated for, except as to battleships. Two 35,000-ton battleships will be launched in June of 1941, while two 45,000-ton ships will be launched in November of 1941. Four more 45,000-ton battleships are due for completion by the middle of 1945. This makes a total of eight vessels and 540,000 tons. The number of submarines and auxiliary vessels now under construction by Japan is doubtless greater than at any other time in her history, but whether there is any possibility of Japan's matching the building program of the United States is an open question, and a question about which there may well be considerable doubt.

The United States naval program is as follows:

	Building		Goal of the 70 percent increase, 1945 or 1946	
	Number	Tonnage	Number	Tonnage
Battleships	10	390,000	35	1,281,800
Aircraft carriers	5	125,800	20	460,600
Cruisers	21	206,000	88	956,374
Destroyers	57	105,070	378	617,060
Submarines	40	59,050	180	231,866
Total	133	885,920	701	3,547,700

Japan's present position, taking all strategic factors into account, gives her a possible superiority. The possession of a navy roughly approaching the size and strength of that of the United States gives Japan a common upper limit of power, inestimably greater than our own. In a Pacific war a United States cruiser with a range of 2,000 miles might be useless, while the same cruiser in the hands of the Japanese, operating close to home, would be a very effective weapon. Parity with the United States would place Japan in the position of having a fleet capable of dominating the entire western Pacific, with practically complete assurance that she could not be interfered with in anything she might choose to do in these waters. Our part in supplying Japan with unlimited materials with which to construct this navy has been tragically shortsighted. This development is also the final blow to all previous concepts of relative naval strengths and their influence upon world politics. The situation is not only new but it is revolutionary. Fortunately the United States now seems to have her eyes open to the danger.

It is reported that in November of this year Japan's largest floating drydock will be towed to Saipan. This is the island in Japan's Pacific Mandate where early this year the Japanese Government refused to allow her own shipwrecked seamen to be landed when rescued by an American vessel.

HARBORS DEVELOPED

Japan has denied fortifying any of these islands but has admitted that considerable money has been spent on the development of harbor works on two of the mandated islands, Saipan and Palau. Work on the harbor of Tanapak (on Saipan) was started in 1926 and completed in 1932. In 1936 "the construction of the port of Palau, extending over 6 years and costing altogether 2,675,500 yen," was begun, the piers and channels of the port being built to accommodate warships. A large modern airport has also been constructed. These two islands are directly east of the Philippines and on opposite sides of Guam. About the time that Congress voted down the strengthening of the Guam defenses Japan announced the establishment of a "commercial" air service to Saipan.

The administration of the mandated islands was placed in the hands of the Japanese by the League of Nations at the close of the World War. These islands, lying directly across the sea routes from the American mainland and Hawaii to the Philippine Islands, the East Indies, and China, and adjoining the British colonies and mandated areas in the South Seas, constitute the most important area, from a strategic standpoint, in the entire west and south Pacific.

The terms of the mandate provide that no military or naval bases or fortifications are to be established in the mandated territory, but this provision has been completely ignored by Japan, and she has no notion of ever relinquishing control over this area. Japan has, under cover of the utmost secrecy, been fortifying all the more important of the 2,550 islands. Naval, submarine, and air bases have been constructed wherever it has been physically possible to do so. It has been definitely established that Japan has a strong submarine base in the Marshalls, only 1,800 miles from Hawaii, and the construction of a huge fuel-storage reservoir and an airdrome has also been completed.

The mandated islands provide the Japanese Navy with a stationary fleet of natural aircraft carriers. The lagoons and protected waterways of many of the islands are perfect hiding places for warships, submarines, and seaplanes, not to mention the land bases for scouts and bombers.

GUAM'S VALUE EMPHASIZED

Saipan, but a short distance to the north and east of Guam, evidently is to be the stronghold and jumping-off place of Japan's power in this part of the Pacific. The value to the United States of Guam as a base is now not even a matter for conjecture. The refusal of Congress to begin fortifying the island a year ago was but another form of the fatal appeasement disease.

Japan has a fishing fleet of 62,000 registered motor vessels, of which about 9,000 are capable of deep-sea work in any part of the Pacific. Many of these vessels are all steel and range in length from 90 to 200 feet. A number of them are reconditioned British coast-patrol vessels. During March and April of this year, 150 powerful new sampans were added to the "fishing" fleet in the Marshall Islands, in addition to 26 submarines being ordered to the mandated islands on May 1.

Within the last 4 or 5 months, according to Kenkichi Kumagai, director of the Japanese Cabinet Information Bureau, 9,500 former residents of the Hawaiian Islands have been sent to the islands of the Japanese mandate. He said that among them were 3,800 American citizens of Japanese ancestry, born and reared in Hawaii. These people, in any future conflict, familiar with the ins and outs of both the Hawaiian Islands and those of the mandate, will be of inestimable value in carrying out Japanese plans.

It has also been reliably ascertained that the Japanese Navy is rushing the installation of a device known as the photoscope, or, as it is known to Japanese naval men, the Sasinscope. It is said that this phototelescopelike device has been perfected to enable naval men to look through a smoke screen. It has been known to exist in the Japanese Navy for some time, but only in January 1940 was it finally perfected. It passed the naval board tests in April.

A number of high-ranking Japanese naval men have confidentially stated that the Japanese Navy has carried out successful experiments with a radio ray. This device is said to have proved to the satisfaction of all connected with it that when it is directed at a given object it will disrupt the functioning of any and all electrical apparatus within 10 miles.

The effect of this radio ray in recent naval operations in the South Seas, installed in two of the latest submarines and four new destroyers, astounded Japanese naval men. It is said that the navy has decided to install this device in all its destroyers and submarines as rapidly as possible. One official, with great elation and confidence, told a colleague that "within a year a third of our navy will be equipped with the Sasinscope and radio ray."

The impact of the successful operation of these devices upon the entire field of air, naval, and land operations will doubtless have a revolutionary effect upon the whole science of making war. How this may affect naval operations and our own position in the Pacific remains to be seen.

Strategic and Critical Minerals and Their Relation to Our National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 13, 1940

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. HOMER D. ANGELL, OF OREGON

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address made by me over the Mutual Broadcasting System national hook-up, September 12, 1940:

Ladies and gentlemen, a bottleneck in national defense is the inability to secure adequate supplies of stategic and critical materials which now come to us from abroad. To overcome this, we must develop sources of these essentials or their substitutes within our own borders so far as possible. The native sources of these strategic and critical minerals are largely in the Western United States. A few days ago an announcement received the attention of the Nation's press. It related to the contributions which the Pacific Northwest can make toward a solution of this national-defense problem. This announcement covered the release of a comprehensive report by the Bonneville Power Administration to the Department of the Interior on Industries Important to the National Defense, Feasible of Establishment in the Pacific Northwest. This report was transmitted by Secretary Ickes to the National Defense Commission.

It is interesting to note an editorial on this report in the Washington (D. C.) Evening Star of August 27. I quote from this editorial:

"In a report submitted to the National Defense Commission by Secretary Ickes, sound arguments are presented for establishing certain essential war industries in the Rocky Mountain and Pacific Coast areas. The far West is a large producer of copper, mercury, zinc, tungsten, and other essential defense materials. These must now be transported to the East for processing and fabrication. Through the use of the vast hydroelectric power resources developed by Government projects, these materials, the report points out, could be manufactured into munitions in the far West, if facilities were available, thus securing a wider geographical distribution to our defense industries, this is a desirable objective."

This report expands and details the principles stated in remarks I made in the House of Representatives May 8, 1940, while discussing the subject. It gives a catalog of Northwestern resources available for contribution to the national-defense program. This report gives detailed consideration in the use of the Government's developments on the Columbia River for processing native materials and natural resources which are feasible of commercial development and are necessary for our national welfare. Our basic national defenses outside of manpower, depend largely upon mechanical equipment. To provide this, we must have vast quantities of strategic, critical and other minerals, and materials together with a continuous supply of low-cost electro-energy for manufacturing purposes. These materials and power must be brought together. I wish to lay before you some facts as to what the Pacific Northwest offers to the Nation's defense program in helping supply these needs. We want to be of service in this time of national emergency.

PRESENT CONTRIBUTIONS TO NATIONAL WELFARE

Many of you may not be aware of the vast storehouse of natural resources found in what was formerly called the Oregon Country, now known as the Pacific Northwest, in our great forests, our clear streams abounding in salmon and other fish life, our rolling wheat plains, our vast uplands producing livestock and wool and our rugged mountains with their wealth of mineral treasures. I call to your attention the extent to which this pioneer country—now embracing four States—Oregon, Washington, Idaho, and Montana, one-eighth of the land area of the continental United States, provides the Nation with power resources and essential products necessary in peace and war.

In agriculture, the four Pacific Northwest States in 1938 produced one-tenth of the Nation's potatoes, one-fifth of the wheat. The Pacific coast and Alaska furnished over one-third of the fish caught for food in the United States.

Our forest products—from our tremendous timber resources—provide 40 percent of the Nation's lumber production, one-third of the wood veneer, and almost one-fourth of the wood pulp. We still have 55 percent of the volume of standing saw timber of the Nation.

In minerals the emphasis of the past has been on the precious metals—gold and silver. However, in recent years mineral production has been increasing, and there are many who believe that we have not yet begun to realize the potentialities of the region's mineral resources. The 11 Western States contribute, in terms of national production, 100 percent of the magnesia for refractories, 98 percent of the potash, 93 percent of the copper, 86 percent of the mercury, 55 percent of the lead, and almost as much of the cadmium and 31 percent of the zinc. Some of these items are minor parts of our national consumption, due to the size of imports, but their importance cannot be minimized.

The Pacific Northwest States themselves, in spite of the relative infancy of their mining industry, contribute over two-thirds of the Nation's production of antimony, one-seventh of the copper, one-third of the lead, one-seventh of the zinc, one-fourth of the mercury, almost half of the manganese ore, and one-seventh of the tungsten concentrates.

COLUMBIA RIVER HYDROELECTRIC POWER

There is, however, one resource in which the Northwest stands above all other regions of the Nation—hydroelectric power. Our mountain peaks, clothed in eternal snow and ice and extensive forests, are the sources of mighty rivers, tributaries to the Columbia River, whose steady flow descends from Canadian headwaters and cleaves the Cascade Range before pouring into the blue Pacific. This, Jefferson's Columbia, and its tributaries, contain the Nation's greatest source of water power, about 44 percent of the potential hydroelectric power of all the streams of the continental United States.

If we were to translate the potential annual output of the Columbia River Basin in terms of use, we would obtain the fabulous figure of 90,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours, an amount equal to the output of the entire electric utility industry of the United States in 1929. This is a wealth which, unlike many resources, cannot be depleted, and which will serve the Nation for ages to come.

Our Northwest population is not large—one-thirtieth of the Nation's total—but it has been increasing at a greater rate than the Nation as a whole. The rich soil, the abundant rainfall, the alluring promises of the Northwest are drawing many earnest families from less bountiful sections of our country seeking fresh opportunities in the land of great distances and great vistas. The opportunities they seek are not to be denied them because this is still a pioneering nation. Our physical frontiers may not be as boundless as they were 50 years ago, but human ingenuity and the desire to wrest security, happiness, and an honest livelihood from our natural resources knows no boundaries. These western citizens will furnish the manpower for the development of these vast natural resources of the Northwest.

DEFENSE ASPECTS OF PACIFIC NORTHWEST RESOURCES

I will analyze briefly some specific phases of Pacific Northwest resource utilization which are of primary importance to our national-defense program, restricting my remarks to power and minerals and their interrelationship.

ELECTRO INDUSTRIES

It has been pointed out frequently that modern civilization owes much of its material progress to the industries whose basic processes are entirely dependent on electric power. For example, our light metals, abundantly distributed in the earth's crust, would be unavailable to us were it not for the so-called electrolytic cell. Similarly, the hard metals, without which the automobile and the airplane could not give us the remarkable services they offer, are products of the electric furnace. The magic force, resident in electric power, wrests from the lowly rock the metals and the nonmetals which permit man to annihilate space, to multiply his strength, to carry his voice and thought over hill and dale, to make the synthetic materials that are the basis for so many household articles.

Important as electro industries may be to our normal everyday life, they become indispensable to a defense program. If it were not for the many ferro alloys and the alloy steels, our guns would bark a few times and then remain silent—worn out, incapable of guiding the shell of destruction to its appointed mark. Our battleships would be cardboard, our tanks could not resist the fire of the antitank artillery. Our airplanes would essay the hopeful but short-lived flight of the barnyard fowl.

Similarly, in the manufacture of munitions the product of the electro industries ranks high. Brass for shell casings, the nitrates for explosives, the chlorines for gases are all derived from the electric furnace and the electrolytic cell.

I need not emphasize or describe further because it is fact today that electric power, guided by the genius of the scientist and the engineer is one of the most important items in our national-defense industries. I would like to point out, however, that these electro industries require very large blocks of continuous and cheap electric power. They cannot use power whose unit price is much in excess of 3 mills per kilowatt-hour nor whose availability is limited to portions of the year or of the day. These industries need power uninterruptedly throughout the year and throughout the day.

POWER FOR DEFENSE INDUSTRIES

There are not many places in our great Nation where such power is available or can be made available in time to meet our present crisis. Rivers like the Columbia, of the type that insure continuous flow, are rare. That is why the development of the Columbia River offers paramount advantages to electro industries. With Bonneville's generators producing thousands of kilowatts, Grand Coulee about to make its share available, and T. V. A. in operation, the Nation need not fear the acute power shortages experienced during the last World War.

The facilities in the Tennessee Valley are being expanded and will be ready in some 2 or 3 years. Today the Columbia River offers plentiful power for industries whose products are needed now in our defense program. This fact must not be overlooked by industry and our defense agencies. Let me specify. The Bonneville project will have 100,000 kilowatts of firm power available at the beginning of next year, above and over the amounts now committed and needed for reserves. In August of next year 200,000 kilowatts will be available from Bonneville and Grand Coulee, and in January 1942, 400,000 kilowatts. These quantities result from the wisdom of Congress in providing the funds and authorizations to advance generating facilities at these projects.

The Aluminum Co. of America's western plant on the Columbia River is now in operation and will make 30,000 tons of pig aluminum a year; 60,000,000 pounds for our airplanes, our transport facilities, and other national uses of the light metal. Other important industries can be established in the Pacific Northwest for operation within a year to 18 months which will provide for shipbuilding and repair; for our west-coast aircraft industry, which represents 60 percent of the dollar volume business of the national industry; for ordnance and munitions to be used in the defense of the west coast and our Pacific outposts. They would obviate choking eastern industry and would provide not only desirable decentralization but would also diversify our sources of supplies in times of emergency. By locating these industries in this area where raw products and power are already available or obtainable we would also be adhering to another principle in national defense, namely, locating essential defense industries away from coast areas and thus less vulnerable to attack.

These industries could produce 155,000 tons of basic materials important not only to the normal economic life of the Pacific Northwest but to our national defense:

Produce	Power requirement	Annual production
	Kilowatts	
Aluminum	65,000	30,000 tons of metal.
High-grade iron and steel	25,000	50,000 tons of metal.
Ferrochrome	30,000	20,000 tons of alloy.
Electrolytic zinc	15,000	35,000 tons of metal.
Nitrates	60,000	30,000 tons fixed nitrogen
Calcium carbide	10,000	20,000 tons of chemical.
Total (less Alcoa plant)	140,000	155,000 tons of products.

We cannot allow this great reservoir of power to remain without the necessary outlets to market.

PACIFIC NORTHWEST MINERALS AND THE NATIONAL DEFENSE

I have discussed so far the benefits of which this Nation can take immediate advantage in the huge power resources of the Pacific Northwest. I would like now to examine briefly our mineral situation.

Strategic and critical minerals are found in the West. The deposits of chrome, of manganese, antimony, and tungsten have not been fully charted, and the Pacific Northwest has not as yet been examined with the care that it deserves. Some of the minerals now known in the Oregon country are of low grade, but are particularly susceptible to treatment by electric power. Metallic chrome and manganese can be obtained from Northwest ores, and magnesium—that increasingly important light metal—can be produced from Northwest magnesite and magnesitic dolomites by the electric furnace, and apparently at a price level lower than that now available. Aluminum can be made from alunite, a western ore. As far as possible we should use our own raw materials for the production of aluminum instead of depending on foreign supplies of bauxite, or on our rapidly shrinking domestic bauxite deposits. And so the list could be expanded. This development and use of our own natural deposits depends on the efforts of the scientist in his laboratory and in the pilot plant, of the geologist and mining man, of the engineer who can translate these investigations into successful commercial operations.

The Pacific Northwest can contribute immeasurably in this emergency toward national defense through the use of its deposits of strategic and critical minerals and other materials, and through the development of the electro industries in the Columbia River area. In this area there are immense deposits of raw materials much of them wholly undeveloped. They will replace essential products now being imported and which may be blacked out at any time. Nowhere else in the Nation is there comparable potential and existing supplies of low-cost power. The Pacific Northwest asks that these powerful resources be enlisted in strengthening our national defense and in providing for our country's welfare in time of peace, in time of emergency, and in time of war which, pray God, may never come.

Wendell Willkie

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 13 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

EDITORIAL FROM PHILADELPHIA EVENING BULLETIN

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin of September 9, 1940, entitled "Strong Leadership Wanted."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin of September 9, 1940]

STRONG LEADERSHIP WANTED

When Wendell Willkie was nominated for the Presidency by the Philadelphia convention there was a general feeling in Republican ranks that a wise choice had been made.

It seemed that professional politicians had been rebuffed and their dictatorial power taken over by the progressive rank and file of the party. For Mr. Willkie had not been groomed by the old-line leaders. He was the popular candidate. It was a heartening sign that the Republicans who do the voting rather than the political engineers who try to direct it had been able to take charge and select the nominee.

Mr. Willkie owed his popularity not alone to his pleasing personality. His premonition utterances had exhibited a rich vein of common sense. His was not a reactionary view. He was willing to accept and pursue the best of the New Deal objectives. He was not going to attempt to turn back the hands of the clock. He proposed to improve on the methods rather than the aims of the march toward social progress.

Besides, there was a big business job ahead of the country—the gigantic job of military preparedness. The idea in the minds of the people who got behind Willkie was to choose a President who could be expected, by virtue of his executive record in the handling of large affairs, to carry through the preparedness program with a minimum of waste and a maximum of efficiency in the shortest possible time. Wendell Willkie has a background of achievement that fits him for that task.

But Mr. Willkie's course since his nomination has not been wholly satisfactory to those of his supporters who have in mind the country's welfare rather than partisan advantage. There is too much evidence that he holds the small things so close to his eye as to obscure his vision of the large things.

Here one suspects the influence, and probably the unwise counsel, of the professional politicians.

They are on the hunt for grounds of criticism, and in the search they overstrain themselves.

The coming election is not going to be decided on the basis of the number of flies to be found in the ointment of general welfare as applied by the New Deal administration, but on the ground of its general effectiveness as a medicament.

The country is interested in broad policy; not in side issues or minor details. Mr. Willkie, for instance, will not get anywhere with independent voters, whose support he needs, by criticisms which suggest that if he were President in the existing emergency he would refrain from using his utmost power to strengthen the national defenses quickly, but would rather let Congress debate the question whether or not he should resort to such Executive authority.

Intimations that he thinks delicate negotiations with foreign powers should be conducted through a megaphone, so that the public may listen in on them at every stage, do not appeal to common sense. That is not the way he managed the affairs of Commonwealth & Southern. And the people want business methods applied, so far as they are appropriate, to affairs of government.

The people like political fronkness and courage. They want strong and competent leadership. Their support at the polls will go to the candidate who convinces them that he understands our foreign and domestic problems and is prepared not only to offer but to execute a sound program for meeting them.

Taxation of Excess Profits

REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH E. CHURCH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 13, 1940

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein a memorandum prepared by Mr. James F. Stiles, Jr., vice president and treasurer of Abbott Laboratories, North Chicago, Ill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, this memorandum embodies a simple formula for determining excess profits for the purpose of taxation. Mr. Stiles is a leading citizen of my district and a personal friend of mine of long standing. I understand that he has submitted the same memorandum I am inserting in the RECORD to every Member of the House and the Senate. I am taking this time in order to call your special attention to it.

You will note that the formula he presents for the purpose of excess profits is a simple one, and that in itself should commend it to us. It has had the endorsement of every tax specialist who has had occasion to examine it. You will note that it stimulates, rather than penalizes, pay-roll expansion and increased employment.

Last week end Mr. Stiles and I conferred with certain members of the Senate Finance Committee in the hope that this particular formula may be incorporated in the legislation now pending in the Senate. If the Senate takes that step, and I hope it will, I urge that the House concur in that action.

The tax bill which passed the House will tend to operate to the disadvantage of small corporations, and it is these very corporations which are the backbone of our industrial system. It behooves us not to enact any legislation which would tend to operate to their disadvantage. If we must have excess-profits-tax legislation, then let us take the time to see that it is soundly devised.

The following simple formula is submitted as a third alternative for corporations in determining what amount is to be taxed as excess profits.

Determine the average ratio during the base period of pay roll (subject to social-security taxes) to net profit (net income after deduction of normal tax); for example:

	Total pay roll	Net profit
1936	$1,000,000	$800,000
1937	1,500,000	1,100,000
1938	1,400,000	1,000,000
1939	2,100,000	1,600,000
Total	6,000,000	4,500,000

Net profit=75 percent of total pay roll.
1941 pay roll: $3,000,000—75 percent=$2,250,000 normal net profits:

Net profit after normal tax	$2,500,000
Allowed as normal profit	2,250,000
Subject to excess-profits tax	250,000

The advantages of this method are:

A. Stimulates rather than penalizes pay-roll expansion and increased employment.

B. Recognizes that industrial profits come primarily from productive activity.

C. Encourages normal business progress and normal business profits.

D. Simplicity of arriving at determining factors and tax—namely, social-security pay roll—net income after normal tax.

This formula should answer the objections to the pending excess-profits tax bill of growing corporations which have ample capital for expansion and those which during the base period had an increasing trend of profit not arising from the national-defense program, as well as those which are in a position finally to realize profits during the years which might be subject to excess-profits tax, which profits result from previous research and development work.

Because of the fact that during any base period selected, whether for 4 or 5 years, the average corporation experiences an abnormal year of unprofitable accomplishment, it would be preferable to let such corporation select 4 out of the past 5 years (1935–39) or 3 out of the past 4 years (1936–39).

This option, of course, should not be available to that part of any taxpayer's business which is subject to the newly proposed tax on armament contracts, nor should it be available to any corporation for any taxable year if its net profits exceed its pay roll.

JAS. F. STILES, Jr.

NORTH CHICAGO, ILL., *September 7, 1940.*

Conscription

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER A. LYNCH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 7, 1940

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, a number of my constituents have written to me opposing conscription at this time. Some opposed it as a forerunner to the sending of an army to aid Great Britain, others opposed it as undemocratic and leading to dictatorship. To them I answered that I could not state my position until the bill was in its final form and debate had been had thereon. I further stated that I felt that conscription should not be had except as a last resort.

I have voted for conscription, convinced that it was for the best interests of our country. Events have moved quickly, so quickly that I would rather make the mistake of being overprepared than unprepared.

That we need an efficient and capable Army no one can deny. That we must protect our homes is beyond question. Declarations of war are not made today. Norway, Holland, Denmark, and Belgium were at peace and went to sleep. The next day found the invaders in their country. France, with one of the bravest armies in the world, but betrayed by Communists and "fifth columnists" behind the lines, lies defeated before a military machine. England, with her mighty navy, has her back to the wall, while from the skies bombs are dropping upon her, destroying not only military objectives but the homes of people as well; killing not only soldiers but women and children as well. Can I, as the Representative of my district, close my eyes to those facts and say, "It cannot happen here"?

The bulk of our fleet is on the alert in the Pacific, guarding our western coast and island possessions. A thin line of warships is protecting our Atlantic coast; our air force is insufficient; our Regular Army on August 16 last numbered only 289,000 men, scattered over the United States, Alaska, Panama, Hawaii, and the Philippines. Our National Guard is 240,000, which, it is estimated, will be reduced some 20,000 by discharges for dependency and physical disability. The Chief of Staff of the Army states we need 1,200,000 adequately trained men under arms to protect our country. Approximately 40,000 men enlisted in the Army last month. At that rate we would not recruit a sufficient number for 20 months—almost 2 years. Call for volunteers! I thought so once, but not now. Some say we are at peace. Make no mistake, the threat of war is imminent. There can be no real peace in the shadow of war. We are preparing our defenses. We want peace, but are we going to have it? Because we want peace, are we going to be unprepared for war?

If we are at peace and there is no danger of war, why should we be spending billions of dollars for equipment for defense? If we are at peace and there is no danger of war, why is it that our people are unanimous in building a two-ocean Navy, which cannot be accomplished for at least 7 years? If we are at peace and there is no danger of war, why has the National Guard been called into service? If we are at peace and there is no danger of war, why do we need 1,200,000 men under arms?

Conscription in time of war, we all agree, is the only fair system. Conscription in time of peace is said to be undemocratic. I believe that to be true as a general principle, but somewhere in those dark hours before war strikes, preparation must be made in the hope that such preparation will cause the war lords of Europe to halt in their mad march and yet with the thought that they will strike.

Call for volunteers and who would answer? It would be the boys who come from God-fearing families, brought up with the thought of service to God and country, imbued with a love for American ideals and American institutions, while those who willingly enjoy the benefits of living in a free country, but are unwilling to accept the responsibility of defending that country, would take the jobs of the boys who had volunteered. And if there were a war, who would be the first to be called? The boys who in time of peace, but in the shadows of war, had volunteered and had been trained for service.

What will happen when the time of training for the National Guard and the first contingent of 800,000 men is over? Are we to have another call for a million volunteers to take their places? Would it not be the same type of boy who volunteered and would it not be the same type who would again take their jobs?

It has been no easy task to come to this conclusion. It is no easy task to take boys away from their homes. It is no easy task for me to vote to send my own boy away, but, after listening long hours to the debate, after reading the testimony before the Military Affairs Committees of the Senate and House, I, alone with my conscience, came to the conclusion that, with the heavy clouds of war lowering over our country, no course was left open to me but to vote for immediate conscription.

The Bonneville Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 13, 1940

STATEMENT OF HON. HOMER D. ANGELL, OF OREGON, BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement

made by me before the Subcommittee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, September 10, 1940:

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, members of the Deficiency Appropriation Committee, I am advised that the President and the Bureau of the Budget have transmitted a Bonneville supplemental estimate of $3,850,000, which is divided as follows:

Item 1. Grand Coulee-Covington transmission line, initial materials, right-of-way, and clearing	$1,500,000
Item 2. Covington-Seattle line	200,000
Item 3. Substation additions	1,600,000
Item 4. Feeder connections	500,000
Item 5. Tools and equipment	50,000
Total	3,850,000

In view of the President's Executive order the first two items are necessary to start work on outlets to permit the sale of Coulee power. No direct Coulee outlets have been authorized to date, and it is obvious that they are necessary. Grand Coulee will bring in three generators totaling 324,000 kilowatts within the next year. This is 50 percent more firm power than was assured by the $65,000,000 T. V. A. appropriation request which by the terms of that appropriation bill will not be fully available within 3 years. I might mention in this connection that Bonneville Dam is completed and Coulee will be within a year. All that is needed hereafter at both sites to acquire any amount additional capacity is the installation of machines—water turbines and generators with a roof above. For the capacity included in the T. V. A. appropriation, these Bonneville or Coulee machines could have been secured for about one-sixth of the amount necessary for a full hydro development with steam auxiliaries. I have been advised that the three Coulee machines I mention cost less than $10,000,000. Columbia power does not require a steam support.

I might also state that additional Bonneville or Coulee capacity can be secured for one-half of the cost of any steam plant, and thereafter there would be no fuel costs involved. Bare fuel operating costs on the basis of T. V. A. reports range from about 1.6 to 3.0 mills per kilowatt-hour, depending on the distance from the fuel source. In the Northwest, Columbia power costs, including all charges, interest, and amortization, are less than the bare fuel cost.

The remaining items of this estimate come within the scope of my investigations, and I desire to comment on the strategic metal and defense contribution that the Northwest can make. The last three items of the submission can fit directly into such a program in my State. The submission is flexible enough to permit the use of these funds, wherever defense industrial requirements arise. Bonneville and Grand Coulee will within the next year have over 500,000 kilowatts of available low-cost power. The Advisory Commission in their appearance before your committee, on the T. V. A. matter, stated in effect that there was a shortage of power capacity required for defense, and that there was no private company in the United States capable of supplying even 200,000 kilowatts. I could add to this statement by saying that there are no power sources in America that can approach the Columbia River plants in low cost.

POWER COSTS AND ELECTROLYTIC PROCESSES

Inquiry and investigation develop the following over-all power facts. The hydro power that the Aluminum Co. is purchasing at the T. V. A. costs about 50 percent more than Bonneville-delivered power. The T. V. A. steam power, with low coal prices, will cost over two times as much as Bonneville power. The Holston Reservoir hydro power will cost, if fully amortized, like the estimate before you, nearly 1.9 times as much as Columbia power. Niagara industrial power sells for 50 percent more than Bonneville power. Eastern and midwestern steam power will cost nearly 3 times as much. All of these comparisons are made on a kilowatt-hour basis for the purpose of pointing out the base economics behind the electrolytic processes, on which the defense program must rest. Electrolytic metal processes cannot economically stand power costs above 3 mills per kilowatt-hour unless there is Federal subsidy in the metal price paid. This economic fact precludes steam power from consideration from such process use. Columbia power derives its advantage from the gifts of nature, in the form of high average river flows, steadiness of flow, high waterfalls, low-cost reservoir sites, and advantageous dam sites with solid floors. As a power producer, the Columbia tops the list of high-class power streams like the Niagara, St. Lawrence, and Colorado.

THE DEFENSE PROBLEM

Modern warfare is one of machines. Machines require metals and modern machines electrolytic metals. I have stated before that the Detroit automobile industry would not have been possible without the superior electrolytic metals produced by Niagara 3-mill current. The two bottlenecks of the last war were power and strategic metals. As time goes on we will see these bottlenecks develop unless remedial measures are early adopted. The Northwest has both. All that is needed is to harness them together. I appear to urge your full consideration of this subject. It is apparent that we cannot afford to isolate such a block of power capacity at this time.

STRATEGIC METALS

On May 8 last, before the present Defense Advisory Committee was created, I addressed the House on the metal and power situation. Originally, I started this investigation as an aid to unemployment, and in the course of this investigation I discovered our great national-defense weakness from the standpoint of vital metals and power. I found that we are importing nearly $200,000,000 annually in vital metals. This importation represents an employment displacement nearly equal to the total metal-mining employment in the United States. To feel absolutely secure, we must declare our independence from foreign material sources. For example, our steel industry would be helpless if the foreign supply of manganese were to be cut off. Large deposits of manganese ores exist in the West, notably in the Olympic Peninsula in Washington. Our western ores are more complex than the ores of other sections, but these can be reduced by electric processes. The Bureau of Mines has developed an electric process for the reduction of western manganese ores. The same situation exists as to magnesium, aluminum from western alunite, chrome, tungsten, antimony, mica, and mercury.

DEFENSE INDUSTRIES

Civilization today would grind to an abrupt stop if the products of the electric furnace and the electrolytic cell should cease to be available. Our automobiles require the high-grade steel and steel alloys made in the electric furnace. The modern transport and military planes of today would be nonexistent if it were not for aluminum and magnesium metal products of the electrolytic cell. The examples can be multiplied as to cover every phase of modern industrial life—and, consequently, the importance of electric power become self-evident, especially if we note that these electro products require huge quantities of cheap power.

It is not easy to find cheap sources of dependable power in the Nation. Present plants are fast becoming loaded up to maximum capacity. We must not be subject to the almost disastrous power shortages of the last World War; and, gentlemen, we need not—the Columbia River projects at Bonneville and Grand Coulee are ready now to furnish ever-increasing quantities of the lowest-cost electric power in the United States. But great as this availability may be, we need the transmission lines to carry the energy from the power plants to the sites where industry will locate.

Ripe fruit can rot and fall to the ground unless we provide the baskets with which to collect the bounties of the fruit tree and transportation facilities to carry it to the markets.

Bonneville is ready to deliver 65,000 kilowatts to the Aluminum Co. of America's plant at Vancouver, Wash., which began operation September 3 of this year for the production of 30,000 tons a year of aluminum which we need in the production of sheets, rods, and structural shapes for our airplane program.

Bonneville is ready to deliver power to the Pacific Carbide & Alloys Co. in Portland for the production of calcium carbide, a chemical important in peace and war.

And Bonneville is in active contact with manufacturers and industrial groups contemplating northwestern production of high-grade steel and steel alloys, ferrochrome—so important for armor plate—electrolytic zinc and manganese, aluminum from western raw materials, chromite, and chlorates. All these are electro industries whose power demands will aggregate many tens of thousands of kilowatts.

I might call your attention to a timely report, just made public, prepared by the Bonneville Power Administration on industries important to national defense feasible of establishment in the Pacific Northwest. This report analyzes the specific contributions which the Northwest can well make to the national-defense program. It lists industries a basic requirement of which is cheap and large blocks of power industries whose products can provide some of the sinews for the defense of the west coast of our Pacific outposts, industries that are needed in the normal economic development of the Oregon country. I am told that if all these interested industries were to be established in the Northwest, their total initial power requirements would be in excess of 250,000 kilowatts. Where else in this Nation can such power be provided, especially in an area where most of the necessary raw materials can be found or readily made available from contiguous areas?

SELF-LIQUIDATION

Under the terms of the Bonneville Act this estimate will be fully recovered. The act is mandatory in this requirement, and the rates to insure repayment are subject to periodical revision and check by the Power Commission before becoming effective. Manifestly, the estimate before you is strictly a business proposition, and also a worth-while contribution to our defense program.

Republican Efforts to Hoodwink the Public

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 13, 1940

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herein an intriguing clipping from the ultraconservative Detroit Free Press, printed on the front page of its issue of September 9, 1940.

I might refer to the article as did the Latins of old, "Res ipsa loquitur" (the thing speaks for itself). However, it might be added parenthetically that, according to this

newspaper story, the Republicans of southern Michigan are so desperate they have resorted to very questionable methods in attempting to perpetrate upon an often too gullible public the impression that Willkie continues in undiminishing popularity. Personally, I have always felt the Willkie popularity was synthetic and was carefully planted as a seed, then transplanted, nourished under glass, and nurtured to a budding fruition of incipient persuasiveness by the loving hands of the scions of special privilege and the stooges of monopolies. I suggest that the readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD study the article carefully. Let Republicans read it and weep. If certain polls, ostensibly indicating that public-utility magnate Willkie was in the lead, resort to anything like the methods so graphically described in this article from a Republican newspaper, one can readily comprehend why it is that the people are rapidly losing faith in so-called opinion polls.

[From the Detroit Free Press of September 9, 1940]

G. O. P. LEARNS IT CAN'T KEEP ROOSEVELT DOWN AT THE FAIR

The State Fair Board of Managers, being Republican almost to a man, was loyal to the Grand Old Party to the end of the fair Sunday night, even though they may not have been entirely ethical in the way they tried to keep the G. O. P. in the ascendancy.

That, at least, was the way it looked to Mr. and Mrs. Henry Rauch, of 59 Seward, who paid 95 good New Deal dollars to rent a concession at the fair where they sold Roosevelt and Willkie stickers and buttons and kept a public scoreboard to show how the sales were going.

All was well with their concession until last Wednesday when, for the first time, the number of Roosevelt buttons sold exceeded the number of Willkie buttons. The scoreboard in front of their concession proclaimed that the President was in the lead in the Rauch straw voting.

"Soon after the scoreboard showed Roosevelt ahead," Rauch said Sunday with a note of bitterness, "Schrader came over and told us to contrive to make Willkie lead the vote or else take the board down."

"Schrader" is Lester R. Schrader, of Centerville, a member of the board of managers who is in charge of renting concession space.

"He told us to start counting twice as much for a Willkie sale as for a Roosevelt sale," Mrs. Rauch chimed in.

Rauch had been counting five votes for each candidate with every button sale. After Schrader had issued his ultimatum he counted 10 votes for every Willkie sale, Rauch said.

Things went along more smoothly until Sunday night, when, despite the 2-to-1 handicap, Roosevelt again forged into the lead.

"Within 2 minutes," Rauch said, "Schrader was over here, and he took our scoreboard away."

WILLKIE TRAILS AGAIN

Rauch borrowed another makeshift scoreboard at about 8:30 p. m. Sunday and chalked up the correct score. It stood: Roosevelt, 5,260; Willkie, 2,940.

"That's the right score, and we are going to keep it right for the rest of the evening—if we can," said Rauch.

Schrader was "out to dinner" when the new scoreboard went up. At a late hour, however, the board was still there.

Aliens and Unemployment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 13 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

ARTICLE BY HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS, OF NORTH CAROLINA

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article written by me for the National Republic magazine, issue of September 1940, published in Washington, D. C., entitled "Aliens Keep Ten Millions Idle."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the National Republic magazine of September 1940]

ALIENS KEEP TEN MILLIONS IDLE

(By Senator ROBERT R. REYNOLDS, of North Carolina)

Some months ago I addressed the Senate on the need of additional immigration restricted and alien deportation legislation, and in opposition to the then highly publicized and propagandized Wagner-Rogers so-called refugee resolution, which would increase the present enormous German quota by 20,000 children, no one of whom would have to be a refugee. At that time some statistical questions were asked me about the number of aliens entering the United States and already in the country, which I was not then prepared to answer. The Senate was then given the impression by my questioners that emigration exceeded immigration, and that there was really no need of any additional immigration legislation, because the Senate was erroneously given to understand no aliens are coming into our country.

Since then I have had prepared from the official Government statistics a table which conclusively and decisively shows that emigration is not exceeding immigration, and that net immigration is, and has been for several years, rapidly increasing.

The official statistics show that another immigration wave of about one-half a million aliens annually, such as came a decade ago, immediately after the enactment of the present 1924 Quota Restriction Act, has set in, as a result of the Hoover public charge administrative restriction of September 8, 1930, being partially relaxed in 1937, and as a result of Congress not having put that administrative restriction on the basis of substantiative law, as urged by President Hoover repeatedly in his messages, and as was attempted by the House passing, by a record yea-and-nay vote of 298 to 88, a bill reducing quota immigration 90 percent in the precise language of my bill (S. 407), on which extensive hearings were held several months ago by the subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Immigration, which has unanimously reported to the full committee a substitute bill that would accomplish the purposes, not only of Senate bill 407 but of several other bills I have introduced.

The nearly half a million aliens who came for almost a decade after the enactment of the present quota legislation are shown conclusively to have been reduced by the Hoover so-called executive order of 1930 to about 150,000 aliens, or 23,068 so-called immigrant aliens, only to be increased by the failure of Congress to enact additional restrictive legislation, and by the relaxation of the present administrative discretion in 1937 to 252,697 aliens last year. The effect of the administrative relaxation in 1937 is even reflected in the number of destitute aliens removed in 1938, when they increased over 1,000 over 1937, and their removal cost Uncle Sam over $100,000 more in 1938 than the corresponding cost in 1937.

I also asked that another statistical table prepared by the Department of Labor, and submitted to the subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriations on January 26, 1938, be printed as a part of my remarks.

The tables and statement are as follows:

"The quota law of 1924 divides all classes of aliens into immigrants and nonimmigrant aliens. The nonimmigrant as defined in section 3 of the 1925 quota law are merely: (1) government officials, such as ambassadors, consuls, and the like, their families, suites, etc.; (2) temporary visitors for business; (3) temporary visitors for pleasure; (4) aliens intransitu both through the United States and from one part of the United States to another through foreign territory; (5) treaty traders. In 1937, fiscal year ending June 30, there were 128,557 nonimmigrants out of 231,884 aliens of all classes; that is, 103,327 immigrants.

"All classes of aliens admitted in 1935 totaled 179,721; 1936, 190,-899; 1937, 231,884 (21.5 percent increase over 1936). Total, 7 years (1931–37), 1,372,686; total, 13 years (1925–37), 4,290,651" (House Appropriations Committee Hearings, Labor, January 26, 1938, pp. 240–241).

Reading the second table we note there were in 1937, 27,762 section 5 immigrants, nine-tenths having no near relatives here, and who were new-seed immigrants; and during the past 7 years there were 151,448; and during the last 13 years, i. e., since the enactment of the quota-restriction law of 1924, 1,054,567, nine-tenths of whom had no near relatives here, every one of the nine-tenths being a job hunter or relief seeker, or dependent upon someone who is. These should have been excluded.

Aliens admitted to the United States under provisions of the Immigration Act of 1924 from 1925 to 1935

[Compiled from the annual reports of the Commissioner General of Immigration and from figures furnished by the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization]

	1925	1926	1927	1928	1929	1930	1931	1932	1933	1934	1935	1936	1937	1938	Total
Total quota	164,667	164,667	164,667	164,667	164,667	153,714	153,831	153,831	153,831	153,774	153,774	153,774	153,774	153,774	2,207,295
Quota visas issued	160,616	161,857	162,396	162,429	155,912	150,879	48,528	12,697	7,954	13,900	17,291	20,184	30,898	45,712	1,151,253
Percentage of quota immigration visas issued	97.5	98.3	98.6	98.6	94.7	98.2	31.6	8.3	5.2	9.0	11.2	13.1	20.1	29.7	(1)
Immigrant aliens	294,314	304,488	335,175	307,255	275,678	241,700	97,139	35,576	23,068	29,470	34,956	36,329	50,244	67,895	2,137,682
Nonimmigrant aliens	164,121	191,618	202,826	193,376	199,649	204,514	183,540	139,295	127,660	134,434	144,765	154,570	186,640	184,802	2,406,750
Total alien admissions	458,435	496,106	538,001	500,631	479,327	446,214	280,679	174,871	150,728	163,904	179,721	190,899	231,884	252,697	4,544,432
Aliens deported	9,495	10,904	11,662	11,625	12,908	16,631	18,142	19,425	19,865	8,879	8,319	9,195	8,829	9,275	

[1] 1,056,042 unused quotas—50 percent plus.

The bill I have sponsored (S. 3201) would exclude practically nine-tenths of the 27,762 section 5 immigrant aliens that entered in 1937, nine-tenths of the 151,448 that have entered during the 7 years 1931–37, and nine-tenths of the 1,054,567 aliens that have entered since 1924, and who ought not have been admitted to further increase our unemployment and relief burdens, directly or indirectly.

From September 8, 1930, to January 1, 1937, consuls drastically restricted immigration admissibility by refusing immigration visas to aliens they believe are "likely to become public charges" after admission here. Before September 8, 1930, there was no such administrative restriction. The effect of this administrative restriction is reflected in the number of section 5 admissions before and after 1930, there being 903,119 such admissions during the 6 years before 1930, as compared with 151,448 during the 7 years since 1930.

On January 1, 1937, the President had the Secretary of State instruct consuls to relax in certain instances this administrative restriction inaugurated by Herbert Hoover on September 8, 1930, and to no longer regard increased unemployment here (there are now about 10,600,000 unemployed), lack of funds, and no near relatives here legally liable for their maintenance and support as the reasons they have been using since 1930 for refusing visas because the alien is likely to become a public charge, particularly as to aliens from Germany and Austria, on account of political conditions there. Since this change there has been a noticeable increase in aliens unemployed and aliens demanding relief and charity. The 100 percent increase in section 5, new-seed or quota immigrants for 1937 over 1936, is due largely to this administrative relaxation and shows the urgent need of putting such administrative restriction on a more substantial basis of law by Congress passing some such bill as S. 3202 that would exclude mere section 5 nonpreference aliens, practically every one of whom is necessarily a job hunter or relief seeker and who has no near relative here.

The immigration bill S. 3201 has a 10-percent exception for certain near relatives (preference quota) and for skilled labor and specialists that might be needed for new industries. With the exception of a few specialists and a few preference-quota relatives, the bill, if it had been enacted, would have kept out during the years 1925–37, nine-tenths of the 1,054,567 aliens that came and are job hunters or relief seekers, and thereby reduced greatly our terrific unemployment and relief burdens. Of course, legal alien entrants are only part of the problem. We know the legal entrants, but do not know, and have had no way of finding out, the number of total aliens in the country in the absence of alien registration in the past.

Quota law of 1924

	1937	7 years, 1931–37	13 years, 1925–37
Sec. 3 or "nonimmigrant" aliens:			
1. Government officials, families, suites	6,493	34,232	66,534
2. Visitors for business	18,317	101,201	224,605
3. Visitors for pleasure	71,138	306,033	534,791
4. Intransitu aliens	31,822	190,551	350,158
5. Treaty traders	787	5,326	12,239
Total	128,557	637,343	1,198,327
Sec. 4 or nonquota and preference "immigrant" aliens:			
1. Husbands of United States citizens	917	5,355	7,321
2. Wives of United States citizens	4,879	37,970	102,994
3. Children of United States citizens	3,740	25,566	83,631
4. Returning residents	51,349	425,984	964,943
5. Natives of nonquota countries	12,037	73,820	841,377
Their wives	83	549	4,316
Their children, unmarried, minors	32	218	1,259
6. Ministers	233	1,747	5,309
Their wives	79	559	2,080
Their children	128	871	3,644
7. Professors	54	464	1,542
Their wives	26	192	450
Their children	26	166	310
8. Students	1,828	9,449	20,280
9. Women who have been citizens	109	772	976
10. Spanish subjects admitted to Puerto Rico	43	179	300

Quota law of 1924—Continued

	1937	7 years, 1931–37	13 years, 1925–37
Sec. 4—Continued.			
11. American Indians of this continent	2	21	44
12. Other nonquota		13	6,581
Total	75,565	583,895	2,047,157
Sec. 5 or "quota immigrant" aliens	27,762	151,448	1,054,567

There is also the emigration factor. Emigration statistics are not official in the sense that immigration statistics are. The Government only really checks or counts aliens coming into the country legally. Nobody knows how many aliens enter illegally, but experts have estimated, and it seems a fair guess, that as many enter illegally as enter legally for permanent residence. Annually our inadequate immigration patrol apprehends hundreds of high-powered automobiles, a large number of speedboats, and even airplanes smuggling aliens into our country.

In 1937, 163 smugglers of aliens, 13,054 aliens entering illegally, and 608 other law violators were arrested, and the autos, trucks, airplanes, and boats seized ran into thousands of dollars. When Department of Labor officials appear before the Appropriations Committee they urge a 50-percent increase in the immigration personnel, much larger appropriations, and tell—I quote from the House hearings on the 1938 appropriation bill—"how quite serious this situation is, with 46,152,918 alien border crossings, 795,333 alien seamen examined, and a shortage of help—meaning immigration law enforcement officers—in practically every district." That is the picture painted by the Department of Labor officials as to aliens before the House Subcommittee on Appropriations, but when the same officials appear before committees of Congress charged with reporting immigration and deportation legislation they say the alien has "vanished" from our midst; and even estimate that, although the official statistics from the census of 1930 reveal the largest foreign population in our history, over 14,000,000 foreign born, and between six and seven million aliens, and over 40,000,000 "foreign-stock persons," that we have now no aliens, because they have either emigrated, died off, or got naturalized; and when pressed about alien registration, the Secretary of Labor, after telling the House Subcommittee on Appropriations that the alien is vanishing and is no longer a problem, then expressed her deep opposition to registering aliens, because she said they (the aliens) "do not want to be fingerprinted" (p. 224), and it would "complicate the Americanization of these people."

The Government does not check aliens out, as it checks and counts the aliens in. So-called emigration is merely the report of departure tickets sold by the steamship and transportation companies. In 1937, which is typical, transportation companies reported 26,736 alien emigrants departed or aliens emigrated from the United States as compared with 35,817 the previous year. Department of Labor officials also told the House Appropriations Subcommittee in 1937 that 50,244 of the 231,884 aliens that entered during the 1937 fiscal year were immigrants, showing immigration was twice emigration, even according to Department of Labor officials' interpretation and classification of the statistics. Even those Department of Labor classified immigration statistics show in 1937 and again in 1938 a 25-percent decrease in emigration and that immigration is at least twice emigration when we have about 10,600,000 unemployed, are having to appropriate a quarter billion dollars for expanding relief rolls, and crime as a result of unemployment is on the rampage.

There is no excuse for allowing a single additional alien job hunter or relief seeker to enter our country. Nine-tenths of the section 5, 27,762 quota aliens that entered in 1937 and over 30,000 in 1938 have no near relatives here, were nonpreference or quota immigrants, and should not have been admitted. No other country of consequence permits it. Each country should care for its own deficient, dependent, and unemployed. Our first thought should be for our own. Charity should begin at home. Immigration should be further restricted at least by passing S. 3201, which would

merely exclude the thousands of aliens now being admitted under section 5, no one of whom has a near relative here and every one of whom comes to take a job away from someone already here or to go on relief or become dependent on someone who has to have a job to support him. First things should be first. We should not decide our American affairs or legislate the way aliens here and abroad "want us to" legislate, but for America and Americans, and as Americans.

Water-Borne Commerce in America's Citadel of Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH J. MANSFIELD

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 13, 1940

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, in these times when there is so much public interest in national defense, those of us who for a long time have devoted our time and energy to planning and improving the navigable rivers and harbors of the United States are gratified at the state of preparedness of the Nation's waterways in the present emergency. We take pride in the fact that the plans have been made with the best interests of the Nation ever in view and that the works have been authorized and constructed from a national viewpoint free from partisan and selfish motives. As a result this country, beginning to prepare for defense, finds its waterways better able than ever before to transport bulk freight and take care of the heavy traffic which the railroads were unable to handle in the first World War and are never able to transport when this country is sufficiently prosperous to produce and put into interstate commerce the heavy tonnages derived from its abundant natural resources, of grain, oil, metal, ores, coal, and manufactured products.

COASTAL AND LAKE REGIONS

The harbors, canals, and navigable rivers of our coastal and lake regions are deeper and better maintained than ever before. The planning has been characterized by thoroughness and vision, and authorized projects have been accomplished in synchronism with the growth and demands of the country. Without referring to all of the important accomplishments, I invite attention to the essential benefits to national defense of the coastal harbors which permit the efficient handling of oil and gasoline, and to the defense value of the harbors of the Great Lakes, which make feasible the transportation of the Lake Superior iron ore to the manufacturing centers of steel and iron. Without these waterway improvements our national defense would indeed be in a bad way.

THE MISSISSIPPI BASIN

In the great central region of the United States, between the Appalachian and Rocky Mountains, as elsewhere, the planning for water-borne transportation has been forehanded, and has been performed with vision. We in Congress have not erred by being too conservative but have authorized improvements in a truly liberal and modern spirit. Our actions have been governed by national motives, and as a result navigable waterways are ready when so many other essentials for defense are unprepared. Let me mention some of the waterway facilities in the Great Mississippi Basin.

LOWER MISSISSIPPI RIVER

From Cairo, Ill., to Baton Rouge, La., we have a barge-line channel 300 feet wide and 9 feet deep, which is maintained in first-class shape, and through which heavily laden barge tows are continually passing up and down the river. Oil and gasoline are hauled by water from refineries at Baton Rouge to St. Louis, Mo., to Kansas City, Mo., to St. Paul and Minneapolis, to Chicago, to Louisville, to Cincinnati, to Pittsburgh, to Nashville, and to innumerable other cities and towns. This oil and gasoline cannot be distributed by any other form of transportation with the same efficiency. Of course, grain, coal, steel products, and cotton are also transported by barge on the Lower Mississippi River.

MISSOURI RIVER

On the Missouri River, from St. Louis to Kansas City, there is a 6-foot channel, and its continuation to Sioux City is about 75 percent completed. The plan is to develop the 6-foot channel into a 9-foot project from St. Louis to Sioux City. At present there are large in-bound shipments to Kansas City of building materials, fuel oil, machinery, and chemicals, and out-bound shipments of wheat, flour, ores, lumber products, and sand.

UPPER MISSISSIPPI AND ILLINOIS RIVERS

Barge-line traffic is affording regular service from the lower Mississippi below Cairo up the Mississippi to St. Louis and to Minneapolis, and up the Illinois River to Chicago. These channels, 9 feet in depth, permit the hauling of coal from the Pennsylvania, Kentucky, and West Virginia coal fields to the cities and towns located on and near these rivers.

OHIO RIVER

The 9-foot navigation project for the Ohio River authorized in 1910 has been completed and it makes possible the economical and efficient manufacture of iron and steel products in the Pittsburgh and Chicago steel-manufacturing areas, by reason of the fact that water transportation makes coal cheap everywhere that the barge lines carry coal. Without abundant iron and plentiful coal due to water-borne transportation, national defense would be in a sad plight. Much has been accomplished, but there remain other connecting waterways in the Ohio Basin that could advantageously be improved.

WATERWAY IMPROVEMENTS ARE A DIRECT AID TO DEFENSE

In summary let me say that but for the comprehensive planning that has been accomplished with thoroughness and vision by the Army engineers of the War Department and but for the broad-minded statesmanship exercised by the Congress in authorizing waterway projects we might not be so well prepared now for the emergency we face. It should always be remembered that transportation of heavy bulk produce can never be handled by any form of transportation with the same efficiency and economy that is possible with waterway transportation. In fact no other form of transportation can fulfill this need in a national emergency. Waterway improvements are a direct and essential aid to national defense and this is particularly true for the great central portion of the Mississippi Basin which is protected naturally by mountain ranges from hostile attack. This region produces grain, cotton, oil, iron, zinc, lead, and other minerals in abundance. Already many plants for processing foodstuffs and factories for the manufacture of the necessities of life are located in it. There is a naval-ordnance arsenal near Charleston, W. Va., the manufacture of explosives is being started near Memphis, there are airplane factories in Kansas and at Nashville, Tenn., and arms are produced at Rock Island. Undoubtedly other establishments for the production of war materials under the defense program will be located in this region. We must not neglect any of our waterways, but especially must the navigable rivers and channels in the central Mississippi Basin be maintained, improved, and extended since water-borne commerce in America's citadel of defense is essential for preparedness.

A Vital Artery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED BRADLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 13, 1940

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, in these days of international turmoil our attention is properly directed to

defense measures which ought to be adopted to safeguard against future attacks.

I have today introduced a bill which asks for a survey and examination for a ship canal connecting Lakes Superior and Michigan. This, I believe, should be studied at this time, despite the fact that the project has previously received an unfavorable report, because attention is now directed to the importance of the proper protection of the locks at Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., in my district, through which is shipped the iron ore so vital to our defense program.

This iron ore upon which our steel plants now depend comes from the mines in northern Michigan, Wisconsin, and Minnesota. The locks take care of the 23-foot drop from Lake Superior to Lake Huron, permitting the shipment by boat of as many as 70,000,000 tons of iron ore in 1 year. If through sabotage or an attack from an enemy nation these locks were destroyed, the shipment would be seriously delayed, and the cost of transportation would be very much increased.

My bill would provide for a study of a second or alternative route, connecting Lakes Superior and Michigan through the construction of a ship canal from Au Train Lake in Lake Superior to Little Bay de Noquet at the head of Lake Michigan. In addition to serving as insurance for defense in an emergency, such a route would cut off a distance of 360 miles in the shipping distance between the mines and the steel mills in the Chicago and Gary, Ind., area.

Also such a canal would serve to open up new territory and make possible the development of power sufficient to operate the locks in the canal, with enough surplus to supply the demands of the cities and towns in the territory and contribute richly to their further development. Such construction would also help residents of the territory to rehabilitate themselves. Due to the depletion of the timber resources which supplied the lumber mills and furnished the raw materials which served toward the upbuilding of our larger urban centers, there is now in many sections of this territory a greater need for relief than elsewhere in the rest of the State of Michigan.

It is my belief that if we can provide this rehabilitation, and at the same time provide for the greater safety of our Nation, the building of this ship canal should receive early and serious consideration.

I ask, Mr. Speaker, for permission to include as a part of my remarks an editorial from the Detroit Free Press entitled "A Vital Artery," telling something of the importance of the Soo locks presently, and some of the earlier history of their construction.

[From the Detroit Free Press]

A VITAL ARTERY

The soldiers patrolling the locks at Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., are entrusted with a grave responsibility.

The destruction of these locks would cut the "life line" of the American steel industry. Coal and iron ore are the two most important minerals in steel making. Was it by design that nature put most of our coal in Pennsylvania and most of our iron ore as far west as Minnesota? At any rate the coal and ore have to be brought together, and the St. Marys Falls Canal is the bottleneck through which this union of essential minerals is effected.

As much as 70,000,000 tons of iron ore have passed through this canal in a year.

As early as 1797 fur traders dug a canal around the rapids at the Soo and built a lock to overcome the drop of 23 feet from Lake Superior to Lake Huron. That was on the Canadian side. American troops destroyed the lock in the War of 1812. All freight then had again to be hauled over the portage, a slow and expensive process.

When the Michigan Legislature voted $25,000 and started to dig itself a new and better canal, which Congress had refused to sanction, soldiers were sent to drive the workmen away. The Michigan canal question, as it was called, was before Congress for years. Among the project's strongest opponents was Henry Clay, who declared that it was "a work quite beyond the remotest settlement of the United States." Congress finally surrendered in 1852 and gave 750,000 acres of public land to help pay the cost of "a ditch around the rapids" on the American side.

The St. Marys Falls Canal was not so far beyond the remotest settlement of the United States but that in 1929 some 92,000,000 tons of freight passed through it—about 4,000,000 tons more than passed through the Panama, Suez, and Kiel Canals together.

A transportation artery of that importance could not be cut without serious results to our whole industrial system.

The Present Task of Law Enforcement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH J. O'BRIEN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 13, 1940

ADDRESS BY J. EDGAR HOOVER, DIRECTOR OF THE FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

Mr. O'BRIEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, before the forty-seventh annual convention, International Association of Chiefs of Police, Milwaukee, Wis., September 9, 1940:

THE PRESENT TASK OF LAW ENFORCEMENT

The annual conferences of the International Association of Chiefs of Police are typical of democracy at its best. Here we who represent law enforcement convene to determine how best we can meet the challenges that lie ahead. Since our last meeting the days have been filled with problems of importance and with difficulties that have at times seemed overwhelming. The future will present even greater emergencies, which will test our utmost ingenuity and our energy.

In recent months the world's complexion has materially changed. Nations of men once free have been cruelly crushed under a heel of might. Green fields have been reddened with freedom's blood and proud landmarks have been reduced to ashes. Transcending a vast expanse of ocean, the hostilities of the Old World have disturbed our own peaceful shores.

Today America has become the battleground of foreign agents. They spin their webs of alien philosophies to ensnare America, and in darkness weave insidious plans to scuttle our national defense. To counter and attack these vicious forces is the present task of law enforcement. Never have we had such responsibilities or opportunities. By protecting the rights of the citizens of this Nation we are preserving the security of America.

We of law enforcement already are aware of the potential dangers that menace every community in the land. These increased burdens on law enforcement produce an open invitation to the underworld to plunder and destroy. However, the threats of the underworld are of little consequence today compared to the threats of subverters who are bent on undermining and weakening our Nation, leaving it vulnerable to open attack.

There is no difference between the ruthless dictator of the criminal underworld and the high-handed political dictator of the upper world. Both deal in avarice, in greed, in lust for power, in mass murder, and in blood purges. We in America believe that prison or the electric chair is the place for such menaces to civilization. If we would protect America, we must determine that no group of espionage agents or subverters and no coalition of paid anti-American propagandists shall sway us from our American way of life.

Long before the present threat to our national security, law enforcement began to place its house in order. But much remains to be done. In times like these, to have widespread public cooperation, law enforcement must have widespread public confidence. When a law-enforcement officer or a public official will sell his honor and integrity to the underworld he will also sell his country's honor to a foreign agent for a price. Law enforcement cannot hope to cope with lawlessness unless it first emulates law and order.

Recently the F. B. I. was the target of widespread vituperation inspired by Communists and racketeers, aided by a few persons in both high and low places who seemingly had no desire to learn the truth. The "smear campaign" designed to discredit the F. B. I. and wreck public confidence in its mission, was planned by a group of Communist termites and furthered by their ever-willing fellow travelers and stooges. While they sought destruction, they were, of course, claiming their constitutional rights of assembly and free speech. To the credit of the American people, their malicious lies were recognized and discounted. We of the F. B. I. knew their charges were false and so did you. We of law enforcement have no love for the slimy racketeering, revolution-inciting ways of the Communist and the bundsman, and we realize that law enforcement will be maligned so long as these propaganda purveyors are allowed to revolt against our way of life.

Last September, the President of the United States designated the F. B. I. to coordinate the attack against the foreign foes within our gates. The President called upon all law enforcement to assist the F. B. I. in this task and to refer to it matters involving espionage, sabotage, subversive activities, and violations of our neutrality regulations. Never has law enforcement responded so promptly or so efficiently, and I am glad of this opportunity to thank

each of you men of law enforcement for the splendid manner in which you have assisted the F. B. I. in this important task.

That there is a "fifth column" in America is an acknowledged reality; that it does menace America is an established fact; that it must be met is the determination of every decent American. A "fifth column" of destruction following in the wake of confusion, weakening the sinews of a nation and paralyzing it with fear can be met only by the Nation-wide offensive of all law enforcement. All America must determine that these foreign interlopers shall not establish themselves behind masquerading fronts.

I am happy to report that today we of law enforcement are better prepared to meet these foes than we were when America found herself embroiled in armed conflict in 1917. Obviously, the forces of the F. B. I., despite its far-flung ramifications, are relatively small compared with the job that must be done. The common task of law enforcement therefore has been to unify its efforts and coordinate its endeavors on every front. This has been achieved to an extent which has exceeded our expectations. In every locality of the Nation conferences have been held between ranking law-enforcement officials and the F. B.-I. to perfect the machinery of internal security, which today is functioning as one agency in handling complaints involving our national defense. Night and day your officers and those of the F. B. I. are quietly working in the closest cooperation in investigating complaints of activities allegedly inimical to our Nation's interests.

I always have abhorred the idea of a national police. Time after time I have pointed out that the only effective system of policing which this Nation wants and needs is a cooperative local, county, State, and Federal law enforcement. Today this is an accomplished fact, and we have done it in the American way. We recognize that the maintenance of our internal security is a joint responsibility. Together we will handle situations as they arise in a calm, impartial manner. There is need, however, for continued coordination of effort.

Unfortunately, in a few States efforts have been made by persons not fully cognizant of the magnitude and technical character of this task to create superstructures of agencies between local law enforcement and the F. B. I. to handle or direct these matters. This can never be, if our internal security is to be best served. There must be a direct and free flow of contact between all law-enforcement agencies and the F. B. I. That is why I am happy today to meet with you members of the International Association of Chiefs of Police. We of the F. B. I. want your ideas, assistance, and cooperation so that together we may better do our job. We will have frequent occasion to meet together and to utilize your facilities in our national program of protection against the activities of the "fifth column." I intend to continue to look to you for your advice and guidance and in turn the entire resources of the F. B. I. are always available to you.

The effectiveness of our efforts cannot be gauged by screaming headlines of dragnet arrests of spies, saboteurs, and subverters. Best results cannot be obtained by blatant statements of sweeping accusations against individuals or groups without legal and competent evidence to support such charges. The preservation of our internal security is too serious a task and too sacred a trust to permit it to be used as a springboard for self-seeking politicians or psychopathic publicity seekers. You know as well as I that such methods accomplish nothing except to console amateur reformers and pseudo Sherlocks. Counterespionage becomes effective only when foreign agents are placed under surveillance, their contacts observed, their methods of communication established, and sources of information ascertained and later controlled. The Nation need have no fear that professional law-enforcement officers of long experience will be moved by any emotional surges of prejudice and passion.

Complaints of espionage, sabotage, and subversive activities have been received by the thousands since the outbreak of hostilities last September. On one day alone, 2,871 complaints poured into the various F. B. I. offices throughout the Nation. The surging wave of patriotism which followed the declaration of a limited national emergency, encouraging as it is, has its dangers. Unbridled activities and loose statements of individuals investigating subversive activities are distinctly un-American, no matter how patriotic the aims. The vigilante method is distinctly contrary to American ideals of justice.

It is not necessary for our citizens to take the law in their own hands unless and until law enforcement breaks down. That, it will not do. The handling of matters dealing with espionage, sabotage, and subversive activities is a task which must be entrusted to experienced officers of law enforcement, if the desired results are to be secured. Citizens' groups could more effectively and expeditiously achieve their patriotic purposes if their energies were directed toward strengthening and supporting the law-enforcement agencies in their communities rather than in seeking to take over their duties and powers.

We of law enforcement must remember that our Nation has been formed of many different racial and national types. We must not allow misled, emotionally guided, or gossip-minded individuals to direct acts of nuisance and oppression against persons of different nationalities.

During the past war a foreign name often aroused suspicion and oppressive action. Already there have been accusations based purely upon racial backgrounds. The great masses of our people of foreign extraction repudiate and abhor the very sentiments expressed by the power-crazed demagogues who would inject into America the deadly virus of communism, nazi-ism, and fascism. The fact that America has been a melting pot is seized upon as a weakness by strategists and dictators abroad. Little do they realize the strength welded by this fuzing of peoples who love the democracy of the United States and hate the oppressions of other lands. The very fact that our ancestors sought a new life in America is proof that they would not wish to transplant here the terror and tyranny that was left behind in the Old World.

In charting our course for the future we must keep in mind that it is better to prevent than to detect. The common task of law enforcement demands not only a preparedness program but a program of prevention. I would urge every chief of police in America to immediately take steps to survey the utilities in his community. Nothing would be so devastating as the pollution of a city's water supply. The destruction of power utilities and fuel supplies could be just as demoralizing as the scream of the dive bomber. Civil defense plans are as vital as war plans. Every facility of the F. B. I. is available to assist you in this task.

We all join in the hope that our Nation will never again find itself at war. Should that time come, however, the armed services of the country can be expected to fulfill their missions. The task of law enforcement, which in reality is the first line of defense, will be to protect our country's sources of supply and the internal forces which will insure victory.

The headlines of past months have emphasized in every possible manner the vital need for training in all fields in the methods of modern warfare. All the equipment that the Nation could possibly afford would be of no practical value unless men were trained to use it effectively. Law enforcement some years ago recognized the necessity for this training in its own field. As a result, this association has played a vital role in the development of the F. B. I. National Police Academy.

The success of the academy has exceeded our fondest expectations. Its some 500 graduates have given a great impetus to widespread police-training schools in every section of the country. Our forces have become training conscious and the state of preparedness which law enforcement has reached is a justifiable source of pride to those of us who have recognized through the years the needs of West Point in law enforcement.

The F. B. I. National Police Academy has now met that need. It has already proven to be a powerful unifying force. In but little more than 5 years highly trained peace officers have returned to their home towns, constituting an encircling ring of protecting outposts. They have taken to their own departments a Nation-wide view point of present problems.

So far the major emphasis of my remarks has been directed toward internal defense from the so-called "fifth column," with its spies, saboteurs, and softeners of public morale. In other years, I have dealt with crime and its treatment. There is little difference between the conniving of the foreign foe within our gates and the filth and scheming of the criminal underworld. The methods that stopped the gangster, kidnaper, and bank robber remain the same. The formula is a simple one—superior manpower, superior equipment, and superior training.

Typical of all law enforcement, the F. B. I. has assumed more responsibilities and a greater volume of work than in any other period of our history. Yet the past year has been the most successful ever experienced—more convictions were secured; more cases were handled; greater services were rendered to you men of law enforcement through the Identification Division, the Crime Laboratory, the F. B. I. National Police Academy, and through training activities. Beyond these tangible achievements lies the fact that law enforcement is still a good investment for the taxpayers' money. During the past year for every $1 which was spent on the regular work of the F. B. I. over $8 were returned to the taxpayers in fines, savings, and the recovery of stolen property.

Naturally, I am proud of the record of the F. B. I. You, too, share in this pride, because the F. B. I. is your central service agency, and it symbolizes your own accomplishments. You have helped us to achieve, as I hope we have helped you. And at this time I extend to you and your associates my heartfelt appreciation for the splendid response you have given our every request. While offering our thanks, we continue to offer our services.

The enjoyable reflection on past attainments should serve as an inspiration for greater achievements in the future. We must press on to make America secure for our men, women, and children. But first we must make it unsafe for all spies, saboteurs, enemy agents, Communists, bundists, and the entire breed of hellish conspirators who have been spawned in the fetid swamps of European hate.

In the present conflict, fortunately, law enforcement has powerful allies. The honest workingman and the honest employer, the true American, whether by birth or by naturalization, owes it to his Nation, to his family, and to his God to stand by the land which protects him. Such real Americans must unite in telling everybody who assails the principles upon which our country was founded that if they do not appreciate what America stands for then they should go to the lands which foster the foreign "isms" they preach. This country has no place for the subverter or for the dictator lover, no matter under what innocent-appearing guise he may masquerade his activities.

Freedom of the press, of speech, and of thought, conceived by the founders of this Nation as a vital part of this country's heritage, were intended for honest persons seeking a land of liberty, and not for crooks or dictators, spies or traitors, Communists or bundsmen. Tc these malefactors the Constitution is merely a scrap of paper, not a symbol of liberty and freedom. They use the Constitution as a shield to protect themselves while they seek to kill, plunder, and

destroy our American way of life. Let us not be beguiled by their smoke screens or their perversion, too often concealed under a false front of alleged civil liberties.

As a peace-loving people we have not emphasized an effective state of preparedness. We have been lulled into an unsafe sense of security by the subtle propaganda that has been unleashed in America. As a result, our defenses, both physical and moral, have been neglected. Fortunately, now in the face of a national emergency, we are developing a real state of preparedness that will defy and overwhelm any external enemies or internal plotters who would destroy this glorious Nation.

In the past we have failed to recognize and to attack the menaces that abound. This does not apply solely to equipping armies or navies. There is not a law-enforcement agency in the land that has not felt the ax of false economy at one time or another. There are few cities in America today which have provided their police departments with adequate compensation, sufficient personnel, and modern equipment. Now is the time to build up the forces of law enforcement and put them on a basis that will enable us to meet every emergency. It is of utmost importance that every police department's personnel be raised to the maximum quota in order that it may properly assist the F. B. I. in dealing with "fifth column" activities.

In surveying the advances of our profession we can take pride in the thought that today we are united. Inspired by the sacredness of a common task, law enforcement presents a solid phalanx of courage and integrity ready, if need be, to stop at no sacrifice to carry out our assignment of protecting America. I am certain that in this national emergency the country can feel safe in the knowledge that its internal defenses are manned by these gallant, skilled, self-sacrificing, patriotic law-enforcement officers, trained in modern methods and vitalized by the spirit that has made America great—the spirit that will continue to make our America endure and conquer every foe from within or without. We dedicate ourselves to this task.

Selective Compulsory Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 13, 1940

STATEMENT OF MILLARD W. RICE, NATIONAL LEGISLATIVE REPRESENTATIVE, VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, much valuable information on the question of compulsory military training can be found in the printed hearings of the House Committee on Military Affairs.

For the benefit of the Members of the House, I am inserting herewith the statement made by Millard W. Rice, national legislative representative, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, before the House Committee on Military Affairs on Tuesday, August 6, 1940.

Mr. Rice is acknowledged as a close student of military affairs and an authority on problems confronting the veterans of the country.

The following statement clearly portrays the position of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States on the question of compulsory military training:

STATEMENT OF MILLARD W. RICE, NATIONAL LEGISLATIVE REPRESENTATIVE, VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS OF THE UNITED STATES, WASHINGTON, D. C.

The CHAIRMAN. We will now hear from the national legislative representative of that militant organization, the Veterans of Foreign Wars. Mr. Rice, will you come forward and make your statement in your own way?

Mr. RICE. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the House Committee on Military Affairs, the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, commonly called the V. F. W., is, as you gentlemen know, a congressionally chartered organization, composed of American citizens who have had active campaign-badge service in some war, campaign, or expedition in which the United States has been engaged.

Inasmuch as most of its members are former front-line fighting men, who have served overseas or in hostile waters, in the United States Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard, during some war, campaign, or expedition in which the United States has been engaged, the V. F. W. has long been insisting that adequate preparation for war is the best preventive against war.

To that end, the V. F. W. has, during all of its more than 40 years of existence, been insisting—by periodic pertinent articles and editorials in its national publication, Foreign Service; by numerous local and Nation-wide radio addresses by its local, department, and national officers and by speeches on the part of its many local department and national officers before gatherings of various organizations and associations—that our Nation was in need of many more men and much more modernized munitions and mechanized motorized matériel, in order to be sure to be able to protect America against any possible aggressive force.

During each of the last several years, Congress has provided for increased appropriations for the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard; there has therefore been a gradual, although apparently too slow, increase in the number of trained men in each of these branches of the armed forces of the United States, and in the incidental equipment, armament, munitions, guns, airplanes, and combatant vessels now so badly needed.

During the last several months this process of expanding our armed forces, both as to men and as to matériel, has been very much speeded up, and will, and should, continue to be speeded up as much as possible until brought up to the strength deemed necessary to guarantee our Nation's defense.

At the fortieth annual national encampment of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States last year several resolutions were adopted calling for "an expanded Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, as well as National Guard, C. M. T. C., R. O. T. C., and Reserve Corps, amply equipped with scientifically developed modernized, mechanized, motorized matériel, sufficient to protect America against any possible aggressive force."

In order that this committee may be advised of the specific terms of the resolutions adopted by our last national encampment, directly related to the question of national defense, I should like to insert in the record at this point copies of three of such resolutions, as follows:

"Whereas the Veterans of Foreign Wars has during the past several years been vigorously advocating specific increases in trained men and modernized, mechanized, motorized matériel for the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps of the United States, and for the National Guard, the Citizens' Military Training Corps, and the Reserve Officers' Training Corps, and the various Reserve corps, by liberalized authorizations and appropriations to that end, with the conviction that effective preparedness for war is the best preparedness against war; and

"Whereas the authorizations and appropriations for national-defense purposes have each year since 1933 substantially liberalized and added to, responsive to the specific suggestions of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, so that appropriations for the United States armed forces for the current fiscal year are about four times as much as was appropriated for the year 1933 and greater than for any fiscal year during time of peace, for which the President and the Congress of the United States are deserving of the sincere gratitude of the American people; and

"Whereas lack of adequate military training was the reason for the useless sacrifice of the lives of many of the youth of America during our Nation's participation in the World War: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, by the Fortieth Naticnal Encampment of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, That we do hereby reaffirm our advocacy of an expanded Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, as well as an expanded National Guard, with C. M. T. C., R. O. T. C., and Reserve Corps, with scientifically developed and modernized, mechanized, motorized matériel and equipment, arms and ammunition, ships and airplanes, and other material, as may be considered desirable and feasible by our national committees on national defense and legislation.

* * * * * * *

"*Resolved* by the Fortieth National Encampment, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, That we give unanimous endorsement to a strong national defense program for the United States and one that will be capable of meeting on equal terms the armed forces of any other nation or combination of nations that may ever threaten the security of our shores or the principles of the Monroe Doctrine: And, be it further

"*Resolved*, That we favor such expenditures as may be necessary for the upbuilding of our national-defense system, including air forces and naval strength, to sufficient proportions to give the United States the balance of power in any dispute that may arise between our country and any other country that may be inclined to question America's position in the Western Hemisphere.

* * * * * * *

"Whereas the world is in a political and economic turmoil, with powerful nations prepared to take by force what they may want, in a world in which war has been present almost continuously during the 20 years since the World War, and when treaties and solemn compacts no longer bind their signatories; and

"Whereas, we view with approval the efforts of this Nation in the last year—

"1. To maintain its peace and safety in a troubled world.

"2. To build its Navy to a strength sufficient to protect our shores and our outlying bases against every possible aggressor.

"3. To increase its strength in the air of the Navy and Army to a size to combat successfully the air fleets that could be brought against us.

"4. To increase the Regular Army and the National Guard to provide an initial protective force of 400,000 to provide for our national protection without delay, and to equip those forces with the best and latest arms, transportation, and equipment.

"5. To provide for the training of the Organized Reserves, the Reserve Officers' Training Corps, and the citizens military training camps, so as to produce a civilian army of maximum strength to support the initial force when necessary and to plan for the manufacture and delivery of modern supplies when needed.

"Whereas, we as veterans oppose war here and elsewhere now and forever, but as veterans we recognize that preparedness for emergency is the only remaining means to maintain peace for our prosperous and glorious Nation; Now therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the fortieth national encampment, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, approves and supports a program for national security adequate to preserve and defend the Republic of the United States of America from all enemies whomsoever."

We, of the V. F. W., do not pretend to be experts in determining the relative strength of the various branches of our armed forces which might be deemed sufficient "to preserve and defend the Republic of the United States of America from all enemies whomsoever."

Maintaining and defending the policies of the Monroe Doctrine constitute an important factor in the defense of the United States.

Having decided that the defense of our own country depends upon our ability, in cooperation with other American countries, to defend all of the Americas against any invasion or aggression by any non-American country, or combination of non-American countries, we consider it to be the task primarily of the Army and Navy Departments to decide just how many trained men we need in each of the several branches of the armed forces, and just what kind, and how much of each kind, of equipment and matériel may be necessary in order to be able successfully to defend America against any possible aggressive action.

The successive recommendations of the War Department and of the Navy Department, as transmitted to the Congress by the President, requesting the enactment of increasing authorizations and appropriations to provide more men and more materiel for national-defense purposes, have been promptly complied with by Congress during the last several months.

It is certain that by becoming adequately prepared to defend the Western Hemisphere we can very much reduce the possibility that any nation will decide to conduct any aggressive action against any part of the Americas.

Those of us who had the experience of front-line service in our Nation's armed forces during the first World War well know the terrible human cost of unpreparedness. Many of the lives of America's youth were snuffed out and thousands of them were wounded needlessly, during the World War, because of their inadequate training and because of the Nation's lack of adequate preparation for war.

We of the V. F. W. well know the cost of the human aftermath of war. We want, if possible, to avoid the necessity for our country becoming involved in war, but if the ruthless actions of other nations should make it necessary for us to become involved in war, then we most certainly want our country, and its young men—the potential veterans of future wars—to be well prepared.

By adequate preparations for war, we not only decrease the probability of becoming involved in war, but, in the event that war should come, we would thereby considerably have lessened the loss of lives and of limbs of our front-line defenders.

In order to reduce the probability of becoming involved in war, and in order to reduce the human aftermath of any such possible future war, the V. F. W. has long been advocating the adoption of a program of adequate preparedness—militarily, industrially, and financially.

Because we have believed that the morale of the men behind the gun is a very important factor in an adequate national defense, we have sought to secure the enactment of legislation to provide adequate pensions for those who may have become injured or disabled by reason of their active service in the armed forces of the United States, and for the dependents of those who may have died by reason of disabilities incurred in such service.

Because we believe that a sense of equitable treatment tends to increase the morale of men actively serving, or who might be inspired to serve, in our armed forces, we have sought the enactment of legislation to provide the same wages, at the same grades, and the same opportunities for promotion, for men in the Army as have long been available for men who serve in the Navy.

Hearings were held last April before the Senate Committee on Military Affairs concerning a bill so providing, namely S. 2224. We pointed out to such committee that it did not seem at all fair that a young man who might otherwise be prompted to enlist to serve in one of the armed forces of the Nation has had the opportunity of enlisting for a 3-year period in the Marine Corps or in the Army, at the low pay of only $21 per month—with the prospects that 95 percent so serving would remain at that pay grade during such 3-year enlistment—whereas had they gone in the Navy their income would be increased from $21 to $36 per month, after 3 months of service, and whereas had they decided to go into the Civilian Conservation Corps they could have enlisted for a 6-month period at a salary of $30 per month.

The enactment of S. 2224, to equalize the pay of enlisted men of the Army with the pay of the enlisted men of the Navy, was urged before the Senate Committee on Military Affairs several weeks prior to the first request for emergency appropriations for national-defense purposes, but has not yet been acted upon because the Bureau of the Budget has requested that action be deferred until next year. We see no reason for postponement of such an important subject.

The last national encampment of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, by a resolution calling for "detailed plans for effective mobilization of men and money, labor and industry, in the event of war," certainly thereby gave its stamp of approval to selective conscription of manpower during time of war.

No resolution was considered by the last national encampment of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, however, as to whether or not there should be selective conscription for training and service in the armed forces of the United States during time of peace. In the event that the required number of men cannot be secured on a voluntary basis for enlistment in the armed forces of the United States, for strictly national-defense purposes, then it would seem that if a national encampment of the Veterans of Foreign Wars were confronted with such situation that it would seriously consider a resolution calling for selective conscription of the manpower of the Nation for training and service in the various armed forces of the United States for needed national-defense purposes.

Our commander in chief, Otis N. Brown, personally has indicated his conviction that the Nation should immediately adopt the principle of selective conscription of manpower for training and service in our armed forces. Various other national officers have indicated their concurrence with that principle.

As the national legislative representative of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, I am not authorized to commit the organization to any proposition essentially different than that authorized by resolutions adopted at its last national encampment. The War and Navy Departments are in the best position to know how many trained men we need in our armed forces. Their representatives have expressed the opinion that selective conscription is necessary in order to have a sufficient number of trained men adequately to maintain our national defense. Therefore, we of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, not being in possession of all of the facts, cannot disagree as to the need for a selective conscription law.

In the event of the enactment of a conscription law, however, we believe that adequate protection should be extended to those conscripted by providing that (1) any such conscripted man who may have been a governmental employee shall be guaranteed reinstatement to his previous governmental position; (2) just as much protection as can constitutionally be granted should be extended as to seniority in and reinstatement to any private employment of any conscriptee; (3) adequate apportionments and allowances should be provided for the dependents of those who may be conscripted; and (4) the same protection, privileges, rights, and benefits should specifically be provided for those who serve or have served in the armed forces of the United States, under any such conscription law, as if they had actively served in the Regular Army or Navy—in other words, such conscripted men should be entitled to the same protection and rights as to insurance, hospitalization, domiciliary care, civil-service preferences, and pension in the event of service-incurred disability, and their dependents should be entitled to the same pensions in the event of death by reason of service-incurred disability, as if such men had served actively in the Regular Army.

It would seem that credit for previous service in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, or the National Guard or R. O. T. C. ought to be given to those whose names might be selected for conscription, in determining the period of additional training and service to be rendered under the contemplated conscription.

It would seem also that present uncertainties and opposition concerning this bill might be in large part eliminated if there should be a specific provision for the establishment of certain classes of prospective conscriptees under the bill, with priority for the call of certain classes, as compared with certain others, during time of peace, and for certain additional classes, in the order of their priority, during time of war.

It would also seem that after such conscription system shall have brought a sufficiently large enlisted Reserve Corps, then thereafter every young man, physically fit, sometime between the ages of 18 and 23, should be required to give 1 year of his life to the active military or naval service of his country, with appropriate credit given for such military or naval training as he may have received in one of the reserve components, such as the National Guard or the R. O. T. C. Such requirement for universal military training of all young men would soon establish a large enlisted Reserve Corps, which could be called into active service in the event of war. Military training should be made available, if not also compulsory, for all physically fit young men in all high schools and colleges insofar as constitutionally possible.

At its last national encampment the V. F. W. adopted a resolution offering the cooperation of all of its units and all of its members during any time of national emergency. We still stand ready so to serve. No stone should be left unturned, no steps should fail to be taken, no law should fail to be enacted which might help to increase the morale of the men who serve, or must serve, in our armed forces, to increase the productiveness of our industry, and speedily to equip our armed forces amply with all types of scientifically developed matériel which might in any way contribute toward the effectiveness of the defense of the Americas and our own national defense.

I thank you for the privilege of submitting this statement.

The CHAIRMAN. We thank you, Mr. Rice, for the constructive suggestions which you have submitted.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, gentlemen, we will go ahead. General Shedd, will you come around, please, sir?

General SHEDD. Yes, sir.

Alabama Heard From on the Poll Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE E. GEYER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 13, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE MOBILE (ALA.) POST

Mr. GEYER of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Mobile Post, of Mobile, Ala. This is but another evidence of the interest that is being aroused on this subject. The editorial follows:

[From the Mobile (Ala.) Post]

TO ABOLISH POLL TAXES

A petition to bring the anti-poll-tax bill to the floor of the House of Representatives was laid on the Speaker's desk by Congressman LEE E. GEYER (Democrat, California). When signed by 218 Members of the House the petition will make the Geyer anti-poll-tax bill, H. R. 7534, a special order of business.

Prohibiting the requirement of the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite for voting at Federal elections, H. R. 7534 was introduced in the House on August 5, 1939. The bill was referred to a subcommittee of the Judiciary and under the chairmanship of FRANCIS B. WALTERS (Democrat, Pennsylvania) hearings were held in March, April, and May of this year.

The Geyer anti-poll-tax bill would make it illegal to require payment of a poll tax in connection with the election of President, Vice President, and Members of Congress. In eight Southern States payment of such a tax is a prerequisite for voting: Alabama, Arkansas, Georgia, Mississippi, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, and Virginia.

"Largely because of the poll tax," said Mr. Geyer, "75 percent of the adult citizens in those States are denied access to the ballot. The amount of tax varies from $1 to $2.50 per year, but in some of the poll-tax States it is cumulative. In other words, if a voter fails to pay his tax for 1 year, he must pay 2 years' tax at the next election, and so on. A Georgian who has not paid his poll tax for 7 years will have to pay $15.50 to vote. In Alabama his bill may run as high as $36.

"In many sections of the eight poll-tax States hundreds of thousands of shapecroppers, tenant farmers, and city workers have been disfranchised because their low incomes do not permit them to buy the right to vote."

In the 1936 Presidential election an average of 66 percent of the adult citizens in the 40 non-poll-tax States voted while the averages in the poll tax suffrage States in that same election was as follows:

Alabama, 20 percent; Arkansas, 19 percent; Georgia, 20 percent; Mississippi, 16 percent; South Carolina, 14 percent; Tennessee, 33 percent; Virginia, 26 percent; Texas, 26 percent.

Organizations supporting the anti-poll-tax bill include: American Federation of Labor, Congress of Industrial Organizations, Young Women's Christian Association, Southern Conference for Human Welfare, Descendants of the American Revolution, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, railway brotherhoods, and other labor, civic, and progressive associations.

The Dutch East Indies Adrift

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL HINSHAW

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 13, 1940

ARTICLE FROM FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, under authority granted to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I submit an article entitled "The Dutch East Indies Adrift," by Mr. Rupert Emerson, which appeared in the July issue of Foreign Affairs, an American quarterly review, volume 18, No. 4, pages 735–41. Mr. Emerson is an associate professor of government in Harvard University and has been recently appointed Director of the Division of Territories and Island Possessions in the United States Department of the Interior. Mr. Emerson is also author of the book, Malaysia: a Study in Direct and Indirect Rule, and other publications.

The article by Mr. Rupert Emerson follows:

[From Foreign Affairs for July 1940]

THE DUTCH EAST INDIES ADRIFT

(By Rupert Emerson)

The German invasion of Holland and the flight of Queen Wilhelmina's government have thrown the Dutch East Indies largely on their own devices. Indeed, as these lines are written there are indications that the center of Dutch economic and financial life is being transferred to the Indies. For instance, leading Netherlands banks and shipping companies are reported to have removed their headquarters to Batavia. Likewise, in the political sphere, the Indies are becoming the center of Dutch power. The Governor General, Jonkheer Tjarda van Starkenborgh Stachouwer, has been empowered to act on his own authority, if necessary. The question therefore arises as to whether the East Indies will be able to survive as a Dutch possession. The answer to this question depends on such important factors as the economic and strategic value of the islands, the state of their defenses, and the policy which the United States would adopt toward any aggression against them!

On April 16, 1940, the Indies found, to their dismay, that they had become the object of those assurances of good will and disinterestedness which have come to be the first harbingers of imminent "protection" and destruction. On that day Mr. Arita, the Foreign Minister of Japan, stated in the veiled but significant language of diplomacy that because of economic and other considerations "the Japanese Government cannot but be deeply concerned over any development accompanying the aggravation of the war in Europe that may affect the status quo of the Netherlands East Indies." This declaration came 2 months after Japan's denunciation of her arbitration treaty with the Netherlands, an act which Tokyo officially described as having no political importance, being merely a routine gesture preparatory to the negotiation of a new treaty. To Mr. Arita's statement the American Secretary of State replied on the following day (April 17) that "intervention in the domestic affairs of the Netherlands Indies or any alteration of their status quo by other than peaceful processes would be prejudicial to the cause of stability, peace, and security, not only in the region of the Netherlands Indies but in the entire Pacific area." The German invasion of the Netherlands early in May immediately brought forth from Mr. Arita a further assertion that Japan would not permit the Indies to change hands. Another official declaration was made in Washington reiterating the statement of April 17, and the American Battle Fleet was kept in Hawaii for "further tactical exercises."

Economically, strategically, and politically the Netherlands Indies occupy a position of striking importance. The bare figures are in themselves impressive. With a land area of 734,000 square miles, the islands are some five times as large as Japan proper. They stretch, as Mr. Hull pointed out, "for a distance of approximately 3,200 miles east and west astride of the Equator, from the Indian Ocean on the west far into the Pacific Ocean on the east." At the last census (1930) the rapidly growing population totaled nearly 61,000,000; at present 70,000,000 would be more nearly correct. About two-thirds of this number is crowded into Java, though that island accounts for little more than one-fifteenth of the Indies' total area. The outer islands are relatively underpopulated and undeveloped except for occasional tracts such as the great rubber and tobacco region on the east coast of Sumatra. The mass of the people are of the Malay race and predominantly Mohammedan in religion; but there are 1,233,000 Chinese and 240,000 persons in the official category of "European," which includes Americans, Japanese, and a large proportion of Hollanders of mixed blood. The Japanese and Formosans in 1930 numbered just over 7,000, and the more recent migration figures indicate no marked increase. The number of Germans appears to be slightly under 7,000; late reports from Batavia indicate that all of them over 16 have been interned.

Holland's East Indian empire constitutes the richest colonial plum in the world. It produces rubber, tin, petroleum, sugar, coffee, tea, tobacco, copra, palm oil, and a host of other commodities, agricultural and mineral. Contrary to popular belief, most of the world's colonial areas are not great producers of essential raw materials; the Indies, however, are an exception, although even they lack certain types of coal as well as iron and cotton. Until the impact of the depression became seriously felt, the Indies concentrated almost exclusively upon the production of raw materials and foodstuffs for export, as well as of certain foodstuffs (notably rice) for local consumption; only to a limited degree were raw materials given a preliminary processing. The crushing effect of the depression on the islands can be seen in the catastrophic decline in the value of their exports from 1,488,000,000 guilders in 1929 to 493,000,000 in 1933 (by 1939 the figure had risen to 740,000,000). Of late there has been a marked swing

in the direction of a planned industrialization in order to relieve unemployment, raise living standards, and reduce the Indies dependence on the world's industrial markets, thereby eliminating some of the causes for economic instability in the islands. Plans already being carried out include the creation of a chemical industry and the construction of plants for manufacturing aluminum, for melting scrap iron, and for the production of aviation gasoline; in addition, many smaller native and local industries are being encouraged.

The United States is the world's largest consumer of rubber and tin; it also holds considerable investments in the islands, particularly in rubber plantations and in oil. We cannot, therefore, be indifferent to the fate of the Indies. (Incidentally, the neighboring territory of British Malaya is the world's largest single producer of rubber and tin, and any change in the status of the Dutch islands must inevitably have drastic repercussions on Malayan economy.) The total direct American purchases in the Indies in 1938 came to $68,800,000 and in 1939 to $93,000,000; but it is very difficult to assess our actual dependence on East Indian supplies because of the large quantities which are transshipped to us via European and Malayan ports. In 1939 the Dutch islands produced 372,000 tons of rubber (35 percent of the world total) as against 376,000 tons for Malaya, and 31,280 long tons of tin (17 percent of the world total). The United States needs large quantities of tin and rubber, not only for its normal peacetime industries such as automobile manufacturing, but for its present greatly expanded defense preparations. At least nine-tenths of the rubber and tin we consume comes from the Indies and the nearby British territories. Another important American import from the Indies is quinine, of which the Dutch produce 90 percent of the world's supply.

Neither Britain nor France depends very much upon the products of the Dutch Indies since their own colonial empires provide for most of their needs. Although in the statistics the British Empire showed as the destination of one-third of the Indies' total exports in 1938, approximately half of this figure represented goods sent to Singapore for distribution to other countries, including Japan and the United States. Great Britain and Eire took about 5 percent of the exports of the islands, and Australia, whose connections with the Indies have in recent years become increasingly important, accounted for over 4 percent. These figures do not, however, adequately reflect the close collaboration that has grown up between the British and the Dutch Empires in the East. It is, in fact, scarcely too much to say that since 1816, when the British returned Java to Holland, the Indies have depended for their protection primarily upon the British Navy. The British have also invested heavily in the islands; for instance, the Royal Dutch Shell has sunk a large amount of capital in the oil fields there. Territorially, too, the connections are close; many small Dutch islands are within sight of Singapore with its great naval base, and the whole northern part of Borneo is in British hands. Australia has a vital strategic interest in the fate of the Indies in general, and a particular interest in New Guinea, of which it controls the eastern half. One of the maxims of Australian foreign policy is that no aggressive power must be allowed to gain a foothold on New Guinea. The Dutch are now engaged in hastily developing their half of the island in order to forestall outside encroachments.

In 1938, Germany's purchases in the East Indies amounted to 23,725,000 guilders, or 3.62 percent of the island's total exports. (The purchases of France amounted to 11,200,000 guilders.) Germany has found the Indies a valuable source of rubber, copra, fibers, and other tropical produce; and a considerable number of Germans have entered not only into the economic life of the islands but also into the Dutch administrative and military services.

Japan's interest in Netherlands India is naturally very great. Besides being a major consumer of its rubber and tin, she has a peculiarly vital concern in its growing petroleum production. Since no detailed Japanese figures as to either petroleum or mineral imports have been published since July 1937, and since Dutch export figures are not very relevant because of the large transshipments made through Singapore, it is impossible to estimate with any precision the extent of Japan's reliance on East Indian oil. It is obvious, however, that in case Japan should be cut off from American and British supplies, the wells in the nearby Indies would prove invaluable to her. The Indies stand fifth among the world's petroleum producers. Their 1939 output was 61,580,000 barrels, the largest in their history. The principal oil-producing region is on the east coast of Borneo, although the production of this field has been declining in recent years while that of southern Sumatra has been growing. According to recent reports, the new wells being bored by the Netherlands New Guinea Petroleum Co., in which both American and British capital is represented, have not yielded promising results. It is generally believed that the producing oil wells have been mined and would be promptly destroyed in case of a Japanese attack. The German experience in Rumania during the World War appears to indicate that this would impede Japanese utilization of the wells for a considerable, and perhaps crucial, period. New refining plants for the production of aviation gasoline are just coming into operation; the first one, near Palembang in Sumatra, began producing on March 2.

As a market the Indies are less important than as a source of raw materials, primarily because of the very low purchasing power of the mass of the people. However, for Japan's low-cost producers of cheap textiles and other commodities they offer attractive inducements in a world of shrinking and increasingly protected markets. A few years ago the Japanese share in the imports of the Indies skyrocketed upward at the expense largely of Dutch and British importers; but this trend was checked abruptly by the imposition of tariffs and quotas primarily aimed at Japan. More recently the internal strains developed in Japan by the "China incident" have seriously impaired her ability to compete in the islands. The Japanese doubtless feel that Holland has unfairly deprived them of a market which they regard as an integral part of that far eastern economy in which they believe themselves to be the major partners. The Dutch, on the other hand, complain that the failure of Japanese purchases in the Indies to keep pace with the flood of Japanese exports to them has been one of the chief causes for the disequilibrium in the islands' economy.

In 1939 Japan sold to the Indies goods worth 85,108,000 guilders, while she bought from them goods valued at only 24,788,000 guilders. Of Japan's total exports in 1939, only 3.9 percent went to the Dutch possessions, and of her total imports only 3.3 percent came from them directly. The Japanese Government has manifested its determination to continue drawing on the raw materials of the East Indies in the same proportions as before Holland was invaded. Both the Dutch and British Governments have assured Tokyo that they will not interfere with Japanese trade in the Indies.

The Japanese authorities have at no time given any overt indication of a desire to assume political control over the Dutch islands, although there are a number of unofficial statements which point in that direction. They have, however, regularly expressed their deep interest in strengthening economic ties. Japan's Foreign Minister declared to the Diet early this year that "With regard to the South Seas regions, the Japanese Government is desirous of maintaining with them a relationship of coexistence and coprosperity through economic cooperation and collaboration in the development of natural resources. We intend to put forth every effort along this line toward enhancing the existing close relation between Japan and those regions." The Dutch, for their part, have shown themselves eager to maintain friendly relations with Japan and to avoid any gestures which might be interpreted as hostile. They have come to find, however, that Japan's ideas as to what constitutes "cooperation and collaboration" overreach the limits of acceptable friendship. This has been especially obvious in Japan's efforts to secure opportunities for settlement and exploitation in New Guinea, which lies less than 500 miles from Japanese mandated islands. For many years Dutch New Guinea has been rife with reports of Japanese espionage, of Japanese fishing vessels far from legitimate fishing grounds, and of Japanese plantations with excellent sites for gun emplacements and landing fields.

Strategically and politically the Indies are extremely important because of the commanding position which they occupy at the crossroads of sea and air routes between Europe, the Far East, and Australasia. For the British Empire, and for Australia and New Zealand in particular, it is of the utmost importance that these islands remain in friendly hands. Were Netherlands India to pass to a hostile power, Britain would find it very difficult to retain Singapore and Hong Kong and to maintain free communications with her Pacific dominions and with China. Much the same can be said for France in connection with Indochina and her Pacific islands. As for the United States, it is concerned in several ways with the political fate of the East Indies. There is our interest in maintaining the balance of power in the Pacific. There is also our interest in keeping open the sources from which we obtain much of our rubber and tin. Above all, there is our interest in the Philippines. Manila may be some 1,800 miles by air from Batavia, but the Dutch islands northeast of Borneo are almost within sight of Mindanao. The Japanese now control all the islands to the east of the Philippines (except Guam); Formosa has been theirs for nearly half a century; they are said to be fortifying the island of Hainan; and they are now occupying the Spratly Islands in the China Sea. If the Dutch East Indies should pass into Japanese hands—and with them perhaps the British possessions on the north coast of Borneo—the Philippines would be completely surrounded.

From an economic point of view, the United States might not in the long run lose heavily from a Japanese occupation of the East Indies. Except for petroleum Japan could absorb only a fraction of the islands' vast production, which would still have to be disposed of on the world market—where the United States would remain by far the best and most available customer. Control over these supplies would, however, give Japan a strong economic and political weapon for compelling concessions from the United States, and in the short run this weapon might prove of great importance. Despite our ambitious projects for stock piling and our barter agreement with Great Britain, we have as yet accumulated very limited reserves of either rubber or tin. It is estimated that the present supplies of both commodities in this country would not last for more than 3 or 4 months at the normal rate of consumption. The extent of our anxieties in this direction is indicated by the fact that imports of rubber since the beginning of December 1939 have been the heaviest in history. In case the United States should become involved in the war, we would doubtless resort, as in the days of the Stevenson restriction scheme, to an extensive use of scrap rubber. There are also possibilities for making synthetic rubber in the United States and for increasing natural rubber production under American auspices in Central and South America. But neither of these sources has yet been developed to a point where it could fill

immediate and pressing needs. In the case of tin, we could obtain a large part of what we need from Bolivia.

Turning to the question of defense, it must be admitted at the outset that for various reasons, including the rapidly changing techniques of warfare, only a very tentative estimate is possible. Even the strength of the Japanese Navy is a matter of surmise, though there is no doubt that Japan has a large preponderance over any other power in far eastern waters. The serious plight of Britain and France offers little hope that any substantial part of their naval or air forces could come to the aid of the Dutch islands. Presumably, neither the British nor the French have any capital ships in the Far East at the present time. Just prior to the outbreak of the European war, the British admiralty reported four of its cruisers in Chinese waters, with a fifth expected and three more cruisers on the East Indies station; to this must be added the six Australian cruisers and the two of New Zealand. Only the American Navy remains as a possible challenge to Japan, and it has been accepted by American naval opinion that operations in waters relatively close to the Japanese bases and shielded in part by the Japanese mandated islands would be extremely difficult and hazardous. The fortifications and bases of the Philippines and Guam are quite inadequate for the main American fleet, which would therefore have to base on Pearl Harbor, some 7,000 miles from Batavia.

The scanty but mobile defense forces of the Indies themselves could cause an attacking force great annoyance but could probably not put up resistance for any considerable time. The Dutch have been keenly aware of their exposed position in the Indies ever since Japan's invasion of Manchuria; yet they appear to have taken no very substantial steps to increase their defense forces in the islands. The Army is estimated to number 50,000 (representing roughly a ratio of 4 natives to 1 European), although somewhat larger reserve forces are undoubtedly available. According to late reports, the Dutch Navy in the Indies consists of 2 cruisers of 7,000 tons, 1 of 6,000 tons, 2 smaller ones of 3,500 tons, 12 destroyers, 18 submarines and a number of light auxiliary vessels. In recent years the Dutch have built up a fleet of seaplanes, many of them purchased in the United States; used as a scouting and bombing force these planes would prove invaluable in holding the narrow straits against invasion. It must, however, be kept in mind that the islands are scattered over a vast area and that the Japanese would therefore find no great difficulty in landing on such outlying islands as Borneo or New Guinea. Against this possibility must be balanced the fact that the distances from Japan to the Indies are great—from Yokohama to Borneo is some 2,400 miles—and that Japanese shipping is already heavily occupied in keeping essential supplies moving to Japan and to the Japanese-occupied parts of China. For Japan to strike far to the south would be to open herself, if not to war with the United States, at least to the sharp curtailment of her vital trade with North America and with the British and French Empires. And, of course, she would be exposing her flank to Soviet pressure, exerted either indirectly through Nationalist China or directly on Manchukuo. As these lines are written, there are reports that Japan is trying to extricate herself as gracefully as possible from China and to reach an understanding with the totalitarian powers with the object of exploiting to the full the present dire straits of the western powers. Should these reports turn out to be true, the situation of the Dutch East Indies would, indeed, become precarious.

What the attitude of the native peoples in the Indies would be in face of a Japanese attack is difficult to say. The nationalist movement is strong and no great love is lost for the Dutch rulers. However, relations between the nationalist leaders and Japan have not, it appears, been close. Japanese imperialism is something the East Indians have no desire to experience. Yet, on the other hand, they also lose no love for the Chinese, who control much of the islands' economic life. The East Indians are hence watching the progress of the present war in China with mixed emotions. Some of them feel that a Chinese victory, resulting in a much strengthened and unified China, would represent an even greater danger for the East Indies than a Japanese victory.

St. Paul's Cathedral of London

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN J. KENNEDY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 13, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW YORK TIMES OF SEPTEMBER 13, 1940

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, today is Friday the 13th, a day looked upon to be of evil omen. This day is such and one, for the people of a great city wait with feinted breath the approach which seems to be inevitable. A missile of death in the form of a time bomb is said to be lying within the sacred precincts in one of the most famous cathedrals in the world, St. Paul's of London. The place occupied by this great cathedral in the history of the people it has served has been most beautifully described in the appended editorial which appeared in the New York Times today. The destruction of St. Paul's was predicted over 100 years ago by Macaulay when, in one of his famous reviews, he said:

She (the Roman Catholic Church) may still exist in undiminished vigor when some traveler from New Zealand shall, in the midst of a vast solitude, take his stand on a broken arch of London Bridge to sketch the ruins of St. Paul's.

[From the New York Times of September 13, 1940]

For more than 200 years the dome of St. Paul's has floated serenely above the roofs of London. It has been many things to many generations of men. To some it has meant enduring strength; to others, who have seen it bathed in moonlight, soaring so lightly over the steeples near by, it has been a miracle of grace. To all in London it has been more personal than any church in the world. It was called the parish church of the Empire, because Londoners turned to it instinctively at deeply felt moments of national joy or sorrow. Streams of history flowed down its aisles; the tombs of heroes, of Nelson and Kitchener and Lawrence of Arabia, lay in its keeping.

What the Campanile is to Venice or St. Peter's to Rome, St. Paul's has been to London. It dominated the city's skyline from the river, from the huddled streets around it, from the distant hills on north and south. Londoners loved it so much that they felt, sometimes, it might not always be there. Nearly a hundred years ago Macaulay wrote of the New Zealander of the future who would stand on London Bridge and see the ruins of St. Paul's. Fifteen years ago the vibration of traffic endangered it, and a fund was raised so that the cathedral could be straightened and preserved. Now a delayed-action bomb has fallen in its churchyard; more than one bomb has exploded so near it that its sooty stones have trembled. Londoners now lift their eyes from the streets of death and destruction and look again at the dome that has meant so much to them, for they know they may never see it again.

Yet St. Paul's has been destroyed and rebuilt many times since Roman sentries stood on Ludgate Hill. There was a St. Paul's on the same spot hundreds of years before the first stones of Westminster Abbey were laid. There was an old, old St. Paul's that crashed in dust and ashes in the great fire of 1666; the masterpiece of today rose from its ruins. The end of this St. Paul's tragic and sickening as it would be, would not mean the end of London. There are more irreparable disasters than the loss of a dozen famous churches, of a hundred treasure houses of history. The supreme issue of this hour is not whether the shell of London can be preserved; it is whether the living spirit of free men and women can be saved, a spirit that has been passed on from one generation to another for hundreds of years, a civilization that lives in the hearts and souls of millions in England and across the seas. As long as the spirit of London remains unconquerable there can be a new St. Paul's. As long as the men and women of England can keep the flame alive within them there will be hope for a new and better world, no matter how much fire and death may rain down upon them.

Electric Power Rates in Wisconsin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES HAWKS, JR.

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 13, 1940

LETTER FROM C. M. JANSKY, OF MADISON, WIS., TO HON. JOHN E. RANKIN, OF MISSISSIPPI

Mr. HAWKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter recently addressed to Hon. JOHN E. RANKIN by Mr. C. M. Jansky, of Madison, Wis.:

MADISON, WIS., *August 26, 1940.*

Representative JOHN E. RANKIN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: "Totius autem injustitiae nulla capitalior est, quam eorum qui tum, cum maxime fallunt, id agunt ut viri boni esse videantur."—Cicero.

Cicero was right when he said that of all wrong, there is none more heinous than that of those, when they deceive us most grossly, so do it as to seem good men. Deceit is iniquitous no matter whether it is practiced by utility promoters, stock salesmen, self-seeking politicians, or a governmental agency. Deceit is deceit no matter what the circumstances.

In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 1 are some figures, inserted by you, which purport to prove that the customers of private electrical utilities "are paying tribute, an indemnity, if you please, to the organized juggernaut known as the Power Trust, etc." You also ask the "people of every State to analyze these figures" knowing full well that very few have either the facilities, data, or ability for such an analysis, and few know that the T. V. A. costs cited by you as a standard of comparison are a pure guess or estimate at best. T. V. A.'s total income last year was $14,850,000, and hence there is no way of determining what the total cost of the energy consumed in the United States at T. V. A.'s rates to the ultimate consumer would be. But that is not of any great consequence. A much more serious matter is the inaccuracy of your figures and the false implications of them.

Congressman BENDER, of Ohio, conclusively showed the falsity of your claims, and as his devastating refutation of the falsity of your charge that privately owned utilities overcharge their customers by more than a billion dollars has had no effect on your propaganda, I am not so naive as to think that accurate figures will have any more effect. Nevertheless, some readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD may acquire a better understanding of the utility controversy, and especially of your unverified and unverifiable propaganda. This letter, therefore, deals only with your propaganda as it relates to the utilities of Wisconsin.

In the article mentioned above, you say that all consumers of electrical energy in Wisconsin in 1938 paid $49,483,978 for the energy they used, and that this was an overcharge of $20,858,242, if T. V. A.'s rates are used as standard. I wonder where you got these figures. The facts as given in the Wisconsin Public Service Commission's preliminary report are as follows:

Private electric utilities

Operating revenues:	
Sales to ultimate consumers	$46,707,000
Sales to other electric utilities	5,721,000
Miscellaneous revenues	1,237,000
Total operating revenues	53,665,000

As costs to ultimate consumers are the issue, it is evident that your figures are approximately $3,000,000 too high, or, to be exact, $2,776,978 too high. Furthermore, according to the same report for 1938, the operating expenses of the private utilities were:

Operating expenses, excluding depreciation	$20,910,000
Depreciation	6,510,000
Taxes	9,177,000
Total deductions	36,597,000

As it is impossible to allocate these deductions between sales to ultimate consumers and other revenues, let's subtract them from the total operating revenues. When we do this we find that the utilities operating income was $17,068,000. It would be interesting to learn how an operating income of $17,000,000 can be stretched into an overcharge of over $20,000,000. Perhaps an item of nearly $4,000,000 means nothing according to New Deal arithmetic.

You further state that the overcharge of $20,858,242 is "in addition to all operating expenses and reasonable returns on legitimate investments." Please note carefully that no "reasonable returns" are included in the total revenue deductions. They must, therefore, come out of the $17,000,000 remaining. As the legitimate investment, not assets, in the property and plants of the private utilities is approximately $300,000,000, the average return on legitimate investment is less than 6 percent. One wonders by what process of hocus pocus these legitimate returns can be swelled into an overcharge of more than $26,000,000. See your reply to Congressman JOHN C. SCHAFER, of Wisconsin, in the July 3 issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

All the above discussion is based on the assumption that your standard of comparison, namely, T. V. A.'s rates, is valid and legitimate. But an examination of this standard discloses that it is spurious and false. I cannot readily compare the distributions of the revenues of all of the private utilities in Wisconsin with like distribution of revenues of T. V. A., but such a comparison between the distribution of the earnings of three outstanding private utilities with those of T. V. A. is very instructive.

Distribution of each $100 of revenue

	Madison Gas & Electric Co.	Wisconsin Power & Light Co.	Wisconsin Electric Power Co.	Tennessee Valley Authority
Operating expense	$46.14	$35.97	$39.65	Not disclosed.
Taxes	18.79	18.28	19.05	$5.
Depreciation	11.10	12.81	12.05	None.
Interest on debt	5.60	17.13	13.00	Do.
Dividends and surplus	18.38	15.81	16.25	None disclosed.

The interest on T. V. A.'s indebtedness is paid by the taxpayers whose money has been sunk in the project and not by the beneficiaries of the development. T. V. A. has no stockholders other than the taxpayers who get neither interest nor dividends on their involuntary investments in the Tennessee Valley.

The above table shows conclusively that the so-called T. V. A. "yardstick" does not contain the same elements as do the privately owned utility rates. In short, that it is a spurious measuring rod. But there is still more conclusive evidence.

In the last fiscal year, the revenue of T. V. A. was $14,850,000. As no one seems to know exactly how much money has been spent on T. V. A.'s projects a reasonable estimate is 350 to 400 million dollars. Interest on these sums at only 3 percent is 10.5 to 12 million dollars. If to the last sum is added 10 percent of the revenues for taxes, the sum is approximately equal to the total income and nothing remains for operation. I know that T. V. A. has allocated only $182,040,672 to electric power. The taxpayers, however, are paying interest on all the moneys spent, and not merely on a part. But if we take the smaller sum and calculate legitimate fixed costs, we discover that T. V. A. is not earning even these. The fixed charges of the three private companies listed above range from 12 to 15 percent of the cost of their property and plant. The New York Power Authority, a municipal ownership advocate, estimates that 11.5 percent of the value of the plant is a reasonable fixed charge. Let's take 10 percent, which is lower than either. Ten percent of the allocated costs of T. V. A. to power is almost $4,000,000 greater than its total revenue. How can a rate that does not yield fixed costs be a "yardstick"?

But there is more evidence that T. V. A.'s rates have no relation to costs of development and hence that they are a spurious "yardstick." Perhaps the most cogent is the following:

"When the power program of the Tennessee Valley Authority was still in its infancy, a group of men sat down in a cottage on a Madison lake, jerked off their neckties, rolled up their sleeves, and went to work.

"The result of their labors was the electric-rate schedule under which T. V. A. power is sold retail and which has hit the nail almost squarely on the head as far as average rate is concerned. The group aimed at an average rate of about 2 cents a kilowatt-hour; the average under T. V. A. is approximately 2.1 cents" (from an interview with David Lilienthal as printed in the Wisconsin State Journal, Aug. 17, 1936).

Perhaps that statement needs no comment, but as T. V. A.'s rates were established long before the costs were known, they obviously could not be expected to yield a revenue to cover all the costs. Their sole, or main, function was to undersell the private utilities in the Tennessee Valley. If the rates had been based on the costs of the development, they would have been so high that T. V. A. would have died aborning.

Apparently municipal and Government ownership advocates think that if the subsidized rates of T. V. A. are lower than the average of the privately owned utilities, they have proved the superiority of governmental ownership. Obviously if such logic is correct, then it follows that if only one privately owned utility has lower rates than T. V. A., the superiority of private ownership is indubitably demonstrated.

As evidence of the superiority of private ownership over governmental ownership according to the foregoing logic, I submit my last electric bill for 168 kilowatt-hours. You will notice that this bill is for $3.62. The same consumption in Tupelo would cost $3.86, which is 24 cents, or nearly 7 percent, higher. Lest anyone think this is an exceptional case, I respectfully refer them to the following table, which shows the relative costs of specific consumptions in Madison, Wis., and Tupelo, Miss. Column I shows the costs with taxes included, and column II shows the relative costs when the taxes paid by the Madison Gas & Electric Co. and T. V. A. are deducted. The electrical division of the local company last year paid 20.5 percent of its gross revenues in taxes. The 18.79 percent given in the preceding table is for both the gas and electric divisions.

Relative costs of specific consumptions of electrical energy in Madison and Tupelo, at domestic rates

Consumption in kilowatt-hours	Madison		Tupelo	
	I	II	I	II
15	$0.90	$0.72	$0.75	$0.71
25	1.10	.88	.75	.71
50	1.60	1.28	1.50	1.40
75	2.10	1.68	2.00	1.90
100	2.60	2.08	2.50	2.38
150	3.36	2.68	3.50	3.35
200	4.10	3.28	4.50	4.28
250	4.85	3.88	5.00	4.75
300	5.60	4.48	5.50	5.23
400	7.10	5.68	6.50	6.17

The table shows conclusively that the net revenue of the local company from domestic consumers is less than that of T. V. A. Ergo, the proposition is demonstrated. I may add, however, that

the local company is a subsidiary of a holding company, the bete noire of demagogic politicians.

I do not claim that all private utilities can reduce their rates to the level of those of the Madison Gas & Electric Co. I merely cite these facts to show that the taxpayer-subsidized T. V. A. is by no means the paragon of excellence you insist it is. The Madison Gas & Electric Co. is advantageously located but it is not subsidized nor does it, according to T. V. A. rates, overcharge its customers.

The Wisconsin Power & Light Co., a subsidiary of an Insull holding company, however, serves 330 communities and their adjacent rural areas located in 31 counties of the State. Two hundred and five of these communities had previously no electric service and 24 had only part-time service. Furthermore, the company was one of the pioneers in rural electrification, which it began long before the Government thought of subsidizing—at taxpayers' expense—such service. It now serves 16,511 rural customers. (See Trans A. I. E. E., vol. XLV, 1926, p. 511.) Obviously under such different conditions the rates cannot be as low as those of the subsidized T. V. A. or of the local utility.

As far back as 1935 you also inserted into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD some figures purporting to prove that Wisconsin utilities were overcharging their customers by $17,893,000. You stated that the people of Wisconsin in 1934 consumed 1,888,207,000 kilowatt-hours, for which they paid $37,026,063. Instead of citing the Tacoma, Wash., municipal utility as a standard of comparison, I wonder why you do not go north some 22 miles and cite the Seattle utility as a paragon of excellence. It, too, is a municipal utility. At that time the average revenue of the Seattle municipal utility was 1.977 cents per kilowatt-hour. If you will take the trouble to multiply the consumption in Wisconsin, as given by you, by 1.977, you will discover that the cost in Seattle would have been some $300,000 more than the figures you gave. You neglected, however, to mention the fact that the Wisconsin utilities paid many more millions in taxes than would have been paid by the Seattle utility. Again, I ask, where is the overcharge?

But even that is not all the evidence confounding your unwarranted attacks on private ownership. In the annual report of T. V. A. for 1935 we find:

"The new power generation facilities provided by Norris Dam and the increase in power output from downstream plants made possible by Norris Reservoir storage are of unquestioned value to national defense since in an emergency unusual power demands for expanded munitions manufacture at Muscle Shoals must be met immediately."

Unless the reports in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD are false, the T. V. A. recently was given by Congress $25,000,000 toward an ultimate construction cost of $65,000,000 to provide power for the present emergency. Obviously the statement in the report is wholly misleading, to say the least.

But when you are driven from the protection of the T. V. A. post you immediately seek shelter under the Tacoma pillar, for in your reply to Senator BRIDGES you say:

"I am going to use the Tacoma, Wash., rates to make my comparisons for the reason that the opposition is constantly bringing up the argument that these overcharges are absorbed by the taxes paid by private companies."

The seeking of shelter under the Tacoma pillar instead of demonstrating the error of your opponents, is a tacit confession that your contention cannot be defended. The untenability of your shelter under the Tacoma rates was demonstrated by Congressman BENDER, but it may not be amiss to correct or to point out some discrepancies between your figures and the figures in the official reports of the Tacoma utility.

The official reports of the utility show that in 1936 the revenue from sales of electricity was $2,359,964.91, and the taxes paid, including gratuitous work, were $272,935.16, which, according to the accountant's calculation, was 11.57 percent of the gross revenue and not 16 percent.

In 1938 the like revenue of the Tacoma utility was $2,473,734.27, and the taxes amounted to $280,418.70, which, the report says, is 11.34 percent of the gross revenue. Believe it or not.

The 1938 report further shows that the value of the plant and equipment of the Tacoma electric utility was $24,429,241.93. This is more than twice the value of the local utility which last year paid $472,738.12. On the basis of plant values, the Tacoma utility should have paid over $800,000 in taxes, and on the basis of earnings it should have paid over $500,000 and not merely $280,000.

If as already stated it is conceded that 10 percent of the depreciated value of the plant and equipment is a fair charge for fixed expenses, then the earnings of Tacoma lack $132,000 to meet the fixed charges and operating expenses. How can the Tacoma rates be made the standard of comparison?

I am not criticizing the citizens of Tacoma for the manner in which they conduct their utility. If they do not desire the utility to earn taxes, interest on the investment, fixed charges, and other expenses, that is their affair. But these charges must be paid by a private utility from earnings as it cannot charge them to the taxpayers. A private utility must earn fixed charges and operating expenses at least if it wishes to stay in business.

As already stated, I wonder why municipal and public ownership advocates think that their case is proved if they can show that one outstanding municipal utility has lower rates than the average rates of all the private utilities in the country. Such a comparison proves nothing as already shown. A much fairer comparison is that made between the average costs to ultimate consumers of both the municipal utilities and privately owned utilities of the whole country. Such a comparison has been made by the Bureau of the Census of the Department of Commerce. According to press release of May 15, 1939 (second series, Elp. 1), in 1937 the private utilities paid 14 percent of their gross revenues in taxes whereas the municipal utilities paid only 1.5 percent of their gross revenues in taxes. But, mirabile dictu, the same report shows that the average selling price to the ultimate consumers was 2.6 cents for the municipals and 2.1 cents per kilowatt-hour for the privately owned utilities. If the percent of gross revenue paid by the private utilities had been only 1.5, the comparative rates could have been 2.6 and 1.84 cents, respectively. On the other hand, if the private utilities had charged the same average rate as did the municipals, the customers of the private utilities would have paid $915,000,000 more than they did. That is, on the assumption that they paid only 1.5 percent of their gross revenues in taxes. See press release, Bureau of Census (third series, Elp. 1), May 23, 1939.

Previously I stated that the Wisconsin Power & Light Co. is a subsidiary of a holding company formed by Samuel Insull, the red herring of public-ownership advocates. It seems to me that that herring should be consigned to the garbage can if those who constantly drag it across the trail wish to avoid its disagreeable odor.

I make no defense of any crime or fraud that Insull may have committed. If he defrauded anyone, it was not the consumers of electric utilities, but the purchasers of his engraved paper. If in these transactions he committed fraud, he should have been punished, but if fraud was committed, the Government was derelict in the performance of one of its most fundamental functions, namely, the protection of the innocent from such fraudulent transactions. It is not the function of government to emulate Insull. What do I mean? Simply this: Every purchaser of Insull's engraved paper did so of his or her own free will; persuaded he may have been, but he was not forced. Legally there is a difference between the Government's action and that of Insull, but will you please explain the moral difference between Insull's squandering of his stockholders' money, which he obtained by persuasion, perhaps, and the Government's squandering of the taxpayers' money, which it extracts from their pockets forcibly? The money is wasted in either case, and I can see no moral difference. The Constitution of the United States does not authorize the Government to go into a proprietary business such as the electric utility business. The Supreme Court of the United States has not declared the power projects of T. V. A. to be constitutional; it has merely declared that the 18 protesting private utilities had no standing in court. It requires more than a mere ipse dixit to prove that the function of government is to provide the people with electricity. If so, it should also provide them with food, clothes, gasoline for their cars, etc., because all of these are more essential to existence than electricity. Therefore the money wasted by the Government in the "write offs" for navigation, in the many navigation projects on inland rivers, the money wasted in Passamaquoddy power project, the Florida Canal, the Nebraska district power projects, the proposed waste for joining the Tombigbee and the Tennessee Rivers under the pretense that this was for national defense, the proposed expenditures for the so-called De Soto expositions, etc., stand on no higher moral plane than the waste of the stockholders' money by Insull. In fact, if Insull had attempted to sell so-called securities on many of the projects I have mentioned he would have been prosecuted for fraud. How, therefore, does an act that if committed by a private individual is a fraud become an act of statesmanship when committed by the Government? Please explain.

Lastly, the most important aspect of the controversy over the cost of privately and publicly produced electricity is not whether the one or the other can sell it the more cheaply. The issue is much more fundamental and important to the future well-being of the country than that. The fundamental issue is between some form of statism and free enterprise. It is the entering wedge between private enterprise and liberty, and some form of State-controlled enterprise and destruction of liberty. With the destruction of private and free enterprise, liberty will be destroyed. Free enterprise is the genesis of liberty and not its product.

There is no enterprise or business more the product of man's initiative, resourcefulness, courage, and self-reliance than the electric utilities. Private enterprise, inventive ingenuity, and skill assisted by private capital produced the generator and all the other electrical apparatus associated with it. Private initiative and ingenuity has made it possible to generate electricity more cheaply by steam than by water. Private research has reduced the consumption of coal per kilowatt-hour from 5 to 7 pounds to less than 1 pound, and the end has not been reached. That is conservation of natural resources par excellence. Governments have contributed nothing to these developments. Electricity is beyond comparison the product of man's endeavors; much more so than the wool in the coat that one wears. The fundamental issue is, Shall all the private resourcefulness, courage, initiative, enterprise, and ingenuity that have contributed so much to the comfort and well-being of man, and that have made possible discoveries and explorations in other fields of inestimable benefits, be stifled by the dead hand of government and political rule? Governments seldom if ever create; they merely appropriate or pirate what has been created by private individuals.

Yours truly,

C. M. JANSKY.

The Poll Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE E. GEYER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 13, 1940

LETTER FROM SCIPIO JONES AND RESOLUTION OF THE SOUTHWEST REGIONAL CONVENTION

Mr. GEYER of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a letter and a resolution. This is but another example of the ardent desire among the people of the South to have the poll tax as a requirement for voting abolished. The letter and resolution follow:

LITTLE ROCK, ARK., *August 23, 1940.*

Congressman GEYER,

Congressional Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am enclosing herein a copy of the resolution that was unanimously adopted by the Southwest regional convention, at the time and place mentioned in the resolution.

I chanced to be in the convention hall at the time the resolution was requested and adopted by the officials of the Southwest regional convention, to see that you receive a copy of the resolution expressing their deep appreciation for the valuable services you are rendering to the disfranchised citizens in different States and to find out if there is any way in which they can assist you in bringing about the enactment of your poll-tax bill.

This organization represents a federation of women's clubs. Mrs. Robert R. Moton is its president (nat.onal), and its headquarters, as I understand, is the Frederick Douglass Home in Washington, D. C. This body is composed principally of women who purchased the Frederick Douglass Home for consideration of several thousands of dollars.

From newspaper reports, it seems that you are fighting the battle of others alone and single-handed, and this club is anxious to help in any way it can.

Very truly yours,

SCIPIO A. JONES.

Whereas Congressman GEYER of California has introduced a bill in Congress to make it a felony to refuse to let a citizen vote unless he has paid his poll tax, and is urging the enactment of such bill: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Southwest Regional Convention, composed of the following States: California, Colorado, Arizona, Arkansas, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Texas, Louisiana, Nevada, and Utah, now assembled at Muskogee, Okla., go on record in endorsing Mr. GEYER's patriotism and expressing to him their deep appreciation for his unselfish service in behalf of the disfranchised citizens for the States aforesaid and other States.

Unanimously adopted this 21st day of August 1940.

ANNIE B. GILLAM,
President, Little Rock, Ark.
WOXIE WEAVER KING,
Secretary, Muskogee, Okla.

Contracts and Allocations for the Construction of Naval Vessels

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL VINSON

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 13, 1940

MEMORANDUM PREPARED BY THE BUREAU OF SHIPS OF THE NAVY DEPARTMENT

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a memorandum prepared for me by the Bureau of Ships in the Navy Department showing the contracts and allocations made for the construction of naval vessels on September 9, 1940.

With the allocation of these ships all combatant tonnage authorized by Congress has been placed under construction.

NAVY DEPARTMENT, BUREAU OF SHIPS,
Washington.

Memorandum for Mr. VINSON:

1. Contracts and allocations made for construction of 201 naval vessels—total value

Newport News Ship Building & Dry Dock Co., 4 aircraft carriers and 2 cruisers	$307,301,000
Bethlehem Steel Co.—Fore River Plant, 4 aircraft carriers and 6 cruisers	450,666,000
Union Plant, 4 cruisers and 18 destroyers	290,974,000
San Pedro Plant, 6 destroyers	65,764,000
St. Island Plant, 10 destroyers	105,132,000
New York Shipbuilding Corporation, 10 cruisers	544,875,200
Federal Shipbuilding & Drydock Co., 5 cruisers and 17 destroyers	310,634,445
Seattle Tacoma Shipbuilding Co., 20 destroyers	206,582,415
Consolidated Steel Corporation, 12 destroyers	128,280,912
Bath Iron Works, 11 destroyers	112,070,200
Electric Boat Co., 25 submarines	145,440,000
Manitowoc Shipbuilding Co., 10 submarines	61,021,000
Los Angeles Shipbuilding & Drydock Co., 1 repair ship	18,168,500
Gulf Shipbuilding Corporation, 4 destroyers	43,836,000
New York Navy Yard, 2 battleships	240,000,000
Philadelphia Navy Yard, 3 battleships	330,000,000
Norfolk Navy Yard, 2 battleships	210,000,000
Boston Navy Yard, 6 destroyers	60,000,000
Charleston Navy Yard, 5 destroyers	50,000,000
Puget Sound Navy Yard, 6 destroyers	60,000,000
Portsmouth Navy Yard, 6 submarines	36,000,000
Mare Island Navy Yard, 2 submarines	12,000,000
Total contracts and allocations	3,788,745,672

2. These prices include armor and armament and Government-furnished material and are corrected to date.

3. In addition to the above ship awards, award was made on 24 sets of submarine-propelling machinery to the General Motors Corporation at $19,800,000; 11 sets of submarine-propelling machinery to the Fairbanks-Morse Co. at $10,307,088; and 8 sets of submarine-propelling machinery to the Hooven-Owens-Rentschler Corporation for $7,617,048; total for the submarine-propelling machinery of $37,274,136.

4. The amount for this propelling machinery is included in the cost of construction of submarines as given in the ship table awarded to the Electric Boat Co., the Manitowoc Shipbuilding Co., for the Portsmouth and Mare Island Navy Yards.

S. M. ROBINSON.

Endorses President Roosevelt for a Third Term

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 13 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

ADDRESS OF MAYOR LAGUARDIA, OF NEW YORK

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix an address delivered last evening by Mayor Fiorello H. LaGuardia, of New York, endorsing President Roosevelt for a third term.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LAGUARDIA'S ADDRESS ENDORSING ROOSEVELT

In a democracy, citizens are called upon at stated intervals to select from amongst themselves the men to whom they will entrust the affairs of government. In a true democracy, the country accepts the choice of the majority. Full discussion of the issues and of personalities of the campaign is helpful.

I shall support the candidacy of Franklin D. Roosevelt for President. Time on the radio was provided through mutual friends, by the National Democratic Committee. I shall not support all the Democratic candidates on local tickets. I will join with other independents and progressives throughout the country in this campaign in bringing support to the candidacy of President Roosevelt. The Honorable GEORGE W. NORRIS, the outstanding leader of all of us independents and progressives, has consented to serve as honorary chairman of an independent committee for Roosevelt.

I belong to no party. I do not like politicians. I want nothing from either party. I do love my country. I am concerned and worried over world conditions and our relations to them. I know that President Roosevelt's foreign policy and his preparedness plan are the only hope of keeping our country out of war. I enthusiastically approve of the social-welfare program of the New Deal. I prefer Roosevelt with his known faults to Mr. Willkie with his unknown virtues.

Government administration is a science; it cannot be learned overnight. In these perilous times there can be no time lost in getting "the feel of things" by a new administration or "time out" for breaking in a new Cabinet.

RECALLS BANK CLOSINGS

I cannot forget the condition of the country prior to 1933. I was then a Member of Congress and knew of the general distress throughout our land, which reached a complete collapse in the early part of 1933 with the closing of banks, business at a standstill, factories closed, and distress everywhere. No President in our history ever took office with greater problems to solve or the country in a more deplorable condition. President Roosevelt met the situation, and with a program daring and courageous restored the confidence of the people in their Government. He immediately put the banks on relief and saved the deposits of industry, the savings of the thrifty, and the money of the investors.

Since that time there has been a constant development of a social welfare program, the like of which has never taken place in our history. Breadlines and soup kitchens were eliminated and work provided for millions of unemployed.

Not only were millions of citizens given employment but every State, county, city, town, and village was enriched by the fruits of such labor. The self-respect and dignity of these American families were maintained.

The frugal, thrifty people had their confidence restored in the banks when they saw the sign, "Deposits in this bank are insured by the United States Government." Often we had attempted to pass a bank-deposit insurance law previous to the Roosevelt administration only to have it defeated year after year.

SAYS MAYORS WERE FRANTIC

Every mayor in this country became frantic at the distressed appeal of the finest type of our citizens—the owners of their own little homes, who saw their years of savings wiped out by the cruel grasp of a mortgage foreclosure. Along came the Roosevelt Home Owners' Loan Corporation, and hundreds of thousands of homes were saved.

For years we had known of the problem of superannuated workers. No State was able to carry this burden itself. Now we have as a permanent policy of government an old age pension system which has permanently removed the horror of the poorhouse from millions of our older fellow citizens. Along with it we have Federal aid to States for the care of dependent children, maintaining the family rather than institutional life. The tin cup has been taken from the unfortunate blind and provisions have been made to partially compensate for the handicap of their terrible affliction.

While temporary work was being provided for the unemployed, a scientific, national system of unemployment insurance has been started.

Since the Roosevelt administration the farmers have seen the difference between interest in their cause translated into legislation and help and campaign promises turned into Presidential vetoes. How chagrined Senator MCNARY must feel. How embarrassing it must be for him to profess his party's friendship for the farmer after having so often felt the sting of a veto from his own party's President.

NO CLAIM OF ORIGINALITY

No claim of originality is made for any of these social-welfare measures. Every one of them has been a subject of study for years. But not until President Roosevelt courageously sponsored these measures and put his now historic "must" on these bills, were they enacted into law.

It takes years to perfect the administration of such measures as unemployment insurance and labor relations. That is true not only of social-welfare laws but it is true of any innovation in our system of government. It took a generation to get a railroad regulation functioning properly, through the agency of the Interstate Commerce Commission. The Federal Reserve bank made many mistakes in the early days of its creation.

We realized at the time of the enactment of social- and economic-security laws that it would take time and experience for perfection and smooth administration.

I do not undervalue the President's opponent. He is a brilliant executive of a utility holding company. If I were a bondholder in the Commonwealth & Southern Corporation, interested only in the dividends of my holdings, and were I to choose between Mr. Roosevelt as the president of this utility company or Mr. Willkie, I would cast my vote for Mr. Willkie. I do not believe that President Roosevelt, with his concern for the American people, with his keen desire to make their homes comfortable and happy, with his determination to bring cheap electric rates all over the country, would make a good president of a utility company, who must necessarily soak consumers to make profits for his bondholders.

The experience of the two men in power companies has been quite different. Mr. Willkie has been engaged mostly in the financial structure natural to a holding company. Mr. Roosevelt has been engaged in the building of great power plants operated for service. Mr. Roosevelt has been turning the mighty wheels of the turbine. Mr. Willkie has been watching the little wheels of the stock ticker.

REFERS TO TAMMANY

Mr. Willkie has had no experience in government. He has had considerable experience in politics. He served his apprenticeship in the Democratic machine of Ohio and obtained his master's degree in Tammany Hall when he was handed a certificate of election to the Tammany county committee. I do not like Tammany Hall. I have licked Tammany time and time again, and shall continue to do so in the future. No one is forced to join Tammany Hall. Prior to my administration it was expedient for businessmen to do so.

Now let me tell you the difference between a member of the Tammany machine and a real Democrat. In 1936—the last Presidential year—there were 2,289,213 enrolled Democrats in New York City. At least 1,700,000 of them are not members of Tammany Hall. They are the same fine type of Democrats that are found all over our country. In addition to the 2,289,213 Democrats in New York City in 1936, there were 413,527 enrolled Republicans. Over 300,000 are not members of Republican organization clubs. They are the same kind of fine type of Republicans found in the mid- and far-West. These nonorganization Republicans and Democrats are the people who have established good government in New York City. These nonorganization Democrats are the people who supported Grover Cleveland and Woodrow Wilson.

In New York City, Democrats voluntarily choose Tammany by joining the local organization club. That is exactly what Mr. Wendell Willkie did.

Tammany also has its county committee. One must be a regular Tammany organization man to be selected for this county committee, for there is no minority there. Mr. Willkie became a member of the Tammany county committee. The Tammany county committee is composed partly of those high in Tammany circles or of those low in the social strata. Utility men are rarely innocent of politics. They know their politicians.

RECALLS ROOSEVELT FIGHT

Mr. Roosevelt entered politics as a Democrat and not as a Tammanyite. He won his spurs as a member of the New York State Senate by fighting Tammany Hall and successfully preventing the Tammany, railroad, and utility interests from sending their man to the United States Senate.

President Roosevelt during the last 7 years has brought about a great change in our Uncle Sam. He is no longer the stern old uncle interested only in diplomacy, rivers and harbors, and interstate commerce. We now have a rejuvenated Uncle Sam, smiling and friendly, concerned with the welfare and happiness of every home in the land. He is no longer a distant, strange figure in Washington. He is in every State, county, city, and town. He is concerned in keeping families together and a roof over their heads. He is tearing down slums and tenements and building sanitary and cheerful homes. He is concerned with boys and girls being able to continue in high school and to go to college, through the assistance of the National Youth Administration. He wants to live in peace but will not permit anyone to trample on our rights or destroy our democratic institutions. Roosevelt has regenerated our country. Roosevelt has made America the hope of the world.

That is why I am for President Roosevelt. That is why children throughout our land each night, when lisping their "Now I lay me down to sleep," add "God bless America."

Conscription—a Golden Opportunity for Americanism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ERNEST W. GIBSON

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 13 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

STATEMENT PREPARED BY A CONSTITUENT

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement prepared by a young man of my State, dealing with the subject Conscription—a Golden Opportunity for Americanism.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONSCRIPTION—A GOLDEN OPPORTUNITY FOR AMERICANISM

In the face of all arguments, that conscription is contrary to Democratic principles and the American way, it is my profound belief that conscription is a golden opportunity for democracy and the furtherance of Americanism.

It is necessary to recognize the fact that our conscripted army is not going to be involved in any conflict outside of the Americas. The statements of the foremost military men of both Britain and the United States support this fact. Such men make the unqualified statement that the British Empire has already supplied all of the men that the British Isles can quarter and that many more are all ready to be transported there whenever the need for them is imminent. Having granted this fact, we may now proceed to proving the golden opportunity which rests in the conscription of our young men.

First, a democracy is defined as being government directly by the people collectively, that is the entire mass of the people working together as a body and cooperatively producing the rules and laws under which they will live and do business with one another.

It has long been recognized and stated as a fact by the foremost psychologists and economists that the troubles of the Nation are directly attributable to the factions which have sprung up. These factions, by trying to further their own particular aims without regard to the aims of the Nation as a whole, are continually opening breaches in the cooperation of the people toward common ends.

Conscription will tend to dispell the causes of these branches: First, the young men who are the backbone of the Nation for the next generation will be drawn together for a common purpose, that purpose being to learn how to best serve and protect the Nation as an entire unit from any enemy attempting to conquer it from the outside. They will learn that any objective must be attained by the concentrated cooperative action of the whole body and not by individual small groups seeking self-aggrandizement. Also, they will learn that all men, shorn of their factional colors, are the same fundamentally and naturally drawn together in attaining a common purpose.

The fact that conscription works equally in all directions and upon all classes and conditions of men will necessarily gather representative members of all factions together. They will then have to plan together, in open discussion, their common problems in a common cause. This in itself will provide closer bonds between the factions which were discussed above and in turn bind the Nation closer together.

Another fact which has long been before the eyes of the Nation is that the people as a whole do not exercise their right of participation in this great Government. The cure has often been stated as political education, teaching the people what their rights, as well as their duties, are in maintaining the rights and privileges granted them under the Constitution. When at any other time and under other conditions will an opportunity as great as that afforded by conscription be presented to teach the people of the United States the working fundamentals of their Government?

It is my fond hope that the training program of conscripts, Reservists, and the Regular military forces will include at least a half hour every drill day devoted to the teaching of democracy, its meaning and its relationship to every citizen. I feel that this teaching will tend to remove a majority of the obstacles which confront the smooth operation of "government of the people, by the people, and for the people," and will again make us "resolve that such government shall not perish from the earth."

Sugar-Beet Farming in United States Contributes One-third of a Billion Dollars to Our National Income, So Why Strangle it?

REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 13, 1940

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I have had prepared by the Department of Agriculture, Triple A, Sugar Division, a statement showing the returns to sugar-beet growers from processors and from the Federal Government for all purposes, covering the seven crops from 1932 to 1938. This shows that the processors have paid to the growers approximately $343,500,000, and the amount paid through the sugar acts which the Congress has approved from time to time is approximately $76,500,000 for the period.

As this table contains a great deal of information interesting to consumers and producers, friends of the industry and enemies of the industry, I ask unanimous consent to insert it in the RECORD as part of my remarks.

This table, Mr. Speaker, is sufficient evidence to convince any fair-minded citizen that the great sugar-beet industry of this country is worthy of an important position in the economy of this Nation. It must not be forgotten that during the past 7 years the Treasury of the United States has been called upon to furnish subsistence to millions of people who were, unfortunately, unemployed. Here is an industry, engaged in producing a nonsurplus crop or food item, which is now justifying its immortality in the economic life of this Nation. It gives employment to thousands of workers. It furnishes buying power to farmers and factory workers and those engaged in numerous industries from which the processors purchase great quantities of goods and which are consumed by the processors in the manufacturing and extracting of the sugar contained in the sugar beets and in its preparation for the consuming market. Such major supplies consist of cotton bags, coal, coke, limestone, rubber goods, machinery parts, transportation services by the railroads and trucking companies, automobile parts and repairs for the vast number of trucks used by the farmers and the manufacturing branch of the industry. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, this is a great industry that furnishes employment for a vast army of our civilian population. It contributes greatly toward supplying our people with one of our principal food items which is so necessary in peacetime and in war. It gives us independence from foreign countries and protects the purses of our people against the exploitation of sugar producers doing business in foreign lands. It contributes to the standard of living of our people who reside in the sugar-beet areas and adds to our national income. Any domestic activity which adds one-third of a billion dollars to our farmers' income is worth protecting and perpetuating. Why strangle it?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The table referred to follows:

Domestic sugar-beet growers—Returns from processors and Federal Government for all purposes covering 7 crops, 1932–38

Crop	Tons sugar beets produced	Total returns to growers						Total returns to growers for actual production		Average returns per ton to growers for actual production					Average total returns to growers per ton produced for actual production, acreage abandonment, and crop deficiency [4]
		Processor payments	Government payments				Total returns	Total of such payments made to all growers	Total returns	Average of such payments made to all growers			Payments under Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act [3]	Total payments for actual production	
			Gross payments under sugar legislation [1]		Payments under Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act	Total Government payments				Processor payments	Payments under sugar legislation [2]	Total			
			For sugar beets produced	For acreage abandonment and crop deficiency	Total										
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)	(16)
1932	9,070,000	$47,705,000						$47,705,000	$47,705,000	$47,705,000	$5.26		$5.26		$5.26	$5.26
1933	11,030,000	56,599,000	[5] $2,577,000		[5] $2,577,000		[5] $2,577,000	59,176,000	59,176,000	59,176,000	5.13	$0.23	5.36		5.36	5.36
1934	7,519,000	38,776,000	13,158,000	$6,418,000	19,576,000		19,576,000	58,352,000	51,934,000	51,934,000	5.16	1.75	6.91		6.91	7.76
1935	7,908,000	45,565,000	8,936,000	573,000	9,509,000		9,509,000	55,074,000	54,501,000	54,501,000	5.76	1.13	6.89		6.89	6.96
1936	9,028,000	54,636,000				$2,510,000	2,510,000	57,146,000	54,636,000	57,146,000	6.05		6.05	$0.28	6.33	6.33
1937	8,784,000	46,249,000	16,434,000	708,000	17,142,000	2,924,000	20,066,000	66,315,000	62,683,000	65,607,000	5.27	1.87	7.14	.33	7.47	7.55
1938 [6]	11,615,000	54,052,000	21,640,000	626,000	22,266,000		22,266,000	76,318,000	75,692,000	75,692,000	4.65	1.86	6.51		6.51	6.57
Total		343,582,000					76,504,000	420,086,000								

[1] Covering gross disbursements to growers under the Jones-Costigan Act and the Sugar Act of 1937, before deducting county association expense and after deducting in 1937 and 1938 the reduction in large-scale payments to growers whose "commercially recoverable sugar" exceeded 500 short tons, raw value.

[2] Payments (excluding those with respect to acreage abandonment and crop deficiency) under Jones-Costigan Act and Sugar Act of 1937; does not include agricultural conservation-program payments.

[3] Although average payments were as indicated, participating producers received approximately 40 cents per ton.

[4] As shown in the explanation for column (16), these averages were derived by dividing the total returns from all sources and for all purposes (column 8) by total production (column 1), but it should be remembered that abandonment and deficiency payments by the Federal Government were not based on actual production.

[5] Refund payment to cover reduction in returns to growers resulting from imposition of the processing tax and/or corresponding floor-stocks tax on sugar for such sugar of the 1933 crop unsold as of June 9, 1934.

[6] Preliminary.

SOURCE AND EXPLANATION

Column (1). From Agricultural Statistics, 1939 volume, for all crops except 1938, which is from Agricultural Marketing Service report.

Column (2). Same as column (1).

Column (3). From Sugar Division and Agricultural Adjustment Administration records; payments with respect to the 1934 and 1935 crops were made on basis of parity; payments with respect to the 1937 and 1938 crops were made at the rate of $0.60 per hundred pounds of "commercially recoverable sugar," raw basis, with graduated reductions to large producers.

Column (4). From Sugar Division and Agricultural Adjustment Administration records; payments with respect to the 1934 and 1935 crops were made at the rate of $1.75 and $1.13 per ton, respectively, on the larger of actual or normal production; because of a severe crop failure in certain areas in 1934, there was a wide disparity between actual and normal production in that year.

Column (5). Column (3) plus column (4).

Column (6). From Agricultural Adjustment Administration records showing total payment to cooperating growers; payments were made at the rate of about $0.40 per ton to those growers who complied with the provisions of the act.

Column (7). Column (5) plus column (6).

Column (8). Column (2) plus column (7).

Column (9). Column (2) plus column (3). This column shows the total amount paid on the basis of actual production by processors and the Federal Government to all growers before giving consideration to abandonment and deficiency or compliance with the provisions of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act.

Column (10). Column (9) plus column (6); explanation for this column is the same as for column (9) except that column (10) shows the total returns for actual production after giving consideration to compliance with the provisions of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act.

Column (11). Same as column (1).

Column (12). Column (3) divided by column (1).

Column (13). Column (9) divided by column (1).

Column (14). Column (6) divided by column (1); these payments, however, were made at the basic rate of about 40 cents per ton to cooperating growers.

Column (15). Column (10) divided by column (1).

Column (16). Column (8) divided by column (1).

Republicans in Congress Back Willkie

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 13, 1940

STATEMENT BY HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement of the minority leader, Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr.:

Edward Flynn, chairman of the Democratic National Committee, accustomed as he is to the goose-stepping in the last 8 years under President Roosevelt, cannot believe anyone can be at all independent. I do not want to cause Mr. Flynn too many sleepless nights and therefore I hasten to reassure him he needn't worry about the cooperation Wendell Willkie will get in Congress after he becomes President next January. Republicans will support his recovery and peace program wholeheartedly as will scores of honest Democrats whose hearts have ached as they have seen this country drift aimlessly the past 8 years toward bankruptcy, inflation, national insecurity, and war.

We may differ with Mr. Willkie on an amendment, but I think the country wants Congress to do some thinking of its own. That is what they expected when Congress stopped the move of Mr. Roosevelt to put a bunch of "Charlie McCarthys" on the Supreme Court bench. That was the way the people expressed themselves when Mr. Roosevelt demanded a "rubber stamp" Congress and set out to make his famous series of purges.

However, I want to assure Mr. Flynn there is no difference between Mr. Willkie and the Republican membership in Congress concerning the fundamental issues in this campaign or before the country at this time. We are opposed to breaking the traditions of this country and giving a third term to any man, and particularly to one who has failed to bring the country recovery, security, or peace.

We are in agreement with Mr. Willkie in his desire to give the country an administration which will stop the reckless joy ride toward bankruptcy. We are for Mr. Willkie in his determination to bring real security to the people by making it possible for them to have real jobs at American wages. We are for Mr. Willkie in his fight to arrest the steady march toward socialism, dictatorship, and extreme radicalism. We are for Mr. Willkie in his battle to give private enterprise a chance to live, to give the small-business man

an opportunity to flourish and thereby provide millions of jobs to American workers. We are for Mr. Willkie in his effort to bring real unity to this country, the unity which is absolutely essential if we are to have a prosperous country and a contented people. The Roosevelt administration has demonstrated that it cannot do this.

Yes, we may differ, Mr. Flynn, on an amendment. This is still a free America and we want after next January to have a free Congress. You can rest assured we will give President Willkie 100 percent cooperation and support in his program to free America from the chains of bureaucracy; to free the country from communistic barnacles, to restore the Government to the people, to bring security and an abundant life to the people instead of merely handing out "applesauce" talk. To give America an opportunity to be free to breathe, free to do and free to go ahead to a finer and better country.

Resolutions Adopted at the Midwest Defense Conference in Kansas City, Mo., August 30, 1940

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 13, 1940

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting herewith a list of the resolutions adopted at the Midwest defense conference, which was held in Kansas City, Mo., on August 30, 1940. Businessmen and other community leaders from the nine States of Arkansas, Iowa, Kansas, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, Oklahoma, and South Dakota attended this important conference, which was called for the purpose of developing cooperative methods whereby a more equitable share of the national defense orders and facilities might be located in the great inland empire represented by this nine-State area.

The following resolutions were adopted at this conference:

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED AT THE MIDWEST DEFENSE CONFERENCE

The representatives of the 9 States and the more than 200 communities here assembled pledge their unqualified support to the national-defense program and their loyalty to the common welfare of our country.

Yet these States and communities are determined that, while they stand united for defense, the program shall not become the occasion of a social and economic tragedy for this region.

For these States and communities cannot but view with genuine concern the social and economic consequences of this program—necessary as it is—if in its operation it is not to be thoroughly and justly decentralized and spread over the Nation.

This nine-State area, while it has found great basic strength in agriculture, has suffered peculiarly because of the lack of an essential balance between industry and agriculture and the shutting off of markets for its products.

GOVERNMENT ADDS WEIGHT

This process has been going on for years. And now, with a sudden and tremendous expansion of industrial expenditures by the Government, we can see an industrial set-up in other areas of the country which would throw this territory more out of balance than ever.

These nine States and their hundreds of communities are resolved that they are not going to be reduced to a position of agricultural slavery.

This great middle western area is already seeing the new process at work—seeing its raw materials and its skilled labor and its great untapped reservoirs of farm boys—the very life blood on which the territory must depend in years to come—drained off into other sections for their further enrichment.

These States and their communities take the position that it is not enough to be for a decentralization of industry in principle.

EMPHASIS ON DECENTRALIZATION

The Middle West insists that in the spending of the billions, and in the allocations of new industries, decentralization shall become a fact, in processing and manufacturing, and this area shall receive its just and proper share of the outlays of public funds.

This is not a cry for "pork." It is the voice of the Middle West asking for justice—for that to which it is clearly entitled, giving each man and woman, insofar as possible, a particular job to do so that all may be busy and all will feel they have a part in the defense of America.

The Middle West today has industries that are not concentrated. They are perhaps small as individual units, but they are large in the aggregate. In addition to the allocation of new plants, the industries already in this region should be utilized.

This conference expresses its satisfaction that the f. o. b. Philadelphia on orders has been eliminated and that split bidding on orders has been established.

WOULD BREAK ALL BARRIERS

It calls for the elimination of any and all barriers that now militate against the Middle West and are obstacles to its meeting of the competition of the more centralized industrial areas on an equal basis.

Advantages of the Middle West are fully commensurate with its claims for fair recognition. They include:

1. Invulnerability against attack.
2. An adequate and easily available supply of raw materials.
3. An adequate and easily available supply of native-born, trained labor.
4. Adequate transportation facilities.
5. Adequate and easily available food supplies.
6. Abundance of fuel and power.
7. Aviation advantages, arising from strategic geographical location.
8. Industries manufacturing clothing, uniforms, and tents.
9. Industries manufacturing steel and steel products.
10. Industries producing leather goods, shoes, saddlery, and the like.
11. Adequate supplies of oil and oil products, natural gas, and coal.
12. Adequate and varied mineral supplies.

In view of all these advantages and existing supplies, the representatives of these nine States and hundreds of communities insist that before the Government undertakes the establishment of new industries, new housing, and other facilities in already congested districts it shall utilize those of the Middle West.

It is the further position of the Middle West that sound defense must have a broad foundation, and that no program of national defense can be sound or adequate unless it includes the vast resources, the industries, the materials, and the multiplied advantages of this great agricultural area; and be it finally

Resolved, That the executive committee of this conference deliver these resolutions through an appropriate committee to the President of the United States, the Advisory Council on National Defense, the Army and Navy Boards, and other proper authorities.

TO THE ADVISORY COMMISSION TO THE COUNCIL OF NATIONAL DEFENSE

Whereas 1,500 representative businessmen from the 9 Middle Western States of North Dakota, South Dakota, Minnesota, Nebraska, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, Arkansas, and Oklahoma, meeting in Kansas City on August 30, 1940, listened with close attention and patriotic interest to an explanation of the part these States may play in the rearmament program of the United States, including the splendid talk by Mr. Ralph Budd; be it now

Resolved, That the Midwest Defense Conference representing these nine States respectfully request the Advisory Commission to the Council of National Defense, and the Army and Navy of the United States, for an outlined list, including specifications, of all rearmament plants yet to be located and the requirements yet to be filled, to be sent the Midwest Defense Conference at its headquarters in the Hotel Muehlebach Building, Kansas City, Mo., and be it further

Resolved, That the Midwest Defense Conference and the several State groups that make it up, will promptly thereafter study this list, weed out those plants and items which it would be impractical to locate in this area, or fulfill here, and thereafter make presentations for the remainder in behalf of this region.

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN

Whereas there is evidence of substantial misunderstanding of the nomenclature of the United States on the part of numerous agencies of the Government, including both Houses of Congress; be it

Resolved by the Midwest Defense Conference in session in Kansas City, August 30, 1940, That for purposes of the general geography in locating the rearmament industries of the country, the region between the Mississippi River and the Appalachian Mountains be hereafter referred to by its true name of the Middle West.

TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

Whereas a great deal of unfortunate confusion has arisen as to the advisability of locating the Government's own rearmament industries in the middle of the country, as well as where the expansion of existing defense industries, now privately owned, should take place: Be it

Resolved, That the Midwest Defense Conference, composed of 1,500 representative businessmen from the 9 States of North Dakota, South Dakota, Arkansas, Iowa, Kansas, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, and Oklahoma, in session at Kansas City, Mo., August 30, 1940, respectfully request the President of the United States to clarify his splendid statement of several months ago regarding the strategic value of locating such industries in the interior, and that he do this in a supplemental expression to the Advisory Commission to the Council of National Defense, and to the Army and Navy planning boards, and to the press of the country, so that there may be a better understanding of what the best thought on this important subject really contemplates.

TO THE INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

Whereas the Interstate Commerce Commission has, upon its own motion, instituted an investigation into the basic freight-rate structure applying to, from, and between points in the general territory

east of the Rocky Mountains, the proceedings being instituted under the I. C. C. Docket Nos. 28300, 28310, and MC C–150; and

Whereas, since this investigation was instituted, an emergency has arisen involving the national defense of this Nation: Therefore be it

Resolved now, That the Midwest Defense Conference, in session in Kansas City, August 30, 1940, urges the Interstate Commerce Commission to pursue its investigation with redoubled vigor and speed, so that if it is found, as this conference believes it will be found, that unfair barriers do exist because of the territorial method of freight rate making, such corrections as should be made will be made with great promptness in the interest of the national defense now, and for the future even-handed prosperity of every part of the United States.

TO THE REPRESENTATIVES AND SENATORS FROM THE NINE MIDDLE WESTERN STATES OF IOWA, KANSAS, MINNESOTA, MISSOURI, NEBRASKA, NORTH DAKOTA, SOUTH DAKOTA, OKLAHOMA, AND ARKANSAS

Whereas the Members of the House of Representatives of Congress of the nine Middle Western States of Iowa, Kansas, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota, Oklahoma, and Arkansas have organized in Washington with the election of Representative KARL MUNDT, of South Dakota, as chairman, for the purpose of advancing the interests of this section so that the United States may rearm along sounder lines; and

Whereas the Senators of these same States have met frequently, although informally, for the same purpose: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Midwest Defense Conference, That these organizations are approved and that the Congressmen and Senators participating in them are urged to continue this activity to a successful conclusion.

TO THE ADVISORY COMMISSION TO THE COUNCIL OF NATIONAL DEFENSE

Whereas Mr. Ralph Budd, one of your members, was kind and considerate enough to travel to Kansas City, Mo., at your instance, we understand, to speak to the Midwest defense conference of 1,500 delegates representing the nine States of Iowa, Kansas, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota, Oklahoma, and Arkansas, Friday, August 30, 1940: Now therefore be it

Resolved, That we thank you sincerely for this cooperation.

TO THE FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

Whereas electric power is an essential in industrial development, especially since more and more industries are becoming electrified, it is proper that careful consideration be given to our developed power resources: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Federal Power Commission be requested to take immediate steps to survey the power situation in the great Midwest area to determine the power requirements for present and future needs for adequate industrial development and national defense in this area.

Mr. Speaker, a study of the figures revealed by national-defense orders up to date shows clearly that this nine-State area is trailing far behind the national average in the amount of business pick-up attributable to national-defense business. Since national defense is a Nation-wide program of great significance to every section of the Union and which must be financed by the taxpayers of all America, it is a highly desirable objective that the procurements involved in this program be distributed over as much of the country as possible without in any way reducing the speed, economy, and efficiency of the national-defense build-up. The very decentralization of national-defense orders and facilities is, in itself, a great step forward toward a more permanent and effective state of national industrial preparedness.

About 2 months go the Members of Congress from this nine-State area formed a group committee for the purpose of cooperating with the National Defense Council and the War Department procurement officials in calling to their attention the availability of the vast natural resources, industrial facilities, and labor reservoirs of this region. Our committee functions as a service group to facilitate the activities of the national-defense officials and is in no sense a pressure group simply trying to secure economic advantages for this nine-State empire.

Among the splendid advantages which this region offers the Government in its preparedness program are the following: Aviation advantages with great airports, favorable climate, and a network of emergency landing fields on level terrain; food at low cost for laborers and for Army units as demonstrated by the fact that as of last January this area had on hand 34 percent of the cattle and calves, 43 percent of the hogs and pigs, and 18 percent of the sheep and lambs in the United States; great facilities for manufacturing clothing, shoes, uniforms, and tents; many steel and steel products plants with easily expandible facilities; strategic location away from coast lines and all possible sources of attack; it is the most invulnerable area in America; 86 percent of the people living in this area are native-born whites; no labor group in America is freer of subversive tendencies than the labor reservoir in this region; oil and oil products are produced in vast quantities in this area and extensive pipe lines make these products readily available throughout the nine States; all three primary fuels—coal, oil, and gas—are found in abundance in this region, and many hydroelectric power potentialities are available for quick development there; great supplies of minerals highly essential in the defense program are scattered throughout the area, including bauxite, cement, zinc, lead, iron ore, and manganese; many of these can provide great stock piles in the ground instead of on top of the ground if a little stimulus is given the use of domestic, strategic, and critical minerals at this time.

Our nine-State committee has been cooperating steadily with the procurement officials in Washington, and with the officers and members of the Midwest Defense Conference, and our members stand eager and ready at all times to do everything it can, individually or collectively, to further the whole defense program of America, and to increase its permanent usefulness and effectiveness by helping to distribute its activities into this inland region where production and living costs are reasonable, and where nature adds her great influence to the protection of industries in this region from any possibility of foreign attack by air, land, or water.

The membership of our committee is as follows:

MEMBERS OF THE NINE-STATE COMMITTEE

Arkansas: E. C. Gathings, Wilbur D. Mills, Clyde T. Ellis, Fadjo Cravens, David D. Terry, W. F. Norrell, Wade H. Kitchens.

Iowa: Thomas E. Martin, William S. Jacobsen, John W. Gwynne, Henry O. Talle, Karl M. LeCompte, Robert K. Goodwin, Ben F. Jensen, Fred C. Gilchrist, Vincent F. Harrington.

Kansas: W. P. Lambertson, U. S. Guyer, Thomas D. Winter, Edward H. Rees, John M. Houston, Frank Carlson, Clifford R. Hope.

Minnesota: August H. Andresen, Elmer J. Ryan, John G. Alexander, Melvin J. Maas, Oscar Youngdahl, Harold Knutson, H. Carl Andersen, William A. Pittenger, R. T. Buckler.

Missouri: Milton A. Romjue, William L. Nelson, Richard M. Duncan, C. Jasper Bell, Joseph B. Shannon, Reuben T. Wood, Dewey Short, Clyde Williams, Clarence Cannon, Orville Zimmerman, Thomas C. Hennings, Jr., C. Arthur Anderson, John J. Cochran.

Nebraska: Hyde Sweet, Charles F. McLaughlin, Karl Stefan, Carl T. Curtis, Harry B. Coffee.

North Dakota: Usher L. Burdick, William Lemke.

Oklahoma: Wesley E. Disney, Jack Nichols, Wilburn Cartwright, Lyle H. Boren, Mike Monroney, Jed Johnson, Sam C. Massingale, Phil Ferguson, Will Rogers.

South Dakota: Karl E. Mundt, Francis H. Case.

KARL E. MUNDT,
Chairman.

BERNARD SPENCER,
Secretary to Congressman Sweet, Secretary.

Speech Nominating Speaker William B. Bankhead for the Vice Presidency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY R. SHEPPARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 13, 1940

ADDRESS OF HON. HARRY R. SHEPPARD, OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech made by me in seconding the nomination of Speaker WILLIAM B.

BANKHEAD, of Alabama, for the Vice Presidency of the United States, delivered at the National Democratic Convention in Chicago, July 20, 1940:

Mr. Chairman, and ladies and gentlemen of this great Democratic convention, in the limited time which I have, it is impossible for me to tell you of the many accomplishments and splendid ideals of the gentleman whom I wish to second for the nomination for the Vice Presidency of these United States. This man has been a Member of the United States Congress for 24 years and in his early service as a Member of the House of Representatives, he was assigned to and served on the Committee of Reclamation and Irrigation which has so much to do with the water problems of our great Nation and at the same time, he also served as a member of the Merchant and Marine Committee and upon these two committees, his application to his duties and the able manner in which he handled them was quickly recognized and he was assigned to the Rules Committee to the House and there served for many years with distinction, again manifesting a splendid ability which was recognized by every Member of the House of Representatives.

His ability, his sincerity and fine, friendly manner so thoroughly established him with the Members of the House of Representatives that upon the death of that honored and splendid gentleman, Speaker Burns, this man was elected to that high position, Speaker in the House of Representatives, by acclamation. This is a feat in itself rarely accorded and definitely indicates the fine regard in which this man was held by every member in his party.

That gesture by the Members of the House of Representatives was splendid, but not enough for trying as the position is and exacting as it is, this splendid gentleman was again reelected at the expiration of his first term without opposition. I know of no man who has more friends, who has deeper respect or enjoys the affection of the Members of the House of Representatives than the gentleman to whom I refer. He has consistently in his position—sometimes alone—supported the administration of Franklin D. Roosevelt 100 percent. A man who has been sympathetic to the problems of the North, the East, the West, and the South that is so proud of him, and as a Representative in Congress from the Golden State of California, it gives me honor far beyond that which I could have anticipated, to second the nomination of a man who would be a worthy teammate of our splendid President, the Honorable WILLIAM B. BANKHEAD.

Proof of Authenticity of the British Secret Document—Concluding Article

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. THORKELSON
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 21, 1940

EXCERPTS FROM THE PRESS AND AN ADDRESS BY DR. NICHOLAS MURRAY BUTLER

Mr. THORKELSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include excerpts from the press, and Need for Action, by Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler.

Mr. Speaker, this is the concluding article in the series which I have inserted in the RECORD, relative to the authenticity of the British secret document. The evidence which I have used is taken from magazines, newspapers, and other publications, which may be found in the Congressional Library. This is particularly true where specific dates are used in the British secret document, such as reference to the last chapter of Triumphant Democracy, by Andrew Carnegie, which appeared in the North American Review, 1893; in Whitaker's Almanac, where American officers were listed; and in the article by A. Maurice Low, wherein he endeavored to minimize the importance of titles conferred on the American officers who were knighted by King George.

Much of this evidence has not only been recorded, but I have photostats of the original articles; such as, for instance, the article which appeared in the New York Times, May 16, 1919, in which it is stated that British interests acquired title to the Famous-Players Laskey Corporation. It is especially significant to note that this deal occurred nearly 1 month before the letter was sent to Lloyd George, and not in December 1919, as stated in Mr. Merrill's report.

The British secret document accepted the fact that Woodrow Wilson was to be the first president of the League of Nations, a position in which he would carry America into the League with him. The League of Nations is now past history, but inasmuch as considerable space is given to it in the secret document, I shall refer to it in order to further authenticate this letter to Lloyd George. I quote from a newspaper article by Shaw Desmond, October 4, 1919:

WILSON SEEN IN ENGLAND AS A FALLEN ANGEL, VICTIM OF IDEALISM AND WRECKED ON SHOALS OF DIPLOMACY—LEAGUE APPEARS DOOMED—EUROPEAN DEMOCRACIES SEE FOUNDATION OF NEW ONE ON ASHES OF COVENANT

(By Shaw Desmond)

When Woodrow Wilson rode out of the west on the wings of the morning to tilt at the windmills of Europe's diplomacy he was hailed by the democracies of Europe as the savior of democracy. It is true he carried with him on one of the aforesaid wings a Sancho Panza of the name of House, whose position in salvation was not quite so clear. The average worker, like the average man, has been puzzling ever since as to the colonel's position. Whether America elected him or whether he elected himself. But let that pass. To the Briton, the American Constitution is a thing fearful and wonderful.

* * * * * * *

They expected him to make war impossible. It looks funny today in the cold print, but that is what they expected. They expected him, as head of that hundred millions which, in the breath of a man, had become the determinative factor in the future of Europe, to be arbiter of the destiny of Europe's democracy. They expected his 14 points to be the Magna Charta of the new democracy—his League of Nations to be—well, what did they expect it to be?

* * * * * * *

THE PRESIDENT'S PROGRESS

The President's progress, forming a picture for a twentieth century Hogarth, is interesting to the social psychologist. Nor is it difficult to follow. It has had so many predecessors. In the beginning Wilson, probably sincere-souled democrat and idealist, set out to reform the world. In that "ecce homo" psychology of his, he saw himself the divinely inspired author of a league of nations, saw his descent down the avenue of time as the founder, caught his reflection in the mirror of history. * * * Then he went to Paris. Paris has always been the grave of reputation.

Somebody, somewhere, somehow, some day, will tell the story of his study with Colonel House of the maze of European treaties before he left. That is not my business. It is enough here to say that he was attempting to master in a month what European diplomacy had studied through generations. When he reached the conference table he was the amateur playing against the professional. He was matching himself, with their own weapons and on their own ground, against the astutest brains in Europe. And he had the same chance as a tallow rabbit in h— with an asbestos greyhound trailing his heels.

The statements made by Mr. Desmond in his article are generally known to those who kept in touch with the happenings in Europe in 1919. Mr. Wilson was hopelessly lost. He was in the hands of international Jewry, the men who wrote and drafted the Treaty of Versailles. Mr. Baruch did not fail to brag about the power he had at the Peace Conference, and it is so recorded in the Senate hearings.

I shall refrain from expressing my opinion of the League at this time, except to say I am absolutely opposed to it and its off-shoots, World Federation and Union Now.

In order to expose one of the most un-American organizations, I now quote from the New York American, December 18, 1934, and March 11, 1935:

CARNEGIE MONEY AND COMMUNIST PROPAGANDA—A NEW DEAL IN DISLOYALTY

When will these everlasting Carnegie Endowments and Carnegie Funds and Carnegie Foundations cease to afflict the American people?

Their persistent self-injection into every situation, with biased and bigoted propaganda, their intrusion into every question, both domestic and international—offering a field for their disloyal and un-American activities—is getting to be more than can be borne, or should be borne.

The latest outrage they have perpetrated is perhaps their worst. It is in the form of a pamphlet entitled "The Political and Social Doctrine of Communism." This pamphlet is the December issue of a periodical calling itself "International Conciliation" published monthly by the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.

In a preface of clumsy apology, excuse is made for the publication on the ground that there should be an authoritative setting forth of both communism and fascism as political, economic, and social doctrines, and then follows the full text of the report on the work of the central committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet

Union by Stalin to the All-Union Communist Party Congress held in Moscow on January 26 of the present year.

As if the threadbare twaddle and familiar bunk of the Soviet tyrant and terrorist were not enough, there is appended to his report an article by Dr. Sidney Hook, professor of New York University, who appeared in the news a few days ago as one of the active figures in the merger of the Communist League in America and the American Workers Party into an organization whose avowed intention is the overthrow of the American Government by force.

It is needless to say that Stalin's article attacks capitalism and exalts communism, predicting that bourgeois capitalism is coming to an end.

The familiar Soviet thesis that the capitalist countries of the world are preparing for an imperialist war against Russia is trotted out for home consumption.

The revival of this bug-a-boo, with the recurrence of open terrorism and murderous repression in Russia, confirms the report that all is not well behind the censorship network of the Soviet Republic.

The Stalin article is propaganda pure and simple.

Its publication by the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace is an act of thorough disloyalty to America—indistinguishable from the common and familiar circulation of seditious and subversive literature by secret agitators.

The organ which carries such stuff, even if it has the imprint of the Carnegie endowment, is not one with less blameworthy and censurable than the skulking enemy of society whose scene of operation is the dark alley and the hideout.

This Carnegie endowment is an old offender. It has persistently advocated American entanglements in all foreign complications. It has steadily condoned Europe's repudiation of its debts to the United States. It has sought to undermine the American democracy by spreading Communist material which is designed and used for propaganda.

Perhaps Carnegie's International Conciliation sees nothing to criticize in Communist Russia's threat of war against Japan, in Russia's alliance with war-hungry France, and her support of Yugoslavia in its war threat to Hungary.

Perhaps the disloyal pacifism of the Carnegie Endowment is so vision-twisted or money-lulled that it can find nothing to criticize in Russia's impudent interference in the life and government of every peaceful and friendly nation in the world with which it can establish contact.

Perhaps it even approves Stalin's declaration:

"The American Communist Party must be improved and bolshevized. For that end we must work in order to forge real revolutionary cadres capable of leading the many millions of the American working class toward the revolutionary class struggle."

Perhaps all this is considered international conciliation. The straight-thinking American is apt to consider it something very different. He knows these Carnegie organizations, their mischievous vaporings, their pestilent un-Americanism, their incurable antagonism to every true and just aim of the United States.

He despises their propaganda and their endowed publications which exist only to disseminate it.

By such publications the Carnegie endowment not only affronts the American reading public but it discredits the press itself and the freedom which the latter enjoys under the Constitution.

THE CARNEGIE ENDOWMENT—ARCH PROPAGANDIST FOR UN-AMERICAN PRINCIPLES

Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler, president of Columbia University and president of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, tells us how to abolish the United States of America in the interests of Europe.

In his report to the directors of the fund which Andrew Carnegie left to promote the Europeanization of America under the mask of universal peace, Dr. Butler expounds quite frankly the astounding anti-American propaganda that this organization is carrying on. This movement is for what Dr. Butler calls a world state. It is the most seditious proposition ever laid before the American public. Seditious because it gives aid and comfort to the Communist, Fascist, and Nazi-ist, absolute enemies of the very rock-bottom principles on which our Government is founded.

In this world state America would be a county, yielding all our liberties and democratic institutions up to the despotic nations of Europe.

Dr. Butler's vast scheme for kidnaping the mentality of American youth and delivering it over to the big shots of Europe consists, so he boasts, of indoctrinating our youth with endowment literature through international mind alcoves, international relations clubs, and children's international mind alcoves.

There are now 352 such clubs in American colleges, he says, and 100 clubs in high schools. The laboratory where this poisonous literature is manufactured is at the endowment offices, at No. 342 Madison Avenue, New York City.

Dr. Butler offers not peace, but a sword. And that sword is aimed straight at the heart of American nationalism. No paid agent of a European power was ever more brazen than this representative of the predatory big shots of Europe when he said that his proposition to make America a part of Europe is analogous to the welding together of the Thirteen Colonies into a whole.

Dr. Butler hides the obvious fact that there has never been a world state sentiment in Europe. He hides the obvious fact that Europe is farther from a United States of Europe than ever in its history. He hides the obvious fact that, after thousands of years of living next door to one another, the nations of Europe are nearer to butchering and poisoning one another in a final demoniac effort at mutual annihilation than ever before.

Is this hypocrisy, publicity paranoia, or a deliberate betrayal of American interests to the foreign nations which have decorated, bemedaled, beribboned and superdegreed Dr. Butler until he, born an American, is now as international as the Marseilles waterfront?

Indeed, a reading of Dr. Butler's career in Who's Who in America gives us the psychological low-down on the doctor's international mania. Honorary degrees from Toronto, St. Andrews, Manchester, Oxford, Cambridge, Glasgow, Paris, Strasbourg, Nancy, Louvain, Rome, Prague, Breslau, Budapest, Szeged, and many others. New Jersey commissioner to the Paris Exposition, Watson professor of American history at British universities, president of the American branch of the Conciliation Internationale, president of the American-Slav Institute in Prague, president of the Kahn Foundation for Foreign Travel of American Teachers, vice president of the Congress of the Royal Institute of Public Health (London), member of the Institute of France, president of the Germanistic Society, honorary vice president of the American-Scandinavian Society, of the American Academy in Rome, of the France-America Society, of the American Hellenic Society, of the Italy-America Society, corresponding member of the Associazone Internationale Per Gli Studi Mediterranei, Rome; honorary member of the Kant Goesellschaft, Berlin; vice president of the Stresemann Memorial Friedensstiftung, Berlin; foreign member of the Czech Academy of Sciences and Arts, Prague; awarded one-half of the Nobel Peace Prize, 1931 (meaning, apparently, that the awarders thought he was only, under cover, a 50 percenter in regard to peace on earth); decorated by the Governments of France, Prussia, Greece, Jugoslavia, Belgium, Poland, Italy, Rumania, Czechoslovakia, Austria, Hungary, Holland, etc.; member Athanaenum (London), Beech (Southampton), Reform (London) Clubs; decorated before the war with the badge of the Commander of the Order of the Red Eagle of Prussia and cabled the Kaiser that "he rose almost to the miraculous."

And now this international showcase for decorations and degrees tells us that the United States of America is through, and that we should join a world state in which we will be the tax gatherer, the goat, and the inexhaustible plum tree.

A world state today means either world communism or world fascism—both of which are regressions, atavisms, completely at variance with the American spirit of personal liberty and national independence.

The Carnegie Endowment for International Peace was founded by a sentimental Scotch crackpot, whose only use for America was what he could get out of it.

In the hands of Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler, it has become a European device for turning America back into a plundered colony of Europe.

There is only one thing to be done with the Carnegie Endowment, and that is for the United States Government to suppress it and sequestrate the fund for loyal purposes.

Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler, I regret to say, has been one of the most submissive tools in the hands of alien governments in the dissemination of radical doctrines within the United States. It is he and others who have used the Nation's wealth to undermine the Republic and spread alien doctrines within our schools, colleges, and churches which are destroying respect for our own Government.

This is particularly dangerous, in that it has changed the true American teachings in our schools, which will in turn destroy patriotism in our youth.

In order to make this clear, I shall quote an article by Dr. Butler, entitled "The Need for Action":

THE NEED FOR ACTION

(An address over the Columbia Broadcasting System, October 3, 1937, by Nicholas Murray Butler)

What is there to say of the dangerous world situation which confronts us all that has not already been said and well said? Surely, more discussion is not necessary. The need is for positive, prompt, and constructive action. That action can only be taken by governments and such governments as still rest upon the basis of democracy depend in turn upon public opinion. Therefore it is public opinion in the United States, in the British Commonwealth of Nations, in France, in Switzerland, in Belgium, in Holland, in the Scandinavian countries, in Czechoslovakia, and in distant Argentina which must bear responsibility for that action, or that failure to act, upon which the immediate future of our long-building western civilization must depend.

It cannot be said that public opinion is without guidance. Of all the numerous and often important international conferences which have been held since the end of the great World War, the most important, the most constructive, and the most helpful was that held at Chatham House in London in the month of March 1935. It was entirely unofficial, although in every sense public.

Some 62 outstanding statesmen, economists, and men of affairs, drawn from 10 nations, then assembled on the invitation of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace to consider and, if possible, to propose a program of action which would deal effectively with the gravely menacing problems of international trade and international finance, as well as with the whole question of international peace and its relation to the economic, the social, and the political organization of mankind. Those who then assembled represented every conceivable point of view and almost every conceivable background of experience and conviction. To their own surprise but to the intense gratification of all, this truly great and representative international group agreed unanimously upon a plan of action to be pressed upon the governments of the civilized world. That plan of action, which has been published in every land, endorsed, and earnestly supported by the international organization of the great chambers of commerce of the world, may be obtained for the asking by addressing the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace at its offices in the city of New York.

Already more than 2 years have passed since the Chatham House Conference was held, and the world continues to drift dangerously toward the breaking point. One of the most distinguished members of that conference, M. van Zeeland, soon became prime minister of his country, Belgium, and in that post has been doing everything in his power to have the recommendations of the Chatham House Conference understood and accepted. Our own Secretary of State, Mr. Hull, has lost no opportunity to do the same thing and his voice is now fortunately being heard not only in Europe but in Asia. But time presses, and the economic and social forces which are disintegrating society will not wait. They must be quickly met and overcome, and constructive, forward-facing movements put in their place. It is no longer possible to say that we do not know what should be done. We have been told what to do, on the highest authority that there is in the world. Nothing stands in our way now but lack of intelligence, sluggish indifference, and that appalling policy of "wait and see," which is the pride of the so-called practical politician, whether in public office or out of it.

More than a year ago the Governments of the United States, Great Britain, and of France made an effective beginning in that international monetary agreement which was quickly accepted by several other nations. But that was only a beginning. Public opinion must require governments to press forward to the establishment of an international monetary unit which shall be as definite and as fixed as the meter or the kilogram. Then and only then can that national and international trade which is the hope of the world be put upon a foundation which will be free from uncertainty. Public opinion must require the taking down of those high tariff barriers and other obstacles to international trade which are impoverishing the mass of mankind for the benefit of a few who are, in effect, living upon an unseen dole which is met in unrecorded fashion by the entire mass of the people. Anyone who will study and reflect upon the facts relative to cotton growing in our southern and southwestern country will quickly find convincing evidence of the severe damage being done to the American people themselves by continuance of present policies of trade restriction.

The struggle between different forms of government need not and should not involve international war, although something may happen to bring about that unhappy result. We in our own end are concerned with the protection of our fundamental democratic principles as embodied in our Federal Constitution with its Bill of Rights, and as illustrated through a century and a half of really marvelous national life and growth. Any talk of our being isolated from the rest of the world is grotesque absurdity. No nation is more closely interrelated with world happenings and world problems than is our own. This is in part the result of our size, in part the result of the varied origins of our complex population, in part the result of our long-time prosperity despite the crises which have confronted us now and again, and in part the result of the success which has attended our great experiment in democracy. If the world does not prosper, we cannot prosper long. If world peace is in danger, our peace is in danger. The one sure way to keep out of war is to join in preventing war, and the one sure way to prevent war is to enact into public policy without further delay the recommendations of the Chatham House Conference, which would remove the outstanding temptations to war.

In the face of a situation such as this, nothing could be more tragic than the contemptuous disregard of formal treaty obligations by governments. Among civilized peoples having some understanding of what morality means, the obligation of a contract has been looked upon as sacred. If this be true as to contracts between individuals, how much more true must it be as to contracts between governments. Yet today we look upon what must be bluntly described as governmental assassination in China by an invading host of Japanese having the authority and bearing the flag of a government which has solemnly engaged with eight other governments to maintain and uphold the territorial integrity of China. We are now assured by legalistic advisers that the eight other nations can do nothing about this breach of trust, since the treaty in question makes no mention of any procedure to follow should it be violated. Can anything more monstrous be said than that? The only inference from it is that contracts made by treaty have no moral obligation whatsoever. If that be true, the time has passed when treaties are needed or should be made. If morality is not to rule human conduct, whether individual or governmental, then we need not trouble ourselves about legal technicalities. The one alternative to moral control is the rule of force. That means constant and growing armaments and eventual world-wide war, with the literal, not figurative or rhetorical, destruction of western civilization. The choice is plain, and there is no time to be lost in making it. It is between the rule of moral principle or world ruin.

In this article Mr. Butler speaks of the British Commonwealth of Nations and the Chatham House conference, neither of which should concern the United States. The gentleman is more concerned with foreign nations and world government than he is in the perpetuation of our own Government; and, feeling that way about it, there is nothing to hinder him from taking up his abode on the other side of the Atlantic.

Mr. Butler also refers to the sanctity of treaties, and I would like to ask him which nation in Europe has more willfully disregarded treaties than Great Britain. She has broken every treaty she has made—not only with us but with other nations as well; and today she stands alone, leaning upon the United States. Europe knows this, and so should we, had we real statesmen in our Government.

Did England keep her treaty with the United States in regard to the payment of the war debt? Did not the author of the British secret document suggest to Lloyd George that England should be careful in her negotiations with the United States until the war debt was canceled? Of course he did, and that is precisely what Great Britain has done.

There is a group in the United States that wants to fight for England, and I say go ahead; and when they are through and disillusioned the true picture will appear in its most tragic form.

I am not interested in Europe, or in the affairs of Europe, except that I want all European nations to stay out of the United States; and they will stay out if our statesmen understand the meaning of neutrality. We need a President who understands our foreign policy from an American viewpoint, and whose interest is at home instead of in foreign governments.

Members of Congress Who Voted Against the United States Entering Into the World War

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CARLSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 13, 1940

PREPARED BY ANSEL WOLD, CLERK OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON PRINTING

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including a list of Members who were in the Sixty-fifth Congress and voted against our entry into war. The list also gives us the names of those Members who are now living. We are indebted to Mr. Ansel Wold, clerk of the Joint Committee on Printing, for this information, and I am glad to include it in my remarks in order that it may become a part of the RECORD.

MEMBERS OF CONGRESS WHO VOTED AGAINST THE UNITED STATES ENTERING INTO THE WORLD WAR

(As compiled September 10, 1940)

SENATE

Gronna	Lane	Stone
La Follette	Norris	Vardaman

Of the foregoing, all are now deceased except Senator GEORGE W. NORRIS, who is a Member of the present Senate.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ALABAMA

Almon, Edward B.
Burnett, John L.

COLORADO

Hilliard, Benjamin C.
Keating, Edward

CALIFORNIA

Church, Denver S.
Hayes, Everis A.
Randall, Charles H.

ILLINOIS

Britten, Fred A.
Fuller, Charles E.
King, Edward J.

MEMBERS OF CONGRESS WHO VOTED AGAINST THE UNITED STATES ENTERING INTO THE WORLD WAR—Continued

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ILLINOIS—continued
Mason, William E.
Rodenberg, William A.
Wheeler, Loren E.

IOWA
Haugen, Gilbert N.
Hull, Harry E.
Woods, Frank P.

KANSAS
Connelly, John R.
Little, Edward C.

MICHIGAN
Bacon, Mark R.

MINNESOTA
Davis, Charles R.
Knutson, Harold
Lundeen, Ernest
Van Dyke, Carl C.

MISSOURI
Decker, Perl D.
Hensley, Walter L.
Igoe, William L.
Shackelford, Dorsey W.

MONTANA
Rankin, Jeannette

NEBRASKA
Kinkaid, Moses P.
Reavis, C. Frank
Sloan, Charles H.

NEVADA
Roberts, E. E.

NEW YORK
London, Meyer

NORTH CAROLINA
Kitchin, Claude

OHIO
Sherwood, Isaac R.

SOUTH CAROLINA
Dominick, Fred H.

SOUTH DAKOTA
Dillon, Charles H.
Johnson, Royal C.

TEXAS
McLemore, Jeff

WASHINGTON
Dill, Clarence C.
La Follette, William L.

WISCONSIN
Browne, Edward E.
Cary, William J.
Cooper, Henry Allen
Davidson, James H.
Esch, John J.
Frear, James A.
Nelson, John M.
Stafford, William H.
Voigt, Edward

All of the Members of the House of Representatives listed above are now deceased with the exception of the following:

CALIFORNIA
Church, Denver S.
Hayes, Everis A.
Randall, Charles H.

COLORADO
Hilliard, Benjamin C.
Keating, Edward

ILLINOIS
Britten, Fred A.

IOWA
Woods, Frank P.

MICHIGAN
Bacon, Mark R.

MINNESOTA
Knutson, Harold

MISSOURI
Hensley, Walter L.
Igoe, William L.

MONTANA
Rankin, Jeannette

NEBRASKA
Sloan, Charles H.

SOUTH CAROLINA
Dominick, Fred H.

WASHINGTON
Dill, Clarence C.

WISCONSIN
Browne, Edward E.
Esch, John J.
Nelson, John M.
Stafford, William H.

Representative HAROLD KNUTSON, of Minnesota, is a Member of the present House of Representatives.

Convention of Jewish War Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DAVID I. WALSH
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, September 14 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

ADDRESS OF HON. DAVID I. WALSH, OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a speech delivered by me at the annual convention of the Jewish War Veterans held in Boston on August 31, 1940.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman and fellow Americans, these are dark days in the world. War and all its destructive results—famine, pestilence, suffering, hatred, and every evil that is an enemy of civilization appears to have been let loose. It is an hour when courage, faithful citizenship, strong patriotism, and trust in the Almighty needs to be joined in the bosom of every person living in America. It is a time for calm, dispassionate thinking and for imbuing in our souls the determination to do everything possible to preserve America, its ideals, traditions, and free institutions.

The qualities which are needed in America today have been splendidly exemplified by the Jewish war veterans of the United States who are tonight gathered here in annual convention. I esteem the opportunity of addressing you who are present and through the instrumentality of this modern magic which we know as radio broadcasting. Indeed it is a distinct privilege to greet you, to congratulate you and to urge a continuation of the patriotic services you rendered in the time of war, during these serious and momentous days for our country and for the world.

Some may inquire, Why a Jewish or any racial organization of American war veterans? Nearly all the racial and religious groups have organized similar veterans' organizations. This does not mean that you or they are not satisfied and proud to be American veterans and belong to the Nation-wide veteran organizations—but it does indicate a desire to take justifiable pride in the contribution which the several racial groups have made to our military service in the American wars. It also serves the purpose of letting the general public know the loyalty and willingness of the children of those who were born in other lands and who are now American citizens, to make the supreme sacrifice of death for the preservation of our American institutions. Let it also be said, it should banish forever the whispering propaganda of those who would question the loyalty of the Jewish-born or other foreign-born citizens and their descendants or seek to deny them the full enjoyment of the civil and religious liberties guaranteed to all citizens by the Constitution.

Let us consider in some detail the glorious record of our Jewish veterans, for it attests the loyalty, the patriotism, and the bravery of those of Jewish ancestry first in the war for our independence and thereafter in every war in which the United States has ever engaged.

In these days, when a billion dollars is voted by Congress for national defense in a few hours, the reference in the history of our Revolutionary War to an advance by a Jewish patriot of $300,000 to help finance the Continental Army under George Washington may appear as a small matter. But it was a huge sum of money in those days and of inestimable aid to the Revolutionary cause.

The rolls of our fighting forces in the War of 1812 and the Mexican War both contain the names of men and officers of Jewish blood.

At the outbreak of the Civil War in 1861 the Jewish population of this country was estimated at about 200,000. Some 8,000 Jews are believed to have served in the Union and Confederate Armies. The veterans' rolls of the Spanish War in 1898 tell a similar story.

The total number of Jews in the service during the World War is conservatively estimated from 200,000 to 225,000, which constituted more than 4 percent of the armed forces of the United States, whereas proportionately the Jews in this country formed about 3 percent of the total population.

No less than 1,100 citations for valor awarded to men of Jewish faith are on record. The Congressional Medal of Honor, of which only 78 have been awarded to date, was conferred on 3 Jewish soldiers. The Distinguished Service Cross is worn by at least 150 American Jews and the Croix de Guerre by 174 Jews of the A. E. F.

The racial and religious groups which you represent, indeed all our racial and religious groups may take justifiable pride in an equally glorious record of service and sacrifice.

It may not be amiss to take this occasion to refer to an incident which occurred a year ago this very month. This incident and this meeting tonight presents the history of progress and advancement of the Jewish people in a striking manner. I refer to the occasion of the unveiling of a monument presented by the Jewish people of Newport, R. I., to the city of Newport, on which occasion I had the honor of delivering the dedicatory address. Two hundred and eighty-one years previous to the date of this dedication a small band of Jewish families, after a long and hazardous sail from Brazil and the West Indies, entered the harbor of Newport and become part of the community which the followers of Roger Williams had founded.

They were poor, weary, discouraged, and disheartened. They brought with them, however, the spiritual values of the religion of their fathers. It was the only influence that sustained them and gave them hope and courage. Realizing the priceless value of the ancient religion of their forbears they immediately turned their thoughts to God. And recognizing the great fundamental duty that man owes to the Almighty, namely, worship, gratitude, praise, and prayer, they built on this spot the first synagogue erected in America. From that day to this, persecuted and exiled Jews have continued to find an asylum in every seaport that encircles the territory of the United States of America.

Tonight I am honored by being invited to join with you in honoring the memory of the thousands of Jewish youths who have given their lives and services to our country.

Tonight as we look about throughout the country we behold a different picture. The kith and kin of those early immigrants have taken a position in American life of prominence and influence, that is proof of the industry, perserverance, and the capacity of the men and women of your blood to benefit by and take advantage of the opportunities and free institutions that America has guaranteed to all who have come here from the Old World to escape tyranny and oppression and to enjoy the benefits of free institutions and equality of opportunity.

The memory of your Jewish ancestry and your Jewish war heroes should fill your hearts with patriotism, your minds with high resolve, the resolve that the land of the free which welcomed your ancestors and for which your heroes fought and died shall ever remain free. On this solemn occasion you fittingly contemplate the service and sacrifice you and your comrades made for America,

and your fellow citizens of every race and creed will join with you in solemnly resolving that all Americans of every race and creed shall dwell in peace with one another. There is a sentiment inscribed on one of the public buildings in the city of Washington which expresses the sentiment that applies to all: "God made us neighbors, let justice make us friends."

If Americans of all religious beliefs would stop blasting at each other's racial inheritance and religious beliefs they would not only give manifestation of sincerity of their religious faith but we would indeed all really live in the true spirit of America. The Old World enmities, jealousies, and long-continued feuds have no place in the life of America.

There is nothing I know of more foreign to the free institutions of America than to question or deny the birthright of every American, no matter from what land or race his ancestors emigrated, to enjoy the equality of opportunity, religious liberties, and social and political justice that are guaranteed to all.

Who would have dreamed a few years ago that in this so-called age of enlightenment that we should be witnessing, under the totalitarian governments of Europe, persecution of religion and of your race as cruel and distressing as in the Dark Ages of bygone centuries. This must never happen in America. All history tells us that wherever in the world religion has been crushed, tyranny has been enthroned. It is not enough to deprecate the hateful intolerance of Hitlerism, but we must be ever vigilant and aggressive to prevent such doctrines from growing on the free soil of America.

We must be on our guard also to preserve our priceless heritage from the insidious forces of destruction within our own land—the question of the defense and security of the democratic institutions of our own beloved country. Let us be alert to detect false propaganda and false dogma from subversive elements and groups that are attempting to undermine and destroy our democratic institutions; indeed to annihilate the freedom for which our forefathers fought and died.

It is difficult to recognize them, therefore they are harder to defeat. It will demand constant alertness and careful reconnoitering to recognize the foe when you meet him, but if guided by basic American ideals and principals for which your comrades died, you cannot fail.

You living veterans who 20 years ago left the military service must not think your battles are over. You must make yourselves the inspired leaders in all the great movements for advancement and progress of our beloved country.

We seek not to suppress the right of any man or woman to think and speak freely. That is their God-given right as American citizens. But we must exert our utmost influence in thought, speech, and action against the apostles of foreign philosophies, alien to American ideals, who would, if they had their way, topple our most precious institutions about us and erect on the ruins the superstructure of destructive communistic or totalitarian government.

Guarding the destinies of America against the perils that threaten it from abroad and the sinister enemies that would undermine it at home is more than ever a cause to which you and I may well dedicate ourselves.

Power Plank in the Democratic Platform

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 5, 1940

SPEECH BEFORE THE PLATFORM COMMITTEE AT THE DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL CONVENTION, CHICAGO, ILL., JULY 15, 1940

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, at the request of our friends in the House, who are members of what we call the public power bloc, I went before the Platform Committee of the National Democratic Convention at Chicago and appealed for the adoption of a power plank in the platform and also for one pledging the party to continue the extension of its program of rural electrification.

I was successful in securing both and, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting here my speech to the platform committee, together with a copy of the power plank adopted by the convention.

The matter referred to follows.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I come here primarily representing the 27,000,000 consumers of electric light and power in this country. I am here to discuss with you for a moment the attitude of the Democratic Party on the outstanding domestic issue of this campaign, and to plead for a strong farmer plank in the platform.

The greatest domestic issue with which we are confronted today is the power question—the development of our water power resources and the protection of the users of electric energy in the rates they have to pay.

I told you in this convention in 1932 that this would be the greatest issue with which we would have to deal for the next 25 years. That prediction is now being borne out. The people are looking to us for protection.

The Republican Party has been "blitzkrieged"; it has disappeared. It succumbed to the Power Trust fascisti at Philadelphia and nominated the Hitler, or the Mussolini, of the power monopoly as its standard bearer in the coming campaign. They even did it before they investigated his politics. My information is he started out a Socialist and landed in the Republican Party, or in charge of the Republican Party, on the third bounce.

While this was going on, our dear beloved friend, Herbert Hoover, was addressing the convention, appealing to them to "hold an election and not an auction." The poor fellow didn't know that the auction had already been held, and that he had been sold down the river by the party he was supposed to represent.

I am chairman of what is called the public-power bloc in the House of Representatives, the most effective unofficial organization connected with either House of Congress. We have adopted a platform, or a program, and I am going to read a portion of it, if you will give me time, in order that you may understand exactly what we are driving at. This power issue reaches into 21,000,000 homes, 4,000,000 commercial establishments, and 2,000,000 industrial plants, 95 percent of whom are overcharged approximately 100 percent for electric energy.

We saw the German machine in 1871 roll down across France and impose an indemnity of $1,000,000,000 on the French nation, which the French people were required to pay within 30 years. But this utility fascisti, this gigantic octopus sprawls over this Nation, runs its tentacles into the pocket of every human being who pays an electric bill and takes from the American people in overcharges approximately $1,000,000,000 a year, or as much in 1 year as the French were required to pay in 30. We have checked those figures and double checked them, and I can prove to any intelligent man that they are substantially correct. Instead of $1,000,000,000 in 30 years, they have taken from us $30,000,000,000; and if we pussyfoot this issue we might as well not nominate a ticket; they would take twenty billions more in the next 20 years. Besides, they have absolutely ignored rural electrification.

Franklin D. Roosevelt has done more for the power consumers of America than all the other Presidents combined up to this time. [Applause.] When we came into power, only about 10 percent of the farm homes of America had electricity; they were around the big cities. We were lagging behind every other nation on earth. England, France, Germany, Norway, Sweden, Belgium, and Denmark, all had 90 percent of their farms electrified. Holland and Switzerland had approximately 100 percent, and even Japan had 90 percent of her farms electrified, while we had only 10 percent. Someone said the other day in answer to that statement, that those were thickly settled countries. That is no answer; New Zealand, a new and sparsely settled country where the farms are few and far between, had 65 percent of her farms electrified 4 years ago.

Now, since we have gone into this struggle, we have electrified 20 percent more, something like 2,000,000 farm homes. The other day in their scramble when the Republican Party broke down at Philadelphia, and the utilities moved in, they absolutely forgot rural electrification entirely. They never mentioned the power issue; but we are going to mention it from now on.

People in your home State of New York, Senator WAGNER, are overcharged, according to the T. V. A. rates, $170,000,000 a year; and according to the Ontario rates, $192,000,000 a year; in the State of the gentleman from Kentucky here [Senator BARKLEY], $11,000,000; in the State of Ohio, $40,000,000; in Massachusetts, $44,000,000. Every man who turns an electric switch, every man in the organization represented by Mr. William Green, of the American Federation of Labor, who spoke here today, every man in the organization represented by Mr. Taber—the National Grange—everyone who has electric lights in his home—except a few isolated areas such as the Tennessee Valley area, or the extreme far West, or in cities like Cleveland, Ohio, where they own their own municipal and distribution systems—has to go down into his pockets and pay as tribute to this fascisti approximately 100 percent in overcharges on his light and power bill every month that rolls around.

A few of us had been carrying on the fight in the House of Representatives, as well as in the Senate. We found we needed organization, so the House Members who favored public power organized what we call the public-power bloc. We adopted a platform setting out the policies for which we stand. That was in 1937. We have fought on that platform for 3 years and have never changed it. There are Members within the sound of my voice, and some of them on this committee, who have fought with us, and who are members of our bloc. They were kind enough to elect me chairman, and I am appearing in that capacity here today.

We say that we are banded together for the purpose of saving for the American people, now and for all time to come, the hydroelectric power of this Nation, one of the greatest natural resources in all the world. If we lose it now, it will be gone forever.

We regard the hydroelectric power in our navigable streams and their tributaries as public property, national wealth, which belongs to all the American people and should be used for the benefit of all. Whoever controls the water power of this country in the years to

come will control the Nation. We believe this power should be made available to every home in America and to every business establishment at rates based upon the cost of generation, transmission, and distribution. If that were done, even in the State of the distinguished gentleman to my right—Governor Olson, of California—where they have the benefit of Boulder Dam power; if it were distributed over the rest of the State at the rates prevailing in the Los Angeles area, they would save something like $30,000,000 a year; and if it were not for Boulder Dam and those cheap rates in Los Angeles, the people of California would pay over a hundred million dollars a year in overcharges for their electric lights and power.

We believe the Government should hold in perpetuity the dams it now owns, or has under construction, or in contemplation, and should build and own the transmission lines to convey the energy generated at those dams throughout the distribution radius and sell it wholesale to cities, towns, cooperative associations, and other public agencies, at the minimum rates necessary to amortize that part of the investment charged to power in 40 to 50 years.

That is our policy at Boulder Dam. We will amortize the Boulder Dam investment in 50 years. They buy falling water, but it costs them at Boulder Dam 1.63 mills per kilowatt-hour. It is delivered at Los Angeles at about 4 mills a kilowatt-hour. This power is being sold at a sufficient profit to pay for the entire Boulder Dam investment in 50 years. Power can be generated with coal, gas, oil, or water power, anywhere in the United States, and distributed to the ultimate consumer at the T. V. A. yardstick rates, after paying all expenses and allowing for reasonable return on legitimate investments.

We believe in encouraging and assisting through governmental aid the counties, cities, towns, cooperative associations, and other public units in owning and operating their electric distribution systems. The Commonwealth & Southern made a contract in 1926 to buy power generated at Muscle Shoals. I live closer to Muscle Shoals than any other Member of Congress. I am one Member whose district is cleared.

The private power companies do not own an insulator in my district, and I hope they never do again. We bought them out and paid what their property was worth. They were buying this power at an average of 2.004 mills a kilowatt-hour in 1932 and were selling it in sight of the dam at 10 cents a kilowatt-hour, or about 4,800 percent spread. In 1932, 1,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity a month cost a residential consumer in my district $66.10. Today it costs him $8.90. We are paying 5 mills a kilowatt-hour for it wholesale, where they were paying 2.004 mills. We are paying more taxes than the power company paid when they owned those distribution systems. We are paying our distribution systems out; and in Tupelo, Miss., where I live, we made so much profit we had to reduce the maximum rates from 3 cents a kilowatt-hour to 2.5 cents a kilowatt-hour, where we were paying 10 cents a kilowatt-hour in 1932.

There are just two sides to this question: The Republicans have taken one side and we have taken the other. We have taken the side of the American people, the ones who pay the bills.

They are sending out this new-made Republican as an apostle of farm relief. I said on the floor of the House a year ago that they were going to try to nominate him for President, and that if they did they would urge him as the farmers' friend. I said there was one thing about it—he could teach the farmers of this country how to water the stock and shear the sheep. [Laughter.]

Mr. CARPENTER, of Kansas. He said in Topeka, Kans., the 1st of June that all the wheat in Kansas could rot in the field if it took him to harvest it.

Congressman RANKIN. Who said that?

Mr. CARPENTER, of Kansas. Mr. Willkie.

Congressman RANKIN. You pay overcharges for electricity in Kansas amounting to $10,000,000 a year. In the State of Ohio they are overcharged $40,000,000. They only raise about 40,000,000 bushels of wheat a year in Ohio. The entire wheat crop of that State wouldn't pay these overcharges, which are being taken out of the pockets of every human being in Ohio who turns an electric switch, except in a few places like Cleveland and Columbus, where they have municipal systems.

Organized labor is going to be with the Democrats, because they haven't anywhere else to go. Nobody else has ever done anything for them. Where are the farmers going? Every farmer in America who has electricity is crazy about it and his wife is crazier about it than he is. Why? Because it brings relief from drudgery. It brings to the home light, refrigeration, the electric iron, the electric washing machine that lifts the burden of drudgery from the housewife, the water pump, and many other things that go to make those homes more pleasant, more attractive. Every farmer who has this power, if he knows the facts, will give us credit for it, and he ought to support the Democratic ticket; every man who hasn't got it is praying for it, and he knows very well he won't get it unless we elect a Democratic administration. The Republicans didn't mention rural electrification in their platform. When I spoke in the House the other day and called attention to the fact that the Republican platform did not mention rural electrification, practically every old guard Republican in the House applauded, which shows that they are committed to the other side of this issue.

I have the rates in every community in America in my office. I have been digging into this subject for years. I can take any town and show to what extent the people are overcharged; and 95 times out of a hundred it will be around 100 percent. Another thing, we are unalterably opposed to pooling our public power with that of private power companies, or to pooling our power lines with theirs. Let the Government own the dams; let the Government own the distribution lines; then let the community own the distribution system.

In order to avoid duplication we favor the Government's purchasing the transmission lines where they would parallel the public lines necessary to carry public power to its destination, provided these lines can be purchased at their actual values. We are not trying to take property for nothing. They are going out now and saying they skinned us out of several million dollars in the Tennessee Valley deal. As a matter of fact, we paid all that property was worth, and I agreed to it in advance, because I was consulted, but we did it to get their hands out of the pockets of the people of Tennessee, Alabama, Mississippi, and Kentucky. We are saving $10,000,000 a year as a result. That will soon pay for the entire purchase.

Our people are using electricity now. Residential consumers in my town are using 170 kilowatt-hours a month, while in the city of New York, and in this city of Chicago they are averaging about 70 kilowatt-hours a month. Low rates result in increased consumption.

We favor the municipalities owning their own distribution systems. Where those distribution facilities are owned by private power companies, we favor aiding the municipality in buying them out, provided they can be purchased at what they are worth. If not, then we favor aiding the municipality in constructing its own distribution systems and stand-by plant. We favor rural electrification on a national scale, in order to supply electric energy to every farm home in America at the present yardstick rates, which means the T. V. A. yardstick rate, which has a maximum of 3 cents a kilowatt-hour and then scales down to 4 mills.

I want to say in that connection, gentlemen, that we have already forced reductions in light and power rates in America since the T. V. A. was created $580,000,000 a year and still have $1,000,000,000 to go. They were charging us the same rates in 1933 as they were in 1925; but when we created the Tennessee Valley Authority, the greatest development of ancient or modern times—one that will take Franklin D. Roosevelt's name down the centuries—when we constructed the T. V. A. and put the yardstick rates into effect, the people raised such a clamor that they began to reduce rates, and up to now they have reduced them about $580,000,000 a year. Wendell Willkie did not do that. This administration did it and made them fall into line—or start to falling into line.

I would like to know the number of State legislators in the United States that are on the pay roll of this power Fascisti from Maine to Mexico. In one State I am told that a majority of the State senators are on their pay roll. They are on there as lawyers. One man said to me, "I have been drawing a very good retainer. I am attorney for them."

"Ever try a case?" I asked.

"Never tried a case. They don't own property in my county," he replied. He was in the State senate. That is their "fifth column" tactics. That is the way they went out and "blitzkrieged" Taft's and Dewey's delegations at the Philadelphia convention. I wish we knew how many members of those delegations were tied in with the power interests in the beginning. The understanding was, "We want you as a Dewey delegate to vote for Dewey until he caves in; then, of course, you know where to go." They packed the galleries with the rest of them.

They also have been sending out canned editorials, and have been filling newspapers with useless advertisements. For what? To rub down the editors. I find that even in the South today those canned editorials are being published by newspapers whose editors don't know what it is all about. That is some more of their "fifth column" tactics. I understand they had a meeting here last night—going to place the name of Wendell Willkie before this convention and ask for his nomination on the Democratic ticket. If they do, Senator BARKLEY, please yield to me for some observations, won't you? [Laughter.]

MEMBER. You think Willkie was Hopson's choice?

Honorable RANKIN. I'm sure he was. [Laughter.]

I don't want to interfere with the Republican Presidential campaign. I think when they nominated Willkie they ought to have put Hopson on as Vice President, and not humiliated my friend, Senator MCNARY. You people from the West ought to resent any such treatment of as good a man as CHARLIE MCNARY.

The next great steal they are trumping up is the Columbia River—that great Blue Danube of the West; the greatest wealth the West has, perhaps, outside of her soil. They are getting ready to try to steal the power at Bonneville and Grand Coulee. If they do, the people of the West will be deprived of one of their greatest birthrights.

Governor OLSON. You ought to include Shasta Dam in that.

Honorable RANKIN. And the Central Valley. They are getting ready to steal that, just as they were trying to steal Muscle Shoals.

We are unalterably opposed to pooling this power at Bonneville and on the Columbia River with any private power company. We want to save the Columbia River for the people of that area. We want to develop every river from the Penobscot to the Rio Grande, from the Columbia River to the Savannah. We want to develop the water power of this Nation and make this country rich and prosperous in the years to come.

As I said, we favor rural electrification. A few years ago I took up this fight for rural electrification, after this power-bloc platform was adopted. I said to these boys: "If you will stay with me,

I will get us $100,000,000 for rural electrification for next year." We got that $100,000,000, and it didn't last throughout the year. This year we added $60,000,000 to that as a result of the efforts of this organization whose members have carried on this fight ever since this administration has been in power.

We believe in adopting the allotment plan, the loan and grant plan that has been used by the P. W. A., in order to enable these rural-electrification projects to build their lines to reach these distressed farmers. Why should you give a city 45 percent grant and 55-percent loan, and then require the farmers to pay all theirs back? We want the same treatment given to them that we give people in the cities. If you will give us half the money the Republicans gave the railroads back in the old days, we will electrify every farm home in America. We will have it understood and so provided that these lines, when built and paid for, will belong to the farmers themselves.

You people are paying over twice as much for electricity as I am. We are paying our lines out. A private power company never amortizes. You will pay yours until doomsday if they get control of this Government, and they will raise it at will and you can't help yourself. They have got their "fifth columnists" in and around, or on, every State utilities commission in America. If they haven't got them on the commission, they are working with or through the commission, with the result there isn't a State in the Union where the commissioners have been able, even since we got control of them, to break their strangle hold and reduce rates to the proper levels. We tried it in Pennsylvania. We were doing fairly well until Pennsylvania, unfortunately, elected the James administration and reversed the policy.

Now look what the James' gang has done to Pennsylvania. According to the Tacoma rates—and I put them in the RECORD the other day—the people in Pennsylvania are overcharged $105,000,000 a year for electric light and power. They have jumped on us Democrats and talked about corrupt politics.

You and I can remember when Pepper and Vare had their ballot-stuffing, vote-buying contest up there, and Vare was declared the Republican nominee by $400,000 majority. [Laughter.] They sent him down to Washington, and the Senate threw him out. [Laughter.]

Sam Insull, whom Mr. Willkie said he wanted to succeed in his great effort—you heard his speech yesterday—succeeded in purchasing a seat, he and his forces from Illinois, and sending a hand-picked Senator down to Washington, and even a Republican Senate refused to seat him.

This same old influence is now shoving forward; they are trying to paralyze our rural-electrification program; they are trying to put a stop to this internal development; they are trying to put a stop to the development of hydroelectric power. They are not going to permit the sale of power at reasonable rates if they can help it. If we lose this fight, the American people will pay $1,000,000,000 a year in overcharges from now on.

We favor the continuation of the Electric Home and Farm Authority, and such extensions of it as may be necessary to enable that organization to extend credit to the householders of America at the lowest rates of interest possible, in order that they may equip their homes with those electrical appliances necessary to lift the burdens of drudgery from the shoulders of the housewife and other members of the families, and enable them to enjoy their share of these blessings which this advance electric civilization provides.

Take it into every home; it doesn't matter whether it is on the farm or in the city. If a man in the city struggles and toils, it is useless to pay him high wages if you are going to take them away from him in house rents and utility rates. If you are going to hold him down to where he can't enjoy any of the comforts and conveniences of life, what good have you done him?

Here is the greatest issue of this campaign. I am for adequately preparing America so that no enemy will ever dare set foot on American soil. I believe in Thomas Jefferson's policy of peace; commerce and honest friendship with all nations; entangling alliances with none. But if we are going to make our country great, we must take these leeches off the American people, and the Democratic Party is going to have to do it.

Now, I want the strongest public power plant this committee can write into the platform. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I will now yield to any question you desire to ask.

MEMBER. Have you copies of this address so that we may have them?

Mr. RANKIN. There are some in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that resemble it very much. [Laughter.]

Mr. Speaker, the platform committee reported the strongest power plank ever adopted by a national convention. It was unanimously approved by the convention. In addition to pledging the party to the policy of "enlarging the rural-electrication program," the convention adopted the following plank on electric power:

ELECTRIC POWER

During the past 7 years the Democratic Party has won the first major victories for the people of the Nation in their generation-old contest with the power monopoly.

These victories have resulted in the recognition of certain self-evident principles and the realization of vast benefits by the people. These principles, long opposed by the Republican Party, are:

That the power of falling water is a gift from God, and consequently belongs not to a privileged few but to all the people, who are entitled to enjoy its benefits;

That the people have the right through their Government to develop their own power sites and bring low-cost electricity to their homes, farms, and factories;

That public-utility holding companies must not be permitted to serve as the means by which a few men can pyramid stocks upon stocks for the sole purpose of controlling vast power empires.

We have condemned the Republican policies which permitted the victimizing of investors in the securities of private power corporations, and the exploitation of the people by unnecessarily high utility costs.

We have condemned the opposition of utility power interests which delayed for years the development of national-defense projects in the Tennessee Valley and which obstructed river-basin improvements and other public projects bringing low-cost electric power to the people.

The successful power developments in the Tennessee and Columbia River Basins show the wisdom of the Democratic Party in establishing Government-owned and operated hydroelectric plants in the interests of power and light consumers.

Through these Democratic victories whole regions have been revived and restored to prosperous habitation. Production costs have been reduced. Industries have been reestablished which employ men and capital. Cheaper electricity has brought vast economic benefits to thousands of homes and communities.

These victories of the people must be safeguarded. They will be turned to defeat if the Republican Party should be returned to power. We pledge our party militantly to oppose every effort to encroach upon the inherent right of our people to be provided with this primary essential of life at the lowest possible cost.

The nomination of a utility executive by the Republican Party as its Presidential candidate raises squarely the issue whether the Nation's water power shall be used for all the people or the selfish interests of a few. We accept that issue.

This was another victory for the power consumers of America, as well as for the public power bloc. It means that this will be one of the chief issues in every campaign from now on until we succeed in developing the water power of the Nation, electrifying every farm home, and reducing rates to where every user will get his electricity at the yardstick rates, or at rates based upon the cost of production and distribution.

It means that we are on our way to an electrified America.

The Complementary Marketing Function of the Bituminous Coal Act to the Interstate Commerce Act and to the National Labor Relations Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN KEE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, September 14, 1940

ADDRESS OF W. A. RICHARDS, OF BLUEFIELD, W. VA.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks, I include the following address delivered by Mr. W. A. Richards, of Bluefield, W. Va., at the annual meeting of section of mineral law of the American Bar Association held in the city of Philadelphia, Pa., September 10, 1940. Mr. Richards is president of the Sovereign Pocahontas Co., has for a number of years been prominently identified with the coal industry of West Virginia, and his able and learned address upon a most timely subject will, I am confident, be of great public interest.

The address follows:

THE COMPLEMENTARY MARKETING FUNCTION OF THE BITUMINOUS COAL ACT TO THE INTERSTATE COMMERCE ACT AND TO THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT

The natural hesitation that I feel as a layman in addressing learned members of the bar on the intimate relationship of the three major Federal laws now regulating the bituminous-coal industry is set at rest only by the hope that a discussion of these laws from the unusual standpoint of their interrelationship to the practical production and marketing problems of an individual operator in that industry may later help the members of the legal profession to come to such a consonance of thought and interpretation of them

as to eventually result in achieving for each interest the largest possible measure of social good with the very minimum of dislocation or conflict to anyone.

I would like it clearly understood that even an intimate acquaintanceship with some of the finest guardhouse lawyers in any man's army has not hardened me sufficiently to infer that any statement I may make herein is in any sense a legal opinion. I have read the able papers of such eminent lawyers as Mr. John L. Steinbugler, Mr. Charles F. Hosford, Mr. Robert W. Knox, and that of Mr. Thomas J. Michie, and I am more than satisfied to leave the law to them. I shall try to cover other points and to talk impersonally, much as an engineer might do in describing the requirements of a bridge necessitated by given conditions of traffic and site.

The wisdom of either the Interstate Commerce Act or the National Labor Relations Act I do not presume to challenge. I accept as a base that they are now supported by the force of public opinion of the substantial majority of the American people, as is best evidenced by the public declarations of the present candidates of the major parties for the office of President of the United States. Given these conditions of traffic and site, I shall try to briefly describe the necessary role of the Bituminous Coal Act in complementing the other two acts from a marketing standpoint, and to point out the desirable objectives of their present and future consonance of interpretation from an operator's standpoint.

Certain it is to my mind that these laws are basically complementary, one to the other, and that on members of your profession rests the chief obligation to assure the needed harmony of their future interpretation and their future improvement.

RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF THE THREE LAWS IN FIXING THE TOTAL COSTS TO THE CONSUMERS

Almost all bituminous coal is consumed at points distant from the mines. Its market value is therefore determined by competition at destination. And the price at the mine is that market price less the applicable transportation cost. Because of the inflexible freight rates, competition manifests itself almost entirely in the sales price at the mine.

Outside of minor quantities shipped solely by truck and by river, or consumed at the mines, probably 90 percent or more is transported, at least in part, by rail. According to studies of the Interstate Commerce Commission, the latest being statement No. 3747, dated October 1937, the ratio of originated freight revenue to the destination value of bituminous coal in 1936 was 56 percent. The same statement gave the average of the freight revenue from all other classes of commodities to their destination values to be but 7 percent; and the corresponding ratio for such classes as "Manufacturers and Miscellaneous" to be but 5.5 percent; agricultural products to be 9.6 percent; and animal and animal products to be but 4.1 percent. If the same ratio of freight rate to delivered value obtained for coal as for the average of all other traffic, it would have reduced the freight rate from $2.25 to 28 cents per ton. Statement No. 3747 declares that these ratios indicate in a general way "the importance of freight rates as a factor in affecting financial returns in individual industries" and that, including coal, "the total freight burden is only 8.47 percent of the total value of the commodities carried."

Here, then is the first great distinction between the marketing problem of bituminous coal and that of all other classes of commodities. Manifestly, the incidence of variations in freight rates from competing mines to their common consuming markets in the United States ranges from 4 to 14 times and averages 8 times as great in its destructive effect on prices at the mine as is the effect of the freight rates on the prices of other classes of commodities at their points of production. Manifest also is the fact that a minimum of 56 percent of the rail destination cost of bituminous coal to the average consumer is thus fixed by the Interstate Commerce Commission under the Interstate Commerce Acts. Since differences in total delivered cost per ton to a consumer of 5 cents or less will divert business between mines, and since freight rate differentials between mines to present common consuming markets of 25 cents per ton are common and that they range higher than $1, their importance in allocating traffic in coal is obvious.

According to reports of governmental agencies, running from the United States Coal Commission of 1922 to the National Bituminous Coal Commission of 1937, the labor proportion of the total cost of producing and selling bituminous coal averages 60 percent. The present rates of wages and hours of work per week are fixed by voluntary collective bargaining between the operators and miners on a Nation-wide basis under the actualities of the National Labor Relations Act. Since labor costs even between mines within subdistricts, vary up to 50 cents per ton, their controlling importance is also obvious in marketing coal. This is the second great distinguishing characteristic of the marketing of bituminous coal, for this ratio of 60 percent is three times greater than is the ratio of labor costs to production value of the 48 largest manufacturing industries, and taking it together with the rail freight rates, a minimum total of 82 percent of the rail destination cost of that commodity is now fixed for the individual consumer not by the Coal Act primarily but by the costs incident to the other two Federal acts.

Of the remaining 18 percent, no less than 10 percent is estimated to be fixed by the operation directly or indirectly of some Federal or State law, leaving but 8 percent of the rail destination cost of bituminous coal to the consumer to be fixed solely through the operation of the Bituminous Coal Act. That law only provides for a realization return to the industry of its average cost before Federal income taxes and does not include any return on the investment, prudent or otherwise. If the industry possessed, inherently, the ability to operate at an average return of 6 percent, it would establish a price structure realizing cost plus 25 cents. Such a structure would be 25 cents per ton higher for every size and grade of coal to every market than the price schedules presently proposed under the act.

The present pattern of distribution or commerce in coal has been the result of the interplay of the three major economic factors of transportation cost, production cost, and quality of the coal. The distribution for the year 1937 is remarkably representative of the average commerce among the States for the 5-year period 1934 through 1938, when the industry operated under a Nation-wide wage scale with no substantial localized suspensions. Upon this pattern of distribution the social interests of the employees, the operators, the mining communities, the railroads, the consumers, and the suppliers of products to the mines, railroads, and consumers are presently builded.

The American people have, through their chosen representatives, seen fit to accord the railroads a fixed price out of the fluctuating market value for coal. They have seen fit to accord to labor a fixed price out of the same fluctuating market value for coal. It is only common sense to believe that the American people meant to accomplish just that. And since the industry has long demonstrated its inherent inability to maintain a stable market price sufficient to pay these two charges and keep itself solvent, that the American people, to make the first two acts meaningful, have desired to assure the fulfillment of the purposes of the first two acts by the complement of the Bituminous Coal Act.

I therefore accept as a base the distribution of bituminous coal for the year 1937 as representative of the interest of employees, employers, railroads, and consumers, as well as others directly dependent upon those industries.

COMPLEMENTARY MARKETING FUNCTION OF THE BITUMINOUS COAL ACT RELATIVE TO THE INTERSTATE COMMERCE ACT

The ideal marketing situation is for each mine to be able to accord each buyer, no matter where he resides in the United States, the same lowest or "most-favored-nation" mine price for any given size and class of coal that is accorded to any other buyer by that mine. Not only does this appeal to a sense of justice and good conscience, but 98.5 percent by value of the commodities carried by rail have a total freight burden of but 7 percent of their market value and can, therefore, cushion the variations and vagaries in their freight-rate charges to accomplish this end.

However, in the case of bituminous coal with a rail freight burden of 56 percent, this is utterly impossible.

The existing freight rate structure for bituminous coal is the most complex and variegated assortment of patterns possible to humanly conceive. The rates permitted the Pocahontas carriers shock the conscience because of their swollen revenues and are approved only because, as a practical matter, the rates of other carriers could not otherwise be increased, said the Interstate Commerce Commission in General Commodity Rates Increases, 1937 (227 I. C. C. 657). No single theory underlies their construction and they vary in all parts of the country from the ideal pattern, of group rates having the same fixed differentials over broad market areas between competing mines, to point-to-point rates having varying differentials from each mine to every destination within more restricted market areas. This structure is the result of accretions to and adjustments on a structure developed during the period of time prior to 1924 when their destructive force or impact on a stabilized mine price had been largely smothered by the involuntary control of production then existing in the bituminous industry which was caused by the doubling growth every 10 years in the annual consumption of coal and by the blessings of an inadequate railroad-car supply.

The full car supply to the bituminous industry, available since 1924, has had the same destructive effect, within that industry, as a full supply of whisky would have had upon the Indians.

These varying freight-rate differentials compel an operator from day to day to vary his mine prices on the same size and quality of coal as between purchasers at different destinations in an endeavor to meet the different competitive conditions then obtaining in the various consuming markets, or else to forego participation in the market demanding the lower price. Unfortunately, the election by one operator to forego such a market in order to protect his price structure by not giving a lower price to one customer than to another, is rendered void of its stabilizing effect if a single one of his competitors, having the same freight rate and quality of coal, elects otherwise And because of oversupply and the insistent need to secure the full operating time necessary to achieve a minimum cost, some operator, like death and taxes, is certain to be compelled to meet the demand of the lower market.

The force of severest competition in the market falls on the smaller sizes of screenings, chiefly a size embracing 1¼- or ¾-inch resultant screenings or fines. This is because the supply-demand ratio for the different sizes of coals increases destructively from the 10 to 9 ratio for lump to the 4 to 1 ratio for screenings because no size smaller than lump can physically be successfully applied in the large size combustion equipment, but all sizes can be applied in the smaller size combustion equipment through application of mine run or by crushing down the large sizes to the specifications of the smaller. These smaller sizes are produced as a consequence of producing the larger sizes and must be currently disposed of or else the railroad siding of the mine is

blocked off by no-bill cars of screenings and the mine must then shut down.

These small sizes are used chiefly by industries because they generally contain the same heat units as the larger sizes and have always sold for substantially less than the larger or domestic household sizes. Modern combustion furnaces, available from a cost standpoint only to larger consumers, are designed to burn these sizes with as high or higher efficiency and therefore substantial economy has resulted to these industries through their consumption of such sizes.

Naturally, the lower the price for coal the higher becomes the ratio of rail freight to destination value of coal; and, therefore, in the case of screenings (¾ inch by 0 in size) the average ratio of rail freight to destination value will not be less than 60 percent and will range as high as 90 percent.

Thus it is that the most destructive impact of varying freight-rate differentials falls on that size of coal that is the most critical from the standpoint of determining the annual opearting time of each mine. And the low cost from full operating time or the high cost from idle time are the main determining factors in the profit or loss of a particular mine in any year.

This is the size of coal that falls within the theory of Mr. E. G. Bailey, vice president of Babcock & Wilcox Co., one of the foremost combustion engineers in the world, that the joint problem of the operators, railroads, and steam generating plants is to take the latent heat of coal in the ground and transform it into steam in the pipes at the lowest possible cost.

Possibly the simplest illustration of the adverse nature of existing freight-rate differentials on the ability of mines to maintain the same price to all consumers wherever located is the situation between the low-volatile mines of central Pennsylvania and southern West Virginia. The operators in these fields share business at Worcester, Mass., New York City, and Youngstown, Ohio, among other destinations. If the mines in central Pennsylvania voluntarily establish the same price, $2.25, for example, for industrial coals to each of these destinations, the price obtainable by producers in southern West Virginia becomes the difference between the sum of the f. o. b. mine price in central Pennsylvania plus its applicable freight rate and the applicable freight rate from southern West Virginia.

This establishes for southern West Virginia $1.45 for Worcester, $1.87 for New York, and $1.25 for Youngstown. As soon as any operator from southern West Virginia grants the low competitive price of $1.25 in Youngstown, then all consumers of that size and grade of coal from southern West Virginia, residing anywhere, demand the same or "most-favored-nation price." It is not long under conditions of oversupply until that low price is quoted everywhere and until it reaches back to Worcester and New York. When it does it forces a reduction in the $2.25 price of central Pennsylvania to meet it, and immediately the reduced price of central Pennsylvania, in turn, is carried back to Youngstown by some operator in central Pennsylvania thereby forcing a reduction in the competitively compelled price of $1.25 from the operators in southern West Virginia. The merry-go-round is then ready for its second downward spiral around the same circuit.

A second illustration among the hundreds in existence is the grotesque series of differentials between the southern West Virginia low-volatile mines of district No. 7 and the southern West Virginia and eastern Kentucky high-volatile mines of district No. 8.

To tidewater markets along the eastern seaboard the freight differential is 9 cents in favor of the low-volatile mines and to Virginia destinations it is 10 cents in favor of the same mines. However, going west, the differential swings against the low-volatile mines in favor of the high volatile in the amount of 10 cents to Cincinnati, 15 cents to Richmond Ind.; 20 cents to Terre Haute, 25 cents to South Bend, then drops to 20 cents to Chicago, and to 15 cents for Minneapolis or St. Paul. Thus, swings of as much as 35 cents per ton in destination costs must be compensated for in f. o. b. mine prices, if equality of delivered prices is to be secured in each market to maintain competitive marketing opportunity for these mines. Just as in the Youngstown-New York-Worcester case, the low price named from either group to any adverse destination by any operator eventually is carried over to all destinations with the exactly similar result of kicking down the original low price.

Aiding and abetting this process is the fact that the ratio between remaining supply to remaining demand rises sharply during the industrial contracting season of the year which forces the producers who have not succeeded in selling early to seek the more adverse markets. The price such an operator is forced to make in this adverse or remote market is then quoted back by him to all markets without knowledge or thought in most instances that his competition lessens in his sheltered markets.

The complementary marketing function of the Bituminous Coal Act in relation to the Interstate Commerce Act is thus seen to be the opportunity it affords to establish prices at the mines that reduce to the very minimum the variations therein necessary to compensate for the existing differentials in freight rates to common markets and yet to still maintain the commerce in coal among the States without friction or diversion. These price differentials necessitate the force of law to secure their maintenance against conditions of prevailing oversupply in the market.

COMPLEMENTARY MARKETING FUNCTION OF THE BITUMINOUS COAL ACT TO THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT

The ideal marketing situation with respect to a Nation-wide wage scale would be first a uniform freight rate from every mine to every destination and similar conditions of cost of production and quality of coal from each producing mine.

Of course, neither uniform freight rates, uniform costs of production, nor uniform qualities of coal happen to prevail. Rather there is every conceivable variation and gradation of each of these three major economic factors.

The unregulated forces of free enterprise broke down the prices of bituminous coal from $2.68 per ton in 1923 to $1.10 during the first half of 1933, in successive yearly declines that were virtually unbroken for each district except for a slight pause of 2 cents per ton in 1926, a year of most extraordinary demand that resulted from long strikes in the American anthracite industry and in the entire British coal industry.

The struggle among mines for survivorship during that period caused all semblance of uniform wage scales within districts or as between districts to disappear except possibly in some sporadic subdistricts, such as those of Illinois. Individual operators, obeying the primitive self-preservation instinct, had largely established varying rates at their mines that tended more and more to be predicated on the economic principle of ability to pay at the level of market price then obtaining. This, of course, was an inevitable consequence caused by the substantial variations in margins secured by mines operating in even the same seam of coal in the same district resulting from differences in the physical conditions of bed horizon, thickness of seam, character of roof and bottom, amount of impurities, and prevailing conditions of the workings. The severity of this unrestricted competition in lowering standards of living can be judged from the fact that wages paid employees in coal mines in West Virginia dropped from an average of $175,000,000 during the 4 years ending June 30, 1923, to less than $52,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1933.

Organization of the industry by the United Mine Workers of America followed rapidly upon the passage of the National Industrial Recovery Act in June of 1933 and by late September of that year a wage contract substantially covering the entire industry had been negotiated through the collective-bargaining process coincidentally with a complementary price-fixing coal code.

An industry-wide wage scale arbitrarily wipes out the individual mine rates within large mining subdistricts that had been based on individual mine ability to pay and sets average uniform rates in lieu thereof. It also narrows, to the economic extreme, broad geographical differentials between sections of that industry. This is because of the competitive ambitions on the part of the advantaged operators and the human interests of the representatives of the miners. Naturally, the low cost or high realization operators gain a substantial financial advantage thereby because of the exceptionally high proportion that wages bear to total costs.

Time alone is all that is theoretically necessary for an ideal business monopoly to inexorably result from such a national wage scale under the price-shattering forces of free enterprise. In the past, however, the fact that coal-mine labor is not susceptible to resettlement in other industries, combined with the force of local opinion desperately trying to preserve its only pay roll, has heretofore tended to prevent an actual business monopoly from obtaining for long. Eventually, resort to just beating widespread bankruptcy by breaking the wage scale sufficiently to permit continuing operation of the hitherto marginal mines has acted to break the threatened business monopoly.

Therefore, one basic principle that must underlie an industry-wide wage scale is that all districts and subdistricts in the bituminous industry must be kept reasonably alive. Economically, this can only be done by a market price sufficiently high to enable that scale to be maintained by such a substantial majority of the operators in the various districts as to secure local public opinion to support it. Studies of frequency tables of realization and costs indicate that a minimum price approximating average cost will enable from 50 percent up to 65 percent of the tonnage in each district to break even or show a profit. Sixty-five percent has thus been regarded by experienced operators in the industry as the bulk line point from which any further drop in realization has heretofore started the cycle of broken wage scales. This is the basis of the return provisions of the present act.

Lest too little regard is accorded to this underlying principle, because shut-downs and bankruptcies have not assumed alarming proportions in the industry during the extensive period necessary to establish valid prices, your attention is directed to the fact the last wage agreement was negotiated only as a consequence of a 6 weeks' shut-down of the mines in the big Appalachian territory, comprising some 70 percent of the Nation's tonnage. This, of course, represented an attempt to improve the market price by a crude form of production control. As Mr. J. L. Steinbugler has told you, the prohibitive shut-down cost of 15 cents to 20 cents per ton of annual capacity to maintain an idle mine practically compels the marginal operator to operate his mine until his working capital and his credit have been entirely wiped out by losses, since his only other alternative is to abandon his property, and once and for all time to sustain the loss of his entire investment.

The direct effect of the act on increasing the standard of living among the employees in the mining industry is illustrated by the fact that the wages paid to employees in the bituminous industry in West Virginia for the fiscal year 1940 increased to $156,000,000 from the $51,800,000 paid in the year ending June 30, 1933. Of the former figure some $25,000,000 is due to greater tonnage shipped.

Thus the complementary marketing function of the Bituminous Coal Act with reference to the National Labor Relations Act is seen to be not only in raising the standard of living and improving the

opportunities for our youth, but in preventing a business monopoly from occurring by means other than the broken wage scales of the past.

CONSONANCE OF INTERPRETATION OF THE THREE LAWS

The thread of symmetry that I find in the interpretation of the three laws was eloquently expressed by Justice Cardozo in his minority opinion in the Carter case to be "the maintenance of commerce among the States without friction or diversion."

Certain it is that the essence of a Nation-wide union wage scale must be to preserve the various locals that make up its whole, for otherwise survivorship alone must compel the idle employees to drop their membership in that union.

Certain it also is that future diversion of commerce among the carriers must force higher rate differentials on the gaining districts in an arbitrary attempt to continue the allocation of railroad traffic. The greater resulting revenue needs of the traffic losers bar adjustments downward in their rates.

Surely the only pragmatic test of whether the existing fair competitive opportunities for the average operator have been preserved by his price relationships under the Coal Act will be the resulting fact of whether he continues to sell his coal in the same relative volume to his competitors or not, consumer requirements and production limitations excepted.

Since freight rate levels and wage rate levels are the result of unity of action among the carriers and the employees, respectively, and that these two factors compose over 80 percent of the rail-delivered cost to the consumer, the stockholders of the coal industry have no more say in the choice of its defensive weapons to fight its economic battles than does England have against Hitler. It must adopt the same unity of action with respect to its price levels. Otherwise the stockholders are in the position of spotting the carriers and labor pat hands in a poker game in which the delivered market value of coal comprises the table stakes, and then trying to win their proper economic share by beating the pat hands by the futile task of drawing better cards.

Acceptance of the principle of the maintenance of commerce among the States without friction or diversion as being both the social and the economic objective standard of the three laws, immediately paves the civilized way for unity of action among the three interests to increase the use of bituminous coal through the lower production costs that will result from profitable operation of the mines and from the research that profitable operation alone permits; to increase the consumer satisfaction in the purchase of coal by eliminating a great many of the arbitrary freight-rate differentials that now compel variations in mine prices and thus provoke a sense of consumer discrimination; and by mutual and intelligently proportioned adjustments of rates and prices to meet the competition of laborless fuels. The accomplishment of the Baily theory is only possible, from an engineer's viewpoint, by the complementary marketing function of the Bituminous Coal Act to the other acts in fulfilling Mr. Justice Cardozo's thread of symmetry.

FUTURE OF THE COAL ACT

a. Criticism of the Act

I recognize, of course, that every industry is composed of three groups of participants. First, that third economically advantaged by production costs or quality and by transportation charges, or by a combination of either two or all of these economic factors. Second, that third disadvantaged by these factors, and lastly the middle third having advantages over some competitors and disadvantages against others.

The record of continuing financial losses to the industry over a long period of years is sufficient for an engineer to accept as evidence of an inherent inability of a voluntary price structure to carry the imposed financial load, and that under the factual record of that generation of experience, that private rights must succumb to public need. Low costs for an entire industry come from profits and not from losses because "the profit motive constitutes the incentive to human endeavor which makes industrial efficiency possible."

With criticisms that the magnitude of the task warrants its abandonment, I have utterly no patience. The officers of the mining companies have been hired by their stockholders to earn money and not to whimper that the job is difficult. Certainly it is a job to be done, whether hard or simple, and the admitted point that it is a task of great magnitude immediately confirms the fact that only by an industrial organization such as is provided in Coal Act could it ever hope to be done. Certainly it is futile to conceive of its being accomplished under the hopeless conditions of the individual marketing cannibalism of open competition.

Nullification of freight rates charged by some critics is an absurdity. Thousands of pages of testimony in congressional hearings, Interstate Commerce Commission hearings, and Bituminous Coal Division hearings bear uncontradicted factual evidence that it is open competition itself that tends to nullify freight rate allocation barriers, by concessions in price larger than the freight differential, and that the price structure under the Coal Act, on the exact contrary limits the mine-price adjustment to the exact freight-rate differentials in the case of common markets, quality being equal, and to less than the freight-rate barrier in the case of markets not common to the producer.

Criticism of the act has been made on the ground that it is not coordinated with a national-fuel policy including oil, gas, hydroelectric power, and anthracite coal.

Competition with such fuels is at destination, and excepting only anthracite coal, the greatest factor in such competition has been the increasing transportation burden placed on bituminous coal. As Commissioner Aitchison stated in his dissenting opinion in General Rate Level Investigation, 1933 (195 I. C. C. 78):

"Generally those commodities which are closest to the soil—agricultural products, fruits, lumber and its products, and coal—have been considered as 'tied to the rails,' and every effort has been made to adhere to the standard-rate scales, so that relatively they have been compelled to bear the greatest proportion of the transportation burden."

Nowhere has such competition been keener than that with fuel oil along the Atlantic seaboard from Norfolk to Porland. The record shows that despite the fact that the Pocahontas carriers were then operating at a net railway-operating income equivalent to cost plus 48 percent after Federal income taxes, that the destination spot price of fuel oil had declined to a comparative price less than the tidewater rail freight alone on coal from the mines on their lines, that wages had been cut to the bone and that the mines were admittedly operating at a cash loss, relief in the form of lower competitive freight rates could not be secured by the coal industry in 1933 either by formal action before the Interstate Commerce Commission nor by informal conferences with the carriers.

The record of the last 18-year period discloses that open competition in the coal industry has been utterly no safeguard to protection from inroads of oil competition along the seaboard because the greatest losses to coal have occurred during the years of lowest mine prices and the resultant periods of strikes or suspensions and the carriers took advantage of the helplessness of the coal industry during this period to actually raise the transportation charges.

Certain it is, therefore, that future competition with such fuels should be met by mutuality of action of the carriers, operators, and miners as, when, and how it develops. To the extent that profitable operation of the mines induces a lowering of general costs and prevents labor disputes, the Coal Act, of itself, will aid the competitive situation of the industry with respect to competing fuels.

The competition of fuels requiring less labor in their production and transportation is part of the much larger problem of existing unemployment in the United States. That unemployment can only be relieved by making employment of such labor profitable.

The Coal Act tends to prevent a business monopoly from occurring because of the opportunity it gives to a greater number of operators to still participate therein with chances of ultimate financial success. Competition of a fair, sound, and healthy nature will be fostered by the very degree that such monopoly is lessened. Criticisms of the act in this respect are as unfounded as are those criticisms charging the annual losses of the industry in the past several years to the operation of the law. There has been no establishment of prices except for a brief period, and these annual deficits have been but the continuation of the string of financial losses to the industry occurring since 1923 due to the unrestrained play of the forces of free enterprise on this industry.

There is but one criticism of the Coal Act that I have consistently felt had some merit and that is whether simple price establishment over a long run of years can withstand the ravages of substantial fluctuations in demand if it was unsupported by direct control over output, or over shipment in commerce. Voluntary provision for such control is provided in the marketing-agency section of the present act.

As Mr. Charles F. Hosford stated in addressing this same section in 1936, the minimum prices have the purpose of balancing production to demand in order that the market as a whole may return the average cost of the industry.

Obviously the necessary restriction in output to achieve such a market value depends primarily on adequate enforcement of the act. In turn, enforcement is rendered easy or hard depending upon the ratio of available supply to current demand, because a demand equalling supply would naturally make enforcement moot. How severe a drop in demand relative to available supply that it would take to so multiply administrative difficulties, though applications for changes by individual mines for more favorable price classifications and thus induce enforcement difficulties by virtue of the numbers involved, cannot be foretold in advance any more than one can predict when such drop in supply-demand ratio would occur, if ever, in the future. Too many variables, such as the impact of the fact that no one mine produces more than a fraction of 1 percent of the total consumption in the largest price area and that therefore classification may not be as important as the length of hearings taken has indicated, such as the opportunity the price stabilization gives to accomplish physical mergers of mines or selling agencies, and such as the operation of marketing agencies may counteract successfully dire predictions or forebodings of difficulties in other directions.

Certain it is to my mind that if freight rates and wage rates can survive the economic pressure of the past 5 years that such fact is an earnest that adequate enforcement can also accomplish the same result with the Coal Act.

I have no doubt whatsoever, that, barring the unescapable imperfections in a task as monumental as the fixing of minimum prices for the entire bituminous industry, that consumers of coal will find great satisfaction in a stabilized price structure from the standpoint of knowing with certitude the prices for coal that their competitors are in reality paying, in the opportunity for reductions in delivered costs or in securing parity of mine prices from a consonance of action under the three laws, and in the

satisfaction that it gives every American to be a part of the profit system. No purchasing agent has ever taken pride in holding the nose of the bituminous industry under the water level of profit; he has only been forced to do so by the requirements of his job to buy as economically as his competitor.

I have no doubt also that the producer of coal, under a price schedule that is simplicity itself compared to his daily variations under open competition and which is no less than 100 times better coordinated with all of his competitors, will find the same great satisfaction at knowing definitely what his price competition actually is, as he has taken for that reason in a uniform wage scale.

No one has expressed the feeling in the industry better than Mr. James W. Carter in the latter regard when he testified in the Carter case.

"So far as labor is concerned, I am sure there is a unanimity of feeling that the men and women employed by and dependent upon the industry should not be subject to a lowering of their standards of living because of the unrestrained play of economic forces. It seems obvious and unanswerable that some provision must be made for the protection of these workers, and it would seem that the best sort of protection which could be afforded them would be the maintenance by statute, of maximum hours of labor and minimum rates of pay" (*Carter* v. *Carter Coal Co.*, R. 278).

Certainly no producer nor consumer, unanimously echoing that feeling, can have anything but satisfaction at operating under and in paying, respectively, prices that translate this social and economic doctrine into an actuality. Therefore, I have no doubt as to the sincere support of the price structure by public opinion, including the producers and consumers.

b. Modification of the act

Strongly as I feel in regard to the probability that simple price fixing will reasonably stabilize the price structure of the coal industry under conditions now possible of prediction for the next few years, I, as an engineer enamored with the axiom that a straight line is the shortest distance between two points, do not desire for a moment to fail to advocate an amendment to the present act establishing a supplementary control of output through marketing quotas.

Only the fact, as stated in Senate Report No. 252, dated March 25, 1937, that direct production control of bituminous coal was of doubtful constitutionality prevented the use of such means to regulate the industry under the present act.

Since then, however, the Supreme Court, in *Mulford* v. *Smith* (307 U. S. 38), has drawn the line of constitutional validity to include the establishment of marketing quotas in interstate commerce, as prophesied by Mr. John L. Steinbugler, and since, from an engineering standpoint, unlimited production of coal at the mine, while physically possible, would not be a desirable or feasible matter if shipments in interstate commerce were restricted, the establishment of marketing quotas in commerce would practically, if not legally, accomplish the same purpose as direct control of production.

As Mr. John L. Steinbugler pointed out to you in 1936, all foreign countries, after years of experience, had centered their regulation of their coal-mining industries around the direct control of production. Such a stabilization measure is now being attempted on a voluntary basis in the Anthracite Coal Industry of Pennsylvania.

The desirability of such an amendment springs from the fact that it simplifies many of the practical problems that arise in the control of output of coal solely by means of price fixing.

It would reduce to a minimum the need for price variations as to common market areas, as to sizes, and as to uses. By placing the premium on possession of the coal rather than on possession of the order, it would greatly aid enforcement of the price provisions of the act.

Its consonance with the Interstate Commerce Act and the National Labor Relations Act I have already outlined.

The standards laid down in the Agricultural Act of 1938 relating to the establishment of marketing quotas in tobacco, that have been approved by the Supreme Court with respect to fixing quotas, allotments, treatment of new farms, and transfers of quotas among farms, seem to be well suited to the requirements of the bituminous industry and can be accepted, by an engineer, in such an amendment to the coal act with the confidence that they are not constitutional experiments.

CONCLUSION

1. I conclude that so long as the Interstate Commerce Acts and the National Labor Relations Act remain in effect that the Bituminous Coal Act is necessary as the marketing complement to each.

2. That the Bituminous Coal Act affords the necessary means to tremendously simplify the present rail freight-rate structure in the direction of permitting the widest possible extension of consumer parity or "most favored nation prices" at the mine and thus conduce to consumer satisfaction and to the increased use of coal.

3. That modification of the coal act should now be sought, in the light of the decision of the United States Supreme Court in Mulford against Smith, to establish marketing quotas for bituminous coal in interstate commerce for the purpose of simplifying the control of production in that industry now exercised by the mediums of freight rates, wage rates, and fixed prices.

4. That the consonance of interpretation of the three laws should be the maintenance of commerce in bituminous coal between the States without friction or diversion.

Address Before Golden Anniversary Convention of the International Printing Pressmen and Assistants' Union of North America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. B. CARROLL REECE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 13, 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. B. CARROLL REECE, OF TENNESSEE

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an address which I delivered before the golden anniversary convention of the International Printing Pressmen and Assistants' Union of North America, held at Pressmen's Home, September 1940:

Mr. President and delegates to the International Printing Pressmen and Assistants' Convention, I received the invitation to address you with a great deal of pleasure because Tennessee is your home, as it were. All the citizens of this State are proud of the fact that the pressmen's home is located in the State of Tennessee, and I am especially proud of the fact that it is located in my district. I am also proud not only of the fact that Tennessee's distinguished son, and my personal friend, is president of this great organization, but that you are meeting here today, in your home, among our beloved east Tennessee hills; and I wish to say that whatever we have, the beauty of our mountains and plains and the hospitality of our hearts, are yours.

Inasmuch as you meet in convention only every 4 years, you have much serious business to transact at this convention. Many events have happened in the world, and many events have happened in our own United States of America since your last convention—events which give us pause; developments which cause use grave concern; developments which we, as Americans, must meet and meet bravely. Not only are world conditions terribly unsettled, not only does bloody war grip the most of Europe, and the smoke and the flame of conflict cover the Far East as well, but our own internal problems are such that they will require our best efforts, our united energy, and our deepest patriotism to overcome, in order that we may not face trouble perhaps from without and from within at the same time.

Therefore, I come to you today as a Representative in Congress, as your representative, not to discuss any of these questions from a partisan standpoint, but to discuss them with you as one American with his fellow Americans; as a citizen of one nation undivided; one people inseparable, whose interests are all bound up together, whose efforts must be for one another if they are to protect each individual in his rights and liberties, as we have known them all our lives in this Nation.

I wish to remind you of something which, of course, you already know, and that is the mutuality of interests between employers and employees. To any thinking man or woman it must be obvious that there is an inseparable mutuality of interest between the employer and the employee. The interests of both the employer and the employee depend upon the consuming public with the purchasing power to acquire and the capacity to consume the goods and services which are produced in the process of the manufacture and distribution of goods and services in our free economy.

It must also be obvious to every thinking person that nothing which steps down industry, which interferes with it too much, which paralyzes it, or causes it to cease to operate, can take place without having a serious, if not disastrous, impact upon labor. After all, we must never forget, my friends, that the only reason for production is consumption. All jobs depend upon consumption. All profits depend upon consumption. All reason for industry of every kind and character depends upon consumption.

It is only in the production of goods and services that we actually produce real wealth. We all know that. It is the exchange value of pay-roll dollars for goods and services that governs the actual wages of the American working man and woman. Regardless of how many dollars are in the pay envelope for any given number of hours of work, it still remains an inevitable and inescapable fact that it is the exchangeability of those pay-roll dollars for goods and services that determines whether or not the wage earners of America will live well or will live poorly.

The question of equitable division of what is produced is as old as history, is older than history, as a matter of fact. Disputes between employer and employee have been going on ever since the first man employed the second man to work for him. Yet I submit to you that it is an undeniable fact that labor attained to greater dignity, it has made greater progress in the United States of America, it has achieved greater rights, it has reached greater heights of accomplishment, both socially and economically, than the working people of any nation in the world ever achieved at any time in history.

In no other country in the world do the working people have anything like the luxurious mode of life they possess in the United States.

Now, just as it is true that this mutuality of interests involves the welfare of the workers whenever industry is interrupted from any cause whatsoever, it is equally true that that same mutuality of interests makes it impossible for labor to be injured without industry being hurt as well.

Since one is the natural complement of the other, and since both are dependent upon a prosperous consuming public, and since the great body of that consuming public necessarily is made up of wage earners, then it naturally follows that any disagreements, any quarrels which cannot be amicably settled, any legislation or any other disturbance of the operations of industry, necessarily must hurt both the employers and the employees. At the same time such conditions must result in either a let-down or a cessation in the production of real wealth—goods and services—and in that way to hurt the consuming public as well.

It must be obvious, it is obvious to all of us, that the more abundant life cannot possibly be gained unless we produce more and more of goods and services—of those things which contribute to, and which are necessary to, the more abundant life, unless we continue to produce them in ever-increasing quantities and at ever-reduced prices without a reduction of wages.

We all agree, I think, that the American economy must be an ever-expanding economy. We must continue, if we are to maintain and perpetuate our free economy, to produce more and more goods and services at lower and lower prices in order that the wage dollar and the farm dollar may have a higher rate of exchangeability for the real wealth of goods and services that go to make up those things which we need and must have if we are to be happy.

This question of the mutual responsibility of industry and labor to each other and to the consumers is not political and it ought never to be made political. It is purely an economic question; it affects us all. You can readily see, of course, that if you are not at work, if you have no wages, the doctor, the barber, the butcher, the candlestick maker must all suffer because you have no money whereby to engage their services or to consume their goods. On the other hand, it is obvious that if industry cannot afford to employ labor and you are out of jobs, then you are not living the more abundant life, you are living a life of hardship and privation along with your dependents.

Now, I am one of those who regards as highly dangerous this trend of the Government taking over paternalistically more and more of the functions of labor unions. I recall that that splendid and able labor statesman, Samuel Gompers, preached for 40 years and more to the labor unions of the United States the gospel of independence of governmental regulation and control. He said time and again that if the labor unions went to the Government to get things done for them, in doing that they gave the Government the right and the opportunity to do things to them if the Government happened at any time to be antagonistic instead of sympathetic to organized labor.

We all recognize the dangerous group pressures which have grown up. Every group and class in the United States wants a subsidy of some sort at the expense of all the other groups and classes, with the result that if all these pressure groups get what they want, all the benefits of all groups would necessarily be nullified by the benefits and the subsidies granted to other groups; we would be no better off than we were before.

Let me also remind you at this point that the working people do not escape taxation. Mr. Roosevelt once well said that:

"Taxes are paid in the sweat of every man who labors. * * * If excessive, they are reflected in idle factories, tax-sold farms and, hence, in hordes of the hungry tramping the streets and seeking jobs in vain. Our workers may never see a tax bill, but they must pay in deductions from wages, in increased cost of what they buy, or—as now—in broad cessation of employment. * * * Our people and our business cannot carry its excessive burdens of taxation."

He never spoke truer words in his life.

The burden of hidden taxes is constantly rising. In 1930 those taxes bearing most heavily on the well-to-do contributed 68.2 percent of the Government's total internal-revenue and customs receipts while miscellaneous taxes and customs receipts bearing most heavily on the consumer—the wage earners—contributed only 31.8 percent of such receipts. As of last Christmas Day, this situation had been almost exactly reversed. According to a statement by Secretary of the Treasury Henry Morgenthau, on December 22 the taxes bearing most heavily on the consumers had gone to more than 60 percent, while the taxes falling most heavily upon the well-to-do had gone to less than 40 percent of the total revenues and customs receipts of the Government.

It means something to you, and it means more to your wives, who have to do the buying, that Federal, State, county, and municipal taxes today in this country consume about 22½ percent of the national income. Let me say to you that those who are making $150 a month are paying in indirect and hidden taxes alone something like $242 a year.

There must be an economic balance between profits and wages, as related to the price the consumers must pay, if they are to have the goods and services which the wage earners of this country must produce if they are to continue to work and to live well.

In the very nature of the American system of economy, then, it is just as important for the wage earners to help to keep the wheels of industry turning as it is for the employers. The wages of workers depend upon the wheels of industry continuing to turn.

The profits of the employers depend upon the wheels of industry continuing to turn. The returns on the investment of capital also depend upon the wheels of industry continuing to turn; and above all, most importantly, the whole standard of living of all of our people depends upon the wheels of industry continuing to turn. That is why it is of such grave and tremendous importance that we put an end to the fears of industry, that we again induce private capital to venture into production, that, as soon as possible, we begin to reduce taxes on business instead of increasing them, in order that industry may carry the burden without having to take it out of wages or without having to close down. That is why it is so important that there be an attitude of helpful cooperation, instead of hostility and suspicion, between the government and business and between industry and labor.

I want to call your attention to the trends we are facing throughout the world today. There is no denying that there is a trend toward dictatorship all over the world. It is also an undeniable fact, my good friends, that in every totalitarian country on this globe organized labor has been wiped out. The wage earners have been brought under the heel of dictatorship the same as everybody else. The labor unions have been disbanded. Their wages have been lowered. Their hours of labor have been lengthened. The conditions of that labor have grown perfectly terrible in most of these countries; and their living levels have gone back 50 years.

Dictatorship, as we all know, begins with small encroachments on the rights and privileges and liberties of the people. It is in most cases a gradual—an almost imperceptible—centralization of government in the hands of a few—most of them people who never submit themselves or their policies to public approval, but who gain power as bureaucrats. Always—without fail—the dictator comes as a savior of the poor people. He comes as a champion of the workers. He makes them extravagant promises of plenty, of leisure, and of short hours of labor at high wages, until he gets power; and then he does precisely what Stalin has done in terror-ridden Russia, what Mussolini has done in crushed Italy, and what Hitler has done in driven Germany—he abolishes the labor unions, he regiments the workers, he gives them their orders and they accept whatever working conditions, whatever wages and whatever hours of labor the dictator prescribes, or they are stood against the wall, or are sent to concentration camps. The trend in the United States has been more and more toward centralization of government in the hands of those at Washington—and I do not now have reference to any particular Administration; it has been true under the Republicans as well as under the Democrats and under the New Deal, because the tendency has been under way for a good many years due to general world conditions, and the pressures of competition in the markets of the world.

There has been an assault on the independence of the judiciary. There has been an assault upon the freedom of the press. There has been regimentation of the farmers. Any curtailment of personal privilege is going to be a curtailment of your privileges along with those of all the other citizens of the United States. I dare say there is no class of citizens in this country who prize more highly and who are ready to fight more determinedly for personal liberty and the Bill of Rights than members of labor unions. Without those liberties there would be no such thing as the labor organization in the first place; secondly, you would not have the privilege, through your unions, of collective bargaining. In the totalitarian countries labor has nothing whatsoever to say about the conditions under which it has to work or the hours it has to work, or the wages it gets for the work. It takes orders. Of course, the very essence of free speech is a free press and a free radio. If the press can be suppressed, if the radio can be influenced or censored, then the next step is to make it so dangerous for the private citizen to express his views that he, too, will remain silent. Now, it is only a step from that point to forcing the labor unions to be silent as well. And, thus, step by step, some of them, as I said a while ago, almost imperceptible, we journey toward dictatorship in one form or another.

Now, I want to speak very frankly about some fallacies and pretenses that some people are trying to foist upon you. You have heard a good deal about conscription of men. But there has been a declaration almost every day that all of the special objectives that have been gained in the last 8 years are to be continued in spite of any requirements growing out of our necessity to build hastily an adequate national defense. Now, of course, you and I, all of us, want a national defense for this country adequate to

protect us against any attempted aggression by any nation or any combination of nations at any time. But we want that national defense built as economically and as efficiently as possible, and in the shortest time possible consistent with economy and efficiency. But in the debates over the conscription bill a good many spokesmen have tried to impress upon the wage earners of the United States that labor was not to be touched in this thing. Now, don't be fooled by that. A little quiet thought will show you the fallacy of those arguments. Whenever any man, young or old, is taken from his job, whether he is getting 40 cents a day, or $4 a day, or $14 a day, whenever he is taken by the Government from his job in private life and is impressed into the military service of the Nation at board and uniform and $21 a month, he has been conscripted, and that is conscription of a worker, of a wage earner, of labor. Now, it would be a wholly different thing if a wage earner were taken from his regular occupation in private life and were put into the Army either at the same work or some other work but were given the same wages; he would in such case be transferred from private life to the Army but he would not be conscripted in the sense of his labor being taken for less money for the service of the Government than he gets in private life for the same service.

Now, that does not mean to say, gentlemen, that we can have any quarrel with the philosophy that every citizen owes to his Nation in time of peril his best services. He does, of course. But I merely want to clear up the point in your minds about conscription of labor. The great mass of those who will be taken in under the Conscription Act will be from the working classes of the United States.

Now, let me touch upon another point. There has been a good deal of agitation and debate over the amendment to the Conscription Act to give the Government power to commandeer plants in event the Secretary of the Navy or the Secretary of War or somebody else in the Government cannot reach a proper agreement with industry. It has been urged that Congress has been to blame because the progress on the national defense has bogged down. Well, now, let me tell you something that your President, Major Barry knows—you know it if you stop to think about it: There has always existed, and there exists now, power under the Constitution for the Government to condemn and to take over for public use any private property of any character and reasonably and rightfully to compensate the owner therefor. That is all that is proposed to be done under this amendment, which was put into this bill, in my opinion, for purely political purposes. We are not discussing now the question of whether or not wealth, so-called, or industry, so-called, should be conscripted to do its part along with the workingman who is being conscripted. We are talking now about this insistence that they are going to conscript industry along with labor. They are definitely not going to do anything of the sort, and the amendment which was added in the Senate to the conscription bill does not accomplish that end at all. What does take place if the powers given to the Government in this amendment, which simply parallel, as I said a moment ago, the powers already existing under the Constitution; then the Government would take over a plant or plants and the owners thereof would be compensated for them at a fair price. Now, there is a vast difference between taking a man who is making $4 or $14 a day in private life and yanking him into the Army, away from his family, and saying to him, "Here's a uniform. We will give you your meals, a cot, and you will get $21 a month," and the Government taking over a going industry or a plant and paying its owners full value for it under some court decision.

I do not intend to discuss today the question of conscripting men or conscripting industry or conscripting wealth beyond what I have told you. I do want to impress upon you, however, that the welfare of each one of us is the welfare of all of us, and the welfare of all of us is necessarily the welfare of each one of us. There can be no concentration of Government at Washington, there can be no regimentation of any of the citizens, there can be no suppression of liberties granted us under the Bill of Rights, there can be no suppression of free press or free speech, without affecting all of us. At the end of that road lies dictatorship and nothing else, because just as surely as the sun rises yonder over Clinch Mountain, it is in the very nature of humanity and the very nature of government that if, as and when all criticism can be effectively silenced, love of power, arrogance, and dictatorship will follow as night follows day.

Now, as I have said, this amendment to the conscription act purports to empower the Government to take over these plants. Now, if the Government does take over any industries, and if the Government had 500,000 or 1,000,000 or 2,000,000 men in the armed service, what do you think is going to happen if there is any discontent, or disagreement between the workers in those plants and the military officials? You know just as well as I do what will happen. The military officials will simply pick out from among the soldiers men skilled in operating those industries and they will put them there and they will be working there under assigned duty as soldiers at $21 a month, and labor not in the military service will find itself out. Now, if that should prove to be the case, there is nothing organized labor can do about it, because organized labor cannot strike against the Government even in peacetimes; and manifestly it could not strike against the Government if the military officials chose to replace civil workers with military workers in any commandeered plant. So, then, my friends, don't be fooled by these protestations that labor is not going to be required to make sacrifices along with everybody else in connection with the preparation of the national defense or in time of war.

Now the fact of the matter is, and Major Barry knows this undoubtedly as well as do I, this conscription bill and this amendment to commandeer plants are just two steps toward the enactment of the mobilization plan in peacetime. That mobilization plan would make of the President of the United States, whoever he is, an absolute military dictator. Boards and commissions would be set up to cooperate with the Army and the Navy, but the Army and Navy officers would be in supreme command under the President of the United States. And let me say to you that there is not a single representative of either labor or agriculture provided for on any of those boards and commissions. Not one.

So then it behooves you to be very vigilant against any overconcentration of power, against the danger that may be hidden either in conscription bills or in bills to commandeer the plants of industry.

I think it is only fair to say that Republican administrations have operated this Nation for 42 out of the 50 years between the end of the Civil War and the beginning of the last World War, and except for 4 years of the Cleveland Democratic administration American industry boomed and labor prospered beyond example, and organized labor developed most of its present strength.

During that long period labor was not yet formed into mobile voting groups, and all of the benefits received under Republican rule were granted without cracks of whips or without threats, so common today, and without huge contributions by organized labor to any political war chest.

Everything that was done to improve the condition and position of labor during this period was done because of the party's natural interest in labor. It was sympathetic. The welfare of both labor and the Nation was best served by endowing workmen with certain powers and certain rights to maintain a definite position in our scheme of economic activity.

I remind you of these facts not because the Republican Party has been the only party that has tried to do anything for labor but to remind you that the New Deal administration has not been the only administration that ever tried to do anything for labor.

Now I am not trying to talk politics here. I am merely pointing out that the evolution of American labor has come about through the evolutions of the times, and not through the actions of any particular political party.

Now, you in this convention represent probably one of the most enlightened and able unions of artisans to be found in the United States or in the world. You are men competent to pass upon these questions You are competent to think for yourselves as to the justice or the advisability of a conscription plan; as to the justice or the advisability of trying to conscript wealth and industry; and you are also competent to look beneath the surface of political promises and to see what dangers to the welfare of the worker lie hidden in these measures.

I haven't a doubt in this world that you fully agree with me that we want to keep our Nation out of war if it is humanly possible to do so.

We want to be at peace with every other nation of the world if we can be at peace with them, and we want to continue to expand our own life; we want to continue to improve our own country; we want to continue to discover and produce more and more of the good things of life.

War is destruction, and therefore it is retrogression; it is never progress. You and I know that following the war there will be economic conditions that must react first and most forcibly against the wage earners. Hard times always do.

Economic chaos always affects the workers first. We face today in this country a very grave danger of inflation, and inflation is bound to hit the workers first, because it actually reduces the exchangeability of their wages for goods and services because prices get clear out of bounds.

Personally, I think there has been too much hysteria created by this war scare. I do not think we are in danger of invasion from any source at this time. I do not believe that the pioneer spirit is dead in America. I believe that America not only has the most magnificient production plant, but she has the ablest and the most intelligent workers, the most competent workers, the most energetic workers, and we can get busy in this country and in less time than it can be done in any other country in the world we can produce a national defense that will be adequate to protect us from any possible danger that might threaten us from any source anywhere in the world.

It especially behooves organized labor, my fellow citizens, to be on guard against the hysteria of war. There is no question in my mind, and I do not believe there is any question in your mind, that if we do get into a war, labor will lose many of its rights and privileges. Many of the gains it has made in the last 20 or 30 years would be lost, certainly for the duration of the war, and in all probability for sometime after the duration of the war, and possibly for many generations to come.

I do not know how many of you may be familiar with the 1939 revision of the industrial-mobilization plan, but I can tell you—and I dare say Major Berry knows about this—that there

is a provision in the 1939 revision of the 1936 Mobilization Act, which in turn was a revision of an earlier act, providing that the commissions and boards of control set up to aid the Army and the Navy in regimenting all of the men, women, and children in the United States, shall be continued after the termination of the emergency until such time as the Commander in Chief shall decide that the readjustment has taken place and restoration to normal life has come about.

It is never a bad thing and in most cases it is a very good thing, to proceed very cautiously about these matters of war, and it certainly can do no harm for us here today to look at this question squarely, to review a little history, and to see actually what has happened to bring any threat of war to us.

A year has passed since war was declared in Europe. As pointed out recently by a very well known columnist, a movement was started here to amend our Neutrality Act. That act, as you will recall, had been passed originally under the theory that should war come in Europe we might be drawn into it if we put ourselves in the way of making money out of it.

We knew that if our ships ventured into the war zones, or if our bankers loaned money to England and France, if our neutrals traveled on belligerent ships, if, in other words, we put ourselves in the way of being an economic ally of one of the warring powers, we might then reasonably expect the other to become offended at us and thus by a series of provocations get us into war.

As was pointed out by this columnist, the President and his congressional leaders demanded certain amendments to that law. They said that these amendments would strengthen the law, that they would make us actually neutral. When the act was passed, they told the American people that we were now safely insulated from involvement in Europe's war.

Now, let us just recall that since that time not one of the European powers has committed against us any act of war. Not one of them has done anything to us to which we can take exception. None of them has insulted us or crossed our path in any way.

Yet, despite those facts, we have drifted day by day, week by week, closer and closer to war. We have done this not because we have been provoked but because our Government has persistently and insistently created provocation after provocation.

Some of our most prominent Americans have insulted foreign governments and rulers.

We have thrown our aid on the side of one of the belligerents. We all know here today that actually we are neutrals in term only but not in spirit or in action. We have sent food, ships, arms, planes to one of the belligerents. And now we are to send a part of our Navy.

Again I wish to remind you that this is not a discussion of the merits of either side of this armed conflict. I am not discussing here who is right and who is wrong in this war. I am merely pointing out facts which, when put together, make a definite pattern. The great point to remember is that none of this warlike atmosphere has been created as a result of any offense offered to us by any other nation. Every step that is leading us into war has originated in this country; not in Wall Street, not with the bankers, not with industry, but in Washington.

Now, Mr. President and delegates, I cannot too strongly urge upon you the necessity, the vital necessity, for organized labor to be vigilant against this drift toward war, because if we do get into war it is absolutely certain that organized labor cannot possibly gain any advantages but must lose many advantages it has already gained.

Organized labor must be vigilant against this constant trend toward centralization of the Government in Washington and the abolition of State's rights. Organized labor must be constantly vigilant to uphold the Bill of Rights, because no class of our citizens can possibly be more interested in free speech, free press, the right of free assemblage, and the right of petition to the Government than organized labor.

As I said a while ago, America has not lost that great pioneer spirit which motivated our forefathers who came to these unknown shores to escape centralized government, tyranny, and compulsory military service in the armies of Europe. Those pioneers came here for freedom, and from these primeval forests and arid plains they carved out the great Nation which is our heritage today. And even greater than the material resources of this Nation they established as the spiritual and cultural freedom which also is our great heritage of today. We must all, as one people, as one nation, be vigilant to uphold and to perpetuate that great heritage and to pass it on to our children and our children's children unimpaired.

So, then, instead of becoming hysterical over this thing, instead of giving up the Bill of Rights, instead of throwing the labor movement back 50 years, instead of going under some mobilization plan in peacetime under which one man, a military dictator, can regiment all of the people, men, women, and children, let us go about this thing in the American way, with American courage, with American enterprise, and in the American spirit, and do the job.

I am sure, let me say in conclusion, that you gentlemen and the unions which you represent are perfectly ready as patriotic citizens to do your share and more toward protecting this Nation. You are perfectly ready to make whatever sacrifices can be shown to be necesssary. You are perfectly ready, if the time ever comes when any enemy ever seeks to land upon our shores and to invade our homes, to shoulder your guns and go out to meet them. You are perfectly ready to man antiaircraft guns and to capture parachute troops—all that sort of thing. But let me say to you that such things as those are separated from us by 3,000 miles of stormy sea.

So, then, let us look forward not to war but to peace. Let us look forward not to continued depression but to a return to prosperity. Let us look forward to working together as American people should work together. Let us look forward to wiping out class hatreds and sectional jealousies and as one Nation, as a people united, go forward to new progress and to new levels of prosperity.

F. H. A.—Its Excellent Administration

REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 13, 1940

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call the attention of the House to the very splendid work being performed by the Federal Housing Administration, and I particularly call your attention to the splendid work they are doing in various metropolitan centers. I have a letter addressed to me by Stewart McDonald, Administrator of the Federal Housing Administration, which reads as follows:

FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, September 10, 1940.

Hon. EMANUEL CELLER,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN CELLER: At the end of June 406,843 New York families had received F. H. A. home-financing loans totaling $39,509,813. These loans were all made by private lending institutions to private citizens. Congress, as you know, in creating the Federal Housing Administration authorized it to insure loans of private-lending institutions and it does not lend Government money.

Of this amount $197,727,214 was obtained by 367,393 families in order to improve, repair, and remodel their properties under the property improvement provisions of title I of the National Housing Act.

In addition, F. H. A. insured loans totaled $198,782,599 in New York for the purpose of financing home ownership for 39,450 families.

New housing for workers in areas of increased industrial activity by reason of the national-defense program has placed a great responsibility upon private construction and financing, which are already responding with enthusiasm and vigor. This response is reflected in the number of new homes being constructed under the F. H. A. program. In fact, with this number currently running approximately 50 percent ahead of the same period last year, we estimate that new-home construction in 1940 will approximate that which took place in 1927–29.

This substantial increase in F. H. A. business will further augment the already stable position of F. H. A. mortgage insurance operations. I am sure it will be of interest to you to know that the estimates for the current fiscal year indicate that this Administration's income will be approximately $9,800,000, in excess of operating expenses.

If you desire, I shall be glad to send you a further summary of F. H. A. operations in New York.

Sincerely yours,

STEWART MCDONALD,
Administrator.

Mr. Speaker, if you go to New York you see miles and miles of splendid homes purchased most cheaply and occupied now by workingmen who have bought them on the installment plan. The sight of these houses occupied by contented families is most cheering and inspiring. This could not have been accomplished had it not have been for the mortgage-guaranty system of the Federal Housing Administration and the fine work being done at the head thereof by Stewart McDonald and his able assistants, Abner H. Ferguson, Ray T. Cahill, Robert B. Smith, and Jay Keegan. [Applause.]

Caught in the Draft

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN G. ALEXANDER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, September 14, 1940

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, after I made my broadcast last Monday night entitled "Conscription," I received many letters such as the following:

Just listened to your most intelligent radio address and would like to have a copy of same with other American messages from you that are available. I am personally putting you in the class of my highest liked in Congress; Hiram Johnson, Burton K. Wheeler and those past, La Follette of Wisconsin, and John K. Shields of Tennessee. I mainly want your speeches for my two boys of military age.

Sincerely,

A. B., *Jacksonville, Fla.*

Another one reads:

I consider myself most fortunate in having just heard your courageous address over the radio tonight. It does my heart good to hear an occasional voice raised in a losing battle for American principles. Your reward will no doubt be the same as that of Col. Charles A. Lindbergh, and a few others who have dared to suggest that American interests be held foremost in our minds.

Sincerely,

E. J. F., *New York City.*

But I also received a few, seven, to be exact, which are not nearly so complimentary. Their authors seemed to think I was too hard on conscription in my evaluation of the benefits or results to be derived from the bill. To that group I wish to say my remarks were only general in nature and very charitable, as I simply classed the current conscription bill as only another false promise and fake cure-all offered the wishful people of America in the name of peace and security from danger. And as I said then, it will fail, just as the so-called Neutrality Act which was held up before us with such glowing promises is failing to safeguard us from war. But I am not going to argue that point now except to say that most assuredly we want preparedness, both individual and national, but preparedness of the right sort. Preparedness which will make us ready for the sort of conflict we are told we are about to face.

Rather in this address it will be my purpose to give some needful and timely advice to the youth of America who may shortly be called into service under the conscription bill now before Congress. Under this bill, men, ages from 21 to 34, inclusive, will probably be taken, ostensibly for 1 year, but actually as provided in this law men will be subject to call thereunder for a period of 15 years and 8 months or until May 1956. Any young man reaching 21 years of age during the next 5 years will also be taken. To these age groups and to their parents and friends I address this message for they need help and advice, judging from the experiences of thousands of World War veterans and as one of whom I speak. Hardly a day goes by that we as Members of Congress do not hear from someone who served in 1917–18 and who has been unable to get what the laws enacted for the benefit of veterans and their dependents provide. One of the main reasons why this situation exists is because of loss of records and because of inability on the part of the veteran or his family to furnish legal and documentary proof of his rights and equity. In other words you must have evidence the same as in courts.

A recent address to the disabled American veterans by Gen. Frank T. Hines, Federal Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, pointed out some statistics which will serve to indicate what I am getting at. You will recall that there were some 4,700,000 men taken into service in the World War. But listen to General Hines. I quote:

The number of widows and children on the rolls on account of non-service-connected World War deaths is now 41,000. The children's rate of compensation on this account is something less than $7 a month. However, the widows rate approximately $30 a month. It should be kept in mind that the data I have just given you relates solely to non-service-connected World War deaths. The persons affected are the widows and orphans of veterans who had service-connected disability, who died of causes unrelated to World War service.

In other words, it is like putting a camel through the needle's eye to get on the compensation or pension roll after the loss of your veteran husband or father, and, as I just said, one of the big reasons for this is because of inability to prove service connection for the death or disability.

You have all heard of the Military Order of the Purple Heart which, as I recall, was instituted by George Washington after or at the time of the Revolution in order to do official honor to those bearing wounds for their country. One of their leaders, National Commander Herbert A. Church, being interested in our future veterans has authorized me to make a statement for them, and it is as follows:

The Military Order of the Purple Heart, an organization composed of men wounded by an act of the enemy, in all of the wars in which the United States has been engaged, joins in full accord in the effort to furnish to the men who are about to enter the service of their country information which will prove to be to their lasting benefit.

The loss of enlistment and service records, whether by careless handling, fire, shell explosion, or any of the many other causes that are attendant upon Army service, is nothing less than catastrophic to the interests of the men who may be concerned. Another cause is one that is fostered and encouraged by the carelessness of the soldier himself. A medical examination is of course obligatory for any one entering the service. One is just as necessary when a man leaves it. Many men who served in the first World War waived their right to that last examination thinking by doing so that they would save time and get back into civilian life much more quickly. They did just that, but now they rue their mistake. Or they failed to state as they left the service that they were suffering from a disability that was not readily apparent to the examining doctor.

Two instances illustrative of these points follow: A man suffered an injury to his back, receiving it while in service. Neither complaint nor history was recorded at time of discharge. He filed claim 2 years after discharge, but the hospital records were hard to find, in fact they were not found until 1929, 10 years after the war. The man is now receiving $100 a month, but has lost compensation up to the year 1929 because no record or history was given by him at the time of his discharge. Another case:

A man suffered from an injury to his leg, from flat feet, and from defective hearing, service connected. The record of the treatment received while still in service was lost. He made no complaint at discharge concerning these disabilities. He is now drawing a permanent total nonservice pension of only $30 per month. Had the record been perfected at time of discharge, he could have been receiving $100 per month as a wounded veteran should.

I can give another case with which I am personally acquainted, where the veteran had had an operation on his neck for cervical adenitis in 1916. He tried to enlist immediately upon the declaration of war in April 1917 but was rejected on account of the scar from the operation, which was presumed to indicate the presence of tuberculosis. He made several other attempts to get into the military service, but without success, until he finally managed to get sent with an infantry draft quota. At camp when examined he stood sidewise to the examining physician so the scar was not noticed and no record made of its presence.

Later on because of exposure to the elements, poor food, and all the extremes of physical strains to which service puts an infantry soldier, the glands in the neck again became infected and after a few days the thin skin on the old scar broke open and pus came out in a steady stream. This veteran also was attacked at the same time with a very bad case of pleurisy. He refused, however, to go to the base hospital for treatment and dressed the scar himself daily for fear he would be hospitalized permanently, or removed from the service. Finally, when he was examined for his discharge, he covered the scar and the opening where the pus was flowing

out with a plain piece of adhesive tape. The examiner asked him what it was and he said, "just a boil," so absolutely no record was made of the real situation.

Reaching home the next day he was immediately taken sick and finally ended up with a severe case of inflammatory rheumatism which lasted a year and still troubles him unless a strict diet is observed and careful living habits are followed. A claim was filed and an attempt made to prove the service connection for this party's suffering and ill health, but there was not the slightest evidence in the records to support the facts, so he still carries the full load of the burden caused by his patriotism.

Now, what is the lesson to be learned from these cases by the boys and men who will serve under this Conscription Act, or as volunteers? It is that they should see that everything is made a matter of record, especially those things having to do with their physical and mental welfare, both present and future, and not forgetting their families and dependents. Keep a daily diary or memorandum, putting in the names and addresses of comrades and friends with whom you associate and serve. Also the names and addresses of your officers, especially the captain of your outfit, and the doctors who treat you if you require medical attention. Also the nurses, too, especially if young and beautiful. This is an excellent idea for future protection, and even if not needed it will be a source of pleasure in years to come to be able to communicate with these new friends and fellow comrades.

Now in conclusion let me make one more suggestion. Early in this address I said personal and individual preparedness is needed. When we know from the records in the Surgeon General's Office that the average mental age, of the draftees in the World War I, was 13.08 years, and when we know that 311,000 of them were wholly illiterate, and 712,000 relatively so, or a total of 1,023,000 veterans who could not read or write English, we can wish for something in the way of preparedness besides training in the manual of arms. But because soldiers are not men, but human machines which are trained to commit legalized murder as unconscientiously as a bomb or a torpedo, we know this aspect will receive small attention.

Conscription rather aims to train men so as to make them oblivious of all former knowledge and practice of conscience, and then such machines, which were once men, can easily and indiscriminately be shipped abroad in the same crates as munitions.

So, as the poet has said, the big problem in personal preparedness is to keep your head while all about you are losing theirs. Keep a positive conviction that no matter how much men are made machines, you will not lose your faith in the good in man's nature, in the true in the world, and in the fact that God is in His heaven and eventually by your service, your sacrifice, and faith will triumph over the forces of greed and hate which foment war.

Naval Legislation Enacted by the Seventy-sixth Congress, Third Session

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL VINSON

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, September 14, 1940

STATEMENT BY THE JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL OF THE NAVY

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement furnished to me by the Judge Advocate General of the Navy:

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,
OFFICE OF THE JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL,
Washington, D. C., September 14, 1940.

The following naval legislation has been enacted by the 76th Congress, 3d session:

Public, No. 412. For the relief of World War sailors and marines who were discharged from the United States Navy or United States Marine Corps because of minority or misrepresentation of age. Approved February 9, 1940.

Public, No. 439. To authorize an exchange of lands between the Richmond, Fredericksburg & Potomac Railroad Co. and the United States, at Quantico, Va. Approved March 15, 1940.

Public, No. 440. To amend the Act of May 4, 1898 (30 Stat. 369), so as to authorize the President to appoint one hundred acting assistant surgeons for temporary service. Approved March 18, 1940.

Public, No. 456. To authorize the Secretary of the Navy to accept, without cost to the United States, a fee-simple conveyance of sixteen and four-tenths acres, more or less, of land at Floyd Bennett Field in the city and State of New York. Approved April 18, 1940.

Public, No. 462. Authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to sell certain surplus land owned by the United States in Bremerton, Wash. Approved April 20, 1940.

Public, No. 465. Authorizing appropriations to be made for the disposition of the remains of personnel of the Navy and Marine Corps and certain civilian employees of the Navy, and for other purposes. Approved April 20, 1940.

Public, No. 466. To authorize an exchange of lands between the city of San Diego, Calif., and the United States, and acceptance by gift of certain lands from the city of San Diego, Calif. Approved April 22, 1940.

Public, No. 482. To amend the Naval Reserve Act of 1938 (Public, No. 732, 52 Stat. 1175). Approved April 25, 1940.

Public, No. 506. Authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to accept on behalf of the United States a bequest of certain personal property of the late Dudley F. Wolfe. Approved May 11, 1940.

Public, No. 524. To amend the act approved February 15, 1929, entitled "An act to permit certain warrant officers to count all active service rendered under temporary appointments as warrant or commissioned officers in the Regular Navy, or as warrants or commissioned officers in the United States Naval Reserve Force, for purpose of promotion to chief warrant rank," so as to permit service in the National Naval Volunteers to be counted for purposes of promotion. Approved May 27, 1940.

Public, No. 525. To amend the act entitled "An act to authorize an exchange of lands between the Richmond, Fredericksburg & Potomac Railroad Co. and the United States at Quantico, Va.," approved June 24, 1935 (49 Stat. 395), so as to permit the removal of certain encumbrances on the lands concerned. Approved May 27, 1940.

Public, No. 541. To authorize the Secretary of the Navy to accept real estate granted to the United States by the city of Miami, Fla., and for other purposes. Approved June 3, 1940.

Public, No. 542. To authorize the Secretary of the Navy to acquire land at Key West, Fla. Approved June 3, 1940.

Public, No. 545. Authorizing the conveyance to the Commonwealth of Virginia, a portion of the naval reservation known as Quantico, in Prince William County, Va. Approved June 6, 1940.

Public, No. 550. To authorize the acquisition, by the United States, of lands in Manchester and Jackson Townships, of the county of Ocean and State of New Jersey, for use in connection with the naval air station, Lakehurst, N. J. Approved June 6, 1940.

Public, No. 558. Authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to accept on behalf of the United States, a gift of the yacht *Freedom* from Sterling Morton. Approved June 6, 1940.

Public, No. 629. To establish the composition of the United States Navy, to authorize the construction of certain naval vessels, and for other purposes. Approved June 14, 1940.

Public, No. 634. To regulate the number of warrant and commissioned warrant officers in the Marine Corps. Approved June 15, 1940.

Public, No. 635. To authorize the construction or acquisition of naval aircraft, the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes. Approved June 15, 1940.

Public, No. 644. Providing for the reorganization of the Navy Department, and for other purposes. Approved June 20, 1940.

Public, No. 657. To transfer the active list of the Construction Corps to the line of the Navy, and for other purposes. Approved June 25, 1940.

Public, No. 666. To authorize the attendance of the Marine Band at the convention of the Grand Army of the Republic to be held at Springfield, Ill., September 8 to 13, inclusive, 1940. Approved June 26, 1940.

Public, No. 671. To expedite national defense, and for other purposes. Approved June 28, 1940.

Public, No. 757. To establish the composition of the United States Navy, to authorize the construction of certain naval vessels, and for other purposes. Approved July 19, 1940.

Public, No. 775. Increasing the number of naval aviators in the line of the Regular Navy and Marine Corps, and for other purposes. Approved August 27, 1940.

Public, No. 782. To amend the act approved March 4, 1925, entitled "An act providing for sundry matters affecting the naval service, and for other purposes," as amended. Approved September 11, 1940.

Public, No. 615. To amend the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, and for other purposes," approved July 1, 1902 (32 Stat. 662), so as to provide uniformity in the pay of all civilian employees of the Navy Department appointed for duty beyond the continental limits of the United States and in Alaska. Approved June 13, 1940.

Public, No. 617. Authorizing the sale of fuel, electric current, ice, and water at isolated naval stations. Approved June 13, 1940.

Public, No. 779. To increase the number of midshipmen at the United States Naval Academy. Approved September 4, 1940.

Public, No. 433. To amend the act entitled, "An act making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, and for other purposes," approved July 1, 1902 (32 Stat. 662), relative to the payment of the commuted rations of enlisted men. Approved March 14, 1940.

The following bills have been reported by your committee and passed by the House but have not yet become law: H. R. 10406, H. R. 10438, S. 4165.

The March of Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, September 14, 1940

BULLETIN OF WOMEN INVESTORS IN AMERICA, INC.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, Women Investors in America, Inc., of which Catherine Curtis, nationally known leader of independent women, is national director, has as its slogan, "We are all investors in America, whether we are stockholders, bondholders, jobholders, or husbandholders."

This independent women's organization, which has membership in every State in the Union, released on August 30 from its national headquarters at 535 Fifth Avenue, New York City, a special bulletin titled "The March of Democracy."

The material contained in this bulletin is of vital interest at this particular time when we hear so much on all sides about democracy. It correctly points out that our country never was intended to be a democracy; that its true, constitutional form of government is a republic. The article is as follows:

THE MARCH OF DEMOCRACY

Today public officials and others in this country speak of our American democracy and state that—to protect it and our liberties—we must join in the defense of the democracies. The founding fathers evidently did not intend our Government to be a democracy, for that word is not found in either the Declaration of Independence or the Constitution. But they did specify a form of government for us in the Constitution in article IV, section 4, which states:

"The United States shall guarantee to every State in this Union a republican form of government."

What is a democracy? The United States Army Manual, 2000–25, on Citizenship states on page 91:

"Democracy: A government of the masses. Authority derived through mass meeting of any form of 'direct expression.' Results in mobocracy. Attitude toward property is communistic, negating property rights. Attitude toward law is that the will of the majority shall regulate, whether it be based upon deliberation or governed by passion, prejudice, and impulse, without restraint or regard to consequences. Results in demagogism, license, agitation, discontent, anarchy."

This same publication states on page 88:

"The Government of the United States is not a democracy but a republic."

The United States Army Manual 2000–25 is no longer used in teaching our soldiers citizenship. It was withdrawn from use a few years ago as some of the matter contained was found to be of "a controversial nature," according to official statements.

That international authority on world revolution, the late Duke of Northumberland, in his book, History of World Revolution, published in 1931, declared:

"The adoption of democracy as a form of government by all European nations is fatal to good government, to liberty, to law and order, to respect for authority, and to religion, and must eventually produce a state of chaos from which a new world of tyranny will arise."

But we were told we entered the World War "to make the world safe for democracy." Let us see what has happened to nations that adopted that form of government:

Russia: Kerensky brought "democracy" to Russia with the revolution of February 1917. All power was centralized in Moscow. Lenin and Trotsky seized that centralized power in the bloody revolution of October 1917 and established the first Soviet-Communist nation. They would have been unsuccessful had not Kerensky first centralized all government power.

Women were "freed" under Russian "democracy." Children became property of the state. Women were given equal opportunity to work beside men in factory, field, and ditch—while their children were cared for in state-controlled nurseries. Women were even "nationalized"—all men being given equal right to them, with the husband having "first choice," provided he was a member in good standing of the state.

Family ties were broken. Divorce was simplified in keeping with the "new democratic freedom"—for marital ties could be broken by either party appearing before a public official and declaring the marriage ended. Is it any wonder Russian men flocked to its "democracy"? Liberty, such as it is in that country, is for members of the Communist Party only.

Hungary: With the collapse of Hungary in late 1918, Count Karolyi seized control of the government and established a "democracy." He offered the Allies more of his country than they asked, in return for recognition of his regime. Son of a wealthy and aristocratic family, he suffered from physical impairment and was ignored by his own class. He entered politics to satisfy his ego and, for political advancement, associated himself with the "rabble" in his country.

Under his "democracy," Hungary was thrown into chaos—governmental powers centralized, later to be seized by Bela Kuhn Cohen, Trotsky lieutenant operating under orders from Moscow. He established a Soviet state, resulting in the slaughter of 160,000 Hungarian men, women, and children in 9 months. The masses ran riot. Privileges and protection were only for those holding cards in workers' unions. Cohen and his associates—most of whom were imported from Russia—looted the public treasury and taxed wealth into poverty.

His regime continued until Cecile Tormay, noted Hungarian woman author, inspired and organized Hungarian women, revived courage and fight in Hungarian men, and drove Karolyi, Cohen, and their followers from the country. Admiral Horthy then took control of the government. He has continued as dictator. Liberty in Hungary at present is for members of Horthy's party only.

Germany: Democracy was established in Germany with the fall of the Kaiser after the World War. Again came complete government centralization and Hitler—slowly but steadily—marched to dictatorship. Long before this war, basic property rights were ignored. Women were urged to bear more and more children for the protection of the state. Liberty in Germany is for members of the Nazi Party only.

Mexico: Calles promoted democracy in Mexico. He centralized complete powers in Mexico City. He moved to the United States when his term of office ended. His successor immediately began to abuse the centralized powers. Calles returned to Mexico to end that abuse, was thrown in jail, his wealth confiscated, and eventually was expelled from his native land.

His successor seized American oil properties in Mexico. American investors in those properties do not know how much, if anything, they will salvage from their investments. But they do know investors in Russian properties seized by the Soviet democracy never salvaged a penny.

Newspaper reports of the recent elections in Mexico claim citizens not members of, or in accord with, the ruling party were barred from voting. The present ruling party will continue in power, unless the opposition stages a successful revolt, with its usual destruction, suffering, and misery. Liberty in Mexico is for members of the Labor Party only.

Italy: Following the World War, Italy limited the powers of her King and established a partial democracy. The usual centralization of power followed and eventually was seized by Mussolini. Without such centralization, Mussolini never could have become dictator. Property rights are negligible in Italy—were so even before the present war. Women have been granted equal opportunities, and Il Duce urges them to bear more and more children for the state. Liberty in Italy is for members of the Fascist Party only.

Austria: Following the World War, Austria became a republic. Within a few years, it changed to a democracy. Today, Austria is no more. It is part of Germany. Liberty in Austria is for members of the Nazi Party only.

Spain: Also following the World War, Spain established a republic. Soon it, too, changed to a democracy, followed by centralization of power in Madrid. The people discovered this centralization was leading to dictatorship, that a plot was well advanced to declare Spain part of the Soviet union.

That discovery resulted in the most horrible civil war in world history. Spaniards revolted against the communistic plot. The internationalists—Communists, radicals, and liberals—rushed to its defense from all parts of the world. The story of that civil war is one of the most atrocious in the civilized world. While the internationalists were in control of the Government, women were given equal opportunities only to find themselves in the trenches, their womanly rights disregarded and assaulted. Russia, France, and other democracies sent arms and munitions to bolster the Spanish internationalists' resistance, but General Franco's Nationalist army won. Franco now is dictator of Spain. Liberty there is for members of the Nationalist Party only.

France: For many years France was a republic with nationalist policies. Following the World War, step by step, it abandoned its nationalism and republican form of government. Finally, under

Leon Blum, called father of the French New Deal, it adopted "democracy" and internationalism as its government policy.

Under Blum's regime, France followed the usual trends of a "democracy"—centralized planned economy, government-controlled prices, unbalanced budgets, riotous government spending, currency revaluation, harassment and restriction of private enterprise, with lowered production, less jobs, and lowered living standards for all except those in power.

Sit-in strikes originated in France under Blum, quickly followed by sit-down strikes in the United States. He led European "democracies" in aiding the Spanish internationalists by stripping his country of defense weapons and sending them to Spain. These were captured by General Franco, turned over to Hitler, and used against France.

France, at war, found her industries in chaos due to Blum's "social reform" laws—her munitions, airplane plants, railroads, and communications practically under control of Communists and internationalists who had risen to power under Blum's protection.

France now is a dictatorship—the result of joining the march of democracy. "Liberty" there is for members of the dictator's party only.

The United States: The trend toward more and more centralization of power in Washington has steadily increased during recent years. This has resulted in continual encroachment, bit by bit, on individual freedom and basic property rights. We have been forced to accept centralized planned economy, currency revaluation, unbalanced budgets, and riotous Government spending. Private enterprise is harassed and restricted by government.

Today, centralized Government control extends over our railroads, radio, utilities, banks, stock and commodity markets, agriculture, labor, and education. Under guise of "emergency" we are asked to accept more and more centralized control.

But we have not quite reached the final stage of "democracy" where "liberty" in the United States is for members of the ruling party only.

Rarely in the messages or statements of our former Presidents, do we find "democracy" mentioned, until popularized by President Wilson during the World War. Since then, our people have been insidiously propagandized to accept "democracy" and forget our guaranteed form of government.

Washington, Jefferson, Madison, John Quincy Adams, Jackson, Harrison, Lincoln, Garfield, Cleveland, and McKinley all spoke and wrote of our republican traditions and institutions. They termed the leaders of our War for Independence the "Fathers of our Republic."

The founders of our Republic deliberately selected that form of government for us because they knew, through its division of powers and decentralization of authority, it guaranteed protection to all. Therefore, they purposely separated the functions of the legislative, executive, and judicial branches, making each independent of the other to protect the rights and liberties of all—minority as well as majority.

The majority of power was placed in the hands of the people's representatives in the Congress and the States. They intended we should look to our elected representatives for protection—not to any one individual in whom all power was centralized. They knew, from Old World experience, centralization would lead to dictatorship and loss of liberty, but a republican form of government would bar that centralization.

It was that basic republican principle of "protection of the rights and liberties of all" that led Alexander Hamilton, Secretary of the Treasury in Washington's Cabinet, to state:

"We are forming a republican government. Real liberty is never found in despotism or in the extremes of democracy."

And John C. Calhoun, famous South Carolina statesman, to declare:

"The Government of the United States is, of course, a republic, in contradistinction of an absolute democracy; and the theory which regards it as a government of the majority rests on a gross and groundless misconception."

Unquestionably it was recognition of that same basic principle that caused the Supreme Court in 1891 to rule:

"The distinguishing feature of a republican form of government is the right of the people to choose their own officers of governmental administration, and pass their own laws in virtue of the legislative power reposed in representative bodies, whose legislative acts may be said to be those of the people themselves; but while the people thus are the source of the political power, their governments National and State, have been limited by written constitutions, and they have themselves thereby set bounds to their power, as against the sudden impulses of mere majorities."

In view of all this, it is time we gave careful consideration to the famous statements of three outstanding fathers of our Republic. The first is that of James Madison, often referred to as the "Father of the Constitution," who said:

"Democracies have ever been spectacles of turbulence and contention; have ever been found incompatible with personal security or the rights of property, and have in general been as short in their lives as they have been violent in their deaths!"

The second is that of Samuel Adams, who declared:

"Remember, democracy never lasts long. It soon wastes, exhausts, and murders itself! There never was a democracy that did not commit suicide!"

And last—but by no means least—is that of Benjamin Franklin, who, when asked at the close of the Constitutional Convention what type of government we were to have—a monarchy or democracy—replied:

"A republic—if we can keep it!"

Will we continue to travel the low road of democracy to national suicide—or will we regain the high road of the republic and keep our independence?

The women of these United States must not forget the part their foremothers played in founding this country—those brave women who stood shoulder to shoulder with their menfolk against wilderness, redskin, and redcoat. Their determination, inspiration, and spiritual ideals spurred on their men to make the vast wilderness a great productive land. Those qualities gave our forefathers the courage to revolt against the tyranny of Old World centralized control, and to establish our Republic.

As we salute our Stars and Stripes, we should remember with pride that a woman gave our Republic that flag—made by her own hands!

Therefore, our women have three powerful investments in these United States—first, the spiritual, which conveys the right to preserve that inspired quality of citizenship directly responsible for founding this free country; second, the physical, which includes the right to a higher standard of living than that enjoyed by women in any other country; and, third, the financial, with the right to own property and freely invest their savings in the private enterprise system for profit, security, and advancement.

Because of women's great contribution to our country and the preferred position they have achieved under our Republic, I recommend they give serious thought to the facts set forth in this bulletin.

As has been pointed out, we have not yet reached the final stage of democracy.

It is reported that George Washington, on laying down his pen after signing the Constitution, said:

"Should the States reject this excellent Constitution, the next will be drawn in blood."

I am convinced that unless our women revive the spiritual ideals and courage of our Revolutionary ancestors, organize as did the women of Hungary, we may well witness the loss of our liberty and independence and the death of our Republic in the days that lie ahead.

Approval of the Conscription Bill Conference Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, September 14, 1940

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, although I have in nowise changed my opinion that passage of this peacetime conscription measure is unwise and a definite threat to both our peace and our freedom, I want to state very clearly what my position in the matter is now. It has been made the law of the land, the method duly enacted for the manning of the defense forces of our Republic.

I reserve my right to criticize this law as much as any other duly enacted law of the land, as well as my right to urge its amendment or repeal at some future date. But I pledge myself to aid wholeheartedly its efficient administration and just enforcement.

Further than this, as it is now the law I expect to vote for such appropriations as are necessary to put it into effect.

Address Before Tennessee Farm Bureau Federation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. B. CARROLL REECE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 13, 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. B. CARROLL REECE, OF TENNESSEE

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an address which I delivered

before the Tennessee Farm Bureau Federation at its annual convention held in Johnson City in October 1939:

Whenever the subject of our farm problem is brought up, my thoughts revert instinctively to the Biblical story of Joseph in Egypt; the unforgettable story of the 7 fat years and the 7 lean years. I do not attribute this to any strange quirk in my mental processes. Rather do I believe that the explanation lies in the plain fact that the story of American agriculture in our day is a story of 7 fat years followed by 7 lean years.

But there the analogy ends. You will remember how Joseph gambled on 7 lean years following 7 fat years and won. And you cannot forget how the economic planners in Washington gambled on 7 fat years and lost. Yet circumstances have conspired to obscure how close to the brink of disaster this gamble pushed our farmers.

Twice were they shoved to the very edge of the abyss. The first time rising prices caused by drought diverted attention from the danger. And that time dust from the great western bowl got in the eyes of the American people and blinded them to the danger our farmers had so narrowly escaped.

Once again last summer our farmers stood on the brink. Then came the war in Europe and temporary salvation. This time we must not let the smoke of Europe's war get in our eyes and blind us to the fact that the perils of the New Deal farm gamble are just as menacing today as they were before the armies of Europe started to march.

The very inconsistencies of this farm policy also have served to obscure its true character. The quick shifts, the lightning changes of position blur the whole picture. Mental images that once were clear have become vague or perhaps even forgotten. How many of us recall that mental picture, once so clear—that picture of Franklin D. Roosevelt, standing in the convention hall in Chicago on July 2, 1932, accepting the Democratic nomination for President of the United States and declaring with gusto:

"We should repeal immediately those provisions of the law that compel the Federal Government to go into the market to purchase, to sell, to speculate in farm products, in a futile attempt to reduce farm surpluses."

To recall that picture now is enough to bring tears to the eyes of the old potato.

Yet if we will peer closely enough through the haze of the dust storms and through the smoke from European battlefields, we will discern one element of consistency, one major characteristic, that is of the essence of the New Deal farm policy. That element is the gambling element. From beginning to end, this farm policy has been nothing more than a huge gamble with Fate.

It is part and parcel of the New Deal devotion to white magic, the frantic search for a witching formula, a cure for all ills, which it has pursued with the same fanaticism that inspired Ponce de Leon in his quest for the elixir of life.

Stripped of all of its impressive-sounding phrases, such as planned economy and ever-normal granary, it stands revealed in stark outline as a gamble with the welfare and security of our great farm population.

I sometimes wonder if the gamblers do not forget how extensive that population is. Farmers constitute 24 percent of our population of some 130,000,000. That is something to give pause to even the wildest-eyed theorist. Can any administration in good conscience undertake to gamble with the welfare of such a numerous group? Can any party stoop so low as to make their well-being the football of partisan politics?

I do not question the good intentions of those who have toyed with our farm problem for almost 7 years. But I do challenge their method of approach; their willingness to trust to a gamble instead of relying on the lessons of experience. And what has it brought the farmer? Let me quote you the answer that was given to that question by Morris Erickson, of North Dakota, a director of the National Farmers' Union. Said Mr. Erickson, in a radio address over the National Broadcasting Co.'s system, on June 24, last:

"While farmers constitute more than 24 percent of the population of the United States, they receive less than 11 percent of the national income."

And Mr. Erickson continued:

"These brief figures sum up, to a great degree, the cause of the numerous problems which beset agriculture."

Now, let me review for you briefly the efforts that have been made to solve those problems and the pathetic results that have attended them.

The original A. A. A. contained obvious weaknesses. But, the old A. A. A. did not ruin the farmers nor the country. It had no chance to do so. Before its fallacies could produce their logical effect in the production of a crushing wheat surplus, the drought intervened. * * * Before the effects of the drought were off, the Supreme Court intervened.

Instead of thanking Providence for this deliverance from the consequences of their own folly and buckling down to the job of working out a real farm program which would take into consideration all of the diverse factors involved, the theorists went off on another gambling spree.

They pulled out of the top hat a whole litter of white rabbits which were sold to the public under the names of soil conservation, agricultural adjustment, and what not. It was another gamble—taking a wild chance on being able to repeal the economic law of supply and demand as related to agricultural products and to substitute for it price fixing—for governmental loans on stipulated commodities are nothing else.

You will recall that the first Agricultural Adjustment Act was put on the statute books in May of 1933 and that it actually swung into operation in July 1933. Now let us look at the net results of our farm-relief legislation 6 years later, in July 1939, before the situation was complicated by the effects of the war in Europe. And, in a spirit of fairness, I want to say that the United States was not the only nation to suffer from the handiwork of economic planners.

Let us begin with wheat. In July there was virtually no important country in the world which did not have a government wheat plan of some sort. Statisticians have calculated that various governments were spending more than $2,000,000,000 annually in an effort to hold up grain prices. After all their activities in recent years, the prospective world supply of wheat for 1939–40 was placed at 5,290,000,000 bushels, the greatest on record, while wheat had fallen in the Liverpool market to the lowest prices reached since Queen Elizabeth's time. By a tariff and Government loans, we had kept American wheat from falling quite so low.

It became strikingly apparent that some of our policies had made the plight of the American wheat grower worse instead of better. There was unmistakable evidence of the futility for a country that grows wheat for export to adopt an acreage restriction scheme. Our own restriction was not great enough to affect the world price, but it reduced farm income by reducing the amount of wheat we had to sell.

We tried but failed to help ourselves by subsidizing wheat for export. In combination with other countries doing the same thing, the result was merely to push down the world price further.

In the 12 months ended on June 30, 1939, the United States Government sold 93,754,000 bushels of wheat in the export markets at a loss to the Government of $25,700,000, or 27.4 cents a bushel. In other words, the foreign consumer was able to get his wheat cheaper at the expense of the American taxpayer. That is not the way to enrich either the farmer or the Nation.

Corn in July was selling at the lowest prices since 1933. For this again our own Government policy must bear a large share of the blame. Last year and the year before the Government made "nonrecourse" loans to enable the farmers to hold large stocks of corn off the market. The loan rate was made so attractive that it even paid farmers to build extra cribs to store on their own farms the corn under Government loan.

The result of all this was that the farmers withdrew from the market and stored in their own cribs some 257,000,000 bushels of 1937 and 1938 corn. This helped to keep up prices for a time, but since the loans matured on August 1—and unfortunately all loans do mature—fear that the Government would be forced to take 100,000,000 bushels or more of the grain in satisfaction of the matured loans and sell it started to depress the market.

I happened to pick up a newspaper the other day and came upon an article by William P. Black, which, in my opinion, is an illuminating commentary on this situation. Mr. Black was making a motor trip through the corn belt of Illinois and without even getting out of his car was able to observe striking symbols of the difficulties of the corn planters of the A. A. A. Said he:

"On one side of the road may be seen a group of the Government's shiny new galvanized steel storage bins erected or being erected to take care of the surplus 1938 loan corn which the farmers declined to hold another year on their own farms.

"On the other side is a field holding a bumper crop of 1939 corn and carrying a sign which proudly states that this corn has been grown from Funk, Pfister, or De Kalb hybrid seed.

"The bins are evidence that the farmer grew too much corn in 1937 and 1938 despite all the efforts of the A. A. A. to hold production close to consumption. They are evidence that the farmers, or at least a large number of farmers, are willing to play along with the ever normal granary idea of the A. A. A. only if the Government does the storing of old corn at its own expense and risk.

"The signs are evidence of the intensification of yield per acre which has gone very far to offset the A. A. A.'s reduction of the acreage seeded. They are evidence also of the strong promotional advertising campaign of the hybrid seed suppliers which this year caused Illinois farmers to plant more than half of their corn acreage in hybrid, and which has brought the State the highest yield per acre ever recorded.

"Larger billboards at highway curves expound more fully the advantages of hybrid seed over the old varieties. They show that the seed suppliers are battling tooth and nail for their share of this new business which owes at least a part of its beginnings to the research of Secretary Henry Wallace on his Iowa seed farm, and a good deal of its expansion to the A. A. A. regulations tending to limit the corn acreage planted, but setting no restrictions on the intensification of per-acre yield."

Mr. Black then goes on to say, and note this carefully:

"At a hotel in Peoria, the traveler met James Wallace, brother of the Secretary, and now an official of the Wallace family's pioneer hybrid seed company. With three associates he was, in the course of a trip, to lay the foundations for an increased Illinois distribution of his company's seed, now a leading brand in Iowa."

What do you think of that? But listen; that isn't all. The next day I picked up another newspaper and read that the A. A. A. is planning a 1940 corn program calling for an acreage reduction in 12 States, averaging approximately 10 percent.

Here is an exhibition that would have warmed the heart of that master of the art of exhibition of curious oddities and strange freaks,

the late P. T. Barnum. Why, it's one of the greatest brother acts of all time. Henry, sitting in Washington, in the chair of the Secretary of Agriculture, ordering a cut of 10 percent in corn acreage. Brother Jim, traveling up and down through the Corn Belt selling the Wallace company's seed with the argument that it will increase the yield per acre. Henry cuts down the number of acres. Jim sells the seed to increase the per-acre production to offset the cut.

But let us get back again to the prices the farmer has been getting for his crops. Were it necessary, I could take up crop after crop, as I have taken up corn and wheat, and show you that in the case of each crop the drop in price has been comparable to the declines in wheat and corn. I have no intention, however, to so presume upon your time and patience or to burden you with dry statistics. Suffice it to say that on July 15, 1939, exactly 6 years after the New Deal farm program was put into operation, the market price of oats, barley rye, buckwheat, potatoes, flaxseed, cotton, butterfat, and wool were lower than they were on July 15, 1933.

It is the July and the August figures which enable us to make comparisons which are the real measure of the success or the failure of the New Deal farm policy. In September and October, as today, the figures reflect the war influence. When Hitler started out to take control of Poland on that day the war started to take control of farm prices.

So it is quite beside the point for apologists for the 6 years of failure to make good the President's promise in his radio fireside talk of October 22, 1933, to raise farm prices; his boast that "if we cannot do this one way, we will do it another. Do it we will." It is idle for these apologists to assert that the rise in prices since the start of the war has added about $1,000,000,000 to farm income and has reduced by about $120,000,000 the Government's losses on wheat and corn loans. But for the war disaster would have overtaken us. And the war at least is something of which not even the most enthusiastic new dealer would have the temerity to say, "We planned it that way." It was just another gamble and another lucky break.

And let me tell you this: Don't get too optimistic over the farm outlook because of the war and the repeal of the arms embargo and the cash-and-carry provisions of the Neutrality Act. The plain facts are that a goodly share of the reduction of our crop surpluses since the beginning of the war has been due to the operations of speculators who had visions of unloading later at a huge profit.

The best-informed opinion in trade circles today runs contrary to this point of view. Observers believe that because of the cash-and-carry provisions, the Allies will limit so far as possible their purchases in this country to arms and ammunition, because they cannot obtain credit, but must pay for what they buy in cash and take their purchases away in their own ships.

For products they are likely to turn to countries where they can arrange convenient credit terms and have their purchases delivered, freeing their own ships for the transportation of arms and ammunition from America. Let me quote briefly from a syndicated article by John T. Flynn, economic authority, which appeared in the newspapers on October 25. Said Mr. Flynn:

"A glance at the records of the board of trade (in Chicago) reveals that there is plenty of speculating in wheat and that the turn-over is heavy among those who have no use for wheat save to gamble in its price.

"But every factor in the situation should make for a lower price. The estimate of the Government as to the prospects of the new crop has been increased. Then by whom and how is the price of wheat being held up?

"It is said in Chicago that Canada is not getting the orders from England for wheat which she expected. That is why wheat is 73 cents there. She is not getting the orders because England is buying wheat in those markets where the Germans go for wheat, in order to prevent the Germans from getting it.

"But if the English are not buying wheat from Canada at 73 cents, is it possible to believe that they are buying it from the United States at 85 cents? That does not make sense. And if the war countries are not buying wheat, and if our enormous surplus remains hanging over the market, and if the outlook for the next crop is greater, then who is buying it in such quantities as to send the price up?"

Who, indeed? as Mr. Flynn asks. Why, the speculators, of course! Heaven help the American farmer if he is placed at the mercy of the wheat-pit speculators!

Now let's look at this New Deal farm policy from another angle, the angle of parity. Ah, parity! That's a term on which the new dealers used to roll their tongues. In the early days of the New Deal enthusiasms, whenever there was talk of farm prices there was always talk of parity. Well, how about it? Let's see.

The objective of this parity of which we heard so much was to restore to farmers the same purchasing power for their commodities in relation to manufactured articles they themselves purchased that prevailed in the 5-year period immediately preceding the World War.

In 1932, the average of farm prices was only 65 percent of that existing in the pre-war 5-year period from 1909 to 1914. This year the average is about 89 percent. Thus, the average gain from 1932 to 1939 is 37 percent.

But the nonagricultural price level has also risen, although by no corresponding margin. The gain, as compared with 1932, is 11 percent. In 1932, at the bottom of the depression, the ratio of prices received by farmers to the prices they paid for what they had to buy was 61 percent of the pre-war parity. Today this ratio has risen to 74 percent, which, of course, is slightly less than three-quarters of the administration's coveted goal.

In plain words, the ratio in 1932 was 39 points short of pre-war parity. Today it is 26 points. There has been a gain of only 13 points, or exactly one-third of the ground that must be regained in order to attain the administration's objective. The failure to achieve the announced purpose therefore is crystal clear.

Now let's forget all about parity prices and look at actual prices. Here again we find only a record of failure. On the basis of figures made public by the United States Bureau of Agricultural Economics, the total gross farm income for the 7 years from 1926 to 1932, inclusive, was $73,718,000,000. For the 7-year period from 1933 to 1939, inclusive, it amounted to only $61,000,000,000 and this total included more than $2,000,000,000 of Government payments to farmers. And incidentally the estimate of the 1939 income for the farmers is about $8,000,000,000 which does not compare favorably with the $10,469,000,000 they received in 1929 or the $15,300,000,000 in post-war 1919.

Here is our striking comparison between the 7 fat years of Republican administration and the 7 lean years under the New Deal. It is true that some of the so-called fat years were none too fat for the farmer, but the fact that in the last 7 years the loss suffered by farmers by comparison amounts to $12,000,000,000 is staggering. Add to this the fact that the loss would have been $15,000,000,000 had it not been for payments by the Government and the figures become overwhelming.

Commenting on these figures, Richard S. Stadermann, president of the American Good Government Society, recently observed with much logic:

"It would seem far better to revise our policies so as to restore the higher farm incomes of the years 1926 to 1932, which included both prosperity and depression, and hence a normal average income. If we could restore the 1926 to 1932 farm incomes, the farmer would have more income without asking for Government payments. Farmers are upright, independent citizens who prefer asking no favors of anyone, but they do insist upon their right to supply the American market with American-raised farm products."

This observation on the right of the American farmer to supply the American market with American-raised products serves to remind us of the inherent conflict between the farm policy and the reciprocal trade treaty policy which the administration has been attempting to pursue at the same time. It results, of course, from the attempt to find a formula for each individual problem and the failure to recognize that most of our problems are inextricably intertwined. When any one of them is tackled without regard for the others the result is likely to be, indeed, actually has been, a pulling in opposite directions which produces little of good and much of evil.

Thus, while our farm policy has had as its objective the reduction of surpluses, even if such reduction has to be accomplished by outright payments to the farmers with the taxpayers' money, in many cases our reciprocal-trade policies have tended to increase our surpluses.

I do not need to remind you of the influx of eggs, turkeys, and other farm commodities into the United States market following the treaty with Canada. Nor do I need to remind you of the constantly increasing stream of imports which is subjecting our farmers and our cattlemen to grossly unfair competition.

Despite my earnest desire not to tax your patience, I am going to ask your indulgence to permit me to recite a few of the import figures of the Department of Commerce which have a very direct bearing on this matter of reciprocal-trade treaties and our duty to preserve the American market for the American farmer.

These figures for the first 6 months of 1939 show that imports of cattle amounted to 486,497 head, compared with 242,584 head for the corresponding period of 1938. Imports of other meat products, which include beef, pork, and poultry, amounted to 79,472,315 pounds compared with 75,884,822 pounds last year, and the total value of the imports of merchandise for the first 6 months of 1939 amounted to $1,071,731,563, compared with $943,315,226 for the comparable 1938 period.

American farmers engaged in the production of hogs should be told in all candor that despite the falling prices for their pork products the importation of pork still continues on a large scale. For the first 6 months of 1939 the imports of cheaply produced pork amounted to 25,827,000 pounds, against 25,661,000 pounds for the same period in 1938.

Our domestic market also is being flooded with cheaply produced fats and oils, which also work to the detriment of the farmer. On August 15 last the wholesale cash price of lard in the New York market fell to 5 cents, a low for the current year and 2 cents less than the price on May 12, 1933, the day the first A. A. A. came into being.

I do not believe there is any need to caution you not to mistake the upswing of farm prices due to the war in Europe for a return of permanent prosperity and a solution of our farm problem. It is just another shot in the arm. Indeed, some of its effects already are beginning to wear off. The latest report of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, for instance, has this to say:

"Prices of slaughtered cattle declined unevenly after the sharp advance in early September, but in the first week of October were somewhat above the low level reached in mid-August." Somewhat above the low level reached in mid-August. What irony.

Even Secretary Wallace, whose credulity at times seems to surpass all human understanding, is not deceived about this war boom in farm commodities. Last summer the Secretary was

tearing his hair in an effort to find still another new scheme to increase farm prices. Now he is going around voicing a warning against the danger of a war boom. He is pointing out that the rise in farm prices in all likelihood will be followed by a slump of corresponding proportions. He is cautioning farmers who are receiving higher prices for their produce to get their storm cellars ready for rough winds in the offing. That, in my opinion, is sound and timely advice.

So where does all of this discussion of our farm problem get us? It leads us, I believe, to the conclusion that all New Deal efforts to solve the problem have failed; that in some respects the problem is even more serious than it was when the New Deal so gleefully undertook to find the right answers by procedure that smacked more of flipping a coin than of thoughtful and painstaking analysis, and that a new start must be made and a new method applied

That is precisely what the Republicans in Congress have undertaken to do. Representative JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr., of Massachusetts, Republican leader in the House, several weeks ago announced the appointment of a committee to make an exhaustive study of agricultural problems. CLIFFORD R. HOPE, of Kansas, ranking Republican member of the Committee on Agriculture, was named chairman.

As to objectives and methods, I do not think there can be clearer exposition than that given by Mr. MARTIN when he announced formation of the committee. At that time he said:

"The many conditions involved in the depressed and unhealthy state of American agriculture cannot be remedied by any single formula. The factors which have operated to reduce agriculture to its present unhappy plight have arisen from causes which extend throughout the entire economic structure of America and the world.

"Some of these causes are due to changes incident to the progress of civilization, technological advancements, and alterations in the mode of life and habits of entire peoples, including those of America, and are permanent. Other factors also involve foreign markets, industrial unemployment at home, sectional, soil, and climatological conditions, each of which must be dealt with in a special way.

"The administration's farm policy is now a demonstrated failure. The so-called remedies have proved to be merely temporary expedients of no permanent value.

"The first prerequisite to an intelligent effort to solve the problems confronting American agriculture is a careful study of each problem and its relation to the others. In order to achieve a comprehensive study of the agricultural problems from the viewpoint of working out permanent solutions, I have named a large study committee composed of Republican Members of the House who have a special knowledge of the various phases of agriculture. In order to encompass the wide range of study and analysis necessary this committee will have to be subdivided into subcommittees, each of which will study one phase or problem.

"The divisions of study fall generally into the following categories: 1. Dairying, poultry, eggs, etc. 2. Livestock, meats, etc. 3. Wheat. 4. Corn and hogs. 5. Potatoes. 6. Vegetables and canning industries. 7. Wool. 8. Cotton and other southern crops, competition, etc. 9. Fruits. 10. Sugar. 11. Farm chemurgy. 12. Soil conservation. 13. Irrigation. 14. Foreign markets, reciprocal-trade treaties, and effects; dumping, barter, etc. 15. Marketing, cost of production, processing, etc. 16. Tobacco. 17. Farm credits.

"It will be necessary to reconcile as far as possible conflicting sectional interests in order that the whole agricultural question may be constructively approached from the standpoint of national welfare.

"It is imperative we work out an affirmative and constructive approach to the rescue of agriculture. It is an outstanding problem and upon our efforts in behalf of the farmer will depend in a large measure the future prosperity of our country."

That is an agricultural program to which I believe all of you can heartily subscribe. You will note that it is no hit-or-miss scheme, no quack remedy, no shot in the arm, but a scientific approach to a problem as important as it is difficult, and which will defy solution unless, as this program does, all of the various factors involved are carefully weighed and balanced.

Benefits of Farm Relief Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED CUMMINGS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, September 14, 1940

LIVESTOCK

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, on August 15, 1940, I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article published in the Farmers' Union Herald showing the prices of grain on December 24, 1932. Today I am placing a similar statement regarding the prices of livestock on the Chicago market on December 23, 1932, and August 27, 1940.

On December 23, 1932, choice yearling steers sold for $7.25; several loads, $6.40 to $7. On August 27, 1940, fat steers, $13.10, some higher; numerous loads, $12 to $13. Hogs, 1932, top, $2.30; good to choice, 140 to 180 pounds, $2.75 to $2.80; packing sows, $2 to $2.25. Hogs, 1940, top, $7.65; good to choice, 190 to 240 pounds, $7.45; sows, $5.40 to $6.65. Lambs, 1932, many loads well finished, 79 to 90 pounds, and fed westerns, $6.25 to $6.40; fat ewes, $1.75 to $2. Lambs, 1940, 25 lower, some good handy weights, $9.50 to $9.75; native ewes, steady, $3.50 to $3.75.

The above increase in prices had a very material effect on the bank accounts in the sections where they raise livestock. For instance, the principal industry in Wyoming is the raising of livestock. In 1933 they had 64 banks with total deposits of $40,366,000. In 1939 they had 58 banks with a total deposit of $70,034,000, or approximately a gain of 72 percent. Colorado, a neighboring State, whose principal industry is farming and the growing of livestock, in 1933 had 139 banks with a total deposit of $203,455,000, and in 1939, 145 banks with deposits of $344,431,000, or an increase of approximately 69 percent. The bank-guaranty law, a part of the New Deal program, insures a return of those deposits. No small part of the 1933 deposits were lost in bank failures.

In 1933 you could not borrow a dollar on any farm in the United States at any rate of interest, and mortgages were being foreclosed by the hundreds of thousands. Now you can borrow it at 3½ percent. The Government has loaned $2,000,000,000. Foreclosures on farm mortgages have decreased 69 percent.

Farm income in 1932 was $4,628,000,000. The estimate for 1940 is $9,000,000,000. In 1933 you sold wheat or corn for any price that was offered at the elevators. Wheat in Liverpool recently was the lowest in 342 years. Yet it sold in the United States for twice the 1933 price. The growers of wheat have borrowed $46,000,000 and the growers of corn $146,562,000. Those loans are absolutely sound. In case of a drought there will be no shortage of bread and no sacrificing of livestock.

SUGAR

People in my district are interested in sugar; in fact, I believe everyone in the United States is. Farmers' income from sugar beets and cane in 1933 was $68,364,000 and in 1939, $90,411,000. In 1932, with a net sugar price of $3.50 per hundred, the growers of beets received $4.56 per ton. In 1940, after deducting the 50-cent processing tax, the same priced sugar nets them $6.20 per ton. In addition to this, the present law also provides liberal payments in case it is necessary to abandon the crop. In 1933 the people who furnished 98 percent of the sugar consumed in the United States, realizing the necessity of doing something to bolster the market, met in Washington and signed a quota agreement. This agreement provided for practically the same quotas that are in existence today. In 1932–33 the world production of sugar was 28,872,000 tons and in 1938–39, 34,719,000 tons. This is an increase of about 23 percent. War conditions in Europe have destroyed a large part of the market for offshore cane. This sugar is accumulating in the hands of the growers and is a threat to future prices.

The 20 republics invited to the recent Pan American Conference in Havana produced during the 1938–39 crop season approximately 5,600,000 long tons of sugar. They consumed 2,400,000 tons, and exported more than 3,000,000 tons. For the current season crop production is estimated at 5,800,000 tons, of which 3,400,000 tons will be available for export. Europe cannot take this sugar. It cannot come to the United States without a complete disruption of our market, and tremendous losses to all elements of the domestic industry. This makes it absolutely necessary to have a quota if we are to receive anything like a reasonable price for our sugar beets.

There is a good deal of discussion at the present time regarding the attitude of the Democratic and Republican Parties on agriculture legislation. I have been a member of the Agriculture Committee since the spring of 1933. All

legislation affecting agriculture is first considered by this committee. Let us read the record.

President Roosevelt called an extra session of Congress in March 1933. On May 12 the first Agriculture Adjustment Act was signed. There were 60 Democrats in the Senate and 34 Republicans. In the House there were 309 Democrats and 117 Republicans. Sixty-five percent of the House Republicans voted against the three-A bill, and 52 percent of the Senate Republicans opposed the measure. Ninety-one percent of the Democrats in the House, and 92 percent of the Democrats in the Senate voted for it. The Hoosaic-Mills decision of the Supreme Court in January 1936 declared this act unconstitutional. Congress then enacted the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act. Seventy-seven percent of the House Republicans voted against it, and 89 percent of the Democrats in the House supported it. Sixty-nine percent of the Republicans in the Senate voted against it, and 82 percent of the Democrats for it. In 1937, when the question of parity payments was before the House for consideration, on a motion to recommit the bill, which was a vote to kill the parity payments, 95 percent of the Republicans voted for it. It was a direct vote against parity payments.

In the fall of 1937 Congress met in special session to enact new farm legislation. In February of the following year the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 became a law. This act contained the conservation program and provided for an ever-normal granary to stabilize supplies and prices of farm products. An important feature of the act was the authorization of parity payments to the producers of five basic crops. The new act also provided for crop insurance on wheat. On the passage of this bill 87 percent of the Republicans voted against it. In the Senate 81 percent of the Republicans opposed it and 79 percent of the Democrats voted for it. In 1939 when the parity payments were again up for consideration the vote of the conference report on June 22 showed 86 percent of the Republicans voted against it. In March 1940 when parity payments were again voted on, 86 percent of the Republicans voted against and 81 percent of the Democrats voted for it. On August 1, 1940, 73 percent of the Republican Members in the House voted against increasing the available capital of the Commodity Credit Corporation from $900,000,000 to $1,400,000,000. If the Republicans had had their way, the farmers who raised corn, cotton, wheat, and tobacco would have lost their opportunity to get Government loans on those commodities this year. That is the record.

Since the close of the first World War 83 percent of the Democrats in Congress have supported farm-relief legislation and only 39 percent of the Republicans. In the 12 years the Republicans were in power 68 percent of the Democrats voted for farm legislation, and in the last 7 years 85 percent of the Democrats have voted for farm legislation and 78 percent of the Republicans have opposed it.

Just how has this affected Colorado?

INCOME

Farmers make more money—1939 cash income up 83 percent from 1932; buying power, 171 percent from 1932; farm real-estate values in 1940, up 13 percent from 1933; 149,174 acres of 1940 wheat protected by crop insurance; 2,047,537 bushels of wheat were put in the ever-normal granary under 1939 commodity loans; $71,753,015 loaned by Farm Credit Administration agencies from 1933 to 1939; debts of low-income farmers reduced $1,395,237 under Farm Security Administration debt-adjustment service; 16,449,000 pounds of surplus foodstuffs distributed to needy in last fiscal year.

CONSERVATION

Farmers are conserving their soil—38,000 Colorado farmers participated in the 1939 A. A. A. program, representing about 85 percent of the State's cropland; 1,563,560 acres covered by 5-year agreement with the Soil Conservation Service in 1939; 281,400 trees distributed for planting during 1939.

SECURITY

Farmers are more secure in their homes—13,700 farm families received rural rehabilitation loans totaling more than $1,674,400 from 1935 to 1940; $1,875,926 made in grants in the same period; 44 tenant families started toward ownership by loans for farm purchases; 2,576 miles of rural electric lines to serve 8,301 farm families made possible by allotments of Rural Electrification Administration; 3,355 more farmers getting central-station electric service in 1939 than in 1935.

DEMOCRACY

Farmers help run the programs—56 county A. A. A. offices with 1,435 county and community committeemen administer A. A. A. program locally; 51 county committees and 20 tenant purchase committees working on program of Farm Security Administration; 75 local national farm-loan associations and 8 production credit associations in operation; 38 county land-use planning committees formed.

Not a bad record.

Far Eastern Triangle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL HINSHAW
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 14, 1940

LETTER OF K. K. KAWAKAMI, AUTHOR OF ARTICLE

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, in justice to Mr. K. K. Kawakami, author of the article, Far Eastern Triangle, I submit the following letter:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *September 13, 1940.*

Hon. CARL HINSHAW,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I feel myself honored to have my Foreign Affairs article reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at your instance. However, I wish to make a few observations on your introductory remarks.

Your remark that my story is couched in difficult diplomatic language is a great surprise to me. I thought that I used the language of the man in the street.

Then, too, I do not feel myself complimented when you say that the article might have been written by the Japanese Foreign Office, and that in any event it must have been approved by that office.

I dashed off that article in a single day, as newspapermen are always in a hurry, and sent it off to Foreign Affairs. I do not write in diplomatic jargon. I confess you are the only gentleman who has said that the article is difficult to understand.

The ideas I express and words I use are my own. My ideas often run counter to the policy of the Japanese Government, but I do not hesitate to express them. I am not in touch with the Japanese Foreign Office. I do not even go to the Japanese Embassy here, except once in a few months.

You may be interested in reading Far Eastern Policy of the United States, by Prof. A. W. Griswold, of Yale University. In fact, my article was inspired by that remarkable book.

Respectfully yours,

K. K. KAWAKAMI.

Daniel A. Reed Assails "Wallace, the Destroyer"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS E. GRAHAM
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 14, 1940

NEWSPAPER ARTICLE

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement of the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED]:

DANIEL A. REED ASSAILS "WALLACE THE DESTROYER"

WASHINGTON.—Congressman DANIEL A. REED, of New York, charged Wednesday that the new dealers already are making plans to continue their program of reckless squandering of public funds should the third-term attempt prove successful in the November elections.

"The evidence is clear that the third-termites despise every thought of prudent policy," REED said. He cited a recent speech by Secretary of Agriculture Wallace, in which the New Deal Vice Presidential nominee praised public squandering since 1933 as an achievement of statesmanship.

"Wallace the Destroyer naturally is not disturbed by the fact that the New Deal has more than doubled the Federal debt in 7½ years. A public official who destroyed more than 10,000,000 head of livestock belonging to the farmers of America, and who then plowed under more than 15,000,000 acres of American crops, obviously would not hesitate to spend other people's money for any cause. The new dealers have been wallowing so long in the United States Treasury that they cannot bear to think of the time—now close at hand—when they will be limited to spending their own funds."

Congressman REED said the Maine election foretold a solid national victory for the Republicans in November.

"The Republican vote in Maine last Monday was the largest, in percent of the total vote cast, since 1928, when the Republicans recorded the greatest national landslide in the history of the party.

"Millions of real American Democrats from coast to coast have repudiated Roosevelt's violent third-term ambitions. With dictatorship engulfing all of Europe and Asia, no real American Democrat will vote for one-man government in the United States

"Our mighty Nation has been weakened by New Deal squandering and demoralized by Roosevelt's broken promises. Recovery has been sacrificed to starry-eyed experimentation. More than 10,000,000 unemployed have been kept out of jobs. But even in this crippled condition, the Nation is not yet ready for a Roosevelt dictatorship. What ground is there for a hope that the authors of court-packing and purge would not quickly embrace all the other methods and devices of dictatorship, if elected for a third term?"

REED recalled President Roosevelt's 1932 promise to reduce Federal expenditure "by not less than 25 percent." Instead, he added, the routine expenses of the National Government, exclusive of defense, have more than doubled. But spending has not brought prosperity.

"The United States per-capita income in 1929 was $672. For 1940, according to the latest Commerce Department reports, our adjusted per-capita income will be only $645. These figures mean only one thing—that the New Deal is dragging America to a constantly lowered standard of living for all the people—the farmer, the worker, and the businessman alike.

"Every year under Roosevelt has brought at least six Roosevelt 'emergencies.' The Nation has lived constantly in an atmosphere of tumult and crisis. And now, after they have tried every device of squandering, Wallace, the Destroyer, tells the American people the New Deal should be given 4 years more to complete its work.

"But the American people have no more time for brain-trust theories. There is important work to be done. We must build up our national defenses. We must catch up on 7 years of New Deal neglect and incompetence. This is a practical job, for practical men. It cannot be accomplished by the Roosevelt-Wallace-Hopkins squanderbund.

"The American people are patient where noble purposes and honest intentions are evident. But our people are in no mood today to place the stamp of approval on an administration which has bluffed through for 7 years by the ignoble devices of trickery and tyranny.

"America is in a mood of rededication. The people are out to reclaim their Government from its despoilers."

Plot To Make United States British Colony

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN L. SWEENEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, September 14, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE GAELIC AMERICAN

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Gaelic American, New York, of September 7, 1940:

[From the Gaelic American, New York, September 7, 1940]

PLOT TO MAKE UNITED STATES BRITISH COLONY

"Union Now" is the title of a society formed a few weeks ago by Clarence K. Streit, who was for 10 years the New York Times correspondent at Geneva, later the same paper's Washington correspondent, and now connected with the Twentieth Century Foundation, a New York Times concern. Union Now is for an immediate merger or alliance of the United States with Great Britain, Canada, Ireland, South Africa, Australia, and New Zealand. In the early months of 1939, after Mr. Streit's return from Geneva, he delivered three lectures at the Cooper Foundation at Swarthmore College, Pennsylvania, in which he advocated a superstate which he referred to as a union of the North Atlantic democracies and the countries which he would unite were at that time United States, United Kingdom, France, Canada, the Netherlands, Belgium, Australia, Sweden, Switzerland, Denmark, Finland, Ireland, Norway, South Africa, and New Zealand.

His revised plan is for a merger of the United States with the British Empire. In a broadcast over WMCA on August 26, under the auspices of Union Now, he made a plea for an immediate merger of the Republic and the Empire. Nothing short of this union will satisfy Mr. Streit's desire to safeguard the British Empire. His speech was broadcast to South and Central America and to Europe. The same program is heard three times a week over the same radio station, WMCA. Who is paying for carrying Mr. Streit's voice all over the world? The cost is very considerable, too much for any private individual.

Mr. Streit, as a Rhodes scholar, spent a full term at Oxford University, England. His training in internationalism at the fountain head of English imperialism gave him inspiration for the plan which he is now trying to foist on the American people.

Cecil Rhodes, the founder of the scholarships, according to his will, had the ambition to bring the world under English rule and in particular, the United States. The Diamond King's scholarships were intended to spread friendship for the British Empire and to inculcate respect in the minds of the Rhodes scholars for English institutions. The Rhodes scholars, and more particularly those from the United States, receive special care at Oxford Part of the scheme is to treat them with kindness, to invite them to the castles and mansions of the titled caste on week ends and short vacations. Everything is done to make them at home and impress them with the importance of the empire. They acquire an English accent and mannerisms and a number of them became more English than the English themselves. It is only those of independent minds and sturdy Americanism who retain a regard for their own institutions. Those who succumb to the blandishments of their fellow students regard England as the greatest country in the world, even greater than their own Republic.

The revised scheme formulated by this product of the Rhodes foundation would place the United States under a supergovernment of which the United States would be one of the seven countries, of which five are outside the American continent and Canada is a British Dominion. This would give the United States only one vote in the union outlined by Streit.

In this union of seven states, England would have six votes, and in case of any disagreement the United States would be outvoted 5 or 6 to 1. This is not a very inviting position for the United States to assume after more than 150 years of complete independence and her present position as the most powerful nation in the world.

Mr. Streit's plan follows that outlined in Carnegie's prophecy that the United States would again unite with Great Britain. In his book Triumphant Democracy, published in 1893, the late iron king states: "Let men say what they will; therefore I say that as sure as the sun in the heavens once shone on Britons and Americans united, so surely is it one morning to rise, shine upon, and greet again the re-United States, the British-American union."

To this purpose Carnegie bequeathed a large part of his legacies, and in particular to the endowment for international peace. Among the many activities of the endowment is the creation of the international mind, which would weaken American patriotism and make college students citizens of the world rather than American nationalists. Both Cecil Rhodes and Andrew Carnegie would make the entire world the patrimony of England and relegate the United States into the subordinate position of a British colony. The Rhodes and Carnegie foundations have the same purpose—that of bringing the world under the jurisdiction of a power that has already annexed by conquest more than a quarter of the world's surface.

So far the Rhodes scholars have not attained to any commanding position in their own country. Their sojourn at Oxford has not helped them to gain any unusual prominence in the United States. This English training has undoubtedly undermined their Americanism without adding in any appreciable degree to the qualities which make for success—political, business, or professional—in the land of their birth.

Mr. Streit will not impress his countrymen with his panacea for world amity by the establishment of a union in which the United States would be submerged by England. Is England a democracy? What do the more than 300,000,000 of India ruled by English bureaucrats know about democracy? Will America be placed in a fantastic union under the tender mercies of Great Britain and her dominions?

An entering wedge for the merging of the United States into the British Empire, is President Roosevelt's fantastic scheme to negotiate a defensive and offensive alliance with Canada, one of the belligerent countries. The negotiations for the acquisition of naval and air bases in Bermuda, the Bahamas, Jamaica, and other islands in the Caribbean Sea must be carried on directly with England. A merger or alliance with the British Empire is evidently being pushed by the Washington administration.

The Dies committee should not keep its eyes closed to the most subtle of all the propaganda with which America has been bombarded, in more than 50 years—British propaganda. Why not investigate Mr. Streit, the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace and the numerous propaganda bureaus, under various names,

maintained by England in our big cities? The time has come to check the influences working for the establishment of the Carnegie-Rhodes proposed British-American union which would haul down the Stars and Stripes and lift up the flag of England. The time is now, not tomorrow, next month, or next year, for that vigilance which is the price of liberty. Wake up, America!

Lundeen's Death a National Loss

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARTIN L. SWEENEY
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 14, 1940

ARTICLE FROM THE GAELIC AMERICAN

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Gaelic American (New York) of September 7, 1940:

[From the Gaelic American (New York) of September 7, 1940]

LUNDEEN'S DEATH A NATIONAL LOSS

The tragic death on August 31 of Senator ERNEST LUNDEEN, of Minnesota, came as a great shock to the millions who esteemed him as a fearless and outspoken exponent of old-time Americanism.

A determined foe of alien propagandists and their native agents, an independent in politics who never bent his will to bossism, and a Senator who could not be cajoled or coerced to support any measure which he regarded as inimical to the best interests of his country, his death is an irreparable loss at this critical period in American history. A man of rare ability and integrity he was an uncompromising opponent of sham and hypocrisy.

He voted in 1917 against President Wilson's declaration of war and time has fully vindicated his stand. He understood that involvement in a war, which had no vital interest for America, was a mistake, even a crime and neither clamor nor hysteria could divert him from opposing a blunder which turned out to be the cause of so much evil, loss of young American lives, and waste of billions of dollars. As time passes the folly of Woodrow Wilson seems more serious and inexcusable. Senator LUNDEEN, who was then a Member of the House, is remembered and revered for his patriotism and steadfastness, while the "yes" men in the House and Senate are nearly all forgotten or despised.

His death at this crisis in the country's affairs is a severe blow to those who were associated with him in an effort to keep the country from involvement in a war which is not worth the life of one American citizen. A veteran of the Spanish-American war, a crack shot, and a man of great energy and versatility, his views, particularly on military affairs, were listened to with respect and attention by his Senate colleagues.

His fight for virile Americanism and his respect for the warning of Washington against foreign alliances made him a leader of the movement to keep America out of the imperialist wars of the Old World. His death, coming so soon after that of the great Borah, weakens the ranks of the old guard in the Senate, the men who fought and defeated the League of Nations, the World Court and the St. Lawrence Waterway Treaty. Senator LUNDEEN will be remembered for his loyalty, courage, and service to his country. Men of his caliber are far too few in the House and Senate.

Senator LUNDEEN'S death is a national loss. May God be good to his noble soul.

A Newspaperman's Estimate of Congressional Accomplishment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS D. CULKIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 14, 1940

ARTICLE FROM THE WATERTOWN (N. Y.) TIMES

Mr. CULKIN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the permission heretofore given by the House I place in the RECORD an estimate of my congressional work written by that able and veteran newspaperman, Mr. Jesse S. Cottrell, and appearing in that excellent paper, the Watertown Times, under date of September 12, 1940. Mr. Cottrell is not only a good newspaperman but a good friend, and I fear he may have slightly overdrawn the record of my services.

The article follows:

[From the Watertown Times]

CULKIN'S WORK THIS SEASON WIDESPREAD—NORTH CONGRESSMAN HAS MANY ACCOMPLISHMENTS TO HIS CREDIT

(By Jesse S. Cottrell)

WASHINGTON, September 12.—With the work of the present session of Congress practically completed and leaders arranging adjournment effective the latter part of this month, Congressman FRANCIS D. CULKIN, of the Thirty-second New York District, is concluding 9 months of the most strenuous but fruitful periods in his long and successful legislative career.

Like other Members of Congress who occupy high stations by virtue of important committee assignments and advocacy of reforms that will be beneficial to their constituents, Judge CULKIN has, in fact, had his nose to the grindstone during the last 9 months, both in committee work and constant attendance upon long sessions of the House.

Judge CULKIN is ranking Republican on two of the most important committees in the House at this time: Merchant Marine and Fisheries, and Rivers and Harbors. Should the next House be Republican, which is now generally conceded by political prognosticators, Judge CULKIN will have the chairmanship, no doubt, of one of these committees. He is also a member of Elections Committee No. 2 and has, during the last 9 months this session has been in progress, written decisions of some of the most troublesome election contests that have been before the House.

In closing out the major part of his legislative program for this session, friends of Judge CULKIN refer with pride to his accomplishments which, generally speaking, have been unusual, in view of the fact that a large number of major measures were before Congress and consumed much of the time and attention of that body in a general way.

One of the most outstanding accomplishments of the Thirty-second District Congressman has been his unceasing and tireless work in behalf of the dairy farmers of northern New York. It is pointed out by his colleagues from dairying sections that he is not only the outstanding but the most fearless sponsor of legislation in the interest of the dairymen and advocate of their interests in the House.

Judge CULKIN has always taken the position that the dairying industry is not only the most vital to human life, but that it is surrounded by circumstances which cause the interest of the dairy farmer to be overlooked in many instances. The Congressman has always sought to free the dairy farmer from the shackles of the monopolistic influences and has sought at all times to bring about conditions whereby the dairy farmer would obtain a fair return for his milk and dairy products.

In furtherance of that objective, he was successful in obtaining an appropriation at this session whereby the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice may be enabled to have sufficient investigators and legal talent to delve into the dairy situation.

As a member of the Committee on Merchant Marine, Judge CULKIN has sedulously and persistently sponsored legislation and has been able to secure it whereby the merchant marine of the country may be amply equipped to carry on a constant flow of exports, especially from the farming sections of this country, so that the farmer might be given the same treatment in finding foreign markets for their products as the manufacturer. In this connection, he was able to free the Merchant and Marine Commission of shipbuilding influences, so that it might carry out its mission.

The estimated saving to the taxpayers of the country wrought by Judge CULKIN in this connection is estimated at forty to fifty million dollars.

Since the Thirty-second District borders on Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River, Judge CULKIN handled every phase of Great Lakes' interests and was largely instrumental in applying the old-age pension law to seamen on the Great Lakes and the oceans. The legislation that he sponsored in this respect, has only recently gone into effect. He also fought constantly for betterment of living conditions and pay for seamen on the Great Lakes and the high seas.

THE SEAWAY PLAN

While handling matters relating to the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence River and their development, the Congressman has ever been mindful of the advantages and benefits that would come to the north country through the proposed Great Lakes and St. Lawrence seaway. Judge CULKIN feels that this great project is now nearer consummation than ever before.

As an example he today hailed the proposed establishment of a Navy base at Newfoundland as a forward step in this respect. He pointed out that establishment of this great base would give a new impulse to construction of the seaway and that it meant that immediately foreign vessels would now be admitted passage on the St. Lawrence as a consequence.

Before leaving for his home at the conclusion of this session, Judge CULKIN hopes to have the program successfully finished under which the proposed acquisition of an additional 300,000 acres for Pine Camp will have been successfully carried out. Backed

by loyal and patriotic citizens in Jefferson, Lewis, Oswego, and other counties, who are vitally interested in this project, Judge CULKIN hopes to secure ample funds for it by including a clause in the final deficiency bill that will be passed during the last days of this session.

Only yesterday, Judge CULKIN made another trip to the War Department and went over the entire matter with high Army officers and feels that the War Department officers will approve the recommendation that this property be acquired just as soon as it reaches their desks.

Judge CULKIN also hopes to obtain a $50,000 appropriation for Cape Vincent, and improvements of the harbor at Clayton, N. Y. Both of these items are on the river and harbor agenda for the next session, and he is confident that he will have little difficulty in having them included in the bill, and has assurance of Senator BAILEY and others that they will be taken care of.

Aside from the Pine Camp project, Judge CULKIN already obtained an appropriation of $270,000 for Madison Barracks at Sackets Harbor, and an additional $200,000 has just been provided at that place for additional housing facilities.

During the present session of Congress, Judge CULKIN handled for the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries the $270,000,000 appropriation for additional locks and improvements in the Panama Canal, and feels that it is one of the greatest contributions to national defense that has been made at this session, although he sponsored and voted for this improvement before existing exigencies arose that have brought about the enactment of the two national-defense programs.

In case the St. Lawrence treaty comes before the next Congress, as is expected, the fiscal phase of it would be referred to Judge CULKIN'S Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, and his intimate knowledge of the seaway proposal, and his experience in handling such matters as the appropriation for the Panama Canal, would serve him in good stead and would be fortunate for the sponsors of the project in this respect.

PENSION MEASURES

A check of Judge CULKIN'S office today revealed that he has obtained the passage at this session of over 75 private pension bills, the largest number to the credit of any House Member, for the benefit of aged widows of Civil War veterans, Spanish-American War veterans, and their dependents, and World War veterans or their dependents. These have all cleared the calendar in the House and have gone to the Senate, and the attitude of that body as to such legislation will determine their fate.

One of Judge CULKIN'S major accomplishments at this session of Congress was obtaining a ruling by the Federal Communications Commission prohibiting liquor advertisement over the radio. He has fought consistently against liquor being advertised on the radio, his position being that a public utility like the radio should not be used to indoctrinate children in the use of alcohol.

This ruling was the result of his bill against liquor being advertised by radio.

Friends of Judge CULKIN feel that while this session of Congress has been the most strenuous in which he has ever participated, it is perhaps the most beneficial to the Nation as a whole and the district which he represents in Congress particularly, so far as the legislation he has sponsored is concerned.

National Defense—The Summit (N. J.) National Defense Organization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD H. McLEAN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, September 14, 1940

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. Speaker, of interest to all who are interested in national defense is the recent reorganization of the National Defense Organization of Summit, N. J., originally instituted in April 1916.

Its purpose is to provide the opportunity for voluntary military training. It will also cooperate with the mayor and Governor of the State in matters of national defense. It has already provided the nucleus of personnel for the local national-defense council.

Thousands of American citizens throughout the country—more accurately, millions—want opportunity most earnestly to get some preliminary military training before the time when they may be called into new and unaccustomed service by a draft act, by universal military training, or similar national necessity. It is all a very human reaction in the face of present dire, undesired necessities.

The following letter depicts this attitude:

On September 23, 1917, I reached Camp Dix, one of the many draftees.

On November 26, 1917, arrived at St. Nazaire, France, member of an engineer labor battalion.

On June 12, 1918, transferred from labor battalion to flash ranging engineers and sent to school.

On August 18, 1918, was given a rifle and told to make up my pack for the front, which I reached next day.

Fortunately for me, I was brought up on a farm, and as a result, was familiar with firearms, because there I was on the front lines with a rifle and no one had even shown me how to load the thing. I personally had two replacements in the front lines ask me to show them how to operate their rifles.

Try to imagine what I would of given for 1 year's military training under my belt.

Looking into the future from my small pond, a need for two, or even three, million trained men could easily materialize. If not, what harm has the training done?

Every community in the country is trying to do something about this, to evolve helpful methods for its citizens in this respect—helpful alike to the individual, and to the country.

An excellent undertaking in this regard is an undertaking involving no national or other expense, but, as it seems to me, valuably effective. It is being administered in the city of Summit, in my county of Union, N. J. This Summit plan involves what they call a little Plattsburg.

The original Plattsburg camp for military training came into being in 1915, through the inspiration of the late Gen. Leonard Wood. Many invaluable officers in the former World War came out of the preliminary training these men had received at Plattsburg.

In the National Defense Act of 1920, the Government provided for continuance of the Plattsburg idea by inaugurating citizens military training camps in every State of the Union, and thousands of young men have since been given opportunity each year to get some preliminary military training, some orderly idea of reasonable discipline, some accustomedness and leadership in handling men, and a valuable impetus toward unselfish patriotic endeavor. All this has been of immense service to individuals and to the country.

The Military Training Camps Association of the United States came into being during the former war, its membership composed mostly of graduates of the original Plattsburg camps. This is an active country-wide organization of well-known men. Upon the passage of the National Defense Act of 1920, the Government recognized the standing, efficiency, and patriotism of the M. T. C. A. and placed it in direct civilian charge of the procurement of candidates in every State for the yearly Citizens' Military Training Camps, which began in 1921. And this year it was this organization that inspired the immensely popular Business and Professional Men's Training Camp at Plattsburg and elsewhere, and administered its inception, cooperating with the Regular Army. The courses of training of this new Plattsburg camp, and the courses of the basic-year training of all the regular C. M. T. Camps, are practically the same. In 1923 the War Department inaugurated the present system of civilian aides to the Secretary of War, comprising a chief civilian aide, a corps-area aide in each of the nine Army corps areas, and a State civilian aide in each of the 48 States. The Secretary of War, on nomination by the M. T. C. A., appoints these civilian aides from the membership of the M. T. C. A.

In Summit, N. J., is a local organization surviving from the former war, called the National Defense Organization of Summit, N. J., widely known then as the N. D. O. It was organized in April, 1916, its object stated to be "to coordinate thought and action for local defense and national preparedness." In February 1917 ex-President Theodore Roosevelt wrote a letter to the N. D. O., certain statements of which letter, in the light of pending developments, are highly interesting and significant. I am permitted to reproduce this letter, as follows:

OFFICE OF THEODORE ROOSEVELT,
February 16, 1917.

Mr. BUFORD FRANKLIN,
Mayor, Summit, N. J.

MY DEAR MR. MAYOR: Good for Summit, N. J. If the rest of the country had the same spirit of enthusiastic patriotism, there isn't

an American citizen on shore or afloat who would be in danger of an attack by the representatives of any power on earth, and we would have universal military training for every man in this country, and every citizen would accept it as a matter of course that in time of war he or she would serve the country in whatever capacity would be most efficient. Meanwhile, until we get universal training of this kind, the best work that can be done is just such work as you, and your fellow citizens of Summit have been doing. I wish you well, with all my heart.

Sincerely yours,

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

Twenty-three years ago, Theodore Roosevelt advocated universal military training as belatedly millions advocate it today. And a prominent weekly took up the matter of the Summit N. D. O. and spread it broadcast; and many towns throughout the country patterned defense and preparedness organizations on the Summit N. D. O. In April 1916, a year before we went into the war, men began learning many elementary military items, and when these men enlisted, or were drafted, after April 6, 1917, they rapidly became noncoms, and later officers, and many returned from France with the highest military decorations.

And last May the N. D. O. of Summit got into active operation again, through the initiative of its former—and present—president, ex-Mayor Ruford Franklin, of Summit; who has also been New Jersey civilian aide to the Secretary of War since the inception of that plan in 1923, and also a member of the executive committee of the M. T. C. A., Second Corps Area.

"Fifth column" activities were at once given consideration in cooperation with Federal, State, and city authorities; a headquarters in a prominent location has been opened for enrollments, information about technical schools, and similar opportunities, and for direct recruiting for the Army, National Guard, and the other services; a women's division is operating, and a course of up-to-date elementary military training was got underway at once. A large group of ex-service officers and men and some recent R. O. T. C. graduates have been training since early June to perfect themselves as instructors. This, of course, is particularly necessary because of the drastic changes in Army drill regulations in force since last year. These men will soon be ready to drill the larger body.

I had opportunity, while at home during the recent brief congressional vacation due to matters at Chicago, to interrogate Mr. Franklin. The executive committee of the N. D. O. has arranged its operating organization on the plan of a regular army "general staff," (G-1, personnel; G-2, intelligence; G-3, training; G-4, supply). "In the matter of training," said Mr. Franklin, "we have arranged courses practically the same as the basic year of the regular C. M. T. C., which is the same as that given the older men at the Plattsburg "business and professional men's camp" this year. In other words, a little Plattsburg right at home. Naturally the men will not live together in tents as at Plattsburg. They will live with their families as usual, and pursue their regular daily avocations; the training and instruction will be in the evenings and on Saturdays. Later, if needed, we have an excellent field ready to be flood-lighted and used. Or wide streets, or a park, can be made available. A nearby gymnasium or large hall will be used in stormy weather. Some difficulties will have to be ironed out; but we are on our way, and let no man tell you differently. Whatever happens, the course we'll give will be the Plattsburg-C. M. T. C. course. If every community in the country would have a little Plattsburg—a little Plattsburg that effectively began the training of a few, or a few hundred, men—then many thousands of patriotic citizens all over the country would feel much better, and of higher morale; and the Army, and the country, would already be measurably on its way toward real preparedness. And all with no expense to anyone; just patriotic expense of spare time.

I asked Mr. Franklin, "What are you going to do about rifles to drill with?" He said, "I expected that question. We have a couple of dozen old Springfield rifles that we have commandeered in various ways. We shall drill the men by squads; which is not so good as we would like; but our men have the spirit and will do the trick. Besides, it should be remembered that there are many items in the Plattsburg course of training that do not necessarily involve drill with an actual rifle. Close order drill, extended order drill, military organization, courtesy and customs, duties of noncoms and officers, elementary map reading, and so forth. As a matter of fact we do not expect to turn out major generals; only incipient ones! In the first World War, the War Department loaned us a couple of hundred old outmoded Army rifles for drilling purposes. There must be millions of such stored away now, all over the country, of no practical use except for drilling. Cannot they be unearthed and put to this real, very practical use? Could it not be done under proper authority and with proper restrictions?

Little Plattsburgs all over the country will serve as a practical, valuable aid to individual patriotic Americans, and as an aid toward actually speeding up the defense and preparedness of the country as a whole. Congress should authorize and direct the War Department to loan at once, for the purposes of civilian drill, all needed old outmoded rifles, to all such practical patriotic organizations as the N. D. O. of Summit, N. J., under proper conditions and restrictions.

With the thought and hope that many of you may carry the Summit, N. J., little Plattsburg plan to your own communities, I am appending hereto the impression of an observer at one of the recent meetings of the Summit N. D. O.; also copies of the first and second reports of the organization to the people of the city:

[From the Summit Herald of August 20, 1940]

THE N. D. O. PRELIMINARY TRAINING COURSE LITTLE PLATTSBURG—JOIN UP!

"Right face; right shoulder arms; forward march!" And 32 men, members of the N. D. O. instructors' training group, were off, in a column of files, for another evening of drill, familiarizing themselves with the infantry drill regulations and tactics.

Your Summit Herald representative, privileged for the first time to witness this group practice the new infantry drill, wore a perplexed expression as he turned to an N. D. O. official. This type of drill was different from that which he expected to see.

Replying to a question, the official explained that the old squad formation of 8 men has been changed to 12 men who now "fall in" in single rank; that rifles are brought to the shoulder while the formation is at a halt; that facings and flank movements largely replace former squad tactics; that intervals are different; that, in short, anyone having had military training prior to September 1939 has a great deal to forget and much to learn anew.

Furthermore, your representative was informed, that former service men, thinking of tactical formations and equipment in terms of their own experiences, will be considerably surprised at the variety of weapons, in addition to the old faithful Springfield, now found in an infantry company, and with which each doughboy must become familiar in case of an emergency. Not only has the infantry company become streamlined, but it is highly technical and mechanized as well.

It was a recognition of these drastic charges and improvements in modern military drill, tactics, and equipment which prompted the N. D. O. to interest a group of former service men, graduates of military schools and other patriotic citizens, to train for the past 2 months under the direction of active Army Reserve officers, learning the new regulations and tactics, to the end that they may form the initial instructors' group for the N. D. O. Little Plattsburg which opens soon after Labor Day.

In connection with little Plattsburg, this N. D. O. official stated, "In addition to other matters being administered under the N. D. O., the present particular effort is being directed toward the approaching commencement of the training course."

Commenting further regarding the desirability for such training in Summit, the N. D. O. official said: "In many communities throughout the United States men are beginning to acquaint themselves with the elementary principles of military drill and discipline. These men are alert; they recognize the critical possibilities with which our country may be confronted, and, realizing the part they may have to play, are getting a head start. They know that even a smattering of military knowledge acquired now can prove most beneficial both to the Nation and to themselves, if and when they are called into active military service. In past similar emergencies many noncommissioned as well as commissioned officers gained their initial advantage through the training received in these voluntary drill groups.

"As in 1917–18, when the N. D. O. of Summit gave such training to hundreds of men, many of whom benefited thereby when they entered the military service, this organization has been making arrangements to give military instruction to all those having the foresight and willingness to spend some of their free time in this constructive effort.

"The N. D. O. little Plattsburg will be open to all men, aged 17 to 50, who desire to take the course. The training to be given is that which is common to all arms of the military and naval service so that those who complete the course and who are later called for active duty or home defense will have the advantage of this experience over other recruits. Furthermore, during the course, those showing aptitude for leadership will be given ample opportunity to develop it in the actual handling of troops at drill and in the field."

The N. D. O. little Plattsburg course is, as nearly as practicable, the same as the basic citizens military training camps' course and the Business and Professional Men's Training Course at Plattsburg.

The basis of the course is infantry drill. Practical training will also be given in interior guard duty, physical training, nomenclature, care, and markmanship of the rifle and pistol, extended order drill, map reading, and military sketching.

Elementary instruction in military organization, Army regulations, customs of the service, duties of officers and noncommissioned officers, military sanitation, hygiene, and first aid, and signal communication will be included. Other subjects may be added as occasion requires and time permits.

The drills and training will be conducted a few hours at night in designated areas out of doors, and in halls during inclement weather, and any sacrifice of free time will be more than counterbalanced by this contribution made to the national need and the experience gained by those who may be later called to the colors. Preparedness is the only insurance against disaster.

Information and enrollment forms may be obtained at N. D. O. Headquarters, 19 Beechwood Road, Summit (open daily 10 to 12, 2 to 4, and 7:30 to 9:30 p. m., Monday through Friday; and on Saturday from 10 to 12 and 2 to 4).

[From the Summit Press of July 18, 1940]

SUMMIT'S N. D. O. ISSUES FIRST COMMUNIQUE TO LOCAL CITIZENS—LISTS SIX MAIN OBJECTIVES AS ITS FUNCTION TO COORDINATE THOUGHT AND ACTION FOR LOCAL DEFENSE AND MATERIAL PREPAREDNESS IN COOPERATION WITH CITY, STATE, AND NATIONAL AUTHORITIES

A detailed report has just been issued on the six objectives of Summit N. D. O. and some of its accomplishments to date. The text of this report, which The Summit Press is pleased to publish, follows:

To the People of Summit:

The National Defense Organization of Summit, N. J., known as the N. D. O. (organized April 1916, refunctioning, May 1940), hereby submits the first of a series of reports to the citizens of Summit:

REPORT NO. 1

The N. D. O. has been functioning actively since its renewal of operations in May. It conceives its function to be, to coordinate thought and action for local defense and national preparedness, in cooperation with city, State, and National authorities.

Accordingly, the N. D. O. has six main objectives, as follows:

1. The consideration of "fifth column" activities. The executive committee at its first meeting authorized and instructed the president to appoint an appropriate committee, the personnel thereof to be known only to the president. This was done at once, and the committee has been actively in touch with the local police authorities, the F. B. I., and other agencies. Any communication in this regard should be addressed: N. D. O., post office box 412, Summit, N. J.

2. The matter of military training Communications were at once sent in May to all ex-service men in Summit and vicinity; and a notable response resulted in two crowded and tensely interested meetings in the council chamber, city hall. Valuable suggestions were made and others later by letter.

One of the points discussed was the drastic changes recently made in the drill regulations used in all branches of the military and naval services.

It is intended to offer soon to all citizens of Summit a course of military training identical, so far as practicable, with the basic-year training of the citizens' military training camps, which is essentially the same training as is being given to the business and professional men's camp at Plattsburg now. The Military Training Corps Association of the United States brought about the C. M. T. C. in 1921 and sponsored the present undertaking and obtained the authorization for it from the War Department.

Ex-Mayor Ruford Franklin, president of the N. D. O., has been a member of the executive committee of the Military Training Camps Association and civilian aide for New Jersey to the Secretary of War, for many years since the first World War; and as such has had charge of procurement for New Jersey for the regular citizens' military training camps; and similarly, for New Jersey, for the Business and Professional Men's Camp of this year.

Under the direction of Lt. Col. Robert E. Woodward, United States Infantry Reserve, one of the chairmen of the N. D. O. Military Training Committee, and a frequent instructor for the regular Citizens' Military Training Camps at Fort Dix and Plattsburg, a group of about 25 ex-service men and Reserve Officers' Training Camp graduates have been practicing the new drill regulations for a number of weeks, drilling 2 evenings from 7:30 to 9 and Saturday morning from 9:30 to 11 each week, to qualify as instructors. In other words, Summit is rapidly preparing to offer its citizens a "Little Plattsburg." This will give men an opportunity for basic military training in advance of any call by the Government.

3. Home defense: This ties in with the foregoing, and plans will be duly perfected and announced.

4. The matter of technical and mechanical training for war purposes: Summit has no institution of its own equipped to do this vitally essential work. In cooperation with Mr. John B. Dougall, superintendent of schools, and Mr. Thomas H. Hogan, in charge in Summit of the State unemployment service, full information as to vocational and technical schools, now being rapidly established under State and Federal authority, will be afforded in due course to citizens at N. D. O. headquarters, 19 Beechwood Road. These schools offer training without cost to those who enter and retain those who show aptitude with pay.

5. Recruiting. The N. D. O. will have full information from the regular recruiting officers of the Army, Navy, National Guard, Marines, and air services for those who desire such. If and when practicable, the attendance of a regular recruiting officer will be obtained at stated times.

6. Women's division. The women's division, Mrs. Carroll P. Bassett, chairman, is rapidly perfecting plans for all proper matters. It will cooperate with the local Red Cross chapter but in no manner seek to duplicate the splendid work already being done by that organization.

Further details as to all the foregoing will be submitted from time to time.

The officers of the N. D. O., are: President, Ruford Franklin; vice presidents, Carroll P. Bassett, Edward B. Twombly, Guy Bates; treasurer, Oliver B. Merrill; secretary general, Newman C. Wade; recording secretary, Frederick C. Kentz.

The operating organization of the N. D. O. follows the plan of a Regular Army General Staff; G–1 (personnel, Gardner Eastman); G–2 (intelligence, Lloyd S. King); G–3 (training, Robert E. Woodward, Theodore S. Kenyon); G–4 (supply, Ralph P. White).

The executive committee consists of the officers; and as ex officio members when called upon, the heads of the G–1, G–2, G–3, and G–4; and the current commanders of Summit Post 138, American Legion, at present John C. Conant, and of Beacon Hill Post 190, Veterans of Foreign Wars, at present Russell McGowan.

General and special enrollments in the N. D. O. will soon be opened at headquarters. General enrollees will be required to sign a card embodying the oath of allegiance to the United States. In addition to the foregoing, special enrollees will enroll for such service as they wish and consider themselves best adapted.

The N. D. O. has no dues or initiation fees. The work has been financed so far by the residue of a small fund remaining from the former wartime. No drive or requests for funds is contemplated now. There may be need for funds in the future. This can be taken care of by special contributions. A number of Summit citizens, without being asked, have already sent substantial checks to the treasurer, "for the good of the cause," an action which is deeply gratifying and symbolic of the spirit of Summit in the present crisis.

Respectfully submitted.

RUFORD FRANKLIN, *President.*
NEWMAN C. WADE, *Secretary General.*

SUMMIT, N. J., *July 16, 1940.*

[From the Summit Herald of August 9, 1940]

THE N. D. O. ISSUES SECOND REPORT IN REFERENCE TO ITS ACTIVITIES

To the People of Summit:

The National Defense Organization of Summit—N. D. O.—hereby submits the second of a series of reports to the citizens of Summit:

REPORT NO. 2

Following previous information, we report that the N. D. O. headquarters, 19 Beechwood Road, will be open for general business next Monday night, August 12. Until further notice, the headquarters will be open every night, except Sundays, from 7:30 to 9:30 o'clock.

The purposes are as follows:

(1) To offer information in reference to aviation schools, technical and other defense schools, courses of training or instruction, activities for women, etc.

(2) To offer information in reference to enlistments in the Army, Navy, National Guard, etc

(3) To receive general enrollments for membership in the N. D. O. The general enrollment form is worded as follows:

"I am a citizen of the United States of America, and professing full allegiance and loyalty to the Nation and to its ideals and personal freedom within law, hereby enroll as a member of the National Defense Organization of Summit, N. J. (the N. D. O.). It is understood, (1) that there are no fees or dues; and (2) that membership entitles the holder to apply for opportunity to take part in some activity of the organization."

(4) To offer special enrollment forms to those desiring same, including enrollment forms for the Little Plattsburg course of military training (to begin early in September), for instruction of women in handling firearms, etc. Information will be afforded as to all such matters.

It should be noted that general enrollments for memberships are basic, and are open to both men and women, 17 years of age or over (no upper limits). (Junior memberships, under 17, will be announced in due course.) A general enrollment means (1) that the enrollee is duly a member of the N. D. O. (no fees, dues, or other obligation); (2) that the enrollee thereupon becomes entitled to participate in any of the defense and preparedness activities instituted through the N. D. O., if he or she desires; (3) that the enrollee is entitled to receive special notices of local or national concern; (4) that, in any event, the enrollee is a live American awake to the present crisis and in sympathy with the aims and endeavors of the N. D. O. to provide for the community such opportunities for preparedness and defense as may be within its power as a local, unofficial organization; and that he or she testifies thus, by such enrollment, to his or her moral support, at least, to united effort for the benefit of the community.

It should be noted also that the officers of the N. D. O. and everyone connected with it, are all giving their time and thought to its operation purely as volunteers, without pay or emolument of any kind. That its expenses for postage, printing, and various unavoidable items (light, telephone, meetings, etc.), are being met from the proceeds of unsolicited contributions from patriotic citizens for the good of the cause. That information about the Summit Plan for Little Plattsburg and other N. D. O. activities is already being asked for by communities in various parts of the country, and is being supplied (as was the case in 1917–18) and will continue to be supplied. That, in cooperation with local, State, and Federal authorities, the matter of the "fifth column" is always under consideration. That, in cooperation with the able work of the Red Cross, plans are in hand for use of resources in the event of increased emergency.

And it should be noted that the fundamental thought of the N. D. O. in these present days of stress is that the only common sense way is to look at matters at their worst; and then, realizing possibilities, to try, so far as humanly practicable, to be prepared for the worst. If the worst doesn't come, so much the better. But it may.

Respectfully submitted.

RUFORD FRANKLIN,
President.
NEWMAN C. WADE,
Secretary General.

SUMMIT, N. J., *August 7, 1940.*

Volunteer System Should Be Given a Trial Before Adopting Compulsory Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD K. CLAYPOOL
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 14, 1940

Mr. CLAYPOOL. Mr. Speaker, we have before the House the question of whether or not to adopt the report of the conference committee on the Burke-Wadsworth compulsory military service bill. When this bill was previously before this House I voted in favor of the bill as then written. At that time it contained the provision delaying conscription for a period of 60 days and providing for voluntary enlistment in the Army during this 60-day period and for any necessary conscription of industry. I favored and still favor this arrangement. Our danger is certainly no more imminent than that of the Dominion of Canada, which has not yet adopted conscription, though it has been in the war as a part of the British Empire for months, and its parent England in dire and immediate danger of invasion, if my information is correct. The people of the United States of America are in my opinion equally as loyal to their Government as the people of Canada are to theirs. At least they certainly are entitled to the opportunity under existing conditions to show their interest in the welfare of the Nation by volunteering to enter the Army in sufficient numbers for 60 days to fill the immediate needs. Furthermore, I believe it will take the Army 60 days to be ready to take on the detailed work of conscription. There is no evidence that the volunteer system for 60 days will not provide all the soldiers the Army can train in the period.

I am strongly in favor of preparedness and have voted for every defense measure and will continue to do so. I want every American soldier to be clothed and armed 100 percent. I want industry speeded to the point that no weapon of defense will be lacking when, if ever, attack comes. My record shows my votes in accord with this statement.

I believe, with our great President, as stated in his speech of September 11, 1940, before a great body of the labor of America, that appropriations of property by paying reasonable compensation therefor is a long recognized right of government. I believe when necessary industry should be conscripted to fill the needs of our Army in an emergency such as now confronts the United States.

I cannot support the conference report leaving out the 60-day period for voluntary enlistment. The object of the Army is to obtain 1,000,000 men by February 1941. The present strength of the Army, including reserves, is 686,000 men. This leaves 314,000 men to be obtained in 4½ months. Enlistments in the Army jumped from 3,872 in the month of January 1939 to 33,888 in August 1940 on the basis of preliminary reports. Final reports are expected to show this enlistment to have reached 45,000 in August. If this rate continues plus the percentage of increase per month as shown from January 1939 to August 1940, the voluntary system would produce the 314,000 men desired by February 1941, and keep in mind that these enlistments were for 3-year periods at $21 per month while the new provision would have required only 1 year enlistment at a base pay of $30 per month. For these reasons I intend to vote against the conference report as now submitted. The House was right when it originally passed the bill with the 60-day opportunity to enlist. I disagree with the conference committee and will not allow them to substitute their judgment for mine as to the patriotism of the men of America.

Let American industry gird itself to arm American men and the hearts and souls and minds of the men of America will respond with valor to the needs of today as did their forefathers of the days of Valley Forge and Chateau Thierry. I have faith in America.

Preserving America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEPHEN BOLLES
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 14, 1940

LETTER FROM L. R. CLAUSEN, OF RACINE, WIS.

Mr. BOLLES. Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to extend my remarks and include a letter received by me from Mr. L. R. Clausen of Racine, Wis., which is so complete and so analytical that I think it should be read by everybody.

SEPTEMBER 5, 1940.

The Honorable STEPHEN BOLLES,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BOLLES: This letter requires no answer, as I am a believer in the American form of government, which is a republic, with Representatives, and not a democracy for direct action, as so many people have been misled to think. Our Senators and Representatives in Congress are there to use their own best judgment, and not to respond to appeals made by telegrams, letters, etc. Your own activity in Congress should be greatly commended.

I presume from my previous letters you will understand how at least one of your supporters feels about—

1. The obvious attempts of the administration to get this country into war.
2. The obviously drummed-up hysteria that is being created by the administration through false representations and false propaganda.
3. The unnecessary and unsound legislation that is coming out of this un-American campaign of un-American activities.
4. The failure to do the obviously necessary thing if the Nation is really and sincerely interested in preparedness.

One example of the vicious and false representation used to instill fear in our people emanates from the statements made by the President himself about submarines being in Alaska, along the Oregon coast, and around Santiago, in the Caribbean Sea, off Halifax, off New England, and off Cape Hatteras, with the outright statement, or the implied reference that these submarines were German. Another example is the statement regarding the ease of invasion of the United States by air from South America, Greenland, Canada, and everywhere else—from Bermuda, and other points on the Atlantic seaboard, with the implication that Germany not only could but intended to invade the United States, further adding to the fears of our people.

Another example is the exaggerated and misleading statements regarding the "fifth column" activities in various countries to the south of us and in South America, with the implication that these are German activities.

Another case of trying to stir up not only fears among the people but hatred against the Germans in general and Germany as a country in particular, is the omission of the real "fifth column" activities in the White House and in Washington, and by the Communist Party in the United States and all the Western Hemisphere

countries; this has been very carefully omitted in this false and misleading propaganda; in fact, the Communists are very carefully protected by the present administration. We have plenty of them drawing money from the Government, on important jobs, right in Washington, where the real "fifth column" activities are centered.

The attitude of the administration toward foreign countries is obviously aimed at putting us in the war, and there are many who feel that there will be a most deliberate attempt to do this before election day so, by some emergency act, the election can be postponed or omitted, leaving the President with full dictatorial powers which have been handed to him by a subservient and un-American Congress. It is obvious, even to the most simple-minded, that Congress has practically abdicated during the past 7 years because it has, by direct legislation and by the confirmation of appointments of the Chief Executive, deprived our citizens of many of their constitutional rights and impaired our Supreme Court, which is presumed to protect these rights.

There are many questions that have never been answered:

(a) Why does the administration aid and abet Communist-controlled countries and simultaneously insult some of our best friends among foreign nations?

(b) Why did we cancel the trade treaty with Japan, our third best customer, who is at peace with us and always fulfills its obligations, and at the same time turn around and aid and abet Communist-controlled China by loaning them hundreds of millions of dollars and sending troops, etc., to protect so-called American rights or the open door? We do not have to spend any money in Japan to protect Americans; American rights and American people who live in Japan are safe.

(c) Why do we withdraw our Ambassador from Berlin, Germany, a good customer and friend of the United States, and at the same time maintain an Ambassador in Moscow in Russia which has been an enemy of the United States ever since 1917, and has done her best to undermine the American form of government?

(d) Why do we insult Italy, one of our best friends and at the same time assist other countries who have double-crossed us on occasion after occasion?

(e) Why do we try to pick a fight and stick our nose in European affairs that are none of our business if we really and truly desire peace?

(f) How can anyone believe that there is any sincerity in the representatives of a Chief Evecutive who has lied to us so continuously during the last 8 years?

The only protection we have left as a Nation is in Congress; our Supreme Court is gone. Our Chief Executive is not only trying to involve us in disastrous foreign wars but he appears to be a willing stooge or accomplice in promoting an international free-for-all general world war.

The foregoing statements may seem to you to be extreme but they are far from telling the whole truth; they are, in reality, much understated, and others, including Senators and Congressmen, have made far stronger statements. If the people of this country could know the real truth about what is being done to them by the national and international activities of their own Government I believe that there would be an uprising that would amount to a civil war.

We have at the present time Senators rising in the Senate of the United States and seriously proposing the confiscation of people's property as well as their services—they have already been deprived of their constitutional rights. It seems almost a form of insanity if there is any honesty or desire to maintain a government or a country where men can enjoy any liberty and freedom whatever.

Any such action as conscription of the people's property and the destruction of their rights is proof of the desire of Congress to destroy America and not to maintain it. Any Senator or Representative who seriously proposes this sort of thing could be very honestly impeached for a violation of his oath of office in my opinion. He cannot uphold the Constitution of the United States and at the same time act and vote in Congress to destroy this Constitution and the rights of the citizens under it.

We draft men to fight or go to war, but what do we draft them for and what are we fighting for? We draft them to fight to maintain our liberty, our freedom and our right to own and hold property; otherwise there would be no point in sending them to war. If people are to be deprived of their liberty and freedom and their right to hold property, then there is no point in drafting men and any talk of conscription of property along with men is an absurdity.

Obviously if you are going to fight you have got to have men and provide them with arms, but you don't have to destroy the liberty and freedom of the people behind these men, the very things that these men enjoy—the things that these men who have been drafted are fighting to protect.

If the Government can conscript factories or money then they can conscript homes and everything else and the very purpose of having a government is wiped out. The American form of government was erected to protect people in their liberty and freedom, and the natural rights of man one of the greatest of which, after the privilege of breathing and eating, is the right to own and hold property. Even a dog fights for rights such as this. Now if the Government is seriously considering the wiping out of these rights under the semiplausible and obvious if not vicious excuse that man must fight then we might as well say good-bye to America because we have lost all the things that America was created for.

A part of the vicious and crooked program that is being carried on is the smearing of industry and the false propaganda emanating from the Government itself to the effect that industry is refusing to carry on its obligations in a defense program, or is conducting a so-called sit-down strike. To anyone who knows what is going on in the country it is not hard to trace the reason for this kind of vicious propaganda. It is obviously nothing more than a part of the general program of making the people hate industry and throwing dust in their eyes so they can be led by the nose into international complications and war without protest until it is too late to protest.

The violence of the campaign against industry that has been carried on in Congress and Washington during the last 7 years, the lying propaganda which was used to make the people believe that industry was behind the wars, and the makers of munitions were trying to promote war, resulted in a Neutrality Act to prevent munitions, etc., being shipped to any belligerent; the temper of Congress, as well as their lack of spine, is demonstrated by the fact that Congress stultified itself a year ago by repealing this act and passing an unneutral act in its place, at a time when European nations were at war. I can think of no more unstatesmanlike performance than this and it is in entire harmony with the campaign against industry which has been recently loosed upon the country from Washington to cover up the incompetence and mistakes of the administration and to throw dust in the people's eyes so they can be herded like sheep into the slaughter of another war, as they were in 1917. The same crooked propaganda, the same methods, and even some of the same individuals, are trying to put this country into the war as were operating in 1917. The same kind of deception is being practiced by the Chief Executive and obviously the same kind of commitments to foreign nations are being secretly made.

There does not seem to be a sufficient number of real Americans in our present Congress to uncover this program and these activities and properly checkmate them.

There is no nation on earth that wants to fight the United States; every nation wants to be our friend; they all want us to be their friend. If we need preparedness, the time to have done it was back in 1919, 1920, and 1921, when many good honest men, good Americans, advised the necessary steps. If we wanted conscription or drafting, it should have been done at that time, and each young man required to spend about a year in the service of his country so he could be taught to be a man. This hasty passage of confiscatory legislation at this late hour, on false misrepresentations, is plainly not only unsound socially and economically but, in my opinion, plainly dishonest.

There is no occasion for any great rush. We can take our time, because no one wants to fight us; no one is going to try to fight us, and we can avoid some of the colossal waste and extravagance which always accompanies any activities of the American Government, especially when it is under the control of political shysters and demagogues. There will be plenty of young men who are willing to take limited service in the Army and Navy to take care of all the requirements, without any drafting at the present time, and there need not be any excessive confiscation of property if the Government will stop throwing away the people's money. Enough can be saved out of the present unnecessary waste of money to finance any kind of a defensive program within the bounds of sanity.

I presume it is true that the protests of one individual American citizen is of very minor consequence, but I could not refrain from writing you my views in the face of the daily events in Washington and the bills that are being seriously introduced in Congress by men who ought to know better or who may be the willing tools of some forces behind them.

Please be assured that I am writing of the majority of Congress and the executive department and not of your individual activities which I strongly approve.

Yours very sincerely,

L. R. CLAUSEN.

Mr. Roosevelt Spoke Truths in His Smoky Mountain Speech

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARL C. MICHENER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, September 14, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE ADRIAN (MICH.) TELEGRAM

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the privilege granted to me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I in-

clude an editorial from the Adrian (Mich.) Telegram, which is as follows:

WE HAVE GROWN SOFT

Rugged individualism is needed in America after all, we are told by President Roosevelt in his speech dedicating the Great Smoky National Park. This was a surprising statement from a President whose administration has so steadfastly preached the duty of the state to look after the needs of the individual. Now the President talks about the duty of the individual to the state, something we all have been familiar with right along but something the New Dealers have not emphasized.

Americans are growing soft, the President declared, saying: "Today we no longer face Indians and hard and lonely struggles with nature—and also—we have grown soft in many ways. If we are to survive, we cannot be soft in a world in which there are dangers that threaten Americans—dangers far more deadly than were those the frontiersmen had to face."

The frontiersmen had no beneficial government aiding them, no wage-hours legislation, no social security, no relief agencies. If they were to survive they had to fight for their existence and by fighting they became strong. For them there was no distribution of surplus commodities; their food had come from the work of their own hands. Neither could they spend all their reserves and mortgage the future. They knew the lesson of thrift, of providing for themselves against the possibility of rainy days.

If the American people have grown soft, as the President said, he is partly responsible. He has led them into fields of soft living. He and his advisers have set them unparalleled examples of public spending for so-called social benefits. To have economized and balanced the Budget was the hard way, the way of the pioneers that the President extolled, but the President chose the soft way—borrowing against the future, postponing the day of reckoning.

President Roosevelt so greatly emphasized the duty of the Nation to take care of the unemployed that many got the idea that idleness under benefit of a Federal check was to be a permanent condition. The incentive to find work was weakened. Individual stamina, courage, and initiative were forced into the background and rated of far less importance than the obligation of the State to make the individual secure.

Mr. Roosevelt spoke truths in his Smoky Mountain speech. In speaking them he was following the leadership of Mr. Willkie for Mr. Willkie spoke them sooner. That is not to his discredit. It is to the credit of both of them, for both of them were right.

Tempus Fugit—Experimentia Docet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS H. CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, September 14, 1940

ARTICLE FROM WASHINGTON TIMES-HERALD

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted by the House, I place in the RECORD a review of certain facts in our military history, important but often forgotten, as set forth by William Randolph Hearst in an article appearing in the Washington Times-Herald. The excerpts follow:

IN THE NEWS—A REVIEW OF MAXIMS AND COMMON SENSE

"Tempus fugit" is a very fine phrase and a very well-known quotation.

One does not have to have any very profound Latin learning to know that time flies.

And, of course, Mr. Roosevelt is quite right in stating that the United States does not want to lose any time in adopting and executing a proper program of preparedness.

But time has been busily engaged in flying for the past 7 years without particularly disturbing the New Deal administration.

And seven thousand million good American dollars have been spent in that protracted period without securing any preparedness whatsoever.

Maybe a little careful and thoughtful consideration by Congress will now be better than overhaste.

We do not wish to lose time, but we do not wish unnecessarily to lose life, or to lose liberty, or to lose even, mayhap, our independence.

There are other phrases besides "tempus fugit" which very learned Harvard men like our great and good President and your humble columnist quote on occasion—and all applicable to the present situation.

There is the Italian motto, "lestina lente," which being translated means make haste slowly—not in order to waste time by any means.

Then in addition to the Italian motto there is the perfectly good English motto, "Look before you leap."

That does not even have to be translated. It is in the native tongue and is sound Anglo-Saxon common sense.

Finally, there is the grand old English line so full of wit and wisdom. "Fools rush in where angels fear to tread."

Davy Crockett said in more homely phrase:

"Be sure you are right and then go ahead."

Davy Crockett went ahead perfectly well in the effective manner which has handed his name and fame down to our time.

But first he took pains to make sure that he was right.

That is all Congress need do, and that is all the patriots in Congress are trying to do.

Using our minds, let us think what happened to the French when they rushed headlong and heedless and unprepared into the present war.

And using our memory, let us recollect what happened to us during the last war when we assembled our vast army of American youth and had no equipment for them, and no sufficient clothes or shelter for them, and no adequate hospital accommodations or hospital supplies.

General Wright, commandant of Camp Doniphan, Okla., declared on January 28, 1918:

"The Army was forced to expand from less than 150,000 men to 10 times that number, and in the process of expansion inefficiency was bound to be found in all departments, and the result of that inefficiency we see right here in the Camp Doniphan base hospital.

"Medical Reserve officers who a few weeks before were practitioners in civil life, many of them merely country doctors, were called on to do the administration work of a great base hospital. Of course, they could not do it, and the patients suffered.

"Whoever is responsible for the delay in the construction of the hospitals is also to blame for these conditions. Instead of having the base hospital furnished and completely equipped when this division moved in, not a nail had been driven. Real construction had not been achieved until the middle of December, and by that time we had on our hands scores of cases of measles and other diseases.

"These cases were forced upon us. Instead of giving us a base hospital at first for us to put the sick men in, we gave them the sick men and they built a hospital around them."

On December 11, 1917, the Senate Military Affairs Committee, "actuated," according to the New York Times, "by criticism from all over the country," began investigation of lack of equipment in Army training camps.

Senator WADSWORTH, speaking for the Senate Military Affairs Committee, declared that not one Army camp post was adequately equipped with ordnance; but in the matter of clothes, the Army was even worse off.

General Crozier, Chief of Ordnance, speaking before the committee on December 12, 1917, said:

"The Government has been trying to do in 1 year what the National Defense Act of 1916, when war was imminent, had planned to have done in 5 years."

On December 19, 1917, Army Surg. Gen. William C. Gorgas announced that poor hospital facilities were responsible for many deaths.

He reported 2,000 cases of measles at Camp Bowie, Tex., and said the base hospital there was unfinished and without water, plumbing, or sewerage conditions.

Another 2,000 cases of measles broke out that month in Camp Sevier, S. C.

Senator Hitchcock read a letter received from Camp Cody, N. Mex., written by a camp trainee. It read in part:

"I can't help but remark the soldiers that are dying in the base hospital of pneumonia. Pretty near every time I go up I see three or four funerals. I feel safe in saying that an average of 10 or 15 a day pass over the Great Divide.

"We have two base hospitals here, with five to six thousand men in each, with practically no attention at all, so I see why there are so many dying off."

On December 28, 1917, Senator MCKELLAR told the committee he had received telegrams from commanders of eight camps telling him they were short of overcoats to the amount of 46,000 in the dead of winter.

Finally the authoritative Government records show that the number of Americans who died in the Great War were:

Killed in action

Army	37,568
Marines	1,450
Navy	871
Total	39,889

Died of wounds

Army	12,942
Marines	1,007
	13,949
Total deaths in action or from wounds	53,838

While due to neglect and insufficient facilities, and unpreparedness and haste, and carelessness the deaths from disease were:

Army	62,670
Marines	304
Total deaths from disease	62,974

So that it will plainly be seen that due to thoughtlessness and impulsiveness, incompetence and inefficiency, and unreasonable hurry and unwise lack of thought and care, the United States rushed into the late war and lost nearly 10,000 more men in the World War from disease than were killed in all the actual engagements on sea or land.

We hurried ahead before we were sure we were right.

We leaped before we looked.

And, as a consequence, we sent 62,000 American boys, dead of neglect and disease, home in boxes to their heartbroken American families—10,000 more than were killed in all our battles in the war.

Let us not repeat the same dreadful mistake.

In 1917 General Crozier said:

"The Government has been trying to do in 1 year what the National Defense Act had planned to have done in 5 years."

Now a more reckless and incompetent administration is trying to do in 1 year what it has spent $7,000,000,000 for and foolishly failed to do in the past 7 years.

Let us now proceed thoughtfully, systematically, and efficiently, and not again be persuaded to rush in like fools.

If we want to display our classical lore, there are other mottoes than tempus fugit.

There is the motto from Tacitus:

"Experimentia docet"—experience teaches.

And there are the inspiring and enlightening words of Patrick Henry:

"I have but one lamp by which my feet are guided and that is the lamp of experience."

Petition Against Entrance Into War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PIUS L. SCHWERT
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, September 14, 1940

PETITION BEARING THE SIGNATURES OF 225 MEMBERS OF THE LADIES' AID OF SALEM EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN CHURCH, BUFFALO, N. Y.

Mr. SCHWERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include the following petition:

BUFFALO, *August 17, 1940.*

Hon. PIUS L. SCHWERT,
Congressman, Forty-second District,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SCHWERT: We, the undersigned, being truly interested and concerned over the grave situation now existing in our national governmental affairs, both at home and abroad, wish to express our hopes and prayers and trust that, with the expressions of others, and with God's blessing and guidance overshadowing us all, true consideration and wisdom will rest with our Representatives who are now charged with the responsibility of guiding our beloved country through its present crisis.

We wish herewith to express our opinion against our beloved country favoring any entrance into the present war, whether it means sending our young manhood overseas or defending other countries in the Western Hemisphere. We feel that the political troubles of foreign countries need not be ours and do not warrant the supreme sacrifice of our youth. In case of attack by a foreign power upon our own country or any of our possessions, then we will be willing to make the utmost sacrifice to defend our country and its democratic principles against foreign aggression. We feel that to send our boys across the seas, there would be nothing to gain and a great loss in manpower, a needless loss, which only a parent can fully understand. The physical and mental wrecks of once healthy, strong manhood are a constant reminder of grim, useless warfare.

We hope and pray that the representatives of all classes of people will be and remain such, and not be influenced by wealth and selfish power. As each problem affecting our neutrality presents itself, may each Representative weigh his decision as though the life of his own son hung in the balance.

The undersigned are a group of citizens associated with Salem Evangelical Lutheran Church, Salem Street at Abbott Road, Buffalo, N. Y.

Respectfully yours,

THE LADIES' AID OF SALEM CHURCH,
MRS. MINA SCHULTZ,
MRS. RUTH POHLMAN,
MRS. A. KASTNER,
Committee.

(Above petition bears the signatures of 225 members of the Ladies' Aid of Salem Evangelical Lutheran Church, Buffalo, N. Y.)

Congress Must Answer to the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. THORKELSON
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, September 14, 1940

Mr. THORKELSON. Mr. Speaker, on the 14th of September 1940, 232 Members of Congress voted for peacetime conscription, an act which is clearly illegal, and for the enactment of which no powers are delegated to Congress by the Constitution of the United States.

Let us not forget that Congress alone is responsible for the security of our Nation and for the welfare of our people; and neither can be protected by engaging in a war wherein we pit our forces against a united Europe, fighting for a common cause.

Some Members of Congress have an erroneous idea of the power which the people have delegated to this body in the Constitution, and to aid in clarification of this I shall quote from page 12091 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, September 13, 1940:

> Section 8 of article I of the Constitution enumerates the powers of the Congress. It says the Congress has the power "to * * * provide for the common defense."
>
> It has the power "to raise and support armies."
>
> It has the power "to provide and maintain a navy."
>
> It has the power "to provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining the militia, and for governing such part of them as may be employed in the service of the United States."

The gentleman who quoted the above forgets, however, that such powers are granted to Congress in order to "provide for the common defense and the general welfare" of the United States. It is not within the rights of Congress to give aid to a foreign power which is at war, and we cannot provide for our defense and promote the general welfare of our people by depleting our own defenses. On the contrary, in giving a part of our Navy to a foreign nation we actually retarded or destroyed our own defenses; and the Constitution calls that treason. The Constitution does not place our first line of defense outside of the United States and we cannot add to our own protection by projecting our first line of defense 2,000 miles from our shores. Neither has Congress the constitutional right to grant the President greater power than that given to him in article II of the Constitution.

It follows, therefore, and I base my opinion entirely upon the Constitution, that Congress did not have the right to sustain the President's act in the transfer of combat airplanes, armaments, ammunition, and the 50 destroyers to a foreign power now at war. In congressional failure to challenge this unwarrantable act of the President, we have jeopardized our defenses—which is not for the general welfare of the people. Article I, section 8, paragraphs 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, and 16, are very clear on this issue, and Congress should be guided by the literal meaning of these paragraphs. These specifically delegated powers are restricted by the tenth amendment, and the powers not mentioned, or what I choose to call unwritten powers, are fully protected by the ninth amendment to the Constitution.

In no place in the Constitution are powers delegated to Congress to conscript men in peacetime or wartime, and Congress has no right to conscript private industries at any time, whether we be at peace or war. After all, it is the people in this Nation who are the power, and they will, in their own interest, and for their own protection, give all aid in manpower and equipment, should such necessity arise for the common defense and the general welfare of the United States.

Congress should never forget that all acts of legislation and appropriation must be in the common defense and for the general welfare of the United States, and not at any time in defense or the general welfare of any foreign power—and certainly not of any power which is at war. Such an act on

our part is not only unneutral but is, in addition to that, an act of war.

The quotation to which I have referred conveniently omits mentioning paragraph 15 of article I, section 8, which I shall now quote:

> To provide for calling forth the militia to execute the laws of the Union, suppress insurrections, and repel invasions.

This states clearly the purposes for which the militia may be called forth, namely, to suppress insurrections and repel invasions, but not to be sent out of the United States in the service of a foreign power.

Then, paragraph 16 is mentioned only in part, and for better understanding I shall now quote all of it:

> To provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining the militia, and for governing such part of them as may be employed in the service of the United States, reserving to the States, respectively, the appointment of the officers and the authority of training the militia according to the discipline prescribed by Congress.

It should therefore be clear that Congress must, until advised otherwise by the people, adhere to these paragraphs as they are written into the Constitution of the United States.

In enacting peacetime conscription legislation Congress forgot its obligated duty to preserve, protect, and defend the rights of the people and the principles of their government. On the same day 218 Members of Congress voted for an appropriation of $500,000,000, which is supposed to be used in the rehabilitation and reconstruction of agriculture and other industries in Central and South America. This, of course, can only terminate in the destruction of our own industries, with more idleness, poverty, and suffering to our people.

I shall discuss each one of these acts, so that the people may know how one Member of Congress views this congressional retreat before the money changers who are now ruling England and America by the control of inflated money and credits, and who are also attempting to rule the world by control of gold and international gold credits. This motley Shylockian wrecking crew is made up of those who designate the patriots who remained to defend their country as "traitors" and "fifth columnists," while they themselves ran away to England and America with their ill-gotten wealth and stolen gold. These cowardly traitors did not have the courage to aid in defense of Norway, Holland, and Belgium, but, like rats leaving a sinking ship, they absconded with the gold under the protection of the British Government and our own refugee ships.

Mr. Hambro, an internationalist, is now traveling in the United States as a Norwegian, which he is not. He is engaged in disseminating pro-British propaganda, advocating aid to England. Is he here in the interest of Norway? If his interest is in Norway, why did he remove the gold from that country? Why did he leave the Norwegian people helpless and unable to buy dire necessities for the lack of foreign-gold credit?

Mr. Hambro is well connected in the English banking circles. Why has he not, with that influence, prevailed upon England to return a few ships to Norway so that they may be used to carry food supplies to a people who are likely to suffer extreme hardships during the coming winter months? Why has he not, with one hundred and fifty millions of Norwegian gold now stored in the United States, set up a credit for that country as an aid to the people he pretends to love? He has shown no such humane inclination. Did he remain behind to meet the invading foe? It is quite evident that he did not, for he is here now trying to involve us in the war, which is the making of his own international banking groups.

No true Norseman should be deceived by the twaddle Mr. Hambro is handing out, for he is as deceptive as those who are now here working for the interests of England in order to restore the United States as a colony of the British Empire under a world government.

How can these deserters, who ran away, shout "traitors" to those who stood by the flag and in defense of their own country?

Many of these deserters, now called refugees, are engaged in the same exploitation of the United States as they were in the countries from which they fled, and will, make no mistake about it, destroy us and leave us as they left the invaded nations of Europe. It was these thieving deserters, who, after having fled to France with the Belgian gold, called King Leopold and his army traitors, when they, short of ammunition, short of water and food, were compelled to capitulate to save defenseless civilians; and the Belgian Army, which, back to the wall, had stood by their guns, fighting for Belgium against better-equipped and organized forces.

I take off my hat to the King of Belgium, who, like a man, stood by his troops, his people, and his country.

Let us look at this from a purely impersonal viewpoint. What would we think of Government officials, who, when faced by an invading force, removed the gold from the Treasury of the United States and then, at the height of danger, deserted their posts for a safer place? I do not believe that such action would sit well with us, and those who were left behind no doubt feel as we would in similar circumstances.

The President and the money changers in America receive these international deserters—or breeding stock as someone has called them—with open arms, when, in justice, they should have been returned to the countries from which they fled and which they did not defend in their hour of greatest need. This administration has opened our gates to all of this riffraff, radicals, and criminals of Europe, who will, if they are allowed to remain in the United States, wreck this country as they have those they so ignobly deserted across the water. Those who cannot enter the United States directly from Europe because of quota restrictions are now coming in through South and Central America or the Caribbean Islands—countries from which it is easier to enter the United States. The United States is now the world's dumping ground for international degenerates and European criminals.

I wonder if anyone has given the slightest consideration to the fact that the people of Norway, Holland, Belgium, and France, being unable to raise sufficient food at home, depend upon imports for such needed supplies, and that the same countries also depend upon imports for clothing and raw materials, the lack of which will cause great hardship and suffering during the coming winter months.

Has anyone given the slightest consideration to the fact that food and other necessities cannot be bought without gold or gold credit, and that many mothers and children in these countries will die from starvation and exposure, because of their having been deprived of buying power? It is well to bear in mind that one nation cannot buy from another without gold or its equivalent, and while thinking of this, do not forget that the total world gold, including the tons stored in the United States vaults, is not owned by the people of the United States, but is instead owned and controlled by the international bankers; by the same people who fled from Norway, Belgium, Holland, and France, and after they had removed the gold to England and to the United States.

We are fortunate, because we are practically self-sustaining, but bear in mind that even we cannot buy rubber, coffee, tea, or travel abroad without gold credit; and that power is, as I have already said, under the absolute control of the Shylocks.

Does anyone realize that England, with the connivance of the administration, has commandeered or taken possession of the merchant marine of Norway, Holland, and Belgium, thereby leaving those countries without means of transporting food supplies to their people, even if they had gold credit in the United States and other foreign countries?

As a neutral American ask yourself this question: Is it an act of justice on our part to give aid to England, and so help her starve the people of Norway, Holland, Belgium, and France, who in no sense are responsible for the conditions which exist in those countries at the present time? Are we, in giving aid to England in this unjustifiable procedure saving Christian civilization? This is a problem to which we might give serious consideration, so that we will not allow ourselves to be led into an international situation where we will, when it is all over, be left without even one single friend among the family of nations.

Is it not probable that we may, in following the people who are blinded by hatreds, be led into a position where we invite reprisals from a unified Christian civilization, which is now fighting for its very life? I do not think that anyone can actually believe that Christianity will be destroyed by the very countries which have given this faith its greatest support. Is it not well for us to bear in mind that Spain, France, Germany, Belgium, Holland, Scandinavia, the Slavonic countries, Italy, and Greece will unite, and that Turkey will join such alliance against the powers that now control the gold? Is it not likely that these nations, united in the interest of their people, may force Russia to join such alliance, under a government purged of the Communist, as crusaders against those whose god is gold and whose savior is a bribe? Suppose such alliance will promise freedom to India and self-government to the native slaves of Africa. Where would we be, tied to the money changers in the British Empire? We would be in a very compromising position, particularly in view of the fact that the English people themselves are not in sympathy with their own administration. I may even say that the British are in less sympathy than we, for they understand the international problem much better than we do.

I have taken the liberty of calling attention to a few of these possible situations, so that Members of Congress may think about it before the administration leads our Nation into a position from which it will be difficult to retreat.

Some day the truth will be told, and we will find that the present administration, the administration advisers, the State Department, and our meddling diplomats are largely responsible for the invasion of Poland, Norway, Holland, Belgium, and France. Evidence which is now filtering through shows clearly that promise of aid was given to Poland and France, and no better evidence should be required to prove that than the following excerpts:

Jacques Doriot in La Liberte, February 2, 1939:

"America has accustomed us to words of support which are denied the next day * * *

"Before relying on the military assistance of the United States of America, let us settle our differences, if possible, with our neighbors. Do not let the chance of peace slip away for the shadow of American support" (translation from Action Francaise, July 11, 1939).

Firmness Does Not Exclude Prudence (by J. Delebecque).

"England's resolution and determination are excellent. One should beware of the intrigue of those who are doubting and those who would like to assume an air of bravery of a kind to precipitate the desired conflict. In the critical period we are passing through the chiefs of state in England, as in France, are literally walking on eggs. There are people who advise them to put on iron-shod boots, because for various reasons—personal interests, fanaticism, total bewilderment—they desire the 'bloody omelette.' The Poles have in hand a blank check signed by London and Paris. They are urged to use it. It is sought to incite and intimidate the British and French ministers by shouting into their ears 'Munich.' The holy war in which they seek to plunge us is not a war for an endangered fatherland; it is a war of 'ideas', the religious war in a new guise; that is to say, a war truly frightful and criminal. Any such affected patriotism is to us terribly suspicious.

"The perfect statesman needs a cool head and a strong heart. And in these days we need more than ever a perfect statesman."

(Monsieur Delebecque was formerly in the French diplomatic service. More recently he has been the specialist on foreign affairs for Action Francaise.)

PART OF THE SPEECH OF GEORGES BONNET BEFORE THE FRENCH SENATE, FEBRUARY 7, 1939

And the United States of America? I have the greatest admiration for the great American democracy and for its eminent chief, President Roosevelt; the admiration felt particularly by all those who have lived in America and certainly, Mr. President Berenger could testify like myself.

We know what may be expected of America. I have retained friendships there from which I experience the loyalty almost every day. But I am not unaware that the best service one can render to our American friends is to allow in our friendship a shade of discretion. [Applause. Very good! Very good!] To avoid expressing herself with any exuberance harmful to her own interests. (Renewed proofs of approbation.)

This does not mean that our own diplomacy should be inactive as you can well understand. We have not ceased during these recent weeks, as formerly, to have the closest contacts with the American Government, and we have found there an active comprehension.

Our three democracies are conscious of their enormous material and moral forces. They know their place on the globe, in history, their economic power, and they know that no nation could impose its hegemony upon them.

But this friendship does not constitute and does not wish to constitute a menace to anyone. It does not aim at anything other than to assure the development of the three great peoples in peace and liberty. No nation, small or great, lacks the certainty that not one of these three democracies has any hostility toward it.

Chancelor Hitler in his recent speech said: "We see no advantage in exporting national socialism as an ideology. We have not any more reason to make war against any other nations because they are democracies."

On our part we may give the same assurance. The democracies do not nourish against anybody, against any nation, the slightest thought of propaganda, still less any aggression. They know that ideas cannot be imposed upon men by violence and they all have the same desire for peace. (Very good, very good.)

For, gentlemen, there has been one truth which the heads of governments, with a concurrence unanimous and comforting, have proclaimed before the bar of public opinion, that war would not increase the happiness or the power of any nation and that it would perhaps mark the end—anyway the retrogression—of European civilization. (Very good, very good, and applause.)

This agreement itself, this unanimity on the evidence, do they not give hope that diplomacy will find means to assure the peoples of the long peace which they wish with all their hearts?

No statesmen could have expressed the feeling of apprehension of the French people better than Jacquest Doriot, J. Delebecque, and Georges Bonnet, and it should be quite evident after reading their statements, that there was a diplomatic solution for England and France, instead of war. These gentlemen also realized that the situation was critical, and that war might terminate in a religious conflict—which would retard if not destroy Christian civilization. They also expressed fear that we could not fulfill the promises made to them by the administration as expressed by our diplomatic representatives in Europe.

However, some unseen power launched both France and England into a war which has already resulted in the loss of millions of lives and untold destruction of property.

What part did we play in launching this conflict by our meddling in Europe? Did we promise help? Diplomatic correspondence with Poland reveals that we did promise our aid, and in the repeal of the arms embargo, we, in a sense, allied ourselves on the side of England and France. Can we Members of Congress wash our hands of guilt? Is it not most probable that had we come out last year with a firm declaration of neutrality, that disagreements would have been settled through diplomatic channels instead of war?

It is my firm belief, that had the Congress adopted such wise course, Europe would have been at peace today. In acquiesence to the President's wishes, Congress has in reality condoned his warlike acts, which we should have curbed in the making. The result is that we are now about to be involved in a conflict that might be as disastrous to us as it will be to Great Britain.

Let us in all fairness admit that Congress alone is responsible for the security of our Nation and for the welfare of our people; and neither interest can be protected by engaging in a war where we will pit our forces against a united Europe and, as the French statements clearly reveal, may terminate in a holy war.

Let us now stop this foolish and supine attitude toward the administration. Let us set the President and his advisers right. Let us prevail upon them to lend every effort in restoring the peace and tranquillity in Europe among the nations which are now torn by strife. It is only in such manner we can justify ourselves as defenders of the civilization we now claim might be destroyed.

This now brings me to the subject that I wish to discuss, namely, conscription in peacetime. Why are we conscripting an army that can be raised by voluntary enlistment, and why are we upsetting our national business structure by conscripting and forcing private industries to submit to Federal domination and dictation, when such industries would only be too glad to give full aid were we threatened by invasion or war by any foreign power?

What is it all about, and why all of this eleventh-hour attempt to bring about a war hysteria among our people by deliberate and planned campaign of propaganda? Is it a childish attempt to scare the united European powers? If so, no one will disagree with me when I say it is too late, and that such act on our part may have the opposite effect by stampeding those powers into a closer union for mutual protection.

Is it not possible that we may bring about a holy war, in which Islam will join the united European powers to free the world of those who use gold as a weapon to crucify business and subdue nations?

Are we conscripting an army to replace the English who are now opposed to this war, and who understand and recognize the evil powers behind the war machine? If such is the case, if our conscript army is to follow the 500,000 rifles recently shipped to England, it will be according to the policy laid down by the League of Nations, by which they intended to police all nations with foreign troops. No one should fail to recognize the import of such procedure, for we are slipping right into such plan, laid down by the League of Nations.

Are we conscripting an army to be transported to Africa or India to battle a unified Europe and Islam in the Sudan, Egypt, Arabia, Iraq, and Palestine in an attempt to establish the contemplated kindom of David, with Jerusalem as the capital? Let us not be fooled, for, as fantastic as this may seem, it is the ultimate goal of the British-Israel World Federation, the Anglo-Saxon Federation, and other internationalistic organizations, which are now interrelated and dominated by those who sit in the grand orient lodges, and who are also in control of world gold and international credit.

In conclusion let me say that the ideas expressed in this discussion are thoughts which I hold to be reasonable. They are not based entirely upon my own opinion, but upon opinions of unbiased and informed statesmen and writers more familiar with conditions in Europe than we are in the Congress of the United States.

I impore Members of Congress to put their shoulders to the wheel by taking charge of this Government, as it is our duty to do, so that we may direct this Nation in its common defense and for the general welfare of the people, who are placing their faith, hope, and trust in the Congress of the United States.

Selective Training and Service Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KEY PITTMAN
OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 18, 1940

LETTER BY HON. KEY PITTMAN, OF NEVADA

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, I ask leave to publish in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter that I have written to Hon. Malcolm McEachin, secretary of state of the State of Nevada, relative to the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS,
Washington, D. C., September 16, 1940.

Hon. MALCOLM MCEACHIN,
Secretary of State, Carson City, Nev.

MY DEAR MR. MCEACHIN: I have your letter in which you state that you will no doubt receive a great many inquiries concerning the contents, operation, and effect of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940. I will have sent to you a number of copies of the act so soon as printed as a public document.

I sent you a copy of the original Burke-Wadsworth bill as it was introduced in the Senate. If you will compare this bill with the act as it passed the Senate, you will find that there have been so many changes made in the bill by amendments on the floor of the Senate that the whole effect of the original Burke-Wadsworth bill has been changed. In fact, from reading the act as it passed the Senate and House, you would hardly recognize that it was based on the Burke-Wadsworth bill.

Unfortunately public opinion was based upon the Burke-Wadsworth bill as introduced. This is quite natural. A number of speeches were made against the bill before the limiting and protective amendments were adopted in the Senate. Nearly all of these amendments were adopted on the last 2 days before the bill was finally passed by the Senate. It was quite difficult to keep up with the purpose and effect of these amendments as they were being passed very rapidly and no official print was made of them until the bill passed the Senate.

In the first place, there was no limitation upon the number of conscriptees that could be inducted into the service by the President except the refusal of Congress to appropriate money for such purpose. If there were no limitations upon the number that might be inducted within the number required to be registered, then the induction of any number would be legal and Congress would be strongly persuaded to appropriate the necessary money. The Senate, however, for the purpose of making absolute limitation in this matter, expressly provided through the Lodge amendment on the day that the bill passed that not to exceed 900,000 of the conscripts or trainees should be inducted into the service or be in training in any 12 months. It has already been stated by the military departments that not to exceed 400,000 would be inducted into the service on the first call, and that it would be at least 6 months before the next 400,000 were inducted into the service for training. The military departments limited themselves to this number because of a lack of facilities for housing a greater number. There is still now another limitation and that is the Lodge amendment which was adopted limiting the trainees to 900,000 in any one 12 months.

The total number of estimated registrants between the ages of 21 and 35, inclusive, is approximately 16,000,000 men. Nevada's quota for registration will be approximately 16,000 men. This may be reduced by the number of men from Nevada now in the military service. Under the statutory limitation and the plan of military service, approximately 400 will be drawn and inducted into the service from Nevada on the first call. At the end of a year's training the trainees will be placed in reserve in different branches of the military service unless an imminent threat of war is pending at the end of the year, in which event they may be retained in the service.

The second important amendment adopted on the floor of the Senate was a provision that these men inducted into the service for training shall not be used in the military service outside of the Western Hemisphere and our own possessions. That means that the President and the military departments are absolutely commanded not to send these soldiers outside of the Western Hemisphere except to our own possessions. It is true that it is contended by two or three able and sincere Senators that the President of the United States would violate this law. Such an attempted violation by any President of the United States is inconceivable. Not only would Congress refuse to appropriate the money for such an undertaking but the President would be subject to impeachment. These Senators base their suspicions upon the alleged and mistaken grounds that the President has violated the law in trading 50 over-age destroyers for 6 naval and air bases off our Atlantic coast. Whilst it would be contrary to international law for the President to sell to Great Britain, a belligerent, these destroyers for gold, which would not give us the immediate defense we need, yet every neutral government, as well as belligerent governments has a right to take any steps deemed necessary for its defense without regard to how such acts may incidentally affect warring powers. These bases are of inestimable value to the United States in the defense of its shores and the Panama Canal.

It is hardly worth while, however, to discuss these legal questions, as the President has time and again promised the country that he does not intend to take our soldiers into the European war. It would be impossible for the United States to land its soldiers in Europe, and the President, having great knowledge of these subjects, is aware of this fact. Great Britain has all of the soldiers she needs. The vital test between Great Britain and Hitler is now on. The immediate results will probably be decided in 2 or 3 weeks. If Great Britain wins this battle, then our danger of war is far removed. If she loses the battle, our danger will be more acute and more proximate.

I am firmly of the opinion that Hitler cannot invade directly the United States. Even if I am correct in this opinion, however, it does not mean that Hitler in cooperation with other totalitarian powers may not establish puppet governments in Latin America and there accumulate their forces and armament for an approach toward our borders. Let us admit that even in the event of victory it would take a year or two or maybe longer for Hitler to accomplish this purpose in Latin America. Still if this attack ever comes from Latin America we must be prepared to meet it and conquer the enemy. At any and all costs it is the intention of the Government of the United States, backed up by the people of the United States, to prevent forever the destruction of our democracy and our liberties such as has been suffered by the democracies of Europe at the hands of the brutal Hitler.

Whether our boys are trained to defend themselves in war or not will not make war come or stay away. If war does come to us at some time through Latin America, then our boys who are qualified for training today would be qualified to fight then and would be conscripted. The only question that we have to consider is: "Shall our boys be thrown into a war improperly trained to protect themselves as many were during the World War or shall they be trained?"

The chief objection made to the present conscription and training is that there should not be conscription in peacetime. Few have made objection to conscription in time of war. The World War proves that there isn't time to train soldiers during war.

There are a few brutal men in the United States and there are a few brutal writers in the United States who favor selecting men of the brutish type and making them more brutal. It is unfair to quote these military maniacs as an expression of the opinion and desires of the United States Senate and the House of

Representatives or of the people of this country. No people in the world are so free of brutal instincts as the American people. We must profit by the experience of the unnecessary destruction of our troops during the World War through the lack of training and the lack of the knowledge necessary to protect themselves on the battlefield against destruction.

There was not sufficient protection granted to those inducted into the training service in the original bill as to the welfare of their dependents, their own financial welfare, and the protection of these trainees against the loss of employment, the loss of their property, and the loss of their benefits under the social laws that our Government has enacted for those who depend upon their labor for their living. Those trainees who leave the Government service or private employment are assured of return to their positions upon their discharge, to the same ranks and priorities and the preservation of all benefits under existing law that they enjoyed at the time they were inducted into the service.

Again the Senate adopted an amendment protecting such trainees while in the service against foreclosures and other actions at law and granting a moratorium on insurance premiums, on unemployment insurance, compensations, and other characters of relief as are now provided by law in cases of foreclosures.

In case the Government is compelled to take over and operate a plant, it is provided that "nothing in this section shall be deemed to render inapplicable existing State or Federal laws concerning the health, safety, security, and employment standards of the employees in such plant." In fact, every provision of law has been made in the act to protect the status of the trainee at the time that he was inducted into the service until he is discharged.

It is recognized in the act that no successful war can be carried on by soldiers alone. Soldiers must be supplied not alone with the instruments of war but also with food and clothing and shelter. For that reason, as was done in the World War, those who can perform more valuable services in the event of war in supplying the necessities of the country as well as the Army will be placed in a deferred class.

The Senate by amendment provided that ministers of the gospel and divinity students should be placed in the deferred class and exempted from training.

It is also provided in the act by amendment adopted in the Senate that students who have entered college in 1940 shall in no case be called into training until July 1, 1941.

Those having dependents and who must rely upon their salaries or wages to support such dependents are placed in a deferred class.

Every protection for the welfare of the trainees has been carefully considered and provided for.

The rules and regulations governing registration and classification and the induction into the training service will be proclaimed and circulated in the near future. There is one thing certain—and that is mandatory in the law—that the conscription boards shall be established in each county in each State and will be composed solely of citizens of such counties. These boards and personnel officers will be appointed by the President of the United States upon the recommendation of the Governors of the respective States. The Senate adopted an amendment which expressly provided that no member of the military services of the United States will be qualified to be a member of any such boards. If any inductee feels aggrieved by action taken by a local board, he will under rules and regulations prescribed by the President have an appeal to an appeal board.

If anything on earth will prevent war being forced upon us, it is the action taken by the President and the Congress in preparing such a defense that no one will dare attack us. It knows that our boys will not be led into any war outside of the Western Hemisphere and our own possessions, and only within the Western Hemisphere if we are threatened with attack.

For the sake of their peace of mind, let the mothers of Nevada and the rest of the country banish groundless fears.

Sincerely yours,

KEY PITTMAN.

Wendell L. Willkie's Visit to Chicago

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 18, 1940

STATEMENT BY HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS, OF ILLINOIS

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement issued a day or two ago by the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], chairman of the midwestern region of the Democratic National Committee, following the visit of the Republican nominee for President to the city of Chicago on last Saturday.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHICAGO, ILL.—Senator SCOTT W. LUCAS, chairman of the midwestern region of the Democratic National Committee, issued the following statement after Wendell Willkie's recent visit to Chicago:

"Mr. Willkie's speeches in Chicago yesterday were sufficient to give the Nation a solemn warning regarding his essential unfitness to be President. I doubt that the whole range of American political history can show a Presidential candidate exposing more clearly and unmistakably his basic instability and entire failure to grasp the meaning of statesmanship and governmental responsibility.

"Nothing in all his gyrations in Chicago yesterday was more revealing than his jeer, 'To hell with Chicago,' made in Cicero on the outskirts of the great metropolis that was entertaining him.

"At the start of his adventurer's dash for the Presidency he announced he would not make a campaign of personalities, and yet, yesterday, he started his western tour with the cry, 'To hell with Chicago.' And I, as a representative of the people of this State in Congress, wish to rebuke him as emphatically as I know how. I am not a resident of Chicago and can therefore speak with more freedom, perhaps, than one who lives in that city. As a citizen of the State of Illinois, of which Chicago is a part, I wish to answer his insult with the statement that he has done more than defame Chicago; he has defamed Illinois, which is proud of its great city and of the people in it.

"This declaration, 'To hell with Chicago,' is no slip of the tongue, no chance quip or wisecrack. He began his day in Chicago by declaring publicly, 'If you will listen for the next 2 months, you will hear the truth in plain Indiana language nobody can misunderstand.'

"His consignment of Chicago to eternal damnation is a revelation of the primary rashness of the Willkie character. It shows his unsoundness, his lack of the balance, and of the wisdom which the Nation needs in this time of appalling emergency. Can any one of the men and women who, 3 months ago, were prepared to admire Willkie, now imagine him as President in the 4 years when the Nation's very fate may depend upon cool judgment?

"Democrats and Republicans alike, among the common people, agree today that what the Nation is going to need to guide its next administration is a seasoned, experienced, and well-trained mind.

"In view of this emergency, and of this performance of yesterday, we, as citizens, are entitled to ask if Willkie isn't the kind of man who might well lose his head, any moment, and say to hell with New England, or the South, or perhaps the whole Middle West.

"He has already as much as said, 'To hell with independent newspapers.' He was president of the powerful public utility which strangled the Chattanooga News because it dared oppose his monopoly. He has treated with contempt the tried and proved statesmen of the Republican Party and has gone off arrogantly with stock brokers and fellow utility barons managing his campaign.

"Yesterday he gave an insult to the patriotic businessmen of the country by declaring that if elected President he would prepare the country for war by giving the authority to 'businessmen not politicians.' In this he totally ignored the fact that the most thoroughly prepared businessmen are now directing the production of the necessary guns and planes. Does he imply that he, who was never more than a corporation lawyer, a front man for gigantic utilities, is abler to direct industrial preparedness than Stettinius of United States Steel and Knudsen of General Motors? Is he more trustworthy than Biggers and the other industrial leaders who are devoting their training and skill toward arming the Nation this minute?

"Some of my Republican friends in the United States Senate tell me they wish 'Willkie wouldn't talk so much.' But I answer with entire seriousness and earnestness that it is fortunate for America that he is talking enough and showing enough of his wisecracks and flippancies to reveal his true incapacity for statesmanship, his inability to comprehend what it takes to achieve common-sense government. Thank God, Willkie is talking. It has given the Nation a chance to discover in ample time that by some curious accident the Republican Party got a patent-medicine showman when it comes to the solemn business of considering national issues in this world crisis.

"In his strange performance of yesterday, Willkie insulted the intelligence of factory workers by assuring them that President Roosevelt has never given a man a job in private industry. This is plain nonsense, as any survey of the relative unemployment in 1932 and in 1939 will show. Long before war orders developed there had been a tremendous gain in national income and employment.

"The net result of Willkie's medicine show invasion of Chicago yesterday will be, I predict, that the city will rebuke him next November with a Roosevelt majority of 500,000 instead of the previously expected 300,000, and that down-State will join with its great metropolis in turning his profane insult back upon his head."

Registration of Aliens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MORRIS SHEPPARD

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 18, 1940

ADDRESS BY LEMUEL B. SCHOFIELD, SPECIAL ASSISTANT TO THE ATTORNEY GENERAL IN CHARGE OF THE IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address on registration of aliens, delivered by Mr. Lemuel B. Schofield, Special Assistant to the Attorney General in charge of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, on August 15, 1940.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is my privilege to talk to you on an important phase of the national-defense program. I shall try to explain the nature and purpose of the Alien Registration Act, and how it will be administered by the Department of Justice, which, with the Post Office Department, has been entrusted by the Congress to carry out the provisions of this new law.

Our country has developed and grown to be the greatest nation on earth, largely because of our traditional policy that peoples of other lands are welcome here. Through the years they came from every corner of the world. They can still come and they are still coming, though their numbers are now limited in accordance with a plan adopted by the Congress some years ago, based on allotments or quotas worked out according to nationalities.

These people came to us because they were looking for a new chance at life. They were seeking freedom. They wanted to live in a land where they could worship God as they saw fit, where their children could go to school, where they could think for themselves and speak out on occasion, where they had a chance to earn their daily bread according to their best ability and to lay aside a little against a rainy day, and where they could live and laugh without being hounded and driven from pillar to post at the whim or caprice of some autocratic overlord. In short, they sought liberation in this land of liberty. They came here to be free.

Almost all of them soon became useful, loyal, and welcome residents of this, their adopted country. Many of them married American citizens, and the children of all of them, if born here, became by operation of law, citizens of the United States. Hundreds of thousands of them took advantage of our liberal citizenship policy and became naturalized, a process which gives to the foreign-born resident the full rights and the same citizens' status as the native-born.

But, for one reason or another, about three and one-half million of them have not become citizens. One reason may be that we have never adopted the unwise policy of forcing citizenship upon anyone. We have never set a time limit and said to them, "You must become citizens or get out." Partly it is due to ignorance. Partly it is because, especially in times like these, the orderly process of granting citizenship by court procedure after careful investigation is not geared up to accommodate large onrushes of applicants. There are thousands of aliens in this country who have declared their intention of becoming citizens, and who are patiently awaiting their turn.

But, whatever the reason may be, the fact remains that we have with us this large number of aliens. For the most part, they are here legally and most of them have been admitted for permanent residence. There can be little doubt that the overwhelming majority of them are decent, loyal, hard-working, respectable people, from whom this Nation has nothing whatever to fear.

But a program of national defense must be adequate and complete. Nothing can be overlooked or neglected. We still have before us the tragic picture of those hapless nations who underestimated the dangers which lurked behind their lines. This Government must know everything it can learn about every alien within our borders. It must find out how many there are, who they are, and where they are. It must know why they are here, and what they are doing. A government to protect its own can do nothing less.

And it must do so, too, for the protection of the aliens themselves. These are dangerous days. Emotions run high, and good judgment and sound reason are apt to be overridden by rashness and impetuous enthusiasm. Hysteria must be kept down, and race hatred and prejudice must not be permitted to hold sway. This Government cannot allow the harmless, law-abiding, loyal alien to be harassed or persecuted by those who would act in passion and haste under a genuine but mistaken sense of patriotism. And it can best protect and safeguard those from other lands who live here if it knows all there is to know about them.

Thus all must agree that the Congress acted wisely and well, in the interest of our national security, when it decided last June that every alien must be registered and every alien over 14 years of age fingerprinted within the 4 months' period beginning August 27 next. It will be noted that the statute applies to every alien. This means, generally speaking, every foreign-born man, woman, and child in the United States and its possessions who has not been naturalized. All aliens over 14 years of age must register in person; children under 14 must be registered by their parents or guardians. When a child reaches the age of 14 he must then register in person. Moreover, after he has registered, an alien must report every change of residence within 5 days after he moves.

And let me emphasize that even though one has declared his intention of becoming a citizen and has received his so-called "first papers," he is still an alien in the eyes of the law and must register.

Registration is compulsory. Every alien must register. The law provides a penalty in the form of a fine and imprisonment for failure to register, as well as for refusal to be fingerprinted, intentionally giving false information, and failing to report changes of address.

Registration will consist of answering certain questions, such as name, address, place of birth, date and place of entry into this country, and occupation. Each alien will be asked how long he intends to remain in this country and whether he has had any military service either here or abroad. He will be required to list his activities and to name any organizations of which he is a member or in which he participates, and to state whether they further the interests or program of a foreign government.

So much for the nature and purpose of the Alien Registration Act. Now, as time will allow, a few words about the manner in which it will be administered. As I have said, the Congress has placed upon the Department of Justice and the Post Office Department the duty of carrying out the provisions of this act, and these two great departments of our Government are working in close cooperation in order that this huge task may be carried out smoothly, efficiently, and with as little disturbance in the lives of our alien population as possible.

The actual registration will be handled by a trained staff of courteous, experienced postal employees who will be on duty during the full period of registration from August 27 to December 26, inclusive, in every first- and second-class post office and in the post office at every county seat. The alien will be required to go there and answer the questions. Adequate provisions will be made for those who are infirm or bedridden or confined in institutions. The answers to the questions will be recorded by the postal employees on official forms. After they have been completed, the alien must sign his name and swear to the truth of his answers. His fingerprints will be made at that time, too. He will not be cross-examined by anyone at the post office, but he will be expected to answer all the questions accurately, completely, and truthfully.

These signed questionnaires will be sent to the Immigration and Naturalization Service at Washington, where they will be filed, indexed, and cataloged to become a part of the permanent records of that Service. Where necessary, they will be checked against other records, and investigations will be conducted, if required, to determine the accuracy of the information thus obtained.

In due course everyone who registers will receive through the United States mail a registration receipt card. This will be his proof that he has registered in compliance with the law. This card should be preserved carefully, and it would be well to have it readily available because, though the law does not require an alien to carry it with him, it does require every alien to register, and this card will be his evidence that he has done so.

In order to make registration easier specimen forms of the questionnaire with full instructions as to each question and how it should be answered will be available at the various post offices well before the first day of registration, August 27. These instructions will contain an exact duplicate of the official registration blank, and it is urged that every alien obtain a specimen form as soon as possible, take it home and study it, and fill it out carefully. He should then take it with him to the post office when he goes to register, so that he can quickly and readily answer accurately and completely the same questions when asked by the registering officer.

And now a word about fingerprinting. Everyone should understand that there is no stigma of any kind attached to it. Hundreds of thousands of persons have had their fingerprints taken and recorded for identification purposes. The day has passed in this country when a fingerprint file is regarded in any sense as a "rogues' gallery." It is simply a modern means of identification. It is the most accurate way to keep records straight and to identify them. Names may be changed; faces changed or even lifted; signatures may be forged; but no two sets of fingerprints have ever matched. In the last war every man who served in the Army, the Navy, and the Marine Corps was fingerprinted. Thousands of people are voluntarily fingerprinted every year. All Federal civil-service workers, all Postal Savings depositors, and many other are fingerprinted as a matter of course. There is no disgrace to it, and no alien should have the slightest compunction in submitting to it.

Let me stress another point. The alien need not fear that the information he gives will be used by the Government to harass him,

or will be available to others to annoy him or discriminate against him in any way. The law provides that the records shall be kept secret and confidential. Nobody may examine them except with the express permission of the Attorney General of the United States. All may rest assured that Attorney General Robert H. Jackson will see to it that these records will not become available except to those entitled to the information for legitimate needs of national defense and for other proper governmental purposes.

Another point which should be brought home to every alien, is that registration is absolutely free. No official fee of any kind is involved and no money need be paid by the alien to anyone. If doubt exists as to whether an individual comes within the provisions of the law, as, for example, whether or not he is a citizen, which is often a complex and difficult legal question, he should play safe and register. If he has any doubt as to how to answer some of the questions, he should go to the post office or to the nearest office of the Immigration and Naturalization Service and make inquiry. He will be furnished with all the help which it is possible to give him, and he cannot pay anything for this advice. Already there have been some complaints regarding persons who are attempting to take advantage of aliens and who pretend that they can "fix things" to avoid registration, or make things easier in answering the questions, or eliminate some of them. They offer this spurious advice in return for a fee. The alien should beware of the "registration racketeer."

Before I close may I direct a word especially to those of you who are citizens of the United States? You can be of great assistance in carrying out this phase of the defense program. Many of you have friends, relatives, or neighbors who are not citizens. You can help your country by helping them understand the purpose of the Registration Act and how its provisions will be carried out. You can tell them where to go to register and when to go. You can be of particular assistance to those who are not familiar with our language and who may have difficulty in reading and understanding the questions, and, above all, you can point out to your alien friends or acquaintances the necessity for them to register and can urge them to do so as soon as they can after the period of registration opens on August 27, so that there will not be a large last-minute rush when the period ends on December 26.

Above all, you can make clear to your alien friends that registration is intended by the Government for the protection of aliens as well as for the protection of our country.

Refuses To Support Third Term

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, September 18, 1940

CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN EDWARD J. FLYNN AND LUTHER HARRISON

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from Edward J. Flynn, chairman of the Democratic National Committee, to Mr. Luther Harrison, of Oklahoma City, and the reply of Mr. Harrison, which I think will be of interest.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL COMMITTEE,
New York City, August 28, 1940.

Hon. LUTHER HARRISON,
Oklahoma City, Okla.

MY DEAR MR. HARRISON: Four years ago your efforts did much to sweep our great leader, Franklin D. Roosevelt, into the White House. This year the cause is even more inspiring. America needs Roosevelt.

I invite you again to carry this message to your fellow citizens. Please fill out the enclosed sheet for the speakers' bureau and send it to me.

With kindest personal regards, I am
Sincerely yours,

EDWARD J. FLYNN, *Chairman.*

OKLAHOMA CITY, OKLA., *September 11, 1940.*

Hon. EDWARD J. FLYNN,
Democratic National Committee, New York City.

DEAR MR. FLYNN: May I thank you heartily for your recent letter, in which you express your appreciation of the services I have rendered the Democratic Party in former campaigns and inquire if my services will be available during the current campaign.

Not once in 48 years have I refused to appear on the stump in behalf of the Democratic ticket in any State or National contest. My first oratorical effort was made in 1892, in behalf of the election of Grover Cleveland. In subsequent campaigns I have spoken (frequently at my own expense) all the way from the Carolina coast out to the foothills of the Rockies. Naturally, I am ready and anxious to take part in any campaign that involves Democratic issues and Democratic candidates.

In 1912 I took the stump at the request of the Oklahoma State Democratic Committee and spoke in every one of Oklahoma's 77 counties against Theodore Roosevelt and the third term. Following the termination of that campaign I received formal letters of thanks for fighting the third term heresy from Governor Haskell and Governor Cruce; from Chairman Tom Harrill, of the Democratic State committee; and from the Democratic county committees of Hughes, Seminole, and Woods Counties.

While I am getting somewhat old to prepare a new speech in its entirety, I still have a copy of the speech I made throughout the Southwest against Theodore Roosevelt and the third-term heresy in 1912; and if it meets with your approval and conforms to your wishes, I shall be glad to make that speech just anywhere in the United States that you suggest. I am still just as strong for the preservation of the third-term precedent as I was when I spoke against its violation in 1896, 1912, 1920, and 1928. Four times in the past 44 years I have fought under the Democratic flag as a recognized Democrat for a principle that was observed by Washington, vitalized by Jefferson, and religiously observed by Madison, Monroe, Jackson, Cleveland, and Wilson. And I am ready to make my fifth battle under the old Democratic flag for the preservation of a principle whose retention I consider essential to the safety of the Republic.

In the event you consider my 1912 speech undesirable, I shall be glad to make, any time and at any place, the speech I made in 1932 in support of the Democratic Party's platform promises to repeal the Hawley-Smoot Tariff Act, to balance the Budget, to reduce the expenses of Federal Government at least 25 percent, and to effectively prevent the return of the saloon.

If at any time during the present campaign you want me to deliver one of the speeches I made in 1912 and 1932, I shall be at your service and subject to your call.

Very respectfully,

LUTHER HARRISON.

Roosevelt Gains According to Gallup Poll

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. SMATHERS
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, September 18, 1940

ARTICLE FROM NEW YORK TIMES

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have published in the Appendix of the RECORD a clipping taken from the New York Times this morning under the heading of Roosevelt gains in three States.

The Gallup poll shows in this newspaper that since August 25 three States have moved from the Willkie column to the Roosevelt column—New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania.

The poll shows that my State of New Jersey is now 54 percent for Roosevelt. Four years ago no one, not even Jim Farley, claimed my State of New Jersey for Roosevelt until 4 or 5 days before the election. In that election the State gave President Roosevelt a 360,000 majority.

It is, therefore, refreshing to see that the Gallup poll today, 6 weeks before the election, claims the State for Roosevelt by a 54-percent majority. As we draw nearer to election day this percentage will increase.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ROOSEVELT GAINS IN THREE STATES LISTED—HE NOW LEADS IN NEW YORK, NEW JERSEY, AND PENNSYLVANIA, GALLUP SURVEY FINDS—BUT RACE IS STILL CLOSE—SHIFT OF THE ADVANTAGE FROM WILLKIE TO THE PRESIDENT SINCE AUGUST 25 SEEN

President Roosevelt has gained and Wendell L. Willkie lost strength in New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania, controlling almost one-fifth of the electoral vote for President, since August 25, according to a survey of the American Institute of Public Opinion, announced yesterday by Dr. George Gallup, the director.

"Gaining four percentage points on Mr. Willkie in New York State, three in Pennsylvania, and five in New Jersey," Dr. Gallup writes,

"President Roosevelt has taken the lead away from the Republican candidate in these three States and buttressed his national position at this stage of the race, the survey shows.

"Whether or not President Roosevelt's gains in these States have been duplicated in other parts of the country remains to be seen. Returns from the institute's third State-by-State survey of Roosevelt-Willkie sentiment are being tabulated and will be reported Friday.

"What has happened in these three eastern States since the previous institute survey August 25 is sufficient to show the problem that faces Mr. Willkie on his present trip through the far West, however. As in the past, the intensification of the war in Europe has been followed by a rise in Roosevelt support. Mr. Willkie, whose active campaign is just beginning, must now attempt to overhaul President Roosevelt in States like New York, Pennsylvania, and New Jersey, which the Republican candidate held during the first weeks of the campaign and which are probably necessary for his election.

"RACE IS STILL CLOSE

"The race in these three States is still close—as close as it was a month ago—but the advantage lies today with President Roosevelt instead of with Mr. Willkie, the survey shows.

"The State-by-State vote of those with definite choices at this time with the net change for Roosevelt since August 25, is as follows:

Electoral votes		Today Roosevelt	Today Willkie	Points of change for Roosevelt
		Percent	*Percent*	
47	New York	52	48	+4
36	Pennsylvania	52	48	+3
16	New Jersey	54	46	+5

"In each of these States the institute survey found a substantial number of voters 'undecided' or without definite choices at this time—12 percent in New York, 11 percent in Pennsylvania, and 13 percent in New Jersey. Many of them still say, 'We don't know very much about Willkie yet; we're waiting to hear what he has to say.'

"The importance of New York, Pennsylvania, and New Jersey lies in the fact that together they account for 99 electoral votes, or almost one-fifth of the 531 in the electoral college.

"FIGURES FOR THIS CITY

"In New York City, where President Roosevelt registered 75 percent of the vote in 1936, he now leads by 67 percent. In Philadelphia, where Roosevelt received 62 percent of the vote 4 years ago, his strength today is at 60 percent.

"The trend since the August 25 survey is shown in the following figures:

	Percent Roosevelt	Percent Willkie	Gain for Roosevelt
New York City	67	33	+4
Up-State New York	38	62	+4
Philadelphia	60	40	+3
Rest of State, including Pittsburgh	49	51	+4

Invasions of England

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY S. TRUMAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 18, 1940

LETTER BY RALPH LOZIER

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter addressed to me by Ralph F. Lozier, Esq., an attorney, of Washington, D. C., setting forth some interesting facts of history with regard to invasions and attempted invasions of Great Britain.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *September 11, 1940.*

Hon. HARRY S. TRUMAN,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR TRUMAN: This letter is prompted by a desire to contribute something to correct a widely accepted fallacy which has no historic foundation, but which may directly, or at least remotely, have a bearing on the question of preparedness.

Since war broke out in Europe in all its frightful savagery, our newspapers, feature writers, publicists, and perhaps a few high-ranking military and naval authorities and experts have frequently asserted that Great Britain had never been invaded since 1066 when the bastard, William, Duke of Normandy, and grandson of a tanner of Faliase, invaded England and defeated Harold, the Saxon, at Senlac or Hastings, which event changed the racial complexion and the political institutions of the British Isles and mightily influenced future world events.

So frequent and so positive have been these claims as to the freedom of England from external aggression since the invasion by William the Conqueror, that millions of Americans readily accepted them without questioning their authenticity. And this fallacy that England had never been invaded since the time of William the Conqueror has, until recently, furnished a fatally false basis for the belief that England is forever immune from invasion. Indeed, the English Government and people, until a few months ago, complacently believed their insular position and preponderance of sea power would make impossible any invasion of the British Isles or seriously hamper their normal participation in world commerce.

To the end that we may not be misled by this myth that England has been free from invasion for 874 years, it might not be amiss to show it has no historic foundation. That the British Isles have been repeatedly invaded since the establishment of Norman supremacy in the eleventh century is convincingly and conclusively demonstrated by numerous historical authorities. One reference will suffice: Between January 22 and March 11, 1778, the English Parliament engaged in continuous debate on the state of the Army and Navy, the conduct of the war with the American Colonies, and the American conciliation bills. On March 11, 1778, the House of Commons went into a committee on the state of the nation in which Charles James Fox moved, "that the present state of the Royal Navy for the defence of Great Britain and Ireland is inadequate to the dangerous crisis of public affairs." Mr. Temple Luttrell opened the debate in an elaborate argument in support of the Fox motion and declared that the English Army and Navy were grossly inadequate for the defense of Great Britain and Ireland. In the course of his argument for a very substantial increase in the British Military and Naval Establishments, Mr. Luttrell said:

"Let those gentlemen who hug themselves with a comfortable persuasion of our entire security from invaders, because of our insular situation, and vigilance, or superior dexterity of our fleet, recollect how many invasions of these islands stand recorded in history. There have been, since the Norman conquest, 24 invasions of Great Britain or Ireland, 9 of which have been made good without any molestation on the seas and 7 have proved successful. Between 1685 and 1689, 4 invasions were effectuated. In May 1685 the Duke of Monmouth sailed from the Texel with 3 ships, and landed without resistance, after beating about in bad weather 19 days, in the English Channel, which then swarmed with cruisers dispatched to intercept his passage. In 1688 the Dutch Fleet, with the Prince of Orange aboard, afterward King William III, and which consisted of 54 men-of-war (besides transports and other vessels, about 500) sailed from Helvoet, and stretched for the Channel. Lord Dartmouth at that time lay with the English squadron of 61 ships of the line, at anchor in The Downs; the weather became thick and hazy, as is usual, with the wind to the southward of the east. The Dutch men-of-war were full 7 hours before they could all stretch to the westward of the English and extended several miles in length; yet the prince contrived to reach Torbay and land his whole army unopposed; though Lord Dartmouth got under way with the utmost expedition possible, and crowded sail to encounter the enemy. I am aware that some writers of that time have hinted strong suspicions against the loyalty and zeal of the British commanders; but the fact is they used their best endeavors, and once got within sight of the Dutch rear; but the wind shifting suddenly to the westward and coming on to blow fresh, just as the Dutch men-of-war had reached Torbay (or as some authors allege, overshot their destination in the night) they were enabled to fetch the landing place, while the ships in chase were forced, by the same gale, so far back as the Isle of Wight.

"The year after the abdication a squadron of 14 French men-of-war landed King James and several of his chief military officers at Kinsale, without meeting with the English squadron dispatched to prevent debarkation; and not long after a second French fleet met with the same facility of landing and put on shore a numerous foreign army for enabling King James to dispute the possession of that kingdom with his son-in-law. But, sir, this alarm of an invasion and the present debilitated state of Great Britain and Ireland will render it absolutely necessary that we reserve two-thirds of our present force for the heart of the realm. The noble lord (North) speaks in high tone and boasts of the 'vigour of our Navy'—being particeps criminis, I suspect, with the First Lord of the Admiralty, rather through mischievous policy than shortsightedness. Another honorable member (the Lord Advocate of Scotland) trusts much to the exertion of our superior naval armaments, 'with energy.' How, sir, can you spare one ship of the line from the defence of this country in case of a French and Spanish war? Suppose you had 43 of the line manned to their full war complement; this strength would scarcely suffice to cover your harbours and coasts; you would have no cruisers, no western squadron. What is to become of your West India islands, your Asiatic settlements, and the important fortresses of Gibraltar and Mahon? The

foreign stations, for a defensive war only against France, will require nearly 50 sail of the line; and against the two houses of Bourbon united you cannot do with fewer of their services than 75 or 80. Your whole present extent of the line of battle would be little better than a Mediterranean command, with proper reliefs. When have you seen so few as 20 sail of the line on that service against the united power of Versailles and Madrid? In the reign of Queen Anne, Sir George Rooks and Sir Cloudesly Shovel commanded a fleet of more than 50 sail of the line in that sea; and the fleet of the enemy was full as numerous; they had 17 three-deckers.

"In the reign of George 1st, Sir George Byng had upward of 20 sail of the line of battle in the Messina fight; and his force was represented as inadequate to that station. In the late king's reign, the squadron under Admirals Matthews and Lestock consisted of above 40 men of war of the line; and the combined fleets of France and Spain proved fully their match. I shall perhaps be told that in 1762, when the French and Spaniards were united against Great Britain, we had few more than 20 sail of the line of battle in the Mediterranean, off Cadiz; and, notwithstanding which, we were too strong for the enemy; but let the gentlemen recollect, that the coup de grâce was given to the naval power of France the preceding summer; and the Spanish Navy was the only one we had to contend with, and near half their men of war of superior rates were on the continent of Spanish America or at Cuba, etc."

The foregoing quotation is from volume 19, page 886, of Hansard's Parliamentary History of England (London edition, 1814).

I am calling your attention to this widely accepted "historic fallacy," because experience of mankind demonstrates that nations, like individuals, are often victims of a false sense of security, and unintentionally and unconsciously lapse into a state of equanimity, self-satisfaction, and excessive self-confidence not always justified by swiftly changing world conditions.

I am one whose faith in our institutions is unimpaired. I still believe that no emergency is so great as to necessitate or justify an abandonment, abatement, or impairment of the principles, policies, and traditions which underlie, permeate, and vitalize our free institutions. I can conceive of no emergency or cataclysmic condition that cannot be successfully met and satisfactorily solved within the framework of our constitutional system by an accurate interpretation and wise application of the fundamental concepts on which our free Government rests. It is foolish to argue that a government, such as ours, cannot function efficiently, defend itself, or protect its interests in crises such as now confront the nations of the world. To argue that a democracy cannot function as efficiently as a totalitarian state in great national upheavals is tantamount to an ignominious confession that our form of government is a delusion and failure in any supreme crisis that may confront us. I have no doubt our Government and the American people will meet the present emergency with a spirit, wisdom, and courage comparable with that of our constitutional fathers.

Sincerely,

RALPH F. LOZIER.

Selective Service Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MORRIS SHEPPARD

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 19 (legislative day of Wednesday, September 18), 1940

ADDRESS BY GEN. GEORGE C. MARSHALL, CHIEF OF STAFF

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, I submit for printing in the RECORD a radio address delivered by Gen. George C. Marshall, the Chief of Staff, on the Selective Service Act.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This afternoon the President gave the final approval to the act of Congress creating a system of selective service for compulsory military training, a great fundamental stride toward the preparation of this country to defend itself, to protect its form of government and its compelling interests in the Western Hemisphere. This morning some 60,000 citizen-soldiers of the National Guard left comfortable homes, their families, and their jobs to fulfill their patriotic mission as members of the Army of the United States.

Within the next 10 days these troops will concentrate in divisional camps in New Jersey, South Carolina, Oklahoma, and the State of Washington to start on a period of intensive military training. Along the east and west coasts of the United States harbor-defense and other units of the guard will move into camps and commence their training in the handling of heavy seacoast guns and smaller weapons. Antiaircraft regiments will assemble at special firing centers to commence practical training in this vital service. National Guard air squadrons of observation planes will move to airfields to perfect their coordinated training with other branches of the Army.

I wish to emphasize the importance of these preparations. We are at peace with every nation in the world. Nevertheless, it is the feeling of the War Department that the next 6 months include the possibility of being the most critical period in the history of this Nation. Ordinary common sense indicates that our preparations should be made accordingly.

The situation today is utterly different from that of 1917. Then we were at war, but we foresaw small possibility of military danger to this country. Today such a possibility trembles on the verge of becoming a probability. Then we could proceed with deliberation. We could wait until we built cantonments, until we first trained officers later to train the men, until we were prepared to form a field army. We did not need to worry about arms, equipment, and ammunition—our Allies were prepared to supply these necessities.

Today time is at a premium and modern arms and equipment must be provided by our own industries, not by allies. We must be prepared to stand alone. We cannot depend on others for protection during a prolonged period of preparation.

Therefore the mobilization this morning of the first increment of the National Guard is the first long step in the preparation of an adequate army of citizen soldiers to man our defenses.

Testifying before a congressional committee last February, I made the statement that our preparations for defense should be carried out in an orderly, businesslike manner, proceeding step by step, in accordance with the major developments abroad; that if Europe blazed in the late spring or summer we must put our house in order before the sparks reached the Western Hemisphere. Even so, it must be admitted that I only partially visualized the full extent of the conflagration and the rapidity with which it was to overwhelm the continent of Europe, yet at the time there was severe criticism of that statement as being unnecessarily alarming.

Today the public and the press are demanding action, immediate and all-inclusive, and there is a more general appreciation of the hazards of our situation. But I fear that there is not so clear an understanding of just what is required in order to produce the desired results.

The time-consuming process in manufacturing materiél—planes, guns, tanks, and other munitions—is partially comprehended, though impatience and forebodings are productive of demands for miracles to overcome delays due to past public indifference; also, I fear that we expect too much of machines. We fail to realize two things: First, that the finest plane or tank or gun in the world is literally worthless without technicians trained as soldiers—hardened, seasoned, and highly disciplined—to maintain and operate it; and, second, that success in combat depends primarily upon the development of the trained combat team composed of all arms. This battle team is the most difficult, the most complicated of all teams to create, because it must operate on unknown ground, in darkness as well as in daylight, amidst incredible confusion, danger, hardship, and discouragements. It is a team of many parts, the decisive element of which remains the same little-advertised, hard-bitten foot soldier, with his artillery support.

From a foreign source, a veteran of the recent fighting, we get this comment: "Wars are still fought by men even though they use elaborate weapons. Troops of all kinds must therefore have physical fitness and toughness that will guarantee their vitality and endurance under prolonged strain."

A German general staff officer is credited with this summary of that army's recent success:

"Our success is due to close teamwork between the air force, armored troops, motorized engineers, and infantry. Of course, the infantry must finally hold the ground, but all others help to bring it up. Our methods are simple in the extreme; they are understood by every soldier in the army. Our foot infantry is the best in the world. Their principal job is marching, and the job of every other arm is to keep them marching forward into enemy land. * * * We move," he says, "on a broad front with armored divisions and air force. Where the initial resistance is too strong for the armored troops to penetrate, it is broken by dive bombers and additional artillery. The way must be cleared for the infantry, with whom the final decision lies. This requires perfect communication and coordination between arms; further, it requires a singleness of command and purpose." He is describing a highly organized team, a balanced team, in contrast to a few highly developed specialties, each operating somewhat according to its own theory of combat.

The War Department has carefully followed the development of the war in Europe for the purpose of analyzing the reasons for the success of one army or the failure of another. While the importance of specialized training is apparent to all observers, the tremendous importance of seasoned soldiers, welded into a perfect team, is the outstanding impression. There is no royal road to such training. It cannot be obtained by reading books or sitting in barracks. The only way we can prepare ourselves for the future is to get out in the open, in all kinds of weather, and take advantage of the lessons forced on nations who are less fortunately situated.

The original recommendation of the War Department that this first increment of the National Guard be ordered into active service last July, was based on the necessity for hurrying to develop a special seasoned reinforcement for the small body of mobile troops of the Regular Army available in continental United States. Today, the entry of this portion of the National Guard on active duty must also serve another purpose. These divisions, these regiments and squadrons that joined the active Army of the United States

this morning, must prepare themselves as quickly as possible to receive and train their portion of the young men selected under the democratic terms of the new law just given force and effect by the signature of the President.

Both the troops of the Regular Establishment and those of the National Guard must absorb in their ranks the men of the Selective Service Act and give them their military training. Furthermore, thousands of officers of the Reserve Corps, mainly products of the R. O. T. C. in our colleges and universities, are either on active duty or are being called to such duty to provide the necessary additional leaders. In other words, the National Defense Act of 1920, the result of our experience in 1917 and 1918, is being put into effect in a businesslike manner. The Selective Service Act has added the final touch of authority to enable America to go to work effectively at the business of preparing herself against the uncertainties, the threatened dangers of the immediate future.

The consummation of War Department plans must be governed by the speed with which adequate shelter can be provided. Until funds were made available the Department could only plan for such important details. Now the problem is the completion of temporary hospitals, sewage and water systems, buildings and other necessities of healthful life. So long as the international situation permits, we will proceed only as rapidly as adequate shelter can be provided. In turn, the trainees under the Selective Service Act will be called out as rapidly as units of the Regular Establishment and National Guard are prepared to receive them—both from the viewpoint of training and of shelter—the first increment about the middle of November.

The middle of October it is planned to order a second increment of the National Guard to join the active Army—the Twenty-seventh Division from New York, the Thirty-seventh Division of Ohio, the Thirty-second Division from Michigan and Wisconsin, and air squadrons of observation planes from New York, Michigan, and Mississippi. The entire National Guard of Puerto Rico and Hawaii will be included in this increment.

For years the National Guard has been preparing for service in the event of a great national emergency. Today that emergency is recognized and the first of these troops of citizen soldiers have reported for duty. Their task is most difficult. They must establish themselves in camp and in the shortest possible time season and prepare their small nucleus of men—about 30 percent of full strength—to receive and train treble their number.

This means long hours of arduous work. For the officers and noncommissioned officers it means not only hard physical work but also intensive daily study of the manuals covering the latest technique in welfare. It is only through discomforts and fatigue that progress can be made toward the gradual triumph of mind and muscles over the softness of the life to which we have all become accustomed.

All this not only takes time but requires wholehearted effort. It demands a standard of discipline which will prevail over fatigue, hunger, confusion, or disaster. Given time to prepare himself, the American makes the finest soldier in the world, and for the first time in our history we are beginning in time of peace to prepare against the possibility of war. We are starting to train an army of citizen soldiers which may save us the tragedy of war.

If we are strong enough, peace, democracy, and our American way of life will be the reward.

Arkansas Democratic State Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PRENTISS M. BROWN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 19 (legislative day of Wednesday, September 18), 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. JOHN E. MILLER, OF ARKANSAS

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MILLER] before the Arkansas Democratic State Convention at Little Rock, Ark., on September 17, 1940.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman and fellow Democrats, this is a notable day in the history of Arkansas democracy. You have gathered here to do honor to your incoming Governor and to plan with him for a great program of sound progress for the State which we love and serve.

You have done me a high honor in inviting me to be present on this happy occasion, and my appreciation is very great. I have no trouble in starting this speech, because the first thing I want to say is what you want to hear: The next Governor of Arkansas has two great gifts. He loves people and he loves to work at a hard job. Moreover, he has a genius for teamwork, and his administration is to begin at a time when all the energies of America will be harnessed under the leadership of other hard-working men and women who love this country and serve it with pride and devotion.

I intend no fulsome eulogy of our modest friend, but I would be disloyal to the dictates of my own heart if I did not put in the record now my high confidence in his character, his driving energy, and his independence of judgment, which he tempers with a sincere appreciation of the counsel of wise friends.

Yes, fellow Democrats, Homer Adkins is going to be a greatly beloved Governor because of his instinctive courtesy toward the great and humble, but he is also going to be a greatly respected Governor because of his unchanged simplicity of habits, his fidelity to his promises, and his firmness in saying "Yes" and "No."

The second thing I want to say is in the nature of a mild admonition to you and me and to all other citizens of the State. The functions of government have piled up enormously in recent years. The personnel of government has increased proportionately. Men of the generation of James P. Clarke or Thomas C. McRae would be amazed if they could look today on the complexity and magnitude of the chief executive's duties. For a conscientious man the Governor's office is an arduous task. Let us spare Homer Adkins as much of the wear and tear of routine problems as possible. Let us free him for the great problems and opportunities which confront him.

We who have so enthusiastically joined in electing our friend to the high office of chief executive of the State owe him loyal and unselfish support in the stirring and trying days ahead. He will need us then quite as much as during the thrill and excitement of the election campaign. One of the firsts tests of our forbearance and loyalty should be the realization that even Homer Adkins, the most patient and persistent job hunter for others the State has ever seen, can't appoint 10 men to a job that requires only 1 man.

An equally important test of the genuineness of our loyalty is in the quality of the men we endorse. Let's offer him the kind of men and women who will treat public office as a public trust. Let us help him fulfill his announced desire to establish the highest standard of public service in the history of the State. The statehouse will not be a comfortable spot for drones during the next 4 years. You can't stay in the same neighborhood with Homer Adkins without an honest expenditure of time and effort. But it is not enough that a leader of the people shall be a tireless worker, short on promises and long on performance, setting an example for steady devotion to the public welfare. The acid test of any leader in these grave days is his willingness and ability to cooperate with other public officials and with private citizens in great and critical matters affecting the national welfare and national defense on both the military and economic fronts.

I have said that the next Governor has a genius for teamwork and no one can doubt that he will be confronted with many opportunities to prove the high estimate of his friends from the first day he takes office. This Nation faces the most solemn crisis since the War between the States. But this is no hour for panic and alarm.

It is the genius of democracy that in a crisis free men voluntarily impose upon themselves the discipline necessary to meet the emergency. Sometimes this discipline has the outward appearance of dictatorship, and sincere men express anxiety for the permanent loss of liberty. But I believe history clearly shows that among free men the passion for freedom grows stronger when its loss is threatened by an aggressor from without. The real danger in a democracy is from an "inside job"—a soft generation which permits its precious liberties to be stolen while listening trustfully to the lullabies of demagogs and "fifth columnists." We cannot ignore the stern reminder of Webster: "Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty."

In spite of certain evidences to the contrary, the prsent genration of Americans is not soft. And this is well, for the road ahead of us is hard. We shall learn anew in the decade we are entering that the American way of life is inexpressibly precious, worthy of great sacrifices, deserving of our strongest defense, a heritage which we propose to transmit unimpaired to our children, even though the price of the transfer shall be our "toil and sweat and blood."

I give fervent thanks that our Anglo-Saxon kinsmen are standing so stanchly against the cruel aggression of the European dictators. I am one who believes they are defending the cause of human liberty throughout the world. I acknowledge spiritual kinship with them and am glad that we are even now effective partners in the bitter struggle.

It will cost us infinitely less of blood and treasure to confront the foe by giving aid to Britain than to wait for him to establish bases in South America and the islands of the Atlantic as a preliminary to an attack upon us.

I deplore war. I pray for peace, but I want America hereafter to keep a loaded gun behind the door. My formula for peace is:

1. Complete military defeat for the dictators.
2. A just treaty of peace without vindictiveness.
3. A stern and continuing disarmament of the aggressor nations.
4. An impregnable navy and air force and an adequate army.

Arkansas has an important part to play in national defense. There are three principle contributions for us to make:

1. Manpower
2. Raw materials.
3. Machines and munitions of war.

In the first two brackets we are already doing a creditable part. I know you are proud that this State is among the first in the Nation in the percentage of volunteers furnished the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps. But the volunteer system is not the wise, efficient, or democratic way to prepare for national defense.

The Selective Service Act is democratic, efficient, American. It establishes the high principle that every able-bodied male citizen shall be subject to a temporary loss of personal freedom in order to insure the future freedom of himself, his neighbors, and his children. There are those who say sincerely that this is a hard principle. I agree. It is hard, but it is necessary. It is hard, but it is glorious, when self-imposed by a free people who stand ready to defend their great heritage with their lives. Let no one doubt that Arkansas will furnish promptly her quota of troops for a great national army.

There have been some pessimistic prophecies from discouraged public officials that Arkansas will not share in the benefits of a stimulated war economy. In scores of materials this State already feels the first impulse of the slowly but steadily rising tempo of war purchases. Arkansas has always been one of the great suppliers of raw materials for the Army and Navy, but we are destined to have much greater demands in the years ahead for food and fiber, oil and gasoline, timber and minerals.

Arkansas bacon is part of the soldier's ration; Arkansas cotton is in his khaki uniform; Arkansas walnut is in his rifle stock; Arkansas bauxite is in the frame of his fighting plane; Arkansas gasoline is in the fuel tank and Arkansas lubricating oil in the bearings; Arkansas lumber by the million feet will shortly be going into cantonments, and Arkansas oil is driving the engines of great naval vessels.

But there is widespread disappointment in the minds of many citizens over our present inability to place an efficient industrial machine at the disposal of our country. Except for our woodworking plants, oil refineries, and garment factories, we are still undeveloped in the field of processing plants for war industries. Nearly everyone thinks first of our virtual domestic monopoly of raw aluminum or bauxite and vast deposits of other strategic and critical war materials, and asks why it is not processed at the mines. The answer to that is insufficient cheap power and discriminatory high freight rates. Indeed, this is the answer to nearly ever major industrial disappointment in Arkansas in recent years. There are other contributing causes now happily on the point of being dissipated under the leadership of a stable State administration, but we may as well face the stubborn reality that Arkansas will not make great progress industrially until our natural power resources are more fully developed and freight rates are lowered for manufactured articles moving out of Arkansas to other regions.

This is not a recent discovery with me, as the records of Congress will disclose. Indeed, much of my congressional life has been spent studying the watersheds of the rivers of Arkansas, and, while my initial proposals have been primarily aimed at flood control and soil conservation, the development of the T. V. A. long ago whetted my appetite for cheap and abundant power for Arkansas.

There is now an encouraging prospect for launching the first step in an early consummation of these plans. I came home 2 weeks ago to attend the hearing at Harrison on the Norfork Dam. I am confident the Army engineers will recommend the installation of full hydroelectric facilities in this first unit. I believe this will mark one of the great milestones in the industrial progress of our State.

Other projects will follow. No useful purpose would be served by reviewing the history of the long, hard fight that has been waged by many of us who envision Arkansas as an industrial and agricultural empire within itself. Suffice it to say that a new era is dawning, and one of the chief problems that the new State administration will have before it is to properly coordinate State functions with Federal functions to the end that the citizens of Arkansas may obtain full benefit of these developments without denying to the citizens of other States the benefits that will flow to them. Progress has been made in rectifying the freight-rate discrimination. Many of our citizens are fully alive to the situation that exists, and I am sure that Governor Adkins and the State administration will have the cooperation of every patriotic Arkansan in their fight for the industrial and agricultural development of Arkansas. The fact that the task is stupendous should not deter us. I know that your incoming Governor will tackle this problem with the same determination with which he has heretofore met every challenge, and I know with the help that you and other good citizens of Arkansas will lend to him that he can, with the cooperation of the Federal Government, make an unprecedented contribution to the removal of the obstacles now barring progress and can and will set in motion State machinery that will make the government of Arkansas an agency of service in all things that tend to promote the happiness and the welfare of her people. There is no profit in lamenting our past failures. If we have failed in the past, that is not any reason why we should continue to fail. If our forests have been denuded, that is no reason why we should not replant them. If our soil has been depleted and has washed away, we should embrace the opportunity to render assistance through State agencies to the owners of the soil who realize now as never before the terrible price that we have paid by permitting our soil resources to dissipate.

As good Americans and as good Arkansans we must press with all vigor for the development, the utilization, and conservation of all our natural resources. The accomplishments of the Federal Government in the Tennessee Valley can be duplicated in Arkansas in all its phases. Situated as we are there is no reason why Arkansas with her matchless citizenship cannot and will not become a priceless asset in the promotion of the national welfare and at the same time become a State second to none. It is a challenge to all of us for unselfish and patriotic service.

You and I realize that some good citizens look with sincere misgivings on the policies of this administration in its relation to private business. I am not one who will defend every detail of policy with the zeal of a partisan. I think mistakes have been made and I acknowledge that some plans, intrinsically sound, have been handicapped by inefficient administrators. But I have little patience with the Roosevelt haters who repeat their bitter refrain of personal abuse and blindly label every major policy as Federal interference.

What is Federal interference? Is it a parity price for cotton? Is it safety for bank deposits? Is it money for highways, bridges, and grade crossings? Is it a program of controlling floods and rebuilding soil? Is it work for men and women without jobs? Is it loans on easy terms for men to save their farms, their homes, their livestock, their stores, their mills, their banks?

What are some of the fruits of Federal interference in Arkansas? Let me call the roll of some of the great Federal agencies which have served the people of this State under the leadership of Franklin D. Roosevelt. It is not feasible to name them all nor to attempt more than the briefest résumé of their activities:

HOME OWNERS' LOAN CORPORATION

Ten thousand, three hundred and forty-four loans have been made in Arkansas by the H. O. L. C., amounting to $18,677,767, with a repayment record which stops criticism.

RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

Since its inception in 1932, the R. F. C. has loaned more than $55,200,000 in Arkansas. Only $20,140,000 of this sum was unpaid on March 1, 1940. Additional disaster loans to the extent of $400,000 have been made. Losses will be negligible.

SOCIAL SECURITY

Funds are being used to aid approximately 22,000 aged persons, nearly 1,000 blind and more than 14,300 dependent children.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

Loans have been made to 13 cooperatives and one private company and these loans financed the construction of more than 7,000 miles of power lines. Fourteen thousand or fifteen thousand farmers are now being served by these lines. Plans are being made for the construction of more than 2,000 additional miles of power lines with this year's allotment of funds.

PUBLIC WORKS ADMINISTRATION

Grants and loans for non-Federal P. W. A. projects in Arkansas total $22,652,668. These projects include 85 waterworks systems, 39 sewer systems, and 54 educational buildings. Some outstanding projects are the Little Rock and Fort Smith waterworks, 6 buildings at the University of Arkansas, 15 buildings at the State hospital at Benton, and important additions to the tuberculosis sanitarium at Booneville.

FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

Loans by private lending agencies have been guaranteed by the F. H. A. for the construction, repair, and refinancing of homes and other buildings for a total of approximately $20,000,000. Here we have a fine example of effective cooperation between private initiative and government.

AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ADMINISTRATION

The A. A. A. has paid to the farmers of Arkansas in various types of benefits more than $129,000,000. Nearly 200,000 farmers are participating in the A. A. A. program and 83 percent of the crop land is covered. Approximately 95 percent of the cotton farmers in the State are participating.

FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION

In the 75 days from January 1 to March 15, 1933, 76 banks failed in Arkansas. Since the F. D. I. C. became effective January 1, 1934, nearly 7 years ago, 5 insured banks have failed without the loss of a single dollar to any depositor who carried a balance of less than $5,000. More than 200 banks, or virtually all those in the State, are now insured.

FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

1. Eight thousand five hundred and seventy-five Federal land-bank and land bank commissioner loans were made from 1933 to June 30, 1938. Few such loans have been made since that time.

2. During this time the Emergency Crop and Feed Loan Office has made 107,257 loans. These loans have also greatly decreased in volume.

3. Production credit associations made more than 48,804 crop and livestock loans.

Agricultural financing is rapidly becoming adequate and at the same time sound. Arkansas farmers are among the foremost in meeting their obligations.

FARM SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

The F. S. A. has aided more than 75,000 needy families in Arkansas. More than 45,000 have received grants and the rest have received loans. At the present time the F. S. A. is helping more than 20,000 families with loans. The tenant purchase division of the F. S. A. has made more than 800 loans to tenants for the purchase of farms.

SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE

Seventeen soil-conservation districts, covering approximately two-thirds of the State, are in operation. The new State administration must give consideration to further cooperation with the owners of the soil to prevent soil erosion.

CIVILIAN CONSERVATION CORPS

Thirty-five C. C. C. camps are operating in Arkansas. Nearly 11,000 of the State's youths are enlisted in the Corps.

NATIONAL YOUTH ADMINISTRATION

Approximately 4,000 youths are receiving student aid, and about the same number of nonschool youths are employed on N. Y. A. work projects.

WORK PROJECTS ADMINISTRATION

Total W. P. A. expenditures up to June 30, 1940, amount to more than $87,000,000. In the fiscal year 1939–40, $21,362,326 was spent. Of this sum $18,712,181 was spent for labor. Approximately 27,000 persons are now employed by W. P. A., but the average for last year was 37,000. W. P. A. accomplishments include:

(1) Repair and construction of 7,681 miles of highways, roads, and streets.

(2) Three thousand seven hundred and ten new bridges and 21,040 new culverts were constructed.

(3) Eight hundred and nine miles of roadside ditches were dug and 846 miles were improved.

(4) Seventy-three miles of paved sidewalks have been built.

(5) Seven hundred and seventy-three public buildings have been erected, 587 improved, and additions made to 45 others.

(a) Of this number 300 new educational buildings are included and 394 others were improved.

(b) The construction of 16 new hospitals and the improvement of 8 more are also included.

(c) Five armories were constructed.

(d) This quota also included 224 new recreational buildings.

(6) Thirty-four new stadia, seating more than 88,000 people, were constructed and 7 others, seating nearly 20,000 people, were improved.

(7) Five new sewerage-treatment plants were built and two others were improved.

(8) Three new water-pumping stations were constructed, two were improved, and two were enlarged.

(9) Nearly 50,000 sanitary privies were constructed; more than 63,000 acres of land were drained for mosquito control.

(10) Three thousand five hundred feet of airfield runways were paved and 4,600 feet of unpaved runways were constructed.

Who is there among us who can rightfully condemn these accomplishments? What is government anyway? Is it an agency to protect the strong from the weak, or is it an agency to give to the weak an opportunity to advance? During the last 7 years the national administration has proceeded upon the theory that government is an agency to help all and not a favored few.

Federal interference, my friends, is your interference. You are the people who elected and reelected Roosevelt; who returned Joe T. Robinson to the Senate to become the greatest legislative leader since Clay, Calhoun, and Webster; who have kept in Congress leaders loyal to the things he fought for. When I think of what this administration has done for Arkansas and its people I am not surprised at the many practical evidences of appreciation which you and other loyal Democrats have shown in the past.

In 1936 the Democrats of Arkansas gave probably the most noteworthy per capita financial support to the ticket of any State in the Union.

This year we have a strong leader in J. H. Graves, recommended by Mr. Adkins to the national committee and warmly endorsed by Senator Caraway, Colonel Barton, and myself. Already he has built a strong staff, and I am told several counties have accepted their quotas and are getting them promptly subscribed by loyal members of the party.

You will agree with me that this is a good year to do another great job for the national ticket. We owe it to Franklin D. Roosevelt. We owe it to Homer Adkins, the incoming chief executive and party leader of a great southern State, which has never faltered in its loyalty to Democracy. We owe it to ourselves as a testimonial of our faith in the program and policies of the party which has furnished the leadership for every great national crisis since Lincoln.

So, fellow Democrats, let us not only give our usual emphatic verdict in votes in November—let us give the national committee prompt and substantial support with our gifts.

There is but one major issue in the national campaign. It must be apparent to all that the Republican platform to a great degree and the Republican candidate to a greater degree have affirmed their faith in the principal policies of the Democratic Party.

The central issue is simply this: Does the Roosevelt administration have a record which commands greater public confidence than is inspired by the promises of the opposition? Shall the American people swap deeds already performed for pledges to perform the same deeds?

It is not a convincing indictment, as the result in November will again clearly show, to charge the President with Federal interference with business, arrogant disregard of State's rights, and maudlin concern for the poor and humble.

In a world-wide epidemic of terrible losses which touched every man in this auditorium, in some instances sweeping away our savings, our jobs, our homes, and the opportunities of our children, shall we, when some semblance of security has been won for ourselves, comfort the hopeless unemployed with denunciation of a national administration which still has the courage to fight for them as it did for every man in this room short months ago?

The third term is not a primary issue in this campaign. Like the President, I should have preferred that circumstances would have permitted him to lay down his heavy responsibilities at the end of his second term. But the American people will not have it so. In spite of the interpretation of the Chicago Tribune and certain other journals dedicated to the "destroy Roosevelt movement," the Democratic National Convention obeyed the overwhelming sentiment of the party in renominating the President to succeed himself.

The vessel of our national safety is caught in one of the wildest storms of modern history. But it is a stanch vessel and its crew is strong-hearted. The skipper of the vessel knows every bolt in the ship, every man in the crew, every foot of the perilous course. He is cool; he is daring; he is wise.

In this crisis, as they look with confidence at their intrepid captain, this is the prayer in the hearts of the American people:

"Thou, too, sail on, O Ship of State;
Sail on, O Union, strong and great!
Humanity with all its fears,
With all its hopes for future years,
Is hanging breathless on thy fate."

Profits and "Paytriotism"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RUSH D. HOLT

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 19 (legislative day of Wednesday, September 18), 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. RUSH D. HOLT

Mr. HOLT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a radio speech which I delivered on September 16, 1940, on the topic Profits and "Paytriotism."

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROFITS AND "PAYTRIOTISM"

All loyal Americans believe in national defense. We know that our country must be defended, but there are at least two types of patriotism in this country—one that is spelled p-a-t-r-i-o-t-i-s-m and the other that is spelled p-a-y-t-r-i-o-t-i-s-m. I desire to discuss the latter class of individuals.

These patriots—and they love to call themselves such—are divided into two classes, the profit patriot and the political patriot. The first loves his country when the country gives him the opportunity to make more profits from national defense or war equipment. The second loves to beat his chest with his words of patriotism and at the same time to remind his listeners of his indispensability as a public servant in the crisis. The first class desires profit and more profit. They realize that hysteria causes the Government to spend more and more and to spend it so quickly that the proper safeguards for the protection of the people are not given. They say, "You better not quibble over price or contract, over labor conditions, over anything. You better get this built by us at once or the country will be destroyed by an invader." These patriots wave the flag with one hand while they stuff a big defense contract in their pocket with the other. He is the profit patriot. The second class realizes the spending of tremendous sums is of great value for pump priming, for spending in his State or his congressional district, and means more people working and more people who will vote to continue their jobs. They are reminded that Congressman X or Senator Y is responsible for the contracts. They know that hysteria will cause many voters to vote to continue them in power. When I say these things they are not phantasies but about actual people.

If one questions the profit gouges that are in store for the Government in some contracts, he is immediately labeled as a man who is slowing up national defense, even though the work would not start for many months. When one says, "Let's have some plan of defense, let's not just throw the money to the winds and hope that we will get a real national defense," he is labeled as one who wants his country invaded.

And may I say here, if the day would come that our country would fall, it will not be the day of invasion but the day when it is destroyed from within, from our own people, from our own borders. It will come when the American people fail in their vigilance to protect their own liberties.

This is an interesting incident that occurred with me in the last month. During my fight against conscription, I was attacked by

a certain newspaper. Don't misunderstand me—I was attacked by many—but this incident is the one I desire to discuss. This paper had a right to attack my position but I thought I would look into the background of the ownership. What did I find? I found that a director was one of the main officials of a concern that had received a large order to manufacture shells; that owners of the paper had received dividends from their operations of business in the belligerent countries; that another director of the paper was also a director in a corporation which had gotten many millions of dollars in contracts from the Army and the Navy and had a large profit increase as a result of war orders. This is not an isolated example of what is going on in our country today. I have much more to give to the Senate in the next day or so.

Since the beginning of the war, we have had established many committees for involvement in the war. They do not state that as their aim but nevertheless, it is their purpose. One of the largest of these has some very interesting sponsors and I shall discuss some of them briefly.

One of the members of this committee is a director of an industrial corporation which has received contracts or allocations for defense items to the amount of more than $500,000,000.

Another member of the committee who is a little more outspoken than some of the others in that he advocates a declaration of war is connected with an aircraft investment corporation whose profits have increased at a tremendous pace since the start of war. Every time more orders are given, it means more dividends for him. But he is being asked to speak here and there as a disinterested, patriotic individual whose only interest is the saving of our country.

Let me go further. One well-known international banking house, who has one of its own family in a powerful political position as well as a member of this committee, has large international holdings, holdings in aircraft manufacturing, holdings in corporations doing war business. And while speaking of international banking, a recent newspaper advertisement appeared in many papers throughout the country advocating our more active involvement in the terrible slaughter abroad. I checked who paid for these advertisements, and I found every international bank in New York City, with the exception of one, having someone directly or indirectly connected with the financing of those advertisements. Such patriotism. Another individual who donated to the advertisement is a director in a corporation that is selling shells to be used in war and whose corporation has received a large order from the United States Government.

One of the most important national-defense officials of our country has a large sum invested in a large steel corporation and was one of its guiding lights. Members of the committee just mentioned a moment ago are on the board of directors. What do you think about the profits of this corporation? During the first 6 months of this year the profits were almost 3,000 percent higher than they were for the first 6 months of last year. The last 6 months of this year points to even greater profits.

Furthermore, some of these corporations who are getting large Government orders are donating money to the campaign funds. They are buying ads in political campaign books. Some time ago there was sold a certain campaign book for $2.50 an issue, but what did certain corporations with orders for our Army and Navy pay for this book? Here are some of them:

A steel company, $7,500.
An aircraft company, $2,500.
A builder of ships, $2,500.
A builder of tanks, $5,100.
A builder of engines, $2,700.

These are a few who paid those amounts for books that were being sold for $2.50.

Please do not misunderstand me. I have not nor do now indict all business with these statements, but I do say these practices should be stopped. Our national defense should not be victimized by those who are profiting personally by their so-called patriotism. I know many businessmen realize all business will suffer as a result of these infamous deeds. They know there is bound to be a reaction to such acts when the people know the truth. I admit it is hard to oppose some of these individuals who are in the most powerful positions in the whole business world where a word from them will cause vicious attacks to appear in newspapers, where a call from them will set in motion forces to destroy anyone who dares to tell the truth, but we must give the people the facts. Because they are powerful, because they are influential is no reason for a public official to refuse to do his duty as he sees it. The American people are going to pay for this mill; yes, a bill of billions of dollars, out of their hard-earned wages. It comes from you. I believe—yes; I know—that the American people are willing to spend whatever is necessary to give us a national defense which will protect us against any or all foes, but they have a right to get a dollar's worth of guns, of ships, of national defense for every dollar that is spent.

It has been said by the President that "no war millionaires will be created," yet they are being created and they will be created. Words, words, words will not stop their being created. It takes legislation with teeth in it to stop these war profits and we don't have it and we are in no prospect of having it.

They have passed conscription. Conscription to take the boys of this country and to force them into armed service. If a drafted boy earns $100 a month, the Government takes 79 percent of his wealth for 4 months and confiscates 70 percent for the next 8 months; yet some industrialists howl and howl when we try to limit profits to 7 percent on Government contracts. Yes; the National Defense Council, the Army, and the Navy have all sent representatives to Congress to protest against any law that would limit profits to 7 percent.

The last war gave us some startling information on war profits. Some of those who made millions then were in organizations at that time to promote war. Today they are in organizations to promote war, while making profits from death and destruction. One airplane company made $11,437,250 profit in 8 years on a $1,000 investment. Think of that! An eleven-million-dollar profit on a thousand-dollar investment. One company was charging England 54½ cents for powder and charged the United States Army 71 cents. And this company was not an English company but one in the United States. A steel bid showed a price of $560 a ton, yet the company itself admitted it cost but $350.73 to make a ton. They made $203 a ton, or 58 percent profit. Not bad when boys were having their lives confiscated.

Profit "paytriotism" challenges America. It has not only challenged it from the standpoint of finance but is paying campaign costs to promote those who will allow them to continue to gouge the American people.

That isn't the type patriotism that will defend America. We need a strong national defense, one to protect us from a foreign foe or from subversive forces within.

The New Deal and National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SHERMAN MINTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 19 (legislative day of Wednesday, September 18), 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. HAROLD L. ICKES, SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR

Mr. MINTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address delivered on September 15, 1940, by the Secretary of the Interior, Hon. Harold L. Ickes, on the subject of the New Deal and national defense.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN FORUM OF THE AIR

SUBJECT: THE NEW DEAL AND NATIONAL DEFENSE

(Remarks of Secretary of the Interior Harold L. Ickes in discussion with Senator STYLES BRIDGES and others.)

Mr. Chairman, I am delighted to assist in bringing, at long last, the distinguished senior Senator from New Hampshire, the official spokesman for Wendell Willkie, and the Republican National Committee, before the microphone tonight. Recently I made a radio speech and Mr. Willkie announced in advance that the Senator had been detailed to reply forthwith. But when I had spoken, Mr. Willkie instructed the Senator not to reply and to cancel his "radio time."

Now this was a very hard thing for the Senator to do, because I understand that no radio time had been contracted for that he could cancel. It was just another bit of Mr. Willkie's showmanship. However, it was widely proclaimed by the partisan press that the nonexistent time of the Senator had been abandoned. Thus Mr. Willkie truly left his "BRIDGES" burning behind him.

The subject that we have agreed to discuss is The New Deal and National Defense. On this subject there is much misinformation abroad in the land. The Republican platform—do you remember it?—viewed with alarm the New Deal record on defense, and Candidate Willkie, the refugee from Wall Street, did likewise in his speech back on the farm at Elwood. Senator BRIDGES, or the Republican National Committee for him, promptly issued a supporting statement—if a declaration that is barren of truth can be said to be "supporting." I quote directly:

"Roosevelt slept as Germany armed. With $18,000,000,000 of blank checks, which he could spend wholly at his own discretion, he built with these funds not one battleship, not a plane, not an antiaircraft gun, not a single tank."

You will note that the Senator's criticism is directed at the 7 years prior to 1940. It has nothing to do with the present defense program, on which you are all so well informed that I could add little.

Fortunately, I can help the Senator tonight to clear away whatever confusion and misapprehension he may have caused. I am sure that he will welcome my efforts in this behalf. I can do this readily, because as Federal Public Works Administrator for 6 years I am personally familiar with the record.

First, let us take the statement that the President did not build a plane with these funds. I am sure, Senator, that as a patriotic

American citizen you will be glad to be told that this is a total error, as you might have ascertained from detailed reports made to Congress and to the public. Nor are these planes "on paper," as your Mr. Willkie says; they are in commission right now.

You said "not a plane," Senator. As a matter of fact, fleets of planes for both the Army and the Navy were built with Public Works Administration emergency funds allotted by the President. With just one allotment, more than 100 planes, not to mention spare engines, parts, radio equipment, and bombing and armament appliances, were provided for the Army. With the same allotment, 130 planes, ranging from bullet-swift fighters to giant flying-boat patrols and bombers were provided for the Navy. This allotment was made by the President from P. W. A. funds in November 1933 at a time when Mr. Willkie, the "great utilitarian," considered it his most patriotic duty to devote himself to "the preservation of public utilities privately owned." Incidentally, Mr. Willkie's utilities are protected tonight by these very planes, while utilities in other lands, however owned, are being bombed.

Is it possible, Senator, that your chief, Mr. Willkie, who offers himself as an informed leader in these critical times, does not know this? Or is it possible that the statements attributed to yourself and to Mr. Willkie were made for political purposes with intent to mislead the country?

I might tell you also that President Roosevelt used emergency funds to build more than 50 military airports throughout this Nation. These funds were also used to construct naval aircraft carriers, to build hangars and production facilities all over the country, and to provide the vital instrumentalities of aeronautical research now serving so well at Langley Field, Va., and in other laboratories that have put American aviation out in front.

Let us continue, Senator. I remember one single P. W. A. allotment of $10,000,000 to begin the motorization and mechanization of our Army, including armored vehicles, thus actually laying the foundations for the motorized army that we are building today.

This $10,000,000 allotment was made in December 1933—years before German Panzer divisions showed the world the tremendous striking power of such equipment. I might also tell you that the same emergency funds helped to provide the Army with a network of 74,000 miles of strategic highways, vital to industrial and military mobilization and indispensable to a mechanized army, together with useful bridges, grade crossings, viaducts, and similar facilities.

In addition to airplanes for the Army and Navy, one single allotment of approximately $9,000,000 from P. W. A. emergency funds was provided by President Roosevelt in July 1933 for the manufacture and modernization of ordnance, the improvement of arsenals, and the renovation and preservation of ammunition. The President also made possible the reconditioning and modernization of our 75-mm. guns.

Don't they tell you these things, Senator? They report them in the papers. But we must be getting along.

You said, Senator, that the President had "$18,000,000,000 of blank checks, which he could spend wholely at his own discretion." That, Senator, is probably the most barefaced distortion of them all, and one which, as a Senator, you should have known better than to make. You know full well that, with few exceptions, the Congress dictated the purposes for which emergency funds might be spent.

As to the first P. W. A. appropriation in 1933, under the National Industrial Recovery Act, the President relied upon a permissive sentence and allotted funds for defense purposes. This action was met by a storm of criticism, much of it by the same newspapers and politicians who are now, as hindsighters, assailing the President for doing all that he could of what they now say he should have done more of.

As a result of this violent criticism, when another P. W. A. appropriation bill was before the Senate in 1935, an amendment, originally offered by Senator Borah, took away any possible discretion on the part of the President to make military or naval allotments. This is the distinguished body of which you are an energetic member, Senator.

The defense allotments that I am referring to were all made more than 5 years ago. Didn't you know that, Senator? Of course, it happened before you got here, but the proceedings of the Senate are not a closed book to you and you owe it to yourself to investigate the record to avoid making a misstatement of fact. In relation to total armament needs, of course a billion dollars may not now seem like a large amount for defense. But when it is considered that the President allocated this total amount out of funds originally intended principally for public works and work-relief projects, it is an outstanding accomplishment. So much so that the Senate saw fit to prevent similar expenditures from 1935 on.

As a matter of fact, Senator BRIDGES, if you had been a stickler for the truth, instead of saying that the President had $18,000,000,000 in blank checks which he could have spent for any purpose, you would have made it clear that, from 1935 on, Congress, by stipulation, amendment, and specific legislation, made it illegal for him to use some eighteen billion dollars of emergency funds for military purposes.

Five years ago your Mr. Willkie may have been so busy fighting the Government development of electrical power that now serves defense needs that he did not know what the President was doing in the way of building up the Army and the Navy, but you, as a Senator, could have told him the facts. You know because you have voted on some of these matters. In fact, Senator, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD discloses that you and your partisan associates, who are now supporting Mr. Willkie, voted regularly for laws and amendments to prevent, or reduce, or curtail, or restrict these emergency-funds appropriations. Inasmuch as you have fought against providing such funds in any form for the President, one is bewildered that you should now complain that more money was not spent.

But let us proceed, Senator. As I have shown, long before the world found itself in its present plight, President Roosevelt's foresight provided funds for military airports such as Mitchel and Randolph Fields; for engine-tooling; for arsenal tools, which today are being worked at top speed; for civil aviation, which is a vital corollary of military aviation; for naval shore works, such as bases, shops, water-front developments, piers, dikes, bulkheads, boilers, machine shops, cranes, storehouses, shipyards, and docks; for Army posts, National Guard armories and camps; for military and naval hospitals; for rifle ranges and proving grounds; and other defense purposes.

Senator, the fact is that, during the last 7 years, while President Roosevelt has expended over $1,000,000,000 of emergency funds in projects directly related to national defense, large additional sums were expended for facilities pertaining to defense, such as veterans' hospitals, railroads, drydocks, dams, and ocean terminals. And this is why, with no thanks to Mr. Willkie or his current party, tonight we have a stronger Nation, more capable of quick and efficient mobilization than if your personal theories of defense had prevailed.

But let us proceed, Senator. You said that the President, with these funds, had built not one battleship, nor could you find any other naval construction financed from emergency funds. Yet tonight on the high seas and at American naval bases are a whole fleet of vessels constructed with emergency funds. These naval vessels guard our shores in a world gone mad. They protect your and my democratic right to debate here tonight. They also make it possible for Mr. Willkie to stage his "Me, too, but—" campaign.

Let us name a few of the vessels that were built as part of this P. W. A. fleet. Included are the *Yorktown* and the *Enterprise*, laid down in 1934 and launched in 1936. Each is a 34-knot, long-range ship capable of carrying 100 aircraft. Each has 120,000-horsepower turbines, driving quadruple screws, and each is manned by 1,788 men of the United States Navy, ready to go anywhere at any time. In this P. W. A. fleet there are also 4 cruisers—the *Vincennes*, the *Philadelphia*, the *Savannah*, and the *Nashville*—in full commission; 4 heavy destroyers—the *Porter, Selfridge, MacDougal,* and *Winslow;* 16 fully armed, 1,500-ton destroyers; 4 submarines; 2 gunboats; and 18 cruising cutters and patrol boats.

In fact, Senator, this P. W. A. fleet was the largest single peacetime addition ever made to the United States Navy. From Harding to Hoover, Republican administrations sent American men-of-war scuttling to Davey Jones' locker. Today, thanks to the New Deal, we have the biggest and finest peacetime fleet in our history.

Despite this official record, Senator, you have charged that "Roosevelt slept as Germany armed."

Apparently, Senator, neither Mr. Willkie nor yourself has ever heard that the first emergency funds made available to Franklin D. Roosevelt after he became President were those in the original N. I. R. A. Act, which became law on June 16, 1933. And on that very day—in fact, simultaneously with the signing of this New Deal legislation—the President issued an Executive Order allotting $238,000,000 for the construction of the naval vessels that I have referred to. Here, Senator, for your information, is a photostat of that order.

Senator, I have stuck to the text. Mr. Willkie and yourself, and all of your king's horses at Republican national headquarters, couldn't find that a penny of emergency funds had been spent during the past 7 years for defense. I have shown you that a billion dollars were spent directly on defense while the Wendell Willkies of the United States were fighting against all emergency expenditures.

Senator, you have not merely missed the boat—you have missed the whole fleet.

Why I Am for Roosevelt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 19 (legislative day of Wednesday, September 18), 1940

STATEMENT BY HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY, OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement recently issued by me setting forth why I am for Roosevelt.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY I AM FOR ROOSEVELT

I am for Roosevelt because he saved American democracy from internal destruction and is now leading the crusade to save it from foreign aggression.

In nations abroad, economic chaos ended in dictatorship; America was saved from the same fate by the heroic measures instituted and carried forward by President Roosevelt.

As the European dictatorships progressively moved toward complete extinction of democracy it was President Roosevelt who first warned us that we were in danger.

He saw, clearly, that the conflict abroad was not merely a struggle between the haves and the have nots, but a revolutionary and world-shaking clash of opposing political and social philosophies.

While the rest of us were refusing to believe that fact, because we didn't want to believe it, he was courageously preparing to meet its challenge—laying down new warships, modernizing our armed forces.

On the domestic front, he rescued us from the economic abyss, and I doubt that there is any man anywhere in America today who can truly say, deep in his heart, that he is not better off, more secure, more hopeful for the future, than he was on that dark day of 1933 when Franklin Roosevelt first took the oath of office.

In the face of possible aggression from abroad, there is no citizen—except "fifth columnists" and blind partisans—who is not glad today that Roosevelt years ago began urging, fighting for, and getting, a more adequate defense.

Roosevelt has fought the enemies of democracy within and without. He is still fighting them. Through 7½ of the most desperate years in world history, when the bright flame of democracy was being extinguished in nation after nation, he has steadfastly held to the American ideal of human liberty.

No President since Abraham Lincoln has been so bitterly reviled by his enemies—as a would-be dictator when he was strong and unwavering, as a starry-eyed idealist when he sympathized with and fought for the "ill-fed, ill-clothed, ill-housed." Yet today he is stronger than ever in the affection of the people, for time in its own way has refuted his detractors.

After the 12-year spree of special privilege which left the Nation prostrate, he had the courage to assume and carry forward successfully the heartbreaking task of reconstruction; today he leads the people's fight to prevent the same privileged interests from recapturing control of the Government and resuming their looting of the Nation's wealth and resources.

As for the third-term issue, it exists only in the minds of political propagandists. The founding fathers specifically refused, Washington among them, to prohibit a third term. Jefferson wanted to establish a two-term tradition to prevent monarchy (hardly a threat today), but it died out after his hand-picked successors, Madison and Monroe, left office No two-term President after them expressed any objection in principle to a third term, and two of them (Grant and Theodore Roosevelt) took positive steps to get a third term, Roosevelt being defeated only because of a factional split in the Republican Party.

It would be a sad thing for the country if, in the midst of one of the greatest crises in history, the people were unable to continue in office the one man of proved ability and experience who is available to them, the one man who is their champion in the age-old conflict between the people and the privileged interests for control of the Government. It can't and it won't happen here.

At a time when influential leaders of the Republican Party are urging appeasement of the dictators, when Republican spokesmen are assailing on all sides the steps taken by the Government to defend our shores, it is time for the American people to serve notice that no Chamberlains need apply.

Because I'm for the Jeffersonian concept of human rights above property rights, I'm for Roosevelt.

Because I'm for government by the people rather than government by the utilities and other special interests, I'm for Roosevelt.

Because I'm for national defense, I'm for Roosevelt.

Because I'm opposed to appeasement of the dictators, I'm for Roosevelt.

National Tax Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. DANAHER

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 19 (legislative day of Wednesday, September 18), 1940

ADDRESS BY GOVERNOR BALDWIN, OF CONNECTICUT

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Hon. Raymond E. Baldwin, Governor of Connecticut, at the governors' dinner of the thirty-third annual conference on taxation of the National Tax Association, held at the Pennsylvania Hotel, New York City, on Tuesday, September 10, 1940.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Your invitation to me to come here tonight was accompanied by a copy of your conference program. I must confess that, as I studied this program and its contents, especially its lists of distinguished and erudite speakers, dismay mounted within me. I cannot claim to be a tax expert. I am doubtful of my right, much less my ability, to match my opinions with those of our own, Connecticut's own, Professor Fairchild, of Yale; your own Dr. Gerstenberg, or such other leaders in their respective fields as you have assembled here. You have summoned a mechanic to a conference of scientists.

What I can bring you are only the observations of a Connecticut lawyer, who, for a little time, has occupied the Governor's chair. And I shall have to admit, to begin with, that whatever I may say to you unquestionably is completely biased. That bias is the traditional American aversion to taxes, all taxes, any taxes, taxes of whatever manner, shape, or form. Taxes are an evil; a necessary evil, yes, but the power to tax is the power to destroy. And therefore it is my opinion that you cannot build a national economy, a sound national economy, upon taxes as we are now doing, as we have been doing.

You cannot build a sound thing upon a destructive principle. That has been the trend of our economy, that is our present-day economy. We have been proceeding upon the theory that taxes, tax spending, will provide the answers to all of our problems. The question here, of course, is not that of providing for the necessary services of Government. To that extent, taxes are, as I have said, a necessary evil. But let me say to you quite frankly that the demagogic politician is to blame when he leads the people, the taxpayers, to believe that taxes will bring more or greater results than they, the people themselves, are able to produce.

There is, to be sure, a certain advantage to be gained from collective or united effort. But this, may I remind you, presupposes that such effort is united and collective. Then the sum total of individual enterprise may indeed be bent to a single purpose, with surprisingly effective result. But it must be the sum total. Our tax problem is to prorate the burden of effort required to each man, to each woman, to each individual in our society, according to his or her individual responsibility for the collective welfare.

In this, I think, we have failed. We have failed because we have not set out to do it—I do not refer to you gentlemen here as having failed: I do not mean to infer that the principles in the various fields of taxation which you have worked out are erroneous; but by "we" I mean the body politic; we have failed.

If five men contribute, each in proportion to the measure of his ability, to the building of a boat, then all five may ride with equal right and privilege. But if one man of the five has been required or compelled to do more than his share, or if you introduce a sixth man who has contributed nothing, then you seriously disturb, if you do not completely upset, the entente. Certainly, in any event, no more has been produced than a boat. Your sixth man may be led to believe that he has obtained "something for nothing"—that government, let us say, has provided him with a boat out of thin air; but government has done nothing of the sort; it has simply taxed the energies, the resources, the abilities of the other five. Nothing exists that did not exist before.

Mind you, now, I find no fault in giving this sixth man a ride, assuming he is marooned, let us say, on an island in the depression. He must be rescued, of course; common humanity dictates it. But common sense forbids that we should base our national economy upon a never-ending series of "rescues." We cannot place ourselves in the position of professing to believe that the efforts of five men have produced as much as six. We cannot assume that the sixth man wants to continue indefinitely as a noncontributor. We cannot, we must not, believe that a redistribution of wealth will result in there being any more wealth in the aggregate.

Yet that is just what we have been assuming in our departures from the primary function of taxation. That primary function, as I understand it, is to defray the necessary costs of government. To that extent, there are five men building the boat, and five going to ride in it. But when government branches out into fields not strictly governmental—into competition with private enterprise, let us say, or, yes, even into fields of social services—I do not say that, in common humanity, in common justice, the "sixth man" should not have his ride in the boat, but let us be sure that the ride lasts no longer than is necessary.

Above all, let us be sure ourselves that a sound economy for five, all equally contributing, is not a sound economy for six, unless all six likewise are equal contributors. It is the primary function of government, I think, to enable all men to contribute. Let me say to you that this has been our basic thought, our basic principle, in Connecticut. No doubt we have been very unscientific about it in many respects, but we have felt that it is government's duty to save taxes as much as possible, rather than to spend as much taxes as possible.

I note that one of your talks here—that of your president, Dr. Gerstenberg—has been upon the subject of tax illiteracy. Let me tell you it is too easy to take advantage of the people's tax illiteracy. Politicians in government have traded upon that illiteracy for years. The unscrupulous politician would have us all believe that we are all sixth men in the boat; and we are asked to be duly grateful for the free rides conjured out of the thin air of government largess. It were time, I think, that we turned in the other direc-

tion. I can only report to you what we have found to be true in Connecticut, but it is rather indicative, and I hope may be helpful.

The problem, admittedly, has been complicated enormously by the present need for national defense. But the basic principles involved remain the same. Indeed, we are seeing now the vital need of a sound tax economy and a sound national economy. Such an economy can exist only upon the basis of production. Unless now we produce more, either the defense program will have to be curtailed or the standard of living lowered. We do not want either of those things to happen. The only answer is increased production. Our program must be a complete reversal of government's economic policies of the past several years—a program of plenty instead of the present program of scarcity. Our problem is the broad one of seeking the highest possible productivity of men and machines. National-defense needs must be filled in addition to, not by sacrificing, our present standards of living, and only through productive effort in all fields—not alone in the field of national defense—can we sufficiently broaden the base of national income to distribute the cost burden of national defense equitably.

In Connecticut we have a balanced budget; we have no State income tax, no sales tax, and no new taxes. When the present State administration took office in January 1939 it faced an indicated deficit in the State's treasury of $1,500,000. Today we have a million-dollar surplus. Yet I want to make this point very close to you: In order to do these things—balance our budget, avoid imposing any new taxes, achieve this million-dollar surplus—it has not been necessary to curtail any necessary State service. Indeed, some of our State services have been materially expanded. And in the field of relief, our relief payments today, per capita, are higher than they were ever before.

Let me say to you that what we have done is this: We have abandoned the apparently prevailing theory of "spend all the taxpayers' money you can." We have abandoned the theory that government—State or National—can snatch out of thin air, by mere tax spending, any lasting, or even real, benefit. Government, above all, must look not at the individual but at the whole body politic of individuals. A man is no richer for taking money out of one pocket and putting it into another. A man must produce; and it is government's highest function to help him to produce by making smooth the economic processes which assist, and which are vital to, production.

That is our meaning, in Connecticut, when we refer to "friendly government"—government friendly to business, to private industry, to labor, to agriculture—friendly in the sense that it is helpful, cooperative, eager to make the way smooth. Taxes don't make the way smooth, therefore we have no new taxes; we are trying to save, not spend, the people's money. Debt doesn't make the way smooth, therefore we have a balanced budget, and we are keeping it balanced; we are living within our means. An antagonistic attitude and "crack-downs" on business and private industry don't make the way smooth, therefore we have friendly government.

I wish that I could go into greater detail as to some of the ramifications of all this, explain them more fully, describe in detail to you the reaction, the immediate, heartening reaction, of our Connecticut people to this sort of program, but time will not permit. I want to mention just one thing, however, that I know will interest you as tax experts:

Though we have no new taxes in Connecticut, we have more taxes. That is the "why" of our surplus in the treasury; we have no new taxes but more tax money is coming in. Taxes represent the State's levy upon the production of its communities.

There are two ways of obtaining increased tax revenues: One, you can invent new taxes and raise already existing tax rates; the other, you can leave the rate structure alone, but increase production. It is this latter alternative that, to my mind, is infinitely preferable, for in it lie not only what additional revenues may be necessary to good government, but also the bases for a sound recovery and a sound national economy.

Terms of the Presidency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD R. BURKE

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 19 (legislative day of Wednesday, September 18), 1940

STATEMENT BY JOHN W. DAVIS

Mr. BURKE. Mr. President, I shall ask unanimous consent to make an insertion in the Appendix of the RECORD, and in explanation I wish to say a few words.

This morning before a subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee considering the advisability of a constitutional amendment limiting the tenure of office of President there appeared a distinguished witness, Hon. John W. Davis, who made a statement which I shall offer for the RECORD.

To the 16 Democratic Senators, as well as to the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS], who in 1928 voted their firm conviction that any variation from the two-term limitation on the Presidency was fraught with peril to this free Republic, I wish to add a word of caution. When they read the RECORD tomorrow—provided unanimous consent shall be given to print the statement of Hon. John W. Davis—I caution them to skip the pages containing this statement, because I am very sure that if any of the 18 distinguished Senators should read the statement he would have revivified in his heart the desire to stand up for his convictions as expressed in 1928. I know some of them do not desire to do so.

I ask unanimous consent that the statement of Mr. Davis be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I welcome the opportunity which the committee has given me to appear in support of one or either of the constitutional amendments which you have before you with reference to the Presidential term. I say one or either because, as I shall point out later on, I would find either form acceptable, although I personally prefer Senate Joint Resolution 15 providing for the single term of 6 years. The underlying principle is the same in both, namely, that a period shall be set beyond which reelection is impossible.

No doubt before these hearings are concluded, the committee will have repeated to it what the founders and statesmen of the country have been saying on the subject for the last century and a half. I should suppose that there is no other single topic on which responsible opinion in America has been so nearly unanimous up to this time, as on the absolute necessity for rotation in the office of the Chief Magistrate. The traditional limitation of two terms of no more than 4 years each comes to us with the overwhelming endorsement of the patriots who have held the Presidential office and many lesser men who have considered the subject. Jefferson, Madison, Monroe, Jackson, Cleveland, Buchanan, William Henry Harrison, Andrew Johnson, Rutherford B. Hayes, William McKinley, Theodore Roosevelt, Taft, and perhaps other Presidents have spoken in its favor in no uncertain terms. It is clear from this roster that it has not been treated as a party question. The words, as well as the examples, of these men and those of many, many others have been or no doubt will be cited to you.

We have the right to believe that a tradition so long established and so universally accepted as this, has sound reason behind it. History and experience leave us in no doubt what that reason is. The one thing upon which those who founded this Government and those who have carried it on have all agreed, is that we should never risk the permanent control of our Government by any single man. One hundred and fifty years ago, men had never heard such terms as "Fuehrer" and "Duce," but they knew the hateful thing those words have come to signify. They called it monarchy and they would have none of it. So when the powerful office of the Presidency was created, they fixed for it only a 4-year term. True, they did not forbid a reelection, although I think they would have done so if the great figure of Washington had not dominated the scene. But his example, followed by that of Jefferson and endorsed by their successors, wrote the two-term tradition deep into the conscience of the country—so deep, in fact, as to make it a part of the unwritten, if not the written law.

Time and again when a constitutional amendment such as the one which you are now considering has been proposed, its adoption has been discouraged by the argument that the two-term tradition was too well settled ever to be disturbed, and that such a tradition is stronger than any form of words. This is not pure fancy, for tradition is a powerful force.

Many compulsions in our Government as well as in our daily lives are due more to tradition than to law. The action of an elector in the electoral college is an instance. Every member of the electoral college is perfectly free in law to cast his vote for any person he chooses, for the offices of President and Vice President. No provision of the Constitution, no statute, no personal oath binds him to the contrary. And yet, every elector holds himself bound to vote for the candidates designated by the party on whose ticket he has himself appeared. This is not merely as a matter of choice but because of tradition and the fear of the public reproach that a departure from that tradition would bring. And when one reflects upon the canons of conduct that control men in their personal affairs, it is amazing to find how many of them are rooted in tradition and tradition alone.

But those who have relied upon tradition to govern the length of the Presidential term, have left one dominating factor out of view; that is, the factor of human nature. It is the nature of the human animal, most human animals, to love place and prominence, adulation, and power. Some, of course, care for all this more than others.

Some love it so much that the power they have is never gladly or voluntarily surrendered. The appetite growing by what it feeds on becomes the master passion of their lives. Such men, even while they realize that some day their power must be laid down, can always find a reason why the fatal day must be postponed. In their minds there is always a crisis in which their services are indispensable; always some great work in hand which they, and they alone, can do. Outwardly they may pretend that they groan under the burden and would be glad to lay it down, but in their secret souls they cling to their places like limpets to a rock. Is not history full of just such instances? Need I resort to illustrations?

Moreover, there are never lacking around the throne those who inflame this deep-seated ambition to hold on. The friends and sycophants of the incumbent, whose political lives are linked with his, constantly assure their chief that the public good demands that he should not desert the ship. It is this sort of sweet music that is the curse of kings. While those who oppose him only arouse a dogged determination in his egotistic heart to choose his time and not theirs for disappearing from the scene. Is tradition powerful enough to hold spirits like these? Time, past and present, answers "No." And since it is not, let us fix a limitation by the law. "In questions of power," wrote Jefferson, "let no more be said of confidence in man, but bind him down from mischief by the chains of the Constitution."

The tremendous power of the Presidential office must never be forgotten. With the exception of the dictators in totalitarian states, no chief of state in the world today has such power as the President of the United States. How greatly this power has been enlarged in recent years, I need hardly remind you. With billions of money to disburse at his will, with places by the hundreds of thousands for him to fill, with scores of discretionary statutes ready to spring into life at his word, with the Army and Navy under his control as Commander in Chief, and the conduct of foreign relations in his hands, where is there another ruler to rival him? Now, I lay it down as irrefutable that any President possessed of these powers, or even one-tenth of them, unless his administration has met with some crushing disaster, can cause himself to be renominated, not once or twice, but as long as he chooses, if the basic law does not forbid. With the two-term tradition broken down, and no law to take its place, we have every reason to dread a future occupancy of the White House limited only by the ambition or the life of the tenant.

I do not profess to a profound knowledge of history, but I do not recall a single case where a republic has survived, except in name, the coming of a permanent chief executive. The name itself counts for little. ."It is with governments," said Chief Justice Fuller, "as with religions; the form often outlives the substance of the faith."

There is an interesting example very near home which many people seem to have forgotten. Porfirio Diaz, a man of great force and ambition, was elected President of Mexico in 1876, under a constitution he had helped to frame, providing for a 4-year term and forbidding reelection. That was the slogan under which he came to power. When the 4 years were up he patriotically declared himself in favor of a strict observance of the constitution, and turned over the office, in 1880, to General Gonzalez, whom he had in fact selected to succeed him. In 1884 Diaz was reelected as he had planned. Thereafter, at each quadrennial election up to 1910 he was voted in without opposition. Opposition there was none, for all of his opponents had been most effectively purged. For 26 years, with the help of his army and lavish grants to his friends, he was the unchallenged dictator of Mexico, until in 1911 the revolution headed by Madero drove him out. To give his successive reelections the color of legality he forced through the Congress in 1887 an amendment permitting it. But of this one historian says: "Only those without principles, only those abject with adulation, could accept this procedure." And the writer adds, "What a price men and nations must pay that politicians be called great."

Men may differ in their estimate of Diaz and of what he did or failed to do in Mexico, but it would be absurd to claim that under him Mexico was a republic in anything but name, or that the Congress, permitted to hold their seats only so long as they agreed with him, were the representatives of a democracy. Mexicans are Mexicans, and Americans are Americans, you will say; but there is nothing in this particular episode that deserves imitation north of the Rio Grande.

I am for this amendment because I do not want to see our form of government Mexicanized.

Personal government is always and everywhere the death of freedom. Power too long continued is always abused for it works queer changes in the minds and morals of those who wield it. The only prophylactic is a wholesome and cleansing rotation in office. If this cannot be compelled by custom, it must be forced by law. For only so can liberty survive. There was never a finer phrase than that of Francis Lieber, who declared that men are "too feeble to wield unlimited power, too noble to submit to it."

The proposed amendment, Senate Joint Resolution 15, offers a 6-year term without possibility of reelection. Is this long enough? Too long for a poor President, perhaps; long enough, to my way of thinking, for even the best. I can imagine that lurid pictures will be painted of some present or future crisis when it will be hurtful to make a change. Not only do I think such pictures are highly imaginary, but the argument they are intended to support proves far too much. For, if it may be unfortunate to change at the end of 6 years, it may be equally so at the end of 8, or 12, or 20. To fall in with this line of reasoning is to abandon altogether the principle of rotation in office, and calmly contemplate the possibility of a permanent President. There is no stopping place.

I refuse, for my part, to believe that in this land of general enlightenment, any man in any post is ever indispensable. I would tremble for my country if such a thing ever came to pass. And I shall tremble quite as much if such an idea can find lodgment in the minds of the American people. It strikes at the root of all our national ideals, all our public professions, all of our boasted capacity for self-government. We have become sterile indeed if we cannot produce at any and all times the men we need to fill our public offices; so sterile indeed that we would then no longer deserve the liberty we would no longer have the will to protect.

Something can be said for a policy of granting two successive terms of 4 years each and no more, on the theory that the people should have the right to displace an unsatisfactory chief magistrate at the end of 4 years and that a President would be encouraged to effort by the prospect of earning an endorsement midway of his service. This, as you know, was the view held by President Wilson in a communication he made in 1913 to the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives of which I happened to be then a member. In spite of my great respect for him and for his memory, I must be permitted to doubt the soundness of this reasoning.

The argument for an interim review of a President's service would have more force if ours were a parliamentary form of government carried on by a Prime Minister and his Cabinet, responsible at all times to a majority of the legislature. They are under a constant possibility of dismissal. But that is not our system. We think we do better if we employ our servants in the executive branch for fixed and certain terms. We want them to realize that what they do they must do within the allotted span of their official lives. We rely upon their zeal for the public good and their regard for their future standing before their fellow citizens and before posterity to spur them on in the discharge of their duties, rather than upon a prospect of continuous reelection. For experience proves, does it not, that when reelection is in view every act and decision—human nature being what it is—is colored by that contingency.

There is an argument in favor of the two 4-year terms as proposed by Senate Joint Resolution 289, which seems to me to have more merit, namely that of national habit. We have worked on that plan for 150 years and have grown accustomed to it. To continue it may be easier than to change, on the sound principle that it is always "wise to preserve what it is not necessary to destroy."

Yet if we are to go through the process of amendment, as I clearly think we must, I would prefer to do the best rather than the expedient thing. A single term would remove from any President the temptation to play for his own reelection. Six years is long enough in which to do all the good one man is likely to accomplish, if he thinks first of his country and not of himself. If his conscience and his zeal do not stir him to his utmost effort in that length of time, the hope that he will do better on a second trial is a vain illusion.

But the vital thing is that we set now a definite, fixed, certain termination to the length of any man's occupancy of the Presidency. If the day ever comes when we have, or imagine that we have, but one man fit for the position, we may as well give up our pretense of being a representative republic and install a permanent or even a hereditary head under any name we choose to give him. In the light of this fatal dawn the recording angel will write across the ruins of our vanished freedom that we had been weighed in the balance and found wanting.

I care not how others may feel, but for myself the man has not yet been born of woman—and I use that phrase because it includes both the living and the dead—the man has not yet been born of woman to whom I would entrust for more than 8 years at the most the vast, the expanding, the fateful powers of the Presidency of the United States.

Tribute to the Late Lillian D. Wald

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. WAGNER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 19 (legislative day of Wednesday, September 18), 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE EAST SIDE NEWS OF NEW YORK

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix an editorial from the East Side News of New York concerning the late Lillian D. Wald, founder of Henry Street Settlement. Miss Wald lived a life richer in satisfaction and achievement than any other woman

of our time. What she has done for underprivileged men, women, and children—for better health, decent housing, and social welfare—has won the grateful thanks of millions in every walk of life. The mark she has left on our social institutions will never be erased.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the East Side News of September 7, 1940]

LILLIAN D. WALD—THE SOUL OF AMERICAN SOCIAL SERVICE STATESMANSHIP WHOSE NAME WILL BE CROWNED WITH AUGUST HALO OF IMMORTALITY

(By Harry H. Schlacht)

A great oak has fallen in the forest of our public life. The East Side bows its head in reverent sorrow at the death of Lillian D. Wald, the champion of the poor and needy, the naked and distressed, the prodigal and the brokenhearted. We loved and honored her because she was a woman of the broadest sympathies, whose heart was ever responsive to our own, because of her elegant scholarship which revealed itself in her public and private utterances, and because of her fiery zeal for truth, justice, and humanity which burned steadfastly at the heart of this lofty personality. Public fame has made it needless for me to add one laurel to her crown of achievements.

When the house on Henry Street opened its doors the East Side was the shore front to Ellis Island. Throughout the years Miss Wald had been in a special sense the friend of all comers. She faced a sequence of events for which her poise and steadiness were exactly fitted. The tumult of the times, with the complexity of its problems, enlarged her capacity for human service. She combined in one symphonic splendor the amazing units of discordant elements about her. The roots of her kindness struck daily deeper into the soil of our affection.

Just as she broadened the vision of statesmen, physicians, nurses, and teachers, she has stretched the imagination of her fellow Americans of older stock as the interpreter of the stranger within the gates; interpreter also of one race to another; of one generation to another; of one class to another. The common brotherhood of man was not a phrase to her; she knew people. She knew, moreover, the psychology of human conflict, from the class of the boys' gangs to age-long feuds between racial and religious groups. Her opposition to evils of the sweatshops, child labor, slum housing, war, and militarism had deep roots in her experience as a neighbor to all races on the East Side.

Lillian Wald was the soul of social-service statesmanship. She has made the world her debtor. She has procured for herself a niche in the temple of fame together with Jane Addams, her intimate friend; Florence Nightingale, Susan B. Anthony, and Louisa Lee Schuyler. She has truly bequeathed to posterity a mighty heritage. Her name will not only be engraved upon tablets of bronze and gold, but ever upon the fleshy tablets of our hearts, and her teachings will blossom in our lives with a supernatural beauty. The human race lost one of its noblest examples; and all the friends of humanity, in whose cause she lived and died, joined hands at her grave.

Heaven is richer—the earth is poorer.

Choice of a Candidate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN G. TOWNSEND, JR.

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 19 (legislative day of Wednesday, September 18), 1940

EDITORIAL FROM NEW YORK TIMES

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the leading editorial published in the New York Times of today, in which it announces its support of the candidacy of Mr. Willkie for the office of President of the United States.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of September 17, 1940]

THE CHOICE OF A CANDIDATE

The New York Times supported Franklin D. Roosevelt for the Presidency in 1932 and again in 1936. In 1940 it will support Wendell Willkie.

It has made its choice, as all Americans must make their choice, in one of the great crises of this Nation's history. The liberties of the American people are in danger. A hostile power, openly proclaiming its hatred of the democratic way of life, has swept across Europe and is now battering at the gates of England, seeking to grasp the eastern approaches to that Atlantic world in which our own democracy has lived and prospered.

Both Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Willkie understand the critical nature of this threat to the United States. Both are citizens of the world. Both know that it is impossible to isolate ourselves from the consequences of a world revolution. Both know that we must take sides morally or count for nothing. Both are opposed to actual intervention in the war, but short of war both favor every possible aid that can be given to the one democracy in Europe that still stands in Hitler's path.

This agreement between the two Presidential candidates on the fundamentals of a foreign policy is a deeply fortunate fact for the American people. Without it we might now be involved in a bitter controversy which would wreck our unity. As matters stand, the choice before us has been narrowed to this question: In whose hands, Mr. Roosevelt's or Mr. Willkie's, is the safety of the American people likely to be more secure during the critical test that lies ahead?

We give our own support to Mr. Willkie primarily for these reasons: Because we believe that he is better equipped than Mr. Roosevelt to provide this country with an adequate national defense; because we believe he is a practical liberal who understands the need of increased production; because we believe that the fiscal policies of Mr. Roosevelt have failed disastrously; because we believe that at a time when the traditional safeguards of democracy are falling everywhere it is particularly important to honor and preserve the American tradition against vesting the enormous powers of the Presidency in the hands of any man for three consecutive terms of office.

Our readers are entitled to a statement of the reasons which, upon mature consideration, have led us to these opinions.

I. DEFENSE OF THE UNITED STATES

In the field of national defense we recognize that Mr. Roosevelt has taken a number of necessary steps, all of which have had our wholehearted endorsement, both before he was ready to take them and later when he had acted. He has recreated the Defense Advisory Commission and called some able men to Washington. He has recommended that Congress appropriate large funds for defense equipment. He has succeeded in negotiating leases for new naval and air bases which are of great potential importance to the defense of the whole North American Continent. He strongly urged Congress to adopt a system of compulsory selective military service.

But there are a number of other equally important steps which Mr. Roosevelt has not taken. He has withheld power from the Advisory Commission and made it a mere consultative agency, unable on its own authority to cut the endless red tape in Washington. He has kept power for himself, tried to be his own defense administrator and retained in his own hands control over too many details of a defense program which still lacks central planning. He has seemed to regard the whole business of defense as a side show to the ordinary activities of the country, requiring no fundamental change in the habits of the American people and no revision of any of the policies of his administration. We find Mr. Willkie's early call for sacrifice, for hard work, "sweat and toil," more reassuring than Mr. Roosevelt's cheerful confidence that we need not let ourselves become "discombobulated" by the task that lies before us.

But all these points, important as they are, only touch the surface of the matter. At bottom, adequate national defense means much more than airplanes, tanks, and cannon, even when all of these are actually on hand and not just "on order." It means a nation strong in its economic health and power, with a thriving industry, full employment, both of manpower and of money, new capital flowing vigorously into new channels of production. It means, in short, a nation with gigantic industrial force behind its army and its navy.

The record shows that Mr. Roosevelt has achieved least success in the solution of this very problem. He has failed to create the conditions for a confident and expanding business. It is a reasonable assumption that this same problem can be managed better by a man who understands business, who has the confidence of business, who has himself been a part of business, whose interest in business problems has been first hand and continuous rather than casual and intermittent, and whose experience includes a successful personal record in stimulating business and expanding industrial production.

In this field Mr. Willkie is the professional and Mr. Roosevelt is the amateur.

II. LIBERALISM AND REFORM

In the field of domestic policy this newspaper has recognized the need of the sound social and economic reforms of the two Roosevelt administrations. It has given its support to these reforms. Specifically, it has endorsed the purpose and the principle of the Social Security Act, the National Housing Act of 1934, the Slum Clearance Act of 1936, the Wagner Housing Act of 1937, the Soil Conservation Act, the Securities Act of 1933, the regulation of the stock exchanges, the supervision of investment trusts. The reforms at which every one of these measures aimed were long overdue.

Mr. Willkie has affirmed his own belief in the necessity of reform and his own support of the major reforms of the Roosevelt administrations. Because of this he has been attacked by the President's friends as a mere plagiarist who is now attempting to steal the New Deal's thunder, and an impostor who is trying to run "on the President's own program." This is a curious attitude for the President's

friends to take. It is a curious attitude, because it suggests a belief that the New Deal has a monopoly on reform and wants nobody else to share in it. But the truth is that no faction and no party has a monopoly on reform in the United States; many men have shared in it and will continue to share in it. "Plagiarism" is beside the point. For 7 years Mr. Roosevelt himself has been making daily use of important reforms introduced by Republican administrations—among them the Sherman antitrust law, the Pure Food and Drug Act, the Children's Bureau, the Executive Budget, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

For ourselves, we welcome the fact that Mr. Willkie stands pledged to conserve rather than to destroy what is best in Mr. Roosevelt's reforms. We believe that these reforms would be safe in Mr. Willkie's hands, not only because Mr. Willkie is a man of good will but because his approach to the problems now before us shows him to be a liberal. He is enough of a student and enough of a realist to know that we are living in a changing time and that it is both necessary and desirable that the Government should take an increasingly active part in policing the financial markets, in safeguarding labor's right to bargain collectively, and in achieving social justice for underprivileged people.

More than this, we believe that Mr. Willkie could be relied upon not to make some of the mistakes and not to take some of the risks which Mr. Roosevelt has made and taken. For we believe that while Mr. Roosevelt has helped enormously to awaken the social conscience of this country, and that while he deserves lasting credit for this leadership, Mr. Roosevelt has also put his own reforms in peril. He has put them in peril by ignoring or by failing to understand the fundamental problem of increased production; by encouraging great numbers of Americans to believe that it is possible to grow richer by working less and producing less; by fostering the idea that there exists somewhere a great fund of wealth which has only to be divided more equitably in order to make everybody prosperous; by permitting important members of his administration to preach the doctrines of class jealousy and class hatred.

Mr. Willkie stated the case accurately when he said that "American liberalism does not consist merely in reforming things; it consists also in making things." It consists in expanding the production of the necessities and the good things of life. Wealth is only another word for production; and in the long run there is no other way to achieve a higher standard of living for the whole people of a nation than to produce goods in abundance.

We believe that Mr. Willkie understands this crucial point better than Mr. Roosevelt, and that he would be more likely to succeed in putting this principle into practice.

III. THE ROAD TO BANKRUPTCY

In the field of fiscal policy our dissent from the course pursued by Mr. Roosevelt dates from his first year in office. We expressed this dissent in 1936, even while supporting him for reelection, and ventured then to express the hope that he would pursue a more responsible fiscal policy during his second term in office. Unfortunately, his course during his second term has become still more reckless.

We cite evidence at three points to support this statement.

(1) The fantastic silver policy of the Roosevelt administration, scarcely begun in 1936, has now grown to almost incredible proportions. More than 2,000,000,000 ounces of a metal for which our Government has no earthly use—approximately a hundred times as much silver as all the silver mines in the United States produced in the year before this policy began—have been bought by the Treasury at overvalued prices in an artificial market. This policy makes no sense, except as a political maneuver to win the support of the so-called silver bloc. Otherwise its only visible results have been to drive off the silver standard the one important country which had previously been on it and to take from other nations useless silver in exchange for our own good wheat and oil and motorcars and other exports. There is only one way to describe such a policy as this. It leads over the hills to the poorhouse.

(2) The National Budget, which was originally to be balanced so courageously, has been continuously out of balance since Mr. Roosevelt entered office. The national debt has more than doubled in 7 years. It is true that the new defense program has now made a balanced budget hopeless at the moment. But even before this program was proposed the administration was operating under a gigantic deficit and spending far more money annually than had ever been raised by taxation in any year in the whole history of the United States. Moreover, the problem of the Budget is not less serious, but far more serious, because of the new difficulties presented by the defense program. For the sake of conserving the national credit in a time of danger, expenditures other than those for defense ought now to be cut to a point at which they balance tax yields. But the administration, with whom borrowing has become a habit, has not proposed a single important economy as an offset against its huge defense spending.

(3) The fundamental trouble is that the administration has thrown overboard the central fiscal theory in which it professed to believe even as late as 1936. It has abandoned the idea that the best contribution it could make to reemployment and recovery is to put its own fiscal house in order. It now believes, and the President frankly says this in his Budget messages, that when business is lagging the Government ought to go in debt deliberately in order to "create purchasing power" and "energize private enterprise." This is the perfect politician's paradise—a paradise in which public money is spent on a gigantic scale without any responsibility of raising an equivalent amount of money by taxation.

We believe that the results of a continuation of this policy will be precisely what Mr. Roosevelt himself said they would be in 1932—"If, like a spendthrift, a nation throws discretion to the winds and is willing to make no sacrifice at all in spending * * * it is on the road to bankruptcy." We believe that there is no real possibility whatever of checking the present trend toward bankruptcy so long as Mr. Roosevelt remains in office. It will be a desperately hard task at best. The only present hope lies in a change of administrations.

IV. THE THIRD-TERM ISSUE

We come, finally, in the choice before us, to an issue which has been defined by more than a hundred years of American history, by the deliberate decision of some of our greatest Presidents, and by the reluctance of many Americans today to surrender what they believe to be a safeguard of the democratic system—the issue of the third term.

From Mr. Roosevelt's own statement in his radio acceptance speech to the Democratic national convention the country knows that even as late as a year ago he had no intention of challenging the tradition against a third term: "Last September it was still my intention to announce clearly and simply at an early date that under no conditions would I accept reelection." This announcement was never made; when the President finally declared his intentions regarding the third term he did not say that "under no conditions would he accept reelection," but merely that he "had no wish to be a candidate again"—a very different statement. The practical effect of the postponement was to lessen greatly the chance of any other Democrat to receive his party's nomination. The practical effect of the change in the character of the President's announcement was to encourage the "draft," which some of the highest officials of his own administration had long favored and long worked to bring about. From these facts it seems to us that only one conclusion can be drawn. As the situation created by the war developed, the President came to regard his own personal leadership as indispensable and to believe that there was no other member of his party, however trusted, however close to him, however deeply in accord with his own convictions about the war or about domestic issues, who could safely take his place.

The doctrine of one man's indispensability is a new doctrine for this country. It is a doctrine which less scrupulous men in Europe have used to root themselves in power. It is a doctrine which we in the United States have good reason to question, particularly when we consider how the powers of the Presidency have grown, what immense patronage, what gigantic expenditures, what enormous power to perpetuate himself in office is now within the grasp of any President of the United States.

These considerations are especially relevant when the particular President who now chooses to remain in office for a third term is the same President who has never surrendered voluntarily a single one of the vast "emergency" powers which Congress has given him. He is the same President who has shown himself so impatient of constitutional restraints that he was willing to circumvent the Supreme Court itself by adding enough members to it to give his own opinions a majority.

In the defeat of Mr. Roosevelt and the election of Mr. Willkie there is an opportunity to safeguard a tradition with the wisdom of long experience behind it.

These are our primary reasons for supporting Mr. Willkie and for strongly urging his election.

In supporting him we do not intend to lose that independence upon which we have always put chief emphasis or to compromise our own convictions. We shall continue to support such of Mr. Roosevelt's views and acts as we find deserving of support. We shall criticize and oppose any of Mr. Willkie's views if they seem to us to lack merit. Above all, we shall do our best to keep our own part in this campaign free of personal controversy and focused on the great issues now before the country. In a time of danger the clearest duty of every good American is to help conserve that national unity which is our richest heritage.

Lillian D. Wald

REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 19, 1940

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, the untimely death of Lillian D. Wald has left a void in the life of the city of New York and the country at large, which will not be easily filled. Miss Wald's name will forever be connected with the elevation of the lives of the poor to a realization that all of us, irrespective of our wealth and social position can be made important and useful members of society.

Lillian D. Wald was born in Cincinnati, Ohio, on March 10, 1867. Her grandfather, who came from Germany about 1848, started the family on this side of the ocean.

Miss Wald lived for many years in Rochester, N. Y., where she was educated at Miss Crittenden's School, "an English and French boarding and day school for young ladies and little girls." After an interval spent in the Middle West, she came to New York City to study in the Training School for Nurses of the New York Hospital and in the Women's Medical College.

In 1893 Miss Wald founded the Henry Street Settlement on the lower East Side, known in its early days as the Nurses' Settlement. The Henry Street Visiting Nurse Service now covers Manhattan, the Bronx, and Queens. The Henry Street technique, inaugurated and perfected by Miss Wald, has spread throughout the world.

The settlement conducts clubs for boys and girls as well as for the mothers and fathers of the neighborhood; classes in arts and crafts, pottery, dancing, English, citizenship, homemaking, first aid; clinics for the mothers and babies, the boys and girls; a music school in which courses are given in all phases of musical study; a theater and dramatic workshop; social events for the young people; and in the summertime, camps for the boys and girls, a daily play school, and day outings for the mothers and children of the neighborhood.

Visitors from the Near East and Far East—from all parts of the world—have come to Henry Street Settlement to call upon Miss Wald and to observe the work done there. The Prime Minister of England, J. Ramsay MacDonald; Governor Smith; President Theodore Roosevelt; Prince Kropotkin; Mme. Breshkovsky; and Signora Gina Lombroso Ferrero are only a few of the many well-known names signed in Miss Wald's guest book at Henry Street.

In an article entitled "Lillian D. Wald—Settler and Trailblazer," Paul U. Kellogg, editor of the Survey, said:

> Just as the pioneer woman of the West had the homestead as her stage, Miss Wald has had its counterpart—the settlement household. She brought to the movement in the nineties its most redoubtable reinforcement, linking with all the ancient concerns of womankind the skill of a new profession. From the outset she was an insurgent and innovator in that oldest of woman's functions, the care of the sick. Nursing training and service as carried on in the hospitals of the day were divorced from the lives of the families from which their patients came. Miss Wald went out into the homes. District nursing of the day was largely identified with religious bodies or charity clinics. She put it on the new basis, and by hourly service paid for by the family whenever possible, brought private nursing within the reach of those with small means or no means at all. From an agent whose presence proclaimed the family's poverty or its failure to give adequate care to its sick member, the nurse's presence proclaimed the family's anxiety to do everything possible for the sufferer. She gave nursing a new status. While the Henry Street nurses did not give treatment except under the supervision of a doctor, they responded to calls from the people themselves and from social agencies no less than to calls from physicians, and they were no longer bound to a single practitioner—changes which were supported by leaders in the profession but at the time brought down the wrath of quacks and sticklers. Doctors and nurses highly trained in hospital routine clung to institutional treatment, but the new practice proved that most children's diseases, for example, lend themselves to home treatment with a lowering of the death rate. The new nurses not only cared for the sick but instructed the mothers how to keep the families well—became, in truth, social workers. The tremendous field for such service is indicated by the fact that 90 percent of sickness is cared for in homes. * * *
>
> When the house on Henry Street opened its doors the East Side was the shorefront to Ellis Island. Throughout the years Miss Wald has been in a special sense the friend of all comers. Just as she broadened the vision of physicians and school teachers, so she has stretched the imagination of her fellow Americans of the older stocks as interpreter of the stranger within the gates; interpreter also of one race to another, of one generation to another, of one economic class to another. Avoiding partisan politics and the despair of the doctrinaire, she has won the hearts and understood the aspirations of Governors, and mayors, and police captains, and ward leaders, rabbis, and priests, and minister, revolutionists and push-cart peddlers, father and son, mothers and daughters.
>
> The common brotherhood of man is not a phrase to her; she knows people. She knows, moreover, the psychology of human conflict, from the clash of boys' gangs to age-long feuds between racial and religious groups. Her opposition to war and militarism had roots deep in her experience as a neighbor to all races on the East Side. Out of a conference at Henry Street during the first year of the World War grew the American Union Against Militarism, of which she was chairman, and which in the succeeding months, when some of the old-time peace societies fell by the wayside and the peace foundations went on the shelf, pressed the Government to make constructive use of its position as the one great neutral in a world at war. Later, after America's entry, a new organization of liberals, including those who had favored, and those who had opposed our entrance into the war, crystallized on a program of democratic war aims and peace settlement—the beginnings of the present Foreign Policy Association, of which Miss Wald is a member of the board.

Miss Wald was the first president of the National Organization for Public Health Nursing, and the plan of town and country nursing of the American Red Cross was her suggestion. In 1909, the New York State Immigration Commission, of which she was a member, created the State bureau dealing with the protection and distribution of immigrants. The Social Halls Association, organized to provide proper places for recreation and labor meetings, was started at Henry Street Settlement and Miss Wald was its first president. Miss Wald has been associated with numerous projects to provide recreation for children and adults, and she served on the original executive committee of the Outdoor Recreation League.

Her experiment with Henry Street nurses in the schools led to the appointment of public-health school nurses in 1902 in New York City. They were the first public-health school nurses in the world, and they are now found everywhere. Her interest in the children of the Nation was largely responsible for the creation of the Federal Children's Bureau.

Miss Wald has served on the executive committees of the Society of Friends of Russian Freedom and the New York Association for the Blind. In 1919 she attended the International Conference at Cannes, France, as a delegate sent by the Department of Labor, and in the same year she was appointed one of the three women representatives at the industrial convention called by President Wilson in Washington. In 1924 she accepted an invitation extended by the Commissar of Health of Soviet Russia to visit the country and advise on their children's problems. Miss Wald was a member of President Theodore Roosevelt's Conference on Child Health and Protection, and of a similar conference called by President Hoover in 1930.

Miss Wald is the author of The House on Henry Street and of numerous magazine, newspaper, and encyclopedia articles. She received the honorary degree of doctor of laws from Mount Holyoke College in 1912 and from Smith College in 1930. She received a medal from the National Institute of Social Sciences (1912), from the Rotary Club (1923), and one of the first three Better Times medals awarded in 1926, for distinguished social service. In January 1932, Miss Wald was the honored guest at a banquet of the society of the Genesee, the first woman ever so honored by the society.

Miss Wald was on the executive boards of the Foreign Policy Association, the Welfare Council of New York, Survey Associates, the Neighborhood Playhouse, the Vocational Service for Juniors, the American Association for Labor Legislation, the American-Russian Institute, the City Affairs Committee, the Citizens' Committee of One Thousand, the National Federation of Settlements, the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, the United States Committee on Cooperation in Pan-American Child Welfare Work; and on the advisory council of the City Housing Corporation, the Milbank Memorial Fund, the Lower East Side Community Council, and the Harmon Foundation for the Advancement of Nursing. Miss Wald had been an active member of the coordinating committee of the Welfare Council of New York City. She was also a member of the technical advisory committee of the League of Nations Association.

Life for her was an exciting pageant; each day brought its demands to meet new situations. Her first obligation was always to her nurses in blue carrying the bag which to many of us was the symbol of bringing scientific care combined with love and tenderness to the humblest in the city.

No. 265 Henry Street is an old red brick house with white facings, built after the War of 1812, when the neighborhood was fashionable. Its yard, fitted up with swings before the dawn of recreation centers, was the pioneer among playgrounds. Miss Wald had made her home there for 34 years, and the house is furnished with simple old mahogany and

shining brasses from Grand Street. Two similar dwellings across the street were also restored by the settlement. One is occupied by Miss Elizabeth Farrell, an old companion in arms who introduced special classes for backward children in the public schools.

The other activities of Henry Street grew naturally out of the nurse's visits. Seeing children kept out of school by small ailments—or staying in school with big ones and giving them to other children—Miss Wald proposed having school nurses, and the city adopted the idea in 1902. She also suggested to President Roosevelt the establishment of a Federal children's bureau, and she became a die-hard opponent of child labor, because these things were forced on her mind by daily observations.

Later she helped to organize the Women's Trade Union League and the Joint Board of Sanitary Control. During the shirtwaiste strike in 1909–10, a Henry Street representative sat in court all day bailing out arrested pickets. In 1912 the Settlement was a headquarters of "fair consideration" for the unpopular side of the Lawrence textile strike.

Members of her board of directors pay tribute to her abilities in finance. It is fun to speculate also on her potentialities as a politician. She could have gone far in politics on her gift for remembering birthdays, alone. She remembered hundreds of them with ease, by a sort of supernatural endowment. That was one of her talents; another is summed up in the matzoth. These Hebrew ceremonial biscuits often appeared on her table, Miss Wald explaining cheerily: "Here is the unleavened bread which our neighbors eat at Passover. We like it so well we eat it with our salad." Such touches of local color went over immensely with visitors from uptown.

She administered a budget of $600,000 a year, but the night telephone rang at her bedside until a fellow worker forcibly removed it. Despite the enormous pressure on her time she managed to read a good deal and go to the theater, and whenever possible she retreated to her farmhouse at Saugatuck, Conn. The East Side was her hobby; she loved it; wanted to see its fine old houses rehabilitated, and was proud of her part in suggesting the huge new apartment block which was to go up at Grand and Broome Streets.

Miss Wald was always the friend of the under dog and was kind to all who came in contact with her. Although herself never possessed of great wealth she was a friend of some of of the wealthiest persons in the United States, and was able by the charm of her personality to divert some of this wealth to the uplift of the poor in whom she was always interested.

The Henry Street Settlement Visiting Nurse Service will be forever a memorial to Miss Lillian D. Wald and a tribute to her great and inspiring personality. The Henry Street service today operates a staff of 250 blue-uniformed nurses with headquarters at 99 Park Avenue, and 18 local nursing centers.

Miss Lillian D. Wald has now gone to the great beyond and thus undoubtedly will be numbered among the great women of her day. To us in Congress, and to me who had the privilege of knowing Miss Wald personally, she typifies that devotion to duty which has forever been the symbol of America and Americanism.

A Post-Primary Message to the People of My District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 19, 1940

A CONGRESSMAN'S REFLECTIONS UPON CAMPAIGN ATTACKS

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Speaker, a heated attempt was made in the recent primary campaign in the Sixth Congressional District of Washington to discredit me because I voted and spoke and worked against the enactment of the Allen bill to deport Bridges. I am proud of that vote, and in no sense wish to make an apology therefor.

The American Bar Association, on September 10, explained that this measure was violative of American traditions and principles, was unconstitutional and unprecedented, and was altogether to be condemned. This is one of the most conservative and learned organizations in America. In addition to that fact, when one recalls that both the Attorney General of the United States, the Honorable Robert Jackson, and the Solicitor General, the Honorable Francis J. Biddle, have expressed themselves decisively and forcefully to the same effect with reference to this bill, it should give pause to those political opponents who, like a drowning man clutching at a straw, seize upon isolated and extreme examples in an effort to encompass one's defeat. The decisive vote given me at the recent Washington State primaries, in the Sixth Congressional District, is an indication of the devastating manner in which my home folks, who have known me and my family throughout my life, rebuked that form of political cavilling.

I defeated my Democratic opponent in King County by a margin of five to one. My vote exceeded the combined votes of all my opponents in the Democratic and Republican primaries by more than 5,000. Yet, this result was attained, Mr. Speaker, while I was remaining on the job in the national capital, in the Halls of Congress, more than 3,000 miles away from the district.

I do not exult or crow over this victory. I pay tribute to it only as an indication of the literacy and intelligence of my own people in the great and progressive State of Washington.

I did not at any time answer my opponents either by letter or orally in connection with their traducing attacks and carping criticism, or their mud-slinging references to my character, private life, or stand on public issues. I do not believe we should prostitute the high office of Congressman, nor lower it to the level of the hog wallow. A campaign for the office of Congressman should be maintained on a plane of dignity and decorum consistent with the status of the great office of Representatives in the Congress of the United States. That I depended upon the common sense and dispassionate judgment of the voters in my district was indicated and justified by the great vote given me by these home people.

I bear no grudges toward my opponents. A man should not be in public life unless his skin is fairly thick; naturally I resent lies and slanders, but I have learned to bear pin prickings with forbearance and good sportsmanship.

I go into the final campaign with renewed vigor and confidence, proud of the folks whom I represent, and glorying in their faith in me, which I do not propose ever to betray. I hope we can discuss campaign issues objectively and without emotional or personal biases—my Republican opponent and I. I have never felt it was sportsmanlike to attack an opponent in his absence or when his back was turned. Even the duck hunter will not level a shotgun at a duck until the bird is safely off the ground—in the air—and given a chance. However, I am not crying or complaining; the people have answered for me. The outstanding aspect of the primary result was that although the mud-slinging charges were reflective upon my patriotism and might have sounded plausible to the uninitiated and the politically unaware, my people entertain such confidence in my integrity, character, good judgment, and were so familiar with my record as a Congressman and with the more than 3,000 votes I have cast as such representative, they renewed their faith in me by the votes they cast in the September primaries.

I thank the people of my home district from the bottom of my heart; not only for my own sake but for that of my dear wife, Lillian Coffee, who is a product of our own State, and for my son, John M. Coffee, Jr., now nearly 12 years of age. Words fail me in attempting adequately to express with appropriate feeling the emotion which arises in me now, but my appreciation toward the people of the Sixth Congres-

sional District is wholehearted and unreserved. I can only reiterate that I thank you voters of my State with every atom of my being.

The Naval Academy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN J. MAAS

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 19, 1940

MINORITY REPORT OF BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE UNITED STATES NAVAL ACADEMY

Mr. MAAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following minority report of the Board of Visitors to the United States Naval Academy, 1940:

MINORITY REPORT OF THE BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE UNITED STATES NAVAL ACADEMY, 1940

His Excellency the PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

SIR: I concur in the recommendations of the Board insofar as they go; however, I feel that the Naval Academy as at present organized is incapable of preparing to the maximum possible degree candidates for commissions in the United States Navy.

The Navy has become highly mechanized and requires of its commissioned corps highly specialized technicians, certainly afloat. Commissioned service in the Navy is a profession in every way comparable, in importance and necessity for adequate preparatory training, to law and medicine. In the case of both of the above professions the candidate is required to have completed his cultural academic education before he enters upon the professional training required by his profession. At the present time at the Naval Academy, we are endeavoring in a 4-year period to give young men their basic cultural education and at the same time their technical professional courses. The academic work completed at the Naval Academy by the midshipmen is comparable to that of a junior college, and the professional work is comparable to that of a junior course in a technical school. Naval officers, in the present day at least, should have an education and professional training comparable to that given in any of the other professions, not merely junior courses. It appears to me that it is utterly impossible to give a full collegiate course and an adequate professional postgraduate course in the limited time available of 4 years. The preparation of a naval officer also requires extensive training in what would be extracurricular activities at any college or technical school, such as infantry drill, boat drill, gunnery, etc. This necessity at the Naval Academy accentuates the situation in regard to lack of time to give the midshipmen the proper essentials of a cultural education and a technical training. The field covered at the Naval Academy should require, at a minimum, 6 years if proper emphasis were placed upon all of the courses attempted.

It is not merely desirable that the naval officer be equipped with a full college education, but this is essential as a preparation for proper assimilation of the technical subjects.

While I believe that today we have the finest Navy in the world and by far the finest corps of commissioned officers of any navy in the world, this situation will not continue unless we keep the preparation of naval officers abreast of material and technological developments.

I respectfully refer you to a number of reports of Boards of Visitors in previous years calling attention to this situation and urgently requesting consideration of this problem.

Each year that I have been a member of the Board of Visitors the civilian educator members of the Board have stressed deficiencies in cultural subjects in the curriculum of the Naval Academy At the same time naval officers appearing before the Board have stressed the necessity for more time for technical studies in view of the rapidly increasing technical development of the Navy. In my opinion, they are both right. Neither can be sacrificed without detriment to the other and to the ultimate results attained in the education of the naval officer. It would appear to me that the real mission of the Government and its responsibility for the preparation of candidates for commissioned service in the Navy is their technical training. Under this theory, and one to which I subscribe, the candidate should have his academic education before he is received by the Government for training. I believe that we should make the Naval Academy into a technical training school rather than a junior educational institution. Candidates for commissions should be college graduates and should go to the Naval Academy as a postgraduate school to take their technical, professional training.

Midshipmen are now taken into the Naval Academy too young to have absorbed the civilian point of view of our great democracy, and after entrance to the academy they are so closely cloistered that they have no further opportunity either to understand or to absorb the civilian point of view. This would be corrected by taking college gradutes into the Naval Academy for strictly professional training.

There is an average of over 20 percent of separations from the Naval Academy for academic failures and lack of aptitude for the naval service. This wastage could be saved if the candidates completed their academic education before they entered the Naval Academy. The saving could be put into extending the R. O. T. C. system, with great benefit to the national defense. If candidates for the Naval Academy were graduates of colleges and universities in R. O. T. C. courses, they would have had a splendid indoctrination into the naval service and a better concept of naval discipline; and those going to the Naval Academy would have selected the Navy as a career as a result of knowledge and genuine desire rather than through mere romance or desire for a free education and an assured job, as is too often the case today.

A most valuable byproduct of this system would be a substantial increase in the number of Naval Reserve officers graduating from the R. O. T. C. courses.

It also appears to me that we are training altogether too many midshipmen for the needs of the Navy. A substantial portion of the billets filled by midshipmen could be better filled by warrant officers and chief petty officers. If the number of midshipmen graduated at the Naval Academy and commissioned in the Navy could be regulated to that number needed for lieutenant commanders, with, of course, a proper allowance for normal attrition, a large part of the wasteful system of elimination that now exists in the Navy in the lower commissioned ranks would be done away with. This would have a decided effect in improving the morale of the entire commissioned officer corps of the Navy.

Should the above system not be adopted, it would seem desirable that at least midshipmen should have 1 year in the ranks as enlisted men immediately preceding their assignment to the Naval Academy. This could be accomplished by making the appointment of a midshipman for 5 years instead of the present 4. It would be a fine thing for the officer to have had experience in the ranks and to understand the problems and the point of view of the enlisted man. It would also give the officer a much better appreciation of his own problems. It is pointed out that this would also be accomplished, however, in a large measure by the candidate's spending 4 years as a member of a college R. O. T. C. system under the first plan herein suggested.

If the Naval Academy were a postgraduate technical school, the student could devote his undivided time and attention to his professional training. Naval officers could very properly teach many of the classes in such courses. Under the present system the majority of instructors in even the academic and cultural subjects are naval officers on temporary shore duty assignment. They are unprepared by training or experience to instruct. While the Naval Academy becames a splendid postgraduate course for the instructors themselves, this is accomplished at the expense of the midshipmen whom they are called upon to instruct. The first year that a naval officer spends at the Naval Academy as a member of the faculty he spends learning how to teach. The officer, it is true, learns a great deal from this. The benefit to the midshipmen in their classes in the meantime is questionable, however. There is no system in operation to train officers in instruction; in fact, no attempt is made at all to prepare or coach officers for instructing. Teaching is a highly specialized profession in itself and requires extensive experience to qualify top-notch instructors. Naval officers, without training for teaching and not selected for any particular ability as teachers, are detailed to the faculty of the Naval Academy merely because they are due for shore duty and must be assigned somewhere. If naval officers are to be used as instructors, they should be given systematic courses of training in teaching before being assigned to the classroom. It is hardly necessary, for instance, that an instructor in English literature or French should have recently returned from sea. This requirement might be desirable for instructors in navigation or gunnery, but is hardly essential to the cultural subjects.

It is pointed out that the untrained naval officer instructor receives a much higher pay than the experienced trained civilian instructor at the Naval Academy. The pay schedule for the civilian members of the faculty is definitely low that of our leading educational institutions. The Naval Academy should not be on a par with educational institutions that merely meet the minimum requirements. It should be brought up to a standard equal to our best civilian educational institutions. To attract educators comparable to those at our best colleges and universities we must bring our instructor compensation into line with that paid at such institutions.

If officers must be used as instructors in nonmilitary subjects, they should be recalled retired officers, who could stay on duty at the academy continuously without the necessity of periodic sea duty. Such retired officers would in the course of time, through experience, become reasonably competent teachers. This would also tend to ease the burden of an already overburdened retired list.

The Superintendent might well be a retired rear admiral, so that the tenure of the head of the institution could be long enough to give some continuity of policy at the Naval Academy by someone who could come to thoroughly understand the institution. The age of such retired flag officer would not be out of line with the age of many college presidents of our great civilian educational institutions.

CONCLUSIONS

It is recommended that the Naval Academy become a postgraduate technical school and that a requirement for admission be a college degree.

It is further recommended that the teaching staff in the nonmilitary subjects be composed entirely of civilians and retired officers.

It is also recommended that the pay scale for the civilian instructors be raised to that for similar instructors in our first-grade civilian educational institutions.

MELVIN J. MASS, M. C.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *May 2, 1940.*

Bottlenecks in National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 19, 1940

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a radio address delivered by me over the National Broadcasting Co.'s national hook-up on Tuesday evening, September 17, 1940.

The address follows:

BOTTLENECKS IN NATIONAL DEFENSE

Through the courtesies of the National Broadcasting Co. I embrace this opportunity to discuss some of the bottlenecks in our national defense. Here in the Congress for months we have given the green light and full speed ahead to the preparedness program. In determining what is best to protect and preserve our country, partisan political considerations must not enter. It is a time when every American citizen, as well as aliens who are guests within our gates, must give unreserved allegiance to our country, and without hesitation or delay perform the services that will safeguard our country in this crisis. The House of Representatives, of which I have the honor to be a Member, has, as you have noted, given immediate consideration to every defense program and measure as soon as it came before us. Regardless of party, we in the House have all joined together in speeding this program to the earliest conclusion possible. This is evidenced by our consideration of the conscription bill, which was taken up almost immediately after being passed by the Senate, and concluded within a few days.

National preparedness, however, is an immense task. America is geared to peacetime pursuits. We are a nation of peace lovers. We want to see the whole world live together in harmony. In the past we have joined with other nations in formulating and concluding peace pacts providing for the settlement of the disputes between nations by peaceful means. While we abhor war, we will not hesitate to fight to defend ourselves. We have never shirked our duty to defend our country, its citizens, and their possessions by force of arms, when necessary. In the unsettled condition confronting the world today we cannot close our eyes to the fact that the world is an armed camp and that many peace-loving nations like ourselves have fallen beneath the path of devastating bombs and the tramp of invading armies. With modern mechanized armies, airplanes, and swift-moving watercraft, we are brought to the realization that our own safety and well-being—indeed, our preservation—may depend upon being armed and prepared to defend our shores and possessions against attacks from any and all invaders.

The Congress, regardless of party, has realized this impending emergency and has adopted such defense measures as will bring our armaments to such a state of perfection that we may successfully defend and protect ourselves. We have appropriated and authorized the expenditure of over $15,000,000,000 to build armaments and prepare defenses that will make America impregnable. As one Member of the Congress, without hesitation I have supported all of this defense program and will continue to do so. It is incumbent upon every one of us to make every sacrifice that this grim job of complete preparedness be done without any delay. We appreciate that time is a crucial element in this great program of national defense. Battleships require some 4 years for construction. Large numbers of bombing planes and aircraft require long periods of time for final completion. Land batteries and defenses, tanks, munitions, and mechanized equipment cannot be constructed without long, laborious application of trained, technical men in the formulation of plans and the production of material, plants, and equipment, and the final completion of the armaments themselves. Manpower is an important element in this construction process. It requires the coordination and mobilization of the great industrial enterprise of America, together with its technical, skilled, and common laborers. They must all work in unison for a common end. This, I believe, we are doing.

In this far-reaching program there are, however, certain bottlenecks which tend to impede progress and delay the day of final accomplishment of this great undertaking. In the short time at my disposal I can only touch upon a few of these hurdles which we will have to surmount.

When we shall have completed this immense construction program of airplanes, mechanized land equipment, water and undersea craft, we are confronted with an equally serious problem—that of providing the manpower with which to operate this mechanized armament. Modern warfare is conducted with technical, complicated machines, which require great skill and training in their operation. It has been the problem of Congress in the last several weeks to enact such legislation as will insure an ample number of trained personnel in our military, naval, and air forces. For 150 years during times of peace we have depended upon voluntary enlistments to secure this personnel. When war actually comes, we have in the past resorted to the draft. The problem with which we have been battling here in the Congress is whether or not now, while we are still at peace, it is necessary to invoke the draft method in order to secure an adequate supply of men for the manning of our immense armament machine. Many of us have felt that it was not in accord with the democratic processes of free America and not necessary to draft men in times of peace and force them into military service. However, both Houses of Congress, after long and careful consideration and debate, have now decided that, in order to protect our best interests in the world crisis and to preserve America as a nation in the event war comes, we should adopt the draft method at this time. This has been done. While I personally did not subscribe to this principle, now that the majority of the Congress has spoken, I believe it is my duty and the duty of every patriotic American to support the program as adopted, wholeheartedly and without reservation. That I am doing, and will continue to do. I do not want to see anything placed in the progress of this program that will delay or impede it. I want to see it put into effect, now that it is the law, at the earliest possible moment, so that the personnel of our forces may be adequately trained and increased to the full strength required, as determined upon by the chiefs of staff of our defense forces. It will require a considerable time to induct these new recruits into the service, prepare for their housing, equipment, and training, together with hospital facilities, and make them an integral part of our fighting forces. It is the plan of the chiefs of staff to put these men into existing units, rather than to segregate them. This, of course, means that immense quantities of clothing, equipment, housing, hospitals, and munitions will be required to augment existing supplies, in order to take care of this immense increase in the fighting forces.

Mistakes will occur, delays will take place, and we must be prepared to be patient with those whom we have charged with the responsibility of this immense undertaking for national defense.

I will now discuss briefly another bottleneck in national defense, namely, the lack of adequate quantities of the so-called strategic and critical minerals. The immense amount of mechanical equipment required for the armament program necessitates, first of all, securing large amounts of metals and nonmetals, not alone for building our factories and plants but also for furnishing material for the completed instrumentalities. The ability to secure metals and oil often determines the outcome of a war. America more than any other nation is self-sustaining in the most of our industrial needs. However, there are certain bottlenecks which may in times of emergency completely cut off our source of supplies for essential materials. There are 33 minerals included in the revised preparedness-materials list of the Army and Navy Munitions Board. Nine of these are strategic and 5 critical, and 19 essential. It will be of interest by reason of the common use of these terms to define them.

STRATEGIC MATERIALS

Strategic materials are those essential to the national defense for the supply of which in war dependence must be placed in whole or in part on sources outside the continental limits of the United States, and for which strict conservation and distribution control measures will be necessary.

CRITICAL MATERIALS

Critical materials are those materials essential to the national defense the procurement problems of which in war, while difficult, are less serious than those of strategic materials, because they can be either domestically produced or obtained in more adequate quantities or have a lesser degree of essentiality, and for which some degree of conservation and distribution control will be necessary.

ESSENTIAL MATERIALS NEITHER STRATEGIC NOR CRITICAL

In this classification are included those materials, essential to the national defense, for which no procurement problems in war are anticipated, but whose status is such as to require constant surveillance because future developments may necessitate reclassification as strategic or critical.

In February 1939 the staffs of the Geological Survey and the Bureau of Mines issued a report upon certain deficient strategic minerals. This report discusses the situation of the United States with respect to seven of the minor metals that are so essential in modern industrial activity that to do without them would require a drastic reorganization in present practices. These metals are manganese, chromium, mercury, tungsten, nickel, tin, and antimony. All of them are essential in peace and critical in war. In none of them is the United States self-sufficient. This situation is illustrated by the following table, which shows the percentage of the Nation's peacetime requirements produced from domestic mines during a recent 5-year period:

	Percentage
Manganese	5–6
Chromium	1
Mercury	40
Tungsten	50
Nickel	0.5
Tin	0.2
Antimony	10

These facts indicate a situation that requires the earnest attention of those upon whom falls responsibility for the national safety in any emergency that would cut us off from foreign sources of supply.

The Seventy-sixth Congress, at its first regular session, passed an act approved June 7, 1939, which directs the Secretaries of War, Navy, and Interior, after consultation with the Secretaries of State, Treasury, and Commerce, to determine the quantity and quality of the strategic materials needed to supply the Nation's industrial, naval, and military needs for common defense. The act authorizes the purchase of these materials through the Procurement Division. Such materials are to be stored at certain places the Secretaries may designate and may be rotated in order to prevent deterioration. It further authorizes an appropriation to be spent under direction of the Secretaries of War and Navy of $100,000,000, to be available from June 30, 1939, through June 30, 1943, and authorizes an appropriation of $350,000 for the Bureau of Mines and $150,000 for the Geological Survey, of the Interior Department, for use in determining the utilization of ores in the United States in relation to the common defense.

Since the enactment of this statute the Congress has made additional provisions for the acquirement of these strategic, critical and essential materials, and up to July 1, 1940, had purchased 64,500 long tons of chromium and 86,500 long tons of manganese, 11,800 pounds of quartz crystals, 6,124 short tons of pig tin, and 449 short tons of tungsten.

There are many virgin deposits within our own borders which, when developed, will supply many of these strategic, critical, and essential materials. Many of these deposits are in the Pacific Coast States and Alaska.

With new abundant, assured, low-cost hydroelectric power in the Columbia River projects, the mineral resources of the four Pacific Northwest States are now susceptible of aiding materially in obviating this bottleneck in our national defense program. The projects at Bonneville and Grand Coulee will provide by July 1942 over 600,000 kilowatts of electric energy. In addition, the total ultimate installations of both projects amount to over 2,400,000 kilowatts. The Columbia River area contains the Nation's greatest source of water power, being about 44 percent of the hydroelectric power of all the streams of continental United States. During the World War the shortage of electrical energy developed an embarrassing hurdle in the preparedness program. However, with the development on the Columbia River and T. V. A., there is no likelihood that such a condition will exist in our present emergency. The laymen may not appreciate that in order to capture these strategic and critical minerals from the original deposits in the earth, reduce them and process them for ultimate utilization in fabricating the mechanical war machines, huge blocks of low-cost electric power are necessary. The Pacific Northwest is not only blessed with having this huge reservoir of potential electric power but it also has large deposits of minerals and other materials which are necessary for carrying forward this undertaking. One of the chief metals required in airplane construction is aluminum. A new plant has just gone into production on the Columbia River, using Bonneville power, which will add materially to our supplies needed immediately in the airplane program. There are immense low-grade clay deposits in the West available for the production of aluminum. A new process has recently been perfected for extracting alumina, which is the essential material in making aluminum, from a common clay found in almost inexhaustible quantities in the Northwest and elsewhere in the United States. This new process, developed by John Henry Walthall, of the T. V. A. staff, was developed in the pilot plant of the T. V. A. and is reported to effect the increase manyfold of the sources of supply of this important metal. If these forecasts prove to be correct, the United States will be completely independent of foreign countries for its supply of this metal essential for airplane construction. At the present time our major supply comes from abroad, which may be cut off in time of war.

The Bonneville Administrator, in the report recently released by him, states that it is probable that the production of ferrochrome, magnesium, and chlorates may soon be initiated in the Columbia River area and that aluminum from Northwest raw materials is likely to be produced in the next few months. Chromium is found in various parts of the Columbia River area. The American supply now comes from Africa, Russia, Turkey, Cuba, the Philippines, and from other foreign countries. Bauxite deposits in the United States are small, but large reserves of the submarginal ores, leucite and alunite, exist in Utah, Colorado, Wyoming, Oregon, and Washington. Further development in technology is needed for the commercial development of these submarginal ores. Occurrences of bauxite in Oregon have been reported, but further detailed surveys are needed to determine the quality and extent of these Oregon deposits. The same situation exists as to nickel, 90 percent of our supply of which is now imported.

Forty-one mineral occurrences have been charted in the Pacific Northwest. This number includes 31 industrial metals, 9 of the 11 strategic metals, and 14 of the 24 critical metals. The extent and quality of all these occurrences has not been fully determined. Low-priced power for modern processes is available, and all that is needed to utilize these resources is an accurate inventory of quantity and quality of minerals and practical processes for beneficiation of the determined quality of the ores.

The progress of the national-defense program will, in a large measure, depend upon securing unlimited supplies of these and other essential materials. The present world war has definitely proven that the United States must develop sources of supply or substitutes therefor, for all of these strategic, critical, and essential materials within our own borders, in order to insure that there will be no interruption of our defense program. Many of the original foreign sources of these materials have now been cut off. We must, not only in the interest of national defense but also in order to develop our own resources, utilize the original sources at home available to us for supplying these most essential materials, not only in times of war but in peace. The Pacific Northwest stands ready to cooperate with the Federal Government in the development and utilization of this storehouse of essential materials lying within its borders.

Taking Stock of Our Foreign-Trade Position

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS F. FORD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 19, 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. HENRY F. GRADY, ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein an address by the Honorable Henry F. Grady, Assistant Secretary of State, at the final session of the twenty-seventh Foreign Trade Convention, at the Palace Hotel, San Francisco, Calif., July 31, 1940.

The address follows:

In taking stock of our foreign-trade position, it is important for all of us to realize that, from the national point of view, foreign trade is not an independent field of economic activity nor an end in itself, but an integral part of our national economy and of our international relations. It is in this broad perspective that the commercial policy of the administration was formulated and is being carried out. Its objective is to promote above all else the welfare of the Nation as a whole, which can be achieved in the fullest measure only under conditions of world peace. It was anticipated that such a policy, being based on the principles of reciprocity and equality of opportunity in international relations, would tend to reduce the causes of economic friction between nations and to make it possible for all nations to realize more fully their economic potentialities and would thereby facilitate the establishment of a sound and lasting peace in the international community.

Such a peace did not materialize. Our failure to adapt our commercial policy after the last World War to the change in our position from a debtor to a creditor country was in part responsible for the severity and long duration of the 1930–32 depression which affected the course of international events which followed. Our present commercial policy has been in effect for only 6 years and has in that short time contributed in an outstanding measure toward the restoration of sanity in international commercial relations. Nevertheless, owing to the direction which international developments had already taken by the time of its adoption, the cause of liberal trade was not advanced far enough to block the course of impending disaster. One factor making its progress less than it might have otherwise been was the strong opposition at home from those who regarded liberal trade principles as inimical to their privileges of exploitation under the excessive tariff of 1930. Furthermore, in its path lay a tangled undergrowth of false doctrines and blind prejudices deeply rooted in more than 50 years of American high-protectionist tradition.

Nevertheless, disaster having overtaken the world, our hope now is to pull through the troubled days ahead with strength to preserve for ourselves, if not for the world, the freedom and liberty which are possible only under the institutions of a democracy. That hope depends upon our subordinating immediate and selfish interests to the national welfare, of which all our interests ultimately depend, and viewing our domestic problems in relation to world problems of which they are a part.

I am sure that many people who have not realized the importance of this before, do now. The realization has been brought home to them suddenly by recent events in Europe and by their concern now for their country's security. The first hysterical impulse following such a belated realization is frequently to demand new and drastic measures. However, before throwing over basic principles, such as those embodied in the trade-agreements program, which have been tried and tested, we should consider what the situation calls for, especially from the point of view of war conditions, the requirements of national defense and the outlook for trade in the post-war period.

The war in Europe has had a pronounced effect on our foreign trade, as may be observed from official figures for the first 5 months of this year. Both our exports and imports greatly increased in this period compared to those of the corresponding periods of the 2

previous years. Large percentage increases in our export sales between the first 5 months of 1939 and 1940 were accounted for by the United Kingdom and France, 92 percent; Canada, 54 percent; and South America, 70 percent. One would not expect to find, of course, that these export increases occurred largely in respect of commodities on which concessions have been obtained abroad in peacetime as the result of trade agreements. As a matter of fact, our export trade with many of the countries in Europe with which we have trade agreements has been seriously disrupted by the war, and, in the case of the United Kingdom and France, the benefits of the concessions obtained from them have in a large measure been offset by wartime trade controls which are permitted under the terms of agreements in the event of a national emergency. The type of goods which has been exported in increased amounts to the United Kingdom, France, and Canada has been determined chiefly by their war needs and our increased sales to South America have consisted in a large part of goods which that continent previously purchased from Europe.

Nevertheless, trade agreements have been a factor of significance in our foreign-trade position under war conditions. It is important to note in this connection that, although our imports increased also in the first 5 months of this year over the corresponding period of last year, they have not increased as much as have our exports, indicating on the part of the foreign purchasers of our goods a drain on their sources of dollar exchange. This has in part caused the belligerents to limit their purchases from the United States to essential items in order to conserve their dollar funds for war materials. The American trade in agricultural products, many of which have not come under the category of essentials, has especially suffered as a result of this policy. Furthermore, the using up of dollar exchange now by the foreign countries concerned may mean, in the case of the belligerents, that their ability to buy American products required by post-war reconstruction will be impaired and, in the case of other countries, that we shall not be able to hold on to the trade gains which have been made.

The drain, however, on the dollar-exchange resources of foreign countries, the consequences suffered as a result thereof by American agriculture, and its possible effects on future trade might be greater than is now the case were it not for the existence of trade agreements. The lowering of our tariffs as the result of these agreements has afforded foreign countries the opportunity of exchanging larger amounts of their goods for American products than would otherwise be possible and thus has relieved in some measure the pressure on their potential dollar-exchange reserves.

In preparing in the present crisis to defend our interests, our homes, and our liberties, we must take into account the fact that foreign trade is regarded by totalitarian governments as a source, not of national prosperity, but of political and military power, and is employed as an instrument of aggression. Whereas we have sought in foreign trade a means for providing, reciprocally, for the fuller employment of labor and for raising living standards of the people in general, the dictators have used their trade bargaining power to increase the dependence of small countries on totalitarian economy in order that such countries might, one at a time, be isolated from their friends and neighbors and more easily brought under their domination. That we may not, as the result of such methods, find ourselves without friends among our neighbors in this hemisphere and surrounded on all sides by the forces of aggression, tyranny, and persecution, we must press forward vigorously, but calmly and sanely, with our good-neighbor policy in the Americas.

The chief source of livelihood of our southern neighbors is the production of raw materials for world markets. Nearly half of their exports in 1937 was sold to Europe, but that trade is now disrupted as a result of the war. If the burden on Latin America of accumulating stocks of export surpluses is permitted to grow, it may be expected that the resistance of the American republics to economic penetration from the Old World will be undermined and weakened. This problem of Latin American export surpluses is one of immediate importance to which, as you know, this Government is giving serious attention. Its solution is highly important to the security of this hemisphere.

The basic need, however, of the defense and prosperity of the Americas is the continued development of closer economic relations among the American republics. There is need of each opening wider its markets to the products of the other republics, of developing industries to supply those markets, and of lending financial and technical assistance for this and other purposes.

I am sure that you are aware of the marked advance which has already been made in this direction under the administration's good-neighbor policy. Of outstanding importance in this connection are the trade agreements which this Government has entered into with 11 American republics, containing mutual guaranties of fair treatment and providing reciprocally for increased market opportunities through a lowering of import barriers. Even opponents of the trade-agreements program who have shouted "wolf, wolf" the loudest have benefited from its stimulus to foreign trade and the resulting expansion of the domestic market for their products. Nevertheless, the opposition of sectional and special interests have constituted a serious threat to the very existence of the trade program. Thanks to their shortsighted greed and also perhaps to the activities of similar privilege-seeking groups abroad, the trade-agreements program has not been advanced as far in our relations with the other American republics as might be desired, especially in view of the present need of American economic solidarity which the protection of common interests demands. In this connection attention may be called to our prohibition, under the guise of sanitary laws, against meat imports from certain areas of South America not affected by the disease against which sanitary safeguards are sought. The failure of this Government to provide warranted relief from such sanitary regulations and the indifference which would appear to be evidenced thereby toward the development of closer inter-American relations do not inspire the cooperation which is necessary to the building up of an adequate hemispheric defense.

Although the people of this country are on guard against "fifth column" activities, they do not appear to be alert yet to the more subtle danger of the existence within our midst of a "sixth column" composed of special interests, who, out of blind selfishness, would sacrifice the common good for personal gain.

What the nature of our international trade relations will be after the war no one, of course, knows. We are in a position, however, to exert a positive influence on such relations in this hemisphere. If the divided interests of this country would realize that their welfare is basically dependent upon the welfare and strength of the Nation as a whole, and would by united, and vigorous efforts urge full cooperation with the other American republics, including reciprocal reductions in trade barriers and mutual assurances of fair and equitable commercial treatment, we should be able not only to lay the economic foundations of hemispheric defense but also to secure compensation in larger inter-American trade for ourselves and other American republics for possible losses in trade with other parts of the world.

The future of our trade with other parts of the world depends in part, it appears, on factors beyond our immediate control. Whatever the developments in this field may be, they are apt to bring home to the American businessman with a jolt the basic truth reflected in our trade-agreement policy, namely, that exports depend ultimately on imports.

For nearly 2 decades American business, representing both agriculture and industry, has been trying to increase its sales abroad while at the same time seeking to restrict its foreign purchases. One of the factors making possible our large excess of exports over imports in the decade of the twenties was foreign loans. In the early years of the thirties a large part of these loans were in default, and we virtually discontinued lending and investing abroad. We continued, nevertheless, to maintain an excess of exports over imports, and foreign countries were thus forced to balance their payments with us by large shipments of gold to this country until they have become largely drained of their gold reserves while we have accumulated a useless surplus.

If we are to receive payment from abroad on account of goods exported, services rendered, and funds invested, it appears that we must be prepared to receive a larger part of it in the form of goods for feeding, clothing, and sheltering our population.

The sooner we recognize that trade is essentially barter, an exchange of goods for goods, the better position we shall be in to safeguard our international commerce and protect American agriculture and industry whose prosperity is dependent on world markets and access to world supplies of raw materials. By what methods this exchange of goods is to be effected is, however, a matter of great concern to us. Shall it be conducted on a liberal most-favored-nation or multilateral basis, or on a preferential and restricted basis of bilateral trade-balancing? For instance, shall we, as has been possible under a most-favored-nation system of world trade, accept raw materials from Southeastern Asia as payment in part for our exports to Europe, or shall we, as a result of bilateralism, be forced to accept instead European products for which we may have less need.

I suspect that those who advocate the adoption by this Government of barter or clearing arrangements are really at heart high-protectionists who mistake such streamlined trade controls as miracle-working devices for promoting exports without increasing imports. If our trade with Southeastern Asia, for example, in which our imports far exceed our exports, were subject to such arrangements, efforts to bring about a more evenly balanced trade might conceivably result in a serious curtailment of our imports of essential raw materials. But assume for the sake of argument that we were able by such efforts to force Southeastern Asia to increase its purchases of American products. This would necessitate naturally a curtailment of its imports from other countries, especially European countries, whose purchases of American products exceed for the most part their sales to us. On the basis of actual experience of various countries with bilateralistic controls, it might be expected that the loss of European markets in Southeastern Asia would lead the European countries eventually to seek a more evenly balanced trade with us; in other words, to increase their sales in this market or to reduce their imports of American products.

Suppose that we should be trading after the war on a bilateralistic basis and should have open to us under a clearing arrangement a large European market for American products. Under such an arrangement the American exporters would receive, in payment for their merchandise, credits abroad in terms of a foreign currency. In order to convert the proceeds of their export sales into dollars,

they would either have to use these credits themselves for the purchase of foreign goods for sale in this country or, directly or indirectly, sell them to American importers for the same purpose or to other Americans having financial obligations to meet abroad. But since the foreign funds could not be spent in any foreign market except the one employing the foreign currency in question, the American demand for the products available in that market or obligations to be met in that particular currency might not be great enough to provide for the disposal of the blocked funds. In order that the American exporters might finally obtain dollars for their goods, import duties on certain foreign products might be substantially reduced to encourage their sale in this country, or, if the American exporters were permitted to do so under the terms of the clearing agreement, they might sell their foreign credits to American importers at a discount, which would also stimulate imports, but at the expense of the exporters and domestic producers. It is more likely, however, that great pressure would be brought to bear on the Government to relieve the American exporters of their blocked funds and that the Government would come to possess a frozen supply of assets abroad in addition to its buried stocks of gold in Kentucky.

Even if our foreign trade, in order to meet the demand in some quarters for further streamlining, were turned over to a government-owned "Amtorg" corporation, or any other new-model trade set-up, the necessity of accepting imports in payment for exports could not be avoided. This necessity is the essence of trade, but if the exchange of exports for imports were effected through bilateralistic channels we should not be free to buy where or what we pleased; nor to buy nor to sell in the best markets. Consequently the benefits to be derived from such an exchange under bilateralism tend to disappear and trade, exports as well as imports, is discouraged.

Incidentally, I might point out that merely the administrative requirements and complicated procedures arising in connection with trade controls would in themselves constitute a heavy burden on foreign commerce. Many of you have probably shared with us the recent experience which throws some light upon the nature of the administrative and regulatory problems which stem from any measure of trade control. I refer to the problems which attended the setting up of the export licensing system required under the National Defense Act which went into effect at midnight, July 4, 1940, to control exports of military equipment and munitions and certain related manufactures and materials, which might be needed for our own defense purposes.

I can well understand the difficulties which faced those of you who had to obtain at short notice licenses to cover shipments about to be loaded aboard the steamer; perhaps you can understand the difficulty which faced the administrative officials in dealing with a sudden flood of thousands of applications at the very time that the entire set-up for examining applications and issuing licenses had to be thought out and organized. Many of these problems are, of course, solved after the initial period is passed and the system settles down to a routine operating basis, but let me remind you that each new control and each new regulation involves, firstly, some initial period of confusion and, secondly, additional routine and the inevitable prospect of recurrent problems of definition and interpretation, all of which is reflected in delay and expense.

Control over the exports of a limited number of products for national-defense purposes is a comparatively simple matter. You can well imagine how complicated and burdensome the administrative problems and regulations might be in the event that our trade were conducted on the basis of barter transactions, clearing agreements, or exchange control.

It is not because of fidelity to noble sentiments or of an allegiance to so-called old-fashioned doctrines that we must continue to uphold the multilateral principles of the trade-agreements program, but because practical considerations and hard-headed business sense leave no other course open. The basic proposition underlying our commercial policy is that foreign trade is a vital factor in the prosperity, strength, and peace of the Nation; our policy is to foster such trade. So long as we hold the national interests above those of any economic group or section of the country, no change in that policy is possible.

We must, of course, be prepared to effect any adjustment in our trade program or to adopt any supplementary measures which conditions in a war-torn and chaotic world may require; and, possibly, as in other fields of our national life, to resort temporarily to measures for which we basically have no liking. A realistic approach, however, to emergency problems of international commercial relations should not obscure from view the importance of taking now whatever action is possible to preserve and strengthen the principles of liberal trade.

The trade-agreements program is at this time a factor of vital significance to the future of our economic relations with the other countries of this hemisphere and also to the New World defense of freedom and democracy. As long as we remain a free people the question of whether this program shall be relegated "to the heaven of lost causes" will be decided not by Mr. Hitler, but by you, through the democratic right to vote, to make representations to your Government, and to speak freely. I cannot believe that the cause of liberal trade is lost any more than that the cause of liberalism and democracy itself is lost. It is my conviction that, notwithstanding the machinations of special interests, whether represented by petty lobbyists or power dictators, democracy will finally triumph in its struggle for prosperity, equality, and freedom.

Politics in Relief

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NOBLE J. JOHNSON
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 19, 1940

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, again I want to call attention of the Members to the political manipulations and favoritism being shown in the administration of W. P. A.

In January of 1940 Indiana had a quota of 70,000, but only 62,344 were employed; the quota remained at 70,000 for February and March, but less than 65,000 were employed during these months. The quota was gradually reduced until in August it was 44,000, but in that month only 41,552 were employed. There has been great suffering in Indiana by many people who could not get employment on W. P. A. during the past year, during which time those administering the law could have employed thousands more than were employed. W. P. A. had the money to employ the full quota. During this time there were thousands duly certified for relief work who could not get employment. Why was it that the full quota was not employed? Was it because W. P. A. officials wanted to hold back the number employed so as to be able to gradually increase the number to be employed just before election, as was done in 1934, 1936, and 1938? The facts seem to prove this to be the reason. Already the number employed is being increased, and at this time I understand they are over the current quota. This increase will probably continue until after election, and then they will again begin laying men off as they did in 1934, 1936, and 1938. It is peculiar that in the nonelection years of 1933, 1935, 1937, and 1939 W. P. A. found no reason to gradually increase the number employed just before November. W. P. A. does not seem to realize that people need work as much in the nonelection years as they do in election years, and that they get just as hungry and need clothes and fuel as much after an election as they do just before an election.

In 1933, a nonelection year, the number employed on relief work declined 15.4 percent from June through October, although industrial production reflecting employment declined 16.5 percent. In the election year of 1934 the number employed on W. P. A. increased 11.6 percent from June through October. In 1935, a nonelection year, relief rolls declined 9.5 percent from June through October. In 1936, an election year, W. P. A. employment increased 14.4 percent, although unemployment had been reduced 13 percent. In 1937, when there was no election, the relief rolls showed a decline of 16.9 percent from June through October, although production declined 10.5 percent in that period. In 1938, an election year, the relief rolls were increased 19.2 percent, although unemployment declined 9 percent. In 1939, when there was no election, the number of W. P. A. was reduced 25.5 percent.

I wrote the W. P. A. officials protesting unwarranted and unreasonable lay-offs and received a reply saying—I quote:

> The relative-need basis that you refer to was not considered in these reductions. * * * The selection of the people for these reductions was made in the district office by the employment staff composed mostly of young ladies who did not know whether a man was white or black, married or single, or any other circumstance about him.

Just think of great numbers of needy people being laid off of W. P. A. without the question of need even being considered, when relief work was started and has been maintained for the sole purpose of providing employment for those in need. Without need there would be no W. P. A., and the money appropriated for relief work should be expended to employ those needing relief. It seems very queer that the young ladies in the district office were permitted to select those to be laid off, and that when selecting those to be laid off managed to avoid laying off any of the nonrelief workers.

May I ask, Why should young ladies in the district office, who had no information about the men, be permitted to select those to be dismissed from work? It is a sorrowful situation when those administering W. P. A. continue to handle it on a political basis. The principle of W. P. A., that of emergency relief, is good, but in the hands of unscrupulous politicians has been used, not for the benefit of those needing relief but in an attempt to perpetuate those administering the law in power.

There is no good reason why so many have been left unemployed for several months just in order to place great numbers to work immediately before election for purely political purposes.

The way W. P. A. has been administered is another link toward regimentation and toward the totalitarian form of government some would like to see established here. Some people are required to be absolutely poverty-stricken, to dispose of every kind of property they have, before they can get employment, while others who do not need relief are employed steadily. In one case in my congressional district a man with a large family was refused employment because he owned a hog. In other words, in many instances a man is driven to complete destitution before he will be given employment and then he is told that if it were not for the present administration he would starve, and the claim made that if the present administration is defeated he will not receive any further work. Of course, this is not true and is the lowest kind of political tactics.

Too much W. P. A. money is being expended for large salaries of administrative and nonrelief employees. Many W. P. A. State administrators receive larger salaries than the governors of their States. Too much money is being wasted in paying exorbitant salaries to white-collared workers and to many nonrelief workers employed at high salaries. There are thousands of men who are unemployed and who are well qualified to hold any position in the entire relief set-up, who need the work, and they should be employed to fill these positions.

Now as the election draws near W. P. A. workers are being told that the reason they have not been employed was because Congress did not appropriate enough money and that Congress only appropriated money for 8 months, beginning with July 1, 1940. The fact is that Congress appropriated every penny that the President and Colonel Harrington asked for the year beginning July 1, 1940, and then Congress gave the W. P. A. officials the authority to spend the whole amount appropriated for the year in 8 months if the W. P. A. officials desired to do so. The workers are also being told that the Republicans are responsible for the 130-hour workmonth and for abolishing the prevailing wage rate. This is absolutely untrue. Such stories are not being told by Members of Congress but by politicians "back home" who apparently do not know and do not want to know the facts, and are being told solely for the purpose of misleading the W. P. A. workers in an attempt to get their votes on election day. Members of Congress know that Colonel Harrington asked for this, I quote from Colonel Harrington's testimony before the Appropriations Committee, which appears on page 20 of the hearings. He said:

> It is my recommendation that persons employed on projects of the W. P. A. be required to work 130 hours per month, and that the earnings of such persons be on a monthly basis, with the requirement that substantially the present national average labor cost be maintained.

The committee reporting this bill has many more Democratic members than Republican members and they reported the bill carrying the provision requested by Colonel Harrington, who said he made the recommendation after discussing it with the President and having his approval. When the bill came on the floor of the House for consideration I was one of those who opposed the 130-hour work-month provision and the abolishment of the prevailing-wage rate, but there were not enough of us to prevent these provisions from being in the law.

Oh, our Democratic friends would like to dodge responsibility for putting these provisions in the relief legislation, but there is no way they can do so. There are 69 Democrats in the Senate and only 23 Republicans. There are 260 Democrats in the House and only 167 Republicans so it is apparent that the Democrats have an overwhelming majority in both the Senate and the House and they pass the legislation they want to pass in whatever form they desire. There are not enough Republicans in Congress to pass any legislation. Everyone knows that 23 Republican Senators cannot outvote 69 Democratic Senators, and that 167 Republican Congressmen cannot outvote 260 Democratic Congressmen. And then, the President can veto any bill, the provisions of which he does not approve, but he did not veto the relief bill with the 130-hour work month and the abolishment of the prevailing-wage provision in it. He approved it and he signed it. Our Democratic friends cannot escape their responsibility for the legislation passed by Congress.

To use the oft-repeated saying:

> They have the knife and they have the cheese and they are cutting it to suit themselves.

Surely politics and favoritism are the only things which could cause W. P. A. to employ 185 relief workers and 864 nonrelief workers on a project. On another project 265 relief workers were employed and 189 nonrelief workers. On another 221 relief workers were employed and 171 nonrelief workers. Even on the W. P. A. building at the New York World's Fair only 17.7 percent relief workers were employed and 82.3 percent nonrelief workers. The hearings are full of such instances. What could cause this except politics and favoritism? Does not this show conclusively that W. P. A. is not being administered in the interest of those needing relief? The purchase of supplies and equipment shows great waste of large sums of money. If the money appropriated for relief work were expended properly and to employ only those needing relief, many thousands more could be employed, and they could be paid better wages. Everyone knows that it is impossible for a person with dependents to live according to the American standard on wages paid by W. P. A. Those working on W. P. A. and those unemployed want to see America put back to work. They want real jobs where they can receive regular American wages and live and enjoy an independent life. For 7½ years they have had no opportunity of regular employment and it must be apparent to all that this administration cannot solve our unemployment problem.

The only thing they have to offer is a continuance of the politically manipulated relief set-up. There are 93,500 nonrelief employees on W. P. A. who are employed in administrative or supervisory positions at salaries of over $1,200; some range as high as $10,000 per year. Many more thousands of nonrelief employees are employed in supervisory positions at salaries less than $1,200 per year. W. P. A. has even spent $178,000 to make a moving picture for propaganda purposes and did not employ a single relief worker. They have refused to make public or to advise Congress of the total number of nonrelief employees or the amount of relief money expended upon nonrelief employees. It is high time that Congress stopped this mismanagement of relief work and the waste of relief money. We know those administering relief will do in the future as they have done in the past and are now doing. They have caused many of our citizens, both young and old, some with large families, to go without work and to suffer for months in order to load the relief rolls just before election. This is not right and should be stopped. Even after the exposé of political manipulations, favoritism, and waste and extravagance of the W. P. A., it continues now as in the past. This shows conclusively that they intend to continue relief administration from a purely political viewpoint.

I tell you that the man and woman needing relief work cannot be longer fooled. They are rightly demanding that money appropriated for relief work be used to employ those needing relief; that the employment of nonrelief workers stop; that favoritism, waste, and extravagance be stopped, and that politics be taken out of relief. I am going to continue my efforts to bring this about. We still have 10,000,000 unemployed in spite of the national-defense program. Many of us do not

believe in this administration's views that millions will never have anything except a W. P. A. job. If we are to continue under our system of government and the American way of living, we must provide regular jobs for our unemployed. This can and will be done. Great efforts are being made to divert people's attention and thoughts to foreign matters in order to get them to forget our domestic problems and the failure of the present administration to solve these problems. Each day these failures increase and the administration becomes more confused.

Our national debt has increased to upward of $60,000,000,000.

Agricultural problems have not been solved; business and industry are in bad condition; unemployment remains about the same; and great sums of relief funds are being diverted from their rightful use and wasted.

The administration of W. P. A. stinks to high heaven and is a monument of everlasting shame in the political history of our country.

How long do you think the people can and will stand for this and how long do you think our Government can exist if we continue on the same road as the last 7½ years?

W. P. A. should be continued as long as it is needed and under conditions which will furnish those working on W. P. A. an opportunity to live and to support their dependents, and our efforts at the same time should be centered upon the solution of this unemployment problem; of greater production in the United States whereby these men can secure employment in this increased production. The war hysteria which has been created and the appropriation of some $14,000,000,000 for national defense will naturally bring about the employment of many people and might give an apparent feeling of prosperity. A prosperity built upon war or on the preparation for war, is a false prosperity; there is nothing permanent about it. History teaches that the backwash after such a false prosperity leaves a condition worse than when this sort of prosperity began.

What we need is a real prosperity, not a false prosperity; a prosperity which gives every citizen an opportunity to have regular employment at regular American wages. A prosperity that will permit our citizens to live a free and independent life, free from all coercion and regimentation. Our people want, and are entitled to, real jobs with real wages and not a permanent continuance of relief-work jobs at starvation wages.

Willkie, Utility Magnate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS F. FORD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 19, 1940

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Mr. Speaker, Wendell Willkie was recently made a member of the board of J. P. Morgan's First National Bank of New York, known as the bank of bankers. So far as I know, he still is on that board. He has been throughout his career a lawyer for special interests, a lobbyist for the Power Trust, a promoter of the type of big business that looks to stock-market manipulation and speculation for the enormous profits that are divided among the little clique at the top.

And yet we hear honest people saying that they may vote for Willkie because he has been and is a businessman who can be depended upon to persuade business to cooperate with the Government. The reverse is true: This utilities promoter can be depended upon, in all positions and at all times, to use his influence to force the Government to cooperate with business, even in the very activities that the great majority of American voters deplore and condemn. No one objects to honest business. Most of us object to exploitation and speculation by business. No one really mistakes a promoter for a business man, if he knows the facts.

LED FIGHT ON WHEELER-RAYBURN BILL

Wendell Willkie first came into national prominence in 1935, when the holding-company bill was being considered by Congress. This bill had for its purpose the stopping of the outrageous cheating of the public through the organization of giant holding companies. These companies made their enormous profits through the watering of stock and other dishonest practices. A holding company is a corporation which is organized principally to own securities issued by other corporations. In the utilities field holding companies were organized in the gay twenties through the purchase of small, independently owned electric companies, which were reorganized and recapitalized, at the public expense.

The Wheeler-Rayburn bill aimed to put a stop to the dishonesty, while leaving untouched holding companies that could show that they served a useful purpose. Never in the history of Congress has a bill been so maliciously attacked.

It was Willkie who led the fight against this bill. It was he and his coworkers who had an avalanche of telegrams and letters sent to Members of the House and the Senate. Many of the names signed to the telegrams were forged, being signed without their owners' knowledge or permission. The drive was overdone; the Members of Congress were not deluded by it. A majority stood pat and voted for the bill.

In 1927–28 we find Willkie in Washington lobbying against the Walsh resolution authorizing the Federal Trade Commission to investigate the utility industry.

In 1929 he moved to New York as general counsel of the Commonwealth & Southern. A few years later he became president of Commonwealth & Southern.

WILLKIE FRONT MAN FOR UTILITIES

He is not a businessman, not an industrialist. He has never produced anything. His career has been that of lobbyist, lawyer, and front man for the utilities, an outstanding leader in the use of those shady practices, that exploitation, that disregard for the public interest that has distinguished the large utilities.

He has always been on the promotion and public relations field, never on the operating or production field.

In 1929 Willkie was general counsel for the Commonwealth & Southern, a holding company created by J. P. Morgan & Co. in that year. First listed in May 1929, the stock soared in October to $24.75 and then fell to $10.

A Federal Power Commission report shows that the write-up by the Commonwealth & Southern of the valuation of the merged companies was $531,205,571.

Thus the investing public was defrauded by paying for a half billion dollars of water in the stock, and the consumers were defrauded by having the book valuation increased as a base for higher rates.

Willkie, the general counsel for the Commonwealth & Southern, approved of this; he expanded under the success of the manipulation; and doubtless wisecracked at the slick befooling of the public.

While Willkie was president of the Commonwealth & Southern, that company became a participating member of the committee of public-utility executives, organized in 1935 to lobby against the holding-company bill.

PARTICIPATED IN RAISING SLUSH FUND

This committee admitted spending $350,000 in opposing the bill. The Commonwealth & Southern was one of the three highest contributors. This money was gotten from the unwilling public which was forced to pay high rates for their light and power.

Willkie was the witness in opposition to the bill before the House Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Willkie is in reality a utilities tycoon who has consistently worked with the Morgan interests and who has consistently and successfully played the Wall Street game. He has personality, driving force, great cleverness. Planning as he did to try to steal the Republican nomination, as predicted by

the gentleman from Mississippi, Representative RANKIN, in a speech made May 23, 1939, he began a build-up that has never been equaled in American politics. Publicity men of highest ability were busy for weeks and even for months in the preconvention Willkie propaganda. Since the Republicans had no strong candidate for the nomination and since many of the leaders agreed that only Hoover had the experience and the understanding of foreign affairs essential to the Presidency at this time, Willkie had his big chance.

Quick to take advantage of the situation, and past master of the art of propaganda, he used every method that an ingenious mind backed with barrels of money could devise. Newspaper publicity, the formation of Willkie-for-President clubs through paid advertising, direct contacts with willing workers everywhere were the prelude. Prior to and during the Republican convention came the avalanche of letters and telegrams from seemingly unorganized citizens to the convention delegates. All urged that the convention abandon the candidates approved by the organization and vote for the young Lochinvar from Wall Street. The galleries are said to have been packed for the occasion. At any rate, the galleries responded to the excitement and the fireworks. So did the delegates. And thus Willkie was nominated and the Republican Party lost the slim chance it had of electing a President.

The real drive back of Willkie is from Wall Street. It is a drive for the control of government by the big corporations—banking, utility, industrial. It is, in reality, a Fascist system they are planning, though only a very few realize it.

WILLKIE'S ATTITUDE SMACKS OF FASCISM

However, Willkie some months ago in an unreported speech so vehemently praised the control by the big financial and industrial leaders that the word "fascism" passed from mouth to mouth.

He is clever. Yes; too clever. For instance, he said away back in 1933 to the Military Affairs Committee of the House that his company favored the program for the development of the Tennessee Valley; but—and here is the crux of the opposition—he opposed the building by the Government of transmission lines or distributing systems. Of course, the profit and the profiteering come from the distributing systems through the sale of power and light to the consumers and through stock manipulation.

And this is the kind of "business" Mr. Willkie and his Wall Street backers want and will have—if they can get it. They are making their last stand now. If they can befool the public into electing Wendell Willkie President, Wall Street will once more control the Government, and the public can once more be damned.

BOASTED OF $9,000,000 HOLD-UP

In the sale of the Tennessee Electric Power Co. properties, a subsidiary of the Commonwealth & Southern, the Tennessee Valley Authority, Willkie asked $100,000,000. The T. V. A. offered $55,000,000 but found it necessary to raise the offer to $70,000,000. Finally it was found impossible to negotiate on that basis and the price paid was $79,000,000. Willkie is said to have remarked that he had bilked the Government—that is, the people of the United States—out of $9,000,000 on that deal.

While all informed people deplored the hold-up we who have fought for the T. V. A. for many years realized that we must get rid of the destructive opposition of this Willkie corporation in order to develop the project for the benefit of the public.

The Federal Power Commission report shows that in 1929 the 25 largest electric utility holding companies had sold securities to the public having a nominal market value of $19,245,157,757. At that time the total capital of all electric and power companies, privately owned, was estimated at $12,000,000,000. In other words, 25 of the largest holding companies had sold securities at prices about 60 percent above the value of all such securities.

Now note that the market value of securities of the 25 leading companies had fallen from over $19,000,000,000 in 1929 to $2,879,000,000 in 1933, before the Roosevelt administration came into power. This loss of over $6,000,000,000 was largely sustained by trusting investors who were advised by banks controlled by the house of Morgan.

The fact is that all of Mr. Willkie's companies were doing more business and making more money in 1938 than in 1933.

These companies have been forced to adopt the Government plan of lowering rates and extending business. Nevertheless Willkie has lead the pack that has attacked the Democratic policies and charged that these have destroyed the utility market.

One of the Willkie companies, the Tennessee Electric Power Co., admitted in 1938 that its net earnings had increased 34 percent since 1933.

But—and here is the rub—the opportunity to promote and speculate, to issue and sell watered stock to the public, to profiteer through pyramiding holding companies, have been curtailed if not entirely stopped.

LIBERTY LEAGUER

Willkie is a member of the Liberty League, along with Al Smith, Lewis Douglas, and other representatives of special privilege, and has stood with the league in opposition to the New Deal.

Willkie refused to register the Commonwealth & Southern with the Securities and Exchange Commission, as required under the Holding Company Act, stating that he was protecting his stockholders' rights against "an unconstitutional process of control and destruction." After the Supreme Court declared the act constitutional Willkie continued to attack it. His main argument has been that this act prevented the utilities from expanding and investing, which the record proves to be untrue.

HIS LABOR RECORD

Willkie poses as a friend of labor. He recently stated that he favors collective bargaining. He did not state that the brand of bargaining he favors is that by company unions, organized by the company executives, to control the employees while nominally representing them. We must judge him by his record, not by the kind words he is now uttering in regard to labor.

These are harsh words. But they are based on the record of the Commonwealth & Southern under Willkie's leadership. This record is written in the history of the Commonwealth & Southern and is available to the public in the La Follette Civil Liberties Committee records and in those of the National Labor Relations Board. These records prove that Mr. Willkie's company has promoted company unions, used spies, has played with tear gas, and has flagrantly violated the workers' rights by fighting the free organization by its employees.

Here is what R. J. Johnson, president, United Auto Workers convention in St. Louis, who referred to Mr. Willkie as "a streamlined version of Herbert Hoover—slicker, more clever, and more charming, but underneath his sympathetic build-up there is still the mind and outlook of public-utilities manipulation and an enemy of labor."

Our Idiotic Monetary System That Is Costing the Taxpayers Over a Billion Dollars a Year

---

REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 19, 1940

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, now is the time to change our monetary system. If it is not changed, a few large banks will receive more money each year by reason of our national-defense and preparedness program than a million men who serve in the ranks will receive. The money that these few banks will receive will be for no service whatsoever. It will

be a bonus or a subsidy because they are now using, and will continue to use if the law is not changed, the credit of this Nation absolutely free of charge. It is not right for the Government of the United States to pay interest to these few big banks for the purpose of using the Government's own credit. Any system such as our own, which requires the people to pay more than a billion dollars a year in taxes to be paid in interest for the use of the Government's own credit is idiotic and should be changed.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS ON THE PUBLIC DEBT AND MONEY

1. Question. What is the amount of the gross public debt?

Answer. At the beginning of September 1940 the gross public debt was $43,905,240,096.48. On the 14th day of September, it has increased $6,000,000.

2. Question. How much gold does the United States own?

Answer. As of September 14, 1940, the United States had in its possession $21,050,970,488.76 in gold, being 601,443,513.8 ounces. It is enough, which if properly used, to eventually pay our entire national debt and finance our national defense and preparedness program.

3. Question. Where is this gold located?

Answer. Seven billion one hundred and twenty-nine million nine hundred and fifty thousand six hundred and fifty-five dollars and twenty-five cents of refined gold has been transferred to the Fort Knox bullion depository. Postal fees amounting to $1,283,391 have been imposed for transporting this gold by mail to Fort Knox. The remainder of the gold is in charge of the Federal Reserve bank in New York and other depositories and assay offices for the Government.

4. Question. Does the United States Government or the Federal Reserve banks have title to this gold?

Answer. All the right, title, and interest in and to all gold in the United States is in the United States Government, and no part of it is owned by a Federal Reserve bank. This answer is confirmed in the Federal Reserve Bulletin for September 1940, page 939. A law passed by Congress is very plain on this subject and there can be no doubt about the Government owning the gold and having complete title to it. Any statement to the contrary cannot be true.

5. Question. Where does the Government get the money with which to buy the gold?

Answer. The Treasury usually has a large amount in the general fund which is subject to check. On September 13, 1940, the Government had on deposit in the 12 Federal Reserve banks $795,719,152.21. In addition, the Government had in special depositories throughout the country over $700,000,000, and in all, on this date, the Government had in its general fund more than two and one-half billion dollars. If the Government purchases a million dollars worth of gold, the Treasury gives a check on the general fund for a million dollars to pay for the gold. This general fund is built up by credits originating in the receipt of taxes, fees, fines, and so forth, and from the sale of Government obligations.

6. Question. How does the Treasury subsequently recover what it has paid for the gold?

Answer. The Treasury issues and deposits gold certificates with the Federal Reserve banks and receives credit therefor in its balance on the Federal Reserve banks' books. This credit replenishes the Treasury's balance and offsets the debit occasioned by the gold's purchase.

7. Question. What was meant by sterilizing gold?

Answer. At one time, it was the policy of the Treasury to pay for gold, but not issue gold certificates to get its money back, or to get credit from the Federal Reserve banks for the amount that had been paid for the gold. This was called sterilizing the gold. This caused the national debt to increase by the amount of the gold purchases and did not result in increasing the banks reserves. This policy was abandoned some time ago and now when gold is purchased, gold certificates are immediately issued and turned over to the Federal Reserve banks where proper credit is given to the Government for the amount of the gold purchases.

8. Question. How is silver purchased?

Answer. It is purchased in practically the same way as gold. When the Treasury buys the silver, it issues silver certificates for which it receives credit on the books of the Federal Reserve banks.

9. Question. How much silver does the Government own?

Answer. On September 13, 1940, the Government owned 1,059,585,993.2 ounces of silver, which was carried on the books of the Treasury as being worth $1,369,969,769. In addition, the Treasury held for the Government 384,639,233.3 ounces of silver dollars, which were worth $497,311,319, or a total of $1,867,281,088.

10. Question. Suppose one in this country produces gold; how does he obtain United States money for it?

Answer. Gold is usually produced by a mining company and it is delivered to the nearest mint or United States Assay Office, where United States money is obtained for it.

11. Question. How is gold purchased by our Government from abroad?

Answer. Practically all of it is sold by foreign treasuries or central banks to our Government. Whether the gold is purchased from the domestic producers or from foreign governments, the effect, eventually, if not immediately, is an increase in bank reserves and bank deposits.

12. Question. If gold were coined and permitted to go into circulation, would it be generally used by the people?

Answer. Any answer to this question will almost be a guess. However, we know that people generally prefer to use bills or paper currency and deposits in banks which are transferable by check instead of either gold or silver. Therefore, if the people were permitted to get gold any time they wanted it, only a relatively small amount would likely remain in circulation. It would be deposited in the banks and would finally find its way back to the Federal Reserve banks or to the United States Treasury.

13. Question. How much money is in circulation that has been issued by the 12 Federal Reserve banks?

Answer. $7,883,000,000 at the end of July this year.

14. Question. What did this money consist of? What kind of money was it?

Answer. It consisted of $66,000,000 in gold certificates; $46,000,000 in silver dollars; $1,565,000,000 in silver certificates; $1,000,000 in Treasury notes of 1890; $386,000,000 in subsidiary coin, such as dimes, quarters, and half dollars; $172,000,000 in minor coin, such as pennies and nickels; $249,000,000 in United States notes; $5,212,000,000 in Federal Reserve notes; $22,000,000 in Federal Reserve bank notes; and $164,000,000 in national bank notes.

15. Question. Is all this money used by the people; in other words, is it in actual active circulation?

Answer. We know that the gold certificates are not in circulation, and it is very doubtful that any of the Treasury notes of 1890 or the Federal Reserve bank notes are in circulation, as they are being taken out of circulation as they are turned in to a bank. The same applies to the national bank notes. Eventually, practically all of our money will be Federal Reserve notes if our system is not changed. The total amount of money in circulation presumes that all the money that has ever been issued by our Government is still in circulation. The fact is that much of it has been destroyed by fires. Some of it has been buried in the ground or stored in lockboxes and other safe places for future use; some of it has been sent to, and remains in, foreign countries; some of it has gone down in shipwrecks; and much of it lost or destroyed in other ways.

16. Question. How much money is supposed to be on deposit in the banks of the country?

Answer. As of March 26, 1940, the 15,000 banks of the country were supposed to have had on deposit $59,017,000,000.

17. Question. How is it possible for the banks to have on deposit $59,000,000,000 when the Government only has outstanding at this time less than $8,000,000,000?

Answer. The difference of $51,000,000,000 is bookkeeping money, sometimes referred to as fictitious money, which is created by our banking system. It is not real but serves the purpose of money.

18. Question. How is money created by a bank?

Answer. Simply by a bookkeeping transaction. A customer gives a note to the bank. The bank gives the customer a deposit slip which shows that he has on deposit at that bank the amount of the note. Under our system, strange but true, someone must go into debt in order for our country to have a sufficient circulating medium with which to transact the business of the country. Our monetary system is based on debt. If all debts were paid, we would not have money to do the business of the country.

19. Question. Suppose all the depositors should demand their money at once, how would the banks get the money with which to pay their depositors?

Answer. The local bank can put up collateral that it has, and especially United States Government securities, which it owns, with the Federal Reserve bank in the district in which the local bank is located and obtain Federal Reserve notes, 100 cents on the dollar. In this way it would be possible for the local banks to pay the local depositors 100 cents on the dollar by obtaining Federal Reserve notes for that purpose.

20. Question. What are Federal Reserve notes and by what authority are they issued?

Answer. Practically all the paper currency that is used is Federal Reserve notes, except the silver certificates in the smaller denominations. A Federal Reserve note is issued by a Federal Reserve bank by virtue of authority that has been granted by Congress.

21. Question. Is a Federal Reserve note an obligation of the Federal Reserve bank issuing it?

Answer. No; a Federal Reserve note is not an obligation of a Federal Reserve bank. It is an obligation of the United States Government. The paper note says on its face that "The United States of America Will Pay to the Bearer on Demand _____ Dollars." It is not a promise of a Federal Reserve bank to pay. It is a promise of the United States Government to pay. It is the same as a blanket mortgage on all the property of all the people in this Nation.

22. Question. Is the Federal Reserve bank issuing this blanket mortgage on the property of all the people owned by the Government of the United States?

Answer. No, part of its stock is owned by the Government or by the people. It is owned solely by the private banks and their investments in the system is practically nil when compared with the enormous business transacted on the credit of the Government.

23. Question. Do you mean to say that the private banks of the country use the nation's credit at will in this way?

Answer. Yes, that is true and without limitation, except such limitations as are imposed by the Federal Reserve Board and by law, which still leaves them enormous powers.

24. Question. Do private banks pay the Government for the use of this great privilege?

Answer. No, the private banks do not pay the Government anything for the use of this privilege. They use the Government's credit free of charge. They only pay the cost of printing the bills which is from 27 cents to 30 cents a $1,000.

25. Question. Is it right for the private banks to use the Government's credit free of charge?

Answer. It can be justified for private transactions, but to my mind no one can justify the Government itself paying the banks interest for the use of its own credit. The local bank is a very necessary, desirable, and helpful institution, and should be encouraged, but not to the extent of a Government subsidy.

26. Question. Suppose a bank in Dallas, Tex., purchases a million dollars in Government bonds from the United States Government, does it actually deliver to the Treasury $1,000,000 in cash?

Answer. No; the Dallas bank gives the Treasury credit for the $1,000,000 and receives $1,000,000 in United States bonds. The United States Treasury issues checks on the Dallas bank to pay the postmaster, the city and rural carriers, all of the Federal officials residing in that area, and such debts as are owed by the Government in that locality. The people receiving these checks do not demand the money on them. They keep the amount on deposit, either with that bank or some other bank in that area, which is the same as keeping it on deposit with that particular bank.

27. Question. Suppose that bank should be in need of money; how could it obtain money on the Government bonds that it had purchased?

Answer. By merely delivering the bonds to the Dallas Federal Reserve Bank. The Dallas Federal Reserve Bank would require the local bank to pay 1-percent interest on the Federal Reserve notes that it had advanced on the Government bonds, but if the Government bonds draw 3-percent interest, the local bank would be privileged to collect the difference of 2 percent. That is the way it works, but in practice there are very few such loans. They are not necessary.

28. Question. How many Federal Reserve banks are there in the United States that enjoy this great privilege?

Answer. Twelve. They are located at Boston, New York, Philadelphia, Cleveland, Richmond, Atlanta, Chicago, St. Louis, Minneapolis, Kansas City, Dallas, and San Francisco. They serve their respective areas.

29. Question. Can the people or private corporations do business with these 12 banks or either of them?

Answer. No. Only the private banks that are privately owned and are members of the System.

30. Question. Do the 12 Federal Reserve banks buy United States Government obligations?

Answer. Yes. The 12 banks now own two and one-half billion dollars in United States Government securities. This does not include the billions of dollars of Government securities held by member banks.

31. Question. What did these banks pay for these Government securities?

Answer. They paid Federal Reserve notes, which are obligations of the United States Government.

32. Question. When a Federal Reserve bank buys a Government obligation and pays for it with another Government obligation, does the Government continue to pay interest on the Government obligation purchased?

Answer. Yes. Although it was purchased with Federal Reserve notes, which are obligations of this Government, the Government continues to pay the Federal Reserve banks interest on the bonds that they so purchased.

33. Question. What is the present interest-bearing debt of the United States Government?

Answer. It is more than $43,000,000,000.

34. Question. How much interest is paid by the Government on this debt each year?

Answer. Much more than a thousand million dollars a year.

35. Question. When additional bonds are issued to carry on our national-defense program, will they be interest bearing, too?

Answer. If our present system is not changed, the Treasury will continue to issue and sell to the banks interest-bearing obligations of the United States Government, or Government bonds. If the interest rate is 2 percent, the American people will have to pay $20,000,000 a year interest on every billion dollars that is borrowed until it is paid back. If the interest rate is 3 percent, the people will have to pay $30,000,000 a year on every billion dollars borrowed.

36. Question. What were the views of the famous Thomas A. Edison on this question?

Answer. About 20 years ago Mr. Thomas A. Edison was inspecting Muscle Shoals. He remarked that the Government should operate that great project in the interest of the people. He was asked if he favored the Government borrowing the $30,000,000 necessary to make repairs. His answer substantially was: "No; why should the Government borrow its own credit? If it issues tax-exempt interest-bearing bonds and sells the bonds to Wall Street bankers to get the money, by the time the bonds are paid the bankers will have collected as much in interest as the Government received on the bonds. In other words, the bankers who will not furnish an ounce of material or a lick of labor will get as much out of it as the men who do the work and furnish the material." Mr. Edison also said at the same time: "Any government that can issue a dollar bond, interest bearing, that is good can issue a dollar bill, non-interest-bearing, that is good; the only difference is the bill is easier to redeem because it does not draw interest." No one can answer Mr. Edison's argument. This same argument can consistently be made on our preparedness program.

37. Question. Do those in charge of the Federal Reserve Banking System dispute what you have said about banks creating money?

Answer. No. Chairman Marriner S. Eccles, the top authority of the Federal Reserve Board here in Washington, testified before the Banking and Currency Committee of the House during the hearings on the Banking Act of 1935, on private banks creating deposits and thereby becoming virtually private individual mints, as follows:

> In purchasing offerings of Government bonds, the banking system as a whole creates new money or bank deposits. When the banks buy a billion dollars of Government bonds as they are offered—and you have to consider the banking system as a whole, as a unit—the banks credit the deposit account of the Treasury with a billion dollars. They debit their Government-bond account a billion dollars, or they actually create, by a bookkeeping entry, a billion dollars.

By a sort of magic the money is created.

In like manner, as the banks increase their deposits or create new money through the purchase of Government bonds, the banks also create new money—increase their deposits—by buying notes and other commercial paper from their customers.

IMBECILIC SYSTEM

I repeat that it is not right for the Government to pay the private banks of the country a bonus of a billion dollars a year in order to obtain the funds to carry on our preparedness and national-defense program. It is not right.

Now is the time to change this idiotic, imbecilic system that requires the Government to pay such enormous sums of money for the use of its own credit. We should no longer permit the abuse of the Government's credit in any such manner.

A LAW WITH 100 WORDS CAN MAKE THE CHANGE

This Congress can pass a law of 100 words, which would at the same time carry out a constitutional mandate to Congress, that would entirely change this system and save the people from $1,000,000,000 to $2,000,000,000 a year on interest that they are now being required to pay, and will soon be required to pay, for the use of their Government's own credit.

It is the duty of Congress to make this change.

CONSTITUTIONAL MANDATE

The framers of the United States Constitution, in article I, section 8, very wisely said:

> Congress shall have the power to coin money and regulate the value thereof.

This provision of the Constitution is mandatory. All Members of Congress are sworn to uphold the Constitution. Why has this provision never been carried out? The answer is simple. In the early days of our national existence the people were deceived into believing that the subject of money was so mysterious and intricate that only a few of the financiers understood the subject, and therefore the great privilege of issuing and distributing money should be farmed out to them. This was done, and it has never been changed, except to give them more power and authority. The strange part of it all is that the ones who are the beneficiaries of this great privilege are not even charged with the duty of furnishing the people a sufficient circulating medium.

What Are We Doing About Narcotics?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 19, 1940

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Speaker, at the meeting of the Opium Information Committee of the League of Nations, in June 1939, a resolution was passed which, in effect, endorsed the Coffee narcotics investigation resolution, in that it called on the nations of the world to make an investigation of the legal and economic aspects of the narcotics question.

The resolution was introduced by the representative from the Netherlands, who, it was authoritatively announced, was led to take action by the statements as to conditions made in a book in which my argument was reproduced from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It is clear, therefore, that such an investigation as the resolution calls for has international approval.

WHY SHOULD THERE BE OPPOSITION TO THE COFFEE NARCOTICS INVESTIGATION RESOLUTION?

The American Commissioner of Narcotics naturally enough opposes such an investigation. He argued before the Geneva committee that the narcotic addict is a criminal, not a sick man, and should be treated as a criminal. The European sponsors of the investigation replied that the United States Government obviously did not support this view, since it had built hospitals—at Lexington, Ky., and Fort Worth, Tex.—for the treatment of narcotic addicts.

The Commissioner, however, holds persistently to his view in opposition to all recognized medical authorities and to the opinions of humanitarians in general. He has repeatedly characterized the narcotic addict as the major criminal of America.

In support of this strange claim, the Commissioner advances a curious argument. He cites fingerprint records which show more recidivists among narcotic-law violators than among any other type of criminals. This, in his view, establishes the narcotic addict as the major criminal of the country. If you accept this reasoning, the same table reveals vagrancy as the second major crime, with prostitution, drunkenness, and suspicion bracketed in the same category; while by the same standard or test such crimes as rape, other sex offenses, arson, and criminal homicide are of minor significance—homicide, for example, showing only 24.1 percent of recidivist fingerprints, against 63.2 percent of narcotic-law violators.

TELL THE TRUTH ABOUT ADDICTS

The valid interpretation of the table is not that the narcotic-law violator is a major criminal, in any proper sense of the word—the contrary being the fact accepted by all competent criminologists—but that addicts are arrested again and again for purchasing the drug that their infirmity makes essential to their well-being; and that dope peddlers violate the statutes with every sale. The crimes, other than the purchase of drugs, committed by addicts are, with very rare exceptions, minor thefts, the forgery of prescriptions, and any and every type of petty peculation to secure money for the purchase of the—to them—all-essential drug.

Even so, the relation of all narcotic drug law offenses to other offenses against State laws and municipal ordinances is shown in true light—in contrast with the misleading fingerprint table—on another page of the Report of the Narcotics Bureau, page 55, Report for 1939, where it is stated that—

> The general relationship of narcotic drug law violations to the general crime picture in the United States is approximately by the following figures:
>
> Arrests for all offenses, 554,376; of which narcotic drug offenses numbered 4,164.

A COMPARISON OF THE DIFFERENT CRIMES COMMITTED

That is to say, 4,164 narcotic law offenses against more than half a million offenses of other types; less than one case in a hundred. Otherwise stated, 99 arrests for all manner of crimes, from drunken driving, to rape, arson, and murder, for every single arrest for the "major" crime of selling or buying a few grains of a narcotic drug.

We must at least commend the candor that impelled the Commissioner to publish the refutation of his own absurd fingerprint deductions. Unfortunately, many people hear of the farcical "major criminal" pronouncement, where one sees or hears of the undramatic factual data which show narcotic-law violations in true perspective—as of almost negligible importance in the general crime picture.

The oft-cited statistics showing more than 2,000—2,275 in 1938—narcotics prisoners in Federal prisons are

altogether misleading, insofar as they are presented or interpreted as suggesting that the use of narcotic drugs conduces directly to the arousing of antisocial instincts and the commission of crime.

PHASES OF NARCOTIC ADDICTION

The truth is that narcotic drugs—and in particular opium and its derivatives, the ones chiefly involved—are, almost by definition, sedatives. In Dr. Kolb's words, they tend to produce "mental and physical lethargy." It has been cogently, if facetiously, suggested that one way to diminish crime would be to induce opium addiction in habitual criminals. Note that Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, in his book Persons in Hiding, finds no occasion to name any narcotic addict among the major criminals whose records he presents.

The narcotics prisoners in the Federal prisons are of two types: (1) smugglers and dope peddlers, most of whom are not drug addicts; (2) addicts who patronized the dope peddler because they had no other possible source of supply or who committed petty thefts to secure money to pay for the drug.

It cannot be too often repeated that there were no narcotics prisoners in Federal prisons until the narcotics authorities misinterpreted the Harrison Act; nor were there any dope smugglers or peddlers. There would be none now if the law were not persistently misread by the narcotics authorities.

TRUTH ABOUT REDUCTION OF NARCOTIC ADDICTION

Reference should be made to another pronouncement of the Narcotics Bureau that is equally misleading and even more ridiculous. This is the assertion that the number of drug addicts in this country has been reduced to an astonishing degree in the past 15 years or so.

This appraisal might be dismissed with the statement that no one else who is entitled to an opinion on the subject pretends to have any accurate knowledge as to how many addicts there were 15 years ago or how many there are now. Perhaps it is worth while, however, to examine the Commissioner's claims in brief detail, because he appears to regard the alleged reduction in the number of addicts as giving strong support to the methods of operation of his Bureau, which we have criticized—and which we continue to criticize.

It happens that two official reports bearing directly on the subject are available: One expressing the opinion of perhaps the foremost authority; the other giving the result of an actual canvas of the addict population of the State of Washington, made officially by another expert who has devoted many years to the study of drug addiction.

The first-mentioned report is in the form of a letter dated February 19, 1940, signed by Dr. Lawrence Kolb, Assistant Surgeon General, Division of Mental Hygiene, of the Public Health Service.

DR. KOLB GIVES HIS OPINION

In this letter, Dr. Kolb quotes the estimate of the Bureau of Narcotics, that there are 1.53 addicts per 10,000 of the population (or about 20,000 addicts all told), and adds that, whereas no survey available is absolutely reliable, "from the information we do have, I am inclined to believe that we still have at least 100,000 addicts to the various opium preparations and cocaine." That would be, at least five times the number estimated by the Narcotics Bureau.

Please note the "at least." Recall, then, that Dr. Kolb's well-known estimate of 1924, which placed the number of opium and cocaine addicts in the country at from 110,000 to 150,000, is the oft-cited basis of official estimates of the addict census of 15 years ago. It is obvious that the Bureau's claim of an 85-percent reduction in addict population in that period has no standing in the eyes of the physician who, because of his long familiarity with the subject and his recent experience in charge of the Federal Narcotic Hospital at Lexington, Ky., may be regarded as the foremost authority in this particular field.

STATISTICS ON NARCOTIC ADDICTION IN THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

Our second official report, dealing with addiction in the State of Washington, was made by Mr. Everett G. Hoffman, recently official State investigator, who for many years has been closely associated with the American White Cross Association on Drug Addictions. Mr. Hoffman's report gives names and addresses of about 3,500 drug addicts in the State of Washington who are known to the police officials or to the White Cross authorities. We may fairly assume that there are many other addicts whose names were not listed; but we need not go beyond the actual list for our present purpose—which is, to compare this actual record with the theoretical estimate of the Bureau of Narcotics.

Fortunately for our purpose, it happens that the Bureau, in its report for 1938, lists the 15 States whose addict population "compiled after thorough investigation of every known source of information," furnished the basis for their estimate of the total addict census. Among these States is Washington, which is credited with only 250 addicts, whereas Mr. Hoffman's official report gives names and residences of 3,500, or 14 times the number estimated by the Bureau.

If we assume that the Bureau's estimate of the addict population of the other States was correspondingly defective, the 2,000 addicts, multiplied by 14, become 280,000.

Rather curiously, this estimate of 280,000 is precisely the figure obtained if we assume—as is altogether probable—that the addict population of Washington is just about the same, proportionately, as that of other States; for Washington has about one-eightieth of the total population of the United States, and if we multiply Mr. Hoffman's 3,500 by 80, we have 280,000; the same number arrived at, as we have just seen, by a different channel of reasoning.

It would appear, then, that, so far as the evidence goes, the addict population, instead of being reduced by 80 percent since 1924, has advanced by more than 100 percent—taking the mean of Dr. Kolb's figures for 1924 as the basis; Dr. Kolb's estimate being, in fact, the one cited by the Bureau of Narcotics as basis for its claim of 80-percent reduction.

One may surmise that what really happened in the office of the Commissioner was the chance shifting of a decimal point—changing a conservative estimate of 200,000 addicts to 20,000. Why the Commissioner failed to note the error, and so was led to make his ridiculous statement—spread broadcast as a news item, and even cited by periodicals that pride themselves on accurate presentation of current events—would perhaps be more difficult to explain. Suffice it that this flagrant misrepresentation is of a piece with other pronouncements—as to criminality of addicts, cures of addicts, and so forth—that have come from the Bureau.

WHAT OF THE CURABILITY OF ADDICTS?

As to the matter of the curability of addicts, and false reports as to results attained, something more should be said since this is pertinent to the question of reliability of the Bureau of Narcotics, though not otherwise a subject with which this legislative body has any direct concern.

FEDERAL NARCOTIC TREATMENT HOSPITALS

The reports of the Bureau of Narcotics point with satisfaction to the achievements of the unique State hospital for the treatment of narcotic addicts, at Spadra, Calif., and the Federal hospital, at Lexington, Ky. The impression is given that highly satisfactory results have been attained at Spadra, and that about 34 percent of permanent cures have been effected at Lexington.

The facts are that the institution at Spadra, so far as its main purpose of curing addiction is concerned, is officially conceded to have been an almost complete failure. So large a proportion of the addicts that came before the courts were found to be incurable that the institution was almost never filled to capacity; and the results attained even with the supposedly curable cases, those of recent origin only, were so meager and discouraging that the institution has ceased to be conducted as a narcotics hospital exclusively, and has been officially opened to other types of patients.

THE LEXINGTON (KY.) HOSPITAL

The Federal Hospital at Lexington is magnificently equipped, and conducted by physicians of the finest type and

the most ample qualifications, headed until recently by Dr. Lawrence Kolb, whose authoritative work in this field was previously referred to. But the results achieved, as recorded by Dr. Kolb, in the Annual Report of the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939, are very different indeed from what the references of the Commissioner of Narcotics—who has no official connection with the institution—would imply.

From Dr. Kolb's report we learn that, of the 1,110 prisoner-patients discharged during the year, no fewer than 412 were classed as "cured." But it is instantly made clear that this only means that these patients were not taking drugs when discharged—somewhat as a duck kept in a dry pen is not swimming. And, qualifying the word "cured", we find the curious term "prognosis good", "prognosis guarded", "prognosis poor", and "prognosis very poor."

PHASES OF PROGNOSIS

The word "prognosis", as used by physicians, means, of course, "prospect" or "probability"—good or bad—of outcome of an illness. "Prognosis good": the patient will probably recover. "Prognosis bad": the patient will probably die. But in the present case the usage of the word is altogether exceptional, not to say contradictory. In effect, it implies that the word "cured" is not meant to be taken at face value, because in every case there is a question as to whether the "cured" patient is permanently freed from the drug "habit"—whether the duck, liberated from the pen, may not return to the water.

So great is the doubt in the mind of the hospital physicians that we find only 31 patients among the 412 discharged or conditionally released as cured who are listed as of "good prognosis," which is to say that there is reason to hope that these 31 patients will not return to the use of narcotics. In a second group of 124 probationers, there are 24 of these hope-inspiring cases. A third group of 279 voluntaries—not prisoners—shows 9 hopefuls.

So we have, all told, among the 1,110, a list of 64 patients who, having been forcibly deprived of narcotics for the term of their incarceration, are hoped to be permanently cured. All the others, to the number of 1,037, are classed as of "guarded prognosis" at best—meaning "we do not expect them to make good"—to "prognosis very poor"—meaning "we know they will soon be back on the drug."

Otherwise stated, there are no cases discharged from the hospital—after having all the advantages that the most scientific treatment known can give—who are unequivocally cured, in the proper sense of that word; that is, made well and insured against recurrence of their infirmity; and only a little over one-half of 1 percent—0.57 percent—of those discharged are regarded as having a really good chance of permanent recovery.

Six-tenths of 1 percent is rather different from 34 percent, is it not? Well, that represents the difference between the optimistic appraisal of the layman who conducts the Bureau of Narcotics and the appraisal of the physicians of the United States Public Health Service, who expertly conduct the splendid hospital at Lexington, as to the curability of the disease, narcotic addiction.

Let me repeat that this legislative body has no direct concern with the question of curability of disease to which we have just adverted. What does concern us, however, is the fact that the United States Government in establishing the hospital at Lexington, and a second one at Fort Worth, Tex., as authorized by action of the Congress, recognizes narcotic addiction as a disease, subject to medical treatment. It is perhaps immaterial, but not without interest, that the Supreme Court has explicitly voiced the same view; whereas the Commissioner of Narcotics holds stubbornly to the view that the addict is not a sick man, but a criminal, and by his rulings makes it impossible for the medical profession outside institutions to offer treatment or aid to victims of the officially recognized malady.

NARCOTIC ADDICTION IS A DISEASE TO BE TREATED; NOT A CRIME TO BE EXPIATED BY IMPRISONMENT

That, I say, is the salient fact which is of interest and concern to this legislative body. That anomaly is my excuse for introducing this bill. Questions of the number of addicts, the criminality of addicts, the curability of addicts, are matters for the statistician, the Department of Justice, the medical profession. But the matter of flouting Federal law—the supplanting of statutes enacted by the Congress with rulings of a minor Bureau of the Treasury Department—is something of vital concern.

That the edicts of one man should take precedence over congressional enactments and clear decisions of the Supreme Court is an anomaly worthy of attention.

But does such an anomaly obtain? I answer, unqualifiedly, yes. That is the actual situation which has obtained throughout the 10 years of the existence of the Bureau of Narcotics. One man, the Commissioner in charge of that Bureau, has persistently interpreted the Harrison Special Tax Act, the statute governing the distribution of narcotic drugs, in a way clearly at variance with the terms of the act itself, and in defiance of the interpretation of the Supreme Court of the United States.

THE HARRISON NARCOTIC ACT IS ERRONEOUSLY ADMINISTERED

The Harrison Act provides in set terms that there shall be no interference with the prescribing or distribution of narcotic drugs by physicians to their patients in the course of their professional practice.

The Supreme Court has declared—Linder case decision, unanimous, 1925—that:

> The Harrison Act makes no mention of narcotic addicts or their medical treatment. They are diseased, and proper subjects for such treatment.

Another decision— Nigro case, 1928—declares that the Harrison Act is a tax measure or it is no law at all.

The Linder decision was cited and quoted in the Butler Mills decision of 1936 to the effect that the Federal Government has no control over the practice of a profession.

Let it be recalled that the Linder case decision, thus cited as basic law, was rendered—unanimously—in reversing a Federal court conviction of a physician for alleged violation of the Harrison Act—the alleged crime consisting in the dispensing to an addict patient of tablets of narcotic drugs—morphine and cocaine.

The Supreme Court decision explicitly affirmed the right of a physician to treat the narcotic-addict patient—"they are diseased and proper subjects for medical treatment"—at the same time declaring that Federal law has no control over the practice of medicine—this being solely a State function—and that if it were assumed that the Harrison Act was designed to exercise such control the act would be invalid and could not be enforced.

THE MEDICAL PROFESSION MENACED

No language could be more unequivocal. Yet the narcotics authorities—the Assistant Prohibition Commissioner, followed by the Commissioner of Narcotics—have persistently flouted these decisions, and, in the name of law, controlled the practice of medicine, as to the administration of narcotic medicines, so effectively that today no physician who has any regard for his own safety dares to accept a narcotics addict as a patient or to attempt to treat the malady for the treatment of which the United States Government has established the hospitals already referred to.

Incidentally, it may be noted that the two Government hospitals have a capacity of about 2,000 patients—1 in 50 of the addict population by Dr. Kolb's minimum estimate. Since a year is a minimum period for institution treatment, 50 years would be required to handle the present coterie of addicts, even if cures were 100 percent instead of a fraction of 1 percent. The province of these hospitals is to make scientific study of the disease narcotoxia—drug addiction—and to make results known to the medical profession, in whose hands, in the nature of the case, the treatment and attempted cure of this malady must rest.

This function of the Federal hospitals—commonly referred to as narcotic farm hospitals—is explicitly recognized in the terms of the congressional act—Porter bill, 1928—which provided for their establishment.

But of what avail is this provision if the medical profession is denied the right to receive narcotic addicts as patients and

treat them by the only known method—reduction and substitution—that gives any hope of success?

THE STATUS OF PHYSICIANS AND NARCOTIC ADDICTS

There was a time when physicians were permitted to treat the victims of narcotics-addiction disease just as they treated the victims of tuberculosis, syphilis, diabetes, or any other malady. But for 20 years this right has been absolutely denied the medical profession—not by law but by bureaucratic edict; with the result that the present generation of physicians has, for the most part, no practical knowledge of the malady and no opportunity to acquire such knowledge.

During the 10-year regime of the Commissioner of Narcotics upward of 10,000 physicians, legally qualified to practice their profession, have been "reported for criminal violation" of the Harrison Act, their crime being the prescribing or administration of the most indispensable of all medicinal agents to persons suffering from a malady for which the Federal Government provides hospitals, and which the Supreme Court declares a proper subject for medical attention.

A large proportion of the physicians thus arraigned have been persuaded to purchase immunity from prosecution, though charged with a felony; but upward of 1,000 have been indicted, haled to court, and prosecuted with all the cunning that years of experience have developed for the narcotics authorities and made available for United States attorneys, who gain credit and prestige directly in proportion to their record of convictions attained.

CERTAIN DOCTORS SINGLED OUT

So helpless have been the arraigned physicians—and so ignorant of the law and of Supreme Court decisions their lawyers—that conviction has been almost a foregone conclusion, for all physicians who were foolish enough to decline to be legally blackmailed—for the law permits the farcical tribute-paying. And the mandatory penalty provided by law is either fine, up to $2,000 on each count, or imprisonment, up to 5 years, or both.

I could name you a physician of my State who is today serving a 9-year sentence in a Federal penitentiary—coupled with a $10,000 fine; whose crime was the administration of hypodermic injections to two patients in his office, in precise accordance with the earlier decision of a Federal judge that any person who came to a physician's office for treatment is ipso facto, a patient, and that a physician is entitled to treat a narcotic addict, according to his own best judgment, precisely as he treats any other patient.

Just what influenced the Federal judge who made the decision just quoted, to reverse himself subsequently, sustain a grotesque jury verdict, and pronounce the incredible sentence of $10,000 fine and 9 years imprisonment—for doing what the jurist had declared legally permissible—just what led to this volte face is a question that might well be given consideration in the course of the congressional inquiry which I am advocating.

THE CASE OF THE LOS ANGELES CLINIC

Another subject that I wish to propose in the same connection is the cause celebre which the Commissioner of Narcotics is quoted as declaring to be the most important case that ever came before the Federal narcotics authorities, namely, the case against a very distinguished physician of Los Angeles, the purpose of which was to close the narcotics clinic conducted at the Los Angeles County Hospital, under auspices of the county medical association and the local board of health.

I shall not claim time here to give any details of this celebrated case. Let me say merely that the trial lasted 6 weeks—followed by 7 weeks of further consideration—and resulted in the most incredible verdict perhaps ever rendered in a court of alleged justice; a verdict pronouncing a distinguished psychiatrist guilty of violation of the Harrison Act, when his sole act in connection with the case was the examination in his office of a patient sent him in consultation.

The specific count on which he was convicted charged the writing of a certain prescription. Yet the jury that rendered the verdict had in their hands the prescription in question, signed by another physician, and it had been stipulated by the prosecution in the course of the trial that this prescription had never been seen or heard of by the clinic physician until it appeared in court; it also stipulated that this accused physician had neither prescribed nor administered any treatment whatsoever in connection with the case.

Such a verdict seems incredible. But even more incredible is the fact that the Federal judge sustained the verdict after 7 weeks of debate, though he himself had declared in open court at the moment the verdict was presented that it was of very doubtful legality.

The judge had previously declared in court, but not before the jury, at the close of the presentation of evidence that no case had been made out against the clinic physician; yet he later effectively charged the jury to convict. He refused a mistrial when the prosecuting Federal attorney caused publication of false statements issuing from the Bureau of Narcotics in a newspaper—scareheaded across the front page—that came into the hands of the jurors. And he subsequently connived at delay in filing of appeal papers, in contravention of rules of the Supreme Court, and thus prevented the appellate division from reviewing the case.

This is but the barest outline of the misconduct of a case designed to overthrow a benevolent and beneficent clinic, the closing of which would, of necessity, throw a group of patients back into the hands of the dope peddlers and restore the illicit traffic worth millions of dollars to the racketeers.

In concluding this discussion, I would call attention to the charges made in the earlier discussion—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 28, 1938—where it was stated that the Commissioner of Narcotics is the costliest man in the world, and that the narcotics racket, unconsciously encouraged by his attitude, costs the country at least a billion dollars a year.

THERE'S NEED FOR AN INVESTIGATION

The present discussion merely presents other aspects of the same problem, leaving many salient aspects unnoticed. But enough has been said to make it clear, I hope, that the bill as presented does not contemplate a mere investigation of the number of drug addicts; nor such puerilities as the question of the addict's medical status. What it does contemplate is an investigation of the conduct of the Commissioner of Narcotics; his alleged disregard of statutes and Supreme Court decisions; his relation to the illegal arraignment of physicians, on the one hand, and to the colossal narcotics racket, on the other; in a word, the investigation of the origin, development, and continuance of a billion-dollar racket, which would disappear almost overnight if the Federal narcotic laws were permitted to function as they were designed to function, and as the Supreme Court declares they should function.

Lest the validity of the closing statement—that the racket would disappear if the law were permitted to function—be questioned, let me ask a simple question: Would there be any market for illicit drugs if the drug addict were permitted to receive what he needs, legitimately, under proper limitations, and at negligible cost?

END THIS RACKET NOW

The question answers itself. If, then, the medical profession were permitted to treat drug addiction—as syphilis, diabetes, tuberculosis, and the rest are treated—no single addict would go to a dope peddler, and the billion-dollar racket of smuggler and peddler would be eliminated. It was precisely because the clinic of the county medical association at Los Angeles was giving an object lesson in the possibility of suppressing the drug racket, while at the same time accomplishing a humanitarian purpose, that the narcotics authorities stepped in to close the clinic—by unfair means, since they knew that they had no legal right to interfere in any way.

Why the Federal narcotics authorities are eager thus to support the racketeers, in contravention of law and humanity, is, essentially, the gist of the question that the proposed congressional investigation would seek to have answered.

An investigation that failed to probe this matter would be merely farcical. The problem for investigation is not a problem of drug addiction, as such; but of the ascribed illegalities of a bureau that has persecuted drug addicts and the physicians who have dared to solace them.

If such persecution has not been instituted and conducted in the interests of the dope smugglers and peddlers, it is for the commissioner to make clear what has been the motivation of his baleful activities.

Please, Mr. Willkie, Quit Misrepresenting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 19, 1940

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, in the making of rash and unsupportable statements, Mr. Wendell Willkie, Power Trust candidate on the Republican ticket, is going from bad to worse.

He is naively trying to impress the country with the idea that President Roosevelt knows very, very little about foreign affairs, but that he, Mr. Willkie, knows all about them. Therefore, forsooth, Candidate Willkie blandly asks the voters to move Mr. Roosevelt out of the White House so he may move in.

Informed people cannot help but wonder where Mr. Willkie is obtaining this supernatural knowledge of foreign affairs which he would have the people believe is so superior to that of the President. For the latter has been kept fully and constantly advised by hundreds of honest, upstanding diplomatic and consular officers who report almost daily to him from the capitals of every country in the world.

CANDIDATE WILLKIE TOO BUSY A MAN TO KNOW MUCH ABOUT FOREIGN RELATIONS

I, myself, am one of the skeptical ones. For I know that for years Mr. Willkie has been a very busy man, what with fighting labor, manipulating stock markets, managing billion-dollar public-utility corporations, watering stock, fighting Congress and the Securities and Exchange Commission in Washington, and with raising millions to bring about his nomination at Philadelphia. And still more recently with his day and night conferences with Republican leaders and Wall Street interests trying to devise ways and means to have himself elected President of the United States.

WILLKIE'S STATEMENTS SO WILD AND UNTRUE SECRETARY OF STATE HULL HIMSELF FELT OBLIGED TO ANSWER

Mr. Willkie's misrepresentations have gotten increasingly worse and more reckless. At Joliet he declared that President Roosevelt had "telephoned" Adolf Hitler and Benito Mussolini "and urged them to sell Czechoslovakia down the river." This statement was so palpably a blunder that Willkie's own press secretary felt obliged to issue a statement to the effect that the Republican candidate had not intended to say what he did say, but had meant to say something else. Willkie's misrepresentation was so glaringly incorrect that Secretary of State Cordell Hull, who seldom engages in political riposte, felt compelled to issue a statement in which he said that Willkie had made it "evident that he is grossly ignorant of the history of the last few years," and continued:

> The President has never communicated by telephone with either Premier Mussolini or Chancelor Hitler. All the President has ever urged upon the nations involved has been in accordance with the provisions of the Kellogg Pact which provides for pacific solution of controversies as they arise.

EQUAL STATUS URGED

In September 1938 he specifically urged in messages made public immediately that a peaceful solution be found through negotiations in which all the nations involved be represented, including Czechoslovakia, and that such negotiations be undertaken by all nations on an equal basis with none of them under the threat of aggression.

Mr. Speaker, from conversations I had with the President myself before and during the Munich Conference I know personally from first-hand knowledge that he did as much as anyone could have done without involving this Nation in war to save the independence and liberties of Czechoslovakia, Poland, and all of the other nations that were subsequently overrun and destroyed by the Nazis.

TRUTH DOES NOT BOTHER UTILITY CANDIDATE IN THE SLIGHTEST

Mr. Speaker, from the very first Mr. Willkie has persistently, shamelessly, yes, and knowingly, misrepresented the true facts about the ever-increasing rise of prosperity, production, profits, and employment under the administration of Franklin D. Roosevelt. Let me cite just a few of the score of such incidents.

At Coffeyville, Kans., September 16 he declared the President was incompetent "to deal with American industry" and charged that "in 7 years of accumulating power he could not make one man a job."

In an article in Printer's Ink he charged the administration had "hampered the functioning of industry." In accepting the Republican nomination August 17, he said:

> For the first time in our history American industry has remained stationary for a decade. * * * As a Nation of producers we have become stagnant.

At a banquet in New York, attended by the publishers of the country's richest newspapers, he again attacked the administration and declared it had "drained the vitality and confidence from industry." About the same time, addressing a Republican gathering at Somerville, N. J., the Republican nominee still again repeated the charge that the New Deal had "thwarted the energies of private enterprise" and "stopped the wheels of industry."

I arise, Mr. Speaker, to denounce each and every one of these statements as entirely inaccurate, maliciously untrue, and as unworthy of a candidate for the great office of the Presidency. I here and now challenge Mr. Willkie to keep on repeating these same unadulterated misrepresentations in every speech he makes from now until election day. If he does, a mass of facts to the contrary will make him appear in the end the sorriest-looking Presidential candidate any political party ever placed before the American people. His reckless and wholly unjustified exaggerations will snow him under.

FACTS, NOT LIES

Practically every line of business in this country is today, and was at the time these reckless and untrue statements were made, more prosperous than ever before. Increased production, increased business, increased net earnings, increased employment, and increased social security is the true story of the accomplishments of the 7-year Roosevelt administration, and it is a record that neither Candidate Willkie nor any of his followers will be able to erase from the American mind. A boom that will smash all records lies ahead for American industry.

In the last 2 weeks I have come across the following actual headlines, and hundreds of similar ones, in such strongly prejudiced Republican newspapers as the Tribune and Wall Street Journal, and such fair, impartial, and accurate independent dailies as the Christian Science Monitor of Boston:

> Car loadings rise 13.7 percent for a new high.
> Jobs upswing sets high for year—Largest steel output since 1929 is forecast.
> Cash farm income above same month in 1939—Net profits of 100 largest manufacturers up an average of 60 percent.
> General Electric reports big sales jump.
> Construction awards up sharply in July.
> Chrysler has biggest sales week in history.
> Employment up 1,000,000 over 1939.

Mr. Speaker, the foregoing headlines, all copied by me verbatim from the journals indicated, tell their own story of Roosevelt prosperity beyond the ability of any and all Republican spellbinders in this campaign successfully to deny.

ALL BUSINESS WAS HANGING ON THE ROPES WHEN ROOSEVELT TOOK OVER

Mr. Speaker, it is unnecessary to recall to this House, for every Member knows it as well as I do that when Franklin D. Roosevelt was sworn in as President on March 4, 1933, every form of business enterprise in the United States was at the lowest ebb in history. The tide changed for the better with the very beginning of the new administration.

Prosperity is no longer "just around the corner." It is here, in the United States, now, today. Note, for instance, this Associated Press dispatch appearing in the Washington Star:

THREE HUNDRED COMPANIES REVEAL EARNINGS UP 37 PERCENT

NEW YORK.—Profits of the first 300 companies to report for the second quarter of 1940 were 37 percent greater than a year ago.

The gain was made in the face of increased taxes for defense purposes, and despite the fact that most leading corporations charged added taxes for the entire first half of the year against April-May-June earnings.

INCREASED EARNINGS OF AMERICAN BUSINESS UNDER ROOSEVELT

Mr. Speaker, I submit that the fairest way of judging what this administration has accomplished for business is by comparing earnings of American businesses for the first 6 months of 1933 with those for the first 6 months of 1940. This I shall do. I hardly expect that Mr. Willkie or any other Republican orator in this campaign will read this table to an audience of American voters, although any or all are quite welcome to do so, I assure them:

	Net profits for first 6 months, 1933	Net profits for first 6 months, 1940	Percent increase
General Electric	$5,953,695	$25,871,572	334
United Fruit	5,073,000	9,379,000	85
Republic Steel Co	2,929,019	6,449,453	120
Atlantic Refining Co	1,002,000	5,266,000	425
Libby-Owens-Ford Glass	2,157,083	5,176,748	140
Caterpillar Tractor	470,765	3,509,514	646
American Brake Shoe & Foundry Co	241,486	1,266,636	425
Beech Nut Packing Co	744,487	1,461,018	96
Kimberly-Clark Corporation	311,511	1,373,651	340
Container Corporation of America	240,177	1,128,735	369
Hanna (M. A.) Co	394,909	1,104,307	179
Eaton Manufacturing Co	31,253	1,908,348	6,054
Borg-Warner Corporation	335,172	2,830,983	747
General Cigar	441,058	574,068	30

American industry, Mr. Willkie, is neither "drained," "thwarted," "stagnant," nor in any manner in the doldrums, as you have been asserting in your speeches, and you know it better than anyone else. It was, however, all those things under Herbert Hoover in 1932, as you also know, but it is not today under Franklin Roosevelt. Therefore, please, Mr. Willkie, stop misrepresenting.

INCREASED PROSPERITY WAS HERE LONG BEFORE OUTBREAK OF EUROPEAN WAR

The above concerns are not principally "war babies." They embrace, in fact, nearly every type of industry from cigars to fruit, confectionery, glass, hardware, notions, to the heaviest construction steel. But the first hue and cry that the people may expect to be raised in rebuttal by the always-prejudiced Wall Street financial wolves and the always-biased Republican orators, none of whom have even been willing to accord the Roosevelt administration due credit for any of the good that it has accomplished, will be falsely to claim that the increases revealed in the foregoing table are due to recent war profits exclusively. This is absolutely erroneous.

The fact of the matter is, there has been a gradual and constant increase in net profits throughout the 7 years of the Roosevelt administration. Take the Caterpillar Tractor Corporation, for instance: The above table shows that the increase in net profits of this organization for the first 6 months of 1940 as compared with the first 6 months of 1933 is 646 percent. The first thought of the Republican campaign managers will be to allege that this tremendous increase is due entirely to European war profits. That this is not so may easily be demonstrated by the fact that the increase in the earnings of this corporation for the first 6 months of 1940 over the first 6 months of 1939, amounted to but 51 percent. The other 595 percent of the 646-percent total increase since this administration has been in power was the accumulation of increases during the 6 years previous to 1939, when there was no European war. So much for that.

SMALL BUSINESSES HAVE PROFITED AS WELL AS LARGE

Though I have thus far referred to the increased net profits of only 300 corporations, the facts are that they represent in like proportion or percentage the profits of 98 percent of the smaller businessmen and manufacturers of the Nation. The stocks of the small manufacturer or businessman are not listed on any exchange and the Wall Street Journal and the prominent financial writers do not take the time to compile and tabulate the profits of the smaller corporations and companies. But I know hundreds of the smaller manufacturers and businessmen, wholesale and retail, who have stated to me that their business is steadily increasing.

REASONS WHY THE MAN NOW IN THE WHITE HOUSE SHOULD BE REELECTED

Mr. Speaker, permit me now to cite some more comparisons between the old deal and the New Deal:

Dividends received by individuals—1932, under Hoover, $2,745,000,000; 1939, under Roosevelt, $4,253,000,000; gain under the New Deal, 55 percent.

Cash farm income—1932, under Hoover, $4,682,000,000; 1939, under Roosevelt, $8,519,000,000, which includes Federal benefit payments of $807,000,000; gain, 82 percent.

Exports—1932, under Hoover, $1,611,000,000; 1939, under Roosevelt, $3,179,000,000; gain, 97 percent.

Wages and salaries—December, 1932, under Hoover, $2,403,000,000; December 1939, under Roosevelt, $3,888,000,000; gain, 62 percent.

Nonagricultural employment—1932, under Hoover, 27,245,000; 1939, under Roosevelt, 34,940,000, exclusive of about 3,000,000 taken care of by the C. C. C., W. P. A., and N. Y. A., which properly should be added to the 1939 figure; gain, 28 percent.

National income—1932, under Hoover, $40,000,000,000; 1939, under Roosevelt, $68,000,000,000. I predict that for 1940 the national income will reach, if indeed it does not exceed, $90,000,000,000; gain, 70 percent.

Weekly pay rolls of factory workers—December 1932, under Hoover, $80,000,000; December 1939, under Roosevelt, $197,000,000; gain under Roosevelt, 146 percent.

Production index (by Federal Reserve Board)—1932 average, under Hoover, 64; 1939 average, under Roosevelt, 105; gain, 64 percent.

Mr. Speaker, I respectfully submit to each and every American voter that even the most rabid Republican has no right justly to complain about the achievements of President Roosevelt in the face of a record like the above.

TOM GIRDLER'S NOTORIOUS REPUBLIC STEEL REPORTS A 495-PERCENT INCREASE OF NET PROFITS

Mr. Speaker, practically all lines of American industry report increased business, increased employment, and increased profits. The average increase of net profits of 100 leading American corporations for the first 6 months of 1940 over the first 6 months of 1939 reaches the astounding figure of 60.5 percent. The very corporations whose officials have been most critical of the New Deal have made the largest profits. For instance, the increase of net profits of the Republic Steel Co. in the period above indicated was $6,449,453 for 1940 as against $1,083,311 for 1939—an increase of 495 percent. Yet Tom Girdler, the president of Republic Steel, has been denouncing the Roosevelt administration with a venom and bitterness that has not been equaled by any other critic.

Throughout the Roosevelt administration the cry of Wall Street men like Mr. Willkie has been: "Unshackle us. You have us tied hand and foot. Remove the fetters that are holding us stagnant and we will show you what we can do." A hundred times—yes, a thousand times—in the last 7 years I have heard the same cry go up on the floor of this House from the spokesmen here for the great industrialists of the Nation. One might imagine from all this wholly unjustified criticism and misrepresentation that the great overlords of

American industry had been bound, gagged, and hog-tied in cellars for the last 7 years. But the tremendous increases revealed in the above table indicate otherwise. Rescued practically from bankruptcy which faced all of them at the conclusion of the Hoover administration, the big manufacturers who are now endeavoring to substitute Mr. Willkie for the man who saved them have made, and are today making, greater profits under this administration than they have ever made. If Tom Girdler is not satisfied with an increased net profit of 495 percent, one cannot help but wonder how much increased profit he would really require in order to be completely satisfied and quit kicking.

TOM GIRDLER AND ERNEST WEIR WORST OPPRESSORS OF LABOR IN AMERICA

Mr. Speaker, let us now turn our attention to another side of this picture, revealing an even more sordid, greedy, and unforgivable view of the men who are fighting our President, and whose insatiable appetite for profits and ever still more profits seems to have no bounds of decency.

Have these great tycoons of industry been willing fairly to share their enormously increased net earnings with their workers? They have not. Not only that, but they have fought and maligned the President and this Congress for every high-minded piece of relief and social-security legislation that we have endeavored to enact into law for the benefit of the working class and the needy.

I do not intend to mince words as to exactly whom I have in mind. I am referring to the two most vicious oppressors of labor in America—Tom Girdler, president of Republic Steel, and Ernest T. Weir, of Weirton Steel. The latter, by the way, is chairman of the Republican Finance Committee, and is now engaged in raising a huge campaign fund for Mr. Willkie. The National Labor Relations Board has, after long and careful investigation, found these notorious labor haters guilty of using espionage, propaganda, and spies in their brutal effort to create wholesale terror among their employees. But their attempt either to coerce or purchase the labor vote for Mr. Willkie will be in vain.

WHY UTILITY AND POWER CORPORATIONS ARE BACKING WILLKIE

Mr. Speaker, the Republican candidate, Mr. Willkie, will not want for campaign funds. Every important utility and power corporation in the United States as well as every other form of big business is backing him to the limit. He has been connected with big corporations all his adult life. He left the Firestone Tire & Rubber Co. in Akron, Ohio, to go with a firm of local corporation lawyers.

In recognition of his great service as chief labor "trouble shooter" for various power, utility, and other corporations from 1917 to 1926, the Commonwealth & Southern Corporation took him over. This corporation controlled the Alabama Power Co., the Georgia Power Co., and many others, of which Mr. Cobb, of the Hodenpyle, Hardy Co., was the controlling figure.

When the ambitious Mr. Willkie landed in New York on the morning of November 4, 1929, to become counsel and later president of Commonwealth, he looked about the imposing Grand Central Station and, much impressed by its richness and grandeur, is credited with having turned to his wife with the comment:

Hell, mother, we'll take this town like Grant took Richmond.

No doubt he figures on taking the Presidency in the same stride.

Immediately he became popular among the sharps of Wall Street and the stock exchange and was soon hailed as one of the bright boys of the house of Morgan.

The specialty of these gentlemen who took him to their hearts is watering stock, scattering holdings, and corrupting public officials. Theirs is the most crooked form of gambling ever devised. The use of marked decks and loaded dice is a commonplace. Millions of investors, large and small, have been robbed of their life savings through the machinations of this gentry.

Among the outstanding villains in the history of America's greatest stock-market swindles were Howard C. Hopson, head of the Associated Gas & Electric, Samuel Insull, and a few others. The country cannot have forgotten the vicious and corrupt fight against the so-called Holding Company Act that was waged right here in Washington by this unscrupulous group, affiliated with whom, but from behind the scenes, was this same man, Mr. Willkie, now the Republican candidate for the Presidency of the United States. A Senate committee headed by Senator Black, of Alabama, now a member of the United States Supreme Court, developed testimony concerning the Hopson crowd that shocked the Nation. Hopson admitted having spent $2,000,000 of the Associated stockholders' money alone, and this without their knowledge or authorization, to bring about the defeat of the so-called death-sentence feature of the Holding Company Act. Mr. Willkie, by the way, has been given credit in Wall Street as having been the shrewd author of the catchy phrase, "death sentence."

The bill was eventually passed. Has it destroyed any company? The fact is the power companies are still increasing their business and making enormous profits, far more than they should, due to the fact they were able to weaken certain provisions of the bill.

WHY WILLKIE TURNED AGAINST THE ROOSEVELT ADMINISTRATION

Mr. Willkie was terribly angered by the action of the Securities and Exchange Commission in enforcing the law. This is one of the reasons why he turned against the New Deal, the reason that in this campaign the great utility corporations will leave no stone unturned to get Mr. Roosevelt out of the White House and to put their fellow operator and comrade, Mr. Willkie, in. He pretends to believe the Roosevelt administration sought to strangle liberty through the S. E. C., but all the S. E. C. wanted to strangle was the power of the Willkie-Insull-Hopson crowd and their kind to make wildcat investments with other people's money.

Another thing that made Mr. Willkie angry was the fact that the Government's T. V. A. power plant came into competition with some of his Commonwealth & Southern properties. But he got even there, for he managed to extract from the Government for some of the properties of which he was nominally the president $78,000,000 in cold cash, which was a good many millions more than they were actually worth.

The national income for 1939 was $69,000,000,000, and for this year promises to be $90,000,000,000. Mr. Willkie is telling around that if a Republican can be elected—meaning himself—it ought to reach $125,000,000,000. But his party did not make a very good record when last in power. In 1932 Mr. Hoover, try as he would, could not get the national income above $40,000,000,000.

WHY ONE COLUMNIST WILL "SUPPORT" WENDELL WILLKIE

Jack Raper, famous columnist of the Cleveland Press, has the following to say on the subject of Mr. Willkie's candidacy:

We believe we'll back Wendell Willkie, supermagnate of utilities, for President. Willkie helped organize, and is president of, the Commonwealth & Southern, which has outstanding 33,673,328 shares of common stock, more than twice as much as any other utility holding company.

In 1929 it sold as high as $30.50 a share, a total value of $1,037,036,504. Today (about the 1st of June) it is selling at around 75 cents a share, a loss to common-stock holders of $999,531,508.

Unless you can show us where there has been a bigger and a better loss, we will stand by Willkie. He's the man to restore confidence and make America safe for "free enterprise."

CANDIDATE WILLKIE'S OATH OF ALLEGIANCE TO PUBLIC UTILITIES PRIVATELY OWNED"

Mr. Speaker, the Republican Presidential candidate is interested in one subject above everything else on earth, and that is "public utilities privately owned." It is his hobby, his passion, his everything. He has said so himself, many, many times, not as a candidate for the Presidency, of course, but most often in secluded banquet halls of New York's great hotels, with fellow rich men, power magnates, great utility moguls, big stockholders, investment brokers, bankers, as his enthusiatic, wildly applauding listeners.

Yes; Mr. Willkie assured these sympathetic friends that he considers service to the cause of "public utilities privately

owned" as on a par in patriotism with service in a foreign war or any other ultrapatriotic or high-minded endeavor.

In an address now suppressed for the duration of the campaign, before a joint meeting of the Economic Club of New York City and the Harvard Business School Club on January 31, 1935, Mr. Willkie—probably with little thought then he would ever be a candidate for the Presidency—poured forth his very soul on the subject of "public utilities privately owned." Here is the drift of it:

> They seek to paint us who represent private enterprise in the utility business as antisocial, unpatriotic, and the despoilers of men. * * *
>
> I do not like to make personal references, but I want to say to you that no duty has ever come to me in my life, even that in the service of my country, which has so appealed to my senses of social obligation, patriotism, and love of mankind as this, my obligation to say and do what I can for the preservation of public utilities privately owned.
>
> All that I have observed, all that I know, and all that I read teaches me that I could do nothing nobler for the future financial stability and political good of my country or the social and economic well-being of my fellow citizens than to stand firm and unafraid against this foolish fad and fancy of the moment.

Mr. Speaker, this being the state of Mr. Willkie's mind, one cannot help but wonder whether, if he were to become President, he would be found on the side of his beloved "public utilities privately owned" or on the side of the gas and electric consumers and the taxpayers of the United States.

Millions of robbed depositors and overcharged gas and electric consumers viewed Sam Insull as the greatest scoundrel that ever trod shoe leather. But Wendell Willkie, as stated by him in this same soon-to-be-famous economic club speech, saw him only as a "forceful, dynamic, and attractive figure."

POWER TRUST INTERESTS HATCHED PLOT TO NOMINATE WILLKIE NEARLY 2 YEARS AGO

The story that went out to the country from the Philadelphia convention to the effect that Willkie was nominated as the result of the spontaneous popular demand of the Nation was all hooey. The Power Trust had been planning to "put him over" for more than a year and a half. If anyone doubts this he has only to refer to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 23, 1939. As far back as that date the gentleman from Mississippi, Congressman JOHN E. RANKIN, tried and true friend of electric consumers, and worthy foe of the Power Trust for many, many years, in a speech on the floor of the House, exposed the hatching of the plot to bring about the nomination of Willkie for President. He said, in part:

> Mr. Speaker, from the press reports we learn that there is a new candidate for President on the Republican ticket, Mr. Wendell L. Willkie, president of the Commonwealth & Southern, who has been referred to as the fashion plate of the Power Trust.
>
> Of course, if he is nominated, little will be said by the Republican press about his connection with the utilities. He will probably be heralded as a friend of the farmer—the farmers' candidate.
>
> There is one thing about it if he should be nominated and elected, the country would then have a President who can teach the American farmers how to water the stock and shear the sheep. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, this Power Trust that groomed, nominated, and is now running Wendell Willkie for President is the most ruthless and the most corrupt combination of wealth and power this country has ever known. It is the greatest racket of modern times. It is collecting in overcharges right now more than $1,000,000,000 a year in tribute from the light and power consumers of the Nation.

DISASTER FACED THE NATION WHEN ROOSEVELT TOOK OFFICE IN 1933

In order to further bring home just what President Roosevelt has accomplished for the country, I desire here to review, very briefly, the terrible conditions that existed when he took office on March 4, 1933. Most of the banks were closed or insolvent. Life and other insurance companies were also insolvent. There was despair in every face. Insane asylums were overcrowded. Men, women, and children throughout the Nation were undernourished, without necessary clothing, one-half the population poorly housed. Thousands upon thousands were living in dugouts and shacks on the city dumps; soup kitchens and bread lines were everywhere. All these poor were utterly ignored by Hoover. All he could say was: "Prosperity is just around the corner."

Business was hanging on the ropes; 75 percent of factories closed; those still open working but 2 or 3 days a week; wages as low as $1 a day. Vagrants in large cities asked to be arrested so they could get something to eat and keep from freezing, but had to be refused because jails were filled to overflowing. World War veterans, half frozen, standing on the street corners at Christmas time selling apples at 5 cents apiece to save themselves from starvation.

Such were the terrible conditions existing on March 4, 1933, which Mr. Willkie and his corps of shrewd Republican campaign managers are now conspiring to have the American people forget. But, in spite of their efforts, millions upon millions will remember that President Roosevelt kept his New Deal promise of seeing to it that hereafter no person in this rich Nation shall starve for the want of food nor freeze for the lack of clothing, heat, and shelter.

REEMPLOYMENT GOING UP AND UP AND UP, UNEMPLOYMENT DOWN

When Mr. Roosevelt took over, 16,000,000 to 18,000,000 were unemployed. Ten million of these have been reabsorbed, either by industry or C. C. C., W. P. A., and N. Y. A. There are today 1,100,000 more persons employed in private industry alone than a year ago, and more and more are being employed daily, not at starvation wages as under the Hoover administration, but at better wages and under improved working conditions.

During June, for example, 235,000 unemployed workers found jobs in the nonagricultural industries. This is a favorable development, since factory employment usually declines in that month. The steel industry took on 25,000 additional workers; electrical machinery, 3,000; woolen producers, 7,000; clothing trades, 7,600. In some lines the increased employment for June, as compared with the same month of 1937, ran as high as 58 percent, and is still going up with every passing month.

And yet Candidate Willkie, in his Coffeyville, Kans., speech had the audacity to say of President Roosevelt that "in 7 years of accumulating power he could not make one man a job." How can the people, in view of this rank falsehood, believe anything whatever that the Republican candidate may say?

WE MAY BE IN THE GRAVEST OF DANGER

Mr. Speaker, this raving madman Hitler may conceivably win the war. It may be hard for us to envisage such an atrocious calamity, but we would not be intelligent men or intelligent and patriotic legislators, in the knowledge that the fate of 130,000,000 people rests in our hands, if we fail to look the facts in the face.

Consider the tragic situation of the British nation. Hitler has his dagger, already crimson red with the blood of 10 murdered nations, pointed at the very heart of England. At this very hour he is saying to Great Britain, "Surrender, or I will destroy your cities and blow your helpless civilians, even your women and children, to eternity." And there is not the slightest doubt in the world but that he would do it. If Great Britain does not get help—and we are the only nation that can give it—it would not be inconceivable if in the end England would be forced to surrender.

WHY AMERICA SHOULD AID GREAT BRITAIN

That is the explanation of why the nations that have already given in, did so, one after another. Mr. Speaker, I hate to concede that armed strength alone controls the destinies of nations. It is contrary to all my life-long hopes and convictions. For, until the last 4 or 5 years, I have been against big armies and big navies—a pacifist. I have believed that love and righteousness and square dealing were stronger and more lasting than sheer military power. But in the light of what we have witnessed in Europe in the last 2 years, I have been obliged to surrender all these feelings and convictions, and it has not been easy for me, but hard, very hard. However, I have been finally forced to the conclusion that Napoleon—or whoever it was—had something, right or wrong, when he said "God is on the side of the army

that has the most cannon." I reluctantly yield to this view, and want this country to get on the side of the most cannon, the most bombers, the most battleships, and to get on that side just as quickly as it is possible to do so. I am in favor of giving Great Britain all the planes, munitions, and help that we can—everything under the sun save men.

Shall we, can we, trust Hitler and make the mistake that Chamberlain made, and now regrets? No, no, no. God forbid.

THIS NATION IS WORTH SPENDING ANY AMOUNT OF MONEY TO PERPETUATE FOR POSTERITY

It is quite true that this Democratic Congress has appropriated a lot of money, but it was necessary to do so to save the Nation when in 1932 and 1933 it was on the very verge of revolution and disaster. But we have appropriated it for a country that is worth spending any sum whatsoever to save. This country, our own United States of America, is the last bulwark of real democracy in a world controlled by dictators bent on destroying every remaining nation that dares to stand for the principle of government of the people, by the people, for the people. Hitler, Mussolini, Stalin, and the Japanese war lords do not want peoples to control their own governments through ballot boxes because they want to control them all themselves—for themselves—through coercion backed by swords and cannon, bombs and bombers.

But while we have spent a large sum of money, I defy anyone to show that it has not been disbursed efficiently, or that the taxpayers have not received their money's worth in the form of a country that is a far better and safer place in which to live as the result of these expenditures under the administration of Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

How, and for what purposes, have we appropriated these vast sums? The people have a perfect right to know. Speaking for myself, I am glad to tell them, for I am proud of this administration, this Congress, and the things we have tried, with the executive and legislative branches working in unity and cooperation, to accomplish for the people of the United States.

First of all, let me say that a very large part of the appropriations have been, or will be, expended in a preparedness program aimed at making this country safe from attack from any quarter. We do not positively know that we will be attacked; of course we all hope we will not be, but it would be criminal, if not actually treasonable, for us under existing circumstances to take any chances. Preparedness appropriations are unavoidable; we have no alternative.

Secondly, we have felt obliged to spend generously of the public funds to feed and house those deserving poor and needy among us that this rich Nation simply cannot ignore and permit to starve or freeze.

THE AMERICAN YOUTH DESERVE A HELPING HAND FROM UNCLE SAM

A third thing we have done, and I am especially proud of this, is to take care of millions of our youth through the Civilian Conservation Corps and the National Youth Administration. When the young reach an age where they feel that life owes them the right and opportunity to work to sustain themselves, to make their own way in the world on their own, and are everywhere turned down, they present the most pathetic of figures. No one may blame them if at last they become discouraged, hopeless, and in the end perhaps even vengeful toward the state of affairs, and the Government that permits it. Since no one else will do it, the National Government must go to their assistance. So here again, as in the matter of preparedness and relief, we have no alternative. Having been born into the world, our poorest youth have, as well as the rich, the right to live, and therefore the right to look to the Government for a helping hand. So long as I remain in Congress I shall vote to give it to them in every practical and feasible way. I do not want, of course, to put them on doles, merely to help them help themselves.

Mr. Speaker, I am glad to be able to state that the C. C. C. is at least one New Deal agency that has never been criticized. Here is a record of C. C. C. accomplishments that speaks for itself, and what father or mother in this broad land will not be as proud of it as I am:

Two million five hundred thousand American boys or young men enrolled.

Five hundred and ninety-three million dollars sent home by enrollees to needy dependents.

One billion eight hundred and sixteen million trees planted.

One hundred and thirteen thousand miles of truck trails or minor roads built.

Forty-three thousand bridges built.

Seventy-eight thousand miles of telephone lines constructed.

Five million six hundred and one thousand and fifty-six man-days spent fighting forest fires.

Five million two hundred thousand erosion-control check dams built.

Three million six hundred and twenty-five acres of forest stands improved to aid growth.

Some people are under the impression the C. C. C. is under Army management. This is not the case. President Roosevelt picked as its head Robert Fechner, a labor man then serving as international vice president of his organization. He was the idol of C. C. C. camps. If you had a boy there, you did not have to worry about him.

BILLIONS OF APPROPRIATIONS NOT EXPENDED BUT LOANED ON GOOD SECURITY

Mr. Speaker, a very important point in regard to these huge appropriations that I very much fear the Republican orators may neglect to tell the voters is that billions of the moneys we have appropriated are not for expenditures in the generally accepted meaning of that word but for loans, which will be returned to the Treasury, with interest. I refer now to the enormous sums we have loaned the small home owners to save their homes from foreclosure, to the farmers to save their farms, to the farmers to plant and harvest their crops and tide them over from perhaps a period of drought or other hard luck, to all forms of legitimate business, ranging from the very smallest of businesses to the great railroads, banks, insurance companies, and so forth.

TO MR. WILLKIE'S STUMP SPEAKERS: HERE IS WHERE SOME MORE OF THE MONEY WENT—$3,000,000,000 DISTRIBUTED BY SOCIAL SECURITY SYSTEM

Mr. Speaker, I would like to state for the further information of Mr. Willkie's stump speakers that the Roosevelt administration's social-security program, 5 years old last month, has distributed $3,000,000,000 to the Nation's aged and unemployed workers and to widows, orphans, and the blind.

To celebrate its anniversary the Social Security Board drew up a statistical picture of its vast operations to show that some 50,000,000 workers—count them, Willkieites, 50,000,000—have been enrolled in the program since President Roosevelt signed the act in 1935.

Established after a long study of European experiences, the social program pours its benefits through a half dozen outlets which are either exclusively Federal enterprises or joint undertakings of Nation and State.

Its insurance benefits for the aged and unemployed are financed by pay-roll taxes, while direct grants from Federal and State treasuries sustain the public-assistance features for the young, the old, and the helpless in need.

PROVIDED FOR 1,983,900 AGED, 807,900 CHILDREN, 48,000 BLIND

At the top of the program is the old-age and survivors insurance system, which pays out monthly benefits to workers who retire at 65, and to their wives, widows, and orphans. Up to June 30 this system paid $38,000,000 to 102,941 persons.

Unemployment compensation, which gives insured workers a moderate weekly sum during a limited number of weeks of joblessness, has distributed more than $1,000,000,000 in benefits.

Of the more than 28,000,000 commercial and industrial workers covered by the insurance, about 1,500,000 new jobless are drawing unemployment compensation.

To find jobs for the insured idle, the social-security system has taken over the employment service. It has filled 5,000,000 jobs during 1939 and the first 6 months of 1940.

The public-assistance program aids some 3,000,000 persons every month, among them 1,983,900 aged, 807,900 children, and 48,000 blind. The expenditure for this part of the system has totaled about $1,900,000,000.

Mr. Willkie has frequently sneered at what he terms the "social laboratories" of the Roosevelt administration. In his acceptance speech, Candidate Willkie promises, if President, "to spend as little money as possible." Social security is the key arch of this so-called social laboratories system, and costs a lot of money.

Those who would starve were it not for the New Deal's financial aid have plenty of cause to ponder over that Willkie promise "to spend as little money as possible." If elected, will Mr. Willkie scrap the whole social-laboratories idea? If so, what, if anything, does he plan to give these 1,983,900 aged, 807,900 children, and 48,000 blind in its place? For, Mr. Willkie, the aged, the children, and the blind cannot work. And they must not starve.

FARMERS OF NATION NOT OVERLOOKED—HENRY A. WALLACE SAW TO THAT

Mr. Speaker, although I personally do not represent an agricultural district, I can assure the farmers of this country that their problems and welfare have not been overlooked by the great man who sits in the White House. Even if he had wanted to do so, which he did not, being that he takes pride in considering that he is something of a real dirt farmer himself, there was a man sitting in his Cabinet who would never for a moment have permitted it. I refer to his great Secretary of Agriculture, one of the best and most loyal friends of the farmer that this Nation has ever had—Henry A. Wallace.

It was because of his appreciation of the fact that his Secretary of Agriculture not only understood and loved farming from a practical as well as scientific viewpoint but that it seemed almost his sole interest in life that Mr. Roosevelt chose him as his running mate for the position of Vice President.

Of the moneys appropriated during the 7 years of the Roosevelt administration, to which I have already alluded, the President and Mr. Wallace saw to it that the vast sum of $7,078,914,124 went for agriculture, or, in other words, for the benefit of the farmers of the Nation.

The appropriation for 1940 alone was $1,370,394,305. Contrast this with the last year's agricultural appropriation of the Hoover administration, $111,661,603, and the farmer may judge for himself whether it would be to his interest to turn the Government back to the Republicans.

Breaking down the 1940 appropriation of $1,370,394,305, we find that some of the worthy purposes for which various sums are to be expended are the following:

Loans, relief, and rural rehabilitation, $161,838,567; agricultural conservation program, $559,556,740; disposal of surplus commodities, $205,677,564; farm-tenant loans, $40,939,511; Farm Credit Administration, $44,604,788; Rural Electrification Administration, $42,698,425; Federal Crop Insurance Act, $5,923,200; parity payments, $225,000,000; and soil-erosion-control program, $22,422,374.

VETERANS HAVE BEEN PROVIDED FOR BY THIS ADMINISTRATION

Mr. Speaker, our World War veterans no longer plan marches on Washington. They may no longer be seen selling apples on the streets at Christmas time. This administration has seen its way clear to take care of those real, 100-percent Americans who were willing to lay down their lives in defense—not only of a great principle—but in defense of the greatest democracy the world has ever seen. What we have done for the veterans of all our wars we will do for all those, and their dependents, who patriotically participate in the great preparedness program that will soon be in effect throughout these United States. We are agreed in the desire never to send another American soldier beyond the seas, but those who loyally assist in preparing a defense of our democracy and our own shores against any possible would-be invader will never be forgotten by this Government.

WHAT PRESIDENT, MR. SPEAKER, HAS OR WILL COMPARE WITH THE PRESENT ONE?

I ask you, Mr. Speaker, was there any real, honest-to-God, humanitarian legislation enacted under the Harding, Coolidge, Hoover administrations? Where did the laws for the feeding of the poor and for their protection come from? Every decent piece of social-security legislation ever placed on our statute books came under the administration of Franklin Delano Roosevelt. Without him we would have today none of the fine laws that protect those who are the very life's blood and backbone of our great Nation—the workers in the mills and factories, the men who operate the trains, busses, airplanes, the men who handle the Nation's mail with 100-percent efficiency, the men who go down in the mines to produce our coal and other minerals, the farmers who produce our daily bread without which none of us could exist.

There is one very important reason why Franklin Roosevelt will be reelected. The poor are for him. He has been for them throughout his entire service in the White House. And now they are for him, and all the Willkies in creation will not be able to take them away from him. And since in this, as in every other country on earth, there are more poor than all the other classes of society combined, his reelection is certain.

AMERICAN NAVY TODAY MOST POWERFUL IN THE WORLD

When President Roosevelt took office our Army and Navy was in its weakest and most dilapidated condition. In 1920 we had had a splendid Army and Navy, with tremendous surpluses of war materials. During the 12 years of Republican rule these surpluses had been disposed of, much of it for a song, and the Navy ruined by virtue of the Kellogg Pact and the nine-power treaty. In 7 years President Roosevelt has brought into being the largest navy in the world, and the largest Army that we have ever had outside of a war period. Though he has been strenuously opposed he has developed an air force 20 times as large as that in existence when he entered office. And his program of preparedness will provide us with a defense on land, sea, and in the air, aimed at making the Nation safe from any kind of attack from any source.

GOVERNMENT'S CREDIT IS VASTLY IMPROVED

Though cities, counties, and States, and even the Federal Government, were on the verge of bankruptcy in 1933 their financial condition, the same as that of the banks, has tremendously improved. There is more money in the banks, and the Government has more gold and silver, in fact, about 80 percent of all the gold in the world, than at any time heretofore. Our American dollar will purchase more today in the United States and throughout the world than ever before.

Government credit, notwithstanding the huge sums expended for preparedness and relief, is the best in our history. In fact, the Government can borrow all the money it needs at less than one-third, and in some instances one-fourth, the interest demanded previous to the Roosevelt administration.

ROOSEVELT ONE OF THE GREATEST OF ALL OUR GREAT PRESIDENTS

Mr. Speaker, I have served under seven Presidents—Theodore Roosevelt, Taft, Wilson, Harding, Coolidge, Hoover, and Franklin D. Roosevelt—and nine Speakers of this House, having seen 34 years of consecutive service. When I add that I have reached and passed my seventy-fourth birthday, you know the inevitable answer. I can no longer look forward with too great expectations. I can only look backward over the road I have traveled. This Nation has been good to me, and I have tried sincerely to show my appreciation by loyally serving here its ideals as best I could.

I am familiar with the history of our country. I know and appreciate the immortal services rendered the Republic by such outstanding Presidents as Washington, Jefferson, Jackson, Lincoln, down to "Teddy" Roosevelt and Woodrow Wilson. It is my sincere belief that the great man today in the White House possesses within himself all the fine qualities that inspired these greatest Presidents of American history.

THREE FINAL BIG REASONS WHY I AM FOR REELECTION OF FRANKLIN DELANO ROOSEVELT

I have known Franklin Roosevelt for 26 years, have been in close contact with him for 15 years of this period, for 8 years under Wilson and 7 years of his own administration. I know from first-hand knowledge that he loves America and this democratic form of government above his own life.

In this grave hour when our liberty and freedom is hanging in the balance, he is the one man in all the world who stands out as the ideal man to lead us safely through our difficulties.

I am for his reelection because he has given us the most advanced social-security program the world has ever known, because he has restored the prosperity that was destroyed by Republican misrule, and because he is determined to make his country safe from attack by any foreign foe. Make no mistake about it, Franklin Roosevelt will go down in history as one of the most humane and greatest Presidents of this the best and mightiest Nation of free men today existing on earth.

McNary Accepts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 19, 1940

EDITORIALS FROM THE UNION FARMER

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to extend my remarks by including two editorials which appeared in the September 1940 issue of the Union Farmer, the official publication of the National Farmers Guild. The editorials follow:

[From the Union Farmer of September 1940]

M'NARY ACCEPTS

Hon. CHARLES L. MCNARY formally accepted the Republican Vice Presidential nomination in a speech at Salem, Oreg., Tuesday, August 27, 1940.

The acceptance speech was American in tone, forceful, and it clearly defined vital American issues. More important than all else, Mr. MCNARY recognized that his nomination and that of Mr. Wallace, the opposing candidate for the same office, makes an answer to the farm price problem the major issue in this presidential campaign.

Strangely, the vast but futile efforts at "farm relief" by Mr. Wallace was the controlling factor in MCNARY'S nomination. MCNARY, the early leader and the present champion of the "two-price system," nominated for the Vice Presidency by the Republicans, forced the nomination of Wallace as the opposing candidate. It is thus that agriculture becomes the major issue with both parties. The public is realizing that the final decision on November 5 actually rests with the farm voters and will be made in the rural counties of the North and Middle West.

While other truly important national issues were discussed by Mr. MCNARY, we shall confine our comment to the main issue on which attention is focused by the two opposing Vice Presidential candidates with opposing principles, with opposing philosophies—the one for price—the other for crop control. The one for more production—the other for less. One demands an American price at home—the other the world's price at home. MCNARY comes out for a 100-percent market price—Wallace for a 69-percent price. It is not hard to distinguish between the opposites.

"The prosperity of agriculture should be the first charge on the attention of any administration," said McNary. Then he proceeded to advance the reason why the farm problem is by no means the exclusive worry of the farmer by citing the example:

"Statisticians find an uncanny correspondence between gross farm income and industrial pay rolls in a given year. When, as in 1929, farm income rose to $12,000,000,000, factory pay rolls also were $12,000,000,000; and when in 1932 farm income dropped to $5,000,000,000, industrial pay rolls fell off similarly.

"A substantial solution of the farm problem may be resolved into a question of markets. Any rational plan must assign the American market to the American farmer. Besides being far and wide the greatest market, it is the only one we may hope to control. The farmer is, at least, entitled to that, and no Treasury benefits can compensate for its loss."

No farmer will overlook the force and the logic of that statement. Alone it is incomplete, but Mr. MCNARY goes on to suggest the remedy by saying:

"For years I have advocated a two-price system—a system enabling the United States to export without injuring the domestic price level. The McNary-Haugen Act, which looked to that end, was twice vetoed by a President. Although conditions have altered radically since the bill was last rejected, I have maintained with undiminished faith that some such formula must still be sought."

The restoration of the agricultural empire as a great American issue in a great American presidential election has come about because of the failure of the vast Wallace schemes to find the answer to price and income and because McNary would lead and fight for the right answer.

The Presidential candidates, Willkie and Roosevelt have approved the agricultural pronouncements of their running mates. We may rejoice that the agricultural issue is made so clear and that the farmers will play so large and so important a part in the November 5th decision.

WALLACE AGAINST HITLER

Henry A. Wallace's formal acceptance of the Vice-Presidential nomination on the Democratic Party ticket gave one the definite impression that he was running for office in the United States against Adolf Hitler, of Berlin, and against Herbert Hoover, of 1932.

In his acceptance speech he mentioned the name of Adolf Hitler at least 25 times. There were 132 column lines in the newspaper copy of the speech devoted to Hitler and the Nazi policies.

While Mr. Wallace may have felt that he would thus strike a sympathetic chord in the hearts of the American people by this appeal to base prejudice and overwhelming fear, we, nonetheless, have a right to believe that we in the United States are running our own election and that we don't have to ask Hitler or Churchill or Mussolini or any other foreign potentate what we shall and what we shall not do. We need not care a damn whether we please or displease a foreign ruler in exercising our choice at the ballot box for President and Vice President in the November elections.

If this theme of the Wallace acceptance speech were to be accepted as the issue in this campaign, then Hitler in fact would be running this Government and determining its policies—which is not true.

The people of the United States are making their own decisions. We shall be concerned only with our own national welfare, the good of the Nation as a whole, and the best interests of our own people. This will guide us in making our decisions on November 5—and the head of any foreign government can like it or not.

There seems to be a strange idea emanating from some Americans who regard this Nation as unusual in the family of nations. They think of it as a satellite, which is foreign to our idea and conception of our own independence. A satellite is something that streams in the wake of its parent sun, which gets its light and takes its course from an external force. To every real American the United States of America is not a satellite nation.

On the whole Mr. Wallace's speech was defensive. He defended the farm program solely on the basis of a comparison with the lowest farm prices of 1932. He made no reference to the success of the program, which he has administered, compared with the standard of "parity prices." He justified a 69 percent price on a 75 percent production on but 5 out of 71 farm commodities on the basis of world conditions, not on the basis of any control we might or should exercise over our own economic destiny.

Mr. Wallace has established a new low in subservient statesmanship. Subservient not to the national welfare but subservient to internationalism.

When Mr. Wallace deplored the fact that this was a presidential campaign and an election year he made the wierdest and most contradictory statement that ever came from the lips of a professed exponent of democracy and a candidate for the high office of President or Vice President of the United States of America.

This is what he said:

"The fact that our presidential campaign and election come now is most welcome to the dictators. They hope to get rid of the unyielding Roosevelt.

"They know that a political campaign is distracting to our people. And they know that in the many months that would elapse before a new administration could act effectively they might have their chance.

"I do not wish to imply that the Republican leaders are willfully and consciously giving aid and comfort to Hitler. But I want to emphasize that replacement of Roosevelt, even if it were by the most patriotic leadership that could be found, would cause Hitler to rejoice."

The oath which Mr. Wallace was required to take as a Cabinet member, and the oath which the Vice President must take upon assuming the office of Vice President, admits of no compromise or qualification in swearing to protect and defend the Constitution of the United States, which provides for the election every 4 years of a President and Vice President, regardless of whether a part or the whole of the rest of the world is at war or at peace.

It is not up to Mr. Wallace to apologize to us or to any foreign ruler for our celebration of independence or for the Constitution of the United States.

Guayule Rubber Seen as Defense Product

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN Z. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 19, 1940

ARTICLE FROM THE NEW YORK TIMES

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Times of September 12, 1940:

[From the New York Times of September 12, 1940]

GUAYULE RUBBER SEEN AS DEFENSE PRODUCT—AKRON MANUFACTURER URGES THAT PLANT BE CULTIVATED HERE

Cultivation of guayule rubber for national defense as a national domestic substitute for imported rubber was proposed yesterday by William O'Neil, of Akron, Ohio, president of the General Tire & Rubber Co., 32-year veteran of the industry.

The guayule plant, resembling milkweed, grows profusely in Texas and other Southwestern States and Mexico, he said, and has properties equal to the foreign product. It has been used for years by rubber manufacturers, he explained, when prices of Malaysian crude rubber rose to 60 cents a pound or more.

"Why copy Hitler with costly synthetic rubber? We can grow guayule here in the United States," Mr. O'Neil said in an interview in the Hotel Lexington before departing today for Akron. Tire prices, he estimated, would double with the use of synthetics on a large scale.

As a member of the crude rubber committee of the Rubber Manufacturers Association, Mr. O'Neil attended in Washington recent sessions of the National Defense Advisory Committee's section of raw material, at which it was proposed to spend $150,000,000 to develop a 300,000-ton annual production of synthetic rubber.

Cost of guayule Mr. O'Neil put at 25 cents a pound, against 20 cents at present for the product imported from Dutch and British possessions, the main suppliers. Synthetic rubber now costs 70 cents, he said.

Not Government, but Farming, Business, and Industry Have Made This Country Great

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER H. GROSS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 19, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE GETTYSBURG (PA.) STAR AND SENTINEL

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include the following editorial appearing in the Gettysburg (Pa.) Star and Sentinel of September 14, 1940:

[From the Gettysburg (Pa.) Star and Sentinel of September 14, 1940]

"NOT GOVERNMENT, BUT FARMING, BUSINESS, AND INDUSTRY HAVE MADE THIS COUNTRY GREAT"

Our first thought, when we consider one of Wendell Willkie's apt phrases, is that a word or two might be added to define possible shades of meaning. However, a characteristic of the anti-New Deal Presidential candidate is that he speaks in clipped sentences which can be taken in only one way. The mailed fist is not concealed within a glove of smooth, radio-tuned words.

The man on the street gets Willkie's meaning because he does not have to parse and analyze the sentence. Such a phrase was this emphatic statement by Wendell Willkie:

"Farming, business, and industry have made this country great—not Government."

A political writer or speaker would have said: "Farming, business, and industry have made this country great under our constitutional, democratic form of government."

But no political writer edits Wendell Willkie's speeches. No. Willkie used the word "government" with the exact shade of meaning President Lincoln had in mind when he said:

"In every case and at all hazards the Government must be perpetuated."

In that emphatic statement, Lincoln meant but one thing: "The form of government" under which we had been living since 1787.

Everybody knows what Lincoln meant by "government." He lived his patriotic life and he died a martyr for that "Government." He saw in that form of government the true principles of individual human existence, of liberty and the pursuit of happiness for all. Lincoln meant that "Government" must be perpetuated not for the dominance of the Government but for the people who live under that Government; those who under it are privileged to live by farming, or by business, or by industry.

When we ponder the full force of the words "Government by the people" we revert to the question: Shall the people rule over their governmental agencies or shall their governmental officers rule the people? Under our form of government a public officer, and even the Government itself, is merely an agent engaged to do the will of the people. The Constitution was so framed that the Government, under that Constitution, should obey and serve the will of the people without violation of the letter or spirit of the Constitution.

There is no conflict here. Both Willkie and Lincoln expressed the same thought.

As Willkie said: "Farming, business, and industry have made this country great—not Government." Individual and free farmers, businessmen and industrialists, and employees not only made this country great, but they also made the Government.

Thus far it has not perished, although it has passed through many crises. The New Deal has done its utmost by deceit, by subterfuge and belittlement of that same form of government, to pave the way for a New Deal dictatorship. But the time has come when farming, business, and industry will call a halt.

At the election next November there can be no leaning away from the spirit of the Constitution. The men and women of the farms, the businesses, and the industries will turn the New Deal out of power and this Nation can then resume its progress in the American way.

Do we want a restoration of the "American way"?

Resolutions of the Western Association of State Game and Fish Commissioners

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 19, 1940

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED AT ASSOCIATION MEETING AUGUST 22–23, 1940

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to extend my remarks by including copies of several resolutions adopted at the meeting of the Western Association of State Game and Fish Commissioners, held in Seattle, Wash., on August 22 and 23, 1940.

The resolutions follow:

Resolution No. 1

Whereas there has been presented a resolution asking that there be set up one Federal conservation organization to handle all wildlife matters; and

Whereas this proposal is of such importance that it is the belief of the Western Association of State Game and Fish Commissioners that it should be given further study: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Western Association of State Game and Fish Commissioners in session in Seattle, August 22 and 23, 1940, does hereby request that an interim committee be appointed to study thoroughly the probable results of such a reorganization and that this committee be prepared to report the results of the study at the annual meeting in 1941; and be it further

Resolved, That this same committee be instructed to investigate the feasibility and the desirability of formulating a Western Federation of Wildlife Interests and to ask all sportsmen's groups and others who are interested in the development, protection, and management of the wildlife resources of the West, to join in one consistent effort to demand that the public lands of the West be conserved in a manner that will accomplish the most good for the greatest number of people and that the exploitation of the public resources of the West for private profit be curtailed; and be it further

Resolved, That if, after direct contact with the sportsmen's groups of the West, it is found to be advisable, an invitation be extended to all wildlife organizations in the West to meet with

the Western Association of State Game and Fish Commissioners at its next annual meeting for the purpose of discussing this very important matter and setting up an organization that will have for its purpose the accomplishment of the above; and be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary of this organization be authorized to expend not to exceed $200 in the year 1940–41 for his expenses in carrying on the business of this organization.

Resolution No. 3

Be it Resolved, That the Western Association of State Game and Fish Commissioners go on record as endorsing the passage of S. 3739, introduced in the third session of the Seventy-sixth Congress, which has been passed by the Senate, May 29 (legislative day, May 28), 1940, and is now in the Committee on Agriculture in the House of Representatives, which bill reads as follows:

"An act to amend the act providing for Federal aid to the States in the establishment of wildlife-restoration projects to be owned by the respective States and maintained by them in accordance with the provisions of their laws.

"Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 8 of the act entitled 'An act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in wildlife-restoration projects, and for other purposes,' approved September 2, 1937, is amended to read as follows:

" 'SEC. 8. Title to any real or personal property acquired, constructed, or improved by any State through the use of funds paid to it under the provisions of this act shall be vested in such State; and it shall be the duty of each State to maintain, in accordance with the provisions of its laws, any wildlife-restoration project established in such State with the use of funds paid to it under the provisions of this act.' "

And that the Representatives from the States which are members of this association be requested to use every influence in securing the passage of this bill in the House of Representatives.

Section 8 of the original bill reads as follows:

"Sec. 8. To maintain wildlife-restoration projects established under the provisions of this act shall be the duty of the States according to their respective laws."

Resolution No. 5

Whereas the United States Government has, at great expense, built what is known as the Bear River migratory-bird refuge in Utah; and

Whereas it is the hub of migration of most of the migratory birds in the western flyways; and

Whereas there is a great amount of water passing through the spillways and into Great Salt Lake during the spring run-offs; and

Whereas if this water is stored during the spring season, it will supplement the water supply for this refuge2 to2 the2 extent that 50-percent additional duck feed can be developed and will be a factor in the elimination of western duck sickness, and will tend to make this refuge operate as the builders desire; and

Whereas there is now pending in the United States Congress H. R. 5236, which calls for appropriations to build a dam in the Bear River for the purpose of accomplishing the above; and

Whereas it seems that the resolution in Congress is not being given the proper consideration: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Western Association of State Game and Fish Commissioners, in session in Seattle, August 22 and 23, 1940, does hereby ask, in the interest of all the States benefited by the western flyways of migratory wild fowl, that the appropriation be made in order that the Fish and Wildlife Service may have funds available for the development of the Deweyville Dam to supplement the Bear River bird refuge water supply; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the Secretary of the Department of the Interior, Chief of the Fish and Wildlife Service, and to all Congressmen and Senators of the 11 Western States.

Resolution No. 9

Whereas Senate bill No. 2576, granting to the Federal Government the right to receive all moneys collected for such activities as haying, grazing, trapping, etc., on wildlife refuges under the administration of the Fish and Wildlife Service, has been introduced in the Senate of the United States; and

Whereas there are many wildfowl refuges located in the various States on which there have been in the past and are now fur bearers that are held with title vested in the several States: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Western Association of State Game and Fish Commissioners, in session in Seattle, August 22 and 23, 1940, does hereby protest the taking of fur bearers on the above-mentioned areas except in accordance with the State laws or in cooperation with the various States after a memorandum of understanding has been mutually agreed upon; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the Secretary of the Department of the Interior, Chief of the Fish and Wildlife Service, and to all Senators and Congressmen of the 11 Western States.

A Contented and Prosperous People Are Not a Prey to Subversive Doctrines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 13, 1940

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I quote from the American Federationist, an official publication of the American Federation of Labor. Mr. Harold D. Jacobs, Assistant Administrator, Wage and Hour Division, United States Government, has written some trenchant observations relative to the "fifth column."

Mr. Jacobs pointed out that the real danger to our country arises from the discontent growing out of poverty, unemployment, and lack of opportunity. The real menace in our midst is the political candidate or the pseudo-patriot who arrogates to himself the sole and exclusive properties of Americanism and who uses an emergency as an excuse for advocating the abolition of democratic processes. Beware of him! Up and down our land today are marching the forces of special privilege wrapped in the American flag, many of them running for political office, chorusing alike, although in different language, a demand that we crack down upon free speech, free assembly, and organized labor.

Here is the declaration of Mr. Jacobs, which I think eminently worthy of study:

There has been a good deal of talk about the "fifth column"? What is the "fifth column"? It is an organization of the disaffected who at the appointed hour would open the gates to the enemy. But there has been some loose thinking about this. I do not think we have much to fear from the enemy who comes among us to preach disaffection. We know how to deal with him. We have much to fear from the enemy within who, often posing as a 100-percent patriot, would fertilize the soil in which discontent can take root and flourish by emptying democracy of its meaning. He is the man who, in the pretense of protecting our liberties, would crush our liberties. He is the man who, on the pretext of national necessity, would stamp out free speech, the free press, the right of assembly, the right to unite with our fellows to promote our collective interests. He is the low-wage payer and the exploiter of labor. He is the fellow who thinks 10 cents an hour quite enough for the support of a workingman's family, who thinks that it is perfectly all right to work labor 60 or 70 hours a week without being restrained in any manner by the necessity of having to pay for the overtime. I do not know of any instance in history in which a well-fed, well-clothed, well-housed, and contented people have succumbed to strange and desperate remedies for imaginary ills.

Richard Rollins

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 19, 1940

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of the House the name of a man who has distinguished himself by rendering a great service to his country. I mention him only because he typifies a corps of America's new unsung heroes.

For the past 8 years, day and night, he has been in action on the firing lines of our dangerous un-American front. He was the first official soldier appointed by the congressional body to combat America's "fifth column." As chief investigator of the McCormack Committee on Un-American Activities, he and his capable battery of assistants tracked down volumes of evidence that even today would shock the American public. It is all a matter of congressional record dating back over 6 years ago.

In 1934 he furnished his congressional superiors with an accurate blueprint of "fifth column" planned destruction of American democracy. Not only did he trace the origin and current activities of these subversive groups, but he identified the perpetrators as well. He furnished definite proof of deliberate acts on the part of a foreign government to incite treason against our Government. The mechanics of the vicious underground and its fantastic plans painted an almost unbelievable picture then. But to our sorrow it has all proven too unvarnished and matter of fact in its graphic detail today.

Ever since then, 5 years ago, when he completed his work for the committee, this man has and still is, engaged in fighting its enemies within our borders. His is a perilous job both physically and mentally, and so often incurs personal sacrifice.

It is therefore fitting that I call the name of Richard Rollins to the attention of this distinguished Congress as a symbol of reward for a patriotic American who has placed honor for his country above worldly goods. Without his help and the help of an army of unsung other American patriots and patriotic organizations, these findings would still be a hidden time bomb set to explode on a peace-loving Nation with all the fury that was recently unleashed in Kenvil.

No Faith In Volunteering?—Army Planned Elaborate Campaign

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 19, 1940

ARTICLE BY BRUCE CATTON

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, during the general debate on the Burke-Wadsworth bill, I took the position that the voluntary enlistment system for the United States Army had not been given a fair trial.

On the basis of 3-year enlistments with a base pay of $21 monthly, the strength of the Army has been increased to 315,000 men as of September 14, 1940.

It is interesting to note that on the above date with partial reports available for August a total of 38,333 men are listed as recruits for last month. When the final reports are received for August the total is expected to pass the 40,000 mark.

I am inserting herewith a very timely article written by Bruce Catton, well-known Washington columnist, in which he reveals some interesting sidelights on the controversial topic of conscription.

Possibly Mr. Catton's article fully explains the position of the Honorable Harry Woodring, former Secretary of War, who, on June 20, 1940, at Topeka, Kans., declared:

How any fair-minded Member of Congress could say that we have given the voluntary system of enlistment with the United States Army Service a fair trial, and that it has broken down, and therefore we need the compulsory service, is beyond my understanding.

Mr. Catton's article is as follows:

BRUCE CATTON IN WASHINGTON

NO FAITH IN VOLUNTEERING?—ARMY PLANNED ELABORATE CAMPAIGN

WASHINGTON.—Now that the smoke has settled over the scrap on the draft bill, a couple of extremely odd things about the whole business remain to be examined.

First is the matter of voluntary enlistment as a means of filling up the ranks of a greatly enlarged Army.

During debate on the bill, administration spokesmen said over and over again that the War Department had absolutely no faith in volunteering as a means of getting a lot of men in a hurry. They also asserted that to try to combine volunteering and conscription—as contemplated in the Fish amendment—would simply mean delay and confusion. Lastly, it was asserted that in the World War the United States was never able to raise more than 40,000 men in 1 month by volunteer enlistments.

Planned to recruit 790,000 men

Simple fact, however, is that the original protective mobilization plan of the War Department—the Army's official schedule for war, until the present draft bill came along—set up a scheme very much like the Fish proposal for raising a wartime army.

Furthermore, this scheme called for raising the Army to war strength pending application of the draft by enlisting—not 400,000 men, as the Fish amendment would have provided, but 790,000.

It's all set forth in a pamphlet called American Selective Service, prepared under the supervision of the Joint Army and Navy Selective Service Committee and issued in October 1939.

At that time the Army did not dream of getting a draft law in time of peace. All the figuring was done on the idea that a draft law could be passed only after war broke out, and that it would be at least 60 days before drafted men would start coming into camp. During those 60 days, it was proposed to get at least 790,000 recruits for Army, Navy, National Guard, and Marine Corps.

Extensive drive outlined

A gigantic enlistment campaign to accomplish this was envisaged. Each Governor was to set up a drive covering his own State, reaching down into each city and county, all of which would be allotted their quotas of men. Civilian committees would be set up to see that the quotas were met.

"The promotional work to accomplish this result in each community," says the pamphlet, "is similar to other drives the mechanics of which are easily understood and frequently employed."

This whole procedure was almost exactly like the procedure called for by the Fish amendment, except that it was aimed at getting twice as many men. Just incidentally, the pamphlet reveals that in the first 60 days after we entered the war in 1917 all arms of the service took in 290,000 men by voluntary enlistment.

Last June: "Nothing to do"

Another odd point is that only 3 months ago the administration was trying hard to get Congress to adjourn—on the ground there was nothing more for it to do.

Joint Republican and rank-and-file Democratic opposition killed this move. Congress stayed on the job. Since then it has passed the two-ocean Navy bill, the National Guard mobilization bill, and the Draft Act, and has taken on the excess-profits tax in addition. If the administration had had its way last June, none of these acts would have been put through.

Federal Pensions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES F. RISK

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 19, 1940

LETTER TO PAWTUCKET (R. I.) TIMES

Mr. RISK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter appearing in the Pawtucket (R. I.) Times, relative to Federal pensions, signed by Mr. John Bradbury, of Pawtucket, R. I.:

[From the Pawtucket (R. I.) Times]

THE TIMES LETTER BOX—FEDERAL PENSIONS

EDITOR OF THE TIMES:

On Wednesday evening, September 11, in Washington, D. C., President Roosevelt addressed the delegates of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Stablemen and Helpers' convention, and the address was broadcast over the radio. I quote the following from his address: "Our progress must continue to be a steady and deliberate one—we cannot stand still, we cannot slip back. We must look forward to certain definite things in the future. For example, the benefits of social security should be broadened and extended, unemployment insurance should cover a larger number of workers. Our old-age pension system should be improved and extended, the amount of pension should be increased, and above all, these pensions must be given in a manner which will respect the dignity of the life of service and labor which our aged citizens have given to the Nation. It is my hope that soon the United States will have a national system under which no needy man or woman within our borders will lack a minimum old-age pension which will provide adequate food, clothing, and lodging to the end of the road—without having to go to the poorhouse to get it. And I look forward to a system which in addition to this bare minimum will enable those who

have faithfully toiled in any occupation to build up additional security for their old age which will allow them to live in comfort and happiness."

What beautiful words and what beautiful thoughts were expressed by our President; and as they came over the radio with splendid intonation of the President's well-modulated voice, what inspiration it must have given our elderly and middle-aged citizens to know that their President said it was his hope that soon we would have a national system in operation that would provide for an adequate pension that would allow them to live in comfort and happiness.

If President Roosevelt is sincere in bringing his hope to a reality as he expressed it to his audience, he can do it before this present session of Congress adjourns. There is a bill now before Congress known as the General Welfare Act (H. R. 5620) which aims to amend the present Social Security Act so as to embody the changes that the President hopes for. The bill is now before the House Ways and Means Committee, and was sponsored by one of his own political party, Congressman WARREN G. MAGNUSON, of the State of Washington. It has a sound tax base which was suggested and recommended by Dr. Paul Studenski of New York University, the tax expert called by the House Ways and Means Committee to analyze the tax bases of measures of this type.

The Magnuson petition, No. 15, to bring this bill out on the floor for debate carries the signatures of 205 Congressmen, and only needs 13 more signatures at this date. We fully understand the necessity of appropriations for national-defense purposes, but we must not forget that our first line of defense is happy and contented population in which the seeds of fascism, communism, or "fifth columnists" could never be sown.

If President Roosevelt is sincere in his hopes for an adequate pension, as he expressed in his address referred to above, all he has to do is to use his influence with Congressman ROBERT L. DOUGHTON, the chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, and 13 more Congressmen to sign the Magnuson petition, No. 15, to bring the bill out on the floor of the House for debate.

Let us hope the President will prove the sincerity of his hope for a real social security. Actions speak louder than words.

JOHN BRADBURY.

PAWTUCKET, R. I., *September 14, 1940.*

Forty-fifth Annual Encampment of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES F. RISK

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 19, 1940

SPEECH OF GOV. WILLIAM H. VANDERBILT, OF RHODE ISLAND

Mr. RISK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech of Gov. William H. Vanderbilt at patriotic services on board the U. S. S. *Constitution*, Sunday morning, September 1, 1940, at the forty-fifth annual encampment of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States:

I am particularly happy to have this opportunity to participate in the forty-fifth annual encampment of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States. It seems to me particularly appropriate that in this time when religious and political persecutions have swept the Continent of Europe almost bare of democracies that the State of Rhode Island, where was established the first government in the world to guarantee to its citizens complete civil and religious liberty, should participate in these exercises. The land of Roger Williams has, since its inception, stood for the freedoms and the rights upon which our Nation is based. It has been peculiarly free in its ideas and peculiarly outspoken in its beliefs. While being the first State to declare its independence of England, it was the last to join the Union, and only did so after the adoption of the first 10 amendments—better known as the Bill of Rights. Rhode Island has been and is a particularly independent State—a fighting State—ready to risk everything for the liberties and freedom it holds so dear.

It is fitting, too, that these exercises should be held on the deck of the U. S. frigate *Constitution*—"Old Ironsides"—the second oldest ship in the United States Navy, which has come to symbolize the enduring qualities of our American democracy. This ship was one of the most important defense units during those critical days following our successful war of independence. In 1798 the *Constitution* helped to clear our coast line and the West Indies of French privateers. From then until 1805 it saw service in Tripoli against pirates, and during the War of 1812 she was the pride of our Navy and one of the prime factors in our naval victories. In the almost 150 years since the launching of the *Constitution* from nearby Hartt's shipyard, ships and sailors and naval strategy have changed, yet this ship bears a record which any unit of our modern fleet would be proud to emulate.

While our dreadnoughts of today, our fast cruisers and destroyers, our airplane carriers and submarines, and all the other units which go to make up our present Navy in no way resemble "Old Ironsides," a link does exist between this wooden ship upon whose deck we stand this morning and the ships of steel which comprise our modern battle fleet. This ship, the *Constitution*, was built in the hour of need of a very young and struggling republic. The ships which are leaving the ways today and which will soon join our modern Navy are being built in the hour of need of a great republic—grown to manhood. National defense was the cry of nearly 150 years ago, national defense is the cry and the vital need of today. Our Constitution, our way of life, our very thoughts and ideas are perhaps more seriously challenged today than ever before in the history of this Nation.

Only a few months ago, many of us in this country labored under the comfortable illusion that 3,000 miles of Atlantic Ocean and four or five or six thousand miles of Pacific Ocean afforded us unassailable security. Our national energy was directed toward solving great constructive needs, stimulating industry and agriculture, finding jobs for the unemployed, promoting better housing, encouraging social advance. We are still interested in doing all that we can in those directions, but we have come to realize as a result of the events we have witnessed abroad that our conception of security was false. We saw free and democratic nation after nation disappear from the continent of Europe. We saw the tide of totalitarianism engulf one nation after another, and we began to realize that our only security lay in being so strong ourselves that no other nation would dare challenge us. We realized that preparedness for war was our only chance for peace. As this realization has grown, we have painfully, slowly, begun to undertake the greatest peacetime program of national defense in our history.

Something over $14,000,000,000 has been authorized to raise our air, naval, and military forces to unprecedented strength in times of peace. Let us only hope that our awakening has not been too late and that we can shake off the lethargy, which has bound us, in time to be ready for any challenge we may have to face.

For many years veteran organizations, yours among them, have demanded a more adequate national defense. You, as veterans, appreciated the necessity of national defense and as fellow veterans I believe you will agree with me that every man is a better man in war and a better citizen at peace for having had a certain amount of military discipline.

I believe wholeheartedly in the free processes of our democratic form of government. I believe in the full discussion by our representatives in Congress of all measures affecting our lives as citizens, but I must admit that at times I grow impatient at the apparent endless bickering and useless waste of time—at times I question the sincerity of some who seem to use their prerogative of discussing only for the purpose of obstructing. I am impatient of the tactics of those men of both parties who have by one technicality or another delayed final consideration and passing of a compulsory military training law. There should, of course, be careful consideration and free discussion of such a measure, but stalling methods and partisan political considerations should play no part.

I believe that the immediate passage of a selective military service bill is essential to our national defense, and, furthermore, I believe such an act is entirely in keeping with our democratic form of government.

I believe that the vast majority of the people of this country feel as I do and that they are prepared to lend all aid short of war to Great Britain in her struggle against the totalitarian states. I feel that these things are steps which, if taken before it is too late, will do more than anything else to keep this Nation at peace.

We do not want war, but at the same time we are determined to protect our way of life, our form of government, our freedom of the press and speech, our right to worship according to the dictates of our own conscience, and all other rights and privileges, no matter what the cost may be.

The war that is going on in Europe today is not simply a war between nations. It is a war of two opposite and diametrically opposed philosophies of life. On the one hand, the philosophy of the State where the individual counts for nothing except where he or she may be used as a small cog or part of a machine—a totalitarian machine. On the other hand, a belief in the dignity of man, of individual rights, liberties, and choices—a democratic nation. We, because of our background, our history, our progress, because of the very things that have made us a great Nation, are inevitably and irrevocably committed to the democratic side. It is a time in the world when we here in America should take our democracy down off the shelf and study it anew, when we should refresh our memories and brighten our appreciation of what our form of government really means to us as individuals. It means that we can have meetings such as this one this morning, attended by men and women of every race, creed, and color, and we can if we wish discuss at this meeting matters pertaining to our political and social welfare, that we can criticize our Government, that we can advocate candidates of our own choosing for various offices, that we can go to any church or no church as we may see fit, that we can read any newspaper we like, listen to any radio broadcast we like, see any movie or play we like and live in peace and tranquillity with our families free from unreasonable search and seizure. It means that we have fair courts to which we may appeal for justice and where regardless of our

social, financial, or religious standing we will receive it. It means all those things and many others, none of which we could enjoy in a totalitarian state. Those are the things which we are determined to defend; those are the things for which we are willing to spend our money, our time, and, if necessary, our lives because those are the things which make life worthwhile to us.

Our Nation today is aroused to the necessity of preparedness and national defense. At the moment we are floundering. We, as a Nation, have not found our feet and placed them on the direct path which is the shortest route to national defense. I say this not in a spirit of criticism, but it is a fact that we are going through a period of lost motion, wasted effort, and we lack coordination and direction. Time—valuable time—is being lost. Perhaps this is inevitable in the transition period between the lethargy of the past and the activity of the future, but if we are to make our form of government work in competition with the world of totalitarian states, we must cut this lost motion to a minimum. We must prove that we, as a democracy, can function adequately, sufficiently, and promptly. We must not forget that totalitarian states, by means of agents cleverly placed in this country, will strive to do all in their power to increase our confusion and our delays. We know that we have Trojan horses and "fifth columnists" within our gates. It is time we took off the kid gloves of diplomacy and dealt with these people with the bare fists of Americanism.

We must preserve our democracy and at the same time we must inject into it more coordination, more efficiency, more speed. I have every faith that we will do this; that we will emerge victorious, whether in peace or in war, but we have no time to lose and no time to waste on the man or woman of whatever party who plays politics with national defense, which is another way of saying our liberty, security, and our personal freedom.

Fair Labor Standards in the Federal Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK W. FRIES
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 19, 1940

Mr. FRIES. Mr. Speaker, I have been a Member of this august body for almost 4 years and have served on the Committees on Labor and the Civil Service.

During this time I have become increasingly aware of the close relationship between working conditions of Federal employees and workers outside the Government. Establishment of a good working policy in the Government and a few organized industries eventually results in similar policies for all industry generally. And, similarly, I am convinced that any break-down in conditions of work in the Federal service will have an immediate effect on workers throughout the country.

The Federal Government is the Nation's No. 1 employer, and if it permits decent labor standards within its own bailiwick to be smashed it will be setting a dangerous precedent and a bad example for all the employers of the Nation.

In the last 8 years the Congress has enacted laws designed to further and protect decent standard working conditions. It has made specific requirements of industrial leaders. Specifically, the maximum number of hours, the minimum wages, and assurance of collective bargaining in good faith are required of all employers in private enterprise. Those who violate these provisions are prosecuted by our Government. Now it would be ironic and inconsistent indeed if the prosecutor were guilty of the same practices as the violator. It could not help but create dissatisfaction, which would be completely unfortunate in these times when national unity is so very important.

SERIOUS THREAT

Right now a serious break-down in labor standards in the Federal service threatens. It should be prevented in the interests of the well-being of the United States.

I am informed that the Bureau of the Budget has informally requested nondefense departments of Government to save approximately one-tenth of their appropriations for the current fiscal year, allocated by this Congress for specific use. The savings are to be made arbitrarily, and the money is reportedly to be used for defense purposes.

Now, as one of the many Americans who served his country during the last war, no one is more deeply interested in an adequate national defense than I. I do not want to advocate anything that would be detrimental to that objective. I am sure that every Member of this body shares my position on this matter. But I insist that if these savings are made at the expense of our loyal Government workers it will be harmful to our national-defense program.

Every single worker in the Federal Government is an American citizen. All of them have taken an oath to perform their duties faithfully and loyally. I have a statement here from the President of the United Federal Workers of America, an organization of Government employees, which expresses clearly the attitude of these faithful public servants. I quote:

> Federal employees are completely willing to bear their just and proportionate burdens in America's national-defense program, and are in fact doing so.
>
> Like other citizens, they are contributing to the welfare of the Nation in the form of increased taxes, and higher living costs. In addition to these burdens of citizenship, they are making special contributions in the form of uncompensated overtime, stepped-up production, curtailed leave, and virtual elimination of merited promotions and earned wage increases.
>
> JACOB BAKER,
> *President, United Federal Workers of America.*

Mr. Baker is right. Government workers are not only shouldering their just share of the defense program; they are in fact carrying more of the burden than the average citizen. For instance, in private industry the workers are compensated for overtime pursuant to the Wage and Hour Act, but in the Wage and Hour Division, which administers the law, employees get no overtime pay.

If the Bureau of the Budget is permitted to carry out its so-called economy plans, even greater hardships will face employees in the Federal service. To achieve its purpose, the Bureau is using its well-known procedure of setting up reserves for each department. The savings contemplated are larger than ever before. Conservative estimates place the total amount at $400,000,000. This sum of money will be saved at the expense of the worker. The Bureau cannot touch fixed funds and trust accounts.

I want to outline in part what these reserves will mean to the affected agencies and their employees.

First. One of the effects of the appropriations cut will be that vacancies as they occur will not be filled. This places an extra burden of work on the remaining employees. With a smaller staff sharing the same or an even greater work load, output will necessarily fall off, efficiency will slump, and morale of the personnel will be undermined.

Second. If this policy is pursued, added overtime will follow with the result that there will be a break-down in the hours established for the Federal service. This, too, would affect output, efficiency, and morale.

Third. There is a distinct possibility that under the Budget Bureau's plans a slash in salary will result. The effects of this on Government workers and on those in private industry need no comment.

Now, if we disregard completely the welfare of Government workers, it is still of the utmost importance to this country that the Bureau of the Budget's plans be checked.

In these days when democracy is on trial, it would be fatal to have a government whose day-to-day functions floundered in inefficiency. These day-to-day functions are the heart of Government operation. These operations are tremendously important. If these functions are impaired, the entire defense program will be impaired. It is extremely important that our Federal service should continue to operate smoothly and effectively. To do this, we must have competent, well-trained personnel. We must have loyal, devoted employees.

This Government has gone to considerable lengths to train its personnel to do a competent, thorough job. We should not tolerate any practice which would hinder the smooth operation of government; nor any policy which would result in trained workers, who represent a Government investment and a national asset, leaving the Federal service to seek fields where returns are richer and treatment more considerate.

We must give deepest attention to the elements of morale and loyalty in government. The loyalty is there, but the Gov-

ernment should not deliberately set out to undermine these highly essential qualities. If we permit such practices, then the Government will inadvertently become its own "fifth column."

The Bureau of the Budget has refused to give simple public assurance that it does not plan through fiscal legerdemain to lower labor standards in the Government service. On Labor Day, President Roosevelt declared that labor's gains will not be lost. But no assurance has been given to Government workers that their labor standards will be protected. If labor standards are smashed in the Government service, it will only signify the beginning of a Nation-wide deterioration in labor standards for all American workers. The Government must not, unwittingly or otherwise, permit or encourage this to be done.

There is only one other point I should like to make. It seems to me that this body is competent enough to study the fiscal needs of government and to make proper recommendations and appropriations. But apparently the Bureau of the Budget disagrees with me.

The Appropriations Committees of both the Senate and the House gave careful scrutiny to the fiscal estimates for Government agencies at public hearings. The Bureau of the Budget appeared before these bodies. Departmental administrators prepared careful estimates and presented briefs, and citizens, civic bodies, and employee groups also gave their views. On the basis of these presentations and its own deliberations, this Congress voted for appropriations for all departments of government, defense and nondefense. It allocated funds to each according to its best lights.

Now, I am informed that the Bureau of the Budget apparently does not think that the best lights of this august body are bright enough. They are implying that we appropriated $400,000,000 too much for nondefense and were short by that amount for defense purposes. If that is their position, let them appear before congressional appropriations committees and state their case.

Granting that the Bureau of the Budget has the right to shift funds about in the interest of better administration, as need is demonstrated, they are overstepping their bounds when they reappropriate funds in such staggering amounts as $400,000,000, earmarked by Congress for specific purposes. If there is any reallocating to be done in such quantity, this Congress should do it. I cannot approve of this fiscal chicanery. Therefore, it is my strong feeling that the Bureau of the Budget be called upon to explain just what they are doing and what they intend to do with moneys appropriated by Congress, to the satisfaction of Congress.

Since the Bureau of the Budget will not apparently give public assurance that there will be no break-down in labor standards in the Federal service, I consider it the duty of Congress to do so. It is our public responsibility to encourage American workers and to give recognition for efficiency and loyalty—particularly to Government workers who are right now vested with all-important functions. This is not a hard thing for Congress to do and if it is done, it will yield large returns in production, loyalty, and efficiency and will set an example fit for private employers to follow.

Opposing Philosophies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARTEL J. JONKMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 19, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE GRAND RAPIDS HERALD

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Grand Rapids (Mich.) Herald of September 18, 1940:

[From the Grand Rapids (Mich.) Herald of September 18, 1940]

OPPOSING PHILOSOPHIES

Wendell Willkie, in his Coffeyville speech, the first of his real campaign for election, hit exactly the correct diagnosis of what this campaign is all about—what the issues are in it. It is useless for the two antagonists to argue about foreign policy or national defense. The whole Nation, after long slumbering, now seems united behind the defense theory and is not too technical as to the means for preparing this country to meet successfully any possible foe. The issue of this campaign is, Which of two philosophies of government do the people prefer? Upon their choice hangs the fate of the Nation and of their own liberties.

These two philosophies are Roosevelt's demand for an unprecedented third term or Willkie's pledge against perpetuation in office.

Do we want Roosevelt's secrecy of the affairs of Government or Willkie's frank report to the people who are the Government?

Shall we choose Roosevelt's theory of centralizing greater and greater powers in Government or Willkie's pledge of giving the Government back to the people?

Shall we have Roosevelt's regimentation of all people or Willkie's encouragement of individual initiative?

Shall we have Roosevelt's constant harassment of business and wealth-producing industry or Willkie's pledge of freedom for private enterprise?

Shall we have Roosevelt's economic system of vast spending, continual deficits, pyramiding debt, and mounting tax burden, or Willkie's ideal of economy in Government, balanced budget, reduction of the national debt, and eventual lower taxes?

Do we choose Roosevelt's theory of supporting the idle by Government dole financed by the thrifty and hard working, or Willkie's pledge to provide work for all who will at private industry?

Do we prefer foreign commitments secretly made by Roosevelt or Willkie's ideal of perhaps the same commitments made after the public has been informed of the intent to make them?

Shall we choose Roosevelt's evasion of the Constitution and the law, attempts to pack the Supreme Court to gain the desired ends, or Willkie's pledge of observance of the letter and the spirit of the basic principles of the American Government?

Shall we choose government by the New Deal and its agents indefinitely or Willkie's pledge of government by the people in accordance with the laws and traditions of the United States?

Those are the issues in this campaign as laid down by Wendell Willkie. They are the very basis of what the people must decide when they go to the polls. That was Willkie's Coffeyville speech.

The World Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD W. CREAL
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 19, 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. J. DAN TALBOTT

Mr. CREAL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following brief address of Hon. J. Dan Talbott at a patriotic meeting at Bardstown, Ky.:

ADDRESS OF HON. J. DAN TALBOTT AT BARDSTOWN, KY., AUGUST 29

I heartily approve of your meeting and I hope that it will convince our people of the emergency and extremity confronting us, and of the necessity for immediate and sound action in governmental affairs. America must be placed in a position where her women and children cannot be murdered and her people enslaved, as so many already are in all of the democracies of Europe.

We Americans instinctively hate war, but as much as we hate it, we must not forget that the freedom we now enjoy was fought for by our ancestors and purchased by them at a great price. They fought for it when our country was weak in manpower and wealth, and won it for themselves and for us. If it is not sacred enough for us to fight for now, should the occasion demand, when we are strong in manpower, resources, and wealth, then we must be prepared to lose it.

As the greatest democracy on earth, populated by the freest people in the world, our Nation affords a choice prize in the eyes of the dictators of Europe and Asia. They hate and sneer at us, as they do at all democracies. They contend that all the democracies of the world are weak in determination, in judgment, and in their ability to defend themselves. To a great degree they have demonstrated their argument in Europe, and it now remains for American democracy to disprove their contentions.

Today everything pertaining to liberty and independence is at stake. The right of free speech, religious freedom, and every principle of independence which was established by our forefathers is being challenged—not only challenged but in most parts of the world is being utterly destroyed. Today Great Britain alone stands between us and the horrible tyrant who is running mad upon the face of the earth.

Hitler, by force and with utter disregard for pledges solemnly made, has taken charge of one country after another in Europe. His powerful war machine has destroyed every country which has dared to oppose him, with the single exception of Great Britain. Hitler has no fear of foolish talk. He understands and respects only those who have the courage and the ability to whip him at his own game. With Great Britain destroyed, his armies will control the entire world, with the exception of America; and when that time comes—when Hitler controls most of the wealth and commerce of the world and enslaves most of the people—what respect will he have for America and her rights as a Nation, if we are woefully and pitifully unprepared to demand our rights and defend ourselves with arms?

The peoples of Czechoslovakia, Poland, Holland, Belgium, Norway, Denmark, and France have been, and the people of England are now being, murdered because for years they were indifferent and lacked foresight. Surely their predicament should be our solemn lesson and warning, but strangely, with this horrible example before us, Congress still debates, week after week and month after month, whether America should prepare to protect herself from wholesale murder and enslavement. England, the last hope of democracy in Europe, for 10 years wasted her time and energy debating instead of preparing for the inevitable, and now her vast empire stands likely to be destroyed and enslaved.

The situation in the world today is not of the American people's making. Only a few years ago a majority of us would have said it could not happen. Today we all know it has happened, and we should be sensible enough to realize that what has happened in Europe and Asia can happen in America unless we immediately build the greatest naval, armed, and air forces in the world, to be manned by properly and competently trained personnel.

A little more than a century and a half ago, when our country was weak and the prey of stronger nations, our forefathers fought for and obtained freedom and national independence. Then they gave us the system of government we so happily enjoy today. God forbid that we, while Hitler is attempting to prove that all democracies are weak and inadequate, shall become soft and let our freedom slip away from us.

I hope your meeting will go on record as asking Congress to furnish England with every ship and plane we can spare without impairing our safety at the present moment; that all food supplies necessary to feed the English people shall be made available to them while they fight their battles for a cause not alone dear to them but to all true Americans as well.

I further hope that the people of Nelson County, in their meeting, will adopt a program of extending to the children of the British Empire refuge in their homes as long as necessary to protect them from the murderous German bombs and machine guns.

Benefits of Prohibition Repeal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. C. ARTHUR ANDERSON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 19, 1940

Mr. ANDERSON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the fallacy of prohibition was amply proven years ago. Our Nation still suffers economically and socially from the effects of this unwise experiment.

Many of us here were law-enforcement officials prior to our election to Congress. As such we came to know first-hand the power and the wealth that came into the hands of gangsters and lawbreakers because they were able to maintain traffic in illicit liquor in spite of the strictest enforcement.

Every living American knows that repeal of prohibition has improved the economic, social, and moral structure of our people. Proper enforcement of law has been made easier and the millions of dollars that formerly found their way into the hands of bootleggers and criminals trafficking in liquor now flow into the hands of honest, hardworking laboring men and into the United States Treasury.

The distillers and brewers of this country are deserving of our highest commendation for their fine cooperation during the past 8 years in educating the people of this country in the quality and virtue of temperance.

I ask unanimous consent to bring this brief statement to an appropriate conclusion by extending in the RECORD at this point a brief article from the American Brewer for August 1940.

FROM THE EDITOR'S WORKBENCH—"MEDICINAL LIQUORS" IN BONE-DRY COUNTIES

The victories of the prohibitionists, as reported from time to time, never tell the whole story. The reader is left to infer that because a certain area voted against liquor and beer licenses then that area is dry, and nobody drinks.

Such, however, is not the case. The first indication of the real condition is usually an exposé of some well-organized bootleg syndicate. Less spectacular, but more definite, are the records of the drug stores.

The Texas Brewers Institute, through its official publication, Beer, publishes a tabulation of 90 bone-dry counties in the State that sustain medical permits authorizing the sale of liquor for medicinal purposes. The average per capita consumption of liquor for 3 months was 0.73 pints. In 22 counties where beer is sold for beverage purposes the sale of liquor under medical permits was 0.51 pints per capita. In 3 wine-and-beer counties the average for 3 months was 0.286 pints per capita.

With fine irony the institute's publication says:

"But temperance weeps while sickness stalks abroad and disease overshadows those counties. Records reveal that those areas present a grave problem to the public-health service. During the first 3 months of 1940 there were 89,073 cases of illness in Taylor County. At least that many prescriptions for liquor were written out by physicians and filled. * * * (It is unlawful to fill a prescription for beer in dry areas.) This was almost 8 pints of hard liquor in 3 months for every man, woman, and child in Taylor County. * * * During the same 3 months the State average for the whole of Texas was 1.32 pints per capita.

"Lubbock County showed a health condition that looks very bad for the great school located there. The doctors found 100,144 cases of the disease that called for prescriptions of hard liquor. The per capita consumption in 3 months was 2.06 pints.

"Every one of the 20,189 inhabitants of Hale County must have been sick two or more times to require 40,872 hard-liquor prescriptions, for an average consumption of 2.02 pints per capita during the 90-day period.

"In Yoakum County the condition must be dreadful. The estimated population is 2,050, and it took 21,262 pints of hard liquor to relieve the sickness there during January, February, and March. That is an average of 10.37 pints—about 8 times the State average. But that county is bone dry. * * * The prohibitionists won a great victory when the county refused to legalize beer last spring by 582 for prohibition and 277 against."

Why do the people in the United States still accept the fallacious belief that legislating against beer licenses and liquor will put a stop to drinking? What usually happens is that a dry area raises a new crop of hypocrites.

Highway Bridges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED BRADLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 19, 1940

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, today this House adopted the conference report on the Mackinac Straits bridge bill, very much in accordance with a bill which I introduced last year by which this Congress grants consent to the State of Michigan to bridge the Straits of Mackinac. The State can, of course, and is expected to, delegate this authority to some State agency. By an act of the 1934 State legislature, the Mackinac Straits Bridge Authority was created to study this question and to construct such a bridge. Therefore, I expect that the State will unquestionably designate the authority as its agency.

Many arguments have been advanced for and against the Mackinac Straits bridge. Many facts and figures have been submitted. I feel, therefore, Mr. Speaker, that no study of this question would be complete without the figures which I append herewith secured by one who has long been deeply concerned with the crossing of the straits, one who was among the first to advocate the establishment of the State ferries, and one who, realizing the total inadequacy of the State ferries to cope with the situation, has long favored a permanent bridge. I refer, of course, to that grand old man of Northern Michigan, our former Governor, Chase S. Osborn. His editorial appeared in the Sault Ste. Marie Evening News, September 9, 1940.

[From the Sault Ste. Marie (Mich.) Evening News of September 9, 1940]

HIGHWAY BRIDGES IN FLORIDA

(By Chase S. Osborn)

The State of Michigan is a summer Florida and the State of Florida is a winter Michigan. In other words, they are both greatly interested in visitors, especially those called tourists, and both offer superb attractions.

When it comes to bridges, both have similar interests also, but Michigan is yet without the vision of Florida. We are just beginning to awaken. Florida has a billion-dollar tourist industry in the winter. Michigan can have the same in the summer.

The State of Florida has 156 miles of bridges according to records compiled up to December 31, 1936. There have been some built since then, but they are inconsequential.

The longest single bridge in Florida, on the Key West extension, is 7 miles in length and extends from Marathon on Key Vaca to Big Pond. There is a drawspan on this bridge at Moser Channel. This bridge is 4 miles longer than the proposed Mackinac Straits structure. The Straits Bridge proper will be 3 miles long, and it will not be weakened by an open span.

The total length of bridges alone, on the Key West extension in Florida, is 19.7 miles out of a total length of 120 miles, the distance of the highway from the mainland to Key West. The Florida objective is nothing compared with that of the Mackinac Straits Bridge. The latter not only gives access to the Upper Peninsula, the playground of Michigan all the year, but also opens a shorter route to the entire Northwest.

Most of the bridges and ferries in Florida are public. However, there are 11 ferries and bridges that are privately owned. These have tolls that are regulated by the State and are reasonable.

The State of Florida has only two toll bridges and one toll ferry. On these the rates are negligible, such as 25 cents over the public ferry that crosses Crooked River, 6.1 miles northerly from Carrabelle. It is free in the daytime but there is a charge of 25 cents at night.

The only public bridges that charge tolls are those 37 miles northeast of Key West and 2 miles east of Lillian.

This information was obtained officially by me from the State road department at Tallahassee, Fla., where Hon. Clyde J. Baser is director of public relations.

It has been stated that the bridges of Florida have cost more money than those of Michigan, even including the one at Mackinac Straits.

I hope those few people who have so little reason to be opposed to the Mackinac Straits Bridge will consider these figures.

William B. Bankhead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LINDSAY C. WARREN

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 19, 1940

RADIO ADDRESS BY EARL GODWIN

Mr. WARREN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address by Mr. Earl Godwin:

This is Earl Godwin speaking to you from Washington, to supplement the bulletins announcing the death of WILLIAM BANKHEAD, Speaker of the House of Representatives, with a word picture of the man from one who from the press and radio galleries watched the entrance, the work, the triumph of a truly great American statesman.

I knew and loved WILLIAM BANKHEAD, and I deeply respected him because he was an American in every thought and act. He was a member of a family deeply rooted in Americanism. I remember the day he was sworn into the House, because there was a new man in the House whose father was at the same time in the Senate from Alabama. His father had been a Confederate officer (4 years' service and three wounds). Incidentally, how many times have I heard Mr. BANKHEAD'S close friend and coworker, Representative SAM RAYBURN, of Texas, leader of the majority, say these words, "The best men these United States have ever produced were those fellows who came out of the Civil War." Incidentally, the House cannot function for a minute without the Speaker, and so, in all probability, Mr. BANKHEAD'S friend, SAM RAYBURN, will be elected Speaker tomorrow, at noon. WILLIAM BANKHEAD'S brother, JOHN, is now in the same seat his father had in the Senate, and the late Speaker is the only man to have been chairman of the powerful Rules Committee, floor leader for his majority party, and also Speaker.

There have been times that the best way to address him was by the name his close friends had for him, just plain Bill. The Speaker of the House rates, always rates the proper and dignified appellation Mr. Speaker. I recall very well the occasion of the first day of the present session of Congress. I was at the microphone in the House describing the scene. Mr. BANKHEAD was to come on immediately, I to introduce him, and with a great deal of nerve I said:

"I will introduce him to you of America by the great title of the completely democratic office he holds, which is Mr. Speaker, but I can best describe his homespun character when I say that to those who love him he is still BILL BANKHEAD," and do you know, he loved it, and said so.

Here was a man who was completely a democrat in his philosophy of life and government; and he stuck to it; and did not compromise. A progressive Democrat; and a Democrat who thrilled thousands upon thousands who heard him speak on hundreds of occasions in his long colorful life, and as democracy progressed WILLIAM BANKHEAD progressed. He was genuinely in tune with the progress of his party. When anyone questioned that in late years he would always say with gentle emphasis "I am a new dealer," and the New Deal owes it to Speaker BANKHEAD that many a time he helped them in a tight spot on Capitol Hill.

Southern Members of Congress have a way of staying in Congress; the constituents take the view expressed often by the late Champ Clark of Missouri—a great Speaker, too—which was that once a district finds a good man it is to the interest of the constituents to keep him in office. He grows in experience and grows in value to Nation, State, and district because with his passing years he steps upward in Congress. BANKHEAD increased in the wisdom of his counsel and the weight of his influence.

Coming from the agricultural South, the years of his service have had great impact on farm legislation in such fundamentals as aid to farm tenants in the owning of farms. Throughout the administration, particularly in the years of his leadership and Speakership, he had been one of the small coterie of experienced lawmakers who have made the House conspicuous for its teamwork. And in this present session especially notable for the fact that its leaders laid down a program of legislation and carried it through almost on the minute. The old football team training no doubt, for BILL BANKHEAD was fullback at Alabama University. He and I were swimming in the Chesapeake Bay 3 weeks ago and he pointed out the effects of an old knee injury, which he contracted as he plunged through the line without interference.

We were guests of a prominent Washingtonian at this swimming party, and as we sat down to dinner the Speaker arose and said to his host, "May I ask you to indulge me in a family custom from time immemorial; may I ask a blessing on this meal?" And as we bowed our heads the Speaker asked God to bless the food before us. And he carried that principle through life. He believed in God.

A good judge of human nature. We were speaking together once of a man of high prominence, but doubtful reputation, "I have never spoken to him," said Mr. BANKHEAD, "but I don't have to learn of his character from others. I have seen him, and you know, God has a very effective way of writing character in a man's face."

He was a tremendous believer in the House of Representatives, in which he served so faithfully, so conspicuously, for all but a quarter century. Sitting with him in the House lobby a few days ago we were speaking of the great American character of that body. "Inside those doors," said he to me, "is the heart and soul of this Republic. America will not go wrong as long as we keep it that way."

He was true to his friends and they were and are true to him. He believed earnestly and sincerely that he had no right to give up his fight for the Vice Presidential nomination at Chicago, and it was his loyalty to his friends that took him a few days ago to Baltimore to address the great meeting at which he was scheduled to speak. He was in pain, but he said, "As long as I am able to stand on my feet I will make that speech, and I will not let those friends of mine down." And he gritted his teeth and went ahead until sheer pain rendered him unconscious and he could not make the address.

Nor will he make another in this material world. But there will remain in the memory of Washingtonians, in the memory of the great army of statesmen who served with him, in the memory of visitors to the galleries—there will remain in the hearts and minds of newspapermen and radio correspondents who were admitted to gallery privileges under the Bankhead regime the vigorous, vibrant, meaningful tones of Speaker BANKHEAD as daily he mounted the rostrum and brought down the gavel at noon with the words:

"The House will be in order."

Mr. Speaker Rayburn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LUTHER A. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 19, 1940

ARTICLE FROM THE DENISON (TEX.) HERALD

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks, I submit herewith an article concerning Speaker SAM RAYBURN.

This article appeared June 23, 1940, in the Denison Herald of Denison, Tex., and was written by Mr. George W. Stimpson, formerly president of the National Press Club of Washington.

It pays a beautiful and well-deserved tribute to the Speaker of the House, and will also be of interest since it is from the pen of one of the most popular and much beloved members of the press gallery.

The article follows:

[From the Denison (Tex.) Herald of June 23, 1940]

SAM RAYBURN IS LAUDED AS MOST VITAL MEMBER OF CONGRESS

(By George W. Stimpson)

(To get an intimate glimpse of Representative SAM RAYBURN, of this (Fourth) congressional district, the Denison (Tex.) Herald asked one of the best-known Washington correspondents to write the story. George W. Stimpson, author, correspondent, and former president of the National Press Club, responded with the following story. Mr. Stimpson describes the Bonham Congressman as "the leader and most vital and important Member of the Congress of the United States."—Editor's note.)

Without SAM RAYBURN the great Red River project would not now be in process of construction.

Without SAM RAYBURN there would not be a lot of other good things in the world.

The Fourth Congressional District is to be congratulated in giving the Nation a public servant of the first order and at the same time having a Congressman ever on the alert to serve the best interests of his district.

His fellow Congressmen say in Washington that SAM RAYBURN is level-headed and has his feet on the ground. We newspaper correspondents think he is the salt of the earth.

To understand SAM RAYBURN you should know something of the long, hard struggle that has brought him from a 40-acre cotton farm in north Texas to a seat in the high councils of the Nation.

PICTURES ARE INSPIRATION

On the mantelpiece in SAM RAYBURN'S office in the National Capitol are two pictures. One is that of an elderly man, with a beard, sharp, firmly chiseled features, apparently tall and spare, sitting informally in a chair, perhaps in his own yard. The other is that of an elderly woman, with white hair, classic features, a firm but kindly face, bespeaking strong character.

These are the father and mother of SAM RAYBURN, the leader and most vital and important Member of the Congress of the United States, responsible for making the laws that govern more than 130,000,000 people.

SAM RAYBURN often looks longingly at these photographs of his pioneer parents, who gave him life, who reared him, who molded his character, who made him what he is today—a leader among leaders in one of the most critical periods of American history.

"Their lives are a source of continual inspiration to me," he once said, half to himself and half to me. "It is good for us to ponder on the part these pioneers played in the building of our country."

SAM RAYBURN'S people lived in the hill country of eastern Tennessee and were of Anglo-Saxon stock who migrated westward from the Atlantic seaboard. His father, William Marion Rayburn, was orphaned and was brought up by a kind uncle. At the outbreak of the Civil War William Marion Rayburn enlisted in the Confederate Army and rode with the legions of Lee to the bitter end of that struggle. His popularity among his comrades is evidenced by the fact that he was chosen captain of his company, an honor which he declined.

HIS FATHER A CONFEDERATE

When the Confederacy collapsed and General Lee rode to Appomattox Courthouse to meet Grant, the hearts of 50,000 southern boys beat with new hope because of the liberal terms of capitulation. Grant, noticing Lee's dress sword at his side, wrote into the articles of capitulation a provision that the officers might keep their side arms. But what was more important, the liberal conqueror agreed that the southern soldiers might keep their horses. After years of near famine, they needed those horses to put in the spring crop.

Like thousands of others who had followed the fortunes of Lee and the storm-cradled nation that fell, William Marion Rayburn started back on his dappled-gray mare to the hills of east Tennessee. The war was over and he had only one thought in mind—to hurry back to the little bottom-land farm on Clinch Creek and to provide for his widowed mother. He had his horse and there was still time to plant corn.

But at Knoxville a thing happened that the paroled soldier never forgot nor forgave. The incident so embittered the youth that he remained an unreconstructed rebel and Yankee-hater to the day of his death nearly 50 years later. The Federals took his horse away from him in violation of Grant's promise.

CHALLENGE IS ACCEPTED

Tired and footsore, he walked the rest of the way to what had been his comfortable home in the Clinch Valley in Roane County. His mother was safe, but nearly all the property had been destroyed by bushwhackers and guerrillas who fought for neither side but plundered both. But William Marion Rayburn accepted the challenge and went to work.

The greatest event in the life of the former Confederate soldier occurred shortly afterward when he was married to Martha Waller, a descendant of an old Virginia family. Children came along in due season. Ten of them were born to William Marion and Martha Rayburn on Clinch Creek—seven boys and three girls. The eighth child was christened SAMUEL TALIAFERRO RAYBURN. We know him by the short and simple name, SAM RAYBURN.

The Rayburns were healthy, industrious, thrifty, and upright folk, and in spite of the many mouths to feed they prospered in a small way on the little corn farm in the Tennessee hills. But opportunity was limited on the bottom lands, and in 1887, when Sam was 5, William Marion and Martha Rayburn decided to sell their place and go to Texas. Texas! All Tennesseans of those days who went anywhere went to Texas. That decision, hard to make, was an important one, because it made SAM RAYBURN, a Texan.

Sam has only a hazy recollection of his childhood life in Tennessee. He can still smell the leather-coat apples from trees that grew near the house. The steamboats, carrying farm produce up and down the Clinch, made an indelible impression on his boyhood mind. The tall smokestacks, with their ruffle-like funnels, fascinated him. To this day he is thrilled by the sight of a steamboat.

THE FAMILY TO TEXAS

The great Norris Dam, keystone of the national power arch, is within a few miles of the birthplace of SAM RAYBURN, author of the Utilities Act.

The long journey from Tennessee to Texas can be better imagined than described. Most of the trip was by train. There were two babies younger than 5-year-old Sam. A family of 12—father and mother and 10 children—with all their personal belongings, had pulled their very roots out of the hills of Tennessee and were off for Texas.

William Marion Rayburn must have been a remarkable man, but Martha Rayburn must have been an even more remarkable woman. It took strength and courage and vision and mother love to take 10 children to a far-away and to them unknown country in the West and start life anew.

The destination was Fannin County, where the pioneers arrived safely, after the long journey, in early spring. With all his earthly savings in his pocket, William Marion Rayburn began to look for a farm. He bought 40 acres of black land and the large family moved into a little frame house, which continued to be the home of the parents and some of the children for more than a quarter of a century.

In Tennessee the Rayburns had been corn farmers. Now they planted cotton, a new crop in north Texas. They knew nothing of raising cotton; neither did anybody else around Windom. The first year the rain fell in torrents and flooded the black land; bollworms, tasting cotton for the first time in that region, followed the rain. William Marion Rayburn made only two and a half bales that first year. It was tough going, with a family of 12, but there was no thought of turning back.

INTERESTED IN PUBLIC AFFAIRS

Another son was born in those early days in Texas. An uncle came to live with the family. There were now 14 members of the family under that one little roof. Providence smiled on the Rayburns, and the farm prospered. The father became a great reader, keenly interested in public affairs. He loved horses and was a fine horseman. I have heard Sam say that his father could drive a team faster than anybody he ever knew.

Sam got his elementary schooling in a two-teacher country school in the neighborhood. But he yearned for a better education. We suspect that even then he had an itch to get into politics. This was easier thought of than done, because no one of the name had ever run for anything. Besides, there was the difficult problem of going to school and improving himself.

"Father, I would like to go away to school."

The very suggestion required courage, as the father and son stood in the cottonfield one summer day 40 years ago.

There was cotton to pick—Sam was good at it—and there were 11 children in the family, and 40 acres of black land was not producing enough to send them all to college. In all things the Rayburns should share equally.

YOUNG SAM PERSISTS

But Sam persisted that day in the cottonfield. He told his father that he did not want money. There would be no trouble with the cotton picking, he thought, and he would manage somehow to pay his expenses at college. He only wanted his father's permission to go.

In the end the boy won the argument. There in the cottonfield with his father, with the door of opportunity opened before him; there on the black land of north Texas, where he had grown almost to manhood under the stern guidance and loving care of his pioneer parents, SAM RAYBURN vowed that he would always stick with his people, and his friends and neighbors know that he has kept that vow.

W. L. Mayo, a truly great educator, was then operating the East Texas Normal College at Commerce, some 14 miles from the Rayburn farm. There boys and girls, with little preparation, could obtain an education at small cost.

William Marion Rayburn hitched his horses to the old buggy and drove Sam to Ladonia, where they took the train for Wolfe City. As Sam climbed up the steps of the coach his father handed him $25. Nobody knew better than Sam what that $25 meant to his father.

Mayo (Sam never speaks of him except with a sort of reverence) gave him credit for a room in a dormitory. He got a job ringing

the college bell. Another student and he formed a partnership to sweep up one of the school buildings, for which they received $8 a month. Sam's share, as junior partner of the firm, was $3.

He studied hard, read many books on biography and history, and was given a teacher's certificate at the end of the first term. To earn money to go back to school he taught in Hopkins County a year and returned to Commerce for a B. S. degree. Another year he taught in the little two-teacher school in Fannin County where he had first gone to school himself.

Sam continued to make his home under the family roof on the farm. One of his brothers had died. The rest of the family clung pretty close together. William Marion Rayburn liked to have the whole family at home at the same time. Those were happy days, but Sam was impatient to start out on a public career. He did a lot of reading those days, mostly about the great men who made America.

A LEGISLATOR WHEN 24

In 1906 he decided to try for the legislature. He rode all over Fannin County on a little brown pony, seeing the voters, talking politics and farming with everybody, and making friends wherever he went. At 24 he found himself a member of the legislature, where he made good from the beginning. While a member of the house down at Austin he studied law a year at the university and was admitted to the Texas bar in 1908. The same year he hung out his shingle in front of a little office in Bonham.

Service at Austin presented opportunity for development, for growth, for study, for the acquisition of knowledge of men and measures. In 1911, at the age of 29, he was Speaker of the House and his fame was spreading over the State far beyond the confines of Bonham and Fannin Counties.

He had been think of running for Congress as far back as he could remember and he decided that his time had come. He had no organization. He just ran. There was no particular issue agitating the people at the moment. He wanted to go to Congress and he told folks so. At 30 he was a Member of Congress.

ON A POWERFUL COMMITTEE

That was in 1913. President Wilson, whom Sam saw inaugurated, called a special session and the House organized immediately that year. The young Member from Bonham was assigned to the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, which had just been made an exclusive committee. He never served on any other standing committee from that day until 20 years later when he became its chairman. In 1936 he left that committee to become Democratic majority leader.

Sam struck up a close friendship with JOHN N. GARNER, who already had served in Congress 10 years when SAM arrived on the scene. They had grown up in the same kind of country in north Texas and they had many things in common. Both were honest, straightforward, square shooting, and believed in reaching their goals by patient, hard work and by mastering the problems and situations with which they were confronted. Both built on a solid rock foundation and both succeeded in winning the complete confidence and respect of their colleagues.

A GREAT AMERICAN

I have related these details because I think they are an essential part of the portrait of this great American. The long road of struggle and hardship of his family are part and parcel of the man.

SAM RAYBURN is of the very soil of north Texas. His attitude toward his own people shows it. The Rayburns still meet whenever possible at the homestead near Bonham. Two brothers, Tom and Will, and a sister, Miss Lou, still live on the farm. There are nine beds in the house and plenty to eat. SAM RAYBURN, like his father before him, would rather be at home than any other place on earth.

Last summer I received a note from him, which read: "I am having a great time on the farm, riding horses some, fishing some, sleeping long. I do trust you will come this way while I am home. The door is wide open and the chickens' legs are yellow."

Only one familiar with the strenuous life he lives in Washington can appreciate what it means to SAM RAYBURN to be among his own people.

He likes to relax from his nerve-racking labors in Washington by talking with his family, his neighbors, his friends, and those he has known from boyhood; by looking over his white-faced cattle and his registered prize Jersey bulls; by taking early morning rides to the river ranch; by fishing in his well-stocked small lake—the things that make life worth while. Greatness has never spoiled SAM RAYBURN.

A NATURAL LEADER

Equipped with natural ability, poise, dignity, and the qualities of leadership, the majority leader of the House has been an effective Member of Congress from the beginning. During the 27 years he has been in Congress he has become familiar with the procedure, has acquired wide experience as a legislator, and has steadily grown in the esteem of his fellow Members.

I had intended to list some of the important laws on the statute books for which he was primarily responsible. But I find it would require two or three newspaper columns merely to name them.

Many people love SAM RAYBURN; everybody respects him who knows him, because he is honest, able, true, and will not lie. He plays square with both his constituents and his colleagues in the House, and they know it. He never indulges in demagogic speeches. He has been an outstanding New Deal and administration leader and his counsel is continually sought by President Roosevelt. Perhaps the greatest tribute that can be paid to his integrity and judgment is the simple fact that he has the complete confidence of all factions of the motley group known as Democrats in the House.

PILOTS VITAL LEGISLATION

Even as chairman of the Interstate Commerce Committee, before he became majority leader, he did more than almost any other Member to promote New Deal legislation in the House. He piloted through such legislation as the Railroad Act, the Stock Exchange Act, the Communications Act, the Electrification Act, the Motor Carriers Act, and the Holding Company Act.

A farmer by birth and blood, he has taken a keen interest in the farm program. In fact, he looks at the general welfare of all classes and conditions of men and strives to accomplish the greatest good for the greatest number.

He was one of the first to advocate an intelligent long-range flood-control, power, and water-conservation program. Long ago he saw that the waters of our great rivers are blessings if they can be harnessed so as to serve instead of destroy. Years ago he pointed out the importance of building dams and reservoirs on the upper reaches of rivers to protect our fertile land, to prevent floods, to conserve water, and to produce power.

THE BEST REPRESENTATION

SAM RAYBURN has a high sense of his responsibility as the leader of the majority party in Congress, and he believes it is his duty to get things done. Long experience in public life has developed his powers as an able speaker, good parliamentarian, and keen observer of men.

He has a rare sense of humor and gets many a chuckle out of his work; but at bottom he is serious, and on occasion he gets downright mad, but usually only when he has a good right to. He rarely goes out socially if he can avoid it. His life at Washington is as simple and unostentatious as his life at home.

The people of the Fourth Texas Congressional District have a right to be proud of their Congressman. By sending SAM RAYBURN to Congress all these years they have given the Nation a great leader and themselves the best possible representation in Washington.

The Voice of Experience

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN G. ALEXANDER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 19, 1940

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday, September 14, I placed in the RECORD an article which I had prepared entitled "Caught in the Draft." This article has received widespread acclaim, and every mail brings many more letters adding additional evidence of the need for the sort of thing which I sought to do for the benefit and protection of the draftees and volunteers who are about to be taken into the armed forces of the United States.

I hope the advice it carried and also the information contained in the two following letters, which come as a voice out of the experience of the past, will be given widespread circulation and that errors of the sort recited and which all ex-servicemen know so well are all too true will be eliminated as far as possible in the present engagement.

The letters referred to are as follows:

HON. JOHN G. ALEXANDER, M. C.,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I have read in the September 14, 1940, issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in the Appendix part, the extension of your remarks under the title "Caught in the Draft." And also that you say you were a veteran of the first World War, 1917–18.

What you said about service men of those days is only too true; of records being lost or in some way misplaced, and soldiers having a hard time to remember or find and prove former disabilities in service and all those related matters we went through. I know of myself, I was only too anxious to get home to bother much about nervous and shellshock disabilities. I never thought of trying for a pension at all at that time; "home" was all I thought about.

Today, as I face the half-century milestone of my life, I feel I ought to have a pension. I've tried several times to get service-connection, even nonservice, too, but never succeeded. I don't even know if my war record is in Washington today. There's always so much "red tape" to prove service and so little I can prove today, as I cannot locate officers and men—for reasons hereafter listed—who knew me in the Regular Army outfit I was a soldier in in 1918, with the A. E. F. All are now either dead or

scattered to the four winds on earth. I have no family, am single, and all relatives and both my parents dead these many years. There's not a person living today of either friend or relative that could help me prove war service. Because of this fact, I have made no effort to try to get on the pension rolls. My nervousness has prevented me from work and it is nearly 20 years since I held a job. Neither am I eligible for Social Security because of this. If it were not for the fact of a trust fund left me my my deceased parents I'd be penniless and likely an inmate of some poor farm, or maybe even dead. But this was not my reason for writing you at all. As I can't prove war service, why try, when there are so many worse off than I that deserve it more?

You spoke of some advice to young 1940 draftees in that they should keep diaries. That is good advice when service is to be only in the U. S. A. and its possessions. But what about foreign shores?

I started and kept a diary and the names and addresses of many buddies of the first World War, and my officers as well, even the doctors, but when I reached France and had been there about 3 months in the training camp, school of artillery, and on the range, one of my division officers, a general (I believe his rank was Brigadier General Haan (I never knew his initials) came through inspecting us and happened to catch me in quarters writing in my diary just personal items that would not have benefited an enemy if one had seen the diary or I had been captured or killed and it found on me.

I never spoke in it of anything military. Even my Army officer ratings were as "Mr. So-and-So." Never his rank. But to make a long story short, this General Haan "blew up like a 75-mm. field piece." Boy, I've never forgotten his words nor facial expressions. I all but landed in the guardhouse and he actually ordered my arrest and trial by drum-head court martial. I fully believe if it had not been for my good record as a soldier and the fact that my lieutenant, Soper, had not interceded for me, I would have been court-martialed and shot the following day. General Haan cited a dozen reasons and rules against carrying any papers, diaries, etc., on one's person within the war zone of France, each ruling with a penalty of disgrace and death. He said I was "aiding and abetting" the Germans by having a written diary on my person, and so ordered my arrest to quarters. If I could only locate some of the men and officers of my old outfit I'm sure they would remember that incident, which can still make me shiver a bit to think how close I came to a dishonorable discharge and shot at sunrise.

This ruling may not have been so in many of the outfits, but it was in ours, and there were quite a number of such books and papers destroyed when my "disgrace" became battery news, many being burned in the cook-shack stove that same night, so my buddies told me.

So if this is the case in a future war of such personal papers "aiding and abetting an enemy," would not it be just as well not to suggest such things to younger minds?

Of course, I understand these names, etc., would be of great service in case of war wounds, but if the penalty for keeping such on one's person was court martial and death, what then?

I hope you'll excuse some mistakes I've made in writing. I can't see as well as I used to, and forgive the liberty I've taken, too, in addressing this letter to you. 'Twas only meant in good part.

I wish for you good health and good fortune, and thank you, sir.

Sincerely,

CHARLES TALMADGE COBB.

COLLINSVILLE, ALA., *September 16, 1940.*

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS OF THE UNITED STATES,
DEPARTMENT OF MISSISSIPPI,
Jackson, Miss., Sept. 17, 1940.

Hon. JOHN G. ALEXANDER, M. C.,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ALEXANDER: I read with much interest your remarks as they appeared in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, September 14, 1940, under the heading "Caught in the Draft." I want to say that you have probably thrown more accurate light upon the veteran's plight than has ever appeared before in any official publication.

I cannot remember offhand whether or not you are a member of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation in the House of Representatives. But, no doubt, you will be interested in a tabulation of Mississippi Army veterans during the World War which appears at page 124 to page 128 of the printed hearings before that committee beginning February 1, 1940. The hearings are in book form.

This tabulation shows that of 15,904 Mississippi white veterans who served overseas during the World War, 466 were found disabled to some degree at time of discharge.

The significant feature of this showing, it appears to us, is the discrepancy in the ratios between the Mississippi veterans' records at time of discharge and the ratios in the whole United States Army, as recorded officially.

In other words, there were 53,000 men killed in action during the World War and 201,000 wounded, a ratio of 1 to 4. But, if these same ratios held good for Mississippi, with 300 killed in action, then it appears that 1,200 Mississippi overseas veterans should have been found disabled to some degree at time of discharge from wounds alone.

As it was, only 466 were found disabled from all causes.

I have also heard numerous veterans who did not have overseas service complain of the same lack of official records. They are usually among men who were shifted constantly from one outfit to another, with consequent periods when there was a lapse in the official records.

All the boys compliment you on the substance of your remarks, and feel that possibly many of those who may now enter the Army will now benefit from our experiences in the World War.

At least you have given them the information. It is up to them to profit by it.

With best wishes from all, I am,

Respectfully,

T. K. STAPLETON,
Department Liaison Officer, V. F. W., Jackson, Miss.

Southern Indiana Labor Day Association Meeting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SHERMAN MINTON
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 20 (legislative day of Wednesday, September 18), 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. SHERMAN MINTON, OF INDIANA

Mr. MINTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a speech delivered by me before the Southern Indiana Labor Day Association at Mount Carmel, Ill., on September 2, 1940.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, 2 years ago I met with you in Boonville. Then, there was no war. We could turn our attention almost exclusively to the consideration of our domestic problems. We breathed the air of free men, and we turned our attention to the solution of problems that had to do with the right to work; the right to be protected in health, and the security of that job and fair wage and hour standards for those who worked. Although there was an unfortunate division in the house of organized labor at the time, there was no one but what believed that soon that division would be solved and the united front of organized labor would present the case of the workers and justice would be done. Unhappily, that division has not yet been overcome, but I believe we can fairly say that it is well on the way toward a favorable termination.

Men and women within the sound of my voice have lived through this long, hard fight for the right of labor to bargain collectively by representatives of their own choosing. Today all parties admit the right of labor to bargain collectively. There are men here today who had to fight a long and bitter struggle to gain recognition of that fundamental right. No one in this democratic country of ours has the hardihood to say that labor shall not have the right to bargain collectively, but it is only within the past 5 years that a government in power in Washington was brave and honest enough to guarantee that right to bargain collectively, by writing it into the law of the land, that you workers could organize and select your own bargaining agents, and no employer would be permitted to wreck your organization, or compel you to sign and work under a yellow-dog contract.

I am proud to say that within my political lifetime in Washington your Magna Carta, the Wagner Act, was placed upon the statute books of the Nation. I voted for that law, and I intend to do what I can to see that that law is not emasculated and destroyed by the interests that sought to prevent its enactment. You may have some differences of opinion among you as to some changes that ought or ought not to be made in that act, but there is no difference of opinion among you as to the preservation of the act.

Much criticism has been heaped upon the Board charged with the administration of the act. Some of it is justified, but that act has never had a fair chance to work unhampered. It has never been accepted by some employers as the law of the land, although the Supreme Court upheld the law 3 years ago. You all remember how employers rejected the law and refused to obey it because some Liberty League lawyers had told them it was unconstitutional. The first 18 months of that law's existence just one order of the Labor Board was obeyed. One hundred injunction suits were field against the Labor Board and the rights of labor so persistently denied by employers in defiance of the law of the land that labor, as a last resort and as its only weapon, had to resort to the strike. But now, since the law has been upheld, most employers have obeyed it. And today, because labor has a tribunal to protect its rights, there are fewer strikes than ever before; 94 percent of all labor disputes arising under the act are now settled amicably by the parties themselves agreeing or the Labor Board dismissing the

proceedings. Only 6 percent of the complaints ever come to trial, and of these the employers win almost half. So, as the act is accepted and the Board is freed from harassing opposition, the problems work out more smoothly.

I am willing to meet the problems that are presented, which reveal the need of some amendments to the act, but I want the amendments to come from labor and the friends of the act, and not from its enemies. The Wagner Act is here to stay. Collective bargaining is no longer a theory; it is a practical, just method that workers insist upon as their right. It has been a long hard fight against strikebreakers, spies, tear gas, machine guns, blacklists, and the "yellow dog" contracts, but the victory is yours.

Another bit of legislation in protection of labor has also been put upon the statute books during my senatorial lifetime. I refer to the wage and hour legislation. For years we have heard the doctrine preached in this country that we had to have a high tariff wall to protect labor against the cheap labor of Europe and Asia, while at the same time the business concerns that profited by the tariff were importing from Europe and Asia this same cheap labor to be exploited right here in America. That wasn't all. While the tariff wall may protect us from the cheap labor of Europe and Asia, it was not possible to enact a tariff wall that would protect us of the North against the slavery economy of the South that still existed, although the Civil War was supposed to have abolished it. The war did free the Negroes, but it didn't abolish slavery. It did not abolish the sweatshop of the East and the North. I had a manufacturer of furniture in southern Indiana tell me that he was paying his spray-gun operators that spray the varnish upon the furniture 40 cents an hour for an 8-hour day, while his competitor in Memphis, Tenn., was hiring colored women at 8 cents an hour and working them 10 hours a day. Obviously this northern manufacturer found it difficult to compete with the low-paid labor of his competitor. It wasn't cheap labor from Europe and Asia he needed protection against; it was cheap labor practices in America.

Organized labor has insisted with Abraham Lincoln that this Nation cannot exist half slave and half free, and organized labor demanded, and we passed, the wage and hour legislation that outlawed the sweatshop, child labor, and slavery economy. I know that this law has not reached the smooth operation that assures us today the goal that organized labor has set for wages and hours to the workers of this country, but we will not turn back to the old days that permitted the unrestrained exploitation of labor through poor pay and long hours.

The American worker is a free man, entitled to a free man's heritage, the right to work reasonable hours for a fair wage.

In addition to the wage and hour legislation and the Wagner Act, factory and mine safety, sanitation, and workmen's compensation, unemployment insurance, and old-age pensions have protected and been assured by the law of the land to the workers. These things did not just happen; they were brought about by the splendid labor organizations of this enlightened and free country. Today you have the right to organize, to bargain, and to receive a fair wage for a fair day's work. Your labor unions are the citadels of your freedom. Thank God that freedom of workers to have the protection of their labor unions is still permitted the workers of America.

I am sorry to say that such is not the condition of the rest of the world today. In Europe, outside of England and little Switzerland, there are no labor unions. All of Europe, except England and Switzerland, is dominated by Hitler and his fellow dictators. Hitler came to power in Germany on his promise to the businessmen that he would destroy the labor unions. Big business in Germany financed the political party of Hitler and built him up with his political goons until they were able to keep their promise with business to destroy the labor unions, and then, to show who was boss, Hitler ran out of the country many of the great industrialists like Fritz Thyssen, who had financed him.

Until recently the International Labor Office in Geneva, Switzerland, represented over 25,000,000 organized labor workers throughout the world. The United States contributed $250,000 a year to the support of that office. Now the office is closed and what is left of it has been moved to America. Trade-unions have been stamped out all over the continent of Europe that Hitler occupies or dominates, and the organizers of labor in these countries were thrown into concentration camps or shot. That is the picture in Europe today. Trade-unionism destroyed, collective bargaining gone, wages and hours are considered not at all in a land of forced labor and concentration camps.

"What has that to do with us?" you say. "That is Europe, this is America. What happens over there does not concern us." Let me direct your attention to the days first following the last war. The war was over and we were told that we could forget the war and turn our attention to the peaceful pursuits on the road back to normalcy. We did. We ignored Europe, and one nation, a defeated nation, being a nation of brave, smart, and enterprising people, bided its time and started to pay attention to war, while we were fed up on war and had turned back on the road to normalcy. That nation that prepared for war built the greatest military machine the world has ever seen. Let us get the picture. I don't like it any better than you do, but we must face the facts. I don't like Hitler any better than you do, but he has enslaved Europe and he commands the greatest military machine in all history. He has conquered nation after nation, stamping out labor unions as he goes on to enslave the people he conquers. Today he controls most of the greatest industrial plants and regions in the world. He controls most of the shipbuilding yards and an enormous merchant marine. He has millions of men under arms and millions more engaged in the war industries. If he should quit making war tomorrow, what would he do with his millions of demobilized soldiers and his idle workmen, turned out of his munitions plants? Europe could not provide work for them. Consequently, Hitler has got to make war and tap the rich resources of the other nations. He would have to support his teeming millions. Where better could he turn than to the rich storehouses, fertile fields, and mines of this hemisphere. I don't want to appear as an alarmist. I want to be sane and realistic, if I can. Especially, do I want to be sane when I talk to you, the workers of the country, because upon your backs rests the burden of the Nation, whether at war or at peace. It is your sons who always fight the wars. It is in the sweat of your faces that wars are paid for. It is your sons, more than any others, who make the sacrifices on the fields of battle.

We don't want war. We want peace. We want only to be let alone to live our own life in peace and on decent relations with our neighbor. But the choice of peace or war does not always lie with us. Belgium, Holland, Denmark, Norway, Poland, Czechoslovakia, all wanted peace. Some of them, like Norway, Denmark, and Holland, thought they knew the way to everlasting peace. They thought that all they had to do was mind their own business, and be unprepared, and ask to be let alone. This, they thought, would bring them peace; but there came a day of rude awakening. They discovered that although they had committed no offense, except to stand across the path of a ruthless, brutal, ambitious man, war was made upon them. They stand today conquered, enslaved, and a subjugated people; conquered by a man who hates democracies and has repeatedly said they ought to be destroyed and has set himself the task to destroy these democracies. His task is about complete in Europe. Only England stands out against him, and I devoutly pray may ever stand against him, but I fear she cannot. I fear she must inevitably succumb before the might and terrible force of this monstrous military machine.

In this world at war, what is our duty? Can we take the chance of assuming that Hitler, who hates democracies and has set himself the task to destroy them, will leave us, the richest and most desirable of all the democracies, severely alone? Can we safely assume that this modern descendant of Attila the Hun, this modern Alexander the Great, will rest on his arms when there are yet worlds to conquer? Can we safely assume that we have nothing to fear from this scourge of free peoples? I do not think we can. We are not going to go over there to fight in Europe's war. No one wants to do that. On the other hand, we have got to be prepared to defend the shores of America, the finest land that free, God-fearing men have ever called their home. It is our precious home, and we cannot afford to have it exposed to the greatest threat that humanity has ever faced in man's long history. We want to be strong enough to defend America's shores, even against the hordes of Hitler, the most brutal, evil genius in human history. We want to be so strong in our defense preparation that he dare not attack us.

When Hitler's great military machine crashed across Europe, through the Low Countries and France, destroying with the fury of an earthquake these countries, America stood aghast and unable to understand the power of this incredible military machine. When the import of what had happened gradually dawned upon America, our people, with almost one voice, shouted for preparedness. Some wanted to know why we were not better prepared, some were critical of this administration because the country was not better prepared, forgetting that in the 1920's, when we were on the road back to normalcy, we had, in accordance with treaties we made in those years, sunk our Navy and permitted our standing Army to fall to the lowest figure in modern times. The truth is that this administration has done more to build up our defenses than any other. But as Hitler rolled over Europe America yelled and screamed for preparedness. The Congress, yielding to what was a universal demand for preparedness, authorized the appropriation of ten billions of dollars with which to purchase battleships, airplanes, tanks, guns, and equipment of all kinds. We then summoned to Washington Messrs. Knudsen and Stettinius, and others—the great industrial leaders of the country—and set them to work upon the task of organizing the industries of the Nation to produce the defense weapons we needed. That program is well under way. Congress did not know how many, or what kind of ships, airplanes, tanks, guns, etc., to provide for our defense, and we had to call in the experts of the Army and Navy to tell us what we needed. These experts were to have the responsibility of preparing our defenses and using the weapons, if the time unhappily ever came to use them. These same experts whom we relied upon to advise us about the defense weapons we needed also had the responsibility of training and directing the men in the use of these defense weapons. They told us that in order to carry out an efficient training program they would have to have men in large numbers and the volunteer system would not produce the men in the quantities when they needed them, to enable them to carry out an efficient training program, and they had to have some kind of compulsory military training.

I know how repulsive to Americans it is to require them, or compel them to do anything. Traditionally, we have always had a small Army and, of course, had not had to resort to conscription. Military life is repugnant to the American sense of freedom and independence, but in a world whose life is ruled and dominated by war, and threats of war, we have to accept the ways of war. After authorizing the appropriation of ten billions of dollars with

which to buy defense weapons, it was perfectly obvious that we had to have the men to use the weapons. I did not feel justified in appropriating billions of dollars for defense weapons, and then not providing the men to use them. I did not feel justified in taking expert advice from our Army and Navy staffs about the weapons, and then reject their advice about the men. So, it became necessary to consider the recommendations of the Army as to how many men they needed and when they wanted them. They advised Congress they wanted to build up the Regular Army and the National Guard to wartime strength, and to provide a million two hundred thousand men, for a reserve, for this establishment. They wanted the first 400,000 in camp this fall, and 400,000 next April, and 400,000 more about 6 months later. These men were to receive a 1 year training, and then go home and remain on reserve. The Army staff advised us they could not get these large numbers of men all at once under the volunteer system, and we would have to have compulsory training to get the men.

The bill now under consideration provides for the registration of all men between 21 and 31 years of age. It is estimated there are between twelve and thirteen million men of that age. After weeding out the physically unfit, those with dependents, and those in key industries, including agriculture, it is estimated there would be about 4,000,000 men in class A. So, it may be seen that a man's chances of ever being called are about 1 in 10, and if he is a class A man, without dependents, physically fit, and not in a key industry, his chances of being called are about 1 in 4. Thus, we see that the likelihood of the draft disrupting industry is remote. Men will be selected in the most democratic way, and the rich man will have to go the same as the poor man. The burden will not fall alone upon the workers. The law provides that if men, when drafted, are employed, their employer has to reemploy them when they come back. That, briefly, is the plan for conscription and the necessity for it.

If you think America is not in danger, then, of course, we don't need any army. We have never had an Army bigger than a police force. If we aren't in danger, why enlarge it? If you don't think we need be prepared to meet and defeat any possible enemies in the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans, then we don't need a two-ocean Navy.

I don't think you want your country to be unprepared. You love America, just as I do. I think it's worth fighting to defend, but you cannot fight to defend America if you haven't the modern weapons and the men trained to use them. I know you believe in preparedness—so do I. We cannot take a chance with our Nation's safety and the future happiness of your children and mine. I hope we won't need or have to use our armed forces. I would rather have them and not need them than to need them and not have them.

There is one thing more that is essential to preserve this land of ours and the homes of free workers. Not only must we have the weapons and the men trained to use them, but we must have the spirit of the men of Valley Forge, Gettysburg, San Juan Hill, and the Argonne. Yes; and back of them must be a united people, with a united purpose. There must be no "fifth column" in America. The greatest weapon Hitler has used in the destruction of the countries he has conquered is the weapon of the "fifth column," made up of unpatriotic, treasonable men and women who betrayed their country. When the forces of Hitler marched through Denmark the way had been prepared by the "fifth columnists," and not a finger was raised against them. Indeed, when Hitler's hordes marched into Norway, the betrayal was so great, and the deception and confusion so complete, that the police of Norway's capitol escorted their conquerors into the heart of the capitol. Brave France, that stood at Verdun "as walls of granite and gates of brass, and cried out to the world, they shall not pass," was by treachery and treason in the army and in civilian life, made the victim of the foulest betrayal in human history.

Today we are advised there is more "fifth column" activity in the United States and our neighbors to the south of us than any place else in the world. Today there exists in this country an organization that dresses in the uniform of Hitler's storm-troopers, wear upon their uniforms the insignia of the swastika, and carry the Hitler flag alongside the Stars and Stripes, while the membership give the Hitler salute and take an oath, recognizing Hitler as their leader. Only a few days ago this organization met in the State of New Jersey. Cooperating with this Hitler organization is an organization of "black shirts" that owe their allegiance to Mussolini, although they live and have their homes in America. Here is what they teach their children to recite:

"When I grow up, when, at least, I am a soldier, I shall fight for Italy, my fatherland, and I shall win. I shall take from the enemies flags and prisoners, and I shall earn many medals of valor."

That is the recitation for children of the "black shirts" in America, not Italy. Not a word about America, that gave them home and opportunity. Not a word about democracy, whose liberty lets such an organization exist at all.

Cooperating with all of them, only to confuse and in the hope that in the end they may encompass the destruction of our form of government, our religion, and our personal freedom, are the Communists, who bear allegiance not to America but to Russia; not to democracy but to Stalin, the dictator.

How can liberty and freedom survive from such threats from without and within? Let us not despair. It can be done. We, who love America and democracy, are the overwhelming majority in the country. We will not let our liberties and our freedom perish. We will prepare to defend them by standing on the shores of America to drive the invader into the sea. Standing on our free soil, in the sight of our homes, our schools, and our churches, we will stamp out the traitors to our cause.

This is America's hour of crisis. This is labor's hour of crisis. Stand fast and guard your sacred heritage as free men who have always known that liberty and freedom were worth fighting for. Pray for peace, but keep the gun loaded and your hearts steeled to the task that calls men to fight sometimes that men might live in peace.

"To every man upon this earth, death cometh soon or late;
But how can man die better than facing fearful odds
For the ashes of his fathers
And the temples of his gods?"

Present Campaign Is Struggle Between Two Opposed Theories of American Democracy

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. MEAD

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 11 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

ADDRESS BY SOLICITOR GENERAL FRANCIS BIDDLE AT SEATTLE CIVIC AUDITORIUM

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an interesting address delivered by Hon. Francis Biddle, Solicitor General of the United States, at the Seattle Civic Auditorium, Seattle, Wash., on August 24, 1940.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is a particular pleasure for me that I am making my first speech in this campaign in Seattle, in the heart of the great Northwest, where the issues seem to me to be outlined with sharp clarity, and where you people understand exactly what they are. I tried to get my friend Judge CHARLES H. LEAVY, who represents you in the Fifth Congressional District, to come out with me, but he's too busy in Congress just now to bother with politics. But he and Senator BONE told me about some of the campaign issues that you were facing out here, and the facts behind them. And I realized that the facts here were only a variation of what happened in Oregon, in Missouri, in Tennessee, in Georgia, in Alabama, in New York State—through and across the country wherever the power controversy exists. And as I thought about our national problems and pondered them against the light of the flaming homes abroad, burned for no other crime than that they held the democratic faith, I realized that power is but one facet of a far greater issue, the issue of American democracy. This I shall now discuss.

For I sincerely believe that this campaign is a struggle between two basically opposed theories of American democracy. The struggle has continually recurred in our history. It is inherent to the eternal vigilance which is the price we all too casually pay for the freedom we have achieved. It immediately found expression in the battle between Hamilton and the Federalists, on the one hand, and Jefferson and the Democrats, on the other. Andrew Jackson dramatized it in his successful fight against Nicholas Biddle and the United States Bank. And, finally, Franklin Roosevelt, carrying on the liberal tradition of the Democratic Party, perfectly expressed it, and realized it when he defeated Hoover—the embodiment of Republican conservatism—in 1932. For the President believes, as Carl Sandburg has said, that "the durable culture of any nation rests on the mind and genius of its common folk, the masses of the people."

Expressed in terms of political faith, the philosophy of the Democratic Party has identified itself with the outlook of the man on the street, the small and independent merchant, the wage earner, and the farmer. Of these, Hamilton and the Adamses were distrustful; they feared and distrusted the people; they disliked direct action, and thought that the guidance of the country's affairs should be more safely entrusted to the class that someone has referred to as "the great washed." Their spiritual and political successors—Harrison, McKinley, Harding, Coolidge, Hoover—shared this skeptical conservatism. Good conservatives, they believed in the tariff for specially favored manufacturers. They disliked disturbing the status quo, and had a religious worship for what they liked to term the rugged individualism of the American businessman.

A misreading of American history is to imagine that this struggle (in general outline) took the form of a conflict between Federal and States' rights. When usurpation of power by the Federal Government seemed dangerous to the leaders of Democracy, as it did in the early days, Jefferson, Madison, Monroe, Jackson, their memories fresh from the tyranny of the power of the King,

insisted on States' rights. But, when it became apparent that oppression of the people's economic interests came not from the States, powerless to cope with the situation, but from the vast conglomerations of private capital, which knew no State bounds, it was natural that the Democratic Party should turn to the Federal Government to find means for building effective curbs on the greedy and ruthless aggression which only too often characterized the march of our commercial and mechanical age. That is exactly what the New Deal has done.

Perhaps it is that which makes old-time Bull Moosers, like Harold Ickes and myself, feel so perfectly at home in the New Deal. For the Progressive movement of 1912, in which we were active, represented the same revolt against the placid indifference to crying evils characteristic of President Taft's 4 years in the White House. I never thought of Teddy Roosevelt as belonging to the Republican outlook of cautious conservatism. He had the restless impatience of the reformer with glaring social ills. And when he ran for a third term, as a Progressive, he was defeated not only because Woodrow Wilson was a more profound and consistent liberal, but because Roosevelt's own party, always pretty timid, became terrified at his moderate show of reform, and, under the gavel of Elihu Root, thought it necessary to steal the nomination from this dangerous radical who had raised his voice to protest against the system.

And therefore I say it is a real pleasure to me to talk here in the vital young State of Washington, where party lines have never been very rigid, and where the liberals and progressives pretty generally seem to line up together. Here the citizens are imbued with the aggressive and progressive ideals of the pioneer and the cooperative spirit of their Scandinavian background. The rank and file have struggled for 50 years to devise the most practicable and equitable means to live with their fellowmen rather than off them. From the fierce struggle against extravagant exploitation of natural and human resources has been born the most liberal legislation of almost any State in the country, aimed at one objective—that the resources of the State belong to all the people of the State rather than the special few. And so the New Deal ideals have found inspiration in the accomplishments of such States as Washington. For your State ranks highest in the unencumbered home ownership. It is one of the highest in literacy and lowest in illiteracy in the Union. It was one of the first States to provide comprehensive community-property laws; to grant equal woman's suffrage; successfully to obtain a minimum-wage law for women. Cooperatives have been the established way of life of the Washington farmer for years. There are 31 telephone cooperatives, all organized and operated through private local initiative. The largest telephone cooperative in the United States is now successfully operating in Skagit, Whatcom, and Snohomish Counties. Through producer, marketing, and consumer cooperatives thousands of families have learned to reduce their costs and increase their services. The Grange Cooperative Wholesale has operated among the rural areas since 1919, and the Pacific Supply Cooperative since 1933. These 2 wholesale groups have 150 combined affiliates, serving thousands of rural families.

This crisis tends to divide the country into actual lines of liberal and conservative. Could the conservatives have a more competent spokesman than the recent president of the Commonwealth & Southern Corporation, himself a shining exhibit of big business at its very biggest, the knightly champion of the utilities protesting but a little while ago—not, it must be admitted, very successfully but still protesting with all the power of his lungs—against what the Government of the United States was trying to do for the people of the United States through the Tennessee Valley Authority, through the Grand Coulee, through Bonneville?

I suspect that Mr. Willkie knows that it is difficult for the country to think of him as a liberal. They think of him as he is—a successful businessman. If you analyze his acceptance speech you will find that it is largely devoted to saying that he, Willkie, is a liberal. "I was a liberal," he cries, "before many of those men had heard the word. * * * I learned my liberalism right here in Elwood. * * * I am a liberal because I believe that in our industrial age there is no limit to the productive capacity of any man." And why should Mr. Willkie wish to make it appear that he is a liberal? Why not frankly say he is a businessman who doesn't like government regulation and therefore hates the New Deal? It is because Mr. Willkie knows that the voters are in no mood to hear the New Deal reforms attacked. And so, after stating the basic principles of his foreign policy by quoting the President, and saying he was in agreement with the President, he hastily reads a creed which sounds like a summary of New Deal legislation. It starts with these sentences, extraordinary only because they come from the lips of the former head of the Commonwealth & Southern Corporation: "I believe that the forces of free enterprise must be regulated. I am opposed to business monopolies." And thereupon he states his belief in the basic New Deal policies—collective bargaining; minimum wages and maximum hours; Federal regulation of utilities, securities markets, banking; old-age and unemployment insurance.

But words do not make a man, and if Mr. Willkie says now that he is a liberal he has never acted like one. His role is not an easy one. He will, I predict, go on fulminating against the New Deal in general terms of Republican hatred, and specifically approve its program of social betterment as he did in his acceptance speech. He will not dare to be consistent but will talk untrammeled free enterprise to the businessman, and say in the next sentence, as he did at Elwood, 'We all know that such concentration of power must be checked." The Weirs, the Pews, the Grundys, the Girdlers will not fear him because they know his record, and they know that a little mild liberal talk on the side is perfectly all right in a political campaign. Willkie will be a liberal all right, but, as he says, he will "do it by spending as little money as possible." He will be all things to all men. He will do his level best to have his liberal cake—and to eat it.

And when he is talking liberalism let us remember what he said in an address before the Economic Club of New York on January 21, 1935, as reported in the Electrical World for February 16, 1935: "I do not like to make personal reference, but I want to say to you that no duty has ever come into my life, even that in the service of my country, which has so appealed to my sense of social obligation, patriotism, and love of mankind as this—my obligation to say and do what I can—." For what? Now, get this—"for the preservation of public utilities, privately owned."

It is normal and healthy to have conservative Democrats like Al Smith, Senator Burke, and ex-Senator Reed, of Missouri, line up with the Republicans in 1940. They hated and deserted the New Deal in 1936; 4 years more of the New Deal was hardly calculated to bring them back when the great issues are up again, far more intensified than ever. No wonder the ex-president of the Commonwealth & Southern Corporation welcomed them to the ranks of the reactionaries.

I am not saying this in any flippant spirit. Firmly I believe in the two-party system. I am certain that it functions better on the realistic division of conservative and liberal, representing roughly the difference in the outlook of the possessing class—who naturally wishes to conserve what it has to keep the economic forces as they are; and the farmers and workers and smaller businessmen for whom changes in the system seem essential to a better life. Each outlook tends to balance the other, and the result should be a middle road between left and right.

And I am convinced that both groups today sincerely desire to defend and sustain the American way of life. But how to preserve it? There the approach is as wide apart as the ancient struggle for power which has not yet ceased, between those who wish to make Government an instrument toward obtaining what all of us want—jobs and homes and enough to marry and rear children who will grow up with some chance of making good; and the men who are still honestly convinced that business should be let alone. Somehow they feel the sacred law of supply and demand will create jobs and rectify unemployment. They hold that it is against the law of God and man to interfere, by social legislation, with the hallowed rights of property. Their dream of the Constitution—a dream realized from the Civil War until not so very long ago—is that it protects corporations by the magic of the due process clause from the inroads of Federal and State regulatory power. Is it surprising that the National Manufacturers' Association and big business in general are squarely lined up behind the ex-President of the Commonwealth and Southern Corporation, as once they were extending a helping and hopeful hand to Mr. Hoover and to Mr. Landon? They have sensed a man after their own heart, after their own pocketbook, and they are trembling with a fresh and feverish excitement. For this newcomer is no politician, but one of them, a man they can understand, who speaks the language with which they are familiar; and yet streamlined, a 1940 model, dressed, of course, in the overalls of a tousle-headed American farm boy from Indiana, but holding in his hand the full dinner pail of that maker of Republican Presidents—Mark Hanna.

But we want more than the ancient political shibboleths. For times have changed in 8 years, and we have seen in that time what the government of a country can do for its people. The platform of the Democratic Party in its preamble eloquently expresses that change. I quote:

"The world is undergoing violent change. Humanity, uneasy in this machine age, is demanding a sense of security and dignity based on human values. * * * What the founding fathers realized upon this continent was but a daring dream, that men could have not only physical security, not only efficiency, but something else in addition that men had never had before—the security of the heart that comes with freedom, the peace of mind that comes from a sense of justice."

And in a larger sense the defense of our American dream, its realization, is not only a defense against the immediate threat of totalitarian arms but the re-creation of that dream as a reality in a more decent life here today for all of us. We cannot ask our youth to fight for a dream that is not translated into the terms of their own needs. We must give them a share in work and in creative energy, a stake in our resources. Unemployment, insecurity, the thin misery of migratory populations, racial hatreds—those things do not stir men to rally behind a tradition which has permitted their growth in the cruel indifference of the modern machine age. Faith without works is not enough. As the preamble to the Democratic platform continues: "To this generation of Americans it is given to defend this democratic faith as it is challenged by social maladjustment within and totalitarian greed without. * * * No nation can be strong by armaments alone. It must possess and use all the necessary resources for producing goods plentifully and distributing them effectively. It must add to these factors of material strength the unconquerable spirit and energy of a contented people, convinced that there are no boundaries to human progress and happiness in a land of liberty."

"Producing goods plentifully and distributing them effectively * * *." We new dealers believe that we have made a beginning in that direction. We ask the country to continue us in

power for another 4 years to complete what we have begun. And so let us pause to look at the record, for you will hear this record attacked in the next 10 weeks by experts in the art of misrepresentation.

You will find a consistent pattern in the legislation which expresses this record, which, for simplification, may be gathered under four headings: The farmer, the industrial worker, the businessman, and the consumer.

First, then, the farmer. The farm program has been far more ambitious than any ever attempted in this country. It is based on the fundamental truth that prosperity cannot be one-sided; it cannot exist in any single group, but must be balanced between farm and city, for if the farm income shrinks, the market for city goods closes up, and, by contrast, the jobless wage earner cannot buy the products of the farm. During the depression, which immediately preceded the launching of the New Deal, the income of farmers had shrunk relatively far more sharply than the income of wage earners. The first necessity, therefore, was to restore parity between them. And this has been to a great extent established. Since 1932 farm income has been doubled; the farm debt and interest rate on farm debt have been reduced; farm foreclosures curtailed; and the farm surpluses distributed to the hungry through the food-stamp plan and through relief agencies. The tools have been subsidies, conservation payments, marketing facilities, low credit. The rural electrification program is at last bringing cheap electricity to the farmers.

But that does not begin to tell the story. It is the American farm epic, the winning back to ourselves the land which we ourselves have so largely destroyed. It is soil conservation, stream purification, replanting the forests, arrest of the waste of our topsoil washed down the great rivers each year, conservation of water resources, cheap fertilizers. This means the reconquering of a continent; it demands immense research and laboratory work through the land-grant colleges and in the experimental stations. It has taken shape in the program for the coordinated development of our river basins for irrigation, flood control, navigation, power. It was foreshadowed in President Roosevelt's vision when he said, at Portland, Oreg., on September 21, 1932, during his first campaign: "This vast water power can be of incalculable value to this whole section of the country.

"It means cheap manufacturing production, economy, and comfort on the farm and in the household. * * * Here you have the clear picture of four great Government power developments in the United States, the St. Lawrence River in the Northeast, Muscle Shoals in the Southeast, the Boulder Dam project in the Southwest, and, finally, but by no means the least of them, the Columbia River in the Northwest." Seven months later, on April 10, 1933, in a message to Congress, he advocated the passage of the Tennessee Valley Authority bill, as follows: "In short, this power development of war days [he was referring to Muscle Shoals] leads naturally to national planning for a complete river watershed involving many States and the future lives and welfare of millions. It touches and gives life to all forms of human concern." For our administration realizes, as the Democratic platform succinctly puts it: "The well-being of the land and those who work upon it is basic to the real defense and security of America."

I can find almost nothing in the agriculture plank of the Republican platform into which you can sink your teeth. There is a beautiful, glittering sentence which reads: "The Republican Party will put into effect such governmental policies [I wonder what], temporary and permanent, as will establish and maintain an equitable balance between labor, industry, and agriculture by expanding industrial and business activity, eliminating unemployment, lowering production costs, thereby creating increased consumer buying power for agricultural products." Isn't that a mouthful? Farmers, please copy.

Recently we read in the newspapers of a great deal of activity on the part of Mr. Willkie in connection with the farm problem. He conferred with farm economists, leaders of farm organizations, farm politicians, and even regular dirt farmers. The farmers were holding their collective breath. What plan would Mr. Willkie bring forth? Something big must be in the wind. * * * And then the oracle spoke. He gave the New Deal farm program a clean bill of health. He would keep the New Deal farm program, he said, until somebody evolved a better plan. Thank you, Mr. Willkie.

I continue with our record: The industrial worker. I list three liberal statutes under this head. First, the National Labor Relations Act, introducing into industry as a whole the principles of self-determination for labor unions, their recognition by employers, and the basic right to collective bargaining, which had already for some years been applied in the field of railroad management. The Democratic platform says: "We pledge * * * to maintain the principles of the National Labor Relations Act."

The Republican platform reads: "Recent disclosures respecting the administration of the National Labor Relations Act require that this act be amended in fairness to employers and all groups of employees so as to provide freedom for and orderliness in self-organization and collective bargaining." I don't know what that means—"all groups." It sounds like an opening for company unions to slide in. That would be an end to collective bargaining. But, whatever it does mean, it is significant that the Republican Party at last bends the knee to another New Deal principle—collective bargaining. Do you remember how only 5 years ago the National Manufacturers' Association and the Liberty League—do you remember those eminent corporate lawyers of the league telling the world the act was unconstitutional, though the Supreme Court of the United States didn't follow their advice; do you remember how these august bodies talked personal liberty and rugged individualism? And now these rights created by the act are accepted as a matter of course.

And we put on the books the Wage and Hour Act and the Federal Bituminous Coal Stabilization Act to bring about, as our platform puts it, "stability of production, employment, distribution, and price indispensable to the public welfare." Child labor in factories has been successfully outlawed; the Walsh-Healey Act insures prevailing wages to workers employed on Government contracts. The Republican platform talks about the Democratic—I quote: "Regime of regimentation which has deprived the individual of his freedom." Perhaps these acts represent to the Republicans the regimentation they have in mind. But the trouble is they don't specify. The Republican platform at no point suggests the repeal of any piece of New Deal legislation. Well, possibly in two instances—they want to give relief back to the States—do you remember the dole?—and they want to have reciprocal-trade agreements approved by Congress, or, in other words, to turn them back into the good old back-scratching, logrolling methods familiar in the days of Smoot and Hawley.

Or regimentation may mean the way we've handled Wall Street, which brings me to our treatment of the businessman. I cite the huge operations of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in underwriting railroads, banks, insurance companies; the banking laws to insure deposits, to improve the Federal Reserve System; the devaluation of the dollar to prevent the cruel spiral of deflation which the depression threatened. Perhaps the Republicans by regimentation had in mind the Holding Company Act, which forever broke the corporate pyramids which Mr. Insull had made popular, when prosperity was just around the corner, or the Securities and Exchange Commission Act to protect investors in securities. And we have not only protected investors, we have started the wheels in motion for the protection of consumers through a policy of enforcement of the Sherman antitrust law which recognizes the American consumer whose interest has been too long forgotten. Our enforcement of that act is aimed at cutting down the costs of housing, food, drugs, fuel, fertilizer, spectacles, and other necessities, where arbitrary prices have in effect been a system of private taxation on low-income groups. We have not used the Sherman Act to interfere with the efficiency of mass production when that efficiency is passed on to the farmers and to the housewives of America. But we have begun to attack on a Nation-wide scale the bottlenecks that interfere with the distribution of goods in a free market. The antitrust laws are being used to break down the trade barriers erected by private groups which make the cost of living higher and thus reduce the real income of the vast mass of our people. We are giving the antitrust laws a significance as an aid to the distribution of goods which they never had before.

President Hoover had called a home-building and home-ownership conference in 1931, which lasted for weeks, and filled 11 impressive volumes with discussions and recommendation. In 1932 came the Federal Home Loan Bank System, with authority to make direct loans to stay the mortgage panic. But although many thousands of application were received, only three loans were made, totalling $9,000.

When President Roosevelt assumed office in 1933 the foreclosure on urban homes had risen to 1,000 a day. This was the highest record ever made in any country in the world at any time. On the President's recommendation Congress passed one of the first and most urgent New Deal relief statutes, creating the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, which had power to take mortgages which were in default and where families were about to lose their homes. Now listen to this record, for it is the story of saving homes. Over 1,000,000 loans were financed, totaling $3,100,000,000, the defaults averaging over 2 years on principal and interest, and over 3 years on taxes. In taking over these mortgages cities and towns were paid over $300,000,000 in taxes, and $100,000,000 was spent in repair and modernization work on the houses. One hundred and ninety-one million dollars in loans have been paid off in full; and, in addition, a billion and a half dollars have been paid to the Government against principal and interest.

Through the Public Works Administration and the Work Projects Administration we have helped municipalities build roads and hospitals, airports, schools and playgrounds, docks and tunnels, thus giving millions of unemployed work in place of direct relief; we have cleared slums and built low-cost houses for the poor; we have trained more than two and a half million youngsters in the C. C. C. camps, and have found work for and given education to more than 2,000,000 young men and women through the National Youth Administration; we have brought security for unemployment and old age by the Social Security Act, which we propose to extend, saying in our platform: "We pledge to make the Social Security Act increasingly effective, by covering millions of persons not now protected under its terms; by strengthening our unemployment-insurance system and establishing more adequate and uniform benefits, through the Federal equalization fund principle; by progressively extending and increasing the benefits of the old-age- and survivors-insurance system, including protection of the permanently disabled; and by the early realization of a minimum pen-

sion for all who have reached the age of retirement and are not gainfully employed."

And last, but, I take it, not least important to this audience, we have brought cheap power to millions of consumers from the Central Valley of California, from the Columbia River, from the Tennessee Valley.

This doubtless is what the Republicans mean by—I quote from the platform—"the relentless expansion of the power of the Federal Government over the everyday life of the farmer, the industrial worker, and the businessman." Doubtless social security, work relief, old-age pensions were what they had in mind when they talked about—I quote again from the platform—"seducing our people to become continuously dependent upon government, thus weakening their morale and quenching the traditional American spirit."

And now for power.

It is unnecessary to remind this audience that the State of Washington has led the country in a successful fight to bring cheap power to her people; that the municipal plant of the city of Tacoma is as old as the State itself, each having begun in 1893; that soon after came Seattle; that before the days of the Rural Electrification Administration the State ranked fifth in the Union, being 47.5 percent electrified; and that today over one-third of the people of the State are served by their own electric systems at the lowest rates in the country. This, of course, will be enormously increased when the proposed transmission lines are built to Bonneville and Grand Coulee. But I wish to emphasize the point that the men of the Northwest have been leaders in the movement to own and control their own resources, power particularly, and have achieved cheap power without outside help through their own initiative and enterprise.

I have attempted to describe some of the more recent manifestations of the struggle of the American people to make a living reality out of the old American vision, the vision of a democracy, which sees the people sharing the wealth of the country, sharing the natural resources of the country. Many of these have been wasted; many are under the control of monopolistic corporate organizations whose operations do not produce goods plentifully and distribute them effectively.

Mr. Willkie said in his acceptance speech last week, after adopting the major New Deal reforms, "But I do not make my claim to liberalism solely on my faith in such reforms. American liberalism does not consist merely in reforming things. It consists also in making things." Of course it does but the making of things, production, responds to the consumers' demand for them, and factories contract and close when the income of the masses of the people shrinks to a point where they cannot buy the things the factories make. Mass purchasing power is necessary to mass production, and the purpose of the New Deal program, consistently and on the whole successfully carried out, was to increase that purchasing power. Mr. Willkie seems to miss the very point of such reforms, speaking of them as if they bore no relation to production.

Electric power is one of the resources I have just spoken of. "The power of falling water," say the Democratic platform, "belongs not to a privileged few but to all the people, who are entitled to enjoy its benefits." Your Democratic State platform, adopted at Yakima on June 15, 1940, contains this plank: "We go on record as favoring public ownership and distribution of all electrical power; therefore we oppose initiative No. 139. We believe that the people of the Northwest should receive the benefits of such power developments as Grand Coulee and Bonneville. We are opposed to turning over the distribution of this power to private interests * * *." That's pretty definite; and cheap electric power does not only mean cheap services to the consumer—light, electric ranges, washers, water heaters, radio, farm implements; it means the development of the resources of your State, your low-grade metals—iron, magnesite, copper—by the use of cheap industrial power.

Now, I'll come to 1939 in a minute. But first let me speak of the pattern which the private utilities—the Power Trust—pursue more or less everywhere. I saw it at close range in the Tennessee Valley when, 2 years ago, I was counsel for the joint congressional committee investigating the Tennessee Valley Authority, and, under specific mandate of the Congress, investigating also interference by the private power companies with the effective administration of the T. V. A.

The committee spent the summer of 1938 in Knoxville, Tenn., investigating conditions on the spot; held further hearings in Washington, D. C., in the autumn and winter; and, finally, made a detailed report of 259 pages on April 1, 1939, based on over 15,000 pages of testimony. Of the joint committee of 9, 3 members, all of them Republicans, dissented in minority reports. On the committee's staff of engineers, headed by Tom Panter, of Los Angeles, were James I. Metcalf, now manager of the Consumers Non-Profit Public Power Corporation, and Paul J. Raver, now administrator of Bonneville.

The pattern, as I say, is the same everywhere. First, incessant litigation to block the Government hydroelectric and multiple-purpose projects. Finally, the projects are built, and in the name of economy and efficiency the power companies demand the right to buy the power at the gate and distribute it to the municipalities and cooperatives or in their own markets. They have no objection to cheap power if they are buying and not selling. So here the Electric Bond & Share and Stone & Webster have endeavored to obtain the benefit of Grand Coulee and Bonneville, just as in the Tennessee Valley the Commonwealth & Southern Corporation, through its operating company the Tennessee Electric Power Co., wanted to distribute T. V. A. power. Thus Mr. Willkie, the president of the Commonwealth & Southern, said in his opening statement before the investigating committee, on November 23, 1938: "* * * It is my personal belief that the T. V. A. should go out of the power business. * * * It is my view that the soundest solution both for the Government and the utilities would be for the T. V. A. to dispose of the power generated by it to the utilities at the switchboard. The utilities would then distribute it to consumers under State and Federal regulations." I wonder if he still holds that view? I do not know, because he doesn't mention power, or T. V. A., or Bonneville in his acceptance speech. He evidently doesn't think they're worth mentioning.

On November 25, 2 days after Mr. Willkie's statement to which I have referred, the New York Herald Tribune, which then was, and still is, a great admirer of Willkie, said in an editorial: "Wendell L. Willkie, president of the Commonwealth & Southern Corporation, came to be accepted by the virtually unanimous consent of his associates as the unofficial spokesman for the power industry." Perhaps Mr. Willkie would now disclaim that leadership.

Failing to secure power from the Federal projects, the utilities next devote themselves to preventing the formation of or destroying markets for public power. The methods are well-known—building spite lines, pouring money into elections, high-pressure propaganda, the introduction of crippling legislation.

I'll give you some examples of Mr. Willkie's operating company in Tennessee, the Tennessee Electric Power Co. I can summarize what the company did in two brief paragraphs found on page 199 of the committee's report. I quote: "In January 1935 the Tennessee State Legislature passed a statute authorizing Chattanooga to purchase or construct a municipal distribution plant, provided the voters of the city should approve the project in a referendum.

"Prior to the referendum the Commonwealth & Southern, and its operating company, the Tennessee Electric Power Co., carried on an active though unsuccessful campaign to defeat the bond issue. A so-called citizens and taxpayers association was formed Its president has since acted as attorney for the Tennessee Electric Power Co., and its treasurer was connected with an underwriting concern which actively handled securities of the same company. The total funds used by the association in campaigning against the bond issue amounted to $22,265.45. Of this $20,000 was contributed by Commonwealth & Southern." The day after this evidence was introduced on the record a statement of Mr. Willkie's was published in the New York Times on August 24, 1938 (p. 2704), in which Mr. Willkie said: "The only regret the Commonwealth & Southern Corporation has is that if a larger contribution could have overcome the propaganda and contributions of the Federal Government and the Tennessee Valley Authority that it did not make such additional contributions." The Tennessee Corrupt Practices Act made it a crime for the officers of any corporation doing business in the State to spend money in influencing a public election in Tennessee. But the Commonwealth & Southern Corporation was a Delaware corporation. It was a mere holding company. It did not do business in Tennessee, according to Mr. Willkie. It would, of course, have been a crime for the Tennessee Electric Power Co. to have spent the money to kill public power. But there was no reason why its holding company should not make a sizeable contribution to get the same result. And Mr. Willkie's only regret was that he hadn't spent more.

And now Mr. Willkie talks about obeying the spirit as well as the letter of the Hatch Act.

I will not stop here to describe to you the committee's other findings on this utility's activities in the Chattanooga election; the use of power company employees by the taxpayers' association; the preparation by power company officials of the association's propaganda; instructions to employees to canvass the voters, and the purchase and use of two vacant lots to "qualify" out-of-town employees.

And this is not a thing of the past. The huge slush fund in the Union Electric Power Co. case in Missouri ran over half a million dollars, never reflected on the company's books, but in kick-backs of lawyers, equipment salesmen, and insurance companies. The money went into the campaign funds of candidates for every office from alderman to governor. The lobbyist kept his list of bribed persons and bribe prospects under a carpet in his office. He went to the penitentiary 4 months ago. Following his conviction United States District Judge George H. Moore, on August 4, 1940, sentenced Frank H. Boehm, former executive vice president of the Union Electric Co. to 5 years for perjury, saying in open court: "Not only members of the legislative bodies were tampered with, but members of the county courts, and a judge of the circuit court was paid a salary larger than the salary paid him by the State. * * * Since the days of the Whisky Ring fraud case * * * there has never been anything I know of in this court in any criminal prosecution that revealed the shocking, sordid details of corruption shown in this case."

And now for initiative 139. Can't you see the same pattern in Washington as was used in Tennessee? It's an old stunt. Here the taxpayers' association becomes the "Let the People Vote League." Sounds kind of American and democratic. But somehow we don't know very much about the people who organized the "Let the People Vote League," or who pays its expenses. People don't just spontaneously uprise like this, particularly in favor of a move to curb their own power. And their propaganda is the same propaganda that

was used in the Chattanooga election—that revenue bonds, in your case the revenue bonds of the public utility districts—are the same as general obligation bonds, thus representing direct obligations of the taxpayer. The taxpayer is led to believe that his taxes are being vastly increased. This, as Senator BONE has so clearly pointed out in his series of five public letters, printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, is of course false and misleading. Revenue bonds are paid only out of power revenues, and are not obligations of the taxpayers.

I suggest that it would be healthy to know who are the contributors to the league. Did the citizens flock to its support in the same sort of way that the taxpayers flocked to the association in Chattanooga? There the citizens put up one-eleventh and the power company ten-elevenths of the total. What happened here? I understand that it has been established that one large contribution was made by a taxpayers' association, which itself received a very substantial contribution from one of the operating power companies. Perfectly all right, but let's find out who is behind this People's League.

Your Democratic State platform is squarely on record against initiative 139. As the party favors the extension of public power, I don't see how it could take any other position; for 139 is obviously aimed to cripple the acquisition of power systems by the public-utility districts. If this initiative were genuine, if its sponsors were really worried about democratic control of public indebtedness, the legislation would be directed to all municipalities, not merely public-utility districts.

And, finally, the bias of No. 139 is made doubly clear when we come to the provision that "the total vote cast on such proposition shall exceed 50 percent of the total number of votes cast within such district at the last preceding biennial general election at which State and county officers were elected." Everyone knows that you just won't get out the vote at these special elections, particularly when a lot of people who stay at home and thus kill the proposal do so because the particular system to be acquired or built may not be in their part of the county, so, of course, they don't vote; yet they nevertheless kill it by staying at home. The sponsors of initiative 139 know that and know that such a proposal is found in no other law of the State dealing with elections. Obviously it is intended to hamper the fight for public power in the State of Washington, where is found nearly a fifth of all of the potential hydroelectric power in the United States. And, of course, it has the support, open or tacit, of the private utilities who are opposed to public power.

You won't have an easy time hooking up your P. U. D.'s to Bonneville and Coulee; you've had a taste of the fight that's ahead of you. I know what it is. After 15 years of opposition and struggle the first public-utility district law in the country was passed in 1931. I need not rehearse to you the struggle in the courts, the taxpayer's injunction suit against the Grays Harbor Public Utility District to prevent the purchase by it of the electric facilities within the county, financed by the utilities, and finally culminating in the unanimous decision of the State supreme court in favor of the district; the court holding, among other things, that revenue bonds to be valid need not be referred to a vote of the people. And now, beaten in the courts, the utilities are making a concealed flank attack and, in the name of democracy, are trying to persuade the people themselves to adopt initiative No. 139, themselves to defeat the spread of power systems owned and operated by the people.

I saw something of the same fight in the Tennessee Valley when Willkie was trying to stop the cities getting their power from T. V. A.

According to the report of the committee investigating T. V. A. (I refer to pp. 62–69), the Authority made a total direct expenditure of $518,159 in defending the constitutionality of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act in 57 cases brought to block the Authority. The committee, pointing out that the Authority estimated that the losses caused by "delays in the consummation of contracts for the sale of power * * * by litigation and injunctions," both to the Authority and to consumers, were $13,545,903, said, in conclusion (I quote): "The committee believes that a substantial part of the legal obstruction of the Authority's program has not resulted from an effort to protect rights which litigants believed themselves to possess. Rather an effort has been made to smother the Authority with duplicating cases and multiplied attacks."

What shall I say in closing? I have not spoken of the foreign war, or much of national defense, except as all the things I have talked of may be considered a part of that defense. In times like these only great leadership is adequate, and the President is a very great leader. The people love him. He understands them, and for 8 years he has fought their battles. Because we are threatened with the horror of war in this crisis is not, I suggest, a reason for abandoning our efforts to make our democracy more effectively decent, but rather we should build more mightily than ever, to create something our boys can fight for with a passionate faith in their hearts for the American land—their land. I do not believe that Wendell Willkie, whose training and brilliant success has been with this great utility holding company, is fitted by experience or outlook to undertake this leadership. He has always been on the side of the utilities, never on the side of the people. And if now he professes to like the New Deal platform and the New Deal laws affecting labor and the farmer, his profession that he would administer them better than those who put them on the books is one which I think you voters will take with a pretty big grain of salt.

For "Democracy," as the Democratic platform says, "is more than a political system for the government of a people. It is the expression of a people's faith in themselves as human beings." That faith has been restored to us under the President's creative spirit. We need it now more than ever. And the people, sensing that, and necessarily uncertain of the future, trusting Roosevelt, knowing him, certain of him, the people will reelect him in November

W. P. A. Work in Texas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LUTHER A. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 19, 1940

LETTER FROM H. P. DROUGHT

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, the Texas delegation in the House, on September 13, met to consider the question of the allotment of W. P. A. funds to the State of Texas, and also with reference to the sewing-room projects of the W. P. A. in that State.

Col. F. C. Harrington, Commissioner of the Work Projects Administration, was invited to be present, but being ill, sent as his representative Mr. Howard O. Hunter, Deputy Commissioner of the Work Projects Administration. Also present, by invitation, was Col. Lawrence Westbrook, regional director of the W. P. A., and Mr. Harry P. Drought, State administrator of the W. P. A. for Texas.

After a full discussion of the matter was had, it was the sense of those present that Mr. H. P. Drought, State administrator, be requested to write a letter to me, as chairman of the Texas delegation, giving the facts relating to both of the subjects discussed at the meeting, and the delegation instructed me to insert the same in the RECORD, and under leave granted me to extend my remarks, I submit herewith Mr. Drought's letter.

FEDERAL WORKS AGENCY,
WORK PROJECTS ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., September 16, 1940.

HON. LUTHER A. JOHNSON, M. C.,
Chairman of the Texas Delegation in Congress,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN JOHNSON: Pursuant to a request made at a meeting in Washington on last September 13 between 16 Members of Congress from Texas and representatives of the Work Projects Administration to discuss the W. P. A. program in that State, the following statement is given you:

W. P. A. EMPLOYMENT IN TEXAS

The Congress has appropriated for W. P. A. employment throughout the country during the current fiscal year the full amount requested by the President. The Work Projects Administration makes every effort to weigh carefully the factors of population, need, unemployment, and emergency relief situations in determining the employment authorizations for all States, and it is believed that on this basis the employment authorization in Texas represents at least that State's fair share of the funds available.

In June 1939 W. P. A. employment in Texas was 3.81 percent of the national total and the State ranked eighth in the number employed. In August 1940 the Texas percentage of W. P. A. national employment had increased to 4.60 percent and the State's rank had risen to sixth. This indicates clearly that consideration has been given to the dislocation of markets for agricultural products and to the increased unemployment among farm tenants and sharecroppers caused by reductions in cotton acreage.

This month there are employed on W. P. A. projects in Texas about 75,000 persons. The factors mentioned will continue to receive consideration in determining the State's W. P. A. employment and it is expected that a substantial increase in this employment will be provided during the winter months. Indeed, Texas' W. P. A. employment in October will probably advance to about 83,000 persons.

It is well known that the need for W. P. A. employment in Texas by able-bodied destitute persons unable to find work is not fully met by the number of jobs provided. But similar situations exist in all of the other States. There are actually 150,000 destitute Texans on the W. P. A. rolls and there are W. P. A. jobs now for only half that number. However, other States have provided general relief programs for their destitute unemployed which, of course, Texas has not done.

In Texas the only provision made for the destitute unemployed who cannot find work on W. P. A. projects is through the distribution to them of food and clothing made available by the Federal Government through the Federal Surplus Marketing Administration. These Federal commodities are used in other States merely to supplement general relief provided by the States themselves. In Texas, with the exception of two or three local relief programs, they are all of the general relief provided.

Of course, any provision for general relief in Texas to supplement W. P. A. employment and the commodities provided by the Federal

Government would have to be made by the Texas Legislature and not by the National Congress.

W. P. A. INTAKE IN TEXAS

In every State in the Union it is the recognized right and responsibility of the State and not of the Federal Government to determine which persons are entitled, on the basis of need, to W. P. A. employment. This administration has safeguarded this right of the States. The determination is made in each State by a State or local agency. In Texas it is made by the State department of public welfare. However, the State of Texas has not provided the funds necessary for the discharge of this responsibility—for an adequate system of referral of needy persons to W. P. A. Therefore the counties in Texas, in cooperation with the State department of public welfare, are trying to provide this W. P. A. referral or "intake" service. Some counties are able to do this adequately but most counties, because of restrictions imposed on their financial operations by the State government, are able to provide only an inadequate intake service. The result is that in many localities in Texas needy persons applying for referral to W. P. A. must wait weeks and even months before a county case worker can interview them.

If this situation is to be corrected and an adequate W. P. A. referral or intake system provided in Texas, the correction must be made in Austin—it cannot be made in Washington.

W. P. A. SEWING ROOMS

Under a provision of the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act, W. P. A. nonlabor expenditures on projects in any State may not exceed an average of $6 per worker per month. In the operation of W. P. A. sewing projects in Texas, all the necessary textiles were formerly purchased with Federal funds, and the quantity of those textiles used caused the W. P. A. nonlabor expenditures on such projects to exceed substantially this statutory limit.

In addition to this, the production of clothing on W. P. A. sewing projects in Texas, while enormous, did not meet the tremendous need of the destitute for clothing. Moreover, many women, unable to master the intricacies of making entire garments, can do efficient work in sewing parts of them. Therefore to provide more clothing for the destitute and to enable more women in need to qualify for sewing-room employment, a modified line production system was installed in W. P. A. sewing rooms. The increase in production thus obtained is resulting in the use of more textiles than formerly.

As substantial W. P. A. nonlabor expenditures are also required on other projects, it has been found that such expenditures cannot be held sufficiently below $6 per worker per month to offset the amount that must be spent in the purchase of all textiles needed on W. P. A. sewing projects.

The Work Projects Administration in Texas will continue to expend $6 per worker per month in the purchase of sewing-project textiles but, as stated, it cannot now exceed this limit. Therefore, the counties and cities sponsoring W. P. A. sewing projects have been asked to provide the funds required for the purchase of textiles in excess of the amount that can be purchased with W. P. A. nonlabor funds within the statutory limit.

Counties and cities in Texas apparently have had little difficulty in providing nonlabor expenditures on construction projects such as roads, streets, bridges, municipal and school buildings, and so forth, in excess of the $6 statutory limit on nonlabor costs. It is thought that these cities and counties can also provide substantially the same expenditures for W. P. A. sewing projects.

That they can provide these expenditures seems to be demonstrated by the fact that Texas cities and counties, according to the latest report available, are now sponsoring W. P. A. sewing-room projects for the employment of more than 11,000 women, while projects formerly sponsored by cities and counties which, because of the requirement mentioned, have refused to continue such sponsorship, employed hardly 2,000 women.

Despite this, it would be unfair to the cities and counties of Texas to assert that their sponsorship of W. P. A. sewing rooms does not present serious financial difficulties. Other States assist their cities and counties in this respect, but Texas not only gives no such assistance but the State has retained restrictions on the financial operations of its political subdivisions which make W. P. A. sewing-room sponsorship a problem hard for them to solve. Only the State government can give this assistance and relax these restrictions.

In this connection it should be noted that the Legislature of Texas has not provided a program of aid to dependent children which has been made available to the State by the Federal Government. Thousands of women now working in W. P. A. sewing rooms in Texas would be eligible for this assistance should the State provide it. The people of Texas have adopted the constitutional amendment necessary to accept this program, but the legislature has not enacted the law required.

CONCLUSION

When it is considered that Texas is receiving its share of W. P. A. employment, that other States, through a general relief program, provide for their destitute unemployed citizens who cannot obtain W. P. A. employment, that other States have provided an adequate W. P. A. intake service by which their citizens in need can gain admittance to the W. P. A. employment rolls, that other States have likewise assisted their counties and cities in the sponsorship of W. P. A. sewing projects and have lightened their burden in this respect by adopting an adequate program of aid to dependent children, it seems obvious that it is the legislature of Texas and not the Congress of the United States from which assistance must be sought in the solution of the problems discussed above.

The unfailing interest of the Texas Congressmen in the W. P. A. program in their State, and their constant aid and invaluable advice have been of the greatest importance in enabling the Work Projects Administration to be of assistance to Texas' needy, unemployed citizens.

With kindest regards, I am,

Yours sincerely,

H. P. DROUGHT,
State Administrator for Texas.

Constitution Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 20 (legislative day of Wednesday, September 18), 1940

[Address by Attorney General Robert H. Jackson for the Constitution Day celebration sponsored by the Cleveland Bar Association and read by Hon. Matthew F. McGuire, the assistant to the Attorney General, over radio station WOL, Washington, D. C., Tuesday, September 17, 1940, at 11:30 a. m., Eastern Standard Time, on a coast to coast hookup. The Attorney General was unable personally to deliver the address as scheduled because he was among those who went to Alabama to attend the funeral of Speaker Bankhead.]

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD an address by Attorney General Jackson intended to be delivered before the Cleveland Bar Association on Constitution Day, which he was prevented from delivering at Cleveland, but which he did deliver over the radio, and I wish to have it in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Under the leadership of the Cleveland Bar Association we are making this anniversary of our Constitution a day of dedication to it and to the spiritual affirmations of free government which underlie it.

One hundred and fifty-three years ago today George Washington, as President of the Constitutional Convention, sent to the old Continental Congress a new Constitution. His claims for the document were modest. He said that "it is liable to as few exceptions as could reasonably have been expected." But he expressed a wish "that it may promote the lasting welfare of that country so dear to us all, and secure her freedom and happiness."

Our history has fulfilled Washington's wish for our freedom and happiness. But we cannot assume that they will remain secure just because there is a parchment here in Washington on which words are written to describe the framework of a free government. That security is found, rather, in the minds and hearts of our people, in their convictions that a free government is the best way of life, and in their devotion to maintaining it. It is this spirit which gives our old Constitution its continuing youth and vitality. Countries which substantially copied our Constitution as their own have failed to achieve real democracy wherever their people have failed to catch its spirit. To a renewal of that spirit of free institutions in our own time we consecrate ourselves today.

I know that you hear the soothing phrases of freedom over and over again, until they resemble a drowsy ritual. But make no mistake about it, democracy is a fighting faith. Our Government rests on great affirmations, and each generation must fight the fight to keep the faith a living one.

We affirm the inherent dignity of the individual, and his right, just as a human being, without any property qualification or test of birth or pedigree, to vote—to influence the course of his Government and the destiny of his race. We affirm his right to an economic order that will let him win a place for himself in accordance with his natural endowments and character. And when age or unemployment disable him, he still has minimum requirements which organized society must not deny him. Before the processes of government, whether in making of laws or administering laws, or in courts of justice, men must stand, as in the eyes of God, equal. And we affirm the right of every man to invoke those great basic freedoms enshrined in our constitutional Bill of Rights which keep inviolate the personality and the conscience and the civil liberties of men.

Even if faint hearts or mistaken judgments keep us from reaching these ideals, as we must confess they often do, our way is not to abandon the ideal but to embrace it more firmly.

We recall today with reverence those bold-minded men—our forefathers—who proclaimed this new pattern of government in the face of a hostile world. They made a solitary venture in government by consent of the governed at a time when every world power was a monarchy. They dared to set up a republic for their

scattered seaboard settlements when they were surrounded on their very borders by kings. Canada remained a possession of George III; Louisiana and the West were for years traded between the King of Spain and the King of France; Florida and the islands were outposts of the King of Spain. And these kings did not appreciate the strong doctrines of equality found in our Declaration of Independence. They hoped to crush the idea of democracy lest it cross the Atlantic and undermine their thrones.

Most of the world which in 1787 was under the thumb of a hereditary monarch is today under the heel of a self-constituted dictator. Many countries of Europe have merely completed a cycle and are back to where they were. Some of them, meanwhile, have toyed with forms of self-government but somehow failed to catch, or later lost, its spirit. We stand now as we stood in 1789, outstanding in the support of free institutions. Twentieth-century dictators, like the eighteenth-century kings, fear the contagion of our democracy.

If they should challenge us on our own continent, as kings challenged our forefathers here, they will find our relative strength and resources to have increased manyfold. And day by day our strength grows while theirs is being exhausted. A European foe, to reach us, must cross our Atlantic threshold, and only this month we have boldly picked up that Atlantic threshold and moved it 500 miles to new outposts in the sea. Only this month we call upon our young manhood—not to go abroad to fight, there is no thought of that, but to train, to harden the muscle, steady the hand, and sharpen the eye. Our superb manpower will master techniques of our defense and come to know modern weapons, as Jackson's pioneers at New Orleans knew their rifles. So, if any foe, in a delirious moment, should cross our new-laid threshold of defense, he will find a warm reception awaiting him.

I think that our preparation for the entertainment of our enemies will make it very unlikely that they will pay us a call. They will, of course, continue to crush out democracy in Europe where they can reach it, but where it is beyond their reach they will try to divide its people, confuse its counsels, discredit its leaders, and imperil its security from within. They hope to undermine our tolerant and warm-hearted way of life. They sneer at our justice and deny our collective competency to order affairs with efficiency and dispatch. But America wants none of their sadistic nazi-ism, nor of their swashbuckling fascism, nor of their deceptive communism which would embrace liberty only to smother it.

We lawyers know from the history of liberties that there is a way of fighting these ideas better than mob violence or persecution. If suppression would really work, czarist Russia, with its spy system and Siberian exile, would not have been the first country in all the world to be overturned by communism. Dictators have yet to learn that a concentration camp cannot kill an idea any more than it kills a typhoid germ.

It is the basic assumption of our free Government that, in the long run, free discussion will kill untruth as sunshine will kill germs. If this is not true, then we have built our house upon the sands. But a century and a half of experience confirms our faith that truth will triumph over error in minds that are free and that our house stands on bedrock.

There is less reason to doubt our internal stability today, because not one of the arguments made for dictator systems now—not a single one of them—is new. Their claims to excel democracy in unity of purpose and command, in swiftness of decision and efficiency of execution—these claims were all made against democracy long ago—in favor of monarchy. And some among our forefathers were won by these arguments and favored monarchy here or thought that it was inevitable elsewhere and so should be appeased. There are also some today who would copy the methods of the dictators, or accept them as inevitable and so to be appeased. But the overwhelming sentiment of our forefathers rejected, as the sentiment of America today rejects, all counsels that we compromise our own democratic way of life to appease foreign pressures or to escape foreign tensions.

The moral integrity of a people is its best physical security. The spiritual values of liberty and self-government will long outlast the bursts of power and speed and efficiency of dictatorships. We choose the ways of freedom, not because they are easy, but because we believe they are eternally right.

A Timetable of Dictatorship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN THOMAS

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 20 (legislative day of Wednesday, September 18), 1940

TABLE PREPARED BY HARTLEY W. BARCLAY

Mr. THOMAS of Idaho. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a timetable of dictatorship, published recently by the Mill & Factory magazine. It is a challenging title.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A timetable of dictatorship

The steps[1]	France	Germany	Italy	Mexico	United States
Extravagant public works	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes.
Debase currency	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes.
Concentrate power in executive	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes.
Undermine independent judiciary	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes.
Excessive subsidies	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes.
Government by decree	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes.
Encourage subversive forces	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes.
Impose confiscatory taxes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes.
Restrict private investments	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes.
Unbalance budget	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes.
Impose planned economy	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes.
Foster class conflicts	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes.
Control of banks	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes.
Destroy morale of industry	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes.
Excessive borrowing	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes.
Enlarge bureaucracy	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes.
Huge national debt	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes.
Pile up hopeless deficits	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes.
Conscript Army	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes.
Nationalize industry	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	?
Regiment farms	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Regiment labor	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Dictatorship	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	

[1] Truly liberal methods such as Federal Housing Administration, Reconstruction Finance Corporation, Home Owners' Loan Corporation, Federal Security Agency, Wagner Act, Social Security, etc., should not be confused with these steps.

It is later than you think.

Every dictatorship that has been established maintains the appearance of legality in the country in which it exists.

Senator Henry F. Ashurst

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PRENTISS M. BROWN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 20 (legislative day of Wednesday, September 18), 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE DETROIT NEWS

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Detroit News entitled "Unspoiled by Defeat," regarding our colleague the Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST].

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Detroit (Mich.) News]

UNSPOILED BY DEFEAT

Among the first political casualties of the season is one who has long been a favorite character of Senate fanciers, and, until lately, had enjoyed the uninterrupted favor of the Arizona voter—HENRY FOUNTAIN ASHURST. With his departure will go the lushest vocabulary in that body, and, as a best friend and candid critic once put it, there will end the "longest theatrical engagement on record." It began in March 1912.

At 19, while turnkey in the jail at Flagstaff, young Henry came upon a volume of Blackstone's Commentaries, and in no time was "throwing 56-pound words across the Grand Canyon. As a matter of course I went into politics." An actor and ex-Detroit newspaper man, C. N. Stark, furthered the comer's first designs on public office—a seat in the territorial legislature. There he opened a career as "silver-tongued sunbeam of the Painted Desert," the end of which is only now in sight.

In Washington he has always endeared himself to the discriminating by taking himself none too seriously. "There never has been superadded to these vices of mine the withering, embalming vice of consistency," he once said in accounting for a sudden switch in sides. "As is obvious to everyone who knows me, I suffer from an inborn, inveterate flair for the histrionic," he said in another moment of self-analysis.

He is the Senator who, when Huey Long had cowed the Chamber into a sort of helpless catalepsy, arose one day and dissected the Kingfish in what stands as the most polished and comprehensive verbal beating given one solon by another in our time. Never again did Huey seem to his colleagues as formidable a figure. He

fought conscription, which may have had a bearing on last week's turn in his fortunes. "The perpetuity of our Government did not absolutely depend on the reelection of one ASHURST," he said, in comment on a result that may have been a shock to one regarded as a fixture in Washington but found him at no loss for the courtly and characteristic word.

Hon. Henry Wallace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GUY M. GILLETTE

OF IOWA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 20 (legislative day of Wednesday, September 18), 1940

ARTICLE FROM THE NATIONAL RECORD

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a news article from the National Record, of the issue of September 21, 1940, concerning Hon. Henry Wallace, the Vice Presidential nominee on the Democratic ticket.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the National Record of September 21, 1940]

HOW WALLACE BROUGHT THE FARMERS UP FROM RUIN—BALANCE BETWEEN AGRICULTURE AND INDUSTRY BROUGHT STABILITY—DOUBLED INCOME FOR AGRICULTURE

Before we tell you who Henry Wallace is, we'll tell you what Henry Wallace has done.

Cash income of American farmers rose from $4,606,000,000 in 1932 to $8,518,000,000 in 1939—and it's still going up.

That's Henry Wallace. That's his achievement, his biography, the basis of his right to stand before the American people as the Democratic candidate for Vice President.

Before we tell you who Henry Wallace is, we'll tell you the meaning of Henry Wallace's achievement.

FARM SYSTEM PERILED

Before the New Deal the free farmers of the United States—at once the most progressive and the most stable element in our society—were being debased into an unfree peasantry, victims of chaotic markets and mounting debts.

Bank and insurance companies were becoming the landlords of America—and under circumstances that were not too wholesome even for the banks and insurance companies.

Under three successive Republican Presidents the income of the American farmer declined. Corn was being burned for fuel. Potatoes were rotting in freight cars. There were farm riots—considered for centuries as a sure mark of deep-seated social disorder and disintegration.

PRICES STABILIZED

The Wallace policies, the Wallace administration of those policies, stabilized farm prices at a level where farmers could live. Wallace saved the American family-owned, family-operated farm, and in so doing deserves a share of President Roosevelt's credit as the greatest conservation of his day. They conserved the fundamentals of the American way by changing what are—comparatively speaking—details.

Every businessman, every factory worker, owes a part of that prosperity and security to the restored financial independence of 8,000,000 American farm families.

The Republicans cavil and jeer at crop control. The jibes stick in their throat. They know that Wallace succeeded where they failed; and that he succeeded without violating any essential principle of American democracy; that he succeeded with expenditures that seem small indeed compared to the result accomplished.

BORN TO THE TASK

The man who rescued the American farmer was born to do just that. His father was Henry C. Wallace, Secretary of Agriculture before him. His grandfather was "Uncle Henry" Wallace, founder of Wallaces' Farmer, and a friend and associate of President Theodore Roosevelt.

Wallaces' Farmer championed the cause of the American farmer for years. Henry Agard Wallace, the New Deal Secretary of Agriculture, has taken the Nation a long way along the road to solution of farm problems.

The Vice Presidential candidate—President Roosevelt's personal choice for the job—was born October 7, 1888, on an Adair County farm in Iowa.

STRONG FOR HONESTY

Following the usual farm-boy life, plus years of boyish experimenting in cross-breeding of plants and seeds, Wallace entered the Iowa State College of Agriculture and Mechanical Arts, and promptly got into trouble because of his penchant for honesty and accuracy. Well versed in farming and plant genetics, he disputed a corn judge's assertion that a particular brand would produce high yields. Wallace proved that the corn was unfertile and almost got bounced. This demand for honesty and accuracy is a distinguishing characteristic.

Graduated in 1910, Wallace went to work as associate editor of Wallaces' Farmer.

HUNGER FIGHTER

But he was also winning a more desirable reputation as an agricultural expert, statistician, and economist. He was canonized by Paul de Kruif as a hunger fighter. His experimenting with cross-breeding and plant genetics produced a product that revolutionized corn growing.

During Coolidge's administration he came out strong for the McNary-Haugen bill (coauthored by his present opponent), and official Washington began to notice the farm editor in the Middle West.

The Wallace star began to shine brightly in 1932 when, despite his long Republican standing, he told farmers that a careful examination of both candidates convinced him that they "would have a chance under Roosevelt, but none with Hoover." He bolted his party, canvassed the State for Roosevelt, and was credited with bringing the first Democratic victory to Iowa in 40 years. When the new administration was organized, President Roosevelt drafted Wallace for the post of Secretary of Agriculture.

AT ROCK BOTTOM

And when Wallace went into office the farm situation was at rock bottom. Overexpansion and overproduction of farm products had glutted the market and ruined prices. Into this picture stepped Wallace and his hope for salvation, the Agricultural Adjustment Act.

Wallace planned to retire from production some 50,000,000 acres, offering to pay farmers who would plow under their surplus crops and keep portions of their fields inactive. The money would come from a processing tax, applied to those who processed farm products for market use. Wallace's plan, in addition to saving a bad situation and increasing the farmer's income, would also rebuild the depleted lands that had been farmed to exhaustion.

Despite the objection of theorists to plowing under crops and murdering little pigs, slogans which foes of the administration were quick to capitalize, the vast majority of farmers were not to be fooled and entered enthusiastically into the new program.

PROCESS TAX FOUGHT

Not so the processors—the packing houses, the millers, and the countless industries which turn raw farm products into food for the table. They fought the A. A. A. with the best legal talent money could buy—even though they added the processing taxes to the prices of their products. Finally, months after the taxes had been paid by the public and farm income was on a definitely more equitable basis, the Supreme Court invalidated the A. A. A.

Undaunted, Wallace and his aides continued the fight. Under a soil-conservation program, a system of crop loans to sustain an ever-normal granary, and the food-stamp plan to absorb surplus commodities, they found new ways to equalize the farmers' income. The success of their efforts is indicated by the fact that today four-fifths of the commercial farmers of the Nation are cooperating with the A. A. A.

Wallace, the man, despite his 51 years, is still somewhat shy and boyish. Over the admonitions of his wife—his college sweetheart, Ilo Browne, whom he married in 1914—and a Negro valet, he tramps around Washington with baggy pants, crooked tie, and tousled hair. He's too busy to primp up. Farmerlike, he is at his best leaning back in his chair, feet propped up on his desk or on the rim of his wastebasket, having a heart-to-heart talk about farm problems with a seasoned "dirt" farmer. Washington avers that the farmer in Wallace hasn't been changed by his Cabinet post or by his nomination to the Vice Presidency.

SEVEN-POINT PROGRAM

Throughout his career Wallace has hewed closely to this seven-point program for the betterment of agriculture:

1. Farmers should have a fair share in the national income; that is, a share that will give the farmers as much purchasing power relative to the average nonfarmer as was the case during the 50 years before the World War.

2. The welfare of all farmers, and city people as well, demands that wide fluctuations in supply and price of major crops be evened out as much as possible by use of ever-normal granary and crop insurance.

3. People who live on the land must have security of tenure.

4. The soil must be used to meet the needs of the present but, at the same time, conserved for the future farmers and city people.

5. By means of cooperatives, farmers should control those processing, purchasing, and service functions which they can handle successfully and efficiently.

6. Family sized farms should have Federal support in the form of benefit payments and other aids to rural income.

7. Federal and State funds must continue to promote agricultural research and farm efficiency as an essential part of the whole program.

Farmer Henry A. Wallace is a farmer at heart.

Limitation of Presidential Term

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD R. BURKE
OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 20 (legislative day of Wednesday, September 18), 1940

STATEMENT BY VANCE C. McCORMICK, FORMER CHAIRMAN OF THE DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL COMMITTEE

Mr. BURKE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the statement made by Hon. Vance C. McCormick, of Pennsylvania, former chairman of the Democratic National Committee, before the subcommittee of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary on limitation of term of Presidency.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I appreciate the opportunity to come before your committee to express my approval of Senate Joint Resolution 289, which limits the Presidency to the "whole or any part of each of two separate terms" of 4 years each.

I will not take your time in discussing the historical and constitutional background of the third-term tradition, as this has already been done by constitutional lawyers, eminent writers, and historians, and others much more ably and effectively than I could do it. I am here to give you simply the views of a newspaper publisher and businessman and one who has participated actively as an officer in the affairs of the Democratic National Committee. I am eager to do what I can to try to save that great party from the errors into which it is being led by its present leaders and to help to restore the principles of democracy as taught by its founders. On that basis I therefore desire to submit for your consideration some of my objections to the third term.

1. The third term is more than "just another tradition." For a century and a half it has had the disapproval of the American people. It was opposed by the early fathers for the same reason it is opposed today—the fear of perpetuation of a one-man government. The principle of limited terms in public office is recognized in the constitutions of 34 of the States.

Until this year the third-term issue never reached the people in an election. Hitherto it was rebuked before it reached that stage. The very fact that under modern conditions it has reached the people is evidence of the political power which can be generated under even the two-term Presidential term and suggests the greater political power of the Presidential office if it could be held for three terms by the same occupant.

2. An ambitious President, able to force his nomination for a third term and being elected, could not be trusted to stop then. His own desire for power or his perfectly sincere belief that he and his policies were indispensable for the welfare of the Nation unquestionably might seek a fourth term and a fifth if age and health permitted.

3. To accept the idea that any man is indispensable as the head of the Government of this Nation can only mean democracy has failed, because if there is only one man capable of administering our Government, his death or incapacity would mean the destruction of the Government. This, of course, is absurd.

That view of indispensability was shared by Mr. Roosevelt himself, who on November 3, 1932, declared, "To indulge in such a fantastic idea of my own individual importance would be to betray the common cause that has brought us all together this year. A great man left a watchword that we can well repeat: 'There is no indispensable man.'"

4. The argument against the third term is even stronger today than when the Government was in its infancy, had relatively few dollars to spend, and a small pay roll of Government employees to support. Today the situation is vastly different. Billions of dollars are being spent in salaries for more than a million Government employees, for grants to States, and to municipalities as subsidies, and fabulously large sums to agriculture and to industry. Add together these sums and the recipients of them and translate them into voting power and instantly we recognize the tremendous influence they could wield on election day. The power over the ballot which could be exercised by the beneficiaries of these enormous funds, along with their friends and relatives, is too tremendous to be left in the hands of any President for more than two terms. It would constitute a bureaucracy of such voting strength that it could perpetuate itself in office and leave the citizens of the Nation helpless to correct it.

5. It is greatly to be regretted that the attempt to break the third-term tradition should come at this particular time when the President and the State Department are exerting every effort to draw into closer union with this country the countries of Central and South America. The acceptance of the third term would be a most unfortunate example to the republics of these countries who in theory are operating under the democratic pattern of government. In the past in this country there has been frequent criticism of the dubious character of some of the democratic governments to the southward. It was often pointed out that democracy in certain of these countries was regarded more as a label than a fact. Claims were made that elections in these republics were conducted by bureaucrats and at the bayonet points of the soldiers of the ruling Presidents. There was no free choice, it was said, and the heads of the nations kept themselves in power by the use of their bureaucratic machines and military might.

The Presidency of Diaz in Mexico was an illustration, as were many others, who kept themselves in office not because of the wish of the great majority of their people but through the power of bureaucratic and military machines.

Up to this time the United States has been setting an excellent example before Central and South American neighbors of a democracy where no president has attempted to remain in office beyond two terms. If this process is reversed and the United States sets out to break the third-term tradition, it will be a vindication of the action of the dictators of Central and South America and a disappointment to the real democrats of those lands who have been looking to this Nation for leadership in the process of free government. Thus a third term here may jeopardize the concert and cooperation of all Central and South American nations which are today so urgently sought. Again, if the United States, by turning its back on the limited terms for the Presidency, sets such an example of Hitler ideology before Central and South America, these nations may conclude that as between totalitarian government in the Americas and in Europe there is no choice.

A 6-year term for the Presidency as against a limit of two terms of 4 years each is undesirable, in my opinion, because a 6-year term is too long for a bad President. Under present conditions, if the people have made an unfortunate choice of a President they can correct the error at the end of 4 years. Under the 6-year term the time necessary to effect a change might have disastrous consequences. If an able and worthy President is chosen and he is rendering satisfactory service to the Nation at the end of 4 years, he may be reelected for another term but beyond that the Nation has felt and feels now that there is danger.

In a previous hearing a member of your committee asked what answer could be given to the man who said he was against the third term in principle but that because of the present foreign crisis he felt the incumbent should be reelected because of his experience. To discuss or answer this question fully and frankly involves matters which some persons may regard as partisan, but with the committee's permission I will be glad to offer a few observations.

If experience itself is to control the election of a President, then, as has been pointed out recently, the argument leads to a perpetual Presidency because if, on account of experience, a two-term President deserves a third term then because of his experience he deserves a fourth more than a third and a fifth term more than a fourth, and so on, until our Presidents would serve for life.

But let us look at the record. What has this supposed experience accomplished?

CERTAINLY NOT NATIONAL UNITY

The great need of the Nation in these difficult times is a united people ready and prepared to meet any emergency. It is difficult to expect unity from a President under whose administration class has been arrayed against class and section against section. Until unity, goodwill and cooperation are reestablished in the United States no matter how many tanks and planes and battleships we have, we are not adequately prepared to meet future crises, nor will we be prepared so long as the National Labor Relations Board is allowed by the President to sow suspicion and discord not only among employers and employees but between employers and employees, preventing that complete cooperation in industry so essential to avoid bottlenecks in a preparedness program.

THIS "EXPERIENCE" CERTAINLY HAS NOT BROUGHT US PREPAREDNESS

For several years the world crisis has been developing serious threats for this country. With all his supposed "experience" the candidate for the third term has not heeded the warnings repeatedly given of the weakness of our national defense. A President with the right kind of foreign organization would have been advised of the critical situation abroad and the dangers facing his country. If the President had this knowledge and refused to share it with his countrymen because of the fear of political consequences, then, I ask, is he the "indispensable man" to lead his country further in this critical hour? This "experience," of which we hear so much, can rest only on such information as is furnished the Government by its diplomatic and foreign agents. That information would be available to any man elected to the Presidency.

It is pertinent to ask what record has the President made in his foreign relations and policies to create the impression that it could not be duplicated by Mr. Willkie or any other able man? The greatest need during recent years to protect this Nation and give it an effective voice in preventing a world-wide catastrophe was the building of a great Army and Navy. Until very recently when the country was bordering on hysteria, how much of an effort did the President make to bring this about? Furthermore, this belated effort, involving the spending of billions of dollars, was put forth unfortunately on the eve of an election.

As further evidence of the supposed "experience," what can be said of the President's desire in the early summer that Congress adjourn and go home? Does this indicate "experience" in the way of preparedness? The importance of keeping Congress in session is demonstrated in the fact that because it ignored the plea of the President and remained in session Congress has enacted such vital measures as a two-ocean Navy, a selective-service law, and appropriation measures to carry them out. Notwithstanding the importance of keeping Congress in session, the President continued to urge its adjournment but happily the pressure of public opinion prevailed in this instance as it did in the attempt to pack the Supreme Court and Congress stayed on the job to the great advantage of the country. Had the President's desires for congressional adjournment prevailed, the Nation would have lacked these essential measures in a preparedness program.

CERTAINLY THIS EXPERIENCE IS NOT MANIFEST IN BUSINESS MANAGEMENT OF THE NATION'S AFFAIRS, SO ESSENTIAL TO PREPAREDNESS AND DEFENSE

For 7 years of this administration this Nation has been beset with the problem of an industrial depression with widespread unemployment. It was a challenge to the business capacity of the Chief Executive of the Government. That problem has not been solved. How could it be under such contradictory policies as spending millions of public funds to irrigate tillable acres of which there was already a surplus and to spend millions more to withdraw still other acres from cultivation? The national debt of forty-seven billion is at its peak in the Nation's history, and more than 7,000,000 persons are still out of employment. What else can you expect when a government subscribes to the fantastic idea that a nation can spend its way out of debt, can distribute more by producing less, and pursues monetary policies which must lead to bankruptcy? A nation preparing its defenses must likewise prepare its finances. Under the New Deal that has not been done. And is that the kind of "experience" we need in a crisis? Is it reasonable to expect that a President who has failed in this challenge to his executive experience and business ability will succeed any better in carrying out the great task of national preparedness, and should he now demand the right to leave the problem in such hands?

As the case stands today, the issue is not one of so-called experience. It is one of retaining in office a man who claims he is indispensable and asks for a third term, thus raising this issue. The anxiety of the American people should not be over the consequences of "switching horses" at this hour but of what the Nation may suffer if there is not a "switch."

It is regrettable that the third-term issue in this election has arisen at a time when its seriousness may be befogged by the tension of a world crisis. The net result of such a crisis might be less devastating to this Nation and its way of life than the violation of an approved tradition like the third term with its encouragement of the very sort of one-man or totalitarian government under which Europe is suffering today. The issue is clear. Do the people want to abandon the American way of life for the sake of this so-called experience which has proved so costly to the country? The democratic way of living needs to be guarded vigilantly in America, and one of the best ways to protect it is to approve the resolution limiting the Presidential term to two terms, which would repudiate the third-term issue, thus settling this fundamental question for all time.

Voting Record of Senator Maloney on Labor Measures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. WAGNER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 20 (legislative day of Wednesday, September 18), 1940

LETTER FROM WILLIAM GREEN

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter which the senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY] has received from Mr. William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, commenting upon Senator MALONEY'S voting record on measures of interest to labor.

It affords me pleasure to ask the publication of this letter, because it states that the record of the Senator from Connecticut is 100 percent favorable to labor.

I also ask unanimous consent that there may be published, in connection with this letter, a compilation of Senator MALONEY'S voting record on legislation in which labor has been interested.

There being no objection, the matters referred to were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR,
Washington, D. C., August 27, 1940.

Hon. FRANCIS MALONEY,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I am in receipt of your letter of August 23, wherein you request a copy of your voting record on measures of interest to labor. I am glad to comply with your request, especially in view of the fact that your record is 100-percent favorable.

May I take this opportunity to express my true appreciation of your wonderful record built up over a period of years.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM GREEN,
President, American Federation of Labor.

LEGISLATION FAVORABLE TO LABOR SUPPORTED BY SENATOR MALONEY

SEVENTY-THIRD CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

S. 598. For the relief of unemployment through the performance of useful public works.

H. R. 4606. To provide for cooperation by the Federal Government with the several States and Territories in relieving the hardship and suffering caused by unemployment.

S. 510. Providing for a national system of employment offices, and public employment offices in the States on a 50–50 basis.

H. R. 5755. To encourage national industrial recovery, to foster fair competition and to provide for the construction of certain useful public works. (N. R. A.)

H. R. 6034. Deficiency appropriations of $3,300,000 to carry out the provisions of S. 598 (above).

Deficiency appropriations of $1,500,000 to further carry out the provisions of H. R. 5755 (above).

Deficiency appropriations for the Board of Mediation (railway labor disputes) and Employees' Compensation Commission.

S. 1580. To relieve the existing national emergency in relation to interstate railroad transportation.

SEVENTY-THIRD CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

H. R. 8781. To increase employment by providing emergency construction of public highways, and to amend the Federal Road Act.

H. R. 8134. Convict labor not to be employed on Federally aided State road work.

H. R. 7513. Appropriations for the Department of Labor, including Commissioners of Conciliation, United States Employment Service, etc.

H. R. 5884. The protection of the right of labor to organize under the provisions for corporate reorganization.

Workmen's compensation awards provable in bankruptcy proceedings.

H. R. 9830. Emergency appropriations for relief, providing for a sum of $1,697,000,000 including $525,000,000 for drought relief.

H. R. 8861. Child labor and minimum-wage provisions to be included in sugar-production agreements under the A. A. A.

S. 2794. To amend the Longshoremen's and Harbor Worker's Compensation Act with respect to the rates of compensation and for other purposes.

H. R. 7213. To provide hourly rate of pay for substitute laborers in the Railway Mail Service and time credits when appointed as a regular.

H. R. 7059. To provide for further vocational development in the several States and Territories.

H. J. Res. 375. The establishment of boards to investigate issues involved in labor disputes and conduct elections to select employees' representative for the purpose of collective bargaining. The right to strike not being affected.

H. R. 9404. To authorize representation of labor on "Federal Prison Industries."

S. 3231. To provide a retirement system for railroad employees and to provide unemployment relief (Railroad Retirement Act).

H. R. 7527. Making an additional appropriation of $1,000,000,000 to carry out the purposes of the Federal Emergency Relief Act of 1933, for the continuation of the Civil Works program.

H. R. 9323. To establish the Securities and Exchange Commission to regulate Wall Street corporation activities.

H. R. 9620. An act to encourage improvement in housing standards and conditions, to provide a system of mutual mortgage insurance; and to create a Federal Housing Administration.

H. R. 9861. The Railway Labor Act of 1934; creating a national railway adjustment board, etc.; prohibits carriers from providing financial assistance to any union; reiterates employees' right to collective bargaining.

SEVENTY-FOURTH CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

S. J. Res. 113. Extending the N. R. A. until April 1, 1935. This resolution repeals the unconstitutional sections of H. R. 5755 (above) but retains provisions relative to minimum wages, maximum hours, the prohibition of child and convict labor.

On an amendment, "prohibiting unfair competitive practices which offend against existing law, including the antitrust laws or which constitute unfair methods of competition under the Federal Trade Commission Act as amended," Senator MALONEY voted "yea."

H. R. 8790. To readjust salaries in the Motor-Vehicle Service of the Post Office.

S. J. Res. 163. Government contractors to agree to comply with requirements as to wages, hours of labor, etc., in applicable codes of fair competition.

S. 3151. To establish a retirement system for employees of carriers subject to the Interstate Commerce Act.

S. 2796. Senator MALONEY voted "yea" on the Public Utility Holding Company Act, which included the so-called death-sentence clause.

On two amendments to eliminate the death-sentence clause Senator MALONEY voted "nay."

H. R. 7260. Creates a system of Federal old-age benefits and provides for aiding States in caring for the needy aged, blind mothers, children, and unemployed (Social Security Act).

On the Hastings amendment to kill title II which provided for old-age benefits Senator MALONEY voted "nay."

H. R. 3896. To provide for the immediate payment to veterans of the face value of their adjusted-service certificates, for controlled expansion of the currency, and to extend the time for filing applications for benefits under the World War Adjustment Act, and for other purposes (Patman bonus bill).

S. 3055. To provide conditions for the purchase of supplies and the making of contracts, loans, or grants by the United States. This bill contains provisions for the prevailing minimum wages, 8-hour day, 40-hour week, and the prohibition of child and convict labor (Walsh-Healey bill).

On a motion to refer this bill to the committee, Senator MALONEY voted "nay."

H. R. 5255. Appropriation of $174,630 for the International Labor Organization.

Appropriations for the Department of Labor, including Commissioners of Conciliation, United States Employment Service, etc.

H. R. 6718. Convict labor not to be employed on Federally aided road construction.

H. R. 8554. Deficiency appropriations for the National Railroad Adjustment Board, the Railroad Retirement Board, and for the Department of Labor.

S. 3303. An act to amend the Bacon-Davis Act of 1931 relating to the rate of wages for laborers and mechanics employed by contractors and subcontractors on public buildings, to provide for the payment of local prevailing wages on contracts over $2,000; to provide for the predetermination of the prevailing rate; payment not less than once a week and without subsequent deduction or rebate on any account.

H. R. 8587. Restriction on changes in wages or working conditions in connection with railroad reorganization proceedings.

H. R. 7167. To provide for unemployment compensation in the District of Columbia.

H. R. 8519. Bonds of public-building contractors required for the protection of persons supplying labor and materials.

H. R. 8651. Retirement annuities for employees over 65 years of age or with 30 years' service with carriers which are subject to the Interstate Commerce Act. (Rail Retirement System Act.)

H. R. 8652. To levy an excise tax upon carriers and an income tax upon their employees for retirement purposes.

S. 2364. Relative to the retirement of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government.

S. 1958. The establishment of the National Labor Relations Act. (Wagner Act.)

On the Tydings amendment "to forbid coercion by labor," Senator MALONEY voted "nay."

H. R. 7709. To provide time credits for substitute laborers in the post office when appointed a regular.

H. R. 6990. To provide a 40-hour week for railway postal clerks (duty being based on an average not exceeding 6 hours and 40 minutes per day for 306 days per annum; and payment for overtime).

H. R. 5375. An act to provide for the payment to charwomen in Government service, on holidays, when no work is performed.

H. R. 6623. To provide assistance against old-age want in the District of Columbia.

H. J. Res. 94. Providing for the prevailing rate of wages to be paid in the construction of buildings, etc.; in connection with the California Pacific International Exposition.

H. J. Res. 117. Appropriation of $4,800,000 for relief purposes; special provisions as to wages, hours, etc., on project work.

On the McCarran prevailing wage amendment as modified to include "that nothing in this section shall apply to the administration of the Civilian Conservation Corps, Senator MALONEY voted "yea."

On the McCarran amendment as a substitute for the Russell amendment providing for the payment of wages according to the prevailing rate, Senator MALONEY voted "yea."

Senator MALONEY voted "yea" on the Russell amendment, which authorized the President to pay such rates of wages as will, in his discretion, accomplish the purposes of this act and not affect adversely or otherwise tend to decrease the going rates of wages paid for work of a similar nature, etc.

On the Adams amendment proposing to reduce the appropriation from $4,900,000 to $2,000,000, Senator MALONEY voted "nay."

On the Byrd amendment to reduce the appropriation from four to one billion dollars, Senator MALONEY voted "nay."

Senator MALONEY voted "yea" on the conference report to H. J. Res. 117.

SEVENTY-FOURTH CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

S. 147. An amendment to the act of June 6, 1933 (S. 510 above), to alter the amount apportioned to certain States for public employment offices affiliated with the United States Employment Service, providing for a minimum allotment of $10,000 a year to each State.

S. J. Res. 233. Prevailing wages to be paid in the construction of Government exhibits for the Great Lakes Exposition.

S. J. Res. 241. Declares December 26, 1936, a legal holiday in the District of Columbia; Federal and District of Columbia employees to be entitled to pay as on other days.

S. 2134. Making it unlawful for persons or corporations to influence or attempt to influence, through fear or intimidation, the vote of any of their employees, at any election for Presidential electors or Members of Congress.

S. 4424. Financial assistance to the States and political subdivisions thereof for the elimination of unsafe and insanitary housing conditions; for the development of decent, safe, and sanitary dwellings for families of low income; and for the reduction of unemployment and the stimulation of business activity; to create a United States Housing Authority (Wagner low-cost housing).

H. R. 10464. Deficiency appropriations for the National Labor Relations Board, Railroad Retirement Board, Railroad Retirement Investigation Commission, and the administration of the Social Security Act.

H. R. 8458. Hours of labor and annual leave of Government employees.

H. R. 8459. Sick leave of Government employees.

H. R. 9863. Appropriations for the Employees' Compensation Commission, National Labor Relations Board, National Mediation Board, and the Railroad Retirement Board.

S. 2625. Merchant seamen entitled to medical relief from the Public Health Service.

S. 4212. Relating to Title II of the National Housing Act; "extending time for loans by the Housing Administrator."

H. R. 11968. Providing for loans by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for the repair of flood and other damage ($50,000,000 available during 1937); extension of insurance by the Housing Administrator.

H. R. 10193. Employees of the mail-equipment shops shall be compensated for 40 hours per week at the same rate heretofore allowed for 44 hours per week (retroactive to October 1, 1935).

S. 2040. To amend the Compensation Act, providing for additional compensation as deemed necessary by the Commission (up to $50 a month), to any employee of the United States suffering total disability.

H. R. 12098. Appropriation of $212,951.59 for the International Labor Organization.

Appropriations for the Department of Labor, including Commissioners of Conciliation, United States Employment Service, liaison with International Labor Organization, etc.; also certain grants to States under the Social Security Act.

H. R. 11418. Convict labor not to be employed on federally aided road work.

H. R. 11581. An amendment to the District of Columbia Appropriation Act providing for $1,656,000 for the purpose of affording relief to residents of the District of Columbia who are unemployed.

H. R. 12120. Additional appropriations for allotments among the States in furtherance of vocational education ($14,200,000).

H. R. 4688. To authorize the operation of stands in Federal buildings by blind persons, to enlarge the economic opportunities of the blind and for other purposes.

H. R. 8455. Authorizing the payments from Works Progress Administration funds to persons employed on river and harbor improvement work for relief of the unemployed.

H. R. 12624. Deficiency appropriations for Employees' Compensation Commission, National Labor Relations Board, National Mediation Board, and the Railroad Retirement Board.

Deficiency appropriation of $29,000,000 for grants to States for unemployment compensation administration and $450,000,000 for social security.

Deficiency appropriation of $1,425,000,000 for work relief, etc.; the payment of prevailing wages required. Also appropriations for the Department of Labor, including the Bituminous Coal Labor Board, etc.

H. R. 6719. An amendment to the Canal Zone Code authorizing the President to prescribe the hours of labor and conditions of employment, medical care, etc.; also liberalizes the retirement system requirements and benefits.

H. R. 12599. States authorized to extend workmen's compensation laws to work on Federal projects, etc.

S. 2293. Relative to the retirement of employees of the Alaskan Railroad.

S. 3055. Contractors for public supplies required to pay prevailing minimum wages, maintain maximum hours of 40 a week, prohibits child and convict labor, and to observe decent working conditions, as amended by the House. (Walsh-Healey bill.)

H. R. 12800. To consider the Guffey coal bill.

SEVENTY-FIFTH CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

H. J. Res. —. Appropriation of $15,000 for extraordinary expenses of the International Labor Office in connection with the Technical Tripartite Textile Conference.

H. J. Res. 331. Emergency appropriation of $280,000 for the Railroad Retirement Board.

S. J. Res. 66. Prevailing rate of wages to be paid in the construction of Government exhibits for the Greater Texas and Pan American Exposition.

H. J. Res. 321. Wage compact establishing uniform standards for conditions of employment. The compact declares "No employer shall pay a woman or a minor under 21 years of age an unfair or oppressive wage."

S. J. Res. 166. Prevailing rate of wages to be paid in the construction of buildings and Government exhibits for the Pan American Exposition at Tampa, 1939.

S. J. Res. 191. Prohibition against picketing before embassies, etc., of foreign governments not to apply to picketing as a result of a bona fide labor dispute regarding construction, etc., of embassy buildings.

S. 2403. To prohibit the transportation of strike breakers in interstate or foreign commerce during labor controversies, and for other purposes.

H. R. 6730. Deficiency appropriation for the Department of Labor.

H. R. 5779. Appropriation of $173,939.74 for International Labor Organization.

Appropriations for the Department of Labor, including Commissioners of Conciliation, United States Employment Service, liaison with international organization, etc.; also certain grants to the States under the Social Security Act.

H. R. 6551. Civilian Conservation Corps established until June 30, 1940, for the purpose of providing employment and vocational training for the unemployed single men.

H. R. 4064. Appropriations for Employees' Compensation Commission, National Mediation Board, and the Railroad Retirement Board.

Appropriation of $19,000,000 and unexpended balance for grants to States for unemployment compensation and administration.

H. R. 8174. Unemployment compensation payments to the States enacting compensation laws in 1937.

H. R. 8245. Deficiency appropriations for the National Labor Relations Board and for the Department of Labor.

To provide financial assistance to the States and political subdivisions thereof for the elimination of unsafe and insanitary housing conditions, for the eradication of slums, for the provisions of decent, safe, and sanitary dwellings for families of low income, and for the reduction of unemployment and the stimulation of business activity, to create a United States Housing Authority, etc.

S. 2475. Fair Labor Standards Act, providing for the establishment of fair labor standards in employment in and affecting interstate commerce, and for other purposes.

Senator MALONEY's vote on the amendments offered to the above act:

"A proposal that the provisions of this act shall not apply to any individual, firm, association, or corporation employing 10 or fewer than 10 persons." Nay.

"A modified amendment proposing that the provisions of this act shall not apply to tobacco warehouses, cotton compresses, cotton warehouses, cotton ginning and bailing, their employers or employees, where the employment is seasonal in character." Nay.

"That the term 'employee' shall not include persons directly employed in the ginning and bailing of cotton where such employment is seasonal." Nay.

"The Secretary of the Treasury be directed to refuse or deny entry to goods, wares, or merchandise produced under such substandard labor conditions which are comparable to or competitive with similar goods produced in the United States under fair labor conditions." Yea.

"The Board's jurisdiction in declaring maximum hours shall not apply to employees employed in a plant located in dairy-production areas if operated by a cooperative association as defined in the Farm Credit Act of 1933." Yea.

"The Board's jurisdiction in declaring maximum hours shall not apply to employees engaged in processing or packing perishable agricultural products during the harvesting season." Nay.

"On the motion to reconsider the amendment providing that any goods produced wholly or in part by convicts or prisoners (except convicts or prisoners on parole or probation) shall be termed as 'unfair goods.'" Yea.

"That the term 'person employed in agriculture,' insofar as it shall refer to fresh fruits or vegetables, shall include persons employed within the area of production engaged in preparing, packing, or storing such fresh fruits or vegetables in their raw or natural state." Nay.

"The regulation in interstate commerce of goods produced by child labor." Yea.

H. R. 1607. Antilynching test vote: Vote on a motion to adjourn, moved in order to prevent discussion of and action on antilynching bill. Antilynching bill would have been displaced if motion carried. Senator MALONEY voted "nay."

SEVENTY-FIFTH CONGRESS, SECOND AND THIRD SESSIONS

H. R. 9544. Appropriations for the Department of Labor, including $1,950,000 for payments to the States for employment service.

H. R. 3609. To protect salaries of rural letter carriers who transfer from one rural route to another.

H. R. 9218. Contracts for the construction, etc., of certain naval vessels to be in accordance with provisions of the act of June 30, 1936, requiring that certain labor stipulations be included in contracts for public supplies, etc.

H. R. 8837. Appropriation of $226,331,000 for the Civilian Conservation Corps and $329,300,000 for the Social Security Board.

H. R. 7834. To amend the District of Columbia Employees' Compensation Act to include any employee performing services in the office of a Member of Congress.

H. R. 8673. Relief of employees on certain Farm Security Administration projects from whose wages sums were deducted in pursuance of a so-called credit hour system.

S. Res. 266. The La Follette bill: To increase by $60,000 the limit of expenditures to investigate violations of the right of free speech and assembly and interference with the right of labor to organize and bargain collectively.

S. 3548. Credit to be given for service prior to August 1, 1920, toward retirement of civil employees.

H. R. 1531. To extend the classified civil service to include postmasters of the first, second, and third classes and for other purposes.

H. R. 10851. Deficiency appropriations for the Department of Labor.

S. 3525. Relative to the eligibility requirements of Senate employees to obtain coverage under Civil Service Retirement Act.

H. R. 3610. Authorizes the Postmaster General to allow additional pay to rural carriers serving heavily patronized routes.

H. R. 9682. Miscellaneous provisions of the income tax law, etc., relating to wages, labor organizations, etc.

H. J. Res. 679. Making appropriations of $1,425,000,000 for work-relief, relief, and otherwise to increase employment by providing loans and grants for public-works projects.

On an amendment setting a minimum wage of $40 a month for workers on relief, Senator MALONEY voted "yea."

On the Byrd amendment striking out title II providing for public works, Senator MALONEY voted "nay."

H. R. 8730. National Housing Act amendments extending the period for writing insurance from April 1, 1937, to July 1, 1939; broadening the eligibility for insurance of mortgages; providing for rental housing insurance to cover projects designed to clear up slum or blighted areas.

Senator MALONEY voted "yea" to H. R. 8730 as amended by the Senate providing for the prevailing rates of pay for work of a similar nature in the same locality.

On the third conference report which eliminated the amendment providing for the prevailing rate of pay, Senator MALONEY voted "nay."

S. 2403. An amendment to the act of June 24, 1936, relating to the transportation of strike breakers, etc., "Making it unlawful to transport or cause to be transported in interstate commerce any person who is to be employed for the purpose of obstructing or interfering with peaceful picketing or self-organization of employees."

H. R. 1543. To amend the act of 1917 relative to the employees of the Immigration and Naturalization Service by providing for promotions and increases in pay for field workers.

H. R. 2006. To permit certain special-delivery messengers to acquire a classified status through noncompetitive examinations.

S. Res. 209. Authorizing $15,000 for the study, survey, and investigation of the problem of unemployment and relief in the United States.

H. R. 4285. To increase the salaries of letter carriers in the village delivery service.

H. R. 7948. Providing for the promotion of employees in the field service of the Customs Bureau.

H. R. 7415. To increase the rates of pay for charmen and charwomen in the custodial service of the Post Office Department.

H. J. Res. 678. Additional appropriation of $3,500,000 for grants to States for unemployment-compensation administration by the Social Security Board.

S. 531. To provide compensation for disability or death resulting from injury to employees of contractors on public buildings and public works.

S. Res. 239. To increase by $10,000 the limit of expenditures of the Special Committee on the Investigation of Unemployment and Relief Problems.

S. 3202. Retirement of the employees of the Alaskan Railroad providing for the payment to the annuitant's estate in the event that he shall die before receiving any annuity.

S. 3330. To increase from 10 to 30 the number of traveling inspectors of the Bureau of Marine Inspection and Navigation.

H. J. Res. 596. Appropriation of $250,000,000 for relief and work relief on useful public projects.

On an amendment to increase the amount from $250,000,000 to $400,000,000, Senator MALONEY voted "yea."

S. 3845. Air carriers to comply with certain regulations as to labor conditions, collective bargaining, rates of compensation and maximum hours, etc.

SEVENTY-SIXTH CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

H. R. 7462. Making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939; to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1939, and June 30, 1940; containing provisions for grants to the Federal Housing Administration; grants to States for public-health service, maternal and child-health service, crippled children, etc; also to the Social Security Board and other relief purposes (third deficiency bill).

On the motion to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI, so that Senator MCCARRAN might offer his amendment providing for the

prevailing rate of wages for persons engaged upon any projects financed in whole or in part by moneys of the United States, Senator MALONEY voted "yea."

Senator MALONEY voted "yea" on the motion of Senator McCARRAN to suspend the above-mentioned rule so that he might offer his amendment providing for the prevailing rate of wages as affected by the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1939.

On a similar motion by Senator MURRAY to suspend the rule so that he might offer his amendment relating to employees of the Work Projects Administration, to wit, "that persons certified for W. P. A. work for a period of 3 months shall have preference over those employed on works projects over a period of 18 months," Senator MALONEY voted "yea."

H. J. Res. 326. Making appropriations for work relief and relief for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1940.

On an amendment to increase the W. P. A. allotment to $400,000,000, Senator MALONEY voted "yea."

On a similar amendment to increase the allotment to $200,000,000, Senator MALONEY voted "yea."

On the amendment which provided that the States bear 25 percent of the cost, Senator MALONEY voted "nay."

H. R. 6635. Liberalization of the old-age insurance system.

The bill contained amendments to the Social Security Act providing for benefit for aged wives, widows, children, dependent parents, and also advancing the date for the commencement of monthly payments to January 1, 1940.

There are provisions extending the old-age insurance to seamen on American vessels, employees of banks, etc.

The Federal grants to the States were increased to $2,020,000 for maternal and child health service, $1,020,000 for aid to crippled children, $2,062,000 for vocational rehabilitation, $4,000,000 for public health.

The act prohibits the use of information concerning State old-age assistance recipients for any political purposes.

S. J Res. 90. Appropriations increased from $500,000 to $1,100,000 for a study of the causes and conditions of unemployment.

H. J. Res. 246. Making a further additional appropriation for work relief and relief for the fiscal year ending 1939 (W. P. A. $100,000,000).

On an amendment to increase the appropriation to the sum recommended by the President ($150,000,000), Senator MALONEY voted "yea."

S. 3041. Making it unlawful to induce any person employed on work financed by the Government to give up any part of his compensation by force, intimidation, or threat of dismissal.

H. R. 4771. Limiting working hours of pneumatic tube system employees (8-hour day).

S. 591. To amend the United States Housing Act of 1937: Providing for the increased authorization of construction loans for the expansion of low-rent housing and slum-clearance program.

On the amendment proposing to reduce the contribution from $45,000,000 to $30,000,000 a year, and the total amount authorized to be cut from $800,000,000 to $400,000,000, Senator MALONEY voted "nay."

S. 2682. Extending wages and hours to Puerto Rico and Virgin Islands.

H. R. 4425. Retirement act for the employees of the Alaskan Railroad.

H. R. 4772. Provides time credit for substitutes in the Postal Service.

H. J. Res. 83. Making an additional appropriation for work relief and relief for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939 ($725,000,000).

On an amendment to increase the appropriation from $725,000,000 to $875,000,000, Senator MALONEY voted "yea."

H. R. 4322. Railway mail clerks were granted the benefit of a holiday on Armistice Day.

S. 1021. Benefits of the United States Employees' Compensation Act extended to Officers' Reserve Corps and Enlisted Reserve Corps of the Army who are physically injured in the line of duty.

H. R. 5474. Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act amended: The waiting time was changed by requiring a single waiting period of 15 days.

The amendment also liberalized the provisions of the law relating to disqualification for benefits.

H. R. 3812. Amendments conforming to the 5-day week, 40-hour law, for postal employees, granting postal employees credit for Saturday in annual- and sick-leave computation.

H. R. 4772. Provides time credit for substitutes in the Postal Service.

H. R. 4786. To extend the provisions of the 40-hour law to pneumatic tube system employees in the Postal Service.

H. R. 2642. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act for the retirement of employees of the Alaskan Railroad who are citizens of the United States," providing for annuity sum to be paid to the estate of the deceased annuitant.

H. R. 2178. An amendment to the above act, providing for a method of promulgating the annuity of employees.

H. R. 4785. Authorizes a differential in pay for night work of postal employees.

S. 2864. Works Financing Act: Appropriates $350,000,000 to P. W. A. for loans for non-Federal projects.

On an amendment seeking to reduce the appropriations for this act, Senator MALONEY voted "nay."

Senator MALONEY voted "yea" on the McCarran amendment which provided for the prevailing rate of wages to be paid workers under the provisions of this act.

On a second amendment seeking to establish the prevailing rate of wages, Senator MALONEY voted "yea."

Senator MALONEY offered an amendment creating a new title, to wit, title II, Public Works Administration, adding $300,000,000 for P. W. A. projects. The amendment also provided for the payment of the prevailing rate of wages; and section 202 authorized that the money realized from the sale of securities acquired by P. W. A. or F. E. A. could be used for making loans in connection with projects.

In debate on the floor, Senator MALONEY said: "I think it is a sin to pay any man as little as $26.50 a month."

SEVENTY-SIXTH CONGRESS, SECOND AND THIRD SESSIONS

H. R. 9850. To expedite the strengthening of the national defense, authorizing the President to use $132,000,000 for emergencies affecting national security and defense.

H. R. 9791. Amend the District of Columbia compensation laws to provide for more liberal payments.

H. J. Res. 544. Making appropriations for work relief and relief for the fiscal year ending June 1941 (W. P. A., $975,000,000).

On an amendment to increase W. P. A. appropriations by $500,000,000, Senator MALONEY voted "yea."

Senator MALONEY voted "yea" on an amendment to provide $100,000,000 for the purchase of surplus commodities.

On an amendment to repeal the 18-month lay-off provision, Senator MALONEY voted "yea." In debate on this amendment the Senator said: "When this proposal first came before the Senate, I very vigorously protested, here and in the committee, the suggestion that the 18-month provision be put in effect."

S. 2639. Subjecting employees of Government-owned railroad in Montana to the act of 1907, "to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon the railroad by limiting the hours of service of the employees."

H. J. Res. 456. Increases from $3,200,000 to $4,700,000 the appropriation for employees' compensation fund and emergency relief.

H. R. 5784. To provide for the conservation and transfer of accumulated sick and annual leave of civil-service employees who became postmasters.

H. R. 7663. Amends the act of July 18, 1939, as to sick leave for postal employees who are classified as substitutes.

S. 607. An act to amend section 40 of the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, etc.," by inserting "and all persons, other than independent contractors and their employees, employed on the Menominee Reservation in Wisconsin."

S. 3650. Extends to Alaska and Hawaii the application of the act of March 3, 1931, which requires that contracts in excess of $5,000 for the construction of public building shall contain a provision for the payment of the prevailing rate of wages to laborers or mechanics employed on such construction.

H. R. 9848. An act to authorize the construction and maintenance of naval aircraft, the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes.

S. 1970. Oppressive Labor Practices Act, prohibiting oppressive labor practice, the use of labor spies, strike breakers, or strike-breaking agencies, etc.

Senator MINTON (Indiana) said: "I am advised that Senator MALONEY would vote 'yea' if present."

S. J. Res. 71. Leave of absence earned by an employee of the Government Printing Office during 1932 which has not been taken or compensated for shall be granted during the years 1940, 1941, and 1942.

S. 3237. Amends the provisions of the Sugar Act of 1937 in regard to child labor, to wit, "prohibiting payments to producers if a child under 14 years of age shall have been permitted to work."

H. J. Res. 544. An amendment to the Emergency Appropriation Act for work relief and relief (above), to wit: "Making it unlawful to deprive or threaten to deprive by any means any person of any employment under this act on account of race, creed, color, or any political activity, support of or opposition to any candidates of any political party in election."

H. R. 8064. Retirement of the employees of the Alaskan Railroad who are citizens of the United States is amended "to include clerical employees within the provisions of the act."

H. R. 1827. Allows moving expenses to employees of the Railway Mail Service who were arbitrarily transferred under order.

H. R. 9007. 1941 appropriation "Labor-Federal Security Act." This act contained provisions for grants to States:

Maternal and child welfare, $5,820,000.

Services for crippled children, $3,870,000.

Child-welfare service, $1,510,000.

Vocational rehabilitation of persons disabled in industry or otherwise, $3,000,000.

This act also provides for appropriations for the National Labor Board, National Mediation Board, and the Railroad Retirement Board, etc.

H. R. 10055. An act making supplemental appropriations for the national defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941.

S. 1032. Amends the Walsh-Healey bill (above, S. 3055), to wit: "Requires the Secretary of Labor in determining minimum wages by industries to recognize the applicable minimum-wage provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act as a floor; fixes a minimum age limit for both sexes; contractors violating the law as to collective bargaining are placed on the ineligible list, applies to Government contracts of $4,000 or more (now $10,000).

H. R. 9007. On an amendment to this act decreasing the C. C. C. appropriation by $25,000 Senator MALONEY voted "nay."

Limitation of the Presidential Term

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD R. BURKE
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, September 20 (legislative day of Wednesday September 18, 1940

ARTICLE BY ARTHUR KROCK

Mr. BURKE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article written by Mr. Arthur Krock and published in the New York Times of September 18, 1940. The article discusses the testimony of Dr. Jacob Gould Schurman before the subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary on limitation of term of the Presidency.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of September 18, 1940]

IN THE NATION—AN ELDER STATESMAN DISCUSSES THE THIRD TERM

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, September 17.—Personal and party considerations and the rules and traditions of the game of politics in the United States are responsible for the lamentable fact that many prominent and influential Democrats who oppose and fear a third Presidential term have not publicly withheld their support from Mr. Roosevelt in this campaign. Though by private expressions most of them have indicated reasons for opposition to him which approach, if they do not approximate, the reasons given by Mr. Willkie in Kansas yesterday, these Democrats are silent.

They have left the cause in which they devotedly believe, and the unfavorable outcome of which they deeply fear, to be fought by Republicans, a few well-known Democrats out of office, and by independent students of American history. This timidity in the presence of what these silent Democrats believe to be a very great threat to American institutions is typical of the effect of the political power which Jefferson suspected would be held by a third-term aspirant. It was one of the considerations which induced him to inaugurate the tradition that was inviolate until July 1940.

Among the thoughtful students of American history who have lately voiced the true feelings of these muted Democrats is Dr. Jacob Gould Schurman, former Ambassador and president of Cornell University. He is a Republican by affiliation. But a glance at Who's Who and remembrance of sundry public services merit Dr. Schurman's listing as an independent political thinker. The other day, in his eighty-seventh year, he gave to the Senate Judiciary subcommittee, headed by Senator BURKE, an outline of his reasons for opposing a third term.

WHY NOT A THIRD TERM

The points made by Dr. Schurman condensed from his statement of them follow:

1. Of the three coordinate departments of the Federal Government, authority in only one—the executive—is vested in a single individual, the President. The life tenure granted by Great Britain to its sovereign is not an analogy because the British King no longer rules.

2. In Great Britain, further refuting the citation of its government form against the two-term tradition, the legislative branch, through the Cabinet, has over the years absorbed the executive department; also, Parliament can challenge any action of the Cabinet at any time, and, by withholding a vote of confidence, can turn out the Government at any time. Furthermore, the Prime Minister and his associates must face the Commons for questioning on any subject at any time.

3. Ancient Rome and modern Germany illustrate the "constitutional" ways by which a popular and ambitious leader can escape the limitations of tenure and become a dictator.

(a) Julius Caesar did it by employing the plunder of Gaul to buy influence in Rome with which to crush Pompey after the First Triumvirate. In the 6 years he was dictator "Cicero tells us that authority of every kind had been committed to him," that is, through the legal forms. In time of war an American President could attain the same power, and the possibility of his Caesarlike use of it should not be permitted to arise.

"Aristotle laid it down," said Dr. Schurman, "that the primary principle of democracy is personal liberty and that among the essential attributes of popular government must be included the system of short tenure of office.

HITLER'S "LEGAL" RISE TO POWER

(b) Hitler, who was unknown and almost unheard of by Dr. Schurman up to the time he left Berlin as Ambassador, used a new but "constitutional" technique to become the master of the German people. "He planted a 'fifth column' behind the lawful government and * * * behind the mass of the German people." Thus he accomplished a revolution and the abolition of personal liberty without resort to civil war—"a phenomenon unique in history." Assisted by the discoveries and inventions of modern science, which permit a modern autocrat to reach control by easier means than those of the past, Hitler came to supreme authority.

"Let us imagine," said Dr. Schurman, "an American leader of Bryan's gifts but with Hitler's love of power." Let us assume that all-consuming ambition moved him, after two Presidential terms, to seek a third. Would not dictatorship be a possible consequence of success? Supreme as Executive, with growing dominion over Congress and the majority party, the nominator of every member of the Supreme Court and Commander in Chief of the Army and the Navy, he could easily become a "constitutional" dictator. The risk should not be run. "A Chief Executive can already * * * embroil the country in a situation which necessitates war."

4. The breaking of a revered custom or a constitutional prescription soon becomes general practice. The doctrine of indispensability is always the same when dictatorship or unlimited tenure is sought. Hitler, Mussolini, and Stalin all proclaim it. But the British recently rejected it in the midst of war. No emergency can justify the doctrine, certainly not the present one.

Dr. Schurman has offered another challenge to what should have already become a great and worthy national debate.

National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BURTON K. WHEELER
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, September 20 (legislative day of Wednesday, September 18, 1940

NEWSPAPER ARTICLES BY KENNETH CRAWFORD AND RAYMOND CLAPPER

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, last week I offered a resolution, proposing a Senate investigation into certain aspects of our national-defense effort. This whole general subject has in recent weeks received the attention of numerous writers, including several outstanding Washington observers. They point out that foreign interests in some of our essential industries may imperil our preparedness program, and suggest changes in existing procedure. Because I believe that these articles are of great interest to all our people who are concerned with making our Nation strong, I send to the desk and ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a series of articles written by Kenneth Crawford, which have appeared in the newspaper PM, and an extremely interesting article by Raymond Clapper.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Daily News of September 18, 1940]

AN IMPORTANT QUESTION

(By Raymond Clapper)

The matter of throwing the spotlight of publicity upon German control or German interest in American industry is receiving growing attention here.

Enough is known to indicate that a considerable German interest exists, probably amounting to nearly $500,000,000. It is in the form of corporation stock holdings and other interests, such as patent royalty agreements. Much of it is covered up and there is even more mystery as to the use to which the proceeds of these investments are put. Undoubtedly some of it is used to finance propaganda and to subsidize trade in Latin America. Since all ownings, wherever located, of German citizens are considered the property of the Reich and subject to its orders, the question becomes one of public interest.

Chairman WHEELER, of the Senate Interstate Commerce Committee, is seeking administration support for a Senate investigation of the ramifications of German ownership. Study also is being given to the matter within the administration.

Interest arose partly from the episode in which the Bausch & Lomb Optical Co., which has close relations with the German Zeiss company and which holds a monopoly on certain patents for Navy equipment, notified the Navy Department that it would be compelled to delay for 6 months delivery of range finders for two new cruisers unless Assistant Attorney General Thurman Arnold withdrew his antitrust suit against the company. Trust-buster Arnold went to town on this and the company paid a $40,000 fine and proceeded promptly with the Navy range finders.

The incident is one of those that Senator WHEELER had in mind in asking for a Senate investigation of the whole question of German tie-ups in American industry. Information indicates to

Senator WHEELER that German and other foreign corporations exert a measure of control over some of our most important defense industries. German chemical interests have heavy stock ownings in certain essential production here.

Senator WHEELER desires to ferret out such foreign ownership and foreign pooling arrangements. Some of these require American companies to supply all patents to their foreign cousins. Some arrangements have required reports from the American company of military articles manufactured, so that Germany knew at all times what our Army and Navy were getting.

In Germany everyone must register with the Government every foreign security, patent, license, or other property holding abroad. Proceeds are subject to Government disposition. Usually the German citizen is paid off cheap in marks and the German Government takes the full dollar value at this end and puts it to its own use. To allow this to continue without some scrutiny by the American Government would be to allow these particular private foreign holdings to be used for special purposes by the German Government.

No such monkey business is permitted among Americans holding property in Germany. Earnings from American corporations doing business in Germany are blocked and held there. They cannot be taken out of the country and can be used there only for approved purposes.

The obvious course is for the American Government likewise to block the earnings of German investments here, impound them, and allow them to be used to pay off Americans who cannot get their earnings out of Germany. It would be turn about, but fair play.

Such action would check the use of these German earnings for propaganda and for subsidizing trade competition against us in Latin America. The method might be to make compulsory the registration of such property and to deposit the proceeds in Government custody to be paid out in settlement of blocked American earnings in Germany. When post-war trade is resumed, such funds might be usable for purchase of American goods for export to Germany.

But before legislation is undertaken, it would seem desirable to dig out the facts through a Senate investigation. The full story undoubtedly would serve an educational purpose here.

[From PM (New York) of September 9, 1940]

HITLER HOLDS OUR STAKE IN EUROPEAN INDUSTRY AS HOSTAGE—GERMANY USES INVESTMENTS AS A LEVER TO PROMOTE APPEASEMENT SENTIMENT HERE

(By Kenneth Crawford)

Hitler is holding hostage in Germany and the nations he has conquered billions of dollars—good American dollars—and he is using them for all they are worth to make friends and influence people in the United States of America. He already has used them as a lever on American public opinion. They account, at least in part, for the nonvocal appeasement sentiment to be found in the high places of business and industry. If he conquers Great Britain, Hitler will have at least another $500,000,000 to hold for ransom.

These dollars represent direct investments of American companies in Germany, France, the Netherlands, Belgium, the Scandinavian countries, and other nations Hitler has taken over. They are in factories, stores, oil wells—all sorts of enterprises. The owners of these European properties are among this country's largest and most influential corporations—General Motors, Ford, Standard Oil of New Jersey, General Electric, International Telephone & Telegraph, Woolworth, International Harvester, Remington Rand, Yale & Towne. Indeed, almost every big American corporation has some stake in European industry.

HITLER'S LINE

The executives and owners of these corporations naturally hope to get something out of their investments in German Europe. Hitler's agents and propagandists are busy assuring them that this is quite possible. Hitler, they say, believes in capitalism and private enterprise. They used the same assurances to lull some French and British capitalists into an appeasement trance. The Cliveden set in Britain was quite willing to accept, at one time, the theory that the only alternatives left in the world were communism and fascism and that the latter, since it left something to the owning classes, was preferable.

Actually, what happens to business in Hitler's Germany differs only in method and degree from what has happened to business in Russia. The owner is not wholly dispossessed, unless he happens to be a Jew or a critic of the regime, but he is a vassal of the state as surely as is the Russian worker. Moreover, he is subjected to a kind of whimsical gangsterism that strips him of honesty, decency, and reason for self-respect. Experiences of the American companies still doing business in Germany should have shown them what to expect. Some of them have learned their lesson and pulled out. Some have played at Hitler's game of bribery and servitude. Others, in fairness, have had no choice. Their properties have been confiscated in all but name.

IS THERE AMERICAN BRIBERY?

None of the American concerns still operating in Germany or in German-controlled territory is now allowed to take any of its profits out of Europe—at least, not in the open. If some are still doing so undercover, it is because they have bribed the right people long and well. Experts on foreign trade, basing their opinion on admittedly inconclusive information, are inclined to believe that no American concern is now getting any of its profits out. They further believe that all American investments in Europe, if Hitler is not beaten, can be written off in red ink right now. That is why the persistence of appeasement sentiment in business circles is so curious a phenomenon. The part some businessmen are playing in the movement to give Great Britain all possible assistance, even if this assistance eventually involves this country in war, is more understandable. It is strange that so few of these men are to be found in the front rank of the fight against fascism.

The exact value of American business investments in Germany itself—the stake to be sacrificed if American business leaders accept the expert advice to write them off—is a matter of dispute. The Commerce Department estimated them at $227,817,000 in a study published in 1938. This guess was based on answers to a confidential questionnaire sent out to all companies with important European holdings.

A $2,000,000,000 STAKE

Douglas Miller, who for 14 years was commercial attaché to the United States Embassy in Berlin, now a professor at the University of Denver and the foremost authority on recent American trade relations with Germany, estimates that Americans own $2,000,000,000 worth of Germany, including manufacturing and business properties, bonds, real estate, bank balances, and miscellaneous assets. In 1928, at the height of the boom, Americans sold Germany almost $500,000,000 worth of goods, but exports have now been completely shut off by the British blockade.

Even before this war, Hitler's policy of barter had all but stopped German-American overseas commerce. What has continued to be important is production by American firms inside Germany. The largest automobile-manufacturing concern in the nation, for example, is a General Motors subsidiary. It has contributed enormously, as have other American companies, to the upbuilding of Hitler's war machine. It had no choice about this. Had it left Germany, abandoning its plant, the property still would have been operated by the Nazis, who long ago passed laws requiring that a majority of the directors and workers in foreign-owned companies be German.

"FIFTH COLUMN" WORK?

Mr. Miller, while not identifying any firm or individual, is authority for the generalization that American companies holding on in Germany have done so by accepting the Nazi system of wholesale corruption. He suspects also that the Hitler regime has used American employees of these companies in Germany to help him establish a "fifth column" in the United States.

He doubts, however, that the overwhelming majority of company officials back home have been taken in. He trusts in the loyalty of these officials, most of whom became enthusiastic about German trade possibilities in 1924, at the time the Dawes plan took effect. They could not then foresee Hitler's rise in power in 1931. The era of American business expansion of Germany was 1925 to 1930. Mr. Miller thinks that $1,000,000,000 of American assets were withdrawn in time—that at one time American holdings in Germany amounted to $3,000,000,000.

"Every American firm doing business in Germany has to stand for a pay-off," Mr. Miller said. "The alternative is to go out of business. The Nazi party is operating the world's most gigantic shake-down—an extortion plan that makes American racketeers blind men with cups by comparison. The American businessman who does not pay the racketeers in Germany faces smashed windows, diverted shipments, labor trouble, and perhaps the concentration camp.

SHAKE-DOWN

"Businessmen came to me to find out how much of a shakedown they would have to stand for to stay in business. I made the best arrangements possible. Sometimes these consisted of a gift to an important party member—an automobile, a house and lot, or a more handsome reward. Sometimes it meant placing a Nazi party member on the board of directors at a big salary, no work attached. Sometimes it meant only giving jobs to minor party officials. Often it meant contributing huge sums to some fund—the so-called Hitler gift, presumably for the poor, was a favorite.

"American firms in Germany stand to lose millions in investments and past profits."

[From PM (New York) of September 10, 1940]

GERMANY CAN TURN ITS G. M. C. WAR MACHINES ON U. S. A.—AMERICAN CONCERN LEFT HOLDING BAG BY NAZI SHAKEDOWN—COMPANY'S RESOURCES USED BY REICH TO HELP DEVELOP FIGHTING UNITS

(By Kenneth G. Crawford)

General Motors will be used here as an example of the American firms still doing business in Germany, not because its cooperation with the Nazis has been more extensive or more helpful than that of some other companies, but because it has been fairly typical. Regardless of intent, the fact is that General Motors money and brains have contributed enormously to the efficiency of the Nazi military machine. The company has applied American mass production methods to the German automobile industry; its German plant has manufactured trucks for the Army; it has reinvested profits in German property; it has played ball with the Nazi hierarchs, which means forced contribution to various "funds," some of which are known to be used for the Army.

It has been estimated by competent observers that no less than 50,000,000 marks in General Motors profits have been reinvested in

Germany because of restriction against their removal. Moreover, export from Germany of General Motors cars has helped Hitler get the foreign exchange he needs to buy military supplies from other countries.

BROTHERS UNDER THE SKIN

There is some irony in the appointment of its former president, William Knudsen, to an important place on the United States Defense Commission. General Motors is in the position of selling the United States Army machines which have no other purpose than to defend this country against machines it previously sold to the Reich.

After the first World War the idea became current, and in some places was accepted, that the wealthy beneficiaries of the capitalistic system were brothers under the skin, whether German, French, British, or American—that their first loyalty was to ownership, regardless of where they were situated in relation to national boundaries. It was even noted that munitions plants didn't seem to be bombed as they might have been. Krupp in Germany, Schneider in France, and Skoda in what became Czechoslovakia seemed to have some kind of understanding relationship. Aviators seemed to feel, for some reason, that it wouldn't be cricket to bomb their plants.

BOUGHT PLANT AT TEGEL

But all that is history and hasn't much to do with the present, the second World War. Munitions plants are being bombed this time, whenever they can be hit. Schneider was nationalized by the French Government, and that, apparently, didn't turn out very well either.

Playing the game in strict accordance with the rules of international trade, General Motors executives decided in the 1920's to set up a factory in Germany rather than export their cars to Germany. This was good business sense for several reasons: It hurdled tariff walls; it offered a new outlet for overabundant capital; it made possible production, at relatively low labor cost, of cars particularly adapted to the needs of European nations, whose tax laws favored light cars over heavy cars.

So General Motors bought a plant at Tegel shortly after the Dawes Plan took effect. The place was a World War munitions plant, and General Motors used it for production of Buicks and Chevrolets. Presently the company discovered that these American cars were too big and too expensive for the continental trade. As to what happened then I quote from American Industry in Europe, by Frank A. Southard, Jr., published in 1931:

"Early in 1929 rumors of negotiations between General Motors and Adam Opel Aktiengesellschaft began to appear. Organized in 1862 as a sewing machine factory, the Opel Co. added the production of motorcars in 1902. By 1929 its shops covered 57 acres and employed 13,000 workers. It is the leader among the German car producers, and sponsored a campaign for united opposition to the American import menace. Despite denials the rumor persisted, fed by conversion of Opel from a proprietorship to a corporation, and by the presence of a General Motors engineer at the Opel works. The persistence was justified by the announcement, at the end of March, that General Motors had acquired 80 percent of the stock of the German company, at a cost of $30,000,000.

"The transaction gave General Motors the most important motorcar company in Europe with the exception of Citroën. The report at the end of the first quarter of 1930 showed a daily production of 200 automobiles and 700 bicycles. The company was producing 60 percent of the cars in the four-horsepower class in Germany and 30 percent of the passenger vehicles in all classes. The production capacity of Opel is to be increased to 200,000 in 5 years' time."

General Motors, operating through Adam Opel, became a big European institution. Authorities other than Southard have placed the original investment of the American company at $40,000,000, most of it in General Motors stock rather than cash, and the subsequent investment at $20,000,000. At the end of 1930 or the beginning of 1931 General Motors sold its Tegel plant. The concern now has total German assets of $69,000,000 and has earned up to $36,000,000. In 1939 the company sold 122,000 cars, of which about 36,300 were exported. Since the current war started the General Motors plant at Russelsheim has had a virtually exclusive contract for production of light trucks, which are highly important to the Army. Its light four-cylinder civilian car is also important to the German export trade.

Just how much General Motors officials in the United States of America have to say about the operation of Adam Opel is a question. At one time the American company had five members on the board of directors—Alfred P. Sloan, James D. Mooney, Fisher, Bradley, and Smith. The last time it published a report in this country about its German works, General Motors said it had only one director left on the board and intimated that it had no control over the company.

Mooney is now liaison officer between General Motors and the Government, charged with responsibility for the company's defense work.

It is obvious that General Motors, fearful of losing all its German investment, has been victimized by the Nazi shakedown system. It is remarkable how little corporation officials know about what their subordinates do. Mr. Knudsen may never have heard anything about the Nazi shakedown. General Motors employees in Hitler's country are, of course, eager to keep their jobs. What they tell the home office may or may not reflect the true situation.

It must be said that General Motors is not wholly German in its foreign operations. It has interests in France, now German, and Great Britain. It also has properties in Sweden, Finland, Denmark, Norway, Latvia, Lithuania, Iceland, Estonia, Belgium, Holland, Switzerland, Austria, Hungary, Spain, and Portugal. Nor does it stand alone as a European motor-car maker. Henry Ford has a large plant in Germany and others spread over Europe. Ford organized a German company in 1925 and by 1928 its assets in Germany added up to more than $3,000,000.

Ford has bigger plants in England and in Ireland. He recently refused to take orders in the United States of America for airplane engines going to England.

[From PM (New York) of September 11, 1940]

CAPTIVE AMERICAN COMPANIES HELP OIL NAZI WAR MACHINES—$275,000,000 INVESTMENTS IN EUROPEAN REFINERIES AND DISTRIBUTION A BIG ASSET TO HITLER

(By Kenneth Crawford)

No American-financed and directed industry in Germany is more important in Herr Hitler's scheme of things than oil refining and distribution. The Nazis have used the German properties of several American concerns to get oil and keep it flowing into their war machines. The Panzer divisions that rolled over the Low Countries and France, the airplanes that now are demolishing parts of London—these burn a product of American genius and wealth.

Standard Oil of New Jersey is one of the largest foreign investors in the Reich, and its great refining plant at Hamburg, its 20,000 filling stations scattered over the country were indispensable to Hitler's war efforts. Socony Vacuum Co. likewise contributed the facilities of a refinery and distribution system.

In a sense, these firms have a direct stake in the fortunes of Germany. They also own properties in the countries Germany is fighting. But if Hitler should become the master of Europe, it would be only through him that American investors could get anything out of their European investments, German, French, or British. While most observers consider Hitler a frail and tricky reed for property rights to lean upon, owners of European property think him the only reed in sight. The Nazis have not discouraged this idea.

HEAVY INTERESTS

The last Government report on the subject placed the total of American investments in foreign oil at $1,035,000,000—$275,000,000 of it in Europe.

Standard's heavy interests in Germany were, of course, acquired long before Hitler emerged from a beer hall. The company has operated for years principally through Deutsche-Amerikanische Petroleum A. G., known as Dapag. The concern was established in 1890, with Standard in control of 95 percent of its stock. By 1928 it had assets of $24,000,000 and made a $1,600,000 profit. Standard also has had an interest in Deutsche Gasolin A. G., which is partly owned by I. G. Farben, and Hamburg-Americanische Oel A. G., and other companies doing a major part of Germany's oil business.

In addition, Standard is closely allied with I. G. Farben in exploitation of oil-refining patents, which the two companies developed jointly. Standard-I. G. Co. was organized in the United States of America in 1929, with Standard holding a majority of the stock and I. G. Farben a minority to use of the hydrogenation process on which the companies held patents. Close alliances between German and American interests are therefore an old story in the oil industry.

OTHER INVESTMENTS

In other industries these alliances are not so close and American investments in German enterprise not so large. But scores of American companies have important German investments, the biggest being General Motors and Ford, International Telephone & Telegraph, General Electric, Westinghouse, International Business Machines, Remington Rand, Pratt & Whitney, Sperry Gyroscope, International Harvester, Underwood-Elliott Fisher, Royal Typewriter, Worthington Pump, Otis Elevator, Mergenthaler Lintoype, Budd, Yale & Towne, Swift & Co., American Radiator, Anaconda Copper, Singer Sewing Machine, Colgate-Palmolive-Peet, and Woolworth.

What these companies are up against, including, of course, the oil companies, is a system under which they have no choice but to serve the Nazi cause or surrender their investments. Orders for the army have priority in the Reich, and there isn't any arguing about it. Hitler makes his own rules as he goes along. Just what these rules are today and what the condition of captive American companies is, no one, including officials of the companies most concerned, knows very definitely. The United States Government likewise is secretive about what current information it has. A majority of members of foreign corporation directorates must be German—and Aryan. American concerns, like others, were blacklisted after Hitler came to power if they continued to employ Jews.

TAX FAVORS FADE

Moreover, although foreign companies frequently got promises of tax favors in the palmy 20's—agreements that were supposed to cover collections for a long future period—most of these have since been discarded. Hitler's tax collectors are heavy handed and capricious in their dealings with foreign corporations. The Hitler method, except perhaps in the case of a few favorites, could scarcely be called appeasement. What his admirers say about his attitude toward private enterprise and what he does are two different things.

Douglas Miller, formerly commercial attaché in the Berlin Embassy, handled protests of American firms which the German Government proposed to tax, not only on their holdings within

Germany, but on all their properties, wherever situated. And then there is the ongoing unofficial taxation. Mr. Miller recalls this incident:

"The American manager of an American firm came to my office one day and told me he wanted to pick up somebody to put on his pay roll. It developed that he had been having difficulties getting the products needed in his operations. When all his efforts to secure such products failed he was told quite simply that there was not enough Nazi representation on his pay roll.

"The man said, frankly, that he wanted to get somebody who would do him the most good for the least outlay. I got in touch with Nazi headquarters and asked that they send over a good man for this particular company. A short time later a young man less than 30 years old came in. He said he was propaganda leader under the Gau, or district leader, in Saxony. He said he would be very glad to give protection to an American firm. 'I am already giving protection to 17 other companies,' he told me, 'and I like very much the idea of protecting number 18—especially since it is an American firm.'

"His salary was set at 500 marks a month—$200—and he went on his way. As far as I know the only way the company ever heard of him again was through his endorsement of his monthly pay checks—but the businessman had no more trouble getting the products he needed."

[From PM (New York) of September 12, 1940]

GERMAN PATENT AGREEMENTS CURB UNITED STATES NATIONAL-DEFENSE PROGRAM

(By Kenneth Crawford)

During the World War we had a law against dealing with the enemy. The Alien Property Custodian took over German-owned assets in this country. After the war Germans were again extended the same legal protection, so far as property rights were concerned, that citizens enjoyed.

Now some of these rights are used to gum up the American defense program at vital points. And the gumming is done with the connivance of Americans. Or perhaps this is too harsh a way of putting it. The practices that now interfere with national defense might not seem sinister in normal times. And they result, in most cases, from agreements entered into long before this war started and Germany became identified again as this Nation's enemy. Since she still is technically a friendly nation, nothing has been done by Congress to prevent this form of nonviolent sabotage.

What has happened is this: Ever since the World War German scientists and engineers, urged on by their country's economic plight, have led in the rapid advance of industrial technology. They have found new methods and new formulae, particularly in the fields of chemistry and metallurgy. Seeking ersatz, they have sometimes found improved materials. Exploiting their discoveries, big German industrial firms have made the most of their equal treatment under the United States patent laws. They have laid claim wherever possible to exclusive right to these new materials.

TRICKS OF THE TRADE

Some of this country's most alert patent law firms have represented these German concerns. All the tricks of the trade have been used on behalf of German clients. In many cases so-called "umbrella" patents, covering large areas of new discovery, have been taken out not because they were likely to stand up in the courts in a show-down but because of their nuisance value. In most cases, however, German patent holders stood ready to guard against infringements to the last legal ditch.

As holders of American patents, these German firms were privileged to choose between three courses:

Manufacture their patented product exclusively.

License an American firm to manufacture it on a royalty basis.

Refrain from manufacturing the product or licensing anyone else to manufacture it in the United States of America.

All three options have been used but No. 2 is the most common.

What the Germant patent-holding company ordinarily does is enter into a licensing agreement with an American company. The patentee may collect royalties or it may permit free use of its formula in the United States of America in exchange for trade advantages—an agreement, for example, that the American company concerned will not export its products into German world-trade areas. Agreements of this kind have seriously interfered with American defense.

A recent example in point is the case of the Bausch & Lomb Optical Co. This company started to produce the optical glass used in torpedo directors, antiaircraft detectors, and other such complex fighting implements during the World War when it was discovered that Germans held all the patents and had not permitted a glass industry of this kind to develop in the United States of America. Patents of the Zeiss Optical Co., the German firm which controlled the American market, were confiscated by the Alien Property Custodian and turned over to Bausch & Lomb.

But after the war, when German patent rights were restored, Bausch & Lomb entered into an agreement with Zeiss to keep its military glass out of the United States of America, and Bausch & Lomb agreed not to invade Europe. The German company, however, still collected royalties on glass manufactured by the American company for the Army and Navy. Thus the Army and Navy paid tribute to a German firm and the American company achieved domestic monopoly on which our armed forces are wholly dependent. Moreover, all new patents on military equipment taken out in the name of the American company become the property of Zeiss.

FORTY THOUSAND DOLLARS FINE

When the Justice Department clamped down on Bausch & Lomb for violation of the antitrust laws, the company threatened to hold up work on battleships for the United States Navy. But it thought better of this and ultimately paid a $40,000 fine.

Then there is the case of the agreement between General Electric and Krupp, German munitions firm, for manufacture of tungsten carbide, a substance used for cutting edges in machine tools. General Electric manufactured tungsten carbide under patent license from Krupp and the Government charges that prices were fixed by the two companies in 1928. In 1936, Krupp sold out the business to General Electric, but retained the right under contract to limit the number of new licensees. Only three licenses have been issued. Tungsten carbide is important to the defense industries.

MAGNESIUM MYSTERY

More important still is the magnesium mystery. The undisputed facts are that magnesium is an alloy one-third lighter than aluminum and extensively used by the Germans to increase the lifting capacity of their airplanes, that only a limited supply of this metal has been produced in the United States of America for some still unexplained reason and that there are German interests in the patent wood pile.

The Dow Chemical Co. is the principal producer in this country and last year the entire American production was less than 10,000,000 pounds, not enough to go very far in American airplanes. Dow produces the metal partly under its own patents and partly under license from the Megnesium Development Corporation of America, which is owned 50 percent by the Aluminum Co. of America and half by I. G. Farbenindustrie, the German chemical trust.

The American Magnesium Corporation also used to produce magnesium, but no longer does. It is owned half by the Aluminum Co. of America and half by General Aniline and Film Corporation. The latter company, in turn, is part owned by a Swiss corporation in which Germans are interested and Aniline itself has had German directors.

It is impossible to draw a definite conclusion from all this that the Germans have forced American airplane manufacturers to use aluminum rather than magnesium in their products because of the obvious interest of the Aluminum Co. of America. It sells more of its product if magnesium is scarce.

At the same time, it is impossible to escape the conclusion that Americans are dealing with Nazi Germany through patent licensing arrangements and that too many of these dealings are under the table.

Two Hundredth Anniversary of the Founding of University of Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 23 (legislative day of Wednesday, September 18), 1940

ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by the President of the United States at Convention Hall, Philadelphia, Pa., on September 20, 1940, in connection with the two hundredth anniversary of the founding of the University of Pennsylvania.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This is a strange period of relapse in the history of the civilization of the world, for in some lands it has become the custom to burn the books of scholars and to fix by government decree the national forms of religion, morality, and culture. In such a time it is more than a mere formality to join with you in celebrating the two hundredth anniversary of this free and independent institution of scholarship. I am honored in becoming an alumnus of the University of Pennsylvania.

The very foundation of this university was concerned with freedom of religious teaching, and with free learning for the many who could not pay for higher education. It was originally proposed as a place where the good and Reverend Dr. George Whitefield might preach his religion without certain difficulties which the old conservatives of Philadelphia threw in his path. Indeed, it was desired to make it unnecessary for him to preach in the sun and rain of the open fields, when the doors of the established churches

were closed against him. And it was the dream of the founders to make it a source of education to the children of the poor who otherwise would go untaught.

The survival and growth of the university through these two centuries are particularly symbolic of the eternal strength which is inherent in the American concept of the freedom of human thought and action. Here is living proof of the validity and force of single-minded service to the cause of truth.

Events in the world are making the vast majority of our citizens think more and more clearly about the manner of the growth of their liberty and freedom, and how hard their people have fought and worked to win and to hold the privilege of free government.

With the gaining of our political freedom came the conflict between the point of view of Alexander Hamilton, sincerely believing in the superiority of government by a small group of public-spirited and usually wealthy citizens, and the point of view of Thomas Jefferson, an advocate of government by representatives of all the people, an advocate of the universal right of free thought, free personal living, free religion, free expression of opinion, and, above all, the right of free universal suffrage.

Many of the Jeffersonian school were frank to admit the high motives and disinterestedness of Hamilton and his school. Many Americans of those days were willing to concede that if government could be guaranteed to be kept always on the high level of unselfish service suggested by the Hamiltonians there would be nothing to fear. For the very basis of the Hamiltonian philosophy was that through a system of elections every 4 years, limited to the votes of the most highly educated and the most successful citizens, the best of those qualified to govern could always be selected.

It was with rare perspicuity, however, that Jefferson pointed out that, on the doctrine of sheer human frailty, the Hamilton theory was bound to develop into government by selfishness or government for personal gain or government by class, which would ultimately lead to the abolishment of free elections. For he recognized that it was our system of free, unhampered elections which was the surest guaranty of popular government. So long as the voters of the Nation, regardless of higher education or property possessions, were free to exercise their choice in the polling place without hindrance, the country would have no cause to fear the hand of tyranny.

At all times in our history since Hamilton there have been many Americans who have sought to confine the ballot to limited groups of people. A quarter of a century ago President Eliot of Harvard summarized his views when he said to me: "Roosevelt, I am convinced that even though we have multiplied our universities in every State of the Union, even though higher learning seems to have come into its own, if the ballot were to be confined to the holders of college degrees, the Nation would go on the rocks in a very few years." It may seem ungracious for a very new degree holder to say this to this audience of older degree holders, but my authority for this view is a great educator, noted for his efforts to disseminate college education throughout the country.

I agree with him thoroughly in his estimate of the superior ability of the whole of the voters to pass upon political and social issues in free and unhampered elections as against the exclusive ability of a smaller group of individuals at the top of the social structure.

On candidates and on election issues I would rather trust the aggregate judgment of all the people in a factory—the president, all the vice presidents, the board of directors, the managers, the foremen, plus all the laborers—rather than the judgment of the few who may be financially interested. On such questions the aggregate total judgment of a farm owner, the farmer, and all the farm hands will be sounder than that of the farm owner alone. I would rather rely on the aggregate opinion, on matters affecting government, of a railroad president, its superintendents, its engineers, foremen, brakemen, conductors, trainmen, telegraphers, porters, and all the others, than on the sole opinion of the few in control of management, or the principal stockholders.

Only too often in our political history, the few at the top have tried to advise or dictate to the many lower down how they should vote.

Even today in certain quarters there are, I regret to say, demands for a return of government to the control of those few, who, because of business ability or economic omniscience, are supposed to be just a touch above the average of our citizens. As in the days of Hamilton, we of our own generation should give them all credit for pure intention and high ideals. Nevertheless, their type of political thinking could easily lead to government by selfish seekers for power and riches and glory. For the great danger is that once the Government falls into the hands of a few elite, curtailment or even abolition of free elections might be adopted as the means of keeping them in power.

I can never forget that some well-meaning people have even recently seriously suggested that the right to vote be denied to American men and women who through no fault of their own had lost their jobs and, in order to keep the family and the home going, were working on work-relief projects.

As long as periodic free elections survive, no set of people can permanently control government. In the maintenance of free elections rests the complete and enduring safety of our form of government.

No dictator in history has ever dared to run the gantlet of a really free election.

These fundamental truths have become commonplace among Americans, but it is well constantly to keep them in mind in order to understand what has happened in other lands. A decade ago, for example, the German people despaired of the processes of their democracy, which were based on the free use of the franchise. They were willing to lend ear to a new cult called nazi-ism—a minority group which professed extraordinary patriotism, and offered bread and shelter and better government through the rule of a handful of persons boasting of special aptitude for government. In those days loudly professed emphasis was placed by this special group on their own purity of purpose. Nothing was ever said about abolishing free elections. Many people of large business affairs, influenced by several factors, and dissatisfied with the democratic system, formed political and economic alliances with this small group.

You and I know the subsequent history of Germany. The right of free elections and the free choice of heads of government were suddenly wiped out by a new regime, still professing the same purity of purpose. It is a travesty on fact to claim that there is any free choice of public officials in that nation today, or that there ever has been one since 1933.

What Jefferson prophesied might happen in this country, if the philosophy of the restricted vote and of government by special class were adopted, did actually happen in Germany before our very eyes.

Many years ago, speaking in San Francisco, I pointed out that new conditions imposed new requirements upon government and upon those who conducted government. As Jefferson write a long time ago: "I know also that laws and institutions must go hand in hand with the progress of the human mind. * * * As new discoveries are made, new truths disclosed, and manners and opinions change with the change of circumstances, institutions must advance also, and keep pace with the times."

We must follow that rule today as readily as then, always with the condition that any change in institutions or in economic methods must remain within the same old framework of a freely elected democratic form of government.

I have pointed out many times that Western migration and the free use of unoccupied lands have ended with the advent of the industrial age; that with the changes wrought by new inventions of steam and electricity, new relationships have arisen between units of finance and industry on one side and the great mass of workers and small businessmen on the other; and that certain Government controls have become necessary to prevent a few financial and industrial groups from harming or cutting the throats of other groups smaller in size but much greater in number.

We have at the same time developed new beliefs in governmental responsibilities to humanity as a whole. It is a relatively new thing in American life to consider what the relationships of government are to its starving or unemployed citizens, and to take steps to fulfill its duties to them.

A generation ago people had scarcely given thought to the terms "social security," "minimum wages," or "maximum hours." It is only within recent years that government has given its attention in a serious, effective way to the insurance of bank deposits, to soil conservation, relief to farmers and to farm tenants, development of cheap electric water power, reclamation of soil by proper use of water and forests; to the prevention of fraud and deceit in the sale of securities; to the assurance of the principle of collective bargaining by workers in industry; to Government assistance to the blind and the handicapped; or to the need of taking care of elderly people without throwing them into the poorhouse.

These are some of the new instruments of social justice which America has forged to meet the new conditions of industry, agriculture, finance, and labor—conditions which had been neglected too long, and which were beginning to endanger our internal security. These are the means which our own generation have adopted to overcome the threats to economic democracy in our land—threats which in other lands led quickly to political despotism.

Benjamin Franklin, to whom this university owes so much, realized, too, that while basic principles of natural science, of morality, and of the science of society were eternal and immutable, the application of these principles necessarily change with the patterns of living conditions from generation to generation. I am certain that he would insist that it is the whole duty of the philosopher and the educator to apply the eternal ideals of truth and goodness and justice in terms of the present and not of the past. Growth and change are the law of all life. Yesterday's answers are inadequate for today's problems—just as the solutions of today will not fill the needs of tomorrow.

Eternal truths will be neither true nor eternal unless they have fresh meaning for every new social situation.

It is the function of education to provide continuity for our national life—to transmit to youth the best of our culture which has been tested in the fire of history. It is equally the obligation of education to train the minds and the talents of our youth; to improve, through creative citizenship, our American institutions in accord with the requirements of the future.

We cannot always build the future for our youth; we can build our youth for the future.

It is in great universities like this that the ideas which can assure our national safety and make tomorrow's history are being forged and shaped. Civilization owes most to the men and women, known and unknown, whose free, inquiring minds and restless intellects could not be subdued by the power of tyranny.

This is no time for any man to withdraw into some ivory tower and proclaim the right to hold himself aloof from the problems and

the agonies of his society. The times call for bold belief that the world can be changed by man's endeavor, and that this endeavor can lead to something new and better. No man can sever the bonds which unite him to his society simply by averting his eyes. He must ever be receptive and sensitive to the new; and have sufficient courage and skill to face novel facts and to deal with them.

If democracy is to survive, it is the task of men of thought, as well as men of action, to put aside pride and prejudice; and with courage and single-minded devotion—and above all with humility—to find the truth and teach the truth that shall keep men free.

We may find in that sense of purpose, the personal peace, not of repose, but of effort, the keen satisfaction of doing, the deep feeling of achievement for something far beyond ourselves, the knowledge that we build more gloriously than we know.

Propaganda To Enter the War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENNETT CHAMP CLARK

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 23 (legislative day of Wednesday, September 18), 1940

ARTICLE BY CHARLES G. ROSS

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, under leave granted to me, I present for publication in the RECORD the article by Mr. Charles G. Ross, published in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of September 22, 1940, under the heading "Inside Story of 'Propaganda Engine' To Send United States Army and Navy Equipment to Britain."

The article referred to is as follows:

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of September 22, 1940]

INSIDE STORY OF "PROPAGANDA ENGINE" TO SEND UNITED STATES ARMY AND NAVY EQUIPMENT TO BRITAIN—BEHIND-THE-SCENES GROUP, INCLUDING WAR ADVOCATES, TAKES A HAND IN CAMPAIGN—HOW WILLIAM ALLEN WHITE AND OTHERS ARE AROUSING PUBLIC TO TRY TO INFLUENCE ROOSEVELT'S ACTIONS

(By Charles G. Ross, Contributing Editor of the Post-Dispatch)

WASHINGTON, *September 21.*

"This engine of publicity and propaganda"—thus William Allen White, Emporia (Kans.) newspaper publisher, in a radio speech August 22, described the Committee To Defend America by Aiding the Allies, of which he is the founder and chairman.

It is this organization which is now, hard on the completion of the destroyer-naval base deal between the United States and Great Britain, heading the movement for new and significant aid to Britain—25 flying fortresses (long-range bombers), 20 torpedo boats, and as many combat planes as possible, now the equipment of our Army and Navy.

White might have added that the committee has proved itself an engine of extraordinary power. That the creation and mobilization of public sentiment by the White committee played a tremendously important part—in a sense, the decisive part—in bringing about the transfer of the 50 destroyers to Great Britain, there can be no doubt.

In the same speech, White modestly described himself as "only the rooster on the cowcatcher, crowing lustily sometimes at the cross roads." That is a gross understatement. He is in fact as well as in name the head of the White committee, and his labors for its objectives have been prodigious. His name alone, because of the widespread public confidence he has long enjoyed, is a valuable asset to the committee.

Since the White committee is engaged in large-scale propaganda—frankly so—its personnel and activities become a proper subject of analysis. Indeed, they become, in the public interest, a required subject. That is true of any form of important propaganda, whatever its aim.

ADVOCATES OF WAR JOIN POLICY GROUP

It is the purpose of this article to examine objectively (1) the workings of the White committee and (2) of a small behind-the-scenes group which has operated with proved effectiveness along lines parallel with those of the White committee and to an extent in collaboration with it. Included in this group are a number of newspaper editors and columnists. Probably its greatest single achievemeent was its persuasion of General Pershing to make his radio speech of August 4—a speech which, members of the group and of the White committee believe, did more than any other single thing to mobilize public sentiment behind the destroyer deal.

This informal group of thirty to forty contains men of varying shades of opinion as to how far the United States should go in aiding Britain. Some are on the cautious side; some are in between; a few, unless they have changed their views since June 9, favor an immediate declaration of war by the United States against Germany.

On the June date 30 citizens in a public statement called for a war declaration. Among the signers were six who are now identified with the above-described group and who attended a group meeting on July 25, with 13 others, at which steps toward bringing about the release of destroyers to Great Britain were agreed upon.

The 30 persons who signed the memorial for a war declaration constitute no fixed propaganda group. They acted, as one of the instigators of the petition explained, "impulsively," with the view primarily to arousing the United States to the danger in which it would find itself from a Hitler victory in Europe. This result, he felt, had been since brought about by events abroad; consequently he believed that at least half of those who called for a formal war declaration on June 9 would not do so today.

There was no meeting of the signers. The petition was drafted in New York and sent around to a selected list of persons believed to be in sympathy with its objective. As soon as a fairly impressive number of signers had been obtained, the petition was released for publication. This ended the activity of this particular group, as such.

ALL AGREE ON WHITE'S OBJECTIVE

Among the signers of the war memorial, the White committee and the informal group working with and behind the committee, there is, of course, a large community of interest, extending up to the point where the extremists diverge in favor of immediate and formal war on Germany. All are agreed on the White committee's proposition that large and continuing aid should be sent to Great Britain, in this country's own defense, and that every effort should be made to induce public opinion to bring pressure on the Government to this end.

All the resources of the White committee are being enlisted, on behalf of its new program for "flying fortresses," torpedo boats, and combat planes.

As an instance, the committee this week arranged for a phone-ringing campaign in New York City, to begin next Tuesday. A corps of 1,410 women volunteers, each taking 2 pages of the telephone directory, will call up all the 735,488 residential numbers in the 5 boroughs of New York City. The job will take 2 weeks. The caller in each case will ask for the woman of the household and seek to line her up for the committee's work. Those who respond favorably will be asked to regard themselves as "American minute women," subject to call from the committee to write letters to the President or Members of Congress in support of the committee's objectives. Leaders of the movement are considering a Nation-wide telephone campaign.

Some idea of the success which the committee already has had in inspiring messages to heads of the Government may be gathered from its estimate that petitions presented under committee auspices to the President and Congress in favor of the destroyer deal carried 3,000,000 signatures.

CHAIRMAN PUTS "ENGINE" IN MOTION

When the decision was reached, in pursuance of the general aims of the committee, to go out for the three-point plane and torpedo-boat program, Chairman White set his engine in motion with a telegram to the heads of the 662 local chapters of the committee. This message, under date of September 12, briefly explained the new project and urged telegrams in its favor to the President.

"There is reason to believe," White wired, "that such material can be sent without hurt to our national defense, particularly as every month the struggle is kept going abroad means the more time we have to prepare the facilities to defend ourselves and the things we believe in."

On the same date, White supplemented this telegram with a letter addressed to the members of the national committee and the officers and chairman of its local chapters. Because this letter—released in full by the committee to the Post-Dispatch along with other material—not only sets out the arguments for the current program but helps to tell the general story of the committee's aims and methods, it is given here in full text:

"MY DEAR FRIEND: I wanted to write this rather long and confidential letter to say a few things about what we have accomplished and our plans for the next few weeks.

"The battle of Britain continues and is now reaching its full fury. We may expect within the next few days the destruction and loss of life to grow greater and greater and a strong possibility of an invasion from either the French and Belgian ports held by Germany or from Norway.

"We believe that the 50 destroyers will be of the greatest physical and moral assistance to Great Britain in repelling the invasion. Their importance cannot be overstated. As part of the arrangement, the United States secured air and naval bases which will be a tremendous factor in national defense. The public almost unanimously applauds the negotiations. I for one believe that the President acted absolutely correctly in negotiating the arrangement as an Executive matter. There was not time for the long debate which congressional consideration would have resulted in. I am proud of the part that this committee and its many chapters played in mobilizing public opinion in support of this great step.

"WHAT WE BELIEVE COULD GO QUICKLY

"But the battle of Great Britain goes on. Other materials will be needed. In fact we can for the sake of simplification think of materials for Britain in two divisions: One, material that will be

needed this week or next to save Britain from destruction before the bad weather sets in. Two, material that Britain will need throughout the winter to be in a position in the spring not only strong enough to resist invasion but powerful enough to take the aggressive. Later on I shall write you about the latter material but today I want to say a word about what we believe could go quickly.

"First, airplanes. We have approximately 75 flying fortresses in our Army. These are incomparably more powerful with a longer range than anything that any other nation has. Also, we have many planes, not all first class, but out of which some could be spared for the defense of London. If an invasion is undertaken, little electric boats, called the "mosquito fleet," would be very helpful in turning back the transports. That would be second only in importance to the destroyers.

"Therefore, we strongly hope that our Government dispatch immediately 25 flying fortresses and as many pursuit planes as possible, and 20 mosquito boats. Every day is important and a few weeks may be too late to save Britain and our first line of defense. (This was covered in today's telegram.)

"This winter the British will need tanks for the desert campaign to protect Suez and Gibraltar; probably food on credit; and a large proportion of the products of American airplane factories. These latter materials we will discuss with you when the present emergency is over."

WHITE URGES FLOOD OF PROPAGANDA

"Many of you wired a few hours after the destroyer deal was completed asking what to do next. I wired Tuesday for letters, editorials, telegrams to the President urging that everything that can be spared from our American armed forces go now to help save London. We were very fortunate in the destroyer matter in being able to mention 50 destroyers and repeat the number constantly. It is not always easy to give as precise figures. Sometimes our instructions will have to be a bit more general. But please have faith in us, knowing that we are trying to do everything possible to secure correct information and that we will not urge anything that we do not believe is wise and possible.

"Although I know that you must be tired from the hard work over the destroyer campaign, I urge you to use every bit of energy and reserve you have in the next 2 weeks in support of our Government sending every bit of material that can be spared to help Britain resist invasion from air and sea.

"One word more, we are getting all sorts of letters and inquiries about our political position. Everything that is done as one moves toward an election naturally seems to have a political motive. A radio commentator referred to us the other night as a Willkie committee and as if to balance that a wire came from one of our branches asking if the rumor was true that the committee was about to come out for Roosevelt. May I say that the committee contains many of the outstanding men of both political parties and I hope a few members of the Socialist Party as well.

"The committee's position will be absolutely nonpartisan. As a nonpartisan committee we support the foreign policy of the President enthusiastically, not because the President is a Democrat but because he is our President, the Commander in Chief of our armed forces, and above everything else, because his foreign policy is one that we can enthusiastically support.

"Sincerely yours,

(Signed) "WILLIAM ALLEN WHITE."

CABLES TO ANOTHER GENERAL FOR SUPPORT

Having in mind the success in getting General Pershing to speak on the radio in behalf of sending 50 American destroyers to Britain, Chairman White then turned to Gen. Douglas MacArthur, former Chief of Staff of the United States Army, now in charge of the defense of the Philippine Islands. White cabled General MacArthur at Manila asking his military opinion as to whether "the time has come for America to give continued and further aid to England in the fight for civilization." In part, General MacArthur cabled in reply:

"The greatest strategical mistake in all history will be made if America fails to recognize the vital moment, if she permits again the writing of that fatal epitaph 'too late.' Such coordinated help as may be regarded as proper by our leaders should be synchronized with the British effort so that the English speaking peoples of the world will not be broken in detail. The vulnerability of singleness will disappear before unity of effort—not too late, not tomorrow, but today."

Immediately the White committee broadcast a leaflet under the heading: "Send those bombers! Stop Hitler now and keep war away from America." The leaflet contained the text of General MacArthur's cablegram to White and urged the recipient to "Wire the President—urge your Senators and Representatives in Washington to take a strong public stand on aid to England—our first line of defense."

JOINT IDEA OF WHITE AND EICHELBERGER

Now, to go back to the inception of the White committee. It was the joint idea of White and of Clark M. Eichelberger, now serving as its director. Eichelberger, a war veteran, grew up in Freeport, Ill. An enthusiast in the cause of world peace through collective security, he became a regional officer and later the national director of the League of Nations Association. (It was to devote himself to the work of this organization that John Hessin Clarke resigned from the United States Supreme Court in 1922.) Last May, White and Eichelberger talked over the necessity, as they saw it, of American aid to the Allies "short of war."

White had served as the chairman of a committee for the revision of the neutrality laws—palpably a change in the interest of the Allies—and he was eager to give further and continuing aid Eichelberger was of like mind. He concedes now, with a wry smile, the irony of the position into which he, as an ardent peace advocate, has been forced by events.

Out of the conversation of White and Eichelberger grew a message to 60 prominent persons of similar views, and the favorable response to this enabled White on May 19 to announce the formation of the Committee to Defend America by Aiding the Allies.

STIMSON AND KNOX BECOME MEMBERS

Among the first to join the movement were former Secretary of State Henry L. Stimson, now Secretary of War; Gov. Herbert H. Lehman, of New York; Col. Frank Knox, publisher of the Chicago Daily News, now Secretary of the Navy, and Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler, president of Columbia University.

The national committee now has 594 members, all of whom have come in at the invitation of White. The officers, in addition to White and Eichelberger, are Hugh Moore, chairman of the executive committee, and Frederick C. McKee, treasurer. Moore is the head of the Dixie Vortex Cup Corporation of Easton, Pa., and McKee is a Pittsburgh cement manufacturer.

With the officers named, Lewis W. Douglas, of New York, Mrs. Emmons Blaine, of Chicago, and Dr. Frank Boudreau, of New York, constitute the executive committee. Douglas is the antinew dealer who resigned as Budget Director under Roosevelt; he is now president of the Mutual Life Insurance Co., of New York. Mrs. Blaine is a sister of the late Cyrus McCormick. Dr. Boudreau is the director of the Millbank Fund, a medical foundation.

FORMING COMMITTEE TO ADVISE ON POLICY

Still in process of formation is the important advisory policy committee. The present members are the following:

Dr. Esther Brunauer, of the American Association of University Women, Washington, D. C.

James B. Conant, president of Harvard University.

Frederic R. Coudert, New York City, lawyer and writer on international relations.

Frank P. Graham, president of the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill.

Frank Kingdon, former president University of Newark, active in social-welfare work; 122 East Forty-second Street, New York City.

Freda Kirchway, editor of the Nation, New York City.

Fiorello H. LaGuardia, mayor of New York City, recently appointed by President Roosevelt as chairman of the United States-Canada Joint Defense Commission.

Thomas W. Lamont, New York City, partner in J. P. Morgan & Co.

Arthur Lovejoy, emeritus professor of philosophy, Johns Hopkins University; chairman of the Baltimore chapter of the White committee.

Robert A. Millikan, physicist, winner of Nobel prize in physics 1923; California Institute of Technology, Berkeley, Calif.

Bishop G. Ashton Oldham, Episcopal Diocese of Albany, N. Y.

Charles Seymour, president of Yale University.

Robert Emmet Sherwood, playwright, East Hampton, Long Island, N. Y.

James Shotwell, professor of history, Columbia University.

Huston Thompson, lawyer of Washington, D. C., former Federal Trade Commissioner.

Dr. Henry P. Van Dusen, professor, Union Theological Seminary, New York City.

W. W. Waymack, director of editorial section, Des Moines (Iowa) Register and Tribune.

Quincy Wright, professor of international law, University of Chicago.

Msgr. John A. Ryan, director of social action department of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, Washington, D. C.

Mrs. Rushmore Patterson, New York and Washington, D. C.

UP TO WEEK AGO $145,000 EXPENDED

The headquarters of the Committee to Defend America by Aiding the Allies are in the building at 8 West Fortieth Street, New York City. There is office space for a staff of about 40, including telephone operators, stenographers, and file clerks. On the ground floor of the same building are the offices of the New York City chapter, which has about 2,200 members and is headed by Dr. Frank Kingdon. Like the other branches scattered throughout the country, this chapter is largely autonomous, though committed to following the policies laid down by the national committee. Herbert Bayard Swope, Jr., heads a special youth division of the New York chapter.

The total membership of the national committee and its 662 local chapters is estimated by White at upward of 100,000. New chapters are steadily being formed. Ninety came into being in August while the campaign for the dispatch of destroyers to Great Britain was at its height. Regional headquarters are being set up. For the Middle West there will be an office at Chicago and for the South one at Chapel Hill, under the direction of Dr. Frank P. Graham, president of the University of North Carolina.

Up to a week ago the national committee had received, as its officers informed the writer, a total of $120,191, from 7,825 persons, and had spent $145,000. The disbursements include $25,000 paid for the publication throughout the country of Robert E. Sherwood's full-page "Stop Hitler Now" advertisement. Except for the $5,000 which Sherwood personally gave toward this sum, the committee

says it has received no subscription of more than $3,000. Neither the Carnegie endowment nor any other foundation, the committee says, has contributed.

When the charge lately was made in the Senate that J. P. Morgan was a heavy contributor, the committee asserted that the total received from Morgan was an unsolicited $500, and that a check for the same amount had come from David Dubinsky's garment workers' union. Less than half the contributions, it was stated, have come from New York City.

The money spent by the national committee is exclusive of whatever may have been spent locally by the various chapters. Some of these have offices and considerable staffs.

"STOP HITLER" AD SHERWOOD'S IDEA

The "Stop Hitler" advertisement was Sherwood's idea. An ardent protagonist of aid for the Allies, he wrote the ad and guaranteed the cost. The committee approved it and published it June 10 in 18 papers throughout the country over the committee's name, with a note appended that the names of all those who had contributed toward its publication were being filed with the State Department. There is no requirement of such filing in the law.

The advertisement attracted much attention and was favorably commented upon by President Roosevelt at a press conference. Mr. Roosevelt said he had not read the advertisement until he heard that it had been written by his friend "Bob" Sherwood, and that while he could not endorse every specific phrase in it, he thought it a fine, educational thing. The advertisement concluded with an appeal for the sending of planes, guns, munitions, and food to the Allies. The destroyers had not then come into the picture. Messages to the President and Members of Congress were urged, so that they would "know that the American people are not afraid to cast off the hypocritical mask of neutrality, which deceives no one, including ourselves."

TONE OF BIG AD PRINTED IN CHICAGO

A second large advertisement, July 15, was published only in Chicago. France by this time having fallen, the advertisement asked specifically for aid to Great Britain to "stop Hitler now."

"Hitler's dream of a world under Nazi rule cannot be realized as long as Britain holds out," ran the argument. "The acknowledged will of our people must not be stalled any longer. Our unlimited sympathy for those who still fight for freedom—and our profound convictions as to our own self-interest—must be expressed in something more formidable than weasel words."

Our Government, it was stated, was being asked by "a small but vociferous group" to "speak in the timorous tones of appeasement." To the appeasement argument the advertisement replied: "It makes no difference to Hitler—and the masters of all the slave states—whether we antagonize them, or bootlick them. They will attempt to continue with their program regardless of what we do or say at the moment."

Readers were urged to write or telegraph the President and Members of Congress and to tell all candidates for office that the Government should send Britain "all the planes, guns, ammunition, food, and essential materials that we can possibly spare—and send them now."

"BETWEEN US AND HITLER STANDS THE BRITISH FLEET"

Another advertisement, filling three-quarters of a page, was published in New York July 30, with the caption "Between us and Hitler stands the British fleet." Readers again were asked to telegraph or write the President and Congressmen in behalf of aid to Great Britain—"before it is too late." The statement was attributed to Adolf Hitler that "we will soon have storm troopers in America * * * we shall have men whom degenerate Yankeedom will not be able to challenge." Contributions to the work of the committee were solicited, and a coupon was printed for the convenience of subscribers. The advertisement stated that the funds for its insertion were "provided entirely by contributions of the American people who believe that helping Great Britain now is the best way to protect America."

Four small ads, paid for by individuals whose names they carried, appeared in the New York Herald Tribune September 3, 4, 5, and 6. These, again, appealed for the sending of messages by mail or wire to the Members of Congress urging "utmost speed in continuing to aid England now." Lines at the end invited contributions for additional advertising. Other such contributions have been received and more are expected by the committee.

AMERICANS FORM A LONDON OUTPOST

Individuals and newspapers in the United States have recently begun to receive a news letter issued by the "Americans-in-Britain Outpost of the Committee to Defend America by Aiding the Allies." This organization, according to officials of the White committee in New York, was formed wholly on the initiative of a group of Americans in London.

"We are America in miniature," says one of the news letters, and the stated purposes of the group are "to act as an observation post of the William Allen White committee; to tell Americans at home what we are seeing, thinking, and hoping for the future; to interpret America to Britain." Arthur Newell, of the Associates for Anglo-American Understanding, and Charles G. Tubbs are cochairmen of the enterprise, which has its headquarters at 29 Gordon Square, London.

AGENCY FOR GUIDING PUBLIC SENTIMENT

There will be occasion in this report to return to the White committee, but at this point there should be a more extended account of the informal group which I have described as working with and behind the White committee. The work of this group has been enormously effective. It has been a sort of idea mill, and, beyond that, an agency for guiding public sentiment (through the writers admitted to its discussion) and for laying the aid-to-Britain cause directly and forcibly before high Government officials, including the President.

The group has no name, no chairman, no treasurer, nor any form of organization. It has stayed strictly in the background, leaving the White committee to function undisturbed as the formal front of the aid-to-Britain movement.

It was the work very largely of this little band of like-minded men brought together by a burning conviction, that enabled Ernest Lindley, a columnist favorable to the New Deal and enjoying exceptional sources of information, a biographer of the President, to write in a recent article on the destroyer-air base deal:

"The duty of informing the public concerning a deal which the President regards as 'epochal' was shouldered by the columnists and editorial writers, with little cooperation from the President and his administration. More than that, a few columnists and editors and publishers were the moving spirits in the whole affair on this side of the Atlantic."

Lindley in the same article refers to the President "as a sort of executive officer for a deal largely arranged and publicly advocated almost exclusively by private citizens." He believes that except for the President's "concern about domestic politics," the destroyer deal could have been closed a month before it was.

"THE MILLER GROUP" BEGINS TO FUNCTION

What I shall call for convenience "the Miller group" had its inception late in June, when two or three of the present membership, discussing national defense, agreed that it would be an excellent idea if a group could be brought together to talk over the fate of the British fleet in relation to our defense, and see if something could not be done to spur our Government to more effective action in aid of Britain than was then being taken.

As a result of this discussion, Lewis W. Douglas, former Budget Director, was host on July 11 to a company of about a dozen, who agreed that it was imperative that this Government should take steps to prevent German control of the North Atlantic. It was agreed that the group should continue its discussions from time to time and that others of similar views should be brought in.

Later, it was decided that the group, while remaining unorganized and entirely fluid, should have a sort of "clearing house" to facilitate the arrangement of meetings and the execution of ideas that might be agreed upon. Francis P. Miller, of Fairfax, Va., well known over the country through his work as an organizer of study groups for the Council on Foreign Relations, was selected for this task. He accepted after obtaining leave of absence from the council, whose directors, like Miller, felt there should be no mingling of the activities of the council with those of a propagandist group.

Miller thereupon, on July 22, opened an office at 11 West Forty-second Street, New York. He was provided with a budget of $3,500 for office expenses for 2 months, the period of his leave of absence. It is expected now that this leave will be extended. Two thousand dollars of the $3,500 was contributed by Ward Cheney, silk manufacturer and a leading spirit in the group, and the rest came from group members or friends in small amounts.

NINETEEN MEN DECIDED ON DESTROYER PROGRAM

On July 25 the group held a dinner meeting at the Century Club in New York City and from the discussion emerged the illuminating memorandum on the destroyers-for-Britain deal. Attending this meeting were the following:

Robert S. Allen, Washington columnist.

Joseph Alsop, Washington columnist.

Ulric Bell, Washington correspondent of the Louisville Courier-Journal.

Barry Bingham, publisher of the Louisville Courier-Journal, son of the late Robert Worth Bingham, Ambassador to Great Britain.

Ward Cheney, silk manufacturer of New York.

Dr. Henry Sloane Coffin, president of Union Theological Seminary of New York.

Clark M. Eichelberger, director of the William Allen White committee.

Harold K. Guinsburg, head of the Viking Press, of New York.

George Watts Hill, banker and farmer of Durham, N. C.

Henry W. Hobson, Episcopal Bishop of Cincinnati.

Ernest M. Hopkins, president of Dartmouth College.

Francis P. Miller, of Fairfax, Va.

Geoffrey Parsons, chief editorial writer of the New York Herald Tribune.

Frank L. Polk, New York lawyer, former Under Secretary of State.

Whitney H. Shepardson, a director of the Council on Foreign Relations, of New York.

Robert Emmet Sherwood, playwright, of New York.

Admiral William H. Standley, retired, of New York.

Dr. Henry P. Van Dusen, professor in Union Theological Seminary of New York.

SIX WAR ADVOCATES ATTENDED MEETING

Of this group of 19, six were signers of the June 9 public statement favoring an immediate war declaration against Germany by the United States. These were Agar, Hill, Bishop Hobson, Miller, Shepardson, and Admiral Standley.

Admiral Standley makes frequent speeches in behalf of the group's policies. In a speech at Chicago last Wednesday night before a meeting sponsored by the Chicago chapter of the Committee to Defend America by Aiding the Allies, Admiral Standley advocated that America "provide an adequate number" of "mosquito boats" to Great Britain to "forestall any menace the U-boats of Germany may be in the Atlantic." Continuing, he said:

"As we advance with our rearmament we should throw more and more ships, airplanes, munitions, and all the material aid and comfort at our command into democracy's fight against Hitlerism * * *.

"We are alive to the belief that, if Britain does not stop Hitler now, sooner or later we must undertake the job ourselves."

ACHESON HELPS POINT OUT THE WAY

Among the other persons who have participated from time to time in the discussions of the group or who, because of their known sympathies, have been invited to do so are the following:

Dean G. Acheson, New York and Washington lawyer, who resigned as Under Secretary of the Treasury because of disagreement with the Roosevelt fiscal policies. Acheson was one of the four New York lawyers who signed the famous August 11 letter to the New York Times asserting the right of the President to make the destroyer-naval-base deal with Great Britain by Executive action alone. This statement, as events have shown, carried great weight with the President, and Attorney General Jackson leaned heavily upon it for his reasoning in support of the transaction. The other signers were Charles C. Burlingham; Thomas D. Thatcher, who was Solicitor General under President Hoover; and George Rublee.

Dr. James Rowland Angell, of Hamden, Conn., former president of Yale University and now educational counselor of the National Broadcasting Co.

Hamilton Fish Armstrong, of New York, editor of Foreign Affairs.

John L. Balderston, of Beverly Hills, Calif., playwright; official Washington observer of the William Allen White committee and former foreign newspaper correspondent.

Dr. James B. Conant, president of Harvard University.

Col. William J. Donovan, of New York, Assistant Attorney General under President Coolidge; recently in Great Britain as an observer for Secretary of the Navy Knox.

Lewis W. Douglas, of New York, antinew dealer who resigned as Budget Director under Roosevelt and now is head of the Mutual Life Insurance Co.

Allen W. Dulles, of New York, lawyer with firm of Sullivan & Cromwell; long in American Diplomatic Service.

Henry R. Luce, publisher of Time, Life, and Fortune.

Henry F. Pringle, author, of New York; biographer of Theodore Roosevelt and William Howard Taft.

Walter Wanger, of Los Angeles, moving-picture producer.

Henry M. Wriston, president of Brown University.

HOW "MILLER GROUP" CARRIED OUT ITS PLAN

All the practical steps outlined in the illuminating July memorandum of "the Miller group" have been taken.

Carrying out the first item on the agenda, three of the group, Herbert Agar, Ward Cheney, and Francis P. Miller, went to Washington early in August, and in personal interviews bore down hard on the President and most of the members of the Cabinet for immediate and drastic aid to Great Britain. Transfer of the destroyers was the great objective.

Agar, accompanied by Eichelberger, of the White committee, saw the President on August 1. Miller talked to Henry Wallace, now Democratic nominee for Vice President. Joseph Alsop talked to Admiral Stark, Chief of Naval Operations. The burden of the message thus driven home to the President and the other officials was that the Government, in view of the danger to this Nation from Hitler's projected world-wide revolution, was pursuing a "cowardly" course; that public opinion demanded more than was being done and would assuredly support the administration in the destroyer deal.

"TALKED TURKEY" TO ROOSEVELT

As Alsop, who was in the middle of the picture, has written: "A great number of persons, both members of the administration and private White House friends, had become disturbed by the President's seeming lethargy." The destroyer deal had been in the wind since the 1st of June, when Prime Minister Churchill had appealed urgently to the President for as many destroyers as we could spare. It was to overcome the "lethargy" of the President that the delegation from the Miller group descended on Washington in August, and, as one of the group has said, "talked turkey" to the administration.

Lindley in the following paragraph attributes too large a part to the writers, though they played an important part, but his picture of the methods by which private individuals sought to influence, and did influence, the course of events in the destroyer deal is essentially accurate:

"For almost 2 months almost everything that was done toward effecting the destroyer deal was done by newspaper columnists and editors. They surveyed the problem with the high officers of the Army and Navy individually, with members of the Cabinet, with leading Senators and Congressmen, with Wendell Willkie, and with the President himself. They persuaded General Pershing to advocate the transfer of destroyers, in a Nation-wide broadcast."

THEN PERSHING, OTHERS ON RADIO

Second on the schedule of the Miller group, as developed at the July 25 meeting, was the launching of "a radio program of education." As related, General Pershing was induced to go on the air for the destroyer deal and he was aided in the preparation of his speech by one of the group—Agar. Broadcasting arrangements were made by Alsop. Later, radio speeches in similar vein were made by Admiral William H. Standley, retired, of New York, former Chief of Naval Operations, a member of the Miller group and also one of the signers of the June statement favoring a war declaration; and by Col. William J. Donovan of New York. Both these speeches were arranged for by Miller, as also was a radio speech by Maury Maverick, mayor of San Antonio, scheduled for today (Saturday).

Members of the Miller group emphasize its entire informality and its ad hoc character. No votes are taken. Friends of the members are freely invited into the discussions, which take place every 2 weeks or so. Ideas are tossed about in conversation and any that are deemed worthy and practicable—such as the launching of the radio program—are sought to be put into execution. Executive responsibility such as it is, rests on Miller.

WILLKIE IS SOUNDED OUT ON DESTROYER DEAL

A member or members of the group helped to sound out Wendell Willkie on the destroyer deal. Though he declined to commit himself publicly in advance, he indicated that he approved it. Consequently, when he came out with his statement, after the conclusion of the deal, approving the result but taking exception to the method, some of the members of the group felt that they had been let down. From within the group, as a result, came the inspiration of a statement, September 10, signed by some 60 citizens who joined, "irrespective of their party affiliations or their views on domestic issues," in an "unqualified endorsement" of the destroyer transaction.

Signatures to this statement, as set out in the preface, were solicited by "three Republicans and pro-Willkie members" of the White committee—Chairman White; President Conant, of Harvard; and Lewis W. Douglas.

WAR ADVOCATE TAKES A BIG PART

Another "practical step" decided upon at the Century Club meeting of "the Miller group" was the "approval of a news letter." Earlier John L. Balderston, successful playwright and former longtime correspondent of American newspapers in London, now a movie scrip writer living at Beverly Hills, Calif., had been in New York and expressed a warm desire to give some practical help to the aid-for-Britain movement. He was one of the 30 signers of the June statement urging the United States to declare war on Germany.

When the news letter idea came up, Miller telephoned Balderston and asked him to undertake the job. Balderston agreed to do so, at his own expense. Miller placed the idea of the letter with the William Allen White committee.

Balderston came on back East late in August and began the preparation of "wire letters" for distribution to a selected list of about 50 newspapers. These letters, which have been put out from Washington at the rate of about two a week, contain "background" information for editors on the needs of Great Britain and the progress of the White movement. The letters are telegraphed under the aegis of the White committee as the William Allen White News Service. A copy of each goes to Miller, who has it mimeographed and distributed by mail among the members of his group and perhaps 100 others throughout the country.

BALDERSON'S ACTIVITY BECOMES EMBARRASSING

Some of the letters, according to the White committee, have been "straight news releases," while others have been primarily for "background" and not intended for textual publication. All the copies distributed through the Miller office have been marked "not for publication." Nevertheless, much of the contents, textually and in paraphrase, of the "background" material as well as the other, has been published, and this publication on one or two occasions, because of Balderston's great zeal in pressing for aid to Great Britain, has been a source of embarrassment to the White committee.

The White committee asserts it draws a sharp distinction between the Balderston conclusions as to British needs and what the committee accepts as its objectives.

THE NOW FAMOUS SEVEN-POINT PROGRAM

On September 5 it was published, on the strength of a Balderston letter listing the "requirements" of Great Britain, that the White committee was about to sponsor a new seven-point program of aid to Great Britain. Balderston had written that the British needed, roughly, in order of priority:

1. A score of motor torpedo boats "wanted at once."
2. Flying boats of the PBY type now being made in San Diego.
3. Flying fortresses, our great long-range bombers.
4. Tanks: "Five or six tanks a day are now being turned out for the United States. The British ask for all of these, please, but not for long, only for the first few weeks of supply."
5. Air fields: "To train pilots in a country where out of any cloud may pop a German fighter presents certain difficulties. Such a country is England. This was foreseen, and the reservoir of pilots in training was decreed to be Canada. But it gets very cold in Canada. In fact, for many months the type of training necessary for fighting pilots cannot be carried on there at all. The British would like the use of air fields for training pilots in Texas and southern California. Training planes could be turned over to them there and would not have to be sent abroad."
6. Two hundred and fifty thousand more Lee-Enfield rifles.

ALSO HE WANTS OUR SECRET BOMB SIGHT

As to the seventh point, involving our jealously guarded bomb sight, reputedly the finest instrument of the kind in the world, Balderston wrote: "Finally there comes the bomb sight. At this point this dispatch hastens to censor itself, and the subject would not be mentioned except that it affords a perfect example of the two ways of thinking possible about any or all of the British requests.

"If we give a secret weapon to a friend, that weapon sooner or later may be captured by the enemy and used against us. That's one way to look at it. That's the way all of Hitler's victims have looked at similar problems. The other way to envisage the problem, of course, is to concede that if your friend is fighting alone, and protecting you while he does so, it is neighborly to give him whatever help you happen to have available, and if this involves risk to yourself, to take that risk in the interest not merely of sound strategy but of your own self-respect."

It was in this William Allen White News Service telegram that Balderston urged public pressure on the Army and Navy chiefs to override any opposition on their part to his seven-point program for aiding Britain.

WHITE DISAVOWS BALDERSTON PROGRAM

Upon publication of the Balderston statement of British needs, Chairman White immediately disavowed it as the program of the committee. As has been reported in the Post-Dispatch, he said that neither he nor the committee favored sending the British any war materials which Army and Navy authorities might consider necessary for American defense. He said that the Balderston program was an inventory of British needs rather than an immediate objective of the committee, and this view was reiterated to the writer by other officials of the committee in New York this week.

Emphasizing that he was against the United States entering the war, White said his objective was that of giving Britain all the aid that could be given "safely, wisely, and legally."

"Personally," he added, "I shall never advocate giving away anything needed for our safety, and by the word 'needed,' I mean what Army and Navy authorities say is needed."

THEN WHITE ADOPTS TWO BALDERSTON POINTS

As already told, the current objectives of the White committee, as outlined by the chairman on September 12, are three:

1. The dispatch to Great Britain of 25 "flying fortresses." This is No. 3 in the Balderston list of British requirements. Balderston hoped that "a small number" of these bombers could be transferred to the British at once. "The flying fortresses," he wrote, "can effectively bomb anything in Germany or Poland and fly home again. Nothing the British or anyone else now has can do this."

2. Twenty "mosquito" boats. This is the same as Balderston's No. 1 recommendation.

3. "As many pursuit planes as possible." This item is not specifically mentioned by Balderston.

Nothing is said in White's letter to his local chapters about flying boats, air fields, Lee-Enfield rifles, or our secret bomb sight. As to tanks (Balderston's No. 4), White's letter suggests that this item, with others, may later be added as an objective "when the present emergency is over."

BALDERSTON IN TOUCH WITH BRITISH EMBASSY

Balderston, as his letters show, is still the first-class reporter that he was in London. That he is in touch with officials of the British Embassy is no secret and has no special significance. Anybody not suspected of being a German agent can go to the Embassy and learn what the British regard as their needs of the moment. The official British position, as the Ambassador, Lord Lothian, has stated in public speeches, is that Britain is glad to receive any aid this country may give; whether or not aid is given is strictly an American concern.

One of the earlier letters in the Balderston series sent out as a wire letter of the William Allen White news service August 27 was as follows:

"One night in July a message came to Washington from Winston Churchill for President Roosevelt. It announced in effect, the writer hasn't seen it and doesn't pretend to quote it, the arrival at British ports of a huge mass of weapons—cannon, machine guns, rifles, and stuff to shoot out of them, too.

"After describing successful convoy precautions Churchill told the President trains were waiting with steam up in all ports, into which ships were being warped, and he said the weapons would be in the hands of British soldiers awaiting them within 24 hours.

"UNITED STATES PATCHED UP LOSS OF ARMS IN FLANDERS

"During this period of extreme crisis, when Churchill's already famous cry of defiance to Hitler, his fight-on-the-beaches speech, was ringing through the world, 15 ships containing roughly 100,000 tons of American weapons and explosives reached Great Britain. Invasion was thought a matter of days or hours by those who knew the tragic lack of means of defense caused by the loss of almost the whole modern equipment of the British Army in Flanders and France.

"Eighty thousand Hotchkiss and Lewis machine guns were sent from this country and now guard the shores of England.

"Some seven hundred 57.5-millimeter field guns with a mountain of shells were sent and now are in service.

"Half a million Lee-Enfield rifles were in those consignments, Churchill said last week that 2,000,000 soldiers armed with rifles now stand ready in Britain. One man in four of Britain's defenders now carries a rifle sent from the United States since the battle of France became the catastrophe of France.

"There has been no invasion, but there might have been and there may be and a high British authority has expressed himself to an American to the effect that these shipments 'repaired, at any rate patched up, a situation desperate in the extreme.'

"In addition to the weapons mentioned, huge quantities of shells, small-arm ammunition, and other materials were shipped across.

SAYS GERMANS WERE AWARE OF SHIPMENTS

"These shipments were far from gifts by the United States to Great Britain. They were rounded up by British purchasing agents and bought from holders in this country in strict compliance with the provisions of the neutrality law for good prices paid in American dollars, the purchaser taking the risk of loss in transit and then seeing to it there was no loss in transit. The method of transfer of Government property to individual firms is well known, and the transfer of airplanes at this time by these or similar methods received full publicity, but few outside inner circles were aware of the successful attempt in progress to help rearm British land armies before the Germans could strike.

"Among those who were aware were members of the ubiquitous German intelligence service, and this fact causes smiles among those who know what has been going on at the cries arising from Capitol Hill and elsewhere that turning over 50 old destroyers will somehow constitute an act of war against Hitler by a nation until now at profound peace with that potentate. Methods of transferring the destroyers will necessarily be legal, technically, and tactfully different from those employed in helping rearm the British Army, but the result will be precisely the same, the implementing of the pledge made by the President at Charlottesville. We have sold the British more than most people realize, as this dispatch shows—sold, not given, a distinction we should keep in mind."

WHITE'S ACTIVITIES DESCRIBED AS AMAZING

But Balderston, of course, is not the only person who has gathered information for the William Allen White committee. White himself has important contacts which have enabled him to get an accurate picture of British needs. Newspaper columnists and editors have helped. There is reason to believe that the survey lately made in Great Britain by Col. William J. Donovan, as an agent of the Secretary of the Navy, has been a fruitful source of information.

Chairman White has been indefatigable in furthering the aims of the committee. The number of persons all over the country whom he consults by telephone is described by his associates as amazing. When he is not working at the job at New York headquarters—he was there lately and had a 5-hour conference with his executive committee—he is likely to be similarly engaged at his Kansas office.

Every decision on policy is his, taken after consultation with his advisers. No proposed chapter of the White committee is permitted to come into the movement unless it subscribes fully to the objectives laid down by the national committee.

The White committee has been set up for the duration of the war and, if the present ideas of its leaders are carried out, for the period of peace making to follow. Appeasement, now and in the future, will be fought to the limit.

LEADERS DEFEND THEIR COURSE

To the criticism that the activities of the committee are heading the country toward war, the leaders of the committee reply that obviously there is no completely safe course for the United States; that anything we may do or not do involves risks; that in fact, the safest course we can take, relatively speaking, is to do what we can to bring about a British victory.

In their view, the steps that might involve us in the war are being taken on the other side, and it is only these, and not any aid we give Great Britain, that might bring us in. If Hitler wanted today to declare war on the United States, he would find a pretext. Any idea that the White committee is seeking or desires to get this country into war is declared to be the sheerest bunk.

There remains the criticism that the activities of the committee tend to strip this country of weapons it may need in its own defense. The recent reply of White to this charge has already been stated.

The director of the committee, Clark M. Eichelberger, in a conversation with the writer, said the committee was simply exploiting a last chance for the United States to stay out of war. He advanced the idea, too, that if the strong sentiment in the United States for aid to the Allies had not been channeled and made effective by the White committee, a sense of frustration would have arisen that might have led us directly toward, and perhaps into war.

Another official said the case for aid to Britain—and for the work of the White committee in arousing public sentiment to that end—was reducible to four points. First, we are in danger; second, we must arm adequately; third, it will take us 5 to 7 years to build the two-ocean navy we require; fourth, to put the matter in the lowest possible terms of self-interest, we can gain time for building up our defenses by enabling Britain to hold out.

The committee will decide from time to time, as the war situation changes, on the concrete objectives of its continuing campaign. Planes and mosquito boats for England are the immediate goal. Tomorrow it may be something different. The success of the committee in the destroyer deal suggests how formidable it will be in any cause it may champion.

OUTSTANDING MEMBERS OF COMMITTEE SEEKING AID FOR BRITAIN

Two St. Louisans are among the outstanding members of the Committee to Defend America by Aiding the Allies. They are George R. Throop, chancelor of Washington University, and Arthur E. Bostwick, former librarian of the St. Louis Public Library. Other members are:

Dean Acheson, New York lawyer; Louis Adamic, author; Julius Ochs Adler, general manager, New York Times; James Rowland Angell, former president of Yale; Frank Aydelotte, president of Swarthmore College; Tallulah Bankhead, actress; Barry Bingham, publisher, Louisville Courier-Journal; Robert Woods Bliss, of Washington, former Ambassador to Argentina; Col. Henry Breckinridge, of New York, former Assistant Secretary of War; Louis Bromfield, author, Van Wyck Brooks, author; John Stewart Bryan, publisher and president of William and Mary College; C. C. Burlingham, New York lawyer; Henry Seidel Canby, editor and author; Carrie Chapman Catt, organizer and former chairman, National Committee on the Cause and Cure of War; Zechariah Chafee, Jr., Harvard law professor; Evans Clark, executive director, Twentieth Century Fund; John H. Clarke, former Justice of the United States Supreme Court; George Creel, chairman, Committee on Public Information during World War No. 1; Walter Damrosch, orchestra conductor; John W. Davis, lawyer, Democratic candidate for President in 1924; Henry P. Davison, partner in J P. Morgan & Co.; Melvyn Douglas, actor; David Dubinsky, labor leader; William Yandell Elliott, Harvard professor of government; Clifton Fadiman, writer and radio entertainer; Dorothy Canfield Fisher, author; Lynn Fontanne, actress; Harry D. Gideonse, president, Brooklyn College of the City of New York; Ellen Glasgow, author; Grover C. Hall, editor, Montgomery (Ala.) Advertiser; Moss Hart, playwright; Helen Hayes, actress; Arthur Garfield Hays, New York lawyer, national director, American Civil Liberties Union; Hamilton Holt, president, Rollins College, Florida; Ernest M. Hopkins, president of Dartmouth College; Rupert Hughes, author; Fannie Hurst, author; Alfred Lunt, actor; Archibald MacLeish, Librarian of Congress; the Right Reverend William T. Manning, Episcopal bishop of New York; J. P. Morgan, banker; Mrs. Dwight W. Morrow, wife of the late Senator Morrow; Conde Nast, magazine publisher; Dr. Reinhold Niebuhr, professor in Union Theological Seminary; Robert Lincoln O'Brien, former chairman, United States Tariff Commission; Eugene O'Neill, playwright; John F. O'Ryan, commander, Twenty-seventh Division, United States Army, in World War No. 1; Ferdinand Pecora, New York Supreme Court justice; William Lyon Phelps, author and Yale professor emeritus; Gifford Pinchot, former Governor of Pennsylvania; Samuel Seabury, New York lawyer; Cornelia Otis Skinner, actress; Booth Tarkington, author; Gene Tunney, former heavyweight champion; Tom Wallace, editor, Louisville Times; Ray Lyman Wilbur, president, Stanford University; Wythe Williams, former European correspondent; Alexander Woollcott, writer; Mary E. Woolley, former president, Mount Holyoke College.

The committee has a chapter in St. Louis, of which the secretary is Miss H. Lorine Pickett, of 6650 Oakland Avenue.

URGES PUBLIC PRESSURE ON NAVY AND ARMY CHIEFS TO OVERRIDE ANY OPPOSITION TO WHITE'S GOAL

How public opinion should be brought to bear against possible opposition of military authorities to the further release of our war equipment to Great Britain was outlined in a recent William Allen White News Service telegram written by the committee's Washington observer, John L. Balderston, who last June publicly urged the United States to declare war on Germany. On this point, Balderston wrote:

"The weapons now wanted, or most of them, may cause a sharp controversy here. They are weapons some United States authorities are inclined to consider needed at home * * * the attitude to be taken by this Government must depend in great part upon whether Great Britain be regarded as our first line of defense.

"If we do what all the other victims of Hitler have done, we will grant aid grudgingly in small packets, because our military men will behave just as the military men in every other menaced country have behaved—hold the best of what they have to meet attack against ourselves and refuse to give it up to Britain or anyone else. Our staffs will perhaps incline to take this attitude. If so, they cannot and should not be criticised; they will be doing their professional duty. Staffs are like that in all countries, and were like that in countries that recently existed but exist no more.

"The only way, it is not inconceivable, in which some needed aid can be sent to Britain in time is for those staffs to be overruled by administrative or legislative action, and the likelihood of this depends in turn upon public opinion. And this is why the William Allen White News Service takes the responsibility of making known what the British most need at this moment, now.

"It does so because public opinion cannot bring pressure to bear in the higher interest of our own country and the cause of world democracy, against possible opposition which might base itself on the highest professional standards of duty, without an occasional dose of facts of a nature not usually made public when nations are at war."

HOW "MILLER GROUP" OUTLINED PLAN TO PUT OVER DESTROYER DEAL

Effectiveness of the policies decided upon by the behind-the-scenes "Miller group" is shown in the outcome of the recent deal by which Great Britain got 50 American destroyers from President Roosevelt in exchange for naval and air bases in the Atlantic. All of the practical steps outlined in an illuminating July memorandum of the "Miller group" have been taken.

A dinner meeting of the "Miller group" was held July 25 at the Century Club in New York City. From the discussion emerged the following memorandum, which was circulated to members of the group and a selected list of others believed to be in general sympathy with the aid-to-Britain movement:

A. PRINCIPLES

The most vulnerable sector in the American defense line is the North Atlantic. Consequently the primary immediate responsibility of the Government is to insure adequate defense in that area.

If Germany wins control of the North Atlantic the period prior to the completion of our own two-ocean Navy will be a period of acute danger for us. During that period the United States could be invaded from the Atlantic.

In order to remove the risk of invasion the Government should take all possible steps to prevent German control of the North Atlantic.

The most certain preventive (until our two-ocean Navy is built) is the continued existence of the British fleet. And the fate of the British fleet will be settled by the battle for the control of the North Atlantic which is about to begin on the shores of England, Scotland, and Ireland.

The British chances of success are at present doubtful; but responsible British officials believe that they could successfully withstand invasion if they had 100 more destroyers.

The United States—it is understood—has more than 100 overage destroyers recently recommissioned.

American naval experts believe that: (1) British crews could take these destroyers to England immediately and without special training; (2) British naval crews could learn to operate them in the discharge of all their naval functions in 2 weeks' to 1 month's time.

In the interest of its own national defense the United States should put a hundred of these destroyers into British hands at once.

B. QUID PRO QUO

So strong was the feeling that the United States should take this action in self-defense, that there was little discussion concerning the consideration to be asked in return for taking such a step.

That the United States should ask for some guaranty that the British fleets should neither be scuttled nor surrendered, but in case of a successful German invasion of England, should operate thereafter from Canadian and/or American bases; or

That these destroyers should be offered to Britain in exchange for immediate naval and air concessions in British possessions in the Western Hemisphere.

C. WAYS AND MEANS

Some thought that it would be more effective to put the destroyers into the hands of the Canadian Government, in connection with a program of joint defense of the Western Hemisphere.

It was generally agreed that (1) the time was too short for a congressional debate on the proposed program, and that (2) effective action could only be taken in time by the President, in cooperation with United States naval officials. Consequently, individuals whom the President believes should see him, and urge him to take action on the reasonable assumption that Mr. Willkie would go along with him.

D. PUBLIC OPINION

It was agreed that regardless of private representations which might be made to the President, the campaign of education concerning the vital importance of the British fleet to us (so well launched by the William Allen White Committee) should be immediately pursued through the press, radio, public platform, personal correspondence with influential individuals, and through all other effective channels.

E. PRACTICAL STEPS

Certain individuals to be designated to see the President.

A radio program of education to be launched immediately.

The group to cooperate fully with the William Allen White Committee, and the committee with the group.

Approval of a news letter to be prepared by three or four outstanding special writers.

Moral backing and practical support for the Committee for the Release of Ships for European Children.

Group to meet again in near future.

SIX MEMBERS OF "MILLER GROUP," NOW SEEKING AID FOR BRITAIN, URGED UNITED STATES TO DECLARE WAR ON GERMANY—RETIRED ADMIRAL STANDLEY AND HERBERT AGAR, EDITOR OF LOUISVILLE COURIER-JOURNAL, ARE AMONG THEM

In the article on William Allen White's "propaganda engine" the Post-Dispatch has disclosed an intermingling of interests seeking United States Army and Navy equipment for Great Britain. As stated in the article, six members of "the Miller group," seeking destroyers for Britain, were among 30 citizens who issued a public statement June 9 urging an immediate declaration of war against Germany and inviting others of like views "to express them publicly through the free democratic institution of the American press."

"In the German view," their statement said, "the American defense program means that the United States has already joined with Great Britain and France in opposing the Nazi drive for world dominion. In the American view, Nazi Germany is the mortal enemy of our ideals, our institutions, and our way of life. * * *

"What we have, what we are, and what we hope to be can now be most effectively defended on the line in France held by General Weygand. The frontier of our national interest is now on the Somme.

"Therefore all disposable air, naval, military, and material resources of the United States should be made available at once to help maintain our common front.

"But such resources cannot be made available fast enough to hold the German Army in check on the European continent or to prepare for the eventual attack on American interests so long as the United States remains legally neutral. Nation-wide endorsement of the defense program shows that the American people have ceased to be neutral in any other sense.

"For this reason alone, and irrespective of specific uses of our resources thereafter, the United States should immediately give official recognition to the fact and to the logic of the situation—by declaring that a state of war exists between this country and Germany.

"Only in this constitutional manner can the energies be massed which are indispensable to the successful prosecution of a program of defense."

ADVOCATES OF WAR DECLARATION

Captioned "A Summons To Speak Out," the statement was signed by the following:

Herbert Agar, editor of the Louisville Courier-Journal and author; winner of the Pulitzer prize for history in 1933. Agar is one of the most active members of the informal group for which Francis P. Miller acts as a sort of clearinghouse. He had a large hand in the preparation of General Pershing's speech of August 4, urging that 50 American destroyers be transferred to Britain.

Burke Baker of Houston, Tex.

John L. Balderston, of Beverly Hills, Calif., playwright and one-time London correspondent of the old New York World. Balderston is now putting out, from Washington, a confidential news letter to editors for the William Allen White Committee.

Stringfellow Barr of Annapolis, Md., president of St. John's College.

J. Douglas Brown, professor of economics at Princeton University.

Richard F. Cleveland, of Baltimore; lawyer; son of President Cleveland.

James F. Curtis, of New York; lawyer; Assistant Secretary of the Treasury from 1909 to 1913.

Edwin F. Gay, of Pasadena, Calif.; economist; formerly dean of the Graduate School of Business Administration of Harvard.

Edward T. Gushee, of St. Louis; executive vice president of the Union Electric Co. of Missouri.

Marion H. Hedges, of Washington; research director and author.

William H. Hessler, of Cincinnati; writer on political economy.

George Watts Hill, of Durham, N. C.; banker and leader in the organization of cooperative marketing and farm organizations; member of the Miller Group.

Bishop (Episcopal) Henry W. Hobson, of Cincinnati, who was a major in the last war; member of the Miller Group.

Leroy Hodges, of Richmond, Va.; economist and author.

Calvin Hoover, of Durham, N. C.; economist, author, and editor.

Edwin P. Hubble, of San Marino, Calif.; astronomer.

Frank Kent, of Baltimore; columnist of the Baltimore Sun.

Edward R. Lewis, of Chicago, historian and sociologist.

George W. Martin, of New York.

L. Randolph Mason, of New York, lawyer.

Stacy May, of New York, economist and social worker.

Francis P Miller, of Fairfax, Va., author and organization director for local committees organized by the Council on Foreign Relations. Leader of the Miller Group.

Helen Hill Miller, wife of Francis P. Miller.

Walter Millis, of New York, editorial writer of the Herald Tribune, author of The Road to War.

George Fort Milton, of Chattanooga, Tenn., newspaper editor and author.

Lewis Mumford, of Amenia, N. Y., writer.

Winfield W. Riefler, of Princeton, economist.

Whitney H. Shepardson, of New York, treasurer and director of the Council on Foreign Relations; assistant to Colonel House at Paris peace conference. Member of the Miller Group.

Admiral William H. Standley, retired, of New York, former Chief of Naval Operations. Member of the Miller Group.

William Waller, of Nashville, Tenn.

Lest We Forget

REMARKS

OF

HON. U. S. GUYER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 23, 1940

Mr. GUYER of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, today while half the world staggers beneath the blows of war that shock the very courts of Heaven, and the rest of the earth trembles beneath the Sword of Damocles which threatens the peace of the whole world, it seems not inappropriate that we examine the steps by which we were catapulted into the bloodiest war in the history of mankind so that we may perhaps avoid the quicksands that dragged our feet into the vortex of armed conflict, a war that will cost us, when the last widow of the last World War soldier gets her last pension check, the astronomical sum of $100,000,000,000.

Before we plunge headlong into another such war, the cost of which would transcend the last one, had we not better pause and count the cost, and, if possible, avoid such a cataclysmic disaster? Let us contrast the position and attitude of our country then and now. There is no teacher like experience, no prophet like the history of the past. It seems to me that we may profit by a review of the facts concerning our entry into the war in April 1917 so that we may be aided in avoiding a like calamity; for who is so stupid as not to know that war with his bloody knuckles is knocking at our door? What was the path we followed to the blood bath a generation ago? Let us review the facts:

"LEST WE FORGET"

In 1912: "Too proud to fight."—Woodrow Wilson.

In 1914: "The people must even think neutral."—Woodrow Wilson.

In 1916: "When pictures of the war in Europe are shown on the screen the people should refrain from applause lest some belligerent conclude that the United States is not neutral."—Woodrow Wilson.

Election day, 1916: "You are working, not fighting—You are living, not cannon fodder—Wilson kept you out of war."—George Creel, Wilson advertisement.

In 1917, one hundred days lated: War declared April 6, 1917.

In 1940?

September 3, 1939: "The Nation will remain a neutral nation, but I cannot ask that every American remain neutral in thought."—Franklin D. Roosevelt.

In contrast with Woodrow Wilson, the President opened the door for unneutral thinking, which is the mother of hysteria and the forerunner of the war fever.

If, in 1917, with Woodrow Wilson obsessed and saturated with a passion for peace, we were plunged into the greatest war in human history, where will we land when led by a bellicose and brutally frank assailant of nations with which we sustain relations of peace issuing threats of "quarantine" and "steps short of war"?

If, in 1915, with William Jennings Bryan, Secretary of State, one of the most eloquent and vociferous apostles of peace, we afterward rushed into a weltering sea of human blood to "make the world safe for democracy," whither are we racing today with a Secretary of State who irritates a jittery world with querulous warnings and a sensitive potential rival with peevish admonitions and caustic insinuations? If we do get into this war we cannot charge this administration with duplicity as we have about balancing the Budget and reducing expenses and taxes. The direction in which we are traveling is certainly obvious.

This precarious situation is the explanation of the insistence of the people that Congress stay on the job and prevent, if possible, our entry into any other nation's war and prevent the sending of American boys to die on alien soil. We have seen how easily we were once precipitated into a foreign war. Saw how evidently against the will of the President and his Cabinet we were dragged into a bloody conflict for which future generations will pay and pay.

It is the opinion of a great many people that commitments unauthorized by Congress might involve us in war. In other words, the great mass of the American people do not trust the Executive and the Executive Department in matters involving the question of war. Next to President Washington's example and admonition against a third term for a President was his warning against "excessive partiality for one nation and excessive dislike for another" and his caution against "entangling alliances." These sage warnings are just as important today as they were when he uttered them. They

constitute, like the tradition on a third term, a sort of unwritten law and whenever we have discarded them we have suffered bitterly for it.

Every American feels sympathetic toward England but does that justify us in plunging into a destructive war in her behalf? Is not our first duty to our own country and its boys? Once we extended help to save democracy and then England permitted Hitler to get command of the air which is the cause of war. There would have been no war if France and England had the command of the air. They were warned by Lindbergh and he was invited to leave England. Now are we again to "make the world safe for democracy?"

Is it not a better policy for us to create an invulnerable national defense for this hemisphere and fill our sky with the best planes on earth? Take no part in other nations' wars. Make no commitments or alliances to drag us into war. Build an Army and Navy that will discourage attack by its superiority. In the meantime let Congress stay in session and sit on the lid.

Some Members complain that staying in Washington will prevent them from making a campaign for election. Conceding for the sake of argument that this is true, it is still our duty to stay on the job if we feel we can contribute toward keeping the country out of war. The people, I am sure, will understand our position and in our absence fight our battle for us. A political campaign is not the most important matter just now. The biggest job for America right now is to keep a level head and avoid the shambles of the European war.

Lord God of hosts, be with us yet; lest we forget.

Principle or Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAT HARRISON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 23 (legislative day of Wednesday, September 18), 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. JAMES F. BYRNES, OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES] on September 20, 1940, over the red network of the National Broadcasting Co., entitled "Is It Principle or Politics?"

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IS IT PRINCIPLE OR POLITICS?

It is somewhat surprising that the Republican candidate, who, but a few short weeks ago, was shouting that he hoped that President Roosevelt would run again because he wanted to meet the "champ," is now crying that the "champ" should not run for a third term.

Daily Mr. Willkie attributes to President Roosevelt the statement that he is indispensable. In 1932 Mr. Roosevelt said there was no indispensable man. In 1940 he would make the same statement.

At this critical juncture in America's history the people are not concerned with any theoretical discussion of a third term or whether any man is indispensable. The issue that concerns them is whether it is better that Franklin D. Roosevelt or Wendell L. Willkie should be the next President of the United States.

The framers of the Constitution wisely refused to limit the number of terms a President might serve. In the century and a half that has elapsed the Congress has not even submitted to the people an amendment limiting the tenure of the President to one or two terms, because they knew the people would never surrender the right to elect whom they pleased for as many terms as they pleased.

The views of the people are in accord with those of George Washington, who said:

"Under an extended view of this part of the subject, I can see no propriety in precluding ourselves from the services of any man who on some great emergency shall be deemed universally most capable of serving the public."

That the emergency today is great is evident from the appropriation of millions of dollars for armament and the drafting of men. That the President is deemed universally most capable of serving the people is evident from every poll.

The view of Washington has been the view of the most conservative and thoughtful students of our constitutional history. As the late Senator Borah, who had as much regard for constitutional traditions as any man I have ever known, said:

"The people who could be trusted to determine whether or not they desire a President for the second term may also be trusted to determine whether or not they desire a President for a third term. I think they can be trusted to settle both questions in a way to best conserve the interest of the people and the Republic."

It is difficult to understand how Republicans who, in 1912, supported Theodore Roosevelt for a third term can seriously invoke the third-term argument against Franklin D. Roosevelt. And be it remembered that that great Democrat, Woodrow Wilson, who defeated Theodore Roosevelt, refused to use against his opponent the third-term argument, declaring that no restriction should ever be placed upon the right of the people to elect a President.

The Republican candidate asks, if a third term, why not a fourth term? I ask, if a second term, why not a third term?

The answer to both questions is that the people can be trusted to wisely select the man best qualified to serve them under existing conditions. No man need fear a third term unless he fears the people.

Just prior to the Democratic convention, the Gallup poll showed 92 percent of the Democrats of the Nation demanding the nomination of Roosevelt. More than 80 percent of the delegates were instructed by the people, either at elections or in State conventions, to vote for the nomination of the President. Mr. Willkie says the renomination of Mr. Roosevelt was a "cut and dried" affair. It was. The people made it so by instructing the delegates to vote for the man they wanted, the man whose 8 years' experience had demonstrated his fitness for the Presidency. The people left no opportunity, as at Philadelphia, for any group, by a "blitzkrieg" of publicity and deluge of telegrams, to nominate a man who had never been voted for by the people of any community for any office.

When you hear men talking about the sacred tradition against a third term, you will find upon investigation that, with very few exceptions, the defenders of tradition opposed President Roosevelt for a second term, and probably for a first term. Their attitude is based upon politics, not upon principle.

Reporting Mr. Willkie's speech in Albuquerque, the United Press said:

"The third-term argument that Mr. Roosevelt has been in office 8 years and therefore is more experienced than a man who has not been in office at all, Willkie described as 'ridiculous, fantastic, a child's-play argument, one that cannot stand up.'"

Well, let us see. Would you, needing the services of a lawyer to save your property, or a physician to save your life, believe it fantastic to employ a man with years of experience instead of a man with no experience?

When Mr. Willkie resigned as president of the Commonwealth & Southern Utility Corporation, he and his associates selected as their president a man who had been connected with that corporation and its predecessors for 28 years, and knew its problems.

Yet you stockholders and directors in the greatest of all enterprises, the Government of the United States, are urged to dispense with the services of a capable and experienced President, and replace him with a man who has had no experience in Government.

And you are asked to do this at a period when the nighttime prayers of men, women, and children go up to thank God for His guidance—and to ask that their President be given continuing strength and wisdom in his self-sacrificing task of keeping America safe and free.

During my service in Congress, I have seen five different Presidents assume office. Some of them had long experience in State or National Government, yet every one of them would have admitted that much of his first year in office was spent studying the powers of the office and the vast machinery of Government. Can this Nation, under conditions now existent, take a chance upon inexperience for an indefinite period?

The Republican candidate would like to make the American people believe that we cannot have a continuity of national leadership for 12 years without sacrificing democracy. He forgets that Mackenzie King has been Prime Minister of Canada for four terms; that Stanley Baldwin and Ramsay MacDonald have served as Prime Ministers of England for three terms, and that De Valera has been Prime Minister of the Irish Free State for four terms.

The Republican candidate warns of dictatorship. No modern dictator has waited for a third term to become dictator. The danger to democracy comes not from an experienced statesman who has handled the gravest domestic emergencies without calling out troops, and without the use of labor espionage, but from an inexperienced leadership which may become panic stricken in time of crisis. The American people know the faults and the virtues of President Roosevelt. They remember 1933. They know how he would act in the gravest emergency. They do not know how Mr. Willkie would act under grave stress and strain.

The Republican candidate says a third term will result in a dictatorship. There can be no dictatorship where we have a free press, free speech, and free elections.

No one questions the freedom of our elections. A recent poll showed two-thirds of the newspapers opposing Mr. Roosevelt. Surely no one can question the freedom of the press under the Roosevelt administration.

Mr. Willkie himself provides positive proof that this is a land of free speech. It is this free speech that is proving his undoing. Had the Republican National Committee, upon the adjournment of the Philadelphia convention, sent Mr. Willkie abroad, there might have been a possibility of his election. His speeches have removed that possibility. Through his speeches the people have come to know him. They have heard him question the veracity of Mr. Roosevelt and refer to the President as "this fellow." Perhaps I am old-fashioned. Perhaps I cling sentimentally to things I learned—in the long ago—to respect. I have respect for the President, whether he is a Republican or a Democrat. And if I know the heart of the American people, they do not approve of any man speaking contemptuously of the President of the United States.

It was as unpleasant to me as it must have been to millions of Americans to learn that Mr. Willkie as he left Chicago resorted to profanity and consigned that American city to the lower regions.

It was not pleasant to read that on the same day in speaking to workers at industrial plants, Mr. Willkie liberally sprinkled his remarks with profane words. He was not recorded as using profane language in speaking to others. If he did this deliberately, believing it would enhance his popularity among those workers, it was an insult to every wage earner in this democracy. If as I prefer to believe, he did not do it deliberately, it evidences a lack of control deplorable in one seeking the Presidency of the United States.

The Republican candidate's charge that President Roosevelt telephoned Hitler and Mussolini urging them to "sell Czechoslovakia down the river" shocked the American people. A few hours later, a member of the "brain trust" accompanying him announced that Mr. Willkie did not mean what he had said. Secretary Hull states that the President did not telephone to either Hitler or Mussolini; that his only communication was through diplomatic channels and was immediately made known to the American people. You and I recall the President's statement: "The conscience and the impelling desire of the people of my country demand that the voice of their Government be raised again and yet again to avert and to avoid war." His voice was truly the voice of America.

Whenever war threatened, President Roosevelt appealed for peace. Mr. Willkie says the appeal failed. It did. But I do not believe it would have been any more effective had it been sprinkled with profane words.

In Illinois, Mr. Willkie declared: "Of all the people with whom I have any acquaintance and have any knowledge of international affairs at all, Franklin Roosevelt is the least qualified to handle the Nation's foreign policy." I know this came as a shock to thoughtful Republicans who differ with Mr. Roosevelt as to domestic problems, but admire his wonderful grasp of foreign problems. It is for them, and it is for you to say whether these irresponsible statements demonstrate that the candidate possesses the poise and control essential to leadership of the American people.

The United Press quoted Mr. Willkie as saying in Texas on Tuesday last:

"Just to think that only in a few isolated spots in all this world people may gather as we are gathered tonight, and men may speak as I speak to you, to determine what shall be the future of our Government."

Splendid. But he omitted to say that the freedom for which he claimed to be grateful was enjoyed under the administration of the President he calls a dictator. In order that such freedom may be preserved for him and for all other Americans, the people are determined to reelect President Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America Meeting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 23 (legislative day of Wednesday, September 18), 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY, OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address which I delivered last Saturday morning, September 21, 1940, before a meeting of the Pennsylvania membership of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America held for the purpose of reelecting President Roosevelt.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, honored guests, and friends of Franklin D. Roosevelt, in these trying hours for America, the hosts of labor bear a particular responsibility for the destiny of our country. As leaders in the labor movement, you share in that responsibility. Labor has justly done honor to President Roosevelt for his fearless championship of its rights. Yet President Roosevelt could have done nothing without the support of the people, who entrusted him with power in 1932, and again in 1936.

Because he has used that power wisely and well, because his country needs him more now than it did even in the dark days of 1932, the people of America are drafting him for new and greater labors. The power he exercises stems from the people. It must be renewed now if he is to be of further service to the cause of democracy—constitutional democracy, political democracy, and industrial democracy.

The President properly has said that the people must base their decision at the polls upon the record he has made and is making, rather than upon campaign speeches. He has properly decided that his place at the hour of crisis is at the helm of government, and not on the political rostrum. Yet the political rostrum must be manned. The challenge of his opponents must be met; the attack of his enemies must be turned back. That is the task of all who have benefited by Roosevelt policies, and not least among them is organized labor.

I am not one of those who says that labor owes Roosevelt a debt of gratitude for befriending it, for what labor has received labor has been entitled to as a matter of right—but I do say that Roosevelt was first to recognize that right and to fight for it. Labor, not from a sense of obligation, but to defend the rightful gains it has made, must fight for Roosevelt as he has fought for labor.

There can be no question that the leadership now controlling the Republican organization is bitterly opposed to labor. Nowhere is that more true than in Pennsylvania. Labor received nothing but promises under Republican rule in this State, and labor knows it. Almost every State in the Union was further advanced in social and labor legislation than Pennsylvania before the forces of liberalism swept over it in 1934.

When the "old guard" gained control again in 1938 one of its first moves was to scuttle the labor laws, either by repeal or nonenforcement. We need only to look at the present Republican leadership in the State and Nation to see that the same disaster which delivered Pennsylvania labor back into the hands of its enemies is inevitable if they capture the White House.

On the national front a utility lobbyist and fixer runs for President on the Republican ticket, with a notorious labor baiter raising the funds and the house of Morgan directing the strategy from Wall Street.

In our own State the anti-Roosevelt legions are led by a Governor who has consistently opposed labor, an arch lobbyist whose Pennsylvania Manufacturers' Association has always been a thorn in the side of the worker, an antiunion oil operator, and a well-known banker who fathered the Philadelphia wage tax.

I don't have to tell you their names; you know every one of them from past bitter experience. The past records of these men are evidence, if any evidence is needed, that the social and labor reforms of the New Deal will be scrapped if they are ever returned to power. They represent no idle threat, but a real, definite, live menace.

When we are enjoying the benefits of the New Deal it is difficult to believe that those benefits may be withdrawn. It seems inconceivable that we should ever dream of going back to the old days. Yet those gains are not everlasting; they can be swept away almost overnight by a hostile President and a hostile Congress. Even today they are constantly under fire in the Congress. More than one big businessman during the past few weeks has attempted to use national defense as an excuse for attack upon the rights of labor. I need not tell you that it is the same people who are also fighting to evade taxation on excess profits.

The Roosevelt administration is not deceived by these would-be profiteers. National defense and internal prosperity must go hand in hand—the United States Government will not take the lead in chiseling the worker out of a fair wage, because it knows that a fair wage is essential to prosperity. It will not be a party to any attempt to break down the labor safeguards it has taken such pains to establish.

I want to pay my tribute to labor, here and now, for the unselfish patriotism it has shown in cooperating on national defense. Labor has shown that it will not profiteer at Uncle Sam's expense. At the same time, in the interest of our country's prosperity, it must not permit profiteers to exploit that patriotism.

We would be doing only half the job of defending our democracy if, while we were straining every effort to ward off outside aggression, we were to permit our economy to be gutted from within by abandoning the progress we have made under the New Deal. When I speak of progress, I mean not only the progress made by labor but also the gains made by legitimate, honest business—as distinguished from the chiseler.

In the disputes over the defense program we find big business constantly bringing up proposals which would favor big business at the expense of little business—schemes which would enrich the sweatshop operator and ruin the competitor who tried to treat labor fairly. Don't let anyone tell you that the conflict is between business and the New Deal; it is the last stand of big business against everyone else, particularly labor.

During the next few weeks great events will shape the future history of the world. While our eyes are fixed upon the battle of

Britain, we must not overlook the battle of America. It is the battle of America. It is the battle to preserve everything we have been fighting for since the black days of our national despair in 1932. President Roosevelt has raised the light to show us the way out of that darkness. Let us keep that light burning.

Walter-Logan Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SHERMAN MINTON
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 23 (legislative day of Wednesday, September 18), 1940

ARTICLE BY CHARLES G. ROSS

Mr. MINTON. Mr. President, under leave granted me, I present for publication in the RECORD an article by Mr. Charles G. Ross, published in the Washington Evening Star of May 8, 1940, under the heading "The reverse of court packing—Logan-Walter bill seen as applying judicial censorship."

The article referred to is as follows:

[From the Washington Evening Star of May 8, 1940]

THE REVERSE OF COURT PACKING—LOGAN-WALTER BILL SEEN AS APPLYING JUDICIAL CENSORSHIP

(By Charles G. Ross)

The Logan-Walter bill to heighten the control of the courts over the work of the administrative agencies of the Government—which is a very mild way of describing it—might be called a court-packing scheme in reverse.

The scheme advanced by the President in February 1937 would have tended to bring the courts under the thumb of the Executive. Wisely and patriotically, the Senate sent it to the scrap heap. Though within the letter of the Constitution, the President's proposal would have violated the fundamental constitutional principle of keeping in balance the three independent branches of the Government—legislative, executive, judicial.

The Logan-Walter bill, except in the case of those agencies which have been exempted, would subject the administrative branch to a court censorship as disruptive of the proper distribution of governmental powers as would have been the court-packing proposal.

DOUBLY HARMFUL

Where the court bill sought to aggrandize the executive arm at the expense of the courts, the Logan-Walter bill seeks to reverse the process and give the courts an unprecedented and wholly unwarranted power over the day-to-day functioning of the affected agencies. The result would harm not only the executive branch but the courts themselves.

Hear the independent testimony of the Brookings Institution:

"The ultimate consequence would be not only to swamp the (appellate) courts with a flood of minor administrative matters that have never been regarded as justifiable cases or controversies, but to retard and hamper the work of the executive branch of the Government to an intolerable degree. The control of the executive branch would be transferred to the courts, and the performance of all executive duties would be subjected to the supervision and control of the judiciary.

"Theoretically, this is contrary to the basic ideas of our form of government, which makes a clear demarcation between executive and judicial duties. Practically, it will destroy the efficient and expeditious operation of the executive departments and throw them into confusion. The cost of government would be multiplied tremendously.

LACK OF CONFIDENCE SENSED

"It is a significant fact that certain administrative agencies are expressly excepted from the operations of the law. While there is no objection to freeing any agency from the shackles of the proposed legislation, the very fact that some agencies (such as the Interstate Commerce Commission and the Federal Trade Commission) are to be exempted would seem to be an indication of a lack of confidence in the basic theories on which the legislation is predicated."

Properly jealous of its own place in the constitutional system, the the Supreme Court has yet shown its full awareness of the rights of the administrative agencies. This from Mr. Justice Stone, in one of his opinions, is pertinent to the discussion of the Logan-Walter bill:

"When the courts are faced with interpretation of the particular, administration breaks down and the manifest purpose of the legislature is defeated unless it is recognized that, surrounding granted powers, there must be a penumbra which will give scope for practical operation. * * * In carrying such schemes (for regulation by administrative bodies) into operation, the function of courts is constructive, not destructive, to make them, wherever reasonably possible, effective agencies for law enforcement and not to destroy them."

A. A. A. DISSENT PERTINENT

And again Mr. Justice Stone said, in his famous dissent in the A. A. A. case: "Courts are not the only agency of Government that must be assumed to have capacity to govern."

When the present Chief Justice, Mr. Hughes, was Governor of New York, he made a memorable speech at Elmira in 1907 in defense of pending State legislation for the regulation of public-service corporations. This was the speech in which he said: "We are under a Constitution, but the Constitution is what the judges say it is, and the judiciary is the safeguard of our liberty and of our property under the Constitution." But Mr. Hughes, pleading for the creation of a regulatory commission with broad powers, gave the other side of the picture as well. He might have been speaking against the hamstringing provisions of the Logan-Walter bill when he said:

"No more insidious assault could be made upon the independence and esteem of the judiciary than to burden it with these questions of administration. * * * Let us keep the courts for the questions they were intended to consider. * * * To say that all these matters of detail which will be brought before the commission * * * should, at the option of the corporations, be taken into court, is to make a mockery of your regulation. * * * You must have administration, and you must have it by administrative officers. You cannot have it otherwise. Under the proper maintenance of your system of Government, and in view of the wide extension of regulating schemes which the future is destined to see, you cannot afford to have that administration by your courts."

COX STATES ITS PURPOSES

In an illuminating colloquy in the House, Representative Cox, of Georgia, a leading proponent of the Logan-Walter bill, said it was framed primarily to "get" the National Labor Relations Board and the Wage and Hour Division of the Labor Department.

The obvious answer is that if Congress wants to "get," or curb the powers of any specific agency, it ought to pass a law addressed to the specific requirements of the case, and not, in the language of Dean Landis, of the Harvard Law School, apply the formula of the procrustean bed. The Logan-Walter bill would do precisely that.

Limitation of the Presidential Term

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD R. BURKE
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 23 (legislative day of Wednesday, September 18), 1940

STATEMENT OF GEORGE W. ROBNETT

Mr. BURKE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD the statement made today before the subcommittee of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary by George W. Robnett, executive secretary, Church League of America, of Chicago, Ill., on the question of the limitation of the Presidential term of office.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

While I address this committee as an individual citizen, I am prepared at the same time to reflect the views of a great many within and outside our organization—the Church League of America—whose impressions I have sought especially for this purpose.

I have anticipated that your committee is interested in learning the sentiment of the citizenry on two main questions, namely:

(1) Shall there be legislation to limit Presidential tenure for any single individual?

(2) If so, what form of restriction would be best suited for the purpose?

In order to obtain a cross section of sentiment upon these two questions, I have consulted a number of people from our committee of clergy, and also from our committee of laymen. In the instance of the clergy, I submitted these questions by letter and received more than 100 replies before I left to come here. These came from all denominations, and without exception they all favored a restricted Presidential tenure. In the matter of the laymen, I called a luncheon meeting in Chicago and invited a number of prominent citizens from all sections of business and professional life. These men were asked to express themselves freely upon these questions, which they did. Among those present, for instance, was Mr. John F. Voigt, recently president of the Illinois Bar Association, whose

address on the Constitution of the United States has become a classic. Mr. Voigt affirmed the importance of restricting the Presidential tenure and cited historical instances where leaders through great popularity (obtained usually by alms and subsidies from the public treasury) sought and obtained more and more power until the complete freedom of the people was lost. Mr. Voigt has been willing to make a statement on this subject, which I attach to this report.

Mr. Dwight Bobb, another constitutional lawyer, was present at this luncheon, and believed that a President should be limited to a single term of not more than 7 years and should not be eligible to succeed himself. Mr. Gordon Hostetter, executive director of the Employers Association of Chicago (a highly important organization) believed that a single term of 6 years would be a proper constructive and desirable limitation. Mr. Samuel T. Chase, whose father was one of the outstanding rebuilders of Chicago after the great fire, and himself widely known in business and civic circles, believed that the groundwork now exists for dictatorship in this country and urged that every possible precaution be taken to head off such a peril. He believed that the President should be limited to his tenure by some effective safeguard. Mr. C. J. Holland, prominent in the railroad-supply business, expressed fear as to what the breaking of the third-term precedent might lead to and in support of his fear of the present trend toward personal government, he quoted the sage advice of Lord Macaulay, written 100 years ago.

Mr. Whipple Jacobs, a young man who came up through the ranks to be president of the largest company manufacturing insulated wire, stated his interest in legislation that would help to preserve our Republic by keeping it a government of the people, by the people, and for the people. Mr. Edison Dick, vice president of the well-known A. B. Dick Co., stated that he was in complete accord with the statement of Mr. Frank J. Loesch which we shall quote hereinafter. Mr. Walter Crawford, formerly president of a bank in the Illinois coal-mining region and also formerly president of the Illinois Bankers Association, believed that we should have legislation restricting Presidential tenure and placing a curb upon any future President who might wish to extend his personal power indefinitely. Mr. O. A. Ross, a prominent Chicago lawyer, favored legal limitation upon the time any one man could serve as President. Mr. Wilbur Helm, formerly a professor at Princeton and Exeter Academy, and now in business, vigorously argued for legislation that would keep any President from becoming entrenched indefinitely. Mr. Helm believed that the breaking of the third-term precedent would be a major disaster in the life of this country. Mr. Robert J. Martin, who is in the public-accounting business, believed that we must go back to basic and moral principles of our forefathers and this, he said meant respect for the limited-term tradition of President. He favored legislation that would preserve this tradition. Dr. George Magill, Presbyterian minister and former college president, feared the psychology of an attempt at legislation unless it were successful—but he believed strongly that every effort must be made to preserve this great American tradition.

I wish, therefore, to report that among the many whom I consulted, and these included prominent Democrats as well as Republicans, I found almost unanimous sentiment for some way of guarding the office of the Chief Magistrate of the Nation from that individual, or that group who might become so impressed with self-importance as to be impelled to use the vast new instruments of power for self-intrenchment and perpetuation of tenure to the point of destroying the democratic character of our Republic.

Nothing, of course, has done so much to arouse this sense of alarm and consciousness of the need of protection as recent political developments. The dreaded third term is no longer a thing to be speculated upon academically. Like Hitler and Stalin, it has become a flesh-and-blood reality—and is regarded by many as an equally great menace to the democratic processes of our civilization. I can say to you that this new spirit of adventure masquerading in the form and spirit of the indispensable man has added wrinkles to the brows of our people in the Middle West. We out that way are rather suspicious of the idea that God has created or ever will create any one ordinary mortal whom he endowed or equipped especially to rule all other human kind. The great Master of life has apparently never considered any man as indispensable.

What I may say to you gentlemen, cloistered here in the halls of Congress, where you are accustomed to hearing learned dissertations and deep philosophic profundities, may indeed seem unorthodox. I imagine that experience would cause you to expect me to bring the repolished words of Washington, Jefferson, Jackson, Grant, Theodore Roosevelt, Harrison, Wilson, and others who expressed themselves forcibly upon this matter of Presidential tenure.

I shall do nothing of the kind. Instead, I shall bring you the words of men who have never been President nor who ever expect to be President, but who have as much stake in the bylanes of American democracy as any of these men ever had. I bring you the words of men whose voices have never been cultured in the classrooms of Harvard, but whose judgments have been whetted by hard knocks on the Great Plains of the Middle West. I bring you not the voices of politicians who seek office or pay rollers who wish to hold onto their patronage jobs, but the earnest views of honest men who want a chance to work and to live as free men under a government that will guard but not goad them. These people may not have read all the Marxian and neo-sociological literature of the latter-day scientists, but they do know that they want to keep their Government humble in its service and subservient to the people and not see it eventuate into a cruel, arrogant, and oppressive dictatorship or oligarchy. They believe that the claim to indispensability (which, of course, is the pretext for breaking down the walls of our third-term tradition) is spurious because such a reason is voided completely by the high uncertainties of life itself. The very fact that a man is here today and gone tomorrow makes it unwise to conclude that any one individual is indispensable to the destinies of a great nation.

I say this in order to dispose of the false equation of indispensability before we approach the main reasons upon which I shall base my recommendation for legislation to limit the tenure of any one individual as President of the United States.

We cannot ignore the outstanding fact that there has grown up in this country, as the result of the action and the expressions of men like Washington, Jefferson, and others, a tradition that one man shall serve no more than two terms as President. This has come to be regarded as an unwritten law or an unwritten part of the Federal Constitution. It has been so claimed by both major parties at times when the matter of a third term has seemed to be a possible threat from either side. This issue was raised by the Democrats in the case of Grant and by the Republicans in the case of Cleveland.

Men distinguished for their scholarly and cultural background, whose understanding runs deep in the philosophies of government and in the legal comprehension of our own constitutional structure, have appeared before this committee and I shall not attempt to review the historical and legal aspects which I know they have presented well. I come to you as an ordinary man who lives and mingles with the common people and has their views of life.

My plea for legislation that will restrict the time which any one individual may serve as President of the United States is simple and factual, and one that every citizen can easily understand, whether or not he may be versed in the lore of tradition and legal history. I bring you, not an academic argument, but a plea of emergency based upon new conditions and circumstances that have arisen during particularly the last 8 years.

I bring you a consensus of sentiment, as I have found it, which resolves itself into widespread apprehension that Federal bureaucracy and Government largess have, during the last few years, and during the last 8 years particularly, been extended to such huge proportions as to place within the grasp of any President leverage that he could easily use successfully to perpetuate himself in office indefinitely, if he were so minded.

Mr. Roosevelt himself has stressed the peril inherent in these "new instruments of power" which he said would be dangerous in the hands of the wrong person.

The third-term tradition has been regarded by many as a strong link in the chain of checks and balances which guards our system of government from the dynastic and despotic perils which sooner or later have infested other systems of government throughout the world and destroyed the individual freedom of the people.

This particular safeguard of limiting Presidential tenure by law has never been incorporated into statute or constitutional amendment for various reasons. Although attempts have been made in that direction such efforts have never been approved by both Houses. But we must remind ourselves that the emergent conditions which I have just cited have never prevailed before when such a legislative attempt has been made. It is likewise true that we have never before conscripted for a peacetime army either, so the fact that it has not been done does not argue against it now. I urge upon this committee the importance of vigorous and immediate action that will protect the people from the perils that are inherent in a continuous process of Government expansion where there is no legal limitation for the tenure of a Chief Magistrate once he is in office.

No better way, I urge upon you, presents itself at the moment than to make it impossible for any one individual to intrench himself behind the Federal Treasury and clothe himself with the raiment of perpetual power through quadrennial reelection.

No one can doubt that, under these new conditions, unless some legislative safeguard be placed upon the possible abuse of this leverage which in this new age has been placed in the hands of the Chief Executive, it will not only lead to the development of dangerous machine political power but will also lead inevitably to harmful regimentation of industry, agriculture, and our whole social structure. It would sooner or later hinder human initiative and destroy our traditional American way of life.

Mr. Frank J. Loesch, general chairman of the Church League of America, whom the Chicago Tribune and the Chicago Daily News have both eulogized editorially as "Chicago's First Citizen" has added the following statement in his own words to what I have said in this general résumé.

Referring to the subject which this committee has under consideration, Mr. Loesch says:

"I believe his [Senator BURKE'S] amendment to the Constitution to limit the President's term to one of 6 years is sound.

"I think the amendment offered by some other Senator and advocated in the Republican Party platform to limit the President to two terms of 4 years does not meet the evil. It is history that no sooner is the President in office than he plans for a second term and all other interests of the public are subordinated to that end. Every policy is advocated with this in view and to keep himself and his friends in office. And that holds true of a Vice President who succeeds a President. In only two cases, that of Theodore Roosevelt or Coolidge, was it successful. It failed with Fillmore and Johnson.

"I believe the 6-year term is long enough to shape a consistent policy and leaves the President to devote his time and talents to

the duties of his office and leaves him free of the pressure to work for a second term always put upon him by those in office or party who wish to profit selfishly by place and power.

"It has the added advantage of not causing a business upheaval every 4 years—6 gives more breathing spell and saves business millions of dollars of loss in the too frequently recurring Presidential elections."

Dr. Almer M. Pennewell, pastor of St. John's Methodist Church, Chicago, and chairman of the Committee of Clergy of the Church League of America, has authorized me to say for him that he believes firmly in restricting the time a President shall serve. He favors an amendment to the Constitution rather than a statutory law because the latter is too easily repealed. He would favor limitation to two terms of 4 years each as he feels that it is well to have the country take stock of itself each 4 years. Dr. Pennewell feels keenly that our precedent of limited tenure for the Chief Executive must be preserved.

From Bishop Frank E. Wilson, S. T. D., Episcopal Bishop of Eau Claire, Wis., and co-chairman of the Committee of Clergy, I quote the following letter:

"I believe it would be very advisable for some decision to be made about the term of the Presidency of the United States in order to avoid just such sharp questions as are now arising in regard to a third term. I would prefer to see us settle down to a single term of 6 years for the following reasons:

"1. It would give us a longer term of stable procedure between elections, with less frequent national upheavals which now occur every 4 years.

"2. It would give an administration a longer period to develop and work out a national policy.

"3. A single term of 6 years would prevent the possibility of a dynastic administration with a perpetual claim on ruling power.

"4. It would avoid the necessity of political activity aimed toward reelection and allow any President to concentrate on the immediate duties of administration.

"Further than that, I believe that 6 years is about as much as any man should be called upon to give if he is to display his maximum efficiency under the heavy pressure of Presidential duties.

"I shall be very much interested in the outcome of the present proposals."

From a Presbyterian minister in Kentucky I quote:

"I favor legislation restricting tenure of the President to get rid of bad Presidents."

A Baptist minister in Omaha, Nebr., says:

"Certainly we should have legislation restricting the tenure of any man occupying such high and important office as President. I see no reason in the world why a third term is needed."

From a theological seminary professor in Pittsburgh, I quote:

"My bitter opposition to a third term is not motivated by political bias, it is rooted in a deep conviction that it looks in the direction of life tenure, which means only one thing—dictatorship. * * * I would gladly vote for a statutory law or a constitutional amendment limiting tenure of office to one term of 6 years."

From a Lutheran minister in Wisconsin, I quote:

"You are going to Washington. May the Lord bless you. My feeling is that there should be legislation especially in times of political restlessness and confusion like ours. Perhaps it would be well to limit it to two terms."

A Methodist minister in South Dakota says:

"May God deliver us from a third term."

A Lutheran minister from Iowa writes:

"There should be legislation restricting the tenure of the President. He should be limited to one term of 6 years. This should not exclude reelection after an interval of 6 years."

I could continue these quotations indefinitely from both clergy and laymen, but the expressions I have given will serve as typical of wide sentiment as it exists today.

Conscription

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENNETT CHAMP CLARK

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 23 (legislative day of Wednesday, September 18), 1940

EDITORIAL FROM KNOB NOSTER GEM

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, one of the best country newspapers in Missouri is the Knob Noster Gem, owned and published by a very brilliant young man by the name of Dan Saults. During his recent illness the newspaper was temporarily edited by a very able young man, 21 years old, one of the most brilliant students in Missouri, by the name of Walter James Carr, Jr. At that time he wrote an editorial on the subject of the draft which seems to me to be so timely and so pertinent, coming from a young college man of his age, that I ask unanimous consent that it may be inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONCERNING THE DRAFT

This question of the draft is a much too radical departure from American precedent to be passed over lightly without sufficient debate. A calm consideration of the measure without any war hysteria is owed to the youth of the Nation. If the draft is unnecessary we don't want it. A few brass hats in the Army who have long wanted conscription have told us the voluntary system is inadequate. Contrast this with a statement recently made in the Army Recruiting News. This statement, incidentally, was stricken from the report somewhere along the line before anyone could see it. And no one would have ever seen it if Isolationist Senator BURTON K. WHEELER had not dug up the evidence. Reported in the deleted article was the following: "The Army recruiting program as a whole * * * is progressing at an excellent rate. Combined results to date * * * are ahead of schedule originally projected. Total enlistments during June were highest number made in 1 month in Army's peacetime history. An appreciable increase in production will help the Army to another new high record in July."

Today even before the Army's big advertising campaign has swung into high gear recruits are coming in at the rate of more than 1,000 a day. If the term of enlistment were reduced to 1 year, and the basic pay brought up equal to or slightly better than that given to those on relief, there is no reason to believe that this rate could not be tripled. If this were the case, the Army would have their 400,000 new men needed and as quickly as the draft could provide them, probably quicker than equipment could be provided.

Of course we can follow the other alternative and do away with the volunteer system. We can substitute the method of force and compulsion. We can draft the youth of the country and destroy the volunteer spirit. We can force them into camps, leaving many of them disgruntled and thinking they are being prepared for Europe's slaughter rather than American defense. We can draft a large number this fall and teach them how to march and how to fire .30-caliber rifles. But we can't teach them how to run tanks, how to shoot big guns, or even how to fire the Garand rifle; in short, we can't teach them how to fight because as yet we have no equipment for them. We won't have this equipment for months to come. This is true in spite of statements to the contrary. Facts and figures bear it out.

And while we're discussing the draft let's remember that France had universal service for years. France had the best trained army on the face of the earth. But when the test came the spirit wasn't there, especially among the officer group; and more important, the equipment wasn't there. Why can't we see the moral of the fall of France and the rise of Germany? Let's begin with a small well-equipped force and strive for efficiency. Then let's expand it as equipment is made ready. While that is being done let's eliminate the large amount of dead wood in the officer class which always accumulates during peacetime. At the same time let's democratize our army as was done in both Britain and Germany, where officers no longer look on enlisted men as social inferiors, and where officers and enlisted men use the same washroom, which is not the case on some of our American bombers. It's a strange paradox indeed to see the No. 1 dictator nation with a more democratic army than the No. 1 democracy.

But let's get back to the draft. Remember back in 1917 when we had the first draft without being any more prepared for it than we are today? Influenza got more of our soldiers than did bullets in France. It was necessary then, but it isn't today. Admittedly our time is limited, but there is every indication that England will hold out at least another year. This would give the volunteer system time to function and also give us time to get equipment. But even if England doesn't hold out for another year, there's nothing much we can do about it. Our men drafted into camps without guns aren't going to frighten Herr Hitler very much.

Money Instability and Its Economic Consequences

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 23, 1940

STATEMENT BY HON. ROBERT L. OWEN

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, every Member of the House should study with care the following timely and

fundamental statement of ex-Senator Robert L. Owen. I am pleased to include it here with my remarks:

MONETARY INSTABILITY AND ITS ECONOMIC CONSEQUENCES

(By Robert L. Owen)

The monetary unit of account by the act of 1792 was made the dollar and the decimal parts thereof. The Constitution authorized Congress to create and regulate the value of money.

The value of money in terms of other property depends on the volume of money in circulation and not on money which is not in circulation. Dollars not only comprise the unit of account but also the medium of exchange by which property values are transferred from one person to another.

The dollar serves also as a storage of value and comprise dollars which are hoarded as currency and as demand deposits, dollars which are invested as an investment in time deposits and savings accounts, and dollars invested in bonds, stocks, real estate, and other forms of property.

When the dollars are stable by virtue of the volume of dollars in circulation as currency and demand deposits, then there is stability in the value of investments of all of the above types.

When the volume of such currency and demand deposits is inflated or expanded so as to interfere with the stability of the volume in circulation, it has the effect of increasing the relative purchasing power, or exchange value in dollars, of real estate and all other forms of investment.

When the dollars represented by currency and demand deposits are contracted by whatever process, such as the contraction of bank loans and bank investments, or by the hoarding of currency and demand deposits, the reverse takes place, affecting the value of real estate; stocks, listed and unlisted; bonds; and the earning power of money through interest on unemployed money falling from a normal rate to an abnormal rate, such as at present.

When the volume of money in circulation rises above the normal amount adequate to the transaction of maximum business and the employment of labor it has the effect of impairing and diminishing the purchasing power of dollars in terms of commodities in the wholesale markets, as well as in all other forms of property, without any advantage to the economic life of a nation; and to the disadvantage of those whose investments are in forms of dollars invested in bonds and debts; and benefits unjustly and unfairly the debtors who would be able to liquidate their debt by the transfer of property whose value had been abnormally and unjustly increased. Contraction of the money supply reverses this process and is unfair to the debtors, destroying the value of their real estate, their investments in stocks and often in bonds, particularly bonds of domestic corporations which may be put into bankruptcy by such an unjust contraction of the volume of money in circulation. The consequences of this was seen in the destruction of values by the contraction of 1921 and 1932 up to date. The reverse took place when money was unduly expanded in the stock markets for speculative purposes, which culminated in 1929, when stocks reached prices far beyond their economic value through an inflation of credits employed in the stock markets. From 1922 to 1932, $50,000,000,000 of new securities were sold to the people of the United States in our domestic corporations.

It seems desirable to present a bird's-eye picture of what has taken place within the last 20 years, because we now have dependable statistics collected together by the Division of Research and Statistics of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System at great expense and time and labor. These statistics are of supreme importance in demonstrating the enormous losses due to monetary instability, which has resulted in losses of actual production and a failure to achieve equally great advantages through maximum production under a stabilized system. There is presented below a table for the last 20 years:

1. The volume of check money debited on the books of all the banks in billions. Since this check money transacts over 95 percent of the monetary business of the country, the currency in circulation is not inserted in the table because of its comparative unimportance in understanding what has taken place.

2. Value of stocks. Violent fluctuations of the value of stocks is emphasized when the extent to which the volume of stocks, listed, has increased is observed, going from about 200,000,000 shares listed on the New York Stock Exchange at the beginning of this period and reaching about 1,450,000,000,000 in 1939.

3. National income, in terms of billions with one decimal point, shows the manner in which national income rises and falls with the volume of dollars in actual circulation.

4. All-commodity index or price level, while rising and falling with the volume of dollars in circulation was not affected in the same degree in the years 1927–29 because the expansion of credit was almost exclusively, to the extent of about $14,000,000,000, in the operations in securities, in stock speculation, in brokers' loans, and in foreign money brought to America for speculative purposes.

5. Purchasing power of the dollar in terms of wholesale commodities. It is always in inverse ratio to the all-commodity index, or so-called price level. The standard price level of 1926 was established at 100 on a basis of $54,700,000,000 required to pay for the entire volume of commodities moving through the wholesale markets for that period. It represents a volume of money, and this should be kept clearly in mind as the basis of the index of the so-called price level. It represents the total annual price of 784 commodities moving in the wholesale primary markets and is not concerned with individual prices but only with the gross value in dollars of all commodities moving in the wholesale primary markets.

6. Ordinary revenues of the United States, profoundly affected by these conditions as will appear from the record.

7. Exports, affected in like manner.

8. Imports, affected in like manner.

Year	Check money turnover [1]	National income [1]	Stock values [2]	All-commodity index or price level	Purchasing power of the dollar in terms of wholesale commodities	Ordinary revenues of the United States [1]	Exports [1]	Imports [1]
1919	645	59.9		135.6	0.74	5.2	7.9	3.9
1920	699	72.4		166.5	.60	6.7	8.2	5.3
1921	569	58.3		93.4	1.07	5.6	4.5	2.5
1922	619	59.7		96.3	1.04	4.1	3.8	3.1
1923	658	69.7		100.3	1.00	4.0	4.2	3.8
1924	687	70.4		94.9	1.05	4.0	4.6	3.6
1925	788	74.8	64.19	103.0	.97	3.8	4.9	4.2
1926	838	79.5	65.59	100.4	.97	4.0	4.8	4.4
1927	915	77.4	67.27	94.1	1.06	4.1	4.9	4.2
1928	1,075	80.4	76.89	96.7	1.03	4.0	5.1	4.1
1929	1,237	82.9	81.73	95.3	1.05	4.0	5.2	4.4
1930	892	68.9	51.89	86.4	1.15	4.2	3.8	3.1
1931	667	54.3	36.38	73.0	1.37	3.3	2.4	2.1
1932	456	40.1	11.89	64.8	1.54	2.1	1.6	1.3
1933	424	42.4	28.29	65.9	1.52	2.2	1.7	1.4
1934	479	50.3	26.20	74.9	1.34	3.3	2.1	1.7
1935	534	55.9	27.78	80.0	1.25	4.0	2.3	2.0
1936	614	65.2	38.00	80.8	1.24	4.1		
1937	635	71.2	39.21	86.3	1.16	5.2		
1938	551	63.6	29.41	78.6	1.28	6.2		
1939	577	69.4	28.70	77.1	1.29	5.6		

[1] In billions of dollars.

[2] Average price per share in dollars, common and preferred.

National income up to 1929 is estimated by the National Bureau of Economic Research, and by the Department of Commerce for succeeding years.

Sources: Bureau of Research and Statistics of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, Department of Commerce, National Bureau of Economic Research, Yearbook for 1940 of the New York Stock Exchange.

We have no annual record for the value of real estate but the Census report for 1922 shows the value of real estate with improvements at $176,000,000,000, falling to $126,000,000,000 in 1932, and to $110,000,000,000 in 1937. It is probably at about the same figure now.

It will be observed that the losses above set forth in national income for the years following 1929 have exceeded $200,000,000,000, if 1929 is to be taken as a standard year. Dependable authorities estimate that the normal growth of productive power of the people of the United States for the last 20 years had averaged 4 percent, until the catastrophe of 1929. Potential improvement, due to increased electric energy, increased production of steam, improved machinery, and the growth of invention justifies the estimate that 4 percent would be a normal increase under conditions of monetary, economic, and financial stability.

The last 20 years have demonstrated the incapacity of private individuals and corporations, however patriotic and well-intentioned, to stabilize our economic and financial system. Our 500,000 domestic corporations have no adequate power to cooperate in control of the money supply, and they have no duty imposed upon them to attempt regulating the value of money. The only power adequate to meet this responsibility is the Congress of the United States under the Constitution using the Federal Reserve System which has the power to expand and contract the volume of money, and to regulate the value thereof by regulating the volume which may be required at any given time for maximum production. It may be fairly said that everybody in the United States who has any information with regard to the subject matter favors monetary, financial, commercial, and social stability, all of which are interdependent, and all of which can be stabilized by the Congress establishing a stable monetary policy, in which a ceiling would be established beyond which the all-commodity index should not rise, and a floor below which the purchasing power of the dollar in the commodity market should not fall. This can only be accomplished by legislative mandate properly implemented and under the instruction and direction of the Congress through a statute which from time to time may be modified as events justify.

William B. Bankhead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS H. CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 23, 1940

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a story of the life of the late Speaker BANKHEAD, as told by him to Mr. William H. Hendrix, published in the September number of a magazine a few days before his death.

The story is as follows:

[From True Story Magazine for September 1940]

I'M PROUD TO BE A POLITICIAN

(By the Honorable WILLIAM B. BANKHEAD, for 24 years Congressman from Alabama, and since 1936 Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, as told to William H. Hendrix)

A little while ago a man from my home district came to my office weighted down with woe. He is still a comparatively young man whom I have known since his youth. He related to me how his small business, a little store he had operated in his spare time from farm work, had gone to pot. Two years of poor crops had put him far in arrears with his mortgage. Lately, he had had much sickness in his family, climaxed by the death of his wife. Bills due the doctor and undertaker were unpaid. Crushed by his staggering burdens, he despaired over the frustration of his early ambition to get a college education and prepare himself for a career.

It appeared that about all the ill fortune that could come to a man had been visited upon him. As we sat and talked, it soon became clear that he had not come to me for advice on where to get financial assistance. It was simply that he was in a desperate state of mind, and wanted to unburden his heart to someone who would understand.

It didn't take me very long to discover that this man's most unfortunate loss was not financial; that debt was not his greatest danger. He had lost faith in himself—and that is the worst bankruptcy that can come to any person. His faith in the eternal goodness of things was shattered.

As I listened to him unfold his unhappy story, I found myself comparing it with some experiences of my own which closely paralleled some of his. His economic reverses brought to mind that gloomy night when I realized that my first 8 months as a lawyer had brought me exactly $64 in income. His bitterness over his failure to obtain an education reminded me of the burning desire of my own youth and early manhood for a theatrical career, and all but irresistible yearning that I abandoned only because for me to have gone on the stage would have broken my mother's heart.

And when he described his grief and sense of utter hopelessness when his wife died, there came to me vivid memories of that dark and awful day soon after the turn of the century when my own first wife died, shortly after our second wedding anniversary. Not only was I bowed with the sorrow that came with the loss of my beloved companion, but I faced the challenge of a mighty problem—caring for two infant daughters, Eugenia, 1 year old; and Tallulah, 3 weeks old.

And so I tried to prescribe for this man's need the thing that sustained me in my own Gethsemane—faith. Faith came to me as a birthright, and has been increased with the understanding the years have brought me. Faith in God, in one's nation, and in one's self. That is a rugged anchorage that will withstand any storm. It is a thing that can be defended with logic and proved by every test that time has provided. In that cruel hour, to me my faith in God, my reliance in His providence, brought comfort and strength to bear my grief; my faith in myself steeled me, steadied me to face the task of carrying on.

As I thus counseled with my troubled friend, I could almost feel the change taking place within him, as he struggled to regain his grip on himself. Since then, I have learned with great satisfaction that he is making a splendid, courageous come-back.

Circumstances of our family in my earliest childhood planted firmly in my heart the fundamental value of simple faith in a way that few children today, I am afraid, have opportunity to experience. Faith was, indeed, the only capital we possessed.

I was born in 1874. The chaos and poverty that followed the Civil War still gripped the region. Luxuries were all but unknown. Those of us who possessed the bare necessities felt thankful. When I hear people today complaining of some little obstacle, the lack of some little thing that they want but cannot afford, I am moved to smile at their plight, as compared to that which every family faced, back in the dawn of my recollection.

My father was a Confederate Army captain. He returned from the war to our little plantation to begin all over again, and nothing to start with. Conditions were primitive. How well I remember, as a little tot, hearing my father and mother talk of the privation that was our lot and the lot of everyone. After dinner they would sit under the dim glow of a kerosene lamp and discuss their problems. And yet, they never gave up—they kept alive the spark of faith to light the path of hope.

My mother combined the piety of Methodism, which she had embraced, with the more rigid disciplinary philosophy of Presbyterianism in which she was bred. So it was that, as soon as I was large enough to toddle around, I was taught both by example and by more painful and direct methods that I had best toddle straight.

Our home was at Moscow, in Lamar County, Ala. It was surrounded by cotton fields and swamplands. There, people just toiled and prayed and hoped. Though everybody had but little, their wants were few and on the whole I believe we managed to get about as much wholesome enjoyment out of life as most people get today.

It was there in the hills that I got my first taste of school life. As soon as I was sturdy enough, I began walking 3 miles down a muddy pathway to a log schoolhouse. School terms were 3 months long—if good luck prevailed and the patrons could scrape up the funds to pay a teacher.

It was there at my birthplace, too, that the first public honor was conferred on me. It fell to my lot to ride a mule to town to get our mail and that of our neighbors. I recall hearing my father say that I wasn't as large as the tiny saddle that I sat upon; but to be entrusted with such an important task was glory enough for me.

When I was 7, the first definite upturn came in the family fortunes. My father was made head of the Alabama prison system. We left our farm home in an ancient, creaky covered wagon, which was the only transportation system I had ever known, and set out for Wetumpka, where father would be stationed. We left the wagon at Tuscaloosa to take the train. Here I got my first look at a locomotive, and it was days before that thrill wore off.

This was in 1881. My father directed the prison system 4 years. In those years I played among and talked with the convicts—that is, the trusties who were permitted limited freedom in the open where I played. I used to tell my friends that I spent 4 years in the penitentiary very early in life.

My father was seriously concerned with prison conditions, and I can say with considerable pride that he launched the move toward prison reform in the State and helped direct attention to the need for reform in other States. I am positive that it was his ceaseless discussion in our home with mother about this or that improper condition that first interested me in public reform generally.

I recall especially one episode of those childish years which emphasizes the concern of my parents to implant in my mind a sense of fundamental values. It was the matter of my friendship with Old Silas.

Old Silas was a trusty. I never knew what his full name was. He was doing a stretch for stealing a horse. I guess I heard him tell his story a hundred times. According to his version, he swapped horses with a sharper who victimized him, exchanging a nearly blind, spavined worthless animal for Silas' own excellent nag.

Realizing he had been swindled, Silas resolved to right the wrong. He inquired around and discovered the sharp trader lived two counties away and habitually made his swapping forays, victimizing easy-going farmers. So, under cover of darkness, Silas went and reswapped, getting back his own good horse and leaving the worthless animal in the swindler's stable.

Silas contended that all he had done was right the wrong that had been done him. But his act didn't square with the statutes, so Silas was doing a term for larceny. One day I had some peppermint stick candy and proffered Silas a stick. He accepted it gratefully, and told me it was the first candy he had tasted in years.

I felt that perhaps I had transgressed by this chummy act, for I was not supposed to be too friendly with the prisoners. And so at dinner (we called it supper then) I told my parents what I had done. But my fear was groundless. I was not scolded.

My mother said to me, "Now, Will, that was all right. Maybe Silas is telling the truth about how he got into trouble. But even if he is telling the truth, he still did wrong, and he is now paying the debt because he sinned. But remember, like all sin, his may be forgiven, if he has faith in God and mends his ways."

My father nodded in agreement and added the remark, typical of his comment in those days. "It's high time we began thinking as much about what these men will be like when they leave here as we do about how to keep them busy while they are here."

There you have a picture of the atmosphere in which my earliest viewpoints were formed—the twinned reliance on God's eternal goodness and the acceptance of man's responsibility. A thorough consciousness of this relationship, I am sure, will help us solve our problems today just as it gave our forbears the strength and will to conquer forests.

When I was 11—in 1885—father quit his prison post and moved to Fayette, which was to be my home until I was admitted to the bar. We established our home there because father had determined to try for Congress, and Fayette was the hub of the district. It was from there that father first went to the House of Representatives, where he served 20 years, then rounded out his public service in the Senate.

I shall never forget that nominating convention back in 1885, the first political conclave in which I had a part. Politics was a wild, untamed thing in that era. The courthouse where the convention was held was thronged with Confederate veterans. Most of the delegates were veterans. The crowd had spirit, enthusiasm, and plenty of noise. When the argument would grow heated one of the participants usually let out a wild rebel yell and hurled his hat through the open window into the courtyard. This gesture was the signal for general pandemonium.

Because I was the son of one of the figures in the convention, I naturally was known to all the delegates, and by noon of the opening day they were calling me Will, and I strutted with importance. And it was right there that I was guilty of the only corrupt practice of my political life. Believe it or not, but I shall confess it right now: I was mixed up in bribery, and let him who will make the most of it!

The convention was deadlocked. I was playing under a tree, just outside the chamber where the delegates were arguing, sweating, and not getting anywhere with their nominating. Late one afternoon a delegate approached me as I was eating a pear. We had several trees in our yard, laden with fruit.

"Listen, Will," the delegate whispered to me, "if you'll bring me half a bushel of them pears tomorrow morning, we'll nominate your daddy—sure!"

Next morning I was on the job bright and early with the bag of pears. Finally my co-conspirator arrived. He gave me a knowing wink, accepted the pears and disappeared in the chamber. Mind you, I hadn't spoken a word to father or mother about my deal.

An hour after the convention assembled that morning, the deadlock was broken. Pickens County switched its votes to father, thus nominating him. I was playing outside the window when the delegate whom I had bribed leaned out and yelled to me:

"All right, Will. Your daddy's got it!"

Our home was quite a distance, but I don't believe that Nurmi today could excel the speed with which I dashed home to mother. I burst in on her as she was busy in the kitchen, screaming at the top of my lungs: "Daddy's got it!" That was all that mattered in the world, it seemed to me then.

But I began to feel worried about the pear episode, and so at dinner I confessed my sin. Instead of a spanking, my father laughed uproariously.

"All you're guilty of is cheating yourself!" he chortled. "The fellow you gave the pears to asked me yesterday if he might have some. I was too busy to bother with it, and told him to see you and make a deal. Now, if you hadn't been such a poor trader you could have got a quarter or 30 cents from him. This way, you didn't get anything."

So father went to Congress in 1886, and I began a crowded school program. Fayette had a one-room, two-teacher school with a high-sounding name—the Fayette Male and Female Academy—which had pupils of all ages from 6 to 25.

It was in my last year in this school, when I was 14, that I had an experience which I want to set down here. Now, I do not believe it is good practice for anyone to go about "wearing his religion on his sleeve," so to speak. But I do believe so sincerely that religion is an essential to character that I wish to say for the record that I embraced it early and have, throughout my life, been happy that I did so.

It was at an old-fashioned revival. We called it "the big meeting" back then. Evangelism with a direct appeal was the order of the day, and it was in this setting that I went forward and united with the church. For nearly half a century it has been my privilege to serve my church. Much of the time I have been a steward, or assisted in some other official capacity. Often I am called upon to speak from the pulpit or to lead in a prayer service. These things I regard as so close to the heart of America, so vitally important as a basis of our national greatness, that I am thankful to have performed my own humble role in the ranks of those who believe in God and regard Him as the true source of all that is good and worthy for humankind.

I finished at the Fayette school and entered the University of Alabama when I was 15.

It was at the university that my desire for a theatrical career first flamed. Though I was quite young in years when I matriculated, my entire life had been spent in an atmosphere of grim, practical reality, and I was pretty seasoned for my age.

And as my thoughts began to center on the future, I could see nothing for me except a stage career.

This desire grew and became more intense as I progressed with my college work. Hungrily I read the classics of the drama. In my room I would enact the great roles as I anticipated doing before audiences in a few years. And the thrill came when I almost felt that I could hear the applause.

My father disapproved the idea, which was discouraging. But it was mother's adamant "No" that forced me, unwillingly and unhappily, to put the urge aside, for the time being. I could not help feeling that I was abandoning the one thing that beckoned me to success. How ardently the young heart is set when it yearns for something.

But mother couldn't bear the thought of my going on the stage. She didn't say it in those words, but I know she felt that the theater was an abiding place for sin. Her heart was set upon my becoming a lawyer. Already, in her own mind, she was forming her own hopes for my future. Later in life I was to know that she had set her heart on my taking my place in public service. And still more years later, I was to realize—or at least, believe—that whatever dramatic talents I possessed found a more beneficial outlet on the great stage of life, in the labors I have followed, than could have been provided in the theater.

I was in the class of '93, a class that turned out a number of graduates who were destined to make history in Alabama, and elsewhere. It was a place of strict discipline, back in those days. It was a military school, and early curfew was the rule for the lads. There was no hanging around the streets—not for us. We were in our classrooms punctually, and our work was properly done—or the prexy found out why in stern, short order. Sundays we marched to church, then marched back to our dormitories.

I played fullback on the university's first football team, an aggregation that started early building a reputation for its "thin red line." I was center fielder on the old baseball nine, and took a hand in track events, too.

But I suppose it was more prophetic of what I was destined to become that I was active in debating, and once won the college medal for oratory. I was active in fraternity affairs, belonged to the literary society, and helped get out the first college annual.

When I finished in Tuscaloosa, I yielded to my family's advice and went to Georgetown to study law. I finished in the class of 1895, returned to Fayette, and was admitted to the bar. I started my law practice in Huntsville, in the office of the good Judge William Richardson, who for many years was a Member of Congress.

Eight months after starting out as a lawyer, I added up my accounts. It was then I faced the somber fact that my earnings had been just exactly $64. And if that slow start wasn't discouraging enough to a budding barrister, there still was the haunting memory of my first case in court.

Picture this: My first case was tried before a Negro justice of the peace. I don't remember all the details, but it was some litigation involving a blind mule. And I lost it.

It was a pretty sorry spectacle when I added it all up. So I decided that greener pastures lay elsewhere. I had a few dollars left from earnings as clerk to some of father's congressional committees while I was a student at Georgetown. I went to New York.

Soon after reaching New York—this was the autumn of 1896—I had my final wrestling match with my stage ambitions and put theatrical hopes behind me forever.

I had discovered that the path to legal recognition in New York was more difficult than I had imagined. Many other young law graduates were on hand, as I was, ready to pounce on any likely opening. I found that a long, poorly paid apprenticeship was a requirement. These disappointments brought a new decision: After all, what I wanted to be was an actor, not a lawyer.

While I contemplated the struggle that a law career would require, I canvassed the opportunities to get started on the stage. It was here that the yearning burned with new intensity—I must go ahead and act, I resolved. I so wrote to my mother. I reasoned that I was now mature, my academic education complete; I must find myself work of a kind that I craved. Just then I saw a newspaper advertisement which seemed to have been written directly in quest of me—a Boston dramatic company wanted a young man with a Southern accent.

I rushed to Boston and saw the manager of the company on a Saturday. We read the script of the play, which I liked tremendously. He talked to me a long time, then engaged me, and told me to report Monday for rehearsal. I was hired at last.

Sunday morning came and, with it, a special-delivery letter from mother. It was her final plea to me to abandon my stage plans. Between the lines, which were plenty emphatic, I could read a deeper meaning. I realized that it would break her heart if I went against her wishes. I never shall forget that Sunday. I sat there in Boston Common most of the day, rereading that letter and thinking long, long thoughts. But when evening came I had made my decision. I did not report for rehearsal.

But that Sunday I made a resolution that appears to have been prophetic. I promised myself that if ever I had a child of my own, and that child showed a desire to go on the stage, I should never oppose its wish. I often recalled that pledge in later years as I watched Tallulah, encouraging in her the flowering of the spark that had been denied expression in me.

It was not long after this that I abandoned, too, my plan to establish myself in law in New York. Both my father and my brother were insisting on my return to my native State, pointing out to me the opportunities that I had at first overlooked. And so it was that I returned to Alabama, with my law books, rather than my banjo, on my knee. In Huntsville, I became a partner in a law firm.

It was in Huntsville that I laid the foundation for what became a lifetime in the public service. It was there that I first devoted serious thought to public service—politics, if you prefer that term. I served as city attorney there. I went to the State legislature from there, and I served as solicitor of the fourteenth judicial circuit. But more important than those early posts was that there my first great happiness was to be attained.

It was while in Huntsville that I met my first wife, Ada Eugenia Sledge. Her home was in Memphis, but she was staying in the Huntsville area at the time.

The way of a man with a maid was much the same, I take it, then as now, except then we didn't have streamlined automobiles and ritzy night clubs as settings for our wooing. We strolled in the soft moonlight in the rural lovers' lanes. I remember one park particularly, just off the downtown area, on a bluff overlooking a small stream. Often we talked for hours there, leaning over the rail beside an old Civil War cannon that still was kept in its original position, its mouth pointing toward the river. And I remember how we used to gaze down on the water, and see reflected there the realization of our dreams of the future. I was full of ambition and the longing to achieve, restless with the plans that stir the young men of every era; she was equally ambitious and eager to help in the attainment of those ambitions.

Our friendship developed swiftly into love. We shared each other's hopes and inclinations in an ideal way. I remember with what delight we talked of the future, and of the many things we hoped to do that would make our lives worth while to ourselves, and of value to the world.

We were married January 31, 1900, in Memphis. How proudly I carried my bride back to Huntsville, and how I rejoiced when all my friends were entranced with her beauty and delighted with her charm and capability.

We were fortunate in our brief happiness in that we could not know how short-lived it was to be. A year later, Eugenia was born. Then one more year, and on January 31, 1902, Tallulah was born, and our happiness was complete.

But our joy was destined to be brief. For my wife was to make the supreme sacrifice of motherhood by giving her life for that of her child. She was stricken with a terrible illness shortly after Tallulah was born. In 3 weeks she was dead.

To go through such a valley of anguish as confronted me then is not only a supreme test of one's faith. It is a test that proves

the necessity of having such faith. Crushed by a blow that was all but unbearable, I emerged with this conviction: I not only must rise above my grief and despair, but I must carry on with more courage than ever the task that the will of God had made doubly hard by taking away my partner.

My mother and sister came to the rescue, taking care of my motherless babies. Sad and lonely years followed for me, but I found joy in watching the children grow up, and in the thought that I would always seek to guide them just as she would, had she been spared. My loneliness continued through 13 unmarried years. The girls were growing up by that time, starting their school careers.

In 1905, 3 years after Tallulah was born, I moved to Jasper, my present home, and entered a law partnership with my brother, John. This law partnership continued until 1916, when I was first elected to Congress.

It was in 1915 that the contentment and happiness that comes only from a happy home life was mine again. Florence McGuire, who was born in my old home town of Fayette, but who then lived in Jasper, my adopted home, came into my life. Her presence brought the first ray of sunshine into my unhappy, drab existence that had been there since that desolate hour 13 years before. Out of our companionship there soon ripened the love that meant a newness of life for me, a rebirth of hope, a new charging of my batteries of faith. To make the prospect more pleasing still, my children, who were "big little girls" now loved her with the same intense devotion that she lavished so spontaneously on them.

We were married January 16, 1915. Now, if I took time to make a speech right here, longer than any I ever made in the House, I could not express in it an adequate tribute to my wife. She adopted my children as her own, helping them through the difficult years as they completed their education, married, and established homes of their own. She was ever their counselor, friend, and confidante. And she has capably and lovingly filled that need that is denied to many men in public life. She has made a real home, whether it is here in Washington, or down at our real home in Alabama. The home is the most important cog in our labyrinth of civilization, and that ours is so perfect is a tribute to my wife. To her goes all the credit. And around her cluster the happiest memories of my children. She shared with me, always, the joy of encouraging Tallulah as she started out, and as she won her laurels on the stage. And she has shared with me in toiling over every problem that has come since we have been together. Truly, in the deepest, truest sense, we have been partners in the journey through life; and as partners we joyously face together whatever the future may hold.

The year after our marriage I entered Congress. If there had been any lingering disappointment over my frustrated stage ambitions—which there was not—my appearance on the national stage would quickly have overcome it. For here there was drama, more than any stage at any time could have offered. It was just as I was cutting my teeth as a Congressman that President Wilson came to us with his resolution that put us into the war. Never, on any stage, was there a more gripping drama than the President's appearance there on the floor that day. There have been many more such thrill-packed, dramatic moments in succeeding years.

It has been my privilege to have a role in this greatest of all shows for many years. As a Member on the floor of the House I had the satisfaction of serving my district and taking part in legislation for the well-being of the Nation. Later, as chairman of the Rules Committee, it was my privilege to occupy a position of greater power. Again, as leader of the majority on the floor, it was my duty to look beyond the fiery debate and discern, if I could, what was best for the Nation in the matter under discussion. As Speaker, it fell to my lot to sit in judgment on matters involving even more responsibility.

And so it is that, remembering my early stage ambitions, I do not feel that I missed any of the drama of life by abandoning the world of make-believe for the realm of reality in response to my mother's pleading. Instead of repeating through life the lines written by great dramatists, it has been my lot to write the lines, create the parts and enact the roles myself on the great stage of life. I can only hope that in the final review the critics will be able to find more to praise than to censure.

You asked me what is the most important thing the years have taught me; what lesson I have gained from my own experience that I would pass on to others. First, I would say that the years have taught me the importance of keeping unshaken one's faith in God, in his nation, and in himself.

As to politics, public service, the change has been swifter, faster, than in any other field of human activity. When, as a youth, I got my first glimpse of Congress, as a clerk, politics was a remote, impersonal thing to most citizens. People discussed politics only at election time, during campaigns. The Government was a thing far removed from the average man's daily life. The average Member of Congress received very few letters, and most of these were requests for garden seeds. Government, to the layman, meant a distant power that jailed post-office robbers and collected a few taxes when money was needed.

Contrast that with today. Now, there is hardly a human relationship that isn't affected in a dozen ways, directly, by some governmental edict or regulation. The Government today has to do with our health, our education, our security, our jobs. It builds highways and hospitals, has to do with pensions and bank deposits. Everything we do, in some way or other, involves some governmental agency; local, State, or national.

It is an excellent thing that this is so, because this growing intimacy between the individual and his Government has given the individual citizen a growing sense of responsibility in the proper operation of his Government. This, in turn, has purged the evil, sinister practices that in some places brought the word "politics" into bad odor a generation or so ago.

There probably were places, some time back, when political bosses in smoke-filled back rooms had much corrupt power over the political set-up. But today the field of politics has moved from those smoky back rooms into every living room in the land. The people, themselves, are the political bosses today, and that is a healthy, happy national condition.

The field of public service today offers more than it ever did in the past to the young men afire with the zeal to serve. There are so many more things being done by our governmental units today than in the past that there is a new challenge every day to the man who wills to do them.

But right here I want to state what to me is a most melancholy fact; yet one for which I do not see any remedy in sight. The field of politics, public service, demands more from a man and gives less in return than any other field of human effort.

If a man is honorable and spurns the chance to profit through the machinations of political position, and serves through his active years with ardor and devotion to the public welfare, in the evening of life he faces a period of living without resources—for he certainly hasn't been able to accumulate a fortune from a career of public service. He is thus what we might term an "economic lame duck." I've seen hundreds of them in my time, and they are tragic reminders of the fate that awaits many more, I'm afraid.

But to the young man who burns with the desire to serve his nation and his fellows, and who is willing to accept as his reward the satisfaction in work well done, the field of politics is more alluring today, I believe, than at any time in the past. This is true because there is more worth-while work to be done today than ever before, awaiting the hand of the man with the will to serve. But it is no place for the man who covets wealth. If he starts out with the hope of accumulating a fortune, then politics is not the field he should choose.

I can say with a feeling of deep thankfulness that I have been happy over my own opportunity to serve the Nation. True, I am not, nor shall I ever be, wealthy; but I have been enriched through the years with that compensation that comes from the knowledge that one is doing his part on the great stage of life, that he is playing his role faithfully and humbly. I have much to be thankful for. And if I was privileged to live my life over again I believe that I would retrace the steps very much as I have taken them.

To sum up in a word my own philosophy, gathered through the years, I would put it in one phrase: Keep bright and shining the lamp of faith and hope.

Recently I was talking of these homely fundamentals to a young New England chap who was contemplating a career in politics. Some friend of his father had advised him to talk to a veteran in public service before definitely making up his mind, and that is how he happened to be presented to me for the interview.

I went over the field with this young fellow, pointing out the really marvelous opportunity that politics offers today to the young man of ambition and the spirit of sacrifice. I pointed out to him that, at his age, most young fellows are thinking more of their personal fortunes, rather than entering what is often a thankless field.

But this young man had zeal. He was of a religious family, and had no special longing for wealth and position. He wanted really to serve.

And when he shook off my warnings and persisted in his contention that he really wanted a political start, I decided perhaps he was too cocky and might be successful, and go "high hat." That is another fatal malady that sometimes afflicts men in public life when they reach high places.

So I cautioned this young man about the danger of getting to believe you're good. Or, as we used to say down in Alabama, the danger of "getting too big for your breeches."

To illustrate my point that, no matter how high one goes, there's always somebody ready to show you how unimportant you really are, I told him the story of my own homecoming after my election to the Speakership.

Now, when I was elected Speaker back in 1936, I was the first Alabaman ever to occupy the chair, so the old home State naturally felt a touch of pride. And the fact that I was elected unanimously, the first man ever to be so elected, heightened the State's feeling. When adjournment time came, the folks back home decided to put on a welcome celebration that would be a corker.

Everybody in my home district, it seemed to me, was there in Jasper, my home town, a county seat of six of seven thousand population. The whole State had joined my district folks in staging the party. The town, and the highways leading into it, were festooned with flags. Barbecue was ready to serve the hungry thousands. The National Guard was out in its best bib and tucker. Name bands were on hand from New Orleans and Chicago. The boys had sent a special streamlined train over to Birmingham to pick me up, and bring me the last lap of the journey in style.

About noontime, an old resident of the hills, away above the town, appeared on the principal corner. It seems he had come to Jasper to see about his taxes. Suddenly he noted the crowds and the troops. Then he glanced at the gay, flag-bedecked streets. He was confused by it all.

Just then a constable, whom the old fellow knew, came by. The constable wore a wide sash across his chest with "Welcome Committee" in 6-inch letters. The old gentleman hailed him.

"Hey, Henry," he said, "what's all this fuss about? There ain't no circus in town today, is there?"

The constable beamed. "No," he said, "no circus, but WILL BANKHEAD'S coming home today."

"Well, I declare!" the old fellow mused. "So Will's comin' home, is he? Good boy—WILL BANKHEAD. I ain't seen him for 3 or 4 years. Last time I seen him I sold him a nice yearlin' I remember. So Will's coming home, y' say?"

The train whistled. "Yes," the constable repeated, "WILL BANKHEAD will be here in 5 minutes. That's his train now."

"Well, well," the old gentleman rambled on, "Good feller, Will is. Say, where in hell's he been, anyhow?"

Who Pays for the New Deal's Propaganda?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 23, 1940

ARTICLE BY HON. ROBERT F. JONES, OF OHIO

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by my colleague from Ohio [Mr. JONES]:

[From Liberty of September 14, 1940]

WHO PAYS FOR THE NEW DEAL'S PROPAGANDA?—A CONGRESSMAN FLINGS A CHALLENGE: ARE THESE THINGS WITHIN THE LAW?

(By United States Representative ROBERT F. JONES, of Ohio)

Contrary to law, and proved guilty of violating the law by its own evidence, the New Deal is operating a political propaganda machine which could teach Dr. Goebbels a thing or two.

The New Deal's propaganda is not prepared by the Democratic National Committee, although it ought to be; nor is it paid for out of the campaign war chest. This advertising, this argument and blandishment, spread by pamphlets, press releases, radio and motion pictures, and traveling exhibits, and out of the mouths of agents in the field, is spread at public expense.

I want to be wholly reasonable. I do not blame the new dealers for striving to remain in power. I know that political propaganda, good or bad, has a place in our political system. Every political faction and pressure group employs press agents.

But, until the New Deal took over the Federal Government, the political press agent and his products were always paid for by the party or group whose interests he served. It took this administration to make the people themselves pay to be propagandized.

Whether you are Republican, Prohibitionist, Democrat, or what not, you are paying to be told that the New Deal way of running the country is best. The cost comes out of the Treasury, out of tax money and borrowed money, and that, I maintain, is wrong.

It is more than wrong. It is illegal. Congress enacted a law on October 22, 1913, expressly forbidding Federal departments to hire publicity agents except when specific authorization and appropriation are provided by it. The chink through which the New Deal advertisers crawled into our cash drawer is the law's permission for the maintenance of information services. What Congress contemplated in making that allowance was a public convenience whereby citizens' questions would get helpful answers. Congress did not intend to permit the establishment of multiple staffs of special pleaders—press agents in fact—or it would not have made that very exact distinction.

But there they are, and at a cost to you of millions of dollars a year; exactly how much, nobody knows. The Bureau of the Budget says, "It would be a practicable impossibility to prepare a compilation of the actual costs under these heads over any period of years." However, I have a few figures. For example, under "Press services, radio broadcasting, exhibits, and motion pictures" this year we find: Federal Works Agency, $708,824; Henry Wallace's Agriculture Department, $698,168; Federal Loan Agency, $202,189; Paul V. McNutt's Federal Security Agency, $172,291; Harold Ickes' Interior Department, $128,633; and so on down a list of 26.

Let me hasten to record the fact that a goodly share of this money does pay for the writing of legitimate information. As to what the rest of it pays for, I won't make any accusation; I will let those come from Government sources.

The law of 1913 forbids the employment of Government press agents. In 1938 the report to Congress of Public Printer Augustus E. Giegengack complained that "there is a disregard of this law by some of the departments and agencies." By law, all Government publications are printed in the Government Printing Office, which would afford a check on publicity; but Mr. Giegengack reports to Congress that, in direct violation of the law, the Federal press agencies are using mimeograph and other duplicating devices.

"I realize," he says, "the advantages which can be taken of present conditions by the departments and agencies to get out propaganda of a type they would not submit to the Government Printing Office, and the waste of public funds involved in this superfluous matter."

In 1932 the blank paper purchased by all the Government departments combined cost $724,188. In 1935 the cost was $1,466,921. In 1936, an election year, it rose to $1,733,056. In 1937, with the New Deal safety entrenched for another 4 years, the administration had to have only $1,333,826 worth of blank paper. In 1938 came the crucial congressional elections, and the paper bill jumped to $1,403,729. The New Deal lost heavily, so it bought $1,658,733 worth of paper in 1939, and this year the bill is $1,775,470.

Last year the Government departments sent out 970,000,000 pieces of mail matter without paying postage. It cost the taxpayers $38,000,000 to have that mail sent to them.

O. K.! I know it; it was not all publicity. But neither was all the press agentry sent out by mail. Tons of it was delivered by hand to the press associations and the newspaper correspondents in Washington.

Let us take the Department of Agriculture as a laboratory specimen of Government press agentry. I don't single it out as the most horrible example, but simply because I have my filing cabinet open at A.

In 1940, Secretary Wallace himself informs me, at my request, his Department is spending $897,460 for publications, which does not include "the cost of preparing material for publication."

Engaged in preparing the Department's publications are 114 full-time employees, 61 half timers, 152 working part time. Fifty are engaged in making movies and visual exhibits. The pay roll totals more than half a million dollars, not including $175,000 in expense accounts.

These publications include the farm bulletins, which are a legitimate and valuable service. They also include—diving at random into the pile of exhibits in my drawer—mimeographed copies of a speech by Mr. Wallace to the American Political Science Association, in which he praises rural electrification and paved roads as an escape from "the monopolistic rackets" of the cities. He winds up with the opinion that "one of the great functions of the higher Government officials in a mature civilization is to understand the battle that goes on steadily between the better educated, overprivileged groups and those who are poorly educated and underprivileged to turn this battle into constructive service for the general welfare."

Figure that out for yourself as a contribution to the art of farming.

Let's dip in the drawer again. Here's a fat one, a 17-page press release marked "For April 27 p. m. papers": Mr. Wallace's speech before a mass meeting in St. Paul, Minn., called by the National Farmers Union and the National Federation of Grain Cooperatives; a speech which was broadcast by N. B. C. It is a defense of the transfer of the Farm Credit system to the Department of Agriculture. "We want no dictator from either Wall Street or Washington telling us what to do," Mr. Wallace says in it. "But we welcome a government which gives us the machinery for expressing our wishes through local leadership * * *. Fight for a better credit system. Fight to guard your farm program against every kind of attack." Fight for the New Deal, in short.

Next my hand closes on a chunky little volume called the A. A. A. Notebook, which reads like a salesman's guide, and proves to be one. It condenses all the Wallace arguments for A. A. A., so all the field agent has to do when confronted by a disgruntled farmer is to look up the answers in the index. Who and what are these field agents? Well, in my Ohio congressional district there are three in every township busily "selling" A. A. A. and the New Deal farm program with the help of these little sales manuals. They work in relays. Agent No. 3, the high-pressure member of the team, even has pictures of any stubborn agriculturist's farm photographed from an airplane, to illustrate where and how submitting to A. A. A. will bring in more money for less work. Besides, the picture is a nice souvenir, suitable for framing. The farmer would be a tough customer indeed if he did not feel flattered. However, there are some who are tough enough to baffle even the third-degree propagandist.

Each of most of the other departments has its Information Service, a staff of trained writers whose duties include the writing of speeches for the Department heads. Exceptions are the War and Navy Departments, whose Press Relation Bureaus are staffed with commissioned officers of the Intelligence Units.

Correspondence with Miss Frances Perkins, Secretary of Labor, left me baffled in an attempt to segregate the cost of publicity in her office, although it is one of the most prolific. Her writing staff is, from her description of the set-up, well concealed under assorted titles and categories. It does an effective job, however, in preparing attractive pamphlets.

Here is one entitled "Workers—How the Wage and Hour Law Affects You," which advises wage earners, if they think their pay is "less than it should be under the law," to get in touch with the nearest

wage-hour office, after working hours, promising that "your name will be kept confidential," and assuring them that "your employer will be violating the law if he fires you." It goes on to say that sometimes "a firm does not keep a record of hours worked and wages paid. Sometimes these are not true records." So employees are advised to keep their own records "in case you have to sue your employer." A successful suit means the employer will have to "pay you twice the amount due plus court costs and reasonable attorney's fees." Now, I am for every right and privilege that is labor's due, and I think a cheating employer should be treated like a common thief, but to my eyes the pamphlet quoted reads like a Communist manifesto.

Another Perkins opus is entitled "Women at Work," and advises employees to "fight for better conditions." It says women have always been active in labor movements and organized strikes since as early as 1824 and 1825. Then it tells how in 1936 and 1937 there were "many strikes in which women played their part. In the huge struggles in rubber, automobiles, and steel * * * women picketed, helped in the 'sit downs * * *'."

Why the emphasis on strikes throughout? I don't think it is commendable for the Labor Department to hire writers and artists, at public expense, to extol the sit-down strikes which disrupted this country 3 years ago. I haven't seen any employers' association circulate literature advising its members to "fight against better conditions." I speak in Congress for thousands of industrial wage earners, and I know the Perkins philosophy is not theirs.

Like most department heads, Secretary Perkins insists she employs no publicity writers, only "information" workers. So does Secretary of the Interior Ickes—outside his office. I have, however, photostat copies of his Department's budget sheets, a sheaf of which is labeled "estimated expenses for information and publicity." His 1940–41 budget calls for employing, for these purposes, 16 persons at a wage cost of $42,190 plus $1,900 for "contingencies." Assigned to his personal office are 6 publicity men at a total annual wage of $16,590 and 8 at $21,660 for radio broadcasting, 2 at $3,940 for motion-picture work.

In answer to my inquiry to the Department of Justice, I received a letter explaining that the Attorney General's "public relations" staff numbered eight persons who received a total of $29,600 a year. Most of the output consists of press releases describing in lay terms the law-enforcement accomplishments of the Department. That is all right—but the letter from the Attorney General's office contained this significant line:

"It should be pointed out that the Department of Justice, unlike some of the other departments, has no publicity unit."

Now, if the Department of Justice knows that other departments maintain publicity bureaus, then it is countenancing a violation of the law.

There is my preliminary case. I have thick envelopes of evidence for nearly every Federal Department, agency, authority, and bureau. Even if the Treasury's coffers were bulging with money, it would be legally and ethically wrong for the New Deal to use public funds to promote its own political theories and fortunes. But the Government is almost broke, and it has to go deeper into debt, at your expense, to pay for this press agentry.

It does worse than that. It takes money authorized by Congress for relief to spend on promotion stunts. Consider the United States Film Service, established merely by President Roosevelt's say-so. It has produced beautiful movies showing the New Deal's own idea of the New Deal's benefits to the Nation. W. P. A. allotted it $75,900 and P. W. A. $75,900—money voted by Congress to support 217 families on relief for a year—to make movies about unemployment!

Worse still, $850,000 of relief funds obtained on the floor of the Senate and House is being used by the New Deal's "How-am-I-doing" department. This agency, officially known as the Government Reports Bureau, is directly under the President. It compiles and summarizes news articles on the New Deal's activities every week, and once a month summarizes magazine articles, and circulates the digest in a mimeographed volume to the top jobholders. As this magazine goes to press, there is not a relief client assigned to the Bureau, although it is using relief funds that could keep the families of 1,200 unemployed sheltered and fed for a whole year.

Maybe it isn't unlawful, but it looks dishonest to me.

The American Column

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 23, 1940

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, recently there was organized in Bloomington, Ill., in my congressional district, one of the finest organizations I have yet heard of. This organization was fostered and given life through the efforts of Mr. Art Kane and Mr. Oscar Hoose, two prominent patriotic businessmen of the above-named city. The formation of the American Column was started early in June of this year. Already there are over 7,000 members in Bloomington in the first unit, and there are several thousand other members in the various units which have been formed in Illinois and elsewhere throughout the United States.

The American Column has a real purpose and objective, namely, that of promoting true Americanism, love of country, and the formation of patriotic groups to defeat un-American thought and activity.

Sponsor of this movement is the Louis E. Davis Post, American Legion, Bloomington, Ill. Already the American Legion, Department of Illinois, has adopted the plan, with the hope that other posts throughout the State and Nation will do likewise.

Mr. Speaker, this is a most worth while and deserving organization, built and fostered by unselfish Americans, who, like all of us here, have but one common interest, which is the preservation of our great Nation. Membership is limited to male Americans over the age of 21. There are no dues or assessments, and it is nonmilitary, nonpolitical, and nonreligious.

It is a privilege for me to call the attention of the House to this newly formed patriotic body of American citizens. Knowing of the interest in this fast-growing movement, I am, by consent given me by this House, including in my remarks the "principles and purposes" of the American Column:

PRINCIPLES AND PURPOSES

The declaration of purposes and principles of the American Column follows:

"With a definite and earnest pledge of sincere allegiance to America, a firm conviction in its democratic principles, an unswerving loyalty to its traditions, an unconquerable devotion to its time-tested blessings and, above all, an imperishable faith that our Nation will continue to be guided in the paths of liberty and justice for its people we join ourselves in a patriotic alliance for our country.

"We believe in these things:

"1. That America is and must continue to be the best place in the world in which to live and labor.

"2. That within its borders there is no room for those who have even a single counterfeit patriotic thought.

"3. That anything less than complete, thorough, and genuine allegiance to this country of any individual or group of individuals who enjoy its blessings is treacherous and should subject them to public condemnation.

"4. That there cannot be tolerated here any fractional Americanism; it must be whole and flawless or it is not such.

"5. That in all dealings between man and man, and between man and government there must be tolerance and consideration, but that such tolerance and consideration must be mutual.

"6. That the constitutional rights of freedom of speech, of the press, and of assembly shall not be denied to anyone provided those rights are not exercised to defeat the very purposes which brought them into being. The right of one person in these things ends when it becomes a wrong to some other person or to the community, State, or Nation.

"7. That in times of national stress, hysteria occasionally asserts itself. As a result, innocent people suffer and are unjustly accused. It should be the province of real Americans to protect their honest and true fellow citizens from unjust criticism and condemnation, as well as to accuse and prosecute those who are un-American in thought or deed.

"To the end, therefore, that true Americanism may continue, that our institutions may survive, and to better serve our Government, we solemnly pledge ourselves as follows:

"1. To completely and definitely promote the cause of true Americanism and to that end, only as the regularly and legally constituted authorities shall determine and direct, assist in the overcoming of subversive and un-American thought and activity in a sane and orderly manner.

"2. To favor and promote the enactment of legislation which has as its basis the curtailment and punishment of all subversive and un-American activities.

"3. To prosper the cause of patriotic education not only in public institutions but in private conversation as well, to the end that those not fully cognizant of the blessings of American citizenship may not be led astray by the teachings and urgings of those who seek to undermine or overthrow our Government.

"4. To enlist in the youth of our Nation admiration and respect for our Nation's flag and the purposes for which it stands."

1940 American Legion Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN J. KENNEDY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 23, 1940

ADDRESS BY ARCHBISHOP FRANCIS J. SPELLMAN CALLING THE AMERICAN LEGION TO DEFENSE OF NATION, SUNDAY, SEPTEMBER 22, 1940

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, we have always taken a deep interest in the annual convention of the American Legion. This year, because of the troubled world conditions and in view of our recently enacted program for national defense, the proceedings of the convention now in session in Boston are being closely followed by every serious-minded person. The address delivered to the delegates by His Excellency, Archbishop Spellman, of New York, is, in my opinion, a most valuable contribution to the pressing and timely subject of national defense. The archbishop, spiritual head of a great archdiocese, speaking as a citizen gave forceful expression to the patriotic sentiments that must be in the heart of every loyal American.

It might be well for every citizen, regardless of his race, creed, or color, to read the inspiring address of the archbishop because it is based on our most sacred national tradition—love of country and fellow man.

I wish to thank the Members of the House of Representatives for giving me unanimous consent to insert the address in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and to congratulate the editor of the New York Times for printing the complete text in this morning's paper.

It was most fitting that this address should be delivered on Sunday in the historic city of Boston in the shadow of the Bunker Hill Monument and within a stone's throw of Faneuil Hall, the "cradle of liberty."

The address follows:

Mr. Chairman, Legionnaires, ladies and gentlemen: There is a fitness in your choice of this place for your assemblage on the first day of your national convention. You are gathered beside the Charles River, the river to which the poet Longfellow repaid with a song the help he had drawn for his spirit from its stillness:

"Thou hast taught me, Silent River,
Many a lesson deep and strong."

We who crowd the margin of this stream on this autumnal night may also learn a lesson—that calmly and without hysteria we may prepare to preserve and defend the peace of our land. This, for us whose minds yield to its spell, is the admonition of the deep and quiet waters of this river "stealing onward like the stream of life."

We have met in the open with the sky as our roof. Looking upward on this dark night of humanity's sufferings, we seek hope in the heavens, and thence not merely a tiny ray but a whole flood of light descends upon us. On the same stars that now shine down on us locked St. Augustine centuries ago, and to his silent questioning they answered: "We are not the God whom thou seekest. He made us."

Yes, the stars proclaim in luminous, inerasable language the existence of God. These stars navigate the firmament in a certain definite way, and the plan, the progress, and the order involved in their movements presupposes an intelligence which could not come from matter or from chance. And this intelligence vast enough to regulate the orbits of heavenly bodies we know by the name of God.

God is that same first cause who designed our bodies, masterpieces resulting from the union of a hundred other masterpieces coordinated in such a manner that despite their separately complicated natures they function with an amazing harmony of action. Every fiber of our bodies, every power of our souls, proclaims the existence of God, and though other pillars upon which our lives are based may have tottered, we still have God, the supreme master of order, and firm is our confidence that through Him, out of the present turmoil, will come order and peace.

RECALLS WORLD WAR TASK

Lights lesser and nearer than the stars beam upon us. These are the lights of old Boston town, lights of hospitality and friendship and lights of freedom, for in convening in Boston we have come to a historic place where American independence was first asserted, when, sped by lantern's flash, the midnight messenger of liberty raised the alarm the sound of which at critical periods still rings and is heard in our land.

This river at the point where we are gathered is close to its outlet in the sea, and the sea for you of the American Legion is of epic memory. Gathered at the rim of ocean, it is natural that your minds should go back in thoughtful retrospect to that heroic embarkation of your youth upon the broad waters of the Atlantic so fateful for yourselves and so providential for our country.

Beyond the seas was France, where battle awaited you, into which you threw the strength and courage of your young manhood with such an impetus as to turn the whole tide of the war; nor did you rest until peace was returned to the world, which at its announcement went delirious with joy.

When the combatants put down their arms historians took up the pen to expose the origins of the sanguinary struggle, and many causes of the war were listed in books that have been published in the last two decades. By these authors the World War was explained in its beginnings by the rivalry of nations for power and wealth, their quest for territorial expansion and imperial domination, their seeking of new markets and outlets for capital investment, their competition in exploiting backward people, motives, all of them, materialistic, sordid, and ignoble.

If these were the underlying causes of the World War, you knew nothing of them. These were not the motives which stirred your minds and inspired you with the will for victory. Yours was an unselfish crusade. You fought for pure and high ideals.

The spark that flamed you into patriotic fervor was flashed by the President of the United States, and you judged it your task, whatever the sacrifice, to bring to accomplishment the ardent hopes that our Chief Executive had formulated in matchless sentences vindicating the inviolability of small nations, the security of democracy and a world rid of the threat and actuality of war. Even though secretly mocked and later openly thwarted by foreign statesmen, these principles were sincerely proposed by President Wilson and by you as sincerely accepted.

Let historians, economists, sociologists, and philosophers who explore human conduct decide among themselves the reasons for the outbreak of the World War; but for a confirmation of my recollection and my understanding of the reasons for our own involvement I shall not resort to books. I shall turn to living witnesses, to you, men of the American Legion; and to my query, why America threw its power into the contest, you will tell me, as you have told your sons, that for them and for all the children of men you braved every peril that they might inherit and possess a world that would not know the evil of war, since the causes leading to war had by your determined valor been removed.

For the disruption of peace, for the calamitous miseries that now oppress mankind, for the sorrows that we fear are yet to come, the responsibility must be placed on others. There can be no revindication against you; for you took no land that had to be reclaimed, you committed no economic wrong that had to be rectified, you suppressed no political liberties that only an uprising could restore. Your honor is forever secure. In military annals you belong to the company of the most knightly who fought without fear, without reproach, and without thought of personal gain or national expansion.

Despite the failure in the realization of our aims in the World War we still remain idealists. To be otherwise is impossible for Americans. But experience has taught us a measure of realism. We know now that we cannot draw the boundaries of States on the map of Europe so that race will never transgress upon race. We know now that we cannot bestow our democratic institutions on peoples opposed by natural feelings and traditions to our political system.

We know now that we cannot continue to remain unarmed when other countries have not imitated our peaceful example. We know now that it is our pressing duty to defend ourselves, our lives, our liberties, and our institutions. Interventionists, isolationists, and those whose political thought lies between these two extremes all agree and must agree on the policy of national defense.

What is worthless needs no guards set about it. The more valuable an object the more it calls for protection. Treasure is kept in secret vaults. A city is patrolled by police. A home is locked and barred against intruders. If in this world there were no greed and envy, no violent actions to enforce illicit desires, these precautions would not be necessary.

Nations do not differ from individuals, and although we have envied none, have wronged none, and have coveted nothing, although we have shared our abundance with a distressful world and have felt ourselves charged to do so before God and men, we have the fear that in many cases our charity has not been requited, our good will has not been reciprocated; we have the additional fear that our national wealth and our national way of life may have aroused envy in others, and this envy might incite actual attempts to conquer us by force of arms, to take from us that which belongs to our people.

For who can gainsay as he envisages on the one hand the vast natural resources of our land and on the other hand the present rapacious temper that is abroad, quickened and emboldened by modern mechanical invention, that it would be worse than folly if we did not immediately proceed to build about ourselves a strong

defense that will discourage any possible effort that might be made against us.

It is better to have protection and not need it than to need protection and not have it. We Americans want peace, and it is now evident that we must be prepared to demand it. For other peoples have wanted peace, and the peace they received was the peace of death. Our good will and the sincerity of our desire for peace have been demonstrated to the extent of sinking our own battleships. We can no longer afford to be moles who cannot see, or ostriches who will not see, for some solemn agreements are no longer sacred, and vices have become virtues and truth a synonym of falsehood. We Americans want peace, and we shall prepare for peace, but not for a peace whose dilemmatic definition is slavery or death.

Valuable as are our material possessions, more precious still are our liberties. For these blessings of a higher kind no less than for our national wealth are we indebted to God. This truth was forcefully enunciated by the Catholic bishops of the United States assembled in the Third Council of Baltimore in the year 1837: "We consider the establishment of our country's independence," the bishops said, "the shaping of its liberties and laws, as a work of special Providence, its framers building better than they knew, the Almighty's hand guiding them. We believe that our country's heroes were the instruments of the God of nations in establishing this house of freedom."

These are impressive thoughts prompting gratitude to God and a deeper appreciation of our inherited liberties. For religion, which traces the sources of all our blessings to a divine Author, has always added its force to patriotism when our Government has summoned our citizens to the country's defense so that those who have sprung up at the call have felt themselves doubly inspired and doubly armed.

Of this twofold influence of religion and patriotism have I been conscious in all the thoughts I have expressed to you on this occasion. The invitation to address you was directed to me as the bishop of the Catholics in the Army and Navy of the United States, and in this capacity and as an American citizen have I spoken to you.

I am proud to address the men of the American Legion, and I believe in you. I believe you mean a great deal to America and that America means a great deal to you. You men cannot conceive of an organization calling itself American that challenges the constitutionality of a bill providing that no Government position in a State may be held by anyone who believes in the overthrow of the Government by force. And yet there is such an organization. You cannot imagine an organization which openly teaches disrespect to the American flag and under the pretense of freedom of religion engages paid workers to go from house to house to attack the religion of others. And yet there is such an organization.

By vocation I am a man of peace. I am consecrated to Christ, the Prince of Peace. Unceasingly, day and night, I pray and I ask my flock to pray for peace. "There is nothing to be gained by war that cannot be gained by peace," was the warning of Pope Pius XII on the eve of the outbreak of the present European conflict. I am a man of peace and I pray and hope and work for peace. Not knowingly would I injure anyone.

I am a man of peace, but gone is my hope of building a world safe for democracy on such foundations as the Treaty of Versailles. Vanished, too, is the mirage of many philanthropic optimists who cherished the vision of a world united in peace and fraternal charity beneath the aegis of science divorced from religion and around the altar of Godless education. Blasted is the dream of a communistic universal brotherhood—blasted by the tell-tale rattle of machine guns and the roar of cannon over Finland.

Science, knowledge, communism, these three great hopes of men, these three great deified abstractions have wavered and failed beneath the pressure of human prejudice and selfishness and the spirit of cruelty and wickedness in high places. A great scientist, himself a refugee from the deification of race and blood, has stepped beyond his depth and suggested that mankind abandon belief in a personal God. That is just what men have done and are doing and the net result is written in the bomb-mangled bodies and the decree-shackled minds of Europe's suffering millions.

What is the answer? There is only one road to peace that I know of, the highroad of democracy, the road marked by the signposts of the Ten Commandments, the road back to Christ and His teachings, in personal life, in national life, and in international life.

This is the road to peace. This is the road for America to take. This is the road our forefathers took when they lived and died for our national independence. This is the road you and your comrades took when they lived and died for the national independence of other countries. This is the road that we shall travel if we are to live in peace, a government of the people, by the people, for the people.

If through indifference or negligence, if through penetration or permeation from without or corruption or disintegration from within, it shall come to pass that some day some conqueror of democracy shall stand at the tomb of George Washington in Mount Vernon and with mock reverence and double-meaning cynicism salute our country's founder with these words: "Washington, we are here to finish your work." God grant that I, for one, shall not be alive to know it.

May God bless the United States of America.

A Modern Caesar

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 19, 1940

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, another "country editor," Mark P. Haines, of Sturgis, Mich., is one of that great class of owners and publishers of newspapers in the smaller cities of the land who keep their feet on the ground, their heads out of the clouds; who use common sense and good judgment; who are not deceived or bedazzled by what they hear over the radio, read in the city papers. He gives us an accurate picture of America's would-be Caesar, who, in Chicago, nominated himself as the candidate of the Democratic Party. Our modern Caesar, who has all of the ambition, though lacking the ability, of the Caesar of old, tried to purge loyal members of the Democratic Party who refused to accept the role of rubber stamps. He is now seeking to fool the people into electing him in November for a third term. He will, if he lives and succeeds, undoubtedly be seeking a fourth and a fifth term in subsequent Novembers, for, so long as he is President, America will never cease to be confronted by an emergency.

Here is a characterization of him from the Sturgis (Mich.) Daily Journal of September 19, 1940:

A MODERN CAESAR

"Brutus: Ay, Casca; tell us what hath chanced to-day, that Caesar looks so sad.

"Casca: Why, there was a crown offer'd him; and being offer'd him, he put it by with the back of his hand, thus; and then the people fell a-shouting.

"Brutus: What was the second noise for?

"Casca: Why, for that too.

"Cassius: They shouted thrice; what was the last cry for?

"Casca: Why, for that too.

"Brutus: Was the crown offer'd him thrice?

"Casca: Ay, marry, was't, and he put it by thrice, every time gentler than other; and at every putting-by mine honest neighbors shouted.

"Cassius: Who offer'd him the crown?

"Casca: Why, Antony.

"Brutus: Tell us the manner of it, gentle Casca.

"Casca: I can as well be hang'd as tell the manner of it: it was mere foolery; I did not mark it. I saw Mark Antony offer him a crown—yet 'twas not a crown neither, 'twas one of these coronets—and, as I told you, he put it by once; but, for all that, to my thinking, he would fain have had it. Then he offer'd it to him again; then he put it by again; but to my thinking, he was very loth to lay his fingers off it. And then he offer'd it the third time; he put it the third time by; and still as he refused it, the rabblement shouted, and clapped their chopt hands, and threw up their sweaty nightcaps, and utter'd such a deal of stinking breath because Caesar refused the crown, that it had almost choked Caesar; for he swounded, and fell down at it."

The timelessness of Shakespeare's insight into the hearts and motives of men is indicated in the excerpt above taken from his play of Julius Caesar.

Julius Caesar was a popular idol. He had led the Roman legions in a victorious war with the hordes of barbarians that threatened to swarm over and destroy the Roman Empire. He had returned to Rome in triumph with many prisoners and much loot, to be acclaimed by the populace. There was a movement afoot to draft him for a king.

It is not too difficult for a discerning mind to see the close analogy between the predicament of the Roman Caesar and that of a modern Caesar who has been offered the crown (nomination) for a third time, and awaits only the verdict of the people to accept it.

Even in those long-ago days there was public resentment, and the people became suspicious of such inordinate ambition. They sensed the reluctance with which Caesar pushed the crown and temptation away.

Fortunately, the American people still have a peaceful weapon with which to curb the craze for power that seems to afflict certain men of destiny. The ballot box is still available and on November 5 every United States citizen has the privilege of expressing his opinion as to the wisdom of continuing a President in power for a third term.

Already this American Caesar is drafting his legions. In numbers and amount that far exceed any reasonable need for home defense

he is creating a military establishment that is geared for an aggressive foreign war.

Can it be that Franklin D. Roosevelt does not wish to relinquish his high office without the added distinction of being a war President? Was that the motivating reason that induced him to undertake to violate the tradition that no American President has ever been elected to a third term? Gen. Hugh Johnson thinks that it was.

With so much power concentrated in his hands over the lives and property of 130,000,000 American citizens, is there anything in President Roosevelt's record or character to reassure the public that he will not use it in a great military adventure on foreign soil?

The President's background, his Messianic complex, his recklessness with other people's money and property all contribute to a conviction that it would be courting national disaster to submit him to such a temptation. With millions of trained soldiers available it would be too much to expect that a man of Roosevelt's impulsive and irresponsible disposition could resist the urge to use them.

If we are headed for war, either defensive or aggressive, what kind of leadership might we expect from a President of Roosevelt's type? What can be said for the judgment of a man who would overlook the obvious qualifications of a Louis Johnson as Secretary of War for a 72-year-old Stimson, whose only recommendation was political expediency? What about the wisdom of naming as Secretary of the Navy a newspaper publisher who was the Republican candidate for Vice President in 1936, but with no experience in naval operations. When, indeed, has the President ever demonstrated any aptitude for selecting competent men and women for the tasks of Government? What kind of war administration would we be likely to get from men of the type of Harold Ickes, Harry Hopkins, Tommy Corcoran, and the lady member of the Cabinet, Mme. Perkins?

These are the questions that every American citizen must ask himself when he goes into the voting booth to cast his ballot on November 5. The choice is still ours. With Roosevelt entrenched for a third term, which, when completed, will make 12 years in the White House, who can be so sanguine as to predict that war is not inevitable?

Willkie Disappoints

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 23, 1940

ARTICLE BY RAYMOND CLAPPER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include the following article by Raymond Clapper, from the Washington Daily News of September 20:

[From the Washington Daily News of September 20, 1940]

WILLKIE DISAPPOINTS

(By Raymond Clapper)

By two tests, the Willkie campaign falls so far short that grave doubts are raised, at least with me, about the kind of job he would do as President.

One test is Willkie's success as an organizer. The other test is to be found in the policies upon which he offers himself for the job. By neither test does Willkie seem to live up to earlier expectations of at least this one of his friends.

At the time he was nominated, Willkie was a highly successful lawyer and business executive. His published utterances, such as those in Fortune magazine, gave evidence of an understanding grasp of national problems. He was equally impressive in private conversations. In all, he seemed, as did Herbert Hoover in 1932, exceptionally well qualified to be President.

Public life is different from private life, and Willkie is entitled to have time in which to hit his stride. But that time must be about up.

The Willkie campaign has been notorious for disorganization. Seldom has there been more chaos in a Presidential campaign. Congressional cloakrooms echo with stories of confusion, hurt feelings, unanswered telegrams and letters, crossed wires, and general demoralization. Willkie is carrying his campaign in his hat. This condition is well known, and is a subject of incessant discusson among politicians here and among newspaper correspondents on the Willkie train, which seems to operate with all the confusion of an amateur road show.

There are always some confusion and friction in a Presidential campaign. But this one is so loose-jointed that it indicates poor direction at the top. If the Willkie administration in the White House functioned with no more unity, coordination, and effectiveness than the Willkie administration in the campaign, then the Government would be almost paralyzed.

The Presidency is more than a business office. It is a political office also, and I don't mean that in a tricky sense. The art of herding an army of politicians and public officials and second-string prima donnas into effective handling of the enormously complicated public business centered at Washington requires more than Willkie has shown in the management of his campaign.

By the test of his policies, Willkie is falling short of the standard which he set for himself earlier.

His start was a brave one in which he disregarded expediency and stood for essentials in foreign policy, which encouraged his friends. But he has dropped his standard and has now reached the point of making narrow-minded appeals to sectional interests. He is using Argentina as a whipping post at a time when we are striving to keep that country from falling completely into the totalitarian orbit. His thrust at the Argentine sanitary convention was unnecessary, and if he carried his attitude into the White House our situation in Latin America would be done serious harm.

Willkie also said, out in the cattle country, that one way to rehabilitate our domestic economy would be "to have the American Navy eat American beef instead of Argentine beef." That was an attempt to reawaken the storm of indignation in the cattle country over the Navy's purchase of about $7,500 worth of tinned Argentine beef a year or so ago. It was fishing for votes at the expense of our interest in Latin America, and it was needless; Willkie evidently didn't know that Congress later passed a law forbidding the Navy to buy foreign beef. If that is the way to rehabilitate our domestic economy, as Willkie suggests, then it has already been done long ago.

The irresponsibility of some of Willkie's other recent talks already has been revealed by his own corrections. He seems to be suffering from a combination of misinformation and bad judgment. If that, coupled with the confusion which he seems unable to eliminate from his campaign organization, gives a fair sample of what Willkie would be as President, then it leaves much to be desired.

Twentieth Convention of the International Association of Machinists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM T. SCHULTE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 23, 1940

ADDRESS BY PAUL V. McNUTT

Mr. SCHULTE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following full text of an address by Paul V. McNutt, Federal Security Administrator, before the twentieth convention of the International Association of Machinists, at Cleveland, Ohio, September 17, 1940:

I want to tell you first of all that I am glad to be here today. Glad to be on this platform with Emmett Davison and other close personal friends. Glad to talk to an organization that represents the finest and best traditions of the trade-union movement.

You have a right to be proud—proud of the strength and integrity of your union—proud of its long record of service to the cause of labor and of service to your country both in peace and in war.

I can tell you this: There is no one in Washington, from the President of the United States on down, who has one single doubt about the machinists. Everybody knows the willingness of this organization and its members to give the full measure of devotion and sacrifice to insure the safety and security of this Nation.

I want to talk a little while about some of the things that seem to me important, as we face the unknown jeopardy of the next few months and years.

In times of great national peril, people get mixed up. They sometimes confound what they want to do with ways of doing it. In everyone's zeal to build up the defenses of the Nation, some of them seem to forget what it is we are getting ready to defend.

If, as we believe, the significance of democracy is its way of life, its processes of government, and the manner in which things are done, it is important that we do not deliberately give up these things before the shooting starts. In such a case, we would discover—ironically—that we had lost the battle with dictators before it had begun. It is vital, therefore, that we hang on to the social reforms of the past few years.

It has taken a mighty effort and a sad experience for us to establish a society in which there is a genuine effort to attain a minimum economic security for everyone.

It has taken us a long time to get the beginnings of old-age pensions, unemployment insurance, aid for the blind and for crippled and dependent children.

It has taken a long time to obtain a program to insure labor against the worst abuses of the capitalistic system, against long

hours and starvation wages, against the sweat shop, against usurped judicial power, perverting the injunction to break strikes.

It has taken a long time to outlaw the infamous "yellow dog" contract, to obtain legal protection for the principle of collective bargaining.

It has taken many generations to get recognition of the proposition that every man is entitled to a job at living wages, and if it is not available, that it is the responsibility of the Government to create the conditions which will secure one to him.

It was no easy matter to get acceptance of the principle that highly involved financial operations should be closely scrutinized by the Government, that promotion schemes and stock issues must meet a certain standard of safety for investors.

It was no easy matter to establish the principle that farmers are entitled to the same protection as industry and that the equalization of the prices for the farm products and industrial products was a proper obligation of the Government.

All these things have been obtained gradually and slowly and by hard plugging. They represent the mature flowering of democratic principles. They are a real and effective effort to create circumstances under which every citizen is assured a decent livelihood and a fair opportunity for a happy life.

These things are democracy. And it is these things that we are now preparing to defend against the threat of destruction. If we voluntarily give up any of these priceless possessions, to that extent we have already conceded defeat at the hands of those who represent and advocate a different manner of life.

The question is often asked whether democracy can equal the pace set by other forms of government. We are told by many an orator of the terrible efficiency of dictatorships. We are told how they mobilize the resources of their nations; how they conscript labor from their citizens; how they confiscate the wealth of the country and ruthlessly regiment, organize, and systematize the lives of every man, woman, and child. The orator will then wave his arms, pop out his eyes, and point out how Germany is supporting an army of 4,000,000 men and is building more airplanes, more tanks, more munitions than all the democracies put together.

We are then asked whether America can meet this challenge. I think the answer is perfectly clear. We can do it with one hand tied behind us.

We, too, have demonstrated that we can meet an emergency. In fact, we have been meeting a major emergency for the past 10 years. We have had, at the bottom of the depression, as many as 3,000,000 men on work relief. We have had another 2,000,000 men on other forms of relief. When you add the dependents of these 5,000,000, there were some fifteen to twenty million people who were being supported by the country. And while it is true that they were not supported very well, it is quite probable that they had a better living than Hitler's labor slaves and military conscripts.

And all this was done without much of an effort. There was, to be sure, a great deal of squawking from certain quarters. There have been some people throughout these past 10 years who were confident that this country was headed straight for bankruptcy. There were those who insisted that the national debt would soon be so high that the Nation could no longer stagger along under the load. There were those who insisted that a billion or two deficit in the Budget was not only fatal to economic recovery, but, if continued for a few years, would bring about the complete collapse of our economic structure.

This was merely throwing dust in our eyes. The truth is that today the actual cost of carrying the national debt is considerably less than it was under the man heralded as the greatest Secretary of the Treasury since Alexander Hamilton. In 1923 the total interest on the national debt was slightly more than a billion dollars a year, or 1.6 percent of the total national income of that year. In 1939 the interest on the debt was slightly less than a billion dollars, or 1.3 percent of the total national income. Although the interest payment estimated for the present year will reach almost the 1923 figure, it will still be only 1.4 percent of the estimated income—far below the carrying charge under Secretary Mellon.

If further proof is needed that expenditures for relief of the unemployed during the last 10 years in no way threatened the financial soundness of the Government, it is to be found in the way in which the financial experts are accepting the present expenditures for national defense.

Bankers, industrialists, and conservative Congressmen, who a year ago were shedding crocodile tears about a billion dollars for work relief, now find that a $15,000,000,000 Budget for national defense carries no risk whatever to the soundness of the country's financial structure.

The reason for this change of judgment is perfectly clear. The squawkers of yesterday are now scared. When they once discover that their own interests are involved they find that America can raise whatever amounts are needed for safety. When the threat is to the welfare of the workers, the farmers, and the plain citizens, the economic conservatives at once find that the national debt is a great menace to our Government and its solvency.

The truth is that this country has been passing through a crisis as great as the one with which we are now faced. In spite of the alarm of the reactionary elements, we were able to meet that crisis. And in spite of the alarmists today we can meet the present situation, dangerous as it may be.

People who doubt the ability of this Nation to maintain itself and its institutions in a world as crazy as this one, will do well to remember what we have got in this country.

Here is a land which by natural wealth and endowment is the most favorable place in the world for men to live. It is not overcrowded. With only 6 percent of the world's population we have 45 percent of the world's wealth. We have more than 60 percent of the world's supply of monetary gold. We furnish 62 percent of the world's oil products. We mine a third of the world's copper and a third of its coal. We possess 30,000,000 of the world's 43,000,000 automobiles; 20,000,000 of the world's 40,000,000 telephones. We raise half of the world's cotton; half of its fruit. We have an adequate supply of labor, skilled and unskilled. Our industrial plants and our scientific knowledge surpass that of any people on earth. In spite of public expenditures of $35,000,000,000 during the depression to afford relief to its victims, our tax rate is far less than in any other civilized nation.

In the face of this situation, we are asked whether we can meet the threat of dictators. I still say, we have the capacity to do it with one hand.

And it is heartening to see what is possible when the full powers of democracy are brought into play, even under terrific obstacles.

Look at England today. Torn and blasted with bombs. London, a roaring inferno. Death raining incessantly from the skies.

What do men think about, in the presence of flaming death? What political and economic views pop into their minds while a fleet of bombers roars overhead? Apparently, they think about the Bill of Rights—not only the Bill of Rights guaranteeing free speech and religious liberty, but the economic Bill of Rights that assures a job and food and clothing.

It may seem odd for people to think of such things when the very ground on which they stand is about to be blown into the North Sea. But I don't think it's odd at all. They are thinking about feeding British children—war orphans, undernourished children, children wounded by the merciless destruction of total war. They have decided to pay, from government resources, a flat sum for every child so that they may all live better than the wartime diet would permit. This is a democratic idea. It is the way democracy responds to pressure.

I want to see our democracy make a similar response. I want us to extend the coverage of old-age insurance until it includes every worker in America. Until it does, I want to see every aged person assured of a decent livelihood, free from humiliating conditions.

I want to see every young person in this land assured of the opportunity for the kind of education he wants and needs to make him a happy and useful citizen. I want to see every man who is willing to work assured of a job at decent wages.

The defense program does not in any sense make the need for these things less. It makes them the more important. And those who argue that a liberal Government policy in times of national peril will be fatal to our security will do well to consider the fate of France.

Why was it that a nation with a great army and thoroughly patriotic working class could be completely crushed and beaten to her knees in 3 weeks' time? French soldiers were brave, French labor skilled. And the loss of life and suffering from 1914 to 1918 was far greater than in the tragic battle of France in 1940.

We are told that France's fall was due to "politics." Politics, my eye. You always have politics in a democracy. There are no politics in Germany or in Italy or in Russia or in Japan. But in England, France, and America there have always been political parties, political processes, and political action.

It is said, in high places, that the liberal government of Blum and the French labor leaders so reduced the industrial productivity of France that she could not turn out the machines necessary to meet German mechanized warfare. But the truth is, as every American newspaperman in France knows, that exactly the opposite is true. Under the liberal government of Leon Blum, the output of French industry was the highest it has ever been in French history. And this production was accomplished not by the stretch-out and wage curtailment, but by decreased hours, increased wages, collective bargaining, and other labor and social reforms which characterize a genuine democratic government.

No; it was not the French liberals and labor leaders who sold out their country to Hitler. On the contrary, it was the same small group of pro-Fascist reactionaries who almost betrayed the British Empire. Men who, for their own selfish ends, were shipping consignments of critical war materials to German markets even after the Nazi legions were on French soil. You can imagine how French soldiers felt when they discovered French silk in German parachutes after shooting down enemy planes.

There are different kinds of appeasers. There are those who want to compromise with dictators, to trade with them, to make such concessions as may be necessary to keep them in a good humor so that a small group of men can carry on a profitable and lucrative business with them. France had such a group and could not get rid of it in time to save her hide. England had such a group and got rid of it barely in time—we hope.

I suppose there are a few appeasers of this kind in America. There have been, for some time, suspicious statistics floating around concerning our trade with Italy and Japan. In the past 6 years we have shipped to Japan 8,500,000 tons of scrap iron. Japan has a hard time getting metal, but she added to her Navy 500,000 tonnage in warships during those 6 years.

What does this add up to? I'll tell you what it adds up to. It means that we are helping to build up the Navy of a strong and antidemocratic nation which is our only threat in the Pacific, just to make business good for a few junk dealers.

But this kind of appeasement is obvious. The greater danger lies in that indirect appeasement which makes concessions to dictators by advocating the abandonment of our democratic life. Men who are willing to junk the reforms of the century on the pretext that we can't afford the luxury of a decent society. Men who insist that because we have to build warships and dive bombers, we have to cut out W. P. A. and curtail unemployment compensation and old-age pensions. People who think we have to give up our vision of a decently housed Nation, a free labor movement, a reasonable standard of living for workers, and a chance for their children to go to college with N. Y. A. help.

Let me quote a statement just issued from the policy pronouncement of one of the most influential organizations in the country—the United States Chamber of Commerce:

"The compelling need for expenditures for the national defense," it says, "makes it more important than ever that the ordinary nondefense expenditures of the Government be brought down to the irreducible minimum, and that every possible means be taken to insure that result."

You can see which way the wind is blowing. The "nondefense expenditures" it is talking about are work relief, social security, soil conservation, housing and slum clearance, aid to tenant farmers, and all the other services designed as the margin for a decent minimum security against want and privation.

In the same statement, the chamber announces solemnly that "hard work, self-denial, and sacrifice, by and for all, are indispensable to both national defense and prosperity."

At the very time this solemn call was made, statistics were released on the business and industrial earnings for the first half of 1940 which shed a lot of light on the "self-denial and sacrifice" of some of our citizens in connection with the defense program. Profits of 400 leading industrial corporations exceeded those of the first half of 1939 by 59 percent. What is more important still, corporate dividends for the first half of the year were up 14 percent. The increase in wages, however, was less than 5 percent in spite of the big upturn in the cost of living.

As our industrial machine is now operating, the profits to proprietors have increased almost three times the slight increase in wages. And the United States Chamber of Commerce wants still more, national defense or no national defense.

It seems pretty clear that the sacrifices which the chamber demands of "all" are not coming from all alike. It is this kind of "appeasement" that threatens to undermine the foundations of our democracy.

Today, I call upon the machinists and all groups of organized labor in America to unite solidly behind a campaign to hold fast to the things that differentiate America from those nations and governments which threaten our very existence, to give battle to every kind of appeasement, and to permit no departure from the decent, liberal, humanitarian way of life that is the very essence of democracy. America must rely upon labor on the home front as well as on any other field of battle.

Bright Lights of Willkie's High Lights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES F. O'CONNOR

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 23, 1940

EDITORIAL ON WILLKIE SPEECHES

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial:

BRIGHT LIGHTS OF WILLKIE'S HIGH LIGHTS

In Chicago he took up the banner of Governor Stark, of Missouri, long enough to assure his audience that if he were elected he would send Ed Kelly and Pat Nash, of Chicago's powerful machine, to the penitentiary.

Goodbye to J. Edgar Hoover, of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Willkie will take care of that as a side issue, if elected.

In Cicero, a suburb of Chicago, he said: "We are in Cicero. To hell with Chicago."

At Joliet, Ill., he said that "Roosevelt had telephoned Hitler and Mussolini and urged them to sell Czechoslovakia down the river at Munich."

Later his press secretary, Lem Jones, said Mr. Willkie had "misspoken," and that he intended to say that the President had urged a settlement at Munich and that the pact there "agreed to sell Czechoslovakia down the river."

Also at Peoria, Ill.: "Of all the men I know who have any acquaintanceship with international affairs, Franklin Roosevelt is the least qualified to lead this Nation."

And then, divine providence or some other agency of the Republican Party stilled his voice with hoarseness.

Facts About Cash Farm Income and Farm Prices Under New Deal as Compared With Republican Administrations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 23, 1940

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, New Deal Vice Presidential candidate, Henry A. Wallace, formerly Secretary of Agriculture, has repeatedly stated, to committees in Congress and on the platform, that American farmers are better off today than they were under the preceding Republican administrations. As an argument for the perpetuation of the New Deal for a third term, Mr. Wallace and other new dealers seek to win farmer support by referring only to farm-price levels and income in 1932. They forget to inform the farmers about their income prior to 1932. They also forget to tell that the Democratic Party took control of Congress on March 4, 1931, and that the Democratic majority used every political means to obstruct the enactment of legislation which would pull our country out of the depression.

Facts and figures from the Departments of Agriculture and Commerce, shown in the tables below, give the true picture of cash-farm income and farm-product prices under the 12 years of Republican administration as compared with the 7 years of the New Deal.

Average farm prices covering 12 years of Republican administration, including 1932, as compared with average prices under 7 years of New Deal

[Source: Departments of Agriculture and Commerce

Products	Average price Republican period, 1921–32	Average price New Deal period, 1933–39	Percent change
Wheat, bushel	$1.017	$0.81	−20.6
Corn, do	.724	.65	−9.2
Oats, do	.386	.336	−12.7
Barley, do	.543	.515	−5.5
Rye, do	.737	.566	−22.8
Cotton, pound	.167	.1027	−38.5
Butterfat, do	.381	.265	−30.4
Chickens, do	.192	.137	−28.6
Eggs, dozen	.281	.193	−31.3
Beef cattle, hundredweight	6.43	5.77	−10.3
Veal calves, do	8.93	6.91	−22.6
Lambs, do	9.65	7.12	−26.2
Hogs, do	8.31	7.00	−15.8
Potatoes, bushel	1.01	.683	−32.4
Wool, pound	.297	.231	−21.9

Cash farm income for American agriculture (calendar year)

(Source: Department of Agriculture)

1921	$8,107,000,000
1922	8,518,000,000
1923	9,524,000,000
1924	10,150,000,000
1925	10,927,000,000
1926	10,529,000,000
1927	10,699,000,000
1928	11,024,000,000
1929	11,221,000,000
1930	8,883,000,000
1931	6,283,000,000
1932	4,682,000,000
Total	110,547,000,000
Average annual income under Republican administrations	9,212,250,000
1933	5,278,000,000
1934	6,273,000,000
1935	6,969,000,000
1936	8,212,000,000
1937	8,744,000,000
1938	7,599,000,000
1939	7,711,000,000
Total	50,786,000,000

Cash farm income for American agriculture (calendar year)—Con.

Average annual income under New Deal administration	$7,255,142,857
Average annual income under Republican administrations	9,212,250,000
Average annual income under New Deal administration	7,255,142,857
Difference	1,957,107,143

Wallace a Presidential Candidate

REMARKS
OF
HON. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 23, 1940

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, if those who decide to vote the Democratic ticket this fall do so in the belief that President Roosevelt should remain in the White House for another 4 years, they are laboring under a false assumption.

For, if the Democratic national ticket should happen to be successful this fall, there is little doubt that Mr. Roosevelt plans to turn the Presidency over to his running mate, Henry A. Wallace, within the next year or two.

There has been ample indication of this ever since the White House controlled Democratic Convention in Chicago in July named Mr. Wallace as the Vice Presidential candidate.

Now, there is conclusive evidence that Mr. Roosevelt has such a plan in mind. This evidence comes from no less a source than M. W. Thatcher, chairman of the National Farmers' Union legislative committee, a confidant of President Roosevelt and one of his most ardent supporters.

Here is what Mr. Thatcher wrote in a letter to all members of his organization after a lengthy conference with Mr. Roosevelt late in July:

> He [the President] discussed at great length how Mr. Henry Wallace was chosen for Vice President through a process of elimination, and in all that analysis it was evident to me that he is deeply conscious that he may not live or it may be necessary for him to resign if he is reelected. Without any quotation at all from his communication with regard to the President, I am positive that if he is reelected and the war situation gives him opportunity to get out, he will resign. I make this statement because he emphasized the qualities of Mr. Henry Wallace as one who is a thorough new dealer, who has unquestioned integrity, fidelity to the common people of this country and the cause of democracy, and who also has one of the best minds and the clearest concept of world problems of any in his group.

This does not come from anyone who can be accused of carrying on any mud-slinging campaign against the New Deal ticket. It comes, I repeat, from a stanch supporter of the President and the New Deal, and a man who boasts of his intimacy with Mr. Roosevelt. It is evidence that Henry Wallace is trying to get into the White House through the back door.

The history of the strategy employed by Mr. Roosevelt to have himself nominated for a third term on the grounds that he is "the indispensable man," what he said at the time he was nominated, and what has transpired since, all seem to fit into the picture presented by Mr. Thatcher.

It will be recalled that Mr. Roosevelt told the convention that if he followed his personal desires he would under no circumstances accept nomination for a third term. He said he was tired and is anxious to retire to Hyde Park and be relieved of the burdens which he has carried for 7½ years.

There is scarcely anyone who will deny that Mr. Roosevelt insisted that Mr. Wallace be named as his running mate, and it is no secret that Mr. Roosevelt feels that the former Agriculture Secretary would carry on his New Deal policies better than any other man.

And in his acceptance address to the Democratic Convention Mr. Roosevelt said:

> To you, the delegates to this convention, I express my gratitude for the selection of Henry Wallace for the high office of President of the United States.

Of course, in his prepared speech of acceptance, this paragraph of Mr. Roosevelt's statement said "the high office of Vice President of the United States."

Whether or not this was a slip of the tongue has never been made clear by Mr. Roosevelt, but psychologists will tell you that very often we blurt out in public when momentarily off guard the very thing we most desire to keep secret.

Since the convention, Mr. Wallace has been parading up and down the country making speeches in a manner befitting a Presidential candidate, except that what he has had to say only reveals that he is eminently unsuited and unqualified to hold the office of President.

Forgotten Morality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 19, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE UNITED STATES NEWS

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to revise and extend my remarks, I include herein an editorial by David Lawrence published in the September 20, 1940, issue of the United States News:

[From the United States News of September 20, 1940]

FORGOTTEN MORALITY—INDIFFERENCE OF THE PRESIDENT TO VIOLATIONS OF LAW IN HIGH PLACES IS CONTRARY TO SPIRIT AND LETTER OF THE CONSTITUTION AND HIS OATH OF OFFICE—PLAIN CONTRAVENTION OF STATUTES IS IGNORED

(By David Lawrence)

The Constitution of the United States says that the President "shall take care that the laws be faithfully executed."

The President, as the responsible head of the Government, must see to it that the heads of all departments of the Government shall obey and particularly that the Attorney General shall enforce the laws on the statute books.

The American people are being asked to elect Mr. Roosevelt for a third term on the ground that he has "experience" in government. What is the nature of that "experience"? The test is written in the oath of office which says "I will faithfully execute the office of President and will to the best of my ability preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States."

Mr. Roosevelt shocked many people when he deliberately attacked the Supreme Court and sought to bring the judgments of its members in harmony with his particular views of the Constitution, but the shock was not half as violent as when Mr. Roosevelt, having been given by a turn of fate the opportunity of appointment, packed the Court with five members of his intimate official group of political advisers.

Fortified by the knowledge that he now has complete control of the highest court in the land, the President may feel he need give no further concern to the Federal statutes and that he and his departmental associates may ignore them at will.

Three flagrant instances of defiance of the statutes can be cited for they reflect a spirit that runs through the New Deal—a spirit of revolution which views the end as justifying the means, no matter how illegal the means.

VIOLATION OF FEDERAL STATUTES IS IGNORED

Thus the Chairman of the National Labor Relations Board recently testified under oath before a House investigating committee that he had violated the Federal statutes governing lobbying and use of Federal funds for that purpose. The incident was drawn to the attention of the Attorney General by the chairman of the House investigating committee.

Nothing was done about it.

Congress put on the statute books in 1909 a law forbidding any contributions by corporations to national political campaigns. The language of the Federal Corrupt Practices Act is clear. Any contribution by a corporation is barred. And "contribution" is defined specifically as "anything of value." Notwithstanding this, the Democratic National Committee has just collected from 170 corporations

more than $150,000 which is brazenly put into the New Deal campaign chest with the purpose of reelecting President Roosevelt.

Nothing is being done about it.

MORAL VALUES DISREGARDED BY THE NEW DEAL

The Federal statutes prohibit anybody from sending out of the jurisdiction of the United States our armed vessels with the intent of delivering them to a belligerent government. The Attorney General rendered an opinion saying it could be done anyhow. The words of the statute plainly contradict his view. No amendment to the act was sought.

The importance of such indifference to law enforcement on the part of the Department of Justice is that all through the Government the lesser officials take their cue from the top. A President of the United States who condones law violation and allows politics or expediency to bar from prosecution those who are giving money to the administration in power or who are carrying on, as did the Labor Board chairman, the partisan objectives of the party in power cannot hope to build up, among the many thousands of Government officials who every day interpret laws and make regulations, a spirit of disinterestedness and even-handed justice.

The way in past history has often been opened to revolution and anarchy where law and order breaks down. Lynch law and jungle law are the inevitable forms of counterattack which have followed failure to apply the law fairly and impartially.

The New Deal has raised a considerable hullabaloo about the difference between property rights and human rights. But there has been a noticeable disregard of the basic moral values that are associated with human rights. Political chicanery is the very basis of disintegration in a democracy. The French politicians failed their Government, because they allowed the cancers of graft and partiality, prejudice and favoritism, to eat away the whole fabric and structure of virile government.

Mr. Roosevelt is credited with beneficent intentions by his many admirers, by the people who regard his personality as a mixture of friendliness and good nature and humanitarianism. But he is asking the people to vote for him now impersonally as an administrator of government after nearly 8 years.

The people are being invited to say whether they want disregard of law to go on, whether they want politicians entrenched so that laws can be applied only to the opponents of the administration and not those who bestow on it their favors.

These are fundamental considerations which go to the heart of honest government.

Our forefathers provided for impeachment of a President who failed to do his duty. It was thought this check against abuse of power would be enough. Such proceedings are unnecessary today because a national election is to be held in a few weeks at which the American people can pass judgment on the President's method of conducting the Government of the United States.

Recently Westbrook Pegler said that the American people didn't care any more about morality in government; that they had adopted a sort of "what the hell" philosophy. Confirmation of this, in part, is to be seen by the way many people are saying it was right to violate the law in order to send England 50 destroyers. It is being said that the President could not have gotten consent of Congress except after prolonged discussion and that the end justified the means.

But isn't that the very argument made in favor of lynching Negroes? Isn't it contended that the courts are too slow or that justice might miscarry after a prolonged trial in our modern courts?

CONGRESS WOULD HAVE EXPEDITED AIR-BASE DEAL

Certainly the President could have obtained the approval of Congress if he had placed the responsibility on both Houses in a message which frankly said that the action had to be taken within 3 days. Congress would not have dared to lose for America those important air bases in the Atlantic. After all, the destroyer question was before the country for nearly 2 months. Likewise the President could have conceded the need for special permission without asking that the statute itself be abrogated, thus safeguarding against future transfers without authority of Congress.

The language of the law is plain. The Attorney General rendered an opinion which will remain on the pages of history as the most flagrant piece of intellectual acrobatics and Machiavellianism the country has ever read.

What profits it that a man gain the whole world and lose his soul? What profits it that America aid Britain and at the same time put in the hands of the Executive a sort of sanction to violate the letter and spirit of our Constitution? Are we about to draft boys to defend that kind of "democracy"?

BREAK-DOWN OF LAW BRINGS TOTALITARIANISM

Once the stern rules of morality and justice in enforcing the laws of the land are broken the whole structure of good government collapses. The citizen then loses faith in the integrity of institutions and too many citizens become receptive to the idea of one-man governments and benevolent dictatorship.

Mr. Roosevelt has had a dramatic opportunity to deal frankly with the cases of law violation under his very nose. When it was found that a Republican Cabinet member erred, President Coolidge appointed two special prosecutors to see that the laws were enforced. He did not hesitate to put in jail a member of his own party—a Cabinet officer under his predecessor, another Republican.

Will the Department of Justice prosecute the Democratic committee members and all others who had a part in violating the Federal Corrupt Practices Act?

Will the Department of Justice arraign the Chairman of the Labor Board for law violation? Or will Mr. Roosevelt, as rumored, send in a recess appointment of the Chairman of the Labor Board as soon as Congress goes home?

These are questions which should make the American people pause as they are invited to continue in office an Executive because of his "experience" in handling the affairs of a democratic government. Has not the time come even at this late date for the laws to be enforced, and will not such a step regain for the President the confidence he has lost? Certainly it will remove the odium of political persecution which the same Department of Justice has manifested by its series of indictments and arrests of prominent businessmen for alleged violations of the complex laws regulating marketing of commercial products. To prosecute some and give immunity to others is not Americanism. It is the beginning of anarchy and ultimately of totalitarianism.

Labor Conditions Surveyed in Talk to Sawmill Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER M. PIERCE

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 23, 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. WALTER M. PIERCE, OF OREGON

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address which I delivered through proxy recently at Dee, Hood River County, Oregon:

The first job at hard labor that I secured after I left home in Illinois, was in a sawmill in Colorado, more than a half-century ago. I was a big strong boy from the Middle West and willing to do hard work to get a start. My experiences and associations with the lumbermen in that early day have always been vividly recalled to my memory when I have come into contact with men interested in the harvesting of trees.

CONDITIONS HAVE IMPROVED

Conditions under which you labor today in lumber mills have vastly improved over those days of the oxen and the crude machinery that was used in sawmills at that time, but still there remain some of the same unsolved problems which we talked over in the lumber camps of days gone by—wages, living conditions, and prospects for the future. Wages have materially advanced in that period of time and conditions are vastly more favorable for the laboring men. (I got $2 a day and board, many worked for $1.50 for 10 to 12 hours a day.) Nevertheless, we have a long way yet to travel before ideal conditions can be enjoyed everywhere by wage earners in sawmills. In some Oregon mills we have the best labor conditions I have ever seen, and our Pacific Northwest wage scales are the highest in the Union.

NO LABOR UNIONS UNDER HITLER

I believe in labor organizations, have always believed in them, and in my various official capacities as legislator and as executive of the State of Oregon I have never forgotten my own struggles, nor been indifferent to the interests of the men who guide the machinery to make the great logs into manufactured products. I know our democratic ideas are being disputed today by the world's conquering armies. I know that in most of Europe labor is enforced and will not again be free so long as totalitarian governments rule. It is said that the big tanks with which Germany conquered France were made by Czechs, friends of the French, over whom armed soldiers stood, commanding their labor. We must defend our country against this kind of an aggressor. When I say "defend our country," I mean not just our shores, but our way of life. Never forget that all the advances made for the benefit of the laboring men in wages and conditions have come under democratic forms of government.

Under the rule of a Hitler, there are no labor unions. Wages are fixed by decree, and labor representatives have nothing to say in regard to the fixing. The wages are little better than enough to live on, and if, for any reason, a man in a totalitarian state is dropped from the pay roll, then he has to accept work in an organization similar to our W. P. A., but where wages are less than subsistence and much lower than those paid in private industry—in short, enforced labor.

DEMOCRACIES MUST BE PRESERVED

As a second proposal, therefore, I would say to keep firmly in mind that your hope to better what you now have rests entirely on the maintenance of our form of government. While I have a firm belief that our system of government can never die, I am not forgetful of the fact that Norway had probably one of the most

democratic governments that ever existed, and lost it. Yes, it is today under the heel of a Hitler dictator, and democratic processes have entirely disappeared. Belgium and Holland, with all their advantages and advanced ideas, are today owned, commanded, and handled exclusively by the same conquerors. Liberty, freedom, and fraternity are dead in continental Europe.

My speech in Congress July 25, 1940, deals with the threat to us from Hitler's victories and our necessary defenses. This is available, upon request, and I do ask that my point of view be given thoughtful consideration by those whom I represent in Congress.

LABOR LEGISLATION

We must not forget, either, that under the economic order in which we labor, the men who own the enterprises and meet the pay rolls must necessarily make a fair margin above cost of production. If they did not do so, there would be no incentive to continue to produce. There would be no work.

In all negotiations remember that it is only by slow degrees that progress is made. "Rome was not built in a day." We have advanced more rapidly in recent years than ever before, and some people think progress has been made so rapidly that reaction will set in. I sincerely hope not. I hope labor can hold the material legislative gains it has made under this administration.

I voted for the wage and hour law, to put a floor under wages and a ceiling over hours. It is my belief that work must be found for all willing workers. The impression I get from careful study is that, in the main, increased use of machinery is largely to blame for the unending line of unemployed. I am well aware of the argument advanced by some employers that the introduction of machinery has increased the demand for labor. It may have done so temporarily and in some places, but in the main it is retiring people from the pay rolls by the millions, and is one of the major causes of the widespread unemployment of today. Industry is producing today at more than 100 percent, perhaps even at 110 percent, and is capable of still greater increase, but it has not absorbed the idle labor. It is easier and more profitable to use a machine than to hire human labor. I have reached the conclusion that machine industry must, through revised methods of taxation, divide the profits so that all may get a share. It may be necessary to go even further in fixing hours of labor.

I voted for the Wagner Labor Relations Act. I did so because I believed it offered a fair means of settling disputes between employers and employees, without making it necessary to resort to the drastic method of the strike. While the law has been severely criticized, and the members of the Board have been subjected to an investigation, nevertheless it is my judgment, and that of many who have been observant, that in the main the law has been most beneficial.

FORESTRY

Since I have represented you in the Congress and, in fact, when I was Governor, I have made extensive studies of forestry problems. I have been honored by the Speaker of the House with an appointment to the Joint Senate and House Forestry Committee of the Congress. The committee has held eight hearings at strategic points all over the country, including Portland, Oreg., and is now preparing legislation. I have become convinced that the time is not far distant when it must be made a punishable crime to cut an unripe tree, even on your own land. The forest belongs not only to the man or firm that owns the land on which the trees grow, but it belongs to all the members of society. The community has an interest in the trees. Cutting of trees should be looked upon as harvest time, and not as that of time for slaughter. The ripe trees should be taken out and provision made for the young and growing trees, so that they may be protected from fires and destructive pests, so far as possible. We want our forests made permanent.

It is known that centuries ago the bare hills of China once were green with forest growth, but they were ruthlessly destroyed; the rains came, the soil was washed away, and now only the bare rocks and the deserted hillsides remain. It behooves us, working men as well as the men who own the forest lands, and all interested in public welfare, to realize that we have a problem in using the forests and at the same time preserving them for generations to come. In our own country magnificent forests have been ruthlessly destroyed. Ghost towns are often the only reminders of the wealth and grandeur of the forests.

VOTERS' PAMPHLET—PRIMARIES

Do not forget that in this State, we have the Voters' Pamphlet at election time, a privilege not enjoyed by other States. It will come to every voter. Every candidate for office has the privilege of stating his case therein, or having it stated by his committee. Measures are also discussed by those who favor and those who oppose them. It comes to you free of charge. Read your Voters' Pamphlet. Since it has come into existence in Oregon, I have always taken from one to two pages in it, in the firm belief that some farmer or laborer would find time, between his hours of labor, to take a few minutes to scan what might be said about me, or by me, on what I have done or what I am trying to do.

You will find on your ballot this fall an initiated measure to move the date of our primaries from May to September. I advise you to vote against this proposal as it would eliminate candidates of limited means. I believe we are far better off in having our primaries in May than to have them in September. It gives more time for citizens to consider and study measures on which they are to vote in November. It gives the candidates more time, also, to present their cases. Primaries held in September mean hurried, intensive campaigns, with much newspaper advertising. September primaries would eliminate our voters' pamphlet, thus limiting publicity for candidates and measures to those who could pay for or command the support of press or radio. In a sparsely settled State like Oregon, it would be a serious mistake to hold primaries in September and then hold the main election in November. Speakers could meet but few voters and educational campaigns on measures would be impossible. I ask you, in the interests of good citizenship and good government, to vote against the change which would make us victims of propaganda and high pressure which cost money.

A BILL OF ATTAINDER

A few weeks ago, a bill was up for final passage in the House, known as the Allen bill. It was a bill which simply directed the authority of the United States, notwithstanding existing law, to deport one certain named individual—Harry Bridges. I was one of the 42 who voted against passage of the bill. The bill went to the Senate, where it was referred to the Judiciary Committee, where it was determined to be a matter for the courts and not for the Congress. In other words, the House, in the Allen bill, was passing a clear-cut bill of attainder which is strictly forbidden by the Constitution. It also denied Harry Bridges the right of a writ of habeas corpus. That is a privilege for which English-speaking people have fought for centuries. It means that the accused has a right to go before a court and state his case. Under the Allen bill, that right was denied to Harry Bridges. An officer would appear at his home, put a hand on his shoulder, and send him to Australia. Does that sound like the United States or like Hitler? You know they say that here in our country a man knows that if there is a noise at his door just before daylight it can only be the milkman. It was even admitted by those urging its passage in the House that the bill was unconstitutional. Since I have been a Member of the House, I have never knowingly voted for an unconstitutional bill. I feel sure my intelligent and thoughtful constituents approve of my vote against the Allen bill. I never voted a more conscientious vote in my life. I have been gratified to learn that the American Bar Association has, by resolution, condemned such legislation.

OUR PRIVILEGES

You workers in the mills in Oregon enjoy with all others the benefits of our advanced ideas of government. You are numbered among citizens of the United States who vote for or against the men who would represent you in the National Capital, the State capital, or at the county seat. That is a high privilege not enjoyed in the totalitarian countries controlled by dictators. Here we can hold an election free and untrammeled. We enjoy the privilege of belonging to political parties of our own choice and voting in the primaries for those whom we think could best represent our parties in the general election. We have the option to change our representation; the men who make our laws. This is a precious privilege gained only after tremendous sacrifices. May we never betray the sacred trust handed down to Americans, especially in Oregon, where so many features of popular or people's government originated or were first fully developed and applied—popular election of United States Senators, the voters' pamphlet, the recall, the initiative, and referendum.

Appreciate America fully. Make use of the opportunity to take part in your Government. Vote; yes, every time; vote intelligently, after careful consideration, study, and thought. Vote for the men who represent your interests and for those you think will do most for the preservation of American ideals and institutions.

Congress Should Stay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH O. BREWSTER

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 23, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW YORK TIMES

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times of today:

[From the New York Times of September 23, 1940]

CONGRESS SHOULD STAY

Congressional leaders have been planning to have Congress adjourn at the end of this week, and the President has indicated his approval of this program. But we should not forget that on June 4, when the German drive against France was in full swing, the President said that he saw no reason, vital to national defense, for holding Congress in session during the emergency—except, as he

unflatteringly added, for the no doubt "laudable" purpose of making speeches.

The pressure of public opinion prevailed against this view. The leaders of Congress were forced to abandoned their plans for an adjournment in mid-June, and except for recesses of about a week each for the political conventions, Congress has remained in session. By remaining in session it has made vital contributions to national defense. It has adopted a universal selective service law which the President himself strongly endorsed. It granted the President authority, which has already been exercised, to mobilize the National Guard. It has passed a huge supplemental defense appropriation bill of $5,250,000,000, under which the President has already been able to let contracts totaling about $4,000,000,000 for 200 new naval vessels. It is passing an excess-profits-tax bill which the President himself demanded, embodying amortization provisions that are necessary to make it possible for industry to erect huge new plants for defense purposes.

Every one of these measures was wanted by the President himself. He could not have had them without Congress. In one or two very important decisions, as in the military understanding with Canada and the trade of 50 destroyers for naval bases, the President has "short-circuited" Congress. But even if no question of legality had been raised, his wisdom in following this course was highly doubtful—particularly when there was ample time for him to seek congressional cooperation. Actions without congressional sanction or consultation on matters of this importance, no matter how much the country may approve the particular steps that have so far been taken, are not precedents to be encouraged.

Mr. Roosevelt's declarations of June 4 and June 11, that he saw no reason why Congress should remain in session, and his belief that it will do no harm for Congress to adjourn now, contrast sharply with that part of his acceptance speech in which he declared: "Events move so fast in other parts of the world that it has become my duty to remain either in the White House or at some nearby point where I can reach Washington, and even Europe and Asia, by direct telephone; where, if need be, I can be back at my desk in the space of a very few hours."

One is obliged to conclude that, while Mr. Roosevelt now regards his own hourly presence and judgment in Washington as indispensable, he does not at all hold the same opinion of the need for the presence and judgment of Congress. But Congress, if it respects itself and recognizes its own function in the democratic scheme of things, will take a different view. No President should be permitted to regard American foreign policy as his private affair. The world situation today is just as critical as it was in June. Emergencies and unforeseen needs requiring congressional action may just as suddenly make their appearance as they have since mid-June.

Even if Congressmen feel that they must go home to campaign for reelection, then they should do so, not by adjourning, but by taking a recess to a date, definitely fixed in advance, promptly following election day. Congress must not abdicate its authority, above all when the decisions to be taken are as momentous as they are today.

Civilians Should Carry Out Provisions of Draft Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 19, 1940

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, it is the obligation of all Members of this House, both those who favored and those who opposed the peacetime conscription of our youth, to see to it that those who are called into the armed forces shall have every possible guaranty that their service will be given under the best possible conditions.

We all, friend and foe alike of this law, must, in the interest of the parents and other loved ones of those called, do our utmost toward assuring them that the registration of our manpower and its subsequent call to the colors and service shall place upon no one an unnecessary hardship. We all, in the interest of our people and our country, must be on the alert to see to it that every individual touched by this law shall be touched in even measure.

This law must not rest with onerous burden upon one while another scarce feels the touch of the law's compulsion.

While this bill was pending in the Military Affairs Committee and before the Congress I made an extensive study of the operation of the Selective Service Act under which we raised our National Army in the World War. In that act and in its operation there were blunders. I have no doubt that time will uncover the blunders in this present act—some of which have been foreseen and some of which have not been.

But there was one outstanding success in the operation of the 1917 act. It cannot be denied that under that act the registration of our manpower was carried through with smoothness and efficiency. It cannot be denied that the provisions of that act were carried out in neighborhoods and by neighbors with a minimum of ill feeling, both for the Nation and among the neighbors, when the actual conscription started.

Much of that success, the authorities assure us, was due to the fact that, to a large extent, almost totally, the operation was a civilian one while, at the same time, a neighborly one. It is true that the Federal Government was the guiding factor. It is true that military officers were probably the spark plug behind the machinery of the registration and the draft.

But the actual, and to our people, palpable working of that draft was divorced—certainly in the public mind—from the military and from the Federal Government.

That was the prime reason for its success where it succeeded.

Now, our peacetime-service law is only a few days old. The ink is scarcely dry upon President Roosevelt's signature. But already there is a lamentable tendency toward overemphasis of the military aspects of this law.

The military will have enough to do with the men called into service later on. They should not anticipate their functions. The obligation for the successful operation of the first phases of this law rests upon the civil authorities and upon the State governments.

That cannot be emphasized too strongly. When this, or any other Nation, has left it up to the military authorities to conduct a draft of manpower those drafts have provoked resentment, riots, and even worse. We want no repetition of that here and now.

I hope that the administration in carrying out this law which it demanded of us will bear that thought strongly in mind.

The tendency which provokes my comments on the situation is already illustrated by some of the preliminary appointments of executives of the draft. Here in the National Capital a brigadier general commanding the National Guard has been named to take charge. Across the line in Virginia, another military officer with the rank of colonel has been appointed.

No doubt, these are both able and intelligent men, thoroughly capable of carrying out their share of the work, and I make no criticism of these gentlemen personally.

But I am convinced that this law, which for its success or failure depends upon public cooperation and support, will receive a better public reception if it is made operative by men who are known as mister rather than as general or colonel.

We provided in the law, wisely, I believe, that members of the draft boards shall have no connection with the military. It was not the intention of the House, I feel sure, that everywhere else in the machinery of this law we should pack in military titles and military uniforms.

The Governors of the several States will do well if they avoid the precedent set in Virginia and in the District of Columbia and make these appointments from civil life, preferably far removed from titles and uniforms. Those will come in their own proper time and place to dominate the lives of those called to service.

Let the call come from the civil side and let the preparations leading to that call be made on the civil side as Congress intended.

Our military officers will have enough and more than enough to do when these men are finally in the service. Because some of us who through the years have pleaded for a progressive system of preparation were ignored, we are going to find that we will need more officer material than is available when we come to training those who are to be called up.

We should not use such officer material in carrying out the civilian angles of the service law.

I am somewhat puzzled, too, as to how these high National Guard officers can be spared from their duties with the guard in view of the urgent necessity presented to us a few months ago of mobilizing the guard. Now that the guard is about to be mobilized, some units having already been called, it is not clear how these high officers can be kept at home to superintend the registration and draft.

There is another proposition which preys on my mind as I contemplate the hundreds of thousands of young men soon to be marching under the colors. And that is the matter of the health of these youths.

We are told that the registration day will be October 16, and that within a month after that, on November 15, the first contingents of the draft army will be called to duty and training.

Mr. Speaker, that rush to get these men into camps causes apprehension in my mind. I recall only too vividly the intense personal hardship that was visited upon the men called in the World War. I recall those immense, unheated, clapboard cantonments into which they were rushed—cantonments that were unfit in many instances for human habitation, but that nevertheless housed hundreds of men.

In those places these men, waiting to carry out a patriotic and dangerous job, were subjected to untold punishment. Their health and in many instances their morale was undermined. Is it to be that way with these new draft contingents?

Are we going to take these young men from their comfortable homes and, in the middle of winter, send them out to poorly conditioned camps?

We all know and some of us recall all too vividly the devastating epidemic of influenza that swept these barracks and on through the entire country during the World War. Such an epidemic thrives on conditions to which these youths may be subjected.

Unless every precaution is taken, unless every care is exercised, we will see disease and death ride over these camps just as it did during the World War.

It may be possible to justify in wartime the conditions which prevailed in some of the camps used during the World War. America will not accept such conditions in peacetime. It should not be asked to.

To my mind it would be far better to delay for a month or two the calling of these men if by so doing we could be assured that the camps will be prepared adequately to prevent a repetition of the horrors of epidemic.

Further, I have seen nothing regarding the preparation of the material to be used by these men which would warrant our calling them to service immediately. We do not have the guns, we do not have the uniforms, we do not have the blankets, we do not have the beds essential to training properly an army of this size. When we will have them no one seems to know.

Now that we have the law on the books, let us call these men the minute we need them, but let us not call them a minute before we are prepared to give them the essentials of their training.

Turners Launch Campaign To Train American Youth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 23, 1940

ARTICLE FROM THE DETROIT NEWS

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in compliment to the attitude of the American Turners, an organization encouraging physical education in schools, the following article from the Detroit News.

The national president of the organization is well known to many Members of this House, being my predecessor in this body—the Honorable Carl M. Weideman.

[From the Detroit News of September 17, 1940]

TURNERS LAUNCH CAMPAIGN TO TRAIN AMERICAN YOUTH

In the belief that American youth has grown "soft" as a result of inadequate physical training in the Nation's school system, Carl M. Weideman, circuit court commissioner and national president of the American Turners, announced today that his organization has started a movement for more widespread and intensive physical education in the schools.

The American Turners was founded as a gymnastic and cultural society in 1848 by a group of German refugees who fled to this country to escape political persecution in their homeland. It has since spread to 130 American cities, and, while its membership is largely Americans of German descent, it has frequently taken a public stand against nazi-ism.

Weideman said he is writing to presidents of the Turners societies throughout the country to organize groups in their communities for the sponsorship of "rational physical education with a view toward developing the manpower of America."

"Our program is particularly important in view of the approaching conscription of an American peacetime army," Weideman said. "Our organization always has held the best interests of the United States paramount, and for that reason we believe that we can perform a great service by stimulating interest in physical training so that young Americans can stand the rigors of army life.

Weideman pointed out that in the first World War draft 33 percent of the Nation's youth were rejected for physical unfitness, while only 6 percent of the membership of the Turners were rejected for the same reason.

"I point to this fact as evidence that the gymnastics and physical training our members undergo constantly made them fit for service when the emergency arose," said Weideman.

Weideman said in each community where the Turners have a society the local officers will cooperate with the school system and other organizations, like the Y. M. C. A., to broaden the scope of physical training in the locality.

What Is a Demagogue?—Washington Times-Herald Predicts Roosevelt's Election

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE T. ELLIS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 23, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON TIMES-HERALD

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, September 22, there appeared in one of the leading newspapers of Washington, the Washington Times-Herald, a clever, copyrighted editorial entitled "What Is a Demagogue?" which I take pleasure in inserting in the RECORD in full, with permission of the Herald:

[From the Washington Times-Herald of September 22, 1940]

WHAT IS A DEMAGOGUE?

A demagogue can be roughly defined as a politician who makes most of his appeals to class prejudices and gets most of his votes out of people's dislikes and resentments. Both Franklin D. Roosevelt and Wendell L. Willkie have been called demagogues.

Maybe there's some truth in both charges. But assuming for argument's sake that both Presidential candidates have their demagogic streaks, what kind of demagogue is Roosevelt and what kind of demagogue is Willkie?

When Roosevelt says that old people should be comfortable rather than live in institutions which may be well run but also may not be, he unquestionably appeals to at least two classes. These two classes are poor old people and poor people who fear a poor old age.

Roosevelt appeals to the class prejudices of the farmers when he says their incomes should be somewhere near parity with city incomes. He appeals to workers' prejudices when he says they should have unemployment insurance; to bank depositors when he says bank deposits should be insured under Government supervision. And so on.

Conversely, he offends most wealthy and quite a few well-to-do people's prejudices when he makes such statements, because these people know it will cost them tax money to pay for these proposed reforms.

Not too many of the wealthy and well-to-do are able to take the larger view that Roosevelt's reforms have in 7 years kept the ship of state from capsizing as it threatened to do before Roosevelt, and may in a few more years give us a fairly well-stabilized social and economic system.

To most of these people, Mr. Roosevelt is a traitor to his class, a rich radical who cannot sincerely feel for the masses of people, a Catiline rather than a Caius Gracchus or a Marquis de Lafayette.

WILLKIE'S APPEAL

Insofar as Mr. Willkie is a demagogue, he strikes us as another kind than Mr. Roosevelt. Mr. Willkie looks to us like an appealer to the class prejudices of the wealthy and well-to-do and of the large middle-class delegation of Americans who believe in the poor-boy-makes-good pattern of Horatio Alger's stories.

Not that Mr. Willkie in his campaign talks is appealing to upper-crust emotions. On the radio and the back platforms and in the auditoriums he is trying to talk shirt-sleeve English and utter husky, forthright, democratic American sentiments.

But Mr. Willkie's whole life prior to the Philadelphia convention is a standing appeal to upper crust prejudices. He didn't start at the bottom, though the hint dropped in some of his remarks is that he did. Both his parents went to college (rare in Indiana a generation ago); his father was a rich real estater till the panic of 1893–96.

Willkie likewise went to college (Indiana University), fighting the fraternities there until the best one on the lot, Beta Theta Pi, asked him in. He sent his own son to Princeton. He began his professional life as a corporation lawyer in Akron, and moved to New York to become a bigger and better corporation lawyer 11 years ago.

He endeared himself to Roosevelt's haters when he made the T. V. A. raise its bid for Commonwealth & Southern's Tennessee properties to $78,600,000. And though he started his presidential campaign at Rushville, Ind., he lived at 1010 Fifth Avenue, New York City, and officed at 20 Pine Street, in the Wall Street district, for years before the campaign.

The groundswell which nominated Willkie was churned up, we believe, by wealthy gentlemen who hoped to lure voters with a tousle-headed, blue-eyed Hoosier type.

LOOKS LIKE ROOSEVELT

We do not see how the Willkie appeal can win out over the Roosevelt appeal. The people can be fooled, and frequently are, contrary to what politicians tell the people just before trying to fool them. But we can't see Willkie, with his fundamental appeal to the wealthy and well-to-do, appealing to the masses.

Therefore, Mr. Roosevelt seems likely to get the bulk of the common people's votes, and thus to be reelected; because there are many more of them than of the well-to-do.

W. P. A. Physical Accomplishments in Sedgwick County

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. HOUSTON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 23, 1940

REPORT BY CLARENCE G. NEVINS, KANSAS STATE W. P. A. ADMINISTRATOR

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I insert a summary of physical accomplishments of the W. P. A. in Sedgwick County, Kans. The report follows:

With the worth of the Work Projects Administration most frequently measured in terms of jobs provided and human distress alleviated, there has been a tendency to obscure its physical accomplishments. The inventory of W. P. A. accomplishments from the beginning of operations in 1935 through June 30, 1940, in Sedgwick County, made public by Clarence Nevins, administrator, today, shows that sizable contributions have been made to Sedgwick County's progress in the 5 years of W. P. A. operations through important construction projects.

One of the most important fields of W. P. A. assistance in Sedgwick County has been the W. P. A. improvements to the Witchita, Kans., municipal airport. Located strategically for national defense, this airport is a source of pride to Witchita residents since it now ranks as one of the finest in the Nation. W. P. A. workers have constructed 3,750 feet of new paved runways and made necessary improvements to the entire airport field.

During the 5-year period, Sedgwick County has acquired through W. P. A. 528 miles of roads and new or greatly improved streets. The modernization and extension of the road system of the county consists of 523 miles of farm-to-market roads. These roads were newly built or straightened, graded, drained, and gravel surfaced to make them safe for passage in wet weather. Many dangerous curves were eliminated. These improvements have included the laying of 884 new culverts, 42 new bridges constructed, and improvements to 2 existing bridges.

The construction of public buildings is another important phase of the W. P. A. program. In Sedgwick County 14 new public buildings have been erected and 12 reconstructed or improved. The buildings include schools, auditoriums, office buildings, etc.

Facilities for sports and other recreational activities in connection with educational institutions were increased by the erection of 1 stadium, 2 gymnasiums. Greater opportunities for public participation in many recreational activities were provided through the construction of 4 swimming pools, 2 wading pools, 26 tennis courts, 8 athletic fields and playgrounds; 11 parks were developed or improved through the clearing of underbrush, general landscaping, building of picnic equipment, and miscellaneous other work.

Since the problems of maintaining an adequate water supply and of providing for proper sewage disposal are of great importance, many projects have been directed toward these ends. Through June 30, 1940, not only had the distribution of water to consumers been facilitated and increased through the installation of 8 miles of water mains, but water systems had also been helped through the construction of 1 water-treatment plant, 3 pumping stations, 21 water wells, 2 storage tanks and reservoirs.

Toward better sewage-disposal facilities W. P. A. project work contributed 3 miles of storm and sanitary sewers, 61 manholes and catch basins, 1 sewage-treatment plant, and 921 new sanitary privies were constructed.

Much work has been done in Kansas in an effort to prevent floods and erosion and to conserve land and water. W. P. A. work in Sedgwick County in this field includes planting of 321,771 trees on 1,044 acres of ground, 2 farm ponds, over 80 miles of fencing, 150,000 acres of drainage, 97 acres of landscaping. Levees and embankments have been constructed for a total of 30,000 linear feet. Other river improvements included the riprapping and general improvement of 5 miles of river banks and the erection of 176 linear feet of retaining walls and revetments. Stream beds have been improved for a total length of 12 miles.

Additional construction included a variety of miscellaneous work such as curbing and guttering, drainage, excavation, weed, and plant eradication, building small recreational facilities such as croquet sets, tree trimming, geodetic surveys, car and railroad track removal, painting traffic lines, etc.

All of these permanent accomplishments for Sedgwick County were effected by W. P. A. labor and practically all of these undertakings combined with the social, educational, health, research, and recreational services have directly or indirectly benefited every citizen in Sedgwick County.

Walter-Logan Bill Should Be Passed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT J. ENGEL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 23, 1940

ARTICLE BY GEORGE ROTHWELL BROWN

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by George Rothwell Brown:

[From the Los Angeles Examiner of September 14, 1940]

THE POLITICAL PARADE

(By George Rothwell Brown)

WASHINGTON, September 13.—Mr. Roosevelt's heroic attitude of a Commander in Chief who is too patriotic to be concerned with and too busy to be bothered with politics, has failed to be impressive in in the light of the many things which indicate that he is playing politics as he never played them before.

It would seem that the Republicans are overlooking an important issue when they fail to call the attention of the American people to the fact that the President is blocking consideration in Congress of two measures, the significance of which to the people could scarcely be exaggerated.

The President, as is clearly proved by the actions of New Deal leaders in the Senate, is determined to bring about the adjournment of Congress before the close of this month without permitting final action on the Logan-Walter bill, and the bill for the improvement of the National Labor Relations Board. They are sticky with politics.

Both of these measures are bottled up in the Senate, after having been approved at the south end of the Capitol by huge majorities.

The Logan-Walter bill passed the House of Representatives by a vote of 3½ to 1, yet Senator BARKLEY, of Kentucky, Democratic

leader of the Senate, and the man who from the floor of that body carries out the instructions which are given to him at the White House, refuses to let this bill come to a vote, notwithstanding he is on public record as pledging that it would be permitted to come to a vote at this session of Congress.

Senator BARKLEY has reached the point in his public career that would make "Charlie McCarthy" look like Daniel Webster.

The Logan-Walter bill is a simple democratic measure designed to put a curb bit on the reckless New Deal bureaucracy which is running wild in nearly every board and commission in Washington, and to give back to the American people, who are harassed and tormented in their business and industry by these arrogant bureaucrats their ancient right to appeal from unjust and illegal decisions to the courts of the land.

That is the purpose of this bill, which Mr. BARKLEY, the White House spokesman in the Senate, refuses to permit to come to a vote. He knows that if he did so the Senate would pass the bill and Mr. Roosevelt would either have to sign it or in vetoing it focus the attention of the people in a critical campaign upon his unwillingness that the New Deal bureaucracy should be hampered in any way.

The transaction leaves Senator BARKLEY in a most unenviable position, although he must be used by now to being thus left. The Logan bill, sponsored by the late Senator from Kentucky, passed the Senate by unanimous consent shortly before his death. With his consent, the Senate reconsidered this vote.

It is said that Mr. BARKLEY made a deathbed promise to his colleague that, in good time, he would bring the bill before the Senate again to be voted on.

Whether this be true or not, during the debate in the Senate on May 30 of this year, Senator AUSTIN read from a statement which had been made to the Senate on August 1, 1939, by Senator BARKLEY, the concluding sentence of which is as follows:

"It is entirely satisfactory to my colleague that the vote by which that bill passed should be reconsidered and that the bill be restored to the calendar, with the understanding that the measure be taken up at some early date in the next session."

It is now a very late date—"in the next session."

The leaders are planning to get Congress out of Washington.

Senator BARKLEY, when are you going to make good on your promise to the Senate?

National-Defense Highways

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JESSE P. WOLCOTT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 23, 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. JAMES W. MOTT, OF OREGON

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by the gentleman from Oregon, Hon. JAMES W. MOTT, at the twenty-sixth annual meeting of the American Association of State Highway Officials, at Seattle, Wash., on September 17, 1940:

Mr. Chairman, it is always a pleasure to me to meet members of the American Association of State Highway Officials and to talk to them. I have met you before in convention and have watched you formulate your policies. I have met many of you when you have appeared as witnesses before our Committee on Roads of the House of Representatives, where you have so often given us the benefit of your experience and your opinions on road matters. I know of no organization whose membership through the years has been more uniformly high in character, more devoted to the national interest, or more abundantly equipped, through knowledge and experience in its own field of endeavor, to make its efforts effective. And so, I feel very highly honored indeed by your invitation to attend this convention over which, by the way, a most distinguished citizen of my State, the Honorable Henry F. Cabell, presides as chairman and retiring president, and I am happy to have the privilege of addressing you briefly upon a subject which, I am sure, is of mutual interest to your association and to the Congress, as well as to the country.

Highways in their relation to the national defense is a subject to which your association and the Congress, particularly the Roads Committees, have already given considerable preliminary study, and we are all awaiting with a great deal of interest the comprehensive report which our good friend, Tom McDonald, Commissioner of Public Roads, will soon make to us on the survey he has been conducting in collaboration with the War Department and the State highway departments.

It is not my purpose to discuss this problem from all of its angles. I wish to confine my remarks on the subject to the legislative angle of it, first, because that is the only angle from which I can approach it with any degree of experience or authority and, second, because it is the only angle with which, officially, I can have anything to do. No legislation on this subject has, of course, as yet been formulated, but that it will be within the very near future, I think there can be no doubt.

At the outset let me express the hope that in our desire to bring the road system of the United States as rapidly as possible to a point where it will meet the needs of the national defense, we may approach the problem in a sane, sensible, and deliberate manner, and that we may be able to avoid the confusion and uncertainty which has accompanied our efforts in some of the other phases of the defense program.

We must try to avoid such confusion, for example, as that which followed the recent announcement that the size of the Army was to be doubled, its mechanized equipment trebled, and its air force quadrupled. That situation was and still is very serious and very unfortunate. I believe we can avoid that in the highway phase of the defense program, and the reason I believe it is because in the building of roads, unlike the building of guns, tanks, and airplanes on a vastly expanded scale, we already have a highly efficient, a long-established, and a thoroughly experienced road-building organization in the United States.

I use the word "organization" in a very broad sense. The road-building organization of this country consists of the several State highway departments, the Public Roads Administration, the Congress of the United States, and the thousands of manufacturers, materialmen, contractors, and their employees, who for 20 years have been functioning every day in a field of activity in which they are experts, and which is capable of immediate and orderly expansion. Moreover, this organization has been functioning during all of that period under a definite legislative plan and policy which has remained basically unchanged and with which the whole organization is thoroughly familiar.

Organization is the important factor in every phase of the defense program. Where we have had it the program has proceeded without serious difficulty. Where it has been lacking, confusion, delay, criticism, and controversy have been the rule. I might illustrate this by citing the remarkable record which the Navy is making in its part of the defense program. The Navy is being expanded, implemented, and modernized upon a scale never before undertaken by any nation, and when the program is completed the United States will have a Navy larger than that of any other two nations combined. The program was commenced immediately upon the passage of the expansion bill, and today the 200 new ships authorized by that bill are now actually on the ways or under contract.

The organization of the Navy is comprised of the Chiefs of Bureaus, who are the planning heads, the Congress, which, through it Naval Affairs Committees, determines the policy, and vast shipbuilding and manufacturing establishments of all kinds, which do the work. It is an organization of experts, which, like the road-building organization, has been long established and continuously operating, with the fullest harmony and cooperation among all of its diversified activities and with the complete confidence of the Congress.

There is a certain parallel between the Roads Committee and the Naval Affairs Committee in the House and also between the two organizations with which these committees work. I happen to be a member of both committees. They both get results in much the same way, and I believe that is largely due to the fact that both have experienced organizations with which to cooperate. I have thought it may be of interest to you to note this, since the road builders, like the builders of ships, are soon to become, we hope, a very important part of the defense establishment.

Now what is the highway problem in its relation to national defense? Let us see first what the picture is at present. Let us then examine what needs to be done to make the highway system an integral part of the defense system. And finally, and that is the phase of it with which, as a member of the Roads Committee, I am most directly concerned, let us inquire by what method and under what jurisdiction and supervision this is to be accomplished.

You are all aware, of course, that while our present highway system is inadequate to meet the needs of modern national defense, it is as a whole by no means in the impossible situation that some have supposed it to be. A part of it is, to be sure, but most of it is not. It is true that, as yet, we have only one Pennsylvania Turnpike. It is true, also, that we have not, as some of the dictator nations have done, built a series of purely Federal highways for purely military purposes; but, nevertheless, we do have an existing highway system which, for average excellence of engineering and construction, for natural strategic value of its location and for its total length in miles, far surpasses any national highway system in the world. And it is upon the basis of that existing system that we should build and improve and extend and expand until every main highway, including every bridge upon those highways, has been brought up to the standard which the War Department has already set for them.

This, rather than the fantastic schemes which some have proposed, such as building a parallel series of Federal superhighways from the Atlantic to the Pacific and another series from Canada to Mexico, is the sane, sensible, and practicable way to proceed. Let us proceed as rapidly as we possibly can. But in proceeding let us not depart any further than may be absolutely necessary from the fundamental procedure, the basic policy, and the presently vested jurisdiction and authority in road matters which in the past have enabled us to reach our present status in the orderly development of a national highway system.

Some 20 years ago the War Department undertook a study of the strategic highway needs of the Nation and in 1922, after a detailed survey of all the principal roads, the Department made a report. It was accompanied by a map, which is sometimes referred to as the "Pershing map," and upon which all main highways were shown and classified with respect to their relative military importance. That report and map have remained the basis of all subsequent study of this question.

The problem of the War Department was, first, to determine and recommend what kind of roads we should have in order to get the Army from one strategic place to another with the greatest safety, the least inconvenience to the public, and in the shortest possible time, and, second, to determine where these highways should be located. The Department did not confine its study simply to the improvement of the then existing highway system. On the contrary it could have recommended, and it would have done so had it deemed it to be in the interest of the national defense, that in the building of new roads new locations should be found.

It is a remarkable fact, however, and a lasting tribute both to the pioneers who laid out the first roads and to the great road building organization which has since developed the system, that the War Department found, in respect to location, that the highway system as it then existed was ideally suited to the needs of the national defense; and although every year since that time the Pershing map has been revised and brought up to date, the general location of the highways on it remain the same. Not only this, but the relative importance of the various highways from the military angle is practically the same on the Pershing map of 1940 as on the map of 1920. So far, then, as any drastic changes in location are concerned, the highway defense program presents no very serious problem.

It is not my intention here to go into detail as to the various recommendations of the War Department. You are as familiar with them as I am and, I dare say, more so, because every road-building program that your State highway departments have planned during the past several years has had to be submitted to the War Department for its approval. And so, although military needs in road building have become steadily greater and the requirements higher, all of the main highways that you have built in recent years have met the requirements which the War Department had set for them at the time the construction of those highways was undertaken. I mention this for the purpose of reminding you that in the construction of highways for national defense you already have a very good start, even though it may be only a start.

Let us now review very briefly what, according to the War Department, is required to bring the existing system up to military standards. There are 75,000 miles of main highways joining strategically important points and vital areas throughout the United States, and there are approximately 3,000 miles of road in and adjacent to military reservations which the War Department considers important as military concentration points, as well as roads adjacent to naval bases, airports, naval training stations, and supply depots. With the exception of roads in military and naval reservations, these are all State roads. And I think it is important in considering any program for improving and expanding our highway system so as to meet the needs of national defense to keep constantly in mind the fact that these highways are State highways, under the exclusive control and jurisdiction of the States. We should be careful to see to it that they remain so. We should permit nothing to happen in connection with this program which might impair or abridge that State control and jurisdiction.

In this 75,000 miles of strategically important highways there are some 20,000 miles which do not meet the present requirements of the War Department. This amount of substandard mileage is deficient in various respects and in varying degrees. Some of it is too narrow, some of it is too crooked, some of it is too steep, some of it is encumbered by railroad grade crossings and highway crossings. Some of it is obsolete in design and engineering. Some of it is too light in construction to sustain the weight of tanks and artillery. Some of it passes through congested towns and villages so that the progress of the Army would be impeded and civilian activities unduly interrupted. Some of it runs through populous areas and includes in its route the streets of great cities—a situation which is incompatible with efficient military use. On these 75,000 miles of highway there are also more than 2,000 bridges which must either be replaced or rebuilt. There are a great many other deficiencies in this substandard portion of our highway system which will readily occur to you as you visualize the picture.

Obviously, our first and most important problem in highway building for national defense is to correct these deficiencies as fast as we can; and in correcting them, of course, those portions of highway which are of greatest strategic value and most in need of reconstruction should have priority, because, unfortunately, we cannot do all of this work at once.

It is not my intention to single cut examples of main highways which are in crying need of reconstruction or improvement, but since at this moment we are meeting on the Pacific coast in a city located at a strategic point on one of the most strategic highways in the United States—the Pacific Highway, U S. 99—I think it would not be out of place to remind you that if war should occur tomorrow, a war involving large concentration of troops on the west coast, it would be a military impossibility to move an army with its tanks, artillery, supply trucks, and other equipment, over this highway from San Francisco to Seattle, because the road contains a series of bottlenecks which, if not eliminated through replacement or very drastic reconstruction, may be fatal to our chance of military success.

I hope while you are all here you may have an opportunity to drive over the Pacific highway from Seattle to San Francisco, and particularly that part of it between Eugene and a point somewhat south of Grants Pass in Oregon. There you will see one of the most glaring examples in the United States of a highway designated by the War Department as one of primary military importance and which is wholly inadequate to the needs of national defense. You will see a road which no modern army could negotiate. There are examples like this in strategic locations in nearly every other section of the country, which the States, through their regular Federal-aid highway programs alone cannot remedy for many years without seriously impeding development of other important highways in other parts of these States. These are the particular stretches of highway which, on account of their primary military importance and their present deplorable condition, should have the immediate consideration of the Congress, the War Department, the Public Roads Administration, and the highway departments of the several States in any program for the development of our highway system into a system of national defense.

The question, then, of what ought to be done seems rather clear. The problem is how are we going to do it? It is obvious we cannot do it entirely on the basis of our present Federal-aid road-building policy; but, as I have said before, in bringing the road system rapidly up to the standards required for national defense we should depart no further from that policy than may be absolutely necessary. At the risk of repetition let me say that all of these roads are still State roads and that they have been built and paid for out of revenue from State and Federal gasoline and other automotive taxes which have been levied exclusively on the road users. And in this respect let me remind you that there is no particular difference, so far as the burden upon the road user is concerned, between the State and Federal tax. They both come out of the same pocket; that is, the pocket of the man who uses the road, and no one else.

Now, since the States must by all means retain control and jurisdiction of these roads they should, I believe, contribute something toward this new highway defense program; for, no matter how valuable the improved highway system may be to the Federal Government for defense purposes, the States will have the full benefit of that increased value for general road purposes. Therefore, the States should help in some degree to pay for it.

It is difficult in advance of thorough consideration by the Congress of legislation on this subject to say what a proper distribution of the cost should be, but my present view is that under the new defense program, which should be distinct from and in addition to the regular Federal-aid program, the Government should contribute by far the major portion of it—I should say not less than 75 percent of the cost and, perhaps, as much as 80 or 85 percent instead of the 50–50 contribution which obtains under existing law. There are a number of sound reasons for this. One of them is that if the States were required to contribute more than 15, 20, or 25 percent for this huge amount of additional roadwork their financial ability to carry on their regular Federal-aid highway programs might be seriously impaired, if not halted altogether.

This division of costs, I think, should apply only on Federal-aid highways which are to be brought up to military standard. As to roads within military and naval reservations, obviously, the Government should bear the entire expense. That should be the case also with connecting roads adjacent to the reservations, the construction or improvement of which is necessitated solely by military considerations.

The question still remains where is this money to come from, and that question becomes one of exceeding importance when it is considered that the estimated cost of bringing our present road system up to the requirements of national defense will be in excess of a billion dollars.

I do not know how others may view the matter but it is my considered judgment that if the entire revenue collected by both the States and the Federal Government from the road users, through gasoline and other automotive sales taxes, were used solely for the purpose of road building the problem would not be difficult of solution.

The States for the most part do use their gasoline-tax revenues exclusively for road-building purposes, but the Federal Government has never done this. The Federal Government, ever since it began collecting Federal gasoline taxes, has insisted upon diverting a large part of this revenue for purposes other than highway construction. It has done this in the face of public opinion and in spite of the fact that it has no moral right to levy a special tax upon one class of its citizens and then spend the revenue from that tax for general governmental purposes. It has a legal right to do this, of course, but I contend the practice cannot be justified in equity and good conscience, and I contend further that we will never be able to solve our highway problem, either from the angle of ordinary peacetime needs or from the angle of national defense until we put a stop to this pernicious practice.

This is not a new position, so far as I am concerned, and it is not new so far as you are concerned. When I was appointed to membership on the House Committee on Roads 7 years ago I

stated my position on this question as soon as the first road bill in which I had the privilege of participating came up for consideration. I have repeated that position and have made it a matter of record in the consideration of every other road bill since that time. I stated then, and I repeat now, that if I am ever placed in position to make my policy in this regard the policy of the Roads Committee of the House I intend to take full advantage of that opportunity. And, I say, further, that in event that time should come the Roads Committee of the House will not permit views of the executive branch of the Government to interfere with the legitimate jurisdiction of the committee to decide upon highway policy and legislation, including the annual amounts of Federal funds to be authorized for road building.

The Federal Government collects each year in sales and excise taxes levied exclusively upon the road users of the several States more than $350,000,000. It expends annually in aid to the States for road building only a little more than half that amount. Its diversion of road-tax revenue to other purposes of Government now amounts to more than $150,000,000 a year. This has been going on for 17 years, and the total diversion has amounted to nearly $2,000,000,000. If, during those 17 years, the Federal Government had spent upon road building as much money as it has collected in special taxes from the road users, the national-highway system today would meet every requirement which the War Department has set for it. And when this diversion has been stopped, and when the whole of Federal road-tax revenue is expended on roads, the major part of the financial problem involved in the highway-defense program will be solved.

Here, then, it seems to me are the principal things we should consider in formulating legislation to bring the national-highway system to national-defense standards, and to make it an integral part of the national-defense system:

First of all, we should have a special bill for this special purpose of highway building for defense. This should be in addition to the regular biannual Federal highway bills, the last of which was signed by the President a few days ago, and which carried an authorization of $163,500,000 per year for the next 2 years. It should be introduced, thoroughly considered, and passed as soon as possible.

Please note that I have said this should be additional legislation. There must be no attempt on the part of the Federal Works Agency to divert any of the money authorized under existing road law for the purpose of commencing this new highway-defense program. I mention this particularly at this time because during the last few days fear has been expressed by some that under section 19 of the 1940 road bill it may be possible for the Commissioner of Public Roads to compel the use of unobligated funds already apportioned to the States, and which by law belong to the States, for the purpose of financing the new defense-highway program. Section 19, in my opinion, and in the opinion of the entire Roads Committee of the House, does not permit of any such interpretation. I am convinced the Commissioner of Public Roads agrees that it does not, and I trust he will take occasion here to assure your association that he does not intend to try to place any such interpretation upon it.

The bill should authorize an amount of money sufficient to make a definite start on the solution of our problem, and it should be followed each year with a similar bill, so that the whole program may be completed as early as possible.

The basic principle of the existing Federal Highway Act should be retained, and should be deviated from only in respect to the division of costs between the States and the Federal Government, so that the major portion of the cost may be borne by the Government.

The formula of allotments of Federal aid money to the States under this new and separate program should be changed only to the extent necessary to give due and proper consideration to the new factors involved, the principal ones of which are, first, the total mileage in each State of highways of primary military importance which are now classified as substandard, and, second, the urgency of the need in each State, from the military angle, of bringing those roads up to standard.

Legislation of this kind will necessarily involve the granting of some discretion to a central authority in the matter of deciding upon priorities, but here again, that discretion should be as limited as the circumstances of the situation will permit.

With a law based broadly upon these main considerations, and with a willingness upon the part of the Federal Government to expend at least as much money for road building as it collects in special road taxes, together with whatever additional amounts may be necessary solely in the interests of national defense, I think we can solve the problem.

And so, Mr. Chairman, for myself and in behalf of my colleagues of the Roads Committee of the House, may I take this occasion to pledge to you and to your successors, and to the members of your association in all the States, our most earnest endeavor to find the best legislative solution we can to the problem of building highways for national defense—to find it as quickly as we can and to get the program for it under way. And in our efforts to do this I want to assure you that we will all be encouraged and strengthened by the knowledge that we have the full cooperation and the wholehearted support of your energetic, efficient, and patriotic organization, whose record from the beginning has exemplified the highest ideals and the great accomplishment in road building—the American Association of State High Officials.

Status of Employees of State Soldiers' Homes Under the Hatch Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS H. CASE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 23, 1940

LETTER FROM CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter received by me from the Civil Service Commission:

UNITED STATES CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., September 20, 1940.

Hon. FRANCIS CASE,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. CASE: Some time ago you wrote to the Attorney General requesting an opinion as to whether or not the Hatch law is to be interpreted to apply to employe s of the South Dakota Soldiers' Home. Your communication was referred to the Civil Service Commission for attention.

We have looked into the status of this agency and find that pursuant to the statute of August 27, 1888 (24 U. S. C. 134), as amended, the Veterans' Administration shares the maintenance of soldiers' homes operated by States and Territories. Funds are included in the regular Veterans' Administration Appropriations Act. These funds are paid by Government checks to the fiscal agent designated by the State to receive such funds. On the basis of the information disclosed it appears that the maintenance and operation of these homes is clearly an activity financed in part from Federal funds. Accordingly it is the opinion of the Commission that employees of the South Dakota Soldiers' Home are subject to the provisions of the Hatch law.

By direction of the Commission.

Very respectfully,

WM. C. HULL,
Executive Assistant.

The United States Is a Republic, Not a Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE HOLDEN TINKHAM
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 23, 1940

ARTICLE FROM THE NEW YORK TIMES

Mr. TINKHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following from the New York Times of September 23, 1940:

[From the New York Times of September 23, 1940]

REPUBLIC OR DEMOCRACY?—WE DID BETTER, IT IS HELD, WHEN WE THOUGHT OF OURSELVES AS THE FORMER

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

I am a little surprised at your editorial in this morning's issue entitled "We, the People," in which you quote me as saying, "It is time to brush aside this word 'democracy' with its connotations."

The editorial fails to quote my next sentence, "It is time to return to the conception of the republic—a conception so clear that all can understand."

It seems to me that your editorial writer must have read somewhat hastily the account of my talk in your issue of September 20.

The editorial says: "If he was trying to draw a logical distinction between republican and democratic forms of government, he may have had some logic on his side."

A fair reading of my speech makes it clear, I think, that I was commenting on the fact that till very recent years we always thought of ourselves as a republic, but that since then, under what I think is studied propaganda, the word "democracy" has slipped into its place.

THE ADDRESS QUOTED

In view of your editorial, may I ask you to print exactly what I did say on the subject in my September 19 address?

"I wonder sometimes if one of the causes of our troubles today does not arise from the fact that we have been overdrilled into believing we are a democracy. This, too, may be one of the latest 'insidious wiles of foreign influence.'

"In the Constitutional Convention of 1787 pure democracy was rejected and the republican form of government was adopted in its place. Neither the Declaration of Independence nor the Federal Constitution contains any mention of democracy—the Constitution does guarantee to each State a republican form of government. Few State papers of the first 125 years of our national existence even contained the word democracy. Julia Ward Howe did not write the Battle Hymn of Democracy. The Nation was almost always spoken of as a republic. Woodrow Wilson, it is true, said we entered the Great War to make the world safe for democracy. But after his administration the word was largely dropped.

"It is only during the past 5 or 6 years that we have heard much about it. Governor Lehman found it unnecessary to use the word a single time in his inaugural address in either 1933 or 1935. But in his address of 1939 he used it 25 times. And in his annual message to the legislature last January he used it no less than 33 times.

"So far as I can see, the great impetus to the use of this word appeared after the meeting of the Communist International in 1935. From then on the Communist line has been to speak of the great 'democracies'—England, France, the United States, and Soviet Russia. I suspect that it was through the powerful influence of the Communist International, having groups in nearly every civilized country and with ramifications extending into unnumbered 'liberal' groups, that this word became substituted almost entirely for the word republic.

"It is time to brush aside this word with its connotations. It is time to return to the conception of the republic—a conception so clear that all can understand."

PUBLIC SPENDING RESTRAINED

It is interesting to note that when we styled ourselves a republic we kept our public spending and debt within reason. We gave private enterprise a real chance to serve the people; we had a higher and more widespread sense of individual responsibility. The people realized that they had duties as well as rights. It was as a republic that we built up the highest standard of living in the world.

But since the word democracy came into use, and the word republic has been almost discarded, we have run wild in public spending and in regimenting our private enterprise. Class distinctions have come into existence. Envy and hatred have been stirred up. Per capita American income—even before taxes—has never returned to the level attained when our conception was of a republic. In the general muddle of permitting ourselves to be classed with certain other countries as democracies, rather than standing out by ourselves as the great Republic of the West, we have permitted Communist, Nazi, and other alien infiltration. The American way of life has been diluted with internationalism.

Perhaps all this is just a coincidence. But I doubt it.

In my Union League speech I said in closing: "Our only hope is to stage a great revival of Americanism, to build for defense, to put our domestic house in order, and to keep out of this war."

MERWIN K. HART.

NEW YORK, *September 21, 1940.*

Good Will Rather Than Class Hatred

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE J. McLEOD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 23, 1940

ARTICLE FROM THE DETROIT JEWISH CHRONICLE

Mr. McLEOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks I include the following article, entitled "Nazi Revival of Yellow Badge," by Mr. Philip Slomovitz, distinguished writer and editor, which appeared in the Detroit Jewish Chronicle of September 13.

This article portrays the necessity of spreading good will among our fellow men rather than encouraging the class hatred which has been springing up, particularly in the last few years.

[From the Detroit Jewish Chronicle of September 13, 1940]

PURELY COMMENTARY—NAZI REVIVAL OF YELLOW BADGE

(By Philip Slomovitz)

Revival by the Nazis of the yellow badge to be worn by Jews and the effort to introduce it as a symbol of shame in conquered lands is cause for reviewing the history of this mark of degradation. The information that came from Antwerp that the non-Jews of the community protested against the introduction of this badge by wearing it as a mark of sympathy with the Jews is of great interest. This action helped to thwart the Nazi scheme in the Dutch community.

In a recent issue of the Catholic World, edited by the Reverend James M. Gillis, Miss Dorothy Penn wrote an article on the "rota" worn by the Jew in the Middle Ages, in which she reviewed in interesting fashion the history of the yellow badge. In the course of her article, in which she made several references to Dr. Solomon Grayzel's The Church and the Jews in the Thirteenth Century, Miss Penn wrote:

"It is said that the origin of the idea of separating believers from nonbelievers by special dress for the latter originated with the Mohammedan Calif Omar in the year 634, when he ordered that in his kingdom unbelievers should wear different headgear and girdle, and a patch on their outer garment on the shoulder—Jews a yellow one, Christians blue, and Magi black. This custom spread through all Islamic lands. In the ninth century in Sicily the Mohammedans made the Jew wear a white symbol with the image of a monkey, and the Christian one with the image of a pig. The same images were affixed to the houses of Jew and Christian. (This fact is quoted from Dr. Grayzel's book.)

"In Christian Europe as early as 1204 we find Pope Innocent suggesting some distinguishing mark for Jew and Saracen. At the famous Lateran Council (1215) it was first officially established that 'Jews and Saracens must be distinguished from Christians by a difference in their clothes.' The reasons given were several: To prevent Christians by mistake having relations with Jewish and Saracen women; that Moses had commanded the Jews to wear dress different from gentile; that otherwise the Jew had a too aristocratic appearance.

"It seems the enforcement of the decree and the details of the insignia were left to local kingdoms and communes. In the diocese of Paris and in France in general the ruling was probably first carried out. A passage from 'Or Saura' of R. Isaac ben Moses, a Jew of Vienna, tells us: 'And when I, the author, was in France, we used to wear round signs (wheels) upon the clothes, for thus it was decreed against the Jews at that time. * * * Some used to sew them into the garment. * * * Others used to make a circle from parchment and attach it to the garment * * *.' This was in Paris about 1217, a little over a year after the Lateran Council decree.

"In general this sign was known as the 'rota,' or wheel, or disk. The insignia were made by the civil authorities and sold to the Jews much as bicycle or auto tags are sold today. This wheel had to be worn by Jews of both sexes, boys of 13 or over, girls of 11 or over.

"The accepted form of this badge came to be a circle of yellow felt, about a palm's width in diameter, sewed on the outer dress, over the left breast or near the left shoulder. Sometimes this disk was half red, half white. Ulysee Robert, French scholar of the last century, sees in this round badge the symbol of the piece of money paid to Judas, or simply a symbol of gold (money) always associated with the Jew. Yellow paint, too, was put on the houses of insolvent debtors in the Middle Ages. To explain the use of a badge half red, half white, Robert points to a medieval legend, very popular and often heard when antisemitic feeling ran high. A Jew is supposed to have stolen one of the consecrated wafers, and as he ran carrying the white host, drops of red blood were seen to come out of it. Hence the red and white badge.

"Naturally the Jews sought to prevent the enactment of such decrees, even going so far as to send representatives to the Pope. When such measures failed, they depended on economic pressure. This latter recourse worked well in Spain where Jews could migrate to Moorish lands, taking their money and trade, and so indirectly aid the Moslem enemies of Spain. In France and Germany the use of economic threat does not seem to have been so effective in mitigating the enforcement of the decree. Charles V is recorded to have permitted the Jews to omit the badge when traveling. The insignia seems to have dropped out of use in the fifteenth century."

Now, in the twentieth century, this nasty symbol of the Middle Ages is being revived again. It is difficult to imagine that enlightened Christian peoples, knowing that the early Christians, too, were subjected to such humiliation, just as Christians were the first to suffer from the ritual-murder libel, later using the libel themselves against the Jews—should tolerate it.

It is interesting to make note of the fact that the sale and distribution of the yellow badges was a matter of business with the states in the Middle Ages. Nevertheless, it was the Jew who was branded as being always associated with gold and money.

Another important fact, in relation to the "badge of shame," will be of interest at this time. Writing in the year 1645, John Evelyn stated: "The Jews in Rome wore red hats, till a Cardinal of Lyons, being shortsighted, lately saluted one of them, thinking him to be a Cardinal as he passed by his coach; on which an order was made that they should use only the yellow color." This anecdote, which is a historical fact, ought to open the eyes of clear-thinking men and women on the question of imposing badges of shame upon a group of people living in their midst. It ought to prove the ridiculousness of spreading hatred among men, instead of encouraging a feeling of good will. There were times—and we have recorded incidents to prove them—when Popes stopped their coaches to chat with the Jews. We have instances in our own times of honest men and women in Antwerp pinning a

yellow patch on their clothes in order to register protest against indignities heaped upon a persecuted Jewish minority. Let this be a lesson for Christians who are abusing their faith. True religion does not know and never should know hatred. Nazi-ism which tries to impose bigotry upon friendly peoples is the very antithesis of true religious faith.

Transportation of American Commodities to Foreign Markets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN KEE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 23, 1940

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter addressed by me on September 19, 1940, to the chairman of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, Hon. SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND. In connection therewith I offer the following brief explanation.

On August 28, 1940, Admiral E. S. Land, Chairman of the United States Maritime Commission, in a letter to the chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, expressed at length his views and recommendations with respect to H. R. 10092, a bill now before the said committee for consideration, the object and purposes of which are stated in my letter hereafter appearing. As the letter written by Admiral Land to the chairman of the committee was, in my judgment, a brief in opposition to H. R. 10092, and as it has a place in the record of the hearing held by the committee on the proposed legislation, I felt that its statements should not go unanswered and unchallenged. I, therefore, addressed to the chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries a letter, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *September 19, 1940.*

Hon. SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND,

Chairman, Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: On August 1, 1940, a hearing, over which, as chairman, you presided, was held by the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries on H. R. 10092, a bill introduced in the House of Representatives by the writer on June 14, 1940. H. R. 10092 has as its object the authorization and direction of the United States Maritime Commission to recondition as speedily as possible and to charter, sell, or operate vessels of the so-called laid-up fleet for the transportation of coal, lumber, wheat, and other basic American-produced commodities to foreign countries. The bill would authorize the appropriation of $10,000,000 to carry out the purpose of the act.

At the committee hearing the author of the bill, together with a number of witnesses favoring its enactment, as well as parties opposing the measure, appeared and presented their views. Such appearances, together with the evidence presented, statements made, and exhibits filed, were recorded at the time and are shown in the record of the hearings, to which reference is had.

There was no appearance at this hearing, nor at any other time so far as the writer is advised, of any representative of the Maritime Commission, nor was there at any time filed as part of the record of the hearing any statement or presentation of any character of the views of the Maritime Commission as to the merits or demerits of the proposed legislation.

Recently, however, through your courtesy, I have been furnished with a copy of a letter addressed to you as chairman of the committee by Admiral E. S. Land, Chairman of the United States Maritime Commission, under date of August 28, 1940. This letter is not, either in form or substance, a report from a Government agency created and established for unbiased and unprejudiced public service, but, surprisingly, the letter so addressed to you by Admiral Land presents at length his personal views upon the proposed legislation, his criticism of the wording of the proposal, a review of prior legislation enacted by Congress of a similar character and alleged results therefrom, a discussion of certain policies of the Maritime Commission, a statement with reference to the present condition of the laid-up fleet, unsubstantiated estimates of the cost of reconditioning the vessels under the terms of the proposed act, the Chairman's understanding of certain policies of the Government, and his expressed judgment to the effect that the proposed measure was generally unfit as a remedy for any ills complained of by the producers and shippers of American basic commodities. The letter is in fact a brief in opposition to the proposed legislation. I shall, however, in this reply, for the purpose of identification, designate the admiral's letter as the admiral's report. The report concludes with the following language:

"In view of all the foregoing the Commission does not recommend the enactment of H. R. 10092.

"This report has been submitted to the Director of the Budget, in accordance with the usual procedure, and he has advised that there would be no objection to the submission of this report to the committee, and that the proposed legislation is not in accord with the program of the President."

With your permission, and as we have no statement in the record from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, I will defer until later any comment upon the statement in the report that "the Director of the Bureau of the Budget * * * has advised * * * that the proposed legislation is not in accord with the program of the President." At the instant, however, and in view of the statement by Admiral Land that "the Commission does not recommend the enactment of the legislation," I wish—again with your permission—to address myself to the not-so-difficult task of answering that part of the Admiral's statement which is argument and correcting that part wherein there are manifest errors of fact.

The Chairman of the Maritime Commission would seem to misconstrue the intent and purpose of the legislation proposed by the terms of H. R. 10092. Here and now I definitely assert that it is not the purpose of the bill, nor the desire of the author, to deprive the Maritime Commission of any power or authority already delegated to it. Neither is it the intent to place upon the Commission any additional burdens. I cannot, however, but recognize the attitude of disinclination upon the part of the Chairman of the Commission to undertake the task that the passage of the proposed measure would naturally assign to the Commission—a task that is neither new nor beyond the scope of the Commission's duty, and an attitude making congressional action imperative.

I shall not here attempt any restatement of the argument and evidence heretofore presented to the committee in support of the legislation proposed by the measure now under discussion. Evidence of the need for additional transportation facilities for the carriage to foreign markets in bulk of such basic American-produced commodities as coal, lumber, wheat, and other necessities was submitted at the hearing, appears in the record, and is not disputed. There is, therefore, not before us the question of the desirability or necessity of establishing facilities for the transportation of such commodities, but the question to be determined is whether or not the legislation proposed by H. R. 10092 is the best, or even a feasible method of accomplishing the desired end. The Maritime Commission, through its Chairman as spokesman, objects to our proposal, not, as I understand it, because the need for additional transportation facilities for bulk cargoes has not been established, but because the Maritime Commission feels that it is not feasible to build up these additional transportation facilities through the instrumentality of the Commission. Therefore the Commission, through its Chairman, objects to being burdened with the task of reconditioning the vessels that are now lying idle and with the duty of either chartering or operating these ships for carriage to foreign ports of the basic commodities mentioned in the bill. May I be pardoned for saying that, in my judgment, Admiral Land, in his letter (or report) to the chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, fails to sustain his position, either by his statement of alleged facts or his argument.

It would seem that one of the admiral's objections to the enactment of the proposed legislation is that the Maritime Commission already has authority to recondition and operate vessels under its control, including the vessels of the laid-up fleet, at which this legislation is directed. The admiral cites section 702 of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 and other acts of Congress (see p. 2 of report of Admiral Land as authority for this statement). This is undoubtedly true, yet it can hardly serve as argument against H. R. 10092, for this latter measure is designed not only to authorize the Commission to recondition and operate these ships, but it also directs such reconditioning and operation. That such mandatory provision is necessary is fully disclosed elsewhere in the admiral's report (as well as by oral statements of the Chairman made in the presence of witnesses) that both the Chairman as well as the Commission are definitely opposed to operating the vessels and will not operate them unless required to do so by congressional action.

Throughout this entire discussion it has been made apparent that the Maritime Commission entertains the idea that the laid-up vessels can be chartered just as they are, imposing upon the charterers the burden of reconditioning. It is the contention of the proponents of the measure under discussion that such a plan is hopeless. I also point out that recent events have proven the utter unwisdom of the idea that charters can be obtained for vessels that must be reconditioned at the charterers' expense, especially when the cost of reconditioning is figured in accordance with the estimates of Admiral Land. On page 3 of the admiral's report, where he discusses the laid-up fleet, he mentions six vessels as being "allocated for charter 'as is'" for intercoastal service. My latest advice is to the effect that in response to invitation by the Commission for bids on the six vessels mentioned by Admiral Land, no bids were received.

Also on page 3 of his report, the admiral refers to the fact that commercial shipyards are filled with national-defense work and that reconditioning of the vessels under discussion would strain the facilities of these yards. This is a complete reversal of the statement made by Admiral Land and several representatives of the Maritime Commission to this writer in the presence of a number of witnesses on the occasion of a more or less recent interview at which this matter was discussed. On that occasion the admiral stated that shippers would have no difficulty in obtaining drydocks

for reconditioning these boats, if they would take them "as is." The Chairman then emphatically indicated that shipyard facilities were quite sufficient to recondition the vessels. It is obvious that if the statement now made in Admiral Land's report is true and reflects the actual present situation, and if drydock facilities are not available to the Commission, they certainly would not be available to private interests. How then can Admiral Land hope to now induce private interests to charter "as is" the unreconditioned ships?

Admiral Land in his report (see p. 3) complains that "the immediate effect of H. R. 10092 would be to substitute for the Commission's discretionary authority to recondition its vessels, a mandatory direction that it do so as rapidly as possible." He also complains that the measure would impose mandatory Government operation. He, therefore, concludes that these mandatory sections would interfere with certain defense measures undertaken by the Commission. I have already briefly pointed out the necessity for a mandatory requirement. Discretionary authority is of no possible use unless exercised. It is true that H. R. 10092 does contain a mandate that the Commission operate such vessels in the laid-up fleet "which have not been sold or chartered or contracted to be sold or chartered." I do not see how any possible interpretation could be put on this language, to the effect that vessels which the Commission has undertaken to recondition and allocate for national-defense purposes or earmarked for other governmental use would be diverted from such assignment. If, however, in the opinion of the committee, the present language of the bill is not sufficiently clear, the paragraph can certainly be amended to clarify its meaning. There has been no statement put into the record nor made by any proponents of the bill as to the actual number of vessels that might be required nor has there been any statement offered by the Maritime Commission as to the number of the ships that will be needed for national-defense purposes. The adjustment of these questions would present no difficulty whatever.

In other paragraphs of the report the admiral points out that coal, one of the commodities to be served by the proposed legislation, is principally a tramp movement and that shipments of coal on liners is an exception rather than the rule, because, among other things, it shuts out regular and more lucrative cargo. Granting, for the sake of argument, that this is true, it leaves the shipment of coal and the building up of foreign markets therefor entirely at the mercy of tramp steamers, but few of which operate under the American flag. It is this difficulty in the matter of having liners or American vessels take coal, as stated in the admiral's report, that makes it necessary to request Congress to recondition the laid-up fleet, thus providing facilities for such shipments.

The following statement made by Admiral Land is certainly enlightening. He says "the transportation overseas of American bulk commodities in shipload lots is practically confined to vessels under foreign registry." It seems to me that no better argument for the passage of the proposed legislation could be advanced. I submit that the quoted statement is a frank admission that our Government is not looking out for its foreign trade through construction and maintenance of adequate shipping facilities.

I also desire to call particular attention to the paragraphs in the admiral's report immediately following the one in which the above-quoted statement occurs. If the admiral is correct in his statements with reference to the movement of bulk commodities, he proves the necessity for having an American tramp service available to American bulk commodity shippers, as they are at present dependent entirely on foreign-flag vessels. It is my judgment that unemployment of idle seamen could have been cut to a minimum had Congress long since set aside funds to recondition and operate a number of these laid-up vessels. Instead of placing unemployed men on direct relief or allowing them to remain idle, it would have been much better to have placed these ships in commission for the movement of bulk cargoes, furnishing employment to seamen and facilities for shippers, even at a sacrifice of profit.

The admiral refers to construction and operating subsidies granted in order to equalize the ships under United States registry and those under foreign flags. He states that this policy does not favor the export of certain commodities over others. One of the commodities in which I am particularly interested is bituminous coal. None of the boats benefited by the subsidies are available for loading coal for overseas or South American movements. Thus coal is still at the mercy of tramp steamers, predominantly flying foreign flags, and there is no equalizing factor in connection with the coal movement, because there are few, if any, American tramp steamers. This, therefore, is certainly discrimination against coal, a basic commodity and a foundation of one of America's greatest industries.

The admiral stresses the desire of the Commission, its policy and accomplishment in the matter of taking the Government out of the business of ship operation. This attitude and policy on the part of the Commission would, in my judgment, be more praiseworthy and commendable if applied to a business in which the demand for service was adequately, or even to a reasonable extent, met by a private enterprise. But when it is shown and admitted that American shipping will not and cannot supply the required facilities, that shippers of bulk cargoes are at the mercy of tramp steamers of foreign registry and that want of transportation denies to American commodities entrance to foreign markets, why should our Maritime Commission so earnestly desire to remove the Government from a field of effort in which no competitive American interests are operating? Why so zealously guard the rights of a private industry that is, to all intents and purposes, nonexistent? It is, in my judgment, incumbent upon Congress, and equally so upon the Maritime Commission, to determine if these boats are needed for carriage of the named basic commodities to foreign ports; and if they are found to be needed they should be made available, regardless of any policy of the Maritime Commission to keep the Government out of ship operation. The operation of vessels by the Maritime Commission is by no means without precedent, a precedent established by the highest authority and which should be followed when demanded by the interests of the American people.

In his report the admiral refers to section 211 (h) of the 1936 act of Congress, by which the Maritime Commission was directed to investigate the advisability of legislation to authorize aids to the producers of certain specified commodities in an emergency. He also refers to section 213 (b) of the same act. For ready reference I quote the acts mentioned:

"SEC. 211 (h). The Commission is authorized and directed to investigate, determine, and keep current records of the advisability of enactment of suitable legislation authorizing the Commission, in an economic or commercial emergency, to aid the farmers and cotton, coal, lumber, and cement producers in any section of the United States in the transportation and landing of their products in any foreign port, which products can be carried in dry-cargo vessels by reducing rates, by supplying additional tonnage to any American operator, or by operation of vessels directly by the Commission, until such time as the Commission shall deem such special rate reduction and operation unnecessary for the benefit of the American farmers and such producers."

"SEC. 213 (b). The Commission shall make studies of and make a report to Congress as soon as practicable on tramp shipping service and the advisability of citizens of the United States participating in such service with vessels under United States registry."

It will be noted that the acts above quoted are mandatory. They "authorize and direct" the Maritime Commission to make certain investigations to determine the advisability of legislation to aid the producers of the very commodities mentioned in H. R. 10092 in the "landing of their products in any foreign port"; and section 213 (b) provides that the Commission "shall" make studies and report to Congress "as soon as practicable" upon the matters in such section mentioned.

The above legislation has been upon the statute books for 4 years, and as evidence that nothing has been accomplished under it I refer to and here quote the concluding sentence of the paragraph of Admiral Land's report, in which he deals with the subject. The admiral says: "Both subjects *now* (italics mine) are receiving continuous study by the Commission, but on the basis of facts developed to the present time the Commission does not feel justified in recommending to the Congress any material departure from the present policy." This statement is certainly an admission that to date the Commission has not carried out its instructions from Congress. In view of this fact, it is rather surprising that the legislation even merited an allusion.

To sustain his attitude of opposition to this proposed action of the Government for the relief of American producers of basic commodities, the admiral makes reference in his report to a loss allegedly suffered by the Government in the operation some years ago of coal-carrying ships to the Mediterranean and South American ports. He states that 45 voyages were made in this trade, with a resultant loss to the Government of $1,561,000, or an average of $5.11 per ton. This matter was fully covered at the hearing before your committee on H. R. 10092, but the admiral makes no reference to the testimony given at the hearing concerning the off-setting advantages in the way of employment in mines and on railroads, and in other relative and allied industries by the movement of this coal overseas, which appreciably reduced the loss referred to in the report. To include that this experience should preclude any further experiments is to likewise inferentially make the same conclusion with respect to the entire operations of the Maritime Commission, in that, as I am advised, this Bureau is now operating at a deficit.

With further reference to the former experience of the Government in operating ships, it is my understanding that under the conditions set up at that time by the Shipping Board the charterer of a vessel was not permitted to book return cargoes, and in most cases where returned cargoes were negotiated, it was through the Shipping Board or the company who represented the Board. Records are not available to show what loss was encountered on three boats having return cargoes, but the loss on the vessels returned light was from 50 to 60 percent of the figure mentioned in the admiral's report. According to available figures there is only one recorded case where the average cost was $3.12 or above, and that was on seven voyages to Civita Vecchia, which averaged $3.33, and included in this figure is 62 cents maintenance and 40 cents administrative, which is excessive.

It is submitted that the cost of the operation of these vessels for movement of coal about 9 years ago, exclusive of reconditioning cost, should be weighed with respect to the benefits to the individual workers and not to the outlay of funds. If direct relief is a necessary factor in our daily life, then relief through the medium of work is of far greater benefit to our people.

The report of Admiral Land fails to take into consideration conditions prevailing in the world today, whereby Germany controls 70 percent of European coal lands, and if England should be defeated, and we are not prepared to meet this situation, we will have a competitor in South America who will receive all the benefits of the money which our Government contemplates advancing to our southern neighbors. We are now planning to send $500,000,000 into the South American republics. Unless the producers of American commodities are given the opportunity to place these

commodities in the South American markets, our half billion of American dollars will cross the Atlantic.

The only other medium through which the exporters of American coal and other commodities can operate and meet the views of the Maritime Commission would be to form a corporation, borrow money from some other Government agency and use it for the reconditioning of the idle vessels owned by the Government. This method is impossible and impracticable, especially so far as the coal industry is concerned. The latter industry has been through a long period of financial loss and consequent embarrassment, and is not in position to put up the necessary funds to go into the shipping business and to meet all requirements and obligations of such new enterprise.

The report of Admiral Land is in many respects misleading. The statement is made that the exports of coal from this country to South American countries have increased enormously since 1938. As a matter of fact, because of lack of shipping facilities, there have never been, and are not today, any "enormous" exports of coal to South America. It is not a true picture of the trade situation to single out any one period of a few months or even an entire year and set forth the happenings of that period. It may be true that at the instant moment or at any one particular time there is and may be a supply of vessels available to carry coal to South America, and it may also be true that some appreciable quantity of coal moved from this country to South America on the high boat rates that obtained during the early part of the present year, but there is a big distinction between the purchase of coal under what we might call compulsion and the purchase of the same commodity through good trade relations and stabilized boat rates. The very fact that South America had to obtain her coal from this country and pay these high boat rates of itself militates against the building up of good and permanent trade relations between this country and the South American republics. We may not hope that our distribution of $500,000,000 in loans to our neighbors of the south will induce them to buy our commodities at a premium. Gratitude may open hearts, but it will not open avenues of trade.

The report of the admiral complains that H. R. 10092 as drafted, applied to vessels other than the laid-up fleet. Further complaint is made that the bill would apply to certain other vessels, such as passenger, refrigerator, and tankers now laid up. There is no objection whatever to the amendment of the bill to meet this criticism. Such amendment can very properly be made in committee before the bill is reported out. I am certainly not concerned with reconditioning refrigerator, passenger, or tank ships and it is certainly beyond the scope of reasoning to construe the bill to require the reconditioning of vessels of this character for the purpose intended or to recondition ships which are not in need of reconditioning.

The report points out that Government money would be risked unnecessarily in the repairing of the vessels, and yet, as pointed out in the hearing before your committee, the Maritime Commission would ask private industry to assume this risk. It is respectfully suggested that private industry should not be asked to assume the burden of building up a Government merchant marine.

The interpretation placed by the admiral's report upon the wording "as rapidly as possible" contained in the bill is not only erroneous; it is surprising. The phrase "as rapidly as possible" is nothing new either in the realm of business or in law. It is certainly not to be assumed that the phrase means that bids must be immediately secured and accepted for the reconditioning of the entire remaining laid-up fleet. The phrase has often been construed as meaning no more immediacy than the words "as soon as practicable," which are found in the initial sentence of section 213 (b) of the present Merchant Marine Act, to which I have heretofore referred. In that section Congress instructed the Maritime Commission to make certain studies and report to Congress as soon as practicable. The act was passed 4 years ago, and so far as I am advised no report has yet been forthcoming. The Commission evidently determined that it was not practicable to sooner report, and had the words in the act been "as rapidly as possible," the Commission could just as easily have determined that it was not possible to sooner report. Notwithstanding this, however, the Commission now assumes to interpret the wording "as rapidly as possible" to mean immediately. I do not think this is a serious question, and believe that I am right in asserting that the legal interpretation of the phrase gives the Commission all necessary latitude in the matter of time.

It is noted that the admiral's report estimates the cost of reconditioning the vessels affected by the proposed legislation at from $200,000 to as high as $500,000 per vessel. Persons familiar with and cognizant of the condition of these vessels have made no such fantastic estimates. It is no doubt true that if the vessels were to be reconditioned in such way as to bring them up to naval requirements, and if their propulsion equipment was renewed, the Commission estimate might possibly be approximately correct, but there is no necessity for such elaborate reconditioning of the vessels for the purpose of transporting coal, lumber, and other basic commodities overseas. It is not only my judgment, but also the opinion of others who are better informed and more qualified to speak, that these ships can be brought within the requirements and specifications of the American Bureau of Shipping at a cost per vessel well within the appropriation of $10,000,000 authorized by the bill. At an interview sometime since Admiral Land stated that the average cost of reconditioning was $15 per dead-weight ton; therefore, after deducting the passenger, refrigerator, and absolute junk vessels, $10,000,000 would recondition at least 50 vessels.

With reference to the cost of operating the vessels, it must be borne in mind that we have no accurate figures to show us what the operating cost will be. It can be safely asserted, however, that if the ships are operated on the basis of fair charges for administration, maintenance, etc., and the elimination of commissions, and the vessels are permitted to load under usual tramp-steamer customs, they should be operated to South America and return in ballast for a figure close to $5 per ton.

The discussion by the admiral in his report of the meaning of the words "commodity" and "produce" as employed in the bill, would seem to be purely academic and of little if any practical value. The wording of the bill is not yet, at least, a law of the Medes and Persians. If deemed necessary, the "commodities" intended to be embraced by the measure can be specifically itemized and "produce" can be tagged to the satisfaction of the admiral's taste. I cheerfully grant the assurance that no pride of authorship will bar clarifying amendments. The issue to be determined is the purpose and intent of the proposal, which I do not for an instant think either the Maritime Commission or its chairman misunderstands. The committee now considering the measure can be, I am sure, safely trusted to clear up such obscurities of expression as may, unhappily, have been used by reason of the author's cultural limitations. In other words, it is not necessary for me to say to the chairman of this committee that if the language of the bill does not clearly express its purpose it can be made to do so before it is reported out.

As heretofore stated it is not my intention to here either repeat or add to the argument for the passage of the proposed measure that was so splendidly and ably presented by others to the committee at the time of the hearing. I cannot refrain, however, from here calling attention to the effect that the passage of this measure will have upon one American produced commodity in which the State I have the honor to represent, as well as many other States of the Union, are vitally interested. I refer to bituminous coal, the production of which is one of the greatest American industries and which furnishes employment to many thousands of American workers.

It has been determined that probably 5,000,000 tons of coal per year can be exported to South American countries provided that shipping facilities can be provided with such certainty that long-term contracts can be made for delivery to South American purchasers. In order to make these long-time contracts for the delivery of coal to our southern neighbors it is necessary that the freight rate be a stabilized and continuing one, and that the coal shipper be assured that shipping facilities will be available throughout the life of the contract. This is necessary in order to definitely fix a delivered price for the coal to the South American purchaser, and to assure that the American coal producer will not be faced with the hazard of changing freight rates. The reconditioning and operation of ships under authorization of the pending measure will accomplish the desired end. The opening of such a South American market for this one commodity alone will give employment to thousands of idle laborers and add millions of dollars to the national annual income.

It can be readily understood that the pending measure is designed to benefit the producers and shippers of commodities which are transported in bulk. It has been called to my attention that practically all vessels now operating under the American flag on routes established or approved by the Maritime Commission and which vessels have been provided by the Commission, are not of a character or so equipped that they can be cheaply operated as bulk cargo carriers exclusively in competition with foreign-flag ships engaged in the same character of shipping. While some of these established lines frequently use their vessels for the movement of bulk cargoes, when other more profitable cargoes are not offered, it is a well-known fact that when these more lucrative cargoes for which the vessels were originally designed can be obtained, the vessels abandon their bulk-cargo business and leave the American producer and exporter of American coal, lumber, grain, and other like commodities without that regular and continuous service which is necessary for the maintenance of their export trade. It is respectfully submitted that we have today as never before an opportunity to supply a continuing service of bulk-cargo carriers and thus lend a helping hand to a class of brave and gallant American producers who have long been ignored by their Government and have had neither governmental aid nor cooperation. The time has come when Congress must assist this class of American producer.

Referring again to the admiral's report, which is concluded by the statement that he had been advised by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget "that the proposed legislation is not in accord with the program of the President," I wish to call attention to the fact that quite some time ago the writer, together with certain representatives of producers of commodities affected by this measure, appeared personally before a representative of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, designated by him to hear our presentation, and we had a full and complete discussion of this subject. It was the understanding that our evidence and statements, which were then and there recorded, would be presented to the Director of the Bureau for his consideration. We were advised that the Director's resolution upon the subject, when had, would be promptly communicated to us. Since that time we have had no word from the Bureau of the Budget.

I am loath to believe that the Director of the Bureau of the Budget would reach and announce a resolution on this subject without advising us of his action, thus violating an understanding had with his representative, completely ignoring the hearing held on the matter and wholly forgetful of our known interest in the subject.

Of course, it is not stated in the admiral's report that the President himself either approved or disapproved the pending proposal nor is it stated that the proposal was ever submitted to the President. It is also not stated just who adjudged the proposal as "not being in accord with the President's program." It can therefore readily be assumed that some other person or persons, who are perhaps better informed as to Presidential programs, might, and very likely would, quickly determine that the proposed measure is not only definitely in accord with and complementary to the President's program for national improvement, international relations and his good-neighbor policy, but also that it conforms to the program of Secretary Hull and would implement the undertakings agreed upon at Habana.

In any event, the statement that the legislation "is not in conformity with the President's program" is, in the language of a profession with which I have some familiarity, hearsay evidence and, therefore, of no probative value.

With every assurance, Mr. Chairman, of my grateful appreciation of the many courtesies you and your committee members have shown to those who are deeply interested in the measure under discussion, I beg to remain

Sincerely yours,

JOHN KEE, M. C.,
Fifth District of West Virginia.

He Loved His Fellow Man

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COMPTON I. WHITE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 23, 1940

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, bright in the annals of statesmanship gleams the illustrious name of WILLIAM B. BANKHEAD, late Speaker of the House of Representatives. No less radiant glows his fame in the memory of many as a man whose kindly interest in their endeavors was a flame lighting the way to greater achievement. If he had considered his epitaph, it would have been characteristic of him to have disregarded his successful career, and he could have suggested with serenity and with sincerity, as did Abou Ben Adhem, "Write me as one who loved his fellow man."

There is none who will remember him with more affection and admiration than Horace C. Carlisle, a septuagenarian with many years of service at the Capitol and still active on the staff of the Capitol Architect. Speaker BANKHEAD wrote the foreword for one volume of Mr. Carlisle's poems, which reads:

FOREWORD

I have examined with great interest and appreciation the poems of Mr. Horace C. Carlisle entitled "Parodies of Praise," and I commend their excellent literary composition as well as their fine spiritual fervor to all persons who are interested in this type of literature. I have known Mr. Carlisle for many years and deeply appreciate his most excellent mental, spiritual, and patriotic qualities, and I am sure that all who may read and consider his literary productions will be deeply impressed with their searching and significant qualities.

WM. B. BANKHEAD,
Speaker, House of Representatives.

When Poet Carlisle sent to the Speaker an acrostic he composed about a year ago, he received the following acknowledgment:

I wish to thank you sincerely for your cordial note of September 1, enclosing poem entitled "Speaker BANKHEAD." I have read it with great interest and appreciate the poem and thank you sincerely for the tribute of praise contained in the acrostic.

In tribute, I submit for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the acrostic referred to, and a poem written by the same author since the Speaker's death:

He that hath knowledge spareth his words: and a man of understanding is of an excellent spirit.—Proverbs XVII:17.

SPEAKER BANKHEAD

A-lmighty God, in His infinite wisdom,
M-ade in His own image man for a cause,
E-ven to rule, in the world He'd created,
R-ightly controlled by His natural laws.
I-n every age, and in every known country,
C-hosen for leadership, great men arise,
A-nd formulate plans to safeguard the nations,
'S-tablishing courses in ways that are wise.

W-ILLIAM B. BANKHEAD, of north Alabama,
I-s a born leader of measures and men,
L-eader whose labors for right and for reason,
L-ive in the fruits of his popular pen—
I-n his great heart is enshrined equal justice,
A-nd every great purpose, slumbering there,
M-asterful in its conception, is surely
B-orn of a faith in Him who answers prayer.

B-rought up by parents of note and distinction,
A-mply endowed with a keen intellect,
N-ational in his mature meditations,
K-ind, and yet candid, in every respect,
H-appy, yet serious, in all his dealings,
E-ver alert, WILLIAM B. BANKHEAD would,
A-s President of our dauntless Republic,
D-o the great job as a great leader should.

—*Horace C. Carlisle.*

The steps of a good man are ordered by the Lord; and he delighteth in his way.—Psalms 37: 23.

A NATIONAL LOSS

Speaker WILLIAM B. BANKHEAD, America's friend,
Recognized as a leader in national thought,
On whose counsels his country could safely depend,
For they always with unalloyed wisdom were fraught—
Never shifted to others the tasks that were laid
Upon him, but courageously carried the load
Uncomplainingly on—undeterred, unafraid—
Till he came to the end of life's wearisome road.

As a Member of Congress, beloved by his peers,
He had served long before he, deservedly, came
To be Speaker—and now mem'ry's sorrowing tears
Testify to the greatness of his worthy name.
With a heart big enough to look over the faults
And see virtues in those who'd opposed him in vain,
He oft "buried the hatchet," forgot their assaults,
And became their beloved benefactor again.

When we needed him most, our revered Speaker passed
Into service more suited to his heart's desire,
For he practiced in full what he preached to the last—
And the life that he lived among men will inspire
Them, along down the years, to look up past the hills
To the eternal God, from whom all goodness comes,
For the peace passing all understanding which fills
Those with hope who put Him first of all in their homes.

—*Horace C. Carlisle.*

At Stake Are Free Enterprise and Free America—While Jobless Still Look for Jobs, Public Debt Zooms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 23, 1940

EDITORIALS FROM OREGON JOURNAL AND LETTER FROM CONSTITUENT IN REFERENCE TO EDITORIAL

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks, I include two editorials appearing in the Oregon Journal and a letter from a constituent with reference to one of the editorials. The editorials and letter are as follows:

[From the Oregon Journal (Portland, Oreg.) of September 18, 1940]

AT STAKE ARE FREE ENTERPRISE AND FREE AMERICA—WHILE JOBLESS STILL LOOK FOR JOBS, PUBLIC DEBT ZOOMS

We deal with a peculiar dilemma in the United States. It has horns, and they are sharp. In a few weeks the voters of the Nation must express themselves upon a national economy that now adds the financing of national defense to the immense peacetime debt.

There is involved a question of plain, unvarnished honesty toward our young people whom we are drafting for military defense and at the same time holding responsible to repay at some future time the billions in debt we have created.

During the present administration $22,000,000,000 have been added to the national debt, which now totals about $45,000,000,000. We created that debt largely to solve unemployment, but we still have the unemployed, millions of them. We proposed "priming the pump," but the pump isn't primed. Free enterprise hasn't taken over the employment of our idle millions. Instead, by creating debt and by increasing taxes we produce money to be used as salve for the surface without remedy for the ill.

The total public debt is imperiling the real value of the property on which it rests. The use of public in place of private money has forced the savings rate down to 1½ percent or less. The incentive to save is being destroyed. We want to get back to an $80,000,000,000 national income but not to be compelled to pay it all in taxes.

There have been wise expenditures for public works, such as power projects, reclamation, roads, and the like which are justified by their permanent value.

But we haven't produced a permanent plan to balance private enterprise and public works. Instead we have submitted to concentration of political power which means concentration of economic power in government. The debt we have created is owned by those who have loaned the money. Who owns the debt becomes master of the debtor.

The third term for which Mr. Roosevelt asks is a violation of tradition. It is also an application for authority to go on concentrating the power of government, imposing a political-economic control upon the people, reducing the American living standard by exhausting taxes and creating a new, permanent, dependent class.

The jobless are still looking for jobs. Private enterprise still waits for release. Free enterprise and a free America are at stake.

Nothing can be more certain than that in November the voters of this great Nation will say the defense of the United States includes return to the American way of free enterprise and self-dependence as much as troops and munitions to warn off foreign aggressors.

[From the Oregon Journal (Portland, Oreg.) of September 12, 1940]

EMERGENCY MAY FURNISH PLAUSIBLE PRETEXT FOR THIRD TERM, BUT NO SOUND REASON TO OFFSET WHERE IT MIGHT LEAD

Seven weeks from next Tuesday the people will elect a President. Eleven weeks have elapsed since Wendell Willkie's nomination at Philadelphia gave a distinct lift to New Deal opponents, and 8 weeks have gone by since President Roosevelt declared in accepting a third-term nomination tendered at Chicago that "my conscience will not let me turn my back upon a call to service."

During the same period the Nazi attack upon Britain has become progressively more furious, and America's activities toward adequate national defense have grown apace.

The spectacle of the European crisis abroad and the defense program at home necessarily have taken the spotlight of public interest away from the political campaign, because fundamentally Americanism takes precedence over partisanship.

The September primaries in eight States have come and gone with inconclusive significance as regards the outcome of the national election.

From this point on, however, the political war at home will be on in real earnest. After a number of visits to defense plants in the East, here and there, and a Labor Day week end in the Tennessee regions, ostensibly as President, Mr. Roosevelt emerged last night as a Presidential candidate in a major labor speech, with the familiar appeal to class prejudice—the same old soap in the same old wrapper.

Tonight, after weeks of intermittent conferences and interviews, Mr. Willkie takes to the road to meet the people in 18 Western States. His entire political fortune rests in his own hands. His is an uphill fight.

Domestic issues cannot further be avoided by the President. It is all very well for administration spokesmen—such as Henry Wallace, for example—in speaking out of character, to bunch all the issues in a single package labeled "Roosevelt or Hitler," and to brand the Republican Party as the party of appeasement. But he fools no one. As the President said in his acceptance speech, "They (the people) will decide on the record." And so they will.

Their minds will run back to March of 1937, when after an enviable record of achievement during his first administration, the President, flushed by an overwhelming victory, instead of consolidating his gains, pushed on to new adventures.

They will remember how complacently the administration condoned the sit-down strikes of that year, which instrument ultimately was outlawed by the Supreme Court.

They will recall the President's willful, if vain, attempt to pack the Supreme Court.

They may appraise the reckless delegation of powers by the Congress to a myriad of bureaucracy. They see the spectacle of one person out of every 13 men, women, and children in the United States as a Federal employee. They witness the concentration of more and more power in the hands of the Executive, and well may ponder "Is that the democratic way?"

Then, too, their collective common sense fears a national debt which under Roosevelt has increased $22,000,000,000 without achieving its purpose, even if the President's running mate does not. And they do not swallow the specious reasoning advanced last week by Henry Wallace in a speech at Champaign, Ill., that such fear is ill founded because, due to lower interest rates, such debt is easier to carry than in 1933.

And finally as election day draws near, they well may ask themselves whether departure from the precedent established by Washington, Jefferson, and other great Presidents, in retiring after their second successive terms, is not fraught with peril to our free institutions.

A third term is urged for President Roosevelt because of the emergency in international affairs. That smacks too much of indispensability which in its very essence is dangerous to liberty. As Jefferson wrote to Henry Guest in 1809, "there never will be a time when real difficulties will not exist and furnish plausible pretext for dispensation, or annulling the principle of rotation."

The third term sought by Mr. Roosevelt for Mr. Roosevelt is a real issue in this campaign which will gather strength as time runs.

To the Journal, a third term is dangerous to our free institutions, even a third term for President Roosevelt. A third term leads down the path to autocracy and there can be no benign autocracy.

FEARS THIRD TERM—WALTER L. TOOZE SAYS COMING ELECTION IS NONPARTISAN FIGHT TO PRESERVE TRADITIONAL LIBERTIES, THAT NO ONE IS INDISPENSABLE

To the EDITOR OF THE JOURNAL:

PORTLAND, September 14.—You are to be congratulated upon your splendid editorial of September 12, entitled "Emergency May Furnish Plausible Pretext for Third Term, But No Sound Reason To Offset Where It Might Lead." It states the issues clearly. This is no partisan fight. Its nonpartisan character is evidenced by the actions of such Democrats as John W. Kaste, who has been a supporter and financial contributor of the campaigns waged in 1932 and 1936 for Roosevelt; by the stands taken by newspapers which have uniformly supported the Democratic ticket, such as the Capital-Journal, of Salem, the Medford Mail Tribune, the Astorian Budget, the Oregon Journal, and many others.

We face a battle in which loyal Americans without regard to party, race, color, or creed are united in defense of the free institutions transmitted to us by our forefathers. They support that brand of Americanism which respects traditions and has faith in our representative form of government; an Americanism that has confidence in the ability of the American people to achieve their own destiny; one that is unwilling to admit the Nation to be so bankrupt in intelligence and statesmanship that its future welfare depends solely upon one man, no matter how great or indispensable that one man may believe himself to be.

Those who subscribe to the doctrine of indispensability have but little faith in America, and wholly fail to appreciate American history. Suppose Roosevelt should die, would our country go to pieces?

There is another danger involved in the present third-term attempt. When we elect a President, we also elect another potential President, the Vice President. Life is always uncertain. Suppose Roosevelt is reelected and should die. Then what? We would have the rabble-rousing Mr. Wallace with his socialistic theories. Would the American people want to turn this Government over to the Wallaces and to their economic and political philosophies?

WALTER L. TOOZE.

National Air Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COSTELLO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 23, 1940

STATEMENT BY COL. J. E. MYERS

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by Colonel Myers, of the Aviation Defense Association:

NATIONAL AIR DEFENSE

The Aviation Defense Association, Inc., of Washington, D. C., is a patriotic, nonprofit organization, established for the purpose of urging proper air defense for the Americas. It holds that "superiority in the air is vital to our peace and safety."

The following outline of its past and proposed operations is presented for your consideration and we ask your immediate assurance of cooperation. Should you require further information, please communicate with the secretary of the committee concerned.

COMMITTEE ON SAFE AIR TRAVEL

(Mr. Chester G. Myers, chairman, Hellam, Pa.)

Purpose: To endorse all measures which will insure safe air travel and particularly to introduce and sponsor legislation for the immediate construction of uniform directional air markers.

Legislation now in Congress:

Senate Joint Resolution 300, placed by Senator CLAUDE PEPPER, of Florida, on September 20, 1940, at our request.

House Joint Resolution 601, placed by Representative J. HARDIN PETERSON, of Florida, on September 3, 1940, at our request.

Providing for the construction of uniform directional air markers in the tops of buildings, roads, etc., in cooperation with the Civil Aeronautics Administration.

COMMITTEE ON AIRPORTS AND AIRWAYS

(Mr. A. R. Towner, chairman, 1421 Upshur St. NW., Washington, D. C.)

Purpose: To endorse all measures for the vast expansion of all commercial aeronautical and meteorological activities, research laboratories, main and feeder air passenger and freight lines, airports and bases, and to advocate the unification and standardization of airplane parts and their accessories.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC RELATIONS

(Hon. M. H. Thatcher, chairman, 741 Investment Building Washington, D. C.)

Purpose: To encourage all possible means of rapid transportation, shipping, and communication for the purpose of increasing trade and friendly relations for the establishment of a strong coalition of all American nations and to bring about a general sense of security by awakening the confidence of the American people in the protection afforded by an adequate military and naval defense and, to this end, to cooperate with all patriotic organizations.

COMMITTEE ON SAFETY SUPERHIGHWAYS

(Col. C. B. Treadway, chairman, Taveras, Fla.)

Purpose: To support legislation for the construction of great lighted superdefense, nonstop highways or rivers of traffic, between all strategic points and air bases, within the boundaries of the Western Hemisphere, as a necessary measure for our national defense and to provide for immediate constructive work for the unemployed. Senate Joint Resolution 814, placed by the late Senator Ernest Lundeen, of Minnesota, on January 19, 1940, House Joint Resolution 1939, placed by Representative J. BUELL SNYDER, of Pennsylvania, on January 5, 1940, providing for the construction of six superhighways north and south, and three east and west from coast to coast, throughout the United States, with air bases at their intersections.

COMMITTEE ON "YOUTH EDUCATION IN AVIATION"

(Mr. R. E. Grabel, chairman, 345 First Street, South, St. Petersburg, Fla.)

Purpose: The editing of a magazine for "youth education in aviation" and the distribution of this magazine and other literature at a reasonable price within the reach of the average American boy or girl for the promotion of air-mindedness in the youth of the Nation; as well as to publish an authentic history of aeronautics as an inspiration to them.

COMMITTEE ON MEMORIALS AND NATIONAL AVIATION DAY

(Col. J. E. Myers, U. S. Army, retired, chairman)

Purpose: To honor, revere, and perpetuate the names and memories of the pioneers of the air, particularly those of Wilbur and Orville Wright, "the fathers of flight," by the annual celebration of National Aviation Day on August 19, Dr. Orville Wright's birth date; and to observe other occasions of national and international import, as well as to encourage the erection of memorials for air achievements, the issue of special air-mail stamps, etc.

Legislation for national aviation day already enacted, as proclaimed by the President of the United States on July 25, 1939.

Senate Joint Resolution 111, Seventy-sixth Congress, first session, placed by Senator CLAUDE PEPPER on April 3, 1939, at our request. (Statement, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, September 20, 1940.)

Other resolutions similar to Senate Joint Resolution 111 were placed at our request for National Aviation Day by the following Members of Congress: Representatives C. A. Anderson, William J. Ashbrook (deceased), Frank Carlson, N. M. Mason, M. J. Maas, J. A. Martin (deceased), M. J. Merritt, Jennings Randolph, J. A. Shanley, H. R. Sheppard, R. M. Simpson, J. J. Sparkman, Jerry Voorhis, M. C. Wallgren. (See extension of remarks by Representative CHARLES I. FADDIS, Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 4411.)

Special credit for the establishment of National Aviation Day on August 19 and for the sponsoring of its observance is accorded to Senators ROBERT REYNOLDS, HATTIE W. CARAWAY, MORRIS SHEPPARD, PATRICK MCCARRAN; Representatives HARRY N. ROUTZOHN, THOMAS A. JENKINS, and many other Members of Congress, as well as Col. John H. Jouett, president of the Aeronautical Chamber of Commerce of America.

Proposed legislation: To honor Orville Wright and the memory of his brother, Wilbur.

House Joint Resolution 591, placed by Representative JOHN M. COSTELLO, of California, on August 7, 1940, at our request, as follows: "That the annual celebration of National Aviation Day on August 19 will be observed in the spirit in which it was initiated and fostered according to such procedure as the President of the United States may in his discretion direct."

House Joint Resolution 123, placed by Representative THOMAS A. JENKINS, of Ohio, on January 19, 1940, providing for the construction of a decorative work of art in the unoccupied space in the dome of the Capitol in commemoration of aeronautical achievement.

We also sponsor the return of the original Wright airplane from England to the United States and the annual issue of commemorative stamps for our pioneers of the air.

The extent and number of congressional resolutions introduced on the above subjects in this session of Congress emphasize the national importance of both commercial and military aviation, and we hope that this interest as shown by Members of Congress will be reflected in public sentiment for our national air defense.

AVIATION DEFENSE ASSOCIATION, INC.

Broader Horizons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEWIS B. SCHWELLENBACH

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, September 18), 1940

ARTICLE BY RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

Mr. SCHWELLENBACH. Mr. President, on August 18 there was printed in the Portland Oregonian an article by Richard L. Neuberger, one of the most brilliant young writers, entitled "Broader Horizons." I ask that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Portland Oregonian of August 18, 1940]

BROADER HORIZONS, THE WEST GOES COUNTRYWARD—THE CENSUS OF 1940 REVEALS WESTWARD POPULATION TREND

(By Richard L. Neuberger)

Portland's population was almost stationary from 1930 to 1940, but the rest of Multnomah County soared 31 percent. Seattle stayed where it was, yet King County, outside Seattle, shot up 39 percent. No new numbers augmented Tacoma's total, but Pierce County, beyond the city limits of Tacoma, registered a 19-percent increase. San Francisco dropped 5,000 people, yet the area around San Francisco filled up like a bonanza land.

In the decade since the last census 131,000 men, women, and children have been added to the population of Oregon. But on the other side of the Continental Divide Nebraska lost 64,000 people, Oklahoma lost 72,000, South Dakota lost 52,000, and North Dakota lost 43,000. Some villages and towns in these States crumbled back into the prairie wilderness out of which they once had been built.

All these statistics have vast and significant meaning. The census tells the story of our times. It reveals great social and economic trends. It explains the map of America. It is an index to history. Now that the preliminary figures for the 1940 census are available, important conclusions about the development of the United States in the last 10 years can be ratified. Many of these conclusions concern Portland and the State of Oregon.

People have been moving out in the country. Get in your automobile and see if this is not so. Drive out Base Line Road, Sandy Boulevard, Canyon Road, or any of the other thoroughfares that lead to the city. Hillsides which were matted with timber in 1930 are now dotted with homes. Hundreds of new bungalows stud the adjacent countryside. Scarcely a road or highway near Portland fails to confirm this impression.

Palatine Hill, the slopes above Sylvan, Dunthorpe, the Powell Valley flats between the city limits and Gresham, the green highlands that fringe Macleay Park in the west, the banks of the Willamette out toward Oregon City, the river in the direction of Linnton, the meadows on the far side of Eighty-second Street—these and a score of other sectors emphasize the fact that there has been a population trek outside the borders of the city.

TREND TOWARD COUNTRY IS NATION-WIDE

This is not alone true of Portland. It applies as well to Seattle, Tacoma, and San Francisco. In fact, it is a trend Nation-wide. Dr. Leon E. Truesdell, population expert of the United States Bureau of the Census, recently declared: "We know that the growth trend which once was greatest in the cities now is obviously some place else—the suburbs or the wide open spaces." And Delbert Clark wrote in the New York Times last week that there is "flight from the cities rather than influx."

Consider the findings of the census in our own Pacific Northwest. The population of Portland increased 17 percent between 1920 and 1930. This leveled off between 1930 and 1940, however, when the increase was only 1.9 percent. But Multnomah County outside the city limits of Portland went up 31 percent. For example, Byron G. Carney, State census director, reports gains of approximately 18 percent for both Gresham and Fairview, small rural communities east of Portland.

Now look northward at Seattle. The largest city in the Northwest stepped up 16 percent in population between 1920 and 1930, but in the next decade stopped growing. It was the first time in 60 years that Seattle had not produced a big increase at the taking of the census. Yet King County beyond Seattle's boundaries made a staggering jump of 39 percent—from 97,934 people in 1930 to 135,949 in 1940. "Many of our former residents," explained Joseph P. Adams, Seattle census supervisor, "are now living just outside the corporate limits on larger tracts of land."

Some information from the Seattle Chamber of Commerce shows what has happened. On the Puget Sound lowlands north of the

city 11,000 new homes have been built since 1930. The new districts include Blue Ridge, Aviation Heights, Windermere, and Hawthorne Hills. South of Seattle there are 6,000 homes which were not there 10 years ago. The Seattle Post-Intelligencer states that "Seattle folk are demanding and getting 'lebensraum.' The last decade has seen thousands of families moving from crowded neighborhoods to more agreeable surroundings in modern suburbia."

What factors lie behind all this? What forces have motivated this trend? One influence not to be overlooked is the increase in what is called "part-time farming." On one of your Sunday afternoon drives around Portland's environs observe how many homes and bungalows have small truck gardens behind them. The owner of a home may be a shipping clerk or a longshoreman, yet outside his kitchen window stalks of corn and potato plants sway in the breeze. Delbert Clark avers that a cause of this is the "attempt by workers to achieve a degree of self-sufficiency in times of economic uncertainty."

Along the Atlantic seaboard there is a movement led by a consulting economist named Ralph Borsodi, which seeks to get people out of crowded cities and settled on small plots of crop-producing land in the country. Magazine editors, newspapermen, artists, actors, lawyers, physicians, and other professional men and women in New York have tried this in small colonies. John Chamberlain, editor of Fortune, describes one of these colonies, Bayard Lane, as "a picture of at least relative independence and contentment." Bayard Lane has vegetable gardens, fruit trees, berry patches, and a cooperative carpenter shop.

As yet the Pacific Northwest has no Bayard Lanes, but many families in this area have moved out to the country individually. Part of this is the desire for security. Stuart Chase, when he visited Portland 7 years ago, urged that industrial workers get "kitchen gardens" back of their houses as "anchors to windward if the jobs give out." Rexford Guy Tugwell, now chairman of the New York City Planning Commission, often speaks of the cities as having "decaying centers and growing peripheries." This is another way of saying that the push is toward the surrounding countryside rather than in the direction of the downtown metropolitan areas.

Truck gardens are not the only reason people have been moving out beyond the last line of paved streets. Improved transportation facilities have made it easy to commute. A 15-mile drive to work is little or nothing now; it can be made easily in half an hour. Shorter workdays, wage and hour laws also contribute to the trend. People have more time for leisure. They can putter around in their gardens whether the gardens grow beets and peas or roses and nasturtiums. Books on vegetables and flowers have sold in ever-increasing quantities in the last few years.

Maj. Roy F. Bessey, of the National Resources Committee, points out that the decentralization of industry has been a force in the outward expansion of urban population. No longer are mills and factories congregated in a few restricted areas. The tendency in the Pacific Northwest, with its immense supply of hydroelectricity in the Columbia River, is for factories to be scattered all over the region rather than concentrated in any one particular place. Note that the new plants now under construction are not by any means confined to the two largest cities, Seattle and Portland.

Although it is nearly forgotten in the wild maelstrom of world events which have occurred in the last 3 years, it is interesting to look back upon the speech President Roosevelt delivered at the dedication of Bonneville Dam in 1937. It has a direct connection with the recent census figures which show Portland, Seattle, and Tacoma static, but with the nearby hinterlands filling up. The President said he wanted no "Pittsburghs" in the Northwest, and then he went on to maintain:

"It is because I am thinking of the Nation and the region 50 years from now that I venture the further prophecy that as time passes we will do everything in our power to encourage the building up of the smaller communities of the United States. Today many people are beginning to realize that there is inherent weakness in cities which become too large and inherent strength in a wider geographical distribution of population.

GROWTH OF BIG CITIES DEPENDS ON TOWNS

"No one would suggest that the great cities of Portland and Tacoma and Seattle and Spokane should stop their growth, but it is a fact that they could grow unhealthily at the expense of all the smaller communities of which they form logical centers. Their healthiest growth actually depends on a simultaneous healthy growth of every smaller community within a radius of hundreds of miles."

Even as the President spoke the hegira out of the cities was on. Mayor Arthur B. Langlie, of Seattle, told the Pacific Northwest Regional Planning Conference in 1939 that for 4 or 5 years people had been moving out of his community into the neighboring suburban areas. To all the apparent reasons for this trend he added the suggestion that perhaps families were anxious to avoid the governmental costs of cities. Taxes might motivate migration, he hinted. City assessments are ordinarily considerably higher than those in the country

Do not make the mistake of thinking that Portland and Seattle are the only cities which have not gained population since 1930. Census compilations indicate that whereas the United States as a whole has increased 9 percent in inhabitants in the last 10 years, communities over 25,000 have experienced only half that increase. As a matter of fact, many of the greatest cities in the Nation actually have lost population. This category includes Philadelphia, St. Louis, Pittsburgh, Cambridge, Akron, and Duluth.

The State of Oregon has fared remarkably well. Its population was elevated 13.8 percent, almost a 6-percent increase over the gain throughout the entire Nation. This is one of the figures which proves that the mighty westward pilgrimage of Dust Bowlers has been no myth. People from submarginal agricultural regions in the Middle West have rolled toward the sundown in a long column ever since 1934. "Drive out on any of the main highways of our State," said the late Senator Borah, of Idaho, in 1936, "and you will see cars, sometimes almost caravans, fleeing from the devastations of the drought."

What he saw is now reduced to statistics. Oregon has gained in population. So has California, another of the States to which the men and women from the Dust Bowl fled. But Nebraska has lost 64,000 people, and other States in the Middle West have dropped proportionately. South Dakota's decline was 7.4 percent; North Dakota's, 6 percent. On the other hand, California gained 21 percent. This was one of the biggest increases in the country. Most of the migrants went there.

County-by-county examination of the census returns from the Prairie States indicates that the loss was heaviest where drought has been the most severe and crop failure most inevitable. Some places in Nebraska and Oklahoma, where wind whipped away the topsoil and the sun caked the ground, are utterly desolate today. Farms fall apart and towns stare out of vacant windows at the ruined scene. Many of the people who lived in such areas have gone to Oregon, California, Idaho, and Washington. The western half of Montana, which is in the Columbia River Basin, has reported an 8.5-percent increase; the eastern part of the State, caught in the swath of the drought, failed to meet this gain.

The regional planning commission for the Pacific Northwest estimates that in the last decade 400,000 have migrated into the Columbia Basin; the Columbia Basin, in the commission's opinion, includes Oregon, Washington, Idaho, and that part of Montana which lies on this side of the Divide. Much of this migration has been composed of people from the Dust Bowl. However, they are not all necessarily farmers. Many of them are men and women who lived in small towns which were dependent on prairie ranches for their economic existence.

Last month Major Bessey told the National Conference on Planning, which met in San Francisco, that "additional land development—largely in the form of public reclamation projects—is needed to meet demands of new settlers and of excess population of the Pacific Northwest's own farm areas." Logically enough, in view of this statement, the greatest population increase in the region has taken place where the Federal Government has constructed huge irrigation undertakings.

Far and away the biggest proportionate gain in Oregon has taken place in Malheur County. In 1930 it had 11,269 people; now it has 19,756. This is a 75-percent boost. The reason is the Vale-Owyhee reclamation project, which has turned thousands of acres of sagebrush into fields of sugar beets. Canals full of water have given life to the soil. At Nyssa a great sugar-beet factory employs hundreds of people and buys the products of many families tilling the land. The Owyhee project, begun during the administration of President Coolidge, has lately been augmented with an enormous new syphon line authorized by Secretary Ickes.

California, too, owes its heaviest proportionate increase to a Government reclamation enterprise. Shasta County was mainly wilderness in 1930. Then last year the Bureau of Reclamation began construction of the stupendous Shasta Dam across the Sacramento River. Great quantities of machinery and many men entered the fastnesses. Actual work started this year. Now the population of Shasta County is up a mere 106.5 percent.

And, to complete the picture, Washington also attributes its major increase to a big dam—in this instance the biggest dam on earth—Grand Coulee. In 1933 only two men lived in the vicinity of the big bend of the Columbia River, where it twists through a granite canyon below the mouth of the Grand Coulee. The two men were Sam Seaton, who ran a dilapidated ferry boat that carried sheep to their upland pastures, and Charley Osborne, who coaxed a straggling peach orchard up through the rocky soil.

Now more than 20,000 people live in that immediate area. The Seattle Argus even believes that Grand Coulee may have enticed some people from Washington's No. 1 community. This may not be as far-fetched as it sounds. Years ago men and women who failed on the dry land at Grand Coulee trekked to the city. Today the land is about to be irrigated, and they are returning to it. Lee Jacobi, of the Seattle Chamber of Commerce, calculates that 3,000 families have moved from the Puget Sound metropolis to the huge irrigation project on the other side of the State.

Probably the most absolute percentage gain in the Northwest is North Bonneville, Wash., just across the Columbia from the Oregon headquarters of the $75,000,000 Government power enterprise. In 1930 there was no North Bonneville, not even an important railroad siding. So the increase has been precisely 100 percent, starting from scratch. Government activities also account for a whopping gain at the Bremerton Navy Yards. The United States naval-expansion program has boosted Bremerton's population 50 percent—from 10,170 in 1930 to 15,076 today.

A few people have moved out of the cities of the Northwest and started to pioneer land, just as did the frontiersmen years ago.

By and large, Portland has come out of the 1940 census with figures which augur well for the future. The city held its own in population, while the neighboring countryside gained greatly. As a trading, commercial, and industrial center Portland now has a

far larger population on which to draw. New industries were planned for Vancouver and Cascade Locks, sufficiently close to Portland to be classified among its "satellite communities." And the State of Oregon, of which Portland is the metropolis, made one of the largest proportionate gains of any of the States in the Nation.

There also is the likelihood that the diffusion of Portland's people over a wider area will have salutary results. Big lawns, spacious yards, vegetable gardens, expansive playgrounds, green fields—these are more in the western tradition than crowded buildings and cramped surroundings. Probably the 1940 census for Portland and vicinity would be pleasing to Thomas Jefferson, who sent Lewis and Clark here in 1803. He was the great advocate of an agrarian economy and never ceased his contention that people should live in the countryside.

A CENSUS TAKER SPEAKS

(By Betty Ann Paddock, census enumerator in Portland)

I will never be sorry that I was selected as one of the thousands of cogs in the 1940 census machine, for I met more interesting and unusual people in 6 weeks than I ever shall again. In spite of the adverse publicity which preceded the census, I found people were flattered by being enumerated. Many insisted on telling much more than they were asked.

Some related the family history for generations back; they told of their personal trials and troubles; the faults and virtues of their husbands; even the personal secrets of their friends and neighbors. One dear old lady, being fifteenth on my current schedule, was asked the birthplace of her parents. Beginning with her several great-grandparents she worked down through ancient to modern history, finally delivering the needed information.

Multnomah County abounds in queer residences. The shanties and huts of the Hoovervilles were not so unusual, nor were the north end flophouses, where 200 men stretch out on the floor of a large room every night, a total of 600 in the 3 floors of 1 barnlike structure.

Along the river front one enumerator found three men living like wild animals inside a big hollow block of cement in the center of a garbage dump. They subsisted on canned heat (Sterno) and what they could salvage from the garbage. Another man was found living inside an unused railroad tank car.

My district included the Ross Island shantytown. News of my coming preceded me. The huts were tidied up, and as I approached each shanty the occupant was all ready for the quiz. They were tickled to death to be enumerated and were especially pleased to know that they were considered residents and not transients, to be descended upon the hectic night of April 8, when most of us plodded through our schedules to midnight or later.

The populace was largely Finnish and Swedish and many of the shanties were immaculate. The men were all eager to be counted, so eager that one of them, who was missed, walked all the way to census headquarters the next day in order to be enumerated.

When it began to rain I stayed in one of the larger shanties and the owner routed all his neighbors through, one after the other. I received the full housing schedule rate for each shanty, most of them valued at $5 or $10, as much as other enumerators got for palatial homes in exclusive parts of the city.

During the first day out a death occurred in the house next to the one I was enumerating. The wail of sirens and news of the death soon disrupted the whole neighborhood, and I was unable to get any work done that day. Nevertheless, the lady was counted even in death, as were all those who died or were killed during the time of the census enumeration. Babies who made their appearance during the census were "kings-X." They have to wait until 1950.

Romance might even have blossomed as a result of the census if it had not been that I was already married and a mother. The day after I completed enumeration of shanty town one of the younger members of the community, whose fancy, no doubt, was turned by the advent of spring, came to the census headquarters to inquire if a proposal of marriage to his enumerator might be in order. I wasn't there at the time, so I'll never know how much of the report I got was fiction. But under other circumstances the proposal might have been worth a second thought—I did meet some very nice men in the Ross Island shanties.

The New Deal's Ever-Normal Poverty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, September 18), 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. CHARLES L. McNARY, OF OREGON, AT EXPOSITION PARK, AURORA, ILL.

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the notable address delivered by the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY], Republican nominee for Vice President of the United States, at Exposition Park, Aurora, Ill., on September 21, 1940. The subject of the address is The New Deal's Ever-Normal Poverty.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NEW DEAL'S EVER-NORMAL POVERTY

I am genuinely happy to be here today. Rejoicing in another harvest with farmers; men who, like myself, practice the ancient and difficult arts of husbandry. You and I need no introduction. Farmers of the vast, fruitful Middle West and farmers of the Pacific Northwest—both suffer from the adverse elements; in common with other agrarian sections of the country both suffer because of an income that too often falls below the cost of production. I speak to you as a farmer. I have worked on a farm since childhood; always the same farm, the farm my grandfather homesteaded almost a century ago. I shall speak with the direct candor of the farmer so that nothing I say may be misunderstood.

The times demand clear definition. The second World War has lasted into its second harvest season. We meet under its threatening shadow; a threat that disturbs our economy, impels us all to extraordinary effort and huge expenditures for defense. At the minimum we shall have to sacrifice our treasure; at the worst we face war in defense of our independence, our way of life, and our rightful prestige in this our hemisphere. If we must face war, let us face it with steady gaze and a single heart. If we must grasp the nettle, let us grasp it firmly. It is too late in our historic day for Americans to flinch from a duty once made plain.

But meanwhile, despite wars abroad and the fevers of a Presidential contest at home, let us hold on to our emotional balance—and our common, or horse sense. We hear that, inasmuch as the war seems to dwarf domestic considerations, we should adjourn domestic politics; that the campaign should be fought out solely in terms of our relationships with Europe and Asia. I take emphatic issue with that doctrine. We must guard the home front, especially in times of international stress, to make sure that enduring values—our liberties and the democratic processes that assure them—are not impaired under cover of an emergency distracting our attention elsewhere. For myself, I shall stress domestic issues.

I am here today to discuss the New Deal's failure substantially to better the lot of agriculture after 7 years of authority, and to suggest hope for the future under a realistic and expansive administration of our common problem. Permit me, however, to digress momentarily. I had supposed, until reading Mr. Wallace's acceptance speech, that there was little disagreement among Americans regarding Hitler. Nor did Mr. Wallace convince me to the contrary. What he did convince me of was that he had elected to transfer his campaign for the Vice-Presidency from the Farm Belt to Europe.

I fear that Mr. Wallace seeks a change of venue. The device is familiar. When I was a young lawyer out in Oregon, we observed that shrewd counsel, in defending a weak case, preferred being as far from the scene of the crime as possible when he went to trial. Mr. Wallace has been physically present in the Farm Belt during the last few weeks, but his uttered thoughts have been far, far away. In my acceptance speech I characterized Secretary Wallace as a "high-minded and sympathetic Secretary of Agriculture." That characterization stands. I had not then observed him as a candidate for office. In his new role he is energetic, articulate—but mischievous in argument. The attempt to make party the test of patriotism is sheer mischief making. If taken seriously, it might injure the national unity so needful in a crisis. He should take greater care, therefore, to avoid weakening the country's common resolution.

To say that the Republican Party is the "party of appeasement"; to suggest that Republicans, as Republicans, are eager to appease Hitler, with the blood of the European democracies fresh on his hands, is, of course, an irresponsible generalization unworthy of a leader in times of tension.

Mr. Wallace charges that congressional debate hinders—his word is "obstructs"—national defense. I dispute that. Does Mr. Wallace propose that Congress abdicate; go home for the duration of the crisis and leave all power and all discretion in the hands of the New Deal? I remind Mr. Wallace that we are yet at peace and the time has not arrived for martial law. I hope the time does not arrive when it shall be unpatriotic for the Congress to fulfill its constitutional functions. I hope that fervently.

Elsewhere in Mr. Wallace's remarkable speeches he credits the New Deal with unique qualifications to arm America. I do not share his faith. I maintain that the New Deal's failure with America at peace disqualifies it for administering the affairs of an America that may be at war. The New Deal's frivolous waste of our substance has enfeebled us in advance of the vast effort that may lie ahead. The shrinkage of business activity in strategic lines finds us with an industrial plant unequal to its enlarged tasks, to say nothing of a depleted reservoir of skilled labor.

The New Deal desires to arm America. No one questions that. But good intentions are not enough. The roads of Poland, Norway, the Netherlands, Belgium, and France were paved with good intentions. Will is needed; a will capable of integrating a gigantic national effort; will plus the willingness to collaborate with all elements in the population and the added—and vital—capacity to get things done. I have every confidence that an administration possessing the attributes I describe would galvanize the Nation into an intensified effort that would shortly spell security against any

foes. I look for that type of administration under Wendell L. Willkie.

The New Deal stands charged with incompetence in preparing to safeguard this country against the ordeal that crushed France and now challenges England. It failed to prepare the agricultural plant for wartime demands. The consequence is that a closing of markets in other parts of the world might find us crippled by shortages of essential raw materials. The irony of this situation is that many of these materials could profitably be grown here, benefiting our own depressed farmers at the same time that their domestic growth assured us against stoppage of supplies. In peacetime we import far too much agricultural produce. Most of the fats and oils, medicinal drugs, starches, fibers, and pulps that we bring in from abroad either can be grown here or home-grown substitutes equally as useful can be made to take their place. The aggregate sum annually expended on these foreign purchases is great.

The part of prudence, as well as the interest of our farmers at a time when world markets were vanishing, should have dictated to the Secretary of Agriculture steps toward closing this possible gap in the national supplies. A wise administration should have surveyed this situation months ago. Secretary Wallace, to my knowledge, exercised himself in two directions toward defense. Employing a direct appropriation for the purpose, he has initiated experiments in rubber cultivation in Brazil and Central America. And he has renamed the agricultural surpluses. You will, of course, recall that the great gluts of wheat, corn, and cotton that still plague the New Deal began as plain surpluses. Then in 1938 Mr. Wallace changed the name, but not the substance, to the ever-normal granary—a condition which, if not checked, seems on the way to providing ever-normal poverty for the farmer. Now the ever-normal granary has been translated into "war reserves." The sound of war reserves is reassuring. It should reassure you to know that the immense hoards of corn, wheat, and cotton held by the Government, either outright or as pledges against nonrecourse loans, no longer overhang the market as plain surpluses.

The only thing wrong with this picture is that, in the absence of foreign demand, our present rate of production seems fully ample to take care of any conceivable requirements a war would levy. Mr. Evans, Administrator of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration, estimates that only 15,000,000 of our acres will be needed to supply foreign requirements this year—against 28,000,000 in 1939.

Happily, the future is not altogether as foreboding as it has just been painted. Given an industrial boom because of war orders—and many analysts predict such a boom—the domestic demand for farm products should steadily expand. But even here we should not count on too swift, or widespread, a recovery in domestic demand. However, a Government green light to business resulting in new jobs for city workers would be reflected at once in improved demand for farm produce. We need a sustained rounded program for restoring American prosperity. We need, in short, what we have been vainly promised for the last 7 years—business recovery.

Surrounded by mountainous surpluses, or reserves, the farmer has been frozen into a dependence on the Government. The New Deal, as everyone knows, did not invent the farm problem. Its offense lies in the fact that, finding agriculture ill of a functional disorder, it made the disorder chronic.

For generations agriculture played a lordly role in American life. The first European migrants to these shores came to farm. Our earliest industries—shipbuilding, milling, tanning, and weaving—grew out of farming. Washington and Jefferson primarily were farmers; they got their livelihoods from tillage. At the time of Washington's first inaugural 9 out of 10 Americans lived on the soil. Thereafter, land-hungry pioneers poured out across mountains, prairie, and plain; preempting fertile valleys; dispersing civilization westward. One does not often nowadays associate adventure with husbandry—but the farmer during all these years was the authentic empire builder.

The years from 1900 to 1914 loom in retrospect as the farmers' golden age. Population expanded by 29 percent. Unrestricted immigration added 22,000,000 mouths to be fed. The world's markets eagerly purchased our surpluses. Acreage values steadily rose. And the farmer had what, in the main, he has lacked since that day—his fair, proportionate share of the national income. He could trade an hour of labor for the product of an hour of labor expended by a city dweller. That of, of course, what we mean in the last analysis by parity.

The year 1920 was the last in which the farmer had an abundant share in the national income based on his proportion in the population. In 1920 his share was more than 20 percent. Last year his share was only 12 percent. That is, of every $8 earned by Americans, only $1 went to the farmer.

Clearly something is woefully amiss. It isn't so much that the farmer isn't as well off as formerly; many Americans in the cities, large and small, are in that fix also. The trouble is that the farmer is worst off disproportionately. He has taken a deeper pay cut than the rest of us. Mr. Wallace concedes that for the last several years farm prices have constituted—apart from Government payments—a clear gift from farmer to consumer of $2,000,000,000 a year. Oddly enough, that is the precise sum—two billions—by which the average farm income for the 7 lean or New Deal years falls below that for the 7 years just preceding the New Deal. Those, I might throw in, were Republican years.

The New Deal, it is true, has kept the farm population off the bread lines. That is not my idea of success. In the 7 New Deal years, average farm income per farm has been only $1,124, including benefit payments; in the 7 preceding years it was $1,432. In its futile attempt to increase prices by withholding crops from the market, the New Deal now has on hand in Government ownership and control 10,000,000 bales of cotton, 500,000,000 bushels of corn, and 100,000,000 bushels of wheat. I do not regard that as successful, especially as farm commodity prices on August 1, 1940, were in approximately the same range as on August 1, 1933.

Actually, the basic farm problem is no nearer solution today than it was on March 4, 1933. The New Deal has reached none of its fundamental objectives. Its farm program is a thing of shreds and patches; settling nothing; merely putting off the day of reckoning. If I did not believe that the New Deal's "success" could be enormously bettered, I should not—as a farmer and a friend of the farmer—be standing before you today. If I thought that the best the Government of the United States had to offer the farmer was regimented subsistence and a permanent state of disparity, then I should despair for my country.

A billion dollars this year goes from the Treasury to the relief of agriculture. A billion dollars richly earned in service to society. A billion dollars which still falls short by an equal sum of the farmers' just due. No thoughtful citizen, in any party, whether a rural or a city dweller, begrudges those payments. They bear the seal of ancient and eminent sanctions. Alexander Hamilton, farsightedly expecting that tariffs protecting manufacturers would work to the disadvantage of the unprotected farmer, advocated subsidies in compensation. Before him, Benjamin Franklin, observing British corn laws created artificial surpluses that depressed farm prices, urged that the government indemnify the farmers. Otherwise, he said, the farmers were being taxed for the benefit of the city consumers.

In passing may it be said that the inclusion of the marketing agreement provision in the Agricultural Adjustment Act was wise and well-considered legislation, and its invocation has proved beneficial to many groups of farmers. This provision may be termed appropriately one of the cornerstones of this act. Under section 32 of this statute a substantial appropriation is provided to encourage the exportations of agricultural commodities and their increased use domestically by diversion. This program has been a particular child of my heart. From that fund has been evolved the food-stamp program which serves the dual purpose of assisting the needy and helping the farmer by reducing surplus crops.

I know of no one who advocates withholding from the farmer the grants he now has—soil conservation, parity payments, crop loans, and other benefits—until the prolonged emergency is past and the farmer no longer at a disadvantage. I have many farmer friends who are gravely concerned over the deficits which these benefits—together with all the New Deal's excess expenditures—are piling up for deferred payment. The farm population will pay its full share in meeting these bills. Furthermore, the administration of these vast paternalistic enterprises leave much to be desired. The inevitable faults of bureaucracy—red tape, favoritism, confusion, and delay—plague these enterprises. They should be decentralized. Costs should be reduced.

The New Deal, satisfied with its farm program, sees the aggregate improvement it has been able to make in the farmers' lot as a maximum aim. I see it as a minimum. I accept that program only as a stop-gap substitute for something better until something better can be provided. And I assert, in full confidence, that the next administration will be able to provide something better. You may quite properly ask the grounds for my confidence. My answer is prompt.

The next administration will not begin, as did the New Deal, with the notion that the American economy is winding up; that it is in its dotage. It was in 1932, before the election, that Mr. Roosevelt set the party line in a speech at San Francisco, wherein he said—and I quote: "Our industrial plant is built. The problem just now is whether under existing conditions it is not overbuilt. Our last frontier has long since been reached and there is practically no more free land. * * * Our task now is not discovery or exploitation of natural resources, or necessarily producing more goods. It is the soberer, less dramatic business of administering resources and plant already in hand. * * *"

The Republican Party and the next administration take direct issue with the concept of a shrinking economy. We propose to create greater abundance; not to strive for scarcity and devote our chief energy to planning how to distribute that scarcity. I have said that the farm problem is primarily one of markets. The New Deal, doubting that markets are expansible and that new markets may be found, has made little effort to find them.

In addition, the next administration will not be bound by the free-trade dogmas of Secretary of State Hull. A patient and lovable gentleman, Secretary Hull yearns for the return of the last century, before the world had been parceled out into trade preserves; before the days of quotas, embargoes, and the other arbitrary devices of totalitarian trade. Hence, the reciprocal-trade treaties, which are not reciprocal, do not promote trade and are not properly treaties, not being subject to ratification by the Senate. They are not reciprocal because, under the unconditional most-favored-nation practice, a treaty negotiated between the United States and Mexico, for example, at once applies to all other countries with which we maintain unimparied trade relations.

It may be appropriate for me briefly to quote from a speech I made in the Senate in April of this year on reciprocal-trade agreements. "What impelling motive should prompt us to lower our standards to those of Europe and Asia or any other country? Our sacrifice will not solve their problems of economics, conquest, or peace. The best contribution we can make to the world, as well as ourselves, is to defend, preserve, and improve our American

standards of living by protecting American markets for American producers at American prices, consistent always with an intelligent policy of reciprocity that does not collide with the resources of any nation with which we contemplate a treaty agreement."

The next administration undoubtedly will deal with foreign countries realistically. At the least, it will reserve to the American farm producer first access to his own market. It will further, by every means, seek to enlarge the American market for farm products—both by improving the consuming power of city consumers and also by encouraging the industrial uses of farm raw materials. Thirdly, it will search for a formula for freeing the American farm price from the vagaries of foreign markets; putting the farmer on the same footing with other American producers, who sell at the American—not the world—price. That simply means folding the American farmer at last into the American economy.

An administration worth its salt will strive for parity prices, not parity payments. It will seek to make our surpluses a blessing and not a curse. It will seek to blot out rural poverty and avoid future enforced shameful large-scale migrations. A first order of business will be restoration of the family-size farmer to his rightful place as an independent producer, realizing, with Jefferson, that the prospering freeholder is the cornerstone of the democratic state.

To me a permanent solution of the agricultural problem does not appear to be insuperable. A substantial solution merely involves a national program which will allot to each farmer his fair share in the American market upon which he will receive parity price. Such a plan would assure the farmer his equitable share in the national income. This desideratum can be accomplished through some form of an allotment plan whereby a segregation will be made of that part of the crop which is required for domestic consumption and that part which is denominated the exportable surplus. Definitely we must not permit the ruinous world price levels to fix the price level of American farm products. Too long, far too long, a world of lower standards of living, lower wages and lower incomes have fixed the price of American agricultural products. Let us end that situation without delay.

A program can and will be evolved by a Republican administration for attaining these objectives. I believe them to be vital to our continuity as a nation of freemen. I believe that through them we can build the greater, happier America wherein the "more abundant life" may become a reality instead of a political phrase.

The Third Term

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE L. HERRING

OF IOWA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 24, (legislative day of Wednesday, September 18), 1940

QUOTATIONS FROM BOOKLET BY SECRETARY ICKES

Mr. HERRING. Mr. President, the founding fathers, distinguished for their great foresight and for soundness in their principles, after its absence had been called to their attention, did not incorporate in the Constitution any provision governing the number of terms a President may serve.

Washington said he did not see any propriety in precluding "ourselves from the services of any man, who on some great emergency shall be deemed universally most capable of serving the public."

Jefferson said that circumstances such as a monarchist being elected as his successor would make him run for a third term.

Hamilton may be styled "Alexander the Great" in the eyes of many men of Republican persuasion in this body. In the Federalist he expressed his belief that circumstances and exigencies would make it essential for an experienced man to continue in office.

President Taft advocated the continuance of Mr. Coolidge for what was considered a third term for the Presidency, as did President Hoover. Theodore Roosevelt offered himself for a third term and Senator Borah said that the people could be trusted to determine whether they desired a President for the third term.

These and other statements of illustrious men and historical sources have been quoted by the Honorable Harold L. Ickes, the Secretary of the Interior, in a very illuminating booklet touching upon the third term. I ask that there be incorporated in the Appendix of the RECORD quotations from the writings of the Secretary of the Interior upon this current question. There is no doubt in my mind that the American people will approve the reelection of Presiednt Roosevelt. I submit the statements of Secretary Ickes.

There being no objection, the quotations were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Everyone knows that the third term is not the real issue in this campaign. The real issue is whether a democratic people should have the right to choose an experienced and trusted leader in a time of grave crisis.

The opponents of President Roosevelt are using the third-term bogey against him. They are trying to create the impression that the third term is unconstitutional, unpatriotic, and a violation of the express will of the founding fathers.

I am presenting the arguments of the founding fathers and other patriotic Americans. Here is a selection of historic and fully documented source materials showing that the third term is not contrary to the Constitution, is not contrary to the wishes of the founding fathers, and is not a violation of American principles.

"Some men look at constitutions with sanctimonious reverence and deem them like the Ark of the Covenant, too sacred to be touched. They ascribe to the men of the preceding age a wisdom more than human and suppose what they did to be beyond amendment. * * * I am certainly not an advocate for frequent and untried changes in the laws and the Constitution * * * but I know also that laws and institutions must go hand in hand with the progress of the human mind. * * * As new discoveries are made, new truths disclosed, and manners and opinions change with the change of circumstances, institutions must advance also and keep pace with the times."

This was written by Thomas Jefferson on whom the anti-third-term traditionalists are leaning so heavily.

The third-term issue is being used cynically by the opponents of President Roosevelt. Some of these opponents, such as the Chicago Tribune and Mark Sullivan, saw nothing wrong with a third term for Theodore Roosevelt or Calvin Coolidge; but they pretend to be frightened at the horrendous possibilities of another 4 years for Franklin D. Roosevelt.

The historic truth is that there is no reason, either in law or in common sense, why any President should not serve for more than 8 years.

In challenging the phoney anti-third-term propaganda I wish to make four essential observations.

My first point is that it is not against the Constitution for a President to seek and to obtain a third term. This is now quite generally understood, despite persistent and hypocritical efforts to make the contrary idea prevail. As the materials presented in this booklet amply show, not only does the Constitution not prohibit a third term, the framers of the Constitution were emphatically against any such limitation.

This question was fully debated at the Constitutional Convention in Philadelphia. It is an historic fact that, almost without exception, the founding fathers objected to setting a limit to Presidential terms. So they left the question open, thereby agreeing that a President should have as many terms as the people might want him to have.

President Washington did decline to accept a third term, to be sure, but he did this not because he was opposed to the third term on principle but because he was physically ill and tired of office. He was eager, in fact, to withdraw after his first term. Only his great sense of duty and the persuasions of his countrymen kept him in an office which he found increasingly burdensome. The reader can find Washington's reasons stated fully in his letter to Lafayette and in his Farewell Address, both of which are reproduced in this booklet.

Washington emphatically rejected the idea of Presidential ineligibility. He considered setting a limit to the Presidential office dangerous to the public welfare.

It is illumindting to trace briefly the Presidential elections after Washington. President Adams was defeated after his first term. Jefferson served two terms, and he had good reason to believe that, owing to the unpopularity of his foreign policy, he could not be reelected. In any case, as some of the material in this booklet shows, Jefferson was just as weary of office as was Washington, and he looked forward eagerly to retirement after 8 years. Moreover, he himself selected his successors, Madison and Monroe, each of whom served 8 years. From the point of view of influence, therefore, it might be said that Jefferson exercised power for 24 years.

John Quincy Adams was defeated after his first term. Andrew Jackson served 8 years and then indicated his successor. From Jackson to Lincoln every President was defeated after his first term. Lincoln was assassinated in the second month of his second term. Grant served two consecutive terms, retired for 4 years, and then vainly tried to get the nomination again. From Grant to McKinley no President was elected consecutively for more than 4 years. McKinley was assassinated during his second term. Theodore Roosevelt served seven and a half years and then, in 1912, sought a third term after an interval of 4 years. He would undoubtedly have been elected if there had been no split in the Republican Party. This is shown by the fact that Roosevelt and Taft together pulled more votes than did the Democratic Party under Wilson.

President Wilson, as the material in this booklet shows, had no objections to a third term. He served 8 years and there is reason to believe that he would have tried to obtain a third term if he had not been gravely ill. After him only Coolidge served for more than

4 years. The majority of the Republican National Committee, including many Republican bigwigs, favored a third term for Coolidge. It seems, however, that Coolidge, who apparently had hoped to be drafted, was outmaneuvered. Thus, no President until Franklin D. Roosevelt actually has been in a position, or has had the chance or the willingness, to serve more than 8 years.

My second point is that, in a democracy, there is no more, or no less, danger in successive and unrestricted Presidential terms than there is in unlimited congressional, senatorial or judicial terms. The founding fathers, in fact, realized this and refused to set any constitutional limits to electing public officials. If a third term for the President is supposed to be a threat to our institutions, then what about a third, fourth, or even a seventh term for a group of Senators or a lifelong tenure for a judge? I am referring the reader to the appendix in this publication, showing the number of Senators in the present Senate who have already served more than two terms of 6 years each.

Many Senators and Congressmen are reelected until they die in office. And frequently their wives succeed them. At the time of Senators Borah's death, for instance, he had been a Member of the Senate for 33 consecutive years. There is no limit on the terms of office for Congressmen and Senators. Federal judges are appointed for life, and yet no one has ever said that these multiple-term Members of Congress, singly or in combination, have been a threat to our democracy. In fact it might be argued that the longer they serve the more experienced they are in public affairs and hence the more useful they become to the American people.

The truth is that so long as we keep our democratic sources pure and persist in our will to be free no force, be it Presidential, judicial, or congressional, can imperil our democracy. Presidents are not dictators, whether they serve one term or three. They are checked by Congress, watched over by public opinion, criticized by a free press, and kept within the limits imposed by the laws of the country. The number of Presidential terms has nothing whatever to do with the powers that a President exercises constitutionally.

My third point is that the whole subject of the third term, especially in this year 1940, is obfuscated by a cloud of hypocrisy. Those who shout loudest against a third term "on principle" are actually opposed to Franklin D. Roosevelt personally. They pretend lofty principles to cover selfish aims. They lurk behind a Maginot line of high-sounding words. And their line can and will be turned by the truth.

The materials selected in this booklet show, for example, how men like Mark Sullivan supported Theodore Roosevelt for a third term in 1912 and Calvin Coolidge for a third term in 1925, but now consider it a violation of a sacred tradition for Franklin D. Roosevelt to have a third term.

My final point is that we constitute a democracy, and that in a democracy the will of the people is the highest law. The vitality of a democracy is endangered if it is inexorably chained to an immutable tradition. If the people want President Roosevelt for another 4 years, they are within their constitutional, legal, moral, and democratic rights in taking him.

In conclusion, I want to quote what Senator William E. Borah said in 1912. The late Senator from Idaho, it should be remembered, was a profound student of American constitutional history.

"The people," Senator Borah said, "who could be trusted to determine whether or not they desire a President for the second term may also be trusted to determine whether or not they desire a President for a third term. I think they can be trusted to settle both questions in a way to best conserve the interest of the people and the Republic."

—

[Letter to the Marquis de Lafayette, April 28, 1788]

GEORGE WASHINGTON (APRIL 28, 1788)

There are other points in which opinions would be more likely to vary. As, for instance, on the ineligibility of the same person for President after he should have served a certain course of years. Guarded so effectually as the proposed Constitution is in respect to the prevention of bribery and undue influence in the choice of President, I confess I differ widely myself from Mr. Jefferson and you as to the necessity of expedience of rotation in that appointment. The matter was fairly discussed in the Convention, and to my full conviction, though I cannot have time or room to sum up the argument in this letter. There cannot, in my judgment, be the least danger that the President will by any practicable intrigue ever be able to continue himself one moment in office, much less perpetuate himself in it, but in the last stage of corrupted morals and political depravity; and even then there is as much danger that any other species of domination would prevail. Though when a people shall have become incapable of governing themselves, and fit for a master, it is of little consequence from what quarter he comes. Under an extended view of this part of the subject, I can see no propriety in precluding ourselves from the services of any man who on some great emergency shall be deemed universally most capable of serving the public.

—

JOHN ADAMS (FEBRUARY 5, 1805)

"I lived 12 years as President and Vice President; Jefferson may possibly last 16" (February 5, 1805, Adams, Writings, vol. 9, p. 590).

—

THOMAS JEFFERSON (JANUARY 6, 1805)—AN EMERGENCY MIGHT MAKE HIM RUN FOR A THIRD TERM

"* * * There is, however, but one circumstance which could engage my acquiescence in another election, to wit, such a division about a successor as might bring in a monarchist" (Letter to J. Taylor, Esq., January 6, 1805. P. 565, The Writings of Thomas Jefferson, edited by H. A. Washington, vol. IV, published by J. P. Lippincott, 1864).

—

[Letter to Gen. Harry White, president, Pennsylvania Republican State Convention, May 29, 1875]

ULYSSES S. GRANT

* * * Now for the third term. I do not want it any more than I did the first time. I would not write or utter a word to change the will of the people in expressing and having their choice. The question of the number of terms allowed to any one Executive can only come up fairly in the shape of a proposition to amend the Constitution, a shape in which all political parties can participate, fixing the length of time or the number of terms for which any one person shall be eligible for the office of President. Until such an amendment is adopted the people cannot be restricted in their choice by resolution further than they are now restricted as to age, nativity, etc. It may happen in the future history of the country that to change an Executive because he has been 8 years in office will prove unfortunate if not disastrous. The idea that any man could elect himself President, or even renominate himself, is preposterous. It is a reflection upon the intelligence and patriotism of the people to suppose such a thing possible. Any man can destroy his chance for the office, but no one can force an election or even a nomination (New York Tribune, May 31, 1875, col. 4, p. 1).

—

[Editorial, Chicago Tribune, November 3, 1912]

CHICAGO TRIBUNE WANTS ROOSEVELT—(THEODORE)—WHY ROOSEVELT?

* * * The Tribune supports Theodore Roosevelt because, though he is a sincere friend of world peace and a potent worker for international arbitration and conciliation, he does not believe in stripping the Nation of its powers of self-defense while the era of armed combat endures.

The Tribune supports Theodore Roosevelt because he is the most formidable national leader who has the vision to see and the courage to deal with the profound problems of social betterment which modern industrialism has thrust upon us for settlement, the urgent problems of the men and women and little children, in field and factory, upon whose shoulders the whole national fabric rests.

The Tribune supports Theodore Roosevelt because it believes with him that these problems should be and must be met now and not later, when they have bred through generations of causeless human suffering the terrible offspring of injustice, hatred, violence, and revolution. In these fundamental problems the enlightened Democrat is as gravely concerned as any other citizen, for himself, for his children, and for his children's children. * * *

Lastly, the Tribune supports Theodore Roosevelt because he is a public man whose career has given from its beginning every pledge of his patriotic devotion to the common welfare, and because he is a statesman whose extraordinary achievements and whose deepening and broadening vision give assurance of his ability to deal practically and adequately with the vital questions confronting the American Republic today.

—

MARK SULLIVAN (MARCH 1925)

Finally, there is not now the feeling against a third term that there was 20 years ago. Twenty years ago there was still current in the very deeps of American political instinct that apprehension about kings and dynasties that had existed at the birth of the Republic and had caused Washington to make the first of the declarations against a third term, and thus start the tradition.

Just why our apprehension has become dissipated it would be difficult to say positively. Probably the fact that things have gone so badly with kings and dynasties during recent years, the clear fact that they are a passing institution, may be the cause of our having so little apprehension about one arising in our own country.

In any event, the suspicion against a third term—whether a third full term of 4 years or a third term in the sense that Coolidge's could be after 1929, if he should have one—that has largely gone out of American politics. The nomination of Roosevelt in 1912, although that nomination did not happen to lead to his election, was sufficient evidence of the passing of the third-term bogy. And in 1920, if Wilson had happened to be in good health, there need be little doubt that he would have been nominated for a third term (World's Work, vol. 49, March 1925, Third Term for Coolidge, by Mark Sullivan, pp. 471–472).

—

WILLIAM HOWARD TAFT (JULY 7, 1925)

"'It would be very satisfactory' if Coolidge were to run for a third term." (Taft to Sutherland, July 7, 1925. Life and Times of William Howard Taft, by Henry F. Pringle, Farrar & Rinehart, 1939.)

—

[From the Washington Star of August 3, 1927]

"PRESIDENT SHOULD WIN," SAYS HOOVER—SECRETARY REITERATES HIS BELIEF THAT COOLIDGE OUGHT TO BE REELECTED

PALO ALTO, CALIF., August 3.—Herbert Hoover, Secretary of Commerce, commenting today on President Coolidge's announcement

that he did not choose to be a candidate for reelection in 1928, declared:

"I regret the suggestion in the President's statement. However, I still believe, as I stated in Chicago 2 weeks ago, that President Coolidge should be renominated and reelected."

—

SENATOR WILLIAM E. BORAH (FEBRUARY 9, 1928)

"* * * There may be times and terms and conditions in which the people would judge it better to have the President for the third time than to change under the circumstances * * *" (p. 2784, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 70th Cong., 1st sess., Feb. 9, 1928).

—

[The Federalist, No. LXXII]

ALEXANDER HAMILTON (MARCH 21, 1788)

To the People of the State of New York:

Among the reasons offered by Hamilton may be quoted those styled as the third and fourth:

"A third ill effect of the exclusion would be the depriving the community of the advantage of the experience gained by the Chief Magistrate in the exercise of his office. That experience is the parent of wisdom is an adage the truth of which is recognized by the wisest as well as the simplest of mankind. What more desirable or more essential than this quality in the first Magistrate of a nation? Can it be wise to put this desirable and essential quality under the ban of the Constitution, and to declare that the moment it is acquired its possessor shall be compelled to abandon the station in which it was acquired, and to which it is adapted? This, nevertheless, is the precise import of all those regulations which exclude men from serving their country, by the choice of their fellow citizens, after they have by a course of service fitted themselves for doing it with a greater degree of utility.

"A fourth ill effect of the exclusion would be the banishing of men from stations in which, in certain emergencies of the state, their presence might be of the greatest moment to the public interest or safety. There is no nation which has not, at one period or another, experienced an absolute necessity of the services of particular men in particular situations; perhaps it would not be too strong to say, to the preservation of its political existence. How unwise, therefore, must be every such self-denying ordinance as serves to prohibit a nation from making use of its own citizens in the manner best suited to its exigencies and circumstances! Without supposing the personal essentiality of the man, it is evident that a change of the Chief Magistrate, at the breaking out of a war, or at any similar crisis, for another, even of equal merit, would at all times be detrimental to the community; inasmuch as it would substitute inexperience, and would tend to unhinge and set afloat the already settled train of the administration."

Communism in the Entertainment Unions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM P. LAMBERTSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 24, 1940

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, my effort to enlighten the members of the acting profession as to the reason for the reluctance of Congress to remove the ban against a Federal theater project as part of the W. P. A. program has been sabotaged through a series of evasions by the Actors Equity Association.

The issue here is very clear. In 1939 the Federal theater project was banned by Congress because it had been shown, in voluminous testimony, that the Federal theater project was wastefully operated, was being used to disseminate communistic propaganda, and was strongly influenced by Communist forces. In 1940 the Actors Equity Association sent several delegations to us to request the lifting of that ban. The members of these delegations showed that they understood the feeling of Congress since they frequently assured many Members of Congress that no "red" influence would be permitted to obtain a foothold again if the project was renewed. The Actors Equity Association had enjoyed a fine reputation as a fair-minded organization, completely loyal to American ways and ideals up to a short time ago. However, in the past year or two several disturbing incidents had tarnished that reputation in the public mind. Congress did not lift the ban on the Federal theater.

Since I sympathized greatly with the unfortunate plight of many fine members of the acting profession, I determined to investigate more fully the present position of their union as regards this question of Communist influence. The results of that investigation I presented here and presented to the Actors Equity Association. I did not charge Communist control. I charged Communist penetration into key positions. I stated that, in my opinion, the deserving actors and actresses who could be helped by a Federal theater project would not receive that aid unless and until Actors Equity Association had completely eliminated the possibility of control by elements holding beliefs subversive to our form of government.

That issue has been steadily obscured by the Actors Equity Association. On September 11 I presented the curious record of undelivered, unanswered letters in my correspondence with the officials of the association. On September 13 I received the following from Mr. Dulzell, with enclosure, purporting to be a letter sent me August 19. I do not reproduce the opinion of counsel, also enclosed, since it merely restates what Mr. Dulzell quoted in his letter of August 7.

NEW YORK CITY, *September 11, 1940.*

DEAR MR. LAMBERTSON: President Bert Lytell, at the council meeting yesterday, stated that he had been informed that you had received no reply to your letter addressed to us dated August 13, 1940. This we are at a loss to understand as on August 19 we replied to your letter giving what we understood was the information you desire, along with an amplified opinion from our legal department. Why this correspondence went astray is beyond us, as it has not been returned here.

However, this is to inform you that your letter of August 13 was read to the council yesterday, along with our reply dated August 19, also the opinion of our chief counsel, and we are taking care that this letter will be sure to reach you by having it registered. The council ordered that copies of our letter dated August 19, 1940, as well as the opinion of our chief counsel be sent to you with the request that they be inserted in, and made a part of, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, which we understand you will have no objection in doing.

Very truly,

ACTORS EQUITY ASSOCIATION,
PAUL DULLZELL,
Executive Secretary.

—

ACTORS EQUITY ASSOCIATION,
New York, N. Y., August 19, 1940.

W. P. LAMBERTSON, ESQ.,
House of Representatives Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LAMBERTSON: Pending consideration by the council of your recent request, I am enclosing a copy of the opinion of our legal department. Regarding this, in view of your statement in your letter of July 26, to the effect that in your own mind there was some question regarding our immunity and that the matter demanded legal consideration, we fail to understand your criticism of us set forth in the first three paragraphs of your letter of August 13. As I see it, we simply acted as advised by our counsel.

You will be interested to know that we have received word that immediately Congressman DIES returns to Washington, attention will be given to our urgent request for a thorough investigation. In this connection, permit us to remind you that we asked that we have your cooperation in having this investigation proceed promptly, but so far have not noticed any particular interest on your part. Are we wrong about this?

Yours very truly,

—

EVASION AND MORE EVASION BY DULZELL

Mr. Dulzell states that his letter of August 19, which never reached me, is in reply to mine of August 13.

I asked, in that letter, for the legal opinion which led them to reverse the decision to publish this matter in their official magazine Equity. That he sends me.

I asked which of the councilors charged had refused to release their association from the threat of a libel suit. This information is not sent me, or even mentioned by Mr. Dulzell.

I asked for the mailing list of the membership, so that I might take the responsibility of informing them on this question. It is not sent me or even mentioned.

I asked again, for the third time, for an explanation of a resolution of the association misquoting me as stating the council was dominated and controlled by Communists. This was not sent me or mentioned.

I asked for further explanation of another phrase in a letter from Mr. Dulzell, of July 25. This is not mentioned.

I asked that the letter be brought to the attention of the council, and to be advised of the date this would be done. No date is given me.

The Actors Equity Council held meetings on August 20, September 3, and September 10. Although I had sent copies of my letter of the 13th to the President and to the association, nothing is presented to the council until September 10, and no action is taken even then to comply with five of my six requests.

I had also suggested, in a previous letter, that the association could obviate any possible risk from libel suits by its members, by asking the Government Printing Office to reprint this part of the RECORD at very small cost, and distributing it to the membership. This suggestion has never been answered.

Mr. Speaker, there is only one conclusion to be drawn. Actors Equity Association, or certain powers in Actors Equity Association, are determined that the full and complete record of this matter shall not be made available to the membership. To my mind, trickery and evasion have been used to conceal and obscure the entire question. Communist control must indeed exist, and must be greater than I had supposed, since such devious methods are used to keep the members in ignorance on so vital an issue.

CONGRESSMAN MARTIN DIES WILL INVESTIGATE

My colleague from Texas, Congressman MARTIN DIES, has announced that the congressional Committee on Un-American Activities will investigate the theatrical unions in the near future. I gratefully and gladly turn all material and records over to him, as I offered in my letter to him of August 2, requesting such investigation.

Although I regret that my original statement, issued merely to help members of the acting profession in their request for a theater project, has resulted in a controversy of such length, I feel that in fairness I must offer for this RECORD the denials of the people involved. These are from Miss Marsh, Mr. Loeb, Mr. Heller, Mr. Jaffe, and Mr. Sherman. Mr. Leroy MacLean has offered me no denial.

JULY 13, 1940.

DEAR MR. LAMBERTSON: I hoped to entirely ignore your public statement of a few days ago in which you referred to the activities of seven members of the Equity Council, my name being included in this group.

Due to very unfavorable comments which your assertion has created, I am compelled to answer these charges with a specific and an emphatic denial.

I want my comembers of the unions in which I am enrolled and all my social, professional, and business associates to know that this statement is definitely untrue. I sincerely believe that those who know me have always found me an honest, fair-minded, sincere, and true American, and, above all, democratic in all activities in which I took part in the unions mentioned.

The actors and the American people will not believe that Congress permitted many thousands to go hungry and our Nation to be deprived of one of the most notable and worth-while W. P. A. projects merely because of this unproven and false opinion.

I am disillusioned to find that an important member of the Government of our land of liberty could speak words so foreign to democracy and Americanism.

I think your remarks have been made without consideration and hope you will not make unproven statements in the future.

Very truly yours,

EMILY MARSH.

HOTEL LINCOLN,
New York, July 11, 1940.

The Honorable WILLIAM P. LAMBERTSON,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: You have accused me of being a Communist. I wish you to know that is untrue. I am not a Communist, nor have I ever been. I believe in our democratic form of government and that its preservation is the hope of the world. I do not believe that you would want to bear the burden of having made an unfounded accusation, and I therefore ask you to publish a retraction of the charges of communism that you brought against me in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

If you do not consent to do this, you are in fair play bound to publish the grounds for your charges together with the sources of information that led you to make them.

Yours truly,

PHILIP LOEB.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *July 9, 1940.*

Hon. WILLIAM P. LAMBERTSON,
House of Representatives:

You were reported in this morning's press as having stated that I am a Communist. This is untrue. The plain facts are that I am not now and never have been a Communist. This charge was evidently instigated either by a crank or someone with a selfish personal motive intent on creating trouble. It is a scandalous condition that permits anyone to issue irresponsible statements which damage the reputation of innocent citizens without at least giving such persons a fair chance to disprove scurrilous allegations. In times such as these one would think that men who hold high positions in our democracy would consider themselves doubly bound to act with scrupulous responsibility and regard for the truth. In this spirit I ask you to issue a public retraction of your completely unfounded charges.

GEORGE HELLER,
Associate Executive Secretary, American Federation of Radio Artists.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *July 11, 1940.*

DEAR SIR: I have denied both in the press and at a meeting of the Actors Equity Council the allegations that I am or ever was a Communist and was content to let it go at that. After all, even the President of the United States and the mayor of New York City have also been absurdly referred to at one time or another as Communists.

But these are hysterical times, and accusations seem to carry the branding stamp of indictment, and so I wish to amplify the statements that I have made.

Let me repeat them, that I have never been a Communist. I am a devout believer in the principles of democracy as laid down by the founding fathers in the Bill of Rights and the Constitution of the United States and am ready to defend those principles with my life.

I therefore ask you to correct the injustice you have done me by publishing this rejoinder in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a forthright answer to the false accusation against me.

Respectfully yours,

SAM JAFFE.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *July 11, 1940.*

Representative WILLIAM LAMBERTSON,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Have denied in the New York press your allegations as to my political affiliations. I have waited hopefully that you would make a public retraction of your statement. As one has not been forthcoming, to my knowledge, I request you repeat your charges outside the boundaries of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, where I may take action. I consider your statement definitely harmful to my professional career and would welcome any proof you may have to offer, which I can readily refute.

HIRAM SHERMAN.

Mr. Alan Hewitt has sent me seven pages of denial and protest. Since this record has already carried Mr. Hewitt's denial I do not feel the space can be given to so lengthy a defense. Mr. Hewitt denies any association with the Theater Arts Committee, and I am inclined to believe him. I therefore offer my apology for having included him with the others in that membership. However, I may say that Mr. Hewitt denies none of the facts regarding his support of Mr. Jaffe and Mr. Loeb, but merely justifies that support by a defense of these two and of the Theater Arts Committee. I am again confirmed in my belief that Mr. Hewitt has allowed himself to be made use of by Communists.

SERPENTINE TRAIL OF COMMUNISM IN THEATER

This is not the place for the complete presentation of the evidence in my possession which led to my charges. However, a very condensed summary will complete this record, and, I hope, some day reach the members of Actors Equity Association, who are being victimized by the present state of affairs. I might say, victimized by their present union government.

In January 1934 a magazine called New Theater was launched in New York City as the organ of the League of Workers Theaters. The League of Workers Theaters had been organized in 1932 and made a "section" of the International Union of the Revolutionary Theater. The International Union of the Revolutionary Theater had "sections" in France, England, Germany, and the United States. Its address was post-office box 527, Moscow, U. S. S. R. The members of the League of Workers Theaters were numerous amateur groups throughout the country, such as the Blue Blouses of Los Angeles, the Workers Theater of Chicago, the New Theater of Hollywood, the Workers Laboratory Theater of New York. They also had certain professional theater organizations as members, among them Artef, the Theater Union, and the Group Theater, all of New York City.

On New Theater's editorial board were such well and widely known Communists as Nathaniel Buchwald, Joseph Freeman, Erwin Piscator, Jay Leyda, Romain Rolland. Hallie Flanagan was a contributing editor, as were Stephen Karnot, John E. Bonn, Virgil Geddes, Mordecai Gorelik, Ralph Steiner,

Leo Hurwitz, and so forth, all later holding important positions in Government-sponsored art projects.

I believe the simplest way to give you a notion of the magazine and its affiliation with the Communist Party of the United States and International Communism is to quote at random from its various issues:

January 1934 John E. Bonn reporting the 1933 Olympiad of Revolutionary Theaters:

The Dutch section performed an antireligious play and a revue contrasting life in the Soviet Union with life in the capitalistic countries—two examples of the perfect agit-prop drama.

February 1934:

The International theme occupies a considerable place in the Soviet Theater reflecting the class struggle of the proletariat in the lands of Fascist dictatorship and in the land of crisis, unemployment, hunger.

* * * The revolutionary movement explodes the lies of capitalism * * * conservatism is based upon lies.

March 1934, Robert Gessner:

I offer my experiences as a propagandist, better termed a "revolutionary artist." * * * All revolutionary art aims to undermine the ideological structure of the middle class and consolidate the working class.

The Theater Union found itself compelled to choose some actors solely for their ability * * * but the more thoughtful have begun to rebel * * * among the younger, all of them are class conscious or sympathetic. * * * They have begun to read John Strachey and Marxist literature.

June 1934:

Our slogan: Theater is a weapon in the class struggle.

September 1934:

We must win over more and more competent artists. We must indeed professionalize the revolutionary theater arts with their assistance and assist them in revolutionizing the professional theater arts.

January 1935:

On the fifteenth anniversary of the Soviet, the Cinema Editorial Staff Sovietskee Kino and Cinema Workers send warm comradely greetings to the New Theater and Workers Cinema League. Congratulations on first all-Soviet issue. * * * Forward with united front against fascism and war for revolutionary art.

November 1934:

From the Second United States Congress Against War and Fascism, held in Chicago, Alice Evans, delegate of the League of Workers' Theaters, sends the following correspondence:

"* * * A pause comes after the singing, and then Harry Ward, national chairman of the League Against War and Fascism, makes a quiet announcement:

"'We will have a demonstration of solidarity from the ranks of the armed forces of the United States. I will ask the audience to be quiet and cooperate in getting through this as quickly as possible, so there will be no disastrous results.'

"Quickly the lights are dimmed, the microphone and speakers' table are moved back. The wide auditorium is hushed. Three thousand three hundred delegates, representing 2,000,000 workers and farmers, lean forward in their seats. Another pause.

"On the stage comes a young man in khaki uniform, the upper half of his face masked. 'In the name of four divisions of the National Guard of the United States, I bring greetings to the Second United States Congress Against War and Fascism. * * * We are organizing anti-strike-duty groups within the National Guard, and we pledge ourselves to carry out the decisions of this congress.'

"As the National Guard man walks quickly off the stage, another young man in khaki, similarly masked, takes his place. A deeper voice this time, less tremolo, more power, more grim certainty: 'As a first lieutenant in the United States Army, I bring greetings not only from myself but from six score soldiers in Michigan, Wisconsin, and Illinois. Our presence at this congress is our answer to the bosses, who try to use the Army to defend their profits against the rising upsurge of the masses of American people. More and more soldiers stand ready to fight with the working class, pledging themselves to turn imperialist war into war against the bosses. Long live the revolutionary struggle against war! Hail the workers', farmers', and soldiers' government of the United States!'

"When it is over and we are back in our seats, beginning to catch breath, there is a glow on every face. * * * A taste we have had—a fleeting foretaste—of the revolution. This single dramatic incident of two young men in khaki, blindfolded to prevent detection, voicing proletarian solidarity, has crystallized for 5,000 people the meaning of the Congress Against War and Fascism. There was never a more smashing proof of the efficiency of dramatic method in winning masses of people to acceptance of an idea and participation in a struggle."

And so it goes. There can be no doubt whatsoever that New Theatre was a Communist organ devoted wholly to advancing the revolutionary cause through the theater. And there can be no doubt, after a careful reading of the 12 magazines issued through 1934, that the editors and contributors were proud and enthusiastic workers for revolution. They say so themselves, over and over again.

AGENTS PROVOCATEURS IN EQUITY

Now in the fourth issue, April 1934, we come suddenly on something of great interest to the members of Actors Equity Association as events proved. The cover carries a smash headline "The Awakening of the Actors—Storm over Broadway." Five pages, about a quarter of the magazine, are devoted to "the real story of the opposition movement in Equity, what brought it about, how it developed, its aims, and what it signifies for the welfare of the actors." It tells the story of what New Theatre calls a mass revolt, a dispute between the manager and actors of Sailor Beware over a salary cut. The date was March 5, 1934. "In a spontaneous revolt" against the bureaucratic and reactionary leadership of Equity meetings were held, nominating committee members, who controlled the election slate, were chosen to be presented to the Equity meeting on March 21—the rank-and-file movement was on its way.

There is no question that New Theatre was the official spokesman for the new faction and consistently propagandized and recruited for it. In every subsequent issue of New Theatre the rank-and-file movement was publicized, advertised editorially, and supported in every possible way. In May they offered "because the matter is so important, the editors will send a copy of the April issue to any actor requesting it. Let us hear from you now."

To again resort to quoting at random, June 1934:

Of vital concern to the workers in the American Theatre is the rise of an actors' movement within the Actors Equity Association with a program in opposition to the prevailing policy of the present high officials of Equity.

July 1934:

At annual election 7 out of 13 were candidates of the new faction * * * stagnant and bureaucratic leadership * * * doubtful tactics employed by Gillmore to obstruct or defeat this progressive group.

November 1934:

Actors who want to safeguard their rights should get in touch with the rank-and-file group through New Theatre.

June 1934—John Howard Lawson:

The season of 1933–34 has been tremendously significant * * * the revolutionary theater is on the threshold of its vital growth. * * * In 1934 this intensification of the class struggle is proceeding rapidly. * * * I am writing this present article in the hope that it will reach some of the stage employees who are affected by this problem. * * * At the present time it is urgently necessary to face the issue decisively and to help toward the building of the revolutionary theater. What does this mean in concrete terms? It means active participation in the rank-and-file movement in Equity and other labor organizations.

So it becomes clear beyond the shadow of a reasonable doubt that the rank-and-file movement in Equity, finally named the Forum, as New Theatre proudly proclaims in its March 1935 issue, is the leading fraction of the Moscow-controlled International Union of the Revolutionary Theatre directed to agitate, propagandize, discredit, and oppose the "reactionary" president, Mr. Frank Gillmore, and turn the Actors Equity Association to the revolutionary cause.

Leading fraction, by the way, is a Communist term. They use a very special vocabulary. Again I quote from a Federal document:

The term "leading fraction" refers to Communist under-cover men and espionage agents. The leading fractionists are those who carry out Moscow's instructions to bore from within the American labor movement. * * * They are picked for their ability to attain leadership or key positions in these organizations singled out for attack. * * * When they attain their objective, control of the organizations, they then are ready to turn them to the ends of the Communist Party. According to Communist rules, those who constitute the leading fraction must be careful to abide by the following:

1. They must be sure not to admit any connection with the Communist Party. In other words they must act under cover.

2. They must gain control of important positions in various unions.

3. Each union must be examined for weak points and openings so that the workings of the Communists will fit the situation.

It is significant that throughout 3 years reporting on the Forum, New Theater never once mentions the names of its leaders or central committee. The leaders of the Forum, as the records of Equity show, were Philip Loeb, George Heller, and Sam Jaffe.

One of the points laid down at the thirteenth plenum of the executive committee of the Communist International, held in Moscow in December 1933:

The third condition is the ability to combine methods of legal and semilegal work with methods of underground work. * * * For the period which is openly before us we do not need simply Communists but Communist underground workers.

B. Vassilev, central committee of the Communist Party, United States of America:

Bring into leading work workers who are unknown to wide masses and to the police * * * good conspirators and completely devoted to the cause of communism. * * * So, within the trade unions, within the International Labor Defense and other legal revolutionary organizations certain cadres of an illegal apparatus must be prepared. * * * It is necessary that at least one comrade who keeps the addresses, connections, etc., should not come to the meetings of the party committee.

If space permitted, I could trace Mr. Heller's and Mr. Loeb's policy and position on Equity issues and parallel them exactly with instructions from Communist Party documents in Federal possession. It is enough now to state what every member of Actors Equity Association must know or can easily verify. Mr. Loeb and Mr. Heller have stood and worked together without deviation since 1934, when they were openly sponsored by the Communist organ—New Theater. And the members of the Group Theater, the Theater Union, Artef, Theater Collective, Theater Arts Committee, and so forth, who in 1934 worked publicly for the Communist cause, have for 6 years, without deviation and with closed ranks, supported Mr. Loeb, Mr. Heller, Mr. Jaffe, Friends of the Soviet Union, the League for Peace and Democracy, and so on, ad nauseum. For 6 years at least, as my records show, they have followed the party line in its incredible gyrations, in abject intellectual slavery.

I have no doubt they will continue their denials of these facts. Let me then quote from one more source, the writings and teachings of their master, Lenin:

But is there such a thing as Communist ethics? Is there such a thing as Communist morality? * * * In what sense do we deny ethics, morals? In the sense in which they are preached by the bourgeoisie, which deduces those morals from God's commandments. * * * We say that our morality is wholly subordinated to the interests of the class struggle of the proletariat. We deduce our morality from the facts and needs of the class struggle.

* * * make any and every sacrifice, and even if necessary, to practice trickery, to employ cunning, and to resort to illegal methods—to sometimes even overlook or conceal the truth—and by every and all means carry on the work of communism.

And from a book published by the Communist Workers Library Publishers, of New York, by Johannes Buchner, The Agent Provocateur in the Labor Movement, I quote from page 51:

The general and fundamental rule for all Communists is: Make no statement. Of course, this does not mean that all questions are simply to be met with the answer, "I refuse to make any statement * * *." But the fundamental principle remains the same. No statements incriminating any comrade, no names, no addresses, not a single fact which would possibly be used directly or indirectly against the party, its organs, or individual members of the organization. * * * Absolute denial even when personally confronted with the persons and despite the evidence * * * since a categorical refusal * * * would convict you of being a Communist, you may permit yourself a few short statements calculated to obtain credence. * * * We must always conceal our plans and our ways of work from the class enemy. Political expediency here is everything.

THEATER ARTS COMMITTEE

Mr. Speaker, I had prepared a lengthy account of my investigation of the theater arts committee, including some amazing correspondence I have had with that organization. However, since the Committee on Un-American Activities will doubtless investigate much more fully than I have been able, I shall confine myself to a few salient points.

The Theater Arts Committee was organized in the spring of 1937, following the call of the Communist International and the central committee of the Communist Party of the United States for a "broader united front" and "increased aid to Spain."

New Theater magazine folded the same month, April 1937, and the New Theater League, which was the name assumed by the League of Workers Theaters in 1935, retired to jurisdiction over the amateur Workers Theaters throughout the country, leaving the cause among professional theaters to TAC.

The editors of TAC in November 1939—the last issue of the magazine in which their names were published—were Edna Ocko, Robert Stebbins, Eleanor Flexner, and Robert Kingsley. The editors of New Theater, as listed in its last issue, April 1937, were Edna Ocko, Robert Stebbins, Eleanor Flexner, George Redfield, and Mark Marvin. Martin Harris also was on both staffs.

The last published executive board of TAC listed 28 people, of whom 20 had been affiliated with New Theater. Of the 36 members of their advisory board, 25 are or were members of two or more Communist front organizations. Mr. Harry Sacher, their counsel, was formerly a teacher in the Communist "Workers School" at 330 South Wells Street, Chicago, Ill. Mr. Bernard Reis, financial adviser, signed with Mr. Sam Jaffe the famous defense of the Soviet Union of last August, which states that all who would proclaim that the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the totalitarian states are basically alike are Fascists.

The theater arts committee was affiliated with the League for Peace and Democracy and the Medical Bureau and North American Committee to Aid Spanish Democracy, both proven Communist front organizations.

A cursory examination of the Daily Worker will reveal the Theater Arts Committee and its activities are favorably publicized from 6 to 12 times in any given month. And only Communist or Communist-controlled organizations are given such frequent and favorable publicity by this registered organ of the Soviet Union.

T. A. C.'s address was until recently 132 West Forty-third Street. The New Theater League was at the same address. Early in 1940 both organizations changed addresses. Theater Arts Committee has changed its address six times, its name four times, its publishing corporation recently. New Theater changed its address five times, its publishing corporation three times. But always the same leaders, the same supporters, and the same policy—strict conformance to the party line—are revealed in every activity of both. TAC members direct the New Theater school. TAC members win the New Theater playwrighting contests. The majority of TAC members are or have been connected with the Theater Union, the Group Theater, Theater Collective, Artef, Workers Laboratory Theater, all of these organizations being members of the former League of Workers Theaters, section of the International Union of the Revolutionary Theater; address, post-office box 527, Moscow, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

The Theater Arts Committee bombarded the theater companies this past summer with propaganda for the American Peace Mobilization, to be held in Chicago under Communist leadership. Last spring it published The Actors Present War, a skillful and subtle piece of propaganda which seems a completely sincere and moving plea for peace until we come on a commendation of Soviet Russia as the only true neutral, the Communist slogan, "The Yanks are not coming," and a typical protest on "persecution, suppressions, and violations of civil liberties."

RESPONSIBILITY OF EVERY ACTOR

Mr. Speaker, the members of the various actors' unions need to get busy on a thorough, drastic housecleaning. I see no reason why they cannot follow the lead of the Civil Liberties Union, many States, and many labor unions, and rule that no member of a Nazi, Fascist, or Communist organization, nor any sympathizer with these enemy systems, may hold office.

In conclusion, I wish to thank Mr. Richard Whorf, Miss Peggy Wood, Mr. Hugh Cameron, Mr. Walter Huston, Mr. Alfred Kappeler, Mr. Robert Haines, Mr. William Gaxton, and the many others who have written me. I am sorry that I cannot introduce all the information or the varying points of view contained in that correspondence.

I would like to quote just three short letters, since they typify the opinion of the majority.

AUGUST 9, 1940.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LAMBERTSON: I noticed in this week's issue of Variety, a theatrical weekly, that you were endeavoring, without success, to secure the names of the various individuals connected with the leftist organization, known as the Theater Arts Committee, which was organized the latter part of 1938.

Enclosed is an original letter of solicitation received by the writer, September 1938, with the information on it, which I think you are desirous of obtaining. Also a page from the Film Daily of October 11, which I also kept.

I am a theatrical man and was approached to join this organization; but at the time, the whole thing smelled like an acrobat's trunk after a 3-months' lay-off, especially as I noticed on the executive board and the advisory council, certain members, who in the past would steal the bird seed out of a cuckoo clock; hence any noble motives that they had suddenly acquired to defend America, would be open to suspicion.

A man, named Robert Reed, was the organizing director at the time that this phoney outfit was first organized.

With best wishes, I remain,

Very truly yours,

———— ————.

P. S. You will notice that the Theater Arts Committee goes on record as being affiliated with the Medical Bureau and North American Committee to Aid Spanish Democracy, also American League for Peace and Democracy—latter organization, as you know, contain such well-known Communists as Earl Browder, Clarence Hathaway, James W. Ford, James Lerner, Elizabeth Gurley Flynn, Ben Gold, etc.

---

410 PARK AVENUE, NEW YORK, *August 23, 1940.*

DEAR MR. LAMBERTSON: I have just read the copies of your statements from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD regarding the communistic element which has slowly but surely been gaining a stronghold in the Actors' Equity Association. As a member of long standing and a stanch supporter of the organization, I can only say that I am shocked and disgusted at what has apparently been going on and am in thorough accord with everything you say.

This element must be stamped out. With the help of men like yourself I am confident we shall be able to eradicate this repugnant and cancerous growth.

Very sincerely yours,

CLIFTON WEBB.

NEW YORK CITY, *August 21, 1940.*

DEAR MR. LAMBERTSON: I thank you very much for your letter and the extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The situation for us in the theater is most unpleasant, and your published statement confirms what has been common gossip for years, that the council of our association has been influenced by what is, to my mind, a most subversive element. I and many others would like to get rid of it. I feel that everyone in the theater should take the matter seriously, and I am most willing to do anything I can to fight this damaging element.

I regret very much that all your records were rejected and not published in the Equity magazine. This seems to demonstrate very clearly the domination of our council by the communistic element which you have attacked.

Very truly yours,

MARGALO GILLMORE.

If the many actors and actresses who have expressed themselves similarly are sincere and determined in their desire to clean up this situation, they can restore the old-time integrity and prestige of the Actors Equity Association. I hope I have helped. Mr. DIES' committee will undoubtedly help. But it is only the vigilance and sustained effort of the membership, the responsibility of the individual actor for his organization, that can correct the present sordid situation.

The Wild Bull of the Pampas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 24, (legislative day of Wednesday, September 18), 1940

EDITORIAL FROM MONTGOMERY (ALA.) ADVERTISER

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, under the leave granted me, I present for printing in the Appendix the editorial from the Montgomery Advertiser of Montgomery, Ala., of the issue of September 21, 1940, under the heading "The Wild Bull of the Pampas, and Jack Dempsey."

The editorial referred to is as follows:

[From the Montgomery (Ala.) Advertiser of September 21, 1940]

THE "WILD BULL OF THE PAMPAS" AND JACK DEMPSEY

Dr. George Gallup, director of the American Institute of Public Opinion, said in analyzing his recent poll, announced yesterday, that if the Presidential election were held today Mr. Roosevelt's victory over Mr. Willkie would be of "landslide proportions."

Dr. Gallup need not have used the phrase. His figures speak much more eloquently of the facts: His count gives Roosevelt 38 States. His total strength in the all-powerful electoral college now stands at 453.

Willkie's is only 78. (Incidentally, but interestingly, Dr. Gallup reports that 85 percent of Alabamians are for Roosevelt.)

This sensational swing toward Roosevelt has occurred since the President swapped the 50 destroyers for the naval and air bases—that time when he shocked Mr. Willkie, the Union Leaguers, and, oh, ever so many other people because he did not consult Congress. You will remember the episode.

This man whom the St. Louis Post-Dispatch denounced in a purple editorial as a dictator and an irresponsible warmonger naturally did not refer his deal to the Senate, as it was not necessary under the Constitution and the statutes. But he did tell the American people all about it, and now the people, speaking through the Institute of Public Opinion, have validated the deal and declared their faith in the President's leadership in the potentially greatest crisis that this country has faced since Valley Forge.

We are assuming, of course, that the Gallup poll is as accurate now as it has fairly consistently shown itself to be in the past. "Old Grandma" crosses her fingers and trusts that Dr. Gallup is not heading toward as big a bust as the Literary Digest was in 1936.

Mr. Roosevelt has captured 10 States from the Hoosier flash in the last 10 days; a State a day is doing pretty well for a candidate who makes no (ahem!) "political" speeches and never mentions his opponent's name or even recognizes his candidacy.

In these 10 days the President's most significant gains have been in such pivotal Eastern States as New York, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and such pivotal Middle Western States as Indiana and Illinois. The President has not yet captured Indiana, but he has 49 percent of the votes there. Other Republican States are: Maine, Vermont, South Dakota, Iowa, North Dakota, Kansas, Nebraska, Massachusetts, and New Hampshire. In all of these States the vote is close. Even in Maine and Vermont Willkie has only 56 percent of the votes. But even in the great pivotal States where Roosevelt is leading the vote is close. In New York, for instance, F. D. R. has only 52 percent against Willkie's 48, and the same in Pennsylvania.

The President's margin of electoral votes (the ones that really count) is all out of proportion to his popular vote. He has a majority of popular votes in this poll. The President has 55 percent of the popular vote, but it may yet run higher since the drift toward him has just begun. However, we shall not know until next week whether that drift has been checked by Mr. Willkie's recent campaign swing through the West. The Republican candidate has been greeted by great crowds. We should know by next Friday what sort of impression he has made upon these crowds.

The probability is that the swing toward Roosevelt is by now so far out of hand that the Republican candidate cannot regain his grip. Mr. Willkie will undoubtedly receive a great popular vote—that is, he would if the election were held today—but a great popular vote that is not quite great enough makes one look bad in the electoral college, and it is in the electoral college that Mr. Willkie, the new gallery god of American politics, will look bad, except in South Carolina. There even the popular vote makes a caricature of his candidacy. Score: 98 percent for Roosevelt. Tops. (This should be of special interest to Senator ELLISON DURANT SMITH and the much-loved Charleston News and Courier, to mention only two latter-day nullificationists.)

We think we can explain Bre'r Willkie's unexpected poor showing in the national polls. In the first place, his theory as to the best way to lay the champ low turns out to be all wrong. In the beginning, being a belligerent, forthright, colorful challenger, his theory was that he should step into the ring and slug it out with what he acknowledged as the champ. That tactic might have been fine and dandy if he and Roosevelt had started from scratch on an even basis. Then again it might not have been, since Roosevelt is the champ only because inherent in him are the rare qualities that make a champion.

But the Hoosier flash forgot that that man is also the President of the United States. The American people are jealous of the dignity and position of their President. If their ruling prince is doing well and there is a crisis in national affairs, they will have no patience with one who abuses their prince as if he were just another favor-seeking politician. That principle is old and constant, but the current challenger muffed it.

Mr. Roosevelt has not attacked Mr. Willkie—he has not even noticed him. Mr. Willkie attacked Mr. Roosevelt, the greatest politician that ever ruled this Nation, but in doing so he abused and misrepresented and misinterpreted the President of the United States.

Well, one cannot fool the people as easily as in the dead days of the dreary past. Today the people are "up" on their politics. They read daily newspapers, weekly magazines, and listen to hourly broadcasts on the radio. Today the people are not more scholarly

than they used to be, but they know more. Their native wit is sharpened daily by the fresh impacts of information and suggestion. They are not as smart as Willkie and Roosevelt, to be sure, but they have the low-down on both. They know which one of them is really on their side. Talk about the democratic process all you like—but you watch the smoke that emerges from chimneys over the firesides of the American people in November. They know who's their honey. The fat coupon clippers who think the common people of America are too dumb to get out of a shower of rain are greater idiots than the plain people they scorn and ridicule. As we have heretofore said in this sacrosanct space, they never see a big train coming until it hits them in the belly and cuts a foot off. Then they get up, regather their busted galluses which they had but a moment before been thumbing arrogantly, go to a hospital, get their wounds dressed, and thereafter either vote for or pray for the Republican ticket. For more than 7 years they have confused the Republican elephant with one or more of the Apostles, notwithstanding that Franklin Delano Roosevelt, with all his manifest faults, is the greatest humanitarian statesman that ever sat in the White House.

Mr. Willkie meant well, but was and is inept. The Advertiser still thinks that the most comical episode in the long history of politics in the major American league was the achievement of this Wall Street lawyer, this utility executive, and but recently a ward-heeling Democrat, in drafting, sacking and putting in a concentration camp for the duration, the Republican Party, the old tormentor of the Democratic South. Every now and then, while sitting alone musing on the sins of this ribald and romantic world "Old Grandma" lays down her knitting and laughs indecorously at what Willkie, of all men, did to the Union Leaguers at Philadelphia.

At Philadelphia the challenger of "the champ" knocked the champ out of the ring in the first round. By the use of nerve gas he paralyzed the Republican opposition, and captured it. But Franklin D. Roosevelt, people's choice, was pushed back into the ring by the reporters, and yesterday we read the blow-by-blow account of the terrible second round. * * * The "Wild Bull of the Pampas" knocked or pushed Jack Dempsey out of the ring when they fought, but the champ hurried back into the ring, and in the second slaughtered his opponent, leaving him gasping, fit only for merciful hospital treatment.

As matters now stand we think the challenger should wait as long as Gene Tunney did. Gene waited until the champ had softened, even then he nearly lost his life, being saved only because of his greater stamina and a long count.

The "wild bull" of Indiana charged and hooked the champ, but he went to sleep in the second round. It was a gallant but reckless charge. There was no sense in it. Walloping Wendell had not been sufficiently seasoned in the preliminaries. Ambition—by that sin the angels fell.

The Radio Monopoly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE J. CONNERY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 24, 1940

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Speaker, one of the greatest problems facing the American people, other than national defense, is to provide steady employment at decent wages for our millions of unemployed workers.

To my mind one of the greatest contributing causes for the lack of job opportunities is the substitution of power machinery in place of manpower in order to reduce costs and, secondly, the inadequate taxes levied on those corporations which, through the development of new and monopolistic methods, secure exorbitant profits on the actual moneys invested as compared with the high taxes levied on those competing industries which provide steady employment for many thousands of our workers at decent wages, the profits of which concerns are not at all excessive.

Illustrative of the above we might compare the meager profits of the press, newspapers, and magazines with vast sums of money invested in costly equipment and highly skilled manpower with the profits of a competing government-protected monopoly—radio broadcasting.

It is well to bear in mind that licenses for radio broadcasting stations are issued wholly within the discretion of the Federal Communications Commission, and are authorized by the Congress provided that the holders of such licenses presumably serve public interest. These licenses, or governmental franchises, are issued without the payment to the Government of even the proverbial penny even in these days when the need of Government revenue is greater than ever.

Yet the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is replete with citations, in the official reports of the Federal Communications Commission, wherein the holders of these licenses of governmental franchises have sold this governmental property for sums ranging into the millions of dollars.

A free press is widely recognized as one of the real bulwarks of a free democracy. The press of America is free because it is beholden to no governmental power or no one or few groups of individuals.

The editors of our thousands of newspapers and magazines, located in almost every community in our land, are free from any concentrated control on the part of any group or groups.

These publications to continue to be free must, however, secure sufficient revenue from advertising to pay the wages of their skilled workers, to pay for the costly machinery necessary for the production of their newspapers and magazines, and to pay the high taxes which the Congress and the States have levied upon them.

It might be well for our tax experts to look into the comparative profits of these two types of competitors for national advertising. For years we managed to get along without radio broadcasting, while I doubt if our Nation and our people would be as well off today had we not had, since prior to the founding of our country, a free and militant press. In passing, I might add it is not my desire to in any way cripple or hinder the radio broadcasting industry. That industry, as does the theater, as well as the press, furnishes information and pleasure to many millions of our people.

However, I repeat, one of the essentials for the preservation of a free democracy is a free press. I doubt if any newspapers or magazines, with possibly rare exceptions, can show profits averaging even 10 percent on the actual investment during the past 10 years.

Newspapers and magazines provide profitable employment, I understand, for well over 100,000 highly skilled American workers, the weekly wages of which will probably average close to $50 per week or some $2,600 per year. On the other hand, it is my understanding that the radio broadcasting industry, as represented by some 705 radio stations officially reporting to the Federal Communications Commission, provides steady employment for some 11,000 workers at an average weekly wage of less than $30 per week, other than some 2,600 musicians and artists who receive an average of $46 per week, plus an additional 1,000 workers, on part time, who average some $15 per week and some 2,350 musicians and artists, on part time, who average some $18 per week.

In competition with our free press we find a radio broadcasting monopoly, wherein two great combines, controlled by a relatively few men, located in one city, can and do dictate as to what radio programs the American people will listen to when they listen at all.

Recently, the Monopoly Investigating Committee of the Federal Communications Commission reported, after an exhaustive 2-year study, that these two radio monopolists during the past 12 years of their existence had received in net earnings, after the payment of taxes and all other necessary expenses, a total of some $45,000,000 on total cash investments, at the most, of less than $4,000,000, a yearly average, for each of the past 12 years, of almost 100 percent in net profits on their actual investments.

For the information of those interested, I quote from the Summary and Conclusions of the Federal Communications Commission Committee Investigating Radio Monopoly the following excerpts—page 20:

> The net earnings of Columbia, during the 12-year period of its existence, have been $22,522,471. Of this amount $16,872,863 (more than 13 times all cash ever paid into the corporation) has been paid to its shareholders in dividends; the remainder is invested largely in current assets. The net earnings for Columbia for 1938 were in the amount of $3,541,741.

And, from page 22, referring to the National Broadcasting Co., I quote:

> The total earnings (net) during the period of its existence (12 years) have been $22,319,833. Since it began paying dividends in 1934 (6 years ago), it has paid to its parent company $18,100,000

(cash dividends of $14,900,000, lease negotiations fees of $2,200,000, and research and development fees of $1,000,000). Of the remainder ($4,219,833), losses on bad financial investments not related to broadcasting have consumed $1,171,763, and $673,333 have been charged off of the goodwill and other intangible values purchased by National. As of the end of 1938, there remained in the company $2,374,735 as earned surplus.

The earnings (net) for National for 1938 were in the amount of $3,434,301. Its investment in tangible property at the end of 1938 was $4,284,032. (Of this amount, $2,346,420 was invested in land and buildings alone.)

From page 20 I quote the following:

Columbia has never received but $1,648,167 from its shareholders, and of this amount it was required to pay out $1,163,860 in 1932 to Paramount-Publix Corporation, one of its shareholders, in the reacquisition of its own stock.

This left an actual remaining cash investment of only $484,307.

The total capitalization of National Broadcasting Co., as shown by the report of the Federal Communications Commission, was never greater than $3,300,000. This makes a total actual cash investment in both companies of $3,784,307, on which net earnings during the past 12 years have amounted to some $45,000,000.

From page 15 of the committee's report I quote:

In 1938 out of the amount retained by Columbia and National ($32,046,218) they paid to themselves as depreciation (1938 alone) $2,860,470 and, after paying all other expenses, had left available for dividends $6,976,040. The dividends actually paid (1938) are not available in this record. They paid dividends for the preceding year, however, of $5,635,006, or 67.5 percent of the net income for that year.

In addition, Columbia, with remaining cash investment of only $484,307, charged off as depreciation, for the 5-year period 1934–38, inclusive, $2,560,379, or more than five times the actual remaining cash invested in that company.

In view of the need on the part of our Government to secure additional and necessary revenues to pay the costs of our national defense, it is my belief that our tax experts might well compare the yearly profits which have accrued to this governmentally promoted radio monopoly, considering the small amount of cash actually invested, with the meager profits of its advertising competitor, our free press, our newspapers, and magazines.

Recently, John B. Haggerty, president, International Allied Printing Trades Associations, comprising the five international printing workers' unions, affiliated with the American Federation of Labor, and president, International Brotherhood of Bookbinders, delivered a short but able address on this subject, which I herewith include as a part of my remarks. I have no hesistancy in recommending to every Member of the House that the facts contained in the remarks presented by President Haggerty at the Golden Anniversary Convention of the International Printing Pressmen and Assistants Union are very informative:

RADIO ADVERTISING THE FRANKENSTEIN OF PRINTED PUBLICATIONS—DEPRIVES THOUSANDS OF PRINTING TRADES WORKERS OF THEIR JOBS—RADIO BROADCAST STATIONS OBTAIN GOVERNMENT MONOPOLY LICENSE—FOR WHICH THEY PAY NOTHING TO THE GOVERNMENT—AND HAVE REALIZED PROFITS OF MILLIONS THROUGH TRANSFER OF THESE LICENSES—PROFITS OF ONE RADIO COMPANY, IN 4 DEPRESSION YEARS, ALONE $17,000,000 ON CASH INVESTMENT OF LESS THAN $1,600,000—CONTINUANCE OF A FREE PRESS AND A FREE DEMOCRACY IS THREATENED—WHAT ARE YOU GOING TO DO ABOUT IT?

The following taken from the address of John B. Haggerty, president, International Brotherhood of Bookbinders, and chairman, Board of Governors, International Allied Printing Trades Association, at the Golden Anniversary Convention of the International Printing Pressmen and Assistants Union, Pressmen's Home, Tennessee, September 9, 1940:

"While the subject I am about to touch upon is somewhat far apart from what I have just stated, it is of vital interest to labor, particularly in the printing trades field, and deals with radio advertising.

"In its first stage, radio appeared to the press as a novelty, with the result that the press gave it millions of dollars worth of space gratis as it always has for professional baseball. The press was gullible enough to give radio far more free space that radio could have ever hoped to purchase. Radio programs were featured much the same as a band concert, and the press played up these radio artists in the theaters while the theater managers played up these radio artists in the papers. This, of course, was fine for the owners of radio stations out selling time to national advertisers.

"It was not realized by the press that through such publicizing on the air it was building up for itself most severe competition. Little did the press appreciate that the radio would spell finish to all sport extras, and as a result of all this the daily newspapers soon heard radio's slogan: 'You get your news first by radio.' This is true, and the radio listener—and almost everyone has a radio—now gets the news on the air as soon as the editor. The press must now realize that it has helped to create its own Frankenstein.

"Commercial advertising is the principal lifeblood of national magazines, newspapers, and farm publications.

"Many thousands of skilled printing-trades workers are dependent for their jobs on the ability and the success of publishers of these magazines, newspapers, and farm publications securing sufficient advertising income, through the printing of advertisements or products sold nationally, to meet their weekly pay roll.

"During the last decade a new and already highly dangerous competitor has entered the field of advertising and has each year deprived additional thousands of our workers of their job opportunities.

"I refer to radio broadcasting, which, for the year 1939, has diverted from printed publications advertising income direct to the radio stations alone of some $170,000,000. This sum of $170,000,000 represents only the amount paid directly to the radio stations. In order to arrive at the true amount of advertising diverted from printed publications in 1939 alone, it would be necessary to add to this $170,000,000 the estimated additional $200,000,000 spent in 1939 for artists, actors, bands, and telephone costs which made the spending of this $170,000,000 with the radio stations advisable.

"Contrast this $370,000,000 spent in 1939 for radio advertising with the total advertising income of $525,000,000 spent with all the newspapers, daily and Sunday; the $150,000,000 spent in 1939 in all our magazines; and the $17,000,000 spent for advertising in all our farm publications. You will readily see that all of the workers dependent upon the continuance of newspapers, magazines, and farm publications for their jobs should speedily realize that this new type of advertising competition menaces not only the security of their jobs but also will have a tremendous influence on their wages and conditions of employment.

"The diversion of advertising income from printed publications to radio broadcasting during the last 10 years surely warrants action on the part of every person interested in the printing industry, whether such persons are employers or employees.

"We, as workers, naturally look to the employers to protect their investments, or, better said, their markets. However, the fact that the employers have not protected either their investments or their markets does not excuse the officials and the members of the printing-trades unions from protecting the job opportunities of the skilled workers in the printing-trades industry.

"In 1929, when newspapers had an advertising income of some $800,000,000; when magazines had an advertising income of $240,000,000; when farm publications had an advertising income of $35,000,000, radio broadcasting stations had an advertising income of but $40,000,000.

"In the succeeding years radio broadcasting advertising income increased yearly by the many millions of dollars, while the advertising income of newspapers, magazines, and farm papers continually decreased.

"Considering only the direct advertising income of the radio broadcasting stations in 1939 of some $170,000,000, and, leaving aside the estimated additional $200,000,000 spent collaterally in putting these radio broadcasting advertisements across, we find that newspapers in 1939 received some 16 percent less, magazines received some 17 percent less, and farm papers received some 50 percent less of the advertising dollars spent than they did in 1929. A different story is found when we learn that radio broadcasting stations, which received only 3 percent of the advertising dollars spent in 1929, in 1939 received almost 20 percent directly of the advertising dollar.

"However, if you add the $170,000,000 which the radio broadcast stations received directly and the estimated $200,000,000 which was spent collaterally to make this radio advertising possible, you find that this new competitor in 1939 received some 70 percent as much as the total amount received for advertising by all of the newspapers and almost twice as much as the total amount spent for advertising in all of the magazines.

"In the case of magazines and newspapers, the owners have necessarily invested many millions of dollars. Likewise, we, representing the workers, have an investment of some 175,000 skilled workers, the majority of whom have served an apprenticeship of at least 5 years in acquiring their skill.

"However, the radio broadcasting stations have comparatively a small cash investment and likewise they provide employment for only a few thousand workers.

"It might also be well for us to bear in mind that the owners of printing establishments and likewise the workers employed in such plants have no Government guaranty of a monopoly in their community. They must face the competition of any person who can purchase or secure printing machinery or who has the skill necessary to produce printed publications.

"The radio broadcasters receive a license from the Government, for which they pay nothing to the Goverment, and also they hold a monopoly in the community in which they operate.

"In passing, I might add that the recent report of the monopoly investigating committee of the Federal Communications Commission concludes that even 'our democracy is threatened' by this radio monopoly. I quote from their report, as follows:

" 'To the extent that the ownership and control of radio broadcast stations falls into fewer and fewer hands, whether they be

network organizations or other private interests, the free dissemination of ideas and information, upon which our democracy depends, is threatened.'

"During the past 10 years we have seen a steady decline in the number of newspapers and magazines published. On the other hand, we have seen a continual increase in the number of radio broadcasting stations licensed by the Government.

"Government reports show that the total cash investment in the Columbia Broadcasting System is less than $1,600,000. Yet, during the depression years of 1935, 1936, 1937, and 1938, this radio broadcasting company received on its cash investment of less than $1,600,000—after the payment of all necessary expenses—a net broadcast income of some $17,000,000.

"The profits of this company are cited simply as illustrative of the millions which this new competitor—radio broadcasting—has ready to expend in contrast with the cry of poverty which we so often hear from the publishers of newspapers and magazines, especially when we seek to better the conditions of the workers in those plants.

"The profits of the radio broadcasting stations, the diversion of advertising from newspapers, magazines, and farm papers, has already resulted in newspaper publishers spending millions of dollars, taken from the profits of newspaper publishing in the past, in the purchase of radio broadcasting stations.

"It is understood that many newspaper publishers contend that the purchase of these competitors for advertising, radio stations, was necessary to protect their local advertising field.

"During the past few years printed publications, especially the newspapers, although the same could well apply to magazines, have found another radio worm diverting their advertising.

"An advertising agency or persons experienced in advertising solicitation secure a license to operate a radio station in one community and then secure additional licenses for booster radio stations in localities, say 25 or 30 miles away. In those localities, with an investment of a comparatively few thousands of dollars they erect a radio transmitter, connected by telephone with the major radio station, and, immediately they divert many additional thousands of advertising dollars from struggling newspapers and farm publications and thus destroy the opportunities for jobs of printing-trades workers employed in those publications.

"One not abreast of these conditions can well ask how has all this happened. How is it that the advertising of newspapers, magazines, and farm papers have been yearly reduced many millions of dollars while radio broadcasting direct income increased from $40,000,000 in 1929 to $170,000,000 in 1939?

"National advertising is handled, promoted, and placed by national advertising agencies. When we find a governmental agency, after an exhaustive survey, reporting that 90 percent of all network commercial programs are builded by advertising agencies, we find one of the reasons for this unusual condition.

"Newspapers and magazines pay to the advertising agencies a commission of 15 percent. Likewise the radio broadcast stations and networks pay to the advertising agencies a commission of 15 percent. If an advertising agency is authorized to pay out $1,000,000 for advertising in newspapers and magazines, they must necessarily contact several different publications and their net income is probably reduced to some 7 or 8 percent of this 15-percent commission. When the same agency has $1,000,000 to spend on radio advertising they contact but one or two radio networks and their 15-percent commission is practically net. Add to this net income the amounts which the advertising agency receives in additional commissions from artists, bands, etc., and you can readily see that the net cash income for the advertising agency is much greater, when they place their advertising with radio-broadcasting stations, than when they place advertising with printed publications.

"The officials of the printing-trades unions, through the board of governors of the international allied printing trades unions, comprising the five international printing trades unions, of which I have the honor of being chairman of the board, realizing the inactivity of the newspaper and magazine publishers have been studying this situation.

"The last meeting of the board of governors of the International Allied Printing Trades Association, after considering some preliminary surveys made, created a committee on radio, consisting of your able and influential president, George L. Berry, Edward J. Volz, president, Photo-Engravers International Union, and myself, as president of the International Brotherhood of Bookbinders, to act on this important question.

"The committee will soon, I hope, be in a position to decide upon definite plans which will protect the job opportunities of thousands of printing-trades workers by preventing the continued diversion of advertising from printed publications to radio-broadcast stations.

"Some months ago this committee addressed a letter to all newspaper and magazine publishers, setting before them certain information and asking their cooperation in finding some way to prevent the continued diversion of advertising income from printed publications to radio-broadcast stations and to protect the job opportunities of those workers dependent upon the publication of newspapers, magazines, and farm papers.

"The outbreak of the war necessitated, for the present, the lessening of our activities. In the meantime, we are accumulating additional data, and it is my hope that we will soon be able to lay before all of the workers in the printing-trades industry a definite plan which we can all support wholly with the one idea in mind of protecting the job opportunities of those dependent upon the printing industry for their means of livelihood.

"With men and management realizing what they are confronted with through the widespread activities of the radio in the advertising field, the question prompts itself, quite naturally, what will they do with the possibility of television, which will take salesmen off the road by sending their pictures into the homes, presenting fashion shows, vacuum-cleaning, and other demonstrations, cooking lessons, etc. So far, the radio, with its medicine shows has given only the dialog, but television will give you both the dialog and the motion pictures of actors and scenery in colors. This is certainly something to worry the printing-trades industry more than the radio, because the air will always be cheaper than newsprint.

"In closing, let me state quite specifically that in this short address I have only touched upon the highlights of this subject so important to all those sincerely interested in the success and advancement of the printing-trades industry, and especially the workers in this industry.

"I would recommend that every delegate to this convention, upon his return to his local union, call the attention of his union to this matter. I would further recommend that each union appoint a radio committee, and your committee, as well as the members of your local union, should call the attention of your candidates for Congress to the fact that this unbridled and unfair competition on the part of radio-broadcast stations, licensed by the Government, and for which license they pay the Government nothing, is depriving many thousands of printing-trades workers of their opportunities for jobs."

A Dirt Farmer Writes About Farming Under the New Deal—Says Roosevelt, Wallace, and the New Deal Have "Sold America Short"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 24, 1940

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, so many politicians are making a living or holding public office by the gentle art of telling the farmers of America how much they have done for them that it is interesting once in a whole to let an actual dirt farmer speak for himself in describing what these new dealers have done to him. The attached letter is from an actual dirt farmer in South Dakota and was written as an open letter in one of the prominent daily newspapers of the State. The author of the letter is a Democrat. The first-hand experience which he reports from his farming experiences under the New Deal indicate clearly that America's farm problem is still unsolved and is the No. 1 economic problem of this country. His letter merits the careful reading of everybody interested in rebuilding the basic industry of America.

This democratic farmer reflects the clear-visioned reasoning of the great bulk of American farmers. Their votes are not for sale. Their opinions cannot be force-fed by high-powered radio programs and Government propagandists. They are smart enough to know when a farm program is working for their advantage without being told by high-salaried Government agents and they are smart enough to know what is wrong with a program of restricted production at home and increased imports from abroad regardless of the finest phrases and the prettiest words of the world's best radio speaker.

America's dirt farmers know that any farm program to be permanently successful must pay full parity prices to the producer for all of his products consumed domestically; they know that half a farm cannot support well-rounded farm prosperity and a tax load levied against a whole farm; they know that good intentions do not mean good income, and that a conflict of policies means eventual bankruptcy for American agriculture. They know that a program designed to meet an emergency cannot be continued until eternity unless it does more than keep the farmer out of the poorhouse. They want a chance to succeed as well as security against starvation.

NEW DEAL FARM PROGRAM AN APPEASEMENT PROGRAM

I have voted for every farm appropriation bill coming before this Congress as benefit checks and parity payments much larger than those parceled out would not amply compensate our farmers for the growing disparity between the price of what they sell and the price of what they buy. But I have persistently pleaded with Congress to meet the challenge of actually solving the farm problem instead of "appeasing" it with checks.

These "subsistence checks" have kept the farmers from complete collapse but they have not made up to him the injury done by the New Deal's cruel program of steadily increasing competitive farm imports and its unique philosophy of paying one group of farmers inadequate checks for not raising crops while taxing them and all other citizens for reclaiming land in other sections to produce more of the same commodities. These payments were no gift to the farmers; they represent no accumulation of unearned increment. They were a pitifully poor substitute for a chance to make a profit these past 7 years; they offer no hope to the young man who desires to set up in the farming business with the hope of saving enough each year to buy and own his own farm and to retire with an independence in old age. Far from being "parity payments" they have not even been "adjusted compensation" for the nearly 8 years of lost opportunity on the American farm. It is no wonder Mr. Wallace talks so much about "appeasement." He should be the country's best authority on the subject. It is the basis of his whole farm program.

This letter from a dirt farmer, a South Dakota Democrat who reasons as he works, presents a real challenge to Congress to reexplore the farm problem with a determination to stick with the question until the American farmer is given the fair chance to which he is entitled. He who manages a farm and works from dawn to dark is entitled to a net profit for his labors fully as much as the owner of an industry who works from 9 to 5 and complains when the Government limits his net profit to 10 percent.

WALLACE URGES "CEILI'G" ON FARM PRICES

Recently this Congress passed legislation removing restrictions on the profit making of certain industries. Whether that action is just or unjust, it is in strange contrast with the public statement of Secretary Henry Wallace about a year ago when he threatened to "put a lid on farm prices" if they rose too much as a result of the European war. He could have saved himself the worry and escaped the embarrassment of going on record against giving the farmer a break because the big problem of the American farmer is still the need for a floor to hold his prices up to parity rather than a ceiling to keep them from going too high.

Were the former Secretary of Agriculture, now stumping the country in his effort to ascend to the Vice Presidency, as quick to plead for a floor to maintain parity prices for the farmer as he was to caution farmers that he would arbitrarily fix a ceiling if their products started to raise in price too fast, foreclosures would be less frequent on the farm today, and the men who do the farming instead of trying to farm the farmer would not be writing letters like the following to the newspapers of the land. The letter follows:

RAP AT WALLACE

TO THE EDITOR OF THE DAILY REPUBLIC:

Read with great interest your literary debate with the Honorable W. A. Prather over Secretary Wallace's assets as head of the Department of Agriculture. I, like W. A., also believe your claim that Wallace has done more for agriculture than any other man in the history of the United States is an amazing statement and must add that this belief, to millions of Americans, is an absurd assumption.

Why? Under the New Deal, of which Wallace is a member and strong supporter, agriculture has been dealt a raw deal. Agriculture has been sold down the river by Wallace, Hull, and all the "brain trusters" at Washington. Strong statements? Yes, but backed by the record. For 8 years I have been on the farm; for 8 years I have gained first-hand knowledge of agriculture and agriculture's needs, which is the backbone of the Nation.

We have been told that we have a surplus of certain crops. We have been told that the farmer should be on parity with industry. The Government has had us reduce our acreage, has given us parity payments, and soil checks, yet agriculture only gets 76 percent of parity. Our foreign markets have been lost. The A. A. A. lost them. The United States today imports more competitive farm products than it sells. While we were reducing our acres, we were importing competitive farm products to an equal amount to displace this reduction. American agriculture must compete with 25-cent-a-day Java and other foreign labor because of Hull and his "fuddy duddies" at Washington. The reciprocal-trade treaties with free trade helps 5 percent of the Nation and harms 95 percent of the Nation. Forty percent of the Nation live on the farm, yet they receive only 17 percent of the national income.

United States economics are governed by a 1–1–7 ratio. For every billion dollars agriculture makes, industry's pay roll is also a billion dollars and the national income is $7,000,000,000. Secretary Wallace himself has pointed out this fact several times, so if agriculture gets 80 cents for corn instead of 40, the national income is boosted by millions of dollars. The same goes all the way down the line with wheat, hogs, cattle, barley, oats, cotton, etc. Yet agriculture can't get parity prices (parity means an equal price for what he sells with industry for what they sell) for his products when he must compete with cheap foreign products and labor that are let in duty-free or practically duty-free under the Hull trade treaties, which are indorsed by Wallace. Industry is protected by tariffs—that was seen to by them in the Hawley-Smoot bill. Hull doesn't lower duties on them; just on agriculture. Thus, a large majority of the Nation suffers for a handful. Give agriculture parity tariff with industry and the Nation will again see prosperity.

Foreign products imported into this country displace millions of acres of American land and has conservatively been estimated to displace the labor of 6,000,000 men. Parity prices today would be about 80 cents for corn, $1 for wheat, $10 per hundredweight for hogs, $12 for cattle, $10 for sheep, etc. Because of the trade treaties, American agriculture, even with Wallace's parity and soil payments, is 25 percent less than it should be, which is robbing Americans of $20,000,000,000 a year income and 6,000,000 unemployed of work. Throw out Hull, Wallace, and the trade treaties, give us protective or parity tariff (equal tariff with industry, whether high or low), give 40 percent of the Nation more dollars and we (the agricultural half of the Nation) will buy more food, more clothes, more cars; likewise, labor will go back to work and have more money. Plants will expand; bang will go the surplus, unemployment and the depression. We can help the needy and balance the Budget.

America is unprepared. America is in debt. And America has been sold down the river because the New Deal gave America a shot in the arm in the form of huge spending and parity payments to farmers, instead of finding the sickness and getting to the bottom of it. The world was in a deep depression from which it grew back to prosperity. America still has 10,000,000 unemployed, 3,000,000 on relief, agriculture at 76 percent of parity, and a $50,000,000,000 debt because for 7 years the New Deal has failed.

No; Wallace has not done more for agriculture than any other man in the history of our country. No; a program like the one described in this writing would have done more for agriculture and the Nation than Wallace and his New Deal have done in 7 long years. No; the New Deal, with its Wallaces and its Hulls, has sold America short.

Yours for a real "new deal"; yours to Willkie, with his pledge of full parity and MCNARY'S support of the program herein outlined. Not Hull and his competition with 25-cent-a-day foreign labor and duty-free products. Not Wallace and his killing of pigs and plowing under of cotton while we imported like products. Not the New Deal and its 7 years of failure. Not the third termers who meddle in foreign affairs and are marching us down the road to war to turn our eyes from the sad and frightful situation of our home affairs.

True, I'm the grandson of W. A. Prather, but my politics are not necessarily his, for I am registered a Democrat, and I, like millions more, are at least waking up. We have been fooled. We are going back to sound Americanism.

JERRY PRATHER.

PLATTE, S. DAK.

Mr. Ladner's Support of President Roosevelt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, September 18), 1940

EDITORIAL FROM PHILADELPHIA RECORD

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Philadelphia Record of the issue of September 11, 1940, under the

heading "From His Own Camp." The editorial discusses the criticism of Mr. Willkie by Mr. Albert H. Ladner, Jr.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Philadelphia Record of September 11, 1940]

FROM HIS OWN CAMP

The gravest and most outspoken criticism of Wendell Willkie which we have seen in recent weeks was delivered on Monday by a Republican, Albert H. Ladner, Jr., a leader of the independents in his party.

Mr. Ladner announced that despite his party affiliations he cannot and will not support Willkie for President. He will work for the reelection of Franklin D. Roosevelt. And he called upon the 230,000 Pennsylvania Republicans who voted for him when he bucked the organization in the Senatorial primary last spring to follow him in this new crusade against Tory leadership.

His chief reason was the reason why many conscientious voters will decline to follow the "barefoot Wall Street lawyer." It is a result of Willkie's opposition to the first practical plan offered by Congress for possible conscription of any industry which refuses to cooperate in the national defense because of greed for excessive profits.

"I have two sons, both of whom hold commissions in the Pennsylvania National Guard," said Mr. Ladner. "I am willing that if my country needs them—and I expect that they will be called—they should and would be ready to make whatever sacrifices are necessary.

"How, then, can I conscientiously give my support to a candidate who places more value upon the dollars contained in the money bags of Wall Street than he does in the blood that flows through the veins of my children?"

The question is unanswerable. Not even in the Record have we used such strong terms as these—from a member of Willkie's own party. We know that they will be heard. Not only by the 230,000 unbossed members of the G. O. P. to whom he directs them, but by countless other Republicans who will refuse to place their faith and their country's fate in the hands of a candidate who believes money to be more sacred than men.

Hearings on Geyer Anti-Poll-Tax Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE E. GEYER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 24, 1940

LETTERS OF HON. LEE E. GEYER, OF CALIFORNIA, TO MEMBERS OF THE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE

Mr. GEYER of California. Mr. Speaker, in an effort to get the hearings on the Geyer anti-poll-tax bill printed, I have written two letters, the first one to all members of the Judiciary Committee and the second to the chairman of the subcommittee that heard the testimony.

The letters follow:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., September 13, 1940.

MY DEAR COLLEAGUE: As you are a member of the Judiciary Committee, I am appealing to you to assist in righting what I believe to be an injustice.

I do not wish to be understood as attacking the motive of any of my colleagues. I do believe, however, that it has been manifestly unfair to the Judiciary Committee, to the House membership, and to me that the hearings on H. R. 7534 have not been printed. I have taken this matter up both with the chairman of your committee, the Honorable HATTON W. SUMNERS, and with the chairman of the subcommittee, the Honorable FRANCIS E. WALTER.

I am attaching a copy of a letter sent to Congressman WALTER on August 24, 1940. This letter will state the case in detail. To date I have not received an answer to this letter. You will note by the letter to him that the hearings were completed on the 17th day of May. That at one time he ordered them printed and then had a change of heart.

I am asking that this committee investigate this matter thoroughly and give all persons interested the opportunity of receiving copies of these hearings. I should be most happy to appear before your committee with this request should you so desire.

Very sincerely yours,

LEE E. GEYER.

AUGUST 24, 1940.

Congressman FRANCIS E. WALTER,
United States House of Representatives,
Old House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR COLLEAGUE: Last Tuesday, August 20, when I inquired of the clerk of the Judiciary Committee, I was amazed to learn that the hearings on H. R. 7534, the Geyer anti-poll-tax bill, had not yet been ordered printed. My records show that these hearings were completed May 17.

I waited until the 4th of June before I first inquired of the clerk of the Judiciary Committee whether or not the hearings were ready for distribution. I was surprised to learn at that time that the hearings had not been ordered printed. The excuse given was that a copy of the testimony of former Congressman Maury Maverick had been misplaced and therefore the printing had been held up. During this time no notice was given this office to the effect that part of the testimony was massing. As soon as we learned of it, we sent to Miss Smedley, assistant clerk of the committee, our carbon copy of the testimony of Mr. Maverick, receipt for which I hold in my office.

On numerous occasions after this, when I would see you on the floor, I would inquire how the printing was coming along. On each occasion you would say that the hearings had been sent down for printing and would no doubt be back soon. For almost 2 months I waited for the hearings to be returned from the printer, and finally I called Miss Smedley and she told me that you had not ordered the material to be sent to the printer. This I related to you one day on the floor, whereupon you insisted that it had been done.

You will recall that to settle the argument as to whether or not the hearings had been ordered printed, we went to the telephone together and in my presence you called the clerk of the committee and found that you were mistaken for you had never given an order to have the hearings printed. At that time in my presence you ordered over the telephone the clerk to send the material to the printer for publication. This was no doubt done, for on July 29 the page proof was given us for correction and on August 5 the copy was returned to the clerk of the committee with all corrections made. The Government Printing Office informs me that they received the proof August 7 marked "O. K. for printing" and the next day, August 8, for some reason unknown to them, the copy was withdrawn.

I was astounded when you told me last week that you did not expect to have these hearings printed at all. You gave two reasons: First, that you didn't consider the bill constitutional, and second, that the hearings were not completed, since no witnesses had appeared against the measure. In regard to the first excuse you give, I do not believe this enters into the picture. So far as the second is concerned, I would like to state that at each of the six hearings you asked whether or not anyone cared to appear in opposition to the bill and that no one was there in that capacity. As you know, many bills have gone through committee unopposed, with the hearings printed for distribution. For you to state now, since the petition has been put on the desk to discharge the committee, that the hearings are not closed, would seem to indicate that you had changed your mind, since you told me so often that the hearings had been authorized for printing.

I do not wish to interpret this letter as impugning the motives of a colleague, but I do feel that you should take immediate steps to have the hearings available for all, lest someone might misunderstand. I trust that they will be available within a few days.

Very sincerely yours,

LEE E. GEYER.

Support of President Roosevelt by Daily World, of Atlantic City, N. J.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. SMATHERS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 24, (legislative day of Wednesday, September 18), 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE ATLANTIC CITY (N. J.) DAILY WORLD

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial published on the front page of the Daily World, of my home city of Atlantic City, N. J., wherein it announces its support of the reelection of Franklin D. Roosevelt.

The Daily World is a Republican newspaper which is published in a Republican community. The Nation is blessed with good fortune when the editors of this newspaper, and

other real Americans, have the courage to place patriotism above profit and country ahead of expediency.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Atlantic City Daily World]

ROOSEVELT FOR PRESIDENT!

President FRANKLIN DELANO ROOSEVELT,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR PRESIDENT: You are now engaged in a struggle to preserve our democracy, a struggle no less serious than those faced by George Washington, Abraham Lincoln, and Woodrow Wilson. Unfortunately for the American people, this crisis comes at a time when you would ordinarily wish to retire to well-earned laurels after serving your country. But the seriousness of the times made your party almost unanimously demand that you continue to lead your country in this, our time of deadly peril.

We are an independent newspaper. We wish to continue as an independent newspaper. But we also wish to continue as free men. In the past this newspaper has almost invariably supported Republican candidates for public office. In the last Presidential election we took no sides.

We read that the great majority of newspapers in this country are against your candidacy for President, that the press is almost solidly arrayed in favor of Willkie. It is true that we have not approved of many of your advisers, policies, and acts; that you have cost us much money, time, and trouble with your numerous agencies. Nevertheless, here is one usually Republican newspaper that has been honestly convinced after months of soul-searching inquiry that your reelection is vital to our country.

While our influence is necessarily confined to the eastern part of sou h Jersey, perhaps we will mean more than that to your candidacy. Perhaps we will be an omen of good luck to you, a talisman of victory.

For, strangely enough, this newspaper has never backed a losing candidate. Every time we have placed our stamp of editorial approval on a candidate for public office—whether he be Governor, Senator, assemblyman, sheriff, mayor, or commissioner—he has been the winner, the ultimate choice of the electorate.

We have nothing against Wendell Willkie. We don't know him well enough to dislike him. He may be a great man. But we don't know.

And we do know, from 8 years of experience, you, Franklin Delano Roosevelt. We know that you have made mistakes, but that when you made mistakes they were sincere mistakes in an effort to do good. But, most important, we know that Franklin D. Roosevelt in his heart has the interest of the little man, the common people.

We do not have that certainty about Wendell Willkie. While his sincerity may be as great as Roosevelt's, we know that many of his important backers are men we distrust—big men with little regard for the man in the street.

It is a time when all Americans who love their liberty should come to the ultimate decision to elect Franklin D. Roosevelt to the Presidency of the United States for another 4-year term as a guaranty of their status as free men in the only democracy remaining in the world.

It is a serious decision for serious times.

Respectfully yours,

THE EDITORS, ATLANTIC CITY DAILY WORLD.

Roosevelt's Revolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 24, 1940

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, at last, in the public press and here in Washington is an editor with courage enough to accurately describe Franklin D. Roosevelt's drive to, as one of his supporters said, "remake America."

Time and again, on the floor of this House and in many other places, from 1935 on, I have called attention to the statement of Bainbridge Colby, Wilson's Secretary of State. He told us back in 1934 that:

> So completely has the administration turned its interest and its energies away from business recovery that it is openly charged, and indeed admitted, that a substantial number of the President's immediate advisers are not desirous of business revival, feeling that to prolong the depression will produce a better psychological background for the prosecution of their revolutionary designs. The overturn of our institutions, including the Constitution, is their avowed goal.

Now comes David Lawrence, who puts into print subsequent facts showing that Colby was right.

Lawrence asks, "What's the matter with American businessmen?" I ask, "What's the matter with Lawrence?"

Businessmen for the last 3 years have been kicked around, persecuted and their businesses hampered and some destroyed by the New Deal agencies—and that means Roosevelt; particularly by the National Labor Relations Board.

What is the matter with writers like Lawrence? They have been praising the New Deal and they are only awakened by the fact that the New Deal revolution is about to gain full fruition under the guise of a preparedness program.

These newspapermen begin to see the end of a free press, the suppression of their publications. When they have endured as much as have American businessmen, they will not be asking, "What's the matter with American businessmen?" They will be saying, "God forgive us for our own inactivity; our own lack of outspoken criticism and condemnation."

Lawrence's article, in the September 27, 1940, issue of the United States News, is as follows:

(By David Lawrence)

WHAT'S THE MATTER WITH AMERICAN BUSINESSMEN?—TIMIDITY HAS REPLACED COURAGE AS BUSINESS LEADERS REMAIN SILENT IN THE FACE OF THE MOST CRITICAL CAMPAIGN IN ALL OUR HISTORY—RIGHTS OF FREE SPEECH ARE NOT CURTAILED BUT BUSINESS GROUPS ARE PASSIVE

The time has come to call a spade a spade in this campaign. It is a contest between two schools of thought—the group which believes in totalitarian regulation of everything by one-man government, and the group which still believes that free enterprise in a democracy can produce economic stability for America.

Businessmen far and wide say they believe in the free-enterprise system. They rightly express fears of confiscation which is embedded, not in the words of the laws passed by the New Deal, but in the regulations arbitrarily phrased and arbitrarily administered by appointees of President Roosevelt.

Businessmen have been complaining that the New Deal for several years has stopped the wheels of production and has prevented capital flow from bringing jobs to the unemployed. Businessmen privately declare their sincere conviction that with our heavy tax load and misuse of governmental funds for "pump priming," America is due eventually for a sad day of reckoning.

But what do businessmen do about it? Yes, they wear Willkie buttons and contribute the modest sums permitted under the Hatch Act—modest and infinitesimal because the New Deal spends the taxpayers' billions to get votes, where the businessmen are permitted to contribute only pennies.

But it isn't money that is needed to eliminate from public power the group of radicals who now are in the saddle. It is simple, old-fashioned courage. It is sacrifice. It is willingness to stand up under the still existent constitutional guaranties of free speech and free assembly and tell everybody within hearing of one's voice that unless America turns in the coming election from the dictatorship of a New Deal oligarchy, it will find itself in an economic chaos which will give America a dictatorship of radicalism far more intensified than anything the United States has ever dreamed was possible in this free land.

LABOR UNIONS WORK ACTIVELY FOR THIRD TERM

The New Deal is bent on confiscation of private property. It extols Government ownership and control. It wants to put America into the war, not necessarily to send troops overseas—it has promised not to do that—but to gain complete possession of all governmental force so as to be able to commandeer everything and confiscate anything which is needed to complete the Roosevelt revolution begun in 1933 by a group of radical advisers in whose hands the President has proved to be a puppet.

Radical labor doesn't remain silent in this campaign. Almost every week New Deal henchmen, working in and among the officials of labor unions in the A. F. of L., manage to get a public endorsement of the third term. John L. Lewis, of the C. I. O., has made his bargain with Mr. Roosevelt. The C. I. O. wants a Labor Board personnel favorable to its viewpoint and Mr. Roosevelt plans to comply. So the C. I. O. is swinging into line for the third term.

DICTATORSHIP CAN BE PREVENTED BY BUSINESSMEN

If labor leaders are misleading workers and telling them that they can count on partisan and biased courts and tribunals as long as Mr. Roosevelt is President, isn't it about time that American businessmen told the workers the truth, namely, that such a course can only lead to disunity and a paralysis of our whole economic system when we need unity for national defense?

Why are businessmen so reticent in this campaign? Can anybody recall in recent weeks a single speech of importance by any outstanding industrialist or manager of any large enterprise urging the public to support Wendell Willkie?

If businessmen really believe that Willkie sincerely stands for the free-enterprise system and that Roosevelt does not, is there any

good reason why businessmen should not talk to their workers, their friends, their fellow citizens in every community in the land and tell them so? Of what are businessmen afraid? Of New Deal diatribes against businessmen for allegedly trying to coerce the workers? Undoubtedly there are here and there tactless employers who will use coercive phrases or who will lose their heads and make threats. There are tactless labor leaders who do and say the same sort of thing.

But American businessmen as a whole can be trusted to express in common-sense terms their understanding of what we need—an efficient and effective American economic system—a system that will protect the savings of the thrifty and prevent men, women, and children from going hungry when the dollar of America's wage earners becomes worthless in its power to purchase the necessities of life.

In Europe, businessmen were cowed into submission by dictatorships and so were the workers. Today American businessmen can prevent dictatorship by standing up and speaking their minds. They will risk only a bit of abuse by the new dealers, and this is not the kind of thing that courageous men have ever feared.

Are American businessmen aware of the dangers that face this country if a nomination obtained by illicit use of governmental power now gives the United States a third-term President? Is there any tradition or any constitutional guaranty which is safe when a group of men holding public power believes that the end justifies the means and that personal ambition must be placed above tradition and custom?

No better exposition of the case against President Roosevelt could have been written than that which the New York Times, the greatest newspaper in America, gave its readers on the morning of Thursday, September 19. The Times is not a Republican paper. It supported Roosevelt in 1932 and again in 1936, when the business and financial community in New York was hostile to a second term. The Times is a Democratic paper by tradition. It now asks its readers to support Wendell Willkie, and it gives three columns of well-reasoned argument telling why. It is an editorial that ought to be in the hands of every voter in every State in the Union, and there is no reason why every businessman should not reprint it and send it to his workers, his customers, his friends, and his neighbors.

ONE-MAN RULE, NATIONAL UNITY THE BIG ISSUES

There is no reason why businessmen should not call mass meetings of their employees—not on their own factory premises—but in public halls.

These meetings should not be addressed by employers as such, but as Americans who have much in common with their fellow citizens and who believe that in time of crisis it is necessary to speak out frankly, by every lawful means, in order to avert the catastrophe which faces the American constitutional and economic system if the principle of one-man rule is allowed to get its foothold.

Whatever admiration a voter may have for Roosevelt as a man, whatever gratitude a voter may have for various checks sent him by the administration, the simple question is whether America can protect herself in a world of war by having unity and industrial efficiency or by adding fuel to the fires of disunity and breaking down the economic system which is so vital to defense preparations and the safety of our men, women, and children.

FREE ELECTIONS ARE ESSENTIAL TO DEMOCRACY

The administration has been unscrupulous in its use of propaganda and misleading statements about defense.

It has failed to build up our defenses, preferring political expediency at every turn to the American welfare.

It has brought zealots and class partisans into public office.

It has forsaken the rules of fair play and morality in administering the laws of the land.

It has converted the courts into vehicles of political chicanery.

It has wasted public money.

It has weakened the fiscal structure of the Nation, and disrupted industry's productive processes.

It has preached hate and class war.

It has forfeited its right to the term "liberal" and has utilized every device of reactionary politics and reactionary government to gain power.

Let American businessmen, American civic leaders, responsible heads of fraternal, professional and trade organizations exercise their rights as citizens to urge the candidate of their choice. We cannot have a free election if any group is afraid to speak out and plead with its members or its friends to listen to sensible exposition of campaign arguments.

Wendell Willkie is today a lone campaigner. A timid Republican group in Congress gives him little aid, preferring the cautions of political restraint. They too, are governed by a fear of getting their fingers burned in the fray. They must get into the battle aggressively now.

Wendell Willkie won his nomination as he will win this election, by being forthright and outspoken, by being frank and honest, and above all, by refusing to be afraid of the combat itself. May American businessmen take a lesson from the man who almost alone won the nomination, but who must now have the cooperation of all those who profess to be his active supporters if he is to achieve victory for American freedom and responsible individualism.

Home Defense Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN G. ALEXANDER
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 24, 1940

STATEMENT OF EMIL E. HOLMES

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement of Emil E. Holmes, national deputy chief of staff, Disabled American Veterans of the World War, regarding H. R. 10113:

I am glad to accept an opportunity to cooperate with Congressman JOHN G. ALEXANDER in bringing before the Nation H. R. 10113, a bill to create a home-defense force. Congressman ALEXANDER has letters from most of the Governors dealing with this measure. The State executives provide some objections.

1. That Federal control of the home-defense forces would destroy State rights. This has not been its intent and could without much difficulty be overcome. The fact that Federal supervision and not control, except in event of an emergency so declared by act of Congress, should and would provide the benefits of a war-risk insurance for members of the home-defense forces. It would also provide a much more systematized and far-reaching care for the disabled. Some very sad cases came out of the home-defense forces in the World War, and the care provided by State organizations was inadequate.

2. One Governor suggests service by home-defense groups without pay. Modern warfare, however, shows that the home organizations may, in fact, be the deciding factor; certainly the fall of France is directly attributable to a weak home defense. This has been the situation in all countries which have been taken over by other powers in the last 2 years. Any military authority will agree that the United States is in a greater danger from within than from without, and that perhaps its most important arm of defense will be the home-defense reserves.

3. Organization of the home-defense forces under the supervision of Federal military experts will remove the danger of such home-defense forces being used as the storm troopers of ambitious State authorities. My own State of Minnesota has undertaken organization of a home-defense force, and it is highly debatable whether there is State legislative authority for such action.

It is a great pleasure to note the unanimous expressions of a need for a highly trained home-defense force; it is likewise a generally accepted fact that such forces are to be faced with a clever and most dangerous opposition. Can it be asking too much, that seasoned veterans be given preference in this important task, or are the Members of Congress going to let a condition in the defenses exist, comparable to that now existing between States, on the question of interstate commerce? Anyone can discover for himself in a very brief study of trade barriers set up by States that those authorities cannot be trusted in a national emergency and to carry out duties of the nature the home-defense forces will face. It requires national unity of the highest order.

EMIL E. HOLMES.

National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL HINSHAW
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

September 24, 1940

ADDRESS BY MAJ. GEN. WILLIAM C. RIVERS, UNITED STATES ARMY, RETIRED

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Maj. Gen. William C. Rivers, United States Army, retired, on station WEVD, September 19, 1940:

These is confused thinking about our national defense at times because some of those who study the question do so with the aid of

the ordinary Mercator maps used in our atlases. Mercator maps are distorted for some areas of the surface of the earth as to both the distances and directions. A more accurate aid is a globe. Take in your hands even a 10-cent globe and look at the United States. You see our geographical position and our strategic situation.

I am glad of this opportunity to speak of our national defense. This is because the subject is of the greatest importance to all of us. Also, I wore the uniform for 47 years. After graduating at West Point I was in all our wars for about the last 50 years. These included the later red Indian troubles in the West, Santiago in Cuba, the Philippines, and France. In France I had a battle command in all our major combats.

I am also glad to talk about our national defense because of the wide circulation of an article in Harper's magazine for August. The article was written by Hanson W. Baldwin, and its title is "Wanted: A Plan for Defense." Baldwin speaks as though we have no plan for defense. He says "that neither the results achieved nor the programs planned meet our defense needs." On the contrary, I assert that we have an excellent and comprehensive plan for defense. Baldwin admits—I use his words—that "it is obvious that the funds appropriated for defense in the past 7 years have not been poured down a rat hole; it is also obvious that the administration of President Roosevelt has done more for defense than any other administration since the World War."

One of Mr. Baldwin's major complaints is "our defense program must be based on the starkest sort of reality." Now, I have been in a good many campaigns and battles. But I have never seen an order for a battle or a directive for a campaign that was based on stark reality. A battle order is based on a commander's estimate of the situation. Any commander who writes an order for battle is obliged to assume much concerning the exact locations of the troops of the enemy and the plans of the commander of the enemy forces.

Similarly the President and Congress at Washington are compelled to base our program for defense partly on the facts we know and partly on suppositions and assumptions. We know our general foreign policy. We also know, as Baldwin states, that we plan our defense policy to include any aggression in this hemisphere on the part of a victorious Germany. We must plan against the gravest danger which seems possible. We are obliged to assume in a comprehensive plan for defense that a victorious Germany will have Italy's aid and that Germany may be in possession of Britain's fleet.

President Roosevelt gave an excellent definition of defense in his letter of January 28, 1938, to Congress. He said, "Adequate national defense means that for the protection not only of our coasts but also of our communities far removed from the coast we must keep any potential enemy several hundred miles away from our continental limits." Baldwin says, "There can be and is virtual unanimity of public opinion on hemisphere defense, which is simply a strategic way of describing the Monroe Doctrine." Baldwin gives an excellent outline and description of what hemisphere defense calls for in both the Atlantic and the Pacific. Also concerning our need for bases and harbors other than those in the United States. It is clear that the Navy is our first line of defense. And that an excellent air force is of the greatest importance to the effective power of the fleet and of the Army. Also that at present we require a much larger Army for defending our harbors and coasts and for possible expeditionary forces to outlying places.

Laws have been passed by Congress and appropriations made or authorized for doubling the Navy and greatly increasing the Marine Corps. The Regular Army and National Guard are being also doubled. Our protective mobilization plan provides for a force, including the Army and National Guard, of 1,200,000 men within the next 6 or 8 months. Preparations have been made for manufacturing the necessary airplanes, arms, tanks, artillery—all the equipment for the large Army. Also for building shelter or quarters for the troops. The Army has been in the field maneuvering for the past year. The National Guard is being called out for continuous service in the field in order to improve the training and discipline of the units.

There is general agreement that we should not prepare to fight an enemy on our own borders or shores. Also that we should not send the Army or Navy to fight in Europe or in Asia. In the Pacific our excellent defensive line runs from the Aleutians, in Alaska, to Hawaii, and on down to the Canal at Panama. In the Atlantic the recent acquisition of the eight bases gives us a defensive line from Newfoundland down to the shoulder of South America. This general line is several hundred miles from our coasts. These new bases guard the five passes which enter the Caribbean from the Atlantic.

Three recent measures of the greatest importance to our defense are the new law for selective conscription of soldiers, the acquisition of the eight new bases in the Atlantic, and the authorization by Congress of the $500,000,000 to the Federal authority which is allowed to use such funds in developing our trade with the South American nations.

Defending all the Americas is a colossal task. The shoulder of South America is much nearer Africa than it is to Charleston, S. C. The shoulder of South America is nearer to Africa than it is to our new base in Puerto Rico. However, we have a new base in South America, British Guiana. In a military sense defending the Americas means in the first place working with the Latin American countries in the effort to aid them and unify them so that they may defend themselves. We must also take more effective steps to improve cultural relations with the other American nations to the south of us.

I conclude with urging two things of great importance to defense. First, Congress ought to carry out the suggestion of Mr. Willkie by passing a law to create a single Department of National Defense under a Cabinet Minister of Defense. Three civilian Assistant Secretaries of Defense would be in charge of the three coequal armed branches—the Navy, the Army, and the Air Corps. A small college of national defense would naturally form a part of the staff of the Secretary of National Defense—a place where a few officers of all the armed services could meet for common study, with a few civilian officials of the State, Labor, and Treasury Departments. The part of the unified and homogeneous Air Corps assigned to the Navy should be under Navy command and orders for duty and training all the time in peace. Similarly, for that part of the Air Corps with the Army—it should be under Army command all the time in peace as well as in war.

Another thing of importance for our defense is the American Fleet should be safely east of the Canal at Panama. This is made more important by our obtaining the new bases in the west Atlantic. The fleet seems now to be immobilized out at Hawaii, several thousand miles distance from the Panama Canal.

More than 5,000 of the some 20,178 Japanese residents of the Philippines, among the 16,000,000 Filipinos, have returned to Japan since the start of the China war. Several interesting illusions often come up about the Far East. One is the idea that—even with the colossal sum proposed, $350,000,000, Guam and Wake Islands—both in the western Pacific and in the midst of numbers of Japanese islands—can be made tenable fortifications. All we can make there are two salients, distant, lonely, and untenable salients. We buy tin in Europe and America—from those who have smelters to which they take the ore they get in the Netherland East Indies or in other parts of the world. Rubber we buy from men who have stocks of it in Singapore, Liverpool, or other markets for rubber. We could, if it were necessary, send ships by the Atlantic to actually haul rubber and tin from Java. We need not send by way of Japan at all. Then the cooperation in the Far East with the British Fleet. We all know Britain has had no capital ships east of the Mediterranean since the Agadir explosion in Morocco in 1911. It is inevitable that the peoples who live in eastern Asia will settle the future of eastern Asia—what President Roosevelt called a sort of Monroe Doctrine for the Far East.

ADMIRAL LEAHY'S OPINION

Admiral William D. Leahy gave to the committees of Congress 2 years ago his judgment in the most thorough discussion of the North Pacific Ocean we have had in 40 years. His opinion was definite and emphatic, as follows: "The Navy which America now has and the Navy which it will have when it is increased by the authority in this bill will be seriously inadequate to the task of sending a naval force to the Philippines. I said it would require at least three times this amount of increase of our Navy, and I doubt if we could—send a naval force to the Philippines—with three times the increase."

The Admiral said also: "The defensive line of the American Navy at the present time reaches from the Aleutian Islands to the Hawaiian Islands, to Samoa, and to the Panama Canal."

The following brief quotations are from Professor Griswold's able article in Harper's for August, on Our Policy in the Far East: "We have failed, as a people and a Nation, to discover in the Far East a region of vital interest to our strategic security and domestic welfare." And, "Geography is perhaps the strongest deterministic agent in international relations."

Dr. Griswold believes there is reason for trying to improve our relations with Japan. Also, that there exists a reasonable basis for such action.

NEW TREATY ADVISED

My own conviction is—after 10 consecutive years' service with the Philippine Government—that we ought to make with Japan a new treaty of trade and friendship. That the treaty should contain clauses indicating Japan's interest in the continued independence of the Philippines after 1946. Japan will not try to annex the republic of the Philippines. She will not make a division of her fleet and armies with Soviet Russia so near at the north. Many Japanese have left the Philippines to return to Japan since the start of the war in China. In any event, Japan will have much of the trade with the Philippines. Japan has not the power or the desire to attack the United States. The distances are too great.

I hope the Filipinos will obtain the independence they have so long desired and which we have so long promised them. I have affection and admiration for the Filipino people. But their country is too far from my country for continued political relations. The inevitable logic of geography is that we should control from the mid-Atlantic westward to the mid-Pacific, a matter of great expense. If we endeavor to maintain a Navy large enough to try to defend the indefensible Philippines, and to aid the defense of South America, it will fetch financial ruin to my own country.

Statements to the effect that the Filipinos no longer desire independence are erroneous. They are, I believe, put out by people who desire our permanent control of and responsibility for the distant Philippines.

John Gunther, who visited Manila, says on page 300 of his book, Inside Asia, that in his opinion the sugar interests of the Philippines oppose independence for the Filipinos.

Sugar people at Manila desire to continue sending their costly sugar to the United States free of all duty. Such a practice would be against the interests of the farmers in many of our own States.

Press reports give account of several unusual public addresses by President Quezon. Mr. Quezon is said to have declared that political parties are not needed in a democracy; that they should be abolished. President Quezon has been voted by the Assembly, at his

request, many great additional powers over the liberties of individuals and over trade, commerce, labor, and other unusual "emergency" powers. The Filipino Civil Liberties Union has publicly stated its belief that this is an unmistakable sign that the President of the Commonwealth desires totalitarianism for the Philippines. I recollect recommending that Philippine independence be granted on July 4, 1940, when I testified before the Tydings Insular Committee in March 1939. Continuation of trade privileges ought to be at the same time granted the Filipinos for several years.

I very greatly doubt Baldwin's statement in his Harper's article—that "Our officers stand too much upon pomp and prerogatives of rank." A few officers of the Army or Navy may be so afflicted, but not many. You can find a few men so afflicted in any profession—among, say, lawyers, judges, journalists, and so on.

Let Us Stop, Look, and Listen—Part I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. THORKELSON

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 23, 1940

Mr. THORKELSON. Mr. Speaker, in many of my discussions I have referred to the "unseen rulers," "world union," "world governments," and back-door executive advisers who have been guiding the hand which is writing death to the Republic; and, having writ, disappear in their temples of gold in "New Jerusalem, New York."

It is of these and others I shall now speak in an attempt to place them correctly in the picture I am about to describe.

The people to whom I shall refer are parasitic, and, like a parasite, they ultimately destroy the host upon which they have lived and grown fat. Sunlight is bactericidal, and under its rays microbia die. I shall turn such light upon those who are boring through the ramparts of our Republic and who are engaged in insidious destruction of the foundation of our Government, the Constitution of the United States. It is with this in mind that I am writing this article, and in the words of St. John, "And ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free."

Mr. Cecil Rhodes and Mr. Andrew Carnegie were interested in Britain, and in the return of the United States as a colony to England. Both of them hoped this reunion could be accomplished by educating the American people. Mr. Rhodes hoped that this education of American youth could be accomplished, as he said, "Under the spires of Oxford"; and to aid in such education Mr. Rhodes endowed scholarships in English universities in order to education Americans in English mannerisms, egotism, and snobbery.

Upon successful graduation in these perquisites, many of the students were placed in the very best positions to carry on the work of Mr. Rhodes. That work, as you know, was to destroy nationalism and faith in our own Government, to belittle America and our people, while praising England; to disparage our Republic and its government, while acclaiming the House of Lords.

The first organizations to promote reunion were strictly Anglo-Saxon and therefore unfavorable or cold toward the Asiatic and Mongoloid Jews. This, of course, was correct and their business, for the Jews are not Europeans; they are Asiatics and of a Mongoloid racial mixture. Let us remember, however, that these groups were pro-British and also cool toward this Republic and all it represents. It is in the knowledge of this that I am opposed to all who ignore the Constitution or constitutional government. I do not criticize the individual membership of the Anglo-Saxon federation. I deplore, instead, its un-American principles; and it is because of such principles and failure to appreciate our own Government that I oppose these organizations.

Let me make this point clear: The Anglo-Saxon Federation is, as near as I know, what the name implies—Anglo-Saxon, pro-British, anti-internationalistic, and anti-American. It is because of this that international Jewry is now coming out against the Anglo-Saxon Federation.

The British-Israel Federation is an entirely different movement, for while it presumes to be a Christian movement, it is in reality a subversive, un-American movement, financed by those who are interested in world government.

Mr. Andrew Carnegie's ambition, similar to that of Cecil Rhodes, was also to bring about reunion of the United States and the British Empire—and his idea was also to accomplish this by education, but on a much larger scale than that of his predecessor. In order that this may be clear to you, I shall quote from A Look Ahead, the last chapter in his book Triumphant Democracy.

> Time may dispel many pleasing illusions and destroy many noble dreams, but it shall never shake my belief that the wound caused by the wholly unlooked for and undesired separation of the mother from her child is not to bleed forever.
>
> Let men say what they will, therefore, I say that as surely as the sun in the heavens once shone upon Britain and America united, so surely is it one morning to rise, shine upon, and greet again "The Re-united States," "The British-American Union."

Mr. Carnegie, like Cecil Rhodes, was intensely pro-British, and his fondest desire was—as the quotation shows—to reunite the United States with the British Empire. It was to accomplish this that Mr. Carnegie created well-financed endowments, so that there would be sufficient money to carry out his plan.

The point which we should bear in mind, is the purpose for which the Carnegie money was to be employed—and that was to undermine and destroy the Government of this Republic.

This attitude, of course, is perfectly normal in Cecil Rhodes, because he was a British subject, and made his money in the British Empire. It is not so easily understandable in Carnegie, for he, while he might have been a British subject, made his money in the United States and should, therefore, have been loyal to the country which gave him his wealth.

The point which all of us must remember is the purpose for which the Carnegie endowments were created and the manner in which this money was employed to exchange British for American traditions, in order to destroy patriotism in our people.

In order to understand this, we need no better evidence than the literature sponsored by the Carnegie Foundation. This literature is filed in all Carnegie libraries, and therefore accessible to the public. I have examined the titles and authorship of many of these articles, and I cannot find one which out and out defends the principles of this Republic, as set forth in the Constitution of the United States. The real Carnegie plan has gone far afield from that held by Mr. Carnegie himself. The cause of this may be found in the cosmopolitan make-up of the various officers, members on the boards of trustees, directors, and so forth.

Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler is himself an internationalist, favorably disposed toward Britain, it is true, but particularly toward the League of Nations, or the so-called Federal Union, Inc. It is such literature which is now found in the public libraries, and it is not only subversive but is in reality the very cause for changes which have taken place in our educational system. No country can survive when its ideals are destroyed, and ours are steadily being undermined by the Carnegie literature. Surely no one will disagree with me, when I say that literature which belittles our own Government is not in the common defense, or for the general welfare of the United States, but is instead contrary to the basic principles of our Government.

The Carnegie endowments and financial aid may therefore be looked upon as a bribe paid to seal the lips of those who should warn the people of the danger which lies in the acceptance of Carnegie donations.

About 250 beneficiaries are listed in the 1935 edition of the Carnegie Corporation report. This list includes practically the whole educational field, from the highest to the lowest. It includes universities, colleges, medical schools, churches, social organizations, public libraries, and many other special organizations, for example: $50,000 to the

American Bar Association, $50,000 to the National Occupational Conference, $538,000 to the American Law Institute, $50,000 to the Brookings Institution, $20,000 to the Church Peace Union, $130,500 to the Teachers College of Columbia, $24,000 to the Commission of Interracial Cooperation; and so the list goes on in the various fields of regular and subversive education. On the face of it, as listed, this may look all above board and is no doubt so held by many of the beneficiaries. It is quite likely that only a few of the endowees consider the ultimate aims of Carnegie and the result of the Carnegie propaganda.

Let us now, in all sense of fairness, evaluate the Carnegie activities in their true light. To do that, we must first of all begin with the principles stated by Carnegie himself—which were to restore the United States as a colony of the British Empire. In the second place, we must evaluate the Carnegie plan under the leadership of Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler. He has been a servant to the British Crown ever since he assumed office as director of this Carnegie propaganda to undermine America. He is still a servant to the same power, but has added another fetish to his worship, namely, the star of David. In this dual capacity, he cannot and is not operating in the interest of our Government, but is instead, as his own statements clearly prove, engaged in subversion of our Government, by his failure to support the Constitution.

Dr. Butler does not hesitate in his advocacy of our abandoning our sovereign status as a nation to become a mere cog in the contemplated international world government. He advocates this openly in his speeches; so it is not simply a statement made by me, but is instead a position which he has taken himself, of his own free will and accord. I wish to say, in fairness to Dr. Butler, that I do not criticize him as an individual, but I do criticize and deplore his principles—which are un-American and foreign to our form of government.

Our Nation is threatened today by a group of men, who because of their position in public, political, social, and private life, are not criticized for their subversive activities. I shall try to place them in their proper position, relative to their interest in the present war, which is now raging in Europe, by division in three groups: The first group is composed of those who are favorable to England; the second group is composed of those who for personal reasons hate Hitler; and the third group is composed of an admixture of both—or those who expect to make a harvest out of the present war.

It is these three groups which are now undermining America, and it is they who are clamoring for war. I venture to say that not one of the members of these three groups will enlist or even register on October 16. If they do enlist, they will be far removed from the actual field of combat.

It is a certain select few in these three groups who own and control the national press, radio, cinema, newsstands, and informative distribution of news, who know better than anyone else that control of gold gives them the power to buy and sell the rights and liberties of the people.

These people recognize the power of the press, so they buy it, because absolute control of the news is essential to their success. This ownership is first to protect themselves; second, to keep truth from the people; third, to falsify all information in order to deceive and confuse public opinion; and fourth, to instill and disseminate untruths against those whom they wish to destroy. It does not matter to them whether that be a friendly nation or patriotic citizens. The only thing that matters is whether or not any statement of fact threatens those who have bought themselves to power by the use of public money, gold, and credits.

There is nothing that hurts our Nation so much today as press control. But such control is imperative to those who are undermining America; for their protection lies in censorship of the press and in complete suppression of any information which may shed light upon their double dealing and intrigue. It should be clear to all that when the daily press—and I include all of the controlled press and certain broadcasters—join hands in an effort to suppress one or two persons, it is not because such individuals lie, it is because they are telling the truth. When these monetary interests cannot succeed in this suppression by legitimate methods, accidents often befall those who have the courage of their convictions, and whose interest lies in the welfare of the country instead of personal glory. To date they have been successful in these assassinations, but the day will come when aroused American patriotic people will drive these enemies of the United States from their temples of evil intrigue.

If there were some way to expose these international racketeers and to reveal them as they really are, not one of them would be in power a month after such exposure. They seem to have Congress "buffaloed," and the Executive appears to be one of those who is more interested in foreign governments than he is in the Government of the United States. It is in the recognition of this evil that I have taken the position that our interests should be entirely in the safety and the security of the United States.

There is much to do at home to set our Nation right, and money expended for such purpose would be an asset—while money expended in the aid of foreign nations to prolong an unnecessary war is an expense and loss to Christian civilization which can never be repaid for its losses in centuries to come. I, therefore, feel it imperative to say that Congress should give no aid to any foreign nation—no matter which one may ask for such help. It is a humane attitude, of course, for Congress to give aid, if possible, to people in stricken areas who may be suffering because of exposure and lack of food, but such help should be universal and not, as now, partial to one nation. Let us always bear in mind that the people themselves are not responsible for the misdeeds of their rulers. Surely no one can hold antagonism and hatreds toward the people of France, Belgium, Holland, Norway, Poland, or any of the countries which have recently been invaded. If we are to pursue and protect our principles, let us follow the teachings of Christ and help all who are in need of help. We are, however, doing the opposite, for we are furnishing instruments to kill and destroy Christian civilization by giving aid to the powers now at war. Who armed Germany? Was it the people themselves, or was it the people who control gold money and credit? Surely no one will contradict me when I say that Germany was armed with money furnished by the international American, English, and German bankers. In view of this, what is all this "hate Hitler" about? Is it a smoke screen the international bankers are employing in order to deceive us, or is it possible that Hitler has double-crossed the international bankers as they did Germany in 1917, when they traded their rights in a country in which they had lived for over 700 years for 30 pieces of Palestine silver?

LET US ESTIMATE POSSIBILITIES

I expect to see Bulgaria, Greece, and Turkey join the United European powers. After such consolidation, we may expect Arabia to join this coalition, in order to set itself free from British rule. These powers united will then take possession of the Mesopotamian oil fields and the Suez Canal. This will leave the road open to Africa for redistribution of colonies within that empire. Many of these states are not favorable to British rule, and it is quite possible that the Transvaal still harbors a grudge and would like to obtain the status of a free and independent nation. The same thing may be said about India, for that nation, as well as England and America is ruled and dominated by the international money changers. In such war, England like ourselves, will be at a disadvantage, in not having land contact with bases and sufficient war material to successfully conduct a war.

I do not believe that Germany will invade England unless that country is forced to capitulate to save her people from starvation and destruction by air. The present air war is no doubt to keep English forces at home, while preparations are made for a southern campaign, as I have already stated. The German air attacks on England are to destroy as much of the Navy and merchant marine as possible, and to destroy war industries and bases of supplies. While this is going on, plans no doubt are already in operation for a concerted attack in Asia and Africa. What plan could be more plausible or profitable to the central European nations than an invasion of Africa; invasion of a country in which may be found

the most productive gold mines and the largest diamond fields in the world? Surely the war booty to be had in such invasion is preferable to risking defeat by an invasion of England.

A NUT FOR CONGRESS TO CRACK

In my discussion of this subject, I cannot refrain from looking ahead, and as I do, I recall the past and England's antagonistic attitude toward the United States.

Suppose England finds that she cannot hold out, and to save her colonies, she agrees with these united Central European powers to negotiate terms of peace. If this should occur, in what position will we be, in view of the fact that we have antagonized every nation in the world by our deliberate unneutral and unfriendly acts. Suppose England restores the former German-owned colonies to Germany, with further division of the Belgian and French possessions among Italy, Germany, and England. Suppose in such agreement, a plan is entered into by these three powers to invade the United States through Canada and other British possessions? In what position would we be, confronted by such united attack? Would we be able to defend ourselves with the Jewish army now organized and equipped, and the millions of Communists who sympathize with the Jewish radicals now in the United States? In what position would we be, with the communistic army now organized to the south of us in Mexico, and which by all reports is armed and ready to invade the United States, when such order is given. Could we today defend ourselves against an attack launched from Canada and from Mexico, particularly in view of the fact that British bases are located within a short distance of our eastern coastal areas?

Is it not possible, if confronted with such attack, we may lose our Pacific possessions to Japan and Alaska to Russia? And is it not possible that such invasion may be successful should the powers now at war in Europe join in a concerted attack upon the United States? It is quite likely that Great Britain may in the near future attempt to induce us to assume protection of Hong Kong, Singapore, and Penang.

Suppose that Congress should foolishly fall for such plan, what would be the consequence? Would not such act on our part terminate in a war with Japan, and would we not, in order to defend ourselves, be compelled to transport our Army to the Orient? If this should happen and war is declared, with our Army 10,000 miles removed from our shores, would we not in such procedure invite attack by the powers to which I have already referred; and is it not possible that such plan may be contemplated to destroy us?

These are a few observations and possibilities which Congress must bear in mind, for it alone is responsible for the common defense and the general welfare of the United States. I know Europe, and in the knowledge of European intrigue I trust no one; and least of all Great Britain—a nation which has double-crossed not only her own colonies but every nation with which she has had contact. I say, therefore, as I have said before, let Congress take charge and guide the destiny of this Nation, in the interest of the United States alone.

With me America comes first, and my opposition to foreign powers is not because I hold any animosity or hatred toward them, but is instead because my interest is solely within the United States and tied up in the security of our country.

Farmers in Eighth Congressional District of Michigan Take the Rap From Foreign Imports; Time To Call a Halt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 24, 1940

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, the farmers of the Eighth Congressional District of Michigan are leading producers of a number of important commodities. It is one of the largest sugar-beet districts east of the Rockies; it is the biggest mint producer in the Nation; we supply great areas with our fine potatoes and we are a principal source of the Nation's navy-bean supply. Other major commodities are also produced in my district.

As result of New Deal tariff reductions the farmers of the Eighth District of Michigan do not find themselves competing with fellow farmers of America but they are forced to compete with cheap foreign imports. These farmers are taking the rap and it is time to call a halt.

Below is a table of a few principal items produced in the Eighth District of Michigan and the extent to which foreign imports compete with them. With these growing imports the comparison of average farm prices of the 12 Republican years and the 7 New Deal years is all the more interesting.

Official Department of Commerce figures

Import items	Unit	1938	1939
Cattle	Head	424,022	753,570
Dry and malted milk	Pound	80,735	2,465,032
Canned beef	Pound	78,597,007	85,862,876
Dry beans	Pound	5,748,329	6,132,141
Potatoes	Pound	45,820,283	93,859,166
Cheese	Pound	54,432,000	59,071,000
Oats	Bushel	7,183	4,293,009
Eggs in shell	Dozen	231,784	328,523
Peppermint oil	Pound	5,466	51,460

Anti-Semitism in This Country

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 24, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON TIMES-HERALD

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Times-Herald of Tuesday, September 24, 1940:

[From the Washington Times-Herald of September 24, 1940]

ANTI-SEMITISM IN THIS COUNTRY

It seems plain that anti-Semitism is on the rise in this country, chiefly because of the war.

BLAMING JEWS FOR THE WAR

Most of our anti-Semites—the Nazis frankly and the others not so frankly—argue that the Jews pushed England and France into declaring war on Germany because they wanted to get their revenge for the way Hitler treats the German Jews. We're told, too, that the Jews are pushing the United States into the war from the same motive.

One favorite anti-Semitic theory is that the Jews control most of the department stores, which do most of the big display advertising in the papers, and that thereby the Jews dictate the papers' editorial policies on foreign affairs.

As far as this newspaper is concerned, its publisher is prepared to testify under oath before any kind of congressional committee that no advertiser has ever, directly or indirectly, tried to influence its editorial policies on foreign affairs.

WE FEEL NO "INFLUENCE"

William Allen White's Committee to Defend America by Aiding the Allies, from which we received 155 post cards over the week end asking us to root for release of 25 flying fortresses and 20 mosquito boats to Great Britain, lists very few Jews on its roster of more than 600 eminent sponsors—as well as very few persons of draft age. And the White committee is the most active single agency pushing us toward the war.

YEARS 1914–1918; 1939–19—?

The United States has one foot in the war and the other on a banana peel, true. And no doubt plenty of Jews would like to see us declare all-out war on Germany, on the theory that Hitler is a beast who ought to be exterminated.

But we do not believe the Jews are to blame as a race or a group for our rush toward Europe's latest war.

Certainly they weren't to blame in 1917. The Kaiser's Germany was friendly to the Jews. Albert Ballin, founder of the Hamburg-American Line, was a sort of personal financier to

Wilhelm II; the Rothschilds were an honored house in Germany; Jewish scientists and scholars were legion, and highly placed, in the Kaiser's time. Plenty of German Jews in this country remained pro-German right up to the time we entered the war.

THE ROAD TO WAR

After we woke up from the World War nightmare, we took to blaming the munitions makers—merchants of death—and the international bankers for having got us into that fight.

We tried to insure against any more of such villainy by passing the Johnson Act against United States loans to foreign nations in default here and the Neutrality Act to prevent war-material shipments to any belligerent nation or nations.

Came the war of 1939–19—?; and now, at the end of its first year, we are well on our way into it.

The President has procured revision of the Neutrality Act to allow cash-and-carry arms shipments. The Johnson Act is under increasing attack, and will probably go when England's cash begins to run low. We've released 50 destroyers to England, in addition to a lot of World War left-over guns and ammunition; and now the 25 flying fortresses deal is warming up. Plenty of us wish we had more merchants of death. The loss of the Hercules powder plant is generally regretted.

WHY ARE WE GOING IN?

All this is being done, we are persuaded, with the approval of the majority of Americans.

Or, if it isn't, the majority have no chance to register disapproval. Both Presidential candidates are interventionists; there is no choice between them on this point, as there might have been if the Republicans had nominated Dewey instead of Willkie.

We think we are going into this war for the same deep, underlying cause that took us in last time—a cause which has nothing to do with the Jews, the bankers, or the "merchants of death." We believe the American people have a subconscious conviction that as long as Britain and the United States together have the world's biggest combined naval power these two nations can run the world; that we've got to hang together or we're likely to be hanged separately. Indeed, this war may be fought for the principal purpose of finding out if air power can conquer sea power.

So once again we seem to have given England a blank check, to draw on as needed. The outlook is dark indeed.

Let Us Stop, Look, and Listen—Part II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. THORKELSON

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 23, 1940

Mr. THORKELSON. Mr. Speaker, just when I begin to remove my war paint, store my tommyhawk, and take up my pipe of peace, some of my defamers of the air and in the press begin to shoot poison arrows in my back. These attacks after awhile become unbearable, and force me in self-defense to take the warpath.

It seems strange to me that my revilers cannot understand that nothing they can say now can hurt me more than what they have already said. I have only a name and a reputation—which I have made by fair dealings with my fellow men. These are intangible assets and cannot be destroyed by my defamers, no matter how much infamy they endeavor to heap upon me. Neither can my defamers hurt me after I leave Congress and when I am no more, for my beliefs and principles are recorded; and will some day light the way to the return of sound constitutional government.

My defamers should know that I am not alone in my belief in constitutional government; nor am I alone in the respect I hold toward the founders of this Republic; for there are millions who share this faith with me. My defamers should realize that there are millions of patriotic citizens in the North, South, East, and West, who would write in the name of a Presidential candidate could they in so doing, be assured that he would enjoin Congress to set this Nation squarely upon the Constitution of the United States.

The major political parties should realize that it is within the rights of the people to make a direct choice for President, by writing in a name, and that they might resort to such procedure in order to establish sound constitutional government. This is particularly true when political parties and the Government fail in their duty to the people. Such procedure is perfectly legal today, because changes in the Constitution have given the people control by direct ballot, and the power of selection and election is entirely within the hands of the majority of the electorate. It therefore behooves the political parties to note this fact—for the people may in sheer desperation, as I have already said, center upon a person of their choice for President, instead of accepting the political offerings of the major parties, who are sponsored by the same financial powers. As a matter of fact, hope for constitutional government will, I believe, depend upon such procedure, and I would therefore advise the best candidate to come out in the open for America, and for equal rights to all—with special favors to none.

Suppose one of the candidates makes a declaration of principles somewhat like this:

I believe in the Constitution of the United States and promise that I will readopt this document as a beacon light from which this Republic shall take its course. I do so in the common defense and for the general welfare of the United States.

I believe in States rights, and in the right of the State to regulate its own affairs within the State; and by two duly appointed representatives in the United States Senate to direct the Government of the United States in its foreign relations and among the several States.

I believe in this—first, because it is constitutional; and, second, because it will reduce the State and Federal operative costs in direct relation to the efficiency of each State government.

It should be clear by now that departure from the Constitution is responsible for the ever-increasing cost of the State administration and in a greater degree for the unwarrantable and excessive cost of the Federal administration. This has come about by overlapping functions of the State and Federal Governments, and by greater and greater centralization of power in the Executive. This centralization of administration powers has brought about a declining public interest in the State government. This is dangerous, for it can only end in total or absolute centralization of power in the Federal Government, while it at the same time destroys the government of the State. If this happens—and let me say that it is now near—we will be ruled by a dictator. I am reasonably sure that such movement is now contemplated by the incumbent administration, and should this come to pass there will be no freedom for business or labor, because all will be regimented by military force. The people themselves will be under constant surveillance by a secret service similar to that of Europe.

It is to prevent such change that I advise return to the principles set forth in the Constitution of the United States, for it is the only document which protects the people against Government usurpation of public rights. We must return to constitutional government, and this should be done in the common defense and for the general welfare of the people of the United States.

I furthermore believe in the constitutional rights of business to operate with utmost freedom and without Federal competition in the field of private industry. Therefore I believe that all Federal-owned and operated business should be liquidated or sold to private interest, so that it may, with other business, aid in employment and in the support of the Government.

I believe in sound, standardized, gold-secured currency, and, believing in this, I advise that the gold now in storage be set aside as security for the people of this Nation, instead of as it is now, controlled by private interests.

I believe in a foreign policy which deals with equal fairness to all nations and with absolute neutrality in peace as well as war. Our foreign policy should end at the 3- or 12-mile limit—whichever distance is agreed upon by international law. I furthermore believe in the freedom to establish military zones at reasonable distances from our shore in order to protect military and commercial operations, such as Bristol Bay operation in Alaska. I also declare that our foreign policy should be in our own interest and not in the interest of

any specially selected nation. Our foreign diplomats should conduct themselves as intelligent Americans and not as old busybodies, meddling in every other nation's business. Our foreign policy today has been based mainly upon egotistical, explosive ideas of some individual or individuals, who have not the slightest idea of what a foreign policy actually means. Our foreign policy has consisted mainly in meddling, fooling, and fiddling with the affairs of other nations, until we finally by our interference have provoked a general European war. It is quite likely that we will pay for this crazy foreign policy in enmities and loss of trade that we will sustain when the war is over.

I believe that our merchant marine should be privately owned and operated with private capital, exactly on the same basis as any other private business. The way the merchant marine is handled by the Government is criminal, and will always be remembered as a collosal fraud. I grant that certain ships which may be called out as auxiliaries or secondary support in naval fleet operation, should be subsidized—and rightly so—because of losses sustained in special construction for such purpose.

I believe in a two-ocean naval fleet, with yearly replacements in all capital ships—so that the fleet will always be ready to meet any enemy, no matter from what quarter they may come.

I believe in full national defense—with fixed and mobile armaments suitable to meet attack by water or land. I also believe in a first-class air force, under command of air-minded men who understand aviation. I also believe in underground bomb-proof airplane factories. I believe the same provision should be made for the storing of airplanes, as nothing provides better protection than bomb-proof shelters. These should be constructed underground instead of in the open, where they can be destroyed by enemy air attacks.

I, furthermore, believe that ammunition factories should be located in sparsely settled parts of the country. Such location would furnish the greatest measure of protection from enemy attacks, no matter whether such enemies be saboteurs within the country, or agents provocateurs operating under instructions of foreign governments. Located in sparsely settled parts of the country, particularly in mountainous regions, such important war industries will also be reasonably well protected from enemy attack.

I believe in universal military training during school years—say, 3 months at the age of 18; 3 months at the age of 19; and 1 year at the age of 20. This last year should be set aside as an educational feature of the training, with scholastic credits. Such training would be of immense advantage to the youth, and to coming generations, for it would instill discipline, respect, and patriotism, which in turn would bring about a closer cooperation and understanding among our people.

Such arrangements would make it possible for us to operate with a small standing army, and yet be prepared on short notice to meet any requirement in the defense of our country.

I furthermore believe that for practical purposes consolidation must in the end take place in North America in order to protect this hemisphere from all foreign attacks. Such union should be accomplished in a peaceful manner, by agreement between the powers interested in such coalition. It must, however, be under the Stars and Stripes.

These are a few thoughts which a wide-awake condidate might have expressed, in order to instill greater confidence. I say a wide-awake candidate, because it is hopeless to expect any sound policy or the return to constitutional government by the present incumbent of the White House.

I often wonder what Congress and the people would think should one of the budding nominees propose a policy somewhat like this:

Members of Congress, over a period of 100 years constant departure from the Constitution and disregard of its principles have proven nearly disastrous to this Nation. We are today like a rudderless ship, drifting here and there without a fixed point of departure, and with an uncertain destination. In other words, we are lost, and have been lost for a number of years; and under the direction of an unseen power which has no interest in the United States. We are now drifting toward an unknown and hostile shore—where communism is rampant, and where dictators rule oligarchican governments. It is not my intention to blame anyone for this deplorable situation, and it would serve no useful purpose to do so. We must, however, recognize that we are far afield from the government which was given to us by the founders of this country in 1787.

It is well to bear in mind that Members of both Houses are responsible as individuals to the people who elected them to office, and jointly to the people of this Nation. With this in mind, it is my desire to inform Congress that from today you shall be responsible for the safety and security of this Republic—as provided for in the Constitution of the United States. Our trouble is not obsolescence of the Constitution, but is instead from our utter indifference to the principles laid down in that document. The Constitution delegates power to Congress, and to no one else. You are, therefore, responsible to the people who elect you to office for the administrative cost of the Federal Government, and for its operation in accord with the principles set forth in the Constitution. I am also in accord with this, and shall, therefore, take care that the law be faithfully obeyed. I shall begin with the fundamental law—the Constitution of the United States.

In line with this, I suggest that you begin by repealing all unconstitutional laws until all three branches of the Government operate again strictly within the Constitution itself. It is only by strict adherence to the Constitution that our Nation can survive, and it is only by full adherence and support of the law that our self-respect can be maintained. You and I want the Republic to survive, and all of us desire to maintain our self-respect as individuals and as a nation. It follows, therefore, that the first law to obey is that which gave independence and life to this Republic, and upon which it must rest to function, or else die. It is the law upon which our Government must rest and which it should be the first to support, instead of, as it is now doing, the first to destroy. Let us therefore place our Government squarely upon the Constitution and let us support and enforce this document with all the powers at our command.

In order that Congress may begin to function properly, I request that you repeal all extra-constitutional powers which you have unmindfully and illegally granted to the Executive. When these powers are repealed, he may begin to operate within article II of the Constitution, and this will restore powers now lost to Congress and allow it to operate as provided for in the Constitution. This will reduce operative costs of the executive department, without additional increase elsewhere in the Government. In reading the Constitution it is clear that all power in that document is granted to Congress, with very little power to the Executive, except in conjunction with the Senate, and the two complete powers, that is, to grant reprieves and pardons.

The Supreme Court was never established as a whitewashing outfit, to pass legislation enacted by Congress. Congress was supposed to be composed of able-bodied and clear-minded men, who would understand whether or not legislation was constitutional before enacted into law. Lacking such understanding, no one has any business to be a Member of Congress. The Supreme Court was never supposed to be tormented by having to pass upon dumb laws enacted to please some faction at home or other selfish interest.

At any rate, Congress from today shall assume responsibility for the common defense and the general welfare of the people, and in this position be able to operate and run this Government without any extra aid. Each State must assume its sovereign function and operate according to and with full responsibility of its reserve power in the Constitution. As each State begins to function, the Federal Government must

recede from the State, in order to remove all overlapping departments and bureaus now operating in duplication of administrative and regulatory functions, and leave to the State the sole responsibility for its own government.

Federal employment should also be reduced in the same ratio as State administrative functions are resumed, with the ultimate object in mind to operate with less than 25 percent of the present employment list. This can easily be accomplished when each State assumes its full sovereign rights and operates its government as set forth in the Constitution of the United States.

It would also enable the Federal Government to concentrate its many elaborately housed departments into one structure, where each and every one will be employed in the exclusive interest of the United States. Such arrangement will leave the Federal Government free to represent the United States in its foreign relations and among the several States, as set forth in article I, section 8, of the Constitution. It will give the Federal Government an opportunity to promote friendly relations with foreign nations to rebuild and acquire foreign markets, in order to provide outlets for our surplus industrial and farm production. In such procedure administrative costs and taxes can be reduced without impairing the Federal income. As a matter of fact, the soundest policy for private industry is operation with the lowest overhead in order to reduce cost of production and permit such business to successfully compete in all markets. The same procedure is more important in a nonearning institution, such as a Government, and careful economic operation in all governments, no matter whether they be State or Federal, is, of course, sound and desirable.

What needs curbing more than anything else are the international and national bankers who for years have used the national monetary wealth to destroy independent operators and acquire their holdings by the free use of public money—which in no sense belonged to the international or private bankers. It is these Shylocks more than any other group of individuals who are responsible for the condition in which we find our Nation today, and they should, in common justice and decency, be placed in exactly the same relation to the Federal Treasury as private individuals occupy in relation to the banks. This, of course, will raise a furore among the money sharks, but it will also cut their power with one stroke of the pen and set our Nation right.

Drastic economy in the case of the Federal administration will show a steady increase in profits from the present taxable income. Reduction of taxes will lower the operative cost of industry, which again will result in low-cost production. This will in turn increase employment, prosperity, and soundness in our industrial business structure.

It should be clear that a Government which depends upon taxes levied upon business for its income, cannot engage in destructive competition with such business, without reduction and final depletion of its own income. The Government which engages in such fool-hardy venture—and particularly on borrowed money—is either engaged in premeditated and malicious destruction of itself, or else it is ignorantly incompetent. I cannot refrain from stating at this point that this is precisely the position of the present administration. The Roosevelt administration is engaged in a most damnable destructive policy, for which there is no excuse. Anyone, no matter how incompetent, realizes full well that this or any other government cannot borrow itself into prosperity, but will instead, in pursuing such contemptible policy, exhaust national credit, only to bring about national bankruptcy. If the truth were known, this is exactly what the Roosevelt administration has in mind.

Our people were prepared for that in 1934, when they were deprived of gold and gold secured currency and investments. With the present inflated currency and bankruptcy, no one will lose except the people themselves, for the international and national bankers are fully protected with the twenty-one billions of gold now stored in National Treasury vaults. This gold is not owned by the Government or by the people. It is instead owned and controlled by those who are holding the gold certificates, and by foreign nations who are holding private industrial stocks and bonds.

For anyone to say, as one gentleman recently stated on the floor of the House, that this gold is the property of the United States, is a most willful and deliberate falsehood. I challenge the Treasury Department or the Executive—it does not matter which—to come out and deny the statements I have made in this discussion, and say, that gold certificates now held by interests outside of the Treasury and by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve banks, are not a claim and a liability against the gold now stored in Treasury vaults of the United States.

I also challenge the Secretary of the Treasury and the Executive to successfully contradict me when I say that we are and have been using a fully inflated currency since 1934. Furthermore, when prices can no longer be manipulated, or price levels maintained, the present currency or money will collapse like a burst toy balloon. In other words, we will have the same sort of inflation which wrecked Germany.

Furthermore, I should like the Secretary of the Treasury and the Executive to successfully deny that the Inter-American Bank, which was recently created by an unconstitutional act of Congress, was set up to establish control of gold credit for North and South America; and that this control of gold and gold credit is to establish complete domination of Central and South American republics, similar to the control which the same people now maintain in the United States; to deny that such control of gold will enslave and destroy those countries, as it has all other nations which have been forced to submit to those whose god is gold and savior is a bribe; to deny that each and every Central and South American nation will be indebted to the international bankers on a comparative scale with our indebtedness to them at this time—which is approximately $60,000,000,000.

I also challenge the President to deny that the present strife in Europe is a war in which the international and Jewish bankers are risking the lives of every Christian foolish enough to fight for them, in order to regain control of the Central European nations, and to force those nations to accept gold credit in return for Jewish domination of all industries and profitable business within those countries.

I challenge any expert to give one intelligent and good reason which will prove that we will not meet with dismal defeat should we join England in the present war. It should be self-evident that our entrance into the war, no matter whether it be in Europe or in the Orient, is bound to meet with failure—first because of the distance from bases and supplies; second, because we are fighting for a cause in which the English themselves have no faith, and which they understand much better than we do in the United States.

The people of England know that they are dominated by a Jewish government, exactly in the same manner as we are dominated by the same tribe in the United States. It is also well to bear in mind that inasmuch as the French and English Navies jointly could not cope with a fleet of rowboats, the English Navy now alone and in need of drydocking and repair cannot engage in successful combat.

Finally, I challenge anyone in the administration to produce one real proof that we are threatened by invasion from any foreign nation except the Jewish refugee communistic army, which has the approval of the War Department and the blessings of the President and his unseen secret advisers.

The public has been fooled for a long time; as a matter of fact, ever since 1933; but they are gradually awakening, not only to the dangers and purposes of the Roosevelt administration, but they are actually realizing and recognizing the powers that are directing the Roosevelt administration as a destructive agency to the Government of the United States.

Distinguished Democrat, Former Congressman Charles H. Martin Heads Willkie Democrats in Oregon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 24, 1940

STATEMENT BY HON. CHARLES H. MARTIN

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks, I include a prepared statement by the Honorable Charles H. Martin, former Democratic Governor of Oregon and former Congressman from the Third Oregon District, which I have the honor to represent at this time. General Martin has to his credit a distinguished record in the United States Army, having attained the rank of major general. On his retirement from the service he took an active part in the counsels of the Democratic Party, having been reared, as he states, in the atmosphere of traditional democracy. My State honored him by electing him to the office of Representative in Congress and later called him to serve as Governor of the State. He was the Democratic candidate for these offices. He has now accepted the chairmanship of the Willkie Democrats in Oregon. Governor Martin's statement is as follows:

I was reared in an atmosphere of traditional democracy; in fact, my father, Senator Martin, of Illinois, was such a strong Democrat that he actually voted for Douglas against Lincoln in 1858. As a lifelong Democrat myself I have always cherished the traditions of that great party. I feel that a third term for any President is hostile to the fundamentals of our American system and especially the Democratic Party that I know. I could not conscientiously, therefore, support any President for a third term. There are other reasons why I feel that a change of administration this year is essential to the best interests of the American people.

NO MAN INDISPENSABLE

I agree with Mr. Willkie that the first essential to a strong national defense is social and economic recovery here at home; the elimination of class warfare—a divided house cannot stand; a revival of the will to work and an opportunity for all to work at gainful wages.

I cannot concede the indispensability of any one man to administer the affairs of our Government; that is the totalitarian way, not the American way. Our American system was never designed to serve the power lust of any one man.

The destiny of our country will be safe in the hands of Mr. Willkie. Our paramount need today is the services of a trained business executive who can straighten out our financial muddle before national bankruptcy overtakes us and direct the course of our defense-preparation program efficiently. Mr. Willkie meets these qualifications with an outstanding background of successful experience and with his keen understanding of the needs of the American people is exceptionally well qualified to do the hard job ahead. Furthermore, he has been a soldier—an American combat soldier in the last war.

I feel a lot in common with Mr. Willkie, having been raised just across the Wabash from his boyhood surroundings. Like Mr. Willkie, I, too, feel that my party has left me—I have not left the party.

PRAISES M'NARY

We in Oregon as well as our neighbors in other Pacific Coast States should feel especially proud of the fact that our own Senator McNARY has been selected as a candidate for Vice President and Mr. Willkie's running mate. His selection greatly complements the high qualities possessed by Mr. Willkie and insures a fair deal for the farmers, for labor, and all others. This is a fortunate choice for our community.

John Sharp Williams, the great Democratic Senator from the State of Mississippi, speaking on the floor of the Senate in 1913 on the proposal to limit the tenure of office of President, stated:

"Washington would not, Jefferson would not, Jackson would not, Grant could not, Roosevelt (Theodore) could not, and nobody ever shall."

I have agreed to serve as Oregon chairman of the Willkie-Democrats and will lend my support actively toward the success of the Willkie-McNary ticket. I call on all true Democrats who still believe in the fundamental traditions of our party to support me in this crusade.

The G. O. P.'s Problem Child

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT GORE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 24, 1940

ARTICLE FROM THE NATION

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Nation of September 21, 1940:

[From the Nation of September 21, 1940]

THE G. O. P.'S PROBLEM CHILD

(By J. Lacey Reynolds)

WASHINGTON, *September 13, 1940.*

At Philadelphia Wendell Willkie made a reputation as a heavyweight politician when he outsmarted the convention managers to clinch the nomination. By now it has become apparent that Mr. Willkie does not pack the terrific punch described in his advance publicity. He seems to belong in the preliminaries, not in the main bout.

His political moves during the past month suggest four weaknesses. First, in his acceptance speech at Elwood he showed himself to be no match for Roosevelt as a radio orator. His most ardent supporters concede that this will be a handicap. Second, he revealed that he was a poor judge of public sentiment by his stand on the draft-industry issue. Third, he has demonstrated a surprising lack of executive ability in dealing with the Republican organization. He has irritated the party wheel horses and failed to reconcile his defeated convention opponents. And fourth, on legislative matters he has kicked the shins of Republican Senators and Congressmen until they threaten to leave him to his fate and to look out for themselves for the rest of the campaign.

Willkie's attack on the Overton-Russell amendment permitting Government seizure of plants did much to tarnish his reputation as a political sage. Even a third-rate politician would have foreseen the inevitable political consequence of opposing conscription of industry while favoring conscription of manpower. When public reaction proved markedly unfavorable he was forced to claim that his stand had been misunderstood and to come out for "selective service" for industry as an alternative to the Overton-Russell amendment. His "selective service" was obviously nothing more than a smoke screen to permit him to escape from a position that was politically untenable.

His stand on the "draft industry" issue had particularly unfortunate consequences in the Senate. When the Overton-Russell amendment passed the Senate on August 28, 9 of the 18 Republicans answering the roll voted for it. They included such rock-ribbed conservatives as AUSTIN, of Vermont, DAVIS, of Pennsylvania, LODGE, of Massachusetts, TOBEY, of New Hampshire, and CAPPER, of Kansas, the last being one of the Senate's shrewdest readers of popular sentiment. Some of these Republicans had put themselves on record during debate as strongly in favor of plant seizure. "It seems unanswerable," said Senator LODGE, for example, "that if we are giving the Government the power to conscript manpower it is only just and fair to give the Government power to conscript industries which are essential to war services." The next day Willkie condemned plant seizure, thereby creating a situation in which the Presidential nominee ran head-on into a substantial block of his party's outstanding Senators.

Republican House Members had a similar experience 2 weeks later when Willkie came out in opposition to the Fish amendment to the conscription bill, which would have permitted 60 days for voluntary enlistments. Of the 169 Republicans in the House, 140 had already voted for the amendment. Minority Leader JOE MARTIN later tried to smooth things over by making it appear that it was just a difference of opinion over a minor amendment. But the 140 Republicans, including JOE MARTIN, knew better. This was not the first time that MARTIN, a stickler for teamwork, had been embarrassed by the lone-wolf tactics of the nominee. Many Republican Members, angered at being left out on a limb, vowed that they would cast off from the nominee and run their own independent campaigns. CHARLIE HALLECK, the Indiana Congressman who is considered to be Willkie's spokesman in Congress, hardly dared show his face in the House chamber for several days afterward. Bitter letters were addressed to Rushville. Typical of the reaction in the House cloakrooms was the comment, "I see where Willkie is heading a third-party movement." No doubt Willkie intended his repudiation of the Fish amendment to signify his ardent support of total defense and "short-of-war" assistance to England; high party strategists felt that some such step was necessary to combat Henry Wallace's charge that Willkie is the "appeasement candidate." But the Fish amendment was not the appropriate vehicle to use, under the circumstances.

The Republicans' current organizational difficulties may be attributed largely to Willkie's lack of political experience and his reluctance to take advice from the party bigwigs. He waited until his campaign plans were practically formulated early this month before calling in Senator VANDENBERG, of Michigan, one of his Philadelphia opponents and a skilled veteran. Senator TAFT, of Ohio, another convention opponent, has never been consulted. Little wonder that the TAFT people are not on the job for Willkie. The Republican nominee might also have benefited from earlier and more frequent conferences with his running mate, the wily Senator MCNARY. These old-time organization leaders have been ignored in favor of sponsors of the independent Willkie clubs, and the mounting friction between the two groups was the real reason party leaders from 21 States met at Rushville on Thursday, September 5. After the meeting, Willkie pledged his support and loyalty to the rank and file of the party, and the G. O. P. stalwarts left with a feeling that their nominee was finally awakening to the political realities of the campaign, that he would work with them in precinct and in Congress. Five days later he dropped his bombshell about the Fish amendment.

On his present tour through the West Willkie may turn out to be a master of back-platform campaigning, and if he does, this will tend to offset some of his past political errors. But so far the record is against him.

No Tax-Proof Shelters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD H. REES

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 24, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE COUNTRY GENTLEMAN

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am pleased to include therein an editorial from the October issue of the well-known and Nation-wide periodical, the Country Gentleman, entitled "No Tax-Proof Shelters." I believe the Members of the House, as well as others who read the RECORD, will appreciate the views expressed in this editorial.

[From the Country Gentleman of October 1, 1940]

NO TAXPROOF SHELTERS

Government expenditures, debt, and taxes are all going up this year. That is because national-defense costs have been added on without trimming down other expenses. About $1,000,000,000 of new taxes have been levied, but the rest of the increased debt is being charged to the future. Both the amount being spent and the eventual bill to be paid are beyond the ability of anyone to comprehend.

Yet the astonishing thing is that there is so little worry about it all. Farmers, who as a general rule are careful about their own finances, would be expected to be uneasy. Some are. But others take the attitude that Federal taxes don't reach such a lot of farmers. They won't be affected as much as other classes, so why worry?

It is true that Federal taxes do not fall upon farmers as directly as they do on some other groups. But taxes do not have to be paid first hand to work their punishing effects. Despite low prices for many farm products, the national cost of living recently increased for the third straight month. One of the largest increases was in food prices. Heavier taxes imposed on those who haul, manufacture, and distribute goods of all kinds figure in this spread. The people who pay these taxes naturally pass on as much of them as they can—in lower prices to farmers, in higher prices to consumers. Either way a sizable share of the taxes comes out of farmers' pockets, not only in the toll collected from their products but also in higher costs for the things they buy. The increasing tax charge that is finding its way into the price structure is making the struggle to restore parity prices constantly more difficult.

But there is another way in which growing Federal taxes are reacting upon the farm population. It is disclosed in a resolution recently passed upon by the board of trustees of the Ohio Farm Bureau Federation. The resolution states that last year the farm bureau offered a State tax program that was generally recognized as sound. But since then the Federal Government has moved further into the tax field, expanding income and excise taxes, and thus preempting the items covered in the farm bureau's proposed taxation program.

So the resolution recommends that "the State should not now take on new activities or expand existing activities, wherever possible to avoid it, and that it should pare its tax program to the available income rather than plan to levy new taxes to meet an expanding program."

As Federal taxes increase—and they must if the Government is to make good on its obligations—the pinch on the State and local tax fields will grow harder. It will become more difficult for them to find sources of tax revenue not already being drained by Washington. A returning dependency on real-estate levies and still higher sales taxes would seem to be their own recourse if they are to continue their functions.

These State and local divisions of government are those nearest to the people, performing the services most needed by those who live on the farms and in the cities and towns. If they are starved out of the available tax fields or forced to lay insupportable burdens on their people, all will suffer.

There are no tax-proof shelters for anyone. As the ever-growing combination of Federal expenditures, debt, and taxes roll on, one thing will become painfully clearer—"the other fellow" isn't going to pay them.

Senator Chavez

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL A. HATCH

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 24, (legislative day of Wednesday, September 18), 1940

LETTER FROM LAREDO TIMES

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, in the Laredo Times of September 18, 1940, appears an open letter addressed to the President of the United States. Inasmuch as this particular letter deals in large part with my colleague the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] and also with certain aspects of Latin American relations, I think it is of particular interest that the letter be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, and I ask unanimous consent that it may be so printed.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Laredo (Tex.) Times of September 18, 1940]

AN OPEN LETTER

President FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT: Our own problem in the World War is more deep-rooted than facing the dictators of Europe. We ourselves probably contribute more to this disorderly condition than we realize.

In making this statement, let's lay down some facts that even the "crackpots" and "coattail hangers-on" in Washington can understand.

DENNIS CHAVEZ, of New Mexico, was opposed for renomination by some of the Democrats out of Washington, including your own son, Jimmie, who delivered a speech on the eve of the election for the Senator's opponent, Mr. DEMPSEY.

Yet of the 96 Senators, Mr. CHAVEZ is the only one of Latin-American origin. With the present problem of understanding the Latin-American countries, these Washington folk oppose the ablest man in the Senate capable of understandingly talking over our mutual problems with the republics of the Americas.

We know Senator CHAVEZ personally and have been with him on several occasions. There is no doubt but that he invited some of the antagonism of his fellow Democrats by possibly forgetting that parties usually fight their differences out within the party and support their party and their leader. We have noted Senator CHAVEZ has not followed this principle on several occasions. He also had the misfortune of his family getting bogged down in political hand-outs in New Mexico which went through the courts and smeared our friend, Senator CHAVEZ.

But these are human errors, and other party leaders have done this or other things. It does not detract from Senator CHAVEZ's unique and outstanding value to the Nation and to the party because of his Latin-American extraction. Four years ago last July, we had the pleasure of hearing Senator CHAVEZ address the Chamber of Deputies in Mexico City. At the same time and making addresses to the same body was our own Senator Connally, the then Senator McAdoo, of California, Ambassador Josephus Daniels, and many other notables of this country.

But the speech which received the closest attention and the most respect from this distinguished body of lawmakers and the great crowd in the galleries was that of Senator CHAVEZ. The remarks of Senator CHAVEZ were quoted more widely than that of all the

other speakers combined. Though his Spanish was a little foreign to the Spanish spoken in Mexico City, the reception was tremendous.

We watched the reaction of the speakers closely because for more than 25 years we have been actively interested in the affairs of Mexico. We found that the people of Mexico felt that Senator CHAVEZ understood their problems far better and more clearly than the other distinguished representatives.

Senator CHAVEZ not only praised his Mexican listeners, but he condemned some of their acts and policies very frankly and openly but in a manner appreciated. He was not foolish enough to tell his listeners that everything in Mexico was fine and dandy—because he didn't think so.

This leads to a point which for several years now we have been trying to get over in Washington. We have tried to get the State and War Departments to understand how to reach a better understanding between Mexico and the United States as well as with all the Latin American countries.

Frankly, Washington has contributed damn little to solving this important problem.

The 40,000 population of Laredo, Tex., is about 90 percent Latin American origin. Three hundred feet across the river are 28,000 people in Nuevo Laredo, Mexico, and all but a small number of families are of Latin American origin. Laredo, Tex., is the only border town whose city and county government is controlled by a political machine dominated mostly by people of Latin American origin. It is the only town on the Mexican border in the United States where complete harmony between the various nationalities work out civic, social, and public life in every respect. This is not true in any other border town from the Pacific to the Gulf of Mexico.

Before Washington got busy and our State and War Departments robbed Fort McIntosh of its personnel, these two cities, Nuevo Laredo and Laredo, were used as a meeting place by the people of northern Mexico for sporting and social events, in which the army people of Mexico across the river would attend these functions together.

What did this mean? Simply that dumbness in Washington tore down the Army post on the border, where understanding between the people of Mexico and the United States was being brought closer together. The people of Mexico knew us and our problems, and we understood them and their problems. Everybody knows that meeting and mixing with the other fellow always helps to bring about better understanding and relations.

Again, we used to have a military band at this post. Ignorance and political sabotage in Washington robbed us of this, too. Here the main rail route to Mexico and the only highway gateway route, when high Mexico officials arrived, our band put the necessary feeling into the occasion. Washington, though, despite our continuous protest, is dumb about its Latin American policy. It almost destroyed Fort McIntosh and it tried to destroy the only Latin American who is a Member of the United States Senate.

Washington should wake up and find out why our relations and understandings south of the border are not better. They should honor a man like DENNIS CHAVEZ instead of trying to beat him.

Send Senator CHAVEZ rather than Roy Howard to visit all the capitals south of the Rio Grande and he will do in these republics just what he did in Mexico City 4 years ago, because they understand and trust him.

Oregon State Federation of Labor Meeting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 24, 1940

RESOLUTION OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a resolution adopted by the executive board of the Oregon State Federation of Labor at its meeting held on Saturday, September 14, 1940.

The resolution follows:

Whereas the decision of the National Labor Relations Board, in determining the bargaining unit for longshoremen of the Pacific coast, included all Pacific ports in a single unit; and

Whereas this ruling denies the longshoremen of a number of ports the privilege of selecting the International Longshoremen's Union as their representative for collective bargaining and thereby denies these workers the American and democratic right of free choice; and

Whereas the fruit of this unfair decision is now evident in disputes existing in the number of Northwest ports, such disputes disturbing and delaying marine transportation, which delays would be removed if the longshoremen were granted their democratic right of free choice of bargaining agency; and

Whereas the position taken by the National Labor Relations Board has the effect of placing all western longshoremen at the mercy and under the domination of Harry Bridges whose wish or whim becomes the law in determining the rights or privileges under which longshoremen may be employed; and

Whereas the western arbiter, acting under the unjust decision of the National Labor Relations Board, has ruled against the exercise of the inherent right of longshoremen in certain northwestern ports, especially the port of Tacoma, to choose the I. L. A. as their bargaining agency: Therefore, be it

Resolved by the executive board of the Oregon State Federation of Labor, That we protest the ruling of the National Labor Relations Board and call upon the Board to reverse the intolerable ruling and, if the Board fails or refuses to make such reversal and by that failure or refusal continues to violate the fundamental rights of workers, that we protest to the national administration against the ruling and call upon the national administration to appoint as members of the National Labor Relations Board persons who recognize the democratic right of workers to be represented in collective bargaining by the agency of their own choosing.

Third Presidential Term

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD R. BURKE

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 24, (legislative day of Wednesday, September 18), 1940

STATEMENT OF RICHARD F. CLEVELAND BEFORE SENATE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE

Mr. BURKE. Mr. President, under the leave granted me, I present for printing in the Appendix of the RECORD, the statement made this morning by Richard F. Cleveland, distinguished lawyer and son of President Grover Cleveland, before the subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee holding hearings on the question of a constitutional amendment to limit the tenure of office of President of the United States and place some control upon the exercise of political power.

The statement is as follows:

STATEMENT OF RICHARD F. CLEVELAND BEFORE SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE SENATE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE ON JOINT RESOLUTIONS 15 AND 289

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I shall not try to review all the factors involved in this extraordinarily vital issue, but will summarize the considerations which I believe most important.

There is no doubt whatever in my mind that if the voters of the United States in 1940 sanction a third Presidential term they will remove our most effective check against the world's present tendency toward concentration of political power. That step is far more significant, of course, than giving President Roosevelt a third term. It is a landmark, a River Rubicon. It is true in all human affairs that after the first momentous overthrow of a restraint the succeeding moves in the same direction become easy and almost inevitable. A young person, for example, may struggle long and hard with his conscience against the first minor criminal offense, or even against the first drink or cigarette, but the second and third and fourth each become less of an issue and soon a habit. The alluring idea that "just once won't hurt" we know to be false.

The committee has already considered, from those better qualified to give it, the detailed history of the tradition against a third Presidential term, from Washington and Jefferson to the present day. That history conclusively proves that the wisest and soundest Americans, who created and preserved our Nation, knew the danger and repudiated it. Of course, if conditions were now different, we should not merely from sentiment cling to an outworn restraint. But with all the changes that have come over the world and this country, the problems of human behavior and political power have not changed. In these respects even Plato and Aristotle are contemporary advisers. The worth and independence of one human soul, and the structure of government and society to promote and protect that worth and independence, are still and always must be, the basic objectives of rational men. The social and political conditions which give individuals opportunity to develop themselves, we call democracy. There are two equally essential factors involved in that idea: One is that men should not be coerced by external restraint; the second, more easily overlooked, is the necessity for citizens in a democracy to contribute actively to the functions of their government and their society. Strong and beneficent paternal

governments might be wise enough not to restrain their subjects, but the fatal disease of such power lies in sapping the independence of human beings by taking from them the duty of arguing, working, fighting, and thinking about the way they shall be governed.

Therefore, based upon the very nature of human beings—not from abstract theory—a paternal government cannot be a democratic government. It is hardly necessary to add that the American Constitution was conceived in that conviction, and that our machinery of government was deliberately set up to allow individuals and communities to be free, certainly, but also to work out and argue out and fight out their own salvation.

The central consideration in this issue is power. In a democracy individual citizens cannot give up their power even if they want to. The Germans wanted to give up their power and accepted Hitler because they were desperate and sought a master. It is possible to understand the surrender of liberty by the Germans, but unthinkable that we should follow them by taking the first step toward perpetuation of political power.

Very strong arguments can be made for centralization of power. Such government is simpler and more efficient in all mechanical ways. It permits prompt decision and action. We all feel impatience at times over the seemingly endless deliberations and arguments of legislative bodies when action is important. But I put it to the committee squarely that the democratic ideal cannot be realized in any other way. In 1789, when the Constitution was adopted, we had the choice between the somewhat clumsy and tedious processes of free government, and the smooth-running, efficient mechanics of powerful government. We have clung to our original choice of government all these years. When we made our choice and whenever we renewed it, we did it knowing that the growth of power was a practical danger only in emergencies. The consistent rejection of a third term has its only significance in emergencies, or when a powerful and popular President seeks to perpetuate his power. The arguments against a third term apply only to emergencies. An emergency is therefore the basic argument against a third term, not in favor of it.

Thus we face again in 1940 a clear, unequivocal choice between the advantages of concentrated political power, and the advantages of the democratic processes. If the temptation were not so great, because of Mr. Roosevelt's personal popularity, and the unprecedented political power which now attaches to the Presidency, there would be no issue. It is perhaps not improper to add that recent attempts made by the Executive to gain control of the judicial and legislative branches of the National Government show that the dangers of concentrated power are real and not imaginary.

I suggest that the so-called founding fathers in the beginnings of our free Government, and that this committee today were and are concerned not with intentions but with power. It is not necessary to charge extravagantly that Mr. Roosevelt wishes to be a dictator, or to challenge his good faith in any respect. It is enough that he, or any other man who follows him and seeks a third elective term, should thereby represent that we must repudiate our deliberate choice of the democratic processes, and that we must now feebly confess that our Nation can no longer produce more than one man fit to be President.

I solemnly believe that unless a third term for any man is forestalled by the voters in free election, or by suitable legislative action, we shall pass the great divide between democratic processes and power government.

William B. Bankhead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS H. CULLEN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 19, 1940

Mr. CULLEN. Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House, it is not easy to find words adequate for expressing the profound sense of sorrow and loss occasioned by the death of Hon. WILLIAM B. BANKHEAD, Speaker of the House of Representatives, Sunday, September 15, 1940.

The untimely death of our distinguished Speaker and my beloved friend has been a very severe shock to me. When I came to Congress on March 4, 1919, my friend WILL BANKHEAD was one of the first Members to greet me and he immediately showed his eagerness to cooperate and offer his advice and wise counsel to one less experienced in the procedures and traditions of this body. During those early days in my congressional career there was born a friendship with WILL BANKHEAD never to be severed but by death. I feel that I have lost one of my dearest friends in the House.

His great humanitarianism, his innate kindliness, and his respect for his fellow man was evidenced in his every activity. He was possessed of a fine sense of honor, and impelled by pure patriotism and a strong sense of duty to give of his time, his boundless talent, and unlimited energy in a fearless endeavor to render to his country the highest possible service.

His family, his colleagues in the House, and his host of friends mourn him. He will always be enshrined within our hearts as a true and noble character. Let us hope that the sterling qualities of his life may encourage others to follow and imitate his example.

Propaganda Stand Denied by MacLeish

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 24, 1940

ARTICLE FROM THE WASHINGTON POST

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, in justice to Mr. Archibald MacLeish, the able and eminent Librarian of Congress, I desire to have printed in the RECORD the following article from the Washington Post:

PROPAGANDA STAND DENIED BY MACLEISH—NEVER ADVOCATED UNITED STATES AGENCY LIKE THOSE OF DICTATORS, HE SAYS

Archibald MacLeish, Librarian of Congress, yesterday denied that he ever had advocated a Federal "propaganda bureau similar to those maintained by the totalitarian countries."

His statement was in response to an editorial appearing in the Charlotte Observer, which was reprinted on the editorial page of the Washington Post on September 9.

At the same time MacLeish affirmed: "I do believe and I have frequently stated that democracy must become again a fighting faith, if it is to survive the present crisis.

"I have frequently stated," he continued, "and I believe that writers, teachers, scholars must throw themselves into the battle for the defense of democracy against fascism in the realm of ideas, as well as in the realm of things.

MUST DEFEND OURSELVES

"I believe," he said, "that this people and this Government must defend themselves against the lies with which fascism attacks them and attacks the democratic form of government here and in Latin America and throughout the world. I do not believe," he said emphatically, "I have never believed, and I have never said that a 'propaganda bureau similar to those maintained by the totalitarian countries' should be established in Washington or anywhere else."

Reason for the statement was expressed by MacLeish as follows:

"In its issue of September 9 the Washington Post quotes the Charlotte Observer as saying that 'Archibald MacLeish, Librarian of Congress, advances the proposition that the Federal Government should have a propaganda bureau similar to those maintained by the totalitarian countries.'

"The editor of the Observer has, presumably, his private means of discovering the opinions of his fellow citizens," the librarian said. "Had he consulted the public record, he would have learned that I have not only never advanced such a proposition, but that I am one of the last men in America who would.

LIES IN THE NAME OF LIES

"He would have learned that I have repeatedly and publicly expressed my hatred of the indecencies and falsehoods of totalitarian propaganda which lies 'not in the name of truth, but in the name of lies,' so that 'the common basis of communication without which a common culture cannot exist' is destroyed.

"He would have learned that I have repeatedly and publicly stated my conviction that democracy is worth fighting for precisely because democracy alone assures the freedom of individual opinion.

"'The essential characteristic of democracy,' MacLeish continued, quoting again, as he had just done, from previous public utterances of his own—'certainly the essential characteristic of democracy contrasted with any form of dictatorship—is this: That democracy is the one form of government which keeps the future open. Dictatorship suppresses doubt, liquidates dissent, polices imagination, freezes the human world in the form in which it is. Only democracy permits the future to occur, for only under a democracy can the scholar say "No," the scientist says "Perhaps," the poet say "Otherwise." This is the essential quality of democracy in action.'"

Bankhead's Passing Leaves Recollections

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 19, 1940

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, unlike material things the bonds of friendship and love are strengthened rather than weakened by a parting. Then it is that all memories of former associations crowd back upon us with a poignancy that is both tender and painful.

When the late Speaker, the beloved BILL BANKHEAD, was with us we felt honored when we conversed with him, but his presence was so commonplace that we sometimes forgot his many diversified interests and avocations. Now that he is gone we grasp at each recollection. So it is that I now recall in a special way my pleasure on more than one occasion when the Speaker and I discussed music or some kindred subject; and how our conversation usually drifted into recitations from Shakespeare. The Speaker knew Shakespeare as he knew the rules of the House. Often he would turn a phrase into a quotation from the Bard of Avon. His attachment followed naturally from his love of the stage.

This was but one facet of his nature. We who had the honor of knowing him recognized his qualities of statesmanship as did the Nation. But more than others, we understood why he was great, for we had the opportunity of observing these other sides of his character. Like Washington the engineer, Franklin the philosopher, or Jefferson the architect, Speaker BANKHEAD had diversified interests that were a part of him.

Although our hearts may be heavy with grief let us lift them up in gratitude for the privilege and honor that was ours in knowing one of the truly great men of this era.

Democracy in Missouri

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 25 (legislative day of Wednesday, September 18), 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS, OF ILLINOIS

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able address delivered by the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] at Moberly, Mo., on Saturday, September 21, 1940.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Ladies and gentlemen of the democracy of the great State of Missouri, there is no honor greater in any political campaign than to be invited to speak in Missouri, for, if Virginia is the mother of Presidents, Missouri has been the mother of orators. If Pennsylvania holds the shrine of American independence, Missouri still is the home of individual independence today.

Great orators and great individualists, men of independent powers and strong in the power of independent words, have kept the name of Missouri in the forefront as the history of our Nation has unrolled.

And so I come to this rostrum inwardly quaking, for I feel all around me in the atmosphere of your State the traditions of such giants as Thomas Hart Benton, Sterling Price, Frank Blair, Senator Vest, and the immortal Champ Clark—men whose words could shake the Nation or bring tears to a crossroads crowd.

I kept remembering this as I came across the great river from your sister State of Illinois yesterday, remembering what a record for bold, courageous action lies stamped across the annals of your Commonwealth, and how that record is being maintained today by Senator BENNETT CLARK, one of the great leaders and parliamentarians in the history of the Senate, and by your other able and distinguished Senator, HARRY TRUMAN, whose reelection is a certainty. Senator TRUMAN will continue in the future, as in the past, to carry forward the constructive and liberal ideals of the Democratic Party. I also desire to pay my high respects and by tribute to your eminent governor, His Excellency the Honorable Lloyd Stark, who have been a close and valued friend of this administration. I bring to him the greetings of his old friend, Gov. Henry Horner, of my beloved Illinois.

It was Missourians, inspired by one of your boldest citizens, Frank Blair, who struck the blow in 1861 that held Missouri, Kentucky, and southern Illinois in the Union and decided the fate of the war in the West.

And on the other side in that same fiery era, it was Missourians, riding behind Joe Shelby in 1865, who were the last to wave the Confederate battle flag on American soil. They would not surrender when the Confederacy fell, and as they rode across the Rio Grande into Mexico, their beloved Stars and Bars still flashed in the sun.

True to their convictions at the start and at the finish of that war, Missourians made a great record in the sixties. Missouri has bred the bone and sinew of independence, and that is one particular reason I am happy to be invited here today, for your ideal has been one that I have tried in my own way to follow. A man has to listen to his conscience, and it leads him sometimes along a difficult path. It has forced me upon occasion to differ with the national administration, which I respect, and with the party I love. To oppose certain details of a major program that I approve has been difficult, but in the end it has made it easier to say, as I now do say, that in this hour of world crisis and national peril I not only approve but I thank God for the international policies of Franklin D. Roosevelt.

I feel this so strongly that I cannot refrain from making here and now a confession. Once in my seat in the Congress I became convinced that I knew more than President Roosevelt about a certain phase of international affairs. That was when the President in his famous speech dedicating a bridge in Chicago in 1937 said—I quote: "The peace of the world and the welfare and security of every nation today is being threatened." He saw war coming in Europe. He warned against it. He tried to get the civilized world to frighten off the aggressor nations by threatening a great quarantine.

When he made those bold statements I admired his bravery. I took off my hat to his inspired words about the beauties of peace and America's search for peace, but, like my friend the late Senator Borah, I thought he had gone too far in predicting war in Europe. We in the Senate had what we believed to be sound and good information that Germany, France, and England would not fight. We thought the President was wrong.

But what did time prove? It proved that he was right and I was wrong. Time proved that he had known exactly what he was saying. Events made it perfectly clear that he had better information than we. And it proved something else, something more important and vital still; it proved that his judgment, his instincts, his sagacity in international affairs have not been rivaled since the days of Abraham Lincoln.

When foreign nations threatened our shores in the 1860's, when indeed a foreign army did violate the Monroe Doctrine and did set up a crowned Hapsburg emperor in Mexico, Lincoln saved the situation—saved the republican institutions of the Western Hemisphere. With words now strong, now soft, with tact supreme, he kept pressing upon the invading powers, and in the end, when the United States stood ready with the largest fleet and the strongest Army in the whole world, the foreign powers withdrew without firing a gun at us. The Monroe Doctrine was reestablished and the Old World of Europe shrank back again to its original borders, and the United States went on to its destiny with social, political, and economic progress developing in the democratic way.

Since that day no other American President has shown the diplomatic skill, the steadfast courage, the concern for the whole Western Hemisphere that President Roosevelt has shown. That greatest of modern Secretaries of State, that cool, unruffled model of patient wisdom, Secretary Cordell Hull, from the native stock of Tennessee, has been at President Roosevelt's side to help achieve a peace, an understanding, an agreement with Latin America never reached before. The Habana Conference is destined to stand as one of the monuments to American statecraft because it is based upon the good neighbor policy, based not on aggression but upon mutual help, upon respect for our sister republics to the south.

Today the Monroe Doctrine, thanks to Roosevelt and Hull, is firmer than ever before, and the cause of democracy and self-government incalculably strengthened from the North Pole to the Straits of Magellan.

Now, when it is so desperately needed, the prestige of democracy rises in the New World as it sinks in the Old World.

Now, when danger menaces our institutions, we feel the strong hand of President Roosevelt guiding us toward a greater self-confidence, not only within our 48 States, but in the whole Western Hemisphere.

Where are our greatest factories for preparedness work to rise? Here in the midlands between the Alleghenies and the Rockies. The President has said so. The work of making us nationally so strong that peace will automatically come is sweeping rapidly forward, and soon the great Mississippi Valley will feel it, for from a military standpoint our main munitions plants, our chief airplane factories should be here in the interior. And under the impulse of this new necessity, forced on us from abroad, more and more of the Nation's production will center in this great valley.

Once again the Mississippi and the Missouri, the Ohio and the Illinois will be black with barges plying back and forth from New

Orleans; the railroads will increase their activities in helping carry the surplus freight; our trade with South and Central America will grow beyond the dreams of any of us here today. New Orleans will be the great port of the midlands as it was a hundred years ago, with the river and railroad traffic bearing our products to the fleets that sail to the ports of sister republics. Already our South American trade has multiplied itself. The catastrophe of Europe had forced us to make good in a material way the spiritual good which President Roosevelt began preaching long before war broke—the good-neighbor policy between the American continents.

Thanks to him, and thanks to the Nation which has endorsed and applauded his next step of acquiring the airplane and naval bases in the islands of the Caribbean, the United States will be ready for any turn of events in the war overseas.

Suppose, if you will, that there had been no good-neighbor policy, no friendly, conciliatory, honest conference at Habana, no lease of those military bases in the islands and ports of the Caribbean—suppose the old imperialism of the past Republican regimes had continued to spread distrust in Latin America.

And then suppose the present war in Europe had come, and England had fallen, as it yet may fall before the onslaught of totalitarian force. Who would own all those islands, those possessions of the defunct Dutch, French, and British Governments?

Hitler would own them, for to the victor belongs the spoils. The totalitarian ideology, utterly foreign and hostile to our theory of government, would be at our doors ready and able to smash us.

But under the wise, the quietly energetic hands of Roosevelt and Hull, this Nation and South America have gone far in preparing against so cruel a danger. The sparks from the inferno overseas may yet fall on Greenland, on Newfoundland, on the Bermudas and imperil us, but we are far readier to stamp out the blaze than most people think. Our danger is still great, the work is only well begun. It must be carried forward by experienced hands.

Our ship of state is traveling through dangerous economic and military seas—the tremendous storm from abroad is lashing us. So far we are still safe, thanks to the firm hand at the helm—the hand that is guiding us toward the harbor of security.

Shall we now disobey the old adage of the sea which tells us "Never drop the pilot in a storm"? Shall we change over to a new pilot who has never been to sea? If we should change to the pilot our Republican friends are urging upon us, it would be years before he could learn the simplest laws of navigation, and we haven't time for that. We haven't a single minute to spare.

That is why President Roosevelt is not here today, touring the midlands, campaigning for reelection. He hasn't time to make the race for President. He has to stick on the bridge, he has to keep his hand on the helm, for the security of this ship of state is the first and foremost thing in his heart.

Let me, in this farming region, put it more in your and my own terms. When the wheat is ripe, you have to get the combine in the field quick or not at all. You must cut the grain before it shatters and is lost. You mount the combine and then just as you start out, someone comes along and says: "Here's a new driver. He says he can cut the wheat so not a grain will be lost. He hasn't ever driven a combine, but he has been reading about it off there in his office in New York, and he says he can do a wonderful job."

What are you going to say to that proposition? Why, before that new man could learn how to drive the machine, all the wheat would have shattered onto the ground, and as likely as not the combine would be wrecked to boot.

In other words, the Republican Party is now proposing nothing but that the Nation in a crisis should start experimenting with an unknown quantity.

The St. Louis Post-Dispatch, certainly no friend of President Roosevelt in this hour, but as we all admit, a newspaper of great independence, integrity, and intellect, put it well the other day—last Tuesday in fact—when it called Wendell Willkie to account for sniping at the President with an air rifle on trivial issues. I quote: "We imagine what voters want nowadays is a program they can ponder. Mr. Willkie, if he has a program, has failed to reveal it, except insofar as he accepts the President's own program. While Mr. Willkie promises jobs, he does not state how he is going to produce them."

And in that same issue the Post-Dispatch prints a cartoon showing the great issue of the day to be America's relation to the European war, and demanding that both parties stick to it.

With that we Democrats agree. We have recognized all along that there is really only one issue in this campaign—and that is the great international emergency and what we shall do to keep its sparks from setting our roof tops afire.

We have seen the forces which damn democracy and crush republican institutions start their cruel, brutal work in central Europe, start in Austria and come westward, crushing and smashing as they come. Austria falls, Czechoslovakia falls, Poland falls, Denmark goes down, so does Norway, Holland, Belgium, France, and this minute the bombs of nazidom are bursting on London.

Where will the bombs stop in their westward progress? Some in America are so fatuous as to dream in their smug fool's paradise that it can never happen here.

But it is the lesson of history that revolutions never stop till someone stops them either by use of force, or with the show of impregnable force. The latter course is President Roosevelt's.

Conquerors are never satisfied. The lust for power feeds upon itself and will not be curbed until it runs bang into some mountainous fortress which sobers the aggressor and makes him think before he batters out his brains. You can't reason with revolutions; you can't argue with madmen. All you can do is bar your doors and call out the police. And under President Roosevelt the United States is calling up its own police—armies of its own young men who will rise so strong, with their ships, their tanks, their planes, that Hitler, after one look at them, will turn back and leave the New World—North and South America—to itself.

The United States has found one man who has proved he can match Hitler in statecraft, and that he knows how to prepare a country so thoroughly that peace will be assured without a single shot ever being fired at or by an American.

Only last week in his masterful speech to the teamsters' union in Washington, D. C., President Roosevelt demonstrated his great diplomatic ability, the diplomacy which is based on common sense and his great and enduring love for human beings—and it is that kind of diplomacy, brains based on right instincts, which will bring us through. In giving anew his pledge to labor's rights, the President voiced once more his old hatred of war, the loathing of bloodshed and carnage which fills his heart.

What a travesty it is to say, as the Republican Party is now saying, in its desperate and frenzied search for issues, that President Roosevelt is hurrying America into war.

You and I know that he is leading us into a state of preparedness that will assure us peace, not war.

But since they have raised this issue, let us look at the kind of man with which they find themselves burdened in this campaign. Let us ask what kind of a President, what kind of a leader will Wendell Willkie be, granting that the national polls are all wrong and that he should by some miracle win the election.

Has there been one thing in Willkie's utterances to assure the Nation that he wouldn't go blundering and butting into calamity soon after becoming President? Has he talked or behaved like a leader who could keep the peace or use diplomacy or brains in an emergency? Again and again he has used rash, helpless, violent words that went far beyond anything President Roosevelt has said about powers that threaten democracy.

On May 28 at Akron, Ohio, he said: "It is clear that England and France constitute our first line of defense against Hitler * * * it is enormously to our advantage to have them win. I should like to make this proposition. I should like to ask Secretary Hull to ask the democracies publicly what help, short of troops, the American people can give."

In short, Willkie stands ready to strip the United States of all its armed forces, if need be. He stands ready to send them overseas. If carried out, this would leave us helpless should Hitler succeed in crushing England.

Willkie was ready in May to go beyond anything the President proposed.

In his Elwood speech of acceptance he spoke far more belligerently than President Roosevelt had ever done against totalitarian powers, and rushed on to shout a pugilistic defiance of Hitler—a vow to fight him in business or war, now and any time in the future. Is that the language, is that the mind, is that the temperament of a President?

Willkie in August was ready to commit the Nation to a belligerency beyond anything the President had considered.

No other Presidential candidate in the past three-quarters of a century has so clearly revealed his temperamental unfitness for the delicate task of guiding our ship of state. No other has shown such gross ignorance of recent history; no one made so many misstatements of fact. He has made them, I think, not in any attempt to deceive, but because he is by nature a hasty, blundering show-off; one who speaks before he thinks.

He spoke before he thought on the so-called conscription-of-industry amendment. This is, as you and I know, merely the policy of having capital bear the preparedness burden with men, share and share alike, and is one that the vast majority of businessmen acknowledge to be just and fair. But Wendell Willkie hasn't anything in common with the vast majority of businessmen. He is a corporation lawyer, the front for large investors, not the type of businessman that you and I know. And in his blundering rashness he blurted out a denunciation of this so-called conscription of wealth and industry and thus revealed where his real interests lay—right with the Wall Street financiers who fatten on small-business men and consumers and laborers alike. He ran true to his life philosophy in placing property rights above human rights.

Then when his Republican managers had spanked him in private for his colossal blunder, he came stumbling out with an even worse apology—he said he hadn't read the Overton-Russell amendment to the selective-service bill, which was the act in question.

Wouldn't the dictators of the Old World welcome an opponent of this kind? Is it any wonder that the Nazis and Fascists of Europe are all praying to such strange gods as they have for the defeat of Roosevelt and the election of Wendell Willkie?

Willkie has already dispelled the myth that he was a capable executive. He has torn to pieces the Republican organization. He has already insulted the whole city of Chicago recklessly, even flippantly, saying "To hell with Chicago." In that city he recklessly let escape over the radio such a flood of profanity as to offend thousands of middle western women who were listening in.

He is definitely not an executive—he is merely a bulldozing corporation lawyer who, with the power of big money behind him, is used to kicking everybody from his path, whether it be rival corporations or the little householder who thinks he is paying too much for electric light.

He doesn't take time to inform himself upon the subjects he wants to discuss. In Peoria, Ill., he disgusted thousands of listeners by declaring that President Roosevelt had telephoned European

rulers and persuaded them to sell Czechoslovakia down the river. Even he hasn't tried to explain away that sheer invention. He has decided to let that one drop in the hope it will be forgotten.

He is like a conceited schoolboy who wants to sit in teacher's chair, ask all the questions, and give all the answers even if they are wrong.

This campaign comes down to one question, one comparison, one choice. Who of the two candidates is the experienced man, and who is the inexperienced man?

On the one hand is Roosevelt, trained as an Assistant Secretary of the Navy, trained as a Governor, trained as a student of history and statecraft—a man whose speeches show deep knowledge and a deeper understanding of the warp and woof of our national character. On the other hand is Willkie who may know corporation law and the devious contrivances of high finance, but who betrays in every word his ignorance of either history, current events, or the hearts of his listeners.

The Republicans present a man unprepared and inadequate. The Presidency would be too much for him. If he should make as many mistakes in the first month in the White House as he has made in his first month on the stump, what a shambles our national economy and our international relations would present. Can America afford to entrust its destiny to a man whose only talent lies in actions which delight the stock gamblers?

What America needs in this crisis is more of the tried and true guidance Franklin D. Roosevelt has been giving our Ship of State. From this meeting let the cry roll out across the Mississippi, across the Ozarks, across the Big Muddy to all the sister States, "the great commonwealth of Missouri will not drop the pilot in a storm."

Manufactured War Hysteria

REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 25, 1940

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, in proposing the resolution which I intend to present, I do so because of a deep conviction that one of two situations must be true; either this Nation, without the knowledge of the Congress or the people, has been brought to the verge of war, or else there is at work in this country a propaganda machine designed to create a fear of war that is damnable in its conception and in its operation.

This Nation is today operating under a cloud of fear, a fear which I charge has been manufactured by the New Deal administration for the purpose of political expediency and in order to convince the people that our situation in the world is so precarious that we dare not "change horses in the middle of the stream."

Scarcely a day has passed for months but that some new fear—some new alarmist report—has been spread upon the pages of the press, inspired by some spokesman for the administration.

On the 16th day of this month the Chief of Staff of the United States Army, Gen. George C. Marshall, declared in a radio address that—

it is the feeling of the War Department that the next 6 months include the possibility of being the most critical period in the history of the Nation.

He declared further:

The situation today is utterly different from that of 1917. Then we were at war, but we foresaw small possibility of military danger to this country. Today such a possibility trembles on the verge of becoming a probability.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the newspapers carried headlines such as:

United States future critical, Marshall declares, calling more guards.

In the next deck of the head it reads:

Military danger seen within the next 6 months by the Chief of Staff.

Then the newspaper account goes on to state:

Warned by Gen. George C. Marshall, Army Chief of Staff, that the United States faces a prospect of military danger which "trembles on the verge of becoming a probability," a second increment of 35,700 National Guard men today began preparations to sever connections with civil life for a year, beginning October 15.

Mr. Speaker, it must be perfectly obvious to any thinking person that alarmist reports of this character going out over the Nation stir up the fears of the people and keep them so unsettled that the normal activities of the country are seriously and adversely affected. Not only is that true, but we also find other stories going out, such as the one which I desire to put in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

The Washington Daily News of September 20 had a story at the top of the page under a two-column head. The head reads as follows:

Army checking up on casket supply.

The article goes on to state:

The War Department is making a survey of the supply of caskets and the production facilities of casket manufacturers in this country.

This information came out incidentally at a board meeting of the Advertising Funeral Directors of America at the Mayflower, Wednesday.

Confirmation was sought at the office of the National Casket Co., whose manager, T. Robert Walmsley, said the survey had been in progress 2 or 3 years. Recently, he added, it had been pushed more vigorously.

* * * At the office of the Assistant War Secretary, Maj. A. Robert Ginsburgh, admitted that such a survey had been in progress but denied that it had special significance.

"We haven't stopped surveying the casket industry for 20 years," he said. "It is just a part of our routine of Army necessities. We have surveyed caskets as we have artillery, airplanes, and other materials of war.

"After all," he said, "if you have 1,000,000 men under arms, even in peacetime you are going to have some casualties; some men are going to fall off trucks and have other accidents and illnesses.

"Then, too," he continued, "when you have an army you have to figure it's going to fight some day. Fighting means casualties, and casualties call for caskets. That's all there is to it. Just a simple matter of being prepared with essentials. We survey everything from armor plate to underwear."

Think of it, Mr. Speaker. That sort of story going out to the fathers and mothers and brothers and sisters of the sixteen or seventeen million young men who are going to be registered in the next few weeks for military service.

It does no good to try to waive these things aside, Mr. Speaker. These reports are alarming the Nation, they are upsetting the activities of the Nation, they are preventing proper attention to our domestic problems, and they are giving a false issue to the people in this campaign.

Now, I submit, Mr. Speaker, that if General Marshall was correct in his statement that "It is the feeling of the War Department that the next 6 months include the possibility of being the most critical period in the history of this Nation," and that "The situation is utterly different from that of 1917. Then we were at war, but we foresaw small possibility of military danger to this country." I say, Mr. Speaker, if General Marshall was accurate in those statements, and if he was accurate in the next statement, "Today such a possibility of military danger trembles on the verge of becoming a probability," then this Congress and the people ought to know something about this danger.

What is the military danger to the United States which "trembles on the verge of becoming a probability"?

From what foreign power or powers, Mr. Speaker, is such a military danger to the United States to be apprehended?

What active steps have been taken by any such foreign power or powers toward making such military danger to the United States probable?

What additional steps by any such foreign power or powers are necessary to render such military danger to the United States actual?

What steps, Mr. Speaker, are necessary to be taken by the United States to prevent the possibility of such military danger to this Nation from becoming actual?

On what date may it reasonably be anticipated that such military danger to the United States will become actual? When will we topple over the brink on the verge of which, the Chief of Staff says, we are trembling?

What section or part of the United States, Mr. Speaker, is most likely to be subjected to this military danger, upon the verge of which the Nation trembles at this hour?

What factors render the possibility of such military danger to the United States greater now than it was in 1917?

What other facts are in the possession of the Secretary of War, Mr. Speaker, tending to substantiate, or explain, or supplement these statements made by the Chief of Staff of the United States Army respecting the military danger to the United States, upon the verge of which the Nation now trembles?

These, Mr. Speaker, are questions which concern not alone this great bureaucracy that has been built up by the New Deal. They are questions that concern this Congress, sir. They are questions which concern the very lives of the men who are going to do the fighting and the bleeding and the dying, if there is any fighting and bleeding and dying to be done. These are questions which concern the heart and the happiness of every father and mother and brother and sister of every man who is conscripted into the ranks of the armed service.

These statements ought not to go out to the country unless they are true—unless there is some basis in fact for them—and if such stories are true, then certainly the Congress and the people ought to be told something about this impending, this grave, threatening military danger upon the verge of which the Nation is trembling and which may overtake us within the next 6 months before we can conscript an army, before we can train the men, before we can provide them with any of the modern implements of warfare—of defense, let alone of offense.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I am, in all earnestness, submitting this resolution, and I plead with this House to adopt it in order that we may find out the truth about these reports.

Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced the following resolution:

Whereas in a radio address on September 16 last the Chief of Staff of the United States Army stated that "* * * it is the feeling of the War Department that the next 6 months include the possibility of being the most critical period in the history of the United States * * *" and that "* * * the situation today is utterly different from that of 1917. Then we were at war, but we foresaw small possibility of military danger to this country. Today such a possibility trembles on the verge of becoming a probability. * * *"; Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Secretary of War is authorized and directed to transmit forthwith to the House of Representatives the following information:

(1) What is the military danger to the United States which "trembles on the verge of becoming a probability";

(2) From what foreign power or powers is such military danger to the United States to be feared;

(3) What active steps have been taken by any such foreign power or powers toward making such military danger to the United States probable;

(4) What additional steps by any such foreign power or powers are necessary to render such military danger to the United States actual;

(5) What steps by the United States are necessary to prevent the possibility of such military danger to the United States from becoming actual;

(6) On what date may it reasonably be anticipated that such military danger to the United States will become actual;

(7) What part of the United States is most likely to be subjected to such military danger;

(8) What factors render the possibility of such military danger to the United States greater now than it was in 1917; and

(9) Any other facts in the possession of the Secretary of War tending to substantiate, explain, or supplement the statements made by the Chief of Staff of the Army respecting military danger to the United States.

World Mother of Mother's Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SHERIDAN DOWNEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 25 (legislative day of Wednesday, September 18), 1940

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the extension of remarks of Hon. Michael J. Stack, of Pennsylvania, in the House of Representatives in 1938, relating to World Mother of Mother's Day.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. STACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Baltimore & Ohio magazine:

"[From the Baltimore & Ohio magazine]

"THE MOTHER OF MOTHER'S DAY

"(By Margaret Talbott Stevens, editor)

"The splendid work of Anna Jarvis, Philadelphia, whom we know as the founder of Mother's Day, is growing more and more widespread. This year she participated in a number of interesting activities in connection with the celebration of the occasion.

"In paying a tribute to the founder, John Wanamaker once said: 'I would rather be the accepted author of Mother's Day than to be King Edward VII (1906) of England.'

"MOTHER OF MOTHER'S DAY

"Mrs. Anna M. Jarvis, the mother of Mother's Day, was a B. & O. mother, and the inspiration for the founding of Mother's Day by her daughter, Miss Anna Jarvis, of Philadelphia. The Jarvis family came to America in 1618 and settled in Virginia.

"WITHOUT PUBLIC SUPPORT

"With no money to support her work save her own limited funds, Miss Jarvis for years has labored until now 50 countries of the world, even Asia and Africa and in distant island possessions, celebrate the day without commercialism.

"MOTHER'S DAY FLAG DAY

"After long effort Miss Jarvis succeeded in having the Congress pass a resolution for the annual display of the flag on Mother's Day.

"Addresses have been made in the Congress in honor of Miss Jarvis as the founder of Mother's Day.

"OBSERVANCE

"Here in America we wear carnations and give gifts to our mothers.

"In Mexico, on Mother's Day, the thatched adobe huts as well as pretentious palaces are decorated with flowers in honor, or remembrance, of mothers. It is a lovely custom, and one for which Miss Jarvis ever will be honored, not alone for the thought which prompted its founding, but also for the labor of love over a long period of years which has brought about its world-wide establishment."

OTHER TRIBUTES

"For many years it has been an established custom to set aside annually a day devoted to the honoring of mothers."

"Let us remember first our devotion to her, the greatest mother of all time, who gave to us the Holy Christ Child." (Gov. Martin L. Davey, of Ohio.)

"You may be sure that Mother's Day in New York State will be duly and appropriately observed in keeping with the finest traditions of motherhood." (Secretary to Governor of New York.)

"Alabama would be derelict in her duty did she not join through her citizens with other States in the Nation paying tribute to mother." (Governor of Alabama, Hon. Bibb Graves.)

"The extraordinary growth of Mother's Day is the natural reaction of the thought of Anna Jarvis, who, sorrowing for the loss of her own mother, desired to dedicate a particular day to the memory of all mothers.

"Mother's Day is now observed in many lands. * * *

"In veneration and love of motherhood, I take pride in proclaiming Mother's Day, and observance in schools and colleges." (Governor of Maine, Hon. Lewis O. Barrows.)

"From a modest beginning through the efforts of Miss Anna Jarvis, its founder, Mother's Day is now observed even to the farthest confines of civilization.

"It is my desire that memories of our State's mothers will linger like a halo in the heart and mind of our entire citizenship." (Governor of Mississippi, Hon. Hugh White.)

Gov. R. S. Vessey, South Dakota, over 30 years ago, said:

"Never before did a celebration spread so widely in such a short period as Mother's Day founded by Anna Jarvis, of Philadelphia."

"Twenty-two years ago (1914), after long effort, Miss Anna Jarvis succeeded in having passed by the United States Congress a joint resolution for the annual display of the flag on Mother's Day, the second Sunday in May, and each year thereafter Old Glory has been displayed on Mother's Day from our National Capitol, American consulates, homes, and churches. * * *

"I wish to remind the citizens of Massachusetts that this (Mother's Day) is truly one day in which we can concur unanimously in our reverential expressions of love and devotion to the greatest of all ideals." (Governor of Massachusetts, Hon. Charles F. Hurley.)

"The presence in Harrisburg this evening of Miss Anna Jarvis, of Philadelphia, is bound to arouse a new and wider interest in the observance of Mother's Day. * * *

"To her, as to all persons whose ideas find wide acceptance, there must be a peculiar satisfaction as Mother's Day approaches.

"The inventors of electric light, the discoverer of radium, the X-ray, and other blessings to mankind have had their deserved exaltation of soul when they survey the consequences of their work, but so have such persons as Miss Jarvis, who have given to the world an idea that summons love and devotion and ennobles mankind as a necessary result." (The Patriot, Harrisburg, Pa.)

BOSTON'S GUEST

"Last year Miss Anna Jarvis, of Philadelphia, founder of Mother's Day, was the guest of the city of Boston, the greatest honor the city ever accorded a woman for personal achievement." (Boston Post, 1925.)

HISTORIC RECORDS

"Mother's Day was founded by Anna Jarvis, of Philadelphia, who designated the second Sunday in May, and Friday preceding for schools, as the time, and the white carnation as the badge" (Webster's New International Dictionary).

"Mother's Day was founded by Miss Anna Jarvis, of Philadelphia" (Winston's Dictionary, Philadelphia).

Other dictionaries, reference works, encyclopedias in United States and foreign countries credit Anna Jarvis as originator of Mother's Day, as do leading organizations and persons.

Back of other historic records have been the unique original features, plans, methods, unrecompensed and consecrated life-work of the founder, which developed the achievements of the incomparable all-nation Mother's Day.

The National Debt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. SMATHERS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 25 (legislative day of Wednesday, September 18), 1940

ARTICLE BY JUDGE FRANK SMATHERS

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator of my native State of North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], made a statement sometime ago:

A New Deal national debt of seventy-five billion is a national calamity, exceeded only by a military invasion by Germany.

To this statement, one of my brothers, Judge Frank Smathers, who summers in western North Carolina, made a reply which was published in the Waynesville Mountaineer, under date of September 19, 1940. I ask unanimous consent that his reply be published in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Waynesville (N. C.) Mountaineer of September 19, 1940]

TOPICS OF THE DAY

(By Judge Frank Smathers)

EDITOR OF MOUNTAINEER:

"A New Deal national debt of $75,000,000,000 is a national calamity, exceeded only by a military invasion by Germany," so says the senior Senator of North Carolina.

By every innuendo and implication, that statement was intended, and is, an indictment and accusation that the Roosevelt administration has about wrecked the economic structure of America.

Many of the Senator's admirers will take exception to that accusation—for the reason that such a national debt does not prove national bankruptcy or a calamity, nor is it just or fair to attribute the plight of the National Budget to Mr. Roosevelt's administration, alone.

The national debt of America cannot be accurately and justly appraised except in the light of a "word picture" of which it is only an integral part. World economy is so sensitive and so integrated that what hurts one part hurts all parts.

America, taken singly, as the Senator does, and viewed only in the light of its own past, her national debt naturally seems appalling and ruinously disproportionate. But when studied and valued in the light of world conditions and in comparison with other nations of the world, then we have just cause to pat our own chests with pride and rejoicing—as the following facts and figures will show.

America's national debt of today is "chicken feed" compared to that of all the larger nations of Europe, most of which are admittedly and hopelessly bankrupt.

If America is broke, the rest of the big nations have long since "expired in a debtors' prison."

1. America's debt burden is no greater in 1940 than in 1920—because the interest rate has been reduced one-half.

2. The Government's credit was never better nor stronger than today, as evidenced by the fact that every time the Government borrows money it is oversubscribed 20 times.

3. America's per capita debt is far less than that of England or any other belligerent or neutral nation.

4. Before the fall of France, she was pouring over forty billions annually into her war machine alone—60 percent of her national income. England was even pouring more into her war machine, and over 50 percent of her national income. It must be far greater now. Russia, Germany, Japan are pouring still more into their war machines.

5. The merchant-marine trade and colonies of Denmark, Holland, Belgium, et al., are all destroyed, absorbed by Germany.

6. Europe's economic life and trade is distorted beyond all recognition.

7. All nations have adopted iron-clad control of exports and imports, and are rationing all internal supplies and resources.

8. England is already employing two foreign currencies—the pound and the Black Bourse. Germany is employing the barter and blocked currency exclusively. All rich men of Europe are liquidated, cleaned out, except England's, and there it looks inevitable—with all taxes at dizzy heights and worse yet to come.

9. With all the world at war, fighting for life and existence; with all labor, capital, trade, industry, agriculture, and currency under State and national control; with bankruptcy and unbalanced budgets universal, with millions idle and starvation stalking the streets; with more than 50,000,000 employed in Europe, making munitions alone; with the gold and hard money systems of free trade and free enterprise strangled or "gone with the wind"; with the money incentive for the moving of goods and employing of men, superseded by a governmental incentive to employ idle men and machines and feed the starving, regardless of cost or profit—it seems strange that a wealthy nation like America, so blessed, unbleeding and unbroken, should become so alarmed over an unbalanced Budget; especially when it costs little Switzerland three hundred and sixty million a year to stay out of war. If we were in her shoes, we'd be spending proportionately fifteen billion annually instead of nine billion, which includes all New Deal "squandering" for relief, public works, farmers, home owners, bankers, railroads, and other big-business barons now grumbling about taxes, and an unbalanced Budget.

Owing to world conditions Mr. Hoover started the march of public spending. Mr. Roosevelt has had to continue it as world conditions got worse instead of better—through no fault of his or Mr. Hoover. Yet, Senator BAILEY would leave the impression with the young Democrats of this State, that Mr. Roosevelt's management of the Nation's finances is a national calamity, exceeded only by a German invasion.

A War on Two Fronts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURTON K. WHEELER

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 25 (legislative day of Wednesday, September 18), 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW YORK DAILY NEWS

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a very able editorial published in the New York Daily News of September 25, 1940. The editorial appears under the heading "A War on Two Fronts." As is well known, the New York Daily News is a strong supporter of the administration.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Daily News of September 25, 1940]

A WAR ON TWO FRONTS—JAPAN AND INDOCHINA

Another sharp statement registering Secretary of State Hull's disapproval of Japan makes United States-Japanese relations a little worse than before. This time Mr. Hull, who, of course, is the Roosevelt administration's official mouthpiece in affairs like this, objects to Japan's grab at French Indochina.

What moral objection there can be to the grab escapes us. France grabbed Indochina in 1863, after 30 years of off-and-on warfare between the natives and French missionaries backed by French soldiers. France is now three-fifths occupied by the Germans, and the government of the other two-fifths of France has consented to the Japanese Indochina grab.

Yet Mr. Hull complains that the Far East "status quo is being upset * * * under duress." What business is that of ours? What duty have we to preserve the status quo in the Far East?

IF HITLER WINS, WHAT ABOUT US?

Aside from the moral angle, there is a practical angle to all this, and a potentially dangerous one.

Though we hope it will not come to pass, it is possible that Hitler may conquer Great Britain and organize Europe into one big German farm, factory, and arsenal, as he hopes to do. That would give him, among other things, a shipbuilding capacity between four and five times as big as our present shipbuilding capacity.

We are already frankly helping Great Britain by every means short of war. Our administration is committed to that policy, and Wendell L. Willkie says he will carry it on if elected.

At the same time, we continually scold Japan. Anything Japan wants to do our Government is against.

If Hitler wins, wouldn't it be natural for him in due time to try to get his revenge on us from the Atlantic side and to tell his semi-ally, Japan, to close in on us from the Pacific?

WHAT IS OUR PACIFIC POLICY?

In such a war on two fronts we might very easily come out second best. Fighting a war on two fronts is regarded by military men as extremely dangerous—something a nation should avoid at almost any cost. Fighting a war on two fronts was one of the big mistakes that cost the Kaiser the World War—and a mistake which Hitler has carefully avoided up to now.

Yet, with all due respect for its sincerity and moral ideals, our Government is laying its lines for just such a war on two fronts.

Oh, for the good old days when the United States was able to mind its own business and stay at home and let the foreigners go in for all this welt politik.

WE GOT ALONG WITH BRITAIN

The common-sense policy would seem to be to try to get along with Japan. We got along with the British Empire to the east of us through all the decades following the Civil War, when Britain was the most powerful nation in Europe. Why can't we get along with powerful and expanding Japan to the west of us—make the Pacific a highway of international trade and friendship, as the Atlantic is between wars?

How To Murder a Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD P. NYE

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 25 (legislative day of Wednesday, September 18), 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW YORK DAILY MIRROR

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial appearing in the New York Daily Mirror of September 23, entitled "How To Murder a Democracy."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Daily Mirror of September 23, 1940]

HOW TO MURDER A DEMOCRACY

The technique of setting up a dictatorship in a great nation has not changed very much since Napoleon was "elected" emperor.

The contemporary "crisis men" in Russia, France, Japan, Italy, and Germany employed about the same technique.

A study of their success discloses that in each case this one step was essential to their schemes:

Slow destruction of the people's respect for and faith in their elected representatives—in Germany it was the Reichstag; in France it was the Chamber of Deputies.

In the United States of America it is Congress that must be discredited before a dictatorship can be set up.

MAKE PEOPLE DESPISE THEIR CONGRESS

Congress, functioning as it was intended to function, becomes the essence of what Lincoln described as "government of the people and by the people."

Congress is not such a body today. Ask yourself, or the average American, adolescent or adult, what he or she thinks of Congress. The answer will run something like this:

"Congress is like a man riding backward on a train—he sees things after he has passed them."

Recent history has demonstrated that as one man or a small and determined group of men succeed in making the people despise their elected representatives, their Congress, then does it become easy in time of a crisis to persuade the people that they must place total power into the hands of some "indispensable man."

Nowhere has that process been better analyzed than in the "non-political" speech that Candidate-President Roosevelt made on free radio time Friday.

He was describing how the National Socialists slowly robbed the German people of their "free elections" by first destroying their faith in the process of democracy.

"A decade ago," said Third-Term Candidate Roosevelt, "the German people despaired of the processes of their democracy, which were based on the free use of the franchise.

THEN BOAST OF "SPECIAL APTITUDE" FOR RULING

"They were willing to lend ear to a new cult called nazi-ism (EDITOR'S NOTE.—It was called national socialism)—a minority group which professed extraordinary patriotism, and offered bread and shelter and better government through the rule of a handful of persons boasting special aptitude for government.

"In those days loudly professed emphasis was placed by this special group on their own purity of purpose.

"Nothing was ever said about abolishing free elections. But you and I know the subsequent history of Germany.

"The right of free elections and the free choice of heads of government were suddenly wiped out by a new regime, still professing the same purity of purpose.

"It is a travesty on fact to claim that there is any free choice of public officials in that nation today, or that there ever has been one since 1933 * * *."

And thus, without meaning to, Candidate President Roosevelt has voiced the motives of the rapacious, brazen plunderbund of machine politicians that "drafted" him for a third term in Chicago.

The Presidential candidate of these politicians professes to view the loss of "the right of free elections" in Germany as a special hell on earth.

But to the political bosses behind the third term, men like Boss Hague, of New Jersey, Bosses Kelly and Nash, of Chicago, Boss "Jailbird" Pendergast, of Kansas City, Boss Crump, of Tennessee, Boss Jimmy "Big House" Hines, of Manhattan, and Boss Ed Flynn, of the Bronx, the loss of the "right of free elections" is a made-to-order heaven.

AND THEN THE PLUNDERBUND MUSCLES IN

If the creatures of this plunderbund take over the Halls of Congress as they have usurped this Nation's city halls, government "of the people and by the people" through a freely elected Congress will have been murdered in the United States of America.

Public Opinion Polls and the Maine Election

REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER M. PIERCE

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 25, 1940

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Speaker, to the inexperienced observer the feat of Dr. George Gallup, of the American Institute of Public Opinion, in predicting correctly a Republican victory in the Maine elections this month establishes beyond question the accuracy of his poll as a barometer of the opinions of the American electorate. Yet a scientific evaluation of the Gallup forecast for Maine and a comparison with the record of the poll in the past indicate that such is not the case. Certain fundamental questions with regard to the techniques employed remain to be answered, and with the poll now in its fifth year, the burden of proof is still upon Dr. Gallup.

In the first place, Dr. Gallup freely admits that "some margin of error is involved in every sampling operation, due to the size of the sample itself." In the Maine election, for example, there were 95 chances out of 100 that the average error would not exceed 4 percent. Since this is a "plus-or-minus 4," the range of the poll would be 8 points and would in a close contest make accurate prediction at best a hazardous affair. Furthermore, if the 4-percent error is as Dr. Gallup claims, there would be a 50–50 chance of it favoring any one party. This, however, is not the case.

The institute's poll in Maine reported in a last-minute check that Congressman RALPH O. BREWSTER would defeat former Gov. Louis J. Brann for the Senate by receiving 62 percent of the total vote. Actually the gentleman from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], according to figures released by Dr. Gallup himself, received 58 percent of the popular vote, or an error of 4 percent in the estimate. It will be noted, however, that this error showed a Republican bias.

For the Governorship, Sumner Sewall, Republican, defeated Fulton Redman, Democrat, 160,743 to 91,856. Mr. Sewall thus gained 64 percent of the total vote cast. But since the institute poll had predicted that he would receive 68 percent, a second error, again favoring the Republicans, and this time also of 4 points, is to be noted.

In the 1936 Presidential election, presumably with the same possibility for error, Dr. Gallup failed to predict in a single State the correct percentages of the Roosevelt-Landon vote. But what is more significant, in 46 of the 48 States his error favored the Republicans. In size, it ranged from 1 percent in Arkansas to 14 percent in Arizona, with a median at 5, 1 point outside his self-established margin of reliability,

and with 25 States actually exceeding the possibility of error. In only 2 States did the poll favor the Democrats, and then by only a single percentage point in each.

The 4-percent Republican bias in the Maine prediction, instead of testifying to the accuracy of the polls, raises anew the question whether the basic cause for error in the Republican favor has been removed. Undoubtedly the institute's techniques have been improved since 1936, but is there evidence to show that this tendency to err on the side of one party, and one party alone, has been remedied? To this, Dr. Gallup has yet to give a satisfactory answer.

Since the failure of the Literary Digest, the polls have made an earnest and honest effort to win popular approval. Yet their tendency to guard their techniques as secrets of the trade has raised certain questions as to their basic reliability. On the fact of it, through pamphlets, magazine and newspaper articles, and books, the polling people have appeared willing to inform the public of their methods. Such is actually not the case. Their explanations have been little more than broad generalizations, and the important information has been withheld. If, as the polls claim, the element of time between the final sampling process and the election may be partially responsible for the changes that occur, is it contended that in over 90 percent of the cases, the Democrats conduct a more energetic last-minute campaign than do the Republicans? This seems highly unlikely. If such is not the case, there is all the more reason why a careful examination of polling methods and devices should be undertaken.

The Gallup poll claims to take a representative sampling of the population, based on several classification break-downs. Among these are age, sex, party, income, and rural-urban distribution. Where does Dr. Gallup acquire the information for such an analysis? What statistics does he use? Since the Literary Digest owed a major proportion of its error to its failure to acquire an accurate economic break-down, it would be interesting to know if the Gallup poll is suffering from the same disability. Unfortunately, the question has never been answered, and we are left only with the assurance by Dr. Gallup that his cross section is valid—plus the election results. The latter are not reassuring.

Assuming, however, that the basic economic break-down is correct, the problems of the interviewer in making his classifications are far from simple, and demand policy decisions on the part of the poll's administrators. It is easy enough to determine by observation a voter's sex, and possibly even his political party. But fitting him into an economic grouping is another matter. Dr. Gallup himself—the Pulse of Democracy, pages 169 to 170—has testified to the inability of people to determine their own economic strata, let alone their willingness to confide it to an interviewer. How, for instance, is such information obtained? Will the process submit to examination by reputable scientists?

These and other questions as to his techniques, Dr. Gallup has steadfastly refused to make clear to the consumer public. What percentage of the electorate has no choice of either issues or candidates? What percentage refuses to state its choice? How large is the sample? What areas are visited?

While it should be clearly understood that errors made by the poll in Maine do not necessarily indicate that similar errors will be made elsewhere, the fact that an underestimate of Democratic strength in Maine corroborates a deficiency known to exist in the poll during the 1936 campaign places upon Dr. Gallup the necessity of making his workways public if he is to expect public acceptance of his device. There is no desire to impute motives to polling officials; yet if the poll is as great an instrument of democracy as Dr. Gallup in his recent book holds it to be, it is essential that it interpret correctly. Another failure such as that of the Literary Digest would tempt Congress, as in many similar situations, to take steps to protect the public.

As pointed out above, the poll, to make the claim of accuracy, must do more than select the winner in any particular contest. The Roosevelt campaign in 1936, and most of the intervening elections which the institute has measured, have shown a clear-cut majority in favor of one side or the other. It will be recalled that where the difference was great enough, or where its "blind spot"—economic distribution—failed to be a determinant, the Literary Digest was tolerably successful until 1936. In the case of an election where the voting would be as close as indicated by the Gallup poll of the campaign on August 25, this year, the latter might as easily be in error. For instance, in the poll of that date, President Roosevelt was accorded 247 electoral votes and Mr. Willkie 284. In doubtful States (those States where a 4-percent error would throw to the other candidate) were 16 States, or 71 electoral votes for Roosevelt and 125 for Willkie. Under these circumstances, and by virtue of its previous Republican bias, one would not expect Dr. Gallup to declare these States for either one man or the other. Indeed, by virtue of the Institute's consistent error in the favor of the Republicans, it would seem more logical to correct the poll by taking some number, such as 3 percent, from the Republicans and giving it to the Democrats. This would transfer 115 electoral votes to the President, giving him a total of 362 and Willkie 153.

The most recent Gallup poll—September 20—however, shows such overwhelming sentiment for President Roosevelt that percentage studies appear a matter of minor importance. Yet it should be recalled even here that 18 States are in a position to change in the party columns by virtue of the 4-percent error. This is enough to elect either candidate, since the group of doubtful States contains such key States as New York, Pennsylvania, and Ohio. With a correction for Republican bias, however, Mr. Willkie would take only Maine, Vermont, and South Dakota.

Any discussion of polls is not complete without a discussion of the interpretations made upon them. Great care must be taken that the interpreter is himself not showing a partisan interest. This is particularly to be feared on the part of the newspapers, already strongly pro-Willkie. While there is no desire to suspect the Institute of partiality, it is nevertheless important, considering the media in which the polls appear, to keep a watchful eye against false and misleading interpretations. The professional apologists should be scrupulously avoided.

On these same lines, it should be borne in mind that with only slightly over a month of the campaign remaining, President Roosevelt will find it necessary to win only 61 electoral votes in addition to those States which he carried in 1936 by a 2-to-1 popular majority. These are: Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Minnesota, Mississippi, Montana, Nevada, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Oregon, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Virginia, Washington, and Wisconsin. Of these, according to the Gallup estimates, only North Dakota is outside the fold, and the defection here is of fairly recent origin.

The burden of proof, then, is still upon Mr. Willkie—and Dr. Gallup.

What Are We Going To Do About Indochina?

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH B. SHANNON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 25, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE PHILADELPHIA RECORD

Mr. SHANNON. Mr. Speaker, I have asked unanimous consent that I may address the House for 1 minute so that I may include therein the following editorial taken from today's Philadelphia Record, based upon the importance of our staying out of trouble in Asia. It is a splendid peace document, I think, and should be read by every American.

[From the Philadelphia Record of September 25, 1940]

WHAT ARE WE GOING TO DO ABOUT INDOCHINA?

Japanese troops have moved through French Indochina. The French Government has given its permission.

Yet Secretary of State Hull again denounces Japan, and presumably France as well, on the ground that the deal was made under duress.

It was made under duress. But what are we going to do about it?

Are we going to war against Japan; and if so, why?

It is clear by this time that Japan is not going to be deterred in her war with China by statements of Mr. Hull or anybody else.

The fact that we do not recognize this conflict as a war does not make it any the less a war, and we are naive, indeed, if we do not expect it to be fought as a war is fought.

The Record has proposed that the United States adopt a new policy in the Far East instead of fanning the flames by selling Japan munitions and then denouncing her for using them.

The Record proposes to policy of offering to mediate the war and bringing peace to the Orient—a peace which can and should benefit China, Japan, and the United States as well.

There are reasons to believe both Japan and China would welcome such a move. There are reasons to believe both of them would thank us for helping to end strife which gives every sign of going on for years.

The Record has been denounced—and also praised—for advocating this course. To the criticisms we merely say that we are proud to sponsor any move which will bring peace to other nations and security to our own.

If there is something shameful in proposing peace, our world, indeed, has gone mad.

Because this question of French Indochina involves not only our peace but our total defense as a Nation and our liberties, we think it time for every citizen to face the facts.

Five years ago the Record warned that "the anti-Japanese movement is a trade war disguised as a moral crusade." We showed then, by the statement of Walter Runciman, of the British Board of Trade, that the United States was being counted upon to protect British interests in her trade rivalry with Japan—even though our own chief oriental trade was with Japan.

Today there is still no other explanation for our persistent meddling in the Far East, our gambling with war there when we face a far greater menace on our Atlantic frontier.

True, the Japanese are denounced on a moral basis. Nor can anyone deny that their grabs are in the very best imperialistic fashion. To say that we cannot, therefore, maintain peaceful relations with her is as absurd as to say that we should not help the British because the British Empire was built by the same kind of imperialism, or because England refuses to give India her freedom.

No one can obscure the record of Japanese oppression. But neither can one deny the immeasurably blacker record of Soviet Russia, which has not only grabbed in every direction, which not only has an alliance with the world's greatest menace, Hitler—but also has a record of bloody immorality without parallel in the modern world, even to the point of destroying her own religions.

Yet it is no secret that our State Department has been trying to appease Russia—in an effort to egg her into a war against Japan.

That very fact throws all morals out the window.

If we can try to appease Russia, let's quit talking on a moral basis. In fact, the only basis which we, as a nation, can afford to adopt is:

What's best for the security of the United States of America?

What is?

We think we know some things that are not.

We certainly don't think messing in French Indochina, when we're arming ourselves against Hitler, is best for United States security.

We don't think leaving ourselves in a position of having to fight on two fronts—the Atlantic and Pacific—at one time, is best for our security.

We don't think that trying to appease Hitler's ally, Stalin—after he's bluntly turned us down—is best for our security. Especially when he's building new fortifications across the straits from Alaska.

We do think that peace in Asia, a peace which will leave both Japan and China our friends, will add immensely to our security and our economic strength.

This is not a question of morals. It is a question of military necessity. The Indochina crisis threatens the show-down.

Sooner or later we must choose—choose between enmity or friendship with Japan; choose between Japan and Russia; choose between having to defend ourselves against enemies on both coasts or on only one.

What are we going to do?

Hon. William B. Bankhead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MILTON A. ROMJUE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 19, 1940

Mr. ROMJUE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks relative to our former and deceased Speaker of this House, Hon. WILLIAM B. BANKHEAD, I wish I could find language to properly portray the splendid character and achievements of this much beloved and appreciated man, but that is beyond and above any words I can summon to my command. I am sure when the membership of this House learned of his passing it was with universal regret, for I verily believe every Member of this body loved and held in the highest esteem this noble character.

He was the seventh Speaker under whom I have served as a Member of this body, every one of whom were fine, outstanding, and able presiding officers. I at all times maintained and enjoyed a cordial and friendly relationship with each of them, but I think I never enjoyed a closer or more intimate friendship with any of them than with Mr. BANKHEAD. Speaker BANKHEAD and I came into this body at the same time, and we soon formed a fast and genuine friendship that endured throughout the remainder of his life. As a member of the delegation that accompanied his remains to its last resting place, Jasper, Ala., I found at his home at Jasper just what one would expect to find in the way of a great attendance of thousands upon thousands of his devoted friends and constituents whom he had so honorably represented in this House. I verily believe that no such great gathering of people were ever before assembled on one occasion in his home town as were there at his funeral.

In company with Mr. Kelly Herring, who seemed to be employed in Speaker BANKHEAD's agricultural interests, Representatives TABER, CARLSON, CASE of South Dakota, and myself, were driven out to his farm while at Jasper. Speaker BANKHEAD, like all great statesmen who have grown up from or close to Nature or rural surroundings, had manifested an interest and devotion to that which was so near his heart. As my mind ran back somewhat over a portion of the history of our country I silently recalled how President Jackson, President Jefferson, and others who, when they had reached a ripe old age, being worn with hard work and devotion to duty, had in their declining years sought peace and quiet among the trees, birds, and domestic animals. These men had gone back to a place of anticipated rest. Speaker BANKHEAD was no doubt looking forward to the time when he might find opportunity to enjoy and embrace a closer communion with a more restful peace and time.

I do not believe I ever served with a more fair and just man—highly intelligent, immeasurably fair and impartial, yet firm and decisive was he.

A devoted friend, a most helpful soul has gone its way, but his great service to his State and his country can never be fully measured, nor will it ever be forgotten.

I shall not attempt to detail his fine service as a Member of this body nor as Speaker of this House. It is so outstanding and well known that the fullest praise could add but little, for it is so superb it stands out like the brightest star that was ever flung into space.

Gone is our friend, but not forever, for we shall meet again.

The Third Term

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW EDMISTON

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 25, 1940

LETTER FROM A CONSTITUENT

Mr. EDMISTON. Mr. Speaker, under permission to revise and extend my remarks and include therein a letter from a distinguished West Virginia lawyer, a constituent of mine, I wish to call attention of my colleagues in the House and all readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that the thought conveyed by Mr. Snider's letter to me certainly in every way

answers those citizens of our country who are opposing President Roosevelt on the sole ground that they do not believe in a third term for any President. Mr. Snider's letter, to my mind, definitely answers those citizens. I hope that many of them will read it and profit thereby. It seems to me, at this critical time in our history, we must not overlook the many good things that the Roosevelt administration has accomplished for this country. We must not lose sight of the fact that if we are to stay out of the present world war, our chances of so doing are so much greater under the leadership of Franklin D. Roosevelt and Cordell Hull than they possibly could be under any other leadership in the country. To throw all of these advantages overboard for the feeble prejudices against a third term is not only anticonstitutional but is anti-American.

ANTI-THIRD TERM IS ANTI-CONSTITUTION

Hon. ANDREW EDMISTON,
Member of the House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR ANDREW: The framers of our Federal Constitution debated thoroughly the question of limiting the term to which a President of the United States could be elected. They did not decide the question. They left it open. It can be changed by a constitutional amendment and only by an amendment. No one President can change it, nor two, nor three, nor four, nor can all the Presidents change it. Nor can precedents or custom change it. It is still open; therefore:

1. Anyone who would exclude the people from electing a President to a third term is against the Federal Constitution.
2. Anyone who would exclude a former President from being a candidate for a third term is against the Federal Constitution.
3. Any man or woman who votes against President Roosevelt solely because he is a candidate for a third term either knowingly or unwittingly will vote against the intention of the Constitution.

Respectfully,

MILLARD F. SNIDER.

The National Commander of the American Legion Pledges Prudence and Common Sense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN M. COFFEE
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 25, 1940

SPEECH BY RAYMOND J. KELLY

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herein a speech by the eminent retiring national commander of the American Legion, the Honorable Raymond J. Kelly.

This speech, it seems to me, reveals a splendid understanding of the issues in America today. It admonishes us that we should be broad and tolerant in our attitude toward others; that we should free ourselves from hysteria and emotional impulses; and that we should unite our peoples by eliminating sources of misunderstanding and acrimony.

I commend the reading of this speech to all patriotic Americans. It is in the best tradition of the American Legion. It is worthy of wide dissemination throughout the length and breadth of our land. It reveals a sound and sensible comprehension of the situation prevailing today with respect to national defense.

The speech follows:

"Congress rejects Stanton-Frye-Lincoln conscription plan for universal selective service."

"National Union Party at Baltimore almost unanimously nominates Lincoln—Intricacies of Lincoln's hand in the the nomination of Johnson for Vice President. Navy-yard labor strikes."

"Chase's resignation from Cabinet is accepted by Lincoln. To visitors who relate gloom to the President, Lincoln states, 'This administration will not be reelected.' McClellan rejects unity proposals."

These highly descriptive headlines which I have just repeated to you were, as you may have guessed, some of the highlights of 1864, another election year of crisis.

Their striking similarity to existing conditions in this country requires no further emphasis or comment.

I have related them to you to illustrate a point all of us are begnning to realize, namely, that types of self-government such as ours do not function normally or most effectively during periods of political unrest preceding our national elections each 4 years.

This is a fact we must face. It is a fact which is elemental in the understanding of the delays which all of us deplore in the effort to strengthen immediately our armed defenses.

But there is one fundamental difference in the conditions of the year 1864 and the year 1940. Then we were a divided Nation involved in a tragic and bloody conflict where millions of fellow-Americans were arrayed one against another.

Today, we are not at war.

In my opinion there is no more important mission for thinking Americans than to give their best efforts to the job of reducing and if possible eliminating the type of war hysteria and fear which in the end most likely may lead us into conflict.

We are at a critical period in our national psychology. The chances for war or for peace have been increased rather than lessened by the pulling and hauling of preelection controversy.

Looking back, a short 6 months ago, we were then a united nation in our determination not to be drawn into the conflict.

The growth since late spring of a spirit of fatality, of predestination on our part as a people to enter this war is the very national factor most likely to plunge us into the holocaust.

As national commander of the American Legion, I wish to condemn with all the responsibility and influence which goes with that office the growth of this feeling of inevitability of our war involvement.

I believe it is my solemn duty to point out to my fellow citizens that the sound policy for our country is to strengthen our national defenses to the utmost, and as efficiently and expeditiously as possible, but these armed forces must be to defend America first, last, and always.

I do not charge that this shift of public opinion toward the position that we are headed for war was directed or intentional. I make no accusation that it was inspired or deliberate.

I believe it has resulted largely from a national fear, bordering on panic, which spread throughout the Nation when a few short months brought the virtual conquest of nearly all Europe by a ruthless and superbly organized military machine.

That this new technique of conquest constitutes a grave menace to our national integrity, we must accept as a hard-bitten reality, in this materialistic world in which we now find ourselves.

Our Government and our people themselves became involved in a great rearmament problem with the appropriations of billions of dollars and the conscription of the Nation's manpower. The movement to increase the powers of the Federal Government progressed to the point that under certain circumstances it can take over and operate private industry to speed up and increase rearmament. These factors intensify the tendency for thinking in terms of war involvement as contrasted with the necessity of keeping the peace.

Today we no longer possess as a united people the will to remain at peace. The danger of this state of mind is obvious.

These are the preliminaries serving to condition and cushion our minds for that final plunge into war. Our one chance to remain at peace is for the Nation to reappraise the national perspective. We must sanely and soberly readopt the outlook that peace, not war, is the goal.

I, for one, am not convinced that it is necessary to whip the American mind up to a frenzy in order to get necessary action to enlarge our national defenses. I am confident that we as a people have the good sense to appreciate what is needed and to go about the job with intelligence.

This problem of national defense is not new to the Legion. No other organization in the country today subscribes more heartily to the efforts now being made to build these defenses.

It is easily understandable that the Legion should feel the way it does about national defense. For 20 years, the pronouncements of the Legion in connection with the interrelated problems of national defense and Americanism have proved prophetic in their truth.

We called the turn.

The problems of national defense would simplify themselves if we possessed an adequate definition of our national defense requirements. Such a definition is lacking. Day to day the objectives seem to change. It may be impossible to anticipate what may be required of our Army, our Navy, our air force, without knowledge of what the future holds.

We cannot rely on soothsayers to predict who might be our enemies or where the fighting might occur. If attack should come, it is safe to assume, I believe, that it would not be by any one nation, but by a group.

The most popular and widely used phrase today in connection with the problems of national defense is that of "bottlenecks."

It is totally unfair to conclude that these bottlenecks are of current origin. Senseless criticism of their existence will not aid in their solution.

We must appreciate that American industry and enterprise have never been geared to the complex problems of modern, total rearmament.

Just because we suddenly decide overnight to rearm does not bring us to the status of an accomplished fact. To believe so is the height of absurdity produced by a policy of wishful thinking.

Intelligent, patriotic Americans are attempting to make sense and to bring order out of the apparently uncoordinated efforts to do everything at once to rearm.

Many of these are men in whom we have every confidence. They are men who have proved their ability to handle matters of this magnitude. They are men who know the problems of American productive industry.

There is no magic wand to be waved over the dollars of national-defense appropriations transmuting them into planes, tanks, or the highly specialized mechanical training to meet modern war requirements demanded of soldiers and sailors.

In short order we are asking these men to retool virtually the factories of the greatest industrial nation on earth. That much of this work is necessarily on paper, does not mean that all possible progress is not being made.

If waste occurs, let's appreciate that there is no truer adage than "haste makes waste." If all other considerations are sacrificed to the demand for speed in rearmament, we must accustom ourselves to something less than idealistic exactitude of efficiency in what we get for the huge sums expended.

It is my personal belief that some of the bottle-neck trouble is the result of the natural desire for the latest and most advanced type of defense weapon, to produce only the best designed tank, battleship, gun, motor, plane, or bomb, rather than to standardize immediately upon what we can actually produce at this time.

If we are to have an Army of more than 1,000,000 men by 1941, I would rather see our soldiers armed with adequate numbers of weapons presently designed, even though they may be 1930, 1935, or 1939 models, than have them inadequately equipped with a scattering few experimental weapons of advanced design.

There is no thought in my mind of having other than the best armament possible to produce for our fellow countrymen who will handle these planes, guns, ships, and tanks. The best is none too good when it means the conservation of the lives of the best young men of America.

But it is my belief that the crying present needs are those of quantity rather than quality production of arms. The time element is all important.

There will be bad headaches ahead in this rearmament program. Their extent can be minimized if those responsible for munitions and armament procurement on the part of the Government accept the advice and the unrestricted assistance of the experienced men who are on the firing line of industrial production. At all hazards, Government and industry must work together. There are too many indications evidenced that they have been at cross purposes—at loggerheads.

Possibly this has been caused mostly by these jittery times with their increasing likelihood of misunderstanding and acrimony, serving only to defeat rather than to aid the progress of national rearmament.

"He who lets his country die, lets all things die;
And all things dying, curse him.
But he who helps his country live, helps all things live;
And all things living, bless him."

Mud Slingers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 25, 1940

POEM FROM PUBLIC OPINION

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herein a brief piece of poetry from the September 1940 issue of Public Opinion, a monthly magazine published at San Antonio, Tex., and edited by the distinguished liberal thinker, J. A. Appler. The poem was taken from a recent issue of War Cry.

Because most of the States have completed their primary campaigns and, in many of them, mud slinging characterized the utterances and activities of some of the candidates, I think it is singularly appropriate that this poem should be thoughtfully read and studied.

In this time of great national crisis it is well that candidates for office avoid the slinging of mud, the dissemination of slanders and the undermining of public confidence in prominent citizens. Now, more than ever, is there imperative need for the inculcation in the public mind of confidence in our Government and its institutions. How can we resolutely and determinedly resist any possible invasion from a potential foe if we are disillusioned, soured, or disgusted with our domestic institutions and leaders?

MUD SLINGERS

They pick the mud from the garden of life—
The garden that's full of beauty;
They sling the mud in the faces around,
Regardless of love and duty.

Real mud is made for the sowing of seed,
For beautiful plants to grow in,
For strength God gives to the laborer's arm,
To spade, to rake, and hoe in.

The mud they sling is the fault they find,
The gossip, scandal, unkindness;
They see no flowers in the garden of life,
Because of their soul's dense blindness.

The mud they sling is with cankerworms filled
It soils the world all around them,
And eats the hearts that the Lord hath made
For love and truth to surround them.

Then leave the mud in the garden of life,
And gather the fragrant flowers—
The flowers of charity, kindness and love—
To cheer someone's lonely hours.

—*War Cry.*

Opposition to Adjournment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 25, 1940

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR, OF OHIO

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address which I delivered last night over the radio:

Ladies and gentlemen of the radio audience, on last June 4, President Roosevelt stated his opinion that Congress might just as well adjourn in a couple of weeks and go home. He said the national defense would not require the presence of the lawmakers in Washington. He also said that we could serve no other purpose except, perhaps, the laudable one of making speeches.

On June 19, ladies and gentlemen, I stated to the Members of the House of Representatives that an unparalleled crisis confronts this Nation, and that that crisis demands that Congress remain in session continuously and indefinitely. At that time I pointed out that events at home and abroad, national policies, and international relations were changing from day to day. Decisions had to be made on questions that would affect the lives and fortunes of our people for a generation to come. I pointed out further, fellow citizens, that many of those questions required decision and approval by the Congress, and that they must not be left to the judgment of any one man.

I further pointed out, ladies and gentlemen, that Congress ought to remain in session to share responsibility for the defense program and exercise its judgment as to the extent of American commitments and involvement in the present world turmoil.

I said then, that in a world at war, when every day brings possible complications closer to the United States, there existed a necessity for Congress to remain in session and perform its constitutional duty as a check and balance on the executive department of the Government.

Now, since that day on June 4, when President Roosevelt expressed his opinion that the Congress might as well adjourn and go home, unless it wanted to remain in session for the purpose of making speeches, the Congress has passed 12 appropriation bills, totaling fourteen and one-half billions of dollars of the taxpayers' money. It has authorized the construction of a two-ocean Navy. It has given the President authority to call the National Guard into service. As it was pointed out editorially a few days ago, it has enacted the alien-registration law; the second Hatch Act; a law to regulate investment trusts; it has adopted a bristling restatement of the Monroe Doctrine. The Congress since that date has confirmed the appointments of a new Secretary of Agriculture, Secretary of War, and Secretary of the Navy, and has before it for confirmation the appointment of a new Secretary of Commerce and a new Postmaster General. This Congress, since that day on June 4, when the President insisted that we go home, has passed a billion-dollar defense tax bill and is at work on a new excess-profits tax; and, most important of all, it has completed action on a bill to conscript manpower.

Our President may be the indispensable man, but, notwithstanding his "indispensable foresight," as one editorial writer put it, he could not foresee the necessity for these far-reaching measures back on that June day when he so gaily bade the Congress pack up its grips and leave the Nation's defense problems with the executive department of the Government.

Now we are again talking about adjournment. The administration leaders in the House propose that Congress adjourn sine die at the end of this month, which would mean that there would be no Congress at Washington in October, November, and December—indeed, not until the new Congress convenes in January.

What will happen in the next 100 days is anybody's guess, but one thing is certain: No similar length of time was ever more important or more dangerous. London could be wiped out and England fall, though God forbid. The British Government might be forced to capitulate and yield its navy; or it could come, bag and baggage, to Canada, the land we are already pledged to defend. The Mediterranean could be turned literally into an Italian lake and the Suez Canal—Britain's life line—into an Italian creek. Gibraltar, symbol of security, could crumble into axis hands and in the Orient—but what's the use of spending space on all the obvious and perilous possibilities?

The minority leader favors 3-day recesses but not adjournment. In spite of the threat of the majority leader that unless we agree to adjournment there will be no recess and we will be kept continuously in session, I believe the Congress ought not to adjourn; because if Mr. Roosevelt, back on June 4, could not foresee all of the necessary acts of Congress which he has since insisted that Congress pass, then he cannot see from now until the end of 1940 what may arise to demand the presence of the Congress at Washington.

The idea of our vast defense program is to keep us out of, not to get us into, war—to stay "short of." Congress is the great restraining influence. It is the deliberative body, whereas the executive branch is the body of action. The fathers planned it that way—check and balance.

The deliberations are often irritating and seemingly futile, full of sound and fury, signifying nothing, but that's not so in the larger concept of our democratic process. Something definite and vital is signified in that plan of the fathers—that we look before we leap. The job of Congress is the looking job. Otherwise we might as well have a one-man system and be done with it.

But, believe it or not, under the perilous circumstances which now prevail, Congress is thinking about quitting—for a hundred days.

It is insisted by the administration leaders that if there arises a need for Congress the President can call us back into extraordinary session. This would create a needless and very great expense for the taxpayers of the country, and the point is that we could not be called back into session unless the President chose to call us back.

Now, my fellow citizens, let's look over some of the unfinished business that now remains before the Congress, and see for a moment whether or not it is wise for the Congress to adjourn and leave the whole question of the national defense and our foreign relations in the hands of the Chief Executive.

Who knows what lies ahead of the Congress of the United States? Who knows what questions of vast importance to the security and the welfare of this Nation may have to be decided before January of 1941? Who knows whether or not it is safe for Congress to leave Washington permanently and go back home, even to conduct a campaign, under conditions whereby it cannot reassemble unless the President should choose to call it back into extra session? Who could foresee, on that last June day what the Congress would be called upon to do between that date and now?

The people are fearful of allowing this situation to drift on under the control of the President of the United States, with Congress gone.

Regardless of the merits or demerits of the deal in which the 50 destroyers were traded for airplane and naval bases, the secret method by which the destroyers were traded away has disquieted the people. It has made them uneasy. It has made them fearful.

They are afraid not only because of the methods adopted in conducting this deal, but they now realize that the President would, if he felt so disposed, conduct other negotiations and present the Congress other accomplished deals, so to speak; and if Congress is not here to check him, no one can say to what limits the Executive might go in these trades and in what way he might involve this country in foreign war.

These are the reasons the people are afraid. These are the reasons the Congress should stay in session. These are the reasons why we should not adjourn. If we only recess, as the minority leader suggests, then the Congress can reassemble itself if its Members feel their presence in Washington is necessary to the welfare and the security of their country.

The people have begun to wonder how the thousands of machine guns and the hundreds of thousands of rifles and the other equipment that we now find we have turned over to Great Britain, diminishing our own national defense by just that much, managed to be turned over without the public knowing anything about it. We read, on the one hand, that our own National Government has to use trucks or farm machinery, and guns simulated out of timber, for training purposes, while at the same time we have sold or given away to Great Britain the machine guns and the rifles and the tanks which might be used to train our own troops. The people are beginning to wonder why it is that acres and acres of perfectly good war tanks are obsolete because they cannot travel more than 3 miles an hour, cannot be used to instruct and train our own troops, and yet Canada is eagerly buying them up in order to train her troops.

There are too many inconsistencies, too many contradictions, and too much suggestion of secrecy about all of these things for the Nation to rest easy if the Congress adjourns sine die.

All of this is not to say that Britain does not need our help. All of this is not to say that we should not give our help to Britain. But all of this is to say that these things are the business of the American people; they are not the personal private affairs of the President of the United States. If this country is going to denude itself of many of its items of defense in order to help one of the belligerents, then the people ought to know that. If this country is going to be led into war by anybody, the people ought to know that in advance. If anything is to be done that may compromise our neutrality and now or later bring us face to face with war, then the people ought to know all about that.

It is now manifest that unless the Congress does stay in session, unless the Congress does keep itself in position to inquire into the transactions, unless the Congress does remain in session so that it may take the proper steps to demand and to secure the information for the people relating to all of these transactions in these foreign relations, then the people cannot know, they will have no way of finding out what is going on until the new Congress assembles next January. At that time it is entirely reasonable to believe that the Chief Executive might present to the new Congress a whole group of "accomplished deals" similar to the destroyer deal.

Under the Constitution, and under the American way of government, my fellow cititzens, it is the function and the responsibility of the Congress to stay on the job whenever the people's rights and the welfare and the security of this nation are to be safeguarded. You all realize, of course, that now, as perhaps never before in the history of this Nation, the Congress is the guardian of the people's liberties and of the peace of this Nation.

I am of the firm conviction that with the European situation as it is and as it is likely to be during the next few weeks, it seems important that every Congressman should stay on the job, through the entire fall if necessary, instead of leaving one man in charge. It is my firm conviction that it is the duty of Congress to remain in session during this crisis so as to be in instant readiness to perform the duties placed upon it by the Constitution. Any other course would be a serious neglect of the Nation's vital interests.

During this period of emergency—when a Congressman votes to go home—his people should vote to keep him home.

The Illinois Waterway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE V. PARSONS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 25, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE CHICAGO TRIBUNE

Mr. PARSONS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Chicago Tribune of September 23:

[From the Chicago Tribune of September 23, 1940]

WATERWAY OF GROWING VALUE

The Illinois waterway extends 320 miles from Chicago to Grafton, Ill., on the Mississippi River. In spite of the handicaps occasioned by the reduction of water from Lake Michigan through the waterway to 1,500 cubic feet a second, ordered by the Supreme Court on January 1, 1939, traffic on the waterway has been steadily growing. Five and one-half million tons moved last year as compared with 4,446,000 tons in 1938. The 1940 movement is expected to reach 8,000,000 tons. The projected depth of the waterway is 9 feet, but during the present season, with more than an average amount of rainfall, barges have been forced to limit their draft to 8 or 8½ feet.

Expert witnesses have testified that deposits of sludge or partly treated sewage have accumulated on the bottom of the Chicago River to a depth of 2 to 4 feet all the way from Damen Avenue to Joliet. Illinois has appealed to the Court for permission to increase the diversion from 1,500 to 5,000 cubic feet a second until the end of 1942, when it is claimed the sanitary district's sewage-treatment plant expansions will be in full operation. The Illinois plea is being opposed by certain Great Lakes States.

It is difficult to understand this opposition. Even if the sanitary necessities of Illinois citizens are ignored, the commercial advantages of the Illinois waterway to the States bordering on the Great Lakes should be sufficient to bring about their approval of the slight increase in diversion requested.

The waterway has cut the cost of coal, oil, and other heavy products, to the benefit of these States, either directly or indirectly. One oil company brings large amounts of oil to its Indiana refinery by barge because that method is cheaper than its own pipeline. Shippers in Wisconsin have received decreased freight charges as a result of lower barge and rail combination rates via

Peoria or Chicago. Paper from Northern States is moving through the waterway to southern destinations and there are prospective movements of cotton from the South to northern destinations via the same route.

As a facility for national defense the waterway is important to the whole country. Its fullest utilization should not be hampered nor prevented by the jealous, sectional desires of a few States which are acting contrary not only to their own selfish interest but the interest of the entire Nation.

An Unsound Commitment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HOLDEN TINKHAM

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 25, 1940

ARTICLE BY WILLIAM LAVARRE

Mr. TINKHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by William LaVarre, an expert on Latin-American affairs:

SOUTH OF THE BORDER—UNCLE SAM, TENANT?—MERELY LEASING NAVAL AND AIR BASES IN THE BRITISH WEST INDIES, WITHOUT NATIONAL TITLE, WILL BRING US ONLY LIABILITIES AND INTERNATIONAL HEADACHES—ARE WE TO SPEND MILLIONS IMPROVING ENGLAND'S LONG-MILKED CARIBBEAN POSSESSIONS AND PROVIDING EMPLOYMENT FOR FOREIGN LABOR, COMMERCE FOR ENGLISH PROFITS?

(By William LaVarre, Fellow, American Geographical Society, Expert on Latin-American Affairs)

Before he left London on his propaganda mission to the United States, Sir George Paish, former economic adviser to the Chancellor of the Exchequer, was told to stop talking about exchanging West Indian Islands for American planes, ships, and to promote instead the idea of merely leasing naval and air bases in the Caribbean to the United States for 99 years. A few weeks previous to his mission, Sir George had publicly proposed at a London dinner that some of England's possessions could be profitably swapped for American war materials, and thus circumvent the embargo of our Johnson Act.

"The danger of our not being able to command enough cash to buy what we need," Sir George had said, "is a matter of life and death. The time is more opportune than ever before for ceding some of the West Indian colonies. Surely out of this vast Empire of ours we can spare one or more of the West Indian Islands."

A number of Americans who heard this speech were amazed that Sir George, an Englishman of the old school, so wholeheartedly fell in with an American wish to secure United States Caribbean fortifications. On the other hand, many British folk who heard it thought the old diplomat had become too mellow with age. Neither the Americans nor the Englishmen knew that Sir George's motives were just as shrewd as usual. One of the most expert horse traders of the British Empire, Sir George had just finished reading a highly confidential report which had been delivered to the colonial office by England's Royal Commission Investigating Conditions in the British West Indies. The commission's report was so malodorous that it had been hastily locked up after Sir George looked at it, and has been seen by very few other people.

The report of the Royal Commission Investigating Conditions in the British West Indies would be, however, of great interest now to our naval and military authorities and to United States Congressmen. It dissipates all glamor and romance about the West Indies in its first sentence. It tells things about Jamaica, Trinidad, Barbados, St. Lucia which no tourist booklet ever dared divulge. Studying the increasing strikes, riots, hunger marches, and "down-arms-day" unrest, to which the foreign office had been deaf and blind as long as possible, the royal commissioners stated the following facts: A great part of the British West Indian population of 2,500,000 (natives) were only occasionally employed. The majority of the people were underfed. Housing conditions were deplorable, in the plantations as well as in the towns. Sanitation in 90 percent of the area was described as "nonexistent." A large section of the population of each island suffered from malnutrition, especially the children. Infant mortality, due to lack of prenatal and infancy care, was increasing.

The Royal Commissioners minced no words in blaming the West Indian disaster on Colonial Office policies which administered each island solely for the purpose of securing for England cheap tropical imports and selling high-priced English exports—and not for the economic benefit of the islands or their inhabitants. Planters had to export their crops at low prices to London and pay high prices for English imports. English banks loaned only for export crops which the Colonial Office wanted, sugar, cocoa, tobacco, and such annual crops as England could profitably use. They would not finance planters for the production of diversified crops which the people of the island needed or which could be sold outside the British Empire. The banks, at high interest rates, would finance high-priced purchases if made from English manufacturers, but not those which local importers might obtain at lower prices from non-English sources. The colonists were no better off in 1940 than the colonists of the eighteenth century had been.

The commissioners charged several governors with incompetence; asked that the islands be immediately cleared of their increasing slums; that garden plots be provided for unemployed and poor families so they could grow their own food; that a free meal be provided each day for each child in each school, and that an immediate grant be sent to West Indian treasuries to finance the crisis of unemployment and social welfare emergencies. An annual dole of at least £1,000,000 ($5,000,000) was urgently advised.

Sir George Paish, studying this disagreeable news at a moment when his charts showed him increasing English war costs, decided quickly that the time, to use his words, was "more opportune than ever before" for ceding some of the West Indian colonies to the United States. But, just before sailing for America to unload two of the most unprofitable islands on the United States taxpayers, his advisers hit upon an idea that seemed to the House of Lords a much better proposal: Instead of getting rid of an impoverished island, why not lease a little section of it to a good tenant for a few years, let him do a lot of work, spend much money locally, increase jobs, pay rolls, and local commerce, which would not only relieve the House of Lords from having to dig into already heavily taxed English estates in order to support the West Indies, but provide such a business boom for the West Indies that the islands might soon be producing a profit for England's colonial office. If the United Stats could be sold the idea of spending millions of dollars in pay rolls, giving thousands of jobs to Jamaicans, Trinidadians, St. Lucians, and unemployed Barbados, and perhaps even providing immediate employment for the unemployed of British Guiana and Honduras, two birds could be killed with one stone—or rather, tenant. England's war debts would be canceled and England's future colonial losses underwritten and subsidized. In addition to this economic miracle, a mere tenant would build fine airports, marine bases, paved highways, and other property improvements, at no expense whatever to the colonial office.

Thus from three directions at once has a campaign been launched upon us to secure our signature to 99-year leases for 18 naval and air bases in exchange for the cancelation of $4,000,000,000 worth of British 1918 war debts and 50 United States destroyers. Simultaneously with Sir George's personal appearances in the United States (and he had cleverly secured advance lecture engagements which, if not canceled, would take him from coast to coast) Viscount Halifax issued a statement in the House of Lords, from whose estates taxes otherwise would have to come to finance the West Indies, that such a leasing arrangement has already been agreed upon in principle by the American administration.

If this is a fact, then the American people had better wake up or we who have already been drained by taxes to offset House of Lords debt defaults since 1918 will be committed, without any chance of public or congressional discussion, to assuming British West Indian liabilities which will drain us for another 99 years. We should find out just to whom Viscount Halifax refers as the party of the first part. Whom have we got, in London or elsewhere, who has committed or can commit the people of the United States to such an international liability? For us to assume the burden of investing in fortifying islands to which we will never have title, or providing pay rolls for foreign labor rather than our own citizens, would be sheer stupidity. But it looks as though someone has promised to do so, for Winston Churchill has also announced his official confidence that "His Majesty's Government is well pleased to accord defense facilities to the United States on 99-year-lease bases. Undoubtedly," he added, "this process (of leasing) means that two great organizations of English-speaking democracies will be somewhat mixed up together in some of their affairs."

"Somewhat mixed up," is a masterful example of understatement. We would be so mixed up that, like the two families who tried to share the same apartment, we'd all end up quickly in the divorce court—or worse.

It is incredible that we Americans could have been pledged, even in principle, to assuming all Caribbean defense costs without any title, for assuming additional liabilities without any tangible, practical, assets. But Viscount Halifax and Winston Churchill, in London, say we have. Sir George Paish on this side of the Atlantic insists we have. And soon, from Nassau, England's new Governor General of the British West Indies, no less a salesman than England's former king-emperor, the Duke of Windsor, plans to issue a congratulatory proclamation. President Roosevelt, when asked to comment on the who, when, and why of this English optimism, also increases the mystery by answering enigmatically that excellent progress is being made but that he cannot go into details because the subject was too involved. Too involved for whom?

If there is going to be, through this leasing scheme, some preliminary form of "union now" with England's liabilities, and we are going to be soon "somewhat mixed up together," it seems to me that we ought at least be allowed to argue the subject in passing. I think that, before any such commitment is made—to lease pieces of islands rather than invest in clear titles—we should have time to consider several facts: That the West Indies are not today in abject poverty is due to United States investments in developing the

Panama Canal, which created new international trade routes that brought shipping lanes past the British doorsteps (and to which thousands of Jamaicans, Trinidadians, and Barbados rushed for employment). But, whereas Puerto Rico, to which we obtained title, does 94 percent of its trade now with the United States, thereby helping to balance our investments in its Caribbean fortifications, the British West Indies send 85 percent of their trade away from the United States.

No matter how much we would invest in fortifying British island tips and bays, no matter how many millions of dollars we contributed to British West Indian labor prosperity, we would not increase our share of the British West Indian trade. Trinidad, for example, in spite of the large United States investments in asphalt, oil, and international air terminals, does only 5 percent of its trade with the United States.

Jamaica, from which the English chased the Spaniards in 1665 and which Englishmen made the center of their profitable Caribbean slave trade, is becoming volcanic with increasing labor unrest. There have been riots even in the British naval docks. If we merely leased tenant's quarters on Jamaica we would have no authority whatever to administer community assets so that the people of Jamaica would benefit. The Colonial Office in London would benefit by every dollar the American Government spent.

The advantages of additional air and naval bases in the Caribbean are urgently evident but these should be established on totally United States administered islands, or internationally partitioned halves of islands, permanently ceded to us for value received. Any actual step in the direction of joint occupancy where we are spending all the money and England is getting all the profit—and non-Americans all the new jobs and pay rolls—is unthinkable until after all such proposals have been discussed by the American people and its constitutional authority—Congress.

There is no doubt that, under war dictatorship, Winston Churchill, Viscount Halifax, and Sir George Paish's economic friends may well be able to decree what England and the British West Indies, and their people will do. But there is still a great deal of difference in the theory of democracy as seen through English and American eyes. We have given, as yet, no authority to any man or any small clique of ministers, with or without portfolios, to sell out even paper assets or old warships for 99 years of increasing liabilities and international complications. We can share the North American Continent with Canadians, ancestrally (for Canada is a dominion, not a colony), and we are good neighbors, and we each have clear title to our own property. But we can't share British West Indian islands successfully as tenants of London's often changeable but always self-centered Colonial Office.

Un-American Activities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HOLDEN TINKHAM

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 25, 1940

LETTER TO THE HONORABLE MARTIN DIES FROM MRS. JAMES CUNNINGHAM GRAY, OF BOSTON, MASS., WITH AFFIDAVIT

Mr. TINKHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and affidavit from Mrs. James Cunningham Gray, of Boston, Mass.:

BOSTON, MASS., *June 23, 1940.*

Hon. MARTIN DIES,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. DIES: It has been called to my attention that on page 2386 of volume 3 of the hearings of the Committee on Un-American Activities, House of Representatives, and on the testimony of John C. Metcalfe, that my name is listed as being present at a "national confederation" in 1936 of a group of Americans who met, according to your report, at Asheville, N. C.

I request that you kindly retract this statement, as it is absolutely false.

I did not attend any "confederation" at Asheville, N. C. Never heard of such a "confederation" and was never in Asheville, N. C., in my life. My name was used without my permission or knowledge.

I am a patriotic American citizen, proud of the country in which I live, and proud of the early history of my forebears who fought and died to make this great country what it is.

For the sake of accuracy of your own report and in justice to myself, I ask the privilege of making a sworn statement, to go into your report as well as the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

That a false statement of this sort against a patriotic citizen can get into a Government report is an amazing fact.

I will appreciate an early reply.

Sincerely for America,

GRACE GRAY.
(Mrs. James Cunningham Gray).

AFFIDAVIT OF MRS. GRACE GRAY, OF BOSTON, MASS.

Whereas my attention has been called to the fact that on page 2386 of volume 3 of the hearings of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, House of Representatives, my name is listed as being present at a national confederation in 1936 at Asheville, N. C.; and

Whereas the testimony of one John C. Metcalfe to this effect is untrue;

Now therefore, I, Grace Gray (Mrs. James Cunningham Gray), of Boston, county of Suffolk, and Commonwealth of Massachusetts, on oath depose and say that I did not attend any meeting of any confederation at Asheville, N. C.; that I have no knowledge of any such confederation; that I have never been in Asheville, N. C., in my life; and that if my name has been used as a member of any such confederation or group, it has been used without my knowledge or consent.

I further depose and say that I am not a member of any group or organization engaged in subversive or un-American activities of any nature.

GRACE GRAY.

Tinkham on the Monroe Doctrine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 25, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE BOSTON SUNDAY POST

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Boston Sunday Post of August 18, 1940:

[From the Boston Sunday Post of August 18, 1940]

TINKHAM ON THE DOCTRINE

Our sturdy Representative from the Tenth Congressional District is noted for his long-sustained crusades for the retention of fundamental rights.

He, GEORGE HOLDEN TINKHAM, has let his record in Congress supplant campaigns for reelection.

In this he has been uniformly successful. He has been able to hunt lions in Africa while aspirants to his seat have hunted flaws in his record.

Now he is off on another issue and, while it has not yet become a dominant question before the Congress, his persistent voice eventually will be heard, for it deals with a forgotten tenet of American foreign policy, but one which cannot be long denied.

Mr. TINKHAM recognizes, as do all Americans, that about the only consistent doctrine we have ever followed in our relations with regard to the rest of the world was that enunciated by President Monroe in 1823.

This Monroe Doctrine was the result of the communication of the then foreign secretary of Great Britain, George Canning, to the American minister in London, Richard Rush.

Canning suggested that Great Britain and the United States issue a joint declaration of policy to the effect that recovery of Spain's American colonies, then independent, in the Western Hemisphere was hopeless and that neither Great Britain nor the United States could see with indifference the acquisition of these colonies by any other power or powers.

President Monroe deliberated over this message with John Quincy Adams and others and, December 2, 1823, he sent a message to Congress which embodied Canning's idea but eliminated Great Britain as an active partner.

The message took the form of two broad delineations of national policy.

The first of these is that we will not tolerate conquest of present Western Hemisphere nations by outside powers, or any further colonization.

The second part has been forgotten and, since 1917, ignored.

This part is the one which deals with noninterference with the internal affairs of Europe and the relations of European nations with each other.

Congressman TINKHAM decided some months ago that, with the growing importance of the Monroe Doctrine as a protection against foreign military footholds, the other part of it should be revived.

Monroe said, "Our policy in regard to Europe remains the same, which is, not to interfere with the internal concerns of any of its powers; to consider the government de facto as the legitimate government for us; to cultivate friendly relations with it, and to preserve these relations by a frank, firm, and manly policy, meeting in all instances, the just claims of every power, submitting to injuries from none * * *."

He goes further and says, "In the wars of the European powers in matters relating to themselves we have never taken any part,

nor does it comport with our policy to do so. It is only when our rights are invaded or seriously menaced that we resent injuries or make preparation for our defense."

To show violations of this part of the doctrine, Mr. TINKHAM has reviewed the entire foreign policy of the past few years, starting with the attempt to embargo oil to Italy during the Ethiopian conquest.

He mentions other violations such as the subsidization of China in the Japanese war, the President's quarantine speech, the sending of officials to Czechoslovakia to back up England's agenda; the Reconstruction Finance Corporation's loan to Finland, and other utterances and acts.

The attitude of the administration on this portion of the doctrine has been that it is impossible for the United States to remain aloof in the world of today; that after aggressor nations accomplish domination of the European continent they will assault us.

In view of the latter conviction, the administration feels that it is up to us to place as many obstructions as possible in the way of victory of the dictatorships and to aid their enemies as much as possible, short of war itself.

Thus it can be seen that Mr. TINKHAM'S proposed revival of the long-dead noninterference clause of the doctrine is at odds with the present policy.

It will remain to see which will prevail, or if the revival comes too late. But it is axiomatic of the TINKHAM system that he clings to his principles with bulldog tenacity and a parliamentary skill born of honest convictions and long experience.

If the future is anything like the past, he will stick to his guns so ardently that the issue will never be forgotten.

The Naval Academy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LANSDALE G. SASSCER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 25, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE EVENING CAPITAL, ANNAPOLIS, MD.

Mr. SASSCER. Mr. Speaker, our United States Naval Academy, located at Annapolis, is one of our most historic and efficient educational institutions. It has been for many years one of the strongest contributing factors to our national defense.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Evening Capital of Annapolis, under date of September 17, 1940.

This editorial sets forth effective and logical reasons why there should be no dismantling of the functions performed at the Naval Academy, and gives practical justifications for the extension of the present facilities.

[From the Evening Capital, Annapolis, Md., of September 17, 1940]

KEEP DOWN TO EARTH

The proposal to establish a second naval academy on San Francisco Bay, with an initial appropriation of $10,000,000, now pending in Congress, is just another example of faulty reasoning under the stress of strengthening the national defense.

With all the hysteria abroad in the world today it is essential that all public officials and particularly Congress keep down to earth and be sure that the huge sums being spent for national defense go to bolster points of weakness.

It is but natural that Representative TOLAN, of California, might conceive it valuable to his State to have another naval academy on the west coast. But is it valuable to the Nation?

The matter has been discussed many times in the past, and the general consensus of opinion has been against the proposal. Nothing has happened to change this viewpoint.

Many intangible things play a part in the effectiveness of a fleet and one of the strongest is tradition. Since the Naval Academy was established in Annapolis tradition has grown through the years. The youthful plebe imbibes it during his first year. The battle flags in the museum, monuments on the grounds, tales of prowess on athletic fields, the silent dow of bronze tablets in Memorial Hall, speaking with vigor, despite their silence, tell a story of men who have died to make the Navy great.

In this cradle of the Navy this tradition becomes a part of the character of the midshipman—it creeps into his mind and heart—and in time of stress, when his great hour arrives, it serves as a torch leading to correct decision.

One has only to picture Commodore Dewey heading into Manila Bay and having in his mind the question "What would Farragut do?" to place a proper value on tradition. The great fleet of England, sweeping the seas of its enemies, is held together by the deeds of the men who battled the Armada, the achievements of the immortal Nelson and hundreds of others whose lives are linked with the present by an invisible bond.

No, you cannot found a new Naval Academy and build this spirit, this tradition, with stone and iron. It takes lives, blood, and time—particularly time.

The proper training of the naval officer cannot be had in duplicate institutions. The midshipmen must live together, study together, absorb the same background in the same way, so that when they become officers they will be interchangeable gears in the great machine that is the United States Navy. There must be uniformity of training and thinking, more than in any other profession.

Two Naval Academies, functioning under different Superintendents, could not be synchronized. Differences would inevitably creep in, different traditions would grow in the two schools and eventually there would be two groups of officers, fundamentally strangers to each other. They would lack that common knowledge of the basic life at the academy which now knits the officers corps into one.

Inevitably with two institutions, the tendency of clique rule would have to be faced. Human beings, built as they are, tend to have those they know around them. This would be bad for the fleet. This clique rule could start in athletic rivalry—harmless in itself—but nothing could keep it from extending into the fleet. Even to risk it might be fatal on a day when the salvation of the Nation may depend on harmonious action of all.

Aside from these reasons it is a waste of money to found a new institution. The present Naval Academy has cost about $30,000,000 to construct. A start from scratch on the west coast would soon boost the original $10,000,000 asked to a much greater sum.

More could be achieved and the Nation better served if $10,000,000 was allocated the present academy for enlargement. Then the existing plant would be able to expand to take care of all demands of a two-ocean Navy.

Congress Is Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OSCAR YOUNGDAHL

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 25, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE MINNEAPOLIS TRIBUNE

Mr. YOUNGDAHL. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Minneapolis Morning Tribune of Monday, September 23, 1940:

[From the Minneapolis Morning Tribune of September 23, 1940]

CONGRESS IS NEEDED

Again an effort is being made to reach agreement on adjournment of the present Congress. If the Senators and Representatives want to abdicate all the power of the legislative branch in this time of emergency, they can adjourn and leave everything to the President. That would not be in the line of duty, for the time more than ever demands that all the functions of government continue in operation.

Members are anxious to get home, not to rest but to campaign. Their impatience is understandable. Their political fences need attention. Yet the best campaigning a Congressman can do today is to stay faithfully on the job at Washington.

In an ordinary year Congress might well have quit work in June, when Mr. Roosevelt opined that further session could serve no purpose except the "laudable" one of making speeches. The country was of different mind, and Congress stayed on. Since the President's effort to hand Congress its hat, he has called on it for another $5,000,000,000 for defense, has demanded and obtained the conscription bill, and several other measures important to the defense program.

There was fear last June that with Congress out of the way, the President would push the country immediately into war. Congress remained in Washington to serve as a check on Executive rashness. It has cooperated to the full in the preparedness program, and has been much more amenable to the President's will than before. Still Congress retains its power as a coordinate branch of the Government, and there is quite as much reason for keeping that power alive as there was in the early summer.

Congress still has important business on its calendar, such as the Walter-Logan bill for regulating the power of boards and bureaus, and amendment of the Wagner Act. It could slow down activity and still take care of pending business in the next month or so. Recesses of a week or two would do no harm, but if the Houses adjourn now, the legislative branch of the Government will suspend until next January, barring a special-session call by the President. Four months that lie ahead may be packed with action and with emergencies greater than we have had since June. The Seventy-sixth Congress should not quit.

National Unity Means National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED. V. IZAC

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 25, 1940

Mr. IZAC. Mr. Speaker, for some time I have been making a study of the subject of national unity as an adjunct of national defense.

When the Dies committee was first authorized I feared that the policy of its chairman would hinder rather than enhance national unity. I believe these fears have been justified by subsequent events.

We must not forget that America is a melting pot into which has poured a steady stream of varied populations for 150 years. We are all products of this blend of nationalities, and most of us love to be known as Americans. It is true that there lingers in the minds of many just a trace of racial pride and racial consciousness—a pride of origin which is inherent in the human race. And I believe we cannot hope to make a better and a stronger nation if we permit attacks by some on those whose origin is different from their own.

Some of the finest citizens in our country are here because of the revolutions in Europe during the middle period of the nineteenth century—as for instance that liberty-loving and freedom-seeking group of German blood who came to this country during the German revolution of 1848. No finer citizens are to be found here than these pioneers and their descendants of today.

Now we hear there are nearly 4,000,000 aliens in our country and of course at times like these many become suspicious of all who cannot show a naturalization certificate. But I find from my own observations that many of these so-called aliens are more patriotic than some who have achieved citizenship. I find, and these facts are corroborated by the Department of Justice, that many aliens have erroneously believed that they were citizens. This is often due to: First, the alien or his father may have voted in a State which granted this privilege to those who had made their declarations of intention; second, some children have erroneously believed that their fathers were naturalized before the children reached the age of 21 years; or third, the father may have died before final papers were issued and the children thought that he was a cititzen.

Some, particularly older persons, feel that the naturalization procedure is too complicated. A few are unable to speak English, as required by statute. Some find the required filing fees difficult to meet for economic reasons.

I believe, however, that if we should appraise the degree of patriotism with which one is imbued on the basis of citizenship we should be making a grave mistake. Of the 5,160,864 immigrants who have come into this country since the World War only some 2,000,000 have become naturalized. Does that mean that there are 3,000,000 disloyal to our institutions? Certainly not, because investigation by the Federal Bureau of Investigation proves that most of the leaders of groups such as Fritz Kuhn who advocate foreign political and religious philosophies have already become naturalized citizens and therefore cannot be called aliens.

As I delved deeper into this problem I came upon more facts. In the last decade 1931 to 1940 our immigration rate into the United States has been only one-tenth of the preceding 30 years. Yet there have been established more foreign and un-American groups than in any similar period in our history. So this leads to but one conclusion. And that is that during the past 8 or 10 years there has been a movement of foreign origin to build up an organization to espouse a certain philosophy and thus aid a cause inimical to our own best interests. And this is being built around a nucleus of not aliens, not social outcasts, but of American citizens.

So when we blast in the press and from the rostrum against the aliens in our midst and thereby bring suffering and disgrace to many innocent people we are completely missing the mark.

I am now positive in my own mind that for the last several years there has been an organized effort on the part of Hitler to build up in this country an auxiliary which would come to his rescue at the crucial moment. He has sent his emissaries who waste no time in taking out citizenship papers. Most of these immigrants have served in the German Army. He did the same thing in Holland, Belgium, Denmark, and Norway. With this "fifth column," as it is now designated, the field of resistance was smoothed in those countries. Here in America the bund, headed by Hitler's agents, grows and grows, adding citizens and aliens alike, until such time as it becomes strong enough to dispute with democracy the advantages of totalitarianism.

Mr. Speaker, I have watched the technique employed by Hitler in those countries his armies have already conquered. He secretly plants in each country a sizeable nucleus of army personnel whose duty it is to contact Germans already in the victim land and with them to form a "fifth column." On the eve of the invasion this group seizes all communications facilities such as telegraph and telephone exchanges and radio stations; all utilities such as gas, electricity, and water-distribution systems; all transportation systems, or at least the essential and strategic points thereof; municipal and government headquarters and offices, including the ministries of war and navy; and the principal newspaper offices and news bureaus. With these in his hands the invaded nation falls an easy victim to the invader.

If there is no other way to avoid suspicion at the large number of strangers entering the friendly countries, Hitler attaches his secret army to the various German consulates and embassies where they are protected in their spying and scheming under the cloak of diplomatic immunity; and if they are not numerous enough for the work in hand the needed number is dropped at the proper moment by parachutes from invading planes.

So it is with this knowledge and to anticipate some of the moves directed at the United States that I have introduced certain bills which I give here in detail and for which I ask the consideration of Congress. The first, H. R. 10492, which will limit the number of "fifth columnists" under the guise of diplomatic attachés is as follows:

A bill limiting number of diplomatic or consular officers or attachés accredited to and maintained in the United States by any foreign power

Be it enacted, etc., That hereafter the total number of diplomatic or consular officers or attachés accredited to and maintained in the United States by any foreign power may, in no case, exceed the number of such officers or attachés accredited by the United States to and maintained in such foreign country.

The second, H. R. 10446, which will prevent information of ship movements and other information of military or naval value from reaching potential enemies is as follows:

A bill disqualifying any member of the Communist Party, the German-American Bund, or certain other organizations for licensing as operator of any radio station on any ship of the United States

Be it enacted, etc., That title III of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"DISQUALIFICATION OF OPERATORS

"SEC. 363. (a) No license as operator of any station on any ship of the United States shall be issued under this act to any person who at the time of application for such license is, or at any time prior thereto has been, a member of the Communist Party, the German-American Bund, or of any organization subject to foreign control which engages in political activity.

"(b) The Commission shall, subject to the provisions of section 303 (m) (2), suspend the license of any operator, insofar as such license authorizes the operation of any station on any ship of the United States, upon proof sufficient to satisfy the Commission that the licensee is, or at any time has been, a member of the Communist

Party, the German-American Bund, or of any organization subject to foreign control which engages in political activity.

"(c) For the purposes of this section—

"(1) an organization shall be deemed to 'engage in political activity' if the purpose or aim, or one of the purposes or aims, of such organization is the establishment, control, conduct, seizure, or overthrow (either immediately or at some specified or unspecified time in the future) of Government in the United States, or of any State or political subdivision thereof; and

"(2) an organization shall be deemed 'subject to foreign control' if (A) such organization limits its membership to individuals who are not citizens of the United States, or limits its membership in such a manner that at least a majority of its members are individuals who are not citizens of the United States, or (B) such organization solicits or accepts financial contributions, loans, or support of any kind, directly or indirectly, from, or is affiliated directly or indirectly with, a foreign government or a political subdivision thereof, or an agent, agency, or instrumentality of a foreign government or political subdivision thereof, or a political party in a foreign country, or any international political organization, or (C) such organization's policies, or any of them, in relation to its political activities are determined by or at the suggestion of, or in collaboration with, a foreign government or political subdivision thereof, or an agent, agency, or instrumentality of a foreign government or political subdivision thereof, or a political party in a foreign country, or an international political organization."

And the third, H. R. 10520, which will cancel the citizenship of those immigrants who have come here for the express purpose of aiding foreign governments against the land that gives them sanctuary is as follows:

A bill to provide for cancelation of citizenship in the case of certain naturalized citizens of the United States

Be it enacted, etc., That any naturalized citizen of the United States shall be considered to have given cause for the cancelation of his citizenship if such naturalized citizen at any time within 20 years of his admittance into the United States advocates, or is a member of or affiliated with any organization or group that advocates, the substitution of a totalitarian form of government for the constitutional democratic form of government of the United States.

SEC. 2. It shall be the duty of the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation to secure information relating to acts and circumstances described in section 1, and, in any case where a naturalized citizen has given cause for cancelation of his citizenship, to certify the facts to the Attorney General for the institution of an appropriate proceeding in any court of the United States having jurisdiction of naturalization of aliens, within whose jurisdiction such individual resides or may be found, for the cancelation of citizenship of such individual, and such court shall have jurisdiction to cancel such citizenship. Any individual whose citizenship is so canceled shall be ineligible thereafter to become a citizen of the United States.

Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, national unity will never be attained in this country by attacking those among us who love America but who do not agree fully with all our views. But national unity and therefore national defense can best be served by taking such steps as I have outlined to prevent the agents of foreign powers from betraying America to the totalitarian dictators.

Agricultural Subsidies to the Average Farmer Are Small

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. REID F. MURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 25, 1940

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, the farm problem of the United States is one that has caused diligent study by many of the leading men of our Nation.

The farmer asks only for a fair consideration of his problem. He asks, and is entitled, to the same benefits of legislation that are accorded other groups. Equality to the farm people should not be complicated if the rest of society wishes to extend this equality.

As long as we have 10,000,000 unemployed people in this country, labor and business have a problem. As long as banks are filled with unused funds, all society has a problem.

FARM PROBLEMS

The Federal Farm Board has had $500,000,000 to stabilize the prices of farm crops and of this amount $175,000,000 have been recovered. The present farm program has distributed over $3,000,000,000 but the farmers' share of the public debt has been increased $6,000,000,000. As the public debt increases, likewise there is an increase in the invisible farm mortgage on every acre of land in this country. The New Deal has put a $1,000 invisible mortgage on every farm in the United States. In terms of cropland only, every billion-dollar increase in the public debt represents 75 cents per acre mortgage.

The following table shows the payments under A. A. A. programs for 1936–39 in Wisconsin and the average payment received by each county during the period 1936–39:

County	Payment	Average per county per year
Adams	$228,343.26	$57,085.82
Ashland	109,217.96	27,304.49
Barron	1,006,794.92	251,698.73
Bayfield	143,221.51	35,805.38
Brown	682,165.03	170,541.26
Buffalo	727,693.02	181,923.25
Burnett	286,367.62	71,591.91
Calumet	352,819.31	88,204.83
Chippewa	918,420.23	229,605.06
Clark	1,047,831.90	261,957.98
Columbia	1,185,532.71	296,383.18
Crawford	518,765.41	129,691.35
Dane	2,086,667.39	521,666.85
Dodge	917,619.96	229,404.99
Door	450,538.00	112,634.50
Douglas	184,440.83	46,110.21
Dunn	1,086,214.65	271,553.66
Eau Claire	627,328.13	156,832.03
Florence	65,731.64	16,432.91
Fond du Lac	767,713.14	191,928.29
Forest	72,089.61	18,022.40
Grant	1,630,532.86	407,633.22
Green	851,175.01	212,793.75
Green Lake	413,353.16	103,338.29
Iowa	880,554.07	220,138.52
Iron	33,176.06	8,294.02
Jackson	692,376.06	173,094.02
Jefferson	758,560.66	189,640.17
Juneau	562,020.15	140,505.04
Kenosha	163,538.59	40,884.65
Kewaunee	422,487.30	105,621.83
La Crosse	429,703.26	107,425.82
Lafayette	1,036,703.68	259,175.92
Langlade	347,589.09	86,897.27
Lincoln	247,361.38	61,840.34
Manitowoc	738,534.80	184,633.70
Marathon	1,439,425.80	359,856.45
Marinette	380,763.80	95,190.95
Marquette	304,838.29	76,209.57
Milwaukee	129,055.89	32,263.98
Monroe	751,801.69	187,950.43
Oconto	566,766.64	141,691.46
Oneida	100,218.73	25,054.48
Outagamie	889,106.98	222,276.75
Ozaukee	238,451.99	59,613.00
Pepin	250,015.64	62,503.91
Pierce	696,673.74	174,168.43
Polk	770,193.50	192,548.38
Portage	814,288.05	203,572.01
Price	160,053.59	40,013.40
Racine	246,640.48	61,660.12
Richland	495,697.19	123,924.30
Rock	1,264,372.57	316,093.14
Rusk	291,057.99	72,764.50
St. Croix	1,097,271.41	274,317.85
Sauk	1,014,400.48	253,600.12
Sawyer	95,860.28	23,965.07
Shawano	778,580.91	194,645.23
Sheboygan	634,649.58	158,662.40
Taylor	374,670.66	93,667.67
Trempealeau	984,206.95	246,051.74
Vernon	826,719.71	206,679.93
Vilas	28,229.09	7,057.27
Walworth	909,402.76	224,850.69
Washburn	196,740.88	49,185.22
Washington	576,788.87	144,197.22
Waukesha	556,122.49	139,030.62
Waupaca	819,067.59	204,766.90
Waushara	575,705.93	143,926.48
Winnebago	468,356.63	117,089.16
Wood	577,272.69	144,318.17
Total	42,976,651.83	10,744,162.96

Number of farms in Wisconsin, 199,877.

Average A. A. A. and parity payments, $10,744,162.

Average A. A. A. and parity payments for 1936–39, $51.

Average A. A. A. and parity payments, 1934–39, $39.

Average A. A. A. and parity payment per county, 1934–39, $157,320.

One insurance company in 1937 received $257,000 in A. A. A. payments; one corporation farm received $112,000 in 1938 and $122,000 in 1939.

Farmers' checks of $39 average are more than offset by the increased hidden taxes of the New Deal and by the decreased farm income of the New Deal.

Dairy products average 25 to 30 percent below the pre-New Deal prices.

From a careful study and consideration of all the problems involved, the following deductions are made:

First. Agriculture is entitled to subsidies as long as other groups are subsidized. We must remember that tax-exempt bonds are a subsidy to capital.

Second. We should not have a program that promises money to our people when there is not anything left in the United States Treasury to promise them.

Third. We must have a pay-as-you-go program.

Fourth. We must realize that all the subsidies so far granted are still a part of the public debt and must be repaid with interest when the great day of reckoning comes. It may appear that Peter is being robbed to pay Paul, but Peter and Paul will both be robbed if the Budget of the Federal Treasury is not balanced.

Fifth. The most fertile and productive farm can be depleted of its fertility and still have the owner receive checks under the guise of soil conservation.

Sixth. We cannot continue to subsidize one-third of our crops at the expense of the rest of the producers. Cotton farmers alone have had 69 percent of the parity payments and one State, Texas, has had 27 percent of the parity money in 1 year.

Seventh. We cannot continue to subsidize each farm $175 or more each year in some States and subsidize the farmers in other States with an average of $7 and have such a program in the realm of common sense or common justice.

Eighth. We must have an agricultural objective, which objective for social and economic reasons should be the largest possible number of farms owned and operated by the owner.

Ninth. We must realize that subsidy checks, to be of material benefit, must reach the hands of the real farm people of our country. In 1937, one insurance company alone received $257,000 on its farms. This is more than the average payments received by all the farmers in the average county of the United States.

Tenth. It is time to realize that the farmers of this country are being deceived when they are promised moneys that can only be given them by continual borrowing and increasing the public debt. This is equally true of other groups of our society in the promises made them.

Eleventh. The American farmer is entitled to the American market insofar as he is able to produce and supply this market and American labor is entitled to this same consideration. Any other program would be for the benefit of the few at the expense of the many. The fact that 25 to 50 percent of the Federal loans are delinquent and the fact that the farm prices are being maintained at such low levels is evidence that we must have a more fair and just approach to the farm problem of this country.

Twelfth. A program that is fair to all farmers must be evolved and this can be accomplished without Federal domination. The philosophy of the McNary-Haugen and the so-called cost-of-production bills are still much fairer approaches to this problem than the cross-purpose schemes of the New Deal.

Address by Hon. Henry T. Wickham to Virginia Legislature

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 19, 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. HENRY T. WICKHAM

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an address made to the joint assembly of the State Senate and the House of Delegates of Virginia on February 23, 1940, by the Honorable Henry T. Wickham, president pro tempore of the Senate of Virginia.

Senator Wickham is 90 years of age. He served in the State Senate of Virginia more than 50 years ago. He is one of the most loved of all Virginians, having the confidence and respect of the entire State. He is the only living Virginian who was taught by Gen. Robert E. Lee at the institution later known as Washington and Lee University after the War between the States.

His address is so illuminating that I ask the privilege of its insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Hon. Ashton Dovell, speaker of the house of delegates, introduced Senator Wickham, as follows:

"Mr. President, Your Excellency, and gentlemen of the joint assembly, we are met to do honor to a distinguished Virginian, and at the same time to witness the enactment of a scene without parallel in the memory of those present.

"With the poet, the solemnity of this occasion and the contribution which our distinguished patron and fellow member is to make, makes us pause, and feel that 'deep within us somewhere there is a something that stirs at times and breathes upon the dying embers of the soul and fans it into flame.'

"Today we see it touching the stringed instrument called the mind and producing another note of genius. It is what we look upon as the divine within us. It is the power that ever urges us upward and onward along the path that no man sees. It has given us the iron roadway, the belted wheel, the churning screw, and the wings of canvas which now beat the air and add the highways of the eagle to human paths.

"Out there in the hills it has builded every home, and here on the coastal plane it has touched the spark on every hearth. It is the spirit of the pioneer, of the individual; it is what has made Virginia great.

"Today, Hanover is proud, and all Virginia is honored. We are met to greet another of Hanover's sons, one who has lived the span reaching from the dark period following the War between the States to the present hour when war clouds hover once more—a man who has seen the past, who is heartily in love with the present, and who faces the future with vigor and is unafraid.

"The county of Hanover has made another great contribution, and the name of another Hanoverian is being written high on the scroll of Virginia's honored sons. You will not find in him any of the attributes of the demagog, or of the autocrat, for he is a simon-pure Democrat, possessed of rare courage and high honor, those virtues so preservative of all other virtues and, with it, the pride that belongs to a king and the simplicity of a shepherd, which bind him so everlastingly to the hearts of his comrades and associates in these halls and outside alike.

"After all, the contribution of great men, and the solution of great problems constitute Virginia's first claim to fame, and we are glad to acknowledge that like the contribution by the Grecian archipelago of Leonidas and Pericles, and the honor thus brought to Greece, Hanover has made a contribution of which she too may justly be proud. Our associate, the distinguished senator from Hanover, has the cosmopolitanism of a Jefferson, the penetrating analysis of a Marshall, and the patient wisdom of a Madison. Yes; he typifies the humbleness and fidelity of that great Virginian about whose life he will reminisce, Gen. Robert E. Lee.

"He is the patriarch of his people; yes, more than that, he is the patriarch of this body, and whatever the future may hold for Virginia, he has made a contribution that challenges every living Virginian. He knows that States may fail and a complete centralization prove to be the wisdom of the future, but that the poetry of life will still find its home in the old order, and that those,

like Senator Wickham, who love Virginia best, will live longest in song and legend, song yet unsung and legend not yet crystalized.

"Gentlemen of the joint assembly, will you arise:

"Senator Henry Taylor Wickham, I have the honor to present to you the General Assembly of Virginia, in joint session."

SENATOR WICKHAM'S ADDRESS BEFORE THE JOINT ASSEMBLY

His Excellency, the Governor of Virginia, Mr. Speaker, Mr. President, my colleagues—may I be permitted to say my dear colleagues—of the general assembly, ladies and gentlemen, I greatly appreciate the high honor of your invitation to address the assembly and to recall some personal recollections of Gen. Robert E. Lee and the Arlington family.

Some explanation is due to account for the circumstance that I myself happen to have recollections of them.

My grandmother, Mrs. Anne Carter Wickham, died on February 25, 1868. On the 4th of March, 1868, General Lee wrote my grandfather a letter. Here it is—I will read it:

LEXINGTON, *March 4, 1868.*

MY DEAR MR. WICKHAM: I grieve most deeply over the great sorrow that has fallen upon you and your house. Death, in its silent, slow march, is fast gathering those whom I have longest loved, so that when he shall knock at my door I will more willingly follow.

She whom we mourn is among those who I have longest and most dearly loved. She was the favorite of my mother, the object of my boyish affection. In the long years of manhood, she has always lived in my memory. And the farthest recollection of her brings me nothing but pleasure.

May He who has dealt the blow in mercy temper its affliction, and enable us to say, Thy will be done.

Yours in true friendship,

R. E. LEE.

Mr. WM. F. WICKHAM.

There was intimacy between the families of Arlington and Hickory Hill. Sometimes in her periodic visits to Arlington my grandmother would take me with her. I remember my first visit, which made a deep impression upon me. I was between 5 and 6 years old and had rarely been away from home. The great pillars at Arlington, the view of the river and the distant city were wonderful to me. I had never seen such a sight before. General Lee was away. The elder children were away. Mrs. Lee and her younger children and some of their young friends comprised the family. I was much younger, was country bred, and did not know any of their games, and was esteemed trundle-bed trash. In fact, I was a rank outsider. General Lee had given his children two Mexican mustang ponies. Their names were Mexique and Santauna. When they were brought out, I took heart of grace, for my grandfather had given me a little horse, and I could ride literally almost by the time I could walk. So, when my turn came, I scrambled upon either Mexique or Santauna, and thinking to "show off," jerked the bridle. Instead of "showing off" the pony t ok the bit in his teeth and ran away down the slope toward the stable, stopped short with his forelegs stiff, and I ignominiously went right over his head, to the consternation of the grown-ups and the wild hilarity of the youngsters. Greatly disheveled, I rejoined the group pleading anxiously for another chance. I knew my grandmother was always ready to give me another chance.

I remember the first time I saw General Lee. Whenever he was stationed in Washington or on furlough it was his custom to take the boat at Alexandria for Aquia Creek; there he would take the train for Taylorsville, where he would be met by a conveyance from Hickory Hill, where he would spend the night and next morning be forwarded to the White House, where he would stay for such time as his business required, and then return to Hickory Hill, spend the night, and next morning be forwarded to Taylorsville on his way home.

Now, my grandmother had frequently told me about Robert Lee, what a splendid man he was; what a great soldier he was; and what he had done in the Mexican War. I never saw him in uniform. His clothes were just like what grandpapa and papa wore. While I did not doubt for a moment what grandma said, yet I wondered. Some friend had given me a boy's book called the Rifle Rangers, describing the adventures of a certain young Captain Haller, who had in fact won the Mexican War. In the confidence of youthful ignorance, I believed this book to be true history Was it not in print, and I could read it. One morning while we were waiting for breakfast I rather timidly took this book, showed it to General Lee, and asked if he knew Captain Haller. He took the book, looked at it, and returned it to me, and said he did not know Captain Haller. This was a great shock to me. Could it be possible that he could be the great soldier grandma said he was and not know Captain Haller? Just at that moment I received another shock. My little sister, just 2 years younger, came dancing into the room, and I became painfully aware of how greatly General Lee preferred the society of little girls to that of little boys. I do not recall seeing General Lee again until I reported as a student to him at Lexington in September 1865. But I did see members of the family many times, and it is difficult to disassociate in my recollection the general from the Arlington family.

John Parke Custis was the son of Mrs. Martha Washington, wife of General Washington, by her first husband, by whom she had four children—Elizabeth, who married Mr. Law; Martha, who married Thomas Peter; and Eleanor (Nelly), who married Lawrence Lewis. George Washington Parke Custis, son of John Parke Custis, married Mary Randolph Fitzhugh, and they were the parents of Mary Custis, wife of General Lee. Their children were Gen. G. W. P. Custis Lee, Gen. William Henry Fitzhugh Lee (Rooney), Mary Custis Lee, Anne Carter Lee, Agnes (Eleanor) Lee, Robert E. Lee, Jr., and Mildred Lee. Martha Custis, wife of Thomas Peter, was the sister of George Washington Parke Custis and aunt of Mrs. R. E. Lee. One of the daughters of Mr. and Mrs. Peter was named Martha. She was the first cousin of Mrs. Lee, and she married Capt. William G. Williams, United States Army, who was killed while leading a charge in the Battle of Monterey, Mexico. They had three children—Lawrence, William Orton, and Martha, known in the family as "Markee." These three children were the great nephews and great niece of Mr. Custis and second cousins of his grandchildren. Mr. Custis, after the death of Captain Williams, took their three children to Arlington and brought them up with his grandchildren. It was a gay and happy family. Fate smiled; not one realized that the finger of fate was about to write a tragedy unsurpassed by the Greek dramatists of old or that the little thread of my life would be woven in the web. Lawrence and "Markee" stayed with the North. Orton Williams and Agnes Lee were boy and girl sweethearts. Orton came South, and under the following circumstances I met Lawrence Williams.

On May 4, 1862, my father was desperately wounded at Williamsburg and was brought home. On May 27 occurred the battle of Hanover Court House, in which the Confederate forces were severely defeated. Part of them retreated by the River Road through Hickory Hill plantation. It was a memorable day for me. When the sounds of the fighting came near there was much excitement at the mansion. Unnoticed, I crept away to the brow of the hill and witnessed, from the distance of about a quarter of a mile, the last stand of the routed soldiers. Next morning a Federal scout tied his horse and came up the walk holding a piece of paper in his hand. My grandmother advanced to meet him, and I was with her. He said, "Is this Mrs. Anne Wickham?" She replied, "Yes." He said, "I want some of your good brandy." She asked, "How do you know I have any?" He said, "This note says so." She said, "Why, you wouldn't read a lady's letter." And he said, "Stop preaching, old woman, and bring me the brandy." She said, "If I bring you the brandy, will you go away?" and he said, "I will, if you bring it quick."

So she brought the brandy and he went away. Later in the day the Federal picket line was extended beyond Hickory Hill and Col. Lawrence Williams, who was in command of the picket line and who knew about us, and who had learned that a wounded officer was there, came to the house. Nothing could have exceeded his courtesy, and he later brought General McClellan's staff surgeon, who, after examination, said my father would die if the attempt to remove him was made, and took my father's parole as a prisoner of war. Lawrence Williams was young, handsome, and dashing. He had a way with children. He came several times and would make his horse, which was a very fine one, jump over the yard fence for our amusement.

After the seven days battles around Richmond Agnes Lee and Mrs. Lee paid us a little visit, and I rode with Agnes Lee over the battlefield of Hanover Court House. I do not recall seeing any of the Lees till December 1862. Shortly after the battle of Fredericksburg, December 13, 1862, Mrs. Lee and Agnes paid us quite an extended visit. My sister and myself each have independent clear memory of what happened at Hickory Hill. William Orton Williams (known in the family as Orton) was an officer on the staff of General Hood, who commanded the army of Tennessee. Learning that a battle was imminent, he got a furlough and served as a volunteer aide to General Lee at the Battle of Fredericksburg. After the battle he came to Hickory Hill and joined Mrs. Lee and Agnes there. He was handsome and charming. My sister remembers that his presents to Agnes were a pair of ladies' riding gauntlets and a riding whip. I remember about the horses being brought out and their cantering off from the gate. There is another reason for the accuracy of our recollection. Children have keen perception and find out much more than people think. Orton was in love with Agnes. It was the first romance of our lives. He was the Prince Charming and she the Sleeping Beauty that our fairy-tale book had made us acquainted with, and we became excited partisans of Prince Charming and believed the Sleeping Beauty would awake, and they would ride away together and live happily ever after. We could not understand it at all when one day after a long session in the parlor (from which we children had been warned to keep away) he came out, bade the family good-bye, and rode away alone. We could not understand it.

The next recollection I have of the Lees was just after the cavalry battle of Brandy Station which occurred on June 9, 1863, in which Gen. W. H. F. Lee was badly wounded. His wife was Charlotte Wickham, a daughter of the house, and she and Mrs. Lee, Agnes, and Mildred were on an extended visit to Hickory Hill. So it was decided to send him there, and on June 12 he arrived with his brother Robert, who was on his staff, in charge till his wound was healed. Robert brought with him the letter from General Lee to Charlotte, which he refers to in his recollections, but which Rev. J. William Jones records in full in his personal reminiscences, in which he says "Tell Cousin Anne I am rejoiced that Williams is unhurt, though pretty Lucy might like to see the ambulance driving up again. I want all the husbands in the field, and their wives at home encouraging them, loving them, and praying for them."

Time passed quickly. I was made generally useful running errands, and bringing hot water from the kitchen. As a reward,

I was permitted to stay in the room when his wounds were dressed. I saw a large hole where the bullet went in, but there were two holes some inches apart where parts of the bullet came out. This was strange. There was much discussion about the rules of civilized warfare. The northern cavalry had just been armed with a new weapon used for the first time at Brandy Station, the Spencer carbine, which had a soft-nosed bullet with a zinc cap on the back designed to become detached and remain in the wound and cause gangrene, blood poisoning, and death. This was fired so close that both the bullet and the zinc cap went through.

On the morning of June 26 we had just finished breakfast and were assembled on the front porch, when, as so graphically told by Robert Lee in his book, we saw a number of hostile cavalry come at full speed up the lawn. Robert ran to the office where his brother lay. Was told to make his escape. He ran across the yard and concealed himself in the great box bushes, where he saw his brother placed on a mattress and taken away in the carriage, a soldier on the box and a mounted guard surrounding him. That truly was a day that stands out in my recollection. The raiding party was led by Colonel Spear. He did not come to the house, but I remember hearing Mrs. Lee say she knew him when he was a sergeant in the Second United States Dragoons when General Lee commanded it. I recall the great dignity and calm of Mrs. Lee and the anguish of Charlotte, who had borne up during Fitzhugh's removal, but broke down afterward.

The purpose of Spear's raid was, in addition to the capture of General Lee, the destruction of the bridges across the South Anna River, about a mile north of Hickory Hill House. They were defended by a bridgehead fort of good size and strength; the garrison consisted of a North Carolina company of about 40 men commanded by Colonel Hargrave, who defended himself manfully, as stated in Colonel Spear's official report.

Spear's force consisted of 1,500 cavalry and a battery of artillery. My cousin, Frank Nelson, and I had long earnestly desired to own a revolver. We knew the only way to get them was from the body of a dead Yankee. When the sound of the firing ceased we thought our time had come, so we slipped away and proceeded toward the bridge. We had approached to about 400 yards of the bridge when a bugle sounded, and instantly we heard the zip! zip! zoo! of Minie bullets. That sound is unmistakable, and once heard is never forgotten. We did not get the revolvers, but retreated in great disorder, dodging behind the shocks of wheat until we reached the River Road, where we saw a large number of our colored people seated on the bank. We joined them and I saw the advance scouts; then the advance guard; then followed a number of soldiers on horseback, each with a dead Yankee on the pummel of the saddle, head hanging down on one side and feet on the other. Their blouses had slipped down and the wound and blood showed. Then followed the wagons commandeered from South Wales and Hickory Hill with the wounded. The Confederate dead were left with orders to the Negroes who did not join them to see to their burial. Then followed the battery and a strong rear guard. As the latter were passing, I saw a number of our colored people, men and women, get up from the bank, run alongside, grasp the hand of the horseman, swing up behind and go away. The large majority, however, stayed. Next morning Moses Napper and Scot Davis, who had been given to Charlotte by her grandfather when she was married, came back to the house and said that in the confusion they had slipped away, crossed the river, and taken the horses off to the big woods of New Design, and that when a scouting party of the Yankees had gone to the house at North Wales, where old uncle lived, and when they found the horses gone they got very rough and had beaten him, injuring him severely. Grandpa and grandma took the buggy and went over to see about him. He was in bed. The house servants were faithful. He was in no immediate danger. When they returned they told Mrs. Lee of his condition. She had written General Lee the details of the capture of their son, and she wrote again to the general, telling him of the treatment to which his old uncle had been subjected. In his reply, General Lee wrote, "The consequences of war are horrid enough at best, surrounded by all the ameliorations of civilization and Christianity. I am very sorry for the injuries done the family at Hickory Hill, and particularly that our dear old Uncle Williams, in his eightieth year, should be subjected to such treatment. But we cannot help it and must endure it." The Lees remained at Hickory till they went to the Hot Springs. On August 7, 1863, Mrs. Lee wrote this letter to my grandmother, extracts from which I will read:

"Hot Springs, August 7th, 1863.

* * * * * * *

"Tho you will not write to me, dear Cousin Anne, yet I know it gives you a great deal of trouble. I will be magnanimous and write to you, though I have not much to tell you that is pleasant.

"Poor Charlotte has been quite sick for the last week, with a doctor attending her. I have been truly grieved for her, especially as I am personally able to do so little for her, but she has her two servants, Annie Leigh, and the girls who attend to her. I am sorry, too, my dear Cousin, not to report to you a more decided improvement in myself. I find some little relaxation in my knees and do not sit down with quite as much pain and difficulty as when I was with you, but do not walk any better. I cannot scarcely expect a rapid change, but did hope by this time to be able to move about with some facility. I must wait and pray for this and for many other blessings that the Almighty sees fit to withhold.

"Tell Ma Fan [another daughter of the house] I got a sweet letter from Leigh, telling me all he knew about poor Orton. I have not yet replied to it; but if she should be writing, will she tell him I got it? I have heard since from his sister Martha, and she tells us she wrote to the Illinois chaplain who was with him and administered the communion, and he told her there was a letter written to us which was sent into the rebel lines, but which we never received. Markee got a few lines, his last words, which she transcribed for Agnes—'Do not believe that I am a spy. With my dying breath I deny the charge. Do not grieve too much for me. I believe in Jesus Christ, who came into the world to save sinners. Altho I die a horrid death, I will meet my fate with the fortitude becoming the son of a man whose last words to his children were, "Tell them I fell at the head of my column." I remain with love to my sisters, brother, and relatives, your devoted brother.' Poor Markee is nearly heartbroken, as well she may be, tho somewhat comforted by the letter received from that chaplain telling her how earnestly he prayed in his last hours for an interest in Christ. Even in this terrible death, which I do not believe at all merited, God may, in His mercy, have taken him from the evil to come. 'What we know not now we shall know hereafter.'

"And now I want you to tell Henry what a comfort his stick is to me. I lay it beside me on my bed every night and can pick up almost anything with it from the floor. Indeed, I could not get along at all without it; and should I be able to throw aside my crutches, it will aid me in walking, as it is very strong. He can get me a handsomer one against my return.

"I also received a letter last night from General Lee, dated August 2nd, in which he says the enemy laid down some pontoon bridges and 'crossed his cavalry and a large portion of his infantry. It seemed at first as if it was the advance of his army, and as I had not intended to deliver battle, I directed the cavalry to retire slowly before them, but to check their too-rapid progress. Finding later in the day that their army was not following, I ordered out the infantry and drove them back to the river. Our loss was small. I suppose they intend to push on to Richmond, but trust they will never reach there.'"

The terrible death of Orton Williams was a shock to Agnes from which she never recovered. She became very quiet and pensive in after life. I do not recall hearing her laugh, and when she smiled it seemed to me that she was looking beyond.

Returning to Mrs. Lee's letter of August 7, 1863, I note particularly what she said about Charlotte. The next deep impression made on me was Charlotte's death. She never recovered, gradually grew weaker, and died in December 1863. She pined for her husband, who was confined in Fortress Monroe as a hostage to be executed, if two prisoners in the Libby Prison, who were under sentence of death in retaliation for the execution of Confederate officers by General Rosecrans in Tennessee, were executed.

When Charlotte was dying, she longed for her husband. Her brother-in-law, Gen. Custis Lee, a general officer of equal rank, a son also of General Lee, and unwounded, went, by permission of President Jefferson Davis, under a flag to Gen. B. F. Butler, who was in command at Fortress Monroe, informing him of Charlotte's condition, and offering to be exchanged and to take his brother's place as hostage under sentence of death. Butler telegraphed this to President Lincoln, who replied that the fate of war had placed her husband in such a perilous position, and that he could not permit the substitution.

I do not recall any incident connected with the Lees in 1864. The character of the war changed entirely. Raids were very frequent, and behavior toward the family at Hickory Hill was frequently very rough. We were often within the enemy's picket lines, and the house and plantation looted. But this is another matter from the subject of this address.

In September 1864, being a well grown boy of 14, I was sent with my cousins, the Oakland boys, to Washington College, where I remained until after the surrender at Appomattox. Bread lines were formed in Lexington and my cousins and I determined to walk home. We did walk much of the way and were treated with the utmost kindness by the people of whom we asked food and lodging at night. Finally we got home, and I saw the desolation of Hickory Hill. And the despair. I remained at home until September 1865, when we heard that General Lee would be the president of Washington College. My parents, like many, many other parents denied themselves the bare necessities of life that I might go back to Lexington to be under him. When I went into his office, which was in the westernmost of the three large buildings, he did not know me, and asked my name. When I told him, he was very cordial and said his family had not arrived but would soon come and that I must feel at home with them, and especially that I should come frequently to take Sunday supper, where there would always be a place for me.

After they came I found myself very welcome. I ran in and out and went many times to Sunday supper during the 3 years I was a student under General Lee. General Lee was always grave. I do not recall ever to have heard him laugh, but he had a warm, affectionate, and charming smile.

He had a plenty of humor and was fond of teasing, especially his daughters about their beaux, and Mildred about her cats, one of which was named Sidney Baxter, after a very reverend and aged predecessor of General Lee in the presidency of the college. I have

many mementos of my associations with the Lees at that time, one of which is this letter which Agnes Lee sent me on my birthday, December 17, 1866. Here it is. I will read it:

"MY DEAR HENRY: I wish you had some of Annie's nice cake for your birthday, and hope this sample lunch will serve to make the day different from the others. I had thought of glass with a silver waiter, a scented note with Latin and Greek quotations, but, ahem, that will do for another occasion. I will wish you now in English alone many happy and studious returns of your birthday.

"Affec. your cousin,

"AGNES LEE.

"Dec. 17th, 1866."

She also gave me a photograph of herself, on the back of which I have pasted it.

I have referred to her smile. I wish you could see this photograph closely, "for on her face there is a smile, as holy, pure, and faint as lights in some cathedral aisle. The features of a saint." Here is a photograph of Mrs. Lee, given me by her while I was a student. I wish each one of you could see it, for it is unique.

I pause for a moment to ask Ebbie Combs, the clerk of the senate, whose record imports an absolute verity, to look at this photograph. I wish everyone could see it, but he can record your vote.

[Mr. Combs, taking the photograph, said, "It is signed Mary Custis Lee, and on the back are the words 'Colored for my dear Henry by his affectionate cousin, Mary C. Lee.' It is a beautiful picture of a very lovely and dear old lady."]

It is indeed a beautiful picture of a dear, dear old lady. The beauty of her soul and the happiness of her heart is reflected in the calm beauty of her face. The four and a half years she was with her husband in Lexington were the happiest years of her life. She gave me this memento because she wished me to remember her as she was.

Here is a photograph of General Lee and Traveller. General Lee is standing holding the bridle, both facing the camera. It is a rare picture, and General Lee signed it for me.

When I graduated, he handed to each member of the graduating class the diplomas. The night before I left I went to the house to take leave of him and the family. They all sent kind and affectionate messages to the family at Hickory Hill. That was the last time I saw General Lee, but I did see much of the family afterward, when various members visited Hickory Hill.

In September 1873, I was suffering from a severe attack of malaria. My sister and I were invited to pay a visit to Mrs. Lee. It was arranged that I should go, and my sister would come later. On September 21 Mrs. Lee wrote her, saying Agnes greatly desired to see her, and on October 1 Mrs. Lee wrote my sister and also my father saying that Agnes' condition had changed greatly for the worse and that my sister had best defer her visit. Here are the letters.

These are among the last Mrs. Lee ever wrote, for Agnes died on October 15, 1873 and Mrs. Lee died November 6, 1873.

I have often been asked my impressions of General Lee. He was always cheerful. He had a winning smile; but I never heard him laugh. He objected greatly to having Traveller's mane and tail snipped, which was frequently done by the girls for souvenirs, always to the General's indignation when he discovered the "snipping." I have often seen him ride Traveller to the baseball field where he would watch the game with interest.

General Lee had a remarkable faculty for recalling the name and the face. At a time when there were 400 students, when he would meet any one of them he would bow, and if he was not in a hurry he would pause, call the name, and make some kindly inquiry about the family.

I have been asked what impression General Lee made upon the student body. It is hard to describe it lest I be thought to exaggerate. But there was not a student who did not know about General Lee. In mental vision they pictured him as he stood on the hill at Fredericksburg in the moment of victory. They saw him as he rode Traveller to the front of his advancing battalions, where the cheers of his army rose high above the thunder of the cannon, the rattle of the musketry, the roar of the burning forest, and the shrieks of the wounded who were being burned alive in those fearful woods; they saw him at Gettysburg, where he said, "It is my fault"; they saw him that dreadful day when he spurred Traveller through the dense undergrowth at Spotsylvania to the head of the column, when the men caught the bridle and shouted, "Lee to the rear! We'll take the guns." And they did take the guns. They saw him in the trenches at Petersburg; they saw him on the hill above Sayler's Creek, where he formed in person his last line of battle; and they saw him at Appomattox. I will not say we worshipped General Lee, but there was a reverence too profound for utterance, and with that reverence there was a sympathy and a sorrow too deep for expression, causing an atmosphere in which we breathed the thought that "we must do what General Lee would wish us to do. Our fathers were his soldiers and obeyed his orders. We are his boys and must do what he would wish."

I saw a remarkable instance of this. I roomed in No. 78 North Dormitory with my cousin George T. Lee, a nephew of General Lee. The student I most admired was Gevens B. Strickler who roomed in No. 79. Both rooms opened directly on the campus. In 1861, he was a freshman and enlisted as a private in the Liberty Hall Volunteers, the college company, and fought through the war in the Stonewall brigade, becoming the captain of the college company. In 1865, he returned to the college in the sophomore class, of which I was a member. He was the best debater in the literary societies and the president of the Y. M. C. A. He and I were friends and we studied together between classes.

One day while we were so engaged, we heard the sounds of a disturbance on the campus and went out, and learned that some of the more venturesome students had gone downtown, gotten into a fuss with the guards of the "Freedman's Bureau," and had been badly beaten and put in jail. Rumor flies fast. The excited students poured from the classrooms, clamoring to be led to the rescue of their comrades. The 400 boys were out of hand. Strickler attempted no speech, but he went quickly among them. He kept saying, "Steady, men! Steady, men!" and I thought "Old G." felt he was back on the field of battle and the Liberty Hall volunteers were getting nervous. "Steady, men! Steady, men! Remember General Lee! No violence. Remember General Lee. Let the law take its course. You must do what General Lee would wish." After a while he quieted them and they dispersed to their several duties. I have never forgotten that scene.

One more "recollection" and I am done!

I have referred to my visit in September 1873. It was a sad visit. When I bade them goodbye, I wept and said I was close to the angels. During my visit I was told of General Lee's last moments. He came home from a protracted vestry meeting, where his last act was a contribution to the church. When he got back to the house, supper was on the table. Entering the room, he attempted to say grace, when his utterance failed and he was supported to his bed. For a few days he lingered, then lapsed into unconsciousness, and when the end came his devoted wife was by his side in her rolling chair holding his hand, and his son, General Custis Lee and his daughters, Agnes and Mildred, were by their mother. Just before the great soul left the body, he roused and murmured, "Tell A. P. Hill he must come up." And after a pause, he said, "Strike the Tent." No attempt to interpret these words has ever been given me by his family. Simply the words as stated.

Now I have heard many memorial addresses by most devout clergymen, and they, with the utmost reverence, likened his last words "Strike the tent" to the last words of the Saviour upon the cross at Calvary, "It is finished." I have never been able to accept this interpretation. General Lee's life was not finished. "Tell A. P. Hill he must come up" was an order. A battle order. An order anticipates action. So "Strike the Tent" was an order. An order requires action. No; I believe when he uttered those words that a vision of glory appeared before his closing eyes. A vision from the progress of the pilgrim. He heard a trumpet sound, and lo! a troop cometh, and encompassed by a cloud of witnesses a veteran pilgrim essays the flood. It is Valiant! It is our Valiant! It is Robert Lee himself! And as his feet entered the water he turned, and said to them upon the bank, "My sword I give to my successor; my skill and my courage to him who can get them, but my scars I take with me as evidence that I have fought the fight; that I have kept the faith." And just then a gentle voice from the bank exclaimed, "My husband, wait for me." And a soft, sweet, gentle voice called from the bank, "My father, wait for me." And he said, "I cannot wait, but you will come." So he passed over the river, and all the trumpets sounded for him on the other side, and soon, very soon, the tender feet of the saintly daughter brought her to the river's brink, and when she felt the water's icy chill she trembled, and angels came down from heaven and comforted her; and they upon the bank wept, and the sweetest singer in all our dear Southland lifted up her voice and sang the parting hymn:

"Ah! for the left; who can bear to miss,
Out of their lives this life, so rare,
Tender! so tender! an angel's kiss,
Hallowed it daily, unaware!
Gracious as sunshine; sweet as the dew,
Shut in a lily's golden core,
Fragrant with goodness, through and through,
Pure as the spikenard Mary bore,
Pensive as twilight! Calm as the dawn!
Agnes has gone."

She has gone to be the saint of the Daughters of the Confederacy. And then in a few days—very, very few days, the sorrowing wife passed the river. And the first to greet them on the other side was the beloved husband and father. And hand in hand they cross the green fields that lie beyond that swelling flood. And hand in hand they ascend that glorious stairway that leads to the coronation hall of heaven, and there they receive their crowns; their crowns of never-fading flowers, gathered from the margin of the river of their lives, and woven for their forehead by the angels in heaven, and there they hear the words, "Well done, good and faithful servants! Enter into the joy of our Lord!"

"Strike the Tent!" The battle flag is furled but the guidon is there, and it points the way; the way that leads to the firm foundation which was General Lee's favorite hymn. Strike the Tent! The battle flag is furled, but the guidon is still there, and it points the way. The way to a firm foundation, on which we can build a stronghold. A stronghold for our faith. A stronghold for our safe refuge. A stronghold where the wicked cease from troubling and the weary are at rest.

Strike the Tent.

"The General has gone forward." And we can follow him still.

Governor Price responded to Senator Wickham's address as follows: "Mr. Speaker, Mr. President, members of the general assembly, ladies and gentlemen: In rising to express the appreciation of this

joint assembly for the delightful address of the president of the senate on his recollections of the Lee family, I am deeply conscious of my inability to adequately execute the commission. It is perfectly evident from the remarks of the distinguished speaker that his contacts with this remarkable southern family have greatly enriched and inspired his career and that these early associations have proved a profound benediction to him.

"The very mention of the Lee family arouses in the breast of every true southerner a feeling of profound gratitude and reverence. It is to be hoped that the reminiscences which we have heard today will create a new interest in the great heritage which is ours and give us an increasing appreciation of our beloved Southland and the distinguished leaders who have immortalized it by sacrificial service. Nowhere in the world could this particular occasion be duplicated. Here in the capital of the Confederacy and in the General Assembly of Virginia we are permitted to listen to a student of General Lee and to have him give us a very touching account of the South's great leader.

"May I express our appreciation of the presence of so many guests who have come to join us in paying tribute to the illustrious son of Hanover County, the genial and capable president of the senate. Our best wishes go with him in his continued service to the old Commonwealth whose interests have always been so near and dear to his heart."

The Test of Americanism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH J. O'BRIEN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 25, 1940

ADDRESS BY J. EDGAR HOOVER

Mr. O'BRIEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of J. Edgar Hoover, Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation, before the Twenty-second Annual National Convention, American Legion, Boston, Mass., September 23, 1940:

The American Legion is an important bulwark of our national security. Today, your organization takes on an added significance in a period of emergency, when all real Americans are united in a determination to protect our Nation. Fortunately, the Nation can depend upon you. You have been proven in the crucible of experience.

In other lands, once free peoples are now subjected to the oppression of dictators. Fear and intolerance have taken the place of freedom, while force has become a dominant factor in world affairs. But of greater importance, American democracy once more is on trial. America must face facts. America must realize that the legions of force are making tremendous sacrifices for an ideal—an ideal which aims to destroy everything we hold dear. The people of the United States, in defense of their homes and their beliefs, must unite with that same singleness of purpose for which our forefathers fought in 1776 and for which many of your brothers-in-arms died in 1917.

From across the seas have come emissaries from totalitarian governments, seeking to undermine our nationalism and to implant their doctrines of hate. In spreading propaganda, these subversive forces have become more brazen. They have penetrated into every realm of decency, seeking allies in our schools, our churches, and our civic organizations. Ever on the alert to capitalize on popular trends, they have joined reform organizations and civil liberties groups, and have played dominant roles in some of the pacifist blocs. Wherever they go, they contaminate, because of the indifference and apathy of too many of our citizens. As a result, our America is at the crossroads.

The time has come when we must make a choice. We can either resolve to protect our temples of liberty, or we can go blindly along believing that all is well. If we follow the latter course, we will some day find our liberties suddenly blacked out by the tyranny of a foreign dictator.

Our people are accustomed to taking liberty for granted. As a result, they have ceased to think seriously about it. But the foes of America have much to say about it. They construe liberty as license, and clamor for even greater license. Liberty and license are as far apart as liberty and tyranny. License breeds tyranny.

In recent days, insidious forces have sought to obstruct our national preparedness program by proclaiming that the strengthening of our Army and Navy abrogates liberty. The Communists, the bundsmen, and their allies of totalitarianism are seeking to weaken America's defense. These traitors, who shout of liberty as they seek to destroy it, tell young people that they should refuse to take up their country's arms.

Americanism is on trial. Its real test lies in the ability of red-blooded Americans to meet and defeat the "fifth column" of destruction, which is already at work. A knowledge of the lurking menace is necessary. Also, there is need to avoid confusion if America is to remain strong. This can be achieved only through clear thinking and positive action. We must understand the problems of the day and how they can best be solved. We must understand that the priceless heritage of a free people is liberty. It is also their greatest achievement. But it must be rewon in each generation, through eternal vigilance and positive action.

Mere lip service to the letter of our democracy will not suffice. We need understanding, and we need a renewed dedication to the spirit of liberty. This will not be easy to do. For a people to remain free, they must be courageous, self-reliant, willing to face the storms of life. Liberty is for the strong in spirit, not for the weak.

Action is necessary to prevent the blood-stream of America from contamination. There can be no procrastination. That this situation exists is no reflection upon the sincerity of the American people, but it does demand that we think straight and seek the truth. In this, the American Legion has set the pace. The necessity for its program, scorned and ridiculed by the Communists and their fellow travelers, has been thoroughly established.

This Nation will be everlastingly indebted to you Legionnaires for your devotion to the principles of our democratic Government. Born of devotion and sacrifice, the American Legion is a reassuring force in the preservation of our internal security. There is a need for your program in every community in the land.

Designated by the President to head the Nation's attack against foreign spies, saboteurs, and subverters, the Federal Bureau of Investigation is proud of its close cooperation with your organization. As the present emergency intensifies, it is only natural that we should depend increasingly upon you for assistance. You have never relaxed your vigilance against the foes of democracy. But now the time has come for you to broaden your program. Ever on the alert to practice Americanism, you must now redouble your efforts to teach Americanism. In short, this means that we must again emphasize the fundamentals that have made America great.

It is a sad commentary indeed that the teaching of religion has been so sorely neglected, because Americanism finds its most lofty expression in terms of spiritual development. The Ten Commandments cannot be improved upon, nor can the Sermon on the Mount be surpassed as a guide for ethical conduct. Yet the godless forces of totalitarianism scoff at everything spiritual and religious. They have used every device at their command to place their mouthpieces upon lecture platforms and in educational institutions to expound in a subtle manner, at times with a veneer of patriotism, their un-American theories.

Intellectual freedom is American. Intellectual license and debauchery is un-American. In righteous indignation it is time to drive the debauchers of America out in the open, where their true purposes may be revealed.

If their motivations are sincere, but due to ignorance, they have no right to instruct in the mental and spiritual development of America's youth. And if they espouse foreign causes, then they should be stopped from further debauching. There is no place in America for traitors steeped in the tyrannical and alien ways of life. American educational forces must come to grips in a unified manner with the needs of the hour, for the general purpose of stimulating the American people to renewed faith in democracy and a willingness to sacrifice in its defense if necessary.

You veterans need not be reminded that you took something into the first World War far more vital than your service equipment. You took something into that war which was not lost in the trenches or on the battlefield, and you brought something home. That something was a soul quality which found spiritual expression in a pattern of citizenship based on the cherished ethics of a Christian civilization. And you brought something home besides scars and haunting pictures of ghastliness and memories of fallen comrades. You returned with a consciousness of the ideals which have preserved our American standards.

It augurs well for our country that you tried and trusted men and women of America should be fused so closely in one great patriotic fraternity. That you have remained militant is a reassurance of the continuing health and vigor of our national morale. It is heartening that you are still militant as the poisonous shadow of dictatorship spreads over Europe and millions of persons, once free, become the puppets of pitiless power.

Yours is a worthy purpose—that of acknowledging your God and serving your country. Cooperation between you and the F. B. I. to this end will raise an insurmountable barrier against successful invasion of our country by any destructive influences of foreign origin.

As the eyes of dictators turn to America, let us be quickened in our efforts to strengthen our defense by the stark realization that their peoples cannot order their own lives. Contrast this horrible picture with life in America, where freedom is guaranteed as an inalienable right. These rights are even extended to the enemies within our midst who prosper and progress as our indifferent citizens lower their guard against the false fronts and insidious advances of domestic foes.

Over a year ago, the President of the United States directed the F. B. I. to lead the American crusade against spies, saboteurs, and subverters. This responsibility was gladly accepted. That the F. B. I. was feared by the forces it was pitted against was attested by the campaign of vilification and hate that was directed against

it by Communists, their fellow travelers and mouthpieces. Falsehood after falsehood was spread, in high places and low, with the hope that a public esteem won by deeds and not words would be weakened.

The Communists, cheered by the underworld, looked forward to the day when the machinery of the F. B. I. would be hampered in carrying out its sworn duty of protecting America. In the face of a record of achievement which made homes safer, these same forces clamored for the dismantling of the F. B. I. But their scurrilous lies remain unproved and unprovable—for they are baseless.

A "fifth column" will never succeed in our country, because we of law enforcement are ready to meet its every advance. Never has there been such unity and cooperation in law enforcement, which recognizes the necessity for coordinated effort.

In the American way, we are quietly demonstrating that the horrors of the Gestapo and Ogpu are un-American and that a national police force as such is unthinkable. As the emergency continues, however, the Communists and the alien propagandists will continue to direct their vituperations against law enforcement, because they realize their cause is hopeless unless law enforcement can be weakened and discredited. That will never happen so long as all American citizens support law enforcement as you have done.

The American way of living will endure only if it is proved to be efficient. The beauty of its ideals and the wisdom of its conduct will be safe only when we demonstrate the ability to function better than bloody-handed dictators. This we can do only through self-sacrifice and a dedication to the common cause of protecting that which we love. America can endure only if we prove ourselves to be stronger than our enemies. We must demonstrate unmistakably our efficiency in government by a willingness to abide by our laws.

If we Americans ever needed clear vision and a firm grasp of fundamentals, today is that day. There are strong forces at work in this country that deliberately seek to overthrow our liberty. We are deluged with foreign "isms" of all kinds. If we are to continue as a free people, what we need is more Americanism. We need it not as a vague ideal, but as a practical, living force in our everyday lives. It is the only sure antidote for foreign "isms."

In the present crisis, there is no need for citizens to band themselves together to take charge of a situation already under control. That we must meet and conquer a "fifth column" of destruction is a common resolve, but we must do it in an orderly and proper manner, through the existing machinery of law enforcement.

I look to the American Legion to overcome any wave of hysteria that may sweep the country. Our task is too important to be interfered with by untrained or self-seeking individuals and publicists who talk much but do little.

The spy, the saboteur, and the subverter must be met and conquered. In doing this we must be certain that the innocent are not injured. You can be of valuable assistance at this time by reporting directly to the F. B. I. acts which you believe inimical to the national defense. These facts can then be evaluated by trained investigators.

Foreign foes in America do not limit their activities to any one locality. Each of their vicious deeds is a part of a greater conspiracy to cripple America. Ill-timed action in one community might reveal little and yet make futile Nation-wide investigative activity which has been carried on by the F. B. I. for months.

The President of the United States recognized the necessity of treating internal security as a national problem. On September 6 last year he called upon all law enforcement to report to the F. B. I. any information "relating to espionage, counterespionage, sabotage, subversive activities, and violations of the neutrality laws." In this manner bits of information from the East can be fitted into smatterings of evidence from the North, South, and West, revealing the complete operations of the enemy within our gates. The coordinating and handling of these matters is the responsibility of the F. B. I., with its Nation-wide scope of operations.

To make effective present plans, it is imperative that complaints and information regarding those who would subvert the Nation be promptly furnished the F. B. I. so that action can be taken today, for tomorrow might be too late. Once we have the facts, intelligent planning and action can follow. If found to be a matter of a local nature, arrangements have already been made to enlist the assistance of cooperative local, county, and State law enforcement agencies.

For years there has been a constant infiltration of foreign isms into every walk of life. With premeditation, foreign powers have been sending their agents to America. Once here and established, they have embarked on a recruitment campaign, enlisting the disloyal and the malcontent. They have sought the protective cloak of citizenship and they stop at no ends to achieve their despicable purposes.

In meeting these termites who are burrowing deeper and deeper into our social order, careful planning, tactful endeavors and persistent efforts are necessary. Counterespionage becomes effective only when foreign agents are placed under surveillance, their contacts observed, their methods of communications established, and sources of information ascertained and later controlled. The effectiveness of our efforts cannot be measured by glaring headlines of wholesale arrests of would-be spies, saboteurs, and subverters. Publicity, and even prosecution, do not prevent subversive activity. They merely transfer it into unknown channels, where the work must be done all over again.

Every time a self-appointed crusader starts beating the tom-toms of racial hatred and prejudice, he makes it that much more difficult for the constituted authorities to carry on. These individuals, before considering the careful planning that has been made to meet the foe, flush the quarry with premature announcements and ill-advised action, causing irreparable damage and invariably accomplishing nothing. The preservation of our internal security is a duty too sacred to be toyed with by psychopathic publicity seekers or to be used by greedy self-seeking politicians as a means of attracting attention.

Already a "fifth column" of destruction is on the march. It manifests itself in many forms, always disguised by a disarming front. These cowardly subverters seek to confuse by propaganda, paralyze by intimidation and in every conceivable manner to slow up production of defense materials. They know no rules except to destroy, they have no code but to subvert, with the hope that ultimately America, weakened internally, will crumble before an invading force or foreign-inspired domestic upheaval.

To keep America strong, we must keep it unsullied by foreign influences or foreign ideals. We have no place for the scheming peddlers of foreign isms who owe allegiance to other lands. As a people, we have lived too long in a fool's paradise. We have argued that two broad oceans were unconquerable fortresses. We now are awakening to the grim reality that the issues are too vital for us to take any chances.

We of law enforcement, in our own sphere, have been preparing for years. The problem of training that confronts America in connection with the increasing of our Army and Navy also confronted law enforcement several years ago. The F. B. I. met it with a far-flung training program, centered around the F. B. I. National Police Academy. Every phase of law-enforcement skill and science was given to police officers.

This campaign for universal training in law enforcement has achieved success. That is why I say the vigilante approach to our present problems is not only unnecessary, but inadvisable. In this you can be of service. The problems of law enforcement are perplexing enough without the meddling of gossip-minded or publicity-seeking individuals. You can help us by keeping down undue hysteria and letting us proceed in our work in an orderly manner.

A vital test of Americanism is the revival of the pioneer spirit of our ancestors. As a people, we have become soft. Modern science has poured the fruit of its inventions into our laps. Physical effort has been minimized. We have been led to believe that struggle was not an essential part of our environment.

But now we have awakened from a poppy-scented dream, and must face the bitter truth and struggle for our national existence as never before. A hard road lies ahead. To traverse it, we must be physically, morally, and mentally fit. Even though the Nation's future is clouded, if we all do our duty, the sun will rise again upon a land safe and free and the menace of the hellish hordes of hate will be met and overcome.

The United States of America and all that it stands for is not an experiment, and has not been since it was founded. It was a success from the day Washington took office under the Constitution. It is a success now in a world of toppling and clashing failures. And it will stand as the founders conceived it, if you actually will it to stand against the voices of totalitarianism which are engulfing the rest of the world. The United States of America has been, is now, and I believe will be, the greatest and freest country to live in on the face of the earth.

Let us then dedicate ourselves to the preservation of the heritage of the American way of living. Let us accept the sacred trust which has been placed upon us by other generations who have shed their blood to fulfill their obligation to America. Already the enemy is gnawing at the vitals of our American institutions. To counterattack, let the call of Americanism sound from coast to coast. Let us unite in dedicating our lives and energy, our efforts and aspirations in a crusade for America. It will be triumphant if every citizen lives the inspiring tenet of the American Legion—"For God and country."

George Washington Did Not Oppose a Third Term

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN KEE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 25, 1940

EXCERPT FROM LETTER OF WASHINGTON TO LAFAYETTE

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an excerpt from a letter written by George Washington to Lafayette, dated April 28, 1788. The

complete text of the letter is printed in volume 9, pages 354–359, Sparks' The Writings of George Washington, published in 1835, a copy of which is in the Library of Congress.

In his letter, after frankly and fully expressing his views upon various questions of public concern, Washington turned to the question of the eligibility of the President to succeed himself in office after having served "a certain course of years." Upon this question he expressed his views in the following paragraph:

WASHINGTON TO LAFAYETTE

There are other points in which opinions would be more likely to vary. As for instance, on the ineligibility of the same person for President, after he should have served a certain course of years. Guarded so effectually as the proposed Constitution is, in respect to the prevention of bribery and undue influence in the choice of President, I confess I differ widely myself from Mr. Jefferson and you, as to the expediency or necessity of rotation in that appointment. The matter was fairly discussed in the Convention, and to my full conviction, though I cannot have time or room to sum up the arguments in this letter. There cannot in my judgment be the least danger, that the President will by any practicable intrigue ever be able to continue himself one moment in office, much less to perpetuate himself in it, but in the last stage of corrupted morals and political depravity; and even then, there is as much danger that any other species of domination would prevail. Though, when a people shall have become incapable of governing themselves, and fit for a master, it is of little consequence from what quarter he comes. Under an extended view of this part of the subject, I can see no propriety in precluding ourselves from the services of any man, who on some great emergency shall be deemed universally most capable of serving the public.

Harry Renton Bridges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAM HOBBS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 25, 1940

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, on June 13, 1940, the House of Representatives of the United States passed the Allen bill (H. R. 9766) providing:

That notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Attorney General be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to take into custody forthwith and deport forthwith to Australia, the country of which he is a citizen or subject, the alien, Harry Renton Bridges, whose presence in this country the Congress deems hurtful.

Although favoring the objective, I deplored the proposed means for its achievement, voted against the rule and against the bill, and on pages 8201 and 8202 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that date appear my reasons.

The House Committee on Immigration and Naturalization reported the bill favorably without having sought or had an expression of opinion from the Department of Justice as to the merits or demerits of the bill.

But when it went to the Senate such an opinion was asked and received. The Attorney General's letter, giving his opinion, is quoted as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
June 18, 1940.

Hon. RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
Chairman, Committee on Immigration, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: This is an answer to your request for the views of this Department concerning the bill H. R. 9766, which provides:

"A bill to direct the deportation of Harry Renton Bridges.

"*Be it enacted, etc.*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law the Attorney General be, and is hereby, authorized and directed to take into custody forthwith and deport forthwith to Australia, the country of which he is a citizen or subject, the alien, Harry Renton Bridges, whose presence in this country the Congress deems hurtful."

If this bill were to become law, it would be a historical departure from an unbroken American practice and tradition. It would be the first time that an act of Congress has singled out a named individual for deportation. It would be the first deportation in which the alien was not even accused either of unlawful entry or of unlawful conduct while here. It would be the first time that Congress, without changing the general law, simply suspended all laws which protect a named individual and directed the Attorney General to disregard them and forthwith to deport "notwithstanding any other provision of law." And it would be the first time since the alien and sedition laws a century and a half ago that any law would provide for a deportation without a hearing or without, indeed, the slightest pretense toward giving the accused what our Nation has long known as "due process of law."

The extraordinary character of the bill upon its face is even more impressive viewed against its background. This same alien has been accused, investigated, and tried at great length, and judgment has been rendered that he had not been proved guilty of the charges made against him. By this bill the United States would deny faith and credit to its own duly conducted legal proceedings.

We have in this country, subject to the jurisdiction of this Department, some three and a half million aliens. One of our great tasks is to assimilate them into our native culture; this can only be done by a deep respect for our processes and tradition. How shall we teach this respect if the Government itself will not abide by a decision in an individual case, and makes acts whose nature is not specified, but which must have been lawful when done, the basis of deportation without hearing? What becomes of equality before the law, of the impersonal and impartial character of our Government, if it is to select unpopular persons to suffer disadvantage or punishment?

I do not now consider whether such a law would violate the constitutional prohibition against congressional enactment of bills of attainder, or ex post facto laws, or the provision of our Bill of Rights which declares that "no person * * * shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law." I do not now try to determine whether the language of this act would work an unconstitutional suspension of the writ of habeas corpus. Nor do I inquire as to any breach of treaty engagements to render fair treatment to nationals of friendly powers lawfully in this country. The law makes me legal advisor only to the President and the Executive Departments, and my predecessors have held that they could not with propriety also render legal opinion to a separate branch of the Government.

But apart from any question of power, I cannot, as head of the department affected by this bill, answer with anything less than emphatic disapproval, your request for views upon it.

The Congress has almost unlimited powers over aliens. It has embodied its policies in general laws. If it is convinced, as I am, that recent experiences show the need for additional safeguards, by all means let us have them. We, who are administratively responsible for dealing with these problems, have advocated greater legislative precautions. But there is no condition, existing or threatened, which needs arbitrary legislation prescribing no rule of conduct, but merely imposing banishment by legislative fiat. The interests of this service can be best protected by enactment of clear and fair rules of conduct that aliens may know, so that those who obey may be unmolested and those who disobey may be expelled. And let any man be heard in his own behalf before he is doomed to exile.

Harry Bridges may be all that this bill implies of him. But certainly he does not deserve a place in our history as a martyr. He is insignificant compared to the issues presented by this bill. Our forefathers objected to a government where "whatever pleased the Prince had the force of law." The report of the House committee comes close to reverting to this when it says that deportation "without assigning any reason is inherent and asserted by this bill."

As an American I would not, for the sake of my own liberty, deny the protection of uniform and indiscriminatory laws, and of fair hearings to even the humblest or meanest of men. As an official of the United States I cannot in good conscience do other than recommend strongly against this bill.

With personal regards,
Sincerely yours,

ROBERT H. JACKSON,
Attorney General.

In my speech against the Allen bill I pointed to the fact that the Smith bill—H. R. 5138—had changed the law as declared by the Supreme Court in the Strecker case, so that when it should have been passed by the Senate and approved by the President we could deport Harry Bridges without resorting to legislative mob violence.

It was most pleasing to me, therefore, when, on August 24, 1940, the Attorney General ordered the Bridges case reopened and reinvestigated because of the change in the law wrought by the Smith Act:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
August 24, 1940.

Attorney General Robert H. Jackson today issued the following statement:

"On June 19, 1940, in response to a request from the chairman of the Committee on Immigration in the United States Senate as to my views on the pending bill to direct the deportation of Harry

Renton Bridges (H. R. 9766), I stated that such a bill, if enacted, would be a historical departure from American practice and tradition, in that it would be the first time that an act of Congress had singled out a named individual for deportation notwithstanding any other provision of law. I indicated at that time that I felt that it would be wiser procedure to take whatever action might be desirable or necessary under authority of laws which apply equally to all.

"On March 2, 1938, the Secretary of Labor initiated deportation proceedings against Bridges. Before those proceedings were completed the Supreme Court handed down a decision in the case of *Kessler* v. *Strecker*, which laid down the rule that in cases of this type an alien must be shown to have been a member of a so-called subversive organization at the time the deportation proceedings were initiated. Accordingly the conclusion reached by the trial examiner in the case, Dean James M. Landis, of the Harvard Law School, dealt only with the question of whether or not Bridges was a member of the Communist Party at the time of the deportation proceedings. Dean Landis' conclusion was that the evidence 'establishes now' that Harry R. Bridges 'is' neither a member nor affiliated with the Communist Party of the United States.

"Since that time, however, in the Alien Registration Act of 1940, Congress enacted legislation specifically designed to alter the rule of the Strecker decision and to make deportable an alien who at any time in the past has been a member of a subversive organization.

"Since the transfer of the Immigration and Naturalization Service to this Department, it has been making a study of deportation cases, which, while properly closed under the preceding law, might possibly be reopened under the Alien Registration Act of 1940. Consequently, I have decided in respect to the Bridges case to instruct the Federal Bureau of Investigation to make a thorough investigation for the purpose of determining whether or not under the newly enacted legislation there is new or additional evidence which would warrant the bringing or reopening of deportation proceedings against Bridges.

"Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, is now on the west coast and will initiate the investigation immediately."

Recently the special committee on the bill of rights of the American Bar Association made its annual report. From it I quote:

"The scope and purposes of this committee can be fairly appraised only in the light of the tense and critical times in which we live.

"It is now apparent to all, except the willfully blind of the victims of foreign propaganda, that a serious threat overhangs the American way of life. No man is wise enough to judge the degree or imminence of that threat. But at best it seems clear that in order to ward it off, we must discipline and control ourselves in many ways that are unknown and unnecessary in quiet times. At worst we may be involved in a desperate struggle against vast forces requiring, as a condition of preserving our integrity and institutions, the mobilization of every tangible and intangible resource. In either case, we must, as a matter of common sense and prudence, submit to discipline and controls that will raise sharp questions in respect of customary 'civil liberties.'

"This situation presents two main sets of problems.

"On the one hand is the problem of so formulating indispensable restrictions that they will be, to the utmost practicable extent, within our general framework of government and constitutional guaranties. We must see to it that concessions of customary privileges and rights do not go beyond what is clearly necessary for national safety; and that such necessary concessions shall be withdrawn upon the passing of the crisis. This can be accomplished by vigilance and by insisting that unusual statutory restrictions on customary rights shall be made subject to renewal from time to time.

"What is most of all essential is to preserve constitutional methods and procedures, however severe the controls must become, since the observance of procedures has always been of the essence of English-American liberty.

"We cite two examples. A bill was recently passed by the House of Representatives calling for the deportation by name of a particular alien, Harry Bridges. We express no view as to whether this man should be deported. But on the question of procedure the bill in question, whether or not constitutional, seems plainly contrary to the spirit of our institutions. He, like any other alien, should have a hearing under a general law applicable to all under similar circumstances. We understand that the bill is at present not being pressed in the Senate, but that a new investigation is being made as to his deportability under the general terms of the amended Immigration Act. This course is proper, whereas the other would be contrary to the American constitutional system, at least in spirit if not in letter.

"Another example is the methods to be used in the suppression, if necessary, of organizations hostile to our system and likely to engage in activities damaging to our national security. Granting that such activities cannot be tolerated in a time of danger, the question of procedure remains. If and when such suppression is needed it should be effected under general laws providing for a fair hearing and not by mob violence or even by official violence, outside the law.

"In exercising vigilance in these directions such a committee as this can help to bring us through the present critical period without permanent impairment of our constitutional liberties.

"On the other side of the shield there is a task to be performed in opposing the perversion of civil rights in such a way that would make us impotent or cripple us in our opposition to foreign aggression and internal disintegration.

"A constitutional republic, no less than any other government, must have the power to preserve its own existence; and the safeguarding of free institutions must not be permitted to imply impotence against enemies either within or without the gate.

"There is such a thing as using alleged constitutional rights as a screen to hide efforts to undermine our system and defeat efforts to strengthen the Nation. There is a danger that by overzeal in some cases or a deliberate misuse of the slogans of civil liberty in other cases, the whole cause of safeguarding our constitutional rights may be discredited.

"Such tendencies should be resisted by such a committee as this, lest the cause of constitutional liberty be prejudiced, just as, on the other hand, this committee should firmly resist real and unjustified encroachments on constitutional rights and procedures, no matter how unpopular such resistance might become.

"The successful functioning of this committee requires at all times a sense of balance and proportion. Such a balance will be all the more needed now; but the importance of the committee's function is enhanced rather than diminished by the very difficulties of the present critical period.

"Grenville Clark, Chairman; Douglas Arant, Zechariah Chafee, Jr., Osmer C. Fitts, Lloyd K. Garrison, George I. Haight, Ross L. Malone, Jr., Burton W. Musser, John Francis Neylan, Joseph A. Padway, Charles P. Taft, Monte W. Lemour."

National Cemetery at Philadelphia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 25, 1940

RESOLUTION OF HENRY H. HOUSTON 2D POST, NO. 3, AMERICAN LEGION, GERMANTOWN, PA.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

HENRY H. HOUSTON 2D POST, NO. 3,
Germantown, Pa., September 18, 1940.

Hon. FRANCIS J. MYERS,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MYERS: At the regular meeting of Henry H. Houston 2d Post, No. 3, Department of Pennsylvania, the American Legion, held on Tuesday evening, September 17, 1940, at its headquarters, 47 High Street, Germantown, Philadelphia, Pa., the following resolution was presented and unanimously adopted:

"Whereas at the present rate of burials there will be no available space for the interment of veterans in the national cemetery located at Haines Street and Limekiln Pike, Philadelphia, after December 1942; and

"Whereas there is no other Government-owned cemetery within a radius of 100 miles of this heavily populated area; and

"Whereas the great need for such place of burial is generally acknowledged: Therefore be it

"*Resolved by Henry H. Huston 2d Post, No. 3, the American Legion*, That the Secretary of War be urged to take the necessary steps to procure a suitable site for a national cemetery within easy access to metropolitan Philadelphia; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Secretary of War, the Congressmen from the first nine congressional districts of Pennsylvania, and to the two United States Senators."

Sincerely yours,

MARTIN B. MCCANN, *Commander.*
JOSEPH D. WALSH, *Adjutant.*

T. V. A. and Bonneville Yardstick Rates

REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. RANKIN
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday September 25, 1940

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, for more than 10 years I have labored incessantly, in and out of Congress, for cheap electricity for all the American people, and have done everything I possibly could to bring about reductions in light and power rates to the ultimate consumers of electric energy in every section of this country.

It has been a hard battle, and I am glad to say that in addition to the assistance of such stalwarts at the other end of the Capitol as Senator NORRIS, of Nebraska, and Senator BONE, of Washington, we have had the support of the majority of the membership of this House. Our efforts have not been in vain. They have borne fruit most abundantly. Already we have realized reductions in electric rates amounting on an average to more than $580,000,000 a year since the creation of the Tennessee Valley Authority and the publication of its yardstick rates.

All who have opposed us in this fight have concentrated their fire on the T. V. A. and its yardstick rates. But their propaganda has strengthened our position by bringing this question to the attention of the American people, and in that way causing them to investigate and try to find out what electricity is really worth, what it should cost them; with the result that the T. V. A. and its yardstick rates have been vindicated, and the people of every State in the Union are clamoring for rate reductions such as have been enjoyed by the people of the Tennessee Valley area.

I have pointed out time and time again that, even with these reductions, the users of electric energy throughout the country are still overcharged something like $1,000,000,000 a year according to the T. V. A. rates. The records show that in 1938 the residential consumers alone were overcharged $297,935,000, while the commercial consumers were overcharged $330,909,000, according to the T. V. A. rates—making a total overcharge for these two classes of customers alone of more than $628,000,000 a year.

But the opposition attempts to offset these figures by saying that the T. V. A. rates are too low. Their chief spokesman in that regard has been Mr. Wendell L. Willkie, president of the Commonwealth & Southern, a utility holding company, and now candidate for President on the Republican ticket. The other day he spoke in Portland, Oreg., in the very shadow of the Bonneville Dam, which this administration has constructed on the Columbia River, and from which electricity is now being distributed throughout the States of Oregon and Washington; and, strange as it may seem, he never criticized one time the Bonneville yardstick rates at which this electricity is being distributed to the people of that area. He did not dare tell them that their rates were too low. I wonder what he will tell the people of the East about the exorbitant rates they now have to pay.

As chairman of the public-power bloc in the House, I am somewhat responsible for that provision of the act creating the Bonneville Administration which makes these cheap rates to the people of that area possible. When a measure was proposed which I felt would paralyze the operation of both Bonneville and Grand Coulee, so far as the distribution of power at reasonable rates was concerned, I conferred with the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. PIERCE] who introduced the bill that finally became law, and as a result of which the people of that great northwestern country are now enjoying rates which I shall show in a moment are a little below the T. V. A. yardstick rates.

Every member of the public power bloc in the House, which includes every Member from the State of Washington, rallied behind that measure which provides for the application of the yardstick so as to give the people of that great northwestern country the same benefits of cheap electricity in every home, on every farm, and in every business establishment that is now enjoyed by the people in the Tennessee Valley area. This now applies to the electricity to be generated at Grand Coulee, as well as that produced at Bonneville.

Let us see how these rates compare. We will first take the residential rates and will place side by side the T. V. A. yardstick rates and the Bonneville yardstick rates. Every one of you can draw your own conclusions.

Residential rates

T. V. A. YARDSTICK RATES

3.00 cents per kwh. first	50 kwh.
2.00 cents per kwh. next	150 kwh.
1.00 cent per kwh. next	200 kwh.
0.40 cent per kwh. next	1,000 kwh.
0.75 cent per kwh. for all over	1,400 kwh.

Minimum bill, $0.75.

BONNEVILLE YARDSTICK RATES

3.00 cents per kwh. first	50 kwh.
2.00 cents per kwh. next	50 kwh.
1.00 cent per kwh. next	200 kwh.
0.50 cent per kwh. next	900 kwh.
0.75 cent per kwh. for all over	1,200 kwh.

Minimum bill, $0.75.

Commercial rates

T. V. A. COMMERCIAL YARDSTICK RATES—FOR DEMANDS OF 10 KW. OR LESS

3.0 cents per kwh. first	150 kwh.
2.0 cents per kwh. next	350 kwh.
1.0 cent per kwh. next	1,500 kwh.
0.8 cent per kwh. all over	2,000 kwh.

FOR DEMANDS IN EXCESS OF 10 KW. BUT NOT OVER 20 KW.

3.0 cents per kwh. first	15 kwh. per kw. demand.
2.0 cents per kwh. next	35 kwh. per kw. demand.
1.0 cent per kwh. next	150 kwh. per kw. demand.
0.8 cent per kwh. all over	200 kwh. per kw. demand.

BONNEVILLE COMMERCIAL YARDSTICK RATES

Demand charge for first 10 kw. demand, or less $0.95 per kw. all additional kw. demand.

ENERGY CHARGES

3.0 cents per kwh. first	150 kwh.
2.0 cents per kwh. next	350 kwh.
1.0 cent per kwh. next	1,000 kwh.
0.8 cent per kwh. next	13,500 kwh.
0.6 cent per kwh. next	25,000 kwh.
0.4 cent per kwh. next	60,000 kwh.
0.3 cent per kwh. all over	100,000 kwh.

Thus it will be seen that the Bonneville rates are equally as low as the T. V. A. rates. In other words, we have carried the yardstick westward to the Pacific Ocean, and have provided for the people of the Columbia River Basin a supply of cheap electric energy that will add more to the wealth of that section, as well as to the comforts and conveniences of the homes and business establishments of its people, than anything else, yes, than everything else, that has been done for them in all the history of this Republic.

It is the greatest blessing from an economic standpoint this Nation can bestow, and yet it is one that will be self-sustaining and self-liquidating, and will ultimately pay back to the Federal Government every dollar it has invested. We are simply doing for the people in the Columbia River area what

we are doing for them in the Tennessee Valley area, and what we expect to do for the people of every other section of this country. If we could spread these rates to every State in the Union, it would result in the further reduction of light and power rates to the residential and commercial consumers of this Nation alone, amounting to $628,000,000 a year—or more than the value of the entire wheat crop or the entire cotton crop of the United States.

That is our objective; that is the consummation for which we have been striving. We are gradually winning this battle. Along with these rate reductions this administration has developed a rural electrification program that has lighted something like 2,000,000 farm homes that never had electric lights in them before. Our objective now is to extend that service to all the other farmers of the Nation, and spread the cheap rates now prevailing in the Tennessee Valley area, and in the Columbia River area, to every nook and corner of the United States.

The Farm Program

REMARKS

OF

HON. R. T. BUCKLER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 1940

Mr. BUCKLER of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, agriculture and farming are the largest and most important businesses in the United States. Most of us know and will agree that when the farmers prosper, merchants and business people and the workers also will prosper and there will be good times in the land.

Despite the great importance of farming and the large number of people living on the farms in the United States, there are only six or seven actual dirt farmers in the United States Congress. As a dirt farmer myself, I am privileged to represent one of the most agricultural districts in the United States. I have had this privilege now for three terms in Congress, and, of course, I am anxious to be reelected, just as well as anyone else, for another 2 years.

However, I want to point out that since there are so many bankers and lawyers in Congress, it is no wonder that it is difficult to secure passage of good farm legislation. I have noticed during my 12 years in the Minnesota State Senate and my 6 years in the United States Congress that it seems to be the custom that lawyers and bankers are placed on the Agricultural Committees. Once in a while we are able to get one or possibly two farmers and agricultural-minded Members on the committee of 21 Congressmen. When I was in the Minnesota State Senate it was my great pleasure and opportunity to secure passage of a bill reducing the contract rate of interest from 10 percent to 8 percent and to get approval of my bill reducing the penalty and interest on delinquent taxes. I also was able to get approval of a bill prohibiting the rural-credit department from taking deficiency judgment after they had foreclosed their farm, and another measure which reduced the prices of Minnesota prison-made twine and farm machinery to the farmers of Minnesota.

As a Member of Congress for the Ninth District, I have not had the honor of passing any so-called major national legislation since this honor comes to but few men and most often only the chairman of a few of the large committees. However, I have fought and voted for legislation which I believe would benefit agriculture and the farmers and the whole Nation. Of course, I have been successful in passing a large number of bills of local, district, and State nature, and I have been greatly assisted in this by the present administration's party leaders in the House with whom I have become well acquainted. Therefore, I have been able to secure successful action on matters of interest and concern to my district in a larger degree than a Congressman who might represent, for instance, the Republican Party, which is in the minority in the House of Representatives.

I have been a farmer all my life, and I think I know some of their problems, and I am sure that I can offer some constructive observations and viewpoints in the efforts which will be made from time to time to improve the present farm program. While the A. A. A. is a start toward equality for the farmer, my firm conviction is that a program calling for the cost of production is needed. I myself have introduced a bill which will give the farmer cost of production for his products. I will continue to fight for this measure and quite a number of similar bills that have also been introduced in Congress. I have supported the farm program of the present administration; however, it must be improved, but it certainly is better than the do-nothing policy of the previous Hoover administration, and it is much more satisfactory than the old Federal Farm Board set-up. As you remember, when we had 40-cent wheat and 2-cent hogs and other farm-commodity prices in about the same proportion which bankrupted millions of farmers in this Nation. Most everybody else can pass on their interest and taxes but the farmers, being at the end of the line, do not only have to pay their own taxes but pay the other fellow's as well. The only reason the farmers all have not gone broke is because they have denied themselves of most of the luxuries of life and have worked themselves as well as their wives and children without practically any return.

Some improvements have been suggested recently, and additional improvements in the present farm program will be considered and adopted from time to time. The program today is a vast improvement over the one which was adopted when I first served during the Seventy-fourth Congress in 1935 and 1936. While I am cooperating in these suggestions to improve the present legislation, my efforts and support are being directed to a cost-of-production plan. If the people elect candidates who are friendly to and will support an adequate farm program, there is some hope of getting equality for agriculture.

Furthermore, I believe, with many others, that there is a place for more actual dirt farmers in the National Congress.

I am sure the voters of my own district, and especially the farmers, will be interested in knowing how the Members voted on the measure which recently became a law which provided for appropriations for loans on wheat and other basic commodities. In like manner on legislation which would provide for parity payments on wheat and other commodities. As the figures indicate most of the Republicans in Congress opposed the $225,000,000 parity program. The record of the Democratic Party is much more favorable to the farmers' interests. In other words, the money which now goes to the farmers and a loan on the wheat is available, not because of the Republican Party and its Members in Congress, but because of the present national administration and the independent and progressive Members in Congress. The vote on March 28, 1939, for $250,000,000 to provide for parity payments was: Democrats, for, 168; Republicans, for, 20; Farmer-Labor, for, BUCKLER; and Republicans, against, 135. On May 9 of this year the vote of appropriation of $212,000,000 for parity payments was: Democrats, for, 183; Republicans, for, 22; Farmer-Labor, for, BUCKLER; and Republicans, against, 131; and when the bill was before Congress to appropriate money for loans on wheat and other commodities the Democratic and Republican vote was about the same as was the vote on parity payments. Without the appropriation there could not be any loans made on wheat, which I understand is 76 cents per bushel in Crookston.

You there have a concrete example of the deep and abiding interest the majority Republican membership of the House took upon this most vital question for the benefit of agriculture. By their votes shall ye know them.

Among other things that have been accomplished in the last few years for the farmers is lower interest rates. You will remember when we paid 6 and 7 percent on farm mortgages, and at the present time it is 3½ percent on Federal land-bank loans.

Another great accomplishment is rural electrification for the farmers of the Nation. That was only made possible through the lifetime work of Senator NORRIS, of Nebraska, who has fought for public-owned light and power. Such projects as Muscle Shoals and the T. V. A. have come about through him and the assistance of the present administration. If it had not been for the T. V. A. we never would have had rural electrification, which is a godsend to the farmers. We fought to free the Negroes 75 years ago, but now we have just started to free the farmer's wife by taking from her shoulders some of the burden she has had to bear for several generations. Although so far it has not been possible to electrify every home, I hope to see the time when every farm will be served by electricity.

American Farmers Will Not Be Deceived

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER M. PIERCE

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 1940

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Speaker, there has come to my desk a very remarkable postal card addressed simply, "Rural, Star, or Post Office Box Holder—Local." It is sent under the frank of our colleague from Minnesota and my personal friend, AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I do not question the right or privilege of our colleague in exercising his franking privilege, but the facts and figures set forth on the reverse side of the postal card are extracts from a speech made by our colleague entitled "American Farmers Will Not Be Deceived," delivered in the House, May 14, 1940. As I read these figures and tried to understand them I became more impressed than ever with the fact that it is very easy indeed to draw incorrect conclusions from statistics specially selected.

I agree with my friend that "American farmers will not be deceived." Every American farmer knows that times are vastly better now than they were when the Democratic Party came into power in March 1933. Wheat in my section was 25 cents a bushel; corn, 10 or 12 cents in the Middle West. I myself sold good fat cattle for a cent and a half a pound. No amount of figures selected here and there can convince the American farmer that we are not better off now under the Presidency of Roosevelt than under the reign of Hoover. Fat cattle are high—exceedingly high. Wool in the Pacific Northwest has sold this year well into 30 cents a pound. It was selling for 8 cents a pound in 1932. The wheat and corn farmers will realize two or three times as much as they would have realized had it not been for the farm program. The A. A. A. has been an outstanding success, and not a failure.

True, we have not attained parity prices, but we have made long advances in improving the situation of the farmer everywhere, from coast to coast. He has had more money for his products. He has had better working conditions. He has had credit when he needed it. He has been able to borrow money on his farm at a lower rate of interest. Yes, our colleague and friend from Minnesota is right, "The American farmers will not be deceived."

FIGURES MAY BE MISLEADING

Opponents of our national farm program charge that the program has not given farmers high enough prices and incomes. They select their own figures on imports, and with these selected figures they try to prove that the present administration during the last 7 years has harmed the farmer. Here are the facts on farm imports, on prices, and on income:

Competitive farm imports during the 7 years before 1932 averaged 37 percent more than during the last 7 years, and total farm imports averaged 61 percent more in the earlier period

	Total farm imports	Competitive farm imports
Average, 1926–32	$1,728,600,000	$769,300,000
Average, 1933–39	1,074,300,000	562,000,000

Agricultural imports now are only about half of agricultural imports during the 1920's. Competitive farm imports in 1929 were about twice as much in value as they were in 1939.

FARM PRICES IN 1939 WERE 43 PERCENT HIGHER THAN IN 1932

The year 1932 showed clearly that imports are not an important factor in farm prices. In 1932 farm imports were lower than they had been in 25 years. According to the theory of those who so bitterly oppose farm imports, 1932 should have been a boom year for farm prices. Actually farm prices in 1932 were the lowest on record. Here are some average farm prices in 1932, compared with 1939 prices, and the percentage increase:

Product	Unit	Price, crop year		Percent increase
		1932	1939	
Wheat	Bushel	$0.38	$0.70	84
Corn	Bushel	.32	.54	69
Cotton	Pound	.065	.091	40
Butter	Pound	.21	.25	19
Wool	Pound	.086	.223	159
Milk	Hundredweight	1.27	1.73	36
Beef cattle	Hundredweight	4.25	7.03	65
Veal calves	Hundredweight	4.95	8.42	70
Hogs	Hundredweight	3.34	6.23	87

FARM INCOME IS APPROXIMATELY DOUBLE THAT OF 1932

In 1932 farm income was $4,682,000,000. In 1939 it was $8,540,000,000, and for 1940 it is estimated at $8,900,000,000, including Government payments. Farmers have gotten this higher farm income during the 7 years of this administration, the very years when many so-called friends of the farmer have been claiming that farmers were being severely harmed by imports.

FARM BUYING POWER IN 1939 WAS EQUAL TO THAT IN 1929 AND NEARLY THREE-FOURTHS (72 PERCENT) LARGER THAN IN 1932

With their 1939 incomes farmers could buy as many of the things they needed as they could in the boom year of 1929, and they could buy 72 percent more than they could buy with their money in 1932. This takes into consideration prices paid by farmers and their interest and taxes, as well as cash farm income.

THE AMERICAN FARMER HAS THE AMERICAN MARKET

Farmers in this country produce practically 100 percent of the corn and hogs consumed in the United States. Our dairy farmers have 99½ percent of the home market, and our beef producers have nearly 95 percent of the domestic market. Farmers live by the income they get, and this income is far more important than the insignificant imports that enter the country. For example, the increase in beef income from 1933 to 1939 was about 22 times greater than the value of all beef imports last year.

THE AMERICAN FARMER'S STAKE IN THE EXPORT MARKET IS BEING PROTECTED

Agricultural exports are, roughly, four times as important to the American farmer as agricultural imports. Last year some 7,000,000 acres would have been required if all competitive farm commodities imported into the United States had been produced in the United States. At the same time, American farmers used more than 28,000,000 acres to produce commodities for export. To sacrifice the export market in order to keep imports out of this country is like asking farmers to trade dollars for quarters. By lowering trade barriers, the

reciprocal trade-agreements program has made possible exports of our farm products. In the fiscal year 1939–40 the value of farm exports was 25 percent more than in the fiscal year 1932–33. Even in the war-torn world of today our trade policy is vitally important in our relations with the other republics of the Western Hemisphere.

Behind the smoke screen of opposition to minor imports of farm products, opponents of the national farm program seek to gain farm support for high industrial tariffs by offering farmers "paper" tariffs. But farmers know that tariff protection enables industries to charge higher prices for their products, while farmers do not get such help from "paper" tariffs. It is estimated that the tariff on manufactured products costs American consumers about $3,000,000,000 annually by boosting prices. The farmer's share of that cost is at least three-quarters of a billion dollars a year. This is a major reason why farmers must have payments and the protection that they get from a national farm program.

FARMERS ARE PRODUCING ABUNDANTLY FOR AMERICA

While opponents of the farm program are attacking a few imports, most of which have been attracted into this country because of higher prices for our farm products, farmers of America have gone steadily ahead. They have adjusted their acreage and are producing abundantly and more efficiently on fewer acres than they needed before. Their soil is enriched, ready to produce more if it is needed. The ever-normal granary is bursting with supplies. As the national-defense program gets into full swing, the predominant fact is that American agriculture is better prepared than any other part of our economy.

Fixed-Fee, Cost-Plus Contracts, Architectural and Engineering Service, and Construction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN TABER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 1940

TABLES SHOWING ARMY CONSTRUCTION CONTRACTS

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following tables with regard to Army construction:

Office of the Quartermaster General—Construction Division—Fixed-fee-cost-plus contracts

ARCHITECTURAL AND ENGINEERING SERVICE (QUARTERMASTER CONTRACTS ONLY)

Location	Project	Estimated construction cost	Fee	Percentage	Date	Firm
Louisiana (area No. 6) near Alexandria	Permanent tent camp.	$4,398,360	$30,923	0.7	Sept. 13	Benham Engineering Co., Oklahoma City, Okla.
Louisiana (area No. 18) near Alexandria	do	4,398,360	30,923	.7	do	E. T. Archer & Co., Kansas City, Mo.
Florida, Blanding National Guard Camp	do	9,064,470	48,760	.5	Sept. 11	Solomon & Keis, Fort Lauderdale, Fla.
North Carolina, Fort Bragg	Cantonment	3,873,695	27,500	.7	do	J. N. Pease, Charlotte, N. C.
Texas, Brownwood National Guard Camp	Permanent tent camp.	4,352,874	30,642	.7	Sept. 12	Koch & Fowler, Dallas, Tex.
Maryland:						
Edgewood Arsenal	Chemical Warfare Service facilities.	6,123,391	60,400	1.0	Aug. 9	Whitman, Requardt & Smith, Baltimore, Md.
Aberdeen Proving Ground	Ordnance facilities.					
Alaska, Elmendorf Field	3 hangars	1,300,000	11,400	.9	Aug. 22	Arch Roof Construction Co., Inc., New York, N. Y.
Massachusetts, Falmouth Military Reservation	Cantonment	7,473,605	39,650	.5	Sept. 11	C. T. Main, Inc., Boston, Mass.
Alabama, Fort McClellan	Permanent tent camp.	3,333,453	26,920	.08	Sept. 12	Weideman & Singleton, Atlanta, Ga.
Pennsylvania, Philadelphia Quartermaster Depot	Warehouses	741,140	58,500	.83	Aug. 21	Ballinger Co., Philadelphia, Pa.
New Jersey, Picatinny Arsenal	Ordnance facilities	958,703	19,850	1.6	Aug. 31	Francisco & Jacobus, New York, N. Y.
Ohio, Ravenna	Ammunition loading plant.	11,940,000	79,200	.7	Sept. 3	Wilbur Watson & Associates, Cleveland, Ohio.
Arkansas, Robinson National Guard Camp	Permanent tent camp.	5,308,125	33,430	.7	Sept. 11	Black & Veatch, Kansas City, Mo.
Georgia, Savannah	Cantonment and permanent tent camp.	2,558,136	23,850	.9	do	J. B. McCrary Engineering Corporation, Atlanta, Ga.
Mississippi, Shelby National Guard Camp	Permanent tent camp.	9,760,800	43,554	.4	Sept. 12	Lockwood Greene Engineering, Inc., New York, N. Y.
Massachusetts, Springfield Armory	Rifle plant	724,975	25,500	3.5	July 29	C. T. Main, Inc., Boston, Mass.

CONSTRUCTION (QUARTERMASTER CONTRACTS ONLY)

Louisiana (area No. 18), Kisatchie National Forest.	Cantonment and permanent tent camp.	$4,242,655	$155,705	3.67		W. Horace Williams Co., New Orleans, La.
Florida, Blanding, National Guard Camp	Permanent tent camp.	8,796,180	268,290	3.05	Sept. 12	Starrett Bros. & Eken, Inc., New York, N. Y.
North Carolina, Fort Bragg	Cantonment	3,731,845	141,850	3.82	Sept. 11	T. A. Loving & Co., Goldsboro, N. C.
Maryland:						
Edgewood Arsenal	Chemical warfare service facilities.	5,898,391	225,000	3.81	Aug. 16	Cummins Construction Corporation and Riggs Distler & Co., Inc., Baltimore, Md.
Aberdeen Proving Ground	Ordnance facilities.					
Alaska, Elmendorf Field, design and construction.	Power and heating plant.	1,600,000	96,000	6.0	Aug. 29	Bechtel-McCone-Parsons Corporation, Los Angeles, Calif.
Falmouth Military Reservation, Mass	Cantonment	7,240,462	233,143	3.22	Sept. 10	Walsh Construction Co., Long Island City, N. Y.
Alabama, Fort McClellan	Permanent tent camp.	3,204,588	128,565	4.02	Sept. 12	Dunn Construction Co., Inc., and John S. Hodgson & Co., Birmingham, Ala.
Pennsylvania, Philadelphia Quartermaster Depot.	Warehouses	700,000	41,140	5.87	Aug. 21	Wark & Co., Philadelphia, Pa.
New Jersey, Picatinny Arsenal	Ordnance facilities.	910,454	48,254	5.3	Sept. 12	John Lowry, Inc., New York, N. Y.
Ohio, Ravenna	Loading plant	11,564,500	375,500	3.245	Sept. 3	The Hunkin-Conkey Construction Co., Cleveland, Ohio.
Arkansas, Camp Robinson	Permanent tent camp.	4,615,920	166,174	3.6		MacDonald Construction Co. and G. L. Tarlton, Contractor, Inc., St. Louis, Mo.
Georgia, Savannah	Cantonment and permanent tent camp.	2,449,156	108,980	4.45	Sept. 11	A. K. Adams & Co. and W. C. Shepherd, Atlanta, Ga.
Mississippi, Shelby National Guard camp	Permanent tent camp.	9,518,663	242,137	2.55	Sept. 12	J. A. Jones Construction Co., Inc., Charlotte, N. C.
Massachusetts, Springfield Armory	Rifle plant	695,000	29,975		Aug. 7	Fred T. Ley & Co., Inc., New York, N. Y.
Illinois, Wilmington	Ordnance facilities	10,863,000	461,700	4.25	Sept. 13	Stone & Webster Engineering Corporation, New York, N. Y.
Texas, Brownwood	Permanent tent camp.	4,197,564	155,310	3.7		Robert E. McKee, El Paso, Tex.

Third Presidential Term

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD R. BURKE

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 26 (legislative day of Wednesday, September 18), 1940

STATEMENT BY HON. BAINBRIDGE COLBY

Mr. BURKE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the statement by Hon. Bainbridge Colby, Secretary of State in the administration of President Wilson, on the resolution to limit the tenure of Presidential office to a single term. The statement was made before the subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee yesterday.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senators, at so late a stage in your hearings it is unnecessary for me to review the origin and the unbroken maintenance throughout our history of the tradition which bars a third term to any President. This has been ably done by speakers who have preceded me.

You are versed in the history of your country, and know well that the precedent established by George Washington has been followed and strictly observed until the present time—inviolate for 143 years.

The question before you is the measure of respect due to a great historical precedent which, through this continuous and universal observance since the country's founding, has ripened into an almost hallowed tradition and acquired morally the force of a constitutional limitation and practically the validity of positive law.

I say "universal observance."

The National House of Representatives, by a practically unanimous vote, in which all party lines were submerged, is on record that in its opinion "the precedent established by Washington and other Presidents of the United States, in retiring from the Presidential office after the second term, has become by universal concurrence a part of our republican system of government, and that any departure from this time-honored custom would be unwise, unpatriotic, and fraught with peril to our free institutions."

The Senate of the United States at a subsequent date expressed itself to the same effect, while periodically both major political parties have adopted at their national conventions platform declarations expressive of the same attitude, as, for instance, the Democratic Party in 1896: "We declare it to be the unwritten law of this Republic, established by custom and usage of 100 years, and sanctioned by the examples of the greatest and wisest of those who founded and have maintained our Government, that no man should be eligible for a third term of the Presidential office."

But the weightiest contribution to the argument against a third term—greater, perhaps, the future historian will say, than Washington's refusal of a third nomination or the warnings of Thomas Jefferson and Andrew Jackson of the danger to our freedom in prolonging the Presidential tenure beyond two terms—is the contribution made by Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

The noble integrity of Washington was unable to envisage what we are witnessing with our own eyes at the present time and realizing in our own experience. "There cannot, in my judgment," said Washington, "be the least danger that the President will by any practicable intrigue ever be able to continue himself one moment in office, much less perpetuate himself in it, but in the last stage of corrupted morals and political depravity."

The vigor of the tradition against a third term springs from a perception of the evils which of necessity flow from the indefinite eligibility of a President for continuing election. Jefferson was strongly of the opinion that a definite period to retention of the Presidential office was necessary to safeguard our elective form of Government; that if some period was not fixed, either by the Constitution or by practice, to the services of the President, his office, though nominally elective, would in fact be for life, and would soon degenerate into an inheritance. The absence of a fixed limitation of tenure, he feared, would undermine the security of Republican Government. In fact, Jefferson went so far as to declare that should a President consent (I might remark, in parentheses, he could not conceive of a President actually seeking continuation of himself in office)—should he "consent to be a candidate for a third election, I trust he would be rejected on this demonstration of ambitious views."

Thus reasoned Jefferson, the man who above all, in the words of President Roosevelt "at all times looked the farthest into the future, examining the ultimate effects on humanity of the actions of the present." But, as I say, President Roosevelt has himself made a very great contribution to the case against a third term. By his course as a President-candidate prior to the nominating convention at Chicago, his direction of its proceedings, and his subsequent actions as its third-term candidate, he has contributed a perfect illustration of every danger and evil which Jefferson foresaw so clearly and against which he warned his countrymen so earnestly. He has taken it upon himself to nullify the precedent of Washington and the tradition established by Jefferson, not by showing either to be wrong, but by showing that he does not care what they thought. To their anticipations of grave abuses in any departure from so sound a principle, he has replied by providing the abuses.

He has brought the question down from the broad philosophical plane on which the effect of undue retention of the presidency on the permanence of the Republic, the integrity of our elective system, and the survival of representative government was discussed by men of learning, and disinterestedness, and handed it over to the State and county chairmen of his political following to do with it as they see fit, which means, of course, as their personal interests may dictate.

Unaffected by Jefferson's expressed hope that any President who would "consent" to be a candidate for a third election would be rejected, he not only "consents," but has with unremitting and eager zeal, sought a third nomination, and now seeks a third election.

Grover Cleveland warned against the power of the patronage at a President's disposal in forcing his renomination. The President has shown what huge proportions this danger can assume, and with what far-flung effectiveness it can be employed. Cleveland also mentioned as pitfalls in the pathway of an ambitious President, "the allurements of power, the temptation to retain public place once gained, and more than all, the availability which his party finds in an incumbent, whom a horde of office holders support with a zeal born of benefits received and the hope of favors yet to come."

All these influences, magnified and swollen beyond anything that has ever been known, we now see unleashed, shamelessly pressed into service, and openly exploited, in the effort to keep a President in office for a third term. The predicted is realized. The apprehended danger has overtaken and enveloped us. No longer are the evil consequences which flow from the indeterminate eligibility of a President for reelection, hypotheses for detached discussion.

The forebodings of Washington and Jefferson and Jackson are fulfilled and justified. No longer need we consider what may happen—what is certain to happen if a President sees fit to jettison this great national tradition. We know now both what may and what will happen, because we behold what has happened. We have before us a detailed graph and working model of the third-term issue in all its grievous aspects. We can see for ourselves.

A third-term candidacy for the Presidency, with its inevitable concomitant of abused Presidential power, affronts not only the national conscience of the American people but violates a basic principle which runs throughout the body of our law. I refer to the accountability of elected officials to the people at short and recurring intervals of time. This is the means we have established to secure our citizens in the control of their government. The theory of our institutions is that the people shall always have at hand the means of terminating the occupancy of an elective office. Anything, therefore, which weakens this control confided to the people, or which disturbs, balks, or falsifies a free expression of their judgment and wishes at the polls, either in the election of candidates or in their nomination at party conventions, is a blow aimed at our democratic theory of government. Our Government is not built upon the theory that the power we vest in an elected official shall be thrown into the scales of a political contest to be exercised in his own interest or to insure his retention in office. Indefinite tenure of a public office enables the incumbent to dig in and resist dislodgment. This is something the people will not tolerate. Their right to pass judgment on an elected official is a basic right. They will not suffer it to be wrested from them or made difficult of effective exercise.

De Tocqueville in his classic work Democracy in America anticipated with clear foresight the situation which confronts us today. Said he, "A candidate who is not the President, seeking the Presidency, is but an individual, while the President seeking renomination is the state itself, intriguing and corrupting with its immense resources."

Here the present issue is stated in its full breadth.

The unceasing tendency of our political development has been to augment the power of the Presidential office. The power to influence legislation, to influence the course of judicial decision, the power of appointment to lucrative office, the unreviewable discretion in the expenditure of the public revenues, the power to initiate policy, the power to determine the great issues of peace and war, and even the future and the destinies of the Nation, are in large measure in keeping of the President.

In a republic such powers should not be lodged in any man for more than a limited and fixed period, and then only under a strict accountability to the people, at recurring and frequent intervals, for their proper use.

We have seen that a tradition, no matter how cherished by the people, or long established, will not protect them against the use by an ambitious President of the vast resources of his office to prolong his tenure of it. We have seen how a national convention can be seeded and planted in the interests of a third term, and how it can be manipulated and forced into the service of a President's ambition, no matter how vaulting, unprecedented, and fraught with danger to our liberties such ambition may be.

Liberty in America and the perpetuity of our free institutions, in the light of the developments of the current year, evidently require a greater protection than is afforded by "unwritten law" or tradition, however sacred we may hold the latter to be. The will

of our people must find expression, it is now perceived, in terms of tougher fiber than a tradition.

We now have reached the time, it is apparent, when this great basic principle of limited tenure of the Presidential office must be safeguarded by an express provision in our Constitution.

We must take up the burden which we have hitherto relied upon tradition to sustain.

A 6-year term for the President, without eligibility for reelection, it seems to me, expresses the prevailing judgment of thoughtful Americans on this vastly important subject. It expresses my own deep conviction.

This is my reason for accepting your invitation to appear before this committee, and for speaking as I venture to do, in favor of the pending resolution.

Position of American Legion on National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL A. HATCH

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 26 (legislative day of Wednesday, September 18), 1940

RESOLUTIONS OF THE AMERICAN LEGION

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. MINTON] was compelled to leave the Chamber. At his request, I desire to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD certain resolutions of the American Legion, which are printed in the publication which I hand to the clerk.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LEGION ASKS STRONG DEFENSE

These were some of the precepts adopted by the Legion:

"No more costly mistake in statecraft can be made than a program which envisages initial fighting upon our continental frontiers, thus bringing a war to our own homes. What happens in such a case is all too patent in the situation of the British Isles today.

"The two great natural bulwarks of our country are the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans, but their value depends upon our physical influence therein.

"We want America strong enough to meet any possible invasion before it arrives and to turn the invader back so that our homes remain intact and our families secure.

"If fighting is necessary to defend the United States, we insist upon being prepared to do the fighting outside of the United States.

"We approve the recommendation made in 1919 by the Joint Army and Navy Board and repeated in 1938 by the Naval (Hepburn) Board, 'that Guam be fortified and garrisoned adequate to its defense against any force that could be brought against it.'

"We recommend that a sound, just, and mutually satisfactory arrangement be sought for the continuance and necessary strengthening of the military and naval defenses of the United States in the Philippines, as a measure essential to the welfare of both peoples and to the preservation of stability in the Pacific.

"We reiterate our demand, as expressed in Chicago in 1939, that the Panama Canal and its approaches be forthwith made impregnable against attack by land, sea, or air.

"We reaffirm our endorsement of the Alaska International Highway and recommend other means of communication and transportation be also established.

HELP FOR BRITAIN IS URGED

"We believe that a sound national-defense policy for this country requires that we should at this time give all practicable aid to Great Britain and those alined with her in their fight for freedom.

"Personal and political influences must not be allowed to interfere with the efforts of our defense agencies to provide for the protection of the Nation.

"Warfare today, more than ever, requires vigorous trained leadership of the highest order in all branches of our armed forces. The mediocre must be removed from important positions and the incompetent eliminated. Practical intensive training alone can produce the high standard of discipline, teamwork, and technique of weapons necessary to modern war and appropriate to the high qualities of the men in service."

The Legion also voted that the selective-service bill should be extended to provide a permanent system of universal military training.

The provision for more bases was contained under a program for naval expansion in these words:

"We urge additional bases for our naval expansion, and we endorse the principle of exchange obsolete equipment for needed air and naval bases."

The resolution on the "American column" was followed by another which called for the Legion to formulate immediately "a plan which will utilize the whole strength of the American Legion for any service which we may be able to give to the constituted authorities of the Federal, State, and local Governments in exposing and combating subversive activities and that we advocate immediate adoption of a plan in all departments and posts, such a plan to become operative when it is deemed advisable to aid our constituted law-enforcement agencies upon their request."

Endorsement of Mr. Willkie's Candidacy By New York Times

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS T. MALONEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 26 (legislative day of Wednesday, September 18), 1940

EDITORIAL FROM BRIDGEPORT (CONN.) TIMES-STAR

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have published in the Appendix of the RECORD an interesting editorial from the Times-Star of Bridgeport, Conn.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Bridgeport (Conn.) Times-Star of September 20, 1940]

THE TIMES AGAINST

The most carefully argued endorsement of Wendell Willkie for President yet to appear was in the long editorial in yesterday's New York Times. It gives four reasons.

It feels Willkie is better able to organize national defense because business health is an essential foundation, and Willkie is a professional, Roosevelt an amateur, in business.

This seems to regard government as nothing more than a big business, a view we can't share. The Presidency is not like the job of running a factory. It is a job of leading a great and multitudinous people and a difficult Congress, requiring wholly different talents and training. At the job of the Presidency, Willkie is the amateur.

The Times, sure that Willkie shares its own approval of most of Roosevelt's social program, thinks Willkie better able to carry it out.

It should be said that the Willkie who spoke at Elwood approved the Roosevelt program, and the Willkie who spoke later at Coffeyville talked the other way. It might be well, before pinning faith on Willkie of Elwood, to wait and see which is the real and final Willkie.

Further, the Times sees the Roosevelt financial course as perilous. If feels that Roosevelt can't change it and adds that it will be "desperately hard" for anybody else to manage and control, though it might be well to let Willkie try it. So that point seems to answer itself.

Lastly, the Times fears the third term because less scrupulous men in Europe have rooted themselves in power by the idea that they and they only are fit to rule.

The sting of that seems to be drawn because the unscrupulous men of Europe fortified the theory of indispensability with secret police and spies, concentration camps, ballot-box stuffing, and terror which Roosevelt hasn't tried, doesn't seem to want to try, and couldn't get away with if he did try. We think this can safely be left to the people. If they don't fear it, it will be because they feel confident of their power to take away power when they choose.

Nonetheless, these are all substantial if not new reasons for being against Roosevelt—better reasons for being against Roosevelt than for being for Willkie.

Perhaps it would have been clearer if the Times had merely said, "We are against Roosevelt for these four solid reasons and that makes it necessary for us to be for Willkie because there isn't any other place for people who are against Roosevelt to go."

This is obviously a choice of the lesser evil for the Times, knowing all about Roosevelt, seems not to know any more than anybody else about Willkie, which as yet isn't much. It is a pessimistic choice and puts it up to Willkie to give his supporters in the coming weeks positive reasons for being for him, which we hope he will do.

The Drift Toward War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. DANAHER
OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 26 (legislative day of Wednesday, September 18), 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR., OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an interesting, timely and valuable address delivered last night on a coast-to-coast broadcast by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], who still retaining his Army commission, and regularly participating in training maneuvers, has a rare insight into the factors in The Drift Toward War.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

All Americans are horrified at the savage news from abroad. The slaughter of innocents, the destruction of everything that makes civilization possible, the maiming of bodies, and the shattering of the human spirit are terrible beyond description. Frightful as these things are, in and of themselves, they become desperate when we realize that the motive for this holocaust is to establish an order which denies the dignity of the individual man, and thereby contradicts the chief purpose and aim of the American dream.

These great changes in Europe will surely affect our economic system, causing dislocation and unemployment. Moreover, we have not the right to assume that they do not actually threaten our vital safety. We hope that they will not. But we must be ready for the worst, and then if the worst does not happen we can return to more normal ways.

What must we do to be ready for the worst? We must first, I think, have clearly in mind that our real duty, as Americans, is to America. As American citizens we can have no other duty, we must be single-mindedly devoted to that duty, and we cannot have our loyalties divided by our strong personal sympathy for those brave men and women abroad who fight for their freedom. Our duty is to keep the United States out of this terrible war insofar as this lies within our power.

Broadly speaking, there are two ways in which we can get into war. One way is for a foreign nation to provoke us so that we have to fight. The other way is for us to provoke a foreign nation so that they have to fight. The best way to avoid involvement in war by the first method is to be so manifestly strong that no foreign nation will dare to molest us. Force is the only universally understood language in the world today. For this reason—and for this reason only—I favor building up our Army and Navy, and building them promptly—to a point which will make any foreign attack on the United States obviously and utterly hopeless.

Have we such an army and navy today? We have not. It was recently testified that we only had enough equipment to put an army of 75,000 men into the field completely equipped, and that it will not be until a year from next January that we shall have enough equipment for an army of 750,000—a figure only slightly in excess of the total of the late Belgian Army. It is stated officially that in the light of the European battle experience all of our airplanes were obsolete. It is not disputed that we have only one navy, and that it will take between 6 and 7 years to develop a so-called two-ocean navy. And the one navy which we now have must use the Panama Canal to move from ocean to ocean, and it is an utter impossibility to give that Canal 100 percent protection. Moreover, it will take 6 years to finish the double sets of locks at Panama, which will greatly increase its safety.

This is not a pretty picture, but it is a truthful one—which is not obscured by the fact that frantic and praiseworthy efforts are now being made to remedy the shortages. It is, moreover, hard to understand how we could arrive at this point in our destiny so woefully unprepared when we look at the warnings of the past few years. In the fall of 1938, for example, it was clear to all observers that the spectre of war, raging and terrible, was again at large in the world. But we did not heed it. I wonder why not? It was surely not due to a desire for economy. We were lavishing billions on all kinds of luxury projects. Even in the case of our military appropriation a large part of the funds went to caretaking and housekeeping and other noncombatant purposes. It is astounding to note that we spent a larger proportion of Federal funds on national defense in the fiscal year 1929 than we have in any subsequent year. Seventeen and seven-tenths percent of our Federal expenses went to national defense in that year, as compared with 11.2 percent in the year 1939. Even more astounding is the fact that in spite of threats abroad, we spent a smaller part of our Federal funds on national defense in 1939 than we did in 1938. I do not try to give the reason for this negligence. The stark fact remains that we are not prepared today to avoid the danger of war by being so strong that no one will dare to provoke us.

What has been our record since these first awful warnings of war became so glitteringly clear 2 years ago? Unfortunately, our record has been a wavering and a contradictory one, a record of bluster, a record of threats which we could not enforce. We apparently assumed that because we had more millionaires and skyscrapers and radios and sedans than any other country, we were therefore a great nation in a military sense. Of course, the dictators were not fooled. They considered us a puny nation from a military standpoint and ignored our threats.

It is a record which shows that we have not been clear in our own minds. We first enacted a law placing an embargo on the sale of arms to all belligerents. Then the very advocates of this scheme repealed it.

It is a record which extended understandable sympathy to the Allies at the same time that the extension of economic advantages to Russia proceeded apace.

We seem to have had every kind of a policy except a consistent policy of preparedness for America first. Of course, some will look at the great effort now being made to arm America and will conclude that we have learned our lesson, and that we are now united on our goal.

But the record of the years certainly holds no ground for the belief that these efforts are more than appropriations of funds and encouraging beginnings. Mr. William S. Knudsen, of the Defense Commission, who is surely a competent witness, says we will not have equipment for 2,000,000 men before the end of 1943. Senator BYRD, a most accurate man, says that the Army and Navy tell him that since May 1 of this year only 99 planes have been ordered by the Army and 244 by the Navy. We have words and inspection trips and publicity, but we do not see any new guns or planes or tanks. There is more talk about the ships and guns we are sending away than about those we are getting.

Moreover, we are still in the grip of misleading ideas.

What are some of these ideas?

We are told that the United States should actively take sides in this war because otherwise the United States will be alone. The word "alone" is uttered with a horrifying undertone. Yet is it not obvious that every nation is alone, that we have been alone for most of our history, and that it is far better to be alone than it is to have one's fate bound up with that of nations less fortunately situated?

We are told that our ships and our guns, if not actually our men, should take their place in the European struggle, and this statement is made on the grounds that to do so will keep the war away from the United States. This is a very dangerous hallucination. The same logic which says that our ships should be in European waters in order to keep the enemy away impels one to the further contention that it would be even better to have had our troops in the heart of Europe, which is at an even greater distance from our shores. Anyone with military experience knows that the question of where to place your outposts is a question of judgment—that they can be placed too close to your main body, and that they can be placed too far away. If your outposts are placed too far away, you get into needless fights which you often cannot win.

Is not the question of sending military equipment abroad an entirely military question, provided, of course, that we all agree that our first duty is to the United States? The decision as to where our outposts should be placed is a military decision, and so is the decision as to what the chance is that American equipment will be used by some hostile power against Americans.

I call attention also to the tendency to create fear and hysteria. I know that there are those who say that only by frightening people can we obtain preparedness. I cannot hold such a low estimate of the intelligence of the people. I think we can be alert without being alarmed.

Finally, we see a lack of frankness and a lack of candor in our official attitude toward the issue of war and peace. Policies which are universally popular are tied up with policies which are very debatable in order to pull us along. The law keeping American ships out of the war zone—a very popular measure—was tied up with the repeal of the arms embargo, and you could not separate the two. The acquisition of naval bases—a popular measure—was coupled with the sending of part of our fleet to the war zone.

An example of this lack of frankness is the so-called destroyer trade. It so happens that I was the first to introduce legislation, with my colleague Senator MCNARY, for acquisition of naval bases in this hemisphere. I favored outright American ownership and not a lease and a sharing of sovereignty—and consequent sharing of trouble—with some other power. We now have these bases on a lease in exchange for which we have agreed to send 50 destroyers abroad. This is the same as saying that we agreed to send a part of our Navy. Let us call things by their true names.

I ask you to consider some of the consequences of this act. First, we deplete our own admittedly inadequate one-ocean Navy.

It is said that we were not using these ships. I point out that we are not using the Army and Navy. We hope never to use them. We have them so that we shall not have to use them.

It is said that these ships were obsolete. I submit that they are not obsolete for the training of men in all the arts of seamanship, navigation, gunnery, and engineering. We do not know how many officers and men are being deprived of important training because of the loss of these destroyers, but there must be many. And in active battle service in the fleet they are far better than no ships at all.

A short while ago, as a Reserve Officer, I served a tour in a company of tanks. Some of these vehicles were obsolete. But men could be taught driving, repairing, tactics, gunnery, and signal communication in these tanks. And these tanks are better than no tanks at all.

Moreover, our 400 tanks here are worth more than 400 tanks in the Battle of Flanders. In that battle 400 tanks were destroyed in a day. They can be used over and over here to train separate sets of men.

I urge that our weapons be kept for our own defense. That is my personal plea. I submit further, however, that if weapons are to be sent abroad, it should be done in the open, after debate, with public participation by consent of Congress. If we really want to send weapons abroad, let us do it wholeheartedly and consciously—not slip sideways into the chasm.

Of course this is not the only aspect of the matter which should have been submitted to Congress. The sending of destroyers makes us a partner in the hostilities. Whether or not you agree with this, should not the people have a say in so vital a matter?

It makes the American people a partner in the enforcement of the blockade. Whether or not you agree with this, should not the people have a say in so vital a matter?

I submit not only that they should have a say but that we should know what more weapons of ours it is planned to send. With rumors current that two-thirds of our aircraft production is going abroad, the time has come for us to settle this question. Either we want to train American boys to fly military planes or we do not. If we do, the planes must be here.

We also hear of a plan to send 32 of our 4-engined bombers—the so-called flying fortress—abroad. We have 46 of these planes. No one has ever suggested that these ships were obsolete. They are so modern and up to date as to be almost unique. European nations, having to fight in congested areas, have not set so much store by the long-range plane as we have who are situated between two vast oceans. We must, of course, look toward Europe, but we must also look toward the Pacific and toward the Caribbean. These are areas in which long-range planes are of the utmost value.

I pass over the fact that we do not allow a man to fly one of these planes until he has been flying for 4 years. If these ships were sent abroad, they would almost inevitably be flown by inexperienced crews with a consequently greater risk of destruction or of falling into enemy hands. Very few pilots in Europe have flown a four-engined ship, or have had experience as a member of a crew of a four-engined ship. It is a very complex job and we cannot train men in the operation of these ships unless we have the ships. We ought to have a thousand of them; we only have forty-six. It would, indeed, be deplorable if we found ourselves left with only fourteen.

Nor should we forget that these planes cost about one-quarter of a million dollars and that when production really gets under way the time required to manufacture a flying fortress will be at least 1 year.

Moreover, the papers are full of stories that another deal is contemplated whereby our Navy is to be given the use of foreign naval bases in the extreme Far East. Singapore in Malaya and a port in Borneo are mentioned. Every high-school student knows that a base in the American hemisphere is one thing and a base on the opposite side of the globe is another. This would be a grievous, dangerous step toward trouble.

When matters of this kind, any one of which would be a major congressional issue in ordinary times, are settled secretly by the Executive, it is small wonder that American citizens ask themselves, "If the Executive can do these things without action by Congress, can he not also declare war without Congress?"

In conclusion I say: America faces certain dangers. America faces the danger of entering this terrible war because we are so weak that some nation will provoke us. The remedy for this is preparedness. America faces the danger of entering the war because we provoke some other nation. The remedy for this is national self-control and a leadership which thinks first of America always. America faces the third danger that if we should enter a war that we should not be successful, and then everything we prize would be destroyed. My fellow citizens, woefully unprepared America is in peril of entering this war—a war which would destroy this Republic as we have always known it. The dreadful drift is on, moving steadily and stealthily like a thick, dank mist across our consciousness. By preparing America, by being single minded in our allegiance to America, we can stop this fatalistic assumption that we are sure to get in. We need not get in. We must not get in. Let us stop this drift toward war.

Abuses on the Part of Certain Public Utility Companies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 26 (legislative day of Wednesday, September 18), 1940

LETTER FROM HON. HOMER T. BONE, OF WASHINGTON

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter addressed by the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] to friends in his own State and elsewhere dealing with abuses on the part of certain public-utility companies.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LETTER NO. 6 ON INITIATIVE 139

UNITED STATES SENATE.

DEAR FRIEND: Prison cells will house three officials of the Union Electric Co. of Missouri because they spent $525,000 to control elections and to corrupt public officials, and then lied about it on the witness stand.

"Since the * * * whisky ring fraud cases * * * there has never been anything that I know of in this court * * * that revealed the shocking, sordid details of official corruption * * * shown in this case," commented United States Judge Moore.

Such an experience may well serve as warning to power-company officers in other States, including our own.

Tactics of the companies in their attempt to put over initiative 139 by using fake committees and by lies and deceit, are reminiscent of power-company fakes and frauds uncovered in our State in previous years by Government agents. United States investigators again are quietly at work in Washington State to uncover power-trust abuses.

Cleverly, the companies have concealed the poison in No. 139 by drafting it to appear a simple measure to enable people to vote on bond issues. However, New York's Journal of Commerce reveals the purpose of No. 139 as utility men see it. This financial paper says in an article August 28:

"The proposed law lessens the bargaining position of the districts, and besides makes it extremely unlikely that a huge revenue bond issue would be approved in a public referendum * * *. Consequently utility observers are keenly interested in the decision of the Washington voters this fall inasmuch as approval of the amendment would be another strong indication—the third this year—of a swing away from public-ownership sentiment."

In other words, initiative 139 was deliberately designed to kill public ownership of electric utilities. It is directed against P. U. D.'s now, but later would be amended to cripple city systems also.

Tell power companies by your vote against this deceptive bill that you object to fakes and frauds, and that you want lower rates. Customers of private companies in our State paid $12,548,000 more for electricity in 1938 than they would have paid at Tacoma rates. Let's get rates down to the real cost of generating and distributing current. We want more rate cuts such as have been forced from our private companies, amounting to $12,000,000 in the last 5 years.

Private power companies say they are superefficient. If so, the Wall Street holding companies that run our plants ought at least to match Tacoma's low rates. I hope they can and will match them. But thus far, even with recent loudly proclaimed rate cuts, they don't come within cannon range of Tacoma or Bonneville rates.

"But," say the companies—and how often you've heard this—"we pay taxes and Tacoma light system does not." That plaintive wail is just more power company bunk. The fact is Tacoma light system pays about the same percentage of its gross revenue in taxes, free service, and cash contributions, as do private power companies in our State.

Just how much tribute the public pays for the dubious privilege of buying electricity from a private company instead of from a public plant is illustrated in a "tale of two cities," Alder and Elbe, in Pierce County. These towns are 6 miles apart. Alder residents buy public "juice," Elbe residents buy private "juice." * * * And Elbe people pay twice as much as those at Alder for the same amount of electricity.

Recent experience in public-utility districts proves they can and will reduce rates. On May 27, the Aberdeen World announced that Grays Harbor P. U. D. had ordered rates cut $150,000 a year beginning July 1. Residential rates were cut 22 percent, industrial

rates 11 percent, city and school rates 25 percent. On May 24, Skamania County Pioneer announced a slash in power rates for that county as the result of P. U. D. action. Pacific County P. U. D. reduced electric rates 21 to 44 percent October 1.

Chief Justice Charles Evans Hughes, when Governor of New York, urged that water-power rights be "preserved and held for the benefit of all the people, and should not be surrendered to private interests."

Safeguard your rights and your pocketbooks as Mr. Hughes urges. Vote "No" on No. 139 and if you have time, let me hear from you.

Yours sincerely,

HOMER T. BONE.

This letter has been printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Seventy-sixth Congress, and is a part thereof.

Division in the Moment of Danger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 26, 1940

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, whatever may be said about the precedent-shattering effort of the President of the United States to win a third consecutive term, one thing is certain. His candidacy is dividing this Nation as it has rarely been divided before. Bitterness bordering on hatred, already encouraged by 8 years of class conflict under New Deal auspices, has reached its climax in the campaign now under way.

This is the moment when the New Deal is shouting from the housetops that America is in danger. This is the moment when the New Deal demands complete unity of action and unanimity of purpose. Yet, in spite of the talk, this same New Deal leadership is prompting the most vicious disunion in the history of our Nation. It is all the more vicious because it is so unnecessary.

We agree that our Nation must rearm for defense purposes. We agree that to achieve this rearmament, our people must be a house united. The President of the United States by his overambitious personal aspirations has given us instead a house divided.

How can we reconcile these contradictions? On the one side stand the new dealers, disrupting the Nation over an issue which should never have been permitted to creep into our midst. On the other side they stand proclaiming their desire for the perfect harmony which they have themselves destroyed. It is one more proof that our national administration constantly conceals from its left hand what its right hand doeth.

To achieve their purposes, the New Deal party is willing to create mass hysteria, to stimulate class hatred, to use the political machines which they have publicly denounced as corrupt and unworthy.

It is all part and parcel of the New Deal philosophy, a philosophy which regards the end as justifying every possible means. Confident that the Great Man knows best what is good for the American people, the New Deal is willing to sacrifice any and every American tradition which gets in its way.

The third-term tradition is dismissed. The traditional division of powers among executive, legislative, and judicial branches of our Government is brushed aside. The doctrine that our people have the right, freely and openly, to choose their own Representatives in Congress is attacked through a purge technique.

Each of these assaults upon American life is justified carefully. The European dictators, too, justified their assaults upon human liberty. They too explained every encroachment upon human rights to their own complete satisfaction. They found these things necessary. Emergency conditions, critical times, self-defense, these were their excuses.

We remain unconvinced. The New Deal has adopted ways of doing things totally alien to the American system. The people of this country must rouse themselves from their slumber to rout the forces leading us off the path of human liberty.

Our Country Is Not a One-Man Country

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DEWEY SHORT
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 26, 1940

ADDRESS OF HON. PHILIP PITT CAMPBELL

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Hon. Philip Pitt Campbell delivered at Washington, Pa., on September 18, 1940:

Americans: I speak to you as patriots—not as partisans.

Our country never was and is not now a one-man country. Our Government was created a republic with three independent branches. It is now a bureaucracy under the control of the Executive.

I paraphrase from an immortal speech.

We are now engaged in a great political contest to determine whether or not we shall restore the Republic, and return the Constitution with its guaranties of a government by an independent Congress, an independent Executive, and an independent Supreme Court, guaranteeing personal security to every citizen, high and low, rich and poor, the right to each, in his own way, without a bureaucratic boss, to pursue his own happiness. The freedom and future welfare of 130,000,000 people and their descendants, for generations, are dependent upon the decision reached in this political contest.

The Republican Convention at Philadelphia was a deliberative convention. It had no bosses. The convention responded to the wishes of the people, and nominated Wendell Willkie for President.

The New Deal party, the holding party for the Democratic Party, held its one-man convention in Chicago. The will of its boss was obeyed. His henchmen, Hague, Kelly, Nash, and Hopkins, all of odious stench, carried out the details that were carefully prepared in advance—far in advance.

Many eligible members of the Democratic Party thought they had a right to offer themselves as candidates for the nomination at, what they thought, was their party's convention in Chicago last July. Every man, as his name was suggested, was turned down by the boss.

GARNER, of long public service and great ability, was turned down by the boss. Hull, another Democrat of long and conspicuous public service, in every way eligible for the nomination, was turned down by the boss. McNutt, a man of splendid ability and conspicuous qualifications, was turned down by the boss. Farley, who had hewn the wood and drawn the water for the Democratic Party through national campaigns and, in every way, qualified for the nomination of his party for the Presidency, was turned down by the boss.

You will recall this was all done before the convention met. No member of the Democratic Party, now a subsidiary of the New Deal party, for a reason of his own, met the approval of the boss. No man mentioned was fit, either for the nomination or for the Presidency, according to the whim of the boss.

That left the New Deal boss in the hands of his henchmen and obedient Cabinet officers, who had been crossing the country, fretting the air with appeals for the necessity of shattering the traditions of a century and a half by nominating the boss—Roosevelt for President for a third term. The boss was nominated.

That formality having been carried out, the boss nominated his running mate over the groans of a paralyzed majority of the convention.

Willkie and MCNARY were nominated by a free convention. Roosevelt and Wallace were nominated by a convention bossed by one man to the same effect as Stalin or Mussolini or Hitler boss conventions and elections in Russia, Italy, and Germany.

The campaign, to make a choice between candidates so nominated has just started.

The nomination of Willkie and McNARY has been accepted by the people and press of the country with much enthusiasm. A woman in Virginia, with a delightfully mellow southern accent, whose ancestors have voted the Democratic ticket ever since the party was organized by Thomas Jefferson, said: "I certainly believe that Mr. Willkie's nomination was in answer to prayer."

Many Democratic newspapers of long standing and great influence, among them one that has supported, with regularity, every Democratic candidate for President of the United States for the last 100 years, have announced their determination to support Willkie and McNARY for President and Vice President of the United States on the Republican ticket.

Each of these Democratic newspapers has given its reasons for supporting Willkie, the Republican nominee, as against Roosevelt, the nominee of the new dealers in the Chicago convention for a third term.

Some of the reasons given by these newspapers for supporting Willkie are:

The defaults, deceptions, maladministrations, frauds, waste of revenues and borrowed money, the increase in the national debt, the violations of the Constitution and the traditions of 150 years, breaking the promises made in the platform of 1932 by the New Deal President.

These Democratic newspapers charge that the New Deal was guilty of trying one foolish experiment after another at the expense of industry and agriculture.

They charge the losing of the cotton market that had been available to the cotton planters of the United States from colonial days down to the date that the New Deal was inaugurated.

They charge the bartering away of the foreign markets for the grain and meat products of the American farmer.

They refer to the hostility that Roosevelt has shown for business and businessmen during the 7½ years he has been President.

All the charges made by these Democratic papers are known to be true. They are of the gravest character. They impose a solemn duty on all the people to look through the smoke screen that has been artfully thrown to conceal them.

The New Deal has substituted public relief for private employment as a means of individual subsistence. This policy of the New Deal is destroying the self-reliance of the individual. It is deadening individual ambition and blighting the spirit of individual hope. This is one of the sure ways to pave the road to a one-man government.

The New Deal has spent and wasted much of the savings of the past and has mortgaged the earnings of many generations of Americans in the future. This is another way to pave the road to dictatorship.

Roosevelt and his henchmen continue to fan the flames of class hatred among the citizenship of the United States. This is another way to prepare the road to dictatorship.

The New Deal is pampering failure and penalizing success. This also prepares the way to a benevolent dictatorship.

The New Deal has already rated our country as a one-man country, and is offering that one man as its candidate, for a third term, as President of the United States. That is a long step in the direction of an absolute dictatorship.

If Roosevelt can nominate himself for a third term, he will have a weaker America to oppose him for a fourth and fifth and sixth term. Then he can say to weaklings the New Deal has made of strong American citizens, "Why all this silly trouble about elections? I now proclaim a Roosevelt dynasty." Jimmie or Elliott heirs.

Our people, with rare exceptions, have been taught the value of a dollar. From their youth up they have been taught to earn or produce something for themselves. As a rule the young men and young women of our country, rich and poor, have had the aspiration to do something for themselves. They know the conditions of American life. They know that debts must be paid; they know that interest reduces the amount available to the family for other expenses.

A reckless spendthrift is a rare exception in our country. Only a few have had the habits of a spendthrift in youth and young manhood or have lived on an income from a spendthrift's trust. Men so pampered do not know either the habits or the aspirations or hopes or fears of the average citizen of the United States. The cases are rare where a man has a maternal table spread before him all the days of his life.

The people of our country have always wanted the right to earn their own way. They do not want our industrial depression made permanent and appropriations made annually for their relief.

Wendell Willkie, the nominee of the Philadelphia convention for President, knows the way the average American makes a living. He has had to earn every dollar he has spent or saved. He earned the price of his own education.

He perfected himself in the law. He acquired a knowledge of economics and business management. He studied and majored in the political history and experience of mankind. He did all this on his own initiative and at his own expense.

He made an outstanding success in his profession as a lawyer. His ability in business management was such that a board of directors, confronted with a most difficult problem in business management, selected him to work out their problem for them. Willkie succeeded.

During his life he has dealt with every problem that has confronted him without endeavoring to distort the facts that were in the problem. He knows the truth when he sees it. In dealing with the public he has told the truth. He has not indulged in deception or demagogy. He has dealt with the law as a science that protects the rights and redresses the wrongs of persons.

He knows our domestic and foreign problems. He will deal with both as he has dealt with the affairs of the business enterprises of his clients and employers. He has shown his ability and honesty in the conduct of everything he has undertaken in the past. Willkie has mastered all his problems.

He has enlightened the minds, awakened the consciences, and refreshed the souls of the American people by the courage and clarity of his statements with respect to current questions, at home and abroad, that are of great moment to the people of the country.

When he had an offer of support from a man who is reputed to have great influence over a minority group, Willkie said, "I do not want his support. I am not interested in the support of any man who is associated with or entertains the beliefs that I understand this man entertains."

Willkie has the kind of cerebral and abdominal equipment that will be required in the next President of the United States. He will be confronted with problems that require both ability and courage of conviction.

No doubt, you have either heard or read the political speech of Candidate Roosevelt to the Teamsters' Union in Washington. If you have, you will recall that he related the fiction, for the nine hundred and ninety-ninth time, that on March 4, 1933, the New Deal led the forgotten man into the more abundant life. He endeavored to leave the impression with the teamsters that all that has been done to advance the welfare of those who earn their living by their own efforts in the United States has been done since the 4th of March, 1933.

Candidate Roosevelt cannot be ignorant of what has been done for every branch of American labor by intelligent and aggressive labor leaders: Martin Irons, Terrence V. Powderly, Sam Gompers, John Mitchell, William Green, J. L. Lewis, and many others, who, for more than half a century, have successfully represented the aspirations of every branch of labor in America. These great labor leaders did not fail in their efforts to advance the cause of those for whom they spoke. They had the cooperation, in all their efforts, of executives and legislators in the States and in Washington through all those years. Volumes of laws were enacted for the benefit of labor before March 4, 1933. Candidate Roosevelt must know this, but assumed he could deceive the teamsters.

He omitted to tell, however, that since March 4, 1933, American labor has suffered the disasters of more strikes than in any other like period in the history of the country, from which laborers have suffered along with their employers.

He did not tell of the many different varieties of New Deal crises and emergencies that have followed each other in rapid succession since March 4, 1933. He did not tell of his annual demands for increased appropriations for relief for every year since March 4, 1933. He merely admitted that after 7½ years of the New Deal, millions are still out of employment. He did not answer the indictment of the Roosevelt administration that John L. Lewis made before the mine workers, January 24, 1940. I quote the indictment:

"As the current year opens, the Democratic Party is in default to the American people. After 7 years of power, it finds itself without solution for the major questions of unemployment, low national income, mounting internal debt, increasing direct and consumer taxation, and restricted foreign markets. There still exists the same national unhappiness that it faced 7 years ago. Labor and the people are losing confidence. They fear for the future, and rightly so." John L. Lewis speaking.

The issue in the campaign of 1932 was 10,000,000 unemployed. Ten millions are out of work in the campaign of 1940.

Roosevelt did not tell the Teamsters' Union and the radio audience that was listening to his political speech that he had asked and that Congress made the relief appropriation for the current year available for spending prior to the 5th day of November 1940. It makes a sizable campaign fund.

He did not tell the millions that are idle and those that have work that he has saddled their children, for generations that are not yet born, with a burden of debt they will be groaning under when they are reading the miserable history that is recorded of the New Deal period.

Roosevelt speaks of the beginning of the New Deal as Stalin speaks of the beginning of bolshevism, as Mussolini speaks of the beginning of fascism, as Hitler speaks of the beginning of nazi-ism. All of them make the date of their assumption of dictatorial power the date they think should be the year 1.

The fact that the boss of the New Deal stresses so much the date of his inauguration makes it the more important for the rest of the American people to recall July 4, 1776, and September 17, 1787, the dates upon which the American people declared their independence and made a fight for freedom, and on which the Constitution of the United States was adopted.

It was on those dates that the greatest advance for the well-being, comfort, and happiness of mankind began. It was on those dates that men and women assumed personal responsibility for every obligation in life. They took inspiration and hope from the guaranties of the Constitution. Citizens became masters of their Government; they were not mastered by it. They supported the Government; they did not ask the Government to support them. They

grew strong by the assumption of personal responsibilities to themselves, to their families, to their country, and to God.

They developed the arts and sciences. They entered new frontiers that were not on the map. They created new opportunities and started new industries. They made the impossible possible, they made the impracticable practicable. They made dreams come true. They initiated conversation between their homes and their places of business. They made their voices heard across continents and over the seas. They made is possible for song and speech, originating in centers of art and learning, to be heard in the remotest places of the earth.

They created luxuries that became necessities. They made instruments that relieved labor of its drudgery. They struck the word "toil" from the American editions of the dictionaries. They shortened the hours of labor. They lengthened the span of human life. They made living better and more comfortable. They made and wore better clothing. They provided and ate better food. They built and lived in better houses. They revolutionized local and long-distance transportation. They made new and profitable employment for millions of men and women and provided profitable investment for billions of capital. They created the billions of new wealth that the New Deal has been wantonly squandering.

These achievements were carried on from generation to generation. They included every phase of American life—the farmers and the laborers in every branch of industry. They increased the products of labor. The hope of personal reward for personal effort, under the guaranties of the Constitution, inspired the ambition of millions who participated in raising the scale of wages and the standards of life to the high plane upon which the people of the United States have, for more than three-quarters of a century, lead the rest of the world.

It may seem strange to you, but all this was before the 4th of March 1933, the date on which Candidate Roosevelt, the head and boss of the New Deal, threw the Constitution of the United States, together with the Democratic platform of 1932, into the trash can.

Since March 4, 1933, new enterprise, new investments, new inventions, new employment, new opportunities for labor have been waiting for the end of the New Deal. The betrayal of the Democratic Party by the flagrant violations of pledges solemnly made in its platform of 1932, and adopted 100 percent by Roosevelt when he flew to Chicago and accepted the nomination, and the contempt of Roosevelt and other New Dealers for the Constitution of the United States, so astounded the country that the people have feared to undertake anything new in which capital could employ labor. So 10,000,000 are out of employment during the campaign of 1940.

The great problem that confronts the American people in this campaign is the problem of restoring the rights and opportunities guaranteed by the Constitution to the citizens of the United States, and of passing these rights and opportunities on to posterity.

We must, in this campaign, restore the Republic, with the Constitution, and all its guaranties. We must pass the Republic on to future generations scarred, to be sure, by the alien political and economic philosophies that were foisted upon it by the New Deal, together with the burden of debt that the New Deal laid upon it. It is the last hope of those who love liberty.

Under Wendell Willkie's leadership, as President of the United States, the country will be taken out of a New Deal receivership and the people will again take up active life as a free people. They will create new opportunities. Labor and capital are beckoning from over the horizon beyond the November election. They are ready to go—they are waiting for the green light.

New frontiers are awaiting in the creative arts and sciences, in architecture, in building, in chemistry, in the creation of new products, in the distribution of all products from points of production to places of consumption. The country is anxiously awaiting the solution of the problem of profitable production and distribution of the products of agriculture and industry, so that no one, anywhere, need fail to secure an abundance of the necessities and comforts of life.

Opportunities to serve mankind are boundless in all these fields, and merely await the removal of the dead hand of the New Deal that has been holding back private enterprise for more than 7 years. On November 5, let us hope that Willkie will loose that hold on labor and capital that is deadening private enterprise.

I repeat, this has not been and is not now a one-man country. The welfare of one hundred and thirty millions of American people require that it shall no longer tolerate a one-man government.

Let it not be said of us that we have been beguiled by empty promises, eloquently crooned to us through the air, of better ways of life than the fathers ordained and established for themselves and their posterity.

We have a debt to our ancestors. We must pay it. We have a duty to posterity. We must perform it. We must meet both obligations on November 5, the last day of a campaign for a restoration of the Republic and of the American way of life.

Our ancestors gave their treasure and the best blood of every generation for more than a century and a half for the liberties and opportunities they bequeathed to us.

Millions of helpless little ones and countless millions yet unborn appeal to us to bequeath to them the liberties and opportunities our ancestors bequeathed to us.

We must not default in the debt to our ancestors and we shall not fail in our duty to our posterity.

"Our father's God, to Thee,
Author of liberty,
To Thee I sing.
Long may our land be bright
With freedom's holy light.
Protect us by Thy might
Great God our King."

What Washington Would Say Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. THORKELSON

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 24, 1940

ARTICLE BY GEORGE E. SULLIVAN

Mr. THORKELSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I include an article by Mr. George E. Sullivan entitled "What Washington Would Say Today":

WHAT WASHINGTON WOULD SAY TODAY

(By George E. Sullivan, member of the bar of the District of Columbia)

It is my firm conviction that, if George Washington—the Father of his Country, and the wisest and truest friend of mankind to come upon this earth since the Divine Saviour—were able to speak to us today, he would say substantially as follows:

Friends and fellow citizens, the period for a new election of a citizen to administer the executive government of the United States being not far distant, and the office being coveted by one seeking a third term in violation of American tradition, and who deems himself so indispensable that he actually assumes an attitude of generous self-sacrifice in being a candidate, the counsels of one who has been respected as the Father of the Republic may not be unwelcome at this time.

1. Clinton Roosevelt: A century ago, in 1841, a much earlier Roosevelt—Clinton Roosevelt—sought to impose upon the American people the old deception of collectivism, as a substitute for this Republic. His book, the Science of Government, published in 1841, embodying his deceptive propaganda, is in the Library of Congress (JK 216 R. 78, Rare Book section). Although loaded with professions of purpose to promote "the general good," the book boldly advocates regimenting workers generally (both factory and farm) like "soldiers in an army." Your forefathers were too wise to surrender constitutional American liberty at the behest of this earlier Roosevelt, whose work antedated Karl Marx's by 7 years. They were unwilling to give away their birthright for either a mess of pottage or collectivistic slavery of any brand. They knew the collectivistic idea had received thorough trials in the early 1600's in the Virginia colony and in the Plymouth colony of Massachusetts, under the most favorable conditions, yet destroying initiative and thrift, converting such colonies, respectively, into half military camp and half penal colony, and making abandonment of collectivism imperative to keep the settlers from starving to death. Your forefathers also knew that the settlers always referred to that period as the "years of slavery."

2. Franklin D. Roosevelt: Less than a century after such unsuccessful attempt of Clinton Roosevelt, another Roosevelt, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, is found to be extensively and persistently engaged in imposing upon you a creeping collectivism, as an experiment to create a supposedly better social order for your general welfare. His so-called New Deal is far from new, and bears a strong resemblance to Marxian sabotage, some features of which so recently, under Blum, undermined France, and made her an easy victim of Hitler. Roosevelt's persistent opposition to balancing the Budget is steadily producing ultimate bankruptcy, in strange accord with the diabolical advice of Lenin and Stalin to cause "practical bankruptcy" to make a victim nation "fully ripe" for Communist take-over. (Foundations of Leninism, by Stalin, p. 95.) Mr. Roosevelt has arrogantly belittled your Constitution as a product of "horse and buggy" days. His flagrant contempt for the salutary warning of the Father of his Country, "Let there be no change by usurpation," is quite obvious. He has brazenly urged Members of the House of Representatives not to "permit doubts as to constitutionality, however reasonable" to block legislation sought by him (vol. 79, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 14363). He has created a veritable labyrinth of bureaucracies, and is constantly gathering to himself new powers. He has even boasted about the building up of "new instruments of public power," which in other hands could "provide shackles for the liberties of the people." You are thus, in effect, warned that his continuance

in office may be essential to protect you against shackles which are ready and waiting. The idea of a return to fundamental Americanism, and eliminating altogether all illegal instruments of power capable of providing shackles, does not appear to have occurred to the person chiefly responsible for such "instruments," and who is willing to violate the Republic's tradition against a third term for President. If your forefathers had the good sense to refuse to surrender constitutional American liberty at the behest of Clinton Roosevelt, why should you not right now call a halt upon your surrender of it at the behest of Franklin Delano Roosevelt?

3. Henry A. Wallace: Mr. Roosevelt's running mate on his third-term ticket is none other than that well-known apostle of scarcity, his former Secretary of Agriculture, Henry A. Wallace. In 1936, Mr. Wallace was the author of a book Whose Constitution? which leaves no doubt about his perfect harmony with the head of the ticket in the collectivist field, and also in resenting the checks and balances in your Constitution. Consequently, he would appear to be no more qualified to take an oath to support your Constitution than the head of the ticket.

4. Defeat Roosevelt-Wallace: No greater service can be rendered this Republic, and perhaps to civilized society, than the crushing defeat of the Roosevelt-Wallace ticket. Let no Senator or Congressman who so far betrays this Republic as to support said ticket be ever entrusted again with public office. Every community should see to it that no one is chosen for the Electoral College who will under any circumstances vote for the Roosevelt-Wallace ticket.

5. Elect only 100-percent Americans to Congress: Be not satisfied to only defeat Roosevelt and Wallace. That is imperative, but not enough. The new Congress must be composed of 100-percent Americans of real courage and ability, who will permit no coercion or interference by any Chief Executive, and will institute impeachment proceedings for Executive misbehavior, regardless of the political affiliations of the Chief Executive. The people have the right to rely upon Congress for prompt and effective action in such matters.

6. Local self-government: Local self-government, functioning honestly and intelligently in each community, is indispensable to the continued existence of this Republic. Recent efforts by crackpot intellectuals, cleric and lay, to defeat it by substituting occupational voting for geographical subdivisions, ought to be indignantly spurned. The Constitution of this Republic places very important and responsible powers in the various local communities, including choosing able and honest representatives to the Electoral College and to Congress. Such communities may freely spurn all outside influence and propaganda, national or international, and may even vote contrary to the much-advertised Gallup poll. These local communities would do well to emphasize that minority rule will not be tolerated, and that minority groups might as well cease their efforts to dominate the communities, because majority rule is going to prevail.

7. Write-in ballots: Write-in ballots constitute the effective remedy in local communities in many situations. For instance, in the First Congressional District of Montana, a mere plurality vote—less than a majority—nominated both of the party candidates for Congress in that district, and in each instance nominated a candidate with a radical record. Through the extensive use of write-in ballots, the voters may ignore both of such candidates, and send to Congress someone who can represent the district and the Republic more creditably. In these perilous times, when the very life of the Republic is at stake, the free use of these write-in ballots becomes a vital citizenship duty.

8. America for Americans: American citizens should not be crowded out of employment and livelihood by an ever-increasing influx of aliens from abroad, and officials responsible for this outrageous condition are unworthy of public confidence. The admission of more aliens at this time is a form of national suicide. Let the true American slogan "America for Americans" be hoisted and honored, and let the sly internationalists who would dishonor it, and their wily supporters, fold up their tents and disappear.

9. Christian civilization: This Republic is dedicated to liberty, based upon the proposition that all men are created equal—not in any narrow sense of Jews only being "men," or fellow Jews only being "neighbors," but in the truly Christian sense of the Good Samaritan parable, in recognition of the universal brotherhood of man. When Christian civilization shall be obliterated from this Republic, the Republic itself will perish. Let no one persuade you otherwise. This Republic is the product of Christian minds and hearts, and Christian culture, and was inspired by Almighty God. In the light of the record since 1933, it is difficult to understand recent assurances by the third-term candidate that he is endeavoring to preserve Christian civilization. Yet it must be preserved in this Republic, to assure equal rights to all American citizens, without regard to the racial stock from which they sprang.

10. National defense: Reasonably adequate preparation for national defense is ever imperative to safeguard against both internal and external danger. Overgrown military establishments, however, are inauspicious to liberty and jeopardize the loss of all liberty rather than providing desirable national defense in a republic. This Republic's chief danger today is from within, and from forces which have long been coddled by the administration in power. Can any sane-minded person depend upon this same administration to furnish you protection against such forces? And, with such conditions uncorrected, the Republic can no more protect against external aggression than a person whose inner organs are disrupted by cancer can protect himself by wearing a coat of armor. Why are the very officials who are aware of and responsible for the present plight of the Republic exhibiting such feverish haste in the taking of steps tending to involve this Republic in war? Is it to so weaken this Republic and also Nazi Germany and Japan that Soviet Russia, which is so pro-Jew that anti-Semitism is punished as counter-revolution, may be the only sizable power left to pick up the wreckage and destroy Christian civilization? The courting of war is, of course, a further violation of American tradition.

11. Menace of hyphenates: Perhaps the greatest menace to this Republic today is its hyphenates. No adherent or supporter of any other organized political nationality can be at the same time a citizen of this Republic. Undivided loyalty is, and must be, demanded. Individual Germans, Italians, British, political Jews, and others must wholly abandon all such political connections, whether national or international, before they can be eligible for American citizenship. The sinister Anglophile propaganda of deception during the last half century, including pollution of American textbooks, seeking surrender by you of the precious heritage of independence, for which your forefathers suffered and died, is the work of designing and unscrupulous British hyphenates. The Declaration of Independence truly narrates the insufferable grievances which compelled the Colonies to separate from Great Britain, whose aggressions are so extensive that the sun never sets upon her domain. Nazi and other kinds of hyphenates should also be identified and their purported American citizenships revoked. Hyphenates usually disguise themselves as real Americans, but their conduct sooner or later reveals them.

To illustrate: No true American can be induced to do or say anything tending to impair or destroy the faith of the American people in the Father of his Country, or in the soundness of the warnings in his Farewell Address. Yet as late as February 1940 Congressman SOL BLOOM, who is listed prominently in the latest Who's Who in American Jewry, burst into the public press with the pointed assertion that when said Farewell Address was released the author of it was so unpopular that he "couldn't have been elected dog catcher." What was his real purpose if not to suggest that the persistent New Deal violations of the warnings in said address were not violations of anything worth while? BLOOM did not allow himself to be deterred from his purpose even by the fact that he had specially committed himself to the honoring of said author when he took the chairmanship of the George Washington Bicentennial Commission. It would seem to be incumbent upon BLOOM to explain his connections, purpose, and objective in thus reflecting upon what true Americans deem sacred. It may throw further light upon the alien or international vintage of the New Deal. The much-advertised columnist, Walter Winchell, whose name is also carried in the latest Who's Who in American Jewry, might also explain why, in February 1938, he charged that the Father of the Republic "wanted to be called 'High Mightiness'" and "never was a general." Winchell's connections, purpose, and objective might also be enlightening. He could hardly have intended to inspire respect and admiration for the Father of his Country, but instead the reverse. Why? It seems inconceivable that anything more charitable could be said about either BLOOM or Winchell than that they must be hyphenates of some sort rather than 100-percent Americans. Perhaps the noted Jewish writer, Maurice Samuel, gave the true explanation in his frank book, You Gentiles, published in 1924, in which he said:

"Our Jewishness is not a creed—it is ourself, our totality" (p. 73).

"We will forever destroy because we need a world of our own" (p. 155).

However small the number may be, it is certainly not true that no 100-percent Americans are to be found among citizens of Jewish stock.

12. Deceit must end: If this Republic is to be preserved as such, there must be a prompt removal of those now in control. If this is not done, it will be plain deceit to continue to call this Nation a republic, the Statue of Liberty should be cast into the sea, and the Nation's Capital should be given some alien or international name suited to what is substituted for the Republic, instead of further insulting the Father of the Republic by continuing to use his name for the Capital of such alien or international substitute.

Why Rob the Aged?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 1940

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I do not know how long those who are paying social security taxes will

continue to suffer and permit the New Deal spendthrifts to squander the funds which are intended for old-age protection. The failure of those most vitally affected to protest against the unconscionable misuse of their funds by the administration leads one to wonder which is the more powerful force in government—fact or propaganda.

Hitler proclaims the doctrine that—

The skillful and unremitting use of propaganda can persuade people to believe that heaven is hell or conversely that the most miserable existence is paradise.

Has this foreign totalitarian technique been imported and put to use here?

Those who have listened to the soft and honeyed words about the retention of "all social gains" need only examine the record to find that this administration has collected and spent nearly $2,000,000,000 of the old-age security funds. To be exact, the tax collections under the Federal old-age and survivors' insurance benefits, title 2 of the Social Security Act, as of August 31, 1940, totaled $2,005,696,643.67.

Of this sum the administration has spent $1,728,100,000 for the operating expenses of the Government. Thus, eventually this sum of $1,728,100,000, together with interest, will have to be fully met by further taxation. Is this what President Roosevelt means when he refers to the retention of all social gains?

But this is only part of the story. In addition, I find that as of August 31, this year, there was a balance in the unemployment trust fund of $1,800,000,000, for which I O U's have been issued. At the present time the current collections for unemployment taxes far exceed the withdrawals from the fund by the States, so that the balance in the fund is steadily increasing or, rather, there is a steady increase in the deposits of I O U's—which must be paid by future taxation.

There is no doubt whatever that the money collected to protect the aged in the sunset of life, and the unemployed, has been squandered along with other wasted billions. The victims of the cunning I O U device, employed by the New Dealers, have not protested because of the persistent Government propaganda to the effect that none of the social gains are to be surrendered. It is evident now that the old-age annuity trust funds will be collected and expended for the running expenses of the Government so long as the present wild and reckless Roosevelt administration is continued in power. Every dollar of the billions to be collected in the future for the security of the aged and the unemployed will likewise be spent and will have to be paid again by the taxpayers unless Congress puts a stop to the racket.

Congress, when it passed the Social Security Act, never contemplated that the pay-roll taxes would be diverted to purposes other than to meet the problem of old age and unemployment. The Congress acted upon the ever-repeated assurance of President Roosevelt that the Budget would be balanced; that the social-security taxes could be used to reduce the then-existing Government debt instead of increasing the debt by printing new bonds in exchange for the cash collected in pay-roll taxes.

Honesty and fair dealing on the part of the administration with those who are compelled to pay the tax require that immediate steps be taken to prevent the further dissipation of these and other trust funds. The Congress cannot escape its responsibility for the misuse of these funds, for it is fully aware now that a Federal debt of $49,000,000,000, which, if contingent liabilities are included, is nearer fifty-five billion, with increasing annual deficits, places old-age security in a most precarious position.

The Roosevelt New Deal administration has already reduced the income of banks, insurance companies, foundations, hospitals, colleges, churches, and eleemosynary institutions by approximately one-half since 1933.

Why should Congress by its inactivity refuse to stop further raids on the much-heralded social gains? Is Congress, in the light of the facts, going to adjourn without taking effective action to protect the old-age annuitants and the unemployed from the destruction of their promised future social security?

Let us hear no more about retaining social gains until there is some evidence of an honest intention on the part of the Roosevelt administration to preserve and protect these so-called gains, instead of destroying them.

President Roosevelt and the Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 25, 1940

Mr. MYERS. Mr. Speaker, as election day draws near, it has become evident that an overwhelming majority of the American people are convinced that the safety and salvation of America and the American way of life can only be maintained and assured by the election of President Roosevelt.

The social gains of the last 7½ years have buttressed and preserved our economic system; the President's foresight and courageous leadership have assured us a national defense which will make this Western Hemisphere impregnable from any attack.

Consequently, the American people determined months ago that they would not hand over their Government and their country to the Republican Party and its vacillating candidate in these perilous days of war, world confusion, and chaos, but rather would rally to the side of their President and follow his leadership in keeping America out of war.

Therefore, as the days and weeks passed, people of all parties and all creeds and all races came to recognize more and more, the greatness of our President and were convinced of the wisdom of his foreign policy.

The trend to the President has turned into an avalanche, which is frankly admitted by all political forecasters. The Republican high command practically concedes the reelection of President Roosevelt.

But the Republicans now believe the way has been found to sabotage the President's next administration and tie his hands, namely, by the election of a Republican Congress. To this end they are bending all their efforts and are now seeking to trade votes in every election district in the country.

I am reliably informed money is being poured into congressional districts which the Republicans consider close. Local sentiment for home-town boys is being fostered, and voters are being told, "Go ahead and vote for the President, but give us a break; split your ticket and vote for the Republican candidate for Congress." By these subtle methods the hate-Roosevelt crowd hopes to defeat the President's friends in Congress who have assisted and worked and labored with him, and thereby ultimately destroy his domestic and foreign program.

Without a Democratic Congress to enact into law the necessary legislation to bolster our foreign policy, our Nation will be forced closer to the brink of war; without a Democratic Congress to defeat any and all attempts to emasculate and rip apart the fabric of social legislation which has been woven over the last 7½ years, the country will be in constant turmoil and a state of helpless confusion.

President Roosevelt needs loyal soldiers by his side in this great crisis; he must have Congressmen and Senators who believe in him, who will work with him and not against him, who will stand shoulder to shoulder for the defense of his policies; who will strike against and fight against intolerance, bigotry, and foreign isms; who hate war just as he does; who will crusade against nazi-ism, communism, fascism, and

"fifth columnists"; who will march with him to keep America free.

I know the American people will not fail President Roosevelt, for he has never failed them. I know they will not fail his friends and his supporters, be they local, State, or National candidates. I know they will elect to the House of Representatives and the United States Senate men who have proven by their votes and their deeds that they sincerely believe in the President's policies.

Let us beware of those who praise the President but seek to elect to Congress men who are his political enemies.

Let us beware of those who give lip service to President Roosevelt and the Democratic Party but are using every means to defeat for Congress men who have stood beside him when the battle was raging.

Report of Representative Schwert to the People of the Forty-second District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PIUS L. SCHWERT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 1940

Mr. SCHWERT. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege for me to have this opportunity to render a report and to give a brief account of my record to the citizens of the Forty-second Congressional District of New York. For the past 21 months I have represented the good people of this district. Members of this Congress have set a peacetime record in the manner in which they have remained in session 18 complete months and a portion of 20 of these 21 months. When the pages of history are written, I believe they will show that this Seventy-sixth Congress has done much to improve and protect the American way of life.

It has been my privilege to represent this great cosmopolitan Forty-second District since January 1939. The district is composed of every race, creed, and nationality, comprising in the aggregate an exemplary cross section of genuine Americanism surpassed nowhere in these great United States. Proud have I been—and even more grateful—of the opportunity to represent these generous citizens, to whom I am greatly indebted. Though I am proud of my district and proud of the people who elect me, I want to be modest about my own record of service. I have tried hard to justify the confidence and to please my constituency, although at times I knew I could not wholly satisfy the cross-current of varied and complex opinion of all of my people on a particular question. I have done my level best, and today I invite the closest scrutiny of my record.

POLICIES OF MY OFFICE

Always to give the best in response to all calls, communications, and inquiries; to maintain an office in Buffalo as well as in Washington, and to see the public personally every opportunity I had to be in Buffalo; to see all visitors from western New York who might journey to Washington, or who might be living in or near Washington because of employment there.

Always to vote on measures as God gives me the light to see the right, for the benefit of the Nation and the majority of my people.

Always to treat capital and labor fairly and equitably, knowing that the harmony of both is essential to a successful economic structure in our democracy.

COMMITTEES

During the year 1939 I served on the following committees: Census, District of Columbia, Expenditures in the Executive Departments, War Claims, and World War Veterans' Legislation. These gave me experience and an insight into questions and problems pertaining to the various census enumerations made by the Government and its departments, pertaining to city government and its many ramifications, pertaining to executive-department expenditures, and the claims and legislation arising from the World War and the veterans who took part in that war. Early in 1940 death caused a vacancy in one of the major committees of the House. I was absent—because of illness—but the Ways and Means Committee offered a resolution naming me to fill the vacancy. The resolution was adopted, and, as a result, I had to resign from the committees previously named and was made a member of the Post Office and Post Roads Committee, which handles all legislation relative to postal matters within our own country, between our country and our possessions, and between our country and foreign countries. This act of the Ways and Means Committee—remembering me during my absence—was greatly appreciated.

LABOR

Support has been given by me to legislation of benefit to labor. I am for Federal protection of the right to collective bargaining and consistently supported legislation for the man and woman who live by daily toil. The best conditions available must be maintained for the man who works. His efforts have built the great structures and industries of America; these assets must in turn pay him the fair chance which he deserves. Legislation involving mergers has been before us, and I have opposed legislation of this type which would cause loss of jobs. With all types of labor in my district I have also opposed legislation that would be unfair to water and motor carriers. In other words, I have supported all legislation which I felt was beneficial to any part of labor, but not legislation which, while benefiting one group to some extent, would finally result in harming another group. Labor representatives have approved this stand.

FARM COOPERATION

Farming sections make up much of my district. I favor organization of farmers, just as I favor organization of laboring men. I favor farmers' cooperating in any way they can. Having been born and raised in the country, my personal contacts and personal dealings with farmers have assisted me in dealing with their problems. Early-morning market reports were available this season because of my efforts, made at the request of farmers' representatives. I have always sought to bring the problems of our farmers to the attention of the proper agencies of government and have not cast a vote detrimental to agriculture in my district.

OLD-AGE ASSISTANCE

For the aged who may or may not have had a really fair chance in active life the country should strive to provide freedom from worry and want in old age. The social-security law was a beginning, but it does not do the job right. There should be an old-age pension, paid by the Federal Government, without harassing the old folks as under present procedure. As a matter of principle and justice, the old folks in all States should receive the same amount monthly. I have on every occasion signed every petition to bring old-age-pension and general-welfare legislation before Congress for action, as well as working amongst my colleagues in behalf of this legislation, and voting for it when vote has been taken. This Congress has failed to make the progress I thought it would make in this matter, but the problem is too important to be forgotten or pigeonholed. The fight for justice to the aged must be carried on.

VETERANS

As an ex-service man, my membership on the War Claims and World War Veterans' Legislation Committees was greatly appreciated. I have favored every bill in the interest of the veterans of the World War and earlier wars, as well as legislation for their widows and dependents. My active support of this legislation is well known. Said support shall continue, for it is my firm belief that our Government should remember and compensate to the fullest those who have fought for our country's welfare. Our veterans should not be neglected in these times when our attention is so frequently directed to

problems growing out of another war. During this session I supported legislation to repay travel allowance to Spanish War veterans and to liberalize pension provisions for World War veterans. I hereby acknowledge the fine cooperation I have received from each and every veterans' organization.

STREAM POLLUTION

Legislation for the preservation of the purity of our rivers, lakes, and streams has received 100-percent support from me. The sportsmen and all lovers of the out-of-doors have noted my support in behalf of conservation of natural resources and the conservation and propagation of game and fish.

POSTAL SERVICE

My predecessor, Senator JAMES M. MEAD, as chairman of the House Post Office and Post Roads Committee, did yeoman work in improving our Postal Service throughout the Nation as well as in our own district. His efficiency as chairman of that committee is known throughout the country. As a member of the committee during 1940 I am pleased to report that I have been privileged to check many rural routes for improved and new service, city deliveries for possible additional service, new location and new equipment for post offices. Though all requests have not been granted, I have worked continually for efficient and improved Postal Service throughout the district.

THE YOUTH PROGRAM

The work of the Civilian Conservation Corps has been of great value to our young people. When a reduction of one-third of the number of camps was on the program last year I joined a group to defeat the reduction and to keep the camp program at about the same level until the first of the year.

The National Youth Administration has been of much benefit in enabling our young folks to continue their education and to obtain training, out of school, to assist them in earning a livelihood. My best efforts have been given for a continuation of this program.

All legislation and appropriations for vocational education and Federal aid for our school system have had my support.

Projects for school buildings and school improvements have received my aid. In these cases the principal credit belongs to the school boards and the teachers having the vision to initiate and push these projects, but it has been a pleasure for me to cooperate in every possible way that this work might go forward.

INDIAN MATTERS

With a portion of an Indian reservation in my district I have given much thought and study to the Indian problem. In many cases the Indians need assistance in education and health matters. Our Indians are sound, practical, and patriotic citizens. They want only what is their right and just due. As one of their white chiefs, I have made diligent effort to analyze their problems.

FEDERAL AID

Careful consideration has been given all legislation under the heading of Federal aid, such as that given by the Work Projects Administration, the Farm Security Administration, the Home Owners Loan Corporation, the Federal Housing Administration, the Farm Credit Administration, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, the Public Works Administration, the United States Housing Authority, and others.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

In the neutrality legislation, amendments to keep United States ships out of combat areas and to keep United States citizens off ships of combatant nations received my active support. These changes have assisted materially in keeping us out of the present war.

As one who loves peace and who is anxious to promote amity amongst nations, I am unalterably opposed to war. Nevertheless I favor adequate national defense. Thus, I have supported the recent rearmament program; and following passage of many amendments, which improved and made the legislation fair and just to all, I accepted the training-program legislation.

UNEMPLOYMENT

Believing that the final answer to many of our problems lies in the proper solution of our unemployment situation, I joined with 70 Members of the House in a study of this question last winter. This was not a regular activity of the House of Representatives. It was voluntary action on the part of all of us, and we formed a nonpartisan unemployment conference. The purpose was to study unemployment from every angle in an effort to remedy the economic situation. The members of this conference met in weekly sessions for many months, examining the unemployment problem, its causes. and its cures, to the end that relief might be replaced by recovery and that labor throughout the land could find steadier and more profitable employment. Careful, written reports were made by 14 subcommittees, and a list of 12 causes of unemployment and 16 approaches to its cure were officially approved by conference members. These reports and recommendations have been published as a House document, known as Document 850, and are available for study. Our conference plans to press for action on this problem as soon as the emergency matters dealing with the national defense are completed.

CONCLUSION

Mr. Speaker, the foregoing is a brief résumé of my 2 years in the House of Representatives. It has been made as brief as possible—and still it gives my stand on most phases of the legislation taken up by the Seventy-sixth Congress.

Today the tragedy of the world events is the greatest since the dawn of history. Thus, Mr. Speaker, I say that to be an American is one of the grandest things that can come to any man. It is my hope and my firm belief that a God-fearing, God-serving, united people, those of us who have the privilege of living in the greatest republic in the world, can, and will, carry forward the torch of freedom, holding it high above the clouds of today's storms, so that generations yet unborn can see its light and follow it—and that we may, in our own way, be able to preserve for posterity this freedom which we now enjoy and which was handed to us unsullied by our forefathers.

My stand on peace and war has already been given to my district. I will only repeat that I will support that part of the 1940 platform of the Democratic Party which reads, "We will not participate in foreign wars, and we will not send our Army, naval, or air forces to fight in foreign lands outside of the Americas except in case of attack." That policy must be adhered to, so that the common, average citizens of this country may continue to live simply, happily, and safely in a land which is a democracy.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, may I urge that all of us resolve anew to bend our efforts toward carrying forward and safeguarding the principles of liberty, so that America, conceived in liberty and born in freedom, shall continue to grow to great heights, and that the principles of Washington, Jefferson, and Lincoln shall not perish from the face of the earth.

Resolution of Polish Army Veterans' Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN LESINSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 1940

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a resolution from the Polish Army Veterans' Association of America, Inc. The Polish Army Veterans' Association was organized during the last World War and fought in France. It has as its officials the following honorary members: I. J. Paderewski, Gen. J. Haller, Dr. T. A. Starzynski, and honorary chaplain, Rev. M. Godlewski.

Its present officers are: L. C. Kajko, national commander; J. Dec, senior vice commander; S. Wojtusik, junior vice commander; L. L. Krzyzak, adjutant general; and A. Zakiewicz, treasurer.

The present Polish Army Veterans' Association of America, Inc., like the Polish Army which is now fighting alongside the British Army in defending England, is offering its services in defense of this country.

SEPTEMBER 20, 1940.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES, FRANKLIN DELANO ROOSEVELT, THE DEPARTMENT OF WAR, AND TO THE GOVERNORS OF THE STATES OF THE UNION, *Greetings*:

The Polish Army Veterans' Association of America, an organization composed of former soldiers of the Polish Army who served in the first World War and representing 27,000 men of Polish extraction, who volunteered for service in 1917–18 from the United States, wishes hereby to offer the services of these soldiers-veterans in the Home Guard, which under the present defense program is to take place of the National Guard called up for service in the Regular Army.

Inasmuch as we are a representative body of men who originally enlisted as volunteers from the United States for service in the Polish Army and were repatriated in 1920 and, having served side by side with the American Expeditionary Forces on the western front, we feel that we should be considered as fit material for any auxiliary service in the defense program of this country.

As loyal American citizens, who now are too old to come under the Selective Service Act but willing and ready to serve this country in any capacity and, having an average of 2½ to 3 years of active military training—we hereby offer our experience and ability to serve the United States at any moment and assure the Government of our readiness to answer your call at any time.

We trust that our offer will be taken under serious consideration and assure you of our fullest cooperation in any and every manner of service we may be called upon to perform.

Respectfully submitted.

POLISH ARMY VETERANS' ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA,
By L. L. KRZYZAK, *Adjutant General.*

Gettysburg Address, 1940 Version

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 25, 1940

LETTER TO SIOUX FALLS (S. DAK.) DAILY ARGUS-LEADER

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following reader's letter which appeared in the Sioux Falls (S. Dak.) Daily Argus-Leader. It speaks for itself, and it does so most effectively.

GETTYSBURG ADDRESS, 1940 VERSION

To the EDITOR OF THE ARGUS-LEADER:

Eight years and $40,000,000,000 ago there was born on this continent a New Deal, conceived by the Democratic Party and dedicated to the proposition that only one man in this country was big enough to be President.

We are now engaged in a great political campaign, testing whether this deal or any other deal costing forty billions and dedicated to such a proposition can long endure.

We are listening for the great crooner of that campaign. We are listening to hear his explanation of the forty billions, of W. P. A., A. A. A., and N. R. A., and total defenselessness. His silence on these subjects speaks loudly.

In a larger senselessness, he speaks loudly of Hitler and Mussolini, impressing us that the battle is between them and him; that he is the only brave man, living or dead, who can lead the opposition to them.

It is for us, as Americans, to dedicate ourselves to the proposition that America is still the land of opportunity. The American people will little note nor long remember what he says this year, but it can never forget what he has done the last 8 years.

And that from the memory of the pioneers of this Nation and their stalwart sons who have tramped the pages of history we take increased devotion to those principles which have made us a nation. That we may not become a government of the Roosevelt, by the Roosevelt, and for the Roosevelt until Roosevelt shall perish from this earth.

E. L. JAY.

WATERTOWN, S. DAK.

Report on Industrial Mobilization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARTIN J. KENNEDY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 26, 1940

REPORT OF MR. MARTIN SWEENY, PRESIDENT OF THE COMMODORE HOTEL OF NEW YORK CITY, TO MAYOR LaGUARDIA

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of the membership of this House a portion of the report submitted to the mayor of the city of New York by Mr. Martin Sweeny, president of the Commodore Hotel in New York. This report contains many valuable suggestions in connection with our program for national defense.

I respectfully request that the members of the Committee on Military Affairs and the Committee on Naval Affairs make a careful study of this report with the view to recommending to the President the desirability of adopting the suggestions of Mr. Sweeny. I believe it important that the many facilities available in New York be used for the various activities of the Government in the present emergency.

I heartily endorse all the proposals contained in the Sweeny report and trust that they will be given serious consideration.

The report follows:

A MEMORANDUM TO THE MAYOR—NEW YORK—THE LOGICAL CENTER OF ADMINISTRATION OF INDUSTRIAL MOBILIZATION AND OTHER EMERGENCY ACTIVITIES CONNECTED WITH THE NATIONAL DEFENSE

With the mobilization of American industry and other measures related to the national defense already moving swiftly through the planning stage, it seems timely and constructive to suggest, for reasons which will be set forth below, that the Advisory Commission of the Council of National Defense—as well as many of the subordinate and coordinating boards and bureaus—be located in the city of New York.

It is in point, however, first to call attention to the fact that New York now faces a period when, unless protective measures are taken, low-ebb business is an alarming possibility. The war has ended ocean travel and, with it, all its related transient business. The freight movement which has been created is artificial and likely to cease overnight. Because New York is not a so-called heavy-industry center we can expect none of the direct advantages of the employment and business booms which will accompany quantity production of the materials of defense in, say, Detroit and Pittsburgh. All this—and most of its economic benefits—are bound to bypass New York. And to this it should be added that an examination of the future must not fail to consider the effect of a possible totalitarian victory in Europe: It would destroy much of America's foreign trade, not alone with Europe but with South America as well; it would reduce the port of New York to a low rank among the shipping centers of the world. Already, according to Iron Age, reports are coming from South America that Germany is offering steel for post-war delivery at prices well below ours.

It is for these reasons, as well as for the peculiar advantages it would have as the administration center of war-industry activities, that New York should be brought immediately to the attention of the President. The locating here of the tremendous administrative organizations that must be set up would give the city its one chance at a share of the Nation's war business. It would immediately place on an earning basis thousands of square feet of dead space in office and loft buildings. It would provide, directly and indirectly, employment for thousands. It would bring other thousands of needed workers from out of town to occupy apartments now vacant. It would attract a great transient population of those whose war-related interests would bring them here to occupy hotel accommodations. There would be a consequent flow of money where it is badly needed. These, briefly, are the advantages which would accrue to New York.

But there is another side to this suggestion; The advantage a New York location would have for the men who are taking over the gigantic task of gaiting industry to meet an unprecedented demand and coordinating its operation with the needs of the Military Establishment.

First, New York would afford them direct contact with the executives of the major industries whose home offices are here—the men with whom they will be constantly dealing. There would be a consequent saving of time, and time is of paramount importance.

Second, New York would afford them direct and time-saving contact with the Nation's financial leaders, who are located here.

Third, New York offers the advantage of adequate housing facilities already in existence and office and loft space ready for occupancy, as compared to Washington, which is underbuilt. And in the matter of apartment and hotel and office accommodations in Washington, it might not be out of place to recall that twice within 25 years the Capital has proved complete inability to handle housing and office-space emergencies. In 1917, Washington, even with its temporary living quarters which were built at great expense—and scapped later—was crowded to a point where men and women lived and worked in chaos. That same condition was approximated in 1933 when a mushroom working population was produced by the needs of N. R. A. and other business relief agencies. Today, Washington, with its facilities taxed almost to the limit, is in no position to meet the situation any more adequately.

Fourth, New York is readily accessible by air and by rail. LaGuardia Field, its new airport at North Beach, not only is equipped with the most modern facilities for handling traffic but is less than half an hour away from the heart of the city; two of the country's great railway systems bring their trains to midtown. Again, here is time saving for those whose vital work will require swift movement to and from the offices of the Advisory Commission. In comparison, Washington loses once more: The commercial airport there is already considered inadequate, and certainly it has not the capacity for the traffic that is bound to develop.

Fifth, New York's communication system is capable of handling the enormous telephone and telegraph traffic which the war-industry administration will produce. There would be no need to set up large-scale temporary installations such as were required at the Capital during the last war—and such as would have to be set up there again.

Sixth, the city's transportation system and its supplemental bus lines not only solve our normal travel problems but are geared to accommodate instantly a sudden increase in population.

Seventh, New York's facilities for feeding additional thousands are well known. With hotel dining rooms and restaurants available everywhere there would be no spectacles such as Washington witnessed in 1917–18, when war workers waited in queues at restaurant doors and menus were exhausted—the result of inexperienced management attempting to take care of crowds.

It may be objected that geographical separation from the War and Navy Departments, with which the Advisory Commission and its various subexecutives will have so much vital business to transact, would prove to be a disadvantage, a handicap, to the work in hand. That objection will not stand because the Commission and the various Army and Navy bureau chiefs, no matter where located, will use liaison aides for keeping each other informed as to requirements and accomplishments and progress. It is not the function of the war-industry administration to design war equipment or to tell the Army or Navy what supplies they need to fight a war. Their job is to learn what materials will be required and to mobilize and coordinate the great industries to produce them. They must be able to assure industry adequate supplies of raw materials, to facilitate production, to cut away the red tape, and to set up the machinery of defense for a rapid and vital expansion. This is a great business undertaking, and it can be accomplished more efficiently in the world's greatest business city than in the center of national politics. The Anglo-French Purchasing Commission, charged with the task of emergency buying and with the whole country to choose from, made that decision long ago and has been here since the outbreak of war.

It is respectfully urged that this matter be presented at Washington.

MARTIN SWEENY, *President.*

Congressional Election—A Continuous Performance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. U. S. GUYER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 1940

Mr. GUYER of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, as the biennial election for Representatives approaches I am often asked why anyone wants to be a Member of this forum fashioned for us by our forefathers in the Constitution, wherein one is in a perpetual campaign for votes and becomes as the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. CARTWRIGHT] has said, "A walking petition for votes."

In an address 4 years ago on the floor I said:

It is one of the inexplicable mysteries of life in which one surrenders his peace of mind, his tranquillity of soul and life under his own vine and fig tree for a disappointing, disillusioning ignis fatuus in the morass of public life. Yet, arduous as the duties are, we are loathe to leave its unrivaled associations, and every Member may refer with pride to his membership in this forum of the people.

That explains roughly why many of us seek this office, but more particularly just now when the gluttons for power at home and abroad seek to make this a totalitarian world. We Members, who are a part of the Government and know firsthand what has taken place heretofore and see clearly what is taking place at this moment, may well claim the privilege of staying in our posts for what we can do to strangle autocracy and rampant bureaucracy and disguised dictatorship at home.

The late Champ Clark, of Missouri, former Speaker of the House, has so lucidly pointed out why Members with experience, training, and seniority are best fitted to meet such a crisis, and how unwise it is to continually change Members of the House, that I have asked unanimous consent to extend my remarks including the address referred to.

THE MAKING OF A REPRESENTATIVE—REMARKS OF CHAMP CLARK AT THE WASHINGTON PRESS CLUB RECEPTION, THURSDAY, MARCH 16, 1916

(Printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 17, 1916)

It is a high honor to be a Representative in Congress, if for only one term, and with the number of terms the honor increases in geometrical rather than in arithmetical proportion. A Member's usefulness to his country should increase in the same proportion. A man has to learn to be a Representative just as he must learn to be a blacksmith, a carpenter, a farmer, an engineer, a lawyer, or a doctor.

"Poeta nascitur non fit"—a poet is born, not made—says Horace; but Congressmen—that is, useful and influential Congressmen—are made largely by experience and practice.

The old Charlotte district in Virginia knew this and kept John Randolph, of Roanoke, in the House till he became a great national figure. Then the Old Dominion sent him to the Senate, and General Jackson sent him to St. Petersburg. There are sporadic cases of similar action in other districts.

It is an unwise performance for any district to change Representatives at short intervals. A new Congressman must begin at the foot of the class and spell up. Of course, the more brains, tact, energy, courage, and industry he has, the quicker he will get up. If he possesses these qualities, and if his constituents will keep him in the House, he is as certain to rise as the sparks are to fly upward. No human power can keep him down. It is only fair and rational to assume that every Representative's constituents desire to see him among the "top-notchers."

Take the present House and see how long the men who hold the high places have served. I cannot name all, but a few as samples.

Mr. Speaker Cannon is serving his fortieth year. He holds the record, or, in pugilistic parlance, "he holds the belt," for length of service in the House in our entire history. In several Congresses he was chairman of the great Committee on Appropriations and then was Speaker 8 years; only one man, Henry Clay, having been Speaker longer.

I am serving my twenty-second year; Minority Leader Mann is serving his twentieth year; Mr. Kitchin, chairman of Ways and Means, his sixteenth; Mr. Fitzgerald, chairman of Appropriations, his eighteenth; Mr. Moon, chairman of the Post Office and Post Roads, his twentieth; Mr. Jones, chairman of Insular Affairs and "father of the House," his twenty-sixth; Mr. Flood, chairman of Foreign Affairs, his sixteenth; Mr. Hay, chairman of Military Affairs, his twentieth; Mr. Glass, chairman of Banking and Currency, his sixteenth; Mr. Adamson, chairman of Interstate and Foreign Commerce, his twentieth; Mr. Stephens, chairman of Indian Affairs, his twentieth; Mr. Slayden, chairman of the Library, his twentieth; Mr. Henry, chairman of Rules, his twentieth; Mr. Lever, chairman of Agriculture, his sixteenth; Mr. Padgett, chairman of the Navy, his sixteenth; Mr. Lloyd, chairman of Accounts, his twentieth; and Mr. Sparkman, chairman of Rivers and Harbors, his twenty-second. There are other big chairmanships, but these will suffice to show that as a rule the big places go to old and experienced Members, for most of the men who rank close to the chairmen are old timers. The same thing holds good with reference to members of the minority. As an illustration, Messrs. Gillette and Cooper, who are serving their twenty-fourth year, are the ranking Republicans on Appropriations and Foreign Affairs, almost certain to be chairman thereof should the Republicans ever again have a majority in the House, as in that event, in all probability, Mr. Mann will be Speaker, unless he is nominated for President next June.

Go through the whole list and you will find, with few exceptions, that the men of long service have the high places.

New England and the cities of Philadelphia and Pittsburgh have understood the value of long service all along, and, having elected a fairly good man to Congress, they keep him in the harness.

The Member of longest consecutive service is called "the father of the House." Five Philadelphians in immediate succession bore that honorable title—Randall, Kelley, O'Neill, Harmer, and Bingham. Then it went to Mr. Dalzell, of Pittsburgh. When General Bingham announced the death of General Harmer, his immediate predecessor as "father of the House," he stated that the five Philadelphia "fathers of the House" had served a total of 147 years, and he served 8 or 10 years after making that interesting statement.

In the second and third Congresses in which I served, Maine, with only four Members, had the Speakership and the chairmanship of the great Committees on Ways and Means, Navy, and Public Buildings and Grounds—a most remarkable circumstance, giving the Pine Tree State an influence in the House and the country out of all proportion to her population and wealth. These four men—Reed, Dingley, Boutelle, and Millikin—each served in the House 20 years or more. Other States might profit by her example.

No man should be elected to the House simply to gratify his ambition. All Members should be elected for the good of the country.

The best rule, it seems to me, is for a district to select a man with at least fair capacity, industrious, honest, energetic, sober, and courageous, and keep him here so long as he discharges his duties faithfully and well. Such a man will gradually rise to high position and influence in the House. His wide acquaintance with Members helps him amazingly in doing things.

I can speak freely on this subject without violating the proprieties, for my constituents have kept me here 22 years, and for 20 years have given me nominations without opposition, for all of which favors I thank them from the bottom of my heart. Their generous action and unwavering friendship have enabled me to devote all my time to the public service. I have not been compelled to spend any portion of my time in "mending my fences." My constituents have attended to that. God bless them.

One other thing: I do not know what committee assignments you new Members secured. If they are good, you are to be congratulated. If bad, do not be cast down. No congressional tenderfoot ever had poorer assignments than I had—Claims and Old Pensions—but I never complained or kicked. I went to work as though those committees suited me exactly. Here is an illustration of what may happen and how luck plays an important part. I was next to top Democrat on both Foreign Affairs and Patents for 8 years—never advanced a peg so far as committees went. Just when, at the beginning of the ninth year on those two committees, I was about to become top Democrat on Foreign Affairs, Hon. John Sharp Williams, then minority leader, assigned me to the foot of Ways and Means, and at the end of 4 years through the happenings of politics in five different States I jumped from the foot to the head of the Democratic minority on Ways and Means. So it may be with you. Events over which you have no control may advance you more rapidly than you dream of or hope for. My advice is this: "Whatever your hand finds to do, do it with your might."

Hon. James A. Farley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH A. GAVAGAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 1940

MAGAZINE AND NEWSPAPER ARTICLES

Mr. GAVAGAN. Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, I dare say that no man in the whole history of our country has laid aside the mantle of office more graciously and princely than our former Postmaster General, James A. Farley. His personal charm is universally conceded, his fidelity and loyalty to cause and friends everywhere extolled, and from every section of the country comes a chorus of praise and appreciation of his rugged honesty of mind, heart, and soul. When the historian of tomorrow records the events and happenings of today he will reserve a niche wherein to place the name and character of Hon. James A. Farley, enshrining it with the Latin proverb: qualis vita, finis ita.

I therefore, Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, insert a number of magazine and newspaper articles concerning Hon. James A. Farley that measure and extol his character and service far beyond my limited power and capabilities.

[From Rural Letter Carrier]

FAREWELL, DEAR JIM!

(By Charles H. Bailey, Rural Letter Carrier, Colon, Nebr.)

Dear Jim: it's hard to realize
Our ways have reached an end,
The pleasant ways we've known so long
Seems parting friends from friend;
Somehow it seems you've found a place
In every postal employee's heart,
And now we learn with keen regret
That you and we must part.

Yes, Jim; you've been a dandy boss,
Our work has been a pleasure,
The memories of the recent years
Will be our richest treasure;
We didn't mind the mud and rain
Nor when the snow kept piling,
For well we knew that back of us,
Our Jim would be there smiling.

Some winds blow north, some blow south,
While some blow east or west,
We labor here a little while
And then pass on to rest;
But when we meet beyond the seas
Where all our journeys end,
We hope you'll be as glad as we,
That you have been our friend.

We hope the hands which take the reins
Your able hands surrender,
Will build within our ranks again
A friendship quite as tender;
So, au revoir, dear brother, farewell!
But in life's twilight dim,
We hope to meet the "boss" again—
Our good old friend, genial Jim.

[From the Phoenix (Ariz.) Republic of September 2, 1940]

THE MEASURE OF A BIG MAN

Few Americans have served in Presidential Cabinets in the United States who, upon resigning, have dropped their portfolios with the plaudits of both political supporters and opponents ringing in their ears. When that occurs, it can be truly said that the one who has been so commended has been a good public servant and has done his work well and faithfully.

James A. Farley, who has ably served the country as its Postmaster General, is leaving the Cabinet of President Roosevelt with the commendation of both Democrats and Republicans. The retiring Cabinet member Thursday was publicly recognized for his services by the Senate. It was not unusual that the Democrats should pay tribute to him but when numerous Republicans joined them, it evidenced the fact that a big man, perhaps the ablest man of the President's Cabinet, was leaving the Government service.

We have not always agreed with some of the things Mr. Farley has done as Postmaster General. We were disappointed when he refused to issue a stamp in commemoration of the four hundredth anniversary of the coming of Fra Marcos de Niza to the Southwest last year. We believed then, and we still believe, that that historic event was as deserving of recognition in that manner as was the four hundredth anniversary of the coming of Coronado which is being observed this year. Mr. Farley, however, disagreed with us and no stamp was issued.

Despite that disagreement, we must recognize Mr. Farley as one of the ablest heads of the postal service we have had in this country. We believe it is with genuine regret that those engaged in the Postal Service in the Nation witness his departure from it.

Two great tributes were paid to Mr. Farley in the Senate Thursday. One was by Senator ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG, a political opponent, when he characterized Mr. Farley as "one of the greatest and most colorful figures in a generation and one of the rarest human souls in our time." The other was paid by Senator ELLISON D. SMITH, a Democrat, who said that when Farley "made a promise, he kept it." No greater praise may be given anyone than that statement.

[From the Boston Sunday Post of September 1, 1940]

FARLEY LEAVES

As James A. Farley left office yesterday after nearly 8 tempestuous years one may readily agree with the sad-eyed janitor who reluctantly took down a picture of the late Will Rogers. According to the janitor, the autographed note on the back "says it quick, but says it all." The line reads: " To my close personal friend, Jim Farley, a practical politician and a gentleman—a rare combination."

[From the Fort Worth Star-Telegram of September 1, 1940]

AN ABLE PUBLIC SERVANT RETIRES

The retirement of James A. Farley today as Postmaster General passes as a routine procedure since Mr. Farley's resignation was announced some weeks earlier, to become effective August 31. Likewise, in a campaign year, more emphasis was given to Mr. Farley's surrender of his duties as Democratic national chairman than to his impending departure from the National Cabinet, because of possible political implications of the first change.

But since Mr. Farley today ceases to be a public servant, a full realization is possible of the loss occasioned by his retirement. The people admittedly lose a most capable Postmaster General, who has given the best possible service for the last 8 years; and the Post Office Department loses an administrative head who was able to inspire both the respect and regard of the entire force with whom he has served.

The Post Office Department will go on as usual, and it is testimony to Mr. Farley's efficient administration that the varied work of that Department will continue without dislocation. The best executive, whether in business or government, is the man who so perfects organization that it can continue without him. Jim Farley is such an executive, and it was this demonstrated ability which caused him to be drafted for two important executive posts in private business.

The Post Office Department under Mr. Farley's direction has become one of the best run large-scale enterprises in the entire country. During the unprecedented years of the present administration the Department has handled its ordinary tasks well and has assumed extraordinary duties without interfering with the speed and efficiency of the mail service. Registration of aliens is a recent case in point.

But no doubt Mr. Farley and his legion of friends take the most pride in the regular work of the Post Office Department. The principal functions of handling mail and parcel post are now performed so well by the Post Office Department that the public is able to take them for granted. Likewise, Mr. Farley's foresight and progressiveness have enabled him to expand the comparatively new Air Mail Service to volume proportions that have permitted a lower postage rate.

Mr. Farley leaves a working personnel in the Post Office Department which is both efficient and loyal. At many times in the past those workers have given public testimony of their high regard for "the boss," who was friend as well. In such respects, Mr. Farley has displayed the qualities of leadership which have marked him as an exceptional man in public affairs.

It is somewhat difficult to think of Jim Farley solely as the retiring Postmaster General without recalling his immense value to his own party as its national chairman. The first Roosevelt nomination in 1932 was due primarily to Jim Farley's organizing genius, and that same ability, coupled with such other capacities as executive direction, figured largely in subsequent successes of the Democratic Party. Jim Farley knew thousands of loyal Democrats throughout the country, just as he knew innumerable postal employees. He was able to call them all by name, carried on correspondence with them, and, in addition to their support as Democrats, Jim Farley won their friendship and affection as was shown by the ovation given him at the Chicago convention.

Mr. Farley will be sorely missed by these fellow Democrats, the rank and file of his party, and of the Post Office Department. His absence from Cabinet meetings and at the councils of his party likewise will be felt. Jim Farley's genial personality, his poise, his cool judgment, and his friendliness have been invaluable assets to the administration, and, in fact, to the whole country. Jim Farley always keeps his head; he knew the virtue of silence; he is a leader of men because he first is a master of self. He is a shining symbol of the self-discipline which every American needs. Private business gains and Government loses immeasurably by the withdrawal of Mr. Farley from public service. And the Democratic organization may find it has lost its great balance wheel, as well as the most astute generalissimo it ever had.

Jim Farley's success at his new tasks is certain because his varied capacities, his energy, loyalty, and other qualities have been well demonstrated in the nearly 8 years of his dual role of Postmaster General and national party chairman.

[From the Tulsa (Okla.) World of September 2, 1940]

MR. FARLEY RETIRES

James A. Farley is leaving political and official life. He now goes out as Postmaster General; he was already out as national Democratic chairman. He is out for reasons of principle.

Mr. Farley appeared in national life more than 7 years ago. He was an original sponsor for Franklin D. Roosevelt and was very largely responsible for his election as President. Both the notable Roosevelt campaigns were managed by Farley, and he came through them with a record as a clean, expert, and extraordinarily able politician. He made a most excellent Postmaster General. His work has rarely if ever been excelled in either of these positions, and he held them simultaneously. Through this public service Mr. Farley built himself into popularity and usefulness and now, as a plain citizen, he is highly potent and very generally respected.

[From the Grand Junction (Colo.) Daily Sentinel]

WITH A NATION'S RESPECT

One does not have to deal merely in platitudes when it comes to paying tribute to James A. Farley in connection with his retirement from the President's Cabinet and from the Democratic national chairmanship. Extravagant statements could be made and still could be kept within the bounds of sincerity. We haven't any hesitancy in saying that the President's Cabinet is all the weaker because of Mr. Farley's retirement. We know whereof we speak when we say that the ablest man that ever directed a Democratic national campaign relinquished that job when Jim Farley quit.

There is this to be said, without the slightest exaggeration (and such exaggeration is always needed in most cases of this kind, whether on the Democratic or Republican side), that James A. Farley retires from these two high-ranking positions retaining to the fullest degree a nation's respect, regardless of politics, as to his ability, his sincerity, his cleanliness in public and private life, and his high standard of citizenship.

Not many times in the Nation's history has the United States Senate voluntarily and informally, with men on both sides participating, taken time out to pay tribute to a great political manager.

There is no need for anybody to deny a contention that the coming campaign is going to be aware of the absence of the great organizing ability and the remarkable personal influence of Jim Farley.

It has been our privilege to know Jim Farley personally for many years, and we are among the countless thousands who feel that the national tributes paid him have been deserved. He will be remembered as a great Democrat and a great party leader long after the names of many of the so-called new dealers who weren't fond of him have faded into oblivion.

[From the Hoboken Jersey Observer of August 31, 1940]

EXIT JAMES A. FARLEY

James A. Farley retires today as Postmaster General after almost 8 years of service, during all of which time, up to a few days ago, he has also been chairman of the Democratic National Committee. This was a difficult dual assignment in which a smaller man would surely have bogged down, either failing to attain a high standard in the administration of his public office or arousing criticism by his management of his party's affairs.

But Mr. Farley emerges from the test triumphantly. Perhaps he is not really a bigger man than he was when he entered the Cabinet, but he has risen inestimably in public esteem, and carries with him into private life the best wishes of all parties and factions.

In a day when Cabinet officers are passing so frequently as scarcely to attract any attention, the Senate paused the other day to pay tribute to his sterling public services, and these tributes came not only from Democrats but from some of the strongest party men on the other side of the Chamber.

[From the Catholic Review of September 6, 1940]

MR. FARLEY'S SUCCESSOR

It is our general policy not to take editorial notice of appointments to political office. However, we would note the appointment of Frank C. Walker as Postmaster General of the United States by saying that we do not think he can do better than to so resolve to so work that he will carry back to private life some day something of the esteem with which his predecessor, James A. Farley, was held the Nation over.

We are not referring to Mr. Farley, the politician, but to Mr. Farley the man. Mr. Farley has made his name one that is symbolical of sincerity and fair play. He is known as a man who never broke his word, no matter how great the pressure, no matter how demanding the call of expediency.

But the thing that has impressed us most about Mr. Farley is the esteem in which he is held by those who worked under him, the thousands of men and women in the Post Office Department.

Mail men, mail clerks and others will tell you unanimously, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, from the northern boundary of our country to the Gulf of Mexico, that Mr. Farley was more concerned with their welfare than with any praise from the country for the way in which he ran his office.

In other words, Mr. Farley was unwilling to save money at the expense of the welfare of those under him. He believed that the men and women of his Department were worthy of their hire. He believed they had the right to enjoy the comforts of life and to care for their families better than they had been enabled to care for them before he took office.

These men and women of the Post Office Department remember that there was a Postmaster General of some 25 years ago who was more concerned with his reputation for keeping down expenses than he was in seeing that the men and women of his Department were given a living wage. The Postmaster General to whom we refer deliberately frustrated a program to increase their salaries merely for the sake of his own reputation. As a result the employees of the post-office service suffered untold hardships at a time when other men and women were getting high wages.

Jim Farley was never that way. He conducted the Post Office Department with an efficiency that probably has not been surpassed in history. That is why there are millions of Americans who

esteem him far more for his love for his fellowmen than for his political acumen and his many other gifts.

[From the Bridgeport (Conn.) Times-Star of September 3, 1940]

JIM FARLEY

A good clean-thinking and clean-living man stepped off the national stage this past week end when Jim Farley left the Government service and left politics to enter business.

He has been, by practically everybody's agreement, a first-rate Postmaster General. He has been also, by the verdict of the ballot count, a remarkably astute political manager, arranging things so that Roosevelt was nominated for the Presidency in 1932 and twice overwhelmingly elected. In the recent third nomination of Roosevelt Jim Farley played no part.

Now he goes out of politics, the immediate major interest of American males, and into two other interests of the people which are almost as important and which have the advantage over politics of being year-round and every-year attractions—baseball and "pop."

May the green ink which he made famous on his political letters shine verdantly henceforth on contracts bringing stars into the Yankee fold and on fine fat sales contracts for "pop."

[From the Washington Union Clerk of September 1940]

RESIGNATION OF POSTMASTER GENERAL FARLEY

Postal employees throughout the Nation will concur in the deserved tribute to Postmaster General James A. Farley contained in the editorial from the Washington Star of August 9, 1940, which is reproduced here:

"It was inevitable that James A. Farley, retiring from the chairmanship of the National Democratic Committee, also should resign his position as Postmaster General. The announcement issued recently, therefore, was not unexpected. But it does not follow necessarily that the news was received by the public without regret.

"Mr. Farley earned his place in President Roosevelt's Cabinet by political assistance rendered, then justified it by proving again as he had on several previous occasions the simple fact that he is a man of sound business acumen, skilled in the management of affairs and of people, efficient in the performance of administrative duty. His term as head of the largest organization of its kind in the world has been eminently successful. Understanding as he did that 'the final test * * * for any official is the record of his service' he applied his 'efforts and energies to the job of making substantial improvements * * * and to saving money for Uncle Sam rather than bothering about petty criticism in regard to details which, after all, were not extremely important.'

"Certainly there were mistakes during Mr. Farley's tenure. But of more lasting importance were such achievements as the inauguration of trans-oceanic air mail, the development of a vast building program for the rehousing of postal facilities throughout the Nation and the gradual improvement of postal revenues for work done for hire.

"Mr. Farley is honorably proud of his career in the Post Office Department. He has the right to look back upon it with satisfaction. The public in appreciation of his labors wishes him well in his new venture into private enterprise."

That the administration of Hon. James A. Farley, for the last 7½ years, "has been eminently successful" will not be seriously disputed by anyone not personally captious. In his letter of resignation, Mr. Farley attributed the success of his administration to the fine cooperation given him by postal employees throughout the service, from his associates in the Department to the last field-service employee.

Such cooperation is, of course, essential to the successful conduct of any institution of the extent and scope of the United States Postal Service. Cooperation of that character is not something, however, that "just happens." Human beings, and postal employees are no exception to the rule, react according to the treatment they receive and according to their confidence or lack of confidence in the justice they may expect from those in authority.

The success of his administration and the fact that there has been cooperation testifies to the confidence that postal employees have had in the fairness and humanitarian attitude of Postmaster General Farley.

To the commendation for efficient and extended Postal Service and sound business administration we would add that of the post-office clerks for the improved morale of employees and the many evidences of his desire to extend to them a fair share of the benefits of improved efficiency.

It was wise leadership that prompted the selection of veteran postal employees for the important administration posts. It was wise administration that prompted the promotion to higher positions in the Post Office Department and to postmasterships of more postal employees than ever before in a similar period. The last 7½ years have witnessed much progress in the development of improved personnel relationships. Postal employees experience sincere regret at the departure of Big Jim. We hope that his successor will be as successful and can assure him of the continued cooperation of the great army of postal employees as long as their confidence in worthy leadership can be maintained.

[From the National Rural Letter Carrier of September 7, 1940]

FARLEY FAREWELL AT DEPARTMENT

With hundreds of employees of the Post Office Department crowding the spacious reception hall of the Postmaster General, Second Assistant Postmaster General Smith W. Purdum gave vocal expression of the sincere regret on the part of the workers on Friday afternoon, August 30, at a farewell reception tendered Postmaster General James A. Farley.

At the conclusion of his remarks, Second Assistant Purdum presented the Postmaster General with a set of diamond cuff links and studs, the gift of the Department workers.

Herewith are the remarks both of Second Assistant Purdum and the response of Postmaster General Farley:

PURDUM REMARKS AT FARLEY FAREWELL PARTY

"Mr. Farley, for 7½ years you have been the head of the most important agency of our Government, having to do with the daily affairs of our people. You have been the leader of, and co-worker with a vast army of men and women in the Department and throughout the States of this Union and our colonial possessions. By your unexcelled leadership and great human understanding, the Postal Service has been placed on a plane supported by integrity, character, loyalty, devotion to duty, and service to the people.

"All of us here in the Post Office Department at Washington, and the thousands in the field, have a deep affection for you, and our love and respect for you is as constant as the throbbing of our hearts. Volumes might be written or spoken concerning yourself by those of us in the service, but no words can be found which could truly show the heartfelt feelings of those who have worked with you and for you.

"This official parting is, indeed, surrounded by a cloud of sadness but when we look forward and upward we see an opening in that cloud, and that is a bright light, which is a part of yourself yesterday, today, and tomorrow. In that light we see words of your splendid Americanism, your devotion to duty and your great understanding, coming from your mind and big heart—the words loyalty and devotion to duty, and give the best that is in us to the people of our country.

"Every moment in your tenure of office as Postmaster General you have been kind and considerate of us and have given us wise counsel, for which we are very grateful.

"Our regard and affection for you are such that they cannot, even in a minute degree, be shown in gold or precious stones, but we here felt that it would be proper and fitting to have you carry away with you a small token as a remembrance of those with whom you have come in almost daily contact.

"On behalf of my associates gathered here this token is tendered you with every good wish and that the blessings of a Divine Providence rest upon you and Mrs. Farley, Betty, Anne, and Jimmie for long life and happiness, and that you may long be spared to the people of our country for a further great service."

FARLEY REPLY TO PURDUM'S TRIBUTE

"Fellow workers, now this is not a pleasant occasion for me. On occasions similar to this, when other men left the Department I knew exactly how they felt and I felt for them. I came down here seven and a half years ago a total stranger. I didn't know one person in the Post Office Department. I was not here very long before I felt as though I knew everycne in the Department because the assistants who were in the Department at the time and those who came in shortly after made me feel perfectly at home, and in the seven and a half years I have been here, everyone connected with the Department in high and low positions have gone out of their way to be kind and considerate and helpful. I was away a great deal of the time on business, sometimes not in connection with the Department, but no matter where I went, no matter what I was doing, I knew full well that the Department would run along all right because those associated with me and conducting the affairs of the Department and its activities were competent and capable men who knew more about the Department and its activities than I did, because they had grown up in the Department.

"Whatever success I have had, if any, in conducting the affairs of the Department have been due entirely to the loyalty and support I have received from my assistants from the top to the bottom. I don't think any Postmaster General in the history of the Nation ever received the same consideration I have received, not only from the men and women in the Department here, but all over the country. I have traveled a great deal in connection with postal activities. I think it can be said without boasting that I met probably more postal employees than all my predecessors put together in the entire history of the Department. I have been in more post offices, visited more people in the Postal Service, and I was glad to do it too; I had a lot of pleasant experiences—some of them very funny.

"I am not going to say any more; I could talk for hours and talk all day and not say any more than I can say in a few words. I shall always be grateful to everyone connected with the Postal Service for everything they have done for me during my connection with it.

"I have been here 7½ years—longer than any other men were permitted to preside over the destinies of the Department with the exception of General Burleson, Gideon Granger, and Return Jonathan Meigs, Jr."

[From the Kansas City (Mo.) Union News, letter of August 1940]

POSTMASTER GENERAL RESIGNS

It is with a positive feeling of regret that we hear of the resignation of James A. Farley as Postmaster General. From the standpoint of the employee personnel, Mr. Farley, or "Genial Jim," as press notices called him, was a good boss. He will be remembered by the men in post office workrooms long after less considerate Postmaster Generals are forgotten. He will be noted in history as the first man to hold that office with sufficient temerity and business acumen to place the blame for the annual so-called deficit where it actually belonged. We sincerely hope that his successor will be possessed of his understanding and democratic approach to personnel problems. We wish Mr. Farley all the success in his new business venture that his personality and ability will secure, and that is considerable.

[From the Catholic News of September 14, 1940]

REPRESENTATIVE CATHOLICS

The Constitution of the United States provides that "no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under the United States." When a person is appointed to public office he is appointed as a citizen and not as a representative of the denomination to which he professes allegiance.

It is natural that publications serving members of a particular religious group will record the fact when one of their fellow members has been honored by selection for high public office. But outside the publications of their particular denomination, the religious affiliations of Cabinet members are rarely published, except when such an officer is a Catholic. Few persons except personal friends and associates know the religious connections of non-Catholic officials, but practically every literate person in the Nation at all familiar with national politics knows from the secular press that the Postmaster General for the past 8 years was a Catholic.

Postmaster General James A. Farley was not a Catholic representative in the Cabinet, but the tributes being paid him now by political friends and foes, by the press of his party and by the opposition, indicate that he was a truly representative Catholic there. All unite in saying of him that his word has never failed to be as good as his bond, and that he has ever been the personification of integrity. This record, demonstrating his fidelity to Catholic principles, is the finest reward he could carry back with him to private life.

Mr. Farley's successor, Mr. Frank C. Walker, also goes into the Cabinet as a citizen and not as a representative in either a religious or a political sense of the church of which he has the privilege of being a member. But we may say that he also has been a representative Catholic, not a mere nominal one but a Catholic who has felt an obligation to take an active part in Catholic action, particularly in the field of charity, a Catholic who has exemplified Catholic principles in his daily life. The daily press asserts that the appointment comes to him unsought, and is accepted as a duty and at a sacrifice. We quote the Atlanta Journal when we say that "those who know him best pay him the high compliment of predicting that as Postmaster General he will prove a worthy successor to James A. Farley."

[From the Postal Record of September 1940]

POSTMASTER GENERAL FARLEY RESIGNS HIGH OFFICE

On August 31, 1940, Postmaster General Farley retires as head of the Post Office Department to accept an inviting offer from private industry, after having served with marked distinction in this high station for more than 7 years. This resignation was made public on August 8, by President Roosevelt, by publication of a letter from Mr. Farley and his own letter of acceptance. "I want you to know how much I appreciate the honor you conferred upon me and the trust that you placed in me," stated Postmaster General Farley in his letter of resignation, "when you appointed me to this important position in your Cabinet, when you took office on March 4, 1933." He likewise referred gratefully to the warm cooperation of his departmental associates, to postmasters and postal employees, Nationwide, throughout his entire term of service.

The two terms of Postmaster General Farley, dating from the 1933 depression low, now present a record of postal progress extraordinary. Mr. Farley, in his letter of resignation, referred briefly to certain major service accomplishments of this period. Postal revenue, now at an all-time high, totaled $766,000,000 for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1940. The Postal Service has been placed on a net self-sustaining basis. Postal labor hours have been reduced from 44 to 40 per week. Air-mail operations have been vastly extended, including the establishment of trans-Atlantic and trans-Pacific service; postal expenditures have been reduced despite record receipts and volume, and an impressive total of outstanding services has been performed for other Government agencies. Paying tribute to the manner in which the Department's relations with its employees had been carried on, Postmaster General Farley said:

"Through our cooperation with each of the employees' organizations, we have succeeded in bringing about a new spirit of friendliness and devotion to duty in the ranks of more than 300,000 postal employees, and I doubt if the morale of the postal workers has ever been higher than it is at the present time."

Voluntary retirements from high office are not infrequent, but few are the occasions where a Nation-wide interest has been so manifest and rarer still, where press and public have joined so unreservedly in bestowing praise for service rendered, as has been accorded General Farley. It is a tribute of appreciation to achievement honorably earned and well deserved. Moreover, it reflects the mature judgment of the people.

In reviewing the administrative record of Postmaster General Farley during a period beginning with service deflation unprecedented, and despite all difficulties moving steadily forward to its present unrivaled eminence, there is none that can more fittingly testify to their regard for Postmaster General Farley than the great army of postal employees who have been privileged to work with and for him. Inspired with confidence by his cheerfulness, his friendliness, his high integrity, and his unfailing desire to be reasonable and fair, this association and its membership have responded gladly to his every service call.

Addressing the National Association of Letter Carriers in its 1933 Atlantic City convention assembled, 6 months after assuming office, Postmaster General Farley declared, "I believe in organization, because only through organization can great results be accomplished. There can be no doubt," he added, "that the condition of postal workers is much better than it would have been without the active work of the various postal associations." He also assured this vast audience that it would continue to be his policy "to discuss frankly with you and your representatives any matters that affect your welfare or the good of the service." Declaring his belief that the Nation was on the road back to prosperity, and that improved employment conditions would accelerate that trend, he announced, "I have directed that the payless furlough be suspended on September 30."

This policy, faithfully adhered to ever since, has been the dominant note in postal administration. On July 3, 1935, Postmaster General Farley, speaking on behalf of the President and himself, withdrew his previous objection and urged the enactment of the Mead 40-hour week bill. This bill, enacted on August 17, 1935, was made operative October 1, 1935, now almost 5 years ago. On June 4, 1936, largely through departmental cooperation, the Higgins 6-to-1 substitute ratio bill, which vastly improved substitute employment conditions, was enacted into law. Meanwhile, the observance of Christmas as a postal holiday has been substantially liberalized.

Addressing the 1937 Kansas City N. A. L. C. convention, Postmaster General Farley said, in confessing to a very warm spot in his heart for letter carriers, "There is something about you boys in gray that makes all Americans proud of you; that makes me proud to be your chief. To me it seems that a greater part of the good will we enjoy is brought to us by you."

Taking the postal service in its varied relations as his theme, Postmaster General Farley, addressing one gathering after another throughout his administration, drove home a continuing message of its growth, dependability, and usefulness. Invariably he exalted its history, its processes and policy, and invariably gave generous credit to his predecessors and all postal employees for the success achieved. His contributions to postal literature are now a great Service asset.

Postmaster General Farley now returns to private life with the universal esteem of the American people. We share in full the satisfaction that must come to him through doing a big job and doing it well, as he views the present healthy condition of postal affairs and its certain promise of greater usefulness. We would have Mr. Farley know how affectionately we regard him and how sincerely our best wishes follow him in whatever the enterprise may be that engages his efforts. Saluting him, we declare, "It has been a glorious 7 years."

[From the San Francisco Postmasters' Gazette]

SO LONG, JIM!

When President Franklin D. Roosevelt reluctantly accepted the resignation of Postmaster General James A. Farley from the Cabinet, effective August 31, 1940, he wrote: "All of us in the administration will miss you deeply. We count on seeing you often. I especially count on this after your years of close personal association. Our friendship will always continue."

That gracious expression of the President of the United States will strike a responsive chord in the heart of every employee of the Post Office Department and, even more particularly, of the postmasters of the Nation and the members of the National Association of Postmasters. It exactly expresses our feelings toward Mr. Farley.

But the President wrote as the head of the Government to a subordinate but important member of his Cabinet. Our expression is diametrically opposite because it comes from the employee to the executive; nevertheless the sentiment is the same. And therein lies the evidence of the unusual affection, respect and regard which Jim Farley inspired.

Whether in the White House, at the Cabinet table, or in the simple gatherings of friends; whether with his immediate assistants and the executives of the Post Office Department or in the more humble ranks of the workers in the field; whether with the United States Senators and Members of the House of Representatives or the thousands of men and women who are just the good plain folks of our country; in a word, whether with the high or the low, the rich or the poor, the prince or the pauper, Jim Farley registered and left the indelible impression of his magnetic personality.

As an organizer he stands without a peer in American politics. As an executive, among other things, he can proudly point to the accomplishments of the past 7 years in the United States Post Office, where 6 out of those years show a postal profit in remarkable contrast to the records of his predecessors. Because loyalty is one of his outstanding characteristics, he commanded in his leadership a respect, an enthusiasm, and a devotion which few men in public or in private life have inspired. In a more personal sense, he has guided his life by such high conduct and ideals as to be an inspiration for every man. As a friend, there was no cross too heavy, no road too rough, no hour too early or too late for Jim Farley's big broad hand not to be helpfully outstretched to those in need.

And so the refrain of the old song, So Long, Mary—How We Hate to See You Go, repeats itself as we bid good-bye to Jim Farley. There are and there should be no tears at his leaving. It is not farewell or another Good-bye, Mr. Chips. For his own purposes and betterment, and for the security of his family, he leaves the Post Office for private and more profitable employment. One would be less than human, however, under such circumstances not to offer some expression of regret at the severance of an association which has been so intimately pleasant. We called him the Big Boss—Big Brother would have been far more appropriate.

So long, Jim! If good wishes will help you in your new field of endeavor, you certainly carry them in abundance from the National Association of Postmasters. Without your inspiration and encouragement, we would not have reached the heights to which we have climbed. Your friendship and helping hand have, in more ways than one, lighted the weary way and lifted the heavy load. May the good that you have done return to you like the proverbial loaves and fishes multiplied a hundredfold. May your influence continue to inspire our devotion and loyalty to the Service and ourselves. May your friendship ever surround us as our affection follows you "while you roam." May the blessings of Providence be showered upon you and your loved ones in abundance. So long, Jim!

WILLIAM H. MCCARTHY.

[From the Post Office Clerk of September 1940]

(Presented to Mr. Farley upon his retirement as Postmaster General August 30, 1940.)

A TRIBUTE TO JAMES ALOYSIUS FARLEY

Whereas the Honorable James Aloysius Farley has served with the highest distinction as Postmaster General of the United States; and

Whereas during the years of Mr. Farley's incumbency the Post Office Department reached a peak of efficiency and service to the American people; and

Whereas all of his contacts with the personnel of the Post Office Department have been distinguished by sympathy, understanding, and rare administrative ability and judgment; and

Whereas throughout this period Mr. Farley has never failed to give the most careful personal consideration to all matters brought to his attention by the United National Association of Post Office Clerks, the National Federation of Federal Employees, the National Rural Letter Carriers Association, and the National Association of Postal Supervisors, which organizations compose the National Legislative Council of Federal Employee Organizations: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the National Legislative Council of Federal Employee Organizations present to Mr. Farley this evidence of their esteem, and extend to him every good wish for his future health, happiness, and success.

LUTHER C. STEWARD,
President, National Federation of Federal Employees.
RAYMOND H. COMBS,
President, National Rural Letter Carriers Association.
JOHN J. BARRETT,
President, United National Association of Post Office Clerks.
MICHAEL F. FITZPATRICK,
President, National Association of Postal Supervisors.

[From the Post Office Clerk of September 1940]

JAMES A. FARLEY, A GREAT AMERICAN

Those things are best said which are spoken simply and from the heart.

Realizing this, we of the United National Association of Post Office Clerks say that James A. Farley leaves the Post Office Department with the love, the affection, the admiration of every man and woman in the Department.

In the years he has served as Postmaster General we have come to know Jim Farley well. We know that he spared no effort to insure the progress of the great Department given into his charge, and to enhance the well-being of its personnel. Because this is so, the Post Office Department has achieved a new peak of service to the American people, the cause of the merit system has been immensely advanced in the Department, and the whole tenor of personnel administration has been improved.

There have been many Postmasters General of the United States. It is a plain statement of fact that James A. Farley's name will be inscribed within that narrow circle reserved for the truly great leaders of the Department.

But over and beyond Jim Farley's tangible accomplishments as Postmaster General he will be remembered by the thousands of men and women of the Department, and especially by the officers and members of the United National Association of Post Office Clerks, for those intangible qualities which give to life its finest meaning.

His warmth and understanding, his quick sympathy, his firm and friendly handclasp, his unfailing courtesy, his genuine concern for the welfare of others—these will not be forgotten. Jim Farley combined administrative ability of the highest order with a humaneness which endeared him to the heart of every employee of the Department, from top to bottom.

The record made by James A. Farley as Postmaster General of the United States was brilliant, perhaps unparalleled in the long history of the Department. In that record he can, and surely does, take justifiable pride. But we know Jim Farley well enough to say that it means even more to him by far that he leaves the Department with the heartfelt good wishes and deep esteem of all who have served under him for the past 7 years.

Jim Farley is that kind of a man.

JOHN J. BARRETT,
President, United National Association of Post Office Clerks.

"And Ye Shall Know the Truth, and the Truth Shall Make You Free"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. THORKELSON

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 24, 1940

Mr. THORKELSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include excerpts from a booklet entitled, "The Truth About England."

These are articles which everyone should read, as they give real information on a subject which is vital to the interests of America. The book is published by the League to Save America First, box 307, Hollywood, Calif.

THE TRUTH ABOUT ENGLAND—FOREWORD

When, in October 1937, President Roosevelt startled America, and the world, with his declaration that the democratic nations must unite to suppress the aggressor nations, the declaration was quietly whispered throughout England and France, as proof, that in "due time" America would again join the Allies in a new war against Germany. When 4 months later, Secretary Harold Ickes broadcast throughout the British Empire (but not in America) the speech in which he promised in substance that should England again be involved in war America would come to her aid as we had done in 1917, the Ickes promise was quietly whispered throughout England and France, as further proof, that in "due time" America would join in another war to make the world safe for democracy.

When, 10 months later, Secretary Cordell Hull convened the Pan American Conference at Lima, Peru, it was quietly whispered in England and France that the purpose of the Lima conference was not as Secretary Hull had indicated—a conference to promote commerce between the United States and the 20 nations of Central and South America—but was instead, an attempt to destroy the commerce then existing between the 20 nations, and the aggressor states, Germany and Italy. So interpreted, the people of England and France regarded the Lima Conference as further evidence that America was aiding the Allies and weakening Germany, for the war soon to begin.

When a few months later, in his best-remembered speech, Mr. Roosevelt declared emphatically that in the present war, the entire resources of America should be pledged to the Allies, his pledge even when qualified by the phrase "short of war," was shouted throughout England and France as proof positive, that in "due time," American troops would fight for the Allies, as in 1917.

In the light of these events—and in view of the further fact that for months past our press and radio, pulpits and platforms have flooded the country with pro-English, prowar propaganda, it should now be evident to every thoughtful American that for more than 3 years, our Government has moved steadily and methodically toward another world war. From now on, we may expect an acceleration of war preparations and war propaganda. Again we will be told that England and America are one people blessed with the same laws, customs, language, and religion; again as in 1917 we will be told that "our interests are identical," that if England loses, we lose. That as England is fighting our battle, we should join in that battle and fight for England. Because we believed these things in 1917, and because there is some danger that we may believe them a second time, we set forth in this booklet conclusive evidence that such propaganda is wholly untrue.

Since "conclusive evidence" must always be founded on facts, we submit as a suitable foundation, the following historical sketch: Of the 340 years of English-American history, America has been free from English domination for exactly 40 years. From

1781 and the surrender of Cornwallis at Yorktown, to 1791 and the founding of the Bank of the United States, we were free from English domination for a period of 10 years. From 1833, when Andrew Jackson destroyed the Bank of the United States, until 1863 when Congress passed the National Banking Act we enjoyed another 30 years of freedom from English domination.

Thus our history falls into two divisions, 40 years of economic freedom, and 300 years of economic and political servitude to English kings, bankers, merchants, and shipowners. Using this 300 years of English domination as a blackboard, we will inscribe in school-teacher fashion a series of dates and events that will reveal and prove the truth about England. * * *

CHAPTER I. THE PERIOD OF CONSTRUCTIVE SERVITUDE

From about 1600 to about 1750, the American Colonies enjoyed a continuing increase in population and prosperity despite an ever-present and increasing restraint imposed by Mother England.

In 1606 the English Crown granted the Colonies their first charter, under which they were permitted to establish a colonial government; and among the grants and privileges set forth in the charter, the concession of greatest importance was that contained in section X, which empowered the colonists to establish their own banking system, and issue and circulate their own colonial money. * * * Because this colonial banking system was free from any English interference, and because their money was issued by the Government and not by private bankers, the Colonies experienced an immediate expansion of commerce, both between the Colonies and with foreign nations. * * * As a result of this expansion in trade, the Colonies grew in population and prosperity until they were known and envied around the world. By 1750 the American Colonies, with a population of nearly 3,000,000 and with a growing commerce sailing the Seven Seas, began to be known in Europe as the American Utopia; but in England this American Utopia with its Colonies were growing too fast in population and wealth. * * * In another generation they would be relatively independent, with their own banks, their own industries, and their own commerce. So the English bankers and manufacturers said to the English Crown, "If the American Colonies attain economic independence they will soon demand political independence, and thus the Crown will lose its brightest jewel and we will lose our best market." Thus began between the Crown, the bankers, and merchants a conspiracy to prevent American independence—either economic or political.

As the first step in the conspiracy Parliament passed a law forbidding the colonies from trading with any nation except England, the Parliament expecting the law to have three specific results:

First, since American ships would no longer call in any ports except those of England, emigration to the colonies from other lands would be greatly restricted and the population of the colonies remain largely English. This result would benefit the Crown.

As a second result of the law the colonies would be compelled to sell their raw materials and farm products to English merchants and be compelled to buy their manufactured products from English merchants, and for such prices as the English merchants would dictate. This result would benefit the merchants and manufacturers.

Third. Since the balance of trade would always be in favor of England, and this trade balance must be paid in gold, the colonies, having no gold, would be compelled to borrow it in England. This result would benefit the bankers of England.

One need not be a financial expert to understand that this first step of the conspiracy would be a terrific blow to the colonies and their expanding commerce, and so it was. In a few years prosperity had given place to poverty, hardship succeeded happiness, and here and there were men who spoke of revolution. But here, as many times later, England had overreached herself, for the colonies, unable to buy or sell to advantage in England, began to solve their problem by building their own factories, and by so doing create a market for their raw materials, create the goods formerly purchased in England, and create employment for their workmen. So, fearing the success of this new threat to their domination, the bankers and merchants of England compelled Parliament to pass a second law, the Stamp Act of 1765.

Under the provisions of this law, no circular or pamphlet, no legal documents such as notes, mortgages, and bills of exchange could be circulated in the Colonies without first affixing thereto English stamps; the stamps ranging in cost from 1 penny to $50. As in the former case, three results were expected from this Stamp Act.

First, it would prevent the Colonies from attaining economic independence, and so benefit the Crown.

Second, it would place such a burden on business, that investments in colonial industry would be curtailed, and so benefit the merchants and manufacturers of England.

Third, since the stamps must be paid for in English money—gold—the Colonies would be forced to borrow from English bankers, thus bringing the bankers complete domination of colonial money.

But again, as in the former case, England had over-reached herself, for the act so completely destroyed colonial business, that there was an immediate and almost unanimous demand throughout the Colonies for revolution and independence. Aware of this threat of revolution, Parliament repealed the Stamp Act in 1766, but the damage was already done and could not be repaired.

For realizing that in the two laws just described, England was attempting to throttle the Colonies; and, realizing further that Colonial expansion could no longer proceed under English rule, the demand for revolution increased in scope and fury until 1776, when the Colonies issued the Declaration of Independence and began the war which ended in victory in 1781, with the surrender of Cornwallis at Yorktown. So ended the 180-year period which we have called the period of constructive servitude—constructive because for 180 years England permitted the development of the Colonies; and servitude because that development proceeded under an increasing English restraint and was stopped when it threatened to expand into colonial economic independence. Had England possessed that spirit of humanity and democracy of which she has boasted, she would have foreseen the folly of her tyranny, but, lacking that spirit, she make the greatest mistake in history, forced America into war losing all the Colonies had become, and all they might have become.

From 1781 to 1791 the new American state was completely free from English domination. During these 10 years the Constitution was enacted as the sovereign law of the land, Washington became our first President, and the new Nation began its march toward world preeminence. But England was not through with us yet; what she had lost at Yorktown she now planned to regain in New York, what she had lost on the field of battle she now planned to recover in the field of finance. And so we come to another chapter in English-American history, a 120-year period of English tyranny, which we shall call

CHAPTER II. THE PERIOD OF DESTRUCTIVE SERVITUDE

While this period officially began in 1791, it actually began in 1778 at Valley Forge, in the darkest days of the Revolutionary War. With General Washington unable to procure funds to equip his dwindling army, it looked for a time as though the war for independence would be lost; but at the psychological moment a Philadelphia merchant, Robert Morris, came to Washington's rescue, and placed at his disposal more than $1,000,000. In those days $1,000,000 was a stupendous sum, and when from authentic records we discover that at the time of his gift Robert Morris was worth approximately $100,000, the question arises where did he get the million he gave to Washington? He got it from another Philadephia merchant, one Haym Solomon, who in turn had received it from a famous European banker. And it is well to remember in this connection, that this million dollars did more than save the revolutionary cause—it changed and crystalized the whole trend of American history.

AN ENGLISHMAN BECOMES OUR FIRST SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY

Soon after making his gift, Robert Morris suggested to General Washington that he appoint a young man named Alexander Hamilton as aide-de-camp, saying that as young Hamilton was an expert financier he could render invaluable services in handling the finances of the Army. Hamilton, who had been born a British subject and trained in British banking and business methods, soon won the confidence of General Washington, and when 11 years later the general had become the President he installed young Hamilton as our first Secretary of the Treasury. It was rumored that the appointment was made on the advice of Robert Morris and Haym Solomon, but be that as it may it is beyond question that Hamilton was better fitted for the office than any other man then available—as his later record revealed.

During his year as Secretary of the Treasury Hamilton placed the national credit on a sound financial basis, following as far as possible the plans and principles long since adopted by the Treasury Department of the English Government. But as later events revealed, Hamilton accomplished something of even greater importance during his year as Secretary of the Treasury—he formed substantial contacts and friendships with leading Members of Congress, who were later to repay his favors in a most substantial manner.

After a year in office and without a word of warning to President Washington, Hamilton resigned, announcing his intention to devote his energies to private business. Since Hamilton had planned the Treasury Department and was the only man in America who understood its intricacies, his sudden resignation precipitated and spread throughout the Nation a loss of confidence in the Government's financial security. Immediately Government finances became involved and Government credit impaired, and when leading bankers and businessmen annouced their loss of confidence, now that Hamilton was no longer in control, a wave of fear and uncertainty engulfed the Nation. Beyond question, this is exactly what Hamilton and his friends had planned and expected—to precipitate a break-down of the Nation's financial structure as the first step of a conspiracy to gain control of the Nation's banking.

About 1 year after his resignation, and with conditions growing from bad to worse, Hamilton petitioned Congress for a charter for a national bank, urging that by no other means could national confidence be restored and the Nation's financial structure preserved. When first made the request was refused, but later as conditions grew worse, and his friends in Congress had done their work, the petition was granted, and Hamilton was given a charter for "the Bank of the United States," the said charter to expire in 20 years. Concerning the internal organization of the new bank, the following may prove interesting: In form and power, it was a duplicate of the Bank of England. Much of its stock was bought by English bankers. The gold which sustained its credit had been brought from England. In brief, the original "Bank of the United States" was

little other than a branch of the Bank of England, as Hamilton had planned it should be, from the day he took office as Secretary of the Treasury. Patterned after the Bank of England, financed with English gold, and with much of its stock owned in England, the bank began its operations—and how did it operate?

It operated as surgeons usually operate, by cutting out something; and in a few years, the bank had cut out the happiness and security of most the Americans in America. And this is how the bank operated:

It restricted its loans (1) to Englishmen who had lately arrived to get in on the ground floor and who at once bought a controlling interest in existing companies and, when this was not possible, started similar companies in competition; (2) made loans to those merchants who would make their foreign purchases in England; (3) made loans to those American Tories of New York, Boston, and Philadelphia, who had opposed our War for Independence. * * * In brief, this Bank of the United States restricted its loans, as far as possible, to those English, and pro-English Americans, who could be counted on to aid in placing the American people under the financial tyranny of Mother England. * * * As the inevitable result of this concentration of money and control of credit, it was but a few years until this crew of pro-English pirates had captured the American ship of state, together with most of the wealth therein contained.

That such a result was inevitable was indicated many years later by Pope Pius XI. In his remarkable monograph, Forty Years After, published in 1931, Pope Pius XI said: "This power (concentrated economic domination) becomes particularly irresistible when exercised by those who, because they hold and control money, are able also to govern credit, and determine its allotment." It was the fact of "allotment" which made the tyranny of the Hamilton Bank "particularly irresistible." For the bank's loans were "allotted" mainly to the English and pro-English. This system of concentrated money and controlled credit Hamilton inaugurated in 1791, a system which in a few years had given a few men complete control of our banking, industry, and commerce, to the end that Englishmen and the pro-English Americans who had opposed the War of Independence received most of the Nation's profits, while those who had fought and won the War of Indepndence had been driven out of business and their properties foreclosed.

In brief, what England had lost at Yorktown and Saratoga, she had regained in New York and Washington: She had lost the battle with bullets, but won the battle with gold, and again the American people, as in the days of the Colonies, were the victims of English tyranny. True, they still retained their boasted liberties, the freedom of speech and assembly, but these were of no avail, for Hamilton could say with Rothschild, "Give me the power to control a nation's money, and I care not who makes its laws." But here again, as in 1765, Mother England had overreached herself—too many Americans had been victimized by her greed, too many merchants and manufacturers had been driven out of business, too many farmers had lost their land, and too many workmen were walking the streets, while newly arrived Englishmen possessed their jobs; indeed, conditions had grown so desperate that even the Congressmen controlled by this "Bank of the United States" were afraid for their lives and jobs. So it happened that in 1811, when the bank's charter was about to expire, and it was certain that Congress would refuse the petition for another 20-year charter, England, fearing the loss of her racket, repeated her trick of 1776 and forced America into war—the War of 1812.

WAR OF 1812

The reader is here cautioned to remember that this War of 1812 was a war of aggression, as was the war which later destroyed the Boer Republic in South Africa. True, the War of 1812 may somewhat contradict the English claim, that all their wars are fought in defense of democracy and Christianity, but be that as it may, the English won the War of 1812 even though our history books claim they lost it. It was a verification of the old statement, that "England never won a war, or lost a peace."

Thus, after burning Washington and parts of other cities, the battlefield was shifted to New Orleans, where Gen. Andrew Jackson easily defeated the English Army under General Packenham. The ease with which America "won" the war, and the nonchalance with which England accepted defeat, has long puzzled some students of history, but the explanation is both simple and obvious—England never expected to win the war, her only objective being—an objective she easily achieved—to bankrupt the American Government. As England had foreseen and planned, the cost of the war would bankrupt the Government, after which the "Bank of the United States" would refuse to circulate its money and renew its loans—then, after a few months of fear and suffering, the people would permit Congress to issue another 20-year charter to the "Bank of the United States." The plan worked out according to schedule, and in 1812 the new charter was issued, and England and the "Bank of the United States" were off for another 20 years of plunder. Twenty years in which the American people would again be victimized, American merchants again driven out of business, American farmers again robbed of their land, and again American workmen walk the streets—and all for a group of English stockholders and pro-English bankers, masquerading behind the title, "The Bank of the United States."

When after another 20 years of loss and suffering, poverty and foreclosure the bank's second charter was due to expire and the bank was preparing to petition for a third charter, Andrew Jackson who had defeated the English in 1812, decided to defeat them again in 1832, and so in this year he ran for the Presidency, promising if elected, that he would destroy the "Bank of the United States" forever. When elected by a tremendous majority he kept his promise, and destroyed the bank which for 40 years had served as the American branch of the Bank of England.

As a result he became, and remains, the most hated American in English history. He also became the most typical American in American history—but he had not destroyed the bank forever, for in 1872 the bank returned, in a new form but under the same control.

Speaks to National League of District Postmasters at Thirty-fifth Annual Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS G. BURCH

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. THOMAS G. BURCH, OF VIRGINIA

Mr. BURCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech which I made before the National Convention of Postmasters at New York City on September 19, 1940:

Mr. Chairman, President Moody, distinguished guests, ladies, and gentlemen, I appreciate the kind invitation to address the National League of District Postmasters at your thirty-fifth annual convention, and am happy to be with you today. It is an honor and a pleasure to be invited to address this organization of postal workers. It is fine to be here in the home city of our distinguished former Postmaster General, Hon. James A. Farley, who resigned his position, effective the first of this month. He was one of the most efficient and humane Postmaster Generals this country has ever known. Under his administration the Post Office Department made great strides in business efficiency and in friendly relationship with the more than 300,000 employees. That the Post Office Service is on a self-sustaining basis, that the employees are enjoying better working conditions, the public getting improved mail service, is in itself a real tribute to James A. Farley. During his term of office the work hours per week have been reduced from 44 to 40; the substitutes have become recognized employees of the Post Office Department; the Air Mail Service improved; R. F. D. Service extended to thousands of citizens not heretofore served; first-, second-, and third-class postmasters have been placed under civil service. Under his administration the receipts of the Department in the last fiscal year increased to $766,000,000, the largest in the history of the Post Office Department; and the Department has been placed on a self-sustaining basis with respect to that part of the service rendered to the public.

We welcome our new Postmaster General, Hon. Frank C. Walker, and are confident he will have a brilliant administration and do credit to himself and honor to the Post Office Department and this administration.

We are fortunate in having career men in the positions of Assistant Postmasters General. Hon. Ambrose O'Connell, Hon. Smith W. Purdum, Hon. Ramsey S. Black, and Hon. Walter Myers are rendering distinguished service in their responsible positions. You, the Committee on Post Office and Post Roads, and the public generally are fortunate in having such capable men to serve in this capacity.

I am delighted to be in the State represented by my good friend and former chairman of the House Post Office and Post Roads Committee, the junior Senator from New York, Hon. JAMES M. MEAD. I served with him on the Post Offices and Post Roads Committee for 8 years. He is well informed on postal legislation and has the interest of the personnel of the Post Office Service at heart. The members of the committee rejoiced in his promotion but regretted to lose him as one of our members.

The Post Office Department is one of the greatest business enterprises in the world, employing over 300,000 people who daily come in contact with our citizens in every walk of life. No institution has more loyal, capable, and conscientious employees than the Post Office Department and none holds a more important and responsible position with the Department than the postmasters to whom is entrusted the responsibility of seeing that the mails are promptly and safely dispatched, not only to all parts of this country, but to the people of every nation. In addition to your usual duties, you have performed outstanding services for other Government departments and agencies within recent years. You rendered valuable service in connection with the payment of the veterans' bonus. You are an important arm of the Government in the sale of United States Savings Bonds for the Treasury Department. You were called upon to aid in the census of unemployed, registration of workers under the social-security

program, and are now engaged in aiding the Department of Justice in registering aliens. Many other duties have been placed upon you, and your assistance to the various governmental departments and agencies has always been prompt and capable.

In my opinion there can be found nowhere in this great Nation a more loyal and patriotic group of American citizens than is represented here in this convention. You men and women are gathered together here today as loyal American citizens and devoted public servants in the service of the Post Office Department and 130,000,000 American people.

There are about 44,000 postmasters in the United States, and in your deliberations here in convention and in your other activities you represent these 44,000 postmasters whether they are members or not, and I am sure any action you may take will be taken in the interest of all postmasters.

I congratulate you on having efficient men as your officials. Your president, John A. Moody, is a man who has your interest at heart, is thoroughly familiar with your needs and is well liked by the officials and legislators in Washington. Your legislative representative, Mr. E. A. Meeks, is always on the job, knows the postal laws from A to Z and you need have no fear but that you will get all that is coming to you if it is within his power to get it.

Organization and cooperation are essential in getting maximum efficiency in any of our efforts. It is through organization properly conducted that the best results are obtained by any group of people. Much credit is due to the representatives of your association in Washington for their assistance and cooperation with the Post Office Department and Post Office and Post Roads Committee in the continual improvement of the Postal Service.

I extend to you the greetings of the chairman of the House Post Office and Post Roads Committee, Hon. M. A. ROMJUE, and of the entire membership of that body. I think it appropriate that I call your attention to the work of this committee during the Seventy-sixth Congress. In the first session the Post Office Committee favorably reported some 15 bills, and during the present session has favorably reported 16 bills, all of them by unanimous report, and all have passed the House. We have considered all bills coming before us on their merits and never allowed politics to enter into our deliberations. A distinguished Member of Congress, who is not a member of the Post Office and Post Roads Committee, made the statement on the floor of the House when we had a bill under consideration that the Members of the House could rest assured that any bill reported favorably to the House by that committee had been thoroughly considered.

I think our committee has an unusual record for the Seventy-sixth Congress. We have recommended, and the House passed, bills improving the status of practically every branch of the Postal Service, such as requiring the appointment of assistant postmasters in first- and second-class offices, additional clerical help in post offices of the third class, and amending the appropriation bill so third-class offices may be furnished equipment and fixtures by the Department. Legislation has been passed by the House helpful to star-route carriers, rural-mail carriers, railway-mail clerks, substitutes in the Postal Service; granting sick leave and other benefits not heretofore enjoyed, clarifying the status of special-delivery messengers, providing an 8-hour workday and payment for overtime of dispatchers and mechanics in charge of motor vehicles, and other legislation which, if passed by the Senate and enacted into law will be helpful to other branches of the Postal Service. We have reported and the House has passed other bills of a clarifying nature which will strengthen existing postal legislation.

The longevity bill is now being considered by a joint committee of the Senate and House, but on account of the defense program with the large appropriations necessary to make this program effective, no action has been taken although hearings have been held and valuable information obtained which can be used at the next session of Congress. I think I am safe in saying that the subcommittee to which this bill was referred is in sympathy with the object of this proposed legislation.

On May 28, 1940, I introduced a bill, H. R. 9923, placing postmasters of the fourth class on an annual salary and fixing their rate of pay, and providing allowance for rent, fuel, light, and equipment and fixing the rate thereof. A companion bill was introduced in the Senate by Senator MEAD. This bill was introduced after exhaustive and painstaking study by the Post Office Department, two of its most efficient and experienced inspectors having been assigned to a special investigation of the proposal, and representatives of the postmasters' associations and members of the Post Office Committee of the House having given it earnest thought and consideration. It is not claimed that this is a perfect bill, and in all probability it will be amended to some extent before reported by the committee to the House, but we believe it is a step in the right direction and will remedy a bad condition now existing in the Postal Service. After it has been enacted into law and given a fair trial, if it appears that amendments are necessary for its equitable administration, we can then give consideration to the enactment of such amendments.

Under this bill it is estimated the postmasters of the fourth class will be paid an additional $900,000 annually. About 22,022 will receive an increase in salary and about 4,401 will suffer a decrease in salary, the average decrease being about $50.87 per annum. The compensation of about 2,471 postmasters will remain as it is at present. The salary will be paid semimonthly. It has been thought by some that in case this bill is enacted into law the fourth-class postmasters would be denied the fee of 3 cents they are now allowed for issuing each postal money order. This is not the case, as it is specifically stated that this provision in the existing law is for clerical help and is in no way affected, but since the question has been raised, it is the intention of the committee to insert a clarifying amendment to the effect that section 717 of title 39 of the United States Code, authorizing the payment of fees on money orders issued at money-order post offices is not repealed. If it is found advisable other clarifying amendments will be made to the bill.

As stated, it is impossible to get a perfect law and one that pleases every member of any group of people, but this bill, if enacted into law, will definitely fix salaries of all fourth-class postmasters and eliminate the system of keeping cancelations; provide annual adjustment of salaries based on variations of business and does not take from the Postmaster General any of his legal rights to adjust compensation in unusual cases.

Section 133, title 39, United States Code, provides: "Where unusual business accrues at any post office, the Postmaster General shall make a special order allowing reasonable compensation for clerical service, and a proportionate increase of salary to the postmaster during the time of such extraordinary business."

This bill lifts the veil of suspicion, fixes definite allowance for rent, light, fuel, and equipment, simplifies the accounting work in every office. It provides fair and uniform method of adjusting salaries as in first-, second-, and third-class offices, does not repeal allowances for unusual conditions and removes any doubt as to what a postmaster's salary will be each month.

You are holding your convention in this great city of New York, the largest city in the Western Hemisphere, with its 7,000,000 people, at one of the most momentous and critical periods in the history in our country—I may say of the world.

Europe is engaged in one of the most, if not the most, brutal and disastrous wars the world has ever witnessed. Loss of life, ruin, and destruction is going on day by day with no relief in sight. We should rejoice that we live in a peace-loving country and have a blessed and priceless heritage which has been handed down to us through generations by our forefathers. Let us not surrender one iota of that heritage, nor surrender our right to live the American way. Let us build the greatest Navy on earth, have the most efficient and effective air force in the world, a great and unconquerable Army. Let us not grow passive for a moment.

In realizing our responsibilities to protect our country there is no room in America for "isms"; every foot of our land is dear to us. There is no place here for the aggressor. We want no dictator. We do not covet or desire additional territory but will defend every inch of soil in our possession and protect the rights of every American citizen. We are a peace-loving people and will not become entangled in the affairs of any foreign country. We will not tolerate an aggressor or permit an army of a foreign power on our soil or the navy of a hostile nation to reach our shores. I hope the people of this country may ever be able to say, "God Bless America, My Home Sweet Home."

Roosevelt's Free Radio Use for Alleged Political Talk Brings Assault by Lawrence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONARD W. HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 1940

ARTICLE BY DAVID LAWRENCE

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by David Lawrence, published recently in the Washington Evening Star:

ROOSEVELT'S FREE RADIO USE FOR ALLEGED POLITICAL TALK BRINGS ASSAULT BY LAWRENCE

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON, September 23.—Although the three major broadcasting companies decided to give free time to President Roosevelt's radio address at the University of Pennsylvania, it was as transparently a political address as if it had been made by Senator GUFFEY who, together with other prominent New Deal Democrats, toured Philadelphia with the President in a manifest piece of political campaigning.

Mr. Roosevelt used his University of Pennsylvania speech to answer recent attacks by Wendell Willkie, Republican nominee. He had every right to do this and nobody can object to a President campaigning for himself. What is causing public criticism is the apparent effort to make a political speech under supposedly nonpolitical auspices and to gain the use of free radio time and thus save the democratic campaign funds for other purposes.

CREATES DISUNITY

The President's speech can be divided into paragraphs and set alongside Mr. Willkie's recent utterances. Mr. Roosevelt took issue with the Willkie charge that Roosevelt had lost faith in the people. The President chose to construe this charge to mean that Mr. Willkie wanted to accept the judgment of only a few people—the managers of business. The President constantly turns most of his campaigning into efforts to array class against class and to create disunity as between the employers and employees of industry.

What Willkie has been charging is that the President is ignoring the representatives of the people in taking important steps without asking for the approval of Congress. There is no reason to believe Congress would have withheld permission to send the 50 destroyers to England, but Mr. Roosevelt was afraid of the people's representatives and not only made an agreement with a foreign government of transcendent importance to the country, but actually ignored a statute passed by the representatives of the people in Congress.

The President endeavored also in his Philadelphia speech to meet the cry of dictatorship by insisting that as long as there are "free elections" no harm can come to America.

What he did not discuss was the fact that free elections no longer exist in the sense in which the term has been used for generations in America. It is estimated, for instance, that 10,000,000 families receive checks nowadays, or benefits of some kind, direct from the Federal Government.

Hence the willingness of a President to allow his own officeholders who disburse these funds to name him for a third term means the use of governmental power and the absence of freedom in a party convention. No more palpable evidence of dictatorship is needed than the way the nomination of Henry Wallace for Vice President was forced on the delegates at the Chicago convention.

Mr. Roosevelt, in his Philadelphia speech, made no reference to the fact that the W. P. A. rolls have been increased each election year and that the scandals over the W. P. A. and A. A. A. were so great in 1936 that the Hatch law had to be passed to try to prevent a recurrence.

Now the spirit and the letter of the Hatch law and the actual provisions of the Federal corrupt-practices act are violated by the President's own campaign committee which has collected upwards of $170,000 from the corporations whose judgment Mr. Roosevelt says he does not care to accept, but whose money looks good to the campaign manager named by his own personal appointment.

The President made quite a point of the difference between the point of view of Alexander Hamilton, founder of the present-day Republican Party, and Thomas Jefferson, acknowledged founder of the Democratic Party of today. This discussion of the two contrasting philosophies in American politics had in it plenty of implications which the listening voter in the midst of a political campaign could not fail to understand, but Mr. Roosevelt, after citing Jefferson as the champion of democracy, failed to quote the founder of the Democratic Party on the one thing that is really germane to the present campaign—the third term. Writing in 1809, after serving two terms, Jefferson said:

JEFFERSON QUOTED

"If the principle of rotation be a sound one, as I conscientiously believe it to be, with respect to this office, no pretext should ever be permitted to dispense with it, because there never will be a time when real difficulties will not exist, and furnish a plausible pretext for dispensation."

Then in 1821, long after his years of retirement gave him a chance to think deliberately and objectively about Presidential tenure, Jefferson wrote again:

"The example of four Presidents, voluntarily retiring at the end of their eighth year and the progress of public opinion that the principle is salutary, have given it in practice the force of a precedent and usage, insomuch that should a President consent to be a candidate for a third election, I trust he would be rejected on this demonstration of ambitious views."

Yet Mr. Roosevelt quoted Jefferson approvingly as the defender of free government and by implication took unto his bosom the Jeffersonian philosophy, when, as a matter of fact, the Democratic Party today is split wide open because Mr. Roosevelt chooses to ignore what Jefferson said and what every President of the United States has respected since the beginning of the Republic about a third term.

Epic of the Red Man's Trial in Tribal Court

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 23, 1940

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, one of the most interesting incidents that has come to my knowledge for many a day took place recently in the district which I have the honor to represent.

Under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting a description of this incident by Mr. Meigs O. Frost, a staff correspondent of the New Orleans Times-Picayune.

The matter referred to follows:

MACON, MISS., September 20, 1940.—At Treaty Ground, Dancing Rabbit Creek, Cameron Wesley, chief of a Choctaw Tribe of less than 50 members, stood acquitted here today by Choctaw tribal law as on August 28 he stood acquitted in the Noxubee County courthouse at Macon, Miss., for the fatal shooting of Evein Tubbee, another full-blooded Choctaw of that vanishing redskin race. Wesley at his own home slew Tubbee with a rifle June 16, 1940. Twice in 2 weeks his life had been in jeopardy, first by the paleface law, then by the law of the redmen. The white man's jury set him free on a plea of self-defense. His redskin tribesmen heard him plead his own case in Choctaw, and his defense was accident. For accident is the only defense against murder by Choctaw laws that stem from the code of ancient Egypt itself, say Indian legal authorities here.

More than 500 white men, women, and children traveled long miles of dusty country dirt roads, stood for hours under a blazing sun, to witness the strange Indian ceremonies.

STANDS BESIDE GRAVE

They saw a dusky wisp of a little man standing by the grave of the man he slew 3 months ago. Chief Cameron Wesley was clad in faded blue overalls far too big for him. They were rolled up several times at the bottoms over heavy work brogans thick with red and yellow dust. His shirt, home-made by his Indian wife, was white turned gray with many washings, its front marked with faded blue embroidery, its neck like that of a Russian blouse, buttoned down the back like the dress of a child. His hat was worn and battered black felt, grimed deep with red and yellow dust.

Wesley's hands were dark and work-hardened at his tasks as a tenant farmer. His face was weathered dark copper. His hair was unfathomable black.

There was a strange pathetic dignity about that scene. And menace of something sinister loomed darkly through the blazing sunlight. For Jennie Tubbee, widow of the slain man, was not there, nor were any of the less than a dozen Choctaws of Evein Tubbee's tribe, the accusers. To the Dancing Rabbit Creek Treaty Grounds had come an Indian boy, loping along the dusty back-country roads with a message. Chief Wesley told his tribe, told his white friends, the message that Indian boy brought.

ACCUSERS ABSENT

"Some white men," said Chief Cameron Wesley, and he named them, and his listeners nodded their heads understandingly, "they got their guns out and they wouldn't let Evein Tubbee's tribe come to the treaty grounds. They don't want me tried. They want me freed so I leave this place. But I do not leave. I stay and pick my cotton. My tribe, they go ahead and try me anyway."

So the tribe went ahead and tried him anyway. It was the same situation as if in a white man's court at a murder trial all the witnesses for the State suddenly vanished. There was nothing to do but quash the case.

And when they had quashed the case, the tribe elected Cameron Wesley chief for life, there in the open air amid the dust of the hard-trodden Treaty Grounds, and then they gave a celebration dance that set the dust to flying and filled the air with throbbing high shrill cadence of Indian whoops.

Sixteen full miles through thick dust clouds the paleface spectators had come to witness the scene, and they were there before the redskins.

JUDGE PRESENT

Among the first of the spectators to arrive was Judge John C. Stennis, of the sixteenth Mississippi judicial district, who drove from his home at DeKalb, Miss. Two weeks ago he presided in the Macon courthouse when Cameron Wesley was tried under white men's law.

"I am attending this Indian tribal trial," said Judge Stennis, "because it represents, in part, a trial of human rights under a system of jurisprudence used many centuries in the Old World; a system that has many aspects of Egyptian law, and which, of course, antedates by many centuries the common law of England, which is the foundation of the law of Mississippi.

"The laws of Mississippi, which have acquitted Cameron Wesley, the defendant at this tribal trial, will seek to make his acquittal valid by attempting to prevent any infliction of any bodily punishment on the defendant by his fellow Choctaws. Of course, any penalty of social ostracism that the Indians may choose to impose may be carried out as far as the law of the State of Mississippi is concerned."

There, too, was William B. Lucas, Macon attorney, who had defended Cameron Wesley successfully 2 weeks ago. And there was a force of quiet, armed deputies appointed by Sheriff Charles Fraley, of Macon, to make sure that whatever the outcome of the trial by the Indian tribe, no bodily harm should come to Cameron Wesley.

Fully 300 white spectators had gathered at the Dancing Rabbit treaty grounds before the first Indian appeared. They copied and snapshotted the massive granite marker on the grounds, placed there by the Daughters of the American Revolution. They copied its deep-graven inscription:

"Here on September 27, 1830, was signed by the treaty of Dancing Rabbit Creek, by which the Choctaw Nation of Indians surrendered

their lands to the United States and removed west of the Mississippi. Commissioners John Coffee and John H. Eaton. Choctaw chiefs, Greenwood Leflore, Mushulatubbee, Little Leader. Erected by Bernard Romans Chapter, D. A. R., Columbus, Miss."

Then, far away amid the trees, the beat of a tribal drum was heard. It was being beaten in slow, steady, marching cadence, the cadence by which the human heart pumps blood. Though the scene was sharp and clear in bright and blazing sunlight, men and women and children looked around, startled.

TRIBAL DRUM BEAT

Up the dusty road, between high clay banks, through a leafy tunnel of ragged trees, a small band of Indians was seen approaching. In the lead an Indian boy of 14 beat the drum. Behind him marched Indian men, carrying the sticks of their ball game, like Lacrosse sticks. Behind them marched the squaws. By the squaws trudged the papooses old enough to walk, their bare feet kicking up the dust. Some of the squaws carried nursing babies at their breasts.

Their faces were inscrutable. Not a muscle moved save the involuntary twitching of coppery eyelids. Up to the Dancing Rabbit Treaty Grounds they marched. Squarely beside the grave of Evein Tubbee, the man he slew, descendants of Mushulatubbee, whose name was carved on that monument as a Choctaw chief who signed the treaty, stood Cameron Wesley, the slayer. In one hand he carried a plant with a flower in bloom. He knelt at the head of the grave. He scooped a hole in the dusty earth with his dark work-hardened hands, and he placed the flower there. His hands patted the earth about the roots as one familiar with the earth and the things that grow upon its breast.

Then he rose and took two steps. He was close beside the grave, yet, but now he was squarely in front of the granite monument on the spot where his ancestors had traded away what today are 25 of Mississippi's 82 counties; traded them away for barrels of rum and home in the Indian Territory that is Oklahoma now.

CADENCE AND COLOR

Then while white spectators strained their ears, the voice of Chief Cameron Wesley rose upon the still, hot air. The cadence of Choctaw, the long-forgotten speech, the language of a dying race, rose and fell, rose and fell.

Paleface nerves were evident in the strained white faces of the spectators who crowded close. But never an emotion showed in the still dark faces of his tribe, standing in a semicircle before him. The group of some 30 Indian men, women, and children glowing with color like a rainbow, like a sunrise, like a sunset. Shrill green, flaming scarlet, vivid blue, bright golden yellow, their cotton and silken garb was slashed with embroideries of bright colored contrasting silk thread and beads of every color in the spectrum.

And this is what Chief Cameron Wesley told them in the Choctaw that has survived 110 years, intact against the English speech that surrounds it:

"Warriors, women, children of the Choctaw Nation, I am your chief, I stand before you here at the spot where our ancestors signed away our land to the white man. My life is in your hands. I have slain a man. If you do not know, thus was the slaying done."

Step by step he rehearsed the fatal day of that Sunday, June 16, 1940. He told how Evein Tubbee had come to his home from Tubbee's home 4 miles away. He said Tubbee had cursed him and his family, threatened them, hurled rocks through the doors and windows of their little home, and had danced the war dance around that home. From his own wood pile, Wesley said, the invader had seized a club, waved it like a war club, and threatened to kill them all.

CHIEF CHANTS STORY

"I did not want to kill. I did not mean to kill," Chief Cameron Wesley's voice rose and fell, rose and fell. The Choctaw cadence was like music on the air. He was not speaking. He was chanting.

"My wife fled, with her youngest baby at her breast," the chief's voice went on. "My sons fled. My daughters fled. We ran. We knew that the devil of drink was within Evein Tubbee. We knew that when the sun rose again he would be ashamed that he had made war talk to us, his friends.

"I picked up my gun and I fled," the chanting voice went on. "Evein Tubbee ran hard behind me. I could hear his feet upon the ground. I ran faster. I thought every step to feel his club upon my head. Then there was the fence, I knew that I could not leap over that fence. I knew that if I stopped to climb that fence he would kill me."

Dramatically the dark little wisp of a man paused. A Choctaw, graduate of American school, stood beside the Times-Picayune reporter, translating the chant word by word. The little group who listened felt their own muscles tighten at the drama of the chant, at the suspense of the pause.

GUN WENT OFF

"I thrust my gun back of me," went on Chief Cameron Wesley's voice. "I hoped it would make Evein Tubbee stop. So I thrust my gun around my side, with the muzzle pointing at him. And I looked over my shoulder. The gun went off. He fell. I did not mean to shoot him. I meant only to make him stop. But the gun went off. He fell. He was dead. The bullet was in his heart. I had killed him."

Another dramatic pause.

"Men of my Nation," Chief Cameron Wesley's voice rose in full chant again. "Women of my Nation. Children of my Nation. My life is in your hands. It was 110 years ago our ancestors signed the treaty with the white men on this top where my father sleeps in his grave beside the grave of the man I killed.

"I have been set free by the white man's law that could have hanged me like a dog. Now I stand before your law, which is my law. The treaty we signed with the white man said that we could live under our laws. I have lived under the Choctaw law. If you say I must die by the Choctaw law, give me the weapon and I will die here by my own hand. If you say that I am banished from my tribe, I will go away, with my cotton unpicked in my fields.

"Men and women are born and they die. But while the clouds come up in the sky, while the water runs, while the rain and sun bring crops out of the earth, the law goes on. I live under our law. I can die under it. It is for you to say.

"I have spoken."

The singing cadence of his voice died away. Silence fell on Dancing Rabbit. You could hear the swift intake of quick-drawn breaths there in the hard, hot sunlight.

CHIEF IMPASSIVE

Impassive, stoic, unflinching, the dark face of Chief Cameron Wesley, set with those black, fathomless eyes, looked steadily into the dark faces and the obsidian eyes that were centered on him. The little group of less than 50 Indians stood motionless for some 2 or 3 minutes that seemed like a year.

Then, out of the crescent ranks of them stepped Johnny Cotton, their overseer, elected by their own vote. He wore a flowered shirt that might have brought a chuckle from those who saw it. But there was that in his face this moment that would not even let a smile dare to be born of it.

Over the hot and dusty bare earth he strode three steps. His hand thrust out. It met and gripped the outthrusting hand of Chief Cameron Wesley.

"Hail, chief," he said, "I have heard. I believe. I speak to tell you that to me you are a free man and chief as before."

"IT IS WELL"

"It is well," said Chief Cameron Wesley.

Both faces might have been carved of some dark wood, for all the emotion they revealed. But that was the moment when a man stepped free of jeopardy.

Eunice Wallace, queen of the Choctaw Tribe, stepped forward.

Her dark hand thrust out; the chief gripped it. Then, one by one, men and women and children, they came to where their chief stood before the great granite marker. The same formula marked each one; the hand grip, the short, spoken phrase, the impassive face.

And there by the grave of the man he slew stood Cameron Wesley. He turned to his white friends.

"I have not all the English to tell you all we say in the Choctaw words," he said. "But they tell me I am their chief for all my life, and they want me to be chief of all the Choctaws in Mississippi."

SHRILL CRIES, DRUM BEATS

Then they danced a dance of celebration around the monument that marks the Dancing Rabbit Treaty Ground. High, shrill Indian yells throbbed through the air. The beat of the drum marked the cadence of leaping feet. The women and children, standing in two lines, facing each other, chanted a clear, musical call as the men circled about them. The lacrosse sticks of their ball game were waved high in air as tomahawks wave in the war dance.

And then Chief Wesley, descendant of warrior ancestors, approached Judge Stennis, the pale-face emblem of the pale-face law.

"You think," he said in a low and gentle voice, "maybe it help my people to pass the hat?"

Judge Stennis' half dollar spun through the air and into the dust-grimed, battered black felt. Scores of coins clinked musically on top of it.

"WAR DANCE TONIGHT"

"Big war dance tonight," announced the Indian chief.

All was "bobbishellie" with Chief Cameron Wesley and people. Everybody was friends once more.

Marshall Ford Dam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH J. MANSFIELD

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 1940

STATEMENT OF HON. JOSEPH J. MANSFIELD, OF TEXAS, BEFORE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement which I made recently before the Committee on Appropriations, Monday, September 9, 1940:

Mr. WOODRUM. Judge, we will be glad to hear you.

Mr. MANSFIELD. On the Marshall Ford Dam on the Colorado River, in Texas, the Government has expended $21,371,000. It is one of these multiple-purpose dams, a superdam—one dam on top

of the other; the lower part for power and the upper part for flood protection—and two appropriations have heretofore been made.

The CHAIRMAN. Is that on the main stream—the main Colorado River?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Not your Colorado River in Nevada and your State.

Mr. TABER. It is on the little Colorado?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes; but it is a large stream—800 miles long.

Mr. CANNON. Where does it have its source?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Right on the border of New Mexico, up in the Great Plains region of Texas, and it flows across the State and down into the Gulf of Mexico.

The CHAIRMAN. Why is it called Colorado?

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is a Spanish name that means red, and the water is frequently of reddish color on account of the red soil in the upper reaches.

The estimated cost of that dam, to start with, was $24,991,000, and you have expended $21,371,000. The Budget has approved $2,500,000 more to complete it, and that will still be less than the estimated cost, to start with.

Mr. TABER. What did you say the estimated cost was?

Mr. MANSFIELD. $24,991,000.

Mr. TABER. And the appropriations to date are what?

Mr. MANSFIELD. $21,371,000.

Mr. TABER. Was there a limit of cost fixed?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I do not think so.

The CHAIRMAN. That was Mr. Buchanan's project, was it not?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes; it was in Mr. Buchanan's district.

The reason I am interested is that the main portion of the flood features are in my district. I have four counties through which this river flows, whereas LYNDON JOHNSON'S district, which was Mr. Buchanan's district, only has two through which it flows, and the flood damage in my district is far greater, because the valley widens out to 12 to 15 miles wide, and that overflows in all of the big floods. We had a tremendous flood last summer, about 3 months ago, and the damage from that was estimated at $5,000,000.

Mr. JOHNSON of West Virginia. Will the completion of this dam take care of that destruction?

Mr. MANSFIELD. This will complete it.

Mr. JOHNSON of West Virginia. But will it take care of the flood damage?

Mr. MANSFIELD. It will practically eliminate all floods originating on the river above that point.

Mr. TABER. How long will it take this dam to silt up?

Mr. MANSFIELD. It will take, I guess, 100 years; I do not know; but the Chief Engineer estimated that it would probably take a hundred years.

Mr. TABER. I understand the Board of Engineers have estimated it will silt up in 6 or 7 years?

Mr. MANSFIELD. No. It will be many, many years, but the engineers can tell you that. The Buchanan Dam is above it, and that will catch the silt. This dam will last for many years longer than the Buchanan Dam, so far as silting up is concerned.

Now the Bureau of Reclamation engineers and also the engineers of the War Department have approved this project.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. We are going to have them in here on it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. And the flood-control bill is pending on the calendar. The President has notified the Speaker not to let it come up; that he had vetoed the rivers and harbors bill and did not want any money expended for these purposes now except where absolutely necessary, and Judge WHITTINGTON is not going to call up the flood-control bill. The bill provides $5,000,000 for levees from Austin to the mouth, or rather, from La Grange, about 60 miles below Austin, to the mouth. That will supplement this dam. The dam, of course, cannot catch the water that flows along the river below it, and there are one or two rather large tributaries that flow into the river below Austin, and the levees are intended to take care of the floods that come from those tributaries. But the main floods that flow down the river come from above this point. The Pedernales, the Llano, and the San Saba Rivers flow into the Colorado above this point, and the Concho, and those are where the main floods have come from.

The estimates of damage, through a period of 13 years, by the engineers of the War Department, are $64,500,000, and 61 lives have been lost during that 13 years. We have later reports on it than that of river floods. That was 8 or 10 years ago that that report was made.

I was county judge there for 20 years and had charge of all of the road and bridge work. There were four bridges in the county in which I lived and three railroad bridges that were washed out a number of times during that 20-year period, and the damage to the railroad was so great that the railway commission of Texas granted an extra charge on all freights crossing that river, as an extra tonnage tax, for having to replace their bridges and the damage that was done to them. That was the Southern Pacific.

I also had charge of the city of Columbus for 14 years, as receiver, when the corporation was abolished, and had charge of the running of the sewage system, the waterworks, and everything during that time, and they were all destroyed on two or three occasions during that time. The damage has been enormous.

Mr. WOODRUM. Well, we will go into it very carefully, judge, and are glad to have your statement on it. Mr. Johnson is coming in on it, and when your transcript comes back suppose you amplify it any way you want to, and put in any facts that you have not covered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Thank you every much. All I want is for you to get the facts before you. And it has been approved by the Budget.

The CHAIRMAN. As I understand you, your idea of this matter is that since we have spent $23,000,000 and $2,500,000 will complete that project, it will be bad business not to complete the project?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes, sir. And, another thing: The equipment will all be removed and it will entail considerable additional expense if the work is not completed continuously, and with this appropriation it will complete the thing before the flood season next summer, they tell me.

Flood protection on this Colorado River has been a major problem for several years. Some time prior to the Civil War the mouth of the river was blocked up by driftwood and other debris. This accumulated for a period of about 70 years, and it was commonly referred to as the raft. It completely filled the bed of the river for a distance of about 27 miles. About 15 years ago this raft was removed, at a cost of $1,225,000, paid by the State of Texas. That has greatly relieved the flood situation on the lower reaches of the river. The river at that time flowed into Matagorda Bay, and the debris from this raft was washed into the bay, filling it up for several miles, destroying the oyster industry.

The bay was separated from the Gulf of Mexico by the Matagorda Peninsula, and a few years ago a channel was cut across the peninsula so that the river now flows directly into the Gulf.

Congress has approved the river for navigation for about 21 miles inland from the Intracoastal Canal. All these improvements near the mouth of the river, made by Federal, State, and local authorities, aggregating about $2,000,000, have greatly relieved the flood situation on that section as well as providing navigation.

With the completion of the Marshall Ford Dam as contemplated by this appropriation, and with the levee system as embraced in the pending flood-control bill, it is believed that the flood situation will be as completely taken care of as it is possible to be done by such improvement.

I have served on the Committees on Flood Control and Rivers and Harbors for 24 years and have a degree of information in regard to nearly all of the rivers in the country. I know of no stream in the United States where flood damage has been more disastrous than it has been on this stream. The valley of the river for 200 miles from the mouth ranges from 1 to 15 miles in width of the most fertile lands in the State of Texas.

Cornerstone Laying of Post Office Building at Broad Ripple, Ind.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS LUDLOW

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 23, 1940

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday was one of the most important days in the history of Broad Ripple, Ind.

With many citizens as witnesses, the cornerstone of a new post-office building was laid with impressive ceremonies.

It fell to my lot to be chosen as the permanent chairman of the meeting, an honor that was all the more appreciated because at Broad Ripple I was among old friends and neighbors.

The ceremonial of laying the cornerstone was performed by the Grand Lodge, F. & A. M., of the State of Indiana, with Right Worshipful Grand Master Claude M. Jacoby, of Logansport, presiding. It was carried out with all of the dignity and beauty of the Masonic ritual. The invocation was by Rev. A. H. Abplanalp, grand chaplain, and the Broad Ripple High School Band gave renditions of patriotic music that charmed all listeners. A feature of exceptional interest was a flag exercise by the Scout troops of Broad Ripple and Nora, Ind. The benediction was by Rev. Joseph V. Somes.

I was presented to the audience by Hon. Adolph Seidensticker, postmaster of Indianapolis, and my address was as follows:

Friends and neighbors of Broad Ripple and northern Indianapolis, it is not my intention on this felicitous occasion to test your powers of endurance by any extended speech of mine, but I will ask your indulgence of my weakness for reminiscences for just a few minutes. This occasion recalls some of my earliest and happiest recollections.

A few years ago I went to Smith W. Purdum, then the Fourth Assistant Postmaster General, and Admiral Christian J. Peoples, then the Chief of the Division of Procurement, and told them of a secret ambition which was rankling in my breast and which I was sure, from all of the unmistakable and clear-cut symptoms,

would never cease to rankle, perhaps with ever increasing intensity, until it was fulfilled.

I had been accustomed to meeting these two splendid officials across the table in the Committee on Appropriations, where, as chairman of the subcommittee in charge of Post Office and Treasury Departments' appropriations, I had interrogated them on many an occasion. They were at that time the chairman of the two-headed interdepartmental committee, representing the Post Office and Treasury Departments, which makes allocations for specific building projects from lump sums voted by Congress.

The two officials listened attentatively while I drew out a rather long-spun yarn, reminding them that even Congressmen sometimes die, and then, again, Congressmen, when they stubbornly refuse to die, sometimes get tossed out on the political scrap heap, and that before either one of those dire fates overtook me I wanted to be helpful in securing a post-office building for my home community in Marion County, Ind., the thriving and growing town of Broad Ripple. I told them of a thousand hallowed memories that bind me in indissoluble bonds of affection to this settlement; that my wife and I own a tract of land out on the Dean Road where, when our ship comes in (if it ever does), we hope to build a home and settle down, and that in the years to come, whenever I mail a letter to Washington bawling out the Government, it will be mailed from this identical post office.

I could see that they were impressed and I thought I could detect a glint of moisture in the admiral's eye. When I had concluded my peroration they promised to send an inspector to Indianapolis to investigate, reminding me in a sort of veiled way that no amount of eloquence would put a project across unless it measured up to certain rules of eligibility as to postal receipts, etc., That was all I wanted to know, as I already had ascertained from Postmaster Seidensticker, whose zeal in favor of the plan was equal to mine, that Broad Ripple probably met the eligibility requirements. The investigation was made, and in due course the inspector's report came into the Department, and I was on hand to receive its contents. It gave the Broad Ripple post office a wide margin to the good over the rigid minimum requirements, holding that a new permanent post-office building ought to be constructed and owned by the Government in this thriving and growing center of population.

Under authority of the Construction Program Act approved June 21, 1938, an allotment of $86,000 was made to include cost of site, building, and administration. On May 20, 1940, this amount was increased $9,500, making the total limit of cost $95,500.

Sites were advertised for and after investigation selection was made on April 19, 1939, of property situated on the east side of Carrollton Avenue south of Sixty-third Street, submitted by Tinch & Grider, as the site on which to erect this building.

The building was designed by the office of the supervising architect, Public Buildings Administration, Federal Works Agency.

On May 29, 1940, the Federal Works Agency awarded the construction contract to John S. Gingrich, of Indianapolis, in the amount of $63,360, with a completion date of 240 calendar days from date of receipt of notice to proceed.

The building is being erected on an inside lot having a frontage of 135.66 feet on Carrollton Avenue and extending to the rear 144.7 feet. The building itself will be 80 feet across the front and will have a depth of 53 feet. It will have a ground floor and one story. The ground area will be 4,528 square feet and the content 133,178 cubic feet.

The building is to be of modern design with brick exterior walls, stone trim, and metal windows. Stone steps, cheek blocks and platform with railings and lamp standards will mark the front entrance.

We have met here today very appropriately to lay the cornerstone for this new and important postal unit, and as I stand in this presence, thinking of the past, what a flood of recollections sweeps over my mind. For months the golden strands of memory have been leading me here to this day and this occasion. When I came to Indianapolis from the deep brush of Fayette County 48 years ago, a green and penniless boy in a strange land, Broad Ripple was as far away from Indianapolis, relatively speaking, as Noblesville is today. There was a wide expanse of farm land between the original mile square and the Ripple, with only an occasional farm dwelling here and there.

Soon after my marriage in 1896 to Miss Katherine Huber, of the staff of the Indianapolis Sentinel, her father, Jonas F. Huber, moved from Irvington to a 70-acre farm on the Dean Road in Washington Township, at what is now Seventy-first Street. No better people ever lived than Mr. and Mrs. Huber. God bless their memory! There are still among us some of the older residents of our township who remember them affectionately. My wife and I own 46 acres of the original 70 acres of the Huber farm on the Dean Road and it is there that we fondly hope sometime to erect our lares and penates in a rose-trellised cottage.

In fact, now that I recall it, I am under a kind of congressional mandate to spend the evening of life there, due to the very extraordinary and peculiar verdict rendered by the Congressional Committee on Elections which found me entitled to a seat in Congress in 1928. After my first election, which occurred that year, my opponent, Mr. Updike, challenged my right to serve on residential grounds, citing that I had long been away from Indiana while pursuing my vocation of Washington newspaper correspondent, but after many legal brows had been corrugated with thought and many learned disquisitions had been prepared and delivered, the congressional committee evolved the theory that my home was where my heart was and where I expected sometime to die, and that erudite decision plunked me right squarely, thence and forevermore, in Washington Township, Marion County, Ind. The unanimous decision of the Republican committee was unanimously ratified by the Republican House of Representatives and I became the first and only person in the history of the Republic to be declared a Hoosier by act of Congress. A noted wit has since remarked:

"It did not require the imprimatur of Congress to brand LUDLOW a Hoosier. You can tell it by looking at him."

Among the vivid recollections of my early married life was a trip my bride and I made with her father in the big wagon from Irvington to his newly purchased farm on the Dean Road. The journey was made at night by way of the city, over a route which may now possibly be College Avenue, though I am not so sure of that. Anyhow it was a bad road with many rough places and the cushionless seat did not add anything to the pleasure of the journey. But being newly married I didn't mind it a bit. If the wagon had ridden over me I would have thought it was a little irregular, but not bad. Every time we hit a chuckhole my bride would cling to me closely for protection. To my way of thinking this privilege of being the strong protector of a lovely girl far more than offset the trials and inconveniences of the trip and my fervent prayer as we went along was for more chuckholes, although every time we struck a chuckhole I could visualize myself eating my meals in a standing posture for days to come. Finally, with a tremendous rattle and several loud bangs the wagon stopped. Something had broken. With half an hour's tinkering by light of the lantern my father-in-law salvaged the situation sufficiently to enable us to drive on. We were all night making that trip from Irvington to the place on the Dean Road. If my wife were here, she could add some embellishments to my description of this epochal trip. Unfortunately she could not come, but she asked me to give her love to everybody here. For some years, or until we began to accumulate a sizable family of our own, we lived with Mr. and Mrs. Huber on the Dean Road. I was a writer on the Indianapolis newspapers in those times and every evening my father-in-law would drive to the entrance of Broad Ripple Park to meet me and take me to his home.

My wife often speaks of the very trying period in her life as a young matron when our two oldest children, Margery and Blanche, attended the Broad Ripple School, riding to and from the Ripple with other children gathered from the four corners of the school district in a horse-drawn bus, or "jolt wagon," as the youngsters called it. This service required early rising, as the bus appeared in front of my father-in-law's house at 6:30 sharp every morning and there was a jerky ride of 22 miles over dusty roads from the time the children were picked up until they were delivered again, safe and sound but well shaken up, at the front gate. My wife often remarks that when the children came home at night it was difficult to recognize them for the dust that covered them from head to feet. We had good schools in Broad Ripple, even in those days. But of course they were not up to the standard set by Karl Ammerman, who is recognized as one of the best school men in the United States.

If it has seemed to you that there was overly much of the personal pronoun in this talk of mine I hope you will forgive me and that you will construe it as an indication, which it is, of my deep personal interest in and affection for this ceremony and all of its background.

I am glad to be here on the same platform with that brilliant and distinguished son of Indiana, Walter Myers, who in the few months he has served as Assistant Postmaster General already has established a record of high efficiency in that important office. I am pleased to have this opportunity to rub elbows with the postmaster of Indianapolis, Mr. Seidensticker, and to say that in the records of the Post Office Department at Washington he is officially recognized as being one of the very best postmasters in the United States and it is a great pleasure to me to be associated on this occasion with Mr. George Thompson, the very efficient manager of the Broad Ripple postal station, whose zeal in paving the way for this new post-office building has been attested by many a personal interview he has had with me and by many a communication on file in my office.

I cannot imagine any other occasion that would have enticed me away from Washington at this particular time when world conditions are so tragically upset and we are building so earnestly the defense and protection that is so necessary to save our own beloved country from involvement. It happens that I am a member of the small subcommittee on deficiencies through which all national-defense estimates are routed to be evaluated for inclusion in appropriation bills. I have voted for all of the estimates sent to us by the Army and Navy and in some instances I have voted to increase budgetary defense estimates where further investigation has shown that the original amount was not sufficient.

"Keep America out of the European war and keep the war out of America" is a motto which to my mind reflects the highest wisdom and patriotism in these trying times. To keep America safe with madmen at loose in the world, it is necessary that we shall make our national defenses so strong that no nation nor any combination of nations will dare to attack us. The task of American statesmanship in these tragic times is to make certain that our boys will not be sent to the slaughter pens of foreign wars and to strengthen our defenses so that war will never come to us. As your Representative, I conceive it to be my duty to work with might and

main to make American defenses impregnable while striving with equal zeal and earnestness to keep America out of foreign entanglements. I cannot for long forsake the hourly obligations that are imposed upon me in this connection. Our subcommittee meets nearly every day, often several times a day, and when this ceremony here is over I shall return immediately to Washington to resume the discharge of my duty, as I see my duty.

A Federal building such as we are erecting in Broad Ripple is far more than a service institution. Great as is its value from the standpoint of service, its even greater value is as a symbol of the strength and dignity and majesty of the Government of the United States, the last citadel of freedom. Every time I visit a foreign country I say "Thank God for America." Last year I visited a country where the labor wage scale ranges from 3 cents to 5 cents an hour. What would our American workingmen think of a wage income around $2.50 and $3 a week? I wonder whether we who enjoy this land of freedom and opportunity can realize what it would mean to live in a country where freedom has been stamped out by the heel of totalitarian oppression and where the individual is directed and coerced and bullied at every turn. This structure should be a reminder not only to those of our era but to generations yet unborn of the blessings of free institutions and the obligation resting upon us and on posterity down to the remotest generation to keep the lanes of opportunity forever open. In the future when we pass this beautiful building and see the glorious ensign of the Republic floating above it, let us solemnly resolve once more "that government of the people, by the people, and for the people shall not perish from this earth."

A high light of the afternoon was an address by Hon. Walter Myers, Fourth Assistant Postmaster General, whose home is in Indianapolis, a short distance from Broad Ripple. In presenting him as the closing speaker, I reminded the listeners that Mr. Myers, who is an outstanding Hoosier orator, needed no introduction to any Indiana audience. Mr. Myers spoke in part as follows:

More than 30 years ago when I first came to Indianapolis, Broad Ripple was a little town out in the country. People went there in the summertime to get near the river and rest. It was reached largely by interurban and street cars.

There were few country roads paved then. Not too many city streets were paved. There were few automobiles. No tractors. No trailers. No trucks. No airplanes. No "blitzkriegs." No income tax. Billion was a term to measure the distance between the stars. Gold was the standard of hard money. There was no totalitarian government.

At that time everybody believed that Government guaranteed to each citizen certain inalienable rights. Each right carried with it a reciprocal duty or obligation such as to pay taxes for the upkeep of the Government and to bear arms in its defense.

How different things are today. Practically every country road is paved and almost every city street. There is practically an automobile for every three or four persons. The bray of the mule and the whinny of the horse have been replaced by the putt-putt of the tractor. Cattle and hogs are taken on a joy ride to the stockyards in trucks or trailers. We have income tax, both State and Federal, and they are getting higher through the necessity of defense. The possession of gold is as much of an offense as the possession of intoxicating liquor was during prohibition. The national debt is measured in tens of billions of dollars and the term billion is now applied to the measurement of money and the counting of germs. Practically all of Europe is under totalitarian government.

In totalitarian government endless duties are imposed on every citizen. It does not necessarily follow that the citizen of these countries is getting reciprocal rights. Each citizen takes what the man above him chooses to give or let him have, and this, according to totalitarian theory, should make him so happy that he is ready to throw his hat in the air and cheer whenever the cheer leader raises his arms or the dictator's name is mentioned. The citizen, according to this theory, is just a minute fraction of the state. The state is something more than the sum of all its parts, and the citizen is something less than a fractional part of the whole.

Rights are "total," duties are "total," and the dictators speak of war as "total," and "total" war means wholesale destruction of men, women, children, the aged, and the defenseless. The truth of the matter is that nothing is "total" in totalitarian governments except tyranny.

And tyranny is tyranny whether it is the tyranny of the autocrat, the tyranny of the mob, or the tyranny of a minority pressure group that in one way or another has obtained and holds the purse strings of the government in one hand and its armed forces in the other.

Our Constitution provides against the tyranny of the autocrat and the tyranny of the mob. It remains to be seen whether it provides sufficiently against the tyranny of the minority pressure group which in a roundabout way leads both to tyranny of autocrats and tyranny of mobs.

Our Government is run in the interest of all the people, and that means in the interest of the average man. It is not intended to make the rich richer or the poor poorer. It is intended to bring the greatest happiness to the greatest number.

So we lay this cornerstone on the principles of truth, justice, and freedom, the same principles upon which the cornerstone of our common country is laid. We lay it in the memory of the living and the dead who have made our country what it is. We lay it in the hope that those yet to come will preserve, protect, and defend it as their fathers did before them. There must be no totalitarian government in America, no "total" political leaders, no "total" political group. America must remain a free country for free men. Dictatorship must be resisted to the death, whether it is sought to be imposed from within or from without. We lay it in the belief that the building here to be erected will be dedicated to that fundamental tenet of our faith—the fullest good for each in the betterment of all.

The Airplane Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS T. MALONEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 27 (legislative day of Wednesday, September 18), 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE HARTFORD (CONN.) TIMES

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very interesting editorial which appeared in the Hartford Times on Thursday, September 19.

The editorial refers to our national-defense program—particularly in reference to the construction of plants—and emphatically to the program and problem of training pilots. Our air program—and pilot training—is a subject with which most of us are greatly concerned, and I am asking the insertion of this editorial only with the hope that it may lay some emphasis on this particular part of our national-defense effort and that it may be helpful.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Hartford (Conn.) Times of September 19, 1940]

THE AIRPLANE PROGRAM

Mr. Knudsen, of the National Defense Commission, said recently at Buffalo that the Army and Navy would have about 11,000 combat planes within 19 months. This figure is based upon a total production between now and May 1, 1942, of 33,000 planes, of which 14,000 are under contract to Great Britain and the remainder will be built for the United States. Of the latter, 60 percent will be combat ships.

Almost at the same time Washington dispatches told of the Army sending hurry-up letters to 21 private manufacturers "for immediate start of a vast program to build 14,394 fighting planes." This program was said to bring the total number of aircraft on order to 22,091.

With the various spokesmen offering figures so widely apart and with Washington talking about appropriations, orders, and programs it is not surprising if the people of the Nation are confused when they try to understand what is being done. It is too much to expect the average citizen to have any accurate knowledge of the actual aircraft program or, indeed, of the whole defense picture.

The Knudsen and Army statements are not in conflict. They do not deal with the same thing. Mr. Knudsen was discussing planes to be completed within a given period. The Army was discussing a larger program which includes that which Knudsen was talking about. But it is not easy for the casual reader to make such distinctions.

Judging from activities in this vicinity, with which Hartford is familiar, Mr. Knudsen's does not seem like an impossible estimate. There are however certain things to be said about it.

Of the 33,000 planes to be built, 14,000 are destined for Great Britain. For the remaining 19,000, which the United States will get, manufacturing facilities probably will have to be provided to a very large extent before there can be any actual building of planes or their power plants. Additional plant facilities must be built and equipped with machinery much of which also is still to be built.

An established and operating airplane or engine company cannot build such plant additions and put them into production in less than 8 months under the most favorable circumstances. For Henry Ford, who is going into the plane engine-building business de novo and whose output is included in the Army estimate, a full year probably will pass before his new plant is in quantity production.

Mr. Knudsen's 11,000 planes, which are to be ready by May 1, 1942, will require at least 25,000 trained pilots and more than twice that

number of trained mechanics to service them. Such men are not trained in a moment, particularly pilots for such complicated ships.

Obviously there is as much need for a gigantic personnel-training program as for a program of plane building. Surely it will profit the Nation little to find itself possessed of 11,000 planes early in 1942 unless it likewise has the manpower to handle them.

It is pertinent to wonder what steps are being taken in that direction. It would be quite as assuring to learn that the Nation's plans in that respect are adequate as to be told in five-figure numbers of the planes which have been ordered.

If it is going to take 8 months, and in the case of Mr. Ford 12 months, to get into production the added plant facilities necessary to build training planes in considerable quantities, it seems apparent that we can hardly start to train fliers in sufficient numbers for at least that time.

On basis of present production of 900 planes a month, of which 80 percent is for the British, we certainly are not getting a horde of training planes now.

We obviously cannot cut down on the British production without lessening Britain's chance of winning, which is important for us.

This suggests that while the present construction program is heartening for the prospects it holds of the early acquisition of adequate air equipment, it does not seem equally reassuring of an early production of planes to train the men who should be ready by early 1942 to man the fighting planes which will be then available. There is a Gordian knot for official scrutiny and someone's cutting.

Involvement of the United States in the War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES W. TOBEY

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 27 (legislative day of Wednesday, September 18), 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE SATURDAY EVENING POST

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Saturday Evening Post of September 7, 1940, entitled "While Yet There Is Time To Think."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Saturday Evening Post of September 7, 1940]

WHILE YET THERE IS TIME TO THINK

In a kind of hypnosis, produced partly by propaganda designed for people who believed themselves to be cynical and immune, partly by a sincere crusading evangel carried on by those whose emotions, as we think, have overcome their reason, but mainly by a government whose foreign policy, to call it such, has been compounded of a spirit of moral grandeur, international heroics, delusions of a military power not in being, false premises, and panic, this country now goes where it does not look and looks where it does not go.

If it should come awake one morning to read in the newspaper headlines, or hear by the radio, that it had walked backward into war, it would take it no doubt as having been somehow inevitable from the first, and yet nobody would be able to say quite how or why it happened.

As the hagfish enters the body of its victim unawares and slowly displaces it by devouring it, so it is that ideas that were clear and virile in the beginning have been devoured by new meanings, with no change of the word shells, until now you may be called anti-American, a "fifth columnist" or an appeaser if you doubt that the only way to keep America out of the war is to get into it, that to save ourselves we have first to save the British Empire, or that our first line of defense is and always has been the English Channel.

The Post's position cannot be misunderstood. Before the blitzkrieg started, we said: "What we need for practical security is first of all a new word. The word is impregnability, or state of supreme defense. We need more than a bigger Navy. We need two, one for the Atlantic and one for the Pacific, each incomparable. We need an impervious antiaircraft wall. We need to be able to meet not any aggressor, but any combination of aggressors. Then we may be sure that the principle of free institutions as a basis of modern civilization shall have, beyond the solace of words, a time yet to live in this world."

And that is our position still.

Now the Congress has voted a 2-ocean Navy; for this proper sea power, for an approach to adequate air power, and for an Army of 2,000,000 men, it has voted in a few weeks extraordinary appropriations rising to $10,000,000,000. We are not interested in the sums. We shall have to spend a great deal more than ten billions to create a power of defense equal to the power of aggression that has made this all at once a pirate world without law, the lean and hungry nations, as Mussolini says, out to take what they can from the fat ones by force. That, too, we have said.

It is defense we are thinking about, not war. And what concerns us now is that this distinction is becoming blurred.

What are we preparing for—defense or war?

Either the executive government itself does not know or it is unwilling to clarify the situation with a few positive words. We suppose the reason why it cannot do this is that it is already too much involved in its own confusions. Pursuing the insidious formula of measures short of war, conceived, to begin with, on a gross underestimate of the aggressor's power, it was carried headlong into acts of physical intervention for the consequences and implications of which the country was in every way unprepared, to say nothing of the fact that it acted without the consent of Congress and beyond the awareness of the people.

In his message to France on June 15, the President said: "The Government of the United States has made it possible for allied armies to obtain, during the weeks that have just passed, airplanes, artillery, and munitions of many kinds, and * * * this Government, so long as the allied governments continue to resist, will redouble its efforts in this direction."

That was the United States Government speaking, acting, pledging itself to assist in the war against Hitler to the utmost, short only of an actual declaration of hostilities. It was already too late to save France. Moreover, nothing we had been able to send her, even our total military power, including the Navy, could have saved her, which was a trifling reality the Government was unable to comprehend.

Only 6 weeks later, the Secretary of War is saying to the House Committee on Military Affairs, in support of the conscription bill, that there is very grave danger of a direct attack upon the United States by Hitler. He is asked how long it will take to prepare a suitable defense. He says: "We will not have it in time to meet the first possibility of invasion."

The Secretary of War, of course, is speaking directly for the administration. He is saying what it thinks. The administration thinks there is very grave danger of an invasion of this country by Hitler before we can be ready to meet it. But this is the same administration that stripped the American defense of rifles, artillery, munitions, and airplanes and sent them to the Allies. It is the same administration that would have delivered to the British Admiralty the whole of our mosquito fleet in building if the Congress had not found a law to stop it. It is the same administration that has ever since been trying to find a way to deliver United States Navy destroyers to the British. If what it thinks is true—that there is grave danger of an invasion of this country by Hitler before we can get ready—then we have not a rifle, a gun, an airplane, or a rowboat to spare, nor any industrial capacity. On the day the Secretary of War was making his statement before the House committee, the New York newspapers carried pictures of National Guard men training with imaginary machine guns devised by plumbers out of gas pipe.

We can imagine circumstances in which the highest strategy would call for taking the war to the enemy. We cannot conceive of circumstances in which it is permitted in sanity to slap danger in the face before you are ready to meet it—to name an enemy who has not named you, to attack an enemy who has not yet attacked you, before you are ready to fight him.

Our enemies, the administration keeps telling the people, are Germany, Italy, and Japan, naming them. Not one of them has made a gesture of war toward us. For all we think and feel about Hitler, he has not attacked us. He says he does not intend to. We do not believe him. Nobody in the world now believes him. Very well. But the American Government has attacked Hitler, first by words, then by measures short of war, then by giving pledge to his enemies to assist them by all physical means to the utmost.

In June the American Government entered the war against Hitler by acts of physical intervention all the worse because they were futile.

In July that same Government is telling the people they are in grave danger of being attacked by Hitler before they can get ready to meet him. "Hitler does not wait," said the Secretary of War to the House Committee on Military Affairs—and the National Guard men in New York training with gas-pipe guns!

What a triumph for statecraft! What strategy!

What a face for a great nation!

These are the conditions under which there has been created in the country a war psychosis, misled by cries of "Stop Hitler now!" and "Defend America by aiding the Allies." We had nothing to stop Hitler with in Europe. A government that either did not know that, or made believe it was not so, now is saying that if he decided to invade the United States soon, as there is very grave danger that he may, we are not ready to stop him here. Nevertheless, it goes on to declare against him an economic war—a Pan-American economic bloc against his European bloc—for which also it is unprepared, not having thought it through, not having calculated the cost.

We do not believe that an invasion of the United States by Hitler is among the imminent possibilities. The word of the Government for it does not greatly impress us. A government that had been so wrong about his power to overcome in Europe and about the power of France to resist could very well be wrong again. Nor do we believe that 50 or 60 destroyers from the United States Navy would save the British Empire. That would be but another futile act of futile intervention, much more likely to infuriate an enemy we are not prepared to meet than to save a friend.

We are bound to be emotionally torn by the spectacle of the British Empire fighting for its life. That is a feeling that lies deep in us and is shared even by those who still can think in a realistic manner. The fall of the British Empire would be a mighty human disaster. Yet we part with those who say, or who believe, it would mean the end of American civilization, and part with them again when they would in any degree weaken the American defense to repair the weakness of Great Britain's, for which Great Britain, not we, are responsible. We add here two reflections—first, that Great Britain would be stronger if she had stood alone; second, the enemy is governed by logic, not emotion.

We stand, therefore, in our first position. Let us jealously mind our own defense in the great manner of a great people, resolved to be let alone. Let us build at any cost a dreadnought defense power such as no aggressor, nor any combination of aggressors, will dare to challenge. Thus we forfend war.

And meanwhile, for this will take some time, let us look very hard at a state of facts. The German thing has conquered Europe. That will be still true whether the British Empire stands or falls.

Who is going to put the German thing back? The British? They are not able.

Shall we do it? Unless we are willing to go to Europe and destroy it there, we may as well make up our minds now that we shall have to live in the same world with it, maybe for a long time, whether we like it or not. Nonetheless, for that reason, only all the more, we should, we must, create on this continent the incomparable power of defense. After that we shall see. For after that we shall be again as we once were, safe and free and dangerous.

Administration of Conscription Without "Fear or Favor"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 24, 1940

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, nothing more typical of the Rooseveltian view of the status of the President's family in this Nation has happened in the 8 years of the New Deal administration than the "sacrifice" which young Capt. Elliott Roosevelt has undertaken by accepting a commission in the Air Service as a "specialist" in procurement.

Gen. Hugh S. Johnson did the Nation a service when he pointed out that the President had said that the selective-service law must be administered "fairly and without fear or favor." That is what the President told the Governors, and that is the way the selective-service law should be administered. As General Johnson pointed out, if the plan is not fairly administered it not only will not work but could be used for politics or any other kind of "fear or favor," and would become one of the most hateful and un-American systems of oppression and injustice ever invented.

It was further very properly pointed out that not only must the administration of the Selective Draft Act be completely fair and equitable, but that it must be so far above suspicion that the whole Nation would be convinced of it. The poorest mother of the most humble son, as the columnist pointed out, must be secure in her confidence that her boy will be treated exactly the same as the son of the most powerful man in the Nation or of all other grades clear down to her own station in life.

It was a spectacle to sicken the heart of every American lover of fair play that on the very day the President was declaring that the Selective Draft Act must be administered "fairly and without fear or favor," his own son Elliott was being commissioned in the service as a captain in the Air Corps. Not as a flyer, because that takes work and training. Elliott goes in as what General Johnson says the airmen call a "kee-wee"—a bird without wings.

He did not apply to any recruiting office. The head of the Army Air Corps, General Arnold himself, assigned the new Captain Roosevelt from the "specialist Reserve" to the new job in "procurement," which has to do with buying supplies, a less hazardous assignment than which could scarcely be found. When asked what kind of a specialist Capt. Elliott Roosevelt was supposed to be, the officials are said to have replied that this information was "confidential."

As a captain, of course, Elliott Roosevelt will draw $200 a month, plus allowances possibly up to $116 a month, instead of ordinary Army pay of $30 a month.

Being 30 years of age, this boy would have been in the selective-draft pool. It is probable that, being married, he would not have been taken in the first draft. It is also true that his mother a few days ago held forth at some length on the theme that her boys, married though they are, should be ready to make the same "sacrifices" that other boys do because their families would be in no danger of want or privation. Of course, this job of being a captain in procurement, where there are no hazards of flying or fighting to be encountered, is a great and noble "sacrifice" on the part of young Elliott Roosevelt. Perhaps it is not rare or even unusual, however, because undoubtedly there are a good many American boys of 30 who would be willing to "sacrifice" themselves as captains in the procurement division of the air service. Indeed, some of them might even be persuaded to make the greater sacrifice of becoming a major or a colonel in the procurement service, provided their "specialist" qualifications were not made a matter of public information.

And thus again we find that the Roosevelt family, from the President down, is never ready to take any dose of the medicine they are so willing to prescribe for the rest of the citizens of this country.

Col. Henry Watterson Warns Against Third Term

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. ROBSION

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 24, 1940

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted I am including in my remarks a great editorial from the pen of one of America's greatest editors, Col. Henry Watterson, a great Democrat, and the former famous and brilliant editor of the Louisville (Ky.) Courier-Journal. This editorial appeared in the Courier-Journal October 12, 1910, in the usual double-leaded Watterson style. The suggested candidacy for a third term of ex-President Theodore Roosevelt prompted these utterances.

The editorial of Colonel Watterson is as follows:

THE ONE-MAN POWER

The President of the United States has more and greater power than any sovereign in Europe. He is the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy. He has the appointment of Federal officers at home and abroad. Through the Treasury Department he may control the rise and fall of prices. Through the Department of Commerce he may coerce the corporations; through the Interstate Commerce Commission, the railways. He is master of the Secret Service. It is his to forbid an act of Congress to become law.

In the hands of a strong, ambitious, and unscrupulous man nothing short of armed resistance could stand against such an array of forces; and armed resistance could nowhere organize itself against a President having the foresight to provide against it; able by a word to concentrate troops at any given point; by the touch of a button to order the arrest of the resistant at the farthest ends of the Republic.

There is no tyranny more unreasoning than that of majorities; no despotism so relentless as party despotism. Backed by these, while inventing a pretext, a President of the United States could do with impunity what a Czar of Russia or a Sultan of Turkey would never dare attempt. Thus throughout the ages have absolutism and arbitrary power done their perfect work. All that stands between the people and these is the time limit set upon Presidential elections, and the third-term tradition bequeathed us by Washington, which has for a period of 100 years restricted the individual occupancy of the Presidential chair to 8 years.

Lift this time limit and life tenure is the logical consequence. Life tenure means absolutism and arbitrary power. Under the title of President we would have an autocrat, having already an imperial republic under democratic forms and names.

Nor is there any less reason why we should not find such a ruler in some popular favorite than that England found one in Cromwell and that Mexico actually has one in Diaz, except that we guard the approaches to life tenure by preserving the third-term tradition, because the 4 years' requirement upon the Presidential election, as we have seen in Mexico, raises no bar against life tenure. The need of one date becomes the exigency of another date until self-perpetuation is not only easy but taken for granted by a people accustomed to usurpations of power. At last the revolution is accepted as a matter of course.

The plea that we are not as other nations, that what has happened elsewhere could not happen here, is a figment of self-love, heedless of the future and glorying in its ignorance.

Colonel Watterson points out in his editorial in 1910:

The President of the United States has more and greater power than any sovereign in Europe. He is the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy. He has the appointment of Federal officers at home and abroad. Through the Treasury Department he may control the rise and fall of prices. Through the Department of Commerce he may coerce the corporations; through the Interstate Commerce Commission, the railways. He is master of the Secret Service. It is his to forbid an act of Congress to become law.

If the candidacy of ex-President Theodore Roosevelt for a third term was a threat to the Nation in 1910, how much greater threat is the candidacy of his cousin, President Franklin D. Roosevelt, in 1940? Theodore Roosevelt at that time was an ex-President with about 7 years and 4 months service. On March 4, 1909, he retired, and the mantle of this high office was placed on the shoulders of President Taft. He was stripped of the power of the Presidency. Most of the men he had given important offices with the Government had been supplanted by the appointees of President Taft.

In 1910 we had approximately 80,718 officers and men in the Army, 47,997 officers and men in the Navy, and 9,486 officers and men in the Marine Corps, but Theodore Roosevelt was merely the ex-Commander in Chief of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps. Today President Franklin D. Roosevelt is the Commander in Chief of an Army, Navy, and Marine Corps of approximately a million men, consisting of the Regular Establishment, the National Guard, and Reserve. At his request the conscription law has been passed that places under his thumb 16,500,000 men ranging in ages from 21 to 36 years of age, and millions of boys who will become 21 years of age within the next 5 years. President Roosevelt can call these millions of men into the service at any time and under certain circumstances can hold them for any length of time, and this same law drafts the wealth of the Nation, industrial plants, and all other agencies that produce those things essential to national defense. That, of course, could include practically everything.

Congress appropriated for the Army and Navy for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1910, a few hundred million dollars. Since January 3, 1940, at the request of President Roosevelt, Congress has appropriated and authorized and placed at his disposal for the Army and Navy and auxiliaries more than $12,000,000,000. In 1910 we had very few bureaus and commissions. Now we have over 60 powerful bureaus and commissions with hundreds of thousands of employees expending billions of dollars annually. In 1910 we had approximately 384,000 Federal officeholders—about two-thirds of these were under the classified civil service. President Roosevelt has under his control now more than a million Federal officeholders, and hundreds of thousands of these are not under civil service. The President has under his control nearly 2,000,000 W. P. A. workers, 300,000 C. C. C. enrollees, a hundred thousand of N. Y. A. workers, and millions of men and women who receive some sort of relief or bounty from the Government distributed by the appointees of the President.

The records of the Treasury Department show that there was expended by this Government for all purposes for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1910, $693,917,000. That was mere pin money. The present Congress, at the behest of President Roosevelt, has appropriated and authorized to be appropriated and expended by the President and his aides, nearly $23,000,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941. That is a sum nearly forty times as much as was expended under the administration of President Taft for the year ending June 30, 1910.

And what about the control and rise and fall of prices under President Roosevelt as compared with 1910? What about the power to coerce the corporations in 1940 as compared with 1910? President Roosevelt has regimented agriculture, labor, industry, and commerce.

Colonel Watterson continues in describing the tremendous power that the President of the United States had in 1910:

In the hands of a strong, ambitious, and unscrupulous man, nothing short of armed resistance could stand against such an array of forces; and armed resistance could nowhere organize itself against a President having the foresight to provide against it; able by a word to concentrate troops at any given point; by the touch of a button to order the arrest of the resistant at the farthest ends of the Republic.

No one denies that the President is politically ambitious. He is the only President in our country's history that has sought a third consecutive term and defied the good example of George Washington, and the advice of Thomas Jefferson, the founder of the Democratic Party, and the warning of Andrew Jackson, the patron saint of the Democratic Party. His cousin, Theodore Roosevelt, after having surrendered the office sought the Republican nomination in 1912, but this was refused him by the Republican Party and then it was that Theodore Roosevelt accepted the nomination of the Progressive Party when the third term was denied him by the American people.

Mr. Roosevelt has a subservient Congress that has granted him more dictatorial and extraordinary powers than have been granted to all of our Presidents in peacetime. He has placed a majority of those who follow his political and economic philosophy on the Supreme Court. He has untold billions at his disposal. He has an army of more than a million Federal officeholders. He has millions of others who are subject to the bounty of his hands, and now he has the manpower and the wealth of the Nation at his disposal. He is the most powerful ruler in the world today and has more power than any ruler in all history. How puny were the powers of the President in 1910 compared with the power today of President Roosevelt. Yet, Colonel Watterson said of the Presidency in 1910, the then powers in the hands of a strong, ambitious, and unscrupulous President, nothing could stand against him short of armed resistance, and armed resistance could nowhere organize itself against a President having the foresight to provide against it as he would be able to prepare against it by concentrating his troops at any given point, and by the touch of a button could order the arrest of any resistant at the farthest ends of the Republic.

Colonel Watterson further comments:

There is no tyranny more unreasoning than that of majorities; no despotism so relentless as party despotism. Backed by these, while inventing a pretext, a President of the United States could do with impunity what a Czar of Russia or a Sultan of Turkey would never dare attempt. Thus throughout the ages have absolutism and arbitrary power done their perfect work. All that stands between the people and these is the time limit set upon Presidential elections, and the third-term tradition bequeathed us by Washington, which has for a period of 100 years restricted the individual occupancy of the Presidential chair to 8 years.

Colonel Watterson warns:

Lift this time limit, and life tenure is the logical consequence. Life tenure means absolutism and arbitrary power. Under the title of president we would have an autocrat, having already an imperial republic under democratic forms and names.

President Roosevelt made a failure as a lawyer and in business. He bankrupted the State of New York as Governor, and has bankrupted this country, and when war threatens we find ourselves unprepared and defenseless, but he now insists that he is the "indispensable man." Washington, Jefferson, Jackson, Cleveland, and others were not indispensable in the trying days of this Republic—they were successful, they were not failures. If it is argued that Mr. Roosevelt is indispensable for a third term, by the same logic he would be more indispensable for the fourth term

and for life. Hitler and Mussolini insist that they are indispensable men. Napoleon was an indispensable man. He left his country broken, torn, and bleeding, as will Hitler and Mussolini leave their countries in the end, and Mr. Roosevelt, if given time, will complete the devastation and wrecking of this Nation.

President Wilson declared most emphatically that there is no "indispensable man" in this country. This Nation must be bankrupt indeed in intelligence, courage, patriotism, and ability if we now find ourselves with only one man that can direct the affairs of this Nation. We are then no longer a great democracy. We are a totalitarian state with one man only possessing the intelligence, experience, and power to direct the destinies of this great people. But some say that we cannot lose our liberties. The indispensable man can take away the liberties of people of Germany or Italy or Russia but it will not happen in the United States. Colonel Watterson says that if we accept the formula that we must elect a man for a third term or a fourth term and then for life, "at the last the revolution is accepted as a matter of course." And as a final warning he points out:

> The plea that we are not as other nations, that what has happened elsewhere could not happen here, is a figment of self-love, heedless of the future, and glorying in its ignorance.

Mr. Roosevelt is not indispensable. Agriculture, industry, and unemployment problems are as far from solution as when he took office March 4, 1933. Taxes, deficits, and the national debt grow by leaps and bounds. It is now said that there are 45,000,000 undernourished people in this country. Class hatred is fanned. We continue to meddle and muddle in the affairs of the nations of Europe, Asia, and Africa, and this indispensable man before he is through will very likely involve us in another bloody, costly world war. This will mean a complete bankruptcy of this Republic, tremendous loss of life, the lowering of our standard of living, a complete upset of our economic, social, and political life, and worst of all the loss of most, if not all, of our cherished liberties.

Other great Democrats like the great Watterson have warned the American people. Will they heed it or pay through the nose in regrets throughout the years?

We have had ample evidence of the tremendous power now wielded by the President. He forced Congress into submission. He stacked the Supreme Court. With this power and the aid of the great political machines in New York and Chicago and New Jersey cities and other places, he silenced great Democratic leaders and beat his party into submission and brought together a lot of "yes men" as delegates, who gave him the nomination for the third term, and forced them to accept his candidate for the Vice Presidency. We see this tremendous power again being used to force him on the American people for a third term.

Tribute to Senator Ashurst

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 27 (legislative day of Wednesday, September 18), 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE ALEXANDRIA (VA.) GAZETTE

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Alexandria Gazette, America's oldest daily newspaper, in which a deserved and most proper tribute is paid to my dear friend and colleague the Senator from Arizona, the Honorable HENRY F. ASHURST.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Alexandria (Va.) Gazette of September 19, 1940]

A DISTINGUISHED SENATOR RETIRES

The title of Carrie Jacobs Bond's beautiful song, The End of a Perfect Day, might well be paraphrased as "the end of a perfect service" in the case of the Honorable HENRY F. ASHURST, the retiring Democratic Senator from Arizona. The sentiment is expressive, too, of that service which has been rounded, complete, and satisfying. It has been given to the Nation and his State in such a manner as to make him the outstanding figure and best beloved Member of that august body, the United States Senate.

His popularity began from the moment he took the oath of office 28 years ago, and it has never been dimmed. Instead it has greatly increased as his capabilities and his display of them were exhibited.

Since the days of Daniel Webster the Senate has not heard so polished, so brilliant, and so forceful an orator. In debate he was the past master of wit, repartee, and rejoinder, but in his verbal combats with his colleagues his rapier was always tipped with a rose. Its thrust was clean-cut and left no poison in the wound. In learning no Senator was comparable with him, except the late John Sharp Williams; even the erudite and scholarly Henry Cabot Lodge did not surpass him. He drank deep at the fountain of knowledge. In courtesy and chivalry he was the peer of James Hamilton Lewis.

His remarks on the most prosaic subjects were classics, and Senate and galleries sat entranced with his eloquence as he spoke. With equal ease and readiness he could discourse at length on literature, art, music, science, philosophy, and the drama. His wide vocabulary has never been equaled in the Senate, and each word uttered fitted like a mosaic in the picture he drew. All of HENRY F. ASHURST'S many attainments might be described by using the superlative, without exaggeration. Even his faults, if he had any, were of the best. His departure causes greater regret to his associates and friends than to himself, for it has been the philosophy of his life to accept fate with a smile.

His defeat for renomination must be found in causes other than himself.